



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Shaykh Bālī-efendi on the Safavids

Author(s): V. Minorsky

Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 20, No. 1/3, Studies in Honour of Sir Ralph Turner, Director of the School of Oriental and African Studies, 1937-57 (1957), pp. 437-450

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of School of Oriental and African Studies

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/610394>

Accessed: 08/06/2010 05:09

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



School of Oriental and African Studies and Cambridge University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

<http://www.jstor.org>

SHAYKH BĀLĪ-EFENDI ON THE SAFAVIDS¹

By V. MINORSKY

1. The Turkmans between the Ottomans and the Persians
2. Shaykh Bālī-efendi and his letter to Rüstem-pasha (c. 1550)
3. Translation of the letter
4. Bālī-efendi's report on the followers of Badr al-dīn
5. Cheshmī-efendi and his report on heretics (early seventeenth century)

1. THE TURKMANS BETWEEN THE OTTOMANS AND THE PERSIANS

THE contents of the document which forms the main subject of the present article are somewhat slender and cannot be appreciated outside the context of the struggles between the Ottomans and the Ṣafavids for the incorporation of the Turkman tribes settled in the territories separating their states. Many points of the situation await further investigation and our summary will be as brief as the complicated subject admits.

The home of the Ottoman dynasty was in the north-western corner of Anatolia, but, by the middle of the fourteenth century, the Turks had crossed over to the northern side of the Straits and the Balkan territories became the nursery of the Ottoman empire. In this unusual surrounding a state was created vastly different from the older Islamic polities. Elsewhere, there existed a strong tradition regulating relations between the rulers and their subjects, both Muslim and those belonging to the class of heterodox 'protected' communities (*dhimmī*). In the Balkans, among the conquered Bulgarians, Rumanians, Serbians, Greeks, and Albanians, the 'ghāzī state' had an absolutely free hand. Perhaps the most striking manifestation of this fact is the unprecedented system of *devshirme*, i.e. the periodical conscription of 'tribute boys', by which Christian children were wrung from their families, churches, and communities to be moulded into Ottoman pretorians owing their allegiance to the Sultan and the official faith of Islam.²

The all-absorbing tasks to be accomplished on the European territory

¹ This article forms No. 13 in my 'Turkmenica' series.

² See J. H. Mordtmann, *Devshirme* in *EI*; I. Uzunçarşılı in *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, II, and recently P. Wittek, 'Devshirme and *shari'a*', *BSOAS*, xvii, 2, 1955, 271-8. Professor Wittek admits (p. 275) that the ḥanafī law of the Ottomans left no loophole for such unusual practice, but he reminds us of the existence of such a loophole in the shāfi'ite law (p. 277), although in the meantime he quotes the Turkish law forbidding the application of the shāfi'ite rite in the *diyār-i Rūm* (*sic*), etc. One wonders whether there exist positive facts or texts showing that the Ottoman government ever sought any theological grounds for their practice. On the other hand are there any indications that the heads of the Ottoman religious organization (whose rite had no loopholes for the *devshirme*) ever protested against this 'brutal offence against the status of the *dhimmīs*'? If not, the presumption would be that the ghāzī state was little hampered by theology, and that the doctors of law were ready, or obliged, to endorse the 'raison d'état'. These considerations are not foreign to the subject of the present article. [As a means of recruitment the *devshirme* was preceded by the practice of converting and enslaving a part of the Christian prisoners captured by the *ghāzīs*.]

delayed the spread of the Ottoman power in Anatolia, where the Turkman principalities tolerated by the loose organization of the old Seljuk state,¹ or born of its disruption under the impact of the Mongol invasion (thirteenth century), still continued their traditional and tribal existence.²

The expansion of the Ottomans in their old homeland did not at all resemble a reunion of brotherly elements. For a very long time the name *Türkmen* was used among the Ottomans as an epitome of backwardness, and the historians exerted their wit at the expense of their tribal cousins by calling them 'ungodly Turkmans' (*Turkmän-i bî-îmân*).

Asia Minor and the lands adjoining it in the east had their own loyalties and their own way of life, and resented incorporation in the centralized Ottoman state saturated with Balkan elements.³ As usual in the Middle Ages, the opposition was inclined to drape itself in the cloak of religious dissidence. In the eighth/fourteenth century dervishism and shī'ite influences were widely spread among the Anatolian Turkmans.⁴ Characteristic are the great revolts in Western Anatolia which broke out in the beginning of the fifteenth century.⁵

By 1390 Sultan Bayazid Yıldırım had subjugated the Anatolian principalities, but in 1402 Tamerlane defeated him at Ankara and this blow gave a new lease of life to the restored principalities.⁶ Murād II (1421–51) and the conqueror

¹ The term 'État centralisé' which M. F. Köprülü, *Les origines de l'Empire Ottoman*, 1935, 78, applies to the Seljuk state must be understood *cum grano salis*. He himself, p. 101, refers to 'les beyliks des marches'. The easy disintegration of the state also indicates the complexity of its structure; cf. Wittek, 'Deux chapitres de l'histoire des Turcs de Roum', *Byzantion*, XI, 1936, 297.

² cf. the present-day retrospect on the Turkman tribes by Professor Köprülü, see op. cit., 57: 'absolument étrangères à la notion d'État, ne connaissant aucun ordre social hors celui de la tribu . . . ces masses indisciplinées, dès que le mécanisme administratif se relâchait un peu, devenaient aussitôt un élément de troubles et d'anarchie', etc. For the 'visiting cards' left by these tribes in the toponymy of Anatolia see A. Refik, *Anadoluda Türk aşiretleri*, Istanbul, 1930.

