

ZÂVIYE-KHANKÂHS AND RELIGIOUS ORDERS IN THE PROVINCE OF
KARAMAN: THE SELJUKID, KARAMANOĞLU AND THE OTTOMAN
PERIODS, 1200-1512

A Ph.D. Dissertation

by
FATİH BAYRAM

Department of
History
Bilkent University
Ankara
September 2008

To my grandfather

ZÂVIYE-KHANKÂHS AND RELIGIOUS ORDERS IN THE PROVINCE OF
KARAMAN: THE SELJUKID, KARAMANOĞLU AND THE OTTOMAN
PERIODS, 1200-1512

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

FATİH BAYRAM

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
HISTORY
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

September 2008

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Prof. Dr. Halil İnalçık
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kara
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. Mehmet Kalpaklı
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. Evgeni R. Radushev
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History.

Asst. Prof. Laurent Mignon
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel
Director

ABSTRACT

ZÂVIYE-KHANKÂHS AND RELIGIOUS ORDERS IN THE PROVINCE OF KARAMAN: THE SELJUKID, KARAMANOĞLU AND THE OTTOMAN PERIODS, 1200-1512

Bayram, Fatih
Ph.D., Department of History
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Halil İnalçık

September 2008

This dissertation analyzes the dervish lodges and Sufi orders in the Province of Karaman of the Ottoman Empire. The main source for this dissertation is the Register of the Pious Foundations of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483. This register details accounts of the pious foundations of dervish lodges from the time of Seljukids and of the Karamanoğlus. There are other types of pious foundations such as mosques and madrasas also mentioned in the register. Yet, the main focus of this study will be the dervish lodges and Sufi orders.

The register of 888/1483 will be analyzed in light of other sources such as chronicles, Sufi hagiographies, and literary works written during the Seljukid, Karamanoğlu, and classical Ottoman periods. The study demonstrates that the dervish lodges remained at the center of life during the period in question and that nearly every segment of society from the ruling class to the masses visited and shared their experiences in dervish lodges. In this dissertation, Sufi orders, particularly the Mevleviyye and the Halvetiyye, will also be analyzed in relation to their attitudes towards political authority.

Keywords: Seljukid, Karamanid, Zâviye, Khankâh, Sufism

ÖZET

KARAMAN EYÂLETİ'NDE ZÂVİYE-HANKÂHLAR VE TARİKATLAR:
SELÇUKLU, KARAMANOĞLU VE OSMANLI DÖNEMLERİ, 1200-1512

Bayram, Fatih
Doktora, Tarih Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Halil İnalçık

Eylül 2008

Bu çalışma, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Karaman Eyâleti'ndeki zâviyeleri ve tarikatları incelemektedir. Bu çalışmanın ana kaynağı, 888/1483 tarihli *Defter-i Evkâf-i Vilayet-i Karaman ve Kayseriyye* adlı vakıf defteridir. Bu kaynak, Selçuklu ve Karamanoğlu döneminde inşa edilen zâviye ve hankâh vakıflarını içermektedir. Bu kaynakta câmi ve medrese gibi başka vakıf çeşitleri de zikredilmektedir. Ancak, bu çalışmanın temel konusunu zâviyeler ve tarikatlar oluşturmaktadır.

888/1483 tarihli kaynak, Selçuklu, Karamanoğlu ve klasik Osmanlı döneminde yazılan vekâyi'nâme, menâkıbnâme ve diğer edebî eserler ışığında incelenecektir. Bu çalışma, zâviyelerin bu asırlarda hayatın merkezinde yer aldığını; devlet adamlarından sıradan insanlara kadar toplumun her kesiminden bir çok kişinin ziyaret ettiği ve tecrübelerini paylaştıkları mekânlar olduğu gerçeğini açıklayacaktır. Bu çalışmada, ayrıca Mevlevîlik ve Halvetîlik gibi tarikatlar, özellikle dervişlerin siyâsî otorite ile ilişkileri açısından, değerlendirilecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Selçuklu, Karamanoğlu, Zâviye, Hankâh, Tasavvuf

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to express my gratitude to the supervisor of the dissertation, Prof. Dr. Halil İnalçık. His wise guidance, constant encouragement and support throughout the long process of research and writing have been invaluable and beyond description with words. His canonical works in the field of Ottoman history constituted the major source of inspiration for this dissertation. Each seminar taken with Prof. Dr. Halil İnalçık has been a wonderful opportunity for me as a student to learn from a great master of history and to be encouraged by him to set sail in search of new areas of research.

I am particularly grateful to Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kara who enlightened me in the field of Sufi studies. I am indebted to Asst. Prof. Oktay Özel who made invaluable comments throughout the process of research and writing and who devoted his precious time to discuss the questions related to the dissertation.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Asst. Prof. Mehmet Kalpaklı who helped a great deal as the Head of the Department of History in enriching the collections of Bilkent University Library. The manuscripts and books brought to the library of the university by Kalpaklı contributed greatly to this dissertation.

I am also grateful to my professors Eugenia Kermeli, Paul Latimer, Cadoc Leighton, Laurent Mignon, Evgeni R. Radushev, Ahmet Simin, Selçuk Akşin Somel, David Thornton, and Zeynep Yürekli Görkay for their support and encouragement throughout the study.

I would also like to express my special thanks to the staff of Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Bilkent University Library, İSAM Library, İstanbul Atatürk Kitaplığı, Konya Bölge Yazma Eserler Kütüphanesi, Koyunoğlu Müzesi Kütüphanesi, La Bibliothèque D'études Arabes et Islamiques of Collège de France, Milli Kütüphane, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Tapu ve Kadastro Genel Müdürlüğü Kuyûd-i Kadîme Arşivi, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Türk Tarih Kurumu Kütüphanesi, and Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi for their patient help and kindness during my research.

I am especially indebted to Sadi Somuncuoğlu and Tümen Somuncuoğlu who gave me a copy of the *Hakikînâme* of Baba Yusuf.

I also would like to express my gratitude to my friends and colleagues. They encouraged and helped me in the process of research, writing and editing the dissertation. I would like to express my special thanks to Nuri Aksu, Aziz Arslan, Dr. Selami Arslan, Dr. Bahri Aydın, Dr. Savaş Barkçin, Hüseyin Bayram, Metin Bezikoğlu, Dr. Murat Çemrek, M. Ali Doğan, Hüdai Ekinci, Marlene Denice Elwell, Abuzer Kalyon, Abdullah Kavaklı, Dr. E. Said Kaya, Tolga Keskin, Dr. Ertuğrul İ. Ökten, M. Fatih Soysal, Dr. M. Mert Sunar, Adem Taflan, Kürşat Urungu Akpınar, Dr. Adnan Uzun, B. Boğaç Turna, Dr. Rıza Yıldırım, Dr. S. Nur Yıldız, Dr. Hüseyin Yılmaz, and Dr. M. Şakir Yılmaz to whom I owe a great deal as an appreciative and forbearing friend.

I am particularly indebted to each member of my family—especially my father, my mother, and my wife— for their benevolence and forbearance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZET	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Literature Review	8
1.1.1 New Trends in the Study of Sufism and Dervish Orders	8
1.1.2 International Civilization of Dervishes	15
1.1.3 Dervish Lodges and the formation of “a New World” in Anatolia	26
CHAPTER II: DERVISH LODGES AND THEIR FOUNDERS IN THE PROVINCE OF KARAMAN	37
2.1 <i>Evkâf Defteri</i> of the Province of Karaman Dated 888/1483	40
2.2 <i>Mensûh</i> (Abrogated) <i>Zâviyes</i>	49
2.3 The Founders of the Dervish Lodges	52
CHAPTER III: RELIGIOUS ORDERS IN THE PROVINCE OF KARAMAN	67
3.1 The Melâmîs and Political Authority	71
3.2 The Mevlevî Order	74
3.3 The Naqshbandî Order	86
3.4 The Halvetî Order	90
3.4.1 Dervish and Dream	93
3.4.2 From the Periphery to the Center	99
3.4.3 Challenge and Response	102
3.4.4 Sending off <i>Khalifas</i>	107
3.4.5 From the Germiyan to the Balkans	109
CHAPTER IV: A SUFI SAINT AS CITY FOUNDER: THE ANALYSIS OF THE <i>MAKÂLÂT-İ SEYYİD HÂRÛN</i>	111
4.1 The Author and the Work	112
4.2 An Ottomanized Version of the <i>Makâlât</i> ?	117
4.3 The Analysis of the <i>Makâlât-i Seyyid Hârûn</i>	123
4.3.1 Celâleddin Rûmî and Ahmed Fakih as Harbingers of a Shaykh	124
4.3.2 Silence about Ibn al-Arabî and Sadreddin Konevî	126

4.3.3	Dream and Journey to Karaman	128
4.3.4	Shaykh, Beg and <i>Vakf</i>	130
4.3.5	Seyyid Hârûn and Dediđi Sultan: Friendship or Rivalry? ..	134
4.3.6	<i>Khalifas</i> of Seyyid Hârûn	136
4.3.7	A Female Shaykh in Seydişehir	137
4.3.8	The Prophet Adam	139
4.3.9	The Belief of the Four Gateways.....	141
CHAPTER V: DERVISHES AND THE “WILL OF GOD”: THE MONGOLS, THE EMPIRE OF TİMUR AND THE OTTOMANS AS VIEWED IN THE KARAMANİD TEXTS WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO ŞİKÂRÎ ...		
5.1	The Ottoman Chroniclers and the Final Ottoman Occupation of the Karamanid Lands	144
5.2	The Ottomans as viewed in the Karamanid Texts	148
5.2.1	Şikârî’s view of the Ottomans and the Karamanids	149
5.2.2	The Prince Cem and the Karamanid Poet Aynî	165
CHAPTER VI: A KARAMANİD SHAYKH AS A CRITIQUE OF HIS TIME: BABA YUSUF OF AKSARAY		
6.1	Seljukids and the City of Aksaray	169
6.2	Safavid Background of Baba Yusuf’s Family	170
6.3	Zeynî and Bayramî Affiliations	172
6.4	Baba Yusuf and His Descendants according to the Ottoman <i>Vakf</i> Registers	179
6.5	Baba Yusuf’s Attitude towards the Ottoman Occupation of the Karamanid Principality	182
6.6	Sources of Baba Yusuf’s Works	184
6.7	Baba Yusuf and the Advice Literature in the Seljukid, Beylik and the Ottoman Periods	186
201		
CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSION		
219		
BIBLIOGRAPHY		
230		
APPENDICES		
A.	Map of the Province of Karaman in the year 1530	255
B.	Excerpts From Manuscripts	257

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The study of religious traditions in the Middle Ages is of great importance to the analysis of history of civilizations, for religion generally remained at the center of life for ordinary people in the pre-modern period.¹ In that era, common people were more prone to a flexible and inclusive view of religion than a formal approach to religious practice. Such flexible and inclusive approach to religion was apparent in some mystical traditions from Europe to China in the Middle Ages.

In this study, the main focus will be an analysis of the mystical way of life pursued by the dervishes in their lodges between the years 1200 and 1512,² within the geographical area defined by the *Defter-i Evkâf-i Vilâyet-i Karaman ve Kayseriye*

¹ In his work entitled *Beş Şehir (Five Cities)*, Ahmed Hamdi Tanpınar examines five cities— İstanbul, Bursa, Konya, Erzurum and Ankara— during the Seljukid and the Ottoman periods from the perspective of a man of letters. Tanpınar refers to the civilization of these cities during the Seljukid and the Ottoman periods as “a religious civilization.” The only rank of this civilization, according to Tanpınar, was sainthood (*evliyâlık*): “Eski medeniyetimiz dinî bir medeniyetti. Beğendiği, benimsediği adama ölümünden sonra verilecek tek bir rütbesi vardı: Evliyâlık. Halkın sevgisini kazanmış adam mübarek tanınır, ölünce velî olurdu.” Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *Beş Şehir*, eleventh edition (first published in 1946), (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2001), p. 45. Although Tanpınar was not a historian, his statement is verified by sources of history. Inscriptions, registers of pious foundations, chronicles and hagiographies, and more importantly tombs of saints can be perceived as evidence of how the rank of sainthood was influential in Anatolia during the Seljukid, Beylik and Ottoman periods, and even today. Ahmet T. Karamustafa explains the role of the “cult of *awliyâ*” in the Islamic society, as follows: “During the Early Middle Period, Sufism and Sunnism, now in close if not untroubled alliance, became the major constituents of the new Islamic social order that emerged after the disintegration of the universalist ‘Abbâsîd dispensation. The this-worldly potential of Sufism was actualized in full force and speed with the emergence of the Sufi *tarîqah* and the Sufi-colored institution of the cult of *awliyâ* throughout Islamdom.” Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *Gos’s Unruly Friends, Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1200-1550*, (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994), p. 99.

² The year 1512 was the last year of Bayezid II (1481-1512)’s reign.

(The Register of Pious Foundations of the Province of Karaman and Kayseri) dated 888/1483: *Kazâ-i³ Konya, Kazâ-i Belviran, Kazâ-i Lârende, Kazâ-i Seydişehir, Kazâ-i Beyşehir, Kazâ-i Çemen, Kazâ-i Akşehir, Kazâ-i Ilgun, Kazâ-i Anduğu, Kazâ-i Ürgüb (Nâhiye-i⁴ Develü, Nâhiye-i Karahisar, Nâhiye-i Ürgüb), Kazâ-i Ereğli, Kazâ-i Aksarâ, Kazâ-i Koşhisar, Kazâ-i Kayseriyye.*⁵

In the first half of the thirteenth century, the Seljukid sultans of Anatolia, particularly Alâeddin Keykubad (1219-1237), patronized scholars and Sufis who came to the Seljukid capital, Konya, from various parts of the world. The foundation registers pay witness to the building activity during the reign of Keykubad throughout Seljukid lands of Anatolia. Among those Sufi masters who visited the court of Keykubad in Konya was Celâleddin Rûmî's father, Bahâeddin Veled. Rûmî was also present at this visit. As it will be discussed later, Celâleddin Rûmî was the most famous Sufi master of the Seljukids and the Karamanids. The texts from these periods referred to him frequently as an example of a venerated Sufi master.

The *vakfs* (pious foundations) mentioned in the *Defter-i Evkâf-i Vilâyet-i Karaman ve Kayseriye* date back to the time of Karamanoğlu (hereafter Karamanids) and Seljukids of Anatolia. What was happening in the dervish lodges of Aksaray, Kayseri, Konya, Lârende (today's Karaman) and Niğde was not much

³ *Kazâ*: "(I) Jurisdiction of a kadi; (II) An administrative unit corresponding to the kadi's jurisdiction in a province." Halil İnalçık, "Glossary," in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, p. 998.

⁴ *Nâhiye* can be defined as "a district constituting the lowest division in the administrative hierarchy." See Suraiya Faroqhi, "Peasants of Saideli in the Late Sixteenth Century," in *Peasants, Dervishes and Traders in the Ottoman Empire*, (London: Variorum Reprints, 1986), 215-249: 215.

⁵ *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, İstanbul Atatürk Kitaplığı, Cevdet Tasnifi, O. 116/1 (H. 888/1483), folio 2a; Fahri Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin)," p. 2. The borders of the Province of Karaman changed from time to time. For information about the Province of Karaman in the sixteenth century, see Nicoara Beldiceanu et Irène Beldiceanu-Steinher, "Recherches sur la province de Karaman au 16e siècle", *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient (JESHO)*, vol. XI (1968): 1-129; M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, "XVI. Asırda Karaman Eyaleti ve Lârende (Karaman) Vakıf ve Müesseseleri", *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. VII (1968): 29-38; M. Akif Erdoğan, "Kanuni'nin İlk Yıllarında Karaman Vilayeti", *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, no. VII (1993): 37-50.

different from the goings on of the dervish lodges in other cities such as Baghdad, Cairo, Herat, Istanbul and Tabriz. Sufi masters of the Middle Ages traveled frequently among these cities either for the sake of knowledge or in search of new disciples. Thus, in some parts of this study, parallels will be drawn between the region defined as the Province of Karaman and other centers of Islamic civilization.

In the literature on dervish lodges, most of the studies take a region as their subject of study and do not pay attention to what was happening in the other parts of the world at a particular time. Most of these studies even neglect to consider what was happening in the neighboring regions in terms of dervish lodges, their founders and Sufi orders. Instead, they only address a particular time and space as if nothing had happened before and as if the other regions remained unchanged throughout long periods.

For a comparative study of the Karamanids with contemporary states or principalities, M. Şehâbetin Tekindağ's contribution cannot be underestimated.⁶ Tekindağ examined the Karamanid principality in the light of the events in the lands of the Ottomans and Mamluks. He also made use of Mamluk sources. From the studies of Tekindağ, it is understood that the Karamanids developed close relations with the Mamluks. Some prominent shaykhs visited Cairo and some Mamluk rulers were eager to patronize such shaykhs. Nevertheless, Tekindağ's main area of interest was political history and he did not deal much with history of dervishes and dervish

⁶ See, for instance, M. C. Şehâbetin Tekindağ, *Anadolu'da Türk Tarihi ve Kültürü, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi'nde 16.5.1966 – 31.5.1966 Arası Verilmiş Konferanslar*, (Trabzon: Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, 1967); M. Şehâbetin Tekindağ, "Son Osmanlı-Karaman Münasebetleri Hakkında Araştırmalar," *Tarih Dergisi*, vol. XIII (1963), no. 17-18, pp. 43-76; M. Şehâbetin Tekindağ, "Karamanlıların Gorigos Seferi (1367)," *Tarih Dergisi*, no. 11, pp. 161-174; M. Şehâbetin Tekindağ, "Karamanlılar," *MEB İslam Ansiklopedisi*, VI, 316-330; M. Şehâbetin Tekindağ, "XIII. Yüzyıl Anadolu Tarihine Aid Araştırmalar, Şemsüddin Mehmed Bey Devrinde Karamanlılar," *Tarih Dergisi*, vol. XIV, no. 19 (1964), pp. 81-98; Şehâbetin Tekindağ, "Konya ve Karaman Kütüphanelerinde Mevcut Karamanoğulları İle İlgili Yazmalar Üzerinde Çalışmalar," *Tarih Dergisi*, no. 32 (March, 1979), 117-136; Şehâbetin Tekindağ, "Fatih Devrinde Osmanlı-Memlûklü Münasebetleri," *Tarih Dergisi*, no. 30 (1976), pp. 73-98.

lodges. This task has been carried out, albeit without a comparative basis, by İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, who published extensive material about particular cities and towns of the Province of Karaman.⁷ As Konyalı lacks the comparative outlook of Tekindağ and since he dealt with the overall history of these regions with a minor interest in dervishes and their institutions, a synthesis of Konyalı's and Tekindağ's work promises to meaningfully contribute to the new literature emerging in the field of Sufi studies.

In this study, Sufi masters as founders of dervish lodges and of religious orders will be discussed in the light of hagiographies, treatises and literary works written by the dervishes. Such a study has not been undertaken for the Province of Karaman. As will be discussed later, the studies on the Province of the Karaman of the Ottoman Empire did not particularly deal with the dervishes and their lodges. They examined the general picture of pious foundations using archival sources, particularly *tahrir*⁸ registers. In these studies, no attempt has been made to analyze these sources with reference to chronicles, hagiographical works and literary sources of the time. Although archival studies are indispensable for the study of history, students of history are expected to examine other sources to better understand the context in which the archival sources appeared.

The *tahrir* registers offer very limited information about the founders of the dervish lodges. They only mention the name and title of the founder of a dervish

⁷ See, for instance, İ. Hakkı Konyalı, *Âbideleri ve Kitâbeleriyle Beyşehir Târîhi*, ed. Ahmet Savran, (Erzurum, 1991); İ. Hakkı Konyalı, *Âbideleri ve Kitâbeleriyle Karaman Tarihi, Ermenek ve Mut Abideleri*, (İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1967); İ. Hakkı Konyalı, *Âbideleri ve Kitâbeleriyle Konya Tarihi*, (Konya, 1997); İ. Hakkı Konyalı, *Nasreddin Hoca Sehri Akşehir*, (İstanbul, 1945).

⁸ *Tahrir*: "(I) Enregisterment; (II) Ottoman system of periodical surveying of population, land and other sources of revenue. Survey registers called *defter-i khâkânî* were of two kinds: *mufâssal*, registering the sources of revenue 'in detail,' and *idjâmâl* that register only their distribution among the military." Halil İnalçık, "Glossary," in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, ed. Halil İnalçık, Donald Quataert, p. 1001.

lodge. Thus, one needs to consult other sources for further information about the founders of the dervish lodges. Other texts such as hagiographies, chronicles, histories of dynasties, and literary sources provide additional information about the dervish lodges and their founders. Hagiographies reveal how Sufi masters were perceived by the dervishes during the Seljukid, Karamanid, and classical Ottoman period.⁹ Naturally, hagiographies entail legendary motives. Yet, by studying hagiographies, one can learn something about the nature of relations between political authorities and dervishes. In the religious climate of the Middle Ages, some dervishes were believed to have possessed divine power. Sultans and begs were wary of the perceived magical power of dervishes.¹⁰ This was one of the main reasons behind the allocation of some lands as *vakfs* (pious foundations) to the dervishes by the rulers. Chronicles and histories of dynasties reveal how dervishes were viewed by the ruling class.¹¹ Literary sources reflect the cultural climate of the time and present the reader with significant details about the world view of the authors. Some Sufi masters such as Baba Yusuf-i Hakîkî had a *dîvân* (collection of poems).¹² In such works, one can encounter criticisms towards the prevailing attitudes and behaviors among the dervishes and religious scholars of the time.

This study goes beyond the world of dervishes. The relations of sultans and begs with dervishes have also been examined in this study. The question of how dervishes perceived the world of sultans and how they challenged the sultans and begs by their popularity among the masses will be discussed. The foundations built for Sufi masters and texts written by or for them during that period will be the main focus of this study. The foundations and texts reveal the fact that most of the Sufi

⁹ The classical Ottoman period has been regarded as the period of 1300-1600. See Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire, The Classical Age, 1300-1600*, (London: Phoenix, 1995).

¹⁰ I am grateful to Halil İnalcık and Mustafa Kara for this information.

¹¹ For further information about that phenomenon, see Chapter V.

¹² For more information about Baba Yusuf-i Hakîkî, see Chapter VI.

masters did not distance themselves from the political arena even if they claimed to be superior to the worldly rulers. The dervish way of life had the challenge of foundations established by the patronage of a particular ruler. Those who rejected such patronage had to face political oppression and those who accepted such help from begs or sultans paid the price when the political climate changed. In some cases, as will be discussed, challenges came from the official religious scholars against the practices of the dervishes. The response of the dervishes in the form of treatises and hagiographies has also been examined in this dissertation.

In this chapter, new trends in the field of Sufi studies will be examined with their relevance to the dervishes in the Province of Karaman. A detailed discussion of Marshall G. S. Hodgson's *The Venture of Islam* will also be offered in order to understand the role of dervishes in Islamic history. Later in this chapter, Ethel Sara Wolper's *Cities and Saints, Sufism and the Transformation of Urban Space in Medieval Anatolia* will be analyzed in order to contextualize the patronage of dervish lodges in Anatolia.

In the second chapter, having examined the general role of dervish lodges in the Islamic world and Anatolia, the subject will be narrowed to the Province of Karaman. The main focus of the second chapter will be the study of the register of pious foundations of the Province of Karaman. An analysis of this source will be put forth with particular reference to dervish lodges and their founders. As will be examined in the second chapter, some Seljukid and Karamanid officials subsidized the building of dervish lodges. Female patrons of dervish lodges will also be discussed in the second chapter.

In the third chapter, religious orders in the Province of Karaman will be discussed in the light of Sufi hagiographies, particularly the *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn* and

the *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*. Since the register of 888/1483 specifies two Sufi orders in the province, the Mevlevî and the Halvetî Orders, these two Sufi orders will be discussed in detail with particular references to travel, patronage, and dreams in Sufi literature. A brief analysis of the Melâmî tradition and of the Naqshbandî Order in the Province of Karaman will also be offered in the third chapter.

In the fourth chapter, the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun* will be analyzed in relation to a Sufi saint who has been believed to be a founder of a town, Seyyid Harun of Seydişehir. The question of how a Sufi saint of the early fourteenth century was narrated in a hagiography written in the mid-sixteenth century will be discussed in that chapter. The religious and political climate of the sixteenth century Ottoman Empire will be discussed in the fourth chapter in order to understand the preoccupation of the author of the *Makâlât* in emphasizing the devotion of Seyyid Harun to the Sunnî path of Islam.

In the fifth chapter, the question of how dervishes of the Seljukids and Karamanids perceived the invaders of Anatolia, the Mongols and Timur, will be analyzed with reference to Aflâkî's *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn*, Şikârî's Karamanid *Shahnâma*, and the *Menâkib-i Seyyid Alâeddin Semerkandî*. In that chapter, the question of how the political affiliations of Sufis affected their perceptions of events will be discussed. It is surprising to discover that a Karamanid shaykh's perception of Timur was not so different from a Karamanid ruler's perception of Timur.

In the sixth chapter, the works of Baba Yusuf will be examined in relation to Baba Yusuf's attitude towards his time. Although Baba Yusuf was not happy with the Ottoman occupation of the Karamanid lands, he maintained his privilege as a holder of a pious endowment after the occupation. In that chapter, sources of Baba Yusuf's works will be analyzed in order to see which books were read among the

Sufi circles of the Karamanid lands. The story of Baba Yusuf as expressed in his writings and in the registers of foundations denotes how some dervishes of the Karamanids had strong ties with the early Safavid shaykhs and how frequently some dervishes changed their political affiliations from time to time.

1.1 Literature Review

1.1.1 *New Trends in the Study of Sufism and Dervish Orders*

According to Karamustafa, during the Early Middle Period, i.e. 950-1250, Sufism and Sunnism became the “major constituents of the new Islamic social order”. The emergence of the Sufi orders and the “Sufi-colored institution of the cult of *evliyâ* throughout Islamdom” consolidated the alliance between Sufism and Sunnism.¹³ The dervish lodges also played a significant role in the consolidation of the alliance between the Sunnî state and the conformist dervishes. Dervish lodges became the centers of Sufi rituals and Sufi manuals and treaties that conformed to the Sunni outlook of the state in which they arose. In return for their services to the state, dervishes enjoyed the state’s support in the form of pious foundations (*vakfs*) for their livelihood and the upkeep of their lodges. A key example of this phenomenon will be explained in the chapters on Seyyid Harun and Baba Yusuf.

J. S. Trimingham’s book entitled *the Sufi Orders in Islam* remains to be a classic of Sufi studies.¹⁴ Nevertheless, new studies began to emerge in the field. Among the new masters of Sufi studies A. T. Karamustafa occupies a significant place. Karamustafa sees serious problems with the “two-tiered” model of religion and criticizes the assumption of “an unbridgeable separation between high,

¹³ Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *Gos’s Unruly Friends, Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1200-1550*, pp. 98, 99.

¹⁴ J. S. Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam*, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1971).

normative and low, antinomian religion.”¹⁵ According to Karamustafa, this model is a major impediment to understanding “the true nature of the deviant dervish groups and the process of their emergence in the aftermath of the Mongol invasions.”¹⁶ Having made this point, Karamustafa also notes that there was “a substantial degree of continuity between pre-Islamic and Islamic religious belief and practice in all the relevant cultural spheres.”¹⁷ Such continuity can be observed in the case of Seyyid Harun. Seyyid Harun (d. 720/1320) was perhaps originally a shaman-like figure. However, the religio-political climate of the sixteenth century led one of his followers to compose a hagiographical work about Seyyid Harun in the year 962/1554-1555. In that work entitled the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun*, Seyyid Harun is presented as a Sunnî shaykh conforming to the ideology of the Ottoman Empire during the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent (r. 1520-1566).

Writing the history of dervishes and their institutions is not an easy task.

Karamustafa explains well why this is the case:

The relevant historical evidence is widely scattered in various sources, somewhat thin, and at times imprecise. This should not be surprising. On one hand, the dervishes themselves were not likely to “document” their way of life in writing, since rejection of this-worldly learning was a logical item on their agenda. This did not prevent them from producing written testimonies of deviant renunciation, especially in the form of hagiographies of the ascetic masters. These accounts were apparently targeted for internal consumption within the dervish groups and did not have wider circulation.¹⁸

One of the dichotomies often stressed in the literature is the opposition between the *ulemâ*, religious scholars, and the Sufis. As it will be explained in the section on the Halvetî Order, tension existed between the religious scholars and Sufis depending on the political climate of the time. Nevertheless, this kind of approach

¹⁵ Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends, Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1200-1550*, (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994), p. 9.

¹⁶ Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends, Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1200-1550*, p. 9.

¹⁷ Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, p. 11.

¹⁸ Karamustafa, p. 51.

has began to be challenged in the recent literature. For instance, Margaret Malamud criticizes the “common view” of the development of Sufi organizations and practices in her article entitled “Sufi Organizations and Structures of Authority in Medieval Nishapur.”¹⁹ Malamud criticizes the dichotomies drawn between Sufis and the *ulema*:

Sufis have generally been contrasted with the ulema to suggest that Sufism and law were incompatible and even hostile to each other: the elaboration and guardianship of Islamic law (fiqh) was the concern of the ulema; the inner, experiential dimension of Islam the concern of Sufis.²⁰

Malamud asserts that there are some problems with “this narrative.”²¹ Malamud’s article deals with Sufism in Khurasan, particularly in Nishapur in the late 10th and 11th centuries. According to the author, Sufis were not often dissociated from the *ulema*. Sufi activities, practices and institutions were not so different than the activities, practices, and institutions of the *ulema*. Most Sufis were members of the *’ulema* and Sufis and *ulema* supported each other.²² However, there was an epistemological difference between the *ulemâ* and Sufis. The *ulemâ* thought that the source of knowledge for the Muslims were the *Qur’an* and of *Sunna* (deeds of the Prophet Muhammad). On the other hand, according to the Sufis, what matters was love of God not knowledge. Sufis believed that love of God was essential for the attainment of truth.

Malamud also emphasizes the role of the Shafî’i *ulema* in incorporating Sufism into the curriculum of the *madrassa*.²³ In the Province of Karaman, there were also cases of cooperation between the *ulemâ* and the shaykhs. As it will be discussed

¹⁹ Margaret Malamud, “Sufi Organizations and Structures of Authority in Medieval Nishapur,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 26 (1994), 427-442.

²⁰ Margaret Malamud, “Sufi Organizations and Structures of Authority in Medieval Nishapur,” p. 427.

²¹ Malamud, p. 427.

²² Malamud, p. 427.

²³ Malamud, p. 430.

later, especially the Sufi orders such as the Mevleviyye, the Halvetiyye, and the Naqshbandiyya developed friendly relations with the religious scholars and prominent religious scholars became the members of these Sufi orders. In some cases, a shaykh also assumed the role of an *'âlim*, religious scholar. For instance, Shaykh Ali Semerkandî, a renowned shaykh of the Karamanids, was an author of a four-volume Qur'anic exegesis.

In his article entitled “*Faqîh* versus *Faqîr* in Marinid Morocco: Epistemological Dimensions of a Polemic,” Vincent J. Cornell criticizes the stereotype of “the eternal conflict between scholar and Sufi.”²⁴ Nevertheless, Cornell does not reject the fact that this conflict was not totally wrong. Instead, Cornell looks at the picture from a different angle:

There is no doubt that a significant difference exists between scriptural literalism at one extreme and the illuminationism of a Shihâb al-Dîn al-Suhrawardî (d. 587/1191) at the other. Furthermore, it is the legitimate task of the *ulema*, as guardians of normative Islam, to establish a clearly demarcated community of belief by maintaining common standards of doctrine and practice. Mystics, on the other hand, seek to “push the envelope” of these boundaries by appealing to a higher truth that transcends such limitations.²⁵

Despite these epistemological differences, Cornell finds instances of close relations between legists and Sufis. According to him, this kind of friendly relations was “certainly” the case in the Maghrib. He quotes the following words of the Shâdhilî master Ahmad Zarrûq (d. 899/1493) about Sufism and *fiqh*: “There is no Sufism except through *fiqh*, because God’s exoteric laws (*ahkâm Allâh al-zâhira*) can only be known through it; there is no *fiqh* but through Sufism, for praxis (*'amal*)

²⁴ Vincent J. Cornell, “*Faqîh* versus *Faqîr* in Marinid Morocco: Epistemological Dimensions of a Polemic,” in *Islamic Mysticism Contested, Thirteen Centuries of Controversies and Polemics*, ed. Frederick de Jong & Bernd Radtke, (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1999), p. 207.

²⁵ Vincent J. Cornell, “*Faqîh* versus *Faqîr* in Marinid Morocco: Epistemological Dimensions of a Polemic,” p. 207.

is only carried out through truthfulness (*sıdq*) and an orientation toward the divine (*tawajjuh*)”.²⁶

Although dervishes claimed to be distant from politics, they competed with each other to gain new followers, especially among the ruling elite. In the *Manâqib al-Ârifîn*, Aflâkî expresses how Rûmî’s grandson, Çelebi Ârif (d. 719/1219), well-orchestrated the rise of Mevlevî Order inside and outside Anatolia. In his various travels, Ulu Ârif Çelebi was accompanied by Aflâkî, from whom he requested the deeds and good attributes of his father and his grandfathers to be compiled.²⁷ On the one hand, Çelebi was dealing with the present state of affairs of his Sufi path, and, on the other hand he was ordering the history of a Sufi order to be compiled. The story of Çelebi Ârif will be discussed in detail in the third chapter.

Similar figures can be found in other Sufi orders. One of them, Ubeydullah Ahrar, has been examined by Dina Le Gall. This case is also relevant to the Province of Karaman in the sense that one of Ahrar’s disciples, Baba Ni’matullah b. Mahmud of Nakhichevan, came from the Caucasus, perhaps by the order of Ahrar, to Akşehir. In Akşehir, one of the towns of the Province of Karaman, Baba Ni’matullah was well respected as an author of several works on the mystical teachings of Muhyiddin Ibn al-Arabî.²⁸ In the epitaph of Baba Ni’matullah, he was called “one of the great *müfessirs* (expert on the Qur’anic exegesis)” and a Naqshbandî shaykh (*Hâcegân-i Nakşibendiyye’den*).²⁹ Thus, it is understood from this inscription that Naqshbandî Order established a presence with Baba Ni’matullah in the Province of Karaman, particularly in Akşehir.

²⁶ Cornell, p. 207.

²⁷ Ahmed Aflâkî, *Âriflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlânâ ve Etrafındakiler)*, tr. Tahsin Yazıcı, vol.1, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1986), pp. 9,10

²⁸ Dina Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism, Naqshbandis in the Ottoman World, 1450-1700*, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), pp. 18-19.

²⁹ “Kibâr-i Ehlullah’dan ve Müfessirîn-i ’izâmdan Hâce Ni’metullah kuddise sırruhû Hazretleri’nin merkad-i münevverleridir,” see İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Nasreddin Hoca’nın Şehri Akşehir, Tarihî-Turistik Kılavuz*, (İstanbul: 1945), pp. 478-479.

Dina Le Gall maintains that there was “a whole pattern of biases in Sufi, Ottoman, and Islamic historiography.” Furthermore, she asserts that these biases did not allow for a possibility of a true understanding of “organized Sufism” and the relationship between Sufism and Islamic orthodoxy.³⁰ Le Gall also underscores the contribution of Karamustafa in challenging the paradigm of separating the two strands of Islam, “one high, normative, or official, the other low, antinomian, or popular”.³¹ Le Gall notes that Ottoman Sufi orders have drawn much less attention than Sufi orders in South Asia.³² To begin to remedy this lack of scholarly attention, Le Gall studied the venture of a Sufi order, the Naqshbandi Order, in the Ottoman world between 1450 and 1700. She explores how various historical realities affected the proliferation of this Sufi order throughout the Islamic lands.³³ She attaches special attention to “the unique role of Ahrar in training and sending off *khalifas* [spiritual successors].”³⁴ Le Gall argues that Ahrar was deliberately engaged in what may be called “a great missionary effort.”³⁵ According to Le Gall, Ubeydullah Ahrar was not an ordinary Sufi shaykh. He was also “a man of keen political and organizational instincts, who presided [over] substantial economic ventures as well as a network of political contacts and patronage.”³⁶ Similar missionary efforts can be observed among the dervishes in the Province of Karaman. For instance, Kazeruni lodges throughout Islamic lands were a part of this grand missionary effort among the dervishes before Ahrar. As it will be discussed later, the Kazerunî lodges in Bursa, Edirne, Erzurum and Konya were a consequence of such an effort.

³⁰ Dina Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 5.

³¹ Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 7.

³² Dina Le Gall, “Forgotten Naqshbandis and the Culture of Pre-modern Sufi Brotherhoods,” p. 89.

³³ Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 2.

³⁴ Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 2.

³⁵ Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 20.

³⁶ Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 20.

Parallel to Karamustafa's and Le Gall's arguments, Terzioğlu draws attention to "ahistorical and essentialist approaches" to Sufism:

Ahistorical, essentialist approaches are even more prevalent in the secondary literature on Sufism. Historians might study the social, political and economic dimensions of the Sufi orders, but rarely examine the ideas expressed in Sufi writings. The philologists and scholars of religion who do study Sufi texts, on the other hand, tend to eschew historical contextualization and privilege explicating these texts in their own terms, that is phenomenologically....It is, however, only in the last decade or so that scholars have begun to analyze Sufi writings as narratives (instead of simply mining them for individual pieces of information).³⁷

Such an analysis of Sufi writings as described by Terzioğlu will be undertaken in the chapter on Baba Yusuf of Aksaray in order to search for possible answers to the question of continuity under the lands occupied by the Ottomans. Such continuity was not limited to the political realm only. Baba Yusuf's works also reflect the continuity in the Sufi texts. He provides a synthesis of different Sufi traditions from the Zeynî Order to the Safavid Order. In spite of the political borders among the Islamic states, dervishes of the Later Islamic Middle Period did not restrict themselves to the allegiance of a specific state. As it will be examined later, Baba Yusuf's father, Shaykh Hamîdüddin, originated from Turkestan and resided at Ardabil, Bursa, Konya and Aksaray. He stayed in the cities of Aqqyunlus, Ottomans, and the Karamanids.

Terzioğlu views two studies, namely Carl W. Ernst's *Eternal Garden: Mysticism, History and Politics at a South Asian Center* and Vincent J. Cornell's *Realm of the Saint: Power and Authority in Moroccan Sufism* as harbingers of a newly emerging trend in Sufi writing. As the titles of these two works imply, in line with Carl W. Ernst and Vincent J. Cornell, Terzioğlu has written a dissertation about "a controversial Sufi master," Mehmed el-Niyazi el-Misrî (1618-94), who lived in a

³⁷ Derin Terzioglu, "Man in the image of God, in the image of times: Sufi self-narratives and the diary of Niyazi-i Misri (1618-94)," *Studia Islamica*, no. 94 (2002).

period of vital transformation in Ottoman social, political and cultural life.³⁸ This work begins with a challenging statement: “This dissertation explores the shifting boundaries between the center and the margins, between establishment and opposition and between orthodoxy and heterodoxy in seventeenth-century Ottoman Empire through a contextual study of the life and works of a controversial Sufi, Mehmed Niyazi al-Misrî (1618-94).”³⁹ As it will be discussed in the chapter on Seyyid Harun, Shaykh Muhyiddin Karamanî was executed on the grounds of heresy by the *fetva*, religious opinion on a legal issue, of Şeyhülislam Ebussu’ud in the year 1550. Some Sufi sources such as the *Menâkıb-i İbrahim-i Gülşenî* viewed Muhyiddin Karamanî as a shaykh conforming to the principles of *shari’a*. In that era, the boundaries between the center and the margins were defined by the state authorities. The dervishes were expected to live in within the boundaries drawn by the state. However, the flexibility of boundaries shifted in different periods of the Ottoman history depending on the nature of the challenges to the political order.

1.1.2 *International Civilization of Dervishes*

Most of the studies on dervish lodges have remained on a local basis. The literature often states that a certain shaykh came from a far away place, mostly Horasan, to Anatolia without bothering about the question of what were the implications of the constant travel of dervishes. Among the historians who focused on the universal character of dervishes and their lodges is the Islamic historian Marshall G. S. Hodgson. In the second volume of his monumental work, *The Venture of Islam*, Hodgson dwells on the importance of Sufism in the Middle Ages.

³⁸ Derin Terzioglu, “Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyazi-i Misrî (1618-1694),” *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, (History and Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard University, January 1999), p. i.

³⁹ Derin Terzioglu, “Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyazi-i Misrî (1618-1694),” p. i.

According to historian Edmund Burke III, Hodgson's three-volume work, *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization* must be seen as "the most ambitious and successful effort to salvage the orientalist tradition to date."⁴⁰ In his *Venture of Islam*, Hodgson views Sufism as "a mainstay of the international social order."⁴¹ According to Hodgson, many Sufis wandered "incessantly in remote parts of the *Dar al-Islam* (The Abode of Islam)."⁴² Hodgson highlights international character of Sûfism in the Middle Ages. According to Hodgson, Sufis were tolerant of local differences.⁴³ This tolerance strengthened international character of Sûfism.

One of the basic limitations of Hodgson was the lack of Turkish sources in his bibliography. He tried to understand Sûfism of the Middle Ages without reading one of the basic three languages of this literature, i.e. Turkish. His linguistic limitation becomes apparent if we look at his choice of the famous Sufi figures. Although he devoted several pages to Rumi and Ibn al-Arabî we do not see a specific paragraph dealing with Ahmed Yesevî, Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli and Yunus Emre, who were also famous in the Ottoman Empire. Hodgson's major contribution to the field is that he pursued a broader perspective in dealing with Sûfism, which had been neglected in most of the studies in the Sufi literature.

According to Hodgson, after 945 CE, the most distinguishing characteristics of the classical 'Abbasî world, "with its magnificent caliphal empire and its Arabic-language culture" were greatly transformed. The world of al-Mansûr, or of Hârûn al-Rashîd, of al-Ma'mûn was "scarcely recognizable" five or six generations later.

⁴⁰ Edmund Burke, III, "Islamic History as World History: Marshall Hodgson, 'The Venture of Islam,'" *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 10, no. 2 (May, 1979), p. 241.

⁴¹ Marshall G. S. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam, Conscience and History in a World Civilization*, vol. 2 (*The Expansion of Islam in the Middle Periods*), (The University of Chicago Press, 1977).

⁴² Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam*, vol. 2, p. 220.

⁴³ Hodgson, p. 220.

Hodgson asserts that by the mid-fifteenth century, “the former society of the caliphate” was replaced by “a constantly expanding, linguistically and culturally international society.”⁴⁴ This international society did not have a single political structure. Instead, its society was ruled by several independent governments. In time, “this international Islamicate society” became “the most widely spread and influential society on the globe.”⁴⁵ Like Hodgson, J. R. McNeill and W. H. McNeill also point out the linguistic and cultural transformation in the Islamicate society. According to J. R. McNeill and W. H. McNeill, the main political phenomenon of the centuries between 1000 and 1500 was “the accelerated Turkic infiltration of the Muslim heartlands.”⁴⁶ The revival of “Persian cultural consciousness and identity” was in line with this phenomenon. J. R. McNeill and W. H. McNeill do not see any contradiction between these trends and asserts that the two combined to create a “courtly style of Turco-Persian culture, government, and warfare”.⁴⁷ This culture was enriched by the “wandering Sufis” and the dervish lodges which were basic centers of social integration.⁴⁸

Hodgson divided the history of Islamic civilization into three periods: the Formative Period (600-945), the Middle Period (945-1503) and the Period of the Gunpowder Empires and Modern Times. He devoted one volume to each period. In Hodgson’s view, the Middle Period from the mid-tenth to the beginning of the sixteenth century is marked by the emergence of an international society and the

⁴⁴ Hodgson, p. 3.

⁴⁵ Hodgson, p. 3.

⁴⁶ J. R. McNeill, and William H. McNeill, *The Human Web, A Bird’s-Eye View of World History*, (New York & London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2003), p. 130.

⁴⁷ J. R. McNeill, and William H. McNeill, *The Human Web*, p. 130.

⁴⁸ Hodgson, p. 213.

diffusion of Sûfism. For Hodgson, the Middle Periods were the high point of Islamic civilization.⁴⁹

Hodgson divided the Middle Period into two parts. The first part is the period of the International Civilization from the mid-tenth century (945) to the mid-thirteenth century, ending with the Mongol invasion of Baghdad in 1258. It is difficult to imagine this international civilization without “wandering dervishes,” according to Hodgson. The second part is the “Age of Mongol Prestige,” until the beginning of the sixteenth century (1503). Of course, like every periodization, Hodgson’s periodization can be critiqued. For instance, it can be criticized on the grounds of examining the great states such as Mamluks and Ottomans under the heading of the “Age of Mongol Prestige.”

In considering the notion of an international civilization of dervishes, one can look to thirteenth-century Konya. The Seljuk sultans, especially Sultan Alaeddin Keykubad (r. 1219-1236) welcomed religious scholars and Sufi masters coming to Konya due to fear of Mongol invasions. Famous scholars and mystics came to the Seljukid capital Konya from Central Asia and Iran in the first half of the thirteenth century. Among these scholars and Sufis were Celâleddin Rûmî and his father, Bahâeddin Veled. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to link the rise of Konya as a spiritual center only with the threat of Mongol invasions. One should not ignore the importance of the *futuwwa* movement. Hodgson views the Caliph al-Nasır (1180-1225)’s *futuwwa* movement as “the last serious effort at finding a new political idea on which to build the unity of Islamdom as a whole.”⁵⁰ Hodgson admires Caliph al-Nasır’s policy of creating many foundations, particularly for the benefit of the poor

⁴⁹ Hodgson, p. 257.

⁵⁰ Hodgson, p. 279.

people.⁵¹ Like Caliph Al-Nasır, Seljuk Sultan Alaeddin Keykubad was famous for establishing numerous foundations. Due to the patronage of the Seljuk sultans and of the *emîrs* under the Mongol protectorate, Konya became a new civilizational center with its palaces, *madrasas*, mosques, dervish lodges and baths in the thirteenth century.

Hodgson asserts that the writings of Umar Suhrawardi (1145-1234) are the most important source to grasp the ideological side of Caliph al-Nasır's policies. He emphasizes Umar Suhrawardi's advice of living in a *khankâh*, a kind of dervish lodge, without worrying about earning one's bread.⁵² Despite Umar Suhrawardi's admiration of *khankâh* life, he became a politically active person and carried out crucial diplomatic missions. One of his missions took place in Anatolian Seljukid capital, Konya. While discussing "the expansion of Islam and of Muslim power" in India in the fifteenth century, Hodgson offers an analysis reminiscent of Ibn Khaldun's *asabiya* (group solidarity) thesis. Hodgson asserts that in India, Muslims could benefit from the resources of a "large and sophisticated cultural tradition" beyond the borders of the Hindu sphere. According to Hodgson, without this "strong international consciousness," the Muslims would have lost their sense of distinctness from the local population.⁵³ The Sufis had also this strong international consciousness, and they wandered incessantly in remote parts of the Islamic world feeling the strength of this consciousness.

Ibn al-Arabî was also among those who came to Konya in the first half of the thirteenth century. Ibn al-Arabî's stepson, Sadreddin Konevi (d. 1273), interpreted and disseminated Ibn al-Arabî's ideas around Konya. *Evkâf Defteri* of the Province

⁵¹ Hodgson, p. 280.

⁵² Hodgson, p. 281.

⁵³ Hodgson, pp. 555-556.

of Karaman (888/1483) in the Ottoman Empire offers a list of Konevî's books, which were allocated as *vakfs*. Among the books in the library of Konevî there were Ibn al-Arabî's works such as *Fusûsu'l-Hikem* (Bezels of Wisdom) in Konevi's own handwriting (*be-hattı Şeyh Sadrüddin*) and *Fütuhât-ı Mekkiye* (Meccan Revelations) in Ibn al-Arabî's own handwriting (*be-hattı Şeyh Muhyiddin*). In this source, there is a catalogue of books in the library of Sadreddin Konevî. Also, titles of books written by Muslim scholars such as Tabari, Ghazalî and Kuşeyrî are provided. The question of what were the possible sources of a Karamanid shaykh in compiling a treatise or book will be discussed in the chapter on Baba Yusuf of Aksaray.

Hodgson views the twelfth century as a century when mutual understanding developed between the *ulemâ* (religious scholars) and dervishes. The man who undertook this task was Ghazâlî. According to Hodgson:

Men like Ghazâlî (d.1111), who combined a mastery of the teachings of the '*ulemâ*' scholars on *Sharî'ah* and *kalâm* with a respect for the independent wisdom of the Sufi mystics, helped to make Sûfism acceptable to the *ulemâ* themselves. By the twelfth century it was a recognized part of religious life and even of religious 'ilm knowledge.⁵⁴

Hodgson views Sûfism as "an institutionalized mass religion"⁵⁵. He explains what he meant by using this term as follows:

In the later part of the Earlier Middle Period, the new Sûfism had its period of greatest bloom. The 'ulamâ scholars, who had been wary of the early Sûfism of an elite, were mostly persuaded by the early twelfth century to accept the new Sûfism of the masses, in conformity with their populist principles, and to try to discipline it. Then, with their acceptance, around the latter part of the twelfth century the reorganization of Sûfism was completed with the establishment of formal Sufi brotherhoods or orders (*tariqa*).

Nevertheless, it is not so easy to assert that the reorganization of Sûfism was completed with the establishment of Sufi orders in the twelfth century. Here, Hodgson is under the influence of the general assumption of his time that the Sufi

⁵⁴ Hodgson, p. 213.

⁵⁵ Hodgson, p. 213.

orders emerged in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Of course, there were some orders founded in these centuries.

One of the major contributions to the study of dervish lodges of Anatolia has been made by Ethel Sara Wolper in her book entitled *Cities and Saints: Sufism and the Transformation of Urban Space in Medieval Anatolia*. Wolper argues that modern scholars viewed the thirteenth century as a century when there were “standardized orders.”⁵⁶ But Hodgson traces the origin of “standardized orders” back to the twelfth century. Wolper explains this general misconception as follows:

Many Anatolian dervish orders, like the followers of Jalâl al-Dîn Rûmî (the *Mawlawîs*) and the followers of Hajjî Bektash (the *Bektâshîs*), trace their beginning to the thirteenth century. Fully developed hierarchial orders (*tariqas*), however, were rarely in existence before the fifteenth century.⁵⁷

The Register of Pious Foundations of the Province of Karaman (888/1483) mentions 160 *zâviyes* and 11 *khankâhs* in that province. Only two religious orders, the *Mevlevîs* and *Halvetîs*, were mentioned in this source.⁵⁸ It was dervish lodges (*zâviye* or *khankâhs*) rather than Sufi orders which were essential in a Sufi’s identity in the thirteenth century. Institutionalization of Sufi orders in Anatolia before the fifteenth century did not occur. Wolper explains this point as follows:

It was individual lodges and not government patrons or Sûfi orders (*tariqa*) that provided the framework for new communal formations. I argue that buildings were central to identity formation. Placing dervish-lodge communities outside of a centralized government structure or *tariqa* puts them in a local landscape.⁵⁹

According to Hodgson, the lodges served the function of social integration. He also emphasizes the co-existence of the mosques and lodges:

⁵⁶ Ethel Sara Wolper, *Cities and Saints, Sufism and the Transformation of Urban Space in Medieval Anatolia*, (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania University Press, 2003), p. 6.

⁵⁷ Wolper, *Cities and Saints*, p. 6.

⁵⁸ Fahri Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin)," *unpublished M. A. thesis*, (İstanbul University, 1996), pp. 160-162.

⁵⁹ Wolper, p. 13.

In addition to the ordinary mosque, each Muslim community now had its *khânikâh* (Arabic, *zâwiyah*), where the Sufi pîrs lived. There they instructed and housed their disciples, held regular *dhikr* sessions (often for a fairly wide congregation), and offered hospitality to wandering Sufis, especially those of the same *tariqah*. These institutions, which had some of the same functions as a European monastery, became basic centres of social integration. They were mostly restricted to men, but in the Earlier Middle Period there were occasionally some for women also.⁶⁰

Hodgson is right in stating that there were some lodges built for women.

Women's names were also sometimes mentioned in an inscription of a dervish lodge. For instance, in an inscription of the Shams al-Dîn ibn Husayn lodge, dating to 687/1289, in Tokat a woman's name, Safwat al-Dunyâ wa al-Dîn, was mentioned. In the Province of Karaman, there was recognition of women patrons such as Huand Hatun. According to the register of *vakfs* dated 888/1483, there was a *vakf* of *dârülhuffâz* (a school for those students who knew the Qur'an by heart) established by Huand Hatun in Konya.⁶¹ More examples of women patrons from the register of 888/1483 will be cited in the next chapter.

According to Hodgson, even if alive a Sufi *pîr* might receive greater reverence than was accorded to any other man except a king.⁶² Nevertheless, in some cases, beyond Hodgson's argument, a Sufi *pîr* might ever receive a higher reverence than a ruler. For instance, Celâleddin Rûmî whose *vakf* was mentioned first among the *vakfs* of the Province of Karaman became more famous than rulers of the time. This point will be discussed in the light of Shikârî's history of the Karamanids and of the almanacs presented to the Ottoman sultans.

Although names of Sultans were forgotten by ordinary people throughout the ages, some shaykhs were remembered throughout centuries in Islamic lands. An example of this is Abû İshak Kazerûnî whose *zâviye* was mentioned in the Register

⁶⁰ Hodgson, p. 213.

⁶¹ M. Akif Erdoğan, "Murad Çelebi Defteri: 1483 Yılında Karaman Vilâyetinde Vakıflar -I-", *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. XVIII, no. 1 (July 2003), p. 155.

⁶² Hodgson, p. 217.

of Pious Foundations of the Province of Karaman (888/1483).⁶³ Kazerûnî Order, which received its name from Abû Ishak Kazerûnî, has been known as the first Sufi order.⁶⁴ It is interesting that a shakyyh who was born in the tenth century in Kazerun was mentioned among the *vakf* registers of Konya in the fifteenth century. Abu İshaq İbrahim bin Şehriyâr (d. 426/1035) was born in Kazerun, a town in Shiraz, in 352/963.⁶⁵ Many *zâviyes* were built in the name of Kazerunî in Islamic lands from the Balkans to China. Sea travelers were often seeking the *baraka*, blessing, of Kazerunî during their long voyages. The famous historian of Sûfism, J. Spencer Trimingham, explains this phenomenon as follows: “His [Kazerunî’s] *baraka* was especially effective as a safeguard against the perils of sea-travel to India and China.”⁶⁶ It is not a coincidence that most of the Kazerunî *zâviyes* were built in port cities.⁶⁷

The famous Muslim traveller of the fourteenth century, Ibn Battuta, visited the tomb of Abu İshak-ı Kazerunî at Kazerun. Ibn Battuta explains the tomb of Kazerunî as follows:

⁶³ Fahri Coşkun, “888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin),” p.47. As I learn from the residents of Konya, the pilgrims of Anatolia who had been going to Mecca through highway (*karayolu*) were visiting the *zâviye* of Kazerûnî in Konya before the practice of highway pilgrimage was abolished.

⁶⁴ M. Akif Erdoğan, “Murad Çelebi Defteri: 1483 Yılında Karaman Vilâyetinde Vakıflar – II-”, *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. XVIII, no. 2 (December 2003), p. 99.

⁶⁵ For more information about Abû Ishak Kazerûnî and the Kazerûnî Order, see *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 3, ed. Seyit Ali Kahraman, Yücel Dağlı, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999), p. 254; Terry Graham, “Abu İshaq Kaziruni: Founder of Sufism’s First Order”, *Sufi*, no. 55 (Autumn 2002), 24-28; H. Adnan Erzi, “Bursa’da İshakî Dervişlerine Mahsus Zâviyenin Vakfiyesi”, *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. 2 (1974); İ. Hakkı Konyalı, *Âbideleri ve Kitabeleri ile Erzurum Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Ercan Matbaası, 1960); Fuad Köprülü, “Abû İshak Kâzerûnî ve Anadolu’da İshâkî Dervişleri”, tr. Cemal Köprülü, *Belleten*, vol. XXXIII, no. 130 (April 1969), 225-236. Niyazi-i Mısri divided the previous Sufi Masters into two groups in terms of their attitude towards “worldly benefits” (*dünyâlık*): those who accept them in order to distribute them to the poor people and those who refuse them totally. According to Mısri, Ebû İshak Kâzerûnî (d. 426/1034) and Hacı İbrahim Efendi belonged to the first group.⁶⁵ Hacı Bayrâm-ı Velî (d. 833/1429-30) and Akbıyık Sultan (d. 860/1456) belonged to the second group. Mısri also identified himself with the second group. See Derin Terzioğlu, “Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyazi-i Misri (1618-1694),” p. 293.

⁶⁶ J. Spencer Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam*, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1971), p. 236.

⁶⁷ Mustafa Kara, *Bursa’da Tarikatlar ve Tekkeler*, (Bursa: Sır Yayıncılık, 2001), p. 95.

I left Shiraz to visit the tomb of pious Shaykh Abu İshak al-Kazerunî at Kazerun, which lies two days' journey [west] from Shiraz. This Shaykh is held in high honour by the inhabitants of India and China. Travellers on the Sea of China, when the wind turns against them and they fear pirates, usually made vows to Abu İshak, each one setting down in writing what he has vowed.⁶⁸

The main source for the life of Abu İshak Kazerûni is his hagiography entitled *Firdevsü'l-Mürşidiyye fî Esrâri's-Samediyye*, which was written by Hatîb Imam Abû Bakr Muhammed b. Abdülkerim (d. 502/1108-1109), who was the third shaykh of the central lodge in Kazerun after the death of Abû İshak in the year 426/1045.⁶⁹ This Arabic hagiography was translated into Persian by Mahmud b. Osman in the year 728/1327-28.⁷⁰ Fritz Meier published the Persian translation of the hagiography of Kazerunî under the title of *Die Vita Des Scheich Abû Ishaq al-Kâzarûnî*⁷¹ In the inscription of the Kâzerûnî lodge in Konya, Abu İshak Kazerûni is called as "*kutbu'l-meşâyikh*" (The Pole of the Shaykhs). The Kazerûnî *zâviye* in Konya was built by Karamanoğlu Mehmet Beg II in the year 821/1418. Yet, the *vakfiye* was written two years before the completion of the *zâviye* building, by the order of Karamanoğlu Mehmed Beg II. Interestingly, in the *vakfiye*, Karamanoğlu Mehmed Beg is described as a *ghâzî* Sultan, who fights for the sake of Islam against infidels (*kâhiru'z-zenâdika*). In this *vakfiye*, Ebû İshak Qazerûnî is called "*seyyidu'l-aqtâb ve's-sâlikîn*" (The Master of the Poles and of the Followers of the Spiritual Path).⁷²

⁶⁸ Ibn Battuta, *Travels in Asia and Africa, 1325-1354*, translated and selected by H.A.R. Gibb, (London: Darf Publishers, 1983), p. 97.

⁶⁹ Mustafa Kara, *Bursa'da Tarikatlar ve Tekkeler*, (İstanbul: Sır Yayıncılık, 2001), p. 87n. Mahmud b. 'Utman, *Die Vita Des Scheich Abû Ishaq al-Kâzarûnî*, ed. Fritz Meier, (Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenlaendische Gesellschaft, 1948), p. 1.

⁷⁰ Fritz Meier, "The Sumâdiyya: A Branch Order of the Qâdiriyya in Damascus," in *Essays on Islamic Piety and Mysticism by Fritz Meier*, tr. John O'Kane, (Leiden & Boston & Köln: Brill, 1999), 304.

⁷¹ Mahmud b. 'Utman, *Die Vita Des Scheich Abû Ishaq al-Kâzarûnî*, ed. Fritz Meier, (Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenlaendische Gesellschaft, 1948).

⁷² İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Âbideleri ve Kitabeleri İle Konya Tarihi*, (Konya: Enes Kitap Sarayı, 1997), pp. 915-916.

The Ottoman *vakf* registers provide valuable information about the Kazeruni lodge of Konya. In the first *evkâf defteri* of the Province of Karaman of the Ottoman Empire dated 881/1476 the Kazerunî lodge was mentioned. In this register, it is stated that the lodge is still functioning.⁷³ The *evkâf defteri* of 888/1483 also mentions the lodge of Kazerunî in Konya. This register states that the the *vakf* of the *zâviye* was acknowledged by "the imperial edict" of the deceased Sultan Mehmed II (r. 1451-1481) (*be-berât-i Sultan Mehmed tâbe serâhu*).⁷⁴ This register also venerates Kazerunî as the Spiritual Master of "the Horizons" (*vakf-ı zâviye-i Mürşid-i Âfâk Şeyh Ebu İshak-ı Kazerunî rahmetullahi 'aleyh*).⁷⁵ The same words are in the *evkâf defteri* of 992/1582: *vakf-ı zâviye-i Mürşid-i Âfâk Şeyh Ebu İshak-ı Kazerunî*.⁷⁶ As noted earlier, there were also other Kazerunî *zâviyes* within Anatolia, such as Bursa, Edirne and Erzurum.⁷⁷ The Qazerunî Order emphasized the need for *ghazâ*, the holy war against infidels. Shaykh Abû İshak-ı Kazerunî is also known as "*Şeyh-i Gâzî*."⁷⁸ The stress on *ghazâ* in the Qazerunî order perhaps appealed to the Ottoman ideal of *ghazâ*. Bayezid I built a *zâviye* for the memory of Kazerunî in Bursa⁷⁹. In the *vakfiyye*, which was dated as 802 /1399, the *zâviye* is described as "Ebû İshakhane"⁸⁰. The similar stories as to the fame of a particular shaykh throughout centuries and throughout many countries can easily be found in the Sufi literature.

⁷³ Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, p. 916.

⁷⁴ Fahri Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin)," p. 47.

⁷⁵ Coşkun, p.47.

⁷⁶ Konyalı, p. 916.

⁷⁷ Konyalı, p. 919.

⁷⁸ Mustafa Kara, *Bursa'da Tarikatlar ve Tekkeler*, p. 89.

⁷⁹ Kara, p. 99.

⁸⁰ Adnan Erzi, "Bursa'da İshakî Dervişlerine Mahsus Zaviyenin Vakfiyesi," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, II (1942), p. 423.

1.1.3 Dervish Lodges and the formation of “a New World” in Anatolia

Halil İnalçık explains how the *Annales* school made an impact on the Ottoman studies in his article entitled “Impact of the *Annales* on Ottoman Studies and New Findings.”⁸¹ According to İnalçık, Köprülü, “the founder of modern Turcology”, was the one who introduced the *Annales* school to Turkey in the 1930’s. İnalçık explains the contribution of Köprülü to the study of the Turkish history as follows:

After 1930, his [Köprülü’s] interest in the work of Lucien Febvre and *Annales* became increasingly evident in both his methodology and his mode of conceptualization. In 1931, he published the first scholarly journal on Turkish legal and economic history, *Türk Hukuk ve İktisat Tarihi Mecmuası*. At the same time a group of young scholars studied with him, among whom were Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, Osman Turan, Mehmet Altay Köymen, Faruk Sümer, and Mustafa Akdağ. As one of his students, I am greatly indebted to Köprülü for my orientation towards institutional, social and economic history.⁸²

In line with Köprülü’s studies,⁸³ in his studies based on archival material Ömer Lütfi Barkan analyzed “the role played by dervish convents (zâviye) in the process of the expansion and settlement of Turkish population in the frontier zone during the foundation of the Ottoman state.”⁸⁴ Barkan’s studies about the dervish lodges pioneered the later studies in the literature.⁸⁵ Barkan restricted his study to the

⁸¹ Halil İnalçık, “Impact of the *Annales* on Ottoman Studies and New Findings,” *Review*, I, 3/4 (Winter/Spring 1978), pp. 69-96.

⁸² Halil İnalçık, “Impact of the *Annales* on Ottoman Studies and New Findings,” p. 70. See also Halil İnalçık, “Türkiye’de Modern Tarihçiliğin Kurucuları,” in *XIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara: 4-8 Ekim 1999, Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, vol. 1, (Ankara: TTK, 2002), pp. 85-166.

⁸³ See, for instance, M. Fuat Köprülü, “Anadolu Selçuklularının Yerli Kaynakları”, *Bellekten*, VII (1947-1948); M. Fuat Köprülü, “Selçuklular Devrinde Anadolu Şairleri”, *Türk Yurdu*, IV (1926): 289-295; M. Fuat Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*, first published in 1918, (Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 1966); Fuat Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, first published in 1926, (Ankara: Akçağ, 2004).

⁸⁴ Halil İnalçık, “Impact of the *Annales* on Ottoman Studies and New Findings,” p. 71.

⁸⁵ In the preface of her collection of articles in a book entitled *Peasants, Dervishes and Traders in the Ottoman Empire*, Suraiya Faroqi explains the contribution of the *Annales* school and Barkan to her studies as follows: “These articles reflect an involvement with the *Annales* school of historiography. This involvement began on the day, now more than twenty years ago, that Professor Barkan dumped several volumes in front of the curious undergraduate that I was then, and with the fascination by

dervish lodges' relations to the land. He himself views his article as a preliminary text for his "*Toprak Meselesi (Land Issue)*" work.⁸⁶ He also writes that his study focuses on villages, rather than city life.⁸⁷ Nevertheless, it is a fact that Barkan, in many areas, was a major source of inspiration for later students of history of dervish lodges in the Ottoman Empire. According to Barkan, dervish lodges were an essential part of the social fabric of Turcoman principalities in Anatolia.⁸⁸ Barkan showed not only how dervish lodges served the land in a peaceful and fruitful way. He also brought back the forgotten sources, particularly *vakf* sources, to the attention of historians. Under the influence of the *Annales* school, Barkan's studies on dervish lodges denoted how ordinary people played a significant role in the economy of the society and how dervish lodges became centers of social integration.

As noted earlier, one of the recent contributions to the Sufi literature was Ethel Sara Wolper's book entitled *Cities and Saints, Sufism and the Transformation of Urban Space in Medieval Anatolia*. Wolper has examined the building activity in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in various parts of the Islamic world. According to Wolper, Sufi structures were an indispensable part of this building activity. For instance, in Ayyubid Syria, Sufi edifices evolved under the patronage of princes. The Ayyubid Sultan Nûr al-Dîn, who was called "al-Zâhid" (the ascetic), built three lodges in Aleppo in the last quarter of the twelfth century. According to P. M. Holt, the greatest of the Mamluk patrons of Sufism was al-Nâsir Muhammad,

Braudel's book on the Mediterranean, which I devoured a few months later. The use of serial data, the study of a geographically limited area over a long period of time, the interest in historical demography can all be linked to the influence of the *Annales*." Suraiya Faroqhi, *Peasants, Dervishes and Traders in the Ottoman Empire*, (London: Variorum Reprints, 1986), p. ix.

⁸⁶ Ö. Lütfi Barkan, "Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zâviyeler," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. 2 (1942), p. 283n.

⁸⁷ Ö. Lütfi Barkan, "Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zâviyeler," p. 289.

⁸⁸ Ömer Lütfi Barkan, Enver Meriçli, *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tahrir Defterleri I*, (Ankara: TTK, 1988), p. 134.

who patronized the building of the royal *khankâh* near Siryaqus, north of Cairo, in the year 725/1325. Ibn Taghribirdî describes how this *khankâh* was built:

The Sultan went out to Siryakus, and with him a number of engineers. He appointed a site at about a league from Siryaqus for the building of a convent. It contained a hundred cells for a hundred Sûfis. Beside it was a mosque where the *khutba* was recited, a guest-house, a bath and a kitchen....He [The Sultan] returned, and the work went on zealously so that it was completed in forty days.⁸⁹

Although Wolper does not explain the case of the Aqqyunlus in her book, it is worth pointing out briefly the significance of the Aqqyunlus in terms of the relations between sultans and shaykhs. Aqqyunlus were natural allies of the Karamanids against the Ottomans. Aqqyunlus' warm hospitality offered to dervishes can be observed in the following words of Uzun Hasan:

From the dawn of the morning of our sultanate and the first appearance of the signs of our caliphate, we have recognized that the doors of victory and conquest that were opened upon the countenance of our good fortune and the portents of ascendancy and prosperity that became evident and manifest upon the pages of the felicitous circumstances of our aspirations were due to the benevolence of the sublime efforts of the dervishes and the beneficence of their lofty fervor.⁹⁰

Aqqyunlu state maintained close ties with not only merchants but also with Sufis.⁹¹ Among those Sufis who had close relations with the Aqqyunlu state was Shaykh İbrahim Gülşenî, who attended the sessions of the administrative council. Though he did not hold any governmental position, he was of significant influence for several Aqqyunlu sultans.⁹² The life story of İbrahim Gülşeni as reflected in the *Menâkib-i İbrâhîm-i Gülşenî*.⁹³ shows how a Sufi was patronized by various states of the age. Gülşenî was present not only in Aqqyunlu court, but also in Mamluk and Ottoman courts.

⁸⁹ P. M. Holt, *The Age of the Crusades, the Near East from the Eleventh Century to 1517*, (New York: Longman, 1986), p. 152.

⁹⁰ John E. Woods, *The Aqqyunlu: Clan, Confederation, Empire*, (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1999), p. 83.

⁹¹ Woods, *The Aqqyunlu*, p. 18.

⁹² Woods, p. 18.

⁹³ Muhyî-yi Gülşenî, *Menâkib-i İbrâhîm-i Gülşenî*, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1982).

After a brief examination of the building activity in the other Islamic lands of the twelfth and thirteenth century, Wolper begins to focus on building activity in the Anatolian cities of Sivas, Tokat, and Amasya in the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries. She stresses the fact that the historical record does not possess the same wealth of sources on the Seljuks of Anatolia as on the Ayyubids or Mamluks. According to Wolper, the cities of Sivas, Tokat, and Amasya were similar to Mamluk Cairo and Ayyubid Aleppo in that under these empires, dervish lodges grew in size and number. On the other hand, the endowments for *madrasas* decreased under these empires.⁹⁴ To these cities Granada should also be added. Maribel Fierro asserts that Granada was “a center of attraction” for Sufis from other regions of the Islamic world during the fourteenth century. Fierro emphasizes the close link between Sufism and commerce in Granada as follows:

Many of the foreign Sufis were merchants such as the Tunisian al-Khalfawî al-Tamîmî (d. 715/1315), who settled in Granada and devoted his life to the distribution of alms to the poor. Sufism and commerce were closely connected and the network of *zâwiyas* and *ribats* which covered the territory of the Nasrid kingdom catered not only for the needs of merchants and travellers, but also for those of the local population.⁹⁵

Wolper also points out such alliance between dervishes and merchants. Wolper denotes how dervish lodges in the Anatolian cities of Sivas, Tokat, and Amasya became centers of social integration between the mid-thirteenth century and the mid-fourteenth century. She asserts that by 1350, a series of newly built dervish lodges changed the life of Anatolian cities. Dervish lodges of this period were built near city entrances and exits, along main thoroughfares, and strategic locations in market areas. After the eclipse of the Seljuks, dervish lodges served the aim of encouraging the growth of specific kinds of mixed communities. Wolper maintains

⁹⁴ Wolper, *Cities and Saints*, p. 25.

⁹⁵ Maribel Fierro, “Opposition to Sufism in Al-Andalus”, in *Islamic Mysticism Contested, Thirteen Centuries of Controversies and Polemics*, ed. Frederick de Jong & Bernd Radtke, (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1999), pp. 198-199.

that by their location, orientation, and function, these lodges facilitated the rise of a new alliance between dervish groups, merchants and local rulers.⁹⁶ Although Wolper is right in asserting the rising influence of local rulers in the aftermath of Kösedağ *vis-a-vis* Seljuk rulers, this kind of alliance was not new and not peculiar to these three cities. Similar observations can be made in other Anatolian cities such as Bursa, Edirne, Erzurum, and Konya in the context of Kazerûnî dervishes and merchants. As noted earlier, Ibn Battuta explained how travelers on the Sea of China made vows to Abû Ishak Kazerûnî due to fear of pirates. Such vows were the main source of income for Kazerûnî lodges.

Wolper asserts that a “new world” was formed between the year 1220, when Celâleddin Rûmî (1207-1273) first came to Anatolia, and the year 1360.⁹⁷ Yet, she does not indicate why she chose the year 1360. Wolper assumes that Bahâeddin Veled (d. 1230) and his son, Celâleddin Rûmî, would have noted “some unique qualities of the Seljuk Anatolia.”⁹⁸ Firstly, according to Wolper, one of these qualities was its location. By the time Rûmî and his father came to Anatolia, the Seljuks of Anatolia had gained control over a large territory extending to the Black Sea in the north and the Mediterranean coast in the south. Due to these new borders, Anatolian cities became “a common stop” for scholars fleeing from Mongol-ruled Iran and Central Asia. The second quality of the cities of Anatolia was “the constant building activity” in these cities.⁹⁹ Between 1215 and 1238, Seljukid Anatolia saw the rise of new mosques, palaces, city walls, and caravansarays, which were built at “an amazing pace.”¹⁰⁰ For instance, at least twenty-four caravansarays were built on

⁹⁶ Wolper, *Cities and Saints*, p. 42.

⁹⁷ Wolper, p. 42.

⁹⁸ Wolper, p. 16.

⁹⁹ Wolper, p. 16.

¹⁰⁰ Wolper, p. 16.

the road between Sivas and Kayseri during the first half of the thirteenth century.¹⁰¹ A new world in Anatolia was largely the work of the Seljuk Sultan Alâeddin Keykubad I (1220-1237). According to Osman Turan, the reign of Keykubad I was “the most prosperous and the most glorious period of Seljuk rule” in Anatolia.¹⁰² Keykubad perceived his court as part of “an international *sunni* culture” and like his predecessor, Keykâvus (r. 1210-1219).¹⁰³

In the *Menâkibü'l-Ârifin* of Aflâkî, an interesting conversation is narrated between the Seljuk Sultan Alâeddin Keykubad and Celâleddin Rûmî's father, Bahâeddin Veled. During their meeting in Konya, Keykubad invited Rûmî's father to his palace. However, he refused the Sultan's invitation and said: “Shaykhs reside in *khankâhs*, *imams* (prayer leaders) in *madrasas*, dervishes in *zâviyes*, *emîrs* in *sarays* (palaces), merchants in *khans*, the *runûd* (street gangs) on house corners, and strangers on the *mistâba* (bench).”¹⁰⁴ According to Wolper, the story between the Seljuk sultan and Rûmî's father described a “perfectly ordered world in which a simple one-to-one relationship pertained between buildings and audiences.”¹⁰⁵ One drawback of Wolper's study is that Wolper overemphasizes the role of buildings throughout her study in the formation of identity for dervishes. Indeed, buildings did form a part of dervish identity during the period in question. Nevertheless, the symbolic world behind buildings should also be sought. Perhaps Rûmî's father did not mean a clear distinction among these types of buildings but Wolper likes to see a clear cut distinction among these buildings.

¹⁰¹ Wolper, pp. 16-17.

¹⁰² Osman Turan, “Anatolia in the Period of the Seljuks and the Beyliks,” *The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. 1: The Central Islamic Lands*, ed. P.M. Holt, Ann K.S. Lambton, Bernard Lewis (Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 246.

¹⁰³ Wolper, p. 17.

¹⁰⁴ Wolper, p. 20. See also Aflâkî, *Âriflerin Menkabeleri*, vol. 1, tr. Tahsin Yazıcı, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1986), p. 101.

¹⁰⁵ Wolper, p. 20.

Wolper uses the term “interpretive community” to indicate groups with a “common vision about the world around them.”¹⁰⁶ She also makes a distinction between the *ulemâ*, “functioned within a framework of legal or institutional textuality,” and others who concentrated on Sufi literature and other kinds of texts.¹⁰⁷ The Sufi hagiographies were written for those dervishes who had a common vision about the outside world. As it will be indicated later, hagiographies of Seyyid Harun, Seyyid Ali Semerkandî were written for dervishes who had a common worldview. Without such texts, it was difficult for dervishes to remember their common past. As it will be discussed in the chapter on Baba Yusuf, the writings of Baba Yusuf venerated previous shaykhs and criticized dervishes of the time and thereby tried to lead the audience to recall their common history of honor and glory.

The impact of the Mongols on the life patterns in Anatolia was also significant. As it has been indicated before, Hodgson calls the period after the Mongol invasions until the beginning of the sixteenth century “The Age of Mongol Prestige.” Wolper highlights the emergence of a new type of alliance formation in Tokat, Amasya, and Sivas.¹⁰⁸ The Mongols, “who represented not just another group of nomads but a nomadic enterprise different in matters of scale, religion, and concern for the preservation of common weal,” weakened the former ties of mutual interest that had bound together scribe, *emir*, sultan, tradesmen, and “the saintly.”¹⁰⁹ Rudi P. Lindner points out the fact that the establishment of “numerous tribal enterprises, or beyliks in the aftermath of the Mongol invasion of Anatolia did not prevent trade and the “flow of goods and ideas.”¹¹⁰ He also adds that the “career of

¹⁰⁶ Wolper, p. 20.

¹⁰⁷ Wolper, p. 20.

¹⁰⁸ Wolper, p. 42.

¹⁰⁹ Rudi Paul Lindner, *Explorations in Ottoman Prehistory*, (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2007), p. 5.

Rûmî and the wealth of the Mevlevî order” indicate the expression of “group devotion” and “the production of literary works far from nomad traditions” even under increasing disorder and Mongol interference in public affairs.¹¹¹ As indicated earlier, one of such literary texts produced in the Mevlevî milieu was Aflâkî’s *Menâkübü’l-Ârifîn*, which will be cited in various parts of this study.

Wolper begins the third chapter of her book, which is entitled “Dervish Lodges and the Transformation of City Spaces,” with a famous poem of Hacı Bayram(d. 1429-1430):

My Lord has created a city
In between two worlds.
One sees the beloved if one looks
At the edge of that city.

I came upon that city
And saw it being built.
I too was built with it
Amidst stone and earth.¹¹²

Wolper asserts that those who saw the growth of Anatolian cities, like in the poem of Hacı Bayram (d. 1430), were built along with these cities. Although she takes the outward meaning of Hacı Bayram’s poem, she tries to denote how dervishes and other city dwellers became instrumental in the formation of the new type of cities.¹¹³ As an example of alliance between the dervishes and other segments

¹¹⁰ Rudi Paul Lindner, *Explorations in Ottoman Prehistory*, p. 5.

¹¹¹ Lindner, p. 5.

¹¹² Wolper, *Cities and Saints*, p. 42.

¹¹³ Fuat Bayramoğlu notes Şeyhülislam Feyzullah Efendi’s commentary on the famous poem of Hacı Bayram as follows:

“Çalabım bir şâr yaratmış
İki cihan aresinde
Bakıcak dîdar görünür
Ol şârın kenâresinde.

Çalab, Türk lisanında Allahü Te’âlâ’nın ismidir. Allahü a’lem muradları bu ola ki Allahü Te’âlâ iki cihan ki dünya ve âhirettir arasında bir şâr yani şehir yaratmış ki âna âlem-i melekûtdır (bir kelime okunamıyor) ervâha müte’allik olan ’âlemdir. Rûh-i insanî ol ’âlemde iken mücerredât silkinde olub müşâhede-i dîdâra müstağrak idi. Kendüsünün ol ’âlemde iken ’âlem-i mülk ü şehâdete nüzûl hulkını beyân ider ki;

Nâgehân ol şâr’a vardım
Ol şâr’ı yapılırd gördüm
Ben dahî bile yapıldım

of society, Wolper quotes from the inscription of *khânqâh* of Mas'ûd ibn Sherifshah: “In the year 637 the weak slave, needy of the mercy of God, built this blessed *khankâh*....and he has endowed and devoted it to the Sufis and the tradespeople.” She adds: “If Konyalı’s reading of the inscription is correct, the building was intended for Sufis and tradespeople organized into a group that was engaged in a commercially profitable craft and partially supported by a *vakf*.”¹¹⁴ She uses an old edition of Konyalı’s book. In a recent edition, it is written that this *khankâh* was endowed for the Sufis (*Sûfiyyîn*) and experts of Islamic law (*fuqahâ*).¹¹⁵

As an example of dervish lodges’ strategic locations, Wolper gives the example of four dervish lodges built in Tokat between the year 1275 and the year 1300:

The location of these four dervish lodges dramatically altered the configuration of space within the city. They affected how various groups navigated to the city center. The Shaikh Majnûn Lodge was the first building that greeted a visitor to the city; the second and third buildings seen by such a visitor, the Sunbul Baba and Khalif Ghâzî Lodges, represented a northern extension of the *maidân* along the main caravan road that ran through Tokat; and on the way to the east-west citadel road the visitor confronted the Shams al-Dîn ibn Husayn Lodge. Anyone entering or exiting the city saw dervish lodges in strategic locations at the main entrance to the city, near the main market, at the main intersection.¹¹⁶

Taş (u) toprak arasında.

Nâgehân bir şehre vardım dediği kendünün anâsırdan mürekkebe olan beden-i insanıdır, ruhdur ki yani taş ve toprak mesâbesinde olan anâsırdan tereküb olunan cisme ben dahî ta'alluk etdim. Pes vücûd-i insanım bir şehir oldu ki garâib-i âsârî Câmî'dir,” Fuat Bayramoğlu, *Hacı Bayram-ı Velî, Yaşamı, Soy, Vakfı*, vol. 2, *Belgeler*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1983), p. 217. A thirteenth century Sufi master of the Seljukid Konya, Ahmed Fakih, used the word “Çalab”, which meant God. While explaining his pilgrimage at Mecca, Ahmed Fakih described how muezzins prayed God:

*O Ka'be kapısının karşısında
O İbrahim makâmı kubbe anda*

Mü'ezzinler o kubbe üzre dururlar

Gice gündüz Çalab'a yalvarurlar. See Ahmed Fakih, *Kitâbu Evsâfi Mesâcidi'sh-Şerîfe*, ed. Hasibe Mazioğlu, (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 1974), p. 28. In the other parts of the same work, Ahmed Fakih used the word “Çalab”. See, for instance, Ahmed Fakih, *Kitâbu Evsâfi Mesâcidi'sh-Şerîfe*, pp. 26, 32, 43.

¹¹⁴ Wolper, *Cities and Saints*, p. 76.

¹¹⁵ I. H. Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, p. 76.

¹¹⁶ Wolper, *Cities and Saints*, p. 52.

According to Wolper, the greatest weakness in the literature on dervish lodges is that dervish lodges are often perceived as institutions and not as buildings. This limited view hindered an understanding of dervish lodges' accessibility to medieval audiences.¹¹⁷ Dervish lodges served as places of teaching, prayer, and discussion. These buildings were more inclusive than the *madrasas* in the sense that they provided a meeting place for Sufi masters, local leaders, and different religious groups from inside or outside the city.¹¹⁸

This tolerant attitude towards individuals in dervish lodges left also a space for women. The sixth chapter of Wolper's book is devoted to women as "guarantors of familial lines."¹¹⁹ Wolper points out the Sufi masters' rivalry among themselves in order to attract communal leaders as disciples. As is examined later, this is evident in the hagiographic literature such as the *Menâkıbü'l-Ârifîn* and *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun*. Wolper employs *Manâqıb al-Ârifîn* as an example of women's role as guarantors of familial lines.

Dervish lodges were also places where Sufis shared their experiences and opinions. For instance, in Vâhidî's *Menâkıb-i Hâce-i Cihân ve Netîce-i Cân* that was composed in the year 929/1522, Hâce-i Cihân proposes to his son Netîce-i Cân that they leave Horasan to settle in a *khankâh* in the vicinity of Medina after a pilgrimage to the holy cities. According to Hâce-i Cihan, this *khankâh* would be a place where "Netîce-i Cân can improve his knowledge and experience of this world by observing the different groups that would visit the *khankâh*." Then, according to the story, Netîce-i Cân accepts his father's proposal and the family left Horasan secretly with

¹¹⁷ Wolper, p. 60.

¹¹⁸ Wolper, p. 69.

¹¹⁹ Wolper, pp. 82-91.

“an entourage of servants.”¹²⁰ The question of how dervish lodges contributed to improving one’s knowledge will be discussed in the next chapter.

¹²⁰ Vâhidî, *Menâkıb-i Hâce-i Cihân ve Netîce-i Cân*, ed. Ahmet T. Karamustafa, (Harvard University, 1993), p. 5.

CHAPTER II

DERVISH LODGES AND THEIR FOUNDERS IN THE PROVINCE OF KARAMAN

Islamic institutions such as the *vakf* and *'imâret*¹²¹ were key institutions in the socio-cultural development of medieval Islamic states. The Seljukids, Karamanids and Ottomans relied on this system to develop social cohesion in which the subjects of the sultans or begs took active roles. However, the greatest patrons of these structures or buildings were the sultans or begs themselves. According to İnalcık, the *vakf-imâret* system was the key institution in “creating a typical Ottoman-Islamic urban structure.” This system was originally an “act of Islamic piety, designed to organize urban space to enable one to live a complete Muslim life.”¹²² İnalcık describes the socio-economic significance of this system as follows:

In large metropolises such as Bursa and İstanbul the city developed not around a single nucleus but around several, variously located, each constructed as a well-planned complex of religious buildings (mosque, madrasa, hospice, etc.), and supported by a *vakf*....Through the *vakfs*, with sources of revenue such as shops rented to the merchants, traders, and artisans in the city, or villages and farms in rural areas, an immense amount of wealth constantly flowed into the city for the maintenance of such complexes.¹²³

¹²¹ *İmâret* was a “complex of institutions including mosque, madrasa, hospital, traveller's hostel, water installations, bridges and roads.” Halil İnalcık, *The Classical Age*, p. 142.

