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ABSTRACT

This dissertation represents an attempt to fill a troubling gap in the secondary scholarship on Islamic, and more specifically, Ottoman intellectual history. It examines the role of a prominent Islamic religio-mystical (Sufi) order, known from the fourteenth century onward as the Halveti, in the religious and intellectual life of the Ottoman Empire during the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Initially famed for their extended periods of ascetic withdrawal into remote areas for the purpose of breaking their carnal desires and engaging in undistracted worship of God, the Halvetis proved to be one of the more durable and influential Sufi brotherhoods in Anatolia, the Balkans, and the Arab lands. Despite its popularity, however, the order has attracted attention in only three isolated cases in the secondary literature. The first of these was during the fifteenth century, when the founding fathers of several branches of the order brought it to both Mamluk Egypt and the nascent Ottoman Empire. Scholarly attention then lapses until the seventeenth century, when prominent Halveti leaders clashed with the puritanical Kadzadeli movement for position and influence in Istanbul during a period of economic and political crisis. Finally, attention has been focused on the later eighteenth century, when Halvetis in Egypt, the Arabian peninsula, and North Africa became exponents of a newly activist and supposedly more “orthodox” mysticism that has been labeled “neo-sufism.” Unfortunately, the existing scholarship on the Halvetis is limited to specific geographical regions and/or to one of these three periods
of Halveti prominence. In addition, scholars of the Halvetis have used hagiographical and biographical sources produced within the order without adequate contextualization. As a result, existing scholarship incorporates erroneous assumptions about the order’s practices and the nature of its social and political role throughout the Ottoman Empire.

Compounding the problem is the fact that religio-intellectual history has until recently been regarded as marginal to broad social, economic and political developments in Ottoman society. Since Ottoman scholars rarely receive a thorough training in this aspect of Islamic civilization, they tend to avoid intensive discussions of the topic, and are content to fall back on the body of secondary literature focusing on the early appearance and development of the Sufi mystical orders in the medieval period of Islamic history during the eight through the fourteenth centuries, or they focus on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Yet within the broader realm of Islamic religio-intellectual history, the Ottoman period is widely viewed as an unproductive era, featuring unoriginal religious works that are derivative of earlier prototypes from Islam’s “classical” period in medieval times.

In order to challenge the received wisdom about the Halveti order and the history of Islamic mystical thought as a whole, this study tracks the consolidation and development of the Halveti order from the end of the fifteenth century through the first half of the eighteenth century, focusing in particular on a provincial sub-branch of the order known as the Sha‘baniyye. The development of this sub-order serves as a window onto developments among the Halvetis as a whole, since each Halveti sub-branch remained autonomous and incubated its own peculiar practices and traditions. Founded in the city of Kastamonu, a venerable Islamic center in northern Anatolia, and centered on the historical figure of Sha‘ban-i Veli, the Sha‘baniyye were seldom recognized by the more influential Halveti
shaykhs and intellectuals of Istanbul over the course of the 16th century, even though Sultan Murad III (r. 1574-1595) took on a Sha’baniyye shaykh as his personal confidant. Nevertheless, the power and influence of the Sha’baniyye had spread throughout the Islamic world, from the Balkans to Egypt.

The dissertation is divided into three parts. The first part examines the life and career of the nominal founder of the order, Sha’ban-i Veli (d. 1569), along with the work of his immediate successors. Forged during a period of crisis for Ottoman Sufi orders during the first half of the sixteenth century, Sha’ban’s career evinced a politically quiescent and non-confrontational tone that would prove ill-suited to the challenges facing the order after his death. The second part examines the career of ‘Îmer el-Fu’âdî (d. 1636), a critical figure who extended the order beyond its provincial base to encompass a wider audience throughout the Ottoman domains. By writing an influential hagiography about the founder of the order, along with a number of letters and tracts aimed at consolidating the order’s ritual, practice and philosophy, Fu’âdî offered a cogent defense of the order’s place within the Islamic tradition against puritanical elements in Ottoman society who sought to abolish it. In addition, he succeeded in transforming the order into a more activist force in Ottoman political, social and intellectual life.

In contrast, the last section focuses on some of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century inheritors of the Sha’baniyye tradition, and their struggles to maintain their own sub-branch of the Halveti order in the Ottoman capital of Istanbul, with little success. The growing prominence of women within this later sub-branch of the order also suggests the need to rethink the extent of women’s participation in religious life.
This work is dedicated to:

Professor Carl Petry

for his support in introducing a young undergraduate student to the field of Near Eastern studies so many years ago

and

the late Professor Şinasi Tekin

for without his tireless endeavors to teach a generation of new scholars the secrets of Ottoman Turkish, this dissertation could never have been written

rahmet olsun canma
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Much like the Muslim mystics that are the subject of this dissertation, I too have had to endure long years of struggle and have had recourse to many different guides in the course of its production. As with any endeavor that requires many years of research in primary sources, along with the necessary funding to carry it out, I have accumulated a long list of debts that I can probably never hope to repay in full.

It would not be an understatement to say that without the support of my academic adviser throughout this process, Prof. Jane Hathaway, this work would never have seen the light of day. In addition to writing endless recommendation letters over the majority of the past decade to support this project and others, she has also been a constant source of constructive criticism in the writing and research processes. Indeed, it was she who first suggested that a study of the various branches of the Halveti order would be illuminating in filling the gaps in the literature on Ottoman religious and cultural history of the early modern period. I can only hope the present study can go some part of the way toward justifying the time and effort she expended on helping its author.

My thanks must also go to Prof. Carter Findley for his comments on the dissertation as it evolved over time. Over the course of my career, his unwillingness to accept anything but the best work I was capable of has been an instrumental part of my success. I also must express my appreciation of his continued support of the project throughout the course of the
research and writing process; even when he was overwhelmed by multiple projects toward the end of my career, he somehow found the time to provide the necessary suggestions and recommendations at the critical times.

Prof. Stephen Dale also must have my thanks for reading and commenting on drafts of my dissertation chapters as they appeared over time. In addition, he cheerfully allowed me to use his seminars as a testing ground for a number of the arguments advanced in this dissertation. Without the insights I gained from him on Central Asian and Iranian history during the medieval and early modern periods, this dissertation would not have advanced beyond its provincial origins.

Additional thanks must also go to Prof. Michael Zwettler of the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures for help with challenging Arabic texts I encountered during the course of research and writing, and Prof. Alam Payind and the staff at the Middle East Studies Center, who provided important funding for the advancement of the project. In addition, the Graduate School provided me with a Presidential Fellowship for the academic year 2003-2004, which allowed me to complete a full draft of the dissertation. For assistance in this process, and a long tradition of support spanning many years, I must also thank my undergraduate adviser, Prof. Carl Petry of Northwestern University.

It has been one of the great joys of this project that assistance has not been limited to just one side of the ocean. The American Research Institute in Turkey, along with its director, Tony Greenwood, provided essential funding and support for the project during my first year of research in Istanbul. I also owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Nevzat Kaya and his staff at the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul, Turkey, for their assistance in locating manuscripts and making the necessary copies to allow me to continue my writing after I had
left Turkey. In addition, my thanks must also go to Dr. Nail Bayraktar and his staff at the Atatürk Kitaplığı in Istanbul for their help in identifying, examining and making copies of the necessary manuscripts on microfilm there. I also thank Dr. Mehmet Saray of Istanbul University for assistance in navigating some of the difficulties posed by working in Turkey. I also would like to acknowledge the gracious help of Profs. Reşat Öngören and Sait Özervarlı of the İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi (İSAM) in directing me to important works that richly contributed to the success of this project. I also thank the staff of the Nuruosmaniye Library in Istanbul for allowing me to examine Murad III’s personal correspondence with his Halveti shaykh, along with a number of rare biographical works on Ottoman Sufis from the 17th century. I reserve a special word of gratitude to Mehmet Rihtim, formerly of Kafkas University in Baku, for sharing the results of his research on the early Halveti order under Yahyâ-yı Şirvânî with me. Thanks should also go to Profs. Halil Berktay and Tülay Artan for offering me the opportunity to present parts of my research at a Sabancı University colloquium in 2001. Finally, I thank the shaykh and the members of the Cerrahî branch of the Halveti order in Istanbul for allowing me to witness a Halveti semâ' and devrân ceremony in their tekke.

My fellow graduate student, Günhan Börekçi, has my thanks for following the project with interest and offering his assistance and suggestions throughout the process of research and writing. Others who have offered useful assistance, constructive criticism, or just plain supportive friendship over the course of this project include, in no particular order: Prof. Erik Ohlander, Dr. Tijana Krstic, Serpil Bilbaşar, Dr. Isa Blumi, Prof. Nabil al-Tikriti, Prof. James Grehan, Prof. Nathalie Clayer, Berat Fındıkli, Dr. David Defries, Prof. Febe Armanios, Prof. Devin Dewese, Prof. Timothy Gregory, Prof. Yücel Yankıdağ, and Gordon
Witty. I am sure that I have forgotten others; please accept my apologies in addition to my gratitude.

A special mention must go to the late Harvard Prof. Şinasi Tekin, his wife, Gönül Tekin, his student, Prof. Selim Kuru, and Prof. Wheeler Thackston for teaching Ottoman Turkish to an occasionally troublesome student over the course of two summers in Ayvalık, Turkey, in 1997 and 1998. The training and experience I gained was invaluable in allowing me to decipher the paleography in, and gain access to, the necessary manuscripts. Prof. Tekin’s sudden passing in the late summer of 2004 was a blow to all of his students, and I can only hope that this study is a fitting contribution to his legacy.

Finally, I must acknowledge a deep debt to my mother and father, Joan and John Curry, for their ceaseless financial and emotional support during these long years. Without their help and support, I could probably not have re-entered graduate school to realize my dream, much less borne the burdens that followed. In addition, I must thank my wife, Suna Curry, for supporting a project that often affected her life as much as it did my own. Thanks must also go to her family members, both in Istanbul and elsewhere, for making my years of research and life there rewarding.
VITA

October 7, 1970 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Born - Westwood, Massachusetts

1988 - 1992 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . B.A., History, Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

1992 - 1993 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Year Abroad Student, Arabic Language
The American University in Cairo, Egypt

1993 - 1994 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . M.A. Program Student, History
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

1995 - present . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Graduate Teaching and Research Associate,
The Ohio State University

PUBLICATIONS

Research Publication


FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: History

Minor Fields: World History
Byzantine History and Late Antiquity
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract ................................................................. ii

Dedication ................................................................. v

Acknowledgments ......................................................... vi

Vita ................................................................. x

Chapters:

1. Introduction .............................................................. 1
   1.1 Islamic Mysticism and the Halveti Order in the Ottoman Context ...... 3
   1.2 A Brief Survey of the Historiography of Islamic Saints and Shaykhs within the Halveti Order ............................................. 14
   1.3 A Brief History of the Halveti Order and its Branches to the Reign of Sultan Süleyman ............................... 20
   1.4 A Study of the Transformations in Muslim Mystical Thought in the Early Modern Period through the Lens of the Şa'bâniyye .................. 35
   1.5 Conclusion and Wider Ramifications ........................................ 37

2. The Rise of the Şa'bâniyye Order in Kastamonu as Reflected in the Hagiographical Sources ..................................................... 41
   2.1 Antecedents of Islamic and Sufi Culture in Kastamonu Before the Arrival of Şâbân Efendi ....................................................... 44
   2.2 The Early Life of Şâbân Efendi and His Induction into the Halveti Order ............................................................ 51
   2.3 Şâbân Efendi’s Struggles to Establish Himself as a Halveti Successor in Kastamonu .......................................................... 60
   2.4 Establishing the Ground Rules for the Followers of the Şa'bâniyye ...... 74
   2.5 Building a Network of Friends, and Confronting the Censurers of Sufism among the Local Population ................................. 85
   2.6 The Foundation of the Şa'bâniyye Tekke and the Establishment of a New Branch of the Halveti Order in Kastamonu .................... 108

xii
2.7 Şâ‘bân Efendi’s Death and Funeral, and Their Contribution to the Spread of the Order ............................................. 124
2.8 Stabilizing the Order in the Wake of Şâ‘bân Efendi’s Death: Osmân Efendi and Hayreddîn Efendi as Successors (1569-1579) ....................... 137
2.9 The Teachers of ʻ Omar el-Fu‘âdî: Abdülbâkî Efendi and Muhyiddîn Efendi (1579-1604) ................................................................. 147
2.10 Conclusion: The Establishment of the Şâ‘bânîyye Branch of the Halveti Order in the Sixteenth Century ........................................... 173

3. Defending the Cult of Saints in Seventeenth-Century Kastamonu: ʻOmar el-Fu‘âdî’s Transformation of the Şâ‘bânîyye Order .......................... 179

3.1 ʻOmar el-Fu‘âdî’s Early Life and Attachments to the Şâ‘bânîyye Before his Accession to the Leadership of the Order .......................... 181
3.2 ʻOmar el-Fu‘âdî’s Struggle to Expand the Şâ‘bânîd Legacy in the Early Seventeenth Century: The Writing of the Menâkîbname-i Şâ‘bân-ı Velî . 196
3.3 Constructing a Tomb for Şâ‘bân Efendi and Maintaining the Order in an Age of Growing Political Instability ................................. 213
3.4 Refining the Concepts of a Sufi Order: The Doctrinal Writings of ʻOmar el-Fu‘âdî ................................................................. 237
3.5 Doctrine and Political Life: ʻOmar el-Fu‘âdî’s Role in Countering the Kâdîzâdeli Criticisms of the Halveti Semâ‘ and Devrân .................... 275
3.6 The Problem of Sources and the Mixed Reception of ʻOmar el-Fu‘âdî’s Legacy in the Final Years of His Life ...................................................... 295
3.7 Conclusion: Interpreting the Life and Legacy of ʻOmar el-Fu‘âdî .... 302

4. The Curious Case of Ünsî Hasan Efendi: A Failed Halveti Candidate for Sainthood? ................................................................. 311

4.1 Shaykh Ünsî Hasan and His Relations with His Hagiographer, İbrâhîm el-Hâs ................................................................. 312
4.2 The Purpose and Method of İbrâhîm el-Hâs’s Hagiography of Ünsî Hasan ................................................................. 322
4.3 The Early Stages of Ünsî Hasan’s Career: His Training with Karabâş ʻAli and His Life at the ʻAcem Ağa Mosque in Istanbul .................. 340
4.4 The Conflicts Between Ünsî Hasan and the Kadîzâdeli Movement at the End of the Seventeenth Century .............................................. 355
4.5 Ünsî Hasan’s Relations with his Followers and Ottoman Statesmen at the Aydinoğlu Tekke in Tophane ............................................. 362
4.6 Ünsî Hasan’s Strained Relations With His Contemporaries in the Early Eighteenth Century ...................................................... 378
4.7 Conclusion: Was Ünsî Hasan Really a Failed Saint? .............. 394
Bibliography ........................................................................................................... 400

Primary Sources: Original Manuscripts .............................................................. 400
Primary Sources in Printed Texts, Translation, or Edited Editions of
Manuscripts ........................................................................................................ 407
Secondary Sources: Monographs and Dissertations ........................................... 410
Secondary Sources: Articles in Journals or Compilations ................................. 422
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: SUFISM AND THE HALVETI ORDER IN THE OTTOMAN CONTEXT

In the study of the Ottoman Empire, many scholars have focused heavily on the social, economic and political history of various regions of eastern Europe and the Near East, while neglecting the field of religious and cultural history. For many years, specialists in the field, regardless of nationality or ideology, have regarded the Ottoman period as one of cultural and intellectual stagnation, especially in the later years of the Empire. In recent years, however, scholars have begun to rethink their perceptions of the cultural and religious life of the Ottomans, and to assess more objectively the role of the Ottomans as important contributors to the religious, intellectual and cultural life of their time. However, a lack of critical studies on this aspect of Ottoman life has hampered attempts to present a coherent picture of the Empire’s history.¹

The majority of the scholarship on the Ottomans in the past six decades has been aimed at political and economic issues, which seek to explain the successes and failures of

the Ottoman enterprise in the realm of secular phenomena. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that the economic and political history of the Ottoman Empire cannot and should not be completely separated from its religio-cultural background. Studies that have tackled religious and cultural topics indicate that both intellectual production and everyday religious activity, amongst Ottoman elites and commoners alike, enjoyed an extraordinary dynamism that touched all aspects of life. In addition, political and economic crises during the Empire’s history often went hand-in-hand with spiritual crises that were equally influential in shaping the course of historical events.2

In a study of the strength and continuing practice of various forms of mysticism in Egypt during the 1980s, Valerie Hoffman noted the apolitical form which most Egyptians’ mystical expression seemed to take. She suggested that the political power of mystical orders during the preceding Ottoman period in fact represented an anomaly rather than the norm.3 One of the Ottoman orders to which she refers was that of the Halveti, a Sufi order that emerged in the region of Azerbaijan and northwest Iran no later than the second half of the fourteenth century, and eventually spread into almost all parts of the Ottoman domains by the beginning of the seventeenth century.


3 Valerie Hoffman, Sufism, Mystics, and Saints in Modern Egypt (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), pp. 15 and 362. Many of the contemporary Egyptians she observed felt the same way, and expressed this viewpoint through their condemnation of a certain shaykh’s relationship with President Gamal ʿAbd al-Nasir during the 1960s, pp. 266-267.
1.1 Islamic Mysticism and the Halveti Order in the Ottoman Context

The Halveti order played an important role in Ottoman politics and society that is still not fully understood. It often took the lead in defending Islamic mystical thought, philosophy, and practice from factions that insisted on literal interpretations of the Qur’an and sources of Islamic law. These debates often centered on issues that still divide Muslim communities even today, in the form of conflicts over what constituted a proper, acceptable form of Muslim belief and practice.4 In addition, the order retained a broad public appeal, notably in parts of the Balkans, which continued even into the twentieth century. The reason for this sustained popularity may have been that the Halvetis were often at the forefront of attempts to spread Islamic belief and practice into regions that did not receive the direct attention of the political and religious leaders based in the imperial centers of the empire. Some scholars have argued that this spread was the direct result of a collaborative effort between Halveti leaders and the Ottoman government leaders in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.5

The existence of this type of organization forces us to reflect on the role of mystical religious organizations in pre-modern Muslim societies such as the Ottoman Empire. Scholars have traditionally advanced several answers that act as conventional wisdom on the

---

4 For an example of how Sufi practices continue in modern times while also raising the suspicions of their contemporaries, see the recent study of David Meyer Buchman, “The Pedagogy of Perfection: Levels of Complementarity Within and Between the Beliefs and Practices of the Shadhiliya/Alawiya Sufi Order of Sana‘a, Yemen” (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1998).

subject. The earliest theoretical foundations laid by the first generation of Republican scholars in Turkey suggested that Turkish mystics from the east, having founded institutional centers (tekkes, or lodges) in Asia Minor from the Seljuk period onward, proved to be the only safety net for a population that was increasingly brought under stress on account of the wars with Byzantium, the Mongol invasions and the various civil conflicts that periodically racked the region. Such scholarship also argued that the Turkic Sufism espoused by such figures as Ahmed Yesevî in Central Asia, and later Yunus Emre in Anatolia, proved much more influential in structuring Sufism in Turkish history than did other variants.6

Later scholarship sought to posit that mystical religious organizations acted as “colonizers,” willing to take doctrinally flexible forms of Islamic belief and practice to the physical and spiritual frontiers of the Muslim world in order to lay the foundation for eventual incorporation into the wider Islamic sphere of influence.7 The question of to what extent this process actually took place, or whether it was even a consciously-articulated goal of the Ottoman ruling household, however, seems open to debate, especially since the historical record also demonstrates ample tension between some Sufi leaders and the Ottoman state.


7 The classic exposition of this thesis, which represents, at least in part, an ideological attempt to demonstrate Turkish origins for the institutions of the Ottoman Empire, derives from the writings of Ömer Lutfi Barkan, “İstilâ Devirlerinin Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zaviyeler,” Vaktflar Dergisi 2 (1942), pp. 279-304, which is followed by a catalogue of Sufi foundations that appear in the evkaf registers of various cities. Barkan’s thinking may have influenced Nathalie Clayer’s aforementioned study of the “implantation” of the Halveti dervishes in the Balkans from the 16th and 17th centuries; see Clayer, pp. 143-179.
More recent scholarship has challenged the idea that state and mystical orders worked closely together, raising the issue that the Ottoman Sufi orders like the Halveti were often at odds with the state, or even targeted by them. Such arguments suggest that the Sufi orders offered an outlet for those who could not find spiritual comfort in the literalist readings of Islamic law and ritual practice, sometimes to the point of acting as a safe haven for the propagation of heterodox movements.\(^8\) Anthropological variations on this theme, especially in the context of North African societies, have argued that Sufi leaders could provide a religious system flexible enough to mix with popular tradition and local custom among the uneducated and illiterate majority.\(^9\) Nevertheless, this type of phenomenon implies the existence of religious tension between the central, urban-based authorities and their more rural or distant subjects. In particular, Ernest Gellner recognized a problem of terminology in attempting to define the category of a “Sufi” in Morocco, and chose to contrast two different groups with the more recognized tradition of scholarly Islam embodied in the \(\textit{\text{i}l\text{\TEXTsty le}m\text{a}}\) class:

\(^8\) Ahmet Ya\text{"ar} Ocak discusses this idea in his work on atheism and heresy in the Ottoman context during the early modern period, and situates branches of the Halveti order squarely in this context of providing a form of shelter for those holding unorthodox ideas about religion; see Ahmet Ya\text{"ar} Ocak, \textit{Osmanl\text{"u} Toplumunda \text{"U}zv\text{"u}l\text{"u}l ve \text{"U}m\text{"u}l\text{"u}hidler (15.-17. \text{"U}l\text{"u}l\text{"u}rler)} (Istanbul: Tarih Vakf\text{"u} Yurt Yay\text{"u}nlar, 1998), pp. 119-131. In doing so, he stakes out a position that is somewhat contrary to that of Clayer, who argues that at least some of the prominent Halveti leaders were at the forefront of a “Sunnitization” campaign in the Balkans; see Clayer, pp. 63-112.

\(^9\) This point of view is best elaborated in the anthropological works of Ernest Gellner, which are often specifically aimed at the Moroccan context; see Ernest Gellner, \textit{Muslim Society} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 114-130. However, these views in fact can be traced back as far as the early Orientalist writings of Ignaz Goldziher, e.g., “The Veneration of Saints in Islam,” \textit{Muslim Studies}, trans. C.R. Barber and S.M. Stern (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1971), vol. 2, pp. 255-341.
Under the general category of Sufism, people tend, for instance, to group together genuine mystics and tribal holy men whose connection with mysticism is minimal....Roughly speaking: urban Sufi mysticism is an alternative to the legalistic, restrained, arid (as it seems to its critics) Islam of the ūlāma. Rural and tribal “Sufism” is a substitute for it. In the one case, and alternative is sought for the Islam of the ūlāma because it does not fully satisfy. In the other case, a substitute for it is required because, though its endorsement is desired, it is, in its proper and urban form, locally unavailable, or is unusable in the tribal context [italics author’s].

In addition to accepting a fundamental contradiction between scholarly Islam (as embodied in an ūlāma class) and mysticism, Gellner also posits a distinction between urban and rural-based mystical trends that implicitly suggests the inferiority of the latter. As a result, these viewpoints have generated considerable criticism within the discipline of anthropology in recent years.

A related trend that emerged in the discussion of the emergence of Sufi orders in later eras was an attempt to paint them as second-rate heirs to a higher intellectual tradition that appeared in a “golden age” of Islamic intellectual and cultural production that occurred between the ninth and thirteenth centuries C.E. In contrast to the mystics of this earlier period, which was marked by a greater intellectual and personal freedom to pursue the mystical path, the orders that emerged over the course of the later medieval and early modern periods became increasingly enmeshed in dogma and ritual that sapped their creative spirit and turned them into stagnant institutions that failed to uphold the legacy of earlier periods. As J. Spencer Trimingham suggested, the early Sufism represented a “natural

---

10 Ibid., p. 115.

expression of personal religion,” as opposed to the more “orthodox” Islam of the ʿulama, which represented “institutionalized religion based on authority, a one-way Master-slave relationship, with its emphasis upon ritual observance and a legalistic morality.”

This type of thinking represents an attempt to project the good attributes of mysticism back into the distant past, while demeaning its value or importance in more recent times. With the adoption of this Orientalist and colonialist construction of the nature of Sufism, the Sufi orders were often painted by Western and Muslim intellectuals alike as being in need of reform or abolition.

Nevertheless, other scholars have, in the course of their work on various subjects, pointed out that Sufi organizations formed one of many potential reference points available to people of various classes which could assist in their daily struggle to maintain or improve their livelihoods and positions in society. In her study of the religious leadership of the Ottoman Empire in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Madeline Zilfi argued that branches of the Sufi orders, like the Halveti in Istanbul, could draw in a broader following.

---


13 See, for example, the criticism of Trimingham’s thesis by Katherine Pratt Ewing, Arguing Sainthood: Modernity, Psychoanalysis and Islam (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997), pp. 46-47.

14 In an odd echo of the discourse of modernity espoused by Western thinkers, esteemed Muslim thinkers like Fazlur Rahman often blame the Sufi orders for corrupting the spirit of classical Islamic thought and practice; see, for example, Fazlur Rahman, Islam, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), pp. 235-254. More recent scholarship suggests that both these paradigms are rooted in ideas about the trajectory of modernization that should be questioned; see Ewing, pp. 2-4 and 41-44.

15 Zilfi, Politics of Piety, pp. 30-40.
As a result of their order’s attraction for diverse members of the population, members of the Halveti could also rise to positions of authority. This enabled members of the Halveti to negotiate with the state on behalf of the community at large during political or economic crises which increasingly disrupted the normal structure of authority, especially in the turbulent decades of the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. However, over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the strengthening of the state and the spread of greater education and literacy, along with the challenges of Western-based intellectual currents, caused mysticism to become increasingly marginalized and relegated to the realm of superstition and intellectual backwardness. As one scholar, Charles Lindholm, suggests:

...[T]he delegitimization of Sufism in the Middle East was accelerated by modern conditions and especially by the dominant power of the central state, but was also rooted in a deep and pervasive conflict between Sufism, with its apotheosis of saints and demand for absolute obedience from disciples, and the characteristic Middle Eastern and Islamic values of equality and autonomy. It is no surprise then to find that Sufis have slowly lost their essential role in Middle Eastern society, and now serve only as mediators in marginal tribal areas, or provide ecstatic performances in impoverished communities, or serve as guides for cultured elites seeking a less demanding, more aesthetic, intellectualized version of Islam. This is where Middle Eastern Sufism is today, and most likely will remain for the foreseeable future.

---


As a result, the appeal of Sufi leaders became increasingly limited, except in certain rare cases where the orders were able to adapt themselves for survival in new contexts. Nevertheless, Lindholm qualifies his own assertions by contrasting this situation to that of South Asia, where the greater autonomy of the orders under British colonialism and the cultural tendency of greater acceptance of hierarchies in the community, ironically enough, has allowed Sufism to maintain a prominent role and even gain in strength. He also notes Turkey as another exception to the general rule that has not necessarily fit the pattern of Sufi stagnation in modern times.

Such explanations neatly encapsulate a political, social, and intellectual role for Islamic mysticism in the broadest historical sense. But do these assumptions represent the reality of all mystical orders, especially in their local contexts and manifestations? Were the first Muslim mystics to appear in predominantly non-Muslim contexts invariably aiming to prepare the ground for a political incorporation of non-Muslim peoples into Muslim states? Did medieval Muslim mystics reject the literalist readings of legal and theological scholars, and the legacy of classical Islamic scholarship, in favor of an entirely different interpretation of religion? How could these organizations, based as they were on principles that often stressed the renunciation of worldly things and a contempt for the value of political and economic power, act as bases of social advancement or even political power? Finally, there is the question of mysticism’s so-called “irrelevance” in the face of modern civilization. Is

---

18 An excellent study of a Sufi order in Egypt that was able to buck the trend of decline and weakness in the mid-20th century is that of Michael Gilsenan, *Saint and Sufi in Modern Egypt: An Essay in the Sociology of Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973).

19 Lindholm, pp. 224-229; see also his remarks on p. 230, n. 10.
mysticism really an outdated intellectual trend, or does it still remain an alternative path to which Muslims can turn, despite the negative associations with superstition and irrationality that many modern ideologies have attached to it?  

In recent years, the field of Islamic and Near Eastern studies has seen an upsurge in interest in the role of mysticism and mystical orders. These studies, mostly focused on the modern period, often take as their goal an elucidation of the fractures between local conceptions of the mystical path and the metanarrative of the classical philosophy of mysticism as elaborated by the great thinkers of Muslim history.  

In contrast to the hierarchy of Christian saints achieved through official canonization by a central authority, Muslim mystics and saints are inherently local in character, and the nature of mystical guides and sainthood varies considerably from one place and time to another. This is because the relationship between a disciple and his teacher is of paramount importance in the conveying of mystical knowledge in the Muslim context and because normative Islam rejects an official hierarchy of saints along the Roman Catholic model.  

As a result, studies of mysticism tend to break down into two types. The first are anthropological studies which usually focus on

---

20 Hoffman, pp. 1-4.

21 The recent work of Katherine Pratt Ewing is a good example of the growing movement towards critiquing the assumptions of the modernist paradigms that have undergirded much of the 20th-century scholarship. For an analysis of how the paradigm of medieval and modern Sufism was made as an attempt to place the contemporary Sufism of India and Pakistan in a negative context as part of the British colonial project, see Ewing, pp. 47-64.

22 See, for example, the evocation of the importance of this relationship in a modern study of a scholar with his own Bektaşi master in the United States in Frances Trix, *Spiritual Discourse: Learning with an Islamic Master* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993). See also the remarks of Eickelman, pp. 274-288.
a specific group in the hope of elaborating wider theories about human thought and behavior. The second group are historical, and frequently focus their attention upon the historical development and classical elaboration of the intellectual and philosophical theory of Islamic mystical thought in its “golden age” (usually no later than the thirteenth century C.E.). There is a basic disjunction between the two which scholars have always found troubling. The first often focuses on areas or groups that might be labeled “marginal” in terms of political power or importance for wider trends in Islamic thought. The subjects of the majority of respected anthropological studies on Muslim mysticism and religious practice tend to cluster on the geographical or economic fringes of the Islamic world, with an imbalance of studies focusing on Morocco, Indonesia, and, more recently, Yemen. One is often struck by just how limited in size or how marginal the mystical groups in question are. On the other hand, the dominant studies of classical mysticism in the Islamic world are often hampered by a focus on the highest levels of philosophical and intellectual thought,

---


25 See the aforementioned dissertation of David Meyer Buchman, n. 4.
with little attention given to how these ideologies might have been received in practice throughout various periods of history.  

Can a way be found to bridge this gap between the anthropological and historical aspects of Islamic mysticism? How might a researcher analyze a mystical order in a pre-modern context, where direct access to personal interactions with the subjects under study, so integral to the anthropological approach to Islamic mystical practice, are lacking? Despite the attempt of recent works to challenge the hegemonic position of modern thought and concepts in Muslims’ interpretation and practice of their beliefs, and to link modern practice with classical intellectual conceptions in some way, I sense that a major field of inquiry which could help to bridge this gap has been ignored. The Ottoman Empire, which encompassed the entire eastern Mediterranean and most of North Africa at its height, was an important historical entity that bridged the transition of the region from the medieval period into the modern. As a result, scholars have frequently had trouble fitting the Ottoman Empire into the general theoretical construction of Islamic civilization and society. It seems to represent a special case that does not fit theoretical models developed to encompass either the “medieval” or “modern” period of Islamic history, thereby ghettoizing the field of

26 This does not deny that these works have been extremely valuable in advancing the study of Muslim mysticism. However, the foundations laid here have often proven difficult to reconcile with studies of Sufism in the modern period. Two outstanding examples of this genre have been Annemarie Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1975), and William C. Chittick, *The Sufi Path of Knowledge: Ibn al-‘Arabi’s Metaphysics of Imagination* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1989). For an amusing account of how attempts to reconcile the historical traditions of early Sufis with the modern realities of the present can go awry in anthropological studies, see William Hickman, “Ümmi Kemâl in Anatolian Tradition,” *Turcica* 14 (1982), pp. 155-167.
Ottoman studies as a whole.\textsuperscript{27} To make matters even more difficult, as William Chittick pointed out in his recent article on Islamic mysticism for the period from the thirteenth through the eighteenth centuries in the second edition of the \textit{Encyclopedia of Islam}, there is a glaring gap in the assessment of mystical literary production and thought from the Ottoman period.\textsuperscript{28}

Recent studies have also pointed toward the importance of the Ottoman context for an analysis of the historical trajectory of Sufism from its medieval foundations to its modern incarnations. Dina Le Gall, in her recent study of the Ottoman Nakşibendi order, has demonstrated that the previous conceptions held by most historians about the Nakşibendi leadership from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries do not hold up well under serious scrutiny of the Ottoman sources. Later incarnations of the Nakşibendi order’s leadership, emanating from the Indian branches of the order, were more aggressive in promoting a \textit{shari'ā}-based orthodoxy and in taking a “missionary” approach to replicating their order in Ottoman lands. Yet when the period of the early modern Ottoman Empire is examined more closely, Le Gall finds that attempts to retroject these conceptions of the Nakşibendi back onto earlier generations of the order prove to be misleading. In fact, the Ottoman Nakşibendi of this earlier period proved to be much the opposite—extremely diverse in their outlooks and often skeptical about extending their teachings to a broader segment of

\footnotesize


Ottoman society.\textsuperscript{29} Such findings provide a great deal of encouragement to scholars who want to rethink the role and practice of mysticism in Islamic history, thereby examining more critically the prevailing historical interpretations of these orders in the political, religious, social and economic spheres of life in Muslim societies of later periods.

The present work seeks to build on and contribute to this growing body of literature by focusing specifically on the experiences of various members of a prominent branch of the Halveti order, the Şa‘bânîyye. An examination of writings of various members of the order over the course of a period from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries points to important transformations in the order’s doctrines and priorities as individual members in different contexts tried to adapt to changing conditions within the Ottoman Empire. However, before proceeding to a detailed examination of this branch of the order, it is worth re-examining the master narratives of the origins of the Halveti order and how it had come to be a part of Ottoman life by the time that Şa‘bân-ı Veli, founder of the Şa‘bânîyye branch of the order, established his legacy in Kastamonu in the final stages of his life.

\textbf{1.2 A Brief Survey of the Historiography of Islamic Saints and Shaykhs within the Halveti Order}

An account of the historical background to the rise of Islamic mysticism in the classical phase of its development (ninth to thirteenth centuries) is beyond the scope of this work, and treated in much more thorough fashion elsewhere.\textsuperscript{30} However, since so many of

\textsuperscript{29} Dina Le Gall, \textit{A Culture of Sufism: Naqshbandis in the Ottoman World, 1450-1700} (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005).

\textsuperscript{30} One of the best short surveys of Islamic mysticism from a historical perspective is that of Alexander Knysh, \textit{Islamic Mysticism: A Short History} (Leiden: E.J. Brill,
the sources for Sufism are based on the creation of hagiographies (defined here as biographical works describing the lives and acts of holy personages in a religious traditions), it is worth the effort to briefly trace the roots of this genre of literature and how it was intertwined with early Islamic literary history.

After the revelation of the Qur’an to the Prophet Muhammad in the early 7th century, his companions and successors began to collect anecdotal materials about his activities and personal qualities in the hope of better understanding how to conduct their own lives in accordance with God’s will. As the era of the Prophet and his immediate contemporaries receded into history, compilations of anecdotes having varying levels of acceptance among the Muslim community (known in Arabic as hadith) began to circulate in different regions and contexts during the formative period of early Islam. Much of this literature was intended to clarify points of doctrine in regard to the foundations and laws of the new faith. However, this legally-oriented material was joined by another type of narrative literature that described the stories and legends surrounding not only the Prophet but his companions, the first four caliphs (successors to the Prophet as leaders of the Muslim community), and other well-known figures who developed a following of their own. This literature, called sirah, sometimes came into conflict with the emerging doctrinal positions taken by what has been posited as the Muslim consensus. Generally speaking, however, much of this literature found an accepted place in Islamic societies, and was even folded into the hadith literature in some cases.

2000); for a perspective more oriented toward the religious aspects of the issue, see William C. Chittick, Sufism: A Short Introduction (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2000).
Subsequently, over the course of the 8th-10th centuries, the contours of Islamic mysticism, or Sufism, began to be defined, initially by the activities of well-known ascetics (zâhhâd). Over time, the growing prominence of these ascetic figures and their activities resulted in the popular recognition among some segments of the Muslim community of their being outstanding evliyâ, holy men who were viewed as being the “friends of God.” It was only natural that the model of compiling oral reports about their activities and sayings into written texts that could serve as a guide for the individual’s conduct would replicate itself in a fashion similar to the sirah of the Prophet Muhammad and his companions. Nevertheless, the 10th and 11th centuries seem to have marked a turning point in the history of Sufism-based literature. A number of authors, writing in either Persian or Arabic, established large biographical compilations of figures from the first centuries of Muslim history who were viewed as exemplary and holy men (and, in some cases, women). It should be noted that earlier compilations of this nature are known from other sources that refer to them; however, they do not seem to have survived into modern times. Nevertheless, a period of consolidation began with the writing of Abû Nasr al-Sarrâj’s (d. 988) Kitâb al-luma‘ and culminated in the compilation of Abû ‘Abd al-Rahman Sulamî’s (d. 1021) Tabaqât al-sufiyyah. Sulamî first took the organizational step of dividing his accounts of the early Sufi masters into five distinct classes (tabaqat), roughly based on their chronological position in history. Other authors began to follow his example with their own

---

31 These are Abû Sa‘îd b. A‘rabî’s (d. 952) Tabaqat al-nussâk and Abû Bakr Muhammad b. Dâvûd’s (d. 953) Hilyat al-awlîyâ‘. Surviving copies of either work have not come to light. See the remarks of Profs. Süleyman Uludağ and Mustafa Kara in their introduction to Abdurrahman Cami and Lamii Çelebi, Nefahâtü’l-Üns: Evliyâ Menktbeleri, ed. Süleyman Uludağ and Mustafa Kara (İstanbul: Marifet Yaytnevi, 1998), pp. 17-18, for a brief overview of the early biographical literature on mystical figures.
variations, such as Abû Nu‘aym al-Isfahâni’s (d. 1038) work, which sought to divide these holy men into two categories of “Sufis” and ascetics. Later writers and Persian translators such as Hujwîrî (d. 1072), Harawî (d. 1088), and Ibîn al-Jawzî (d. 1198), were influenced by both works and made additions to them.32

The Turkic and Central Asian groups who settled Anatolia during Seljuk and Mongol times deviated from these models of hagiographical writing that had emerged in Arabic and Persian letters during the pre-Mongol period. Early hagiographical writing in Seljuk and beylik-period Anatolia reflects a type of religious leader who focused predominantly on his military activities and conquests, and who often espoused beliefs and practices that later generations would come to view as heterodox.33 Nevertheless, by the time the Ottomans conquered Constantinople in 1453, they were no strangers to the hagiographical literature of the past. This early literature was often written in either Arabic or Persian, sometimes with translations passing between the two languages. Two of the most notable works that had a long life in Ottoman religious and social history were the Persian-language Manaqib-e ʻArifin of Aflâkî, which related anecdotes about the line of shaykhs centered on Mevlânâ Celâluddin Rûmî, and the Tezkiretü'l-evliyâ of Feridüddîn ʻAttâr, produced in the thirteenth

32 For a general listing of this eleventh and twelfth century literature see ibid., pp. 18-21. The appearance of a substantial number of saintly biographies during this period is a topic that requires further research; see L. Massignon and B. Radtke, “Tasavvuf: 1) Early Development in the Arabic and Persian Lands,” Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd ed. (EI²) (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998).