³ P. Wittek, 'De la défaite d'Ankara . . .', *REI*, 1938, I, p. 7: 'Avec ses troupes d'élite, les janissaires, formées de captifs tombés tout jeunes aux mains des ghazis, au cours des razzias en pays chrétiens, et avec les auxiliaires que les princes balkaniques . . . devaient lui amener personnellement, Bayezid disposait d'une supériorité écrasante sur ces émirats (d'Anatolie)'; cf. Wittek, *Byzantion*, XI, 312, on the resentment of the poet Ahmedi against Sultan Bayazid's action in Anatolia.

⁴ M. F. Köprülü, *Anadoluda İslâmîyet* (1922, unfinished), p. 89. A Venetian report of 8 April 1514 estimates the number of shī'ites in Asia Minor at 'four-fifths of the whole of Anatolia', see N. Jorga, *Gesch. d. Osm. Reichs*, II, 327.

⁵ On the revolts in 1416 of Badr al-dīn and his associates Börklüje-Muştafâ and Torlaq Hû-Kamâl, see Hammer, *GOR*, 1840, I, 293; Babinger, *Schejch Bedr ed-din*, 1921, and Babinger, 'Der Islam in Kleinasien', *ZDMG*, LXXVI, 1922, 126–56. See also the important critical review of Babinger's thesis in M. F. Köprülü-zade's 'Bemerkungen z. Religionsgeschichte Kleinasiens', *Mitteilungen z. Osmanischen Geschichte* (Wien), I, 1922, 203–22, and especially M. Şerefeddin Yaltkaya, *Bedreddin in Isl. Ansiklopedisi* (which sums up the contents of the monograph by the same author, Istanbul, 1924).

⁶ With some exaggeration, H. A. Gibbons, *The foundation of the Ottoman Empire*, Oxford, 1916, 280, enumerates 26 large and small amirates in Anatolia. The book of the American author, despite its many mistakes and misunderstandings, still represents a considerable amount of work and new ideas.

of Constantinople Muḥammad II (1451–81) completed the unification of Anatolia under their sceptre, but the situation remained unsafe because of the existence and influence of other rival forces further east.

By the fourteenth century two powerful and autonomous federations of Turkman tribes had been formed, that of the QARA-QOYUNLU in Armenia, and that of the AQ-QOYUNLU in Diyārbakr.¹ The Aq-qoyunlu had already taken part in Timur's campaign against Sultan Bayazid (1402), and when in 1467 they absorbed their Qara-qoyunlu rivals and defeated the last energetic Timurid, their dominions, extending from Herat and the Persian Gulf to Anatolia, secured them an important place among the neighbours of the Ottoman Empire.

Under UZUN-ḤASAN (1466–78), the Aq-qoyunlu did not conceal their designs in Anatolia and were in close touch both with the remaining principalities of Asia Minor (Qaraman) and with the European powers. In case of Uzun-Ḥasan's success, the Republic of Venice was ready to recognize him as the lord of Constantinople. However, after the first clash with Sultan Muḥammad, Uzun-Ḥasan prudently refrained from any new challenges. No sooner did his successor, Sultan Ya'qūb, die (in 1490), than struggles among the princes, in the course of a decennium, disrupted the Aq-qoyunlu power, but then its succession was taken up by a fresh, and a more serious, candidate.

With the advent of SHAH ISMĀ'IL ŞAFAVĪ (1502) opened the long series of Turco-Persian moves and counter-moves which lasted almost down to our own times. The story of Shaykh Şafī of Ardabil (b. 1252, d. 1334) and his successors needs no re-telling. The shaykhs had succeeded in establishing a large clientèle among the Turkman tribes, right down to the heart of Anatolia and to northern Syria. Perhaps instinctively the Turkmans sought religious allegiance to the chiefs in the far rear, independent of their prevailing and centralizing western neighbours. The early shaykhs were strictly orthodox and their religious authority could not be called in question and opposed. The turning-point came in the years 1449–56, when a descendant of Shaykh Şafī in the fourth generation, the young SHAYKH JUNAYD, appeared too energetic and restless for the then ruler of Persia, the Qara-qoyunlu Jahānshāh. Junayd was expelled from Ardabil and spent six or seven years in visiting the adepts of his house among the Turkman tribes of Anatolia and Syria.² It is possible that having discovered shī'ite leanings among the Anatolians, he felt that a wider scope for his enterprise would open with his own move in the same direction. No clear indications as to his exact arguments can be culled from our sources, but the later developments show that he assumed the rôle of a descendant of the shī'ite imams, and even of an incarnation of their

¹ The history of the early Aq-qoyunlu was written by Abū-Bakr Tih-rānī. A copy of his *Tārīkh-i Diyārbakriya* (incomplete at the end) was discovered in Iraq, and it is to be hoped that Dr. F. Sümer (Ankara) will succeed in bringing out an edition of it.

² W. Hinz, *Irans Aufstieg zum Nationalstaate*, 1936, 25. See Minorsky, *Persia in 1478–90*, 1957.

spark of divinity. When his claims and activities aroused the suspicion both of the Sultan and the lords of Egypt, he had to take refuge with Uzun-Ḥasan in Diyārbakr. No doubt, the orthodox ruler of the Aq-qoyunlu objected to the vagaries of the young shaykh, but he could not fail to appreciate his useful links with the western Turkmans. Both Junayd and his son Ḥaydar (born in Diyārbakr) married Aq-qoyunlu princesses and this circumstance may have had some importance in preparing the advent of Shah Ismā'il and in gaining for the Ṣafavids the loyalty of further groups of tribesmen.