¹²² Halil İnalcık, “İstanbul: An Islamic City,” in *Essays in Ottoman History*, ed. Halil İnalcık, (İstanbul: Eren Yayınları, 1998), p. 268.

¹²³ Halil İnalcık, “İstanbul: an Islamic City,” in *Essays in Ottoman History*, pp. 258-259. For a key example of *vakf* study about an Ottoman city, see Richard Van Leeuwen, *Waqfs and Urban Structures, The Case of Ottoman Damascus*, (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1999).

In this chapter, an indispensable part of this system, i.e. hospices built for dervishes, will be examined in the light of the register of pious foundations of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483. Before elaborating on this register, the historical background of the rise of dervish lodges in Anatolia will be briefly discussed.

During the second half of the 11th century, Seljukid officials began to patronize the building of dervish lodges, which were called *khankâhs*.¹²⁴ In addition to establishing a number of madrasas, the Seljukid vizier Nizam al-Mulk also patronized the building of dervish lodges throughout the Seljuk domains. For instance, in Isfahan, he ordered the director of a *khankâh* to present the needs of the *khankâh* to him each year.¹²⁵ This example denotes the fact that Nizam al-Mulk was personally involved in the development of Sufi institutions in the Seljukid lands.

According to Claude Cahen, the Seljukids patronized the building of mosques and other public centers. However, according to Cahen, the Seljukids' "principal innovation" was the madrasa:

The Seljukids were the first to give them any real importance and to cause them to be put into practice on a large scale. The madrasa is an establishment for instruction which, unlike earlier instruction, is specially organized for the teaching of the religio-juridical sciences from the orthodox point of view. It acquired great wealth, in the form of pious foundations (*vakfs*) which were allocated to it, and it was from among the students taught by its masters that the officials of the regime were to be recruited....It was Nizam al-Mulk himself who founded, in Baghdad, the most famous of all madrasas, the Nizâmiyya, to which he summoned the greatest scholars of the time, including al-Ghazâlî.¹²⁶

As Cahen indicated, *vakfs* were established for the support of the *madrasas*.

For instance, the register of the pious foundations of the Province of Karaman dated

¹²⁴ Claude Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey, A general survey of the material and spiritual culture and history, 1071-1330*, tr. J. Jones-Williams, (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1968), p. 44; Margaret Malamud, "Sufi Organizations and Structures of Authority in Medieval Nishapur," p. 436.

¹²⁵ Margaret Malamud, "Sufi Organizations and Structures of Authority in Medieval Nishapur," p. 436.

¹²⁶ Claude Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 42-43.

888/1483 mentions various madrasa *wakfs* from the Seljukid of Anatolia.¹²⁷ However, the so-called orthodox point of view was not peculiar to the madrasas only. Dervish lodges had a significant role in the campaign of Sunnitization during the Seljukid, Karamanid and Ottoman periods.

The Anatolian Seljukid state built most of the *zâviyes* on the trade route from Antalya and Alâiye to Iran and to Turkestan, in such cities as Konya, Aksaray, Kayseri, Sivas, Erzincan and Erzurum.¹²⁸ There was also a network of dervish lodges in the Anatolian Seljukid state.¹²⁹ Although caravanserais were usually built by the rulers of the Anatolian Seljukid state, some *zâviyes* were also built by wealthy people. The *zâviyes* that were situated on the trade routes also contributed to the security and social services on the trade routes in the Anatolian Seljukid state.¹³⁰

Dervish lodges were meeting places of certain rulers, officials, merchants, scholars and Sufis. Chronicles and hagiographies narrate how different segments of society visited dervish lodges and how they took part in Sufi rituals. Thus, the dervish lodges can be viewed as centers of political and social activity. Some dervish lodges, particularly Bayramî and *ahî* lodges, took part in economic activities such as farming and leatherworking. Sufi hospices were also centers of cultural activity. Some of them had libraries. As will be explained later, a number of scholars came to Konya in order to study the manuscripts in the library of the lodge of Sadreddin Konevî.

¹²⁷ See, for instance, M. Akif Erdoğan, "Murad Çelebi Defteri: 1483 Yılında Karaman Vilâyetinde Vakıflar I," *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. 18 (July 2003), pp. 151-153.

¹²⁸ Osman Turan, "Selçuklu Kervansarayları," p. 474.

¹²⁹ Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, "Zâviyeler, Dinî, Sosyal ve Kültürel Tarih Açısından Bir Deneme," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, 12 (1978), p. 255.

¹³⁰ Osman Turan, "Selçuk Kervansarayları," p. 492.

2.1 *Evkâf Defteri* of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483

Before discussing the literature on the *Evkâf Defteri* (the Register of Pious Foundations) of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483, a brief analysis will be made about the defterological studies about certain Ottoman provinces, which have been called “*sancak* studies.”¹³¹ As Oktay Özel indicates, most of these studies are “descriptive in nature”¹³² and do not go beyond the *tahrir* registers. The historical context which produced the registers has been neglected in most of the *sancak* studies. In spite of the shortcomings of the *sancak* studies, one can learn useful information about the general condition of dervish lodges in various cities of Anatolia from these studies.

A few examples will be cited in order to understand how *sancak* studies contributed to the study of dervish lodges in Anatolia. Ömer Demirel has examined the role of pious foundations in Sivas during the Ottoman period in his book entitled *Osmanlı Vakıf-Şehir İlişkisine Bir Örnek: Sivas Şehir Hayatında Vakıfların Rolü*.¹³³ Demirel notes nine dervish lodges founded during the pre-Ottoman period: Abdülvahab Gazi, Hacı Abdurrahman, Dârü’r-Rahâ, Hangâh-i Tokmak, Şeyh Çoban, Ahî Emir Ahmed, Şeyh Erzurum, Yağıbasan and Şeyh Hasan.¹³⁴ In his book entitled *XVI. Yüzyıl Lârende (Karaman) Kazasında Yerleşme ve Nüfus*, Osman Gümüşçü indicates four dervish lodges that gave their names to *mahalles* (district) in Lârende

¹³¹ *Sancak*: “A sub-province; administrative unit under a *sancak-begi* (*beyi*); a *beglerbegilik* is divided into several *sancaks*.” Halil İnalçık, “Glossary,” in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, ed. Halil İnalçık, Donal Quataert (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 1000. For an overview of the *sancak* studies, see Oktay Özel, “The Transformation of Provincial Administration in Anatolia: Observations on Amasya from 15th to 17th Centuries,” in *The Ottoman Empire, Myths, Realities and ‘Black Holes,’ Contributions in Honour of Colin Imber*, ed. Eugenia Kermeli and Oktay Özel, (İstanbul: ISIS Pres, 2006), p. 54; Adnan Gürbüz, *XV.-XVI. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Sancak Çalışmaları*, (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2001).

¹³² Oktay Özel, “The Transformation of Provincial Administration in Anatolia: Observations on Amasya from 15th to 17th Centuries,” p. 54.

¹³³ Ömer Demirel, *Osmanlı Vakıf-Şehir İlişkisine Bir Örnek: Sivas Şehir Hayatında Vakıfların Rolü*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2000).

¹³⁴ Ömer Demirel, *Sivas Şehir Hayatında Vakıfların Rolü*, p. 57.

of the sixteenth century Ottoman Empire: Kiçi Zâviye, Mansur Dede Zâviyesi, Hacı Abbas Zâviyesi, Kirişçi Baba Zâviyesi.¹³⁵ İsmet Miroğlu explains briefly dervish lodges in the sixteenth century Erzincan in his book entitled *Kemah Sancağı ve Erzincan Kazası (1520-1566)*. There was a Mevlevîhâne (the lodge of Mevlevî dervishes), the annual income of which was 4350 *akçes*, a Haydarîhâne (the lodge of Haydarîs), the annual income of which was 1357 *akçes*, a Kalenderhâne (the lodge of Kalenders), the annual revenue of which was 900 *akçes*, at Erzincan in the sixteenth century.¹³⁶ The Mevlevî lodges in the Province of Karaman will be discussed later. However, the lodges of Kalenderîs and Haydarîs will be mentioned here. In the year 888/1483, there was a Kalenderhâne, the annual revenue of which was 1495 *akçes*, and a Haydarîhâne, the annual income of which was 150 *akçes*.¹³⁷ In the same year, there was also a Kalenderhâne, the income of which was not stated in the register, in Lârende.¹³⁸ In Beyşehir, there was also a Kalenderhâne, the annual income of which

¹³⁵ Osman Gümüşçü, *XVI. Yüzyıl Lârende (Karaman) Kazasında Yerleşme ve Nüfus*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2001), p. 84.

¹³⁶ İsmet Miroğlu, *Kemah Sancağı ve Erzincan Kazası (1520-1566)*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1990), pp. 152-153. In the *Menâkıb-i Hâce-i Cihân ve Netîce-i Cân*, which was composed in the year 929/1522 by an "otherwise unknown Vâhidî," these dervish groups were described as follows:

Mevlevîs: "Beards grown and moustaches trimmed in accordance with the Law and traditions. Eyes kohled. Wearing goreless, one-piece caps, over the length of which appear green lines in the shape of the letter *elif*. The lappets of the turbans wrapped over the caps reach down to the waist. Dressed in tunics and black robes with scarfs around the neck. Carrying banners and playing on tambourines, drums and reed-flutes. Chanting hymns and prayers and engaged in *semâ*." Vâhidî, *Menâkıb-i Hâce-i Cihân ve Netîce-i Cân*, ed. Ahmet T. Karamustafa, (Harvard University, 1993), p. 11.

Haydarîs: "Faces clean-shaven, except for moustaches that droop down like leeches over the chins, only to turn back upwards to reach the ears; the parts of the moustaches above the lips twisted inwards like prawns. Single locks of twisted hair over the forehead (the rest is presumably not shaven)...Carrying drums of various sizes, tambourines and banners. Chanting prayers and praises to God." Vâhidî, *Menâkıb-i Hâce-i Cihân ve Netîce-i Cân*, ed. Ahmet T. Karamustafa, p. 8.

Kalenders: "Clean-shaven faces. Naked except for loose woolen mantles, golden or black in color, with conical caps made of hair. Carrying drums, tambourines and banners, chanting prayers and singing melodious tunes with joy and fervor." Vâhidî, *Menâkıb-i Hâce-i Cihân ve Netîce-i Cân*, ed. Ahmet T. Karamustafa, pp. 6-7. For further information about the *Kalenders*, see Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Marjinal Süflilik: Kalenderiler (XIV-XVII. Yüzyıllar)*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999).

¹³⁷ Fahri Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin)", *unpublished M. A. thesis*, (İstanbul University, 1996), p. 47.

¹³⁸ Coşkun, p. 93.

was 2260 *akçes*, in the year 888/1483.¹³⁹ The annual income of the Kalenderhâne in Beyşehir was greater than the one in Konya in the year 888/1483.¹⁴⁰

In his work entitled *XVI. Yüzyılda Adıyaman (Behisni, Hısn-ı Mansur, Gerger, Kâhta) Sosyal ve İktisadî Tarihi*, Mehmet Taştémir indicates a number of dervish lodges in Adıyaman region (*Behisni, Hısn-ı Mansur, Gerger, Kâhta*).¹⁴¹ Taştémir expresses briefly the *zâviye* of Shaykh Abdurrahman Erzincanî and indicates that Erzincanî was a *khalıfa* (spiritual successor) of Shaykh Safiyüddin Ardabilî (d. 1334), who was the founder of the Safavid Order. According to Taştémir, it is most likely that Shaykh Abdurrahman Erzincanî and Shaykh Hamîdüddin-i Aksarayî, known as Somuncu Baba, knew each other. The Safavid Order will be discussed in the chapter on Baba Yusuf, who was the son of Shaykh Hamîdüddin-i Aksarayî.

Miriam Hoexter highlights the fact that for a long time *vakf* studies remained “marginal,” attracting relatively small interest.¹⁴² She views the international conference on “*Vakf* in the Contemporary Muslim World (19th and 20th centuries),” held in İstanbul in 1992, as “one manifestation of the growing interest” in *vakf* studies.¹⁴³ According to Hoexter, the creation of endowments, particularly for the establishment of madrasas and Sufi lodges, was a means for political legitimization and influence in the society for local governors.¹⁴⁴ The question of political

¹³⁹ Coşkun, p. 116.

¹⁴⁰ Ahmet T. Karamustafa presents the following information about the *Kalenderhânes* in the Ottoman Empire: “There was a *zâviye* known as *Kalenderhâne* (‘the house of Kalenders’) in İstanbul during the reign of Mehmed II. Several decades later, a tax-register (*tahrîr*) dated 929/1522-23 records another *kalenderhâne* in Lârende, in the province of Karaman. These reports, when coupled with other less certain notices of *kalenderhânes* in Birgi, Bursa, Erzincan, and Konya, suggest that such hospices were not uncommon.” Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*, p. 67.

¹⁴¹ Mehmet Taştémir, *XVI. Yüzyılda Adıyaman (Behisni, Hısn-ı Mansur, Gerger, Kâhta) Sosyal ve İktisadî Tarihi*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999), pp. 242-246.

¹⁴² Miriam Hoexter, “Waqf Studies in the Twentieth Century: The State of the Art,” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient (JESHO)*, vol. 41, issue: 4 (1998), 474-495: 474.

¹⁴³ Miriam Hoexter, “Waqf Studies in the Twentieth Century,” p. 483.

¹⁴⁴ Hoexter, p. 478.

legitimacy will be discussed in relation to Sufi hagiographies written within the geographical boundaries of the Province of Karaman during the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The literature on the Sufi hagiographies often neglected the political context of the time. Moreover, the literature on the registers of pious foundations of a particular region of Anatolia often disregarded the writings of scholars and Sufi masters of this region. What will be pursued in this study is an analysis of the worldviews of the founders of dervish lodges in the light of both the registers of pious foundations and the writings of dervishes living in lodges supported by these foundations.

Registers of pious foundations are the most important source for the study of dervish lodges. Faroqhi explains what can a historian learn from such registers as follows:

Madrassa and *zâviye* can be studied by special kinds of *tahrir*, namely registers of pious foundations which were often composed at the same time as the main *defter*. They generally contain the name of the institution, the place where it was located and the sources of income assigned to its maintenance. In the case of a *zâviye*, the name of its original *şeyh* was often mentioned, and if the registers were carefully kept, the names of his successors were appended in subsequent versions. Quite often the *vakıf* registers contained a short history of the foundation as well.¹⁴⁵

The first register of the pious foundations of the Province of Karaman was undertaken in the year 881/1476.¹⁴⁶ Feridun Nafiz Uzluk published this register, with an introduction and useful footnotes. Although Uzluk translated this register to modern Turkish, his work also includes the copy of the original register.¹⁴⁷ The second register of the Province of Karaman belonged to the year 888/1483.¹⁴⁸ In this

¹⁴⁵ Suraiya Faroqhi, "Rural Society in Anatolia and the Balkans during the Sixteenth Century, I," p. 166.

¹⁴⁶ *Tapu- Kadastro Genel Müdürlüğü Kuyûd-ı Kadîme Defterleri*, no. TK 564.

¹⁴⁷ F. Nafiz Uzluk, *Fatih Devrinde Karaman Eyâleti Vakıfları Fihristi*, (Ankara: Vakıflar Umum Müdürlüğü, 1958).

¹⁴⁸ *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, İstanbul Atatürk Kitaplığı, Cevdet Tasnifi, O. 116/1 (H. 888/1483). The *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye* includes only a small part of Kayseri. In his article entitled "Urban Population in Anatolia in the Sixteenth Century: A Study of Kayseri, Karaman, Amasya, Trabzon, and Erzurum," Ronald C. Jennings explains why he chose these five cities as

register, the Ottoman administration acknowledged the former imperial decrees and letters issued by the Karaman begs, Ilhanids, Çobanoğulları and Erednaoğulları.¹⁴⁹ This practice was not peculiar only to the Karaman Province. It was a general practice pursued by the Ottoman sultans to develop a conciliatory attitude towards the local people.

The register of pious foundations of 888/1483 has been transcribed by Fahri Coşkun in his M. A. thesis.¹⁵⁰ Although this is a major contribution to the study of the Province of Karaman, this work does not deal with dervish lodges in detail. According to Coşkun, there were 546 *vakfs* in the Province of Karaman in the year 888/1483.¹⁵¹ The greatest number of *vakfs* were *mescids* (small mosques), the number of which was 174. The number of *zâviyes* (dervish lodges) was 160. According to Coşkun, there were also 44 mosques (*câmi*'), 33 family *vakfs*, 28

subject of his study, as follows: "The five cities of central and eastern Anatolia which are the subject of the study represent an area peculiarly neglected by contemporary historians. Under the Seljuks and Mongols the cities of central and eastern Anatolia were of great importance and the area was certainly more advanced in commerce and culture than western Anatolia. It was more 'Turkish' and less 'Ottoman' in character than western Anatolia or much of the Balkans; most of it was conquered only relatively late by the Ottomans, and it remained distant from the center, from the Ottoman cultural orbit." Ronald C. Jennings, "Urban Population in Anatolia in the Sixteenth Century: A Study of Kayseri, Karaman, Amasya, Trabzon, and Erzurum," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 7 (1976), p. 25. Although Jennings did not deal with the whole province of Karaman, similar statement can be made for the whole Province of Karaman. What Jennings meant by Karaman was Lârende, today's Karaman city. Jennings is right in stating the fact that central Anatolia was culturally more advanced than the western Anatolia under the Seljuks and Mongols. The superiority of central Anatolia in terms of cultural activity can be detected in the registers of pious foundations. As these sources indicate, the culture and arts developed also under the patronage of the Karamanid begs. However, remaining distant from the center had its price. From the sixteenth century onwards, the cities of central Anatolia such as Konya, Lârende, and Kayseri began to lose their status as cultural centre rivalling the cities of western Anatolia and the Balkans. It was Istanbul which became the unrivalled center of culture and arts of the entire empire from the late fifteenth century onwards. For more information about the rise of Istanbul as a cultural center after the Ottoman conquest of city, see Halil İnalçık, "İstanbul," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition, vol. 9 (1973), 224-248.

¹⁴⁹ "Vakf-i zâviye-i Kazan Han mukarrer be-mekâtib-i ümerâ-yi mâzî ve defter-i köhne der-tasarruf-ı Şeyh Mehmed veled-i Şeyh İsmâ'il"; "Zâviye-i Pehlivan Ğâzî ez yârân-i Seyyid Ğâzî der-tasarruf-ı Şeyh Ahmed Fakîh ve Hasan Fakîh 'an evlâd-i Şeyh Çoban mukarrer be-mekâtib-i ümerâ-yi mâzî ve mektûb-i İbrahim Beg ve berât-ı Sultan Mehmed tâbe serâhu, tâbi'-i Develü"; "Vakf-i hankâh-i Eradna der-Kayseriyye mukarrer ber-müceb-i defter-i köhne", see Şehabettin Tekindağ, "Son Osmanlı-Karaman Münasebetleri Hakkında Araştırmalar", *Tarih Dergisi*, vol. XIII, no. 17-18, pp. 74-76.

¹⁵⁰ Fahri Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin)", *unpublished M. A. thesis*, (İstanbul University, 1996).

¹⁵¹ Coşkun, p. XXI.

dâru'l-huffâz (school for those who knew the Qur'an by heart) and 27 madrasas, and ten *khankâhs*.¹⁵² As discussed later, in fact there were *khankâhs* (dervish lodges of great size) in the Province of Karaman in the year 888/1483. Confusion about the number of *khankâhs* derived from the fact that there were two *khankâhs* of Sahib Ata, one in Konya the other in Akşehir. There were also other types of *vakfs* such as *dârül-hadis* (school for the study of sayings of the Prophet Muhammed).¹⁵³ Coşkun's classification of the *vakfs* in the register is useful for an analysis of the type of foundations in the Province of Karaman.

Coşkun presents a detailed table at the end of his study. In this table the reader learns about the incomes of the *vakfs* that existed in the Province of Karaman in the year 888/1483. This table, which constitutes twenty-two pages, clearly notes the names of *zâviyes* and *khankahs* in the entire province. According to the table prepared by Coşkun, the richest foundation in the Province of Karaman was the *'imâret* of Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg (r. 1423-1464). In the year 888/1483, the annual income of the *'imâret* of Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg in Konya was 114,230 *akçes*, which constituted 14.91% of the total income of the province.¹⁵⁴ The foundation of the *'imâret* in Konya consisted of 169 shops (*dükkân*), twenty-three villages, fifteen *zemîns*, four *mezra'as*,¹⁵⁵ three households (*hâne*), two baths, one garden, one *kapan*,¹⁵⁶ one mill, and one *dolab*.¹⁵⁷ In the year 888/1483, the annual

¹⁵² Coşkun, p. XXI.

¹⁵³ For a complete list of the *vakfs* mentioned in the register, see Fahri Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin)," p. XXI.

¹⁵⁴ Coşkun, p. XIX. *Akçe* was a silver coin and it was the "chief unit of account in the Ottoman Empire." See Halil İnalçık, *The Classical Age*, p. 217.

¹⁵⁵ *Mezra'a*: "a field under cultivation or a large farm with no permanent settlement; it may be originally a deserted village or land reclaimed by a nearby village." See Halil İnalçık, "Glossary," in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, ed. Halil İnalçık, Donald Quataert, p. 999.

¹⁵⁶ *Kapan* (in Arabic *kabbân*): "(I) A large public weighing device; (II) Caravanserai or mart in which such a device is placed to weigh goods and collect dues." See Halil İnalçık, "Glossary," in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, p. 998.

income of the *'imâret* of İbrahim Beg in Lârende (today's Karaman) was 51,377 *akçes*, which constituted 6.66% of the total income of the province.¹⁵⁸ The pious foundation of İbrahim Beg in Lârende consisted of eighteen villages, eleven *zemîns*, seven baths, seven gardens, three *mezra'as*, four mills and one shop.¹⁵⁹ The main contribution of Coşkun to the study of the Province of Karaman derives from the fact that he presents the reader with a detailed table consisting of the income of the pious foundations and that in the introduction of his M. A. Thesis, he offers a brief analysis of the register of pious foundations of the Province of Karaman. However, he does not elaborate on the dervish lodges, their founders, their affiliations with the Sufi orders and their relations with the political authority.

M. Akif Erdoğan published a transcription of the register of pious foundations of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483 in three parts in the journal *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*.¹⁶⁰ Erdoğan calls the register "Murad Çelebi Defteri" due to the fact the land survey (*tahrîr*) of the Province of Karaman was undertaken by Murad Çelebi bin Hamza Beg in the year 888/1483.¹⁶¹ Perhaps the process of surveying began earlier than the year 888/1483, which was the date of the final version of the register.¹⁶² The survey undertaken by Murad Çelebi was a part of the general survey

¹⁵⁷ Coşkun, p. XIX. *Dolab* had different meanings: "(I) A turning device; (II) Water wheel; (III) A vortex of affairs, bank." See Halil İnalçık, "Glossary," in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, p. 997.

¹⁵⁸ Coşkun, p. XIX.

¹⁵⁹ Coşkun, p. XIX.

¹⁶⁰ M. Akif Erdoğan, "Murad Çelebi Defteri: 1483 Yılında Karaman Vilâyetinde Vakıflar," *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. 18, issue: 1 (July 2003), pp. 119-160; vol. 18, issue: 2 (December 2003), pp. 99-140; vol. 19, issue: 1 (July 2004), pp. 119-154.

¹⁶¹ M. Akif Erdoğan, "Murad Çelebi Defteri: 1483 Yılında Karaman Vilâyetinde Vakıflar," *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. 18, issue: 1 (July 2003), p. 121.

¹⁶² For more information about the process of land survey in the Ottoman Empire, see Halil İnalçık, "Land Surveying," in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, pp. 132-142. For more information about the use of *tahrir* (land survey) as a source for history, see B. Cvetkova, "Early Ottoman *Tahrir* Defters as a Source for Studies on the History of Bulgaria and the Balkans," *Archivum Ottomanicum*, vol. VIII (1983), 133-212; Kemal Çiçek, "Osmanlı Tahrir Defterlerinin Kullanımında Görülen Bazı Problemler ve Metod Arayışları," *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, no. 97 (August 1995), pp. 93-111; Kemal Çiçek, "*Tahrir Defterleri* as a Source for

of the entire empire. In the Ottoman Empire, a general survey was to be carried out when a new sultan ascended to the throne upon the death of the former sultan due to the fact that all deeds and titles became “legally null and void” until the new sultan confirmed them.¹⁶³ In the year 1481, Bayezid II (r. 1481-1512) ascended to the Ottoman throne upon the death of his father, Mehmed II (r. 1451-1481). The significance of the register of the pious foundations of the Province of Karaman lies in the fact that one can observe the effects of Bayezid II’s friendly policy towards dervishes in a register of pious endowments prepared in the transition period from the Karamanid rule to the Ottoman rule. Although the Ottomans invaded the core Karamanid lands in the year 1468, the consolidation of the Ottoman rule in the former Karamanid lands took many years.

The register of pious foundations of the Province of Karaman is 110 folios. Erdoğan indicates that some parts of the register related to the pious foundations of the towns of Koçhisar and Kayseri is missing. The original register might have been larger than the existing one.¹⁶⁴ Like Coşkun, Erdoğan also examines the type of *vakıf*s mentioned in the register.¹⁶⁵ Nevertheless, an analysis of the register in the light of other sources such as chronicles, Sufi hagiographies, *vakfiyyes* (deeds of a pious foundation), and the literary sources of the time is lacking in both studies.

A study on the educational institutions of the Karamanids, among which were also dervish lodges, has been carried out by İsmail Çiftçioğlu in his dissertation

History,” *unpublished M. A. thesis*, (Birmingham: University of Birmingham, 1989). Mehmet Öz, “Tahrir Defterlerinin Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırmalarında Kullanılması Hakkında Bazı Düşünceler,” *Vakıflar Dergisi*, vol. XXII (1991), pp. 429-439.

¹⁶³ Halil İnalçık, “Land Surveying,” in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, pp. 137-138.

¹⁶⁴ M. Akif Erdoğan, “Murad Çelebi Defteri: 1483 Yılında Karaman Vilâyetinde Vakıflar,” *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. 18, issue: 1 (July 2003), p. 121. See also M. Akif Erdoğan, “Karaman Vilâyeti Zâviyeleri,” *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. 9 (1994), 89-157.

¹⁶⁵ For the analysis of the register by Erdoğan, see M. Akif Erdoğan, “Murad Çelebi Defteri: 1483 Yılında Karaman Vilâyetinde Vakıflar I,” *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. 18, issue: 1 (July 2003), pp. 118-132.

entitled “Vakfiyelere ve Tahrir Defterlerine Göre Karamanlı Eğitim-Öğretim Kurumları (Educational Institutions of the Karamanids according to land surveys and deeds of pious foundations).”¹⁶⁶ As the title denotes, Çiftçioğlu limits his subject to the Karamanids. He does not examine the dervish lodges founded by the Seljukids of Anatolia. However, since considerable number of the dervish lodges mentioned in the register of 888/1483 was founded during the Karamanid rule, Çiftçioğlu’s work is a significant contribution to the literature. Çiftçioğlu not only examines only dervish lodges but also other educational institutions such as madrasas, and *dârülhuffâz* schools. He classifies dervish lodges in terms of their affiliations with Sufi orders. For instance, according to Çiftçioğlu, the Mevlevî *zâviyes*, which were founded during the reign of the Karamanids, consisted of the *zâviye* of Ahi Musa (Akşehir), Kalemî (Lârende), Fahriyye Mevlevîhânesi (Aksaray), Seyyid Yunus (Akşehir), Ateşbâz-i Velî (Konya), Şems-i Tebrizî (Konya).¹⁶⁷ In addition, Çiftçioğlu compares the revenues of the dervish lodges in the years 1483, 1500 and 1530.¹⁶⁸ As the title of his dissertation indicates, Çiftçioğlu uses *tahrir* registers and the *vakfiyyes* as a source. Like Coşkun and Eroğlu, he does not analyze the other sources such as hagiographies, treatises and other literary works written by the founders or dwellers of dervish lodges.

In the introduction of the register, the surveyor indicates that the land survey was carried out by the imperial edict of Sultan Bayezid II. Then the surveyor’s name and the name of secretary (*kâtib*) is mentioned. Finally, the date of the survey is provided, which was 888/1483:

¹⁶⁶ İsmail Çiftçioğlu, “Vakfiyelere ve Tahrir Defterlerine Göre Karamanlı Eğitim Kurumları,” *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, (Isparta: Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, 2001).

¹⁶⁷ İsmail Çiftçioğlu, “Vakfiyelere ve Tahrir Defterlerine Göre Karamanlı Eğitim Kurumları,” p. 176.

¹⁶⁸ Çiftçioğlu, pp. 178-179.

*Defter-i mücmel-i evkâf-i vilâyet-i Karaman ve Kayseriyye ki be-fermân-i Hazret-i Sultan bin Sultan Sultan Bayezid Han bin Sultan Mehmed Hân halledelâhu mülkehû ve sultânehû ve efâza 'ale'l-âlemîne birrahû ve ihsânehû nübişte şod be-ma'rifet-i 'abdeyn-i fakîreyn Murad Çelebi bin Hamza Beg ve Mehmed el-fakîr el-kâtib 'afâ'l-lâhu 'anhümâ ve sânehümâ 'ammâ şe'nihimâ fî târih-i sene semân ve semânîn ve semâ'ni mi'e min Hicreti'n-Nebeviyye.*¹⁶⁹

2.2 *Mensûh* (Abrogated) *Zâviyes*

Most of the studies based on the *tahrir* registers neglected the fact that the surveyors, who carried out the work of *tahrir*, were expected to act according to instructions given to them. These instructions changed in different times, particularly from one sultan to the next. In the last years of his reign, especially following his great victory over Uzun Hasan in 1473, Mehmed II subjected to a review all the *mülk* and *vakf* lands, including dervish lodges, throughout the empire. Tursun Beg, who was “personally involved in the revision and abrogation (*naskh*) operation as a director in the finance department,”¹⁷⁰ indicates that Bayezid II returned 20.000 villages and properties of freehold (*emlâk*) and pious foundations (*evkâf*) that were confiscated during the reign of Mehmed II to their “rightful owners.”¹⁷¹ İnalçık explains how this policy changed during the reign of Bayezid II (1481-1512):

One can see the significance of the operation in Ottoman society through the *tahrir* registers of Bayezid II where hundreds of *vakf* and *mülk* lands were returned to their former owners. In fact, Bayezid's reign constituted a total reaction to the Conqueror's policies in all state affairs, in particular in landholding.¹⁷²

The register of the pious foundations of the Province of Karaman (*Evkâf-i Vilâyet-i Karaman ve Livâ-i Kayseriyye*) dated 888/1483 begins with the following

¹⁶⁹ *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, İstanbul Atatürk Kitaplığı, Cevdet Tasnifi, O. 116/1 (H. 888/1483), folio 2b; Fahri Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin)," p. 2; M. Akif Erdoğan, "Murad Çelebi Defteri: 1483 Yılında Karaman Vilâyetinde Vakıflar I," *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. 18, issue: 1 (July 2003), p. 134.

¹⁷⁰ Halil İnalçık, "How to Read 'Âshık Pasha-zade's History," in Halil İnalçık, ed., *Essays in Ottoman History*, (İstanbul: Eren Yayınları, 1998), pp. 38-39.

¹⁷¹ Tursun Beg, *The History of Mehmed The Conqueror*, ed. Halil İnalçık, Rhoads Murphey, (Minneapolis, Chicago: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1978), p. 22.

¹⁷² Halil İnalçık, "How to Read 'Âshık Pasha-zade's History," p. 39.

statement, which can be perceived as a reaction to Mehmed II's policies related to the pious foundations:

*Köhne defterde mestûr olub mensûh kaydolunan ve defterden hâric olan evkâfın vakfîyye-i şer'îyyesi ve İbrahim Beg'den mukarrernâmesi olanlar emr-i 'âlî mücebince mukarrer buyrulub defter-i cedîde kaydolundu.*¹⁷³

In the register, there are a few examples of dervish lodges that were abrogated (*mensûh*) during the reign of Mehmed II (1451-1481). These lodges were registered as *vakfs* in the year 888/1483 in line with the instructions given by Bayezid II to the surveyors. For instance, in the year 881/1476, the *khankâh* of *Müstevfî* (the Seljukid Minister of Finance) *Celâleddin* was turned into *timar*¹⁷⁴ due to the reason that the lodge building was in ruins.¹⁷⁵ It was restored as *vakf* in the year 888/1483.¹⁷⁶ Another abrogated dervish lodge, the *zâviye* of Shaykh Hasan-i Rûmî,¹⁷⁷ in Konya

¹⁷³ *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 1b; Coşkun, p. 2.

¹⁷⁴ *Timâr*: "Literally 'care, attention,' Turkish equivalent *dirilik*, *dirlik* 'livelihood,' a term denoting non-hereditary prebends to sustain a cavalry army and a military-administrative hierarchy in the core provinces of the Ottoman Empire. The system of *timars* was not only the underpinning of the military-administrative organization of the empire but also the determining factor for its *mîrî* land system and for the peasants' status and taxation, as well as for its agrarian economy in the classical age, 1300-1600." Halil İnalçık, "Timâr," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition, 502-507: 502.

¹⁷⁵ See Feridun Nafiz Uzluk, *Fatih Devrinde Karaman Eyâleti Vakıfları Fihristi*, (Ankara: Vakıflar Umum Müdürlüğü, 1958), p. 23.

¹⁷⁶ "Vakf-i Hankâh-i Müstevfî Celâleddin der-nefs-i Konya mukarrer buk'ası harâb olduğu eelden mensûh olub sâbikâ Seyyid Mehmed'e ber-vech-i timâr verilmiş imiş. El-ân Pâdişâh-i 'âlem-penâh mukarrer idüb vakfîyyetin mezbûr Seyyid Mehmed'e sadaka olundu. Vâkıf rûhu için günde birer cüz Kur'an okumak mukayyed." *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 23a; Coşkun, p. 43. According to Aflâkî, Müstevfî Celâleddin was one of the disciples of Celâleddin Rûmî (1207-1273). He narrates the following story about Müstevfî: "It is transmitted that one day Celâleddin Müstevfî held a great feast and invited all the prominent men. When they set up the table and proclaimed the invitation to partake of the food, with complete gusto and a true appetite everyone busied himself with the fine foods. But Mevlânâ [Rûmî] did not eat and paid no attention to the food. Müstevfî lowered his head and implored him to eat. Khodâvandgâr [Rûmî] excused himself, saying: 'My stomach has become very weak. It resembles the lean beast of burden with sores on its back which brays and bends down when they attach the pack-saddle, and has no strength to bear the load. For if he had not been beaten (*kûfta*), several meat-balls (*kûfta*) would have been eaten.' The unfortunate Müstevfî wept and rendering service in full (*müstevfâ*), he became a bondsman and disciple. He honored the companions with splendid honorific robes and that same day he spent three thousand dirhems as money thrown to the *semâ''*-singers (*qavvâl-andâz*)." Shams al-Dîn Ahmad-e Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God (Manâqeb al-ârefîn)*, tr. John O'Kane, (Leiden & Boston & Köln: Brill, 2002), p. 391.

¹⁷⁷ See Feridun Nafiz Uzluk, *Fatih Devrinde Karaman Eyâleti Vakıfları Fihristi*, p. 22. According to Konyalı, Shaykh Hasan-i Rûmî was the brother of Shaykh Osman-i Rûmî, who was Celâleddin Rûmî's contemporary. Osman-i Rûmî will be examined later in this study. See Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, pp. 752-753.

was restored again as a *vakf* in the year 888/1483. The shaykh of the *zâviye* was Mehmed Çelebi, who was the son of Mevlânâ Sarı Ya'kub.¹⁷⁸

The register indicates some cases in which some parts of the *vakf* of a certain dervish lodge were abrogated in the former register, i. e. in the year 881/1476. For instance, according to the register of 888/1483, a village called Ma'ruf in Akşehir was formerly a part of the *vakf* of the *zâviye-i Hacı İbrahim* during the reign of Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg (1423-1464) and it was turned into *hassa*¹⁷⁹ for the *şehzâde* (prince) in the year 881/1476. Later, three-fourths ($\frac{3}{4}$) of the village was added to the *vakf* of the *zâviye* of Hacı İbrahim and the remaining one fourth ($\frac{1}{4}$) to the pious foundation of the *zâviye* of Seyyid Mahmud Hayran, by Şehzâde Abdullah (d. 1482) before the compilation of the register. The surveyor indicates that he saw the letters of Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg, in which it was stated that three fourths ($\frac{3}{4}$) of the village belonged to the *vakf* of the *zâviye* of Hacı İbrahim and the remaining one fourth ($\frac{1}{4}$) to the *zâviye* of Seyyid Mahmud Hayran.¹⁸⁰ In line with the Ottoman

¹⁷⁸ “Vakf-i zâviye-i Şeyh Hasan-i Rûmî der-nefs-i Konya. Zâviye-i mezbûrenin buk'ası münhedim olub harâb olduđu ecilden sâbıkâ mensûh olmuş. El-ân Sultân-i 'âlem-penâh vakfiyyetin mukarrer kılub Mevlânâ Sarı Ya'kub ođlu Mehmed Çelebi'ye sadaka idüb hükm-i Hümâyûn virilmiş.” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 26b; Coşkun, p. 49. In the marginal note (*derkenâr*) on the same page, a short history of the *zâviye* is presented: “Zâviye-i mezbûre zamân-i mâzîde münhedim olub mezkûr Koçac nâm karye dahî müteferrik olub köy yerini Karamanođlu, Mevlânâ Sarı Ya'kub'a çiftlik tarîkiyle şenletmege virüb müşârün ileyh dahî çift koşub şenledüb ta'mîr itmiş. Vakfiyyet üzre tasarruf idermiş. Sonra ođluna sadaka olunmuş. Ođlu tasarrufunda iken mensûh olub Pâdişâh-i 'âlem-penâh 'arızada evkâf-i mensûhayı mukarrer idicek karye-i mezbûreyi dahî mukarrer idüb hükm-i şerîf sadaka olunmuş.” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 26b; Coşkun, p. 49. As will be indicated later in the fifth chapter, Mevlânâ Sarı Ya'kub was one of the prominent shaykhs of the Karamanids. One of the descendants of Sarı Ya'kub was the shaykh of another dervish lodge, the *khankah* of Rahime Khatun in Lârende: “*Vakf-i Hankâh-i Rahime Hatun der-nefs-i Lârende meşihat der tasarruf-ı Mehmed Çelebi bin Mevlânâ Şemsüddin bin Mevlânâ Sarı Ya'kub be-hükm-i Pâdişâh-i 'âlem-penâh hullide mülkühü.*” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 46a; Coşkun, p. 82. For more information about Mevlânâ Sarı Ya'kub, see Mecdî Mehmed Efendi, *Şakaik-i Nu'maniye ve Zeyilleri, Hadaiku'ş-Şakaik*, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan, (İstanbul: Çađrı Yayınları, 1989), pp. 83-84; Ahmet Faruk Güney, “Gaza Devrinde Kur'an'ı Yorumlamak: Fetih Öncesi Dönemde Osmanlı Müfessirleri ve Tefsir Eserleri,” *Dîvân: İlmî Araştırmalar*, vol. 10, no. 18 (2005), p. 233.

¹⁷⁹ *Hass* or *hassa*: “(I) Belonging to a member of the elite or to the sultan; (II) Those prebends pertaining to the elite or to the sultan; (III) A farm or vineyard assigned to the direct controller of a timar-holder.” See Halil İnalçık, “Glossary,” in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, p. 997.

¹⁸⁰ “Vakf-i zâviye-i Hacı İbrahim bin Şeyh Hasan der karye-i Ma'rûf tâbi'-i Akşehir mukarrer be-hükm-i Sultânî tevliyet der tasarruf-i Hacı İbrahim veled-i Hasan Çelebi be-hükm-i Pâdişâh-i 'âlem-

practice of *istimâlet*,¹⁸¹ the surveyor was expected to review the edicts of the former rulers in the conquered lands.

2.3 The Founders of the Dervish Lodges

As indicated earlier, 11 *khankâhs* were mentioned in the register.¹⁸² These were namely: Sâhib (Konya),¹⁸³ Kadı Mürsel (Konya),¹⁸⁴ Shaykh Vefâ (Konya),¹⁸⁵ Lala Rûzbe (Konya),¹⁸⁶ Müstevfî Celâleddin (Konya),¹⁸⁷ Nâib (Konya),¹⁸⁸ Şeref

penâh hullide mülkühû...Karye-i mezbûre Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg zamanında vakfa tasarruf olunmuş. Sonra evkâf mensûh olıcak köhne defterde [the register of the year 881/1476] vakfa kayd olunmayub şehzâdeye hassa yazılmış. Pâdişâh-i âlem-penâh e'azze'llâhu ensârahû Karaman'a çıkıcak devlet eşîğine 'arz olunub merhûm Sultan Abdullah'a hükm-i Hümâyûn virilüb kadîmden vakf idiği sâbit olursa mukarrer kılasın diyü buyurmuş. Merhûm dahî teftîş idüb vakfiyyetin mukarrer idüb nişân virmiş. Örfiyyesini dahî bile tasarruf itmişler. Mezkûrun nişânına binâen İbrahim Beg'in mükerrer mukarrernâmeleri görülüb karye-i mesfûrenin selâse erba'ı vakf-i zâviye-i mezkûra rub'-i âharı vakf-i zâviye-i Seyyid Mahmud Hayran diye mukayyed bulunduğü sebebden 'öşri vech-i mezbûr üzre iki zâviyeye bile kaydolundu." *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 77b; Coşkun, p. 130. The *zâviye* of Hacı İbrahim was one of the richest *vakfs* in the Province of Karaman. In the year 888/1483, the annual income of the *zâviye* was 34,020 *akçes*. See Fahri Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin)," pp. 130-131.

¹⁸¹ *İstimâlet*: "Literally to make someone inclined to accept; an Ottoman term for winning over the population in conquered lands or enemy territory." Halil İnalçık, "Glossary," in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, p. 998. For further information about the policy of the Ottoman empire in the conquered lands, see Halil İnalçık, "Ottoman Methods of Conquest," *Studia Islamica*, vol. III (1954), pp. 103-129.

¹⁸² Raymond Lifchez indicates that in "Turkish Islamic sources," the dervish lodges are referred to by "a variety of names": *tekke*, *hanekâh* [khankâh], *âsitâne*, *zâviye*, *dergâh*. He points out basic features of these names as follows: "Tekke and hanekâh are generic terms for any dervish facility, with tekke the one more commonly used. Âsitâne generally indicates a major tarikat facility —a grand lodge— zâviye a dervish hostel or residence belonging to no particular order. The term dergâh marks a tekke with a tomb attached to it." Raymond Lifchez, "The Lodges of Istanbul," in *The Dervish Lodge, Architecture, Art, and Sufism in Ottoman Turkey*, ed. Raymond Lifchez, (Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press, 1992), p. 76. Although such distinctions can be made among these terms, in most cases, the terms *zâviye* and *khankâh* were used interchangeably. For further information about the terminology of dervish lodges, see Fuad Köprülü, "Ribât," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. 2 (1942), 267-278; Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, "Zaviyeler, Dinî, Sosyal ve Kültürel Tarih Açısından bir Deneme," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. 12 (1978), 247-269; A. Yaşar Ocak, Suraiya Faroqhi, "Zâviye," *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 13 (İstanbul: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1986), 468-476. For information about the *khankâhs* in the Memlukids, see Leonor Fernandes, *The Evolution of a Sufi Institution in Mamluk Egypt: The Khankâh*, (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1988), Emil Homerin, "Saving Muslim Souls: The Khankâh and the Sufi Duty in Mamluk Lands," *Mamluk Studies Review*, vol. 3 (1999), pp. 59-83.

¹⁸³ "Vakf-i Câmî' ve Hankâh ve Türbe-i Sâhib der-nefs-i Konya," *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 12a; Coşkun, p. 23.

¹⁸⁴ "Vakf-i Câmî' ve Madrasa ve Hankâh-i Kadı Mürsel der-nefs-i Konya," *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 14a; Coşkun, p. 27.

¹⁸⁵ "Vakf-i Câmî' ve Hankâh-i mürşidü's-sâlikîn kutbü'l-ârifin Hazret-i Şeyh Vefâ der-nezd-i Meram," *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 14b; Coşkun, p. 28.

¹⁸⁶ "Vakf-i Hankâh-i Lala Rûzbe bin Abdullah der-bâtin-i Ahmedek-i Konya," *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 22b; Coşkun, p. 42.

Mesud (Konya),¹⁸⁹ Rahime Hatun (Lârende),¹⁹⁰ Sâhib Fahreddin (Akşehir),¹⁹¹ Eradna (Kayseri),¹⁹² and Melik Mahmud Gâzî (Aksaray).¹⁹³ Most of the *khankâhs* were built in Konya, the capital of the Seljukids and later, the Karamanids.

Six of the eleven *khankâhs* mentioned in the register were built by the Seljukid statesmen. The inscription of the *khankâh* of Sâhib Fahreddin, who was known as Sâhib Ata, in Akşehir is still extant today. According to the inscription, the *khankâh* of Sâhib Fahreddin, who was the vizier of the Seljukids of Anatolia, in Akşehir was built in the year 659/1260.¹⁹⁴ The *khankâh* of Sâhib in Konya was also built by the same person, Fahreddin Ali (d. 687/1288), in the year 678/1279.¹⁹⁵ The *khankâh* of Lala Rûzbe, who was the *lala* (tutor) of Keykubad I, was built during the

¹⁸⁷ “Vakf-i Hankâh-i Müstevfî Celâlüddin der-nefs-i Konya,” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 23a; Coşkun, p. 43.

¹⁸⁸ “Vakf-i Hankâh-i Nâib der-nefs-i Konya,” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 23b; Coşkun, p. 44.

¹⁸⁹ “Vakf-i Hankâh-i Şeref Mes’ud der-nefs-i Konya,” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 23b; Coşkun, p. 44.

¹⁹⁰ “Vakf-i Hankâh-i Rahime Hatun der-nefs-i Lârende,” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 46a; Coşkun, p. 82.

¹⁹¹ “Vakf-i Madrasa ve Hankâh ve Mescid ve Çeşme ve Türbe-i Fahrüddin Sâhib-i Sultan ‘Alâeddin der-nefs-i Akşehir,” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 78b; Coşkun, p. 132.

¹⁹² “Vakf-i Hankâh-i Eradna der Kayseriyye,” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 109a; Coşkun, p. 175. Kayseri was the capital of the Eretnids (Eratnalılar). For more information about the Eretnids, see Kemal Göde, *Eratnalılar (1327-1381)*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1994).

¹⁹³ “Vakf-i Hankâh-i Melik Mahmud Gâzî der-nefs-i Aksaray der tasarruf-i Evhadüddin bin Şeyh Baba Yusuf,” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 110a; Coşkun, p. 176. For further information about the *khankâh*, see Bekir Deniz, “Aksaray - Melik Mahmud Gazi Hangâhı (Darphane),” in *III. Millî Selçuklu Kültür ve Medeniyeti Semineri Bildirileri, 20-22 Mayıs 1993*, (Konya, 1994), pp. 35-53. The *khankâh* of Melik Mahmud Gazi will be discussed in the chapter on Baba Yusuf.

¹⁹⁴ “ ‘Ammere hâza’l-hankâh fi eyyâmi devleti’s-Sultâni’l-A’zam zillü’l-lâhi fi’l-âlem ‘izzü’d-dünyâ ve’d-dîn Ebü’l-Feth Keykâvus bin Keyhüsrev...es-Sâhibü’l-A’zam Fâhru’d-devle ve’d-dîn ‘Ali bin El-Hüseyn tekabbele’l-lâhu a’mâlehû ve beleşhû fi’d-dâreyn âmâlehû fi sene tis’a hamsîn ve sittemi’e.” İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Nasreddin Hoca’nın Şehri Akşehir, Tarihi-Turistik Kılavuz*, (Akşehir, 1945), p. 294.

¹⁹⁵ Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, p. 719. For further information about Fahreddin Ali (Sâhib Ata), see [Anonim] *Anadolu Selçukluları Tarihi (Historie Des Seldjoukides d’Asie Mineure Par Un Anonyme)*, tr. Feridun Nafiz Uzluç, (Ankara, 1952), pp. 36-41. The unknown author of this work asserts that Fahreddin Ali was the last qualified vizier of the Seljukids and that after the death of Fahreddin, Konya remained in turmoil and disorder. See [Anonim] *Anadolu Selçukluları Tarihi*, tr. Feridun Nafiz Uzluç, p. 41. Aflâkî narrates that one day Seljukid statesmen visited Celâleddin Rûmî in order to show their loyalty and respect for Rûmî. Among the visitors, according to Aflâkî, were Sâhib Fahreddin, Mu’ineddin Pervane, and Celâleddin Müstevfî. See Ahmed Aflâkî, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlânâ ve Etrafindakiler)*, vol. 1, tr. Tahsin Yazıcı, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1986), p. 155.

reign of Seljukid Sultan Alaeddin Keykubad I (r. 1219-1237).¹⁹⁶ The *khankâh* of Şeref Mes'ud or Mes'ud bin Şerefşah was built in the year 637/1239.¹⁹⁷ The *khankâh* of Rûzbe and Mes'ud was originally under the control of the the *ahîs*.¹⁹⁸ Later, these *khankâhs* were given to the Mevlevîs due to the *ahîs*' reaction to the Mongol rule in Anatolia.¹⁹⁹ As stated before, Müstevfî Celâleddin, who was the founder of the *khankâh* of Müstevfî Celâleddin, was one of the ministers of the Seljukids. The exact name of Nâib is not specified in the source, yet it is certain that he was a Seljukid official.²⁰⁰ Nâib was the name given to the governors of cities or towns in the Seljukids of Anatolia.²⁰¹

The *khankâh* of Kadı Mürsel was built by Kadı Mürsel bin Hacı Mustafa during the reign of Karamanoğlu Mehmed Beg II (d. 1423). Kadı Mürsel was the *kadiasker* (the highest judge) of the Karamanids.²⁰² The mosque and *khankah* of Shaykh Vefâ (d. 896/1491), sometimes referred to as İbn-i Vefâ or Ebü'l-Vefâ, was built by Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg (r. 1423-1464).²⁰³ The *vakfiyye* of the mosque is kept in the archive of *Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü* (The General Directorate of Pious

¹⁹⁶ Aynur Durukan, "Konya'da Selçuklu Mimarisi," in *Gez Dünyayı Gör Konya'yı*, ed. Ahsen Erdoğan, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2001), p. 142.

¹⁹⁷ Aynur Durukan, "Konya'da Selçuklu Mimarisi," p. 142. Ethel Sara Wolper, *Cities and Saints*, p. 76. Konyalı published the incscription of the *khankâh* of Mes'ud bin Şerefşah. According to the inscription, the *khankâh* was built during the reign of the Seljukid Sultan Keyhüsrev II. Konyalı states that Konya was one of the centers of leather trade. The *khankâh* of Mes'ud was one of the centers of leatherworking and the dervishes living in the *khankâh* were sharing the income coming from the leather working. For further information about the *khankâh*, see İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, pp. 387-388.

¹⁹⁸ Aynur Durukan, "Konya'da Selçuklu Mimarisi," p. 142. For further information about *ahîs*, see Neşet Çağatay, *Bir Türk Kurumu Olan Ahilik*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1997); Mikail Bayram, Ahi Evren, *Tasavvufî Düşüncenin Esasları*, (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1995); Ahi Evren (Şeyh Nasîrüddin Mahmud Al-Hoyî), *İmânın Boyutları (Metâli'u'l-İman)*, tr. Mikail Bayram, (Konya, 1996); Mikail Bayram, *Tarihin Işığında Nasreddin Hoca ve Ahi Evren*, (İstanbul, 2001).

¹⁹⁹ Ahmed Aflâkî, *Ariflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlânâ ve Etrafindakiler)*, vol.2, tr. Tahsin Yazıcı, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1987), p. 135; Aynur Durukan, "Konya'da Selçuklu Mimarisi," p. 143.

²⁰⁰ "Vakf-i Hankâh-i Nâib der-nefs-i Konya," *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 23b; Coşkun, p. 44.

²⁰¹ For more information about *nâibs* under the Seljukids of Anatolia, see Osman Turan, *Türkiye Selçukluları Hakkında Resmî Vesikalar, Metin, Tercüme ve Araştırmalar*, second edition (first published in 1958), (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1988), p. 62.

²⁰² İ. Hakkı Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, p. 424.

²⁰³ Reşat Öngören, *Tarihte Bir Aydın Tarikatı: Zeyniler*, (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2003), p. 137.

Foundations), in Ankara.²⁰⁴ The date of the *vakfiyye* is 864/1459. In this *vakfiyye*, Shaykh Vefâ is referred to as “Eş-Şeyh Muslihü’l-Hakk ve’d-dîn Eba’l-Vefâ Çelebi Mustafa.”²⁰⁵ There is also a second version of the *vakfiyye*, the date of which was 875/1470.²⁰⁶ In this *vakfiyye*, Shaykh Vefâ is referred to as “Mustafa Çelebi bin El-Hâc Ahmed bin El-Hâc Yahyâ eş-şehîr bi-veled-i Vefâ.”²⁰⁷ Thus, there is confusion about the exact name of Shaykh Mustafa Çelebi.²⁰⁸ In this study, conforming to the usage of the register of 888/1483, Shaykh Mustafa Çelebi will be referred to as Shaykh Vefâ.

According to Konyalı, Rahime Hatun belonged to the Karamanid dynasty.²⁰⁹ Rahime Hatun was one of the women patrons mentioned in the register of 888/1483. In the register of 888/1483, another example of a dervish lodge that has the name of a woman is the *zâviye-i Hând Hatun*, who was the daughter of the Seljukid sultan Kılıç Arslan III, in Niğde. According to the register, Hând (Khwând) Hatun was also the founder of a *vakf* for her emancipated slaves (*’utekâ*) and the descendants of them (*evlâd-i ’utekâ*).²¹⁰ In the inscription of the Khalif Ghâzî lodge, which was built in Tokat in 691/1291, Khwând Hatun’s name was mentioned as follows:

The construction of this *buq’a*, called the house of faith and work, has been ordered in the days of the empire of the August Sultan, Ghiyâth al-Dunyâ wa al-Dîn Abû al-Fath Mas’ûd, son of Kai-Ka’us—may God eternalize his empire!—and in the days of the empire of the magnificent Malika Azmat al-Dunya wa al-Dîn Seljukî Khwand, daughter of Qılıç Arslan—

²⁰⁴ “Konya’da Şeyh Ebü’l-Vefâ Vakfı,” *Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi*, vakfiye tarihi: 864, vakıf defteri no. 596, page: 192/177. In the *vakfiyye*, there are references to the shaykh of Vefâ, Abdüllatif Kudsi (d. 856/1452) and to the founder of the Zeynî Order, Zeynüddin Hafî (d. 838/1435). The Zeynî Order will be discussed later.

²⁰⁵ “Konya’da Şeyh Ebü’l-Vefâ Vakfı,” *Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi*, vakfiyye tarihi: 864, vakıf defteri no. 596, page: 192/177.

²⁰⁶ For a copy of the *vakfiyye*, see Appendix.

²⁰⁷ Konya’da Şeyh Ebü’l-Vefâ Vakfı,” *Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi*, vakfiye tarihi: 875, vakıf defteri no. 596, page: 192/177.

²⁰⁸ For further information concerning confusion about the name of Shaykh Vefâ, see Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, pp. 552-556; Reşat Öngören, *Tarihte Bir Aydın Tarikatı: Zeyniler*, pp. 130-132.

²⁰⁹ İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Karaman tarihi*, p. 544.

²¹⁰ “Vakf-i Hând Hatun bint-i Kılıç Arslan bin Keyhüsrev bin Keykubad ’utekâsına ve evlâd-i ’utekasına vakf eylemiş,” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 95a; Coşkun, p. 156. According to the register, Hând Hatun was also the founder of a *zâviye* foundation: “Vakf-i zâviye-i Hând Hâtun el-mezbûr der-nefs-i Niğde,” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 95b; Coşkun, p. 156.

may God support her kingdom!—by the weak slave who is in need of the mercy of God, Khalif, son of Sulaymân—may God accept this from him—in the year 691.²¹¹

In her article entitled “Peasants of Saideli in the Late Sixteenth Century,” Suraiya Faroqhi points out the sanctuaries which attracted visitors from the *nâhiye* of Saideli in the Province of Karaman. “The most prominent” among these sanctuaries, according to Faroqhi, was the *türbe* (tomb) of Mevlânâ Celâleddin-i Rûmî, the *zâviye* of Sadreddin Konevî and the mosque of Devlet Hatun²¹² in Konya.²¹³ Faroqhi adds

²¹¹ Ethel Sara Wolper, “Princess Safwat al-Dunyâ wa al-Dîn and the Production of Sufi Buildings and Hagiographies in Pre-Ottoman Anatolia,” in *Women, Patronage, and Self-Representation in Islamic Societies*, ed. D. Fairchild Ruggles, (New York: State University of New York Press, 2000), 35-52: 43-44. For further information about female dervishes and women patrons of Sufi buildings in Islamic lands of the Medieval Age and Early Modern Period, see Margaret Smith, *Muslim Women Mystics, The Life and Work of Rabia and Other Women Mystics in Islam*, (Oxford: Oneworld, 2001). Emil Homerin, “Living Love: The Mystical Writings of ‘Â’ishah al-Bâ’ûniyah (d. 922/1516),” *Mamluk Studies Review*, vol. 7 (2003), pp. 211-234; Kishwar Rizvi, “Women and Benevolence during the Early Safavid Empire,” in *Women, Patronage, and Self-Representation in Islamic Societies*, ed. D. Fairchild Ruggles, pp. 123-153; Speros Vryonis, “The Muslim Family in 13th-14th Century Anatolia as Reflected in the Writings of the Mawlawi Dervish Eflaki,” in *The Ottoman Empire (1300-1389), Halcyon Days in Crete I, A Symposium Held in Rethymnon, 11-13 January 1991*, ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou, (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1993), pp. 213-223.

²¹² “Vakf-i mescid-i Devlet Hatun bint-i Biremuni der-nefs-i Konya imâmet der-tasarraf-i Mevlânâ Abdi be-hükmi-i Sultân Mehmed tâbe serâhu.” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 33b; Coşkun, p. 60. As understood from the *vakfiyye* (dated 610/1213) of the mosque of Devlet Hatun, Devlet Hatun belonged to the Seljukid dynasty. The *vakfiyye* refers to Devlet Hatun as follows: “Devlet Hatun bint-i Ahmed el-‘Arûsî min Âl-i Selçuk.” See İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, p. 383. Konyalı indicates that the *khan* of Devlet Hatun in Saideli in time led to a change in the name of Saideli, which has been known as Kadınhanı. Konyalı adds that the actual name of Devlet Hatun was Raziyye Hatun and that in line with the Turkish tradition, women’s actual names were not mentioned in inscriptions and *vakfiyyes*. Instead, according to Konyalı, women patrons, particularly those who were members of a certain dynasty, were referred to as Sitti, Devlet or Hant.” Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, p. 386. For more information about Devlet Hatun and her mosque, see İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, pp. 378-386. In his work entitled *Beş Şehir*, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar wrote that Vâlîde Camii in Üsküdar was built by the Ottoman Sultan Selim II (r. 1566-74) for his wife. In line with “etiquette of dynasty,” Selim II referred to his wife as “the mother of his son, Murad” and avoided mentioning her name: “Üsküdar’da güzelliğini Yahya Kemal’den tanıdığımız Valide camii [mosque of Atik Valide Sultan] Sinan’ın son eserlerindedir. Yahut hiç olmazsa plan ve ilk inşaat onundur. Bu cami ve etrafı, hayrata yapılan ve manzarayı bir tarafından kapayan ilâvelere rağmen hâlâ Türk İstanbul’un en güzel köşelerinden biridir. Bu camide semt ile çok iyi anlaşan bir kendi içine çekiliş vardır. Cami, II. Selim’in çok sevdiği karısına bir hediyesidir. Fakat saltanat âdâbı karısının adını söylemeğe mâni olduğu için, ondan ‘Ferzend-i ercümend oğlum Murad tâle bekâ’uhû vâlidesi seyyidetü’l-mühadderât ilâ ahirihî dâmet ismetühâ cânibinden Üsküdar’da binâ olunacak’ diye bahseder. Bu hicâbı beğenmemek kâbil değil. II. Selim, ‘Kıdvetü’l-emâcîd ve’l-ekârîm Sinan zîde mecdühû’ diye onu [Sinan’ı] över. Bâkî, Sokullu, Sinan, Piyale Paşa, Kılıç Ali Paşa, Hüsrev Paşa: İşte bu fânî dünyada babasından II. Selim’e kalan mîraslar.” Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, *Beş Şehir*, eleventh edition (first published in 1946), (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2001), p. 36. Gülru Necipoğlu explains the imperial decree of Selim II related to the mosque of Atik Valide Sultan in Üsküdar as follows: “The mosque complex came to be known as Atik Valide Sultan (Old Queen Mother) after two others were built in Üsküdar for later queen mothers. The details of its construction can be traced from imperial decrees. The earliest one, issued by Selim II, is dated 16 February 1571. It orders the kadıs of Sapanca and İzmit to help the men sent by the endowment administrator and by Mustafa, the building supervisor of

that the foundation of Dediği Dede,²¹⁴ which will be discussed in the fifth chapter in relation to Seyyid Harun, in Mahmuthisar was also a “likely focus of attraction.”²¹⁵ It seems that Shaykh Dediği was associated with the Turgutoğulları, a family which came to the Konya region along with the Karamanids after the decline of the Seljukids of Anatolia.²¹⁶ It is not a coincidence that the first foundation mentioned in the register of pious foundations of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483 was the tomb of Mevlânâ Celâleddin (d. 1273)²¹⁷ and that the second foundation mentioned in the register was the *vakf* of Sadreddin Konevî (d. 1274).²¹⁸ The total annual income of the *vakf* of the tomb of Celâleddin Rûmî, one of the richest foundations in the province, was 46,047 *akçes*.²¹⁹ The role of Rûmî’s tomb as a sanctuary for the Karamanid begs will be discussed in the fifth chapter.

‘the mosque that is being built in Üsküdar for the mother of my son Murad.’ ” Gülru Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire*, (London: Reaktion Books, 2005), p. 284. For more information about Selim II’s wife, Nurbanu Sultan, and the mosque complex of Atik Valide Sultan, see Gülru Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire*, pp. 280-292. As Tanpınar indicates in his works, Sinan’s architectural works represented the peak of the Ottoman civilization. However, to produce an architect like Sinan took many centuries for Turks. Behind the architectural works of Sinan, the religious and cultural legacy of the Seljukids and of the Karamanids can also be sought. For more information about the architectural works of Sinan, see Gülru Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire*, (London: Reaktion Books, 2005).

²¹³ Suraiya Faroqhi, “Peasants of Saideli in the Late Sixteenth Century,” p. 231.

²¹⁴ “Vakf-i zâviye-i Dediği Sultan ‘aleyhi’r-rahmeti ve ‘l-ğufrân meşihat be-nâm-i Mehmed Çelebi ve Durdıhan be-hükm-i ‘âl-i şân.” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 92a; Coşkun, p. 153.

²¹⁵ Suraiya Faroqhi, “Peasants of Saideli in the Late Sixteenth Century,” p. 231.

²¹⁶ Suraiya Faroqhi, “Peasants of Saideli in the Late Sixteenth Century,” pp. 229-230. For more information about Turgutoğulları, see M. Zeki Oral, “Turgutoğulları, Eserleri ve Vakfiyeleri,” *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. 3 (1956), pp. 32-64.

²¹⁷ “Vakf-i Türbe-i Mutahhara-i Sultânü’l-Ârifin Şeyhü’l-Muhakkikîn Hazret-i Mevlânâ Celâleddin kaddese’l-lâhu sirrahu’l-‘azîz mukarrer be-hükm-i Hâkânî ve tevkî’-i Sultânî meşihat der-tasarraf-i Mehmed Çelebi be-hükm-i şerif ve nezâret be-nâm-i Seyyid Mahmud be-hükm-i Pâdişâh hullide mülkühû.” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 1b; Coşkun, p. 3. The *vakf* of the tomb of Mevlâna Celâleddin was usually mentioned first among the *vakfs* of the Province of Karaman. See, for instance, Feridun Nafiz Uzluç, *Fatih Devrinde Karaman Eyâleti Vakıfları Fihristi*, p. 9; 387 Numaralı Muhâsebe-i Vilâyet-i Karaman ve Rûm Defteri (937/1530) I, Konya, Bey-şehir, Ak-şehir, Lârende, Ak-saray, Niğde, Kayseriyye ve İç-il Livâları (Dizin ve Tıpkıbasım), (Ankara: Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 1996), p. 24. For further information about the Mevlevî dervishes, Suraiya Faroqhi, “Agricultural Crisis and the Art of Flute-Playing: The Worldly Affairs of the Mevlevî Dervishes (1595-1652),” *Turcica*, vol. 20 (1988), pp. 43-63.

²¹⁸ “Vakf-i Mürşid-i Tarîk-i Nebevî Hazret-i Şeyh Sadreddin Konevî ‘aleyhi’r-rahme. Meşihat der-tasarraf-i Mevlânâ Abdi veled-i Sofci be-hükm-i Pâdişâh hullide mülkühû ve tevliyet be-nâm-i Mevlânâ Bedreddin veled-i müşârün ileyh be-hükm-i Hümayûn.” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 4a; Coşkun, p. 8.

²¹⁹ Coşkun, p. 8.

The annual income of the foundation of Sadreddin Konevî was 25,220 *akçes*.²²⁰ The *zâviye* of Sadreddin Konevî will be discussed later.²²¹ The foundation was built in the year 673/1274-75, and it also consisted of a library for the “use of those descendants of the founder who should feel an inclination toward religious studies.”²²²

In her book entitled *Subjects of the Sultan, Culture and Daily Life in the Ottoman Empire*, Suraiya Faroqhi refers to dervish lodges as “a way into the world of books.”²²³ Faroqhi states that large convents would have a “library of books donated by dervishes and other devotees of the saint.”²²⁴ She refers to the main convent of the Mevlevî order in Konya as a key example of a library donated by dervishes. She explains the library as follows: “Published as a book, the catalogue runs to three hefty volumes....The great Islamic theologians and mystics, such as Ghazâlî, ‘Attâr and, above all, Ibn ‘Arabî are each represented by several manuscripts.”²²⁵ One such library was also mentioned in the register of 888/1483.

²²⁰ Coşkun, p. 11.

²²¹ For further information about the life and influence of Konevî in the history of Sufî thought, see Hüdaverdi Adam, “The Relationship Between Muhyiddin Ibn al-Arabî and Sadreddin Al-Konevî,” *Akademik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, no. 24 (2005), 153-164; William C. Chittick, “The Central Point, Qunawî’s Role in the School of Ibn ‘Arabî,” *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn ‘Arabî Society*, vol. XXXV (2004), pp. 25-45; Jane Clark, “Early Best-sellers in the Akbarian Tradition: The Dissemination of Ibn ‘Arabî’s Teaching Through Sadr al-dîn al-Qunawî,” *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn al-Arabî Society*, vol. XXXIII (2003), pp. 22-53; Gerald Elmore, “Sadr al-Dîn al-Qunawî’s Personal Study-List of Books by Ibn al-‘Arabî,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, vol. 56, no. 3 (July 1997), pp. 161-181; Suraiya Faroqhi, “Vakıf Administration in the Sixteenth Century Konya: The Zaviye of Sadreddin Konevî,” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient (JESHO)*, vol. XVII, part 2, pp. 145-172.

²²² Suraiya Faroqhi, “Vakıf Administration in the Sixteenth Century Konya: The Zaviye of Sadreddin Konevî,” p. 147. See also Mikail Bayram, “Sadru’-d-Din Konevî Kütüphanesi ve Kitapları,” in *Türkler*, vol. 7, ed. Hasan Celal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek, Salim Kara, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002), 585-589: 585.

²²³ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Subjects of the Sultan, Culture and Daily Life in the Ottoman Empire*, (London, New York: I. B. Tauris Publishers, 2000), p. 188.

²²⁴ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Subjects of the Sultan*, p. 189.

²²⁵ Faroqhi, p. 189. See also Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, *Mevlânâ Müzesi Yazmalar Kataloğu*, four volumes, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1967).

According to the Register of Pious Foundations of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483, there were 170 books in the library of Sadreddin Konevî.²²⁶ The register presents a full list of these books.²²⁷ Some of these books were multiple volumes such as *Fütûhât-i Mekkiye* (*Meccan Revelations*) of Ibn al-Arabî in his own handwriting (*Fütûhât-i Mekkiye be-hatt-i Şeyh Muhyiddin rahmetu'l-lahi 'aleyh*).²²⁸ Most of the books were related to *tefsîr* (Qur'anic exegesis), *hadith* (sayings of the Prophet Muhammed), Islamic mysticism, ethics, medicine, logic, history, and books of etiquette.²²⁹ As will be discussed later, many Sufis and scholars came to study in the library of Sadreddin Konevî during Karamanid and Ottoman rule in Konya. According to Mikail Bayram, among those scholars and Sufis who studied in the library of Konevî were Mecdüddin Muhammed el-Firûzâbâdî (d. 1414), Molla Abdurrahman-i Câmî (d. 1492), Akşemseddin (d. 1459) who was the shaykh of the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II, Yâr Ali Şirâzî (d. 1412), Seyyid Şerif el-Cürçânî (d. 1414), and Hacı Mü'min Halife, who a Qadirî shaykh in Konya.²³⁰ The *vakf* of

²²⁶ Coşkun, p. XVIII.

²²⁷ For the full list of the books in the library of Sadreddin Konevî, see *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, İstanbul Atatürk Kitaplığı, Cevdet Tasnifi, O. 116/1 (H. 888/1483), folios 5b-8b; Fahri Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin)," pp. 11-15.

²²⁸ *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 5b; Coşkun, p. 11.

²²⁹ To give an idea about the books in the library of Sadreddin Konevî, the following titles can be mentioned: "Keşşâf....*Tefsîr-i Kebîr* (four volumes).... *Kitâb fi't-Tıb* (three volumes), *Kitâb-i Milel ve Nihal*....*Füsûsu'l-Hikem be-hatt-i Şeyh Sadreddin*....*Kitâb min-İhyâi'l-'Ulûm* [of Ghazâlî (d. 1111)]....*Kitâbü'n-Nefehât be-hatt-i Şeyh Sadreddin*....*Kitâb-i Edeb-i Kâtib*....*Kitâb-i Sahih-i Müslim*....*Kitâb-i İlmi Meşâyikh*.... *Kitâb-i Mantık*, *Kitâbü't-Taberî*....*Kitâb-i Târihi'l-Mülûk*." Fahri Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin)," pp. 11-14. In his Ph. D. dissertation entitled "Ermenek Kazâsı (1500-1600)," Bilal Gök presented a table of books, which were kept in the mosque of Emir Rüstem Paşa and in the *Bednam Mu'allimhânesi*, according to the *evkâf defteri* of 1584. At that date, the mosque of Emir Rüstem Paşa had nine volumes of books and the *Bednam Mu'allimhânesi* had 57 volumes of books. Among the books in these libraries, the following can be mentioned to give an idea about which books were read in the Province of Karaman: "Keşşâf of Zemahşerî (d. 1143), *Dürer* of Molla Hüsrev (d. 1480), *Gülistan* of Sa'dî, *Menâr* of Ebu'l-Berekât Hafizüddin en-Nesefî (d. 1310), *Tefsîr* of Muhammed Birgivî (d. 1573) and *Tefsîr* of Nasreddin Abdullah b. Ömer Beydâvî (d. 1286)." Bilal Gök, "Ermenek Kazası (1500-1600)," unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, (Malatya: Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İnönü Üniversitesi, 2006), pp. 170-172. For further information about libraries of dervish lodges, see Gönül Gülşen Türk, "Tasavvuf Kültüründe Derviş-Kitap Münasebeti ve Tekke Kütüphaneleri," unpublished M. A. thesis, (Bursa: Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Uludağ Üniversitesi, 1995).

²³⁰ Mikail Bayram, "Sadru'd-Din Konevî Kütüphanesi ve Kitapları," pp. 587-588. For more information about Mü'min Halife, see İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, pp. 281-286; İsmail

Mü'min Halife was one of the abrogated (*mensûh*) foundations in the year 881/1476. It was turned into *timar* in that year.²³¹ According to the register of 888/1483, Mevlânâ Mü'min Halife was a founder of a family *vakf*²³² in Konya and the seventy-five disciples of Mü'min Halife were exempt from such taxes as *'avârız* and *tekâlîf-i dîvâniye*.²³³

In some cases, the Ottoman government granted some privileges such as exemption from certain taxes to the residents of the newly conquered lands. For instance, the residents of Konya and Kayseri were exempt from taxes altogether “on account of the faithfulness which they had shown during the wars with Uzun Hasan.”²³⁴ Such privileges were essential in securing the loyalty of the people of the conquered lands. The great majority of the native aristocracy of the Province of Karaman maintained their positions, “often with their previous land rights.”²³⁵ In the *defter* of 929/1519, the following phrase points out this policy: “those *timar*-holders whose fathers were once the notables of Karaman...”²³⁶ According to İnalçık, such

Çiftçioğlu, “Vakfiyelere ve Tahrir Defterlerine Göre Karamanlı Eğitim Kurumları,” pp. 258-260. The Qadîrî Order received its name from Shaykh Abdülkâdir Jilânî (Geylânî) (470/1077-561/1166). For further information about Abdülkâdir Geylânî and the Qadîrî Order, see *Abdülkâdir Geylânî Dîvânı, Sûfî Kasîdeleri ve Rûmuzlu Makaleler*, ed. Mustafa Utku, Yusuf Zeydan, (Bursa: Sır Yayıncılık, 2005); Mustafa Kara, “Abdülkâdir Geylânî Hazretleri’nden Gazi Paşa Hazretleri’ne veya Tasavvufun Gücü,” in Mustafa Kara, ed., *Dervîşin Hayatı, Sûfînin Kelâmı, Hal Tercümeleri, Tarikatlar, İstılahlar*, (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2005), pp. 485-513; Khaliq Ahmad Nizamî, “The Qâdiriyyah Order,” in *Islamic Spirituality, Manifestations*, ed. Seyyed Hossein Nasr, (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1991), pp. 6-25.

²³¹ See Feridun Nafiz Uzluk, *Fatih Devrinde Karaman Eyâleti Vakıfları Fihristi*, p. 23.

²³² For further information about family *vakf*, see Halil İnalçık, “Land Possession Outside the Mîrî System,” *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, p. 125.

²³³ “Vakf-i evlâd ve mülk-i kıdvetü’l-ulemâ fahrü’l-meşâyikh Hazret-i Mevlânâ Mü'min Halife bermûceb-i vakfiyye-i şer'îyye ve şîrâ'nâme-i şer'îyye ve mukarrernâme-i İbrahim Beg ve Pâdişâh-i 'âlem-penâh hullide mülkühû....Dervîşân-i Mevlânâ Mü'min Halife der-nefs-i Konya 75 nefer avârız ve tekâlîf-i dîvâniyyedenmu'âf ve müsellemler olmak için İbrahim Beg'den mu'âfnâmeleri var. El-ân âsîtâne-i devlete 'arz olunub mukarrer kılındı.” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 29b; Coşkun, pp. 54-55. *Avârız* can be defined as “extraordinary levies or services introduced by the state on emergency situations, mostly to support the navy.” Halil İnalçık, “Glossary,” in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, p. 995. For further information about taxes to be paid by the tax-paying people (*re'âyâ*), see Halil İnalçık, “Osmanlılar'da Raiyyet Rûsûmu,” *Belleten*, vol. 23, no. 92 (October, 1959), pp. 575-609; Halil İnalçık, “Resm,” *Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition, vol. 8 (1996), pp. 486-487.

²³⁴ Halil İnalçık, “Ottoman Methods of Conquest,” *Studia Islamica*, no. 2 (1954), pp. 107-108.

²³⁵ Halil İnalçık, “Ottoman Methods of Conquest,” p. 118.

²³⁶ İnalçık, p. 118.

people constituted the majority of the *timar*-holders in the Province of Karaman.²³⁷ Some notables of the province enjoyed larger *timar* or *ze'âmet*s with the title of beg. Among such notable families were the Turgud, Kögez, Teke, Bozdoğan, Samagar, Yapa, Egridir, Emeleddin, Bulgar, Adalibey, Uchari, Yavasul Musa, and Bozkır.²³⁸ The Ottomans were aware of the fact that the native aristocracy of the Karamanids had “strong tribal ties.”²³⁹ The Karamanids were the natural allies of the Mamluks and Aqqyunlus against the Ottomans. The founder of the Safavids, Shah Ismail (1501-1524), supported Turcoman tribes against the Ottomans. However, the Ottomans managed to overcome “the rebellious attitude of the Karamanid tribal aristocracy” by such favors to them.²⁴⁰

The small number of *mensûh zâviyes* in the register of 888/1483 may be attributed to the general policy of the Ottomans in the newly conquered lands. Some shaykhs were affiliated with the Karamanid tribal aristocracy. For instance, Dediği Sultan was affiliated with the Turgud tribe. It seems that the Ottomans avoided abrogating a lot of dervish lodges in the Province of Karaman. Bayezid II's policy of returning the abrogated dervish to their former owners might have led to a sympathy towards the Ottoman administration among the dervishes in the Province of Karaman. The Ottomans venerated certain Sufi masters such as Celâleddin Rûmî, Sadreddin Konevî, and Ahmed Fakih, whose tombs and lodges were in Konya.

The register of 888/1483 refers to the pious endowment of Hâce Fakih, who was also known as Ahmed Fakih or Fakih Ahmed, after mentioning the foundations of Rûmî and Konevî.²⁴¹ Compared to the incomes of the foundations of Rûmî and

²³⁷ İncalcık, p. 118.

²³⁸ İncalcık, p. 118.

²³⁹ İncalcık, p. 118.

²⁴⁰ İncalcık, pp. 118-119.

²⁴¹ “Vakf-i Kutbü'l-büdelâ fi'l-ezmân Hazret-i Fakih,” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 7b.

Konevî, the annual income of the foundation of Fakih was very low: 1370 *akçes*.²⁴² Perhaps the surveyor was familiar with the popularity of Ahmed Fakih in Anatolia and he mentioned Fakih's foundation in the third place among the foundations of Konya.

According to Mikail Bayram, there were two Sufi masters whose name was Ahmed Fakih in the thirteenth century. Those who wrote on Ahmed Fakih were not aware of the fact that there were two Ahmed Fakihs of note in the thirteenth century.²⁴³ Bayram asserts that their source of information was Aflâkî, who also confused the two Ahmed Fakihs.²⁴⁴ In the *Menâkıb-ı Şeyh Evhadüddin-i Kirmânî*, Ahmed Fakih was mentioned as a disciple of Shaykh Evhadüddin-i Kirmanî (d. 635 H. /1237). This was the first Ahmed Fakih, who died in the year 618 H. (1221).²⁴⁵ According to Mikail Bayram, the second Ahmed Fakih, which was mentioned by Aflâkî, died in the year 651/1253, not in the year 618/1221. The author of *Çerhnâme* and *Kitâbu Evsâf-i Mesâcidi's-şerîfe* could be the one who was a close friend of Rûmî.²⁴⁶

²⁴² Coşkun, pp. 15-16.

²⁴³ For more information about Ahmed Fakih and his works, see Fuad Köprülü, "Selçuklular Devrinde Anadolu Şairleri II, Ahmed Fakih," *Türk Yurdu*, vol. IV, no 22 (Teşrin-i Evvel, 1926): 289-295; Ahmed Fakih, *Çerhnâme*, ed. Mecdut Mansuroğlu, İstanbul, 1956; Ahmed Fakih, *Kitâbu Evsâf-i Mesâcidi's-şerîfe*, ed. Hasibe Mazıoğlu, (Ankara, 1974); Mikail Bayram, "Anadolu'da Te'lif Edilen İlk Eser Meselesi," *V. Milli Selçuklu Kültür ve Medeniyeti Semineri Bildirileri (25-26 Nisan 1995)*, (Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Selçuklu Araştırmaları Merkezi, 1996), pp. 95-96.

²⁴⁴ Mikail Bayram, "Anadolu'da Te'lif Edilen İlk Eser Meselesi," *V. Milli Selçuklu Kültür ve Medeniyeti Semineri Bildirileri (25-26 Nisan 1995)*, (Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Selçuklu Araştırmaları Merkezi, 1996), pp. 95-96.

²⁴⁵ Mikail Bayram, "Anadolu'da Te'lif Edilen İlk Eser Meselesi," p. 96.

²⁴⁶ Mikail Bayram, "Anadolu'da Te'lif Edilen İlk Eser Meselesi," pp. 96-97. It is also probable that there was only one Fakih Ahmed in the thirteenth century. Mikail Bayram asserts that the first Ahmed Fakih was a *mezcûb* (one lives in seclusion in mountains and caves) type of dervish and that a *mezcûb* type of dervish could not write a book. However, some dervishes wrote several works before they became *mezcûbs*. Even the life story of Celâleddin Rûmî who left madrasa life after his meeting with Şems-i Tebrizî and who lived in seclusion for a long period after the death of Tebrizî can be cited as an example of this phenomenon. Thus, the question of Ahmed Fakih's historical personality remains to be analyzed in detail. I would like to express my gratitude to Halil İnalçık for reminding me of the possibility of existence of only one Ahmed Fakih in the thirteenth century.

Ahmed Fakih was a famous saint among the Mevlevî and Bektaşî dervishes.²⁴⁷ It seems that the famous Ahmed Fakih of the thirteenth century was the one who was a close friend of Celâleddin Rûmî. Most of the sources such as the Ottoman almanacs (*tarihî takvimler*) mentioned Ahmed Fakih together with Celâleddin Rûmî. As will be discussed in the fourth chapter, the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun* also referred to Ahmed Fakih together with Rûmî.

In the legendary sources written in the fifteenth century one can see references made to Ahmed Fakih as one of the saints of Anatolia. For instance, in the *Saltuknâme*,²⁴⁸ which was compiled by Ebu'l-Hayr Rûmî on behalf of Prince Cem (d. 1495), reference is made to "Fakih Ahmed Sultan."²⁴⁹ The *Saltuknâme* was completed in the year 1480,²⁵⁰ when Prince Cem was governor of the Province of Karaman. More importantly, it was completed only three years before the register of the pious endowments of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483. Such legendary sources reflected the perception of ordinary people of the time. According to the story, Sarı Saltuk, "a legendary figure of the thirteenth century,"²⁵¹ visited the tomb of Ahmed Fakih because he had died before the visit of Sarı Saltuk.²⁵² In the

²⁴⁷ According to Tekindağ, the date of death of Hâce Ahmed Fakih was 650/1252. For further information about Ahmed Fakih, see Şehabettin Tekindağ, "Büyük Türk Mutasavvıfı Yunus Emre Hakkında Araştırmalar," *Belleten*, vol. 30 (1966), 59-90: 77n.; Osman F. Sertkaya, "Ahmed Fakih," *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2, (İstanbul, 1989), pp. 65-67.

²⁴⁸ For further information about *Saltuknâme* and other legendary works written in Medieval Anatolia, see Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds, The Construction of the Ottoman State*, (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1995), pp. 62-90.

²⁴⁹ *Saltuknâme, The Legend of Sarı Saltuk Collected from Oral Tradition by Ebu'l-Hayr Rûmî (Part 5: folios 351a-450b), Text in Facsimile with a Critical and Stylistic Analysis and Index by Fahir İz*, (Harvard University, 1976), folio 359a (p. 717).

²⁵⁰ Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, p. 71.

²⁵¹ Kafadar, p. 71.

²⁵² "Kırşehir'ne geldi. Andan ol şehirde olan velîlerle buluşdı. Fakih Ahmed Sultan vefât eylemişdi. Varub kabrini ziyâret kıldı. Hacı Bektaş ve Ahî Evran... ve hem dahî nice velîler gelüb anda cem' olub sohbet eyledirler." *Saltuknâme, The Legend of Sarı Saltuk Collected from Oral Tradition by Ebu'l-Hayr Rûmî (Part 5: folios 351a-450b), Text in Facsimile with a Critical and Stylistic Analysis and Index by Fahir İz*, (Harvard University, 1976), folio 359a (p. 717). Interestingly, the author of the *Saltuknâme* mentioned Ahmed Fakih among the saints of Kırşehir such as Hacı Bektaş-i Velî and Ahî Evren. Perhaps it is due to the fact that Ahmed Fakih was one of the saints of the Bektaşî tradition, the center of which has been Kırşehir since the thirteenth century. For more information about the significance of Ahmed Fakih in the Bektaşî tradition, see Fuad Köprülü, "Selçuklular Devrinde

Saltuknâme, there are references to other saints of the Province of Karaman, Celâleddin Rûmî, Şems-i Tebrizî,²⁵³ and Seyyid Mahmud Hayranî.²⁵⁴ According to Aflâkî, Seyyid Mahmud Hayrânî was a disciple of Celâleddin Rûmî.²⁵⁵ As will be discussed in the fourth chapter, Bektaşî sources viewed Hayrânî as a disciple of Hacı Bektaş.

