

**THE POLITICS OF SUFI NETWORKING: NAQSHBANDIS IN THE
OTTOMAN ISTANBUL, 1650-1800**

by
İSA UĞURLU

Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Sabancı University
January 2024

**THE POLITICS OF SUFI NETWORKING: NAQSHBANDIS IN THE
OTTOMAN ISTANBUL, 1650-1800**

Approved by:

Prof. Tülay Artan
(Dissertation Advisor)

Assoc. Prof. Abdurrahman Atçıl

Prof. Selim Karahasanoğlu

Assoc. Prof. Selçuk Akşin Somel

Prof. Christoph K. Neumann

Date of Approval: January 26, 2024

İSA UĞURLU 2024 ©

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

THE POLITICS OF SUFI NETWORKING: NAQSHBANDIS IN THE OTTOMAN ISTANBUL, 1650-1800

İSA UĞURLU

HISTORY Ph.D DISSERTATION, JANUARY 2024

Dissertation Supervisor: Prof. TÜLAY ARTAN

Keywords: Naqshbandi, Istanbul, Murâd Bukhârî, Mehmed İsmet, Patronage

This dissertation examines the history of the Naqshbandi order in the Ottoman Istanbul by focusing on a hundred and half centuries period from 1650 to 1800. As such, it delves into the historical trajectory of the order and key Naqshbandi figures in five main chapters. The first chapter explores the Naqshbandi lodges established in the city from the mid-15th century to the end of the 18th century, categorizing them into first- and second-wave lodges. Utilizing new archival documents, it reassesses their significance and function, shedding light on the reasons behind their establishment. Focusing on Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî, the second chapter analyzes his networking policies in Istanbul through his understudied correspondences and treatises. It unveils insights into his socio-political and religio-Sufi connections, highlighting the formation of an immaterial republic around him resembling the Western Republic of Letters. The third chapter discusses four primary reasons behind the dissemination and consolidation of the Naqshbandi order, emphasizing its concordance with the ulema and sharia, familial cooperations with seyyids, the constructive role of lodgeless şeyhs, and intra-Sufi cooperation that fostered by the culture of coexistence. The fourth and fifth chapters are reserved for Mehmed İsmet Efendi, a lodgeless şeyh with affiliations to multiple Sufi brotherhoods. While the fourth chapter delves into his biography and scholarly works, and explores his intellectual orientations, the fifth chapter investigates the patronage networks supporting his scholarly production, highlighting the role of diverse patrons adhered to various Sufi orders in his endeavor.

ÖZET

SUFI AĞLARININ SİYASETİ: OSMANLI İSTANBUL'UNDA NAKŞİBENDİLER, 1650-1800

İSA UĞURLU

TARİH DOKTORA TEZİ, OCAK 2024

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. TÛLAY ARTAN

Anahtar Kelimeler: Nakşibendi, İstanbul, Murâd Buhârî, Mehmed İsmet, Himaye

Bu tez, Nakşibendi tarikatının Osmanlı İstanbul'undaki tarihini 1650 ile 1800 arasındaki yüz elli yıllık bir döneme odaklanarak incelemektedir. Bu bağlamda, tarikatın tarihi seyrini ve önde gelen Nakşibendileri beş ana bölümde araştırmaktadır. Birinci bölüm, 15. yüzyılın ortasından 18. yüzyılın sonuna kadar İstanbul'da kurulan Nakşibendi tekkelerini, bunları “birinci dalga” ve “ikinci dalga” şeklinde sınıflandırarak tetkik etmekte, yeni arşiv belgelerinden faydalanarak bunların önemini ve fonksiyonunu yeniden değerlendirmekte ve kurulma sebeplerini aydınlatmaktadır. Şeyh Murâd Buhârî'ye odaklanan ikinci bölüm, onun İstanbul'da network kurma politikalarını yeterince çalışılmayan mektupları ve risaleleri üzerinden analiz etmekte, sosyo-politik ve dini-tasavvufi bağlantılarının içyüzünü ortaya çıkarmakta ve etrafında Batı'daki Bilginler Cumhuriyeti'ni andıran soyut bir cumhuriyetin teşekkül ettiğini vurgulamaktadır. Üçüncü bölüm, Nakşibendi tarikatının yayılması ve güçlenmesinin arkasındaki dört asıl sebebi tartışarak, ulema ve şeriatla olan uyumun, seyyidlerle kurulan ailevi ittifakların, tekkesiz şeyhlerin yapıcı rolünün ve birlikte var olma kültürüyle beslenen Sufilerarası işbirliğinin altını çizmektedir. Dördüncü ve beşinci bölümler, birçok tarikata müntesip tekkesiz bir şeyh olan Mehmed İsmet Efendi'ye ayrılmıştır. Dördüncü bölüm, hayat hikayesine ve ilmi eserlerine dalmak suretiyle onun entelektüel yönelimlerini araştırırken, beşinci bölüm onun ilmi üretimini mümkün kılan himaye ağlarını araştırmakta, çeşitli tarikatlara intisabı olan birçok haminin onun gayretindeki rolünü vurgulamaktadır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Tlay Artan for her unwavering support, invaluable guidance, and relentless encouragement throughout my doctoral journey. She has guided me patiently and provided me with insightful feedback and comments throughout my research. Her expertise, encouragement, and sincerity have been instrumental in completing this dissertation.

I am also profoundly grateful to the members of my committee, Abdurrahman Atıl, Selim Karahasanođlu, Seluk Akın Somel, and Christoph K. Neumann, for their generous and constructive criticism, eye-opening comments, expert advice, and scholarly inputs, which have significantly enriched the quality of this study. I am also thankful to Yusuf Hakan Erdem who contributed to my research at the initial stages of it, and Seyfi Kenan who encouraged me by expressing his trust in me during a torrid time.

I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to the staff and directors of the manuscript libraries of Sleymaniye, Beyazıt, Kandilli Observatory, and Istanbul University who provided a comfortable and spacious environment for me during my research. I am particularly indebted to Tahsin Tahaođlu from Kandilli and staff of Sleymaniye and Beyazıt who patiently helped me upon my endless requests throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. I also thank to the masterminds of National Library of Turkey, Manuscripts Institution of Turkey, Princeton University, and Bibliothque nationale de France who digitalized and presented to our attention their manuscript collections. I must also express my sincere thanks to the staff of ISAM, Ottoman Archives, and Information Center at Sabancı University for their invaluable assistance and resources, and for the quality of the service that I have received.

I am indebted to my colleague zgn Deniz Yoldalar, the chief mpeddif, who generously provided me with the copies of the books from his private collection and guided me with his experience. Ahmet ztrk, Sidar Eli, and Mehmet Kuru were bounteous enough to donate me source books that I needed when writing my dissertation. I am thankful to them.

I would not be able to complete this dissertation without the financial support of several institutions and philanthropists. I gratefully acknowledge the scholarships

that I have enjoyed throughout my Master and PhD education at Sabancı University since 2015. I thank to my advisor, Tülay Artan, who employed me in her TÜBİTAK-funded project from September 2017 to June 2020. It was her project that gave me experience and taught me methods of research in the manuscript collections. I would like to express my special thanks to Abdurrahman Atçıl who generously included me in his ERC-funded project, OTTOLEGAL, from June 2022 to December 2023. Without his support, this dissertation would not be possible. Enes and Ramazan Gürgöze, Xhoni Qoku, Yasin Tikici, and Yusuf Reşit Akbal generously covered my accommodation expenses in a tough time. I am thankful to all of them.

I would like to thank Kelly Brewer for meticulously reading and editing this dissertation and correcting my mistakes. However, the remaining errors are my own. I would also like thank to Rizwan Jahangir who spent days fixing my LaTeX manuscript. I am also grateful to my dear friends Abdullah Güloğlu, Abdullah Karaaslan, Ardit Gjeli, Aslınur Memiş, Ayten Seven Taştan, Bahadır Yolcu, Cevat Sucu, Farzad Rokhsar Talabazar, Fatih Doğan, Fatih Zeybek, Fırat Köklü, Hüsametdin Şimşir, İbrahim Kılıçaslan, İsmail Noyan, Mehmet Sezgin, Meryem Yetkin, Mine Arslan, Nimet İpek, Oğuzhan Doğan, Oğuzhan Duru, Oğuzhan Yılmaz, Özkan Karabulut, Samer Sharani, Şeyma Nur Temel, Talha Katırcı, Tunahan Durmaz, and Yasser Zouzou who either showed interest in my research and bombarded me with constructive questions or made the boring and monotonous life on campus more beautiful and comfortable. I would like to apologize to anyone whose contribution I have forgotten to acknowledge.

Last but not least, I am profoundly grateful to my family for their continuous love, encouragement, and sacrifice none of which I can ever pay back.

*Dedicated to
My mother and father and the Republic of Turkey in its centenary*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
OZET	v
LIST OF TABLES	xii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Literature Review	6
1.2. Sources and Methodology	13
1.2.1. Untapped Primary Sources: Collection of Letters	14
1.2.2. Marginal Notes in Astrological Calendars	14
1.2.3. Books and Treatises Authored by the Naqshbandi Masters ...	16
1.2.4. Biographical Dictionaries	16
1.2.5. Chronicles	17
1.3. Structure of the Dissertation	18
2. FIRST- AND SECOND-WAVE NAQSHBANDI LODGES IN ISTANBUL FROM CONQUEST TO THE END OF THE 18TH CENTURY	22
2.1. Introduction	22
2.2. First-wave Naqshbandi Lodges in Istanbul	22
2.2.1. Observations on the Fatih Emîr Bukhârî Lodge in the 16th Century	29
2.3. Second-wave Naqshbandi Lodges in Istanbul during the 17th and 18th Centuries	33
2.3.1. Naqshbandi Lodges as Shelters for Central and South Asians .	33
2.3.1.1. The Naqshbandi Qalandarism	41
2.3.2. The Role of Mujaddidiyya and Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî	45
2.3.3. The Role of the Naqshbandi Patrons	51
2.3.4. Eyüp: A Center of Attraction for Naqshbandis	55

2.3.4.1. Edirnekapı Emîr Bukhârî Tekkesi as the center of gravediggers	57
2.4. The Eighteenth-Century: A Period of Resurgence for Sufi Orders in Istanbul?	60
2.5. Conclusion	62
3. A FRESH BLOOD: ŞEYH MURÂD BUKHÂRÎ AND PENETRATING HIGH-RANKING OFFICIALS THROUGH THE EPISTOLARY EX- CHANGE	65
3.1. Introduction	65
3.2. Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî in Ottoman Lands: New Findings	66
3.3. A Few Notes on Şeyh Murâd’s Letters	76
3.3.1. Letters in Motion: Few Notes on Their Identification	81
3.3.2. The Problem of Communication and Transportation: Official and Private Couriers and Pilgrimage Caravans in the Service of Şeyh Murâd	86
3.4. A Naqshbandi Republic of Letters?	91
3.5. An Attempt to Form Muradi Branch Within the Naqshbandiyya	102
3.5.1. The Reception of Şeyh Murâd and His <i>Istihlāk</i>	109
3.5.2. Letters as A Means of Monitoring State Affairs, Controlling Statesmen, and Protecting Personal and Familial Interests	113
3.5.2.1. Sharing the sorrows and joys	116
3.5.2.2. Intercession for disgraced dignitaries	119
3.5.2.3. Being content with “enjoin good and forbid evil” ...	123
3.5.3. Protection for Personal and Familial Interests	131
3.5.4. Serving the Provincial <i>Ulema</i>	136
3.6. The Impossibility of A Naqshbandi Faction Within the State Orga- nization	142
3.7. Conclusion	144
4. NETWORK-CREATING MEANS OF PENETRATION: THE NAQSH- BANDI REALITIES OF THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES	149
4.1. Introduction	149
4.2. Concordance with the <i>Ulema</i> and Sharia	150
4.3. Familial Cooperations With <i>Seyyids</i> : The Impact of Prophetic Nobility	160
4.4. The Role of Lodgeless <i>Şeyhs</i>	168
4.5. Multiplicity of Identity, Intra-Sufi Cooperation, and Culture of Co- existence	175
4.6. Conclusion	185

5. MEHMED İSMET EFENDİ: A LODGELESS NAQSHBANDI ŞEYH WITH MULTIPLE SUFI AFFILIATIONS	188
5.1. Introduction	188
5.2. Mehmed İsmet Efendi's Life and Career: What Known?	189
5.3. Shifting Status: An Efendi Son of An Agha	192
5.4. Mehmed İsmet's Educational Background and Career	194
5.5. Mehmed İsmet as A Sufi	200
5.6. Mehmed İsmet's Nuclear Family and Probate Inventory	201
5.7. Mehmed İsmet's Intellectual Orientations	206
5.7.1. A Critic and Man of Poetry	207
5.7.2. A Consultant to the Grand Vizier	213
5.7.3. A Practitioner of the Astronomy	218
5.7.4. A Reader of Sufism	225
5.8. Conclusion	228
6. SEEKING PATRONAGE: MEHMED İSMET IN THE NETWORKS OF HIGH-RANKING OFFICIALS AND SCHOLAR-BUREAUCRATS	231
6.1. Introduction	231
6.2. A Few Notes on the Ottoman Patronage System	231
6.2.1. The Kiblelizâde Family: An Unshakable Friendship	235
6.2.2. The Köprülüs: A Stagnant Relationship	237
6.2.3. La'îzâde Abdülbâkî Efendi: An Old Friend	239
6.2.4. Patronage During the Grand Vizierate of Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha (1718-1730)	242
6.2.4.1. Hâşimzâde Seyyid Mehmed Efendi: another Melami friend	242
6.2.4.2. Şeyhülislam Yenişehirli Abdullâh Efendi: scholarly patronage in salons	244
6.2.4.3. Şeyhülislam Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullâh Efendi: Melami patronage	246
6.2.4.4. Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha: the two faces of the courtly patronage	248
6.2.4.5. Kethüdâ Mehmed Pasha: a shadowy patronage	252
6.2.4.6. İzzet Alî Pasha: from pupil to patron	253
6.3. Sultans and Post-Rebellion Patrons	256
6.4. An Analysis in Lieu of Conclusion	260
7. CONCLUSION	263
BIBLIOGRAPHY	267

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Şeyhs of Ayvansaray Emîr Bukhârî Lodge	26
Table 2.2. Şeyhs of Edirnekapı Emîr Bukhârî Lodge	27
Table 2.3. Şeyhs of Hekîm Çelebi Lodge	28
Table 2.4. Şeyhs of Fatih Emîr Bukhârî Lodge	32
Table 2.5. Naqshbandi tekkes in Istanbul (17th and 18th centuries)	34
Table 2.6. Newly established tekkes in Istanbul and its vicinity	57
Table 2.7. Number of tekkes belonging to most common Sufi orders in Istanbul	61
Table 3.1. The addressees and number of received letters	82
Table 4.1. Seyyids buried around Emîr Bukhârî lodge in Edirnekapı	166
Table 4.2. Lodgeless Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi şeyhs	170
Table 5.1. The total value of Mehmed İsmet's assets and their ratio in total wealth.	205
Table 5.2. The total value and ratio of subtractions in the inventory.	206
Table 5.3. The total amount and ratio of shares in the inventory	206
Table 6.1. Mehmed İsmet's patrons, their Sufi affiliations, and scholarly works submitted to them	258

1. INTRODUCTION

“This order of Ebrbuharee was first instituted by their founder and institutor Ebrbuhar, from whom they have their denomination, who herein followed the precepts and rules of his master Nacksbende, from whom in like manner the order of Mevelevee or Dervises are derived.”¹

Writing in the third quarter of the 17th century, Sir Paul Rycaut (1629-1700), the British diplomat who served for seven years as the secretary to Heneage Finch (1628-1689), the British ambassador to Istanbul from 1660 to 1667, and for ten years as the consul of Izmir, made these valuable observations on the current state of the Naqshbandi order in Istanbul under “Of the Order of Religious Turks called Ebrbuharee.”² Despite his grave mistake in attributing the Mevlevi order to Muhammad Bahâ al-Dîn Naqshband (1318-1389),³ Rycaut directly drew attention to at least two facts concerning the state of the Naqshbandi establishment in the Ottoman capital in the seventeenth century: first, that the Naqshbandi order was the order of religious Turks, and second, that it was identified with Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî (d. 1516), the Bukharan Naqshbandi *şeyh* and namesake of three lodges founded in the first three decades of the 16th century. The most meaningful conclusion that we can infer from Rycaut’s observations is that the Naqshbandi order had failed to dominate Istanbul during the 17th century at least in terms of the number of the *tekkes*. In fact, as I will argue in the first chapter of this study, the Naqshbandiyya never became dominant in terms of the number of lodges in the Ottoman capital from the time

¹Paul Rycaut, *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*, the third edition, (London: Printed for John Starkey and Henry Brome, 1670): 141. The first edition of the book came out in 1668.

²For a detailed life story of Rycaut and his years in the Ottoman Empire, see Sonia Anderson, *An English Consul in Turkey: Paul Rycaut at Smyrna, 1667-1678*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989); Linda T. Darling, “Ottoman Politics Through British Eyes: Paul Rycaut’s ‘*The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*,’” *Journal of World History* 5/1 (1994): 71-97. See also Hasan Baktır, “Bir İngiliz Şarkiyatçının Portresi: Sör Paul Rycaut,” *TAED* 65 (2019): 165-188.

³In fact, he mentioned in a few pages ago that the founder of the order was “Mevelana”. See *ibid*, 138.

of the conquest of Constantinople until the end of the 18th century. Its position remained so throughout the 19th century and the first quarter of the 20th century, when the young Turkish Republic finally abolished the *tekkes* on 30 November 1925. Instead, as can be understood from the specimens of the *mecmū^ca-i tekāyā* such as the historical lists of the *tekkes* founded in Istanbul, that it was the Khalwati order with all its branches that dominated Sufi life in the city throughout the centuries.⁴ However, the Khalwati order did not emerge as the main beneficiary of the ban on the Bektaşî order on 10 July 1826. Instead, after the destruction of the *tekkes* less than sixty years old, the long-established *tekkes* were given to Sunni orders, including the Naqshbandî, Mevlevî, Khalwatî, Qadîrî, Bayramî, Rufaî, Sa'dî and Gülşenî. More importantly, it was the Naqshbandî şeyhs who were given the majority of the Bektaşî lodges. Not only was the Naqshbandî order “the most benefited *tariqa* from the results” of the abolition of Bektaşî order, but also “[b]ecause of their significant contribution during the abolition process,” Naqshbandîs “were awarded the wealthiest Bektashî lodges and given the task of sunnizing Bektashîs.”⁵

What were the historical circumstances under which the Naqshbandî order evolved from a localized, limited and self-contained establishment equated with Emîr Bukhârî into a self-confident, widespread and consolidated entity qualified to “sunnitize” the Bektaşîs and administer their long-standing lodges? What were the factors that made the Naqshbandî order credible in the eyes of the state and society? How did the Naqshbandî order consolidate its authority in the center of the Ottoman Empire? This dissertation embarks on finding plausible answers in the light of such questions. While recognizing the diversity of factors, causes and conditions behind the historical developments and phenomena, it argues that networking contributed to the growth and consolidation of the Naqshbandî order in Istanbul. In other words, it was the conscious policies of the Naqshbandî masters to build networks that led them to exploit existing social, political, religious, cultural and economic means and circumstances. This, in turn, necessitated constructive dialogue and interaction with the existing social, religious and political establishments and endeavor for the continuation of the tolerance and culture of coexistence.

⁴These registers are composed of twenty-three lists the earliest of which survived from 1708 and the last one completed a few weeks before the abolishment of the *tekkes*. They were either sponsored by the state or products of the personal curiosity of the Sufis. For more on them, see Erkan Övüç, “Mecmua-i Tekâyâların Serencamı ve Yeni Bir Liste Neğri,” *Tasavvuf: İlmî ve Akademik Araştırma Dergisi* 27 (2011): 269-320. Sixteen of these lists were published firstly by Ahmed Nezih Galitekin. See, Ahmed Nezih Galitekin, *Osmanlı Kaynaklarına Göre İstanbul: Câmî, Tekke, Medrese, Mekteb, Türbe, Hamam, Kütüphâne, Matbaa, Mahalle ve Selâtin İmâretleri*, (İstanbul: İşaret Yayınları, 2003). See also Günay Kut and Turgut Kut, “İstanbul Tekkelerine Ait Bir Kaynak: Dergeh-nâme,” *Türkische Miscellen: Robert Anhegger Festschrift*, (İstanbul: Editions Divit Press, 1987): 226-229; Cahit Telci, “Osmanlı Yönetiminin Yeni Yıl Kutlamalarından: İstanbul Tekkelerine Muharremiye Dağıtımı,” *Sufi Araştırmaları/Sufi Studies* 3/6 (2012): 1-29.

⁵Özkan Karabulut, “The Rehabilitation of the Bektashî Order (1826-1876),” Unpublished MA Thesis, (Sabancı University, 2017): 19. For the implementation of abolition, see *ibid*, 30-34.

From this aspect, my research is a humble contribution to the developing scholarship approaching Ottoman history through network analysis. For instance, in her analysis on the centuries-long success of the Ottoman Empire, Karen Barkey has argued that “the answer to the question of the longevity of empire can be found in analyses of the organizations and networks connecting large segmented and constantly changing structures, and by focusing on the multivalent, networked, vertical, and horizontal linkages and the malleable compacts established between state and social actors.”⁶ Starting from this point of view, she finds out that, among others, the success of Osmân Ghazi, the founder and eponym of the empire, was his organization skills and ability to convert existing horizontal ties into vertical ties, the mission that contemporary Turcoman beys failed to materialize. Thus, he “was able to join previously unconnected elements and to build new networks from the combination of existing networks.”⁷

The existing network of Naqshbandis that Sir Paul Rycaut observed during his years in Istanbul was that of seven *tekkes* founded within a century following the conquest of the city by the Ottomans. The first of these lodges was established in 1455-56 and the last in 1550. The current documentation indicates that no Naqshbandi tekke was erected for approximately one hundred and thirty years following the date. In a period of a hundred-odd years starting 1680s and ending in 1792, however, at least eighteen new *tekkes* belonging to the Naqshbandi order were built in the Ottoman capital. Therefore, in view of such an interesting chronological division, throughout my dissertation, I will respectively refer to the *tekkes* in the first and second groups as “first-wave” and “second-wave” lodges. Such a classification and appellation are also consistent with historical facts and developments of the Naqshbandi order. While first-wave lodges belonged to the Ahrari branch of the Naqshbandiyya, second-wave lodges were established during a period when Mujaddidi, Kasani and even Muradi branches were favorably recognized and represented in the city. Therefore, what follows in this introduction is a brief analysis of the historical context of the period that my dissertation aims to cover more in full.

The formation of the Mujaddidi branch of the Naqshbandiyya in Mughal India through the efforts of Ahmad al-Sirhindî (1564-1624), the Hanafi jurist, scholar, and Naqshbandi master who was hailed by his followers as a godly imam (imām-i Rabbānī) and the reviver/renewer/rejuvenator of the second Islamic millennium (mujaddid-i alf-i thānī), was a major turning point in the history of the Naqshbandi order in both India and the Ottoman Empire. Living under the rule of Akbar Shah

⁶Karen Barkey, *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008): 6.

⁷Karen Barkey, *ibid*, 31.

(r. 1556-1605), who was accused of embracing syncretic creeds and thoughts impermissible to Sunni Islam, Şeyh Ahmad considered it a lofty aim and divine mission to revive the rule of sharia at the state level and in society as a whole. In other words, in his view, the solutions to the socio-political and religious problems of contemporary India could be developed not through new interpretations of Islam, but by returning to the Islamic roots and ideals of previous generations.⁸ This understanding led him to send his representatives over Muslim India, a policy rigorously implemented by his son, Muhammad Ma'sûm (1599-1668), whose two disciples, Ahmad Juryânî (d. 1707) and Murâd Bukhârî (d. 1720), carried the Mujaddidi branch to the Ottoman capital. However, Juryânî and Bukhârî adopted diametrically opposed methods of propagating Mujaddidi principles. While the former preferred to carry out his mission through a network with Mecca in the center, where he resided, the latter, partly due to the political atmosphere of the period, preferred to be mobile in an extensive tri-centered network circled around Damascus, Bursa and Istanbul. The Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi order spread expeditiously throughout the Ottoman lands including the Hejaz, the Levant, Anatolia, the Balkans, and the capital because of the direct and indirect role and influence of these masters. Moreover, it was largely due to their ante-mortem efforts and post-mortem influence that the second-wave lodges were built in Istanbul.

In the time frame that my dissertation covers, the Naqshbandi establishment in Istanbul, in spite of sporadically recurring clashes, benefited greatly from the détente established between the Ottoman and Safavid empires and the reopening of Iran to Central Asian hajj traffic, the two developments that facilitated the more comfortable passage of Central Asian pilgrims to Ottoman lands in general and to the Holy Lands of Islam in particular.⁹ To these, we must add the inner power struggles

⁸For the growing literature on Sirhindi and his transformative role in the history of Sufism, see Yohanan Friedmann, *Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi: An Outline of His Thought and a Study of His Image in the Eyes of Posterity*, (Montreal and London: McGill-Queens University Press, 1971); idem, *ibid.*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Muhammad Abdul Haq Ansari, *Sufism and Shari'ah: A Study of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi's Effort to Reform Sufism*, (London: The Islamic Foundation, 1986); Arthur Buehler, "The Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah and its Rise to Prominence in India," *Bulletin of the Henry Martyn Institute of Islamic Studies* 13 (1994): 44-61; idem, *Revealed Grace: The Juridic Sufism of Ahmad Sirhindi (1564-1624)*, (Louisville: Fons Vitae, 2011); idem, "Shari'at and 'Ulama in Ahmad Sirhindi's 'Collected Letters'," *Die Welt des Islams* 43/3 (2003): 309-320; idem, "Tales of Renewal: Ahmad Sirhindi, Reformer of the Second Millennium," in *Tales of God's Friends: Islamic Hagiography in Translation*, ed. J. Renard, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009): 234-248; Necdet Tosun, *Îmâm-ı Rabbânî Ahmed Sirhindi: Hayatı, Eserleri, Tasavvufî Görüşleri*, (Istanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2009).

⁹For a study on the seventeenth-century political crisis in Central Asia and its influence over the pilgrimage traffic, see Thomas Welsford, "The Re-opening of Iran to Central Asian Pilgrimage Traffic, 1600-1650," in *Central Asian Pilgrims: Hajj Routes and Pious Visits between Central Asia and Hejaz*, eds. Alexandre Pappas, Thomas Welsford, and Thierry Zarcone, (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2012): 149-167. On the peace and diplomatic rapprochement between the Ottomans and the Safavids see Selim Güngörürler, "Fundamentals of Ottoman-Safavid Peacetime Relations: 1639-1722," *Turkish Historical Review* 9 (2018): 151-197; idem, "Shi'ite-Iranian Pilgrims and Safavid Agents in Holy Sites Under Ottoman Rule, 1690-1710," in *Entangled Confessionalizations?: Dialogic Perspectives on the Politics of Piety and Community-Building in the Ottoman Empire, 15th-18th Centuries*, eds. Tijana Krstic and Derin Terzioğlu, (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2022): 725-743.

taking place between the Toqay Timurid khans and princes, the members of the Janid Dynasty who were the natural candidates for the throne of the Khanate of Bukhara. In light of these interrelated developments, from 1641 to 1681, after their dethronements, Imâm Quli (d. 1644), Nadir Muhammad (d. 1651), and Abd al-Azîz (d.1683), three successive Bukharan khans “headed for west into Iran for the ostensible purpose of performing the hajj.”¹⁰ To these political refugees, one must add Sufi-turned-princes, who headed for the Ottoman capital. As will be discussed in the first chapter, Shâh Haydar Resâ (d. 1700), a Bukhara-born Uzbek prince, after spending some years in India, would finally take refuge in Istanbul, where he established the first specimen of the second-wave Naqshbandi lodges in 1680s.¹¹ Likewise, we can surmise that political disturbances in the Central Asia constituted one of the many reasons for the flight from the hometowns of eminent Naqshbandi şeyhs such as Murâd Bukhârî, Ahmad Juryânî, Abdullâh Nidâi Kâshgharî, Sâfî Özbekî, Abdülekber, etc., who either personally visited Istanbul or sent their deputies to there in order to spread the Naqshbandi order. Last, but not least, as in the cases of Gaznevî Mahmûd (d. 1692), Şîrvânî Ebûbekir (d. 1723), Abdullâh Buhârî (d. 1745?), it was during this period that talented artists and promising applicants from Central Asia headed for Istanbul to make career in the offices.¹²

¹⁰Thomas Welsford, “The Re-opening of Iran to Central Asian Pilgrimage Traffic, 1600-1650,” 153-154. On the life and political career of Nadir Muhammad Khan, see Audrey Burton, “Nadir Muḥammad Khān, Ruler of Bukhara (1641-1645) and Balkh (1645-1651),” *Central Asiatic Journal* 32/1-2 (1988): 19-33. After the weakening of the Toqay Timurids who were of Tatar-Mongol origins, the Uzbek Manghit Dynasty took over the control of the Khanate and ruled it until 1920. On Uzbeks as the military force and bureaucrats of the Toqay Timurids, see Wolfgang Holzwarth, “The Uzbek State as Reflected in Eighteenth Century Bukharan Sources,” *Asiatische Studien* 60/2 (2006): 321-353.

¹¹As can be inferred from the example of Dara Shukoh (1615-1659), the son and heir of Shah Jahan, taking refuge in Sufism was a way to escape the tragic end of the political conflicts. Even so, Dara Shukoh was not spared by the Mughal emperor Aurangzeb (r. 1658-1707). See Tasadduq Husain, “The Spiritual Journey of Dara Shukoh,” *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress* 61 (2000-2001): 461-473.

¹²On Gaznevî Mahmûd, see İsa Uğurlu, “Gaznevî Mahmûd: A Neglected Ottoman Clerk His Career, Miscellany, and His Religious and Literary Network,” Unpublished MA Thesis, (Sabancı University, 2017); idem, “Süheyl Ünver’in Gaznevî Mahmûd ve Mecmûası Hakkındaki Notları,” *Zemin* 3 (2022): 276-290. For a recent study on Gaznevî Mahmûd’s artistic dexterity, see Elif Zeynep Atçıl, “Tuhfe-i Gaznevî Tezyînatı ve XVII. Yüzyıl Kitap Sanatlarındaki Yeri,” Unpublished MA Thesis, (Marmara Üniversitesi 2023). On Şîrvânî Ebûbekir, see İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi: XVIII. Yüzyıl*, vol. IV/2, the sixth edition, (Ankara: TTK, 2011): 602-604. For an ongoing study on Şîrvânî Ebûbekir’s manuscript collection, see Ali Aslan, “Yazma Eserlerde Mülkiyet Tezâhürleri ve Temellük Kayıtları: Reisülküttab Acem Bekir Efendi Örneği,” PhD Diss., (İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2024). On Abdullâh Buhârî, see Filiz Çağman, “Abdullah-ı Buhârî,” *TDVIA*, vol. 1, (İstanbul: TDV, 1988): 87-88. On the Central Asian artists in the cosmopolitan Istanbul, see the following studies conducted by Tülay Artan. Tülay Artan, “Cosmopolitanism in the Early 18th-Century Ottoman Capital: The Impostor, the Alchemist, the Merchant and the Personal Dimension,” *Turcica* 55 (2024) (forthcoming); idem, “Cosmopolitan Istanbul, 1650–1750: Strangers in the Company of Manuscripts, Paintings and Coffee,” in *Twelve Cities- One Sea. Early Modern Mediterranean Port Cities and Their Inhabitants*, eds. Giovanni Tarantino and Paola von Wyss-Giacosa, Quaderni series of the Rivista Storica Italiana, (Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 2023): 156-177; idem, “The Paradoxes Of Hagia Sophia’s Ablution Fountain: The Qasida al-Burda in Cosmopolitan İstanbul, 1740,” in *Hagia Sophia in the Long Nineteenth Century*, ed. Benjamin Anderson and Emily Neumeier, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2024): 66-97; idem, “The first, hesitant steps of Ottoman protocol and diplomacy into modernity (1676-1725),” *The Court Historian* 26/I. *Special Issue: Monarchy and Modernity since 1500* (2021): 29-43; idem, “Patrons, Painters, Women in Distress: The Changing Fortunes of Nev’îzade Atayi and Üskübi Mehmed Efendi in Early Eighteenth-Century İstanbul,” *Muqarnas: An Annual on the Visual Culture of the Islamic World* 39 (2022): 109-152.

The accumulation of wealth by the Ottoman ulema and Sufi masters, and the changing dynamics of patronage, contributed positively to the construction of second-wave Naqshbandi lodges. As will be discussed in the first chapter, of seven first-wave lodges, five were state-sponsored, four by the sultans and one by the grand vizier. As for the lodges of the second-wave, with the exception of the establishment of two *tekkes* by the grand vizier Bâhir Köse Mustafâ Pasha (d. 1765) and one by the vizier Abdullâh Pasha (d. 1756), the remaining fifteen lodges were built either by scholar-bureaucrats¹³ or by the *şeyhs* associated with the order. Such a shift in tekke patronage can also be seen in the case of the Khalwati order. In the sixteenth century, thirty-two of the forty-six Khalwati lodges were built by high-ranking officials. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, however, only eleven of the newly constructed forty lodges were sponsored by statesmen; the remaining twenty-nine lodges were installed by the Khalwati *şeyhs*. During the period, none of the twelve lodges of the Qadiri order, which had no tekke in Istanbul prior to the seventeenth century, owed their existence to the grandees of the empire. These exciting statistics on the founders of the Naqshbandi, Khalwati and Qadiri lodges have one thing in common: the wealth accumulation of the great ulema families. As Madeline Zilfi has argued, the roots of the Great Molla families, who dominated the ulema system in the 18th century, can be traced back to the 17th and 16th centuries.¹⁴ As *askerîs*, they were exempt from taxation, but unlike other *askeris*, they were rarely subjected to the confiscations carried out by the state, which in turn led to capital accumulation in their families. It was from such an accumulation of wealth that a significant proportion of second-wave Naqshbandi lodges were founded as full-fledged complexes.

1.1 Literature Review

Concerning the Naqshbandi presence in Istanbul, several books and articles have been published. While in some of these studies the Naqshbandiyya in the Ottoman capital is the main focus of the research, in some studies it constitutes only subsections. To the extent I know, the earliest academic study on Naqshbandi presence

¹³I borrow this term from Abdurrahman Atçıl and use it alternately with Gilles Veinstein's "scholar-officials". See Abdurrahman Atçıl, *Scholars and Sultans in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017); Gilles Veinstein, "Religious institutions, policies and lives," in *The Cambridge History of Turkey: The Ottoman Empire as a World Power, 1453-1603*, vol. 2, ed. Suraiya Faroqhi and Kate Fleet, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013): 320-355.

¹⁴Madeline Zilfi, *The Politics of Piety: The Ottoman Ulema in the Postclassical Age, 1600-1800*, (Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1988); idem, "Elite Circulation in the Ottoman Empire: Great Mollas of the Eighteenth Century," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 26/3 (1983).

and expansion in the Ottoman capital is Kasım Kufralı's 1949 PhD dissertation on the formation and dissemination of the order. As a Naqshbandi-Khalidi şeyh known to have given ijaza to many vicegerents, Kufralı reserved the second part of his dissertation for the history of the grounding and spreading of the Naqshbandi order in Istanbul from the city's conquest to the late 19th century. As to the late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century history of the order, he particularly focuses on the role of Murâd Bukhârî, Yekdest Ahmad Juryânî and Abdullâh Nidâî Kâshgharî, the three eminent şeyhs who contributed to the order's diffusion in the capital. Since Kufralı's dissertation is the first study on the history of the Naqshbandi order in Turkish academic circles, it has won recognition and methodologically affected subsequent studies. He published as an article the second section of his dissertation's second part in 1949.¹⁵ İrfan Gündüz's study on state-tekke interactions is another work that discusses in two subsections the arrival and expansion of the Naqshbandiyya in Ottoman lands and the political reasons behind the order's proliferation. From among the first-generation şeyhs, Gündüz introduces only Abdullâh İlâhî of Simav and Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî.¹⁶

From the late 1980s to the beginning of the 21st century, in at least five PhD dissertations, the historical presence of Naqshbandis and the order in Istanbul had been the matter of discussion. Dina Le Gall's sizable study on the Ottoman Naqshbandiyya, for example, is an edited version of her dissertation submitted to Princeton University in 1992.¹⁷ In this study, composed of two parts,¹⁸ she attempts in the first part (chapters 1-4) to examine the presence and dissemination of prominent Naqshbandi figures within the Ottoman borders by considering their flow from Transoxiana into the capital city and Anatolia, the Balkans and Arabia. The second part of the book (chapters 5-7), however, is devoted to the discussion of the main teachings, principles, practices of the order, its strict dependence on sharia and Sunnism, and the structure of its organization and interregional network of connections. Although, the author intends to portray the historical situation of the order from 1450 to 1700, it seems that a large part of 17th- century İstanbul and Anatolia were not discussed with the exception of the argument regarding leading Naqshbandi figures such as

¹⁵Kasım Kufralı, "Nakşibendiliğin Kuruluşu ve Yayılışı," Unpublished PhD Diss., (Istanbul University, 1949); "Molla İlâhî ve Kendisinden Sonraki Nakşibendiye Muhiti," *TÜDED* III/1 (1949): 129-151. This article has republished in *Tasavvuf Kitabı*, ed. Cemil Çiftçi, (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2003): 42-64. My references will be to the latter edition. On the biography of Kufralı, see Muhammed Küfrevî, "Küfrevî, Kasım," *TDVIA*, vol. EK-2, the 3rd edition, (Ankara: TDV, 2019): 102.

¹⁶İrfan Gündüz, *Osmanlılarda Devlet-Tekke Münasebetleri*, (Ankara: Seha Neşriyat, 1984): 39-69.

¹⁷Dina Le Gall, "The Ottoman Naqshbandiyya in the pre-Mujaddidi Phase: A Study in Islamic Religious Culture and Its Transmission," PhD. Dissertation, (Princeton University, 1992).

¹⁸Dina Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism: Naqshbandis in the Ottoman World, 1450-1700*, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005).

Şeyh Mahmûd Urmevî (d. 1639), who was able to propagate his teachings in Diyarbekir, where he took refuge in the early 17th century, and Bosnevi Osmân (d. 1664), a reputed Naqshbandi master in Istanbul. The earlier presence of the order, particularly in 16th-century Istanbul, however, was discussed in detail in the first chapter of the book. The footnotes of the chapter, I must state, give witness to the endeavor, great effort and solid grasp of the primary sources. When it comes to Arabia, however, the focus of the author, to a large extent, is on the Medinese Naqshbandi-Shattari şeyh İbrâhîm Kurânî's (d. 1690) teachings and his struggles against Naqshbandi orthodoxy, that is, his defensive position in favor of the vocal invocation and Ibn Arabi's controversial theory of waḥdat al-wujūd (the Unity of Being). In addition to the remarkable book, Le Gall penned two articles which included elaborated discussions regarding 16th- and 17th-century Naqshbandis and their main teachings and practices, which were expressed in her dissertation and book. Whereas the first article, examines the position of Bosnevî Osmân during the Qadızadeli-Khalwati struggles,¹⁹ the second tends to discuss in detail the main teachings, principles, and practices of Naqshbandis and their struggle for Sunni orthodoxy.²⁰

During a twelve-year period from 1990 to 2002, the Department of Sufism under the Faculty of Theology at Marmara University released four PhD dissertations studying the Sufism and Sufis in the Ottoman Anatolia during the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries. In the earliest of these studies, Reşat Öngören reserved for the 16th-century Naqshbandis the second chapter of his work. Except for two short subsections on the Naqshbandis of Bursa and Amasya, the chapter is totally about the situation of the Naqshbandi order in Istanbul. Thanks to available biographical dictionaries, the author is able to identify first-generation Naqshbandi şeyhs and their successors in the city.²¹ Necdet Yılmaz, who studied the history of Sufism in seventeenth-century Anatolia, too, carried out an introductory and descriptive research on the Naqshbandiyya with a particular focus on Istanbul. Thanks to the ill-stared case of Şeyh Mahmûd Urmevî and his son, İsmâ'îl Çelebi (d. 1669), Diyarbekir was also brought to the attention as one of the Naqshbandi centers in Anatolia. Taking after Öngören's methodology, Yılmaz examines in the second part of his book the relations of Sufis with the state and the ulema through a successful utilization of Sufi

¹⁹Dina Le Gall, "Kadızelis, Nakşbendis, and Intra-Sufi diatribe in the 17th century Istanbul," *The Turkish Studies Association Journal* 28 (2004): 1-28.

²⁰Dina Le Gall, "Forgotten Naqshbandis and the Culture of pre-Modern Sufi Brotherhood," *Studia Islamica* 97 (2003): 87-119.

²¹Reşat Öngören, "XVI. Yüzyılda Anadolu'da Tasavvuf," PhD Diss., (Marmara Üniversitesi 1996). *Osmanlılar'da Tasavvuf: Anadolu'da Sûfîler, Devlet ve Ulema (XVI. Yüzyıl)*, (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2000): 117-154.

manuscripts, biographical dictionaries and chronicles. However, he does not seem to have developed a steady method of classification in his research. While in some cases he categorizes Sufi masters under the lodge to which they belonged, in some cases he does not deem such a classification necessary.²² The history of the Sufism and the situation of mystic orders in eighteenth-century Anatolia have been scrutinized by Ramazan Muslu, who devoted a significant portion of his work on the Naqshbandi order in Istanbul and beyond. The main novelty and contribution in his study is the consistent categorization of the şeyhs under the *tekkes* they served. Thus, by presenting basic information regarding the earliest phase and current state of each lodge during the targeted century, the author was able to successfully introduce branches and sub-branches of each order, the *tekkes* belonging to each and the şeyhs serving them. However, Muslu as well as Yılmaz and Öngören did not develop a critical approach to the primary sources, including the hagiographies of Sufis nor did they use official documents when writing about the şeyhs and *tekkes*. Therefore, in some cases, mystical legends melted into historical facts were treated without a critical filter.²³ Nevertheless, when introducing the second-wave Naqshbandi lodges, I will be utilizing Muslu's study. The last study conducted at Marmara University on the history of Sufism in Anatolia has come out under the signature of Hür Mahmut Yücer, who went through the 19th century. Istanbul took center stage in this study, as well as the previous ones.²⁴

Necdet Tosun is another scholar who studied the Naqshbandi history at the Department of Sufism at Marmara University. In his doctoral thesis, submitted in 2002, he focused on the historical period from Abd al-Khaliq Ghijduwânî (1103-1179) to Ahmad al-Sirhindî (1564-1624), with special attention to Muhammad Bahâ al-Dîn Naqshband (1318-1389), the eponym of the order, and his influences. Since Tosun is of the opinion that the Khwajagan school, which was identical to the Naqshbandiyya, dominated the characteristics of the order down to the formation of the Mujaddidi branch by al-Sirhindî, he brings to our attention under separate chapters the formation of the Khwajagan school/order, the history of the Naqshbandiyya before the rise of the Mujaddidiyya, the early phase of Naqshbandi expansion in Anatolia, the Sufi education and main principles of the order and the socio-political relations of the Naqshbandi order with other Sufi brotherhoods. In this organization, the historical presence of the Naqshbandi order in Istanbul comes into question only

²²Necdet Yılmaz, "XVII. Asırda Anadolu'da Tasavvuf," Phd Diss., (Marmara Üniversitesi 2000). *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: Sûfîler, Devlet ve Ulemâ*, (İstanbul: OSAV, 2001): 379-396.

²³Ramazan Muslu, "XVIII. Asırda Anadolu'da Tasavvuf," PhD Diss., (Marmara Üniversitesi, 2002); *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: 18. Yüzyıl*, (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2003): 229-309.

²⁴Hür Mahmut Yücer, "XIX. Asırda Anadolu'da Tasavvuf," PhD Diss., (Marmara Üniversitesi, 2002); *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: 19. Yüzyıl*, (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2004): 245-340.

in the third chapter where he introduces us to members of the Ahrari and Kasani branches of the order in the city. However, what we learn from this chapter is the confirmation of the existing literature produced by Kasım Kufralı, Dina Le Gall, and Reşat Öngören. Utilizing extensive scholarly production by the Naqshbandis, the fourth and fifth chapters are particularly valuable contributions to the literature.²⁵

Naqshbandi lodges built in Istanbul have been the subject of research in several important studies. In this regard, Thierry Zarcone's study on the history of the Turkistani and Indian dervishes and their *tekkes* must be considered among the earliest publications.²⁶ With this article, Zarcone identified all lodges built by and for the Central and South Asian Sufis since the conquest of the city until the fall of the Ottoman Empire. With a generous use of Ayvansarâyî's *Ḥadīkatü'l-Cevāmi'*, several biographical dictionaries, manuscripts written and read in Sufi circles, and Revnakoğlu's handwritten notes preserved in Divan Edebiyatı Müzesi, he successfully uncovers and introduces also the lodges built for the Naqshbandi dervishes. The most salient shortcoming in his study, however, is the lack of archival documentation. Nevertheless, Zarcone's study deserves much attention for directing our attention to the tradition of celibacy and Naqshbandi qalandars. Apart from this article, Zarcone has written for *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* several encyclopedic entries regarding the Naqshbandi lodges constructed in Istanbul.²⁷

The two-volume *Eyüp Tarihi* based on meticulous field research by Mehmet Nermi Haskan is a useful study for being acquainted with the Naqshbandi lodges and the burial areas where Naqshbandi şeyhs were buried.²⁸ Confined to the historical architectural works built in the boundaries of Eyüp, Haskan's research is practical for my dissertation in terms of the pieces of information that the author has collected by reading and deciphering the inscriptions of buildings and the tombstones of prominent figures including some Naqshbandi şeyhs. In its original form, Haskan's study lacked archival documents preserved in the Ottoman Archives. With the support of

²⁵See Necdet Tosun, "Tasavvufta Hâcegân Ekolü: XII-XVII. Asırlar," PhD Diss., (Marmara Üniversitesi, 2002). For the earlier publication extracting from this dissertation see, Necdet Tosun, *Bahâeddin Nakşbend: Hayatı, Görüşleri, Tarikatı (XII-XVII. Asırlar)*, (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2002). For the recent publication, see idem, *Hâcegân Yolu: Hoca Bahâeddin Nakşbend ve Tarikatı (XII-XVII. Asırlar)*, (İstanbul: Erkam Akademi, 2022).

²⁶Thierry Zarcone, "Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul," *Anatolia moderna – Yeni Anadolu* 2 (1991): 137-200.

²⁷Thierry Zarcone, "Afganiler Tekkesi," *DBIA*, vol. I, 86; "Buhara Tekkesi," *DBIA*, vol. II, 325-326; "Emir Buhârî Tekkesi," *DBIA*, vol. III, 165-167; "Haydar Taşkendi Tekkesi," *DBIA*, vol. IV, 26-27; "Hindiler Tekkesi," *DBIA*, vol. IV, 74-75; "Kalenderhane Tekkesi," *DBIA*, vol. IV, 398-399; "Kaşgarî Tekkesi," *DBIA*, vol. IV, 485-486.

²⁸Mehmet Nermi Haskan, *Eyüp Tarihi*, vols. I-II, (İstanbul: Türk Turing Turizm İşletmeciliği Vakfı Yayınları, 1993). On Haskan and his books based on field research, see Gündegül Parlar, "Haskan, Mehmet Nermi," *TDVIA*, vol. EK-1, revised second edition, (İstanbul: TDV, 2020): 540-541.

the Municipality of Eyüp, Talip Mert has revised, annotated and enriched the text by adding archival documents regarding each monument situated in Eyüp.²⁹

Another study pertaining to the Naqshbandi lodges erected in Istanbul has recently been published.³⁰ Despite the similarities with Zarccone's abovementioned article, this work is narrower but deeper in scope in the sense that it is dedicated only to the *tekkes* set up for Naqshbandi şeyhs and dervishes of Uzbek origin. The book is on the history and historical transformation of five Naqshbandi lodges, the Emîr Buhârî Tekkesi in Ayvansaray/Eğrikapı, Buhara Tekkesi, Murâd Buhârî Tekkesi, Kalenderhâne Tekkesi, and Özbekler Tekkesi. The authors explain the reason for preferring Emîr Bukhârî Tekkesi of Ayvansaray rather than Fatih or Edirnekapı as its role in spreading the order in Istanbul and embedding the Mujaddidi tradition through prominent incumbent şeyhs.³¹ The reason behind the exclusion of Kâşgarî Tekkesi, another lodge built for Central Asian Sufis, on the other hand, is not explained. As a demanding study, the book deserves credit both for being well-conducted research utilizing archival documents and manuscripts and representing the analytical and critical perspective of the authors.

As an encyclopedia confined to Istanbul, *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, a significant composition accomplished in the beginning of 90's, is a useful secondary source for initially acquainting us with historical buildings of Istanbul, including first- and second-wave Naqshbandi lodges and shrines. When it comes to the lodges built for the Central and South Asian Sufi masters and dervishes, as mentioned above, Thierry Zarccone has penned seven encyclopedic articles. We must add to this Baha Tanman's articles on the history and architectural details of Naqshbandi lodges. Moreover, Tanman has written dozens of articles also for *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*.³²

Butrus Abu-Manneh has produced two considerable articles on to the Naqshbandi-Mujaddidis establishing themselves in Ottoman territories. The first article focuses on Murâd Bukhârî's teachings and his effort to disseminate the order in the Ottoman

²⁹Mehmet Mermi Haskan, *Eyüp Sultan Tarihi*, vols. I-II, annotated by Talip Mert, (İstanbul: Eyüp Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2008).

³⁰Okan Yeşilot, Yüksel Çelik, and Muharrem Varol, *İstanbul'daki Türkistan Tekkeleri: Ata Yurt ile Ana Yurt Arasındaki Manevi Köprüler*, (İstanbul: TÜRÇEK, 2017).

³¹Ibid, 34.

³²Baha Tanman, "Âbid Çelebi Tekkesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 1, 308, "Afganiler Tekkesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 1, 400, "Emîr Buhârî Tekkesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 11, 126-128, "Hindîler Tekkesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 18, 68-69, "Murad Buhârî Tekkesi," *DBIA*, vol. V, 514-516, "Şeyh Murad Tekkesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 39, (İstanbul: TDV, 2010): 62-64, "Mustafa Paşa Tekkesi," *DBIA*, vol. V, 564-565, "Neccarzâde Tekkesi," *DBIA*, vol. VI, 59-60, "Özbekler Tekkesi," *DBIA*, vol. VI, 199-202, "Özbekler Tekkesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 34, 121-123, and 123-124.

capital.³³ The article is noteworthy in terms of introductory notes on the teachings of the Mujaddidiya, and the three sojourns undertaken respectively in 1681-1685, 1708-1709, and 1717-1720 by Murâd Bukhârî to establish his order in Istanbul. Yet, the most original contribution of Abu-Manneh's study to the field is that he attempted to uncover and shed light on Murad Buhari's connections in Istanbul by utilizing a very original primary source: the epistles of the şeyh. In addition, the author investigates Murad Buhari's teachings by evaluating counsels and repeating sentences written in the epistles. However, Abu-Manneh abstains from utilizing all surviving letters, and does not attempt to reveal the entire network through which Murad Buhari aspired to spread his order. The second article, published thirty-two years earlier than the one mentioned above, considered the early 19th-century state of the Naqshbandiyya by focusing on dissemination of the Naqshbandi-Khalidi order in Ottoman Iraq, Damascus, Anatolia and Istanbul under the guidance of Khâlîd Baghdâdî (d. 1827), who himself received a Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi education from his preceptor Abdullâh Dihlawî in Delhi. As to the ongoing Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi influences in the Ottoman Empire, the author mentions in the second part of his article that a "second Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi wave reached Istanbul early in the 18th century by means of Ahmad Joryani, known as Yekdest." In the relevant part, we are told that the order was propagated in Istanbul by his deputies such as Müstakîmzâde Süleymân Sa'deddîn (d. 1788) and Mehmed Emîn Kerkükî/Bursevî (d. 1813). The most important contribution of the author is his portrayal of Mehmed Emîn and his disciples as "reform" figures who managed to create close connections with reformer sultans Selim III (r. 1789-1807) and Mahmud II (r. 1808-1839).³⁴ Yet, we should add that Abu-Manneh has been criticized by Halil İbrahim Şimşek within the context of this article, in terms of his preference to attribute more value to Mehmed Emîn Bursevî and neglect the role and importance of Mehmed Emîn Tokadî (d. 1745), one of the most revered disciples of Yekdest Ahmed.³⁵

Halil İbrahim Şimşek has produced a book and a few articles on 18th-century Naqshbandi-Mujaddidis residing in Anatolia and Istanbul. The last edition of his book, composed of two main parts, presents us in the first part with Murâd Bukhârî and Mehmed Emîn Tokadî, two distinguished Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi preceptors from whom derived many disciples and deputies.³⁶ The second part, on

³³Butrus Abu-Manneh, "Sheikh Murâd al-Bukhârî and the Expansion of the Naqshbandî-Mujaddidî Order in Istanbul," *Die Welt des Islams* 53/1. (2013): 1-25.

³⁴Butrus Abu-Manneh, "The Naqshbandiyya-Mujaddidiyya in the Ottoman Lands in the Early 19th Century," *Die Welt des Islams* 22 (1982): 1-36.

³⁵Halil İbrahim Şimşek, "Anadolu Müceddidilerine İlişkin Bazı Tarihi Bilgilerin Kullanılışı Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme." *Gazi Üniversitesi Çorum İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 1/2 (2002): 219-220.

³⁶Halil İbrahim Şimşek, 18. *Yüzyıl Osmanlı Toplumunda Nakşibendi-Müceddidilik*. İstanbul: Litera

the other hand, gives in detail Sufi views and teachings, mystical secrets of invocation and main principals of the Naqshbandi order. Despite involving numerous precious introductory information (particularly) as to the followers of the above-mentioned şeyhs in his book, the author does not embark on a systematic analysis of their networks, which, we may claim, is the most apparent deficiency of his study. Apart from this significant book, Şimşek penned a noteworthy article for correcting the mistakes and completing the gaps occurred in secondary literature on the Naqshbandi-Mujaddidis.³⁷ In one of his recent articles relating to Murâd Bukhârî, Şimşek does not attempt to introduce the slightest novelty to the field.³⁸ In addition to these studies, Şimşek published a few descriptive studies as to the teachings of some leading Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi preceptors living in Anatolia and Istanbul.³⁹

1.2 Sources and Methodology

As a study of Naqshbandi networks, the networking policies of the Naqshbandi masters and the collective history of the Naqshbandi order, with a special focus on the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Istanbul, where the Naqshbandi order was gradually but firmly established during the second half of the fifteenth century, this dissertation is primarily a prosopographical research project. However, by relying on a wide range of primary sources that were the products of the intellectual accumulation of individuals, and by focusing on the interactions, connections and relationships between the Sufi dervishes and masters, it contributes to the historiography of the social and intellectual history of the Ottoman Empire. To this end, it not only adopts the approaches of social and intellectual history, but also benefits from the possibilities of social network analysis. Nevertheless, except for excel tables I have included in my manuscript, my study does not claim to be an exhaustive analysis of social networks in which graphs, maps, and statistical computations are produced through digital technologies. Nor does it aim to overwhelm the reader with sociological theories. Instead, it generously uses the vocabulary of social network

Yayıncılık, 2016.

³⁷Şimşek, “Anadolu Müceddidilerine İlişkin,”

³⁸Şimşek, “Nakşibendî-Müceddidiliğin Anadolu’ya Taşınmasında Köprü Bir Şahsiyet Olarak Muhammed Murad el-Buharî,” in *Buhara’dan Konya’ya İrfan Mirası ve XIII. Yüzyıl Medeniyet Merkezi Konya*, Konya: Konya Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2019: 175-186.

³⁹Şimşek, “İki Nakşibendî-Müceddidî’nin Deveran Savunması: Mehmed Emin-i Tokadî ve Müstakîmzâde Süleyman Sadeddin Örneği,” *Tasavvuf* 10 (2003): 283-298., “Mesnevihân Bir Nakşibendiyye-Müceddidiyye Şeyi Neccârzâde Mustafa Rıza’nın Hayatı ve Tasavvufî Görüşleri,” *Tasavvuf* 14 (2005): 159-178., “Mehmed Emin Tokadî’nin Tuhfetü’l-Tullâb li-Hidâyeti’l-ahbâb Risalesinin Karşılaştırmalı Neşri,” *Tasavvuf* 18 (2007): 263-275.

analysis, approaches the sources in a relational fashion and aims to contextualize the cases through historical explanations. What follows is an explanation of my methods of approach for each cluster of primary sources used in this dissertation.

1.2.1 Untapped Primary Sources: Collection of Letters

The collected letters of Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî are the most original and invaluable primary sources of the current study. Most likely, Şeyh Murâd's disciples habitually collected his letters as source of blessing while he was still alive. Years after his death, however, a few of his eminent followers including Mehmed İsmet Efendi and the future şeyhülislâm Veliyyüddîn Efendi (1684-1768), attempted to compile a collection of the letters for themselves and the Naqshbandi circles of Istanbul. Mehmed İsmet successfully completed his mission. His collection of 227 letters became popular among the Naqshbandis and were copied by others during the 18th and 19th centuries. However, despite Şeyh Murâd's leading role in the spread of the Naqshbandiyya in Ottoman lands, his collected letters have received little attention. The only historian who has paid great attention to the letters and utilized a considerable number of them in one of his articles on the history of the Naqshbandi order in Ottoman lands is Butrus Abu-Manneh.⁴⁰ Yet, he appears unconcerned in all surviving letter collections. Moreover, since he was not aware of the letters that Şeyh Murâd sent to Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi (d. 1741), his study fails to portray the special and private relationships that developed in the network with Şeyh Murâd in its center. By utilizing Şeyh Murâd's existing letters, I aim on the one hand to clarify the remodeled and reformulated teachings he transmitted to his disciples through the letters. On the other hand, however, I intend to portray his social, political, and religious networks together with all its components and connections. Thus, I will be able to contribute to both Naqshbandi historiography and the growing field of Ottoman ego-documents for which letters as primary sources are of significant importance.

1.2.2 Marginal Notes in Astrological Calendars

As neglected primary sources in the Ottoman historiography, the marginal daily notes written in astrological calendars constitutes another cluster of the most original historical records on which my dissertation is based. However, since they are the

⁴⁰Butrus Abu-Manneh, "Sheikh Murâd al-Bukhârî and the Expansion of the Naqshbandî-Mujaddidî Order in Istanbul," 1-25.

product of the pen of Mehmed İsmet Efendi (d. 1747), I use them only in the fourth and fifth chapters, where I focus on his life, career, Sufi affiliations, intellectual orientations and networks. To the best of my knowledge, with the exception of the daily notes of the chief astrologer, Sadullâh Ankaravî (d. 1855), who collected them in at least sixteen astrological calendars, the daily notes that have survived through astrological calendars have not been the subject of academic research.⁴¹ Two of Mehmed İsmet’s astrological calendars have been identified in the literature.⁴² My research in the manuscript library of the Kandilli Observatory brings to light another five calendars containing his daily notes.⁴³ By working on these calendars, I aim to contribute to the growing literature on Ottoman ego-documents,⁴⁴ for among the topics he preferred to record were the latest rumors, current developments concerning himself and his family members, political developments, and the appointment, dismissal and exile of high-ranking officials and members of the ulema. It seems to me that the main reason for him to enter details regarding the career of leading figures was that the heroes of the plot were either his close friends or his patrons. In this regard, astrological calendars are valuable sources for revealing Mehmed İsmet’s socio-political and Sufi connections. In addition, his calendars deserve closer attention, as they contain daily notes on meteorological events such as rain and snow fall, the onset of storms as well as natural disasters such as earthquakes (zelzele) and the plague (ṭācūn). More strikingly, he recorded outbreaks not only of small-scale fires (ḥarīḳ-i cüz’î), but also of conflagrations (ḥarīḳ-i küllî), which had been a regular feature of Ottoman Istanbul for centuries. For the sake of the dissertation, my focus will be on the records relating to people and their actions rather than natural disasters.

⁴¹Gülçin Tunalı Koç, “Sadullah el-Ankaravi: Daily Concerns of an Ottoman Astrologer.” Unpublished MA Thesis, (Boğaziçi University, 2002). Salim Aydüz is the first historian who brought our attention astrological calendars as significant sources for the Ottoman historiography. See Aydüz, “Osmanlı Devleti’nde Müneccimbaşılık ve Müneccimbaşılar,” Unpublished MA Thesis, (İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1993): 74-97; idem, “Müneccimbaşı Takvimleri ve Tarihi Kaynak Olarak Değerleri,” *Cogito* 22 (2000): 132-144; idem, “Osmanlı Devleti’nde Müneccimbaşılık Müessesesi,” *Belleter* 70 (2006): 167-264; esp. 215-224; and idem, “İslam Medeniyetinde Takvimler,” *Yedikıta* 60, (August 2013): 52-59.

⁴²*Osmanlı Astronomi Literatürü Tarihi*, vol. I, ed. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, prepared by Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, Ramazan Şeşen, Cevat İzgi, Cemil Akpınar, İhsan Fazlıoğlu, (İstanbul: IRCICA, 1997), 426-427; Salim Aydüz, “İsmet Mehmed Efendi (ö. 1747) ve Tedâhül-i Seneye Dair Risâlesi,” *Kutadgubilig Felsefe-Bilim Araştırmaları Dergisi* 15, (March, 2009): 230.

⁴³For the calendars that were known, see Kandilli Rasathanesi Kütüphanesi, Takvimler, no. T26 and T33. For the calendars that I have detected, see *ibid.*, no. T25, T28, 418, T30, and T36.

⁴⁴For the growing literature on the Ottoman ego-documents, see Selim Karahasanoğlu, “Ottoman Ego-Documents: State of the Art,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 53 (2021): 301-308. See also Tunahan Durmaz, “Family, Companions, and Death: Seyyid Hasan Nûrî Efendi’s Microcosm (1661-1665),” Unpublished MA Thesis, (Sabancı University, 2019): 10-18. For a study evaluating astrological calendars as ego-documents, see İsa Uğurlu, “Recording History and Documenting Ego in the Eighteenth-Century Istanbul: Astrological Calendars as Ego-documents,” (forthcoming).

1.2.3 Books and Treatises Authored by the Naqshbandi Masters

Except the first chapter, which focuses on the Naqshbandi lodges, I utilize a considerable number of scholarly compositions in manuscript and published forms. In doing so, my intention in the second, third and fourth chapters is to analyze the intellectual orientation, production and reception of Naqshbandi masters, such Murâd Bukhârî, Abd al-Ghanî Nâblusî, La'îzâde Abdûlbâkî, Mehmed Emîn Tokadî, Mehmed İsmet, Seyyid Abdurrahmân, Müstakîmzâde Süleymân Sa'deddîn and Seyyid Mustafâ Râsim. In the fifth chapter I evaluate Mehmed İsmet's scholarly network, his books and treatises in manuscript form serve my research in terms of ownership and completion records. Focusing specifically on these records, I show how Mehmed İsmet, as an intellectual and a lodgeless şeyh, managed to establish his own patronage networks in the Ottoman capital or to exploit pre-existing ones.

1.2.4 Biographical Dictionaries

Biographical dictionaries are useful primary sources for studies on the history of the Ottoman ulema and Sufis. For this reason, in this study, I will make use of *Şekâ'îku'n-Nu'mâniyye* by Taşköprizâde Ahmed (d. 1561) and its supplements, namely *Hadâ'îku's-Şekâ'îk* by Mecdî Mehmed (d. 1591), *Hadâ'îku'l-Hakâ'îk* by Nev'izâde Atâî (d. 1635), *Vekâyi'ü'l-Fudalâ* by Şeyhî Mehmed (d. 1731) and *Tekmiletü's-Şekâ'îk* by Fındıklılı İsmet (d. 1904).⁴⁵ I utilize these dictionaries whenever biographical information on the Sufis and scholars mentioned in my chapters is needed. My perspective will be relational. Since my dissertation covers the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, I frequently benefit from Şeyhî Mehmed's entries in *Vekâyi'ü'l-Fudalâ* to gain a good understanding of the lives and careers of Sufi masters and scholars and to reveal the connections between the learned circles of Istanbul. In addition to these biographical dictionaries, I will benefit from *Tuhfe-i Haṭṭātīn* by Müstakîmzâde Süleymân Sa'deddîn (1719-1788), *Sicill-i Osmânî* by Mehmed Süreyyâ (1845-1909) and *Sefîne-i Evliyâ* by Osmânzâde Hüseyin Vassâf

⁴⁵Taşköprülüzâde Ahmed Efendi, *eş-Şakâ'îku'n-Nu'mâniyye fî 'Ulemâi'd-Devleti'l-Osmâniyye: Osmanlı Âlimleri*, prepared by Muhammet Hekimoğlu, (İstanbul: YEK, 2019); Mecdî Mehmed Efendi, *Hadaikü's-Şakaik*, facsimile edition, prepared by Abdülkadir Özcan, (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989); Nev'izâde Atâî, *Hadaikü'l-Hakaik fî Tekmiletü's-Şakaik*, facsimile edition, prepared by Abdülkadir Özcan, (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989); Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekâyi'ü'l-Fudalâ*, vols. I-II, prepared by Abdülkadir Özcan, (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989); Şeyhî Mehmed Efendi, *Vekâyi'ü'l-Fuzalâ: Şeyhî'nin Şakâ'îk Zeyli*, prepared by Ramazan Ekinci, vols. 1-4, (İstanbul: YEK, 2018); Fındıklılı İsmet Efendi, *Şakaik-i Nu'maniye ve Zeyilleri: Tekmiletü's-Şakaik fî Hakk-ı Ehli'l-Hakaik*, prepared by Abdülkadir Özcan, (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989).

(1872-1929).⁴⁶ These are meticulously compiled rich sources based on extensive field and source research in cemeteries and manuscript libraries. For example, *Sefîne-i Evliyâ* was published in Istanbul in 1925 as the fruit of twenty years of research. It contains nearly two thousand entries on the biographies of the şeyhs of various Sufi brotherhoods and is one of the most commendable sources of the Naqshbandi biographies.⁴⁷ Since the authors of these texts were either Sufi dervishes or masters affiliated with several Sufi orders, they were curious and careful enough to collect useful biographical information about the Sufi intellectuals of the Ottoman Empire. Nevertheless, in order to have a historical depiction as realistic as possible, I will subject these sources to comparative evaluation whenever the occasion arises.

1.2.5 Chronicles

In the Naqshbandi networks of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Istanbul there were many dignitaries, scholar-bureaucrats, and officials of senior and inferior ranks who were the subject of the history, not as Sufis but as civil servants and statesmen. Occupying the posts of the grand vizier, vizier, chief mufti, chief judge, qadi, and so on, they often confronted each other and split into factions. The chronicles of the period, namely *Vekâyi'nâme* by Abdurrahmân Abdî Pasha (d. 1686), *Zübde-i Vekâyi'ât* by Defterdâr Sarı Mehmed Pasha (d. 1717), *Zeyl-i Fezleke* and *Nusretnâme* by Silâhdâr Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa (1658-1726), *Târîhs* by Râşid Mehmed (d. 1735), Abdî (d. 1764?), and Subhî Mehmed (d. 1769), contain invaluable pieces of biographical and contextual information as to our heroes.⁴⁸ Therefore, given the partial attitudes of the chroniclers, I will use them through comparisons and crosschecking with other surviving primary sources in order to have a better description of intra-Sufi relations.

⁴⁶Müstakîmzâde Süleymân Sa'deddîn Efendi, *Tuhfe-i Haḥḩâḩîn*, edited and annotated by İbnülemin Mahmûd Kemâl Bey, (İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1928); *Tuhfe-i Hattâtîn*, ed. Mustafa Koç, (İstanbul: Klasik, 2014); Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i Osmânî*, vols. 1-6, prepared by Nuri Akbayar, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996); Osmânzâde Hüseyin Vassâf, *Sefîne-i Evliyâ*, vols. 1-5, (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2006).

⁴⁷For the biographies of the Naqshbandi şeyhs in this source, see *Sefîne-i Evliyâ*, vol. 2, 15-420. On Hüseyin Vassâf, see Cemal Kurnaz and Mustafa Tatçı, "Hüseyin Vassâf," *TDVIA*, vol. 19, (İstanbul: TDV, 1999): 18-19.

⁴⁸Abdurrahman Abdi Paşa, *Abdurrahman Abdi Paşa Vekâyi'-nâmesi [Osmanlı Tarihi 1648-1682]*, prepared by Fahri Ç. Derin, (İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2008); Defterdâr Sarı Mehmed Paşa, *Zübde-i Vekâyi'ât (1656-1704)*, prepared by Abdülkadir Özcan, (Ankara: TTK Basımevi, 1995); Silâhdâr Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa, *Nusretnâme: İnceleme – Metin (1106-1133 / 1695-1721)*, prepared by Mehmet Topal, (Ankara: TÜBA, 2018); Nazire Karaçay Türkal, "Silahdar Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa Zeyl-i Fezleke," Unpublished PhD Diss., (Marmara Üniversitesi 2012); Râşid Mehmed Efendi and Çelebizâde İsmâ'il Âsım Efendi, *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vols. I-III, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan, Yunus Uğur, Baki Çakır, and Ahmet Zeki İzgeör, (İstanbul: Klasik, 2013); Abdî, *Abdî Tarihi: 1730 Patrona İhtilâli Hakkında Bir Eser*, ed. Faik Reşat Unat, (Ankara: TTK, 2014); Vak'anüvis Subhî Mehmed Efendi, *Subhî Tarihi: Sâmi ve Şâkir Tarihleri ile Birlikte (İnceleme ve Karşılaştırmalı Metin)*, ed. Mesut Aydıner, (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2007).

1.3 Structure of the Dissertation

Apart from the introduction, this dissertation has five chapters relating to the state of the Naqshbandi order during a period stretching from 1650 to 1800. Whereas the first chapter is on the Naqshbandi lodges built in Istanbul following the city's conquest to the end of the 18th century, the second chapter focuses on Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî's activities aimed at building an extensive network from 1680's until his death in 1720. The third chapter analyzes four reasons behind the success of the Naqshbandi order as a growing entity during the 17th and 18th centuries. The fourth and fifth chapters are reserved for Mehmed İsmet Efendi, an outstanding but neglected Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi şeyh who enjoyed an attractive life and career during the first half of the 18th century.

The primary goal in the first chapter is to shed light on historical Naqshbandi lodges built in Istanbul over a period of three-and-a-half centuries. To this end, in the first order, the lodges will be subjected to a dual categorization: first- and second-wave lodges. Such a classification seems indispensable because a time interval of one hundred and thirty years sharply separates two distinct century-long periods during which there were seven and eighteen lodges established respectively. Then, the chapter introduces and discusses details of great importance regarding the history and function of the *tekkes* and their founders and şeyhs. The targeted lodges, in fact, have been matter of discussion in several academic studies. My contribution is to reconsider them in light of new archival documents and existing primary sources such as manuscripts. For this purpose, in the first part, I reassess the Emîr Bukhârî lodge located in Fatih, for it had been under the supervision of native şeyhs before its ultimate transfer to Ahmed Sâdık (d. 1586), a Bukhara born Naqshbandi master, and to his spiritual successors all of whom were his progeny. The second part will be a reevaluation of the second-wave lodges set up either in the intramural or extramural city. I will claim in this regard that Eyüp became a center of attraction for Naqshbandis, particularly in the 18th century because of the lodges built for Sufi masters and dervishes of Central and South Asian origin; that Naqshbandi Qalandarism and the tradition of celibacy, which were represented in some of the lodges, were transformed owing to concerns of the state and tekke-founders; that the increase in number of Naqshbandi lodges was due to the patronage of the wealthy patrons and the direct and posthumous influence of Murâd Bukhârî and Yekdest Ahmad Juryânî; that strict connections were formed between the gravedigger lodges and Emîr Bukhârî lodge located at Edirnekapı; and that the growth was a phenomenon not only for the Naqshbandi but also Khalwati and Qadiri orders in

the 18th century Istanbul.

The second chapter is devoted exclusively to Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî, fresh blood in the history of the Naqshbandi order in Ottoman lands. The chapter tries to analyze the politics of his networking, particularly in Istanbul, in light of his surviving letters, Qur'anic dictionary and treatises. Thanks to the rigorous use of the letters new insights into Şeyh Murâd, his family members and his socio-political and religio-sufi networks have emerged. The first purpose of the chapter is to draw attention to new contributions to his biography. Since the correspondence between Şeyh Murâd and his disciples took place in the absence of the parties in the same place, the second aim of the chapter is to introduce the network of communication and transportation that came into being in Şeyh Murâd's Naqshbandi circles. In this context, it is argued that he and his high-ranking disciples of substantial wealth, employed official and private couriers and pilgrimage caravans to ensure the continuity of Sufi communication. Thirdly, the chapter contends that the network formed around Şeyh Murâd was of lettered men and resembled an immaterial republic. By highlighting similarities between Şeyh Murâd's Sufi network and the Western Republic of Letters, the chapter also contributes to the extensive literature on the Republic of Letters. After discussing these three points, which constitute the first part of the chapter, the main reasons for the composition of the letters will be argued in the second part. Considering the average content of the letters, the chapter contends that Şeyh Murâd composed them in order to spread his teachings, which, while not introducing fundamental novelties in the field of Sufism, they were novel in the sense that they contained remodeled views and reformulated vocabularies of the previous generations. By reformulating existing concepts of Sufism, the chapter argues that Şeyh Murâd aimed to consolidate his authority within Naqshbandi circles, which, in turn served the purpose of establishing a Murâdî branch of the Naqshbandiyya. In addition Şeyh Murâd continued to correspond with his disciples in order to maintain control over them from a distance. The methods serving such a purpose were varied and they will be explained in the chapter. Lastly, considering the power struggles between Şeyh Murâd's high-ranking disciples, it will be argued that neither he aimed to exercise power over state affairs, nor could such a will be achieved in the historical conditions of the period.

The third chapter is an attempt to clarify four basic reasons that allowed the Naqshbandi order to gain power and establish a reputation at the social and the state levels during the 17th and 18th centuries. Utilizing Şeyhî Mehmed's *Veḳayî'ü'l-Fuḍalâ* in particular, the chapter proposes in its first and second sections that the concordance with the ulema establishment and sharia, and the familial cooperation with seyyids and nakîbüleşrâf families were two main reasons why the Naqshbandi order

became established in the Ottoman capital and was adopted by a large number of the ulema and urbanites. In this regard, the chapter argues that Naqshbandi masters, either as descendants of the Prophet or claiming to be so, or with close ties to the seyyids, enjoyed the reverence of society and the patronage of high-ranking officials. Therefore, as well-trained and competent preachers who occupied the pulpits of the neighborhood and imperial mosques, they were able to win social sympathy, which in turn led to the expansion of the order through mosques and *tekkes*. As the third reason, the chapter specifically underlines the role of the lodgeless *seyhs* in the development and expansion of the order in Istanbul. Without being tied to a lodge, these masters were able to propagate the Naqshbandi order in their business and social networks as grand viziers, viziers, grand muftis, chief judges, qadis, imams, teachers, professors, and calligraphers. Finally, the chapter highlights Naqshbandi outreach to other Sufi orders as a constructive factor in the continuity and empowerment of the Naqshbandiyya in the capital. It argues that their tolerance of other orders' right to exist and their liturgical practices, as well as their advocacy of a culture of coexistence, above all maintained the continuity of the Naqshbandi order.

The fourth chapter relates to the biography and scholarly works of Mehmed İsmet Efendi, a lodgeless *seyh* who had authorization from at least five Sufi brotherhoods including Naqshbandiyya, Mevleviyye, Qadiriyya, Shadhiliyya, and Bayramiyya. Thanks to his previously unknown manuscripts preserved in the collection of Veliyyüddîn Efendi in the Beyazıt Library, his probate inventory discovered in the Kismet-i Askeriye registers, and his daily notes penned on seven astrological calendars catalogued in the Kandilli Observatory Library, we are in an advantageous position to write about life, career and scholarly production of this neglected Sufi master and scholar. Thus, the chapter will offer a better understanding of his educational background and career, family, wealth, and Sufistic and intellectual orientations. Particularly regarding his intellectual accumulation, the chapter attempts to demonstrate that he not only produced poetic works, but also penned critical commentaries on them, wrote consultative pamphlets for the grand vizier, did not restrict himself to theoretical readings of astronomy and astrology, but also practiced them, and was a good reader of Sufi texts authored by prominent Sufi masters identified with different mystic orders.

The fifth chapter is an attempt to shed light on the patronage networks that made Mehmed İsmet's literary and scholarly compositions possible. Through the rigorous use of his daily notes, autographs, translations and copies of pre-existing scholarly works, the chapter aims to identify the patrons who promoted his scholarly output. Considering that Mehmed İsmet had the approval of five Sufi orders, the chapter investigates and asks to what extent belonging to different orders led to

the diversification of patrons and patronage. As an explanation, it will be maintained that his multiple Sufi connections allowed him to become part of patronage networks in which well-to-do patrons adhering to multiple Sufi brotherhoods already existed. It will be emphasized in this context that Mevlevi, Bayrami-Melami and Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi were the most salient orders that attracted his powerful patrons at the state level. Be that as it may, the chapter establishes that the Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi milieu stood out from others in terms of its unrivalled influence over him and his patrons.

2. FIRST- AND SECOND-WAVE NAQSHBANDI LODGES IN ISTANBUL FROM CONQUEST TO THE END OF THE 18TH CENTURY

2.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the functioning Naqshbandi lodges in 17th— and 18th— century Istanbul. By utilizing untapped primary sources regarding operating and recently built Naqshbandi *tekkes* and the *şeyhs*, I aim to find answers to the following questions: What were common and peculiar threads of Naqshbandi lodges in Istanbul during the centuries in question? What were the roles of the lodges in the neighborhoods where they were situated? To what extent were external developments within the order embraced and how the new Naqshbandi flux was treated by adherents of the order in the Ottoman capital? To what extent had the existing patronage system influenced the continuity and propagation of the order? In response to these and similar questions, I will show that neither the roles and functions of Naqshbandi lodges nor the Naqshbandi *şeyhs* and their followers can be understood solely through the analysis of the dynamics of Sufism and religion. I claim that changing, transforming, and redeveloping social and political networks enable us to understand the Istanbulite Naqshbandis, who were dynamic enough to pursue emergent changes and transformations either in the order or in the society and political establishment. It was this ability, I assert, that made possible the durability and prolongation of the order in Istanbul. For this, however, an introduction is needed for the historical Naqshbandi lodges founded in Istanbul.

2.2 First-wave Naqshbandi Lodges in Istanbul

The Naqshbandi lodges and *şeyhs* have come into question in several studies in which the historical presence of the order in the Ottoman capital have been a matter of

investigation. Thanks to the research conducted by Kasım Kufralı, Thierry Zarccone, Ekrem Işın, Hamid Algar, Cemaleddin Server Revnakoğlu, Reşat Öngören, Ramazan Muslu, Hür Mahmut Yücer, Dina le Gall, and Halil İbrahim Şimşek,⁴⁹ obscurities in the history of the Naqshbandiyya in Anatolia and Istanbul have gradually waned in importance and are all but forgotten. However, the Naqshbandi lodges founded in the late 15th to the 18th centuries, in addition to the studies mentioned in the first footnote of this chapter, encyclopedic entries written by Thierry Zarccone, and Baha Tanman for *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* and Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi and investigations made by Martin Grace Smith, Klaus Kreiser, and Nuran Çetin constitute significant contribution to the history of the Naqshbandi order.⁵⁰ It is, to a large extent, thanks to efforts of these researchers that we are able to realize a bifurcated lodge system of Naqshbandiyya in Istanbul, which consists of *tekkes* under the control of Naqshbandi *şeyh* families who secured the continuity of the order in the city and *tekkes* built for and operated by the Central and South Asians who visited Istanbul for reasons including pilgrimages, careers in state administration, business and crafts.

The Naqshbandi Order, alongside Bayrami, Vefai (or Zeyni), and Khalwati *tarīqats*,

⁴⁹Kasım Kufralı, “Naqşibendiliğin Kuruluşu ve Yayılışı,” Unpublished PhD Diss., (Istanbul University, 1949), “Molla İlâhî ve Kendisinden Sonraki Naqşibendiye Muhiti,” *TÜDED* III/1 (1949): 129-151. This article has republished in *Tasavvuf Kitabı*, ed. Cemil Çiftçi, (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2003): 42-64. My references will be to the latter edition. Thierry Zarccone, “Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul,” *Anatolia moderna – Yeni Anadolu* 2 (1991): 137-200; Ekrem Işın, “Naqşibendilik,” *DBIA*, vol. VI, (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1993-1994): 31-38; Hamid Algar, “Naqshband,” *EI*, vol. VII, (Leiden: Brill, 1993): 933-934, “Naqshbandiyya: in Persia and in Turkey,” *ibid*, 934-937, “Naqşibendiyye,” *TDVIA*, vol. 32, (İstanbul: TDV, 2006): 335-342, and “The Naqshbandi Order: A preliminary survey of its history and significance,” *Studia Islamica* 44 (1976): 123-152; C. Server Revnakoğlu, *Eski Sosyal Hayatımızda Tasavvuf ve Tarikat Kültürü*, prepared by M. Doğan Bayın and İsmail Dervişoğlu, (İstanbul: Kırkambar Kitaplığı, 2003): 149-156; Reşat Öngören, *Osmanlılar’da Tasavvuf*, 117-154, “İstanbul’da Tasavvufî Hayat,” in *Büyük İstanbul Tarihi*, vol. V, eds. M. Âkif Aydın and Coşkun Yılmaz, (İstanbul: İBB Kültür Yayınları, 2015): 265-275; Ramazan Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: 18. Yüzyıl*, (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2003): 229-309; Hür Mahmut Yücer, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: 19. Yüzyıl*, (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2003): 245-340; Dina le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism: Nakshbandīs in the Ottoman World, 1450-1700*, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005); Halil İbrahim Şimşek, *18. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Toplumunda Naqşibendî-Müceddidilik*, (İstanbul: Litera Yayıncılık, 2016).

⁵⁰See Thierry Zarccone, “Afganiler Tekkesi,” *DBIA*, vol. I, 86, “Buhara Tekkesi,” *DBIA*, vol. II, 325-326, “Emir Buhârî Tekkesi,” *DBIA*, vol. III, 165-167, “Hindiler Tekkesi,” *DBIA*, vol. IV, 74-75, “Kalenderhane Tekkesi,” *DBIA*, vol. IV, 398-399, “Kaşgarî Tekkesi,” *DBIA*, vol. IV, 485-486; Baha Tanman, “Âbid Çelebi Tekkesi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 1, 308, “Afganiler Tekkesi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 1, 400, “Emir Buhârî Tekkesi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 11, 126-128, “Hindiler Tekkesi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 18, 68-69, “Murad Buhârî Tekkesi,” *DBIA*, vol. V, 514-516, “Şeyh Murad Tekkesi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 39, (İstanbul: TDV, 2010): 62-64, “Mustafa Paşa Tekkesi,” *DBIA*, vol. V, 564-565, “Neccarzâde Tekkesi,” *DBIA*, vol. VI, 59-60, “Özbekler Tekkesi,” *DBIA*, vol. VI, 199-202, “Özbekler Tekkesi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 34, 121-123, and 123-124; Martin Grace Smith, “The Özbek Tekkes of Istanbul,” *Der Islam* 57 (1980): 130-139; Klaus Kreiser, “Kaşgarî Tekyesi: Ein Istanbul Naqshbandî-Konvent und Sein Stifter,” in *Naqshbandis: Historical Developments and Present Situation of a Muslim Mystical Order*, (Istanbul-Paris: ISIS, 1990): 331-335; Nuran Çetin, “Kaşgarî Tekkesi,” *Tarihi, Kültürü ve Sanatıyla Eyüpsultan Sempozyumu VIII: Tebliğler*, (İstanbul: Eyüp Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2004): 294-305, “Murad Buhari Tekkesi ve Fonksiyonları,” *Amasya Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 4 (2015): 5-36, *idem*, *Gönül Sultanlarının Ağırlandığı Tekke: Kâşgarî Dergâhı*, (İstanbul: Eyüpsultan Belediyesi Yayınları, 2018).

is one of the oldest orders settled in Istanbul following the conquest of 1453.⁵¹ Although a certain Ahmed-i İlâhî is introduced as the first Naqshbandi *şeyh* to took refuge in Istanbul, where he gave sermons in the presence of Mehmed II (d. 1481), we do not find a long-serving lodge attributed to him. The earliest center of Naqshbandiyya in Istanbul is Hindîler Tekkesi, erected in 860/1455-1456⁵² for a Naqshbandi *şeyh* named Khwaja Ishaq Bukhârî-i Hindî upon Mehmed II's order, passed into the Qadiriyya in the mid-17th century but was reclaimed by the Naqshbandiyya in the following century.⁵³ Despite its uninterrupted service from the second half of the 16th century to the closure of *tekkes* and *zâviyes* in 1925,⁵⁴ the chain of *şeyhs* occupying the post of Hindîler Tekkesi has not been brought to light. The only attempt made for this purpose was by Thierry Zarcone, who, by resting on the tombstones in the burial area of the *tekke*, revealed the names of *şeyhs* serving in the lodge since the late 18th century. However, as Zarcone emphasized himself, “[n]aturally, this *silsile-nâme* will not be free of errors and will need to be completed or corrected in the future according to the new documentation that may be updated.”⁵⁵ Owing to the transliteration of dozens of qadi registers of Istanbul, the names of at least four Hindî *şeyhs* have come to light. While two of them (Şeyh Fethullâh and Şeyh Abdüsselâm) are identified as the *şeyh* of the Hindîs, the remaining two *şeyhs* (Abdülğanî and Kemâleddîn) are merely dubbed as “Hindî”.⁵⁶ From the sijills we understand that only Şeyh Fethullâh still assumed the post of the Horhor Hindîler Tekkesi in mid-October 1624, for he was identified as such among the witnesses of a notarial litigation in which the said Şeyh Abdülğanî was one of the participants.⁵⁷ Twenty years later, on 1 May 1644, a certain Şeyh Abdüsselâm appears among the

⁵¹Revnakoğlu, *Eski Sosyal Hayatımızda Tasavvuf ve Tarikat Kültürü*, 149, Reşat Öngören, “İstanbul’da Tasavvufi Hayat,” 240-296.

⁵²The year of foundation is established by Cemaleddin Server Revnakoğlu. Conveyed by Ali Emre İşlek, “Osmanlı Devleti’nde Hindî Tekkeleri,” Unpublished PhD Diss., (Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, 2020): 52.

⁵³Thierry Zarcone, “Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul,” 172-174; Baha Tanman, “Hindîler Tekkesi,” 67. According to *Otman Baba Velâyetnâmesi* which was penned by Küçük Abdal in 1483, Otman Baba visited the Hindîler Tekkesi when passing through Istanbul, an explicit indication that the first Naqshbandi *tekke* had already been there. Depending on an archival document dated 10 October 1817, Ali Emre İşlek claims that the Hindîler Tekkesi was the earliest lodge of Chishtiyya rather than Naqshbandiyya in the Ottoman capital. For his argumentation see *ibid*, 58-61.

⁵⁴Resting on Revnakoğlu’s handwritten notes on the Hindîler Tekkesi, İşlek asserts that the *tekke* was in ruin before its reconstruction under Şeyh Turâbî-i Hindî in 1737. İşlek argues that it might be destroyed by the conflagration of 1660 (İhrâk-ı Kebîr) which wiped out many buildings also in Horhor – Aksaray where the said lodge had been erected. See *ibid*, 56-57, and 62.

⁵⁵My own translation. See, Zarcone, *ibid*, 174. For the chain, see *ibid*, 176.

⁵⁶On Şeyh Abdülğanî, see *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri: Rumeli Sadareti Mahkemesi 40 numaralı Sicil (H. 1033-1034 / M. 1623-1624)*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz, (İstanbul: İBB Kültür A.Ş., 2019): 65, 96 and 296. On Şeyh Kemâleddîn, see *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri: Eyüp Mahkemesi 74 numaralı sicil (H. 1072-1073 / M. 1661-1662)*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz, (İstanbul: İSAM, 2011): 394.

⁵⁷*İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri: Rumeli Sadareti Mahkemesi 40 numaralı Sicil*, 296.

witnesses as “the *şeyh* of Hindîs” in a case regarding the heirless property of Receb b. Abdullâh, a Hindî merchant who died in Kağıthane.⁵⁸ The existence of a Hindî lodge and merchant community in Kağıthane, as Ali Emre İşlek rightly reminds us, corresponds to the historical background depicted by Evliya Çelebi (d. 1684?), who points out a Hindî lodge and Hindîs living in and around Kağıthane.⁵⁹ However, İşlek concludes that the Hindîler Tekkesi in Horhor was either worthless in the eyes of Hindîs in the mid-17th century or devastated by the natural disasters such as conflagration and flood, two remarkable claims in need for further studies.⁶⁰

In addition to the Hindîler Tekkesi, the two first-wave *tekkes*, where Naqshbandi invocation and rituals had uninterruptedly been observed since the last years of Bayezid II’s reign (r. 1481-1512), were built in the name of Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî (d. 1516), the disciple of famous masters Khwaja Ubaydullâh Ahrâr (d. 1490) and Abdullâh İlahî (d. 1491), and the most venerated Naqshbandi *şeyh* in Istanbul before the arrival of Murâd Bukhârî (d. 1720). Whereas one of them was constructed before 1512 in the vicinity of the Mosque complex of Mehmed II, the other was built in Ayvansaray/Eğrikapı in 1512. As to the latter, we learn from Ayvansarâyî that it was the private property of Ahmed Bukhârî, and because it was endowed as a familial waqf, the property had remained in the hands of legal heirs, but Şeyh Muslihuddîn Mustafâ (d. 1657-58), who married the granddaughter of Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî, restored and enlarged its waqf.⁶¹ Depending on this detail and the roster of *şeyhs* in which lists Muslihuddîn Mustafâ in the first place, Dina le Gall claims that “this site slipped out of Naqshbandî control and ceased to exist as a Naqshbandî tekke for over a century. It was only in the mid-seventeenth century that the property reverted to Naqshbandî use.”⁶² However, it seems more reasonable that the *şeyhs* of Emîr Bukhârî lodge in Fatih were unconditional supervisors and incumbents of this tekke as well, since it was stipulated as the property of Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî, who left no male descendant behind. In other words, we can assert that it was during the incumbency of Seyyid Abdullâh (d. 1670), the then serving *şeyh* at Fatih lodge,

⁵⁸ *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri: Eyüp Mahkemesi (Havass-ı Refia) 49 numaralı sicil (H. 1054 / M. 1644)*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz, (İstanbul: İSAM, 2011): 75.

⁵⁹ On the funeral pyres lit and cremated corpses witnessed by Evliya Çelebi in the Kağıthane valley, see also Tülay Artan, “Cosmopolitanism in the Early 18th-Century Ottoman Capital: The Impostor, the Alchemist, the Merchant and the Personal Dimension,” *Turcica* 55 (2024) (forthcoming).

⁶⁰ For İşlek’s conclusion see *ibid.*, 55-56.

⁶¹ “Bu mescid ve zâviye mülk olmağla vereseşi yedinde kalup ba^cde zemân şeyh-i mezbûruñ tarîkinden Muşlihuddîn Muştafâ Efendi şeyh-i mezbûruñ kerîmezâdesini tezevvüc iderek zâviye-i mezkûreye şeyh olup ve vakfına müceddeden nizam virüp be-her sene mevlüd-i şerif kırâ³ati için dalı vakfını tevsi^c eylemiş ...” Hafız Hüseyin Ayvansarâyî, *Hadikatü'l-Cevâmi'*, (Dersa'âdet: Matba'a-i 'Âmire, 1281): 45-46; Hafız Hüseyin al-Ayvansarayî, *The Garden of Mosques*, translated and annotated by Howard Crane, (Leiden: Brill, 2000): 52.

⁶² Le Gall, *Nakshbandîs in the Ottoman World*, 51.

that Muslihuddîn Mustafâ was appointed as the new *şeyh* to the Ayvansaray lodge. If this is so, then, the name of *şeyhs* serving at Ayvansaray lodge must be as listed as in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Şeyhs of Ayvansaray Emîr Bukhârî Lodge

	Şeyh	Death
1	Seyyid Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî	922/1516
2	Mahmûd Çelebi	938/1531-32
3	Abdullatîf Çelebi	971/1563
4	Cemâlzâde Seyyid Mehmed Efendi	993/1585
5	Seyyid Ahmed Sâdık Bukhârî	994/1586
6	Kavaklızâde Mehmed Efendi	1000/1592
7	Şa'bân Efendi	1002/1593
8	Seyyid Ziyâeddîn Ahmed	1011/1602-3
9	Seyyid Fazlullâh b. Muhammed Sa'îd	1046/1637
10	Seyyid Abdullâh	1080/1670
11	Muslihuddîn Mustafâ	1068/1658
12	Hüseyin Efendi	1086/1675
13	Yûsuf Efendi	1100/1688
14	Osmân Efendi	1137/1724
15	Karamanîzâde Ahmed Efendi	1149/1736
16	Kırımî Ahmed Efendi	1156/1743
17	Mehmed Emîn Tokadî Efendi	1158/1745
18	Halîl Birgivî Efendi	1163/1749
19	İbrâhîm Efendi	1169/1755
20	Hasan Efendi	1167/1753
21	Mustafâ Efendi	1196/1781

In addition to these *tekkes*, a third *tekke*, also named after Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî, was built before the year 937/1530 by Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî's disciple and son-in-law Khwaja Mahmûd Efendi (d. 1584) in Edirnekapı outside the city walls. Regarding the *tekke*, it is claimed by Baha Tanman that it passed to the Sivâsî branch of Khalwatiyya in 1086/1675-76, and, after reverting to Naqshbandiyya, it passed to Qadiriyya in 1731 upon its renowned *şeyh* Şeyhî Mehmed's death.⁶³ However, it seems more rational to define these handovers of position at Edirnekapı *tekke* as a transition "to spiritual descendants of another Naqshbandî line"⁶⁴ rather than a clear-cut passage from the Naqshbandi to the Khalwati or Qadiri orders. This is so, because it is understood from Şeyh Feyzî Hasan's biography rendered by his

⁶³For more on *tekkes* dedicated to Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî see Ekrem Işın, "Naksibendilik," 32; Thierry Zarcone, "Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul," 139-144, "Emir Buhârî Tekkesi," 165-167; Baha Tanman, "Emir Buhârî Tekkesi," and Dina le Gall, *Nakshbandis in the Ottoman World*, 38-39.

⁶⁴Le Gall, *Nakshbandis in the Ottoman World*, 41-42.

son Şeyhî Mehmed that the primary reason behind Feyzî Hasan's nomination might have been that he had already completed his Naqshbandi training under the famed Naqshbandi *şeyh* Bosnevî Osmân (d. 1664).⁶⁵ That is, it was most probably due to his Naqshbandi *ijaza* that he was able to serve in the lodge. In comparison, we may contend that what allowed Qadiri *şeyhs* to supervise the Edirnekapı *tekke* starting with the appointment in 1731 of Şâhkadınzâde Şeyh Abdurrahmân Efendi (d. 1750) was their authorization in the Naqshbandi order (see Table 2.2).

Table 2.2 Şeyhs of Edirnekapı Emîr Bukhârî Lodge

	Şeyh	Death
1	Mahmûd Çelebi	938/1531-32
2	Menteşeli Hâcî Halîfe	?
3	Takıyyüddîn Ebûbekir	965/1557-58
4	Sefer Efendi	?
5	Hamza Efendi	?
6	Taşçızâde Mehmed Efendi	?
7	Mustafâ Efendi	?
8	Mehmed Emîn Efendi	?
9	Feyzî Hasan Efendi	1102/1690
10	Şeyhî Mehmed Efendi	1144/1731
11	Şâhkadınzâde Abdurrahmân Efendi	1163/1750
12	Feyzullâh Efendi	1184/1770
13	Abdurrahmân Efendi	1225/1810

Thanks to the support of Süleyman II's powerful grand vizier Rüstem Pasha (d. 1561), the fourth well-established Naqshbandi *tekke* was founded during his grand vizierate (v. 1544-53) in the Koska neighborhood of Istanbul, between Beyazıt and Aksaray, by Hekîm Çelebi (d. 1567), the younger *khalîfa* of Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî.⁶⁶ As can be seen in Table 2.3, also demonstrated by Dina le Gall, “[i]t was around this tekke that he began to develop his own circle and initiatic line... The Fîl Dâmî tekke itself had as shaykhs seven of his spiritual descendants (Muştafâ Nakşbendzâde, Ya^cķüb İlâhîzâde, Aḥmed Tirevî, İbrâhîm Efendi, °Osmân Bosnevî, Mu^cabbir Ḥasan, and Muştafâ Efendi Esîrî Dâmâdî)”.⁶⁷ Another *tekke* in the Halıcılar neighborhood is attributed to Hekîm Çelebi, but the inference from Ahmed Münib Efendi's (d. 1918) *Mecmû^ca-i Tekâyâ* published in the 1890 is feeble and cursory at best.⁶⁸ As understood from this misattribution, in comparison to

⁶⁵Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayiu'l-Fudalâ*, vol. II, 37-38.

⁶⁶For an introduction on Hekîm Çelebi or Fildamı lodge see Reşat Öngören, “İstanbul'da Tasavvufî Hayat,” 268-270. On Hekîm Çelebi see Nev'îzâde Atâî, *Hadaiku'l-Hakaik fi Tekmiletî's-Şakaik*, 216-217.

⁶⁷Le Gall, *Nakshbandîs in the Ottoman World*, 42.

⁶⁸For the misattributions see Günay Kut and Turgut Kut, “İstanbul Tekkelerine Ait Bir Kaynak: Dergeh-

the aforementioned convents of Emîr Bukhârî, the literature on the Hekîm Çelebi lodge is far from satisfaction. Be that as it may, my research in the Ottoman Archives sheds light on an account book of great importance pertaining to the Hekîm Çelebi *tekke*. According to the register in question, the construction of the Hekîm Çelebi *tekke* complex, which includes a bathhouse (*hammâm*), an upstairs guesthouse (*misâfirhâne-i fevkânî*), a kitchen (*maṭbah*), a chamber for the şeyh, and sickrooms (*oda-i marzân*), started at the beginning of Shawwâl 960 [10 September 1553].⁶⁹

Table 2.3 Şeyhs of Hekîm Çelebi Lodge

	Şeyh	Death
1	Hekîm Çelebi	974/1567
2	Nakşibendzâde Mustafâ Efendi	979/1571
3	İlâhîzâde Ya'kûb Efendi	990/1582
4	Tirevî Ahmed Efendi	1034/1624
5	İbrâhîm Efendi	?
6	Bosnevî Osmân Efendi	1074/1664
7	Mu'abbir Hasan Efendi	1102/1687
8	İspirî Dâmâdı Mustafâ Efendi	1120/1708
9	Seyyid Fazlullâh Efendi	1121/1709
10	Ahmed Mekkî Efendi	1122/1710
11	Çelebi Şeyhzâde Abdurrahmân Efendi	1162/1749
12	Mehmed Efendi	1167/1754
13	Yâsîncizâde Osmân Efendi	1187/1773

Besides these long-standing lodges built either by Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî or his son-in-law Mahmûd Çelebi, a certain Bâbâ Haydar Semerkandî (d. 1550), another disciple of Ubaydullâh Ahrâr for whom Süleymân I had a mescid-*tekke* built in Eyüp, appears as an eminent, first-generation Naqshbandi *şeyh* in the Ottoman capital.⁷⁰ Yet, the

nâme,” in *Türkische Miscellen: Robert Anhegger Festschrift*, (Istanbul: Editions Divit Press, 1987): 232; Ekrem Işın, “Nakşibendilik,” 33; Reşat Öngören, “İstanbul’da Tasavvufî Hayat,” 268; Lokman Turan, “İstanbul Dergâhları Hakkında Bilinmeyen Bir Eser: Lutfî’nin Hânkâh-nâme’si,” *Türkbilgi* 21 (2011): 45. For more on Ahmed Münib and his text see Selami Şimşek, “Son Dönem Celvetî Şeyhlerinden Bandırmalızâde Ahmed Münib Efendi’nin Hayatı, Eserleri ve Mecmûa-yı Tekâyâ’sı,” *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 21 (2007): 135-172.

⁶⁹See BOA, TS.MA.d 3893.

⁷⁰Reşat Öngören, “İstanbul’da Tasavvufî Hayat,” 270. According to a legend conveyed by Aysel Okan, it was Bâyezid II who built a *mescid* for Bâbâ Haydar. See *İstanbul Evliyaları*, 3. eds, (İstanbul: Kapı, 2008): 283-291. For more on Bâbâ Haydar and his *tekke-mescid* see Mecdî Mehmed Efendi, *Hadaikü’ş-Şakâik*, 435; Ayvansarâyî, *Hadikatü’l-Çevâmî*, 285; idem *The Garden of Mosques*, 303-304; Hamid Algar, “Baba Haydar,” *TDVIA*, vol. 4, (Istanbul: TDV, 1991): 367; Baha Tanman, “Baba Haydar Camii ve Tekkesi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 4, 367-368; Mehmet Nermi Haskan, *Eyüp Tarihi*, vol. I, (İstanbul: Türk Turing Turizm İşletmeciliği Vakfı Yayınları, 1993): 27-29; Haşim Şahin, “Klasik Çağ Osmanlı İstanbul’unda Nakşibendilik: Eyüp’te Baba Haydar Örneği,” in *Tarihi, Kültürü ve Sanatıyla Eyüpsultan Sempozyumu VII Tebliğler*, (İstanbul: Eyüp Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2003): 415-419; and Nuran Çetin, “Eyüp Tekkeleri,” Unpublished PhD Diss. (Marmara Üniversitesi 2012): 126-132.

current documentation demonstrates that Bâbâ Haydar introduced no *khalîfa* during his years in Istanbul. Be that as it may, the surroundings of his *tekke*, where he was buried, were turned into a prestigious burial area particularly for some Naqshbandi *şeyhs* and their relatives dwelling at the Emîr Bukhârî lodge in Fatih.⁷¹ In addition to Bâbâ Haydar's *tekke*, there emerge a few dervish convents which were either built or run by second-generation Naqshbandi *şeyhs*, but abandoned for other Sufi orders soon afterwards. The best-known example of this is Âbid Çelebi Tekkesi built by Âbid Çelebi (d. 1498), the descendant of Jalâl al-Dîn al-Rûmî and an eminent *khalîfa* of Abdullâh Îlâhî of Simav who devised the lodge to perform both Naqshbandi and Mevlevi rituals.⁷² The second significant example, in this regard, is Taşlı Zaviye, where Sâlih Muslihuddîn Mustafâ (d. 1553), one the novices of Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî served long years.⁷³ Nonetheless, despite the certainty that Âbid Çelebi Tekkesi served the Naqshbandis and Mevlevi for decades, we cannot trace the subsequent Naqshbandi presence in Taşlı Zaviye.

2.2.1 Observations on the Fatih Emîr Bukhârî Lodge in the 16th Century

Having introduced a sketch of the lodges and convents constructed under the control of the Naqshbandis since the late 15th and early 16th centuries, I will briefly canvass a closer familiarity with the masters who assumed positions of teaching, guidance and management. In so doing, I indicate that although the lodges in question were permanently under Naqshbandis, no constant control mechanism of any Naqshbandi *şeyh* family over the lodges had been accomplished, apart from the prestigious lodge near the mosque complex of Mehmed II. Such an attempt is crucial considering Ekrem Işın's claim that it was because of the powerful *şeyh* families that the Naqshbandiyya remained energetically organized from its initial years to the beginning of the 19th century in Istanbul. The two examples given by Işın in this regard are the Naqshbandi group following the footsteps of Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî and the family of Khwaja Muhammad Huseynî, which split into two branches represented by Khwaja Ahmed Sâdık (d. 1586) and Khwaja Muhammad Sa'îd (d. ?).⁷⁴ Insofar as

⁷¹See for instance, Şeyh Seyyid Fazlullâh (d. 1635), Şeyh Seyyid Abdullâh (d. 1670), his son-in-law Seyyid Ahmed Efendi (d. 1680), Şerife Emetullâh Hatun (d. 1686), Seyyid Ahmed Efendi (d. 1713), Şeyh Seyyid Abdülkebîr (d. 1719), Şeyh Seyyid Mehmed Refî' (d. 1719), Şeyh Seyyid Abdurrahmân (d. 1774). For the names in question, I am depending on Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayiu'l-Fudalâ*, vol. I, 61, 488, 567, and vol. II, 676; and Mehmet Nermi Haskan, *ibid*, 28.

⁷²This lodge was built before 1494 and considered the second Mevlevi convent in Istanbul. For more see Baha Tanman, "Âbid Çelebi Tekkesi," For his short biography see Mecdi Mehmed Efendi, *Hadaiku's-Şakaik*, 367-368.

⁷³Mecdi Mehmed, *Hadaiku's-Şakaik*, 436.

⁷⁴Ekrem Işın, "Nakşibendilik," 36.

the crucial role of the former master, Dina le Gall clings to the same reasoning when claiming that “[r]ather than nonhereditary spiritual descendants, the successors of Aḥmad Ṣādiq were all *khalīfas*-cum-biological progeny, whether sons, brothers, or nephews. Theirs was a Naqshbandi line as well as a family patrimony centered on a single tekke (though not quite akin to the phenomenon of hereditary families of shaykhs and shrine caretakers that are known to us from other environments and from other, often more localized, tariqas.”⁷⁵

Notwithstanding the familial dominance of Khwaja Muhammad Huseynî on the Naqshbandi chain coming into existence at the Emîr Bukhârî Lodge in the vicinity of Mehmed II’s mosque complex, such an authority begins only in the late 16th century as seen in Table 2.4.⁷⁶ The table shows that Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî left no hereditary successor in the tekke. This is perhaps because he left his family in Bukhara when embarking on a journey to Anatolia in the retinue of his master, Abdullâh Îlâhî.⁷⁷ If this is so, we may assume that it was his later marriage in Anatolia that gave birth to his daughter married to the successor *şeyh*, Mahmûd Çelebi. However, it is conceivable that his immediate family had also taken refuge in Anatolia and later in Istanbul. Likewise, Table 2.4 shows that during seventy-year period from Ahmed Bukhârî’s death in 1516 to the inauguration of Ahmed Sâdık Bukhârî in 1585, the lodge remained under the leadership of three Ottoman Sufi masters. A closer gaze at the biography of the *şeyhs* listed in the table demonstrates that, apart from Mahmûd Çelebi and Abdullatîf Çelebi, and the two *şeyhs* succeeding Ahmed Sâdık — Kavaklızâde Mehmed Efendi and Şa‘bân Efendi—, all of the remaining *şeyhs* claimed noble lineage derived from the Prophet Muhammad. Even so, there had to be special links between the *seyyids* and the exceptional four figures who made possible their appointment as *şeyh* to the Fatih lodge. Such a peculiar relation can, indeed, be applied to Mahmûd Çelebi, who was an adopted child of Seyyid Ahmed el-Kırmî (d. 1474), one of the eminent scholars who immigrated to Anatolia during the reign of Murâd II.⁷⁸ As regards to Abdullatîf Çelebî who is identified as the

⁷⁵Dina le Gall, *Nakshbandîs in the Ottoman World*, 45.

⁷⁶I have comparatively utilized the lists of *şeyhs* given by Hâfız Hüseyin Ayvansarâyî and Zâkir Şükrî Efendi the biographic entries penned by Mecdî Mehmed, Nev’îzâde Atâî, and Şeyhî Mehmed. See *Ayvansarâyî, Hadîkatü’l-Cevâmî*, 42-44; Hafız Hüseyin al-Ayvansarayî, *The Garden of Mosques*, translated and annotated by Howard Crane, (Leiden: Brill, 2000): 49-50; Zâkir Şükrî, *Die Istanbul derwisch-konvente und ihre scheiche: (Mecmua-i Tekaya)*, transcribed by Mehmet Serhat Tayşi, ed. Klaus Kraiser, Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1980: 67-68. Mecdî Mehmed Efendi, *Hadaiku’ş-Şakaik*; Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayiu’l-Fudalâ*, vols. I-II, prepared by Abdülkadir Özcan, (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989).

⁷⁷“Şeyh Îlâhî püm-ı Rüm şavbına müteveccih olduğda Seyyid Aḥmed Buḥārî ehl ü ‘ıyâlini Buḥārâ’da terk idüp” Mecdî Mehmed, *Hadaiku’ş-Şakaik*, 362-363.

⁷⁸For the short biography of Mahmûd Çelebi see Taşköprülüzâde Ahmed Efendi, *eş-Şakâ’iku’n-Nu’mâniyye fî ‘Ulemâi’d-Devleti’l-Osmâniyye: Osmanlı Âlimleri*, prepared by Muhammet Hekimoğlu, (İstanbul: YEK, 2019): 824-825; Mecdî Mehmed, *ibid*, 518-519. On Seyyid Ahmed Kırmî see Taşköprülüzâde, *ibid*, 146-148; Mecdî Mehmed, *ibid*, 101-102.

descendant of Koyun Mûsâ Pasha, a renowned vizier of Mehmed II,⁷⁹ except for the family bond tiding him to Mahmûd Çelebi, there is no reference to the nobility of his lineage. However, it seems likely that, following the death of Mahmûd Çelebi, the Fatih lodge came under the oversight of pasha families as in the examples of Abdullatîf Çelebi, and Cemâlzâde Seyyid Mehmed Efendi, who himself was member of Cemâlîs. The latter, a distinguished family named after Cemâleddîn Aksarâyî (d. 1388-89), raised the esteemed of the Khalwati *şeyhs*, Cemâl Halvetî (d. 1494) and Cemâleddîn İshak Karamanî (d. 1527), and the former's son Pîrî Mehmed Pasha (d. 1532) who served as qadi, treasurer, vizier, and grand vizier under Bâyezid II, Selim I and Süleymân I.⁸⁰ Cemâlzâde Seyyid Mehmed Efendi, we are told, was the son of Cemâleddîn İshak Karamanî and was buried in Sütlüce in the vicinity of the Congregational Mosque of Sütlüce, most probably a burial area near the *tekke*, which Pîrî Mehmed Pasha had built in the name of Şeyh İshak.⁸¹ Cemâlzâde Mehmed was not the only Naqshbandi *şeyh* to have Khalwati background. As is reported by Atâî, the seventh *şeyh* of the Fatih lodge, Şa'bân Efendi, received his initial Sufi training from his fellow townsman and famed Khalwati, Şeyh Şa'bân-ı Velî (d. 1569) in Kastamonu. After relocating to Istanbul, he became the disciple of Hekîm Çelebi, who taught him Naqshbandi civility.⁸² Kavaklızâde Mehmed Efendi is another graduate of Hekîm Çelebi who managed to become the incumbent of the Fatih lodge. However, he was neither affiliated with the Khalwati order nor belonged to a prominent pasha family. Still, as a Bursan of humble origin, he was able to become tutor of Alî Pasha, the former governor general of Egypt and the vizier Ferhad Pasha (d. 1595).⁸³

The succession of the abovementioned multifarious figures in the Fatih Emîr Bukhârî lodge proves that the founder Emîr Bukhârî did not stipulate being replaced by a lineal successor after his death. As stated above, it was the family of Seyyid Ahmed Sâdik Bukhârî who achieved a permanent spiritual lineage in the lodge

⁷⁹Nev'izâde Atâî, *Hadaiku'l-Hakaik*, 84-85. I have not found details regarding the biography of Koyun Mûsâ Pasha.

⁸⁰On Cemâleddîn Aksarâyî see Mustafa Öz, "Cemâleddin Aksarâyî," *TDVIA*, vol. 7, (İstanbul: TDV, 1993): 308-309. On Cemâl Halvetî see Mehmet Serhat Tayşi, "Cemâl-i Halvetî," *TDVIA*, vol. 7, 302-303. On Cemâleddîn İshak Karamanî, see Reşat Öngören, "Karamânî, Cemâleddin İshak," *TDVIA*, vol. 24, (İstanbul: TDV, 2001): 448-449.

⁸¹See Zâkir Şükrî, *Mecmua-i Tekaya*, 68; Reşat Öngören, "Karamânî, Cemâleddin İshak," 448; Ayvansarâyî, *Hadikatü'l-Cevâmî'*, 303, and *The Garden of Mosques*, 321. For the short biography of Cemâlzâde Seyyid Mehmed Efendi, see Atâî, *Hadaiku'l-Hakaik*, 361.

⁸²Atâî, *Hadaiku'l-Hakaik*, 371. See also Dina le Gall, *Nakshbandîs in the Ottoman World*, 41-42. For an introduction on Şa'bân-ı Velî, see Mustafa Tatcı and Cemal Kurnaz, "Şâbân-ı Velî," *TDVIA*, vol. 38, (İstanbul: TDV, 2010): 208-210.

⁸³On Kavaklızâde Mehmed, see Atâî, *Hadaiku'l-Hakaik*, 371; Âşık Çelebi, *Meşâ'irü's-Şu'arâ*, prepared by Filiz Kılıç, (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2018): 384. On Ferhâd Pasha see Mehmet İpşirli, "Ferhad Paşa," *TDVIA*, vol. 12, (İstanbul: TDV, 1995): 383-384.

Table 2.4 Şeyhs of Fatih Emîr Bukhârî Lodge

	Name of the Şeyh	Affinity	Death
1	Seyyid Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî	Founder	922/1516
2	Mahmûd Çelebi	Son-in-law of the founder	938/1531-32
3	Abdullatîf Çelebi	Son-in-law of the former	971/1563
4	Cemâlzâde Seyyid Mehmed Efendi	Successor of the former	993/1585
5	Seyyid Ahmed Sâdık Taşkendî	Son of M. Abdussemî‘	994/1586
6	Kavaklızâde Mehmed Efendi	Successor of the former	1000/1592
7	Şa‘bân Efendi	Successor of the former	1002/1593
8	Seyyid Ziyâeddîn Ahmed	Son of Ahmed Sâdık	1011/1602-3
9	Seyyid Fazlullâh b. Muhammed Sa‘îd	Grandson of M. Abdussemî‘	1046/1637
10	Seyyid Abdullâh	Son of the former	1080/1670
11	Seyyid Fazlullâh	Son of the former	1121/1709
12	Seyyid Abdulkebîr	Son of the former	1131/1719
13	Seyyid Mehmed Refî‘	Son of the former	1132/1720
14	Seyyid Abdurrahmân	Brother of the former	1188/1774-5
15	Seyyid Hamdullâh	Son of the former	1212/1798
16	Seyyid Mehmed Şerefeddîn	Son of the former	1214/1799
17	Seyyid Mehmed Nesîb	Brother of the former	1228/1813
18	Seyyid Mustafâ Halvetî	Successor of the former	1259/1843
19	El-Hâc Ahmed Fâiz Efendi	Successor of the former	1273/1856
20	El-Hâc Abdullâh Ferdî	Successor of the former	1274/1857
21	Halîl Cemâl Efendi	Son-in-law of the former	?

in question. Yet, this was not an easy task, for it needed a continuous arrival of Naqshbandi kinfolk from Transoxiana. Ahmed Sâdık Bukhârî himself is a fair sample for understanding the circumstances of the period. Even though he came to Istanbul circa 980/1572-73, he had to wait for thirteen years to be appointed to the tekke.⁸⁴ After his death, his son, Seyyid Ziyâeddîn Ahmed, had to complete an interim of seven years to secure the post of the lodge, which may indicate that either Ahmed Sâdık’s family members were not dwelling in Istanbul when he passed away or his son had not been authorized to substitute his father. Although we

⁸⁴For his undetailed biography see Atâi, *Hadaïku’l-Hakaik*, 362-363.

do not know the reason behind Ziyâeddîn Ahmed's delayed appointment, we know for sure that a case similar to second scenario occurred when, after his death in 1011/1602-03, his paternal cousin Seyyid Fazlullâh, in spite of being a proxy of Ahmed Sâdik, was obliged to wait for five years to take over the organization of the lodge in 1016/1607-08.⁸⁵ Nevertheless, needless to say that it was Seyyid Fazlullâh and his descendants who supervised the Fatih Emîr Bukhârî lodge from 1607-08 to 1813, over two centuries.

2.3 Second-wave Naqshbandi Lodges in Istanbul during the 17th and 18th Centuries

I have focused on the early Naqshbandi establishments in Istanbul with particular attention to the Emîr Bukhârî *tekke* located in Fatih. I have tried to demonstrate how the said convent was run before the arrival of Seyyid Ahmed Sâdik Taşkendî and his son Ziyâeddîn Ahmed, who ensured the subsequent supervision of their families there. Obviously, the abovementioned lodges were of the first-wave built either by the first generation (i.e. Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî and Bâbâ Haydar Semerkandî) or the second (i.e. Mahmûd Çelebi, Hekîm Çelebi, and Âbid Çelebi), spiritual descendants of Ubaydullâh Ahrâr and remained under the influence and control of Ahraris since the beginning of the 16th century. Second-wave Naqshbandi lodges, however, emerged only during the late 17th century, the following century enjoyed a burst in numbers. Therefore, considering Table 2.5, my intention in this subsection is to identify newly erected lodges, analyze the circumstances that rendered possible their construction, and depict the panoramic view of the order particularly in 18th century Istanbul. While undertaking such a pivotal task, I want to draw attention in the meantime to momentous developments in the long-serving Naqshbandi convents of the city.

2.3.1 Naqshbandi Lodges as Shelters for Central and South Asians

The role of Central Asian Naqshbandi *seyhs* in the development of the order in Istanbul is an established fact. As is discussed in the beginning of this chapter, it was due to the endeavors of the two disciples of Khwaja Ubaydullâh Ahrâr, Abdullâh Îlâhî of Simav and Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî, that the order flourished and spread in the

⁸⁵ According to Şeyhî, Fazlullâh received his Sufi education from Ahmed Sâdik when both were in Transoxiana. See Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayiu'l-Fudalâ*, vol. I, 60-61.

Table 2.5 Naqshbandi tekkes in Istanbul (17th and 18th centuries)

	Tekke	Neighborhood	Patron	Year
1	Hindîler	Horhor	Mehmed II	1455-56
2	Âbid Çelebi	Fatih	Âbid Çelebi	ante 1494
3	Emîr Bukhârî	Fatih	Bâyezid II	ca. 1500
4	Emîr Bukhârî	Ayvansaray	Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî	1512
5	Emîr Bukhârî	Edirnekapı	Süleymân I	ca. 1530
6	Hekîm Çelebi	Fatih -Koska	Rüstem Pasha	ca. 1550
7	Bâbâ Haydar	Eyüp	Süleymân I	ca. 1530-50
8	Şâh Haydar	Üsküdar	Shâh Haydar Resâ	ca. 1680s
9	Buhara/Özbekler	Kadırga	Defterdâr İsmâ'îl Efendi	1692
10	Neccârzâde	Beşiktaş	Neccârzâde Mustafa Rızâ	ca. 1710s
11	Murâd Bukhârî	Eyüp-Nişanca	Ebulhayr Ahmed	1715
12	Alacaminâre	Üsküdar	Hüseyin Dede	1730
13	Şeyhülislâm	Eyüp-Nişanca	Şeyhülislam Mustafâ	1742
14	Kalenderhâne	Eyüp	La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî	1743
15	Kâşgarî	Eyüp	Yekçeşm Ahmed Murtafâ	1745
16	Özbekler	Üsküdar	Abdullâh Pasha	1753
17	Mustafâ Paşa	Eyüp	Bâhir Köse Mustafâ Pasha	1753
18	Kurşunlu Mahzen	Galata	Bâhir Köse Mustafâ Pasha	1753
19	Olukbayır	Eyüp	Hâcî Alî Efendi	1761
20	Tâhir Ağa	Fatih	Seyyid Mehmed Ağa	1763
21	Murâd Molla	Fatih	Dâmâdzâde Murâd Mollâ	1769
22	Seyyid Baba	Fatih	Şeyh Seyyid Mustafâ	ca. 1750s
23	Atâullâh Efendi	Beykoz	Şeyh Mehmed Atâullâh	1789
24	Afgânîler	Üsküdar	Nu'mân Bey	1792
25	Beşikçizâde	Fatih	Şeyh Süleymân Efendi	ca. 1790s

Ottoman capital and beyond. Three long-standing Naqshbandi lodges attributed to Emîr Bukhârî and the *tekke* built for Bâbâ Haydar Semerkandî are, as is mentioned above, among first-wave Naqshbandi convents built for Central Asian şeyhs in Istanbul. When it comes to the existence of South Asian masters, the abovementioned Hindîler Tekkesi appears as the oldest shelter for them following the city's conquest. In the mid-17th century, another convent named after Hindîs came into view in the Kağıthane neighborhood. The Naqshbandi affiliations of the Kağıthane lodge, however, is yet to be confirmed.

Similarly to the previous wave, second-wave Naqshbandi lodges gained recognition in Istanbul by the construction of a *tekke* for outsiders. However, this time the beneficiaries were both Uzbek and Indian Naqshbandi dervishes, or it was the case at least on the paper. As can be seen in Table 2.5, the first of the second-wave Naqshbandi lodges was built during the last quarter of the 17th century by Şeyh Haydar Taşkendî, who chose Resâ as his pseudonym in poetry. Depending on Ottoman and

Indian sources, Thierry Zarcone is the first researcher to present the existence of a *tekke* built for Naqshbandi qalandars in the Bülbülderesi neighborhood of Üsküdar.⁸⁶ The founder of the said *tekke*, Şâh Haydar Taşkendî or Haydar Resâ Efendi (d. 1700), was a Bukhara-born Uzbek prince who abandoned earthly authority for Sufism and became the disciple of Bâbâ Palangposh (d. 1699), a Ghujdawan-born Naqshbandi master who took refuge in 1675 in Deccan, where he would stay until his death. Şeyh Haydar Taşkendî, we are told, entered the land of Rum, and resided in the Bülbülderesi (Bülbüldepesi in Şeyhî) valley of Üsküdar, where he would establish his *kalenderhâne-tekke* with his own money.⁸⁷ It is understood from a small number of official correspondences pertaining to this *tekke* that it had come to be known as Şâh Haydar Tekkesi.⁸⁸ Another petition dating 26 April 1698/15 Shawwâl 1109, implies that the *tekke* had also been known as “Özbekler Tekkesi,” under Şeyh Sâfi Özbekî. In his petition, after introducing himself as a stranger (*ğarîb-diyâr*), destitute (*faķîrûʔl-hâl*) and all alone (*kesîrûʔl-ʔiyâl*), Şeyh Sâfi asks for a daily ration of bread and two excellent meals to be given from the *imâret* of Mihrimâh Sultân.⁸⁹ As can be inferred from the document, towards the end of his life, Şâh Haydar was no longer the incumbent in his *tekke*, and was replaced by one of his Uzbek deputies such as Şeyh Sâfi. One of the official documents reveals that, at least from February 1710 onwards, the *tekke* received from the Mukâtaʔa of Filibe an annual rice subsidy of forty bushels (*kîle*). Upon a petition submitted by residents of the *tekke*, it was decided on 19 July 1711 that the *tekke* should receive its share from the Imperial Kitchen quarterly rather than annually with the calculation that 10 *kîle* should be given every three months. The very same petition clarified further that the *tekke* belonged to the Naqshbandi order and its residents were composed of dervishes and poor, most likely qalandars.⁹⁰

The second *tekke* erected for Uzbeks was completed in 1692 as a result of the financial patronage of the Defterdâr İsmâʔil Efendi. A court record dated 17 May 1740 [20 Şafar 1153] conclusively affirms that the *tekke* in question was established for the benefit of the Uzbek poor, i.e., Uzbek Sufis (*Defterdâr-ı sâbık merhûm İsmail*

⁸⁶Zarcone, “Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul,” 157-159.

⁸⁷Zarcone, “Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul,” 157-158. For the short biography of Şeyh Haydar and selected pieces of his poems, Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayiuʔl-Fudalâ*, vol. II-III, 205. See also İsmail Hakkı Aksoyak, “Resâ, Şeyh Haydar Resâ Efendi,” <https://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/resa-seyh-haydar-resa-efendi> (15.06.2023). For a short entry on the *tekke*, see also Ayvansarâyî, *The Garden of the Mosques*, 536.

⁸⁸See for instance BOA, C.EV.. 88/4369/1, and BOA, C.EV.. 218/10853/1.

⁸⁹BOA, AE. SMST.II. 86/9210/1.