Such Turkmans, under the name of *shāhī-sevān*,¹ formed the mainstay of the Ṣafavid power, but instead of the loose tribal links which had cemented the Qara-qoyunlu and Aq-qoyunlu federations, they were united this time by their allegiance to the *Murshid-i Kāmīl*, who was capable of working miracles, nay, was even himself a vessel of Godhead. In the list of tribes which carried Shah Ismā'il to the throne there were groups of tribes called *Rūmlu* ('those of Anatolia'), *Shāmlu* ('those of Syria'), *Tākke* (in ancient Lycia), etc., and one clearly realizes what leaven of future struggles they represented in the relations between the 'Grand Turk' and the 'Grand Sofi'.

The momentum of the strife was somewhat lost after the death of Shah 'Abbās I (1587–1628), who weakened the tribal Turkoman element among his supporters and replaced it by more disciplined new troops recruited in Persia and particularly among the Transcaucasian Christians, quite probably in imitation of the Ottoman janissaries.²

Somewhat paradoxically, the great achievement of the Ṣafavids proved to be the creation of a Persian state, independent of the goodwill of its neighbours and linked up with the Iranian tradition. This task could not have been realized without stable frontiers. On the other hand, the Ṣafavids had stepped into the shoes of their Aq-qoyunlu predecessors and in the west were anxious to incorporate a large part of the faithful Turkmans and their territories. Thence the entanglements with Turkey, which also coveted Anatolia and the lands stretching beyond it. On the whole, the Ottomans proved more westernized and stronger than the Persians, and gradually the frontier was more or less stabilized by the somewhat vague treaty of 1049/1639 concluded between Sultan Murād IV and Shah Ṣafī.³

On the surface, the long struggles between Turkey and Persia often took the aspect of a religious war between the sunnite orthodoxy and the shahs 'gone astray' (*shāh-i gūmrāh*). Apart from the angry epithets exchanged

¹ 'Those loving the shah', but with a hint at the 'Shah of Sanctity' (*shāh-i vilāyat*), i.e. 'Ali.

² See Minorsky, *Tadhkirat al-mulūk*, 1942, 30, 189, and Minorsky, 'La Perse au 15-me siècle', Rome, 1957.

³ It was reserved to our generation to establish in 1914 a clear delimitation of the Turco-Persian frontier line based *grosso modo* on the seventeenth century *status quo*, though Persia, in her later negotiations with Turkey, made some additional concessions and gave to Turkey the territory including Mt. Lesser Ararat.

between the two adversaries,¹ the sources available on the theoretical justification of the conflicts are scarce.

On the Persian side, some traces of the 'secret doctrine' of the Şafavids are found in the *dīvān* of poems composed by Shah Ismā'īl under the *nom de plume* of *Khaṭā'ī*.² Some hints at the aberrations of the shah can be gathered from the reproaches addressed to him by the Uzbek khan 'Ubayd-allāh in 936/1520, see *Aḥsan al-tavārikh*, 226-31. Also characteristic are the debates instituted in 1743 by Nādir-shah when he was eagerly, but vainly, striving to establish an agreement with the sunnites.³

From the point of view of the expanding Ottoman Empire, large numbers of shī'ites within the Turkish territory would have been considered as a 'fifth column'. In 917/1511 Shāh-qulī Bābā,⁴ son of one of the devoted deputies (*khalīfa*) of Shah Ismā'īl's father, revolted in the province of Tākke and fought several battles with the Ottoman army before he lost his life and his turbulent followers retreated into Persia. In the following year, during the troubles in Turkey, the shah sent Nūr 'Alī khalīfa to summon his followers and they devastated Asia Minor and burnt Toqat.⁵ The energetic Sultan Selim, who had succeeded his father on 25 April 1512, had 40,000 shī'ites massacred⁶ before he went to defeat Shah Ismā'īl at Chaldīran in 920/1514.

Force was on the Turkish side but the Persian propaganda was more subtle and penetrating. To struggle against it the Ottomans established an intelligence service and tried to control public opinion. The documents quoted in the present article present an interest as showing the way in which it was done and the collaboration of the spiritual powers with the civil and military authorities.

2. SHAYKH BĀLĪ-EFENDI AND HIS LETTER TO RÜSTEM-PASHA

The MS of the well-known Turkish history of Ibrāhīm Pechevi⁷ belonging to the École des Langues Orientales Vivantes in Paris (No. 103) contains two annexes written in the same hand as the remaining text. The date of the first annex (Temeshvar, 1063/middle of March 1653) is close to Pechevi's time and the place of his employment :

وقد وقع الفراغ من تنميق هذه الرسالة المباركة في أواسط شهر ربيع الآخر
سنة ثلث (كذا) وستين والف بمدينة طمشوار المحروسة.

¹ See the diplomatic correspondence of the time in Feridūn-bey's collection and its abstract in E. G. Browne, *LHP*, iv, 67-9 and 73-5.

² For the edification of his Turkman supporters he wrote it in Turkish. See Minorsky, 'The poetry of Shāh Ismā'īl', *BSOAS*, x, 4, 1942, 1006a-53a.

³ See 'Abdullāh al-Suwaydī, *Kitāb al-hujjaj al-qat'iya bi-itifāq al-firaq al-islāmiya*, Cairo, 1329. Russian résumé by Professor A. E. Schmidt in *V. V. Bartoldu*, Tashkent, 1927, 69-107 and 532.

⁴ Called *Shaytan-qulī* by the Turks.