Anadolu Şairleri II, Ahmed Fakih," pp. 290-291; M. Fuad Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*, ninth edition (first published in 1918), (Ankara: Akçağ, 2003), pp. 79, 80.

²⁵³ The lodge of Şems-i Tebrizî, Celâleddin Rûmî's close friend, was at the disposal (*tasarruf*) of Çelebi Ârif's descendants: "Zâviye-i Şems-i Tebrizî rahmetu'l-lâhi 'aleyh rahmeten vâsi'aten derbâtın-i Konya tevliyet Hazret-i Mevlânâ Celâleddin evlâdından Ârif Çelebi'ye şart olunmuş. Ba'dehû evlâdına ve evlâd-i evlâdına batnen ba'de batnin ve neslen ba'de neslin mutasarrıf olalar, diyü vakfiyelerinde mestûr. El-ân Ârif Çelebi evlâdından Ahî Ali oğlu Mehmed Çelebi tasarrufunda." *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 28a; Coşkun, p. 53. For further information about Şems-i Tebrizî, see Jereer El-Moor, "The 'Sun of Religion' Meets Its 'Reviver'? A Review-Article of Me and Rûmî: The Autobiography of Shams-i Tabrizî," *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn al-Arabî Society*, vol. 38 (2005), 65-89.

²⁵⁴ "Azmi Konya eyledi. Anda dahî varub Mevlâyî [Mevlânâ Celâleddin Rûmî] ile ve Şems-i Tebrizî'yle ve Hüsameddin ve bâkî ehlu'l-lah gelüb musâhib oldular. Bir niçe gün sohbet kılub andan 'azm ider [idüb] Akyanus [Akşehir] şehrine gitdi varub Seyyid Mahmud Hayrân'ın kabrini ziyaret eyledi." *Saltuknâme, The Legend of Sarı Saltuk Collected from Oral Tradition by Ebu'l-Hayr Rûmî (Part 5: folios 351a-450b), Text in Facsimile with a Critical and Stylistic Analysis and Index by Fahir İz*, foli 359a (p. 717). For more information about Hüsameddin Çelebi, see Ahmed Aflâkî, *Âriflerin Menkibeleri (Mevlânâ ve Etrafindakiler)*, vol. 2, tr. Tahsin Yazıcı, pp. 124-146. In the register of 888/1483, the *zâviye* of Seyyid Mahmud Hayran is mentioned first among the pious endowments of the town of Akşehir. The income of the *zâviye* of Hayran was 11,950 *akçes*. See *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, İstanbul Atatürk Kitaplığı, Cevdet Tasnifi, O. 116/1 (H. 888/1483), folios 76b-77a; Fahri Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin)," pp. 129-130. For further information about Seyyid Mahmud Hayran, see Menderes Coşkun, *Manzum ve Mensur Osmanlı Hac Seyahatnameleri ve Nâbî'nin Tuhfetü'l-Harameyn'i*, (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 2002), p. 166; İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Nasreddin Hoca'nın Şehri Akşehir*, pp. 417-456; Yusuf Küçükdağ, "Seyyid Mahmud-ı Hayranî ve Akşehir'de Seyyid Mahmud-ı Hayranî Manzumesi," in *Türk Tasavvuf Araştırmaları*, (Konya: Çizgi Yayınları, 2005), pp. 311-322; Rıfki Melül Meriç, *Akşehir Türbe ve Mezarları*, (İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1936), pp. 145-158. The second foundation mentioned in the Akşehir section of the register is the *zâviye* of Hacı İbrahim, the income of which was 34,020 *akçes*. The *vakf* of the *zâviye* of Hacı İbrahim was one of the riches *vakfs* in the province. The income of the foundation of Sadreddin Konevî was less than that of Sadreddin Konevî, 25,220 *akçes*. See Fahri Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin)," pp. 8-11, 130-131. According to Köprülü, the Bektaşî sources refer to the famous saints of the thirteenth century such as Celâleddin Rûmî, Seyyid Mahmud Hayranî, and Hacı İbrahim Sultan in order to increase the legitimacy and the popularity of the Bektaşî path of Sufism. He adds that the date of the *vakfiyye* of Seyyid Mahmud Hayrânî was 655/1257-58 and that the *vakfiyye* of Hacı İbrahim Sultan was 665/1266-67. See M. Fuad Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*, p. 245. İ. Hakkı Konyalı published the *vakfiyye* of Hacı İbrahim Sultan in his history of Akşehir. However, according to Konyalı, the date of the *vakfiyye* of Hacı İbrahim was 776/1374. See İ. Hakkı Konyalı, *Nasreddin Hoca'nın Şehri Akşehir*, pp. 377-386. It seems that Konyalı was right in asserting that Hacı İbrahim lived in the fourteenth century. He proves his argument in the light of various archival sources. For more information about Shaykh Hacı İbrahim, İ. Hakkı Konyalı, *Nasreddin Hoca'nın Şehri Akşehir*, pp. 387-403.

²⁵⁵ Ahmed Eflakî, *Âriflerin Menkibeleri*, vol. 2, tr. Tahsin Yazıcı, p. 55.

In another legendary work entitled *Hızırnâme*, which was written by Shaykh Mehmed Dede known as Muhyiddin Çelebi in the year 880/1476, there was also a reference to Ahmed Fakih as one of the saints of Anatolia.²⁵⁶ The author of the *Hızırnâme* was a Zeynî dervish from Eğridir, a town in Hamid-İli (today's Isparta).²⁵⁷ He also refers to the other shaykhs of the Province of Karaman such as Celaleddin Rûmî, Sadreddin Konevî,²⁵⁸ Seyyid Mahmud Hayrânî, Pîr Es'ad,²⁵⁹ Shaykh Sadaka,²⁶⁰ Seyyid Harun, whom will be discussed in the fourth chapter, and Şems-i Tebrizî.²⁶¹ Written only seven years before the register of 888/1483 and in a neighboring province, Hamid-ili, the *Hızırnâme* denotes how the Sufi masters of the Province of Karaman were influential in the minds and memories of the people of medieval Anatolia. As expressed in the introduction of the dissertation, the analysis of the foundation registers with the literary works of the time is indispensable to the understanding of the religious context of the time under consideration. The question

²⁵⁶ Muhyiddin Çelebi, *Hızırnâme*, Topkapı Emanet Hazinesi, no. 1734, folio 47b. I would like to express my gratitude to Zeynep Yürekli Görkay for giving me a copy of the *Hızırnâme*.

²⁵⁷ Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, "Hızırnâme," *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 17, (İstanbul: 1998), p. 418.

²⁵⁸ In Konya, there was also the lodge of Shaykh Sadri, who is sometimes confused with Shaykh Sadreddin Konevî: "Vakf-i zâviye-i Şeyh Sadri der-nefs-i Konya," *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 26b. Abû Bakr ibn al-Zakî (d. 694/1294-95), who was known as Shaykh Sadri, was the author of a Persian book of *inşâ* (*the art of letter-writing*) entitled *Ravzat al-Kuttâb va Hadikat al-Albâb*. For more information about the author who was also referred to as Shaykh Sadri and his work, see Abû Bakr İbn al-Zakî, *Ravzat al-Kuttâb va Hadikat al-Albâb*, ed. Ali Sevim, (Ankara: TTK, 1972), pp. 1-77; Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, pp. 716-719.

²⁵⁹ The register of 888/1483 mentions Pîr Es'ad as follows: "Vakf-i zâviye-i Pîr Es'ad Sultan der-nefs-i Konya," *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 28a. Although the *zâviye* does not exist today, the inscription of the tomb of Shaykh Es'ad still exists. According to the inscription, Şeyh Es'ad died in the year 662/1263. There is a small grave next to the grave of Şeyh Es'ad. People of Konya believe that this small grave belongs to the cat of Şeyh Es'ad, who is also called *Pisili Sultan*.²⁵⁹ See Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, p. 703. The *vakfiyye* of the *zâviye* of Pîr Es'ad is extant today, in the archive of the Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü. The date of the *vakfiyye* is 844 H. (1450/1451).

²⁶⁰ The register of 888/1483 mentions Shaykh Sadaka as follows: "Vakf-i zâviye-i Şeyh Sadaka der-nefs-i Konya," *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, folio 27a. According to Konyalı, Shaykh Sadaka was the tutor of Sa'deddin Çelebi, who was the son of Sadreddin Konevî (d. 1274). For more information about Shaykh Sadaka, see Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, pp. 755-756.

²⁶¹ Muhyiddin Çelebi, *Hızırnâme*, folio 47b. For further information about the author of *Hızırnâme* and its manuscript versions, see Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, "Hızırnâme," *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, pp. 417-419; Muhammet Ali Bulut, "Eğridirli Şeyh Mehmet Dede Sultan'ın Hızırnâme'si (İnceleme - Metin)," *unpublished M. A. thesis*, (Erzurum: Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Atatürk Üniversitesi, 2003), pp. 1-26; Seyyid Alizâde Hasan b. Müslim, *Hızırnâme, Alevî Bektâşi Âdab ve Erkânı (Buyruk)*, Baki Yaşa Altınok, ed., Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2007, pp. 19-22.

of how the Sufi literature addressed the political context of the time will be discussed in the following two chapters.

CHAPTER III

RELIGIOUS ORDERS IN THE PROVINCE OF KARAMAN

Sufi masters mentioned in the register of pious foundations of the Province of Karaman (888/1483) had different attitudes towards political authority. Some of them used conformist political discourse such as in the case of the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun*, which will be discussed in the following chapter. Others maintained their dissident discourse in their works as in the case of Baba Yusuf of Aksaray, whom will be discussed in the sixth chapter. Furthermore, other Sufi masters remained outsiders to the political scene as was in the case of Dediği Sultan, whom will be discussed in the following chapter. Yet, remaining outside of the political scene can also be viewed a kind of dissidence. As Terzioğlu asserts, “Sufism in and of itself does not imply a political outlook, but can be used to support a variety of political ideals and agendas.”²⁶² The common characteristic of the Sufi masters mentioned in the register of 888/1483 was that they were holders of the *zâviye* foundations which were confirmed by the Seljukid or Karamanid rulers. Later, as stated before, the Ottoman sultans also confirmed the foundations established during the Seljukid and Karamanid rulers.

While examining the relations between dervishes and sultans, one should bear in mind that dervishes had a feeling of superiority over those who enjoyed political

²⁶² Derin Terzioğlu, “Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyazi-i Misrî (1618-1694),” p. 278.

power. For instance, a seventeenth century Sufi master, Niyazi-i Mısrî (1618-1694) recorded a different version of the story which is said to have taken place among Plato (ca. 428-347 B.C.), Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) and Alexander the Great (r.336-323 B.C.). Before narrating the story, it is worth pointing out the fact that Plato had already died before Alexander the Great became the king of Macedon at the age of twenty. However, it is a fact that Aristotle was the tutor of Alexander the Great.²⁶³

In line with popular Islamic tradition, the famous philosophers Plato and Aristotle were perceived as “shaykh” and “*khalîfa*” in the *Mecmû'a-i Kelimât-i Kudsiyye-i Hazret-i Mısrî* (The Collection of the Sacred Words of the Venerable Mısrî).²⁶⁴ According to the story narrated by Mısrî, when Alexander the Great heard of Plato's fame, he sent a messenger to ask Plato to be his “shaykh.” Plato replied to the messenger with this challenging statement: “What use could I have for the distinction of being Alexander's shaykh, when sovereignty (*saltanat*) itself was within my power, and I did not deign to exercise it?”²⁶⁵ Instead, Plato sent his “disciple (*khalîfa*)”, Aristotle, to Alexander the Great. In the end of the story, Mısrî gave a message to the sultans of the time by attributing all victories of Alexander the Great to the *khalîfa* of Plato, Aristotle: “If it were not for Aristotle, Alexander would

²⁶³ *Mesnevî* commentator, İsmail Hakkı Bursevî (d. 1725), indicates that there were two Alexanders in history. The first Alexander, according to Bursevî, was contemporary with the Prophet Abraham. The second Alexander was the one whose tutor was Aristotle. Bursevî adds that the first Alexander was a believer of God and that perhaps he was a prophet. However, according to Bursevî, the second Alexander was an infidel. Bursevî asserts that most scholars and poets did not know this fact: “Mezkûr İskender, Hazret-i İbrahim 'Aleyhisselâm ile mu'âsır olduğu kütüb-i tevârîhde mestûrdur. İmânı müttefakun 'aleydir ve nübüvveti muhtelefün fihdır ve bir İskender dahî vardır ki, âna Zülkarneynü'l-Asğar ve İskender-i Rûmî dahî dirlər ki hukemâ-i meşâhîrden Aristalis âna vezîr olmuşdur. Mısır kurbünde olan İskenderiye'de nasb-i meyl ve vaz'-i âyîne iden bu İskender'dir....Bunun zamânı Hazret-i İsâ 'aleyhisselama karîbdır ve küfri müttefakun 'aleyhdır ve bu iki İskender'in miyânını fark itmeyüb ulemâ ve *şu'arâdan* çok kimesne ğalata düşmüşdür.” See İsmâ'il Hakkı Bursevî, *Rûhu'l-Mesnevî*, vol. 1, (İstanbul: Matba'a-i Âmire, 1287), 349. For more information about the perception of Alexander the Great in the Islamic tradition, see Mino S. Southgate, “Portrait of Alexander in Persian Alexander-Romances of the Islamic Era,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 97, no. 3 (July-September, 1977), pp. 278-284.

²⁶⁴ For information about the *Mecmû'a-i Kelimât-i Kudsiyye-i Hazret-i Mısrî*, see Derin Terzioğlu, “Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyazi-i Mısrî (1618-1694),” p. 19.

²⁶⁵ Derin Terzioğlu, “Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyazi-i Mısrî (1618-1694),” p. 292.

not have been praised in the Qur'an, and achieve the renown that will last until the Day of Judgment. It is the shaykhs of monarchs who make or ruin their reputation".²⁶⁶ Similar examples abound in the Sufi literature. As will be examined in the sixth chapter, Baba Yusuf's writings had a similar Sufi outlook regarding the meaning of being a sultan.

A similar story in terms of Sufis' attitude towards political authority was narrated in the *Otman Baba Vilâyetnâmesi*.²⁶⁷ The story is related to the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II (1451-1481) and Otman Baba. One day, while sitting at Silivri-Kapı, Otman Baba heard that the sultan intended to conquer Belgrade, which was at the hands of the Hungarians at that time. According to the *Vilâyetnâme*, Otman Baba warned Mehmed II not to undertake the Belgrade campaign against the Hungarians: "They shall squeeze fire in the bells and you will have to flee (*Çanlarına od tıkarlar, kaçarsın*)."²⁶⁸ The sultan did not take this warning seriously and undertook the Belgrade campaign. During the campaign what Otman said came true.²⁶⁹ On the way back from the campaign, Mehmed II again met Otman Baba and Otman Baba asked: "Tell me who is the sultan, you or I?" The Sultan dismounted at once and kissed Otman Baba's hand and said: "You are the *Pâdishâh* and the Divine *sirr*, my beloved

²⁶⁶ Terzioğlu, p. 292.

²⁶⁷ İnalçık explains the importance of the *Otman Baba Vilâyetnâmesi* as follows: "*Vilâyetnâme-i Sultan Otman*, also referred to in the work as *Vilâyetnâme-i Shâhî* or *Vilâyetnâme-i Sultan Baba*, was completed in August 1483 by one of Baba's dervishes, Küçük Abdal, a nickname given by Otman Baba himself. From a reference in the work we learn that the author was with Otman Baba in the Dobruja in 1462. Written by one of Baba's dervishes who evidently collected material carefully, and from Baba's own words, the *Vilâyetnâme* constitutes an important source for an authentic account of Baba's life, the Sufi doctrine of abdalism, and the history of Rum Abdalları in general." See Halil İnalçık, "Dervish and Sultan: An Analysis of the *Otman Baba Vilâyetnâmesi*," in Halil İnalçık, ed., *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society*, (Indiana: Bloomington, 1993), p. 19.

²⁶⁸ Halil İnalçık, "Dervish and Sultan: An Analysis of the *Otman Baba Vilâyetnâmesi*," pp. 28-29.

²⁶⁹ İnalçık, p. 29. İnalçık explains Mehmed II's siege of Belgrade as follows: "Mehmed II's main task in the Balkans was to undermine Hungarian influence. In 1451 the Despot of Serbia, Brankovic, with Hungarian aid, seized the Krusevac region, thus extending Hungarian influence across the Danube towards the heart of the Balkans. After the conquest of Istanbul, Mehmed, in four campaigns, brought Serbia into subjection, finally annexing it in 1459. In 1456, however, the Hungarians had forced him to abandon the siege of Belgrade." Halil İnalçık, *The Ottoman Empire, the Classical Age: 1300-1600*, (London: Phoenix, 1995), p. 27.

father. I am only your humble servant.” Baba said: “You should know that I am Pâdishah, not you.”²⁷⁰ Whether that story was true or not, it reflected the perception of dervishes about the kingship of the world.

Aflâkî narrates a similar story between Celâleddin Rûmî’s father, Bahâeddin Veled who was known as *Sultânü’l-’ulemâ* (the Sultan of the Religious Scholars), and Muhammed Khvârazmshah. Before leaving Balkh, Bahâeddin Veled said the following words to the Khvârazmshah during his Friday sermon:

Oh king of this transient realm, know and be aware – though you do not know and are not aware- that you are a sultan and I am sultan. They call you Sultan of the Commanders and they call me Sultan of the Religious Scholars, and you are my disciple. Verily, your dominion and kingship depend on a single breath, and my kingship and dominion are also attached to a single breath. Once that breath is cut off from your carnal soul, you shall not remain and your throne, good fortune, kingdom, descendants, family line and connections shall not remain....But when our precious breath leaves our carnal soul, our lineage and offspring, who are the Tent Pegs of the earth, will exist until the advent of the Resurrection.²⁷¹

After these challenging words, Bahâeddin Veled added that the Mongols would arrive soon and that they would destroy the realm of the Khvârazmshah.²⁷²

Interestingly, Aflâkî related the calamity of the Mongol invasion of the kingdom of Khvârazmshah to Bahâeddin Veled’s leaving of Balkh. The question of how dervishes perceived the Mongols will be discussed in the fifth chapter.

İnalçık divides the religious orders in the Ottoman Empire into two main groups. The first group of the religious orders in the Ottoman Empire consisted of the established orders, the lodges of which were supported by the income coming from pious foundations. This group of religious orders had "a clearly defined organization and fixed rites and ceremonies."²⁷³ The most well-known of these orders consisted of the Naqshbandîs, the Mevlevîs, and the Halvetîs. As indicated earlier, these orders

²⁷⁰ Halil İnalçık, "Dervish and Sultan: An Analysis of the *Otman Baba Vilâyetnâmesi*," p. 29.

²⁷¹ Shams al-Dîn Ahmad-e Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God (Manâqeb al-’ârefîn)*, tr. John O’Kane, (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2002), p. 13.

²⁷² Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 13.

²⁷³ Halil İnalçık, *The Ottoman Empire, the Classical Age: 1300-1600*, p. 190.

existed in the Province of Karaman in the fifteenth century. According to İnalçık, the second group of religious orders in the Ottoman Empire were the “secret orders”, usually known as the *Melâmîs* or *Melâmetîs*, which sought blame of the people for perfection of their soul.²⁷⁴ The *Melâmîs* avoided all external organization and symbols. Since they were more or less opposed to political authority, they did not have any link with the state.²⁷⁵

As indicated earlier, the register of the foundations of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483 pointed out only two Sufi orders, the *Mevlevî* and the *Halvetî* orders. However, in the light of other sources such as Sufi hagiographies, it would not be wrong to assume that there were other Sufi orders such as Naqshbandiyya in the Province of Karaman in the late fifteenth century. In this chapter, after a brief introduction to the *Melâmiyye* movement, the *Mevlevî*, *Naqshbandî* and *Halvetî* Orders will be discussed.

3.1 The *Melâmîs* and Political Authority

The *Melâmî* movement was significant in the Province of Karaman. As will be discussed in the sixth chapter, Baba Yusuf-i Aksarayî (d. 1487), who was the *khalîfa* of Hacı Bayram, manifested strong *melâmî* inclinations in his works. Pîr Aliyy-i Aksarayî (d. 1528), who was believed to be one of the *qutbs* (the pole of the age) of the *Melâmî*-Bayramî order, was subject to political oppression due to the accusation of being a *mehdî*.²⁷⁶ What follows is a brief historical background of the *Melâmî* movement.

²⁷⁴ Halil İnalçık, *The Classical Age: 1300-1600*, p. 191.

²⁷⁵ İnalçık, p. 191.

²⁷⁶ Dina Le Gall defines *mehdî* as follows: “the awaited savior who, according to a widely held Islamic belief, will restore religion and justice before the end of the world; various messianic movements in Islamic history acted in the name of declared mehdîs,” Dina Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 236. For more information about Pîr Aliyy-i Aksarayî, see Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, *Melamilik*

In his *Risâlat al-Malâmatîyya*, Abû 'Abd al-Rahman al-Sulamî (d. 412/1021) discussed not only the biographies of the Sufis but also different types of Sufism. Al-Sulamî explained the Malâmatîs as follows: "He [God] has granted them [the *Melâmîs*] all kinds of spiritual graces, but does not expose them to the view of the common people; their outward behavior is that of people who live in separation from God, but inwardly they dwell in the sweetness of divine union."²⁷⁷ Thus, according to al-Sulamî, the blame of the common people towards the *Melâmîs* does not necessarily mean the blame of God towards the *Melâmîs*. Conversely, according to al-Sulamî, the *Melâmîs* were those who reach the grace of God due to the fact that they always contemplate God from their hearts. As will be mentioned later, Al-Sulamî was one of the Sufî authors mentioned by Baba Yusuf in his *Treatise on Sufism (İlmü'l-Meşâyikh)*.

In his work entitled *Tomar-ı Turuk-ı Aliyye, Melâmîlik*, Sâdık Vicdânî classified the *Melâmîs* into three periods:

- 1- *Melâmîs* of the first period (*Devre-i ûlâ Melâmîleri*),
- 2- *Melâmîs* of the middle period (*Devre-i Vustâ Melâmîleri*),
- 3- *Melâmîs* of the last period (*Devre-i Uhrâ Melâmîleri*).²⁷⁸

The *Melâmîs* of the first period emerged in the third century of the Islamic calendar at Nishapur. The *Melâmîs* of the first period are also known as the *Qassâriyuns* due to the name of the famous *Melâmî* or *Melâmatî*, Abû Sâlih Hamdûn b. Ahmad b. Ammâr al-Qassâr.²⁷⁹ Nevertheless, it would be wrong to assume that al-

ve *Melâmîler*, (İstanbul: Gri Yayın, 1992), pp. 43-47; Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, "XVI.-XVII. Yüzyıllarda Bayramî (Hamzavî) Melâmîleri ve Osmanlı Yönetimi," *Belleten*, vol. 61, no. 230 (April 1997), pp. 95-96; Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler (15.-17. Yüzyıllar)*, third edition (first published in 1998), (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2003), pp. 270-272.

²⁷⁷ Annemarie Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, p. 87.

²⁷⁸ Sâdık Vicdânî, *Tomar-ı Turuk-ı Aliyye, Birinci Cüz: Melâmîlik*, (İstanbul: 1338), p. 24.

²⁷⁹ "Devre-i ûlâ Melâmîliğine Kassâriye; mensûblarına Kassâriyân nâmı verilmişdir; çünkü bu melâmîlik tabaka-i ûlâ evliyâ-i izâmından Ebî Sâlih Hamdûn bin Ahmed bin Ammâratu'l-Kassâru'n-

Qassâr was the first Melâmî. There were Melâmîs before al-Qassâr. What al-Qassâr did was to spread the Melâmiyye in Nishapur in an organized way. Al-Qassâr was the head of Melâmîs in Nishapur and played a crucial role in disseminating the ideas and practices of the Melâmî Order.²⁸⁰ The Melâmîs of the middle period is known as *Melâmî-Bayrâmîs*. Al-Hajj Seyyid Muhammad Nûru'l-Arabiyyü'l-Melâmî is known as the Master of the Melâmîs of the third period.

The Bayrâmî-Melâmî Order was founded after the death of Hacı Bayram-i Velî (d. 1429), the founder of the Bayrâmî Order.²⁸¹ Bayramî Order was divided into two branches. The first one led by Ak Şemseddin (d. 1459), who was the shaykh of the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II, had a conformist attitude towards the rulers. The second one, the Bayramî-Melâmî Order, was led by Dede Ömer (d. 1455).²⁸² Following the example of Hacı Bayram, the Melâmî-Bayramîs were eager to reap the fruits of their labor and did not accept any alms from the state or from individuals.²⁸³ They were subject to some prohibitions from the Ottoman government. In spite of the strict control on their activities, they managed to build several lodges in the Ottoman Empire.²⁸⁴

The Melâmîs were sympathetic towards the Safavids. Thus, the Ottoman government treated them ruthlessly in the sixteenth century. For instance, İsmail Ma'şûkî, the *qutb* of the Melâmîs, was executed on the Atmeydanı with his twelve disciples, in 1529. Also, in 1561, Şeyhülislam Ebussu'ud condemned to death another Melâmî, Hamza Bâlî of Bosnia. In his *fetvâ* (religious opinion on a legal

Nişâbûrî kaddesellâhu sirrahu'l-âlîye mensûbdur," Sâdık Vicedânî, *Tomar-ı Turuk-ı Aliyye, Birinci Cüz: Melâmîlik*, p. 25.

²⁸⁰ Abdülbâkî Gölpinarlı, *Melâmîlik ve Melâmîler*, (İstanbul: Gri Yayın, 1992), p. 5.

²⁸¹ Gölpinarlı, *Melâmîlik ve Melâmîler*, p. 34.

²⁸² Rüya Kılıç, "Bir Tarikatın Gizli Direnişi: Bayramî Melâmîleri veya Hamzavîler," *Tasavvuf*, vol. 4, no. 10 (June, 2003), p. 252; J. Spencer Trimmingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam*, p. 78.

²⁸³ Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire, the Classical Age: 1300-1600*, p. 191.

²⁸⁴ Selçuk Eraydın, *Tasavvuf ve Tarikatlar*, (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1997), p. 424.

issue), Ebussu'ud declared Hamza Bâlî as a heretic and an atheist. Hamza Bâlî was accused of gathering a few thousand disciples around him in his homeland in Saraybosna.²⁸⁵ The execution of Hamza Bâlî had a deep effect on the minds of the people. Hamza Bâlî became a "patron saint of the *Melâmîs*, who henceforth were often known as Hamzawîs."²⁸⁶ The Hamzawîs who were concentrated in Bosnia were subject to persecution in the seventeenth century. Yet, the Melâmî Order began to spread in the big cities of the Ottoman Empire, such as Istanbul and Edirne. Later, it also infiltrated into the ruling classes.²⁸⁷

3.2 The Mevlevî Order

According to Annemarie Schimmel, Turkish culture "owes much to the Mevlevis. They were the order that cultivated calligraphy and music, as well as poetry in the classical Persian Ottoman style."²⁸⁸ Since the thirteenth century, the city of Konya, the capital of the Anatolian Seljukids and of the Karamanids, has been known for its saint, Celâleddin Rûmî (1207-73).²⁸⁹ Since the literature on Rûmî is rich enough, rather than dealing with the details of his biography, focus is placed on his *Discourses (Fîhi Mâ Fîh)* in order to understand how his discourse affected the lives of his descendants, particularly Çelebi Ârif. It was in the time of Çelebi Ârif (d. 719/1320) that the Mevlevî Order became an international Sufî order exceeding the borders of Ârif's homeland, Anatolia, and gaining new followers in the Ilkhanid capital, Tabriz. In the *Menâkübü'l-Ârifîn* ("The Feats of the Knowers of God"),²⁹⁰

²⁸⁵ İncalcık, *The Classical Age: 1300-1600*, pp. 192-193.

²⁸⁶ İncalcık, p. 193.

²⁸⁷ İncalcık, p. 193.

²⁸⁸ Annemarie Schimmel, "Sufism and Spiritual Life in Turkey," in *Islamic Spirituality*,

Manifestations, vol. II, ed. Seyyed Hossein Nasr, (New York: SCM Press Ltd., 1991), p. 228.

²⁸⁹ See, for instance, Abdûlbaki Gölpınarlı. *Mevlânâ Celâleddin*, (İstanbul, 1959); Abdûlbaki Gölpınarlı, *Mevlana'dan Sonra Mevlevilik*, (İstanbul, 1953).

²⁹⁰ See Shams al-Dîn Ahmad-e Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God (Manâqeb al-ârefîn)*, tr. John O'Kane, (Leiden & Boston & Köln: Brill, 2002).

Şemsüddin Ahmed Aflâkî (d. 761/1360)²⁹¹ narrated the rise of the Mevlevî Order as an international order. More importantly, he was a witness of this process. Köprülü explains the significance of Aflâkî's *Menâkib* as follows:

It is an unrivalled source for religious and social history. No other historical document can compare with it in describing the daily life, organization of cities and villages, characteristics of nomads, relations among social classes, religious movements, economic conditions, dress, customs of Anatolia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In a number of subjects that I have studied, I noticed that Aflâkî completely agrees with our most reliable sources, including inscriptions. Indeed, this *menâkib* book, which is frequently based on what the author personally saw and heard, was written much more carefully than many chronicles.²⁹²

Aflâkî indicates that his shaykh, Çelebi Ârif, spent most of his time with “the sight-seeing of travels and reading books of secrets.”²⁹³ Aflâkî, who accompanied Çelebi Ârif in most of his travels, states that even on his deathbed, Çelebi Ârif reminded Aflâkî of collecting the feats (*menâkib*) of previous Mevlevî shaykhs: “Do not go anywhere else, and busy yourself with [what] I have told you, i.e. collecting the feats (*menâkib*) of our forefathers and ancestors and writing them down until you complete this.”²⁹⁴

The contribution of Çelebi Ârif to the Mevlevî Order was twofold. Firstly, he tried to gain new disciples during his various travels. While narrating the sermons of Çelebi Ârif in various cities, Aflâkî describes dervish lodges as places of gathering

²⁹¹ John O’Kane gives the following information about Aflâkî: “Not much is known about Şemseddin Ahmed Aflâkî-yi Ârifî beyond the bare facts he incidentally reveals in his extensive work the *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn*. Since he gives no information in the reports he presents indicating that he had grown up in Konya, we are probably justified in assuming that he was neither born, nor did he spend his childhood, in the Seljukid capital. We learn from the *Menâkib* that his father died in Saray where he apparently enjoyed patronage at the court of Özbek Khan, as a religious scholar or a man of distinction. It is thought that Aflâkî may have acquired his surname because he had undertaken some astronomical research (*aflâk* : the heavenly spheres), and in one place in the *Menâkib* he is addressed as ‘*attâr*, perfume-seller or druggist, indicating that he had had some training in this area as well.” Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. IX.

²⁹² Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, *The Seljuks of Anatolia, Their History and Culture according to Local Muslim Sources* [translation and edition of “Anadolu Tarihi’nin Yerli Kaynakları”, originally published in *Belleten* 7 (1943)] tr.& ed. Gary Leiser , (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1992), p. 39.

²⁹³ Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 611.

²⁹⁴ Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 681. For the original (Persian) version of that story, see Şams al-Dîn Ahmed al-Aflâkî al-Ârifî, *Manâkib al-Ârifîn*, vol. 2, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1976), p. 970.

where people were fascinated by the speech of Çelebi Ârif and where most of the audience became his disciples.²⁹⁵ Secondly, Çelebi Ârif ordered his disciple, Aflâkî, to compile the deeds of his forefathers and ancestors. Aflâkî's *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn* represented the common past of the Mevlevî Order. It was one of the basic texts to be narrated by the shaykhs to the dervishes in the Mevlevî lodges.

The source of inspiration for Çelebi Ârif's travels might be sought in the life and teaching of his grandfather, Celâleddin Rûmî. When Rûmî and his father came to Lârende, today's Karaman, from Balkh, Emîr Musa built a *madrassa* for Rûmî's father, Bahâeddin Veled.²⁹⁶ Seljuk Sultan Alâeddin Keykubad I (1219-1237) invited Bahâeddin Veled to Konya. As will be examined in the fifth chapter, the Karamanid rulers also patronized Mevlevî dervishes. The Mevlevî Order spread to the Balkans and further lands under the patronage of the Ottoman sultans. From the fifteenth century onwards, Mevlevî lodges spread to many Ottoman cities. Most of the Ottoman sultans, in particular Murad II, Bayezid II, Selim I and Murad III, were closely interested in the *Mevlevî* dervishes. For instance, Murad II patronized the

²⁹⁵ Şams al-Dîn Ahmed al-Aflâkî al-Ârifî, *Manâkib al-Ârifîn*, vol. 2, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, pp. 939, 945, 952, 954, 958, 962.

²⁹⁶ Aflâkî narrates the building of the *madrassa* for Rûmî's father by Emîr Musa as follows: "When...Bahâ-e Veled left Erzincan and, stopping at one halting-station after another, arrived at the city of Lârende which is a dependency of Konya. One of the lieutenants of the sultan of Islam 'Alâü'd-dünyâ ve'd-dîn Keykubad was there, a person named Emîr Mûsâ who was the *subaşı* and governor of that province. What a man he was! He was a Turk, a brave warrior, pure of heart and a sincere seeker. Emîr Mûsâ heard that so great a person was arriving from Khorasan and he knew that such a sun (*chor*) did not shine so easily (*âsân*) in every place. He came forth on foot with all inhabitants of the city and the military to welcome him, and they became disciples. As much as he invited him to his palace, Bahâ-e Veled would not consent. But he did request a *madrassa* with the result that Emîr Mûsâ ordered a *madrassa* to be built for Bahâ-e Veled in the middle of the city," Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 20. For the original (Persian) version of that story, see Şams al-Dîn Ahmed al-Aflâkî al-Ârifî, *Manâkib al-Ârifîn*, vol. 1, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1976), pp. 25, 26; for the Turkish version of that story, see Ahmed Aflâkî, *Âriflerin Menkibeleri (Mevlâna ve Etrafindakiler)*, tr. Tahsin Yazıcı, vol. 1, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1986), p. 100. According to the *evkâf defteri* of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483, known as Murad Çelebi Defteri, there was *vakf* of the *madrassa* of Emîr Mûsâ in Lârende. The register does not give the date of establishment of the *madrassa* and it does not have any information regarding for whom it was built: "Vakf-i madrasa-i Emîr Mûsâ der nefsi Lârende tedris der tasarruf-i Mevlânâ Behlül be hükm-i şerîf tevliyet der tasarruf-i Mahmud be-hükm-i Hümâyûn," M. Akif Erdoğan, "Murad Çelebi Defteri: 1483 Yılında Karaman Vilâyetinde Vakıflar II," *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. 18, no. 2 (December 2003), p. 119.

building of a large Mevlevî lodge in the Ottoman capital, Edirne. As under the Karamanids, the Mevlevî Order under the Ottomans had also succeeded in gaining followers in the ruling class.²⁹⁷

The friendly attitude of the Mevlevîs towards the sultans may be attributed to the teaching of Celâleddin Rûmî (1207-1273). Rûmî's *Fîhi Mâ Fîh (Discourses)* begins with the famous saying of the Prophet about the relations between the scholars and princes: "The worst of scholars is he who visits princes, and the best of princes is he who visits scholars. Happy is the prince who stands at the poor man's door, and wretched is the poor man who stands at the door of the prince."²⁹⁸ After quoting this famous saying Rûmî begins to interpret it in a different manner:

People have taken the outward sense of these words to signify that it is not right for a scholar to visit a prince, lest he should become amongst the worst of scholars. That is not their true meaning, as they have supposed. Their meaning is rather this: that the worst of scholars is he who accepts help from princes, and whose welfare and salvation is dependent upon and stems from the fear of princes....When, however, the case is otherwise, when the scholar has not become qualified with learning on account of princes but rather his learning from first to last has been for the sake of God....If such a scholar goes formally to visit the prince, it is himself who is visited and the prince is the visitor.²⁹⁹

Although Rûmî justifies the visit of some scholars to the kings, he makes clear how he perceives a dervish and a king in the following pages of *Discourses*:

A dervish once entered the presence of a king. The king addressed him, 'O ascetic.' 'You are the ascetic,' dervish answered. 'How should I be an ascetic,' the king demanded, 'seeing that the whole world belongs to me?' 'Ah, you see things the opposite of what they are,' replied the dervish. 'This world and the next and all that there is to possess, these all belong to me. I have seized the whole world. It is you who have become satisfied with a mouthful and a rag.'³⁰⁰

The statements made by the dervish to the king is reminiscent of the words of

²⁹⁷ Inalcık, *The Classical Age*, p. 201.

²⁹⁸ *Discourses of Rûmî*, tr. Arthur J. Arberry, (Richmond: Curzon Pres, 1994), p. 13.

²⁹⁹ *Discourses of Rûmî*, p. 13; see also Mevlânâ Celâleddin Rûmî, *Fîhi Mâ Fîh*, tr. Ahmed Avni Konuk, (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 1994), pp. 5-6.

³⁰⁰ *Discourses of Rûmî*, pp. 31-32; see also Mevlânâ Celâleddin Rûmî, *Fîhi Mâ Fîh*, tr. Ahmed Avni Konuk, p. 21.

Bahâeddin Veled to Muhammed Khvârazmshah. Although dervishes claimed to be distant from the pleasures of the world by using such discourses, they competed with each other to gain favor of the sultans.

Ahmet T. Karamustafa sees in Mevlevi tradition “two conflicting modes of spirituality.” The first was a “socially conformist approach that tried to direct Rûmî’s ecstatic piety into legally acceptable channels.”³⁰¹ The conformists were called “the arm of Veled” after Rûmî’s son, Sultan Veled (d. 712/1312).³⁰² The second mode of spirituality in the Mevlevî tradition, according to Karamustafa, was associated with the name of Shams of Tabriz from Azerbaijan. The second approach did not exercise “any kind of control over ecstatic spiritual experience.”³⁰³ The social deviants were called “the arm of Shams.”³⁰⁴ According to Karamustafa, the arm of Shams was evident since the early phases of the Mevlevî Order.

Karamustafa cites Çelebi Ârif (d. 720/1320) as an example of “the arm of Shams” based on the fact that he openly consumed wine and maintained good relations with socially deviant dervishes, such as followers of Barak Baba.³⁰⁵ Nevertheless, like conformist dervishes, Ârif Çelebi also maintained good relations with the begs of his time. This practice was in line with the teaching of Ârif’s grandfather, Rûmî, who justified the visit of scholars and Sufis to the rulers of the time. Aflâkî explains in detail the visits of his shaykh, Çelebi Ârif, to the rulers and begs of his time. As indicated earlier, according to Aflâkî, Çelebi Ârif traveled to the Ilkhanid capital, Tabriz, in the first years of the reign of Ghazan Khan (r. 1295-

³⁰¹ Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*, p. 82.

³⁰² Karamustafa, p. 82. For information about Sultan Veled and his works, see Sultan Veled, *İbtidâ-nâme*, tr. Abdülâkî Gölpınarlı, (Konya: Konya ve Mülhakatı Eski Eserleri Sevenler Derneği, 2001), pp. I-XIX.

³⁰³ Karamustafa, p. 82.

³⁰⁴ Karamustafa, p. 82.

³⁰⁵ Karamustafa, p. 82.

1304).³⁰⁶ Aflakî narrates this event as follows: “At the time that Ghazan Khan had recently become sovereign (*pâdshâh*), Çelebi Ârif felt the desire to go to see the lands of Persian Iraq (*‘Irak-i ‘Acem*) and to meet the prominent man of that region.”³⁰⁷ According to Aflakî, when Ghazan Khan heard about Çelebi Ârif’s miracles, he invited Çelebi Ârif to his palace. However, Ârif declined the offer by these words: “His [Ghazan Khan’s] welfare consists in our not meeting him. From a distance we will invoke God on behalf of the just sultan’s good fortune....and we will remain engaged in our dervishhood.”³⁰⁸ As understood from the story, initially being a dervish, Çelebi Ârif distanced himself from the sultan, Ghazan Khan, whom he called *sultân-i ‘âdil* (just sultan).³⁰⁹ Then Ghazan Khan ordered his viziers to devise some plan so that he might see Ârif’s “blessed face one time.”³¹⁰ Hearing the words of her husband, Ghazan Khan, Iltermesh Khatun said: “I will make arrangements for a gathering and offer him a *semâ’* so that his blessed face will be seen.”³¹¹ Iltermesh Khatun sent the son of Şeyhülislam of the Ilkhanids to invite Çelebi Ârif to the *semâ’* (“a collective ritual of listening to chanted verses with or without musical accompaniment as a way of helping to induce ecstatic states”).³¹²

³⁰⁶ Hodgson explains the reign of Ghazan Khan as follows: “In 1295 a Buddhist, Ghazan, took the throne and forthwith turned Muslim, seeing value in an Islamic policy for the state....At Tabriz, the capital, not only Buddhist temples but churches and synagogues were torn down. However, the war against Muslim Egypt was continued; by 1300 Damascus was occupied, with much destruction, but in 1303 the Mongols were disastrously defeated in Syria. Ghazan now patronized specifically Islamic learning, but retained the old breath of vision....Ghazan’s vizier, whose efforts at sound administration, he firmly supported, was a physician and scholar, Rashiduddin Fazlullah....A town for scholars which he [Rashiduddin Fazlullah] built near Tabriz was provided not only with a great library and arrangements for tradesmen and the like, but fifty physicians, some of whom were brought Egypt and India and China.” Marshall G. S. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam*, vol. 2, p. 415.

³⁰⁷ Aflakî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 589; Şams al-Dîn Ahmed al-Aflakî al-Ârifî, *Manâkib al-Ârifîn*, vol. 2, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, p. 844.

³⁰⁸ Aflakî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 591; Aflakî, *Manâkib al-Ârifîn*, vol. 2, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, p. 847.

³⁰⁹ *Manâkib al-Ârifîn*, p. 847.

³¹⁰ Aflakî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 591; Aflakî, *Manâkib al-Ârifîn*, p. 847.

³¹¹ Aflakî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 591; *Manâkib al-Ârifîn*, p. 847.

³¹² Dina Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 238.

Ârif accepted the invitation.³¹³ During the *semâ'*, according to Aflâkî, Çelebi Ârif recited “several wondrous quatrains.”³¹⁴ In the end, Ghazan Khan became a *muhibb* of Çelebi Ârif and his wife, Iltermesh Khatun, became a *mürîd* (disciple) of Ârif.³¹⁵

Dina Le Gall defines the word *muhibb* as follows: “literally, ‘lover’; one of several words used to denote a Sufî, sometimes in the sense of a shaykh’s casual follower rather than a full-fledged disciple.”³¹⁶ Aflâkî narrates the story so skillfully of how his shaykh declined the invitation of a sultan like Ghazan Khan. The real hero of the story was not Ghazan Khan who became only a *muhibb* (“a casual follower”) of Çelebi Ârif but Iltermesh Khatun whose invitation was accepted by Çelebi Ârif. In the end, Iltermesh Khatun became a *mürîd* of Ârif. The word *mürîd* signified a higher stage than the word *muhibb* in the Sufî hierarchy. This story also signifies the role of women in the rise of the *Mevlevî* Order.

Aflâkî’s *Menâkib* is a valuable source in terms of the role of women in the society and politics of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Aflâkî narrated the stories related to the women of the time, particularly those women who were the wives or daughters of the Seljukid and the Ilkhanid sultans or statesmen. It seems that Aflâkî tried to denote how the *Mevlevî* Order played a crucial role in the social and political life of the time. Interestingly, Aflâkî perceived the family of Rûmî as a spiritual dynasty rivalling the political dynasties of the time in terms of popularity. He called the family of Rûmî “*hânedân*.” In most cases, the women of the dynasties of the time served the family of Rûmî. For instance, according to Aflâkî, the wife of

³¹³ Aflâkî does not mention the name of the Şeyhülislam and his son. See *Manâkib al-’Ârifîn*, p. 847.

³¹⁴ Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 591; *Manâkib al-’Ârifîn*, p. 847.

³¹⁵ *Manâkib al-’Ârifîn*, p. 848.

³¹⁶ Dina Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 236.

the Ilkhanid Sultan Keyghatu (r. 1291-1295),³¹⁷ Paşa Hatun, was one of the lovers of the family of Rûmî (*hânedân*).³¹⁸ Çelebi Ârif was calling her “*Bânû-yi rûy-i zemîn* (“Lady of the earth’s surface”).³¹⁹ In another part of his book, Aflâkî mentions the list of Seljukid women who attended a *semâ’*-gathering led by Çelebi Ârif at Tokat: “Gumaj Hâtun, Khâvandzâde, the daughter of Mu’îneddin Pervâne, and the daughter of the Master of the Wine (*şarab-sâlâr*).”³²⁰

Aflâkî narrates another visit of Çelebi Ârif to the new Ilkhanid capital, Sultâniya, in the year 716/1316. Aflâkî was among those who accompanied Çelebi on this journey, which began in 715/1316. Aflâkî explains the reason for this visit as follows: “Along with the noble disciples I accompanied that sultan of mankind [Çelebi Ârif]—God elevate his memory— when he decided to set out for Sultâniye to give advice to the sovereign of the era, Oljeytu Khan, and to bring him back to life from the religion of the Shi’ites and the Râfedites.”³²¹ Aflâkî was correct in stating that Oljeytu Khan (r. 1310-1317) adopted Shi’ite sect of Islam. According to Spuler, Oljeytu Khan put pressure on the Sunnî subjects of the Ilkhanids. Oljeytu’s pro-

³¹⁷ For more information about Keyghatu, See Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, tr. John O’Kane, p. 723; Bertold Spuler, *İran Moğolları, Siyaset, İdare ve Kültür, İlhanlılar Devri, 1220-1350*, tr. Cemal Köprülü, second edition (first published in 1957), (Ankara, 1987), pp. 99-103.

³¹⁸ “Hîdmet-i Paşa Hatun.... ez cümle-i muhibbân-i hânedân bûde,” *Manâkib al-’Ârifîn*, p. 889.

³¹⁹ *Manâkib al-’Ârifîn*, p. 889; *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 622.

³²⁰ *Manâkib al-’Ârifîn*, p. 891; *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 623. Claude Cahen calls Mu’îneddin Suleyman Pervâne “a true dictator under the Mongol pretocerate” and gives the following information about Pervâne: “The period extending from the flight of ‘Izz al-Dîn or, alternatively, from the appointment of a little earlier of Mu’îneddin Suleyman (still known as the *pervâne*) as the real head of the government under Rukn al-Dîn, until his tragic death in 1277, marks a stage in the decline of the Seljukid State, an attempt to strike a balance – a difficult feat which, save at the end, he managed to achieve- between the desire to retain the Mongols’ full confidence and the re-organization of the State in some of its traditional aspects, particularly as a Muslim State. The task was not easy but, whatever his personal ambitions, it may be thought that Mu’în al-Dîn succeeded in giving the inhabitants of Rûm a respite, or indeed a period of recovery, after the ordeals of recent years.” See Claude Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey, A General Survey of the Material and Spiritual Culture and History, 1071-1330*, tr. J. Jones-Williams, (London: Sidwick and Jackson, 1968), pp. 222, 280.

³²¹ Shams al-Dîn Ahmad-e Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God (Manâqeb al-’ârefîn)*, tr. John O’Kane, p. 600.

Shi'ite policies led to resistance in the cities of Baghdad, Isfahan, and Shiraz.³²² By narrating that visit, Aflâkî tried to emphasize the loyalty of the Mevlevî Order to the Sunnî sect. According to Aflâkî, when they arrived at the city of Sultâniya in the year 716, Oljeytu had already died.³²³ Again, Aflâkî was right about the year of death of Oljeytu, who died in the year 716/1316.³²⁴ In that story, Aflâkî mentions Hâce Reşîdüddin Fazlullah (645-718/1247-1318), who was the author of *Câmi'ü't-tevârih* (Collection of Histories)³²⁵, and Hâce Ali Shah, who were the viziers of Oljeytu.³²⁶

³²² Bertold Spuler, *İran Moğolları, Siyaset, İdare ve Kültür, İlhanlılar Devri, 1220-1350*, tr. Cemal Köprülü, p. 266.

³²³ *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 601.

³²⁴ Bertold Spuler, *İran Moğolları, Siyaset, İdare ve Kültür, İlhanlılar Devri, 1220-1350*, tr. Cemal Köprülü, p. 131.

³²⁵ Hodgson explains the importance of Reşîdüddin as a statesman and a historian as follows: "But at least as suggestive developments in historical writing came in the Persianate realm, where history was accepted as an important part of belles-letters, as part of the glory of the Turkic amîrs and sultans. With Mongol rule had come a broadening in the world perspective that already was relatively broad among Muslims. The vizier of the Il-khans, Rashiduddin Fazlullah, whom we have met as a vigorous administrator supplying hospitals and establishing villages, had broad intellectual interests; by profession originally a physician, he wrote on diverse subjects, including theology and most notably history. He was a patron of many historians, but himself compiled the most substantial historical work of the time. His 'Collection of Histories' may be reckoned as the first of the works having some claim to be called 'world histories' that could justify such a claim in the sense of being reasonably comprehensive. Taking advantage of the extensive official contacts of the Mongol court, as well as of the distant trade that converged on Marâghah and Tabriz the capitals, Rashiduddin enlisted the services of the learned men from all regions, even from such relatively out-of-the way lands as the Occident or Kashmir and Tibet (whose missionaries were wide-ranging at that time, however). He evidently chose his informants for their reliability and had such records as they could produce or recall rendered- and doubtless normally abridged- into Persian, and edited them in an accurate and matter-of-fact way. The result was a systematic set of accounts of the peoples of the greater part of the citted societies of the Oikoumene. The whole was more balanced in its coverage, having substantial amounts of material not only on Muslim but on non-Muslim peoples, than any other history written up to that time; and, though his example was followed to some degree in the subsequent Persian historical tradition, Rashiduddin's work was more comprehensive and balanced than any later history claiming to be a world history until the twentieth century." Marshall G. S. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam*, vol. 2, p. 485.

³²⁶ Aflâkî does not give detailed information about the Ilkhanid viziers. He only points out the uneasiness of the Ilkhanid viziers about the timing of the *semâ'*-gathering: "The prominent men of Sultâniye were still in their mourning clothes, and so far no *semâ'*-session had taken place and they had not beat the kettledrums. When the sound of the kettledrums and the uproar of the people of the *semâ'* reached the ears of the viziers, i.e. Hâce Reşîdüddin, Hâce Ali Shah and others, they sent Hâce Sa'îd, the sovereign's Master of the Wardrobe, and inquired about the situation, saying: 'How and why had they committed this untimely boldness without permission from the men of rank. Until Bû Sa'îd Khan comes and Chuban is present, it is inappropriate for anyone to indulge in rejoicing at the same time as this mourning.' When Hâce Sa'îd entered through the door of the retreat (*zâviye*) and beheld Çelebi in a state of great excitement, his eyes filled with tears and, placing his head at Çelebi's foot, he lost his senses. Then Çelebi embraced him and said: 'Tell the esteemed men of prominence: Although the king is dead, our King remains. For whereas you are in mourning, obedient bondsmen are engaged in rejoicing.'" *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 602. For the viziers of Oljeytu, see Spuler, *İran Moğolları*, p. 125.

Aflâkî's accuracy about the dates of events and the names of prominent men of the time denotes how Köprülü was accurate in stating that the *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn* was written much more carefully than many chronicles.

During the early fourteenth century, Anatolia was ruled by various Anatolian principalities. As indicated earlier, Aflâkî narrated the visits of Çelebi Ârif (d. 719/1320) to the begs of Anatolian principalities. Aflâkî mentions a visit of Çelebi Ârif to Menteşeoğlu Mes'ud Beg (d. 719/1319), who was one of the “*muhibbân*” of the family of Celâleddin Rûmî.³²⁷ According to the story, Mes'ud Beg held a *semâ'*-session for Çelebi Ârif. The religious scholars and shaykhs of this principality were also present at this gathering. A quarrel broke out between Çelebi and a renowned shaykh of that principality. Two days after the quarrel, the shaykh died. Impressed by the extraordinary acts of Çelebi Ârif, many people of that principality became Çelebi's disciples and Mes'ud Beg bestowed upon Çelebi “five male and female slaves, ten handsome horses, ten fine cloaks of *saqerlât* cloth and twenty *sûf-e morabba'* (“a variety of woolen cloth”).”³²⁸ According to Aflâkî, Mes'ud Beg became Çelebi's disciple and Mes'ud Beg sent him “sums of *felûrîs* (gold coins: florins) and silver in cash.”³²⁹ Ârif Çelebi did not hesitate to accept such kinds of gifts. It would not be wrong to assume that he was a conformist dervish although he maintained good relations with socially deviant dervishes, as stated by Karamustafa earlier.

As indicated before, Aflâkî explains the visits of Çelebi Ârif to the begs of the time such as Germiyanoglu Yakub bin Alişir, who became a “disciple (*mürîd*) of

³²⁷ *Manâkib al-Ârifîn*, p. 851. For the principality of Menteşeoğulları, see Halil Edhem, *Düvel-i İslâmiyye*, (İstanbul: Millî Matba'a, 1927), pp. 283-285; İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Anadolu Beylikleri ve Akkoyunlu, Karakoyunlu Devletleri*, (İstanbul: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1988), pp. 70-83.

³²⁸ *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 595.

³²⁹ *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 595.

Çelebi.”³³⁰ In some cases, begs are said to have visited Çelebi Ârif to ask for victory against enemies. When Çelebi Ârif was in the town of Birgi, Aydınöglu Mübarizüddin Mehmed Beg (d. 1334) visited Çelebi to ask for “assistance and good fortune from the invisible world.”³³¹ According to Aflâkî, the father of Çelebi Ârif, Sultan Veled, called Mehmed Beg of Aydın “Sultan of the Warriors for the Faith (*Sultânü'l-ğuzât*).”³³² Ibn Battuta, who came to Anatolia in the year 733/1333, praised the noble character, generosity and hospitality of Mehmed Beg of the house of Aydın.³³³

Aflâkî also praises the son of Mehmed Beg, Umur Beg of Aydın, as a warrior for faith. As İnalçık indicates, “the most brilliant *ghazâ* exploits in the marches” were undertaken by Umur Beg of the House of Aydın between the years 730/1330 and 746/1345. Umur Beg’s *ghazâ*, holy war, activity was also extended to naval engagements. In May 1348, Umur Beg was killed in an attempt to recapture the castle in the port of İzmir, which had been captured by Christian forces.³³⁴ Aflâkî explains the *ghazâ* exploits of Umur Beg as follows: “The King of Commanders, model of champions, a second Hamza,³³⁵ godly warrior for the faith, Bahâeddin Umur Pasha....strove continuously in raids against unbelievers until his final moment when he attained the rank of martyr and became one of the people of felicity.”³³⁶ Since Çelebi Ârif died in the year 719/1320, Aflâkî does not make any mention of Çelebi’s visit to Umur Beg. Unlike the *Menâkübü'l-Ârifîn*, most of the

³³⁰ *Manâkib al-Ârifîn*, pp. 945-947; *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, pp. 661-663. For more information about the principality of the Germiyanöglu, see Halil Edhem, *Düvel-i İslâmiyye*, pp. 292-294; İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Anadolu Beylikleri ve Akkoyunlu, Karakoyunlu Devletleri*, pp. 39-54.

³³¹ *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 663.

³³² *Manâkib al-Ârifîn*, p. 948; *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, pp. 663-664.

³³³ Ebû Abdullah Muhammed Ibn Battuta Tancî, *Ibn Battuta Seyahatnâmesi I*, tr. and ed. A. Sait Aykut, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2000), p. 420.

³³⁴ Halil İnalçık, “The Emergence of the Ottomans,” in *The Cambridge History of Islam*, eds. P. M. Holt, A. K. Lambton, Bernard Lewis, vol. 1, (The Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 271.

³³⁵ Hamza was the uncle of the Prophet Muhammad. He was famous as a legendary warrior and martyr in Islamic history. See Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, tr. John O’Kane, p. 750.

³³⁶ *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 664.

hagiographical works lacked chronological consistency. As Köprülü indicated earlier, in most cases, Aflâkî was cautious in the sequence of events. In the story related to Umur Beg, Aflâkî narrates a dream of Umur Beg in which Çelebi recited this couplet to him:

Whoever bears our letter of protection in his tunic's hem
Enjoys heroic status wherever he goes on land and sea.³³⁷

Immediately after mentioning this couplet, Aflâkî asserts: "It was then that he set off and conquered the island of Sakız Adası (Chios). They carried away more mastic than can be described. After imposing the *kharaj*, he made the island into his own estate."³³⁸

The information given by Aflâkî related to Umur Beg is similar to the one narrated in the *Destan (Book of Exploits)* of Umur Paşa³³⁹, which was dedicated to the Ottoman Grand Vizier Mahmud Pasha (d. 1474).³⁴⁰ In light of the constant Genoese threat against Chios, Byzantine Emperor Andronicus III arranged a meeting with Umur and his brother, Hızır, near the Çeşme (Aerythrea) peninsula. The emperor's offer to Umur Beg was a "large sum of money (100,000 gold pieces in the *Destan*)."³⁴¹ Umur rejected the offer. Finally, according to the *Destan*, the emperor

³³⁷ *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 665. For the Persian original of this couplet, see *Manâkib al-Ârifîn*, p. 950.

³³⁸ *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 665; *Manâkib al-Ârifîn*, p. 950.

³³⁹ See *Le Destan d'Umur Pacha (Düsturnâme-i Enverî)*, tr. and ed. Irène Mélikoff-Sayar, (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1954).

³⁴⁰ İnalçık explains the importance of the *Destan* of Umur Pasha as a source for the history of western Anatolia and the secondary literature about the *Destan* as follows: "The *Destan (Book of Exploits)* of Umur Pasha, an unusually rich Turkish source for the history of the Aegean world and the crusades in the period 1328-1348, has attracted the attention of Turcologists and Byzantinists from the time of its discovery and publication in 1929 by Mükrimin Halil Yinanç. Recently, Paul Lemerle devoted a whole volume to a detailed analysis of the information contained in the *Destan* in light of the contemporary Byzantine and Western sources." Halil İnalçık, "The Rise the Turcoman Maritime Principalities in Anatolia, Byzantium, and the Crusades," in *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society by Halil İnalçık*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies and Turkish Ministry of Culture Joint Series, vol. 9, 1993), p. 309.

³⁴¹ Halil İnalçık, "The Rise the Turcoman Maritime Principalities," p. 317.

agreed “to bestow Chios” upon Umur, which meant “submission and payment of the annual *mal-i kharadj*, or tribute money.”³⁴²

The example related to the story of Umur Beg can be viewed as evidence of Aflâkî’s originality as an author. Such contemporary accounts about the rulers and begs of Anatolia were rare in the fourteenth century. Aflâkî was aware of the importance of *ghazâ* for “the Turcoman Maritime Principalities” of western Anatolia.³⁴³ Aflâkî believed that his shaykh, Ârif Çelebi, contributed to the *ghazâ* exploits of Umur Beg through a dream. The role of dreams in the life of dervishes will be discussed later in this chapter.

3.3 The Naqshbandî Order

Similar to Çelebi Ârif, Naqshbandî shaykhs had a tendency for long-distance travel. In the words of Le Gall, “Naqshandîs were always ready to travel, whether it was to various centers of Islamic learning or as pilgrims to the Holy Places in the Hijaz, as Bahâeddin Naqshband is said to have done twice.”³⁴⁴ Nevertheless, one should bear in mind that the propensity for long-distance travel was not unique to the Naqshbandîs. As discussed earlier, Aflakî’s *Menâkıbü’l-Ârifîn* is rich enough in terms of examples about how Mevlevî dervishes travelled from Central Asia to Central Anatolia and from there to the various parts of the Islamic world. The case of Halvetîs was not so different. As will be discussed later in this chapter, Yusuf Sinan’s *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye* denoted how an order spread from the heartland of Anatolia, particularly Aksaray and Amasya, to the Balkans in the west and to India in

³⁴² İnalçık, p. 317.

³⁴³ For further information about the significance of *ghazâ* for the Turcoman principalities, see Halil İnalçık, “The Rise the Turcoman Maritime Principalities in Anatolia, Byzantium, and the Crusades,” in *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society by Halil İnalçık*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies and Turkish Ministry of Culture Joint Series, vol. 9, 1993), pp. 309-341.

³⁴⁴ Dina Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 171.

the east. Nevertheless, the propensity for long-distance travel among dervishes became possible with the patronage of Muslim rulers from Granada to India.

The Muslim rulers competed with each other to attract the famous scholars and Sufis to their courts.³⁴⁵ As J. R. McNeill and William H. McNeill argue, in the aftermath of the Mongol invasions, the patronage of Muslim princes had gained a universal character: “Many Muslim princes from Uzbekistan to Spain also patronized science, propelling advances in astronomy, navigation, mathematics, and geography.”³⁴⁶ For instance, the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II (r. 1451-1481) sent Hâce Atâullah Kirmânî to invite the famous Naqshbandî scholar Abdurrahman Câmî (d. 1492) to his court in Constantinople.³⁴⁷ He offered Câmî five thousand gold coins immediately to be paid upon accepting invitation of the sultan, and one hundred thousand gold coins when he arrived at Constantinople.³⁴⁸ Nevertheless, Câmî declined the offer, albeit with some hesitation. Although he did not actually come to the court of Mehmed II, he dedicated his *Durratü'l-fâkhira*, an intellectual prose work completed in 886/1481, to Mehmed II and sent it to him.³⁴⁹ It was Molla Ali Fenârî “who prompted Mehmed II to ask Câmî for the composition of such a

³⁴⁵ İnalçık explains this fact as follows: “Hanedanlar arasında rekabet ve üstünlük yarışı, yalnız muhteşem saraylar, hadem ve haşemde değil; ilim ve sanatın hâmilliğinde de kendini gösterirdi....15. yüzyılda Semerkand, Herat, Tebriz, İstanbul ve Delhi’de ortak yüksek saray kültürü sayesinde sanatkar, bir memlekettten ötekine gittiği zaman aynı himaye ve anlayışı, aynı sıcak ve coşkulu karşılamayı buluyordu. Osmanlı sultanı; özellikle Orta Asya ve Azerbaycan’da Türkçe ve Farsça’ya hâkim münşileri, şâirleri, âlimleri kendi pâyitahtına çekebilmek için büyük fedakârlıklara hazırdı. Fatih Sultan Mehmed ve II. Bayezid, zamanın İranlı büyük şâir ve mutasavvıfı Molla Câmî’yi İstanbul’a getirmek için çok çaba harcamışlardır.” Halil İnalçık, *Şâir ve Patron*, (Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları, 2003), p. 10, 11.

³⁴⁶ J. R. McNeill, William H. McNeill, *The Human Web, A Bird’s-Eye View of World History*, (New York & London: W. W. Norton and Company, 2003), p. 133.

³⁴⁷ For more information about the life and works of Câmî, see Ali Asgar Hikmet, *Câmî, Hayatı ve Eserleri*, tr. M. Nuri Gençosman, (Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1963).

³⁴⁸ Ertuğrul İ. Ökten, “Câmî (817-898/1414-1492): His Biography and Intellectual Influence in Herat,” *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, (Department of History, The Faculty of the Division of the Social Sciences, the University of Chicago, June 2007), p. 155.

³⁴⁹ Ertuğrul İ. Ökten, “Câmî (817-898/1414-1492): His Biography and Intellectual Influence in Herat,” p. 193.

work.”³⁵⁰ Nevertheless, when this work arrived at Constantinople, Mehmed II had already died and his son Bayezid II (r. 1481-1512) was serving as the new Ottoman sultan. Bayezid II also sought to bring Molla Câmî to his court. Nevertheless, Câmî again declined this invitation due to the fact that he did not want to leave the Timurid kingdom, which was superior to the other kingdoms according to Câmî. However, Molla Câmî dedicated the third book of the *Silsilat al-Zahab (Golden Chain)* to the Sultan Bayezid II.³⁵¹

Mehmed II’s interest in Central Asian scholars was not peculiar only to Câmî. He brought Ali Kuşçu, who was accompanied with nearly two hundred Central Asian and Iranian scholars, from Samarkand.³⁵² He was particularly interested in Naqshbandî immigrants from Bukhara. He built a dervish lodge for them and commissioned the writing of a commentary of the *Miftâhu’l-Ghayb* of Sadreddin Konevî to them.³⁵³ According to Le Gall, in Anatolia and the Balkans, Naqshbandîs acquired a reputation as “the defenders and disseminators of the mystical teachings of Ibn al-Arabî and as the carriers of and perpetuators of a much-coveted Perso-Islamic literary culture.”³⁵⁴

³⁵⁰ Ökten, p. 199.

³⁵¹ Ökten, p. 194. İnalçık explains the efforts of both Mehmed II and his son Bayezid II to bring Câmî to İstanbul, as follows: “Klasik İnan edebiyatı ve düşüncesinin son büyük temsilcisi Abdurrahman Câmî (1414-1492), tüm İslam hükümdarlarının davette yarıştıkları İslam dünyasının Voltaire’i idi. Fâtih Sultan Mehmed ona 5000 altın armağan göndererek İstanbul’a çağırmış, II. Bayezid onu Osmanlı ülkesine getirmek için büyük çaba harcamıştır. Bayezid, Câmî’ye gönderdiği mektupta onu ‘nûru’l-hak ve hakikat’ ve ‘nakşibend-i i’ tikâd’ diye anıyordu. Câmî cevabında, ‘bahşîşhâ-yi şeh haddî nadârând’ (Sultanın bağışlarına sınır yok) diye bildiriyordu. Osmanlı sultanı, Câmî’nin gönderdiği eserleri (‘külliyât-i Câmî’ il-kemâlât’) (belki Nafahât) aldığını bildirecek kendisine bin flori altın gönderdi. Câmî cevabında:

Câmî kucâ ‘atâ-yi Şeh-i Rûm az kucâ

K’in lûf-i gayb mî-rasidaş az reh-i ‘umûm

diye Osmanlı sultanının lûtfuna şükranını ifade ediyordu. Kuşkusuz, Osmanlı Sultanı, İnan ve Orta Asya ortak kültürünün en tanınmış temsilcisi Câmî’ye gönderdiği mektup ve bağışlarla, bu kültürün bir hâmişi, patronu olduğunu göstermek istiyordu.” İnalçık, *Şâir ve Patron*, pp. 19-20.

³⁵² İnalçık, p. 13n.

³⁵³ Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 57

³⁵⁴ Le Gall, p. 93.

As a stepson of Ibn al-Arabî, Sadreddin Konevî was famous in the Sufi circles of the Timurid lands. Konevî was one of the Sufi scholars mentioned by Câmî most frequently.³⁵⁵ Ertuğrul İ. Ökten explains Câmî's view of Konevî as follows:

In Câmî's historical reformulation Ibn al-Arabî's student, Sadreddin Konevî, stands out as a major reference point. Câmî acknowledged Konevî's scientific authority in exoteric, rational and traditional sciences, and also wrote that Ibn al-Arabî had granted Konevî 'the truth of eternal manifestation' in a dream. In the eyes of Câmî, such qualifications must have made Konevî the authority without whose works Ibn al-Arabî's *wahdat al-wujûd* based sayings could not be seen within the boundaries of reason and the Shari'a.³⁵⁶

As indicated earlier, the Naqshbandî order came to the Province of Karaman, particularly Akşehir, with Baba Ni'metullah b. Mahmud Nakhchivânî (d. 902/1496-7), who was originally from the Caucasus. He wrote a commentary on the *Fusûsu'l-Hikem (The Quintessence of Wisdom)* of Ibn al-Arabî and a Qur'anic exegesis entitled *al-Favâtihu'l-Îlâhiyye ve'l-Mefâtihu'l-Ghaybiyye*.³⁵⁷ The famous Naqshbandî figure Ubaydullah Ahrar was also known as an expert on Ibn al-Arabî. Nevertheless, Naqshbandîs' interest in Ibn al-Arabî goes back to Bahâ al-Dîn's *khalîfa*, spiritual successor, Muhammad Parsâ. According to Parsâ, the *Fusûs* and the *Fütûhâtü'l-Mekkiyye* were like a "soul" and "heart." The study of these two works, for Parsâ, would encourage observance of the Prophet's *sunna* (deeds of the Prophet Muhammad).³⁵⁸ One of the Sufi orders that emphasized the observance of the Prophet's *sunna* was the Halvetî Order, which will be discussed now in the light of a primary source, *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye* of Yusuf Sinan.

³⁵⁵ Ökten, p. 198.

³⁵⁶ Ökten, p. 329.

³⁵⁷ Le Gall, pp. 63, 125.

³⁵⁸ Le Gall, p. 126.

3.4 The Halvetî Order

As indicated earlier, in his work entitled *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization*, Marshall Hodgson views Sufism as "a mainstay of the international social order".³⁵⁹ According to Hodgson, many Sufis wandered "incessantly in remote parts of the *Dâr al-Islam* (The Abode of Islam)".³⁶⁰ One of the key examples of the international character of Sufism can be observed in the Halvetiyye Order, which experienced a golden age, though not without crises, in the Classical Age of the Ottoman empire, i. e. the sixteenth century.

The Halvetî order had various branches throughout its history.³⁶¹ We will examine only the Cemâlî-Halvetî branch in the late fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries in order to understand how Sufi masters wandered "incessantly in remote parts of the *Dâr al-Islam*" from the Balkans to India. Our primary source for this task will be Yusuf Sinan (d. 985 H. / 1577-78)'s *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, which is composed of 77 pages.³⁶²

Until recently, Yusuf Sinan's work has largely been neglected in the literature. It was John J. Curry who has made a brief analysis of Yusuf Sinan's work.³⁶³ In his article, Curry discusses the rise of Sufi literature, particularly the

³⁵⁹ Hodgson, p. 220.

³⁶⁰ Hodgson, p. 220. For further information about dervish travellers, see Resul Ay, "Ortaçağ Anadolu'sunda Bilginin Seyahati: Talebeler, Âlimler ve Dervişler," *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, no. 3 (Spring 2006), pp. 17-53.

³⁶¹ For the branches of the Halvetî order, see Nathalie Clayer, *Mystiques, État et Societe, Les Halvetis dans l'aire Balkanique de la fin du XVe siècle à nos jours*, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), pp. 163-179; Rüya Kılıç, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Gülşenî Tarikatı (Genel Bir Yaklaşım Denemesi)," *Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi*, no. 15 (2004), pp. 209-226.

³⁶² Yusuf Sinan, *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, Süleymaniye Library, Esad Efendi no. 1372; Although often neglected in the literature, there is also another manuscript version of Yusuf Sinan's *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye* in *Bibliothèque Nationale de France: Suppl. Turc*, no. 48, folios 1b-21b. The date of this manuscript is *Şa'ban* 992/1584-1585. Perhaps this date is the date of *istinsâh*, a hand-writing copy of an original manuscript, rather than the date of the original manuscript. See Yusuf Sinan ibn Yakub, [*Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*], *Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Supplément Turc*, no. 48, folio 21b. E. Blochet describes this manuscript as follows: "Un petit traité, sans titre (folio I verso), dans lequel un auteur, nommé Yousuf ibn Yakub (folio 4 verso)". See E. Blochet, *Suppl. Turc*, p. 185.

³⁶³ John Curry, "The Growth of Turkish hagiographical literature within the Halveti order in the 16th and 17th centuries", *The Turks, 3: Ottomans*, ed. H. Celal Güzel, C. Cem Oğuz, Osman Karatay,

Halveti literature, in Islamic history. He explains importance of Yusuf Sinan's work as follows:

Not only does it mark the chronological beginning of the rapid growth in Turkish hagiographical literature pertaining to the Halveti order of the period, but its content and structure betray some of the author's motivations in creating the work.³⁶⁴

Curry rightly asserts that secondary literature focuses on study of shaykhs rather than hagiographers.³⁶⁵ Following this observation, Curry explains the essence of his article: "This short article will try to address: What made the writers of Halveti *tarikat* hagiography suddenly feel the need to create a body of Turkish literature to document their saintly figures between 1575 and 1630? Who was their intended audience? And how might their motivations affect or bias these authors' presentation of their beloved saints?"³⁶⁶ Curry's main emphasis in his article is to point out the importance of the *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye* in the hagiographical literature.

What follows in this chapter is a discussion of how the Halvetis "wandered incessantly in remote parts of Dar-al-Islam" in the light of *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye* and of how dreams acted as a catalyst for this mobility. The *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye* has not been studied from this perspective. According to Humphrey J. Fisher, dreams have encouraged people "to embark on missionary journeys".³⁶⁷ The history of Halveti order was rich enough in terms of such missionary journeys. One of the key examples of such journeys can be found in Yusuf Sinan's work.

Yusuf Sinan begins his work by a short introduction about the history of the Halvetî order. He emphasizes "the purity" of the Halvetî order because, for him, this order remained loyal to its origins throughout centuries from the time of the Prophet

(Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 2002), pp. 912-920.

³⁶⁴ John Curry, "The Growth of Turkish hagiographical literature...", p. 913.

³⁶⁵ Curry, p. 913.

³⁶⁶ Curry, p. 913.

³⁶⁷ Humphrey J. Fisher, "Dreams and Conversion in Black Africa," in *Conversion to Islam*, ed. Nehemia Levtzion, (New York: Holmes&Meier Publishers, 1979), p. 233.

Muhammad. According to Yusuf Sinan, Halvetiyye is “the easiest” and “the closest” path to God.³⁶⁸ He asserts that the Halvetî order encompasses both esoteric and exoteric sciences.³⁶⁹

Yusuf Sinan dedicated his work to Sultan Murad III (r. 1574-95). Taking into account the fact that Yusuf Sinan went to Medîna in the Hegira year of 985 (1577-1578) and died there in 987 H. / 1579-80, it can be safely argued that he submitted his work to Sultan Murat III (r. 1574-1595) during the first years of his sultanate. Perhaps Yusuf Sinan aimed at getting the patronage of the new sultan. In a sense, Murad III assumes the role of both patron and the chief audience in Yusuf Sinan’s eyes.³⁷⁰ In the introductory chapter he exalts the name of Sultan Murad III by calling him “the Sultan of both religion and state (*Pâdişâh-ı dîn ü devlet*)³⁷¹.

In the light of the author’s insistence on the Halveti order’s loyalty to the roots of Islamic tradition one can argue that among his audience was *ulemâ* (the religious scholars) and bureaucrats of the time. Of course, like every *menâkıb* (deeds of a shaykh) work, his main audience is Halveti dervishes and those who were prone to knocking the door of the Halvetiyye. The fact that he gives Ottoman translation of his Arabic quotations from Quranic verses and sayings of the Prophet Muhammad leads us to conclude that he wanted his work to be understood by ordinary persons, aside from *ulemâ* circles.

Köprülü asserts that Halveti order was “a bourgeois order which maintained its Sunni form” like Mevlevî and Rifai orders.³⁷² On the other hand, according to

³⁶⁸ “Velâkin akrab-i turuk ve eshel-i sebîl bî-iştibâh tarîka-i enîka-i Halvetiyyedir ki Fahr-i Âlem sallallahu aleyhi vesellemden bu zamâna gelince teğayyür ve tahrif olunmamışdır”, Yusuf Sinan, *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, Süleymaniye Library, Esad Efendi no. 1372, folio 3a.

³⁶⁹ “Ulûm-i zâhire ile ulûm-i bâtinayı cem’ idüb...” *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 3b.

³⁷⁰ Pâdişâh hazretlerinin rikâb-ı Hümâyûn ve cenâb-ı sa’âdet-makrûn ve meymûnlarına hulûs-ı ‘ubûdiyyetim i’lâm için bir latîf risâle te’lif eyliyem.” *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 7b.

³⁷¹ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 6b.

³⁷² M. Fuad Köprülü, *The Origins of the Ottoman Empire*, tr. and ed. Gary Leiser, (State University of New York, 1992), p. 101.

B.G. Martin, a Sufi order may embrace different doctrines at different times. According to Martin, Khalwati order sometimes approached Shi'ism and sometimes approached "Sunni orthodoxy".³⁷³ If we look at Yusuf Sinan's attitude towards other orders, we will see that he uses respectful words about other orders, particularly the Zeyniyye order. Even in the part on the Halveti-Zeyniyye rivalry about the issue of succession after the death of Sultan Mehmed II (1451-1481), he does not use a disrespectful language about Shaykh Vefa. Instead, he exalts his name by respectful words.³⁷⁴ It seems that the author did not want to raise any suspicion about the Sufi world in the mind of the Sultan. In another part he praises the Mevlevî order and the masterpiece of its founder, Celâleddin Rûmî's *Mesnevî*.³⁷⁵ On the other hand, as will be discussed later, in the part about the debate between Sünbül Efendi and Sarı Gürz (or Kôrez) he accuses Sarı Gürz of being tough (*ğalîzü't-tab' kimesne idi*). Although he is very cautious about his wording about Sufi masters, he does not refrain from using heavy words about the ulemâ who opposed to the Sufi *Weltanschauung*.

3.4.1 *Dervish and Dream*

Sultan Murad III (r. 1574-1595), to whom Yusuf Sinan dedicated his *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, was known for his interest in esoteric sciences, especially dream interpretation. He has been known as a "mystically minded Sultan".³⁷⁶ Yusuf Sinan also calls Murad III "*derviş-sîret*" Sultan, a sultan living a Sufi way of life.³⁷⁷ According to Hulvî, Yusuf Sinan had the opportunity to meet Sultan Murad III

³⁷³ G.B. Martin, "A Short History of Dervishes", *Scholars, Saints, and Sufis, Muslim Religious Institutions since 1500*, ed. Nikki R. Keddie, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), p. 276.

³⁷⁴ "Kıdvetü'l-ârifîn, zübdetü'l-vâsilîn Shaykh Vefâzâde Hazretleri..." *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 12a.

³⁷⁵ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 15b.

³⁷⁶ Alexander Knysh, *Islamic Mysticism: A Short History*, (Leiden & Boston & Köln: Brill, 2000), p. 266.

³⁷⁷ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 6b.

during the Sultan's visit to the tomb of Merkez Efendi. During his visit, the Sultan was impressed by Yusuf Sinan's good voice in reciting Qur'an and he wanted to appoint Yusuf Sinan as his Chief İmam (*İmâm-ı Sultânî*). Nevertheless, the Sultan's advisors did not deem it appropriate to dismiss the present Chief İmam. Then, upon the request of Yusuf Sinan, he was appointed as *Shaykhü'l-Harem* in Medîna in 987 H. / 1579-80.³⁷⁸

Shaykh Şücâ (d. 1582) was the first and foremost among shaykhs who were patronized by Murad III. The Sultan's high respect towards Shaykh Şücâ was a consequence of his interpretation of Murad's dream with his accession to the Ottoman throne when he was *şehzâde* (prince) in Manisa.³⁷⁹ Sultan Murad III sent his dreams in a written form to Shaykh Şücâ to be interpreted by him. The Sultan's great favour towards Shaykh Şücâ was subject to criticism by some contemporary Ottoman historians. For instance, Mustafa Âlî criticized Murad III for showing high respect to Shaykh Şücâ, who happened to interpret one of the Sultan's dreams "correctly."³⁸⁰ Sultan Murad III was also sending his dreams to be interpreted by Shaykh Aziz Mahmud Hüdâî. Hüdâî's *Mektûbât* includes Hüdâî's correspondences with various Ottoman sultans including Murad III.³⁸¹ Nevertheless, among Ottoman Sultans, Murad III was not unique in terms of relying on shaykhs' interpretation of dreams. An interesting story took place in the last year of the reign of Sultan Süleyman the Magnificent (r. 1520-1566). The story was related to a Halvetî shaykh, namely Nûreddinzâde Mustafa Muslihuddin (d. 1574) from the Filibe/Plovdiv region

³⁷⁸ Mahmud Cemâleddin el-Hulvî, *Lemezât-ı Hulviyye ez Lemezât-ı Ulviyye (Büyük Velilerin Tath Halleri)*, ed. Mehmet Serhan Tayşî, (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1993), pp. 484-485.

³⁷⁹ Cemal Kafadar, "Mütereddit Bir Mutasavvıf: Üsküp'lü Asiye Hatun'un Rüya Defteri, 1641-43," *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Yıllığı- V*, (İstanbul, 1992), p. 184.

³⁸⁰ Cemal Kafadar, "Self and Others: The Diary of a Dervish in Seventeenth Century Istanbul and First-Person Narratives in Ottoman Literature," *Studia Islamica* 69 (1989), p. 131.

³⁸¹ Cemal Kafadar, "Self and Others," p. 131.

in today's Bulgaria. Upon his dream of the Prophet, Nûreddinzâde visited the Sultan surprisingly in the night. Nûreddinzâde told the Sultan that in his dream the Prophet demanded the Sultan to resume *ghazâh* (religious warfare). Then, the Sultan decided to initiate the Szigetvar campaign. Nûreddinzâde joined this campaign as the "army shaykh" (*ordu şeyhi*).³⁸² This dream is reminiscent of the dream of Aydınoğlu Umur Beg in which Çelebi Ârif foretold him the conquest of *Sakız Adası* (Chios).

It is not clear whether Yusuf Sinan gave special emphasis on dreams in his *Tezkire* by taking into account Sultan Murad III's interest in dreams. It might be just a coincidence, though an interesting one. The history of dreams are as old as history of mankind. In his book entitled *The World of Late Antiquity AD 150-750*, Peter Brown asserts: "The historian is in danger of forgetting that his subjects spent much of their time asleep, and that, when asleep, they had dreams."³⁸³ We see a mention of dream as early as in the *Epic of Gilgamesh*. Gilgamesh rose and spoke to Ninsun, his mother, to untie his dream:

Last night, Mother, I saw a dream
There was a star in the heavens.
Like a shooting star of Anu it fell on me.
I tried to lift; too much for me.
I tried to move it; I could not move it.³⁸⁴

In the Islamic tradition, perception of dream has been shapen by a saying of the Prophet Muhammed: "Dream is one of the forty-six elements of *nubuwwah*, Prophethood".³⁸⁵ Claiming to be the essence of Islamic tradition, Halvetî tradition also saw divine element in dreams. In his *Tarîkatnâme*, Shaykh Sünbül Sinan

³⁸² Zeynep Yürekli, "A Building Between the Public and Private Realms of the Ottoman Elite: The Sufi Convent of Sokollu Mehmed Pasha in Istanbul," *Muqarnas, an Annual on the Visual Culture of the Islamic World*, ed. Gülru Necipoğlu, (Leiden: Brill, 2003), p. 163.

³⁸³ Jonathan G. Katz, *Dreams, Sufism and Sainthood, The Visionary Career of Muhammad al-Zawâwî*, (Leiden, New York, and Köln: E. J. Brill, 1996), p. V.

³⁸⁴ *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, Tablet I.iv; quoted in Kelly Bulkley, "The Evil Dreams of Gilgamesh: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Dreams in Mythological Texts" in *The Dream and the Text: Essays on Literature and Language*, ed. Carol Schreier Rupprecht, (The State University of New York, 1993), p. 161.

³⁸⁵ Kafadar, "Müteredit Bir Mutasavvîf," p. 180.

advised dervishes to tell their Shaykhs about their dreams. According to Shaykh Sünbül Sinan a dervish should not tell his or her dream to anybody else unless the Shaykh appointed such a person to interpret the dervish's dream.³⁸⁶

In another kind of legendary works, namely *menâkıbnâmes*, dreams occupy a crucial place due to the belief that dream is a direct way to reach to God. Often a dream serves a turning point in a disciple or a master's life. For instance, *Menâkıb-i Shaykh Ali Semerkandî* narrates a story about Shaykh Ali Semerkandî's dream. Like some Halvetî shaykhs, Shaykh Ali Semerkandî (d. 860 H. / 1456) was particularly interested in *tefsîr*, i.e. exegesis of the Qur'an, and wrote *Bahru'l-Ulûm*, a four-volume exegesis of the Qur'an.³⁸⁷ According to this *Menâkıb*, Semerkandî left Central Asia and came to the realm of the Karamanoğlu Principality in the year 832 H. / 1429-1430 upon the order of the Prophet Muhammad in Semerkandî's dream.³⁸⁸

Jacques Le Goff asserts that during the Middle Ages, "the dream was one of the primary battlegrounds on which God contended with the Devil for the possession of man's soul."³⁸⁹ In Yusuf Sinan's case the Devil always loses in the battlegrounds of dream. Yusuf Sinan's narration of dreams is in line with the medieval vision of "awakening via a dream."³⁹⁰ In *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, conversions did not take place from a different religion to Islam. Instead, conversions took place within Islam, from *madrâsa* circles to *zâviye* circles. The following question can be raised at this point:

³⁸⁶ "Her ne düş görürse şeyhe arz eyleye; ta'bir iderse dinleye, itmezse ta'biri nedür dimeye...Ve şeyhden ğayrıya vâkı'asın dimeye, meğer şeyh ta'yin idüb ta'bire izün virdüğü âdem ola, âna diye...Ve pişkademden öndin vâkı'a arz itmeye, meger ol olmadığı meclisde ola yâhûd danışa", quoted in Kafadar, "Mütereddît Bir Mutasavvıf," p. 179. For more information about perception of dream in Halvetî order, see Mustafa Tatçı, Halil Çeltik, *Türk Edebiyatında Rüya Tâbirnâmeleri*, (Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 1995).