⁹⁰BOA, C.EV.. 88/4369/1. “Üsküdar’da Bülbülderesi’nde vâķiʔ çarîķ-i Nakşibendiyyede Şâh Haydar Tekyesi’nin dervîşân ve fuķarâsına”

Efendi'nin Özbekler fukarâsına meşrûta olmak üzere binâ eylediği tekke).⁹¹ Given the close connections between the şeyhs of this lodge, known also as Buhara Tekkesi and the Khanates of Central Asia, it has been considered the most important of the Uzbek *tekkes* in Istanbul.⁹² As Thierry Zarccone demonstrates, from the late 18th century to the closure of tekkes in 1925, the *tekke* and its *şeyhs* appear in many cases as intermediaries and ambassadors between the Ottoman Empire and the Khanates owing to the *şeyhs*' command over Chagatai Turkic and their familiarity with Central Asia and its traditions.⁹³ Such a significant role and importance was attributed to this *tekke*, and we may therefore claim that it was reinforced by the location of the *tekke* in the Kadirga neighborhood in the vicinity of the Topkapı Palace.

As can be seen in Table 2.5, compared to the previous century, the 18th century enjoyed an apparent rise in the number of *tekkes* founded for long-standing Sufi brotherhoods of Istanbul. The Murâd Buhârî Tekkesi, for instance, was not only the second Naqshbandi convent erected in the city in the 18th century but also the fourth example of second-wave lodges put at the disposal of a newcomer *şeyh* of Central Asian origin. Constructed as a madrasa complex in the Nişanca neighborhood of Eyüp in the mid-17th century, we are told that the building was transformed into a *tekke* in 1715 by Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi (d. 1741), the then chief jurist of Rumelia, and left to the command of Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî, the first and most influential Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi guide in the city.⁹⁴ Thus, the *tekke* grew to be known as the first center of the Mujaddidi branch of the Naqshbandiyya in the Ottoman capital, so much so that leading scholar-bureaucrats and high-ranking officials whose Naqshbandi affiliations were incontrovertible contributed to the complex by sponsoring the construction of architectural extensions such as prayer rooms, fountain and *şâdirvân*, a free-standing bathhouse, a ritual space, a pulpit for the masjid, and the tomb of the then Şeyhülislam Veliyyüddîn Efendi (d. 1768).⁹⁵ A

⁹¹ *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri: Bab Mahkemesi 172 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1152-1153 / M. 1740)*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz, (İstanbul: Kültür A.Ş., 2019): 498.

⁹² Zarccone, “Buhârâ Tekkesi,” 325; Tanman, “Özbekler Tekkesi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 34, 121.

⁹³ Zarccone, “Buhârâ Tekkesi,” 325; and “Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul,” 150-153. Details regarding the history of Buhara Tekkesi can be found in Zarccone and Tanman's recently mentioned studies. See also Smith, “The Özbek Tekkes of Istanbul,” 137-139; Tanman, “Buhara Tekkesi: Mimari” *DBIA*, vol. II, 326-327; Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf*, 298-299; and Mustafa Alkan, “Osmanlı Devleti'nde Özbek Tekkeleri,” in *Yitik Hafızanın Peşinde: Buhara Konuşmaları*, eds. Mehmet Dursun Erdem and others, (Ankara: Pruva, 2019): 261-263.

⁹⁴ See “Murad Buhârî Tekkesi,” *DBIA*, vol. V, 514-516, “Şeyh Murad Tekkesi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 39, 62-64, Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf*, 273-275. For the short biography of Ebulhayr Ahmed see, Mehmet İpşirli, “Damadzâde Ahmed Efendi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 8, (İstanbul: TDV, 1993): 449-450.

⁹⁵ Depending on Ayvansarâyî, Tanman counts among the philanthropists with power and wealth the names of Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi, Şeyhülislam Veliyyüddîn Efendi, the commissioner of the Naval Arsenal Mehmed Efendi, the grand viziers Köse Mustafâ Pasha and Yirmisekizcelebizâde Mehmed Saîd Pasha. See Tanman, *ibid*, 62. See also Ayvansarâyî, *The Garden of the Mosques*, 312.

salient aspect peculiar to this *tekke* is that although it was installed initially for the sake of a Bukharan spiritual guide, all of his spiritual descendants had their origins in Ottoman lands rather than Central Asia.⁹⁶ For exceptions, one should wait until the third quarter of the 19th century for the arrival of Şeyh Seyyid Süleymân (d. 1877) and his son Abdülkâdir (d. 1923) from Balkh.⁹⁷ The striking point, however, does not necessarily denote the absence of Central Asian dervishes at the Murâd Buhârî Tekkesi. On the contrary, as a result of a petition written by Seyyid Yahyâ Özbekî, the *şeyh* of Buhara Tekkesi, resolved on 11 September 1763/3 Râ 1177, we know for sure that Central Asian dervishes were allowed to stay at the Murâd Buhârî Tekkesi. In his petition, while appealing for the banishment/exile of a dervish named Abdurrahmân from the lodge to another place, Şeyh Yahyâ reports that Dervish Abdurrahmân was previously kicked out of the lodges of Murâd Buhârî and La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî (*ve hânkâh-ı Murâdiyeden maṭrûd ve tekye-i La‘lîzâde’den merdûd*).⁹⁸ Considering that the lodges of Buhara and La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî (i.e. Kalenderhâne) were organized for the benefit of Central Asian Naqshbandis (particularly Uzbeks), we may conclude that Murâd Buhârî Tekkesi, too, was kept ready to serve newly arrived dervishes. Therefore, it is likely that in cases of unavailability and over-capacity, the three lodges left to each other the solution of the problem, an explicit indication of the direct communication channels between them.

The fourth convent reserved for the use of Central Asian Naqshbandi dervishes was the Kalenderhâne Tekkesi, rejuvenated by La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî in Eyüp in 1743. Despite the conventional admission that it was built by La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî for Şeyh Abdullâh Kâshghari, doubts remain in the literature, since Ayvansarâyî once points at La‘lîzâde Mehmed, the father of Abdülbâkî, as the founder of the *tekke* in question.⁹⁹ Indeed, the latter possibility is more reasonable when considering the endowment deed of the *şibyân mektebi* constructed as a part of *tekke*-complex. As Mustafa Alkan discusses, the *vakfiye* dated 23 October 1740/2 Sha‘bân 1153 explicitly mentions that the *mekteb* in question was newly erected next to the entrance gate of the Kalenderhâne, hard evidence for the long-abiding presence of the *tekke* there.¹⁰⁰ Another *vakfiye* dated 21 July 1744/10 Jumâda al-Âkhir 1157 explicates

⁹⁶For the names of Murâd Bukhârî’s successors in this lodge, see Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf*, 274-275, and Tanman, “Şeyh Murad Tekkesi,” 62.

⁹⁷On Abdülkâdir Belhî, see Nihat Azamat, “Abdülkâdir-i Belhî,” *TDVIA*, vol. 1, 231-232.

⁹⁸For the petition see BOA, AE.SMST.III, 67/4960/1.

⁹⁹For the doubts see Zarcone, “Kalenderhane Tekkesi,” 398, and Alkan, “Osmanlı Devleti’nde Özbek Tekkeleri,” 253. See Ayvansarâyî, *Hadîkatü’l-Cevâmî’*, 276, and *The Garden of Mosques*, 296. Elsewhere, however, Ayvansarâyî attributes Kalenderhâne to La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî. See *Hadîkatü’l-Cevâmî’*, 260; idem, *The Garden of Mosques*, 282; and Hâfiz Hüseyin Ayvansarâyî, *Mecmûâ-i Tevârih*, prepared by Fahri Ç. Derin and Vâhid Çubuk, (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1985): 268-269.

¹⁰⁰Alkan, *ibid*, 254. For the said endowment deed see VGMA, *Defter* 629: 500.

that the Kalenderhâne Tekkesi was instituted to serve Uzbek celibates who came to be known as qalandars from among the followers of the Murâd Bukhârî's order, i.e. Naqshbandiyya (*Muhammed el-Buhârî el-ma'rûf bi-Nakşibend hazretlerinin tarikat-i aliyeleri fukarasından Kalenderân tabir olunur mücerredân-ı Özbekiyyeye mahsus olup*).¹⁰¹ La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî's special emphasis in this article shows, on the one hand, that Şeyh Murâd Buhârî's posthumous fame and influence was one of the factors that triggered the establishment of the *tekke*. On the other hand, it reveals that the celibates-to-be inhabitants of the *tekke* were expected to be keen adherents of the Naqshbandi order. So much so that, the importance of the silent dhikr, the most favored method of invocation in the Naqshbandiyya, was particularly emphasized in the Persian inscription of the *tekke*.¹⁰² Be that as it may, we are told that in addition to the celibacy tradition of Khorasan Naqshbandism, the Yasawi style of vocal remembrance, i.e. *dhikr-i arra* or "dhikr of the sow", was also maintained on a regular basis in the Kalenderhane Tekkesi.¹⁰³ As such, further studies should be conducted on the simultaneous coexistence of the vocal and silent invocations in a Naqshbandi *tekke* in Istanbul in the mid-18th century, for, more or less at the same time, the proponents of the *jahrî* and *khâfî* dhikr within the Naqshbandi order constituted two conflicting factions in Northwest China, and, towards the last fifth of the century led tumultuous disturbances, particularly in Kansu province of China under the Qing dynasty.¹⁰⁴

In 1745, two years after the reactivation of the Kalenderhane Tekkesi, another convent was put into the service of the Naqshbandiyya out of the benevolence of Yekçeşm Ahmed Murtazâ, once the commissioner of the Naval Arsenal. Being the fifth complex founded for the benefit of Central Asian Naqshbandi Sufis in Istanbul,

¹⁰¹ Alkan, *ibid*, 255. For the endowment see VGMA, *Defter* 629: 498.

¹⁰² Osman Ergin, *Türk Şehirlerinde İmarat Sistemi*, (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Matbaası, 1939): 30-31. See also Zarcone, "Kalenderhane Tekkesi," 398, and "Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul," 155. Osman Nuri Ergin is incorrect when claiming that the silent invocation had been performed due to the malignity of ignorant people.

¹⁰³ Zarcone, "Kalenderhane Tekkesi," 398, and "Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul," 155; Ekrem Işın, "Melamîlik," *DBIA*, vol. V, (İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1994): 385. For more on Kalenderhane Tekkesi see Zarcone, "Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul," 153-157; "Kalenderhane Tekkesi," 398-399; Haskan, *Eyüp Sultan Tarihi*, vol. I, annotated by Talip Mert, (İstanbul: Eyüp Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2008):95-98; Ahmet Ersen and Mehmet Ulukan, "Özbek Tekkeleri ve Eyüp Özbekler Tekkesi," in *Tarihi, Kültürü ve Sanatıyla Eyüpsultan Sempozyumu IX: Tebliğler*, (İstanbul: Eyüp Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2005): 133-145; Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf*, 277-278; Alkan, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Özbek Tekkeleri," 253-261.

¹⁰⁴ For the conflict between the advocates of the silent and vocal dhikr see Joseph Fletcher, "Central Asian Sufism and Ma Ming-hsin's New Teaching," in *Studies on Chinese and Islamic Inner Asia*, ed. Beatrice Forbes Manz, (Aldershot: Variorum, 1995): 75-96, and "The Naqshbandiyya and the Dhikr-i Arra," *Journal of Turkish Studies / Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* I (1977): 113-119. According to Fletcher, Ma Ming-hsin (Muhammad Emîn), the leader of "the New Teaching" and reckless defender of the vocal invocation, after his long journey and study in Arab countries turned to China in 1761. Chang-Kuan (Nabil) Lin, however, states that he returned to China in 1745. See "Ma Ming-Hsin," *TDVIA*, vol. 27, (Ankara: TDV, 2003): 268.

the convent became known as Murtazâ Efendi Tekkesi or Kâşgarî Tekkesi in Eyüp. It is said that the first incumbent of the lodge, Şeyh Abdullâh Nidâî of Kashghar (d. 1760), previously the post-holder in the Kalenderhane Tekkesi, renounced his position in the Kalenderhane, since it was designated for celibate *şeyhs*. In other words, Abdullâh Nidâî had to leave Kalenderhane Tekkesi upon his marriage. However, this was not the first marriage of the *şeyh*. Given that his successor son, Ubeydullâh Efendi, died at the age of forty-five in 1184/1770, we understand that he was born as the fruit of the previous marriage in 1139/1726-1727, a clear indication that Abdullâh Nidâî was a widower when staying at Kalenderhane. The unique case of Şeyh Nidâî, as has already been argued in the literature, indicates that the tradition of celibacy was not observed in Kâşgarî Tekkesi. However, it is thought that Turkic culture of Central Asia was represented to a large extent in the *tekke*, too. As Zarccone puts it, the two convents cultivated different mystical ideologies. Whereas a Naqshbandi-Qalandari form was embraced in Kalenderhane, a new, energetic, and rigorist form was represented in Kâşgarî Tekkesi.¹⁰⁵ The most striking feature of Kâşgarî Tekkesi, on the other hand, is that it was the second center after the Murâd Buhârî Tekkesi from where the Mujaddidi branch of the Naqshbandiyya spread in Istanbul. Nevertheless, as can be seen in the examples of Abdullâh Nidâî and his son, Ubeydullâh Efendi, it was also the only venue where the Kasani branch found the opportunity to be represented.¹⁰⁶

The Özbekler Tekkesi, founded in 1753 by Abdullâh Pasha (d. 1756), the commissioner of the mint (*darbhâne emîni*) and subsequent governor of Maraş at the time, was established as the sixth lodge to serve Naqshbandi dervishes of Central Asian origin. Being the most famous of the Uzbek *tekkes*, it was located, unlike others, in neither the intramural city nor Eyüp but on a high hill, Sultantepe, behind the town of Üsküdar. According to a legend conveyed by Grace Martin Smith, the sultan had the *tekke* built for Uzbek pilgrims who used to sojourn in Üsküdar under the guidance of a Naqshbandi *şeyh* and set up their tents on Sultantepe.¹⁰⁷ Along the lines of abovementioned lodges, Turkic culture and Central Asian customs and traditions had to be vigorously maintained in this complex. As in the Kalender-

¹⁰⁵Zarccone, "Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul," 164. Hamid Algar regards Zarccone's assertions "entirely unwarranted". In his opinion "Nidâî's move from the kalenderhane to the tekke, far from involving the adoption of 'a new, energetic and rigorist form of the Naqshbandiyya,' seems to have been dictated exclusively by his wish to marry, not by any desire or need to acquire new spiritual loyalties." See Algar, "From Kashghar to Eyüp: The Lineages and Legacy of Sheikh Abdullah Nidâî," in *Naqshbandis in Western and Central Asia*, ed. Elisabeth Özdalga, (Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, 1999): 10.

¹⁰⁶For more on Kâşgarî Tekkesi and its importance in the history of the Naqshbandiyya see Zarccone, "Kaşgarî Tekkesi," 485-486, and "Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul," 164-165; Tanman, "Kaşgarî Tekkesi: Mimari," *DBIA*, vol. IV, 486-487; Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf*, 288-300; Çetin, "Kaşgarî Tekkesi," 295-305.

¹⁰⁷Smith, "The Özbek Tekkes of Istanbul," 131.

hane Tekkesi, there are indications that the tradition of Naqshbandi style celibacy and the Yasawi style of vocal dhikr were ardently observed in Özbekler Tekkesi. Furthermore, the surviving guestbook, which was kept and preserved in the *tekke* from 1905 to 1923, evidently demonstrates that it was frequently visited not only by Central Asian Sufis and pilgrims, but also artisans and merchants who tried to make money in Istanbul.¹⁰⁸ Given this significant detail, one may conclude that this had always been the reality of the Özbekler Tekkesi, a crucial point in need of further studies.¹⁰⁹

Towards the end of the 18th century, the seventh lodge in the service of outsiders was erected for Qalandari dervishes in the Murad Reis neighborhood across from the Çinili Mosque in Üsküdar. Although it is once mentioned that it was founded by its very first *şeyh*, Ahmed Nâsir-i Afghânî in 1792,¹¹⁰ current literature agrees on Nu'mân Bey as the builder of the *tekke*. Due to obscurities in his biography, it is hard to identify the founder accurately. However, there are reasonable signs that it was Sultanzâde or Yeğen Ali Paşazâde Halîl Nu'mân Dede (d. 1798), the founder of the Üsküdar Mevlevihanesi, who also established the Afgânîler Tekkesi. Completion in 1792 of both architectural projects in Üsküdar is one of the reasons to think in this way. The second and more convincing reason, is that both buildings were designed to serve as guesthouses to itinerant dervishes, pilgrims, and strangers coming from abroad. Indeed, as is emphasized by Tanman, it was this very feature that distinguished the Mevlevihane of Üsküdar from remaining ones established in Istanbul.¹¹¹ Thirdly, it is known that the Afgânîler Tekkesi was reregistered in the name of Nu'mân Bey's waqf in February 1956.¹¹² Lastly, at least in two archival documents, the founder of Üsküdar Mevlevihanesi Halîl Nu'mân Dede is identified as "Şeyh Nu'mân Bey".¹¹³ Given the details of these significant points, I conclude that Sultanzâde or Yeğen Ali Paşazâde Şeyh Nu'mân Bey, once the incumbent şeyh of

¹⁰⁸For a satisfactory study utilizing the said guest registers see Lâle Can, *Spiritual Subjects: Central Asian Pilgrims and the Ottoman Hajj at the End of Empire*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2020). It was Smith who remarked the registers for the first time in an academic study. See "The Özbek Tekkes of Istanbul," 131-133.

¹⁰⁹For an introduction on Özbekler Tekkesi, see Smith, "The Özbek Tekkes of Istanbul," 130-137; Zarccone, "Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul," 147-150; Tanman, "Özbekler Tekkesi," *DBIA*, vol. VI, 199-202, and "Özbekler Tekkesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 34, 123-124; Alkan, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Özbek Tekkeleri," 264-267.

¹¹⁰Zarccone, "Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul," 161, and "Afganîler Tekkesi," 86.

¹¹¹Tanman, "Üsküdar Mevlevihânesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 42, (İstanbul: TDV, 2012): 372.

¹¹²Ömer Koçyiğit, "Üsküdar Afganîler Tekkesi ve Haziresindeki Mezar Taşları," in *Uluslararası Üsküdar Sempozyumu VI, 6-9 Kasım 2008, Bildiriler*, vol. I, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz, (İstanbul: Üsküdar Belediyesi, 2009): 668.

¹¹³See BOA, HAT. 108/4320, and BOA, C.EV. 575/29027/1.

Galata Mevlevihanesi, was the founder of both Üsküdar Mevlevihanesi and Afgânîler Tekkesi. If this is the case, it is worthy to note that a Mevlevi *şeyh* did not restrain himself from developing close connections with the Naqshbandiyya affiliated Qalandari dervishes of Central and South Asian origin. In the final analysis, the Afgânîler Tekkesi, erected particularly for Afghan and Central Asian Naqshbandi celibates—where the tradition of Naqshbandi celibacy was keenly maintained—deserve to be the subject of further studies.¹¹⁴

2.3.1.1 The Naqshbandi Qalandarism

Following the brief introduction of the second-wave Naqshbandi lodges built for the interest of the Central and South Asian dervishes, a few words are due for distinguishing the understanding of celibacy in its rooted Qalandari tradition and in the Naqshbandi system. Emerging from the influence of Buddhism and Hinduism in the eleventh-century Khurasan, the Qalandariyya was a loosely organized order of unorthodox wandering dervishes. Qalandari Sufis were believed to have adopted doctrines of the Malamatiyya to distinguish themselves from other Muslims with the significant exception that “whereas the Malāmātīs, without boasting or ostentation, carried out scrupulously God’s commands, the Qalandarīs sought to destroy all custom and tradition and to conceal their actions from public view.”¹¹⁵ Although Qalandaris were infamous for their violation of traditional Islamic society, they established their own rules and conventions which were essentially as follows: free from clothing, practice *chahār darb* (shaving of the beard, mustache, eyebrows, and hair), self-laceration, asceticism, wandering, mendicancy, celibacy, sexual libertinism and love for boys (not necessarily pederasty), use of intoxicants and hallucinogens, and elevation of music and dance.¹¹⁶ Despite their antagonism towards the norms and moral codes of orthodoxy, Qalandaris interacted with and influenced a few Sufi brotherhoods, such as Bektāşi, Khalwati and Mevlevi, to such a degree that the Şemsi Sufis, who attributed themselves to Shams-i Tabrizî (d. 1247) and showed up as a result of reciprocal interactions between the Mevlevi and Qalandari systems at the initially, completely embraced a Qalandari character by the 16th century thanks

¹¹⁴On the lodge of Afghans, see Tanman, “Afganîler Tekkesi,” 400, and “Afganîler Tekkesi: Mimari,” *DBIA*, vol. I, 86-87; Zarccone, “Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul,” 160-161, and “Afganîler Tekkesi,” 86; Koçyiğit, “Üsküdar Afganîler Tekkesi ve Haziresindeki Mezar Taşları,” 665-688.

¹¹⁵Tahsin Yazıcı, “Qalandar,” and “Qalandariyya,” *EI2*, vol. IV, 472-474.

¹¹⁶Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Marjinal Sûfilik: Kalenderîler (XIV-XVII. Yüzyıllar)*, (Ankara: TTK, 1992):161-174, 177-180; Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in Islamic Later Middle Period (1200-1550)*, (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994): 13-23. For an introduction on the history of the Qalandariyya see Nihat Azamat, “Kalenderiyye,” *TDVIA*, vol. 24, 253-256.

to the Mevlevi şeyh Dîvâne Mehmed Çelebi.¹¹⁷

In contrast to the flourishing literature on mutual communication between the Qalandarism and prominent Sufi orders mentioned above, the Naqshbandi-Qalandari interaction as an area of study is still in its infancy. Exceptional studies, in this regard, are those conducted by Thierry Zarccone and Ekrem Işın who brought to our attention Naqshbandi-Qalandari exchange through a few notes and anecdotes regarding celibatarian Naqshbandi dervishes of Central and South Asian origin staying at the abovementioned second-wave lodges. Zarccone particularly emphasizes that Qalandari culture found its way into the Ottoman Empire thanks to the abovementioned *kalenderhânes* (the *tekkes* of Kalenderhâne, Özbekler, and Afgânîler), where Central Asian Naqshbandiyya representations took place differently from its Indian and Meccan sisters, had all the characteristics of a complex heterogenous compound, and maintained ties with the old Qalandari and Yasawi cultures.¹¹⁸ Following Zarccone's tracks, Ekrem Işın admits the significant place of the *kalenderhânes* in the representation of the Naqshbandi-Qalandari celibacy in Istanbul. The likely transformation in Istanbul of Central Asian Naqshbandi-Qalandari culture, however, has not received sufficiently the attention it deserves. Therefore, an all-inclusive study on the transformation of Qalandarism and Naqshbandi-Qalandari dervishes on their way from homeland to a foreign soil including the Ottoman capital would be a great contribution to the field. This is so because, as is realized from the testimony of Zayn al-Âbidîn Shirvânî (d. 1838), an Iranian Ni'metullâhî Sufi who visited Central Asia in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, the deep-rooted continuities in the current state of the Naqshbandi Qalandaris during the period in question were well-observed, and a comparative observation of Central Asian Qalandaris at home and abroad would shed light on the changes and transformations, if any, in their plight and lives in a foreign country.

In the course of his journeys he had encountered three classes of Naqshbandîs: *sharî'a*-observant Sunnis, who did indeed constitute the great majority; Shi'is, of whom he had never met more than two or three; and *qalandars*, "ignorant of the *sharî'a* and regarding it as a mere series

¹¹⁷Ocak, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Marjinal Sûfîlik: Kalenderîler*, 202-205. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 81-82. Depending on Şâhidî İbrâhîm Dede's (d. 1550) *Gülşen-i Esrâr* and Sâkîb Dede's (d. 1735) *Sefîne-i Nefîse-i Mevleviyân*, Gölpinarlı claims that it was particularly thanks to the Mevlevi şeyh Dîvâne Mehmed Çelebi (d. after 1544) that the Şemsi temperament coalesced into the Qalandari, Bektaşî, and Hurufî orders in the first half of the 16th century. See Abdülbâki Gölpinarlı, *Mevlânâ'dan Sonra Mevlevîlik*, (İstanbul: Gül Matbaası, 1983): 114-122. On the Qalandari-Bektaşî synthesis see Ocak, *ibid.*, 205-215. On Dîvâne Mehmed Çelebi, see Nihat Azamat, "Divane Mehmed Çelebi," *TDVIA*, vol. 9, (İstanbul: TDV, 1994): 435-437.

¹¹⁸Zarccone, "Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul," 188.

of fetters.” These *qalandars* neither prayed nor fasted; regarded marriage as forbidden; consumed large quantities of bhang and hemp juice; travelled ceaselessly; recited poetry whenever the mood took them; considered it incumbent to beg every Thursday; and cheerfully designated themselves as “God’s fools”. Their relation to Islam was purely nominal, and their sole claim to the true *faqr* of the Sufis consisted of the clothes they wore.¹¹⁹

In a recent study on the Naqshbandi convents erected for the Turkistani dervishes, the authors Okan Yeşilot, Yüksel Çelik, and Muharrem Varol, too, draw attention to the mutual interaction and communication of the Naqshbandi and Qalandari elements, especially in the *kalenderhânes* of Istanbul, and challenge “kalenderhâne” as an appellative. According to them, this may not be an appropriate term to describe the lodges built for the Naqshbandi *qalandars*, as it seems to be given due to the presence of celibate dervishes there. Naqshbandi *qalandars*’ disdainful abandonment of the earthly pleasures might be another reason behind the designation of their *tekkes* as *kalenderhâne*.¹²⁰ Relying on these remarks, we can take it a step further by pointing out at least two significant transformations happening within the Naqshbandi Qalandarism in Istanbul. While the first alteration was in the understanding of celibacy, the second was regarded mendicancy. As to the former, as cited above, Zayn al-‘Âbidîn Shirvânî reports that Naqshbandi *qalandars* of Central Asia regarded marriage as forbidden even as late as the late 18th century. The story of Şeyh Abdullâh Nidâî Kashgharî, however, betokens multiple understanding of the celibacy in the Naqshbandi Qalandarism. To recall, the legend goes that he was obliged to renounce the post of the Kalenderhane Tekkesi upon his marriage, since the position had been stipulated for celibate *seyhs*. What has escaped attention is that Abdullâh Nidâî had never been a straitlaced observant of celibacy. As I have already noted, upon his death, he was succeeded by his thirty four year-old son, Ubeydullâh Efendi, in 1760, a clear indication of his earlier marriage. Though we do not know how many times he married, we do indeed know that as widower he married once again around 1745, the year he transferred to Kâşgarî Tekkesi. Given the familiarity between La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî and Abdullâh Nidâî, and devotion of La‘lîzâde’s *tekke* to the Uzbek celibates, we can readily assert that La‘lîzâde’s purpose in erecting Kalenderhâne Tekkesi was to look after unmarried wandering Naqshbandi dervishes rather than promoting a Qalandari-style celibacy. At this point, we must remember that celibacy as a disposition and preference is not pro-

¹¹⁹ Conveyed by Hamid Algar in “From Kashghar to Eyüp,” 6-7. For an introduction on the eyewitness author, see Y. Richard, “Zayn al-‘Âbidîn Shirvânî,” *EI2*, vol.XI, (Leiden: Brill, 2000): 484.

¹²⁰ *İstanbul’daki Türkistan Tekkeleri: Ata Yurt ile Ana Yurt Arasındaki Manevi Köprüler*, (Istanbul: TÜRÇEK, 2017): 182.

moted in Islam. Therefore, we come across married incumbent *şeyhs* particularly in Özbekler Tekkesi, one of the *kalenderhânes* of Istanbul. For instance, Şeyh Abdülekber (d. 1785), the first *şeyh* of the *tekke*, left behind three wives.¹²¹ Given these examples, we may state that a softer and moderate understanding of Naqshbandi Qalandarism occurred in Istanbul.

Another pillar of the traditional Qalandarism shared also by the Central Asian Naqshbandi qalandars but seems to have been transformed in Istanbul is mendicancy. Zayn al-‘Âbidîn Shirvânî’s witnessing on this particular was straightforward: Naqshbandi qalandars considered it a duty to beg every Thursday. In addition, we should remember a remarkable Naqshbandi-Qalandari figure brought to our attention by Thierry Zarccone: master Şeyh Haydar Taşkendî, who, as an Uzbek prince, born in Bukhara but left the realm of his family’s political influence for Deccan where he adhered Bâbâ Palangposh (d. 1699), a Ghujdawan-born Naqshbandi master. It is said that Şeyh Haydar, after completing his sojourn in India, headed for the Ottoman capital and resided in Üsküdar, where he established a *tekke*. What is more striking in the story of Şeyh Haydar Taşkendî is that he made qalandars stay at his lodge and beg in turns: “About forty qalandars waited upon him, and everyday one of the forty would go out and bring back what he had begged. What had been offered sufficed all the *faqîrs* as nourishment to keep body and soul together.”¹²² In fact, we do not know accurately whether Şeyh Haydar really encouraged his dervishes to beg, or an ongoing tradition of mendicancy within the circles of the Naqshbandi qalandars of India was ascribed also to him. Considering that several anecdotes pertaining to the beggary of dervishes in Bâbâ Palangposh’s circle were penned with pleasure in *Malfûzât-i Naqshbandiyya*, we may think that the author attributed these manners to Şeyh Haydar to describe him as an obedient and devoted adherent and *khalîfa* of Bâbâ Palangposh.¹²³ Nevertheless, it is very likely that Şeyh Haydar, too, dispatched his disciples for begging. However, there is a significant indication that this custom came to an end or transformed gradually after the death of Şeyh

¹²¹ *İstanbul’daki Türkistan Tekkeleri*, 229.

¹²² Zarccone, *ibid*, 158. This significant report from the biography of the *şeyh* is penned by Bâbâ Shâh Mahmûd, another disciple of Bâbâ Palangposh and the designated successor of his companion Bâbâ Shâh Muhammad Musâfir (d. 1714). Bâbâ Mahmûd’s text which was written in Persian under the title *Malfûzât-i Naqshbandiyya* gives significant details as to the twenty-four disciples, khalifas, and associates of Bâbâ Palangposh and Bâbâ Musâfir. The entire text was translated into English by Simon Digby. For the entry on Şeyh Haydar see *Bâbâ Mahmûd, Sufis and Soldiers in Aurangzeb’s Deccan: Malfûzât-i Naqshbandiyya*, translated from Persian with an introduction by Simon Digby, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001): 244-246. For a meticulous article on *Malfûzât-i Naqshbandiyya* and the historical context which made possible the Naqshbandis’ presence in the late 17th and early 18th century Deccan see Simon Digby, “The Naqshbandis in the Deccan in the Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Century A.D.: Bâbâ Palangposh, Bâbâ Musâfir and Their Adherents,” in *Naqshbandis: Historical Developments and Present Situation of a Muslim Mystical Order*, ed. Marc Gaborieau, Alexandre Popovic, and Thierry Zarccone, (Istanbul: ISIS, 1990): 167-207.

¹²³ For some of such anecdotes see *ibid*, 100-101, 179-180, 196-197, and 236-237. It must be born in mind that begging as a method serves to humiliate the soul in the Qalandari understanding.

Haydar. As I mentioned above, we know for sure that his *tekke* received yearly at least forty *kīle* rice (ten *kīle* per quarter) from the imperial kitchen by the beginning of the 18th century. By providing a quarterly allowance of aid-in-kind, the Palace might aim to hinder the residents of the *tekke* from mendicancy. I assert that, with the same purpose in mind, the founders of the Naqshbandi *tekkes* built for the itinerant dervishes, donated revenue-generating landed properties in the 18th century.¹²⁴ If this is so, we can eagerly claim that door-to-door mendicancy and remaining in a state of poverty, as deep-rooted customs and methods of purification, gradually abandoned by Naqshbandi qalandars enrolled to the *kalenderhânes* of Istanbul. Yet, this does not mean that they gave up begging for alms or refused in-kind aid, for these were essential for running the lodges.¹²⁵

2.3.2 The Role of Mujaddidiyya and Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî

It is an established fact that before the advent of the Naqshbandi *şeyhs* affiliated with the recently formed Mujaddidi branch, the vicegerent masters of the Ahrari branch, outputs of the first-wave lodges, had dominated the scene in Istanbul. The construction of the second-wave lodges over almost a century-long period roughly from the late 17th to the late 18th century, however, as will be discussed below, was on the one hand the favor and patronage of the high-ranking officials developing spiritual affinities with Naqshbandi *tariqa*. On the other, it was by virtue of a noticeable increase in the number of Naqshbandi masters gradually making an appearance in the Ottoman capital. The latter reasoning appertains even to Şeyh Haydar Taşkendi who, as a Naqshbandi-Qalandari *şeyh*, seemed unsuccessful in making connections with the fruit-bearing Mujaddidi branch during his sojourn in India when considering the dearth of information pertaining to his and qalandar colleagues' relations with the disciples of Ahmad al-Sirhindî (d. 1624), the founder of the Mujaddidiyya: "In our text [*Malfūzāt-i Naqshbandiyya*], there is not a single reference to Shaykh Ahmad Sarhindi. Moreover, though there are many references to faqīrs travelling to and fro between the Deccan and Transoxiana over a period of forty years, and of their passing through Shahjahanabad (Delhi) and Lahore, and even of the places where they lodged in these cities, there is not a single mention

¹²⁴For income-generating properties donated by the *tekke* founders and other philanthropists see Alkan, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Özbek Tekkeleri," 253-269; and *İstanbul'daki Türkistan Tekkeleri*, 89-97, 168-175, 197-209, 235-247.

¹²⁵Note that during the holy month of Ramadan and other holy days the practice of tolerable mendicancy continued among madrasa students until the early 20th century. See Mehmet İpşirli, "Cer," *TDVIA*, vol. 7, 388-389.

of a visit to the takya of Sarhind.”¹²⁶ Nonetheless, there is no harm in asserting the following: given that Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî’s first expedition to Istanbul coincided with a five-year period from 1681 to 1686,¹²⁷ it is possible that he had come in contact with his Uzbek compatriot, Şeyh Haydar, and his Qalandari dervishes. Moreover, even much earlier than such a connection in the Ottoman realms, they may have been acquainted with each other back in the years in Transoxiana.

At this point, the most triggering cause behind the construction of the lodges in service of Central and South Asian Naqshbandis must be brought to the table. What does it mean when at least seven convents were set up within time span of almost a century, save the Şâh Haydar Tekkesi, all were built by high-ranking officials and scholar-bureaucrats? In order to have a convincing answer to this question and for a better understanding of the reasons underpinning the formation of second-wave *tekkes*, the role and posthumous influence of Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî must not be disregarded. It is clear that his sojourns to several Ottoman-Arab cities since the 1660s familiarized him with notables and preeminent scholars who would be profoundly influenced by his charismatic personality, competence in many disciplines, and hard work deriving from his sincere commitment, enthusiasm, and ambitions.¹²⁸ For this reason alone, well-to-do disciples may have attempted to build such convents to please the *şeyh* in his lifetime or to perpetuate his memory after his death. The first fitting example is the abovementioned Buhârâ Tekkesi, built by Defterdâr İsmâ‘îl Efendi in 1692. Given Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî’s strong influence on statesmen, I am convinced that the spiritual authority on the part of the *şeyh*, and affection and reverence for İsmâ‘îl Efendi’s part were among the reasons leading the latter to embark on a lodge project for the Bukharan dervishes. From among the letters that Şeyh Murâd exchanged with his Ottoman high-ranking followers, the one sent to a certain İsmâ‘îl Efendi may be of great value for discerning a possible relationship between the *şeyh* and the *defterdâr*. Indeed, from among the letters in hand, only two were sent to addressees bearing the name İsmâ‘îl. The official position of the addressee is demonstrated in a single case, that is, in the letter to Mevlânâ İsmâ‘îl, the qadi of Aleppo.¹²⁹ However, the titles of the recipients are different in the two letters, Efendi in one and Mevlânâ in the other, an indication to the fact that two distinguished figures are in question. Therefore, I am inclined

¹²⁶Simon Digby, *Sufis and Soldiers in Aurangzeb’s Deccan*, 3-4.

¹²⁷For further details on Murâd Bukhârî’s life story, voyages and travels see Butrus Abu-Manneh, “Sheikh Murâd al-Bukhârî and the Expansion of the Naqshbandî-Mujaddidî Order in Istanbul,” *Die Welt des Islams* 53/1. (2013): 1-25; and Şimşek, *18. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Toplumunda Nakşibendî-Müceddidîlik*, 87-99.

¹²⁸For more details in this regard see the second chapter in this dissertation.

¹²⁹For the letters see *Mesmû‘ât ve Mektûbât*, fol. 34a-b, and 98a. The former is sent to the qadi of Aleppo.

to think that İsmâ'îl Efendi with whom Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî exchanged letter(s) might be none other than the *defterdâr* himself.¹³⁰

The second lodge coming into existence in Istanbul thanks to the direct role of the *şeyh* during his lifetime was the aforementioned Murâd Buhârî Tekkesi converted in 1715 from a madrasa to a tekke by Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi, the then chief jurist of Rumelia, for the use of the *şeyh*. Murâd Bukhârî's influence and spiritual authority on not only Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi but also on his son, and even grandson, is an indisputable fact. So much so is the case that, Ebulhayr Ahmed's grandson, Dâmâdzâde Mehmed Murâd Mollâ (d. 1778), who was born in 1718 named after the *şeyh*.¹³¹ The most essential documentary evidence to Murâd Bukhârî's strict relationship and coordination with Ebulhayr Ahmed, however, is the collection of the thirty-five letters he had sent to him.¹³² Given these letters, definite signs of an intimate and absolute *şeyh-murâd* relationship, one can understand better why Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi provided patronage for Şeyh Murâd since 1681 and turned his father's madrasa into a *tekke* for him in 1715.

Şeyh Murâd Efendi's fame did not come to an end after his death. On the contrary, his posthumous influence continued to motivate prominent figures who had once been his disciples to serve the Naqshbandi order, particularly through the construction of *tekkes* in Istanbul. We can count at the outset the name of La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî Efendi, who, as has been mentioned earlier, restored the Kalenderhâne Tekkesi in 1743 for the Uzbek Naqshbandi qalandars. What concerns us in this context is the crucial sentence in the lodge's endowment deed in which the endower La'lîzâde enunciates that he endows the lodge for the Uzbek celibates who are attached to the order of Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî. It is a well-known fact that La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî was exiled to the island of Limnos following the defeat of the Ottomans by the Habsburgs in August 1716. Furthermore, we know that it was thanks to Şeyh Murâd's intercession that he was freed from living in exile. However, when he arrived

¹³⁰Thanks to Defterdar Sarı Mehmed Pasha's (d. 1717) *Zübde-i Vekâiyât*, we know that Defterdâr İsmâ'îl Efendi whose sobriquet was Kirli served as *defterdâr* twice; once from 7 June 1690 to October 1691, and secondly from 4 April 1693 to 15 August 1694. It was during his second term that he was granted the title of pasha. For more on Kirli İsmâ'îl Pasha and his successful career see Tanju Demir and Betül Çelik, "XVII. Yüzyıl Sonlarında Aydın'da Bir Osmanlı Bürokrati: Defterdâr İsmail Paşa (Kirli)," *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 26/42 (2007): 67-83. Note also that the future *şeyhülislâm* Ebûishak İsmâ'îl, a well-known disciple of Şeyh Murâd, was appointed the qadi of Aleppo in 1692. See Muhammed Nur Doğan, "Ebûishak İsmâil Efendi," *TDVIA*, vol. 10, 278-279.

¹³¹For Murâd Mollâ's biography see Mehmed Süreyyâ, *Sicill-i Osmânî*, vol. IV, 1114-1115; and Hatice Özdil, "Başka İsimlerle Karıştırılan Bir Mesnevi Şârihi: Mehmed Murâd Nakşibendî," *Turkish Studies* vol. 8/12, (Fall 2013): 1013-1014.

¹³²For more on the relationship between the two figures, see the third chapter of this dissertation. The letters sent to Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi are collected in *Mektûbât-ı eş-Şeyh es-Seyyid Mehmed Murâd*, Veliyyüddin Efendi no. 1837, fols. 2b-29b.

in Istanbul, he would learn that the *şeyh* had already passed away.¹³³ Given these biographical details, we can assert that La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî upreared the Kalenderhâne Tekkesi after many years as sign of his deep respect for the memory of the *şeyh* and as a duty of his loyalty to him. Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî’s posthumous fame and influence seems to answer the purpose in the construction of another lodge, i.e., Mustafâ Paşa Tekkesi, founded in 1753 as a consequence of the donation of the then grand vizier Köse Mustafâ Pasha (d. 1765). Considering that Muhammad Bahâ al-Dîn (d. 1756), the son of Murâd Bukhârî, was the first *post-nishân* of this *tekke*, it was nominated as the second Mujaddidi center in Istanbul after Murâd Buhârî Tekkesi.¹³⁴ A few decrees dated Evâsiṭ-I Z̤ 1167 (28 September–8 October 1754) clearly points out that the first *şeyh*, Murâdzâde Muhammed Efendi, who was none other than Muhammad Bahâ al-Dîn, was invited to Istanbul after the completion of the *tekke*.¹³⁵ This reality, one may claim, raises the possibility that the Mustafâ Paşa Tekkesi was built for Şeyh Muhammad Murâdî. Be that as it may, the posthumous influence and unvitiated dignity of the *şeyh* should not be overlooked.

The Murâd Mollâ Tekkesi, named after its founder, Mehmed Murâd Mollâ, is another lodge built in honor of Şeyh Murâd. Being the grandson of Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi, Murâd Mollâ was named after the *şeyh* who had aroused his father and grandfather’s admiration. Thanks to the favorable impression that Şeyh Murâd left behind, following in the footsteps of his grandfather, in 1769, Murâd Mollâ had a *tekke* built for Naqshbandis in the Çarşamba neighborhood within the intramural city rather than in *extra muros*. It seems likely that two distinctive aspects differentiate this lodge from remaining Naqshbandi convents of Istanbul. Firstly, into the *tekke*-complex was incorporated a free-standing library building in 1775. Thus, as the first of its kind, a *tekke* with a physically unattached library came into existence.¹³⁶ Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, the main contribution of the lodge to the cultural and religious life of Istanbul seems to be the successful coalescence of the Naqshbandi and Mevlevi traditions there. Yet, available evidence demonstrates that such an amalgamation was carried through particularly in the first half of the 19th century during the incumbency of Seyyid Mehmed Murâd

¹³³Nihat Azamat, “La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî,” *TDVIA*, vol. 27, 90-91.

¹³⁴Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf*, 276. Ayvansarâyî is mistaken when identifying Murâdzâde Alî Efendi as the first *şeyh* of the *tekke*. See, *Hadîkatü’l-Cevâmî*, 291, and *The Garden of the Mosques*, 309. Şeyh Alî was the son of Şeyh Mehmed, and upon the death of his father, he replaced him in the Kurşunlu Mahzen lodge built by Köse Mustafâ Pasha. See BOA, SOSM.III. 90/6914/1, and BOA, SOSM.III. 90/6913/1.

¹³⁵In the decrees in question the vizier, qadis, local notables, qadis and their deputies, and other officers controlling the cities on the road from Damascus to Üsküdar were asked to provide convenience and satisfy the needs of Şeyh Mehmed Murâdî. See BOA, *Mühimme Defteri*, no. 57/619; BOA, AE.SMHD.I.. 237/19064/1; and BOA, C..DH.. 88/4370/1.

¹³⁶Hatice Aynur, “Murad Molla Kütüphanesi ve Yapım Kitabesi,” *Z Dergisi* 5 (2021): 121.

Efendi (d. 1848), the third *şeyh* of the *tekke* and renowned Mathnawî reciter of the time who established a lodge for teaching, reading, and reciting of the Mathnawî in the vicinity of Murâd Mollâ Tekkesi in Çarşamba.¹³⁷

The role of Murâd Bukhârî in the dissemination of the Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi order in Istanbul is an established fact. However, he was neither the sole representative of the Mujaddidiyya in the city nor the only exhorter behind the construction of second-wave lodges. His unique position in the Naqshbandi networks of Istanbul was remarkable, but there were other *şeyhs* with Mujaddidi affiliations for whom lodges were built. What is exceptional in the situation of these masters was that their Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi chain connected to Ahmad al-Sirhindî, i.e., the founder of the Mujaddidiyya branch, through Yekdest Ahmad Juryânî (d. 1707) rather than Murâd Bukhârî, the two renowned disciples of Muhammad Ma'sûm (d. 1668), i.e., the son and caliph of al-Sirhindî. The Neccârzâde Tekkesi's restoration and reorganization as a Naqshbandi convent by Şeyh Neccârzâde Mustafâ Rızâeddîn Efendi (d. 1746) probably during the second decade of the 18th century, is a good example in this regard, because Şeyh Neccârzâde's spiritual lineage goes back to Ahmad Juryânî by way of Arabzâde Muhammed İlmî Edirnevî (d. 1718) and his *şeyh* Muhammed Semerkandî (d. 1705).¹³⁸ What distinguishes Neccârzâde's *tekke* from other Naqshbandi convents is the observance of Celveti and Naqshbandi rituals there. This is so because Neccârzâde had license from these orders, as well as from the Mevleviyye. Yet, the dominant bent in him and his *tekke*, we are said, was the Naqshbandi.¹³⁹

The second lodge where the spirituality of not only Ahmad Juryânî but also Murâd Bukhârî is felt is the Şeyhülislâm Tekkesi, which the then *şeyhülislâm* Seyyid Mustafâ Efendi (d. 1745) had built in the Nişanca neighborhood of Eyüp in 1744. Being the son of the slain *şeyhülislâm* Seyyid Feyzullâh Efendi (d. 1703), Seyyid Mustafâ Efendi (1679-1745) had a life and career with ups and downs. We know, for instance, that he was able to climb all madrasa ladders within two and a half years, and from September 1698 to March 1703, he unintermittedly carried out the judgeship of Salonika, Mecca, and the chief military judge of Anatolia.¹⁴⁰ Following the execution

¹³⁷Baha Tanman, "Murad Molla Tekkesi ve Kütüphanesi," *DBIA*, vol. V, 516-518; "Murad Molla Külliyesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 31, (Ankara: TDV, 2020): 187-188. On Mesnevîhâne Tekkesi which is also known as Dârülmesnevî Tekkesi, see Tanman, "Mesnevîhâne Tekkesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 29, (Ankara: TDV, 2004): 334-336; and "Mesnevîhane Tekkesi," *DBIA*, vol. V, 408-409.

¹³⁸For Neccârzâde and his spiritual lineage I depend on Şimşek, *18. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Toplumunda Nakşibendî-Müceddidîlik*, 130-136; idem, "Neccârzâde Rızâ Efendi," *TDVIA*, vol. 32, 483-484.

¹³⁹Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf*, 276-277.

¹⁴⁰Michael Nizri, *Ottoman High Politics and the Ulema Household*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014): 92-93.

of his father, however, he was exiled alongside of his brothers to Bursa, where he was obliged to stay until 1730. According to Ayvansarâyî, Seyyid Mustafâ adhered to Yekdest Ahmad Juryânî during his judgeship in Mecca.¹⁴¹ However, it is very likely that he was initiated into Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî as well in Bursa. As I mentioned earlier, given that Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî resided approximately six years in Bursa from 1712 to 1718, “one could assume that he formed a close friendship with Murâd Bukhârî and other Naqshi-Mujaddidis during his obligatory residence in the city.”¹⁴² Thus, we can readily contend that, because of his adherence to Şeyh Murâd and Şeyh Ahmad, years after their demise, Şeyhülislâm Seyyid Mustafâ decided to establish a *tekke* in tribute to both. The third lodge built for the veneration of Ahmad Juryânî is the Kâşgarî Tekkesi. To remember, it was found by Yekçeşm Ahmed Murtazâ in 1745 and donated as a venue of Sufism to the Kasani branch of the Naqshbandiyya. What is overlooked in the case of Kâşgarî Tekkesi is that its founder, Murtazâ Efendi himself, was a disciple and deputy of Ahmad Juryânî.¹⁴³ What is more interesting in this unique case is that as an authorized Naqshbandi *şeyh* and scholar-bureaucrat, Murtazâ Efendi established the *tekke* not for his own use, but for a Central Asian Kasani *şeyh*, such as Abdullâh Nidâî.

Apart from newly constructed lodges, the spiritual lineage of Şeyh Ahmad Juryânî, was lucky enough to have representation in one of the first-wave Naqshbandi lodges which until then had been under the care and Sufistic oversight of şeyhs from the Ahrari branch of the order. The salient example in this context was the Emîr Bukhârî lodge located in Ayvansaray. As Halil İbrahim Şimşek has pointed out, the first appointment to the Ayvansaray *tekke* from among the disciples of Ahmad Juryânî was of Kırımî Ahmed Efendi (d. 1743), assigned there in 1736 after the death of Şeyh Karamanîzâde Ahmed Efendi. Following the demise of Kırımî Ahmed, the renowned Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi master, Mehmed Emîn Tokadî (d. 1745), who had been under the tutelage of Ahmad Juryânî from 1702 to 1705, was convinced by the aforementioned Şeyhülislam Seyyid Mustafâ Efendi to serve as a *şeyh* at the convent of Ayvansaray. Upon Mehmed Emîn Efendi’s death, which brought to end his two-year term, şeyhs Halîl Murâdî of Birgi (d. 1749), Hasan (d. 1753), and İbrâhîm (d. 1755) became the post-nishîn respectively. Even though we do not know whether the three *şeyhs* were the part of Ahmad Juryânî’s lineage, we exactly know that their successor, Şeyh Mustafâ Efendi, who had been in charge from 1755 to 1781, was part and parcel of Juryânî silsila, for he received his Naqshbandi ijaza from Şeyh

¹⁴¹Ayvansarâyî, *Hadikatü'l-Cevâmi'*, 283, and *The Garden of the Mosques*, 302.

¹⁴²İsa Uğurlu, “Gaznevî Mahmûd: A Neglected Ottoman Clerk, His Career, Miscellany, and Religious and Literary Network,” 53.

¹⁴³Şimşek, 18. *Yüzyıl Osmanlı Toplumunda Nakşibendî-Müceddidîlik*, 189.

Kırımî Ahmed Efendi.¹⁴⁴

The first-wave lodges must have also enjoyed the mastery of Murâd Bukhârî's Sufi caliphs. However, except for one instance mentioned by Şeyhî Mehmed, there is a dearth of information and documentation as to the presence of Murâd Bukhârî's disciples at the long-standing Naqshbandi-Ahrari lodges. The *şeyh* in question is İspirî Dâmâdı Mustafâ Efendi (d. 1708).¹⁴⁵ Born in Izmir, he completed his initial education under his father and İbrâhîm Efendi, the mufti of the city, and headed for Istanbul for specialization. After graduating from the imam of the sultan Mehmed Efendi, he was assigned to a madrasa. However, after a short while he would give up his teaching position to adhere to Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî. Completing his Sufi education under the direction of the *şeyh*, he spent some time as a preacher in several mosques of the city, and eventually became the incumbent *şeyh* of the Hekîm Çelebi Tekkesi in 1699 and remained in the post there until his death in 1708.¹⁴⁶ After Şeyh Mustafâ's death, the post of the *tekke* passed into Şeyh Seyyid Fazlullâh Efendi (d. 1709), the then *post-nishân* of the Fatih Emîr Bukhârî lodge. Upon the sudden death of Seyyid Fazlullâh in Sinai, to Şeyh Ahmed al-Mekkî (d. 1710) was given the *tekke*. Although his biography remains shrouded in darkness, it is possible that Ahmed al-Mekkî was one of the disciples of Şeyh Mustafâ Efendi. Furthermore, a master-disciple relationship between Şeyh Murâd and himself would not be surprising, if both were dwelling at the same time in Istanbul. In conclusion, we may claim that the influence and spiritual lineages of both Murâd Bukhârî and Ahmad Juryânî were observable in the 18th century, not only in second-wave lodges but also in first-wave lodges such as Hekîm Çelebi and Ayvansaray Emîr Bukhârî.

2.3.3 The Role of the Naqshbandi Patrons

The increase in the number of second-wave lodges cannot be thoroughly understood without considering the role of the *tekke*-founders who bestowed favors on Naqshbandi *şeyhs* and their followers. In other words, it was the financial support and

¹⁴⁴See Şimşek, 18. *Yüzyıl Osmanlı Toplumunda Nakşibendî-Müceddidilik*, 138, 140-141, 156-159. For more on *şeyhs* of Ayvansaray lodge see, *İstanbul'daki Türkistan Tekkeleri*, 49-60.

¹⁴⁵Depending on the printed copy of Ayvansarayî's *Hadîkatü'l-Cevâmi'*, Muslu and Şimşek read Şeyh Mustafâ's title as "Esîrî Dâmâdı". However, in the manuscript, Şeyhî gives the title as "İspirî Dâmâdı" and states that Şeyh Mustafâ established kinship bond with the preacher of Ayasofya Mosque İspirî Ali Efendi through marriage. See Şeyhî, *Vekayiu'l-Fudalâ*, vol. II-III, 417, and *Vekayî'u'l-Fuzalâ: Şeyhî'nin Şakâ'ik Zeyli*, vol. 3, prepared by Ramazan Ekinci, (Istanbul: YEK, 2018): 2717.

¹⁴⁶Şeyhî, *Vekayiu'l-Fudalâ*, vol. II, 416-417; Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf*, 236-237; and Şimşek, 18. *Yüzyıl Osmanlı Toplumunda Nakşibendî-Müceddidilik*, 119-120. Because of mistransliterating the word as "Musul" rather than "mevsûl" Muslu concludes that Mustafâ Efendi was appointed as a professor to a madrasa in Mosul. From such a misconception Şimşek infers that Mustafâ Efendi went from Mosul to Damascus where he adhered to Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî.

philanthropy of the patrons that occasioned a significant number of the Naqshbandi lodges to be set up as charities. It is beyond doubt that a comparison of the situation between other Sufi brotherhoods in the 17th and 18th centuries will present a more realistic view. Since one of the claims of this dissertation pertains to the positive role and constructive impact of the patrons on the dissemination of the Naqshbandi *tekkes* in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a numerical comparison of the lodges built for several dervish orders by *şeyhs* and patrons will be an appropriate task. For this purpose, an analysis in light of Table 2.7 is necessary. Considering Table 2.7, one realizes that only Mevlevi convents were built by patrons rather than Sufi masters. The only exception in this regard is the Mevlevi master, Halîl Nu'mân Dede, who built the Mevlevîhâne of Üsküdâr in 1792. However, as is discussed above, his family bonds provided him great wealth, and he came to fore as a patron rather than a *şeyh*. The opposite case was seen in Qadiri circles where twelve convents were founded, to a large extent (75%), by Qadiri masters. The more unusual and remarkable situation on the part of Qadiris was that in two of three examples in which the founders were not *şeyhs*, Âlime Hatun (d. 1821), the daughter of the qadi Mestcizâde Osmân Efendi and wife of Şeyh Mustafâ Resmî Efendi (d. 1793), appears as the founder of the lodges.¹⁴⁷ When it comes to the Bayrami lodges, it seems that, from the twelve *tekkes* put into service in the 17th and 18th centuries, only three (25%) were commissioned by statesmen.¹⁴⁸ The most important development within the Bayrami circles seems to have occurred in the 17th century under the guidance and scholarly activities of Azîz Mahmûd Hüdâyî (d. 1628) and his spiritual descendants who established at least five *tekkes* only in Üsküdâr.¹⁴⁹

A superficial comparison between the Naqshbandi and Khalwati orders in terms of the founders of their *tekkes* will suffice for a better realization of the change and transformation that happened in the foundation of both over the centuries. For instance, throughout the 16th century, whereas thirty-two of forty-six Khalwati lodges were erected by courtiers and high-ranking officials, only ten were built by *şeyhs*, two by artisans, and one by a member of *ulema*.¹⁵⁰ In other words, 70 percent of

¹⁴⁷The two lodges Âlime Hatun built for her husband in 1204/1789-1790 are known as Resmî Efendi Tekkesi and Kabaluk Tekkesi. For more see Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf*, 404-405. On the former see Tanman, "Resmî Efendi Tekkesi," *DBIA*, vol. VI, 316-317, and "Resmî Tekkesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 34, 584-585. On Kabakulak Tekkesi see <http://mustafaesmiah.net/mustafaahi/tekkeler/kabakulak.html> (accessed 28.06.2023).

¹⁴⁸These were Himmet Efendi Tekkesi by Defterdâr İbrâhîm Efendi in the second half of the 17th century, Hâşim Efendi Tekkesi by Hekimoğlu Alî Pasha in 1732, and Sarmaşık Tekkesi by Kazasker Abdulkadir Efendi in the second half of the 18th century. See respectively Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf*, 517, 491-492, and 439-440.

¹⁴⁹The *tekkes* in question were Hüdâyî Âsitânesi, Şeyh Câmî'i Tekkesi, Selâmî Alî – Selâmsız, Selâmî Alî – Acıbadem, and Selâmî Alî – Kısıklı. See Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf*, 440, 474, and 480-482.

¹⁵⁰Ayşe Bölükbaşı, "XVI. Yüzyılda İstanbul'daki Halveti Tekkeleri," 13.

all Khalwati *tekkes* owes their buildings to prominent figures in the empire. In the 17th and 18th centuries, when a sequential decline and rise occurred in the number of Khalwati *tekkes*, the ratio of the lodges constructed by the dignitaries dropped as low as 27.5 percent and twenty-nine of forty lodges, which constituted 72.5 percent, were installed by the Khalwati *şeyhs*. Regarding high-ranking patrons funding the construction of seventeenth-century Khalwati lodges, it is a curious observation that at least three of them served as the grand viziers.¹⁵¹ As to eighteenth-century lodges, however, it is said that Ahmed III had the reputed Cerrâhî Âsî tânesi built in 1703 at the very beginning of his reign, and Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha contributed to the Tatar Efendi Tekkesi built for Tatar Hasan Efendi (d. 1766).¹⁵² As far as the Naqshbandi lodges are concerned, Table 2.5 and 2.7 demonstrate that those instituted under the favor of administrators and scholar-bureaucrats, and those brought into existence by the Naqshbandi masters presented a ratio of two-thirds to one-third: (59%) vs (31%). Contrary to first-wave lodges, none of the second-wave lodges were built upon the initiatives of the sultans. Likewise, except for Köse Mustafâ Pasha, no grand vizier patronized Naqshbandi *tekkes* in the 17th and 18th centuries, a situation observed in at least three cases in the seventeenth-century Khalwatiyya. What makes the Naqshbandi case special is either the domination of the wealthy scholar-officials such as Dâmâdzâde Ebulhary Ahmed, La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî, Şeyhülislâm Seyyid Mustafâ, and Dâmâdzâde Mehmed Murâd Mollâ, or the existence of statesmen such as Defterdâr İsmâ'îl Efendi, Yekçeşm Ahmed Murtazâ Efendi, Nu'mân Bey, and Seyyid Mehmed Agha, who seem to have a background in the *ilmiye* establishment. Abdullâh Pasha and Köse Mustafâ Pasha, however, were two unique patrons who enjoyed administrative power in the higher echelons of the state.

The completion date of some Naqshbandi lodges suggests that a struggle for prestige and competition for good deed took place between their founders. Such a possibility is particularly observable in the first half of 1740s, when La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî, Şeyhülislâm Seyyid Mustafâ, and Yekçeşm Ahmed Murtazâ set up their *tekkes* one

¹⁵¹See for instance Bayram Pasha (d. 1638) who built Bayram Paşa Tekkesi as a part of his mosque complex in 1634-1635, Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Ahmed Pasha (d. 1676) who built Akbıyık Tekkesi for Çarhacı Şeyh Ahmed Efendi (d. 1669), and Morah Hasan Pasha (d. 1713) who built Nasûhî Tekkesi for Şeyh Mehmed Nasûhî (d. 1718) in 1688. Because of the chronological errors, Ayvansarâyî was mistaken when stating that Bayram Pasha lodge was erected for the Qadiriyya and Akbıyık Tekkesi was set up by Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha (d. 1691). See *The Garden of the Mosques*, 50 and 65. For the tekkes in question see Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf*, 94-95, 165, and 189. See also Tanman, "Bayram Paşa Külliyesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 5, (İstanbul: TDV, 1992): 267-268, and "Akbıyık Mescidi ve Tekkesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 2, (İstanbul: TDV, 1989): 222-223. For Çarhacı Şeyh Ahmed see Üzeyir Aslan, "Çarhacı, Şeyh Ahmed Efendi," <https://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/carhaci-seyh-ahmed-efendi> (accessed 27.06.2023).

¹⁵²Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf*, 87, and 219-220; Tanman, "Nüreddin Cerrâhî Tekkesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 33, (İstanbul: TDV, 2007): 253-256; Ayvansarâyî, *The Garden of the Mosques*, 392. It is highly possible that the expense ledgers of the grand viziers contain inputs regarding their patronage for the Sufi masters and *tekkes*. However, I have not utilized these sources in the current study.

after another in Eyüp. The year 1753, on the other hand, witnessed the inauguration of two considerable *tekke*-complexes: Mustafâ Paşa Tekkesi in Eyüp and Özbekler Tekkesi in Üsküdar. We learn from Ayvansarâyî that Köse Mustafâ Pasha and Abdullâh Pasha, the founders of the said complexes, had a relationship of patron and client. So much so that, during the first grand vizierate of the former, it culminated in the appointment of Abdullâh Pasha as the steward of the grand vizier.¹⁵³ Therefore, it has already been proposed that the reasons behind the construction of Özbekler Tekkesi by Abdullâh Pasha should be sought in his closeness to the grand vizier Köse Mustafâ Pasha.¹⁵⁴ Given these significant details, we may claim that the Naqshbandi patrons in question mutually influenced and encouraged each other when embarking on the construction projects of *tekkes*.

At this point, a few notes should also be written on the grand vizier, Köse Mustafâ Pasha, and his's unique position in the Naqshbandi circles in the mid-18th century.¹⁵⁵ As mentioned above, he not only built a *tekke* named after himself, but also invited Şeyh Muhammad Murâdî, the son of Murâd Bukhârî, from Damascus to Istanbul to serve there. Furthermore, as is conveyed by Ayvansarâyî, he renovated Kurşunlu Mahzen, a cistern inherited from the Byzantine time era in Galata. and used as an arsenal since then, and turned it into an imperial mosque by putting in a *mahfil* for the sultan. The role of the deceased Şeyh Murâd appears alongside that of his son in the conversion of the building from a cistern to a mosque. Narrating from Şeyh Muhammad Murâdî, Ayvansarâyî pens the story as follows: “My father, Şeyh Murad Efendi -may his grave be hallowed-, beheld in his dreams a bridge being built from Üsküdar to Galata and angels passing over it. When he asked them for an explanation, they answered, ‘Some of the Companions of the Prophet were buried in the Kurşunlu Mahzen. We are on our way to make a pilgrimage to them.’¹⁵⁶ Despite ambiguities in wording of Ayvansarâyî, we understand that Şeyh Muhammad Murâdî narrated his father's dream to the grand vizier in a letter, so the cistern was cleaned and transformed into a mosque.¹⁵⁷ In addition, Köse Mustafâ Pasha built inside the Kurşunlu Mahzen Mosque a Naqshbandi lodge consisting of six rooms and appointed Şeyh Muhammad Murâdî as the its head of it.¹⁵⁸ Lastly, Mustafâ

¹⁵³ Ayvansarâyî, *The Garden of the Mosques*, 512.

¹⁵⁴ *İstanbul'daki Türkistan Tekkeleri*, 225.

¹⁵⁵ For more on Köse Mustafâ Pasha's life and career see Mücteba İlgürel, “Mustafa Paşa, Köse,” *TDVIA*, vol. 31, 345-346

¹⁵⁶ Ayvansarâyî, *The Garden of the Mosques*, 366. See also *Hadikatü'l-Cevâmi'*, vol. 2, 39.

¹⁵⁷ According to Howard Crane's translation, it was Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî who wrote the letter to the grand vizier Köse Mustafâ Pasha. See *The Garden of the Mosques*, 366.

¹⁵⁸ Yusuf Sağır published the endowment deeds of the grand vizier's foundations. For small details on Kurşunlu

Pasha's endowments to Murâd Buhârî Tekkesi must be remembered.¹⁵⁹ During his first term, in 1753, he added the complex of Murâd Buhârî Tekkesi, a free-standing building for the observance of self-inspection (*murâqaba*), extended and renovated the mosque of the complex, and added four rooms to the complex for dervishes.¹⁶⁰ Considering these endowments, we can may readily conclude that Köse Mustafâ Pasha favored and promoted the Naqshbandiyya, the order to which he adhered, by taking the advantage of his position as the grand vizier.

2.3.4 Eyüp: A Center of Attraction for Naqshbandis

Following the conquest of Istanbul, not only the intramural but also extramural site of the conquered city enjoyed a set of construction projects under its conquerors aiming with the intention of restoring the city to its former splendor and majesty through rejuvenations, renovations, and reconstructions. As discussed by Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, it was in this context that the grave of Abu Ayyub al-Ansari (d. 669), the companion of the prophet and the then eponym of the small town of Eyüp, was discovered, and “the subsequent construction of a mausoleum and mosque complex there articulated a spatial and temporal distance to the sacred sites of the former rule” that concentrated at the intramural site of the city.¹⁶¹ As explained by Suraiya Faroqhi, “Eyüp was a small town, functionally dependent upon Istanbul, a major pilgrimage center and the site of large cemeteries. But from an administrative point of view, it was the center of an independent district, the Haslar kazası, which included all of Istanbul's Rumelian hinterland, from Büyük Çekmece in the south to Arnavudköyü on the Bosphorus in the north.”¹⁶² For the purposes of the current research, however, the main area of interest is not the entire administrative district

Mahzen lodge see Sağır, “Sadrazam Köse Mustafa Paşa'nın Vakıf Eserleri,” *Vakıflar Dergisi* 40 (2013): 57, 59, 63-64, and 78. See also footnote 84 above. For the firman recognizing the appointment of Şeyh Muhammad Murâdî to the lodges of Mustafâ Pasha and Kurşunlu Mahzen, see BOA, C.MF. 56/2758/1.

¹⁵⁹For a comparative analysis on Mustafâ Pasha's endowments for the lodges of Mustafâ Paşa and Emîr Buhârî see Serpil Özcan, “Toplumsal ve Mekansal Konumuyla Otakçıyan Mustafâ Paşa Tekkesi,” *Kadim* 5 (2023): 161-167.

¹⁶⁰Yusuf Sağır, “Sadrazam Köse Mustafa Paşa'nın Vakıf Eserleri,” 57, 79-80. It is understood from a significant petition dated 15 November 1752 that the *mescid* of Murâd Buhârî Tekkesi was extended and turned into a mosque due to the need for a mosque for Friday prayer in the vicinity of the *tekke*. “Merhûm el-Şeyh Murâd Efendi Tekyesi mescidinin câmi^e olmağa şalâhiyyeti olup kurb u civârında edâ-yı şalât-ı Cum^âa olunur câmi^e-i şerif olmadıgından etrâf u civârında sâkin ehâlî ve tekyede mevcûd fuqarâ eyyâm-ı şiddet-i şitâda ‘usret çekmeleriyle” BOA, AE.SMHD.I. 264/21374/2.

¹⁶¹Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, *Constantinopolis / Istanbul: Cultural Encounter, Imperial Vision, and the Construction of the Ottoman Capital*, (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009): 45. For Kafescioğlu's discussion on the project in question, see *ibid*, 45-51. See also Feray Coşkun, “Sanctifying Ottoman Istanbul: The Shrine of Abû Ayyûb al-Anşârî,” Unpublished PhD Diss., (Freie Universität Berlin, 2015).

¹⁶²Suraiya Faroqhi, “Migration into Eighteenth-Century ‘Greater Istanbul’ as reflected in the Kadı Registers of Eyüp,” *Turcica* 30 (1998): 166.

of Eyüp, but rather a relatively small piece of land that slopes down from Edirnekapı toward the Golden Horn, with the particular importance of Otakçılar and Nişanca neighborhoods and the valley where the tomb and mosque of Ayyub al-Ansari are located.¹⁶³ It was in and around this zone that thanks to patronage of the Ottoman sultans and grandies of the empire in repopulations and migrations, the growth and expansion of the town over the centuries reached a point that, towards the middle of the 17th century, Evliyâ Çelebi felt to stated that there was no free space between the walls of Istanbul and Eyüp.¹⁶⁴

My claim at this point is that the expansion of the Naqshbandi *tekkes* in Eyüp can be understood within this historical context. As is seen in Table 2.5 and Table 2.6, eight out of twenty-five (32%) Naqshbandi *tekkes* built in Istanbul from the mid-15th century to the late 18th century were founded in Eyüp alone. The ratio becomes even more striking given that Eyüp encompassed 6 of 16 (37.5%) newly constructed Naqshbandi lodges in the 18th century. Moreover, given that even the Khalwati order, which continuously dominated the *intra muros* Istanbul since the very beginning of the 16th century had only three newly built *tekkes* in Eyüp in the 18th century, the significance of the twice as many lodges of the Naqshbandis is understood better. In addition, for discerning the exceptional place of Eyüp for Naqshbandis, one must consider that in the 18th century, the number of the new *tekkes* erected for the Naqshbandi *şeyhs* was only two in Galata, four in Üsküdar, and four in the walled city. Nevertheless, as can be inferred from Table 2.6, the Naqshbandi dominance in Eyüp, at least in terms of the *tekkes*, might not have been a phenomenon before the 18th century. Such a finding seems crucial because an unrivaled preeminence of the Naqshbandiyya in Eyüp in the second half of the 19th century may lead the historian to an anachronistic explanation that the order had always been in a preponderant position in the town.¹⁶⁵ However, as mentioned above and as seen in Table 2.5, the earliest two lodges built within the borders of Eyüp were Emîr Bukhârî in Edirnekapı and Baba Haydar in Nişanca, and both were erected during the first half of the 16th century. For the construction of the third Naqshbandi lodge in the town, one had to wait until 1715, the year that a

¹⁶³The significance of Otakçılar and Nişanca neighborhoods for Naqshbandis is also emphasized by Davud İbrahimli in his MA Thesis on the cultural influences of *tekkes* in the 19th century Istanbul. See “İstanbul Tekkelerinin Kültürel Hayata Etkileri (Özbek Tekkeleri Örneğinde),” Unpublished MA Thesis (İstanbul Üniversitesi 2022): 58-60.

¹⁶⁴For Evliya Çelebi’s statement I depend on Tülay Artan, “Eyüp,” *TDVIA*, vol. 12, 2. For more on historical development of Eyüp under the Ottoman rule see *ibid*, 1-6. For an incomplete list of Ottoman monuments built within the borders of Eyüp see Mehmet Nermi Haskan, *Eyüp Tarihi*, vols. I-II, (İstanbul: Türk Turing Turizm İşletmeciliği Vakfı Yayınları, 1993). See also Halil İnalcık, “İstanbul,” *Eİ2*, vol. IV, (Leiden: Brill, 1997): 224-248, and “İstanbul: Türk Devri,” *TDVIA*, vol. 23, (İstanbul: TDV, 2001): 220-239.

¹⁶⁵For an example of such an approach see Davud İbrahimli, “İstanbul Tekkelerinin Kültürel Hayata Etkileri,” 57-62.

tekke was formed for Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî by Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi. Yet, the existing documentation demonstrates that, in terms of social functions, the Edirnekapı *tekke* might differ to a certain extent from the remaining lodges built in Eyüp. Therefore, in what follows, an idiosyncratic function of the *tekke* in question will be brought to the table.

Order	Intramural			Eyüp			Galata			Üsküdar		
	15-16.	17.	18.	15-16.	17.	18.	15-16.	17.	18.	15-16.	17.	18.
Naqshbandi	5	1	4	2	0	6	0	0	2	0	1	4
Khalwati	28	9	16	6	1	3	8	3	3	4	2	6
Qadiri	0	1	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Bayrami	4	1	1	0	2	0	2	2	0	1	4	2
Mevlevi	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1

Table 2.6 Newly established tekkes in Istanbul and its vicinity

2.3.4.1 Edirnekapı Emîr Bukhârî Tekkesi as the center of gravediggers

According to a decree issued on 14 September 1726/17 Muḥarram 1139, Alî b. Mûsâ, a resident (*tekye-nişân*) of the Edirnekapı Emîr Bukhârî lodge, was appointed as the supervisor (*nâzır*) of the lodges of gravediggers (*mezârcı tekyeleri*) located outside at the city gates such as Eğrikapı, Edirnekapı, Topkapısı, Silivrikapısı, and Yedikule. It is understood from the content of the said decree that it was issued upon the complaints that the incumbent residents of the lodges in question had not properly dug graves for the dead of Muslims.¹⁶⁶ The decree proves in the first place that in the first quarter of the 18th century, at least five lodges had already been constructed for the gravediggers at the gates on the land walls of Istanbul.¹⁶⁷ Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, it affirms that the lodges in question had come under the control of the Naqshbandis. Was there any connection between the lodges of gravediggers and the Sufi lodges in general, and Edirnekapı Emîr Bukhârî lodge in particular? What was the meaning of having a Sufi *tekke* built in and around the gates of the city walls? It has been stated once that lodges had been built for gravediggers within the borders of Eyüp at an early date, probably following the conquest of the

¹⁶⁶ *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri: İstanbul Mahkemesi 24 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1138-1151 / M. 1726-1738)*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz, (İstanbul: İSAM, 2010): 41. The document has utilized by Selma Kuşu in her dissertation on the social and economic life in Eyüp in the first quarter of the 18th century. See Selma Kuşu, “XVIII. Yüzyılın İlk Çeyreğinde Eyüp’te Sosyal ve Ekonomik Hayat,” Unpublished PhD Diss., (Trakya Üniversitesi 2019): 169-170.

¹⁶⁷ Selma Kuşu, *ibid*, 169.

city.¹⁶⁸ The relationship between the gravediggers and Sufi brotherhoods, however, is among topics looking for further studies. Nonetheless, I intend in this subsection to point out possible interrelationships between the lodges of gravediggers and Sufi orders in Istanbul.

As to the gravedigger lodges situated outside the Edirnekapı gate, the Ottoman traveler, Evliyâ Çelebi, gives witness only to a certain *tekke* formed for gravediggers (*gūr kazanlar*) and tomb keepers (*türbedārlar*). While remaining silent about the formers, he explains that the tomb keepers had been responsible since the reign of Mehmed II for keeping annually an account of the names of notables and grandees (*a^cyān u kibār*) buried there. The main reason behind such a tradition, goes Evliyâ, is sporadic disputes over the borders of the graves which necessitates checking with the registers (*sicillāt*). Evliyâ Çelebi pretentiously likens the registers to his *Seyāhat-nāme*, defines them as marvelous chronicles of the dead (*acāyib tevārīh-i mevtā*) and a sign from the day of judgement (*kıyāmetden bir nişān*), and maintains that enrolling all the dead in this way is such an unprecedented manner that exists nowhere.¹⁶⁹ Evliyâ Çelebi's testimony says nothing about would-be relations and co-operations between the gravediggers and Sufis. Nor does he clarify whether the names of ordinary people had been recorded in the registers. Despite such shortcomings, his sentences are noteworthy for proving the existence of gravedigger lodges in the 17th century.

When it comes to the contact between the Sufi and gravedigger lodges, current documentation indicates that it was at least since the 16th century that the two sides developed close connections with each another. For instance, a court record dated 29 December 1585/7 Muḥarram 994 makes it clear that el-Hâc Mehmed b. Alî, the *şeyh* of Sarı Âşık lodge in Eyüp, alongside of being the head of the said *tekke*, was himself a gravestone dealer and the boss of gravediggers.¹⁷⁰ Another record, dating from the second decade of March 1586 mentions that a certain Hüseyin Dede endowed his house on the condition that it should serve as a convent for the poor and gravediggers.¹⁷¹ As can be understood from their titles (i.e. *şeyh* and *dede*) in both cases, the overseers of the aforementioned lodges were themselves mystics and their disciples residing in the said convents were supposed not only to complete

¹⁶⁸Kuşu, *ibid*, 169.

¹⁶⁹Evliyâ Çelebi b. Derviş Muhammed Zillî, *Evlîya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi: Topkapı Sarayın Bağdat 304 Yazmasının Transkripsiyonu – Dizini*, prepared by Orhan Şaik Gökyay, vol. 1, (İstanbul: YKY, 1996): 154.

¹⁷⁰*İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Eyüp Mahkemesi 3 Numaralı Sicil (H. 993-995/M. 1585-1587)*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz, (İstanbul: İsam, 2011): 55.

¹⁷¹*İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Eyüp Mahkemesi 3 Numaralı Sicil*, 174-175; and Kuşu, *ibid*, 169.

their Sufistic education but also to serve as gravediggers in the nearby graveyards. The affiliation of masters, however, is indefinite. A third court record dated again March 1586, evidently refers to a Sufi gravedigger, i.e. Dervîş Mehmed b. Mehmed, who served in the cemetery neighboring the Tokmak Dede convent.¹⁷² Given the unambiguous identification in this record, one can readily concludes that Dervîş Mehmed was one of the morticians dwelling in Tokmak Dede, a *tekke* located at outside Eĝrikapı gate.¹⁷³ Another court record dated 14 November 1749/3 Dhî¹-hijja 1662 reveals that more than a century and a half later the Tokmak Dede lodge was still a functioning shelter for Sufi gravediggers. This time, however, the *tekke*-residing şeyh (*zāviyedār ve tekke-nişîn*) Ahmed was ordered not to meddle in the task of Seyyid Mehmed, the gravedigger in charge, which is a clear indication that the şeyh of Tokmak Dede lodge had did not have a firm control over all gravediggers affiliated with his *tekke*.¹⁷⁴ A second court record from 1749 denotes a gravedigger lodge located at outside the Yenikapı Mevlevihanesi, the existence of which has already been mentioned by the decree issued on 14 September 1726.¹⁷⁵ Given the proximity and adjacency between the two *tekkes*, we may speculate that, except for certain periods, the gravediggers of the lodge were under the command and tutelage of the şeyhs of the Yenikapı Mevlevihanesi.

From what has been written so far it is understood that the common ground of Sufi and gravedigger lodges founded outside the land walls of Istanbul might have been shaped by intertwined relationships and cooperations. Such an inference, as is argued, hinges upon the assertion that gravedigger lodges, in their localities, were under the command and control of the immediate Sufi lodges regardless of the latter's affiliations. The only exception, as has been unveiled above, came about as a result of the decree of 1726, which brought the gravedigger lodges located at the five gates of the city under the supervision of the Naqshbandi Emîr Bukhârî lodge in Edirnekapı. What might be, then, the main reasons allowing short-lived authority of the Emîr Bukhârî lodge over gravedigger lodges? The geospatial location of the lodge, we may claim, was one of the reasons facilitating its surveillance over gravediggers. This is to say that the commanding ground of the Emîr Bukhârî lodge standing near the summit of the highest hill of Istanbul, monitoring the slopes going down to the Golden Horne and Marmara Sea, had to provide a central position. The second and

¹⁷² *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Eyüp Mahkemesi 3 Numaralı Sicil*, 187.

¹⁷³ It is also known as Yâvedûd Tekkesi. For more on the *tekke*, see Baha Tanman, "Yâvedûd Tekkesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 43, (İstanbul: TDV, 2013): 349-350.

¹⁷⁴ *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Eyüp Mahkemesi 182 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1154-1161/M. 1741-1748)*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz, (İstanbul: Kültür A.Ş, 2019): 536.

¹⁷⁵ The exact date of the record is 28 October 1749 [16 Zî¹-ka^cde 1162]. See *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Eyüp Mahkemesi 182 Numaralı Sicil*, 546.

more important reason, might be the prestige and esteemed position of the lodge among not only the gravediggers but also integral artisans such as stonemasons; there are indications that at least two craftsmen of stonemasonry or their first-degree relatives were able to become the *şeyh* of the Edirnekapı Emîr Bukhârî lodge during the 17th century. As seen in Table 2.2 above, Taşçızâde Mehmed Efendi, the sixth incumbent, and his son Mustafâ Efendi, successively became the post-nishân of the lodge in question.¹⁷⁶ The title of the former betokens that he was the son of a stonemason. Depending on this fact, we may think that he and his son, too, crafted the stonemasonry. If this is the case, we can conclude that they underwent a period of training and practice in the lodge where gravediggers and stonemasons dwelled together, and since they were next to the Naqshbandi lodge, they were able to attend lessons of the occupant *şeyh*, who would subsequently incorporate them into the Naqshbandi circles.

2.4 The Eighteenth-Century: A Period of Resurgence for Sufi Orders in Istanbul?

Had the radical increase in the number of the Naqshbandi lodges in the 18th century been a phenomenon for other Sufi orders as well, or was it incidental only to the Naqshbandiyya? In response to this question, figures in the Table 2.7 make it clear that, compared with the 17th century, three out of five firmly established Sufi brotherhoods enjoyed in the 18th century a growth in convent numbers. Therefore, we may claim that it was, in one respect, against this background that the spread of the Naqshbandi *tekkes* happened. Be that as it may, it is obvious that the expansion of the Naqshbandi, Khalwati, and Qadiri circles had its idiosyncratic explanations since the dissemination of each had not rested on similar historical conditions and opportunities. In other words, while the 18th century Khalwati advancement owes much to the deep-rooted and widespread *tekke* networks formed particularly in previous centuries,¹⁷⁷ it was essentially in this century that a blast an

¹⁷⁶Due to the silence of our sources, we know almost nothing about the details of their biographies. A certain Taşçızâde Mehmed Çelebi b. Ramazân who occurred as the deputy of the then qadi of Niğbolu Abdülfettâh b. Velî in a court record dated 14 December 1637 [26 Rajab 1047] might be none other than Taşçızâde Mehmed Efendi, the incumbent *şeyh* of Edirnekapı lodge. For the record, see *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Eyüp Mahkemesi 37 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1047/M. 1637-1638)*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz, (İstanbul: İsam, 2011): 158.

¹⁷⁷The predominance of the Khalwati order in terms of its *tekkes* and *şeyhs* before the 19th century is an established fact. For ascertain the number of Khalwati *tekkes* in the 16th century Istanbul, I am resting against Ayşe Bölükbaşı's PhD Dissertation. See Ayşe Bölükbaşı, "XVI. Yüzyılda İstanbul'daki Halveti Tekkeleri," Unpublished PhD Diss. (İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi, 2015), and "XVI. Yüzyılda İstanbul'daki Halveti Tekkelerinde Mekânsal İşleyiş: Tekkelerin Mensup Oldukları Külliye İçindeki Diğer Birimlerle İlişkileri," *Bilecik Şeyh Edebali Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 3/1 (2018): 214-

exponential growth occurred in the number of the Naqshbandi and Qadiri lodges. Yet, unlike the Naqshbandi order, which had with its roots in the late 15th- and early 16th- century Istanbul, the Qadiri order was relatively new in the city, for its earliest formation came into existence in the 17th century when Kâdirîhâne Tekkesi or Kâdirîler Âsitânesi was put into service in 1630 and when Kubbe Tekkesi was built towards the end of the century.¹⁷⁸ With the then lodges built during the 18th century, however, the Qadiri order would be well visible in the city.¹⁷⁹ Contrary to the three orders which were reinforced by the introduction of new *tekkes* in the 18th century, it was in the previous century that an explosion was witnessed in the number of Bayrami *tekkes*. Such development was particularly because of the Celveti branch of Bayramiyya which was formed by Azîz Mahmûd Hüdâî (d. 1628), whose disciples established five lodges in Üsküdar.¹⁸⁰ As to the Mevlevi order, however, a significant break is not observable in the number of their *tekkes*. In fact, an absolute dependence on the number of *tekkes* can be misleading in the Mevlevi case given that their influence had been mostly due to the efforts of *dede* families who nurtured dozens of masters throughout the 17th and 18th centuries.¹⁸¹

Table 2.7 Number of tekkes belonging to most common Sufi orders in Istanbul

Order	Centuries				Founded by			
	15-16.	17.	18.	Total	Şeyhs		Officials	
					15-16.	17-18.	15-16.	17-18.
Naqshbandi	7	2	16	25	2	7	5	11
Khalwati	46	15	28	90	10	29	36	11
Qadiri	0	2	10	12	0	12	0	0
Bayrami	7	9	3	19	3	9	4	3
Mevlevi	2	2	1	5	0	0	2	3

239. For the newly established Khalwati lodges in the 17th and 18th centuries, I depend on Ramazan Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: 18. Yüzyıl*, 63-228.

¹⁷⁸ On Kâdirîhâne see Baha Tanman, “Kâdirîhâne Tekkesi” *TDVIA*, vol. 24, (Istanbul: TDV, 2001): 129-131; Muslu, *ibid*, 398-400. On Kubbe Tekkesi, see Muslu, *ibid*, 400-401.

¹⁷⁹ For the Qadiri lodges built in the 17th and 18th centuries see, Ramazan Muslu, *ibid*, 373-426.

¹⁸⁰ On the biography of Hüdâî see, Hasan Kâmil Yılmaz, “Aziz Mahmud Hüdâyî,” *TDVIA*, vol. 4, 338-340. Although Ramazan Muslu inclines to identify Celvetiyye as an independent Sufi order, I prefer Reşat Öngören’s approach when locating Celvetiyye under Bayramiyya. I depend of the following studies when revealing the number of Bayrami tekkes per year. Ramazan Muslu, *ibid*, 427-492 and 507-528; Reşat Öngören, “İstanbul’da Tasavvufî Hayat,” 275-286; Mehmed Akif Köseoğlu, “İstanbul’da Bayramî Şeyhlerinin Postnişin Olduğu Tekkeler ve Günümüzdeki Durumları,” *Uluslararası Hacı Bayram-ı Velî Sempozyumu Bildiriler Kitabı 1*, ed. Ahmet Cahid Haksever, (Ankara: Anıl Matbaacılık, 2016): 429-470.

¹⁸¹ Ramazan Muslu records in this regard the names of Mevlevi dedes such as Sırrî Abdî (d. 1631), Mehmed Memiş (d. 1723), Gavsî Ahmed (d. 1697), Ebûbekir (d. 1775), Sâfî Mustafâ (d. 1744), Ahmed (d. 1771), and Mevlânâzâde Mehmed (d. 1796). See *ibid*, 318-345. For more on the Mevlevi lodges in Istanbul, see *ibid* 355-372.

2.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I have focused on the Naqshbandi lodges established in Istanbul particularly in the 17th and 18th centuries. In accordance with this purpose, I have attempted to classify Naqshbandi *tekkes* as “first-wave” and “second-wave.” While the former category includes convents erected in the second half of the 15th century and the first half of the 16th, the second category involves the lodges built during a period stretching from the late 17th century to the late 18th century. As a result of such a concentration, my findings have been what lies ahead.

First, I have attempted to contribute to the literature on the first-wave lodges first by bringing to the attention neglected primary sources to clarify uncertainties as much as possible. My concentration, in this regard, has been on the *şeyhs* of the Fatih Emîr Bukhârî lodge established by the celebrated Ahrari-Naqshbandi master, Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî, c. 1500 and maintained its pivotal position among Istanbulite Naqshbandis for centuries. Since the *tekke* has been identified with the family and descendants of Khwaja Ahmed Sâdık Taşkendî, I have considered it a duty to show that before and even after his incumbency Naqshbandi *şeyhs* originating from the Ottoman realms controlled the post of the *tekke* approximately from 1516 to 1585, and from 1586 to 1593. What is striking in the biography of the Ottoman masters served in this lodge is that they were either *seyyid* or in the networks of *seyyids*. Moreover, it seems likely that a rather close relationship emerged between the Naqshbandi and Khalwati orders during the period, when the latter dominated the scene in the Ottoman capital.

Second, I have aimed to demonstrate that the role of the patrons or philanthropist builders cannot be disregarded in the erection of the convents during the period under scrutiny. The benefactors of the five of seven first-wave lodges were sultans (Mehmed II, Bâyezîd II, Süleymân I) or the grand vizier (Rüstem Pasha), and in only two cases was the builder the *şeyh* himself. However, out of eighteen second-wave *tekkes*, *şeyhs* had directly involvement in the construction of seven lodges. The remaining eleven *tekkes* were charities of high-ranking officials and scholar-bureaucrats. A comparison between Naqshbandi, Khalwati, and Qadiri lodges seems crucial in this regard. During the 15th and 16th centuries, the period in which first-wave *tekkes* of the Naqshbandiyya occurred, except for ten of forty-six, all Khalwati lodges were eagerly sponsored by the grandis of the empire. During the 17th and 18th centuries, however, of the newly constructed forty lodges, only eleven were backed by statesmen. In the case of the Qadiri lodges, it seems that none of them received assistance from officials. Given the statistics, one can conclude that the

Naqshbandiyya had already replaced Khalwatiyya in the 18th century in terms of receiving financial support from high-ranking officials.

Third, it so happens that Eyüp became a center of attraction for Naqshbandis particularly in the 18th century. The construction in Eyüp of six convents puts Naqshbandiyya ahead of other Sufi brotherhoods in the district. This reality owes its explanation in the first place to all six patrons who aspired to set up lodges for the Naqshbandi şeyhs on the parceled lands. One may further claim that Naqshbandis had a special interest for the town because of the venerated atmosphere provided by the tomb of Abu Ayyub al-Ansari. If so, one must question the reasons behind the relative weakness of other orders in and around the town. Moreover this chapter sheds light on the fact that gravedigger lodges within the borders of Eyüp officially came under the supervision of the Naqshbandi Emîr Bukhârî lodge in Edirnekapı in the 18th century. What is more remarkable in this regard is that, in the 17th century, at least two şeyhs of the Edirnekapı lodge were affiliated with the gravedigger lodges.

Fourth, the lodges built to serve şeyhs and dervishes of Central and South Asian origin have been the matter of discussion in the current chapter. Depending on existing literature, the chapter has approved that the six *tekkes* established in Eyüp and Üsküdar were reserved for the benefit and well-being of the pilgrims, merchants, wanderers and itinerant dervishes from abroad. In this context, the idiosyncratic condition of the Naqshbandi qalandaris and Naqshbandi-style celibacy tradition, too, have been canvassed in this chapter. Following in the footsteps of Thierry Zarcone and Ekrem Işın, it has been asserted that a Naqshbandi influenced Qalandarism based on the pillar of celibacy might transform into a moderate stage in Istanbul. The main reasons leading such a claim are supposed state control over the Sufi lodges and rich sources of revenues stipulated by the founders for the dwellers-to-be of the founded *tekkes*.

Fifth, the chapter has discussed that Mujaddidi şeyhs and patrons took active roles in the dissemination of the Naqshbandi *tekkes* in Istanbul. Particular attention, in this context, deserves to be directed to the lodges built for the benefit of wandering dervishes. My contribution is that the direct role and posthumous influence of both Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî and Yekdest Ahmad Juryânî had motivated Naqshbandi patrons in building lodges for the poor and celibate outsiders. In order to prove the relationship between Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî and the founders of *tekkes*, I have considered the letters exchanged between Murâd Buhkari and İsmâ'îl Efendi (Buhara Tekkesi), Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi (Murâd Buhârî Tekkesi) and La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî Efendi (Kalenderhane Tekkesi), and speculated on the possible influence of the şeyh on Damâdzâde Mehmed Murâd Mollâ (Murâd Mollâ Tekkesi), Abdul-

lâh Pasha (Özbekler Tekkesi) and Köse Mustafâ Pasha (Mustafâ Pasha Tekkesi). In addition, I have pointed out direct links and posthumous influence of Şeyh Ahmad Juryânî on Neccârzâde Mustafâ (Neccârzâde Tekkesi), Şeyhülislâm Mustafâ (Şeyhülislâm Tekkesi), Yekçeşm Ahmed Murtazâ (Kâşgarî Tekkesi). Lastly, I have revealed in this context that the disciples of Murâd Bukhârî and Ahmad Juryânî were lucky enough to be assigned to first-wave lodges in the late 17th and 18th centuries respectively in Hekîm Çelebi and Ayvansaray Emîr Bukhârî lodges.

Finally, I have argued that eighteenth-century expansion of Naqshbandi lodges may also be understood from a holistic point of view. That the number of Naqshbandi, Khalwati, and Qadiri tekkes increased in the 18th century compared to the 17th century, indisputably testifies that prominent Sufi brotherhoods enjoyed growth in their network of influence in the period in question. Possible reasons behind such an augmentation, however, have not been discussed in the chapter since it goes beyond its scope, claims and intentions.

3. A FRESH BLOOD: ŞEYH MURÂD BUKHÂRÎ AND PENETRATING HIGH-RANKING OFFICIALS THROUGH THE EPISTOLARY EXCHANGE

3.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî (d. 1720), fresh blood in the history of the Naqshbandi order in Istanbul. Based on Şeyh Murâd's neglected 275 Arabic letters of varying lengths, I will attempt to analyze the politics of Naqshbandi networking in the case of social, political, and Sufistic networks that came into existence between Şeyh Murâd and his disciples during a forty-year period covering the last vicennium of the 17th and first fifth of the 18th centuries. Thus, first, I will question whether a "Naqshbandi Republic of Letters" occurred during the period. Then, seeking explanations for the reasons behind Murâd Bukhârî's success and the exchange of letters between him and his disciples, I claim that Şeyh Murâd's correspondence served at least three purposes. Firstly, through the circulation of letters, Şeyh Murâd was able to spread among his followers his reformulated teachings and theories which resulted in an attempt to form a "Muradi" branch of the Naqshbandiyya. Secondly, it was because of the letters rather than ad hoc discourses he managed to transmit his order to high-ranking officials and scholar-bureaucrats. Thirdly, correspondences enabled Şeyh Murâd to stand over his disciples, to keep their interest and spirit alive, to meet their needs and promote them in state administration. Before conducting such an analysis, however, I would like to draw attention to new biographic information that has emerged through new primary sources including the letters.

3.2 Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî in Ottoman Lands: New Findings

Although a newcomer in the cosmopolitan atmosphere of the Ottoman capital, Şeyh Murâd appeared to immediately catch the eye of city dwellers, including a significant number of officials and scholars. Such an honoring, following his death in 1720, resulted in relatively longer and detailed biographic entries in Turkish and later in Arabic.¹⁸² By utilizing these entries, the biography of Şeyh Murâd has been repeated with small contributions in a few studies as follows.¹⁸³ The story of Şeyh Murâd begins in Samarqand in 1640 when he was born into a highly esteemed *naqîb al-ashrâf* family. After completing his initial education in his hometown, he went to India, where he met Muhammad Ma'sûm, the son of Ahmad al-Sirhindî (d. 1624) and his master in the Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi order. Accompanying his preceptor, he went on the pilgrimage to Mecca, where he sojourned for three years. Then he embarked on a long-distance voyage during which his main destinations were Baghdad, Isfahan, Balkh, and Samarqand. The most distinguishing feature of this journey was that he had the chance to visit Safavid cities, where he met Persian Shiite scholars, including celebrated poet, Sâib Tabrîzî (d. 1676), to whom he presented a selection of his poems.¹⁸⁴ Soon afterward, for performing his second pilgrimage, he went to Mecca through Baghdad, and after completing his holy deed stopping by Cairo he headed for Damascus. In Damascus, he arrived around 1670, married and established residence. In 1092/1681, upon an invitation, Şeyh Murâd went to Istanbul, where he stayed for five years. It was during this period that prominent members of *ulema* and high-ranking officials adhered to him. In 1097/1686, we see Şeyh Murâd on his way to Damascus from where he would embark for his third hajj. What differentiates this pilgrimage from the previous ones is that Şeyh Murâd, rather than accompanying the official hajj caravan, travelled

¹⁸²Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekâyi'u'l-Fudalâ*, vol. IV, 673-675 and *Vekâyi'u'l-Fuzalâ*, prepared by Ramazan Ekinci, vol. 4, 3272-3275; Muhammad Khalil b. 'Alî al-Murâdî, *Silk al-Durar fî A'cyân al-Qarn al-Thânî 'Ashar*, vol. IV, ed. Dara b. Hazm, (Beirut: Dâru'l-Bashâ'iri'l-Islâmiyya, 1988): 129-131; Ruhsar Zübeyiroğlu, "Mecmû'atü't-Terâcim: Mehmed Tevfik Efendi," Unpublished PhD Diss., (İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1989): 239-240.

¹⁸³Karl K. Barbir, "All in the family: The Muradis of Damascus," in *Proceedings: IIIrd Congress on the Social and Economic History of Turkey*, ed. Heath Lowry and Ralph Hattox, (Istanbul: ISIS, 1990): 330-334; Şimşek, 18. *Yüzyıl Osmanlı Toplumunda Nakşibendî-Müceddidîlik*, 87-109, and "Murad Buhârî," *TDVİA*, vol. 31, 185-187; Abu-Manneh, "Sheikh Murâd al-Bukhârî and the Expansion of the Naqshbandî-Mujaddidî Order in Istanbul." 6-15; Mehmet Şakir Yılmaz, "Sufi brotherhood beyond boundaries: Murad al-Bukari's (1640-1720) travels and residence in Istanbul," 23rd CIEPO Symposium 11-15 September 2018, Sofia, Bulgaria. This text of the presentation is published online. See <https://openaccess.ihu.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/20.500.12154/819/yilmaz2018.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y> (accessed 2.09.2023).

¹⁸⁴This detail is recorded in *Silk al-Durar*, 129. It is worth of recalling that Sâib Tabrîzî himself was a traveller seeking for patronage in Mughal India. The fruit of his eight-year presence at Mughal court was *sabk-i Hindî*, a novelty firstly in the classical Persian and then in the Ottoman poetry through the imitation of Indian style unusual and unexpected metaphors and images. See Paul Losensky, "Şâ'eb Tabrizi," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, <https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/saeb-tabrizi> (accessed 2.09.2023).

to Hijaz with his own retinue by traversing Arab tribes. Spending a year there, Şeyh Murâd went back to Damascus where he would stay until the enthronement of Mustafâ II (s. 1695-1703). Receiving an invitation from Feyzullâh Efendi (d. 1703), the then *şeyhülislam* and the tutor of the new sultan, in 1696, Şeyh Murâd travelled for the second time to Istanbul where he would stay for a short while.¹⁸⁵ In terms of its results, however, the trip was extremely fruitful since “Mustafa II granted him several villages in the vicinity of Damascus as *mālîkâne*,” and “enabled him to establish two Naqshbandî-Mujaddidî *zāwiyas*.”¹⁸⁶ Financially at ease, from then on Şeyh Murâd enjoyed another decade in Damascus, which came to an end with his fourth visit to Mecca in 1119/1707. Right after the pilgrimage, he made his third visit to Istanbul in 1120/1708 with the intention to permanently stay there. However, because of suspicion on the part of the grand vizier, Çorlulu Alî Pasha (v. 1706-1710), on the pretext that Şeyh Murâd wishes for another pilgrimage, he was forced to hastily leave the capital city on 28 May 1709 accompanied by the imperial navy under Chief Admiral, İbrâhîm Pasha.¹⁸⁷ But following a stopover in Chios, kapudan pasha allowed him to disembark in Alaiye (Alanya) from where he went to Bursa by way of Konya and Kütahya. In August 1717, he travelled to Istanbul for the fourth time, and passed away on 12 Rabî^c al-Ākhir 1132/22 February 1720.

The life story of Şeyh Murâd Bukhâri summarized above is marked by his travels. Indeed, such a predisposition on the part of the Naqshbandi masters was not unconventional in the tradition of the order. On the contrary, traveling was one of the eight substantial principles formulated by Abd al-Khâliq Ghijduwânî (d. 1202), the initial founding figure preceding Muhammad Bahâ al-Dîn al-Naqshband (d. 1389), the eponym of the order. As has been emphasized by Hamid Algar, “in its terrestrial as well as spiritual aspects ... ‘travel within the homeland’ (safir dar watan)” was “a distinctive and normative rule for his [i.e., Ghijduwânî] followers.” When it comes to terrestrial travel, we learn from Algar’s paraphrase from Fakhr al-Dîn Alî Safî Kâshifî (d. 1532), the Persian Naqshbandi Sufi who wrote *Rashaḥāt-i ‘Ayn al-Ḥayāt* on the early history of the order, that “the elders of the path have followed different choices in this respect: some have begun by travelling, then chosen to stay in one place; some have begun by remaining in one place and later started to travel; others have abstained from travel throughout; and yet others have travelled unceasingly throughout their spiritual careers. All of their choices were in principle valid,

¹⁸⁵ According to Mehmed Tevfik, the second journey to Istanbul took place in 1101/1689-90. See Ruhsar Zübeyiroğlu, *ibid*, 239.

¹⁸⁶ Abu-Manneh, *ibid*, 11.

¹⁸⁷ Abu-Manneh is mistaken when he states “Apparently this took place in the fall of 1709”. See *Ibid*, 14. In fact, this was the arrival of the navy from its expedition. See *Târih-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vol. II, 812 and 823.

conditional only on the forming of a sound intention and correct purpose.”¹⁸⁸

Şeyh Murâd was among those who unceasingly travelled. Yet, during his fifty-odd years in the Ottoman realms his travels seem to have been arranged to have sojourns in three central cities, Damascus, Bursa, and Istanbul, where his family members and disciples with high ranks lived. Owing to rigorous biographic entries written by Şeyhî Mehmed and Muhammad Khalîl Murâdî, in addition to his four travels to Mecca and Istanbul, we know that he visited the prominent cities of the Muslim world mentioned above. Yet, new research and understudied primary sources bring our attention to new details regarding Şeyh Murâd’s biography, specifically his travels. His summarized biography in the literature portrays a figure rejoicing in journeys to well-known cities where he stayed for a given period. Our sources, on the other hand, show that his travel network within the Ottoman realms was much wider and could not be confined to cities such as Mecca, Medina, Baghdad, Cairo, Damascus, Konya, Istanbul, and Bursa. Furthermore, it comes to light that when Şeyh Murâd embarked a journey, instead of a well-planned peregrination ending in the target destination in a short span of time, he amusedly travelled with his retinue, stopped by the villages, towns and cities located on his route, and spent days, weeks, and months in locations where he was unexpectedly invited. In some cases, Şeyh Murâd left Damascus because of worrisome situations harming his inner peace. For instance, when the governor of Damascus İsmail Pasha severely overcame the conflicts regarding the *sharifate* of Mecca in 1694, he settled in Aleppo for a while.¹⁸⁹ Furthermore, until recently, it has been supposed that he had been in Damascus at the beginning of the 18th century. But as has been proved by Yaşar Sarıkaya, he was in Tarsus at least in 1702. According to an *ijazat-nama* he gave to Şeyh Mustafâ b. Osmân (d. 1734), the father of Ebû Saîd el-Hâdimî (d. 1762) of Konya, Şeyh Murâd had been in Tarsus in that year.¹⁹⁰ Given that he was identified as “Shaykh Murâd al-Naqshbandî al-Tarsûsî” in the license in question, one can assert that his sojourn in and around Tarsus was long enough that “Tarsûsî” as an epithet was ascribed to him. A short epistle dispatched from Şeyh Murâd to his son Muhammad, further clarifies that the şeyh had been in Hama in 1119/1707, likely during his third expedition from Damascus to Istanbul.¹⁹¹ Lastly, given that

¹⁸⁸Hamid Algar, “Tariqat and Tariq: Central Asian Naqshbandîs on the Roads to the Haramayn,” in *Central Asian Pilgrims: Hajj Routes and Pious Visits between Central Asia and the Hijaz*, eds. Alexandre Papas, Thomas Welsford, and Thierry Zarcone, (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2012): 25-26.

¹⁸⁹Mehmet Ş. Yılmaz, “Sufi brotherhood beyond boundaries,” 2-3. Yılmaz depends on Khalîl Murâdî, the great grandson of Şeyh, in this anecdote, but he does not refer any of his texts.

¹⁹⁰Yaşar Sarıkaya, *Merkez ile Taşra Arasında Bir Osmanlı Âlimi: Eb Saîd el-Hâdimî*, (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2008): 41-45.

¹⁹¹*Mektûbât*, Veliyyüddin Efendi, no. 1780, fol. 104a.

Mehmed İsmet Efendi (d. 1747), the collector of Şeyh Murâd's epistles, received from Şeyh Murâd his ijaza for performing Naqshbandi rituals on 28 Jumâd al-Âkhir 1125/22 July 1713 in Edirne,¹⁹² it becomes certain that he was in and around Edirne during the summer of that year. This is a significant detail because it was assumed that Şeyh Murâd had been in Bursa during that time. During the summer of the next year, however, he was in Bursa where he spent his days with friends, adherents and companions in outdoor lectures and sermons given in the gardens of the city during the holy months of Rajab, Sha^cbân, and Ramađân, i.e., July-October 1714.¹⁹³

From these newly uncovered bits of information we understand that Şeyh Murâd's travels were not limited to the cities mentioned in the biographical dictionaries. Moreover, it surfaces that he enjoyed seasonal trips around cities where he dwelled for a particular time slot. Particularly during the summers and hotter months, if not in the city center, he would prefer to stay in a summer camp on the highlands to avoid the heat. For example, in one of his letters addressed to Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi, he asks for a house-functioned Turkmen tent, i.e., *oba* (*qubbatu^t-Turkmâniyya khayr-gâh ya^cnî oba*), because on the land, he did not feel comfortable in the haircloth tent (*khayma*) due to severity of his illness.¹⁹⁴ It is revealed in another letter written on 8 Ramađân for one of the disciples residing in Istanbul that Şeyh Murâd enjoyed the summer of that year in summer resorts established in the mountains of Bursa (*dayya^cnâ hâza al-şayf fî ba^czi maşâyif al-jibâl*) due to the plague hitting Bursa. When the letter was penned, however, the pestilence had almost disappeared from Bursa, but then came down upon Istanbul, so that Şeyh Murâd invokes God to lift it from there, too.¹⁹⁵

His collected epistles bring to light more details regarding Şeyh Murâd's presence in Ottoman lands. The first cloudy point regards the initial phase of his life in Damascus and Anatolia. How did he manage to survive in a climate in which he was a stranger? The already existing and well-established networks of the Naqshbandi lodges dedicated to Indian and Central Asian Sufis, pilgrims, merchants, wanderers and adventurers in the holy lands of Islam and historical cities of the empire had

¹⁹²Mehmed İsmet, *Simât-ı İsmet*. Veliyyüddin Efendi, no. 3191, fol. 177b. It has already been conceived that Şeyh Murâd visited Edirne at the beginning of 1680s. See Artan, "El Yazmaları Işığında Bir Çevre ve Çehre Eskizi," 25. But we are deprived of clues for his earlier visiting to this Ottoman city.

¹⁹³This is an established fact. The sermons given in Menteş and Ömür gardens, and "the garded under the street" were noted down by several disciples. But they are understudied and lacked a satisfactory analysis. See Murat Demir, "Murâd-ı Nakşibendî ve Menâkıbı," Unpublished MA Thesis, (Uludağ Üniversitesi 1998); Fakirullah Yıldız, "Sohbetnâme-i Muhammed Murâd Buhârî," MA Thesis (İstanbul Üniversitesi 2017). The latter is published as Muhammed Murad Buhârî, *Sohbetnâme*, (İstanbul: Litera, 2017).

¹⁹⁴*Mektûbât-ı eş-Şeyh es-Seyyid Muhammed Murâd*, Veliyyüddin Efendi, no. 1837, fol. 104a.

¹⁹⁵*Mektûbât*, fol. 112b.

to be one of the reasons. Being founded on trade and pilgrimage routes connecting different regions of the then Muslim world and historical and religious sites where tombs and shrines of prophets, companions and saints were believed to exist, the lodges continuously attracted visitors.¹⁹⁶ In spite of lacking an exact date of establishment, recent scholarship uncovers that Indian and Central Asian lodges were erected in many Ottoman cities, which includes Mecca, Medina, Cairo, Jerusalem, Damascus, Aleppo, Antakya, Adana, Tarsus, Konya, Karahisar-ı Sâhib (Afyon), Aydın, Kütahya, Bursa, Istanbul, Edirne, Drama, Vukovar, Tosya, Urfa, Ayntab, Van, Süleymaniye, Baghdad.¹⁹⁷ Our primary and secondary sources show that Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî visited at least fourteen of these cities during his journeys,¹⁹⁸ which may indicate, on the one hand that he benefited from their presence on his itinerary, and on the other hand that he scheduled his route in accordance with the networks of these lodges.

Another reason for Şeyh Murâd's success in Ottoman domains was his ability to find patrons from among the ruling elites of the empire, who provided for him financial support, as well as for his large family and disciples. As I have discussed in the previous chapter, the role of patrons in dissemination of the second-wave Naqshbandi *tekkes* in Istanbul was an established fact. It was within such a historical context that in Istanbul he received the support of the chief physician, Nûh Efendi (d. 1707), and his heirs who put a waterfront residence of the family at the disposal of Şeyh Murâd, Hüseyin Efendizâde Mustafâ Efendi, who arranged his garden most probably for şeyh's outdoor talks and lectures, and Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi, who converted his father's madrasa to a Naqshbandi *tekke* for Şeyh Murâd in 1715.¹⁹⁹ About twenty years before Ebulhayr Ahmed's initiative, strongly backed by a powerful figure such as Şeyhülislam Feyzullâh Efendi, he was able to set up two *tekke* complexes in Damascus. On the outset of the relationship between Şeyhülislam Feyzullâh and Şeyh Murâd, satisfactory explanations are yet to be brought forward. When and on which occasion the two figures had been acquainted with each other? Did they meet in Istanbul as early as the 1680s during Şeyh Murâd's first sojourn to the city, or was it through an intense net formed between them after Feyzullâh gained

¹⁹⁶Hamid Algar, "Tariqat and Tariq: Central Asian Naqshbandis on the Roads to the Haramayn," 21-135; Rishad Islam Choudhury, "The Hajj and the Hindi: The Ascent of the Indian Sufi Lodge in the Ottoman Empire," *Modern Asian Studies* 50 (2016): 1888-1931; Cemil Kutlutürk, "Transnational Sufi Networks in India and Anatolia: Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah Order," *Journal of History Culture and Art Research / Tarih Kültür ve Sanat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 9/2 (2020): 267-278.

¹⁹⁷See Thierry Zarcone, *Sufi Pilgrims from Central Asia and India to Jerusalem*, (Kyoto: Center for Islamic Area Studies at Kyoto University, 2009): xv; Ali Emre İşlek, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Hindî Tekkeleri,"; Mustafa Alkan, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Özbek Tekkeleri,".

¹⁹⁸The cities in question were Mecca, Medina, Cairo, Jerusalem, Damascus, Aleppo, Tarsus, Konya, Karahisar, Kütahya, Bursa, Edirne, Istanbul, and Baghdad.

¹⁹⁹Halil İbrahim Şimşek, "Murâd Buhârî," *TDVIA*, vol. 31, 186.

control over the *ulema* bureaucracy towards the end of the century? The current documentation does not allow us to make undisputed opinions and conclusions on this point. Nevertheless, there is a strong possibility that they knew each other before 1670, the year Şeyh Murâd settled in Damascus. Noting that Feyzullâh Efendi embarked upon his pilgrimage in Jumâd al-Âkhir 1078/November-December 1667,²⁰⁰ we can speculate that it was during and after the hajj season of 1078 that they began to develop close connections with each other.

Şeyh Murâd's epistles demonstrate that, in addition to abovementioned figures, he enjoyed the patronage of the Köprülü family, particularly during 1670s and 1680s, his initial two decades in Damascus, Anatolia, and Istanbul. An undated epistle sent to Köprülüzâde Nu'mân Pasha (d. 1719) before his two-month grand vizierate from 16 June 1710 to 16 August 1710 is very crucial in this regard. The epistle clarifies that it was thanks to the patronage of the grand vizier's father, Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha (d. 1691), that Şeyh Murâd was able to assure his presence in Damascus and make longer his initial phase in Istanbul, which lasted for five years from 1681 to 1686. This is so, because he reminds Nu'mân Pasha that when trouble intensified with the poor and weak dervishes during their sojourn in Damascus and Rum, they appealed to the support of his father.²⁰¹ Certainly, high-ranking officials who appeared as patrons and protectors in the socio-political and Sufistic networks of Şeyh Murâd could not be limited to the mentioned elites of the empire. On the contrary, their number was higher than thought, and a complicated relationship had taken root between them and the *şeyh*. Furthermore, as is documented in the epistles, grand viziers such as Şehîd Alî Pasha (d. 1716) and Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha (d. 1730) were also parts of this network. But since I will focus on the characteristics of the network in the following subsections of this chapter, I do not go into detail at this stage.

The best illuminated part of Şeyh Murâd's life story in the epistles is the period of approximately one and a half years starting with his departure from Istanbul on 28 May 1709 to his arrival in Bursa on 30 October 1710. According to the conventional historiography, apprehended by the increasing popularity and influence of Şeyh Murâd, grand vizier Çorlulu Alî Pasha thought of sending him away from Istanbul; for executing the plan he entrusted Grand Admiral Moralı İbrâhîm Pasha (d. 1725), who served twice as grand admiral from 1706 to 1709, and from 1717 to

²⁰⁰ *Vekâyi'ü'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. III, 2333.

²⁰¹ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 39a. The title of Nu'mân Pasha is "al-wazîr al-mukarram" in the epistle. For the biography of Köprülüzâde Mustafâ and Nu'mân pashas see respectively Abdülkadir Özcan, "Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Mustafa Paşa," *TDVIA*, vol. 26, 263-265; and "Köprülüzâde Nûman Paşa," *ibid*, 265-267.

1718.²⁰² The real reason behind the naval campaign of 1709 was to repair the fortress of Limni Island, which fell into ruin as a result of explosion in ammunition store triggered by the lightning strike on 15 Shawwāl 1120/28 December 1708.²⁰³ Given that the navy stopped on the island of Chios (Sakız) and headed for Alaiye (Alanya), where Şeyh Murâd disembarked, we can conclude that this was a multi-dimensional expedition. An epistle which was sent to Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi probably from Lârende (Karaman) in the fall of 1709 discusses the campaign without the slightest mention of the situation on Limni.²⁰⁴ We learn from the letter that during the break on Chios, Şeyh Murâd received correspondence from Ebulhayr Ahmed, an indication that his high-ranking disciples closely followed and were interested in Şeyh Murâd's adventure with the navy.²⁰⁵ Perhaps, the most noteworthy detail in Şeyh Murâd's letter is that he accompanied the navy until the end of the campaign, and only by its accomplishment did he disembark in Alaiye, which might mean that he visited Rhodes and witnessed combat between Ottoman and Venetian naval fleets.²⁰⁶ Not all the visited islands and coastal cities were recorded in the letter, but in light of Şeyh Murâd's statement that they were back with the naval forces in Alaiye upon the completion of the naval expedition,²⁰⁷ we may conclude with caution that they visited islands such as Crete and Cyprus or coast cities of the Levant.

Despite the sudden and forced journey resembling an exile, Şeyh Murâd was pleased, especially with its conclusions. In an epistle dispatched from Lârende for Feyzullâh Samarqandî, who resided in Medina at that time, he wrote that "It is from the favor of Allah to travel with His soldiers on the land and sea, and frontier stations in the coasts, islands, and cities where happened an increase in the number of beloved friends. The travel has now ended in Lârende and I wish it ends in you in the end."²⁰⁸ His satisfaction with the voyage was so such that he called the grand admiral as his son (*waladinā*) in the letter penned for Ebulhayr Ahmed, and praised

²⁰²For more on Moralı İbrâhîm Pasha's career and waqfs see Münir Aktepe, "Kapudân-ı Derya Moralı Aşçı Hacı İbrahim Paşa ve Vakfiyeleri," *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* 6 (1975): 177-203.

²⁰³*Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vol. II, 801; Aktepe, *ibid*, 180.

²⁰⁴For the letter see *Mektûbât*, Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 1837, fol. 24b.

²⁰⁵The letter was probably conveyed the land and reached the island by way of İzmir.

²⁰⁶The chronicler Râşid states that during his seasonal Mediterranean campaigns İbrâhîm Pasha used to visit Rhodes where the khan of Crimea Devlet Girây was in exile. See footnote 17 in Aktepe, *ibid*, 181. When the navy victoriously reached Istanbul in the fall of 1709, three galleons and a small brig (*şahîya*) captured from the enemy were in the convoy of the ships. See Aktepe, *ibid*, 181.

²⁰⁷The relevant part is as follows: "summa haysu intahat murâbaţat al-baħr wa'adnā ma'a waladinā ra'is al-askarhā ilā al-ʿAlā'iyya wa kharajnā minhā".

²⁰⁸"wa laqad manniʿllāhi Taʿālā sayr al-barr waʿl-baħr wa ribātihi ma'a ʿaskarihi bi-sawāhil wa jazāyir waʿl-bilād fi taksir al-aħbāb fihi subhānahū wa intahā al-sayr al-ān ilā Lārende fa-ʿasā an-yantahā ākhiruhu ilaykum." *Mektûbât*, Veliyüddin, no. 1780, fol. 114a.

the naval forces as “soldiers of God” in the letter to Feyzullâh Samarqandî. He was also content with the hospitality of the nobles of Alaiye, in whose summer resorts he was hosted likely in the late August. The only apprehension on his behalf was for his family and dervishes in Damascus. Therefore, as he states in the letter to Ebulhayr Ahmed, he sent a courier to Damascus to inform them about his condition and convey their message to Konya, his next station.

Although the exact date of Şeyh Murâd’s arrival to Konya is ambiguous, we can speculate that he had been there before the coming of the winter. If this is so, it is likely that he arrived there before the Ramâdan of 1121/1709 (4 November-3 December). His intention, as is understood from one of his letters to Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi, was to leave the city after the mawlid of the Prophet Muhammad, which fell on 12 Rabîʿ al-Awwal 1122/11 May 1710. But because of the insistence of the residents of Konya he could not depart.²⁰⁹ The letter in question further elucidates that it was in Konya that he received a detailed epistle from Damascus in which his son, Muhammad, asked for the abolishment of heavy taxes on the subjects of Damascus, particularly those living in the villages assigned as *mâlikâne* to Şeyh Murâd. According to Abu-Manneh, “encouraged by the dismissal of Çorlulu from the grand vizierate in June 1710, he wrote to beg the permission of the Porte to stay at Bursa, which was granted.”²¹⁰ That Şeyh Murâd had already declared his intention to leave Konya months before the dismissal of the grand vizier, proves that his settling in Bursa had nothing to do with Çorlulu Alî Pasha. Indeed, it has come to light that he was repeatedly invited by Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi to stay in Bursa at his mansion prepared for him and his retinue.²¹¹ Therefore, when Şeyh Murâd arrived Bursa on 7 Ramaḍân 1122/30 October 1710, he settled in Dâmâdzâde’s house.²¹² On his way from Konya to Bursa he continued to inform Ebulhayr Ahmed about his journey. Before leaving Konya, for instance, he wrote a letter in which he declared that he pleased the people of Konya by extending his lodging there, but his aim was now to go to Karahisar.²¹³ In Karahisar, he wrote to his loyal disciple at least two letters. In the first one, he informed Ebulhayr Ahmed that he had received his and other disciples’ letters on his way from Konya and declared that the courier of the present letter would inform him about his illnesses. From the second we learn that his break in Karahisar lasted longer than anticipated

²⁰⁹For the letter see *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 18b.

²¹⁰Abu-Manneh, *ibid*, 14.

²¹¹“wa laqad ânastanî makâtîb al-jamîʿ muḥarriḍatun lanâ ʿalâ Burşa” *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 20b.

²¹²*Mektûbât*, Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 1837, fol. 17b.

²¹³“wa qad akhaznâ khawâḍiri ahli Konya bi-maksun ʿindahum wa qaşḍunâ al-ân Kāraḥiṣār” *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 2b.

because of the plague hitting adjacent areas, hindering his exit from the city.²¹⁴ Perhaps, towards the end of September Şeyh Murâd left Karahisar for Kütahya. It seems likely that his intention was to stay and relax there for the rest of autumn, but due to severe cold he felt anxious that his stay would last until the end of the winter. Therefore, he suddenly decided on the last day of Sha‘bân [23 October 1710] to leave Kütahya for Bursa where he would arrive after a week.²¹⁵

Şeyh Murâd’s epistles give further information regarding his family members. Thanks to the secondary sources utilizing Silk al-Durar and Maṭmaḥ al-Wājid the biographical dictionaries written by Muhammad Khalîl, the great-grandson of Şeyh Murâd, on the prominent figures living in the 12th Hijri century (October 1688-November 1785) and on the biography of his father Alî al-Murâdî (d. 1771), we have been informed about Muhammad (1682-1755) and Mustafâ (?-1750), Şeyh Murâd’s two sons.²¹⁶ As Karl Barbir has demonstrated, Şeyh Murâd’s lineage continued through these two figures. In an undated correspondence sent probably to one of his masters, however, Şeyh Murâd speaks of his four young children, Ahmed, Muhammad, Mustafâ and Es‘ad, who begged for the addressee’s prayers.²¹⁷ Ahmed would not occur in any letter again, which may indicate that he passed away as a young child. Es‘ad, on the other hand, appears in another undated letter sent from Damascus to Istanbul in which Şeyh Murâd informs the anonymous recipient that he received the imamate warrant of his son, Es‘ad Efendi, and expresses his gratitude to him for his intercession during the process.²¹⁸ Şeyh’s presence in Damascus during the exchange of the letter indicates on the one hand that the correspondence took place before 1708, the year he rode off the city. On the other, it shows that Es‘ad Efendi was sufficiently competent to be appointed as the imam of a mosque.

An advisory letter written for male and female members of the şeyh’s extended family is so important that for the first time the females of his family can be iden-

²¹⁴For the first and second letters sent from Karahisar see respectively *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 13b and 11b.

²¹⁵*Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 20b.

²¹⁶Karl K. Barbir, “All in the family: The Muradis of Damascus,” 327-355; Şimşek, 18. *Yüzyıl Osmanlı Toplumunda Nakşibendî-Müceddidilik*, 110-112; Abu-Manneh, *ibid.* In *Silk al-Durar*, from among Şeyh Murâd’s sons only the biography of younger Muhammad Bahâ al-Dîn, the grandfather of the author, was recorded. See *ibid.*, vol. IV, 114-116. We are said that Muhammad Khalîl Murâdî began the composition of *Maṭmaḥ al-Wājid* following his father death in 1771 and completed it in 1199/1784. See Issa Abusaliem, “Manhac al-Murâdî fi Kitābuhu Maṭmaḥ al-Wājid fi Tarjamat al-Wālid al-Mājid,” *Majallatun Kulliyat al-Adâb* 59 (2016): 444.

²¹⁷*Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 99b-100a. A short note on the copy of the epistle claims that Şeyh Murâd sent it to his preceptor Muhammad Ma’sûm (d. 1668). However, Muhammad was born in 1682, fourteen years after the death of Şeyh Muhammad Ma’sûm.

²¹⁸*Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 87a-b. Although the name of the recipient is not recorded, the content of the letter implies that it was Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi.

tified.²¹⁹ Despite the uncertainty in its date, it was probably penned in 1710s when he was in Bursa and his family in Damascus, because his only son mentioned in the letter is Muhammad, who, as Karl Barbir has stated, had been left behind in Damascus to control the family and oversee its waqfs. As is understood from another letter sent from Bursa to Delhi to Muhammad Zubayr, the grandson of Muhammad Ma'sûm, the other son, Mustafâ, was with Şeyh Murâd in Bursa.²²⁰ Separated from his family, Şeyh Murâd invokes Allah to be reunited with his family, for he needs their service. The epistle indicates that Şeyh Murâd had three daughters (Emîne, Âyşe, and Sâliha), four grandsons (İbrâhîm, Abdullâh, Khalîl, and Ahmed), and two granddaughters (Nefîse and Meryem) alive at that time. Being obsessed with intrafamilial tranquility, Şeyh Murâd cared about the hierarchy and control of elders over juniors within the family living in the same mansion. In this regard, he advises his daughters to get on well with each other and with his daughters-in-law, whose names are never mentioned in the epistle but who are identified through the children to whom they gave birth. In the same vein, the şeyh particularly asks his daughters to obey the absolute authority of his son, Muhammad, and his wife. Muhammad stands as proxy to Şeyh Murâd not only as the head of the family in the city but also as his vicegerent in the Naqshbandiyya. Therefore, the şeyh urges all of them to adhere to Muhammad and receive from him *dhikrullâh*. The epistle likewise brings to light that Şeyh Murâd attached great importance to the scholarly and Islamic education of male and female members of his family. Due only to this reason, he recommends his daughter Âyşe and granddaughter Meryem “to strive bodily and heartily for beneficial knowledge and good deeds” and commends his daughter-in-law to invite his grandson, Ahmed, to the right path to advise him decently. Moreover, the epistle reveals that Şeyh Murâd had closely followed the education and improvement of his grandchildren, who did not shy away from exchange letters with him. He was so pleased with Khalîl's letter, the calligraphy and fluent wording in Abdullâh and İbrâhîm's letters, and the gift sent by Meryem that he felt obliged to express his opinion for each of them.²²¹

²¹⁹For the letter see *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 113a-114a.