These earlier works were influential in the creation of ʿAbdurrahman Câmî’s (d. 1492) *Nefâhâtü’l-uns min hadarâtu’l-kuds*. Some credit this work with welding the Sufi traditions of various Sufi orders and their important figures from the western and eastern halves of the Islamic world together, despite the author’s pro-Nakşibendi leanings. This massive work came to be translated into Turkish by Lami’i Çelebi (d. 1532), perhaps during the reign of Selim I (r. 1512-1520), although it was eventually completed and presented to Süleyman I (r. 1520-1566) after his successful siege of Belgrade in 1521. However, in one of a number of additions, Lami’i Çelebi became the first to append a list of some of the early shaykhs of the Halveti order to the body of the work despite his own Nakşibendi orientation.

From this point forward, we begin to catch our first glimpse of the origins of the Halveti order and its subsequent spread into the Ottoman Empire. However, subsequent hagiographical writings that illuminate the growth and expansion of the Halveti order over time tend to pose difficulties in interpreting the order’s early history. Leaving the appendix of Lami’i Çelebi aside, the earliest Halveti hagiographical works that appear in any

---


35 Ibid., p. 30-31. It is also worth noting here the influence that Turkish translations of Ferîdüdîn Attar’s *Tezkiretü’l-Evliyâ* had upon the development of menâkibnâme biographical literature, see Ocak, *Kültür Tarihi Kaynağı Olarak Menâkibnâmeler*, p. 83.
significant number date from the latter half of the sixteenth century. By then, these works had taken on a significantly defensive and apologetic tone aimed at deflecting criticism of the rituals and practices of the various branches of the order from others in their society who did not look kindly upon them.36 In addition, the works often took a didactic approach, with the anecdotes describing events from the lives of the saints that aimed to teach their audience about how to address their own relationships with both the order and its shaykhs. As a result, many scholars have argued that these works give us very little in the way of objective or historically trustworthy information about the actual lives of their subjects; rather, they tend to follow predetermined patterns of what the audience of their own times recognized as “saintly,” or they address the concerns of the present through the lens of a respected figure from the past.37 As a result, hagiographical writings on a shaykh or the activities of his followers cannot be interpreted properly unless they are placed squarely within the historical contexts of their authors. Sadly, much of the recent and voluminous historical production of Turkish scholars of Ottoman religious life, especially those dealing with the activities of various shaykhs within the Halveti and other Ottoman orders, have neglected this caveat.

36 For an overview of the first wave of Halveti hagiographical writing, which showed remarkable diversity in form and scope, see John J. Curry, “The Growth of Turkish Hagiographical Literature within the Halveti Order in the 16th and 17th Centuries,” in The Turks, ed. Hasan Celâl Güzel et al. (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 2002), v. 3, pp. 912-920.

37 For a good overview of this historiographical principle applied to the hagiographical works of the early period of Sufism in its Central Asian context, see Jürgen Paul, “Au début du genre hagiographique dans le Khorassan,” Saints Orientaux, ed. Denise Aigle (Paris: De Boccard, 1995), pp. 15-38. An interesting structural breakdown of various elements in different types of Turkish hagiographical writing can be found in Ocak, Menâkıbnâmeler, pp. 70-96.
As a result, their studies continue to focus on the saints themselves, often at the expense of their hagiographers, who are fascinating historical figures in their own right.\(^{38}\)

Nevertheless, it is worth taking a look at the various attempts by Ottoman writers and compilers to construct a history or biographical sketch of the early figures in the Halveti order. When various accounts are compared with one another, and sometimes checked against the written works of the early Halveti shaykhs themselves, a basic chronology and geography of the spread of the Halveti order up to its arrival in Istanbul during the 1480s emerges. Since the Şâbâniyye branch of the Halveti conceived of itself as emerging from this broader tradition, it is necessary to revisit the historical narrative of the spread of the Halveti from their origins in the area of Azerbaijan and northwestern Iran in the 14th century.

\section*{1.3 A Brief History of the Halveti Order and Its Branches to the Reign of Sultan Süleyman}

The origins of the Halveti order are shrouded in mystery. The name of the order itself derives from the Arabic word \textit{khalwah}, meaning “cell” or “retreat,” indicating that its devotees practiced a form of withdrawal from society. Were you to ask a Halveti shaykh about the question of origins, he would undoubtedly provide you their \textit{silsile}, or chain of authoritative transmitters of the Halveti doctrine, which stretches back through Islamic

\(^{38}\) Good examples of this trend can be found in the recent spurt of works dealing with various notable saints of the Ottoman period published by İnsan Publications (İnsan Yayınılar) in Istanbul, which can be found in the bibliography of this dissertation. This is not to deny the utility of these works as tools for mapping the contours of study for the lives, works and followers of given saints; however, the degree to which these studies represent an actual portrait of the person involved, as opposed to subsequent constructions of them, is usually left open to question. An exception to the general rule can be found in Himmet Konur, İbrâhîm Gâlişenî: Hayatt, Eserleri, Tarikat (Istanbul: İnsan Yayınılar, 2000), pp. 92-93.
history to the fourth rightly-guided caliph, ʿAlî (d. 661). Along the way, the doctrine was ostensibly passed down through such luminaries as the noted early mystic Hasan al-Basrî (d. 728), the sixth Shiʿite imam Jaʿfar al-Sadīq (d. 765) and the noted Sufi shaykh Abu Najîb al-Suhrawardî (d. 1167), among others. In fact, some scholars have drawn attention to the fact that one of the early figures in the Halveti silsile, İbrâhîm Zâhid al-Jilânî (d. 1300), is the common ancestor for both the Halvetis and the order that would come to form the backbone of the Iranian Safavid dynasty, as İbrâhîm Zâhid al-Jilânî was the guide of the notorious Safi al-Dîn Ardabilî (d. 1334), whose shrine was a major center for the Shiʿite Safavids despite the probable Sunni orientation of its occupant.\footnote{See, for example, B.G. Martin, “A Short History of the Khalwati Order of Dervishes,” in \textit{Scholars, Saints, and Sufis: Muslim Religious Institutions since 1500}, ed. Nikki R. Keddie (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 284-285. Martin’s remarks on the quasi-Shiʿite origins of the order, however, may not be accurate in light of more recent studies.}

Complicating the matter is the fact that there seem to have been two separate orders that were associated with the name “Halveti.” One of these emerged in the eastern Islamic world in the area of eastern Iran, central Asia and Afghanistan, while the other emerged farther to the west in northwestern Iran and Azerbaijan. The eastern branch of the order, to the best of my knowledge, died out at a considerably earlier date. Recognizing the confusion, Lamiʿî Çelebi offered a helpful clarification after completing his translation of Abdurrahman Câmî’s entries on the Halveti shaykhs of the eastern Islamic world with which Câmî was more familiar.

According to what I heard from the older people who lived in Herat, these aforementioned Halveti shaykhs are not the Halveti shaykhs who are famed in Anatolia and the area of Şîrvân in our times. The exalted silsile of these aforementioned shaykhs comes from Shaykh Rükneddîn Alâüeddîve Simnânî.
Even though Mollâ Câmî did not touch upon the *silsile* of İbrâhîm Zâhid to avoid making his work too long, this poor one [Lâmi‘î Çelebi] will explain a blessed number of those famed and well-known ones from that noble *silsile* as a group up into our own times.\footnote{More information on this individual had been included previously in the *Nefahâtü’l-Üns*, see Lâmi‘î Çelebi, Mahmûd b. ʿOsmân b. ʿAlî Nakkaş b. İlyâs (d. 1532), *Nefehâtü’l-Üns: Evliyâ Menkibeleri*, ed. and trans. Süleyman Uludağ and Mustafa Kara (İstanbul: Marifet Yayınılar, 1998), pp. 611-616.}

More likely, the reason that Câmî did not include the western branch of the Halveti was that he was unaware of their origins altogether. Lâmi‘î Çelebi, recognizing the growing importance of the “western Halveti” by the early sixteenth century, when he was writing, realized that he had to find a way to explain the confusion, and did so as best he could.

In fact, Lâmi‘î Çelebi’s additions to the *Nefahâtü’l-Üns* represent perhaps our only clues about the origins of what would come to be the Halveti order in the Ottoman domains. One of the Nakşibendi shaykhs, Uzun Muslihuddin Halife, who had gained his training from Mollâ İlahi (d. 1490), a noted figure in 15th-century Ottoman Sufi circles, had written in one of his works that İbrâhîm Zâhid al-Jilânî was the original founder of the Halveti practice of progressing through seven spiritual stages. Subsequently, these practices came to be refined and channeled through the person of Pir ʾÖmer el-Halveti (d. 1397 or 1398) in the fluid milieu in which Halvetis of both eastern and western branches were active during the period of Timurid rule.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 697-698.}\footnote{Unfortunately, much of this must remain in the realm of speculation, since Lâmi‘î Çelebi does not offer much in the way of elaboration on these connections, and his language is rather vague. See *Nefahâtü’l-Üns*, p. 698.}
According to Halveti writings from a later period, the life of Pir ʿÖmer el-Halveti was the turning point in generating a separate order from the teachings of the original silsile dating back to Prophetic times. This would suggest that the origins of the Halveti order should be sought in the area of western Iran and Azerbaijan during the tumultuous period of the 14th century. While some scholars have sought to downplay Pir ʿÖmer’s importance in institutionalizing Halveti ritual and practice in favor of later and better-known Halveti shaykhs, the Ottoman Halveti historians credited him with being the first to apply the name “Halveti” to the order. Nevertheless, the fifteenth century would see the Halveti order expand dramatically from its local roots in the mountains of northwestern Iran and Azerbaijan.

A number of factors worked in conjunction to allow for the spread of the Halveti order in the decades following Pir ʿÖmer’s death. The first of these was the growing interest of ambitious Anatolian Turkish Muslims who wished to gain a better knowledge of the traditions of their faith. (In fact, not all of these Anatolians embarked on this quest willingly, as Timur forcibly relocated to Iran and Central Asia a number of talented Anatolians, who later returned with knowledge of the scholarship of the east as a byproduct of their stay there.) As the Ottoman Empire was considered something of a cultural backwater even

---

43 See, for example, the remarks of Martin, pp. 276-277. Martin suggests that Pir ʿÖmer was “not the man to propel an organization very far in the institutional sense.” However, given the state of our sources on late fourteenth-century northwestern Iran, perhaps it would be best to avoid seeing an absence of evidence as evidence of absence.

44 An example of this phenomenon was the career of the Halveti scholar Pir İlyâs of Amasya, a contemporary of Yahyâ-yı Şirvânî. After being deported to the city of Şirvân and forced to take up an assignment there in support of the expanding Timurid Empire, he was exposed to the Sufis and ʿulama of the region, including a number of Halveti shaykhs. See Mehmed Mecdî Efendi (d. 1591), Hadâʾikuʾ-š-Šekâʾik-i Nuʾmâniye
after its capture of Constantinople and growing expansion into Anatolia and the Balkans, most Anatolian Muslims interested in pursuing a full training in the Islamic sciences and culture had to look eastward to Iran and Transoxiana, make the pilgrimage to the holy cities of the Hijaz, or go to various parts of the Mamluk domains, such as Cairo or Damascus. However, the fifteenth century also saw the rise of the Akkoyunlu dynasty, with its center in Tabriz. While many Muslims of the period still felt that the best centers of Islamic culture, learning and scholarship lay farther to the east in Transoxiana, at the Timurid court in Herat, or in the ancient Arab capitals, the Akkoyunlu capital in Tabriz proved attractive enough to maintain a number of prominent Sufi orders, īlāma and scholars until the end of the fifteenth century. A good example is the founder of the Egypt-based Gülşeniyeye branch of the Halveti order, İbrâhîm-i Gülşenî, who departed from Anatolia with the intention of going to Transoxiana to continue his education, only to settle and remain indefinitely in Tabriz when he realized that he could easily pursue his aspirations there. As a result, the growing number of Muslim scholars passing back and forth between Anatolia and Transoxiana began to encounter Halveti shaykhs at the Akkoyunlu court more frequently.


45 For instance, the great Persian scholar and poet Abdurrahman Jâmî (d. 1492) was invited to the court at Istanbul by Sultan Mehmed II during the 1470s while he was making the pilgrimage to the Hijaz; however, he rejected the offer, probably because he viewed the emerging Ottoman state as a backwater compared to his own region.

However, the high point of the Akkoyunlu Sultanate also coincided with the career of an energetic and ambitious shaykh based in Baku by the name of Yahyâ-ýt Şirvânî (d. 1465).

Yahyâ’s spiritual descendants, of whom there would be many (one account claims more than 10,000)\(^{47}\), spread throughout the Ottoman Empire in the two centuries after his death, most notably to Egypt, Anatolia, and large parts of the Balkans.\(^{48}\) He did not succeed in joining the Halveti order easily himself, as his own father actively worked to prevent his entry into the order, and even tried to assassinate the shaykh with whom he undertook his training, Sadreddîn el-Halveti.\(^{49}\) In addition, even after he had succeeded in gaining his father’s grudging acceptance of his choice, Yahyâ ran into trouble with his own shaykh, Sadreddîn, who increasingly favored another of his followers for the succession to his position after his death. When the chosen successor, a man by the name of Pirîzâde, began to behave in a hostile manner towards Yahyâ after the death of their shaykh, Yahyâ departed from his home town of Şumâhî (in the area of Şîrvân) and moved to the Caspian port city of Baku. Despite the temporary victory of his adversary, Yahyâ-ýt Şîrvânî would come to be the one of the most famous successors in the Halveti silsîle.\(^{50}\)

---

\(^{47}\) Haci Ali (d. after 1074 H.), Tühfetü’l-Mucâhidîn (Istanbul: Nuruosmaniye Ktp. MS 2293), fol. 527b; see also Martin, p. 278.

\(^{48}\) The spread of the order in the Balkans in particular has been well-documented by Nathalie Clayer in her book Mystiques, État et societé: Les Halvetis dans l’aire Balkanique de la fin du XVe siècle à nos jours.

\(^{49}\) Over half of the biographical entry on Yahyâ-ýt Şîrvânî in Taşköprüzâde is given over to stories surrounding this conflict between Yahyâ and his father; see Mecdfî, v. 1, pp. 287-288.

\(^{50}\) It is unfortunate that the biographical entry of Taşköprüzâde does not give us more information about why this dispute emerged; see ibid., v. 1, p. 288.
Perhaps because of his dispute with his rival, Yahyâ aggressively recruited and trained successors for the Halveti path as a way of strengthening his position. The period just at the end of Yahyâ’s life also witnessed the activities of Shaykh Haydar, who would later become an instrumental figure in the emergence of the Safavid line. The troubles of the period and the rise of heterodox or Shi‘ite tendencies in the region may also have contributed to Yahyâ’s desire to train large numbers of people. When he was questioned about his unusual practice of training large numbers of followers, he responded that he wanted them to teach proper morals (*te’ā dib*) to the general public, and he implied that only one of them would eventually emerge to act as his true successor and replacement.\(^5\)

Nevertheless, many of Yahyâ’s followers would prove to be talented organizers and important Muslim mystics in their own right, and a number of them had returned to their home towns in eastern Anatolia by the time of Yahyâ’s death. Even so, the ostensible founder of the Şâ’bânî silsile in the Ottoman Empire, Cemâl el-Halveti (also referred to in the sources by the moniker “Çelebi Halife,” d. 1499), attempted to bypass Yahyâ-yî Şîrvânî’s immediate successor, Mehmed el-Erzincânî, in favor of going directly to Yahyâ himself, which illustrates the regard in which Yahyâ was held during the mid-fifteenth century.\(^2\)

Cemâl el-Halveti was a pivotal figure in the spread of the Halveti order in the Ottoman domains, and founded a separate branch of the Halveti order from which the Şâ’bânîyye would later spring. Born in the central Anatolian city of Aksaray to a prominent

\(^{51}\) Ibid.

\(^{52}\) *Nefehâtü’l-Üns*, p. 707.
and influential family that also included such luminaries as the future şeyhülislâm Zenbilli ʿAlî Efendi and Sultan Selim I’s vizier Pirî Paşa, he was a figure well-placed to contribute to the rise of the Halveti in the Ottoman lands. Although he initially began his Sufi training under a shaykh of the Zeyniyye order, he later became attracted to the Halveti and traveled around the various cities and towns of northern central Anatolia, attaching himself to various Halveti shaykhs along the way. While he eventually completed his training under Mehmed el-Erzincânî, their initial meeting did not prove auspicious, and he departed to Baku with the intention of becoming a follower of Yahyâ-yî Şirvânî. However, he found that he was too late, arriving shortly after Yahyâ’s death and burial. After deciding to sleep at the foot of the newly-built grave, Cemâl saw a vision of Yahyâ commanding him to return to Erzincân to complete his training with his chosen successor, and so Cemâl returned there.

Nevertheless, the pupil would outshine the master in this case. Perhaps due to his connections with an influential family in the region, Cemâl el-Halveti became attached to the court of the future sultan Bayezid II in Amasya. Since Amasya was already a Halveti stronghold due to the activities of the aforementioned Pir İlyâs, Cemâl found fertile ground for his activities and became one of Bayezid’s confidants. Most of the hagiographies and biographical sources on Cemâl el-Halveti’s life stress his participation in the events that would catapult Bayezid II to the throne in the wake of his father’s death in 1481. Sultan Mehmed II’s grand vizier Mehmed Paşa had sided with Bayezid’s rival Cem, and was trying

53 For more on the various members of the Cemâlî family in Ottoman history, see Yusuf Küçükdağ, II. Bayezid, Yavuz ve Kanûnî Devirlerinde Cemâlî Ailesi (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1995).

54 Sinaneddin b. Yusuf b. Ya’kub (d. 1581), Tezkiretü’l-Halvetiyye (İstanbul: Süleymaniye Lib. MS Esad Efendi 1372/1), fol. 11a.
to undermine Bayezid’s position at the court in Istanbul. According to the narrative, Bayezid sent an emissary to Cemâl el-Halveti to inform him of his wish to do something about Mehmed Paşa’s activities against him. However, it was well-known that Mehmed Paşa always wore a magic-square talisman (vefk) to protect himself, which had been drawn up for him by a prominent Zeyniyye leader, Shaykh Vefâ (d. 1491).⁵⁵ The shaykh confessed that he could not break the spiritual power of Shaykh Vefâ, but that if the Sultan would wait for thirty-three days, an important event would take place and a way might be found to solve his problem. Sure enough, news of Sultan Mehmed II’s death came after a month, and the various contenders to the throne began mobilizing their forces. Luckily for Bayezid, Mehmed Paşa one day accidentally rubbed off some of the writing on his talisman, and was forced to give it to one of Shaykh Vefâ’s dervishes to be repaired. Shortly thereafter, the janissaries rose up and murdered Mehmed Paşa, clearing the way for Bayezid’s eventual accession to the throne.⁵⁶

The victory of Sultan Bayezid paved the way for the Halveti to become one of the most prominent orders in the Ottoman Empire. While Cemâl el-Halveti and his followers were initially hesitant about their patron’s entreaties to join him in the capital, they eventually made the journey and were given a former Christian church which was subsequently converted into a mosque (known today as the Sünbül Efendi mosque in

⁵⁵ For an extended discussion of the life and career of Shaykh Vefâ that includes a discussion of this anecdote and Vefâ’s relations with Sultan Mehmed II and Sultan Bayezid II, see Reşat Öngören, *Tarihte Bir Aydın Tarikatı Zeynîler* (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2003), pp. 130-154.

⁵⁶ This narrative appears in the *Tezkiretü’l-Halvetiyye*, fols. 11a-12a; and the *Nefehâtü’l-Üns*, pp. 707-708, among others.
Istanbul) under the direction of Bayezid’s grand vizier Koca Mustafa Paşa. Despite his death on the pilgrimage at the end of the 15th century, perhaps from the plague, Cemâl el-Halveti guaranteed a long and prosperous future for the Halveti order in the Ottoman domains.

A number of Cemâl el-Halveti’s writings have survived to give us some additional insight into his character and the mystical thought that he espoused. The manuscripts that have survived are written almost entirely in Arabic and seem to be aimed at a moderately-educated scholarly audience. One tract, a commentary on the reported proverbs of the first caliph, Abu Bakr, imbues each of the statements with a mystical meaning which Cemâl subsequently ties into a couplet of Persian mystical poetry by famed literary figures such as Celâleddîn Rûmî and Abdurrahman Câmî.57 Another tract, which Cemâl el-Halveti claims to be transmitting on the authority of Yahyâ-yi Şîrvânî himself, seeks to imbue the simple Islamic ritual of the ablution before prayer with a deep spiritual sense of cleansing the soul.58 Clearly, this was mystical philosophy that was aimed predominantly at a limited circle of educated elite who had the requisite skills to learn Arabic. Only in much later times do we see this tract translated into Turkish to reach a wider audience.59 Even Cemâl’s successor, 

57 Cemâl el-Halveti, a.k.a. “Çelebi Halife” (d. 1499), Risâlah fî tâ’wil kalîmat Imâm ‘alâ tahqîq Amîr al-Mu’minîn Abû Bakr as-Siddîq (Istanbul: Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 1555/2). Documents like this also force us to rethink B.G. Martin’s claims that the early Halveti had a strong Shi‘ite influence; see, for example, Martin, pp. 284-285.

58 Cemâl el-Halveti, a.k.a. “Çelebi Halife” (d. 1499), Risâlah fî tahqîq al-wudû’ al-bâtinî (Istanbul: Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 1683/1), fols. 2a-9a.

59 See, for example, the 19th-century translation of the aforementioned tract by one Veliyüddîn Maraşî Emirzâde, Vuzû’-i bâtinî ve gusul hakkında risâle (Istanbul: Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 1740).
Sünbül Sinân Efendi, continued to write in Arabic during the early decades of the 16th century, and it was only toward the latter half of the 16th century that prominent Halveti leaders began to produce works in Turkish to broaden their audience.

The prominent position and close association of Cemâl el-Halveti and his followers with the royal household of Bayezid II would have mixed results, however. When Bayezid II was deposed by his son Selim in 1512, Selim went on to execute the grand vizier Koca Mustafa Paşa, who was a prominent patron of the Istanbul Halveti. He even sought to destroy the Kocamustafapaşa mosque by removing its supporting columns as construction material for an addition to the palace, and was only prevented from doing so by the direct intervention of Sünbül Efendi, who confronted him directly before the mosque and talked him out of the idea. 60 Although Sünbül Efendi’s successful intervention to save the mosque suggests some influence within Istanbul, the Halveti and other Sufi groups probably suffered additional pressure from the Ottomans’ life-and-death struggle with the Safavids during Selim’s reign. Many Sufi orders, especially those that had clearly originated in the area of the Safavid heartland, became suspect in the eyes of the rulers and scholars who prosecuted the war against the Safavid menace. 61 As a result, by the mid-sixteenth century the Halveti

---

60 One hagiographer of Sünbül Efendi preserved a story whereby the saint cleverly allowed Selim I to save face by permitting him to carry out his order to destroy the Halveti tekke outside the mosque. He suggested that Selim destroy the chimney flues on top of the tekke rather than accept the public humiliation of forcing him to rescind his own command. Since he proved his loyalty to the new Sultan in this manner, Selim repented of his action and allowed the Halveti dervishes to continue their activities there. See Mahmud Cemaleddin Hulvî (d. 1651), Lemezât-ı Hulviyye ez Lemezât-ı Ulviyye (Büyük Velilerin Tatlı Halleri), trans. Mehmet Serhan Tayşi (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 1993), pp. 447-448.

61 Martin, pp. 283-284.
leadership throughout the Ottoman domains had withdrawn from their close relationship with the Sultan, and had begun to keep a lower profile in society. During times of trouble in the long reign of Süleyman Kanûnî, such as the conflict in the 1550s and 1560s with his sons and heirs to the throne, Mustafa and Bayezid, there is some evidence that prominent Halveti shaykhs became suspect. Nevertheless, this did not stop the order from gradually expanding its membership and range as its followers began to spread out from the capital.

However, the impact of the Safavid threat on the Ottoman branches of the Halveti was not entirely negative. The anti-Sunni persecutions of the Safavid rulers led many prominent Halveti leaders and their followers to flee the old Halveti heartlands, and settle in Ottoman domains. The Egyptian branches of the Halveti order, in the form of the Gûlşenîyye and others, eventually rose to prominence among the Turkish-speaking population there, for instance. As the epic narrative of the Gûlşenî hagiographer Muhyi-yi Gûlşenî suggests, many Iranian and Azerbaijani exiles from the east eventually found a home in the Ottoman domains, and entered the service of both the sultan and the order. By the end of Sultan Süleyman’s reign, the Halveti had once again gained official favor, and a

---

62 One hagiography recounts the narrative of a scholar imprisoned together with the Halveti shaykh Gazanfer Dede. Despite demonstrating a miraculous ability to allow himself and his cellmate to walk freely outside the prison when the guards were not looking, the scholar recounted that Gazanfer Dede voluntarily returned to the jail cell so that he would not violate the law by disobeying the sultan’s order. See Seyfullah Kazım b. Nizâmeddin (d. 1601?), Çâmi’ü’l-ma’ârif (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Lib., MS Hacı Mahmud Efendi 2335), fol. 10b. While Gazanfer Dede was eventually freed, others were not so lucky, and several Halveti shaykhs were executed or subjected to inquisitorial processes during Süleyman’s reign. The father of a noted Halveti hagiographer, Ya’kûb el-Germiyânî (d. 1571), fled in terror when the sultan tried to make him take a public role in reciting a prayer for rain during a drought; see Tezkiretü’l-Halvetiyeye, fols. 36a-b.
Halveti shaykh played an integral role in convincing Süleyman to undertake his final campaign to the west in 1566.\footnote{Clayer, p. 115.}

Over the course of the latter half of the 16\textsuperscript{th} and early 17\textsuperscript{th} centuries, the descendants of this first wave of Halveti leaders attained some of the highest and most publicly visible posts as preachers in the great state-sponsored Ottoman mosques of Istanbul, Edirne, and Bursa. At one point, a prominent Halveti dervish from the Şâbâniyye branch even achieved the distinction of becoming a personal advisor to Sultan Murad III.\footnote{Part of the personal correspondence that Sultan Murad III wrote to this Halveti notable has survived, although the responses of his shaykh have not. See Sultan Murad III (d. 1595), \textit{Kitâb-ı Manâmât} (Istanbul: Nuruosmaniye Lib. MS 2599).} Yet just as the order reached the height of its influence, the empire was confronting political, economic and social turmoil. One of the most important manifestations of this turmoil was the appearance of the Kadızâdeli movement, which swept through much of Anatolia in the Ottoman Empire during the seventeenth century. The basic ideology of the Kadızâdeli movement was an attempt to “purify” Islamic belief and practice by rooting out all of the “innovations” that had corrupted the Muslim community since the days of the Prophet Muhammad in 7\textsuperscript{th}-century Medina. In this sense, the movement is often described as a precursor to modern-day Islamic “fundamentalist” movements in the Near East. The Kadızâdelis viciously attacked religio-mystical orders, and in addition challenged many of their fellow Ottomans to defend the validity of practices as mundane as drinking coffee, smoking tobacco, and even shaking hands. The Kadızâdeli movement, in the course of its attacks on Ottoman religious institutions and figures during the seventeenth century, reserved its special ire for the
Halvetis. Kadızâdeli leaders took aim at their ceremonies and the lodges in which they practiced them, and sought to have individual Halveti leaders removed from high positions in the religious and political hierarchy, disregarding their claims to be sacred intermediaries between the believers and God.\footnote{For more on the Kâdîzâdelis and their attacks against the Halveti institutions in Istanbul, see Zilfi, \textit{Politics of Piety}, pp. 129-172.}

Many of the issues over which the two groups clashed derived directly from the social and economic context of the Ottoman Empire at the time. Demographic pressures and economic strains caused by a growing population, along with long wars with the Hapsburgs in Europe and the Safavids in Iran led to population pressure upon the land and the growing inability of the state to pay its own troops and officials. As a result, too many people were being trained in the scholarly hierarchy for too few positions. The spread of firearms among mercenary forces also led to disruptions in the Anatolian countryside, especially as inflation made it more and more difficult for Ottoman officials to pay them. Many rural and small-town scholars were displaced, and subsequently fled to the cities in times of disruption by rebellious forces. Increasingly, Sufis and more traditional scholars found themselves in competition for posts in the areas to which they had migrated. Thus, one facet of the Kadızâdeli-Halveti conflict was economic and political in nature–competition over limited positions in an era of economic scarcity. However, the Kadızâdelis also gave voice to concerns that had nothing directly to do with these problems; to dismiss the movement as simply another cynical attempt at manipulating the Ottoman power structure to the advantage of a particular interest group, as some scholars have suggested, is therefore
Kadızâdeli polemic extended to seemingly obscure doctrinal matters, such as whether or not it was considered righteous to curse the name of the late 7th-century Umayyad caliph Yazid (r. 680-683 C.E.), who was responsible for the killing of Husayn, son of the early caliph and revered Muslim leader 'Ali. Interestingly enough, the Ottoman historian Na’îma (d. 1716), writing in the decades after the Kadızâdeli heyday, described the movement not as a novelty, but as a manifestation of a recurring ideological and social problem that had troubled Islamic civilization almost from its very inception.67

In the end, the Kadızâdeli movement did not succeed in its goals of abolishing Sufism and purifying Ottoman society of all of what they described as “innovations.” Nevertheless, they left their mark on the Sufi orders over much of the period covered in this study. How the branches of the Halveti order coped with hostile forces in their social and intellectual environment is a key part of the history of mysticism and Ottoman religious life during the early modern period, and the formation and subsequent development of the Şa'bâniyye order is an excellent case study of how the branches of the order evolved in response to the threats that arose during the transitional periods of the Ottoman Empire’s history.


67 Mustafa Na’îmâ (d. 1716), Târîh-i Na’îmâ (Istanbul: Matba’a-yî Amîre, 1863), v. 6, p. 218.
1.4 A Study of the Transformations in Muslim Mystical Thought in the Early Modern Period through the Lens of the Ṣaḥāniyye

The various branches of the Halveti order produced a wealth of hagiographical works which describe the lives of each branch’s notable leaders and holy men during the critical transition period of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries of Ottoman history. Most of these works were compiled by a number of prominent Halveti authors with contacts at the imperial court in Istanbul between 1575 and 1630. Furthermore, they were compiled at a time in which the territorial expansion of the empire had slowed, and Ottoman subjects from all walks of life faced a general crisis marked by economic, political, and military instability. As a result, most of these texts present the historiography of the order in the context of the difficulties of that period. The holy men of the past are usually presented as exemplary models of a better time who had to be emulated in the present if the glories of empire and the purity of religious faith were to be recovered. Over time, these hagiographies became increasingly sophisticated and ideological in their structure and content.

It would not be possible to present a complete catalogue of the major Halveti branches, whether in Istanbul or elsewhere, without sacrificing the rich and fascinating details that often went into the making of a branch of the order. As a result, this dissertation seeks to examine these issues and others through the lens of a well-known branch of the Halveti order, the Ṣaḥāniyye. The period from the early development of the Ṣaḥāniyye branch of the order in the 16th century to its growing strength throughout the Ottoman Empire by the beginning of the 18th century gives us a unique opportunity to discover how an order might emerge and propagate itself during the early modern transitional period of Ottoman history. In addition, what sets this branch of the order apart from its
contemporaries is that it did not originate close to the centers of power in Istanbul or one of the other major urban settlements of the realm; rather it emerged in the smaller and much more rural environment of Kastamonu, a town in the northern Anatolian mountains. Over time, it gradually expanded from a small clique of followers in the area of Kastamonu proper to a substantial order with members in the surrounding towns of northern Anatolia, and eventually established a formidable presence in the Ottoman capital, Istanbul, in addition to spreading throughout parts of the Balkans. Over the course of this period, the order seemed to have had a good deal of success in penetrating Ottoman society, and even at times becoming a political actor. In Chapter 2, I will discuss the life and career of the founder, Şa‘bân-ı Veli (d. 1569), as reflected in the various hagiographical and biographical sources that discuss his life and the founding of his order. This constituted the first phase of the order’s development, in which a locally charismatic leader was able to build a modest network of followers who then sought to extend the order throughout the region, especially in the aftermath of the saint’s death. However, Şa‘bân was very much a product of the turbulent politics of the first half of the sixteenth century in Anatolia, and he displayed a certain reticence toward political life as a result.

In addressing Şa‘bân’s life, we must also introduce a critical figure to whom we owe most of our information about Şa‘bân’s life and the early history of the order: ʿÖmer el-Fuʿâdî (d. 1636). In addition to examining the ways in which he presents Şa‘bân’s life and the history of the order in his written work, the Menâkıbnâme-i Şa‘bân-ı Veli, in chapter 2, I devote Chapter 3 to examining Fuʿâdî’s own life and cultural context more thoroughly, with a further eye toward the other forms of didactic literature that he produced to advance the cause of the order. This approach reinforces the point that the writing of Şa‘bân’s
hagiography was but a single foundation stone upon which Fu’âdî constructed a larger and more centralized order that would pursue a more aggressive political and social agenda that included the greater recruitment of followers and an active defense of Halveti rituals and practices in the face of growing criticism from an increasingly puritanical movement that would eventually coalesce under the leadership of Kadîzâde Mehmed (d. 1635).

Finally, in Chapter 4, I examine a more curious aspect of the Şa‘bâniyye branch of the order. I follow the emigration of the order to Istanbul and the problems that it faced there by examining the life of Ünsî Hasan Efendi (d. 1723). Ünsî Hasan was ostensibly a follower and successor of one of the most celebrated Şa‘bâniyye and Halveti saints of the seventeenth century, Karabâş ʿAlî Veli (d. 1687). Nevertheless, the disruptions caused by the puritanical attempts at reform by the Kadîzâdeli movement and its last powerful leader, Vani Mehmed Efendi (d. 1685), led Ünsî Hasan to once again seek to withdraw both himself and his followers from the political and social life of the times. However, as the tortured hagiography of his follower İbrâhîm el-Hâs (d. 1761) suggests, these decisions did not prove wise in ensuring the survival of his sub-branch of the order in Istanbul, and turned Ünsî Hasan into a footnote compared with some of his contemporaries, who espoused a less strict form of spirituality. Despite these diversions, the case of Ünsî Hasan is worth considering, not least because the female members of his family and his order often take center stage in the narrative of his hagiography.

1.5 Conclusion and Wider Ramifications

In the long run, the issues raised in this study of a key branch of the Halveti order will point the way toward a future for the study of mysticism in a broader historical context.
The period examined here suggests an environment marked by challenges toward older forms of spiritual belief and practice. There was also an increasing need to codify more clearly and spread more widely a basic form of religious education that could be available beyond just the circles of the elect. Finally, there was also a growing awareness that the concerns of religious mysticism could not be completely divorced from political and social realities. It is possible to compare the trends noted here with those of the Reformation and the Wars of Religion in Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth century, albeit with critical differences that may have given broader dimensions to the conflict in Europe, such as the extensive use of the printing press. In addition, it is also worth considering the ultimate trajectory of the Halveti, who declined in numbers and influence relative to the arrival of new orders like the Mujaddidi-based Nakşibendi especially during the nineteenth century in Anatolia, but nevertheless experienced a continuing spread and revival in parts of Africa.

My hope is that this dissertation will lay the groundwork for an in-depth portrait of a branch of the Halveti order that can contrast the philosophical outlook of one of the order’s founding figures with the vision of the order propagated by its later members, who subsequently settled into positions of power and prestige within the Ottoman state. By pursuing this course, I can lay a framework for a comparison with modern studies of mystical orders and practitioners that can shed light on the historical transitions that occurred both in the structure and intellectual production of the order, with special reference to the influence of movements of religious renewal and purification upon the history of Islamic mysticism.
Such a study has ramifications beyond just that of Islamic mysticism, however. Some scholars have cautioned that the study of mystical traditions in a wider comparative sense can mislead the researcher into seeing connections that do not exist, or that coincide only due to extremely different trends in the intellectual framework of a given religious context.\textsuperscript{68} In addition, anthropological and comparative studies of religion have created scholarship tainted by hegemonic discursive forms that define religion according to its context in the thought of the Enlightenment period, denying the subject a voice in the construction of his/her own beliefs.\textsuperscript{69} These warnings are well-founded, and must be taken into account in any serious comparative study. Yet it is worth pursuing some key comparison on a broader plane of analysis, for isolating traditions in their own narrow contexts has sometimes proved counterproductive, especially in the study of Islamic civilization and the Ottoman Empire in particular.