³⁸⁷ See Şeyh Ali Semerkandî, *Bahru'l-Ulûm*, 4 vol.s, Süleymaniye Library, Kılıç Ali Paşa, no. 106.

³⁸⁸ "Resûl aleyhisselâm beyne'l-yakaza ve'l-menâm Hazret-i Şeyhe gelüb eyitti: '...Benim icâzetimle ümmetimi irşâd idüb dilşâd eyle.Ehl-i Karamankâbil-i islâh, karîb mine's-salâh mü'minlerdir. Hak Te'âlâ seni ol iklîme rahmet ve ol kavme hidâyet virmişdir. Sana tâbî olanlar, benim has ümmetim ve ehl-i sünnetim olur," *Menâkıb-i Şeyh Ali (Alâüddin) Semerkandî*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yazmaları, no. TTK-Y-419, folio 49b.

³⁸⁹ Susan Parman, *Dream and Culture, an Anthropological Study of the Western Intellectual Tradition*, (New York: Praeger, 1991, p. 31.

³⁹⁰ Susan Parman, *Dream and Culture*, p. 67.

What is the place of Devil in madrasa circles? In the section about Sünbül Sinan, madrasa circles are accused of being captive to the worldly pleasures.³⁹¹ The true place for the love of God was dervish lodges in the Halvetî teaching.

In the *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, famous cities of Islamic civilization such as Mecca, Jerusalem, Cairo, Damascus and Istanbul are mentioned as frequently visited places by wandering Halvetî dervishes. According to Yusuf Sinan, Halvetiyye was as old as Islam itself. With respect to time, Halvetiyye is similar to the Ottoman claim of eternal state, *devlet-i ebed-müddet*. In *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, we see something like *tarîk-i ebed-müddet*, eternal order. By tracing the origin of the Halvetiyye back to the Prophet Muhammad, Yusuf Sinan traces the origin of the order to the immemorial time. With respect to space dimension of the Halvetiyye, Yusuf Sinan's picture is something like the Ottoman ideal of *nizâm-ı âlem*, world order. Halvetî dervishes wandered around the world from Egypt to India to give an order to the world's human society under the guidance of a Halvetî *qutb* (the pole of the age) around whom the world was believed to revolve.

One sees a reflection of this belief in Seyyid Yahya Şîrvânî (d. 869 H. / 1464-1465)'s dream. Seyyid Yahya's dream is interesting in terms of understanding the Halvetî order's universal outlook. In his dream, Seyyid Yahya sees himself in Heaven and throws the seeds of wheat to "the East," and to "the West" and to "the Iranian and Arabian realms."³⁹² Şîrvânî asked for an interpretation of his dream from his shaykh, Pîr Sadrüddin. Pîr Sadrüddin interpreted Şîrvânî's dream with as a harbinger of numerous *khalifas* (spiritual successors).³⁹³ What Pîr Sadreddin meant by his interpretation was the predominance of the Halvetî order throughout the

³⁹¹ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 23b.

³⁹² *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 8b.

³⁹³ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 8b.

world. This becomes clear with additional information given by Yusuf Sinan. He mentions four *khalifas* of Yahya Şîrvânî, namely Molla Pîr Muhammed Erzincanî, Dede Ömer Rûşenî, Molla Ali Halvetî and Molla Habîb-i Karamanî. According to Yusuf Sinan, these four *khalifas* of Şîrvânî illuminated all parts of the world.³⁹⁴

A similar dream story has been mentioned in the *Baburnâme*, an autobiography of the founder of the Mughal dynasty in India. Babur's spiritual guide was Hâce Ubeydullâh Ahrar-i Semerkandî. According to the Ottoman historian Hocâ Sadeddin, Hâce Ubeydullah was the shaykh of Shaykh Cemâlüddin İsmail-i Şîrvânî-i Halvetî, who came to Anatolia during the reign of Sultan Bayezid II (1481-1512).³⁹⁵ Hâce Ubeydullah's legacy in the Mughal dynasty was as influential as Shaykh Edebali's legacy in the Ottoman dynasty. In *Baburnâme*, Babur Şah mentions his dreams related to Hâce Ubeydullah. In one of Babür's dreams, Hâce Ubeydullah promised the conquest of Semerqand to Babur, which came to pass.³⁹⁶ The link between India, the Central Asia, the Caucasus and Anatolia among Halvetî dervishes was clear. Yusuf Sinan writes that a Halvetî dervish was sent to India by Merkez Efendi. Due to the efforts of this dervish, Halvetiyye flourished in India.³⁹⁷

In his work, Yusuf Sinan dwells on four Halvetî shaykhs: Çelebi Halife, Sünbül Efendi, Merkez Efendi and Yakub Efendi. Yusuf Sinan's narration of four leading shaykhs of the Cemali-Halveti order is not without meaning. It can be observed with a close reading that he expresses not only life of a Sufî master but of a Sufî order with the challenges from outside world and the responses within the community. He was aware of the fact that "wandering incessantly" was not without

³⁹⁴ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 8b.

³⁹⁵ Hoca Sadedin Efendi, *Tâcü't-tevârih*, vol. 5, p. 264.

³⁹⁶ Gazi Zahirüddin Muhammed Babur, *Vekayi (Babur'un Hâtrati)*, vol. 1, tr. Reşit Rahmeti Arat, (Ankara: TTK, 1987), p. 87.

³⁹⁷ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 30a.

sacrifice. Liberty to wander did not always open the ways for giving order to the world, which was also primary claim of emperors or Sultans. The four shaykhs discussed by Yusuf Sinan will be examined under four headings:

3.4.2 *From the Periphery to the Center*

Çelebi Khalifa was born in Aksaray and came from the family of Cemâlüddin-i Aksarayî. Yusuf Sinan writes that the genealogy of Çelebi Khalifa's family goes back to the First Caliph Abu Bakr (r. 632-634 AD). The Aksaray region seems an important place for Halvetî dervishes. The register of the pious foundations of the Province of Karaman dated 888 H. / 1483 mentioned a *vakf* of Halvetîs in Aksaray. As indicated earlier, this register mentioned 160 *zâviyes* and 10 *khankâhs* in the Province of Karaman and pointed out only two Sufî orders in that Province. One of them was the Mevleviyye and the other is the Halvetiyye in Aksaray.³⁹⁸ Yusuf Sinan writes that Çelebi Khalifa's title of Çelebi derives from the fact that he was coming from the family of a Kadıasker. As Yusuf Sinan writes, Çelebi Khalifa (d. 1497-1498) is also known as Cemâl-i Halvetî, who gave his name to a major branch of the Halvetî order –Cemâlî-Halvetîs. Yusuf Sinan gives valuable information about Çelebi Halife's family.³⁹⁹ Selim I's Grand Vizier Pîrî Mehmed Paşa was the uncle of Çelebi Halife. It seems that Çelebi Khalifa came from a noble family, which had a say not only in religious affairs but also political affairs of the Ottoman Empire.

The common trait of Halvetî shaykhs mentioned by Yusuf Sinan was that they had a certain degree of madrasa education. Nevertheless, at some point they realized that madrasa life was not enough for their felicity. In Çelebi Khalifa's case

³⁹⁸ Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin)," pp. 160-162.

³⁹⁹ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 9b.

something different happened. After departing from *madrassa* life, Çelebi Khalifa became a disciple of a Zeynî shaykh. Intentionally or not, Yusuf Sinan does not mention the name of this Zeynî shaykh. We learn from Hulvî's *Lemezât* that the name of this Shaykh was Hacı Khalifa (d. 894 H. / 1488-89).⁴⁰⁰ According to Yusuf Sinan, the Zeynî order did not satisfy Çelebi Khalifa. Then Çelebi Khalifa became a disciple of a Halvetî Shaykh, Shaykh Tahir who was *ümmî*, i.e. illiterate.⁴⁰¹ Shaykh Tâhir advised Çelebi Khalifa to be a disciple of Seyyid Yahya Şirvânî due to Yahya Şirvânî's higher spiritual status than himself. Then Çelebi Khalifa set out for Şirvan but when he arrived at Şirvan he saw the funeral of Seyyid Yahya. Nevertheless, in Çelebi Khalifa's dream, Seyyid Yahya told Çelebi Khalifa to be a disciple of Molla Pîr. Then, upon the advice of Seyyid Yahya in dream, Çelebi Khalifa became a disciple of Molla Pîr. Later Molla Pîr sent him to Anatolia (*diyâr-ı Rûm*) to spread the Halvetî order there.⁴⁰² Çelebi Khalifa came to Tokat and Amasya, which were the main cities of the Province of Rûm in Anatolia. This story indicates how a dream led the life of a Halvetî shaykh. Çelebi Khalifa's story shows how right Marshall Hodgson was right in asserting that Sufis wandered incessantly in remote parts of the *Dâr al-Islâm*. Dervish lodges remained at the center of life for the dwellers of Anatolia as was the case throughout what Marshall G. S. Hodgson calls "international Islamicate society."⁴⁰³

Yusuf Sinan also narrates a story of a kind of alliance between a prince, Şehzâde Bayezid, and a shaykh, Çelebi Khalifa. The future Bayezid II (r. 1481-1512) was governor of Amasya during Çelebi Khalifa's stay at Amasya. This story is

⁴⁰⁰ Mahmud Cemâleddin el-Hulvî, *Lemezât-ı Hulviyye ez Lemezât-ı Ulviyye (Büyük Velilerin Tatlı Halleri)*, ed. Mehmet Serhan Tayşî, (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1993), p. 428.

⁴⁰¹ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 10a

⁴⁰² *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 10b.

⁴⁰³ Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam*, vol. 2, p. 3.

crucial for shedding light on the relations between shaykhs and sultans and for the rivalry among various Sufi groups to attain the patronage of the greatest patron of the empire, the Sultan. Yusuf Sinan writes that Şehzâde Bayezid asked the help of Çelebi Khalifa in order to ascend the throne. Yusuf Sinan asserts that the main opponent of Şehzâde Bayezid was the Grand Vizier of Mehmed II, Ahmed Paşa.⁴⁰⁴ The name of Mehmed II's Grand Vizier was actually Karamanî Mehmed Paşa, not Ahmed Paşa. Yusuf Sinan must have confused the name of the Grand Vizier.

This story is also interesting in terms of the rivalry between the Zeyniyye and Halvetî orders. In the story, it is narrated that Grand Vizier Karamanî Mehmed Paşa was under the protection of *vefk* (a kind of talisman), of Muslihuddin Mustafa who came to be known as Shaykh Vefâ (d. 896/1491). As indicated earlier, even in a subject of rivalry between Zeyniyye and Halvetiyye, Yusuf Sinan does not hesitate to add the title of *Hazret*, the Holy Man, before the name of Shaykh Vefâ.⁴⁰⁵ Originally from Konya, Shaykh Vefâ was on the side of Şehzâde Cem, who was governor of the Province of Karaman. Yusuf Sinan asserts that the Grand Vizier, who was also coming from the Province of Karaman, was supporting Şehzâde Cem. The reasoning of Yusuf Sinan behind the triumph of Şehzâde Bayezid in the succession issue is fascinating. According to Yusuf Sinan, the Grand Vizier sent his *vefk* to Shaykh Vefâ to be repaired by him. At that time, Mehmed II was dead and the Grand Vizier was concealing this fact in order to secure the throne for Cem. Realizing the death of the Sultan, the Janissaries killed the Grand Vizier while Shaykh Vefâ was repairing the *vefk*. While reading this story one gets the impression that it was the *vefk* who was the hero of the story (*Vefk başından gidicek devlet dahî gidüb Yeniçeriler kendüyi*

⁴⁰⁴ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 10b.

⁴⁰⁵ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 11a.

*katl iderler.')*⁴⁰⁶ Yusuf Sinan ignored other circumstances, which will be discussed later in relation to Şehzâde Cem. After the accession of Bayezid to the throne, Çelebi Khalifa went to İstanbul with his one hundred disciples. This event can be viewed as the transfer of the Halvetî order from the periphery to the center of the Empire.

3.4.3 Challenge and Response

In the early sixteenth century an interesting phenomenon occurred in terms of the history of Sûfism. As will be discussed later, a Sufi order, i.e. the Safavid order, was transformed into a Shi'ite state. The Safavid order got its name from its founder, Shaykh Safiyyüddin of Ardabil (1252-1334). It was with his descendant Shah İsmail that the Safavid order became a Safavid state. Following the example of Timur, Shah İsmail's aim was to make Anatolia a part of his empire. He was writing his poems in Turkish. Turcomans of Anatolia were not happy with the centralization of the Ottoman Empire. Like Timur and Uzun Hasan before him, Shah İsmail exploited this opportunity. Sixteenth-century Ottoman history can not be understood without taking the Safavid challenge into account. Long wars were fought between these two empires and the Ottomans witnessed rebellions of Turcomans led by Şahkulu in 1511 and by Kalender Çelebi in 1527. During the Ottoman-Safavid wars of 1534-35 a Turcoman poet, Pîr Sultan Abdal, wrote the following poem. In his poem he views the Safavid emperor as *Mahdî*, the Savior of the World:

My holy Mahdi must come,
He must set up his high council,
He must destroy the unjust,
And one day take revenge for me.⁴⁰⁷

⁴⁰⁶ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 11b.

⁴⁰⁷ İnalçık, *The Classical Age*, p. 196.

Pîr Sultan Abdal expresses how Turcomans viewed the Safavids and the Ottomans:

He marched on the land of Rûm,
The great Imam from the stem of Ali is coming.

Let the breasts of dissenters be burned,
Let the Lord of the Age's word be law.
Let it be known who is the sultan.⁴⁰⁸

The rise of the Safavid state led to a turning point in Ottoman religious policies. Suspicion of the state was not only towards the Turcomans. Taking into account the Safavid example, the Ottoman bureaucrats began to view some Sûfi orders as detrimental to the survival of the state. The Ottoman ulemâ also strengthened this suspicion. As Nathalie Clayer has examined in detail, some Sufi scholars, particularly those belonged to the the Halvetî Order contributed a great deal to the “sunnitization” campaign in the sixteenth-century Ottoman Empire.⁴⁰⁹ The question of how the campaign of Sunnitization affect the lives and works of the dervishes will also be examined in the chapter on the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun*.

The acts of dervishes began to be strictly investigated by bureaucrats and ulemâ in the sixteenth century. The *Gülşenîs*, a sub-branch of the Halvetî Order, and the Melâmî-Bayrâmîs were subject to persecution. Between 1538 and 1561, two Melâmî-Bayrâmî shaykhs and a Gülşenî shaykh were executed by the state.⁴¹⁰ Especially the permissibility of *semâ*⁴¹¹ was questioned by the *ulemâ*. This question bothered the minds of religious scholars throughout the centuries of the Ottoman history. It was Shaykh Sünbül Sinan who responded successfully to the initial

⁴⁰⁸ İnalçık, p. 196.

⁴⁰⁹ See Nathalie Clayer, *Mystiques, État et Société*, pp. 90-112.

⁴¹⁰ Aslı Niyazioğlu, “Ottoman Sufi Shaykhs Between This World and the Hereafter: A Study of Nev’izâde ‘Atâ’î’s (1583-1635) Biographical Dictionary,” *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, (Harvard University, 2003), pp. 146-147.

⁴¹¹ *Semâ*: “A collective ritual of listening to chanted verses with or without musical accompaniment as a way of helping to induce ecstatic states.” Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 238.

challenges against the Halvetiyye in the early sixteenth century. In the seventeenth century another Halvetî Shaykh, Ebülhayr Mecdüddin Abdülmecid known as Sivasi Efendi (d. 1639), had to deal with a similar challenge posed by the Kadızadelis.⁴¹²

The dispute, related by Yusuf Sinan, among the Halvetî Shaykh Sünbül Sinan Efendi (d. 943/1536) and Sarı Gürez (d. 929/1521-22), *qadi* of Istanbul, and Gürez Seydi, *müderri*s in madrasa of Sahn-ı Seman, was about the Sufi practice of *semâ'*. One should bear in mind that this is the Halvetî account of the story. Nevertheless, it is a fact that Sünbül Sinan succeeded in maintaining the unity of his order, i.e. the Cemâlî-Halvetî order, in an environment of deep suspicion towards Sufi orders. After him, this order also began to be called "Sünbülüyye order."⁴¹³

Sarı Gürez and Gürez Seydi were among the scholars who opposed the Sufi practice of *semâ'*. This strong opposition led the chief mufti Zenbilli Ali Cemâlî (d. 932/1525) to pen a treatise in favor of *semâ'*. Ali Cemâlî's defense of *devran* was crucial in the sense that none of the chief *muftis* who came after him undertook defense of *devran*.⁴¹⁴ Ali Cemâlî's view of *devran* can possibly be attributed to the fact that he came from an ulemâ family with "a long history of Sufi affiliation".⁴¹⁵ Ali Cemâlî was the first-degree cousin of Çelebi Halife. Zenbilli Ali Cemâlî was the disciple of Shaykh Vefâ (d. 896/1491), who was one of the prominent shaykhs of the Karamanids, and later of the Ottomans. He was also the affiliate of several Halvetî masters.⁴¹⁶ Nevertheless, this favorable attitude towards Halvetis began to change after Zenbilli Ali Cemâlî Efendi. His immediate successor, the chief *müfti* Kemalpaşazâde, posed a grave challenge to the dervishes by penning a treatise

⁴¹² See Madeline C. Zilfi, "Kadızadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, vol. 45, no. 4 (October 1986), 251-269.

⁴¹³ See Nazif Velikahyaoğlu, *Sünbülüyye Tarikatı ve Koca Mustafa Paşa Külliyesi*, (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1999).

⁴¹⁴ Terzioğlu, p. 222.

⁴¹⁵ Terzioğlu, p. 222.

⁴¹⁶ Terzioğlu, p. 222.

against Sufi practice of *semâ'*. Nevertheless, Kemalpaşazade's real target was not Halvetîs but the controversial Melâmî-Bayramî dervish, Oğlan Shaykh (d. 945/1539).⁴¹⁷

The place where the story between Sünbül Sinan and opponents of *semâ'* took place is interesting. The story took place not in a dervish lodge but in the mosque of the Sultan Mehmed II (r. 1451-1481). Sünbül Efendi was an authority on *tefsîr*, exegesis of the Qur'an. According to Yusuf Sinan, Sünbül Efendi was preaching on Fridays in the mosque of Mehmed II. The mosque of Mehmed II was one of "the two highest-ranking mosque-madrasa complexes in the Ottoman 'ilmiyye'.⁴¹⁸ The other was mosque of Süleymâniye. In the early seventeenth century the new mosque of Sultan Ahmed I began to be seen as prestigious as these two mosques. In 1617 Halvetî Shaykh Abdülmecid Sivasî Efendi "was deemed worthy of the honor of scattering the jewels of sermon and admonition" at the new mosque of Sultan Ahmed I and was bestowed its Friday preacher position.⁴¹⁹ Numerous Halvetî shaykhs succeeded in obtaining Friday preacher (*vâ'iz*) positions in the major mosques of İstanbul throughout the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries.⁴²⁰ Between 1621 and 1685, forty-eight appointments were made to the Friday preacher posts at the imperial mosques of Ayasofya, Sultan Ahmed I, Süleymaniye, Bayezid and Mehmed II. At least nineteen of these forty-eight appointments involved the Halvetîs, including Sivasi (d. 1639), Evliyazade Mustafa (d. 1647), Abdülahad Nuri (d. 1651), and Ümmî Sinanzâde Hasan (d. 1677).⁴²¹ Halvetîs were eager to get the Friday preacher posts in order to share their views with the masses, and thereby to get new disciples among them.

⁴¹⁷ Terzioğlu, p. 222.

⁴¹⁸ Zeynep Yürekli, "The Sufi Convent of Sokollu Mehmed Pasha in Istanbul," p. 175.

⁴¹⁹ Madeline C. Zilfi, "Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul," p. 256.

⁴²⁰ Yürekli, pp. 174-175; Zilfi, "Kadizadelis," p. 267.

⁴²¹ Zilfi, pp. 267-268.

Yusuf Sinan narrates that while Sünbül Efendi performed *semâ'* with his disciples in the mosque of Mehmed II, the roof of the mosque was being elevated and dervishes were seeing the whirling of angels. This kind of extraordinary things were not uncommon in the *menâkıbnâmes*, hagiographical works.⁴²² Yusuf Sinan admits the seriousness of the issue of *semâ'* in the eyes of the ulemâ by writing that ulemâ were divided about the question of *semâ'*. Nevertheless, he asserts that most of the ulemâ were supporting Sünbül Efendi.⁴²³

The story was as follows: One day several *ulemâ*, religious scholars, gathered in the mosque of Mehmed II and invited Sünbül Efendi to discuss the permissibility of *semâ'*. Sünbül Efendi came to the mosque with his disciples, among whom was Yusuf Sinan's father Yakub Efendi. There were Sarı Gürez (d. 928 H. / 1522), Qadi of İstanbul, and Gürez Seydi (d. 923/1517), *müderri*s of *Sahn-ı Seman*, among the ulemâ. Shaykh Sünbül Efendi told Sarı Gürez that dervishes practice *semâ'* in the state of ecstasy and that they lose control of their bodies but they do not lose their minds. According to Sünbül Efendi, like in a state of fever (*hummâ*) in which body trembles but humans do not lose their reason, during *semâ'* dervishes were not devoid of their faculty of reason. Then, according to Sinan, *ulemâ* were surprised with the reasoning of Sünbül Efendi. Then, Sünbül Efendi began to insult Sarı Gürez by these words: 'You were also stupid in the past like now.'⁴²⁴ Sünbül Sinan also despised Gürez Seydi by these words: "When you were *müderri*s in the madrasa of Koca Mustafa Paşa you were attending *semâ'* gatherings. Were not you aware of the sinfulness of *semâ'* at that time or did you practice *semâ'* in order to get the favour of

⁴²² For the general characteristics of *menâkıbnâmes*, see A. Yaşar Ocak, *Kültür Tarihi Kaynağı Olarak Menâkıbnâmeler*, Metodolojik Bir Yaklaşım, (Ankara: TTK Yayınları, 1997).

⁴²³ "Ulemâ iki fırka olmuş idi. Ekseri Shaykh Sünbül tarafına idi. Mübâhase-i ilmiyyede kimse ğâlib olmazdı," *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 22b.

⁴²⁴ "Sen evvelden dahî hamâkat üzre idin..." *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 23a.

the Grand Vizier Koca Mustafa Paşa?⁴²⁵ After these words, Shaykh Sünbül Sinan began to preach in the mosque and after preaching eighteen madrasa students became dervishes.”⁴²⁶

While reading this story, one cannot help asking these questions: Was it so easy to insult the Chief Judge of İstanbul? Was such behavior compatible with the very cautious attitude of the Cemâlî-Halvetîs towards bureaucrats and *ulemâ*? Why did such successful reasoning and preaching culminate in only eighteen new disciples from the *madrasa* circles? It seems that the number eighteen was a favourite number for Yusuf Sinan. In the beginning of his work, he praises the Prophet as the prophet of 18,000 worlds (*âlems*).⁴²⁷

3.4.4 *Sending off Khalîfas*

As mentioned earlier, Dina Le Gall studied the venture of a Sufi order, Naqshbandî Order, in the Ottoman world between 1450 and 1700. She has explored how various historical realities affected the proliferation of this Sufi order throughout the Islamic lands.⁴²⁸ She has emphasized “the unique role of Ahrar in training and sending off *khalîfas*.”⁴²⁹ Le Gall asserts that Ahrar was deliberately engaged in what we may call “a great missionary effort.”⁴³⁰ According to Le Gall, Ahrar was not an ordinary Sufi shaykh. He was also “a man of keen political and organizational instincts, who presided over substantial economic ventures as well as a network of

⁴²⁵ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folios. 23a-23b.

⁴²⁶ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folios. 22a-23b.

⁴²⁷ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 2a.

⁴²⁸ Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 2.

⁴²⁹ Le Gall, p. 2.

⁴³⁰ Le Gall, p. 20.

political contacts and patronage”.⁴³¹ A close reading of Yusuf Sinan’s chapter on Merkez Efendi would reveal a similar missionary character in the Halvetî order.

It would not be wrong to assume that Merkez Efendi’s career represents the triumph of the Halvetî order in the face of the challenge of the Safavids. Sünbül Efendi’s response to this challenge with his *Risâle fi ’z-Zikr*, a treatise on *dhikr*, and his famous dialogue with the *ulemâ* of the time in the mosque of Mehmed II. In the *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, Yusuf Sinan seems to be proud of mentioning that Merkez Efendi accompanied Şehzâde Süleyman, future Süleyman the Magnificent, in Manisa and Sultan Süleyman in İstanbul. Although Merkez Efendi had close ties with Şehzâde Süleyman in Manisa, Süleyman’s father, Selim I, was attempting at destroying the Halvetî center in İstanbul, i.e. the lodge of Koca Mustafa Paşa built for Çelebi Halife, due to his anger at Koca Mustafa Paşa.⁴³² The fact that Şeyhülislam Ebussu’ud was the İmam of Merkez Efendi’s funeral (959 H. / 1551-52) shows Cemâlî-Halvetî order’s success at convincing the head of the *ulemâ* about the loyalty of the Halvetî order to the Ottoman Sunnî world view.⁴³³ Yusuf Sinan asserts that Merkez Efendi had more than 500 *khalifas* and that he had a *khalifa* still in India.⁴³⁴ Hulvi gives a detailed account of Merkez Efendi’s *khalifa* in India.⁴³⁵ Yusuf Sinan himself studied *tefsir* with Merkez Efendi.⁴³⁶

⁴³¹ Dina Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism, Naqshbandis in the Ottoman World, 1450-1700*, p. 20.

⁴³² Hulvî, *Lemezât*, pp. 447-448.

⁴³³ Yusuf Sinan, *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 29b.

⁴³⁴ “Hulefâsı beşyüz neferden mütecâvizdir. Rivâyet olunur ki hâlâ diyâr-ı Hindde halîfesi vardır.” Yusuf Sinan, *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 32a.

⁴³⁵ Hulvî, *Lemezât*, pp. 466-467.

⁴³⁶ Yusuf Sinan, *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 30b.

3.4.5 From the Germiyan to the Balkans

Yusuf Sinan writes that his father was born in a place called Şeyhlü in the Germiyan region.⁴³⁷ Both Hulvî and Atâ'î repeat this information without mentioning which city of Germiyan region Shaykh Yakub was born. Most probably, Shaykh Yakub was born in Kütahya, which was the center of the Germiyanoglu principality. In Yakub Efendi's case we observe a similar story: A person in *madrassa* life being captive to worldly pleasures (*iş ü iştret*) was "awakened via a dream" and entered Sufi path.⁴³⁸ What was unique about Yakub Efendi was his story in the Balkans. With him, Cemâlî-Halvetî order found a way of flourishing in the Balkans. Of course, he was not the only Halvetî Shaykh in the Balkans.⁴³⁹ There were other Halvetî Shaykhs in the Balkans such as Sofyalı Bali and Nûreddinzâde Mustafa Muslihuddin (d. 1574) in the sixteenth century. Yusuf Sinan mentions both of these shaykhs.⁴⁴⁰ Shaykh Yakub Efendi went to Yanya, in today's Greece, upon invitation of a Halvetî disciple from Yanya.⁴⁴¹ Yakub Efendi was patronized by Lütfi Paşa's wife Şah Sultan in Yanya. Lütfi Paşa was the governor of Yanya when Yakub Efendi was a shaykh in Yanya. When Lütfi Paşa became Grand Vizier, his wife Şah Sultan built a mosque and a *khankâh* in Davud Paşa and invited Yakub Efendi there.⁴⁴² Yakub Efendi came to İstanbul under the patronage of the wife of the Grand Vizier. Like Aflâkî, Yusuf Sinan also pointed out the women patrons of the time, who supported the Halvetî Order.

⁴³⁷ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 30b; Hulvî, *Lemezât*, p. 477; Atâ'î calls Shaykh Yakub "Şeyh Yakub el-Germiyânî", see Nev'izâde Atâ'î, *Hadâiku'l-Hakâyık fî tekmileti'ş-Şakâik*, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan, (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989), p. 204.

⁴³⁸ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folios 30b-31a.

⁴³⁹ In one of his seminars, Halil İnalçık told that he saw a Halvetî lodge (*tekke*) in Üsküb, a city in Macedonia.

⁴⁴⁰ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folio 17a.

⁴⁴¹ *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folios 32a-32b.

⁴⁴² *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folios 33a-33b.

Yusuf Sinan did not devote much space to the literary works of four leading Shaykhs of the Halvetî order, namely Çelebi Halife, Sünbül Efendi, Merkez Efendi and Yakub Efendi. What is important for him is these shaykh's deeds, not literary works. Yusuf Sinan himself writes that his aim is to introduce "glorious deeds" (*menkıbetler*) of these Shaykhs.⁴⁴³ He explains why he chose these four Shaykhs among various Halvetî shaykhs. It was these shaykhs who brought and disseminated Halveti order to Anatolia, and to India, and the Balkans.⁴⁴⁴ And among these shaykhs was his father, Ya'kub Efendi. Thus, the reader comes across the first-hand knowledge about the sufis of the sixteenth century. In spite of its small size, *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye* can possibly be viewed among the classics of *menâkıbnâme* literature like *Menâkıbü'l-Ârifîn* in terms of its authenticity. Like Çelebi Ârif who traveled to Tabriz in the east and to Birgi in the west, dervishes narrated by Yusuf Sinan wandered from Anatolia to remote lands such as India in the east and to the Balkans in the west.

⁴⁴³ "Mesned-i sa'âdetimiz Çelebi Halife ve Sünbül Efendi ve Merkez Efendi ve Yakub Efendilerin cümlesi müte'âkıben bir seccâdeye cülûs etmişlerdir. Bunların sîretlerinden ve menkıbetlerinden el-kalîlü yedüllü 'ale'l-kesîrdiyü birer menkıbe zikreliyem." *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, 8a.

⁴⁴⁴ Bir latîf risâle te'lîf etliyem ki mazmûnı menkıbet-i meşhûn-ı tarîk-i Halvetiyyenin diyâr-ı Rûm'a gelüb münteşir olmasına kimler olmuşlardır ve ğâyet meşhurları kimlerdir icmâl üzre beyân idüb ve hulefâlarından dahî nâmdârlarını 'ıyân eyliyem" *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, folios 7b-8a.

CHAPTER IV

A SUFÎ SAINT AS CITY FOUNDER: THE ANALYSIS OF THE *MAKÂLÂT-İ SEYYİD HÂRÛN*⁴⁴⁵

The rise of cities and their development throughout the ages have been a major study field for historians.⁴⁴⁶ The cities have been examined not only from a material perspective but also from a spiritual perspective. A river or a castle might be the symbol of a city. In the same way, a saint or a shrine might be a symbol of city throughout the ages. In this article a Medieval Sufi saint, Seyyid Hârûn (d. 1320), who is believed to have come to today's Seydişehir, a town in Anatolia, at the beginning of the fourteenth century will be examined. One of his descendants wrote a hagiographical work about Seyyid Hârûn. This hagiographical work, *Makâlât-i Seyyid Hârûn*, was written taking into account the politics of the mid-sixteenth century Ottoman Empire, which challenged the Sufis' views and activities especially in the central and eastern Anatolia due to the Safavid propaganda. Thus, the author of

⁴⁴⁵ A revised version of this chapter will be published in *Turcica* 40 (2008).

⁴⁴⁶ For an overview of the literature on history of Turkish cities, see Yunus Uğur, "Şehir Tarihi ve Türkiye'de Şehir Tarihçiliği: Yaklaşımlar, Konular ve Kaynaklar", *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, vol. 3, no. 6 (2005), 9-26; and for a review of the literature about Anatolian towns in the Ottoman classical period, see Mehmet Öz, "Osmanlı Klasik Döneminde Anadolu Kentleri," *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, vol. 3, no. 6 (2005), 57-88; and for an interview with Suraiya Faroqhi on historiography of Turkish cities, see Coşkun Çakır et al., "Suraiya Faroqhi ile Türk Şehir Tarihi Üzerine," *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, vol. 3, no. 6 (2005), 437-455.

the *Makâlât*, Abdülkerim bin Şeyh Musa, tried to form a Seyyid Hârûn figure that conformed to the Ottoman campaign of “Sunnitisation.”⁴⁴⁷

4.1 The Author and the Work

Abdülkerim bin Şeyh Musa was one of the grandsons of Seyyid Hârûn’s brother, Seyyid Bedreddin, from the ninth line. *Defter-i evkâf-ı livâ-i Konya* (992/1583) (the book of registers of the pious foundations of Konya) mentions him as “Şeyh Abdülkerim veled-i Şeyh Musa”⁴⁴⁸. He was one of the holders of the vakf of Seyyid Hârûn, which included *zâviye* (dervish lodge), *câmi* (mosque) and *madrassa*. While reading this work, the reader should bear in mind that the author belonged to the family of Seyyid Hârûn. The work has various similarities to other hagiographies and, as well, some peculiarities. It is noticeable that the *Makâlât* has something to say about the psychology of the Ottoman dervishes in the mid-sixteenth century.

Three manuscript copies of the *Makâlât* exist: Manisa Murâdiye Kütüphânesi, Mevlânâ Müzesi Kütüphânesi and Konya Bölge Yazma Eserler Kütüphânesi.⁴⁴⁹

⁴⁴⁷ For a detailed analysis of the Ottoman campaign of “Sunnitisation”, see Nathali Clayer, *Mystiques, État et Societe, Les Halvetis dans l’aire Balkanique de la fin du XVIe siècle à nos jours*, (Leiden:E. J. Brill, 1994), pp. 90-112.

⁴⁴⁸ “Nesl-i Seyyid Hârûn, Şeyh Abdülkerim veled-i Şeyh Musa, Sunullah veled-i o ve Mevlânâ Mehmed veled-i Seydi Ibrahim ve zâviye-i mezkûrenin hüddâmı ve fukarâ-i mücavirîn der zâviye ve hüddâmı-i Câmî-i Seydi Hârûn, Selâtîn-i mâziyye âl-i Osman—enâra’llahu burhânehum— ve âl-i Karaman ümerâsı ahkâmı mücebince Seydi Hârûn zâviyesi, Câmî ve madrasası ve âna müte’allik vakf müsekkefâtın termîm ve ta’mîrine hizmet etmek için Şeyhzâde Mehmed’den mâ’adâ otuz nefer kimesne cem’-i zamanda hizmet edegelmişlerdir ve defâtîr-i kadîmede dahî mukayyed ve mastûrlardır,” see M. Akif Erdoğan, “Seydişehir Seydi Hârûn Külliyesi Vakıfları Üzerine Bir Araştırma,” *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. VII (1992), p. 129-130.

⁴⁴⁹ a-Manisa Muradiye Kütüphânesi, no. 1390; b- Konya Mevlânâ Müzesi Kütüphânesi, no. 1513;

c- Konya Bölge Yazma Eserler Kütüphânesi Faik Soyman Vakfı Kitapları, no. 281; for a detailed information about manuscript copies of the work, see Abdülkerim bin Şeyh Musa, *Makâlât-ı Seyyid Hârûn*, ed. Cemal Kurnaz, (Ankara:TTK, 1991), p. 1.

Initially, Çağatay Uluçay published the *Makâlât* in the journal *Bellekten*.⁴⁵⁰ However, this edition does not contain the chapter entitled *Sülûk-i Seyyid Hârûn alâ tarîk-i Muhammed Mustafâ salla'lahü 'aleyhi vesellem* (“The joining of Seyyid Hârûn to the Path of the Prophet Muhammed, Grace of God be upon Him”) in which the author also discusses the story of creation of Adam and the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Paradise. Cemal Kurnaz carried out the critical edition of the *Makâlât*.⁴⁵¹ In spite of the importance of this work for the history of Sufism in Anatolia in the aftermath of Mongol invasions, it has not been studied thoroughly from various sides such as relationships between political authorities and dervishes or the formation of a saint cult in Anatolia throughout the centuries. The literature on Seyyid Hârûn does not dwell much on the fact that *Makâlât-i Seyyid Hârûn* was written in the mid-sixteenth century, more than two centuries after the death of Seyyid Hârûn. No effort has been made to compare the themes discussed in the *Makâlât* with other hagiographies and contemporary sources.

The *Makâlât-i Seyyid Hârûn* was composed in 962/1554-1555 (“*Hicret-i Peygamber salla'l-lahu aleyhi vesellem dokuz yüz altmış ikisinde ahvâl budur*”).⁴⁵² It narrates the story of the establishment of the town of Seydişehir, which got its name from Seyyid Hârûn. The title of the work, i.e. *makâlât*, is interesting in the sense that it is related to oral teachings of a particular Sufi master. Nevertheless, the author presents his audience with mostly acts and doings of his hero, Seyyid Hârûn. In her article about the diary of Niyazi-i Mısrî (1618-94), Derin Terzioğlu makes an interesting observation about (auto)biographical tradition in Ottoman Sufism. She states that some Ottoman dervishes wrote about themselves in the compilations that

⁴⁵⁰ M. Çağatay Uluçay, “Makâlât-i Seyyid-Hârûn,” *Bellekten*, vol. X, 40 (1946), pp. 749-778.

⁴⁵¹ Abdülkerim bin Şeyh Musa, *Makâlât-i Seyyid Hârûn*, ed. Cemal Kurnaz, (Ankara:TTK, 1991).

⁴⁵² “Hicret-i Peygamber salla'l-lahu aleyhi vesellem dokuz yüz altmış ikisinde ahval budur”, *Makâlât*, p. 65.

were the product of the oral teachings of their masters (*malfûzât, makâlât*).⁴⁵³ She gives the example of the Celveti master Mahmud Hûda'î (d. 1623) who authorized his disciples “to make copies of both the diary he kept as a Sufî adept and the visionary account he wrote as a perfected master”.⁴⁵⁴ In the case of the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Hârûn*, an Ottoman dervish Abdülkerim bin Şeyh Musa wrote about a Sufi shaykh who lived beyond the borders of the Ottoman principality. As the author points out, in the early fourteenth century Seydişehir was a part of the Eşrefoğlu principality.

The author claims that the former *makâlât* of Seyyid Hârûn was lost and that dervishes from Aydın and Saruhan, today's Manisa region, came to ask him to rewrite it on the basis of what he had heard from “the saints” (*evliyâ*).⁴⁵⁵ We do not know whether the *Makâlât* of Seyyid Harun was written before the sixteenth century. The author indicates that there were some Persian sources and that he translated them into Turkish.⁴⁵⁶ But he does not specify what was the nature of these Persian sources. The audience in the author's mind was perhaps the Turcomans of the Province of Karaman and of the Western Anatolia. As Feridun Emecen points out, the Saruhanoğlu region was under the influence of Turcoman babas and dervishes.⁴⁵⁷ According to Köprülü, the use of Turkish developed in the Western Anatolia in the fourteenth century, particularly within the borders of the Aydınoğlu principality.⁴⁵⁸

⁴⁵³ Derin Terzioğlu, “Man in the Image of God in the Image of the Times: Sufi self-narratives and the diary of Niyazi-i Misri (1618-94)”, *Studia Islamica*, no. 94 (2002), p. 144.

⁴⁵⁴ Derin Terzioğlu, “Sufi self-narratives and the diary of Niyazi-i Misri (1618-94)”, p. 144.

⁴⁵⁵ “Husûsâ Karamanun Seydişehir’de Hârûn el-Velîdür. Cümle evliyânun serdefteridür...Ammâ ânun makâlâtı zâyî’ olmuştur. Çok cehdler olub bulunmamuş. İmdi ehibbâ begâyet arzumanlık idüb Aydın ilinden ve Saruhan ilinden nice âşıklar, sâdıklar gelüp biz fakîre tevazzu itdiler ki sen pîrsin, hem evliyânun neslisin. Sana lâzîmdur, bu Seyyid Hârûn’un makâlâtını azîzlerden işitüb bildüğün üzere yazub beyân idesin.”, *Makâlât*, p. 22.

⁴⁵⁶ “Ba’zı Fârisî evrak bulunub Fârisîyi Türkîye tercüme idüb tahrîr olındı”, *Makâlât*, p. 22.

⁴⁵⁷ Feridun M. Emecen, *İlk Osmanlılar ve Batı Anadolu Beylikler Dünyası*, (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2003), p. 133.

⁴⁵⁸ M. Fuad Köprülü, “Anadolu Selçukluları Tarihinin Yerli Kaynakları,” *Bellekten*, vol. 7, no. : 27 (1943), p. 399.

The author, whose audience also included dervishes from Western Anatolia preferred to write in Turkish. He preferred a simple language that could be understood by common people.⁴⁵⁹ Perhaps in order not to bore his audience, the author is preoccupied with brevity.⁴⁶⁰ Compared to most of the hagiographical works such as *Menâkıbü'l-Ârifîn* and *Menâkıb-i İbrahim Gülşenî*, the *Makâlât* is very brief. It is only seventy pages.⁴⁶¹

The author's claim about the existence of some Persian sources beforehand is reminiscent of the Bektaşî tradition that there was an earlier Arabic version of the *Makâlât* of Hacı Bektaş and that this Arabic text was translated into Turkish by Hatiboğlu Muhammed in the year 812/1409. As Ocak argues, an original Arabic version of the *Makâlât-i Hacı Bektaş* never existed before. According to Ocak, Hacı Bektaş as expressed in the *Makâlât-i Hacı Bektaş* is very different from the "genuine" Hacı Bektaş who lived in the thirteenth century.⁴⁶² The similar statement can be made about Seyyid Harun. The real Seyyid Harun (d. 1320) might have been very different from the one expressed in the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun*.

According to the author, Seyyid Hârûn belonged to Seydişehir of Karaman: *Karaman'un Seydişehirinde Seyyid Hârûn el-Velî*.⁴⁶³ This was true for the mid-sixteenth century but it was not the case during the period in which Seyyid Hârûn

⁴⁵⁹ Abdülkerim bin Şeyh Musa, *Makâlât-ı Seyyid Hârûn*, ed. Cemal Kurnaz, pp. 6-10.

⁴⁶⁰ "Bunda ahvâl çokdur. Her birisini söylemek kıssayı dirâz ider. Dinleyenlere kehlik virür.", *Makâlât*, p. 53.

⁴⁶¹ Abdülkerim bin Şeyh Musa, *Makâlât-ı Seyyid Hârûn*, ed. Cemal Kurnaz, p. 82, 125.

⁴⁶² Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Marjinal Sufilik, Kalenderîler (XIV-XVII. Yüzyıllar)*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1999), p. 206; Irène Mélikoff shares the opinion of Ocak about the question of the an original Arabic version of the *Makâlât-i Hacı Bektaş*, see Irène Mélikoff, *Hadji Bektach, Un Mythe et ses Avatars, Genèse et évolution du soufisme populaire en Turquie*, (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1998), p. 63 ; Irène Mélikoff, *Hacı Bektaş, Efsaneden Gerçeğe*, tr. Turan Alptekin, (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Kitapları, 1998), p. 102.

⁴⁶³ *Makâlât*, p. 22.

lived.⁴⁶⁴ Interestingly, there is no mention of the Ottoman empire or the reigning Ottoman Sultan, Süleyman the Magnificent (r. 1520-1566) in the text.

There are mainly two types of Sufi hagiographies in terms of being a source for history.⁴⁶⁵ The first type of hagiographies such as the *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn* often follows the chronology and takes into account the sequence of events. The second type of hagiographies such as the *Vilâyetnâme* of Hacı Bektaş narrates events irrespective of the chronology. In the second type of the hagiographies, it is not certain in which century the shaykh, for whom the hagiography was written, lived. Köprülü places the *Makâlât* of Seyyid Hârûn between the *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn* of Aflâkî and the *Vilâyetnâme* of Hacı Bektaş in terms of its chronological coherence. It is not as reliable as the *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn* but more reliable than the *Vilâyetname*, according to Köprülü.⁴⁶⁶ In his book about the Beyşehir of the sixteenth century, entitled *Osmanlı Yönetiminde Beyşehir Sancağı (1522-1584)*,⁴⁶⁷ Erdoğan briefly mentions the importance of the *Makâlât* of Seyyid Hârûn for the history of the region but he does not deal with what was the nature of the relationships between political authorities and dervishes in the Ottoman empire of the sixteenth century and he does not ask the question of why the *Makâlât* was written in the sixteenth century.

⁴⁶⁴ For the Province of Karaman in the sixteenth century, see Nicoara Beldiceanu et Irène Beldiceanu-Steinher, "Recherches sur la province de Karaman au 16e siècle", *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient (JESHO)*, vol. XI (1968): 1-129; M. Tayyib Gökbiçgin, "XVI. Asırda Karaman Eyaleti ve Lârende (Karaman) Vakıf ve Müesseseleri", *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. VII (1968): 29-38; M. Akif Erdoğan, "Kanuni'nin İlk Yıllarında Karaman Vilayeti", *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, no. VII (1993), pp. 37-50; Alaaddin Aköz, "Şer'iyye Sicillerine Göre XVI. Yüzyıl Sonu ile XVII. Yüzyıl Başlarında Karaman," *unpublished M. A. thesis*, (Konya: Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Selçuk Üniversitesi, 1987).

⁴⁶⁵ I would like to express my gratitude to İnalçık for this information.

⁴⁶⁶ M. Fuad Köprülü, "Anadolu Selçukluları Tarihinin Yerli Kaynakları," p. 424.

⁴⁶⁷ M. Akif Erdoğan, *Osmanlı Yönetiminde Beyşehir Sancağı (1522-1584)*, (İzmir, 1988).

4.2 An Ottomanized Version of the *Makâlât*?

Carl W. Ernst indicates that books about the lives of saints mostly have “an explicitly political context.”⁴⁶⁸ According to Ernst, implicit political motives in hagiographies can be inferred “by reference to contemporary events or by comparison with other hagiographic texts ostensibly describing the same period”.⁴⁶⁹ In her article entitled “The Bektâşhis: A Report on Current Research” Faroqhi dwells on the attempts at extracting historical facts from hagiographical works such as the *Vilâyetnâmes* of Sultan Şücaeddin.⁴⁷⁰ She points out the fact that such kind of analyses focus on “the great debates of the time such as the tension between şeriat-minded and heretic world world views” instead of “the concrete details of zâviye life.”⁴⁷¹ As stated before, in most of the studies on the dervish lodges, the the details of zâviye life are examined without any reference to the political and religious context of the time in question.

In his article entitled “The Growth of Turkish Hagiographical Literature within the Halveti order in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth centuries,” John J. Curry asks the following question: What made the writers of Halveti *tarikât* hagiography suddenly feel the need to create a body of Turkish literature to document their saintly figures between 1575 and 1630? Who was their intended audience? And how might their motivations affect or bias these authors’ presentation of their beloved saints?”.

⁴⁶⁸ Carl W. Ernst, *Mysticism, History and Politics at a South Asian Sufi Center*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), second edition, firstly published in 1992 by the State University of New York, p. 85.

⁴⁶⁹ Carl W. Ernst, *Mysticism, History and Politics at a South Asian Sufi Center*, p. 85.

⁴⁷⁰ See Orhan F. Köprülü, “Velâyetnâme-i Sultan Şücaüddin,” *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, vol. 17 (1972), pp. 177-184.

⁴⁷¹ Suraiya Faroqhi, “The Bektâşhis: A Report on Current Research”, in *Bektachiyya, Etudes sur L’ordre Mystique des Bektachis et les Groupes Relevant de Hadji Bektach*, ed. Alexandre Popovic et Gilles Veinstein, (Istanbul: ISIS Press, 1995), p. 10.

⁴⁷² In the article Curry elaborates on *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye* of Yusuf Sinan b. Ya'kub (d. 987/1579-1580). After discussing the main themes in the *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye* he reaches the following conclusion: "This short text gives us a wonderful look at how the motivations that drove the author of a hagiographical work could function on multiple levels. Not only does the text reflect the author's desire for a prestigious position within the Ottoman government, but it also plays multiple roles as a defense of the Halvetî *tarikât*, the author's father, and by extension perhaps even the author himself".⁴⁷³ In the case of the *Makâlât*, various motivations might have also been at work. We knew that the author, Abdülkerim b. Şeyh Mûsâ, was holder of a *vakf* ratified by the Ottoman Sultan. Perhaps he tried to secure his position by penning a work in line with the Ottoman world view. The *Makâlât* can also be viewed as a defense of the followers of Seyyid Hârûn in the sceptic environment against the Sufis in the mid-sixteenth century. In fact, Abdülkerim b. Şeyh felt the need to write such hagiographical work nearly twenty years before Yusuf Sinan.⁴⁷⁴

We should not overlook the possibility that an earlier version of the *Makâlât* might have existed. If so, it was probably written from a Karamanid point of view. Beyşehir, Akşehir, and Seydişehir were disputed regions among the Karamanoğlus and the Ottomans and these towns changed hands until the final Ottoman occupation

⁴⁷² John Curry, "The Growth of Turkish Hagiographical Literature within the Halvetî Order in the 16th and 17th Centuries," *The Turks, 3: Ottomans*, ed. H. Celal Güzel, C. Cem Oğuz, Osman Karatay, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 2002), p. 913.

⁴⁷³ John Curry, "The Growth of Turkish Hagiographical Literature," p. 915.

⁴⁷⁴ Yusuf Sinan dedicated his work to Sultan Murad III (r. 1574-95). Taking into account the fact that Yusuf Sinan went to Medîna in the Hegira year of 985 (1577-1578) and died there in 987 H. / 1579-80, it seems that he submitted his work to Sultan Murat III (r. 1574-1595) during the first years of his sultanate. For the manuscript versions of *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, see Yusuf Sinan, *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, Süleymaniye Library, Esad Efendi no. 1372; Although often neglected in the literature, there is also another manuscript version of Yusuf Sinan's *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye* in Bibliothèque Nationale de France: Suppl. Turc, no. 48, folios 2a-22a. The date of this manuscript is *Şa'ban* 992/1584-1585, see Bibliothèque Nationale de France: Supplement Turc, no. 48, Yusuf Sinan ibn Yakub, [*Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*], folio 22a. Perhaps this date is the date of *istinsâh*, a hand-writing copy of an original manuscript, rather than the date of the original manuscript. E. Blochet describes this manuscript as follows: "Un petit traité, sans titre (folio I verso), dans lequel un auteur, nomme Yousuf ibn Yakub (folio 4 verso)". See E. Blochet, *Suppl. Turc*, p. 185.

of Karamanoğlu principality in 1468.⁴⁷⁵ İnalçık explains the difficulties that the Ottoman Empire had in controlling Turcoman tribes of the Karaman Principality as follows:

Although Mehmed II occupied Karaman in 1468, he was unable to subjugate a number of Turcoman tribes living in the mountains which extend to the Mediterranean coast. These tribes were not subdued for the next fifty years, and from time to time rose in revolt around pretenders to the throne of Karaman.⁴⁷⁶

As stated before, the Ottoman attitude towards popular religious orders such as the Kalenderîs began to change after the rise of the Safavids in 1501. These popular orders were widespread among Turcomans in Anatolia. The Ottomans witnessed rebellions of Turcomans led by Şahkulu in 1511 and by Kalender Çelebi in 1527. Kalender Çelebi, who claimed descent from Hacı Bektaş, gained the support of kalender dervishes and Turcoman tribal leaders.⁴⁷⁷ According to the Ottoman chronicler Peçevî (Peçûyî) İbrahim Efendi (982/1574-1059/1649), “Kalender Şah” succeeded in attracting many followers “that had not been attained before by a rebel”⁴⁷⁸. Kalender and his followers defeated the Ottoman army led by the governor of Anatolia, Behram Pasha. The rebels killed notable commanders including the Governor of the Province of Karaman, Mahmud Pasha. In the face of this humiliating defeat, the Ottoman Grand Vizier İbrahim Pasha resorted to diplomatic measures to

⁴⁷⁵ Halil İnalçık, *Fatih Devri Üzerinde Tetkikler ve Vesikalar*, third edition, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1995), pp. 15n.

⁴⁷⁶ İnalçık, *The Classical Age*, p. 28.

⁴⁷⁷ “Hurûc-i Kalender-i nâ-halef ve istisâl ve tedbîr-i O, sene 933: Hacı Bektaş-i Velî evlâdından ya’nî Kadıncık Ana’dan burnı kanı damlasıyla nefis oğlu olan Habîb Efendi evlâdından ol tâifenin i’tikâdı mücebince Kalender ibn-i İskender ibn-i Balım Sultan ibn-i Rasûl Çelebi ibn-i Habîb Efendi’dir.”, Peçevî İbrahim Efendi, *Tarih-i Peçevî*, ed. Fahri Ç. Derin, Vahit Çabuk, (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1980), p. 120. For more information about the rebellion of Kalender Çelebi, see Ahmet Refik, *Onaltıncı Asırda Rafizilik ve Bektaşilik*, (İstanbul: Muallim Ahmet Halit Kitaphanesi, 1932), pp. 11-12; John Robert Barnes, “The Dervish Orders in the Ottoman Empire,” in *The Dervish Lodge: Architecture, Art, and Sufism in Ottoman Turkey*, ed. Raymond Lifchez, (Berkeley & Los Angeles & Oxford: University of California Press, 1992), p. 37; Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı İmparatorlu’nda Marjinal Sufilik: Kalenderîler (XIV-XVII. Yüzyıllar)*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1999), pp. 129, 130.

⁴⁷⁸ “Mezbûr Kalender Şah bir derece kuvvet ve kudret ve mertebe cem’iyyet ıssı oldu ki şimdîye degin bir hâricîye müyesser olmamışdır. Ne kadar ışık ve abdal nâmına ‘akîdesi nâ-pâk bir mezheb var ise yanına cem’ olmağla yigirmi otuz bin eşkıyâ idüğü tahkîke irmiş idi”, Peçevî İbrahim Efendi, *Tarih-i Peçevî*, p. 121.

divide Kalender's followers. Since most of Kalender's forces were from the Dulkadir province, İbrahim Pasha succeeded in dividing Kalender's forces by rewards and promises of granting *timars* to Dulkadir sipahis. Having lost most of his followers, Kalender Çelebi was defeated and killed by the Ottoman forces on 22 Ramadan 933/21 June 1527. Celalzâde Mustafa Çelebi, who accompanied İbrahim Pasha as *reîsü'l-küttâb*⁴⁷⁹ during the Ottoman campaign against Kalender Çelebi's forces, describes Kalender Çelebi as a renegade (*mülhid*), who "rebelled with the hope of sultanate".⁴⁸⁰

These rebellions led to the trend towards "a more conservative, shari'a-minded Ottoman State".⁴⁸¹ This trend was partly a work of Ebussu'ud, who acted as a Şeyhülislam in the period. Süleyman the Magnificent called Ebussu'ud "my brother in this world and in the other".⁴⁸² As a *Şeyhülislâm*, Ebussu'ud attempted to build a mosque in every village and obliged the villagers to conduct their prayers in the mosques. He also condemned heretical sects and therefore alienated the Turcomans.⁴⁸³

When one looks at the style of language of the *Makâlât*, a question arises whether the work was really lost or it was rewritten in order to conform to "a more conservative, shari'a-minded Ottoman State."⁴⁸⁴ The reason the author felt the need to revise the *menâkıbnâme* of Seyyid Hârûn may be found in a tragic happening, just four to five years before the compilation of the *Makâlât*. This event related to a Sufi

⁴⁷⁹ *Reîsü'l-küttâb*: "chief of the clerks" and "the head of the offices attached to the grand vizierate", see İnalçık, *The Classical Age*, p. 224.

⁴⁸⁰ Mehmet Şakir Yılmaz, "Koca Nişancı of Kanuni: Celalzade Mustafa Çelebi, Bureaucracy and 'Kanun' in the Reign of Suleyman the Magnificent (1520-1566)," *unpublished Ph. D. thesis*, (Ankara: Bilkent University Department of History, September 2006), pp. 67, 68.

⁴⁸¹ Halil İnalçık, "State and Ideology under Sultan Süleyman I", in *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire, Essays on Economy and Society*, ed. Halil İnalçık, (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1993), p. 81.

⁴⁸² Halil İnalçık, "State and Ideology under Sultan Süleyman I", p. 81.

⁴⁸³ İnalçık, p. 81.

⁴⁸⁴ İnalçık, p. 81.

Master from the Province of Karaman, namely Shaykh Muhyiddin-i Karamanî. This shaykh was executed on the grounds of heresy by the *fetva*, religious opinion on a legal issue, of Ebussu'ud in 1550.⁴⁸⁵ According to the court records, during his trial, Karamanî was accused of wrong conception of *vahdet-i vücud*⁴⁸⁶ and of disbelief in prophets, except Muhammed. According to the court records, Muhyiddin-i Karamanî claimed that there had been only four persons superior to him: the Prophet Muhammed, the Caliph Ali, Ferîdüddin Attar, and Ibn al-Arabî and that he perceived himself superior to other prophets.⁴⁸⁷

Due to the Safavid leanings among certain dervishes, particularly Melamîs, there was a tremendous increase in accusations of *zendeka*⁴⁸⁸ and *ilhâd*⁴⁸⁹ during the reign of Suleyman the Magnificent (1520-1566).⁴⁹⁰ However, the main reason behind these accusations was a strict interpretation of Sunnî sect of Islam by the religious scholars of the time. Before Shaykh Muhyiddin-i Karamani, some Sufi masters and scholars were executed for heresy in the sixteenth-century Ottoman empire. Among

⁴⁸⁵ “Mahrûsa-i İslâmbolda emr-i şerîf üzere katl olunan Karamanlı Şeyh demekle ma'rûf olan şahsın, katli icab eden sebep-i şer'î ne idüğü, hîn-i teftişte hâzır olmayan ehl-i İslâma beyân buyurub müsâb olalar.

El-Cevâb: Zaruriyât-i dînden olub nusûs-ı kâtî'a ile sâbit olan ahkâm-i şer'at-i şerîfeye inkâr ile zındık idüğü ve hazret-i Resûlullah (sallallâhu aleyhi ve sellem) cenâb-i rif'atlerini tahkîr vechi ile zikr ettiğı tarîk-i şer'î ile sâbit olduğı için katl olunmuşdur.”, see M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ, *Şeyhülislâm Ebussu'ud Efendi Fetvaları Işığında 16. Asır Türk Hayatı*, (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1983, pp. 193, 194; Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, “Kanuni Sultan Süleyman Devrinde bir Osmanlı Heretiğı: Şeyh Muhyiddin-i Karamanî,” in *Prof. Dr. Bekir Kütükoğlu'na Armağan*, İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basimevi, 1991), p. 477.

⁴⁸⁶ The doctrine of *vahdet-i vücûd* or *wahdat al-wujûd* is defined by Dina Le Gall, as follows:

“Literally, ‘the unity of being’; both critics and admirers have used this term to refer to a set of ideas about the relationship between God and the created world that they took to be a ‘doctrine’ and associated especially with Ibn al-‘Arabî; in the eyes of critics this doctrine asserted the identity of God and creation.” Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 240.

⁴⁸⁷ Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler (15.-17. Yüzyıllar)*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998), pp. 322-323.

⁴⁸⁸ “A term used in medieval times primarily in reference to Manichaeism but also more loosely to refer to heretical unbelief; in sixteenth-century Ottoman usage it was employed interchangeably with *ilhâd*.” Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 241.

⁴⁸⁹ “A term used from ‘Abbasid times in the sense of heretical unbelief; in sixteenth-century Ottoman usage it was employed to describe subversive movements and doctrines, especially those with messianic or Shî‘î overtones.” Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 234.

⁴⁹⁰ For a detailed analysis of the terms *zendeka*-zındık and *ilhâd*-mülhid, see Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler (15.-17. Yüzyıllar)*, pp. 6-15.

them were Molla Kabız (d. 1527), Hakim Ishak (d.1527) and Şeyh İsmail Maşuki (d.1529).⁴⁹¹ But what was unique in the case of Şeyh Muhyiddin-i Karamani was that he originated from the Province of Karaman and his execution took place just four or five years before the compilation of the *Makâlât*. Probably, this event made a great impact on the memory of the Sufi milieu in the Province of Karaman and perhaps led our author to replace the old version of the *Makâlât*, if it had existed before, with a new one in order to prevent suspicious eyes from turning their attention to this modest Sufi milieu.

According to the *Menâkıb-i İbrahim-i Gülşenî*, which was composed by Muhyî-yi Gülşenî (d. 1014 H./1605-1606) between the years 977 H./1569 and 1013H./1604, the sixteenth century was a difficult period for most of the Ottoman Sufis. In the words of John J. Curry, the *Menâkıb-i İbrahim-i Gülşenî* is “perhaps the greatest work of hagiography ever produced by an Ottoman author”.⁴⁹² Muhyî-yi Gülşenî points out a *fetvâ*, religious opinion, of Molla Arab, who acted as Ottoman *Şeyhülislam* from the year 893 H./1488 until his death in 901 H./1496, legitimizing the execution of those who believe in the *Fusûs* of Ibn al-Arabî. He explains how hostile was the ulemâ against the Sufis in the year 957 H./1549-1550⁴⁹³. If we recall

⁴⁹¹ Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, “Kanuni Sultan Süleyman Devrinde bir Osmanlı Heretiği: Şeyh Muhyiddin-i Karamanî,” p. 475.

⁴⁹² John J. Curry, “Home is Where the Shaykh Is: The Concept of Exile in the Hagiography of İbrahim-i Gülşenî”, *Al-Masaq*, vol. 17, no. 1 (March 2005), p. 48.

⁴⁹³ “Fakîr ol zaman Edirne’de idim. Sene seb’a ve hamsîn ve tis’a mie [957 H./1549-1550] idi. Hattâ ol yıl ehlullah’dan bir ‘azîz intikâl etmiş idi. ‘Ah şeyh-i mâ’ ve ‘Şeyhimiz’ diyü iki tarih dimiş idim. Kayserlîzâde oğlu şerîkim Mustafa Çelebi ol gün bu fakîre gelüb babası onda ol münkirîn-i ehlullâh cem’ olub muhibb-i fukarâ olanlara mutlakâ zarar kasdın eyleyüb Âşık Efendi’ye hâtırına gelmeyin nâ-meşrû’ isnâd idüb fakîr ol tarihleri Karamanî için dimişdir, diyü küllî tertîbler itdiklerin haber virdi. Fakîr hoş hâl oldum ki, ‘Elhamdülillah bizi dahî ehlullah sülküne dâhil etmişler’, didim. Eytidi: Ammâ babam zulm idüb kizbler ta’biye idüb bana bile ta’lîm itmek murâd itdi ve eyitdi: ‘Muhyî seninle muhtelîtdir. Her ne isnâd itsen mesmû’umdur. ‘Bu meşâyih ve Fusûs’a mu’tekid olanları katl itmek savâbdır’, Molla Arab-ı Vâ’izden ben işitdim.”, Muhyî-yi Gülşenî, *Menâkıb-i İbrâhîm-i Gülşenî*, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1982), p. 362; for the life and works of Mevlânâ Alâeddin Ali Arabî who was known as Molla Arab, see Mecdî Mehmed Efendi, *Hadaiku’ş-Şakaik*, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan, (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989), pp. 171-176; Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i Osmanî*, tr. Seyit Ali Kahraman, ed. Nuri Akbayar, vol. 1, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996), pp. 230,231. For more information about the Gülşenî Order, see Rüya Kılıç,

the fact that *Makâlât* was written in the year 962 H./1554-1555, the importance of Muhyî-yi Gülşenî's observations about the religious and political climate of the Ottoman empire becomes clear. Muhyî-yi Gülşenî also accuses Ebussu'ud of leading to the execution of Shaykh Muhyiddin-i Karamanî.⁴⁹⁴

4.3 The Analysis of the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Hârûn*

In *Makâlât* of Seyyid Hârûn, there are references to famous shaykhs of thirteenth century Konya, namely Mevlânâ Celâleddin-i Rûmî and Ahmed Fakih. The author asserts that before his death Celâleddin-i Rûmî mentioned the arrival of a shaykh from Horasan to Konya.⁴⁹⁵

“Osmanlı Devleti’nde Gülşenî Tarikatı (Genel Bir Yaklaşım Denemesi),” *Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi*, no. 15 (2004), pp. 209-226.

⁴⁹⁴ “Meger Mustafa Paşa tekyesi yanında bir madrasa dahi binâ itmiş, ânı Ebussu’ud Hâce Çelebi Hazretlerine virmiş. İki dânişmendi Karamânî meclisine varırlar; rubûde-i mahabbet-i İlâhî olub mürîd olurlar. Karamânî der ki, varun yine Mollanız hıdmetinde olun; gâhî fukarâ ile cem’ olmanız kifâyetdir. Fi’l-vâki’ Şeyhin rızâsın gözedüb yine Ebussu’ud Hazretlerinin dersine hâzır olurlar. Emmâ fukarâ meclisini dahî terk itmezler. Hâce Çelebi Şeyh’e haber gönderir ki, ‘Ol bizim dânişmendlerimizi meclise komayub redd itsün, yohsa kendüye zararım dokunur’. Şeyh cevab virür ki, ‘Anların zâhiren zararı dokunub bize şehâdet nasîb olacağın Pîrimiz dahî işaret itmişdir. Emmâ ehllullah meclisinden talebeyi reddetmek tarîkatde yokdur. Emmâ yine hâtır-ı şerîfleri için tenbîh ideyim”, diyüb dânişmendleri çağırub ‘elbette benim rızâmı isterseniz varun üstâdımız hıdmetinde olun’, diyecek ‘biz üstâdımızı bulduk, diyüb esbâbların tağyîr idüb dervişler kisvesine girürler. Bu kere Ebussu’ud Efendi bî-huzur olub Karamanî hakkında çok kelimât ider. Ol esnâda Karamanî İstanbul’a varır. Kostantınıyye halkı alıkoyub muhabbet iderler. Ebussu’ud Efendi Sahn’a varub İstanbul kadısı olub kadıasker oldu. Edirne’ye Sultan Süleyman ile vardıkda Karamanî dahî Edirne’ye varır. Bazı kimesneler ğaraz idüb Sultan Bayezid Camii’nde tefîş iderler. Karamanî bir iki âyet tefsîr idüb hayli hakâyık beyân itmegin ol nevbet zafer bulmazlar. Meclisde du’â idüb dervişleri ile zıkr iderek gider. Ehl-i ğaraz olanlar hayli bî-huzûr olub zamân-i âhara te’hîr iderler. Çün Hâce Çelebi Efendi müftî oldu. Sene seb’a ve hamsîn ve tis’a mie [957 H.]’de vaka’a mâ vaka’a nitekim beyân oldu. Emmâ Fakîr Muhyiddîn Karamanî’nin mecâlisinde hâzır oldum. Ve va’az ve tahkîkâtı istimâ’ itdim. Hilâf-ı şer’-i şerîf bir nesne işitmedim ve muhâlif fiil görmedim. Emmâ Karamanlı olmağın edâsı) Türkâne ve ta’zîm ile zikrolıcak eşrâfî bir ’aceb yâd iderdi. Hattâ bazı dekâyık ve hakâyık beyân iderken der idi ki, ‘niçün bu meclise Çivi (?) ve Yâvesi (?) oğlu hâzır olmazlar. Niçün kendülere hayf iderler. Nitekim beyân itdik. Pes nev’an ğurûr-i şeklî olub ’akıbet zarar itdi”, see Muhyî-yi Gülşenî, *Menâkib-i İbrâhim-i Gülşenî*, pp. 381-383.

⁴⁹⁵ *Makâlât*, p. 29.

4.3.1 Celâleddin Rûmî and Ahmed Fakih as Harbingers of a Shaykh

In some *menâkibnâmes*, authors are eager to include the name of Rûmî as a source to legitimize their Sufi master's spiritual authority. In some cases, Rûmî is said to foretell the coming of a certain shaykh. As in the *Makâlât* of Seyyid Hârûn, we come across a similar story in the *Menâkib-i İbrahim Gülşenî*.⁴⁹⁶ According to Muhyî-yi Gülşenî, Sufi masters sometimes foretell the birth of a shaykh in the way that Bayezid-i Bistâmî heralded the coming of Abu'l-Hasan Harakânî 150 years before the birth of Harakânî.⁴⁹⁷ Like Bayezid-i Bestâmî, Gülşenî adds, Celâleddin Rûmî heralded the coming of İbrahim-i Gülşenî 300 years before the birth of Gülşenî.⁴⁹⁸

The author of the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun* quotes a verse from the *Mesnevî* and gives a Turkish translation for his reader.⁴⁹⁹ According to Dina Le Gall, reading the *Mesnevî* was a common means of recruiting new disciples for some of the orders. She gives the example of Taşköprülüzâde, who came to know his Naqshbandî master Mahmud Çelebi by reading the *Mesnevî* with him.⁵⁰⁰ Being a contemporary of Taşköprülüzâde (d. 1561), the author of the *Makâlât* praises Celâleddin Rûmî and refers to *Mesnevî* to prove God's grace towards Seyyid Hârûn. Although the author does not say anything about which Sufi order Seyyid Hârûn belonged to, he places

⁴⁹⁶ Muhyî-yi Gülşenî, *Menâkib-i İbrâhîm-i Gülşenî*, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1982), pp. XXVI.

⁴⁹⁷ “Bayezid-i Bestâmî kuddise sirruhû'l-azîz Şeyh Ebu'l-Hasan-i Harakânî razıyallahu 'anhın gelmesine yüz elli yıldan evvel işâret itmiştir”, Muhyî-yi Gülşenî, *Menâkib-i İbrâhîm-i Gülşenî*, p. 11.

⁴⁹⁸ “Şeyh İbrahim Gülşenî 'aleyhi'r-rahmetü'l-lâhî'l-ğaniyy, 'âlem-i sübütdan vücûda gelmezden üçyüz yıl evvel kâşif-i esrâr-i 'ulûm Mevlânâ-yı Rûm efâzana'l-lâhü min berekâtihî ve 'aleynâ min küşûfâtihî buyurmuşdur:

Dîdem rah-i hûb-i Gülşenî râ

Ân çeşm-i çerâğ-ı Rûşenî râ”, see Muhyî-yi Gülşenî, *Menâkib-i İbrâhîm-i Gülşenî*, p. 8.

⁴⁹⁹ “Pes Mevlânâ buyurdu kaddesa'llâhu sırrâhû: Çün kabûl-i Hak buved z'ân mer-merâst, dest-i o der-kâr-hâ dest-i Hudâst- Şol kimse kim Allah'un kabûli ola, ânun her işde eli Allah'un kudret elidür demek olur”, *Makâlât*, p. 36.

⁵⁰⁰ Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 57.

the path of Seyyid Hârûn as closer to one of the “established orders” such as the Mevlevî, Halvetî and Naqshbandî orders.

According to the *Makâlât*, Ahmed Fakih also mentioned the coming of a shaykh named Hârûn from the Iranian realm (*Acem ülkesi*) and advised his disciples to be disciples of Seyyid Hârûn after his death.⁵⁰¹ Ahmed Fakih was so important in the eyes of the Ottomans that Sultan Mehmed II’s shaykh Akşemseddin asserted that the conquest of Constantinople was “the work of providence through the prophet Khidr and Faqih Ahmed whom he called Qutb-i âlem, the pole of the universe”.⁵⁰² Interestingly, an almanac presented to the Ottoman Sultan Murad II (r. 1421-44, 1446-51) begins with dates related to Celâleddin Rûmî, Sadreddin Konevî and Hâce Ahmed Fakih together with the names of Rûmî’s father, Hazret-i Bahaeddin, and Rûmî’s son, Sultan Veled and a famous figure of Rûmî’s Mesnevî, Çelebi Hüsâmeddin. This almanac published by Osman Turan firstly mentions famous Sufi masters and then it points out dates related to former sultans or begs after a brief mention of astrological events such as solar eclipse.⁵⁰³ Similar examples about the

⁵⁰¹ “Meger Mevlânâ dünyâdan göçüb Horasan’dan bir evliyâ gelür diyü vasiyet itmiş idi. Ve dahî Hâce Fakî’ya halkı dimişdi ki sultânüm sen dünyâdan göçer oldun, bizi senün yirüne bir kimesneye ısmarla didiler. Hâce Fakî didi ki, an-karîbi’z-zamân Acem’den bir evliyâ gelse gerek. Anun nâmı Hârûn’dur.”, *Makâlât*, p. 29.

⁵⁰² Halil İnalçık, “İstanbul: An Islamic City”, in *Essays in Ottoman History*, (İstanbul: Eren Yayınları, 1998), 249-271.

⁵⁰³ “İftihâru’l-muhakkikîn ve’l-müdakkikîn Mevlânâ Celâleddin Belhî, kaddese’llahu sırrahu ‘l-azîz, toğaldan ve Hazret-i Bahâeddin, rahmetu’llahi ‘aleyhi vefâtından berü ikiyüz kırkbir yıldur; Sultânü’l-mahbûbîn ve’l-ma’şûkîn Sultan Veled, kaddese’llâhü sırrahû, toğaldan berü ve Mevlânâ Celâleddin ve Hazret-i Kutbu’l-muhakkikîn Şeyh Sadreddin, rahmetu’l-lâhi ‘aleyhimâ vefâtından berü yüz yetmiş sekiz yıldır; Çelebi Husâmeddin toğaldan berü yüz yetmiş sekiz yıldır; Çelebi Husâmeddin toğaldan berü yüz altmış iki yıldır; Hâce Fakîh Ahmed, kaddese’l-lâhü sırrahû vefâtından berü iki yüz yigirmi yedi yıldır....Güneş küllî dutulaldan ve karanu olub yılduzlar zâhir olaldan ve Sultan Melik Nâsir vâkı’asından ve Sultan Melik Eşref cülûsundan, Şam begleri il birle alaldan berü toksan bir yıldır; Kadı Burhaneddin cülûsından ve Ali Beg bin Muhammed Beg bin Ertene Beg vâkı’asından berü altmış tokuz yıldır; Timur Beg Bağdad şehrin vilâyet birle aladan berü, Sultan Ahmed kaçub Sultan Berkuk katına gelelden berü elli sekiz yıldır...” See Osman Turan, *İstanbul’un Fethinden Önce Yazılmış Tarihi Takvimler*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1954), pp. 44, 45; as Turan points out there are some chronological inconsistencies in such almanacs but in spite of such inconsistencies, the value of these almanacs as a source for historians is undeniable. For the importance of these almanacs for the history of pre-Ottoman and Ottoman periods, see Osman Turan, *İstanbul’un Fethinden Önce Yazılmış Tarihi Takvimler*, pp. 1-8.

exalted status of Ahmed Fakih among the Ottomans can be found in other Ottoman almanacs and chronicles.

4.3.2 *Silence about Ibn al-Arabî and Sadreddin Konevî*

Interestingly, we do not encounter the names of other venerated Sufis such as Ibn al-Arabî (d. 620/1226) and his stepson, Sadreddin Konevî (d. 673/1274), in the *Makâlat*. However, we come across a different case in a work entitled *Câmi'ü'l-Meknûnât* (*Collector of the Concealed*), which was written in 936/1529. The author of that work is Mevlânâ Îsâ, who was born in Hamid ili, a neighboring region of the Province of Karaman.⁵⁰⁴ As Flemming suggests, this work is “ostensibly a *gazâvat-nâme*” but its main theme is “announcing the end of the world and preparing the initiated for this event.”⁵⁰⁵ In that work Mevlânâ Îsâ, who was probably a Halvetî scholar according to Flemming, praises thirty *Kutbs*, the Poles of the Age, beginning with the Prophet Muhammed and ending with Muhammed Mehdî. Among these thirty *Kutbs*, we see the name of Sadreddin Konevî but we can not see the names of either Rûmî or Ahmed Fakih in the list.⁵⁰⁶

⁵⁰⁴ For further information about *Câmi'ü'l-Meknûnât* and its author, see Barbara Flemming, “Public Opinion Under Sultan Süleyman”, in *Süleyman the Second and his Time*, ed. Halil İnalçık and Cemal Kafadar, (İstanbul: the ISIS Press, 1993), pp. 49-57.

⁵⁰⁵ Barbara Flemming, “Public Opinion Under Sultan Süleyman”, p. 51.

⁵⁰⁶ “Kutbü's-sâlis ve'l-işrîn Şeyh Sadrüddin Konevî:

Yigirmi üçüncü Şeyh Sadrüddin'dir,

Ki kutb-i âsumân ile zemindir.

Bu oldu Hacı'nın kâim-i makâmı

Hem ol mazhar idendi harf-i lâmi”, see Mevlânâ Îsâ, *Câmi'ü'l-Meknûnât*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yazmaları no. TTK Y. 240/3, folio 79b; The thirty *Kutbs*, in the words of Mevlânâ Îsâ, are as follows: “1- Hazret-i Rasûlullah 'aleyhisselâm, 2- Haydâr-i Kerrâr ya'ni Hazret-i Ali kerreme'llâhu vechehû, 3- Hasan-i Basrî, 4- Habîb-i Acemî, 5- Dâvûd-i Tâ'î, 6- Ma'rûf-i Kerhî, 7- Serîr-i Sakatî, 8- Cüneyd-i Bağdâdî, 9- Mümşâd (?) Zü'n-Nûrî, 10- Muhammed Dineverî, 11- Muhammed Bekrî ya'ni Diyarbekrî, 12- Kadî Vahyüddin, 13- Ebî Necib Sühreverdî, 14- Kutbüddin Ebherî, 15- Ruknüddin Sehâbî, 16- Şihâbüddin Tebrizî, 17- Seyyid Cemâlüddin, 18- Şeyh İbrahim Gilânî, 19- Ahî Ahmed, 20- Pîr Ömer Halvetî, 21- Ahî Merem, 22- Hacı İzzüddin, 23- Şeyh Sadrüddin Konevî, 24- Esseyyid Yahyâ, 25- Mevlânâ Pîr Ömer, 26- Muhammed Aksarayî, 27- Şeyh Üveys Karamanî, 28- Ahmed Rûmî, 29- Hamîd Hindî, 30- Muhammed Mehdî”, see Mevlânâ Îsâ, *Câmi'ü'l-Meknûnât*, folios 76b-80a.

As a stepson of Ibn al-Arabî, Sadreddin Konevî was famous not only in the Ottoman lands but also in the Timurid lands. Konevî was one of the Sufi scholars mentioned by famous Naqshbandî scholar Abd al-Rahman Câmî (d. 1492) most frequently.⁵⁰⁷ As stated before, Ertuğrul İ. Ökten explains Câmî's view of Konevî as follows:

In Câmî's historical reformulation Ibn al-Arabî's student, Sadreddin Konevî, stands out as a major reference point. Câmî acknowledged Konevî's scientific authority in exoteric, rational and traditional sciences, and also wrote that Ibn al-Arabî had granted Konevî 'the truth of eternal manifestation' in a dream. In the eyes of Câmî, such qualifications must have made Konevî the authority without whose works Ibn al-Arabî's *wahdat al-wujûd* based sayings could not be seen within the boundaries of reason and the Shari'a.⁵⁰⁸

Nevertheless, in spite of Konevî's efforts to bring the teachings of Ibn al-Arabî within the boundaries of the Shari'a, there were some *ulemâ* who condemned Ibn al-Arabî's doctrines. As Knysh indicates, many medieval *ulemâ*, particularly "the mainstream Muslim theologians", viewed Ibn al-Arabî as "the founder of the heretical doctrine of oneness of being (*wahdat al-wujûd*).⁵⁰⁹ For instance, in Istanbul, al-Halabî (d. 956/1459) wrote *Ni'mat al-zari'a fî Nusrat al-şari'a* to condemn the *Fusûsu'l-hikem*, the "Bezels of Wisdom," of Ibn al-Arabî and he accused Ibn al-Arabî of heresy.⁵¹⁰ We do not know whether the author of the *Makâlât* heard anything about this *fetvâ*. But, it seems that he was aware of the fact that some teachings of Ibn al-Arabî was controversial despite the fact that Ibn al-Arabî's works became "text-books" in Ottoman *madrasas*.⁵¹¹

The influence of Ibn al-Arabî in the Ottoman Empire reached to the extent that the two great commentators of the *Mesnevî* of Rûmî, İsmâ'il Ankaravî (d.

⁵⁰⁷ Ertuğrul İ. Ökten, "Câmî (817-898/1414-1492)," p. 198.

⁵⁰⁸ Ökten, p. 329.

⁵⁰⁹ Alexander Knysh, *Islamic Mysticism*, p. 168.

⁵¹⁰ Ahmet Ateş, "Muhyiddin Arabî", *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 8, (Eskişehir: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2001), p. 554; A. Ateş, "Ibn al-Arabî", *Encyclopedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. 3, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986), p. 711; One of those Ottoman scholars who wrote a commentary on *Fusûsu'l-Hikem* of Ibn al-Arabî was Şeyh Bedreddin (d. 1416). See Michel Balivet, *Şeyh Bedreddin, Tasavvuf ve İsyân*, tr. Ela Güntekin, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000), p. 102.

⁵¹¹ A. Ateş, "Ibn al-Arabî," p. 711.

1041/1631-32) and Sarı Abdullah Efendi (d. 1041/1661), interpreted the *Mesnevî* in the light of Ibn al-Arabî's doctrines. As Ahmet Ateş points out, from the fourteenth century onwards Ibn al-Arabî's teaching became the main tenet of Anatolian Sufism.⁵¹² However, some Sufi scholars suggested that the ordinary people be forbidden to read Ibn al-Arabî's books ("for they were not equipped to appreciate them").⁵¹³ Perhaps the author of the *Makâlât* whose audience was ordinary dervishes might have hesitated to mention Ibn al-Arabî and Sadreddin Konevî in the text.

4.3.3 *Dream and Journey to Karaman*

According to *tahrir* registers of the Ottoman Empire, there were also other settlements which bear the name of a shaykh of Central Asian origin. For instance, in Lârende (today's Karaman city) a village got its name from Shaykh Hacı İsmail-i Horasanî. But this village does not survive today. In the *tahrir*, the Ottoman tax survey, of 924 H. (1518) for the Province of Karaman, it is stated that Shaykh Hacı İsmail came with his disciples from Horasan.⁵¹⁴ It is not known whether a dream or the Mongol threat drove Şeyh Hacı İsmail from Horasan to Karaman.

In her study on Naqshbandîs, Le Gall explains the role of deceased spiritual masters in sending their followers on missions as follows:

⁵¹² Ateş, p. 711.

⁵¹³ Maria Kalicin, Krassimira Mutafova, "Historical Accounts of the Halveti Shaykh Bali Efendi of Sofia in a Newly Discovered *Vita* Dating from the Nineteenth Century," *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, vol. 12, no. 3 (July 2001), p. 343.

⁵¹⁴ "1518 (924) tarihli Konya eyaleti Mufassal Sayım Defterinde (T. D. no.871/63 Lârende (Karaman) kazasının *Şeyh Hacı İsmail Köyü* ve kurucuları hakkında şu bilgiler vardır: 'Mezbûr Şeyh Hacı İsmail 'an cema'atin dervişleriyle diyâr-i Horasan'dan gelmiş azîz imiş. Bunda tavattun idüb, ba'dehû oğlu Musa Paşa bunda bir zaviye bina idüb, ba'dehû onun oğlu Güvegi Çelebi dahî bir zaviye binâ idüb etbâ'ı ile sâkin olub ellerinde ber-vech-i vakfiyet tasarruf edilen yerleri var.'" See Ömer Lütfi Barkan, Enver Meriçli, *Hüdavendigar Livası Tahrir Defterleri I*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1988), 137; According to Barkan, Yunus Emre (d. 1320) was one of the descendants of Hacı İsmail-i Horasanî. Although we do not know the exact date of the arrival of Hacı İsmail to Lârende, today's Karaman, most probably he came to Lârende in the thirteenth century. See Ömer Lütfi Barkan, Enver Meriçli, *Hüdavendigar Livası Tahrir Defterleri I*, p. 138; Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf*, second edition (first published in 1961), (İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 1992), pp. 64, 65.