²²⁰Abu-Manneh, *ibid*, 14. For the letter see *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 38a-39a.

²²¹İbrâhîm, who was the son of Muhammad, borned in 1118/1706-07 and died on 8 July 1730. See *Silk al-Durar*, vol. I, 25-30. Khalîl, himself a şeyh, was the son of Muhammad. He was born in 1120/1708-09 and died on 10 November 1733 and was buried in the Turbat Dhu'l-Kifl, near to his brother İbrâhîm. See Ibn Kânnân, *Yawmiyyât Shâmiyya*, ed. Akram Hasan al-^cUlbî, 439. Abdullâh was the son of Mustafâ, he died in 1733, eighteen years before his father. See Barbir, “All in the family: The Muradis of Damascus,” 344.

3.3 A Few Notes on Şeyh Murâd's Letters

Despite awareness as to the existence of Şeyh Murâd's letters, they have been utilized so far only in four studies. Mehmet Ünal, who conducted the earliest study on the scholarly works of Şeyh Murâd, has translated short passages from six letters, two of which were written for the chief physician Ömer Efendi, one for Khalîl al-Shâmî, one for the grand vizier Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, and two for anonymous addressees.²²² In one of the earlier studies utilizing the letters, Butrus Abu-Manneh seems to minutely read the letters available to him to historicize Şeyh Murâd's life in the Ottoman domains and to understand his teachings.²²³ In doing so, he depends on a collection of letters, of which two copies exist, each containing 213 letters "the majority of which were written in Arabic and a few in Persian" and sent to Şeyh Murâd's disciples, friends, family members. Regarding the collector, Mehmed İsmet Efendi (d. 1747), and the collected letters, Abu-Manneh states that he compiled them later in the 18th century "from many hands and copied them verbatim," entitled *Maktûbât*, but "did not copy the addressee and none of them bears the date of writing. Among the few mentioned addressees, however, are the names of individuals who occupied the highest positions in the state." Following this, Abu-Manneh contents himself with giving the names of the head physician, Ömer Efendi (d. 1724), the vizier, Nu'mân Pasha (d. 1719), the grand viziers, Şehîd Alî Pasha (d. 1716), and Nevşehirli Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha (d. 1730), şeyhülislams Ebû İshak İsmâ'îl (d. 1725) and his son, İshak Efendi (d. 1734), and Şeyh Muhammad Zubayr, the grandson of Muhammad Ma'sûm.²²⁴ The third study that makes use of Şeyh Murâd's epistles was carried out by Tülay Artan, who conveys Abu-Manneh's opinions on the letters sent to Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha. Artan shows particular interest in the letters written for İbrâhîm Pasha, but seems unconvinced about a special relationship between the şeyh and the grand vizier.²²⁵ Lastly, some of the addressees of Şeyh Murâd's letters were listed in a study without reference to the content of the letters.²²⁶

²²²Mehmet Ünal, *Seyyid Murâd-ı Buhârî Hazretleri 'Kuddise Sirruh' Külliyyâtı-1*, (İstanbul: Kutupyıldızı Yayınları, 2013): 43-45.

²²³Butrus Abu-Manneh, "Sheikh Murâd al-Bukhârî and the Expansion of the Naqshbandî-Mujaddidî Order in Istanbul."

²²⁴See *ibid.*, 7-8, and 14-17. The two collections utilized by Abu-Manneh are preserved in the manuscript libraries of Süleymaniye and Beyazıt. See Esad Efendi, no. 1419; and Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 1380.

²²⁵Tülay Artan, "El Yazmaları Işığında Bir Çevre ve Çehre Eskizi," 27-28. Artan conveys that Abu-Manneh kindly shared with her two letters in Arabic, believed to have been addressed to İbrahim Paşa.

²²⁶Mehmet Ünal and Aliye Yılmaz, "Muhammed Murâd-ı Buhârî ve 'Risâle-i Nakşibendiyye' Adlı Eseri," *Turkish Studies: International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*

My research on the several copies of Şeyh Murâd's collected letters brings to light new details about the compilation. First, contrary to Abu-Manneh's finding that a few letters were in Persian, I have seen no letter penned in Persian. But in some letters one can see Persian couplets. Secondly, I realize that the copies of *Mektübât* were more than those mentioned in the literature, and misleading information regarding its catalogue numbers has gained recognition. Therefore, the correction of misinformation must be carried out at this stage. So far, we have been informed of three copies by Halil İbrahim Şimşek (Veliyüddin 1780, Pertev Paşa 246, Darülm-esnevi 275) and Fakirullah Yıldız (Veliyüddin 1780, 1781, and 1838), two copies by Abu-Manneh (Esad 1419, Veliyüddin 1380), and a single copy by Ünal and Yılmaz (Veliyüddin 1838).²²⁷ My research does not confirm the existence of Şeyh Murâd's *Mektübât* in Pertev Paşa 246, Darülm-esnevi 275, and Veliyüddin 1380.²²⁸ In addition to the copies in Veliyüddin 1780, 1781, 1838 and Esad 1419, I have been able to identify the following six copies: Veliyüddin 1810 and 1837, Pertev Paşa 246 M-1, Darülm-esnevi 273, and İÜ-TY 3442 and İÜ-TY 10484 the two collections located in Istanbul University Rare Book Collection. Thus, the number of detected copies of *Mektübât* is ten for the moment, and it is probable that new copies will emerge in the future. Whereas two of these copies (Veliyüddin 1781 and 1838) were Mehmed İsmet's autographs, the remaining copies were duplicated by different hands most of whom are unknown to us. The copy of Veliyüddin 1837 has particular importance for my research, since it is for the first time that we come across the original epistles of Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî bound in it.²²⁹ These are 35 epistles that Şeyh Murâd sent to Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi. Considering them, we realize that Şeyh Murâd used to pen his letters on the front face of the paper. His seal, however, appeared on the reverse side. Moreover, the compilation contains another cluster of 45 epistles, which were sent to at least 31 figures.

For the moment, we know neither the beginning nor the completion date of the collection in the hands of Mehmed İsmet Efendi, the compiler of *Mektübât*. Most

9/3 (2014): 1543-1544. The listed names are Muhammad al-Murâdî, the head physician Ömer Efendi, Hâdîzâde Mehmed Efendi, the qadi of Aleppo İsmâ'il Efendi, Mestçizâde Abdullâh Efendi, Şeyh Khalîl al-Shâmî, the preacher of Bayezid Mosque Şeyh Süleymân Efendi, Nu'mân Pasha, Seyyid Abdullâh, and İshak Efendi. The authors rest on Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 1838, another copy catalogued in the manuscript collection of Veliyüddin Efendi.

²²⁷Şimşek, 18. *Yüzyıl Osmanlı Toplumunda Nakşibendî-Müceddidilik*, 106; Yıldız, *Sohbetnâme*; Ünal and Yılmaz, "Muhammed Murâd-ı Buhârî ve 'Risâle-i Nakşibendiyye' Adlı Eseri,"

²²⁸In Pertev Paşa 246 the commentary of *Qaşîdat al-Burda* by Muhammad b. Fayḡullâh; in Darülm-esnevi 275, the fourth volume of *Minhâj al-Wâ'izîn wa Midrâj al-Nâşihîn*; and in Veliyüddin 1380, *Kitâbu Nuḥbat al-'Azâ'im fî Zakât al-Zahab wa'l-Fidât wa'l-Uruḍ wa's-Sawâ'im* of Abdurrahmân b. Muhammad b. Abdulwahrâb are catalogued.

²²⁹In the library catalogue, this compilation is mistakenly attributed to Şeyh Mehmed Murâd b. Abdülhalîm (1788-1848), the post-nishîn of Murâd Mollâ Tekke since 1815. See *Mektübât-ı eş-Şeyh es-Seyyid Mehmed Murâd*, Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 1837. For Mehmed Murâd b. Abdülhalîm see M. Hüdaî Şentürk, "Murad Nakşibendi," *TDVIA*, vol. 31, 188-189.

likely, he attempted to collect and make a fair copy of letters after the death of his şeyh.²³⁰ He was lucky enough that the disciples of Şeyh Murâd preserved the original copies of the letters in hand, so he could call upon them for copying the letters. Nevertheless, in some cases, he was unable to convince the addressees to take from them the original letter. The best documented examples in this regard are 31 original letters preserved by Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi but were not found in Mehmed İsmet's compilation.²³¹ The main reason for Ebulhayr Ahmed's hesitation in sharing some of Şeyh Murâd's epistles with Mehmed İsmet was obviously regarding privacy. Contrary to the great majority of the letters, which were condensed by Şeyh Murâd's teachings, advice, and exhortations, the original letters at the disposal of Ebulhayr Ahmed were related to Şeyh Murâd's personal struggles and to his waqf in Damascus, special requests from the addressee. Based on such a significant reality, we can deduce that there were other disciples unknown to us who abstained from sharing with the collector, Mehmed İsmet, the private and personal letters written by Şeyh Murâd.

The available copies of *Mektûbât* indicate that the earliest compilation that Mehmed İsmet completed was that of Veliyüddin 1781. It is likely that, for his own use and for his fellows, he recopied the compilation during subsequent years. The carefully prepared copy (Veliyüddin 1838) and two copies of *Mektûbât*, which were recorded in his inventory after his death, can be counted as proofs in this regard.²³² Two pieces of letters emerging, but standing apart from the autograph copy (Veliyüddin 1781), prove that Mehmed İsmet did not give up searching for new letters of Şeyh Murâd.²³³ Yet, Mehmed İsmet was not the only disciple who attempted to collect the scattered letters of his master. The most convincing clue in this regard is İÜ-TY 3442, the collection prepared by a disciple still unknown to us. The compiler of the manuscript prefers a different content layout than that of Mehmed İsmet Efendi. The array of the exact same letters in the collection is not parallel with Mehmed İsmet's arrangement. What is more striking is that the compiler, instead of focusing only on the Naqshbandi circles of Istanbul, seems to have collected letters from other cities where Şeyh Murâd's disciples were residing. This is so because he would clearly write on one occasion that he received some letters from Dervîş Mustafâ and copied

²³⁰Years before this project, he recorded in his private compilation a letter that Şeyh Murâd wrote for him. See *Simâ't-ı e'İşmet*, Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 3191, fol. 142b.

²³¹For the four epistles taken from Ebulhayr Ahmed, see *Mektûbât*, Veliyüddin Efendi no. 1780, fol. 30a, 30a-b, 95a-96b, and 97b-98a. For the original version of the said letters see respectively *Mektûbât*, Veliyüddin Efendi no. 1837, fol. 25b, 9b, 4b, and 17b.

²³²See *Kismet-i Askeriye*, no. 107, fol. 8a.

²³³See *Mektûbât* no. 1781, fol. 29a-b. The initial twenty two folios of this manuscript was reserved for Şeyh Murâd's sermons. For his letters see fol. 23b-117b. An ownership record on the front folio of *Mektûbât* reads that Mehmed İsmet had the text written, but the script says the exact opposite.

them in Thessaloniki on 28 Jā 1141/30 December 1728.²³⁴

My research brings to light that updated versions of *Mektübāt* compiled by Mehmed İsmet were prepared by different hands for different collectors. For instance, an unknown scribe made a copy (Veliyüddin 1780) for Şeyhülislam Veliyyüddîn Efendi (d. 1768) by adding four letters from Dâmâdzâde Ahmed Efendi. Except the original 35 epistles he received from his şeyh, there is no indication that Dâmâdzâde Ahmed attempted to acquire a collection of the letters. Veliyyüddîn Efendi, on the other hand, after the death either of Ahmed Efendi in 1741 or his son, şeyhülislam Dâmâdzâde Feyzullâh Efendi in 1761, managed to take possession of the letters and bound them in a single volume together with 45 epistles dispatched to at least 31 fellow disciples (Veliyüddin 1837).²³⁵ Unlike the original ones, all forty-five letters constituting the second cluster in Veliyyüddîn Efendi's collection had already been copied by Mehmed İsmet.²³⁶ What is even more striking is that the copyist was Veliyyüddîn, apparent evidence that he, too, attempted to collect letters of his deceased şeyh. Although he was not as successful as Mehmed İsmet in compiling the letters, he steadfastly collected for his library abovementioned four copies of *Mektübāt*. Yet, none of these compilations had a date of completion. The only compilation with an approximate date of consummation in Veliyyüddîn Efendi's manuscript collection is Veliyüddin 1810, which seems to be completed in the year 1151/1738. Although the recopying date of the letters was not mentioned in the *majmua* in question, the same scribe who duplicated Şeyh Murâd's sermons, states that he completed the task on 21 Şafar 1151/10 June 1738.²³⁷ Despite the disarray in the composition of the text, it contributes to our understanding of Şeyh Murâd's network by bringing our attention to four letters written to Seyyid Zeynelabidîn Efendi which were unnoticed by Mehmed İsmet Efendi.²³⁸ Moreover, from ownership records penned on the bookplate of the manuscript, we know that it had been in the possession of Mustafâ İffet Efendi (d. 1759-60) in 1169/1755-56, and Abdülvehhâb Efendi, whose connection to the Naqshbandi circles will be explained in the last chapter of this dissertation.

Despite indisputable evidence that Şeyh Murâd had developed extremely strong

²³⁴See *Mektübāt*, İÜ-TY no. 3442, fol. 23a. This collection is falsely attributed to Murâd Mollâ in the catalogue of the library.

²³⁵For a short introduction on Dâmâdzâde Feyzullâh Efendi see Mehmet İpşirli, "Feyzullah Efendi, Damadzâde," *TDVIA*, vol. 12, (Istanbul: TDV, 1995): 525-526.

²³⁶Veliyyüddîn Efendi not only copied the second cluster of letters but also wrote a preface to the volume in question. It is thanks to his introduction that we know now that Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi was the addressee of the original letters. Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 1810, fol. 35b.

²³⁷Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 1810, fol. 35b.

²³⁸For the letters in question, see *ibid*, fol. 112b-113b.

connections with the Dâmâdzâde family, the only copy of *Mektûbât* in the possession of Dâmâdzâdes (Darülmesnevi 273) was dictated by Şeyhülislam Dâmâdzâde Feyzullâh Efendi to a certain Mehmed Emîn b. Hâfız Mustafâ during his first tenure in the office.²³⁹ It was from this copy that Mehmed Reşîd Efendi (d. 1813), the elder son of the renowned Naqshbandi calligrapher, Eğrikapılı Mehmed Râsim Efendi (d. 1756), made a fair copy for himself (Esad Efendi 1419) in 1192/1778-79.²⁴⁰ Pertev Paşa 246 M-1, however, was copied by an unknown pen most probably in the 19th century and stamped with the waqf seal of the Selimiye Tekkesi library, which was engraved in 1252/1836.²⁴¹ Compare to Mehmed İsmet's compilation, the copy lacks many letters, but contains 32 letters that do not exist in Mehmed İsmet's composition. Scrupulously read by a later reader, the copy bears the anonymous reader's postscripts on the repeated letters in the collection. Needless to say, when crosschecking the copies at hand, I have benefited from these short notes.

After the exclusion of repeated letters in the available collections of *Mektûbât*, we have 275 letters of varying lengths sent from Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî to his disciples. Yet, my research demonstrates that Mehmed İsmet had not seen and copied at least 48 of them. Current research, shows that from among those that escaped Mehmed İsmet's notice, 40 letters were recorded in Veliyüddin 1837, four appeared in Pertev Paşa 246 M-1, and four in Veliyüddin 1810. Out of all letters, including 35 letters dispatched to Dâmâdzâde Ahmed, the copyists of *Mektûbât* collections enunciated the names of addressees in only 82 letters. However, through an elaborative and comparative reading of the letters, I have managed to establish the addressees in 118 examples as can be seen on Table 3.1. Thus, the names of at least 43 addressees to whom Şeyh Murâd had written at least a letter, have become evident. Nevertheless, as the remaining 157 correspondences imply, the number of pen pals exceeded the tight cluster of forty-three individuals. Indeed, notwithstanding my failure in detecting the letters penned for them, the content of some letters demonstrates that

²³⁹The completion date of the text was Jâ 11, 69/12 February 1756. Feyzullâh Efendi's first phase in the office came to an end on 26 July 1756. See İpşirli, *ibid.* In addition to his well-known pamphlets such as *Risâle-i Nakşibendiyye* and *Silsiletü'z-Zehab*, the recorded sermons of Şeyh Murâd were bound in the Darülmesnevi 273 compilation (fol. 1b-59b). For the letters see fol. 60b-193b.

²⁴⁰1192/1778-79 is the date of the ownership record penned on the bookplate. Considering that the script in the ownership record and in the text is exactly same, I claim that Mehmed Reşîd Efendi copied the text for his use in the year in question. For the letters see Süleymaniye Library, Esad Efendi, no. 1419, fol. 60b-180b. On Mehmed Râsim Efendi, see Uğur Derman, "Mehmed Râsim, Eğrikapılı," *TDVIA*, vol. 28, 514-515. On his son Mehmed Reşîd Efendi, see Yılmaz Öksüz, "Eğrikapılı Mehmed Râsim ve Divançesi (İnceleme-Metin)," Unpublished MA Thesis, (Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi 2010): 21; *Tuḥfe-i Haṭṭâtin*, 448-449.

²⁴¹See Süleymaniye Library, Pertev Paşa, no. 246 M-1, fol. 1b. For an introduction on Selimiye Tekkesi which was built by Selim III in 1801-1805 and renovated by Mahmûd II in 1834-1836 as a Naqshbandi lodge see Baha Tanman, "Selimiye Tekkesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 36, 438-439. The library of the tekke which was sponsored by Pertev Pasha (d. 1837) completed in 1836. See İsmail Erünsal, "Pertev Paşa Kütüphanesi," *TDVIA*, vol. 34, 238. On Pertev Pasha's career see Carter Findley, "Factional Rivalry in Ottoman Istanbul: The Fall of Pertev Pasha, 1837," *Journal of Turkish Studies / Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* X (1986): 127-134, and "Pertev Mehmed Said Paşa," *TDVIA*, vol. 34, 233-235.

Şeyh Murâd had corresponded with figures whose names are not listed in the Table 3.1. His written communication with Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed, for instance, reveals that he had exchanged letters with not only his father, Mustafâ Râsîh Efendi, and the to-be *şeyhülislam* Veliyyüddîn Efendi, but also Süleymân Efendi, Mollâ Alî, Mollâ Ahmed, Hasan Efendi, Abdullah, Halîl, İbrâhîm and the notables of Damascus about whom we are not informed further.²⁴² The letter to İsmâ‘îl Efendi, the qadi of Aleppo, shows that he communicated with a certain Abdulmu‘mîn Efendi.²⁴³ From another letter, sent most likely to Dâmâdzâde Ahmed, we learn that he had a mentor-disciple relationship with the vizier, Silahdâr Süleymân Pasha (d. 1715), for he asks the addressee to send the courier of the private letter to Rhodes, where the pasha was in exile.²⁴⁴ Another letter to an anonymous addressee proves that he exchanged letters with many Sufis and scholars living in the Holy Lands, such as Şeyh Dakhlî and Mollâ Feyzî, who resided in Mecca and al-Korânî, al-Mar‘aşî, and Mollâ Cârullâh, who were living in Medina.²⁴⁵ These examples prove that in Şeyh Murâd’s networks of letters not only the identified and listed figures take part but also many other names who are unknown to us for the moment but will be recognized and discovered in the future.

3.3.1 Letters in Motion: Few Notes on Their Identification

How broad was the date range during which Şeyh Murâd corresponded with his disciples? When exchanged, between which cities and regions did the letters travel? How did Şeyh Efendi and his disciples ensure the safety of the communication? Were there ruptures and discontinuities between the sender and the receiver? This subsection has been envisioned to come up with satisfactory explanations for these questions. The clarification of these matters is important because it will contribute further to our understanding of the Naqshbandi networks in which Şeyh Murâd was at the center. However, it must be noted that since we are deprived of all letters, both written by Şeyh Murâd and written to him, it is not possible to entirely reveal the scope of his networks coming into existence through this means of communication. Under such circumstances, it seems more reasonable to tackle with the problem by

²⁴²See *Mektûbât*, Veliyyüddin Efendi, no. 1837, fols. 3b, 5b, 12b, 22b, 23b; and Veliyyüddin Efendi, no. 1780, fol. 109a-b.

²⁴³*Mektûbât*, Veliyyüddin Efendi, no. 1780, fol. 34a-b.

²⁴⁴*Mektûbât*, Pertev Paşa, no. 246 M-1, fol. 109a.

²⁴⁵*Mektûbât*, Veliyyüddin Efendi, no. 1780, fol. 119a-120a. It is possible that al-Mar‘aşî was none other than Seyyid Ömer Mar‘aşî, one of his disciples listed in the table. al-Korânî, was most probably İbrâhîm al-Korânî (d. 1691), the prominent Sufi and scholar of the period. Mollâ Cârullâh, must be Veliyyüddîn Cârullâh Efendi (d. 1738).

Table 3.1 The addressees and number of received letters

	Addressee	Number
1	Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi	40
2	Muhammad al-Murâdî	9
3	Muhammad and Mustafâ al-Murâdî	2
4	Muhammad al-Murâdî and Abdurrahîm al-Kâbilî	2
5	Family Members	1
6	Mustafâ Efendi b. Hüseyin Efendi	6
7	Ilkhân al-A'zâm	1
8	Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha	1
9	Şehîd Alî Pasha	3 + 5
10	Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha	4
11	Nu'mân Pasha	1
12	Hekimoğlu Alî Pasha	1
13	Şeyhülislam Feyzullâh	1
14	Şeyhülislam Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Alî	1
15	Şeyhülislam Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullâh	1
16	Şeyhülislam Mirzâ Mustafâ	2
17	Şeyhülislam Ebû İshak İsmail	1
18	Şeyhülislam İshak Efendi	2
19	Şeyhülislam Mehmed Sâlih	3
20	Şeyh Muhammad Zubayr	1
21	Şeyh Khalîl Shamî	1
22	Şeyh Kassâbzâde Süleymân	1
23	Şeyh Feyzullâh Samarqandî	1
24	Şeyh Seyyid Ömer Mar'aşî	1
25	Şeyh (anonymous)	1
26	Nakîbüleşrâf (anonymous)	2
27	Arec Emîr Efendizâde Zeynelâbidîn	4
28	İsmâil Efendi (Defterdâr)	1
29	Hekimbaşı Ömer	2
30	Mestcizâde Abdullâh	2
31	Seyyid Lalîzâde Abdülbâkî	1
32	Mehmed Sâlim	1
33	Seyyid Yâsin + Seyyid Abdülkâdir	2
34	Kevâkibî Ahmed	1
35	Kevâkibî Veliyyüddîn	1
36	İsmâil Efendi (qadi of Aleppo)	1
37	Halîl Efendi (nâib of Aleppo)	1
38	Hayrullâh Efendi	1
39	Hâdîzâde Mehmed	1
40	Bayrâm Efendi	1
41	Simavîzâde Mehmed Efendi	1
42	Yahyâ Efendi (Kırımîzâde)	1
43	Mehmed Vehhâbî	1

using Table 3.1.

Given the table in question, one realizes that Istanbul and Damascus were two hubs of attraction during the circulation of the letters. This was because it was in Istanbul, where most of Şeyh Murâd's disciples, who enjoyed high ranks in the state administration, lived and preferred to stay, except for certain intervals during which they performed official duties in the provinces of the empire. In Damascus, on the other hand, his family members were living and wherever he was he had to continue the communication with them. However, as the second, third, fourth, and fifth rows of the table unveil, the total number of detected letters dispatched to family members was only fourteen, which constitute a slight ratio in the totality. The main reason behind such a situation, no doubt, was the sense of privacy on the part of the şeyh. In other words, it is most likely that, except for those filled with or dominated by moral exhortation and sermons, he did not give consent to the reproduction of the letters with private content addressed to his family members. Had it been the other way around, it might not have been possible for the letters to be sent to distant cities such as Mecca, Medina and Delhi to be recopied in a collection compiled in Istanbul.²⁴⁶

At this point, we must remember that the notion of privacy was so central in the minds of Sufis and scholars of the period that, during his journey to Mecca in 1693, Abd al-Ghanî al-Nâblusî (d. 1731), a Damascene master in Naqshbandi and Qadiri orders and prolific scholar known for hundreds of his pamphlets, would remain silent in his memoirs on several letters he received from family, friends and disciples on the pretext that “they contain news and what is not suitable to be mentioned in these memoirs.”²⁴⁷ The sense of privacy was inherent also in some contemporary Western men of letters to the extent that they or their successors could either destroy the letters or censor them. One of the best-known incidents, in this context, is the burning of some letters of Benedictus Spinoza (d. 1677) by his friends after his death. As is reported on Spinoza's published letters by German traveller, Vetter Hallmann, who visited Rieuwertz junior, in 1703 “More letters had been found than had been printed; but they were of no importance, and so were burned. But he [Rieuwertz] had kept one letter, which was lying upstairs among his things. At last, I persuaded him to fetch the letter and show it to me. It was a short letter written in Dutch

²⁴⁶For the letters dispatch to these cities see *Mektûbât*, Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 1780, fol. 38a-39a, and 119a-120a.

²⁴⁷For Nâblusî's words see Samer Akkach, *Letters of a Sufi Scholar: The Correspondence of 'Abd al-Ghanî al-Nâblusî (1641-1731)*, (Leiden: Brill, 2010): 20. For Nâblusî as a fiery debater of his period see Nir Shafir, “The Road From Damascus: Circulation and Redefinition of Islam in the Ottoman Empire, 1620-1720,” Unpublished PhD Diss., (UCLA, 2016): 110-152. For his biography see Ahmet Özel, “Nablusî, Abdülganî b. İsmâil,” *TDVIA*, vol. 32, 268-270.

on half sheet of paper. The date was the 19 April, 1673.”²⁴⁸ Henry Oldenburg (d. 1677), the secretary of the Royal Society of London, who had been part of Spinozan epistolary exchange—he sent at least seventeen letters to Spinoza and received from him at least eleven letters—on the other hand, was famous for censoring letters. He “diplomatically pruned letters of ‘all Personal Reflections,’ polish compliments as well as rude remarks, before publishing them in the *Philosophical Transactions*.”²⁴⁹

That Istanbul and Damascus were two hubs collecting letters of Şeyh Murâd must not mislead us in our inferences on their initial destinations. Given that Şeyh Murâd spent a considerable portion of his life in Damascus, Bursa and Istanbul, one can conclude that most of his letters departed from these cities. Yet, as I have demonstrated above in the context of his seventeen-month journey starting from Istanbul in late May 1709 ending in Bursa in late October 1710, as a traveling Sufi he could send letters to Istanbul from anywhere on his way to Bursa and receive answers wherever he wanted. All in all, it must be known that we deal with a scholar and Sufi whose letters went back and forth between his current location and the islands of Chios and Rhodes, and cities of Mecca, Medina, Istanbul, Edirne, Bursa, Damascus, Delhi, Alaiye, Larende, Konya, Karahisar, Kütahya, Aleppo, Hama, Mar‘aş, Gharan, and wherever his disciples set foot.

All but one of Şeyh Murâd’s letters are undated. The only example is the letter he penned for his son, Muhammad al-Murâdî, on 20 Muḥarram 1121/1 April 1709 from Istanbul to Damascus.²⁵⁰ In addition, he seldomly wrote the name of the city or town from where he dispatched the epistle. To this, one should add the copyists’ refrainment from writing the names of the addressees. In the absence of date, origin and destination of the message and the name of the receiver, in almost all instances, the only way to historicize the letters is context-oriented reasoning. Adopting this method, I have been able to observe that his earliest letter was one that he wrote to one of his masters in which he mentioned his four underage sons, because the existence of underage boys indicates that the letter was penned in 1680s. The second earliest dated letter, again from 1680s, was that sent to the vizier, Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha (d. 1691), during his incumbency as the custodian of the island of Chios in either 1685 or 1688.²⁵¹ Although his name was not specified in the letter

²⁴⁸Quoted in Abraham Wolf, *The Correspondence of Spinoza*, (New York: The Dial Press, 1928): 443.

²⁴⁹Lorraine Daston, “The Ideal and Reality of the Republic of Letters in the Enlightenment,” *Science in Context* 4/2 (1991): 371.

²⁵⁰*Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 104a.

²⁵¹*Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 57a-b. The receiver of the letter is identified only as “the guardian of Chios” in this letter. Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha was the guardian of the island in the years in question. See Abdülkadir Özcan, “Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Mustafa Paşa,” *TDVIA*, vol. 26, 263-265.

he received, taking into consideration Şeyh Murâd's laudatory words given to him in abovementioned posthumous letter written to his son, vizier Nu'mân Pasha, I tend to think that "the guardian of Chios" was none other than Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha. When it comes to Şeyh Murâd's latest letter, however, I rely on the compiler Mehmed İsmet Efendi, who confidently commented on the letter sent to the grand vizier, Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha (v. 1718-1730), that it was written towards the end of Şeyh Murâd's life, and, thereafter, he did not write letter to notables.²⁵² If this is so, we can conclude that during his last years Şeyh Murâd exchanged letters only with family members living in Damascus.

Applying the same method, I have also distinguished a letter penned for Şeyhülislam Feyzullâh Efendi (d. 1703) from Damascus circa 1700, in which he informed the şeyhülislam that the righteous had performed the Friday prayer on the second Friday of Sha'cban and Eid prayer of Ramađân behind Şeyh İsmâ'îl in the Umayyad Mosque, and that the residents of the city joyfully prayed for the sultan and the şeyhülislam.²⁵³ As is understood from these statements, a restoration project had been carried out in the mosque, and the people of the city were allowed to pray there only on two holy days. I have not been able to detect the exact date of the restoration. Yet, an archival document preserved in the Ottoman Archives proves that a restoration project was going on for the Great Mosque of Damascus in the closing years of the 17th and beginning of the 18th centuries. Such an inference is due to the petition written by the qadi of Damascus, Seyyid Şeyh İbrâhîm, on 15 Ramađân 1111/6 March 1700 in which he requested the appointment of Mansûr b. Lutfullâh as architect to the vacant position of deceased Mikhail b. Sefâr dhimmi.²⁵⁴ This was most probably the restoration project started in 1699 by the sultan, Mustafa II, who "financed the installation and maintenance of a structure to surround the tomb of St. John (al-Nabi Yahya, known as John the Baptist in the Christian tradition)."²⁵⁵ In the absence of date and names of addressees in the letters, coevaluation of multiple letters has enabled me to determine, for instance, the recipients of three different epistles and the approximate date of correspondence. In the letters, two hints are at work: first, the common subject of discussion, i.e., fever or malaria (*humma*) hitting a certain Sâlih Efendi; and second, Hekîmzâde, a

²⁵² *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 28a-29a. "... fi awâkhiri awqâtihi al-sharîfat wa azunnuhu annahum lam yaktubû ba'cдах namîqatun ilâ al-a'cyan"

²⁵³ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 112b-113a. Şeyh İsmâ'îl was either İsmâ'îl b. Şeyh Eyyûb (1645-1723) who was the imam and preacher at the Umayyad Mosque, or İsmâ'îl al-Hâik (1636-1701), the Hanafi mufti of Damascus. For their biographies see Silk al-Durar, 249-250 and 256-258.

²⁵⁴ BOA, İE.EV.. 36/4139.

²⁵⁵ Steve Tamari, "Ottoman Madrasas: The Multiple Lives of Educational Institutions in Eighteenth-Century Syria," *Journal of Early Modern History* 5/2 (2001): 112.

certain disciple who informed Şeyh Murâd of the disease. Receiving the initial letter in which he was informed about Sâlih's disease, Şeyh Murâd wrote two letters, one to Sâlih, the other to his father to transmit his healing wishes. A few months after the letters, he wrote a third letter to Hekîmzâde himself complaining about the hiatus in correspondence.²⁵⁶ Even though Mehmed İsmet did not write the name of the addressees, I have been able to identify them thanks to Şeyh Murâd's distinctive statements in each letter. For instance, when writing Yahyâ Efendi, Sâlih's father, he would say that he was informed about the prevalence of fever over "their Sâlih" (*Akhbirnî Hekîmzâde fî şahîfatihî min ghalabat al-ḥummâ 'alâ Şâlihunâ*). In the letter to Sâlih, he would write that Hekîmzâde Efendi had written about the prevalence of fever over "him" in his report (*wa qad akhbarnâ Hekîmzâde Efendi fî mu'annanihi min ghalabat al-ḥummâ 'alaykum*). In the letter to Hekîmzâde, on the other hand, he reminded him that he had mentioned to him the disease of "their Sâlih" (*wa innamâ zakartum min da'fi Şâlihunâ*). Bearing the receiver's name, two other letters in the collection convince me that Sâlih Efendi was the future *şeyhülislam* Mehmed Sâlih Efendi (d. 1762). who joined the circle of Şeyhülislam Yenişehirli Abdullâh Efendi, become his son-in-law, and himself serve as the *şeyhülislam* from 26 January 1758 to 30 June 1759.²⁵⁷ Hekîmzâde, on the other hand, was obviously the grand vizier-to-be, Hekîmoğlu Ali Paşa (v. 1732-35, 1742-43, and 1755), when recalling that Şeyh Murâd resided for a while in his deceased father's, chief physician Nûh Efendi's (d. 1707) waterfront residence back in 1718.²⁵⁸ As mentioned above, the date of these letters are unclear. However, given that the chief physician, Nûh Efendi, served from 1695 to 1707, we can conclude that the correspondences in question may have taken place towards the end of this term.²⁵⁹

3.3.2 The Problem of Communication and Transportation: Official and Private Couriers and Pilgrimage Caravans in the Service of Şeyh Murâd

How did Şeyh Murâd and his addressees manage the communication and its continuity? Did they benefit from the long-existing and state-sponsored postal system or depend on private transportation provided by merchants? Or did they develop a simpler but more functional system for maintaining communication and sustaining

²⁵⁶For the letters sent to Sâlih and his father Yahyâ, see respectively *Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 40a and 39a. For the letter dispatched Hekîmzâde see *ibid*, fol. 4a.

²⁵⁷For the two letters bearing Mehmed Sâlih's name, see *Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 17b and 33a. On Mehmed Sâlih's career see Tahsin Özcan, "Mehmed Sâlih Efendi," *TDVIA*, vol. 28, 526.

²⁵⁸On Hekîmoğlu, see Münir Aktepe, "Hekîmoğlu Ali Paşa," *TDVIA*, vol. 17, 166-168.

²⁵⁹For the list of chief physicians and their serving period see Nil Sarı, "Hekîmbaşî," *TDVIA*, vol. 17, 161-164.

the unity of the Sufi brotherhood? Questioning how al-Nâblusî communicated with his relatives, students, friends, and disciples, Samer Akkach once speculated about the official postal system in the service of the Damascene Sufi and scholar. In addition, he has pointed out the existence of commercial and private postal services in which postmen, merchants, friends, relatives, and pilgrims were situated as transmitters of the messages, and concluded that “effective non-official postal services, commercial and private, were available to members of public.”²⁶⁰ As an understudied subject, the military and civil postal systems of the Ottoman Empire are relatively better illuminated when the nineteenth-century reforms are in question. When it comes to the seventeenth and eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire, however, only the official, Istanbul-centered networks of communication and transportation in the service of the Porte became the matter of discussion in emerging literature. We are informed, for example, about “ulak-menzil system,” which depended on mounted Tartar messengers (*ulak*), foot-messengers (*peyk*) and stations (*menzilhâne*), and running on three main routes in Anatolia and Rumelia, i.e., the right, central, and left branches. Starting from Üsküdar, the right branch connected Anatolia, Aleppo, Damascus, and Hijaz to the capital; the central branch reached as far as the Persian Gulf via Anatolia and Iraq, and the left branch approached Tabriz through Ankara, Tokat, and Erzurum. A fourth route came to existence between Istanbul and Izmir when the latter became “a trade center frequented by European merchants” by the second half of the 17th century.²⁶¹ In Rumelia, the right branch linked Istanbul to the cities on the western, northwestern, and northern coasts of the Black Sea as far as Ochakiv (Özi) and Crimea; the central branch, extended to Belgrade through Edirne, Sofya, Plovdiv, and Nis; the left branch, in parallel with the Via Egnatia, the ancient Roman road system connecting Constantinople to Adriatic Sea, ran through Rodosçuk, Gümülcine (Komotini), Kavala, Thessaloniki and Durres.²⁶²

²⁶⁰ Akkach, *Letters of a Sufi Scholar*, 15-21.

²⁶¹ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Pilgrims and Sultans: The Hajj under the Ottomans*, (New York: I.B. Tauris, 1996): 41-42. For an introduction on Izmir’s increasing importance as a trade center see Daniel Goffman, *Britons in the Ottoman Empire, 1642-1660*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998).

²⁶² See Davut Hut, “History of Communication in Istanbul,” in *History of Istanbul: From Antiquity to the 21st Century*, vol. VI, <https://istanbultarihi.ist/592-history-of-communication-in-istanbul> (accessed 19.09.2023). See also, Yücel Özkaya, “XVIII. Yüzyılda Menzilhane Sorunu,” *AÜDTCFD XXVIII/3-4* (1970): 339-368; Colin Heywood, “The Ottoman Menzilhane and Ulak System in Rumeli in the Eighteenth Century,” in *I. Uluslararası Türkiye’nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Tarihi Kongresi Tebliğleri*, eds. Osman Okyar and Halil İnalçık, (Ankara: 1980): 179-186, idem, “The Via Egnatia in the Ottoman Period: The Menzilhane of the Sol Kol in the late 17th / early 18th centuries,” in *The Via Egnatia Under Ottoman Rule (1380-1699)*, (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1996): 129-144, idem, “The Evolution of the Courier Order (ulak hükmi) in Ottoman Chancery Practice (Fifteenth to Eighteenth Centuries),” in *Osmanische Welten: Quellen und Fallstudien Festschrift für Michael Ursinus*, eds. Johannes Zimmermann, Christoph Herzog, and Raoul Motika, (Bamberg: University of Bamberg Press, 2016): 269-312; Yusuf Halaçoğlu, *Osmanlılarda Ulaşım ve Haberleşme (Menziller)*, (Ankara: PTT, 2002); Sema Altunan, “XVIII. Yüzyılda Silistre Eyaletinde Haberleşme Ağı: Rumeli Sağ Kol Menzilleri,” *OTAM* 18 (2005): 1-20; Ali Açık, “Osmanlı Ulak-Menzilhane Sistemi Çerçevesinde Tokat Menzilhane (1690-1840),” *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi* 19/2 (2004): 1-33.

Several specimens that I have culled from among the letters of Şeyh Murâd illuminate how the şeyh had maintained his communication with disciples living in distant places. But, unfortunately, none of them clarifies whether he benefited from the state-backed postal system connecting remote regions of the vast empire. Lacking thorough documentation, I only speculate that he may not have exploited the existing communication and transportation system, but his high-ranking disciples most likely did so. In other words, it seems likely that he had indirectly taken advantage of the *ulak-menzil* system. If this had not been the case, such correspondence between him and Dâmâdzâde Ahmed Efendi during the seventeen-month period from late May 1709 to late October 1710 would not have been possible. As such, we can cautiously conclude that Dâmâdzâde relied upon fast-moving mounted *ulaks* to hear about the condition of his master and his retinue in Anatolia. Such a reasoning is further valid in the cases when Şeyh Murâd's addressees were viziers and grand viziers such as Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha, Nu'mân Pasha, Şehîd Alî Pasha, Silahdâr Süleymân Pasha, Moralı Basmacızâde İbrâhîm Pasha, and Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha. Since the means of transportation and communication were state-controlled, it is most likely that Şeyh Murâd asked one of his disciples living in Istanbul to direct the courier of his private letter to Rhodes, where Silahdâr Süleymân Pasha had been in exile.²⁶³

One of the most functional but seasonal means of communication, for not only Şeyh Murâd but also all subjects of the empire including Sufi circles, was the annual pilgrimage caravan travelling back and forth between Istanbul and Mecca through cities and stations in Anatolia, the Levant and the Arabian Peninsula. The frequently intersecting imperial and small-scaled caravans carried not only pilgrims but also merchants, passengers and pack animals, luxuries, commodities, spices, textiles, and guard troops of the caravan.²⁶⁴ In addition, diseases, new ideas, debates, news, books, pamphlets, and letters were carried via caravans on pilgrimage.²⁶⁵ Şeyh Murâd was lucky enough to send letters to his disciples through hajj caravans, particularly when in Istanbul and Damascus, the two most significant centers of the caravan routes. There is no doubt that his sojourns in Damascus were partic-

²⁶³ *Mektûbât*, Pertev Paşa, no. 246 M-1, fol. 109a.

²⁶⁴ For a study on the politics of the pilgrimage and hajj caravans by the land see Suraiya Faroqhi, *Pilgrims and Sultans: The Hajj under the Ottomans*.

²⁶⁵ For the correlation between the hajj season and the spread of cholera in the second half of the 19th and early 20th century see particularly the third and fourth chapters under Part Two entitled "Ecologies of Empire" in Michael Christopher Low, *Imperial Mecca: Ottoman Arabia and the Indian Ocean Hajj*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2020): 43-114; and the fourth chapter in Lâle Can, *Spiritual Subjects: Central Asian Pilgrims and the Ottoman Hajj at the End of Empire*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2020): 125-148. On the Ottoman precautions against the infectious diseases during the period, see Gülden Sarıyıldız, "Hicaz'da Salgın Hastalıklar ve Osmanlı Devleti'nin Aldığı Bazı Önlemler," *Tarih ve Toplum* 104 (1992): 82-88. On the circulation of new ideas, debates, and written works, see Nir Shafir, "The Road From Damascus: Circulation and Redefinition of Islam in the Ottoman Empire, 1620-1720".

ularly lucrative, because, by relying on the caravans moving between Istanbul and Mecca, he was able to send messages to friends, relatives and disciples living in the Holy Lands of Islam, receive their letters when the caravan was back in Damascus. When the caravan headed for the Ottoman capital, he could dispatch letters for those living in Anatolian cities and Istanbul. Some letters in *Mektübāt* explicitly demonstrate that he sent and received letters through pilgrims travelling in the hajj caravan.²⁶⁶ He even once sent at least two pilgrim couriers with letters to the same addressee. In one of the letters written to the anonymous addressee, he says that he will write a letter that another courier from among the pilgrims will take to him and bring with him the response, so he asks the addressee, to take care of the courier.²⁶⁷ From a letter dispatched to Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi, we learn that accompanied by other many letters, the letter of his son Muhammad arrived to him from Gharan, a historical station located in the northwest of Mecca on the pilgrimage route.²⁶⁸ The letter infers that his son, Muhammad, who preferred to stay either in Damascus or Hijaz delivered in Gharan his letter to the pilgrims who headed for Anatolia and Istanbul.

While largely functional, the hajj caravan was risky, since sometimes the letters could be poorly handled, fail to be delivered to the addresses or lost en route. Therefore, in some letters, we indirectly hear about Şeyh Murâd's correspondents complaining that they had not received his letters.²⁶⁹ In such cases, Şeyh Efendi would feel obliged to repeat or summarize the content of the missing letters or be obliged to admit that he had been unaware of the situation. In one of his letters to an anonymous disciple, for example, he stated that he wrote to him several times, especially with the pilgrims, but he did not know whether they arrived.²⁷⁰ In particular, his son, Muhammad, kept complaining that he could not receive letters written for him. Welcoming this situation, Şeyh Murâd would try to appease at least two of his anonymous disciples who complained about discontinuity in correspondence.²⁷¹ In a letter, he tried to raise hope by saying “my [son] Muhammad, too, has complained several times about interruption of our letters, but then in these

²⁶⁶For some specimens see *Mektübāt*, no. 1780, fol. 106b-107a, 108b-109a, 111b, 119a-120a, and *Mektübāt*, no. 1837, fol. 15b, 22b.

²⁶⁷*Mektübāt*, no. 1780, fol. 111b. “wa sanaktubu ma[‘]a ġayri hāzā al-hāmil aydan min al-ḥujjāj wa huwa [‘]alā [‘]azm al-[‘]awd fa layaḥmilu ilaynā makātībikum al-mufaṣṣalat wa layakun naẓarikum [‘]alayhi”

²⁶⁸*Mektübāt*, no. 1837, fol. 15b.

²⁶⁹See for instance, *Mektübāt*, no. 1780, fol. 106b, 106b-107a, 108b-109a, 112a-b, and *Mektübāt*, no. 1837, fol. 21b.

²⁷⁰*Mektübāt*, no. 1780, fol. 106b-107a. “wa qad katabnā lakum marrāran siyyamā ma[‘]a al-ḥujjāj wa ba[‘]-duhum fa-lam nu[‘]allim bi-wuṣūlihā”

²⁷¹*Mektübāt*, no. 1780, fol. 106b, 112a-b.

days a letter came to us from him in which he thanks for the arrival of some letters.”²⁷² It seems likely that because of disruptions in communication, Şeyh Murâd, and particularly his high-ranking disciples approved the employment of couriers for uninterrupted and better communication. The mention in some letters of couriers sent by the şeyh to his disciples and family members is hard evidence in this regard. As has been explained above, he dispatched from Larende to Damascus a courier to carry his message to his family and deliver their letters to Konya. In a letter, he explained to his anonymous penpal who might have protested the cessation of letters, that previously he sent two Uzbek couriers with the hajj caravan, then, two months later, another courier named Ibn Maghribî, who carried the letters of Sufi brethren (*ikhwān*) and now Seyyid Sâlih, another courier, who would bring messages to him.²⁷³ Ibn Maghribî, on whom I have found no information, might be either a loyal disciple of the şeyh, or a private courier or a merchant in transit between Istanbul, Anatolian cities and the Levant. Regardless of their identity, the existence of couriers in Şeyh Murâd’s networks makes me think that they were consciously chosen from among *şeyh*’s disciples, friends and relatives to maintain the order of communication and transportation between the *şeyh* and his recipients. In cases when the courier was a disciple, being tasked with the correspondence was also a requirement for self-discipline. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that employing either private or subservient couriers was a costly practice, and only a Sufi *şeyh* like Şeyh Murâd, who had a regular income from life-term mâlikâne in Damascus or his disciples with significant positions in state administration, could hire them.

Lastly, we must emphasize another prevailing method adopted by the circles of Şeyh Murâd in conducting intra-order communication. Separated by long distances, it was impossible for them to exchange letters frequently. Therefore, in many cases, concertedness was reached between him and his disciples in letter exchange. As mentioned above, he received bulks of epistles from his son and many other pilgrims who had dispatched them from Gharan. In several examples, we see him receiving Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi’s letters accompanied by those of a certain Süleymân Efendi, Abdullâh Efendi, Mollâ Alî and other brethren.²⁷⁴ In two other cases, İsmâ’îl Efendi, the qadi of Aleppo, and a certain Abdulmu’în Efendi, and Alî Efendi and his son, Mehmed Efendi, jointly acted when sending the letters to the şeyh.²⁷⁵ In return, he would pen letters for his addressees one after another, combine them

²⁷²Ibid, 112a. “wa kâna Muḥammadî ayḍan shakâ marrâran min inqitâ’i makâtîbinâ summa fi hâzihi al-ayyam jā’anâ kitâbun minhu yashkuru min wuṣûli ba’ḍ al-makâtîb”

²⁷³*Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 119a-120a.

²⁷⁴*Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 12b, 13b, and 23b.

²⁷⁵*Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 8b-9a, and 24b.

into separate groups, and send each cargo along to where it belonged. Thus, to each group of disciples living in different cities and family members dwelling in Damascus, couriers carried letters from Şeyh Murâd. He must have spent a significant portion of his time writing letters for his adherents. So much so that, in one instance, he needed to explain his addressee unknown to us that because of weakness in his right hand, he was unable to hold the pen for three days.²⁷⁶

3.4 A Naqshbandi Republic of Letters?

Used by Italian humanist Francesco Barbaro (1390-1454) for the first time in a letter sent to his colleague, Poggio Bracciolini (1380-1459), in 1417 and revitalized by Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536) in one of his seminal works, *Anti-Barbari* in 1494, The Republic of Letters or *Respublica litteraria*, meant the network of learned, learning and literature in continental Europe. During the Reformation in Western Christianity in the 16th century, it was perceived as an alternative to *Respublica Christiana*, but Latin survived as the *lingua franca* of the realm.²⁷⁷ As an established concept, we are told, it emerged in the early 17th century, but its widespread acceptance was only by the end of that century. As has been defined by Paul Dibon, as an imaginary republic during the absolutist reign of the Sun King, Louis XIV, who personally ruled France from 1654 to his death in 1715, it was “an intellectual community transcending space and time, [but] recognizing as such differences in respect to the diversity of languages, sects, and countries...”²⁷⁸ In a more idealized description, however, it has been portrayed as “a democracy of peers, if not equals” during the age of monarchies, and as an “ideal republic” which “was a vast invisible and unshakable society, whose civic links were nourished by an uncompromising love for the truth, though tempered by friendship, and a respect for knowledge and talent.”²⁷⁹ The ideal of the Republic has been described in a study analyzing the Enlightenment Republic of Letters as follows: “An elite confraternity distinguished by merit in literature, scholarship, and science; by near total freedom of expression; by equality among members, in defiance of rank and birth; and by tolerance

²⁷⁶ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 120a-b. “wa yadî al-yumnâ qad irtaḥat aʿşābihâ ḥattâ lam-yumkin lî an-amsaka al-qalam illâ baʿda salâsat ayyâm”

²⁷⁷ Dirk van Miert, “What was the Republic of Letters? A Brief Introduction to A Long History,” *Groniek: Historisch Tijdschrift* 204-205 (2014): 271-272.

²⁷⁸ Quoted in Dena Goodman, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment*, (Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press, 1994): 15.

²⁷⁹ Marc Fumaroli, *The Republic of Letters*, translated from French by Lara Vergnaud, (New Heaven, London: Yale University Press, 2018): 9.

-tolerance that was emphatically religious and incidentally national.”²⁸⁰ In a recent study claiming to periodize the six hundred-year odd history of the Republic of Letters, the republic and its republicans have been introduced as follows:

The Republic of Letters was the network of scholarly and scientific community of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. It consisted of scholars and scientists who worked as professors, secretaries, courtiers, physicians, lawyers, or whoever was rich enough to support themselves. By frequently corresponding with each other, they formed a flexible, self-regulating and international conglomerate of networks spanning the whole of Europe. People became part of this community by the very act of writing letters: those scholars who failed or refused to establish sustained lines of communication, could not be reckoned as citizens of this Republic.²⁸¹

Francocentric historiography has discovered a parallel between the history of the French monarchy under the House of Bourbon and that of the Republic of Letters during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. ²⁸² According to this point of view, “the history of the Republic of Letters is interwoven with that of the monarchy from its consolidation after the Wars of Religion and until its downfall in the French Revolution.”²⁸³ Conformity between the monarchy and the Republic was so well-founded that it can be observed in historical developments. For example, the establishment and consolidation of the new postal system at the beginning of the 17th century in France marked not only the growing power and control of the state, but also demands “by a growing literate and commercial public of which the citizens of the Republic of Letters were a significant part.”²⁸⁴ Furthermore, particularly in the 17th century, the Republic of Letters reciprocally nourished and was nourished by the salons, salon culture, and the private scientific societies whose formation was funded by the French aristocracy. As to the participants of the salons and scientific societies, we are said that “[m]agistrates or officers of the court, men of the church or sword, secretaries, lawyers, and physicians who participated in those societies did

²⁸⁰Lorraine Daston, “The Ideal and Reality of the Republic of Letters in the Enlightenment,” 374-375.

²⁸¹Dirk van Miert, “What was the Republic of Letters?” 270.

²⁸²For some studies emphasizing indispensable role and place of France, French, and French culture in the history of the Republic of Letters see Paul Dibon, “Communication in the Respublica litteraria of the 17th century,” *Respublica litterarum. Studies in the Classical Tradition* 1 (1978): 43-55; Dena Goodman, *The Republic of Letters*; Marc Fumaroli, *The Republic of Letters*.

²⁸³Goodman, *The Republic of Letters*, 12.

²⁸⁴Goodman, *The Republic of Letters*, 19.

so outside of their professional lives, or outside of any professional life during a time of leisure that, in their eyes, was the only one suitable to truly liberal and of course intellectual activities.”²⁸⁵ By the foundation of the French Academy of Sciences in 1666, some leading figures of the Republic of Letters gradually came under the patronage, influence and control of the monarchy, and entered in the service of the state. The most remarkable impact of the Academy, perhaps, was that it indirectly forced the incrementally secularized members of the Republic to abandon Latin, the language of the Church.²⁸⁶ Abstention from using Latin was certainly a prospective process and it had still been in demand in the 18th century, particularly in the scientific and scholarly compositions. But the 18th century was also a period of significant transformations within the Republic of Letters. With increasing literacy, printing press, developing networks of the postal system, gradual evolvment of the middle class, and the publication of *Encyclopédie* by Denis Diderot (d. 1784) and Jean le Rond d’Alembert (d. 1783) during the third quarter of the 18th century, the Republic of Letters had crossed lines of academies. Direct communication accelerated between self-proclaimed French philosophers and ordinary people, and reputed names of the old republic began to be challenged by the new generation of the learned.²⁸⁷ With *Encyclopédie* being the main platform for publications on sciences and arts, communication between men of letters from all over Europe accelerated even further. Obviously, this was a reformation in the history of the Republic and “it had begun among men who were spread out across Europe and held together by an epistolary network and, with Latin, a common language.”²⁸⁸

Considering the peculiarities of its circles and self-definitions suggested by its members, historians and researchers of the Republic of Letters have proposed several keywords for a better understanding of such an intangible entity. Though it may not apply to all men of letters identifying themselves with the republic, characteristic attributes of this formation are thought to include, but are not limited to the following denominators: equality, openness, tolerance, freedom from prejudice, mutual respect, criticism, universality, objectivity, cosmopolitanism, autonomy and liberty, exchange of ideas, reciprocity, and plain language. For example, Pierre Bayle (d. 1706), a skeptical French philosopher and leading figure of the French Enlightenment, encyclopedist and author of *Dictionnaire Historique and Critique*, a critical

²⁸⁵Marc Fumaroli, *The Republic of Letters*, 110-111.

²⁸⁶Goodman, *The Republic of Letters*, 21.

²⁸⁷Goodman, *The Republic of Letters*, 53-89, 136-182; Elizabeth Eisenstein, “Print Culture and Enlightenment Thought,” *Réseaux* 6/31 (1988): 7-38; Robert Darnton, “A Polis Inspector Sorts His Files: The Anatomy of the Republic of Letters,” in *The Great Cat Massacre*, (New York: Basic Books, 1999): 145-190.

²⁸⁸Goodman, *The Republic of Letters*, 27-28.

dictionary of ideas and historical and mythical figures, would assure that “Freedom reigns in the Republic of Letters. This Republic is extremely free state. We only recognize the empire of truth and reason.”²⁸⁹ Be that as it may, there were incidents in which members of the Republic could no longer tolerate each other. The best-known example, perhaps, is correspondence between Benedictus de Spinoza (1632-1677), the famous Dutch philosopher of Portuguese-Jewish origin and Willem van Blyenbergh (1632-1696), a Dutch merchant and self-proclaimed Calvinist theologian, on several theological questions including the “problem of evil.” Being at completely opposite poles, angry with the way the debate was conducted, and angered by his correspondent’s pietistic criticism, Spinoza asked Blyenbergh not to continue correspondence.²⁹⁰ The debate had been so ingrained that Gilles Deleuze (d. 1995), the French postmodernist and antirationalist philosopher, who wrote a monograph of Spinoza, described the letters as “the letters on evil.”²⁹¹

The Republic of Letters cannot be confined to France or any contemporary Western state and society, nor can it be restricted with a certain period of time or a specific interval between centuries. In recognition of this reality, scholarship in the 20th and 21st centuries considers it legitimate to define and study the Republic of Letters as a formation of the lettered, which existed in any particular region or city including non-Western counterparts,²⁹² occurred around a renowned scholar, or within a specific community or intellectually defined age.²⁹³ Emboldened by current scholarship on the Republic of Letters, we can reconsider Şeyh Murâd’s letters within the scope of the literature in question. Such a predilection seems legitimate and more reasonable

²⁸⁹For the French quotation from Bayle see Goodman, *The Republic of Letters*, 12.

²⁹⁰For the eight letters exchanged between Spinoza and Blyenbergh from 12 December 1664 to 3 June 1665, see Abraham Wolf, *The Correspondence of Spinoza*, (New York: The Dial Press, 1928): 141-196, 199-200.

²⁹¹Gilles Deleuze, “The Letters on Evil (correspondence with Blyenbergh),” in *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*, translated by Robert Hurley, (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1988): 30-43.

²⁹²Maurits van den Boogert, “Patrick Russell and the Republic of Letters in Aleppo,” in *The Republic of Letters and The Levant*, eds. Alastair Hamilton, Maurits van den Boogert, and Bart Westerweel, (Leiden: Brill, 2005); *The Reach of the Republic of Letters: Literary and Learned Societies in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, eds. Arian van Dixhoorn and Susie Speakman Sutch, (Leiden: Brill, 2008); Gabor Almasi, *The Uses of Humanism: Johannes Sambucus (1531-1584), Andreas Dudith (1533-1589), and The Republic of Letters in East Central Europe*, (Leiden: Brill, 2009);

²⁹³Abraham Wolf, *The Correspondence of Spinoza*; Dena Goodman, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment*; Anne Goldgar, *Impolite Learning: Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters, 1680-1750*, (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1995); Laurence Brockliss, *Calvet’s Web: Enlightenment and the Republic of Letters in Eighteenth-Century France*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); *Jesuit Science and The Republic of Letters*, ed. Mordechai Feingold, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2005); Constance Furey, *Erasmus, Contarini, and the Religious Republic of Letters*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Hanan Yoran, *Between Utopia and Dystopia: Erasmus, Thomas Moore, and the Humanist Republic of Letters*, (Lanham, New York: Lexington Books, 2010); Cristina Marras, “Leibniz Citizen of the Republic of Letters: Some Remarks on the Interconnection Between Language and Politics,” *Studia Leibnitiana* 43/1 (2011): 54-69; İlker Evrim Binbaş, *Intellectual Networks in Timurid Iran: Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Alī Yazdī and the Islamic Republic of Letters*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); Alexander Bevilacqua, *The Republic of Arabic Letters: Islam and the European Enlightenment*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2018); Michael Carhart, *Leibniz Discovers Asia: Social Networking in the Republic of Letters*, (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2019).

to me, because Şeyh Murâd's Arabic letters betoken in the first place the existence of learned networks in the center of which was situated the *şeyh* himself. The presence of Arabic as the *lingua franca* in the Naqshbandi circles of Şeyh Murâd is important because it bears on the one hand a resemblance to the Western Republic of Letters where Latin had maintained its significant position as the *lingua franca* up until the turn of the 18th century when it was replaced by French. The ever-increasing reputation of French in the Republic of Letters would reach a point that German philosopher, Gottfried Leibniz (1646-1716), despite "all his hopes that German could be perfected into a 'bright mirror of reason' ... addressed the great majority of his 400-odd correspondents -including many fellow Germans- in French."²⁹⁴ On the other hand, it is a turning point in the Naqshbandi tradition, in the sense that, contrary to his spiritual predecessors Şeyh Muhammad Ma'sûm (d. 1668), Şeyh Ahmad al-Sirhindi (d. 1624), Ubaydullâh Ahrâr (d. 1490), and many other Naqshbandi *şeyhs* who embraced Persian as the *lingua franca* in their correspondences and scholarly compositions, Şeyh Murâd preferred to pen letters in Arabic.²⁹⁵ Such a preference, of course, cannot be interpreted as a rupture in the Naqshbandi tradition, since the tradition of letter writing did not come to an end, Naqshbandi men of letters continued to be educated in three languages: Turkish, Persian, and Arabic; Persian remained as the *lingua franca* of Naqshbandis of Central and South Asia. In other words, since the spheres of influence and activity in Şeyh Murâd's case was no longer Central Asia and India, but Anatolia, Rumelia and Arab lands, the *lingua franca*, at least in the correspondences, was no longer Persian but Arabic. Nevertheless, it is possible that early in his career he wrote his letters in Persian particularly when corresponding with his colleagues and masters living in India and Central Asia.

Communication through epistolary exchange is one of the significant commonalities between the Republic of Letters and its Naqshbandi counterpart in the Ottoman realm during the 17th and 18th centuries. As discussed above, having been separated from his family members and disciples by long distances, Şeyh Murâd was in dire need of a functioning communication system in which private couriers assumed substantial responsibility. When it comes particularly to its equivalent

²⁹⁴Conveyed in Lorraine Daston, "The Ideal and Reality of the Republic of Letters in the Enlightenment," 376.

²⁹⁵For an introduction on Ahmad al-Sirhindi's 539 letters collected in three volumes see J.G.J. ter Haar "The Collected Letters of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi," *Manuscripts of the Middle East* 3 (1988): 41-44. The Arabic translation of the collected letters include 536 letters. For the English translation of selected letters see Arthur Buehler, *Revealed Grace: The Jurisidic Sufism of Ahmad Sirhindi (1564-1624)*, (Louisville: Fons Vitae, 2011). For the problems of translation in Sirhindi's letters written in medieval Indo-Persian see Arthur Buehler, "Translation Issues in Ahmad Sirhindi's Collected Letters: Why Shari'ah Is A Lot More Than Just 'Islamic Law'," *Oriente Moderno* XCII/2 (2012): 311-321. On Muhammad Ma'sûm's 652 letters collected in three volumes I have not seen any study. For Turkish translation of the letters see Muḥammad Ma'şûm, *Terceme-i Mektûbât-ı Ma'şûmiyye*, (Istanbul: Matbaa-i Litoğrafya, 1277/1860). For Ubaydullâh Ahrâr's collected letters see *The Letters of Khuwāja 'Ubayd Allāh Ahrâr and His Associates*, eds. Jo-Ann Gross and Asam Urunbaev, (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

rooted in Western Europe, shorter distance between cities and towns and a better-functioned state-sponsored postal system had eased uninterrupted communication. In the Ottoman Empire, however, because of the mountainous topography of Anatolia, Rumelia, the Levant, and Hijaz, geographical regions where Şeyh Murâd's letters circulated, distances between locations were longer, the circulation of letters was harder and necessitated much time.²⁹⁶ To this obstacle, we should also add the insufficiency of the then official postal system regulated for the transportation of official messages and state affairs. Then, what about the materials exchanged during the correspondence? When it comes to the Enlightenment Republic of Letters, it is reported that “[c]orrespondence in the Republic of Letters ranged from short notes and letters of introduction to lengthy newsletters and scientific reports, from the personal and private to the public and published. It could complement printed matter, go into print, or enclose what was printed.”²⁹⁷ However, in the epistolary networks of Şeyh Murâd, aside from short notes, letters in various lengths that once penned and sealed by the şeyh, I have not come across any other authored text that exchanged between him and his disciples. Yet, from at least two of his letters sent to Dâmâdzâde Ahmed, we understand that during the composition of his Qur’anic dictionary, *Jâmi‘ al-Mufradât al-Qur’ân*, he asked for Turkish, Persian and Arabic commentaries, and dictionaries to be sent to Bursa where he was living.²⁹⁸ After the completion of the dictionary, he sent it to at least one of his learned disciples (most probably Dâmâdzâde), who criticized the problems in it. In return, he delightedly thanked to him for the criticism and recommended one of his disciples who was also the courier of the letter, to make a new and fair copy of the text.²⁹⁹ When epistles of

²⁹⁶For some studies on Ottoman mountains and their impacts daily life, trade, politics, mobility etc., see J. R. McNeill, *The Mountains of the Mediterranean World*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Ali Yaycıoğlu, “Ottoman Montology: Hazardous Resourcefulness and Uneasy Symbiosis in a Mountain Empire,” in *Crafting History: Essays on the Ottoman World and Beyond in Honor of Cemal Kafadar*, (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2023): 345-374; and Molly Green, “Ottoman Mountains: Mobility in a Forbidding Environment,” in *ibid*, 375-391.

²⁹⁷Goodman, *The Republic of Letters*, 17-18.

²⁹⁸For the earlier and later letters on this topic, see respectively *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 14b and 22b. In a recently published study, Numan Çakır has shown that Şeyh Murâd plagiarized Vankulu Lugaṭı when composing the Turkish part of his dictionary. See his “Murad Buhârî’nin Kur’ân Sözlüğünün Türkçe Bölümlerinin Özgünlüğü Meselesi,” *Tefsir Araştırmaları Dergisi / The Journal of Tafsir Studies* 6/2 (2022): 706-732. In fact, in his earlier letter to Dâmâdzâde Ahmed, Şeyh Murâd explained how he would conduct the process of research and writing for his Qur’anic dictionary. The letter clarifies that he charged some madrasa students for this task (*wa qad qayyadtu bi-tawfîqihî subhânahu ba’d talabat al-‘ilm fi tartîbi Mufradât al-Qur’ân al-‘Azîm*); that he would pattern his dictionary after Râghib al-Isfahânî’s (d. 1108-09) *al-Mufradât fi Gharîb al-Qur’ân*; that he thought that insertion of Persian and Turkish dictionaries into his own *Mufradât* would be beneficial and useful. But, since he did not have Persian and Turkish dictionaries to carry out his project, he would ask Dâmâdzâde to send him al-Şirâḥ for Persian and *Wânquli* for Turkish translations. The letter also provides details that he had sent the incorrect and inaccurate copy of Râghib al-Isfahânî’s *al-Mufradât* to Dâmâdzâde in return for an authentic and pristine copy, and asked also for the copies of *al-Taysîr* of al-Dânî (d. 1053) and *al-Kifâya* of Khatîb al-Baghdâdî (d. 1071). Given these significant details, we can speculate for the moment that Şeyh Murâd had thoroughly exploited for the Arabic version of his Qur’anic dictionary the *Mufradât* of al-Isfahânî, and for the Persian version the *Şirâḥ* of which author I have not seen any information.

²⁹⁹“wa laqad sarranî mâ zakartum min quşûr al-taṭbîq ... wa qad waşşaynâ li-ḥâmil al-raqîmat bi-istiktâbi nuskhât ukhrâ min Jâmi‘ al-Mufradât ‘alâ isti‘jâl” *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 115a.

Abd al-Ghanî al-Nâblusî (1641-1731), a Damascene Naqshbandi-Qadiri Sufi scholar and contemporary of Şeyh Murâd, are in question, we realize that he produced most of them in the form of pamphlets and treatises rather than letters, and compiled and titled them *Wasāʾil al-Taḥqīq wa Rasāʾil al-Tawfīq*, a preference that brought him closer to his peers from among the members of the Republic of Letters, whose letters “were frequently not letters in the modern sense, but dissertations ‘epistolary dissertations.’”³⁰⁰

The Naqshbandi Republic of Letters resembles its Western equivalent also in terms of the centrality of savant/erudite conversation (*conversatio erudita*) in the circles formed around the *şeyh* or teacher. Marc Fumaroli, the first historian who drew attention to the importance of the savant conversation among some learned of the seventeenth century Republic of Letters, reminds us that “Erasmus defined correspondence as an ‘exchange between absent friends.’” Relying on Erasmus’s definition, he claims further that “[t]hat description essentially suggests that in-person conversation between friends was the most desirable form of communication.”³⁰¹ We are told by Fumaroli that savant conversation regained its honor and historical precedence in the second half of the 17th century through two intellectual developments that would not have been favored by Enlightenment philosophers. First, thanks to the German scholar, Daniel Georg Morhof (1639-1691), who offers us in his *Polyhistor* “the most articulated account of the art and erudite conversation in one dedicated chapter” and second, thanks to the *ana* literature, “a rather unique genre” that “enabled readers to participate, more or less faithfully, in the intimacy of an erudite circle gathered around a teacher and to hear his spoken word, rather than his official, public, and written voice.”³⁰² According to Morhof, nothing could improve man more than frequent conference with savant; it was the happiest discipline that touched the spirit “more profoundly than that dull path that passes by reading and solitary meditation.” Therefore, Fumaroli explains that savant conversation was “the supreme method of sharing information and education, a ‘general discipline’ to develop the mind, inseparable from its agrément.”³⁰³ This was because, during erudite conversations there appears agreement between participants, and most importantly, erudition “was not linked to the volume or profusion of savant’s publications, impressive though they may have been, but to the wisdom inherent to his

³⁰⁰Wolf, *The Correspondence of Spinoza*, 35.

³⁰¹Fumaroli, *The Republic of Letters*, 122. For more on savant conversation, see the seventh chapter in *Ibid*, 122-132.

³⁰²*Ibid*, 125.

³⁰³*Ibid*, 127.

singular being (memory and *ingenium*).”³⁰⁴

The savant conversation was one of the pillars of the Naqshbandi order. Yet, rather than *conversatio erudita* it has come to be known as “conversation” or “companionship” with the *şeyh* (*şoḥbet*, *şuḥbet*, or *şuḥba*), depending on the regions in which it was performed. As Dina le Gall has emphasized, this was an *irshādī* mode of Sufism. The *murshid şeyh* as “the intimate guide of disciples in the transformative process of progressing toward mystical union, was at center stage.”³⁰⁵ Texts circulating in the Naqshbandi circles quote from Muhammad Bahâ al-Dîn Naqshband, the eponym of the order, a very popular adage flowing as follows: “our is a tariqa of *şuḥba*, not seclusion (*khalwa*), because in *khalwa* exists reputation, and by reputation comes calamity.”³⁰⁶ The *şuḥba* is rooted in the Naqshbandi tradition so that it is directly associated with the *rābiṭa*, one of the most fundamental methods of advancement in the Naqshbandi order that can be rendered as “the practice of fixing the visual form of the shaykh in the imagination as a prelude to taking on his qualities to making him the conduit for the flow of divine energy.”³⁰⁷ In his undated letter to İlkhân-i A‘zâm, following in the footsteps of Muhammad Bahâ al-Dîn Naqshband, Şeyh Murâd emphasizes indistinguishability between the savant conversation and the Naqshbandi order by stating that the order (and path) of the khwājagān is the conversation (*wa ṭarīqati ḥadarāti khwājagān quddisat asrāruhum al-şuḥbatun*).³⁰⁸ The savant conversation and attachment to the *şeyh* so deeply penetrated into the Naqshbandi tradition that in one of his letters to Mehmed Vehhâbî of Lârende, he stated that all the troubles arose from poor *şuḥba*, absence of dervishes’ *rābiṭa* for the *şeyh*, and triumph of heedlessness.³⁰⁹ He admitted in one of his letters to Hüseyin Efendizâde Mustafâ Efendi that attachment to the *şeyh* reinforced the authority of the savant conversation and wiped out all doubts.³¹⁰ As he explained in a letter to Şeyh Kassâb Süleymân, the *vâiz* of Sultan Bâyezid Mosque, the sa-

³⁰⁴Ibid, 129-130.

³⁰⁵Dina Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, 157.

³⁰⁶Dina Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, 158. Ubeydullah Ahrâr, *Melfûzât*, translated from Persian to Turkish by Fakirullah Yıldız, (İstanbul: Litera Yayıncılık, 2021): 13. Muhammad Bahâ al-Dîn Naqshband’s remark was conveyed by Mollâ Jâmî (d. 1492) in his infamous *Nafaḥât al-Uns*. See “va mî farmûda and ṭarīqa-i mā şoḥbat ast va dar-khalwat shohrat-ast va dar-shohrat âfat” in *Kitābu Nafaḥât al-Uns li-‘Abd al-Raḥmân al-Jâmî*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya no. 2140, fol. 158b. “Bilgil ki ṭarīk-i dervīşān ba‘d ez-tecrīd ve tefrīd şoḥbetdür ve ḥalvet şöretdür ve şöret âfetdür” in *Tuḥfat al-Ṭalībîn wa ‘Umdat al-Wāşilîn*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Fatih no. 5385, fol. 86a.

³⁰⁷Dina le Gall, *ibid*, 159.

³⁰⁸*Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 10b-11b.

³⁰⁹*Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 9b-10a. “ḥabībī qurrati ‘aynī kullu al-balā min sū‘i al-şuḥbat wa khuluwwi rābiṭat al-fuqārā wa ḡalabat al-ḡaflat”

³¹⁰*Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 76a-77b. “fa al-şuḥbat lā tabqā taraddudan fi shay‘in ... fa al-rābiṭat tuqawwimu maqām al-şuḥbat”

vant conversation had to be continuous, because “the truth of truths” could only be obtained through continuous conversation, which lead dervish to “the most exalted purpose”—God.³¹¹ But, how could the savant conversation be maintained when the *şeyh* and his disciples were separated by long distances? As I discussed above, the only solution was the exchange of letters. However, correspondence could never be a counterbalance to the savant conversation. As Şeyh Murâd states in one of his letters to a disciple unknown to us, an elaborated clarification of the matters can only be through the savant conversation since the Naqshbandi order is the order of the conversation not of correspondence or literary composition (*kitābat*). Nevertheless, he accepts that under such circumstances correspondence functions as mutual conversation,³¹² which is in line with Erasmus’ position that defines correspondence as an “exchange between absent friends”.

If one were to speak of an equivalent of the Republic of Letters formed in Ottoman domains and depended on reciprocal correspondence for continuous communication, not only Naqshbandi circles but also other Sufi brotherhoods present several historical and agreeable instances. Indeed, in terms of intellectual networks formed by Sufis and scholars through reciprocal exchange of correspondences and treatises, substantial examples emerged in the Muslim world as early as the 10th century when an informal network of anonymous members of *Ikhwān al-Şafā* such as The Brethren of Purity, produced fifty-two treatises on several topics including music, astronomy, logic, geography, ethics, magic, arithmetic, geometry and so forth in Abbasid Basra.³¹³ Modelling on this initial example, we are told that a similar network of intellectuals existed around Sharaf al-Dīn Alī Yazdī (d. 1454), a Timurid court historian and scholar of Persian origin, in Iran in the 15th century.³¹⁴ In the Indian subcontinent, too, letters circulated through many intellectual networks of Sufis over the centuries. For instance, as evidenced by his collected letters *Maktūbāt-i Quddusiyya*, a network of the lettered had emerged around the eminent Chishti-Sabiri şeyh Abd al-Quddus Gangohī (d. 1537) during the first half of the 16th century.³¹⁵ When it comes to the 17th century India, as I mentioned above, we

³¹¹ *Mektūbāt*, no. 1838, fol. 12a-b. “... bi’l-şuḥbat al-muttaşilat ilā ḥaqīqat al-ḥaqā’iq wāşilat ilā maqşūd al-a’lā”

³¹² *Mektūbāt*, no. 1838, fol. 6a-b. “wa tafşil al-bayān lā yata’tī illā bi’l-şuḥbat ... ma’anna tarīqatuhum al-şuḥbat lā al-kitābat ... wa al-murāsalat taqarraba al-muşāfahat”

³¹³ Yves Marquet, “Ikhwān al-Şafā,” *EI2*, vol. III, 1071-1076; Enver Uysal, “İhvân-ı Safâ,” *TDVIA*, vol. 22, 1-6; Fatih Altuğ, “İhvân-ı Safâ’da Zoopolis ve Kozmopolis Karşı Karşıya,” *Doğu Batı, Faunaya Ağıt: Hayvan* 82 (2018): 223-244. Since 2018 onwards, Oxford University Press has published the treatises of *Ikhwān al-Şafā* under the editorship of several editors as part of the “Epistles of the Brethren of Purity” series.

³¹⁴ İlker Evrim Binbaş, *Intellectual Networks in Timurid Iran: Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Alī Yazdī and the Islamicate Republic of Letters*.

³¹⁵ It is said that most of his surviving letters were penned for the Muslim nobles and rulers of the Indian sub-

see through at least two samples that networks of intellectuals came into being around the Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi masters, Ahmad al-Sirhindî (d. 1624), and his son, Muhammad Ma'sûm (d. 1668). Like their counterparts in Iran and India, Ottoman men of letters formed circles of erudition in which circulating letters not only sustained communication between separated friends, but also provided the patron-client relationships and served their worldly needs. The collected letters of Lâmiî Çelebi (1473-1532), a prolific scholar and Naqshbandi şeyh from Bursa, prove that the author penned the letters to assure his high-ranking addressees his loyalty and strict obedience to them.³¹⁶ From the second half of the 16th century to the first quarter of the 19th, Ottoman men of the pen in the Ottoman capital left behind thousands of letters collected either in separate collections or decades of *münşeât* compilations.³¹⁷ However, as can be seen in studies on Ganîzâde Mehmed Nâdirî (d. 1627), Veysî (d. 1628), Okçuzâde (d. 1630), Azmîzâde Hâletî Nergisî (d. 1635), Nev'îzâde Atâyî (d. 1635), Nâbî (d. 1712), Nahîfî (d. 1738), Çelebîzâde İsmâ'îl Âsım (d. 1760), Ebûbekir Kânî (d. 1792), extensive scholarship on Ottoman *inşâ* literature has revolved for decades around either the stylistic features of the letters or the skills of the talented author in composing overly ornate prose. In other words, in only a small number of studies have the historical importance of chancery manuals, which may include both formal and private epistles composed by abovementioned figures, their significance as sources for patron-client relations, and social, political and cultural history been analyzed.³¹⁸

continent. See M. Zameer Uddin Siddiqi, "Shaikh Abdul Quddus of Gangoh and Contemporary Rulers," *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress* 31 (1969): 305-311; Muzaffar Alam, "The Mughals, the Sufi Shaykhs and the Formation of the Akbari Dispensation," *Modern Asian Studies* 43/1 (2009): 140-141. For his biography see Simon Digby, "Abd al-Qoddus Gangohi (1456-1537 A.D.): The Personality and Attitudes of A Medieval Indian Sufi," *Medieval India: A Miscellany* 3 (1975): 1-66; B. B. Lawrence, "Abd al-Qoddûs Gangôhî" *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, <https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/abd-al-qoddus-gangohi-indo-muslim-saint-and-litterateur-d-1537> (accessed 2.10.2023); G. Bowering, "Gangôhî," *EI2* Suppl. 312-313; Rıza Kurtuluş, "Gengûhî, Abdulkuddûs," *TDVIA*, vol. 14, 24.

³¹⁶The transcription of Lâmiî's letters can be seen in two studies. See Hüseyin Karaman, "Lâmiî Çelebi'nin Münşeâtı," Unpublished M.A. Thesis, (Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi 2001); and Hasan Ali Esir, *Münşeât-ı Lâmiî (Lâmiî Çelebi'nin Mektupları) -İnceleme-Metin-İndeks-Sözlük-*, (Trabzon: Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2006).

³¹⁷For one of the earliest studies on Ottoman letters, see Orhan Şaik Gökyay, "Tanzimat Dönemine Değın Mektup," *Türk Dili* 274 (1974): 17-87. Focusing on official epistolary, including *münşeât* collections of the 19th century and excluding manuscripts of letters prepared by Sufi circles, Josef Matuz lists 137 chancery manuals recorded in the library catalogues. See Josep Matuz, "Über die Epistolographie und Inşâ' -Literatur der Osmanen," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft* 1 (1969):574-594.

³¹⁸See among others John R. Walsh, "The Esâlibü'l-Mekâtib (Münşe'ât) of Mehmed Nergîsî Efendi," *Archivum Ottomanicum* 1 (1969): 213-302; Christine Woodhead, "Ottoman İnşa and the Art of Letter-Writing Influences Upon the Career of the Nişancı and Prose Stylist Okçuzade (d. 1630)," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları VII-VIII / The Journal of Ottoman Studies VII-VIII* (1988): 143-159; idem, "Circles of Correspondence: Ottoman letter-writing in the Early Seventeenth Century," *Journal of Turkish Literature* 4 (2007): 53-68; idem, "Writing to a Grand Vezir: Azmîzade Efendi's Letters to Nasuh Paşa, 1611-1614," in *Osmanlı'nın İzinde: Prof. Dr. Mehmed İpşirli Armağanı*, (Istanbul: TİMAŞ, 2013): 485-492; idem, "Learning From Letters: Problems and Potential in Studying Münşe'at Mecmuaları," in *Klasik Edebiyatımızın Dili (Bildiriler)*, ed. Mustafa İsen, (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı, 2017): 195-206; idem, "The Ottoman Art of Word-Painting. Rhyme and Reason in Seventeenth-Century Turkish Literary Letters," *The Seventeenth Century* 38/5 (2023): 885-903; Andras J. Riedlmayer, "Ottoman Copybooks of Correspondence and Miscellanies as Source for Political and Cultural History," *Acta Orientalia Academiae*

Contrary to the rhetorical, rhymed, bombastic and flowery prose literature that gives the author the opportunity to flaunt his skills and expertise on the one hand and to perpetuate communication and preserve the patronage network on the other, correspondences composed within the circles of Sufi brotherhoods were plain, lucid, loud and clear, for they were transmitters of Sufistic knowledge from the master to his adherents. A close look at Ottoman Sufi networks demonstrate that Khalwati circles generated remarkable collections of frank and easily understandable correspondence from the last quarter of the 16th century to the first quarter of the 18th centuries. In this regard, we can count dream letters dispatched from Murâd III (r. 1574-1595) to Şeyh Şücâ and from Âsiye Hatun to Şeyh Muslihüddîn and his successor son, Şeyh Hasan, circa 1641-43, the scattered letters of Niyâzî-i Mısrî (1618-1694), letters from Khalwati-Karabaşı Şeyh Mehmed Nasûhî (1648-1718) to his disciple, Dervîş İbrâhîm Agha, a steward in the imperial treasury, and letters from Khalwati-Gülşenî Şeyh Hasan Sezâi (1669-1738) to his family members and disciples.³¹⁹ Roughly during the same period, apart from that of Lâmiî Çelebi mentioned above, we have no collection of letters composed by Naqshbandis. By the last quarter of the 17th and during the 18th centuries, however, aforesaid collections of Arabic letters composed by Abd al-Ghanî Nâblusî and Şeyh Murâd came to the forefront. It was also in the 18th century that figures who seemed to be affiliated with both Naqshbandi and Mevlevi orders devised their personal collection of flowery and rhetorical letters. Nahîfî Süleymân Efendi (d. 1738), a follower of Mevlevi Naqshbandi, and Melami orders, a famous poet and statesman who served under Şehid Alî Pasha, and, following his death, under Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha until 1726, was one of the scholar officials who left behind some of his correspondences.³²⁰ Küçükçelebizâde İsmâ'îl Âsım Efendi (d. 1760), another famous poet and official chronicler who served as şeyhülislam during the last months of his life, is another Mevlevi-Naqshbandi who had at least two of his clerks copy his correspondence. Whereas İsmâ'îl Âsım's earlier collection, which included thirty-seven letters was composed by Hâdîzâde Mehmed Emîn Efendi of Bursa, the disciple of Şeyh Murâd with whom he had exchanged letters, the later

Scientiarum Hung 61/1-2 (2008): 201-214.

³¹⁹ See see Özgen Felek, *Kitâbü'l-Menâmât: Sultan III. Murad'ın Rüya Mektupları*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2014); Cemal Kafadar, "Mütereddît Bir Mutasavvîf: Üsküplü Asiye Hatun'un Rüya Defteri 1641-1643," in *Kim var imiş biz burada yoğ iken: Dört Osmanlı: Yeniçeri, Tüccar, Dervîş ve Hatun*, (İstanbul: Metis, 2009): 123-191; Derin Terzioğlu, "Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyâzî-i Mısrî (1618-94)," Unpublished PhD Dissertation, (Harvard University, 1999); Üsküdarlı Mehmed Nasûhî Halvetî, *Seyr ü Sülûk Mektupları (Mürâselât)*, prepared by Mustafa Tateri and Abdülmecit İslamoğlu, (İstanbul: H Yayınları, 2017): 157-392; Himmet Konur, *Hasan Sezâi ve Mektupları Işığında Tasavvuf Hayatı*, (İzmir: Tibyan Yayıncılık, 2003)

³²⁰ For Nahîfî's eight letters penned during the last quarter of the 17th and first quarter of the 18th centuries, see Ramazan Ekinçi, "Sevgiliye ve Dost(lar)a Mektuplar: Münşeât-ı Nahîfî," *TAED* 54 (2015): 239-287. For his life story and career, see İrfan Aypay, "Nahîfî Süleyman Efendi (Hayatı, Eserleri, Edebi Kişiliği ve Divan'ının Tenkitli Metni)," Unpublished PhD Diss. vol. I, (Selçuk Üniversitesi 1992): 1-9; Edith Gülçin Ambros, "Nahîfî," *EI2*, vol. VII, 905; Mustafa İsmet Uzun, "Nahîfî," *TDVIA*, vol. 32, 297-299.

collection which consisted of 235 letters was prepared by a certain Lutfî Efendi.³²¹

3.5 An Attempt to Form Muradi Branch Within the Naqshbandiyya

In his *Tibyānu Wasā'il al-Ḥaqā'iq fī Bayāni Salāsīl al-Ṭarā'iq*, an exhaustive encyclopedia written during the last quarter of the 19th century on the history of mainstream Sufi orders and their branches, Harîrîzâde Mehmed Kemâleddîn (1850-1882) mentions a “Muradi” branch connected to Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî that came into existence within the Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi order.³²² Had such a branch really formed as claimed? According to Halil İbrahim Şimşek, a Muradi branch did not actually materialize.³²³ Contrary to Şimşek, I believe that a Muradi branch emerged from within the Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi order at least in the 18th century in Bursa, Konya, and Damascus. Indeed, traces of the historical presence of such a formation in Damascus are well-documented. The abovementioned *Silk al-Durar*, penned by Muhammad Khalîl, the great grandson of Şeyh Murâd, intently recorded the biographies of Murâdîs, all of whom were either sons or grandsons and great grandsons of Şeyh Murâd. Of course, in the text in question, “al-Murâdî” was utilized in the first place as a patronymic title to identify Şeyh Murâd’s progeny. Yet, considering the continuity in his family’s spiritual authority in Damascus, we can contend that al-Murâdî had also referred to the continuous influence and authority of the Muradi branch in the metropolis. Three surviving texts from the second half of the 18th century prove that from among the Naqshbandi circles in Anatolia, some individuals or groups of dervishes had already assumed “al-Murâdî” as a descriptive title for themselves. The first and second texts are the copies of *Jāmi' al-Mufradāt al-Qur'ān*, the Qur’anic dictionary of Şeyh Murâd, which were completed in Bursa on 25 Rabî' al-Awwal 1166/30 January 1753 and in 1169/1755-56. The copyist of the former text, el-Hâc Dervîş Abdurrahîm, utilizes “al-Murâdî” and “al-Bursevî” to

³²¹For the biography of Küçükçelebizâde İsmâ'il Âsım, see Abdülkadir Özcan, “Âsım Efendi, Çelebizâde,” *TDVIA*, vol. 3, 477-478. He was known with his affiliation to the Mevlevi order, but considering that he was the son-in-law of the chief physician Ömer Efendi, another disciple and correspondent of Şeyh Murâd, I tend to think that he was also an adherent of the Naqshbandi order. For this significant detail, see Semavi İyice, “Hekimbaşı Ömer Efendi Külliyesi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 17, 165-166. For his letter collection prepared by Hâdîzâde Mehmed Emin Efendi, see Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Esad Efendi, no. 3832, fol. 1b-29b. For Şeyh Murâd’s letter to Hâdîzâde Mehmed, see *Mektûbât*, Veliyüddin, no. 1838, fol. 6b. For the collection composed by Lutfî Efendi, see Küçük Çelebizâde İsmâ'il Âsım Efendi, *Münşe'ât-ı Âsım*, prepared by Fahri Unan, (Ankara: TTK, 2013). Fahri Unan states that he was not able to detect the manuscript copy of the collection. See *Ibid*, XXIII and XXVII. For the manuscript copy that escaped Fahri Unan’s notice, see *Münşe'ât-ı Çelebizâde c.Âşım Efendi*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Halet Efendi, no. 358.

³²²Harîrîzâde, *Tibyānu Wasā'il al-Ḥaqā'iq fī Bayāni Salāsīl al-Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, İbrahim Efendi, no. 432, fol. 121a.

³²³Şimşek, “Murad Buhârî,” *TDVIA*, vol. 31, 186.

introduce himself and his şeyh, Seyyid Sa'îd al-Naqshbandi, who dictated the copy in hand.³²⁴ The said Şeyh Seyyid Sa'îd must have been the copyist of the second text was completed three years later in 1169. In the text, he introduces himself as “Mehmed Sa'îd al-Murâdî al-Naqshbandî,” and makes it clear that he is the disciple of Şeyh İbrâhîm al-Bursevî, who was none other than Karababazâde İbrâhîm (d. 1722), the disciple and deputy of Şeyh Murâd in Bursa and one of the recorders of his sermons delivered there.³²⁵ Given these significant details, I conclude that a Naqshbandi-Muradi branch had taken root in Bursa as early as the first half of the 18th century. The third text is a commentary entitled *Tuḥfat al-Aḥbâb fî al-Sulûk ilâ Tarîq al-Aşḥâb* on Şeyh Murâd's *Silsilat al-Zahab*. It was written in 1174/1760-61 in Konya by Şeyh Kösec Ahmed al-Trabzonî (d. 1777), a Naqshbandi and Mevlevi şeyh who followed the Naqshbandi order through Ebû Sa'îd Hâdimî (d. 1762) in the middle of the century, but attached also elements of the Mevlevi order towards the end of his life in the city in question.³²⁶ Considering that the author, Şeyh Kösec Ahmed was identified as “al-Murâdî” and “al-Naqshbandî”³²⁷ in the two copies of this text, I claim that the Muradi branch of the order was also formed in Konya, probably through the effort of Ebû Sa'îd Hâdimî in the 18th century.

Did Şeyh Murâd really intend to create a Muradi branch of the Naqshbandiyya? If so, how did he manage to establish a branch named after him? In response to these questions, I argue that his aim was to be associated with a new path within the order bearing his name. For achieving this purpose, he depended on the circulation of letters, continuous travels, and regularly organized gatherings, where erudite conversations took place between him and his followers. In other words, it was through these mechanisms that he was able to spread his teachings, personal method, approach and agenda in Sufism, and, if he had one, his own doctrine. In fact, he had never overtly claimed to pave a new path, and, quite the contrary, when propagating he would depend only on the Naqshbandi order and the path of *Khwâjagân*, the historical flag-bearers of the order. But, as understood from his surviving letters, he was aware of his potential and conscious enough of his personal charisma and the mission that took him on the road. As emphasized by Butrus

³²⁴See, Muhammed Murâd, *Câmi'u'l-Mufredât*, Nuruosmaniye, no. 479, fol. 624b.

³²⁵For the copy duplicated by Şeyh Mehmed Sa'îd al-Murâdî, see İstanbul Üniversitesi, NEK-AY, no. 339.

³²⁶The completion date of autograph copy is recorded in Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Hasan Hüsnü Paşa, no. 7891/1, fol. 19a; and Milli Kütüphane Yazmalar Koleksiyonu, no. 06 Mil Yz A 8301/1, fol. 21b. For a study on obscurities regarding Şeyh Kösec Ahmed, see Ali Üremiş, “Yeni Bilgiler Işığında Trabzonlu Kösec Ahmed Dede,” *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 19 (2006): 175-191.

³²⁷In the bookplate of a copy Şeyh Ahmed is introduced as “Şeyh Dervîş Ahmed al-Trabzonî al-Naqshbandî al-Murâdî”. See Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Bağdatlı Vehbi, no. 2045, fol. 1a. In the completion record of the other copy which was completed in Bursa in 1191/1777-78 he is presented as “al-Naqshbandî al-Murâdî al-Hâdimî”. See Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Aşir Efendi, no. 422/3, fol. 170b.

Abu-Manneh, for explaining the reason for which he stayed in Bursa, he would write to Muhammad Zubayr that he would be able to “transmit the word of truth” to the capital, the seat of the caliphate.³²⁸ In a few other letters to his disciples, he expressed that his personal and their collective purpose in their localities was “to deliver the word of salvation” (*li-iblāġi kalimat al-naṣr ilā maḥallihī bi-wasāṭati aḥbābinā*), “to deliver the word of truth” (*li-iblāġi kalimat al-ḥaqq*), “to implant the word of truth” (*fī ilqāʿi kalimati ḥaqq bi-wāsiṭati amsālikum*), “to promptly convey the word of goodness” (*tablāġi kalimat khayr fī waqt ilā maḥallihī*), “to anticipate the time the word of goodness reach the good” (*li-tawaqquʿu waqt li-kalimat khayr ilā ahli khayr*).³²⁹ Undertaking such a noble cause, he had to persuade the target audience that he was not an ordinary, run-of-the-mill *ṣeyh*. Therefore, he felt compelled in his teachings transmitted through his written words and erudite conversations to say something new and to be novel rather than repeating the usual formulations that had been circulating among Sufis for centuries. Without considering the role of disciples in reinforcing the authority of their master, I claim that it was mainly in this way that established his fame and charisma as the founder of a new branch within a deeply rooted, well-grounded Naqshbandi order.

What, then, were the teachings of Ṣeyh Murād? In his article on the *ṣeyh*, Butrus Abu-Manneh has brought our attention his teachings transmitted through the letters. To summarize Abu-Manneh’s findings on the issue, we should agree that two main themes were emphasized in the letters: “The first was the exposition of the rituals and principals of the order, and the second was Sheikh Murād’s concern for Islam.” The core of the first was twofold: “to observe constantly [the believer’s] presence with God and secondly to follow in full His honoured beloved one [i.e. the Prophet].” Thanks to observance of these precepts, “continuous worshipping [of God] which leads to annihilation *istihlāk* [in Him]” would occur. Moreover, a Naqshbandi had to obey the *sharīʿa*, pay regard to the *sunna* of the Prophet in his actions, and avoid *bidʿa* (reprehensible innovations) and *rukḥṣa* (toleration of prohibitions under mitigating circumstances). In addition, he “emphasized the absolute unity of God..., stressed the need to observe the *rābiṭa* (mystical link) with him.” As to his concern for Islam, on the other hand, Abu-Manneh realized that “[a]t a time of defeat and retreat of the Muslim state at the hands of ‘the infidels’ and growing anxiety and despair, he exhorted his followers who reached higher positions in the state to be extremely vigilant about their religion and to work for its revival.” It was through letters that he was able to preach the ideals of Orthodox Islam and use

³²⁸ Abu-Manneh, “Sheikh Murād al-Bukhārī and the Expansion of the Naqshbandī-Mujaddidī Order in Istanbul,” 14.

³²⁹ *Mektūbāt*, Veliyüddin, no. 1780, fol.87a, 98a, no. 1837, fol. 4b, 5b, 29b.

his “spiritual prominence to exert moral and religious influence on statesmen and other dignitaries, and to call upon them to defend the fundamentals of Islam.”³³⁰

What was the novelty in Şeyh Murâd’s teachings? Neither Abu-Manneh nor anyone else who has written on Şeyh Murâd and the expansion of the Naqshbandi order in the heartland of the Ottoman Empire, has addressed this question. In fact, Şeyh Murâd’s views and ideas summarized by Abu-Manneh had already been articulated by many other scholars and teachers within not only Naqshbandi circles but also circles of other Sufi orders long before Şeyh Murâd’s appearance and continued to be expressed long after his death. I assert that the pivotal novelty in his teachings was in the conceptualization and reformulation of the message rather than in its content. To put it differently, I posit that he successfully established and reinforced his authority through the installation of new or seldom-used concepts culled from the vocabulary of Sufism rather than the articulation of new ideas. Thus, by highlighting rare terms, reformulating them in the texts, and imbuing in them new meanings, he managed to consolidate his authority as the founder of a new branch in the Naqshbandi tree.

Because of its frequent use in the letters, the most remarkable concept in the Sufi parlance of Şeyh Murâd is *istihlāk*, which, as we have seen above, is translated as “annihilation” by Abu-Manneh. Through a close reading of the letters, we realize that Şeyh Murâd uses the word to cover the meaning of *fanā* or *fanā fillāh* (extinction of the self in God), a widespread and well-recognized concept in Sufi terminology. Despite its centrality in Sufi minds, to the best of my knowledge, Şeyh Murâd utilized the concept of *fanā* in only four letters of which two were written to Dâmâdzâde Ahmed and Mehmed Sâlih.³³¹ Except for this rare use, in the rest of his letters, he always used *istihlāk* in lieu of *fanā* when he needed to emphasize the state of *fanā* in dervish. *Istihlāk*, as a concept, meant more for Şeyh Murâd, but before going into detail, we must underline a few points regarding *fanā*. In the Sufic tradition, two definitions have been developed for *fanā*. First, “the passing-away from the consciousness of the mystic of all things, including himself, ... and its replacement by a pure consciousness of God,” and second “annihilation of imperfect attributes ... and their replacement by the perfect attributes bestowed by God.”³³² In this understanding, taken with the loss of consciousness, the humanly agent is

³³⁰For Abu-Manneh’s subsection of the teachings of Şeyh Murâd, see “Sheikh Murâd al-Bukhârî and the Expansion of the Naqshbandî-Mujaddidî Order in Istanbul,” 16-20. For more on Şeyh Murâd’s teachings see Haticce Taş, “Murâd Buhârî’nin Hayatı Eserleri ve Tasavvufî Görüşleri,” Unpublished MA Thesis, (Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi 2015): 20-46.

³³¹For the letter sent to Dâmâdzâde, see *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 4b; and the one for Mehmed Sâlih see *Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 17b. for the remaining two letters see no. 1780, fol.67a-68b and 80b-82a.

³³²Fazlur Rahman, “Baḳā² wa-Fanā,” *EI2*, vol. I, 951.

replaced by the divine personality of God, he is in ecstasy, and from that moment on, God is the only actor and man is not responsible for his actions and states that may contain contradictions to the *sharīʿa* and *sunna*.³³³ Whether such a state is temporary or permanent has led to heated debates among Sufis and scholars. Moreover, these debates are directly related to the doctrines of *waḥdat al-wujūd* (the oneness of being, or unity of being) attributed to the Andalusian mystic and scholar, Ibn Arabī (1165-1240), and *waḥdat al-shuhūd* (the oneness of witnessing, or unity of appearance) developed by ‘Alā al-Dawla Simnānī (1261-1336), but established as a doctrine at the hands of Şeyh Ahmad al-Sirhindī.³³⁴ To summarize roughly, according to the *waḥdat al-wujūd*ist view, only God exists; the world we see around us is the shadow of God’s names and attributes. Since shadows are imaginary and have no real existence, the only existence is of God. The *waḥdat al-shuhūd*ist view, on the other hand, maintains that God and all His creation simultaneously exist. Everything that is created is shadow in the sense that God manifests Him in it.³³⁵ In conjunction with these debates, it is mostly defenders of *waḥdat al-wujūd* who claim that dervish’s *fanā* in God is constant once he tastes its flavor. Proponents of *waḥdat al-shuhūd*, on the other hand, highlight that the state of *fanā* is instant and transient; it is impossible for human beings to be united with God; if there is a union, it is the union of images not of being. Once the dervish comes to his sense, he is responsible for all his actions as a worshipper.

When we analyze Şeyh Murād’s idea of *istihlāk* against this background, we realize that it was the central concept in his Sufi terminology. It always appears in the following formulation in advice to disciples: “the continuation of worship on the path of *istihlāk*” (*dawām al-‘ubūdiyyat ‘alā ṭarīq al-istihlāk*).³³⁶ The formulation points out that *istihlāk* is the last phase that a Naqshbandi dervish reaches in the process of self-discipline. Most importantly, it is a path of its own, and can be considered identical with that of the Naqshbandi order. Therefore, in a few letters in which we identify his disciples Seyyid Ömer of Mar‘aş, Mehmed Sâlih Efendi, İshak Efendi, and Şeyh Süleymân, the preacher of Bâyezid Mosque, among the addressees,

³³³Hellmut Ritter, “Fenā,” *IA*, vol. 4, 546-547.

³³⁴Yohanan Friedmann, *Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī: An Outline of His Thought and a Study of His Image in the Eyes of Posterity*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000): 26; M. Nazif Şahinoğlu, “Alāüddeve-i Simnānī,” *TDVIA*, vol. 1, 346; William C. Chittick, “Waḥdat al-Shuhūd and Waḥdat al-Wudjūd,” *EI2*, vol. XI, 37-39; Ekrem Demirli, “Vahdet-i Vücüd,” *TDVIA*, vol. 42, 434.

³³⁵Necdet Tosun, *İmâm-ı Rabbânî Ahmed Sirhindî: Hayatı, Eserleri, Tasavvufî Görüşleri*, (Istanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2009): 88-107. For more on the comparison between Sirhindī and Ibn Arabī and their doctrines see Cavit Sunar, *İmam Rabbânî – İbn Arabî: Vahdet’i Şühûd Vahdet’i Vücûd Meselesi*, second edition, (Istanbul: Anadolu Aydınlanma Vakfı Yayınları, 2006). On *waḥdat al-wujūd*, see also Seyyed Hosein Nasr, *Three Muslim Sages: Avicenna- Suhrawardî-Ibn ‘Arabî*, (New York: Caravan Books, 1976): 104-108.

³³⁶Şeyh Murād stressed this formulation in many of his letters. For some examples see *Mektûbât*, no. 1838, 3b-4a, 6a-b, 9a-b, 9b-10a, 10b-11b, 12a-b, 16a-b, 17b-18b, 19b-20a, 20b-22a, 24a-b, 25a-b, 25b-26a, 33a; and *Mektûbât* no. 1780, fol. 78b-79b, 101a-b, 102a-b, 115a-b, 117a-119a.

he states that the order or path (*ṭarīq*, *maslak*) is of *istihlāk* as in the formulation of “wa huwa ṭarīqi dawām al-^cubūdiyyati ^calā ṭarīq al-istihlāk”³³⁷ and “wa dhālika maslak dawām al-^cubūdiyyati ^calā ṭarīq al-istihlāk.” As can be extracted from the formulation, the continuous worship is a must-have for a Sufi during the process. Yet, as explained by Şeyh Murād, in almost all letters in which he discusses *istihlāk*, servanthood of the worshipper necessitates constant presence with God and complete obedience to the Prophet Muhammad (*dawām al-ḥudūr bi-Hi subḥānahū wa kamāl al-ittibā^c li-Ḥabībihī al-karīm*). How can a believer maintain presence with God and obey the Prophet? To this question, he emphasizes inseparable binaries (*mutalāzimān*). Thus, it comes out that one can obey and be in the presence of God and Prophet externally and internally (*zāhīran wa bāṭinan*) by believing in God and surrendering to Him (*imānan wa islāman*), loving and practicing good (*ḥubban wa ^camalan*), heartily and bodily (*qalban wa qāliban*), and devoutly and by renouncing the world (*ikhlēṣan wa tabattulan*).³³⁸ What is the outcome of continuous worship on the path of *istihlāk*? For Şeyh Murād, the greatest reward at the end of the process is not a union with God (*waḥdat*) but existence of a consistent (*qā²im*) connection or bond (*nisbat*) between God and worshipper, and Omnipotency (*Rubūbiyyat*) and servitude (*^cubūdiyyat*).³³⁹ This explanation is very crucial, for it underlines the eternal and everlasting hierarchy between God and servant, and dissimilarity between the eternal Creator and the mortal created. Therefore, and perhaps upon the questions and requests of disciples who wanted more details, he needed to further emphasize the importance of the matter. In his letter to the chief physician, Ömer Efendi, for instance, he states that the body and all its parts are blessed by God’s blessings; before God, the worshipper is in a state of non-existence as in the original; God, on the other hand, is Everlasting and in Him the worshipper is annihilated.³⁴⁰ In his letter to Ishak Efendi, who served as şeyhülislam from October 1733 to his death on 31 October 1734, Şeyh Murād clarifies that “*istihlāk* is a necessary bond and adoration only comes with it; the worshipper is forever a worshipper in all circumstances, modes, time, and space; God, on the contrary, is Ever-Living, All-Powerful, Omniscient, All-Hearing, All-Seeing, and All-Encompassing.”³⁴¹

³³⁷See *Mektübāt*, no. 1838, fol. 12a-b, 16a-b, 17b-18b, 33a.

³³⁸See particularly *Mektübāt*, no. 1838, fol. 6a-b, and 6b, the letter sent to Hâdizâde Mehmed Efendi of Bursa.

³³⁹See for instance the following explanation in his letter written for Mirzâ Mustafâ Efendi (d. 1722), who served as şeyhülislam from December 1714 to June 1715: “*dawām al-^cubūdiyyat ^calā ṭarīq al-istihlāk bi-madmūnihā wa huwa al-maqsūd bi-zuhūr al-nisbat bayn al-^cubūdiyyat wa al-Rubūbiyyat*” *Mektübāt*, no. 1838, fol. 10a-b. See also *ibid*, fol. 6a-b, 10b-11b, 12a-b, and 20b-22a.

³⁴⁰*Mektübāt*, no. 1838, fol. 3b-4a. “*fa inna al-wujūd wa tawābi^cihi kullihā fā²iḍun min fayḍihī subḥānahū bada²an wa baqā²an fa-laysa li²l-^cabd illā aṣlihi wa huwa al-^cadam wa innamā Huwa qā²imun bihi mus-tahlīkun fīhi.*”

³⁴¹*Mektübāt*, no. 1838, fol. 16a-b. “*fa al-istihlāk qayḍun lāzimun lā yata²tī al-^cubūdiyyat illā bihi fa al-^cabd*

Şeyh Murâd's emphasis on the sharp contrast between God and all His creation in terms of the constant state of Omnipotency and servitude, and eternalness and mortality, is a deviation from both the *waḥdat al-wujūd*ist doctrine that advocates the unity of beings, and the *waḥdat al-shuhūd*ist doctrine that justifies the transient unity of images. By emphasizing constancy in the state of God as God, and the worshipper as worshipper, describing *istihlāk* as a necessary bond between them, and underscoring "annihilation through continuous worship," he directs our attention to a third way, the path of servitude (*ʿubūdiyyat*), which has absolute legitimacy in sharia and *sunna*. Nevertheless, it must be expressed that this view, too, was not an innovation by Şeyh Murâd in the history of the Naqshbandiyya. Long before him, al-Simnânî (1261-1336) proposed *ʿabdiyyat* as "the highest level for a good perception of existence," and under his influence, Şeyh Ahmad al-Sirhindî upheld the same opinion towards the end of his life. In this theory, one either perceives of God and the world separately or sees the world but not God.³⁴² In other words, unity of being is impossible between God and His creation, and one can perceive God's creation through the universe He has created but can never perceive Him. Then, we can readily assert that when proposing a third way, rather than making a novelty, Şeyh Murâd was under the influence of Ahmad al-Sirhindî, the father of his own *şeyh*, Muhammad Ma'sûm, and the second master in his Sufi lineage. His only novelty was conceptual, to replace *ʿabdiyyat* with *ʿubūdiyyat*.

As I mentioned above, when highlighting *istihlāk*, Şeyh Murâd did not introduce a new concept to Sufi vocabulary, but rather substituted a rarely used term for *fanā*, one of the most common concepts in Sufic terminology. Apart from Sufism, *istihlāk* has developed as a term in Islamic jurisprudence (*fiqh*) as well as in commercial and business law of contemporary Muslim states. In *fiqh*, it denotes the disappearance or perishment of a small amount of forbidden matter (whether food or drink) in a large amount of clean and ḥalāl matter to the extent that it is no longer forbidden.³⁴³ In contemporary commercial and business law, however, it means consumption.³⁴⁴ When it comes to the emergence of *istihlāk* as a concept in Sufi terminology, my research demonstrates that Hakîm Tirmidhî (d. 932) was the first Sufi scholar to

kullahu ʿabdun wa fi kulli ḥāl wa ṭawr wa zamān wa makān ʿabdun wa al-Mawlā jalla jalāluhū Ḥayyun Qādirun ʿAlīmun Samīʿun Baṣīrun Muḥīṭun"

³⁴²Necdet Tosun, *İmâm-ı Rabbânî Ahmed Sirhindî*, 108.

³⁴³Yunus Naci Cıvız, "İslam Hukukunda İstihlāk ve Hükümleri," *Yalova Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 5 (2015): 225-248; Murat Şimşek, "Helal Gıda Araştırmalarında Günümüz Fıkıh Promlemi Olarak İstihâl ve İstihlāk," *Helal ve Etik Araştırmalar Dergisi / Journal of Halal and Ethical Research* 1 (2019): 1-17; Mohammad Hashim Kamali, "Perishment, Extreme Dilution," in *Shariah and the Halal Industry*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021): 97-102.

³⁴⁴Kemal Serkan Keskin, "Katma Değer Vergisi ile İstihsal (üretim) ve İstihlak (tüketim) Vergileri Arasındaki Farklar, Her İki Vergi Rejiminin Uygulanmasına Yönelik Avantaj ve Dezavantajlar," *Vergi Raporu Dergisi* 219 (2017): 9-36.

conceptualize the term. In his *Kayfiyyat al-Sulūk ilā Rabb al-‘Ālamīn*, the text that he devised to answer the questions of his anonymous friend, who himself was a Sufi master, he describes *istihlāk* as a spiritual station below *fanā*. Therefore, he continues “the masters among us are scornful of this [i.e. *istihlāk*], because it is a waste of time, and loss of [true] rank, and associates the world with that which is unsuitable to it.”³⁴⁵ In one of the earliest sources written on Sufis and Sufi concepts in the tenth century, Muhammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Kalābādihī (d. 990) explains it under the concept of *maḥabba* (love). Quoting from a certain Abū Abd al-Allah al-Nabāḥī, he says that *istihlāk* is “the annihilation of man in God the Creator” inasmuch that “there is no earthly pleasure [*ḥazz*] left in him and no trace of his affection remains.”³⁴⁶ Ibn Arabī is another Sufi scholar who kept *istihlāk* in use as a Sufic concept in his composition, which has come to be known as *Risālat al-Anwār*. However, what he did was not a novel contribution, but rather a word-for-word plagiarism from Hakīm Tirmidhī’s abovementioned text.³⁴⁷ Thinking together, Şeyh Murād’s understanding of *istihlāk* with that of the earlier Sufi scholars mentioned here, one can easily notice that he tried to transform the spiritual position of the concept by raising it to the level of *fanā*, attributing it connotations of the well-established concept of Sufism. Unlike Hakīm al-Tirmidhī, Ibn Arabī, and Abd al-Karīm al-Jīlī who downplayed *istihlāk* in the face of *fanā*, Şeyh Murād attributed great importance to it, making it the center of his teachings through its consistent and resolute use in his letters, savant conversations and scholarly works. It was through this manner that he was able to establish himself as the founder of a new branch within the Naqshbandi order.

3.5.1 The Reception of Şeyh Murād and His *Istihlāk*

If Şeyh Murād attempted to form a Muradi branch, how was the reception of his teachings in Naqshbandi circles? Were there Sufi acclaims for him and his teachings?

³⁴⁵ al-Hakīm al-Tirmidhī, *Kayfiyyat al-Sulūk ilā Rabb al-‘Ālamīn*, ed. ‘Āşim Ibrāhīm al-Kayyālī, (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 2007): 11-12. For the text, see *ibid*, 11-22. For the translation I mainly depend on Rabbia Terri Haris who mistakenly attributes the text to Ibn Arabi. See Ibn Arabi, *Journey to the Lord of Power: A Sufi Manual on Retreat*, translated by Rabbia Terri Haris, (Rochester: Inner Traditions International, 1981): 28. Entitled *Risālat al-Anwār* in the catalogues of the manuscript libraries of Istanbul, this text is attributed to Ibn al-Arabī rather than Hakīm Timirdhī.

³⁴⁶ Abū Bakr Muhammad b. Ishāq al-Bukhārī al-Kalābādihī, *Kitāb al-Ta‘arruf li-Madhhab Ahl al-Taşawwuf*, ed. Arthur John Arberry, (Qahira: Maktabat al-Khānji): 79. On al-Kalābādihī, see A. J. Arberry, “Kelābāzī,” *IA*, vol. VI, 537-538; Paul Nwyia, “al-Kalābādihī,” *EI2*, vol. IV, 467; Süleyman Uludağ, “Kelābāzī, Muhammed b. İbrāhīm,” *TDVIA*, vol. 25, 192-193.

³⁴⁷ For Ibn Arabī’s text and Abd al-Karīm al-Jīlī’s (1365-1408) commentary on it, see ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Jīlī, *al-Asfār ‘an Risālat al-Anwār fīmā Yatajallā li-Ahl al-Dhikr min al-Anwār*, ed. ‘Āşim Ibrāhīm al-Kayyālī. For the text, see Ibn Arabi, *Journey to the Lord of Power*. The late Muzaffer Ozak (1916-1985), the *post-nishān* of the central lodge of the Khalwati-Jerrāhī order from 1966 to his death, and Tosun Bayrak (1926-2018) his deputy in the US, wrote separate introductions for this publication.

The written material that survives particularly from the 18th-century Naqshbandis allows us to answer these questions in the affirmative. As discussed in the previous sections of the current chapter, the *ante-mortem* and posthumous circulation of his letters, the ten copies of his *Mektübât*, most of which were composed following his death in the 18th century, and the existence in the 18th-century Damascus, Bursa and Konya of Muradi Naqshbandis are clear indications to a favorable reception of Şeyh Murâd and his teachings. To this, we should add the composition of twenty-one copies of *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt al-Qur^ʿān*, his Qurʿanic dictionary written in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish.³⁴⁸ My research on the copies of this text demonstrates that except for a single copy duplicated in the 19th century,³⁴⁹ the rest were products of the 18th century. In fact, the number of copies with a record of completion dated to the 18th century is thirteen, but considering that most of them were kept in libraries founded by high-ranking officials in the 18th century, I confidently conclude that all of the copies were brought about in the same century.³⁵⁰ Şeyh Murâd and his assistants succeeded in completing *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt* on 14 Şafar 1131/6 January 1719.³⁵¹ It seems likely that over a period of forty years from the date to 1172/1758-59, at least twelve copies of *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt* were brought into being for not only modest Naqshbandi circles, but also high-ranking officials and scholar-bureaucrats including Hekimoğlu Alî Pasha, Hacı Beşîr Ağa, Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi, Veliyyüddîn Efendi and Çelebizâde Abdurrahîm. It is noteworthy that whereas two of the copies were prepared for Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed around 1140/1728, at least three copies were reproduced in and around 1169/1755-56, and a copy was duplicated in 1172/1758-59 for Veliyyüddîn Efendi, who owned a second copy that passed to the ownership of Mehmed Râgıb Pasha (d. 1763).³⁵²

³⁴⁸On the colophons of the manuscripts, see the 50th footnote in Numan Çakır. Çakır has located twenty copies of Şeyh Murâd’s dictionary, he nevertheless states that there are seventeen copies of it in the manuscript libraries. See Numan Çakır, “Murad Buhârî’nin Kur’ân Sözlüğünün Türkçe Bölümlerinin Özgünlüğü Meselesi,” 714. The twenty-first copy which I have located in Nuruosmaniye no. 481 is a deficient but illuminated copy of thirty folios. The distinctive *kelîme-i tevhîd* on fol. 1a of the manuscript indicates that it has been transferred from the chief black eunuch Hacı Beşîr Agha’s (d. 1746) manuscript collection.

³⁴⁹See Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Pertevniyal no. 91. This copy was duplicated in Mecca in 1273/1856-57.

³⁵⁰From three copies kept in the manuscript collections of al-Azhar University of Cairo, Maktabat al-Haram of Mecca, and Chester Beatty Library of Dublin, I have not been able to uncover the date of the copy preserved in Mecca. We are said that the copy in al-Azhar Library is dated 1169/1755-56. See Mushtaq Ahmad Wani, “Development of Islamic Sciences in Kashmir,” Unpublished PhD Diss. (Aligarh Muslim University 1999): 45. The copy catalogued in Chester Beatty, no. 5078 is said to be authored by a certain Ibrâhîm al-Brusawî in the 18th century. See Arthur J. Arberry, *The Chester Beatty Librar: A Handlist of the Arabic Manuscripts*, vol. VII, (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co., Ltd., 1964): 26. There is no doubt that he was the copyist Karababazâde Ibrâhîm (d. 1722) rather than the author of the text. See Numan Çakır, *ibid*, 715.

³⁵¹Çakır, *ibid*, 715. For the autograph copy see Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Murad Buhari, no. 25. The completion record of the composition can be seen in Nuruosmaniye, no. 480, fol. 940b; and Fatih, no. 653, fol. 378b.

³⁵²For the manuscripts of Dâmâdzâde Ahmed, see Fatih, no. 652, 653. For the copies from 1169 see Nuruosmaniye, no. 479; Hamidiye 65, and al-Azhar, no. 32933. For the copy from 1172, see Veliyyüddin, no.

The great demand for Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt in the middle of the 18th century can be explained in the context of a substantial increase in the number of the Naqshbandi *tekkes* during 1740s and 50s. As I have shown in the first chapter, at least six *tekkes* were established by grandees such as Şeyhülislam Mustafâ, La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî, Yekçeşm Ahmed Murtazâ, Abdullâh Pasha and the grand vizier, Bâhir Mustafâ Pasha, over a period stretching from 1742 to 1753. It is clear, then, that the visible rise of the Naqshbandi order in the mid-18th century can best be observed in the demand for Şeyh Murâd’s Qur’anic dictionary and the increase in the number of the lodges.

The favorable reception of Şeyh Murâd and his teachings can also be viewed through the interest in his pamphlets. Growing literature has already demonstrated that he composed at least four tracts on the teachings and rituals of the Naqshbandi order. The tracts in question were as follows: *Silsilat al-Zahab*, *Risāla fî Talqîn-i İsm-i Zât ‘alâ Tariqat-i Naqshbandiyya*, *Risāla fî al-Ta‘rîf al-Rûh* and *Risāla fî Sulûk al-Naqshbandiyya*.³⁵³ To these, we should add a fifth tract, *Risāla al-Mansûbat*, a previously unrecognized composition copied by Şeyh Murâd’s son and deputy Muhammad Bahâ al-Dîn.³⁵⁴ Of these, the first and second works became more popular and were included in many manuscript collections. All but *Risāla fî Talqîn-i İsm-i Zât* were penned in Arabic. *Silsilat al-Zahab*, on the other hand, was translated into Turkish as part of two commentaries in the 18th and 19th centuries. The Turkish text of *Risāla fî Talqîn-i İsm-i Zât* and commentaries on *Silsilat al-Zahab* are crucial, because, as in the case of his letters and Qur’anic dictionary, they enable us to understand better Şeyh Murâd’s reception by Ottoman learned. Furthermore, it was because of them that Ottoman Sufi circles became more familiar to Şeyh Murâd’s conceptualization of *istihlāk* and found the opportunity to reflect on it. In one of earliest copies of *Risāla fî Talqîn-i İsm-i Zât* dated Shawwāl 1124/November 1712, *istihlāk* was interpreted as an equivalent to *fanā*, as disposition of “staying in despicableness of non-existence to know the blessings of existence in all its aspects.”³⁵⁵ When it comes to *Silsilat al-Zahab*, La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî’s translation of and commentary appears as one of the first steps taken by an Ottoman to understand the şeyh and his concepts and formulations. In his commentary entitled *Risāla*

449. For the copy that Râgıb Pasha received from Veliyyüddîn’s collection, see Ragıb Paşa, no. 102.

³⁵³See Halil İbrahim Şimşek, 18. *Yüzyıl Osmanlı Toplumunda Nakşibendî-Müceddidilik*, 102-109, idem, “Murad Buhârî,” 186; Ünal and Yılmaz, “Muhammed Murâd-ı Buhârî ve ‘Risâle-i Nakşibendiyye’ Adlı Eseri,” 1543-1545; Hatice Taş, “Murâd Buhârî’nin Hayatı Eserleri ve Tasavvufî Görüşleri,” 15-19; Ali Çoban, “Telif ve Teklif: XVIII. Yüzyıl Osmanlı’sında Nakşibendîlik Risaleleri,” *TALİD* 16/31-32 (2018): 141-145; Numan Çakır, “Murad Buhârî’nin Kur’ân Sözlüğünün Türkçe Bölümlerinin Özgünlüğü Meselesi,” 712-713.

³⁵⁴See Veliyyüddin Efendi, no. 1810, fol. 153b-155b; Süleymaniye Library, Darülmünevi, no. 273, fol. 10b-13a.

³⁵⁵“yokluk alçaklığında durup varlık ni‘metini tevâbi‘i ile tanıyup” Veliyyüddin Efendi, no. 3191, fol. 141b.

al-Murādiyya fī Ṭarīqat al-Naqshbandiyya, when translating *istihlāk* as a method of obtaining the most certain knowledge of God through annihilation in Him (*ḥaqq al-yaqīn*), La‘lîzâde leaves the term in its place and reinforces its meaning by adding *fanā* to his translation as follows: “öyle ḥaḳḳa’l-yaḳīn ki istihlāk ve fenā ṭarīḳiyle olan devām-ı ‘ubūdiyyet sebebiyle muḥaḳḳaḳ ve sābit olmuşdur.”³⁵⁶ *Tuḥfat al-Aḥbāb fī al-Sulūk ilā Ṭarīq al-Aḥbāb*, the Arabic commentary written by Kösec Ahmed al-Trabzonî on *Silsilat al-Zahab* in 1174/1760-61, is another text in which the path of *istihlāk* is rethought. According to Şeyh Kösec Ahmed, *istihlāk* was “the complete annihilation of the worshipper in his submission to God to the extent that no trace of his egotism remains.”³⁵⁷ More than a century after the emergence of La‘lîzâde’s Turkish commentary, Mehmed Rüstem Râşid (d. 1863), a Sivas-based Naqshbandi-Khalidî şeyh, the deputy of Khâlîd al-Baghdâdî, undertook the translation of *Silsilat al-Zahab*, completed it around 1272/1855-56, and published his work on 15 Muḥarram 1274/5 September 1857 in Istanbul. On a marginal note in his composition, he likens the state of an annihilated dervish to a “corpse in complete surrender.”³⁵⁸

La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî, Kösec Ahmed Trabzonî, and Mehmed Rüstem Râşid had authorization in the Naqshbandi order. Their scholarly works mentioned above facilitated the spread of Şeyh Murâd’s teachings and reformulated concepts including *istihlāk*. Şeyh Murâd’s scholarly and spiritual influence was not limited to scholars in question and there were others who seemed to adopt Şeyh Murâd’s conceptual novelties in their works. The first example in this regard is Mustafâ Râsim Efendi, a Naqshbandi lexicographer and proto-encyclopedist who penned the first comprehensive dictionary on the concepts of Sufism in the Ottoman Empire. In his *Iştilâḥât-i İnsân-i Kâmil*, the dictionary that he was able to complete in forty-four years from 1780 to 1824, he wrote at least three entries through block quotations from Şeyh Murâd. However, except the entry on egotism (*enāniyyet*), he did not mention his source, Şeyh Murâd.³⁵⁹ Unspecified block quotations from Arabic to Turkish in the

³⁵⁶ *Risāla al-Murādiyya fī Ṭarīqat al-Naqshbandiyya*, Süleymaniye Küüphanesi, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, no. 2456/2, fol. 70b. I have not been able to locate the exact completion date of La‘lîzâde’s commentary.

³⁵⁷ Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Bağdatlı Vehbi, no. 2045/1, fol. 3b. Abdullâh Eyyûbî (d. 1836) translated Kösec Ahmed’s text from Arabic to Turkish in 1824. For the transcription of his translation see Bilal Tekin, “Abdullah Eyyûbî’nin Tuhfetü’l-Ahbâb Tercümesi,” Unpublished MA Thesis, (Marmara Üniversitesi 2019): 148-262.

³⁵⁸ “meyyit gibi kemâl-i teslîmiyetde olmağa derler” in Mehmed Rüstem Râşid, *Durr al-Muntakhab min Bahr al-Adab fī Tarjamat Silsilat al-Zahab*, (Istanbul: Tabḫâne-i ‘Amire-i Litoğrafya, 1274): 4. For Şeyh Mehmed Rüstem’s short biography see Mehmet Arslan, “Râşid, Râşid Mehmed Rüstem Efendi, Sivaslı,” <https://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/rasid-rasid-mehmed-rustem-efendi> (accessed 11.10.2023).