The development of the Halveti order, and its increasing difficulties with ideological and factional forces critical of its rituals and practices, finds echoes in the intellectual and religious history of Christian Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In particular, the Halvetis’ struggles with the Kadırzâdelis evoke the Catholic church’s struggles with the rise of radical Protestantism, with its ideological rejection of intermediaries between


\textsuperscript{69} This argument has been most articulately advanced by Talal Asad, Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).
the believer and God as embodied in the concept of the priesthood.\textsuperscript{70} Some anthropologists have argued for a cyclical nature in a given religious community’s understanding of its religious context. The rejection of external forms and modes of expression are a hallmark of periodic movements of religious renewal, and societies that develop strong systems of shared classifications, combined with strong societal pressures on the individual, react to changes in the cultural context by attempting to squeeze out “innovations” which do not fit into their system of established categories.\textsuperscript{71} The rise of the Halvetis, and the challenges they faced in defending their mystical traditions vis-à-vis the inherited apparatus of classical Islamic thought and its more puritanical interpreters, can add to our understanding of the clashes caused by movements of religious purification. It may also shed light on whether mystical belief systems have a brighter future in the intellectual production of the world’s religions, in contrast to attempts to paint them as being little more than a doomed remnant of the intellectual heritage of the pre-modern world.

\textsuperscript{70} Francis Clark, \textit{Eucharistic Sacrifices and the Reformation}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (Oxford: Blackwell Press, 1967).

\textsuperscript{71} See the work of Mary Douglas, \textit{Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (London: Routledge, 1996).
CHAPTER 2

THE RISE OF THE ŞA’BÂNİYYE ORDER IN KASTAMONU AS REFLECTED IN THE HAGIO-BIOGRAPHICAL SOURCES

On the southwest side of the modern town of Kastamonu in the Black Sea region, behind the hilltop fortifications that once guarded this strategic route through northern Anatolia, lies the tomb and mosque of the great Halvetî saint Şa’bân-ı Veli Efendi (d. 1569). It remains an important spiritual and historical landmark in the city of Kastamonu right down to the present day, being regularly visited by the local community. While tracing his spiritual ancestry back to Yahyâ-ı Şirvânî, like most of the other Halvetî shaykhs, Şa’bân is best known for founding the major branch of the Halvetî order known as the Şa’bânîyye. While this branch of the order would come to be a powerful political and social force in Ottoman circles in the second half of the seventeenth century under the guidance of such key figures as Karabâş ‘Alî Veli (d. 1685) and Nasûhî Efendi (d. 1718), its earlier history and development have still not received the comprehensive study that they deserve.

---

1 The lives, works and successors of both men are given in the recent monumental work of Necdet Yılmaz, Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf: Sufiler, Devlet ve Ulema (XVII. Yüzyıl) (İstanbul: Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı, 2001), pp. 102-123. Nasûhî Efendi and his works have been the subject of a recent monograph; see Kemal Edib Kürkçüoğlu, Shaykh Muhammed Nasûhî: Hayatı, Eserleri, Divanı, Mektupları (İstanbul: Alem Ticaret Yayıncılık, 1996). We will focus more on this period in Chapter 5.

2 The first modern historical study of this branch of the Halvetî order was written by Muhammed İhsan Oğuz, Hazret-ı Şa’bân-ı Veli ve Mustafa Çerkesî, 2nd ed. (İstanbul: Oğuz Yayınları, 1995) at the close of the Great War in 1918 (the study on the later
eighteenth-century figure of Mustafa Çerkeşî was not completed until 1961, and appended by the editor at a later date, see pp. 11-12); the study is still worth consulting, as Oğuz seemed to have insights from his time that are otherwise lost today. The order first came under scrutiny in Western scholarship in the early 1950s by the great German Orientalist scholar Hans Joachim Kissling, whose “Ša bân Velî und die Ša bânijje,” Dissertationes Orientales et Balcanicae Collectae (Munich: Beiträge zur Kenntnis Südosteuropas und des Nahen Orients, 1986), pp. 99-122, contains useful insights about the connection of the sources about the Ša'bânîyye branch of the Halveti order, the career of Ša'bân and his successors, poetry produced by the order, and the structures of the Ša'bân-ı Veli complex, but it is thoroughly descriptive in most cases and makes little attempt at a deeper historical analysis of these materials. The short tract of Ziya Demircioğlu, Ša'bân-ı Veli ve Postnişînleri (Kastamonu: Azim Matbaası, 1997), based on a longer work examining all of Kastamonu’s known saints published in 1962, is a much briefer overview, but contains a very good drawing of the complex and its inscriptions. While these Turkish-language works are based on the hagiographical source materials, they generally do not move beyond the descriptive accounts of the anecdotes contained in the sources to further assess the historiography of the order.

In fact, before examining the growth and development of the early Ša'bânîyye branch of the Halveti order, I must stress that our sources derive almost entirely from the work of ʻÖmer el-Fu ’âdî (d. 1636), who will be the subject of chapter 3. Due to the complexity that marks Fu ’âdî’s interaction with his subject, Ša'bân Efendi, I cannot avoid foreshadowing some of the circumstances surrounding the composition of the hagiography in the course of this chapter, and a brief explanation of the character of the hagiography that documents this notable Muslim saint’s life is in order before proceeding to the events that it describes. Fu ’âdî’s Menâkîb-ı Ša'bân-ı Veli, in the form that it has come down to us, is not the original
Numerous manuscript copies of this work have survived from previous centuries, but few of them differ significantly from the printed text of the manuscript that first appeared in the nineteenth century: Ömer el-Fu‘âdî (d. 1636), Menâkıb-ı Şerif-i Pîr-i Halvetî Hazret-i Şâ‘bân-ı Veli ve Türbename (Kastamonu, 1877/1294 H.), hereafter referred to as Menâkıb-ı Şâ‘bân. A copy of this work also exists in a published modern Turkish translation that I purchased on-site at the tomb complex in Kastamonu, which succeeds in conveying an abridged form of the original, but without retaining the expression of certain key details that enhance our understanding of the text. See Muhammed Safi, ed., Menâkıb-ı Seyh Şâ‘bân-ı Veli ve Türbename (Kastamonu: Şâ‘bân-ı Veli Kültür Vakfı, 1998).

Fu‘âdî describes the events that led to his decision to prepare an abridgment for broader circulation among the general public of his day in Menâkıb-ı Şâ‘bân, pp. 5-6. We know that the original was written in Arabic based on a reference to a chapter heading in the longer hagiography, which Fu‘âdî cites in its original Arabic version on p. 68.

Abdulkadiroğlu, p. 64.
contemporary hagiographer Muhyi-yi Gülşeni, Fu’âdî intersperses the material he has chosen with his own scholarly observations on various aspects of doctrine with which these anecdotes are concerned. He identifies these clearly in the work, and labels each of them “advisory notes” (lâyîha). As a result, Fu’âdî is never really absent from the narrative, and in parts of the work, commentary explaining or clarifying aspects of the material channel and control, even dominate, the way in which the audience receives the text.

Despite this methodological problem in interpreting the Menâktb-i Şâbân-î Veli, it is nevertheless rewarding to sift through the details that Fu’âdî’s work does give us about Şâbân Efendi’s life and career in the earlier half of the sixteenth century. This exercise can serve to introduce the circumstances surrounding the composition of Fu’âdî’s hagiography in the first part of the 17th century, along with the reasons he chose to make use of this material for the sake of later generations. In addition, the work expresses some of the difficulties faced by mid-sixteenth century Halveti shaykhs in the process of establishing their order in the provincial milieux of the Ottoman Empire.

2.1 Antecedents of Islamic and Sufi Culture in Kastamonu Before the Arrival of Şâbân Efendi

By the time Şâbân-î Veli made his home in Kastamonu in the first half of the sixteenth century, the city had already been integrated to some extent into the Islamic world for several centuries. After the invasions of the Seljuk Turks, various Turcoman tribes and

---

Latin Crusaders following the Byzantine defeat by the Seljuk general Alp Arslan at Manzikert in 1071, the Danişmend rulers established themselves in north-central Anatolia and first took control of Kastamonu in 1105. Although the city passed briefly back into Byzantine hands periodically during the 1120s and 1130s with the campaigns of various Byzantine leaders into the Anatolian plateau, a nominally Islamic sovereign would rule over the city up until the Ottoman absorption of the province following the conquest of Constantinople. However, after the weakening and dissolution of the Danişmend polity towards the end of the twelfth century, the city and settlements in its environs, while theoretically a part of the prominent imperial polities of their day (e.g. Seljuk, Ilkhanid, and briefly, Ottoman), often operated in a quasi-autonomous manner under local Turcoman rulers. With the growing weakness and eventual breakup of the Seljuk and Ilkhanid polities in the fourteenth century, Kastamonu became the center of a beylik that would maintain a certain degree of independence until almost a decade into the reign of Mehmed the Conqueror, when it was at last incorporated into the Ottoman state. Even in modern times, the city of Kastamonu and its environs are still home to some of the oldest Turco-Islamic architecture in the region, with mosques from the pre-Ottoman period taking a prominent

7 For more on the dynastic and political history of central Anatolia during the Seljuk and beylicate periods, into which Kastamonu and the Turcoman groups based in its environs periodically intrude, it is still worth consulting the monumental work of Claude Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey: A General Survey of the Material and Spiritual Culture and History c. 1071-1330, trans. J. Jones-Williams (New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1968), esp. pp. 310-313. The same author also tackled the issue of Kastamonu’s ambiguous position in the borderlands between the more prominent states of its era in a separate article: Claude Cahen, “Questions d’histoire de la province de Kastamonu au XIIIe siècle,” Selçuklu Araştırmaları Dergisi 3 (1971), pp. 145-158.
place in many parts of the city.\textsuperscript{8} Going hand-in-hand with this growth of Islamic monumental heritage was a proliferation of saints’ tombs and holy places, some of which were built by the rulers of the Çobanoğulları (r. ca. 1262-1292) and the Candaroğulları (also known as the İsfendiyaroğulları, r. 1292-1459) families from the thirteenth through the fifteenth centuries. Many of these are still maintained today, and proudly shown to visitors as a part of the local culture and lore.\textsuperscript{9} These holy places, and the Muslim populations that attached themselves to them, probably played an important role in the gradual conversion of the Christian population to Islam over the course of subsequent centuries.

In fact, we are told that Şa'bân-ı Veli was not the first prominent Halveti shaykh to establish the order’s legacy in the region. Oddly enough, Ömer el-Fu’âdî made the editorial decision to set aside the third chapter of his hagiography to discuss another saint by the name of Seyyid Sünnetî Efendi (d. 1459), who predeceased Şa’bân Efendi and predated the founding of his branch of the order by several generations. Sünnetî Efendi’s tomb is marked

\footnote{8 Indeed, Kastamonu province is home to a number of painted wooden mosques from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries that are unique contributions to the history of Islamic architecture and art. See Zühtü Yaman, \textit{Kastamonu Kasaba Köyü’nde Candaroğlu Mahmut Bey Camii} (Ankara: Kano Ltd. Şti., 2000).

\footnote{9 While visiting Kastamonu, I and my wife were taken to the tomb of Aşıkî Sultan, which is clearly one of the oldest surviving structures in town with a two-story architectural plan, and an open archway in front. The lower half of the tomb holds the mummified remains of five bodies, including that of Aşıkî Sultan, a Seljuk commander who was reported to have fallen as a martyr fighting the Byzantines in the early 12\textsuperscript{th} century. Local people told us a story about a governor from the period of the early Turkish Republic who, after seeing a fire atop the tomb in a dream, awoke and looked out to see that the area of the tomb was on fire. Nevertheless, after extinguishing the fire, they found that the feet of one of the mummies in the tomb were miraculously undamaged by the blaze. For a brief study of the remains of the Aşıkî Sultan complex, see Kemal Kutgûn Eyüpâlî, \textit{Bir Kent Tarihi: Kastamonu} (İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık, 1999), pp. 60-61.}
by a refurbished tombstone in the Şâbân-ı Veli complex today, lying just outside the wall containing the prayer niche of the present mosque on the site. We know very little about Sünneti’s early life, aside from the fact that he was esteemed as having been a descendant of the Prophet Muhammad, and was born and raised in the area of Kastamonu.10 About his subsequent life, we do know that he proved remarkably adept on the mystical path and had a natural ability in composing poetry. Therefore, the shaykhs of his area eventually concluded that they could not guide him to his full potential, and insisted that he go to complete his training with Yahyâ-yi Şirvânî (d. 1464-65). When he arrived outside Yahyâ’s Sufi lodge in Şirvân in central Iran, Yahyâ sensed his presence and told his followers that a descendant of the Prophet wishing to join the order had just arrived, and that they should bring him inside. Yahyâ’s dervishes dutifully trooped outside to find Sünneti waiting for an audience, but were surprised to find that their guest was not wearing the green turban characteristic of those of the Prophet’s lineage. After Sünneti had entered and sat down with his future shaykh, Yahyâ was equally confused.

When [Sünneti] had kissed his hand, he said, “Welcome, dervish, but why didn’t you bring your green [turban]?” The dervish responded, “My lord, I came to your threshold to serve with sincerity. I am not capable of anything other than service. But [with the excuse] that ‘he is among the descendants of the Prophet,’ I would not be given that latrine-cleaning service that is necessary in the rules of conduct, and by not completing my service, which is required at your threshold, I would also not find perfection in the knowledge of God that I obtained. I came [dressed this way] out of fear that I would remain deficient.” Sultan [Yahyâ] commanded, “Dervish, you completed the service with this sincere intent; we know the service that is suitable and necessary for you. Come, bring your green [turban].”11

10 Menâkıb-ı Şâbân, pp. 34-35.

11 Ibid.
The result of this encounter was that after completing his long years of service with Yahyâ, Şünnetî was sent back to Kastamonu as one of his many successors, and settled in the northern part of the city in an area behind the hill where Kastamonu’s fortress stood. He built a small mosque there, and gave guidance there until his death.

The anecdote betrays hidden tensions beyond just documenting the spiritual pedigree of its subject, however. It probably does, in fact, reflect issues of this earlier, mid-fifteenth century period in the history of the Halveti order, in that there seemed to be some question over whether or not the class of seyyîds (descendants of the Prophet Muhammad) and Sufis could mix without compromising the rules that governed each sphere of behavior. Good Muslim leaders, even respected and powerful Sufi masters like Yahyâ-yi Şirvânî, could not be seen making members of the seyyîd class engage in the type of demeaning work that the Halveti order considered necessary to humiliate and tame the passions of the carnal soul. In this anecdote, Yahyâ gets around this tension by recognizing his disciple’s attempt to temporarily renounce his “seyyid-hood” as proof that he has already surpassed this stage of the order’s training. It also would have succeeded in preserving the reputation of a figure who had a built-in claim to sanctity as a purveyor of the order’s doctrine, a quality which would not have escaped Yahyâ’s notice, given what we know about his strategy of spreading the order’s teaching far and wide.

Despite this echo of the earliest periods of Halveti political and religious doctrines, ‘Ömer el-Fu’âdî had a more important purpose in mind in including these anecdotes about this Halveti predecessor from the era of the Candaroğlu period of Kastamonu’s history. Along with the informants from whom he drew this information, he felt the need to link the founder of his own branch of the order, Şâ‘bân-ı Veli, with this illustrious predecessor.
during the comparatively late period in which Fu’âdî wrote his hagiography, in the first
decade of the seventeenth century, the local spiritual descendants and followers of this
earlier Halveti predecessor may still have been showing some resistance to an upstart group
that had established itself as a replacement among them in comparatively recent times. The
Menâkıtb-1 Şa’bân-1 Veli notes that Sünnetî’s son, Seyyid Muzaffereddîn Efendi, was a
prominent local müfti and teacher in the prominent Atâbey Gazi medrese and mosque
complex in Kastamonu, and was buried close to his father. While the Menâkıtb does not
elaborate further, this information suggests that the legacy of Seyyid Sünnetî and his
descendants was perhaps not all that distant at the time when Şa’bân-1 Veli settled in
Kastamonu, and may even have persisted into Fu’âdî’s own lifetime. If so, Fu’âdî certainly
did his best to allay concerns about the potential for conflict or disconnect between the two
traditions:

On account of [Sünnetî’s] capacity for divination being powerful, and his
knowing the Preserved Tablet (levhe âlim), knowledge came to him that his
silisile would be cut off, and that his prayer rug would go empty for a time.
When he beseeched God with a measure of heartfelt remembrance, it is
related...that he used to meet with the Prophet Hzîrî, peace be upon him, on
many troubling matters and important issues, and he used to benefit from
him. This time, at the end of his supplication, the Prophet Hzîrî...was ready,
and predicted: “O Seyyid Ahmed Sünnetî, do not be concerned at all! In fact,
by the command of God your silisile will be cut off, and your prayer rug will
go vacant for a time. But after some time a lord of the Pole of the Age will
come from the silisile of Seyyid Yahyâ Sultan, and he will once again revive
your prayer rug. The teaching and guidance on your prayer rug will again be
established in a permanent and uniform way with his divinely granted power,
and the divinely granted states and God-given benefits of his successors, and

12 Ibid., p. 35. For more information on the location and character of the Atâbey
Gazi mosque, which still exists today despite some renovations, and its medrese, which
survived into the 1960s but has now been destroyed, along with other constructions
attributed to the Çobanoğlu leader Muzaffereddîn Yavlak Arslan (d. 1291) in
Kastamonu, see Eyüpgiller, pp. 58-59 and 67.
the successors of the successors who will give guidance after him on his prayer rug. They are also yours, and you will not be forgotten; you will be remembered until the day of judgment, and you will be remembered with a prayer of blessing.” After he gave this good news, [Sünnetî] became calm, and when he went to the other world, he was buried in the area of the prayer-niche of the aforementioned mosque.¹³

The meeting of Seyyid Sünnetî with Hızîr described here was not an unusual occurrence in the literature of Ottoman Muslim mystics.¹⁴ Through the use of this meeting, Fu’âdî is able to link the earlier figure of Seyyid Sünnetî with the career of Fu’âdî’s protagonist of a century later. By doing so, he helps to confer legitimacy on the career of the later saint among the local population of Kastamonu by linking him with a prominent pious figure from the past, while inviting the followers of Sünnetî Efendi into the fold by linking the two orders into a divinely ordained and unified whole. Such a strategy would have succeeded in placating both local populations who might have felt marginalized within the new order and the order’s original members, who came to Kastamonu from other regions (as we shall see, Şa’bân-ı Veli’s shaykh was based in Bolu). It also would have contributed to enlarging the following of the order under the direction of Şa’bân and his successors. Nor can we ignore the important role played by the putative founder of the Ottoman branches of the Halvetî order, Yahyâ-yî Şirvânî. It is critical for the presentation of Şa’bân Efendi in the hagiography that both Şa’bân and Sünnetî could be linked to the traditions and teaching of this fifteenth-century figure who had worked to spread the order in its earlier years. As we

¹³ Menâkıb-ı Şa’bân, pp. 35-36.

¹⁴ See, for example, the discussion that the Halveti shaykh Ümmî Sinân (d. 1568) had with Hızîr and his counterpart İlyâs, as witnessed by Seyyid Seyfüllah Kazım b. Nizâmeddîn (d. 1601?), Câmi’ü’l-Ma’ârif (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Ktp. MS Haci Mahmud Efendi 2335), fols. 13a-14b.
shall see in the following chapter, this reverence for the founding father of much of the Halveti tradition played a critical role in Fu’âdi’s attempts to strengthen the order he had inherited from his sixteenth-century predecessors.

Fu’âdi clinches the sacred character of the relationship by concluding his chapter on Sünnetî Efendi with an anecdote related on the authority of his father-in-law, Hüsâmeddin Halife, along with a number of local people living in the area who could remember the event: a flood had occurred many years earlier, perhaps during Fu’âdi’s teenage years. Fu’âdi relates that the flood destroyed the walls surrounding the mosque and tomb complex. As a result, both Sünnetî’s and Şâbân-I Veli’s tombs had to be opened for repairs. In the course of the exhumation, they found that Sünnetî’s body had miraculously failed to decay, a symbolic recognition of divine favor. In addition, Şâbân-I Veli’s feet had assumed a position that clearly indicated the respect and honor in which he held Sünnetî Efendi.¹⁵

2.2 The Early Life of Şâbân Efendi and his Induction into the Halveti Order

Having tied up this important loose end that marked the local context in Kastamonu, Fu’âdi then goes on to devote the majority of his work to the life and career of Şâbân-I Veli, starting with his birth and childhood. In contrast to those of his predecessors and contemporaries, Şâbân’s early life is not particularly well-documented or corroborated by multiple sources. What Fu’âdi does tell us is that Şâbân was born in a small village close to the town of Taşköprü, which lies to the east of Kastamonu, near the end of the fifteenth century. Supposedly, his mother and father died when he was very young, leaving him to

¹⁵ Menâkıb-I Şâbân, p. 36.
Abdülkerim Abdulkadiroğlu mentions an anecdote, probably from Hüseyin Vassaf’s Sefine-i Evliyâ, that Şa’bân took lessons from one Hoca Veli b. Osmân (d. 1512), who is buried in the Abdûrrezzak Camii Türbesi in Kastamonu, during this period. However, Vassaf’s sources may reflect oral traditions and additions formulated at a much later date, as Fu’âdî has nothing to say about this. See Abdulkadiroğlu, p. 38.

Menâkıb-ı Şa’bân, p. 37. See also the remarks of Abdulkadiroğlu, pp. 37-38. He correctly notes that Fu’âdî goes out of his way to stress that Şa’bân’s being an orphan and raised on the kindness of a milk-mother put him in a situation identical to that of the Prophet Muhammad.

After his arrival in the Ottoman capital, like most of the great Sufis of his era who had acquired knowledge of the exoteric aspects of the Islamic sciences, Şa’bân-ı Veli felt dissatisfied with his education and became attracted to the more mystical aspects of religion.
He began to search among the Sufi masters and scholars of Istanbul for a mystical guide. But most of the Sufi masters whom he sought out in Istanbul were unable to help him in his struggle, and he seems to have spent a good deal of his time alone and withdrawn from the company of others.\(^\text{18}\) While Fu’âdî presents this as praiseworthy and takes the opportunity to insert some of his own poetry praising the importance of solitude in pursuing the path, the anecdote may also reflect the difficulties an aspiring provincial scholar like Şa‘bân may have faced in the capital in being taken seriously as a student.\(^\text{19}\)

In fact, there is some confusion in the historical sources about who Şa‘bân’s shaykh actually was. The generally accepted personality among Şa‘bân’s successors was a Bolu-based shaykh by the name of Hayreddîn Tokâdî (d. 1525), one of the successors to Cemâl el-Halveti (d. 1494). However, Nevîzâde ‘Atâ’î (d. 1635), author of a biographical dictionary of ulema and saints for this period, provides contradictory information about Şa‘bân’s place in the Halveti chain of transmission. At one point, he concurs with the standard account and names Hayreddîn Tokâdî as Şa‘bân-ı Velî’s shaykh, but in another part of the work devoted to the biography of Şa‘bân himself, he claims that Şa‘bân’s shaykh was in fact a man by the name of Konrapâl Muslihuddin Efendi. In Fu’âdî’s Menâkîb, on the

\(^{18}\) Şa‘bân’s dissatisfaction with esoteric knowledge, or ʻilm-i zâhir, and his search for a proper mystical guide fall squarely into a hagiographical trope that guides the lives of most Halveti shaykhs, if not notable Sufi shaykhs throughout Islamic history in general. See, for example, the mind-numbing regularity of this pattern for the early Halveti figures up through Cemâl el-Halveti and his Sünbüliye tarikat successors in the 17th-century biographical encyclopedia of Halveti shaykhs in Hâcî ʻAlî, Tühfetü’l-Mücâhidîn (Istanbul: Nuruosmaniye Ktp. MS 2293), fols. 517b-550a.

\(^{19}\) Menâkîb-1 Şa‘bân, p. 38.
other hand, this individual is a contemporary follower of Hayreddin Tokadî alongside Şa’ban. 20

The accepted version that was established in Fu’âdî’s hagiography was that Şa’bân received an inspiration by means of a dream to return to his home region after failing to reach his goals, be they mystical or otherwise, in Istanbul. While he was on the road back to Kastamonu, the caravan in which he was traveling stopped in the town of Bolu. Awaiting their departure on the next stage of the journey, Şa’bân’s companions decided to go and visit the local Sufî hospice. At first, Şa’bân may have seemed to his companions to have been an unlikely candidate for Sufi-hood, despite his troubled nature and mystical leanings.

In fact, when his companions said, “Come, let’s go and listen to the tevhid-chanting 21 of the Sufîs,” Şa’bân Efendi’s wishes also leaned strongly toward coming to Sultan [Hayreddin] right away with the urge of attraction and divine love which was in his heart, and spending the whole night. But being a rational and judicious man in his basic character, he didn’t show an open attraction. He made a polite indication and showed a cautious countenance before going, saying, “You shall come to the Sufîs and their tevhid-chanting. But their states of ecstasy are dominant; as soon as the ecstasy imposes itself on those who are excessive in divine zeal and [who have] the light of faith in their hearts, they become a group of chain-makers. 22 They pull [others] into their own path and silsile. Don’t be careless, or it will be a difficult situation.” But his traveling companions were attracted to the zîkîr; they

---

20 The two contradicting references can be found in Nevîzâde ʿAtâ’î, Hadaʾiküʾl-hakâʾîk fi tekmiyetüʾl-şeḳâʾîk (Istanbul: Çağrı Yayımlar, 1989), v. 2, pp. 62 and 199. For a laudable attempt to resolve the confusion in the sources that also includes information found in the early 20th-century work of Hüseyin Vassaf, the Sefine-i Evliyâ, see Reşat Öngören, Osmanlılar’da Taşayvuf: Anadolu’da Sûfîler, Devlet ve Ulemâ (XVI, Yüzyılı) (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2000), pp. 80-81.

21 A repeated chant invoking the monotheistic formula, usually in the form of “Lâ ilaha illâ Allah,” or “There is no god but God.”

22 The expression Şa’bân used is zîncirci tâ’ifesi, which I interpret as having a negative meaning, implying a group that seeks to bind someone irrevocably to them, somewhat like a modern-day cult.
went, saying, “Get up, let’s go, what are they capable of?” They entered into the zikr circle, and afterward Şa‘bân Efendi sent them back to their lodging places, saying, “Didn’t I say to you that they were a group of chain-makers? A state has come over me [such] that I have no remedy but to stay. I’ll come in the morning,” and he himself remained there. 23

Ironically, given his initial reaction to the whole affair, Şa‘bân never rejoined his traveling companions to continue their journey. Şa‘bân spent the remainder of the night explaining his troubles to Hayreddîn Tokâdî, reciting the Halveti litany of the Vird-i Settâr and, once morning came, praying the dawn prayer. He then submitted all of his worldly property to his new shaykh, accepted the garments symbolic of initiation into the Halveti order, and began his life anew on the mystical path. He would remain in Bolu for a number of years, receiving mystical training from his shaykh, before he finally setting out on his own. 24

The anecdote, while representing a decisive turning point in Şa‘bân’s life (along with that of any potential Sufi adept in the audience who would hear this narrative), also gives us some clues about how the Halveti order was perceived among the religious classes of the early 17th century. Şa‘bân’s initial resistance probably stemmed from some level of conviction among the exoterically-minded ulema with whom he studied that Sufi gatherings could be dangerous places for those who did not approach them with caution. Nevertheless,


24 Abdulkadiroğlu, perhaps relying on Vassaf’s *Sefine-i Evliyâ*, suggests that Şa‘bân first pledged his allegiance to Tokâdî in 1519, and did not depart with the successorship to Kastamonu until sometime in 1530 or 1531. However, this does not correspond with Tokâdî’s date of death, which is generally accepted as having occurred in 1525. Still, if we accept Fu’âdi’s assertion that Şa‘bân spent 12 years in the company of his shaykh (*Menâkıtb-i Şa‘bân*, p. 42), then Şa‘bân would have been little more than a young teenager when he first met Tokâdî. While this is not outside the realm of possibility, we must nevertheless accept that our information about this period in Şa‘bân’s life is marked by a good deal of chronological uncertainty. See Abdulkadiroğlu, p. 40.
their ceremonies and gatherings were magnets for social activity in the community, especially for travelers who lacked other connections in any given local milieu. Şaˈbân himself would have been an ideal example of an individual who lacked strong family or political connections in society based on the circumstances of his childhood, and Halveti shaykhs like Tokâdî undoubtedly recognized this. They could draw on these struggling groups of people to expand their followings and ensure the survival of their branches of the order in the post-Şirvânî Ottoman world. A person like Şaˈbân, who had received some degree of religious education above that of the typical individual in society, would have been especially attractive as a recruit. Nor can we discount the fact that Fuʿâdî may have wanted to use the narrative of Şaˈbânˈs initial resistance to the order as an illustration of how potential aspirants to the Halveti order should not enter into it based solely on their enjoyment of the social experiences it entailed. While Şaˈbânˈs more enthusiastic companions enjoyed only the social aspects of the zikr ceremony and did not join the order when it came time to depart, Şaˈbân clearly engaged in a good deal more reflection on the matter, and undertook additional actions that caused him to take the critical step of pledging himself to the order.

Fuʿâdî claims that a great many stories exist about Şaˈbânˈs life and experiences under the guidance of Hayreddîn Tokâdî, to the point where reciting them all would needlessly prolong the narrative. However, he chooses to focus on a critical anecdote related on the authority of Hayreddînˈs son Mehmed Çelebi Efendi, who took his fatherˈs place as shaykh after moving to Amasya and developing his own following there.25 Fuʿâdî may have

25 Menâkı̇b-ı Şaˈbân, p. 40. The existence of Mehmed Çelebi is attested to in the sources; see Abdizade Hüseyin Hüsameddin, Amasya Tarihi, ed. Ali Yılmaz and
chosen this anecdote in particular for its trustworthiness, rooted in a contemporary observer of the careers of both Șa‘bân and his shaykh. It reveals interesting aspects of Halveti practice in training aspirants on the path in the early 16th century, and clarifies why the later 17th-century biographer ʻAtâ’î was confused about who Șa‘bân’s shaykh was.

When they sent Konapavi Muslihuddîn Efendi, who was a famous scholar and a contemporary of Șa‘bân Efendi in Bolu, to his homeland of Konapa, the esteemed [Muslihuddîn] was a knowledgeable one, sound of intellect, and gentle in nature like Hazret-i ʻOsmân. Șa‘bân Efendi also, by having a cheerful disposition and a persevering character like Hazret-i ʻAlî, went to support and help him by the will of God. While traveling, Muslihuddîn Efendi halted alongside the road and thought for a while. Then he turned and wanted to go back to Bolu again. As soon as Șa‘bân Efendi asked, “Why are you turning and going back to Bolu?” he replied, “A sensation came over me [such] that I didn’t find the strength to guide others and the suitability for the successorship in myself, [so] I’ll go back to my esteemed [shaykh], and I’ll serve the order some more, and from that I’ll be suitable for the successorship.” Șa‘bân Efendi...said, “O brother, this feeling is necessary for you on account of leaving behind pride and vanity and the annihilation of existence. This means that nothing remains of base characteristics in you, and you are perfected in the righteousness of the self, the purification of the heart, and the cleansing of the soul. But it is clearly a mistake to consider this, because it is necessary to think badly about a perfected guide, saying ‘He sent me without perfecting my state and unprepared for the successorship.’ Here’s what is proper right now: You should obey the order,

---


26 In modern parlance, Konrapalı would be substituted for this more Persianized form of the word.

27 The narrator here is comparing the two men to ʻUthmân and ʻAlî, the third and fourth of the Rightly-Guided Caliphs respectively. When narrating the initiation of Șa‘bân into the Halveti order under his shaykh, Fuʻâdî earlier had compared his submission to that of the first caliph, Abu Bakr, as well. As we shall see, some of Fuʻâdî’s other writings and teachings specifically focus on the example of the first four caliphs as important models for the followers of the order.
and go to the place where you were sent, with the assistance of the spiritual power of the esteemed [shaykh].”

Şa‘bân’s timely intervention succeeded in fortifying his companion and allowed him to continue the mission to which he was assigned. The anecdote suggests that in earlier periods, the Halvetis of rural Anatolia may have worked in groups of two, with a lower-ranking member of the order going along as an assistant to a successor in order to gain experience before receiving his own assignment. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the fact that Fu‘âdî effectively uses this anecdote to demonstrate how Şa‘bân had achieved a superior spiritual presence compared to that of his contemporaries even at a comparatively early stage of his training, and thereby establishes a common hagiographical trope to the benefit of the hagiography’s protagonist. Since the Istanbul-based ‘Atâ’î was probably not directly acquainted with the narrative given in Fu‘âdî’s work, and perhaps received only secondhand information of limited quality on the activities of prominent Şa‘bâniyye leaders at the time he was compiling his own biographies, his erroneous suggestion that Konrapalı Muslihuddîn was Şa‘bân’s shaykh is more understandable. It is clear that he probably never saw or heard anything substantial about Fu‘âdî’s hagiography, because the story so clearly implies that if anyone was acting as a shaykh in the relationship, it was Şa‘bân Efendi.

...[W]hen they came to Konapa, no disciple or follower appeared for some time, and Şa‘bân Efendi also couldn’t slight the esteemed [shaykh Tokâdî] and depart. One day he said to Muslihuddîn Efendi, “Go up to the pulpit on Friday and draw the people to the house of the order with the strong cord of the manifest sacred law from an aspect of exoteric guidance. One hopes that by attraction from an aspect of the esoteric state, the people will become your disciples and followers for this reason.” On account of the esteemed [shaykh]’s being a knowledgeable and judicious figure, when he encouraged and invited [people] to the şeri‘ât and tarikat with spiritual preaching and

---

28 Menâkıb-ı Şa‘bân, pp. 40-41.
devout admonition, everyone slipped into rapture and emotion according to his own level and condition. That day, all of those who were present became followers, and several of the people took the oath of allegiance and became dervishes. 29

Behind the vague wording, what the narrative implies is that Şa’bân Efendi recognized that the best strategy for establishing themselves in this milieu was not to flaunt their esoteric credentials as Halveti Sufis, but to adapt themselves to the more basic levels of religiosity found among the local population, and draw them into the order gradually from this starting point. While the wording does not make it explicit, this may have included appealing to local customs and superstitions. 30 It was a lesson that many of the comparatively well-educated literati of the Halveti path struggled to learn in the early stages of their careers as shaykhs, especially if they were sent to regions that did not resemble the more cultured urban centers of the Ottoman world in which many of them had spent time. Indeed, this may have

29 Ibid., pp. 41-42.

30 It should be noted that the Sünbüliyye Halveti shaykh Merkez Efendi (d. 1552) traveled in the rural areas around Bursa attempting to guide the local people there in the earlier part of his career. One of the anecdotes preserved about him from that time in his career suggests that he was not always successful with the local people either. One day, he was preaching in the local mosque with his eyes closed in reverence, but because it was close to harvest time, the local farmers did not feel inclined to stay and listen to him. Since they were more attached to the branch of Sufism tied to the Bursa saint Emîr Sultân, they had little interest in his words in any case. Despite the fact that the mosque had rapidly emptied out, Merkez Efendi continued to preach, much to the exasperation of the mosque’s guardian. Sarcastically, he remarked that he would just give Merkez Efendi the key and have him lock up when he was done. In response, Merkez Efendi informed him that while the people may have departed, the angels invisible to the sight of the uninitiated had not, and it was to them that he was directing his admonitions. The anecdote is preserved in Sinâneddîn b. Yûsuf b. Ya’küb (d. 1581), Tezkîretü'l-Halvetiyye (İstanbul: Süleymaniye Ktp. MS Es’ad Efendi 1372/1), fols. 27b-28a, and it suggests the type of tactics to which newcomers to a given region may have had to resort in order to compete for the attention of the local population.
been part of the test that their guides set for them as they neared the end of their training.\textsuperscript{31} Şa‘bân may have been especially valuable in this particular enterprise due to his roots in one of the smaller Anatolian rural communities, which may have been why Shaykh Hayreddîn sent him along as an assistant for this venture with Muslihuddîn Efendi.

\textit{2.3 Şa‘bân Efendi’s Struggle to Establish Himself as a Halveti Successor in Kastamonu}

Given Şa‘bân Efendi’s experiences with Muslihuddîn Efendi, one would have thought that he would have been more successful when it came time to take up his own position. This would not be the case, however, as Şa‘bân found, like so many other Sufis who had reached an advanced stage on the path, that he had to overcome some hidden weaknesses of his own. His initial attempts to settle in the area of Seyyid Sünnetî’s old mosque on the northwestern side of the fortress suffered from a major drawback—it was on the edge of town and few of the townsfolk lived in the area or went there frequently.\textsuperscript{32} So he had to move to a more centrally located mosque, known in his time as the Cemâl Ağa

\textsuperscript{31} Over a century later, in his younger years the famed Halveti mystic Niyâzî-i Misrî (d. 1694) would leave a rural community in the area of modern-day Denizli to which his shaykh had assigned him in disgust, because the people there proved more interested in boasting about his having come to their community than in actually listening to what he had to say. See Derin Terzioğlu, “Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyâzî-i Misrî (1618-1694)” (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University, 1999), pp. 82-84.

\textsuperscript{32} This suggests that the geographical boundary of the urban area of Kastamonu had shrunk between the 1450s and the 1520s, perhaps as a result of the disturbances caused by the Ottoman-Safavid conflicts, unless Seyyid Sünnetî had built his mosque outside of the city to maintain solitude from the everyday world, as some Halveti shaykhs were wont to do.
He initially proved to be no more successful than Muslihuddîn Efendi in Konapa.

He came and he worked and meditated there for a time with the large crowd, [but] never formed connections with the people. His tongue was [engaged] in the remembrance of God, and his heart in the thought of God. Under the influence of spiritual poverty and true annihilation, his actual poverty and poor state were very visible. One day while he was waiting in the corner of solitude, as a test and chastisement from God, a pure-hearted person saw the esteemed [shaykh]’s state of utter destitution and said, “Hey there shaykh, you’ve sat in this mosque hungry and alone for how long now! You’re a good and trustworthy person. It’s spring, and every shepherd is necessary. Take our animals to pasture, let it be a salary for you.” Şa’bân said, with a smile on his gentle face, “I also came to take animals like you to pasture,” indicating and alluding [to the fact] that he came from God to guide the people of Kastamonu. That person didn’t understand the wish of the shaykh, and said, “If you’re free from anxiety (safâñ var ise), you know best.”