Naqshbandis knew and celebrated many individuals who communed with prophets, deceased tariqa masters, the awliya (“friends of God”), or the paradigmatic mystical guide Khidr. They expected the inhabitants of the ‘world of the unseen’ to interact routinely with their human interlocutors by extricating them from danger, dispatching them on missions, or conferring on them guidance, mystical insights, and even formal Sufi initiations. Communication with the ‘world of the unseen’ might occur during sleep or in a state of wakefulness.⁵¹⁵

“Having been dispatched on a mission” by “the inhabitants of the world of unseen,”⁵¹⁶ as in the words of Le Gall, Seyyid Hârûn set out for today’s Seydişehir region with his forty disciples (*cümle kırk kişidir*).⁵¹⁷ It seems that the number ‘forty’ (*kırk*) is a fabricated number introduced to recall the forty companions of the Prophet Muhammed who have been highly respected in Sunni tradition. The word ‘40’ is also used in the *menâkıb* of Dediği Sultan. According to this *menâkıb*, Dediği Sultan left Horasan with forty “felt-covered” tents of Turgud and Bayburd.⁵¹⁸ As Irène Mélikoff indicates, ‘forty’ is “a symbolic number” (“*un nombre symbolique*”) not only in the Islamic tradition but also in Christian and Judaic traditions.⁵¹⁹

Among those who came with Seyyid Hârûn was his brother Seyyid Bedreddin, Mahmud Seydi, Akça Baba Sultan, Nasibli Seydi, Haydar Baba, Ali Baba, and Gök-Demür Baba. Thus, it can be said that Babas occupied a crucial place among Seyyid Hârûn’s followers.⁵²⁰ This situation did not change much in later times. For instance, we learn from the *Evkaf Defteri* (book of registers of pious

⁵¹⁵ Dina Le Gall, “Forgotten Naqshbandis and the Culture of Pre-Modern Sufi Brotherhoods,” *Studia Islamica*, no. 97 (2003), pp. 100-101.

⁵¹⁶ “Kudretten sem’üme bir âvâz geldi, ‘Yâ Hârûn Rûm’a çık, Karaman vilâyetinde Küpe Dağı dirlir bir dağın şarkından yanına şehir yap. Ol şehrin halkı sulehâ ola. Şakî olanun âkıbeti hayr olmaya’, diyü işidürin. İmdi bu haber beni mest ü hayrân eyledi.”, *Makâlât*, p. 23.

⁵¹⁷ *Makâlât*, p. 25.

⁵¹⁸ Rudi Paul Lindner, *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia*, (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1983), p. 79.

⁵¹⁹ Irène Mélikoff, *Hadji Bektach, Un Mythe et ses Avatars, Genèse et évolution du soufisme populaire en Turquie*, (Leiden&Boston&Köln: Brill, 1998), p. 17 ; Irène Mélikoff, *Hacı Bektaş, Efsaneden Gerçeğe*, tr. Turan Alptekin, (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Kitapları, 1998), p. 48; for further information about the number “forty” and its implications in the Christian and Islamic traditions, see F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, vol. II, (Istanbul: the ISIS Press, 2000), pp. 329-335.

⁵²⁰ For the influence of Babas on the Ottoman society and politics see Halil İnalçık, "Dervish and Sultan: An Analysis of the Otman Baba Vilâyetnâmesi", *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society*, (Bloomington, 1993), p. 21.

foundations) of the Province of Karaman dated 888 H./1483 that the holder of vakf of Seyyid Hârûn in Seydişehir was also a Baba, Hüsni Baba.⁵²¹ Wolper asserts that the Turcomans who immigrated to Anatolia in the thirteenth century were accompanied by religious figures called Babas.⁵²² The culture of the Babas who immigrated to Anatolia was closer to the traditions of Turkish central Asia than to the “cosmopolitan culture of the towns.”⁵²³

Perhaps other figure of the *Makâlât*, Dediği Sultan, was one of these Babas. According to the *Menâkıb* of Dediği Sultan, Celâleddin Rûmî invited Dediği Sultan to Konya with a letter. In his reply to Rûmî’s letter Dediği Sultan gave examples from the life of the Prophet Adam, Moses, Jesus and Muhammed and refused to settle in a city.⁵²⁴ Perhaps Dediği Sultan’s reluctance to live in a city is in line with Babais’ unwillingness to be a part of the “cosmopolitan culture of towns”. As far as we understand from the *Makâlât*, Seyyid Hârûn gave up his nomadism and decided to set up a town. But his choice was believed to be a product of a divine inspiration.

4.3.4 *Shaykh, Beg and Vakf*

When Seyyid Hârûn arrived at Küpe Mountain in today’s Seydişehir, he settled at the mountain’s foot. The author presents a lively and moving picture of Seydişehir and Küpe Mountain in the Middle Ages. The author writes that it was spring time and the mountain was marvellous with its tulips, gardens, and fountains.⁵²⁵ This information can also be viewed as an allegory. Although we do not

⁵²¹ Fahri Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri," p. 94.

⁵²² Wolper, *Cities and Saints*, p. 19.

⁵²³ İnalçık, *The Classical Age*, pp. 186-187.

⁵²⁴ M. Zeki Oral, "Turgutoğulları, Eserleri, Vakfiyeleri", *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. 3 (1956), p. 46.

⁵²⁵ "Gördi Seyyid Hârûn Sultan dağın dâmeninde bir depecügi bir nür ihâta etmiş. Ol araya kondılar. Her cânibi çayır çemen, akar sular, bahâr eyyâmı çiğdem ve benefşe, sünbül, reyhân, dürlü lâleler, nergis, susen, cümle şükûfât, hazrevât, sebzevât, sovak bınarlar, gönül-ârây, revân-sây", *Makâlât*, p. 37.

know whether it was spring time when Seyyid Hârûn arrived at Kupe Mountain, we can assume that the author made an analogy between what spring brings to nature and what Seyyid Hârûn brought to Seydişehir. Our hero in the story is supposed to present a new life to “a ruined place”.⁵²⁶

As in other hagiographies, the *Makâlât* contains various extraordinary events. We will cite a miracle story (*kerâmet*) that is reminiscent of Wolper’s view of buildings as places of identity formation.⁵²⁷ Before beginning to build the new town, Seyyid Hârûn saw the vision of the Prophet accompanied by “the paradigmatic mystical guide Khidr”⁵²⁸, recalling the words of Le Gall, and his companions and Uways al-Karani inside a mosque.⁵²⁹ The mosque, as a house of God, welcomed Seyyid Hârûn and he was taught “secrets” inside the mosque by the Prophet.⁵³⁰ Uways al-Karani called him “my son.”⁵³¹

According to the story in the *Makâlât*, Seyyid Hârûn succeeded in building a new city in today’s Seydişehir. Of course, like other hagiographies, it is narrated as a result of the miracles of a Sufi master. As in other hagiographies, the author narrates that many people converted to Islam under the influence of Seyyid Hârûn.⁵³² The author of the *Makâlât* points out an ancient town in the place of Seydişehir before the coming of Seyyid Harun: “*Vervelid şehri dirler bir kâfir harâbesine vardılar*” (“They came to a city called Vervelid that had been populated by infidels.”)⁵³³ More

⁵²⁶ “Ändan sonra cümle halk ile Vervelid şehri dirler bir kâfir harâbesine vardılar. Gördiler il yok, âdem yok, harâb olmuş”, *Makâlât*, p. 39.

⁵²⁷ “Zirâ Üveys el-Karânî’ye derûn-ı karâbet var idi.”, *Makâlât*, p. 38.

⁵²⁸ Dina Le Gall, “Forgotten Naqshbandis and the Culture of Pre-Modern Sufi Brotherhoods”, p. 100.

⁵²⁹ *Makâlât*, p. 38.

⁵³⁰ “Hazret-i Muhammed aleyhi’s-salatu ve’s-selâm nice nesne ta’lîm-i esrâr söyledi”, *Makâlât*, p. 38.

⁵³¹ “Üveys el-Karani oğlum diyü envâ’ tekrîm ü ta’zîm ile nice esrâr-i ilâhîye vâkıf eyledi”, *Makâlât*, p. 38.

⁵³² “Kâfirleri îmâna geldiler, müslümanlari itmi’nân-i kalb buldular”, *Makâlât*, p. 40.

⁵³³ *Makâlât*, p. 39.

probably, in the place of Seydişehir there was a Greek settlement or monastery before the coming of Seyyid Harun to that region.

The *Makâlât* of Seyyid Hârûn gives us insight into the nature of the relationships of shaykhs with political authorities. According to our source, the rise of Seyyid Hârûn's popularity among the population of Seydişehir led to the suspicion of the beg of the Eşrefoğlu principality. Eşrefoğlu was told that a shaykh turned a camel into a stone.⁵³⁴ Today, people of Seydişehir still believes in this miracle or legend that is called *Deve Taşı Efsânesi*. A stone that is like a camel has been still kept in today's Seydişehir.⁵³⁵

The author devotes a special chapter to the visit of Eşrefoğlu to Seyyid Hârûn. Eşrefoğlu sent his vizier to Seyyid Hârûn in order to discover Seyyid Hârûn's intentions in the region. When the vizier asked the disciples about Seyyid Hârûn they told him that Seyyid Hârûn had no intention of worldly kingship (*Dünya pâdişahlığına zerre kadar meyli yokdur*).⁵³⁶ The vizier of Eşrefoğlu became a disciple of Seyyid Hârûn under the influence of Şeyh's miracles (*kerâmât*).⁵³⁷ Ultimately, Eşrefoğlu Mubarizuddin Mehmed Beg himself became a disciple of Seyyid Hârûn.⁵³⁸

The inclusion of this story has something to say for the sixteenth-century. The author was perhaps trying to persuade his audience that Seyyid Hârûn's path had not nothing to do with politics. As we mentioned, Seydişehir had been a disputed region among the Karamanoğlus and the Ottomans in the period 1381-1468 and changed

⁵³⁴ “Deveyi taş eyledi”, *Makâlât*, p. 44.

⁵³⁵ Mehmet Önder, *Seydişehir Tarihi*, p. 140.

⁵³⁶ *Makâlât*, p. 45.

⁵³⁷ *Makâlât*, p. 46.

⁵³⁸ *Makâlât*, p. 51.

hands until the Ottoman occupation of the Karamanoğlu principality in 1468.⁵³⁹ The author seems to have been aware of this fact and tried to show loyalty of the followers of the path to the existing authority, i.e. the Ottoman Empire.

According to the *Makâlât*, Eşrefoğlu Mübârizüddin Mehmed Beg gave Seyyid Hârûn some land as vakf.⁵⁴⁰ According to *defter-i evkâf-i livâ-i Konya* dated 992/1583, Eşrefoğlu gave a few gardens of Seydişehir to Seyyid Hârûn.⁵⁴¹ The information given by the *Makâlât* in terms of Eşrefoğlu's allocation of lands and gardens is in line with the *vakf* registers of the Province of Karaman. Other sultans or begs added new vakfs to the zawiya. For instance, Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg allocated the village of *Ulukilise* to the zâviye.⁵⁴² *Kilise* village is also mentioned in the *Makâlât*.⁵⁴³ It was not only begs who allocated new lands to the complex. The emancipated (*âzadlı*) slave of Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg, Bahadır Ağa, also gave a village, Yenice, to the *vakf* of Seyyid Hârûn.⁵⁴⁴

As indicated earlier, hagiographies of Sufi saints often put the Sultan of the time in position to become a disciple of a certain shaykh. In the *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn*, there is a similar story which is said to have taken place between Eşrefoğlu Mübârizüddin Mehmed Beg and Mevlevî shaykh Çelebi Ârif (d. 719/1319), the grandson of Celâleddin Rûmî. According to the story, Eşrefoğlu invited Çelebi to Beyşehir. The author of *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn*, Aflâkî (d. 761/1360), does not say why Eşrefoğlu invited Çelebi to Beyşehir. According to Aflâkî, Eşrefoğlu behaved like “a

⁵³⁹ Halil İnalçık, *Fatih Devri Üzerinde Tetkikler ve Vesikalar*, third edition, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1995), pp. 15n.

⁵⁴⁰ “Eşrefoğlu Muhammed Beg....didi ki, benüm şehrumde köşkümle bir has bahçem vardır, âni dahi vakf etdüm, siz şahid olun, didi....Eşrefoğlu varup Bigşehir'nde vakfiye yazdurup gönderdi”, *Makâlât*, p. 51.

⁵⁴¹ “Mukâtaa-i bağât-ı nefsi Seydişehir ve zemin-i vakf beher dönüm elli akça vakf-ı Mehmed Bey bin Süleyman Bey bin Eşref hâkim-i Beyşehir”, see M. Akif Erdoğan, “Seydişehir Seydi Hârûn Külliyesi Vakıfları Üzerine Bir Araştırma”, *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, VII (1992), p. 121.

⁵⁴² Erdoğan, “Seydişehir Seydi Hârûn Külliyesi Vakıfları Üzerine Bir Araştırma”, p. 85.

⁵⁴³ *Makâlât*, p. 47.

⁵⁴⁴ Erdoğan, “Seydişehir Seydi Hârûn Külliyesi Vakıfları Üzerine Bir Araştırma”, p. 85.

humble servant” (*envâ’-ı bendegîhâ kerd*) of Çelebi Ârif.⁵⁴⁵ He also gave his son Süleyman Şah as a present (*pîşkeş*) to Çelebi and made his son a disciple of this Mevlevî Şeyh.⁵⁴⁶ Although both Seyyid Hârûn (d. 720/1320) and Ulu Ârif Çelebi (d. 719/ 1319) lived in the same period we do not see any mention of Ulu Ârif Çelebi in the *Makâlât* and that of Seyyid Hârûn in the *Menâkibü’l-Ârifîn*.

4.3.5 Seyyid Hârûn and Dediği Sultan: Friendship or Rivalry?

One frequently mentioned names in the *Makâlât* is Dediği Sultan. According to the *menâkibnâme* of Dediği Sultan, Dediği Sultan was a descendant of Ahmed Yesevî of Horasan and Dediği was also a cousin of Hacı Bektaş.⁵⁴⁷ It seems that Dediği Sultan represents both a friend and a rival of Seyyid Hârûn. If we look at other sources we see that Dediği Sultan can be considered among non-conformist Sufis. Lindner views Dediği Sultan as a typical late medieval Anatolian holy man: “His preference for the distant, visible hills, for animals before men, and his distinctive red striped cap, all are the stock in trade of the late medieval Anatolian holy man”.⁵⁴⁸ Lindner might be right in viewing Dediği Sultan as such, but the Dediği Sultan of the *Makâlât* is one who acknowledges the superiority of Seyyid Hârûn.

The story between Seyyid Hârûn and Dediği Sultan is reminiscent of a story between Hacı Bektaş and Seyyid Mahmud Hayran. According to the *Vilâyetnâme* of Hacı Bektaş, “a late 15th-century hagiography of the saint”⁵⁴⁹, “lion-riding” Seyyid Mahmud Hayrânî with his three hundred Mevlevî dervishes came to see Hacı Bektaş.

⁵⁴⁵ Aflâkî, *Manâkib al-Ârifîn (Metin)*, vol. 2, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, p. 925.

⁵⁴⁶ Aflâkî, p. 925.

⁵⁴⁷ M. Zeki Oral, "Turgutoğulları, Eserleri ve Vakfiyeleri," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. 3 (1956), p. 45.

⁵⁴⁸ Rudi Paul Lindner, *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia*, (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1983), p. 80.

⁵⁴⁹ Martin van Bruinessen, “Haji Bektash, Sultan Sahak, Shah Mina Sahib and Various Avatars of a Running Wall”, *Turcica, Revue D’Études Turques*, vol. XXI-XXIII (1991), p. 57.

When Seyyid Mahmud Hayrânî saw Hacı Bektaş, who was coming on a huge stone, Seyyid Mahmud repented and acknowledged the superiority of Hacı Bektaş.⁵⁵⁰ Striking similarities can be drawn between the *Makâlât* of Seyyid Hârûn and the *Menâkıb-i Hacı Bektaş*, which is also called the *Vilâyetnâme*.⁵⁵¹ According to the *Makâlât*, Seyyid Hârûn was a "just ruler (*emîr-i âdil*)" in Horasan.⁵⁵² Seyyid Hârûn was visiting the tombs of his grandfather and granduncle, who was said to be "shah" of Horasan. The father of Hacı Bektaş, Seyyid Muhammad, was said to be a "padishah" of Horasan, according to the *Menâkıb-i Hacı Bektaş*.⁵⁵³ Like Seyyid Hârûn, Hacı Bektaş was believed to be a seyyid.⁵⁵⁴

As in the *Vilâyetnâme* of Hacı Bektaş, the author of the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Hârûn* is preoccupied with highlighting the supremacy of his hero. When Seyyid Hârûn and Dediği Sultan decided to pray together Dediği Sultan said that Seyyid Hârûn must lead the prayer. The author also writes that when they walked together Seyyid Hârûn walked in the front and Dediği Sultan followed him.⁵⁵⁵ According to Lindner, Dediği Sultan seems to have been "a lesser, heterodox rival to Seyyid Hârûn Veli".⁵⁵⁶ But in the *Makâlât* we can also observe a preoccupation with placing Dediği Sultan within the borders of conformist or so-called orthodox Sufis. This was, in a way, to be achieved by the influence of Seyyid Hârûn upon Dediği Sultan.

⁵⁵⁰ "Seyyid Mahmud-i Hayrânî de arslan üstünde, elinde yılan gelirken bir de baktı ki Hünkâr [Hacı Bektaş], cansız bir kayaya binmiş, yürütüb gelmede....Seyyid Mahmud'la dervişler, Hünkâr'ın eline ayağına düştüler", *Manâkıb-i Hacı Bektaş-i Veli, 'Vilâyet-Nâme'*, ed. Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, pp. 49, 50; see also Martin van Bruinessen, "Hacı Bektash, Sultan Sahak, Shah Mina Sahib and Various Avatars of a Running Wall," p. 57.

⁵⁵¹ See *Manâkıb-i Hacı Bektaş-i Veli, 'Vilâyet-Nâme,'* ed. Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, (Istanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 1958).

⁵⁵² *Makâlât*, p. 23.

⁵⁵³ *Manâkıb-i Hacı Bektaş-i Veli, 'Vilâyet-Nâme'*, ed. Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, p. 3.

⁵⁵⁴ *Manâkıb-i Hacı Bektaş-i Veli, 'Vilâyet-Nâme'*, ed. Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, p. 1.

⁵⁵⁵ *Makâlât*, p. 55.

⁵⁵⁶ Lindner, *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia*, p. 99n..

According to the *Makâlât*, Dediği Sultan wanted to marry Seyyid Hârûn's daughter. But Seyyid Hârûn turned his daughter into a man by his miracle.⁵⁵⁷ Seyyid Hârûn was reluctant to marry his daughter to Dediği Sultan; the author does not tell why. There is inconsistency in the *Makâlât* in terms of Seyyid Hârûn's behaviour towards Dediği Sultan. While Seyyid Hârûn was reluctant for his daughter to marry Dediği Sultan, when Dediği Sultan died Seyyid Hârûn went into seclusion due to his sadness for the remainder of his life.⁵⁵⁸ On the other hand, according to the *menâkıb* of Dediği Sultan, Seyyid Hârûn died before Dediği Sultan and Dediği Sultan performed as *imam*, the leading person, the funeral prayer of Seyyid Hârûn.⁵⁵⁹

4.3.6 *Khalifas of Seyyid Hârûn*

According to the author, Seyyid Hârûn sent some of his *khalifas* to various parts of Anatolia: Mahmud Seydi to Alâ'iye, today's Alanya; Zekeriya to Manavgat; Ali Baba, Gök Seydi, Kilim-pûş and Siyah Derviş to Teke ili, today's Antalya; Akça Baba to Germiyan ili, today's Kütahya, and Nasibli Baba to Aydın. International character of other Sufi orders such as *Mevleviyye* and *Nakşibendiyye* is not evident in the path of Seyyid Hârûn. At least we do not have a source indicating such case. As we learn from the *Makâlât*, Seyyid Hârûn's *khalifas* remained within the borders of Anatolia.

Some other sources confirm the information given in the *Makâlât* related to at least one of Seyyid Hârûn's *khalifas*. According to the author, Mahmud Seydi sent to Alâ'iye, today's Alanya by Seyyid Hârûn, as it has been mentioned before.⁵⁶⁰ In fact, a zaviye was built in the name of Mahmud Seydi in Alâ'iye. A village was also

⁵⁵⁷ *Makâlât*, p. 56.

⁵⁵⁸ *Makâlât*, p. 57.

⁵⁵⁹ M. Zeki Oral, "Turgutoğulları, Eserleri ve Vakfiyeleri," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. 3 (1956), p. 45.

⁵⁶⁰ *Makâlât*, pp. 58-59.

named after him. This village seemed to have been large, because it contained eleven *mahalles* during the reign of Suleyman the Magnificent (r. 1520-1566), according to a tax survey.⁵⁶¹ Although the inscription of the *zâviye* is not extant today, the *vakfiye* still survives. It was approved by Kılıç Arslan Bey and the date of the *vakfiye* was 866/1462. In the *vakfiye*, Mahmud Seydi is mentioned as “Sultan of the Shaykhs”, “Sultânü’l-meşâyihi’s-sâlikîn Eş-Şeyh Mahmud Seydi Alâ’î.”⁵⁶²

4.3.7 A Female Shaykh in Seydişehir

In her book entitled *Subjects of the Sultan: Culture and Daily Life in the Ottoman Empire*, Faroqhi makes following observation about female shaykhs:

In fact, in most convents the rank of shaykh was passed down through the founder’s family, and there was thus only a limited choice of candidates. At least in the fifteenth century there were occasional examples of female shaykhs; at least one such women followed in the steps of another female shaykh as superior of a convent. In some cases, women were involved as administrators of the pious foundation, having inherited their status by virtue of belonging to the founder’s family.⁵⁶³

The *Makâlât* presents an interesting story related to a female shaykh after the death of Seyyid Harun. There was indeed “a limited choice of candidates”, as in the words of Faroqhi, after the death of Seyyid Harun. We learn from an inscription in the tomb of Seyyid Hârûn that he died in the year 720 H./ 1320.⁵⁶⁴ Although the *Makâlât* does not mention the date of Seyyid Hârûn’s death we know that Eşrefoğlu Mübârizüddin Mehmed Beg (d. 1322) was contemporary with Seyyid Hârûn.

⁵⁶¹ Konyalı does not give the date of the register, see İ. Hakkı Konyalı, *Alanya (Alaiye)*, ed. M. Ali Kemaloglu, (Istanbul: Ayaydın Basımevi, 1946), pp. 341-342.

⁵⁶² I. Hakkı Konyalı, *Alanya (Alaiye)*, p. 346.

⁵⁶³ Suraiya Faroqhi, *Subjects of the Sultan: Culture and Daily Life in the Ottoman Empire*, (London, New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 2000), pp. 188-189.

⁵⁶⁴ “‘Ammara hâzihi’t-türbetü’ş-şerîfetü, vefâtü’l-merhûm el-mağfûr seyyidü’l-fukarâ Seydi Hârûn teğammedehü’l-lâhü bi-ğufrânihi fi sâlis ‘ısrîn Rebî’u’l-evvel sene ‘ısrîn ve seb’a mie”, See also M. Zekî Oral, "Turgutoğulları, Eserleri ve Vakfiyeleri", *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. 3 (1956), p. 55n.; Abdurrahman Ayaz, *Seydişehir Tarihi, Seyyid Hârûn Veli, Şeyh Hacı Abdullah Efendi*, pp. 66,67. According to Mehmet Önder, the exact date of Seyyid Hârûn’s death is May 3, 1320, see Mehmet Önder, *Seydişehir Tarihi*, p. 109.

According to Uzunçarşılı, Eşrefoğlu Mehmed Beg built a mosque, the inscription of which is dated 720/1320 in Bolvadin. When Timurtash revolted in 1326, he occupied Beyşehir and led to the dissolution of the Eşrefoğlu principality. The territories of the Eşrefoğlu principality was divided between the Karamanoğlus and the Hamidoğlus.⁵⁶⁵

After the death of Seyyid Hârûn, the question of succession arose among his followers. His only child was his daughter Halife Sultan. And the other alternative was Seyyid Hârûn's nephew Musa. The author presents this story in a fluent and moving style and he also expresses hesitations of dervishes about a female shaykh.⁵⁶⁶ According to the author, Halife Sultan served as shaykh for forty years.⁵⁶⁷ Here, the author again uses the number 'forty'. In fact, as far as we learn from an inscription and a note on a manuscript in Mevlanâ Museum Library, Halife Sultan died in the year 768 H./1367.⁵⁶⁸ She seemed to live forty-eight years after her father's death.

⁵⁶⁵ Claude Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, p. 305.

⁵⁶⁶ "Dahî vasiyyet kıldı. Beni bu savma'am içinde koyasız didi, üzerüme türbe yapasız. Şimdi şimden girü Hak'dan yana gider olduk, âhiret hakkın helâl eylen didi. Andan bu halka giriv düşdi. Biz çobanı gitmiş koyun gibi perâkende olub târümâr mı oluruz diyü inleşdier...Bir zamandan sonra Haydar Baba, dahî azîzler cem' olub tedbîr kıldılar. Didiler buna kâim-i makâm Şeyh Mûsa mı olsun, Halife Sultan mı olsun tereddüt itdiler. Ba'zısı, Halife kerâmetüyle erdür ol olsun, Şeyh Musa dahî gençdür, hem ergendür, hem divânedür, lâyük degüldür, meger evlene akli başına gele didiler. Ba'zısı Mûsâ'ya iderlendiler. Şeyh Mûsâ bana gerekmez diyü îbâ eyleyüb kaçdı. Halife'yi Sultan yirine kâim-i makâm kıldılar. Halife için ba'zılar didi ki hunsâdur. Ba'zısı didi ki, hunsâlıkdan geçüb Sultan'ın du'âsıyla er olmuşdur didiler. Bu kez cümle'nün ittifâkıyla Halife Sultan, Sultân'un kâ'im-i makâmı oldu, türbeyi tekyeyi ihyâ eyledi." *Makâlât*, pp. 60-62.

⁵⁶⁷ "Kırk yıl bu tarîk üzre geçti. Halife dünyadan göçer oldı.", *Makâlât*, p. 62.

⁵⁶⁸ "Halife Sultan Türbesi, Seyyid Hârûn-ı Velî Camii'nin kuzeydoğu bitişiğindedir....Kuzey kapısı üzerinde tek satırlık kitabesi vardır. Kitabenin ortasındaki bir kısım eksiktir. Okunabilen bölümleri şöyledir: 'Umira hâzihi't-türbetü's-şerîfe...tâbe serâhâ fi yevmi'l-cum'a 'aşar Şevval sene semâ'n ve sittîn ve seb'a mie'....Kitâbede işâret edilen 10 Şevval 768 (9 Haziran 1367) tarihinin Seyyid Hârûn'un kızı Halife Sultan'ın ölüm tarihi olduğunu, Seyyid Hârûn'un Konya Mevlanâ Müzesi İhtisas Kütüphanesi'nde 1513 envanter numarasında kayıtlı (Menâkıb-ı Seydi Harûn-ı Velî) adlı yazmaya iliştirilen kağıttaki şu ibareden anlıyoruz: 'Vefât-i Halife Sultan bint-i Hârûn-i Velî nevvera'l-lâhu merkadehû fi yevmi 'aşar min Şevvâl fi yevmi'l-cum'a sene semâ'n ve sittîn ve seb'a mi'e [768]', Mehmet Önder, *Seydişehir Tarihi*, p. 111.

The author briefly mentions the shaykhs after Seyyid Harun until his time and in that section he emphasizes these shaykhs respect for the “four caliphs” (*çihâr-yâr*) of the Prophet.⁵⁶⁹

4.3.8 *The Prophet Adam*

One of the most peculiar aspects of the *Makâlât* is the inclusion of the story of expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Paradise. The inclusion of such story is a rare instance in *menâkibnâme* literature, i.e. hagiographies. It is also strange that this story is explained not in the beginning of the work but in the last part of the work. We learn from the *Makâlât* that the inclusion of this story serves the aim of giving advice to dervishes not be polluted by sins. After narrating this story the author writes that all the sufferings of Adam were the result of only one sin. In that part of the *Makâlât*, the author criticizes himself and writes that he fell into many sins and that he is afraid of the bad outcomes of his sins.⁵⁷⁰ As will be discussed in the sixth chapter, blaming oneself (*melâmet*) was not rare in Sufi literature.

In *Historical Dictionary of Sufism*, importance of Adam in Sufism has been explained as follows:

Sufis associate him [Adam] especially with mystical knowledge, for God infused in Adam knowledge of the names of all things and commissioned him to teach all humankind....Adam's forty years in sorrowful exile from the Garden, symbolize the formative experience of the retreat. Sufis associate the Day of the Covenant with the creation of Adam. As the first shaykh of the human race, his role is to help seekers to recover their lost memory of their divine source and the goal of the spiritual journey. It was because of his refusal of God's command that he bow to the newly created body of Adam that the angel Iblis became Satan.⁵⁷¹

⁵⁶⁹ *Makâlât*, p. 64.

⁵⁷⁰ *Makâlât*, p. 72.

⁵⁷¹ John Renard, *Historical Dictionary of Sufism*, (Oxford: The Scarecrow Press, 2005), p. 25.

Ibn al-Arabî begins his *Fusûsu'l-Hikem* with “the Word of Adam.”⁵⁷² However, as expressed earlier, we do not see any mention of Ibn al-Arabî in the *Makâlât*. In the story explained in the *Makâlât*, Adam, Eve, a peacock, and a snake were deceived by Satan in Paradise.⁵⁷³ All of them were expelled from the Paradise. Adam was left alone in Serendil, Eve was left alone in Jeddah, in today’s Saudi Arabia, the peacock was left in Arabic lands (*Arab diyârına*) and the snake was left in Isfahan, in today’s Iran.⁵⁷⁴

Famous Islamic historian Tabari (d. 923) mentions different opinions about where Adam was believed to have settled in the world after being expelled from the Paradise. Some say that he settled in Jeddah or in India.⁵⁷⁵ Tabarî points out the belief in Islamic tradition related to the land of India: “The land with the sweetest smell on earth is the land of India. When Adam was cast down there, some of the smell of Paradise clung to India’s trees.”⁵⁷⁶ Seyyid Harun’s near contemporary, Ibn Kesir (d. 1373) also mentions that Adam was believed to have fallen down either in the land of India or in the land of Arabia, today’s Saudi Arabia.⁵⁷⁷ The author’s message to the reader of the *Makâlât* was that the story of Adam represented how a

⁵⁷² *Ismail Hakkı Bursevi’s Translation and Commentary of Fusus al-Hikam by Muhyiddin-i Arabi*, tr. Bulent Rauf, R. Brass, and H. Tollemache, (Oxford, and Istanbul: Muhyiddin Ibn al-Arabî Society, 1986), p. 91.

⁵⁷³ For “the myth of creation” in Bektaşhi tradition see Irene Melikoff, *Hadji Bektaşh, Un Mythe et ses Avatars*, (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 184-188.

⁵⁷⁴ *Makâlât*, pp. 71,72.

⁵⁷⁵ Al-Tabari, *The History of al-Tabarî*, vol.1, tr. Franz Rosenthal, (State University of New York Press), p. 290.

⁵⁷⁶ Al-Tabari, *The History of al-Tabarî*, vol.1, p. 291.

⁵⁷⁷ Ibn Kesir, *Al-Mabda’ ve al-Nihad*, vol. 1, ed. Ahmad Abd al-Vahhab Fetih, (Cairo: Dar al-Hadis, 2002), p. 81. Amr Ibn al-Jahiz (d. 868) makes the following observation about the link between Adam and India to show the superiority of the Indians nearly in nearly every field: “As regards the Indians, they are among the leaders in astronomy, mathematics- in particular, they have Indian numerals- and medicine....They possess the game of chess, which is the noblest of games and requires more judgement and intelligence than any other....They have splendid music....They have a great deal of poetry, many long treatises, and a deep understanding of philosophy and letters. The book of *Kalila wa Dimna* originated with them....When Adam descended from Paradise, it was to their land that he made his way.” Lynda N. Shaffer, “Southernization”, in *Agricultural and Pastoral Societies in Ancient and Classical History*, ed. Michael Adas, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001), p. 312.

person captive to worldly desires fell into a ruined state. However, one can find his beloved if he copes with the sufferings of life under the guidance of a perfect Sufi master like Seyyid Harun.

4.3.9 *The Belief of the Four Gateways*

It is well known that the most important belief after that of the *mürşit*, spiritual guide, is the “doctrine of the Four Gateways”, *dört kapı*- 1- the *şerî’at* (*shari’a*) or “orthodox, Sunni religious law”, 2- the *tarikât* or “teachings and practice of the secret religious order”, 3- the *ma’rifet* or “mystic knowledge of God”, 4- the *hakikat* or “the immediate experience of the essence of reality”.⁵⁷⁸ According to Bektaşî tradition, “these four gateways to religious knowledge and experience were first revealed to Adam by the Angel Gabriel.”⁵⁷⁹ Following the Bektaşî tradition, the author of the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun* explains the story of the creation of Adam and Eve and their expulsion from the Paradise and the teaching of the Angel Gabriel to Adam.⁵⁸⁰

After narrating the story of Adam, the author begins to explain the doctrine of four gateways without any mention of Bektaşî tradition.⁵⁸¹ There are striking similarities between the doctrine of four gateways as expressed in the *Makâlât-i Hacı Bektaş* and in the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun*.⁵⁸² For instance, according to the *Makâlât-i Hacı Bektaş*, there are ten components of the *hakikat*: 1- “To become dust”, *turâb olmak*, 2- “not to find fault with the seventy-two religious communities”, *yetmiş iki milleti ayıplamamak*, 3- “not to prevent anything, against its destiny”, *elden gelen*

⁵⁷⁸ John Kinsley Birge, *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*, (London: Luzac & Co., 1937), p. 102.

⁵⁷⁹ Birge, *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*, p. 102.

⁵⁸⁰ *Makâlât*, pp. 65-74.

⁵⁸¹ *Makâlât*, pp. 77-81.

⁵⁸² See Hacı Bektaş Velî, *Makâlât*, ed. Esad Coşan (sadeleştiren: Hüseyin Özbay), (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1996), pp. 11-20 and *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun*, ed. Cemal Kurnaz, pp. 77-81.

her şeyi 'ala kadrihî men' etmemek, 4- “to be safe from the created world”, *dünya içinde yaratılmış andan emîn olmak*, 5- “to bow before the ultimate ruler”, *mülk ıssına yüz sürüb yüzü suyun bulmak*, 6- “to speak of the mysteries (only) in the fellowship of mystics”, *hakikat sohbetinde esrâr söylemek*, 7- “spiritual progress in God”, *seyr fillah*, 8- “spiritual progress, and continued existence in God, *seyr ve bekâ billah*, 9- “supplication”, *münâcât*, 10- “contemplation, or vision, *müşâhede*, i.e. to attain to God, most high, *Tanrı te'âlâ'ya ulaşmak*.⁵⁸³ In the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Hârûn*, ten components of the *hakikat* are listed as follows: 1-*Türâb olmak*, 2- *Yetmiş iki millete bir nazar etmek*, 3- *Güci yitdiğini mü'minlerden dirîğ itmeye*, 4- *Kamu mahlûkât andan incinmeye*, 5- *Mülk ıssına yüz sürüb yüz suyun bulmaktır*, 6- *Her musâhabetde esrâr kelâmın söylemekdür*, 7- *Seyr*, 8- *Sır*, 9- *Münâcât*, 10- *Müşâhede*.⁵⁸⁴

It seems that the author of the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun* viewed the doctrine of four gateways in line with the Sunni worldview of the Ottoman empire of the sixteenth century. As Karamustafa indicates, the Bektaşî dervish community was transformed into “a full-fledged Sufî order” during the sixteenth century. The reason of the success of the Bektâşîs, according to Karamustafa, was their “firm connection with the Ottoman military system: the Janissaries, by long-standing tradition, paid allegiance to Hacı Bektaş.”⁵⁸⁵

The story of Seyyid Hârûn can also be viewed in terms of what Alexander Papas has suggested, that the Sufis adapted the cities to themselves.⁵⁸⁶ On the one hand, this story can be seen as a story of a Sufî saint who was thought to have established a new town and who redefined this space with new buildings. Today, the

⁵⁸³ Birge, pp. 104-105.

⁵⁸⁴ *Makâlât-i Seyyid Hârûn*, p. 81.

⁵⁸⁵ Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, pp. 83-84.

⁵⁸⁶ Alexander Papas, “Towards a New History of Sufism: The Turkish Case,” *History of Religions*, vol. 46, no. 1 (August 2006), p. 88.

residents of Seydişehir are proud of their saints.⁵⁸⁷ On the other hand, this story can also be viewed as one of a dervish who adapted an old text of hagiography to the context of his time, i.e. the sixteenth century and who contributed to maintaining the pride of a medieval town of Anatolia until present day by putting narrated stories into a cautiously designed text.

⁵⁸⁷ In the foreword to *Seydişehir Tarihi*, Sadi Irmak begins his words as follows: “Horasanlı bir Türk olan gönül sahibi bir velî’nin, ailesi ve kendisine uyan kırk kadar dervişi ile Horasan’dan Anadolu’ya göçmesi, Eşrefoğulları devrinde Küpe dağının eteklerine gelerek burada konaklaması olayı, Seydişehir Tarihi’nin başlangıcı sayılır.”, see Mehmet Önder, *Seydişehir Tarihi*, (Seydişehir: Seydişehir Belediyesi, 1986), p. 1.

CHAPTER V

DERVISHES AND THE “WILL OF GOD”: THE MONGOLS, THE EMPIRE OF TİMUR AND THE OTTOMANS AS VIEWED IN THE KARAMANİD TEXTS WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO ŞİKÂRÎ

In the literature on the Karamanids, there is widespread hesitation to use Şikârî's history of the Karamanids due to the fact that Şikârî did not bother to date the events he narrated. As such, Şikârî's text is a problematic text because the reader cannot follow the sequence of events due to lack of chronology in the text. Furthermore, it is not exactly known which part consists of Şikârî's own thoughts and which part comes from the original Persian text of Yarcânî, which will be explained later. Not much effort has been made to compare Şikârî with other primary sources written in Anatolia during the Later Islamic Middle Period, 1250-1500.⁵⁸⁸ Moreover, Şikârî's text has not been examined thus far from the point of the Sufi outlook. The question of why Şikârî frequently refers to Celâleddin Rûmî has not been asked in the literature. Despite these shortcomings, Şikârî's rendition is useful in that Şikârî underscores that the Karamanids were not only the political heirs to the Seljukids, that they were also spiritual heirs to the Seljukids. It is not a coincidence that the lodge and tomb of Celâleddin Rûmî (1207-1273), a Seljukid Sufi master, serves the role of relief from disasters of the world for the Karamanid rulers

⁵⁸⁸ Here, I use the periodization of Marshall Hodgson. See Marshall G. S. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam*, vol. 2, pp. 376-378.

throughout Şikârî's account. Before analyzing the text of Şikârî, the nature of relations between the Ottomans and the Karamanids in terms of Sufi Masters will be examined briefly.

Like Hâce Ahrar, whose political mission was “to ensure peace between the Timurid rulers,”⁵⁸⁹ some Karamanid Sufi masters played an intermediary role between both the Ottomans and the Karamanids. In some cases, the Karaman Begs sent some prominent shayhks as envoys to the Ottoman court.⁵⁹⁰ For instance, Ishak Beg sent Molla Şemsüddin Ahmed, who was the son of Molla Sarı Yakub as an envoy to the Ottoman sultan to achieve peace with the Ottomans in 869 H./1465.⁵⁹¹ Although this mission was unsuccessful, it denotes the role of Sufi masters in the politics of the Karamanids. According to the *Evkaf defteri* (Book of Registers of *Vakfs*) of the Province of Karaman of the year 888 H./1483, the *khankâh* of Rahime Hatun⁵⁹² in Lârende was at the disposal of Mehmed Çelebi, who was the son of Molla Şemsüddin. It seems that at that date, i.e. in the year 1483, Molla Şemsüddin was not alive and his son was serving as the shaykh of the *khankâh* of Rahime Hatun. Only ten *khankâhs* were mentioned in this register and one of them, the *khankâh* of Rahime Hatun, was at the disposal (*tasarruf*) of this shaykh family. The register also refers to both Molla Şemsüddin and his father Sarı Yakub as Mevlânâ, which denotes their high status as a religious scholar: “*Vakf-i Hankâh-i Rahime Hatun der-nefs-i*

⁵⁸⁹ Ökten, “Câmî (817-898/1414-1492),” p. 215.

⁵⁹⁰ This practice was not peculiar to the Karamanoğlus. This was a widespread phenomenon especially among the Timurids. For instance, according to Muhyî-yi Gülşenî, Sultan Hüseyin Baykara sent Şeyh Abdullah-ı Horasanî with an imperial letter to the court of Aqquyunlu Sultan Uzun Hasan: “Sultan Ebû Sa’îd Ebû’l-Hayr neslinden bir ulu şeyh var imiş ki Şeyh Abdullah-i Horasânî dirler imiş. Hüseyin Baykara sulh için bir ‘uzrnâme yazub şeyhle Sultan Hasan’a irsâl ider,” Muhyî-yi Gülşenî, *Menâkıb-i İbrâhîm-i Gülşenî*, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1982), p. 29.

⁵⁹¹ Şehabettin Tekindağ, “Son Osmanlı-Karaman Münasebetleri Hakkında Araştırmalar,” *Tarih Dergisi*, vol. XIII, no. 17-18, 43-76: 51.

⁵⁹² Rahime Hatun was believed to be the wife of the Prophet Eyyub, who was known for his forbearance. We do not know whether this *khankâh* was built for the memory of the Prophet Eyub’s wife or for a Seljukid woman.

Lârende meşihat der tasarruf-ı Mehmed Çelebi bin Mevlânâ Şemsüddin bin Mevlânâ Sarı Ya'kub be-hükm-i Pâdişâh-ı 'âlem-penâh hullide mülkühü."⁵⁹³

Having indicated briefly the role of the shaykhs in the diplomatic relations between the Ottomans and the Karamanids, the question of how the final Ottoman occupation of the Karamanid lands in the 1460's and the 1470's were perceived by the Ottoman and the Karamanid sources will be examined.

5.1 The Ottoman Chroniclers and the Final Ottoman Occupation of the Karamanid Lands

The Ottoman chroniclers such as Âşıkpaşazâde and Neşrî acknowledge the fact that during the final Ottoman occupation of the Karamanid lands there was tremendous plundering, which led the settlers of Karamanoğlus to intimidation and pessimism. One can sense the degree of pessimism among the people of the Karamanids in the words of the Karamanid poets, particularly Aynî and Baba Yusuf.⁵⁹⁴ After the Ottoman occupation of the Karamanid lands the Ottomans exiled some families from Lârende, Ereğli and Aksaray.⁵⁹⁵

⁵⁹³ Fahri Coşkun, "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri," p. 82. For more information about Sarı Ya'kub, see Mecdî Mehmed Efendi, *Şakaik-i Nu'maniye ve Zeyilleri, Hadaiku'ş-Şakaik*, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan, (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989), pp. 83-84; Ahmet Faruk Güney, "Gaza Devrinde Kur'an'ı Yorumlamak: Fetih Öncesi Dönemde Osmanlı Müfessirleri ve Tefsir Eserleri," *Dîvân: İlmî Araştırmalar*, vol. 10, no. 18 (2005), 193-244: 233.

⁵⁹⁴ "İy dirîğa kim cihân zulmin be-gâyet eyledi
Halk-ı 'âlem baş açub andan şikâyet eyledi

Yıkdı dâr-ı devletin mülk-i Karamanun dirîğ
Çarh-ı zâlim zulm idüb yine 'adâvet eyledi
Her gören ağladı ol meşhûdı görmeyen dahî
Her kişünün gözleri âna şehâdet eyledi

Bülbülâ gül soldı çün hasret demidür âh vâh
Vuslat-ı gülşen geçüb firkat demidür âh vâh
Lutfun eyyâmı geçüb kalmadı 'âlemde safâ

Although the Karamanid sources are silent about Akkoyunlu Sultan Uzun Hasan's plundering in the Karamanid lands before the arrival of the Ottoman army, the Ottoman chroniclers stress this point and wrote that Uzun Hasan ruined the Karamanid lands before the Ottomans.⁵⁹⁶

Both Âşıkpaşazâde and Neşrî blamed the Ottoman Vizier Rum Mehmed Paşa for his brutality towards the local people and his arbitrary policies in exiling some prominent Karamanoğlus, including Celâleddin Rûmî's great-grandson, Emir Ali

Dünyede şimden girü mihnet demidür âh vâh," Ahmet Mermer, *Karamanlı Aynî ve Divânı*, (Ankara: Akçağ, 1997), p. 189.

⁵⁹⁵ Şehabettin Tekindağ, "Son Osmanlı-Karaman Münasebetleri Hakkında Araştırmalar", *Tarih Dergisi*, vol. XIII, no. 17-18, 43-76: 61,62. The district where the exiled people of Aksaray settled in İstanbul has been called Aksaray since the late fifteenth century. See Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede, *Müneccimbaşı Tarihi*, tr. İsmail Erünsal, (Tercüman Yayınları, not dated), p. 340.

⁵⁹⁶ Âşıkpaşazâde explains the plundering of Uzun Hasan in the Karamanid lands as follows: "Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg'ün altı oğlu kaldı. Emmâ himmeti büyük oğlunda idi ki yerine o beg olaydı. Hazinesini dahî ol hükm itdüğü ilde komış idi. Ol Silifke'dür ve bu Karaman oğlanlarının kıssası çoktur, illâ öbür oğlu kim ânun adı Pîr Ahmed'dür. Ol Konya'da otururdu ve ol büyüğü kim İshak'dur. O İç İl'de otururdu. Silifke'yi taht idündi. İki küçücük oğlanları kaçdılar. Sultan Muhammed Han Ğâzî'ye geldüler. Ve bu İshak Beg, Uzun Hasan etegin tutdı. İlçi gönderdi. Hayli mal bile gönderdi. Eyitdi kim, 'Gel! Benüm karındaşları vilâyetden kaçur, tâ bunda gelince her göçüne bin vireyim,' didi. Hasan dahî bu sözi kabûl itdi. Erzincan'dan yürüdü. Gelüb Sivas'ı geçdi. İshak dahî ol araya geldüğü işidicek karşıladı. Alub geldi Karaman vilâyetine. Karındaşıyla buluşdurdu. Uğraş itdiler. Pîr Ahmed'i ilden çıkardılar. Hemîn ki Uzun Hasan ki girü vilâyetine girdi. Pîr Ahmed dahî Sultan Muhammed Han etegin tutmuşdı. Ol zaman kaçub Sultan Muhammed Han'a gelmiş idi. Uzun Hasan dahî Karamanoğlu'nun vilâyetinde çok bedbahtlıklar itmişdi. Niçelerün malların ve davarların almış idi. Elhâsıl-i kelâm, vilâyet-i Karaman'ı bozdu; harâb eyledi." Âşıkpaşazâde, *Menâkıb-i Âl-i Osman*, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Emanet Hazinesi, no. 1433, folios 172b-173a. Neşrî's version of the story was not so different from Âşıkpaşazâde but Neşrî gives more detailed and accurate version: "Rivâyetdir ki, Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg vefat edip yedi oğlu kaldı. Biri İshak, biri Pîr Ahmed ve biri Karaman ve biri Kasım ve biri Alâüddin ve biri Süleyman ve biri Nure Sofu'dur ki, kitabın evâilinde zikrolundu. Ve Süleyman'la Nure Sofu küçürek idi. Evvel-i vehlette kaçıp Sultan Mehmed'e gelmişlerdi. Kalanı Karaman vilâyetinde idi. Bu oğlanların mecmu'ü Sultan Mehmed bin Yıldırım kızı Sultan Hatun'dan idi. Ammâ İshak câriyeden idi. Ve hem cümlesinden İshak büyüğüydü. Ve İbrahim Beg'in dahi hâl-i hayatında himmeti İshak Beg'e idi. Zira İshak Beg'den gayrısında 'Osmanlılık alacası vardır', diye sevmezdi...İshak Beg, Uzun Hasan'ın etegini tutup eyitti: 'Gel kardeşlerimi vilâyetten kaçır, tâ bunda gelince, her göçüne bin flori göndereyim', dedi. Hasan-i Dıraz flori avazını işidip, kabûl edip, hemen Erzincan'dan yürüyüp Sivas'tan geçecek, İshak işidip, istikbâl edip, alıp, Karaman vilâyetine götürdü. Pîr Ahmed'i kardeşleriyle sürüp ilden çıkardılar. Ve Hasan-i Dıraz ki, hemîn vilâyet-i Karaman'a girdi. Pîr Ahmed kaçıp, Sultan Mehmed'e gelip, İstanbul'da ayağına düştü. Amma hasan Dıraz Karaman ilinde çok bedbahtlıklar edip, bî-kıyas zulümler etti. Elhâsıl vilâyet-i Karaman'ı bozup, harap ve her iklimden *mâl-i amân* diye yağmaya yakın işler etti. Ve Beg-şehri, üç yüz evdir, gâret edip, cebrledavarlarını aldıktan sonra otuz altı bin akçe mâl-i emân aldı. Kalanını dahî buna göre kıyas eyle. Ve derler ki, davar cinsinden yalnız yirmi bin deve alıp gitti.", Mehmed Neşrî, *Kitâb-ı Cihan-nümâ, Neşrî Tarihi*, ed. Faik Reşit Unat and Mehmed A. Köymen, vol. II, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995), pp. 770-775.

Çelebi, to Istanbul.⁵⁹⁷ Nevertheless, it should be kept in mind that Âşıkpaşazâde had personal prejudice against Rûm Mehmed Paşa, “who actually did good services for the Sultan, particularly in the conquest of Agriboz (Euboea).”⁵⁹⁸ Âşıkpaşazâde owned some properties in İstanbul and accused Rûm Mehmed Paşa of “the re-introduction of the rent on such properties,” writing:

He was the son of an infidel and became very intimate with the Sultan, and one of his viziers. The infidels from the old [Byzantine] families were his father’s friends. They warned him saying that look: these Turks have succeeded in reconstructing this city [of ours] and settling; you have to do something. They took our country and possess it in front of us....The Vezir replied: “Let us bring back the *mukâta’a* which was imposed previously, so that these people would give up building their *mulk* properties and the city would remain in ruins and eventually in our hands”....Because of this *mukâta’a* people gave up the reconstruction and began to leave the city.⁵⁹⁹

5.2 The Ottomans as viewed in the Karamanid Texts

The Seljukid Sultan Alâeddin Keykubad III (d. 702/1303) is said to have asked a poet named Dehhânî to compile a work about the Seljukid Dynasty in the style of Firdawsî’s *Shahnâma*.⁶⁰⁰ Upon the order of the Seljukid Sultan, Dehhânî

⁵⁹⁷ “Bu Rûm vezir [Rûm Mehmed Paşa] İstanbul’un intikâmını almaya gayet hevesli idi ki Müslümanları incite idi. Bu defa fırsat buldu. Elhâsıl Lârende’den ve Konya’dan ziyade evler almaktan muradı Rûm vezirin bu idi ki Müslümanların evlerini yıkdırub rızıkları ve düzenlerini bozdurmaktı. Lârende’den gelecekleri şöyle yazdı ki Mevlânâ Hünkâr’ın oğlunu beraber sürdü ki O Emir Ali Çelebi oğlu Ahmed Çelebi’dir. Elhâsıl Rûm Mehmed, Padişah emrinden dışarı çok çıkmıştı.”, *Âşıkpaşaoğlu Tarihi*, ed. H. Nihal Atsız, (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1985), pp. 170,171; “Rûm Mehmed Paşa varub Lârende’yi şöyle sürdü-kim, hattâ Mevlânâ Celâeddin oğlanlarından Emîr Ali Çelebi’yi bile sürdü. Sonra Pâdişah ânı yine yerine gönderdi. Ve bi’l-cümle Lârende’yi tamam yıkıp, harap ettirdi”, *Neşri Tarihi*, p. 783.

⁵⁹⁸ Halil İncalcık, “How to Read Âşık Pasha-zâde’s History,” in *Essays in Ottoman History*, (İstanbul: Eren, 1998), p. 38.

⁵⁹⁹ Halil İncalcık, “How to Read ‘Âşık Pasha-Zâde’s History,” pp. 38,39.

⁶⁰⁰ According to Köprülü, the Seljuk Sultan who ordered Dehhânî to compose a Seljukid *Shahnâma* was Alâeddin Keykubad III: “In an ode that he [Dehhânî] presented to a Seljukid ruler...the poet also asks the ruler’s permission to return again to Horasan, his native land...This poet had come to Anatolia from Horasan, and his desire to return to his native country could only have been in the time of Alâeddin Keykubad III because that was when the İlkhânid Empire controlled both Anatolia and Horasan and assured the security of the roads. Otherwise, those who had previously fled to Anatolia before the invading Mongols would have come to settle there with no intention to return. It would also be difficult to relate this event to the period of Alâeddin Keykubad II. At that time, the poet al-Qâni’î, who wrote the first Seljukid *Shahnâma*, was still alive and may have been occupied with writing the last part of it. In fact, he wrote his *Kelile ve Dimne* after finishing that work. There is strong likelihood that Hâce Dehhânî saw al-Qâni’î’s *Shahnâma* and perhaps intended to write his work to complete it. Keykubad III, perhaps being faithful to the practice of his ancestors, pursued the goal of completing

wrote a Seljukid *Shahnâma*, which consisted of 20,000 couplets. According to Köprülü, while composing the Seljukid *Shahnâma*, Hâce Dehhânî examined “certain books and even official documents at the Konya court and in the Seljuk government archives.”⁶⁰¹ This work is not extant today.⁶⁰² However, it is known that the Karamanid Alâeddin Beg (d. 1397-1398) saw this work and that he asked Yarcânî to write a similar work for the Karamanid Dynasty.⁶⁰³ Upon the order of Alâeddin Beg, Yarcânî wrote the Karamanid *Shahnâma*.

5.2.1 Şikârî’s view of the Ottomans and the Karamanids

The *Shahnâma* of Yarcânî was translated by Şikârî, “who lived in the Karamanid territory,” to the Ottoman Turkish in the sixteenth century.⁶⁰⁴ Yarcânî’s *Shahnâma* dealt with the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. However, one comes across the events of the fifteenth and early sixteenth century in Şikârî’s history of the Karamanids. Köprülü suggests that Şikârî either extended Yarcânî’s work by adding the later periods into that work or he translated an extended version of Yarcânî’s

this history of the dynasty by including his own time in it. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that the work was written not in Turkish but in Persian, although our poet had the ability to write his *Shahnâma* in Turkish, which by that time had reached a level of literary development whereby it could be used for the writing of such a work.”, Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, *The Seljuks of Anatolia, Their History and Culture according to Local Muslim Sources*, tr. and ed. Gary Leiser, (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1992), pp. 18-19.

⁶⁰¹ Köprülü, *The Seljuks of Anatolia*, p. 19.

⁶⁰² M. Fuad Köprülü, “Anadolu Selçukluları Tarihi’nin Yerli Kaynakları,” *Belleten*, vol. VII, no. 27 (1943), 379-458: 396-397.

⁶⁰³ For further information about Karamanoğlu Alâeddin bin Alâeddin Halil Beg, see Halil Edhem, “Karamanoğulları Hakkında Vesâik-i Mahkûke,” *Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni Mecmu’ası*, vol. 2, no. 12, 741-760: 744-749.

⁶⁰⁴ Köprülü, *The Seljuks of Anatolia*, p. 20. Lindner discusses different opinions about Şikârî: “Scholars have thus had to search for Ottomans who were called Şikârî, and have come up with a few candidates: an Ahmet or Haydar Şikârî, who died in 1506 or 1584, the son and grandson of high Ottoman officials, and the author of an incomplete Mesnevî treatment of the story of Yusuf and Zuleyha; a judge of Malkara whose name appears in an official register dated 1567; or Şikârî Çelebi, a judge and minor poet of the reign of Ahmed I. Although Ahmet or Haydar Şikârî, who was described as an ‘unconventional’ personality, might seem the most likely candidate, there is absolutely no evidence to link him, or any of the known Şikârîs, with the modest author of our Karaman history,” Lindner, *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia*, p. 146.

Shahnâma. Perhaps some other chroniclers before Şikârî extended that work and Şikârî translated that work into the Ottoman Turkish.⁶⁰⁵

It was only Müneccimbaşı who used the Karamanid history of Şikârî among the Ottoman chroniclers.⁶⁰⁶ The seventeenth century Ottoman historian Derviş Ahmed Dede b. Lutfullah (d. 1702), also called Müneccimbaşı, had used Şikârî from a text copied in the year 1025/1615.⁶⁰⁷ Wittek quotes a passage from Müneccimbaşı's *Câmi'ü'd-düvel* in his monograph on the principality of Menteşe. In that part, Müneccimbaşı refers to a "person named Şikârî" but he does not give any information about Şikârî.⁶⁰⁸ However, Wittek expresses his doubts about the use of Şikârî's text as a source for the origin of the principality of Menteşe.⁶⁰⁹ Cahen is of the same opinion with Wittek about the use of Şikârî's Karamanid *Shahnâma*. Cahen

⁶⁰⁵ Köprülü, "Anadolu Selçukluları Tarihi'nin Yerli Kaynakları," p. 400n.

⁶⁰⁶ Köprülü, p. 399.

⁶⁰⁷ Rudi Paul Lindner, *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia*, p. 145; Bursalı Mehmed Tâhir gives the following information about Müneccimbaşı: "Urefâ ve fuzelâ-yi Mevleviye'den bir zât-i ma'ârif-simât olub Selâniklidir. Pederi Konya Ereğlisinden hicret eylemiştir. Sultan Mehmed bin Sultan İbrahim'in müneccimbaşısı idi. Müverrihîn-i Osmâniye içinde şâyân-i vusûk târîh-i 'umûmî yazanlardandır. *Câmi'ü'd-Düvel* isminde olan eseri 'Arabîyyü'l-'ibâre olub 'Arabî, Fârsî, Türkî seksen küsur tevârîhe mürâca'at netîcesinde meydana gelmiştir. Şâ'ir-i meşhûr Nedim Efendi tarafından fakat 'âdî bir sûretde *Sahâifü'l-Ahbâr* ismiyle Türkce'ye terceme olunarak üç cild üzere tab' olunmuştur. Zamânın hakikatine, târîh kelimesinin lafzına ve mebd-i 'i'tibâr olunan meşhûr târîhlerin vaz'larına dâir 'ilm-i hey'ete müte'allik mesrûdâtıyla 'ilm-i târîhin ta'rîfine, mevzû'una, gâyetine ve müverrihe lâzım olan umûr ve ma'lûmata dâir yazdığı ifâdâtı bâ'is-i istifâdedir. Hilkat ve ahvâl-i enbiyâdan Hulefâ-yi Râşidîn ve kibâr-i ashâb-i güzîn ile zuhûr-i İslâm'dan mukaddem olan hukûmât ve akvâmdan ve müahharan teşekkül iden hukûmât-i müslime ve tavâ'if-i mülûk ile mülûk-i gayr-i müslime hukûmâtından bâhisdir. Vakâyi'-i Âl-i Osman 1083 târîhine kadardır. *Câmi'ü'd-Düvel*'in bir takımı kütübhâne-i 'umûmîde, bir takımı Enderun-i Hümâyûnda Sultan Ahmed-i Sâlis kütübhanesinde, bir takımı Edirne'de Sultan Selim kütübhanesinde vardır. En mükemmel tevârîh-i 'umûmiyemizdendir." Bursalı Mehmed Tâhir, *Osmanlı Müellifleri I-II-III*, vol. 3 (Ankara: Bizim Büro Basımevi, 2000), pp. 142-143; Müneccimbaşı's father, Lutfullah, was a native Ereğli, a town of Konya. He served his shaykh, Halil Dede, in Mevlevîhâne of Kasımpaşa for fifteen years. In 1086/1675-6, he was appointed as *musâhib-i pâdişâhî* for the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed IV. He was dismissed from this office in *Muharrem* 1099/November 1687. After his pilgrimage in 1102/1690-91, he became the shaykh of the *Mevlevîhâne* in Mecca. For more information about Müneccimbaşı, see Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicil-i Osmanî, Osmanlı Ünlüleri*, tr. Seyid Ali Kahraman, ed. Nuri Akbayar, 6 vol.s, vol. 1, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996), pp. 184-185; J. H. Kramers, "Müneccimbaşı," *The Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition, vol. 7, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993), pp. 572-573.

⁶⁰⁸ "Fî târîh-i Türkî ellefehû şahsun yukâlû lehû Şikârî fî begân-i ahvâlî'l-Karamaniyye...", Paul Wittek, *Menteşe Begliği, 13-15. Asırlarda Garbî Küçük Asya Tarihine Ait Tetkik*, tr. O. Ş. Gökyay, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1986), p. 172.

⁶⁰⁹ Paul Wittek, *Menteşe Begliği*, p. 48.

views Şikârî's work as "semi-legendary and not chronological."⁶¹⁰ Despite of these concerns, Şikârî remains a valuable source for understanding how the Karamanids viewed the world around themselves. As Lindner indicates, the Şikârî chronicle is the "only pro-Karaman source for the fifteenth century Anatolian history," presenting the reader with an "invaluable view of the cultural assumptions and expectations which ruled in Karaman."⁶¹¹

Şikârî traces the origin of the Karamanids to Nûreddin, known as Nûre Sofî, who left the emirate to his son Karaman and became a disciple of Baba İlyas-i Horasanî. Nûre Sofî originated from Azerbaijan and after staying at Sivas for some years he finally settled in the Ermenek region.⁶¹² According to Şikârî, Nûre Sofî lived in the caves for seven years after he became a disciple of "the great shaykh," Baba İlyas.⁶¹³ In the register of the foundations of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483, Nûre Sofî was described as the forefather of the Karamanids (*vakf-i zâviye-i Nûre Sofî cedd-i evlâd-i Karaman*).⁶¹⁴

The Ottoman chronicler Âşıkpaşazâde gives the genealogy of his family as follows: "Dervish Ahmed Âşıkî, son of Yahya, son of Selman, son of Bali, son of Âşık Pasha, son of Muhlis Pahsa, son of Baba İlyas, who was one of the *khalîfas* of Abu'l-Wafâ."⁶¹⁵ As İnalçık points out, after the conquest of Istanbul Mehmed The Conqueror "must have been particularly content to host the son of Âşık Pasha in his

⁶¹⁰ Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, p. 59.

⁶¹¹ Lindner, *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia*, p. 105.

⁶¹² Cahen, p. 281.

⁶¹³ Şikârî, *Karamanoğulları Tarihi*, ed. M. Mesud Koman, (Konya: Yeni Kitab Basımevi, 1946), pp. 15-16; for more information about Baba İlyas-i Horasanî, see Elvan Çelebi, *Menâkıbü'l-Kudsîyye fî Menasibü'l-Ünsîyye, Baba İlyas-i Horasanî ve Sülâlesinin Menkabevi Tarihi*, ed. İsmail E. Erünsal, Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995).

⁶¹⁴ *Defter-i Evkâf-i Vilâyet-i Karaman ve Kayserîyye*, İstanbul Atatürk Kitaplığı, Cevdet Tasnifi, O. 116/1, folio 46a.

⁶¹⁵ Halil İnalçık, "How to Read Âşıkpaşazâde's History," p. 31.

capital since the bitter rival of his house, the Karamanids, were associated with Baba İlyas' descendants from the beginning.”⁶¹⁶

In his history, Şikârî seems to be inclined towards Sufism, using respectful language for the Sufî master. In the text, Celâleddin Rûmî is perceived as the patron saint of the Karamanids. In some cases, according to Şikârî, the Karamanid begs were visiting the lodge and tomb of Rûmî in difficult times in order to benefit from his *baraka* (“divine blessing or charisma bestowed by God on a *walî* or pious individual”).⁶¹⁷ Şikârî narrates a story of a dream of Karamanoğlu Alâeddin Ali Beg. According to the story, Alâeddin Beg spent a night in the tomb of Rûmî. On that night he saw Rûmî in a dream. In that dream, Rûmî was in a gathering with the prophets. He foretold Alâeddin Beg of the conquest of Gorigos castle and told him that his name would be “Ebu'l-Feth (The Conqueror)” from now on. The following morning, Alâeddin went to Ârif Çelebi for an interpretation of that dream.⁶¹⁸ Karamanoğlu Alâeddin Beg (1359-1397/98) built the “green tomb” (*yeşil türbe*) of Rûmî from *ghazâ* booty.⁶¹⁹ The Gorigos campaign of Alâeddin Ali Beg took place in the year 1367.⁶²⁰ Ottoman sources also indicate that the earlier sultanic mosques in

⁶¹⁶ İnalçık, “How to Read Âşıkpaşazâde’s History,” p. 33; Dina Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, p. 232.

⁶¹⁷ For references to Celâleddin Rûmî in Şikârî’s text, see Şikârî, *Karamanoğulları Tarihi*, ed. M. Mesud Koman, pp. 38-39, 43-44, 102, 107, 126, 145, 165, 189.

⁶¹⁸ Şikârî does not indicate whether it was Ulu Ârif Çelebi (d. 1320) or the second Ârif Çelebi (d. 1421), who was the son of Emîr Âdil Çelebi (d. 1368). It seems that he meant the second Ârif Çelebi. For a complete list of the shaykhs of the central lodge of the Mevlevî Order, see Abdûlbâki Gölpınarlı, *Mevlânâ’dan Sonra Mevlevilik*, (İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitabevi, 1953), pp. 152-153.

⁶¹⁹ Şikârî, *Karamanoğulları Tarihi*, p. 107.

⁶²⁰ Şikârî presents the reader with a lively and moving story of the Gorigos campaign of Alâeddin Ali Beg. Perhaps Yarcânî, to whom Alâeddin Ali Beg ordered to compose a Karamanid Shahnâme, took part in that campaign and perhaps we owe the vivid picture of the events during that campaign to Yarcânî. However, the text of Yarcânî is not extant today. Şikârî does not hesitate to mention the number of dead persons in the Karamanid army. According to Şikârî, the Karamanid army consisted of 40,000 men. The Karamanid army faced heavy losses during the campaign. The number of dead persons in the Karamanid army was 8,300, according to Şikârî, see Şikârî, *Karamanoğulları Tarihi*, pp. 107-109. However, Şikârî does not give the number of the dead persons in the army of Gorigos which also consisted troops from Cyprus and İskenderun. Yet, he indicates that both sides faced heavy losses and that the Karamanids were in vain in the face of the great number of the “infidel army”: “Kâfir askerlerine şöyle koyuldular. Kırmağa başladılar. Dağılan asker dahi bir yere gelüb yürüdüler. Üç gün üç gice cenk eylediler. Kan ırmak olub akdı. Ammâ kâfir katı çok idi. Gene İslâm za’fa düşdü. Alâeddin ânı görüb ‘Ah!’ eyledi. Aydın Oğlu eydür: ‘Ey Sultan’ mel’ûnlar sâfi demür ne

Bursa and Edirne were built with the booty acquired in military victories in Christian lands. For instance, The Great Mosque (*Ulu Cami*) of Bursa was built with the booty of Nikopolis campaign of Bayezid I in 1396.⁶²¹ In the Islamic tradition, it is not considered as a pious act to build mosques with the taxes paid by the Muslim people. Gülru Necipoğlu refers to an interesting event related to that perception from Cordoba of the tenth-century: “The people of Cordoba....refused to pray in the costly enlargement the tenth-century Umayyad caliph al-Hakam II made to the city’s Great Mosque until the qadi swore that it had been financed with the ruler’s legal one-fifth share of war booties.”⁶²²

Şikârî does not give the date of establishment of the green tomb of Rûmî. However, from other sources, it is known that the tomb of Celâleddin Rûmî was firstly built in the year 673/1274.⁶²³ İ. Hakkı Konyalı shares Şikârî’s conviction that the green tomb of Rûmî was built by Karamanoğlu Alâeddin Ali Beg. Konyalı suggests that Alaeddin Beg destroyed the original tomb built in the year 673/1274 and replaced it with a green tomb. Konyalı views Alâeddin Beg as a patron of Mevlevî buildings.⁶²⁴ In the inscription at the mosque of Aktekke or Mâder-i Mevlânâ,⁶²⁵ the date of which is 772/1371, Alâeddin Beg is called “Ebu’l-Feth (The

ok batâr, ne kılıç keser, heman ‘inâyet Allah’a kaldı,” Şikârî, p. 108. The reader also comes across legendary stories while reading that part of Şikârî: “Bir sa’at içinde kâfir sınıb kal’aya düştü. Gâziler Alâeddin’in bargâhın götürüb kal’aya karşı kurdular. Dîvân eylediler....Bir gün taşra çıkub gördüler ki, derya içine bir iki mu’tenâ burc yapmışlar; öyle yüksektir ki, her kulesi âsumana çıkmış. Andan sonra bu kal’ayı ihâta etmişler. Dağ tarafına bir kal’a dahi peydâ eylemişler; dibine bir hendek kesmişler. Sedd-i İskender gibi deryâ içine salmışlar. Bir başından bir başına ok irişmez....Meğer bu kal’ayı İskender zamanında divler yapmış idi”, Şikârî, *Karamanoğulları Tarihi*, p. 109; for more information about the Gorigos campaign, see Şehabettin Tekindağ, “Karamanlı’ların Gorigos Seferi (1367),” *Tarih Dergisi*, no. 11, pp. 161-174.

⁶²¹ Gülru Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire*, (London: Reaktion Books, 2005), p. 60.

⁶²² Gülru Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan*, p. 59.

⁶²³ Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, p. 636.

⁶²⁴ Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, pp. 638-641.

⁶²⁵ In the early twentieth century, Sapançalı Hüseyin, who was a teacher in the school of Karaman İdadisi, writes that the *zâviye* of Mader-i Mevlana had one room for the shaykh and eight rooms for dervishes and there was nice garden in the middle of the *zâviye*. He also adds that some parts of the

Conqueror).”⁶²⁶ As was mentioned earlier, according to Şikârî, this title was bestowed on Alâeddin Beg by Rûmî in a dream.⁶²⁷ Konyalı also published a part of the *vakfiye* (the deed of the endowment of a foundation), of the lodge of Mâder-i Mevlânâ. According to the *vakfiye* of the lodge that was endowed by Alâeddin Beg in the year 769/1367, the foundation would be at the disposal of the Celâleddin Rûmî’s descendants.⁶²⁸ This document indicates that Alâeddin Beg was indeed the patron of the Mevlevî order. Şikârî’s references to Rûmî throughout the text was not meaningless. The inscriptions and foundation registers pay witness to Şikârî’s implicit claim throughout his history that Alâeddin Beg respected highly Celâleddin Rûmî and his descendants.

The veneration of the famous Sufis of Konya such as Celâleddin Rûmî and Sadreddin Konevî can easily be detected in the sources written in the Anatolian principalities. Esterâbâdî’s *Bezm ü Rezm*, which was written by the order of Kadı Burhaneddin (d. 800/1398) of Sivas and was completed in the year 800/1397-98, serves as a fitting example of this phenomenon.⁶²⁹ In that work, Esterâbâdî praises Celâleddin Rûmî, Ibn al-Arabî and his stepson, Sadreddin Konevî.⁶³⁰ Esterâbâdî

zâviye were in a ruined state in need of repair. For further information, see Sapançalı H. Hüseyin, *Karaman Ahval-i İctimaiyye, Coğrafiyye ve Tarihiyyesi*, 1338 R./1341 H., ed. İbrahim Güler, (Ankara: TTK, 1993), pp. 56-57.

⁶²⁶ “Es-Sultânü’l-A’zam zıllü’l-lah fi’l-âlem mâlikü’r-rikâbi’l-ümem Seyyid-i selâtini’l-‘Arab ve’l-‘Acem kâhirü’t-tuğât ve’l-mütemerridin kâtilü’l-kefere ve’l-müşrikîn Ebü’l-Feth ‘Alâüddin bin Halil bin Mahmud bin Karaman hallede’l-lâhu memleketehû a’lâ elviyetihî ve nasara a’vânehû fi târih-i evâil-i Rebî’i’l-evvel sene isneyn ve seb’in ve seb’a mietü’l-Hicriyyeti,” Konyalı, *Karaman Tarihi*, pp. 230, 231.

⁶²⁷ Şikârî, p. 107.

⁶²⁸ “Alâ evlâdi’ş-şeyhi’l-a’zam kutbu’l-aktâb...şeyhü’l-meşâyihî’l-kibâr vâkıf-i esrâri’l-melikü’l-cebbâr safvetü’l-evliyâ...vârisü’l-enbiyâ ve’l-mürselîn mürşidü’l-cinn ve’l-ins Mevlânâ Celâlü’l-hakk ve’ş-şerî’a ve’l-mille ve’l-dîn ravveha’l-lâhu rûhahû,” Konyalı, *Karaman Tarihi*, p. 253.

⁶²⁹ For further information about Esterâbâdî and his *Bezm ü Rezm*, see the preface written by Fuad Köprülü in the printed version of that work: Aziz bin Erdeşir-i Esterâbâdî, *Bezm ü Rezm*, ed. Kilisli Rif’at Beg, (İstanbul: Evkaf Matbaası, 1928). pp. 5-21; for further information about Kadı Burhaneddin of Sivas, see İ. Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Anadolu Beglikleri ve Akkoyunlu, Karakoyunlu Devletleri*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1988), pp. 162-167.

⁶³⁰ Esterâbâdî calls Celâleddin Rûmî “Hüdâvendigâr kutbü’l-‘ârifin sultânü’l-muhakkikîn Mevlânâ Celâlü’l-hakk ve’l-dîn,” see Aziz bin Erdeşir-i Esterâbâdî, *Bezm ü Rezm*, p. 337; He calls Sadreddin Konevî “kutbü’l-muhakkikîn Şeyh Sadreddin Konevî,” see Aziz bin Erdeşir-i Esterâbâdî, *Bezm ü Rezm*, p. 384.

indicates that dervishes of the Sadreddin Konevî Lodge sent a manuscript of *Fusûs al-Hikem* (“Bezels of Wisdom”) of Ibn al-Arabî to Kadı Burhâneddin and that Kadı Burhâneddin examined this work closely.⁶³¹ It is known that Kadı Burhaneddin was an “author of an important summary of Sadreddin Konevî’s teachings.”⁶³² As understood from the foundation register of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483, there was a manuscript of the *Fusûs al-Hikem* written by the hand-writing of Sadreddin Konevî (*Fusûsü’l-Hikem be- hatt-i Şeyh Sadreddin*) in the library of Sadreddin Konevî.⁶³³ This example indicates the need to compare the texts such as *Bezm ü Rezm* and *Şikârî* with the foundation registers. In line with the general outlook of the people of the time, such texts entailed Sufi connotations. As the text of *Şikârî* denotes, these sources did not separate the realm of politics and the realm of spirituality.

The spiritual aid of Celâleddin Rûmî was also sought by the Ottoman sultans and princes. Süleyman I (r. 1520-1566) built a Friday mosque next to the tomb of Rûmî in Konya. According to Mustafa Âlî, the sultan commissioned the building of a domed mescid adjacent to Rûmî’s “illuminated tomb.”⁶³⁴ Later in 1559-60, he financed the building of another domed hall for the “whirling ritual (*semâ’hâne*)” next to the tomb tower and a “free-standing double-minaret Friday mosque of matchless elegance.”⁶³⁵ Şehzâde Selim, the son of Süleyman the Magnificent, was the governor of the Province of Karaman, the capital of which was Konya, between the years 1558 and 1562. Selim visited the tombs of Konya’s saints in order to seek spiritual help

⁶³¹ Aziz bin Erdeşir-i Esterâbâdî, *Bezm ü Rezm*, pp. 12, 384.

⁶³² William C. Chittick, “Ibn ‘Arabî and His School,” in *Islamic Spirituality, Manifestations*, ed. Seyyed Hossein Nasr, (New York: SCM Pres Ltd., 1991), p. 56.

⁶³³ M. Akif Erdoğan, “Murad Çelebi Defteri: 1483 Yılında Karaman Vilâyetinde Vakıflar I”, *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. XVIII, no. 1 (July 2003), p. 139, Fahri Coşkun, “888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Vakf Defteri: Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin,” p. 11.

⁶³⁴ Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan*, p. 63.

⁶³⁵ Necipoğlu, p. 63.

from them, particularly Rûmî, before his battle with his brother Bayezid.⁶³⁶ The future Selim II won the battle against his brother. Mustafa Âlî attributed Selim's victory to his father's military support and to "the spiritual aid of Rûmî."⁶³⁷ A chronicle attributed the victory of Selim to the miracle of Rûmî: "A dust cloud suddenly emerged on top of (the tomb tower of) His Highness Mevlana Hüdavendigâr, rose to the sky, and after whirling for a while descended upon prince Bayezid and his soldiers."⁶³⁸ These examples reflect the exalted perception of Rûmî among the Ottoman ruling class and historians of the time.

Şikârî despises the origin of the Ottomans (*Osman bî-asıldır*)⁶³⁹. According to Şikârî, Osman Beg (d. 1326) was the "police magistrate" (*shakhna*) of Alâeddin Keykubad. He does not specify which Alâeddin Keykubad he meant. Perhaps, on the basis of information given by Yarcânî, Şikârî meant Alaeddin Keykubad III (d. 702/1303), who ordered Dehhânî to compile a Seljukid *Shahnâma*. Şikârî asserts that the Ottomans owed their kingdom to the Karamanids, particularly Karamanoğlu Mehmed Beg, who permitted them to rule. Şikârî presents the Karamanids as heirs of the Seljukids.⁶⁴⁰ Şikârî's claim about the origin of the Ottoman principality is groundless due to the fact that Osman paid allegiance to the begs of Kastamonu,

⁶³⁶ Necipoğlu, p. 63.

⁶³⁷ Necipoğlu, p. 63.

⁶³⁸ Necipoğlu, p. 63.

⁶³⁹ Şikârî, p. 131.

⁶⁴⁰ "Evvel tabl ü 'alemi Osman'a Karamanoğlu virmiş idi," Şikârî, *Karamanoğulları Tarihi*, ed. M. Mesud Koman, p. 47; "Râvî eydür: Keykubad oğlu Alâeddin'in, Osman şahnesi idi. İnönü'nde sürüsü gezerdi. Koyun, at deve beslenürdü. Osman anlara müvekkel idi. Zîrâ kâfir ol tarafa yakîn idi. Gelüb almasın diyü Osman'ı müvekkel kılmışdı. Ol zaman ki, Alâeddin firâr eyleyüb Karamanoğlu Mehmed Beg kendi beglerine vilâyet tevzî eyledi. Osman gelüb hürmet idüb Sultan'ın ne kadar sürüsü varsa getirüb muhâlefet eylemedi. Mehmed Beg dahî Osman'a üç pâre şehir bağışlayub tabl ü 'alem virüb beg eyledi," Şikârî, *Karamanoğulları Tarihi*, ed. M. Mesud Koman, p. 130; "İbn-i Osman'ın ne ahdi dürüstdür, ne îmânî," Şikârî, *Karamanoğulları Tarihi*, ed. M. Mesud Koman, p. 159; "İbni Osman muhkem zebûn olub aman diledi. Süleyman Paşa eydür: 'Fırsat demidir Pâdişâhim, hemen kiralım. Zîrâ bunlar bî-asıldır. Han oğlu değıldir. İyilik nedir, mürüvvet nedir bilmezler," Şikârî, *Karamanoğulları Tarihi*, ed. M. Mesud Koman, p. 161; "Râvî eydür: Âl-i Selçuk neslinden Keyhüsrev'in kızı kızından bir kız kalmış idi. Gâyet mahbûbe idi. Hutun Banu dirler idi. Aksaray'da sarayları var idi. Alâeddin, Mehmed Beg'e alıvrüb kırk gün düğün eylediler. Lârende sahrasın ni'metle doldurdular. Kırk gün iş ü safâya meşgul oldular. Bir oğlu vücûda geldi, adına İbrahim Beg dirler." Şikârî, p. 161.

Çobanoğulları, in the first years of his reign, not to the Karamanid Beg.⁶⁴¹ However, Şikârî's text denotes how the Karamanids perceived the Ottomans. Şikârî seems to have had a longing for the former glory of the Karamanids who were the "Rustem and Afrasyab of their age," according to him.⁶⁴² In Şikârî's text, the reader comes across frequent references to the legendary heroes of Firdevsî's *Shahnâma*.⁶⁴³ It seems that these references were originally derived from Yarcânî's Karamanid *Shahnâma*.

Şikârî views the Karamanids as great builders and patrons of knowledge and arts. On the other hand, he presents the Ottomans as destroyers of the buildings. For instance, according to Şikârî, Alâeddin Beg built a "marvellous mosque" (*bî-nazîr bir câmi'*) and a tomb for himself with revenue of the booty of the *ghazâ* after he returned from the Gorigos campaign.⁶⁴⁴ Şikârî also points out that Alâeddin Beg founded four dervish lodges and twenty-one *khans*.⁶⁴⁵ The foundation registers testify that there was a mosque called *câmi'-i Alâeddin Beg* in Lârende.⁶⁴⁶ Immediately after mentioning the "marvellous mosque" built by Alâeddin Beg, Şikârî explains how the Ottoman Grand Vizier Gedik Ahmed Pasha destroyed this mosque, along with other five major mosques, four madrasas, and thirty-three small

⁶⁴¹ Halil İnalçık, "The Emergence of the Ottomans," in *The Cambridge History of Islam*, eds. P. M. Holt, A. K. Lambton, Bernard Lewis, vol. 1, (The Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 266; Halil İnalçık, "Osmanlı Tarihine Toplu Bir Bakış," in *Osmanlı*, vol. 1, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 1999), p. 40.

⁶⁴² "Evvel Karamanîler zamanın Rüstem ve Afrasyâb'ı idiler." Şikârî, p. 71.

⁶⁴³ See Şikârî, p. 88.

⁶⁴⁴ Şikârî, p. 112; In one of his lectures, İnalçık said: "In the Islamic tradition the booty from *ghazâ*, holy war, is perceived as sacred. Thus, the sultans were eager to build mosques or other buildings with the revenues coming from the *ghazâ*. It is not considered a pious act to found a mosque or other religious building from the tax revenues that are paid by the Muslim subjects."

⁶⁴⁵ Şikârî, p. 113.

⁶⁴⁶ *Vakf* defters of the Province of Karaman mention the mosque of Alâeddin Beg. In the *vakf defteri* of the Province of Karaman dated 881/1476, it is indicated as follows: "Vakf-i Câmî'-i Alâeddin der nefs-i Lârende," Konyalı, *Karaman Tarihi*, p. 255; According to the *vakf defteri* of the province of Karaman dated 888/1483, the mosque was in ruins but its *vakf* still existed. The total income of the *vakf* was only 300 *akçes*. When compared to other *vakfs* in the same province, the revenue of the mosque of Alâeddin Beg is low. The register is as follows: "Vakf-i Câmî'-i Alâeddin Beg der nefs-i Lârende. Câmî harâb olmuş. El'ân vakfî der tasarruf-i Mevlânâ Hüseyin hatîb-i 'imâret-i İbrahim Beg be hükûm-i Pâdişâh-i 'âlem-penah hullide mülkühû," M. Akif Erdoğan, "Murad Çelebi Defteri: 1483 Yılında Karaman Vilâyetinde Vakıflar II", *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. XVIII, no. 2 (December 2003), p. 118.

mosques.⁶⁴⁷ İnalçık explains the Karamanid campaign of Gedik Ahmed Pasha as follows:

In 1469-72 he [Gedik Ahmed Pasha] subdued the mountainous part of Karaman-İli and its coastal area, taking Alâ'ıye in 1471, Silifke, Mokan, Gorigos, and Lulye (Lullon) in 1472. In 1472 a dangerous attack of the Akkoyunlu forces, which, led by the Karamanid prince Pîr Ahmad, had advanced as far as Hamid-İli, was repelled by Gedik Ahmed, who subsequently reconquered Karaman-İli.”⁶⁴⁸

Şikârî writes that Gedik Ahmed Pasha came to Lârende (today's Karaman) seven years after the conquest of Constantinople (1453) and that he stayed there for six years.⁶⁴⁹ Like in other parts of his work, Şikârî does not pay attention to the chronology in that part. As İnalçık indicates, the conquest of the Karamanid lands by Gedik Ahmed Pasha took place between the years 1469 and 1472. However, it is noted in the foundation registers of the Province of Karaman in the years 881/1476 and 888/1483 that the mosque of Alâeddin Beg was in ruins in these years.⁶⁵⁰ It is not known for sure who was responsible for the ruined state of the mosque at that time.

Şikârî seems to be proud of the 'imâret complex of Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg (r. 1423-1464), who was a “great builder” and “qutb (the pole of the age),” according to Şikârî.⁶⁵¹ It was not only Şikârî who praised İbrahim Beg in the Karamanid texts. According to the *Menâkıb-i Şeyh Alâeddin Semerkandî*, which was written by one of Semerkandî's disciples, Muhammed Nur Bahş (d. 869/1464-65), Shaykh Alâeddin Ali Semerkandî left Semerkand for Karaman via a dream in which the Prophet ordered him to set out for Karaman.⁶⁵² According to Konyalı, Shaykh

⁶⁴⁷ Şikârî, p. 112.

⁶⁴⁸ Halil İnalçık, “Ahmad Paşa Gedik,” *Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition, vol. 1, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986), pp. 292-293.