³⁵⁹ The entries in question were “enāniyyet”, “Ṭarīkat-ı Aliyye-i Nakşibendiyye Usûlü” and “Ṭarīkî’l-İnsibâğ”. See İhsan Kara, “Tasavvuf İstilâhları Literatürü ve Seyyid Mustafa Râsim Efendi’nin İstilâhât-ı İnsân-i Kâmil’i,” PhD Diss., vol.II, (Marmara Üniversitesi, 2003): 100, 424, and 424-427. For the published version of the dictionary see Seyyid Mustafa Rasim Efendi, *Tasavvuf Sözlüğü: İstilâhât-ı İnsân-i Kâmil*, (Istanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2008). On the lexicographer Seyyid Mustafâ Râsim, see İhsan Kara, *ibid*, vol. I, 101-102; and *idem*, “İbnü’l-Arabî’nin Tasavvuf İstilahlarına Etkisi ve Seyyid Mustafa Rasim Efendi’nin İstilâhât-ı

text proves that he read Şeyh Murâd's circulated letters and utilized them for his dictionary. *Iştîlâhât-i İnsân-i Kâmil* indicates further that Mehmed Sâdik Erzincânî (d. 1794), an Erzincan-based Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi *şeyh* who settled in the Ottoman capital in the last quarter of the 18th century, too, exploited Şeyh Murâd's formulations. Mustafâ Râsim's quotation from Şeyh Mehmed Sâdik demonstrates that the latter benefitted from Şeyh Murâd in his explanations on the benefits of *istihlāk*, which results in a connection between God and worshipper.³⁶⁰ Lastly, we should point to Şeyh Murâd's influence on another 19th-century Naqshbandi-Khalidi *şeyh*, Mustafâ İsmet Garîbullâh of Yanya (1808-1873). In at least one of his Arabic letters to his disciple Alî Sırrî Şem'ullâh, he maintained that remembrance of God could only be possible through the annihilation of the heart (*bi-tarîqi istihlāk al-qalb*).³⁶¹ Given these examples, we can confidently claim that Şeyh Murâd's reception in Sufi and scholarly circles was approvable, as his particular emphasis on *istihlāk* and his reformulation of already existing terms of Sufism engaged the attention of many subsequent Naqshbandi *şeyhs* and scholars of the 18th and 19th centuries to the extent that they either wrote commentaries on his works or exploited his words in their compositions.

3.5.2 Letters as A Means of Monitoring State Affairs, Controlling Statesmen, and Protecting Personal and Familial Interests

Months before the meeting of the war cabinet that declared war on the Tsardom of Russia on 20 November 1710, rumors regarding a possible military campaign against the Russians reached Şeyh Murâd's ears in the summer of 1710 in Karahisar, where he took a breather on his way from Konya to Bursa but could not depart due to the plague hitting adjacent areas. Therefore, in the second letter he wrote from Karahisar to Dâmâdzâde Ahmed, he asked him to be informed in detail about the truth of the matter, the would-be role of the imperial navy stationed in the Mediterranean Sea and its commanding admiral, the grand admiral.³⁶² Does this passage

İnsân-ı Kâmil'i Örneği," *Tasavvuf: İlmî ve Akademik Araştırma Dergisi* (İbnü'l-Arabî Özel Sayısı-2) 23 (2009): 592-593.

³⁶⁰See "Tasavvuf İstihlâhları Literatürü ve Seyyid Mustafa Râsim Efendi'nin İstihlâhât-ı İnsân-ı Kâmil'i," vol. II, 671. The quoted passage is as follows: "Alâ tarîki'l-istihlāk devâm-ı ubûdiyyetin faydası ancak devâm-ı huzûr ve kemâl-i ittibâ' zımında bulunur. Ve ol fayda kurb-i Hakk'ı ve cemî' maârifî câmi' olan rubûbiyyet ile ubûdiyyet beyninde vâki' olan nisbetin zuhûrudur."

³⁶¹Quoted in Mahmud Ustaosmanoğlu, *Sohbetler*, vol. 1, (İstanbul: Ahıska Yayınevi, 2012): 9-10. Şeyh Mahmud Ustaosmanoğlu, was an expert on Şeyh Mustafâ İsmet Garîbullâh. He transcribed, edited and published Şeyh Mustafâ's *Risâle-i Kudsiyye*. See Şeyh Mustafa İsmet Garîbullâh, *Risâle-i Kudsiyye*, vol. 1-2, ed. Mahmud Ustaosmanoğlu, (İstanbul: Ahıska Yayınevi, 2021).

³⁶²*Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 11b. "wa haysu shâ'at akhbâr al-safar ilâ cabhat al-Rûs ... an haqîqat amrihi lam na'lam kamâ yanbağî wa hal wachi Donanmati Baħr al-Abyađ ilâ tilka al-cabhat wa kayfa amri amîruhâ

attest that Şeyh Murâd wanted to intervene directly in state affairs or that he wanted to monitor domestic and foreign affairs distantly? The second option seems more realistic to me. It is no longer a mystery that the great majority of Şeyh Murâd's collected letters were written for the upper echelons Ottoman state administration including grand viziers, viziers, grand muftis, judges and madrasa professors. Through constant communication with grandees and scholar-bureaucrats, Şeyh Murâd was able to spread his teaching and propagate his order among them. This, as discussed above, was the primary function of the letters. The second function of the letters was related to more mundane and concrete purposes. I claim that by exchanging letters with senior officials, Şeyh Murâd aimed to keep an eye on his disciples enjoying high ranks, to follow state affairs remotely, and to protect and maintain his own benefits as well as of his disciples, family and lodges in Damascus and Istanbul. However, I must underline this significant point: He did not aim to form in the state organization a Naqshbandi clique under his direct control, nor he attempted to interfere in the state affairs. On the contrary, he was aware of his limits and seemed to take the utmost care not to become embroiled in factional rivalries and interpersonal conflicts.

There is no doubt that Şeyh Murâd enjoyed contacting and influencing officials of the empire, but we have clues that he tried his best to avoid being the initiator of a master-disciple relationship with them. In other words, as a tutor he expected his prospective novices to commence the process of Sufi education by attending in his savant conversations or by consulting him through letters. This was pertinent to at least to his relationship with the members of the *ulema*. When, for instance, Dâmâdzâde Ahmed wanted to know whether he had written to a certain Velî, or asked the *şeyh* to write a letter for that person, who was most probably the future şeyhülislam Veliyyüddîn Efendi (d. 1768), he wrote the following passage in reply: "I have not written to him for a while, because I have already taught you that my letter is response to a letter, or a favor for a seeker. Since he did not write, I did not write. Even if there was need for advice, its influence depends on the desire. Since he appealed to you, I dispatch a letter to you that you transmit it to him."³⁶³ As is clearly understood from the passage, Şeyh Murâd expects a novice not only to start the communication, but also to eschew intermediaries during the communication. This was an essential condition, because the relationship between the *şeyh* and a beginner disciple is private, and the latter is expected to hide nothing from his master. When it comes to his contact with dignitaries who had already

fa-^casâ an-ta^fşulûna lanâ dhâlika kullahu". For more on the background of campaign see Akdes Nimet Kurat, *Prut Şeferi ve Barışı 1123 (1711)*, vol. I, (Ankara: TTK, 1951); see also Kemal Beydilli, "Prut Antlaşması," *TDVIA*, vol. 34, 359.

³⁶³ *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 22b.

proven themselves, we do not know accurately who the exact initiator of the process of spiritual journey was. What we know is that when there was an interruption of communication with officials, he would not hesitate to restore communication and become its second initiator. For instance, in the abovementioned letter to the vizier, Nu'mân Pasha, he stated that if he were able to revive the correspondence, it would pervade friendship and familiarity.³⁶⁴ In another example, towards the end of his letter to Hâdîzâde Mehmed Efendi, the secretary of Küçükçelebîzâde, İsmâ'îl Âsım Efendi, he explained the reason behind his correspondence: "What I aimed at by writing is to inquire about your soundness."³⁶⁵ These examples explicitly indicate that there was a rupture in communication between them and that Şeyh Murâd wanted to revive it.

Who were the correspondents of Şeyh Murâd? As shown above in Table 3.1, I have managed to detect at least forty-three of his addressees, some of whom have been identified in the previous studies referred to in the current chapter. In addition to the dignitaries recognized in the literature, it is the current study that expands our knowledge and awareness of grandees such as grand vizier Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha, future grand vizier, Hekîmoğlu Alî Pasha, vizier Silahdâr Süleymân Pasha, şeyhülislams Feyzullâh, Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Alî and Veliyyüddîn Efendi in the network of Şeyh Murâd. The dominance of *ulema* in this network is particularly remarkable. Considering only those who were able to climb to the rank of the grand mufti, we realize that he exchanged letters with at least nine figures. While four of them, Feyzullâh Efendi (d. 1703), Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Alî Efendi (d. 1712), Mirzâ Mustafâ Efendi (d. 1722) and Ebû İshak İsmâ'îl Efendi (d. 1725) became grand mufti during the lifetime of Şeyh Murâd, the rest, Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullâh (d. 1732), İshak Efendi (d. 1734), Dâmâdzâde Ahmed Efendi (d. 1741), Mehmed Sâlih Efendi (d. 1762) and Veliyyüddîn Efendi (d. 1768) were appointed to the post during the years after his death. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that, except the names listed in the Table 3.1, he had contact with many other senior officials and scholar-bureaucrats including grand muftis, qadis and madrasa professors, but for the moment we cannot identify them.

I have argued above that Şeyh Murâd paid particular attention to the continuity of letter exchange with his disciples, both ordinary and those enjoying authority in state administration. In many cases where letters were interrupted, he reminded his disciples that he waited a long time for their letters³⁶⁶, an implication that

³⁶⁴ *Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 13a-b.

³⁶⁵ *Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 6b.

³⁶⁶ For some examples, see *Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 9b-10a, 10a-b, 10b-11a, 24b, 24b-25a, 26b-27a, 32a-b,

they should write letters more often. In his letters to Mehmed Vehhâbî, Mirzâ Mustafâ, and Ilkhân al-A‘zâm, he needed to express his happiness for the arrival of long-awaited letters.³⁶⁷ Due to frequent loss of communication, he felt compelled in many letters to ask his disciples to continue writing letters for him by utilizing repeated formulations such as “do not cut me off from your news” (*lā tanqati‘c ‘annī akhbārikum* or *akhbārika*), “do not cut me off your pleasant news” (*lā tanqati‘c ‘annī akhbārikum al-sārrat*), “do not cut me off news of your soundness” (*lā tanqati‘c ‘annī akhbāri salāmatikum*).³⁶⁸ The addressees of the most of these letters are still unknown to us. Among the letters with a known recipient, on the other hand, we see figures such as the grand vizier, Şehîd Alî Pasha, chief physician, Ömer Efendi, to-be *şeyhülislam*, Mirzâ Mustafâ Efendi, Dâmâdzâde Ahmed Efendi, and the anonymous head of the descendants of the Prophet (*naqīb al-a‘zam*). What was the reason for Şeyh Murâd’s insistence on such a request? In terms of master-disciple relationship, the main reason behind his insistence was his desire for the permanence of the spiritual bond existing between him and his followers. Given that a significant number of his followers were senior statesmen of the empire, however, I assert that through continuous exchange of letters he intended to keep them under his influence and control, and to penetrate their feelings, so that he could pursue his interest and follow state affairs more closely.

3.5.2.1 Sharing the sorrows and joys

How, then, did he manage to control his distinguished followers over long distances? My research demonstrates that he implemented, among others, three significant methods to bolster his own confidence and thus maintain his influence over his followers. In this regard, he shared their pain and joy, mediated for them when they fell out of favor, and restricted himself with the Qur’anic commandment of “enjoin good and forbid evil” rather than interfering in state affairs. Butrus Abu-Manneh has noted that Şeyh Murâd’s letters were written down “[a]t a time of defeat and retreat of the Muslim state at the hands of ‘the infidels’ and growing anxiety and despair” and that “[h]is mission came at a time of socio-political transformation cou-

39b-40a; *Mektübât*, no. 1780, fol. 107b-108a, and 109a-b.

³⁶⁷See respectively, *Mektübât*, no. 1838, fol. 9b-10a, 10a-b, and 10b-11a.

³⁶⁸For some letters containing requests like these, see *Mektübât*, no. 1838, fol. 3b-4a, 5a, 7b, 9a, 10a-b, 20b; *Mektübât*, no. 1780, fol. 71b-72a, 85a-b, 86b, 87a-b, 91a-b, 94a-b, 100b-101a, 105a, 111b-112a, 112a-b, 117a-119a; and *Mektübât*, no. 1837, fol. 2b, 16b, 27b, 45b-46a.

pled with the brutal shock of severe military defeat at the hands of ‘the infidels.’³⁶⁹ These statements touch only one side of the truth. Şeyh Murâd’s fifty-odd years in the Ottoman domains witnessed not only defeats and retreats but also victories and reconquests. From the Battle of Vienna (1683) to the Battle of Zenta (1697), and from the Peace Treaty of Karlowitz (1699) to the Peace Treaty of Passarowitz (1718), Ottoman armies lost to and reconquered from the armies of the Holy League several cities, islands, and frontier towns and fortresses. For instance, Belgrade changed hands three times during this period. Ottomans lost the city in September 1688, retook it in November 1690, and lost it again in August 1717. Nish was captured by the forces of the Holy League in September 1689, but lost it to the Ottomans in September 1690. The Morean peninsula was seized by the Republic of Venice in the summer of 1686 and remained under the Venetian rule until its reconquest in the summer of 1715. The island of Chios fell in October 1694, but Ottoman rule was restored in February 1695.³⁷⁰ The importance for our subject of these and other exchanges in the rulership is that Şeyh Murâd’s high-ranking disciples were at the forefront during the military expeditions. Ottoman forces under the grand vizier, Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha, for instance, not only expelled the forces of the Holy League from the Balkans, but also reconquered cities such as Belgrade, Nish, and Sementire (Smederevo), and fortresses on the banks of Danube including Fethüislam (Kladovo), Vidin, and Hirsova (Harşova) during the summer campaign of 1690.³⁷¹ Defterdâr Kirli İsmâ’îl Pasha (d. 1698), another disciple, who, as discussed in the previous chapter, established the Buhârâ Tekkesi for the Central and South Asian Naqshbandis in 1692, is known for his successes not only as the head of the financial office, but also as a military commander under Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha in the western frontiers of the empire. Şehîd Alî Pasha, who served as grand vizier from late April 1713 to his death on 5 August 1716 was the mind behind the reconquest of the Peloponnesian peninsula in 1715. And the grand vizier, Nevşehirli Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, was the architect of the Peace Treaty of Passarowitz.

As the situation dictates, during a period of successive defeats and victories in battle, Şeyh Murâd sent letters to his disciples to either relieve or congratulate them. In a letter written for an anonymous statesman during an ongoing military campaign, he stated that they were waiting for the victory of the *ghazis* for a long

³⁶⁹ Abu-Manneh, “Sheikh Murâd al-Bukhârî and the Expansion of the Naqshbandî-Mujaddidî Order in Istanbul,” 18-19.

³⁷⁰ For more on the military campaigns carried out during the period in question, see İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. III/1, (Ankara: TTK, 1995): 434-595.

³⁷¹ Abdülkadir Özcan, “Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Mustafa Paşa,” 263-265.

time while praying for them to return victorious.³⁷² In the letter to İsmâ‘îl Efendi who, I believe, was none other than abovementioned Defterdâr Kirli İsmâ‘îl, after expressing warm wishes for him, he states that the troops has been struck by ulcer (*qarh*), the realm has overflowed, and “corruption has spread on land and sea as a result of what people’s hands have done,” Yet, immediately afterwards, he soothes him with another Qur’anic verse: “So do not slacken, do not grieve; if you have believed, you are indeed the most superior.”³⁷³ In another letter which was written right after hearing the defeat of the Ottoman troops, he sorrowfully said that “[our] tranquility has been broken with the breaking of the soldiers of Islam.”³⁷⁴ Upon hearing the news of victory, too, he put pen to paper. This time, however, his aim was to salute his victorious followers and pay them his compliments. Most probably after the campaign of Prut (1710-11) or Morea (1715), he sent a letter to Dâmâdzâde Ahmed to congratulate him and “all communities of Islam for this sacred victory.”³⁷⁵ In a letter written probably for a victorious vizier or grand vizier, he congratulates his adherent for his endeavor, resolution, faithfulness and for returning safely laden with booty.³⁷⁶ In another letter, again to an anonymous dignitary, the addressee is saluted for his triumphant return from the lesser jihad to the grater jihad.³⁷⁷

Yet, military triumph was not the only occasion for Şeyh Murâd to send greetings and good wishes to his disciples. Several examples that I culled from his collected letters show that he was keen on sharing his blessings with those struck by illnesses and greetings with recently married ones. As I mention above, he would send healing wishes to Mehmed Sâlih Efendi and his father, Yahyâ Efendi, upon hearing from Hekîmzâde Alî that the former was caught by *humma*. When a certain Mehmed Emîn fell ill, he wrote to his father to express his wishes for a speedy recovery.³⁷⁸ When Dâmâdzâde Ahmed informed him about the paralysis (*nâzila*) afflicting him,

³⁷² *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 112a-b.

³⁷³ For the letter see, *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 98a. For the first verse see *Qur’an*, al-Rûm:41; for the second verse see Âli ‘Imrân: 139.

³⁷⁴ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 108b-109a. “wa qad inkasarat al-khawâṭir bi-inkisâri ‘askar al-Islâm”

³⁷⁵ *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 19b. “wa ahnikum wa iyyânâ ma‘âshir al-Islâm bi-hâdhihi naṣr al-‘azîz” I have not come across with any detail in Dâmâdzâde Ahmed’s biography regarding his presence in a military campaign. Most probably he was in the retinue of a pasha at least in a military campaign.

³⁷⁶ *Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 15b. “wa ahnikum bi’l-‘awdi sâliman ghâniman bi’l-ghayrat wa al-sabât wa al-sadâd”

³⁷⁷ *Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 4b. “wa ahnikum bi’l-‘awdi mansûrîna min al-jihâd al-aṣghar ilâ al-jihâd al-akbar taqabbalallâhu Te‘alâ minkum jamî‘an”. It is maintained in the hadith literature that while combatting physically on the battlefield is the lesser jihad, fighting against the lower self is the greater jihad. On jihad see Emile Tyan, “Djihad,” *EI2*, vol. II, 538-540; and Ahmet Özel, “Cihad,” *TDVIA*, vol. 7, 527-531.

³⁷⁸ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 101b.

he began his response by praying for his health.³⁷⁹ In addition to these specific examples, he uttered his blessings for another sick disciple unknown to us.³⁸⁰ When it comes to his greetings for newlywed followers, I have found only two specimens where he wishes for the happiness in two worlds.³⁸¹ All of these congratulatory and consolatory addresses, get-well wishes and greetings for marriage should be seen primarily as humanitarian gestures and most basic humanitarian duties. On the other hand, however, it must be borne in mind that sharing the joy and pain of grandees could serve to influence them. In other words, Şeyh Murâd's courtesies also aided in consolidating his authority and developing a strong control mechanism over his high-ranking disciples.

3.5.2.2 Intercession for disgraced dignitaries

The second method that Şeyh Murâd adopted to maintain his control over the authorities was to lend them a hand when they lapsed from grace and to mediate for them for positions in state administration. Regarding the intercession for others, I have noticed a remarkable case going back to his years in Damascus where he interceded for a local janissary family to be given the commandery of a pilgrimage caravan. He writes in an undated letter carried by an anonymous janissary to one of his high-ranking disciples that the courier, like his ancestors, was member of the local janissary corps in Damascus and belonged to local tribes and clans. His intention was to make his father and uncle the commanders of a hajj caravan, but his own claim was to be affiliated with the Sublime Porte (*Bābiyya*).³⁸² Such an intervention on behalf of a local janissary family with strong tribal connections is particularly striking. It proves on the one hand Şeyh Murâd's growing interactions with and influence on local tribes and families. On the other, however, it betokens his desire to direct state affairs. Since the letter is undated, we do not exactly know the historical context in which it was written. But, as touched upon earlier in this chapter, when İsmail Pasha, the governor of Damascus and the commander-in-chief of the pilgrimage caravan, ruthlessly solved conflicts over the *sharifate* of Mecca in 1694 against the interests of Sharif Sa'd, Şeyh Murâd harshly condemned him and left Damascus for Aleppo, where he settled for a while. With reference

³⁷⁹ *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 16b.

³⁸⁰ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 72a-b.

³⁸¹ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 82a, and 105b.

³⁸² *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 120b-121a. "wa hâdhâ hâmil al-raqîmiyya min jund al-Shâm aban wa jaddan min ahl al-^çashâyir wa al-qabâyil wa qad yaqşidu bi-abihi wa ^çammihî umarâ al-^çhajj wa zu^çmihi an-yantasibu ilâ Bâbiyya"

to the incident, Mehmet Şakir Yılmaz has concluded that “[i]t seems that Murad Buhari attempted to influence Ottoman policy about amirate of hajj and sharifate of Mecca. If we are to believe Muhammed Halil Muradî, his great grandfather even managed to reach Sultan Ahmed II, who passed away on 6 February 1695 without reaching a decision about latest undesirable results of İsmail Pasha’s actions. Sultan Mustafa II replaced him and reversed the Ottoman policy towards Sharif Sad in the first days of his reign.”³⁸³ It was perhaps against this background that Şeyh Murâd recommended a local janissary family to be appointed as the commander of the hajj caravan. The conclusion seems reasonable, because it is an established fact that from the first quarter of the 17th century to the beginning of the 18th century, the majority of *amîr al-hajj* were chosen from among the janissary elders residing in Damascus.³⁸⁴ Nevertheless, since the name of the janissary and his family was unspecified, we do not know whether he was appointed to the intended office.

Şeyh Murâd had to have attached special importance to Damascus. Long years after his intervention for the post of the *amîr al-hajj*, he recommended to Dâmâdzâde Ahmed in 1714 the appointment of a certain Mollâ Hasan to the qadiate of Damascus.³⁸⁵ However, the list of the qadis of Damascus indisputably proves that Dâmâdzâde Ahmed failed to fulfill his master’s recommendation at least for Damascus, for Mollâ Hasan’s name is absent there.³⁸⁶ Given that Mirzâ Mustafâ Efendi and Alî Pasha, the then şeyhülislam and the grand vizier, were Şeyh Murâd’s disciples and correspondents, Dâmâdzâde Ahmed’s failure in this incident draws further attention. Nonetheless, perhaps due to ongoing conflicts between the crews of Dâmâdzâde Ahmed and Mirzâ Mustafâ,³⁸⁷ Şeyh Murâd’s offer for Damascus was dismissed.

In contrast to uncertainty in the first case and failure in the second, Şeyh Murâd successfully restored the dignity of at least two disciples who had fallen into disfavor and exiled to the islands of the Mediterranean. The first episode in this regard is the story of Bâkîzâde Abdülhâdî Efendi’s (d. 1143/1730-31) rescue from exile in Cyprus. Abdülhâdî Efendi belonged to an *ulema* family from Bursa. Abdülbâkî Efendi, his father, was a Sufi scholar who served as the Friday preacher in Hisar mosque in the

³⁸³Mehmet Ş. Yılmaz, “Sufi brotherhood beyond boundaries,” 3.

³⁸⁴Münir Atalar, “Emîr-i Hac,” *TDVIA*, vol. 11, 132.

³⁸⁵*Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 13b. “wa hâdhâ al-Mollâ Ḥasan yurîdu al-Shâm fa-layakun ‘alayhi ḥusni nazarikum”

³⁸⁶For the list covering the period from 1115/1703-04 to 1143/1730-31, see Şeyhî Mehmed Efendi, *Vekâyi’u’l-Fuzalâ: Şeyhî’nin Şakâik Zeyli (İnceleme-Tenkitli Metin-Dizin)*, vol. III, 2789-2790; and *ibid*, vol. IV, 3378-3379.

³⁸⁷See Mehmet İpşirli, “Mirza Mustafa Efendi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 30, 168.

city. Completing his education, Abdülhâdî was appointed as a madrasa professor in Muḥarram 1106/August-September 1694. However, in due course, he switched from madrasa professorship to *qaza* administration. We see him as a delegated judge in Tire in 1116/1704-05 and in Trablusşam (Tripoli) in 1119/1707-08. In Jumād al-Ākhir 1123/July-August 1711, however, he was appointed as the qadi of Kayseri. Şeyh Murâd's abovementioned letter, written to Dâmâdzâde Ahmed conveying Mollâ Hasan's request for Damascus, clarifies that Abdülhâdî was in Bursâ that year but already sent to exile to Cyprus when the letter was penned. In fact, neither the date of the letter was specified nor did Şeyh Murâd give a clue about the cause and place Abdülhâdî's exile. In light of an imperial order issued for the governor Mustafâ Pasha and the qadi of Bursa in Evâḥir-i Cā 1126/4-13 July 1714, we surely know that Abdülhâdî, the former qadi of Kayseri, was sent to exile to Cyprus on charges of being a public agitator (*şāhib-i cem'iyet*), aider of bandits (*mu'ad-i eşkıyā*), the source of disorder (*menba'ı fesād*), and of causing a revolution in the order (*ihtilāl-ı nizām aḥvāl ve rü'yyete bâ'is ve bādī olmağla*).³⁸⁸ Following Abdülhâdî's exile, Şeyh Murâd immediately wrote Dâmâdzâde the letter in question. There, he reported what follows about Abdülhâdî, his family and their assistance for him, and asked for the immediate aid of Dâmâdzâde: "My beloved! Hâdî Efendi has been exiled. It is of his neighborly kindness that ever since we landed here from your land, he, his father, his brother, and his sons have doted on and loved us. But now, not only he but all of them are in state of calamity that they importunately and disturbingly appeal us that cannot be described. And, it is from the *ṭarīqat* to help those in need whether it be minors or elders or women."³⁸⁹ The known career path of Abdülhâdî demonstrates that Şeyh Murâd's letter served the purpose in this specific case. Because, two and half years following the exile, we see him as the qadi of Manisa in Muḥarram 1129/December 1716. Afterwards, he would be appointed to the qadiate of Diyârbekir in Rabī' al-Awwal 1134/December 1721 and of Üsküdar in Jumād al-Ākhir 1139/January 1727.³⁹⁰

The second figure who received Şeyh Murâd's assistance during days of hardship in exile was La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî Efendi (1679-1746). Following the defeat of the Ottoman armies in the Battle of Petrovaradin against the Habsburg armies in August 1716, and the death of the grand vizier, Şehîd Alî Pasha on the battlefield, La'lîzâde

³⁸⁸BOA, *Mühimme Defteri* no. 122, fol. 57a, order no. 178.

³⁸⁹*Mektübât*, no. 1837, fol. 13b. In fact, this was not the first case that Abdülhâdî enjoyed Şeyh Murâd's favor in his career. Most probably during an interim period that he spent in Bursa, he asked Şeyh Murâd to mediate on his behalf for the teaching position in one of the imperial madrasas of Bursa. Şeyh Murâd interceded for him by conveying his request to a scholar-bureaucrat who was most probably Dâmâdzâde Ahmed. For the letter, see *Mektübât*, no. 1838, fol. 34b.

³⁹⁰For the short biography of Abdülhâdî Efendi, see Fındıklılı İsmet Efendi, *Şakaik-i Nu'maniye ve Zeyilleri: Tekmiletü's-Şakaik fi Hakk-ı Ehli'l-Hakaik*, 23-24.

was charged with leading astray the grand vizier by waiting for the propitious moment to launch attack on the enemy.³⁹¹ Therefore, he was stripped of all authority and sent into exile in Limnos probably towards the end of that year. We learn from La‘lîzâde that he had stayed on the island for eighteen months during which time he continued to communicate with Şeyh Murâd, who guided him through the epistles (*kerem ve himmetleriyle bi’l-mükâtebe ifâza ve istifâde vâki’ olurdu*). Additionally, he states that Şeyh Murâd mediated on his behalf for his release from the island and for his abode in Bursa.³⁹² Thanks to La‘lîzâde’s testimony about himself, this part of story is well illuminated. Şeyh Murâd’s neglected letters clarify further ambiguities in the story. A letter sent to Dâmâdzâde Ahmed Efendi, for instance, explicitly reveals that when attempting to release La‘lîzâde from the island, Şeyh Murâd acted not on his own will but on the will of Dâmâdzâde Ahmed, who dared not to be the intermediary to free his friend from captivity. Accordingly, what Şeyh Murâd did was nothing other than what he was recommended to do through a letter sent by Dâmâdzâde in that he wrote letters to the grand mufti and the chief physician asking their assistance in freeing La‘lîzâde.³⁹³ The chief physician, Ömer Efendi, who would hold the post from 1715 to 1724, and the grand mufti Ebû İshak İsmâ‘îl, who served as şeyhülislam from December 1716 to May 1718, were followers of Şeyh Murâd with whom they exchanged letters. Therefore, as the surviving letter written for Ömer Efendi shows, he drew for them a short but clear roadmap on what they should do: “I ask by the grace of God for your favor on La‘lîzâde in his release from the island and for his abode in Bursa or in another place on God’s extensive earth on the condition that he repents, out of [your] compassion for his *sharîfa* mother, [your] kindness for her honorable ancestor, and your good work before the dignitaries, in particular His Excellency *ķāymaqām*.”³⁹⁴ As this passage suggests, Şeyh Murâd emphasized, among others, two significant points. First, that La‘lîzâde must repent for his grave mistake: his interest in astrology that resulted in the misdirection of the slain grand vizier and poor command of the Ottoman armies. Second, that

³⁹¹Silâhdâr Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa, *Nusretnâme: İnceleme – Metin (1106-1133 / 1695-1721)*, prepared by Mehmet Topal, (Ankara: TÜBA, 2018): 1033 and 1044; Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, 870.

³⁹²“On sekiz ay Limni Kalesi’nde hûşçîn-i harmen-i eb ve dane iken Şeyh Hazretleri zâhîren ve batman bu bendelerine inâyet buyurup tarâf-ı devlete mahsûs şefâatnâme irsâl edip hakkımda hüsn-i şehâdet ve Limni Kalesi’nden istihlâs ve Bursa’da maiyet ve hizmetlerinde olmaya ricâ buyurdular.” See Büşra Çakmaktaş, “La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî’nin Mebde’ ve Meâd Adlı Eseri,” Unpublished MA Thesis, (Marmara Üniversitesi, 2010): 253. See also Nihat Azamat, “La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî,” *TDVIA*, vol. 27, 90-92. For one of the letters sent to La‘lîzâde see *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 53a-b.

³⁹³*Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 15b. “wa ata²nî minkum mu²nisatun dhakartum fihâ kitâbatun shafâ²at li²l-Muftî wa âkhir fi takhlîşi La‘lîzâde fa-katabtu li²l-Muftî wa Hekîmbaşî mâ tarawnuhu”

³⁹⁴*Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 85b. “wa arjû min fadlillâhi Ta‘âlâ husni nazarikum ‘alâ La‘lîzâde fî takhlîsihi min al-jazîrat ilâ arđillâhi al-wâsi‘at aw ilâ Burusa bi-sharđi tawbatihî ... tarahhûman ‘alâ wâlidat al-sharîfat ikrâman li-jaddihâ al-karîm bi-sa‘yikum al-jamîl ‘inda hazarâti wulât al-umarâ jazâhumullâhu Ta‘âlâ khayran siyyamâ ‘inda al-khayri hazrati al-Qâyim-maqâm al-jamîl” This letter was partly translated to Turkish by Mehmet Ünal. See *Seyyid Murâd-ı Buhârî Hazretleri ‘Kuddise Sîrruh’ Külliyyâtı-1*, 45.

the chief physician Ömer Efendi should request, in particular, the assistance of the *kāymaḳām*, Nevşehirli İbrâhîm Pasha, who would be appointed as the grand vizier a few months later. Why did Şeyh Murâd direct Ömer Efendi to İbrâhîm Pasha and no to someone else? It so happens that he was one of the *şeyh*'s most reliable and loyal followers. Most importantly, he had gradually eliminated his rivals in state administration and won the absolute confidence of Ahmed III who designated him as grand vizier and kept him in that position for more than twelve years. Because of these reasons, through the agency of the grand mufti and the chief physician, Şeyh Murâd entrusted the question of La'lîzâde's liberation from exile to İbrâhîm Pasha, who would free him during his first year in the grand vizierate. This is a clear indication of the unwavering alliance and concordance of Naqshbandi officials in this matter.

3.5.2.3 Being content with “enjoin good and forbid evil”

The third point that contributed to Şeyh Murâd's control over his high-ranking adherents was his self-awareness regarding his limits. Being conscious about his incapacity in the politics and fearing possible failure when intervening in factional and interpersonal struggles, he refrained from interfering in state affairs as much as possible. It is striking that he was so eager to develop strong links with dignitaries, yet so distant from state affairs. There were many justifications for his desire to remain in the background and stay out of the sight. Since the beginning of his stay in the Ottoman realm, he witnessed or heard about several brutal incidents, where many scholars and Sufi masters were either lost their lives or were uprooted from their localities and forced into exile. One of the most famous examples in this context is the banishment of Niyâzî-i Mısrî (1618-1694), a far-famed Khalwati *şeyh* exiled to the Mediterranean islands three times: first, from Edirne to Rhodes where he stayed for nine months from September 1674 to May 1675; second, from his hometown Bursa to Limnos, where he stayed for fifteen years from April 1677 to 1692; third, from Edirne in 1693 to Limnos, where he died the year after.³⁹⁵ Another Sufi and scholar subjected to exile in Limnos was Karabaş Alî, a Şa'bânî-Khalwati *şeyh* who stayed on the island from 1679 to 1683 with Niyâzî-i Mısrî.³⁹⁶ Atpazarî Osmân Efendi (1632-1691), a Celveti *şeyh* who developed close connections with palace circles, was exiled to Cyprus in 1690 by the order of Köprülü Fâzıl Mustafâ

³⁹⁵Derin Terzioğlu, “Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyâzî-i Mısrî (1618-94),”; Mustafa Aşkar, “Niyâzî-i Mısrî,” *TDVIA*, vol. 33, 166-169.

³⁹⁶Kerim Kara, “Karabaş Velî,” *TDVIA*, vol. 24, 369-371. For the tense relationship between Niyâzî-i Mısrî and Karabaş Alî in Linnî, see Derin Terzioğlu, “Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyâzî-i Mısrî (1618-94),” 167-170.

Pasha, the grand vizier and disciple of Şeyh Murâd, due to his harsh criticism of the wars against the Austrians. He died in exile in the year after.³⁹⁷ To these figures we should add another Khalwati *şeyh*, Mehmed Nasûhî Efendi (1648-1718), who was exiled to Kastamonu, where he stayed from 1714 to 1716.³⁹⁸ Even though we have no evidence as to direct communication between Şeyh Murâd, the said Khalwati and Celveti *şeyhs*, by taking into consideration their fame in the Sufi circles of the Ottoman capital, we can conclude that the *şeyh* was cognizant of their stories ended in exile.

From among Şeyh Murâd's contacts, however, at least three celebrated scholars and Sufis stand out for their disastrously ended careers. Among them, two figures, Vâni Mehmed Efendi (d. 1685) and Şeyhülislam Seyyid Feyzullâh Efendi (1639-1703) are particularly noteworthy. Despite their perennial influence on and cooperation with the sultans and grandees, following breakouts stemming from worsening internal and external conditions, the former was expelled from the imperial court in 1683 to stay in Bursa where he would pass away. The latter, who was not so fortunate, was slayed by the rebellious forces along with his son, Fethullâh Efendi, in Edirne. The third figure that can be counted in this context was La'î Mehmed Efendi (1640-1707), the father of La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî Efendi. He was born into and grew in the Bayrami-Melami milieu of Istanbul and became a successful scholar-bureaucrat. During his judgeship in Mecca from Muḥarram 1110/July 1698 to Muḥarram 1111/July 1699, he developed cordial relationship with Şeyh Murâd. In Dhî'l-ḥijja 1118/March 1707, he was exiled to Cyprus where he passed away in Jumâd al-Awwal 1119/August 1707.³⁹⁹ Mirzâ Mustafâ Efendi, one of Şeyh Murâd's disciples who held the office of grand mufti from the mid December 1714 to the late June 1715, was known for his passion for power politics, which resulted in his dismissal from the office and banishment from the capital four times. He was exiled to Midilli in February 1689, to Cyprus in May 1691, to Sinop in July 1699 and to Trabzon in June 1715.⁴⁰⁰ Contrary to abovementioned Sufis and scholars, he managed each time to redeem himself and return to the capital.

³⁹⁷Sakıb Yıldız, "Atpazarî Osman Fazlı," *TDVIA*, vol. 4, 83-85. Atpazarî Osmân Efendi's hatred and hostility for Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha can be seen in his wording recorded by İsmâ'îl Hakkî Bursevî (1653-1725), his adherent and deputy in the Celveti order. See İsmâ'îl Hakkî, "Kitâb-ı Silsile-i İsmâil Hakkî bi-Tarîk-i Celvetî" in *Celvetilik Metinleri*, edited and translated by Selami Şimşek, (İstanbul: Ketebe, 2021): 268.

³⁹⁸Kerim Kara, "Mehmed Nasûhî," *TDVIA*, vol. 28, 500-5002; Mustafa Tatcı, *Üsküdarlı Muhammed Nasûhî ve Divân'ı*, (İstanbul: Kaknüs, 2004): 26.

³⁹⁹On La'î Mehmed's relationship with Şeyh Murâd, see Nihat Azamat, "La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî," 90. On La'î Mehmed's biography, see Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekâyi'u'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 3, 2422-2425. We are said by Şeyhî that La'î Mehmed was dismissed from the judgeship of Edirne in Şafar 1103/October 1691. From this time to his judgeship in Mecca he was given the honorary rank (*pāye*) of Mecca in 1691, and that of Istanbul in Jumâd al-Awwal 1109/November 1697. It is possible that he had been in Mecca during this period.

⁴⁰⁰İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. IV/2, 462-464; Mehmet İpşirli, "Mirza Mustafa Efendi," *TDVIA*, vol. 30, 167-168.

Moreover, during his third residence in Istanbul, Şeyh Murâd himself became a victim of factional strife taking place between the grand vizier, Çorlulu Alî Pasha and the Melami coalition of Silahdâr Alî Agha, that is the future grand vizier Şehîd Alî Pasha, and the then şeyhülislam Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Alî Efendi (d. 1712). According to Râşid, the chronicler of the time, when realizing that Şeyh Murâd was highly honored and respected by the grandees, grand vizier Çorlulu Alî Pasha took offence for an unknown reason (*sebeb-i nâ-ma'lûm ile Sadra'zam Çorlulu Ali Paşa'ya vesîle-i iğbirâr olup*) and charged the grand admiral. İbrâhîm Pasha, to expel the şeyh from the capital.⁴⁰¹ Based on Râşid, without questioning the real reason, it has been suggested in the literature that the struggle took place between Çorlulu Alî Pasha and Şeyh Murâd.⁴⁰² A few other studies mention the formation of a possible coalition between Melamis and Naqshbandis during the period in question.⁴⁰³ In all probability, however, Şeyh Murâd was not partake in the power struggle between the grand vizier and the Melami faction. It is plausible that by sending the *şeyh* from Istanbul, Çorlulu intended to prevent the Melami faction from taking advantage of Şeyh Murâd's presence in the city, because both Silahdâr Alî Agha and Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Ali had developed close connections with the *şeyh*. Hence, Moralı Basmacızâde İbrâhîm Pasha, a reliable and loyal protégé of the grand vizier and the then grand admiral charged with the execution of the plan, disembarked Şeyh Murâd in Alaiye while Çorlulu was still holding the grand vizierate. Furthermore, as I mentioned above, Çorlulu did not restrict Şeyh Murâd from travelling nor did he prevent his disciples from contacting him. As such, Dâmâdzâde Ahmed and others were able to communicate with him during the journey, which started in late May 1709 and ended in late October 1710.

Due to bitter struggles in the upper echelons of the state that resulted in the expulsion and even execution of celebrated Sufis and scholars including Şeyh Murâd's acquaintances and followers, and in order to retain the life-term tax-farms that he had benefitted from for a long time, Şeyh Murâd had to be aware of the limits of his influence and authority. Moreover, receiving excessive attention in the capital could constitute grounds for prosecutions. Therefore, he had to exercise caution so as to not raise doubts of the dignitaries. As can be discerned from his following statements in a letter sent from Istanbul to Damascus, because of the influx of visitors, once, his uneasiness and apprehension reached a point that he felt obliged to

⁴⁰¹Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vol. II, 1177.

⁴⁰²Şimşek, 18. *Yüzyıl Osmanlı Toplumunda Nakşibendî-Müceddidîlik*, idem, "Murad Buhârî,"; Abu-Manneh, "Sheikh Murâd al-Bukhârî and the Expansion of the Naqshbandî-Mujaddidî Order in Istanbul,"

⁴⁰³Ekem Işın, "Melamîlik," *DBIA*, vol. 5, 384-385, idem, "Ali Efendi (Paşmakçızade)," *DBIA*, vol. 1, 190-191; Tülay Artan, "El Yazmaları Işığında Bir Çevre ve Çehre Eskizi," 25-26.

appease the government and asked for leniency and patience for a few days: “So far, we have suffered from an influx of visitors in Istanbul. Therefore, we had to request from the ministers of the state their patience for days to remove the stampede of the needy.”⁴⁰⁴ One indication of awareness regarding limited authority was to be content with recommendations and leave the final word to disciples enjoying senior ranks. Therefore, as can be seen in the abovementioned cases regarding exiles and appointments, Şeyh Murâd was not in a position to push his followers further when they failed to fulfill his requests.

Another indication is the avoidance of harsh criticism for the errors of the grandees when giving them advice in accordance with the commandment to “enjoin good and forbid evil.” For this reason alone, when warning against confidence in the science of stars the grand vizier, Şehîd Alî Pasha, known for his interest in science even on the battlefield, he adopted soft wording in his message emphasizing trust in God rather than signs of the stars: “Steadfastness in trust in God by severely rejecting astrology will lead to victory, because believers put their trust in God.”⁴⁰⁵ It seems likely that in his relationship, particularly with Şehîd Alî Pasha, Şeyh Murâd refrained from engaging in interpersonal and factional conflicts even in favor of his disciples due to his inability to lead his decisions. The most appropriate example in this sense is, perhaps, the catastrophic end of the former grand vizier, Silahdâr Süleymân Pasha, in Rhodes in 1715. Süleymân Pasha owed his grand vizirate to Şehîd Alî Pasha. He had been appointed as the grand vizier on 12 Shawwâl 1124/12 November 1712 and dismissed from the office on 6 April 1713 upon the recommendation of Alî Pasha, the *silâhdâr*.⁴⁰⁶ Following his short grand vizierate, he enjoyed another short-term in state administration, but this time as an admiral-in-chief from 13 April 1713 to 7 November 1713. Subsequently, he was respectively appointed as the guardian to the islands of Kos (İstanköy), Heraklion (Kandiye) and Chania (Hanya) in Crete and Rhodes. Yet, in Rhodes, where he was appointed in early Shawwâl 1126/10-20 October 1714, his official duty was turned into exile at first, and then he was executed upon a decree issued in the mid Shawwâl 1127/10-20 October 1715.⁴⁰⁷ Mehmed Râşid and Fındıklılı Silahdâr Mehmed Agha, the two chroniclers of the

⁴⁰⁴ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 105a. “wa nahnu ila’l-ân fî muzâhamat al-zuwwâr bi-İstanbul wa qad lazama an-asharnâ ilâ al-arkân bi’ş-şabr ‘annâ ayyâman li-raf’i izdihâmi ahl al-hâjât”

⁴⁰⁵ *Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 7b-8a. The addressee of the letter is specified only in the collection catalogued under Pertev Paşa, no. 246-M1, fol. 10a-b. “ashadd tankîran li’n-nujûm tasabbutan ‘alâ al-tawakkul al-jâlib li’n-naşr wa ‘alâ Allâh fa-layatawakkal al-mu’minûn”

⁴⁰⁶ Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vol. II, 871; Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. IV/1, 93, 97.

⁴⁰⁷ On his short biography see Mehmed Süreyyâ, *Sicill-i Osmânî*, vol. 5, 1542-1543, and Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. IV/2, 296-298. For the decree regarding his execution see BOA, *Mühimme Defteri*, no. 123, 58, entry no. 282. For the decree regarding his transfer from Chania to Rhodes see BOA, *Mühimme Defteri*, no. 122, p. 166, entry no. 496.

period, are silent about the reason behind the execution of Silâhdâr Süleymân Pasha. What the latter could say was that Şehîd Alî Pasha was the mastermind behind the dismissal of Köprülüzâde Nu'mân Pasha and execution of the grand viziers, Çorlulu Alî Pasha (d. 1711), Gürcî Yûsuf Pasha (d. 1713), Hoca İbrâhîm Pasha (d. 1713) and Silâhdâr Süleymân Pasha (d. 1715).⁴⁰⁸ Şeyh Murâd must have been aware of intrigues of his ruthless disciple. But, he had no power and spiritual authority to prevent him from executing his plans. Nor, as understood from the collected letters, attempted to hinder execution of the dismissed officials. Therefore, when his disciple, Silâhdâr Süleymân Pasha, was in exile in Rhodes, he did not dare to directly and openly communicate with him. Rather, what he would do was to send the letter by private courier for Süleymân Pasha to one of his high-ranking disciples, most likely Dâmâdzâde Ahmed Efendî, and request his assistance for shipping the courier to Rhodes. “If the transportation is not possible for the courier of the letter,” he would say “let your favor be for him.”⁴⁰⁹ Indeed, there are indications that Şeyh Murâd distrusted and cringed before Şehîd Alî Pasha. An intimidating incident which happened during his sojourn in Bursa is remarkable in this regard. In a letter written for an anonymous receiver, he wrote that “in the middle of the month of Sha^cbân, letters came to me from two dervishes not known to me saying that the grand vizier (*waliyyu^l-amr*) has taken an oath to do away with you and he is determined to do so. Beware and leave for Baghdad. If your friends direct you to Damascus, do not obey them.”⁴¹⁰ We are not informed about the threat the grand vizier mentioned in the letter. Yet, considering that Şehîd Alî Pasha was, perhaps, the only powerful, capable and longer-lasting grand vizier during Şeyh Murâd’s sojourn in Bursa in the second decade of the 18th century, I tend to think that it was he who intimidated the *şeyh*.

Before powerful, self-ordained, and capricious statesmen such as Şehîd Alî Pasha, Şeyh Murâd had nothing to do but remind them of good and evil, a significant Qur’anic bidding for the self-regulation of the Muslim community. As a divine commandment, “enjoin good and forbid evil” used nine times in the *Qur’an* to refer “the collective duty of the Muslim community to encourage righteous behavior and discourage immorality as recognized by reason and the Islamic moral and legal system.

⁴⁰⁸Silâhdâr Fındıklı Mehmed Ağa, *Nusretname*, 1054-1055.

⁴⁰⁹*Mektûbât*, Pertev Paşa, no. 246 M-1, fol. 109a. “wa uşîkum bi-îşâli raqîmat fa-aşallahu ilaykum bi-yadi hāmili hādhihi al-raqîmat ilā al-wazîr Süleymân Paşa bi-Rodos ... in-lam yumkin li-hamil al-raqîmat al-îşāl wa la-yakun ^calayhi ḥusni nazarikum”

⁴¹⁰*Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 85a-b. “wa qad ata^cnî kitâbât min darwîshayn fî awâşîti Sha^cbân lam aḥaqqaq ma^crifatihumâ yadhkurâni anna waliyyu^l-amr qad ḥalafa bi^lllâhi^l-^cazîm ^calâ annahû qad sa^câ fî qatlîka wa huwa muşîrrun ^calâ dhālîka fa-aḥdharû adhab ilâ Baġdād wa in akhtāra laka aḥbābîka ilā al-Shām fa-lā taṭu^cahum”. See also Abu-Manneh, “Sheikh Murâd al-Bukhārî and the Expansion of the Naqshbandî-Mujaddidî Order in Istanbul,” 14-15.

Aims to remove oppression from society and instead establish justice. Applied to moral, social, political, and economic facets of life. It is, ideally, the distinguishing trait of the Muslim nation.”⁴¹¹ In Ottoman historiography, the phrase has mostly been the subject of discussion as a source of legitimacy for the puritan movement of the Qadizadelis. Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, Necati Öztürk, Madeline Zilfi and Semiramis Çavuşoğlu have demonstrated how Qadizadelis instrumentalized the admonition to serve their religious and political ambitions.⁴¹² Devoting a chapter to this topic, Marc David Baer interpreted it as “the central tenets of the Kadizadeli piety” in the race for the conversion of non-Muslims and reconversion of Muslims into Islam.⁴¹³ Marlene Kurz has shown the centrality of the command in the understanding of Fazlîzâde Alî, who penned in 1740s a polemical work harshly criticizing the statesmen and *ulema*, attacked the entire Ottoman Muslim community, and condemned the changes and transformations he witnessed in social life and the public sphere.⁴¹⁴

Our attention has already been drawn to interactions between Naqshbandis and Qadizadelis, and the possible relations between Şeyh Murâd and Vâni Mehmed Efendi, acknowledged as the leading figure of third Qadizadeli wave in the Ottoman capital, and his pupil Şeyhülislam Seyyid Feyzullah Efendi, in the forefront.⁴¹⁵ What has been unknown as my findings show Şeyh Murâd had developed close connections with the successors of Üstüvânî Mehmed Efendi (1608-1661), the most prominent figure in the second wave of the Qadizadeli movement during the 1650s. After a series of verbal attempts against Sufis, especially the Khalwatis, embolden by their connections in the state echelons and janissary corps, Üstüvânî Mehmed and his followers decided to enclose all Sufi tekkes in Istanbul in 1656. However, with swift intervention of the grand vizier, Köprülü Mehmed Pasha (v. 1656-1661), the Qadizadeli faction was disbanded and their leaders, including Üstüvânî Mehmed, were expelled to Cyprus. Following a few months of exile on the island, he was

⁴¹¹“Amr bi al-Maruf wa’l-Nahy an al-Munkar,” in *The Oxford Dictionary of Islam*, ed. John L. Esposito, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003): 19-20. For an introduction on the origins, historical reception in different sects in Islam and importance of the motto for the Muslim community see Mustafa Çağrı, “Emîr bi’l-Ma’rûf Nehiy ani’l-Münker,” *TDVIA*, vol. 11, 138-141.

⁴¹²Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, “XVII. Yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Dinde Tasfiye (Püritanizm) Teşebbüslerine Bir Bakış: ‘Kadizâdeliler Hareketi’,” *Türk Kültürü Araştırmaları XVII-XXI/1-2*, (1979-1983): 208-225; Necati Öztürk, “Islamic Orthodoxy Among the Ottomans in the Seventeenth Century With Special Reference to the Qâdî-zâde Movement,” Unpublished PhD Diss., (University of Edinburgh, 1981); Madeline Zilfi, “The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 45/4 (1986): 251-269; idem, “The Kadizadeli Challenge,” in *The Politics of Piety*, (Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1988): 129-181; Semiramis Çavuşoğlu, “The Qadizadeli Movement: An Attempt of Şerîat-Minded Reform in the Ottoman Empire,” Unpublished PhD Diss, (Princeton University, 1990).

⁴¹³Marc David Baer, *Honored by the Glory of Islam: Conversion and Conquest in Ottoman Europe*, (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2008): 63-80.

⁴¹⁴Marlene Kurz, *Ways to Heaven, Gates to Hell: Fazlîzâde ‘Alî’s Struggle with the Diversity of Ottoman Islam*, (Berlin: EB-Verlang, 2011): 20, 34.

⁴¹⁵Dina le Gall, “Kadizadelis, Nakşbendis, and Intra-Sufi Diatribe in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul,” 1-28; Tülay Artan, “El Yazmaları Işığında Bir Çevre ve Çehre Eskizi,” 24-27.

allowed to leave the island to live his hometown, Damascus, where he would pass away.⁴¹⁶ The biographies of at least two Uṣṭuwānīs having been penned in Silk al-Durar proves that Üstüvânî family was one of the distinguished families of the city.⁴¹⁷ Learning from Üstüvânî Mehmed's failure in Istanbul, his heirs in Damascus must have recomposed themselves and renounced sharp interpretations on religious matters in public space. Perhaps, it was due to such a renunciation that a certain Muhammad Üstüvânî, who had to be grandson or great grandson of the celebrated Üstüvânî Mehmed, appeared as a serving disciple of Şeyh Murâd during his years in Anatolia and Istanbul.⁴¹⁸ Needless to say, Muhammad Üstüvânî's presence in the circles of Şeyh Murâd indicates also that his family's relationship with the *şeyh* goes back to the past.

How did Şeyh Murâd conduct the guidance of “enjoining good and forbidding evil” for senior officials? The content of some letters demonstrate that he transmitted the main message he wanted to give by putting it in the form of prayer and good wishes. For instance, when invoking “may Allah converge the frightened poor of Islam and the brotherhood through you” in his letter to Köprülüzâde Nu'mân Pasha,⁴¹⁹ he referred to the heartbreaking situation of the state and society that had to be recovered. In the letters written for grand viziers, he adopted specifically formulated prayers and good wishes to guide them. By presenting the prayer “I pray to God to revive by you this position (*maqām*), to guide you rightly in the situation He ordained, to elevate your favor towards the means of His help ... to elevate by you His word, to devastate and rout by you His evil-commanding (*ammārat*), accursed (*rajīm*), and debauched (*fajarat*) enemies, and to help by you to His soldiers in whom He is pleased and with Whom they are pleased”⁴²⁰ for a grand vizier unknown to us, he not only professes his confidence in him, but also shows him what he must do and the path he must follow. In another letter dispatched for an anonymous grand

⁴¹⁶For Üstüvânî's biography see Muammer Göçmen, “Üstüvânî Mehmed Efendi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 42, 396-397. For an insightful analysis particularly on the second wave of the movement, see Marinos Sariyannis, “The Kadızadeli Movement as a Social and Political Phenomenon: The Rise of a ‘Mercantile Ethic’,” in *Political Initiatives from the Bottom-Up in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. A. Anastasopoulos, (Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2012): 263-289.

⁴¹⁷For the biographic entries on Mustafâ Üstüvânî (d. 1713), the son of Üstüvânî Mehmed, and Yahyâ Üstüvânî (d. 1746), see Silk al-Durar, 200-201 and 229-231.

⁴¹⁸In at least two letters one of which was written for Şeyh Abdurrahîm al-Kâbilî and Muhammad Bahâ al-Dîn al-Murâdî, Şeyh Murâd's deputies in Damascus, Şeyh Murâd mentioned the names Muhammad al-Üstüvânî, al-Hâj Niyâz and Alî Çelebi among his serving attendants. See *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 105a, and 107b-108a.

⁴¹⁹*Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol.13a-b. “fa-^casâ an yasta³nis bi-kum al-ğurabâ al-mutawaḥḥishûn al-Islâm wa ukhuwwatihi”

⁴²⁰*Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 14b-15a. When writing “to guide rightly in the situation He ordained” and “in whom He is pleased and with Whom they are pleased” he reminds respectively Qur'anic verses al-Kahf:10 and al-Fajr:28.

vizier, he put into paper the following prayers and good wishes: “I entreat God to make you the eyes of ‘the strange Islam’ and Muslims, to have mercy through you on rulers and subjects (*al-rāʿī waʿl-raʿīyyat*), to open by you the paths of victory, to devastate by you the enemy, to crush by you oppression and oppressors.”⁴²¹ In another letter he wrote “I ask God for your salvation and happiness in the two worlds, and by you the salvation of the world, and particularly of the rulers, subjects and the elevation of His word.”⁴²²

As is understood from the cited prayers, the peace of the Muslim community and the soundness of nobles and subjects, and the suppression of the enemies of the Ottoman Empire equated with the enemies of God, and the eradication of tyranny and oppression are among themes emphasized by Şeyh Murâd. By mentioning the said goods and evils in his messages, he aimed to guide his disciples to the right path. Yet, as can be seen in what follows, it was only in one of the letters that he explained to the anonymous correspondent how he could manage the office he held and what he should do when running the state: “I pray to God ... to revive by you this position, an office of trusteeship and of protection for Islam and for the care of its fundamentals and for the supervision of its pillars that brings the victory and crushes the enemy. Indeed, all these come about by the fulfillment of gratitude to God for whom your nation rightly stands, by the enforcement of law, by giving advices, ... by the justice and benevolence, and by giving the office to the competent.”⁴²³ Şeyh Murâd penned such adhortatory letters not only for the viziers and grand viziers but also for scholar-bureaucrats who were burdened with administrative duties in the provinces. For instance, when Dâmâdzâde Ahmed Efendi was appointed qadi of Mecca in the beginning of the 18th century,⁴²⁴ he dispatched to him a letter containing the following special advice related to affairs of the Holy Lands: “I implore God to ease by you the rulers and subjects, to elevate by you His word, to devastate by you His enemy, to revive by you His religion, to magnify by you His stations of the great pilgrimage (*mashāʿir*), to restore by you His cities, to show mercy by you on His servants.”⁴²⁵ Thus, it turns out that the

⁴²¹ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol.92a-b. “The strange Islam” is a reference to a well-known hadith which is as follows: “Islam began as something strange and will go back to being strange, so glad tidings to the strangers.” <https://sunnah.com/ibnmajah:3986> (accessed 29.10.2023).

⁴²² *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 91b.

⁴²³ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 90b-91a. See also Abu-Manneh, “Sheikh Murâd al-Bukhârî and the Expansion of the Naqshbandî-Mujaddidî Order in Istanbul,” 19.

⁴²⁴ For the moment, we do not know the exact date of Dâmâdzâde’s appointment to Mecca, but we know that before appointing to the judgeship of Istanbul in 1706, he was the qadi of Mecca. See Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa, *Nusretnâme*, 844. This detail does not occur in Şeyhî’s account. According to him, Bekrizâde Ahmed Efendi, a Damascene scholar, was the qadi of Mecca from Muḥarram 1116 to Muḥarram 1117/6 May 1704-25 April 1705. See Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekâyi’u’l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 3, 2374-2376, 2783.

⁴²⁵ *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 21b. “wa ataḍarraʿ ilaʿllāhi Taʿālā an yarīḥa bikum al-rāʿī wa al-raʿīyyat wa yaʿlā

content of his prayers and good wishes might differ from one another depending on the rank of the recipients. Most importantly, in order not to offend high-ranking disciples and to keep them under control, they were penned in a soft style to guide them on the path of “enjoining good and forbidding evil”.

3.5.3 Protection for Personal and Familial Interests

For Şeyh Murâd, the personal and familial interests and the needs of the *tekkes* located particularly in Damascus were among leading motives for exchanging letters with some dignitaries. On this point, I have explained that his relationship with Dâmâdzâde Ahmed cannot be reduced to a *murshid-murid* communication, as it involved satisfaction of the interest through the provision of needed books and a tent for Şeyh Murâd. From the disciple’s point of view, serving the master and fulfilling his needs was not only part of his/her spiritual journey, but also the most basic humanitarian gesture. This was a long-established tradition, in which gift-giving was also a part. Therefore, it is not surprising when we come across incidents in which Şeyh Murâd thanks and expresses his satisfaction for the presents he received with the letters.⁴²⁶ However, we confirm only five gift-givers in six cases where an anonymous grand vizier, Şehîd Alî Pasha, Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, Dâmâdzâde Ahmed and Mestcizâde Abdullâh (d. 1737) appear as the givers.⁴²⁷ Unfortunately, except a single incidence where he was given ginger and two cases in which he was given female slaves, we are not informed about the quality and nature of the gift. Female slaves were sent to him by the grand vizier, Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha and Dâmâdzâde Ahmed Efendi. It is likely that he accepted the grand vizier’s present. But a surviving letter, shows us that he rejected the slave girl presented to him by the Dâmâdzâde Ahmed. Since his excuse for refusing the concubine is worthy of notice, I would like to quote it here: “I thank to you for the concubine that you gifted ... but I apologize for rejecting her. This is not because of her poor creation, or absence of her competence, or my reluctance for marriage. Indeed, there is remedy in her. Instead, it is because of the appearance of pregnancy in her by completion of fetus according to the clairvoyant of the tribes.” The passage reveals

bikum kalimatihî wa yaqhar bikum ʿaduwvihî wa yuhyî bikum dînihî wa yuʿazzim bikum mashâʿirihî wa yaʿmur bikum bilâdihî wa yarham bikum ʿibâdihî”

⁴²⁶See for instance, *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 3b, 9b, 26a; *Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 5b-6a, 7b, 24a-b, 37b, 40a-b, *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 82a, 82b, 84b-85a, 86b, 88a, 100b-101a, 113a-114a.

⁴²⁷For the two letters sent to Dâmâdzâde see *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 9b, 26a; for the letter for Şehîd Alî Pasha, see *Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 7b; for the letter to the anonymous grand vizier see *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 86b; and for the letter to Mestcizâde Abdullâh, see *Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 24a-b. We learn from *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 3b, a letter sent to Dâmâdzâde Ahmed Efendi, that the grand vizier Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha sent a female slave to Şeyh Murâd.

a scandal. It suggests that the gifted concubine had intercourse with someone else weeks before her experience with Şeyh Murâd. The exploiter might be the previous owner. But the *şeyh* had also committed a grave offence in the process. He violated the period of *‘iddat* and *istibrā* by not waiting for the completion of at least three lunar months before sexual intercourse. Therefore, as is understood in what follows, that he expressed his regret and asked God for forgiveness: “May Allah forgive me that I abhorrently abused her without *istibrā* of [her] purity. I am the one seeking forgiveness.”⁴²⁸

Gift-giving constitutes only one face of the coin in Şeyh Murâd’s relationship with his adherents. The other face of the relationship deals the fulfillment of needs and the protection of interests by his disciples upon his request. Needless to state that letters were instrumentally very useful in this process. However, the contacted authority might delay the request or be incapable of satisfying it. It is meaningful within this context that Şeyh Murâd explicitly expressed his need for many male servants in one of the letters written for Dâmâdzâde Ahmed. Upon Dâmâdzâde’s failure or procrastination he wrote in the next letter that a single servant would also suffice.⁴²⁹ This was one of the last letters that he sent for Dâmâdzâde from Bursa, and, in the absence of further correspondence on this matter, we do not know whether or not his request for servants was observed. Years before this incident, however, he appealed several times to his contacts in Istanbul for their assistance in responding to his and his relatives’ needs, and solving legal and financial problems of his *tekke* located in Damascus. As I have already mentioned, during his residence in Damascus, before 1708, he obtained a *berât* granting *imamate* of a mosque to his son, Es‘ad. It was thanks to the same correspondences that he was able to introduce his son, Muhammad Bahâ al-Dîn, to the scholarly bureaucracy of Istanbul to guarantee professorship for him in a madrasa in Damascus.⁴³⁰ While struggling for positions with regular incomes for his sons, he was very careful not to violate the classical Islamic ideals. For example, upon hearing that his son, Muhammad, who had suffered hardship due to financial problems, successfully reserved for himself the income of a town as a pension (*arpalık*) with the encouragement of the *şeyhülislam*, Şeyh Murâd immediately intervened in the matter and had the decision annulled.

⁴²⁸For the letter in question see *Mektübât*, no. 1837, fol. 9b. “*istibrā*” has been defined by Sir James W. Redhouse as follows: “An abstaining from intercourse with a newly obtained slave woman until after her menstruation, so that, if she proves to be pregnant, this may not be attributed to the new owner.” Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon*, new impression, (Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1996): 89. On *‘iddat*, see Yvon Linant de Bellefonds, “*Idda*,” *EI2*, vol III, 1010-1013; H. İbrahim Acar, “*İddet*,” *TDVIA*, vol. 21, 466-471.

⁴²⁹*Mektübât*, no. 1837, fol. 15b. “*wa kuntu dhakartu lakum min shiddat al-iḥtiyāj ilā al-khawādim al-muta‘addida fa-idhā al-wāḥidat ayḍan infa‘adat*”

⁴³⁰See *Mektübât*, no. 1780, fol. 87a-b, 109a-b.

In his opinion, receiving side income of arpalık was a violation of *Qur'ân* and *sunna*. Because of this he was resentful of his son and the şeyhülislam, and sorrowfully and disappointedly explained to his son what follows: “A decision granting *arpalık* to you has been issued, but I returned it to be given to someone else other than you. ... I marveled at him [i.e. şeyhülislam] that this happened, for he knew that my consent was not for such things. I thought that you secretly asked him to do this, and I accused you of this. If you had told me that, I would have disavowed you. If you make a mistake with the fomentation of *mala fide* dignitaries (*bi-tarjîbi quranâ'î al-sû'î*), your repentance and remorse must be immediately to Allah.”⁴³¹

The needs and interests of the *tekke* he founded in Damascus is another factor that motivated Şeyh Murâd to reach out grandees through letters. Thanks to protection and financial support of the grand vizier, Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha, and the grand mufti, Seyyid Feyzullâh Efendi, he was firmly entrenched in Damascus, where he would establish a madrasa and a *tekke* complex for which a life-term tax farm (*mâlikâne mukata'a*) was also granted.⁴³² His letters prove that whenever the time came for the renewal of the contract (*tajdîd al-amr*) between the waqf of the tekke and the Chief Accounting Office (*Baş Muhâsebe*), rather than submitting a petition to official authorities, he asked his high-ranking followers in Istanbul for the solution of the case. It is understood from a letter that it was perhaps in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century that he received the assistance of several dignitaries including the father of the addressee (*wa laqad jâhada al-wâlid wa amsâlihi ma'a 'uluwwi marâtibihim*), for the renewal of the contract to protect the benefit of Muslims (*fî maşâliḥ al-'ibād*) and affairs of the poor, i.e., dervishes (*fî ḥimāyati 'alâqat al-fuqarā*).⁴³³ In an uncertain date in the 18th century, however, he depended on Dâmâdzâde Ahmed and an anonymous dignitary when an inspection was carried out on the pious foundation through comparison of ledgers preserved by the waqf and Baş Muhâsebe.⁴³⁴

When explaining the main reason behind Şeyh Murâd's travel to Istanbul in 1708, the chronicler Mehmed Râşid states that it was due to the encroachment of oppres-

⁴³¹ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 71a. For Şeyh Murâd's two letters to the şeyhülislam which contain similar criticism see *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 70b, and 90a-b. He informed Dâmâdzâde Ahmed about this bothersome situation. See *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 9b. Şeyh Murâd's criticism of the *arpalık* would be shared by abovementioned Fazlızâde Alî who claimed that receiving arpalık stipend was a means to bleed the *beytûlmâl*. See Marlene Kurz, *Ways to Heaven, Gates to Hell*, 49-50. On the implementation of the arpalık in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries see Zilfi, *The Politics of Piety*, 66-70.

⁴³² On life-term tax farms in the Ottoman Empire, see Mehmet Genç, “Mâlikâne,” *TDVIA*, vol. 27, 516-518.

⁴³³ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 120b-121a.

⁴³⁴ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 99a-b.

sors upon some villages granted to him as *mâlikâne*.⁴³⁵ Karl Barbir has pointed to possible links between Şeyh Murâd's departure and Nasûh Pasha's (d. 1714) appointment as governor of Damascus in the same year: "More than any other governor of the early eighteenth century, Nasuh demonstrated his determination to implement the Ottoman authorities' new controls over the province's fiscal resources and political life, the very policy that Sayyid Murâd had unsuccessfully opposed."⁴³⁶ Butrus Abu-Manneh, on the other hand, has stated that "it does not seem that Sheikh Murâd was able to establish a strong presence of the order in Damascus. And after the violent death of Feyzullâh Efendi in the revolt of 1703, which also led to the deposition of the sultan, Sheikh Murâd seems to have faced considerable pressure in Damascus, the nature of which is unclear."⁴³⁷ Given that Nasûh Pasha was appointed to Damascus on 18 August 1708 and reached the city during the beginning days of November 1708,⁴³⁸ we can conclude that Şeyh Murâd's departure had nothing to do with his incipient governorship. Some of the letters tell us that there were at least two basic causes that led Şeyh Murâd's flight from Damascus: first, heavy debts of his son Muhammad, and second, heavy taxes on both the revenues of his waqf and the subjects living in the villages and arable lands granted to him as a life-term tax farm. In other words, his main purposes in traveling to Istanbul in 1708 was to find a philanthropist grandee who would vouch for or directly pay his son's debts and to mediate tax relief.

On his way from Konya to Bursa in the late 1709 and early 1710, Şeyh Murâd repeatedly reminded Dâmâdzâde Ahmed of his troubles in question and asked him to pay close attention to them.⁴³⁹ Simultaneously, towards the end of his grand vizierate, Çorlulu Alî Pasha showed interest in Şeyh Murâd's troubles to find solutions for them. Being informed about the development by the grand admiral, Şeyh Murâd wrote to Dâmâdzâde that what the grand vizier should do was nothing but abolish duties levied on the incomes of the poor from villages and arable lands, and to offer his son, Muhammad, treats to pay off his debts.⁴⁴⁰ Dismissed

⁴³⁵Râşid, *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vol. II, 1177. "ber-vech-i mâlikâne uhdelinde olan ba'zı kurâya tetâvül-i eyâdî-i zalemeyi def' ü ref' etmek keşâkeşi ferâğ-ı hâtırlarına dağdağa verdiğinden"

⁴³⁶Karl Barbir, "The Muradis of Damascus," 333.

⁴³⁷Abu-Manneh, "Sheikh Murâd al-Bukhârî and the Expansion of the Naqshbandî-Mujaddidî Order in Istanbul," 13.

⁴³⁸Muhammed Yazıcı, "Asilikten Paşalığa Bir Osmanlı Yöneticisi: Osmanoğlu Nasuh Paşa'nın Hayatı ve Muhallefâtı," in *Geçmişten Geleceğe Küçük Asya Anadolu*, ed. Mustafa Aça and Mehmet Ali Yolcu, (Çanakkale: Paradigma Akademi, 2022): 155-156.

⁴³⁹See for instance *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 2b and 18b.

⁴⁴⁰*Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 2b. The grand admiral during this period was Eğribozlu Mehmed Pasha who replaced Moralı Basmacızâde İbrâhîm Pasha in 1709. Considering that the latter was Şeyh Murâd's disciple with whom he travelled to Alanya in the said year, I tend to think that by "qapudan pasha" he was referring

from the office soon after, Çorlulu Alî Pasha would be able to lessen neither the burden of taxes nor the debts. Furthermore, we do not know whether Şeyh Murâd's request for tax reduction was fulfilled in subsequent years. What we know is that he was able to make the future grand vizier, Nevşehirli Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, the agha in the imperial palace, pay his son's debts, which was valued at 5250 *guruş* or 630.000 *akçe*.⁴⁴¹ Learning that İbrâhîm Agha agreed to pay the debts, he sent a letter with the moneylender to the agha in which he expressed his gratitude and profound prayers and asked him to pay the debt in full quickly.⁴⁴² Even though the date of payment is uncertain, we can surmise that it was made in the first half of 1710s. Considering his statement "we have repeatedly witnessed the faithfulness of your commitment ... and your reiterant cautionry for the surrounding vulnerable" in one of the latest letters he wrote towards the end of his life for Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, who held the grand vizierate, I conclude that Şeyh Murâd was financially supported several times by Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha.⁴⁴³ There is no doubt that a special relationship was formed between the two figures over the course of time.⁴⁴⁴ Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha's continuous financial patronage for the *şeyh* and the trust Şeyh Murâd placed in him when rescuing La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî from exile is clear evidence in this regard. İbrâhîm Agha's consent to pay a large debt out of his own pocket denotes the deep roots of his relationship with Şeyh Murâd. It is very likely that theirs was *murshid-murid* sincerity going back to İbrâhîm's earlier career in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Furthermore, it must be remembered that he had also developed close connections with Mevlevis and Bayrami-Melamis of the time.⁴⁴⁵ Taking into account these details, we can assert that he did not recoil from having affiliations with Sufi brotherhoods and masters serving in Istanbul.

İbrâhîm Pasha.

⁴⁴¹Thanks to the reform in the Ottoman monetary system in the beginning of Ahmed III's reign, stability that lasted nearly sixty years was ensured in the exchange rate of Ottoman *guruş* and *akçe*. See Şevket Pamuk, *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000): 162-163; idem, "Kuruş," *TDVİA*, vol. 26, 458.

⁴⁴²For the letter see *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 110a-b. "wa laqad astadnâ min hâmil al-raqîmiyyat min harjiyyati tariqiyya 5250 ğurushan fa-[°]asâ an-yasa[°]ûna fî adâ[°]ihi ilayhi sarî[°]an tamâman wa kamâlan"

⁴⁴³*Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 28a-b. "wa ashhadatnâ marrâran [°]alâ şîdq ta[°]ahhudika ... wa kafâlatika li[°]q[°]-du[°]afâ bi[°]l-jiwar [°]alâ al-takrâr"

⁴⁴⁴Despite surviving letters exchanged between Şeyh Murâd and Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, the peculiarity of their relationship has not been noticed before. See for instance, Abu-Manneh, "Sheikh Murâd al-Bukhârî and the Expansion of the Naqshbandî-Mujaddidî Order in Istanbul," 17; Artan, "El Yazmaları Işığında Bir Çevre ve Çehre Eskizi," 27-28, footnote 98.

⁴⁴⁵Artan, "El Yazmaları Işığında Bir Çevre ve Çehre Eskizi," 5-6, 36-37.

3.5.4 Serving the Provincial *Ulema*

The last factor that kept correspondence alive and enabled Şeyh Murâd to maintain control over his disciple in the Ottoman capital was his struggle to find cadres and patrons in Istanbul or provinces for newly graduated madrasa students, and to help the needy among his followers. In addition to short letters written to find solutions for such problems, there are decades of letters bearing short notes, hints and intercessions regarding the problems of Sufi brothers and/or others who asked for Şeyh Murâd's help and intercession. It is crucial to note that, unlike previous incidents mentioned in this chapter, Şeyh Murâd not only applied the assistance of dignitaries, but also often wrote to his son, Muhammad, his deputy and the head of his family in Damascus, asking him to help the needy who came to him. What made Şeyh Murâd's role as an intermediary more striking and even more exceptional, was his Sufi identity and the written evidence he left behind. It is noteworthy in this regard that in at least 33 of 275 letters he interceded for the courier or "bearer of the letter" (*ḥāmīl al-raqīmat*) going to Istanbul, Damascus, Hijaz or any other places for special purposes. However, except for Dâmâdzâde Ahmed, who received thirteen letters, his son, Muhammad, who got seven letters, and Şeyhülislam Feyzullah and Hüseyin Efendizâde Mustafâ Efendi, each of whom took one letter, I have not been able to determine the names of addressees for whose favor Şeyh Murâd wrote the letters.⁴⁴⁶

It is known that following the enthronement of Mustafâ II (s. 1695-1703) and appointment of Seyyid Feyzullâh as *şeyhülislam*, Şeyh Murâd was able to establish in Damascus two complexes that served simultaneously as tekke and madrasa. Whereas the first *tekke*-madrasa complex, Madrasa/Zāwiyya al-Murādiyya, which consisted of fifty-two rooms for disciples and students, the second complex, Madrasa/Zāwiyya al-Barrāniyya, had thirty rooms.⁴⁴⁷ In fact, if we are to believe Khalīl al-Murâdī, Madrasa al-Murādiyya was not a newly constructed complex, but rather a conversion from an inn where men of wickedness and debauchery (*ahl al-fisq wa'l-fujūr*) had stayed. By its conversion, Şeyh Murâd prepared an endowment deed in which he stipulated that beardless boys (*amrad*), married men (*mutazawwij*) and tobacco smokers (*shārib li't-tutun*) were forbidden to lodge there. This meant that only young men and celibates who had no bad habits were allowed to stay, a stipulation

⁴⁴⁶For the letters to Dâmâdzâde, see *Mektübât*, no. 1837, fol. 8b, 9b, 10b, 10b, 13b, 13b, 20b, 21b, 23b, 27b, and *Mektübât*, no. 1780, fol. 88a, 109a-b, 120b-121a; for the letters to his son, see *Mektübât*, no. 1780, fol. 103a, 103a, 103b, 103b, 103b, 104a, 104a-b; for the letter to Feyzullâh Efendi, see *Mektübât*, no. 1780, fol. 112b-113a; for the letter to Hüseyin Efendizâde Mustafâ Efendi, see *Mektübât*, no. 1780, fol. 78a. For remaining letters see, *Mektübât*, no. 1780, fol. 83b, 86b, 86b-87a, 87a-b, 87b-88a, 100a-b, 106a, 109b, 114a, 119a-120a, and *Mektübât*, no. 1838, fol. 34b.

⁴⁴⁷See Abu-Manneh, "Sheikh Murâd al-Bukhārī and the Expansion of the Naqshbandī-Mujaddidī Order in Istanbul," 11.

that would be embraced partly by La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî for his Kalenderhâne *tekke*.⁴⁴⁸ Madrasa al-Barrâniyya, however, was a new project that completely belonged to Şeyh Murâd. According to Steve Tamari, the madrasa was the mansion of Şeyh Murâd “transformed into a mosque-madrasa complex.”⁴⁴⁹ In the absence of Şeyh Murâd in Damascus, the first madrasa was controlled by his son Muhammad Bahâ al-Dîn, while Mustafâ, the other son, served as a professor in the second madrasa.⁴⁵⁰

In the dearth of sources, we can only speculate about pupils and graduates attending lectures and lodgers inhabiting the two madrasa-*tekkes*. First, it is undoubtful that members of Şeyh Murâd’s extended family, were among the residents of the complexes. To them one should add the family of Abdurrahîm al-Kâbilî (d. 1723), the deputy of Şeyh Murâd in Damascus, and Central Asian relatives of both *şeyhs* who might temporarily visit them there.⁴⁵¹ Secondly, given that Damascus was a crucial departure and arrival station on the pilgrimage and trade routes, it is very likely that Central Asian pilgrims, merchants and wandering dervishes made visits to these complexes on their way throughout the year, but especially during the pilgrimage season, a well-known fact particularly when it comes to lodges established for outsiders in Istanbul. It is possible that, after completing their holy deeds, some young pilgrims from Central Asia stayed there to further their education or to join the existing madrasa system. Lastly, we must consider local students having education in Şeyh Murâd’s madrasas. The presence in Şeyh Murâd’s retinue of abovementioned Muhammad al-Üstüvânî might betoken that sons of some prominent Damascene families were receiving their education in these madrasas. However, it is equally true that families from rural Damascus, too, entrusted their sons to Şeyh Murâd. For instance, we know that Mustafâ al-Nâblusî (d. 1740), a Hanbali jurist in Damascus, “stayed at one of the Muradiyya madrasas after moving to Damascus from Nablus.”⁴⁵²

Where were the graduates of Şeyh Murâd’s madrasas employed? What was the role of Şeyh Murâd in their scholarly career after their graduation? There is no harm in thinking that some of the graduates would have positions such as assistants, lectur-

⁴⁴⁸See *Silk al-Durar*, 130. This *tekke*/madrasa came to be known as “Madrasa al-Naqshbandiyya al-Jawâniyya al-Murâdiyya” in Damascus. See BOA, AE.SOSM.III, 58/4228.

⁴⁴⁹Steve Tamari, “Ottoman Madrasas,” 124.

⁴⁵⁰For Muhammad’s trusteeship over and professorship at Madrasa al-Murâdiyya, see BOA, AE.SOSM.III., 58/4228. While enjoying the professorship of *dâhil* rank at Madrasa al-Barrâniyya, Mustafâ would be appointed by Şeyhülislam Feyzullâh Efendî as a professor of *Sahn* rank on 24 Şafar 1111/21 August 1699. See BOA, AE.SMST.II., 86/9312.

⁴⁵¹For the biography of Şeyh Abdurrahîm al-Kâbilî, see Ibn Kannân, *Yawmiyyât Shâmiyya*, 351-352; al-Murâdî, *Silk al-Durar*, vol. IV, 9-10.

⁴⁵²See footnote 79 in Steve Tamari, “Ottoman Madrasas,” 124.

ers, professors, preachers, imams and muazzins in either the functioning madrasas of Damascus, the number of which reached 65 in the 18th century,⁴⁵³ or the mosques of the city where circles were formed under the supervision of scholars to teach Islamic sciences. The administrative and secretarial positions in the pious endowments and households of the local notables were also open to senior and inferior members of *ulema*. Having controlled a regular income from the *mâlikâne* granted to him, Şeyh Murâd, too, was in a position to employ madrasa graduates in his own madrasas and the mosque that was part of his waqf he established in 1108/1696-97. Despite not being a native of the city, Şeyh Murâd did not hesitate to rely on Damascene Sufis and scholars in his endowments. We are told, for example, that he stipulated in the endowment deed of Madrasa al-Murâdiyya many positions, that of including caretaking of the books of madrasa for Şeyh Abd al-Rahmân al-Manîni, a deputy of Şeyh Murâd, and professor and supervisor of the Sumaysatiyya madrasa-*tekke*. Following his death, his positions were transferred to his brother Ahmed al-Manîni (1678-1759), another student and deputy of Şeyh Murâd, and by his death, living descendants of Şeyh Abd al-Rahmân.⁴⁵⁴ We have already mentioned that Şeyh Murâd guaranteed warrants for his three sons, Mustafâ, Muhammad and Es'âd, positions of professorship and imamate. However, his sons were not the only teachers in his madrasas. For example, we are said that Abd al-Rahmân al-Kafirsûsi (d. 1765) "started his career as an 'alim at one of the Muradiyya madrasas before becoming Shafi'i mufti and a prime contender for the prestigious Qubbat al-Nasr teaching post at the Umayyad Mosque."⁴⁵⁵ According to Khalîl al-Murâdi he travelled to Istanbul to receive the warrant for the said muftiship. Be that as it may, it is likely that he turned his connections with the Murâdis of Damascus into his advantage during the process.

I have emphasized that during and after his years in Damascus, Şeyh Murâd was closely interested in the problems of the city and the appointments to senior offices such as judgeship and *amîr al-hajj*. I have also mentioned that he sent a letter from Damascus to Şeyhülislam Seyyid Feyzullâh during the restoration of the Umayyad Mosque in 1699-1700. The letter has particular importance for our subject, for it proves his involvement on behalf of the scholars of the city in the appointments to the Umayyad Mosque and the Madrasa al-Badrâ'iyya, one of the religious education centers of the city established as a Shâfi'i school in the 13th century by the qadi

⁴⁵³For the number see Tamari, "Ottoman Madrasas," 127.

⁴⁵⁴See Tamari, "Ottoman Madrasas," 124. For the biography of Ahmed al-Manîni, see *Silk al-Durar*, vol. I, 133-145. Umm al-Khayr Khadija, the daughter of Ahmad al-Manîni was married to Ali al-Murâdi, the grandson of Şeyh Murâd and son of Muhammad. See Barbir, "All in the family: The Muradis of Damascus," 345.

⁴⁵⁵Tamari, "Ottoman Madrasas," 124, footnote 79. For his biography see *Silk al-Durar*, vol. III, 324.

of Damascus at the time, Najm al-Dîn Abû Muhammad Abdullâh al-Badrâ'î (d. 1256).⁴⁵⁶ Considering that in the letter Şeyh Murâd thanks to the *şeyhülislam* for his right decision to give the pulpity of the Umayyad Mosque to the competent (*khîṭābat al-Amawî li-ahlihi*), I infer that he took an active role throughout the process. When it comes to appointments to vacant teaching positions in the Badrâ'iyya Madrasa, we learn that he intervened in the assignments at least three times by relying on the patronage of Feyzullâh Efendi. In the first instance, he requested the said madrasa from Feyzullâh for some seekers of knowledge since it had remained idle (*li-ba'ḍ talabat al-ʿilm li-ta'attulihā*), an indication that it had been inactive for a while. In the second case, he requested it for Seyyid al-Ḥiṣnî, for he merited it (*li-istiḥqāqihî*). And, now, he requested it once again, but this time for Hasan al-'Ajlânî (d. 1728).⁴⁵⁷ Given that a certain Mahmûd al-Kurdî was one of the professors in the madrasa, in September 1685,⁴⁵⁸ we can speculate that Şeyh Murâd was able to activate it after his arrival in the city in 1670s, owing to his acquaintance with Şeyhülislam and Vâni Mehmed Efendi. Since the post of professorship in this madrasa was stipulated for multiple professors to teach at the same time,⁴⁵⁹ it is possible that some graduates of Şeyh Murâd's madrasas or his local friends managed to secure the unoccupied positions for themselves.

The presence of Şeyh Murâd as an intermediary between the center and province, state and subject, and sources and interest were not exceptional cases or unconventional situation. On the contrary, countless examples that we come across in the primary sources, including biographic dictionaries, ostend that it was a common practice for anyone seeking his/her benefits, including a madrasa output, a usurper, stakeholder or local gentry in provinces of the empire, to find someone who could serve him as an intermediary in the province or the center. Khalîl al-Murâdî's *Silk al-Durar* and Ibn Kannân's *Yawmiyyât Shāmiyya* are significant sources for a better understanding of provincial *ulema*'s struggles for the local and central offices. Utilizing *Silk al-Durar*, Abdul-Karim Rafeq has established that the eighteenth-century

⁴⁵⁶See the footnote 89 in Su'ud Muhammad al-Asfur, "The Political Role of the Ulama of Damascus at the Time of Circassian Mameluks," *Anali Gazi Husrev-Begove / Gazi Husrev Bey's Library Annals XXIII-XXIV* (2005): 382.

⁴⁵⁷*Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 112b-113a. Seyyid al-Ḥiṣnî was most probably Damascus-born famous şeyh Seyyid Taqî al-Dîn (1643-1717), or, less likely, one of his relatives Abdurrahmân, Yahyâ, and Muhib al-Dîn. For Seyyid Taqî al-Dîn's biography, see *Silk al-Durar*, vol. II, 5-6; and Ibn Kannân, *Yawmiyyât Shāmiyya*, 277.

⁴⁵⁸See BOA, AE.SMMD.IV., 21/2341.

⁴⁵⁹Up until 3 Ramaḍan 1157/10 October 1744, seven şeyhs simultaneously benefitted from this madrasa, each receiving one *akçe* per day. Upon the renouncement of five beneficiaries around this time, a certain Şeyh Abdurrahmân b. Muhammad replaced them. The seven beneficiaries, the first five of whom would relinquish their post, were as follows: Şeyh Muhammad Sa'îd, Şeyh Muhammad Abû al-Muftî, Şeyh Muhammad Abû al-Surûr, the military şeyh Muhammad al-'Ajlânî, Şeyh Muhammad Abû al-Hasan, Şeyh Muhammad Sâlihî, and the military şeyh Mustafâ. See BOA, C..MF., 142/7070.

“Syrian ulema” often travelled to Istanbul for two purposes: “to enroll in the sultanic schools so as to qualify for higher office, and to seek favours to consolidate their standings in their home towns.” According to his findings, from among the Syrian *ulema* whose biography was recorded by al-Murâdî, 58% of Alepine, 47% of Damascene and 50% of Qudsi *ulema* had travelled to Istanbul to secure their benefits.⁴⁶⁰ Given this reality with Şeyh Murâd’s intercession for the provincial *ulema* and notables, I conclude that a significant number of Damascene scholars benefited from his influence over the members of the central bureaucracy during the last quarter of the seventeenth and first quarter of the eighteenth centuries. Therefore, when asking an anonymous scholar-bureaucrat for his favor for a madrasa for the righteous, erudite and virtuous bearer of the letter who connected to him by an ancient bond,⁴⁶¹ Şeyh Murâd mediated most likely for one of his Damascene disciples. In another letter dispatched to Dâmâdzâde Ahmed, he requested that he send al-Hâjj Abdullâh, his servant dervish and the courier of the letter, to Damascus, and if possible, to allocate a salary for him from the *bayt al-mâl*.⁴⁶² In some cases, even if the need of the person making the request was not mentioned, Şeyh Murâd felt obliged to present him with praising words. He introduced one of them, for example, as someone harmless and beneficial for the addressee.⁴⁶³ For another one, he wrote what follows: “Our beloved son, the bearer of the letter, has visited us. We have found refreshment in him and we did not contemplate about him, because he has succumbed to your charms.”⁴⁶⁴ Nonetheless, it is remarkable that in most of cases the specific requests of supplicants were not mentioned. Surely, in such cases, the carrier of the letter would verbally explain his request to the senior official and the written message that he carried from Şeyh Murâd to his disciple would function as a letter of reference for him.

I have pointed out the significant position of Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi several times in the current chapter. The collected letters prove that, for Şeyh Murâd, he was the most reliable disciple in Istanbul. On many occasions when he needed something and wanted to rescue someone from exile and help an aspirant for his appointment to a desired or suitable position, Dâmâdzâde Ahmed appeared as the first authority to be consulted. The primary reason behind such a confidence was the deep-rooted presence of Dâmâdzâde’s family in Istanbul, in the *ulema* hierarchy

⁴⁶⁰ Abdul-Karim Rafeq, “Relations Between the Syrian ‘Ulamâ’ and the Ottoman State in the Eighteenth Century,” *Oriente Moderno* 18/79 (1999): 76. For more in this regard, see especially 74-81.

⁴⁶¹ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 86b-87a.

⁴⁶² *Mektûbât*, no. 1837, fol. 10b.

⁴⁶³ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 114a.

⁴⁶⁴ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 87b-88a.

and Naqshbandi circles. Minkârîzâdes, the family of Dâmâdzâde Ahmed's maternal grandfather, had been present in Istanbul since the late 16th century. Born in Istanbul in 1609, his grandfather, Minkârîzâde Yahyâ Efendi (d. 1678), enjoyed a tenure lasting more than eleven years from 21 November 1662 to 21 February 1674 as the *şeyhülislam*. Although from Çankırı, his father, Mustafâ Râsih Efendi (d. 1684), was a well-known figure within the *ulema* and Naqshbandi networks of Istanbul. Dâmâdzâde Ahmed himself was an Istanbul-based scholar and judge. Except for his judgeships in Thessaloniki from May 1696 to June 1698, Bursa from October 1700 to November 1701 and Mecca a few years later, he spent the rest of his life as a madrasa professor and judge in Istanbul. He was the qadi of Istanbul from 22 September 1706 to 28 September 1707. From this day to 2 March 1710, he ruled Kütahya from Istanbul through his deputy as an arpalık, and directly transferred to the chief judgeship of Anatolia, the position that he would hold until 5 May 1711. Following a short break, he was appointed as the chief judge of Rumelia on 19 April 1714 and remained in the position until 18 April 1715. His second term in the position was from 21 February 1718 to September 1719, and his third term covered a period from 26 February 1724 to 13 July 1725. Lastly, he served as *şeyhülislam* from 24 February 1732 to 22 October 1733.⁴⁶⁵ The continuous presence in Istanbul and familiarity with the scholarly and secular bureaucracy made Şeyh Murâd dependent on Dâmâdzâde Ahmed in most cases. Therefore, once the demands became more frequent, he felt obliged to apologize to Dâmâdzâde due to the large number of people expecting his favors for their needs.⁴⁶⁶

Spending a significant part of his life separated from his family members living in Damascus, Şeyh Murâd relied on letters to maintain communication with them. In his absence, his son, Muhammad Bahâ al-Dîn, and his deputy in the order, Şeyh Abdurrahîm al-Kâbilî, looked after his family, the affairs of his waqf and the education of his disciples there. Having control of a regular income from the granted *mâlikâne*, his deputies in Damascus must have enjoyed a relatively rich and comfortable life. In such conditions, it is possible that in addition to itinerant dervishes, the local poor and needy, the debt-ridden, the stranded wayfarer, and the like depended on his *tekke*-madrasas supported by the waqf. Therefore, in at least seven letters to his son or Şeyh Abdurrahîm, Şeyh Murâd asked their assistance, either for the courier of the letter or local figures who turned to him. Seyyid Yâsîn (d. 1733) of Hama,

⁴⁶⁵ For his career and life story see Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. IV/2, 469-470; İpşirli, "Damadzâde Ahmed Efendi," *TDVIA*, vol. 8, 449-450; Şeyhî, *Vekâyi'u'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 3, 2270, 2274, 2778-2781, 2820; vol. 4, 3366-3367. For the career of Mustafâ Râsih Efendi, see Şeyhî, *Vekâyi'u'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 2, 1267-1269. For more on Minkârîzâde, see Özgün Deniz Yoldaşlar, "Minkârîzâde Yahya and the Ottoman Scholarly Bureaucracy in the Seventeenth Century,".

⁴⁶⁶ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 88a. "ḥabîbî a^ctadhîru ilaykum ^can kasrat al-multamisât fi qaḍâ³ ḥājât al-muḥtājîn i^ctimâdan ^calâ i^ctinâ³ikum fihim fa-lâ yasqalanna ^calaykum"

a descendant of Abd al-Qâdir al-Jilânî (d. 1078-1166) and himself a Qadiri şeyh and an eminent Sufi scholar of the time and the heirs of a certain Seyyid Hüseyin were among the natives offered a livelihood.⁴⁶⁷ Moreover, it seems that he had shown a particular interest in the problems of his friends and disciples embarking on a pilgrimage. In a letter, he asked his son to help the noble bearer of the letter on his way to the hajj, particularly by providing a horse.⁴⁶⁸ In another incident when his son, Şeyh Abdurrahîm, and many of his relatives were in Mecca, he asked them to pay close attention to the courier of the letter when he arrived there.⁴⁶⁹ By displaying his philanthropy through such backings and subsidizations, Şeyh Murâd fulfilled his obligation to God and His servants. On the other hand, however, he strengthened his image of protector and helper şeyh, which in return consolidated his authority over his followers and those depending on him.

3.6 The Impossibility of A Naqshbandi Faction Within the State Organization

Did Şeyh Murâd, who was able to develop close connections with so many senior officials and scholar-bureaucrats, want to establish within the state organization a Naqshbandi faction consisting of homogeneous, coherent, target- and interest-oriented, interdependent, and loyal figures were subjected to his authority? If he had such a goal, did he succeed? A discussion in this regard is nothing but a speculation, for it is impossible to know his ultimate target. The written evidence surviving to the date, however, proves that he had no such a purpose. Even if he pursued such a goal, it is evident that a harmonious and consistent Naqshbandi faction claiming to rule the state and the sources did not come into existence. To substantiate this claim, it suffices to recall the struggles and intrigues taking place between grandees known by their affiliations with the Naqshbandi order. The conflicts and bloody rivalries between Şeyh Murâd's disciples are proper examples in this regard. Şehîd Alî Pasha, was known to have exchanged letters with Şeyh Murâd. But, he seems to not have come under the influence and control of the şeyh, for he did not hesitate to undermine the position of several authorities, including Şeyh Murâd's followers, in order to pave the way for himself. As a result of his ruses, grand viziers, Çorlulu Alî Pasha (v. 1706-1710), his patron and pupil in the *enderûn*, Gürcü Yûsuf Pasha

⁴⁶⁷ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 103b, 104a-b. When Seyyid Yâsîn died, however, he left behind superabundant wealth, lands, fiefs, real estates. See Ibn Kannân, *Yawmiyyât Shâmiyya*, 437.

⁴⁶⁸ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 103b.

⁴⁶⁹ *Mektûbât*, no. 1780, fol. 103a.

(v. 1711-1712), Silahdâr Süleymân Pasha (v. 1712-1713) and Hoca İbrâhîm Pasha (v. 1713) were executed; Baltacı Mehmed Pasha (v. 1704-1706, 1710-1711) was exiled first to Midilli and then to Limni, where he passed away, and Köprülüzâde Nu'mân Pasha (v. 1710) was banished from Istanbul to serve in the western frontiers of Cyprus and Crete, where he died.⁴⁷⁰ From among these grand viziers, Nu'mân Pasha and Silahdâr Süleymân Pasha were disciples of Şeyh Murâd, but he could not dissuade Şehîd Alî Pasha, another disciple, from deauthorizing the former and wiping out the latter. Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, whose devotion to Şeyh Murâd was more pronounced, was appreciated for his favor and mercy even on the grandees who had done evil to him before his grand vizierate.⁴⁷¹ However, when Mehmed İsmet Efendi, one of the disciples and deputies of Şeyh Murâd in Istanbul and collector of his letters, requested a teaching position for a madrasa through a qasida in 1726, he rejected the request.⁴⁷²

Fights for senior positions among the Naqshbandi members of the Ottoman *ulema* constitutes another base for my claim that neither Şeyh Murâd attempted to form under his control a Naqshbandi clique within the state nor was such a formation achieved undesignedly. Mirzâ Mustafâ Efendi, who served as şeyhülislam from 15 December 1714 to 27 June 1715, and his son, Mehmed Sâlim Efendi, were followers of Şeyh Murâd. Despite his commitment to Şeyh Murâd, however, Mirzâ Mustafâ considered Dâmâdzâde Ahmed a rival and was uncomfortable with his incumbency as the chief judge of Rumelia. For these reasons, he underhandedly composed poetic petitions against Dâmâdzâde which resulted in the loss of offices for both.⁴⁷³ It was probably due to this rivalry that Şeyh Murâd failed to secure the qadiate of Damascus for a certain Mollâ Hasan Efendi. Ebû İshak İsmâ'îl Efendi, Şeyh Murâd's adherent who served as şeyhülislam from 11 December 1716 to 6 May 1718, owed this position to Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, the caimacam of the grand vizier. Contrary to İbrâhîm Pasha, who was in favor of peace with the Austrians, he inclined toward the continuity of the war. Therefore, he even lobbied for the appointment of Köprülüzâde Nu'mân Pasha to the grand vizierate at the expense of Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha in 1718. But he failed to fulfill his projection and was exiled to Sinop, where he would reside for more than two years.⁴⁷⁴ His son, İshak Efendi (d. 1734), too, was the follower of Şeyh Murâd. He managed to serve as *şeyhülislam* from 21 October

⁴⁷⁰For their intriguing career and life stories, see Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. IV/2, 280-305.

⁴⁷¹Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. IV/2, 313.

⁴⁷²See the last chapter of this dissertation.

⁴⁷³Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. IV/2, 462-463; İpşirli, "Mirza Mustafa Efendi," 167-168.

⁴⁷⁴Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. IV/2, 464-465; Muhammed Nur Doğan, "Ebûishak İsmâil Efendi," *TDVİA*, vol. 10, 278-279.

1733 to 31 October 1734. Before his appointment to the position, however, his anticipated assignment to the chief judgeship or Rumelia was impeded by Dâmâdzâde Ahmed, the *şeyhülislam* who regarded him as a rival and a threat to his current position. Upon İshak Efendi's protest against *şeyhülislam* Dâmâdzâde Ahmed, he was exiled to Kütahya, his arpalık. It was only thanks to direct intervention of the sultan, Mahmûd I (r. 1730-1754), that İshak Efendi was brought from Kütahya and appointed grand mufti. ⁴⁷⁵

These examples prove that a coherent, target- and interest-oriented, and interconnected Naqshbandi faction did not emerge during Şeyh Murâd's lifetime or after his death. Nor he attempted to effectuate such a clique within the state formation. Secondly, it turns out that rather than the group or communal interests, Şeyh Murâd's followers prioritized personal interests and the continuation of the hierarchical order. It seems likely that, for high-ranking Naqshbandis, as long as personal interests did not intersect, being attached to the same şeyh was not the sufficient reason to enjoy and share privileges. In other words, among multiple identities, being a Naqshbandi was not the primary and preeminent identifier for disciples in the service of the state. An official was first an official, and a scholar-bureaucrat was first a scholar. Then would come his affiliation with the Naqshbandi order. Being cognizant of this reality and such power politics in statecraft, Şeyh Murâd had to be very cautious in order to not end up on the losing side. Therefore, he did not interfere in politics and state affairs as much as possible.

3.7 Conclusion

Through an elaborated utilization of Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî's letters, I have designed the current chapter in two main bodies. In the first body, I intended to shed light on the dark spots in his biography, to elucidate how he maintained his communication with his disciples, friends, and family members, to show how his letters were collected years after his death, and to question whether a Naqshbandi Republic of Letters formed around Şeyh Murâd. In the second part, I focused on the main reasons behind Şeyh Murâd's desire for continuous exchange of letters with his addressees, among whom high-ranking officials constituted a significant portion. I have claimed in this regard that his initial purpose in writing letters was to propagate his reformulated teachings, which would result in return in the formation of the Muradi

⁴⁷⁵Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. IV/2, 469-472; Muhammet Nur Doğan, "İshak Efendi, Ebûishakzâde," *TDVİA*, vol. 22, 530-531.

branch of the Naqshbandiyya. Secondly, I have asserted letters allowed him or afforded him the opportunity to consolidate and maintain control and influence over his high-ranking followers in the service of the state, to protect his own interests, those of his family and his lodges, and to find cadres for his provincial followers in the center and particularly in their localities. Lastly, I argued that although he had been keen on developing affiliations with grandees, neither did intend to establish a Naqshbandi faction within the state machinery, nor did such an interest- and target-oriented organization emerge spontaneously after Şeyh Murâd's death.

Given that his collected letters contain significant information regarding his biography, the current chapter has aimed at first to bring to light unknown or cloudy details as to Şeyh Murâd's life story, his family and the initial phase of his relations with dignitaries. As to his family members, for instance, it has become clear that apart from Mustafâ and Muhammad, his two sons, who have already been identified in the literature, he had two more sons: (Ahmed and Es'ad), three daughters (Emîne, Âyşe, and Sâliha), four grandsons (İbrâhîm, Abdullâh, Khalîl, and Ahmed), and two granddaughters (Nefîse and Meryem). Secondly, it has come out that Şeyh Murâd was a mobile preceptor. Rather than staying in certain places, he constantly travelled in Ottoman towns and cities located on the trade and pilgrimage routes. "Travel within the homeland" (*safar dar-watan*), one of the eleven principals of the Naqshbandi order, and his self-confidence and conviction that he was divinely commissioned to spread the word of truth were the main reasons behind his travels. Nonetheless, it is particularly noteworthy that he visited cities where the Indian lodges were erected for itinerant dervishes. But, since the sources of these *tekkas* were insufficient to meet his and his dervishes' needs, he turned to the dignitaries of the state. As a stranger and newcomer in the Ottoman lands, he seems to have enjoyed the patronage of Köprülü Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha, Vânî Mehmed Efendi, Şeyhülislam Feyzullâh Efendi and the heirs of Şeyhülislam Minkârîzâde Yahyâ, particularly of his son-in-law, Mustafâ Râsih Efendi. In the later parts of his life, however, he benefited from the patronage of viziers and grand viziers such as Köprülüâde Nu'mân Pasha, Şehîd Alî Pasha, Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, Silâhdâr Süleymân Pasha, Basmacızâde Morah İbrâhîm Pasha, and scholar-bureaucrats such as the chief physicians, Nuh Efendi and Ömer Efendi, Hüseyin Efendi, Dâmâdzâde Ahmed Efendi and Ebû İshak İsmâ'îl Efendi.

Due to his incessant travels, Şeyh Murâd had spent a significant part of his life separated from his adherents and family members. Because of this, he relied on the exchange of letters to maintain the communication with his disciples, friends, and relatives. The current chapter has maintained that during the process he and his addressees adopted, among others, two significant methods. First, they depended

on the existing commercial and pilgrimage routes through which their messages were transported. Secondly and more importantly, however, they employed private couriers who carried letters from the *şeyh* and his followers and vice versa. The main reasons in hiring private deliverers, however, were the fear for interruption in communication and the private content of the message. Such an operation was possible in their circles because both Şeyh Murâd and his high-ranking devotees had wealth, allowed them to hire dispatch-riders for transportation.

The chapter directs attention to the way in which letters were recorded, duplicated, and preserved. Leaving aside letters with private content, it seems likely that hortative letters were reproduced and circulated by Şeyh Murâd's followers immediately after their composition or arrival to addressees. They were intently preserved because they were survivals of the *şeyh* and source of blessings for the disciples. Therefore, after Şeyh Murâd's death, Mehmed İsmet, the collector of the letters, was able to record 227 in his collection. The chapter asserts that neither was Mehmed İsmet the only disciple attempting to make a collection of letters, nor managed to collect all surviving letters. Of forty-eight letters unseen by Mehmed İsmet, thirty-one letters were in the possession of Dâmâdzâde Ahmed Efendi, who did not share them with anybody because of the sense of privacy. The chapter argues further that apart from Mehmed İsmet Efendi, an anonymous collector who composed the manuscript catalogued under İÜ-TY 3442, Dâmâdzâde Ahmed Efendi and Şeyhülislam Veliyyüddîn Efendi attempted to collect scattered letters of Şeyh Murâd from different hands.

One of the significant contributions of the current chapter is that it evaluates Şeyh Murâd's learned circle, which owed its intra-communal communication to the letter exchange within the context of the extensive literature on the Republic of Letters. The Republic of Letters was an imaginary republic of the learned particularly in 17th- and 18th- century Europe. Its members depended on the constant exchange of letters to keep communication alive among themselves. The chapter discusses whether a Naqshbandi Republic of Letters came into existence around Şeyh Murâd. It proposes in this regard that there were some similarities between the Republic of Letters and Şeyh Murâd's lettered circles. The first similarity that the current chapter has discovered is the existence of a *lingua franca* in Şeyh Murâd's Naqshbandi network. Whereas Latin and later on French was the *lingua franca* of the Republic of Letters, the *lingua franca* of its Naqshbandi equivalent was Arabic. The second commonality of the two entities, the chapter claims, was the "communication through epistolary exchange" since both depended on the exchange of letters to maintain the communication. Lastly, the chapter asserts that "the centrality of savant/erudite conversation (*conversatio erudita*)" was a significant similarity

between the two republics. Yet, while savant conversation was a matter of fact, particularly for some German scholars by the second half of the 17th century, as an *irshâdî* mode of Sufism that attaches great importance to the personal conversation and companionship with the Sufi master, it was one of the pillars of the Naqshbandi order since its foundation.

In the second body of the current chapter, I tried to understand the reasons behind Şeyh Murâd's willingness to pen for his disciples so many letters. The initial finding of the chapter is that, separated from disciples residing in different localities, Şeyh Murâd educated them through letters. In the meantime, he was propagated his teachings through reformulated and reinterpreted concepts, which had been ingrained in the Sufi lexicon. The chapter asserts that his primary purpose in adopting such a method was to establish himself as the founder of a Muradi branch in the Naqshbandi order. Bringing to light several historical examples of Naqshbandis identifying themselves as "Murâdî" in eighteenth-century Konya, Bursa, and Damascus, the chapter contends that Şeyh Murâd had indeed succeeded in establishing a Muradi branch. By utilizing commentaries written on Şeyh Murâd's pamphlets and texts quoting from his scholarly works, the chapter explored further the circulation of Şeyh Murâd's reformulated Sufistic concepts and the reception of his teachings within the circles of Sufi brotherhoods. As a result, it propounds that Şeyh Murâd's reception was particularly favorable in the eyes of La'îzâde Abdülbâkî, Kösec Ahmed Trabzonî, Mehmed Rüstem Râşid, Mustafâ Râsim Efendi, Mehmed Sâdik Erzincânî, and Mustafâ İsmet Garîbullâh of Yanya, the Naqshbandi şeyhs and authors whose scholarly works played an instrumental role in spreading Şeyh Murâd's teachings.

The chapter has discussed that epistolary exchange between Şeyh Murâd and his followers was also functional in the sense that it allowed the *şeyh* to maintain his control and influence over grantees of the empire, to protect the benefits of his family members and lodges, and to find appropriate positions and sources of income for provincial disciples whose merit was beyond dispute. As to the former point, it has been put forward that he guaranteed the continuity of his worldly and spiritual authority on his affiliates with senior ranks through congratulatory and consolatory letters that share their joys and sorrows, favoring letters that restored dignity to the disgraced, and adhortatory letters with the purpose of "enjoining good and forbidding evil." In relation to this topic, I have argued that Şeyh Murâd was not strong enough to intervene in politics and state affairs. What his limited power and influence enabled him to do was to compose these kinds of letters by which he was able to remotely monitor and control his pupils of high ranks in state administration. With this and the power struggles between Şeyh Murâd's followers in mind,

the chapter also asserts that neither a harmonious Naqshbandi faction came into existence in the state machinery, nor did Şeyh Murâd himself attempt to undertake such a political project. However, in the case of Şeyh Murâd's personal and familial interests, as well as those of the provincial scholars who developed close relations with him, the chapter demonstrates that the letters worked opportunely.

4. NETWORK-CREATING MEANS OF PENETRATION: THE NAQSHBANDI REALITIES OF THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

4.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the Naqshbandi realities of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. During the period, the Naqshbandi order became more visible in Istanbul. In this context, I will turn to the religious and political factors and phenomena to which the success of the Naqshbandi order can be attributed. What were the reasons behind the gradual development and influence-building skills that contributed to the visibility of the order in the Ottoman capital? In response to this question and as a contribution to the existing literature, I will first discuss the relationship of the Naqshbandi *şeyhs* and their alliance with the scholars and scholar-bureaucrats, arguing that this relationship assertively contributed to the image and spread of the order. Secondly, by focusing on their links with *seyyids* and leading *seyyid* families, I will point to proximity to *seyyids* and *seyyidhood* as a reason for their ability to exert influence. In doing so, I will particularly highlight many *seyyid* *şeyhs* serving in the Naqshbandi lodges of Istanbul. Thirdly, I will focus on “lodgeless *şeyhs*,”—the *şeyhs* without a specific lodge, who did not serve in any of the second-wave Naqshbandi lodges in the eighteenth century. It was these *şeyhs* who, after receiving authorization from a Naqshbandi master, continued their spiritual guidance without affiliation to a lodge. Their endeavor, I will assert, contributed directly to the spread of the order in Istanbul. Finally, I will discuss their relationship with other Sufi orders. In doing so, I will emphasize that it was consciousness about “coexistence” and “mutual respect” rather than a desire for conflict and antagonism that shaped and even dominated Naqshbandis’ relationship with other Sufi brotherhoods. In this section, in order to strengthen my argument, I will draw attention, first, to the existence among the Naqshbandis of the *jāmiʿ al-ṭuruq* *şeyhs* who received authorization from many Sufi orders, and second, to the positive views of

eminent Naqshbandi şeyhs towards other orders.

4.2 Concordance with the *Ulema* and Sharia

In the previous chapter, I emphasized several times the significant position of official *ulema* in the networks of Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî. How should we understand the dominant presence of the *ulema*, the champions of the sharia, within the Naqshbandi circles of the Şeyh Murâd? Was this a situation confined only to his scholarly and Sufi milieu or a historical phenomenon of the Naqshbandi order? Writing on the history of the Naqshbandiyya since 1970s, Hamid Algar is one of the first scholars emphasizing the “interrelation of the shari‘a and ʔarīqa” in the Naqshbandi order. According to him, strict obedience to sharia and sunna, and precedence of the Bakrī silsila (*silsilat al-zahab*), that not only betokens the order’s identification with Orthodox/Sunni Islam but also legitimizes the supremacy of silent dhikr over vocal invocation, have always been distinctive features of the Naqshbandis wherever they existed, whether it be Transoxiana, Iran, India, Arabia, Anatolia, Balkans or Caucasia. He particularly stresses that ever since the appearance of the Naqshbandis in the Ottoman realms in the fifteenth century, “the order has played a role of cardinal importance in the spiritual and religious life of Turkish people. Sober and rigorous, and devoted to the cultivation of God’s Law and the exemplary model of the Companions, it was above all the order of the ulama: countless members of the learned institution gave it their allegiance.”⁴⁷⁶ Hamid Algar’s opinions as to the affinity between the Naqshbandis and *ulema* have been shared by Reşat Öngören, Necdet Yılmaz, Ramazan Muslu and Hür Mahmut Yücer, who have studied the history of Sufism in Anatolia focusing on the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries. Acknowledging that the foundation of all Sunni orders is based on sharia and that the borders between sharia and tariqa is permeable, each of these authors finds special links between Naqshbandis and members of the *ulema* in the Ottoman Empire.⁴⁷⁷ However, only Reşat Öngören has attempted to explain why the dialogue between Naqshbandis and *ulema* was more well-grounded. In his opinion, the competence

⁴⁷⁶For some of his studies on the history of the order, see Hamid Algar, “Some Notes on the Naqshbandi ʔarīqat in Bosnia,” *Die Welt des Islams*, New Series, vol. 13/3-4 (1971): 168-203; idem, “The Naqshbandi Order: A Preliminary Survey of Its History and Significance,” 123-152; idem, “A Brief History of the Naqshbandi Order,” in *Naqshbandis: Historical Development and Present Situation of a Muslim Mystical Order*, (Istanbul: ISIS, 1990): 3-44; “Naqshband,” *EI2*, vol. VII, 933-934; idem, “Naqshbandiyya: in Persia and in Turkey,” *EI2*, vol. VII, 934-937; idem, “Naqşibendiyye,” *TDVIA*, vol. 32, 335-342.

⁴⁷⁷Reşat Öngören, *Osmanlılar’da Tasavvuf: Anadolu’da Süfîler, Devlet ve Ulema (XVI. Yüzyıl)*, 335-396; Necdet Yılmaz, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: Süfîler, Devlet ve Ulemâ*, 449-457; Ramazan Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: 18. Yüzyıl*, 598-621; Hür Mahmut Yücer, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: 19. Yüzyıl*, 747-776.

of Naqshi masters in religious sciences, the perfection of their spiritual influence, their success in treading a fine line between the internal and external state of the dervish, their preference for silent dhikr over the vocal one, and their ability to educate madrasa affiliates without distracting them from the madrasa were among the reasons that persuaded Ottoman *ulema* in favor of the Naqshbandi order.⁴⁷⁸ With regard to interconnectedness of the sharia and tariqa in understanding 18th century Naqshbandi-Mujaddidis, Hasan Gümüsoğlu, another historian of Sufism, has authored an article recently published. By utilizing selections from texts written by Kadızâde Mehmed Efendi (d. 1635), Murâd Bukhârî (d. 1720), Abd al-Ghanî al-Nâblusî (d. 1731), Mehmed Emîn Tokadî (d. 1745), Ebû Sa'îd Hâdimî (d. 1762) and Müstakîmzâde Süleymân Sa'deddîn Efendi (d. 1788), renowned Naqshbandi figures of the 17th and 18th centuries, he has argues that Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi şeyhs were in defense of sharia and the creed of Sunni Islam, a view that has been proposed by historians studying the Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi order.⁴⁷⁹

When it comes to Naqshbandi-*ulema* relations in the Indian subcontinent a different narrative is of concern. The general tendency in the literature in this context is that strict adherence to sharia may not be a characteristic feature of all Naqshbandis of India before the advent of Şeyh Ahmad al-Sirhindî (1564-1624), the founder of the Mujaddidi branch of the order and self-proclaimed renovator of the second millennium (*mujaddid-i alf-i thānī*) known for his prioritization of sharia and religious sciences and determining agency in giving the *tekkes* the function of madrasas. Because of Sirhindî's harsh criticism of the modus vivendi and modus operandi of the Muslim Indian state and society, including that of Sufi brotherhoods, which, in his view, were against sharia and Islamic ideals, his and his successors' missionary activities were impeded by obstacles. We are told that “[o]ne was fierce religious antagonism on the part of the rival Naqshbandi lineages and of orthodox circles at large, who were alarmed at Sirhindî's extravagant statements. Another was the inability of the Mujaddidis to establish firm contacts with the political authority. Then there was the inner rivalry among the Mujaddidi family itself, which prevented unified action.”⁴⁸⁰ This was the overall picture of seventeenth-century India under the Mughal Empire. With the disintegration of Mughal rule in the following century, in the Indian subcontinent “[t]he political crisis resulted in the disappearance of most Naqshbandi lines dependent on the government, leaving the Mujaddidiyya the

⁴⁷⁸Öngören, *ibid*, 392-393.

⁴⁷⁹Hasan Gümüsoğlu, “Osmanlı’da Nakşibendiyye/Müceddidiyye Tarikatı ve Ehl-i Sünnet Hassasiyeti,” *Mezhep Araştırmaları Dergisi* 15/2 (2022): 482-509.

⁴⁸⁰Itzchak Weismann, *The Naqshbandiyya: Orthodoxy and activism in a worldwide Sufi tradition*, (London: Routledge, 2007): 61.

only viable offshoot.”⁴⁸¹ And, because of the efforts of prominent Naqshbandi masters including Mîr Nâsir ‘Andalib (1693-1759), his son Mîr Dard (1720-1785), Shah Waliullâh of Delhi (1703-1762), Mirzâ Mazhar Jân-i Jânân (1699-1781) and many others, particularly in the Northern India, the increasingly influential Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi order “was to shape the views of many ‘ulama toward sobriety in spiritual experience and rigorous adherence to the religious Law.”⁴⁸²

It is indubitable that securing the support of the *ulema* for themselves and their order was a well-reasoned strategy, a deserved success, and an advantage for the Naqshbandi şeyhs in conducting righteous and nonhazardous relations with the state and society. Being conscious of this fact, Khâlid al-Baghdâdî (1779-1827), the founder and eponym of the Khâlidiyya branch of Naqshbandiyya known for his success spreading the Naqshbandi order to rural and uneducated masses through his deputies, would write to one of his disciples the following command: “Do not initiate into the order except distinguished ‘ulamâ.” This is important, because as Butrus Abu-Manneh explains, the Naqshbandi order “is an urban order and as such it spreads primarily among the upper and the more educated ranks of society.”⁴⁸³ As can be inferred from these explanations, “interdependency” is the right if not the most appropriate word to describe the relationship between the Naqshbandis and the official *ulema*. So much so that, one can see among the şeyhs lodging in the first- and second-wave Naqshbandi *tekkes* of Istanbul many madrasa graduates, dropouts and professors. The biographies of Seyyid Fazlullâh Efendi (d. 1709) and his son, Seyyid Abdülkebîr Efendi (d. 1719), the two successive şeyhs of Emîr Bukhârî lodge located in Fatih, are significantly important for a better understanding of the cooperation between Naqshbandi order and the *ulema*. Born in 1049/1639-40, Seyyid Fazlullâh was nominated mudarris by the chief judge of Rumelia Karaçelebizâde Mahmûd Efendi in 1055/1645 when he was only six years old. As a typical example of “cradle ulema”, he remained in the dâhil rank Maksûd Bey Medresesi until November 1656. Until October 1666, he held the professorship of hâric rank Şa‘bân Ağa Medresesi. After that, he was appointed to Sinan Ağa Medresesi, where he served until March 1670. Upon the death of his father, Seyyid Abdullâh Efendi,

⁴⁸¹Weismann, *ibid*, 63.

⁴⁸²Barbara D. Metcalf, “The ‘Ulama in Transition: The Eighteenth Century,” in *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982): 28.

⁴⁸³For the quoted command of Khâlid al-Baghdâdî and Abu-Manneh’s explanation, see Butrus Abu-Manneh, “The Rise and Expansion of the Naqshbandi-Khalidi Sub-order in Early Nineteenth Century,” in *Studies on Islam and the Ottoman Empire in the 19th Century (1826-1876)*, (İstanbul: ISIS, 2001): 18. For more on the spread of Naqshbandi-Khalidi order in the Ottoman lands and its interactions with high echelons of the state, see “The Naqshbandiyya-Mujaddidiyya and the Khâlidiyya in Istanbul in the Early Nineteenth Century”, “The Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi and the Bektashi Orders in 1826”, and “The Naqshbandiyya-Mujaddidiyya in Istanbul in the Early Tanzimat Period”, related articles of Abu-Manneh collected in *ibid*, 41-57, 59-71, and 99-114.

around this time, he relinquished the official madrasa hierarchy to become the serving şeyh of the lodge. Upon his death in September 1709 during his journey to Mecca, his son Seyyid Abdülkebîr replaced him in the *tekke* in May 1710. Seyyid Abdülkebîr was also a madrasa graduate. He received his *mülâzemet* from şeyhülislâm Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Alî Efendi in March 1701, but rather than teaching in a madrasa, he remained as the secretary of his patron who would become şeyhülislâm on 26 January 1704. The only madrasa in his teaching career was Cenâbî Efendi Medresesi, where he served as a *hâric* rank professor from November 1706 to May 1710. From this date to his death on 13 June 1719, however, he was the incumbent şeyh of the *tekke* in question.⁴⁸⁴

The existence of several scholar şeyhs who successively served in the Hekîm Çelebi Tekkesi, one of the first-wave Naqshbandi lodges of Istanbul, is worthy of mention to have a good grasp of the Naqshbandi-*ulema* relationship. One of the best-known examples, in this regard, is Şeyh Ahmed of Tire (d. 1624). Born and received his initial education in Tire-Aydın, he went to Istanbul, where he graduated from Atâullâh Ahmed Efendi (d. 1571), the Birgi-Aydın born tutor of Selim II (r. 1566-1574) and protégé of the grand vizier, Rüstem Pasha (d. 1561), known for his adherence to the Naqshbandi order. Perhaps due to loss of his powerful tutor and patron, around 1000/1592, Şeyh Ahmed moved to Tire, where he served as a madrasa professor and town mufti. It was there, according to the biographer, Atâî, that he was introduced to the Naqshbandi order, a weak and dubious statement given his earlier presence in the Naqshbandi circles of Istanbul. In the following years, he went back to Istanbul where he would serve as the incumbent şeyh of the Hekîm Çelebi lodge until his death.⁴⁸⁵ Şeyh Ahmed was not charged with high-ranking madrasas of Istanbul. Nor did he serve as a qadi of a central town or city. But he had fame and prestige in and influence over the official *ulema* ranks. Therefore, in the absence of the grand mufti, Hocazâde Es'ad Efendi (1570-1624), who was taken to the Khotyn campaign, he served as the deputy şeyhülislam in Istanbul in 1621.

Şeyh Ahmed was not the only *post-nishân* with a madrasa background in the Hekîm Çelebi lodge. Nor he was the only provincial man of knowledge seeking his future and spiritual fortune in Istanbul. Bosnevî Osmân (d. 1664), Mu'abbir Hasan (d. 1687), İspirî Dâmâdı Mustafâ (d. 1708) and Ahmed al-Mekkî (d. 1710), his successors at the lodge, too, were provincial scholars who went to Istanbul in search of a better career. While Osmân and Mu'abbir Hasan originated from Bosnia, Mustafâ

⁴⁸⁴For the biographies of Seyyid Fazlullâh and Seyyid Abdülkebîr, see Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayi'u'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 3, 2719-2720, and *ibid*, vol. 4, 3276-3277. On Fazlullâh, see also Necdet Yılmaz, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: Süfiler, Devlet ve Ulemâ*, 380-381.

⁴⁸⁵For Şeyh Tirevî Ahmed's biography, see Nev'izâde Atâî, *Hadaiku'l-Hakaik fî Tekmileti's-Şakaik*, 759-760. For Atâullâh Efendi's biography see, *ibid*, 149-151.

was from İzmir. Ahmed, however, most probably came from Mecca. However, the current documentation indicates that it was Hasan and Mustafâ who participated in the official madrasa system. Mu'abbir Hasan, for instance, was the son of the deputy district governor (alaybeyi) of Mostar,⁴⁸⁶ and in Istanbul became student in one of the *mûsule-i Sahn* rank madrasas. Mustafâ, on the other hand, had already been an educated madrasa graduate before his arrival in Istanbul, where he would become the official graduate of Mehmed Efendi, the imam of the sultan.⁴⁸⁷ It was thanks to Mehmed Efendi's *mülâzemet* that he was appointed as professor to a *dâhil* rank madrasa. When it comes to Bosnevî Osmân, however, we cannot ascertain his connection with the existing madrasa hierarchy. What we know about him is that he was a well-educated disciple and deputy of Şeyh Tirevî Ahmed Efendi. Therefore, as early as 1031/1621-22, three years before the commencement of his duty at the Hekîm Çelebi lodge, he was appointed to the Fatih Mosque as the Friday preacher. He transferred to Bayezid Mosque in 1045/1635-36, to Süleymaniye Mosque in 1052/1642-43 and to Ayasofya Mosque in 1061/1651, the position that he retained until his death in 1664. Bosnevî Osmân's consistent and prolonged tenure at the pulpits of the these imperial mosques stands in stark contrast to İspirî Dâmâdı Şeyh Mustafâ's career trajectory. As mentioned in the first chapter, he was a madrasa professor when he adhered to Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî. It is worthy to note that he renounced his madrasa career and transferred to preaching. After serving as a teacher and preacher in Hocapaşa Mosque, he was appointed to Fatih in April 1690, to Bayezid in February 1692, to Süleymâniye in February 1694 and to Ayasofya in November 1694. It was only in July 1699 that he became the incumbent *şeyh* of Hekîm Çelebi lodge. Yet, his links with madrasa were never cut. As is stated by Şeyhî, he instructed at Sultân Bâyezid Medresesi as the deputy of şeyhlülislâms Debbâğzâde Mehmed (November 168–February 1688, and March 1688–June 1690), Ebû Sa'îdzâde Feyzullâh (June 1690–March 1692, and April 1692–June 1694), Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Alî (January 1704–February 1707), and Sadreddînzâde Sâdık Mehmed (June 1694–March 1695 and February 1707–January 1708).⁴⁸⁸

It is not surprising that the preacher of the imperial mosques is a madrasa graduate or has perfection in Islamic sciences. However, it should be remembered that

⁴⁸⁶Müstakîmzâde, *Meşâyih-nâme-i İslâm*, Süleymaniye Library, Esad Efendi, no. 1716/1, fol. 8b.