⁵ See *Aḥsan al-tavārikh*, 125, 128, 134.

⁶ Idris Bidlīsī, *Selīm-nāma*, B.M. Add. 24,960, ff. 68b-70b. As noted by E. G. Browne, *LHP*, iv, 72, the Persian historians do not mention this melancholy event.

⁷ Pechevi was a native of Pécs in Hungary. Born in 982/1574 he died in 1061/1650, or a few years earlier. A part of his career was spent in Temeshvar. See Babinger, *GOW*, 1927, 192-5.

The annexes were discovered by the late Abraham Danon (d. 1925), who published one of them¹ but only referred to the second (dated about A.D. 1548–9). He most kindly allowed me to copy it out from his notes and it will form the main subject of the present article. In conclusion I shall offer some considerations on the document published by A. Danon himself, which was drawn up some 75 years later than the first.

The new document (MS 103, f. 10r) is a copy of a letter addressed to Rüstempasha, twice Grand Vazir under Sultan Suleyman.² The sender of the letter is Shaykh Bālī-efendi 'who lies buried in Sofia', and the letter, judging by its epistolary formulas, seems to be complete. Shaykh Şūfī Bālī khalifa is mentioned in Tashköprü-zadé's biographical work.³ The author states that he was a learned and pious man who led the poor and the unfortunate along the path of righteousness and strongly supported the *sharī'at*. He died in Sofia in 959/1552 and was buried outside the town, at Şālīhiya where there stands a mosque and a *tekye*.⁴ The translator of Tashköprü's work into Turkish, Mejdī-efendi of Adrianople, in his postscript (*tedhyyil*) adds that Bālī-efendi's birthplace was Strumja (Strumitsa in Macedonia) but he lived in Sofia where he died in 960/10 February 1553. He enjoyed the favour of Sultan Suleyman whom he accompanied on several campaigns and recited prayers for his victories. Mejdī-efendi, during his visit to Sofia, read the marvellous compositions (*rasāyil-i 'ajībe*) of the shaykh, among which he mentions a treatise on Predestination (*qaḍā va qadar*), a commentary on Ibn al-'Arabī's *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, etc.⁵

The period of Bālī-efendi's letter is more closely indicated by the reference to the brother of Shah Tahmāsp, Alqāş.⁶ This prince was governor of Shīrvān, but revolted in 954 and fled, by way of the Crimea, to the court of Sultan Suleyman. Together with Alqāş, the sultan invaded Azarbayjan in 955 (summer of 1548), and during the winter Alqāş carried out a deep diversion into Persian Iraq. In 956/1549 his relations with the Ottomans became strained. He did not respond to the summons of the sultan and took refuge in the fort of Merīvān (Persian Kurdistan), where he was captured by a Kurdish chief and sent to Shah Tahmāsp. He was imprisoned in the castle of Qahqaha (near Ardabil) and in the beginning of 957/1550 was thrown down from its walls.

As Bālī-efendi speaks of the liquidation (*raf'*) of Alqāş, one has to infer

¹ 'Un interrogatoire d'hérétiques musulmans (1619)', *Jour. As.*, 1919, avril, 281–93.

² See Hammer, *GOR*, 1840, II, 197, 246, 350, 848: from March 1545 to October 1553 and from 28 September 1555 to 9 July 1561 when he died.

³ *Shaqa'iq al-nu'māniya*, Cairo, 1310, II, 64; German transl. by O. Rescher, Galata, 1927, 332.

⁴ He must not be confused with the native of Tire (in Aydin) Serkhosh Bālī-efendi, who died in 981/1573 and lies buried near Qurshunlu-türbe, see Pechevi, I, 465–6, and the continuation of Tashköprü-zadé by 'Alī Miniq, German transl. (by Rescher), Stuttgart, 1934, 73.

⁵ The Turkish translation, completed in 995/1586, 30 years after the composition of the original work, was printed in Constantinople in 1269/1852, pp. 251–2.

⁶ This name seems to be of Caucasian (Daghestanian) origin > Alkhas, though perhaps remotely connected with Arabic al-Khāṣṣ.

that the letter was written after 956/1550. Bālī-efendi hints also at some disappointment felt on the Ottoman side, because of a military expedition (*ghazā*) which did not proceed according to the desire of the sultan. In fact, when Sultan Suleyman entered Tabriz (on 20 Jum. II 955/27 July 1548), his horses and camels died in large numbers for lack of fodder. After a five days' stay in the town, Suleyman¹ moved back *via* Van, Diyārbakr, and Aleppo. The Persians came on the heels of the retreating Turks and Shah Tahmāsp rapidly advanced to Arzinjān. It was a moment when the sultan must have felt annoyed, as indicated by Bālī-efendi. This again points to the time about 956/1549.

The tone of the letter suggests that Bālī-efendi stood on terms of intimacy with the Prime Minister, Rüstem-pasha. This clever native of Croatia accompanied Sultan Suleyman on his campaign to Tabriz and was certainly well informed concerning the affairs of the enemy. The more astonishing is the simple-hearted readiness of the shaykh to comfort and support the Grand Vazir with his garbled stories. The blanks in his information and his memory are readily filled in with pure inventions, the object of which is quite clear. Having accumulated his moral authority, the mystic of Sofia wished to bolster up the purely political and military action taken by the government and to free the conscience of his 'son', the Grand Vazir, from any restraints with regard to the enemies vowed to destruction and extermination.

Bālī-efendi's letter is quite outspoken and the only commentary it needs is to underline his free handling of historical facts.