Sha’bân’s determination in the face of desperation was admirable, and Fu’âdî seeks to use this anecdote as a means of educating the seekers on the path about avoiding the temptations of the world at all costs. He later relates another anecdote about Sha’bân’s stay in the Hüsâm Halife mosque in which a friend tries to help Sha’bân by washing his undershirt, only to have the threadbare material rip apart in his hands as he tries to wash it. Loss of clothing in the cold environment of Kastamonu was no laughing matter, but Şa’bân bravely shrugged it off, saying, “The judgment is God’s; we came into the world naked, and we’ll go out naked.”

---

33 This mosque lay just east of the Sünnetî mosque, and it was built sometime in the first half of the 15th century. It came to be referred to as the Hüsâm Halife mosque in 'Ömer el-Fu’âdî’s time, but it was demolished during the 1950s, along with the tomb of Cemâleddîn Ağa, the mosque’s namesake. This reference is interesting in that it allows us to track exactly where the settlement zone of Kastamonu came to an end in the early years of Sultan Süleyman’s reign. See Eyüpgiller, pp. 71-72 and 75.

34 Menâkıb-ı Şa’bân, pp. 42-43.

35 Ibid., p. 46.
Much of Ṣaḥbān’s life story revolves around this simple message on various levels, and the hagiography misses no opportunity to illustrate it.

Yet another important message to the audience lurks behind the narrative, however, and that is that an aspirant to true mystical leadership cannot ignore the broader society in which he lives to focus solely on his own spiritual state and relationship with God. The kind-hearted herdsman is therefore interpreted as a message from God bluntly reminding Ṣaḥbān that he is losing his way. On a more material level, though, this anecdote illustrates the difficulties a stranger like Ṣaḥbān had in assuming leadership in a new society. One cannot help but wonder how many Halveti shaykhs-to-be failed to gain acceptance in the environments to which they were sent, perhaps even dying alone in the corner of some mosque in the process, as Ṣaḥbān almost did. The story further indicates how the common people of the Anatolian plateau in the early 16th century had little understanding of the subtlety of Sufi aspirants like Ṣaḥbān. It doesn’t take much imagination to suspect that the kind-hearted shepherd walked away from this encounter thinking his altruism had been wasted on a person who was extraordinarily foolish, crazy, or both!

The modern reader is not the only one who might think that this narrative paints a rather negative portrait of the great saint’s early life. Fu’âdī recognizes a competing narrative that was circulating on the authority of “our brother by birth” (sulbi birâderimiz) Yâycı Hacı Mehmed Dede36 that spun the story in a somewhat different light. Instead of placing the incident in Kastamonu, Mehmed Dede narrated that this event took place in the

36 Kissling interpreted this remark to mean that this was Fu’âdī’s brother and family relation, one of two who could be identified by name; see Kissling, “Ṣaḥbānijje,” p. 100.
village of Çağ'a east of Bolu while Şâ'bân was traveling to take up his assignment in Kastamonu. When he reached Çağ'a, he decided to undertake the traditional Halveti 40-day spiritual retreat in the Beg Mosque, and after several days the people began to take a liking to him. A man came and said, “Sufi shaykh, you are poor, and a way of making a living is necessary for you, and you also like solitude. Come and let’s give the hand of animal-grazing to you; take our animals to pasture.” When Şâ'bân replied, “I take animals out to pasture by the command of God, just let it be that I don’t let the wolf take them!” the uncomprehending shepherd exclaimed, “Don’t wait, go out to pasture, may God make it easy [for you]!” Clearly, this narrative puts Şâ'bân Efendi in a much stronger position, whereby he is not really failing in his mission outside of being guilty of the minor error of temporarily neglecting his duty to guide others as charged by his shaykh, perhaps out of fear of failure. Nevertheless, Fu’âdî still feels compelled to nervously interject a brief explanation after presenting his audience with these two narratives.

The wish to write down these anecdotes is not to insult Şâ'bân’s good renown. But these suggestive actions narrated in a demeaning form come forth from God to the prophets and saints to augment the attainment of the mystical state, to test [them], and to serve as a warning to others. It is known to the mystics.\(^\text{37}\)

By presenting this part of the story as a didactic text aimed at teaching its audience how to avoid potential long-term mistakes on the path, and to maintain their humility as they may be reminded of their failings by the humblest and basest of people, Fu’âdî is able to recast Şâ'bân’s weaknesses as strengths without resorting to censorship of his saint’s history. In other words, Fu’âdî presents these stories as examples of necessary setbacks in the spiritual

\(^{37}\) Both this second anecdote and Fu’âdî’s advisory commentary on the issue appear in the Menâkib-ı Şâ'bân, p. 43.
training of every holy figure in the Islamic tradition, rather than letting the audience think that this was a failure inherent in Ṣaʿbân’s character alone. The historian can credit Fuʿâdî for his courage in not shying away from an element in his saint’s history that might have raised doubts about his legacy among a contemporary audience, and tackling it in a constructive manner.

In addition to confronting both his own problems and an indifference to his form of mysticism among the common people, Ṣaʿbân also had to contend with the fact that Kastamonu was not devoid of Sufi activity, and he was not marching into a spiritual vacuum. This may be reflected in another anecdote, narrated on the authority of Muhyiddîn Efendi, who at the time of the writing of the Menâkîb-1 Ṣaʿbân was the Friday prayer leader at the Atâbey Gazi mosque and a son of one of Ṣaʿbân’s successors. Muhyiddîn apparently prefaced his story with the remark that it was intended to specifically address the question of why Ṣaʿbân did not immediately rise to prominence upon his arrival in Kastamonu, and why he did not immediately manifest any acts of grace. The anecdote revolves around the reaction of an otherwise unknown shaykh of the Bayrâmî order by the name of Îsâ Dede to the news that Ṣaʿbân was coming.

Îsâ Dede commanded his dervishes, “A master painter from the area of Bolu is coming to Kastamonu; go and meet [him].” When he indicated [this to Ṣaʿbân], they went as far as the place named Derbend and Soluk, and they saw that an impoverished but rich-hearted Halveti dervish was coming alone and on foot, giving off a ray of the light of annihilation in [both] his exterior and interior. The esteemed [Ṣaʿbân] was aware through the inspiration of God that they were coming with this intent, but he hid his true state, his secret and state being strong in his heart, and he acted to preserve the secret. In short, those dervishes shook hands and talked with the esteemed [Ṣaʿbân], but they didn’t get any reply from his mouth that indicated his mastery or
successorship. They continued to look, thinking, “This is not the person that the esteemed [shaykh] gave news about and requested.”

Îsâ’s dervishes eventually returned empty-handed, although their master knew they had in fact encountered the person they were looking for. Nevertheless, he kept the secret hidden from them out of admiration for Şa’bân. While the anecdote could potentially serve a role in reconciling the adherents of the two orders by granting Îsâ Dede’s blessing and respect for the young Şa’bân, the narrative also bears an undercurrent of suspicion. Şa’bân’s unwillingness to reveal himself to his questioners may hint at a need to keep a low profile early in his career with other more well-established shaykhs and their followers active in the less anonymous environment of the smaller urban settlements of the region. Fu’âdî, on the other hand, does not dwell on these aspects but instead presents his reader with two additional pieces of commentary that probably reflect the types of questions previous audiences directed at this tradition when it was related to them orally. Knowing that his audience would once again struggle with the idea that a saint would come in an impoverished condition, virtually unknown to his fellow men, Fu’âdî cites the desire of all good dervishes to remain in a spiritually annihilated state, devoid of existence, as an explanation. The argument goes that Şa’bân Efendi would have had no use for gaining fame by making his presence known, and so he had no desire to reveal himself to the group sent out to meet him. As a result, he says, Şa’bân was able to gain an extraordinary divinely-granted insight, and this is why he had achieved such fame in their own time. In addition, Fu’âdî also felt it wise to explain why Îsâ Dede alluded to Şa’bân by presenting him as a master painter. Since the greatest ability of the shaykh is to replace the bad character traits

---

38 Ibid., p. 44.
of his followers with good ones, he has the power of “painting them anew,” so to speak. He concludes by citing the writings of a local Kastamonu poet, Mahvî Efendi, praising Şâbân Efendi for doing just that.  

As Şâbân slowly began to adapt to his new situation, he renewed his attempts to revive the Halvetî presence in the largely abandoned Seyyid Sünnetî mosque nearby, with its empty cells. Making some inquiries among the local population, he learned the story of Seyyid Sünnetî from some of the older people in the area, and was told how he died before his son was old enough to take over his position. Sensing an opportunity, Şâbân Efendi made the pre-ordained decision to take over the work that Sünnetî’s untimely death had left undone, and immediately stated his intention to perform the 40-day retreat of the Halvetî order in Sünnetî’s old cell in the mosque. This act began to draw the attention of his fellow townsman in Kastamonu, who began to spread the word that a holy man had come and taken up residence in the mosque. Şâbân soon found an assistant in the form of Eyüb Halife, who later told his son Abdülvâsi’ Dede, the prayer-leader for the Şâbâniyye order during Fu’âdî’s time in Kastamonu, about his experiences helping the aspiring saint renew the presence of the Halvetî order there.

Our father Eyüb Halife was a true friend of the esteemed [shaykh], and undertook to send food to him every day in his cell in the mosque. By being distracted somehow, he forgot to send [the food], and saying, “Help, everyone; we forgot the esteemed [shaykh] and he goes hungry at the

---

39 Ibid., pp. 44-46. Almost a decade later, Fu’âdî would devote a section of his Türbenâme to Mahvî Efendi. He was one of Şâbân’s followers who had achieved a perfected state, and who regularly recited poetry lauding both his master and the mystical path. Unfortunately, his poetry was apparently misunderstood by some of the people in his society, and Fu’âdî criticized those who failed to listen to Mahvî Efendi’s poems with the ear of the heart, rather than try to interpret them in their exoteric state. See ibid., pp. 138-140, where Fu’âdî once again presents this poem for a new audience.
mosque!” he hurried with the food to the mosque with great regret. When he apologized, the esteemed [shaykh], in order to give guidance, said, “This is the state of affairs, and this is the lot and share of this place. The esteemed [shaykhs] who came before, whose Sufi we could not be, experienced this struggle. Several days ago, I found the leftovers of a mouse [living] in the wall, and thinking that he should not go hungry, I didn’t eat all of it, and I left some of it for him. I gave myself up to God, and didn’t demonstrate a need for anyone. Praise be to God, the gifts of God are many; we didn’t go hungry,” and he revealed that he had found satiety through divine nourishment and gave thanks and praise [to God].

This simple act of humility marked a turning point in that it succeeded in winning Şa’bân a degree of recognition among key members of the community that he needed in order to begin building his own order. Nevertheless, his initial attempts to revive the Sünnetî Efendi complex remained ultimately unsuccessful, a point underlined by the fact that Eyüb Halife’s forgetting to bring food meant that the shaykh went hungry for several days. Eventually, a generous and pious man by the name of Seydi Efendi, whom the local people called “Çetin Baba,” invited him to take up residence at the Honsâlâr mosque. Since the Honsâlâr mosque complex was located on the other side of the fortress, within the settled area of the city, Şa’bân Efendi accepted the offer and abandoned the old Sünnetî mosque. It seems that his exile from his preferred place of settlement would last for quite some time, perhaps even several decades, as he did not return there until the end of the 1550s.

Having reached this point in the story, Fu’âdî suddenly drifts off into what appears, at first glance, to be a tangential discussion about an interpretation of a snippet of a Qur’anic

---

40 Ibid., p. 47.

41 Ibid., p. 48. For more information on the Honsâlâr mosque, which lies on the other side of the old fortress, more towards the northwestern part of the town of Kastamonu, and was built sometime in the first half of the 15th century, see Eyüpgiller, p. 71.
verse, “God brings a people whom he loves and who loves him.” Fu’âdî explains to his audience that according to this verse, when God makes it known that a given believer has reached an advanced mystical stage and truly loves God, the angels that surround the divine Throne become aware of this fact and pass the word down through the various layers of angels in the seven heavens, until it reaches the level of the angels who descend to earth. Those angels who descend to earth by God’s command then inspire Muslims to recognize these people through their love for God, and to love and follow them in turn. This will then allow those so inspired to be saved on the day of judgment by being resurrected with the beloved friends of God. Yet in a more substantial clarification that he issues following the relation of this exegesis, Fu’âdî explains that this favor is not bestowed on everyone, nor is it bestowed randomly.

The angels...inspire that person who manifests angelic qualities, who is attracted to self-improvement, who seeks out goodness to the extent that is possible, by achieving dominance over the human condition and the spiritual power in his body. But that person that Satan wins over, by not disciplining his carnal soul and not purifying his heart, and by being attracted to the carnal passions of the soul...is not granted the angelic inspiration. If the situation were not like this, then let there be any rational person in the world, he would find the pious ones and the friends of God, he would love [them], and he would become a dervish and a lover, and no ignorant and censuring people would remain, and they would all have followed the people of God. If he is a follower and lover only because of the needs of the carnal soul, without the aforementioned good condition in his body, he has no forward progress, and he falls into the passions of the carnal soul, and censures with doubt and suspicion on account of some little issue, and does not achieve the

---

42 Al-Qur’ân, 5: 54. The full verse from which Fu’âdî draws this phrase runs as follows, “O you who believe, whomever among you rejects his religion, God will bring forward a people whom he loves and who loves him, gentle with believers, harsh upon the unbelievers, striving in the way of God, and they do not fear the blame of the slanderer. That is the favor of God, he bestows it on whom he wills. God is infinite, all-knowing.”
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wish to be guided on the path of God. He remains veiled from the councils of the lords of the knowers and the people of God.\textsuperscript{43}

In other words, what Fu’âdî is teaching here does not in fact represent any digression from the previous set of anecdotes about the struggles Şâbân went through in his early years in Kastamonu. Rather, it is a justification of Şâbân’s apparent lack of success in the early part of his career, based on the fact that it was not the saint who was deficient, but the people around him who were in need of guidance and the angelic inspiration necessary to recognize a saint! In addition, Fu’âdî’s remarks also point to another constant source of doubt within the community, in the form of those who censure the practices of the cult of saints as being un-Islamic, and exhort his audience to devote themselves wholeheartedly to their own saint to avoid such a fate.

Fu’âdî has good reason to stress this point to his audience. Şâbân continued to struggle with the paradoxical tension inherent in the relationship between the ideals of the Halveti path and the public presence that often accompanied greater advancement in mystical knowledge, which did not suit his own temperament very well. After his colleague Seydî “Çetin Baba” Efendi invited Şâbân to the Honsâlâr mosque to take up a position there, Şâbân achieved a certain measure of success in conveying his religious teachings to the local people through preaching there. Even Şâbân’s direct successor as head of the order, Hayreddîn Efendi (d. 1579), seemed to recall this period of their saint’s career with admiration, and perhaps a tinge of regret and disappointment, as his son Hacı İlyâs Efendi related to Fu’âdî.

\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Menâkıb-ı Şâbân}, pp. 49-50.
When the exoteric knowledge of the noble [Ṣaʿbān] became known, he used to go to the pulpit in the Honsâlâr mosque to preach about exoteric knowledge in the time of my father Hayreddîn’s training as a dervish and when I was a youth, with the intent of increasing strength in the order and in esoteric guidance through the divine wisdom. He used to comment on the exalted Qur’ân, and transmit and explain the noble traditions of the Prophet connected with the shari’âh and the order and [give] many pleasant sermons. They were sublime gatherings! But by his esoteric guidance on the path becoming stronger, and no need remaining for exoteric guidance, and increasing in the weakness of old age, he left preaching and advising from the pulpit.\(^\text{44}\)

Ṣaʿbān’s voluntary withdrawal from what had become at least a modestly successful preaching career may have troubled the circle of followers he had amassed. Many other Halveti figures who preached in mosques cheerfully did so until their deaths and saw no problem in maintaining this type of public presence in the community. A development like this begged for an explanation, and Ṣaʿbān’s withdrawal may well have been on account of infirmities related to old age. However, another anonymous informant or informants suggests that Ṣaʿbān himself offered a more important philosophical reason for his withdrawal from public preaching and rejecting this career path.

It is related that Ṣaʿbān used to say that the [world of] existence and vanity never used to come to a guide who performed the basic tenets in the corner of solitude with honesty and uprightness, and taught the knowledge of the Divine from an esoteric perspective. Rather, it was a reason for complete annihilation and advancement toward annihilation. But he used to warn his successors and dervishes among the people of knowledge, saying, “If someone were to go to the preacher’s pulpit or the dais [of a mosque] and give sermons and advice, he has to be fearful of the possibility of mixing the state and essence of exoteric knowledge with esoteric and divine knowledge, which is a reason for annihilation.”\(^\text{45}\)

\(^{44}\) Ibid., pp. 60-61.

\(^{45}\) Ibid., p. 61.
One could argue at this point, based on the previous anecdotes in which Şa’bân is gently chided for his hesitance in engaging with the people he is supposed to be guiding, that Şa’bân never felt truly comfortable fulfilling the duties of guidance with which he was charged.\footnote{In the development of the biographical elements of the life story of the Prophet Muhammad, most stories that indicate a lack of self-confidence in the Prophet or attempts to shirk the revelatory duty that had been conferred upon him came to be expunged from or marginalized in the traditions. See Uri Rubin, The Eye of the Beholder: The Life of Muhammad as Viewed by the Early Muslims (Princeton, NJ: Darwin Press, 1995), pp. 113-115. Şa’bân’s lack of self-confidence, already implied if not accepted by a number of Fu’âdî’s anecdotes, would also have troubled followers looking to legitimize a sacred personality.} Interestingly enough, however, his arguments about abandoning the world of existence bear an uncanny resemblance to that of his contemporary in the Sünbüliyye branch of the order in Istanbul, Yusuf b. Ya’kûb el-Germiyânî (d. 1571). Just as in the case of Yusuf and his son and hagiographer Sinâneddîn, ‘Ömer el-Fu’âdî and his contemporaries clearly felt the existence of a generational chasm between their predecessors in the order and themselves on the point of the need for a public presence.\footnote{Sinâneddîn b. Yusuf b. Ya’kûb (d. 1581)’s hagiography betrays a deep tension between himself and his father over the issue of participating in Ottoman public life. When Sultan Suleymân’s retinue attempted to nominate Sinâneddîn’s father to offer a public prayer for rain during a year of drought, he ran away and hid, causing great scandal and embarrassment for all involved. Part of the reason for Sinâneddîn’s writing the hagiography itself may have been to explain his father’s odd actions. See Tezkîretü’l-Halvetiyye, fols. 36a-37b, and John J. Curry, “The Growth of Turkish Hagiographical Literature Within the Halvetî Order in the 16th and 17th Centuries,” in The Turks, ed. Hasan Celâl Güzel et al. (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 2002), v. 3, p. 915.} Ottoman society and culture were changing, not just in Istanbul, but also at the provincial level in Kastamonu. This forced Fu’âdî once again to interject himself into the discussion and relay a tensely-worded warning to those who might suggest that this uncomfortable aspect of his shaykh’s career...
and thinking required that the Halveti Sufis engage in a form of self-marginalization vis-à-vis their immediate society.

But the [words] mingled with wisdom and enjoining of protection of the master [Ṣaʾbân] are not absolute [in meaning]; they are contextually based. He spoke in absolute [terms] for emphasis in making them wary of this issue, meaning his noble wish was this: If a person’s state and honor are good, and the attribute of pride and vanity not present in his being, and if his spiritual annihilation, intellect, state, and knowledge in mysticism are powerful, then he will not fall into pride, vanity, [the world of] existence, or pleasure by preaching and admonishing on the dais and [in the] pulpit. Now, his permission and acceptance are confirmed for the trustworthy ones who are perpetually in esoteric guidance and who have not lost their state or the purity of their gnostics in both the inner world and the real world because this situation is the situation and action of the prophets also. It is in no way censured or forbidden! This apparent and manifest state and action would never be suitable among the perfected ones of the great shaykhs....It would be necessary to disprove the perfected ones’ being the heirs of the Prophets...and [they would] be defective in their legacy....If he were not to choose to preach and admonish while perfected and in [this] state, and if he were to focus his state and action on esoteric guidance as much as possible while he was able, no weakness would come to his state or to his honor. Free choice is preferable in a perfected one, and the state of the perfected one is committed to the command of God. God most High knows his wisdom, and the people of wisdom know those who are like them.48

This message is so important that Fuʿâdī sees fit to cover Hayreddîn Efendi’s narrative about Ṣaʾbân’s preaching, along with both Ṣaʾbân’s explanation and his own clarification of Ṣaʾbân’s remarks a second time in the subsequent chapter of the Menâkîb-1 Ṣaʾbân, when he introduces additional anecdotes about the successorship of Hayreddîn Efendi as the second leader of the Ṣaʾbâniyye order. By doing so, he guaranteed that if his work was introduced to an audience as isolated parts, rather than as a unified whole, the lessons about the nature

48 Menâkîb-1 Ṣaʾbân, pp. 61-62.
and importance of preaching in this context would not be overlooked! Just as in the stories about Şa‘bân’s troubling encounter with a local shepherd, Fu‘âdî once again relays a story in which he must defend his protagonist from potential accusations and questions about his actions, which clearly ran contrary to expectations in a time of changing norms about the need for Sufis to engage in preaching in mosques. The generation of Halveti figures who came of age in the early and mid-sixteenth century had reservations about tying their mysticism too closely to public, and therefore potentially political, positions in society. This was a result of their bad experiences during the events of Selim I’s reign, and getting caught up in the witch hunt for Safavid sympathizers that saw the imprisonment and even execution of a number of mystics during their youth. On the other hand, the generation that Fu‘âdî and his contemporaries represented at the turn of the seventeenth century no longer found

49 Ibid., pp. 104-105. A modern reader would be moved to dismiss Fu‘âdî as disorganized and repetitive in his composition, given that he repeats these three anecdotes later in his work. Still, it is important to consider that his work was probably not received at a single sitting, but was perhaps introduced in vignettes or read out to people while they were visiting the tomb complex. Therefore, this repetition indicates the degree to which this was a lesson that Fu‘âdî desperately wanted his contemporaries to learn in conjunction with these observations on Şa‘bân’s actions and public practice.

50 See, for example, the story of Shaykh Dâvûd, a successor of a successor of Çelebi Halife, who reportedly made a remark that was misinterpreted by his followers as indicating that he claimed to be the messianic figure known as the mahdî, and led to his execution, in Tezkîretü’l-Halvetiyye, fols. 16b-17a. The problems that mystics encountered during the reign of Süleyman if they were viewed as becoming too involved in internal politics is also hinted at in an anecdote about Shaykh Gazanfer (d. 1567), as told by Seyyid Seyfullah. The anecdote takes place when the two are imprisoned in the same cell on suspicion of taking the side of Sultan Süleyman’s son Bayezid during the succession crisis at the end of the 1550s; see Çâmi‘ü’l-Ma‘ārif, fol. 10b. Doctrinally suspect viewpoints may also have played a role in this imprisonment as well; see Öngören, p. 306.
such wariness an effective strategy in the growing tension between Halveti Sufis and their detractors in the public arena throughout the Ottoman domains.\footnote{For a good summary of the importance of preacher positions at various mosques in the Ottoman capital of Istanbul during the seventeenth century, especially in the dynamics of the Halveti-Kâdîzâdeli conflict of the seventeenth century, see Zilfi, “Discordant Revivalism,” pp. 265-269. These conclusions are detailed more fully in Zilfi, \textit{Politics of Piety}, pp. 129-181. The situation Fu’âdi faced in narrating these particular anecdotes indicates the growing importance of preaching for Halveti Sufis in the years before Kâdîzâde Mehmed (d. 1635) and those who were lumped together as his successors in a perceived religio-political movement intensified their attacks against them.}

\subsection{2.4 Establishing the Ground Rules for the Followers of the Şa\textsuperscript{b}ânîyye}

Several of the anecdotes that follow deal with some of the problems Şa\textsuperscript{b}ân had in organizing and propagating his order in Kastamonu and its environs. Perhaps leery of his earlier experiences as Hayreddin Tokâdi’s successor and assistant to Muslihuddûn Efendi in Konrapa, Şa\textsuperscript{b}ân laid down a general rule that no more than one successor could operate within a given region of the countryside. The situation that sparked this ruling was the departure and subsequent disappearance of one ʿAlî Dede, one of Şa\textsuperscript{b}ân’s successors about whom we unfortunately know very little. Despite the fact that he had left his position and disappeared from the local scene for quite some time, Şa\textsuperscript{b}ân refused to accede to his dervishes’ request to send them a new successor in his place.

When it appeared the prayer rug of the quarter would remain empty, and some of his dervishes requested a successor in his place, the lord [Şa\textsuperscript{b}ân], being the sovereign of wisdom of the city of the province [of Kastamonu], said, “Is there absolutely nothing left from his \textit{hünkâ} or other objects in the

\footnote{A patched woolen cloak that marked an individual as being a fully-sanctioned member of the Halveti order, often granted by a shaykh to his disciple after the completion of his mystical training. See Knysh, \textit{Islamic Mysticism: A Short History}, pp.}
lodge where he lived and gave guidance?” After they responded, “There is,” the lord [Ṣaʿbān] commanded, “Dervishes! Even if there were only a carpet or rush matting in place of a successor, one does not immediately send a successor in its place.”

Ṣaʿbān’s cautious response to the situation indicates that he was wary of attempts to replace one of his successors in an arbitrary manner. He was also concerned about the potential for conflict among his successors if two of them came to establish themselves in the same location. Ṣaʿbān seized on the opportunity that this problem offered to spell out for all of his dervishes a policy of how and when a successor could be removed from a position, or a new one introduced to a region.

...[Ṣaʿbān] said, “While [a successor] is teaching principles and guiding in a small city (küçük şehir) or town (kasaba), it is never suitable that another successor head off to that place and live there, since he will not be leader for all of them, and the leader [there] will not be under his command. When he reaches that town, it is against proper etiquette to leave his own prayer rug and to pray, unless [the other successor’s] abandonment [of his post] has been established, or he demonstrates a state of being opposed [to the order’s principles]; then it is deemed proper to depose [him]. At that time, he who is the leader of all and the head of the district removes him, and shall choose

173 and 177 for more on the introduction and development of these ritual symbols in tartkat Sufism after the sixth/twelfth century. Ṣaʿbān’s point here is probably that if ʿAlī Dede had left anything of his behind, it indicated that he intended to return at some point.

53 Menâkıb-ı Ṣaʿbân, pp. 50-51.

54 The prayer rug of a Halveti leader, called a seccâde in Arabic and Turkish, was symbolic of his presence and a symbol of his authority within the lodge even if he were not present. Therefore, to leave one’s seccâde behind while performing the ritual prayers elsewhere could be construed as a challenge to the authority of another Halveti leader in the area, as saints were capable of imbuing their prayer rugs with their spiritual power. It is implied that if one Halveti dignitary visits another, the proper etiquette would be to roll up his seccâde and take it with him wherever he went, including to basic functions like ritual prayers. In addition, the term was used as a synonym for the Arabic tariqah (denoting a Sufi order), implying that wherever one left his prayer rug, that was the seat of his particular power base within a Sufi order. See Alexander Knysh, “Sadjidjâdah,” EI², v. 8, pp. 742-743.
another person to sit in his place. Or, if a city becomes big, each of its neighborhoods should be judged to be a town (kasaba). At that point it is suitable [to place additional successors]. And this specific point is an area which will be strictly adhered to!"\textsuperscript{55}

\section*{Notes}

\textsuperscript{55} Menâkıb-i Şa'ban, p. 51.

\textsuperscript{56} Şa'ban's blunt rejoinder to Mustafa Dede's and Nurullah Efendi's attempts to defy him may be phrased as an insult toward the manhood of those who were advocating such a position. Şa'ban's point is that "real men" obey proper etiquette and uphold the command of their spiritual leader. Why he should choose pious old women as a negative
reached Nurullah Efendi, by being fixed in a perfected state and enlightened with the light of etiquette, he understood the real situation, and [his party] renounced [their goal] with submission and acceptance.  

While Şa‘bân’s triumph over his adversaries as a conclusion to this anecdote is not surprising, the existence of this report in the hagiography is. While clashes among potential successors to the legacy of a deceased shaykh as head of a branch of the Halveti order were not uncommon, to challenge a living shaykh’s control over his own branch of the order on his home ground well after he had established his credentials does not appear in any other known Halveti hagiographical source.

This is indicative of a couple of possibilities. The first follows from what we have seen of Şa‘bân’s life up to this point, which is that he was not possessed of the most effective personality to take on a broader public leadership role in the region, a role to which he did not really aspire. The shaykh continued to be a quiet and withdrawn individual, especially in his later years, as Fu‘âdî notes.

When the sultan became old, and weakness came to his body, he was attracted to seclusion and hiding away like Pîr ‘Ömer Halveti. He used to enter the blessed cells which are now a place of visitation in his lodge, which was the place of Seyyid Sünneti’s residence. It is related that he didn’t see the world for seven years, and that he busied himself with obedience and

counterpart, however, is not so clear. The language here may betray a 400-year-old idiom whose contextual meaning is not readily apparent to the modern reader.

57 Menâkıtb-1 Şa‘bân, pp. 51-52.

58 The disputes over the succession of Merkez Efendi to the leadership of the Sünbüliyye branch of the order after Sünbül Efendi failed to give clear guidance on who was to succeed him were recorded in the Tezkiretül-Halvetiyye, fols. 29a-30a, and Mahmûd Cemâleddin Hulvî in the Lemezât-1 Hulviyye ez-Lemezât-1 Ulviyye, pp. 463-464, indicating how such situations could arise.
servitude to the station of devotion to worship, and the witnessing of the divine.\textsuperscript{59}

It is notable that in the course of relating this anecdote, Fu‘âdî raises the example of the eponymous founder of the Halveti order, Pîr ʻÖmer el-Halveti, as a model to which Şa‘bân could be compared as a way of legitimizing his behavior.\textsuperscript{60} On the other hand, some of his other successors in the wider region of the province of Kastamonu and beyond may have aspired to a more activist role in establishing the order in the political and social lives of their communities, rather than following Şa‘bân’s lead in valuing seclusion and withdrawal from the world. The anecdote may also indicate that orders like the Şa‘bâniyye based in predominantly rural areas, which conspicuously lacked a centralized base in the larger population centers of the Ottoman Empire that allowed for closer and more frequent contact between shaykhs and their successors, were more fractious and contentious in contesting the dynamics of power within the order. This may have been reflected in Şa‘bân’s own career, as well, as he managed to lay successful claim to Seyyid Sünnetî’s defunct legacy, despite not being his direct spiritual descendant in the material world.

Fu‘âdî, with the perspective of hindsight into the order’s history, underscores Şa‘bân’s point by utilizing an allusion common to both Sufism and the genre of “mirrors for princes” literature in seeking to define the power of temporal rulers and Sufi leaders as belonging to two separate spheres. He likens the issue of multiple successors competing or

\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Menäkb-ı Şa‘bân}, p. 74.

\textsuperscript{60} In fact, Fu‘âdî made a point of stressing the pivotal role Pîr ʻÖmer el-Halveti (d. 1397) played in founding a new \textit{silsile} that broke away from the chain of authorities going back to the caliph ʼAlî by establishing the practice of seclusion out in the wilderness that would eventually give the order its name (derived from the Arabic word \textit{khalwa}, meaning “cell”). See ibid., pp. 30-31.
overlapping in a single area to the insoluble problem of two political rulers trying to exist in the same realm when he remarks:

[Şa'bân]’s noble wish is that just as it is not proper to openly seat two rulers in one country, the successors of shaykhs are also like that. The guidance of shaykhs and manifest sovereignty are both a manifestation of the power of disposal [given by] God. They are patterned after each other.61

In other words, the authority of kings and sultans is the exoteric manifestation of God-given power, while the authority of Sufi shaykhs and their successors is the esoteric and spiritual manifestation of this power. This policy established distinct spheres of influence in the various population centers and regions of the area of northern Anatolia, and Şa'bân’s and Fu’âdî’s vision of this type of order would come to exemplify the Şa‘bâniyye shaykhs’ strategies in establishing their order throughout the Ottoman domains in the 17th century.

It is nevertheless implied in Fu’âdî’s narrative that this policy objective had been established somewhat more successfully at the time he prepared and wrote the Menâkib-1 Şa'bân than it had been in Şa'bân’s own lifetime. While Şa'bân may have successfully forestalled the potential dissenting movements represented by the followers of ‘Alî Dede and his successor Nurullah Efendi, others did move to challenge Şa'bân’s status as head of the order, or abandoned the order outright in favor of trying to propagate the teachings of others.

While it was established that Şa‘bân Efendi was the Pole [of the Age] (kutb),62 some people deceived in their own opinion and covered with the veil

61 Ibid., p. 51.

62 Kutb, or “pole,” is a term used in its simplest form to refer to the highest-ranking saint in the hierarchy of saints active in any given temporal context. The most straightforward discussion of the hierarchy of saints that came to be elaborated by al-Hakîm al-Tirmidhî (d. 873) and Ibn al-'Arabî (d. 1240), and the issues that it raised in mystical theology can be found in Schimmel, Mystical Dimensions of Islam, pp. 199-203. See esp. p. 200, where the importance of being able to recognize the pole is stressed
of existence were not able to know the exalted station of the master [Ṣâ‘bân] in their own time, and they did not understand his spiritual power after he departed to the world of souls. They also didn’t understand the states and powers of the noble ones who guided according to the divine secret on his prayer rug after him. They did not believe them [to be] perfected ones, but deficient and [people] to be surpassed, and they spread prayer rugs among the people of Kastamonu from their own lines of descent (silṣile) and other lines of descent, and they were [aiming] in the direction of [giving] guidance. But none of their guidance became established, and their lines of descent didn’t become permanent; they became nonexistent and disappeared. This fact is clearly known and witnessed by everyone in Kastamonu and other places.\(^{63}\)

Fu’âdî, speaking at a time when the Ṣâ‘bânîyye branch of the Halveti order had become more firmly established as part of Ottoman society, seems to be able to dismiss these attempts to abandon Ṣâ‘bân and his legacy as an impotent challenge that was doomed to failure from the start. For the historian, however, the narrative indicates that Ṣâ‘bân’s success in establishing his order was by no means a foregone conclusion. Many of his countrymen, and indeed even many of his own followers, considered him deficient enough as a spiritual leader that they sought to present themselves as credible alternatives for spiritual guidance within Kastamonu itself, to say nothing of other parts of northern Anatolia. In terms of its politics and organization, the Ṣâ‘bânîyye order in the mid-sixteenth by Celâlîddîn Rûmî in an even more blunt way than in Fu’âdî’s exposition. The complexity of this hierarchy in Ibn al-ʿArabî’s thought is laid out in a concise way also by Michel Chodkiewicz, Seal of the Saints: Prophethood and Sainthood in the Doctrine of Ibn ʿArabî (Cambridge: The Islamic Texts Society, 1993), pp. 89-98. One should also note pp. 99-100, n. 18, where Chodkiewicz advances the contention that the tarikat-based Sufism of subsequent generations “lacked precision” in applying Ibn al-ʿArabî’s theory, implying a criticism that later Sufi orders and their leaders interpreted his thinking in an oversimplified way, and that he personally would take a dim view of Fu’âdî’s claim. See also the remarks of William C. Chittick, The Sufi Path of Love: The Metaphysics of Ibn al-ʿArabî (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989), pp. 369-375.

\(^{63}\) **Menâkîb-1 Ṣâ‘bân**, pp. 52-53.
century most likely suffered from schisms and wayward followers. Even with the benefit of hindsight, Fuʿâdî himself does not miss the chance to criticize any potential claimants to the leadership of the Ṣaʿbânîyye order who might challenge his own position or that of his masters. Digressing from the narrative quoted above, he addresses his audience directly to comment on the dangers of a lack of etiquette (edeb).

My noble brothers! According to the understanding [of the Arabic proverb] “God is merciful in a matter; he knows its amount and he doesn’t exceed its bounds,” everyone must know his own state and place on every specific point. It is also necessary to know the power of the exalted, aged, and noble ones among the shaykhs and others. Not knowing the states and powers of high and noble ones is a product of not knowing his own state and amount. There is no more useless quality in a human being than this....Not knowing their states and powers, or knowing but not observing and respecting their rights, is a product of lack of propriety. Those who abandon etiquette and do not know the power of the people of ability will not find fortune or perfection. He who does not stay close and keep company with the people of good etiquette, and the noble ones who act according to the understanding “all of mysticism is etiquette”...and he who keeps company with rude and obnoxious people and converses with and forms bonds with them, will not find nobility or prosperity.⁶⁴

The key to this entire argument rests in the term “etiquette,” or edeb. In the context of Ottoman mysticism and the mystical orders that had grown up over the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, proper etiquette was linked to a form of exaggerated deference that dominated social relations between a shaykh and his followers. In any political or social context in Ottoman society, brashly challenging one’s social superiors in the Ottoman hierarchy was generally frowned upon for the simple reason that it bred chaos and disorder based on the power struggle that would ensue. Indeed, the writings of Ottomans from the elite classes often reflect a disdain for upstarts who sought to displace

---

⁶⁴ Ibid., pp. 53-54.
established elites in various walks of life; the works of the great contemporary Ottoman historian of this period, Gelibolu Mustafa ‘Alî, are excellent examples of this literature.65 This enjoined system of polite deference to one’s superiors, however, was taken to extremes in the ideal Sufi framework. Earlier Sufi intellectuals and theorists had advocated a relationship between guide and seeker whereby the seeker should be like a corpse in the hands of his guide, or a lump of clay that should be fashioned as the master saw fit. To fail to surrender one’s agency to the shaykh and obey his will, even in situations that seemed problematic to the disciple, would therefore be a violation of good mystical edeb.66 Fu’âdî, much like his older contemporary Mustafa ‘Alî, was aware of pressures that could arise from a new generation of upstarts, the only difference being that his career was located in the sphere of religious rather than courtly and administrative politics. He therefore utilized these long-established principles to defend and uphold the established order as being based on the penultimate rung of the divine hierarchy.