⁴⁸⁷For the career of İmâm-ı Sultânî Mehmed Efendi, see Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayi'ü'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 2, 1044-1045.

⁴⁸⁸On the career of Bosnevî Osmân, Mu'abbir Hasan, and İspirî Dâmâdı Mustafâ, see respectively Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayi'ü'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 2, 1356, 1414-1415, and *ibid.*, vol. 3, 2716-2718. On Bosnevî Osmân, see also Dina Le Gall, "Kadızelis, Nakşbendis, and Intra-Sufi Diatribe in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul," 4-5. On the careers of şeyhülislams who patronized İspirî Dâmâdı Mustafâ, see Mehmet İpşirli, "Debbâğzâde Mehmed Efendi," *TDVIA*, vol. 9, 62-63; *idem*, "Feyzullah Efendi, Ebûsaidzâde," *TDVIA*, vol. 12, 526; *idem*, "Paşmakçızâde Ali Efendi," *TDVIA*, vol. 34, 185-186; *idem*, "Sâdık Mehmed Efendi, Sadreddinzâde," *TDVIA*, vol. 35, 395.

madrasas were not the only centers of religious education in a period when education policies were not centralized and monopolized by the state. In fact, before the modernization of education in the Ottoman Empire, neither the state nor the madrasa were the only decision- and policy-makers in education.⁴⁸⁹ It has been brought to our attention that informal circles of learning in the mosques and *tekkes* contributed to education and literacy in Istanbul, Bursa, Cairo, Damascus and other Ottoman cities.⁴⁹⁰ These circles educated not only preacher Sufis in religious sciences, but also townsmen, including public storytellers, *çelebis* and members of military groups.⁴⁹¹ Nevertheless, particularly when it comes to the training of preachers, madrasa seems to be the most important center for their cultivation. “Of the thirty-five preachers” in the seventeenth-century Bursa, for example, “twenty are madrasa graduates. Of this twenty, eight individuals occupied posts as *müderrişes* in Bursa, one is a retired military judge, one a former judge, while the remaining ten are mentioned simply as graduates of a 40-akçe or lower-level madrasa.”⁴⁹²

A closer look at Sufi preachers identified in the biographical dictionaries of the *ulema* reveals that, rather than their Sufi affiliations, their competence in religious sciences, and, perhaps, the eloquent oratory, and most probably their connections with the state and statesmen, were the most important criteria for an appointment to the imperial mosques. The existence of not only Naqshbandi but also Khalwati, Qadiri, Zeyni, Celveti, Bayrami and Mevlevi *şeyhs* among the preachers of the grand mosques of Istanbul is satisfactory evidence to understand this reality. The level of education, the skill of oracy and the ability of comprehension and articulation of the matter, however, might vary from preacher to preacher. This is also valid when it comes to the elections and/or selections of *şeyhs* for the posts of the lodges belonging to different Sufi orders. It is obvious that not all *şeyhs* had the same or similar level of education and charisma. It is also clear that the minimum qualification requirements to become a *şeyh* changed from order to order. In fact, it was the master *şeyh* who had the last word in the selection of his deputies. Therefore, someone who was considered competent in one order could be considered inadequate in another.

⁴⁸⁹For the modernization of the education in the Ottoman Empire, see Selçuk Akşin Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire 1839-1908 Islamization, Autocracy, and Discipline*, (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

⁴⁹⁰Nelly Hanna, *In Praise of Books: A Cultural History of Cairo's Middle Class, Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century*, (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2003); Dana Sajdi, *The Barber of Damascus: Nouveau Literacy in the Eighteenth Century Ottoman Levant*, (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2013); Aslıhan Sümeyra Gürbüz, “Teachers of the Public, Advisors to the Sultan: Preachers and the Rise of a Political Public Sphere in Early Modern Istanbul, (1600-1675),” Unpublished PhD Diss., (Harvard University 2016): 180-224.

⁴⁹¹Gürbüz, *ibid.*

⁴⁹²Gürbüz, *ibid.*, 73-74. For a recent study on the preaching and preachers in the early modern Ottoman Empire, see Emrah Şahin, “Dinin Toplumsallaşmasında Aracı Bir Kurum: Erken Modern Osmanlı Toplumunda Vaaz ve Vaizler,” Unpublished MA Thesis, (TOBB Ekonomi ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi, 2020).

The biography of Feyzî Hasan Efendi (d. 1690), the father of Şeyhî Mehmed, is particularly remarkable in this regard. According to Şeyhî, born in 1036/1626-27, his father adhered to the renowned Khalwati-Sivasi *şeyh* Abdülahad Nûrî Efendi (d. 1651) in 1054/1644 when he was eighteen years old. He received both his Khalwati ijaza and initial madrasa education from Abdülahad Nûrî. Feyzî Hasan continued his madrasa education under Fâzıl Monla Çelebi, Dersi'am Sâlih Efendi and Bıçakçı Mehmed Efendi, and received his graduation certificate from Kudsîzâde Şeyh Mehmed Efendi (d. 1674) most probably when the latter became either the chief judge of Anatolia (October 1650) or chief judge of Rumelia (April-May 1651). Then he was appointed to one of the *dâhil* rank madrasas. But, after a short while, he renounced his madrasa career in return for preaching in mosques. He was the Friday preacher of the Arakiyyeci İbrâhîm Çavuş Mosque from 1652 to 1668, the year he transferred to the Kılıç Alî Pasha Mosque as Sunday preacher in lieu of the Mevlevi *şeyh*, el-Hâc Ahmed Dede, who passed away in Medina in 1078/1667-68. It was during this initial pulpitry that he adhered to Bosnevî Osmân and el-Hâc Ahmed Dede from whom he received his Naqshbandi and Mevlevi authorization. Thanks to his Mevlevi ijaza, he replaced his *şeyh* in Kılıç Alî Pasha Mosque. His Naqshbandi ijaza, on the other hand, opened for him the door of the Naqshbandi lodge located in Edirnekapı where he served as the *şeyh* from late 1675 until his death on 14 November 1690.⁴⁹³ Feyzî Hasan's biography indicates that his thorough education in religious sciences and his authority in three orders contributed to his career as a preacher *şeyh*. Because he had such qualifications he was able to transfer from a neighborhood mosque to a grand mosque, and then from there to one of the oldest Naqshbandi *tekkes* of Istanbul.

The close connections between the Naqshbandi *şeyhs* and the eminent figures of the official *ulema* hierarchy had twofold influence on the spread of the order in the Ottoman lands. These links, on the one hand, enabled the recruitment of more and more scholar-bureaucrats into the order. The participation of statesmen from secular and scholarly bureaucracy in the Naqshbandi circles resulted in the first place in favor of the *şeyhs* themselves, their family members and their lodges. Many cases that I have discussed in the previous chapters and the current one prove that it was owing to connections and cooperations with the officials of the state that Naqshbandi preceptors managed to guarantee job positions with regular incomes in government offices, mosques, madrasas and waqfs for themselves, their relatives, and even their disciples. It was also because of such connections that they were rewarded

⁴⁹³For the biography of Kudsîzâde Şeyh Mehmed, el-Hâc Ahmed Dede and Feyzî Hasan Efendi, see respectively Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayî'u'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 2, 1072-1077, 1367-1368, and 1861-1863. On el-Hâc Ahmed Dede, see also Necdet Yılmaz, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: Sûfiler, Devlet ve Ulemâ*, 279-280. On Abdülahad Nûrî Efendi, see *ibid*, vol. 2, 1327-1334, and Abdullah Uçman, "Abdülahad Nûrî," *TDVIA*, vol. 1, 178-179.

with *tekke*-madrasa complexes in metropolises of the empire. Having a madrasa background and strict links with existing *ulema* networks contributed, on the other hand, to relations between Naqshbandi *şeyhs* with the ordinary people. The venues and spaces where interactions with the public took place were mosques and Sufi lodges. Serving as preachers in the mosques of Istanbul, like their peers from other Sufi orders, Naqshbandi masters had the opportunity to teach the congregation core values of Islam and the basic provisions of sharia. It was also through the pulpits of the mosques that preacher *şeyhs*, most of whom held the post in or had a connection to a *tekke*, were able to make political speeches on current issues and spread their orders among the urbanites.

When it comes to the function of the mosque rostrum as a platform for religio-political debates, Ottoman historiography has long revolved around the so-called Qadizadeli movement specified as anti-Sufi, puritan, fundamentalist, and challenged mostly Khalwati *şeyhs* preaching in the imperial mosques of the Istanbul in the 17th century. However, as Derin Terzioğlu convincingly argues in the historical context starting from the mid-sixteenth century onwards, “Sufi preachers had distinguished themselves as political commentators long before the emergence of Kadızadeli movement, and would continue to do so long afterwards.”⁴⁹⁴ According to her, it was these “Sunna-minded” and “opinion-maker” Sufi preachers who contributed to the “Sunnitization” of the state and society by giving advice and preaching in the mosques and composing instructive texts for the use of the people. Qadizadelis, on the other hand, despite their opposition and rivalry for some Sufis and their beliefs and practices, “did not reject sufism or sufis categorically.” Terzioğlu also makes the curious observation in that “[g]enerally speaking, the Kadızadelis seem to have concentrated in their writings on social and religious practices, and not delved into administrative matters such as taxation, appointments to public offices or criminal law.”⁴⁹⁵ Sufi preachers neither hesitate to encourage rulers to obey and perform the sharia in the state administration, nor they abstain from participating in and directing insurrections against the government. Abdülmecîd Sivasî (1563-1639), the Khalwati master who became the target of the first-generation Qadizadelis, for instance, was known with his written advice to Ahmed I (r. 1603-1617) for the observation of sharia.⁴⁹⁶ One of the most distinguishing incidents in which a Sufi preacher took a politically active role to lead the politics of power was the rebellion of 1730, which resulted in

⁴⁹⁴Derin Terzioğlu, “Sunna-minded Sufi Preachers in Service of the Ottoman State: The Naşihatnâme of Hasan Addressed to Murad IV,” *Archivum Ottomanicum* 27 (2010): 243.

⁴⁹⁵Terzioğlu, “Sunna-minded Sufi Preachers in Service of the Ottoman State,” 256, and 258.

⁴⁹⁶Cengiz Gündoğdu, “Osmanlı’da Tarikat Şeyhinin Padişahı Uyarı ve Teşviklerine Yönelik Bir Örnek,” *EKEV Akademi Dergisi* 50 (2012): 25-46.

the deposition of Ahmed III, and the execution of the grand vizier, Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, and viziers, Kaymak Mustafâ Pasha and Kethüdâ Mehmed Pasha. As Selim Karahasanoğlu has brought to our attention, İspirîzâde Ahmed Efendi (d. 1730), the Friday preacher of Ayasofya known to run negotiations between the palace and rebels, became the leading figure during the revolt. Although he was not the mastermind of the rebellion, “the occurrence of the 1730 rebellion in the known manner was thanks to the guidance of İspirîzâde.”⁴⁹⁷

İspirîzâde Ahmed’s leadership in the revolt is crucial to understand the influence of a Naqshbandi preacher during one of the landmark upheavals of the 18th century. Born in İspir-Erzurum, his father İspirî Alî Efendi (d. 1692) went to Istanbul during a time when influential Erzurumî figure Vânî Mehmed Efendi was invited by the grand vizier Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Ahmed Pasha (v. 1661-1676). As a new arrival in the city, İspirî Alî enjoyed particularly the patronage of the *şeyhülislam*, Minkârîzâde Yahyâ Efendi who introduced not only him but also another Erzurumî, the future *şeyhülislâm*, Seyyid Feyzullâh Efendi, to the official *ulema* hierarchy. His career as a preacher started in 1072/1661-62 in the Eyub Mosque, and within ten years he reached the top position: the Friday preachership of Ayasofya in March 1672.⁴⁹⁸ İspirî Alî Efendi was presumably a Naqshbandi şeyh. As stated previously, his son-in-law, Mustafâ Efendi, was the Naqshbandi *şeyh* of the Hekîm Çelebi lodge. İspirîzâde Ahmed was also part of the existing Naqshbandi circles of Istanbul. As an archival document proves, after the death of his father, he lost the privileges given to the father in the Dârülhadîs of Sofu Mehmed Pasha. It was only by the beginning of Seyyid Feyzullâh’s second term as grand mufti that his privileges were restored.⁴⁹⁹ Another document demonstrates that when he was the preacher in the Selimiye Mosque in 1708, he was given the vacant preachership of Şeyh Mustafâ, his recently deceased Naqshbandi brother-in-law, at the Bostancılar mosque, located in the Imperial Garden (*hâsbahçe*).⁵⁰⁰

As to the mosque as the functional space in the service of the Naqshbandi masters to spread the order among the urbanites, an attention-grabbing anecdote conveyed by Müstakîmzâde deserves attention. Quoting from Şeyh Ağırşakçı Mehmed

⁴⁹⁷Selim Karahasanoğlu, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda 1730 İsyânına Dair Yeni Bulgular: İsyânın Organizatörlerinden Ayasofya Vaizi İspirîzâde Ahmed Efendi ve Terekesi,” *OTAM* 24 (2008): 108.

⁴⁹⁸For İspirî Alî’s biography see Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekâyi’u’l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 3, 1979-1980. See also Karahasanoğlu, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda 1730 İsyânına Dair Yeni Bulgular,” 112-113.

⁴⁹⁹See BOA, AE. SMST.II. 11/1004. This document utilized firstly by Selim Karahasanoğlu. See the footnote 17 in Karahasanoğlu, “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda 1730 İsyânına Dair Yeni Bulgular,” 102.

⁵⁰⁰This was upon the request of his nephew Mehmed. See BOA, C..EV.. 601/30344.

Efendi, the deputy of Khalwati-Sivasi şeyh Mehmed Nazmî Efendi (d. 1701),⁵⁰¹ Müstakîmzâde writes the following about abovementioned Şeyh Bosnevî Osmân: “It is one of the strangest things that in every mosque where he was Friday preacher, after the preaching he properly performed the great *hatm*, the adornment of the *tariqa*. I have been present many times in these assemblies which were held by the participation of the aspirants and adherents of the *tariqa*.”⁵⁰² Writing in the second half of the 18th century, Müstakîmzâde, himself a Naqshbandi *şeyh*, finds strange that Bosnevî Osmân organized gatherings in mosques for performing *hatm-i hâcegân*, the most crucial and distinctive Naqshbandi invocation.⁵⁰³ The astonishment of Müstakîmzâde proves that Sufi preachers rarely used mosques to spread the order to which they adhered. On the other hand, Ağırşakçı Mehmed Efendi’s testimony attests that mosques were functional for Bosnevî Osmân to propagate his views and spread the order among the congregation. One of the crucial points in Mehmed Efendi’s statements is that not only the followers (*muhibbân*), but also aspirants (*tâlibân*) were participants in this Naqshbandi dhikr. Bosnevî Osmân’s allowance for aspirants to attend the ceremonies, was a deviation from the Naqshbandi tradition instructing that attendees of the *hatm-i hâcegân* could only be the followers of the order. Since this was a matter of high concern in the order, Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî would reiterate in his letters to his newly appointed deputies that this dhikr was unique to the Naqshbandi order, and therefore, those who had not been affiliated with the order should not be included in its circles.⁵⁰⁴ As such, we may conclude that Şeyh Bosnevî Osmân aimed to spread the Naqshbandi order among urbanites by establishing dhikr circles in the imperial mosques and condoning the participation of non-adherents to them.

⁵⁰¹On Mehmed Nazmî, see Hasan Aksoy, “Nazmi Efendi, Mehmed,” *TDVIA*, vol. 32, 460-461.

⁵⁰²See Müstakîmzâde, *Ahval-i Şuyûh-i Ayaşofya*, Süleymaniye Library, Esad Efendi, no. 1716/2, fol. 14a. “Ġarâ’ibdendür ki Cum’a vâ’izi olduġu her câmi’de ba’de’l-va’z zînet-dih-i ʔarîkat-ı Şiddîkiyye ve Selmâniyye ve ber-güzâr-ı silsile-i Ġucduvâniyye olan hatm-i kebîr-i ma’rûfi iltizâm üzere icrâ buyurup tâlibân ve muhibbân-ı hâzîrân ile edâ buyurdukları meclîsde kerrât ile bulunmuşduġ deyü Nazmî Efendi hulefâsından Ağırşakçı Mehmed Dede nâm merd-i mevsu’u’l-ke’lâmdan muharrir-i mu’âşşirûn mesmû’u’l-olmuşdur”

⁵⁰³On *hatm-i hâcegân* see Reşat Öngören, “Hatm-i Hâcegân,” *TDVIA*, vol. 16, 476-477.

⁵⁰⁴See, for instance, “Wa ammâ khatm-i khâjagân fa-innahû wirdun mansûbun ilayhim makhsûşun li-fuqarâ’ihim wa li-man uzînû min al-şulaġa ma’rûfun bi-’azîm al-khayr wa al-barakat” in the letter to İlkhan al-A’zam, and “wa min al-mansûbât ilâ mashâyikhinâ wirdun laysa min da’âyim ʔarîqihim yuqâlu lahû khatm-i khâjagân ... wa lâ yasta’miluhû illâ ahli ʔarîqihim wa bi’l-izni minhum” in the letter for Seyyid Ömer of Mar’aş in *Mektûbât*, no. 1838, fol. 10b-11b, and 17b-18b.

4.3 Familial Cooperations With *Seyyids*: The Impact of Prophetic Nobility

The explicit presence of *seyyids*, holding authentic or fabricated certificates, among the Naqshbandis of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is a crucial fact that deserves special mention here. The proximity to the official *ulema*, who in most cases formed a bridge between the state and the order, and statesmen and Sufi masters, resulted in a flow of benefits from the state to the order in cases where Sufi preachers played an active role. Descent from the Prophet, I argue, had a positive impact on the charisma of the Nashbandi *şeyhs*, particularly in their relations with common people, who attended their sermons and erudite conversations in the dervish lodges and neighborhood and imperial mosques. By linking themselves to the lineage of Prophet Muhammad, they were ensuring social respect and veneration for themselves. By the same token, the social and economic privileges could be given to them, their immediate relatives, and *tekke* and madrasa complexes built for them. In fact, such characteristics were compatible with the historical realities of the centuries in question. It is an interesting observation, for instance, that “[w]hile sayyid/sharif status promised prestige and privilege throughout Islamic history, it was not very often that the drive to acquire Muhammadan nobility reached the proportions it did in Ottoman lands in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.”⁵⁰⁵ We are notified that the main incentive for the commoners to obtain a certificate regarding their nobleness, was the objective to be exempted from the heavy *avarız* taxes, once exceptional extraordinary levies that began to be collected regularly by the 17th century.⁵⁰⁶ As a result, Ottoman Balkans, Anatolia, Syria, the Levant, and Egypt enjoyed a major increase in the number of *seyyids* or pseudo-*seyyids* (*müteseyyid*) claiming descendancy from Prophet Muhammad and even formed political factions in their localities, especially in the Arab populated lands.⁵⁰⁷ It was also during these centuries that powerful and influential families claiming prophetic nobility became more apparent particularly in the *ulema* bureaucracy in Istanbul

⁵⁰⁵Hülya Canbakal, “On the ‘Nobility’ of Provincial Notables,” in *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire: Halcyon Days in Crete, V (A Symposium Held in Rethymno, 10-12 January 2003)*, ed. Antonis Anastasopoulos, (Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2005): 47.

⁵⁰⁶Rüya Kılıç, *Osmanlıda Seyyidler ve Şerifler*, İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2005; Hülya Canbakal, *Society and Politics in an Ottoman Town: Āyntāb in the 17th Century*, (Leiden: Brill, 2007): 77-89; idem, “The Ottoman State and Descendants of the Prophet in Anatolia and the Balkans (c. 1500-1700),” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 52 (2009): 542-578.

⁵⁰⁷Bruce Masters, “Power and Society in Aleppo in the 18th and 19th Centuries,” *Revue du monde musulman et de la Méditerranée* 62 (1991): 151-158; Michael Winter, *Egyptian Society Under Ottoman Rule, 1517-1798*, (London: Routledge, 1992): 182-192; Dror Ze’evi, *An Ottoman Century: The District of Jerusalem in the 1600s*, (New York: State University of New York Press, 1996): 63-86.

and among the local families in the provinces.⁵⁰⁸

Despite some exceptional examples, there is no harm in thinking that most of the Sufis and scholars who were able to bring written evidence or produce witnesses to their claim of prophetic nobility were in fact pretenders. İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı has emphasized that most of Ottoman grand muftis who came to be known as *seyyids* were in fact ethnic Turks who obtained certificates by forgery to hold the office in question.⁵⁰⁹ Sir Paul Rychaut (1629-1700), who spent seventeen years in Istanbul and Izmir from 1660 to 1677, claimed that the *nakibüleşrâfs*, the head of the descendants of the Prophet, abused the office by giving certificates to pretenders. “The Turks being well acquainted with this abuse” he goes “carry the less respect to the whole generation; so that as often as they find any of them drunk or disordered, they make no scruple to take off their green turbans first, kissing them and laying them aside with all reverence, and afterwards beat them without respect or mercy.”⁵¹⁰ Şeyhülislâm Seyyid Feyzullâh Efendi, who once served as the *nakibüleşrâf* from November 1686 to February 1688, was one of the *seyyids* accused of claiming false lineage. According to the chronicler, Silâhdâr Fındıklılı Mehmed Agha, not only was his lineage fictitious, but he was also a magician.⁵¹¹ Perhaps due also to this thought in the minds of rebels, he would be brutally slayed alongside his son Fethullâh, the *nakibüleşrâf*, in 1703.⁵¹² Notwithstanding such historical examples and accusations, my task in the current chapter is not to conduct an inspection on self-proclaimed *seyyids* as the central and provincial *nakibüleşraf*s often did particularly in the late 16th and 17th centuries.⁵¹³ Rather, what is more important for this study is the existence within Naqshbandi circles of many Sufi masters and scholars with the title of *seyyid*.

As I have already discussed in the first chapter, *şeyhs* claiming a lineage from the Prophet constituted a significant number among the masters of first-wave Naqshbandi lodges of Istanbul. Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî, the founder of Fatih and Ayvansaray

⁵⁰⁸ Canbakal, “On the ‘Nobility’ of Provincial Notables,”; Winter, *Egyptian Society Under Ottoman Rule*; Laura Bottini, “Les Descendants du Prophete a Homs: Notes en Marge,” *Oriente Moderno* 79/2 (1999): 351-373; İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti’nin İlmiye Teşkilâtı*, fourth edition, (Ankara: TTK, 2014): 169-173.

⁵⁰⁹ See the second footnote in Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti’nin İlmiye Teşkilâtı*, 172.

⁵¹⁰ Paul Rychaut, *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*, 111.

⁵¹¹ Nazire Karaçay Türkal, “Silahdar Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa Zeyl-i Fezleke,” 1120. For Silâhdâr’s contradictory statements on Seyyid Feyzullâh’s nobleness, see Ayhan Işık, “Maktûl Şeyhülislâm Feyzullah Efendi’nin Torunu Nakibü’l-eşrâf Abdullah Efendi’nin Hayatı ve Terekesi,” *Mezhep Araştırmaları Dergisi* 14/2 (2021): 914-915.

⁵¹² For the detailed story of his last days see Silâhdâr Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa, *Nusretname*, 781-784.

⁵¹³ Murat Sarıcık, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Nakibü’l-Eşrâflık Müessesesi*, (Ankara: TTK, 2003): 137-142.

lodges and the eponym of Fatih, Ayvansaray and Edirnekapı lodges, was himself a *seyyid*. Following his death, except four *şeyhs* who were members of ethnic Turkish families of Anatolia, all the *şeyhs* who succeeded his post in the Fatih lodge up until mid-19th century bore the honorary title of *seyyid*. Similarly, Mehmed Efendi, the first incumbent *şeyh* of the Hekîm Çelebi lodge was a *seyyid*. It is also worthy to recall that many *seyyids* appeared either as founder *şeyhs* or patrons of second-wave Naqshbandi lodges. Among the founders of these lodges, for instance, Şeyhülislâm Mustafâ, La‘îzâde Abdülbâkî, and Mehmed Agha, who established respectively the *tekkes* of Şeyhülislam, Kalenderhâne and Tâhir Ağa in 1742, 1743 and 1763 were famous for their noble lineage. In the same vein, Murâd Bukhârî, the first *şeyh* of the Murâd Bukhârî lodge in Istanbul and the founder of two *tekke*-madrasas in Damascus, was a celebrated *seyyid* whose father had served as the *nakîbüleşrâf* of Samarqand. We must also remember that Şeyh Mustafâ who founded ca. 1750 Seyyid Baba lodge, where he became the first *şeyh*, Abdullâh and Abdülekber (d. 1787-88), the two initial *şeyhs* who succeeded each other at Özbekler Tekkesi, and Çelebi Şeyh Mehmed (d. 1794), the fourth *şeyh* at Kâşgarî Tekkesi were well-known *seyyid* masters in second-wave lodges.⁵¹⁴

The tenure of *seyyid* masters at the Naqshbandi lodges of Istanbul had to be functional and fruitful in the sense that it provided a prestigious position to the *tekkes* where they lodged. The claim for prophetic descent could influence sincere and devout common people more than anyone, since the veneration of the Prophet and his deceased and living descendants was an honorable task kept alive in the collective memory of Muslims. The presence of many *şeyhs* bearing the title of *seyyid* served in the Naqshbandi lodges, we can assert, resulted in the spread of the order among ordinary urbanites. It was perhaps because of this reason that Sir Paul Rycaut realized in seventeenth-century Istanbul a type of Naqshbandiyya identified with a *seyyid*. He equated the prevalent Naqshbandi establishment in Istanbul with “the Order of religious Turks called Ebrbuharee” which derived from “the Holy Emir Ebrbuhar” who was none other than Emîr Bukhârî.⁵¹⁵ The living legends and fame of Emîr Bukhârî in 17th- and 18th- century Istanbul is not surprising, for it was a city where the dead and the living were side by side. As can be seen in the examples of Abû Ayyub al-Ansârî, Abû Shayba al-Khudrî, Abû al-Dardâ and Ka‘b b. Mâlik, the tombs of the Companions were erected on Ayvansaray-Eyüp line. The tombs of Sufi saints such as Emîr Bukhârî, Ebu’l-Vefâ, Merkez Efendi, Sünbül Efendi, Toklu Dede, Tokmak Dede, Yahyâ Efendi and Azîz Mahmûd Hüdâî, on the other hand,

⁵¹⁴For the list of Naqshbandi masters at Seyyid Baba, Kâşgarî Tekkesi, Murâd Buhârî Tekkesi, and Özbekler Tekkesi, see Zâkîr Şükrî Efendi, *Mecmu‘a-i Tekaya: Die Istanbuler Derwish-Konvente und Ihre Scheiche*, ed. Klaus Kreiser, (Freiburg: Klaus Schwarz, 1980): 36, 50-51, 56, 76.

⁵¹⁵Paul Rycaut, *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*, 141.

were founded in the intramural and extramural quarters of the city.⁵¹⁶ Whether they belonged to *seyyids* or not, they were centers of attraction for city dwellers, pilgrims and itinerant dervishes. In at least two letters to Dâmâdzâde Ahmed, Şeyh Murâd expressed his intention to visit the tomb of Abû Ayyub al-Ansârî and the Companions along with him.⁵¹⁷ He was such an impressive *seyyid* master that people used to flock to visit him during his sojourns in the city. After his death, however, his tomb became a site of veneration.

The Naqshbandi-*seyyid* relations and interactions are documented in its best in the biographical dictionaries of the *ulema*. Şeyhî Mehmed's *Veķāyi'ü'l-Fuḍalâ* is essential in this regard. The source enables us to identify a remarkable number of scholars with the title of *seyyid* in *ulema* bureaucracy. With reference this source alone, I claim that a Naqshbandi-*seyyid* cooperation came into existence in the Ottoman *ilmiye* establishment in the 17th and 18th centuries. What made this collaboration even more striking was its consolidation through familial bonds and friendships. The coordination of renowned *nakîbüleşrâfs* and some Naqshbandi şeyhs deserves a closer look for a better understanding of the topic. The first example is Kudsîzâde Şeyh Mehmed Efendi (d. 1674), who incessantly served as the *nakîbüleşrâf* for almost eighteen years from March 1657 to September 1674. From as early as 1035/1625-26, when he was a promising professor of *Sahn* rank, as the chief judge of Anatolia and Rumelia, and as the *nakîbüleşrâf*, he gave *mülâzemet* to at least ten novices. What made Kudsîzâde's candidates special for the *ulema* quota was that three of them were relatives, namely maternal grandfather, maternal uncle, and the father of the biographer, Şeyhî Mehmed, the future Naqshbandi şeyh of the Edirnekapı lodge. Whereas Ahmed Efendi (d. 1643-44), the maternal grandfather of the author, was introduced to the hierarchy of the *ulema* when he was thirty-six years old, his son, Mecdî Mehmed, was nominated in 1650 when he was thirteen. Feyzî Hasan Efendi, Şeyhî Mehmed's father and the future Naqshbandi master of Edirnekapı lodge, however, as mentioned above, was included in the quota in either 1650 or 1651 in his mid-twenties.⁵¹⁸ The liaison between Kudsîzâde Şeyh Mehmed's family and that of Şeyhî Mehmed continued after the death of Kudsîzâde. In 1683, for example, the chief judge of Anatolia Mehmed Efendi (d. 1686), who himself was a Naqshbandi

⁵¹⁶For more on the tombs most of which were part of tekke-complexes in Istanbul, see Baha Tanman, "İstanbul Tekkeleri," in *Antik Çağ'dan XXI. Yüzyıla Büyük İstanbul Tarihi: Mimari*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz, vol. VIII, (İstanbul: İBB Kültür AŞ., 2015): 410-427; and Halil İbrahim Düzenli, "İstanbul Türbeleri," in *ibid*, 428-449. On the tombs of Toklu Dede and Abû Shayba al-Khudrî as sites of veneration, see Christoph K. Neumann, "Toklu Dede: A Byzantine Building in Ottoman Istanbul," in *Anekdotia Byzantina: Studien zur Byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur*, eds. Isabel Grimm-Stadelmann, et al. (De Gruyter, 2023): 489-502.

⁵¹⁷Mektübât, no. 1837, fol. 9b and 12b.

⁵¹⁸For the biographies of Ahmed, Feyzî Hasan, and Mecdî Mehmed, see respectively Şeyhî Mehmed, *Veķayi'ü'l-Fuḍalâ*, vol. 1, 435-436; vol. 2, 1861-1863; and vol. 3, 2633-2636.

and once the novice and secretary of Kudsîzâde, nominated Mecdîzâde Ahmed (d. 1723), the son of Mecdî Mehmed and the cousin of Şeyhî, as his *mülâzım*.⁵¹⁹

Kudsîzâde Mehmed's case seems even more special when we take into consideration his relations with renowned Naqshbandi-Melamis of the period who claimed descent from the Prophet. Seyyid Mehmed Hâşim Efendi (d. 1677), the Melami *qutb* after the execution of Sütçü Beşîr Agha (d. 1662), was the novice of Kudsîzâde Mehmed. He adhered to Kudsîzâde during his qadiship in Bursa in 1644 and was introduced by him to the official ulema system.⁵²⁰ Another renowned Naqshbandi-Melami was Şeyh Seyyid La'lîzâde Mehmed Efendi (1642-1707), the father of La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî Efendi. He was only eight years old when Kudsîzâde reserved a novice quota for him.⁵²¹ Naqshbandi-Melami interaction and cooperation is also observable in the case when Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Alî, the Melami *qutb* after the death of Seyyid Mehmed Hâşim Efendi, gave *mülâzemet* to Seyyid Abdülkebîr and appointed him his secretary. Seyyid Abdülkebîr served from 1710 to 1719 as the incumbent şeyh of the Emîr Bukhârî lodge located in Fatih. Given these examples, we may argue that a direct channel of communication and cooperation existed between leading and luminary *seyyids* and the Naqshbandi order in Istanbul. Nevertheless, it must be born in mind that these figures had simultaneously enjoyed multiple identities. They were not only well-educated seyyids occupying offices in *ulema* bureaucracy, but also adhered to several Sufi paths. Therefore, it is hard to determine which was the most dominant identity in their personalities.

In addition to Kudsîzâdes and Paşmakçızâdes, Feyzullâh Efendizâdes, Fenârîzâdes, Seyrekzâdes, Es'adzâdes, Hocasâdes and Allâmezâdes were among *nakîbüleşrâf* families associated with the Naqshbandi order. Unlike others, Kudsîzâdes played a leading role in the existing Naqshbandi network of tekkes. As a petition dated 22 Muḥarram 1101/5, November 1689 indicates, the charitable foundations of Emîr Bukhârî's *tekkes* came under the supervision of Kudsîzâdes during the long tenure of Kudsîzâde Şeyh Mehmed Efendi. After his death, the supervision of the foundations passed to his daughters, Şerîfe Râbî'a, Şerîfe Hatîce, and Şerîfe Âyşe.⁵²² Another petition dated 24 Shawwâl 1111/14, April 1700, demonstrates that Şerîfe Ayşe was still controlled the waqfs of Emîr Bukhârî. This time, however, not directly

⁵¹⁹For Mecdîzâde Ahmed, see Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayi'ü'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 4, 3028-3030.

⁵²⁰For his biography, see Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayi'ü'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 2, 1123-1126. See also the sixth chapter of this study.

⁵²¹Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayi'ü'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 3, 2422-2425.

⁵²²BOA, İE.ENB. 4/391.

but through the deputies.⁵²³ Obviously, this was a deal between Naqshbandi *seyyid* families. Kudsîzâdes were able to manage the waqfs of Emîr Bukhârî because of their lineage, which was claimed also by Emîr Ahmed Bukhârî. Şeyhülislâm Feyzullâh Efendi's inference in the second case was familial rather than procedural. Because, as we learn from Şeyhî Mehmed, his son Ahmed (1680-1716), was the son-in-law of Kudsîzâde Şeyh Mehmed Efendi, and it is possible that he was the husband of Şerîfe Ayşe.⁵²⁴

As can be understood from the entries that I have culled from Şeyhî Mehmed's biographical dictionary and presented in this chapter, his was a useful primary source for a better portrayal of Naqshbandi-*ulema* and Naqshbandi-*seyyid* interactions, since some of Naqshbandi scholars used *seyyid* as an identifying title. What contributes even more to the uniqueness of Şeyhî's dictionary is his rigorous attention to record the burial places of the deceased from the 17th and 18th centuries, especially when it comes to the extramural *hazîre* of Emîr Bukhârî Tekkesi near Edirnekapı (108 deceased), and the Pınarbaşı cemetery (47 deceased) in Bursa. Utilizing Şeyhî Mehmed's notes as to the burial places of *seyyid ulema*, I have found 108 deceased buried in the extramural *hazîre* of Emîr Bukhârî lodge. Given this, one can easily notice twenty-one *seyyids* who constitutes almost one fifth of all individuals (See Table 4.1). What is even more striking is that twelve of twenty-one *seyyids* were members of five prominent *nakîbüleşrâf* families, respectively four from Fenârîzâdes, three from Seyrekzâdes, three from Es'adzâdes, one from Hocazâdes, and one from Allâmezâdes. Furthermore, three of twenty-one *seyyids* who were buried there (Seyrekzâde Seyyid Yûnus Efendi (d. 1652), Fenârîzâde Seyyid Mehmed Efendi (d. 1696), and Seyyid Ca'fer Efendi (d. 1697)), had served once as the *nakîbüleşrâf*.⁵²⁵ Allâmezâde Seyyid Abdullâh (d. 1656) and Hocazâde Seyyid Mehmed (d. 1702), on the other hand, were sons of *nakîbüleşrâfs*.⁵²⁶ Therefore, I have come to conclusion that Fenârîzâdes, Seyrekzâdes, Es'adzâdes, Allâmezâdes and Hocazâdes were also among *nakîbüleşrâf* families affiliated with the Naqshbandi

⁵²³In her petition to the then Şeyhülislâm Feyzullâh Efendi, she requested that Osmân, the current deputy-trustee of the *tekke* located in Ayvansaray who failed to administer the waqf be replaced by a certain İbrâhîm who was trustworthy, straightforward, and capable for the position. Although nothing more is said about İbrâhîm in the petition, considering that Şeyhülislâm Feyzullâh's inclination for the benefits of his family, we may conclude that it was his son İbrâhîm (d. 1709). For the petition see BOA, İE.ENB. 5/561. For Feyzullâh Efendi's family tree, see Michael Nizri, *Ottoman High Politics and the Ulema Household*, 23. For İbrâhîm, see Mehmed Süreyyâ, *Sicill-i Osmânî*, vol. 3, 749.

⁵²⁴On Ahmed, see Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayi'u'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 3, 2659-2661. See also Ahmet Türek and F. Çetin Derin, "Feyzullah Efendi'nin Kendi Kaleminden Hal Tercümesi," *Tarih Dergisi* 24 (1970): 71-72.

⁵²⁵For their biographies, see respectively Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayi'u'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 1, 668-670; vol. 3, 2067-2069, and 2080-2082.

⁵²⁶For their biographies, see Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayi'u'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 1, 750-751; and *ibid.*, vol. 3, 2175-2176. For the biographies of *nakîbüleşrâfs* Allâme Seyyid Mehmed Şeyhî and Hocazâde Seyyid Osmân, see *ibid.*, vol. 1. 229-236, and vol. 3. 2159-2161.

establishment in Istanbul.

Table 4.1 Seyyids buried around Emîr Bukhârî lodge in Edirnekapı

	Name	Family	Certificated by	Last Position
1	Şeyhî Mehmed	Fenârîzâde	Şeyhülislâm Hoca Sa‘deddîn	Qadi - Eyüp
2	Mehmed Ef.	Fenârîzâde	Karaçelebizâde Mahmûd	Nakîbüleğrâf
3	Lütfullâh	Fenârîzâde	Şeyhülislâm Çatalcalı Alî	Mudarris
4	Ahmed	Fenârîzâde	Karaçelebizâde Mahmûd	Qadi - Mecca
5	Yûnus Ef.	Seyrekzâde	Ganîzâde Mehmed	Nakîbüleğrâf
6	Mehmed Âsım	Seyrekzâde	Şeyhülislâm Esîrî Mehmed	Mudarris
7	Abdurrahmân	Seyrekzâde	Şeyhülislâm Çatalcalı Alî	Mudarris
8	Mes‘ûd	Es‘adzâde	Kadrî Efendi	Mudarris
9	Mehmed Ebussuûd	Es‘adzâde	Karaçelebizâde Mahmûd	Qadi - Aleppo
10	Mehmed Sa‘deddîn	Es‘adzâde	Şeyhülislâm Çatalcalı Alî	Mudarris
11	Mehmed Hocasâde	Şeyhülislâm	Çatalcalı Alî	Mudarris
12	Abdullâh	Allâmezâde	Unknown	Mudarris
13	Abdurrahîm	Çukacîzâde	Şeyh. Ahîzâde Hüseyin	Qadi - Filibe
14	Ahmed	Çukacîzâde	Unknown	Qadi - Medina
15	Ca‘fer Ef.	...	Şeyhülislâm Ebu Sa‘îd	Nakîbüleğrâf
16	Mehmed Ef.	Alîzâde	Unknown	Qadi - Kayseri
17	Mehmed Sabrî	...	Şeyhülislâm Yahyâ	Qadi - ?
18	Mustafâ	Edîbîzâde	Şeyhülislâm Yahyâ	Qadi - Üsküdar
19	Mustafâ	...	Unknown	Mudarris
20	Abdullâh	Eşrefzâde	Kadrî Efendi	Mudarris
21	Mehmed	...	Şeyh. Debbâğzâde Mehmed	Mudarris

The said examples prove the existence of well-established links and intertwined relationships between “Great Molla” families who produced chief judges and grand muftis alongside *nakîbüleğrâfs*.⁵²⁷ The members of some of these families shared three common identities: they were *seyyids* by birth, scholars by professional inclination and Naqshbandis by Sufi taste. Moreover, consciousness for intra-familial co-operations was a significant power in their hands. Therefore, the then chief judge of Rumelia, Karaçelebizâde Mahmûd Efendi (d. 1653), did not hesitate in 1055/1645 to give *mülâzemet* to at least four underage *seyyids*. Whereas one of them, the abovementioned Seyyid Fazlullâh Efendi, would serve as the incumbent *şeyh* of the Emîr Bukhârî lodge in Fatih from 1670 to 1709, and Fenârîzâde Seyyid Mehmed Efendi chaired the office of nakâbet from December 1694 to March 1695. Fenârîzâde Seyyid Ahmed (d. 1698) and Es‘adzâde Seyyid Mehmed Ebussuûd (d. 1682), the remaining two novices, however, completed their careers as qadis.⁵²⁸ Except Şeyh

⁵²⁷ On Great Molla families of the 18th century, see Madeline Zilfi, *The Politics of Piety*, 43-80; and “Elite Circulation in the Ottoman Empire: Great Mollas of the Eighteenth Century,” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 26/3 (1983): 318-364.

⁵²⁸ For their biographies see Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayi‘u’l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 2, 1234-1235; and vol. 3, 2092-2093.

Seyyid Fazlullâh, who was buried in the skirts of Mount Sinai, all three novices of Karaçelebizâde Mahmûd were buried around the Emîr Bukhârî lodge located in Edirnekapı. A similar situation applies to four novices of the then *şeyhülislâm*, Çatalcalı Alî Efendi (d. 1692), who held the office for more than twelve years from February 1674 to September 1686 and from March 1692 to April 1692. His novices, Fenârîzâde Lütfullâh (d. 1697), Es‘adzâde Mehmed Sa‘deddîn (d. 1699), Hocazâde Mehmed (d. 1702) and Seyrekzâde Abdurrahmân (d. 1704) were all *seyyids* and members of established *nakîbüleşrâf* families in Ottoman scholarly bureaucracy. Except Seyrekzâde Abdurrahmân, whose paternal uncle Seyrekzâde Yûnus and paternal cousin Seyrekzâde Abdurrahmân had once become the *nakîbüleşrâf*, the remaining three novices of Çatalcalı Alî were the sons of *nakîbüleşrâfs*. Needless to say, all of them were buried in Edirnekapı around the Emîr Bukhârî lodge.⁵²⁹

The meticulousness of Şeyhî Mehmed in recording the burial ground of those buried around the Edirnekapı Emîr Bukhârî lodge is crucial given that both he and his father, Feyzî Hasan, were serving masters of the *tekke* in question. Obviously, by drawing attention to such seemingly trivial details in biographic entries in *Vekâyi‘u’l-Fudalâ*, he aimed to implicitly emphasize the Naqshbandi affiliations of those deceased. Considering that enclosed graveyards of the intramural Sufi lodges could function as posthumous gathering places of the regulars of the relevant lodges,⁵³⁰ we can conclude the *extra-muros* cemetery in the vicinity of the Emîr Bukhârî lodge served the same function. Yet, the burial ground of the Emîr Bukhârî lodge was distinguishable from those of other intramural and extramural *tekkes*, particularly in terms of its spiritual atmosphere created by the sepulture of countless *seyyid* scholars there. Writing during the last quarter of the sixteenth century on this lodge and adjacent mosque were built by Şeyh Mahmûd Çelebi in 1530, the biographer, Mecdî Mehmed Efendi (d. 1591) clarified that still in his time “that mosque and that

⁵²⁹For their biographies see Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekâyi‘u’l-Fudalâ*, vol. 3, 2090-2091, 2126-2127, 2175-2176, and 2344-2345. On Çatalcalı Alî Efendi, see Mehmet İpşirli, “Çatalcalı Ali Efendi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 8, 234-235.

⁵³⁰For some studies on several *hazires* of Istanbul, see among others Aksel Tibet, Ekrem Işın, and Dilek Yelkenci, “Stelae Turcicae VIII: Yenikapı Mevlevihânesi Haziresi,” in *Cimetières et Traditions Funéraires dans le Monde Islamique / İslâm Dünyasında Mezarlıklar ve Defin Gelenekleri*, vol. I, (Ankara: TTK, 1996): 223-281; Yavuz Özdemir, *Galata Mevlevihânesi Müzesi*, (İstanbul: Türkiye Turing ve Otomobil Kurumu, 2008); Aslı Sağıroğlu Aslan and Yeşim Sökütlü, “Şeyh Devati Mustafa Haziresi’ndeki Mezar Taşları,” *TÜBİTAK: final report*, (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi, 2016); Yeşim Sökütlü, “İstanbul-Üsküdar Şeyh Devati Mustafa haziresinde yer alan mezar taşları,” Unpublished M.A Thesis, (Erciyes Üniversitesi, 2015); Sahure Yarış, “Üsküdar Ayazma Camii Haziresi’ndeki Mezar Taşları,” *Sanat Tarihi Dergisi XXVII* (2018): 197-249; Sahure Yarış and Zülküf Yarış, “Üsküdar’daki Çingene Fırını Camii (Karakadı Camii) Haziresi’ndeki Mezar Taşları Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme,” *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 9/44 (2016): 738-756; Ahmet Semih Torun, “Şeyh Muhammed Murâd-ı Buhârî Tekkesi Haziresi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme,” *Vakıflar Dergisi* 34 (2010): 125-161; Mesut Ayar, “Eyüp’te Oluklubayır Nakşibendî Tekkesi,” *İstanbul Araştırmaları* 2 (1997): 53-66; for an elaborated version of this article see Mesut Ayar, “Eyüp’te İsmi Unutulmuş Bir Tekke: Şeyh Arapzâde Hacı Ali Efendi Nakşibendî Dergâhı,” in *Yücel Dağlı Anısına*, eds. Evangelia Balta, Yorgos Dedes, Emin Nedret İşli, and M. Sabri Koz, (İstanbul: Turkuaz, 2011): 31-51; Ömer Koçyiğit, “Üsküdar Afganiler Tekkesi ve Haziresindeki Mezartaşları,” 665-688.

lodge have become famous for its affiliation with Emîr Bukhârî and have become wellspring of the learned (*‘ulemā*) and righteous (*şulehā*). By the burial of a great multitude and abundance of predecessor nobles (*eşrāf-ı eslāf*) there, it has overflowed with blessed graves.”⁵³¹ These statements prove that as early as the late sixteenth century, the burial area of the Emîr Bukhârî lodge in Edirnekapı had turned into a center of attraction for the *ulema* claiming descent from the Prophet Muhammad. As I have demonstrated, this tradition steadily continued into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and almost one fifth of all deceased buried around this *tekke* were *seyyids*. It must also be remembered that the cemetery was a typical example of many *extra-muros* cemeteries which were systematically promoted by Ottoman authorities since the late fifteenth century, “much in the style of Western cemeteries of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.”⁵³² Therefore, the existence in this burial area of graves belonging to *seyyids* and *ulema*, who were not affiliated with the Naqshbandi order, would not be surprising.

4.4 The Role of Lodgeless Şeyhs

The third factor in the expansion of the Naqshbandi order in Ottoman lands was the mission of the lodgeless *şeyhs*. I use “lodgeless *şeyh*” in this study to describe a Sufi master authorized by a Naqshbandi *şeyh* to teach and spread the principles of the order but was not conditioned to conduct the guidance by retreating to a *tekke*. In other words, a lodgeless *şeyh* was a deputy whose priority was to practice his social status and profession in daily life rather than fulfilling duties that an incumbent *şeyh* performed daily at his *tekke*. However, this does not mean that he never served in a *tekke*. Therefore, I include in this category those who carried out short-dated services in the lodges during their long career. As can be seen in the table composed of identified lodgeless *şeyhs* below (Table 4.2), they were mostly members of the official *ulema* who could serve in different stages of their lives as imam, muezzin, preacher, müderris, qadi, chief judge, mufti, and chief mufti. Nonetheless, there were also officials who held “secular” posts in the state administration, and more

⁵³¹ Mecdî Mehmed Efendi, *Hadaiku’ş-Şakaik*, 519. “hâlen ol cāmîc ve ol zāviye Emîr Buḫārîye intisābla şöhret bulup ‘ulemā ve şulehā yatağı olmuşdur eşrāf-ı eslāfdan cem‘-i keşîr ve cem‘-i ğafîr anda defn olunup mezārāt-ı mütebereke ile tölmuşdur”

⁵³² Edhem Eldem, “Urban Voices From Beyond: Identity, Status and Social Strategies in Ottoman Muslim Funerary Epitaphs of Istanbul (1700-1850),” in *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire*, eds. Virginia Aksan and Daniel Goffman, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007): 234. On the transformation of western cemeteries and their relocation as extramural burial grounds see Philippe Ariès, *Western Attitudes Toward Death: From the Middle Ages to the Present*, trans. Patricia M. Ranum, (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1975): 69-73; Julie Rugg, “Defining the Place of Burial: What Makes a Cemetery a Cemetery?,” *Mortality* 5/3 (2000): 259-275.

importantly, artisans and craftsmen who constantly engaged with society. Setting aside some exceptional figures such as Mehmed Emîn Tokadî, who authorized at least forty-four *şeyhs* in the Naqshbandi order,⁵³³ it is likely that each lodgeless *şeyh* initiated fewer followers into the order than incumbent *şeyhs* who controlled *tekkes* for years. Yet, it is highly likely that the number of lodgeless *şeyhs* exceeded that of those officially recognized with lodges. It was for this reason alone that the Naqshbandi order could be propagated through all layers of society and in the networks of artisans and guilds.

In the fourth table in the Appendix of his book on the history of Sufism in the eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire, Ramazan Muslu has attempted to list the names of scholars who were affiliated with Sufi orders. Out of thirty-five figures listed in his table, twenty had affiliations with the Naqshbandi, six with Mevlevi, four with Khalwati, two with Celveti, one with Bektaşî and one with Bayrami orders. The order of only one scholar, Şeyhülislâm Mehmed Sâdık Efendi (d. 1709), whose patronage for İspirî Dâmâdı Şeyh Mustafâ was mentioned above, however, could not be detected by Muslu.⁵³⁴ Unfortunately, the author was unaware of the fact that the listed scholars in his table were lodgeless *şeyhs*, at least when it comes to those affiliated with the Naqshbandi order. He failed to realize, for instance, that Karababazâde İbrâhîm Efendi, Kimîl Mehmed Bey, Cârullâh Veliyyüddîn, Dâmâdzâde Ebulhayr Ahmed Efendi and Mehmed İsmet Efendi, five of ten scholars listed jointly in his and my tables were authorized Naqshbandi masters rather than mere adherents of the Naqshbandi order.⁵³⁵ Considering this fact, we can conclude that all of thirty-five names that Muslu recorded were in fact authorized lodgeless *şeyhs*. If this is so, it becomes clear that lodgeless mastery was a phenomenon for the circles of almost all Sufi brotherhoods particularly in the 18th century. However, it had to be a well-established tradition adopted specifically by the Naqshbandi order.

My table on the lodgeless *şeyhs* is in agreement in the first place with the findings of the existing literature, in the sense that Murâd Bukhârî and Ahmad Juryânî, the two disciples and deputies of Şeyh Muhammad Ma'sûm, had contributed much to the spread of the Naqshbandi order among the scholar-bureaucrats and grandees of the empire. Thirteen deputies of Şeyh Murâd and nine deputies of Şeyh Ahmed constitutes two-thirds of the list. With the addition of six masters authorized by

⁵³³For the list of forty-four deputies of Mehmed Emîn Tokadî, see Hüseyin Vassâf, *Sefîne-i Evliyâ*, vol. 2, 72.

⁵³⁴For the list, see Ramazan Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: 18. Yüzyıl*, 743.

⁵³⁵Curiously enough that although he knew that Mehmed Hâdimî was an authorized *şeyh*, he listed him among scholars adhered to the order. See *ibid*, 607-608.

Table 4.2 Lodgeless Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi şeyhs

	Lodgeless Şeyh	Death	Last Position	Authorized by
1	Seyyid Feyzullâh Ef.	1703	Şeyhülislâm	Murâd Bukhârî
2	Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Alî	1712	Şeyhülislâm	Murâd Bukhârî
3	Ebulhayr Ahmed Ef.	1741	Şeyhülislâm	Murâd Bukhârî
4	Veliyyüddîn Ef.	1768	Şeyhülislâm	Murâd Bukhârî
5	İdris Ef.	1705	Qadi - Üsküdar	Murâd Bukhârî
6	La'îzâde Abdülbâkî Ef.	1746	Qadi - İstanbul	Murâd Bukhârî
7	Karababazâde İbrâhîm	1722	Mudarris	Murâd Bukhârî
8	Vâsîf Mehmed Emîn Ef.	1725	Mudarris	Murâd Bukhârî
9	Mehmed Sâlim Ef.	1743	Chief Judge	Murâd Bukhârî; Fazlullâh Ef.
10	Mehmed İsmet Ef.	1747	Mudarris	Murâd Bukhârî
11	Hâdimî Mustafâ Ef.		Mudarris	Murâd Bukhârî
12	Hâdimî Mehmed Ef.	1762	Mudarris	Murâd Bukhârî
13	Rahmetullâh Bukhârî	1751	?	Murâd Bukhârî
14	Muhammed Semerkandî	1705	Şeyh	Ahmad Juryânî
15	Kıml Mehmed Bey	1732	Muhâsebe-Anadolu	Ahmad Juryânî
16	Kahramân Agha	?		Ahmad Juryânî
17	Ziyâeddîn Mehmed	1736	Chief Judge	Ahmad Juryânî
18	Veliyyüddîn Cârullâh Ef.	1738	Qadi - Edirne	Ahmad Juryânî
19	Heykel Hüseyin Ef.	1739	Calligrapher	Ahmad Juryânî
20	Seyyid Mustafâ Ef.	1745	Şeyhülislâm	Ahmad Juryânî; Murâd Bukhârî
21	Yekçeşm Ahmed Murtazâ	1747	Rûznâmçe-i Evvel	Ahmad Juryânî
22	Mehmed Emîn Tokadî	1745	Şeyh	Ahmad Juryânî; Murâd Bukhârî
23	Cezerizâde Mehmed Sa'îd	1752		Mehmed Emîn Tokadî
24	Mehmed Bahtî	1753	İmâm	Mehmed Emîn Tokadî
25	Halîl Ef.	1773		Mehmed Emîn Tokadî
26	Müstakîmzâde Süleymân	1781	Calligrapher	Mehmed Emîn Tokadî
27	Seyyid Yahyâ Ef.	1784		Mehmed Emîn Tokadî
28	Ahmed Şevkî Ef.	1785		Mehmed Emîn Tokadî
29	Eğrikapılı Mehmed Râsim	1756	Calligrapher	Kırımî Ahmed
30	Sohrâb Agha	?		Kahramân Agha; Nâblusî
31	Emîr Agha	?		Kahramân Agha
32	Mustafâ Efendi	1731	Odabaşı	Kahramân Agha
33	Mehmed Râşid	1735	Chief Judge	Emîr Ağa
34	Köse Ahmed Trabzonî	1777		Hâdimî Mehmed
35	Mehmed Âgâh Ağa	1770		Neccârzâde Mustafâ Rızâ

Mehmed Emîn Tokadî, who himself was the deputy of Şeyh Ahmed, eight-tenths shows up. The exceptional presence of the official *ulema* among the lodgeless *şeyhs* is an indisputable fact. It is noteworthy in particular that twelve of thirteen deputies of Şeyh Murâd served in the upper echelons of the scholarly bureaucracy as *şeyhülislâm*, qadi, chief judge, and *müderris*. Such a situation is, of course, in conformity with my findings presented in the previous chapter regarding Şeyh Murâd's networks. Besides that, Table 4.2 points to a striking procedural difference between Şeyh Murâd and

Şeyh Ahmed. Contrary to the former, who concentrated his influence on the ulema, the latter extended his hand to secular bureaucracy from where he was able to recruit disciples such as Kımıl Mehmed Bey, Kahramân Agha, and Yekçeşm Ahmed Murtazâ. It was through the guidance of these figures that the Sufi chain of Yekdest Ahmed ensured its continuity in secular bureaucracy as can be seen in the examples of Sohrâb Agha, Emîr Agha, and Odabaşı Mustafâ Efendi.⁵³⁶ Therefore, in what follows, I will bring attention to Kımıl Mehmed Bey, Mehmed Emîn Tokadî, and Heykel Hüseyîn Efendi, three lodgeless Naqshbandi *şeyhs* representing the mystical lineage of Yekdest Ahmad Juryânî.

Kımıl Mehmed Bey is one of the most remarkable figures to have a better understanding of a lodgeless *şeyh* in high position in state administration. He was the son of Doğancı Hüseyin Pasha (d.1691), who served as the head of the financial office from 14 October 1687 to 21 March 1688. Hüseyin Pasha's incumbency in the financial office likely occasioned his three sons', Kımıl Mehmed, Mahmûd and İbrâhîm, appointments to positions in the same bureau in the beginning of their careers. We know, for instance, that Mahmûd served as Defter Emîni before his appointment as Mâliye Tezkirecisi in November 1695. Educated in the imperial school, İbrâhîm, the other son, had already become a steward in the inner treasury thanks to Çorlulu Alî Pasha. After serving as *silâhdâr* of the sultan for two months from February to April in 1704, he became pasha and was appointed as governor of Şehrizol in October of the same year. From this date to 1715, he served thrice as governor of Şehrizol, twice in Aleppo, and once in Ezurum, Mosul and Diyarbekir. Completing his first phase in the eastern provinces of the empire, he served as the custodian of Mediterranean islands and coastal cities such as İnebahtı, İstanköy and Ağrıboz from June 1715 to October 1720, the date he became the governor of Maraş. It was during his government in Maraş when he was called to Istanbul in 1721 to be married either to Ayşe Sultan or Emîne Sultan, the two daughters of Mustafâ II who were born 1696.⁵³⁷ After the marriage, which took place after the *mevlûd* ceremony of 1133/11 January 1721, he was transferred to Erzurum as governor. It was there that he was charged with the commandership of armies going for the campaign on Revan and Gence. Finally, he passed away in Erzurum in the winter of 1724.⁵³⁸

⁵³⁶ On Odabaşı Mustafâ Efendi who received his Sufi training from Kahramân Agha, see Fındıklılı İsmet Efendi, *Tekmiletü'ş-Şakaik fî Hakk-ı Ehli'l-Hakaik*, 342.

⁵³⁷ On "the relative silence surrounding the princesses' marriages" that "gave rise to some confusion regarding their identities" see Tülay Artan, "Royal Weddings and The Grand Vezirate: Institutional and Symbolic Change in the Early Eighteenth Century," in *Royal Courts in Dynastic States and Empires*, eds. Jeroen Duindam, Tülay Artan, and Metin Kunt, (Leiden: Brill, 2011): 361-362. Although the chronicler Râşid recorded the name of princess as Ayşe in his entry on the *mevlûd* ceremony dated 11 January 1721, his successor Çelebizâde Âsım identified her as Emîne in the entry on the death of Silâhdâr İbrâhîm Pasha. See respectively in *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vol. II, 1215, and vol. III, 1347-1348.

⁵³⁸ On Doğancı Hüseyin Pasha, see *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vol. I, 417; Mehmed Süreyyâ, *Sicill-i Osmanî*,

Silâhdâr İbrâhîm Pasha's long service in the eastern and Arab provinces of the empire was not accidental. By assigning him to the provinces in question, the steerers of the state mechanism in Istanbul aimed on the one hand to eliminate his possible influence and domination in state affairs in the center. On the other hand, however, they aimed to control provincial politics by benefitting from his presence there, which indicates that the center was sure of his loyalty to the sultan. The second possibility seems more reasonable to me because our sources contain telling clues regarding his familial connections, particularly with Arabs and Arab-populated regions. When his father, Hüseyin, was dismissed from his office on 21 March 1688 and imprisoned, the *imâm* of Süleymân II (r. 1687-1691), Arabzâde Abdülvehhâb Efendi (d. 1691), took an active role for his forgiveness. It was thanks to Arabzâde Abdülvehhâb's intervention that Hüseyin Efendi was not only pardoned, but also promoted to the rank of pasha and appointed governor of Basra, an Arab province, in May 1688.⁵³⁹ Following the banishment of Arabzâde Abdülvehhâb in January 1690 by the grand vizier Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha from the court of Süleymân II to Medina, where he would pass away in Muḥarram 1103/September-October 1691,⁵⁴⁰ things became aberrant for Hüseyin Pasha. First, he was called from the island of Ağrıboz to Edirne and then executed soon after the death of Arabzâde Abdülvehhâb Efendi.⁵⁴¹ Having close connections with Arabs and Arab-populated regions seems to have had a decisive impact on the career of Kımıl Mehmed Bey, the son of Hüseyin Pasha and elder brother of Silâhdâr İbrâhîm Pasha. For instance, following his tenure as Rûznâmçe-i Evvel, he carried in 1690 and 1692 the robes of honor and berâts of Ahmed b. Ghâlib (d. 1701) and Muhsin b. Hüseyin (d. 1695), the two successor sharifs of Mecca.⁵⁴² From 1710 to 1717, he served as the *şeyhü'l-harem* of Mecca, which necessitated simultaneously the ruling of Habeş province, which was deprived of its former importance, and the governorate of Jeddah sanjak.⁵⁴³ In his case, however, the governorate of Habeş was given to him only in November

vol. 3, 721; İsmail Hâmi Danişmend, *Osmanlı Devlet Erkânı*, (İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1971): 278. On Hüseyin Pasha's son Mahmûd, see *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vol. I, 513. On Silâhdâr İbrâhîm Pasha, see Mehmed Süreyyâ, *Sicill-i Osmanî*, vol. 3, 778; *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vol. III, 1347-1348.

⁵³⁹ On Defterdâr Hüseyin Efendi's dismissal and re-promotion see Defterdar Sarı Mehmed Paşa, *Zübde-i Vekayiât*, 287, 289; and *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vol. I, 340-341.

⁵⁴⁰ For Arabzâde Abdülvehhâb Efendi's career, see Şeyhî Mehmed, *Vekayi'ü'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 3, 1977-1978. On Arabzâdes, see Arzu Güldöşüren, "Üç Asır İstanbullu Bir Ulema Ailesi: Arabzadeler," *DİVÂN* 23/45 (2018/2): 27-79.

⁵⁴¹ Defterdar Sarı Mehmed Paşa, *Zübde-i Vekayiât*, 359-360, 409, 411; *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vol. I, 384, 416-417.

⁵⁴² *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vol. I, 419-420; İsmail Hakki Uzunçarşılı, *Mekke-i Mükerrerme Emirleri*, (Ankara: TTK, 1972): 92-94.

⁵⁴³ On the history of Habeş under the Ottoman rule, see Cengiz Orhonlu, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Güney Siyaseti: Habeş Eyaleti*, (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası, 1974). For the deterioration of the situation in the 18th century, see *ibid*, 129-140. See also *idem*, "Habeş Eyaleti," *TDVİA*, vol. 14, 363-367.

1714. In treatment similar to that given his brother İbrâhîm, Kımıl Mehmed Bey was prevented from rising in the administrative ranks of the central bureaucracy. Şehîd Alî Pasha's enmity towards him was so virulent that he issued a decision for his execution the day before his disaster in Petrovaradin on 5 August 1716. Even though he enjoyed the rank of pasha as the governor of Habeş, upon his return from Mecca in 1717, he was demoted and continued his career as an experienced specialist in the finance office. We know, for instance, that he was a mevkûfâtçı in 1726. In May 1728, however, he was appointed as the Chief Accountant of Anatolia.⁵⁴⁴

Could a lodgeless *şeyh* in a senior position serve as a master of a Sufi brotherhood in the Ottoman capital? And if so, how? The *menâkıbnâme* of Mehmed Emîn Tokadî, drafted by his disciple, Seyyid Yahyâ Efendi (d. 1784), but completed by Ahmed Hasîb Üsküdârî (d. 1786) is a useful source where satisfactory answers to our questions can be found. Containing first-person narratives from Mehmed Emîn Tokadî, the text has the characteristics of an ego-document.⁵⁴⁵ According to the *menâkıbnâme*, from November 1702 to March-April 1706, Mehmed Emîn stayed in Mecca, where he was initiated by Yekdest Ahmad Juryânî to the Naqshbandi order. Upon his return from Mecca, Ahmad Juryânî gave him two hundred gold coins and handed him a letter of recommendation to be delivered to Kımıl Mehmed Bey, his deputy in Istanbul.⁵⁴⁶ It was because of this letter that Mehmed Emîn was patronized by Kımıl Mehmed in his mansion and further educated in the Naqshbandi path. These significant details in the *menâkıbnâme* denote on the one hand that Şeyh Ahmad Juryânî, as in the case of Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî, enjoyed a rich, high-quality living rather than the life of a destitute, idle dervish. On the other hand, it demonstrates that the roles assumed by Dâmâdzâde Ahmed Efendi in Şeyh Murâd's case, were played by Kımıl Mehmed Bey in this case. What Mehmed Emîn observed in Kımıl Mehmed Bey's mansion, were fine details regarding the training method of a lodgeless Naqshbandi *şeyh*. We are told that Kımıl Mehmed, a solemn and laconic

⁵⁴⁴For his career see Mehmed Süreyyâ, *Sicill-i Osmanî*, vol. 3, 963-964; and Müstakîmzâde, *Tuhfe-i Hattâtîn*, 406. Mehmed Süreyyâ has penned this entry by utilizing anecdotes in the *menâkıbnâme* of Mehmed Emîn Tokadî where the date of Kımıl Mehmed is recorded as 1132/1720. However, a chronogram recorded by Ayvansarâyî proves that he died in 1145/1732. For the incorrect date in the *menâkıbnâme* see, Ahmed Hasîb Üsküdârî, *Menâkıb-ı Mehmed Emîn Tokadî*, Princeton University Library, Islamic Manuscripts, no. 495, fól. 9a. This text is erroneously entitled *Bevâkîtü'l-Haremeyn* and attributed to Müstakîmzâde. For Ayvansarâyî's record, see Ayvansarâyî, *Mecmuâ-i Tevârih*, 214. For pieces of information regarding Kımıl Mehmed Bey's career in the chronicle of Râşîd Mehmed and Çelebizâde İsmâ'îl, see *Târîh-i Râşîd ve Zeyli*, vol. I, 376, 415, 419-420, 564; *ibid*, vol. II, 821-822, 888, 1032; and *ibid*, vol. III, 1484-1485, 1596.

⁵⁴⁵Barbara Kellner-Heinkele, "The Pearl in the Shell: Sheykh Mehmed Emin Tokadi's (d. 1745) Self-vita as Scripted by Sheykh Seyyid Hasib Üskudari," quoted in Selim Karahasanoglu, "Learning from Past Mistakes and Living a Better Life: Report on the Workshop in Istanbul on 'Ottoman Ego-Documents'," *Review of Middle East Studies* 54/2 (2020): 299.

⁵⁴⁶For the biography of Mehmed Emîn Tokadî, see Hüseyin Vassâf, *Sefîne-i Evliyâ*, vol. 2., 62-78; Halil İbrahim Şimşek, *Mehmed Emîn-i Tokadî: Hayatı ve Risaleleri*, (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2005); *idem*, 18. *Yüzyıl Osmanlı Toplumunda Nakşibendî-Müceddidilik*, 141-161; *idem*, "Mehmed Emin Tokadî," *TDVIA*, vol. 28, 467-468.

figure, often had savant conversations with his guests. In his initial conversations with Mehmed Emîn, he explained complicated topics pertaining to spiritual journey of a dervish. Since he was well-versed in the history of the Naqshbandi order and had a good grasp of knowledge on the biographies of its pioneering figures, he could tell the most appropriate anecdote whenever a hardship appeared in Mehmed Emîn's state of mind. Furthermore, to some degree, he could reveal and estimate correctly what was in his heart and mind.⁵⁴⁷

A comparative reading of the *menâkıbnâme* and *Tuḥfe-i Ḥaṭṭāṭîn* is telling not only on the methods adopted by some lodgeless *şeyhs* to disseminate the Naqshbandi order in Istanbul, but also on how the order was enrooted among the calligraphers. We learn from first-person narratives of Seyyid Yahyâ, the drafter of the *menâkıbnâme*, that whereas Mehmed Emîn Tokadî preferred to execute spiritual guidance at his home located in Fil Yokuşu street in Zeyrek, Heykel Hüseyin Efendi (d. 1739-40), another disciple and spiritual nominee of Yekdest Ahmad Juryânî, used to gather with his followers in a barbershop opposite the funeral gate of the Ayasofya. It is worthy note that both *şeyhs* hunted after eligible postulants in order to incorporate them into the *tariqa*. While Mehmed Emîn mostly entrusted this duty to his dervishes, Heykel Hüseyin walked through the streets and mosques of the city in search of suitable students. For instance, the latter would find Seyyid Yahyâ by the fountain of Koca Mustafâ Pasha Mosque before a Friday prayer and invite him to the barbershop. Yet, upon being inspired that Mehmed Emîn was responsible for Seyyid Yahyâ's guidance, he relinquished him. Mehmed Emîn met with Seyyid Yahyâ for the first time during his visit to the calligrapher, Kâtibzâde Mustafâ, whose mansion in Aksaray neighborhood overflowed with students of calligraphy. This significant anecdote in the *menâkıbnâme* indicates that the mansions and salons of calligraphy were among places where lodgeless *şeyhs* recruited followers for their order. Given Kâtibzâde Mustafâ Efendi's adherence to the Naqshbandi order, one can surmise that he often invited to his mansion Naqshbandi *şeyhs* equipollent to Mehmed Emîn to give lectures to his pupils. As a master of calligraphy and a lodgeless *şeyh*, Heykel Hüseyin Efendi is an appropriate example for having a better understanding of the close connections between interpenetrating circles of Naqshbandis and calligraphers. According to Müstakîmzâde, he was accustomed to have erudite conversation with his pupils when practicing calligraphy, an explicit indication that he did not omit the spiritual education of his calligraphy students.⁵⁴⁸

⁵⁴⁷ Ahmed Hasib Üsküdârî, *Menâkıb-ı Mehmed Emîn Tokadî*, fol. 8a.

⁵⁴⁸ For the first-person narrative of Seyyid Yahyâ, see Ahmed Hasib Üsküdârî, *Menâkıb-ı Mehmed Emîn Tokadî*, fol. 10a-15a. For Heykel Hüseyin Efendi, see Müstakîmzâde, *Tuḥfe-i Ḥaṭṭāṭîn*, 178-179. For Kâtibzâde Mustafâ Efendi, see *ibid*, 533.

4.5 Multiplicity of Identity, Intra-Sufi Cooperation, and Culture of Coexistence

Writing about the self-perception of twentieth-century Muslim Moroccans, Gary S. Gregg has found that multiple identities, seemingly at odds with each other, are assumed by the same individual. Thus, he has concluded “[t]he multiplicity of identities indicates that the culture is not only distributed but that individuals do not act as stable points of integration. Rather, this multiplicity suggest much more volatility to both personality and culture than most theories assume.”⁵⁴⁹ Gregg’s is a psychological and anthropological analysis of modern Muslim individuals who developed identities under the conditions of the twentieth-century world. Was formation of multiple identities possible for a Muslim Ottoman in 17th- and 18th- century Ottoman Empire? Is it possible to study the history of Ottoman Sufis and Sufism without sinking into prejudices of the Eurocentric and even ethnocentric scholarship that perceive “the formation of ‘independent’ selves in ‘individualist’ cultures” and “‘interdependent’ selves in ‘collectivist’ cultures.”⁵⁵⁰ Can we trace the formation of multiple identities in a Naqshbandi Sufi who had sense of belonging in several Sufi brotherhoods?

My answers to these questions are in the affirmative. However, as a concept “multiple identities” refers to harmonious and coexistent rather than conflicting identities in my adaptation, for there were Sufis who belonged to several Sufi brotherhoods. In fact, the sense of belonging to several Sufi brotherhoods is more common among ordinary people than among educated dervishes who are more likely to be identified with a single order. In this regard, we need to consider the inhabitants of a neighborhood where lodges of different Sufi orders were established in close proximity to each other. Baha Tanman has highlighted the dense construction of *tekkes* along the belt of the city walls from Yedikule to Ayvansaray, in the neighborhoods lined up on the Beyazıt-Edirnekapı axis, on the slopes leading down from this axis to the Golden Horn and the Bayrampaşa stream in and around Aksaray and the Aksaray-Kocamustafapaşa axis, and in the vicinity of the Nişanca and Otakçılar neighborhoods on the line from Edirnekapı to Eyüp.⁵⁵¹ In whose favor was inhabi-

⁵⁴⁹Gary S. Gregg, “Culture, Personality, and the Multiplicity of Identity: Evidence from North African Life Narratives,” *Ethos* 26/2 (1998): 148.

⁵⁵⁰Gary S. Gregg, *Culture and Identity in a Muslim Society*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007): 17-18. For the theory of multiple identities see Seymour Rosenberg and Michael Gara, “The Multiplicity of Personal Identity,” *Review of Personality and Social Psychology* 6 (1985): 87-113.

⁵⁵¹Baha Tanman, “Osmanlı Şehrinde ve Mahallesinde Tekkelerin yeri: İstanbul Örneği,” in *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf ve Süfiler: Kaynaklar – Doktrin – Ayin ve Erkan - Tarikatlar – Edebiyat – Mimari – İkonografi – Modernizm*, ed. Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, (Ankara: TTK, 2005): 425-428; idem, “İstanbul Tekkeleri,” 413-414.

tants' sense of belonging in the neighborhoods where several Sufi orders represented their lodges? Considering only a short line in Nişanca, where Naqshbandi, Khalwati, and Cerrâhî circles formed around the lodges of Murâd Bukhârî, Abdülmecîd Sivasî, and Sertarîkzâde, I conclude that, with some exceptions, the inhabitants of this neighborhood developed a sense of belonging to all three lodges and did not refrain from showing their respect to their incumbent *şeyhs*. They were able to attend the circles of vocal dhikr on Sunday at the Sertarîkzâde Tekkesi and on Thursday at the Sivasî Tekkesi. On Friday, however, they could visit the Şeyh Murâd Tekkesi, where the silent invocation was practiced.⁵⁵² This was also the case for the *halaqas* of religious and scholarly conversations in the *tekkes* and sermons in the neighborhood or imperial mosques where the masters of these and other Sufi lodges educated the congregation. In these special gatherings, ordinary urbanites were able to develop multiple identities and a sense of belonging to different Sufi brotherhoods, which in turn contributed to a culture of coexistence in the city.

Contrary to ordinary people who may have felt free to continue or give up the Sufi gatherings of several *şeyhs* at the same time, the educated dervishes and masters were generally expected to abide faithfully to a single *şeyh* and order, which in turn resulted in their identification with the order connected to a single identity. Adherence to multiple orders was legitimate but necessitated above all strict, equal, and simultaneous commitment to the principles of other orders and *şeyhs* from whom the authorization has been received. However, since this was a heavy burden on the dervish and carried the risk of not being perfected in any order, the aspirants of the Sufism were recommended to practice a single order rather than joining several orders at the same time.⁵⁵³ Be that as it may, surviving historical records prove the existence of many Sufi masters who had been affiliated with several brotherhoods in the Ottoman Empire during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. “Like other ‘ulema of his time,” for instance, we are told that a Damascene Sufi and scholar, Abd al-Ghanî al-Nâblusî, “belonged to a number of Sufi tariqas (orders), the most important for him being the Naqshbandiya and the Qadiriya orders.”⁵⁵⁴ Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî, like his Damascene peer and Hindî masters, were

⁵⁵²For dhikr days in the *tekkes* of Istanbul in the late 19th century, see Selami Şimşek, “Son Dönem Celvetî Şeyhlerinden Bandırmalızâde Ahmed Münib Efendi’nin Hayatı, Eserleri ve Mecmuâ-yı Tekâyâ’sı,” 152-168. On the dhikr ceremonies practices in the *tekkes* of Istanbul, see Ömer Tuğrul İnançer, “İstanbul’da Tarikat Ayin ve Zikirleri,” in *Antik Çağ’dan XXI. Yüzyıla Büyük İstanbul Tarihi: İslam*, vol. V, 316-340.

⁵⁵³Sâdık Vicedânî, *Tarikatler ve Silsileleri (Tomâr-ı Turûk-ı ‘Aliyye)*, prepared and abbreviated by İrfan Gündüz, (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1995):107; Muslu, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: 18. Yüzyıl*, 621-622, footnote 399.

⁵⁵⁴Abdul-Karim Rafeq, “‘Abd al-Ghani al-Nabulsi Religious Tolerance and ‘Arabness’ in Ottoman Damascus,” in *Transformed Landscapes: Essays on Palestine and the Middle East in Honor of Walid Khalidi*, eds. Camille Mansour and Leila Fawaz, (Cairo & New York: The American University in Cairo Press, 2009): 1.

educated in the Naqshbandi and Qadiri orders. Feyzî Hasan Efendi, the father of the biographer Şeyhî Mehmed, mentioned above, had authorization in the Khalwati, Mevlevi and Naqshbandi orders. It is highly possible that he delegated his authority to his son, who succeeded him in the Emîr Bukhâri Tekkesi in Edirnekapı. Mehmed Emîn Tokadî had authorization in the Naqshbandi, Qadiri, and Shadhili orders.⁵⁵⁵ Mehmed İsmet, as will be discussed in the next chapter, received the ijaza from at least five orders, namely Naqshbandi, Mevlevi, Qadiri, Bayrami and Shadhili. To these and many other examples, we must add prominent Melami-affiliated *şeyhs*, including Sarı Abdullâh Efendi (d. 1660), Seyyid Mehmed Hâşim Efendi (d. 1677), Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Alî Efendi, Şehîd Alî Pasha, La‘lî Mehmed Efendi and La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî Efendi, whose connections with Naqshbandi *şeyhs* have been mentioned several times in this study. The most striking Naqshbandi *şeyh* with multiple Sufi affiliations, perhaps, was Müstakîmzâde Süleymân Sa‘deddîn Efendi (d. 1719-1788). Although he had been authorized in five tariqas—Naqshbandi, Qadiri, Mevlevi, Khalwati and Celveti—, the number of *şeyhs* who gave him authorization was fourteen. What is even more notable in his case is that eight of the masters were members of five Khalwati branches— respectively three Şemsi, two Nasuhi and one each from Sivasi, Sünbülü, and Ramazani branches.⁵⁵⁶

There is no doubt that most of these *şeyhs* obtained ijaza from the masters of different orders as a *baraka* as a sign of blessing (*tabarrukan*) for themselves. On the other hand, as I have discussed in the example of Feyzî Hasan Efendi above, this tradition enabled him to operate the Naqshbandi lodge in Edirnekapı. Yet, it was also by virtue of this tradition which was hand in hand with intra-Sufi cooperation and religious tolerance that a culture of coexistence was established in the Ottoman Empire during the relevant time period. For instance, Abd al-Ghanî al-Nâblusî penned two polemical treatises in 1672 and 1692 to defend himself and Ibn al-Arabî against vehement attacks by an anonymous Rûmî/Turkish scholar who accused them of nonbelief, since they mentioned “the possibility that non-Muslims might go to paradise rather than hell” by paying jizya, which in return brings earthly and heavenly happiness. In his defence, in which his tone was as ugly as his opponent, after describing the anonymous scholar with diatribes and derogatory attributions, al-Nâblusî claimed that the unnamed scholar was incapable of understanding both sharia and Arabic, for he “insists that only Muslims are promised paradise by God whereas dhimmis ... are destined to go to hell” and argued in opposition “that by paying jizya, which bring financial support to the Muslims, non-Muslims would be

⁵⁵⁵Hüseyin Vassâf, *Sefîne-i Evliyâ*, vol. 2, 63-64.

⁵⁵⁶Ensar Karagöz, “İlmiye Teşkilatı Tarihine Kaynaklık Eden Bir Âlim: Eserleriyle Müstakîmzâde Süleyman Sadeddin,” Unpublished PhD Diss., (İstanbul Üniversitesi 2022): 87-88.

forgiven by God for their unbelief and, like Muslims, would then be qualified to go to paradise where all become Muslims in the hereafter.”⁵⁵⁷ In order to justify his position he brought forward an interesting explanation: “[S]ince some of the *ḍimmīs* were led by God to inner faith (*al-īmān bāṭinan*)” he went on “their happiness becomes specific happiness and thus they enter Paradise along with Muslims. They become Muslims according to the laws of the hereafter, but not of this world.”⁵⁵⁸ Al-Nāblusī was also a defender of Sufism and Sufi orders and their rituals against the strident criticism of the intolerant *ulema*. In 1685, he penned a treatise, *al-ʿUqūd al-luʿluʿiyya fī tarīq al-sāda al-Mawlawiyya*, which gained widespread circulation, in defence of the Mevlevi order and the *samāʿ* and *dawarān* rituals of Mevlevis. There, considering the fact that the invocation of God, recitation of the *Qurʿan*, narration of hadith and praising the Prophet, the Companions and the saints were the components of the Mevlevi rituals, he concluded that there were no contradictions to sharia and sunna in their gatherings.⁵⁵⁹

Al-ʿUqūd al-luʿluʿiyya of al-Nāblusī is a considerable specimen testifying that Naqshbandi scholars who had multiple Sufi affiliations contributed to the culture of coexistence and sustained intra-Sufi cooperation and collective consciousness of the Muslim community through scholarly works in which they attempted to defend other Sufi brotherhoods. *Al-ʿUqūd* was translated into Turkish by Peçevî Ârif Ahmed Dede (d. 1724), who served as the *post-nishān* of the Yenikapı Mevlevihanesi from 1713 to his death. Ahmed Dede was a *jāmiʿ al-ṭuruq* şeyh. Being the son of Şeyh Mustafâ (d. 1699), a Khalwati-Uşşaki şeyh, he was born into a Khalwati milieu. He explains in the introduction of his translation that he embarked on such a project at the insistent request of Dervîş Ömer, the chief cook of the Mevlevihane of Konya, who was at that time was a dervish in the Mevlevihane of Filibe where Ahmed Dede was the incumbent *şeyh*. The translation was done during Ahmed Dede’s incumbency in Filibe. It is also worth noting that he translated the text for the benefit of the dervishes of the narrow circles in and around the *tekke* rather than a wider audi-

⁵⁵⁷For quotations see Abdul-Karim Rafeq, “‘Abd al-Ghani al-Nabulsi Religious Tolerance and ‘Arabness’ in Ottoman Damascus,” 3-4. On al-Nāblusī’s religious tolerance, see *ibid.*, 2-8. For the summary of the treatise, see Michael Winter, “A Polemical Treatise by ʿAbd al-Ġanī al-Nabulsi against a Turkish Scholar on the Religious Status of the *Ḍimmīs*,” *Arabica* 35 (1988): 92-103. According to Nir Shafir, “[i]n one copy from Damascus, a reader or copyist seems to have identified the anonymous Rumi as one Maḥmūd b. Shaykh ʿAlī.” See Nir Shafir, “The Road From Damascus: Circulation and Redefinition of Islam in the Ottoman Empire,” 150.

⁵⁵⁸Michael Winter, “A Polemical Treatise by ʿAbd al-Ġanī al-Nabulsi against a Turkish Scholar,” 99.

⁵⁵⁹İbrahim Gök, “Three treatises on the Mawlawi order, being a critical edition of al-Uqūd al-luʿluʿiyyah by ʿAbd al-Ghaniyy al-Nabulsi, al-Tuhfah al-bahiyyah by Trabzoni Ahmed Kosec, and al-Suhbah al-safiyah by Darwish Mahmud Asʿad Ghalib, together with a critical introduction,” Unpublished PhD Diss., (Lancaster University 1977); Ahmad Sukkar, “ʿAbd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī of Damascus (d. 1143/1731) and the Mawlawī Sufi Tradition,” *Mawlana Rumi Review* 5 (2014): 136-170; Abdulcebbar Kavak, “Şeyh Abdülġanī en-Nablusī’nin (ö. 1143/1731) Mevlevilik Müdafaası: el-Ukûdu’l-Lü’lüyye fî Tariki’s-Sâdeti’l-Mevleviyye Adh Eseri,” *TAED* 56 (2016): 1125-1151.

ence.⁵⁶⁰ Yet, it was Müstakîmzâde, the prolific Naqshbandî şeyh, who introduced al-Nâblusî's Mevlevî defence to wider readership. His was a Turkish commentary entitled *Şerh-i 'İbârât*, which was completed in twenty days in July 1768.⁵⁶¹ In spite of eleven surviving copies of Ahmed Dede's translation, at least twenty copies of Müstakîmzâde's commentary survived to the date,⁵⁶² which is a clear indication that Naqshbandî circles positively contributed the circulation of the texts.

Müstakîmzâde's favorable attitude towards the Mevlevî order was not an exceptional case in eighteenth-century Sufi environments. Nor he was alone in defending the continuation of the culture of coexistence and tolerance in the Ottoman capital. Much before him, Mehmed Emîn Tokadî, who instructed and authorized him in the Naqshbandî order, had written in 1122/1710-11 a treatise entitled *Şiyânet-i Dervîşân der Bahs-i Deverân-i Şüfviyân* to defend the legitimacy of vocal dhikr and rotation of dervishes (*dawarân*) during the invocation.⁵⁶³ By penning such a treatise, Mehmed Emîn Tokadî willingly defended and justified the right of existence of all Sufi orders adopting and practicing vocal and rotational dhikr in their circles. Following in the footsteps of his master, Müstakîmzâde wrote in 1197/1782 *Maḳûlât-ı Devriyye*, a treatise in which he not only defended the vocal dhikr and *dawarân* but also discussed with the rigor of a jurist the permissibility of musical instruments in Sufi ceremonies.⁵⁶⁴ In their discussion on the permissibility of the vocal dhikr and *dawarân*, both Mehmed Emîn and Müstakîmzâde based their arguments on two basic grounds. First, the pure intention of the dervish untainted by hypocrisy, and second, the remembrance and worship of God, the most blessed purpose. The same grounds were also shared by Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî, who approved of the vocal dhikr in one of his sermons delivered in Bursa in or around the date Mehmed Emîn Tokadî penned his *Şiyânet-i Dervîşân*. However, unlike Mehmed Emîn and Müstakîmzâde,

⁵⁶⁰For more on Ahmed Dede and his father Şeyh Mustafâ, see Mehmet Yunus Yazıcı, "Peçevî Şeyh Ârif Ahmed Dede ve Ukûdü'l-Lü'lü'ye fî Tarîki's-Sâdeti'l-Mevleviyye Tercümesi," Unpublished MA Thesis (Ankara Üniversitesi 2016): 16-21. For another study on Ahmed Dede's translation, see Muhammed Tayyip Durceylan, "Abdulḡanî en-Nâblusî'ye Ait el-Ukûdü'l-Lü'lüyye İsimli Eserin Ârifi Ahmed Dede Tercümesi (Tahkîk ve Transkripsiyon)," Unpublished MA Thesis (Marmara Üniversitesi 2015).

⁵⁶¹For a handsome study on the text, see Müstakîmzâde Süleymân Sa'deddîn, *Şerh-i 'İbârât: Mevlevîlik, Mûsikî ve Semâ' (İnceleme – Tenkitli Metin)*, prepared by Ensar Karagöz, (İstanbul: YEK, 2019). For a convincing analysis on Müstakîmzâde's Mevlevî connections see, *ibid*, 33-41.

⁵⁶²For the copies of Ahmed Dede's translation, see Mehmet Yunus Yazıcı, *ibid*, 55-59. For the copies of Müstakîmzâde's commentary, see Ensar Karagöz, *Şerh-i 'İbârât: Mevlevîlik, Mûsikî ve Semâ'*, 54-62.

⁵⁶³For Mehmed Emîn Tokadî's arguments in favor of *devrân* in this text, see Halil İbrahim Şimşek, "İki Nakşbandî Müceddidinin Deverân Savunması -Mehmed Emin-i Tokadî (ö. 1745) ve Müstakîmzâde Süleymân Sadeddin (ö. 1788) Örneği," *Tasavvuf: İlmî ve Akademik Araştırma Dergisi* 10 (2003): 283-198. The completion date of *Şiyânet-i Dervîşân* is found in Süleymaniye Library, Esad Efendi, no. 1849/1, fol. 54a.

⁵⁶⁴Halil İbrahim Şimşek is the first researcher utilizing some passages from this text in his "İki Nakşbandî Müceddidinin Deverân Savunması". For a thorough study on *Maḳûlât-ı Devriyye* see Mustafa Demirci, "Makûlât-ı Devriyye'de Müstakîmzâde Süleymân Sa'deddîn'in Mûsikî ve Semâa Dair Görüşleri," *C.Ü. İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* XVIII/2 (2014): 171-190.

he opposed *dawarān* and *samā^c* particularly on the grounds that musical instruments were elements of dhikr in them. Nevertheless, he did not put *dawarān* and *samā^c* under the category of “forbidden” (*ḥarām*). Rather, he contented himself with saying that there was no consent (*riẓā*) to and permission (*ruḥṣat*) for them and, thus declared that they were permissible under mitigating circumstances (*‘uzr*) such as trance and ecstasy during which the worshipper is unconscious due to the perfection of the divine love.⁵⁶⁵

The divergence of opinions in the examples of Şeyh Murād, al-Nāblusî, Mehmed Emîn, and Müstakîmzâde strengthened rather than weakened the culture of co-existence in which different Sufi orders owed their existence and survival to the sense of intra-Sufi cooperation and mutual tolerance digested by mystics who enjoyed at the same time the multiple identities of an orthodox Muslim scholar belonging to several tariqas. The flourishing of such a common attitude further proves that the Naqshbandi establishment in the Ottoman Empire, and especially in Istanbul, was not monolithic and monotonous, but multifaceted and colorful. One of the idiosyncratic figures who deserves mention in this regard is a certain Seyyid Abdurrahmân Nakşibendî (d. 1188/1774-75), who was in all probability the şeyh of the Emîr Bukhârî Tekkesi in Fatih from 1148/1735-36 until his death.⁵⁶⁶ His *Risāle-i Mübeyyin-i Zamān*, a treatise completed in Shawwāl 1133/July-August 1721 and dedicated to the grand vizier, Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha (v. 1718-1730), who, according to the author, generously treated the high and the low according to their ranks and positions, is of particular importance in terms of its contributions to our understanding of Ottoman pluralism.⁵⁶⁷ Apart from the *sebeb-i te’lîf* section, the text contains five other sections, all of which had the main theme of advising the grand vizier on corrupt officials, *ulema*, Sufis and common subjects, and on the virtue of being generous and benevolent in state affairs. In this respect, the text resembles the pessimistic and declinist Mirror of the Princes genre with which we are familiar, particularly in the late 16th and 17th centuries. However, the present text also has idiosyncratic aspects in terms of its praise and criticism of the new generation born

⁵⁶⁵Şeyh Murād articulated these words in Bursa in his savant conversations which were recorded by Karababazâde İbrâhîm, his disciple and deputy. See Beyazıt Library, Veliyyüddin Efendi, no. 1810/1, fol. 3a-b.

⁵⁶⁶According to *Mecmû‘a-i Tekâyâ* of Zâkir Şükrî, he was the şeyh of the lodge from 1720 to his death. However, *Tekmiletü’s-Şakaik* of Fındıklılı Mehmed İsmet mentions that Şeyh Abdülazîz Efendi who was one of the three sons of Şeyh Fazlullâh Efendi (d. 1709) was the şeyh of the *tekke* in question from 1135/1722-23 to his death in 1148/1735-36. According to Fındıklılı, 1135 was the death of the previous şeyh Mehmed Refî‘. Zâkir Şükrî, however, records 1132/1720 as the year of his death. See Zâkir Şükrî, *Die Istanbul derwisch-konvente und ihre scheiche: (Mecmua-i Tekaya)*, 68; and Fındıklılı Mehmed İsmet, *Tekmiletü’s-Şakaik fi Hakk-ı Ehli’l-Hakaik*, 432-433.

⁵⁶⁷For the text see Seyyid Abdurrahmân Efendi, *Risāle-i Mübeyyin-i Zamān*, Bibliotheque Nationale, Supplement Turc, no. 1555. It is composed of 15 folios/29 pages on each were irregularly written down 13 or 14 lines.

after the Hijri year 1100/1688-89 (section 1), and its tolerant and protective attitude towards the members of other Sufi orders, especially the Bektāşis and the Mevlevis (sections 5 and 6).⁵⁶⁸

Believing that the humanity was in the end of times, the Lunar Period (*devr-i kameri*) during which the Apocalypse would break out, Seyyid Abdurrahmân made eschatological explanations on the facts and developments of his day. He considered in this regard that the generation of the Hijri twelfth century was a special generation: the kids of this period were very beautiful, cute, clever and wise. They were reasonable enough and had a good grasp of implications and signs, which resulted in their arrogance. Therefore, as sons, daughters, dervishes, pupils and servants, they disliked their fathers, mothers, şeyhs, teachers and masters, claiming that they knew everything that their guides knew.⁵⁶⁹ The characteristic features of the *ulema* and Sufis born into *devr-i kameri* are also remarkable. The *ulema*, for instance, was mostly keen on luxury and ostentation (*ihtişāma kâ'il*), while devout Kadızâdelis were prone to usury (*ribāya mâ'il*). When it comes to *ehl-i tarîk*, it so happens that the neophyte dervishes were mostly disbelievers (*mülhid*) and *ibāhî-meşreb* who made the forbidden lawful, and *şeyhs* were *kalender-meslek* and disregardful with respect to religious matters. The world-passionate (*ehl-i dünyā*) were mostly deceitful, and judges and rulers (*hâkim*) witnessing their sedition were merciless.⁵⁷⁰ Despite all these bothersome and poor qualities of the new generation, Seyyid Abdurrahmân was not hopeless, because, he knew that just and competent people, scholars who practice what they know, and Sufis who have reached perfection can be found at any age. He was sure that true saints, sane lunatics, God friendly poor, perfect *ulema*, Sufis, and intelligent men who reached perfection in every science also abounded in this age.⁵⁷¹ Therefore, in the third section of his treatise, he delved into the theory of ethics to explain the quality of humanity (*insāniyyet*) and being human (*ādemiyyet*). These were two excellent and necessitated virtues that could only be found in a human being who was moralized with the morals and adorned with the attributes of God and the Prophet (*aḥlāk-ı ḥamīdī*). Since the ethics and servitude were interconnected, for a man the purpose behind worshipping and struggling for God, too, was to realize his humanity,⁵⁷² an opinion that had been expressed by

⁵⁶⁸For the first section which is dubbed “İkinci Bâb” see *Risāle-i Mûbeyyin-i Zamân*, fol. 2b-6a. For the last two sections, see *ibid*, fol. 11a-15b.

⁵⁶⁹Seyyid Abdurrahmân Efendi, *Risāle-i Mûbeyyin-i Zamân*, fol. 2b-3a.

⁵⁷⁰Seyyid Abdurrahmân Efendi, *Risāle-i Mûbeyyin-i Zamân*, fol. 3b.

⁵⁷¹*Ibid*, 4a-b.

⁵⁷²*Ibid*, 6a-8a.

Râghib al-Isfahânî (d. 1108).⁵⁷³

Conveying the meaning of a saying of the Prophet, Seyyid Abdurrahmân emphasized that one of the necessities of humanity and being human was to show respect to the elders and mercy to the little ones (*kendüden a^{el}lāya mekremet ve kendüden ednāya merḥamet*).⁵⁷⁴ Given that the addressee of his treatise was the grand vizier, the political connotations of the words he used cannot be ignored. In this particular context, *a^{el}lā* was senior officials who deserved reverence. *Ednā*, however, was the subject and the low-ranking officials who needed the protection and benevolence of the superior. For this reason, he discussed in the fifth section the lofty class who were worthy of honor and beneficence (*ikrām ve iḥsāna lāyık olan tārīfe-i celīle*). The first group he mentioned was of honorable and devout dignitaries including pashas with two or three banners (*tug*), aghas, all high-ranking statesmen who had become impoverished and indebted over the course of time. It was an act of charity and worship in the sight of God to bestow on these people, and to dismiss those evil and cruel officials who did not accept the advice. The second group consisted of all members of the *ulema* from students to the madrasa professors and chief judges (*mevālī*). Donating to the poor and elderly of the *ulema* was not only a good deed (*sevāb-ı aẓīm*) but also like honoring God and His prophets. The third group was of veteran ghazis, including retired and particularly wounded janissaries, artillerymen, foot soldiers, sailors, and cavalrymen. Then came the poor, destitute and lunatic dervishes and *seyhs*; it is the most virtuous form of worship (*efdāl-i ibādet*) to treat them and to repair their hearts, which are the house of God, with good words. The same applies to the rest of the poor Muslims.⁵⁷⁵

Concluding his remarks on the lofty classes worthy of honor and charity, Seyyid Abdurrahmân turned once again to the Sufis. In this regard, he highlighted that donating to the poor, oppressed and the afflicted was a great good deed for any Sufi brotherhood. Furthermore, he emphasized that real charity which was certainly acceptable in the sight of God was that given either to the insane and destitute poor or to the indigent dervishes, *seyhs* and scholars.⁵⁷⁶ Donating to poor Sufis was a means to an end in the mystical mentality of Seyyid Abdurrahmân. He was sure, on the one hand, that the Ottoman Empire would survive until the Day of Judgement, for Alî, the fourth caliph, and Ibn al-Arabî talismanically pointed to this fact in their

⁵⁷³Majid Fakhry, *Ethical Theories in Islam*, (Leiden: Brill, 1994): 177.

⁵⁷⁴Seyyid Abdurrahmân Efendi, *Risāle-i Mübeyyin-i Zamān*, 7b-8a.

⁵⁷⁵Seyyid Abdurrahmân Efendi, *Risāle-i Mübeyyin-i Zamān*, 11a-12a.

⁵⁷⁶Ibid, fol. 12b-13a.

treatises.⁵⁷⁷ On the other hand, for the execution of this purpose, i.e., the survival and longevity of the sultanate and the state, as well as the abundance of sustenance and blessings, there was need for some daily rituals. In return for a regular salary and subsistence from the ḥalāl jizya property, from among the righteous, each of twelve individuals had to recite twelve thousand “Throne Verses” (*Ayat al-Kursi*), each of three individuals had to separately recite seven thousand surahs of *Ikh̄lāṣ*, *Falāq*, and *Nās*, one had to recite forty surah *al-Faṭḥ*, and one had to recite one thousand *Fātiḥa* every day. The rewards of this worship had to be dedicated to the souls of the Prophet, his son-in-law and the fourth caliph, Alī, his daughter Fâtima, and his grandsons Hasan and Hüseyin. In the same vein, for receiving the blessings of “the Threes,” “the Sevens,” and “the Forties,” Bektaşî and Mevlevî dervishes had to be paid from the jizya treasury forty para or *akçe* each day.⁵⁷⁸

Why, did Seyyid Abdurrahmân, as a Naqshbandî dervish, develop a special attitude towards the Bektaşî and Mevlevî dervishes and put them in a privileged position in his treatise? Do his attitudes indicate that he was inclined toward Shiism and an unconventional interpretation of Islam, or that he was a Sufi with multiple identities who wanted to preserve the culture of coexistence in the Ottoman capital? Did Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, who is said to have been a Melami, play a tacit and constructive role in the composition of such a text? In his well-known book on the history of the Melamiyye, Abdûlbaki Gölpmarlı has controversially claimed that the inclination to Shiism can penetrate into all Sufi orders due to the affection for the Ahl al-Bayt, the family of the Prophet. However, in his opinion, such an inclination is observable in particular in the Hamzavî-Melami circles. To substantiate his claim, he utilized poems written by Sârbân Ahmed (d. 1545) and Olanlar Şeyhî İbrâhîm Efendi (d. 1655), the two Melami masters, and entries written by Reisülküttâb Sarı Abdullâh Efendi (d. 1660) on twelve Imams.⁵⁷⁹ Nevertheless, he needed to add that the Melami-Hamzavis neither went to extremes in their Shiism, nor had a true Sunni creed, but they were, however, somewhere in between since they had not denigrated the first three caliphs.⁵⁸⁰ Despite Gölpmarlı’s instantiations as to the Shiism of the Melamis in question, given the great reverence shown by Sunnis to the Ahl al-Bayt, it is unlikely that they were Shiis practicing *taqiyya* in Sunni Ottoman society. As a Shiite affiliated with Mevlevî and Bektaşî orders, it is more likely that he has found

⁵⁷⁷Ibid, fol. 14b.

⁵⁷⁸Ibid, fol. 14a.

⁵⁷⁹Abdûlbaki Gölpmarlı, *Melâmîlik ve Melâmîler*, 55-67, 90-113, and 197-199.

⁵⁸⁰Abdûlbaki Gölpmarlı, *Melâmîlik ve Melâmîler*, 99.

parallels between his stories and theirs.⁵⁸¹ At this point, we must consider also that Gölpınarlı tended to see conflicts and disagreements between the Sufi orders, rather than elements of coexistence and mutual cooperation. He was aware of the mutual relations between the orders, but in his understanding, one of the parties was always dominant and favored intervention to the detriment of the other party. According to him, as can be seen in Bektaşî-Mevlevî and Khalwâtî-Mevlevî relations, the first party wished to dominate Mevlevism and to incorporate the famous Sufi order into its own tradition. In the Mevlevî-Naqshbandî communication, however, the Mevlevîs, who had been open to esoteric interpretations of Shiism, were in the position of giving rather than accepting from the Naqshbandîs who had always been strict practitioners of Sunni Islam. For Gölpınarlı, there were great differences between the Naqshbandî and Mevlevî conceptions of Sufism. Therefore, the fusion between the two orders since the second half of the eighteenth century was artificial, ostensible and therefore one-sided. Accordingly, it was the Naqshbandîs who melted in the Mevlevî crucible and became Mevlevî, rather than the Mevlevîs of whom only a small number were imbued with Naqshî devotion, the vast majority remained steadfast to their order.⁵⁸²

Gölpınarlı's prejudiced approach to the relations between the Sufi orders would fail to explain the reasons behind Seyyid Abdurrahmân's protectionist attitude toward the Bektaşî and Mevlevî dervishes. This is so, because he was categorically engaged in the inter-Sufi relations, which in return resulted in an intentional denial or failure to see blurriness of the borders between the Sufi brotherhoods and the multiplicity of identities in the Sufis. As Derin Terzioğlu has convincingly argued in her dissertation on Niyâzî-i Mısrî, even in the Qadizadeli-Khalwâtî hostility in the 17th century, "the two did not oppose each other en bloc." Rather, there emerged "salafî-minded *Ḥalvetîs*" who fiercely opposed the rituals and mindsets of some contemporary Khalwâtîs. We are told for instance that as a Khalwâtî şeyh, Ahmed Rûmî-i Akhisârî (d. 1632) was an inspirational scholar for Qadizadeli.⁵⁸³ Another example was Münîr of Belgrade (d. 1617?), who "wrote a letter to 'sheikhs in Istanbul' criticizing them for their practice of *devrân* and *semâc*." Lastly, there were several Khalwâtî şeyhs including Karabaş Alî (d. 1686), who, as a militant rival of the Qadizadeli did not

⁵⁸¹For Gölpınarlı's short intellectual biography filled with discrepancies and regrets, see Ömer Faruk Akün, "Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki," *TDVIA*, vol. 14, 146-149.

⁵⁸²Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, *Mevlânâ'dan Sonra Mevlevîlik*, 293-328. See particularly 319-322.

⁵⁸³According to Mustapha Sheikh and Yahya Michot, his harsh criticism toward the Khalwâtî order misidentifies him as a şeyh from Khalwâtîyya. See Yahya Michot, "Akhisârî, Ahmed-i Rûmî," *TDVIA*, vol. EK-1, the second edition, 60-62. Considering his favoritism for the silent dhikr, Mustapha Sheikh has brought to attentions his inclination to the Naqshbandî order. See particularly in Mustapha Sheikh, *Ottoman Puritanism and its Discontents: Ahmad al-Rûmî al-Âqhisârî and the Qādizādelis*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016): 56-77.

shy away from opposition to Niyâzî-i Mîsrî, another renowned Khalwati *şeyh* claiming prophethood and messiahship during his years in Bursa and in exile in Limni.⁵⁸⁴ The disunity of Khalwatis in the face of Qadizadeli hostility is noteworthy in that it proves a multiplicity of identities and allegiances that Sufis and scholars managed to develop in the Ottoman Empire. It was from this dynamism that Kâdîzâde Mehmed (d. 1635), the eponym of the Qadizadelis, was a good reader of Sufism, a follower of the Khalwati order in the earlier phase of his career, and an affiliate of the Naqshbandi order.⁵⁸⁵ When his dynamism was combined with the consciousness for the culture of coexistence, the Naqshbandi *şeyhs* mentioned above would attempt to compose treatises to defend other Sufi brotherhoods against ruthless attacks. Seyyid Abdurrahmân's *Risâle-i Mübeyyin-i Zamân* proves that Mevlevi and Bektaşî orders and dervishes enjoyed the Naqshbandi tolerance during the first half of the 18th century. The *Iştilâhât-i İnsân-i Kâmil* of the Naqshbandi lexicographer, Mustafâ Râsim Efendi, attests that such a tolerance continued throughout the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, considering that he counted the Bektaşî and Mevlevi orders among the Sunni Sufi orders and declared legitimate their rituals including vocal dhikr, *samâ*^c and *dawarân*.⁵⁸⁶

4.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I tried to explain four important reasons for the consolidation of the Naqshbandi order in Istanbul in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The first reason relates to the close ties they were able to develop with the official *ulema*. Concordance with the *ulema* and sharia can be ascertained from the Naqshbandi *şeyhs*' educational background. It is a curious observation in this context that many *şeyhs* of the Hekîm Çelebi Tekkesi in the seventeenth century were madrasa graduates. Seyyid Fazlullâh and Seyyid Abdülkebîr, the two successor *şeyhs* of the Emîr Bukhârî Lodge in Fatih, are particularly noteworthy figures for having a better understanding of the Naqshbandi-*ulema* interaction, since they abandoned their

⁵⁸⁴Derin Terzioğlu, "Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyâzî-i Mîsrî (1618-1694)," 247-253. Other Khalwati *şeyhs* who opposed and criticized Niyâzî-i Mîsrî were Mehmed Nazmî (d. 1700) and Khalwati-Celveti *şeyh* İsmail Hakkî Bursevî (d. 1725). On their opposition toward Niyâzî-i Mîsrî, see Abdûlbaki Gölparlı, "Niyâzî-i Mîsrî," 216-224.

⁵⁸⁵On Kâdîzâde Mehmed's Sufi affiliations, see Baki Tezcan, "The Portrait of the Preacher as a Young Man: Two Autobiographical Letters by Kadizade Mehmed from the Early Seventeenth Century," in *Political Thought and Practice in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Marinos Sariyannis, (Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2019): 187-249.

⁵⁸⁶İhsan Kara, "Tasavvuf İstîlâhları Literatürü ve Seyyid Mustafa Râsim Efendi'nin İstîlâhât-ı İnsân-i Kâmil'i," PhD Diss., vol.II, 116, 197, 359-360, 424, 583-584, 615-616, 667-668, 719.

professorial careers in madrasas to replace their deceased fathers in the *tekke*. Their perfection in the religious sciences afforded many Naqshbandi *seyhs* the opportunity to occupy the pulpit of imperial mosques in Istanbul. In view of this fact, I have argued that it was with the official duties in the city's mosques that enabled to interact with the urbanites and teach them the niceties of the order. In this way, they were able to spread the Naqshbandi order among the populace of Istanbul.

The second reason that paved the way for the spread of the Naqshbandi order in the Ottoman capital was familial cooperation with long-established *seyyid* families. The presence of many *seyyids* among the Naqshbandi masters is clear evidence of their special place in the Naqshbandi networks. The burial ground of the Emîr Bukhârî Tekkesi in Edirnekapı singly presents a depiction of *ante-mortem* and *post-mortem* interactions between the *seyyids* and the Naqshbandi order. Drawing particularly on the biographical dictionary of Şeyhî Mehmed, I have shown that one fifth of the deceased buried in and around the *tekke* in Edirnekapı were *seyyids* by birth. What is even more striking in this context is that the *seyyid* families, including but not limited to the Fenârîzâdes, Seyrekzâdes, Es'adzâdes and Kudsîzâdes, occupied significant positions in Naqshbandi circles in Istanbul. Some of the members of the *nakîbüleşrâf* families were themselves authorized in the Naqshbandi order. Moreover, they not only patronized the sons of Naqshbandi masters in the official *ulema* hierarchy but also ensured the continuity of the order in the city. It is possible that their noble lineage aroused the respect of ordinary city dwellers who attended their lectures in the *tekkes* and mosques.

As a third reason for the expansion of the Naqshbandi order in Istanbul, I have attributed it to the positive role of the lodgeless *seyhs*. A lodgeless *seyh* was a learned who had authorization in the order but did not practice his mastership by lodging in a *tekke*. He could serve as a grand vizier, vizier, chief mufti, chief judge, qadi, madrasa professor, calligrapher, poet, and so on in his career. Still, he did not retreat from practicing the order in his private and social life. The number of lodgeless *seyhs* exceeded the number of reigning masters of the *tekkes*. With the exception of Mehmed Emîn Tokadî, who had authorized at least forty-four individuals, the lodgeless *seyhs* trained and authorized perhaps fewer aspirants than the officially recognized *tekke seyhs*. However, since their number was greater, the total number of their deputies exceeded that of incumbent *seyhs*, which in turn contributed greatly to the spread of the Naqshbandi order in Istanbul. Finally, utilizing the legend of Mehmed Emîn Tokadî and *Tuhfe-i Haţţâtîn* of Müstakîmzâde, I have discussed that one of the social milieus in which the Naqshbandi order was propagated by the lodgeless *seyhs* was the circles of the calligraphers, where calligraphy teachers who also enjoyed Naqshbandi mastership and taught their students the basics of the

order.

The fourth reason that contributed to the consolidation of the Naqshbandi order in Istanbul, as I have argued, was the Naqshbandis' struggle to maintain the surviving culture of coexistence. As strict observers of sharia and Sunni Islam, the Naqshbandi order has always been placed in a separate position from other Sufi brotherhoods, and in some cases, the Naqshbandis have been identified with the Qadizadelis. However, my research shows that a significant number of Naqshbandi masters enjoyed multiple identities in the sense that they were authorized not only by the Naqshbandiyya but also by several other Sufi orders. It was thanks to the efforts of the Naqshbandi *şeyhs* who followed several Sufi orders that the inter-Sufi relations were on track and the tolerance and culture of coexistence could be preserved in the Ottoman capital. This was so, because in their scholarly writings on popular religious and Sufistic issues, they defended the principles and rituals of other Sufi orders against attacks from the fundamentalist *ulema*, who considered the rituals of the Sufi orders to be reprehensible innovations. Thus, as advocates of the silent dhikr, Naqshbandi Sufi scholars defended the legitimacy of the vocal dhikr, *samā^c* and *dawarān* by taking under their protective wings the Sufi orders that practiced these rituals, including the Mevleviyye and Bektaşiyye.

5. MEHMED İSMET EFENDI: A LODGELESS NAQSHBANDI ŞEYH WITH MULTIPLE SUFI AFFILIATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the life, career, intellectual orientations and scholarly networks of Mehmed İsmet Efendi (d. 1747), a neglected lodgeless şeyh and madrasa professor known for his compilation of a set of Murâd Bukhârî's letters, enjoyed multiple Sufi affiliations and developed close connections with the seyyids of his time. As a result of limited number of studies, numerous dark spots pertaining to the scholar have not been clarified, yet. Such a situation is, of course, due to under-investigated and untouched primary sources libraries and archives. Thanks to my research in manuscript libraries and Ottoman archives, new primary sources dealing with the significance of the figure has recently begun to come to light. Owing to the worthily exploration of the sources, we have now in hand not only previously neglected biographical notes written by the 18th century biographers about Mehmed İsmet, but also his daily notes and his estate inventory prepared after his death, and the scholarly works whether being copies of the older texts or newly autographed eulogies, pamphlets and books all of which were produced by him and submitted to different patrons in the first half of the 18th century. Through the utilization of these emergent sources, we come across with a polymath madrasa professor who had proficiency not only in rational and transmitted Islamic sciences but also in astronomy, astrology, Sufism and literature. Furthermore, it comes to light that he was affiliated with at least five Sufi orders by obtaining an ijaza that would enable him to propagate the order. The very sophisticated scholar enjoyed a multiplicity of identities during his lifetime, at least, with respect to his communication with the Sufi orders. How could an Ottoman scholar build multiple Sufi affiliations in 18th-century Ottoman Istanbul? To what extent the existing social, political and religious structures made a contribution to the consciousness of multiplicity during this period? Seeking satisfactory answers to these questions, I assert in this chapter

that the equilibrium in the existing religio-political and social structures may have undergirded and sustained the ascent of a versatile figure such as Mehmed İsmet, who was able to combine multiple identities in his persona. To develop familiarity with the neglected Sufi and scholar, at first, I combine and canvass dispersed pieces of information them for a better understanding of his life and career. Secondly, I focus on his personal and scholarly interests and abilities by utilizing his literary and scientific works preserved in manuscript libraries.

5.2 Mehmed İsmet Efendi's Life and Career: What Known?

The compiler of Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî's epistles introduces himself as Mehmed İsmet ibn İbrâhîm in the introduction of his compilation.⁵⁸⁷ Considering this initial identification, we may obtain further information from the biographical dictionaries of the 18th century, particularly those of Müstakîmzâde (d. 1788) and Râmiz (d. 1788). After identifying him as Mehmed İsmet b. İbrâhîm b. Hasan in Tuḥfe-i Ḥaṭṭāṭîn, Müstakîmzâde states that he was an Istanbulite (*şehrî*) man of science and knowledge born in Lâlezâr neighborhood and came to be known as "Hâcî Efendi." He practiced calligraphy (*naskh* and *thuluth*) under the tutorship of Hâfız Osmân Efendi (d. 1698), one of the most prominent master calligraphers of his time whose influence continued in the subsequent centuries. According to Müstakîmzâde, Mehmed İsmet adhered to the Naqshbandiyya not in his youth or earlier career but in a later stage when he had already been a respected madrasa professor. In addition, he notes that Mehmed İsmet died in 1160/1747. The biographical dictionaries also mention that Mehmed İsmet produced scholarly works such as a gloss of *Luğat-ı Şâhidî*, several pamphlets on religious topics, and other works as to history and poetry. Sahaflar Şeyhizâde Mehmed Es'ad Efendi (d. 1848) points out the existence of another work by Mehmed İsmet: an endowed corpus in the library of Bayezid Mosque under the title *Simât-ı 'İşmet*. When it comes to the scholarly career of Mehmed İsmet, a small piece of information can be extracted from Râmiz's biographical dictionary. Although unable to trace Mehmed İsmet's academic career from the beginning, it is Râmiz who states that he obtained the tutorship of hâric madrasa through examination in 1141/1728-29, gradually climbed the ladders of madrasa hierarchy, and was appointed as professor in one of the madrasas of Mûsile-i Süleymâniye ladder,⁵⁸⁸

⁵⁸⁷Murâd Bukhârî, *Mektûbât-ı Şeyh Murâd Nakşibendî*, Beyazıt Library, Veliyyüddin Efendi, no. 1780, fol. 26b. See also Butrus Abu-Manneh, "Sheikh Murâd al-Bukhârî and the Expansion of the Naqshbandî-Mujaddidî Order in Istanbul," 8.

⁵⁸⁸In the 18th century Ottoman madrasa hierarchy, mûsile-i Süleymâniye is the ninth of the twelve ranks. A professor of this rank would be paid 60 akçes daily. The ranks of madrasas were respectively as follows:

the position that he would remain in until his death in 1166/1752-53.⁵⁸⁹ Given that all other biographers agreed on the year 1160/1747 as Mehmed İsmet's year of death (Mehmed Süreyya reports the exact date as 2 Dhî'l-qa'da 1160/5 November 1747), we may be doubtful of the details penned by Râmiz on Mehmed İsmet's academic career. Therefore, in what follows, depending on Mehmed İsmet's hitherto neglected scholarly works preserved in the Veliyüddin Efendi collection in Beyazıt Library and those in several collections preserved in the Süleymaniye Library, and comparing them with what has already been penned in the biographical dictionaries of the time, I will attempt to bring to light the missing details regarding his biography and scholarly career. Thus, we will be able to have a more explicit and convincing biography of the scholar.

In fact, it was again Müstakîmzâde who noted the known complete pedigree of Mehmed İsmet Efendi which was as follows: Hâcî Çelebi b. İbrâhîm b. Hasan b. Ahmed.⁵⁹⁰ This is an accurate chain when comparing Müstakîmzâde's note with Mehmed İsmet's personal records on his scholarly works. Therefore, given Müstakîmzâde's shift from "Hâcî Efendi" to "Hâcî Çelebi" in Mehmed İsmet's sobriquet, it becomes evident that he had seen the latter's scholarly works when penning *Mecelletü'n-nişâb* where the complete pedigree is noted.⁵⁹¹ If this is so, a few

İbtidâ-i Hâric, Hareket-i Hâric, İbtidâ-i Dâhil, Hareket-i Dâhil, Mûsile-i Sahn, Sahn-ı Semân, İbtidâ-i Altmışlı, Hareket-i Altmışlı, Mûsile-i Süleymaniye, Hâmise-i Süleymaniye, Süleymaniye, Dârü'lhadîs-i Süleymaniye. See İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin İlmiye Teşkilatı*, (Ankara: TTK Basımevi, 1988): 33-38, and 55-60; and Mehmet İpşirli, "Medrese: Osmanlı Dönemi," *TDVIA*, vol. 28, (Ankara: TDV, 2003): 330.

⁵⁸⁹The biographical pieces of information pertaining to Mehmed İsmet's life and career can be extracted from the following primary sources: Müstakîmzâde Süleymân Sa'deddîn Efendi, *Tuhfe-i Hattâtîn*, 375-376; idem, *Tuhfe-i Hattâtîn*, ed. Mustafa Koç, (İstanbul: Klasik, 2014); Râmiz, *Âdâb-ı Zurefâ*, prepared by Sadık Erdem, (Ankara: AKM, 1994): 227-228; Mehmed Tevfik, *Mecmû'atü't-Terâcîm*, İÜNEK-TY, no. 192, fol: 98a; Mehmed Es'ad Efendi, *Bâğçe-i Safâ-Endüz*, prepared by Rıza Oğraş, (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2018): 149; Fatîm Efendi, *Hâtîmetü'l-Eş'âr (Fatîm Tezkiresi)*, prepared by Ömer Çiftçi, (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2017): 359-360; Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i Osmânî*, vol. 3, 840; Mehmed Nail Tuman, *Tuhfe-i Nâilî: Divan Şairlerinin Muhtasar Biyografileri*, vol. 2, (Ankara: Bizim Büro Yayınları, 2000): 679.

Mehmed İsmet was firstly introduced in *Osmanlı Astronomi Literatürü Tarihi*, vol. I, ed. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, prepared by Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, Ramazan Şeşen, Cevat İzgi, Cemil Akpınar, İhsan Fazlıoğlu, (İstanbul: IRCICA, 1997), 426-427. Salim Ayduz has strenuously collected and utilized the existing pieces of information regarding Mehmed İsmet's life and scholarly works in his article entitled "İsmet Mehmed Efendi (ö. 1747) ve Tedâhül-i Seneye Dair Risâlesi," *Kutadgubilig Felsefe-Bilim Araştırmaları Dergisi* 15, (2009): 224-226; idem, "İsmet Mehmed Efendi," *TDVIA*, vol. EK-1 (İstanbul: TDV, 2016): 664-666. Yunus Kaplan has attempted to write a biographical entry on Mehmed İsmet Efendi. See "Mehmed İsmet Efendi," (16.10.2014), <http://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/ismet-mehmed-ismet-efendi>, (accessed 20.03.2021); Abdullah Uğur, "Muhammediye'nin Bir Beyti Üzerine Mehmed İsmet'in Şerhi," *edebali islamiyat dergisi* 4 (2020): 4-6; and Muhammad Çİşmet b. İbrâhîm, *al-Rifd al-Nađr 'alâ 'Aqâ'id al-Khidr*, edited by Muhammed Osman Doğan, (Amman: Arwiqa, 2021): 27-30.

⁵⁹⁰Müstakîmzâde Süleymân Sa'deddîn Efendi, *Mecelletü'n-nisâb fi'n-neseb ve'l-kunâ ve'l-elkâb*, (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2000): fol. 320a. It is known that Müstakîmzâde had completed *Mecelletü'n-nişâb* in Ramađân 1175/March 1762. The composition of *Tuhfe-i Hattâtîn*, however, started in 1173/1759-60 and came to an end in 1202/1787. For an introduction on both works see Ahmet Yılmaz, "Mecelletü'n-Nisâb," *TDVIA*, vol. 28, (Ankara: TDV, 2003): 237-238; and Uğur Derman, "Tuhfe-i Hattâtîn," *TDVIA*, vol. 41, (İstanbul: TDV, 2012): 351-352.

⁵⁹¹A reading note on Muhammed Subhân el-Hindî's *Lawâmi'c al-Subühî fi Şarĥ al-Fass al-Nühî*, a pamphlet

original records of Mehmed İsmet must be presented for a better understanding of his self-presentation. Focusing on Mehmed İsmet's books and scholarly works preserved in different collections, but particularly the Veliyyüddin Efendi collection in the Beyazıt Library, one realizes a few formulas developed by him for his self-identification. Whereas some of the ownership records penned on the manuscripts just bear his name as "Mehmed İsmet" or "Mehmed b. İbrâhîm." Most of the ownership records and some of his completion records in pamphlets are read as "Mehmed İsmet b. İbrâhîm" and "İsmet Mehmed b. İbrâhîm". Apart from these formulas, one also comes across longer identifiable formulas elucidating the short lineage of Mehmed İsmet such as "Mehmed İsmet ibn İbrâhîm b. Hasan b. Ahmed," "Mehmed İsmet ibn İbrâhîm el-'arîf bi-Kethüdâzâde Hâcı Çelebi," and "Mehmed İsmet ibn İbrâhîm b. Hasan b. Ahmed el-'arîf bi-Kethüdâzâde Hâcı Çelebi," From the latter records it is understood at first glance that Mehmed İsmet had come to be known as "Hâcı Çelebi" instead of "Hâcı Efendi" within his immediate surroundings upon performing the hajj ritual in 1701.⁵⁹² So much so that, when Ottoman chronicler Çelebizâde Âsım reported the formation of a commission responsible for the translation of Bedreddîn 'Aynî's *‘Iqd al-Jumân fî Târîhî ahl-i Zamân*, he counted among thirty scholars a certain Hâcı Çelebi who was none other than Mehmed İsmet Efendi.⁵⁹³ Secondly, it becomes explicit that his father was a certain İbrâhîm who had been a steward (*kethüdâ*). Therefore, the identification of his father seems crucial for ascertaining Mehmed İsmet's career path and the network within which he moved.

recopied by Mehmed İsmet on 25 Sha‘bân 1127/26 August 1715, indicates that Müstakîmzâde had seen, acquired, and read Mehmed İsmet's some works during later years since he explicitly notes that he has been honored by scrutinizingly reading the pamphlet in question in the year 1191/1777-1778. See Es‘ad Efendi no. 1534, fol. 1a.

⁵⁹²It is Salim Aydıız who reveals the year Mehmed İsmet performed his haj. See *ibid*, 224. In one of his dictation (*istiktâb*) record, which must also be considered as an ownership record, Mehmed İsmet refers himself as "el-Hâc". See "İstaktabahū al-‘abd al-faqîr ilā Allāh subhānahū al-Ḥāj Meḥmed ‘İşmet ibn İbrâhîm ḡafarallāhū lehumā" in Veliyyüddin Efendi no. 3221, fol. 1a.

⁵⁹³See Râşid Mehmed Efendi and Çelebizâde İsmâ‘îl Âsım Efendi, *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vol. III, 1484-1485. For an introduction on translation committees which were established upon grand vizier Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha's (v. 1718-1730) order see İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi: Karlofça Anlaşmasından XVIII. Yüzyılın Sonlarına Kadar*, vol. 4/1, 7th facsimile, (Ankara: TTK Basımevi, 2011): 152-155, and Mehmet İpşirli "Lale Devrinde Teşkil Edilen Tercüme Heyetine Dair Bazı Gözlemler," in *Osmanlı İlmî ve Meslekî Cemiyetleri: 1. Millî Türk Bilim Tarihi Sempozyumu, 3-5 Nisan 1987*, ed. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1987): 33-42.