⁶⁴⁹ Şikârî, p. 112.

⁶⁵⁰ See F. Nafiz Uzluç, Fatih Devrinde Karaman Eyaleti Vakfları Fihristi, p. 25; Akif Erdoğan, “Murad Çelebi Defteri: 1483 Yılında Karaman Vilâyetinde Vakflar II,” p. 118.

⁶⁵¹ “Râvî eydür: İbrahim Han'ın tekkesi, Câmî' ve hânekahı, 'imâret ve köprüsü ve hanları cümle altmış dört tanedir. Hayrâtı bî-nihâyedir. Hem kendüsi ehl-i tevhiddir. Tabakât-i evliyâda kutb makâmına vâsıl olmuş idi,” Şikârî, p. 191.

Alâeddin or Ali Semerkandî arrived at Lârende in 836/1432-1433.⁶⁵³ At that time, İbrahim Beg was the ruler of the Karaman dynasty. In the *Menâkıb-i Seyyid Ali Semerkandî*, Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg was told to be a disciple of Seyyid Ali Semerkandî. According to the story, when İbrahim Beg became a disciple of Ali Semerkandî, the shaykh began to call him as “the Sultan of all Muslims” (*Sultân-i selâtîn-i ehl-i dîn*).⁶⁵⁴

According to Tekindağ, the reign of Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg can be viewed as the peak of the Karamanid power and glory.⁶⁵⁵ He patronized scholars and men of arts. The greatest monument he patronized was the ‘imâret complex in Lârende. He also founded various public buildings, mosques, madrasas, bridges and irrigation canals⁶⁵⁶. The ‘imâret complex of Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg offers an example of the infrastructure upon which a lively socio-cultural milieu was built. This complex consisted of a mosque, madrasa, kitchen and *dârü’l-huffâz*, school for those who knew Kur’an by heart.⁶⁵⁷ Among the witnesses (*şâhids*) of the vakfiye of

⁶⁵² "Resûl aleyhisselam, begne'l-yakaza ve'l-menâm Hazret-i Şeyhe gelüb eyitti: '...Benim icâzetimle ümmetimi irşâd idüb dilşâd eyle. Ehl-i Karaman bir bölük ve âl-i hayyirân...kâbil-i islah, karîb mine's-salah mü'minlerdir. Hak Te'âlâ seni ol iklîme rahmet ve ol kavme hidâyet virmişdir. Sana tâbî olanlar, benim has ümmetim ve ehl-i sünnetim olur," Muhammed Nurbahş, *Menakıb-i Şeyh Alaeddin - i Semerkandî*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yazmaları, no. TTK-Y-419. For further information about Shaykh Alaeddin Ali Semerkandî and his works, see Osman Yılmaz, "Bursa'da Semerkandiyye Kültürü ve Menâkıb-ı Ali Semerkandî", *unpublished M. A. thesis*, (Bursa: Uludağ Üniversitesi, 1998); İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Âbideleri ve Kitâbeleri ile Karaman Tarihi, Ermenek ve Mut Âbideleri*, (İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1967), pp. 201-219; Mustafa Kara, *Türk Tasavvuf Tarihi Araştırmaları, Tarikatlar, Tekkeler, Şeyhler*, (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005), pp. 413, 414; İsmail Hakkı Mercan, "Şeyh Alâeddin Ali es-Semerkandî ve Menâkıb-nâmesi, Menâkıbnâme'ye Göre Osmanlı-Karamanlı Mücadelesi", *XIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara, 4-8 Ekim 1999, Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2002), pp. 47-76.

⁶⁵³ Konyalı, *Karaman Tarihi*, p. 212.

⁶⁵⁴ "Hemân dem Sultan İbrahim 'Azîz'in [Seyyid Ali Semerkandî'nin] ayağına düşüb beg'at eyledi ve telkîn-i zikr aldı...Hazreti Pîr [Seyyid Ali Semerkandî] tebessüm itdi: 'İy Pâdişah! Şimdi Sultân-i selâtîn-i ehl-i dîn oldunuz. İznimizle tahtınıza gidesiz. Bizim evrâd-i şerîfemizi her bâr okuyasız. İnşâ'allâhu Te'âlâ dünyâda mansûr ve muzaffer olasız ve âhiretde münevver ü mesrûr olasız.' Sultan İbrahim, Hazret-i Pîr'in du'âsın ve nefesin ve himmetin ve evrâdın alub sürûr ü hubûr ile tahtına gitdi." Seyyid Nizam Bedahşî, *Menâkıb-i Seyyid Ali Semerkandî*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Hacı Mahmud Efendi 4603, folio 51a.

⁶⁵⁵ Şehabettin Tekindağ, "Karamanlılar," p. 325.

⁶⁵⁶ Faruk Sümer, "Karaman-Oghulları (Karamanids)," p. 624.

⁶⁵⁷ İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, "Karamanoğlu Devri Vesikalarından İbrahim Beg'in Karaman İmâreti Vakfiyesi," *Bellekten*, vol. 1 (1937), p. 58.

this *'imâret* complex there was a Mevlevî shaykh: Mehmed Çelebi bin Ârif Çelebi el-Mevlevî⁶⁵⁸, who was the shaykh of Konya Mevlevîhânesi.⁶⁵⁹ The *vakfiye* again pays witness to Şikârî's implicit claim that the Mevlevî Order was the most important and the most popular dervish order under the Karamanids. Like other *'imârets*, *'imâret* of Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg consisted of some institutions which provided revenue for the upkeep of this *'imâret* such as Çardaklı Hamam, Hacı Veli Hanı, Bekirece Değirmeni, and Hacı Alâüddin Oğlu Bağı.⁶⁶⁰

The question of how the Karamanid scholars and Sufis viewed the conflict between Timur and the Ottoman Sultan Bayezid I (r. 1389-1402) is of interest to understand how the political and religious realms converged during these centuries. In 1398, Bayezid I annexed the territories of the Karamanids and the principality of Kadı Burhaneddin, establishing a “centralized empire stretching from the Danube to the Euphrates.”⁶⁶¹ Naturally, the Karamanids perceived Timur as their savior from the Ottoman rule. Interestingly, the Karamanid dervishes also joined the campaign against the Ottomanids. For instance, in the *Menâkıb-i Seyyid Ali Semerkandî*, Seyyid Ali Semerkandî (d. 860/1455-56) is said to ask one of his disciples, Evhadüddin-i Horasanî, to help Timur against Bayezid I.⁶⁶²

⁶⁵⁸ According to Uzunçarşılı, this Ârif Çelebi was the second one. He should not be confused with Ulu Ârif Çelebi, who was the grandson of Celâleddin Rûmî. See İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, “Karamanoğlu Devri Vesikalarından İbrahim Beg'in Karaman İmâreti Vakfiyesi,” p. 105n.

⁶⁵⁹ Uzunçarşılı, “Karamanoğlu Devri Vesikalarından İbrahim Beg'in Karaman İmâreti Vakfiyesi”, p. 105.

⁶⁶⁰ Uzunçarşılı, pp. 93-97.

⁶⁶¹ İnalçık, *The Classical Age*, p. 16.

⁶⁶² “Hazret-i Kutb [Seyyid Ali Semerkandî] beni...nusret-i cüyüş hıdmetine kodı...Hattâ Timur Sultan Yıldırım'ı ahz eyledi ki Timur Hân'ın nusretine me'mûl olmuşdum.” Seyyid Nizam Bedahşî, *Menâkıb-i Seyyid Ali Semerkandî*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Hacı Mahmud Efendi 4603, folio 97a. The date of this manuscript is 1082 /1671-72; see folio 114b, but this date was the date of copying (*istinsâh*). For the manuscript versions of the hagiography of Ali Semerkandî, see İsmail Hakkı Mercan, “Şeyh Ali Semerkandî ve Menâkıbnâmesi,” pp. 67-69. The date of the original manuscript is not known. However, as we learn from the *Menâkıbnâme*, it was written after the death of Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg (d. 1464), folio 43b. According to Konyalı, Muhammed Nurbahş, the author of another version of the hagiography of Ali Semerkandî, went to Semerkand and met Bedahşî in Semerkand; see Konyalı, *Karaman Tarihi*, p. 205. Ali Şir Nevayî mentions a certain poet named Mevlânâ Bedahşî in Semerkand without giving the exact name of him. According to Nevayî, Mevlânâ

Şikârî narrates the story of the coming of Timur to Anatolia and his victory over Bayezid I (r. 1389-1402) without mentioning any date. While reading that story the reader feels as if he or she reads a hagiographical work. According to the story narrated by Şikârî, during the Timur's occupation of Sivas, "an itinerant dervish (*budalâ*) named Mir Hasan was saying: "The fire of Horasan set fire to Rûm (*Horasan ateşi Rûm'u yakdı*)."⁶⁶³ Karamanoğlu Mehmed Beg (d. 1423) went to Ârif Çelebi (d. 1421), "who was a descendant of Celâeddin Rûmî", to ask what that "mad man (*divâne*)" meant by those words.⁶⁶⁴ Çelebi told him that Timur was the "fire of God's wrath (*Timur Allah Te'âlâ'nın gazab ateşidir*)."⁶⁶⁵ Çelebi also advised him not to intervene in God's plan because no one can gain victory against Timur.⁶⁶⁶ According to Şikârî, Timur came to Konya and stayed there for three days but he fled from Konya to Horasan. The reason why Timur fled from Konya was due to a dream that Timur had had, according to Şikârî. In that dream, forty men from the tomb of Celâeddin Rûmî appeared and destroyed all signs of Timur's kingship including his

Bedahşî was one of the poets admired by Uluğ Beg Mirza (d.1449). For more information, see Ali Şîr Nevâyî, *Mecâlisü'n-Nefâyis*, ed. Kemal Eraslan, (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 2001), p. 334. It seems that the original version of the *Menâkıbnâme* was written in Persian and that Bedahşî translated it to Turkish. Following the tradition of the *menâkıbnâme* writing, Bedahşî exaggerates the deeds of his shaykh. He also adds an important point. He chose among the *menkıbes*, the glorious deeds, of the shaykh only those ones which conformed to the *shari'a* : "Lisân-i Fârisîde *Câmî'u'l-Menâkıb* adlı bir kitab gördüm. Anda onbinden ziyâde hârîka ve bârika ve târika tahrîr olunmuşdı ve *Câmî'u'l-Bevârik* adlı bir kitab dahî gördüm. Şeyh Şihâbeddin Hindî cem' eylemişdi. Yüz menkıbe idi. Cümlesi Şeyh Sultan [Seyyid Ali Semerkandî] hazretlerinin ahvâl-i hafiyyesi ve etvâr-i celiyyesi ve hâlât-i merziyyesi idi. Şöyle ki akl-i ma'âşda olan kişiler işitseler idi gümâna düşerlerdi. Pes bu 'abd-i müstehâm el-fakîr el-hakîr es-Seyyid Nizam ol kitabları mütâla'a idüb kavânin-i şer'iyyeye muvâfık olan menâkıbdan yigirmi dört menkıbe tercüme eylkedim." See Seyyid Nizam Bedahşî, *Menâkıb-i Seyyid Ali Semerkandî*, folios 3a, 3b.

⁶⁶³ Şikârî, *Karamanoğulları Tarihi*, p. 182. İnalçık explains what Rûm means as follows: "Rûmî [is] a designation for the Turks from al-Rûm, which was once under the Eastern Roman Empire. The name *Rûmî* was widespread in all eastern Islamic countries, including the Arab lands, Persia, Central Asia and Indonesia, from the 9th/15th century onwards. The Ottomans restricted the name Rûm to the provinces in the Amasya and Sivas areas.", İnalçık, "Rûmî", *Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition, p. 612.

⁶⁶⁴ Şikârî does not specify the name of Çelebi, see Şikârî, *Karamanoğulları Tarihi*, p. 182. According to Gölpınarlı, the second Ârif Çelebi acted as the shaykh of the central lodge of the Mevlvî Order in Konya between the years 1395 and 1421. See Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı, *Mevlânâ'dan Sonra Mevlevîlik*, p. 152.

⁶⁶⁵ Şikârî, p. 183.

⁶⁶⁶ Şikârî, p. 183.

crown, seal and sword. Thus, Timur fled Konya in fear never to return again.⁶⁶⁷ This story appears to be far from truth, but such stories reflect popular beliefs in medieval Anatolia.

Timur's story as narrated by Şikârî is reminiscent of a story in the *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn* of Aflâkî. As mentioned before, Celâleddin Rûmî is presented as the patron saint of the Karamanids in Şikârî's text. Eflakî completed the *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn*, which is the most important source for the Mevlevî Order, in the year 754/1353.⁶⁶⁸ Alâeddin Beg, who ordered the poet Yarcânî to compose a Karamanid *Shahnâma*, ascended the Karamanid throne after the year 757/1356 and the date of the death of Alâeddin Beg was 800/1397-98.⁶⁶⁹ Thus, it can be safely argued that *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn* was completed before the Karamanid *Shahnâma* of Yarcânî. Perhaps the *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn* was one of the sources of Yarcânî's Karamanid *Shahnâma* and of Şikârî's history of the Karamanids.

According to Aflâkî, when the army of Baycu, "the Mongol general who defeated the Seljukids at the Battle of Köse Dağ (1243),"⁶⁷⁰ besieged Konya, all inhabitants of Konya came to Celâleddin Rûmî for help against the Mongols. Rûmî ascended to the top of a hill and there busied himself with prayer. While narrating that story, Aflâkî points out the fact that at that time, the Mongols were not Muslim and that they had destroyed *madrasas*, and mosques in many Muslim cities. All efforts of the Mongol soldiers to kill Rûmî, according to Aflâkî, were in vain:

When Baycu was told of this story, he rose in person and came out of his tent. He asked for a bow and arrow, and shot a flying arrow at Mevlânâ [Rûmî]. The arrow turned around and fell within the Mongol army. Mounting up, he drove his horse forward three times but saw that it would not move. In extreme rage and anger he dismounted and set out on foot. Due to the almighty divine power of 'Be!' and it is (6/73), both his feet became bound and he was unable to move. Then he said: 'That man in truth belongs to the Yaratghân. His anger must

⁶⁶⁷ Şikârî, p. 184.

⁶⁶⁸ Ahmed Aflâkî, *Âriflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlânâ ve Etrafindakiler)*, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, vol. 1, (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1986), p. 11.

⁶⁶⁹ Tekindağ, "Karamanlılar," pp. 321-323.

⁶⁷⁰ Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, tr. John O'Kane, p. 720.

be avoided. In whatever city or province there is a man like this, those people will not be conquered by us.⁶⁷¹

Immediately after narrating that story, Aflâkî quotes the following words of Celâleddin Rûmî about Baycu: “Baycu is a Friend of God but he does not know it.”⁶⁷² Impressed by the miracles of Rûmî, according to Aflâkî, the Mongol army left Konya.⁶⁷³ Like Timur in Şikârî’s text, Bajū left Konya due to the miracles of Rûmî, as narrated by Aflâkî. Aflâkî also narrates an interesting story related to the Karamanids and the Mongols. This story, too, is also similar to the story narrated by Şikârî related to Timur. As mentioned before, according to that story, one of Rûmî’s descendants, Çelebi, told Karamanoğlu Mehmed Beg (d. 1423) that Timur is the fire of wrath of God. Aflâkî narrates a story related to Ârif Çelebi, the grandson of Rûmî, who perceived the Mongols as “the will of God”:

Likewise, in the time of the Karamanids, the city of Konya was in Karamanid hands. Because Çelebi favored the army of the Mongols, this party was annoyed and would frequently raise objections, saying: ‘You do not want us who are your neighbors and supporters (*muhibbân*) but you definitely favor the foreign Mongols.’ Çelebi replied: ‘We are dervishes. Our glance is turned toward the will of God. Whomever God wishes and whomever He entrusts with His sovereignty, we are on that person’s side and we want him....He has taken sovereignty away from the Seljukids and given to the family of Chengiz Khan, in accordance with: *God gives His kingship to whom He wills* (2/248). We want the same as God wants.’⁶⁷⁴

While examining works such as Şikârî’s history, the necessity to examine other texts is indispensable since such texts were written taking into account the intended audience. As pointed earlier, the original version of Şikârî’s text was Yarcânî’s *Shahnâma* of the Karamanids, which had been written for the Karamanid Alâeddin Ali Beg (r.757/1356—800/1397-98). Thus, Şikârî’s history of the Karamanids is replete with of examples of value judgements against the Ottomans.

⁶⁷¹ *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, pp. 179-180. For the original Persian version of that story, see Aflâkî, *Manâkib al-’Ârifîn (metin)*, vol. 1, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, pp. 258, 259.

⁶⁷² *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 180; *Manâkib al-’Ârifîn*, p. 259.

⁶⁷³ *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 180; *Manâkib al-’Ârifîn*, p. 259.

⁶⁷⁴ *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, pp. 647-648. For the Persian original of that story, see Aflâkî, *Manâkib al-’Ârifîn (metin)*, vol. 2, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, pp. 925-926.

Other texts written by rival dynasties harshly criticized the Karamanids. For instance, in the *Bezm ü Rezm*, which was written for Kadı Burhaneddin who fought against the Karamanid Alâeddin Beg and gained victory over him, Esterâbâdî emphasizes the “wickedness of the Karamanids” (*habâset-i peser-i Karaman*).⁶⁷⁵ Esterâbâdî refers to the *Selçuknâme* to explain the origin of the Karamanids. According to Esterâbâdî, it is stated in the *Selçuknâme* that the forefathers of the Karamanids were coal miners in Lârende.⁶⁷⁶ Although Esterâbâdî does not state the author of the *Selçuknâme*, according to Köprülü, Ibn Bîbî was the likely author.⁶⁷⁷ In Ibn Bîbî’s history of the Seljukids entitled *El-Evâmirü’l-’Alâiyye fi’l-Umûri’l-’Alâiyye*, the reader encounters a similar explanation about the origin of the Karamanids.⁶⁷⁸ According to İbn Bîbî, the forefathers of the Karamanids were the Turcoman coal miners in the Ermenek region who transported the coal to Lârende for sale.⁶⁷⁹

As noted earlier, Şikarî claimed that the Ottomans owed their kingdom to the support of the Karamanids. However, in Enverî’s *Düsturnâme*, the reader comes across the opposite view. The *Düsturnâme* was dedicated to the Ottoman Grand Vizier Mahmud Pasha (d. 1474).⁶⁸⁰ According to Enverî, it was Karaman Beg who

⁶⁷⁵ Esterâbâdî, *Bezm ü Rezm*, p. 98.

⁶⁷⁶ “Çûn der Selçuknâme mestûrest ke peser-i Karaman ez evlâd-i fehâmân-i Lârende est,” Esterâbâdî, *Bezm ü Rezm*, p. 97.

⁶⁷⁷ Esterâbâdî, p. 13.

⁶⁷⁸ For an analysis of Ibn Bîbî’s history of the Anatolian Seljukids, see Sara Nur Yıldız, “Mongol Rule in Thirteenth-Century Seljuk Anatolia: The Politics of Conquest and History Writing, 1243-1282,” *unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation*, (Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, The University of Chicago, 2006), pp. 415-497.

⁶⁷⁹ “Evlâd-i Karaman ke peder-i îşân der ibtidâ-i hâlet ez fehâmân-i Türkmenân-i nevâhî-i Ermenek be-vilâyet-i Kamerüddin ma’rûfest bûd ve hemvâre ez ân kûhhâ be-Lârende fahm keşîdî...” İbn Bîbî (El-Hüseyn b. Muhammed b. Ali el-Ca’ferî er-Rugedî), *El-Evâmirü’l-’Alâiyye fi’l-Umûri’l-’Alâiyye* (Tıpkıbasım), ed. Adnan Sadık Erzi, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1956), p. 687. See also İbn Bîbî, *Selçuknâme*, tr. Mükrimin Halil Yinanç, ed. Refet Yinanç, Ömer Özkan, (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2007), p. 242. According to Tekindağ, İbn Bîbî is wrong in tracing the origins of the Karamanids to Kamerüddin. Both Tekindağ and Sümer accept Yazıcızâde Ali’s claim that the Karamanids belonged to the Avshar tribe. For further information about the origin of the Karamanids, see Şehabettin Tekindağ, “Karamanlılar,” pp. 316-319 and F. Sümer, “Karaman-oghulları (Karamanids),” p. 619. As I learn from İnalçık, the coal mining was a prestigious business in medieval Anatolia.

⁶⁸⁰ Halil İnalçık, “Mehmed the Conqueror (1432-1481) and His Time,” in *Essays in Ottoman History*, (İstanbul: Eren, 1998), p. 89.

was indebted to Osman Beg, “who saved Karaman from the Tatars.”⁶⁸¹ Another example of how the Ottomans viewed the Karamanids would be the *Gazavât-i Sultan Murad b. Mehemmed Han* in which the Karamanids were accused of allying with the “infidels” against the Ottomans.⁶⁸² Such perception towards the Karamanids can be observed in the other Ottoman chronicles.

5.2.2 The Prince Cem and the Karamanid Poet Aynî

The Şehzâde (Prince) Cem, the governor of the Province of Karaman, was one of the rulers praised by Şikârî. According to Şikârî, people of Karaman liked the governorship of Cem because he restored the former glory of the Karamanids after the catastrophe of the Ottoman occupation by acting with justice and by building new palaces and *bedestans* (covered market for the sale of goods).⁶⁸³

Cem succeeded his deceased brother Mustafa as governor of the Province of Karaman, the center of which was Konya, in the middle of Sha‘ban 879/20-30 December 1474. Karamânî Mehmed Pasha, the Ottoman grand vizier from 881/1476 to 886/1481, supported Cem against Şehzâde Bayezid in their struggle for the Ottoman throne. However, nearly all the opponents of Karamânî Mehmed Pasha

⁶⁸¹ “Nûre Sofî ođlı Mîr Karaman
Eyledi Osman’a hizmet bir zaman

Almıř idi ilini anun Tatar
Vardı Osman cümle kıldı târ ü mâr

Sürdi Tatar’ı Karaman’ı kodı

Nûsha içre râvîler böyle didi.” Nazif Öztürk, ed., *Fatih Devri Kaynaklarından Düstûrnâme-i Enverî, Osmanlı Tarihi Kısmı (1299-1466)*, (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2003), pp. 22,23.

⁶⁸² “Ez-în-cânib Pâdişâh-i ‘âlem-penâh hazretleri bu elçilere [Karamanođlu elçileri] aslâ iltifat etmeyüb ve yüzlerine bakmayub buyurur kim, ‘Karamanođlu dedikleri pelîdin dîni îmânı yokdur ve kâfir-i bî-dîn ile arka edüb taht arzusuna düřmüş’.” Halil İnalçık and Mevlüd Ođuz (eds.), *Gazavât-i Sultan Murad b. Mehemmed Hân, İzladi ve Varna Savařları (1443-1444) Üzerinde Anonim Gazavâtnâme*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1989), p. 6.

⁶⁸³ Şikârî, p. 198.

supported Bayezid because Karamânî Mehmed Pasha's financial policy had been "ruinous for the holders of *vakfs*, and *mülks*."⁶⁸⁴

When Mehmed II died on 4 *Rebî'ü'l-evvel* 886/3 May 1481, Karamânî Mehmed Pasha was executed by his enemies with the support of the Janissaries. Bayezid came to Istanbul with the support of Janissaries and all measures were taken to prevent Cem from entering Istanbul. However, Cem came as far as Bursa where "he had the khutba read and coins struck in his name."⁶⁸⁵ In his struggle against Bayezid, Cem cooperated with the Karamanids, particularly Kâsım Beg, "who never gave up the idea of restoring his principality of Karaman."⁶⁸⁶ However, at Yenişehir, Cem was defeated by the regular Ottoman troops under Bayezid on 22 *Rebî'ü'l-âhir* 886/20 June 1481. After this defeat, Cem fled to Konya and took refuge in Tarsus, a town under the rule of the Mamluks. Cem was received by the Mamluk Sultan Kayıtbay as a prince in the Mamluk capital. In 1482, Cem returned to Anatolia with Mamluk assistance, but he again failed. Cem then fled to Rhodes in the same year. The threat of Cem concerned Ottoman Sultan Bayezid II (r. 1481-1512) until Cem's death on 25 February 1495.⁶⁸⁷

As İncalcık points out, since Cem was "a valuable hostage bringing political prestige as well as money the rulers of the time were most anxious to have him."⁶⁸⁸ For instance, in September 1482, Bayezid's ambassador to P. d'Aubusson, Grand Master of the Knights of St. John in Rhodes, made an agreement with the Grand Master about Cem "who was to be detained by the Knights so as not to cause any concern to Bayezid."⁶⁸⁹ The Ottoman ambassador promised to pay 45 thousand

⁶⁸⁴ Halil İncalcık, "*Djem*", *EI, the second edition*, vol. 2, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983), p. 529.

⁶⁸⁵ İncalcık, "*Djem*," p. 529.

⁶⁸⁶ İncalcık, p. 529.

⁶⁸⁷ İncalcık, p. 530.

⁶⁸⁸ İncalcık, p. 530.

⁶⁸⁹ İncalcık, p. 529.

Venetian gold ducats annually to meet Cem's expenses. On 9 June 1493, another ambassador of Bayezid came to Rome to deliver 150 thousand ducats as Cem's pension.⁶⁹⁰ Rather than going into details of Cem's life story here, a brief account of Cem's boon companion, Aynî, is provided.

One of the Karamanid poets who reacted against the Ottoman occupation of the Karamanoğlu principality in his poems was Aynî.⁶⁹¹ Aynî was the *nedîm*, boon companion, of Şehzâde Cem during Cem's governorship in the Province of Karaman between the years 1474-1481.⁶⁹² It seems that after the Prince Cem's defeat in 1481, Aynî sought another patron which came to be the Karamanid Kasım Beg, who had been an ally of Şehzâde Cem against Şehzâde Bayezid.⁶⁹³ Upon Kasım Beg's death without leaving any male heir behind in 1483 Aynî wrote the following verse, indicating that Kasım Beg's death signified the end of Karamanid dynasty:

*Çünkü Sultan Kâsımın nâzik teni oldu türâb
Vaktidür şimden girü mülk-i Karaman oldu harâb*⁶⁹⁴

⁶⁹⁰ İncalcık, pp. 529-530.

⁶⁹¹ For the *dîvân* of Aynî, see Ahmet Mermer, *Karamanlı Aynî ve Dîvânı*, (Ankara: Akçağ, 1997).

⁶⁹² According to the *Vâkı'ât-i Sultan Cem*, Şehzâde Cem became the governor of the Province of Karaman in the year 879 [1474] upon the death of the Şehzâde Mustafa and Cem's governorship lasted more than three years. According to the author of the *Vâkı'ât*, Şehzâde Cem translated *Cemşid ü Hurşid* into Turkish for his father, Mehmed the Conqueror: "Karındaşı merhûm Sultan Mustafa, Uzun Hasan seferinden geldükten sonra müteveffâ olıcak yerine Karaman'a gönderildi. Sene tis'a ve seb'in ve semâ'nemi'e Şa'banımın evâsıtında andan sonra altı yıldan ziyâdece Karaman'da durub binmek inmek şikâr etmek ok atmak gürz salmak ta'lim eyledi. Hattâ Sultan 'Alâüddinün gürzlerine Konya'da ve Lârende'de nice vakıyye halkalar zamm eyledi ve Hâce Selman'un kitabını Cemşid ü Hurşidini Sultan Muhammed adına tercüme etdi," see Nicolas Vatin, *Sultan Djem, Un Şehzâde Ottoman dans l'Europe du XVe siècle d'après deux sources contemporaines: Vâkı'ât-ı Sultan Cem, Œuvres de Guillaume Caoursin*, (Ankara: La Société Turque d'Historie, 1997), p. 119, 121. For Aynî and Şehzâde Cem, see Edip Âli Bakı, *XV. Yüzyıl Konya-Karaman Şairlerinden Aynî*, (Ankara: Ulus Basımevi, 1949), pp. 21-23; for more information about the *nedîm* or *musâhib* poets in the classical Turco-Persian literature, see Halil İncalcık, "Klasik Edebiyat Menşei: İrani Gelenek, Saray İşret Meclisleri ve Musâhib Şâirler," in *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, ed. Talat Sait Halman et al., (İstanbul: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2006), pp. 221-282.

⁶⁹³ Şehabettin Tekindağ, "Son Osmanlı-Karaman Münasebetleri Hakkında Araştırmalar", *Tarih Dergisi*, vol. XIII, no. 17-18, 43-76: 72. According to the *Vâkı'ât-i Sultan Cem*, the Prince Cem and Kasım Beg cooperated with each other in order to defeat the Ottoman sultan Bayezid.⁶⁹³ However, these efforts were in vain. See Nicolas Vatin, *Sultan Djem*, p. 135. For further information about Şehzâde Cem, see also Hoca Sadeddin Efendi, *Tâcü't-tevârih*, vol. 3, ed. İsmet Parmaksızoğlu, pp. 202-235.

⁶⁹⁴ Ahmet Mermer, *Karamanlı Aynî ve Dîvânı*, p. 189.

As stated earlier, Aynî's patron, the Şehzâde Cem, lost his campaign against his brother, Bayezid, for the Ottoman sultanate and Prince Bayezid became the Ottoman Sultan Bayezid II (r. 1481-1512). It seems that Aynî kept his hope that one day Cem would become the Ottoman sultan.⁶⁹⁵ However, this hope began to gradually dissipate, especially once Aynî lost his second patron, Kasım Beg. His difficult situation led him to use rude words against the Ottomans.⁶⁹⁶

Striking analogies can be drawn between Aynî and Baba Yusuf of Aksaray not only in terms of their attitude towards the Ottoman rule but also in terms of their Sufî affiliations. According to Ahmet Mermer, Aynî's shaykh was a disciple of Hacı Bayram (d. 1430).⁶⁹⁷ Baba Yusuf of Aksaray was a disciple of Hacı Bayram, who was the *khalîfa* of Hamîdüddin-i Aksarayî known as Somuncu Baba.⁶⁹⁸ Both Aynî and Baba Yusuf experienced the Ottoman occupation of the Karamanid lands. However, although Baba Yusuf initially reacted to the Ottoman rule in Aksaray in his works, he and his sons maintained their positions as *vakf* holders under the Ottoman rule. Interestingly, absent is the name of Aynî in the *vakf* registers of the Province of Karaman. The case of Baba Yusuf will be the topic of the next chapter.

⁶⁹⁵ “Şeh Cem Frengistanda ger mahzûn olup ğamġin ise
Rûmun ilinde şâh olup bir gün ola şâdân ola.

Aynî ânı görmeyeli giryân olubdur zâhirâ
Bâtın yüzi mekşûf olub az kaldı ki handân ola.” Mermer, *Karamanlı Aynî ve Divânı*, p. 325.

⁶⁹⁶ “Çûn esâsı ‘ışk elünden kondı iy Sultan Cem
Bir dahî bas ayaġını gel bu bünyâd üstine

Cân hayâlün geldüğünce âh ider sînem dahî
Ol Süleymandur ider bünyâdını bâd üstine

İy Karaman şâhı öldi har-sıfat olan rakîb
İtleri Osman ilinün itdi feryâd üstine,” Mermer, p. 633.

⁶⁹⁷ “Hacı Bayram’un cihanda nakdisin meh-rûsısın
Ben mürîd oldum sana iy şeyh-i müştâkum benüm”,
See Ahmet Mermer, *Karamanlı Aynî ve Divânı*, pp. 15,16. Although Mermer states that the name of Aynî's shaykh could be Müştâk, the evidence he presents is not satisfactory and needs to be further analyzed.

⁶⁹⁸ Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, *Melâmîlik ve Melâmîler*, (İstanbul: Gri Yayın, 1992), p. 3.

CHAPTER VI

A KARAMANID SHAYKH AS A CRITIQUE OF HIS TIME: BABA YUSUF OF AKSARAY

Most of the Karamanid shaykhs did not leave a written source for later generations. Instead, they concentrated on oral teaching by narrating the stories from the former shaykhs in the gatherings in the dervish lodges. In some cases, as it was in the case of the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun*, one of the followers of a particular shaykh compiled a work on the basis of such oral teachings. However, in the case of Baba Yusuf, the historian is fortunate to have a number of sources written by a Karamanid shaykh himself. Before analyzing the content of Baba Yusuf's works, it is worth explaining briefly the rise of Aksaray as a cultural center under the Seljukids. The Karamanids also contributed to the rise of Aksaray as one of the cultural centers of the Islamic world. There was a constant movement of shaykhs and scholars from Central Asia, Iran, and the Arab lands to and from Aksaray. Baba Yusuf's writings can also be considered as a representation of the lively cultural milieu of Aksaray under the Seljukids and the Karamanids.

6.1 Seljukids and the City of Aksaray

Aksaray derived its name from the white palace built by the Seljuk Sultan Kılıçarslan II (1156-1192).⁶⁹⁹ The Sultan Kılıçarslan II commissioned the building of mosques, caravanserais, and *bedestans*, a covered market for the sale of commodities, in order to make this town a center of trade and culture. He also invited scholars, artists and tradesmen from Azerbaijan.⁷⁰⁰ Aksaray was also called *Dârü 'z-zafar*, “the City of Victory,” due to the fact that it served as headquarters of the Seljukid army during the Crusades. After the collapse of the Seljukids, Aksaray became a part of the Karamanid or Karamanoğlu principality. Although Kadı Burhaneddin of Sivas (d. 1398) took control of Aksaray for a short period of time the Karamanids succeeded in retrieving it from Kadı Burhaneddin’s reign. Aksaray remained a part of the Karamanids until the Ottoman occupation of the Karamanid lands in 1468. Kılıçarslan’s building activity in Aksaray culminated in the rise of Aksaray as a center of culture during the Seljukid and the Karamanid periods.

The first Ottoman *madrasa*, Muslim theological school, was established at İznik in 1331. The first Ottoman *müderris*, the chief teacher and administrator, of this *madrasa* was Davud of Kayseri. Baba Yusuf’s grandfather Musa-yi Kayserî also originated from Kayseri. İnalçık explains how the Ottoman *madrasas* developed in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and how was the role of Kayseri and Aksaray in the establishment of *madrasa* system in the Ottoman Empire:

When an Ottoman sultan wished to establish a new *madrasa*, he would invite scholars from the old Anatolian cultural centers, such as Konya, Kayseri or Aksaray, or from elsewhere in the Islamic world, from Persia, Turkestan, Egypt or Syria. In the reign of Murad II, Alâ al-Dîn of Tus (d. 1482) and Fakhr al-Dîn, who had been brought from Persia, enhanced the reputation of the rapidly developing Ottoman *madrasa*. During the formative period of Ottoman culture in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Ottoman ulema traveled to Egypt, Persia or Turkestan to complete their education under the great scholars of those lands.⁷⁰¹

⁶⁹⁹ M. Zeki Oral, “Aksaray’ın Tarihî Önemi ve Vakıfları,” *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. 5 (1962), p. 223.

⁷⁰⁰ Osman Turan, “Anatolia in the Period of the Seljuks and the Beyliks,” p. 252.

⁷⁰¹ İnalçık, *The Classical Age*, p. 166.

Baba Yusuf's family originated from Turkestan. Baba Yusuf and his father, Shaykh Hamîdüddin, had strong ties with the early Safavid shaykhs of Ardabil. In line with the statements made by İnalçık, it can be argued that Baba Yusuf was a heir to a rich heritage of Islamic civilization which bore the colours of different geographies from Tabriz to Aksaray. Baba Yusuf's writings bear witness to that argument.

One of the towering figures among the Aksaray *ulemâ*, religious scholars, during the Karamanid period was Cemâleddin-i Aksarayî (d. 791 H./1388-89). Aksarayî was the great grandson of Fakhr al-Dîn Râzî (1149-1209) whose school entered Anatolia through Sirâj al-Dîn of Urmiye during the Seljukid period. Aksaray also hosted one of the descendants of Ghazâlî (d. 1111) in the sixteenth century.⁷⁰² It is worth pointing out here the importance of Cemâleddin Aksarayî not only for the Karamanids but also for the Ottomans. Cemâleddin Aksarayî was known as “a Turkish philosopher, who was born and died at Aksaray”.⁷⁰³ Aksarayî was the follower of Fahreddin Râzî, who had established a “more philosophical concept of Islam” through “the fusion of mysticism with the intellectual sciences.”⁷⁰⁴ Cemâleddin Aksarayî served as the *müderris* of Zincirli Madrasa at Aksaray.

Allegedly, the first Ottoman *Şeyhülislam*, “the head of the hierarchy of *ulemâ*,” Şemseddin b. Muhammed b. Hamza (d. 834/1431), known as Molla Fenarî, was one of Aksarayî's students. Molla Fenari presented his *tefsîr*, the Qur'anic exegesis, on *sûre-i Fâtiha* (the opening chapter of the Qur'an), to Karamanoğlu

⁷⁰² “Ammera hâzihi'l-'imârete li-ta'lîmi'l-Kur'ân li-vechi'llâhi Te'âlâ Hamza Beg bin Sinan Beg târîhuhû sene hamse ve selâsîn ve tis'a mie [935/1528-1529] neslühû İmam Ğazâlî, Aksaray'ın Bîmârhâne mahallesindeki mektep kitâbesidir....Türkçesi: ‘Yüce Tanrı'nın rızası için Kur'an okunmak üzere bu imareti İmam-ı Ghazâlî neslinden Sinan Bey oğlu Hamza Bey, 935H./1528-1529 yılında yaptırdı, demektir.” See M. Zeki Oral, “Aksaray'ın Tarihi Önemi ve Vakıfları,” p. 226. According to Oral, perhaps Hamza Beg's grandfathers migrated from Tûs to Aksaray before the sixteenth century. See M. Zeki Oral, “Aksaray'ın Tarihi Önemi ve Vakıfları,” p. 227.

⁷⁰³ I. Melikoff, “Djâmâl al-Dîn Aksarayî,” *Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition, vol. II, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983, p. 419.

⁷⁰⁴ İnalçık, *The Classical Age*, p. 175.

Mehmed Beg II.⁷⁰⁵ Molla Fenârî's father was a *khalîfa* of Sadreddin Konevî whose lodge was frequented by the Ottoman scholars and shaykhs such as Akşemseddin.⁷⁰⁶ Through his father, Molla Fenârî also became the leading figure in teaching and disseminating Ibn al-Arabî's thought in the Ottoman Empire.

Another scholar, Seyyid Şerif Cürcânî, is said to have set out from Karaman to Aksaray due to Cemâleddin Aksarayî's reputation in the Islamic world but on his way he heard that Aksarayî had died. However, he met Molla Fenârî in Aksaray and they then went to Egypt together.⁷⁰⁷ As İncalcık has pointed before, the Ottoman *ulemâ* went to Egypt to meet the great scholars of the time. Cürcânî was also important in the tradition of knowledge in the Ottoman Empire. In the diplomas issued by the Ottoman *ulemâ*, the tradition of knowledge was traced back, through Seyyid Şerif Cürcânî, Nasreddin Tûsî and al-Râzî to al-Ghazâlî.⁷⁰⁸

6.2. Safavid Background of Baba Yusuf's Family

The family of Baba Yusuf, also known as Baba Yusuf-i Hakîkî, was originally from Turkestan.⁷⁰⁹ In the history of Turkish Sufism Turkestan occupies a crucial place due to the figure of Ahmed Yesevî. Deweese explains the importance of Ahmed Yesevî in the history of Turkish Sufism as follows:

The Yasavî tradition takes its most common appellation from the figure of Ahmad Yasavî, whose *nisba* is in turn derived from the name of his native town, Yasi, now known as 'Turkestan', in southern Kazakhstan; Ahmad Yasavî, usually said to have died in 562/1166-7, is customarily portrayed as the earliest Sufi among the Turks of Central Asia, and specifically

⁷⁰⁵ Mecdî Mehmed Efendi, *Hadâiku 'ş-Şakaik (Şakaik-i Numaniye ve Zeyilleri)*, vol.1, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan, (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989), p. 53.

⁷⁰⁶ Ahmet Faruk Güney, "Gaza Devrinde Kur'an'ı Yorumlamak: Fetih Öncesi Dönemde Osmanlı Müfessirleri ve Tefsir Eserleri," p. 222.

⁷⁰⁷ Mustafa Öz, "Cemâleddin Aksarayî," *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 7, (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı (TDV), 1993), p. 308.

⁷⁰⁸ İncalcık, *The Classical Age*, p. 175.

⁷⁰⁹ Ali Çavuşoğlu, *Tasavvuf Risalesi ve Metalîu'l-İman*, p. 9. According to Minorsky, Mirza Jihan-Shah b. Qara Yusuf, who "became the ruler (*vâlî*) of Azerbaijan by investiture (*tafwîz*) from Shahrukh", also used the pen-name of Hakîkî in his poems. For more information, see Vladimir Minorsky, "Jihan-Shah Qara-Qoyunlu and His Poetry," in *Medieval Iran and its Neighbours*, p. 294.

as the ‘founder’ of the *silsila* and ‘Sufi order’ that bore his name, but is perhaps best known for the magnificent shrine erected in his honour at the end of the fourteenth century by Timur. Ahmad Yasavî, moreover, is typically described, in Central Asian hagiographical literature, as the ‘chief’ of the mashâ’ikh-i turk, the ‘Turkic shaykhs’⁷¹⁰.

Baba Yusuf’s father Hamîdüddin b. Musa-yi Kayserî, who was known as Şeyh Hamid-i Aksarayî (d. 815/1412), was a disciple of Alâeddin-i Ardabilî (d. 1429).⁷¹¹ There is a story related to Şeyh Hamîd-i Aksarayî in the *Menâkib-i Şeyh Ali Semerkandî* (Hagiography of Shaykh Ali Semerkandî). According to the story, one day in a gathering with his disciples Şeyh Hamîd-i Aksarayî told his dervishes about the extraordinary qualities of Seyyid Ali Semerkandî.⁷¹² It is not a coincidence that the author of the *Menâkib* includes Hamîd-i Aksarayî in the text. Hamîd-i Aksarayî known as Somuncu Baba was a famous Sufî among the Ottomans and the other principalities of Anatolia. Among the disciples of Hamîd-i Velî was Hacı Bayram-ı Velî (d. 1430), who was regarded as “one of the four *qutbs* [The Pole of the Age] of Anatolia.”⁷¹³ Taking into account his audience, comprised mainly of Karamanids, the author of the *Menâkib* might have intended to benefit from the fame of Hamîd-i Velî in order to attract new dervishes to the path of Seyyid Ali Semerkandî, which was known as Semerkandî order.

⁷¹⁰ Devin Dewese, “The Mashâ’ikh-i Turk and the Khojagân: Rethinking the Links between the Yasavî and Naqshbandî Sufi Tradition,” *Journal of Islamic Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2 (July 1996), 180-207, pp. 180-181; Mustafa Kara, “Buhara’dan Bursa ve Bosna’ya Dervişâne Bir Yürüyüş,” *Türkler*, vol. 5, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002), 561-568.

⁷¹¹ Gölpınarlı, *Melâmîlik ve Melâmîler*, p. 3.

⁷¹² “Şeyh Hamîd-i Aksarayî bir gün ashâbına eyitdi: ‘Size bir sâhib-i kerâmet azîz zikr ideyim ki dünyâ ve ukbânun kerâmâtı ânun bir kabzasındadır. Zümre-i evliyâda ândan ziyâde velî gelmemişdür. Nûr-i üli’l-ebşâr kâmindür’. Yârânlar eyitdiler: ‘Kimdür?’ Şeyh Hamîd eyitdi: ‘Fâzıl-i Mâverâî’ n-nehir Seyyid Ali Semerkandîdür ki hâlâ Karaman’da olur’. Yârânlar eyitdiler ki: ‘İy Sultân-i kümmelîn! Hazretiniz ki Seyyid Ali hakkında böyle şehâdet idersiz. Bedrûstî ol ‘azîze kim mu’âdil ola?’ Şeyh Hamîd eyitdi: ‘Yârânlar yalnız ben degil. Kırk bin kırk dört kâmil velî dünyâya gelmişdir. Cümlesi Şeyh Ali’nün kerâmetine ve vilâyetine ve fazlına ve ‘ilmine mu’teriflerdür.’” See Seyyid Nizam Bedahşî, *Menâkib-i Seyyid Ali Semerkandî*, folios 95b-96a.

⁷¹³ The other three *qutbs* of Anatolia, according to Mustafa Kara, were Celâleddin Rûmî, Hacı Bektaş and Shaykh Şa’ban-i Velî; see Mustafa Kara, *Türk Tasavvuf Tarihi Araştırmaları*, pp. 28.

As noted earlier, Shaykh Hamidüddin was a disciple of Alâeddin-i Ardabilî, who was one of the shaykhs of the Safavid order.⁷¹⁴ Perhaps Baba Yusuf went to Ardabil with his father during his childhood but it is not exactly known when Baba Yusuf was born and when Hamidüddin stayed at Ardabil. The Safavid order received its name from Shaykh Safî al-Dîn (650-735/1252-1334), who was a disciple of a Sunnî shaykh Zâhid Gîlânî. A recent analysis of early Safavid shaykhs has been carried out by Rıza Yıldırım in the light of the Safavid and Ottoman sources.⁷¹⁵ Thus, the early Safavid shaykhs are briefly mentioned in relation to Baba Yusuf's works.

After the death of Shaykh Zâhid in 700/1301, Shaykh Safî assumed the headship of the "Sunnî Sufî organization" formerly led by Shaykh Zâhid.⁷¹⁶ Then Shaykh Safî moved to Ardabil, a city between Tabriz and the Caspian Sea, where he stayed until his death in 1334.⁷¹⁷ According to Evliyâ Çelebi, the tomb of Shaykh Safî was a beautiful place with his marvelous garden and "hundreds of dervishes" were serving the visitors, which was possible due to the rich revenue of the *vakf* (religious foundation).⁷¹⁸ According to Zeki Velidi Togan, the Safavids established a

⁷¹⁴ Gölpınarlı, *Melâmîlik ve Melâmîler*, p. 3.

⁷¹⁵ Rıza Yıldırım, "Turcomans between Two Empires: The Origins of the Qizilbash Identity in Anatolia (1447-1514)", *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, (Ankara: Department of History, Bilkent University, February 2008), pp. 151-244.

⁷¹⁶ David Morgan, *Medieval Persia, 1040-1797*, (London & New York: 1988), p. 107.

⁷¹⁷ Mazzaoui explains how Shaykh Safî was perceived by his contemporaries and how the Mongol rulers respected Shaykh Safî, as follows: "A Mongol superintendent of finances of nearby Qazwin, a historian, poet, and geographer of the İlkanid period, Hamd Allah Mustavfi of Qazwin, has left us one of the earliest, if not the earliest, authoritative references on Shakyh Safî ad-Dîn, written in 731/1330, only four years before Shaykh Safî's death. In it he tells us that Safî ad-Dîn is still alive and is very influential. The Mongol rulers respect him, and he has saved many people from being harmed at their hands. In his geographical work, *Nuzhat al-qulûb*, completed in 741/1340, six years after Shaykh Safî's death, Hamd Allah Mustavfi – in his description of Ardabil of the fourth clime-mentions Shaykh Safî ad-Dîn again, but by using the formula 'May God have mercy on him' we know that the old man had died. Hamd Allah adds the very useful information that most of the people of Ardabil are Shafî'îs and are the followers (*mürîds*) of Shaykh Safî ad-Dîn," Michel M. Mazzaoui, *The Origins of the Safawids, Shi'ism, Sufism, and the Ghulât*, (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1972), p. 46.

⁷¹⁸ "Cümle İrân u Tûrân şâhlarının ibtidâsı bu Şeyh Safî'dir kim tulû'ları bu Ardabil'dendir. Ve Ardabil'in (---)de bir bâğ-i İrem'de kubbe-i âlîler içre medfûnlardır kim nice yüz dervîşân-i zîşân türbedârânları vardır. Şeb u rûz cemî'-i züvvârâna ni'metleri mebzûldur ve evkâfî azîmdir.", *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, ed. Zekeriya Kurşun, Seyit Ali Kahraman, Yücel Dağlı, vol. 2, (İstanbul: Yapı

“precious library” (*çok kıymetdâr kütüphâne*) in the *khankâh* of Shaykh Safî. The books in the library of the *khankâh* were moved to the Asian Museum of St. Petersburg during the Russian occupation in 1828.⁷¹⁹

In the *Habîbu's-Siyar*, which was dedicated to the Safavid Shah Isma'îl by the historian Khwandamir (d. 1535), the genealogy of the Safavid dynasty was stated as follows:

It is not hidden from those who know the genealogies of the offspring of the Prophet that in five generations the shah's noble lineage reaches Shaykh Safiuddin Abu'l-Fath Ishaq al-Ardabili, and that shaykh's lineage goes back to the Seventh Imam, Musa al-Kazim. Therefore, he is Abu'l-Muzaffar Shah Isma'îl, son of Sultan-Haydar, son of Sultan-Junayd, son of Shaykh Ibrahim, son of Khwaja Ali, son of Shaykh Sadruddin Musa, son of Shaykh Safiuddin Ishaq.⁷²⁰

According to Trimmingham, the Safavid Order, which began as a Sunnî Order, was “the most interesting Shi'î-Sufî movement from the historical point of view.”⁷²¹ As noted earlier, the reason behind the significance of the order derives from the fact that Shah Ismail, who was one of the descendants of Shaykh Safî, turned the Safavid Order into the Safavid state in 1501 and that the Safavid state became a Shi'ite state which began to challenge its Sunnî rivals, mainly the Ottomans.

After the death of Shaykh Safî, the succession in the Safavid Order became hereditary. Shakh Safî was succeeded by his son, “the highly respected” Sadreddîn (1305-1392). Sadreddin's son, Hâce Alâeddin Ali, acted as the head of the Safavid

Kredi Yayınları, 1999), p. 228. Shaykh Bâlî Efendi of Sofia sent a letter to the Ottoman Grand Vizier Rüstem Pasha about the Safavids. In that letter, Bâlî Efendi praised Shaykh Safî as follows: “Shaykh Safî, who is the ancestor of this people of Evil, belongs to a ‘chain’ of shaykhs. In the ‘chains’ which we have seen he is mentioned as a *sayyid*. *Sayyid* or not, the faith of Islam should be respected. In any case, it is known that Shaykh Safî is a Perfect Murshid and one of God's men (*ehl Allah*)”, Vladimir Minorsky, “Shaykh Bâlî Efendi on the Safavids,” in *Medieval Iran and its Neighbours*, (London: Variorum Reprints, 1982), 437-450:444-445.

⁷¹⁹ A. Zeki Velidi Togan, “Azerbaycan,” *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2, (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1949), pp. 112-113.

⁷²⁰ Khwandamir, *Habîbu's-Siyar, Tome Three, Part Two: Shahrûkh Mirza-Shah Isma'îl*, tr. and ed. W. M. Thackston, (Harvard University, 1994), p. 555. For information about the *Habîbu's-Siyar* and its author, see Khwandamir, *Habîbu's-Siyar, Tome Three, Part One: Genghis Khan-Amir Temür*, tr. & ed. W. M. Thackston, (Harvard University, 1994), pp. IX-XII.

⁷²¹ Trimmingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam*, p. 99.

Order until his death in 1429. According to Mazzaoui, Hâce Ali was a very active and influential figure during the reign of Timur. As explained by Mazzaoui, there were followers of the Safavid Order in Anatolia at that time. Hâce Ali died in Palestine while he was occupied with gaining new followers in the Mamluk territory.⁷²² Hâce Ali's son and successor İbrahim, who was known as Shaykh-shâh, died in 1447.⁷²³ In his *divân*, a work consisted of collection of a poet's poems, Baba Yusuf also calls Shayh İbrahim "Şeyh-şâh" and devotes a chapter entitled "Rumûz der medh-i Sultân-i Meşâyikh Şeyh-şâh" to praise Shaykh İbrahim.⁷²⁴

Early Safavid shaykhs exerted a considerable influence on the thinking of Baba Yusuf. For instance, in the *Treatise on Sufism*, Baba Yusuf cites a story from the life of Shaykh Safî, the founder of the Safavid Order, in order to demonstrate how Shaykh Safî avoided being famous in the society.⁷²⁵ Baba Yusuf's father, Shaykh Hamidüddin, is also said to have left Bursa after he was given the task of leading the first Cum'a prayer in the Ulu Câmi of Bursa on the grounds that he became famous in the city. Baba Yusuf narrates a story, which took place in Tabriz, from Shaykh Sadreddin in the *Treatise on Sufism*. According to the story, in Tabriz, there was a famous person whose name was Muhammed, but he was known as Ârif due to his profound knowledge. One day, this man visited Shaykh Safî. Shaykh Safî

⁷²² Mazzaoui explains how Hâce Ali was an influential figure during the reign of Timur as follows: "During Hâce Ali's period (of roughly a quarter of a century), the affairs of the Order prospered to such a degree that the Sufi Shaykh could wield so much weight and influence as to ask the great Timur to set free certain captives he had brought back with him from Anatolia after his victory over the Ottoman Sultan Bayezid at Ankara in 804/1402. The significant point here, though, is the fact that these captives were the followers of the Order, and when set free, they were sent back home to Anatolia, with representatives (*hulefâ*) appointed to go with them," Michel M. Mazzaoui, *The Origins of the Safawids*, p. 54.

⁷²³ J. S. Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam*, p. 100. Baba Yusuf calls Shaykh İbrahim "the Sultan of the saints" (*Sultân-i evliyâ*) and "the Shah of religion" (*Şeh-i dîn*), see Baba Yusuf, *Hakikînâme*, folio 144b.

⁷²⁴ *Hakikînâme*, folio 334b.

⁷²⁵ See Baba Yusuf, *İlmü'l-Meşâyikh*, folio 32a. Baba Yusuf also quotes sayings of Shaykh Safî: "Şeyh Safiyyüddin kaddese'l-lâhu sırrahû buyurur ki: 'Rûy-i zemîn ğaflet-âbâddur; zîr-i zemîn hasret-âbâd'. Ya'ni mâdâm ki, kişi yiryüzünde hevâ-yi nefis ile meşğûldur; ğafletdedür çûn yir altına gireler ecel irdügi dem." Baba Yusuf, *İlmü'l-Meşâyikh*, folio 55b.

asked the man his name; the man replied that his original name was Muhammed and that people of Tabriz were calling him Ârif, “adept in divine or mystical matters”.⁷²⁶ Then Shaykh Safî asked him whether he knew himself (*kendüni tanur mısın ki 'ârif dirler?*). The man replied that he had read many books about Sufism and about the words and deeds of the Shaykhs. Then, Shaykh Safî said: “What you have read so far was the deeds of others not yours. Tell me your words and deeds.”⁷²⁷ In the *Treatise on Sufism* Baba Yusuf also refers to Hâce Ali, the third shaykh of the Safavid Order, in relation to Hâce Ali’s opinion about “miracle of saints” (*kerâmet*).⁷²⁸ In his *dîvân*, Baba Yusuf devotes some chapters entitled “der-teslîm ve tefvîz ve nasâyih-i Şeyh İbrahim”, “Kasîde der-medh-i Sultanü'l-Meşâyikh İbrahim” to Shaykh İbrahim (d. 1447).⁷²⁹ In such chapters in which some of the Safavid Shaykhs were praised, one can not find any detail about the life of these Shaykhs. Baba Yusuf uses sentimental words expressing his longing for these shaykhs. Although it is not known for certain whether Baba Yusuf had seen any one of the Safavid Shaykhs, he had a first-hand knowledge about them through his father, Shaykh Hamîdüddin.

⁷²⁶ Sir James W. Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon*, second edition, (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 2001), p. 1276.

⁷²⁷ “Hikâyet: Hoca Sadreddin kaddese'l-lâhu sirrahû dir ki: 'Tabriz'de Ârif adlu ki meşhûr-i vakt idi. Hazreti Şeyh'a kaddese'l-lâhu sirrahû geldi,' dir. Şeyh âna buyurdu ki: 'Nâmet çîst?' ya'ni 'adun nedür?' didi ki, 'Adum Muhammeddür. Emmâ 'Ârif dirler.' Buyurdu Şeyh: 'Ya'ni şinâsâyîsen. Kendüni tanımış mısın ki, Ârif dirler.' 'Ârif eyitdi: 'Men niçe kitâb makâlât-i meşâyikhden ve 'ilm-i tasavvufdan okımışam ve bilmişem.' Şeyh buyurdu ki: 'Ol hod ânlarun işi ve mu'âmelesidür. Ez ân-i tû gû ya'ni senün kanı?'” Baba Yusuf, *İlmü'l-Meşâyih*, folio 40a. This story is reminiscent of the philosophy of Socrates (ca. 470-399 B.C.): “Although as a young man he [Socrates] had been interested in natural philosophy, he abandoned this tradition in favor of the search for moral self-enlightenment urged by Heraclitus. ‘Know thyself’ was Socrates’ plea. An unexamined life, he argued, was not worth living.” Mark Kishlansky, Patrick Geary, Patricia O’Brien, *Civilization in the West*, vol.1, (New York: Longman, 1997), pp. 80-81.

⁷²⁸ “Sultan Hoca Ali kaddese'l-lahu sirrahû nasîhat eyle buyurmuşdur ki: ‘Keşf keşişe dahî olur. Bâtil 'ibâdete müvâzabet göstermeg ile ânlarda hâsıl olurmuş. Kerâmet Şeytan'dandur ki ol istidrâcdur ve kadem ki âna tayy-i mekan dirler diyügdür bir lahza mağribden meşrika varur gelür ki, ânlaru dahî olur. Pes tâlibün gerekdür gönlinde Allah'dan özge olmaya. Ya'ni tahliye-i kalbdür mâ dün-i Hak'tan...” *İlmü'l-Meşâyikh*, folio 44b.

⁷²⁹ For references to Shaykh İbrahim in the *dîvân* of Baba Yusuf, see *Hakîkinâme*, folios 144a, 147a, 149b, 150a, 166b.

Minorsky indicates that the early shaykhs of the Safavid Order were “strictly orthodox”. According to Minorsky, the turning point in the history of the Safavid Order came in the years 1449-56, when “a descendant of Shaykh Safi in the fourth generation, the young Shaykh Junayd, appeared too energetic and restless for the then ruler of Persia, the Qaraqoyunlu Jahanshah.”⁷³⁰ Shaykh Junayd (d. 1460) was expelled from Ardabil and he spent six or seven years among the Turcomans of Anatolia and Syria. It seems that Baba Yusuf was aware of the turning point in the Safavid Order. As it will be discussed later, in his works, Baba Yusuf refers to the first four shaykhs, namely Shaykh Safi, Shaykh Sadreddin, Hâce Ali, and Shaykh Ibrahim, with great respect. However, in Baba Yusuf’s works, absent are the names of Shakyh Junayd (d. 1460) and Shaykh Haydar (d. 1488), although they were contemporaries of Baba Yusuf. The reason for Baba Yusuf’s silence on Shaykh Junayd is perhaps due to an event that happened in the year 1451 at the *zâviye* of Sadreddin Konevî.

During his stay in Anatolia, Shaykh Junayd visited the lodge of Sadreddin Konevî (d. 673/1274). At that time, the shaykh of the lodge of Sadreddin Konevî was Abdüllatif Kudsî (d. 856/1452), who was born in Quds in the year 786/1384. Kudsî came to Konya in the year 1448 and stayed there for approximately three years⁷³¹. During his stay at the lodge of Konevî, Shaykh Junayd began to express his opinions about the companions of the Prophet. When Kudsî and Junayd debated about religious matters, Kudsî concluded that Junayd was a heretic due to Junayd’s opinions about the companions of the Prophet. After that debate, Kudsî wrote a letter

⁷³⁰ Vladimir Minorsky, “Shaykh Bâlî Efendi on the Safavids”, p. 439. For more information about Shaykh Junayd, see Walther Hinz, *Uzun Hasan ve Şeyh Cüneyd, XV. Yüzyılda İran’ın Millî Bir Devlet Haline Yükselişi*, tr. Tefik Bıyıkhoğlu, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1992).

⁷³¹ Yusuf Küçükdağ, “Osmanlı Dönemi Konya Tekke ve Zâviyeleri,” *Dünden Bugüne Konya’nın Kültür Birikimi ve Selçuk Üniversitesi*, (Konya, 1999), p. 139.

to the Karamanid ruler, İbrahim Beg, in which Kudsî complained about Shayh Junayd. When Junayd heard about that letter, he fled to Aleppo.⁷³² This example shows the role of a lodge and its shaykh in the maintenance of the Sunnî creed in the Karamanid principality. The fact that Kudsî wrote a letter to the Karamanid ruler can also be viewed as evidence of the close relationships of conformist shaykhs and rulers in the Karamanid lands.

6.3 Zeynî and Bayramî Affiliations

Through the efforts of Abdullatîf Kudsî and his followers, the Zeynî Order spread in Anatolia and the Balkans.⁷³³ Kudsî left Konya for Bursa, the former Ottoman capital, on Receb 15, 855/August 13, 1451. In the same year, some of Kudsî's disciples, among whom was el-Hâc Muslihüddin Mustafa known as Shaykh Vefâ (d. 896/1491), came to Bursa.⁷³⁴ The reason why both Kudsî and Shaykh Vefâ left Konya and went to Bursa might be due to them wanting to seek the favor of the Ottoman Sultan Murad II, who was widely known as a patron of scholars and sufis.

⁷³² Abdürrezzak Tek, *Abdullatîf Kudsî, Hayatı, Eserleri ve Görüşleri*, (Bursa: Emin Yayınları, 2007), pp. 41-42. Shayh Junayd (d. 1460) was succeeded by his son Haydar (d. 1488). The Safavid state was founded by Shah İsmail (d. 1524) in 1501. According to Hans R. Roemer, the Safavid state was a "Turcoman achievement": "First of all, the Safavid state, founded by Shah İsmail, was a Turcoman achievement. Since its founder was descended from Uzun Hasan, the Safavid state can be considered as a direct continuation of the Aq-Qoyunlu principality, which in turn replaced another Turcoman regime, that of the Qara Qoyunlu, thirty five years before. Those Turcoman states had been characterized by an undoubted instability, and their shaky systems, which in both cases led to a remarkably short-lived existence, had much in common with many other Turkish states, namely the Anatolian beyliks of post-Mongolian times, and also the Timurid successor states on Persian territory. Quite different was the Safavid state: it lasted more than two centuries and somehow survived up to modern times in several successive states which adopted and preserved a good deal of its characteristics." Hans R. Roemer, "The Qizilbash Turcomans: Founders and Victims of the Safavid Theocracy," in *Intellectual Studies on Islam, Essays written in honor of Martin B. Dickson*, ed. Michel M. Mazzaoui, Vera B. Mooren, (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1990), p. 29. For more information about the Safavid Order and the Safavid state, see Roger Savory, *Iran Under the Safavids*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

⁷³³ Reşat Öngören, *Tarihte Bir Aydın Tarikatı: Zeynîler*, (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2003), p. 76.

⁷³⁴ Abdürrezzak Tek, *Abdullatîf Kudsî, Hayatı, Eserleri ve Görüşleri*, p. 43; for more information about Shaykh Vefâ and his works, see Faysal Okan Atasoy, "Melhame-i Şeyh Vefâ, Giriş-Metin-Sözlük", *unpublished M.A. thesis*, (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, 2001); Reşat Öngören, "Fatih Devrinde Belli Başlı Tarikatlar ve Zeyniyye", *unpublished M.A. thesis*, (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 1990), pp. 93-115.

During the reign of Murad II (r. 1421-1451), many scholars came to Anatolia from the Arab lands, Turkestan and Crimea. Among these scholars were Molla Gürânî, Alâeddin Tûsî, Şerefeddin Kırîmî, Seydi Ahmed, Kırîmî, Fahreddin Acemî, Alâeddin Ali Arabî, and Acem Sinan. According to İnalçık, most of these scholars were the students of Seyyid Şerif Cürcanî and of Taftazanî. Thus, they contributed to the revival of the cultural life of the Ottoman Empire by bringing the debates between Cürcanî and Taftazanî to the Ottoman *ulemâ* circles.⁷³⁵ The other reason for Kudsi's movement to the Ottoman city of Bursa might be the spread of the Zeynî order in the Ottoman lands. During the reign of Murad II, sufi orders such as Mevlevî, Zeynî and Bayramî orders spread in the Ottoman lands.⁷³⁶ Before the coming of Abdüllatif Kudsi, who was one of the *khalifas* of Zeynüddin Hafî (d. 838/1435), there had been Zeynî dervishes in Bursa.⁷³⁷ Zeyneddin Hafî was one of the shaykhs mentioned with reverence by Baba Yusuf in his works and Baba Yusuf was a reader of Zeyneddin Hafî's *risâle*, treatise.⁷³⁸

Baba Yusuf's shaykh, Hacı Bayram, was one of the shaykhs respected by the Ottoman Sultan Murad II. Due to his respect for Hacı Bayram, Murad II conferred tax exemptions to Hacı Bayram's disciples.⁷³⁹ Although Baba Yusuf was also a disciple of Hacı Bayram, his political allegiance differed from that of his shaykh. Baba Yusuf was a firm supporter of the Karamanids. Baba Yusuf's father, Shaykh

⁷³⁵ Halil İnalçık, "Murad II," p. 614.

⁷³⁶ Halil İnalçık, "Murad II," p. 614.

⁷³⁷ Reşat Öngören, *Tarihte Bir Aydın Tarikatı, Zeyniler*, p. 82.

⁷³⁸ "Şeyh Zeyneddin Hâfî rahmetu'l-lâhi 'aleyh,...eger dünyâ meşâyıkhdan dolu ise dahî kaçan mürîdün bâtınında şeyhinden ğayrına ta'alluk olsa ânun bâtını feth olmaz Hazret-i Vahdâniyetine," Baba Yusuf-i Hakîkî, *İlmü'l-Meşâyıkh*, Süleymâniye Library, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, no. 2974, folio 54b. Baba Yusuf also refers to the treatise of Hafî as follows: "Zeyneddin Hâfî, risâlesinde dahî dimişdür ki, 'Hak Te'âlâ'nun feyzi münkati' olub mürîd terakkîden kalmak ekser degüldür illâ bu cihetden ya'ni 'adem-i rabt-i kalbdendir. Pes sâlik dâim teveccühde gerek kişi ki halka ikbâl ide Hak'dan i'tirâz itmîş olur." Baba Yusuf-i Hakîkî, *İlmü'l-Meşâyıkh*, folio 55a.

⁷³⁹ Halil İnalçık, "Murad II," p. 614; Fuat Bayramoğlu, *Hacı Bayram-ı Velî, Yaşamı, Soyu, Vakfı*, vol. 1, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1983), p. 47.

Hamîdüddin, differed from Abdüllatif Kudsî in the sense that while the former moved from Bursa to Konya and finally settled at Aksaray, the latter moved from Konya to Bursa. However, both cases can be seen as a result of a deliberate choice because Hamîdüddin left Bursa in 1400, two years before the defeat of the Ottoman Sultan Bayezid I (r. 1389-1402) by Timur in Çubuk Ovası, near Ankara. Kudsî left Konya sixteen years before the Ottoman occupation of Konya, the seat of the Karamanids, in 1468. It seems that dervishes were following the political developments with care and they were shifting their political allegiances accordingly. Thus, in most cases, careful study of the historical record reveals more dynamic and volatile relationships between dervishes and sultans than had been supposed. In such relationships, dervish lodges played a significant role in the perpetuation of a solid base of cooperation. Abdüllatif Kudsî did what was expected of a shaykh of the lodge of Sadreddin Konevî, which was the second most important lodge after that of Celâleddin Rûmî. He cooperated with the Karamanid ruler in the maintenance of the Sunnî creed within the borders of the Karamanid principality.

Although some studies have been done on Shaykh Baba Yusuf, also known as Yusuf-i Hakîkî or Güzel Baba,⁷⁴⁰ not much effort has been expended to examine his works and ideas under the time and space dimensions in which his works appeared. Some studies have focused on the literary side of his works.⁷⁴¹ Some of Baba Yusuf's works were written in a critical period just after the Ottoman occupation of the Principality of Karaman. Baba Yusuf's opinions about the

⁷⁴⁰ Konyalı, *Aksaray Tarihi*, vol. 2, (İstanbul: Fatih Yayınevi, 1974), p. 2706. Sometimes Baba Yusuf of Aksaray has been confused with Baba Yusuf of Sivrihisar, who was a *khalifa* (spiritual successor) of Akşemseddin. Baba Yusuf of Sivrihisar died in the year 917 H./1511-12 in Istanbul; see Konyalı, *Aksaray Tarihi*, vol. 2, p. 2712.

⁷⁴¹ Erdoğan Boz, "Hakîkî Dîvânı, Dil Özellikleri, Kısmî Çeviriyazılı Metin (vol. I), Söz Dizini (vol.II)," 2 vol.s, *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, (Malatya: İnönü Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 1996); Ali Çavuşoğlu, "Yusuf Hakîkî'nin *Mahabbet-nâme* Adlı Eserinin Tenkitli Metni ve İncelenmesi", *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2002).

Ottoman occupation may provide some hints about how the Ottoman occupation was perceived by the residents of the Karamanoğlu Principality. Moreover, the story of Baba Yusuf and his family exhibits what Özel calls “the inclusive and pragmatic character of the transition process.”⁷⁴² Although initially Baba Yusuf was not supportive of the Ottoman occupation of Aksaray, over time, he and his descendants enjoyed the status of being a shaykh of a *khankah* and holder of a family vakf. According to a register in the archive of the Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü, the foundation of Baba Yusuf still existed in the year 1277/1860-1861.⁷⁴³

6.4. Baba Yusuf and His Descendants according to the Ottoman *Vakf* Registers

According to the Ottoman *vakf* registers, Baba Yusuf and his descendants maintained their *vakfs* during Ottoman rule in Aksaray. In the first *evkaf defteri* (the book of registers of the religious foundations) of the Province of Karaman in the year 881/1476, Baba Yusuf was mentioned as the shaykh of *khankah* of Melik Mahmud Ghâzî. Melik Mahmud, who was the son of Danishmendîd Yağıbasan. This register

⁷⁴² Oktay Özel, “The Transformation of Provincial Administration in Anatolia: Observations on Amasya from 15th to 17th Centuries,” in *The Ottoman Empire, Myths, Realities and ‘Black Holes’, Contributions in Honour of Colin Imber*, ed. Eugenia Kermeli and Oktay Özel, (İstanbul: ISIS Pres, 2006), p. 53. Özel’s review of the literature on the transition process after the Ottoman conquest of various provinces of Anatolia is illuminating: “The only informative literature on the administrative transition from Seljukid Anatolia to that of the Ottomans is provided by the relevant parts of the introductory chapters of the defterological studies done for certain Ottoman provinces, collectively referred to as *sancak* studies. Many of these studies, mostly Ph.D. dissertations, are available in libraries in Turkey and a number have been published. Combined, these provide a general idea of early Ottoman administrative divisions in provinces where the *timar* system was in force. However, they are mostly descriptive in nature and reiterate a common pattern detailing the course of events leading towards the Ottoman takeover of the area concerned, generally followed by the outline of the development of Ottoman administrative system as portrayed in the extant *tahrir* registers. What is lacking in most of these studies is a discussion of the peculiarities of the transition process and an analysis of the terminology employed in each case. There are of course exceptions, such as the works by Tayyip Gökbilgin, Bahaeddin Yediyıldız, and Mehmed Öz.” Oktay Özel, “The Transformation of Provincial Administration in Anatolia: Observations on Amasya from 15th to 17th Centuries,” p. 54.

⁷⁴³ The register is as follows: “Nezâret-i Evkâf-i Hümâyûn evkâfından Aksaray kazâsında Şeyh Hamîd-i Velî ve Baba Yusuf-i Hakîkî vakfî, sene 1277,” *Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi*, defter no. 2365, sıra no. 80.

also mentions a *mâlikâne* (possession) of Baba Yusuf.⁷⁴⁴ The Ottoman Sultan approved the *mâlikâne* of Baba Yusuf that had been established under the Karamanid rule.⁷⁴⁵ As indicated earlier, Ottoman sultans acknowledged the land grants of the former Muslim rulers.⁷⁴⁶ It seems that Baba Yusuf and his family were considered a distinguished family due to the fame of his father, Shayh Hamîd-i Velî, in Anatolia. Thus, as it is evident in his works, Baba Yusuf felt a sense of attachment to the Karamanids and was wary of whether or not the newcomers, the Ottomans, would treat his family favorably.

According to the *evkâf defteri* of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483, the shaykh of the *khankâh* of Melik Mahmud Gâzî was the son of Baba Yusuf, Evhadüddin.⁷⁴⁷ Although he was alive, Baba Yusuf (d. 1487) left the duty of being shaykh of the *khankâh* to his son, perhaps, in order to concentrate on writing his works. As noted in the register of 888/1483, Baba Yusuf transformed his *mâlikâne* into a family *vakf*. The *defter* refers to a *vakfiyye*, the deed of endowment of a *vakf*.⁷⁴⁸ According to the *vakfiyye*, dated H. 884/1479, Baba Yusuf would serve as the shaykh of the *khankâh* of Melik Mahmud Gâzî. Furthermore, he and the shaykhs after him

⁷⁴⁴ *Divânî-mâlikâne* system, which is also known as *mâlikâne-dîvânî* system, was based on “dual ownership” (*iki baştan*) principle in which “the state and landowner shared the surplus of the peasant production as tax or rent”. In this system, the owner’s share in tithes (*mâlikâne*) and the state’s share (*dîvânî*) were taken in different rates depending the fertility of the soil and local custom; *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Halil İnalcık, Donald Quataert, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 128. For more information about *divânî-mâlikâne* system, see Ömer Lütfî Barkan, “Mâlikâne-divânî”, in *Türkiye’de Toprak Meselesi, Toplu Eserler 1*, pp. 151-208; Mehmet Öz, *XV-XVI. Yüzyıllarda Canik Sancağı*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999), pp. 123-141; Margaret L. Venzke, “Aleppo’s Malikane-Dîvânî System”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 106, issue 3 (July-September 1986), 451-469.

⁷⁴⁵ Uzluğ, p. 56; Konyalı, *Aksaray Tarihi*, vol. 2, p. 2707.

⁷⁴⁶ Halil İnalcık, “Land Possession Outside the Mîrî System,” in *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Halil İnalcık, Donald Quataert, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 128.

⁷⁴⁷ “Vakf-i Hankâh-i Melik Mahmud Ğâzî der nefsi-i Aksara der tasarruf-i Evhadüddin bin Hazret-i Şeyh Baba Yusuf,” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Vilâyet-i Karaman ve Livâ-i Kayseriyye*, İstanbul Atatürk Kitaplığı Muallim Cevdet Yazmaları, no. O- 116/1, folio 110a.

⁷⁴⁸ “Vakf-i ebnâ-i Mürşidü’s-sâlikîn Hazret-i Şeyh Baba Yusuf bin Şeyh Hamîdüddin kuddise sirruhu’l-’azîz bi-ibneyn Şeyh Evhadüddin ve Şeyh Safî ber-müceb-i vakfiyye ve be-hükm-i Pâdişâh-i ‘âlem-penâh hullide mülkühü,” *Defter-i evkâf-ı vilâyet-i Karaman ve livâ-i Kayseriyye*, İstanbul Atatürk Kitaplığı Muallim Cevdet Yazmaları, no. O- 116/1, folio 110a.

would receive a quarter of the revenue of the foundation and ten dervishes would stay at the *khankah* and they would be awarded the remaining three fourth of the revenue of the foundation.⁷⁴⁹

According to İnalçık, under Ottoman rule, most *mâlikanes* were converted into *vakfs*. In some cases, the sultan allowed the addition of the *divânî* portion to the *vakf* as a “favor to *vakfs* endowed by eminent persons.”⁷⁵⁰ While there is not extant evidence for such favor of the Sultan in the *vakf* registers but it is known that Baba Yusuf turned his *mâlikâne* into a family *vakf*. The reason why Baba Yusuf founded a family *vakf* might be to ensure a “perpetual source of revenue for his family and offspring.”⁷⁵¹

6.5 Baba Yusuf’s Attitude towards the Ottoman Occupation of the Karamanid Principality

As Maribel Fierro points out, the Sufis’ attitude towards political authorities took different forms: “Some cooperated with the established rulers or at least avoided confrontation, some confronted the rulers by word and some did so by action.”⁷⁵² Baba Yusuf’s case was a different and contradictory one. Baba Yusuf harshly criticized the Ottoman occupation of Aksaray in his works. However, in spite of his words against the Ottoman occupation he did not reject to benefit from the revenue coming from the pious foundation approved by the Ottoman sultan.

⁷⁴⁹ M. Zeki Oral, “Aksaray’ın Tarihi Önemi ve Vakfları,” p. 239, 240.

⁷⁵⁰ Halil İnalçık, “Land Possession Outside the Mîrî System,” p. 128.

⁷⁵¹ İnalçık, p. 125.

⁷⁵² Maribel Fierro, “Opposition to Sufism in Al-Andalus”, in *Islamic Mysticism Contested, Thirteen Centuries of Controversies and Polemics*, ed. Frederick de Jong & Bernd Radtke, (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1999), p. 197.

According to Şikârî, the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II exiled nearly three hundred scholars, shaykhs and müftîs from Aksaray to İstanbul.⁷⁵³ Baba Yusuf was not among those who were subject to exile. Yet, this did not refrain Baba Yusuf from criticizing the Ottoman occupation of Aksaray. Although he maintained his position as shaykh of the *khankah* of Melik Mahmud Gazi, he had a longing for the reign of Karamanids. Baba Yusuf criticized the Ottomans for neglecting *ghaza* (religious warfare) and for indulging in plunder:

*Yıkılıp şehirler sara[y]ları gör
Oldı evvelki gibi yabanlık*

*Haslet-i hâfız-i bilâdi'l-lâh
Gerek olayıdı nıgehbânlık*

*Halkı zulm ile târ ü mâr iden
Anlar oldı zihî cihanbânlık*

*Karamanlığını komaz Karaman
Gitmiş illâ ki İbn-i Osmanlık*

*Ğâzilik ğârete mübeddel olup
Divlik oldı hem Süleymanlık*

*Bereket bulına mı bir süride
Ki âna kurd ide çobanlık.*⁷⁵⁴

In Islam, it is forbidden to use arms against other Muslims. Thus, the Ottomans were subject to criticism due to the fact that they waged war against other Muslim states or principalities. To counter such criticisms, the Ottomans argued, for instance, that they had acquired through “canonically licit ways the lands of the houses of Hamid and Germiyan which were a bone of contention between them and the house of Karaman.”⁷⁵⁵ When the Ottomans intended to wage war on the Karamanids or any other Muslim state, the Ottomans issued *fetvâs*, a legal ruling, from the *ulemâ* indicating that their actions were “in accordance with the shari’a and

⁷⁵³ Şikârî, *Karamanoğulları Tarihi*, p. 197.

⁷⁵⁴ *Hakikînâme*, folios 201a-201b.

⁷⁵⁵ İnalçık, “Emergence of the Ottomans,” p. 289.

therefore licit.”⁷⁵⁶ The Ottomans, as “leaders of the *ghazâ*”, claimed that they had to repulse the Karamanid attacks from the rear in order to continue “their *ghazâ* obligations in Rumeli.”⁷⁵⁷ The Karamanids and others who prevented the Ottomanids’ *ghazâ* obligations were proclaimed as “rebels against religion.”⁷⁵⁸

6.6. Sources of Baba Yusuf’s Works

What was the cultural milieu of a Karamanid shaykh and what was the nature of the the composition of audiences of a particular Sufi work? While the composition of the audience of a particular work of a Sufi of the fifteenth century is not exactly known, some clues about the general nature of the audience of a book or a treatise emerge by studying the style of language used in the text and by examining which of the previous shaykhs and scholars were mentioned in the text. When one reads the works of Baba Yusuf one likely would conclude that the audience of Baba Yusuf’s works was comprised primarily of dervishes. This much is most certain: Baba Yusuf did not dedicate his books to a particular name. There were not clear demarcations among the Sufi orders, particularly between the established orders such as Mevleviyye, Nakşibendiyye, Halvetiyye and Zeyniyye, in the fifteenth century. Thus, Baba Yusuf did not hesitate to refer to the shaykhs of different Sufi orders even in the same paragraph.

Among the works of Baba Yusuf, who was also known as Baba Yusuf-i Hakîkî, the most important for a student of history is his *dîvân* called *Hakîkî Dîvânî* or *Hakîkînâme*. In his *dîvân*, which is two volumes and totally 353 folios, he openly expressed his opinions about the Ottoman occupation of the Karamanid lands and his

⁷⁵⁶ İnalçık, p. 289.

⁷⁵⁷ Halil İnalçık, “The Rise of Ottoman Historiography,” in *From Empire to Republic, Essays on Ottoman and Turkish Social History*, (İstanbul: ISIS Press, 1995), p. 4.

⁷⁵⁸ İnalçık, “Emergence of the Ottomans,” p. 289.

feelings about the society in which he lived. Some of his verses in the *dîvân* are reminiscent of ethics literature. One who reads Baba Yusuf's *dîvân* would perhaps conclude that this was a kind of a moral treatise written for dervishes. Baba Yusuf's advices to the dervishes of his time are scattered throughout his *dîvân*.

Baba Yusuf also authored of a work entitled *Mahabbetnâme* (The Book of Love), which consisted of poems of Baba Yusuf. In that work there is the *na't* (eulogy) of the Prophet Muhammad and of the Four Caliphs, Abû Bakr, 'Umar, Uthman, and Ali. Thus, Baba Yusuf does not leave any room for any speculation as to whether or not he was affiliated with the Shi'ite sect. Like the *Hakîkînâme*, the *Mahabbetnâme* can be seen as a moral treatise on society, particularly dervishes.⁷⁵⁹ A dissertation has been written on the *Mahabbetnâme* of Baba Yusuf by Ali Çavuşoğlu. Although Çavuşoğlu explains the content of the *Mahabbetnâme*, Çavuşoğlu's main focus is the literary aspect of that work. A thorough analysis of the *Mahabbetnâme* in the light of sources of Baba Yusuf's works and of the contemporary Sufi texts remains to be done.

Following Ghazalî (d. 1111), the Ottoman *ulemâ* thought that the study of philosophy was permissible merely as preparation for the study of scholastic theology; it was not permissible to study philosophical problems which were contrary to the Qur'an.⁷⁶⁰ Baba Yusuf's contemporary, Molla Câmî (817-898/1414-1492), also asserted "the superiority of the Sufis over the philosophers in understanding universe."⁷⁶¹ Baba Yusuf was more harsh than the Ottoman *ulemâ* in terms of his attitude towards philosophy. He totally rejected the usefulness of

⁷⁵⁹ Ali Çavuşoğlu, "Yusuf Hakîkî'nin *Mahabbet-nâme* Adlı Eserinin Tenkitli Metni ve İncelenmesi," *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2002), p. 44.

⁷⁶⁰ İnalçık, *The Classical Age*, p. 176.

⁷⁶¹ Ökten, "Câmî (817-898/1414-1492)," p. 20.

philosophy as a source of knowledge. Interestingly, in the *Mahabbetnâme* he perceives philosophy as contrary to the Sunnî belief:

*Yokdur felsefiyyâtun ho nûrı
Hem olmaz felsefinün bil şu'ûrı*

*Bu tahkîkâta ki ilm-i ledünnî
Rumûzun fehm idemez ğayr-i Sünnî*

***Mahabbetnâme** dîrler bu kitâba
Gel imdi istimâ' it bu rebâbâ⁷⁶²*

Baba Yusuf also wrote the *İlmü'l- Meşâyikh* (The Knowledge of Shaykhs), in which he discusses the qualities of an ideal shaykh and the necessity for affiliating with a religious order. He also composed a *hâşiye* (annotation), on the *Şerh-i Hadîs-i Erba'in* (Commentary on the forty sayings of the Prophet Muhammed) of his father Hamîdüddin.⁷⁶³ Moreover, according to Mikail Bayram, Baba Yusuf translated the *Metâliu'l-Îmân* (*Dimensions of the Belief*) into Turkish. Bayram asserts that the original author of that work was Şeyh Nasîrû'd-Dîn Mahmud al-Hoyî, who was known as Ahî Evren.⁷⁶⁴

⁷⁶² Ali Çavuşoğlu, "Yusuf Hakîkî'nin Mahabbet-nâme Adlı Eserinin Tenkitli Metni ve İncelenmesi," p. 263.

Baba Yusuf criticizes the study of philosophy in other parts of the *Mahabbatnâme*:

"Çü Yunânî degül bu hikmet-i cân
Ne bilsün bes bu râzı feylesofân

İder ser-geşte bu sad feylesofi
Bu hikmetde ki bulmaz ol vukûfi

Hezârân felsefîyi nitsün almaz
Ki bunda felsefe hiç işe gelmez

Hakâyık gülşenidür cân bu gülşen

Kime Hak'dan açlıdıyısıa revzen", Ali Çavuşoğlu, "Yusuf Hakîkî'nin Mahabbet-nâme Adlı Eserinin Tenkitli Metni ve İncelenmesi", p. 108.