It is necessary to be humble towards and fear exalted ones because the perfected men who become the pole of the world, by truly knowing the actions and attributes of God Most High, and by taking their spiritual powers from God the Guider himself through their power’s unification with the

65 The magisterial work of Cornell Fleischer on the life and career of Gelibolu Mustafa ‘Alî (d. 1601) does an outstanding job of situating his writings in the context of a transformation of Ottoman society whereby the old established Ottoman elite families were being challenged and displaced by new actors on the political scene. Later in his life, ‘Alî became especially concerned about proper behavior, qualifications for a given position, and the importance of competence as the primary determinant for prominent positions in society. See Cornell Fleischer, Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Âlî (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), pp. 184-186 and 204-211. See also the comments in Zilfi, Politics of Piety, pp. 102-105.

66 Tringham argues that the Sufi literature and handbooks produced during the sixth/twelfth century constituted the key turning point in establishing this tenet among Sufi orders; see Tringham, The Sufi Orders in Islam, p. 29.
manifestation of the divine essence, and with their power’s being a divinely-granted power, appear with kindness and favor to the seekers and noble ones who respect the rules of the şeri āt and the order. They act with the attribute of divine wrath and come out against those who depart from proper etiquette and who do not understand [their own] state and amount. Because they are assistants to God, their acceptance is the acceptance of God, and their wish is God’s wish. As in the case of the Messenger of God and the Prophet Hızır, their power of disposal in every place appears by the command and will of God.⁶⁷

Therefore, to show disrespect toward those who are one’s superiors in sanctity is to defy God himself—an unenviable position for any dervish to place himself in! Nevertheless, the basic responsibilities inherent in this relationship did not rest solely upon the shaykh’s followers, and Fu’âdî goes on to note the characteristics that mark a proper spiritual guide deserving of the edeb relationship.

But this [power of disposal] is not so that...they shall act according to their own desires and the requirements of their carnal souls, and they should not evince avarice, rancor, malice, envy, and other negative qualities like other people. Don’t you see that the powers of those who act according to a negative attribute and the malice of the carnal soul are ephemeral, and they don’t achieve their wishes? Rather, they will also fall into pain and suffering. Şa‘bân Efendi, on account of his working with the aforementioned divine power and ability, on every specific point...the mark of his powers is present and enduring.⁶⁸

The perpetuation of Şa‘bân’s legacy in the decades after his death serves as proof for Fu’âdî that his subject’s mastery of the etiquette of Halveti mysticism and the spiritual qualities that bring one close to God were of a superior quality and should be respected as such. His opponents’ failure to displace or surpass him in his spiritual legacy likewise served as an additional proof that they lacked the necessary attributes to be favored in this manner by

⁶⁷ Menâkıb-ı Şa‘bân, pp. 54-55.
⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 55.
God. On the whole, Fu’âdî’s philosophy and argumentation were simple: success in the propagation of a branch of the order before and after one’s passing are the best proof of sainthood.\textsuperscript{69} To underscore this point, he relates, citing an additional informant by the name of Erzerumî Hasan Dede, how Şâbân trained 360 successors in total, and sent them to places throughout the Ottoman domains.\textsuperscript{70}

2.5 Building a Network of Friends and Confronting the Censurers of Sufism Among the Local Population

Part of what allowed Şâbân to maintain his position in the face of challenges was the relationships he was able to build with some of the prominent scholarly figures of the region. Many of the names Fu’âdî recounts, such as “Mehmed Efendi known by the name Memdi Halife, and Mehmed Efendi known by the name Kızılzade, and Hasan Celebi whose pen name was Mahvî, and Sufi Muhyiddîn Efendi who had previously been the müfti of Kastamonu, and ʿAbdî Efendi known both as Molla Nâyi and İbrikçizade, perfected and skillful in all variety of sciences, and...a gentleman with the surname Hactzade,” would

\textsuperscript{69} I will discuss Fu’âdî’s presentation of the concept of sainthood, along with its relevance to the audience he was addressing in this work, more fully in the following chapter.

\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Menâkıb-ı Şâbân}, pp. 58-59. Yet apparently even this dry factual anecdote was controversial, as some related that Şâbân himself communicated to someone in a dream that he prayed for only 300 successors, and the Prophet or God himself took over for the other 60. Fu’âdî goes on to assure his readers that this is a perfectly legitimate interpretation based on potential activity in the realm of the imaginary world (‘âlem-i misâl). It should also be noted that the number 360 corresponds to one of the theories of the number of saints present at the head of the hierarchy; see Schimmel, \textit{Mystical Dimensions}, p. 202.
probably be known only to Kastamonu residents of centuries past.\\footnote{Menâkth-i Şa‘bân, p. 62. We do know, however, that Mahvî Efendi was the poet who was well-known for a piece of poetry lauding Şa‘bân’s renown as a mystical guide; see p. 68 above.} Nevertheless, Şa‘bân was able to establish relationships with several critical figures, not all of whom were from Kastamonu proper. While Fu‘âdî liked to stress İskilibî ʿAbdülbâkî Efendi as the most notable of these companions, based on the fact that he became third in the line of succession from Şa‘bân and acted as Fu‘âdî’s first mystical guide, two other figures may have proved more critical in supporting Şa‘bân during his lifetime. The first was a man whose origins lay in the mining center of Küre-i Nühâs in the mountains north of Kastamonu, known as Küreli Mehmed Çelebi. Despite his humble origins, he had managed to participate in scholarly circles with the great Ottoman jurist Ebusu‘ûd (d. 1574), and had supposedly impressed the great jurist.\\footnote{Fu‘âdî includes an anecdote about Küreli Mehmed that claimed: When someone asked the renowned Ottoman legal scholar Ebusu‘ûd, “Did it [ever] happen that a sort of embarrassment fell over him or that his heart trembled when transmitting the noble commentary [on the Qur’an] in so many medreses and gatherings?” he said, “One day many virtuous gentlemen from among the jurists were present at one or two gatherings, and no place came into my heart for any of them at all. But I saw Mehmed Çelebi from Nuhâs Küre, and at that time, it occurred [that my heart] trembled a little bit. But it didn’t happen again.” Menâkth-i Şa‘bân, p. 63. The story has the ring of the tall tale about it, however, and I have found no mention of Küreli Mehmed in any of the biographical compilations of prominent ulema in the empire for this period. The town of Küre still exists today on the road from Kastamonu to İnebolu, but its importance as a mining center declined during the years following the establishment of the Turkish Republic; see Eyüpgiller, p. 47.}
seek out the solution to his problem in all manner of books and tracts, he was unable to find an answer. When he finally presented his case to Şa'bân, however, he was able to solve his problem merely by uttering a single word. He concluded by remarking, “How can I not become the dervish and servant of a perfected guide like him?” One should stress that Küreli Mehmed’s repute was perhaps mostly local in nature. Yet the fact that he had rubbed shoulders, like Şa'bân himself, with the scholars of the capital would have given him a legitimacy to which most of Kastamonu’s population would not have had a claim. It also would have given the doctrine of sainthood an important defender from its growing body of critics, one who had come from their own ranks and now publicly rejected their anti-Sufi biases.

The second, more important figure who would come to play a critical role in the development of the Şa'bâniyye at a later time in their history was Kastamonulu Muharrem Efendi (d. 1576). Muharrem Efendi was initially a successor-in-training to Benli Muhyiddîn Efendi, a mysterious figure about whom we have very little data, but who seems to have achieved widespread notoriety by withdrawing from society and building himself a retreat on the mountain of İlgâz some distance south of Kastamonu during the time of Sultan Selim I. Those who had the courage to follow him there utilized the remote location as a way of breaking away from “love of the world.” Unfortunately, Taşköprüzâde offers us little to go on outside of this vague information, and seems to be aware of Benli Efendi only because

---

73 Menâkıb-ı Şa'bân, p. 63-64. Küreli Mehmed’s anecdote reflects a standard trope for the experience of many Halveti notables that leads them to join the order after a period of reflection, which reflects the spiritual power of the Halveti guide who eventually solves their problems. Şa'bân Efendi himself had a similar experience with his own guide, as we have seen.
of having encountered Muharrem Efendi in the scholarly circles of Istanbul before his death in 1561.\footnote{See Mecdî, Hadâ'ikü'l-Õekâ'ik, v. 1, p. 426, for this brief biographical entry.} As a result, we do not know when Benli Sultan died, although we do know that it was some time before Şa'bân himself, as Fu'âdî claims that Şa'bân completed Muharrem Efendi’s mystical training after Benli Sultan’s death. Şa'bân apparently also paid the occasional visit to Benli Sultan in his mountain retreat, as one anecdote in the Menâkîb-1 Şa'bân recounts how Şa'bân suddenly had a premonition of the death of ʿOsmân Fakîh, an old friend whom Benli Sultan had authorized to lead his funeral prayer upon his death, and ordered his dervishes to carve a stone by the side of the road into a tombstone as a result.\footnote{Menâkîb-1 Şa'bân, p. 81. Like the aforementioned anecdote involving the Bayramî shaykh ʿIsâ Dede, however, this anecdote may be interpreted as reflecting tension between Şa'bân’s followers and those of a more established local shaykh of some significance by demonstrating how Şa'bân’s knowledge of unseen events surpassed that of Benli Sultan on a matter of considerable significance to him.}

Muharrem Efendi himself proved to be a more publicly renowned and enduring figure during his lifetime. Diverging from the path of his shaykh, Benli Sultan, he chose to emerge from seclusion after the death of his master and take up prominent positions in the religious hierarchy in the Ottoman capital of Istanbul. Based on Taşköprüzâde’s knowing that he was a prominent figure, we can guess that Benli Sultan died at some point during the decade of the 1540s or the 1550s, and Muharrem Efendi eventually made his way to Istanbul some time thereafter, rising to enough prominence to earn himself a place in Taşköprüzâde’s biographical work before it was completed in 1558.\footnote{We know this from materials appearing within the work; see remarks of Dr. Abdülkadir Özcan in the introduction to Mecdî, Hadâ'ikü'l-şekâ'îk, pp. xi-xii.} Luckily, Taşköprüzâde’s successor, Nevîzade ʿAtâ’i (d. 1635) was able to elaborate more fully on the career of Muharrem Efendi.
Efendi during the latter years of Sultan Süleyman’s reign, under the name “eş-Şeyh Muharrem b. Mehmed.”

He came forth from the land of Kastamonu...and he benefitted from his service to the scholars of the age, Îsrâfilzâde and Çivizâde. 77 After the labors of struggle and giving of the sweets of the goal of conversation in the house of benefit of the most learned of his time and moment, Sa’dî Efendi, he formally pledged allegiance to Benli Muhyiddîn Efendi, among the notables of the Halveti order....After that, he gained the object of companionship...with the notables of the Bayramî order. When his fame and reputation became world-renowned by preaching, advising, and the transmitting of Prophetic tradition and commentary [on the Qur’an] in some of the lands of Islam, he was invited to Istanbul and was appointed with a daily 30-akçe [silver coin] stipend to the Sufi Mehmed Paşa school of Prophetic tradition (dâru’l-hâdis)....When Sultan Süleyman completed his noble mosque in Zu’l-hicce of [the year] 964 (1557)...the dais of preaching and advising was appointed to these people [of that school]. He made commentary on the speech of [God] on that dais...for a long time, and taught repeatedly the commentaries of Beyzâvî and Kaşşâfi [two renowned medieval scholars of Islamic law]. [He died] at the end of Cemâziyü’l-evvel in [the year] 983 (1576).... 79

What first strikes us about Muharrem Efendi’s early training is that one of his prominent teachers in his formative years was one of the most inflexible anti-Sufi personalities who rose to power in religious circles during Sultan Süleyman’s reign. Çivizâde’s career was marked by a certain rigidity on controversial religious questions that

---

77 Çivizâde, also known as Molla Muhyiddîn Şeyh Mehmed b. İlyâs (d. 1547), held the position of Grand Müfti of Istanbul from 1539-1542 after a distinguished career in various positions both in the Ottoman capital and other places. Molla Fahruddîn Îsrâfilzâde (d. 1537) was another prominent scholar in the capital and sometime rival of Çivizâde. See Mecdî, v. 1, pp. 446-448 and pp. 475-476, for their biographies in Taşköprüzâde’s work.

78 Sa’dî Çelebi, or Molla Sa’dullah b. ‘İsâ b. Emîr Hân (d. 1539), served as the Grand Müfti who preceded Çivizâde, and acted as the successor to the great Ottoman intellectual and writer Kemâlpashaşâde (d. 1534) in the position for five years. See Mecdî, v. 1, pp. 443-445, for his biography in Taşköprüzâde.

often alienated him from his colleagues and even the sultan himself, as exemplified by a
decree condemning the establishment of pious foundations (evkâf) with gold or silver specie,
as opposed to property or real estate. He also condemned the works of revered but
controversial Sufi masters like Ibn al-ʿArabî, Celâlüddîn Rûmî, and the Egyptian saint
Shaykh ʿUmar ibn al-Fârid (d. 1235), a position which deeply disturbed many of his fellow
scholars and was probably responsible for his dismissal from the post of Grand Müfti in
1542. In addition, for the purposes of the history of the Halveti order, it is equally
important to note that he was also reputed to have been a prominent student of the infamous
Ottoman jurisprudent Sarı Gürz whom, as we shall see in the following chapter, was a
nemesis of the Halveti leader Sünbül Efendi in Istanbul during the reign of Selim I and the
early part of Süleyman’s reign by attacking the legitimacy of the semâ and devrân.

Oddly enough, the aforementioned İsrâflîzâde was said to be a sometime rival to
Çivîzâde, having been passed over for a teaching post in one of the most prestigious
medreses (educational institutions for the study of Islamic law and tradition) in 1529. He
was also, in contrast to a figure like Çivîzâde, known for his interest in the rational sciences
(ʿulûm-i ʿakliye), and was once the target of an inquisition about his beliefs by Çivîzâde and

80 ʿUmar b. ʿAlî ibn al-Fârid was an Egyptian saint whose mystical poetry often
bordered on the scandalous but who was highly regarded in many Sufi and intellectual
circles in the centuries after his death. See Julian Baldick, Mystical Islam: An

81 Richard C. Repp, The Müfti of Istanbul: A Study in the Development of the
Ottoman Learned Hierarchy (London: Ithaca Press, 1986), pp. 250-252, discusses some
of the controversial issues in which Çivîzâde involved himself that eventually led to his
dismissal.

82 Ibid., p. 246, and see also Tezkîretü'l-Halvetiyye, fols. 22b-24a.
several other prominent *ulema*. Despite the danger that this posed, he was able to withstand the political pressure and maintain his career, and Taşköprüzâde himself remembers that one of his tracts achieved fame during the time he was a teacher (*dânişmend*) in the capital.\(^{83}\) What all this suggests is that Muharrem Efendi, like so many other Sufis-to-be, began his career by studying with a wide variety of teachers, some of whom were stringent critics of Sufism and the rational sciences, and others who were more supportive. He eventually came to repudiate the views of hardliners like Çivîzâde—a detail that 'Atâ’î’s text doesn’t explicitly report in Muharrem Efendi’s biographical entry.

The aforementioned Sa’îdî Efendi, on the other hand, with whom he subsequently studied, was probably the most important influence on Muharrem Efendi’s early career by virtue of the fact that he too had roots in the province of Kastamonu, and is reported to have come from various towns and villages either in the vicinity of Sinop or Kastamonu proper.\(^{84}\) In fact, Sa’îdî Efendi may have acted as a patron to the young scholar, enabling him to enter and mix with the most prominent scholarly circles in the capital.

In any case, Muharrem Efendi at some point abandoned the scholarly circles of the capital and attached himself to Benli Sultan before his death, but he apparently did not succeed in completing his Sufi training under Benli Sultan. As ‘Atâ’î notes, he may have left to establish relationships with the shaykhs of the Bayrâmî order instead. ‘Atâ’î’s

\(^{83}\) For the confusing situation surrounding the struggle for the post, along with the biography of İşrâfilzâde, including details of his examination and his writings, see Repp, p. 248, and Mecdî, v. 1, p. 476.

\(^{84}\) Sa’îdî Çelebi’s career as a *müfti* seems a bit less eventful than those of his predecessor and successor, at least from Richard Repp’s perspective; see Repp, pp. 240-244. This seems justified by the fairly uneventful biography of Sa’îdî that appears in Mecdî, v. 1, pp. 443-445.
presentation of Muharrem Efendi’s career is therefore at odds with that of Fu’âdî, who claims that Şa’bân stepped in to complete Muharrem’s training after Benli’s untimely death. It is impossible to say which account is more accurate, but one might suspect Fu’âdî of exaggerating a genuine friendship and respect between the two men into a standard Sufi master-disciple relationship. On the other hand, it is equally clear that Muharrem Efendi never recognized any discrepancy between a career in the scholarly hierarchy and the practice of Sufism. He may have leaned more toward cultivating the companionship of the Sufi shaykhs than becoming an actual Sufi aspirant himself, much as the notable Persian scholar ʿAbd al-Rahman Câmî (d. 1492) was attracted to the Nakşibendi order and has provided us with important sources on its history, but never really became a full-fledged member or successor to any given shaykh. We do know that Muharrem Efendi, like Câmî, authored a work about the saints, and that he was able and willing to quote freely from some

85 This would not be a surprising or even unusual position for a learned Ottoman to take even in the more turbulent period of the 17th century, as pointed out by Derin Terzioğlu in Chapter 3 of her dissertation on the life and career of Niyâzî-i Misrî (d. 1694). For an overview problematizing the relationship among ulama and Sufis, and the debates over what constituted “orthodox” Islam over the course of Ottoman and Islamic history, see Terzioğlu, pp. 190-276.

86 Devin Deweese first suggested that Câmî’s Nefahâtü’l-Üns was intended to support the idea of silsile-based Sufism rather than any particular order; see Devin Dewese, An “Uvaysî” Sufi in Timurid Mawarannahr: Notes on Hagiography and the Taxonomy of Sanctity in the Religious History of Central Asia (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, 1993), pp. 11-12, a view seconded by Jürgen Paul, Doctrine and Organization: The Khwâjagân Naqshbandiya in the First Generation after Bahâ’uddîn (Berlin: Das Arabische Buch, 1998), p. 14. See also the remarks of the editors of the most recent preparation of Jâmî’s hagiographical work in its Turkish translation on his connections with Sufism: Süleyman Uludağ and Mustafa Kara, Nefahâtü’l-Üns: Evliyâ Menkîbeleri, pp. 30-31, where they note that his connections with the Nakşibendi order were rivaled by his interest in other forms of Sufism as exemplified by Ibn al-ʿArabî and the Persian poetry of Mevlânâ Celâleddin Rûmî, among others.
of the great Sufi biographical collections, such as the Tezkireti‘l-Evliyâ of Ferîdüddîn ‘Attâr (d. 1221) and others in his public lessons and teaching.87

The role that Muharrem Efendi played in cementing Şa‘bân’s legacy among the people of Kastamonu will be discussed subsequently, but for now it is important to note that by stressing the existence of such connections, Fu’âdî could counter the image that many people had of Şa‘bân during his lifetime. In addition to the perception that Şa‘bân was too withdrawn or unsure of his own state to be considered seriously as a Halveti leader, Fu’âdî also felt obligated to comment on the misperception among many in his society that Şa‘bân was an uneducated or illiterate (ümmî) person,88 despite his scholarly training in Istanbul early in his life.

While there was so much of the rational and scriptural sciences in the manifestation of the prophetic heritage...of that lord of the people of annihilation, he appeared in the form of an uneducated person like the pole

87 This is confirmed both by the biographical entry by ‘Atâ’î and by Fu’âdî; see ‘Atâ’î, v. 2, p. 355, and Menâkîb-ı Şa‘bân, p. 93-95.

88 The Turkish term ümmî, derived from Arabic, has different shades of meaning based on context. The simplest is to be illiterate, but it can also have a more subtle meaning of being insufficiently educated or trained to function in a given position. Some draw a distinction between ümmî and câhil in that the former indicates a lack of intellectual knowledge, while the latter indicates a lack of moral or ethical knowledge. Many shaykhs actually claimed the label ümmî as a source of pride, as it implies that their mystical knowledge and advancement on the path had been granted by God through His inspiration (ilhâm), rather than being a product of educational prowess. Of course, more exoterically-minded scholars probably took a dim view of such ideas. One contemporary of Şa‘bân’s, a prominent Halveti shaykh by the name of Ümmî Sinân (d. 1568), took this nickname merely because it was one of the nicknames of the Prophet Muhammad; see Öngören, pp. 92-93. See also Éric Geoffroy, “Ummi,” EI², vol. 10, pp. 863-864, and his more detailed comments on the subject in Éric Geoffroy, Le Soufisme en Égypte et Syrie sous les derniers Mamelouks et les premiers Ottomans: Orientations spirituelles et enjeux culturels (Damascus: Institut Français de Damas, 1995), pp. 299-307. Uri Rubin suggests a link with an inheritance from Jewish religious tradition and thought; see Rubin, pp. 22-30.
of the Arabs, Habîb-i ʿAcemî, and he used to be wary of exoteric knowledge. Because just as knowledge of the esoteric and divine mysteries is a reason for annihilation and unity, exoteric knowledge is usually a reason for [the world of] existence and multiplicity. Because of this, Şâbân always behaved like a dervish, and he never engaged in intellectual discussions. Everyone thought he was uneducated.

At least one prominent figure within the broader framework of the Halveti order learned this the hard way. One of the successors of Sünbûl Efendi (d. 1529) in Istanbul by the name of Mahmûd Efendi was teaching in a village called Okçular in the area of his home region of Araç. One night, he saw the Prophet in a dream, and when he requested increased advancement on the path, the Prophet gave him good tidings that he would attain superior perfection at the hands of a great pole of his time. Awaiting the appearance of this individual, Mahmûd Efendi began to hear scattered reports about Şâbân Efendi in Kastamonu. Drawing on the personal witness of his own spiritual guide and immediate predecessor as head of the Şâbânîyye branch of the Halveti order, Muhyiddîn Efendi (d. 1604), Fuʿâdî relates that one day Muhyiddîn came to Kastamonu with Mahmûd Efendi while he was still engaged in his dervish training with Şâbân. Mahmûd Efendi spoke about

---

89 Habîb-i ʿAcemî (d. 747-8) was considered to be one of the earliest Sufî figures by subsequent generations of Islamic mystics, and a successor to the great ascetic Hasan al-Basrî (d. 728). The Halveti shaykhhs considered these historical figures to be among the first shaykhhs to transmit the mystical knowledge of the Halveti order to subsequent generations from the caliph ʿAlî b. Abû Tâlib (d. 661) via his sons, and revered their memory. However, Fuʿâdî’s description of him as “pole of the Arabs” has an ironic tone to it, seeing as his connection to the title of being ümmî derived from his inability to recite the Qurʾān properly in Arabic due to his Persian origins. See the description in Hulvî, pp. 156-157 and 161-162.

90 Menâkıb-ı Şâbân, p. 59.

91 Araç is the name of a small town lying some distance directly to the west of Kastamonu on the road heading west toward Safranbolu and Istanbul. A small fortress survives in modern times, still guarding the route which led through this area.
his dream, but to test Mahmûd Efendi’s ability to be humble and submit to him, Şâ'bân refused to interpret it. After three days of speaking about his dream, only to have Şâ'bân continue to remain silent, a tear fell out of Mahmûd’s eye, and he said that although he was among the successors of Sünbül Efendi, he needed Şâ'bân’s help to achieve perfection, and renounced his life as Sünbül Efendi’s follower and successor. Now that Mahmûd had demonstrated total submission, Şâ'bân finally accepted his sincerity and interpreted the events in his dream. Only then did Mahmûd learn what Şâ'bân kept secret from the exoteric ʿulemâ: that he was an extremely well-educated individual.92

In addition to reiterating that his protagonist’s reticence did not indicate a lack of ability, Fu’âdî was also at pains to stress that Şâ'bân was clearly an upholder of the exoteric aspects of the sacred law, and did not tend towards the wilder extremes of ecstatic mysticism. He reported that Şâ'bân used to employ a simple analogy to teach his dervishes about the relationship between the exoteric law (ṣerîʿat) and the mystical path (tarikat). He told them to view the ṣerîʿat as being like the outer shell of an almond or the skin of a piece of fruit, with the tarikat being the tasty inner core that is desired by the seeker. However, one should not go the route of the atheist (mülhid) by saying that the shell or peel can be thrown away once the desired object is reached! Instead, one must think of it as a process of making an almond ripen on a tree. If the shell doesn’t develop properly, then the tasty inner part fails to develop properly and the entire almond goes rotten.93 Fu’âdî also includes an anecdote in which some of the congregation of a mosque witnessed one of Şâ'bân’s

92 Menâkıb-i Şâ'bân, pp. 59-60.

93 Ibid., pp. 55-56.
dervishes falling into a mystical state whereby he did not perform his prayers correctly and remained stuck in a standing, kneeling, or prostrate position for long periods. When the imam of the mosque, Seydî Sâlih Halife, refused to intervene without first consulting Şa‘bân himself, Şa‘bân initially defended his dervish. However, when he discussed the matter with the dervish in private, he recognized that it in fact was a serious problem and did not hesitate to castigate him for falling into error.

...[Şa‘bân] asked, “My dervish, when you return to the real world from the state of immersion which occurs while you are praying, do you pray that prayer again?” As soon as that dervish, puffed up with pride in the secret of the meaning which is noted [in the Persian couplet] “The prayer of the ascetics is sitting and prostration; the prayer of the knowers is the annihilation of existence,” said in the noble presence with complete sincerity, “My lord, can a prayer which is prayed with that state and with the annihilation of existence be prayed again?,” that source of the şerîât and mine of piety [Şa‘bân Efendi] was distressed at that dervish. He commanded, “Hey dervish, what are you saying, you speak wrongly! It is necessary to pray again with the known principles. If you don’t pray [again] it is atheism and unbelief. If [you are] a dervish and if [you are] of the people of perfecting [the path], it is necessary to respect the noble law as much as possible....”

These anecdotes display the strategy Şa‘bân employed in training his dervishes, which was a strict, shari‘ah-based mysticism that probably would have won the approval of the great synthesizer of mysticism and exoteric ritual practice, Abû Hamîd al-Ghazâlî (d. 1111), despite the fact that it had been merged with the overlay of external symbols and systematic training germane to the devotees of the Halveti order in subsequent centuries.95 These

94 Ibid., p. 57.

95 Al-Ghazâlî has been viewed generally as inclining towards a rationalized form of mysticism, whereby having proper knowledge of religious ritual and practice is a key component of the process of attaining love of God and closeness to Him. See the provisional assessments of his legacy in Knysh, pp. 148-149, and also the remarks of Binyamin Abrahamov, Divine Love in Islamic Mysticism: The Teachings of al-Ghazâlî
anecdotes also provided balance and context that clarified and recast some of the anti-exoteric statements and behaviors that Ṣâ‘bân exhibited in other situations. In addition, he showed a talent for expressing these ideas in a simple and direct language that his largely rural and uneducated countrymen could understand, and this implies he had little use for the ecstatic and doctrinally suspect forms of Islamic mysticism exemplified by much of the Persian poetic and literary corpus that the Ottomans had inherited. It was a lesson from which his eventual successor and hagiographer, Fu‘âdî, would benefit in his own writings and teachings for an increasingly broad audience of his countrymen in the early seventeenth century.

Nevertheless, Ṣâ‘bân could not avoid the drumbeat of the ever-present anti-Sufi critique even though he upheld the sacred law as the primary referent for his followers’ instruction. Perhaps due to his growing success at the Honsâlûr mosque in attracting a circle of followers to his preaching and teaching, others in the town rose up to censure him.

But those who were deficient, uneducated shaykhs of the exoteric scholars who didn’t know his state, and those who were uncomprehending and troublemaking people, followed their own perverse unfounded opinion instead of submitting, and with Satanic urges and the misleading of the carnal passions, censured the Halveti shaykhs and their dervishes. Those who thought badly [of the shaykh], according to the verse “Satan made their deeds look attractive to them, and turned them from the path,”96 their own statements, actions and other states appeared pleasing to them. While bound with the chain of the love of the world and the shackle of the hopes of the carnal soul, they did not avoid great sin, bad thinking and fanaticism, and left

---

96 A fragment from al-Qur’ân, 27: 24 (an-Naml). The full text of the verse is part of a broader Qur’ânic narrative dealing with the actions of King Solomon vis-à-vis the Queen of Sheba.
themselves in the manner and sense of the verse, “We will put iron collars on their necks.”

They censured and interfered in the practice, garb and cloaks for the order of those who are in state of divine nearness, and the masters of the mystics in the state of the verse, “Surely the devotees will drink cups flavored with palm blossoms.” They used to refer with words that were not suitable to the dignity of the noble [Ṣa’bân], God forfend, and they denied that the shaykh were the people of God, and [denied] their states with ignorant and nasty attributions.

Fu’âdî’s use of verses from the Qur’ân to define and separate the censuring movement from that of the shaykh and their followers was a useful tactic in defending the order’s founder and his legacy from polemical attacks, not least because detractors of the Sufi orders often employed the same rhetorical strategy. Establishing Qur’ânic support in any battle for religious legitimacy was fundamental in the polemical environment that the narrative had broached, and Fu’âdî recognized, from the earliest periods of his leadership of the Ṣa‘bâniyye order, the need to ground the legitimacy of the Halveti order in a Qur’ân- and tradition-based discourse. Since the accusations of the censurers revolved around the idea that Halveti shaykh like Ṣa’bân were attempting to establish a self-serving claim to superiority over others that God never granted to mankind, such a description also turned the tables of the debate on the censurers, accusing them of having exceeded the bounds of their own legitimacy by being arrogant about the levels of their own knowledge.

Nevertheless, rhetorical cleverness was not enough to win this polemical battle, and Fu’âdî goes on to make it clear that the party of censure paid a heavy price for their bad

---

97 Another fragment from al-Qur’ân, 36: 8 (Yâ Sîn).

98 Al-Qur’ân, 76: 5 (ad-Dahr).

99 Menâkîb-1 Ṣâ’bân, pp. 64-65.
attitude about Şa‘bân and the tarikat-based Sufism of their era. Perhaps in a thinly-veiled allusion to the case of Kürelî Mehmed Çelebi and others like him, Fu‘âdî remarks:

Some of those who censured Şa‘bân and thought badly about [him] without any good reason were destroyed by God’s command and will, while others abandoned their censure by encountering the power of the saints through Şa‘bân’s grace and God’s help and guidance. The censure of the censurers and the harm [caused by] the people of envy, outside of those who became the disciples and followers of the lord [Şa‘bân], came to naught. Since God was on the side of the noble one, his own dervishes and successors were in a tranquil state of divine purity, and his detractors were held back from the knowledge of God and the condition and perfection of the people of God. The sign of these conditions is manifest and enduring in the [survival of the] silsîle and lodge at the present [time].

Once again, the success and survival of the Şa‘bânîyye after their founder’s death serves as proof that the accusations and attacks against their legacy were unfounded. Still, in structuring the narrative of the hagiography, Fu‘âdî is not satisfied with merely stating the basic point but continues with a graphic example demonstrating the fate of those who harassed and denigrated the Halveti path, and Şa‘bân in particular. He clearly wants no doubt to linger in the mind of his audience about the danger of disrespect for the Halveti legacy in Kastamonu, and draws on the testimony of a living member of the Şa‘bânîyye circle, Memî Hoca Efendi, to illustrate the point.

...[A] knowledgeable and virtuous person by the name of Evliyâ Şücâ‘î came to Kastamonu. While [I] was coming with our fellow city-dweller Bilâl Halife and learning from him, the aforementioned Evliyâ Şücâ‘î used to say, “It is the Halveti [shaykhs who are to blame]” in the pulpits, on the daises and in the other gatherings, and launch into his own unfounded opinion on the issue of the Sufî devrân, and attack and impugn with cursing and

100 Ibid., pp. 66-67.

101 The ceremony of the devrân, the practice of forming a circle and performing a form of dance with musical instruments which accompanied the recitation of the Halveti zikr, was a lightning rod for criticisms directed against the order during the sixteenth and
vituperation about other states of which he knew nothing. God forfend, he used to say words not suitable to the dignity of the shaykh. On account of being one of the notable scholars, he used to make people think more poorly of the master on account of his words. But the noble one heard and knew, and was tolerant and forbearing, and used to commend the matter to God. One day, [Şüca'] became sick by the will of God. While the two of us, Bilâl Halife and I, were looking after [him], one night he opened his eyes and said, “Whatever shall happen to me, it is because I interfered with and attacked Şa'bân Dede. Bring [him] to me, and let us restore his rights,” and he sent Bilâl Halife. When he came, the noble one, while knowing his substance, never showed abstention or affliction. When [Şa'bân] wished to come, because of his good moral [character], some of the dervishes said, “That person called you a great swine and an atheist among many people in the pulpits and [on the] daises, and made so much slander and censure like this. Are you going to him?” Şa'bân set out, replying, “It doesn’t matter; he did it without knowing; this situation comes to us and those like us. The lot of this position [of being a Halveti shaykh] is like this; let him be accepted by us. A person of knowledge is a brother; he forgave and confessed his sin; let’s reach him before he dies; he is a knowledgeable person; don’t let him depart without faith.” But before the noble one could come, [Evliyâ Şüca'] died. The noble one still prayed the departed’s funeral prayer and was present for his burial. Bilâl Halife heard about these situations, and became the devoted follower of the shaykh.\

After confirming that Bilâl Halife did indeed become one of Şa'bân’s successors, and was buried in the village of Turhâl after being sent there to spread the order, Fu’âdî remarks that, “The great hope is that the knowledgeable one [Evliyâ Şüca’], by [means of] the breath of the noble one and his prayers, has gone to the afterlife with faith.” Nevertheless, the palpable uncertainty surrounding the ultimate fate of Evliyâ Şüca’ would not be lost on Fu’âdî’s audience, as he died before he could obtain Şa'bân’s formal forgiveness. More importantly, Fu’âdî uses the narrative in a didactic manner as well, instructing his audience as to how to deal with the growing criticism of their order and its practices in the public

\[102\] Menâkıb-i Şa'bân, pp. 67-68.
arena. The best strategy, as Șa'bân Efendi advised the more self-righteous of his dervishes, is not to lash out at their critics or engage in schadenfreude, but to forgive and attempt reconciliation with them whenever the opportunity presents itself. Some might argue that this reflected the weak position of the Halveti order in Ottoman society, in that its members dared not stick up for themselves in the political arena against respected elite scholars like Evliyâ Şucâ‘. However, the more likely explanation is that this sort of behavior allowed the dervishes to maintain an honorable high ground that was an asset in their conflicts with the anti-Sufi factions in their midst. Furthermore, vengeful competitiveness was a vice that the teaching of their path demanded they avoid if they were to achieve true mystical advancement.¹⁰³

Fu’âdî argues that this latter interpretation was sanctioned by remarks ostensibly made by the founding figure of the Halveti silsile himself, the caliph ‘Alî b. Abî Tâlib (d. 661), when he said that “Whoever does not have the practice of God, the practice of His messenger, and the practice of His saints has nothing.” Fu’âdî adds that when the caliph ‘Alî was asked in response to this statement, “What is desired from the practice of God (sunnat Allah),” he replied, “Concealment of the secret and the shameful (kitmân al-sîrr wa’l-âyb).” Fu’âdî interpreted for his audience the meaning of these words, arguing, “That person must be a concealer of secrets, be it his own secret or that of another, and must be someone who covers up shame, be it his own shame or that of another.” In other words, God Himself forbids using others’ mistakes or wrongdoing as an excuse to attack them—a policy that took

¹⁰³ Fu’âdî would reiterate this point in a chapter of one his tracts illustrating the vices to avoid on the Halveti path; see Ömer el-Fu’âdî (d. 1636), Risâle-i Muslihu’l-nefs (Istanbul, Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 614/25), which will be examined in the following chapter.
direct aim at the very foundation of the activities of those who censured and disparaged the
Sufis in the public arena. Subsequently, when ʿAlī was asked about the practice of the
Prophet, he replied “dissimulation (al-mudārât).” Fuʿâdī again interprets the Arabic
meaning of ʿAlī’s response to indicate to his audience that

...[Dissimulation] is not to inflict pain and suffering on the people who fight
[with you] and confront you in anger; it is to abandon conflict and
confrontation [in favor of] patience and forbearance. Because if a person
does not show patience and forbearance with his enemy, and intends to take
his revenge by conflict and confrontation, it increases the enmity of the
enemy and the rancor of the malicious. The tranquility of the heart departs,
and pain and suffering increase. The upstanding dervish is not he who
abandons fighting and confrontation, but rather [he who] does good to his
enemy in response to his maliciousness!

The practice of the Prophet, as interpreted by the Halveti path, therefore, is to seize the moral
high ground from one’s enemies not only by refusing to rise to the temptation of avenging
slights aimed at one’s own person and honor, but by doing good to one’s enemy in response.
This is significant when one considers how strongly embedded the culture of honor was in
pre-modern Ottoman society during this period, but it fits in well with the focus of the
Halveti path on controlling one’s own carnal desires, of which the desire for petty revenge
would be considered one. Fuʿâdī then concludes the triad of basic virtues by discussing
ʿAlī’s response to the question about the practice of the saints of God, to which ʿAlī replied,
“the bearing of suffering (ihtimâl al-adhî).” Fuʿâdī does not elaborate extensively on this

104 The importance of honor in Ottoman society is well-documented in Leslie
Peirce’s study of how the Islamic court was used in the province of Aintab during the 16th
century. In this study, Peirce finds that many of the individuals who came to court did so
not in the expectation of winning their cases, but as a means of utilizing a public forum to
maintain or defend their honor before the community; see Leslie Peirce, Morality Tales:
Law and Gender in the Ottoman Court of Aintab (Berkeley: University of California
Press, 2003), especially pp. 179 and 385-386.
aspect of the caliph’s words, saying only that “it is to be patient and endure the cruelty of the people,” and that it would require another whole tract to explain further the wealth of detail underlying this concept. He concludes by holding up Șa‘bân as the best embodiment of these three principles, pointing out that they are what saved him and his followers from his detractors, and warning that the dervishes of today would be wise to follow his example.  

Nevertheless, Șa‘bân had to be on his guard against the constant threat of harassment that the faction of censure represented. Another anecdote from a later period in his life is related by a contemporary of Fu’âdî’s, Ahmed Sâ‘atçî Efendi, about his own personal experience with Șa‘bân. He had been a student of theology in the capital, Istanbul, but while paying a visit to his home town of Kastamonu, he heard about Șa‘bân’s powers of discernment and his ability to read the inner state of others. As a result, he and a friend went to the shaykh to see for themselves if the rumors were true. Although Șa‘bân obliged them with a demonstration his spiritual powers, he also expressed his disapproval of their attempts to be clever.