5.3 Shifting Status: An Efendi Son of An Agha

We are informed by İbnülemin Mahmûd Kemâl about a marginal note referring to Mehmed İsmet's father. According to this short note, Mehmed İsmet's father had been the *kethüdâ* of a grand vizier during Mehmed IV's long reign (r. 1648-1687).⁵⁹⁴ This single note immediately raises two questions pertaining to the career of İbrâhîm, the father of Mehmed İsmet Efendi. On the one hand, given that Mehmed İsmet himself was an efendi and member of the *ulema* class one might wonder whether the same situation could be applied to his father. On the other hand, however, remembering Mehmed IV's long-lasting sultanate coincided with the vizierate of twenty sadrazams, we might wonder about the grand vizier for whom İbrâhîm served as a *kethüdâ*. Fortunately, a note penned in the formerly unknown ijaza of Mehmed İsmet Efendi elucidates the status of İbrâhîm. The Qadiri ijaza dated 23 Rajab 1123/6 September 1711 and given by Muhammad Subhân el-Hindî (d. 1713), a Qadiri master from Lucknow who sojourned in Istanbul at the beginning of 1710s, introduces Mehmed İsmet as "Mehmed İsmet Efendi ibn İbrâhîm Ağa".⁵⁹⁵ Likewise, İbrâhîm is identified as "Ağa" in qadi registers in which posthumous disputes pertaining to Mehmed İsmet were written down.⁵⁹⁶

In spite of the certainty that Mehmed İsmet's father had been an agha, it is still doubtful whether he served as a *kethüdâ* under one of Mehmed IV's grand viziers. The reason behind our suspicion is due to Hâfız Hüseyin Ayvansarâyî's statement that İbrâhîm Ağa was the *kethüdâ* of the *kâimmakâm*.⁵⁹⁷ Given that the latter title had been used to betoken both the grand vizier and the governor of Istanbul since the second half of the 17th century,⁵⁹⁸ it is possible that it was the *kâimmakâm* of Istanbul that İbrâhîm Ağa served for. However, it seems to me that the served statesman was the grand vizier himself. Therefore, at this point, we can attempt to trace İbrâhîm Ağa's career in Ottoman high administration by utilizing the late 17th century chronicles. Given the relevant chronicles, we realize the presence of several İbrâhîm Aghas in the service of grand viziers. For instance, during the early years of his grand vizierate, Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Ahmed Pasha's (v. 1661-1676)

⁵⁹⁴See Müstakîmzâde, *Tuhfe-i Haţtâţîn*, 376, the second footnote.

⁵⁹⁵See Veliyüddin Efendi no. 3204, fol. 1b. Considering Mehmed İsmet's idiosyncratic script, I conclude that the certificate was recopied by him in a later date but the date of copying is not recorded.

⁵⁹⁶In the registers the formula is always "merhûm 'İşmet el-Hâc Mehmed Efendi ibn İbrâhîm Ağa". See İSAM, *Kismet-i Askeriye*, no. 104, fol. 43a, 45a, 93b; no. 105, fol. 72b; and no. 107, fol. 6b.

⁵⁹⁷Hâfız Hüseyin Ayvansarâyî, *Mecmuâ-i Tevârih*, prepared by Fahri Ç. Derin and Vâhid Çabuk, (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1985): 359.

⁵⁹⁸Yücel Özkaya, "Kaymakam," *TDVIA*, vol. 25, (Ankara: TDV, 2002): 84-85.

kethüdâ had been a certain İbrâhîm Agha who was given presents by the sultan and Musâhib Mustafâ Agha after returning from the Austrian campaign of 1663-1664.⁵⁹⁹ Likewise, Merzifonlu Kara Mustafâ Pasha (v. 1676-1683) chose a Kara İbrâhîm Agha as his kethüdâ during his third term as Rikâb-ı Hümâyûn Kâymakâmı (1671-1676). Kara İbrâhîm would be appointed as Mîrâhûr-ı Evvel in 1671.⁶⁰⁰ Since Kara İbrâhîm Agha would gradually rise in state administration and finally become the grand vizier after the execution of Kara Mustafa Pasha,⁶⁰¹ we can conclude that he was not Mehmed İsmet's father, who had been celebrated for his position as kethüdâ. The chronicles of the period also mention the name of an İbrâhîm Agha who served as *kethüdâ* under the grand vizier Kara İbrâhîm Pasha and was inducted as *cebecibaşı* in 1695, eight years after the execution of his former patron.⁶⁰² These pieces of information, however, do not clarify whether Mehmed İsmet's father had been in the service of Fâzıl Ahmed Pasha or Kara İbrâhîm Pasha. Furthermore, due to the dearth of information, we are unsure whether he served under Sarı Süleymân Pasha (d. 1687) or Abaza Siyâvuş Pasha (d. 1688), the last two grand viziers of Mehmed IV.⁶⁰³ Nevertheless, bearing in mind that Mehmed İsmet as an efendi was the son of an agha, it is evident that he did not pursue the career line of his father during a time in which a "tendency for sons to follow in the careers of their fathers" had already emerged and was more or less a common occurrence.⁶⁰⁴

Not only Mehmed İsmet, but also his younger brother Osmân was disinclined to follow in his father's footsteps. Since our sources denote that he had a younger brother bearing the name Osmân in *ulema* hierarchy, a few words regarding his younger brother must be expressed. We learn from Müstakîmzâde's entry on Osmân b. İbrâhîm, that Mehmed İsmet tutored his brother on the track of the Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi order. Müstakîmzâde's presentation demonstrates that Osmân Efendi, like his elder brother, was a calligrapher for he was instructed by to-be şeyhülislâm Veliyyüddîn Efendi (d. 1768) in exercising *ta'liq* script. Likewise, he was accom-

⁵⁹⁹ Abdurrahman Abdi Paşa, *Abdurrahman Abdi Paşa Vekâyi'-nâmesi [Osmanlı Tarihi 1648-1682]*, 196-197. For an introduction on Fâzıl Ahmed Pasha and his campaigns see Abdülkadir Özcan, "Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Ahmed Paşa," *TDVIA*, vol. 26, (Ankara: TDV, 2002): 260-263.

⁶⁰⁰ Defterdâr Sarı Mehmed Paşa, *Zübde-i Vekâyi'ât (1656-1704)*, prepared by Abdülkadir Özcan, (Ankara: TTK Basımevi, 1995): 18, and Abdurrahmân Abdî Paşa, *ibid*, 352. For Kara Mustafâ Pasha see Abdülkadir Özcan, "Merzifonlu Kara Mustafa Paşa," *TDVIA*, vol. 29, (Ankara: TDV, 2002): 246-249.

⁶⁰¹ See Abdülkadir Özcan, "Kara İbrâhîm Paşa," *TDVIA*, vol. 21, (İstanbul: TDV, 2000): 329-330.

⁶⁰² See *Zübde-i Vekâyi'ât*, 488, and 577-578, and Râşid Mehmed Efendi and Çelebizâde İsmâ'îl Âsım Efendi, *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, vol. 1, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan, Yunus Uğur, Baki Çakır, and Ahmet Zeki İzgeör, (İstanbul: Klasik, 2013): 463.

⁶⁰³ For Sarı Süleymân Pasha see Abdülkadir Özcan, "Sarî Süleymân Paşa," *TDVIA*, vol. EK-2, 535-538. For Abaza Siyâvuş Pasha see Fikret Sarıcaoğlu, "Siyâvuş Paşa, Köprülü Damadı," *TDVIA*, vol. 37, (İstanbul: TDV, 2009): 313-315.

⁶⁰⁴ See Norman Itzkowitz, "Eighteenth Century Ottoman Realities," *Studia Islamica* 16 (1962): 91.

plished in astronomy and in producing astronomical devices such as sinecal quadrants (*rubu'*). Contrary to his brother, however, he attempted to build a career in judgeship rather than having a professorship in madrasa. According to Müstakîmzâde, Osmân Efendi died at the beginning of Mahmûd I's reign (r. 1730-1754) when he was qadi in Kavala.⁶⁰⁵ The last detail as to Osmân Efendi must be revised taking into account what Mehmed İsmet witnessed. Thanks to the latter's daily notes penned for the year 1146-47/1733-34, it is clear that Osmân Efendi, who left Istanbul for Kavala on 27 Dhî'l-ḥijja 1146/31 May 1734, arrived the city on 8 Muḥarram 1147/10 June 1734 where he would die on 7 Rajab 1147/3 December 1734. He was interred in the Dizdâr cemetery.⁶⁰⁶

5.4 Mehmed İsmet's Educational Background and Career

For a better picture of Mehmed İsmet's career line and life story, the utilization of neglected primary sources as well as the reevaluation of existing material is inevitable. Though his year of birth is not reported in the primary sources mentioned above, we may speculate that he was born in the 1670s or 80s when taking into consideration that his earliest known scholarly work, *Fayẓu'l-Hādī li-Ḥalli Muşkilāti's-Şāhidī*, was completed in 1112/1700-1701.⁶⁰⁷ Likewise, we are informed by biographical dictionaries neither about the madrasa he graduated from nor the teachers from whom he received his education. However, considering that his father had been an agha of the grand vizier, I tend to think that he was trained in a palace school and received his primary education from private teachers. Despite the scantness in biographical information as to his earlier years and education, I have come across significant indications regarding at least five tutors who educated him in different disciplines. The already known figure in this regard, as is reported by Müstakîmzâde and Es'ad Mehmed Efendi, was the master calligrapher, Hâfiz Osmân Efendi (d. 1698), under whose tutorship he practiced *naskh* and *thuluth* script. Therefore, at this point, we may assert that Hâfiz Osmân's existence as one of Mehmed İsmet's teachers might be another reason to lead us to conclude that he may have been educated in the palace school, for the former had practiced calligraphy with many high-ranking of-

⁶⁰⁵For an introduction on Osmân Efendi, see *Tuḥfe-i Ḥaṭṭāṭîn*, 683; and Fındıklı İsmet Efendi, *Tekmiletü's-Şakaik fi Hakk-ı Ehli'l-Hakaik*, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan, (İstanbul: Çağrı, 1989): 69.

⁶⁰⁶See Mehmed İsmet, *Taḳvīm-i Sāl-i 1146-1147*, Kandilli Rasathanesi no. T418, fols. 5a, 11a.

⁶⁰⁷See Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 3249, fol. 62b-111b. Although the gloss was penned in Ottoman Turkish its completion record was written in Persian (*tamāmī in musvadda-i perīshān dar-tārīḫ-i "Fazl-i Rabb" [1112]*).

ficials including sultan Mustafa II (r. 1695-1703), the prince and subsequent sultan Ahmed III, and the ensuing grand vizier, Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha.⁶⁰⁸

When it comes to the professors with whom Mehmed İsmet studied religious sciences, however, a few short notes written down in his scholarly works provide very crucial information. Depending on these records, Salim Aydüz was able to identify two teachers, Mehmed b. Mehmed el-Bursevî el-Mevlevî and Câbîzâde Halîl Fâiz Efendi.⁶⁰⁹ Since Aydüz does not refer to any sources, I am not in a position to confirm that Mehmed İsmet was trained by Mehmed b. Mehmed el-Mevlevî (d. 1712). However, we may presume that he professed Mevlevi practices with Mehmed İsmet. When it comes to Câbîzâde Halîl Fâiz (d. 1722), however, there is satisfactory evidence as to the tutor-pupil relationship between him and Mehmed İsmet. In a short note written in Persian as to Halîl Fâiz's suicide on 11 Jumâd al-Âkhir 1134/29 March 1722, Mehmed İsmet commemorates the scholar in question as “ustâdinâ el-Mevlâ Ḥalîl Efendi,” the literal meaning of which is “our master Halîl Efendi.”⁶¹⁰ More evidence, in this regard, is an explanatory note written in Turkish in which Mehmed İsmet clarifies the reason behind his choice to make a fair copy of his master's gloss on *Âdâb-i Husayniyya*.⁶¹¹ Lastly, in the introduction of his *Fawâ'id al-Nadriyya fî Hall al-Nûniyya al-Khidriyya*, a gloss on Halîl Fâiz Efendi's gloss on *Ḳaṣîdetü'n-Nûniyye* of Hızır Bey (d. 1459), where Mehmed İsmet states that he embarked on the completion of Halîl Fâiz Efendi's interrupted commentary, once again he identifies the latter as his master.⁶¹² What is more striking in the introduction, however, is that Mehmed İsmet introduces Halîl Fâiz not only as his tutor but also his friend (*şadîqî*), which, we may contend, indicates that the former was trained by the latter during a later period when he had completed his madrasa education, rather than during his pupillage in the madrasa. In addition, given that *Ḳaṣîdetü'n-Nûniyye* was penned by the 15th century Ottoman scholar Hızır Bey to teach the basics of Islamic creed and philosophy,⁶¹³ we can conclude that Mehmed

⁶⁰⁸According to Uğur Derman, the confirmed number of the calligraphers who were trained by Hâfız Osman is almost fifty. See Uğur Derman, “Hâfız Osman,” *TDVIA*, vol. 15, (İstanbul: TDV, 1997): 98-100. See also Müstakîmzâde, *Tuhfe-i Ḥattâtin*, 30 and 301-304.

⁶⁰⁹See Salim Aydüz, *ibid*, 224.

⁶¹⁰See Laleli, no. 2381, fol. 1a., and the 25th footnote in Aydüz, *ibid*, 226.

⁶¹¹The entire note is as follows: “Üstâdımız merhûm Fâyiz Ḥalîl Efendi'nün Âdâb-ı Hüseyiniyye üzerine olan tahrîrâtıdır ki müsveddede kalmış idi. Bu fakîr sa'îy idüp ba'zî muskalarun ve ba'zî kenâr nüshalarun zafer buldığım mertebe iltifât idüp bu maḥalle cem' ve bir dîbâce sebt eyledüm.” See Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 2864, fol. 1a.

⁶¹²Esad Efendi, no. 1233, fol. 37b.

⁶¹³See Mustafa Said Yazıcıoğlu, “el-Kasidetü'n-Nûniyye,” *TDVIA*, vol. 24, (İstanbul: TDV, 2001): 571-572. For Hızır Bey's life story and works see *idem*, “Hızır Bey,” *TDVIA*, vol. 17, (İstanbul: TDV, 1997): 413-415.

İsmet studied Islamic philosophy under the supervision of Halîl Fâiz Efendi.

Mehmed İsmet's diligence for continuous learning after graduating from madrasa, can also be observed in tutor-pupil relationship between him and a certain Muhammad Subhân el-Hindî (d. 1713), who emerged as the fourth known teacher of Mehmed İsmet in a specific ijaza mentioned above. Depending on the diploma in question, we are in a satisfactory position to state that Mehmed İsmet received hadith education and teachings, and rituals of the Qadîrî order from Muhammad Subhân el-Hindî during the latter's sojourn in Istanbul until 1712.⁶¹⁴ Nevertheless, considering Mehmed İsmet's competence in Islamic sciences, one can also assert that the reason behind Muhammad Subhân's preference to give an ijaza to him was nothing other than networking to develop closer connections with the multi-talented scholar based in the Ottoman capital. The fifth known teacher to Mehmed İsmet at least in Naqshbandi teachings was surely Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî, whose epistles were collected by the former. Despite the ambiguity that Müstakîmzâde and Es'ad Mehmed Efendi brought about in their biographic entries in which they claim that Mehmed İsmet received his Naqshbandi training from not Şeyh Murâd Bukhâr, but from one of his students, Ayvansarâyî emphasizes that he adhered to Şeyh Murâd Efendi.⁶¹⁵ The testimony to the fact that it was Murâd Bukhârî from whom the former received Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi teachings and rituals is *Simât-ı 'İşmet*, Mehmed İsmet's neglected compendium, which includes a significant number of pieces of information regarding his life and academic career. Thanks to this important work, we learn about a Persian quatrain uttered by Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî four days before his death. It is thanks to an explanatory note attached to this quatrain that we know for sure that Murâd Bukhârî was Mehmed İsmet's *şeyh* and tutor.⁶¹⁶ Furthermore, this compendium makes certain that Mehmed İsmet was a Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi *şeyh* for he obtained Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî's ratification to perform the far-famed Khwâjagân invocation (*khatm-i khwâjagân*) on 28 Jumâd al-Âkhir 1125/22 July 1713 in Edirne.⁶¹⁷ Though Mehmed İsmet was unaffiliated with Naqshbandi lodge as a *post-nishân*, we learn from Müstakîmzâde's testimony

⁶¹⁴See Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 3204, fol. 1b-2a. Mehmed İsmet penned a short entry on the life story of Muhammad Subhân el-Hindî in *ibid*, fol. 3a.

⁶¹⁵See Esad Efendi, no. 1233, fol. 1a; Ayvansarâyî, *Mecmuâ-i Tevârih*, 359.

⁶¹⁶The relevant part of the note is as follows: "Ferîd-i zemân vahîd-i evân şeyhüm kuṭb-i 'aṣr Şeyh Murâd Efendi ḥazretleri 'âlem-i fâniden mülk-i bâkiye intikâllerinden dört gün mukaddem zebân-ı şerîflerinden vârid olan kelâm-ı ḥaḳîkat-mâldür." See Mehmed İsmet, *Simât-ı 'İşmet*, Veliyüddin Efendi no. 3191, fol. 141b.

⁶¹⁷"Khatm-i khwâjagân râ qaddasallâhū asrâruhum az-shaykh Muḥammad Özbekî ma'zûn shodîm dar bist hashtom az Jumâdî al-Âkhirî yawm al-Jum'a fî shahr-i Edirne fî sana 1125." *Simât-ı 'İşmet*, fol. 177b. Mehmed İsmet recorded the ijaza given by Murâd Bukhârî in his compendium, an explicit indication that it was given to him by the şeyh around this time as an confirmation of his sheikhdom. However, the name of Mehmed İsmet is not recorded in it. See *Simât-ı 'İşmet*, fol. 142b-143b.

that he taught his younger brother, Osmân Efendi, the teachings and rituals of the Naqshbandi order.⁶¹⁸

Available sources do not shed light on when and from which madrasa Mehmed İsmet graduated. Yet, considering his scholarly works preserved in several manuscript collections, the composers of the biographical dictionaries likely agreed that the quality of education he received was sophisticated. His competence in *elsine-i selâse*, the three Islamic languages—Arabic, Persian and Turkish—, for instance, is particularly emphasized.⁶¹⁹ On the other hand, scholarly works penned by Mehmed İsmet, and a variety of the records penned in the manuscripts preserved in different collections, illuminate not only Mehmed İsmet’s scholarly and scientific orientation, but also the dark spots of his life and career coincided with the first half of the 18th century. For instance, as is already mentioned above, it is obvious that he was able to complete *Fayzu’l-Hādî li-Hallî Muşkilâti’ş-Şāhidî*, his earliest known scholarly product in 1112/1700-1701. In addition, it seems likely that he went on pilgrimage in 1701. From the preface of this very first composition, it is understood that Mehmed İsmet presented his book to a certain Kiblelizâde Mîr Ahmed, an indication that he was able to build up a patron-client relationship with him.⁶²⁰ Such a patronage relationship, however, cannot be traced until the middle of 1710s when taking into consideration the completion date of Mehmed İsmet’s written works presented to several dignitaries. By the 1720s, he was able to develop close connections with high-ranking officials including Sultan Ahmed III, the grand vizier, Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, the viziers, Kethüdâ Mehmed Pasha (d. 1730) and İzzet Alî Pasha (d. 1734), and the şeyhülislams, Yenişehirli Abdullâh Efendi (d. 1743) and Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullâh Efendi (d. 1732) to whom he presented at least one of his compositions. One of these works, a eulogy presented to the grand vizier, sheds light not only on Mehmed İsmet’s situation, but also on his previous years which remained in the dark because of the paucity of information. In the eulogy, Mehmed İsmet frankly states that if he is not appointed to a madrasa as a müderris his disposition would worsen since his waiting period after graduating from madrasa amounted to twenty years (*Zemân-ı infişālüm dahı bâliğ oldı ‘işrîne / Meded-res-i medrese olmazsa hâl-i bende rüsvâdur*).⁶²¹ This eulogy, as is understood from its context, was submitted to the grand vizier together with a pamphlet whose title is not mentioned (*Eger zāt u zemân ile olursa işte burhānum / Risāle ile bu şî‘r-i*

⁶¹⁸For Müstakimzâde’s entry on Osmân Efendi, see *Tuhfe-i Haṭṭāṭîn*, 683.

⁶¹⁹See for instance Mehmed Es’ad Efendi, *Bâğçe-i Safâ-Endûz*, 149.

⁶²⁰See Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 3249, fol. 63a.

⁶²¹See Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 3249, fol. 61b.

bî-tekellüfden hüveydâdur). Obviously, the *Risāle* in question was *Risāle-i Tedāhül*, Mehmed İsmet's only known pamphlet presented to the grand vizier.⁶²² Given that the pamphlet was completed in Jumād al-Ākhir 1138 [February 1726], we can assume that it was since 1118/1706-07 that Mehmed İsmet had been waiting for being appointed to a madrasa as a professor. At this point, we should remember that in the 18th century, it was particularly common for madrasa graduates to fulfill waiting periods before being appointed to a judgeship or professorship. The waiting period was called *mülâzemet* or *nevbet*, but it must be recalled that *mülâzemet* pointed out in the most general sense the status of a qualified madrasa graduate waiting for a position in a *kaza* or madrasa organization.⁶²³ Therefore, no matter his age, it is likely that Mehmed İsmet officially graduated from an unknown madrasa around the year 1118/1706-07 and waited as a *mülâzım* for almost twenty years to be assigned to the professorship of a madrasa. Mehmed İsmet's long-lasting status as a *mülâzım* during the interim period is observable also through the records of Çelebizâde İsmâ'îl Âsım Efendi, the official chronicler of the time, who introduced the former as a *mülâzım* when reporting the formation of a committee responsible for the translation of Bedreddîn 'Aynî's historical account *'Iqd al-Jumân fî Tārîh ahl-i Zamân*.⁶²⁴

Due to his long-lasting waiting period as a candidate, in the eulogy, Mehmed İsmet expressed his desire to be inducted as a professor to a *hâric* madrasa, the lowest of the twelve-ranks in madrasa hierarchy. Furthermore, he requested to be appointed to the intended position directly by the grand vizier rather than any high-ranking madrasa tutor who would subject him to a qualification exam (*Çerâğ-ı Hâşşa dâhîl kıl havâle itme üstâda / Buyur kılkünle bir hâric ki hüküm-i Hakk'a mecrâdur*). Additionally, given the statement "include me among the imperial novices/apprentices" (*Çerâğ-ı Hâşşa dâhîl kıl*) in the first line of the distich, we can claim that Mehmed İsmet, first implied being introduced to the madrasa hierarchy directly through the grand vizier, which would preclude an examination before the appointment, considering the centuries-old practice that enabled the sultan, grand vizier and viziers to propose competent individuals to the madrasa system.⁶²⁵ Second, however, he might allude

⁶²²For the two copies of this pamphlet see Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 3249, fol. 125b-133a, and Atıf Efendi, no. 2604. For an illustrative study on this pamphlet see particularly 235-251 in Salim Aydüz, "İsmet Mehmed Efendi (ö. 1747) ve Tedâhül-i Seneye Dair Risâlesi".

⁶²³For the discussions on the bilateral practice of *mülâzemet* see İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin İlmîye Teşkilatı*, 45-53; Mehmet İpşirli, "Mülâzemet," *TDVIA*, vol. 31, (İstanbul: TDV, 2006): 537-539; Özgün Deniz Yoldaşlar, "Minkârizâde Yahya and the Ottoman Scholarly Bureaucracy in the Seventeenth Century," 199-206. For the evaluation of the situation during the second half of the 15th and first half of the 16th centuries see Abdurrahman Atçıl, *Scholars and Sultans in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*, 74-81, 102-113, and 134-145.

⁶²⁴See above footnote 593, and Aydüz, *ibid*, 233.

⁶²⁵İpşirli, "Mülâzemet," 538.

to being assigned a duty in the palace rather than a madrasa. Though the last seems a very weak possibility, it is likely that he would not refuse a position in the palace or state offices under the grand vizier, which would mean that he attempted to initiate a new career in bureaucracy rather than in official madrasas.

The existing evidence demonstrates that Mehmed İsmet's requests from the grand vizier were not met. As is already touched upon, it was Râmiz who reported that Mehmed İsmet had been appointed to a *hâric* madrasa upon his successful examination in 1141/1728-29. If this is the case, it becomes explicit that he was neither granted a *hâric* position by the grand vizier nor exempted from the examination, which were his main requests from Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha in 1138/1726. Yet, the preface of Mehmed İsmet's commentary on Isâm al-Dîn Isfarâyînî's *Istîcâre* entitled *Sharḥ-i Istîcâra-i Fârisiyya-i cIşâm*, reveals that Mehmed İsmet received his *mülâzemet* around 1140/1727-28 for being able to be assigned to a madrasa. For since Mehmed İsmet overtly expressed in the text completed in 1140/1727-28 that he began to pen his work for İzzet Alî Pasha upon the "occurrence of *mülâzemet*" (*mulâzemet vukûc yâft*),⁶²⁶ we can contend that he managed to take his exams and obtain his position in a *hâric* madrasa owing to the efforts of İzzet Alî Pasha as a patron and mediator. It is apparent, then, that after completing his long-lasting waiting period as a novice and attaining his ultimate *mülâzemet*, Mehmed İsmet was assigned to a madrasa of *hâric* rank unknown to us. Notwithstanding, as is reported from Râmiz above, it is apparent that he gradually climbed the madrasa hierarchy and obtained the professorship in one of the *Mûsile-i Süleymâniye* madrasas where he would remain in until his death. This reality is confirmed also by Mehmed İsmet's newly discovered probate inventory and a few posthumous dispute records in which he is identified as the *müderri*s of *Mûsile-i Süleymâniye*.⁶²⁷ Luckily, a crucial note in one of the previously unutilized calendars of Mehmed İsmet makes it clear that he was appointed to the professorship of *Mûsile-i Şahn*, the fifth rank in the madrasa hierarchy, on November 15, 1740/25 Sha'cân 1153.⁶²⁸ This note demonstrates that, in the course of seven years, he continued to climb the madrasa ladder and ultimately received a position in one of the ninth-rank madrasas of *Mûsile-i Süleymâniye*. Fortunately, a biographical entry penned by a certain Mehmed Tâhir reveals that the last madrasa, where Mehmed İsmet taught before his death was Atîk Alî Paşa (*ḥînuhû sâra mudarrisan bi-Mûşile-i Süleymâniye bi-Madrasat cAlî*

⁶²⁶See Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 3249, fol. 27b-28a, for the entire text see *ibid*, 27b-50a.

⁶²⁷For the probate inventory see İSAM, Kismet-i Askeriye 107, fol. 6b-10a.

⁶²⁸The note is as follows: "Rutba rasîdan-i Mûşila-i Şahn". See Mehmed İsmet, *Taḳvîm-i Sâl-i 1152-1153*, Kandilli Rasathanesi no. T33, fol. 9b.

5.5 Mehmed İsmet as A Sufi

When it comes to Mehmed İsmet's adherence to the Naqshbandi order, there emerge ambiguities pertaining to his initial adherence to the order, and the *şeyh* from whom he received the basic teachings and rituals of the order for the first time. As is already mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, it was Müstakîmzâde who reported that Mehmed İsmet adhered to the Naqshbandiyya in his later years when he was a competent and respected madrasa professor. This implies that his devotion to the order was a matter of the late 1730's and 1740's when recalling that his very first appointment to a *hâric* madrasa might have coincided with the year 1140/1727-28. Furthermore, Mehmed Es'ad Efendi's unknown Arabic entry penned on the front page of a manuscript bearing the ownership record of Mehmed İsmet clarifies that the deceased Mehmed İsmet was introduced to the order not by Murâd Bukhârî but by some of his deputies (*wa lahû nisbatun ilâ al-Ṭarîqat al-Naqshbandiyya min ba'd khulafâ al-Shaykh Murâd*). In the absence of Mehmed İsmet's own writings about his obedience to the Naqshbandi order, based only on Müstakîmzâde and Mehmed Es'ad's statements, one might claim that his attachment to the Naqshbandi order had not happened during the years in which the eminent Naqshbandi *şeyh* Murâd Bukhârî (d. 1720) propagated the order in Istanbul. Yet, it was Murâd Bukhârî who warranted him in Edirne the sheikhdom of the order in July 1713. In all likelihood, it was this acquaintanceship that allowed Mehmed İsmet to collect and copy the scattered epistles of Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî. Moreover, if the epistles were not dispersed but transferred directly from Murâd Bukhârî or his heirs we can conclude that the link between Mehmed İsmet and the latter was closer and stronger than anticipated. The Naqshbandiyya, however, was not the only Sufi order to which Mehmed İsmet was attached. As is already mentioned above, the *ijaza* he received from Muhammad Subhân el-Hindî during the latter's sojourn in Istanbul until 1712 allowed him not only to teach hadith but also to instruct the principles and practice the rituals of the Qadiri order. Put differently, Muhammad Subhân designated Mehmed İsmet as his deputy to teach and propagate the Qadiri order in Istanbul. In spite of omitting the Qadiri order, a previously unknown record pertaining to Mehmed İsmet's life and career indicates that he endeavored to learn the teachings of other Sufi orders such as Mevleviyye, Naqshbandiyya, Shadhiliyya and Bayramiyye. What is more striking

⁶²⁹See Esad Efendi, no. 1233, fol. Ia.

in this entry, however, is Mehmed Tâhir's introduction of Mehmed İsmet as a şeyh in the sciences of Sufism (*Shaykhan fi al-ʿulūmi't-taṣawwuf wa lahū nisbat ... liʿt-tariqat al-Mawlawiyya waʿn-Naqshbandiyya waʿsh-Shādhiliyya waʿl-Bayrāmīyya*).⁶³⁰ Be that as it may, given that the existing silsilas of the Naqshbandi order do not identify a Mehmed İsmet among the şeyhs who raised disciples, we can readily infer that his aim was to learn about the teachings and practices of the order rather than professing the order as a şeyh.

5.6 Mehmed İsmet's Nuclear Family and Probate Inventory

Before attempting to uncover the intellectual biography of Mehmed İsmet, in the current position, a few words for presenting his nuclear family and his death are due. For this purpose, the only primary sources in hand are his probate inventory and a few posthumous dispute records, all of which were arranged and penned into Kismet-i Askeriye registers by the scribes of the Askerî Kassâm in 1747.⁶³¹ As far as we are informed by these records, Mehmed İsmet left behind a wife by name Hadîce and two non-adult daughters, who were identified as Habîbe and Rûkiye. His wife Hadîce, we are told, was the daughter of a certain Hüseyin Ağa about whom we have no more information. The identification of Mehmed İsmet's father-in-law as an "Ağa" is crucial when recalling that his father himself was an "Ağa" in the service of a grand vizier. This is to say, in spite being a member of the *ulema*, Mehmed İsmet was married off to the daughter of an agha rather than an *âlim*, which might be an indication that the marriage took place under the guidance and recommendation of the fathers who may have been familiar with each other from their services in vizier and pasha households. Yet, the year of the wedding is uncertain. Given that his daughters were still underage at the time of his death in 1747, one may think that he got married during the second half of the 1730's. However, it is equally valid to think that his marriage had already taken place, but his children had died due to infectious diseases, particularly the plague, which continued to afflict Istanbul during the first half of the 18th century.⁶³²

⁶³⁰See Esad Efendi, no. 1534, fol. 41a.

⁶³¹The records as to Mehmed İsmet Efendi exist in the registers numbered 104, 105, and 107. For his probate inventory see İSAM, Kismet-i Askeriye no. 107, fol. 6b-10a; for the remaining records see Kismet-i Askeriye no. 104, fol. 43a, 45a-45b, 93b; and no. 105, fol. 72b-73b. For an introduction on the functions of askerî kassâms see Said Öztürk, "Kassâm," *TDVİA*, vol. 24, 579-582.

⁶³²According to Nükhet Varlık, big waves of plague hit Istanbul in 1713, 1719, 1728-29, 1739-43, 1759-65, 1784-86, and 1791-92. See Nükhet Varlık, "İstanbul'da Veba Salgınları," in *Antik Çağdan XXI. Yüzyıla Büyük İstanbul Tarihi*, vol. IV, (İstanbul: İBB Kültür A.Ş., 2015): 150. For a seminal work studying the existence and transmission of the plague under three phases and the Ottoman perception of it terms of

Mehmed İsmet's unstudied calendar prepared for the Hijri year 1153 [1740-1741] confirms our suspicion as to child death stemming from the plague. According to his frequently written personal notes, which were in line with the related rows of the calendar, in November 1740, Mehmed İsmet's three children (two daughters and one and one son) died from the plague, which, as is inferred from the notes pertaining to the death of several individuals, hit the city particularly during the late Rajab, Sha^cbān, and early Ramaḍān. We are told in this regard that his ten-years old daughter, Fâtma Azîze, contracted the plague in the morning on Sha^cbān 16, passed away in the late afternoon on Sha^cbān 18, and was buried the day after [November 9, 1740]. His eight-year old son, Mollâ Necîb İbrâhîm, was hit by the pestilence on Sha^cbān 21 and died in the wee hours of Sha^cbān 27 [November 17]. The five-month old Ümmü Gülsüm, his youngest daughter, however, got the illness on Ramaḍān 4 and died the day after [November 24, 1740]. The notes testify that not only the children but also the slaves of Mehmed İsmet contracted and died from the plague during this short period. For instance, one of his female slaves, Ferruh, who was struck by the plague the night of Rajab 28 (*shikasta shodan-i Farrukh qabîl-i nişf-i nahâr*) and died on Sha^cbān 1 [October 22, 1740] (*Ferruh nâm cāriye fevt oldı*). Süleymân and Rahîme, a male and a female slave, respectively caught the terminal illness on Sha^cbān 15 and 16 and passed away at the same time, at half past nine on Sha^cbān 18/November 8 (*Bu Salı gicesi sâ'at dokuz buçuğda Süleymân ve Rahîme dâr-ı beğāya gıtdiler*). Another male slave, Süleymân the Elder, died on Sha^cbān 21, the day his son Necîp İbrâhîm contracted the plague (*Büyük Süleymân fâvt shod, Oğlum Mollâ Necîb hasta oldı*). The only exceptional recovery from among Mehmed İsmet's household was a female slave named Nefîse. Though, we are informed that she was struck by the plague on Sha^cbān 14 (*Ma^cṭûn shodan-i Nafîsa*), there emerged no further record as to her death, an indication that she survived.⁶³³

When it comes to Mehmed İsmet's death, once again, we are in an advantageous position to trace the link between his death and infectious diseases, for the years 1747-48 witnessed a catastrophic epidemic resulting in the destruction of a significant portion of the population in Istanbul. Despite the silence of the chronicles on infectious diseases hitting Istanbul during these years, we can conclude that there was a devastating disease during these years by considering the sudden increase in the number of Kismet-i Askeriye registers regarding the short period. To clarify,

precaution, treatment and politics in the 15th and 16th centuries see Nükhet Varlık, *Plague and Empire in the Early Modern Mediterranean World: the Ottoman Experience, 1347-1600*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015). For a broad perspective on the natural disasters in the Ottoman Empire and the Ottoman attitude towards them see Yaron Ayalon, *Natural Disasters in the Ottoman Empire: Plague, Famine, and Other Misfortunes*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

⁶³³For the records pertaining to the death of Mehmed İsmet's children and slaves see Mehmed İsmet, *Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1152-1153*, fol. 9a-10a.

whereas the four-year period between 1154-1157 [1741-1745] is represented by only 6 registers, the two-year period of 1160-1161 [1747-1748] witnessed the recording of 12 registers, all of which are preserved in ISAM. Yet, we do not have explicit evidence that mentions the emergence of epidemics in Istanbul at the time. The two-year period of 1164-1165 [1751-1752], which witnessed the burst of a formidable plague in Istanbul, however, has a total number of 16 registers.⁶³⁴ Accordingly, considering the similar numbers of registers kept from 1747 to 1748 and 1751 to 1752, we can infer that there was a devastating epidemic in Istanbul, not only in the latter period, but also during the previous period.⁶³⁵ The dispute records kept in Kismet-i Askeriye registers shed light as well on other members of Mehmed İsmet's nuclear family. In addition to a female slave of Georgian origin identified as Hüsnâ in the probate inventory, we come across three manumitted male and female slaves, Alî b. Abdullâh, Safiye bt. Abdullâh and Hanım bt. Abdullâh, again of Georgian origin, claiming a share in Mehmed İsmet's inheritance.⁶³⁶ We are informed in another record about the amount of cash bequeathed to these manumitted slaves. According to the statements of witnesses in the record, ten days before his death, Mehmed İsmet acknowledged before the witnesses that he had freed the slaves in question, and determined that each female slave should receive 100 and male slave 50 gurûş from his inheritance upon his death.⁶³⁷ Given that from among the four slaves of Georgian origin, since only Hüsnâ was not manumitted by Mehmed İsmet before his death, we can propose that she was either an underage or a recently owned slave who had not spent a certain time period in the service of her owners.⁶³⁸ Since the existence of four slaves in Mehmed İsmet's household is also testament to his wealth, a brief presentation of his estate inventory becomes unavoidable.

We are told by Mehmed Süreyya that Mehmed İsmet died on 2 Dhî'1-qa^cda 1160/5 November 1747. Yet, the inventory of his assets was put in order on 15 Muḥarram 1161/16 January 1748. The main reason behind this delay may relate to the epidemic. However, we know that in the meantime, there were settled disputes re-

⁶³⁴The British ambassador to Istanbul, James Porter, had regularly informed London about this last endemic during his stay in Istanbul. See Ahmet Büyükaksoy, "James Porter'm İstanbul Büyükelçiliği (1747-1762)," Unpublished PhD Diss., (Marmara University, 2016): 248-250.

⁶³⁵The small number of registers during a chosen time period may also be an indication of the vanishment of the registers under external conditions such as fires. A gradual increase in number of the registers, however, might also prove the firm control of the state in record keeping. For being sure about the occurrence of an epidemic in a specific region, there must exist at least a few records in a register regarding the frequent intrafamilial deaths of several individuals.

⁶³⁶See respectively register no. 107, fol. 9b, and no. 104, fol. 43a.

⁶³⁷See İSAM, Kismet-i Askeriye, no. 104, fol. 45b.

⁶³⁸Hakan Erdem has demonstrated that it was a common practice in the Ottoman Empire at least in the 19th century to free slaves after a certain period of service which was more or less seven years. See Hakan Erdem, *Slavery in the Ottoman Empire and its Demise, 1800-1909*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996): 155-156. See also Mehmet Akif Aydın and Muhammed Hamidullah, "Köle," *TDVİA*, vol. 26, 242.

garding his oral testament [16 Zî'l-hicce 1160 / 19 December 1747], his slaves' claim for inheritance and the return of Kâdîzâde Mehmed Efendi's endowed books, which were at Mehmed İsmet's disposal before the latter's death, both on 7 Muḥarram 1161/8 January 1748.⁶³⁹ Ultimately, when his inventory was released, it revealed that the absolute amount of assets sold was 1,577,956 *akçe*. The inventory in question is composed of three categories, when it comes to the lists of assets it included. In the first place, in addition to the 897 books and pamphlets owned by Mehmed İsmet, three astrolabes, two telescopes (*dūrbān*) and rolls of paper were estimated at 333,677 asper, approximately 21,15 percent of his total wealth. Then comes the list of personal belongings, domestic utensils, kitchenware, golden and silver wares etc., valued at 358,769 (22,74 percent). In the final category, however, hard cash amounted to 705,510 *akçe* is recorded (44,71 percent). It must be stated that the residence in which Mehmed İsmet and his family lived constituted the most precious entry in the inventory (180,000 *akçe*; 11,4 percent). Although the hard cash is particularly noteworthy as an indication of capital accumulation of the deceased, we are unable to determine the sources of his income except for the salary he received for teaching in the madrasa of *Mûsile-i Süleymâniye* rank. Nevertheless, we may speculate that he was able to protect an already existing fortune inherited from his father or assert more confidently that he made a fortune through his connections with high-ranking officials and his presence in their gatherings, where he managed to present his competence and abilities. Since the latter will be discussed in the next chapter of this dissertation, at this point I want to point out the assets which he may have inherited from his father. At least one of the two telescopes that existed in the inventory might have been transferred from İbrâhîm Ağa to his son, Mehmed İsmet, for the telescope was an important technological device for high-ranking officials, particularly on the battlefield. In addition to *dūrbān*, it is likely that Mehmed İsmet inherited from his father valuable furs such as “fıstıķı çūķaya ķaplı semmūr pāçası kürk” (15,000 *akçe*) and “fıstıķı çūķa ķaplı semmūr kürk” (24,120 *akçe*). Given that the female slave whose appraised value was 36,000 *akçe* in the inventory, we may speculate that the furs passed to son from the father thanks to the latter's higher position in the service of the grand vizier. Nevertheless, it is fair to state that Mehmed İsmet might have been rewarded these furs as *câize* from high-ranking officials to whom he presented his scholarly works,⁶⁴⁰ or he purchased them from the furrier

⁶³⁹For his inventory and dispute records as to his assets see above footnote 632. For solving the problems the officials went to deceased Mehmed İsmet's house in Uzun Yūsuf neighborhood. It is striking that the disputes settled on 7 Muḥarram 1161/8 January 1748 were recorded in different registers. That is to say, whereas the dispute as to the books was written down into the register numbered 105, the dispute regarding his slaves' claim for inheritance was recorded in the register 107. Mehmed İsmet misappropriated the endowed books of Kâdîzâde Mehmed when he was the trustee of the waqf. See İsa Uğurlu, “18. Yüzyılda Şahsi Bir Kütüphanenin İnşası ve Dağlışı: Mehmed İsmet Efendi Kütüphanesi Örneđi,” (forthcoming).

⁶⁴⁰For a short introduction on the implementation of *câize* in the Ottoman context, see Mustafa İzmet Uzun,

in the bazaar as a result of a plain and simple transaction. Finally, we can claim that he inherited military equipment and paraphernalia made out of silver from his father. In this regard, we can refer to the existence in the inventory of a silver and a *hilālī* mace (*debūs*; respectively 2905 and 760 *akçe*), silver swords such as *kılıç* (1860 *akçe*) and *gaddāre* (1800 *akçe*), and a considerable amount of silver equestrian gears, including saddles (*raht*) and bridles (*reşme*). Considering that there emerged also iron equestrian gear and a single black packhorse (*kara bārgīr*; 3600 *akçe*) in the inventory, we can conclude that the luxurious silver military equipment and saddlery (four of them were valued at 5300, 5300, 8005, and 9000 *akçe*) were from Mehmed İsmet's father, who had been an agha in the service of a grand vizier. In addition to this very brief identification of assets which might have been the remain of his father, a few words should be expressed as to the debts as well as the remainder of the inventory. Given in the inventory the total value of the subtraction, which is 363,323 *akçe* (23 percent), we realize that the attested debts constitute the largest proportion (205,222 *akçe*; 56,5 percent). Moreover, it is noteworthy that Mehmed İsmet bequeathed several individuals including his manumitted slaves with a total of 53.100 *akçes*, equal to 3.4 percent of his wealth. When it comes to the remainder (1,214,633 *akçe*), by force of well-defined Islamic law of inheritance, his wife was allowed one eighth of the wealth (151,829 *akçes*), whereas the two underage daughters equally received 531,402 *akçe* (43,75 percent).⁶⁴¹ Yet, since the daughters were underage, a certain el-Hâc Mehmed Ağa b. Şa'ban had been appointed as a guardian by Mehmed İsmet to look after the orphans and manage their wealth until they reached lawful age. From a document recorded in a Kismet-i Askeriye register, we know that this trustee was allowed to spend 80 *akçes* daily for the expenditures of each daughter, which demonstrates that the wealth of each daughter sufficed for a living of approximately 6642 days or 18 years.

Table 5.1 The total value of Mehmed İsmet's assets and their ratio in total wealth.

ASSETS		
Items	Value	Ratio
Books	333,677	% 21,15
Wares	358,769	% 22,74
Hard Cash	705,510	% 44,71
Residence	180,000	% 11,4
TOTAL	1,577,956	% 100

"Câize," *TDVIA*, vol. 7, (İstanbul: TDV, 1993): 29. For a detailed study of patronage and sponsorship of the poets and literary production during "the Classical Age" see the 8th and 9th chapters in Halil İnalçık, *Has-bağçede 'ayş u tarab: Nedîmler, Şâirler, Mutribler*, (İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları, 2011); and idem, *Şâir ve Patron: Patrimonyal Devlet ve Sanat Üzerinde Sosyolojik Bir İnceleme*, (Ankara: Doğu Batı, 2003).

⁶⁴¹Hamdi Döndüren, "Ashâbü'l-Ferâiz," *TDVIA*, vol. 3, (İstanbul: TDV, 1991): 467-468.

Table 5.2 The total value and ratio of subtractions in the inventory.

DISCARDS			
Items	Value	Ratio in Discards	Ratio in Total
Debts	205,222	% 56,5	% 13
Levies and Charges	65,869	% 18,12	% 4,17
Bequest	55,800	% 15,36	% 3,54
Personal Benefaction	33,840	% 9,31	% 2,14
Missing in Inventory	2,592	% 0,71	% 0,16
TOTAL	363,323	% 100	% 23,01

Table 5.3 The total amount and ratio of shares in the inventory

SHARES			
Items	Value	Ratio in Share	Ratio in Total
Wife	151,829	% 12,5	% 9,62
Daughter	531,402	% 43,75	% 33,68
TOTAL	1,214,633	% 100	% 76,98

5.7 Mehmed İsmet's Intellectual Orientations

After the clarification of Mehmed İsmet's family background, biography, life, education and the introduction of his probate inventory, in this section my intention is to focus on his intellectual tendencies utilizing his neglected scholarly works preserved in several manuscript collections together with his estate inventory used for the first time in the context of this dissertation. Indeed, the composers of the biographical dictionaries of his time were aware of his competence in several social and religious disciplines such as calligraphy, poetry, Sufism, and history. His competence in three Islamic languages, too, was appreciated by the biographers of the time. However, it seems likely that no author of the biographical dictionaries realized his adequacy in natural sciences. The only exception in this regard, it seems, was Mehmed Tâhir Efendi, who penned a posthumous biographical entry which has remained unexposed in the manuscript until now. In his entry Mehmed Tâhir praised Mehmed İsmet's competence, not only in learning and teaching Sufi orders, but also his perfection in both revelational (*naqlî*) and rational (*‘aqlî*) sciences (*‘âliman fâḍilan lahû ‘uluww al-ka‘b fî al-‘ulûm al-‘aqliyya wa al-naqliyya*). Given that, for the latter sciences, he particularly alluded to astronomical sciences such as theoretical astronomy (*hay‘at*) and the science of the stars (*nujûm*) (*wa kāna lahû ‘uluww ka‘b fî al-falakiyyât khuṣûsan fî ‘ilm al-nujûm wa al-hay‘at*) stating that he composed many scholarly works pertaining to the revelational and rational sciences (*wa lahû taṣānîf*

wa shurūhi kathīra li^ʿl-^ʿulūm al-^ʿaqliyya wa al-naqliyya),⁶⁴² it becomes an unavoidable task to delve into his intellectual orientations for a more explicit familiarization of his capacities. By undertaking such a research project, I claim and demonstrate that Mehmed İsmet’s interest in social and natural sciences was not confined to theoretical readings. In other words, I contend that rather than contenting himself particularly with theoretical readings of natural sciences, he continuously practiced them and produced concrete, tangible outputs as a result of his investigations.

5.7.1 A Critic and Man of Poetry

Mehmed İsmet’s accomplishment in the three Islamic languages and his talent in calligraphy resulted in the composition of many scholarly works including authorized, translated and duplicated books and pamphlets concerning the religious and natural sciences, history, and to artistic works such as poetry. His earliest known scholarly work, which bore the title *Fayzu^ʿl-Hādī li-Ḥalli Muşkilāti^ʿş-Şāhidī* was a gloss on *Luğat-ı Şāhidī*. We know that the author of the *Luğat*, İbrâhîm Şāhidî, was the son of Sâlih Hüdâyî Dede (d. 1480), a Mevlevi şeyh who served during the second half of the 15th century as the founder and earliest *post-nishân* of the Mevlevîhâne of Muğla, where he gave lectures on *Mathnawî*.⁶⁴³ A successor şeyh of the same mevlevîhâne, İbrâhîm Şāhidî (d. 1550), penned his *Luğat* as a versified Persian-Turkish dictionary, which is mostly known as *Tuhfe-i Şāhidî* and written in the mathnawi form to make *Mathnawî* more understandable for Turkish readers and to teach Persian at the beginner level.⁶⁴⁴ As the author did not attempt to introduce Persian grammar and confined himself only to the translation of approximately 1400 Persian words and some verses in 453 distiches,⁶⁴⁵ we can deduce that the latter claim is baseless. Mehmed İsmet’s gloss on the text, however, undertakes a study of explanation and interpretation of each of İbrâhîm Şāhidî’s verses, not only in terms of literal meanings of Persian and Arabic words, but also figurative meanings in context. Furthermore, he neither refrains from introducing symbols, metaphors and figures of speech adopted by Şāhidî in his poems, nor hesitates to

⁶⁴²Esad Efendi, no. 1534, fol. 41a.

⁶⁴³For a short and inadequate introduction of Sâlih Hüdâyî Dede and Mevlevîhâne of Muğla see Namık Açıkgöz, “Muğla Mevlevîhânesi,” in *Ulusal Sempozyum: Günümüzde Yurt İçi Mevlevîhânelerinin Durum ve Konumları: Bildiriler-Sunular, 9-10 Aralık 2013*, (Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Mevlâna Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Yayınları, 2017): 293-294. For a better introduction see Mehmet Nuri Çınarcı, “Hüdâyî Seyh Sâlih Dede,” (05.11.2020) <http://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/hudayi-hudayi-hudayi-dede-seyh> (accessed 15.05.2021).

⁶⁴⁴Mustafa Çıpan, “İbrâhîm Şāhidî,” *TDVIA*, vol. 38, (İstanbul: TDV, 2010): 273-274.

⁶⁴⁵For the numbers and full text of *Tuhfe-i Şāhidî* see Atabey Kılıç, “Türkçe-Farsça Manzum Sözlüklerden Tuhfe-i Şāhidî (Metin),” *Turkish Studies* 2/4 (Fall, 2017): 516-548.

criticize his poetry in terms of syntax and phrases. Even though it has been claimed that “Ottoman literature produced no literary criticism except for biographies, bibliographies and superficial commentaries,”⁶⁴⁶ most of which were produced during the so-called Classical Age,⁶⁴⁷ we can extract pieces of serious literary criticism in Mehmed İsmet’s commentary, which seems to be strictly dependent on the traditional way of commentary writing in terms of explaining the words and phrases and grammatical structure of the text.⁶⁴⁸ What makes Mehmed İsmet’s work more scientific, as is the case in the previous commentaries, is his references to and utilization of well-known scholarly works, including İbrâhîm Şâhidî’s *Gülşen-i Esrâr*, Hüsâm b. Hasan el-Konevî’s *Tuḥfe-i Hüsâmî* which was imitated by Şâhidî when composing his *Tuḥfe*, erudite hadith scholars Kâdî ‘ÿyâz al-Yakhsûbî’s *Kitâb al-Shifâ* and İbn Mâja’s *al-Sunan*, renowned Persian dictionaries such as *Farhang-i Jihāngîrî*, *Shâmîl al-Lughat*, *Şihâh al-‘Ajam*, *Lughat-i Ni‘matullâh* and other texts such as *Fî Qânûn al-Adab al-Qadîr*, Mevlânâ’s *Mathnawî*.

Even if penned in Turkish, the introduction of *Fayzû‘l-Hādî li-Ḥalli Muşkilâtî‘ş-Şâhidî* is useful to have a better understanding of the place, importance, and sentimental value of Persian for an Ottoman man of the pen, at least in the beginning of the 18th century. A sentence which is read “Infinite glorification be that God who brightened the hearts of the scholars (‘âlimân) with the glittering lights of Arabic and washed the hearts of the wise (‘ârifân) with the drops of the water of life of Persian”⁶⁴⁹ demonstrates on the one hand the almost equivalent position of Persian and Arabic for an Ottoman savant, and emphasizes on the other the identification of Arabic with *‘ilm* and *‘âlim* and Persian with *‘irfân* and *‘ârif*. The equivalence of Persian with the language of *Qur’an* is observable also in the following discussion of the author who tries to underline the importance of Persian by conveying four hadith wordings exalting the Persian language. In one of these hadith, copied by Mehmed İsmet, it is stated that the language of paradise is Arabic and pearly white Persian (*lisānu ahl al-jannat al-‘Arabîyya wa al-Fârisîyya al-Durriyya*).⁶⁵⁰ Based on these hadith wordings conveying Ibn Mâjah’s interpretation regarding the im-

⁶⁴⁶Talat S. Halman, *A Millennium of Turkish Literature: A Concise History*, edited by Jayne L. Warner, (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2011): 33.

⁶⁴⁷Mustafa İsmet Uzun, “Tezkire: Türk Edebiyatı,” *TDVIA*, vol. 41, (İstanbul: TDV, 2012): 70. See also Nagihan Gür, “Osmanlı Edebiyatında Eleştiri ve Latîfî’nin Tezkiretü’ş-Şu‘arâ’sı Üzerine,” *Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları. Festschrift in Honor of Walter G. Andrews 34/II* (2010): 82-83.

⁶⁴⁸For an introduction on commentaries in the Ottoman literature see Yekta Saraç, “Şerhler,” in *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, vol. II, (İstanbul: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2006): 121-132.

⁶⁴⁹“Şükr-i bî-kıyâş ol Rabb-i Celîl’üñ ... olsun ki derûn-ı ‘âlimânı lem‘ât-ı envâr-ı Tâzî birle pür-tâb, ve kulüb-ı ‘ârifânı reşhât-ı âb-ı ḥayât-ı Fârisî ile sirâb kılup” in Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 3249, fol. 62b.

⁶⁵⁰Ibid, fol. 62b.

portance and precedence of Persian in learning and speaking, Mehmed İsmet states that he attempted to write a commentary on Şâhidî's text to clarify its difficulties and to demonstrate the distortion of Persian by common Turks (*‘Avām-ı Arvāmdan ‘ārız tahriḫātı ‘ayān ve müşkilātı beyān olunmaḫ sevḏasıyla*).⁶⁵¹ Mehmed İsmet's reminder as to the deterioration of Persian in the hands of common people may not be surprising when we recall that he was a scholar who may have felt obliged to correct the deformations in Persian. Yet, it is more reasonable to evaluate his commitment to Persian within the context of his presence in and adherence to the Naqshbandi and Mevlevi circles where Persian had an esteemed position. Regarding the Naqshbandis' role in the propagation of Persian and Perso-Islamic culture, it was once argued that “[I]n the Ottoman world, they routinely acted as the carriers, disseminators, and perpetuators of a Perso-Islamic literary culture, ... composed verse in Persian, wrote commentaries on Persian grammar and language, or exhibited expertise in Persian literature in other ways.”⁶⁵² We may, therefore, conclude that Mehmed İsmet's favorable approach to Persian most likely arose from factual reasons known to the Ottoman Sufi circles that existed in Istanbul rather than being a mere rhetorical play on words.

Fayzu’l-Hādī li-Hallī Muşkilāti’s-Şāhidī was not the only commentary penned by Mehmed İsmet on the scholarly works composed in poetic forms. The second commentary, in this regard, is his Turkish commentary entitled *Şerḫ-i Ğazel-i Şā’ib*, penned on Sâ’ib-i Tebrîzî's Persian ode consisting of thirty-six couplets. We are informed by Mehmed İsmet that he embarked on this project upon the request of the şeyhülislam of the time, Yenişehirli Abdullâh Efendi, for whom he completed the commentary in hand on 12 Rabîc al-Ākhir 1135/20. January 1723.⁶⁵³ Close attention to the text makes it clear that the author applied a different stylistic and textual arrangement in his poetic analysis. As is the case in *Hallī Muşkilāti’s-Şāhidī*, he does not abstain from translating, interpreting or explaining the distiches word by word or phrase by phrase. The novelty of the author in his commentary is that he attempts to explain many couplets in detail under a new title read “maḫşül-i beyt.” Being that the literal meaning of the title is “the product of couplet,” we can infer that Mehmed İsmet, as an expert in Persian literature, undertakes a task to introduce and explain a complicated work of art replete with figurative and

⁶⁵¹Ibid, fol. 63a.

⁶⁵²Dina Le Gall, *Naqshbandis in the Ottoman World*, 172. For the important role of Persian within the Naqshbandi networks see especially 169-175 in *ibid*.

⁶⁵³For Mehmed İsmet's commentary see Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 3249, fol. 112b-124b. For Sâ’ib-i Tebrîzî, see Cengiz Sadıkoğlu, “Sâib-i Tebrîzî,” *TDVIA*, vol. 35, (İstanbul: TDV, 2008): 541-542, and Paul Losensky, “Sâ’eb Tabrizi,” *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, online edition, (20.07.2003), <https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/saeb-tabrizi> (accessed 22.05.2021).

ambiguous words and meanings. Nevertheless, the author does not ponder on the “maḥşūl-i beyt” part for all couplets. A close reading of the text demonstrates that he penned the longest explanation for the third couplet, whereas he abstained from typing detailed interpretations for the couplets between verses 17 and 22.⁶⁵⁴

Mehmed İsmet’s third known commentary was penned on Hızır Bey’s (d. 1459) poetic work composed in Arabic, which explains the basics of the Islamic faith and dogma. As the first qadi of Constantinople after the conquest, Hızır Bey’s composition has come to be known under the name *‘Aḳā’id-i Hızır* or more commonly as *Ḳaṣīde-i Nūniyye*. The latter, we are said, was embraced due to the letter *nūn*, which constituted the last letter in all 105 distiches in this poetic output. As to the content of Hızır Bey’s text, it introduces and explains the dogmas of Sunni Islam such as having faith in the necessity of God’s eternal and infinite existence, the signs of His creation, the miracles of the Prophet Muhammad, the characteristic determinants of the prophets, the legitimacy of the four caliphs, the necessity of the hereafter, resurrection, hell and paradise, and punishment and rewards.⁶⁵⁵ The existing evidence indicates that Mehmed İsmet composed two separate commentaries on Hızır Bey’s text. The first text, the revision of which was completed on 24 Zî’l-hicce 1141/2, July 1729, was submitted to İzzet Alî Pasha under the title *al-Fawā’id al-Naḍriyya fî Hall al-Nūniyya al-Khidriyya*. Mehmed İsmet makes it clear in the preface that it was first his tutor Halîl Fâiz Efendi who embarked on the text’s composition (*faqad taṣaddî ustādî*), but because of his unexpected death he was not able to complete the commentary of the entire text with the exception of the first six distiches. However, lacked serious criticism.⁶⁵⁶ Therefore, though it has been claimed that Mehmed İsmet was assisted by Halîl Fâiz Efendi when penning this work,⁶⁵⁷ we can confidently refute this assertion by taking into consideration Mehmed İsmet’s own expressions. Mehmed İsmet’s second commentary on Hızır Bey’s *Ḳaṣīde-i Nūniyye*, which bore the title *Rifd al-Naḍr ‘alā ‘Aḳā’id al-Khidr*, was ultimately completed in 1144/1731-32 and submitted to the ḡeyhülislâm, Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullâh Efendi.⁶⁵⁸ The stylistic and textual comparison of these commentaries uncovers the idiosyncratic styles of Mehmed İsmet and Halîl Fâiz. In *Rifd al-Naḍr*, Mehmed İ-

⁶⁵⁴For this commentary see in Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 3249, fol. 112b-124b.

⁶⁵⁵For more on *Kasīde-i Nūniyye* of Hızır Bey see Mustafa Said Yazıcıoğlu, “el-Kasīdetü’n-Nūniyye,” *TDVIA*, vol. 24, 571-572. For the full text of the *Kasīde* and its Turkish and French translations see idem, “Hızır Bey ve ‘Kasīde-i Nūniyye’si,” *AÜİFD* XXVI (1983): 549-588. For Hızır Bey see idem, “Hızır Bey,” *TDVIA*, vol. 17, (İstanbul: TDV, 1998): 413-415.

⁶⁵⁶“wa lâkin mā sā’ada al-dahr li-itmāmihi bal wafaqa li-sharḥ sittat abyāt min awwalihā wa huwa laysa muntaqidan bi-insijāmihi” Esad Efendi, no. 1233, fol. 37b.

⁶⁵⁷Salim Ayduz, *ibid*, 230.

⁶⁵⁸See Reşid Efendi, no. 328.

met resembles his already existing style in *Ḥalli Muşkilâti²Ş-Şāhidī*. This is to say, he was inclined in the composition to interpret Hızır Bey’s text word by word or phrase by phrase, but without elaborate explanations. Yet, unlike *Ḥalli Muşkilâti²Ş-Şāhidī*, he neither referred to a primary source, nor mentioned the title of a scholarly work or name of an author. When it comes to *al-Fawā²id al-Naḍriyya*, however, it is likely that Mehmed İsmet imitates the formal and contextual styles of Halîl Fâiz, who had expounded on the first six distiches of *Kaşîde-i Nūniyye*. Since Halîl Fâiz Efendi implemented a method of commentary in which each couplet was glossed in a body instead of separate words and phrases, Mehmed İsmet renounced his usual method and maintained the method already adopted by his tutor Halîl Fâiz.

Trained in three Islamic languages, Mehmed İsmet, not only produced commentaries on Arabic, Persian and Turkish scholarly works penned in poetic forms such as ghazal, qasida, and mathnawi, but also composed poetry in these languages.⁶⁵⁹ The biographical dictionaries of the time state that he adopted “İşmet” as his pseudonym in poetry. Yet, we do find a collection of his poems in the manuscript collections, except for a very small number of poems recorded in manuscripts scattered about. For instance, he wrote one of his couplets in Persian in the first folio of a manuscript preserved in the Veliyüddîn Efendi collection.⁶⁶⁰ Even though we do not encounter his Arabic poems, we do find in three different sources a ghazal and two qasidas, all of which were penned in Turkish.⁶⁶¹ Both eulogies in question were presented to the grand vizier, Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, but only one of them was recorded in the compilation of poems submitted to the pasha during his long term in office.⁶⁶² Given that the title of the eulogy was recorded as “Kaşîde-i Şulhiyye-i İşmet,” we can speculate that Mehmed İsmet submitted the eulogy upon the peace treaty of Passarowitz, signed between the Ottoman Empire and Austria and the Republic of Venice on July 21, 1718.⁶⁶³ However, since the submission date of the

⁶⁵⁹Mehmed Es’ad Efendi, *Bâğçe-i Safâ-Endûz*, 149., Aydüz, ibid, 225.

⁶⁶⁰“Turâb-i pâ-yi mardân-i muḥabbat / Ḥaḳîr u zarrâ-i nâ-bûd İşmet” in Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 1797, fol. 1a.

⁶⁶¹For the ode see Fatîn, ibid, 359-360. See also Aydüz, ibid, 225. For the two eulogies see Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 3249, fol. 59b-61b, and Metin Hakverdioğlu, “Edebiyatımızda Lâle Devri: Nevşehirli Dâmat İbrâhîm Paşa’ya Sunulan Kasideler, İnceleme-Metin,” Unpublished PhD Diss., (Selçuk Üniversitesi, 2007): 695-697.

⁶⁶²These poems were collected and copied in a compilation which was composed by Fâiz Efendi and Şâkir Bey. The compilation was composed of the poetry of 98 poets who penned 502 poems in different poetic forms. However, not all of the poems recorded in the compilation were submitted to Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha. For instance, we are said that the number of eulogies submitted to İbrâhîm Pasha was 242 out of 256. For the compilation see Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Halet Efendi, no. 763. For more but repeated information on this compilation see Metin Hakverdioğlu, ibid, 39-53., Hakverdioğlu “Fâiz Efendi ve Şâkir Bey Mecmuasından Lâle Devri Harpleri ve Sulhları (Ebcedli Tarih Manzumeleri),” *AUID* 9 (December, 2017): 76-80., and Kenan Bayram and Metin Hakverdioğlu, “Fâ’iz Efendi ve Şâkir Bey Mecmuası’nın Mecmuaların Sistematik Tasnifi Projesi’ne (MESTAP) Göre Tasnifi ve Nahîf’inin Bilinmeyen Bir Kıt’ası,” *Kesit Akademi Dergisi* (December, 2020): 309-312.

⁶⁶³For the treaty see Abdülkadir Özcan, “Pasarofça Antlaşması,” *TDVIA*, vol. 34, (İstanbul: TDV, 2007):

eulogy unspecified, there is the possibility that it was presented to the grand vizier upon the partition treaty signed with the Russian Empire for a warless division between Ottomans and Russians of the territories of the Safavid Empire “in such a way as to leave the Caspian provinces of Iran in Russian hands, the Turks acquiring most of Azarbaijan and much of Transcaucasia.”⁶⁶⁴ Nevertheless, a few clues from the eulogy indicate that Mehmed İsmet composed his laudatory poem for a peace treaty, which terminated an ongoing bloody war, which was very likely referred to the conflicts between the Ottomans and the coalition of Austrians and Venetians. For instance, he states in the second couplet that it was this peace that brought to an end the fights and conflicts of the battlefield, ushering in a restoration of world peace and order (*Oldı güm-geşte yine ma^creke-i ceng ü cedel / Buldı āsāyāş-i zibende fezā-yn ^cālem*). In the eighth couplet, on the other hand, it is alleged that it was İbrâhîm Pasha’s merciful threshold where all mournful refugees, noblemen and elders sought help (*Dāmen-i re^fetine mülteciyān eşrefiyān / Marāz-ı ceng ile āzürde bütün ehl-i hirem*). Taking into consideration these particular distiches, we may conclude that it was due to the Peace Treaty of Passarowitz that Mehmed İsmet composed a poetic work in praise of İbrâhîm Pasha.

The second eulogy, which consisted of sixty-three couplets, was likely submitted to the grand vizier in 1726. It was through this eulogy that Mehmed İsmet made his two main requests to Dāmâd İbrâhîm Pasha: first, as a candidate to be exempted from the examination, and second, to be appointed to a madrasa of *hâric* rank. Unlike the previous eulogy, which was presented to the grand vizier after the completion of a peace treaty, the second eulogy was penned during a period marked by an ongoing war with the Safavid Empire. Notwithstanding, the main theme of the poem was not the praise of prowess in battle, bravery, heroism or valor but the portrayal of the beauties of spring, pointedly rendered in the beginning of the poem, and the administrative abilities of the grand vizier. Considering that the terms ‘festival’ and ‘new-day’ (*^cıd u nev-rūz*) were used together in the twenty-eighth distich of the

177-181. It has been thought that “Şulhiyye” as a new genre in the classical Ottoman qasida was an indication of the transformation in the Ottoman poetry, for the first examples of it were produced by the Ottoman poets Nâbî (d. 1712) and Sâbit (d. 1712) upon the Treaty of Karlowitz (1699). Bayram Rahinguliyev, who prepared a Master Thesis on the *Şulhiyyes* produced upon the peace treaties of Karlowitz and Passarowitz, utilized the only *Şulhiyye* penned by Nâbî and Sâbit, and two *Şulhiyyes* composed by Seyyid Vehbî (d. 1736) for his thesis. Considering this fact, we can confidently claim that he was not aware of the *Şulhiyye* written by Mehmed İsmet. See Bayram Rahinguliyev, “Osmanlı Edebiyatında Dönüşümün Şiiri: Sulhiyyeler,” Unpublished MA Thesis, (Bilkent University, 2007). See also Ali Fuat Bilkan, *Osmanlı Şiirine Modern Yaklaşımlar*, (İstanbul: Leyla ile Mecnun Yayıncılık, 2006): 97-104; and idem, “İki Sulhiyye Işığında Osmanlı Toplumunda Barış Özlemi,” in *Türkler*, vol. 12, eds. Hasan Celal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek, Salim Koca, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınevi): 598-605.

⁶⁶⁴Firuz Kazemzadeh, “Iranian Relations With Russia and the Soviet Union, to 1921,” in *The Cambridge History of Iran: From Nadir Shah to the Islamic Republic*, vol. 7, edited by Peter Avery, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991): 320. This partition treaty is dubbed as the “İran Mukâsemenamesi” in the Ottoman sources. For much detail on this treaty see Stanford Shaw, “Iranian Relations With the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries,” in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 7, 300, and particularly Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. 4/1, 192-194,

poem, we can conclude that this was a *Nevrūziyye* type eulogy, which was submitted most likely to Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha on 21 March 1726, the first day of spring.⁶⁶⁵

The content of the eulogy, however, is not restricted to compliments for the balsamic beauty of spring, the outstanding characteristics of the grand vizier and the personal requests of the poet. The fifty-sixth couplet of the poem is the sole and exclusive verse in which a crucial element of criticism of the official state policy regarding examination and inspection of the madrasa graduates comes into existence. On the pretext that the positions are entrusted to the most qualified during his vizierate, Mehmed İsmet implores the grand vizier to abolish the implementation that favors the sons of ulema for appointments to madrasas (*Meḥādāme medāris olmasun mīrās luṭf eyile / Zemānuñda emānet ehline çünkim mü'eddādur*). At this point, it must be remembered that the practice of favoring children of the *ulema* had been legitimized by two successive imperial decrees issued by Ahmed III in 1715. It has already been discussed in secondary literature that it was because of these decrees that “*Ulema* sons were explicitly exempted from the most telling lines of inquiry. When asked about qualifications, *ulema* sons only had to respond with their own name and that of their father. Bypassing questions on age and studies, *ulema* sons in effect could advance to the coveted status of novice merely by reminding the *şeyhülislam* of their parentage.”⁶⁶⁶ Bearing in mind the well-known historical context of the decrees, we can infer from his single couplet that Mehmed İsmet was an opponent of the practice of favoritism offered for the benefit of the sons of the *ulema*. However, given his appeal for exemption from the qualifying exam and appointment to a *hâric* madrasa, one might also assert that his condemnation was for his own benefit, which had not been appeased during his long waiting period as a *mülâzim*. Nevertheless, it seems likely that he felt, as an abled and competent man of science and knowledge, satisfied with the professorship of a madrasa in a milieu where unqualified sons of *ulema* were given concrete privileges because of their familial connections.

5.7.2 A Consultant to the Grand Vizier

As an erudite scholar and poet, Mehmed İsmet presented to the grand vizier not only flattering eulogies, which offered critiques of the historical and socio-political realities

⁶⁶⁵ *Nevrūziyye*, as a genre, refers the poems submitted to high-ranking officials upon the coming of the spring. Therefore, it is also denominated as *Bahâriyye*. For an introduction on *Nevrūziyye* genre in Ottoman qasida see Azmi Bilgin, “Türk Edebiyatında Bayramlar ve Nevruz Bayramı,” *Türk Dili* 617 (2003): 448-452., Cemal Bayak, “Nevrūziyye,” *TDVIA*, vol. 33, (İstanbul: TDV, 2007): 62., Kazım Yetiş “Bahâriyye,” *TDVIA*, vol. 4, (İstanbul: TDV, 1991): 473-474.

⁶⁶⁶ Madeline Zilfi, *The Politics of Piety: The Ottoman Ulema in the Postclassical Age, 1600-1800*, (Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1988): 57. See also Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin İlmîye Teşkilatı*, 49-52.

within their unique context, but also an instructive and path-breaking pamphlet which deserves a close attention. The pamphlet in question which bears the title *Risāle-i Tedāhul*, was completed in Jumād al-Ākhir 1138/February 1726, was likely submitted to the grand vizier together with a *Nevrūziyye* on 21 March 1726. Since the review of the pamphlet reveals not only Mehmed İsmet's critical approach to the budget crisis, but also his knowledge of theoretical astronomy and its outputs, its consideration is crucial at this point.

As a text on the solution as to the budget crisis and imbalance of income and expenditures stemming from the leap year as a result of the inconsistency in the solar and lunar calendars, *Risāle-i Tedāhul* is an adequate example of the author's competence in astronomical calculations. As stated by the author, he attempted to compose such a work upon the request of the grand vizier, who ordered the composition of such a pamphlet during the translation of Bedreddin 'Ayni's voluminous history *‘Iqd al-Jumān*, a task undertaken by thirty scholars, among whom appeared the author himself.⁶⁶⁷ Given the text, we can readily state that whereas two-thirds of the text were designated for the comparative introduction and identification of the solar calendars (i.e. Alexandrian, Coptic, Persian/Yazdegerdi, and Jalali) and the lunar Hijri calendar, one-third was reserved for solutions for the imbalance of incomes and expenditures in the Ottoman imperial treasury. While the revenues were collected in accordance with the solar fiscal calendar, the expenditures (mainly wages) were arranged with respect to the Hijri lunar calendar,⁶⁶⁸ the author attempts to propose solutions for the inconsistency in the balance of incomes and expenditures. Unsurprisingly, then, Mehmed İsmet approaches the subject by pivoting around the implementation of tax farming (*iltizām*) as a means of revenue levied in the distributed imperial lands (*mukāṭa‘a*). According to him, it was undeniable that due to the inconsistency of the solar and lunar calendars both of which were applied by the financial office, the tax farmers were able to exploit the imperial treasury, for they leased a *mukāṭa‘a* according to the Hijri calendar but exploited it in compliance with the solar calendar. Put differently, although they leased a three-year *mukāṭa‘a* officially for 1062 days, they exploited its revenues for 1095 days (*Tedāhule sebeb oldur ki kameriyye ile üç sene bir tahvîl ile satılan mukāṭa‘atun üç mahşûli ‘âdetâ biñ doksan beş günde hâşul olurken defterlerde biñ altmış iki gün yazılıyor*).⁶⁶⁹ The loss to the imperial treasury was more severe in the long run, explains Mehmed

⁶⁶⁷Aydüz, *ibid*, 239 and 244. For the transliteration of *Risāle-i Tedāhul* see *ibid*, 241-251.

⁶⁶⁸Interestingly enough that Mehmed İsmet denominates the calendars not as *takvīm* but *tārīḫ*. For the adoption of both solar and lunar calendars in the Ottoman fiscal system see Halil Sahillioğlu, "Sıvış Yılı Buhranları," *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 27/1-2 (1967): 77-83.

⁶⁶⁹Mehmed İsmet, *Risāle-i Tedāhul*, Veliyüddin Efendi no. 3249, fol. 131a., and Aydüz, *ibid*, 249.

İsmet, when considering that it was deprived of a full year's revenue approximately in thirty-two solar years during which exist thirty-three returns (*maḥṣūl*) since a period of thirty-two solar years is almost equal to thirty-three lunar years. Moreover, the author implies that it was almost impossible to bring order to this system and compensate the loss of the treasury, for both solar and lunar calendars are simultaneously in use, respectively in leasing the *muḳaṭa'as* to the tax farmers and receiving the payments for the contracted revenues. However, according to Mehmed İsmet, the disarray is not solely due to the inconsistency of the calendars in use. The first problem in this regard is related to corrupted tax farmers prone to misinform the financial office by producing account books lacking in full accounts of revenue items for each year. This is to say, it was beyond the realm of possibility to receive a precisely recorded account book kept by the officials in service of the tax farmers (*müfredāt defterleri ḥod ümenā ve nüzzārdan bi't-temām gelmek ihtimālī yokdur*).⁶⁷⁰ The second problem, however, is directly related to officials of the imperial treasury who failed to thoroughly inspect and analyze the account books of tax farmers due to their incapacity for detailed investigation in account books kept for decades.⁶⁷¹

Despite detecting and diagnostic determinations as to the leap year question and deficit of the imperial treasury, Mehmed İsmet neither suggests reforms in Ottoman financial bureaucracy, nor favor the application of solar fiscal calendar in leasing *muḳaṭa'as*, for collecting revenue and paying regular salaries. According to him, the sole solution for minimizing the loss of the imperial treasury stemming from inconsistency of solar and lunar calendars, was to apply only the Hijri calendar when hiring out *muḳaṭa'as* and collecting taxes, “since in the sublime law (*shari'a*), all obligatory payments including either the tributes paid by non-Muslims or alms [rendered by Muslims] depend on passing over of a full year arranged by the lunar [Hijri] calendar.”⁶⁷² What does this imply when taking into consideration the context within which it was put into words? First, given that it does not advocate using the solar calendar in tax collection and salary payments, one can assert that it demonstrates the constant position of an Ottoman intellectual in favor of the traditional execution of the budget balance according to Islamic practice. Secondly, this suggestion, in fact, was reasonable and realistic when recalling that the quarterly cash payments of the *kapıkulu* soldiers, which constituted a remarkable expense item for the treasury, was arranged in accordance with the Hijri calendar.⁶⁷³ In other words, the

⁶⁷⁰ Aydın, *ibid*, 249-250; *Risāle-i Tedāhul*, fol. 132a.

⁶⁷¹ Aydın, *ibid*, 250; *Risāle-i Tedāhul*, fol. 132b.

⁶⁷² “Zirā şer'î şerifte eger ḥarāc-ı zimmî ve eger zekât kısmı ve sâyir ḥavelân-ı ḥavl ile farz olan ḥuşuşlar cümlesi sene-i kameriye ḥesabı üzredür.” Aydın, *ibid*, 250; *Risāle-i Tedāhul*, fol. 133a.

⁶⁷³ See Mehmet Mert Sunar, “Ulûfe,” *TDVIA*, vol. 42, (İstanbul: TDV, 2012): 124.

implementation of a single calendar [i.e. Hijri] would fairly contribute to the balance of income and expenditures in the imperial treasury. The main problem in this regard, however, is the ambiguity concerning the period and method of farming of land taxes. When and how, for instance, would the state or tax farmer be able to collect the taxes in conformity with a lunar calendar rotating each year? Despite Mehmed İsmet's reluctance to solve the issue, we may speculate that he imagined a system in which the subjects of the empire would be responsible for keeping a share of the treasury (whether in cash or kind) and pay it to officials upon their appearance during a designated time period, which may occur in any month or season. In this vein, considering that the *harâç* tax in the Ottoman context might include not only the land tributes and tithes, but also poll tax collected in cash directly sent to the imperial treasury,⁶⁷⁴ then, we may speculate about achievements in the monetization of the Ottoman tax system during the 18th century. It might be the development in fiscalization that gave Mehmed İsmet confidence in suggesting an overall implementation of the Hijri calendar in tax collection and salary payment. Otherwise, he may not have recommended the employment of a rotating calendar, which may have been useless in collecting annual fees and charges.⁶⁷⁵ Lastly, given Mehmed İsmet's long-term calculations and estimations of the balance of incomes and expenditures, we may acknowledge Harun Küçük's claim that there developed "an emergent sense of distant posterity in the bureaucratic profession that rejected short-sighted enthusiasm and focused on long-term regulation and profit."⁶⁷⁶ The only problem is that Mehmed İsmet was not a bureaucrat, but rather an intellectual member of the *ulema*.

At this point, it must be stated that Mehmed İsmet's text, particularly in terms of its main argument on the imbalance of income and expenditure stemming from inconsistency of the solar and lunar calendars and its favoritism towards the implementation of the lunar Hijri calendar, seems to be a brief summary of an already existing text penned by a certain el-Hâc Seyfullâh (d. 1606), who introduced himself as Muğaṭa'acı of Anatolia, but was identified as Seyfullâh Çelebi ed-Defteri. From the records at the end of the text, we understand that Seyfullâh was able to complete it on December 21, 1572/Wasaṭ-i Sha'ebân 980 and a later pen copied it on February 1, 1623/ Awâkhir-i Rabî' al-Awwal 1032. In his recently published book, Harun Küçük asserts two significant contentions as to the content of Seyfullâh's

⁶⁷⁴Halil İnalçık, "Djizya: Ottoman," *EI2*, vol. 2, (Leiden: Brill, 1991): 562-566., and idem, "Cizye," *TDVIA*, vol. 8, (İstanbul: TDV, 1993): 45-48. See also DİA, "Haraç," *TDVIA*, vol. 16, (İstanbul: TDV, 1997): 88-90.

⁶⁷⁵Personal meeting with Hülya Canbakal in February 2021.

⁶⁷⁶Harun Küçük, *Science Without Leisure: Practical Naturalism in Istanbul, 1660-1732*, (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2020): 140.

text. First, he contends that “The thrust of Seyfullah’s treatise is quite straightforward. If imperial farms were not taxed on the solar year, it created an unjust situation in which the taxpayers did not collect crops at the same pace as the lunar Muslim year.” Secondly and more radically, he maintains that “Seyfullah also had an invective against the all uses of the lunar calendar in that the only reason it was still honored was out of deference to early Muslims who were not sophisticated enough to observe the annual motion of the sun.”⁶⁷⁷ Considering the relevant part of the text, we can readily state that Seyfullâh Çelebi’s thoughts recurrent in Mehmed İsmet’s text were the opposite of what Harun Küçük supposed them to be. For instance, being conscious of the reality that sharia was a source of legitimacy for the state to collect certain taxes from Muslim and non-Muslim subjects, Seyfullâh Çelebi explicitly warns that “[I]n the sublime law (shari‘a), all obligatory payments, including either the tributes paid by non-Muslims or alms [rendered by Muslims] and others are arranged by the lunar [Hijri] calendar. Being recorded as obligatory payment in registers denotes that they must be collected upon the completion of a full lunar year, stretching from the beginning of Muḥarram to the end of Zîl-hicce. Accordingly, it is not in conformity with the law to compute an additional single day after the completion of the lunar year.”⁶⁷⁸ In other words, Seyfullâh Çelebi stresses that tax farmers must exploit the contracted muḳaṭa‘a in compliance with the lunar calendar rather than the solar calendar, a clear indication that he was not in favor of the latter.

In addition to displaying its author’s submissions for redressing the balance of income and expense in the imperial treasury, *Risāle-i Tedāḫul* is also worthy of notice in terms of its testimony to the author’s level of knowledge in theoretical astronomy. A close reading of the text demonstrates that Mehmed İsmet had embraced the Ptolemaic system, which envisions the geocentric model in which the universe with the Earth at the center was surrounded by nested celestial spheres.⁶⁷⁹ The influence on Islamic astronomy of Ptolemy is well known. The lesser-known, however, is that Muslim/Arab “astronomers were hard at work reforming the Ptolemaic planetary system—otherwise known as geocentric model—through a complex process involving mathematical models and astronomical reasoning to account for the

⁶⁷⁷See respectively, Harun Küçük, *ibid*, 135 and 138.

⁶⁷⁸“Şer‘-i şerifde eger zimmi ḥarācıdur ve ger zekātdur ve ger sā‘ir ḥavelān-ı ḥavl ile farz olan ḥuşūşlardur cümlesi sene-i kameriye ḥesābı üzredür ve defterlerde vācib yazılmanun ma‘nāsı ol senede gurre-i Muḥarrem’den gāye-i Zîl-hicce’ye degin temām bir ḥavl-i kāmīl-i kameriñiñ ḥavelāniyla alınması farz ve vācib olan aḳçe dimekdür bu taḳdīrce her sene-i kameriye temām olduḳdan şoñra bir gün ziyāde ḥesāb olunmaḳ şer‘an cā‘iz olmaz.” Seyfullâh Çelebi, *Risāle-i Seyfullâh Çelebi ed-Defteri*, Süleymaniye Library, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, no. 6344, fol. 88a.

⁶⁷⁹For the characteristics of Ptolemaic system see Peter Whitfield, *Landmarks in Western Science: from prehistory to the atomic age*, (London: The British Library, 1999): 41-45, for the Turkish translation of the book see, *idem*, *Batı Biliminde Dönüm Noktaları*, trans. Serdar Uslu, 5th ed., (İstanbul: Küre, 2007).

discrepancies between theory and observation.”⁶⁸⁰ With this in mind, one can easily see the Ptolemaic/Islamic influences in the pamphlet in question. Mehmed İsmet’s argument that “despite the westward motion of the outermost celestial sphere (*felek-i a^czam*) the motion of remaining celestial spheres is eastward” is a reflection developed by Muslim astronomers on the Ptolemaic system.⁶⁸¹ The second example in this regard is the author’s statement that the sun circulates its celestial sphere in a solar year,⁶⁸² a pure Ptolemaic claim arising from the assumption that the moon, the sun, planets and stars, all of which revolve around the motionless Earth. Nevertheless, it must be stated that Mehmed İsmet never mentions anything about a motionless Earth at the center of the universe in the text.

5.7.3 A Practitioner of the Astronomy

It has been argued that “[b]y the time of Newton’s death in 1727, science had become a major force in western intellectual life, exerting a powerful influence on philosophy and theology. The education of a gentleman still centered on the classics and mathematics, but no cultivated man could remain ignorant, in general terms, of Copernican astronomy, the theory of gravity, or of concepts such as vacuum, chemical reactions, magnetic force and so on.”⁶⁸³ Given this, one may tolerate the still-continuing dependence of Mehmed İsmet to the outmoded Ptolemaic astronomy. In fact, available evidences indicate that, in the second half of the 17th century, thanks to the translation of the French astronomer Noel Durret’s *Nouvelle Théorie des Planetes* into Arabic and later its introduction into Ottoman Turkish, some Ottoman intellectuals including the translator Tezkireci İbrahim Efendi (d.?), the chief astronomer Müneccimek Şekîbî Mehmed Çelebi (d. 1668), chief judge of Rumelia Ünsî Efendi (d. 1664) and the qadi of Belgrade Cezmî Efendi (d. 1692) became familiar with the Copernican (heliocentric) system and the followers of Copernican mathematicians and astronomers such as Nicolaus Copernicus (d. 1543), Tycho Brahe (d. 1601), Johannes Kepler (d. 1630), Philippe van Lansberge (d. 1632), and

⁶⁸⁰Toby E. Huff, *The Rise of Early Modern Science: Islam, China, and the West*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993): 55. For the Muslims’ contribution to the medieval astronomy see Huff, *ibid*, 54-62, and Whitfield, “The Islamic Masters” *ibid*, 50-65., and Tevfik Fehd, “İlm-i Felek,” *TDVIA*, vol. 22, (İstanbul: TDV, 2002): 126-129.

⁶⁸¹“Felek-i a^czamun hareketi şarkdan garba olup sayir eflāk harekāt-ı hāşşaları ile garbdan şarka devr iderler.” in Aydıüz, *ibid*, 244-245., and *Risāle-i Tedāhül*, fol. 127b. For an introduction on celestial spheres in Ptolemy and Islam see Alexander Raymond Jones, “Ptolemaic system,” *Encyclopedia Britannica*, (19.05.2020), <https://www.britannica.com/science/Ptolemaic-system>, (accessed 18.09.2021)., Cemal Kurnaz, “Felek,” *TDVIA*, vol. 12, (İstanbul: TDV, 1995): 306-307.

⁶⁸²“ve şems feleğini üç yüz altım beş günde devr idüp” Aydıüz, *ibid*, 245; *Risāle-i Tedāhül*, fol. 127b.

⁶⁸³Whitfield, *ibid*, 160.

Noel Durret (d. 1650).⁶⁸⁴ However, as is stated by Harun Küçük, it seems that “Ottoman authors never mention Tezkireci. [...] Most importantly, İbrahim Müteferrika, who defended the Copernican system and openly attacked the medrese scholars for their ignorance of theoretical astronomy in 1732, did not know about Tezkireci.”⁶⁸⁵ Nonetheless, we may speculate that some Ottoman intellectuals might have already heard about the advancements in favor of the heliocentric system in the Western astronomy. This might be so, particularly when recalling that an Italian traveler named Pietro della Valle (d. 1652) penned a letter in 1623 to inform a Persian erudite from Lâr, Mullah Zayn al-dîn al-Lârî, with the intention of informing him of the Copernican and Tyconic systems and to convert him into Christianity, for he thought that “the advanced state of European astronomy resulted from religious superiority.”⁶⁸⁶ Given that Pietro della Valle had been in Istanbul from August 1614 to September 1615,⁶⁸⁷ it is possible that he had informed also some Ottomans of these systems. Nevertheless, we are told that “in the years that he spent in the East, Turkish rather than Persian and Arabic was the language that he knew best and used most frequently” and “[d]espite his efforts to learn Turkish, he made few attempts to meet Turks, either in Istanbul or on his journeys; instead he travelled with his own small retinue, seeking out the company of expatriates, merchants, or Maronite Christians.”⁶⁸⁸

Despite having taken a long time for Ottoman intellectuals to acknowledge the Copernican system in astronomy and outputs of the Scientific Revolution taking place in the West, there is evidence that Ottomans expeditiously utilized the telescope, a significant technological device developed during the Scientific Revolution. This invention was achieved in 1608 by the Dutch technician, Hans Lippershey (d. 1619), but it was Galileo who was “[g]reatly excited—as much by its commercial potential for military and maritime use as by its scientific novelty—quickly built a telescope with a nine-power magnification, and by the end of the year he had developed one of thirty power. In January 1610, he turned his telescope to the skies: he observed

⁶⁸⁴Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, “The Introduction of Western Science to the Ottoman World: A Case Study of Modern Astronomy (1660-1860),” in *Science, Technology and Learning in the Ottoman Empire: Western Influence, Local Institutions, and the Transfer of Knowledge*, (Hampshire: Ashgate Variorum, 2004): 3-10. According to İhsanoğlu, Durret’s book had to be translated between 1660-1664. The introduction of the text, however, was translated into Turkish from Arabic during the winter of 1663.

⁶⁸⁵Harun Küçük, *ibid*, 138-139.

⁶⁸⁶See Avner Ben-Zaken, “Exchanging Heliocentrism for Ur-Text,” in *Cross-Cultural Scientific Exchanges in the Eastern Mediterranean, 1560-1660*, (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2010): 47-75. It was Aydın Sayılı who introduced Della Valle’s letter to the Turkish academia. See “Tycho Brahe Sistemi Hakkında XVII. Asır Başlarına Ait Farsça Bir Yazma (An Early Seventeenth Century Persian Manuscript on the Tyconic System),” *Anadolu* 3 (1958): 79-87.

⁶⁸⁷Mahmut H. Şakiroğlu, “Della Valle, Pietro,” *TDVIA*, vol. 9, (İstanbul: TDV, 1994): 144-145.

⁶⁸⁸J. D. Gurney, “Pietro della Valle: The Limits of Perception,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 49/1 (1986): 105..

the surface of the moon...”⁶⁸⁹ When it comes to the year 1657, thanks to Kâtib Çelebi’s testimony in his latest book penned on the history of the Ottoman navy, it becomes evident that the imperial navy had already had experience using the telescope particularly in the vessels of the admirals.⁶⁹⁰ In addition, we understand from a settlement reached between Jewish hardware dealers and Greek glassmakers on June 27, 1662, that the former had monopolized for many years the trade of items including eyeglasses, telescopes (or binoculars), broom, inkwell, basket and mirrors, all of which were transported by ship from the Western countries.⁶⁹¹ Furthermore, towards the end of the 17th century, telescopes and/or binoculars occurred in the inventories of several Ottoman elites, including efendis and aghas,⁶⁹² manifest evidence for the Ottomans’ interest in newly developed technological devices.

Having possession of a telescope may demonstrate that the possessor agha might have benefited from it during military expeditions in which he participated. How, then, can we render its appearance in an efendi’s inventory? Furthermore, how can we interpret the existence of a telescope among the inherited assets of an efendi by his contemporaries for his proficiency in astronomy? In response to these questions, it is within the scope of this chapter to contend that Mehmed İsmet, as a man of astronomical knowledge, did not merely cling to the traditional way of practicing astronomy, but attempted to use a newly invented telescope to observe the sky. The most pronounced evidence concerning his astronomical practices is the two calendars he prepared for the years 1144-1145 [1731-1733] and 1152-1153 [1739-1741].⁶⁹³ Mehmed İsmet, in all likelihood, composed these calendars based on an existing database. This is to say, the celebrated zij of the Timurid mathematician and astronomer sultan, Ulugh Beg (r. 1447-1449), and its annotations and adaptations produced by the Ottoman practitioners of astronomy.⁶⁹⁴ If this is so, one may think

⁶⁸⁹Whitfield, *ibid*, 125.

⁶⁹⁰“Ve kapudan gemilerinde bir dürbîn dahi olur. Lâzım geldikde isti’mâl ederler.” Kâtib Çelebi, *Tuhfetü’l-Kibâr fî Esfâri’l-Bihâr*, prepared by İdris Bostan, (Ankara: TÜBA, 2018): 236-237; and Kâtib Çelebi, *Kâtib Çelebi’den Seçmeler*, prepared by Orhan Şaik Gökyay, (İstanbul: MEB, 1997): 216. It is understood that Kâtib Çelebi began and was able to complete this book in the year 1657. See İdris Bostan, “Giriş,” in *ibid*, 35-36. See also Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Kâtib Çelebi,” TDVIA, vol. 25, 36-40.

⁶⁹¹“kadîmü’l-eyyâmdan beri dârü’l-harbden sefineler ile gelen hırdavâtdan gözlük ve dürbîn ve süpürge ve devât ve sepet ve âyine Mahmûdpaşa sükunda vâki’ hurde-fürüş Yahûdî tâifesinin mahsûs metâ’larıdır deyü” *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri İstanbul Mahkemesi 10 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1072-1073 / M. 1661-1663)*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz, (İstanbul: İBB Kültür A&Ş, 2019): 647.

⁶⁹²See the inventories of Mehmed Emin Efendi, Hasan Ağa, Kadı Yusuf Efendi, Süleyman Ağa, and Mehmed Efendi in the Kısmet-i Askeriye register no. 19 in *İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Kısmet-i Askeriye Mahkemesi 19 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1109-1110 / M. 1698-1699)*, ed. Coşkun Yılmaz, (İstanbul: İBB Kültür A&Ş, 2019): 226, 825, 846, 945, and 978.

⁶⁹³Both calendars are preserved in Kandilli Observatory Library under the Takvimler catalogue no: 26 and 33. See Ayduz, *ibid*, 230.

⁶⁹⁴The zij of Ulugh Beg had been in demand of the Ottoman astronomers and timekeepers since the second

that he did not make a particular investigation and observation nor utilize specific astronomical instruments during the process of calendar-making, other than copying earlier examples before him. However, Mehmed İsmet's inventory indicates that he, in the strictest sense of the word, had been a practitioner of the astronomy by utilizing particular devices used in astronomical observations and calculations. The existence in the inventory of two telescopes (*dürbîn*), three astrolabes (*uṣṭurlāb*) including a Persian made (*Acemiyye*) and an illustrated (*muṣavver*) one, four sinecal quadrants (*rubu^c*) one for Egypt/Cairo (*Rubu^c-i Arz-i Mıṣır*) and two for Istanbul, and two celestial equators (*mu^caddel*) have great importance in this regard.⁶⁹⁵ Considering these tools, we can readily conclude that Mehmed İsmet, rather than contenting himself to the theoretical readings of astronomy, practiced it by observing the sky and produced some concrete outputs in his investigations. This inference, on the one hand, is a very significant output of this study when remembering that Mehmed İsmet was not counted among the scholars who practiced science in the seventeenth- and eighteenth- century Istanbul in Harun Küçük's aforementioned study that attempts to shed light on practical sciences practiced in Istanbul. On the other hand, it shows that at least some Ottoman practitioners of astronomy had not waited until the second half of the 18th century to exercise newly invented technological devices (telescope in this case), an established assertion among the historians studying Ottoman scientific history.⁶⁹⁶

On Mehmed İsmet's preoccupation with astronomy, we have revealed that despite his dependence on the obsolete Ptolemaic geocentric system, it is likely that he had utilized astronomical instruments, and more significantly, he depended on a new invention: the telescope. The available two calendars from the beginning and end of the fourth decade of the 18th century demonstrate that he was able to effectuate his astronomical works during this period in particular. In this vein, one may wonder whether there was an antecedent to the practice. Despite the dearth of evidence concerning his scientific works before the period, there is satisfactory evidence that he had already engaged in theoretical readings in astronomy and astrology, even if not practicing them. The earliest example I have encountered in this regard is an incomplete translated copy of the renowned Ottoman mathematician and astronomer

half of the 15th century. It would eventually fall into disfavor upon the translation of Cassini's zij by Halifezâde İsmâ'il b. Mustafâ (d. 1790) in 1772. For the long-lasting influence of Ulugh Beg on the Ottoman astronomers see Salim Aydüz, "Uluğ Bey Zici'nin Osmanlı Astronomi Çalışmalarındaki Yeri ve Önemi," *bilig* 25 (Bahar, 2003): 139-172. For a detailed analysis of an 18th century Ottoman calendar which was authored in accordance with Ulugh Beg's zij see Gerhard Behrens, "An Ottoman Calendar for 1740/41," *Middle East Studies Online Journal* 4/2 (2011): 1-47.

⁶⁹⁵İSAM, Kismet-i Askeriye, no. 107, fol. 8b.

⁶⁹⁶See for instance, İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. IV/2, 6th facsimile, (Ankara: TTK, 2011): 534.

Mîrim Çelebi's (d. 1525) *Masāʿil*, which entered Mehmed İsmet's possession in 1111 [1699-1700].⁶⁹⁷ In addition, we have evidence that Mehmed İsmet devoted himself to reading and copying astronomical texts, especially during the second decade of the 18th century. For instance, he states that he was able to bring to completion the copying of the eminent Muslim astronomer Abd al-Rahmân al-Sûfi's (d. 986) *Şuwar al-Kawākib al-Thābita*, his best known work on the fixed stars at the beginning days of Rabīʿ al-Awwal 1123/19-28, April 1711.⁶⁹⁸ Furthermore, a compendium of the texts on astronomy explicitly unveils that he read and copied several texts on astronomy and astrology during early the 1710s. The earliest example in hand, is *Sullam al-Samā* of Jamshîd b. Mas'ûd b. Mahmûd al-Kâshî (d. 1429), a mathematician and astronomer connected to Ulugh Beg's scholarly milieu in Samarkand. The end note of al-Kâshî's work indicates that it was copied by Mehmed İsmet in the early days of Dhî'l-qa'da 1121/January 21-30, 1710.⁶⁹⁹ Then comes the *Masāʿil* of Mîrim Çelebi, which was copied completely as of the date of 2 December 1710/10Shawwāl 1122.⁷⁰⁰ Another example proves that a few months later Mehmed İsmet reproduced for himself Şemseddîn Ahmed's (d. 1708) pamphlet bearing the title *Risāla fî al-ʿAmal bi-r-Rubuʿ al-Muqanṭara*, whose copying came to an end on April 23, 1711/Rabīʿ al-Awwal 5, 1123. Given that the typing of this text in was finished during the last third of March 1691/Awākhir Jumād al-Ākhir 1102],⁷⁰¹ we can easily infer that Mehmed İsmet strove not only to acquire the classical texts, but also for newly produced works on Islamic astronomy.

Apart from these works of astronomy and astrology read and duplicated by Mehmed

⁶⁹⁷The ownership record is as follows: "From the consignations of the time to the poor Mehmed İsmet ibn İbrâhîm, fî sanat 111." See *Terceme-i Mesāʿil-i Mîrim*, Veliyyüddin Efendi, no. 2318, fol. 1a. The preface and a very short first part of the original Persian text is missing in this Turkish translation. For Mîrim Çelebi, see İhsan Fazlıoğlu, "Mîrim Çelebi," *TDVIA*, vol. 30, (İstanbul: TDV, 2005): 160-161., and idem, "Mîrim Çelebi: Mahmûd ibn Qutb al-Dîn Muhammad ibn Muhammad ibn Mûsâ Qâdîzâde," in *The Biographical Encyclopedia of Astronomers*, ed. Thomas Hockey, (New York: Springer, 2007): 788-789.

⁶⁹⁸See Veliyyüddin Efendi, no. 2278, fol. 111a. The title of the copied text is *al-Juzʿ al-Awwal min Şuwar al-Kawākib fî al-ʿUlum al-Thawābit*. For an introduction on Abd al-Rahmân al-Sûfi and his well-known text, see Cengiz Aydın, "Abdurrahman es-Sûfi," *TDVIA*, vol. 1, (İstanbul: TDV, 1988): 172-173., and Samuel Miklos Stern, "'Abd al-Rahman al-Sufi," *EI2*, vol. I, (Leiden: Brill, 1986): 86-87.

⁶⁹⁹See Veliyyüddin Efendi no. 2283/5, fol. 120a. For the biography of al-Kâshî see Sadettin Ökten, "Kâşî," *TDVIA*, vol. 25, 15-16.

⁷⁰⁰Although the title of the text is specified by the author as *Risāla dar-Ahkām-i Tālîʿ*, a later pen remarks it as *Masāʿil-i Mîrim dar-Ahkām-i Tālîʿ* in the inner cover of Veliyyüddin Efendi no. 2283. The author, who introduces himself as Mehmed b. Mahmûd b. Kâdîzâde al-Rûmî al-shahîr bi-Mîrim, dedicates his work to the grand vizier Ahmed Pasha. Yet, since the date of completion is missing we are not in a position to identify the grand vizier who might be either Gedik Ahmed Pasha (v. 1474-77) or Hersekzâde Ahmed Pasha (v. 1497-98, 1503-06, 1511, 1512-14, and 1515-16), or Dukakinzâde Ahmed Pasha (v. 1514-15). Even though İhsan Fazlıoğlu has not listed this pamphlet among Mîrim Çelebi's works in his *TDVIA* entry, he states in a longer entry published in his personal website that there are more than ten texts on astronomy and astrology including *Masāʿil* are attributed to Mîrim Çelebi. <http://fazlioglu.blogspot.com/2018/07/ihsan-fazlioglu-mirim-celebi.html> (accessed 1.11.2021).

⁷⁰¹See Veliyyüddin Efendi no. 2283/3, fol. 92b. The text was written for the purpose of introducing the known astronomical instruments and the way they were used. See Reşat Öngören, "İshak Hocası," *TDVIA*, vol. 22, (İstanbul: TDV, 2000): 533-534.

İsmet during the early 1710's, there emerged a few other scholarly texts copied by others, but they ultimately passed to his ownership during the period. The works in question, interestingly enough, were bound together in a single compilation: Veliyüddin Efendi no. 2318. A short cosmographical treatise written in Arabic and entitled *Gharāyib al-Funūn wa Mulaḥ al-^cUyūn* points to February 1719/Rabī^c al-Awwal 1131 as the date of duplication. Despite the lack of the name of the copier in the text, given the personal handwriting, we can attribute the copy to Mehmed İsmet.⁷⁰² The second example is the copy of *al-Tuḥfat al-Nizāmiyya* of the Persian astronomer Abd al-Qâdir Rûyânî (d. 1519), penned as a commentary on *Sî Faṣl* of Nâsiru'd-dîn Tûsî (d. 1274) and dedicated to the sultan, Yahyâ Kiyâ of Gilan, to inform him about the solar and lunar calendars and several given issues pertaining to the stars. The end note of the treatise denotes that it was copied by Mehmed İsmet's brother, Osmân b. İbâhîm, in 1130/1717-1718, but the date Mehmed İsmet took possession is unclear.⁷⁰³

Assuming that these texts which were written on astronomy, astrology, and cosmography, ultimately ending in Mehmed İsmet's possession, we can conclude that he, as a man of the late 17th and 18th centuries, firmly adhered to the works of celebrated Muslim astronomers who preceded him. The portent of his rigorous use on Islamic sources on astronomy can also be traced in his predilection for Islamic astronomical instruments listed in his estate inventory and mentioned above. The only exception in this regard, however, was the existence of the two telescopes in his inventory, which can be interpreted as a solid proof that he utilized new products of Western technology in his astronomical observations and calculations.

Yet, how can we test the reliability of his observations and calculations? Is it possible to examine the accuracy and reliability of an eighteenth-century Ottoman scholar who produced astronomical calculations? To give a convincing answer to these questions, one should analyze tangible examples of calculations occurred in the scientific works of the time. When it comes to Mehmed İsmet, these examples can only be traced through the two calendars he produced for the years 1144-1145

⁷⁰²See Veliyüddin Efendi no. 2318/3, fol. 80b. This treatise is a copy of the second part of *Kitābu Gharāyib al-Funūn wa Mulaḥ al-^cUyūn* which has been bought and digitalized by Bodleian Library and studied in detail as part of "The Book of Curiosities Project". The main aim of the second part of this book is to inform the reader about the zodiac and the actual location of the signs of zodiac. For more on the content of the book see Mohammed Abattouy, "The Book of Curiosities or A Medieval Islamic View of the Cosmos," (published 28.10.2008) <https://muslimheritage.com/the-book-of-curiosities-or-a-medieval-islamic-view-of-the-cosmos/> (accessed 3.11.2021). For the English translation of the entire book see *An Eleventh-Century Egyptian Guide to the Universe: The Book of Curiosities*, ed. Yossef Rapoport and Emilie Savage-Smith, (Leiden: Brill, 2014).

⁷⁰³For the copy, see Veliyüddin Efendi no. 2318/5, fol. 83b-98a. For initial information regarding Abd al-Qâdir Rûyânî see Charles Ambrose Storey, *Persian Literature: A Bio-bibliographical Survey*, vol. II, (London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1972): 78., and David Pingree, "Abd-al-Qader Ruyani," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, vol. I/2, (updated 14.07.2014) <https://iranicaonline.org/articles/abd-al-qader-ruyani> (accessed 3.11.2021).

[1731-1733] and 1152-1153 [1739-1841]. The most conspicuous astronomical observation and calculation in these texts, is a specific estimation as to the lunar eclipse for the night of Jumād al-Ākhir 14, 1145, the night connecting the first and second days of December 1732. According to Mehmed İsmet's calculations, there would be a total lunar eclipse (*külliyen münhasif*) on the night in question phase by phase as follows: following five hours and six minutes after the sunset the eclipse shall start, the total eclipse shall continue for an hour and 5 minutes, half of the eclipse shall lift within fifty minutes, the remaining half of the eclipse shall lift within fifty minutes, the moon shall regain its initial brightness in an hour and five minutes.⁷⁰⁴ The National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA) database of the lunar eclipses proves that Mehmed İsmet's estimation materialized on the said night. It is understood from NASA's analysis provided by the American astrophysicist, Fred Espenak, and Belgian astronomer and meteorologist, Jean Meeus, that there was a total lunar eclipse the greatest moment of which was at 21:39:42.⁷⁰⁵ Furthermore, the map of the eclipse demonstrates that its longitude crossed Anatolia, an incontrovertible clue that it had been perfectly observed by naked eyes in Anatolia, Istanbul and Rumelia. Another accurate point in Mehmed İsmet's calculation is the local time of both the sunset and eclipse when taking into account that the sunset was at 16:32 in Istanbul, in December 1, 1732.⁷⁰⁶ Put differently, that the total lunar eclipse shall occur following five hours and 6 minutes after the sunset is almost realized with the error margin of (0:1:42) according to the following calculation: (16:32+5:06=21:38). The big mistake in Mehmed İsmet's calculation, however, pertains to the duration of the stages of the eclipse when compared to and contrasted with his calculation with that of Fred Espenak. According to the Mehmed İsmet, the duration of the total eclipse was 1 h and 5 min, and the partial and penumbral eclipses would come to an end withing the remaining 2 h and 45 min. Espenak's estimates, on the other hand, indicates that whereas the duration from the greatest moment to the end of the total eclipse was 50 min the remaining time constituted 1h 56 min. All in all, despite his miscalculations especially regarding the duration of the phases of this total lunar eclipse, we can readily maintain that Mehmed İ-

⁷⁰⁴“Tārīḫ-i hicret-i a^czamu¹-^cuzamā ve ekberü¹-küberā ḥazretlerinin BİN Yüz Kırk Beş senesi [...] şehri Cumādī¹-Āḫirenün on dördüncü Seşenbe gicesi gurüb-ı şems zātü'l-ḥaḳḳādan beş sâ^cat ve altı daḳıka inkızā³etle ḳamer-i ḥuṣf iktizā-yı inḫisāfa bed³ idüp külliyyen münḥasif ola ve gurübdan altı sâ^cat ve on bir daḳıkada bed³-i meḳs olup ve yedi sâ^cat bir daḳıkada vasaṭ-ı ḥuṣūf ola ve yine yedi sâ^cat elli bir daḳıkada bed³-i incilā olup ve sekiz sâ^cat elli altı daḳıkada temāmen müncelî ve pür-ziyā ola. Allāhu a^clam wa yaf^calu mā yashā.” Mehmed İsmet, *Takvīm-i Sāl-i 1144-1145*, Kandilli Rasathanesi no. T26, fol. 13b. It is also possible that the calculation was made by the chief astrologer of the time.

⁷⁰⁵For Fred Espenak's detailed analysis as to the lunar eclipse of December 1, 1732 see Espenak, “Total Lunar Eclipse of 1732 Dec. 01,” (updated 05.11.2015) <http://www.eclipsewise.com/lunar/LEprime/1701-1800/LE1732Dec01Tprime.html> (accessed 9.11.2021). For the detailed list of lunar eclipses from 1701 to 1800 see the following link: <https://eclipse.gsfc.nasa.gov/LEcat5/LE1701-1800.html>

⁷⁰⁶For the timetable of the sunrise and sunset of December 1732 see <https://www.timeanddate.com/sun/turkey/istanbul?month=12&year=1732> (accessed 9.11.2021)

met on the whole had been successful in his thorough observations and calculations concerning the sky and the movements of the stars, given that he approximately estimated the total lunar eclipse.

5.7.4 A Reader of Sufism

We have mentioned that Mehmed İsmet's inventory included a total number of 897 books and pamphlets. A detailed study of his inventory would shed light not only on the biography of an 18th century Ottoman intellectual and manuscript collector, but also on the reading practices of an erudite who devoted himself to reading and writing scholarly works related to different fields of scholarship such as tafsir, hadith, poetry, history, astronomy, astrology, cosmography and Sufism. Yet, since such an independent study would go beyond the purpose of this chapter, in this subsection, I touch only upon some of his recorded books pertaining to Sufism. By doing so, I will claim that we are in a better position to determine to which Sufi order he developed closer and more intimate connections. As I have demonstrated, he was affiliated with not only the Naqshbandi order but also several other Sufi orders such as Qadiri, Mevlevi, Shadhili and Bayrami.

If the books in one's possession can be evaluated as a token of his/her personal pleasures and fields of interest, we can conclude that Mehmed İsmet was a reader of celebrated Sufi scholars noted for their commitment to the doctrine of "the Unity of Being" (*waḥdat al-wujūd*), the core of the mystical teachings of Ibn al-Arabî (d.1240). This is so evident in the inventory when taking into consideration that he acquired several compositions by Ibn al-Arabî's, which includes five unidentified pamphlets, a copy of *Musāmara* and a gloss of his *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*.⁷⁰⁷ Thanks to the ijaza given by Muhammad Subhân al-Hindî to Mehmed İsmet in September 1711, which I have mentioned, we know for certain that it was the former with whom the latter studied the thorough verification and examination of al-Arabî's *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*.⁷⁰⁸ Besides Ibn al-Arabî's scholarly works, there emerge *Gulshan-i Rāz* of al-Shabustarî (d. 1320) and *Mantiq al-Ṭayr* of al-Attâr (d. 1221), the two well-known literary specimens of the mystical texts assimilating the doctrine of *waḥdat*

⁷⁰⁷For the life, career, scholarly works, and religious views and mystical teachings of Ibn al-'Arabî see Mahmud Erol Kılıç, "İbnü'l-Arabî, Muhyiddin," *TDVIA*, vol. 20, (İstanbul: TDV, 1999): 493-516; Çağfer Karadaş, "İbnü'l-Arabî: İtikadî Görüşleri," *TDVIA*, vol. 20, 516-520; Mahmut Kaya, "İbnü'l-Arabî: İslam Düşüncesindeki Yeri," *TDVIA*, vol. 20, 520-522; and Ahmet Ateş, "İbn al-'Arabî, Muhyi'l-dîn," *Eİ2*, vol. III, (Leiden: Brill, 1986): 707-711.

⁷⁰⁸"wa qirā'î Kitābu Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam wa Khuṣūṣ al-Kilam ... min awwalihi ilā ākhirihî qirā'at taḥqîq wa tadqîq" Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 3204, fol. 1b.

al-wujūd.⁷⁰⁹ The most unmistakable proof as to Mehmed İsmet's interest in reading texts pertaining to the doctrine in question, we may maintain, are the venerated compositions of Jalâl al-Dîn al-Rûmî (d. 1273), *Mathnawî*, *Dîwân-i Kabîr* and *Fîhi mâ-Fîh*.⁷¹⁰ It is striking that he not only possessed five copies of *Mathnawî*, recorded as *Mesnevî-i Şerîf* in the inventory, but also the 16th-century Ottoman scholar, Mustafa Şem'î Efendi's (d. 1602) celebrated commentary of it.⁷¹¹ However, we should state that, the absence in the inventory of the reputed gloss on *Mathnawî* of an illustrious Mevlevî şeyh, İsmâ'îl Rusûhî Ankaravî (d. 1631), is also remarkable when remembering the close connection between Mehmed İsmet and the Mevlevî order.⁷¹² In addition to these texts, there exists Sultân Veled's (d. 1312) *Ma'ârîf*, the author's only prose in Persian in which the content of his three mathnawis were reorganized.⁷¹³

The predominance in Mehmed İsmet's inventory of the Sufi texts composed by Mevlevîs is not limited to the abovementioned works of al-Rûmî, his elder son, Sultân Veled, and Mustafa Şem'î Efendi. A pamphlet as to the Mevlevî order (*Risâle-i Mevlevî*), Mehmed İsmet's gloss on Şâhidî's *Tuḥfe (Şerḥ-i Şâhidî)*, and an identified *Şâhidî Nazîresi*, all of which were recorded in the inventory, had to be known to Mevlevî circles during the first half of the 18th century. Therefore, being a follower of Mevlevî order alongside some others, it would not be unusual to find established texts of each order in his inventory. Nevertheless, several manuscripts preserved in the Veliyüddin Efendi collection imply that some of Mehmed İsmet's books may have either been sold before his death or were not put down in writing during the preparation of his inventory. For instance, while not being among the

⁷⁰⁹For the importance of these texts with regard to the doctrine of "the Unity of Being" see M. Nazif Şahinoğlu, "Attâr, Feridüddin," *TDVIA*, vol. 4, (İstanbul: TDV, 1991): 95-98; H. Ahmet Sevgi, "Mantiku't-Tayr," *TDVIA*, vol. 28, (Ankara: TDV, 2003): 29-30; Adnan Karaismailoğlu, "Şebüsterî," *TDVIA*, vol. 38, (İstanbul: TDV, 2010): 400-401; H. Ahmet Sevgi, "Gülşen-i Râz," *TDVIA*, vol. 14, (İstanbul: TDV, 1996): 253-254; J. T. P. de Bruijn, "Mahmûd Shabistari," *EI2*, vol. VI, (Leiden: Brill, 1991): 72-73.

⁷¹⁰al-Rûmî's and his followers' affinity for *waḥdat al-wujūd* is particularly emphasized by Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı who penned several works to introduce the history, doctrine, and ceremonies of the Mevlevî order. See particularly *Mevlânâ'dan Sonra Mevlevîlik*, 2. ed. (İstanbul: İnkılap & Aka, 1983): 185-243., and *Mevlevî Âdâb ve Erkânı*, (İstanbul: İnkılap & Aka, 1963). See also Tahsin Yazıcı, "Mawlawiyya," *EI2*, vol. VI: 883-887., F. de Jong, "Mawlawiyya," *EI2*, vol. VI, 887-888., Reşat Öngören, "Mevlânâ Celâleddîn-i Rûmî," *TDVIA*, vol. 29, 441-448., Şermin Barihüda Tanrıkorur, "Mevleviyye," *TDVIA*, vol. 29, 468-475.

⁷¹¹For Şem'î see Şeyda Öztürk, "Şem'î," *TDVIA*, vol. 38, (İstanbul: TDV, 2010): 503-504. The first volume of Şem'î's commentary has been studied by Abdülkadir Dağlar as part of his PhD dissertation. See Abdülkadir Dağlar, "Şem'î Şem'ullâh Şerḥ-i Mesnevî (I. Cilt): İnceleme – Tenkitli Metin – Sözlük," Unpublished PhD Diss., (Erciyes Üniversitesi 2009).

⁷¹²For Ankaravî see Erhan Yetik, "Ankaravî, İsmâil Rusûhî," *TDVIA*, vol. 3, (İstanbul: TDV, 1991): 211-213. For the list of the translations and commentaries of *Mathnawî* see İsmail Güleç, "Mevlânâ'nın Mesnevî'sinin Tamamına Yapılan Türkçe Şerhler," *İlmi Araştırmalar* 22 (2006): 135-154., Ahmet Topal, "Mesnevî'nin Türkçe Manzum Tercüme ve Şerhleri," *TAED* 32 (2007): 39-51., Şener Demirel, "Mevlânâ'nın Mesnevî'si ve Şerhleri," *TALİD* 5/10 (2007): 469-504., Mehmet Özdemir, "Mesnevî'nin Türkçe Şerhleri," *Turkish Studies* 11/20 (2016): 461-502.

⁷¹³Veyis Değirmençay, "Sultan Veled," *TDVIA*, vol. 37, (İstanbul: TDV, 2009): 521-522.

books listed in the inventory, Cevrî İbrâhîm al-Mevlevî's (d. 1654) *Mecmû'a-i Nûr-ı Esrâr-ı Ehl-i Hâl*, Sîneçâk Sinâneddîn Yûsuf al-Mevlevî's (d. 1546) short treatise on *Mathnawî*, *İntihâb-ı Mesnevî*, and the Chief Astrologer (müneccimbaşı), Şeyh Ahmed b. Lutfullâh al-Mevlevî's (d. 1702) *Ghāyat al-'Udad fî 'Ilm al-'Adad*, a book on arithmetics, are among the books bearing either the ownership record or the seal of Mehmed İsmet.⁷¹⁴ In spite of not being counted among the books recorded in the inventory, we know for sure that Mehmed İsmet owned at least two significant texts of the Bayrami-Melami order, both of which were written by the eminent Bayrami-Melami şeyh and renowned Ottoman bureaucrat and reisülküttâb, Sarı Abdullâh Efendi (d. 1660). The first is his masterpiece entitled *Semerātü'l-Fu'ād fî'l-Mebde ve'l-Me'ād*. Sealed with Mehmed İsmet's signet, the end note of the book indicates that it was completely copied by him during the first half of Rabî' al-Âkhir 1116/19 July–3 August 1704. The second book, *Cevheretü'l-Bidāye ve Dürretü'n-Nihāye*, however, bears only Mehmed İsmet's seal.⁷¹⁵ Given Sarı Abdullâh Efendi's intimate relationship with the Mevlevi and Celveti orders, his commentary on the first volume of *Mathnawî* and his fervency in narrating the biographies of the teachers of the Sufi orders such as Naqshbandi, Bayrami-Melami, Khalwati, and Celveti, one may even speculate about his historical personality as a role model for Mehmed İsmet, for the latter himself adhered to several Sufi orders during his lifetime. However, it is equally true that pluralism in identity, in all likelihood, had been a phenomenon for Ottoman scholars and Sufis in the 17th and 18th centuries.

It can be observed through the list of Mehmed İsmet's books that the Mevlevi and Naqshbandi orders were the two prominent systems that particularly lead him to own, acquire or copy their distinctive texts. When the latter comes into question, a *Risāle-i Nakşibendiye* together with *Silsile-i Nakşibendiye* and *Ṭarīkat-i Nakşibendiye* instantly draw the attention. Even though I have not been able to find these texts

⁷¹⁴The accession records of these manuscripts are respectively as follows: Veliyüddin Efendi no. 1622, 1817/12, and 2329. Cevrî's composition has come to be known as *Hâl-i Tahkikât*. For an introduction on Cevrî's scholarly works and vague biography see Hüseyin Ayan, "Cevrî İbrâhim Çelebi," *TDVIA*, vol. 7, (İstanbul: TDV, 1993): 460-461. For an inadequate study on *Hâl-i Tahkikât* see Gencay Zavotçu, Simge Sakarya, Yeliz Alkaya, "Cevrî, Hall-i Tahkikât ve 'Aynü'l-Füyûz Âdli Eserleri," *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi* 8/1 (2019): 275-290. See also Yeliz Alkaya, "Cevrî, Hall-i Tahkikât ve 'Aynü'l-Füyûz: İnceleme-metin (1b-36b)," Unpublished MA Thesis, (Kocaeli Üniversitesi, 2018). For Sîneçâk see Mehmet Fatih Köksal, "Yûsuf Sîneçâk," (published 05.09.2013) <http://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/yusuf-sinecak> (accessed 30.11.2021). For the biography and scholarly compositions of the prolific chief astrologer Ahmed Dede see Ahmet Ağırakça, "Müneccimbaşı, Ahmed Dede," *TDVIA*, vol. 32, (İstanbul: TDV, 2006): 4-6.

⁷¹⁵The accession records of two books are as follows: Veliyüddin Efendi no. 1662, and 1678. For an introduction on the life, career, and works of Sarı Abdullâh Efendi see Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, *Melâmîlik ve Melâmîler*, facsimile edition, (İstanbul: Gri Yayın, 1992): 137-142., and Nihat Azamat, "Sarı Abdullah Efendi," *TDVIA*, vol. 36, (İstanbul: TDV, 2009): 145-147. It is remarkable that Sarı Abdullâh Efendi was able to escape from the indictments of atheism and apostasy which were assigned to several preceding Bayrami-Melami-Hamzavi şeyhs. For more on the tensions between the Bayrami-Melami şeyhs and the Ottoman state see Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, "XVI.-XVII. Yüzyıllarda Bayrâmî(Hamzavî) Melâmîler ve Osmanlı Yönetimi," *Belleten* LXI/230, (1997): 93-110; and idem, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler (15.-17. Yüzyıllar)*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998): 251-313.

in the manuscript collection of Veliyüddin Efendi, I have encountered a collection of four treatises penned by four preeminent Naqshbandi şeyhs and scholars, Bahâ al-Dîn Naqshband (d. 1389), Ya'qûb Charkhî (d. 1447), Ubaydullâh Ahrâr (d. 1490) and Abd al-Ghanî al-Nâblusî (d. 1731), bearing Mehmed İsmet's ownership record. The distinctive *ta'liq* script exercised in the first three treatises (*Maqâmât*, *Risâla-i Unsiyya*, and *Fiqarât*) demonstrates that all of them were copied by Mehmed İsmet, but only the *Fiqarât* of Ubaydullâh Ahrâr bears the date August 18, 1745/20 Rajab 1158 as the completion date of its copying.⁷¹⁶ The fourth treatise, *Natîjat al-^cUlûm* of Abd al-Ghanî al-Nâblusî, however, was copied by Mehmed İsmet in naskh script, and the year of its composition is indicated by the word *ghafnah*, () a chronogram marking the year 1138/1725-1726.⁷¹⁷ The book might have had particular importance for Mehmed İsmet or a curious Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi man of knowledge since the reason behind al-Nâblusî's attempt in 1112/1700-1701 in typing it was to pen an explanatory commentary on the profound meanings of the topics argued by Ahmed Fâruk al-Sirhindî in his *Masâ'il fî al-^cAqâ'id al-Kashfiyya al-Wicdâniyya*.⁷¹⁸

5.8 Conclusion

In this chapter I have attempted to shed light on the life, career and scholarly orientations of Mehmed İsmet's neglected personality by using biographical entries written by his contemporaries and focusing on his inventory and scholarly compositions, most of which are preserved in various collections in the manuscript libraries of Istanbul. To this end, my first purpose was to shed light on the dark spots in his life and career. Thus, reevaluating the emergent primary sources, a more possible and realistic life and career story of this under-researched scholar is put on paper. As an initial result, it happens that even though he was the son of an agha, he was a

⁷¹⁶Veliyüddin Efendi no. 1755/1, fol. 51a. For an introduction on the biography of the eponym of the Naqshbandi order, see Hamid Algar, "Bahâeddin Nakşibend," *TDVIA*, vol. 4, (İstanbul: TDV, 1991): 458-460; and "Nakshband, Khwâdja Bahâ' al-Dîn," *EI2*, vol. VII, (Leiden: Brill, 1993): 933-934. For Ya'qûb Charkhî see Arif Nevşahi, "Ya'kûb-i Çerhî," *TDVIA*, vol. 43, (İstanbul: TDV, 2013): 281-282; and for Ubaydullâh Ahrâr see Necdet Tosun, "Ubeydullah Ahrâr," *TDVIA*, vol. 42, (İstanbul: TDV, 2012): 19-20. See also Algar, "The Naqshbandi Order: A Preliminary Survey of Its History and Significance," *Studia Islamica* 44, (1976): 123-152.