3. TRANSLATION FROM THE TURKISH

The copy of the advice (naṣīḥat-nāme) sent by the late Shaykh Bālī-efendi, who lies buried in Sofia, to the Prime Minister (ṣadr-i a'zam) Rüstem-pāshā concerning (the Şafavids) Alqāş and Tahmās (Tahmāsp). (In it the Shaykh), may his grave be sanctified, has explained the beginnings of the immoral Qizil-bāsh.

In the name of God, Merciful and Compassionate.

Your Excellency, Pasha, my son! May God give many years of life to His Majesty the Sultan (*Hünkār*),² and may he achieve elevation in this and the other world. After the prayer (*ghibba al-du'ā*): you should not say, that this Holy War (*ghazā*) did not achieve its purpose (*murād*), that H.M. the Hünkār's wish was not realized, that the prayers of the learned and virtuous ('*ulamā-va ṣulahā*) were not accepted, and that the power (*ta'thīr*) of the Exalted Qur'ān did not manifest itself.

The answer is offered here that there are three classes of those who pray: the common, the distinguished (*khāṣṣ*), and the especially distinguished (*akhaṣṣ*).

¹ *Ahsan al-tavārikh*, years 953-6/1546-9; *Tarikh-i Pechevi*, I, 267-83; already at that moment Pechevi (I, 273) refers to the dissatisfaction of Suleyman with the rough proceedings of his protégé Alqāş; *Sharaf-nāma*, I, 85-6 and II, 198: none of the Persian amirs, whom Alqāş had promised to bring over to the Ottoman side, joined the sultan.

² Thus spelt throughout, for *Khünkār* < *Kh'andkār*.

The first pray thus : ‘ whatever be the desire of His Majesty the Ḥunkār, thou God, render it successful ’. These people are (God’s) beloved (but?) in such affairs it is not their duty (*shān*) to look for God’s acceptance.

The distinguished class did not know what the Ḥunkār’s plan was, but admitted that perhaps its realization would not meet with God’s consent. Then, it might lead to mischief (*fisād*), and thus our prayers (too) might prove contrary to God’s will and we might happen to be in revolt (*‘āṣī olavuz*). Then they turned to a still better prayer : ‘ O God, do whatever is blissful for our Sovereign ’, for the habit of the distinguished requires (*خواصك معتاد لرننك*) (*مقتضاسنجه*) that in every affair they pray for (the realization of) God’s will.

As for the most distinguished, their duty (requires) that, since the Ḥunkār had ordered prayers, they paid attention (*nazar*) to the order, and considered it with utmost concentration. They knew that things should happen (*olsa gerek*) in accordance with his order made with prescience (*keshf*) and the knowledge of the divine will (*‘ilm-i ladun*). Therefore they did engage in prayer—and let it be known that the third category consists of the highest among the saints (*evliyā*) and their prayers are accepted.

Now that these three categories have made prayers for the accomplishment of the Ḥunkār’s wishes, no doubt their wishes will be accepted. Nor is there any doubt that the Exalted Qor’ān has manifested its influence.

However, in accepting a prayer, the divine habits and rules are fourfold, namely :

1 : that, (either the object) of the prayer is granted immediately after the prayer ; 2 : or, (only) some effect (of the prayer) is produced ; 3 : that (either) the prayer, as it is (*‘aynā*), is realized ; 4 : or that something more blissful takes place and thus the effect of the Exalted Qor’ān becomes apparent.

The presence of Alqāṣ in the lands of Islam is highly pernicious. He has been removed (*raf’*), and some delay has ensued regarding Tahmās (*Tahmāsp).¹ The intention was that he should be removed from that kingdom and that Muhammad’s *sharī‘at* should be enacted. This too is expected to take place soon, and the Ḥunkār will see all his wishes realized.

Now let us report on those sons of Evil (*evlād-i shu‘m*) and it is a true report (for) we heard it from trustworthy people from among (?) the great community.

(They said) : Shaykh Ṣāfi [*sic*], 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. And it is mentioned (*qayd olummush*) that some murshids recognized him as a sayyid. Sayyid or not, the faith of Islam should be respected.² In any case, it is known that Shaykh Ṣāfi is a Perfect Murshid

¹ The accepted Persian pronunciation is *Tahmāsīb* (Turkish influence?).

² Shaykh Ṣāfi was a highly respected shaykh, but proofs of his appurtenance to the children of the Prophet are lacking, see *BSOAS*, xvi, 3, 1954, 518. See recently N. Falsafi, *Zindaqānī-yi Shāh ‘Abbās I*, 1332/1953, 3–4, 157–9.

and one of God's men (*ehl Allāh*). This is the true position and now we come to develop (*bayān*) the report (*khābar*).

One day Shaykh Şāfi invited some of his eminent murīds to his retreat (*khalvet-khāne*). On their coming they found their shaykh in tears. They made so bold as to ask: 'O shaykh, why are you weeping?' and he replied: 'I once saw a dream: that in my loins (*bel*) tiny puppies¹ were yapping and calling to one another. I did not pay any attention (*hiç qayırmadım*) and gave (my dream) a different interpretation. Yet what was going to happen proved to be coming and there was something to appear. I know now that (my dream) referred to the externally (existing world) (اولاجق اولور ايمش و ظهور ايده جك) (ایمش شمدی بدم ظاهره متعلق ايمش). And he cried: 'From the loins of a man like Mu'āwiya a Yazīd was born, and from the loins of a dog like myself a dog will come and it must come', and he wept again. 'Those dogs barking in my loins are a sign that from my descent a tyrannous band will rise and uproot the Muhammadan law. It will oppress the learned, the pious and the believers, and destroy them by the sword and by torture. May the Almighty let them perish, them and their followers.'