As soon as we kissed the hand and sat, without even asking about our state and thoughts, he said, “It is not a good thing to test the shaykhs. Because those who want to request exoteric and esoteric help from the people of God,

---

105 The entire text of Fu’âdî’s discussion that I have outlined here was given a special section in the work entitled “The Anecdote of Hazret-i Alî,” which appears in Menâkib-i Șa‘bân, pp. 65-66. Fu’âdî clearly enjoyed employing this type of didactic strategy, in which he would ply his audience with a tradition about the Prophet and/or one of the first four caliphs, then elaborate upon that tradition to comment on the proper course of action to take in response to a problem in his own time.

106 Richard Repp defines a danişmend as a student involved in the higher education system of the day, i.e., the Sahn medrese system or anything higher than an educational institution paying its teachers a 20-akçe stipend, implying that Ahmed Sâ‘atçî Efendi was a student of some significance. However, the term is notoriously slippery in its usage. See Repp, p. 37 and n. 23.
and be satisfied on every specific point, may be held back from this wish. It is necessary to beware and fear [this] as much as unbelief.” The water was dumped on our heads [along] with the glass, and we immediately sank into the valley of shame and embarrassment. When we made our apologies and kissed the blessed hand again, he asked about our thoughts with a complete level of kindness and concern, and dispelled our embarrassment with wise words, saying, “It wasn’t [out of] vanity.”

The fact that Ahmed Efendi probably began his career in the ʿilmiye hierarchy placed him in the same position as many other scholars who were imbued with a distrust of Sufi leaders with whom they were not immediately familiar. Testing these shaykhs, as we have seen, was a common practice aimed at discrediting or embarrassing the ones who did not have the proper background, and Şaʾbân reacted accordingly, even though he treated the offending young men fairly leniently. However, Şaʾbân’s remarks had the potential to raise questions among the scholars of his day when he likened testing a shaykh to unbelief. Could the two even approach the same level of sinfulness? Even Fuʿādī was troubled by the remark, and proceeding to offer commentary on the incident to clarify the matter.

The meaning of the noble one’s saying to Şāʾtçī Efendi, “It is necessary to fear and beware as much as becoming an infidel” is attributed to warning and cautioning; otherwise, unbelief was his meaning. But his meaning is not “ṣerî ṣat unbelief.” The places of consideration on the stages of the path are many, and one of them is the four states [of] ṣerî ṣat, tarikat, maṣrifet, and hakikat. Every stage among the people of God has [a position of] both faith and unbelief. It is known to the people. If there were to be a possibility

---

107 Menâktb-ı Şaʾbân, pp. 72-73.

108 These four stages were commonly thought by the Halvetis and others to represent a basic schema of how the seeker on the path grew closer to God, starting with the exoteric aspects of the Sacred Law (ṣerî ṣat), then mastering the rules of the Sufi order’s path (tarikat), and thereafter moving into the acquisition of esoteric knowledge granted by God (maṣrifet), which finally results in a sense of certainty of one’s relationship with Him through a spiritual vision (hakikat). A modified table expressing the various stages of the Sufi path similar to what is being discussed here can be found in Tringham, pp. 152-153.
of being an infidel by testing the shaykhs, it is not being an infidel by means of ṣerîʿat unbelief. But it is being an infidel through “tarikat unbelief.” Because it means that if the shaykhs are found in a state of unity and solidarity, being friends with God, and not in the state of separateness and lacking unity [with God], then when they are not able to connect with you, and when they don’t reflect the form you want to see in their mirror, you’ll fall into censure, you’ll cover up the truth, thinking, “He’s not the perfected shaykh I wanted,” and you’ll remain blocked off from their secret, their perfection and their state, and you’ll remain a censurer and unsatisfied.¹⁰⁹

By reclassifying the nature of unbelief to limit it to transgressions committed on the Sufi path, Fu’âdî is able to recontextualize the remarks of his protagonist to achieve a less controversial meaning, limiting the transgression of the two future followers to a mere failure to uphold the rules and etiquette of the order. Still, the overall point the audience would take away from these passages was that making inquisitions to test the powers of a shaykh could have disastrous results, because the seeker would not be qualified to interpret the results, and could commit a terrible sin by falsely censuring a shaykh who did not behave in the way that the seeker expected or preferred. These anecdotes also served to bolster wavering members of the order who were being pressured by outsiders, to search for signs that Sufi leaders like Ṣaʿbân could manifest a lack of perfection. The lesson was that a lack of trust in the ability of one’s shaykh would result in a failure to achieve the desired goal on the path.

Fu’âdî also implies that the Ṣaʿbânîyye engaged in a tactical alliance with the dervishes of the Mevlevî order, who were also active in Kastamonu and its environs. While the Menâkîb-i Ṣaʿbân-ı Veli stops short of trying to establish formal historical links between the Halveti shaykh Ṣaʿbân-ı Veli and the putative founder of the Mevlevis, Celâluddîn Rûmî,

¹⁰⁹ Menâkîb-i Ṣaʿbân, p. 73.
as Muhyi-yi Gülşeni does in his hagiography of İbrâhîm-i Gülşeni, his work nevertheless recognizes the Mevlevî order as a legitimate fixture in the religious environment of the region. In one anecdote, Şa'bân refuses to allow one of his successors to complete the training of one of his dervishes, Hasan Dede.

One of the successors of Şa'bân Efendi was about to confer a turban tassel (kisve) and place it on the head of a dervish of exalted power by the name of Hasan Dede in his own lodge in the area of Tokat, when a call came from an unseen person, “Don’t put it on!” He stopped to reflect, thinking, “Is this call divine, or is it satanic?” and in his mystical contemplation he recognized that it was divine...so after abandoning the giving of the tassel, he went to Kastamonu to visit [Şa'bân] with that dervish. When they met in the cells, as soon as he gave word of this state, the sultan said: “I was the desperate one who made that call. Praise be to God that you had an ear, and you heard it.” When he was asked, “So why did you forbid it?” he replied, “This dervish will be one of the perfected people among the dervishes of Molla Hünkâr, and he will be assigned their tassel. I forbid [the girding of the Halveti tassel], so that he need not remove it afterwards.” In fact, it occurred like that by the command of God, and it is renowned that the dervish Hasan became a perfected Mevlevi, and a scholar of the Mesnevî.

One could interpret this as being a way to keep the Halveti order from being spoiled by another turncoat, but the friendly tone of the anecdote toward Hasan Dede and his ultimate goal indicates that this was not a threat on the order of that posed by renegades who established their own silsiles, as discussed previously. Adding to this demonstration of Şa'bân’s ability to prognosticate future events, Fu‘âdî includes the story of an abortive...

---

110 The first chapter of Muhyi-yi Gülşeni’s hagiography of İbrâhîm-i Gülşeni explicitly seeks to link İbrâhîm’s career with that of Mevlânâ Celâluddîn Rûmî by demonstrating how certain poetic couplets from Rûmî’s Mesnevî predicted the subsequent appearance of İbrâhîm; see Muhyi-yi Gülşeni, Menâktb-i İbrâhîm-i Gülşeni, pp. 8-12.

111 Ibid., p. 79. The Mesnevî is the greatest poetic work of Celâluddîn Rûmî, widely viewed as the founder and central figure in the Mevlevî order among the Ottomans.
attempt at the pilgrimage to Mecca by a Mevlevi contemporary, Mehmed Urgâncızâde, who clearly had friendly relations with the Halvetis of the order established by Şa'bân and his successors in Fu’âdî’s own time.

...[Mehmed said:] “When we reached the province (vilâyet) of Reşîd [to the east of Kastamonu], in that city we ran into an ecstatic mystic famed in those parts for unveiling [the unseen]. My companion, in order to take the breath of that ecstatic by way of an augury, said: ‘Poor one, I am going on the noble pilgrimage. I wonder, will my pilgrimage be blessed, and will I be guided to the pilgrimage this year?’ He replied with the manifestation of his favor, ‘Go to it; let it be blessed.’ Afterwards, when [my companion] requested an augury also for [me] and said, ‘What do you say about this dervish?’ he looked at my face and said, ‘For this one Şa'bân Efendi’s favor is sufficient.’ When it was asked, ‘Which Şa'bân Efendi’s [favor]’ he said, ‘The Şa'bân Efendi who is buried in his own land of Kastamonu!’ By the command of God most high, this poor one [Mehmed] fell ill and was not guided to the pilgrimage [in] this year. I came back to Kastamonu.”

Fu’âdî concludes Mehmed’s anecdote with his own final remark:

He was never absent from contemplation and remembrance, and zeal and experiencing [God] in order to perfect [his] state in the circle of the zikr and other places of purity in the lodge of Şa'bân Efendi, thinking, “My pilgrimage was [to] this place.”

Some might find it odd that a Mevlevi dervish would participate so actively in the rites of another order while nevertheless maintaining his status as a Mevlevi; however, the two Sufi orders seemed to be closely linked in Kastamonu. Abdülbâki Gölpnarlı has noted that parts of the performance of the Şa'bânîyye zikr in Kastamonu show the influence of Mevlevi practices. Part of this may just be the general movement within some branches of the

---

112 Ibid., p. 78.

113 Abdülbâki Gölpnarlı, Mevlânâ’dan Sonra Mevlevilik, 2nd ed. (İstanbul: Gül Matbaası, 1983), p. 319. He also notes close connections between the Mevlevis in the capital and a much later descendant of the Şa'bânîyye branch of the order, Nasûhî Efendi, about whom more will be said in Chapter 4.
Halveti order toward a closer relationship with the legacy of Rûmî, as exemplified by the Gülşenî branch of the order in Egypt. It may also have represented the desire of the members of the two orders to join forces in defending their ritual practices against anti-Sufi factions in their society. However, Kastamonu was the site of a major Mevlevi lodge, ranked sixth in importance behind those of Konya, Bursa, Eskişehir, Gelibolu, and Aleppo. In spite of this fact, we do not have much information on the activities of the Mevlevi order in Kastamonu or of its nature, although it seems that the connections between the two orders persisted well into the 18th century. Given some of the other anecdotes expressing feelings that tend more in the direction of hostility toward, or at best a wary and limited form of cooperation with, other Sufis, even those who were members of the other branches of the Halveti order like Mahmûd Efendi of the Sünbüliyye, the Şa'bâniyye seem to have had a

---

114 Ibid., p. 334. Gölpınarlı explains that the Mevlevi institutions were divided into âsitânês and zâviyes, with the shaykhs of the former taking precedence over those of the latter. Unfortunately, aside from the references given by Fu’âdî, we do not have much information on the Kastamonu branch of the Mevlevi order in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Reşat Öngören includes only a couple of Mevlevi shaykhs for the sixteenth century, and does not discuss any Kastamonu references; see Öngören, pp. 205-218. Nor does Necdet Yılmaz’s more detailed list of Mevlevi shaykhs in the 17th century include any information about Kastamonu-based Mevlevi activities, with the exception of Kârî Ahmed Dede (d. 1679). Interestingly enough, Kârî Ahmed Dede was the son of an unnamed Halveti shaykh in Kastamonu, so we cannot rule out the possibility, albeit a distant one, that he was related to Fu’âdî or one of his successors. He went on to become head of the Mevlevihane in Istanbul’s Yenikapı district, and was linked with other Halveti shaykhs during his career there; see Necdet Yılmaz, Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf, pp. 280-281. The lack of information that we have for this period demonstrates the lack of source material on Sufi orders in the Ottoman provincial cities, and underscores the importance of Fu’âdî’s work in informing us in detail about that particular world.
strong independent streak that led them to stake out a distinct position in the religious and political milieu of their time.\textsuperscript{115}

2.6 The Foundation of the Şa ˙bânîyye Tekke and the Establishment of a New Branch of the Halveti Order in Kastamonu

It is not clear when Şa ˙bân decided to leave his preaching career to withdraw to a more secluded life, although we know that age and disillusionment with his public presence played a role in his decision. In addition, the pressures of censure from anti-Halveti factions, along with his struggles with wayward followers, may have figured in his retreat from a more public presence in the religious life of Kastamonu. However, another major incident also played a key role in making him reconsider his options. We know from the Menâkıb-ı Şa ˙bân that a disastrous and destructive fire wiped out much of the town of Kastamonu sometime in the mid-16\textsuperscript{th} century, and Şa ˙bân read into that event a divine message recalling him to the original task with which he had felt he was divinely charged.

...In the Atâbey Gazi quarter a fire broke out by the command of God. The wind lifted a burning piece of wood from one of the houses that burned, and burned the city from one end to another, up to the Honsâlâr mosque.\textsuperscript{116} Its pulpit and roof being [made of] wood, it caught fire more easily on a summer day, and it couldn’t be stopped. When half the city, along with the blessed cells of the mosque, were burnt, his pleasure was secreted in sorrow, and

\textsuperscript{115} Such fractiousness was, in fact, not uncommon in the history of various leaders of the Halveti order even beyond Şa ˙bân’s practices, as noted by Nathalie Clayer in the context of a broader discussion of whether or not the Halveti can even be theoretically approached as a unified whole. See Clayer, Mystiques, état et sociétié, p. 28.

\textsuperscript{116} From this we know that the fire’s range and destructiveness were substantial, as the Atâbey Gazi quarter lay in the oldest part of the city just east of the fortress in the center of town, and it would have moved northward through the settled part of the city up to Kastamonu’s Honsâlâr mosque on the northwestern edge of town. See the map in Eyüpgiller, p. 220.
saying, “The command and judgment belongs to God,” he said to his faithful lovers who wanted to rebuild the cells by [means of] allusion and a sign, “Let them not be rebuilt; there is a command of God in the fire. Let a home be bought for me in the area of the Seyyid Sünnetî mosque in Hisârardî. Because I am that guardian of the secret of Seyyid Sünnetî....The will of God is in our going to that place.” In short, they could not dispute his words, and the houses were bought through the action of Eyyüb Halife, father of Samed Halife, which are now the lodge of the four corners of the world and the tomb full of light, and as soon as he went to the other world he died [in the Sünnetî mosque].

The description of this tragic event in Kastamonu’s history demonstrates how things had changed since Şa’bân’s arrival in Kastamonu. During the reign of Sultan Süleyman, the town itself had expanded both in population and in area, and now reached as far as the old Seyyid Sünnetî mosque. In addition, Şa’bân had acquired followers of some financial means who were able to purchase real estate and homes in the area of the mosque to which to relocate the head of the new and growing branch of the order. The fire undoubtedly changed the dynamics of settlement and population in the city, as newly-homeless citizens were forced to relocate, at least temporarily, to the parts of the city that had not burned. All of this allowed Şa’bân to establish a place strictly for himself and his order, as opposed to the now-damaged Honsâlâr mosque, which he had shared with others. The stage was

117 Menâkıb-ı Şa’bân, pp. 68-69.

118 Eyüpgiller provides a diagram illustrating the growth of the city from Byzantine times up through the beginning of the twentieth century that illustrates this point, although he does not specify exactly when the growth in various parts of the city occurred during the early Ottoman period of Kastamonu’s history (defined as 1461 through the seventeenth century). See Eyüpgiller, p. 56.

119 We know from the mühimme defterleri that shortly after Fu’âdî’s birth in the year 1560, the small mosque that Seyyid Sünnetî had built was expanded into a larger mosque that could accommodate the Friday prayer, which confirms the narrative in the Menâkıb-ı Şa’bân as historically accurate. See Eyüpgiller, p. 107 and n. 422.
therefore set for the final establishment of the focal point around which the future followers of the Şa'bâniyye branch of the Halveti order would congregate after his death.

While Şa'bân had made significant progress in Kastamonu through his years of struggle in establishing a branch of the order, the descriptions in the anecdotes of the problems he faced, ranging from wayward followers to attacks on the legitimacy of Sufism itself, suggest that the order’s existence was still tenuous. It seems, however, that the years leading up to Şa'bân’s death contributed to the strength of his following, albeit in modest ways. Fu’âdî does not shy away from relating the miraculous acts of grace that his protagonist manifested during the final years of his life, but offers only a smattering of them, most of which lack grandiosity. Indeed, many of them reflect the walks of life that were represented in Kastamonu during the latter half of the sixteenth century. Still, Şa'bân and Fu’âdî both shared an aversion to playing up the miraculous aspects of saintly powers as distracting from the real issues that the believers should be focusing on. In the most spectacular manifestation of divine grace that Fu’âdî includes in the abridged hagiography, he utilizes an anecdote not just to demonstrate Şa'bân’s powers, but to express concern about the danger inherent in them.

One day a young merchant came with sheep and linen cloth, and wanted to meet [with Şa'bân]. When the youth was asked about his circumstances, he said, “When [I was] traveling by sea, by command of God a storm blew up. While making vows to God, I also requested help from the noble one, and said, ‘My true one, Şa'bân Dede, if you are a real saint, with the aid of God reach out to us!’ With the power of God most high a hand appeared, gave a smack to our boat, and turned it to one side, and from the front it grabbed the side and straightened that boat there out like an arrow, and when we arrived at the place which was desired, the hand disappeared. This is the reason for our being saved from calamity. And many people on the boat saw this and vowed an offering.” When he revealed the secret which had appeared from the power of the Pole [of the Age], the dervishes who were present took him outside in confidence and said, “Young man, don’t ever say this again;
there’s no acceptance for it.” Then the dervish doorkeeper had him meet the noble one in the inner cells, and as soon as he kissed his hand, he warned him with a blessed prayer, saying, “Lamb, why are you revealing our secret? Haven’t you heard the saying, ‘Did you see the camel, I didn’t even see a small one?’” After that, no one ever took a response from his mouth about this again.121

Given the tone in which the young merchant beseeches Şa‘bân Efendi, we might wonder why he isn’t also criticized for lacking the proper amount of faith in his saint. However, Şa‘bân’s major complaint is with the youth’s public proclamations of the saint’s assistance to him.

Given the existence and potential prominence of anti-Sufi and anti-Halveti forces in the region, Halveti leaders like Şa‘bân had to walk a fine line on the issue of their miraculous powers. Increasingly, rather than display such powers openly like the Sufi leaders of earlier times, they demanded that they be kept secret.122 This guaranteed that a certain tension would exist between the hagiographer and his subject, as Fu‘âdî clearly felt that he could not

---

120 This is a variation on an idiomatic stock phrase in Turkish, Deve gördün mü? Kuçuğun dahi görmedim. It is used in a context of attempting to avoid admitting all knowledge or responsibility for a given event. It perhaps derives originally from a phrase uttered by a pre-Islamic Arab tribal figure who used the expression to forswear responsibility for a tribal feud.

121 Menâktb-i Şa‘bân, pp. 69-70.

122 Elements of this point of view in fact appear as early as the 13th century, if not earlier, and are not completely novel ideas. In a discussion of how Ibn al-‘Arabî viewed his predecessor ʿAbd al-Qâdir al-Jîlânî (d. 1166), William Chittick notes that Ibn al-‘Arabî did not have any problems with ʿAbd al-Qâdir’s production of miracles and wondrous occurrences. Nevertheless, he implicitly criticized him vis-à-vis his colleague Abû’s-Suûd Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn al-Shibl. Ibn al-‘Arabî made the argument that since Abû’s-Suûd was more circumspect in his demeanor and did not take on a public role to the extent that his master did, he in fact superseded him in his advancement on the mystical path. See William C. Chittick, The Self-Disclosure of God: Principles of Ibn al-‘Arabî’s Cosmology (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998), pp. 376-386.
produce an effective document for his audience without highlighting at least some of the acts of grace that Şa‘bân manifested. Nevertheless, he treats this episode with a considerable amount of caution, and appends to the story of the youth his own commentary on the result of his encounter with the saint.

...If they know that he is a real saint and that his acts of grace are true, they know that it will be lost if they reveal it. Because of this, they are wary of revealing secrets. But as soon as there is a liar and deceiver who has no source for his act of grace, he wants to sell acts of grace and spread the secret in every place for the acquisition of money and the other aims of the corrupt. May the secret of the true saints be pure!  

It is here that Fu‘âdî reveals the other side of the problem that members of the Halveti order faced in their everyday lives.

While the censuring of the anti-Halveti and anti-Sufi factions was troublesome enough, those who sought to engage in questionable practices were even worse, because they corrupted the cult of saints by misusing the qualities of the saints, and misrepresenting the point of sainthood. He makes this even clearer after another anecdote about ‘Osmân Efendi, Şa‘bân Efendi’s eventual successor to the leadership of the order after his death. When ‘Osmân came one day from Tokat, where he had been sent, to visit Şa‘bân, he came to the door of the cell, stopped short, then turned around and left. Some bystanders saw that he didn’t go in and asked him why he didn’t knock at the door and enter. He told them that “the jinn have come to the master; they are discussing a dream-vision and talking about other intellectual issues. I was too polite to enter.” Fu‘âdî adds to ‘Osmân’s remark:

Some of the 360 successors of [Şa‘bân] had been given the ability to perfect the jinn, according to their station, from God; and they made the successorship prayer for them to be given spiritual dispensation over the

\[\text{\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., p. 70.}\]
A vefk is a small amulet marked off in the form of a grid, with each square having some sort of name, word, or number inscribed in it. If properly drawn up and maintained, such squares were thought to have protective powers, as we have seen in the story of Shaykh Vefâ’ and his protégé in the struggle for succession to Sultan Mehmed II. Perhaps aware of this issue, Fu’âdî does not deny the legitimacy of this magical practice outright.

Fu’âdî’s remarks reveal that forms of “pseudo-Sufism” and magical practices competed with the cult of saints among the general population, and he sought to deny their legitimacy vis-à-vis the more religiously sanctioned ways of dealing with the serious problems of everyday life. In narratives like these, we realize that Fu’âdî used the acts of grace of the founder of his order as an important tool; otherwise, more credulous members of the public would go to those who promised them a more immediate solution to their problems. The implication behind his final statement is that perhaps some of the renegades from Şa’bân’s order chose to take up such practices as a way of boosting their own standing, or as a shortcut to fame and increased prosperity in preference to the ideals embodied in the order. In the Menâkıb-i Şa’bân, we see an author who has to walk a tightrope between questionable forms of popular

---

124 A vefk is a small amulet marked off in the form of a grid, with each square having some sort of name, word, or number inscribed in it. If properly drawn up and maintained, such squares were thought to have protective powers, as we have seen in the story of Shaykh Vefâ’ and his protégé in the struggle for succession to Sultan Mehmed II. Perhaps aware of this issue, Fu’âdî does not deny the legitimacy of this magical practice outright.

125 Menâkıb-i Şa’bân, pp. 89-90.
practice and folk magic, and an ever-watchful scholarly class that looked to seize on any
evidence of questionable doctrine as a way of eliminating the order from the religious life
of the community.

Perhaps because of his awareness of this problem, Fu’âdî offers corroborating
accounts of the “invisible hand” of Şa‘bân Efendi in other contexts as well. One of these he
relates from one of his neighbors, a pious woman by the name of Şehri Hoca, who was the
wife of Fu’âdî’s contemporary and fellow dervish İbrâhîm Dede. One day, noting that
Şa‘bân had somehow injured his hand,

...[she] prepared a salve, saying, “A wound appeared on the inside of the
hand of Şa‘bân Efendi.” As soon as it was asked, “What kind of wound?”
she said, “God knows.” After a time a person came like the aforementioned
youth and revealed the secret. While [he was] traveling by sea, an infidel
boat came and while fighting, he requested an act of grace from the shaykh
in return for a vow to God. As soon as he said, “My true one Şa‘bân Dede,
reach out to us with the help of God,” a hand appeared opposite him and the
shot from the cannon hit that hand with a puff of smoke. He said, “I knew
that hand was the blessed hand of Şa‘bân Dede, and by the command of God
he blocked the shot of the cannon from this poor one.”

What we see here is a probable variation on the first narrative involving the young merchant
as it spread throughout the community, taking on embellished forms and alternative
caracterizations through oral transmission. Since it suits his purpose of establishing this
power of protection that Şa‘bân could employ in the defense of those who called on him for
extraordinary aid, Fu’âdî is happy to exploit the multiple manifestations of the narrative. He
went on to add a third narrative, as well, in which a builder from the quarter in which Şa‘bân
lived, Muhyiddîn Esendîloğu, overhears a man who came to thank Şa‘bân for helping him
out of a tight spot.

...He said, “My Sultan, may God most high be pleased with you. I was
lifting a millstone with my companion in the quarry at İlgaz mountain, and
while [I was] standing it up on its side and crafting it into a millstone, it toppled over and went into a stream bed from which it could not be lifted out. When it happened, I requested help from God most high and help and succor from you, saying, ‘My true one, Şa‘bân Dede, if you’re a real saint, grab it!’ By the command of God, a hand appeared and with a slap the stone was lying on its side. I knew right away that hand was yours. You were kind and appeared for our trouble.” The noble one was completely embarrassed and said, “Hey man, what are you saying? What word have I of this? Power and the hand of ability are God’s. This state that you speak of is not ours,” and he rejected [the man’s] words vehemently in order to preserve his state and secret. He sent him away from the gathering and when [the man] went out this poor one [Muhyiddîn] said to him, “Hey stupid man, haven’t you seen anything at all? Is this type of thing said to these people?”

In the end, like the other stock characters in the previous two narratives, the hapless stoneworker in this tale was called back later in private, forgiven, and told to keep his mouth shut. Nevertheless, all of the anecdotes revolve around the elements of the same call to God through his intercessor, Şa‘bân Efendi, and the refusal of Şa‘bân to accept responsibility for the miraculous solution of the various problems publicly, while allowing a quiet resolution subsequently, allowing the act of grace to be admitted in secret after the proper criticism had sunk in.

While the more spectacular and supernatural act of grace for which Şa‘bân was famous had to be handled with considerable care through the multiple narratives that the hagiographer compiled, other acts of grace that the shaykh performed were much more down-to-earth. One anecdote Fu‘âdî recalls from his own childhood gives us a nice insight into how Şa‘bân’s female followers, including Fu‘âdî’s own mother and sister, related to their shaykh.

...My now-deceased mother’s sister was sick, and her head hurt greatly. For a long time, prayers were [both] read [aloud] and written out, and doctors

---

126 Both this and the aforementioned narrative appear in ibid., pp. 70-72.
also tried to remedy it, but a cure was never found. One day my mother consulted with my father, and they came to the sultan with pure belief, saying, “Whenever the Pole of Poles whose prayers are accepted, Șâ’bân Efendi, does not pray, it won’t get better.” They met in his cell with eight women among the notable members [of the community] (erbâb-i hâcet)\textsuperscript{127}, and several of the women requested only a prayer without explaining or disclosing their wishes, and [Șa‘bân] recited only the Fatiha.\textsuperscript{128} When it came the turn of my now deceased mother, the noble one didn’t just recite the Fatiha; he also lifted up his blessed kisve-tassel with his right hand and rubbed his blessed forehead once with his blessed hand. He recited the Fatiha [together] with this sign. Before my now-deceased mother could return to the house, her sister’s headache had completely gone, and it was confirmed and known that she was completely cured.\textsuperscript{129}

The ability to cure sickness and avert chronic illness is a necessary sign of Halveti sainthood to which Fu’âdî can bear personal witness. Still, one cannot help but note the absence of male figures at this gathering, with the possible exception of Fu’âdî’s father.\textsuperscript{130} It may be that while the patriarchal figures in these households were away on business or traveling to other places in the region, their wives relied on Șa‘bân as a means of protection for both their husbands and themselves. Unfortunately, the anecdote allows us to do little more than speculate on these issues, as Fu’âdî does not elaborate fully on any additional context for this

\textsuperscript{127} It is unfortunate that the Menâkþ is not more specific on who these individuals were, but the point of the anecdote suggests that at this late stage of his life, Șa‘bân had become an important figure in the community. The term may refer to members of the community involved in trade or running some kind of business.

\textsuperscript{128} The opening seven verses in the first chapter of the Qur’ân. Many Halveti shaykhs and other pious figures in Muslim societies recite this verse as a way of blessing those seeking their assistance.

\textsuperscript{129} Menâkþ-i Șa‘bân, p. 80.

\textsuperscript{130} Given the structure of the language in the anecdote, it is not out of the question that he was merely involved in the decision to seek Șa‘bân’s help, and subsequently did not actually attend the ladies’ session with Șa‘bân occurs in the anecdote. This raises the interesting possibility that Șa‘bân met separately with his female devotees.
event. Nevertheless, it does suggest, along with a number of the other narratives we have covered so far, that a substantial portion of Şa'bân’s clientele consisted of well-to-do members of the community with some standing and that they often occupied privileged positions in the accounts that Fu’âdî chose for the abridged hagiography. This may be a product of Fu’âdî’s own background as the descendant of some of these well-to-do members of the community who served as his primary informants. However, it may also suggest that Şa'bân’s following in the years before his death may have consisted primarily of a core circle of upper middle-class Kastamonu citizenry. Despite imbalances in the gender breakdown in the narratives, one should not neglect the fact that an important part of this base of support consisted of the women of the community. It is perhaps not surprising that as the events in the narrative begin to draw closer to the period of Fu’âdî’s own childhood, he begins to draw on women’s narrative contributions to Şa'bân’s legacy, probably through his own female relations on his mother’s side.

This is not to say that poorer or wealthier members of the community did not recognize the value of Şa'bân’s growing order in their community in seeking help for their own troubles. While a herdsman from the early part of Şa'bân’s career may have found him a bit strange or off-putting, others looked to him later on for salvation from the various personal crises which afflicted them. Fu’âdî chose a remarkably insightful anecdote that indicates how the process worked, or could work for an undecided audience member listening to the narrative.

It is related that one day a trustworthy and impoverished farm laborer, without compare in pure belief among the upstanding lovers of the noble one, came into the noble presence [of Şa'bân Efendi]. He said, “My sultan, I had a donkey. By God’s command it died. I am a man with a wife and children. I have to come on foot, and I am without remedy. Please pray a blessed
prayer for me, that God does not force me to ask help from despicable people, and He will grant livestock (davâr) with your prayer and kindness, and let Him save [us] from hopelessness.” Knowing about his pure belief, [Şaʿbân] raised his hand and prayed, and said, “Be patient, brother, let God give.” The following day a sipahi¹³¹ brought a yellow mule as an offering. After the shaykh prayed for its acceptance [by God as an offering], he said, “Let the person whose donkey died and who requested a prayer come.” When that poor person came, he submitted the mule to the poor one and said by means of advice and admonishment, “Take now, poor one; God most high gave a mule in place of the donkey from the treasury of the unseen on account of your belief in charity, and your pure belief in the kindness and breath of the saints and good men. By seeking help from this station, you found this once again at the door of God. You won’t be forced to seek help from undesirables. Be grateful for the blessing, and be a true servant to God most high.” That sipahi, who was present there, was astonished, and exclaimed, “Glory be to God (subhânullah)!” When asked about his astonishment, he said, “My mule was born in a group of animals; I vowed one to the noble one as the share [belonging to] God, but I didn’t hurry in bringing it. I was going to see to some of my affairs in the city tomorrow and bring it then, but a greater urgency overcame my heart and I brought it today. It had an ultimate cause (hikmet)!”¹³²

In this case, Şaʿbân is able to play the role of an intermediary between the overseer of a military landholding and a poor farmer who is in danger of losing his livelihood due to bad luck, redirecting the charity offered by the wealthier members of society to those in need. While the wealthier and more powerful members of society may sometimes have provided for those less fortunate out of personal piety, in most cases they probably did not have the time or inclination to go out and solve individual problems. In addition, the rules of social etiquette probably limited the amount of meaningful interaction people would have with those who were not of their own rank in the social hierarchy, or within their own household

¹³¹ For a summary of the historical development of the role of sipahi, the cavalrymen who were involved in the administration of the sub-units of Ottoman provinces to the end of the sixteenth century, see Imber, Ottoman Empire, 1300-1650, pp. 193-206.

¹³² Menâkıb-ı Şaʿbân, p. 84.
or patronage network. Şâbân, having devoted his life to the ideal of charitable giving and the practice of not valuing material goods, could act as a sort of pre-modern charity for the people of the community, rewarding those who followed the basic principles of the religion with necessary assistance as a lender of last resort. While Fu’âdî liked to claim that his mentor was so generous that he was “never able to rub two akçe coins together,” these narratives suggest that valuables came into the order in equal measure to their expenditure.¹³³

Poor farmers were not the only ones who could benefit from the order’s largesse in a period of personal crisis. Another contemporary of Fu’âdî’s, a maker of bellows for the metal forges in Kastamonu by the name of Köürükçü Kelle Mustafa, used to recite the same story over and over again in any gathering in which the subject of debt and owing money came up.

I owed a debt of 1,200 akçe [silver coins] to someone. When it was too stressful and difficult, I sought money [given] as a good deed with a thousand thanks from my wealthy friends, and sought [a loan] with interest from others.¹³⁴ When it was not possible to get [money] from anyone, in the end I turned to God, and as soon as I said, “O lord of the worlds, if there is a cure for me it is surely from you; out of reverence for your prophets and saints, your help is necessary for me,” the Pole of the World Şâbân Efendi came into my mind by God’s inspiration. Thus, I came to his noble presence to take his prayer, and when I announced my situation, he lifted up the carpet he was sitting on and said, “There’s a little money there; take it.” I stretched out a hand and took it. But I was embarrassed to take all of it. Knowing that I did not take it all [despite] the darkness of the cell, he said, “Take it all. God most high sent it for you; it’s all yours.” The poor one [Mustafa] took all of it and put it into a kerchief. He raised up his hand and prayed. Afterwards I counted it, and it was the exact same amount of akçe as my

¹³³ Ibid., p. 82.

¹³⁴ Meaning he sought both no-interest loans from friends and interest-bearing loans from moneychangers.
In the age of high inflation that the Ottoman Empire had begun to enter at the close of Sultan Süleyman’s reign, Halveti notables like Şa‘bân often gained a certain degree of respect simply by acting as the bank of last resort for otherwise productive citizens who had fallen into arrears by some means. In return, they would receive followers like Kelle Mustafa, who would voluntarily act as free publicity, proclaiming their good deeds and renown. Of course, if one had asked Şa‘bân about the reasoning behind his giving, he would merely have explained that this was an integral part of the Halveti path and that he sought no earthly reward for it. Nevertheless, these types of incidents clearly did bring worldly as well as otherworldly rewards, in the form of support, popular acclaim, and defense of the Halveti order, its principles, and its leaders, a process that was best exemplified in a poetic couplet that Fu’âdî cited in his description of Şa‘bân’s extraordinary generosity: “If the shaykh is enamored of money, the hope of the disciple is that salary • The king of the dinar is not always the king of insight (didâr).”

This was not the only form of networking in which the Halveti order’s leaders could engage. Their principles of hospitality in housing travelers, as exemplified in the events that led up to Şa‘bân’s own initiation into the Halveti path, made them excellent sources of knowledge about the wider Ottoman world and even beyond. Fu’âdî notes a number of anecdotes in which several of Kastamonu’s denizens travel abroad, either on the pilgrimage

---

135 Menâkıb-ı Şa‘bân, p. 85.

136 Ibid., p. 83. Read maçaş for the erroneous printing of mabâş in the printed text.
to Mecca or to other parts of Anatolia, and encounter people who ask them about Şa‘bân and seek news of him. Even after his death, his followers were sometimes able to exploit these connections in faraway places. A trio of Kastamonu pilgrims, one of whom was Şa‘bân’s successor, traveled to Egypt many years after his death on the way to Mecca. When they stopped to visit one of the tombs of the local saints there, however, they were suddenly accosted by a mystic they found waiting there for them.

Within the noble tomb we saw a person from the evlâdı Ārab who was wearing white clothes and was in the world of mystical contemplation. As soon as all of us came in the door of the tomb, he lifted up his head and saw us, and shouted once with longing. He came before us eagerly, saying, “Noble ones who come from the true saint Şa‘bân Efendi in Rûm, come hither!” When he asked, “Has any one among you seen the blessed beauty of that sultan?,” Hâfız ‘Alî Efendi, having seen [Şa‘bân] at the time of his youth, informed him of his characteristics. He kissed his eyes with sincerity, and honored and ennobled all of us greatly.

Another informant who was a successor to Benli Sultan told Fu’âdî about another event that had occurred in the distant past, when an unnamed shaykh in Khurasan had a vision of Şa‘bân Efendi in Anatolia while in an ecstatic state, and sent two dervishes to Kastamonu to investigate, telling them, “Go and visit and gaze into the mirror of beauty, and see what form appears [there].” When they arrived in Kastamonu and requested a meeting with Şa‘bân Efendi, he never emerged; he merely handed a mirror to one of his own dervishes and

---

137 It is important to recognize that this term is not necessarily used to refer to an individual of Arab descent, but has multiple meanings within the Ottoman context of the 16th-18th centuries. In this case, it most likely is used to distinguish a local resident from the visitors from Rûm. See Jane Hathaway, “The Evlâdı Ārab (‘Sons of the Arabs’) in Ottoman Egypt: A Rereading,” in In Frontiers of Ottoman Studies: State, Province and the West, vol. 1, eds. Colin Imber and Keiko Kiyotaki (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005). pp. 203-216.

138 Menâkıb-ı Şa‘bân, pp. 77-78.
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told him to give the two visitors the mirror and they would understand. The two dervishes departed as quickly as they had come, recognizing the allusion immediately. Fu’âdî uses the occasion to denounce once more the censurers of Şa'bân Efendi and the Halveti order, complaining that while knowledgeable mystics were able to understand the signs of sainthood in a glance, these simple signs were obscured to his detractors by their own vanity and delusions of grandeur.\textsuperscript{139} The narrative itself is suspect due to its trope-filled nature, as the Khurasanî mystics, hidden away in a distant realm at the farthest reaches of the Safavid polity, were often introduced as justification for purported far-flung worldly travels of Ottoman Sufî shaykhs.\textsuperscript{140} In addition, the use of a mirror as a symbol of the acquisition of mystical and philosophical knowledge is widespread in the history of Islamic literature. Still, Fu’âdî uses these anecdotes to stress the theory of Ibn al-'Arabî about the hierarchy of saints that make up the hidden substructure of both the seen and unseen worlds, and how the follower (or potential follower) of the Halveti shaykhs could take advantage of this far-flung network of God’s friends.