⁷¹⁷Veliyüddin Efendi no. 1755 fol. 137b. For the biography and scholarly works of this prolific Naqshbandi-Qadiri şeyh see W.A.S. Khalid, "'Abd al-Ghanî b. Ismâ'il al-Nâbulusî," *EI2*, vol. I, 60; Ahmet Özel, "Nablusî, Abdülganî b. İsmâil," *TDVIA*, vol. 32, 268-270; Elizabeth Sirriyeh, *Sufi Visionary of Ottoman Damascus: 'Abd al-Ghanî al-Nâbulusî, 1641-1731*, (London: Routledge, 2005); and Samer Akkach, *Abd al-Ghanî al-Nabulusî: İslam and the Enlightenment*, (Oxford: Oneworld, 2007): 9-43.

⁷¹⁸Al-Nâblusî, *Natîjat al-^cUlûm*, Veliyüddin Efendi no. 1755, fol. 115b.

good example of scholars who did not follow in the career line of their fathers, for he built his career in the ulema hierarchy. However, despite this significant preference, he had to wait for a long time to be assigned to a position in a madrasa. Although he completed his madrasa education around the year 1118/1706-1707 he had to fulfill a long-lasting waiting period until 1140/1727-1728 to be appointed a madrasa of *hâric* rank as a professor. After guaranteeing the scholarly position, however, he gradually climbed the ladders in the official madrasa system to the extent that before his death in 1747, he had attained the professorship of *Mûsile-i Süleymâniye*, the ninth of the twelve ranks in the system. In the same vein, the chapter demonstrates that Mehmed İsmet successfully made a fortune owing either to his continuous task in madrasas, or to the efficient management of wealth inherited from his father. As to his nuclear family, thanks to the occurrence of his daily notes, we know for sure that in November 1740 Mehmed İsmet's 10 year-old daughter, Fâtma Azîze, 8 year-old son, İbrâhîm Necîb, and 5 month old-daughter, Ümmü Gülsüm, had died from the plague, which not only killed his children but also his four male and female slaves, close friends and several Sufi şeyhs with whom he was acquainted. Notwithstanding this calamity, he would leave behind two non-adult daughters, Rûkiye and Habîbe, the year of his death.

Secondly, in this chapter, a fresh look at the intellectual and scientific world of Mehmed İsmet Efendi has been offered. Focusing on his continuous effort to compose original works as an author and to copy numerous works as a calligrapher, I have tried to be more familiar with the reading and writing habits, and intellectual orientations of the Ottoman intellectual who continuously produce during the first half of the 18th century. To this end, not only his productivity in poetic compositions, and glosses and commentaries on poetic and dogmatic works, but also his competence, particularly in Sufism and astronomy, have been covered. As to Sufism, it has been argued that he owned, copied and read the texts of many Sufi orders, including Mevlevi, Naqshbandi, Bayrami and Qadiri, orders with which he had affiliations both as an adherent and as şeyh. In other words, not only he was a reader, but also a practitioner of the Sufism. As concerns his interest in astronomy, thanks to Mehmed İsmet's estate inventory in which many books pertaining to the theoretical astronomy (*hay'at*) and the science of the stars (*nujûm*) were listed together with two telescopes (*dûrbîn*), three astrolabes (*usturlâb*), and four sinecal quadrants (*rubu^c*), I have demonstrated that rather than being content with theoretical readings of astronomy, he practiced it by observing the sky and produced as a practitioner of the science some concrete outputs as a result of his investigations and observations. In this regard, it has been proven that his ability in astronomy was so advanced that he was able to correctly calculate the prospective lunar eclipses as in

the case of the eclipse that occurred on the night of Jumād al-Ākhir 14, 1145, the nexus connecting the first and second days of December 1732. Another significant detail in Mehmed İsmet's concern for astronomy pertains to his pamphlet titled *Risāle-i Tedāhul*, the text submitted to the grand vizier, Dâmâd İbrâhîm Paşa, on March 21, 1726. Mehmed İsmet discusses in the text problems stemming from the inconsistency of the lunar and solar calendars in the Ottoman treasury and finance office, as he favored the lunar calendar, not only in salary payments, but also in tax collection. My contribution in this regard is that the composition was in fact a successful exploitation of an already existent pamphlet completed by Defterî Seyfullâh Çelebi on December 21, 1572. As such, the main argument of both authors was similar.

Thirdly, the chapter argues that Mehmed İsmet enjoyed multiple identities given his intimate relations with at least five Sufi orders. Based on the documentation, I have contended that the Naqshbandiyya was not the only Sufi order to which Mehmed İsmet adhered. Given that his first known scholarly work, a commentary penned in 1112/1700-1701 on the *Lugat* of Mevlevi şeyh İbrâhîm Şâhidî (d. 1550), we can assert that his earliest Sufi affinities were towards the Mevlevi order. A neglected ijaza which was given to Mehmed İsmet in 1711, however, it clarifies that he adhered to Muhammad Subhân el-Hindî, a Qadiri şeyh from Lucknow. Mehmed İsmet's personal notes penned into a miscellany belonged to him. However, it proves that he was instructed and ratified by Murâd Bukhârî, the renowned Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi şeyh. Another previously neglected biographical entry penned by Mehmed Tâhir Efendi, however, goes a step further by indicating that his adherence was not only to the Naqshbandiyya and Mevleviyye, but also to Shadhiliyya and Bayramiyya. Comparing the names of the texts pertaining to Sufism in Mehmed İsmet's inventory with the books preserved in Veliyüddîn Efendi's manuscript collection and bearing Mehmed İsmet's seal, ownership records or *istinsâh* records, we can further contend that he had been a good reader of Sufism, for he possessed the esteemed texts of several Sufi orders, including Mevleviyye, Naqshbandiyya, Bayramiyye and Qadiriyya. Nevertheless, it is understood that the Bayrami-Melami, Mevlevi and Naqshbandi texts might have constituted a significant portion of Mehmed İsmet's library, an indication that he had developed closer connections with these Sufi orders.

6. SEEKING PATRONAGE: MEHMED İSMET IN THE NETWORKS OF HIGH-RANKING OFFICIALS AND SCHOLAR-BUREAUCRATS

6.1 Introduction

After elucidating Mehmed İsmet's affiliations with different Sufi orders in terms of his readings of the Sufi texts, in this chapter, my purpose is to reveal Mehmed İsmet's intellectual connections by focusing on his scholarly works, which were, over the course of time, submitted to different patrons who provided financial support for their composition. What was the role of patron-client relations in Mehmed İsmet's oeuvre? To what extent did the existing order of patronage affect his scholarly enterprise? In light of these questions, I will attempt to demonstrate how he was able to affiliate himself with existing intellectual and political milieus and networks which affirmatively contributed to his scholarly productions, whether they be compilations or duplications. In the meantime, by utilizing his neglected daily notes, I will attempt to demonstrate that the patronage networks in which Mehmed İsmet was situated, rather than being totally formal, rigid, and court-centered, were simultaneously flexible, informal, and based on friendship.

6.2 A Few Notes on the Ottoman Patronage System

The Ottoman patronage system has yet to be studied through the lens of court culture. In one of the earliest studies on the sixteenth-century Ottoman patronage system, the late Halil İnalcık was of the opinion that high culture could exist only as high court culture in patrimonial states such as the Ottoman Empire, the Turko-Mongol empires of Central and South Asia and the Florentine Republic under the Medici House, where the palaces of the ruling dynasty and grandis were the sole

source of reputation, dignity, wealth and prestige.⁷¹⁹ The classical Ottoman poet and poetry (*dîvân*) as parts of high culture are matters of discussion in İnalçık's study. Following in the footsteps of İnalçık, Tuba Işınsu Durmuş analyzes literary patronage in the Ottoman Empire by focusing on the role of the sultanic and vizierial courts. A significant novelty in her study, we may state, is the short introduction on extra-palatial patronage circles. However, due to an underutilization of primary sources, the study lacks credibility.⁷²⁰ Typically, in the classical or patrimonial patronage system, the patron and his protégés are in question as two integral parts of a whole. However, the parties are not equal, and indeed, inequality is the main factor ensuring the continuity of the system. Whereas one party, as a socio-political agent, has control of the power and resources, the other party, despite its passive and dependent position, has the knowledge, ability and intellectual profundity. As is explained by Miri Shefer-Mossensohn more plausibly and satisfyingly,

“Patron-protégé relationships (*intisap*) were characterized by dependance and loyalty, and revolved around benefit, gratitude, and obligation. These were personal relationships, often close, even intimate, with inherently unequal power and status among the partners. The patron was committed to helping his protégé and promoting his interests through support of the latter's work and livelihood, and the protégé, on his part, compensated the patron with his services and helped in promoting the patron's interests. Protégés were trustworthy and loyal providers of services to their patrons. Patrons supported their protégés financially and politically, while the latter in turn helped their patrons advance their own political and financial status ... This social arrangement featured a constant exchange of goods and services.”⁷²¹

Although courtly patronage is perceived as sultan-centered and palace-oriented, one must not diminish the role of intermediaries in the establishment, even if they are none other than courtiers and the place of performance is nowhere other than the palace. Emine Fetvacı pointedly explained in the context of the manuscript patronage of the Ottoman palace that intermediaries who facilitate the recognition of an author are also part and parcel to the patronage: “[w]hile the sultan might ostensi-

⁷¹⁹Halil İnalçık, *Şâir ve Patron: Patrimonial Devlet ve Sanat Üzerinde Sosyolojik Bir İnceleme*, (Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları, 2003): 10.

⁷²⁰Tuba Işınsu Durmuş, *Şair ve Sultan: Osmanlı'da Edebi Himaye*, (İstanbul: Muhit Kitap, 2021). For the subsection on the extra-palatial circles see *ibid.*, 122-134. This study is the expanded edition of her earlier book, *Tutsan Elini Ben Fakirin: Osmanlı Edebiyatında Hamilik Geleneği*, (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2009).

⁷²¹Miri Shefer-Mossensohn, *Science among the Ottomans: The Cultural Creation and Exchange of Knowledge*, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015): 127. For a general portrayal of the classical patronage system, see *ibid.*, 127-132.

bly be considered the patron of any work created in the palace manuscript workshop with funds from the treasury, the intermediary who promotes an author by encouraging the sultan to commission him is also a patron.”⁷²² Thus, from the mid-16th century onwards, alongside the sultans, grand viziers, and viziers, chief black and white eunuchs emerged as patrons of arts, architecture, manuscripts and manuscript production in the Ottoman Empire.⁷²³ Surely, the advent of chief eunuchs as patrons of artistic and literary production had to do with the power politics in the imperial palace. The more they secured their future and ensured permanency in the palace, the more reputation they gained as benefactors and supporters of the men of arts and literature. The grand viziers and viziers deprived of such opportunity and forced to leave after a short period the lucrative positions due to power struggles might not have been able to build the career of a successful and benevolent tutelar. Therefore, as can be seen in the examples of Mahmûd Pasha Angelovic (d. 1474), Sokollu Mehmed Pasha (d. 1579), Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Ahmed Pasha (d. 1676), and Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha (d. 1730), the grand viziers who managed to stay in office for a decade or more, when the stability in governance and durability in the office were achieved, the grand viziers, too, would come to the forefront as generous, mighty and learned patrons.⁷²⁴

Yet, Ottoman patronage system as well as that of contemporary states and societies should not be reduced to mere patrimonial tutelage. Nor should we envisage a sharply prescribed and extremely formal system in which the dependent and weak party is doomed to all sorts of formalities far from sincerity. Putting it another way, we should also consider the possibility of a more flexible and informal system fueled by the sincerity and friendship of the parties. As is discussed by İnan, who focused on literary patronage of the Ottoman Empire during the 15th and 16th cen-

⁷²²Emine Fetvacı, “Viziers to Eunuchs: Transitions in Ottoman Manuscript Patronage, 1566-1617,” PhD Diss., (Harvard University 2005): 19. For the published version of her dissertation see *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013).

⁷²³On the patronage of chief eunuchs see particularly the fourth and fifth chapters in Fetvacı, *ibid*; Jane Hathaway, *Beshir Agha: Chief Eunuch of the Ottoman Imperial Harem*, (Oxford: Oneworld, 2005): 85-102; *idem*, “Eunuch Households in Istanbul, Medina, and Cairo During the Ottoman Era,” *Turcica* 41 (2009): 291-303; *idem*, *The Chief Eunuch of the Ottoman Harem: From African Slave to Power-Broker*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018): 193-220; Leyla Kayhan Elbirlik, “Dialogue Beyond Margins: Patronage of Chief Eunuchs in the Late 16th Century Ottoman Court,” *Sanat Tarihi Yılığ* 22 (2010): 63-99; George Junne, *The Black Eunuchs of the Ottoman Empire: Networks of Power in the Court of the Sultan*, (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2016): 150-230; Berat Açı, “Habeşi Mehmed Ağa’nın (ö. 1590) Vakfettiği Kitaplar ve Akibetleri,” *International Journal of Turkology* 6 (2020): 67-83.

⁷²⁴Theoharis Stavrides, *The Sultan of Viziers: The Life and Times of the Ottoman Grand Vizir Mahmud Pasha Angelović*, (Leiden: Brill, 2001): 294-326; Uros Dakic, “The Sokollu Family Clan and the Politics of Vizierial Households in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century,” Unpublished MA Thesis, (Central European University, 2012): 62-78; Muhammed Fatih Çalışır, “A Virtuous Grand Vizier: Politics and Patronage in the Ottoman Empire During the Grand Vizierate of Fazıl Ahmed Pasha (1661-1676),” Unpublished PhD Diss., (Georgetown University, 2016); *idem*, “Sadrazam Köprülüzâde Fazıl Ahmed Paşa’nın Hâmiliğindeki İlmî Faaliyetler,” in *XVIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi (1-5 Ekim 2018, Ankara) Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, vol. IV, prepared by Semiha Nurdan and Muhammed Özler, (Ankara: TTK, 2022): 35-48; and Ünal Araç, *İktidar ve Sanat: Damat İbrahim Paşa’nın Hamiliği (1718-1730)*, (İstanbul: Vakıfbank Kültür Yayınları, 2022).

turies, the form of patronage might not have been strictly formal and apathetical. Conversely, it “sometimes went beyond the bestowal of money on a needy poet: it involved a companionship between the patron and his favored poet” and when it comes to the protected poets, it was possible that they “established patronal as well as personal ties with powerful courtiers, as well as with the sultan.”⁷²⁵ Considering that this is applicable, even in cases where the patron, was a high-ranking official, it becomes easier to think about the extent of the flexibility, ease and unconventionality in cases where patrons were from the members of the *ulema* and lower-ranking bureaucrats. A recently submitted master thesis on literary patronage of sixteen “şeyhülislam families” represented by forty-one grand muftis in the *ilmiye* bureaucracy, has facilitated the analysis of Ottoman *şeyhülislams* as patrons of poetry and poets.⁷²⁶ In another study, literary patronage of twenty-five families who introduced into the Ottoman scholarly bureaucracy fourteen grand muftis, twenty-five chief judges, and twenty-seven qadis has successfully been documented. However, the characteristics of their patronage remains unexplored and unanalyzed.⁷²⁷ More recently, it has been manifested that at least twelve scholars attached themselves to “the Threshold of Minkârîzâde,” i.e., the seat of Minkârîzâde Yahyâ Efendi, who uninterruptedly served as the chief mufti for twelve years from 1662 to 1674. It has been further argued that within the same context at least six scholars who enjoined the patronage of the deceased Minkârîzâde by way of receiving *mülâzemet* from him were able to climb to the laudable position of chief jurist during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.⁷²⁸ It is against such a background that the circles of patronage from which Mehmed İsmet benefited can be understood in a more proper way. Depending on who the patron was, his relationship with his patrons could be at once formal or informal, rule-bound or free from rules, flexible or inflexible. Therefore, in what follows, I will take the initiative to uncover Mehmed İsmet’s patrons and the peculiarities of the relationship he had with them.

⁷²⁵Murat Umut İnan, “Imperial Patronage of Literature in the Ottoman World, 1400-1600,” in *The Empires of the Near East and India: Source Studies of the Safavid, Ottoman, and Mughal Literate Communities*, ed. Hani Khafipour, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2019): 496-497.

⁷²⁶Hilâl Kılıç, “Şeyhülislam Ailelerinin Kültür ve Sanat Alanına Katkıları,” Unpublished MA Thesis, (TOBB Ekonomi ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi, 2018).

⁷²⁷Tuba Işınsu Durmuş, “Divanlarda Kendilerine Sunulan Övgü Şiirleri Üzerinden Osmanlı Sanatına Katkı Sunan Aileler Üzerine Tespitler,” *Divan Edebiyatı Araştırmaları Dergisi* 26 (2021): 143-220.

⁷²⁸Özgün Deniz Yoldaşlar, “Minkârîzâde Yahya and the Ottoman Scholarly Bureaucracy in the Seventeenth Century,” 212-225, and 227-234.

6.2.1 The Kiblelizâde Family: An Unshakable Friendship

As is mentioned in the previous chapter, the evidence at hand shows that Mehmed İsmet's earliest scholarly work, *Fayẓu'l-Hādī li-Hālli Muşkilāti's-Şāhidī*, was presented to a certain Kiblelizâde Mîr Ahmed in 1112/1700-1701. Yusuf Öz who studied the commentaries on *Tuhfe-i Şāhidī*, identifies Kiblelizâde Ahmed as the son of Murâd Ağa, the master sergeant of guardsmen in Egypt. Salim Aydüz, the first researcher to embark upon preparing a list of Mehmed İsmet's scholarly works, depends on Yusuf Öz's initial finding. As asserted by Öz and Aydüz, Mehmed İsmet, the tutor of Murâd Ağa at the beginning of the 18th century, began to prepare this gloss on Şâhidî's *Luğat* upon the latter's request for a simple and understandable text for the benefit of commons.⁷²⁹ Considering Öz's research we can readily state that this significant information exists only in a copy preserved in the Topkapı Palace Museum Revan Collection.⁷³⁰ However, in the introduction of the autograph copy in which solely Kiblelizâde Mîr Ahmed's name is mentioned, one does not come across evidence for the details propounded by Öz and Aydüz.⁷³¹ Accordingly, what we can bring forward regarding this text is that it was penned for two specific purposes: to clarify the difficulties in Şâhidî's *Luğat* and to unveil the deterioration of Persian in the hands of common Turks. It was submitted to Kiblelizâde Mîr Ahmed after its completion. Since it is discernable that a member of the *Kiblelizâdes* promoted the composition of a significant gloss on Şâhidî's *Luğat*, a few words are in order to recall the family's existence in Ottoman high politics. The eponym of the family, Kibleli Mustafâ Pasha, the son-in-law of Köprülü Mehmed Pasha (d. 1661), would be appointed as a vizier during the grand vizierate of Köprülü Fâzıl Ahmed Pasha (v. 1661-1676).⁷³² The surviving primary sources evidently prove that the *Kiblelizâdes* maintained close relations with the *Köprülüs*, who not only raised sons, nephews and grandsons for top-ranking offices, but also displayed benevolence for their sons-in-law (Kibleli Mustafâ Pasha, Kaplan Mustafâ Pasha, Kara Mustafa Pasha and Siyâvûş Mustafâ Pasha).⁷³³ It is because of this basic reason that we find members

⁷²⁹Yusuf Öz, *Tuhfe-i Şāhidī Şerhleri*, (Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1999): 63-64; Aydüz, "Risâle-i Tedâhul," 227.

⁷³⁰See Mehmed İsmet, *Fayẓu'l-Hādī li-Hālli Muşkilāti's-Şāhidī*, TSMK, Revan no. 613, fol. 1a.

⁷³¹Abdullah Uğur has already corrected this grave mistake. See "Muhammediye'nin Bir Beyti Üzerine Mehmed İsmet'in Şerhi," 5-6.

⁷³²M. Tayyip Gökbilgin, "Köprülüler," *IA*, vol. VI, facsimile edition, (Eskişehir: MEB, 1997): 897; M. Tayyip Gökbilgin, R. C. Repp, "Köprülü," *EI2*, vol. V, (Leiden: Brill, 1986): 259.

⁷³³İbrahim Metin Kunt, "The Köprülü Years, 1656-1661," Unpublished PhD Diss., (Princeton University, 1971); Halil İnalçık, "Köprülüler," in *Devlet-i 'Alīyye: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Üzerine Araştırmalar*, vol. III, (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2015): 27-113; Ayşegül Ünal, "Köprülü Ayşe Hanım ve Osmanlı'da Hâne Politikaları," Unpublished MA Thesis, (İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2018): 14-19.

of the Kiblelizâde family in high-ranking offices during the last quarter of the 17th and first half of the 18th centuries. One of the most renowned figures in this regard, is Kiblelizâde Alî Bey (d. 1702), the son of Kibleli Mustafâ Pasha, the chief of the imperial stables (*mîrâhûr-ı evvel*), and the favorite nephew of the grand vizier, Köprülü Amcazâde Hüseyin Pasha (v. 1697-1702), who was executed as a result of Şeyhülislam Feyzullâh Efendi's plot against him.⁷³⁴ Another significant and probably the most prominent member of the family is Kiblelizâde Mehmed Bey (d. 1733), the son of Alî Bey, who managed to be appointed as the head of top-tier state offices such as custodian of the Imperial Armory (1720), the chief fiscal officer of the Imperial Arsenal (1721-1727), the chief accountant (1727-1728) and the chief of the Rûznâmeçe-i Evvel office (1728-1729, 1730-1731).⁷³⁵ Lastly, we can quote the name of Kiblelizâde Mîr Ahmed Bey's son, Kiblelizâde Mahmûd Bey (d. 1763-1764), another eminent Kibleli appointed to the position of clerkship in the Imperial Arsenal (1753, 1760), Küçük Rûznâme (1768) and the Imperial Council during the second half of the 18th century.⁷³⁶

How might the rise and a possible decline of the Kiblelizâde family affect Mehmed İsmet's career and scholarly works? Although we cannot trace at large such a relationship based on mutual interests, we know for sure that Mehmed İsmet maintained his intimate connections with the *Kiblelizâdes*, even if the only patron from among the family was Mîr Ahmed, to whom he submitted his earliest work at the very beginning of the 18th century. For this reason, he felt obliged to write a note on 4 November 1133/26 Jumâd al-Ûlâ 1146 that "news regarding the death of Kiblelizâde Mehmed Bey has reached from al-Quds, and all of his belongings and real estate was confiscated by the Imperial Treasury."⁷³⁷ With this in mind, we can readily argue

⁷³⁴For the detailed reports regarding Kiblelizâde Alî Bey's execution and Feyzullâh Efendi's role in it, see Michael Nizri, *Ottoman High Politics and the ulema Household*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014): 100, 118-120. For a totally different report correlating the execution with the forbidden love between Alî Bey and a concubine or a young male servant of the imperial palace, see Reşad Ekrem Koçu, "Ali Bey (Kiblelizade)," *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, vol. II, (İstanbul: Nurgök Matbaası, 1959): 631. See also Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i Osmanî*, vol. 1, ed. Nuri Akbayar, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996): 248.

⁷³⁵Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i Osmanî*, vol. 3, ed. Nuri Akbayar, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996): 964. Mehmed Süreyya mistakenly declares 1144/1731-32 as Kiblelizâde Mehmed Bey's year of death.

⁷³⁶According to Mehmed Süreyya, Kiblelizâde Mahmûd was the son of Kiblelizâde Mehmed Bey. See *ibid.*, vol. 3, 910-911. However, since the former identifies himself in an ownership record as "Mîr Mahmûd ibn el-Hâc Ahmed eş-şehîr bi-Kiblelizâde" it becomes evident that he was the son of Kiblelizâde Ahmed Bey. For the record see Süleymaniye Library, Kılıçalipaşa no. 1007, fol. 1a. In addition, Mehmed Süreyya mistakenly states that Kiblelizâde Mahmûd Bey died after 1180/1766-67. According to Kiblelizâde Mahmûd's headstone inscription which was published by Alî Emîrî Efendi in August 1918, the death year of the former was 1177/1763-64. See the 18th footnote in Nuri Sağlam, "Ali Emîrî Efendi ile Mehmet Fuad Köprülü Arasındaki Münakaşalar – II," *İlmî Araştırmalar* 11 (2001): 94.

⁷³⁷"Kiblelizâde Mehmed Beg'ün Kudüs'den fevti haberi geldi. Cemîc-i eşyâ ve emlâkını taraf-ı Mîrîden zabt itdiler." *Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1145-1146*, Kandilli Rasathanesi no. T28, fol. 9a. Mehmed İsmet Efendi's daily note is confirmed by the initial inventory of Kiblelizâde Mehmed Bey's confiscated property which was prepared on 5 November 1733/27 Jumâd al-Ûlâ 1146. See BOA, D..BŞM.MHF. 26/8. An elaborated study of the 26th folder of this archive will pave the way for a better analysis of the extensive wealth of *Kiblelizâdes*, for there are records as not only to their belongings and immovables in Istanbul but also those

that intimacy is particularly observable in the relations between him and Kiblelizâde Mîr Mahmûd. For instance, on 13 September 1736/7 Jumâd al-Âkhir, he did not refrain from writing that Mîr Mahmûd came from Babadağ. ⁷³⁸ Furthermore, we know that Mîr Mahmûd managed to complete for himself in 1146/1733-1734 a copy of *Fayzû'l-Hādî li-Halli Muşkilâti Ş-Şâhidî*, the gloss which was presented to his father by Mehmed İsmet. ⁷³⁹ Two years later, in 1148/1735-1736, he made a fair copy of the celebrated poet and statesman of the 18th century İzzet Alî Pasha's *Dīvân* on which Mehmed İsmet's seal was stamped, an indication that Kiblelizâde Mahmûd prepared the copy in question by request of Mehmed İsmet. ⁷⁴⁰ Given these substantial pieces of information, we can confidently conclude that Mehmed İsmet kept in touch with the *Kiblelizâdes* throughout his life, tried to keep abreast of latest developments with regard to the members of this family and pursued a relationship based on the exchange of the books and intellectual pursuit and endeavor. Lastly, remembering that Şâhidî's *Luğat* was a popular text in Mevlevi circles and that Mehmed İsmet himself had been affiliated with this Sufi order, we are in need of further studies on the Mevlevi's connections with the *Kiblelizâdes*, who sponsored the composition of a gloss on the *Luğat* of a celebrated Mevlevi şeyh. ⁷⁴¹

6.2.2 The Köprülü: A Stagnant Relationship

Mehmed İsmet's personal compendium demonstrates that he developed close connections with and enjoyed the patronage of both the Kiblelizâdes and the *Köprülü*s, the latter paving the way for the Kiblelizâdes in state administration. Seeking the patronage of *Köprülü*s is not surprising with regards to Mehmed İsmet's part given their long partnership in statecraft, which necessitated patronage for art, architecture and intellectual output including scientific research and literary works. Studies focusing on the political, cultural and intellectual networks and patronage of the Köprülü grand viziers, inform us particularly about the household politics of

showed up in different parts of Anatolia and Rumelia.

⁷³⁸“Âmadan-i Mîr Maḥmûd Kiblelizâde az-jâ nib-i Bâbâdağ” *Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1148-1149*, Kandilli Rasathanesi no. T30, fol. 8a.

⁷³⁹See *Şerḥ-i Şâhidî li-İsmet Efendi*, Süleymaniye Library, Kılıçalıpaşa, no. 1007.

⁷⁴⁰See *Dīvân-ı İzzet ʿAlî Paşa*, Esad Efendi, no. 2672. Since this manuscript is stamped also by the seal of Veliyüddîn Efendi and is not recorded in Mehmed İsmet's estate inventory, we can deduce that it passed first into Veliyüddîn Efendi's possession during Mehmed İsmet's lifetime, but eventually made its way to Kiblelizâde Mahmûd's collection.

⁷⁴¹Ayşegül Mete has studied in the third chapter of her dissertation the social networks of the 18th century Mevlevi şeyhs who resided in Istanbul. It seems that the *Kiblelizâdes* has not come to her notice. See Ayşegül Mete, “XVIII. Asır İstanbul Mevleviliği”, Unpublished PhD Diss., (Sakarya Üniversitesi, 2019): 312-405.

Köprülü Mehmed Pasha, the founder of the Köprülü household, and the intellectual auspices of his son, Fâzıl Ahmed Pasha.⁷⁴² *Köprülüs'* sponsorship of artistic and scientific works, particularly of later generations, including Numân Pasha (d. 1719), the last Köprülü grand vizier, and his vizier brothers, Abdullâh Pasha (d. 1735) and Es'ad Pasha (d. 1726), however, needs further investigation.⁷⁴³

It is understood from Mehmed İsmet's collection that he submitted an ode to at least a member of Köprülü family, Köprülüzâde Es'ad Bey, the son of the Köprülü grand vizier, Fâzıl Mustafâ Pasha. Although the reason behind the submission of the ode is unclear, considering the noun phrase “*şeyhu'l-ḥarem*” in the seventh couplet, we may deduce that the ode was presented to Es'ad Bey upon his appointment to a prestigious position in Mecca and Medina.⁷⁴⁴ An Arabic eulogy in *Simât-ı 'İşmet*, Mehmed İsmet's compendium, may be another indication for his intimate relationship with Köprülü family. The title and content of the poem in question make it clear that it was Köprülü grand vizier Nu'mân Pasha to whom a certain Es'ad Efendi submitted a eulogy in Jumâd al-Awwal in 1122/28 June – 27 July 1710, a few weeks after the former's appointment to the grand vizierate on 16 June 1710.⁷⁴⁵ This is understood from the last line of the poem emphasizing that Nu'mân Pasha became the grand vizier (*Sāra Nu'mān al-zamān ṣāhiban li'd-dawlat*). Considering this particular ode and eulogy, we may contend that Mehmed İsmet was also able to develop close connections with high-ranking officials from among the *Köprülüs*.

⁷⁴²See for instance, Metin Kunt, “The Köprülü Years, 1656-1661,” and idem, “Ethnic-Regional (Cins) Solidarity in the Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Establishment,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 5/3 (1974): 233-239; Sultan Murat Topçu, “Köprülüzade Fazıl Ahmet Paşa'nın Bani Kişiliği,” *Karadeniz Uluslararası Bilimsel Dergi* 8 (2010): 68-88, and idem, *Gücün Mimariye Yansıması: Köprülüler*, (Ankara: TTK, 2015); Fatma Baş, “17. Yüzyıl Divanlarında Köprülü Ailesinden Sadrazamlara Sunulan Kasideler Üzerine Bir İnceleme,” *Journal of Turkish Language and Literature* 2/1 (2016): 35-50; M. Fatih Çalşır, “A Virtuous Grand Vizier: Politics and Patronage in the Ottoman Empire During the Grand Vizierate of Fazıl Ahmed Pasha (1661-1676),” Unpublished PhD Diss., (Georgetown University, 2016): 133-160, and idem, “Köprülü Sadrazamlar ve Süfi Çevreler,” in *Osmanlı'da İlm-i Tasavvuf*, ed. Ercan Alkan and Osman Sacid Arı, (İstanbul: İSAR, 2018): 793-802; Cumhur Bekar, “The Rise of the Köprülü Household: The Transformation of Patronage in the Ottoman Empire in the Seventeenth Century,” *Turkish Historical Review* 11 (2020): 229-256; Tuba Işımsu Durmuş, “Divanlarda Kendilerine Sunulan Övgü Şiirleri Üzerinden Osmanlı Sanatına Katkı Sunan Aileler Üzerine Tespitler,” *Divan Edebiyatı Araştırmaları Dergisi* 26 (2021): 183-186. For Merzifonlu Kara Mustafa Pasha's architectural patronage see Ramazan Pantık, “Merzifonlu Kara Mustafa Paşa Vakıfları: Yönetimi, Kentsel Gelişime Katkıları ve İktisadi Yapısı,” Unpublished PhD Diss., (Hacettepe Üniversitesi, 2021).

⁷⁴³For Numân Pasha see Abdülkadir Özcan, “Köprülüzâde Numan Paşa”, *TDVIA*, vol. 26, 265-267. For Abdullah Pasha see Sultan Murat Topçu, “Köprülüzade Abdullah Paşa'nın 15 Cemadiel-evvel 1133 – M. 14 Mart 1721 Tarihli Vakfiyesi'ne Göre İmar Faaliyetleri ve Bani Kişiliği,” *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 4/17 (2011): 405-415.

⁷⁴⁴Mehmed Süreyya does not refer such a position in his entry on Köprülü Es'ad Pasha. See *Sicill-i Osmânî*, vol. 2, 496. According to Mehmed Süreyyâ, he adopted “Hicri” as a pseudonym in his poetry. However, Gül Ustaömer and Gencay Zavotçu attributes him “Hâsim” as a penname by depending on the biographical dictionaries of Râmiz and Safâyî. See Gül Ustaömer, “Hâsim Dîvânı-İnceleme-Metin ve Düzyazı Çeviri,” Unpublished MA Thesis, (Kocaeli Üniversitesi, 2010); and Gencay Zavotçu, “Hâsim, Köprülü-zâde Es'ad,” (01.01.2014) <http://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/hasim-kopruluzade-esad> (accessed 22.09.2022).

⁷⁴⁵For the poem in question see *Simât-ı 'İşmet*, fol. 151b. The title which literally reads “by Es'ad Efendi” must be penned in a later time. Nu'mân Pasha's grand vizierate had lasted only two months from 16 June to 16 August 1710. See Abdülkadir Özcan, “Köprülüzâde Numan Paşa,” 265-66.

It is conceivable that he submitted odes and eulogies to the Köprülü grand viziers, Amcazâde Hüseyin Pasha and Nu‘mân Pasha, and vizier Abdullâh Pasha, but the current documentation does not enable us shed light on them. Mehmed İsmet’s daily notes, apart from a single note declaring the death of Köprülüzâde Abdurrahmân Pasha b. Abdullâh Pasha in Trabzon on 11 August 1730/26 Muḥarram 1143, are also unclear as to the extent of his relationship with the *Köprülü*s,⁷⁴⁶

6.2.3 La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî Efendi: An Old Friend

When it comes to the mid-1710s, La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî Efendi (d. 1746) appears as significant patron and protector for Mehmed İsmet. Our sole primary source, in this regard, is *Simâṭ-ı ‘İşmet*, which included not only his poems, chronograms, selection of notes from his readings and selections from short treatises, but also copy records of seven books duplicated by him during the two-year period between 1127-28/1715-16 and of two books copied in 1133/1721 and 1134/1722.⁷⁴⁷ Given that six of these books were copied for La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî, one can realize his significant role in Mehmed İsmet’s life as a patron during the period. Such a reasoning, there is no doubt, implicitly betokens also a possible patron-client relationship between Mehmed İsmet and Şehîd Alî Pasha (d. 1716) whose patronage for and intimate connection with La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî were such well-known realities that the chronicler Râşid felt obliged to put it on record.⁷⁴⁸ However, due to the dearth of sources, we cannot reveal the particular aspects and details of the relationship between Şehîd Alî Pasha and Mehmed İsmet Efendi. Notwithstanding, considering the interest in astronomy and astrology of all three, and their affiliation to the Bayrami order, we may assert that it was because of these reasons that they developed a close relationship. In regard to the former, we are informed by chroniclers of the period that Şehîd Alî Pasha’s and La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî’s dependence on astronomy and astrology was so solid that, in 1716, it resulted in the rout of the Ottoman armies by the Habsburg armies and the death of the grand vizier in Petrovaradin, for they

⁷⁴⁶For this note see Mehmed İsmet, *Taḳvîm-i Sâl-i 1142-1143*, Kandilli Rasathanesi no. T25, fol. 6a.

⁷⁴⁷Mehmed İsmet entered only the *instinsâh* records of books that he recopied between 1126-1128 / 1714-1716, and of the two recopied in 1133/1721. See *Simâṭ-ı ‘İşmet*, fol. 149b-150a, and 151b.

⁷⁴⁸See for instance in *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, 821, 830, 861, 870 and 877. For an introduction on La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî’s life, career, and scholarly works see Abdülbaki Gölpinarlı, *Melâmîlik ve Melâmîler*, 153-155; Nihat Azamat, “La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî,” *TDVIA*, vol. 27, (Ankara: TDV, 2003): 90-92; Mehmet Ünal, “Yetîmî, La‘li-zâde Abdülbâkî,” (06.07.2014) <http://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/yetimi-lalizade-abdulgazi> (accessed on 03.07.2022). For an introduction on La‘lîzâde’s presence in Naqshbandi circles see Tülay Artan, “El Yazmaları Işığında Bir Çevre ve Çevre Eskizi: Kadızâdeliler, Müceddidiler ve Damad İbrahim Paşa (1730),” *Müteferrika* 50 (Kış 2016): 27, and 32-33.

awaited the propitious moment to attack the enemy.⁷⁴⁹ Yet, whereas the chronicler, Silâhdâr Mehmed Ağa, explicitly puts the blame on La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî by accusing him infidelity and apostasy, Râşid Mehmed Efendi accuses İbrâhîm Ağa, the kethüdâ of the grand vizier, of being the real cause of the defeat. The most remarkable point in Râşid’s narrative, however, is that he introduces La‘lîzâde as the tutor of İbrâhîm Ağa, an implication that he taught him the science of stars.⁷⁵⁰ Whatever the reliable narrative, it seems that reliance on astronomy and astrology, once again, was one of the main reasons that brought them together under Şehid Alî Pasha’s leadership. Nevertheless, it must be stated again that there is no evidence regarding Mehmed İsmet’s presence in their scholarly gatherings.

After this short introduction, we can now return to our main subject: the patron-client relationship between La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî and Mehmed İsmet and book production. As stated above, Mehmed İsmet’s collection demonstrates that he copied for La‘lîzâde at least six books from the mid-1710s to the beginning of 1720s. However, we identify the titles of only three of them. The copying of the first book, *Kitâb al-Bârî fî Ahkâm al-Nujûm* of Alî ibn Abî Rijâl al-Shaybânî al-Maghribî al-Qayrawânî (d. after 1040), was completed on 14 March 1715/8 Rabî‘ al-Awwal 1127.⁷⁵¹ Considering that it was an encyclopedic book consisting of eight large chapters on significant topics in astrology,⁷⁵² we may conclude that La‘lîzâde prompted Mehmed İsmet to make a fair copy of it on account of his familiarity with astronomy and astrology. Recalling Mehmed İsmet’s advance in the science of hadith, we may assert that it was due to this reasoning that he ordered a copy of *Mishkât al-Maşâbih*, Khâtib al-Tabrîzî’s famous commentary on al-Baghawî’s *Maşâbih al-Sunnah*, whose duplication was completed by Mehmed İsmet in mid-May 1716/silahi Jumâd al-Awwal 1128, and *Şahîh* of Muslim, one of the six most reliable hadith collections in Sunni Islam, completed on 1 January 1721/2 Rabî‘ al-Awwal 1133.⁷⁵³ In addition to these featured books, Mehmed İsmet copied for his patron three further books whose titles and authors are still unknown to us. Nevertheless, their completion

⁷⁴⁹See *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, 870; Silâhdâr Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa, *Nusretname: İnceleme – Metin (1106-1133 / 1695-1721)*, prepared by Mehmet Topal, (Ankara: TÜBA, 2018): 1033 and 1044.

⁷⁵⁰See *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, 821, and 830.

⁷⁵¹Mehmed İsmet, *Simât-ı cİşmet*, fol. 150a.

⁷⁵²Pieces of information as to Alî b. Abî al-Rijâl and his works can be found in George Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science: From Homer to Omar Khayyam*, vol. I, (Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins Company, 1962): 715-716; Carl Brockelmann, *History of the Arabic Written Tradition*, sup. vol. 1, translated by Joep Lameer, (Leiden: Brill, 2017): 408-409; Muammer Dizer, “Alî b. Ebü’r-Ricâl,” *TDVIA*, vol. 2, (İstanbul: TDV, 1989): 387-388; and Fuat Sezgin, *Geschichte Des Arabischen Schrifttums*, vol. VII, (Leiden: Brill, 1979): 186-188.

⁷⁵³*Simât-ı cİşmet*, fol. 150a and 151b. For the significant place of *Mishkât al-Maşâbih* in hadith literature see İbrahim Hatiboğlu, “Mesâbihu’s-Sunne,” *TDVIA*, vol. 29, 259-260.

records indicate that two of them were completed during the same year, one in 1716 [1138], the other on 28 March 1716/4 Rabī^c al-Ākhir 1128, and the remaining one during the last third of Ramaḍān 1134/4-14 June 1722.⁷⁵⁴

The relationship between La‘līzāde Abdūlbākī and Mehmed İsmet, however, cannot be confined to an ordinary liaison of patronage. As discussed at the beginning of this chapter, there is a possibility that the former taught the latter the principles and observances of the Bayrami order. One may also extend the scope of their relationship by identifying La‘līzāde as one of the tutors from whom Mehmed İsmet received his astronomy and astrology education. Despite vagueness in these points, there is certainty that the two maintained their relationship until the last years of their lives. Indications of this are Mehmed İsmet’s daily notes penned on the relevant dates with references to La‘līzāde. For instance, he wrote on 8 March 1737/6 Dhī^l-qa^cda 1149 that La‘līzāde became the qadi of Istanbul.⁷⁵⁵ The best examples of the daily notes, in this regard, pertain to reciprocal visits and traffic taking place between the two at different times, a clear indication of a close friendship and intimate relationship. We know, for example, that La‘līzāde visited Mehmed İsmet on 31 October 1736/25 Jumād al-Ākhir 1149.⁷⁵⁶ Despite this single note as to La‘līzāde’s visit, there are several notes demonstrating that Mehmed İsmet paid visits to La‘līzāde particularly after the latter settled in the Eyup district. Interestingly enough, before moving to Eyup, Mehmed İsmet wrote that he visited La‘līzāde twice.⁷⁵⁷ After La‘līzāde’s move to Eyup on 6 October 1740 [15 Rajab 1153],⁷⁵⁸ however, it seems that Mehmed İsmet frequently visited him during the remaining part of the year. We are told, for instance, that he visited La‘līzāde in Eyup on 22 December/8 Shawwāl, 8 February/22 Dhī^l-qa^cda and 8 March/20 Dhī^l-hijja in 1153/1740-41. From one of the notes we understand that the visit to La‘līzāde might have coincided with the visit to the tomb of Şeyh Murād Bukhârî, situated in Nişânca, on the road to Eyup.⁷⁵⁹ In other words, he might have scheduled for the same day two visits when heading for Eyup. With these unilateral or reciprocal visits, it is apparent that the relationship between the two figures was intimate and more than a mere patron-client and tutor-pupil relationship.

⁷⁵⁴ *Simât-ı c’İsmet*, fol. 150a and 151b.

⁷⁵⁵ “La‘līzāde es-Seyyid ‘Abdūlbākī Efendi İstanbul Kāḍīsı oldu.” *Takvīm-i Sāl-i 1148-1149*, fol. 12b.

⁷⁵⁶ “Āmadan-i Bākī Efendi.” *Takvīm-i Sāl-i 1148-1149*, fol. 9a.

⁷⁵⁷ These visits took place on 9 June 1732/15 Dhī^l-hijja 1144 and 6 September 1740/14 Jumād al-Ākhir 1153. See respectively *Takvīm-i Sāl-i 1144-1145*, fol. 4a; and *Takvīm-i Sāl-i 1152-1153*, fol. 7a.

⁷⁵⁸ “Bākī Efendi Eyüb’e naql eyledi.” *Takvīm-i Sāl-i 1152-1153*, fol. 8a.

⁷⁵⁹ See for instance, “La‘līzāde Efendi. Ba^cdehū Şeyh Efendi türbesine varıldı.” *Takvīm-i Sāl-i 1152-1153*, fol. 12a.

6.2.4 Patronage During the Grand Vizierate of Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha (1718-1730)

During the grand vizierate of Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha (v. 1718-1730), following in the footsteps of their predecessors, the statesmen of the time sustained the existing networks of protection and the conventional patronage system, which encouraged the poets, artists and scholars to produce scholarly and artistic works and masterpieces.⁷⁶⁰ Unlike the previous periods, however, it is likely that, during this period in particular, fresh blood was injected into the incentivization of translations from Arabic and Persian to Ottoman Turkish. Mehmed İsmet's works at hand testify that he began to submit not only translations, but also duplications and original compilations to the celebrated statesmen from 1718 to 1730.

6.2.4.1 Hâşimzâde Seyyid Mehmed Efendi: another Melami friend

After La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî's fall from grace, Mehmed İsmet's quest for a new patron did not last long; a new door opened for him two years later in 1130/1718, when Hâşimzâde Seyyid Mehmed Emîn Efendi (d. 1738-39) ordered a copy of *al-Shifâ* of Qâdî 'Iyâz (d. 1149) and *Mashâriq al-Anwâr al-Nabawiyya* of Hasan al-Saghânî (d. 1252).⁷⁶¹ From the completion record of *al-Shifâ* it is understood that it was completed on 13 Jumâd al-Âkhir 1130/14 May 1718.⁷⁶² What is remarkable within this context is that despite the disappearance of *al-Shifâ*'s copy replicated by Mehmed İsmet, we know for sure that he recopied this text for Hâşimzâde Mehmed Emîn Efendi, because the completion records of many of his works are entered in the collection. The accomplishment date of *Mashâriq al-Anwâr al-Nabawiyya*, however,

⁷⁶⁰The period coinciding with the grand vizierate of Nevşehirli Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha had long been identified as the "Tulip Age" in the literature. For criticism towards this legendary periodization through rewriting and rereading the time period in question see Tülay Artan, Tülay Artan, "18. yüzyıl başlarında yönetici elitin saltanatın meşruiyet arayışına katılımı," *Toplum ve Bilim* 83 (1999/2000): 292-322; Can Erimtan, "The Perception of Saadabad: The 'Tulip Age' and Ottoman-Safavid Rivalry," in *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Dana Sajdi, (London&New York: I.B. Tauris, 2007): 41-62; Selim Karahasanoğlu, "A Tulip Age Legend: Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in the Ottoman Empire (1718-1730)," Unpublished PhD Diss., (Binghamton University State University of New York, 2009): 1-37; idem, "Osmanlı Tarihyazımında 'Lale Devri': Eleştirel Bir Değerlendirme," *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar* I/7 (2008): 129-144; idem, "İstanbul'un Lale Devri mi?: Tarih ve Tarih Yazımı," in *Masaldan Gerçeğe Lale Devri*, ed. Mustafa Armağan, (İstanbul: TİMAŞ, 2014): 57-106. See also Feridun Emecen, "Matruşka'nın Küçük Parçası: Nevşehirli Damat İbrahim Paşa Dönemi ve 'Lale Devri' Meselesi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları/The Journal of Ottoman Studies* 52 (2018): 79-98.

⁷⁶¹For an introduction on the authors and their books see M. Yaşar Kandemir, "Kâdî İyâz," *TDVIA*, vol. 24, 116-118; idem, "eş-Şifâ," *TDVIA*, vol. 39, (İstanbul: TDV, 2010): 134-138; Mehmet Görmez, "Sâgânî, Radiyyüddin," *TDVIA*, vol. 35, (İstanbul: TDV, 2008): 487-489; İbrahim Hatipoğlu, "Meşâriku'l-Envâri'n-Nebeviyye," *TDVIA*, vol. 29, 361-362.

⁷⁶²Mehmed İsmet, *Simâ-ı cİşmet*, Veliyyüddin, no. 3191, fol. 149b.

was Friday 4, November 1718/10 Dhī^l-ḥijja 1130, the first day of the *eid al-adha*.⁷⁶³ Who was Mehmed Emîn Efendi? What do we know about his and Hâşim Mehmed's presence in Naqshbandi circles? Our sources reveal that Seyyid Hâşim Mehmed (d. 1677), who originated from Bursa was able to advance in his career under the favor of *Nakîbüleşrâf* Kudsîzâde Şeyh Mehmed Efendi (d. 1674) as a result of his acquaintance with him during his service as the qadi of Bursa from May to December 1644. By dint of his allegiance to the Mehmed Efendi's household, Hâşim Mehmed secured an appointment as *müderris* to the İvâz Efendi Medresesi in 1657, the year Kudsîzâde Şeyh Mehmed Efendi was appointed *nakîbüleşrâf*. During Kudsîzâde Mehmed's eighteen years in office, Hâşim Mehmed had been hired in many madrasas, and at the same time served Kudsîzâde as a secretary.⁷⁶⁴

When it comes to Hâşim Mehmed's son, Seyyid Mehmed Emîn, the introductory notes as to his career unequivocally attest Hâşimzâdes' consolidated presence in the Ottoman *ilmiyye* bureaucracy. Born and raised in Istanbul, Seyyid Mehmed Emîn probably benefited from his father's connections in his academic and juristic career. Taking into consideration remarks strewn about in *Vekâyi'ü'l-Fudalâ*, one can infer that the first position he received as a madrasa professor was that of lecturer in 1114/1702 in the Dersiyye-i Abdülhalim Medresesi, a madrasa of *ibtidâ-yı hâric* rank. His removal on 6 April 1708/15 Muḥarram 1120 from the madrasa of Ahmed Paşa, a madrasa of *hareket-i dâhil* rank, demonstrates that he climbed the first four ranks of the madrasa hierarchy within six years. Considering that after completing his service in the madrasas of Şeyhülislam Yahya Efendi (*ibtidâ-yı hâric*) on 9 November 1712/9 Shawwâl 1124, and Siyâvuş Paşa in November 1714/ Dhī^l-qa^cda 1126, and appointed as the qadi of Diyarbekir in February 1715/Şafar 1127, it becomes evident that instead of continuing in the madrasa system, he shifted to jurisdiction. However, he stayed in the position for a full year but was dismissed on 24 February 1716/1 Rabī^c al-Awwal 1128. For the second appointment to the qadiate of another, city he had to wait until 17 August 1719/1 Shawwâl 1131, the day he was inducted to Baghdad. It seems that it was during this interlude that he requested from Mehmed İsmet the copies *al-Shifâ* and *Mashâriq al-Anwâr*, a clear indication that he felt obliged to satisfy his personal desires as a patron of scholarly

⁷⁶³“Tamâm âmad Mashâriq rûz-i Jum^a ... barâ-yi rasm-i Mavlânâ Mehmed walîd-i ḥazrat-i Hâşim Mehmed hazâr u şad u sî rafta zi-hicrat be-rûz-i ‘id-i adḥâ yâft” *Mashâriqü Anwâr mina’l-Ḥadîth*, Süleymaniye, no. 324, fol. 182a. It is worthy of attention that Mehmed İsmet prepared another completion record in Arabic for this work, but it seems that he renounced to utilize it. The record in question is as follows: “tamma ‘alâ yad al-‘abd al-faqîr Mehmed ‘İşmet al-haqîr aslahallâhu aḥwâluhû fî al-dârayn wa huwa ‘alâ kulli shay³in Qadîr yawm al-nahâr fî shahr al-Zî^l-ḥijjat al-ḥarâm li-sana thalâthîn wa mi³a wa alf.” See Mehmed İsmet, *Simât-ı ‘İşmet*, fol. 149b.

⁷⁶⁴For more about the biographies of Kudsîzâde Şeyh Mehmed and Seyyid Hâşim Mehmed see respectively see in Şeyhî Mehmed Efendi, *Vekâyi’ü'l-Fuzalâ: Şeyhî’nin Şakâ’ik Zeyli*, vol. 2, 1072-1077, and 1123-1126. For Hâşim Mehmed see also Müstakîmzâde, *Tuhfe-i Ḥattâ’in*, 721-722.

works. Further notes pertaining to Seyyid Mehmed Emîn displays that he fulfilled the qadiate in at least three more cities apart from Diyarbekir and Baghdad. For instance, we know that he lost his office in Filibe on 1 July 1726/1 Dhī^l-qa^cda 1138; he was appointed on 17 October 1727/1 Rabī^c al-Awwal to Kütahya, where he served for a full year;⁷⁶⁵ and he was in service in Damascus, where he passed away in 1151/1738-1739.⁷⁶⁶

At this point, we should remember the significant number of *seyyids* buried in or around the extramural hazîre of the Emîr Bukhârî Tekkesi near Edirnekapi and the Kudsîzâde family's supervision of the charitable foundations of the Emîr Bukhârî lodges, which were discussed in the third chapter. These details, and the favor that the esteemed *nakîbüleşrâf* Kudsîzâde Şeyh Mehmed Efendi displayed for Hâşimzâdes, Mehmed İsmet's connections with *seyyids* and seyyid families who established strong links with the Naqshbandis deserve further attention. For the moment, though, we are in a secure position to claim that Mehmed İsmet perpetuated his relations with the Hâşimzâde family, who charged him with the duty of copying *al-Shifâ* and *Mashâriq al-Anwâr* in 1718. Because of this reason, when he heard about the death of Hâşimzâde Mehmed Emîn in 1151/1738-1739, he penned a chronogram to mark the year of his death.⁷⁶⁷

6.2.4.2 Şeyhülislam Yenişehirli Abdullâh Efendi: scholarly patronage in salons

The grand vizierial period of Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha is celebrated not only for its powerful political figures in state administration but, also for influential men of knowledge from among the members of the *ulema*. The most respected of this group, perhaps, was the *şeyhülislam* Yenişehirli Abdullâh Efendi (d. 1743), the head of *ulema* bureaucracy who managed to hold the office from 1718 to 1730. Such a long duration in office, might have resulted in a particular patronage system which would enable novices to be introduced to the official *ulema* hierarchy or provide scholars with an opportunity in their scholarly productions. When it comes to the former possibility, due to the absence of an *ulema* biography reporting the careers of the members of *ulema* whose death coincided with the post-1731 period, the year Şeyhî Mehmed Efendi completed the penning of his *Vekâyi'u'l-Fudalâ*, we

⁷⁶⁵The biographical notes as to Seyyid Mehmed Emîn's career can be extracted from *Vekâyi'u'l-Fuzalâ*, vol. 3, 2806; and vol. 4. 2943, 3029, 3041, 3183, 3200, 3209, 3243, 3388, 3389, and 3404.

⁷⁶⁶Müstakîmzâde, *Tuhfe-i Haṭṭâṭîn*, 722; Fındıklılı İsmet Efendi, *Tekmiletü's-Şakaik fî Hakk-ı Ehli'l-Hakaik*, 153-154.

⁷⁶⁷*Tuhfe-i Haṭṭâṭîn*, 722; and *Tekmiletü's-Şakaik*, 154.

know very little about candidates introduced to the system by Yenişehirli Abdullâh Efendi during his long career.⁷⁶⁸ As to Yenişehirli Abdullâh Efendi's auspices for scholarly activities, however, we are in a better position because of the growing literature on the period. Perhaps the best-known example in this regard is his fatwa, which discusses the importance of the art of printing (*başma şan'atı*) in duplicate production of books in a short span of time (*zemân-ı kalilde bilâ-meşakka nusah-ı kesire hâşıl olup*), justifying İbrâhîm Müteferrika's (d. 1747) enterprise in printing technology.⁷⁶⁹ But what do we know about the relationship between the *şeyhülislam* and Mehmed İsmet Efendi? As I mentioned above, upon the request of Yenişehirli Abdullâh Efendi, Mehmed İsmet successfully completed a commentary titled *Şerh-i Ğazel-i Şâ'ib* on Sâ'ib-i Tebrîzî's Persian ode on 12 Rabî' al-Âkhir 1135/20 January 1723. The preface of the commentary indicates that Mehmed İsmet attempted to compose the commentary as a contribution to the discussions on Sâ'ib-i Tebrîzî's Dîvân in the intellectual salon of the *şeyhülislam*.⁷⁷⁰ This explanation points on the one hand to the scholarly gatherings at the *şeyhülislam*'s mansion, demonstrating his encouragement and support for the commentary of poetic texts from Persian to Turkish on the other hand. It is likely that the *şeyhülislam* requested commentaries on Sâ'ib's poems from scholars who regularly attended the sessions. This is an explicit indication of Abdullâh Efendi's literary patronage, given Mehmed İsmet's statement that he was honored by being admitted to the *şeyhülislam*'s lofty gathering-place (*maḥfil-i 'âlîlerine vüşul ile şeref-i tām*).⁷⁷¹ Nevertheless, if the *şeyhülislam* had his protégés prepare an overall commentary of Sâ'ib's Dîvân, the composition still remains mystery. Although we cannot trace the continuity in the patron-client relationship between Yenişehirli Abdullâh Efendi and Mehmed İsmet in subsequent years due to scant primary sources, Mehmed İsmet's daily notes do, however, tell us that he concerned about his former patron's circumstance in exile. Thus, a few unknown, significant points as to the dismissed *şeyhülislam* come to

⁷⁶⁸An exceptional scholar, in this regard, is Fetvâ Emîni Mehmed Fikhî Efendi. See Osman Şahin, "Fetvâ Emîni Mehmed Fikhî Efendi'nin (1147/1735) Hayatı ve Eserleri," *Diyanet İlmî Dergi* 3/44 (2008): 129-142. Şeyhî was able, for example, to identify at least 81 figures who received the status of mü'lâzım from Minkârîzâde Yahyâ Efendi who had hold the office of şeyhülislâm from 1662 to 1674. See Özgün Deniz Yoldaşlar, "Minkârîzâde Yahya and the Ottoman Scholarly Bureaucracy in the Seventeenth Century," 253-254.

⁷⁶⁹For the copy of the fatwa see Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. IV/2, 514. See also, Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. 4/1, 160; Mehmet İpşirli, "Lale Devri'nde Yenilikçi Bir Âlim: Şeyhülislam Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi," in *İstanbul Armağanı: Lâle Devri*, vol. 4, ed. Mustafa Armağan, (İstanbul: İBB Kültür Yayınları, 2000): 251; and Orlin Sabev, *İbrahim Müteferrika ya da İlk Osmanlı Matbaa Serüveni (1726-1746)*, (İstanbul: Yeditepe, 2006): 137; Vefa Erginbaş, "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: İbrahim Müteferrika and His Intellectual Landscape," in *Historical Aspects of Printing and Publishing in Languages of the Middle East*, ed. Geoffrey Roper, (Leiden: Brill, 2014): 83.

⁷⁷⁰"Dîvân-ı belâgat-ı unvânları müzâkeresi münâsebetiyle ba'z kelimâtına şerh-güne bir maḳâle taḥrîrine cesâret" Mehmed İsmet, *Şerh-i Ğazel-i Şâ'ib*, Veliyüddin Efendi no. 3249, fol. 113b.

⁷⁷¹*Şerh-i Ğazel-i Şâ'ib*, fol. 113b.

light. It is known that the 1730 Rebellion resulted in the *şeyhülislam* being sent into exile in Gelibolu in September 1730. By issuance of an edict in Ramađān 1144/ March 1132, he was ordered to perform the haj, and after this religious duty, to conduct the judgeship of Medina for a full year, 1145/24 June 1732 – 13 June 1733, and afterwards to reside in his waterfront residence in Kanlıca.⁷⁷² An edict dated on 15 Rabī^c al-Ākhir 1146/25 September 1733, however, indicates that after the completion of his service in Medina, Abdullāh Efendi was given another command during his stay in Damascus: to reside in Manisa, his benefice (*arपालk*).⁷⁷³ Mehmed İsmet’s daily note as to this appointment confirms that Yenişehirli Abdullāh, after his service in Medina, rather than going directly to his residence in Kanlıca, was ordered to stay in Damascus, where he would receive another order that led him to Manisa.⁷⁷⁴ Another significant note typed on 11 Rajab 1153 [2 October 1740] proves that the former *şeyhülislam*’s years in exile of came to an end in Gelibolu, for he was eventually forgiven during these days.⁷⁷⁵ Accordingly, we can assert that after spending ten years in exile, Yenişehirli Abdullāh Efendi was finally allowed to dwell in his residence in Kanlıca three years before his death.⁷⁷⁶

6.2.4.3 Şeyhülislam Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullāh Efendi: Melami patronage

Another celebrated scholar-bureaucrat to whom Mehmed İsmet offered a scholarly composition was Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullāh Efendi (d. 1732). Being the son of the former şeyhülislām, Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Alī Efendi (d. 1712), and a member of one of the great *ulema* families in control of the Ottoman ilmiye bureaucracy during the 18th century,⁷⁷⁷ Paşmakçızâde Abdullāh was successfully promoted in the official hierarchy as a result of his family’s powerful connections to the *ulema* establishment. The existing material demonstrates that it was during the second

⁷⁷²For the edict see BOA, AE.SMHD.I., 258/21056. For a few details regarding Yenişehirli Abdullāh Efendi’s under-studied biography see Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. IV/2, 466-467; Mehmet İpşirli, “Abdullah Efendi, Yenişehirli,” *TDVIA*, vol. 1, 100-101; and Muhammed Kara, “Lale Devrinde Şeyhülislamlık ve Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi,” Unpublished MA Thesis, (Balıkesir Üniversitesi, 2017): 41-48.

⁷⁷³BOA, AE.SMHD.I., 258/21067; Kara, *ibid*, 46.

⁷⁷⁴The note was penned on 18 Rabī^c al-Ākhir 1146/28 September 1733: “Şeyhülislām-ı esbak ʿAbdullāh Efendi Şām’da meks fermān olunmuşken bā-ḥaṭṭ-ı hümayūn arपालığı olan Magnisa’ya gelmek üzere mektüb gidüp” *Takvīm-i Sāl-i 1145-1146*, fol. 8a.

⁷⁷⁵“Geliboli’da menfi olan şeyhülislām-ı esbak ʿAbdullāh Efendi ʿafv ve iṭlāk olundu.” *Takvīm-i Sāl-i 1152-1153*, Kandilli Rasathanesi no. T33, fol. 7b.

⁷⁷⁶According to Uzunçarşılı, he was allowed in 1155/1742 to live in his waterfront residence in Kanlıca. See *ibid*, 467.

⁷⁷⁷For more about the leading *ulema* families in this period, see particularly in Madeline Zilfi, *The Politics of Piety*, 43-80; and “Elite Circulation in the Ottoman Empire: Great Mollas of the Eighteenth Century,” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 26/3 (1983): 318-364.

term of Paşmakçızâde Abdullâh's chief judgeship of Rumelia from Shawwâl 1141 to Rabîc al-Awwal 1142/May 1729-October 1730 that Mehmed İsmet attempted to obtain his patronage.⁷⁷⁸ This happened, as I mentioned above, through his submission to Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullâh Efendi a commentary bearing the title *Rifd al-Nadr ʿalâ ʿAqâʿid al-Khidr*, a text on Hızır Bey's *Kaşide-i Nûniyye*. The earliest known copy of the text makes it clear that it was completed by Mehmed İsmet in 1142/1729-30, when his patron was the chief judge of Rumelia.⁷⁷⁹ The second copy, however, bears 1144/1731-32 as the date of completion, which falls during the patron's tenure in the şeyhülislamate.⁷⁸⁰ Given that both copies were penned by Mehmed İsmet and dedicated to the şeyhülislam (*alâ wa huwa bi'l-warâthat muza-yyan masnad al-fatwâ*), we can conclude that he brought the text into existence while Paşmakçızâde held the chief judgeship of Rumelia, but was able to present the completed copy after his patron's appointment to the office of the şeyhülislam. Given that the preface of the text had been changed by the author at least twice within three years, one may claim that his initial intention was to submit it to the previous şeyhülislam, Yenişehirli Abdullâh Efendi, who lost the office after the breakout of the 1730 Rebellion. However, Mehmed İsmet's short note in the colophon of Veliyyüddin no. 3249 manuscript proves that he submitted it to Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullâh Efendi (*Paşmakçızâde es-Seyyid ʿAbdullâh ibn es-Seyyid ʿAlî Efendi'ye virilmiştir*). Furthermore, considering his longer eulogistic expressions about the sublime and immaculate lineage of the şeyhülislam, we conclude that it was Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullâh Efendi to whom he dedicated his commentary, since *seyyids* were particularly venerated as descendants of Prophet Muhammad.⁷⁸¹

From Mehmed İsmet's existing notes jotted down here and there, one can infer that his close connections with Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullâh Efendi might not have been confined to the intellectual relations that developed between them. In addition, significant daily events pertaining not only to Seyyid Abdullâh Efendi but also other members of the Paşmakçızâde family engaged his attention. A Persian chronogram concerning Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Alî Efendi's appointment to the şeyhülislamate for the second time in 1124/1712 is a good example in this regard.⁷⁸² The second

⁷⁷⁸For more on Paşmakçızâde Abdullâh's biography see Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. IV/2, 468-469; İpşirli, "Paşmakçızâde Abdullah Efendi," *TDVIA*, vol. 34, 185.

⁷⁷⁹"tamma bi-ʿawnihi ʿâma ithnayn wa arbaʿin wa miʿa wa alf" *Rifd al-Nadr ʿalâ ʿAqâʿid al-Khidr*, Veliyyüddin, no. 3249, fol. 26b.

⁷⁸⁰"tamma bi-ʿawnihi taʿalâ ʿâma arbaʿa wa arbaʿin wa miʿa wa alf" *Şerh-i Nûniyye*, Reşid Efendi no. 328, fol. 23a.

⁷⁸¹See Veliyyüddin Efendi no. 3249, fol. 2a; and Reşid Efendi no. 328, fol. 2a.

⁷⁸²For the chronogram see *Simât-ı ʿİşmet*, Veliyyüddin Efendi no. 3191, fol. 175b. For more on the life and

note, on the other hand, was penned upon the death of his patron Paşmakçızâde Abdullâh in Konya on 26 Jumâd al-Âkhir 1145/14 December 1732.⁷⁸³ Taking into consideration these specific examples, we maintain that the close links between the Paşmakçızâde family and Mehmed İsmet might have already become stronger by the beginning of the 18th century, while senior member, Seyyid Alî Efendi, was still alive. This relationship must have continued at least until the years following Seyyid Abdullâh's death.

6.2.4.4 Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha: the two faces of the courtly patronage

Being eager for favor and financial support of high-ranking officials of the time, it would be inconceivable for Mehmed İsmet to not curry favor from the then puissant grand vizier, Dâmâd İbrâhîm, Pasha who was known for his beneficence for the scholars and scholarly activities as grand vizier.⁷⁸⁴ As an indication of this predicament, Mehmed İsmet appealed several times to the grand vizier to be incorporated into his circle of favoritism. To recall what we have already stated in this context, we should remember Mehmed İsmet's pamphlet, *Risâle-i Tedâhul*, as to the leap year problem in the Ottoman finance office and treasury, and his two laudatory eulogies (*Şulhîyye and Nevrûziyye*), the contents of which have been discussed. Thus, we are in a position to conclude that he submitted his *Şulhîyye* upon the assent of the Peace Treaty of Passarowitz (1718), and his *Nevrûziyye* together with the *Risâle* on 21 March 1726. Furthermore, we know for sure that he was employed in the commission formed in 1138/1725 to translate from Arabic into Turkish Badr *al-Dîn al-'Aynî's* *‘Iqd al-Jumân fî Târîh ahl-i Zamân*. In addition to these works, it is certain that he showered the grand vizier with a compilation of eloquent quotes and short counsels articulated by the Prophet Muhammad, saints, and erudite scholars. The compilation comprising archaic Arabic sayings is entitled *Simta al-Durar* (literally meaning the necklace/chain of pearls). However, its apophthegmatists are unspecified individually. Despite the uncertainty in the text's date of completion, we may speculate that it was presented to the grand vizier during the mid-1720s,

career of Paşmakçızâde Seyyid ‘Ali Efendi see Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. IV/2, 455-457, 459; and İpşirli, “Paşmakçızâde Ali Efendi,” *TDVIA*, vol. 7, 185-186.

⁷⁸³“Yine şehr-i mezbûruñ yigirmi altıncı günü Paşmakçızâde es-Seyyid ‘Abdullâh Efendi Şâm’dan Konya’ya geldiklerinde vefât eyledi.” *Zâyiçe-i Tâli‘e-i Sâl 1144-1145*, no. T26, fol. 9b.

⁷⁸⁴On Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha's patronage see Ünal Araç, *İktidar ve Sanat: Damat İbrahim Paşa'nın Hamiliği (1718-1730)*, (İstanbul: Vakıfbank Kültür Yayınları, 2022). See also, Sevda Önal Kılıç, “Edebiyat Patronajı Açısından Damat İbrahim Paşa Dönemine Dair Genel Bir Değerlendirme,” *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi* 61 (2018): 3-14; Tuba Işımsu Durmuş, “Divanlarda Kendilerine Sunulan Övgü Şiirleri Üzerinden Osmanlı Sanatına Katkı Sunan Aileler Üzerine Tespitler,” 202-205.

given that Mehmed İsmet presented at least three separate compositions to him during the years 1725 and 1726.⁷⁸⁵

To continue in this vein, few words should be expressed about Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha's patronage for scholars, scholarly works and cultural endeavors including printing and poetry. Insofar as the establishment of printing technology for the benefit of Muslim and Turkish-speaking readership particularly in Istanbul, the favorable role not only of the sultan and the grand vizier, but also of the *şeyhülislam* and leading scholar-bureaucrats must be emphasized. Therefore, of the printed copies of each book published prior to the 1730 Rebellion should be attributed to collaborative planning and execution rather than a single individual.⁷⁸⁶ Yet, the protection for the poets and promotions for the poetry might had direct links to the goût, aesthetic pleasure and passionate desire of the patron who wanted to display his generosity during his years in the office for serve as his legacy even after his death. Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha is among those who achieved these basic goals consequently for the favor bestowed on poets during his years in government. As is mentioned above, out of 256 eulogies recorded in the *Mecmû'a* compiled by Fâiz Efendi and Şâkir Bey 242 were submitted to Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha.⁷⁸⁷ In a recently published study which has not utilized this significant primary source, but rather the *Dīvāns* of the period in question, the author nevertheless rightly demonstrates that the grand vizier was by far the most celebrated throughout the period stretching from the beginning of the 15th century to the end of his grand vizierat—the 109 eulogies submitted to him by the leading poets of the time suggest this.⁷⁸⁸ However, Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha's patronage cannot be confined to his promotions for the composition of poetry, either. Owing to studies carried out on the limits of his continued support for scholarly compositions, we are in a better position to understand his substantial contribution as a benefactor of new compositions and translations of lucubratory works, particularly during 1720s. For instance, he initiated the formation of at least four translation committees obliged to translate Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede's *Jâmi'*

⁷⁸⁵For the compilation see Mehmed İsmet, *Simta al-Durar*, Veliyyüddin no. 3249, fol. 51b-58a.

⁷⁸⁶The books published by İbrâhîm Müteferrika's printing press before the breakout of the rebellion were *Vânkulu Luğati* (1729), *Tuḥfetü'l-Kübâr fi Esfâri'l-Bihâr* (1729), *Târîḫ-i Seyyâh* (1729), *Gülşen-i Hulefâ* (1730), *Târîḫ-i Tîmûr-i Gurkân* (1730), *Târîḫü'l-Mıṣrı'l-Ḳadîm* (1730), *Târîḫü'l-Mıṣrı'l-Cedîd* (1730), *Târîḫ-i Hind-i Ğarbî* (1730), and *Grammaire Turquie*. See Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. 4/I, 158-162; idem, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. 4/II, 514-515; Orlin Sabev, *İbrahim Müteferrika ya da İlk Osmanlı Matbaa Serüveni*, 182-204; idem "The First Ottoman Turkish Printing Enterprise: Success of Failure?," *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Dana Sajdi, (London&New York: I.B. Tauris, 2007): 70.

⁷⁸⁷See above footnote 663.

⁷⁸⁸See Tuba İşınsu Durmuş, "Divanlarda Kendilerine Sunulan Övgü Şiirleri Üzerinden Osmanlı Sanatına Katkı Sunan Aileler Üzerine Tespitler," 203-204, and 209. It is conceivable that the total number of the eulogies submitted to Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha were much more than those appeared in the *dīvāns* and the *Mecmû'a* in question.

al-Duwal or Şahāyif al-Akhbār (1720-1730), Aristotle's *Physics* (1721-?), Badr al-Dîn al-'Aynî's *‘Iqd al-Jumān fî Tārîḫ ahl-i Zamān* (1725-1726), and Khwāndamîr's *Ḥabîb al-Siyar* (1725-1726).⁷⁸⁹

A fifth committee possibly, was formed for the translation of Ibn Khaldûn's *Muqaddima* from Arabic to Turkish. In the preface of his incomplete translation submitted to the newly enthroned Mahmûd I soon after his accession on 2 October 1730, the translator Pîrîzâde Mehmed Sâhib (d. 1749) states that he commenced the translation five years earlier in 1138/1725-1726, but could only complete two thirds of the text.⁷⁹⁰ What does Pîrîzâde's hastily submission of a text that could not be translated over the course of five years hint at when remembering Dâmâd İbrâhîm's incentives for scholarly production? Pîrîzâde justifies his sudden decision in submitting an unfinished translation by referring to the new sultan's "innate favor for the essence of the knowledge and perfection, and benevolence for the substance of the wisdom."⁷⁹¹ The main reasons behind Pîrîzâde's sudden present, however, might be related to the tragic end of Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha and Pîrîzâde's further expectations from the new government under the new sultan. Mehmed İsmet's eyewitness testimony, informs us that it was Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha who had *Muqaddima* translated.⁷⁹² Mehmed İsmet's definitive statement that the grand vizier had Müneccimbaşı's *Şahāyif al-Akhbār*, Ibn Khaldûn's *Muqaddima*, Khwāndamîr's *Ḥabîb al-Siyar*, and al-'Aynî's *‘Iqd al-Jumān* translated,⁷⁹³ clarifies that a committee was also formed for the translation of *Muqaddima*. Nonetheless, since there appears equally strong evidence that not only Pîrîzâde but also Nedîm delayed the translations entrusted to them by the grand vizier, further studies are needed for clarifying

⁷⁸⁹ Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, vol. 4/I, 152-155; İpşirli, "Lale Devrinde Teşkil Edilen Tercüme Heyetine Dair Bazı Gözlemler," 33-42; Aydıöz, "Lale Devri'nde Yapılan İlmî Faaliyetler," *DİVAN* 3 (1997): 147-159. The formation of a translation committee for Aristotle's *Physics* has escaped İpşirli's notice. According to Uzunçarşılı and Aydıöz, it was the celebrated poet of the time Nedîm rather than a commission who translated Ahmed Dede's compendium from Arabic to Turkish in ten years. See Uzunçarşılı, *ibid*, 154-155, and Aydıöz, *ibid*, 148-150.

⁷⁹⁰ Pîrîzâde Mehmed Sâhib, *Tercüme-i Mukaddime-i İbn Haldûn*, ed. Yavuz Yıldırım, Sami Erdem, Halit Özkan, and M. Cüneyt Kaya, vol. I, (İstanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2015): 73. For the facsimile edition of the text see İbn-i Haldun, *Mukaddime-i İbn-i Haldun Tercümesi*, ed. Yusuf Turan Günaydın, (Ankara: Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü, 2016). See also Tahsin Özcan, "Pîrîzâde Mehmed Sâhib Efendi," *TDVIA*, vol. 34, 288-290.

⁷⁹¹ "fiṭrat-ı selîmelerinde cevher-i ‘ilm ü kemâle rağbet ve tervîc-i metâ‘-ı ‘irfâna himmet merkûz olmaḳla" *Tercüme-i Mukaddime-i İbn Haldûn*, 73-74.

⁷⁹² *Risâle-i Tedâhül*, fol. 126b. The earliest reference with regard to the grand vizier's patronage for the translation of *Muqaddima* was made by Aydıöz. See the 87th footnote in "İsmet Mehmed Efendi (ö. 1747) ve Tedâhül-i Seneye Dair Risâlesi". Yavuz Yıldırım, in the absence of the primary sources, has accurately explained Pîrîzâde's translation within context of the "translation movement" of the period, without speculating about the grand vizier's possible role in it. See "Mukaddime'nin Osmanlı Dönemi Türkçe Tercümesi," *DİVAN* 21 (2006): 18-19. This article has been revised and republished in the introduction of *Tercüme-i Mukaddime-i İbn Haldûn*, 25-54.

⁷⁹³ *Risâle-i Tedâhül*, fol. 126b-127a; Aydıöz, 243-244.

ambiguities in this regard. Before ending this short reminder with respect to Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha's scholarly patronage, it must be stated that his sponsorship was offered not only to the committees, but also to renowned figures in charge of translating books from Arabic, Persian or Western languages into Turkish, or to the individuals who voluntarily attempted to submit a translated book or newly composed text to the grand vizier.⁷⁹⁴

Even though Mehmed İsmet submitted at least two eulogies to the grand vizier (1718, 1726), a pamphlet (1726), a translated chapter from *ʿIqd al-Jumân* (1725-1726) and an Arabic compilation of eloquent quotes, we are unsure whether he managed to guarantee his financial support and protection during the years following 1726. In fact, as I have discussed, the existing documentation shows that since his requests were not granted by the grand vizier, he consulted the tutelage of İzzet Alî Pasha, who enabled his appointment to a *hâriç* rank madrasa as a professor. Furthermore, it is likely that alienation and political apathy emerged between him and the grand vizier's circle in the process leading up to the 1730 rebellion. It had to be because of this main reason that he followed the revolt and its aftermath, with the exception of a few daily notes, unperturbably and inexpressively. In the first note penned on 15 Rabîʿ al-Awwal 1143/28 September 1730, he writes that a popular uprising broke out against the grand vizier and his associates in Istanbul (*ğuluvv-i ʿâmm dar-İstanbul barâ-yi şadr-i aʿzam İbrâhîm Paşa va atbâʿash*). Four days later, on 19 Rabîʿ al-Awwal/2 October, he reports that Sultân Mahmûd ascended to the throne upon Sultân Ahmed's abdication (*julûs-i Sultân Maḥmûd Ḥan baʿd qaşr-i yad-i Sultân Aḥmed Ḥan*). In a longer but undated note summarizing the results of the insurrection, however, he mentions the dethronement of the sultan, the slaying of the grand vizier, Kaymak Mustafâ Pasha, and Kethüdâ Mehmed Pasha, the dismissal and exile of the *şeyhülislam* and new appointments to high-ranking offices.⁷⁹⁵ His most remarkable note as to the revolt, however, is a belatedly inscribed chronogram marking the Hijri year of the incident (1143). The chronogram pointing to 12-13 Rabîʿ al-Awwal/25-26 September consisted of the very last commanding sentence in the second verse of the Sura al-Hashr and was vertically written down

⁷⁹⁴Many of such scholarly works have been identified and introduced in the literature. See for example Aydüz, "Lâle Devri'nde Yapılan İlmî Faaliyetler," 159-170; Tülay Artan, "El Yazmaları Işığında Bir Çevre ve Çehre Eskizi," 86-88; Sabev, "Lâle Devri İlk Osmanlı Türk Matbaasını Nasıl Etkiledi?," in *Lale Devri'nde Osmanlı Devleti ve Nevşehir*, eds. İlyas Gökhan, Hüseyin Saraç, Gökçe Özcan, (Kayseri: Kömen Yayınları, 2018): 629-632; Sevdâ Önal Kılıç, "Edebiyat Patronajı Açısından Damat İbrahim Paşa Dönemine Dair Genel Bir Değerlendirme," 3-14; and Tuba İşinsu Durmuş, "Divanlarda Kendilerine Sunulan Övgü Şiirleri Üzerinden Osmanlı Sanatına Katkı Sunan Aileler Üzerine Tespitler," 202-205.

⁷⁹⁵"Halʿ-i Sultân Aḥmed Ḥan bā-ğuluvv-i ʿâmm va ʿazl u nafy-i Muftî ʿAbdullâh Efendi va katl-i Vezîr İbrâhîm Pasha va Kapudan Muştafâ Pasha va kethüdâ-yi Vezîr Meḥmed Agha. Mîrzâzâde Şeyḫ Meḥmed Efendi şeyhülislâm shod. Silâhdâr Meḥmed Pasha şadr-i aʿzam shod. ʿİmâdzâde Naḳîbüleşrâf Zülâlî Ḥasan Efendi şadr-i Anadolî va baʿd az-chand rûz Dürri Efendi şadr-i Rûm shodand." For these notes see *Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1142-1143*, fol. 8a.

in the calendar unlike other horizontal notes.⁷⁹⁶ Being that the relevant Quranic verse is read as “So take a lesson (from this), O people of insight!,” we may conclude that Mehmed İsmet interpreted not only the revolt, but also the executions of high-ranking officials, as a warning for Ottoman society. To be more precise, given that he also identified the upheaval as a popular uprising (*guluww-i ʿāmm*), we can assert that he fell in line with the camp of the opponents including the subjects, janissaries and grandies dissatisfied with the state of internal and external affairs under Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha’s authority.⁷⁹⁷ Be that as it may, with regard to the leaders of the rebellion, he did not shy away from denominating them as highlanders, a pejorative word also used by the chronicler Subhî (d. 1769) for identifying the Albanian leaders of the incident.⁷⁹⁸

6.2.4.5 Kethüdâ Mehmed Pasha: a shadowy patronage

Our findings make it clear that the sultan and the grand vizier were not the only dignitaries promoting translations from different languages to Turkish during the 1720s. Taking solely Mehmed İsmet’s rendering into consideration, it comes to light that Kethüdâ Mehmed Pasha (d. 1730), one of the two son-in-law pashas of the grand vizier, attempted to finance scholarly activities during a period when Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha commissioned the translation of several texts into Turkish. The recopying date of the text translated by Mehmed İsmet for Kethüdâ Mehmed Pasha was 1138/1725-1726, the year in which the grand vizier ordered the translations of *ʿIqd al-Jumân*, *Ḥabîb al-Siyar* and *Muqaddima*. Given this reality, we may contend that Kethüdâ Mehmed Pasha was willing to embark upon funding his own scholarly works by patterning himself after the grand vizier. However, there exists equally valid evidence, too, connoting that it was Mehmed İsmet who took the first step in this process. This is so when considering the preface of *Terceme-i Tibyânü’l-Ḥikem*, the book submitted to Kethüdâ Mehmed Pasha, in which we are informed that it had already been translated into Turkish but had not been presented to anyone up to that time. Moreover, we are told that it was a translation of selected topics from

⁷⁹⁶See *Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1142-1143*, fol. 8a.

⁷⁹⁷Münir Aktepe, *Patrona İsyanı: 1730*, (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1958); Tülay Artan, “18. yüzyıl başlarında yönetici elitin saltanatın meşruiyet arayışına katılımı,” *Toplum ve Bilim* 83 (1999/2000): 292-322; Abdülkadir Özcan, “Patrona İsyanı,” *TDVIA*, vol. 34, 189-192.

⁷⁹⁸[14 Jumâd al-Ülâ 1143/25 November 1730]: “Kâtl-i ʿāmm-i Tağîyân dar-Sarây-i Humâyûn. Muhsinzâde Yeniçeri Ağası, Cānım Ḥoca Kaşudan, Pehlîvân Ḥalîl Ağa Kûl Kethüdâsı shodand.” *Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1142-1143*, fol. 10a. For Subhî’s accounts with regard to the rebellion and the elimination of the rebel leaders see Vak’anüvis Subhî Mehmed Efendi, *Subhî Tarihi*, 22-32 and 57-69. Contrary to Mehmed İsmet and Subhî, Abdî uses “highlanders” to denominate Anatolian Turks who participated the rebellion. See “... ve Anadolu cebel Türkü bî-dîn ve bî-mezhepler idi.” in Abdî, *Abdî Tarihi: 1730 Patrona İhtilâli Hakkında Bir Eser*, 36.

one of Aristotle's books which had already been translated into Arabic as *Tibyān al-Ḥikam*.⁷⁹⁹ Considering that the text comprises decades of selected aphorisms or erudite explanations (*ḥikmet*) pertaining to animals (*ḥayvānāt*), plants (*nebatāt*) and waters (*miyāh*), one may think that Aristotle composed a book of aphorisms, which cannot be proved by the literature on Aristotle. Glancing through them, however, we may assert that they were extracted from the Corpus Aristotelicum which discusses topics relating to five categories—logic, physics, metaphysics, ethics and politics, and rhetoric and poetics.⁸⁰⁰ This might be so, because, despite Mehmed İsmet's reference to *Tibyān al-Ḥikam* neither Kâtib Çelebi nor Carl Brockelmann are aware of such a text attributed to Aristotle.⁸⁰¹

6.2.4.6 İzzet Alî Pasha: from pupil to patron

The most esteemed patron in the eyes of Mehmed İsmet, perhaps, was İzzet Alî Pasha (d. 1734), who, as is discussed above, introduced him into the official *ulema* hierarchy in 1140/1127-1728 by nominating him as a *mülâzim*. Even though, for the moment, we do not have a considerable amount of evidence with reference to the background of their relationship, there emerges a remarkable sign that their initial relation was tutor-pupil in nature. Given Ayvansarâyî Hâfız Hüseyin's entry on Yolgeçen Mescidi, in which Mehmed İsmet is explicitly identified as the tutor of İzzet Alî Pasha,⁸⁰² we can infer that he instructed İzzet Alî during his waiting period as a *mülâzim* when the latter was of school age. Another connection between them appears through their association with the Kiblelizâde family. We are told that

⁷⁹⁹“Mu'allim-i evvel Âristiṭâlis ḥekîmûn Tibyânü'l-Ḥikem ile mütercem kitâbindan ba'z mesâ'il-i ḥikemiyye lisân-ı Türkiye naql ve tehzîb ve üç faşl üzre tertîb olunduğda bir zât-ı mestûre-şifâton menkıbeti ile 'unvânı muṭarraz ve nâm-ı nâmîleriyle evrâk-ı müşerrez kılmak ḡarîn-i ḥuşûl-i merâm ve vuşûl-i netîce-i kâm olmağın” Mehmed İsmet, *Terceme-i Tibyânü'l-Ḥikem*, Veliyyüddin, no. 3249, fol. 134b.

⁸⁰⁰The authorship of many texts attributed to Aristotle is dubious. It is thought that they came into existence from within Aristotelian School and passed to the Muslim Arabs by means of late Greek commentaries and interpretations. See Richard Walzer “Aristu,” EI2, vol. I, 630-633; Whitaker Deininger “Aristotle,” in *World Philosophers and Their Works*, vol I, ed. John K. Roth, (Pasadena&Hackensack: Salem Press, 2000): 70-100. The most reliable edition of Corpus Aristotelicum in English was prepared by the Oxford University by depending on Prussian philologist Augustus Immanuel Bekker's standardization in form of reference. See *The Works of Aristotle*, vols. I-XII, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931).

⁸⁰¹See the index in Kâtib Çelebi, *Keşfü'z-Zünûn: Dizin*, vol. 5, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2007): 2115. The most similar title recorded by Brockelmann, is Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Iskandarânî's al-Tabîb's *Tibyān al-Asrār al-Rabbāniyya fi'l-Nabatāt wa al-Ma'âdin wa al-Khawāṣṣ al-Ḥaywāniyya* which was completed in 1299/1881. See Carl Brockelmann, *History of the Arabic Written Tradition*, sup. vol. 2, translated by Joep Lameer, (Leiden: Brill, 2016): 801.

⁸⁰²“Müderrişinden 'İzzet Paşa ḥâcesi Mehmed 'İşmet Efendi” Ayvansarâyî, *Hadîkatü'l-Cevâmi'*, (Dersa'âdet: Matba'a-i 'Âmire, 1281): 220. This detail has firstly been pointed out by İrfan Aypay who prepared a PhD dissertation on İzzet Alî Pasha's Divân and Nigâr-nâme. See Ali İrfan Aypay, *Lâle Devri Şairi İzzet Alî Paşa, Hayatı-Eserleri-Edebî Kişiliği, Divan: Tenkitli Metin, Nigâr-nâme: Tenkitli Metin*, (İstanbul: 1998): 2. Howard Crane's following translation is misleading: “The müderriş Mehmed İsmet Efendi, known as Hacı Efendi, who was a teacher in the [medrese of] İzzet Paşa...” See Hafız Hüseyin al-Ayvansarayî, *The Garden of Mosques*, translated and annotated by Howard Crane, (Leiden: Brill, 2000): 242.

İzzet Alî began to serve under Kiblelizâde Mehmed when the latter was appointed as *defterdâr*.⁸⁰³ More importantly, as a third node, we know that both were employed in the translation committee organized for the translation of *‘Iqd al-Jumân* in 1138/1725-1726.⁸⁰⁴ These significant details, indicate that Mehmed İsmet and İzzet Alî had been acquainted long before 1140/1127-1128, the year that the former officially benefited from the latter’s tutelage for being appointed to a madrasa of *hâriç* rank. 1140 is the year in which İzzet Alî was appointed as *defterdâr*.⁸⁰⁵ As I have explained above, this is also the year in which Mehmed İsmet received his *mülâzemet* and completed his *Sharḥ-i Isti‘āra-i Fārisiyya-i ‘Iṣām*, penned in Persian and presented to İzzet Alî Pasha upon the obtaining the permission to teach at a madrasa. However, this was not the only composition Mehmed İsmet presented to İzzet Alî. The second work offered to İzzet Alî was an Arabic commentary on Hızır Bey’s *‘Aḳā‘id-i Hızır* or *Ḳaṣīde-i Nūniyye*. In fact, as is stated above, Mehmed İsmet had penned two separate commentaries on *Ḳaṣīde-i Nūniyye*, *Rifd al-Naḍr ‘alā ‘Aḳā‘id al-Khidr* for Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullâh Efendi (1142-1144) and *al-Fawā‘id al-Naḍriyya fî Hall al-Nūniyya al-Khidriyya* for Alî İzzet (1141). Yet, to call to mind once again, the text penned to the approval of İzzet Alî in 1141 was the revision of an earlier copy completed in 1139. From Mehmed İsmet’s existing autograph, found in Esad Efendi’s manuscript collection, we understand that he was able to complete it in Rajab 1139/February-March 1727, but reproduced it on 24 Dhî’l-ḥijja 1141/21 July 1729 by adding a full-page prayers for God’s blessings and İzzet Alî’s well-being.⁸⁰⁶ Given that İzzet Alî’s name is revered in the closings of the commentary rather than in the reface, we find out that Mehmed İsmet’s initial purpose was not to submit it to İzzet Alî, but after the latter’s appointment as the head of the financial office, it seems that he presented his second scholarly work to him as well.

İzzet Alî’s financial support continued to fuel Mehmed İsmet’s scholarly production in later years when he became a pasha.⁸⁰⁷ The factual situation is understood from

⁸⁰³Yunus Kaplan, “İzzet, İzzet Alî Paşa,” <http://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/izzet-ali-pasa> (accessed on 03.06.2022).

⁸⁰⁴Râşid Mehmed Efendi and Çelebizâde İsmâil Âsım Efendi, *Târih-i Râşid ve Zeyli*, 1485.

⁸⁰⁵Hafız Hüseyin al-Ayvansarayî, *The Garden of the Mosques*, 545.

⁸⁰⁶For the dates in question, see respectively Mehmed İsmet, *al-Fawā‘id al-Naḍriyya fî Hall al-Nūniyya al-Khidriyya*, Esad Efendi no. 1233, fol. 106b and 107a.

⁸⁰⁷According to Subhî he obtained the title of pasha on 21 Rabî‘ al-Âkhir 1144/23 October 1731 upon hearing the second conquest of Hemedan. See Subhî, *ibid*, 115-116. The most comprehensive and reliable biography of İzzet Alî Pasha is written by İrfan Aypay and Fatma Sabiha Kutlar Oğuz. See Aypay, *ibid*, 1-10; İzzet Ali Paşa, *Divân-ı İzzet ve Nigâr-nâme (Tezkire-i Nigâriyye)*, prepared by Fatma Sabiha Kutlar Oğuz, (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2019): 4-11. See also Nurettin Albayrak, “İzzet Ali Paşa,” *TDVIA*, vol. 23, (İstanbul: TDV, 2001): 556-557; Ömür Ceylan, “Şiirin Seyir Defteri I” *Walter G. Andrews Armağanı – I / Festschrift In Honor of Walter G. Andrews*, ed. Mehmet Kalpaklı, *Journal of*

a posthumous note written by Mehmed İsmet on the bookplate of his compilation consisting of three Arabic glosses.⁸⁰⁸ In the note in question, the compiler frankly states that he put them on paper owing to the deceased İzzet Alî Pasha's benevolence.⁸⁰⁹ Despite the appearance of his signature on these pamphlets, the author does not specify the date of their composition. Therefore, we are unable to determine the exact date of each pamphlet's composition. Nonetheless, considering that he identifies his patron as a pasha, we can speculate that these scholarly productions came out after the deceased patron's advancement to the vizier/pasha rank. What is more striking in the context of these essays is that he did not present them to his protector. The main reason behind such a situation, on the one hand, may be attributed to İzzet Alî Pasha's presence in Anatolia and Revan since Dhî'l-ḥijja 1144/May 1732. On the other hand, however, we may claim that as a client he was not bound to dedicate these scholarly works to his patron. The more important point in this regard, then, was the promotion of scholarship, rather than the submission of a scholarly work to the patron. If this is so, further studies should be carried out for a better understanding of this aspect of Ottoman scholarly patronage. A few words are also in order concerning a peculiar detail in the patron-client relationship between the figures in question. All of the compositions presented by Mehmed İsmet to İzzet Alî were penned either in Arabic or Persian. Obviously, the main reason behind this was the patron's appreciation for the treatises typed in these languages. İzzet Alî's competence in three Islamic languages in this regard makes it clear. However, except for Mehmed İsmet's works in question and of poetry in his name, there is need for further studies on his patronage for the arts and scholarly activities.⁸¹⁰

The intimacy between Mehmed İsmet and İzzet Alî can be traced through the daily notes taken by the former. Five notes penned within a month from the late Dhî'l-qa'da to the late Dhî'l-ḥijja 1144, show us that he recorded his patron's appointment

Turkish Studies 34/I (2010): 142-143; Cihan Tatlıkatık, "İzzet Ali Paşa Divanı'nın Tahlili," Unpublished MA Thesis, (Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, 2020): 2-5; Fatma Sabiha Kutlar Oğuz and Nagihan Gür, "Bir Bürokrat-Şaire Yazılmış Şiirler Seçkisi: İzzet Ali Paşa Mecmuası," in *Prof. Dr. M. Fatih Köksal'a Armağan*, (İstanbul: DBY Yayınları, 2021): 856-868;

⁸⁰⁸The glosses which were rebounded together in Veliyüddin Efendi no. 1797 are respectively as follows: *Hāshīya ʿalā Hāshīya-i Zībārī ʿalā ʿIṣām al-İstiʿāra*, fol. 1b-29b; *Hāshīya ʿalā Şarḥu'l-Waẓʿiyya li'l-ʿIṣām*, fol. 30b-126b; *Hāshīya ʿalā Muşliḥ al-Dīn al-Lārī*, fol. 127a-129b, and 130b-188b.

⁸⁰⁹"Bu fakîrün müsevvedâtıdır, merhûm veliyyü'n-ni'amum ʿİzzet ʿAlî Paşa himmetiyle kâleme gelmişdür." Mehmed İsmet, *Mecmû'a*, Veliyüddin Efendi no. 1797, fol. Ia.

⁸¹⁰For İzzet Alî's patronage for poetry and poets see particularly Fatma Sabiha Kutlar Oğuz and Nagihan Gür, "Bir Bürokrat-Şaire Yazılmış Şiirler Seçkisi," 851-908.

as governor of Kütahya,⁸¹¹ his passage to Üsküdar for Kütahya,⁸¹² his departure from Üsküdar where Mehmed İsmet was ready for farewell,⁸¹³ and his arrival in Kütahya.⁸¹⁴ In another note, he would briefly summarize İzzet Alî Pasha's departure from İstanbul for Kütahya, and conclude that he was charged to go to Revan upon the advent of the military campaign.⁸¹⁵ The close relationship between the two figures, as the notes suggest, leads the client to record all significant events and moments regarding his patron's movement from Istanbul to Üsküdar, Kütahya and Revan. The most remarkable detail is Mehmed İsmet's presence in Üsküdar to bid farewell to his patron, which is a clear indication of his loyalty, love and respect.

6.3 Sultans and Post-Rebellion Patrons

Existing documentation demonstrates that Mehmed İsmet composed scholarly works not only for high-ranking officials, but also for the long-reigning sultan Mahmûd I (r. 1730-1754). Additionally, it appears that he continued to copy books for the celebrated figures even after his involvement in the madrasa hierarchy as a professor from 1728 to 1747. Despite the absence of clues on the scholarly compositions presented to the previous sultan, Ahmed III (r. 1703-1730), speculation would lead us to the conclusion that, as a talented poet and competent scholar, Mehmed İsmet might have pen panegyric poems and treatises, not only for the grand vizier, viziers, and high-ranking scholar-bureaucrats but, also for the sultan himself. Yet, there is need for further research to bring them to light if they exist. On the liaison between Mehmed İsmet and Mahmûd I, however, there are more reliable hints that convince us of a possible patron-client relationship between the two figures. One of his daily notes written on 21 December 1730/10 Jumād al-Ākhir 1143, for instance, shows that he met with the newly enthroned sultan and enjoyed his bounty.⁸¹⁶ Mehmed İsmet would not record such an encounter or meeting again, but another daily note

⁸¹¹«[27 Dhî'l-qa'ada 1144/22 May 1732]: 'İzzet 'Alî Paşa Kütahya vâlisi oldu.' Mehmed İsmet, *Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1144-1145*, Kandilli Rasathanesi no. T26, fol. 4a.

⁸¹²«[29 Dhî'l-qa'ada/24 May] Üsküdar'a geçdiler." Ibid, fol. 4a.

⁸¹³«[7 Zî'l-hicce/1 June] Üsküdar'dan hareket itdiler. İmrüz vedâ, gördüm." Ibid, fol. 4a.

⁸¹⁴«[26 Zî'l-hicce/20 June] Kütahya'ya vâsıl oldılar." Ibid, fol. 5a.

⁸¹⁵«Hamîs günü Defterdâr 'İzzet 'Alî Paşa nısfü'n-nehâra qarîb kürk giyüp Kütahya vâlisi oldu. Sebt günü Üsküdar'a naql idüp bir hafta meksden şoıra yine Sebt günü manşıb-ı 'âlîlerine 'âzîm oldılar. Haqq sübhânehû ve te'âlâ tevfiğ-i refiğ eyleye. Sefer zühuruyla cânib-i Revân'a me'mûr oldılar." *Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1144-1145*, fol. 4a.

⁸¹⁶«İmrüz pâdişâh-ı 'âlem-penâh hazretlerin gördüm ni'mete vardım." *Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1142-1143*, fol. 11a.

implies that he continued to present his works to the sultan during the following years. For example, he writes on 23 February 1745/21 Muḥarram 1158 that he delivered the almanacs and the *Nevrūziyye* on that very day (*Erbaʿā günū taḳvīmler ve Nevruziyye virildi*).⁸¹⁷ The note alone proves on the one hand that he produced annual calendars for statesmen upon their orders each year. On the other hand, it points out that he might have composed poetry regularly in the *nevrūziyye* genre for the appreciation of the sultan and grandies of the Empire to celebrate the coming of the spring.

It is remarkable that Mehmed İsmet did not abstained from copying books for the usage of officials after his appointment to the *hâriç* rank madrasa in 1140/1727-28. Thanks to one of his books which is still preserved in Veliyyüddîn Efendi's manuscript collection, and his daily notes penned in 1733 and 1740, it is discovered that he undertook the duplication of at least five books during his career as a madrasa professor. Yet, the names of two of them remain undetermined. The completion date of one of the books testifies that the qadi of Thessaloniki, Ahmed Efendi, had Mehmed İsmet make a fair copy of *al-Multaqāt fî al-Fatawā* of Muhammad b. Yûsuf al-Samarqandi (d. 1161) in 1141/1728-29 for his library.⁸¹⁸ Another figure who indented for the copies of books was Râmî Paşazâde Abdullâh Bey. Mehmed İsmet's daily note dated on 19 June 1733/6 Muḥarram 1146 reads that he delivered Abdullâh Bey's orders, which were complete copies of two books, *Sharḥ al-Shifā* and an unidentified book of Alî al-Qârî.⁸¹⁹ The significant point in this regard is that the copy of the latter book was of the second volume. Therefore, we may conclude that Abdullâh Bey had asked Mehmed İsmet for the copy of the first volume of Alî al-Qârî's book or had him copy several other books for his library. Mehmed İsmet's daily notes betoken also a possible ongoing relationship with Ebezâde Abdulvehhâb Efendi and Yirmisekizzâde Mehmed Sa'îd Agha. This time, however, we are not informed about the books which were copied for these patrons. From a note penned on 18 October 1740 [27 Rajab 1153], we learn that he visited Ebezâde to give him what he had already copied for him.⁸²⁰ Although one cannot identify this Ebezâde Efendi through a sole consideration of this entry, another daily note clarifies that he was

⁸¹⁷Mehmed İsmet, *Taḳvīm-i Sâl-i 1157-1158*, Kandilli Rasathanesi no. T36, fol. 12b.

⁸¹⁸See al-Samarqandi, *al-Multaqāt fî al-Fatawā*, Veliyyüddin Efendi no. 1573. This is a book on topics of Hanafi fiqh. For an introduction on the book and author see Ahmet Özel, "Semerkandî, Muhammed Yusuf," *TDVIA*, vol. 36, 479-480.

⁸¹⁹"Râmî Paşazâde ʿAbdullâh Beg'ün Şifâ Şerḥi ʿAlî Kârî'nün cild-i sânisî çüḳadârına teslim olundu." *Taḳvīm-i Sâl-i 1145-1146*, fol. 5a.

⁸²⁰"Ebezâde Efendi'ye gidüp mektübât virildi." *Taḳvīm-i Sâl-i 1152-1153*, fol. 9a. I am inclined to interpret "mektübât" as copied books rather than epistles when recalling his network based on book duplication.

Ebezâde Abdulvehhâb Efendi.⁸²¹ A possible liaison of patronage established with the Ottoman statesman and diplomat Yirmisekizzâde Mehmed Sa'îd Agha can be comprehended from a few daily notes written in the late 1732 and 1733. Considering the notes in question, we understand that Mehmed İsmet recorded Mehmed Sa'îd's departure from Istanbul for Sweden on 11 November 1132/23 Jumād al-Awwal 1145, and his return on 29 September 1733/19 Rabīc al-Ākhir 1146.⁸²² It is understood that on the latter date he welcomed newly arrived Mehmed Sa'îd Agha and delivered to him the draft copies in hand (*Maḥallde müsveddeler virildi*). Another daily note mentioning that Mehmed Sa'îd Agha paid a visit to Mehmed İsmet explicitly demonstrates that their relation had crossed the limits of patronage.⁸²³ Thus, we may readily assert that although Mehmed İsmet's interaction with high-ranking officials resembled, on the one hand a patron-client relationship, it was at the same time a matter of friendship, at least when it comes to Mehmed Sa'îd Agha.

Table 6.1 Mehmed İsmet's patrons, their Sufi affiliations, and scholarly works submitted to them

Patron	Name of Presentation	Type of Presentation	Year	Patron's Order
Kıblelîzâde Mîr Ahmed	<i>Fayzu'l-Hādî li-Halli Muşkilâti's-Şāhidî</i>	Autograph	1700-01	Mevlevi?
Es'ad Bey (Köprülüzâde)	<i>Ġazel</i>	Autograph	1713-14?	?
Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Efendi	?	Copy	November 1714	?
La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî	<i>Kitāb al-Bārî fi Aḥkām al-Nujūm</i>	Copy	March 1715	Bayrami-Melami & Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi
	?	Copy	1716	
	?	Copy	March 1716	
	<i>Mishkāt al-Maşābîḥ</i>	Copy	May 1716	
	<i>Şaḥîḥ al-Muslim</i>	Copy	January 1721	

⁸²¹See “[15 Rabīc al-Awwal 1157 / 28 April 1744]: Ebezâde ‘Abdulvehhâb Efendi dîda shod.” *Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1157-1158*, fol. 3a. In spite of the absence of information regarding Ebezâde Abdulvehhâb Efendi's biography we may think that he was the son of the former *şeyhülislam* Ebezâde Abdullâh Efendi (d. 1714). For Ebezâde Abdullâh see Mehmet İpşirli, “Abdullah Efendi, Ebezâde,” *TDVIA*, vol. 1, 98.

⁸²²See “Cemāziyye'l-evvelînüñ Yigirmi Beşinci Ḥamîs günü Yigirmisekiz Çelebizâde Sa'îd Ağa İsveç'e revâne şod.” *Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1144-1145*, fol. 9a; and “Āmadan-i Sa'îd Agha az-İsveç.” *Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1145-1146*, fol. 8a.

⁸²³“[12 Jumād al-Awwal]: Āmadan-i Sa'îd Agha ba-khāna-i mā.” *Ibid*, fol. 9a.

	?	Copy	June 1722	
Hâşimzâde Seyyid Mehmed Efendi	<i>al-Shifâ</i>	Copy	May 1718	Bayrami-Melami & Naqsh –
	<i>Mashâriq al-Anwâr al-Nabawiyya</i>	Copy	Nov. 1718	
Şeyhülislâm Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi	<i>Şerh-i Ğazel-i Şâ'ib</i>	Autograph	January 1723	Mujad
Şeyhülislâm Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullah Efendi	<i>Rifd al-Nadr ʿalâ ʿAqâ'id al-Khidr</i>	Autograph	1729-30	Bayrami-Melami & Naqsh.-Mujad.
	<i>Rifd al-Nadr ʿalâ ʿAqâ'id al-Khidr</i>	Autograph	1731-32	
Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha	<i>Şulhiyye</i>	Autograph	1718	Mevlevi & Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi
	<i>Simta al-Durar</i>	Autograph	1725-26?	
	<i>ʿAynî Târîhi</i>	Translation	1725-26	
	<i>Nevrûziyye</i>	Autograph	March 1726	
	<i>Risâle-i Tedâhul</i>	Autograph	March 1726	
Kethüdâ Mehmed Pasha	<i>Terceme-i Tibyânü'l-Hikem</i>	Translation	1725-26	?
İzzet Alî Pasha	<i>Sharh-i Isti'âra-i Fârisiyya-i ʿİşâm</i>	Autograph	1728-29	?
	<i>al-Fawâ'id al-Nadriyya fî Hall al-Nûniyya al-Khidriyya</i>	Autograph	March 1727	
	<i>al-Fawâ'id al-Nadriyya fî Hall al-Nûniyya al-Khidriyya</i>	Autograph	July 1729	
Ahmed Efendi (Qadi of Selanik)	<i>al-Multaqâ fî al-Fatawâ</i>	Copy	1728-29	?
Râmî Paşazâde Abdullâh Bey	<i>Sharh al-Shifâ</i>	Copy	June 1733	?
	<i>ʿAlî al-Qārî</i>	Copy	June 1733	?
Yirmisekizzâde Mehmed Sa'id	?	Copy	September 1733	?
Ebezâde Abdulvehhâb Efendi	?	Copy	October 1740	?

Sultan Mahmûd I	<i>Nevrûziyye</i>	Autograph	February 1745	Mevlevi & Naqshbandi
	<i>Takvîm</i>	Autograph	February 1745	

6.4 An Analysis in Lieu of Conclusion

The most significant contribution of this chapter is the detailed portrayal of the scholarly, religious, political and intellectual networks through which Mehmed İsmet managed a continuous scholarly production either in the form of recopying age-old texts or autographic compositions. The chapter highlights the manners in which he sought the patronage, sponsorship and protection of several high-ranking officials at least from 1112/1700-1701 to continue his scholarly output. I have demonstrated in this regard that, particularly in the first and second decades of the 18th century, he leaned on the financial support of the Kiblelizâde and Köprülüzâde families and La'lîzâde Abdûlbâkî Efendi. However, our primary sources make it clear that it was particularly during the years coinciding with the grand vizierate of Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha (v. 1718-1730) that he was able to develop close connections with the dignitaries including the grand vizier Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha himself, the viziers Kethüdâ Mehmed Pasha (d. 1730) and İzzet Alî Pasha (d. 1734), the *şeyhülislams*, Yenişehirli Abdullâh Efendi (d. 1743) and Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullâh Efendi (d. 1732), and finally Hâşimzade Seyyid Mehmed Efendi to whom he presented at least one of his compositions.

We are no longer strangers to Mehmed İsmet's network, and hence, we are in a secure position to analyze the web of relationships in which Mehmed İsmet was able to survive as a Sufi intellectual either by duplicating already existing texts or producing original works of art and science. In this context, the first outcome of the chapter is as follows: despite his familiarity with the cadre running the state, the surviving works manifest that he did not find an opportunity to reach the sultan for presenting his abilities. The only exception in this regard is Mahmûd I, to whom were presented a *Nevrûziyye* and a *Takvîm* in February 1745. There are clues that they had known each other since the enthronement of the sultan in 1730, and it is highly likely that Mehmed İsmet regularly presented his works to the sultan. However, only those he submitted towards the end of his life can be ascertained for now.

The second finding of the analysis of Mehmed İsmet's network pertains to the dynamics of the patronage at the time. It is an analysis that enables us to settle when a patron felt obliged to provide financial opportunities for men of merit and competence or when a client decided to seek the financial support from a man of means and wealth. Special cases around Mehmed İsmet demonstrate that he usually applied for the monetary backing of high-ranking officials when they had already been or were newly appointed in the office. From the angle of patrons, in general they patronized the capable while controlling financial resources and/or guaranteeing a handsome income for themselves. Except for Ebezâde Abdülvehhâb Efendi, who was about to complete his waiting period in Istanbul before his appointment as the qadi of Damascus in the year 1155 [March 1742-February 1743]⁸²⁴ and Hâşimzâde Seyyid Mehmed Emîn Efendi, all the patrons mentioned above were consistent with such an unwritten rule of patronage. The most stand-out examples in this context, on the other hand, are La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî Efendi and Hâşimzâde Seyyid Mehmed Emîn Efendi. For the former, as can be seen in the table, Mehmed İsmet copied at least four books during the years 1715 and 1716. After a five years of disappearance, it seems that La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî ordered the copying of two books in 1721 and 1722. The instability in the patron-client relationship between the two figures is in accord with ups and downs in La'lîzâde's life and career. As mentioned above, he enjoyed a prestigious position during the grand vizierate of Şehîd Alî Pasha, which lasted from April 1713 to August 1716. Upon the defeat of the Ottomans at the hands of Habsburgs in 1716, La'lîzâde was sent into exile in Limnos and it was only during the later months of 1720 that he was allowed to return to Istanbul, where he was assigned a professorship at the madrasa of Vâlide Sultân.⁸²⁵ Evidently, it was during the latter period of prosperity that he asked Mehmed İsmet for the duplication of two books. With reference to Hâşimzâde Seyyid Mehmed Emîn Efendi, to recall, it was during the interim period between the judgeship of Diyarbekir (February 1715-February 1716) and Baghdad (August 1719-August 1720) when he had Mehmed İsmet copy two books for his own use in May and October 1718. As we understand from these examples, patronage was exhibited to the client when the patron had guaranteed his position, bringing him regular income in the rotation of appointments.

Lastly, while conducting research for this chapter, I discovered that the patron-client relations in Mehmed İsmet's case had two essential characteristics. On the

⁸²⁴Ibn Budayr who has become known as "the Barber of Damascus" in the literature, wrote in his account of events that Ebezâde Abdülvehhâb Efendi was the qadi of Damascus on 4 Jumâd al-Âkhir 1155/6 August 1742 when an imperial edict arrived the city. See Şeyh Ahmet el-Bedirî el-Hallâk, *Berber Bedirî'nin Günlüğü, 1741-1762: Osmanlı Taşra Hayatına İlişkin Olaylar*, translated by Hasan Yüksel. (Ankara: Akçağ, 1995): 11. For an original work on Ibn Budayr and his history account see Dana Sajdi, *The Barber of Damascus: Nouveau Literacy in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Levant*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013).

⁸²⁵For his life and career see Azamat, "Lâ'lîzâde Abdülbâkî," *TDVIA*, vol. 27, 90-92.

one hand, instead of being totally formal, rigid and rule-bound, they were simultaneously informal, flexible and unfettered from conventional restrictions and rules. On the other hand, they were dependent on and influenced by surrounding Sufi circles. Regarding the former, we should consider the patrons listed above together. There is no doubt that the relations between Mehmed İsmet and Köprülüzâde Es'ad Bey, Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, Kethüdâ Mehmed Pasha and Sultan Mahmûd I were formal, rule-based, refined, and except for Es'ad Bey, courtly. In such a relationship the client strictly hinged on the patron and his decisions. His submitted work may be appreciated and rewarded, or it may be disfavored and left unanswered. To remember, Mehmed İsmet's request through a eulogy for a position of professorship was declined by the grand vizier, Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, in 1726. Yet, as can be observed in his affairs with La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî Efendi, İzzet Alî Pasha, Yirmisekizzâde Mehmed Sa'îd and the members of the Kiblelizâde family, more intimate, friendship-based and easy-going liaisons developed between the parties. For this reason, Mehmed İsmet regularly recorded in his daily notes the developments in the lives of the figures, who, as I have demonstrated, were his close friends. Particularly noteworthy is his relationship with İzzet Alî Pasha, who had once been his pupil but became his patron. The second characteristic of the network of interest in which Mehmed İsmet was situated was its partial dependency on the long-existing Sufi establishment. Such a reality is markedly observable in the incontrovertible allegiance of some of his patrons to the Bayrami-Melami, Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi and Mevlevi orders. Given that he submitted to Kiblelizâde Mîr Ahmed *Fayzû'l-Hādî li-Hallî Muşkilâti'sh-Şâhidî*, a gloss on a Mevlevi şeyh's, İbrâhîm Şâhidî, Persian-Turkish dictionary in verse, we may conclude that his patron adhered to the Mevlevi order. Sultan Mahmûd I, to whom at least two autographic works were presented, and grand vizier, Dâmâd İbrâhîm Pasha, who received at least five compositions, are known for their affiliations to and support for Mevlevi and Naqshbandi orders.⁸²⁶ The most dominant and best-detected Sufi brotherhoods in Mehmed İsmet's network, on the other hand, were the Bayrami-Melami and Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi orders. We must recall once again La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî, Hâşimzâde Seyyid Mehmed Emîn and Paşmakçızâde Seyyid Abdullâh, whose allegiance to the orders in question was indubious. Given these examples, we can readily conclude that for having a good grasp of his relations with some of his patrons one must consider the roles of the long-existing Sufi links in Istanbul.

⁸²⁶Tülay Artan, "El Yazmaları Işığında Bir Çevre ve Çehre Eskizi: Kadızâdeliler, Müceddidiler ve Damad İbrahim Paşa (1730)," 27-28, and 35-36.

7. CONCLUSION

In this dissertation, I have attempted to rethink the history of the Naqshbandi order in Istanbul by focusing a period of one and a half centuries, from the mid-seventeenth century to the end of the eighteenth century. During the period, the Naqshbandi establishment in Istanbul underwent a radical transformation from a localized, limited and self-contained modest formation to a complex, widespread, self-confident and consolidated one. The dissertation is an attempt to find plausible answers to the reasons for changes and transformations in the structure of the Naqshbandi order through historical contextualization, socio-political, religio-Sufi and intellectual network analysis. However, in embarking on such a project, rather than undertake a formal network analysis requiring the preparation and interpretation of graphs, maps and statistical calculations, I have adopted a more flexible approach, limiting myself to the use of vocabulary of the social network analysis, which does not require digital intervention in the manuscript.

The subject of the study, the Naqshbandi order of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has been perceived as a living entity that tended to evolve and transform rather than remain a static, stable and inert institution. Therefore, rather than the institutional entity and identity of the order, Naqshbandis have been the subject of discussion as dynamic and lively actors. The Naqshbandis of the relevant period were social, political, religious and Sufi agents who actively participated in social life and the political order, living luxurious and comfortable lives rather than modest ones in seclusion. By composing books, treatises and letters utilized in this dissertation, I demonstrate that they contributed to the cultural and intellectual accumulation of the empire. Moreover, except a few Naqshbandi masters who devoted themselves to *tekkes* where they taught and performed the teachings and rituals of the order, all Naqshbandi figures in this study as deputies and dervishes enjoyed Naqshbandi identity as a secondary status in social and political arenas. As such, they constituted a large group at different echelons of the state such as grand viziers, viziers, grand muftis, chief judges, qadis, officials of higher and lower ranks, and in

the social life as madrasa professors, imams, preachers, artisans and craftsmen.

Since Naqshbandis were active components of the secular and scholarly bureaucracy and society, a holistic approach was adopted for this study. Thus, the present dissertation is not a typical specimen conducted in Sufi studies. Rather, it is a research project that simultaneously contributes to the social, political, intellectual, Sufi, prosopography, micro, and minor studies in history, because the primary sources utilized vary from official chronicles and archival documents to the more personal and private Sufi letters, from autograph manuscripts to recopied booklets and tracts, from daily marginal notes in the astrological calendars to ownership records and colophons in the manuscripts once owned, read, circulated and preserved in Naqshbandi circles. Thanks to these sources, we have a good grasp of the patron-client relationship that made possible the construction of Naqshbandi lodges in Istanbul, the material and social well-being of the Naqshbandi masters in the city, the reasons behind uninterrupted communication between masters and disciples, the novel teachings circulated among the Naqshbandi dervishes and scholarly milieus, the historical factors that contributed to the expansion of the order, and the methods adopted by the Naqshbandi masters for the continuous control of followers among whom high-ranking officials and scholar-bureaucrats constituted a significant portion.

The dissertation contributes to the history of Islamic Sufism when it comes to Şeyh Murâd Bukhârî and his reformulated teachings that circulated through his letters. The circulation of letters, the current study argues, served the formation of a new branch, the Muradiyya, in the deep-rooted Naqshbandi tradition. Therefore, as a novelty, Şeyh Murâd had frequently emphasized in his letters the phrase “the continuation of worship on the path of *istihlāk*” (*dawām al-‘ubūdiyyat ‘alā ṭarīq al-istihlāk*). Through the frequent use of such a phrase in his letters, scholarly compositions and savant conversations, he was able to reconsider *istihlāk* (self-annihilation) as a Sufi term, raising its degree from a despised, useless, and time-wasting position of annihilation to the most exalted one. Thus, he used the term to cover the meaning of *fanā or fanā fillāh* (extinction of the self in God), concepts that would be replaced by *istihlāk* in Şeyh Murâd’s Sufi terminology. Moreover, it was through the letters that he sought to undermine the *waḥdat al-wujūd*ist view of “the unity of being,” replacing the concept of *waḥdat* (union, unity) with *nisbat* (connection, bond) to emphasize the eternal and everlasting hierarchy between the God and His creation. These intellectual interventions in the understanding of Sufism long practiced in Istanbul, contributed in turn to the authority of Şeyh Murâd as the founder of the Muradi branch of the Naqshbandiyya. Thus, Şeyh Murâd’s position in the Naqshbandi tradition is reconsidered, and rather than being evaluated as an ordinary Sufi

master in Naqshbandi history, he is promoted to the rank of Ubaydullâh Ahrâr (1404-1490), the founder of the Ahrari branch, Ahmad al-Sirhindi (1564-1624), the eponym of the Mujaddidi branch, and Khâlid Baghdâdî (1779-1827), the founder of the Khalidiyya.

As a study focusing on a period of century and a half from 1650 to 1800, the study aimed to fill an important gap in the literature. This is an interim period prior to the advent of the Khalidi branch of the Naqshbandiyya in the Ottoman capital. The networking policies of Naqshbandi masters, their concordance with existing social, political, and religious establishments and their fruitful relationship with society and bureaucracy during the period resulted in the expansion and favorable reception of the Naqshbandi order in the Ottoman capital. It was this base that the Khalidi branch would successfully install itself by the first quarter of the 19th century. By focusing on the period through a reconsideration of the existing and hitherto neglected primary sources, the dissertation challenges the conventional discussion that the Mujaddidi branch of the Naqshbandiyya dominated the scene before the arrival of the Khalidi masters. Instead, it highlights the formation and co-existence of the Muradi branch within the Naqshbandi circles, particularly in Damascus, Konya and Bursa. The remarkable historical development, in turn, implies that the Muradi branch also appeared in Istanbul, the hub of high-ranking disciples of Şeyh Murâd. The dissertation is also a contribution to the socio-political history of the Ottoman Empire in the sense that it deals with the connections and interactions between Naqshbandi masters and their disciples who occupied senior offices in the secular and scholarly bureaucracy. Revealing Naqshbandi affiliations of dignitaries and scholar-bureaucrats, it draws attention to the Sufi aspects of Ottoman statesmen. The adherence of Ottoman dignitaries to Naqshbandi masters may mislead one to believe that a Naqshbandi clique had formed within the state apparatus, especially under Şeyh Murâd in the first quarter of the 18th century. Nevertheless, the dissertation discusses that despite carefully pursued control over and elaborately enhanced close connections with the ruling elites and scholar-bureaucrats, an internally coherent, hierarchically organized, and harmoniously functioning Naqshbandi faction did not emerge within state organization under the leadership of Şeyh Murâd, nor, did he undertake such an engineering. Rather, it argues that the realization of such a project was impossible due to power struggles and hostilities between Şeyh Murâd's senior disciples, who fought for lucrative administrative and judiciary positions. This was because being a Naqshbandi or serving a Naqshbandi master was not a priority in their mentality. In fact, Şeyh Murâd's relationship with grandees of the empire was complicated and unpredictable. Although existing literature associates him with the so-called Melami faction, the dissertation shows that their

relationship was marked by mutual distrust and tension, particularly with regard to the Melami qutb Şehîd Alî Pasha, who did not hesitate to eliminate some of Şeyh Murâd's disciples.

The significant role played by Murâd Bukhârî and Ahmad Juryânî in the expansion of the Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi order in the Ottoman Empire is an established fact. Based on surviving primary sources, the thesis has analyzed the socio-political and religio-Sufi networks of the former and examined his politics of networking. Due to a dearth of information on Şeyh Ahmad, who is said to have spent almost forty years in Mecca, the current study has failed to analyze his network and the politics of religiosity. Be that as it may, my initial comparison of the two figures reveals two features one common and one distinct. As far as their similarities are concerned, it is striking enough that both were very careful not to get involved in political matters and not to incur the wrath of the state and statesmen. For this reason, Şeyh Murâd seems to have done his best not to spend much time in Istanbul, in order to avoid living under the uncomfortable surveillance of the state. Şeyh Ahmad, on the other hand, managed to keep a low profile by retreating to Mecca. This is, of course, one side of the coin. The other side shows that Şeyh Murâd had chosen the *ulema* as the target of his mission. It is true that many dignitaries of secular bureaucracy including grand viziers, viziers and military commanders were the addressees of his letters, but the *ulema* seems to have been his main target, as most of his letters were dispatched to scholar-officials. Most importantly, one cannot see among his deputies the aghas and pashas who held administrative positions in the state apparatus. Ahmad Juryânî was more flexible in the authorization of officials controlling secular offices. He gave ijaza to Kahramân Agha (d. ?), Kımıl Mehmed Bey (d. 1732), Beşîr Agha (d. 1746) and Yekçeşm Ahmed Murtażâ (d. 1747), as well as to many members of the *ulema*. This attitude did not end with his death but continued through his spiritual chain in the following decades. Kahramân Agha, for example, appointed Emîr Agha and Sohrâb Agha as his deputies. Mehmed Emîn Tokadî, who was one of the most famous deputies of Şeyh Ahmad, authorized the grand vizier Yeğen Mehmed Pasha (d. 1745), the vizier Abdülvehhâb Abdî Pasha (d. ?), and many aghas, including his brother Sâlih, Hazînedâr Osmân, Hammâmî Yûsuf, Hammâmî Mehmed, Mukbil Ahmed, Seyyid Mehmed, Tevfik-i Hânî Mustafâ and Mehmed. The continued inclusion of ruling elites and bureaucrats in the spiritual lineage of Yekdest Ahmad may indicate a hidden agenda also embraced by his followers. Nevertheless, this is a promising subject for future studies. As new primary sources, such as the letters and personal manuscripts, become available, further studies will be conducted on the networking policies of Şeyh Ahmad and his spiritual followers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Documents in the Ottoman Archives (BOA), İSAM, and VGM

Alî Emîrî

AE.SMHD.I. 237/19064, 258/21056, 258/21067, 264/21374.

AE. SMMD.IV. 21/2341.

AE. SMST.II. 11/1004, 86/9210, 86/9312.

AE.SMST.III. 67/4960.

AE.SOSM.III. 58/4228, 90/6913, 90/6914.

Bâb-ı Asâfi

Mühimme Defterleri (A.DVNSMHM.d.) 57/619, 122/178, 122/496, 123/282.

Bâb-ı Defterî

Başmuhâsebe Kalemi, Muhallefat (D.BŞM.d.) 26/8

Cevdet

Dahiliye (C.DH) 88/4370/1

Evkaf (C.EV) 88/4369, 218/10853, 575/29027, 601/30344,

Maarif (C.MF) 56/2758, 142/7070

Hatt-ı Hümayûn

HAT. 108/4320

İbnü'l-Emîn

Ensab (İE.ENB.) 4/391, 5/561

Vakıf (İE.EV.) 36/4139.

Topkapı Sarayı

TS.MA.d 3893.

İSAM

Kısmet-i Askeriye. no. 104, no. 105, no. 107.

Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü

VGMA. Defter no. 629/498. no. 629/500.