Now, my son, the effect and the requirement of that prayer is that it is necessary to defeat by the sword and to destroy by force (*qahr*) that tribe, its great and its small (*ulusunı kichisini*), its property and women, with the exception of the children (*şibyān*). There is no other means, for it is impossible to reform (*islāh*) this tribe by kindness and mercy.

Let us again proceed with our purpose. When Shaykh Şāfi approached his end, he convoked his friends and said: 'Agree all of you, and from among yourselves elect someone to be my successor (*qā'im-maqām*). My son is not worthy of my place. Let him go and acquire perfection and let someone else sit in (my) place. Let him not sit at my hearth (*ojaq*), for he is not suitable for my place'. Having thus proclaimed his will he departed to the other world.

They say, he had a son Muḥammad-shāh by name.² As he wanted to occupy his father's place, the şūfis split in two divisions (*bölük*): those who were licentious (*ehl-i havā*), together with (Muḥammad-shāh's) mother, went to one side and promoted him to his father's place and among the ignorant and the common he had a large following. The other division were the şūfis who are People of the Truth (*ahl-i haqq*),³ and they did not accept (this decision) saying that it was contrary to the Shaykh's ruling. Each of them betook himself to a

¹ *Enjek*, see *Tarama sözlüğü*, I, 1943, 267, 269.

² This is pure invention. Shaykh Şāfi (1252-1334) was succeeded by his son, the highly respected Şadr al-dīn (1305-92). The latter's son Khwāja 'Alī acted as the head of the order down to 1427. His son and successor İbrāhīm, known as Shaykh-shāh, died in 1447. During the minority of his son Junayd, his brother Ja'far b. İbrāhīm became the *locum tenens*, and it was he who, in agreement with Jahānshāh Qara-qoyunlu, expelled Junayd from Ardabil.

³ Probably in general meaning. But see below, p. 449, the particular sect designated by this name.

country and being occupied with his own plight (*hāl*) acted in conformity with the *sharī'at*.

Muḥammad-shāh established himself in his father's place but his situation (*hāl*) became such that gradually his assembly (*majlis*) came to consist mostly of licentious men and heretics (*ravāfid*), while learned and pious men shunned his assembly. Because of the multitude of the ignorant (in the assembly), the idea of a Holy War (*ghazā*) occurred to Muḥammad-shāh and moved by this mania (*savdā*) he several times led expeditions towards Georgia.

When he died his son Junayd¹ took his place, and those who loved Muḥammad-shāh crowded together (*choqdular*)² round Junayd, and he too several times set out on campaigns of Holy War, and as they were successful (*rāst geldi*), good and bad (*eyü-yatlu*) in great numbers joined him. They came and applied for permission to march on Georgia through Persia (*'ajam*). The king agreed to this but one of his vazirs did not approve of it (and said): 'O my king, this lot does not enjoy a good reputation among people, let your slave go and see what kind of men they are'. With the king's order he went to discover that all that tribe had gone astray (*dālalat*) and came to report: 'Is this the way of a shaykh and the dervishes? Should there be (?) any clever men (*ehl-i 'ilm*) among them, much blood will be shed before we repel them'. The matter being so (*öyle olsa?*), the king forbade them (to go on) but they did not obey his order (*buyuruq*), saying: 'be it as it may, we shall not renounce this expedition' (*bu ghazādan rujū' etmeziz*).

In view of this situation, the king on his part sent a detachment of men and there was a great battle. Finally the army gone astray was put to flight. Junayd was beheaded and his people defeated and scattered.

The son of Shaykh Junayd, Ḥaydar, was brought to the king and the doctors of law issued a *fatvā* for his execution, but some of them intervened before the king saying: 'For the rebellion of the father the son cannot be responsible (*akhdh*)'. They did not leave him in Ardabil, but kept him prisoner in Tabriz. There was no means for him to study. He wandered, drunk, in the streets strumming his *tambūra*. The person who at that time was sultan had a widowed sister who did not enjoy a good name or good manners. By chance they fell in love, the pregnancy of the young woman became evident, and everybody knew that the cause of it was this young man. This was an undeserved shame for all the chiefs and nobles. Consequently they married (Ḥaydar to the widow) and sent him with his wife to Ardabil.³ A short time passed (*sehl*

¹ As mentioned above, Junayd was the son of Ibrāhīm Shaykh-shāh, of whose *ghazā* nothing is known. When after a six years' absence Junayd returned to Ardabil, his position with Jahānshāh became again intolerable. He had to leave Ardabil and went on a *ghazā* to the Caucasus, but on 4 March 1460 lost his life in a clash with the troops of the shīrvānshāh Khalil whose territory he was crossing.

² *Tarlama sozlüğü*, I, 165: *üşüşmek*.

³ Ḥaydar was born in Diyārbakr when his father had gone to Ardabil and Shirvan in 1459-60. Ḥaydar was brought up by his mother's brother Uzun-Ḥasan, who later gave him in marriage his own daughter (born of the princess of Trebizond)!

zemān geçti) and Ismā'il was born prematurely. The heretics said it was a miracle, while the doctors of law gave a decision proclaiming Ismā'il a bastard (*veled el-zinā*). This term acquired notoriety in those parts, and when Ismā'il grew up this was reported to him (*qulağına kodular*). When he asked: 'Who put out this talk about me?', the answer was: 'The doctors of the sunnis said so'. Ismā'il said: 'Should I find an occasion, I shall murder the doctors with various kinds of torture and then uproot the sunnis and, instead, I will spread (*yürüdüm*) the *shī'a* creed. I will avenge (*intiqām alam*) my father and grandfather'.