The pillars (evtâd) which are among the men of the unseen (ricâl-i gayb) are four [in number]. They also call them “the four men,” and the budalâ’, who are seven [in number], and the nücebâ’, who are 40 [in number], and the nukabâ’, who are three [in number].\textsuperscript{141} And all the rest of the men of God are

\textsuperscript{139} The anecdote and Fu’âdî’s discussion occur in ibid., pp. 76-77, and again in the Türbenâme section of the work, pp. 180-182.

\textsuperscript{140} For the influence of the culture of Sufism in Khurasan and Transoxiana in the development of Sufi literature among the Turks, see Ocak, Kültür Tarihi Kaynağt olarak Menâkıbınâmeler, p. 13.

\textsuperscript{141} It is notable here that Fu’âdî’s conception of the various ranks of sainthood found in the hierarchy of the unseen world does not follow that of Ibn al-'Arabî himself, as Ibn al-'Arabî labels the nukabâ’ as being twelve in number, following al-Qur’ân, 5: 12, and the nücebâ’ as being eight in number, in addition to reversing their order in the
hierarchy. By Fu’âdî’s time, it seems that aspects of this categorization had undergone some degree of modification in different branches of the order, thereby calling into question the extent to which we can assume any given Ottoman Sufi order’s conception of the complexity of Ibn al-‘Arabî’s teachings. See the description of Ibn al-‘Arabî’s cosmology in Chodkiewicz, esp. pp. 96-98 and 103-104. In fact, Fu’âdî’s description here does not even correspond fully with the account given in Oğuz, pp. 46-48, where he claims the *nukabâ*’ are twelve in number, not three.

Here we are granted a look at how provincial Halvetis explained Ibn al-‘Arabî’s cosmology and theory of sainthood in a context that their countrymen could understand and value.

The free movement of the saints in the unseen world also raised the controversial topic of *tayy-i mekân* (miraculously moving from one place to another), which was a way in which saintly figures could transcend time and space to appear in faraway places even when they appeared to be present in their homelands. The “unseen hand” of Şâbân Efendi was one form of this manifestation, but Fu’âdî had another problem to tackle—the generally-known fact that Şâbân Efendi never completed the ritual pilgrimage to the sacred cities of the Hijâz. In discussing the final years of Şâbân’s life, Fu’âdî uses this manifestation of sainthood in an anecdote that manages to tackle both problems at the same time. An unnamed person from one of the villages near Kastamonu, having made the pilgrimage to Mecca, falls ill and is unable to travel when it comes time for his caravan to depart. Trapped and impoverished in Mecca, he longs to return home, but there is nothing he can do. At last a stranger takes pity on him, and tells him to look for an old Halveti shaykh who prays the morning prayer with the Hanefî imâm every day, on the side of the Ka’bah where the golden

---

142 *Menâkıb-i Şa’bân*, p. 79.
rainspout sticks out from its top, and grab onto the hem of his clothing before he can finish the prayer and refuse to let go, no matter how hard the shaykh pressed him to relent. When the man goes to that place, he recognizes Şa‘bân Efendi, grabs onto him and implores him for his help. After a great deal of resistance and embarrassment, Şa‘bân Efendi finally relents on the condition that he tell no one of his secrets, and tells him to close his eyes. When he opens them, the hapless villager finds himself standing before his home in his own village.143 This narrative serves a dual purpose. First of all, it offers confirmation of Şa‘bân’s ability to master the divine hierarchy and transcend any given time and place. The corollary to this is that he had no trouble fulfilling his ritual obligations, as during the final years of his life, while he appeared to be in seclusion in his cell, he was in fact praying every day in the grand mosque in Mecca.

2.7 Şa‘bân Efendi’s Death and Funeral, and Their Contribution to the Spread of the Order

One of the pivotal events in any hagiography is the death of its subject, and Fu‘âdî’s account is no exception. Some eleven pages are given to the discussion of the events surrounding Şa‘bân’s passing; along with the issues they raise, they make up nearly a sixth of the chapter devoted to Şa‘bân’s life. This comes as no surprise, because with the troubles that the order had faced during Şa‘bân’s lifetime, the succession of a new leader would be an important matter to consider. Luckily for the order’s followers, Şa‘bân himself was able to warn them of the impending transition, and smooth the way for the changes that would come.

143 The full text of this narrative appears in ibid., pp. 74-76.
When...Şa'bân Efendi was about to arrive at the heavenly world...the lovers and dervishes came into his presence. He advised and admonished everyone according to his level and state. With life-giving words, he gave enlightenment and elevation to everyone’s soul, and happiness and light to everyone’s heart. When they said, “My sultan, as soon as you go to the afterworld...what will happen to the state of the path, principles, lovers and dervishes?” he said, “Don’t be pained; refer all your states to God...Our end is more auspicious than our beginning.”

The succession itself may have been a more complicated matter. Fu’âdî is quick to indicate that Şa'bân had clearly expressed his own will about the short-term process of transition as a means of maintaining stability within the order’s leadership, and named his immediate successors.

One day, when it was asked of that mine of acts of grace and ruler of saints, Şa'bân Efendi, “Who [will take] the prayer-rug after you?” he announced the appointment with God’s inspiration, saying, “Osmân comes, and after him Hayreddîn comes.” When it was asked, “Who comes after them?” he made no appointment, [but] said “The prayer-rug will find its owner.”

The historian might be quick to dismiss this tidbit as an ex post facto justification offered by Fu’âdî to legitimize the course that the order took after Şa'bân’s death. Nevertheless, the events of Şa'bân’s life indicate that he may have wanted to avoid a succession struggle if at all possible, at least until his chosen successors had obtained the necessary time and distance to preserve the order’s teaching. However, the ever-cautious Şa'bân was not willing to engage in long-term predictions about the future, and left the order open in the long term to the most talented of the followers of his order. This would prove a wise decision.

---

144 Ibid., pp. 90-91.

145 Ibid., p. 101. This text is the introductory statement to the first of the anecdotes in the fifth and final chapter of the Menâkîb-ı Şa'bân, which describes Şa'bân’s first four successors as leaders of the order.
The anecdotes that Fu’âdî provides about the initial period after Şa’bân’s death indicate chaos, disorder, and, not surprisingly, a deep sense of depression. When Şa’bân’s followers heard of the passing of the great shaykh, they “wept and wailed with the burning of separation, and with âh and yâh sighs, their dark anguish rose to the heavens.” Another witness reported that “the sons of man were not the only ones on the face of the earth to cry; the angels, the firmament, and the sun and moon in the heavens also cried. Lightning flashed and thunder roared and all the clouds wept.” He went on to note that even after the day of Şa’bân’s burial, it rained for most of the following forty days, mirroring the prescribed period for Muslims for mourning the dead.146

Notwithstanding Şa’bân’s precautions, his death seemed to take his followers largely by surprise, as many in the area had to hurry to Kastamonu to attend the funeral. Even his appointed successor, ʿOsmân Efendi, was not able to reach Kastamonu in time for his master’s death and funeral prayers, having been based some distance away in Tokat. It seems that the funeral was even delayed until Friday afternoon to accommodate all of the comings and goings that the occasion warranted.147 Even when some semblance of order did return, to the point where the group could come together to prepare the funeral of the great saint, another controversy with political implications broke out.

146 The two separate anecdotes occur in ibid., pp. 91-92.

147 Fu’âdî indicates the degree of scrambling that took place among the saint’s followers in the immediate vicinity of Kastamonu in ibid., p. 93. Apparently, Şa’bân died on a Wednesday, meaning that his funeral was delayed for two days. Abdülkerim Abdülkadiroğlu questions whether the burial could have been delayed to take advantage of the more auspicious date on Friday, but admits he lacks the evidence to confirm or deny the reports; see Abdülkadiroğlu, p. 44.
The lovers and dervishes saw that nothing would be accomplished by crying. When they said, “The judgment is God’s, and verily we belong to God,” and set out to wash and wrap the corpse, generous and wealthy people among his lovers brought fine shrouds. While everyone was [arguing and] saying, “Let him be wrapped in the shroud that I brought!” Abdussamad Halife brought a shroud that had been dipped in the waters of Zemzem and said, “This shroud belongs to the noble one himself. I brought it as a gift when I came from the noble pilgrimage. At that time, he didn’t take it himself; he said, ‘In our path, there is no saying, ‘Take this, hide it away, and let me be wrapped in it when I die.’ In the end, God is the guarantor for the coffin, and we accepted your gift. Let it stay with you; if destiny wish it, you shall bring it and wrap [me in it].’ The right is mine.” They suspected a trick, but after they confirmed and corroborated this state of affairs with the report of trustworthy witnesses, they broke off [their insistence].

When we consider the personalities involved, this decision had considerable implications for the future of the order. Abdussamed Halife was the son of Eyüb Halife, one of Şa’bân’s first followers and one of the people primarily responsible for establishing Şa’bân’s lodge in the area near Seyyid Sünnetî’s mosque. As a result, this debate can be interpreted as a conflict over who would lay claim to the great saint’s sanctity. Would it be his closest long-term followers, who were not necessarily the sources of greatest temporal power in the community, or would it be the core of followers who came later, who appeared to be much wealthier and capable of laying a claim through their resources to a position of leadership? The broader debate lying behind the issue of Şa’bân’s shroud was resolved in favor of the former, more established membership, who had spent most of their lives in service to Şa’bân and his order. In coming to this decision, the order successfully upheld its basic principle, which was to value service to God and his religious institutions in the form of Şa’bân and

---

148 A well in the area of the sacred mosque at Mecca whose water supposedly has curative and sacred powers.

149 Menâkıb-i Şa’bân, p. 92.
his branch of the Halveti order over access to worldly sources of power and privilege, a point that Fu’âdî may have been tacitly trying to reinforce to the audience of his own time. Thus, we see that the order had successfully passed its first test after the death of its founder.

Nevertheless, this event was not a pivotal turning point of the post-Şa‘bân era in the order’s history. The death of the order’s founder, as in so many other situations pertaining to public figures in a given society, paradoxically provoked a powerful surge of interest among the local population in Kastamonu. In spite of this, however, it was not a local personage who came to play the decisive role in cementing Şa‘bân’s legacy. By coincidence, the aforementioned Muharrem Efendi, preacher at the Süleymaniye mosque complex in Istanbul and a long-time prominent religious figure, had returned to Kastamonu for a visit, and was about to make a delayed return to the Ottoman capital. In his own words, his delay in departure had been at the request of his old friend Şa‘bân himself, as he revealed to the crowd that had gathered for Şa‘bân’s funeral.

[Muharrem Efendi] said, “Muslims! When I wanted to go to Istanbul, and came to seek permission, he said, “Muharrem, brother, wait a few days, pray my [funeral] prayer, and go after that. The poor one [Muharrem] said [to himself], ‘He is not sick [to the extent that] he should die; however, he is sitting in the cell with the weakness of old age,’ and I deemed his noble request a possibility. Before 20 days had passed, this situation occurred, and what that mine of grace [and] the Lord’s wishes were, [they] are now known and established.” When he bade farewell to the people, saying, “It is forbidden for you and for me [alike that I] stay in Kastamonu,” a state appeared in him with these words of farewell...[and] they moaned and cried together like the sheep and the lamb.151

---

150 One is tempted to liken it to the surge in record sales and media coverage of musical artists who have recently died in the United States, such as that following the late rock star Kurt Cobain, the country legend Johnny Cash, or even the famed singer Barış Manço in Turkey.

151 Menâkıb-i Şa‘bân, p. 94.
Apart from the colorful rural imagery Fu’âdî uses in his allusion, which reflects his own roots in the local community, he may have taken liberties with this particular anecdote in presenting Muharrem Efendi as a disciple of Şa‘bân. It seems more likely that they were friends and contemporaries, with Muharrem possibly being the more respected of the two, at least in the perception of Kastamonu residents.

Still, Şa‘bân’s followers were fortunate to have a notable figure like Muharrem Efendi present to lead his funeral prayer. Because he was respected by the local population as a prominent local figure well-established in Istanbul’s religious and political circles, pride of place in performing the funeral prayers was gladly granted to him. His talents in public oratory did not disappoint those who ceded the task to him, as his status as a prominent political and religious figure in the broader context of the Ottoman polity proved capable of drawing a huge crowd. Not all of these local citizens were attached to the order, and many of them may not even have been aware of its existence, given the tone of the speech. Muharrem Efendi, whose own background predisposed him to support the Muslim cult of saints, took the opportunity afforded by the death of his friend and contemporary Şa‘bân to whip the large crowd into a furor over the neglect they had shown to the greatness in their midst.

The aforementioned Muharrem Efendi preached and gave advice to the people, and spoke of the virtuous ones of the order and the anecdotes of the saints on the occasion. He said about the master [Şa‘bân]: “Muslims! Şa‘bân Efendi was one of the masters who have manifested sainthood and grace from the time of the Prophet until this moment, and who are mentioned in the Tezkiretü’l-Evliyâ and other [such works], and whose states and perfection

---

152 The Tezkiretü’l-Evliyâ is a hagiography, written by Feridüddin ʿAttār (d. 1221), that contains anecdotes about 21 figures from early Islamic history (ca. 8th-10th century), not all of whom are primarily remembered as Sufis (but are perhaps co-opted as
are spoken of [there]. He was a master who would bend over the neck of his horse, and would seek in such-and-such a province thinking, ‘A good saint and a perfected guide is there,’ and he would find [him] and be satisfied and gain a share of his guidance on the path of God.” He expressed regret about [the loss of] all of the seekers, saying, “But what shall we do? We didn’t know his power. What a pity that we have lost a perfected guide like this!” He praised and lauded those who had lived long enough to [meet] the master, and those who were satisfied with the knowledge of God from him.\textsuperscript{153}

In fact, Muharrem Efendi’s funeral eulogy would prove to be a magnificent didactic tool designed to educate the crowd not only about Şa‘bân himself but about how to respond to the death of a great saint. In including a portion of the remarks that Muharrem Efendi made, Fu’âdî knew that the process Muharrem initiated during this extraordinary event would embed Şa‘bân’s legend and the order he would found in the fabric of Kastamonu’s life. Taking his cue from a story about the funeral of the great proponent of ecstatic mysticism Beyazid al-Bistâmî (d. 874), Muharrem Efendi exhorted his audience to participate not just passively, by their presence, but actively in the burial of the great saint.

Muharrem Efendi brought forth the noble corpse of Şa‘bân Efendi, and explained the virtue and laudability of praying his [funeral] prayer. He related some of the anecdotes of the saints pertaining to this situation....[and] he said: “On the night that Bayezid Bistâmî passed into the afterlife, [his successor] Ebu Mûsâ saw in a trustworthy dream-vision that he took the Exalted Throne onto his head. In fact, when Ebu Mûsâ woke up, and was bewildered by the secret of the vision and its interpretation, there came into his mind with the inspiration of God: ‘Go to Bayezid, and let him make an interpretation of the vision.’ Ebu Mûsâ came to Bistâm, but he saw Bayezid had passed into the afterlife. When Ebu Mûsâ saw the funeral procession of the noble one, he was not able to grab onto the bier on account of the crowds and great multitude of people. In the end he went under the coffin, and took

\textsuperscript{153} \textit{Menâkıb-i Şa‘bân}, pp. 93-94.
Muharrem Efendi’s use of this anecdote gives us a rare glimpse into how the great hagiographical texts that were a part of Ottoman religious life during its heyday were used in preaching to the general population and exhorting them to some course of action. By citing the basic text of an anecdote from a recognized source like the Tezkiretü’l-Evliyâ illustrating how to act at the time of a great Sufi’s funeral, he succeeded in guaranteeing the enthusiasm and active participation of the crowd in Șa’bân’s funeral procession. This experience and the state of excitement that this generated amongst his audience when they emulated the experience of Ebu Mûsâ would make the event in which they were about to participate become a great and memorable episode in their lives.

To underscore the value of their participation and leave no illusions about the benefits, Muharrem Efendi, drawing on his experiences with the Bayrâmî shaykhs, went on to recite the story of an ordinary farmer who had an extraordinary experience after attending the funeral of Hacı Bayrâm.

The day that Hacı Bayrâm Sultan went to the afterlife, a farmer came to the city of Ankara to get a plowshare repaired. He saw there was no one in the

---

154 Ibid., pp. 94-95.

155 The basic text of the anecdote to which Muharrem Efendi referred appears in somewhat abbreviated form in the aforementioned edited text of the Tezkiretü’l-Evliyâ, p. 207 (fols. 229b-230a).

156 Muharrem Efendi’s connections with the Bayrâmî order before he came to Istanbul to take up his position at the Süleymaniye are discussed in ʿAtâʾi, v. 2, p. 355.
shops; instead, they had gone to the funeral prayer of Hacı Bayrâm....He hung the plowshare around his waist and went to the funeral prayer also. Afterwards, the ironworkers put the plowshare into the forge, and while they worked hard, they couldn’t get it hot, and they stood surprised and bewildered. They informed the chief judge and the müfti. They also were stupefied....In the end, when they informed a noble one...who was a person having secret knowledge from the successors of Hacı Bayrâm, he asked with the inspiration of God, “Where did you take the plowshare?” As soon as that person gave word that he was present at Hacı Bayrâm’s funeral prayer and that the plowshare was with him, that noble one among the people of states solved the problem. He explained in pure belief, saying, “It is a sign that he who prayed the funeral prayer of Hacı Bayrâm Sultan will not burn in the fiery wood of hell, due to the sanctity of that master.” At that point, Muharrem Efendi exhorted [the audience] to the funeral prayer of Şa‘bân Efendi, saying, “In reality, Muslims, it is like that!”

The powerful images that this anecdote evoked among a rural population then sparked a response for which perhaps even Muharrem Efendi was not prepared. A near-riot erupted as the devotees of the order sought to take Şa‘bân’s body to the slab at which his funeral prayer would be prayed at the conclusion of Muharrem Efendi’s eulogy. ‘Ömer el-Fu‘âdî, then only nine years of age, goes on to relate and relive for his audience the events that were burned forever into his memory from that day, and how the mobs had incorporated the elements of Muharrem Efendi’s speech into a very public form of participation.

All the people of the land even brought their little children, and while there was so much desire and inclination to perform the noble one’s funeral prayer, their desire was increased [even more] by Muharrem Efendi’s words, and there was a great crowd and throng as in the funeral prayers of Hacı Bayrâm Sultan and Bayezîd Bistâmî. My now-deceased father made [me] come to [Şa‘bân’s] funeral prayer when I was a child, [and I saw] when the inner circle of dervishes draped the black covering, like [that of] the Ka’ba of God, atop the white coffin in which the beautiful body was placed, and when they

---

157 *Menâkıb-t Şa‘bân*, pp. 95-96.

158 About his recollection, Fu‘âdî remarks that, “Even [I who] at that time was a young boy, when I mention or think of that state in the present, that state [of being] and intoxication come into my heart as if that place [and time] were here now.” Ibid., p. 98.
placed the black turban atop his head which was proof that he was the most noble Pole and the most exalted of Muslims. [I saw] when they came out to pray his funeral prayer, with the black turban that appears atop the coffin, and with the tevhîd-calls that the reciting dervishes made with vigor and loud voice. I saw in front of me that when [Şa'bân]...who was hidden from the eye of the people by being in seclusion for so much time, appeared from the door...by vigor, experience [of God], fever and rapture appearing among the people, one person would shout out with sincerity while another would weep in anguish. Such a cry of commotion and a call of yâ hû arose and came forth that it could not be written with the pen or described with speech....They grabbed onto the wooden poles attached to the coffin like the handholds of the Ka’ba, and some could not even hold on to one due to the crowd and multitude. But by the appearing of angelic power...they entered under the coffin of the noble one and carried it upon their heads, like the angels that carried the exalted throne, and like Ebu Mûsâ who carried the exalted throne in his dream and the following [day] carried the funeral bier of Bayezid upon his head. Those who could not do that rubbed their hands or their handkerchiefs on his coffin, his black covering or his black turban, with the intent of rubbing [their] forehead as at the Beytü’l-Harâm or the Black Stone, 159 and afterwards they rubbed their faces. In short, there was such a crowd and throng that the funeral bier could not go forward; it got stuck in place, and sometimes it went backward, and it was not guided with the haste which is canonically laudable in making the funeral prayer. 160 Since postponement was necessary, permission was given to the men of the head emîr who were present at the funeral to push away and forbid the people by prudent means and polite behavior, and they also acted wisely in a customary form. When they forbade and pushed away the people by a good method, the enlightened coffin was placed on the funeral slab, and they began the prayer to enjoin mercy and salvation. 161

159 Namely, the Ka’bah in Mecca and the Black Stone situated at one of its corners.

160 It is implied that the funeral proceedings all took place in the mosque of Seyyid Sünnetî and the Halveti lodge close to it. However, the distance between them is not very great, so this may indicate that the crowds flocking to Şa’bân’s funeral proceedings and Muharrem Efendi’s speech may have had to be accommodated in one of the larger mosques in the city center, or the ceremonial prayer field (namâzgâh) lying just south of the center of the old town of Kastamonu. For more information on the namâzgâh, which is now the site of the Gazı İlköğretim school, see Eyüpgiller, pp. 115, and the maps on pp. 231 and 396.

161 Menâkīb-i Şa’bân, pp. 96-97.
The commotion that ensued was evidently not limited to the funeral procession. The anecdotes surrounding Şa'bân’s death give us interesting insights into how the concept of relics and sacred substances functioned in rural Kastamonu during this period. For example, while Muharrem Efendi and one of Şa'bân Efendi’s followers were washing the saint’s body, other people struggled to collect the water that was used in the washing and put it into various kinds of receptacles, or wet their handkerchiefs. Even those who weren’t able to scoop up the excess before it hit the ground gathered up the mud which was created by the spillage from the washing process, thinking that it would prove valuable in the curing of illnesses and other problems. In addition, others even tore to pieces the rush matting that Şa'bân had sat upon while in his room in the lodge and divided it up amongst themselves, as if it were booty taken in a conquest. The destruction was not just limited to the rush matting. Şa'bân’s followers even struggled to place his coffin in the grave they had prepared.

Before the noble coffin made it to the side of the sepulcher, and the carrying-rods were taken from the noble coffin, the people broke apart the rods to take a piece with blessings, saying, “It is from a real saint,” and they distributed it as if [it were] a living wage.... They also gravitated to the noble coffin...and they clutched the pieces of the noble coffin to their chests for the cure of the wounds of their hearts, as if [it were] a part of [their] share of God. They hid it away like their souls, and...it was a cure for problems and a remedy for however many illnesses through the wisdom of God and the acts of grace of the saints. They smoked it for [curing] fevers and other illnesses. In addition to cures being found by the command of God, it is known that by an act of grace, yogurt was made by mixing a piece of the coffin into water, [even] without adding any fermented milk (damûzluk).

---

162 Ibid., pp. 92-93.

163 Ibid., pp. 98-99. The specific mention of yogurt, a white food that conveys images of purity and virtue in Ottoman culture, may be symbolically significant as well; see, for instance, the remarks of Jane Hathaway, A Tale of Two Factions: Myth.
From this anecdotal evidence, one can see that the cult of relics revolved around keeping a piece of an object that had the blessed aura (bereket) of the saint, and that these relics had important functional uses that made them objects of value. Seen in this light, Fu’âdi’s warnings about hiding one’s miraculous acts of grace from the general public due to the economic incentives they entailed were clearly not idle ones. However, these relics were not spread around to found other shrines in the region, or prominently displayed in the tomb; they were instead considered objects of value for personal use, to be saved for an invocation of assistance in extraordinarily difficult situations. Such assistance consisted primarily of the prevention of illness or the provision of food; this demonstrates the major concerns of a pre-modern rural population in much the same way as pre-modern European folktales, such as those of the Brothers Grimm and others.\textsuperscript{164}

Another motif common to Islamic saints was the divine illumination of their tombs, and in this Şa’bân was no exception. Underscoring the point that failure to participate in a saint’s funeral meant squandering an important opportunity, Fu’âdi concludes his remarks by relating the story of a farmer who had come to Kastamonu to pray the Friday prayers on the day of the funeral. He heard about the event but had other business to attend to in town after the Friday prayer and didn’t attend. While walking home through the hills above town, however, he noticed that a rainbow appeared that stretched down from the sky toward the

\textsuperscript{164} See the comments of Robert Darnton, \textit{The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History} (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1984), pp. 25-34.
district of Hisârardt, despite the fact that there had not been any rain.\textsuperscript{165} When he mentioned this to Hacî Mehmed, the informant for the anecdote, Hacî Mehmed rebuked him, saying, “Oh stupid man! Why didn’t you go to the funeral prayer of a master like him? That wasn’t a rainbow that appeared. It was a light from God [shining] upon the noble one!”\textsuperscript{166} Fu’âdî also stresses that the funeral was attended by the jinn, angels, and spirits of the unseen hierarchy of saints, who continued to illuminate the tomb at night even after the excitement subsided. In this way, the influence of Şa‘bân Efendi grew even more powerful after his death than it had been in his life.

Still, this did not mean that the order had transcended all of its problems. One can sense a lingering, if not deep, sense of insecurity in many of the narratives. It is nowhere more evident than in Fu’âdî’s final remarks.

How many [people] saw, knew and became aware of the anecdotes and states which were written up to this point from the first chapter....So many upright and good-hearted people were like that [person] who sees by believing in and affirming those who know and see, [and] do not censure. But how many others also could never see or know, and did not understand the secret, wisdom, or aspect of those who saw and knew, [but] remained under a veil and in the valley of ignorance due to [their] censure. Because this point is a divinely-given virtue. Not everyone is guided to it. “Say: Verily bounty is in the hands of God; he gives it to whomever He wishes, and He is the possessor of great bounty!”\textsuperscript{167} The person who will not submit in every respect to a guide on the path of God, he shall remain rejected and uneducated; he doesn’t know the state and power of the true saints. Because he who comes to the saint comes to God. It is also said that some of the seekers are touched by God, while others are touched by those who are

\begin{footnotes}
165 Fu’âdî fails to note that this account seems to contradict the earlier anecdote from another informant that Şa‘bân’s death sparked the onset of much rain, thunder and lightning! See Menâkıb-ı Şa‘bân, pp. 91-92.

166 Ibid., pp. 99-100.

167 Qur’ân, 57: 29.
\end{footnotes}
touched [by God]. Both of these are true statements. But if he is of the people of aptitude, and if he exchanges the useless attributes of his carnal soul, through struggle and ability, for good attributes, the veils and afflictions will leave his soul, and his heart will be a mirror full of purity and clarity. He will be among the people of witnessing and awareness, and he will know the states and secrets of the saints who are the perfection of the actions and attributes of God Most High, and the people of the manifesting of the divine essence, and he’ll be saved from censure.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 100-101. Fu’âdî titles this final section, “An advisory note, by way of a conclusion (lâyiha ʿalâʾl-vechüʾl-hâtime).”}

Even in a closing statement intended to be the triumphant conclusion of Ṣaʿbân’s life and career, behind Fu’âdî’s exhortations to his audience to take up the Halveti struggle by revering the example of Ṣaʿbân Efendi, the mutterings of the unconvinced and hostile anti-Sufi factions in Ottoman society linger just out of earshot, like the sinister whisperings of unseen spirits. The decades following Ṣaʿbân’s death would see new challenges for the branch of the Halveti order that he had established, and they would not be long in coming.

\section*{2.8 Stabilizing the Order in the Wake of Ṣaʿbân Efendi’s Death: ʿOsmân Efendi and Hayreddîn Efendi as Successors (1569-1579)}

The first crisis of the post-Ṣaʿbân era was not long in coming. Ṣaʿbân’s hand-picked successor, ʿOsmân Efendi (d. 1569), arrived as quickly as he could from his own lodge in Tokat to take up his duties. Unfortunately for the still-grieving followers of the saint, he was unable to steady the order in the aftermath of Ṣaʿbân’s death. His hurried journey to Kastamonu to take up his position was followed almost immediately by a perhaps ill-advised attempt at immediately initiating ascetic exercises rooted in his grief over his spiritual guide’s death. This asceticism took the form of a 40-day spiritual retreat (erba Ḣın) in Ṣaʿbân Efendi’s tomb, and it appears to have taken its toll on his health. According to the dates
According to the dates inscribed upon their tombs on the site in Hisârardı, Şa’bân died on the 4th of May (18 Zi’l-ka’dâ), and Osmân Efendi died almost exactly forty days later on the 14th of June (28 Zi’l-hicce) of the year 1569. This does not tally properly with the descriptions in the Menâkîb-ı Şa’bân, however, as it implies that Osmân did not arrive until after the shaykh had been buried on the 6th of May. When he did arrive, he performed the 40-day retreat, only to die on the 40th day as he was completing the Halveti ritual practice of the erba‘în. Either Fu’âdî has not remembered the narrative correctly, or the tomb markers represent a later addition by people who interpreted Fu’âdî’s account a bit too literally without picking up on the nuances. There may also have been an attempt to make it look as if Osmân Efendi died at the end of the mourning period, as Fatima did with the Prophet. Compare the description of the tomb markers in Demircioğlu, pp. inserted between pp. 18-19, with the text of the Menâkîb-ı Şa’bân, pp. 103-104.

Un fortunately, the rapid and untimely demise of Osmân was not the only problem that swirled around his checkered career as a leader in the order. The anecdotes that Fu’âdî does include about the short-lived shaykh imply an uneasiness about him. His early background requires some tactful explanation.

Having a lively and loving disposition, and being a youth full of generosity and munificence, he was addicted to eating, drinking, [playing] stringed

---

169 According to the dates inscribed upon their tombs on the site in Hisârardı, Şa’bân died on the 4th of May (18 Zi’l-ka’dâ), and Osmân Efendi died almost exactly forty days later on the 14th of June (28 Zi’l-hicce) of the year 1569. This does not tally properly with the descriptions in the Menâkîb-ı Şa’bân, however, as it implies that Osmân did not arrive until after the shaykh had been buried on the 6th of May. When he did arrive, he performed the 40-day retreat, only to die on the 40th day as he was completing the Halveti ritual practice of the erba‘în. Either Fu’âdî has not remembered the narrative correctly, or the tomb markers represent a later addition by people who interpreted Fu’âdî’s account a bit too literally without picking up on the nuances. There may also have been an attempt to make it look as if Osmân Efendi died at the end of the mourning period, as Fatima did with the Prophet. Compare the description of the tomb markers in Demircioğlu, pp. inserted between pp. 18-19, with the text of the Menâkîb-ı Şa’bân, pp. 103-104.

170 Menâkîb-ı Şa’bân, pp. 103-104.
instruments and conversation with upright friends. But he used to abstain from immorality, vice and association with evil people. While in this state, he ran into the master [Ṣaḥbân] at some place, and when he rubbed his face in the dust of his dignity by kissing his knee and requested his help and prayers...the zeal of the carnal passions was replaced with spiritual zeal, and metaphorical (mecâzî) love with true (hakîkî) love. He met together with the master again by chance, and renounced talk of concerns save God, repented from his heart and soul and pledged allegiance [to the shaykh]. Being on the journey to God, he broke his stringed instrument into pieces and became one who spoke of naught but the word of the heart.  

As in the case of the relationship between the Sünbülüyye hagiographer Sinâneddîn and his father Yaʿkûb, we once again encounter a saint who began his career as a person who may have been considered something of a reprobate. The difference is that here, Fuʿâdî feels obliged to clarify the situation by indicating that despite his sinful past, ʿOsmân Efendi was not actually much of a sinner, as his friends were not bad people, and he just had to overcome some bad habits. It seems that in the time Fuʿâdî was writing, a justification needed to be offered for the youthful failings of Ṣaḥbân’s initial successor, failings that did not mark the life of Ṣaḥbân himself. In addition, these remarks about ʿOsmân’s younger years imply that he was not from a financially poor background, as he had time to eat, drink and carouse with his friends. While the hagiography is silent on the issue, we can guess that ʿOsmân was from one of the more influential families in Kastamonu, which may have been why Ṣaḥbân felt him to be a good successor for the community after his death.

Had these been the only problems that the community faced in assessing ʿOsmân Efendi’s brief tenure and legacy, they probably could have been overlooked. Still, the

---

171 Ibid., pp. 101-102.

172 This is, at any rate, the implication of the narrative given about the delayed submission of Sinâneddîn to his father’s guidance in Hulvî, pp. 483-484.
narrative implies that ʻOsmân was not always circumspect in his public discourse and disposition, and this often was a cause for concern even among his followers. At one point, even Şaˈbân had to step in to defend his successor against the murmurings of other Halveti dervishes under his guidance.

When [ʻOsmân] came from Tokat to Kastamonu to pay a visit to the master [Şaˈbân], while making conversation in the place where the dervishes were having a feast to honor the guest, since ʻOsmân Efendiˈs character was open and his spiritual power advanced, he showed the waves of ecstasy that were in the ocean of his heart...and the pearls of spiritual knowledge that were on the surface and edge of his soul....[W]hen he spoke so many words full of secrets, some of the people of the gathering with spiritual power could handle it, [but] some of them not having the ecstatic state could not bear it, and when they informed the master [Şaˈbân] that he was revealing secrets, that mine of wisdom and treasury of knowledge listened to them and understood their wishes, and after thinking a while, said, “My lambs, be silent about ʻOsmân and leave him to his ecstatic state.” By means of an allusion to explain the perfection of his proximity and nearness to God Most High, and the perfection of his state and knowledge in the divine secrets, he commanded, “Dervishes! ʻOsmân is a descendant of the cushion (minder oğlânı).”173 Wherever he should sit, in whatever manner he should sit, whatever he should say and whatever form he should say it in is accepted in the presence of God Most High.”174

Underneath the vague language of Fuˈâdîˈs narrative, the reader senses that ʻOsmân was somewhat indiscreet in his public utterances, and may have tended toward the ecstatic range of the mystical spectrum in a way akin to the famed mystic Mansûr al-Hallâj (d. 922). His conduct and remarks clearly worried some of Şaˈbânˈs followers, a fact that suggests that Şaˈbânˈs choice of successor was questioned even before his death. After all, this was serious business, for the sixteenth century had seen a number of cases in which indiscreet

---

173 This term refers to someone who is in a position of power and authority by right of his or her birth.

174 Menâkıb-ı Şaˈbân, pp. 102-103.
or misunderstood words had triggered an inquisition and execution at the hands of the political authorities. One wonders also if this had something to do with attempts by others to put themselves forward as alternate choices for the succession and chain of authority. It is testament to the force of Ṣaʿbān’s personality and the strength of his following that the order held together in the face of such a controversial choice.

Given the brevity of ʿOsmān’s tenure at the head of the order, his detractors may not have had time to take any significant action. Still, there were also indications in the narrative that ʿOsmān himself did not wish to take up the position of head of the order. While this is explained in light of his knowing that he did not have long to live, his actions may also have reflected a certain discomfort or intimidation at the very thought of taking Ṣaʿbān’s place. When he first arrived in Kastamonu from Tokat, rather than move into the lodge adjacent to the complex or take up residence in the room that Ṣaʿbān had occupied, he instead took up residence at the foot of Ṣaʿbān’s tomb and spent the night there. When the dervishes came the next morning and tried to bring him to Ṣaʿbān’s prayer rug, he refused the honor.

[ʿOsmān] let forth a sigh and said, “Brothers, this inconsolable one didn’t come here to give guidance. I came to do the 40-day retreat (erbaʿîn). I’ll pass on to the afterlife by moving from the corporeal to the spiritual realm on the fortieth day, because I have no strength for enduring his separation [from me].” When they said, “God Most High deliver you from grief; the suffering of the master’s departure is enough for us!,” he replied, “The judgment is God’s. This evening, the prophet Hīzīr came, and he dug my tomb on the north side of the noble one’s.”

\[175\] Ib. p. 104. One should not forget that Hīzīr also played a role in forging the link of succession between Seyyid Sünnettî and Ṣaʿbān Efendi.
The dialogue suggests that perhaps ʿOsmân Efendi, despite the advanced degree of spiritual progression that he had achieved on the path, might have spent too much time away from the order at his post in Tokat and lacked the level of comfort with Ṣâbân’s local following that might have been a desirable quality after the traumatic loss of the great saint. Regardless of the actual reasons, the course of events meant that the dervishes thus had little choice but to look to the second successor in the chain of command.

Hayreddîn Efendi (d. 1579) had a more successful and prolonged career as the head of the order, and managed to impose some degree of stability. Although he had been sent to Amasya by Ṣâbân to build the order there, he seems to have maintained stronger links with the community in Kastamonu. He originally worked as a shopkeeper in the marketplace in town and was a respected member of the local community of some means, albeit not one of the city’s high elite. As a result, his return to take up the position did not seem to entail as much awkwardness as was implied in the anecdotes about ʿOsmân Efendi’s return. Still, this may be reflective of Fuʿâdî’s informant and friend in the order, Hacî İlyâs Efendi, who was Hayreddîn’s son. We have already encountered him through his recollection of going with his father to the Honsâlâr mosque to hear Ṣâbân’s sermonizing and teaching. His friendship with Fuʿâdî, and his direct witness to the events described, may have allowed Fuʿâdî to humanize Hayreddîn in a way that he could not in the case of the less well-known ʿOsmân, who died while the hagiographer was still a child.

In addition to describing his father’s early service and work with Ṣâbân, Hacî İlyâs also spoke of the difficulties his father’s service caused for his family. As Hayreddîn became more deeply involved in the order, he withdrew from the day-to-day running of his business, and left the shop in the charge of workers. Eventually, he had to turn the business
over to Hacî İlyâs when Ṣa‘bân commissioned him to spread the order elsewhere, but his son proved to be ill-prepared to take over the affairs of his father.