B. Manuscripts

Abd al-Qâdir Rûyânî. *al-Tuḥfat al-Niẓāmiyya*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 2318/5. fols. 83b-98a.

Abd al-Rahmân al-Sûfî. *al-Juzʿ al-Awwal min Şuwar al-Kawākib fî al-ʿUlûm al-Thawābit*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 2278.

Ahmed Hasîb Üsküdârî. *Menâkıb-ı Mehmed Emîn Tokadî*. Princeton University Library. Islamic Manuscripts. no. 495.

Ahmed b. Lutfullâh al-Mevlevî. *Ghāyat al-ʿUdad fî ʿİlm al-ʿAdad*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 2329.

Cevrî İbrâhîm al-Mevlevî. *Mecmūʿa-i Nûr-ı Esrâr-ı Ehl-i Hâl*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 1622.

Çelebizâde °Āşım Efendi. *Münşe'ât-ı Çelebizâde °Āşım Efendi*. Süleymaniye Library. Esad Efendi. no. 3832.

———. *Münşe'ât-ı Çelebizâde °Āşım Efendi*. Süleymaniye Library. Halet Efendi. no. 358.

Gharāyib al-Funūn wa Mulaḥ al-°Uyūn. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 2318/3.

Harîrîzâde. *Tibyānu Wasā'il al-Ḥaqā'iq fî Bayāni Salāsıl al-Ṭarā'iq*. vol. III. Süleymaniye Library. İbrahim Efendi. no. 432.

İzzet Alî Paşa. *Dīvān-ı °İzzet °Alî Paşa*. Süleymaniye Library. Esad Efendi. no. 2672.

al-Kāshî. *Sullam al-Samā*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 2283/5. fols. 108b-120a.

Kösec Ahmed al-Trabzonî. *Tuḥfat al-Aḥbāb fî al-Sulūk ilā Ṭarīq al-Aşḥāb*. Süleymaniye Library. Aşir Efendi. no. 422/3.

———. *Tuḥfat al-Aḥbāb fî al-Sulūk ilā Ṭarīq al-Aşḥāb*. Süleymaniye Library. Bağdatlı Vehbi. no. 2045/1.

———. *Tuḥfat al-Aḥbāb fî al-Sulūk ilā Ṭarīq al-Aşḥāb*. Milli Kütüphaneye Yazmalar Koleksiyonu. no. 06 Mil Yz A 8301/1.

———. *Tuḥfat al-Aḥbāb fî al-Sulūk ilā Ṭarīq al-Aşḥāb*. Süleymaniye Library. Hasan Hüsnü Paşa. no. 7891/1.

La'lîzâde Abdülbâkî Efendi. *Risāla al-Murādiyya fî Ṭarīqat al-Naqshbandiyya*. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi. Hacı Mahmud Efendi. no. 2456/2.

Mecmū°a. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 1755.

Mecmū°a. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 3221.

Mecmū°a-i Kaşā'id ve Ebyāt. Süleymaniye Library. Halet Efendi, no. 763

Mehmed Emîn Tokadî. *Şiyānet-i Dervîşān*. Süleymaniye Library. Esad Efendi. no. 1849/1.

Mehmed İsmet. *al-Fawā'id al-Nadriyya fî Ḥall al-Nūniyya al-Khidriyya*. Süleymaniye Library. Esad Efendi. no. 1233. fols. 37b-107a.

———. *al-Fawā'id al-Nadriyya fî Ḥall al-Nūniyya al-Khidriyya*. Süleymaniye Library. Laleli. no. 2381.

- _____. *Fayzül-Hādī li-Hallī Muşkilāti's-Şāhidī*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 3249. fols. 62b-111b.
- _____. *Fayzül-Hādī li-Hallī Muşkilāti's-Şāhidī*. TSMK. Revan. no. 613.
- _____. *Hāşhiya-i 'İşmet 'alā Ādāb-i Husayniyya*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 2864.
- _____. *İcāzet-nāme*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi no. 3204. fols. 1b-2b.
- _____. *Kaşīda*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 3249. fols. 59b-61b.
- _____. *Mecmū'a-i Hāşhiye*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 1797.
- _____. *Rifd al-Naḍr 'alā 'Aqā'id al-Khidr*. Süleymaniye Library. Reşid Efendi. no. 328.
- _____. *Rifd al-Naḍr 'alā 'Aqā'id al-Khidr*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin, no. 3249.
- _____. *Risāle-i Tedāhul*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 3249. fols. 125b-133a.
- _____. *Risāle-i Tedāhul*. Süleymaniye Library. Atıf Efendi. no. 2604. fols. 1b-7a.
- _____. *Sharḥ-i Isti'āra-i Fārisiyya-i 'İşām*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 3249. fols. 27b-50a.
- _____. *Simāt-ı 'İşmet*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 3191.
- _____. *Simta al-Durar*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 3249. fols. 51b-58a.
- _____. *Şerḥ-i Ġazel-i Şā'ib*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 3249. fols. 112b-124b.
- _____. *Şerḥ-i Şāhidī li-'İşmet Efendi*. Süleymaniye Library. Kılıçalipaşa. no. 1007. Mîrim Çelebi. *Risāla dar-Aḥkām-i Tālī'*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 2283.
- _____. *Terceme-i Mesā'il-i Mîrim*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi, no. 2318.
- _____. *Terceme-i Tibyānü'l-Hikem*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 3249.

Mollâ Jâmî. *Kitābu Nafahāt al-Uns li-^cAbd al-Raḥmān al-Jāmî*. Süleymaniye Library. Ayasofya. no. 2140.

_____. *Tuḥfat al-Ṭālibîn wa ^cUmdat al-Wāsilîn*. Süleymaniye Library. Fatih. no. 5385.

Muhammed Murâd al-Bukhârî. *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt al-Qur^ʿān*. al-Azhar. no. 32933.

_____. *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt al-Qur^ʿān*. Hamidiye. no. 65.

_____. *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt al-Qur^ʿān*. İstanbul Üniversitesi. NEK-AY. no. 339.

_____. *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt al-Qur^ʿān*. Süleymaniye Library. Fatih. no. 652.

_____. *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt al-Qur^ʿān*. Süleymaniye Library. Fatih. no. 653.

_____. *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt al-Qur^ʿān*. Süleymaniye Library. Murad Buhari, no. 25.

_____. *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt al-Qur^ʿān*. Nuruosmaniye. no. 479.

_____. *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt al-Qur^ʿān*. Nuruosmaniye no. 480.

_____. *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt al-Qur^ʿān*. Nuruosmaniye no. 481.

_____. *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt al-Qur^ʿān*. Süleymaniye Library. Pertevniyal. no. 91.

_____. *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt al-Qur^ʿān*. Ragıb Paşa. no. 102.

_____. *Jāmi^c al-Mufradāt al-Qur^ʿān*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 449.

_____. *Mektübāt*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 1780.

_____. *Mektübāt*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 1781.

_____. *Mektübāt*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 1810.

_____. *Mektübāt-ı eṣ-Şeyḥ es-Seyyid Muḥammed Murād*. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 1837.

_____. *Mektübāt*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 1838.

_____. *Mektübāt*. Esad Efendi. no. 1419.

_____. *Mektübāt*. İÜ-TY. no. 3442.

_____. *Mektûbât*. İÜ-TY. no. 10484.

_____. *Mektûbât*. Darülmecnevi. no. 273.

_____. *Mektûbât*. Süleymaniye Library. Pertev Paşa. no. 246 M-1.

Muhammed Subhân el-Hindî. *Lawâmi^c al-Subûhî fî Sharh al-Fass al-Nûhî*. Süleymaniye Library. Esad Efendi. no. 1534.

_____. *Lawâmi^c al-Subûhî fî Sharh al-Fass al-Nûhî*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 3204. fols. 3a-32a.

Müstakîmzâde Süleymân Sa‘deddîn. *Ahval-i Şuyûh-i Ayaşofya*. Süleymaniye Library. Esad Efendi. no. 1716/2.

_____. *Meşâyih-nâme-i İslâm*. Süleymaniye Library. Esad Efendi. no. 1716/1.

al-Nâblusî. *Natîjat al-^cUlûm*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 1755.

al-Saghânî. *Mashâriqu Anwâr minâ^l-Hadîth*. Süleymaniye Library. Süleymaniye, no. 324.

al-Samarqandi. *al-Multaqât fî al-Fatawâ*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 1573.

Sarı Abdullâh Efendi. *Cevheretü^l-Bidâye ve Dürretüⁿ-Nihâye*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 1678.

_____. *Semerâtü^l-Fu^{âd} fî^l-Mebde ve^l-Me^câd*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 1662.

Seyfullâh Çelebi. *Risâle-i Seyfullâh Çelebi ed-Defterî*. Süleymaniye Library. Hacı Mahmud Efendi. no. 6344.

Seyyid Abdurrahmân Efendi. *Risâle-i Mübeyyin-i Zamân*. Bibliotheque Nationale. Supplement Turc. no. 1555.

Sîneçâk Sinâneddîn Yûsuf al-Mevlevî. *İntihâb-ı Mesnevî*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 1817/12.

Şemseddîn Ahmed. *Risâla fî al-^cAmal bi^r-Rubu^c al-Muqanţara*. Beyazıt Library. Veliyyüddin Efendi. no. 2283/3.

Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1142-1143. Kandilli Observatory Library. no. T25.

Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1144-1145. Kandilli Observatory Library. no. T26.

Takvîm-i Sâl-i 1145-1146. Kandilli Observatory Library. no. T28.

Taḳvīm-i Sāl-i 1146-1147. Kandilli Observatory Library. no. T418.

Taḳvīm-i Sāl-i 1148-1149. Kandilli Observatory Library. no. T30.

Taḳvīm-i Sāl-i 1152-1153. Kandilli Observatory Library. no. T33.

Taḳvīm-i Sāl-i 1157-1158. Kandilli Observatory Library. no. T36.

C. Printed Sources

‘Abd al-Karīm al-Jilī. *al-Asfār ‘an Risālat al-Anwār fīmā Yatajallā li-Ahl al-Dhikr min al-Anwār*. ed. ‘Āşim İbrāhīm al-Kayyālī.

Abdī. *Abdî Tarihi: 1730 Patrona İhtilâli Hakkında Bir Eser*. ed. Faik Reşat Unat. Ankara: TTK, 2014.

Abdurrahman Abdi Paşa. *Abdurrahman Abdi Paşa Vekâyi‘-nâmesi [Osmanlı Tarihi 1648-1682]*. prepared by Fahri Ç. Derin. İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2008.

Abû Bakr Muhammad b. Ishâq al-Bukhârî al-Kalâbâdhî. *Kitâb al-Ta‘arruf li-Madhhab Ahl al-Taşawwuf*. ed. Arthur John Arberry. Qahira: Maktabat al-Khânji.

An Eleventh-Century Egyptian Guide to the Universe: The Book of Curiosities. ed. Yossef Rapoport and Emilie Savage-Smith. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Âşık Çelebi. *Meşâ‘irü’ş-Şu‘arâ*. prepared by Filiz Kılıç. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2018.

Bâbâ Mahmûd. *Sufis and Soldiers in Awrangzeb’s Deccan: Malfûzât-i Naqsh-bandiyya*. translated from Persian with and introduction by Simon Digby. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Defterdâr Sarı Mehmed Paşa. *Zübde-i Vekâyi‘ât (1656-1704)*. prepared by Abdülkadir Özcan. Ankara: TTK Basımevi, 1995.

Evliyâ Çelebi b. Dervîş Muhammed Zillî. *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi: Topkapı Sarayı Bağdat 304 Yazmasının Transkripsiyonu – Dizini*. prepared by Orhan Şaik Gökyay. vol. 1. İstanbul: YKY, 1996.

Fatîn Efendi. *Hâtimetü’l-Eş‘âr (Fatîn Tezkiresi)*. prepared by Ömer Çiftçi. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2017.

Fındıklılı İsmet Efendi. *Şakaik-i Nu‘maniye ve Zeyilleri: Tekmiletü’ş-Şakaik fî Hakk-ı Ehli’l-Hakaik*. prepared by Abdülkadir Özcan. İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları,

1989.

Hâfız Hüseyin Ayvansarayî. *Hadîkatü'l-Cevâmi'*. Dersa'âdet: Matba'a-i 'Âmire, 1281.

———. *Mecmuâ-i Tevârih*. prepared by Fahri Ç. Derin and Vâhid Çubuk. İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1985.

Hafız Hüseyin al-Ayvansarayî. *The Garden of Mosques*. translated and annotated by Howard Crane. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidhī. *Kayfiyyat al-Sulūk ilā Rabb al-°Ālamīn*. ed. °Aşim İbrāhīm al-Kayyālī. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-°İlmiyya, 2007.

Ibn Arabi. *Journey to the Lord of Power: A Sufi Manual on Retreat*. translated by Rabbia Terri Haris. Rochester: Inner Traditions International, 1981.

İbn-i Haldun. *Mukaddime-i İbn-i Haldun Tercümesi*. ed. Yusuf Turan Günaydın. Ankara: Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü, 2016.

Ibn Kannân, *Yawmiyyât Shâmiyya*. ed. Akram Hasan al-°Ulî.

İsmâ'îl Hakkî. “Kitâb-ı Silsile-i İsmâil Hakkî bi-Tarîk-i Celvetî.” in *Celvetilik Metinleri*. edited and translated by Selami Şimşek. İstanbul: Ketebe, 2021.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Eyüp Mahkemesi 3 Numaralı Sicil (H. 993-995/M. 1585-1587). ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. İstanbul: İSAM, 2011.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri İstanbul Mahkemesi 10 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1072-1073 / M. 1661-1663). ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. İstanbul: İBB Kültür A&Ş, 2019.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri: İstanbul Mahkemesi 24 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1138-1151 / M. 1726-1738). ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. İstanbul: İSAM, 2010.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Eyüp Mahkemesi 37 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1047/M. 1637-1638). ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. İstanbul: İSAM, 2011.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Kısmet-i Askeriye Mahkemesi 19 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1109-1110 / M. 1698-1699). ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. İstanbul: İBB Kültür A&Ş, 2019.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri: Rumeli Sadareti Mahkemesi 40 numaralı Sicil (H. 1033-1034 / M. 1623-1624). ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. İstanbul: İBB Kültür A.Ş., 2019.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri: Eyüp Mahkemesi (Havass-ı Refia) 49 numaralı sicil (H. 1054 / M. 1644). ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. İstanbul: İSAM, 2011.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri: Eyüp Mahkemesi 74 numaralı sicil (H. 1072-1073 / M. 1661-1662). ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. İstanbul: İSAM, 2011.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri: Bab Mahkemesi 172 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1152-1153 / M. 1740). ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. İstanbul: Kültür A.Ş, 2019.

İstanbul Kadı Sicilleri Eyüp Mahkemesi 182 Numaralı Sicil (H. 1154-1161/M. 1741-1748). ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. İstanbul: Kültür A.Ş, 2019.

İzzet Ali Paşa. *Dîvân-ı İzzet ve Nigâr-nâme (Tezkire-i Nigâriyye).* prepared by Fatma Sabiha Kutlar Oğuz. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2019.

Kâtip Çelebi. *Kâtip Çelebi'den Seçmeler.* prepared by Orhan Şaik Gökyay. İstanbul: MEB, 1997.

_____. *Keşfü'z-Zünûn: Dizin.* vol. 5. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2007.

_____. *Tuhfetü'l-Kibâr fî Esfâri'l-Bihâr.* prepared by İdris Bostan. Ankara: TÜBA, 2018.

Küçük Çelebizâde İsmâ'îl Âsım Efendi. *Münşe'ât-ı Âsım.* prepared by Fahri Unan. Ankara: TTK, 2013.

Mecdî Mehmed Efendi. *Hadaiku's-Şakaik.* facsimile edition. prepared by Abdülkadir Özcan. İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989.

Mehmed Es'ad Efendi. *Bâğçe-i Safâ-Endûz.* prepared by Rıza Oğraş. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2018.

Mehmed Rüstem Râşid. *Durr al-Muntakhab min Bahr al-Adab fî Tarjamat Silsilat al-Zahab.* İstanbul: Tabhâne-i Âmire-i Litoğrafya, 1274.

Mehmed Süreyya. *Sicill-i Osmânî.* vols. 1-6. prepared by Nuri Akbayar. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996.

Mehmed Tevfik. *Mecmû'atü't-Terâcim.* İÜNEK-TY. no. 192.

_____. "Mecmû'atü't-Terâcim: Mehmed Tevfik Efendi." prepared by Ruhsar Zübeyiroğlu. Unpublished PhD Diss., İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1989.

Muhammad 'İşmet b. İbrâhîm. *al-Rifd al-Nadr 'alâ 'Aqâ'id al-Khidr.* edited by Muhammed Osman Doğan. Amman: Arwiqa, 2021.

Muhammad Ma'şûm. *Terceme-i Mektûbât-ı Ma'şûmiyye.* İstanbul: Matbaa-i Litoğrafya, 1277/1860.

Muhammed Murad Buhârî. *Sohbetnâme*. Prepared by Fakirullah Yıldız. Istanbul: Litera, 2017.

Muhammad Khalîl b. ‘Alî al-Murâdî. *Silk al-Durar fî A‘yân al-Qarn al-Thānî ‘Ashar*. vols. I-IV. ed. Dara b. Hazm. Beirut: Dāru’l-Bashā’iri’l-Islāmiyya, 1988.

Mustafa İsmet Garîbullah. *Risale-i Kudsiyye*. vols. 1-2. ed. Mahmud Ustaosman-ođlu. Istanbul: Ahıska Yayınevi, 2021.

Müstakîmzâde Süleymân Sa‘deddîn. *Mecelletü’n-nisâb fi’n-neseb ve’l-kunâ ve’l-alkâb*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2000.

—————. *Şerh-i İbârât: Mevlevîlik, Mûsikî ve Semâ‘ (İnceleme – Tenkitli Metin)*. prepared by Ensar Karagöz. Istanbul: YEK, 2019.

—————. *Tuhfe-i Hattâtîn*. edited and annotated by İbnülemîn Mahmûd Kemâl Bey. İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1928.

—————. *Tuhfe-i Hattâtîn*. ed. Mustafa Koç. İstanbul: Klasik, 2014.

Nev’îzâde Atâî. *Hadaiku’l-Hakaik fî Tekmileti’ş-Şakaik*. facsimile edition. prepared by Abdülkadir Özcan. İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989.

Osmânzâde Hüseyin Vassâf. *Sefîne-i Evliyâ*. vols. 1-5. İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2006.

Pîrîzâde Mehmed Sâhib. *Tercüme-i Mukaddime-i İbn Haldûn*. ed. Yavuz Yıldırım, Sami Erdem, Halit Özkan, and M. Cüneyt Kaya. vol. I. Istanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2015.

Râmiz. *Âdâb-ı Zurefâ*. prepared by Sadık Erdem. Ankara: AKM, 1994.

Râşid Mehmed Efendi and Çelebizâde İsmâ‘îl Âsım Efendi. *Târîh-i Râşid ve Zeyli*. vols. I-III. ed. Abdülkadir Özcan, Yunus Uğur, Baki Çakır, and Ahmet Zeki İzgeör. İstanbul: Klasik, 2013.

Rycaut, Paul. *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*. the third edition. London: Printed for John Starkey and Henry Brome, 1670.

Sâdık Vicdânî. *Tarikatler ve Silsileleri (Tomâr-ı Turûk-ı ‘Aliyye)*. prepared and abbreviated by İrfan Gündüz. Istanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1995.

Seyyid Mustafa Rasim Efendi. *Tasavvuf Sözlüğü: İstîlâhât-ı İnsân-ı Kâmil*. Istanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2008.

Silâhdâr Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa. *Nusretnâme: İnceleme – Metin (1106-1133 / 1695-1721)*. prepared by Mehmet Topal. Ankara: TÜBA, 2018.

_____. “Silahdar Fındıklılı Mehmed Ağa Zeyl-i Fezleke,” prepared by Nazire Karaçay Türkal. Unpublished PhD Diss., Marmara Üniversitesi 2012.

Şeyh Ahmet el-Bedirî el-Hallâk. *Berber Bedirî'nin Günlüğü, 1741-1762: Osmanlı Taşra Hayatına İlişkin Olaylar*. translated by Hasan Yüksel. Ankara: Akçağ, 1995.

Şeyhî Mehmed. *Vekayiu'l-Fudalâ*. vols. I-II. prepared by Abdülkadir Özcan. İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989.

_____. *Vekâyi'u'l-Fuzalâ: Şeyhî'nin Şakâ'ik Zeyli*. prepared by Ramazan Ekinici. vols. 1-4. İstanbul: YEK, 2018.

Taşköprülüzâde Ahmed Efendi. *eş-Şakâ'iku'n-Nu'mâniyye fî 'Ulemâi'd-Devleti'l-Osmâniyye: Osmanlı Âlimleri*. prepared by Muhammet Hekimoğlu. İstanbul: YEK, 2019.

The Works of Aristotle. vols. I-XII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931.

Tuman, Mehmed Nail. *Tuhfe-i Nâîli: Divan Şairlerinin Muhtasar Biyografileri*. vol. 2. Ankara: Bizim Büro Yayınları, 2000.

Ubeydullah Ahrâr. *Melfûzât*. translated from Persian to Turkish by Fakirullah Yıldız. İstanbul: Litera Yayıncılık, 2021.

The Letters of Khwāja 'Ubayd Allāh Ahrār and His Associates. eds. Jo-Ann Gross and Asam Urunbaev. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Üsküdarlı Mehmed Nasûhî Halvetî. *Seyr ü Sülûk Mektupları (Mürâselât)*. prepared by Mustafa Tatçı and Abdülmecit İslamoğlu. İstanbul: H Yayınları, 2017.

Vak'anüvis Subhî Mehmed Efendi. *Subhî Tarihi: Sâmi ve Şâkir Tarihleri ile Birlikte (İnceleme ve Karşılaştırmalı Metin)*. ed. Mesut Aydın. İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2007.

Zâkir Şükrî. *Die Istanbuler derwisch-konvente und ihre scheiche: (Mecmua-i Tekaya)*. transcribed by Mehmet Serhat Tayşi. ed. Klaus Kraiser. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1980.

Secondary Sources

Abattouy, Mohammed. “The Book of Curiosities or A Medieval Islamic View of the Cosmos.” Accessed 3 November 2021. <https://muslimheritage.com/the-book-of-curiosities-or-a-medieval-islamic-view-of-the-cosmos/>

Abu-Manneh, Butrus. "Sheikh Murād al-Bukhārī and the Expansion of the Naqshbandī-Mujaddidī Order in Istanbul." *Die Welt des Islams* 53/1 (2013): 1-25.

_____. "The Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi and the Bektashi Orders in 1826." in *Studies on Islam and the Ottoman Empire in the 19th Century (1826-1876)*. Istanbul: ISIS, 2001: 59-71.

_____. "The Naqshbandiyya-Mujaddidiyya and the Khālidiyya in Istanbul in the Early Nineteenth Century." in *Studies on Islam and the Ottoman Empire in the 19th Century (1826-1876)*. Istanbul: ISIS, 2001: 41-57.

_____. "The Naqshbandiyya-Mujaddidiyya in Istanbul in the Early Tanzimat Period." in *Studies on Islam and the Ottoman Empire in the 19th Century (1826-1876)*. Istanbul: ISIS, 2001: 99-114.

_____. "The Naqshbandiyya-Mujaddidiyya in the Ottoman Lands in the Early 19th Century." *Die Welt des Islams* 22 (1982): 1-36.

_____. "The Rise and Expansion of the Naqshbandi-Khalidi Sub-order in Early Nineteenth Century." in *Studies on Islam and the Ottoman Empire in the 19th Century (1826-1876)*. Istanbul: ISIS, 2001: 13-26.

Abusaliem, Issa. "Manhac al-Murādī fī Kitābuhu Maṭmaḥ al-Wājid fī Tarjamat al-Wālid al-Mājid," *Majallatun Kulliyat al- Ādāb* 59 (2016): 435-458.

Acar, H. İbrahim. "İddet." *TDVIA*. vol. 21. 466-471.

Açikel, Ali. "Osmanlı Ulak-Menzilhane Sistemi Çerçevesinde Tokat Menzilhanesi (1690-1840)." *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi* 19/2 (2004): 1-33.

Açıkgöz, Namık. "Muğla Mevlevîhânesi." in *Ulusal Sempozyum: Günümüzde Yurt İçi Mevlevîhânelerinin Durum ve Konumları: Bildiriler-Sunular, 9-10 Aralık 2013*. Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Mevlâna Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Yayınları, 2017: 293-303.

Açıl, Berat. "Habeşî Mehmed Ağa'nın (ö. 1590) Vakfettiği Kitaplar ve Akıbetleri." *International Journal of Turkology* 6 (2020): 67-83.

Ağırakça, Ahmet. "Müneccimbaşı, Ahmed Dede." *TDVIA*. vol. 32. Istanbul: TDV, 2006: 4-6.

Akkach, Samer. *Abd al-Ghani al-Nabulusi: Islam and the Enlightenment*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2007.

_____. *Letters of a Sufi Scholar: The Correspondence of ʿAbd al-Ghanī al-*

Nābulusī (1641-1731). Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Aksoy, Hasan. “Nazmi Efendi, Mehmed.” *TDVIA*. vol. 32. 460-461.

Aksoyak, İsmail Hakkı. “Resâ, Şeyh Haydar Resâ Efendi.” Accessed 15 June 2023.
<https://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/resa-seyh-haydar-resa-efendi>

Aktepe, Münir. “Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa.” *TDVIA*. vol. 17. 166-168.

_____. “Kapudân-ı Derya Morali Aşçı Hacı İbrahim Paşa ve Vakfiyeleri.” *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* 6 (1975): 177-203.

_____. *Patrona İsyanı: 1730*. Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1958.

Akün, Ömer Faruk. “Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki.” *TDVIA*. vol. 14. 146-149.

Alam, Muzaffar. “The Mughals, the Sufi Shaykhs and the Formation of the Akbari Dispensation.” *Modern Asian Studies* 43/1 (2009): 135-174.

Albayrak, Nurettin. “İzzet Ali Paşa.” *TDVIA*. vol. 23. Istanbul: TDV, 2001: 556-557.

Algar, Hamid. “A Brief History of the Naqshbandī Order.” in *Naqshbandis: Historical Development and Present Situation of a Muslim Mystical Order*. Istanbul: ISIS, 1990: 3-44.

_____. “Baba Haydar.” *TDVIA*. vol. 4. Istanbul: TDV, 1991: 367.

_____. “Bahâeddin Nakşibend.” *TDVIA*. vol. 4. Istanbul: TDV, 1991: 458-460.

_____. “From Kashghar to Eyüp: The Lineages and Legacy of Sheikh Abdullah Nidāi.” in *Naqshbandis in Western and Central Asia*. ed. Elisabeth Özdalga. Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, 1999: 1-15.

_____. “Naqshband.” *EI2*. vol. VII. Leiden: Brill, 1993: 933-934.

_____. “Naqshbandiyya: in Persia and in Turkey.” *EI2*. vol. VII. Leiden: Brill, 1993: 934-937.

_____. “Nakshband, Khwâdja Bahâ' al-Dîn.” *EI2*. vol. VII. Leiden: Brill, 1993: 933-934.

_____. “Nakşibendiyye.” *TDVIA*. vol. 32. Istanbul: TDV, 2006: 335-342.

_____. “Some Notes on the Naqshbandī Ṭarīqat in Bosnia.” *Die Welt des Islams*. New Series. vol. 13/3-4 (1971): 168-203.

_____. “Târîqat and Târîq: Central Asian Naqshbandîs on the Roads to the Haramayn.” in *Central Asian Pilgrims: Hajj Routes and Pious Visits between Central Asia and the Hijaz*. eds. Alexandre Papas, Thomas Welsford, and Thierry Zarcone. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2012: 21-135.

_____. “The Naqshbandi Order: A Preliminary Survey of Its History and Significance.” *Studia Islamica* 44 (1976): 123-152.

Alkan, Mustafa. “Osmanlı Devleti’nde Özbek Tekkeleri.” in *Yitik Hafızanın Peşinde: Buhara Konuşmaları*. eds. Mehmet Dursun Erdem and others. Ankara: Pruva, 2019: 247-285.

Alkaya, Yeliz. “Cevrî, Hall-i Tahkîkât ve ‘Aynü’l-Füyûz: İnceleme-metin (1b-36b).” Unpublished MA Thesis, Kocaeli Üniversitesi, 2018.

Almasi, Gabor. *The Uses of Humanism: Johannes Sambucus (1531-1584), Andreas Dudith (1533-1589), and The Republic of Letters in East Central Europe*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Altuğ, Fatih. “İhvân-ı Safâ’da Zoopolis ve Kozmopolis Karşı Karşıya.” *Doğu Batı, Faunaya Ağıt: Hayvan* 82 (2018): 223-244.

Altunan, Sema. “XVIII. Yüzyılda Silistre Eyaletinde Haberleşme Ağı: Rumeli Sağ Kol Menzilleri.” *OTAM* 18 (2005): 1-20.

Ambros, Edith Gülçin. “Naḥîfî.” *EI2*. vol. VII. 905.

Anderson, Sonia. *An English Consul in Turkey: Paul Rycout at Smyrna, 1667-1678*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Ansari, Muhammad Abdul Haq. *Sufism and Sharî‘a: A Study of Shaykh Aḥmad Sirhindî’s Effort to Reform Sufism*. London: The Islamic Foundation, 1986.

Araç, Ünal. *İktidar ve Sanat: Damat İbrahim Paşa’nın Hamiliği (1718-1730)*. Istanbul: Vakıfbank Kültür Yayınları, 2022.

Arberry, Arthur. John. “Kelâbâzî.” *IA*. vol. VI. 537-538.

_____. *The Chester Beatty Librar: A Handlist of the Arabic Manuscripts*. vol. VII. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co., Ltd., 1964.

Ariès, Philippe. *Western Attitudes Toward Death: From the Middle Ages to the Present*. trans. Patricia M. Ranum. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1975.

Arslan, Mehmet. “Râşid, Râşid Mehmed Rüstem Efendi, Sivashı,” *TEIS*. Accessed

11 October 2023. <https://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/rasid-rasid-mehmed-rustem-efendi>

Artan, Tülay. “18. Yüzyıl Başlarında Yönetici Elitin Saltanatın Meşruiyet Arayışına Katılımı.” *Toplum ve Bilim* 83 (1999/2000): 292-322.

_____. “Cosmopolitan Istanbul, 1650–1750: Strangers in the Company of Manuscripts, Paintings and Coffee.” in *Twelve Cities- One Sea. Early Modern Mediterranean Port Cities and Their Inhabitants*. eds. Giovanni Tarantino and Paola von Wyss-Giacosa. Quaderni series of the Rivista Storica Italiana. Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 2023: 156-177.

_____. “Cosmopolitanism in the Early 18th-Century Ottoman Capital: The Impostor, the Alchemist, the Merchant and the Personal Dimension.” *Turcica* 55 (2024) (forthcoming).

_____. “El Yazmaları Işığında Bir Çevre ve Çehre Eskizi: Kadızâdeliler, Müceddidîler ve Damad İbrahim Paşa (1730).” *Müteferrika* 50 (2016): 1-94.

_____. “Eyüp.” *TDVIA*. vol. 12. İstanbul: TDV, 1995: 1-6.

_____. “Patrons, Painters, Women in Distress: The Changing Fortunes of Nev'izade Atayi and Üskübi Mehmed Efendi in Early Eighteenth-Century İstanbul.” *Muqarnas: An Annual on the Visual Culture of the Islamic World* 39 (2022): 109-152.

_____. “Royal Weddings and The Grand Vezirate: Institutional and Symbolic Change in the Early Eighteenth Century.” in *Royal Courts in Dynastic States and Empires*. eds. Jeroen Duindam, Tülay Artan, and Metin Kunt. Leiden: Brill, 2011: 339-399.

_____. “The first, hesitant steps of Ottoman protocol and diplomacy into modernity (1676-1725).” *The Court Historian* 26/I. Special Issue: Monarchy and Modernity since 1500 (2021): 29-43.

_____. “The Paradoxes Of Hagia Sophia’s Ablution Fountain: The Qasida al-Burda in Cosmopolitan İstanbul, 1740.” in *Hagia Sophia in the Long Nineteenth Century*. ed. Benjamin Anderson and Emily Neumeier. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2024: 66-97.

al-Asfur, Su‘ud Muhammad. “The Political Role of the Ulama of Damascus at the Time of Circassian Mameluks.” *Anali Gazi Husrev-Begove / Gazi Husrev Bey’s Library Annals XXIII-XXIV* (2005): 365-394.

Aslan, Ali. “Yazma Eserlerde Mülkiyet Tezâhürleri ve Temellük Kayıtları: Reisülküttab Acem Bekir Efendi Örneği.” Unpublished PhD Diss., İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2024.

Aslan, Aslı Sağıroğlu and Yeşim Sökütlü. “Şeyh Devati Mustafa Haziresi’ndeki Mezar Taşları.” *TÜBİTAK: final report*. Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi, 2016.

Aslan, Üzeyir. “Çarhacı, Şeyh Ahmed Efendi.” Accessed 27 June 2023. <https://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/carhaci-seyh-ahmed-efendi>

Aşkar, Mustafa. “Niyâzî-i Mısırî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 33. 166-169.

Atalar, Münir. “Emîr-i Hac.” *TDVIA*. vol. 11. 132.

Atçıl, Abdurrahman. *Scholars and Sultans in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Atçıl, Elif Zeynep. “Tuhfe-i Gaznevî Tezyînatı ve XVII. Yüzyıl Kitap Sanatlarındaki Yeri.” Unpublished MA Thesis. Marmara Üniversitesi, 2023.

Ateş, Ahmet. “İbn al-‘Arabî, Muhyî’l-dîn.” *EI2*. vol. III. Leiden: Brill, 1986: 707-711.

Ayalon, Yaron. *Natural Disasters in the Ottoman Empire: Plague, Famine, and Other Misfortunes*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Ayan, Hüseyin. “Cevrî İbrâhim Çelebi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 7. İstanbul: TDV, 1993: 460-461.

Ayar, Mesut. “Eyüp’te İsmi Unutulmuş Bir Tekke: Şeyh Arapzâde Hacı Ali Efendi Nakşibendî Dergâhı.” in *Yücel Dağlı Anısına*. eds. Evangelia Balta, Yorgos Dedes, Emin Nedret İşli, and M. Sabri Koz. İstanbul: Turkuaz, 2011: 31-51.

_____. “Eyüp’te Oluklubayır Nakşibendî Tekkesi.” *İstanbul Araştırmaları 2* (1997): 53-66.

Aydın, Cengiz. “Abdurrahman es-Sûfî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 1. İstanbul: TDV, 1988: 172-173.

Aydın, Mehmet Akif and Muhammed Hamidullah. “Köle.” *TDVIA*. vol. 26. 242.

Aydüz, Salim. “İslam Medeniyetinde Takvimler.” *Yedikata* 60 (August 2013): 52-59.

_____. “İsmet Mehmed Efendi.” *TDVIA*. vol. EK-1. İstanbul: TDV, 2016: 664-666.

_____. “İsmet Mehmed Efendi (ö. 1747) ve Tedâhül-i Seneye Dair Risâlesi.” *Kutadgubilig Felsefe-Bilim Araştırmaları Dergisi* 15 (March, 2009): 223-264.

_____. “Lâle Devri’nde Yapılan İlmî Faaliyetler.” *DİVAN* 3 (1997): 147-159.

_____. “Müneccimbaşı Takvimleri ve Tarihi Kaynak Olarak Değerleri.” *Cogito* 22 (2000): 132-144.

_____. “Osmanlı Devleti’nde Müneccimbaşılık ve Müneccimbaşılar.” Unpublished MA Thesis, İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1993.

_____. “Osmanlı Devleti’nde Müneccimbaşılık Müessesesi.” *Belleten* 70 (2006): 167-264.

_____. “Uluğ Bey Zîci’nin Osmanlı Astronomi Çalışmalarındaki Yeri ve Önemi.” *bilig* 25 (Bahar, 2003): 139-172.

Aynur, Hatice. “Murad Molla Library ve Yapım Kitabesi.” *Z Dergisi* 5 (2021): 121-123.

Aypay, İrfan. *Lâle Devri Şairi İzzet Ali Paşa, Hayatı-Eserleri-Edebi Kişiliği, Divan: Tenkitli Metin, Nigâr-nâme: Tenkitli Metin*. İstanbul: 1998.

_____. “Nahifi Süleyman Efendi (Hayatı, Eserleri, Edebi Kişiliği ve Divanı’nın Tenkitli Metni).” Unpublished PhD Diss., vol. I. Selçuk Üniversitesi, 1992.

Azamat, Nihat. “Abdülkâdir-i Belhî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 1. 231-232.

_____. “Divane Mehmed Çelebi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 9. İstanbul: TDV, 1994: 435-437.

_____. “Kalenderiyye.” *TDVIA*. vol. 24. 253-256.

_____. “La‘îzâde Abdülbâki.” *TDVIA*. vol. 27. Ankara: TDV, 2003: 90-92.

_____. “Sarı Abdullah Efendi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 36. İstanbul: TDV, 2009: 145-147.

Baer, Marc David. *Honored by the Glory of Islam: Conversion and Conquest in Ottoman Europe*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Baktır, Hasan. “Bir İngiliz Şarkiyatçının Portresi: Sör Paul Rycaut.” *TAED* 65 (2019): 165-188.

Barbir, Karl K. “All in the family: The Muradis of Damascus.” in *Proceedings: IIIrd Congress on the Social and Economic History of Turkey*. ed. Heath Lowry and Ralph Hattox. İstanbul: ISIS, 1990: 327-353.

Barkey, Karen. *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Baş, Fatma. “17. Yüzyıl Divanlarında Köprülü Ailesinden Sadrazamlara Sunulan Kasideler Üzerine Bir İnceleme.” *Journal of Turkish Language and Literature* 2/1 (2016): 35-50.

Bayak, Cemal. “Nevrûziyye.” *TDVIA*. vol. 33. Istanbul: TDV, 2007: 62.

Bayram, Kenan and Metin Hakverdioğlu. “Fâ’iz Efendi ve Şâkir Bey Mecmuası’nın Mecmuaların Sistematik Tasnifi Projesi’ne (MESTAP) Göre Tasnifi ve Nahîfî’nin Bilinmeyen Bir Kıt’ası.” *Kesit Akademi Dergisi* (December, 2020): 307-327.

Behrens, Gerhard. “An Ottoman Calendar for 1740/41.” *Middle East Studies Online Journal* 4/2 (2011): 1-47.

Bekar, Cumhuri. “The Rise of the Köprülü Household: The Transformation of Patronage in the Ottoman Empire in the Seventeenth Century.” *Turkish Historical Review* 11 (2020): 229-256.

Bellefonds, Yvon Linant de. “İdda.” *EI2*. vol III. 1010-1013.

Ben-Zaken, Avner. “Exchanging Heliocentrism for Ur-Text.” in *Cross-Cultural Scientific Exchanges in the Eastern Mediterranean, 1560-1660*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2010: 47-75.

Bevilacqua, Alexander. *The Republic of Arabic Letters: Islam and the European Enlightenment*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2018.

Beydilli, Kemal. “Prut Antlaşması.” *TDVIA*. vol. 34. Istanbul: TDV, 2007: 359-362.

Bilgin, Azmi. “Türk Edebiyatında Bayramlar ve Nevruz Bayramı.” *Türk Dili* 617 (2003): 448-457.

Bilkan, Ali Fuat. “İki Sulhiyye Işığında Osmanlı Toplumunda Barış Özlemi.” *Türkler*. vol. 12. eds. Hasan Celal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek, Salim Koca. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınevi: 598-605.

_____. *Osmanlı Şiirine Modern Yaklaşımlar*. Istanbul: Leyla ile Mecnun Yayıncılık, 2006.

Binbaş, İlker Evrim. *Intellectual Networks in Timurid Iran: Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Alī Yazdī and the Islamic Republic of Letters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

Press, 2016.

Boogert, Maurits van den. “Patrick Russell and the Republic of Letters in Aleppo.” in *The Republic of Letters and The Levant*. eds. Alastair Hamilton, Maurits van den Boogert, and Bart Westerweel. Leiden: Brill, 2005: 223-264.

Bottini, Laura. “Les Descendants du Prophete a Ḥoms: Notes en Marge.” *Oriente Moderno* 79/2 (1999): 351-373.

Bölükbaşı, Ayşe. “XVI. Yüzyılda İstanbul’daki Halveti Tekkeleri.” Unpublished PhD Diss., İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi, 2015. ————. “XVI. Yüzyılda İstanbul’daki Halveti Tekkelerinde Mekânsal İşleyiş:

Tekkelerin Mensup Oldukları Külliye İçindeki Diğer Birimlerle İlişkileri.” *Bilecik Şeyh Edebali Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 3/1 (2018): 214-239.

Böwering, G. “Gangōhī.” *EI2* Suppl. 312-313.

Brockelmann, Carl. *History of the Arabic Written Tradition*. sup. vol. 1. translated by Joep Lameer. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

———. *History of the Arabic Written Tradition*. sup. vol. 2. translated by Joep Lameer. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Brockliss, Laurence. *Calvet’s Web: Enlightenment and the Republic of Letters in Eighteenth-Century France*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Bruijn, J. T. P. de. “Mahmūd Shabistarī.” *EI2*. vol. VI. Leiden: Brill, 1991: 72-73.

Buehler, Arthur. *Revealed Grace: The Jurisdic Sufism of Ahmad Sirhindi (1564-1624)*. Louisville: Fons Vitae, 2011.

———. “Sharī‘at and ‘Ulama in Aḥmad Sirhindī’s ‘Collected Letters.’” *Die Welt des Islams* 43/3 (2003): 309-320.

———. “Tales of Renewal: Ahmad Sirhindi, Reformer of the Second Millennium.” in *Tales of God’s Friends: Islamic Hagiography in Translation*. ed. J. Renard. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009: 234-248.

———. “The Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah and its Rise to Prominence in India.” *Bulletin of the Henry Martyn Institute of Islamic Studies* 13 (1994): 44-61.

———. “Translation Issues in Aḥmad Sirhindī’s Collected Letters: Why Sharī‘ah Is A Lot More Than Just ‘Islamic Law.’” *Oriente Moderno* XCII/2 (2012): 311-321.

Burton, Audrey. "Nadir Muḥammad Khān, Ruler of Bukhara (1641-1645) and Balkh (1645-1651)." *Central Asiatic Journal* 32/1-2 (1988): 19-33.

Büyükaksoy, Ahmet. "James Porter'in İstanbul Büyükelçiliği (1747-1762)." Unpublished PhD Diss., Marmara University, 2016.

Can, Lâle. *Spiritual Subjects: Central Asian Pilgrims and the Ottoman Hajj at the End of Empire*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2020.

Canbakal, Hülya. "On the 'Nobility' of Provincial Notables." in *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire: Halcyon Days in Crete, V (A Symposium Held in Rethymno, 10-12 January 2003)*. ed. Antonis Anastasopoulos. Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2005: 39-50.

———. *Society and Politics in an Ottoman Town: 'Ayntāb in the 17th Century*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. "The Ottoman State and Descendants of the Prophet in Anatolia and the Balkans (c. 1500-1700)." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 52 (2009): 542-578.

Carhart, Michael. *Leibniz Discovers Asia: Social Networking in the Republic of Letters*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2019.

Ceylan, Ömür. "Şiirin Seyir Defteri I." in *Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları. Festschrift in Honor of Walter G. Andrews* 34/I (2010): 121-172.

Chittick, William C. "Waḥdat al-Shuhūd and Waḥdat al-Wudjūd." *EI2*. vol. XI. 37-39.

Choudhury, Rishad Islam. "The Hajj and the Hindi: The Ascent of the Indian Sufi Lodge in the Ottoman Empire." *Modern Asian Studies* 50 (2016): 1888-1931.

Cıvız, Yunus Naci. "İslam Hukukunda İstihlāk ve Hükümleri." *Yalova Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 5 (2015): 225-248.

Coşkun, Feray. "Sanctifying Ottoman Istanbul: The Shrine of Abū Ayyūb al-Anşārī." Unpublished PhD Diss., Freie Universität Berlin, 2015.

Çağman, Filiz. "Abdullah-ı Buhârî." *TDVIA*. vol. 1. İstanbul: TDV, 1988: 87-88.

Çağrıçı, Mustafa. "Emîr bi'l-Ma'rûf Nehiy ani'l-Münker." *TDVIA*. vol. 11. 138-141. vÇakır, Numan. "Murad Buhârî'nin Kur'ân Sözlüğünün Türkçe Bölümlerinin Özgünlüğü Meselesi." *Tefsir Araştırmaları Dergisi / The Journal of Tafsr Studies* 6/2 (2022): 706-732.

Çakmaktaş, Büşra. “La‘lîzâde Abdülbâkî'nin Mebde' ve Meâd Adlı Eseri.” Unpublished MA Thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2010.

Çalışır, Muhammed Fatih. “A Virtuous Grand Vizier: Politics and Patronage in the Ottoman Empire During the Grand Vizierate of Fazıl Ahmed Pasha (1661-1676).” Unpublished PhD Diss., Georgetown University, 2016.

_____. “Köprülü Sadrazamlar ve Sûfî Çevreler.” in *Osmanlı'da İlm-i Tasavvuf*. ed. Ercan Alkan and Osman Sacid Arı. Istanbul: İSAR, 2018: 793-802.

_____. “Sadrazam Köprülüzâde Fazıl Ahmed Paşa'nın Hâmiliğindeki İlmî Faaliyetler.” in *XVIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi (1-5 Ekim 2018, Ankara) Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*. vol. IV. prepared by Semiha Nurdan and Muhammed Özler. Ankara: TTK, 2022: 35-48.

Çavuşoğlu, Semiramis. “The Qādîzâdeli Movement: An Attempt of Şerî'at-Minded Reform in the Ottoman Empire.” Unpublished PhD Diss., Princeton University, 1990.

Çetin, Nuran. “Eyüp Tekkeleri.” Unpublished PhD Diss., Marmara Üniversitesi 2012.

_____. *Gönül Sultanlarının Ağırlandığı Tekke: Kâşgarî Dergâhı*. Istanbul: Eyüpsultan Belediyesi Yayınları, 2018.

_____. “Kaşgari Tekkesi.” *Tarihi, Kültürü ve Sanatıyla Eyüpsultan Sempozyumu VIII: Tebliğler*. Istanbul: Eyüp Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2004: 294-305.

_____. “Murad Buhari Tekkesi ve Fonksiyonları.” *Amasya Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 4 (2015): 5-36.

Çınarcı, Mehmet Nuri. “Hüdâyî Şeyh Sâlih Dede.” *TEİS*. Accessed 15 May 2021. <http://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/hudayi-hudayi-hudayi-dede-seyh>

Çoban, Ali. “Telif ve Teklif: XVIII. Yüzyıl Osmanlı'sında Nakşibendîlik Risaleleri.” *TALİD* 16/31-32 (2018): 133-176.

Çıpan, Mustafa. “İbrâhim Şâhidî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 38. Istanbul: TDV, 2010: 273-274.

Dağlar, Abdülkadir. “Şem'î Şem'ullâh Şerh-i Mesnevî (I. Cilt): İnceleme – Tenkitli Metin – Sözlük.” Unpublished PhD Diss., Erciyes Üniversitesi 2009.

Dakic, Uros. “The Sokollu Family Clan and the Politics of Vizierial Households in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century.” Unpublished MA Thesis, Central

European University, 2012.

Danişmend, İsmail Hâmi. *Osmanlı Devlet Erkânı*. İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1971.

Darling, Linda T. "Ottoman Politics Through British Eyes: Paul Rycaut's 'The Present State of the Ottoman Empire'" *Journal of World History* 5/1 (1994): 71-97.

Darnton, Robert. "A Polis Inspector Sorts His Files: The Anatomy of the Republic of Letters." in *The Great Cat Massacre*. New York: Basic Books, 1999: 145-190.

Daston, Lorraine. "The Ideal and Reality of the Republic of Letters in the Enlightenment." *Science in Context* 4/2 (1991): 367-386.

"December 1732-Sun in Istanbul." Accessed 9 November 2021. <https://www.timeanddate.com/sun/turkey/istanbul?month=12&year=1732>

Değirmençay, Veyis. "Sultan Veled." *TDVIA*. vol. 37. İstanbul: TDV, 2009: 521-522.

Deininger, Whitaker. "Aristotle." in *World Philosophers and Their Works*. vol I. ed. John K. Roth. Pasedena&Hackensack: Salem Press, 2000: 70-100.

Deleuze, Gilles. "The Letters on Evil (correspondence with Blyenbergh)." in *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. translated by Robert Hurley. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1988: 30-43.

Demir, Murat. "Murâd-ı Nakşibendî ve Menâkıbı." Unpublished MA Thesis, Uludağ Üniversitesi, 1998.

Demir, Tanju and Betül Çelik. "XVII. Yüzyıl Sonlarında Aydın'da Bir Osmanlı Bürokratı: Defterdâr İsmail Paşa (Kırlı)." *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 26/42 (2007): 67-83.

Demirci, Mustafa. "Makûlât-ı Devriyye'de Müstakîmzâde Süleymân Sa'deddîn'in Mûsikî ve Semâa Dair Görüşleri." *C.Ü. İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* XVIII/2 (2014): 171-190.

Demirel, Şener. "Mevlânâ'nın Mesnevî'si ve Şerhleri." *TALİD* 5/10 (2007): 469-504.

Demirli, Ekrem. "Vahdet-i Vücûd." *TDVIA*. vol. 42. 434.

Derman, Uğur. "Hâfız Osman." *TDVIA*. vol. 15. İstanbul: TDV, 1997: 98-100.

- _____. “Mehmed Râsim, Eğrikapılı.” *TDVIA*. vol. 28. 514-515.
- _____. “Tuhfe-i Hattâtîn.” *TDVIA*. vol. 41. Istanbul: TDV, 2012: 351-352.
- DİA. “Haraç.” *TDVIA*. vol. 16. Istanbul: TDV, 1997: 88-90.
- Dibon, Paul. “Communication in the Respublica litteraria of the 17th century.” *Respublica litterarum. Studies in the Classical Tradition* 1 (1978): 43-55.
- Digby, Simon. “‘Abd al-Qoddus Gangohi (1456-1537 A.D.): The Personality and Attitudes of A Medieval Indian Sufi.” *Medieval India: A Miscellany* 3 (1975): 1-66.
- _____. “The Naqshbandîs in the Deccan in the Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Century A.D.: Bâbâ Palangposh, Bâbâ Musâfir and Their Adherents.” in *Naqshbandis: Historical Developments and Present Situation of a Muslim Mystical Order*. ed. Marc Gaborieau, Alexandre Popovic, and Thierry Zarcone. Istanbul: ISIS, 1990: 167-207.
- Dizer, Muammer. “Ali b. Ebü’r-Ricâl.” *TDVIA*. vol. 2. Istanbul: TDV, 1989: 387-388.
- Doğan, Muhammed Nur. “Ebûishak İsmâil Efendi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 10. 278-279.
- Döndüren, Hamdi. “Ashâbü’l-Ferâiz.” *TDVIA*. vol. 3. Istanbul: TDV, 1991: 467-468.
- Durceylan, Muhammed Tayyip. “Abdulğanî en-Nâblusî’ye Ait el-Ukûdü’l-Lü’lüyye İsimli Eserin Ârifî Ahmed Dede Tercümesi (Tahkîk ve Transkripsiyon).” Unpublished MA Thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2015.
- Durmaz, Tunahan. “Family, Companions, and Death: Seyyid Hasan Nûrî Efendi’s Microcosm (1661-1665).” Unpublished MA Thesis, Sabancı University, 2019.
- Durmuş, Tuba Işımsu. “Divanlarda Kendilerine Sunulan Övgü Şiirleri Üzerinden Osmanlı Sanatına Katkı Sunan Aileler Üzerine Tespitler.” *Divan Edebiyatı Araştırmaları Dergisi* 26 (2021): 143-220.
- _____. *Şair ve Sultan: Osmanlı’da Edebi Himaye*. Istanbul: Muhit Kitap, 2021.
- _____. *Tutsan Elini Ben Fakirin: Osmanlı Edebiyatında Hamilik Geleneği*. Istanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2009.
- Düzenli, Halil İbrahim. “İstanbul Türbeleri.” in *Antik Çağ’dan XXI. Yüzyıla Büyük İstanbul Tarihi: Mimari*. ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. vol. VIII. Istanbul: İBB Kültür AŞ., 2015: 428-449.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth. "Print Culture and Enlightenment Thought." *Réseaux* 6/31 (1988): 7-38.

Ekinci, Ramazan. "Sevgiliye ve Dost(lar)a Mektuplar: Münşeât-ı Nahîfi." *TAED* 54 (2015): 239-287.

Elbirlik, Leyla Kayhan. "Dialogue Beyond Margins: Patronage of Chief Eunuchs in the Late 16th Century Ottoman Court." *Sanat Tarihi Yıllığı* 22 (2010): 63-99.

Eldem, Edhem. "Urban Voices From Beyond: Identity, Status and Social Strategies in Ottoman Muslim Funerary Epitaphs of Istanbul (1700-1850)." in *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire*. eds. Virginia Aksan and Daniel Goffman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007: 233-255.

Emecen, Feridun. "Matruşka'nın Küçük Parçası: Nevşehirli Damat İbrahim Paşa Dönemi ve "Lale Devri" Meselesi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları/The Journal of Ottoman Studies* 52 (2018): 79-98.

Erdem, Hakan. *Slavery in the Ottoman Empire and its Demise, 1800-1909*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996.

Ergin, Osman. *Türk Şehirlerinde İmaret Sistemi*. Istanbul: Cumhuriyet Matbaası, 1939.

Erginbaş, Vefa. "Enlightenment in the Ottoman Context: İbrahim Müteferrika and His Intellectual Landscape." in *Historical Aspects of Printing and Publishing in Languages of the Middle East*. ed. Geoffrey Roper. Leiden: Brill, 2014: 53-100.

Erimtan, Can. "The Perception of Saadabad: The 'Tulip Age' and Ottoman-Safavid Rivalry." in *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century*. ed. Dana Sajdi. London&New York: I.B. Tauris, 2007: 41-62.

Ersen, Ahmet and Mehmet Ulukan. "Özbek Tekkeleri ve Eyüp Özbekler Tekkesi" in *Tarihi, Kültürü ve Sanatıyla Eyüpsultan Sempozyumu IX: Tebliğler*. Istanbul: Eyüp Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2005: 133-145.

Erünsal, İsmail. "Pertev Paşa Library." *TDVIA*. vol. 34. 238.

Esir, Hasan Ali. *Münşeât-ı Lâmiî (Lâmiî Çelebi'nin Mektupları) -İnceleme-Metin-İndeks-Sözlük-*. Trabzon: Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2006.

Espenak, Fred. "Total Lunar Eclipse of 1732 Dec. 01." Accessed 9 November 2021. <http://www.eclipsewise.com/lunar/LEprime/1701-1800/LE1732Dec01Tprime.html>

- Eyice, Semavi. "Hekimbaşı Ömer Efendi Külliyesi." *TDVIA*. vol. 17. 165-166.
- Fakhry, Majid. *Ethical Theories in Islam*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya. "Migration into Eighteenth-Century 'Greater Istanbul' as reflected in the Kadı Registers of Eyüp." *Turcica* 30 (1998): 163-183.
- _____. *Pilgrims and Sultans: The Hajj under the Ottomans*. New York: I.B. Tauris, 1996.
- Fazlıoğlu, İhsan. "Mîram Çelebi: Mahmûd ibn Qutb al-Dîn Muhammad ibn Muhammad ibn Mûsâ Qâdîzâde." in *The Biographical Encyclopedia of Astronomers*. ed. Thomas Hockey. New York: Springer, 2007: 788-789.
- _____. "Mîrim Çelebi." *TDVIA*. vol. 30. Istanbul: TDV, 2005: 160-161.
- _____. "Mîrim Çelebi." Accessed 1 November 2021. <http://fazlioglu.blogspot.com/2018/07/ihsan-fazlioglu-mirim-celebi.html>
- Fazlur Rahman. "Baḳā° wa-Fanā." *EI2*. vol. I. 951.
- Fehd, Tevfik. "İlm-i Felek." *TDVIA*. vol. 22. Istanbul: TDV, 2002: 126-129.
- Felek, Özgen. *Kitâbü'l-Menâmât: Sultan III. Murad'ın Rûya Mektupları*. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2014.
- Fetvacı, Emine. *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.
- _____. "Viziers to Eunuchs: Transitions in Ottoman Manuscript Patronage, 1566-1617." PhD Diss., Harvard University, 2005.
- Findley, "Factional Rivalry in Ottoman Istanbul: The Fall of Pertev Pasha, 1837." *Journal of Turkish Studies / Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* X (1986): 127-134.
- _____. "Pertev Mehmed Said Paşa." *TDVIA*. vol. 34. 233-235.
- Fletcher, Joseph. "Central Asian Sufism and Ma Ming-hsin's New Teaching." in *Studies on Chinese and Islamic Inner Asia*. ed. Beatrice Forbes Manz. Aldershot: Variorum, 1995: 75-96.
- _____. "The Naqshbandiyya and the Dhikr-i Arra." *Journal of Turkish Studies / Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* I (1977): 113-119.
- Friedmann, Yohanan. *Shaykh Aḳmad Sirhindî: An Outline of His Thought and a Study of His Image in the Eyes of Posterity*. Montreal and London: McGill-Queens University Press, 1971.

———. *Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindî: An Outline of His Thought and a Study of His Image in the Eyes of Posterity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Fumaroli, Marc. *The Republic of Letters*. translated from French by Lara Vergnaud. New Heaven, London: Yale University Press, 2018.

Furey, Constance. *Erasmus, Contarini, and the Religious Republic of Letters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Galitekin, Ahmed Nezih. *Osmanlı Kaynaklarına Göre İstanbul: Câmî, Tekke, Medrese, Mekteb, Türbe, Hamam, Kütüphâne, Matbaa, Mahalle ve Selâtin İmâretleri*. İstanbul: İşaret Yayınları, 2003.

Genç, Mehmet. “Mâlikâne.” *TDVIA*. vol. 27. 516-518.

Goffman, Daniel. *Britons in the Ottoman Empire, 1642-1660*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998.

Goldgar, Anne. *Impolite Learning: Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters, 1680-1750*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1995.

Goodman, Dena. *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment*. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Göçmen, Muammer. “Üstüvânî Mehmed Efendi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 42. 396-397.

Gök, İbrahim. “Three treatises on the Mawlawi order, being a critical edition of al-Uqud al-lu’lu’iyyah by ‘Abd al-Ghaniyy al-Nabulusi, al-Tuhfah al-bahiyyah by Trabzoni Ahmed Kosec, and al-Suhbah al-safiyah by Darwish Mahmud As’ad Ghalib, together with a critical introduction.” Unpublished PhD Diss., Lancaster University, 1977.

Gökbilgin, M. Tayyip. “Köprülüler.” *IA*. vol. VI. facsimile edition. Eskişehir: MEB, 1997: 892-897.

Gökbilgin, M. Tayyip and C. Repp. “Köprülü.” *EI2*. vol. V. Leiden: Brill, 1986: 259.

Gökyay, Orhan Şaik. “Kâtib Çelebi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 25. 36-40.

———. “Tanzimat Dönemine Değın Mektup.” *Türk Dili* 274 (1974): 17-87.

Gölpınarlı, Abdülbâki. *Melâmîlik ve Melâmîler*. facsimile edition. İstanbul: Gri Yayın, 1992.

———. *Mevlânâ’dan Sonra Mevlevîlik*. İstanbul: Gül Matbaası, 1983.

_____. *Mevlânâ'dan Sonra Mevlevîlik*. second edition. İstanbul: İnkılap & Aka, 1983.

_____. *Mevlevî Âdâb ve Erkânı*. İstanbul: İnkılap & Aka, 1963.

_____. "Niyâzî-i Mısırî." *Şarkiyat Mecmuası* VII (1972): 183-226.

Görmez, Mehmet. "Sâgânî, Radyyyüddin." *TDVIA*. vol. 35. İstanbul: TDV, 2008: 487-489.

Green, Molly. "Ottoman Mountains: Mobility in a Forbidding Environment." in *Crafting History: Essays on the Ottoman World and Beyond in Honor of Cemal Kafadar*. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2023: 375-391.

Gregg, Gary S. *Culture and Identity in a Muslim Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

_____. "Culture, Personality, and the Multiplicity of Identity: Evidence from North African Life Narratives." *Ethos* 26/2 (1998): 120-152.

Gurney, J. D. "Pietro della Valle: The Limits of Perception." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 49/1 (1986): 103-116.

Güldöşüren, Arzu. "Üç Asır İstanbullu Bir Ulema Ailesi: Arabzadeler." *DÎVÂN* 23/45 (2018/2): 27-79.

Güleç, İsmail. "Mevlânâ'nın Mesnevî'sinin Tamamına Yapılan Türkçe Şerhler." *İlmi Araştırmalar* 22 (2006): 135-154.

Gümüšoğlu, Hasan. "Osmanlı'da Nakşibendiyye/Müceddidiyye Tarikatı ve Ehl-i Sünnet Hassasiyeti." *Mezhep Araştırmaları Dergisi* 15/2 (2022): 482-509.

Gündoğdu, Cengiz. "Osmanlı'da Tarikat Şeyhinin Padişahı Uyarı ve Teşviklerine Yönelik Bir Örnek." *EKEV Akademi Dergisi* 50 (2012): 25-46.

Gündüz, İrfan. *Osmanlılarda Devlet-Tekke Münasebetleri*. Ankara: Seha Neşriyat, 1984.

Güngörürler, Selim. "Fundamentals of Ottoman-Safavid Peacetime Relations: 1639-1722." *Turkish Historical Review* 9 (2018): 151-197.

_____. "Shi'ite-Iranian Pilgrims and Safavid Agents in Holy Sites Under Ottoman Rule, 1690-1710." in *Entangled Confessionalizations?: Dialogic Perspectives on the Politics of Piety and Community-Building in the Ottoman Empire, 15th-18th Centuries*. eds. Tijana Krstic and Derin Terzioğlu. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2022: 725-743.

Gür, Nagihan. “Osmanlı Edebiyatında Eleştiri ve Latîfi'nin Tezkiretü'sh-Şu'arâ'sı Üzerine.” *Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları. Festschrift in Honor of Walter G. Andrews* 34/II (2010): 79-90.

Gürbüz, Ashlan Sümeýra. “Teachers of the Public, Advisors to the Sultan: Preachers and the Rise of a Political Public Sphere in Early Modern Istanbul, (1600-1675).” Unpublished PhD Diss., Harvard University, 2016.

Haar, J. G. J. ter. “The Collected Letters of Shaykh Aḥmad Sirhindī.” *Manuscripts of the Middle East* 3 (1988): 41-44.

Hakverdiođlu, Metin. “Edebiyatımızda Lâle Devri: Nevşehirli Dâmat İbrâhim Paşa'ya Sunulan Kasîdeler, İnceleme-Metin.” Unpublished PhD Diss., Selçuk Üniversitesi, 2007.

_____. “Fâiz Efendi ve Şâkir Bey Mecmuasından Lâle Devri Harpleri ve Sulhları (Ebcedli Tarih Manzumeleri).” *AUID* 9 (December, 2017): 73-101.

Halaçođlu, Yusuf. *Osmanlılarda Ulaşım ve Haberleşme (Menziller)*. Ankara: PTT, 2002.

Halman, Talat S. *A Millennium of Turkish Literature: A Concise History*. edited by Jayne L. Warner. New York: Syracuse University Press, 2011.

Hanna, Nelly. *In Praise of Books: A Cultural History of Cairo's Middle Class, Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2003.

Haskan, Mehmet Nermi. *Eyüp Tarihi*. vols. I-II. İstanbul: Türk Turing Turizm İşletmeciliđi Vakfı Yayınları, 1993.

_____. *Eyüp Sultan Tarihi*. vols. I-II. annotated by Talip Mert. İstanbul: Eyüp Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2008.

Hathaway, Jane. *Beshir Agha: Chief Eunuch of the Ottoman Imperial Harem*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2005.

_____. “Eunuch Households in Istanbul, Medina, and Cairo During the Ottoman Era.” *Turcica* 41 (2009): 291-303.

_____. *The Chief Eunuch of the Ottoman Harem: From African Slave to Power-Broker*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Hatibođlu, İbrahim. “Mesâbîhu's-Sunne.” *TDVIA*. vol. 29. 259-260.

_____. “Meşâriku'l-Envâri'n-Nebeviyye.” *TDVIA*. vol. 29. 361-362.

Heywood, Colin. “The Evolution of the Courier Order (ulağ hükmi) in Ottoman Chancery Practice (Fifteenth to Eighteenth Centuries).” in *Osmanische Welten: Quellen und Fallstudien Festschrift für Michael Ursinus*. eds. Johannes Zimmermann, Christoph Herzog, and Raoul Motika. Bamberg: University of Bamberg Press, 2016: 269-312.

_____. “The Ottoman Menzilhane and Ulak System in Rumeli in the Eighteenth Century.” in *I. Uluslararası Türkiye'nin Sosyal ve Ekonomik Tarihi Kongresi Tebliğleri*. eds. Osman Okyar and Halil İnalçık. Ankara: Meteksan, 1980: 179-186.

_____. “The Via Egnatia in the Ottoman Period: The Menzilhanes of the Sol Kol in the late 17th / early 18th centuries.” in *The Via Egnatia Under Ottoman Rule (1380-1699)*. Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1996: 129-144.

Holzwarth, Wolfgang. “The Uzbek State as Reflected in Eighteenth Century Bukharan Sources.” *Asiatische Studien* 60/2 (2006): 321-353.

Huff, Toby E. *The Rise of Early Modern Science: Islam, China, and the West*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Husain, Tasadduq. “The Spiritual Journey of Dara Shukoh.” *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress* 61 (2000-2001): 461-473.

Hut, Davut. “History of Communication in Istanbul,” in *History of Istanbul: From Antiquity to the 21st Century*. vol. VI. Accessed 19 September 2023. <https://istanbultarihi.ist/592-history-of-communication-in-istanbul>

Işık, Ayhan. “Maktül Şeyhülislâm Feyzullah Efendi'nin Torunu Nakîbü'l-eşrâf Abdullah Efendi'nin Hayatı ve Terekesi.” *Mezhep Araştırmaları Dergisi* 14/2 (2021): 904-947.

Işın, Ekrem. “Ali Efendi (Paşmakçızade).” *DBIA*. vol. 1. 190-191.

_____. “Melamîlik.” *DBIA*. vol. V. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1994: 380-386.

_____. “Nakşibendîlik.” *DBIA*. vol. VI. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1993-1994: 31-38.

Itzkowitz, Norman. “Eighteenth Century Ottoman Realities.” *Studia Islamica* 16 (1962): 73-94.

İbrahimli, Davud. “İstanbul Tekkelerinin Kültürel Hayata Etkileri (Özbek Tekkeleri Örneğinde).” Unpublished MA Thesis, İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2022.

İhsanoğlu, Ekmeleddin. “The Introduction of Western Science to the Ottoman World: A Case Study of Modern Astronomy (1660-1860).” in *Science, Technology and Learning in the Ottoman Empire: Western Influence, Local Institutions, and the Transfer of Knowledge*. Hampshire: Ashgate Variorum, 2004: 1-44.

İlgürel, Mücteba. “Mustafa Paşa, Köse.” *TDVIA*. vol. 31. 345-346.

İnalçık, Halil. “Cizye.” *TDVIA*. vol. 8. Istanbul: TDV, 1993: 45-48.

_____. *Devlet-i ‘Aliyye: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Üzerine Araştırmalar*. vol. III. Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2015.

_____. “Djizya: Ottoman.” *EI2*. vol. II. Leiden: Brill, 1991: 562-566.

_____. *Has-bağçede ‘ayş u tarab: Nedîmler, Şâirler, Mutribler*. Istanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları, 2011.

_____. “Istanbul.” *EI2*. vol. IV. Leiden: Brill, 1997: 224-248.

_____. “İstanbul: Türk Devri.” *TDVIA*. vol. 23. Istanbul: TDV, 2001: 220-239.

_____. *Şâir ve Patron: Patrimonyal Devlet ve Sanat Üzerinde Sosyolojik Bir İnceleme*. Ankara: Doğu Batı, 2003.

İnan, Murat Umut. “Imperial Patronage of Literature in the Ottoman World, 1400-1600.” in *The Empires of the Near East and India: Source Studies of the Safavid, Ottoman, and Mughal Literate Communities*. ed. Hani Khafipour. New York: Columbia University Press, 2019: 493-504.

İnançer, Ömer Tuğrul. “İstanbul’da Tarikat Ayin ve Zikirleri.” in *Antik Çağ’dan XXI. Yüzyıla Büyük İstanbul Tarihi: İslam*. vol. V. 316-340.

İpşirli, Mehmet. “Abdullah Efendi, Ebezâde.” *TDVIA*. vol. 1. 98.

_____. “Abdullah Efendi, Yenişehirli.” *TDVIA*. vol. 1. 100-101.

_____. “Cer.” *TDVIA*. vol. 7. 388-389.

_____. “Çatalcalı Ali Efendi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 8. 234-235.

_____. “Damadzâde Ahmed Efendi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 8. Istanbul: TDV, 1993: 449-450.

_____. “Debbağzâde Mehmed Efendi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 9. 62-63.

_____. “Ferhad Paşa.” *TDVIA*. vol. 12. Istanbul: TDV, 1995: 383-384.

_____. “Feyzullah Efendi, Damadzâde.” *TDVIA*. vol. 12. Istanbul: TDV, 1995: 525-526.

_____. “Feyzullah Efendi, Ebûsaidzâde.” *TDVIA*, vol. 12. Istanbul: TDV, 1995: 526.

_____. “Lale Devrinde Teşkil Edilen Tercüme Heyetine Dair Bazı Gözlemler.” in *Osmanlı İlmî ve Meslekî Cemiyetleri: 1. Millî Türk Bilim Tarihi Sempozyumu, 3-5 Nisan 1987*. ed. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu. Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1987: 33-42.

_____. “Lale Devri’nde Yenilikçi Bir Âlim: Şeyhülislam Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi.” in *İstanbul Armağanı: Lâle Devri*. vol. 4. ed. Mustafa Armağan. Istanbul: İBB Kültür Yayınları, 2000: 249-257.

_____. “Medrese: Osmanlı Dönemi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 28. Ankara: TDV, 2003: 327-333.

_____. “Mirza Mustafa Efendi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 30. 167-168.

_____. “Mülâzemet.” *TDVIA*. vol. 31. Istanbul: TDV, 2006: 537-539.

_____. “Paşmakçızâde Abdullah Efendi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 34. Istanbul: TDV, 2007: 185.

_____. “Paşmakçızâde Ali Efendi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 34. Istanbul: TDV, 2007: 185-186.

_____. “Sâdık Mehmed Efendi, Sadreddinzâde.” *TDVIA*. vol. 35. 395.

“Islam began as something strange.” Accessed 29 October 2023. <https://sunnah.com/ibnmajah:3986>

İşlek, Ali Emre. “Osmanlı Devleti’nde Hindî Tekkeleri.” Unpublished PhD Diss., Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, 2020.

Jesuit Science and The Republic of Letters. ed. Mordechai Feingold. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2005.

Jones, Alexander Raymond. “Ptolemaic system.” *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Accessed 18 September 2021. <https://www.britannica.com/science/Ptolemaic-system>

Jong, F. de. “Mawlawiyya.” *EI2*. vol. VI. 887-888

Junne, George. *The Black Eunuchs of the Ottoman Empire: Networks of Power in the Court of the Sultan*. New York: I.B. Tauris, 2016.

Kafadar, Cemal. “Mütereddit Bir Mutasavvıf: Üsküplü Asiye Hatun’un Rüya Defteri 1641-1643.” in *Kim var imiş biz burada yoğ iken: Dört Osmanlı: Yeniçeri, Tüccar, Derviş ve Hatun*. Istanbul: Metis, 2009: 123-191.

Kafesçioğlu, Çiğdem. *Constantinopolis / Istanbul: Cultural Encounter, Imperial Vision, and the Construction of the Ottoman Capital*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.

“Kabakulak Âsitânesi.” Accessed 28 June 2023.
<http://mustafaresmiahi.net/mustafaahi/tekkeler/kabakulak.html>

Kamali, Mohammad Hashim. “Perishment, Extreme Dilution.” in *Shariah and the Halal Industry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021: 97-102.

Kandemir, M. Yaşar. “eş-Şifâ.” *TDVIA*. vol. 39. Istanbul: TDV, 2010: 134-138.

_____. “Kâdî İyâz.” *TDVIA*. vol. 24. 116-118.

Kaplan, Yunus. “İzzet, İzzet Alî Paşa.” *TEIS*. Accessed 3 June 2022.
<http://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/izzet-ali-pasa>

_____. “Mehmed İsmet Efendi.” *TEIS*. Accessed 20 March 2021.
<http://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/ismet-mehmed-ismet-efendi>

Kara, İhsan. “İbnü'l-Arabî'nin Tasavvuf İstilahlarına Etkisi ve Seyyid Mustafa Rasim Efendi'nin İstilâhât-ı İnsân-ı Kâmil'i Örneği.” *Tasavvuf: İlmi ve Akademik Araştırma Dergisi (İbnü'l-Arabî Özel Sayısı-2)* 23 (2009): 583-600.

_____. “Tasavvuf İstilâhları Literatürü ve Seyyid Mustafa Râsim Efendi'nin İstilâhât-ı İnsân-ı Kâmil'i.” PhD Diss., vols.I-II. Marmara Üniversitesi, 2003.

Kara, Kerim. “Karabaş Velî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 24. 369-371.

_____. “Mehmed Nasûhî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 28. 500-502.

Kara, Muhammed. “Lale Devrinde Şeyhülislamlık ve Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi.” Unpublished MA Thesis, Balıkesir Üniversitesi, 2017.

Karabulut, Özkan. “The Rehabilitation of the Bektashi Order (1826-1876).” Unpublished MA Thesis, Sabancı University, 2017.

Karadağ, Çağfer. “İbnü'l-Arabî: İtikadî Görüşleri.” *TDVIA*. vol. 20. Istanbul: TDV, 1999: 516-520.

Karagöz, Ensar. “İlmiye Teşkilatı Tarihine Kaynaklık Eden Bir Âlim: Eserleriyle Müstakîmzâde Süleyman Sadeddin.” Unpublished PhD Diss., İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2022.

Karahasanoglu, Selim. “A Tulip Age Legend: Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in the Ottoman Empire (1718-1730).” Unpublished PhD Diss., Binghampton University State University of New York, 2009.

_____. “İstanbul’un Lale Devri mi?: Tarih ve Tarih Yazımı.” *Masaldan Gerçeğe Lâle Devri*. ed. Mustafa Armağan. İstanbul: TİMAŞ, 2014: 57-106.

_____. “Learning from Past Mistakes and Living a Better Life: Report on the Workshop in Istanbul on ‘Ottoman Ego-Documents.’” *Review of Middle East Studies* 54/2 (2020): 294-302.

_____. “Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda 1730 İsyanına Dair Yeni Bulgular: İsyanın Organizatörlerinden Ayasofya Vaizi İspirîzâde Ahmed Efendi ve Terekesi.” *OTAM* 24 (2008): 97-128.

_____. “Osmanlı Tarihyazımında ‘Lale Devri’: Eleştirel Bir Değerlendirme.” *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar* I/7 (2008): 129-144.

_____. “Ottoman Ego-Documents: State of the Art.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 53 (2021): 301-308.

Karaismailoğlu, Adnan. “Şebüsterî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 38. İstanbul: TDV, 2010: 400-401.

Karaman, Hüseyin. “Lamiî Çelebi’nin Münşeâtı.” Unpublished MA Thesis, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, 2001.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T. *God’s Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in Islamic Later Middle Period (1200-1550)*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994.

Kavak, Abdulcebbar. “Şeyh Abdülganî en-Nablusî’nin (ö. 1143/1731) Mevlevilik Müdafaası: el-Ukûdu’l-Lü’lüyye fî Tarîki’s-Sâdeti’l-Mevleviyye Adlı Eseri.” *TAED* 56 (2016): 1125-1151.

Kaya, Mahmut. “İbnü’l-Arabî: İslam Düşüncesindeki Yeri.” *TDVIA*. vol. 20. İstanbul: TDV, 1999: 520-522.

Kazemzadeh, Firuz. “Iranian Relations With Russia and the Soviet Union, to 1921.” in *The Cambridge History of Iran: From Nadir Shah to the Islamic Republic*. vol. 7. edited by Peter Avery. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991: 314-349.

Kellner-Heinkele, Barbara. “The Pearl in the Shell: Sheykh Mehmed Emin Tokadi’s (d. 1745) Self-vita as Scripted by Sheykh Seyyid Hasib Üsküdarî.” “Workshop: Ottoman Ego-Documents.” Istanbul Medeniyet University, March 2020.

Keskin, Kemal Serkan. “Katma Değer Vergisi ile İstihsal (üretim) ve İstihlak (tüketim) Vergileri Arasındaki Farklar, Her İki Vergi Rejiminin Uygulanmasına Yönelik Avantaj ve Dezavantajlar.” *Vergi Raporu Dergisi* 219 (2017): 9-36.

Khalid, W.A.S. “‘Abd al-Ghanî b. Ismâ‘îl al-Nâbulusî.” *EI2*. vol. I. 60.

Kılıç, Atabey. “Türkçe-Farsça Manzum Sözlüklerden Tuhfe-i Şâhidî (Metin).” *Turkish Studies* 2/4 (Fall, 2017): 516-548.

Kılıç,Hilal. “Şeyhülislam Ailelerinin Kültür ve Sanat Alanına Katkıları.” Unpublished MA Thesis, TOBB Ekonomi ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi, 2018.

Kılıç, Mahmud Erol. “İbnü’l-Arabî, Muhyiddin.” *TDVIA*. vol. 20. Istanbul: TDV, 1999: 493-516.

Kılıç, Rüya. *Osmanlıda Seyyidler ve Şerifler*. Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2005.

Kılıç, Sevda Önal. “Edebiyat Patronajı Açısından Damat İbrahim Paşa Dönemine Dair Genel Bir Değerlendirme.” *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi* 61 (2018): 3-14.

Koç, Gülçin Tunalı. “Sadullah el-Ankaravi: Daily Concerns of an Ottoman Astrologer.” Unpublished MA Thesis, Boğaziçi University, 2002.

Koçu, Reşad Ekrem. “Ali Bey (Kiblelizade).” *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*. vol. II. Istanbul: Nurgök Matbaası, 1959.

Koçyiğit, Ömer. “Üsküdar Afganiler Tekkesi ve Haziresindeki Mezar Taşları.” in *Uluslararası Üsküdar Sempozyumu VI, 6-9 Kasım 2008, Bildiriler*. vol. I. ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. Istanbul: Üsküdar Belediyesi, 2009: 665-688.

Konur, Himmet. *Hasan Sezâî ve Mektupları Işığında Tasavvuf Hayatı*. Izmir: Tibyan Yayıncılık, 2003.

Köksal, Mehmet Fatih. “Yûsuf Sîneçâk.” *TEIS*. Accessed 30 November 2021. <http://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/yusuf-sinecak>

Köseoğlu, Mehmed Akif. “İstanbul’da Bayramî Şeyhlerinin Postnişîn Olduğu Tekkeler ve Günümüzdeki Durumları.” *Uluslararası Hacı Bayram-ı Velî Sempozyumu Bildiriler Kitabı 1*. ed. Ahmet Cahid Haksever. Ankara: Anıl Matbaacılık, 2016: 429-470.

- Kreiser, Klaus. “Kaşgarî Tekyesi: Ein Istanbuler Nakşbandî-Konvent und Sein Stifter.” in *Naqshbandis: Historical Developments and Present Situation of a Muslim Mystical Order*. Istanbul-Paris: ISIS, 1990: 331-335.
- Kufralı, Kasım. “Molla İlâhî ve Kendisinden Sonraki Nakşibendiye Muhiti.” *TÜDED* III/1 (1949): 129-151.
- _____. “Molla İlâhî ve Kendisinden Sonraki Nakşibendiye Muhiti.” in *Tasavvuf Kitabı*. ed. Cemil Çiftçi. İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2003: 42-64.
- _____. “Nakşibendiliğin Kuruluşu ve Yayılışı.” Unpublished PhD Diss. İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1949.
- Kunt, İbrahim Metin. “Ethnic-Regional (Cins) Solidarity in the Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Establishment.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 5/3 (1974): 233-239.
- _____. “The Köprülü Years, 1656-1661.” Unpublished PhD Diss., Princeton University, 1971.
- Kurat, Akdes Nimet. *Prut Seferi ve Barışı 1123 (1711)*. vol. I. (Ankara: TTK, 1951.
- Kurnaz, Cemal. “Felek.” *TDVIA*. vol. 12. İstanbul: TDV, 1995: 306-307.
- Kurnaz, Cemal and Mustafa Tatcı. “Hüseyin Vassâf.” *TDVIA*. vol. 19. İstanbul: TDV, 1999: 18-19.
- Kurtuluş, Rıza. “Gengûhî, Abdulkuddûs.” *TDVIA*. vol. 14. 24.
- Kurz, Marlene. *Ways to Heaven, Gates to Hell: Fazlîzâde ‘Alî’s Struggle with the Diversity of Ottoman Islam*. Berlin: EB-Verlang, 2011.
- Kuşu, Selma. “XVIII. Yüzyılın İlk Çeyreğinde Eyüp’te Sosyal ve Ekonomik Hayat.” Unpublished PhD Diss., Trakya Üniversitesi, 2019.
- Kut, Günay and Turgut Kut. “İstanbul Tekkelerine Ait Bir Kaynak: Dergeh-nâme.” in *Türkische Miscellen: Robert Anhegger Festschrift*. İstanbul: Editions Divit Press, 1987:
- Kutlutürk, Cemil. “Transnational Sufi Networks in India and Anatolia: Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah Order.” *Journal of History Culture and Art Research / Tarih Kültür ve Sanat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 9/2 (2020): 267-278.
- Küçük, Harun. *Science Without Leisure: Practical Naturalism in Istanbul, 1660-1732*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2020.

Küfrevi, Muhammed. “Küfrevî, Kasım.” *TDVIA*, vol. EK-2. the 3rd edition. Ankara: TDV, 2019: 102.

Lawrence, B. B. “‘Abd al-Qoddūs Gangōhī.” *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Accessed 2 October 2023. <https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/abd-al-qoddus-gangohi-indo-muslim-saint-and-litterateur-d-1537>

Le Gall, Dina. *A Culture of Sufism: Naqshbandis in the Ottoman World, 1450-1700*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.

_____. “Forgotten Naqshbandis and the Culture of pre-Modern Sufi Brotherhood.” *Studia Islamica* 97 (2003): 87-119.

_____. “Kadızedelis, Nakşbendis, and Intra-Sufi diatribe in the 17th century Istanbul.” *The Turkish Studies Association Journal* 28 (2004): 1-28.

_____. “The Ottoman Naqshbandiyya in the pre-Mujaddidi Phase: A Study in Islamic Religious Culture and Its Transmission.” PhD Diss., Princeton University, 1992.

Lin, Chang-Kuan (Nabil). See “Ma Ming-Hsin.” *TDVIA*. vol. 27. Ankara: TDV, 2003: 268-269.

Losensky, Paul. “Şā‘eb Tabrizi.” *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Accessed 2 September 2023. <https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/saeb-tabrizi>

Low, Michael Christopher. *Imperial Mecca: Ottoman Arabia and the Indian Ocean Hajj*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2020.

“Lunar Eclipses: 1701 to 1800.” Accessed 9 November 2021. <https://eclipse.gsfc.nasa.gov/LEcat5/LE1701-1800.html>

Marquet, Yves. “Ikhwān al-Şafā.” *EI2*. vol. III. 1071-1076.

Marras, Cristina. “Leibniz Citizen of the Republic of Letters: Some Remarks on the Interconnection Between Language and Politics.” *Studia Leibnitiana* 43/1 (2011): 54-69.

Masters, Bruce. “Power and Society in Aleppo in the 18th and 19th Centuries.” *Revue du monde musulman et de la Méditerranée* 62 (1991): 151-158.

Matuz, Josef. “Über die Epistolographie und Inšā’ -Literatur der Osmanen.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft* 1 (1969):574-594.

McNeill, J. R. *The Mountains of the Mediterranean World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

- Metcalf, Barbara D. "The 'Ulama in Transition: The Eighteenth Century." in *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860-1900*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982: 16-45.
- Mete, Ayşegül. "XVIII. Asır İstanbul Mevleviliği." Unpublished PhD Diss., Sakarya Üniversitesi, 2019.
- Michot, Yahya. "Akhisârî, Ahmed-i Rûmî." *TDVIA*. vol. EK-1. the second edition. 60-62.
- Miert, Dirk van. "What was the Republic of Letters? A Brief Introduction to A Long History." *Groniek: Historisch Tijdschrift* 204-205 (2014): 269-287.
- Muslu, Ramazan. *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: 18. Yüzyıl*. İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2003.
- _____. "XVIII. Asırda Anadolu'da Tasavvuf." PhD Diss., Marmara Üniversitesi, 2002.
- Nasr, Seyyed Hosein. *Three Muslim Sages: Avicenna- Suhrawardî-Ibn 'Arabî*. New York: Caravan Books, 1976.
- Neumann, Christoph K. "Toklu Dede: A Byzantine Building in Ottoman Istanbul." in *Anekdotia Byzantina: Studien zur Byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur*. eds. Isabel Grimm-Stadelmann, et al. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2023: 489-502.
- Nevşahi, Arif. "Ya'kûb-i Çerhî." *TDVIA*. vol. 43. İstanbul: TDV, 2013: 281-282.
- Nizri, Michael. *Ottoman High Politics and the Ulema Household*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Nwyia, Paul. "al-Kalābādihî." *EI2*. vol. IV. 467.
- Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Marjinal Sûfîlik: Kalenderîler (XIV-XVII. Yüzyıllar)*. Ankara: TTK, 1992.
- _____. *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler (15.-17. Yüzyıllar)*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998.
- _____. "XVI.-XVII. Yüzyıllarda Bayrâmî(Hamzavî) Melâmîler ve Osmanlı Yönetimi." *Bellekten* LXI/230, (1997): 93-110.
- _____. "XVII. Yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Dinde Tasfiye (Püritanizm) Teşebbüslerine Bir Bakış: 'Kadıızâdeliler Hareketi'" *Türk Kültürü Araştırmaları* XVII-XXI/1-2, (1979-1983): 208-225.

Oğuz, Fatma Sabiha Kutlar and Nagihan Gür. “Bir Bürokrat-Şaire Yazılmış Şiirler Seçkisi: İzzet Ali Paşa Mecmuası.” in *Prof. Dr. M. Fatih Köksal’a Armağan*. İstanbul: DBY Yayınları, 2021: 856-868.

Okan, Aysel. *İstanbul Evliyaları*. the third edition. İstanbul: Kapı, 2008.

Orhonlu, Cengiz. “Habeş Eyaleti.” *TDVIA*. vol. 14. 363-367.

_____. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Güney Siyaseti: Habeş Eyaleti*. İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası, 1974.

Osmanlı Astronomi Literatürü Tarihi. vol. I. ed. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu. prepared by Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, Ramazan Şeşen, Cevat İzgi, Cemil Akpınar, İhsan Fazlıoğlu. İstanbul: IRCICA, 1997.

Öksüz, Yılmaz. “Eğrikapılı Mehmed Râsim ve Divançesi (İnceleme-Metin).” Unpublished MA Thesis, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, 2010.

Öngören, Reşat. “Hatm-i Hâcegân.” *TDVIA*. vol. 16. 476-477.

_____. “İshak Hocası.” *TDVIA*. vol. 22. İstanbul: TDV, 2000: 533-534.

_____. “İstanbul’da Tasavvufî Hayat.” in *Büyük İstanbul Tarihi*. vol. V. eds. M. Âkif Aydın and Coşkun Yılmaz. İstanbul: İBB Kültür Yayınları 2015:

_____. “Karamânî, Cemâleddin İshak.” *TDVIA*. vol. 24. İstanbul: TDV, 2001: 448-449.

_____. “Mevlânâ Celâleddîn-i Rûmî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 29. 441-448.

_____. *Osmanlılar’da Tasavvuf: Anadolu’da Sûfîler, Devlet ve Ulema (XVI. Yüzyıl)*. İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2000.

_____. “XVI. Yüzyılda Anadolu’da Tasavvuf.” PhD Diss., Marmara Üniversitesi 1996.

Övüç, Erkan. “Mecmua-i Tekâyâların Serencamı ve Yeni Bir Liste Neşri.” *Tasavvuf: İlmi ve Akademik Araştırma Dergisi* 27 (2011): 269-320.

Öz, Mustafa. “Cemâleddin Aksarâyî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 7. İstanbul: TDV, 1993: 308-309.

Öz, Yusuf. *Tuhfe-i Şâhidî Şerhleri*. Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1999.

Özcan, Abdülkadir. “Âsım Efendi, Çelebizâde.” *TDVIA*. vol. 3. 477-478.

_____. “Kara İbrâhim Paşa.” *TDVIA*. vol. 21. İstanbul: TDV, 2000: 329-330.

_____. “Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Ahmed Paşa.” *TDVIA*. vol. 26. Ankara: TDV, 2002: 260-263.

_____. “Köprülüzâde Fâzıl Mustafa Paşa.” *TDVIA*. vol. 26. Ankara: TDV, 2002: 263-265.

_____. “Köprülüzâde Nûman Paşa.” *TDVIA*. vol. 26. Ankara: TDV, 2002: 265-267.

_____. “Merzifonlu Kara Mustafa Paşa.” *TDVIA*. vol. 29. Ankara: TDV, 2002: 246-249.

_____. “Pasarofça Antlaşması.” *TDVIA*. vol. 34. İstanbul: TDV, 2007): 177-181.

_____. “Patrona İsyanı.” *TDVIA*. vol. 34. 189-192.

_____. “Sarı Süleyman Paşa.” *TDVIA*. vol. EK-2. 535-538.

Özcan, Serpil. “Toplumsal ve Mekansal Konumuyla Otakçıyân Mustafâ Paşa Tekkesi.” *Kadim* 5 (2023): 143-175.

Özcan, Tahsin. “Mehmed Sâlih Efendi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 28. 526.

_____. “Pîrizâde Mehmed Sâhib Efendi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 34. 288-290.

Özdemir, Mehmet. “Mesnevî'nin Türkçe Şerhleri.” *Turkish Studies* 11/20 (2016): 461-502.

Özdemir, Yavuz. *Galata Mevlevîhânesi Müzesi*. İstanbul: Türkiye Turing ve Otomobil Kurumu, 2008.

Özdil, Hatice. “Başka İsimlerle Karıştırılan Bir Mesnevi Şârihi: Mehmed Murâd Nakşibendî.” *Turkish Studies* vol. 8/12. (Fall 2013): 1009-1016.

Özel, Ahmet. “Cihad.” *TDVIA*. vol. 7. İstanbul: TDV, 1993: 527-531.

_____. “Nablusî, Abdülganî b. İsmâil.” *TDVIA*. vol. 32. İstanbul: TDV, 2006: 268-270.

_____. “Semerkandî, Muhammed Yusuf.” *TDVIA*. vol. 36. 479-480.

Özkaya, Yücel. “Kaymakam.” *TDVIA*. vol. 25. Ankara: TDV, 2002: 84-85.

_____. “XVIII. Yüzyılda Menzilhane Sorunu.” *AÜDTCFD* XXVIII/3-4 (1970): 339-368.

Öztürk, Necati. “Islamic Orthodoxy Among the Ottomans in the Seventeenth Century With Special Reference to the Qāḍī-zāde Movement.” Unpublished PhD Diss., University of Edinburgh, 1981.

Öztürk, Said. “Kassâm,” *TDVIA*. vol. 24. 579-582.

Öztürk, Şeyda. “Şem‘î.” *TDVIA*. vol. 38. Istanbul: TDV, 2010: 503-504.

Pamuk, Şevket. *A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

———. “Kuruş.” *TDVIA*. vol. 26. 458.

Pantık, Ramazan. “Merzifonlu Kara Mustafa Paşa Vakıfları: Yönetimi, Kentsel Gelişime Katkıları ve İktisadi Yapısı.” Unpublished PhD Diss., Hacettepe Üniversitesi, 2021.

Parlar, Gündegül. “Haskan, Mehmet Mermi.” *TDVIA*. vol. EK-1. revised second edition. İstanbul: TDV, 2020: 540-541.

Pingree, David. “‘Abd-al-Qader Ruyani.” *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Accessed 3 November 2021. <https://iranicaonline.org/articles/abd-al-qader-ruyani>

Rafeq, Abdul-Karim. “‘Abd al-Ghani al-Nabulsi Religious Tolerance and ‘Arabness’ in *Ottoman Damascus*.” in *Transformed Landscapes: Essays on Palestine and the Middle East in Honor of Walid Khalidi*. eds. Camille Mansour and Leila Fawaz. Cairo & New York: The American University in Cairo Press, 2009: 1-18.

———. “Relations Between the Syrian ‘Ulamā’ and the Ottoman State in the Eighteenth Century.” *Oriente Moderno* 18/79 (1999): 67-95.

Rahinguliyev, Bayram. “Osmanlı Edebiyatında Dönüşümün Şiiri: Sulhiyeler.” Unpublished MA Thesis, Bilkent University, 2007.

Redhouse, Sir James W. *A Turkish and English Lexicon*. new impression. Beirut: Librairie du Liban, 1996.

Revnakoğlu, C. Server. *Eski Sosyal Hayatımızda Tasavvuf ve Tarikat Kültürü*. prepared by M. Doğan Bayın and İsmail Dervişoğlu. Istanbul: Kırkambar Kitaplığı, 2003.

Richard, Y. “Zayn al-‘Ābidīn Shirwānī.” *EI2*. vol.XI. Leiden: Brill, 2000: 484.

Riedlmayer, Andras J. “Ottoman Copybooks of Correspondence and Miscellanies as Source for Political and Cultural History.” *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung* 61/1-2 (2008): 201-214.

- Ritter, Hellmut. "Fenā." *IA*. vol. 4. 546-547.
- Rosenberg, Seymour and Michael Gara. "The Multiplicity of Personal Identity." *Review of Personality and Social Psychology* 6 (1985): 87-113.
- Rugg, Julie. "Defining the Place of Burial: What Makes a Cemetery a Cemetery?." *Mortality* 5/3 (2000): 259-275.
- Sabev, Orlin. *İbrahim Müteferrika ya da İlk Osmanlı Matbaa Serüveni (1726-1746)*. Istanbul: Yeditepe, 2006.
- _____. "Lâle Devri İlk Osmanlı Türk Matbaasını Nasıl Etkiledi?." in *Lale Devri'nde Osmanlı Devleti ve Nevşehir*. eds. İlyas Gökhan, Hüseyin Saraç, Gökçe Özcan. Kayseri: Kömen Yayınları, 2018: 618-637.
- _____. "The First Ottoman Turkish Printing Enterprise: Success of Failure?." *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century*. ed. Dana Sajdi. London&New York: I.B. Tauris, 2007: 63-89.
- Sadikoğlu, Cengiz. "Sâib-i Tebrîzî." *TDVIA*. vol. 35. Istanbul: TDV, 2008: 541-542.
- Sağlam, Nuri. "Ali Emîrî Efendi ile Mehmet Fuad Köprülü Arasındaki Münakaşalar – II." *İlmî Araştırmalar* 11 (2001): 89-98.
- Sağır, Yusuf. "Sadrazam Köse Mustafa Paşa'nın Vakıf Eserleri." *Vakıflar Dergisi* 40 (2013): 55-86.
- Sahillioğlu, Halil. "Sıvış Yılı Buhranları." *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 27/1-2 (1967): 77-83.
- Sajdi, Dana. *The Barber of Damascus: Nouveau Literacy in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Levant*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2013.
- Saraç, Yekta. "Şerhler." in *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. vol. II. Istanbul: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2006: 121-132.
- Sarı, Nil. "Hekimbaşı." *TDVIA*. vol. 17. 161-164.
- Sarıcaoğlu, Fikret. "Siyavuş Paşa, Köprülü Damadı." *TDVIA*. vol. 37. Istanbul: TDV, 2009: 313-315.
- Sarıck, Murat. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Nakîbü'l-Eşrâfîk Müessesesi*. Ankara: TTK, 2003.

Sarıkaya, Yaşar. *Merkez ile Taşra Arasında Bir Osmanlı Âlimi: Eb Said el-Hâdimî*. Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2008.

Sarıyıldız, Gülден. “Hicaz’da Salgın Hastalıklar ve Osmanlı Devleti’nin Aldığı Bazı Önlemler.” *Tarih ve Toplum* 104 (1992): 82-88.

Sariyannis, Marinos. “The Kadızadeli Movement as a Social and Political Phenomenon: The Rise of a ‘Mercantile Ethic’” in *Political Initiatives from the Bottom-Up in the Ottoman Empire*. ed. A. Anastasopoulos. Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2012: 263-289.

Sarton, George. *Introduction to the History of Science: From Homer to Omar Khayyam*. vol. I. Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins Company, 1962. Sayılı, Aydın. “Tycho Brahe Sistemi Hakkında XVII. Asır Başlarına Ait Farsça Bir Yazma (An Early Seventeenth Century Persian Manuscript on the Tyconic System).” *Anadolu* 3 (1958): 79-87.

Sevgi, H. Ahmet. “Gülşen-i Râz.” *TDVIA*. vol. 14. Istanbul: TDV, 1996: 253-254.

———. “Mantıku’t-Tayr.” *TDVIA*. vol. 28. Ankara: TDV, 2003: 29-30.

Sezgin, Fuat. *Geschichte Des Arabischen Schrifttums*. vol. VII. Leiden: Brill, 1979.

Shafir, Nir. “The Road From Damascus: Circulation and Redefinition of Islam in the Ottoman Empire, 1620-1720.” Unpublished PhD Diss., UCLA, 2016.

Shaw, Stanford. “Iranian Relations With the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries.” in *The Cambridge History of Iran: From Nadir Shah to the Islamic Republic*. vol. 7. edited by Peter Avery. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991: 295-313.

Shefer-Mossensohn, Miri. *Science among the Ottomans: The Cultural Creation and Exchange of Knowledge*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015.

Sheikh, Mustapha. *Ottoman Puritanism and its Discontents: Aḥmad al-Rūmī al-Āqḥisārī and the Qāḍizādelis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Siddiqi, M. Zameer Uddin. “Shaikh Abdul Quddus of Gangoh and Contemporary Rulers.” *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress* 31 (1969): 305-311.

Sirriyeh, Elizabeth. *Sufi Visionary of Ottoman Damascus: ‘Abd al-Gahnî al-Nâbulusî, 1641-1731*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Smith, Martin Grace. “The Özbek Tekkes of Istanbul.” *Der Islam* 57 (1980):

130-139.

Somel, Selçuk Akşin. *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire 1839-1908 Islamization, Autocracy, and Discipline*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Sökütlü, Yeşim. “İstanbul-Üsküdar Şeyh Devati Mustafa haziresinde yer alan mezar taşları.” Unpublished MA Thesis, Erciyes Üniversitesi, 2015.

Stavrides, Theoharis. *The Sultan of Vezirs: The Life and Times of the Ottoman Grand Vezir Mahmud Pasha Angelović*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Stern, Samuel Miklos. “Abd al-Rahman al-Sufi.” *EI2*. vol. I. Leiden: Brill, 1986: 86-87.

Storey, Charles Ambrose. *Persian Literature: A Bio-bibliographical Survey*. vol. II. London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1972: 78.

Sukkar, Ahmad. “Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī of Damascus (d. 1143/1731) and the Mawlawī Sufi Tradition.” *Mawlana Rumi Review* 5 (2014): 136-170.

Sunar, Cavit. *İmam Rabbanî – İbn Arabî: Vahdet’i Şühûd Vahdet’i Vücûd Meselesi*. second edition. Istanbul: Anadolu Aydınlanma Vakfı Yayınları, 2006.

Sunar, Mehmet Mert. “Ulûfe.” *TDVIA*. vol. 42. Istanbul: TDV, 2012: 124.

Şahin, Emrah. “Dinin Toplumsallaşmasında Aracı Bir Kurum: Erken Modern Osmanlı Toplumunda Vaaz ve Vaizler.” Unpublished MA Thesis, TOBB Ekonomi ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi, 2020.

Şahin, Haşim. “Klasik Çağ Osmanlı İstanbul’unda Nakşbendilik: Eyüp’te Baba Haydar Örneği.” in *Tarihi, Kültürü ve Sanatıyla Eyüpsultan Sempozyumu VII Tebliğler*. Istanbul: Eyüp Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2003: 415-419.

Şahin, Osman. “Fetvâ Emîni Mehmed Fıkhî Efendi’nin (1147/1735) Hayatı ve Eserleri.” *Diyanet İlmi Dergi* 3/44 (2008): 129-142.

Şahinoğlu, M. Nazif. “Alâüddeve-i Simnânî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 1. 346.

———. “Attâr, Ferîdüddin.” *TDVIA*. vol. 4. Istanbul: TDV, 1991: 95-98.

Şakiroğlu, Mahmut H. “Della Valle, Pietro.” *TDVIA*. vol. 9. Istanbul: TDV, 1994: 144-145.

Şentürk, M. Hüdayi. “Murad Nakşibendi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 31. 188-189.

Şimşek, Halil İbrahim. *18. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Toplumunda Nakşibendi-Müceddidilik*. İstanbul: Litera Yayıncılık, 2016.

_____. “Anadolu Müceddidilerine İlişkin Bazı Tarihi Bilgilerin Kullanılışı Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme.” *Gazi Üniversitesi Çorum İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* I/2 (2002): 213-227.

_____. “İki Nakşibendî-Müceddidî'nin Deveran Savunması: Mehmed Emin-i Tokadî ve Müstakîmzâde Süleyman Sadeddin Örneği.” *Tasavvuf* 10 (2003): 283-298.

_____. “Mehmed Emin Tokadî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 28. 467-468.

_____. *Mehmed Emîn-i Tokâdî: Hayatı ve Risaleleri*. İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2005.

_____. “Mehmed Emin Tokadî'nin Tuhfetü't-Tullâb li-Hidâyeti'l-ahbâb Risalesinin Karşılaştırmalı Neşri.” *Tasavvuf* 18 (2007): 263-275.

_____. “Mesnevihân Bir Nakşibendiyîye-Müceddidiyîye Şeyi Neccârzâde Mustafa Rıza'nın Hayatı ve Tasavvufî Görüşleri.” *Tasavvuf* 14 (2005): 159-178.

_____. “Murad Buhârî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 31. 185-187.

_____. “Nakşibendî-Müceddidîliğin Anadolu'ya Taşınmasında Köprü Bir Şahsiyet Olarak Muhammed Murad el-Buhârî.” in *Buhara'dan Konya'ya İrfan Mirası ve XIII. Yüzyıl Medeniyet Merkezi Konya*. Konya: Konya Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2019: 175-186.

_____. Neccârzâde Rızâ Efendi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 32. 483-484.

Şimşek, Murat. “Helal Gıda Araştırmalarında Günümüz Fıkıh Promlemi Olarak İstihâle ve İstihlâk.” *Helal ve Etik Araştırmalar Dergisi / Journal of Halal and Ethical Research* 1 (2019): 1-17.

Şimşek, Selami. “Son Dönem Celvetî Şeyhlerinden Bandırmalızâde Ahmed Münib Efendi'nin Hayatı, Eserleri ve Mecmûa-yı Tekâyâ'sı.” *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 21 (2007): 135-172.

Tamari, Steve. “Ottoman Madrasas: The Multiple Lives of Educational Institutions in Eighteenth-Century Syria.” *Journal of Early Modern History* 5/2 (2001): 99-127.

Tanman, Baha. “Âbid Çelebi Tekkesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 1. 308.

_____. “Afganiler Tekkesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 1. 400.

_____. “Afganîler Tekkesi: Mimari.” *DBIA*. vol. I. 86-87.

- _____. “Akbiyık Mescidi ve Tekkesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 2. İstanbul: TDV, 1989: 222-223.
- _____. “Baba Haydar Camii ve Tekkesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 4. İstanbul: TDV, 1991: 367-368.
- _____. “Bayram Paşa Külliyesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 5. İstanbul: TDV, 1992: 267-268.
- _____. “Buhara Tekkesi: Mimari.” *DBIA*. vol. II. 326-327.
- _____. “Emîr Buhârî Tekkesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 11. 126-128.
- _____. “Hindîler Tekkesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 18. 68-69.
- _____. “İstanbul Tekkeleri.” in *Antik Çağ’dan XXI. Yüzyıla Büyük İstanbul Tarihi: Mimari*. ed. Coşkun Yılmaz. vol. VIII. İstanbul: İBB Kültür AŞ., 2015: 410-427.
- _____. “Kâdirhâne Tekkesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 24. İstanbul: TDV, 2001: 129-131.
- _____. “Kaşgarî Tekkesi: Mimari.” *DBIA*. vol. IV. 486-487.
- _____. “Mesnevîhane Tekkesi.” *DBIA*. vol. V. 408-409.
- _____. “Mesnevîhâne Tekkesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 29. Ankara: TDV, 2004: 334-336.
- _____. “Murad Buhârî Tekkesi.” *DBIA*. vol. V. 514-516.
- _____. “Murad Molla Külliyesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 31. Ankara: TDV, 2020: 187-188.
- _____. “Murad Molla Tekkesi ve Library.” *DBIA*. vol. V. 516-518.
- _____. “Mustafa Paşa Tekkesi.” *DBIA*. vol. V. 564-565.
- _____. “Neccarzâde Tekkesi.” *DBIA*. vol. VI. 59-60.
- _____. “Nûreddin Cerrâhî Tekkesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 33. İstanbul: TDV, 2007: 253-256.
- _____. “Osmanlı Şehrinde ve Mahallesinde Tekkelerin yeri: İstanbul Örneği.” in *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf ve Sufiler: Kaynaklar – Doktrin – Ayin ve Erkan – Tarikatlar – Edebiyat – Mimari – İkonografi – Modernizm*. ed. Ahmet Yaşar Ocak. Ankara: TTK, 2005:
- _____. “Özbekler Tekkesi,” *DBIA*. vol. VI. 199-202.

- _____. “Özbekler Tekkesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 34. 121-124.
- _____. “Resmî Tekkesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 34. 584-585.
- _____. “Resmî Efendi Tekkesi.” *DBIA*. vol. VI. 316-317.
- _____. “Selimiye Tekkesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 36. 438-439.
- _____. “Şeyh Murad Tekkesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 39. Istanbul: TDV, 2010: 62-64.
- _____. “Üsküdar Mevlevîhânesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 42. Istanbul: TDV, 2012: 372-374.
- _____. “Yâvedûd Tekkesi.” *TDVIA*. vol. 43. Istanbul: TDV, 2013: 349-350.
- Tanrıkorur, Şermin Barihüda. “Mevleviyye.” *TDVIA*. vol. 29. (Ankara: TDV, 2004): 468-475.
- Taş, Hatice. “Murâd Buhârî'nin Hayatı Eserleri ve Tasavvufî Görüşleri.” Unpublished MA Thesis, Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, 2015.
- Tatcı, Mustafa. *Üsküdarlı Muhammed Nasûhî ve Divân'ı*. Istanbul: Kaknüs, 2004.
- Tatcı, Mustafa and Cemal Kurnaz. “Şâbân-ı Velî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 38. Istanbul: TDV, 2010: 208-210.
- Tatlıkatık, Cihan. “İzzet Ali Paşa Divanı'nın Tahlili.” Unpublished MA Thesis, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, 2020.
- Tayşi, Mehmet Serhat. “Cemâl-i Halvetî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 7. 302-303.
- Tektin, Bilal. “Abdullah Eyyûbî'nin Tuhfetü'l-Ahbâb Tercümesi.” Unpublished MA Thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2019.
- Telci, Cahit. “Osmanlı Yönetiminin Yeni Yıl Kutlamalarından: İstanbul Tekkelerine Muharremiye Dağıtımı.” *Sufi Araştırmaları/Sufi Studies* 3/6 (2012): 1-29.
- Terzioğlu, Derin. “Confessional Ambiguity in the Age of Confession-Building: Philo-Alidism, Sufism and Sunni Islam in the Ottoman Empire, 1400-1700.” in *Entangled Confessionalizations?: Dialogic Perspectives on the Politics of Piety and Community-Building in the Ottoman Empire, 15th-18th Centuries*. eds. Tijana Krstic and Derin Terzioğlu. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2022: 563-624.
- _____. “Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyâzî-i Mısrî (1618-94).” Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 1999.
- _____. “Sunna-minded Sufi Preachers in Service of the Ottoman State: The

Naşihatnâme of Hasan Addressed to Murad IV.” *Archivum Ottomanicum* 27 (2010): 241-312.

Tezcan, Baki. “The Portrait of the Preacher as a Young Man: Two Autobiographical Letters by Kadızade Mehmed from the Early Seventeenth Century.” in *Political Thought and Practice in the Ottoman Empire*. ed. Marinos Sariyannis. Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2019: 187-249.

The Oxford Dictionary of Islam. ed. John L. Esposito. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

The Reach of the Republic of Letters: Literary and Learned Societies in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe. eds. Arian van Dixhoorn and Susie Speakman Sutch. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Tibet, Aksel, Ekrem Işın, and Dilek Yelkenci. “Stelae Turcicae VIII: Yenikapı Mevlevîhânesi Haziresi.” in *Cimetières et Traditions Funéraires dans le Monde Islamique / İslâm Dünyasında Mezarlıklar ve Defin Gelenekleri*. vol. I. Ankara: TTK, 1996: 223-281.

Topal, Ahmet. “Mesnevî'nin Türkçe Manzum Tercüme ve Şerhleri.” *TAED* 32 (2007): 39-51.

Topçu, Sultan Murat. *Gücün Mimariye Yansıması: Köprülüler*. Ankara: TTK, 2015.

_____. “Köprülüzade Abdullah Paşa'nın 15 Cemadiel-evvel 1133 – M. 14 Mart 1721 Tarihli Vakfıyesi'ne Göre İmar Faaliyetleri ve Bani Kişiliği.” *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 4/17 (2011): 405-415.

_____. “Köprülüzade Fazıl Ahmet Paşa'nın Bani Kişiliği.” *Karadeniz Uluslararası Bilimsel Dergi* 8 (2010): 68-88.

Torun, Ahmet Semih. “Şeyh Muhammed Murâd-ı Buhârî Tekkesi Hazîresi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme.” *Vakıflar Dergisi* 34 (2010): 125-161.

Tosun, Necdet. *Bahâeddin Nakşbend: Hayatı, Görüşleri, Tarîkatı (XII-XVII. Asırlar)*. İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2002.

_____. *Hâcegân Yolu: Hoca Bahâeddin Nakşbend ve Tarîkatı (XII-XVII. Asırlar)*. İstanbul: Erkam Akademi, 2022.

_____. *İmâm-ı Rabbânî Ahmed Sirhindî: Hayatı, Eserleri, Tasavvufî Görüşleri*. İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2009.

_____. “Tasavvufta Hâcegân Ekolü: XII-XVII. Asırlar.” PhD Diss., Marmara Üniversitesi, 2002.

_____. “Ubeydullah Ahrâr.” *TDVIA*. vol. 42. İstanbul: TDV, 2012: 19-20.

Turan, Lokman. “İstanbul Dergâhları Hakkında Bilinmeyen Bir Eser: Lutfî'nin Hânkâh-nâme'si.” *Türkbilig* 21 (2011): 22-48.

Türek, Ahmet and F. Çetin Derin, “Feyzullah Efendi'nin Kendi Kaleminden Hal Tercümesi.” *Tarih Dergisi* 24 (1970): 69-92.

Tyan, Emile. “Djihad.” *EI2*. vol. II. 538-540.

Uçman, Abdullah. “Abdülahad Nûri.” *TDVIA*. vol. 1. 178-179.

Uğur, Abdullah. “Muhammediye'nin Bir Beyti Üzerine Mehmed İsmet'in Şerhi.” *edebali islamiyat dergisi* 4 (2020): 1-13.

Uğurlu, İsa. “Gaznevî Mahmûd: A Neglected Ottoman Clerk His Career, Miscellany, and His Religious and Literary Network.” Unpublished MA Thesis, Sabancı University, 2017.

_____. “Recording History and Documenting Ego in the Eighteenth-Century İstanbul: Astrological Calendars as Ego-documents.” (forthcoming).

_____. “Süheyl Ünver'in Gaznevî Mahmûd ve Mecmûası Hakkındaki Notları.” *Zemin* 3 (2022): 276-290.

Uludağ, Süleyman. “Kelâbâzî, Muhammed b. İbrâhîm.” *TDVIA*. vol. 25. 192-193.

Ustaosmanoğlu, Mahmud. *Sohbetler*. vol. 1. İstanbul: Ahıska Yayınevi, 2012.

Ustaömer, Gül. “Hâsim Dîvânı-İnceleme-Metin ve Düzyazı Çeviri.” Unpublished MA Thesis, Kocaeli Üniversitesi, 2010.

Uysal, Enver. “İhvân-ı Safâ.” *TDVIA*. vol. 22. 1-6.

Uzun, Mustafa İsmet. “Câize.” *TDVIA*. vol. 7. İstanbul: TDV, 1993: 29.

_____. “Nahîfî.” *TDVIA*. vol. 32. 297-299.

_____. “Tezkire: Türk Edebiyatı.” *TDVIA*. vol. 41. İstanbul: TDV, 2012: 69-73. Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. *Mekke-i Mükerrreme Emirleri*. Ankara: TTK, 1972.

_____. *Osmanlı Tarihi*. vol. III/1. Ankara: TTK, 1995.

_____. *Osmanlı Devleti'nin İlmiye Teşkilatı*. Ankara: TTK Basımevi, 1988.

_____. *Osmanlı Devleti'nin İlmiye Teşkilâtı*. fourth edition. Ankara: TTK, 2014.

_____. *Osmanlı Tarihi: Karlofça Anlaşmasından XVIII. Yüzyılın Sonlarına Kadar*. vol. 4/1. 7th facsimile. Ankara: TTK Basımevi, 2011.

_____. *Osmanlı Tarihi: XVIII. Yüzyıl*. vol. IV/2. the sixth edition. Ankara: TTK, 2011.

Ünal, Ayşegül. “Köprülü Ayşe Hanım ve Osmanlı'da Hâne Politikaları.” Unpublished MA Thesis, İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2018.

Ünal, Mehmet. *Seyyid Murâd-ı Buhârî Hazretleri 'Kuddise Sirruh' Külliyyâtı-1*. İstanbul: Kutupyıldızı Yayınları, 2013.

_____. “Yetîmî, La'li-zâde Abdülbâkî.” *TEIS*. Accessed 3 July 2022. <http://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/yetimi-lalizade-abdulgazi>

Ünal, Mehmet and Aliye Yılmaz. “Muhammed Murâd-ı Buhârî ve ‘Risâle-i Nakşibendiyye’ Adlı Eseri.” *Turkish Studies: International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* 9/3 (2014): 1535-1549.

Üremiş, Ali. “Yeni Bilgiler Işığında Trabzonlu Köseç Ahmed Dede.” *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 19 (2006): 175-191.

Varlık, Nükhet. “İstanbul'da Veba Salgınları.” in *Antik Çağdan XXI. Yüzyıla Büyük İstanbul Tarihi*. vol. IV. İstanbul: İBB Kültür A.Ş., 2015: 146-151.

_____. *Plague and Empire in the Early Modern Mediterranean World: the Ottoman Experience, 1347-1600*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Veinstein, Gilles. “Religious institutions, policies and lives.” in *The Cambridge History of Turkey: The Ottoman Empire as a World Power, 1453-1603*. vol. 2. ed. Suraiya Faroqhi and Kate Fleet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013: 320-355.

Walsh, John R. “The Esâlibü'l-Mekâtib (Münşe'ât) of Mehmed Nergîsî Efendi.” *Archivum Ottomanicum* 1 (1969): 213-302.

Walzer, Richard. “Aristu.” *EI2*. vol. I. 630-633.

Wani, Mushtaq Ahmad. “Development of Islamic Sciences in Kashmir.” Unpublished PhD Diss., Aligarh Muslim University 1999.

Weismann, Itzhak. *The Naqshbandiyya: Orthodoxy and activism in a worldwide Sufi tradition*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Welsford, Thomas. "The Re-opening of Iran to Central Asian Pilgrimage Traffic, 1600-1650." in *Central Asian Pilgrims: Hajj Routes and Pious Visits between Central Asia and Hejaz*. eds. Alexandre Papas, Thomas Welsford, and Thierry Zarcone. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2012: 149-167.

Whitfield, Peter. *Batı Biliminde Dönüm Noktaları*. trans. Serdar Uslu. the fifth edition. Istanbul: Küre, 2007.

_____. *Landmarks in Western Science: from prehistory to the atomic age*. London: The British Library, 1999.

Winter, Michael. "A Polemical Treatise by ʿAbd al-Ġanī al-Nabulusi against a Turkish Scholar on the Religious Status of the Dimmīs." *Arabica* 35 (1988): 92-103.

_____. *Egyptian Society Under Ottoman Rule, 1517-1798*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Wolf, Abraham. *The Correspondence of Spinoza*. New York: The Dial Press, 1928.

Woodhead, Christine. "Circles of Correspondence: Ottoman letter-writing in the Early Seventeenth Century." *Journal of Turkish Literature* 4 (2007): 53-68.

_____. "Learning From Letters: Problems and Potential in Studying Münşe'at Mecmuaları." in *Klasik Edebiyatımızın Dili (Bildiriler)*. ed. Mustafa İsen. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı, 2017: 195-206.

_____. "Ottoman İnşa and the Art of Letter-Writing Influences Upon the Career of the Nişancı and Prose Stylist Okçuzade (d. 1630)." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları / The Journal of Ottoman Studies* VII-VIII (1988): 143-159.

_____. "The Ottoman Art of Word-Painting. Rhyme and Reason in Seventeenth-Century Turkish Literary Letters." *The Seventeenth Century* 38/5 (2023): 885-903.

_____. "Writing to a Grand Vezir: Azmizade Efendi's Letters to Nasuh Paşa, 1611-1614." in *Osmanlı'nın İzinde: Prof. Dr. Mehmed İpşirli Armağanı*. Istanbul: TİMAŞ, 2013: 485-492.

Yariş, Sahure. "Üsküdar Ayazma Camii Haziresi'ndeki Mezar Taşları." *Sanat Tarihi Dergisi* XXVII (2018): 197-249.

Yariş Sahure and Zülküf Yariş. "Üsküdar'daki Çingene Fırını Camii (Karakadı Camii) Haziresi'ndeki Mezar Taşları Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme." *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 9/44 (2016): 738-756.

Yaycıoğlu, Ali. "Ottoman Montology: Hazardous Resourcefulness and Uneasy Symbiosis in a Mountain Empire." in *Crafting History: Essays on the Ottoman World and Beyond in Honor of Cemal Kafadar*. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2023: 345-374.

Yazıcı, Mehmet Yunus. "Peçevî Şeyh Ârif Ahmed Dede ve Ukûdü'l-Lü'lü'ye fi Tarîki's-Sâdeti'l-Mevleviyye Tercümesi." Unpublished MA Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi, 2016.

Yazıcı, Muhammed. "Asilikten Paşalığa Bir Osmanlı Yöneticisi: Osmanoğlu Nasuh Paşa'nın Hayatı ve Muhallefâtı." in *Geçmişten Geleceğe Küçük Asya Anadolu*. ed. Mustafa Ağa and Mehmet Ali Yolcu. Çanakkale: Paradigma Akademi, 2022: 151-172.

Yazıcı, Tahsin. "Kalandar." *EI2*. vol. IV. 472-473.

_____. "Kalandariyya." *EI2*. vol. IV. 473-474.

_____. "Mawlawiyya." *EI2*. vol. VI. 883-887.

Yazıcıoğlu, Mustafa Said. "Hızır Bey." *TDVIA*. vol. 17. İstanbul: TDV, 1997: 413-415.

_____. "Hızır Bey ve 'Kasîde-i Nûniye'si." *AÜİFD XXVI* (1983): 549-588.

_____. "el-Kasîdetü'n-Nûniyye." *TDVIA*. vol. 24. İstanbul: TDV, 2001: 571-572.

Yeşilot, Okan, Yüksel Çelik, and Muharrem Varol. *İstanbul'daki Türkistan Tekkeleri: Ata Yurt ile Ana Yurt Arasındaki Manevi Köprüler*. İstanbul: TÜRÇEK, 2017.

Yetik, Erhan. "Ankaravî, İsmâil Rusûhî." *TDVIA*. vol. 3. İstanbul: TDV, 1991: 211-213.

Yetiş, Kazım. "Bahâriyye." *TDVIA*. vol. 4. İstanbul: TDV, 1991: 473-474.

Yıldırım, Yavuz. "Mukaddime'nin Osmanlı Dönemi Türkçe Tercümesi." *DİVAN* 21 (2006): 17-33.

Yıldız, Fakirullah. "Sohbetnâme-i Muhammed Murâd Buhârî," MA Thesis, İstanbul Üniversitesi 2017.

Yıldız, Sakıb. "Atpazarî Osman Fazlı." *TDVIA*. vol. 4. 83-85.

Yılmaz, Ahmet. "Mecelletü'n-Nisâb." *TDVIA*. vol. 28. Ankara: TDV, 2003: 237-238.

Yılmaz, Hasan Kâmil. "Aziz Mahmud Hüdâyî." *TDVIA*. vol. 4. 338-340.

Yılmaz, Mehmet Şakir. "Sufi brotherhood beyond boundaries: Murad al-Bukari's (1640-1720) travels and residence in Istanbul." Accessed 2 September 2023. <https://openaccess.ihs.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/20.500.12154/819/yilmaz2018.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Yılmaz, Necdet. *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: Sûfîler, Devlet ve Ulemâ*. İstanbul: OSAV, 2001.

Yoldaşlar, Özgün Deniz. "Minkārîzâde Yahya and the Ottoman Scholarly Bureaucracy in the Seventeenth Century." Unpublished PhD Diss., Boğaziçi University, 2021.

Yoran, Hanan. *Between Utopia and Dystopia: Erasmus, Thomas Moore, and the Humanist Republic of Letters*. Lanham, New York: Lexington Books, 2010.

Yücer, Hür Mahmut. *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: 19. Yüzyıl*. İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2004.

_____. "XIX. Asırda Anadolu'da Tasavvuf." PhD Diss., Marmara Üniversitesi, 2002.

Zarcone, Thierry. "Afganîler Tekkesi." *DBIA*. vol. I. 86.

_____. "Buhara Tekkesi." *DBIA*. vol. II. 325-326.

_____. "Emir Buhârî Tekkesi." *DBIA*. vol. III. 165-167.

_____. "Haydar Taşkendî Tekkesi." *DBIA*. vol. IV. 26-27.

_____. "Hindîler Tekkesi." *DBIA*. vol. IV. 74-75.

_____. "Histoire et croyances des derviches turkestanais et indiens à Istanbul." *Anatolia moderna – Yeni Anadolu* 2 (1991): 137-200.

_____. "Kalenderhane Tekkesi." *DBIA*. vol. IV. 398-399.

_____. "Kaşgarî Tekkesi." *DBIA*. vol. IV. 485-486.

_____. *Sufi Pilgrims from Central Asia and India to Jerusalem*. Kyoto: Center for Islamic Area Studies at Kyoto University, 2009.

Zavotçu, Gencay. “Hâsim, Köprülü-zâde Es‘ad.” *TEIS*. Accessed 22 September 2022. <http://teis.yesevi.edu.tr/madde-detay/hasim-kopruluzade-esad>

Zavotçu, Gencay, Simge Sakarya and Yeliz Alkaya. “Cevrî, Hall-i Tahkîkât ve ‘Aynü'l-Füyûz Adlı Eserleri.” *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi* 8/1 (2019): 275-290.

Ze'evi, Dror. *An Ottoman Century: The District of Jerusalem in the 1600s*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1996.

Zilfi, Madeline. “Elite Circulation in the Ottoman Empire: Great Mollas of the Eighteenth Century.” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 26/3 (1983): 318-364.

_____. “The Kadızadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul.” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 45/4 (1986): 251-269.

_____. *The Politics of Piety: The Ottoman Ulema in the Postclassical Age, 1600-1800*. Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1988.