⁷⁶³ For information about various manuscript versions of Baba Yusuf's works and other works attributed to Baba Yusuf, see Ali Çavuşoğlu, "Yusuf Hakîkî'nin Mahabbet-nâme Adlı Eserinin Tenkitli Metni ve İncelenmesi", pp. 18-29.

⁷⁶⁴ Ahi Evren (Şeyh Nasîrû'd-Dîn Mahmud al-Hoyî), *Îmânın Boyutları (Metâli'u'l-Îman)*, tr. & ed. Mikail Bayram, (Konya, 1996), p. 50. For different opinions about the original author of *Metâli'u'l-Îman*, see Erdoğan Boz, "Hakîkî Dîvânı," p. XV.

Baba Yusuf frequently refers to verses from the Qur'an and also to the sayings of the Prophet in his works. Additionally, the reader also comes across Persian poems in his works. Baba Yusuf wrote in a simple Turkish similar to the style of Yunus Emre.⁷⁶⁵ When comparing the poems of Yunus Emre (d. 720/1320-21) and the poems of Baba Yusuf, there are striking similarities in terms of content and style. Both poets preferred to write in simple Turkish that could be understood by ordinary people, although both of them were able to write in Arabic and Persian. Both poets lived at least some part of their lives within the borders of the Karamanid Principality. Both poets used frequently the themes of love, death, travel and *ğurbet*, "separation from one's native country"⁷⁶⁶, *melâmet* (blaming oneself), in their poems.⁷⁶⁷

⁷⁶⁵ For more information about the "Yûnus-style", see Gönül Alpay Tekin, "Turkish Literature," in *Islamic Spirituality, Manifestations*, vol. 2, 350-361: 354-356.

⁷⁶⁶ Hans Wehr, *Arabic-English Dictionary, fourth edition*, ed. J. M. Cowan, (Ithaca: Spoken Languages Services, Inc., 1994), p. 783.

⁷⁶⁷ In the *Treatise on Sufism*, Baba Yusuf also refers to Yunus Emre: "Yunus Emre dir: 'Bir devlüngeç yuva yapar; yürür ilden yavri kapar. Doğan ileyinden sapar, Zîrâ elinde murdarı var.' Devlüngeç kağduğı yavri hod nefsi-emrde murdâr degüldür. Tâhir yumurdadır. Pes zîrâ elinde murdarı vardı. Ma'nisi budur ki, mürîd ki mürebbî huzûrından ve meşâyikh tarîkından kuvvet-i bâtin hâsıl itmedin müdde'î bî-ma'nînün iğvâsı ve idlâli kaynağına düşdi. Pâk i'tikâd iken murdâr olur. Zîrâ çün zulmât-i rayb ü gümân ile zubâb-i hicâb istilâ ide tâlib tîh-i tereddüde mütehayyir ve sergerdân olur." Baba Yusuf-i Hakîkî, *İlmü'l-Meşâyikh*, Süleymâniye Library, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, no. 2974, folios 30a, 30b. For a reference to Yunus Emre in the *Hakîkînâme*, see Baba Yusuf, *Hakîkînâme*, folio 212a. Gölpınarlı explains in detail themes of Yunus Emre's poems in his book entitled *Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf*. The following poems of Yunus Emre can serve as an example of some of these themes:

"Kayseri Tebrîz ü Sivas Nahcuvan Mar'aş u Şiraz
Gönül sana Bağdad yakın âlemlere dîvânesin

İndik Rûm'a kışladuk çok hatr ü şer işledik

Uş bahar geldi gerçü göçtük elhamdü lillah," Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf*, second edition, (İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitabevi, 1992), p. 69. Similar themes can be detected in the following poems of Baba Yusuf:

"Ne Şark ü Ğarb kanda kalan şehr-i Endülüs

Mısır'a bir adım Adana, Tabriz Irak değül," *Hakîkînâme*, folio 152b.

"Cihân'un ne vefâsı var bilürsin

Ki işi dâimâ oldı tahavvül

Gözün aç pîr rihlet vakti oldı

İregör menzile itme tesâhül," *Hakîkînâme*, folio 227a.

"Cân olıcak Dımışk-i ışk subhı ola Şam-i bâtinun

It should be noted here that the main source of information for a shaykh who lived in Anatolia of the fifteenth century might have largely benefited from the oral teachings of previous shaykhs and dervishes. Thus, in his works, Baba Yusuf refers to dervishes from whom he heard stories. Most of these dervishes were former disciples of his father, Shaykh Hamîdüddin. Hence, the reader of Baba Yusuf's works gleans clues about the dervish way of life in a particular lodge of the Province of Karaman which has endowed with the memory of a glorious past lived by the former shaykhs. The reader of his works also learns how the community of a certain dervish lodge was saddened by the death of a dervish in the community. As Wolper has argued before, dervish lodges played a significant role in the formation of identity in Anatolia of the Middle Ages.⁷⁶⁸ Stories related to previous shaykhs and dervishes had been narrated in the gatherings under the leadership of a shaykh of a particular lodge. The place where dervishes heard about a story was also important for the identity formation. The dervish lodges were also places in which the teachings of a particular Sufi community were narrated throughout ages.

Apart from oral sources, Baba Yusuf also used written sources while he was composing his works. Baba Yusuf was familiar with the classical Sufi literature.⁷⁶⁹ Writing in Aksaray of the fifteenth century Aksaray, Baba Yusuf felt himself free to wander incessantly in remote corridors of time and space in his works. The reason for his references to different periods of human history and to different cities of the

Kûşe-i Mısır dilde gün ola ki yüz Hama Hamus," Baba Yusuf, *Hakikînâme*, folio 165a.

For further information about Yunus Emre and his era, see Şehabettin Tekindağ, "Büyük Türk Mutasavvıfı Yunus Emre Hakkında Araştırmalar," *Belleten*, vol. 30 (1966), pp. 59-90; Bahaeddin Yedi yıldız, "Yunus Emre Dönemi Türk Vakıfları," in VIII. Vakıf Haftası Kitabı, *Türk Vakıf Medeniyeti Çerçevesinde Yunus Emre ve Dönemi, Restorasyon ve Kıbrıs Vakıfları Semineri, 4-5-9 Aralık 1990*, (Ankara: Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları, 1991), pp. 23-27.

⁷⁶⁸ Wolper, *Cities and Saints*, p. 13.

⁷⁶⁹ See, for example, Baba Yusuf-i Hakikî, *İlmü'l-Meşâyikh*, Süleymâniye Library, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, no. 2974, folio 50b.

Islamic lands can be attributed to vast range of his readings or hearings from the epics of kings to the Sufi classics and to his travels throughout his life.

Baba Yusuf refers to ideal rulers of the *pand-nâma* (advice for kings) literature such as Solomon and Alexander the Great and on the other hand, he mentions cities such as Baghdad, Damascus, and Ardabil and rivers such as the Nile and the Ceyhun in his poems. One of the main themes of his works appears to be the unity of Islamic civilization from the Andalus to Tabriz.⁷⁷⁰ His Sufi affiliations were also in line with his belief in unity of Islamic civilization. In one part of his *divân*, he refers to Ibn al-Arabî and in other parts of his *dîvân* he refers to the shaykhs of Ardabil. What Baba Yusuf saw in the Islamic civilization was the heritage of Sufism. He proposes a Sufi way of life instead of the kind of life pursued by the former kings such as Darius. According to Baba Yusuf, a simple life is the path to felicity whereas being famous like the former sultans or kings culminates in catastrophe.⁷⁷¹ Baba Yusuf also states that the kingship of the world is not desirable thing because even the great kings such as Solomon could not escape death.⁷⁷²

Baba Yusuf devotes a chapter, which is entitled “medh-i dervîşân”, to the praise of dervishes. In that chapter he indicates that dervishes are the sultans of the spiritual world.⁷⁷³ More importantly, according to Baba Yusuf, the prayer of dervishes is the cause of world order: “*Nizâm-i ’âleme küllî sebep du’âlarıdır,*” and

⁷⁷⁰ “Ne Şark ü Ğarb kanda kalan şehr-i Endülüs
Mısr’a bir adım Adana, Tebriz ırak deĝül.” *Hakikînâme*, folio 152b.

⁷⁷¹ “Yıkılır çûn sonra itme dâr-i Dârâ’ya heves
Şöhret çûn âfetdir ferâgat hâsıl eyle bul huzûr.” *Hakikînâme*, folio 152b.

⁷⁷² “Bu mülk imâreti çû Süleyman’a kalmadı.” *Hakikînâme*, folio 252a.
“Kanı mülûk noldı selâtın ki bil yakîn
Bulmadı kimse hiç ecele çâre.” *Hakikînâme*, folio 252b.
“Kanı Hüsrevân-i ’Âdil?” *Hakikînâme*, folio 273b.

⁷⁷³ “Niceye saltanat-i ma’neviyye degmişdür
Ki sâyesinde ânun ol hümadur dervîşler.” *Hakikînâme*, folio 161a.

all sultans are in need of the prayer of dervishes: “*Mîr ü selâtîn du’âsına muhtâc*”.⁷⁷⁴

The terminology such as *nizâm-i ’âlem* (world order) used by Baba Yusuf in his works is reminiscent of the “advice for kings” literature.

Baba Yusuf takes license in referring to different periods of history in the light of Islamic tradition. He does not refer to a specific source while mentioning to a particular episode or a particular person. He frequently gives references to prophets and famous sufis and their stories in the path of divine love.⁷⁷⁵ In his poems Baba Yusuf refers to mythological motives such *simurgh* and the mountain Kaf.⁷⁷⁶ This is not surprising due to the fact that one of Baba Yusuf’s works are Ferideddin Attâr’s *Mantuku’t-Tayr* (*The Conference of Birds*). Baba Yusuf’s references to Attâr will be discussed in relation to a famous follower of Attâr, Celâleddin Rûmî, in the following pages. Here, the question of how Baba Yusuf’s Sufi affiliations are represented in his works will be discussed,

There is a chapter in the *Hakîkînâme* about Hacı Bayram entitled “Medh-i Şeyh Hacı Paşa kaddese’llâhu sırrahû”.⁷⁷⁷ Baba Yusuf calls Hacı Bayram as Hacı Paşa.⁷⁷⁸ Hacı Bayram is called as Hacı Paşa in some other sources such as *Gülzâr-i Ma’nevî* of İbrahim Tennûrî, who was a khalifa of Akşemsetdin.⁷⁷⁹ According to Trimmingham, Hacı Bayram (d. 1429), who was the shaykh of Baba Yusuf, manifested “a strong *Melâmatî* tradition.”⁷⁸⁰ Following his shaykh, Baba Yusuf also

⁷⁷⁴ *Hakîkînâme*, folio 161b.

⁷⁷⁵ “İzzet-i Nûh u Şiş ü Âdem

Dâvud u Nebî, Mûsâ-yı kelîm.” *Hakîkînâme*, folio 244b.

⁷⁷⁶ “Kışver-i Kudsün gülistânına uçuldu yine,

Kim görür simurğ-ı Kâfi, kurbün ol cevelânını.” *Hakîkînâme*, folio 313a.

⁷⁷⁷ *Hakîkînâme*, folios 24a-25a.

⁷⁷⁸ “Künci (?) Sinan Hacı Paşam hazretinden rivâyet ider ki, Şeyh Hacı Paşa buyurdı ki dir: ‘...Hazretî Şeyh eydür ki Monla Hacı, ‘sakın ki mağrûr olmyasın hâ!’ dir. Kendüme gelicek yine Şeyh’ün kemâline îmân getürdüm.” Baba Yusuf, *İlmü’l-Meşâyih*, folio 47b. For other reference to Hacı Paşa, i.e. Hacı Bayram, in the *Treatise on Sufism*, see *İlmü’l-Meşâyikh*, folio 47b.

⁷⁷⁹ Fuat Bayramoğlu, *Hacı Bayram-i Velî, Yaşamı, Soyı, Vakfı*, vol. 1, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1983), pp. 16, 17.

⁷⁸⁰ Trimmingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam*, p. 75.

exhibited *Melâmâtî* inclinations. Baba Yusuf blames himself in various parts of his work being captive to the worldly pleasures in spite of his long age.⁷⁸¹ Was Baba Yusuf a Melâmî-Bayramî? Derin Terzioğlu explains the difficulties Melâmî-Bayramî encountered in the Ottoman Empire as follows:

However, while some Melami-Bayramis took the ideal of *melamet* so far as to conceal their Sufi identity altogether, others functioned within the tekke organization, and were not in appearance distinguishable from regular Bayrami Shaykhs. To make the matters more complicated, after a number of Melâmî-Bayrâmî shaykhs were executed on charges of “heresy” in the sixteenth century, many of their followers established a dual affiliation with one another in order to avoid persecution. In the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Halvetî, Celvetî, and to some extent, the Mevlevî orders provided them refuge, while in the eighteenth century, many Melâmî-Bayramîs held a dual affiliation with the Nakşbandî-Mujaddidîs.⁷⁸²

In the literature on the *Melâmî-Bayramîs*, the case of Baba Yusuf is not analyzed. Although Baba Yusuf manifested strong *Melâmâtî* inclinations in his writings, he was not accused of heresy like the Melâmî-Bayramî shaykhs. Baba Yusuf were among those shaykhs who functioned within the *tekke* (dervish lodge) organization, in line with Terzioğlu’s statement. Indeed, Baba Yusuf criticized the Ottoman rule in Aksaray. However, he was not among the rebels against the Ottoman state. As indicated earlier, Pîr Aliyy-i Aksarayî (d. 1528) was one of the *qutbs* of the Bayramî-Melâmî Order. It seems that Aksaray was one of the centers of this Sufi order. Although Baba Yusuf used *melâmî* inclinations in his works, he did not hesitate to benefit from revenue coming from a foundation established by the approval of the sultan. Unlike most of the followers of the *Melâmî-Bayramîs*, Baba Yusuf was not accused of heresy, as far as we know. Thus, Baba Yusuf can not be viewed as a typical Bayramî-Melâmî.

⁷⁸¹ “Kimseler bencileyin nefsinde olmasın zebûn
Ermiyem avrat mı bu yolda muayyen bilmezem.” *Hakîkînâme*, folio 274b;
“Zünnâr-ı melâmeti kuşan tiz.” *Hakîkînâme*, folio 222a;
“Saç sakal ağardı utanmaz mısın,
Geçti ömrün yine hirsun bayağı.” *Hakîkînâme*, folio 353a;
“Bize hil’at olur melâmet bil.” *Hakîkînâme*, folio 136b.

⁷⁸² Terzioğlu, “Niyazi-i Misrî (1618-1694),” p. 237.

According to the Bayramî sources, Hacı Bayram united in his person the Naqshbandî and Halvetî orders. Thus, the adherents of the Bayramî order used two types of *silsilas* (a list of shaykhs of a particular Sufî order): the Bakrid and the Alid *silsilas*. The former went back to the First Caliph Abû Bakr whereas the latter went back to the Fourth Caliph Ali b. Abû Tâlib.⁷⁸³ In a part of his *dîvân*, *zîkr-i isnâd-i hurka*, Baba Yusuf refers to the shaykhs in the *silsila* of his *tarîqa*.⁷⁸⁴ First of all, this *silsila* is an 'Alid *silsila*.⁷⁸⁵ Among the shaykhs mentioned by Baba Yusuf in the *silsila* are Hasan-i Basrî, Dâvûd-i Tâ'î, Serî Sakatî, Cüneyd-i Bağdâdî, Şiblî, Evhadüddin-i Kirmânî, Baba Yusuf's grandfather, Şemseddin Mûsâ Kayserî, and his father, Şeyh Hamîdüddin. He also refers to Ibn al-Arabî as Şeyh-i Ekber.⁷⁸⁶ In another part of his *dîvân*, he also refers to the *Fusûsü'l-Hikem* (Bezels of Wisdom) of Ibn al-Arabî.⁷⁸⁷ However, no mention has been made about Ibn al-Arabî's famous

⁷⁸³ There were various types of the Bakrid and the Alid *silsilas* in the Bayramî order. Fuat Bayramoğlu explains the issue of the *silsila* in the Bayramî order as follows: "Arşivimizde uzunluğuna düzenlenmiş cönkler gibi, 330x210 m/m. boyutlarında on yaprak halindeki bir defterde kurşun kalemiyle yazılmış Tarikat Silsilenâmeleri arasında Bayramiye Tarikatı'na ilişkin çeşitli silsilenâmeler bulunmaktadır. ...Hacı Bayram-ı Velî, Naqshbandîlik ile Halvetîlik'i bir araya getiren bir kurucu, eski deyimle 'Câmî'-i Naqshbandiyya ve Halvetiye' olmuştur. Bu nedenle, geleneğe göre Bayramiye tarikatının silsilesi bir koldan Bâyezid-i Bistâmî'ye başka koldan da Cüneyd-i Bağdadî'ye çıkar; onlardan da hem Halife Ebû Bekir'e, hem de Hz. Ali'ye ulaşır. Ebû Bekir'den inen Sıddıkî Silsilenâme şöyledir:

1- Ebû Bekir Sıddîk, 2- Selman Farisî, 3- Kasım İbn Muhammed İbn Ebû Bekir, 4- İmam Cafer Sadık, 5-Bâyezid Bistâmî, 6- İbrahim Bistâmî, 7- Şeyh Musa el-Bistâmî, 8- Ebu'l-Hasen Cürcanî, 9- Ahmed Horasanî, 10- Süleyman İsfahanî, 11- Süleyman Buharî, 12- İshak Harezmî, 13- Sadeddin Bağdadî, 14- Mahmud Kerhî, 15- Osman Rumî, 16- Mahmud Basrî, 17- Hasan Esterâbâdî, 18- Süleyman İskenderânî, 19- İbrahim El-Basrî, 20- Şeyh Şâdî Er-Rûmî, 21- Hamîdeddin Aksarayî, 22- Hacı Bayram Velî." Fuat Bayramoğlu, *Hacı Bayram-ı Velî, Yaşamı, Soyu, Vakfı*, vol. 2, *Belgeler*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1983), p. 221.

Alid *silsila* is as follows:

"1- Ali el-Murtazâ, 2- Hasan Basrî, 3- Habib A'cemî, 4- Davud Tâî, 5- Ma'rûf Kerhî, 6- Seriyî Sakatî, 7- Cüneyd Bağdadî, 8- Mîmşâd Dîneverî, 9- Muhammed Dîneverî, 10- Vecîhüddin el-Kadî, 11- Ebu'n-Necîb Suhreverdî, 12- Kutbeddin Ebherî, 13- Rükneddin Muhammed Nahhas El-Buharî, 14- Şehâbeddin Tabrizî, 15- Cemâleddin Şirâzî, 16- İbrahim Zâhid Gîlânî, 17- Safiyüddin Ardabilî, 18- Sadreddin Ardabilî, 19- Alâaddin Ali Ardabilî, 20- Hâmid Hamîdüddin Aksarayî, 21- Hacı Bayram-ı Velî." Fuat Bayramoğlu, *Hacı Bayram-ı Velî, Yaşamı, Soyu, Vakfı*, vol. 2, p. 222.

⁷⁸⁴ *Hakîkînâme*, folios 22b-23a.

⁷⁸⁵ "Ez Ali kerremellahu veche-i üst

Şâh-i merdân-i dîn ü şîr-i veğâ." *Hakîkînâme*, folio 23a.

⁷⁸⁶ *Hakîkînâme*, folio 23a.

⁷⁸⁷ *Hakîkînâme*, folio 165a.

follower, Sadreddin Konevî. Another famous Sufi Master of the Karamanid lands, Ahmed Fakih, is not mentioned in Baba Yusuf's works.

It is obvious that Baba Yusuf had a broad Sufi outlook, sharing common principles with various Sufi orders such as Safavids, Mevlevîs, Naqshbandîs, Zeynîs and Halvetîs. Baba Yusuf might have been affiliated with the Bayramî Order. According to Bursalı Mehmed Tahir, Baba Yusuf was trained in the Sufi path by Hacı Bayram-ı Velî after his father's death.⁷⁸⁸ Since Baba Yusuf's shaykh was Hacı Bayram, the founder of the Bayramî order, Baba Yusuf might be viewed as a follower of Bayramî order. In spite of such affiliation, Baba Yusuf referred to the works of the shaykhs of the other Sufi orders such as Celâleddin Rûmî Shaykh Safi and Zeynüddin Hafî.

According to Mikail Bayram, Baba Yusuf gave the name of Evhadüddin to his son due to his respect towards Evhadüddin Kirmani.⁷⁸⁹ In the *Treatise on Sufism*, which is also known *İlmü'l-Meşâyikh* or *Tasavvuf Risâlesi*, Baba Yusuf quotes a poem from Evhadüddin Kirmanî.⁷⁹⁰ Thus, it would not be wrong to assume that the works of Kirmânî were also a source of information for Baba Yusuf. Baba Yusuf also named his other son Safî, perhaps due to his respect for Shaykh Safiyyüddin of Ardabil.

In Baba Yusuf's works, references are made to previous famous shaykhs such as Bayezid-i Bistamî, Zünnûn-i Mısrî, Hakîm Senâ'î, Ferîdeddin Muhammed Attâr, Necmeddin Dâye, Celâleddin Rûmî, Evhadüddin Kirmânî, and Yunus Emre.⁷⁹¹ It

⁷⁸⁸ Bursalı Mehmed Tâhir, *Osmanlı Müellifleri*, vol. 1, (Ankara: Bizim Büro Basımevi, 2000), p. 196.

⁷⁸⁹ Mikail Bayram, *Şeyh Evhadüddin Kirmani ve Menâkıbnâmesi*, (İstanbul: Kardelen Yayınları, 2005), p. 87.

⁷⁹⁰ Baba Yusuf-i Hakîkî, *İlmü'l-Meşâyikh*, folio 30a.

⁷⁹¹ When we read his *Treatise on Sufism*, we realize that Baba Yusuf has an inclusive attitude towards other orders and Sufi Masters. Çavuşoğlu mentions the list of shaykhs included by Baba Yusuf in the *Treatise on Sufism*: Necmeddin Dâye, Şeyh Evhadüddin Kirmânî, Şeyh Attâr, Yunus Emre, İmam Cafer-i Sadık, Şeyh Safî, Salahaddin-i Reşid, Bayezid, Zünnûn, Şiblî, Hoca Ebdülmelik Serâvî, Cemâleddin Ali, Şeyh Zâhid, Ahî Ferec-i Zengânî, Hoca Sadreddin, Necmeddin-i Kübrâ, Sultan Hoca

seems that he was familiar with famous Sufi masters' works and hagiographical works about them. For instance, in the *Treatise of Sufism*, he refers to *Hakâyik al-Tefsîr* of Abû 'Abd al-Rahman al-Sulamî (d. 412/1021) as "*Hakâik-i Sülemî*".⁷⁹² According to Knysh, al-Sulamî's legacy may be examined under there main categories: "Sufi biographies, commentaries on the Qur'an, and treatises on the Sufi ethics and customs".⁷⁹³ Thus, it is not strange that the reader comes across the name of al-Sulamî in a treatise on the Sufi ethics that was composed by Baba Yusuf.

It seems that Baba Yusuf was also familiar with the *âdâb* (books of rules), literature of the Sufî authors.⁷⁹⁴ In his article on the *Âdâb al-Murîdîn* of Necmeddin Kübrâ (d. 618/1221), Fritz Meier makes an interesting analogy between the monastic orders and Sufism: "Just as the whole life in the monastic orders fundamentally came to be subjected to *regulae, constitutiones* and *consuetudines*, so the whole of Sufism

Ali, Kösece Şeyh Ömer, Hacı Paşa, Künci Sinan, Cemâleddin Urmevî, Şeyh Zeyneddin Hafî and Şeyh Safiyyüddin. See Çavuşoğlu, *Tasavvuf Risâlesi*, p. 15n.

⁷⁹² *İlmü 'l-Meşâyikh*, folio 50b.

⁷⁹³ Alexander Knysh, *Islamic Mysticism*, p. 127. Knysh devotes three pages to the life and works of Al-Sulamî in a book of general history of Sufism. Knysh explains the significance of al-Sulamî and his works in the history of Sufism as follows: "In view of al-Sulamî's great importance for Sufi history, his personality and literary work merit a close examination. He was born at Nishapur in 325/937 or 330/942 to a family of wealthy Arab settlers....An avid student of *hadîth*, al-Sulamî traveled widely throughout Khurasan and Iraq in search of renowned *muhaddithûn*, visiting Merv and Baghdad for extended periods of time....When al-Sulamî returned to Nishapur about 368/978, his teacher Ismâ'il b. Nujayd had passed away, leaving him a substantial sum of money, a house and a library. The house and the library soon became the center of a small Sufi lodge (*duwayra*) in the quarter of the town known as *sikkat al-Nawand*. There al-Sulamî spent the remaining forty years of his life as a resident scholar, paying visits to Baghdad on a number of occasions. Towards the end of his life, he was highly respected throughout Khurasan as a Shâfî'i man of learning and the author of numerous Sufi manuals. Upon his death, al-Sulamî was buried in the Sufi lodge he had established....His principal commentary on the Qur'an, "The Truths of Qur'an Interpretation" (*Haqâ'iq al-tafsîr*), is a voluminous collection of exegetical discourses attributed to the early Sufi masters. Based on the selections from the Qur'an commentaries by such Sufis as Ibn 'Atâ' (d. 309/922), al-Wâsitî, al-Tustarî, al-Kharrâz and al-Junayd, this work represents the first concerted attempt to put the art of esoteric exegesis firmly on the Muslim intellectual map. From then on, allegorical interpretation of the Muslim Scripture became integral to the Sufi tradition alongside biographical, pedagogical and ethical literature." Knysh, pp. 125-127.

⁷⁹⁴ For the historical background of the *âdâb* literature, see Halil İnalçık, "Turkish and Iranian Political Theories and Traditions in Kutadgu Bilig," in *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire*, (Indiana: Bloomington, 1993), pp. 1-18.

came to be under *âdâb*.”⁷⁹⁵ Among the authors of *âdâb* works, Baba Yusuf seems to influenced Necmeddin Dâye and Dâye’s shaykh, Necmeddin Kübrâ.

Necmeddin Ebûbekir ibn Muhammed el-Râzî (573/1177-654/1256), known as Necmeddin Dâye, occupies a significant place in the *Treatise on Sufism*. On the first page of the *İlmü’l-Meşâyikh*, known as the *Treatise on Sufism*, the reader comes across the name of Dâye.⁷⁹⁶ In another page of the same work, Baba Yusuf quotes from Dâye when he discusses the importance of dreams in terms of the relationships between a shaykh and dervishes. Dâye is claimed to have said that the Perfect Man should be the one who knows how to interpret dreams.⁷⁹⁷ It seems that Baba Yusuf was a close reader of Dâye’s works, for the reader comes across many references to Dâye in Baba Yusuf’s works.⁷⁹⁸ Dâye was a disciple of Necmeddin Kübrâ (d. 1221). Dâye’s shaykh, Necmeddin Kübrâ, is also mentioned by Baba Yusuf.⁷⁹⁹ Under the threat of the Mongols, Dâye fled to Malatya in 618/1221. In the year 620/1223, he composed the *Mirsâd al-’Ibâd Min al-Mabda’ ila’l-Ma’âd* (“The Path of God’s Servants from the Beginning until the Return to Him”, which is “the most celebrated of Dâye’s works”).⁸⁰⁰ Dâye finally settled in Konya where he met Celaleddin Rûmî and Sadreddin Konevî. According to Cahen, Dâye’s fame in Asia Minor is demonstrated by “the number of manuscripts of the *Mirsâd* still found in Turkish

⁷⁹⁵ Fritz Meier, “A Book of Etiquette for Sufis”, in *Essays on Islamic Piety and Mysticism by Fritz Meier*, tr. John O’Kane, (Leiden, Boston, and Köln: E. J. Brill, 1999), p. 53.

⁷⁹⁶ Baba Yusuf’s two works, namely *Metâli’u’l-Îmân* and *İlmü’l-Meşâyih*, are kept in one manuscript volume. *Metâli’u’l-Îmân*, which consists of 26 folios, is a translation of Ahî Evren’s work. *İlmü’l-Meşâyih* or the *Treatise on Sufism* begins with the folio 26a. On that page, Baba Yusuf stresses the need to be in service of the shaykhs and he cites a passage from Dâye. Necmeddin Dâye is said to have told that Moses served Shu’ayb for ten years in the initial stage of his spiritual progress: “Necmü Dâye rahmetü’l-lâhi ‘aleyh dir ki: ‘Mûsâ ‘aleyhisselâm kemâl-i mertebe-i nübüvvetle ve derece-i risâlet-i ülü’l-’azm ile hâl-i bidâyetde on yıl Şu’ayb ‘aleyhisselâm hizmetinde mülâzemet itdi.” *İlmü’l-Meşâyikh*, folio 26b.

⁷⁹⁷ Baba Yusuf, *İlmü’l-Meşâyikh*, folio 28a.

⁷⁹⁸ See, for instance, *İlmü’l-Meşâyikh*, folios 28a, 29a, 41b, 42b, 43b, 48b.

⁷⁹⁹ Baba Yusuf, *İlmü’l-Meşâyikh*, folio 42a.

⁸⁰⁰ Muhammad Isa Waley, “Najm al-Dîn Kubrâ and the Central Asian School of Sufism (The Kubrawiyyah)”, in *Islamic Spirituality, Manifestations*, vol. 2, p. 92.

libraries”, and by “the fact that a Turkish translation of it was later made”⁸⁰¹. Dâye was also the author of the *Bahru’l-Haqâ’iq (The Ocean of Divine Realities)*, “an esoteric commentary on the Qur’an.”⁸⁰² Aflâkî states that during his stay at Tabriz with Ârif Çelebi, Mevlânâ Şehâbeddin Mu’îd gave Çelebi a “manuscript of the Qur’anic commentary of Shaykh Necmeddin Dâye” as a gift to Çelebi.⁸⁰³ According to Aflâkî, the Qur’anic commentary of Dâye was the “stock-in-trade of the investigators of the Qur’an (*sermâye-i muhakkikân-i Qur’an*).”⁸⁰⁴ Aflâkî further indicates that Ârif Çelebi bestowed this manuscript on the “King of Preachers, Mevlânâ Alâeddin-i Kastamoniyye.”⁸⁰⁵ With pride, Aflâkî adds: “A manuscript of this commentary had not yet existed in the realms of Rûm. Through the blessing of this sultan (Çelebi) it became widespread in these realms.”⁸⁰⁶ As understood from this story, Dâye was one of those Sufi authors venerated in the Mevlevî circles.

According to Browne, there were the “three great mystical *mesnevî* writers of Persia”: Sanâ’î of Ghazna or Balkh, Shaykh Ferîdeddin Attâr and Celâleddin Rûmî.⁸⁰⁷ S. H. Nasr and L. Matini also assert that Persian Sufi poetry reached its peak in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries with the works of Sanâ’î, Attâr, and Rûmî.⁸⁰⁸ Baba Yusuf refers to these three mystical *mesnevî* writers in his works.⁸⁰⁹ In

⁸⁰¹ Claude Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 257-258. Aflâ

⁸⁰² Muhammad Isa Waley, “Najm al-Dîn Kubrâ and the Central Asian School of Sufism (The Kubrawiyyah),” p. 90.

⁸⁰³ Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 652.

⁸⁰⁴ Aflâkî, *Manâkib al-’Ârifîn*, vol. 2, p. 933; Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 652.

⁸⁰⁵ *Manâkib al-’Ârifîn*, p. 933; *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 652.

⁸⁰⁶ *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 652.

⁸⁰⁷ Edward G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia, vol. II, From Firdawsi to Sa’di (1000-1290)*, Maryland: Iran Books, 1997 (firstly published in 1902), p. 317. Victoria Rowe Holbrook defines the term *mesnevî* as follows: “The term *mesnevî* names a genre of verse: narrative poetry in couplets, each two lines of which rhyme together”, Victoria Rowe Holbrook, *The Unreadable Shores of Love, Turkish Modernity and Mystic Romance*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994, p. 8.

⁸⁰⁸ S. H. Nasr and J. Matini, “Persian Literature,” in *Islamic Spirituality, Manifestations*, vol. 2, 328-349: 336.

⁸⁰⁹ See, for instance, *İlmü’l-Meşâyikh*, folios 28a, 45a. Baba Yusuf also mentions Senâ’î in his *dîvân*: “Şehr-i ışka çün Senâyî ol Hakîkî şehriyâr.” *Hakîkînâme*, folio 108b. Both Senâ’î and Attâr were the main sources of Celâleddin Rûmî’s works. Arberry explains how Attâr met Rûmî in Nishapur as follows: “Bahâeddin [Rûmî’s father] made his way first to Nishapur, all too soon to share the horrible

the *Mahabbetnâme* (Book of Love) Baba Yusuf calls Attâr “Şâh-i dîn” (Shah of religion).⁸¹⁰ As noted earlier, Baba Yusuf seems to a close reader of Attâr’s *Mantuku’t-Tayr* (Conference of Birds).⁸¹¹ Celâleddin Rûmî, one of the most renowned followers of Senâ’î and Attâr, has also been venerated as an author by Baba Yusuf. In the *Treatise on Sufism*, Baba Yusuf refers to Celâleddin Rûmî as Hazret-i Molla and quotes frequently from the *Mesnevî*.⁸¹² Baba Yusuf also offers an interesting quotation from the *Fîhi Mâ Fîh* (“Discourses”) of Celâleddin Rûmî in relation to Mecnûn’s love for Leylâ. According to Arberry, the romance of Leylâ and Mecnûn is cited frequently by Sufis as a “prototype of perfect devotion.”⁸¹³ Baba Yusuf’s quotation from *Fîhi Mâ Fîh* serves the same aim. After quoting this story, Baba Yusuf suggests to his reader how the story shows perfect devotion to the love of the shaykh:

fate of Balkh, and there called upon the venerable poet and mystic Ferîdeddin ‘Attâr...Ferîdeddin ‘Attâr recognizing in Celâleddin the signs of spiritual greatness, presented him with a copy of his *Asrâr-nâma* (“Book of Secrets”), an important poem of mystical life which Rûmî studied deeply and from which he was delighted in later years often to quote.” *Discourses of Rûmî*, tr. A. J. Arberry, p. 3.

⁸¹⁰ “Taleb sermayesi ehl-i tarîkun
Taleb pîrâyesi ehl-i tarîkun

Taleb tâliblerin bil devletidür
Efendi mezhebi vü milletidür

Sevenler Hâlik’i olmaz talebsüz
Talebdeb el çeken mürted edebsüz

Dimişdür şâh-i dîn ol Şeyh Attâr
Hüdâ rûhını itsün ğark-i envâr”, Ali Çavuşoğlu, “Yusuf Hakîkî’nin Mahabbet-nâme Adlı Eserinin Tenkitli Metni ve İncelenmesi,” 2002), beyit no. 3125-3128.

⁸¹¹ “Çü şehbâz idicek ol ‘âlemi seyr
Sana ma’lûm ola bu *Mantuku’t-tayr*

Dahî sen kûh-i Kâf’a irmemişsin
Süleyman yüzini hem görmemişsin.

Süleyman hem degülsin saltanatda
Bil imdi mertebendür meskenetde,” Ali Çavuşoğlu, “Yusuf Hakîkî’nin Mahabbet-nâme Adlı Eserinin Tenkitli Metni ve İncelenmesi,” p. 189.

“*Mantuku’t-tayr*’ı ‘acebdür sen eger bilürsen,” *Hakîkînâme*, folio 327b.

⁸¹² Baba Yusuf, *İlmü’l-Meşâyikh*, folios 30a, 34a, 40b, 41a, 42a, 46a, 49b. According to Hollbrook, the *Mesnevî* of Rûmî is the most widely known book in the Islamic world after the Qur’an. For more information, see Victoria Rowe Holbrook, *The Unreadable Shores of Love*, p. 17.

⁸¹³ *Discourses of Rûmî*, p. 248.

Fîhi Mâ Fîh'de eydür: "Ol zamânun hûbların bir yire cem' itdiler. Dahî Mecnûn'a eytdiler: 'Hak Te'âlâ kemâl-i kudretinden kürre-i 'âlemde neler yaratmışdır!'. Mecnûn başın kaldurub birine nazar itmedi, dir. Eytdiler: 'Hey, işbu hûblara bir nazar itsene!'. Mecnûn eyidi: 'Leylî mahabbeti bir tîğ-i bürrân üstüme dutmuşdur. Başumı kaldurmağa korharam ki boynum ura' ". Mürîd tâ şeyhün vilâyet-i cemâline 'âşık olub saltanat-i vilâyeti, siyâseti gönline eser itmeyince münâsebet-i ma'nevî hâsıl olub şeyhün bâtnından mürîde meded yitişmez.⁸¹⁴

The *Fîhi Mâ Fîh* of Rûmî has been translated into English as *Discourses of Rûmî* by A. J. Arberry, the story of Leylâ and Mecnûn that has been narrated by Baba Yusuf is included in the *Discourses of Rûmî*. There are some minor differences in the details of the story:

It is related that a certain king summoned Mecnûn before him.

'What has happened to you and what has befallen you?' he enquired. 'You have disgraced yourself, forsaken your hearth and home, become wasted and utterly destroyed. What is Leylâ? What beauty is hers? I will show you many beautiful and lovely girls, make them your ransom and bestow them upon you.'

When they had been brought to court, Mecnûn and the lovely girls were duly introduced. Mecnûn kept his head cast down, staring in front of him.

'Well now, lift up your head and look!' the king commanded.

'I am afraid,' Mecnûn replied. 'My love for Leylâ is a drawn sword. If I raise my heard, it will strike it off.'

Mecnûn had become so immersed in his love for Leylâ. After all, the other girls also had eyes and lips and noses. What then had he beheld in her, to come to such a state?⁸¹⁵

⁸¹⁴ Baba Yusuf, *İlmü'l-Meşâyikh*, folio 48b. In the Turkish translation of the *Fîhi Mâ Fîh* that has been undertaken by a Mevlevî dervish, Ahmed Avni Konuk (1868-1938), the story of Leylâ and Mecnûn that had been quoted by Baba Yusuf appears as follows: "Mervîdir ki: Pâdişah Mecnûn'u ihzâr etti ve ona dedi: 'Sana ne olmuştur ki, kendini rüsvây ettin ve hânümândan geçip harâb ve fenâ oldun? Leylâ ne oluyor ve onun ne güzelliği vardır? Gel sana güzeller ve zarîf dilberler göstereyim ve sana fedâ edip ihsân edeyim.' Vaktâki dilberleri ihzâr eylediler ve onlar Mecnûn'a güzel güzel cilveler ettiler; Mecnûn başını eğmiş, önüne bakar idi. Pâdişah buyurdu: 'Ay oğul, başını kaldırıp baksan a!' Mecnûn cevap verdi: 'Leylâ'nın aşkı kılıç çekmiştir, korkuyorum; eğer başımı kaldırırsam, o kılıcı başıma vurur.' Mevlânâ Celâleddin Rûmî, *Fîhi Mâ Fîh*, tr. Ahmed Avni Konuk, ed. Selçuk Eraydın, (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 1994), pp. 49-50.

⁸¹⁵ *Discourses of Rûmî*, tr. A. J. Arberry, p. 63. There is also another story which is similar to that story in the *Discourses of Rûmî*: "In Mecnûn's time there were many girls more beautiful than Leylâ, but they were not loved of Mecnûn. 'There are girls more beautiful than Leylâ,' they used to tell Mecnûn. 'Let us bring some to you.' 'Well,' Mecnûn would reply, 'I do not love Leylâ after form. Leylâ is not form. Leylâ in my hand is like a cup; I drink wine out of that cup. So I am in love with the wine which I drink out of it. You have eyes only for the beaker, and are unaware of the wine. If I had a golden beaker studded with precious stones, and in the beaker there were vinegar or something else other than wine, of what use would that be to me? An old broken gourd in which there is wine is better in my eyes than such a goblet and a hundred like it.' " *Discourses of Rûmî*, p. 83.

6.7 Baba Yusuf and the advice literature in the Seljukid, Beylik and the Ottoman Periods

Most of the Sufi orders began to be patronized by the begs and sultans from the twelfth century onwards. For instance, in Ayyubid Syria, Sufi edifices evolved under the patronage of princes. The Ayyubid Sultan Nûr al-Dîn, who was called “al-Zâhid” (the ascetic), built three lodges in Aleppo in the last quarter of the twelfth century. According to Wolper, “the grandeur of Aleppo’s Sufi buildings” led Ibn Jubayr to write that “these Sufis are the Kings of the land, for God has spared them the trouble of getting provisions and cleared their minds for His worship.”⁸¹⁶ This intense building activity of the Sufis even led some *ulemâ* to criticize dervish lodges as centers of extravagance. The Hanbalî scholar Ibn al-Jawzî (d. 597/1200) regarded dervish lodges (*khanqâhs*) of Baghdad as “decorated palaces”.⁸¹⁷ Wolper maintains that the cities of Aleppo and Baghdad in the twelfth century were similar to Cairo in the fourteenth century in terms of experiencing the growing popularity of Sufis.⁸¹⁸ The reason behind the *ulemâ*’s criticism of Sufis was the expenditures of the Sufi institutions as a result of the growing popularity of Sufis. Increasing expenditures for Sufi buildings meant decreasing funds for the *madrasas*. Wolper further asserts that some prominent *ulemâ* even tried to enjoy residence in dervish lodges instead of *madrasas* due to the fact that the standard of living in dervish lodges gained momentum in these centers of Islamic civilization.⁸¹⁹ The rise of dervish lodges as

⁸¹⁶ Wolper, *Cities and Saints*, p. 24.

⁸¹⁷ Wolper, p. 24.

⁸¹⁸ Wolper, p. 25.

⁸¹⁹ Wolper, p. 25. Mircea Eliade explains the response of the *ulemâ* to the growing popularity of Sufis, as follows: “Although obliged to tolerate Sufism, the *ulemâ* continued to watch out for foreign elements, especially Iranian and Gnostic ones which, through the teachings of certain Sufi masters, threatened what the Doctors of the Law regarded as the unity of Islam...The response of the *ulemâ* was the multiplication of the *madrasas*, the colleges for theological education with their official status and salaried professors. By the eighth/fourteenth century, the hundreds of *madrasas* had concentrated

centers of extravagance also led some Sufis to criticize the practices of dervishes. Among such Sufis who criticized the dervishes was Baba Yusuf of Aksaray.

Baba Yusuf's expansive knowledge can easily be detected in his works. This quality can also be observed in the works of some other Sufi masters. For instance, Derin Terzioğlu explains the nature of Abdülmecid Sivasî's works as follows:

Among the writers examined here Sivasî is the only one whose writerly identity was not circumscribed by his Sufi one. His writings do not easily fit one genre, but exhibit features of a variety of genres from *'akâ'id* books, expounding the basic teachings of Islam, to the mirrors-for-princes literature; they also testify to his broad field of expertise and interest.⁸²⁰

Like Sivasî, Baba Yusuf was also interested in *akâ'id* and translated Ahi Evren's *Metâli'ul-Îman* into Turkish.⁸²¹ Although Baba Yusuf did not write an autonomous book in the genre of the mirrors-for-princes literature, his criticisms towards the society of his time is reminiscent of the advice literature. Fleischer indicates two types of advice literature. The first type is the Persian "mirror for princes," the example of which was the *Âsafnâme* of Lütfi Paşa. The second type was "ethics" (*ahlâk*) literature, "the Islamicized version of Platonic and Aristotelian political philosophy which was given its classical Ottoman form by Kınalızade Ali Çelebi (d. 1572) in his *Ahlâk-i 'Alâ'î*."⁸²² Baba Yusuf's works can be viewed as closer to ethics literature. However, the intended audience of Baba Yusuf was not the sultan or high authorities of the state, as was the general case for advice literature. As indicated earlier, the audience Baba Yusuf had in mind seems to be ordinary dervishes, particularly those belonging to the Bayramî Order.

the control of higher education in the hands of the theologians." Mircea Eliade, *A History of Religious Ideas*, vol. 3 (*From Muhammad to the Age of Reforms*), tr. Alf Hiltebeitel, Diane Apostolos-Cappadona, (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1985), p. 150.

⁸²⁰ Terzioğlu, "Niyazi-i Misrî (1618-1694)," p. 258.

⁸²¹ Mikail Bayram, "Anadolu Selçukluları Zamanında Evhadî Dervişler" in *Türkiye Selçukluları Üzerine Araştırmalar*, (Konya: Kömen Yayınları, 2003), p. 81.

⁸²² Cornell H. Fleischer, "From Şeyhzade Korkud to Mustafa Âli: Cultural Origins of the Ottoman Pand-nâma," in *IIIrd Congress on the Social and Economic History of Turkey, Princeton University, 24-26 August 1983*, ed. Heath W. Lowry, Ralph S. Hattox, İstanbul: the ISIS Pres, 1990, p. 69.

It seems that Baba Yusuf was familiar with two types of ethics literature: those written for the Sufis and those written for kings. As it has been pointed out before, Baba Yusuf refers to Necmeddin Kübrâ and Necmeddin Dâye in his works. Both of these Sufi scholars were the authors of works of ethics. On the other hand, Baba Yusuf was also familiar with the *Shahnama* of Firdawsî. What follows is a discussion of both types of ethics literature with particular reference to political and social criticism in such types of works.

As understood from the works of Baba Yusuf, he was familiar with Firdawsî's *Shahnâma*. He refers to some of the kings mentioned in the *Shahnâma* such as Feridun, Rustem, Keyhusrev, Alexander the Great and Darius.⁸²³ Apart from the kings mentioned in the *Shahnâma*, Baba Yusuf also refers to the ideal rulers in the advice literature such as Solomon, Lokman, Alexander the Great and Anushirewan.⁸²⁴ Nevertheless, it would be wrong to assume that Baba Yusuf had extensive knowledge about these kings. He does not go beyond mentioning the names of the famous kings in order to remind his reader of the vanity of all human efforts to escape death.

Baba Yusuf distinguishes two types of kingship. One is the sultans of the world and the other is the sultans of both worlds. He asserts that ultimately there is no value in becoming a world ruler.⁸²⁵ Thus, he suggests for his reader to be in

⁸²³ In some of his poems, Baba Yusuf refers to heroes of the *Shahnama* of Firdawsî. The following verses can be cited as an example:

“Kim olur Rüstem-i destan önünde

Yana Sâm u Nerîmân cân önünde.” Ali Çavuşoğlu, “Yusuf Hakîkî'nin Mahabbet-nâme Adlı Eserinin Tenkitli Metni ve İncelenmesi”, p. 163.

“İskender devleti yohsula degmez.” Baba Yusuf, *Hakîkînâme*, folio 137b.

“Kanı Keyhüsrev ü Dârâ vü Feridun?” Baba Yusuf, *Hakîkînâme*, folio 183a.

For the *Shahnâma* of Firdawsî, see Ferdowsî, *Shah-nama, The Epic of Kings*, tr. Reuben Levy, ed. Amin Banani, London: Arkana, 1990.

⁸²⁴ See, for instance, *Hakîkînâme*, folios 137b, 147b.

⁸²⁵ “Hükm idenler cihâna kanı yâ şol

Pâdişâhlar ki eyledi hanlık?” *Hakîkînâme*, folio 200b.

service of the sultans of the eternal world, i.e. the shaykhs.⁸²⁶ There is a chapter entitled “Concerning the Wayfaring of Kings and the Lords of Commands” in the *Mirsâd al-’Ibâd* of Necmeddin Dâye, which was perhaps one of the main sources of Baba Yusuf’s works. In that chapter, Dâye also distinguishes two types of kingship: “kings of the world” and ‘kings of religion.’⁸²⁷

As indicated earlier, the Ottoman scholars composed works in the genre of the *mir’âtü’l- mülûk* or *mir’ât-i mülûk* (mirror for princes) . Among the earlier ones in this genre is Ahmed bin Hüsâmeddin Amâsî’s book entitled *Kitâb-i Mir’âtü’l- Mülûk* (The Book of Mirror for Princes).⁸²⁸ This book was submitted to Sultan Mehmed I (r. 1413- 1421). As its title implies, this work was written in the genre of “mirror for princes.” A common theme of this literature is the importance of justice for the maintenance of law and order. They see the just ruler as the greatest gift of God to the subjects.

Şehzâde Korkud (d. 1513), the son of Ottoman Sultan Bayezid II (r. 1481- 1512), is critical of the Ottoman society in his work entitled *Da’wat al-nafs al-tâliha ilâ al-’a’ mâl al-sâliha* (“The Erring Soul’s Summons to Virtuous Works”): “In the cities Muslims are lax in performing ablution, in the countryside the peasants neglect prayer and are ignorant of the most basic requirements of the law, and the political authorities do nothing to enforce prayer or fasting during Ramadan”⁸²⁹. Korkud accuses the qadis of “violating the shari’a by collecting illegal fees and accepting stipends from the state which often derive from illicit sources, including *timar*

⁸²⁶ “Pes eger nefis eger halk her ne ki tâlibe pây-bend ola ve şeyh hizmetine mâni’ ola; gerekdür ki irâdet bâzûsı kuvvetiyle kat’ eyleye. Tâ devlet-i fakrdan mahrûm kalmaya ki iki cihân devletinden mahrûmlıkdur.” *İlmü’l-Meşâyikh*, folio 50a.

⁸²⁷ Najm-al-Dîn Râzî Dâye, *The Path of God’s Bondmen from Origin to Return (Mersâd al-’ebâd men al-mabdâ’ elâ’l-ma’âd)*, tr. Hamid Algar, (New York: Caravan Books, 1982), p. 396.

⁸²⁸ For the transcription and interpretation of the text, see M. Şakir Yılmaz, “Political Thought in the Beginning of the Ottoman Empire as expressed in Ahmed bin Hüsameddin Amasî’s *Kitâb-i Mir’âtü’l-Mülûk*”, *unpublished M.A. thesis*, (Ankara: Department of History, Bilkent University, 1998).

⁸²⁹ Cornell H. Fleischer, “From Şeyhzade Korkud to Mustafa Âlî,” pp. 70-71.

grants”. Korkud also criticizes state control of the learned establishment which has made the *ulemâ* “more concerned to ingratiate themselves with the political authorities and gain high position than to uphold the moral and intellectual standards of their profession”⁸³⁰. As it will be discussed later, such kind of criticisms toward the religious establishment can be detected in Baba Yusuf’s works.

Kınalızâde (1510-1572) wrote his book *Ahlâk-ı Alâ’î*⁸³¹ on behalf of Ali Pasha, the governor of Syria, in 1564. According to Fleischer, this work is an expanded adaptation of *Ahlâk-i Jelâlî* of Jelâleddin Davânî (d. 1502). The *Ahlâk-i Jelâlî* is itself based on *Ahlâk-i Nâsirî* of Nasreddin Tûsî, the prominent forerunner of the philosophical ethics tradition.⁸³² The *Ahlâk-i ‘Alâ’î* of Kınalızâde consists of three books (*kitâb*): 1- ethics (*‘ilm-i ahlâk*), 2- economics (*‘ilm-i tedbîri’l-menzil*), 3- politics (*‘ilm-i tedbîri’l-medîne*). Nevertheless, the last part of the second book is also related to politics. In the last section of the second book and in the third book, Kınalızâde deals with the qualities necessary for an ideal ruler. It is not a coincidence that the first book of Kınalızâde deal with ethics. Unlike Kınalızâde, Baba Yusuf did not deal with economics and politics in a systematic way. However, most of Baba Yusuf’s works can be viewed as a kind of work of ethics written for dervishes.

Baba Yusuf was critical of not only the Ottoman occupation but also the society in which he lived. Baba Yusuf begins his translation of the *Metâli’u’l-Îmân* (Manifestations of Belief), by asserting that the essence of Islamic belief did not survive in his time. Thus, he dedicated himself to a translation of the *Metâli’u’l-Îman*

⁸³⁰ Cornell H. Fleischer, “From Şeyhzade Korkud to Mustafa Âlî: Cultural Origins of the Ottoman *Pand-nâma*”, p. 72.

⁸³¹ Kınalızâde Ali Çelebi, *Ahlâk-i ‘Alâ’î*, 3 vol.s, (Bulaq, 1248).

⁸³² Cornell H. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: the Historian Mustafa Âlî (1541-1600)*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), p. 100.

to remind the dervishes of his time how the previous Sufis lived according to the teachings of Islam:

*Dîn esâsı münhedim, îmân güneşi küsûfa yüz tutdı ve İslâm nûrı ğurbet zâviyesinde mütevârî oldı.*⁸³³

In the same work, Baba Yusuf refers to a saying of the Prophet Muhammad indicating that the Last Day was coming due to the disorder and turmoil in the society:

*Pes her vakt husûsâ bunun gibi asırda ki “inde fesâdi ümmetî” buyurduĝu rûzigârdur.*⁸³⁴

Having pointed out the problematic nature of his time, Baba Yusuf indicates that he translated the *Metâli’u’l-Îmân* into Turkish in order to be easily read by dervishes. However, he does not indicate who was the author of the original text:

*Bu lem’aya ki Metâli’u’l-Îmân tesmiye kıldı. Hâdim-i fukarâ Yûsuf bin Hâmid bin Mûsâ tercüme kıldı. Tâliblere âsân olmaĝıçün. Emma elfâz u ’ibârâtın tebdil ve taĝyir itmedi.*⁸³⁵

In the *Mahabbetnâme*, Baba Yusuf perceives the age in which he lived as a strange time. He was uneasy about the abundance of ignorant people in the society:

*’Acebdür şimdi hali rûzgârın
Yumup ĝaflet gözin Türk’ün Tatar’un*

*Ki her yirde görürsin cem’-i cühhâl
İder mü’minler ile ceng-i deccâl*

*Ki her yirde begüm ehl-i fesâdı
Görürsin emre olmaz inkıyâdı*⁸³⁶

One of the themes frequently stressed by Baba Yusuf in his works is “*fitne-i âhir zaman*” (turmoil of the last episode of world).⁸³⁷ In a chapter entitled “*der-*

⁸³³ Baba Yusuf, *Metâli’u’l-Îmân*, folio 1b.

⁸³⁴ *Metâli’u’l-Îmân*, folios 2a, 2b.

⁸³⁵ *Metâli’u’l-Îmân*, folio 2b. According to Mikail Bayram, the original author of the *Metâli’u’l-Îmân* was Shaykh Nasirüddin Mahmud al-Hoyî, who was known as Ahî Evren. See Ahî Evren (Şeyh Nasirüddin Mahmud al-Hoyî), *Îmânın Boyutları (Metâli’u’l-Îmân)*, Konya: Damla Ofset, 1996, pp. 35-36.

⁸³⁶ Ali Çavuşoĝlu, “Yusuf Hakikî’nin Mahabbet-nâme Adlı Eserinin Tenkitli Metni ve İncelenmesi,” p. 135.

⁸³⁷ Baba Yusuf, *Hakikînâme*, folio 202a.

şikâyet-i ahvâl-i halk-i rûzgâr” in his *dîvân* he criticizes the people of his time. One of the themes observed in Baba Yusuf’s verses is the theme of loneliness and separation from the former shaykhs, especially his father, Shaykh Hamîdüddin. Such feelings led him to perceive his time as a time of disorder and decadence:

*Ĝarîb bî-kesüz ğurbetde kalduk
Nidevüz bilmezüz hayretde kalduk*

*Gidelden âh şâhân u ‘azîzân
Düşüb toprağa uş zilletde kalduk*

*Dirîğâ hânedanlar kaldı hâlî
Zamân-i fitne vü fetretde kalduk*⁸³⁸

Upon the death of his brother, Halil Baba, Baba Yusuf wrote a *mersiyye* (elegy) about him entitled “*Mersiyye-i Halil Baba.*”⁸³⁹ This section is one of the moving and fluent parts of his *dîvân*. In the *mersiyye*, he expresses his longing for the company of Halil Baba in the gatherings of dervishes (*Kanı ol sohbet ol cem’iyyet-i ihvân Halil Baba?*).⁸⁴⁰ In that part, he also views his era as a time of scarcity of qualified men (*kaht-i ricâl*).⁸⁴¹

In his works, Baba Yusuf stresses the need for acting in accordance with *shari’a*. He blames the men of his time for neglecting the principles of *shari’a* and for indifference to pursuing a pious way of life. In his *dîvân*, Baba Yusuf criticizes the people of his time in the chapter entitled “*der-ğaflet ve kasâvet-i halk-i rûzgâr*” (unwariness and low spirit of the people of the time) as follows:

*Halâyık emr-i şer’a uymaz oldı
Ki Hak sözi kulağa koymaz oldı.*⁸⁴²

⁸³⁸ *Hakîkînâme*, folio 207b. In other parts of the *Hakîkînâme*, we come across similar feelings: “Kaldı hâlî bu cihan gitdi şuyûh u ulemâ
Ne belâdur bize kalmak bu zuhûr-i fitene.” Baba Yusuf, *Hakîkînâme*, folio 317b.

⁸³⁹ *Hakîkînâme*, folios 36b-37a.

⁸⁴⁰ *Hakîkînâme*, folio 36b.

⁸⁴¹ *Hakîkînâme*, folio 37a.

⁸⁴² *Hakîkînâme*, folio 335a.

There is a chapter entitled “*Şikayet ez fitne-i âhir zaman ve tahvîl-i ahvâl ve kaht-i ricâl*” in the *dîvân* of Baba Yusuf.⁸⁴³ In that chapter, Baba Yusuf states that the Last Day is approaching and that immorality infiltrated into all segments of society. As noted earlier, such criticisms to the Ottoman society were also made by Şehzâde Korkud. According to Baba Yusuf, people were not living in accordance with the principles of *shari’a* and heretics (*mülhidler*) were everywhere.⁸⁴⁴ In the chapter entitled “*kasîde der beyân-i şurûr-i fiten-i âhirü’z-zamân ve ahvâl-i halk-i rûzgâr*” Baba Yusuf again states that the Last Day is near due to the lack of qualified men and due to chaos in the world:

*Ahvâl ’acîb oldı İslâm ğarîb oldı
Bes vakt karîb oldı eyvah nideliüm eyvah*

*Dîn kayğusı yok halka işler belürür tuhfе
Doldı bu cihan fitne eyvah nideliüm eyvah*⁸⁴⁵

Baba Yusuf also points out the lack of order in the society. Interestingly he perceives the *shari’a* as the basis of order in the society:

*Kalmadı nizâm-i şer’ eyvah nideliüm eyvah*⁸⁴⁶

As is understood from the chapter entitled “*der-şikâyet ve temennâ-yi merhamet*,” Baba Yusuf kept his hope that one day Aksaray would be rescued from its ruined state through the “justice of the Shah.” Here, Baba Yusuf uses the word “Şeh” and “Han” instead of the words of “Pâdişâh” or “Sultan.” However, in the same part, he uses the word “*dâd*” which means justice and he calls for action to win

⁸⁴³ See Baba Yusuf, *Hakikînâme*, folios 126a, 126b.

⁸⁴⁴ “Dirîĝ âhir zaman oldı belürdi çok ’alâmetler
Olub zâhir fesâd işler şü bid’atler, dalâletler

Dutılmaz şer’ ahkâmı atıp ardına İslâmı
Görün her müdbir-i ’âmî ki ne ider sefâhetler

Zebûn oldı muvahhidler olup ğâlip mukallidler
Dirîĝa ah mülhidler ider dürlü şenâ’atler

Edeb kanda hayâ kanda Resûle iktidâ kanda
Begüm sıdk u safâ kanda dutub kalbini kasâvetler” *Hakikînâme*, folio 126a.

⁸⁴⁵ *Hakikînâme*, folio 335b.

⁸⁴⁶ *Hakikînâme*, folio 337a.

the hearts of the *re'âyâ*, the ruled class. Thus, in the light of the following verses, it would not be wrong to assume that Baba Yusuf meant the Ottoman Sultan by the words “Şeh”, and “Han.” It seems plausible to argue that Baba anticipated the issue of an *'adâletnâme* (rescript of justice) from the Ottoman Sultan to punish those who ruined Aksaray. Interestingly, Baba Yusuf calls those who ruined Aksaray “*merdümhôr*,” (men-eating cannibal):

*Bu biz düşmüşlere Şeh'den 'inâyet ayruğ olmaz mı?
Bu mihnetkeşlere Hân'um nihâyet ayruğ olmaz mı?*

*Zelîl olduk heman kat'-i recâ mı idelim yohsa
Bize bir merhamet yoh mı himâyet ayruğ olmaz mı?*

*Cenâh-i 'adli neşr idüb dahî Şeh dâd almaz mı?
Bu merdümhôrlardan ya şikâyet ayruğ olmaz mı?*

*Bu iklimde olan işler hemân ma'fû müdur eyvah
Re'âyâ ğayrına cürm ü cinâyet ayruğ olmaz mı?*

*Bu resme Aksara şehri yıkılsun şöyle gitsün mi?
Ra'iyet hâtırın itmek ri'âyet ayruğ olmaz mı? ⁸⁴⁷*

As these verses indicate, it seems that Baba Yusuf was familiar with the *pand-nâma* (advice to kings) literature, the main theme of which was justice. In his works, Baba Yusuf refers to the ideal rulers such as Solomon, Alexander the Great and Anushirevan.⁸⁴⁸ He also seems to be aware of the long-established Near Eastern tradition of the *'adâletnâmes* issued by the Sultan to punish the state authorities who oppressed the subjects. This was the last resort to address the injustices committed by the local authorities against the subjects. In a sense, *'adâletnâmes* were issued to win the hearts of the subjects, and they were perceived as the end-result of the justice of the sultan.⁸⁴⁹

⁸⁴⁷ *Hakikînâme*, folio 344a.

⁸⁴⁸ See, for instance, *Hakikînâme*, folios 252a, 273a,

⁸⁴⁹ Halil İncalcık, “Adâletnâmeler,” in *Osmanlı'da Devlet, Hukuk, Adâlet*, (İstanbul: Eren, 2000), p. 75. For the significance of justice in the history of Middle Eastern state tradition, see Halil İncalcık, “State and Ideology under Sultan Süleyman I,” in *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire, Essays on Economy and Society by Halil İncalcık*, 70-94: 70-78; Halil İncalcık, “Turkish and Iranian Political Theories and Traditions in Kutadgu Bilig,” in *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire, Essays on Economy and Society by Halil İncalcık*, 1-18: 7-9.

One contemporary source of the fifteenth century written by Tursun Beg points out the importance of justice for the maintenance of order the society. In the the *Târih-i Abu'l-Fath* (The History of Mehmed The Conqueror), Tursun Beg describes moral qualities of Ottoman Sultan Bayezid II (r. 1481-1512). According to Tursun Beg, the “two great royal virtues, justice (*’adl*) and forbearance (*hilm*)” were “combined in perfection” in Bayezid’s character. Like Baba Yusuf, Tursun Beg explains the significance of justice for preventing turmoil and anarchy in the society:

Justice is inextricably bound up with severe punishment (*siyâset*) which is symbolized by the sword. That is to say, without summary punishment oppression cannot be prevented nor justice established. Sultan Bayezid was able to prevent turmoil and anarchy (*fetret ve fesâd*) in the Ottoman state with his sword and by virtue of his courage.⁸⁵⁰

As it will be discussed later, in the *pand-nâma* literature, the sultan’s use of the sword against the elements of turmoil and anarchy in the society was perceived as a sign of the sultan’s strength and authority. Following the *pand-nâma* literature, Tursun Beg emphasized the need for the justice of the sultan and protection of the *re’âyâ* in order to maintain political stability.⁸⁵¹ In line with Tursun Beg, Baba Yusuf put great emphasis on justice in order to prevent the inhabitants of Aksaray against the oppression of the authorities. It is not a coincidence that Tursun Beg discussed the theory of the state in the light of the *pand-nâma* literature, particularly with reference to Nasîr al-Dîn Tûsî’s *Ahlâk-i Nâsirî*, in the introduction of the *Târih-i*

⁸⁵⁰ Tursun Beg, *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror*, ed. Halil İncalcık, Rhoads Murphey, (Minneapolis, Chicago: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1978), p. 21. İncalcık and Murphey explain the importance of Tursun Beg’s work as follows: “Tursun Beg, author of *Târih-i Abu'l-Fath*, has left us the most detailed and important account of Mehmed the Conqueror’s time...He, like many other Ottoman historians, such as İdris Bidlisî, Celâl-zâde Mustafa, Selânikî, and Âlî, was an historian belonging to the government secretarial (*küttâb*) class. Most of these historians also belonged to that category of bureaucrats known as the *kâtib-i tadbîr* who, as members of the highest rank in the secretarial profession, were in close relations with all the statesmen responsible for the formulation of policy. They considered it part of their duty as historians to record their experiences as an aid to others in the good management of government affairs.” see Tursun Beg, *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror*, pp. 11,17; Halil İncalcık, “Tursun Beg, Historian of Mehmed the Conqueror’s Time,” in *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire, Essays on Economy and Society*, ed. Halil İncalcık, pp. 417-431.

⁸⁵¹ Tursun Beg, *The History of Mehmed the Conqueror*, p. 17.

Abu'l-Fath. Similarly, Baba Yusuf also pointed to the main tenets of ideal rulership, such as justice, in his works. Nevertheless, Baba Yusuf did not devote a special chapter or section for the theory of sultanate. Yet some elements of this literature are present in various parts of his works, especially in the parts in which Baba Yusuf refers to the ideal rulers in world history. Baba Yusuf's definition of the sultanate differed from that of Tursun Beg in the sense that the real sultanate belonged to the realm of the Perfect Saints according to the former and that there is no such distinction in the latter.

Baba Yusuf's criticisms were not limited only to the social and political sphere. He did not hesitate to criticize the religious establishment of his time, particularly Sufis. According to him, most of the Sufis did not deserve to be called Sufi and they had to take off the robes and crowns that were peculiar to the real Sufis:

*Şimdiki Sufilerün ekserinün tâcın, hırkasın çıkarmaludur; bu kandan ki her küstâh u mahrûm nâ-ehli mahrem sanub kisvet geydürürler. Hâşâ hâşâ hiç revâ olmaya.*⁸⁵²

Baba Yusuf criticizes the Sufis of his time for being captive to the worldly desires. He calls such Sufis “*lokma-perest Sufi*.”⁸⁵³ Like Baba Yusuf, his contemporary Molla Câmî (817-898/1414-1492) criticized the Sufis of his time. Câmî criticized the Sufis for their involvement in worldly affairs and for accepting posts in the state administration.⁸⁵⁴ According to Câmî, the Sufis' behavior towards the outside world was very far from that of the ideal and the Sufis became captive to the men of the post: “If a military commander (*amîr*) came to their [the Sufis']

⁸⁵² Baba Yusuf, *İlmü'l-Meşâyikh*, folio 34a.

Yunus Emre also gives the similar message to his readers:

“İy bana iyi diyen adımı Sufî koyan

Acab Sufî mi olur hırkayıla tac giyen”, Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf*, p. 201.

⁸⁵³ “Pes ne safâ-yi bâtn hâsıl ola şol lokma-perest Sufiden ki murâkabesinde gözledüğü halkun atâsı ve likâsı ola.” Baba Yusuf, *İlmü'l-Meşâyikh*, folio 34b.

⁸⁵⁴ Ökten, “Câmî (817-898/1414-1492),” p. 103.

meeting their voice [during the loud *dhikr*] would become even louder. The leading Sufi (shaykh) would talk about spiritual discovery (*kashf*), inspiration (*ilhâm*), and verifying the Truth (*tahqîq*) but his behavior would reveal that he was just pretending.”⁸⁵⁵

Abdullah b. Eşref who was known as Eşrefoğlu Rûmî (d. 874/1469), the son-in-law of Hacı Bayram, also lobbed similar criticisms towards other shaykhs.⁸⁵⁶ Like Baba Yusuf, Eşrefoğlu Rûmî also noted the lack of real shaykhs in his work *Müzekki'n-Nüfûs* that was written in the year 852/1447 and views his era a time of disorder and turmoil.⁸⁵⁷ Like Baba Yusuf and Şehzâde Korkud, Eşrefoğlu openly condemned nearly all segments of the society in which he lived. He accused the begs of his time of being unjust and the *qadis* of taking bribes and the *müderresses* (the chief teacher and administrator of a *madrasa*), of sinfulness and preachers of being captive to worldly desires. Eşrefoğlu also pointed to the rise of pseudo-shaykhs in the society:

*İmdi zaman azdı ve karındaşların dahî halleri döndü. Tuğyân ve münâfık çoğaldı ve meşâyikh kalmadı. Begler zâlim oldılar ve kadılar rişvet-hor oldılar. İlme uymaz oldılar ve 'ilmi kendü hevâlarına çeker oldılar ve müderresler fâsık oldılar. Tefsîr ve hadîs madrasalarda okunmaz oldu. Fakîhler ve dîn ilmin bilür kişiler az kaldı. Vâ'izler dünyâ için mescidlerde va'z idüb akçe diler. İlme begler kapusunda rağbet bulmayan dânişmendler şeyhlik tarikin tutub müdârâ ile halkın dünyâsın alur oldılar.*⁸⁵⁸

A similar criticism towards the *ulemâ* can be observed in the popular *Anonymous Chronicles*, which was originally compiled in the time of the Ottoman Sultan Bayezid II (r.1481-1512):

The *ulemâ* were not corrupt under Osman, Orhan and the Ğâzî Hüdâvendigâr as the *ulemâ* in our time are...Anyone with the knowledge of the religious science did not care for money at that time...In our time to get a kadi-ship people, in fierce competition, may kill each other. Men not qualified for the position obtain kadi-ship just by approaching someone (of high

⁸⁵⁵ Ökten, “Câmî (817-898/1414-1492),” p. 147.

⁸⁵⁶ Fuat Bayramoğlu, *Hacı Bayram-ı Velî*, vol. 1, p. 52.

⁸⁵⁷ Bizim zamânımız şimdiki zamândır. Hicret-i Resûl aleyhisselâmın sekizyüz elli ikinci yılıdır ve bu mübârek Ramazan'ın aşr-i âhîridir. Ya'ni bu kitâb ol târîhde cem' oldu dimek olur.” See Abdullah ibn-i Eşref Rûmî, *Müzekki'n-nüfûs*, (İstanbul: Bosnevî el-Hâc Muharrem Efendi Matbaası, 1291), p. 24.

⁸⁵⁸ Abdullah ibn-i Eşref Rûmî, *Müzekki'n-nüfûs*, p. 24.

place) and serve him for some time...They find intercessors (*dilekci*) who go to solicit a position for them, they visit in crowds the homes of begs and kadiaskers, humiliate themselves (by demanding position) instead of being present at the company of the great scholars (*mülâzemet*).⁸⁵⁹

In his *dîvân*, Baba Yusuf distances himself from the sultans and advises dervishes to be distant from the sultans of the time.⁸⁶⁰ This kind of approach assumed by Baba Yusuf is line with the Sufi belief about the superiority of the Sufis over worldly rulers. However, in practice Baba Yusuf and his family were holders of a *vakf* approved by the Ottoman sultan. Thus, he can be viewed as a conformist shaykh in spite of the content of his works. Conformist dervishes were subject to harsh criticism from those who rejected cooperation with the state authorities. For instance, in the *Otman Baba Vilâyetnâmesi*, which was completed in August 1483 by one of the followers of Otman Baba, Küçük Abdal, we come across the following criticism against all conformist dervishes:

⁸⁵⁹ Halil İnalçık, “A Report on the Corrupt Kadis under Bayezid II,” p. 76. Immediately after his criticisms towards *ulemâ* and *kadis* of the time, the author of the *Anonymous Chronicles (Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman)* blames Çandarlı Kara Halil and Karamânî Rüstem for introducing new and detrimental practices to the Ottoman government: “İlerü zamanda kadılığa bir dânişmend taleb idüb bulurlardı. Şimdiki zamanda ki yeni dilekçiler bulub dilek atdurub gelüb begler ve kadıaskerler kapusına kör kör üşerler. Dökülüb hor u hakîr olub mülâzemet itmezlerdi. Heman kim Osman beglerine Acem ve Karamanîler musâhib oldı, Osman Begleri dahî dürlü dürlü günahlar mürtekeb oldılar. Kaçan kim Çandarlı Kara Halil ve Karamânî Türk Rüstem bu ikisi ol zamanda ulular ve âlimler idi; heman kim bunlar Osman begleri yanına geldiler; dürlü dürlü hîle ile âlemi toldurdılar. Andan ilerü hesâb-difter bilmezlerdi. Hemân ânlar Osman begleri yanına geldiler, hesâb defteri ânlar te’lîf itdiler. Akçayı yığub hazîne idinmek ânlardan kaldı. Sonun hiç fikr itmediler; koyup gideceklerin anmadılar; kendülere mağrûr oldılar.”, *Anonim Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, F. Giese Neşri, ed. Nihat Azamat, (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1992), p. 33.

⁸⁶⁰ “Selâtîn-i asra ne indüre baş

Ne meyl ide milke ne devrâna hiç

Ne kasma bakar ol ne yüz kasma
Ne hod tâk-i kisrâ ne hâkâna hiç

Ki can âleminde teferrüc kılan
Nazar eyleye mi bu zindana hiç?” *Hakîkînâme*, folio 72a;

“Sen cihandan aceb ne iledesin
Tut ki oldun halîfe-i Bağdad

Hem nefse gerek tezkiye evvel
Olasın tâ ki kâbil-i irşâd.” *Hakîkînâme*, folio 93b;

“İndürmeye Hakîkî selâtîn-i asra baş.” *Hakîkînâme*, folio 118b.

They are afraid of the lords of this world (*dünyâ begleri*),
They invite people to the path of the Truth,
But their followers are none but boys and women.
All they are concerned about are material gains,
They have no self-respect or honesty.⁸⁶¹

The Ottoman poet and historian Mustafa Âlî of Gelibolu (1541-1600) directs the similar criticisms towards the dervishes of the sixteenth-century Ottoman empire in his poem entitled *Hulâsatü'l-Ahvâl* (Summary of Circumstances):

If you belong to the Gülşenî order or the Mevlevî order,
You will be a king in the opinion of the elegant.
They will accuse heretics and sectarians
But you will be a bon-vivant beyond sin.
If you put on the garment of the Haydarî order,
You will be the earring-marked slave of the shaykh's residence.⁸⁶²

One can observe similar kind of criticisms towards the rulers, society and religious establishment in some of the works written during the Seljukids. In the *Siyâsetnâme* ("The Book of Government"), the Seljukid vezir Nizâmülmülk praises wise rulers who possessed "divine splendour and sovereignty":

Consider how great is the fame of kings who were wise, and what great works they did; names such as these will be blessed until the resurrection- Afridun, Ardashir, Nushirwan The Just, The Commander of the Faithful 'Umar (may Allah be pleased with him), 'Umar ibn Abd al 'Aziz (may Allah illuminate his resting place), Harun, al Ma'mun, al Mu'tasim, Isma'il ibn Ahmad the Samanid, and Sultan Mahmud (Allah's mercy be upon them all). The deeds and ways of them all are well known, for they are regarded in histories and other books; men never cease reading about them and singing their praises and blessings.⁸⁶³

In his works, despite Baba Yusuf praising these kinds of world rulers, particularly the Prophet Solomon, Alexander the Great and Nushirwan or

⁸⁶¹ Halil İnalçık, "Dervish and Sultan," p. 27.

⁸⁶² Andreas Tietze, "The Poet as Critique of Society: A 16-Century Ottoman Poem," *Turcica, Revue D'études Turques*, vol. IX/1 (1977), p. 153.

⁸⁶³ Nizam al-Mulk, *The Book of Government or Rules for Kings (The Siyasat-nama or Siyar al-Muluk)*, tr. Hubert Darke, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), pp. 15-16. Browne explains the significance of the *Siyasat-nama* of Nizam al-Mulk as follows: "The *Siyasat-nama* is, in my opinion, one of the most valuable and interesting prose works which exists in Persian, both because of the quantity of historical anecdotes which it contains and because it embodies the views on government of one of the greatest Prime Ministers whom the East has produced – a Minister whose strength and wisdom is in no way better proved than by chaos and internecine strife which succeeded his death." Edward G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia, vol. II, From Firdawsi to Sa'di (1000-1290)*, first published in 1902, (Maryland: Iran Books, 1997), p. 214.

Anushirwan, they do not represent his ideal person. Instead, as mentioned before, Baba Yusuf prefers the way of life pursued by the famous Sufis such as Junayd-i Baghdadî, Bayezid Bestâmî, Sena'î, Attâr, and Rûmî. In his *dîvân*, apart from references to the ideal Sufis, Baba Yusuf also complains about the “heretics” of his time. He is particularly critical of the spread of Hurufîs in his time.⁸⁶⁴ Indeed, from the fifteenth century onwards, the Hurufîs began to spread rapidly in the Ottoman lands, particularly in Anatolia and Rumelia. In Anatolia,† The Hurûfî poet Nesîmî was flayed alive due to his beliefs in 1408. The persecution of the Hurûfîs, who were perceived as atheists by the religious scholars of the time such as Baba Yusuf, continued in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The violent persecution of the Hurûfîs increased in strength after the plot against Bayezid II (r. 1481-1512).⁸⁶⁵

Like Baba Yusuf, the Seljukid Vezir Nizâmülmülk was not happy with his era and he worried about the rise of heretics and non-Muslims in society and the government offices:

Everywhere indifference is predominant; there is no zeal for religion, no concern for revenue, no pity for the peasants, the dynasty has reached its perfection; your [the Seljuk Sultan Melikshah's] humble servant is afraid of the evil eye and knows not where this state of affairs will lead. In the days of Mahmud, Mas'ud, Tughril and Alp Arslan (may Allah have mercy on them) no Zoroastrian or Jew or Rafîdî would have had the audacity to appear in public place or to present himself before a great man. Those who administered the affairs of the Turks were all professional civil servants and secretaries from Khurasan, who belonged to the orthodox Hanafi or Shafi'i sects.⁸⁶⁶

In a manuscript entitled *Fustâtu'l-'adâle fî kavâ'idi's-saltana* in the Bibliotheque Nationale of France, one encounters similar criticisms towards the

⁸⁶⁴ “Çoğaldı Hurûfîler eyvah nidelüm eyvah!” *Hakîkînâme*, 336b. The founder of the Hurûfî Sect was Fazlullah of Esterâbâd and the famous poet Nesîmî was one of the *khalîfâs* of Fazlullah, who was executed by the order of Miranshah, son of Timur, in 1394. see Kathleen R. F. Burrill, *The Quatrains of Nesîmî, Fourteenth Century Turkic Hurufî*, (The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1972), p. 21.

⁸⁶⁵ İnalçık, *The Classical Age*, p. 193. For more information about the rise of the Hurûfîs in the Ottoman lands, see Abdûlbaki Gölpınarlı, *Hurufîlik Metinleri Kataloğu*, second edition (first published in 1973), (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1989), pp. 26-31.

⁸⁶⁶ Nizam al-Mulk, *The Book of Government or Rules for Kings*, p. 25.

sultans, *ulemâ* and qadis.⁸⁶⁷ This work was dedicated to the beg of Kastamonu Muzaffereddin Mes'ud bin Alp-yürek by Muhammed bin Mahmud el-Hatîb in the year 683/1283-1284.⁸⁶⁸ Muzaffereddin Mes'ud is also known as Muzaffereddin Yavlak Arslan in contemporary sources.⁸⁶⁹ Yavlak Arslan, who was a “descendant of the famous Seljuk *Emîr* Hüsâmeddin Çoban,” assumed the title of *sipâh-bed-i diyâr-i uc* (captain-general of the marches).⁸⁷⁰ The fact that Muhammed bin Mahmud el-Hatîb presented his work to the beg of Kastamonu was not a coincidence. At that time, the *udj* emirates from the Byzantine frontier along the River Sakarya to Kastamonu were subject to the beg or *emîr* of Kastamonu. One of these emirates that was subject to the *emîr* of Kastamonu was the Ottoman principality under the leadership of Osman Gazi. Pachymeres attributes the rise of Osman Gâzî to a “struggle with the dynasty of ‘Amurios,’ *emîrs* of Kastamonu.”⁸⁷¹

Like Eşrefoğlu Rûmî and Baba Yusuf, el-Hatîb was not content with his time. According to Karamustafa, *Fustâtu'l-'adâle fî kavâ'idi's-saltana* is a “work of heresiography” and it contains “the earliest known account of the emergence of the Kalandars.”⁸⁷² Muhammed el-Hatîb asserts that the former sultans were waging war by their swords against the heterodox elements (*zenâdika ve ehl-i bid'at*) in society⁸⁷³. Like Tursun Beg, el-Hatîb also points out the significance of using the sword against those who were the source of turmoil and anarchy in society. El-Hatîb

⁸⁶⁷ Muhammed el-Hatîb, *Fustatu'l-'adâle fî kavâ'idi's-saltana*, Bibliotheque Nationale, Suppl. Turc 1120. For more information about that work, see Osman Turan, “Selçuk Türkiyesi Din Tarihine Dair Bir Kaynak: Fustatu'l-'adâle fî kavâ'idi's-saltana,” in *Fuat Köprülü Armağanı*, (İstanbul: Osman Yalçın Matbaası, 1953), pp. 533, 534.

⁸⁶⁸ Muhammed el-Hatîb, *Fustatu'l-'adâle fî kavâ'idi's-saltana*, Bibliotheque Nationale, Suppl. Turc 1120.

⁸⁶⁹ See Osman Turan, “Selçuk Türkiyesi Din Tarihine Dair Bir Kaynak: Fustatu'l-'adâle fî kavâ'idi's-saltana,” p. 533n; Kerîmüddin Mahmud, *Müsâmeretü'l-Ahbâr*, ed. Osman Turan, first published in 1944, (Ankara: TTK, 1999), pp. 170-171.

⁸⁷⁰ İnalçık, “The Emergence of the Ottomans,” p. 266; Halil İnalçık, “Osmanlı Tarihine Toplu Bir Bakış,” in *Osmanlı*, vol. 1, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 1999), p. 40.

⁸⁷¹ İnalçık, “The Emergence of the Ottomans,” p. 266.

⁸⁷² Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, p. 62.

⁸⁷³ Muhammed el-Hatîb, *Fustatu'l-'Adâle fî Kavâ'idi's-Saltana*, Bibliotheque Nationale, Suppl. Turc 1120, folio 50b.

implicitly accuses the contemporary sultans and begs of being lazy in waging war against the heterodox movements. El-Hatîb also criticizes the religious scholars of his time for neglecting their duties of preventing the spread of heterodox beliefs and for not informing the sultans about such dangers. Instead, according to el-Hatîb, the *ulemâ* of his time was busy with obtaining offices and high status.⁸⁷⁴ He asserts that the *ulemâ* and the shaykhs, were not aware of the threat posed by the “heretics in the form of *cavlakîs*” (*zenâdîka der-sûret-i cevâlik*).⁸⁷⁵ The author states that he wrote this book in order to “complain” (*în kitâb şikâyetest*) about these heretics.⁸⁷⁶ He also indicates that his book is “wisdom” and “counsel” for the ruler of the time.⁸⁷⁷ The author also praises the previous Seljuk sultans for their incessant campaign against Shi’ites and heretics.⁸⁷⁸ For instance, he reminds the sultans or begs of the time of the help for Tugrul Beg for the Caliph against the Shi’ite Buveyhids.⁸⁷⁹

El-Hatîb also gives an example of an ideal shaykh Osman-i Rûmî who conformed to the “path of former shayks” (*tarîk-i meşâyih-i selef*). Shaykh Osman-i Rûmî’s disciples, for el-Hatîb, were also busy with prayer (*’ibâdet*), isolation from society (*halvet*), and remembrance of God (*zikr*) and they also conform to “the tradition of the shayks of the tarîqa” (*sünnet-i meşâyih-i tarîkat*).⁸⁸⁰ However, Cemâleddin Sâvî (d. 630/1223), a former disciple of Şeyh Osman Rûmî, according to

⁸⁷⁴ “Ulemâ-i rûzigâr be-mansıb ve câh meşgûlend”, Mahmud el-Hatîb, *Fustatu’l-’Adâle fî Kavâ’idi’s-Saltana*, folio 50b.

⁸⁷⁵ *Fustatu’l-’Adâle*, folio 64a.

⁸⁷⁶ *Fustatu’l-’Adâle*, folio 64b.

⁸⁷⁷ “Der în kitâb ’ilm-i hikmetest ve hem pend,” see *Fustatu’l-’Adâle*, folio 68b.

⁸⁷⁸ *Fustatu’l-’Adâle*, folios 66b-68a.

⁸⁷⁹ For more information about Tugrul Beg’s victory against the Buveyhids, see *The History of the Seljuq Turks, From The Câmi’ al-Tawârîkh, An Ilkhanid Adaptation of the Saljuq-nâma of Zahîr al-Dîn Nishapûrî*, tr. Kenneth Allin Luther, ed. C. Edmund Bosworth, (Richmond: Curzon, 2001), pp. 41, 42; Osman Turan, *Selçuklular Tarihi ve Türk-İslam Medeniyeti*, (İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları, 2003), pp. 131-136.