Now we return (*geldik*?) to the story of Ḥaydar.¹ When he went to Ardabil he took his father's place. All the ignoramuses, libertines and heretics gathered round him in masses (*bashına choqdular*) and he followed the path of the Holy War. He led several expeditions and overpowered (*choq kimesneye qādir oldu*) many people.² Once, with plenty of arms (*yaraq*), they marched as if against the Georgians, though their intention was to use the occasion for capturing the throne of Persia (*'ajem takhtini*) by force (*basqun edip*). Someone came to report their secret to the king who got in readiness. When, coming from one direction, they were passing, the army collected by the king met them and said: 'Return to your place, there is no leave for you from the king'. The ill-starred lot resisted and a great battle began, which ended in Ḥaydar's head being cut off and his filthy lot being defeated, while in their saddlebags (*heybe*) were found 500 cuirasses (*jebe*) and sets of plate-armour (*zirih*).

One of the murids of Shaykh Ḥaydar who took part in that battle (*jenkte bile imish*?) told me the details. He said: 'We were taken unawares (*ghafletde bulundug*): the cuirasses were not on our backs, or we would have accounted (*qaydin görürdük*) for that Persian lot'. Ismā'il (who) was still a child found himself together (الله *bile*, with his father?).³ The men fled with him and in Ardabil put him in his father's place. He suspended (*fāriğh*) the expeditions but ordered his friends to gather arms in secret and keep them in stores, his decision being to reappear at a (suitable) time. Thus they made their preparations and, when disturbances (*fitret*) broke out in the Persian country, he reappeared and it is common knowledge what he did.

Now, my son, the Persian country nurtured and favoured (*'ināyet*) that filthy tribe, and what loyalty (*vefū*) did they find? If on our part, we shower honours and favours on Alqās, or someone else, what will be the profit (*ne fayda bulavuz*)? They are the seed of error and sparks (*qıjıljım*) of the infernal fire. Wherever you put them they will pass through the seven layers (of the

¹ A repetition, or an alternative draft kept in Bāli-efendi's papers.

² Ḥaydar was sent to Ardabil after Uzun-Ḥasan Aq-qoyunlu defeated Jahānshāh Qaraqoyunlu (on 17 November 1467). He led three expeditions to the Caucasus, and on the last of them (9 July 1488) was killed in a battle with the troops of his cousin Ya'qūb Aq-qoyunlu which were supporting the shīrvānshāh. See Minorsky, *Persia in 1478-90*, 1957, 117-19.

³ Ismā'il was a child in the care of his mother in Ardabil.

earth) and return to their source. Alive or dead, in the Islamic territory they are nothing but harm, and their removal from it is very happiness !¹

After having been drafted (*tesvīd*), this letter has been sent to your Excellency that the position of this ill-starred tribe of evil should become known to you in detail.

And now, this is all (*bāqī wassalām*) !

4. BĀLĪ-EFENDĪ'S REPORT ON THE FOLLOWERS OF BADR AL-DĪN

In his critical survey of F. Babinger's thesis on Shaykh Badr al-dīn, M. F. Köprülü-zade quotes another report by Bālī-efendi on the group of Badr al-dīn's (see above, p. 438) followers still flourishing at his time in Dobruja (Deli-Orman). Bālī-efendi pressed Sultan Suleyman to punish the heretics. He described Badr al-dīn as a dissolute drunkard recommending wine as the true nectar promised in the other world. In his view this world was God's open table (*süf're-yi Haqq*). Whoever knows 'the Man', knows God (*Haqq*), and 'I am God' (*anā'l-Haqq*). Badr al-dīn's ignorant followers performed *sijda* ('prostration') before him and called him 'God'. Having blown out the candles they performed abominations in darkness.

The author of the important 'Bemerkungen' somewhat cautiously admitted that Bālī-efendi's exposé might strengthen our knowledge of the tenets and practices of Badr al-dīn's sect.² In the light of Bālī-efendi's presentation of the history of the Şafavids this assumption loses much of its probability. The şūfī investigator, closely connected with the views of the government, was surely ventilating the hotchpotch of his recollections in order to support the interests of the centralized state. His writings are obviously not on the level of St. Augustine's views on Manichaeism.

5. CHESHMĪ-EFENDĪ AND HIS REPORT ON HERETICS

As regards the other annexe to the MS of Pechevi, which was published by A. Danon (see above, p. 442), it claims to be a summary of the confessions (*i'tirāf*) made by some heretics (*malāhīda*) living in Constantinople, in the presence (*mejlis*) of the late Cheshmī-efendi, who was appointed by (the Sultan's) order (*fermān*) to conduct the investigation. As regards the person of the official inquisitor, A. Danon refers to his earlier article,³ in which he mentioned Cheshmī-efendi as the qāḍī of Constantinople appointed after the murder of Sultan

¹ cf. Cheshmī-efendi's *dammara-hum Allāh*. See below, p. 450.

² 'Bemerkungen', 1922, 212-13: 'Die folgenden Zeilen Bālī-efendis, der bei Bekanntgabe dieser Ideen und Lehren dem Sultan deren Bestrafung rät, vermögen unsere obigen Darlegungen über Bräuche und Lehrsätze der Anhänger Bedr ed-dins sehr gut zu bekräftigen'. The author quotes Bālī-efendi's statement from a commentary on Yaziji-oğlu's *Muhammadiya*, I, 58. The author of the commentary (Haqqī) calls Bālī-efendi a şūfī following the path of the shari'a (*mutasharri'*). See also this reference to Bālī-efendi and other shaykhs in M. Şerefeddin Yaltkaya's article in *Islam Ansiklopedisi: Bedreddin*.