⁸⁸⁰ *Fustatu’l-’Adâle*, folio 51b.

the author, left the path of his shaykh and became the founder of the *cavlakîs*.⁸⁸¹ Like El-Hatîb, Baba Yusuf believed that being a Sunnî was a prerequisite for being an ideal shaykh. Thus, Baba Yusuf did have serious difficulty in integrating into the Ottoman political order founded by Mehmed The Conqueror.

⁸⁸¹ *Fustatu'l-'Adâle*, folio 53a; Osman Turan, “Selçuk Türkiyesi Din Tarihine Dair Bir Kaynak: Fustatu'l-'adâle fî kavâ'idi's-saltana”, pp. 539-541. In the Kalandarî sources, the story between Shaykh Osman-i Rûmî and Cemâleddin Sâvî was narrated differently. According to the *Manâkib-i Camâl al-Dîn-i Sâvî*, which was completed by Hâtîb-i Fârisî in 748/1347-48, Osman-i Rûmî became a disciple of Cemaleddin Sâvî. See Hatîb-i Fârisî, *Manâkib-i Camâl al-Dîn-i Sâvî*, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, first published in 1972, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999), pp. X-XVIII; Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, pp. 40-44; Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Kalenderîler*, p. 16. Celâleddin Rûmî's biographer, Sipehsalar, indicates that Rûmî met prominent shaykhs during his stay at Damascus. Among the shaykhs Rûmî met were Ibn al-Arabî, Sa'deddin el-Hamevî, Evhadeddin Kirmânî, and Osman Rûmî. See Feridun bin Ahmed-i Sipehsalar, *Mevlânâ ve Etrafindakiler, Risâle*, tr. Tahsin Yazıcı, (İstanbul: Tercüman Gazetesi Yayınları, 1977), p. 35. Perhaps Shaykh Osman-i Rûmî later settled in Konya. The register of 888/1483 mentions the *zâviye* of Shaykh Osman-i Rûmî: “Vakf-i zâviye-i Şeyh Osman-i Nûrî rahmetu'l-lâhi 'aleyh rahmeten vasi'aten der-Konya,” *Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye*, İstanbul Atatürk Kitaplığı, Cevdet Tasnifi, O. 116/1 (H. 888/1483), folio 24b. For further information about Shaykh Osman-i Rûmî, see Konyalı, *Konya Tarihi*, pp. 753-755.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

This study analyzes the dervish lodges and religious orders in the geographical area constituting the Province of Karaman of the Ottoman Empire, according to the Register of Pious Foundations of the Province of Karaman (*Defter-i Evkâf-i Vilayet-i Karaman ve Kayseriye*) dated 888/1483. This dissertation argues that the dervish lodges of that region were an indispensable part of the political, social and cultural life during the Seljukid, Karamanid, and the classical Ottoman period and that most of the Sufi masters had a broad and inclusive world view transcending political borders and limitations.

The dissertation denotes how the Halvetî Order led by Çelebi Halife and the Zeynî Order led by Shaykh Vefâ allied themselves with rival princes. The former group supported Prince Bayezid, the future Bayezid II (r. 1481-1512), and the latter group sided with Prince Cem, who had been the governor of the Province of Karaman between 1474 and 1481. Yusuf Sinan's *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye* narrates the story of the rise of the Halvetî Order in the Ottoman capital, Istanbul, with the support of Bayezid II and the Grand Vizier Koca Mustafa Paşa. The Seljukid and Karamanid rulers also sought the support of dervishes in order to receive spiritual assistance from them. The belief patterns of individuals from sultans to ordinary people did not diverge much in medieval Anatolia. As understood from the sources

of the period, inhabitants of medieval Anatolia believed in the spiritual power of dervishes.

Dervish lodges were also centers of social integration which opened their doors to nearly all segments of the society. Women also attended the rituals in dervish lodges. The register of pious foundations of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483 mentions some women as founders of pious foundations such as dervish lodges. Although women did not have a significant role in the *madrasa* system, they had the opportunity to attend the gatherings that took place in dervish lodges. Sometimes, madrasa students gave up their studies to become a disciple of a certain shaykh. The author of *Menâkib-i İbrahim Gülşenî*, Muhyî-yi Gülşenî, narrated an interesting story about this phenomenon. Muhyî-yi Gülşenî attributed the execution of Shaykh Muhyiddin-i Karamanî (d. 1550) to the envy of Ebussu'ud towards Karamanî due to the fact that some of Ebussu'ud's students left madrasa study to become disciples of Karamanî.

Dervish lodges served as centers of cultural activity as well. Dervishes were listening to their shaykhs, most of whom were well-versed in various branches of knowledge from Qur'anic exegesis to history. As the sixth chapter denotes, the shaykh of the Melik Mahmud Ghâzî lodge, Baba Yusuf, wrote in a number of areas from literature to Sufî ethics. Some dervish lodges such as the *zâviye* of Sadreddin Konevî had precious libraries. Prominent scholars and shaykhs such as Akşemseddin, the shaykh of the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II, studied the books in the library of Sadreddin Konevî.

In the first half of the thirteenth century, Anatolia represented the golden age of the Seljukid arts and culture after a century of the calamity of the Crusades. The Seljukid Sultan Alaeddin Keykubad's patronization of the arts and sciences

culminated in the rise of the Seljukid capital, Konya, as one of the cultural centers of the world. Famous Sufi masters such as Celâleddin Rûmî and Ibn al-Arabî came to Konya and transmitted their mystical teachings to subsequent generations through their books and students. Even during the turmoil of Mongol rule in Anatolia in the second half of the thirteenth century, the learning activity did not cease. On the contrary, dervish lodges began to attract many visitors not only those from the ordinary people but also from the ruling classes.

Despite the challenges of rule by the Mongols, who were infidels in the eyes of the residents of Anatolia, dervishes developed various coping mechanism. The *Ahî* movement openly opposed Mongol rule in Anatolia. Other dervishes, particularly Mevlevîs, perceived the Mongols as the manifestation of God's will on earth. A similar event occurred during Timur's invasion of Anatolia. According to the *Menâkıb-i Şeyh Ali Semerkandî*, the disciples of Semerkandî were praying to God for the victory of Timur against Bayezid. Some dervishes had a practical attitude towards political events. They tried to ally with the winning side in order to pursue a peaceful life in the dervish lodges patronized by the ruling elite.

The Seljukid authorities and local begs were in need of legitimacy and popularity in order to perpetuate their reign. They were aware of the fact that dervishes were comprised of different layers of society, from the bottom to the top. Although they were patronizing religious scholars, who constituted only a small segment of society, they were more eager to patronize Sufi masters, who had a large following behind themselves. Such support by the rulers and begs was indispensable for their legitimacy in the eyes of ordinary people. The support of the Sufi masters for the Seljukid authorities and the begs of the Turcoman principalities of Anatolia is evident in such sources as the *Fîhi Mâ Fîh (Discourses)* of Celâleddin Rûmî, the

Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn of Aflâkî, and the hagiographies of Seyyid Harun, and Shaykh Seyyid Ali Semerkandî. Such written sources were the product of oral culture among the dervishes and thus had the memory of centuries transmitted from one generation to the other. In the *Fîhi Mâ Fîh*, Rûmî praises the Seljukid vizier Mu'ineddin Pervâne. In the *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn*, Aflakî narrates how some begs of Anatolia were referred to as the “Sultan of *ghazis*” by Mevlevî shaykhs. In the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun*, Eşrefoğlu Mübârizüddin Mehmed Beg was presented as a disciple of Seyyid Harun. In the *Menâkib-i Şeyh Ali Semerkandî*, Karamanoğlu İbrahim Beg was praised as an ideal ruler. These texts reflected how the rulers and begs were perceived by dervishes who were contemporary with these rulers.

Proximity to the ruling elite was one of the themes frequently mentioned in the Sufi hagiographies. In theory, proximity to the rulers was criticized in the Sufi literature. However, the authors of hagiographies often wrote that the sultans or begs of the time became disciples of their shaykhs and that they served the Sufi path by allocating lands as endowments to the shaykh. One of the key examples of this phenomenon has been discussed in the chapter on the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun*, where it was noted that the same ruler was viewed as a disciple of two shaykhs in different hagiographies.

The fourteenth century Anatolia has not been studied in detail compared to the thirteenth century and the fifteenth century. That century was often viewed as a century of transition between the Seljukids and the Ottomans. The neglect of the fourteenth century has been explained by a limited number of sources. In fact, the question is not the quantity of sources but perception of sources among the students of history. It is a/an historian's duty to extract historical facts from such sources. It is true that most of the sources of this period were semi-legendary one. As has been

discussed in the third chapter, most of the stories narrated by Aflâkî were not groundless. According to Aflâkî, a Sufi Master of the early fourteenth century—Çelebi Ârif—felt free to visit the Ilkhanid capitals, Tabriz and Sultaniya. Aflâkî did not hesitate to include a detail in the story related to the famous historian Rashiduddin, who was not happy with the timing of the *semâ'*-gathering of Ârif Çelebi. The reader of Aflakî is treated to the details of the travels of Çelebi Ârif to Tabriz in the west and Birgi in the west. The search for new patrons and new disciples led some dervishes to pursue a semi-nomadic life.

The Sufi literature added a divine element to this kind of travels. According to the hagiographical literature, both Seyyid Harun and Shaykh Ali Semerkandî came to the realm of the Karamanids by a divine command. The authors of hagiographies tried to add a divine element to the lands of the Karamanids by narrating such stories. In these sources, the Karamanid lands were referred to as places which had the tombs of such Sufi masters as Celâleddin Rûmî, Sadreddin Konevî, and Fakih Ahmed. It is interesting to discover that the registers of pious foundations of the Province of Karaman in the Ottoman Empire began with the names of these Sufi masters. Even in the almanacs (*tarihî takvimler*) presented to the Ottoman Sultans prior to the conquest of Constantinople there were frequent references to these Sufi masters who were buried in the lands of the Karamanids.

The story of Seyyid Hârûn as expressed in the *Makâlât*, written in the mid-sixteenth century, denotes how a Sufi community migrated from Horasan to today's Seydişehir region and how this community spread from this region to other places in Anatolia. The author stresses the Karamanid identity of his shaykh in spite of the fact that Seyyid Harun lived within the borders of the Eşrefoğlu principality. The author's insistence to view Seyyid Harun as a Karamanid shaykh derives from the author's

claim that two renowned shaykhs of the Province of Karaman, namely Rûmî and Ahmed Fakih, served as the harbingers of a perfect shaykh, i.e. Seyyid Harun. However, the author does not mention anything about the other renowned shaykh of the Province of Karaman of the Ottoman Empire, Sadreddin Konevî. The reader also does not come across the name of the spiritual master of Konevî, Ibn al-Arabî, in the text. The author's silence about Ibn al-Arabî and Konevî can be attributed to the skepticism towards the beliefs and activities of Sufis in the sixteenth century. Given the composition of his possible audience, the author might have perhaps avoided dealing with a Sufî master whose teaching was controversial in the eyes of some Ottoman *ulemâ*.

Although the author of the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun* is familiar with the Bektaşî tradition, he does mention Hacı Bektaş and other famous figures of this tradition. He only deals with Dediği Sultan, who was a cousin of Hacı Bektaş according to *menâkıbnâme* of Dediği Sultan. The story of Dediği Sultan is also interesting in the sense that Dediği Sultan represented a nomadic type of shaykh who was led by an urban shaykh who founded a city, i. e. Seyyid Harun. The author of the *Makâlât* ends his work with the the Bektaşî doctrine of the Four Gateways, which is more or less the copy of the one expressed in the *Makâlât* of Hacı Bektaş.

The author of the *Makâlât-i Seyyid Harun* did not hesitate to make mention of a significant phenomenon in the history of Sufism. After the death of Seyyid Harun, his daughter succeeded him as a shaykh. Women's roles in the maintenance of Sufi orders are explained in other hagiographies as well. One of the key examples of this phenomenon has been narrated by Aflâkî, whose shaykh Çelebi Ârif was said to have disciples among the wives and daughters of the Ilkhanid and Seljukid sultans and viziers.

In the study of Ottoman history writing, the Ottoman occupation of Anatolian cities has not been researched in detail. Most of the studies which have been done on this subject took a sympathetic view towards the Ottomans. However, in actuality, the Ottomans were not as well-received in the conquered lands as it has been supposed. At the very least, it can certainly be argued that the Ottomans were not welcomed in the former Karamanoğlu lands, if relying on the words of the Karamanid poets.

Mehmed the Conqueror's deportation of the Karamanids, among whom were religious scholars and Sufis, was not without meaning. Mehmed II was aware of the fact that the Karamanids had a rich tradition of culture and arts inherited from the Seljukids. On the one hand, Mehmed II was claiming to be the heir of Caesars of Rome and on the other hand, he was transferring the cultural tradition of the Seljukids as represented by the Karamanids to the new capital of his empire, Istanbul.

Mehmed II's last vizier was Karamanî Mehmed Pasha, who contributed to the process of the rise of Istanbul as a world city. Mehmed II encouraged the writing of commentaries on the works of Sadreddin Konevî. Mehmed II's shaykh, Akşemseddin, was one of those scholars who studied the books in the library of Sadreddin Konevî in Konya. Allegedly, the first Ottoman şeyhülislam Molla Fenârî was one of the students of the renowned scholar of the Karamanids, Cemâleddin-i Aksarayî. One section of Istanbul has been called Aksaray since the latter half of the fifteenth century due to the fact that the former residents of Aksaray of the Karamanids settled there. A Karamanid shaykh, Shaykh Vefâ (d. 896/1491), who migrated to Istanbul after the conquest gave his name to a district of Istanbul which has been called as Vefâ since the late fifteenth century. A famous Ottoman chronicler

of the fifteenth century, Âşıkpaşazâde, who was one of the descendants of Baba İlyas, linked the rise of the Ottoman state with the Vefâ'î Order, which was founded by Seyyid Ebu'l-Vefâ in the twelfth century. In Şikarî's history of the Karamanids, Baba İlyas was referred to as the shaykh of Nûre Sofî, the ancestor of the Karamanids. Âşıkpaşazâde was the disciple of Abdüllatif Kudsî who was the shaykh of the *zâviye* of Sadreddin Konevî in Konya. All these examples indicate that the Karamanid culture became one of the constituent elements of Ottoman civilization from the latter half of the fifteenth century onwards. After the demise of the Karamanids, it was only the Ottomans who claimed to be the heirs of the Seljukids.

Baba Yusuf criticized the plunder of the Ottoman soldiers in the Karamanid lands, particularly Aksaray. Prior to the Ottoman conquest of Aksaray, Baba Yusuf was serving as a shaykh of the *khankâh* of Melik Mahmud Gazi in Karamanid Aksaray. Although he criticized Ottoman practices in the Karamanid lands, his vision of religion and that of Sufism was close to the Ottoman one. He was a firm supporter of the Sunnî sect of Islam.

Although Baba Yusuf praised dervishes in some parts of his works, he was not content with the way of life pursued by the contemporary Sufis. In a sense, he had a longing for the golden age of the Sufis as lived by Bayezid-i Bestâmî or Cuneyd-i Bagdadî, as in the way that *pand-nâma* writers had a longing for the golden age of the ideal rulers which was believed to have been attained during the reigns of Prophet Solomon, Alexander the Great and Anushirewan. Baba Yusuf's broad fields of interest and his inclusive attitude towards seemingly rival Sufi masters can be viewed as a result of the Sufi milieu in which he was trained. The mental outlook of his works demonstrate how a Karamanid shaykh of the late fifteenth century perceived the outside world.

Baba Yusuf's works reflect the legacy of three main schools of Sufism. The Central Asian School of Sufism affected Baba Yusuf's world view through the works of Necmeddin Kübrâ and Necmeddin Dâye. The influence of Kübrâ and Dâye on Baba Yusuf has been observed particularly in the field of ethics literature. Baba Yusuf was also under the influence of the Persian School of Sufism. The early Safavid shaykhs, namely Shaykh Safî, Shaykh Sadreddin, Hâce Ali and Shaykh Ibrahim, exerted a particular influence over Baba Yusuf's works. In line with the early Safavid shaykhs, Baba Yusuf emphasized the importance of being Sunnî; thus, he avoided praising the fifth shaykh of the Safavid order, Shaykh Junayd, who was declared a heretic in the *zâviye* of Sadreddin Konevî by the shaykh of the *zâviye*, Shaykh Abdüllatif Kudsî. Baba Yusuf was also a reader of those Sufis who preferred to write in Persian. Among them were Hakim Senâ'î, Ferîdeddin Attâr, Celâleddin Rûmî, Evhadeddin Kirmânî, and Ahi Evren. In terms of style, Baba Yusuf's works were in line with the Turkish School of Sufism represented by Yunus Emre. In view of his audience, Baba Yusuf preferred to write in a simple Turkish which could be understood by the dervishes of Anatolia.

Although Baba Yusuf was not supportive of the Ottoman conquest of the Karamanid lands, particularly Aksaray, he did not leave Aksaray after the Ottoman occupation. Some of the Karamanid shaykhs went to the Mamluk and the Akkoyunlu lands after the downfall of the Karamanid principality. However, Baba Yusuf remained at Aksaray until his death and his sons maintained the status of being the shaykh of the *khanqah* of Melik Mahmud Gazi in Aksaray. Baba Yusuf turned his *mâlikâne* into a family *vakf* in order to provide a perpetual source of income for his family. The case of Baba Yusuf provides some clues about the question of continuity in the Anatolian lands occupied by the Ottomans. Baba Yusuf's texts offer an eye-

witness account of the crisis situation after the Ottoman occupation of the Karamanid lands in the late fifteenth century.

Some authors during the Seljukid and Karamanid and Ottoman periods did not hesitate to remind sultans, religious scholars, and Sufis of their duty to protect the Sunnî faith against heretics. Such a collaboration among sultans, religious scholars, and Sufis was expressed in the *Siyâsetnâme* of Nizâmülmülk, and the *Fustâtu'l-'adâle fi kavâ'idi's-saltana* of Muhammed el-Hatîb. Like dervish lodges, such texts were also influential in the maintenance of the Sunnî creed in the society. It was not a coincidence that El-Hatîb referred to ideal rulers such as the Tuğrul Beg and Alp Arslan of the Seljukids and to an ideal shaykh such as Shaykh Osman-i Rûmî, whose name was mentioned in the *Deftter-i evkâf-i vilâyet-i Karaman and Kayseriyye (888/1483)*. The collaboration among the sultans, religious scholars, and Sufi masters continued during the Seljuk, Karamanid, and Ottoman periods, but it was in the sixteenth century Ottoman Empire that such collaboration resulted in an increase in the number of victims among the non-conformist Sufi circles, particularly Bayramî-Melâmîs, due to the rise of the Safavids.

The current study diverges from previous studies in a number of ways. Firstly, the previous studies did not deal particularly with dervish lodges in the Province of Karaman. They examined dervish lodges together with other kinds of *vakfs*. Secondly, previous studies about the Province of Karaman mainly relied upon *tahrir* registers and *vakfiyyes* for their sources. The current study examines the register of pious foundations of the Province of Karaman dated 888/1483 in light of hagiographies—the *Makâlat-i Seyyid Harun*, the *Menâkib-i Şeyh Ali Semerkandî*, the *Menâkibü'l-Ârifîn*, *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*—Şikarî's history of the Karamanids, legendary sources such as the *Düstûrnâme* of Enverî, *Hızırnâme*, *Saltuknâme*, and

the works written by a Karamanid shaykh, Baba Yusuf of Aksaray. Such an analysis has not been undertaken before for the Province of Karaman. Thirdly, this study analyzes the political climate of the sixteenth century in order to understand why a hagiographical work was written for Seyyid Harun in the mid-sixteenth century in spite of the fact that he died in the year 720/1320. Fourthly, the dissertation examines the similarities between Şikârî's history of the Karamanids and other texts written during the Karamanid rule in Konya. Finally, the dissertation explores the political and social criticism during the Seljukid, Karamanid and Ottoman periods and it denotes the continuity of that tradition in the works of Baba Yusuf.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

A- Primary Sources

A.1. Archival Sources

İstanbul Atatürk Kitaplığı

Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye, İstanbul Atatürk Kitaplığı, Cevdet Tasnifi, O. 116/1 (H. 888/1483).

Tapu ve Kadastro Genel Müdürlüğü Kuyûd-i Kadîme Arşivi

Defter-i Evkâf-ı Karaman ve Kayseriyye. Kuyûd-i Kadîme Defterleri, no. TK 564 (H. 881/1476).

Defter-ı Evkâf-ı Vilâyet-i Karaman ve Livâ-ı Kayseriye ve İçili, Kuyûd-ı Kadîme Defterleri, no. TK 565 (H. 906/1500).

Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Arşivi

Vakfiyye-i zâviye-i Pîr Ebî Sultan (Konya), vakfiyye defteri no: 589, sahîfe: 14/25, vakfiyye tarihi: 1296 (H.).

Vakfiyye-i zâviyye-i Pîr Es'ad (Konya), vakfiyye defteri no. 585, sahîfe: 102/110, vakfiyye tarihi: 844 (H)..

Vakfiyye-i Eş-Şeyh Muslihü'l-Hakk ve'd-Dîn Eba'l-Vefâ Çelebi Mustafa (Konya), vakfiyye defteri no: 596, sahîfe: 192/177, vakfiyye tarihi: 864 (H.) ve 875 (H.).

Vakfiyye-i Zâviye-i Kettâncı Baba (Lârende), vakfiyye defteri no: 585, sahîfe: 54/57, vakfiyye tarihi: 840 (H.).

A.2. Manuscripts

Âşıkpaşazâde, *Menâkıb-i Âl-i Osman*, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Emanet Hazinesi, no. 1433.

Baba Yusuf-i Hakîkî, *Hakîkînâme*, Sadi Somuncuoğlu Nüshası.

Baba Yusuf-i Hakîkî, *İlmü'l-Meşâyikh*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, no. 2974.

Mehmed Nurbahş, *Menâkıb ve Makâlât-i Şeyh Aliyy-i Semerkandî*, Koyunoğlu Müzesi Kütüphanesi, no. 13508.

Mehmed Nurbahş, *Menâkıb-i Şeyh Alaeddin -i Semerkandî*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yazmaları, no. TTK-Y-419.

Mecmû'a-i Külliyyât-ı Şeyh Ali Semerkandî, Koyunoğlu Müzesi Kütüphanesi, no. 11833.

Mevlânâ İsâ, *Câmî'u'l-Meknûnât*, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yazmaları no. TTK-Y-240/3.

Muhammed el-Hatîb, *Fustatu'l-'adâle fî kavâ'idi's-saltana*, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Supplément Turc, no. 1120.

Muhyiddin Çelebi, *Hızırnâme*, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi, Emanet Hazinesi, no. 1734.

Seyyid Nizam Bedahşî, *Menâkıb-i Seyyid Ali Semerkandî*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, no. 4603.

Yusuf Sinan, *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Esad Efendi, no. 1372.

Yusuf Sinan ibn Yakub, *Tezkire-i Halvetiyye*, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Supplément Turc, no. 48.

A.3. Published Primary Sources

- Abdullah ibn-i Eşref Rûmî, *Müzekki'n-nüfûs*, İstanbul: Bosnevî el-Hâc Muharrem Efendi Matbaası, 1291.
- Abdurrahman Câmî, *Nefehâtü'l-Üns Min Hadarâti'l-Kuds*, Lâmi'î Çelebi, tr., İstanbul: Marifet Yayınları, 1980.
- Abdülkadir Geylânî Dîvânı, Sûfi Kasîdeleri ve Rûmuzlu Makaleler*, Mustafa Utku, Yusuf Zeydan, eds., Bursa: Sır Yayıncılık, 2005.
- Abdülkerim b. Şeyh Mûsâ, *Makâlât-ı Seyyid Hârûn*, Cemal Kurnaz, ed., Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu (TTK), 1991.
- Abû Bakr İbn al-Zakî, *Ravzat al-Kuttâb va Hadîkat al-Albâb*, Ali Sevim, ed., Ankara: TTK, 1972.
- Ahi Evren (Şeyh Nasîrüddin Mahmud Al-Hoyî), *İmânın Boyutları (Metâli'u'l-İman)*, Mikail Bayram, tr., Konya, 1996.
- Ahmed Aflâkî, *Âriflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlânâ ve Etrafindakiler)*, vol. 1, Tahsin Yazıcı, tr. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1986.
- Ahmed Aflâkî, *Âriflerin Menkıbeleri (Mevlânâ ve Etrafindakiler)*, vol.2, Tahsin Yazıcı, tr. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1986.
- Ahmed Fakih, *Çerhnâme*, ed. Mecdut Mansuroğlu, İstanbul, 1956.
- Ahmed Fakih, *Kitâbu Evsâfi Mesâcidi's-Şerîfe*, Hasibe Mazıoğlu, ed., Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 1974.
- Ahmet Refik, *Onaltıncı Asırda Rafizilik ve Bektaşilik*, İstanbul: Muallim Ahmet Halit Kitaphanesi, 1932.
- Anadolu Selçukluları Tarihi (Historie Des Seldjoukides d'Asie Mineure Par Un Anonyme)*, Feridun Nafiz Uzluk, tr., Ankara, 1952.
- Anonim Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*, F. Giese Neşri, Nihat Azamat, ed., İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1992.
- Âşıkpaşaoğlu Tarihi*, H. Nihal Atsız, ed., Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1985.
- Aziz bin Erdeşir-i Esterâbâdî, *Bezm ü Rezm*, Kilisli Rif'at Beg, ed., İstanbul: Evkaf Matbaası, 1928.
- Barkan, Ömer Lütfi, and Enver Meriçli. *Hüdavendigâr Livası Tahrir Defterleri I*, Ankara: TTK, 1988.
- Discourses of Rûmî*, Arthur. J. Arberry, tr., Richmond: Curzon Pres, 1994.

- Ebû Abdullah Muhammed Ibn Battuta Tancî, *Ibn Battuta Seyahatnâmesi I*, A. Sait Aykut, tr. and ed., İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2000.
- Elvan Çelebi, *Menâkıbu'l-Kudsiyye fî Menâsıbi'l-Ünsiyye*, ed. A. Yaşar Ocak and İsmail Erünsal, İstanbul, 1984.
- Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 3, Seyit Ali Kahraman, Yücel Dağlı, eds. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999.
- Ferdowsi, *Shah-nama, The Epic of Kings*, Reuben Levy, tr., Amin Banani, ed., London: Arkana, 1990.
- Feridun b. Ahmed Sipehsâlâr, *Mevlânâ ve Etrafindakiler*, tr. Tahsin Yazıcı, İstanbul, 1977.
- Gazavât-i Sultan Murad b. Mehemed Hân, İzladı ve Varna Savaşları (1443-1444) Üzerinde Anonim Gazavâtnâme*, Halil İnalçık and Mevlûd Oğuz , eds., (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1989.
- Gazi Zahirüddin Muhammed Babur, *Vekayi (Babur'un Hâtıratı)*, vol. 1, Reşit Rahmeti Arat, tr., Ankara: TTK, 1987.
- Göçek Abdal, *Odman Baba Vilâyetnâmesi, Vilâyetnâme-i Şâhî*, Şevki Koca, ed., İstanbul: Bektaşî Kültür Derneği, 2002.
- Halil Edhem, "Karamanoğulları Hakkında Vesâik-i Mahkûke," *Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni Mecmu'ası*, vol. 2, no. 12, 741-760.
- Hâtîb-i Fârisî, *Manâkib-i Camâl al-Dîn-i Sâvî*, ed. Tahsin Yazıcı, Ankara: TTK, 1999.
- Hicrî 835 Tarihli Sûret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvanid*, Halil İnalçık, ed., Ankara: TTK, 1987.
- Ibn Battuta, *Travels in Asia and Africa, 1325-1354*, H.A.R. Gibb, tr. London: Darf Publishers, 1983.
- Ibn Kesir, *Al-Mabda' ve al-Nihad*, vol. 1, Ahmad Abd al-Vahhab Fetih, ed., Cairo: Dar al-Hadis, 2002.
- İbn Bîbî (El-Hüseyn b. Muhammed b. Ali el-Ca'ferî er-Rugedî), *El-Evâmirü'l-'Alâiyye fî'l-Umûri'l-'Alâiyye (Tıpkıbasım)*, Adnan Sadık Erzi, ed., Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1956.
- İbn Bîbî, *Selçuknâme*, Mükrimin Halil Yinanç, tr., Refet Yinanç and Ömer Özkan, eds., İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2007.
- İsma'îl Hakkı Bursevî, *Rûhu'l-Mesnevî*, vol. 1, İstanbul: Matba'a-i Âmire, 1287 (H.).

- Ismail Hakki Bursevi's Translation and Commentary of Fusus al-Hikam by Muhyiddin-i Arabi*, Bulent Rauf, R. Brass, and H. Tollemache, tr.s, Oxford: Istanbul: Muhyiddin Ibn al-Arabî Society, 1986.
- Kerimüddin Mahmud b. Muhammed (Aksarayî), *Müsâmeretü'l-Ahbâr*, tr. M. N. Gençosman, Ankara, 1944.
- Khwandamir, *Habibu's-Siyar, Tome Three, Part Two: Shahrukh Mirza-Shah Isma'il*, W. M. Thackston, tr. and ed., Harvard University, 1994.
- Kınalızade Hasan Çelebi, *Tezkiretü'ş-Şu'arâ*, 2 vol.s, ed. İbrahim Kutluk, Ankara, 1979-1981
- Lâmiî Çelebi, *Terceme-i Nefehâtü'l-Üns*, İstanbul, 1270 (H).
- Le Destan d'Umur Pacha (Düsturnâme-i Enverî)*, Irène Mélikoff-Sayar, tr. and ed., Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1954.
- Mahmud b. 'Utman, *Die Vita Des Scheich Abû Ishaq al-Kâzarûnî*, Fritz Meier, ed. Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenlaendische Gesellschaft, 1948.
- Mahmud Cemâleddin el-Hulvî, *Lemezât-ı Hulviyye ez Lemezât-ı Ulviyye (Büyük Velilerin Tatlı Halleri)*, Mehmet Serhan Tayşî, ed., İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1993.
- Manâkib-i Hacı Bektaş-i Veli, 'Vilâyet-Nâme,'* Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, ed., İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 1958.
- Mecdî Mehmed Efendi, *Şakaik-i Nu'maniye ve Zeyilleri, Hadaiku'ş-Şakaik*, Abdülkadir Özcan, ed., İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989.
- Mehmed Neşrî, *Kitâb-ı Cihan-nümâ, Neşrî Tarihi*, vol. 2, Faik Reşit Unat and Mehmed A. Köymen, eds., Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995.
- Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i Osmanî*, 6 vol.s, Seyit Ali Kahraman, tr., Nuri Akbayar, ed., İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996.
- Mehmed Şemseddin (Ulusoy), *Bursa Dergâhları: Yâdigâr-ı Şemsî*, 2 vol.s, ed. Mustafa Kara and Kadir Atlansoy, Bursa, 1997.
- Mevlânâ Celâleddin Rûmî, *Fîhi Mâ Fih*, Ahmed Avni Konuk, tr., İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 1994.
- Muhyî-yi Gülşenî, *Menâkib-i İbrâhîm-i Gülşenî*, Tahsin Yazıcı, ed. Ankara: TTK, 1982.
- Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede, *Müneccimbaşı Tarihi*, İsmail Erünsal, tr., İstanbul: Tercüman Yayınları, not dated.

- Najm-al-Dîn Râzî Dâye, *The Path of God's Bondmen from Origin to Return (Mersâd al-'ebâd men al-mabdâ' elâ'l-ma'âd)*, Hamid Algar, tr., New York: Caravan Books, 1982.
- Nev'îzâde Atâ'î, *Hadâiku'l-Hakâyık fî tekmileti'ş-Şakâik*, Abdülkadir Özcan, ed., İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989.
- Nizam al-Mulk, *The Book of Government or Rules for Kings (The Siyasat-nama or Siyar al-Muluk)*, Hubert Darke, tr., New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.
- Peçevî [Peçûyî] İbrahim Efendi, *Tarih-i Peçevî*, Fahri Ç. Derin, ed., Vahit Çabuk, İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1980.
- Sâdık Vicdânî, *Tomar-ı Turuk-i Aliyye, Birinci Cüz: Melâmîlik*, İstanbul: 1338 (H.).
- Saltuknâme, The Legend of Sarı Saltuk Collected from Oral Tradition by Ebu'l-Hayr Rûmî (Part 5: folios 351a-450b), Text in Facsimile with a Critical and Stylistic Analysis and Index by Fahir İz*, Harvard University, 1976.
- Sapancalı H. Hüseyin, *Karaman Ahval-i İctimaiyye, Coğrafiyye ve Tarihiyyesi*, 1338 R./1341 H., İbrahim Güler, ed., Ankara: TTK, 1993.
- Seyyid Alizâde Hasan b. Müslim, *Hızırnâme, Alevî Bektâşî Âdab ve Erkânı (Buyruk)*, Baki Yaşa Altınok, ed., Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı (TDV), 2007.
- Shams al-Dîn Ahmad-e Aflâkî, *The Feats of the Knowers of God (Manâqeb al-'ârefîn)*, John O'Kane, tr., (Leiden & Boston & Köln: Brill, 2002), p. 391.
- Sultan Veled, *İbtidâ-nâme*, Abdülâkî Gölpınarlı, tr., Konya: Konya ve Mülhakatı Eski Eserleri Sevenler Derneği, 2001.
- Şams al-Dîn Ahmed al-Aflâkî al-'Ârifî, *Manâkib al-'Ârifîn (Metin)*, vol. 1, Tahsin Yazıcı, ed., Ankara: TTK, 1976.
- Şams al-Dîn Ahmed al-Aflâkî al-'Ârifî, *Manâkib al-'Ârifîn (Metin)*, vol. 2, Tahsin Yazıcı, ed., Ankara: TTK, 1980.
- Şikârî, *Karamanoğulları Tarihi*, M. Mesud Koman, ed., Konya: Yeni Kitab Basımevi, 1946.
- Taşköprülüzâde, *Eş-şekâiku'n-nu'mâniyye fî ulemâ'id-devleti'l-Osmâniyye*, ed. Ahmed Suphi Furat, İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1985.
- The History of the Seljuq Turks, From The Câmi' al-Tawârîkh, An Ilkhanid Adaptation of the Saljuq-nâma of Zahîr al-Dîn Nishapûrî*, Kenneth Allin Luther, tr., C. Edmund Bosworth, ed., Richmond: Curzon, 2001.
- Turan, Osman. *İstanbul'un Fethinden Önce Yazılmış Tarihî Takvimler*, Ankara: TTK, 1954.

- Tursun Beg, *The History of Mehmed The Conqueror*, Halil İncalcık, and Rhoads Murphey, eds., Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1978.
- Uluçay, M. Çağatay. "Makâlât-i Seyyid-Hârûn," *Bellekten*, vol. X, 40 (1946): 749-778.
- Uzluç, F. Nafiz. *Fatih Devrinde Karaman Eyâleti Vakıfları Fihristi*, Ankara: Vakıflar Umum Müdürlüğü, 1958.
- Uzunçarşılı, İ. Hakkı. "Karamanoğulları Devri Vesikalarından İbrahim Bey'in Karaman İmaretı Vakfiyesi," *Bellekten*, I (1937), 56-127.
- 387 Numaralı Muhâsebe-i Vilâyet-i Karaman ve Rûm Defteri (937/1530) I, Konya, Bey-şehri, Ak-şehir, Lârende, Ak-saray, Niğde, Kayseriyye ve İç-il Livâları (Dizin ve Tıpkıbasım), Ankara: Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 1996.
- Ünsî, *Selçuk Şehnâmesi*, tr. M. Mesud Koman, Konya: Ülkü Basımevi, 1942.
- Vâhidî, *Vâhidî's Menâkıb-ı Hâce-i Cihân ve Netice-i Cân*, Ahmet T. Karamustafa, ed., Harvard University, 1993.
- Vatin, Nicolas. *Sultan Djem, Un Şehzâde Ottoman dans l'Europe du XVe siècle d'après deux sources contemporaines: Vâkı'ât-ı Sultan Cem, Œuvres de Guillaume Caoursin*, Ankara: La Société Turque d'Historie, 1997.

B- Secondary Sources

- Adam, Hüdaverdi. "The Relationship Between Muhyiddin Ibn al-Arabî and Sadreddin Al-Konevî," *Akademik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, no. 24 (2005): 153-164.
- Aköz, Alaaddin. "Şer'iyye Sicillerine Göre XVI. Yüzyıl sonu ile XVII. Yüzyıl Başlarında Karaman", *unpublished M.A. thesis*, Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi, 1997.
- Aköz, Alaaddin. "XVI. Asırda Karaman Kazası," *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi, 1992.
- Aköz, Alaaddin. "XVI. Yüzyıl Sonunda Karaman," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, no. 9 (1989), 331-345.
- Aşkar, Mustafa. *Tasavvuf Tarihi Literatürü*, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2001.
- Atasoy, Faysal Okan. "Melhame-i Şeyh Vefâ, Giriş-Metin-Sözlük", *unpublished M.A. thesis*, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2001.
- Atçeken, Zeki. *Konya'daki Selçuklu Yapılarının Osmanlı Devrinde Bakımı ve Kullanılması*, Ankara: TTK, 1998.
- Ay, Resul. "Ortaçağ Anadolu'sunda Bilginin Seyahati: Talebeler, Âlimler ve Dervişler," *Tarih ve Toplum Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, no. 3 (Spring 2006): 17-53.
- Bakı, Edip Âli. *XV. Yüzyıl Konya-Karaman Şairlerinden Aynî*, Ankara: Ulus Basımevi, 1949.
- Balivet, Michel. *Şeyh Bedreddin, Tasavvuf ve İsyân*, Ela Güntekin, tr., İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000.
- Barkan, Ö. Lütfi. "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Bir İskan ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler I, İstila Devirlerinin Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, II (1942): 279-386.
- Barkan, Ömer Lütfi. *Türkiye'de Toprak Meselesi*, İstanbul: Gözlem Yayınları, 1980.
- Baykara, Tuncer. *Türkiye Selçukluları Devrinde Konya*, Ankara, 1985.
- Bayram, Mikail. Ahi Evren, *Tasavvufî Düşüncenin Esasları*, Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1995.

- Bayram, Mikail. "Sadru'd-Din Konevî Kütüphanesi ve Kitapları," in Hasan Celal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek, Salim Kara, eds., *Türkler*, vol. 7, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002), 585-589.
- Bayram, Mikail. *Şeyh Evhadüddin Kirmani ve Menâkıbnâmesi*, İstanbul: Kardelen Yayınları, 2005.
- Bayram, Mikail. *Tarihin Işığında Nasreddin Hoca ve Ahi Evren*, İstanbul, 2001.
- Bayramoğlu, Fuat. *Hacı Bayram-ı Velî, Yaşamı, Soyu, Vakfı*, vol. 2, *Belgeler*, Ankara: TTK, 1983.
- Beldiceanu, Nicoara, and Irène Beldiceanu-Steinher, "Recherches sur la province de Karaman au 16e siècle," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient (JESHO)*, XI (1968): 1-129.
- Birge, John Kinsley. *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*, London: Luzac & Co., 1937.
- Boz, Erdoğan. "Hakîkî Dîvânı, Dil Özellikleri, Kısmî Çeviriyazılı Metin", *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, İnönü Üniversitesi, 1996.
- Browne, Edward G. *A Literary History of Persia, vol. II, From Firdawsî to Sa'dî (1000-1290)*, first published in 1902, Maryland: Iran Books, 1997.
- Bulut, Muhammet Ali. "Eğridirli Şeyh Mehmet Dede Sultan'ın Hızırnâme'si (İnceleme - Metin)," *unpublished M. A. thesis*, Atatürk Üniversitesi, 2003.
- Kathleen R. F. Burrill, *The Quatrains of Nesimî, Fourteenth Century Turkic Huruî*, The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1972.
- Cahen, Claude. *Pre-Ottoman Turkey: a general survey of the material and spiritual culture and history .c.1071-1330*, J.Jones-Williams, tr., London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1968.
- Chittick, William C. "The Central Point, Qunawî's Role in the School of Ibn 'Arabî," *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabî Society*, XXXV (2004): 25-45.
- Chittick, William C. "Rûmî and the Mawlawiyyah," in Seyyed Hossein Nasr, ed., *Islamic Spirituality, Manifestations*, vol. II, New York: SCM Press Ltd., 1991.
- Christian, David. *Maps of Time, An Introduction to Big History*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Clark, Jane. "Early Best-sellers in the Akbarian Tradition: The Dissemination of Ibn 'Arabî's Teaching Through Sadr al-dîn al-Qunawî," *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn al-Arabî Society*, XXXIII (2003): 22-53.
- Clayer, Nathalie. *Mystiques, État et Societe, Les Halvetis dans l'aire Balkanique de la fin du XVe siècle à nos jours*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.

- Coşkun, Fahri , "888/1483 Tarihli Karaman Eyaleti Vakıf Tahrir Defteri (Tanıtım, Tahlil ve Metin)," *unpublished M. A. thesis*, İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1996.
- Curry, John. "The Growth of Turkish hagiographical literature within the Halveti Order in the 16th and 17th centuries," in H. Celal Güzel, C. Cem Oğuz, Osman Karatay , eds., *The Turks, 3: Ottomans*, Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 2002, 912-920.
- Cvetkova, B. "Early Ottoman *Tahrir* Defters as a Source for Studies on the History of Bulgaria and the Balkans," *Archivum Ottomanicum*, VIII (1983), 133-212.
- Çağatay, Neşet. *Bir Türk Kurumu Olan Ahilik*, Ankara, TTK, 1997.
- Çavuşoğlu, Ali. *Tasavvuf Risalesi ve Metalîl-İman, inceleme ve metin*, Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 2004.
- Çavuşoğlu, Ali. "Yusuf Hakîkî'nin Mahabbet-nâme Adlı Eserinin Tenkitli Metni ve İncelenmesi," *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, Erciyes Üniversitesi, 2002.
- Çiçek, Kemal. "Osmanlı Tahrir Defterlerinin Kullanımında Görülen Bazı Problemler ve Metod Arayışları," *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, no. 97 (August 1995): 93-111.
- Çiçek, Kemal. "*Tahrir Defterleri* as a Source for History," *unpublished M. A. thesis*, University of Birmingham, 1989.
- Çiftçioğlu, İsmail. "Vakfiyelere ve Tahrir Defterlerine Göre Karamanlı Eğitim Kurumları," *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, 2001.
- Demirel, Ömer. *Osmanlı Vakıf-Şehir İlişkinine Bir Örnek: Sivas Şehir Hayatında Vakıfların Rolü*, Ankara: TTK, 2000.
- Deniz, Bekir. "Aksaray - Melik Mahmud Gazi Hangâhı (Darphane)," in *III. Millî Selçuklu Kültür ve Medeniyeti Semineri Bildirileri, 20-22 Mayıs 1993*, Konya, 1994, 35-53.
- Deweese, Devin. "The Mashâ'ikh-i Turk and the Khojagân: Rethinking the Links between the Yasavî and Naqshbandî Sufî Tradition," *Journal of Islamic Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2 (July 1996), 180-207.
- Durukan, Aynur. "Konya'da Selçuklu Mimarisi," in Ahsen Erdoğan, ed., *Gez Dünyayı Gör Konya'yı*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2001, 91-175.
- Düzdağ, M. Ertuğrul. *Şeyhülislâm Ebussuûd Efendi Fetvaları Işığında 16. Asır Türk Hayatı*, İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1983.

- Eliade, Mircea. *A History of Religious Ideas*, vol. 3 (*From Muhammad to the Age of Reforms*), Alf Hiltebeitel and Diane Apostolos-Cappadona, trs., The University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- El-Moor, Jereer. "The 'Sun of Religion' Meets Its 'Reviver'? A Review-Article of Me and Rûmî: The Autobiography of Shams-i Tabrizî," *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn al-Arabî Society*, vol. 38 (2005), 65-89.
- Elmore, Gerald. "Sadr al-Dîn al-Qunawî's Personal Study-List of Books by Ibn al-'Arabî," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, vol. 56, no. 3 (July 1997): 161-181.
- Emecen, Feridun M. *İlk Osmanlılar ve Batı Anadolu Beylikler Dünyası*, İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2003.
- Eravşar, Osman. *Gezginlerin Gözüyle Konya, Gez Dünyayı, Gör Konya'yı*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2001.
- Eraydın, Selçuk. *Tasavvuf ve Tarikatlar*, İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1997.
- Erdoğan, Muzaffer. *İzahlı Konya Bibliyografyası*, İstanbul, 1950.
- Erdoğan, M. Akif. "Kanuni'nin İlk Yıllarında Karaman Vilayeti," *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, VII (1993): 37-50.
- Erdoğan, M. Akif. "Karaman Vilâyeti Zâviyeleri," *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. 9 (1994), 89-157.
- Erdoğan, M. Akif. "Karaman Vilayetinin İdari Taksimatı," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, XII (1992): 425-430.
- Erdoğan, M. Akif. "Murad Çelebi Defteri: 1483 Yılında Karaman Vilâyetinde Vakıflar I," *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, vol. 18 (July 2003): 118-132.
- Erdoğan, M. Akif. *Osmanlı Yönetiminde Beyşehir Sancağı (1522-1584)*, İzmir, 1988.
- Erdoğan, M. Akif. "Some Observations on the Urban Population of Karaman Province in the Reign of Murad III with regard to the Mufassal Defters", *Collection Turcica*, vol. VIII: 341-347.
- Erdoğan, M. Akif. "XV. ve XVI. Yüzyılda Beyşehir Sancağı (1466-1584)", *unpublished Ph. D. thesis*, Ankara, 1989.
- Ernst, Carl W. *Mysticism, History and Politics at a South Asian Sufi Center*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Eyice, Semavi. "İlk Osmanlı Devrinin Dini-İctimaî Bir Müessesesi - Zaviyeler ve Zaviyeli Camiler", *İÜ İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, XIII (Oct. 1962- Feb. 1963).

- Faroqhi, Suraiya. "A Map of Anatolian Friday Mosques (1520-1535)", *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, IV (1984): 161-174.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya. "Agricultural Crisis and the Art of Flute-Playing: The Worldly Affairs of the Mevlevî Dervishes (1595-1652)," *Turcica*, vol. 20 (1988): 43-63.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya. *Peasants, Dervishes and Traders in the Ottoman Empire*, London: Variorum Reprints, 1986.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya. "Peasants of Saideli in the Late Sixteenth Century," in Suraiya Faroqhi, ed., *Peasants, Dervishes and Traders in the Ottoman Empire*, London: Variorum Reprints, 1986, 215-249.
- Suraiya Faroqhi, *Subjects of the Sultan, Culture and Daily Life in the Ottoman Empire*, London: I. B. Tauris Publishers, 2000.
- Faroqhi, S. "Taxation and Urban Activities in Sixteenth Century Anatolia", *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, I, no. 1 (1979-80), 39-50.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya. "Vakıf Administration in the Sixteenth Century Konya: The Zaviye of Sadreddin Konevî," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient (JESHO)*, vol. XVII: 145-172.
- Fernandes, Leonor. *The Evolution of a Sufi Institution in Mamluk Egypt: The Khankâh*, Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1988.
- Fleischer, Cornell H. *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: the Historian Mustafa Âlî (1541-1600)*, Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Fleischer, Cornell H. "From Şeyhzade Korkud to Mustafa Âlî: Cultural Origins of the Ottoman Pand-nâma," in Heath W. Lowry and Ralph S. Hattox, eds., *IIIrd Congress on the Social and Economic History of Turkey, Princeton University, 24-26 August 1983*, İstanbul: the ISIS Press, 1990, 67-77.
- Flemming, Barbara. "Public Opinion Under Sultan Süleyman", in Halil İnalçık and Cemal Kafadar, eds., *Süleyman the Second and His Time*, İstanbul: the ISIS Press, 1993, 49-57.
- Göde, Kemal. *Eratnahılar (1327-1381)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1994.
- Gök, Bilal. "Ermenek Kazası (1500-1600)," *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, İnönü Üniversitesi, 2006.
- Gökbilgin, M. Tayyip. "16. Yüzyılda Karaman Eyaleti ve Lârende (Karaman) Vakıf ve Müesseseleri," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, VII (1968): 29-39.
- Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. *Melamilik ve Melamiler*, İstanbul: Gri Yayın, 1992.
- Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. *Mevlânâ Celâleddin*, İstanbul, 1959.

- Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. *Mevlana'dan Sonra Mevlevilik*, İstanbul, İnkılâp Kitabevi, 1953.
- Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. *Mevlânâ Müzesi Yazmalar Kataloğu*, four volumes, Ankara: TTK, 1967.
- Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. *Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf*, first published in 1961, İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitabevi, 1992.
- Gölpınarlı, Abdülkadir. *100 Soruda Türkiye'de Mezhepler ve Tarikatlar*, İstanbul, 1969.
- Graham, Terry. "Abu Ishaq Kaziruni: Founder of Sufism's First Order", *Sufi*, no. 55 (Autumn 2002): 24-28.
- Gümüüşçü, Osman. *XVI. Yüzyıl Lârende (Karaman) Kazasında Yerleşme ve Nüfus*, Ankara: TTK, 2001.
- Güney, Ahmet Faruk. "Gaza Devrinde Kur'an'ı Yorumlamak: Fetih Öncesi Dönemde Osmanlı Müfessirleri ve Tefsir Eserleri," *Dîvân: İlmî Araştırmalar*, vol. 10, no. 18 (2005): 193-244.
- Gürbüz, Adnan. *XV.-XVI. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Sancak Çalışmaları*, İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2001.
- Güzel, Abdurrahman. *Abdal Mûsâ Velayetnâmesi*, Ankara: TTK, 1999.
- Güzel, Abdurrahman. *Kaygusuz Abdal (Alaaddin Gaybî) Menâkıbnamesi*, Ankara: TTK, 1999.
- Halil Edhem, *Düvel-i İslâmiyye*, İstanbul: Millî Matba'a, 1927
- Hasluck, F. W. *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, vol. II, İstanbul: the ISIS Press, 2000.
- Hikmet, Ali Asgar. *Câmî, Hayatı ve Eserleri*, M. Nuri Gençosman, tr., Ankara: MEB, 1963.
- Hinz, Walther. *Uzun Hasan ve Şeyh Cüneyd, XV. Yüzyılda İran'ın Millî Bir Devlet Haline Yükselişi*, Tefvîk Bıyıklıođlu, tr., Ankara: TTK, 1992.
- Hodgson, Marshall G.S. *The Venture of Islam, Conscience and History in a World Civilization*, vol. 2, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Hoexter, Miriam. "Waqf Studies in the Twentieth Century: The State of the Art," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient (JESHO)*, vol. 41 (1998), 474-495.
- Holbrook, Victoria Rowe. *The Unreadable Shores of Love, Turkish Modernity and Mystic Romance*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994.

- Holt, P. M. *The Age of the Crusades, the Near East from the Eleventh Century to 1517*, New York: Longman, 1986.
- Homerin, Emil. "Living Love: The Mystical Writings of 'Â'ishah al-Bâ'ûniyah (d. 922/1516), *Mamluk Studies Review*, vol. 7 (2003): 211-234.
- Homerin, Emil. "Saving Muslim Souls: The Khankâh and the Sufi Duty in Mamluk Lands," *Mamluk Studies Review*, vol. 3 (1999): 59-83.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Ahmad Paşa Gedik," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition, vol. 1, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986, pp. 292-293.
- İnalcık, Halil, and Quataert Donald (eds.), *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Dervish and Sultan: An Analysis of the *Otman Baba Vilâyetnâmesi*," in Halil İnalcık, ed., *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society*, Indiana: Bloomington, 1993, 19-36.
- İnalcık, Halil. "*Djem*," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition, vol. 2, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983, 529-530.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Eyüp Projesi," in *Eyüp: Dün / Bugün, 11-12 Aralık 1993*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1994: 1-23.
- İnalcık, Halil. *Fatih Devri Üzerinde Tetkikler ve Vesikalar*, Ankara: TTK, 1987.
- İnalcık, Halil. "How to Read 'Âshık Pasha-zade's History," in Halil İnalcık, ed., *Essays in Ottoman History*, İstanbul: Eren Yayınları, 1998, 31-50.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Impact of the *Annales* on Ottoman Studies and New Findings," *Review*, I, 3/4 (Winter/Spring 1978): pp. 69-96.
- İnalcık, Halil. "İstanbul," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition, vol. 9 (1973), 224-248.
- İnalcık, Halil. "İstanbul: An Islamic City", in Halil İnalcık, ed., *Essays in Ottoman History*, İstanbul: Eren Yayınları, 1998, 249-271.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Klasik Edebiyat Menşei: İranî Gelenek, Saray İşret Meclisleri ve Musâhib Şâirler," in Talat Sait Halman and et al., eds., *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, İstanbul: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2006, 221-282.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Land Possession Outside the Mîrî System," in Halil İnalcık, and Donald Quataert, eds., *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, Cambridge University Press, 1994, 120-131.

- İnalcık, Halil. "Land Surveying," in Halil İnalcık and Donald Quataert, eds., *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*, Cambridge University Press, 1994, 132-142.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Mehmed the Conqueror (1432-1481) and His Time," in Halil İnalcık, ed., *Essays in Ottoman History*, İstanbul: Eren Yayınları, 1998, 87-110.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Mehmed II," *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. VII, 506-535.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Murad I," *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Murad II," *İslam Ansiklopedisi*.
- İnalcık, Halil. "“Osmanlı Medeniyeti” ve Saray Patronajı," in Halil İnalcık and Günsel Renda, eds., *Osmanlı Uygarlığı*, Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2004, 13-27.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Osmanlı Tarihinde Dönemler: Devlet-Toplum-Ekonomi," Halil İnalcık and Günsel Renda, eds., *Osmanlı Uygarlığı*, vol. 1, Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2004, 30-235.
- İnalcık, Halil. *Osmanlı'da Devlet, Hukuk, Adâlet*, İstanbul: Eren Yayınları, 2000.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Osmanlılar'da Ra'yyet Rüsûmu," *Belleten*, vol. 23, no. 92 (October, 1959), 575-610.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Osmanlı Tarihine Toplu Bir Bakış," in *Osmanlı*, vol.1, Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999, 37-117.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Ottoman Methods of Conquest," *Studia Islamica*, no. 2 (1954): 103-129.
- İnalcık, Halil. "State and Ideology under Sultan Süleyman I," in Halil İnalcık, ed., *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire, Essays on Economy and Society*, Bloomington: Indiana University, 1993, 70-94.
- İnalcık, Halil. *The Ottoman Empire, The Classical Age*, London: Phoenix, 1995.
- İnalcık, Halil. *Şâir ve Patron*, Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları, 2003.
- İnalcık, Halil. "The Emergence of the Ottomans," in P. M. Holt, A. K. Lambton, and Bernard Lewis, eds., *The Cambridge History of Islam*, vol. 1, The Cambridge University Press, 1970, 263-291.
- İnalcık, Halil. "The Question of the Emergence of the Ottoman State," *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, 2 (1980): 71-79.

- İnalcık, Halil. "The Rise the Turcoman Maritime Principalities in Anatolia, Byzantium, and the Crusades," in Halil İnalcık, ed., *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society*, Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies and Turkish Ministry of Culture Joint Series, vol. 9, 1993, 309-341.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Timâr," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition, 502-507.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Turkish and Iranian Political Theories and Traditions in Kutadgu Bilig," in Halil İnalcık, ed., *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire*, Indiana: Bloomington, 1993, 1-18.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Tursun Beg, Historian of Mehmed the Conqueror's Time," in Halil İnalcık, ed., *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire, Essays on Economy and Society*, Indiana: Bloomington, 1993, 417-431.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Türkiye'de Modern Tarihçiliğin Kurucuları," in *XIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara: 4-8 Ekim 1999, Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, vol. 1, (Ankara: TTK, 2002), 85-166.
- Jennings, R.C. "Urban Population in Anatolia in the Sixteenth Century: A Study of Kayseri, Karaman, Amasya, Trabzon and Erzurum", *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, VII, no. 1 (1976), 21-57.
- Kafadar, Cemal. "Mütereddît Bir Mutasavvıf: Üsküp'lü Asiye Hatun'un Rüya Defteri, 1641-43," *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Yıllığı- V*, İstanbul, 1992, 168-222.
- Kafadar, Cemal. "Self and Others: The Diary of a Dervish in Seventeenth Century Istanbul and First-Person Narratives in Ottoman Literature," *Studia Islamica* 69 (1989): 121-150.
- Kafadar, Cemal. "The New Visibility of Sufism in Turkish Studies and Cultural Life," in Raymond Lifchez, ed., *The Dervish Lodge: Art and Sufism in Ottoman Turkey*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992, 307-22.
- Kalpıklı, Mehmet (ed.). *Osmanlı Divan Şiiri Üzerine Metinler*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999.
- Kara, Mustafa. "Abdülkadir Geylânî Hazretleri'nden Gazi Paşa Hazretleri'ne veya Tasavvufun Gücü," in Mustafa Kara, ed., *Dervişin Hayatı, Süfînin Kelâmı, Hal Tercümeleri, Tarikatlar, İstılahlar*, İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2005, 485-513.
- Kafadar, Kafadar. *Between Two Worlds, The Construction of the Ottoman State*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Kara, Mustafa. "Buhara'dan Bursa ve Bosna'ya Dervişâne Bir Yürüyüş," *Türkler*, vol. 5, Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002, 561-568.
- Kara, Mustafa. *Bursa'da Tarikatlar ve Tekkeler*, Bursa: Sır Yayıncılık, 2001.

- Kara, Mustafa. *Dervişin Hayatı, Sûfinin Kelâmı, Hal Tercümelere, Tarikatlar, İstilahlar*, İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2005.
- Kara, Mustafa. *Din, Hayat, Sanat Açısından Tekkeler ve Zâviyeler*, İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 1990.
- Kara, Mustafa. *Metinlerle Osmanlılarda Tasavvuf ve Tarikatlar*, Bursa: Sır Yayıncılık, 2004.
- Kara, Mustafa. *Metinlerle Günümüz Tasavvuf Hareketleri: 1839-2000*, İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2002.
- Kara, Mustafa. *Tasavvuf ve Tarikatlar Tarihi*, İstanbul, Dergâh Yayınları, 1985.
- Kara, Mustafa. *Türk Tasavvuf Tarihi Araştırmaları, Tarikatlar, Tekkeler, Şeyhler*, İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2005.
- Karamustafa, Ahmet T. *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Period 1200-1550*, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994.
- Karamustafa, Ahmet T. "Kalenders, Abdâls, Hayderîs: The formation of the Bektâşîye in the Sixteenth Century," in Halil İnalçık and Cemal Kafadar, eds., *Süleyman The Magnificent and his Time*, İstanbul: ISIS Press, 1993.
- Katz, Jonathan G. *Dreams, Sufism and Sainthood, The Visionary Career of Muhammad al-Zawâwî*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Keddie, Nikki R. *Scholars, Saints, and Sufis, Muslim Religious Institutions since 1500*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
- Kılıç, Rüya. "Bir Tarikatın Gizli Direnişi: Bayramî Melamîleri veya Hamzavîler," *Tasavvuf*, vol. 4, no. 10 (June, 2003): 251-272.
- Kılıç, Rüya. "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Gülşenî Tarikatı (Genel Bir Yaklaşım Denemesi)," *Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi*, no. 15 (2004): 209-226.
- Knysh, Alexander. *Islamic Mysticism: A Short History*, Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Konyalı, İ. Hakkı. *Âbideleri ve Kitâbeleriyle Beyşehir Târîhi*, Ahmet Savran, ed., Erzurum, 1991.
- Konyalı, İ. Hakkı. *Âbideleri ve Kitabeleri ile Erzurum Tarihi*, İstanbul: Ercan Matbaası, 1960.
- Konyalı, İ. Hakkı. *Âbideleri ve Kitabeleriyle Karaman Tarihi, Ermenek ve Mut Âbideleri*, İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1967.

- Konyalı, İ. Hakkı. *Âbideleri ve Kitabeleriyle Konya Tarihi*, Konya: Enes Kitap Sarayı, 1997.
- Konyalı, İ. Hakkı, *Âbideleri ve Kitabeleriyle Niğde Aksaray Tarihi*, 3 vol.s, İstanbul: Fatih Matbaası, 1974-1975.
- Konyalı, İ. Hakkı. *Alanya (Alaiye)*, M. Ali Kemaloglu, ed., İstanbul: Ayaydın Basımevi, 1946.
- Konyalı, İ. Hakkı. *Nasreddin Hoca'nın Şehri Akşehir, , Tarihî-Turistik Kılavuz*, İstanbul, 1945.
- Köprülü, M. Fuat. *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Kuruluşu*, Ankara, 1972.
- Köprülü, Fuad. "Abû İshak Kâzerûnî ve Anadolu'da İshâkî Dervişleri", Cemal Köprülü, tr., *Belleten*, XXXIII (April 1969): 225-236.
- Köprülü, Fuad. "Selçuklular Devrinde Anadolu Şairleri II, Ahmed Fakih," *Türk Yurdu*, vol. IV, no 22 (Teşrîn-i Evvel, 1926): 289-295.
- Köprülü, M. Fuat. *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*, Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı, 1966.
- Köprülü, M. Fuad. *The Origins of the Ottoman Empire*, Gary Leiser, tr. And ed., State University of New York, 1992.
- Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad. *The Seljuks of Anatolia, Their History and Culture according to Local Muslim Sources*, [translation and edition of "Anadolu Tarihi'nin Yerli Kaynakları", originally published in *Belleten* 7 (1943)], Gary Leiser , tr. and ed., Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1992.
- Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, first published in 1926, Ankara: Akçağ, 2004.
- Köprülü, Orhan F. "Velâyetnâme-i Sultan Şücaüddin," *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, vol. 17 (1972): 177-184.
- Kramers, J. H. "Münedjimbashi," *The Encyclopedia of Islam*, second edition, vol. 7, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993, 572-573.
- Kunter, Halim Baki. *Türk Vakıfları ve Vakfiyeleri Üzerine Mücmel bir Etüd*, İstanbul, 1939.
- Kunter, Halim Baki. "Tarsustaki Türkistan Zaviyelerinin Vakfiyeleri," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, III (1956), 1-12.
- Kuran, Abdullah. "Karamanlı Medreseleri," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, VIII (1969), 209-225.

- Küçükdağ, Yusuf. "Osmanlı Dönemi Konya Tekke ve Zâviyeleri," in Haşim Karpuz, ed., *Dünden Bugüne Konya'nın Kültür Birikimi ve Selçuk Üniversitesi*, Konya, 1999, 135-155.
- Küçükdağ, Yusuf. "Seyyid Mahmud-ı Hayranî ve Akşehir'de Seyyid Mahmud-ı Hayranî Manzumesi," in Yusuf Küçükdağ, ed., *Türk Tasavvuf Araştırmaları*, Konya: Çizgi Yayınları, 2005, 311-322.
- Ladurie, Emmanuel Le Roy. *Montaillou, The Promised Land of Error*, Barbara Bray, tr., New York: George Brziller, Inc., 1978.
- Le Gall, Dina. *A Culture of Sufism, Naqshbandis in the Ottoman World, 1450-1700*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.
- Leeuwen, Richard Van. *Waqfs and Urban Structures, The Case of Ottoman Damascus*, Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Lifchez, Raymond. "The Lodges of Istanbul," in Raymond Lifchez, ed., *The Dervish Lodge, Architecture, Art, and Sufism in Ottoman Turkey*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992, 73-129.
- Lindner, Rudi Paul. *Explorations in Ottoman Prehistory*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2007.
- Lindner, Rudi Paul. *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia*, Bloomington: Indiana University, 1983.
- Malamud, Margaret. "Sufi Organizations and Structures of Authority in Medieval Nishapur," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 26 (1994): 427-442.
- Mazzaoui, Michel M. *The Origins of the Safawids, Shi'ism, Sufism, and the Ghulât*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1972.
- McNeill, J. R. and William H. McNeill. *The Human Web, A Bird's-Eye View of World History*, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2003.
- McNeill, William H. *The Rise of the West, A History of the Human Community*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Meier, Fritz . "A Book of Etiquette for Sufis", in *Essays on Islamic Piety and Mysticism by Fritz Meier*, John O'Kane, tr., Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999, 49-92.
- Meier, Fritz . "The Sumâdiyya: A Branch Order of the Qâdiriyya in Damascus," in *Essays on Islamic Piety and Mysticism by Fritz Meier*, John O'Kane, tr., Leiden: Brill, 1999, 283-307.
- Mélikoff, Irène. *Hacı Bektaş, Efsaneden Gerçeğe*, Turan Alptekin, tr., İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Kitapları, 1998.

- Mélikoff, Irène. *Hadji Bektach, Un Mythe et ses Avatars, Genèse et évolution du soufisme populaire en Turquie*, Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Mercan, İsmail Hakkı. “Şeyh Alâeddin Ali es-Semerkindî ve Menâkıb-nâmesi, Menâkıbnâme’ye Göre Osmanlı-Karamanlı Mücâdelesî”, *XIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Ankara, 4-8 Ekim 1999, Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler*, Ankara: Yürk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 2002, 47-76.
- Meriç, Rıfki Melül. *Akşehir Türbe ve Mezarları*, İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1936.
- Mermer, Ahmet. *Karamanlı Aynî ve Dîvânı*, Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 1997.
- Miroğlu, İsmet. *Kemah Sancağı ve Erzincan Kazası (1520-1566)*, Ankara: TTK, 1990.
- Moutaftchieva, Vera. *Le Vakıf—Un Aspect de la Structure Socio-Economique de L’Empire Ottoman (XVe-XVIIe s.)*, Sofia: Comite de la Culture, Centre National des Langues et Civilisations Anciennes, 1981.
- Necipoglu, Gülru. *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire*, London: Reaktion Books, 2005.
- Niyazioğlu, Aslı. “Ottoman Sufi Shaykhs Between This World and the Hereafter: A Study of Nev’izâde ‘Atâ’i’s (1583-1635) Biographical Dictionary,” *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, Harvard University, 2003.
- Nizamî, Khaliq Ahmad. “The Qâdiriyyah Order,” in Seyyed Hossein Nasr, ed., *Islamic Spirituality, Manifestations*, London: SCM Press Ltd, 1991, 6-25.
- Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. *Babailer İsyânı*, İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1996.
- Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. “Hızırnâme,” *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, 417-419.
- Ocak, A. Yaşar. *Kültür Tarihi Kaynağı Olarak Menakıbnâmeler, Metodolojik Bir Yaklaşım*, Ankara: TTK, 1997.
- Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. “XVI.-XVII. Yüzyıllarda Bayramî (Hamzavî) Melâmîleri ve Osmanlı Yönetimi,” *Belleten*, vol. 61, no. 230 (April 1997): 93-110.
- Ocak, A. Yaşar. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Marjinal Sufilik: Kalenderîler (XIV-XVII. Yüzyıllar)*, Ankara: TTK, 1999.
- Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar (ed.), *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf ve Sufiler, kaynaklar-doktrin-ayin ve erkan-tarikatlar-edebiyat-mimari-ikonografi-modernizm*, Ankara: TTK, 2005.
- Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler (15.-17. Yüzyıllar)*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2003.
- Ocak, A. Yaşar, and Suraiya Faroqhi, “Zâviye,” *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 13,

- İstanbul: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1986, 468-476.
- Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. "Zaviyeler, Dinî, Sosyal ve Kültürel Tarih Açısından bir Deneme," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. 12 (1978): 247-269.
- Oral, M. Zeki. "Aksaray'ın Tarihî Önemi ve Vakıfları," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. 5 (1962): 223-240.
- Oral, M. Zeki. "Turgutoğulları, Eserleri ve Vakfiyeleri," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, no. 3 (1956): 32-64.
- Ökten, Ertuğrul İ. "Câmî (817-898/1414-1492): His Biography and Intellectual Influence in Herat," *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, The University of Chicago, 2007.
- Önder, Mehmet. *Mevlânâ Şehri Konya*, Ankara: Konya Turizm Derneği, 1971.
- Önder, Mehmet. *Seydişehir Tarihi*, Seydişehir: Seydişehir Belediyesi, 1986.
- Öngören, Reşat. "Fatih Devrinde Belli Başlı Tarikatlar ve Zeyniyye," *unpublished M.A. thesis*, Marmara Üniversitesi, 1990.
- Öngören, Reşat. *Osmanlılar'da Tasavvuf : Anadolu'da Sufiler, Devlet ve Ulemâ (XVI. Yüzyıl)*, İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2000.
- Öngören, Reşat. *Tarihte Bir Aydın Tarikatı: Zeynîler*, İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2003.
- Öz, Mehmet. *XV-XVI. Yüzyıllarda Canik Sancağı*, Ankara: TTK, 1999.
- Öz, Mehmet. "Osmanlı Klasik Döneminde Anadolu Kentleri," *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, vol. 3, no. 6 (2005), 57-88.
- Öz, Mehmet. "Tahrir Defterlerinin Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırmalarında Kullanılması Hakkında Bazı Düşünceler," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, XXII (1991): 429-439.
- Özel, Oktay. "Limits of the Almighty: Mehmed II's 'Land Reform' Revisited," *JESHO*, 42 (1999): 226-246.
- Özergin, M. K. "Anadolu'da Selçuklu Kervansarayları", *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi*, no. 20 (1965), 141-170.
- Özönder, Hasan. *Konya Velileri*, Konya, 1990.
- Parman, Susan. *Dream and Culture, an Anthropological Study of the Western Intellectual Tradition*, New York: Praeger, 1991.

- Popovic, Alexandre and Gilles Veinstein, (eds.), *Bektachiyya, Etudes sur L'ordre Mystique des Bektachis et les Groupes Relevant de Hadji Bektach*, Istanbul: 1995.
- Renard, John. *Historical Dictionary of Sufism*, Oxford: The Scarecrow Press, 2005.
- Rizvi, Kishwar. "Women and Benevolence during the Early Safavid Empire," in D. Fairchild Ruggles *Women, ed., Patronage, and Self-Representation in Islamic Societies*, New York: State University of New York Press, 2000, 123-153.
- Roemer, Hans R. "The Qizilbash Turcomans: Founders and Victims of the Safavid Theocracy," in Michel M. Mazzaoui and Vera B. Mooren, *Intellectual Studies on Islam, Essays written in honor of Martin B. Dickson*, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1990, 27-39.
- Rupprecht, Carol Schreier. *The Dream and the Text: Essays on Literature and Language*, The State University of New York, 1993.
- Savory, Roger. *Iran Under the Safavids*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Schimmel, Annemarie. *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975
- Schimmel, Annemarie. "Sufism and Spiritual Life in Turkey," in Seyyed Hossein Nasr, ed., *Islamic Spirituality, Manifestations*, vol. II, New York: SCM Press Ltd., 1991, 223-232.
- Sertkaya, Osman F. "Ahmed Fakih," *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2, İstanbul, 1989, 65-67.
- Smith, Margaret. *Muslim Women Mystics, The Life and Work of Rabia and Other Women Mystics in Islam*, Oxford: Oneworld, 2001.
- Southgate, Mino S. "Portrait of Alexander in Persian Alexander-Romances of the Islamic Era," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 97, no. 3 (July-September, 1977): 278-284.
- Spuler, Bertold. *İran Moğolları, Siyaset, İdare ve Kültür, İlhanlılar Devri, 1220-1350*, Cemal Köprülü, tr., Ankara, 1987.
- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. *Beş Şehir*, İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2001.
- Taştemir, Mehmet. *XVI. Yüzyılda Adıyaman (Behisni, Hısn-ı Mansur, Gerger, Kâhta) Sosyal ve İktisadî Tarihi*, Ankara: TTK, 1999.
- Tek, Abdürrezzak. *Abdüllatif Kudsi, Hayatı, Eserleri ve Görüşleri*, Bursa: Emin Yayınları, 2007.

- Tekindağ, M. C. Şehabettin. *Anadolu'da Türk Tarihi ve Kültürü, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi'nde 16.5.1966 – 31.5.1966 Arası Verilmiş Konferanslar*, Trabzon: Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, 1967.
- Tekindağ, Şehabettin. "Fatih Devrinde Osmanlı-Memlûklü Münasebetleri," *Tarih Dergisi*, no. 30 (1976): 73-98.
- Tekindağ, Şehabettin. "Konya ve Karaman Kütüphanelerinde Mevcut Karamanoğulları İle İlgili Yazmalar Üzerinde Çalışmalar," *Tarih Dergisi*, no. 32 (March, 1979): 117-136
- Tekindağ, M. Şehabettin. "Karamanlılar," *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. VI, 316-330.
- Tekindağ, M. Şehabettin. "Karamanlı'ların Gorigos Seferi (1367)," *Tarih Dergisi*, no. 11: 161-174;
- Tekindağ, M. Şehabettin. "XIII. Yüzyıl Anadolu Tarihine Aid Araştırmalar, Şemsüddin Mehmed Bey Devrinde Karamanlılar," *Tarih Dergisi*, XIV (1964): 81-98
- Tekindağ, Şehabettin. "Son Osmanlı-Karaman Münasebetleri Hakkında Araştırmalar," *İstanbul Üniversitesi. Tarih Dergisi*, XIII (1963): 43-76.
- Tekindağ, Şehabettin. "Büyük Türk Mutasavvıfı Yunus Emre Hakkında Araştırmalar," *Bellekten*, vol. 30 (1966), 59-90.
- Terzioğlu, Derin. "Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyâzî-i Mısırî (1618-1694)," *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, Harvard University, 1999.
- Togan, A. Zeki Velidi. "Azerbaycan," *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 2, İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1949, 91-118.
- Trimingham, J. Spencer. *The Sufi Orders in Islam*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Turan, Osman "Anatolia in the Period of the Seljuks and the Beyliks," in ed. P.M. Holt, Ann K.S. Lambton, Bernard Lewis, eds., *The Cambridge History of Islam, vol. 1: The Central Islamic Lands*, Cambridge University Press, 1970, 231-262.
- Turan, Osman. "Selçuklu Kervansarayları," *Bellekten*, X, no. 39 (1946): 471-496.
- Turan, Osman. *Selçuklular Tarihi ve Türk İslam Medeniyeti*, İstanbul, 1969.
- Turan, Osman. *Selçuklular ve İslamiyet*, İstanbul, 1971.
- Turan, Osman. *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye*, İstanbul, 1971.
- Turan, Osman. *Türkiye Selçukluları Hakkında Resmî Vesikalar, Metin, Tercüme ve Araştırmalar*, first published in 1958, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1988.

- Türk, Gönül Gülşen. "Tasavvuf Kültüründe Derviş-Kitap Münasebeti ve Tekke Kütüphaneleri," *unpublished M. A. thesis*, Uludağ Üniversitesi, 1995.
- Türkmen, Kerim. "Karamanoğulları Devri Kitabeleri," *unpublished Ph. D. thesis*, Selçuk Üniversitesi, 1989.
- Uğur, M. Ferit & Mesut Koman, *Sahib-Ata ve Oğullarının Hayatı ve Eserleri*, İstanbul, 1934.
- Uğur, Yunus. "Şehir Tarihi ve Türkiye'de Şehir Tarihçiliği: Yaklaşımlar, Konular ve Kaynaklar," *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, vol. 3, no. 6 (2005): 9-26.
- Uluçay, M. Çağatay. *İlk Müslüman Türk Devletleri*, Ankara, 1975.
- Uz, M. Ali. *Baha Veled'den Günümüze Konya Alimleri ve Velileri*, Konya, 1993.
- Uzluk, F. Nafiz. "Karaman Eyaletine Ait Vakıfların Fihristi (1)," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, sayı: IV (1958), 263-264.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. *Anadolu Beylikleri ve Akkoyunlu, Karakoyunlu Devletleri*, İstanbul: TTK, 1988.
- Üçer, Sırrı, and Koman, M. Mesut. *Konya İli Köy ve Yer Adları Üzerinde Bir Deneme*, Konya, 1945.
- Ünver, Süheyl. "Yetmiş Yıl Önce Konya," *Bellekten*, XXXI (1967).
- Velikahyaoğlu, Nazif. *Sünbülüyye Tarikatı ve Koca Mustafa Paşa Külliyesi*, İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1999.
- Venzke, Margaret L. "Aleppo's Malikane-Dîvâni System", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 106, issue 3 (July-September 1986), 451-469.
- Vryonis, Speros. "The Muslim Family in 13th-14th Century Anatolia as Reflected in the Writings of the Mawlawi Dervish Eflaki," in Elizabeth Zachariadou, ed., *The Ottoman Empire (1300-1389), Halcyon Days in Crete I, A Symposium Held in Rethymnon, 11-13 January 1991*, Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 1993, 213-223.
- Waley, Muhammad Isa. "Najm al-Dîn Kubrâ and the Central Asian School of Sufism (The Kubrawiyyah)," in Seyyed Hossein Nasr, ed., *Islamic Spirituality, Manifestations*, vol. II, New York: SCM Press Ltd., 1991, 80-104: 92.
- Wallbank, T. Walter, and Arnold Schrier. *Living World History*, Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1982.
- Wittek, Paul. *Menteşe Begliği, 13-15. Asırlarda Garbî Küçük Asya Tarihine Ait Tetkik*, O. Ş. Gökyay, tr., Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1986.

- Woods, John E. *The Aqqyunlu: Clan, Confederation, Empire*, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1999.
- Wolper, Ethel Sara. *Cities and Saints, Sufism and the Transformation of Urban Space in Medieval Anatolia*, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania University Press, 2003.
- Wolper, Ethel Sara. "Princess Safwat al-Dunyâ wa al-Dîn and the Production of Sufi Buildings and Hagiographies in Pre-Ottoman Anatolia," in D. Fairchild Ruggles, ed., *Women, Patronage, and Self-Representation in Islamic Societies*, New York: State University of New York Press, 2000, 35-52:
- Yediyıldız, Bahaeddin. "Yunus Emre Dönemi Türk Vakıfları," in VIII. Vakıf Haftası Kitabı, Türk Vakıf Medeniyeti Çerçevesinde Yunus Emre ve Dönemi, Restorasyon ve Kıbrıs Vakıfları Semineri, 4-5-9 Aralık 1990, Ankara: Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları, 1991, 23-27.
- Yıldırım, Rıza. "Dervishes in Early Ottoman Society and Politics: A Study of Velâyetnâmes as a Source for History", *unpublished M.A. thesis*, Ankara: Bilkent University, 2001.
- Yıldırım, Rıza. *Seyyid Ali Sultan (Kızıldeli) ve Velâyetnâmesi*, (Ankara: TTK, 2007).
- Yıldırım, Rıza. "Turcomans between Two Empires: The Origins of the Qizilbash Identity in Anatolia (1447-1514)", *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, Bilkent University, February 2008.
- Yıldız, Sara Nur. "Mongol Rule in Thirteenth-Century Seljuk Anatolia: The Politics of Conquest and History Writing, 1243-1282," *unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation*, The University of Chicago, 2006.
- Yılmaz, Mehmet Şakir. "Koca Nişancı of Kanuni: Celalzade Mustafa Çelebi, Bureaucracy and 'Kanun' in the Reign of Suleyman the Magnificent (1520-1566)," *unpublished Ph. D. dissertation*, Bilkent University, 2006.
- Yılmaz, M. Şakir. "Political Thought in the Beginning of the Ottoman Empire as expressed in Ahmed bin Hüsameddin Amasî's *Kitâb-i Mir'âtü'l-Mülûk*", *unpublished M.A. thesis*, Bilkent University, 1998.
- Yılmaz, Osman. *Bursa'da Semerkandiyye Kültürü ve Menâkıb-i Ali Semerkandî*, *unpublished M. A. thesis*, Uludağ Üniversitesi, 1998.
- Yürekli, Zeynep. "A Building Between the Public and Private Realms of the Ottoman Elite: The Sufi Convent of Sokollu Mehmed Pasha in Istanbul," in Gülru Necipoğlu, *Muqarnas, an Annual on the Visual Culture of the Islamic World*, Leiden: Brill, 2003, 159-185.
- Zilfi, Madeline C. "Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, vol. 45, no. 4 (October 1986): 251-269.

APPENDIX A

Map of the Province of Karaman in the year 1530⁸⁸²

⁸⁸² 387 Numaralı Muhâsebe-i Vilâyet-i Karaman ve Rûm Defteri (937/1530) I, Konya, Bey-şehri, Ak-şehir, Lârende, Ak-saray, Niğde, Kayseriyye ve İç-il Livâları (Dizin ve Tıpkıbasım), (Ankara: Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 1996), p. 137.

APPENDIX B

Excerpts From Manuscripts





قَرَمًا لِيَعْنِي قَمَرًا تَرَمَان
غَارَلِقْ غَارَتَه مُبَدَّلْ أُولِي
بِرَكَّتْ بُولِيَامِ بِنِ سِرْدَه
نَهْرُ أُولُرُوزْ كَارَقَمَه رِيلَه
صُعْقَانْكَ بُو جُورِ مَحْتَرَكْ
مَمْلَكَتَه نَهْ أَمِنْ وَرَنَهْ أَمَانْ
بِرَاطِرَانِ هَمَّ حَرَامِيْلَرُ
كُرْجَهَانْكَ فَنَاءِ بِنِ جُورِيْلَه
وَرْدَهْدَاشِ فَسَادْ قَلْمَادِي
دَكَمَه لَرْدَه بِلَنْمَزْ أُولِدِرْ بِنِ
بِي حِيَا لِيغْ شَهْدِ مَسْخَرَه لِقْ
قَاضِي لِقْ وَنَزْدِ أُولِدِرْ وَبِشِي
كُشْتِ بِنِ لِكْ وَكَرَامَتُدُرْ

كُنَيْشِ اَلَا كِهْ اِبْنِ عَثْمَانِ لِقْ
دِبُولْكَ أُولِدِهَمْ سُلَيْمَانِ لِقْ
كِهْ اَكَا قَرْدِ اَيْنِ جُوبَا لِقْ
صَنْ كِهْ خَلْفَه يَدِكَلَرِي قَانَلِقْ
اِشَلَرِي أُولِدِرْ اَرَكِرِيَا لِقْ
كَارِ اَتْرَاكْ نَبِي اِيْمَانِ لِقْ
دَكَمَه بَرْدَه قَمَرًا اَبَادْ اَلِقْ
جَانَنَه خَلْفُكَ اِنْدِ زِنْدِ اِشَلِقْ
هَبِجْ بِنِ مَصْلَحَتَه اَسَا لِقْ
پَاكْ دِرْ لِكِيْلَه سُلْمَانِ لِقْ
خَلْقِ اِچِنْدِ دُرْ اَهْلِ عَرْفَانِ لِقْ
لَا فِ وَنِزْ وَ يِرْ وَ دِيْنَه نَفْصَانِ لِقْ
شُولْ كِنَا كِيْلَه خِرَامَانِ لِقْ



سینه

ختم بکم عمی باق من بلاء قوش فاق
نیل عجیب اول خون سرد کطله بر بخونستر
کز کز لک اج یتیم یق قیغولون یتیمه
وی نه نیکسک اجر لر جوکان ایچ کج لر
حقیقی شمس اول بزنی کز من قشر کزی

در شکیات و تمنای مرگ

بو برد شمشلره شهدن عنایت ایغ المزی
عجبه فخر حمد بوغم فار اولوغدن
ذیل اولوق هان قطع رجا ای ایدم نجبه
جناح عدل شر اید پد خجی شه داد المزی
بو اقلیم اولر ایشلره هام معفور مدزی و
بودیمه اقسا شهری فیلسون نیله کسوغی
هار درویش فلسوغی بو جور اجدد دکنه

بو محنت کشلره خانم نهایت ایغ المزی
بنه قولغه نور هدایت ایغ المزی
بنه پر مرحت نجی حمایت ایغ المزی
بو مردم خوز لودن به شکیات ایغ
رعایا غیر نه جرم جنایت ایغ المزی
رعیت خاطر ن املک رعایت ایغ المزی
بو قومه صحه دامن نهایت ایغ المزی

دخی امینله راحت بو ولایت اینغ اریغ عجبه لطفله دیکه یه رایت اینغ	نه شکل کربو خایله فکرته عملک ویر حقیق شکر غرن خلاص و لمانه جان
--	---

مردان حق **در بیان صفت**

فوشم انرا هلنه من مسجد میخانی جان که کسرمز کن اول جزیح جانانی اکه که پرفش الدن سکر له بیانی یو کاعاقل فو کنده کالنه دیوانی فنده بولدرین بلاسن عاشق مشانی اندک وصل اوله وحذب شمعنه پروانی قلین قفل حواسه راست بش دندانی کرسون محرم دکل حنائی متانی کر دکل بزلوده سن بر عشق اری مردانی	سز کا کسرمه راه کعبه و تخانی فی صلاه دایموند منت شکر قدر صرمعل نور صلاح زهدیه فسوفانی سز ظن اندک بویری اکلم صندکم واز اول جالی نشان شوقند بقیس ذره کار چون نور علی نور اولدیم فروغ بو طلسناز بزین کج حقا بوق بلدی سرخمدن طره هر محروم که محرم دکل یوزکی خاک ایش حقیقی یوز اربال جلال
--	--

در صحبت و بیان صفت **اهل طریقت**