³ 'Contribution à l'histoire des sultans Osman II et Mustafa I', *Jour. As.*, 1919, juillet, 69-139, septembre, 243-310.

Osman II in 1622. We know some further stages in his career, for under Sultan Murād he acted as the supreme judge (*qāḍī-‘asker*) of Anatolia and in 1632 was transferred to the same post in Rumelia. However, before he arrived there, the judges of Anatolia accused him of venality (*irtishā*) in giving 100 distinguished appointments (*yüz gūzide mansīb*) to unworthy candidates. The qāḍīs of Rumelia joined their colleagues in their written protest submitted to the Sultan, and the latter cancelled the appointment and exiled (*nefy*) Cheshmī-efendi to Brusa.¹

The document (four printed pages) is too short to be a complete account of Cheshmī-efendi’s official inquiry and its form (even without the initial *basmala*) suggests that it is more likely a brief summary of the more interesting points, in which case it may include elements picked out from the allegations of some witnesses.

A. Danon refrained from defining more exactly the group to which the accused belonged and thought that they might have been affiliated to the Ḥurūfīs or Bektashīs. This surmise can hardly be accepted, for it would lead us to suppose that the Şafavid tendencies had penetrated into the circles closely connected with the janissaries.²

The fact that the accused confessed to their recognition of Shah ‘Abbās (d. 19 January 1629) as their *murshid* points rather to their being Persians, or some Turkman adepts of the Şafavids. It is said that at their assemblies they recited the ‘ words ’ of *Shah Ismā‘īl Khaṭā‘ī*, which they called *ma‘nī*.³ It is true that *Khaṭā‘ī* was that shah’s poetical *nom de plume*⁴ and, on the other hand, we know that the Ātesh-begī branch of the Ahl-i Ḥaqq sect considered Shah Ismā‘īl ‘ the *pīr* of Turkestan ’—in which case ‘ Turkestan ’ is supposed to refer to the Turkman tribes of Azarbayjan.⁵ Even then the rôle of *Khaṭā‘ī* in the syncretic and receptive system of the Ahl-i Ḥaqq religion was far from being outstanding. The reference to the fraternal unions between a man and a woman, whom the document calls *Ḥaqq qarīndash*, is also a practice of the Ahl-i Ḥaqq (*shart-i iqrār* ‘ the contract of recognition ’), meant to conduce to the edification of the brother by the moral influence of his sister-elect.⁶ The inquirer naturally uses this vulnerable point to introduce his ready accusations of utter immorality—an arm which at all times was wielded against heterodoxy, and from which even early Christianity was not immune. Having demonstrated the perversity of the contemptible sectarians, the document attributed to Cheshmī-efendi

¹ *History of Na‘īmā*, 1147/1734, I, 513; Hammer, *GOR*, 1829, v, 136 (or 1840, III, 102).

² See also Köprülü-zade’s opinion in his ‘ Bemerkungen ’, 1922, p. 214, n. 1, and his *Les origines du Bektachisme*, Paris, 1926, 24.

³ ‘ (A saying full of) meaning ’, apparently in verse, cf. the present-day Turkish *mānī* (*ma‘nī*) in the sense of ‘ song ’.

⁴ See Minorsky, ‘ The poetry of Shāh Ismā‘īl ’, *BSOAS*, x, 4, 1942, 1006a–53a.

⁵ See Minorsky, *Études sur les Ahl-e-Haqq*, in *Revue du Monde Musulman*, 1920–1 (in book form, pp. 108–12), and Minorsky, *Ahl-i Haqq* in *EI*.

⁶ See loc. cit., 141–2; cf. *akhū wa ukhtu al-ākhira* of the Yazīdis.

ends with prayers to God to exterminate the heretics (*dammara-hum Allāh, qahhara-hum Allāh*).

If, at first sight, the heretics referred to by Cheshmī-efendi have some points in common with the Ahl-i Ḥaqq, there is no indication either of the connexion of this sect with Shah 'Abbās, or of its expansion as far as Constantinople. The whole presentation of the official memorandum (or its abstract) is too patchy and vague. The official inquisitor displays too obviously his desire to condemn the sectarians on the traditional grounds of immoral practices. The document can hardly be placed above the level of Bālī-efendi's letter, and we must not forget that the reputation of Cheshmī-efendi himself was far from immaculate.

The truth of the information contained in the two documents is suspect, but their interest consists in the light they throw on the complacency of the sunnite şūfis and judges in supporting the interests of the Ottoman State.

Additional note to p. 437.

The varying Western attitude towards the *devşirme* would form a subject for a curious study. Few would go as far as Dr. Giese in his wholesale admiration ('Das Problem d. Entstehung d. osm. Reiches,' *Z. für Semitistik*, II, 1924, 268): 'Die Devşirme und die Einführung des Janitscharenkorps ist also nicht die diabolische Erfindung Murads I, wie sie bisher in den europäischen Geschichtswerken dargestellt wird, sondern sie ist der Abschluss einer langen Entwicklung, die uns das Genie der osmanischen Sultane in der Zusammenfassung und Ausnutzung der vorhandenen Kräfte für ihre Zwecke zeigt'. However, even the latest authorities, far from displaying any token of *saeva indignatio*, bow to the inexorable idea of the Islamic *dār al-ḥarb*, or refer to the possibility of advancement for the young converts. On similar grounds the status of a eunuch was not devoid of certain privileges.