[Hacî İlyâs related]: One day the noble [Ṣa‘bân]...sent [Hayreddîn] to Amasya with the successorship. He didn’t take anyone from his family or children [with him], but he gave to this poor one [Hacî İlyâs] a purse into which he placed the capital [from the business], and he said, “Don’t ever empty this purse, and place whatever you earn into it as soon as you earn it. Take from it, and spend for the specific things that are necessary for the shop and the house, and take it all out at once and don’t estimate or count it; place a little or a lot of silver coins into it [without regard to amount]; it will never run out. But be warned; you should not reveal this to strangers! If a stranger hears, this state and blessing will depart from the purse.” The state that he spoke of...was confirmed and accurate [regarding] the purse. I [İlyâs] used to estimate that if I were to put in one silver coin, it would generate ten silver coins, and if I were to put ten silver coins, it would generate a hundred; it never ran out. The poor one used to be conceited due to this act of grace; I didn’t used to balance expenditure with income. One day, an elderly dervish by the name of Emrullah Dede who was among my father’s friends spoke persistently for the purpose of advice and admonishment: “Did your father tell you [to behave] like this? Why are you going around in idleness?” This poor one, neglectfully thinking that Emrullah Dede was among the elder dervishes and not a stranger, explained the secret of the purse to him and gave word of its nature. As soon as I said “God willing, the purse doesn’t empty out through the secret of the saints and the act of grace of the pure ones,” he scolded me, saying, “Oh spendthrift, oh incorrigible one, why are you revealing the secret of the saints? Did it fall to you to betray the trust of the saints in this way?” After that, I couldn’t find the state that [existed] before in the purse.\(^\text{176}\)

Of course, the narrative serves the useful purpose of reminding its audience not to gossip or brag about miraculous events, especially if they were tied to financial gain of some kind. Fu‘âdî emphasizes this point once again by appending one of his ubiquitous advisory notes to the story, arguing that it is for this reason that the saints do not reveal their powers to everyone, since if someone who doesn’t understand the problems inherent in wielding this

\(^{176}\) Ibid., p. 106.
power reveals its secret, he will cause the saint in question a great deal of difficulty. Still, behind the narrative we can also discern tension between Hayreddin and his son. Instead of looking after the family business in a frugal and careful way, İlyâs probably squandered all of the family’s fortune on having a good time, as many young people in any given time or place would be prone to do. The narrative that İlyâs transmitted to his friend Fu’âdî would have served not only Fu’âdî’s purposes, but also might have allowed İlyâs to save face by publicly repenting of his failings, both worldly and spiritual.

Fu’âdî includes a second anecdote from İlyâs in which the latter describes a mysterious encounter he had two days before ‘Osmân Efendi’s death while passing through the courtyard of the Ağa İmaret mosque in Kastamonu. A dervish approached him and began to speak to him as if he were an old friend, asking him how his father was doing in Amasya. When İlyâs said that he had just had word of him, and that he was well, the stranger informed him that he had good tidings, in that ‘Osmân Efendi would die in two days, and that his father would be returning to take his place shortly. As he turned and hurriedly departed by the courtyard door, a confused İlyâs ran after him, only to find that he had disappeared. When his father subsequently returned, İlyâs asked him about this. His father informed him, “He is one of the forty who are perpetually arranging and improving

---

177 Ibid., p. 107.

178 The mosque to which İlyâs refers in this anecdote is clearly the Yakup Ağa mosque and soup-kitchen complex, which was built during Selim I’s reign and developed further during the latter half of the 1540s. It is interesting to note that a prime source of the revenue for the upkeep of the mosque and soup-kitchen came from the stores of the iron-workers from the area of Hisârardı, implying that Şa’bân’s following had an interest in this area. See Eyüpğiller, pp. 104-105 and 125.
the states and affairs of the sons of mankind by God’s command,” and that he had asked him to convey word of the impending changes to his son to gladden his heart.\textsuperscript{179}

The joy that this news brought, despite the fact that the death of Şa‘bân’s immediate successor was required to bring Hayreddîn home, also demonstrates the extreme difficulty in which the followers of a Halveti shaykh could be placed once he deemed them worthy of spreading the order to other parts of the Ottoman domains. In sum, the assignment of spreading the order to another region required the devotee to uproot himself from his accustomed environment, and this sacrifice represented the ultimate test of loyalty to the head of the order and its principles of rejecting all worldly ties. Hacî İlyâs’s misuse of the family finances clearly represented the tip of the iceberg in terms of the disruptions that Hayreddîn’s promotion imposed upon his family. One can’t help but wonder how other immediate family members, such as Hayreddîn’s wife, might have felt about these issues. Nevertheless, the fact that Hayreddîn took up the challenge and the sacrifices it entailed gave him the legitimacy to succeed to leadership of the order when the time came.

Unfortunately, the abridged hagiography gives us little else by which to assess Hayreddîn’s career as head of the order after he took up the task of guidance in Şa‘bân’s and 'Osmân’s place in Kastamonu. Since Fu‘âdî did not really attach himself firmly to the Halveti order until many years after Hayreddîn’s death in 1579, he did not have a great deal of personal experience with either of Şa‘bân’s first two successors. Nevertheless, his

\textsuperscript{179} The full text of the anecdote appears in \textit{Menâktb-1 Şa‘bân}, pp. 107-108. It is not fully clear to me how the “forty” described here fits into Ibn al-‘Arabi’s teaching, although they resemble the category of \textit{mudabbirûn} described in Chodkiewicz, pp. 112-114, who had similar properties to the individual described in the anecdote. Muhammed İhsan Oğuz, on the other hand, would have defined the individual as one of the \textit{nukabâ’}; see Oğuz, p. 47.
omission seems odd, given that he knew Hayreddin’s son fairly well. His brief description does suggest the character of Hayreddin’s tenure, however.

...In addition to sending perfected and excellent followers to all parts of the world, his blessed breath was the cause of cures through the power of God. People concerned about necessities (erbâb-i hâcât), who were afflicted by every illness, sickness, or other calamity, used to depart from the noble presence satisfied, and others used to reach satisfaction after some time [had passed].\textsuperscript{180}

While upholding Şa‘bân’s legacy of training additional successors and spreading the order, Hayreddin had strong connections with the business and mercantile communities in Kastamonu from his former career, and these people clearly flocked to him for help, as part of the local constituency for the order, as they had to Şa‘bân earlier. His son’s presence in the vicinity of a mosque near the metalworkers’ shops may indicate that he had connections with that trade, but this is only speculation. Sadly, Fu‘âdî has little to add that would help us further assess Hayreddin’s career, and one can’t help but think, as the hagiography moves onward, that we know more about his son, Hacİ İlyâs, than we do about Hayreddin himself. The silence is all the more frustrating because we know that the Şa‘bânîyye branch of the Halveti order, under the aegis of one of its followers, the notorious Şeyh Şúcâ’ (d. 1580), had risen to power through the latter’s attachment to the royal court, first through his introduction to Murad III in Manisa, and then subsequently in the Ottoman capital after Murad’s accession to the Ottoman throne.\textsuperscript{181}

\textsuperscript{180} Menâkıb-i Şa‘bân, p. 108.

\textsuperscript{181} Şeyh Şúcâ’ was the individual to which Murad III addressed his letters describing his dreams and problems with religious issues, mentioned in the introductory chapter, p. 33, n. 64. His legacy will be discussed more fully in Chapter 3. We know from the date included with a chronogram placed over the front entrance to the renovated Seyyid Sünnetû mosque near the Şa‘bânîyye lodge complex that Şeyh Şúcâ’ initiated the
2.9 The Teachers of Ömer el-Fu’âdî: Abdülbâkî Efendi and Muhuyiddîn Efendi (1579-1604)

In any case, by the time Hayreddîn Efendi’s ten-year tenure as head of the order came to an end in 1579, changes were bound to occur. Abdülbâkî Efendi (d. 1589) would be the first successor to leadership in the order who did not have the direct blessing of Şa’bân himself, and was instead elected by the leaders of the order in an assembly. In addition, the end of his career would mark the beginning of that of ‘Ömer el-Fu’âdî, the future hagiographer of the Şa’bânîyye. Perhaps due to his personal experience and contact with his two predecessors, Fu’âdî’s description of them is a bit more detailed than that which he gives for Şa’bân’s first two successors. Nevertheless, what immediately strikes us about Abdülbâkî’s career is that he was not always resident in Kastamonu during his leadership of the order. When Fu’âdî decided to pursue the path of Sufism in his mid-twenties, he sought out the great successor to Şa’bân Efendi whom he had known in his youth, only to find that he was making an extended visit to his home town of İskilip at the time, and that Fu’âdî would have to wait some time until his return.182 This is not as surprising as one might think, as during this period İskilip was not an insignificant center and was enjoying somewhat of a heyday, having recently seen a number of evkaf founded by the great

---

first renovation of the mosque sometime between 1574 and 1580; one source claims 1576. See the reproduction of the inscription in Demircioğlu, insert between pp. 18-19. Another scholar concurs with this reading, but suggests that ebcด in the inscription add up to 1574; see Abdulkadiroğlu, p. 113. Yet another source claims the date on the inscription to be 1580; see Eyüpgiller, p. 107.

182 Ibid., p. 114. The Turkish term sîla, implying an extended visit to one’s friends and family in one’s place of birth, is used to describe the visit.
Ottoman şeyhülislâm Ebûsu’ûd (d. 1573). While Ebûsu’ûd also endowed a number of properties in Istanbul and spent most of his life and career there, he clearly retained a strong connection with his hometown, where his father had been a prominent Bayrâmî shaykh who authored a number of works. In addition, the town was not lacking in Sufi foundations and sites, for by the time Evliyâ Çelebi visited the town in the 17th century, it had become home to a surprising number of pilgrimage places and saints tombs, and he lists at least five of them by name.

In his younger years, Abdülbâkî had to live in the shadow of his father ʿAli, who had acquired a good deal of fame locally for reasons that had nothing to do with religion. Both Abdülbâkî’s son and some of the older folk of İskilip recalled the event for Fu’âdî many years later when he asked them why Abdülbâkî’s father was nicknamed “Persian” (Acem) ʿAli.

---


...[T]hey related that a famed and mighty wrestler came from the lands of Persia to Anatolia, and when he came to the sancak of Çorum, whichever champion he was to wrestle with, he defeated [him]. When he was about to depart for Istanbul, he also wrestled with the champion ʿAli. [ʿAli] fearlessly defeated the Persian, and became famous by that name.\(^{186}\)

It is interesting that Fuʿâdî also corroborates this claim by citing additional informants, namely several of the noted successors of Necmeddîn Hasan Efendi (d. 1610), the longtime head of the Sünbüliyye order in Istanbul at the Kocamustafapaşa lodge, although he does not give their names. This indicates that by the first decade of the seventeenth century, when Fuʿâdî wrote his work, the two branches of the order seem to have established better relations than they had enjoyed in Șaʿbân’s time.\(^{187}\) It is still curious that members of the Istanbul-based branch of the order had heard of this event, unless this implies that these particular followers originally hailed from İskilip and later joined Necmeddîn Hasan’s branch of the order. Subsequently, they were perhaps sent to Kastamonu and environs, where they encountered Fuʿâdî and corroborated the narratives circulating about Abdülbâkî’s father and his defeat of the Persian wrestler. Beyond these connections, however, the story is interesting in and of itself, simply because it reflects upon

\(^{186}\) Menâktb-i Șaʿbân, pp. 108-109.

\(^{187}\) Ibid., p. 108. It is not clear whether or not the earlier anecdote in which Șaʿbân poaches a successor of Sünbüll Efendi’s actually reflects what could be termed “bad relations.” Nevertheless, I doubt Sünbüll’s followers and successors would have enjoyed the implications of its existence. Fuʿâdî clearly did have indirect knowledge of Necmeddîn Hasan, as he describes him as being “a scholar and a knower of the exoteric and esoteric meanings and secrets of the four books.” This corresponds with hagiographical descriptions of Necmeddîn as being well-versed in the four sacred texts: the Qurʾan, the Torah, the Gospels (İncil) and the Psalms (Zebûr). See the remarks in the hagiography of Mahmûd Celâlüddîn Hulvî (d. 1651), who became a follower of the Sünbüliyye branch of the Halveti order in Istanbul under the guidance of Necmeddîn Efendi before his death in Hulvî, p. 491.
one of the pastimes of the Anatolian countryside in the form of wrestling contests staged between local competitors and traveling professionals. One might also speculate that the wrestler in question might have been part of a Safavid campaign to demonstrate the physical superiority of the Safavid warriors over their Ottoman counterparts in the earlier half of the 16th century, aiming to sway the opinions of Anatolians whose allegiance to the Ottoman state was not strong. Therefore, ʿAcem ʿAli’s defeat of this champion might have carried overtones of Sunni Ottoman heroics against a Persian invader to its audience. On the other hand, it is not outside the realm of possibility that the name carried overtones of foreign origin that had to be explained away in the anti-Safavid politics of the time.

These points notwithstanding, Fuʿādī’s use of this anecdotal background took a different form. Rather than dwelling on the heroism of Abdülbâkî’s father, he chose instead to illustrate how the popular sport of wrestling competitions that many rural Anatolian communities embraced could serve as a metaphor for important ideas pertaining to the Halveti path.

...According to the understanding [of the Arabic proverb], “The son is the secret of the father,”...his son [Abdülbâkî] did not exert himself in wrestling in the objective [sense]; he wrestled instead with the powers of the carnal soul which drew strength from negative attributes which were in the subjective world, meaning he blocked his soul from obtaining the needs of the carnal soul [from] the base characteristics of the world. By being victorious over the carnal soul through this struggle, he learned the rational sciences (funûn-ı ʿâkıliye) and perfected [his knowledge of] the transmitted scholarship (îlûm-ı naklıye) in the world of utter poverty. He was a traveler on the path of exoteric [knowledge], and he studied the best lessons from the most excellent masters, and became famous through perfected knowledge....His carnal passions, which were placed in his human existence in opposition to the soul by command of God, attacked his human soul through the power of exoteric knowledge, which gives worldliness and conceit to a person through the interference of the needs of the carnal soul, and [they] came out to the lands of humanity from the lands of nature like the wrestler came from the lands of Persia. When he did not accept or consent
to the annihilation of existence and the leaving of the world, which is the reason for eternal permanence and eternal life, and wanted to grapple with the wrestler of the carnal passions, thinking, “Do you block me from the fortune of the world, success and state offices, and the boon companions that have come?”...and confront the spiritual powers in the desert of bewilderment and on the field of love, the wrestling match announcer (câzgîr) of rational goals entered the playing field and made the two of them wrestle.

Behind the elliptical and dense language spread over this passage, Fu’âdî describes the struggle that Abdülbâkî Efendi had with the idea of giving up his worldly power and position which came from his mastery of the exoteric sciences. By using the metaphor of a wrestling match, Fu’âdî is able to instruct his audience by creating an image of the struggle that would take place in every seeker of God between his/her divinely-inspired spirit and the passions of his/her carnal soul. The metaphor also serves the subtle purpose of placing Abdülbâkî’s achievement in the same league as that of his father, which must have been significant if stories of it still circulated decades after the event. Fu’âdî’s rhetorical flourishes notwithstanding, it is clear that Abdülbâkî had obtained a solid educational background before he began his career as a mystic. He reportedly even lost the sight in one eye during his youth on account of his extensive reading during his studies, which led some of his contemporaries to quip that if this hadn’t happened, his knowledge would have been overwhelming in scope.

When Abdülbâkî did eventually decide to abandon the benefits of his worldly success and his possessions and embark on the Sufi path, he confronted the challenge of which

---


189 Ibid., p. 109. The story also appears during Fu’âdî’s description of some of Şaʾbân’s more prominent followers on p. 63.
Some confusion might be caused by the existence of two Bâlî Efendis, one of them being Sofyal Bâlî Efendi (d. 1553), one of the most prominent Halveti shaykhs of that time. However, he also received word of Şaˈbân Efendi in Kastamonu in the Empire’s Asian provinces. Perhaps swayed by his hereditary roots in that area of north-central Anatolia, he eventually decided to visit Şaˈbân Efendi first in the hope of reaching a decision about his ultimate course. While speaking with Şaˈbân in his cell, he discerned Şaˈbân’s superiority through his plays on words. When Şaˈbân asked him his name, and he responded, “Abdülbâkî,” Şaˈbân encouraged him to take up the path of Sufism if he truly wanted to be a servant of God. More importantly, Şaˈbân also remarked to him, “Young man, as soon as you are knowledgeable and learned in the two forms of knowledge, exoteric and esoteric, you’ll have two wings, and in knowledge of God you’ll go out and fly up to the highest stations and the exalted throne, and mix the honey (bal) with oil.” Abdülbâkî recognized that through these plays on words, Şaˈbân had displayed an awareness of his

---

190 Some confusion might be caused by the existence of two Bâlî Efendis, one of them being Sofyal Bâlî Efendi (d. 1553) and the other Sarhoş Bâlî Efendi (d. 1573 or 4). Based on the chronology of Abdülbâkî’s life, the latter might seem a more natural fit; however, since Sarhoş Bâlî Efendi came from Tire, near Aydın in western Anatolia, and spent most of his career in Istanbul, it is clear that it must be Sofyal Bâlî Efendi to whom Fuˈâdī alludes here. See Öngören, pp. 45-48, for the basic biographical information about the two, who both traced their silsiles back to Kastım Çelebi (d. 1518), a successor to Cemâl el-Halveti. This information also allows to us to effectively estimate the comparatively early date (before 1553) when Abdülbâkî came and pledged allegiance to Şaˈbân, meaning that when he took over the successorship, he had been Şaˈbân’s recognized follower for over 25 years.

191 Abdülbâkî literally means in Arabic, “servant of the Everlasting,” the “Everlasting,” of course, being one of the 99 names of God.

192 Menâkib-i Şaˈbân, p. 111.
thinking about pledging allegiance to Sofyalî Bâlî Efendi as well, and promptly recognized Şa‘bân as his guide on the spot.

Based on our knowledge of the life and career of Sofyalî Bâlî, Abdülbâkî’s choice was not without significance in the cultural context of the era. According to the description of Abdülbâkî’s early career as a scholar well-versed in exoteric knowledge, he would have seemed a natural fit with the former. Sofyalî Bâlî was one of the most respected Halveti shaykhs in the empire up to his death, and engaged in a number of the most important religious controversies of his time, one of which was his writing of an influential letter to Sultan Süleyman defending the practice of pious foundations endowed with cash against the attacks against it by the aforementioned Şeyhülislâm Çivizâde. In addition, Nathalie Clayer has also defined him as an active crusader against religious groups that he viewed as falling into heresy. For a brief overview of Sofyalî Bâlî Efendi’s activities and career, see Clayer, pp. 70-81. Clayer views him as one of the pivotal Balkan Halveti figures of the sixteenth century.

Her successors proved to be far more influential in the capital, at least in the short run, than those of a provincial shaykh like Şa‘bân, as evidenced by the case of one of his prominent successors, Muslihuddin Nureddinzade (d. 1574). By rejecting Sofyalî Bâlî in favor of Şa‘bân, Abdülbâkî had chosen a simpler life that was not as involved with politics

---

193 For a brief overview of Sofyalî Bâlî Efendi’s activities and career, see Clayer, pp. 70-81. Clayer views him as one of the pivotal Balkan Halveti figures of the sixteenth century.

194 Ibid., pp. 81-90. Muslihuddin reportedly established connections with the grand vizier Sokullu Mehmed Paşa and his wife, who built a lodge for him and his followers in the capital, and had good relations with the Şeyhülislâm Ebûsu‘ûd. He was sometimes criticized for these relationships; see Fleischer, Bureaucrat and Intellectual, pp. 57-58. Another scholar notes that Muslihuddin also continued the hard line of his master on questions of heresy, and that he condemned the Vâridat of Şeyh Bedreddîn, a fifteenth-century shaykh condemned for heresy and executed, in opposition to many of the prominent scholars who came both before and after him. See Ocak, Osmanlı Toplumunda Zindiklar ve Mülhidler, p. 188.
and worldly issues, and chosen Fu’âdî’s protagonist and his more restrained principles over an individual who many at the time might have thought was a far more talented and influential person.

In keeping with his general practice, Șa’bân trained his follower and then dispatched him to another town in the region to build the order there. Perhaps recognizing his potential connections in the region around İskilip, Șa’bân sent Abdülbâkî to the town of Çorum, a fairly significant center in the region. Based on his fairly early attachment to Șa’bân as his spiritual master, we can guess that he spent many years in the region, moving between Çorum and his hometown of İskilip nearby. When Hayreddîn Efendi died in 1579, the notables of the order gathered, and recognizing Abdülbâkî’s long years of experience and multiple careers on both the exoteric and esoteric paths of knowledge, the dervishes quickly elected him to succeed as head of the order. He clearly found substantial support both in Kastamonu and in the eastern towns that the order had reached, and clearly went on to play a role in further consolidating the order. One of his practices was to spend Thursday evenings teaching all who wanted to participate aspects of the Qur’ân and the traditions of the Prophet Muhammad, in addition to giving the Friday sermon in the mosque. With his credentials in both exoteric and esoteric branches of knowledge, his sessions attracted not only the local folk but many of the most prominent scholars of the immediate vicinity. According to Fu’âdî’s recollection, he was a talented speaker who had the ability to stir his audiences into emotional rapture, with each individual benefitting according to the level of his knowledge and training.

---

195 Menâkîb-i Șa’bân, p. 111-112.
With this state and speech, when he made speeches from [the place where he sat], and when the dervishes afflicted with infinite troubles listened with the ear of the heart and soul to the exposition full of ecstasy and the heart-ravishing explanation full of purity, they became amazed and bewildered. They fell from a state of sobriety into a state of annihilation, and some grew tired of the ascendancy of love with the manifestation of the state of ecstasy, and some others shouted out with ardor. When it came to the cries of ḥāy and ḥū and the circle of the zikr of God formed with the ascendancy of the thought of God, sometimes it used to occur that the noble [Abdülbâkî], by being found in the second stage (fark-i sâñî) and the [state of] the stage after union (fark-i ba-ðü’l-cem), used to throw himself involuntarily into the circle of the zikr, and used to occupy himself with the vocal zikr which was the cause of divine openings for the dervishes through the state of rapture. Through this eagerness and witnessing, many people became part of the order and achieved satisfaction, and he sent followers to all parts.197

While his predecessors also indulged in Halveti practices like this, one senses that Abdülbâkî’s stature and willingness to engage in a more public role by reaching out to all levels of the local population as head of the order helped to increase the order’s strength and visibility in the region. In addition, the beginning of Abdülbâkî’s career as head of the order coincided with the height of the power and influence of Şeyh Şücai at the court of Sultan Murad III, along with the resources he was directing into the Şa’bânîyye complex in Kastamonu.198 Following Şa’bân’s example in his earlier career, Abdülbâkî drew the people

196 These technical terms probably refer to being in the sixth and seventh stages of the Halveti path, which are also referred to as cem ûl-cem and ehadiyyetü’l-cem in some sources. The term fark-i sâñî may refer to the process whereby the soul of a Sufi returns from the world of the unseen to the evidential world to benefit others. See Trimingham, p. 157, and Oğuz, p. 26.

197 Menâkib-i Şa’bân, pp. 112-113.

198 We know that Şeyh Şücai and Abdülbâkî Efendi were aware of each other, and probably personally acquainted from the vakf that was established by Şücai for the upkeep of the mosque renamed in his honor. In it, he stipulates the income that is to be given to Abdülbâkî Efendi as head of the order there, which seems to be a daily salary of five akçe and two dirhems. See the copy of the foundation deed in Mehmet Behcet, Kastamonu: Âsâr-i Kadîmesi (Istanbul: Matba’a-ýî Amîrê, 1925), p. 156.
in with lectures on exoteric subjects, and by touching them emotionally was able to draw them into membership in the Halveti order. As a result, the order that Fu’âdî inherited fifteen years after his original teacher’s death may well have been a product of Abdülbâkî’s decade of work as head of the order. Among the prominent figures who joined the order during this period was Fu’âdî’s contemporary and informant for some of the anecdotes in the Menâkıb, Sâ’atçi Efendi, but the number of members had grown so large that Fu’âdî did not even include this information in his longer hagiographical work. Instead, he directed those who were interested in tracking the development of the order’s membership to a specific informant who was still living at the time he wrote the work, Elmâctzâde Muhyiddîn Efendi.\footnote{Menâkıb-i Şa’bân, p. 113. We have encountered Ahmed Sâ’atçî Efendi’s contribution to the narratives earlier in this chapter. We have no further information on Elmâctzâde Muhyiddîn, unfortunately, and the fact that Fu’âdî has to refer to oral testimony on the issue indicates that he was appending this last section onto the work from scratch, having never included a discussion of the issue in his previous writings.}

Unfortunately, Fu’âdî was never able to complete his training with Abdülbâkî, as the latter died before the process was complete. Fu’âdî’s failure to complete his training may have had something to do with Abdülbâkî’s absences from Kastamonu, as we know that he died in İskilip and was buried there, rather than with Şa’bân Efendi and his first two successors.\footnote{Abdulkadiroğlu, p. 59.} Beyond these anecdotes, Fu’âdî was reluctant to put into writing further anecdotes about his former master, especially in regard to the extraordinary occurrences that were connected with him. Abdülbâkî not only shared Şa’bân’s aversion to public proclamation of his acts of grace or direction of divine intervention to his followers; he
insisted that they not be discussed even among the circle of his followers. Therefore, Fu’âdî abstains from any further description of the events of his master’s career, and stresses that Abdülbâkî had even refused permission for his followers and successors to discuss them after his death. Subsequently, with the death of his first guide, Fu’âdî, like the other dervishes, eventually had to transfer his allegiance to Abdülbâkî’s successor, Muhyiddîn Efendi (d. 1604).

However, we know from Fu’âdî’s own admission that he did not immediately shift his allegiance to the new successor, and other followers of the order may not have done so either. For several years after Abdülbâkî’s death, Fu’âdî apparently left the Sufî path and engaged in other pursuits, which may have indicated some disruption within the order over the choice of successor. This may have had something to do with the more humble origins of the new successor, who originally came neither from the town of Kastamonu proper, nor from an ulema background. Instead, he had first entered the Sufî path not through Şa’bân himself, but through one of his minor followers, Mahmûd Efendi, who was giving guidance in the town of Küre-i Hadîd (literally, “iron forge”), a village in the vicinity of the modern-day town of Araç, west of Kastamonu, that may have been a mining town. While the towns and villages around Kastamonu were not incapable of generating competent religious scholars, as exemplified by the case of Şa’bân’s friend and supporter Kürelî Mehmed’s studies in Istanbul, some in the order may have preferred a more high-profile successor.

---

201 Menâkıb-i Şa’bân, p. 117.

202 Küre-i Hadîd was attached to the kazâ of Araç, and was home to an ancient mosque that was built sometime during the first half of the 14th century by İsmâ’il Bey İsfendiyâr. See Behçet, p. 65.
These reservations notwithstanding, Mahmûd Efendi did make a contribution to his local branch of the Şa‘bâniyye that would prove influential to later generations. This was a short epistle entitled Risâle-i Tâciyye (The Treatise on Headgear), which came to occupy a place in the hearts of later Halveti dignitaries. It is perhaps notable that it was included among a compilation of ʿÖmer el-Fuʿâdî’s writings in subsequent decades, despite the fact that he was not the author of the work! The letter was probably transmitted subsequently into the Şa‘bâniyye canon by Mahmûd’s follower Muhyiddîn. Either Mahmûd Efendi or one of his subsequent transmitters explained the circumstances of his letter’s composition in Arabic before launching into the Turkish text, although it is not clear what language the original letter was written in.

When some of the brothers requested knowledge of the canonically-appropriate dervish headgear (qalansuwah), for the purpose of opposing [some] disruptive men (al-rijâl al-maftûnah), the poor one Mahmûd b. Nafs b. Kamâl b. Maṣûd [...] wanted [...] to compile what he understood from the Book, the practice of the Prophet, the consensus of the community, and whatever [else] discusses [the issue of headgear] from the religious sciences, so that it will be a benefit for the surety of the believers, a gentle [reminder] for the doubts of the waverers, and a defense against the censuring of the censurers.

Since the actual content of the letter is written in Turkish, and often includes translations of Arabic hadith and other textual references, I assume this was the original language of transmission. Nevertheless, it is not outside the realm of possibility that later copyists translated the work themselves.

The manuscript has several corruptions that make interpreting this part of the sentence rather difficult and also make the subject of the sentence unclear. It is not certain whether or not the introduction represents the voice of Muhyiddîn Efendi (or some other transmitter), or that of Mahmûd Efendi himself.

Despite some difficulties in interpretation, it is clear that the text was put together sometime around the midpoint of the 16th century as a means of deflecting anti-Sufi criticism about practices surrounding the wearing of dervish headgear. One should note that this is not the only known Halveti tract from this period about this topic, as Seyyid Seyfullah Kâzım b. Nizâmeddîn (d. 1601) also penned a short tract on the matter in Istanbul contemporary to this one. This suggests that this was an important topic about which many 16th-century shaykhs felt obliged to comment, and indeed Seyfullah phrases his tract in the form of answers to commonly asked questions about the nature of the headgear his dervishes were wearing, such as whether it was a strict requirement for them or just a canonically laudable act. However, the defensive tone of this short missive is also apparent in that the questioners claim that the headgear being worn is not that of previous generations as it has fourteen seams instead of twelve. In the aftermath of the Safavid wars, dervishes arriving from or having connections to founders who had lived in the eastern regions of the Islamic world were probably subject to suspicious inquiries about the nature of their beliefs, especially if

---

206 Seyyid Seyfullah was himself the descendant of a Sufi shaykh, Seyyid Nizâmeddîn b. Şihâbuddîn (d. 1550), who fled from Baghdad before the Safavid advance and came to Istanbul in the time of Sultan Selim I. As the first chapter of one of his works, he includes several short hagiographical entries on a number of the prominent Halveti shaykhs of Istanbul, suggesting that he eventually became affiliated with the Halvetis in some way, even if he was not a full-fledged member of the order. See Seyfullah Kâzım b. Nizâmeddîn, Câmiü’l-Ma’ârif, fols. 2b-16b.

207 Seyyid Seyfullah Kâzım b. Nizâmuddîn b. Seyyid Şihâbuddîn Bağdâdî (d. 1601), Risâle-i Tâcnâme (Istanbul, Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 1619/3), fols. 200b-201a. It should be noted here that twelve seams would suggest an allusion to the twelve imams of Shi‘ite provenance, and therefore an Ottoman Sunni order may have seen it as wise to make a change as a result.
their dress set them apart from the general population. See a good example of this phenomenon, see the court case of a female teacher, Haciye Sabah, as noted by Leslie Peirce in her study of Aintab’s court records. Haciye Sabah was accused by members of her community, perhaps because of her origins, of having Safavid sympathies, even though most of her activities seemed more representative of typical Sufi activities; see Peirce, Morality Tales, pp. 253-275.

What this indicates in terms of Mahmûd Efendi’s version of this project is that even at the village level, some anti-Halveti censuring activity was the norm, and Mahmûd Efendi saw the wisdom in proffering a simple text that his less-advanced following could use to repulse the attacks of their detractors and uphold their calling. The appearance of this letter amongst others written primarily by ‘Ömer el-Fu’âdî on various aspects of the Şâbâniyye rules and practices suggest that it may have inspired him to produce additional literature like it. As we shall see in the following section, he aimed to better educate novices on the finer points of the Şâbâniyye path. In fact, one of his later works that sought to outline the fundamental aspects and components of the Şâbâniyye order and its doctrines
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208 For a good example of this phenomenon, see the court case of a female teacher, Haciye Sabah, as noted by Leslie Peirce in her study of Aintab’s court records. Haciye Sabah was accused by members of her community, perhaps because of her origins, of having Safavid sympathies, even though most of her activities seemed more representative of typical Sufi activities; see Peirce, Morality Tales, pp. 253-275.

209 Ibid., fols. 201a-204a. One should note a critical difference between these two branches of the order, however, as Seyyid Seyfullah’s branch wore a cap with 14 seams rather than the dâl cap (headgear shaped like the Arabic letter dâl, or “â”) favored by Mahmûd Efendi, and therefore the symbolism they employed differed somewhat, although they share some basic components. Some of Seyfullah’s detractors saw the lack of a dâl cap as a cause for criticism, see fol. 201a.
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paid tribute to Mahmûd Efendi and his early contribution by describing in its introductory chapter the importance of Sufi clothing and dress.  

As for Mahmûd Efendi, his tract reproduced for his readers the attacks to which he felt compelled to respond. The censuring faction complained that the Prophet Muhammad had never worn this type of headgear, that the Halvetis had invented it of their own accord, and that it was an innovation (hâdes). Basing his response on variations on a Prophetic tradition that “whosoever resembles a group, he is among them,” Mahmûd Efendi responded that nobody had ever interfered with the great shaykhs of the past, and if his opponents had any justification from the books of the law against wearing headgear, they should bring it forth. If they tried to declare it to be an innovation, the response of the dervishes should be that going against the Qur’ân, traditions of the Prophet, and consensus of the community is the real innovation. While his opponents may have drawn on a tradition from the chapter on clothes in a work entitled the Masâbih, which stated that the Prophet and his companions wore only headgear that was “not raised (ghayr murtafi),” Mahmûd Efendi argued that since the Prophet also said “[there is] no hardship in our religion (lâ jurh fî dîninâ),” there should not be any fighting over this issue. He goes on to state that during the time of the Prophet Muhammad, there were four types of headgear: the “dâl” hat (shaped like the Arabic letter dâl), which resembled the Halveti cap of Mahmûd’s day; the knitted cap (örme); a terk similar to what the Bektaşi dervishes wore; and something called an on iki terk (12-point

---
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210 Ömer el-Fu’âdî (d. 1636), Makâle-i Ferdiyye ve Risâle-i Virdiyye (Istanbul, Süleymâniye Lib., MS Es’ad Efendi 1734/3), with the introduction running from fols. 22a-36a. Fu’âdî cites Mahmûd’s letter as part of his argument on fols. 28a-b of this work, which will be addressed presently.
helmet?) similar to what the Zeyniyye dervishes wore. Since both Muhammad and the four rightly-guided caliphs all wore these types of headgear, there thus could be no prohibition against them. However, one wonders how convincing Mahmûd’s argument was to the skeptics in his society, as his proof for this assertion consisted only in the introductory phrase “it is related that (rivâyet olunur ki).”

The overall tone of the letter, however, suggests that in contrast to Seyyid Seyfullah’s, Mahmûd Efendi’s goal in writing the letter was not to win over his enemies. In fact, at one point he suggests that the attacks of the censurers were a good sign.

Let it be known to [you] faithful ones...that you will never have any hardship on account of their throwing these sorts of stones of curses at [you]. Perhaps the levels of its blessing and benefit are many, since [you] should be forbearing and patient....Let [you] leave off fighting and confronting these kind of censurers. Because it is known to everyone that a person doesn’t throw stones at a tree without fruit [on it]. It is also no secret to a rational person that most of the immature youths who throw stones [do so to] trees that are full of fruit!

In fact, over half of the letter is given over to explaining to the dervishes themselves the various forms of symbolism embedded in the characteristics of the Halveti dervish headgear and its various tassels. Drawing on the basic principle that “all of Sufism is etiquette,” Mahmûd Efendi’s letter reads more like a pep talk designed to encourage the dervishes to take pride in wearing their headgear and to embrace the symbolism in it. For example, the novice dons a white turban, then works his way up to the black of a perfected master; for the
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211 For more on the history and practices of the Zeyniyye order, see the recent work of Reşat Öngören, Tarihte bir Aydın Tarikatı: Zeynîler.

212 Risâle-i Tâciyye, fols. 17a-b.

213 Ibid., fol. 20b.
color black symbolizes the successful break from worldly goods and the annihilation of the self.  

In addition, the four named parts of the headgear correspond both to the first four rightly-guided caliphs and the four fundamental components of the Sufi path embodied in the concepts of şeriât, tarîkat, ma′rifet and hakîkat.

While Mahmûd Efendi’s contribution to Halveti literature is an interesting one, it clearly did not propel him to a high-ranking place in the order outside of his localized milieu in the area of Araç. Furthermore, the accounts Fu’adh gives about Muhyiddin Efendi’s early career do not necessarily indicate an auspicious beginning that would lead him to become a high-profile leader in the order. His master Mahmûd Efendi suddenly died shortly before the completion of Muhyiddin’s training in Kûre-i Hadid, leaving the troubled dervish little choice but to come to Kastamonu to ask for guidance from Şâbân himself. When he threw himself on Şâbân’s mercy, saying that he had lost his shaykh and that he was nothing but a stranger, Şâbân replied, “The judgment belongs to God. Be well; if you are a true seeker and lover [of God], he who wants shall find God. You aren’t a stranger in this lodge. You be a reminder of Mahmûd Efendi for me. We’ll serve [you] in the degree that we can.” Muhyiddîn apparently became one of Şâbân’s dervishes after he and his supporters had established a lodge for Şâbân to live in at the future site of his tomb sometime around the year 1560. This would have made Muhyiddîn a comparatively late arrival to the order, as

---

214 Ibid., fol. 19b.

215 Ibid., fols. 17b-18a.

opposed to Șa‘bân’s previous three successors. From implied anecdotal evidence in the narratives surrounding their careers, we know that ʿOsmân, Hayreddîn, and Abdülbâkî had all entered Șa‘bân’s service while he was still preaching at the Honsâlâr mosque in the northwestern part of the city.

Still, his contemporaries soon discovered that whatever Muhyiddîn lacked in terms of esteemed origins, he made up for in his devotion to the order. Being a poor man from the rural area west of Kastamonu, Muhyiddîn Efendi lacked the means to take up residence in the area of Șa‘bân’s lodge in the Hisârard quarter of the city. In fact, he seemed to have had trouble securing any residence at all, which is noted in one of the narratives.

Since there was no heat in the lodge, and since he suffered greatly on winter days, he used to live in poverty in a warm room attached to the bathhouse next to the Honsâlâr mosque, and used to come to the lodge from one end of the city to the other. In addition to never missing a single one of the pillars [of Islam], he was charged with the duty of beginning the supererogatory night prayers (teheccüd tevhîdi) with one of the gatekeeper dervishes. It is related that on account of his complete zeal and effort, he never neglected his duties, thinking, “Let there be no deficiency in my education by [my] being derelict in my duty,” and sleep never came to his eyes, and he was always present at his service in the mosque at the time of supererogatory night prayers. He never used to pass up his duties [by remaining] at a great distance on snowy, icy or muddy days in particular. The noble [Șa‘bân] used to observe him secretly, enjoy [his efforts] and make prayers. What a delight it is that a trustworthy seeker should serve the order faithfully, and will become suitable and deserving of the prayers of blessing and exalted favors of the noble ones who are the representatives on the prayer-rug of a master like him! 217

From this, we realize that Muhyiddîn spent his initial years of service to Șa‘bân Efendi as a borderline homeless person, living on the grounds of the lodge itself when the weather permitted and, perhaps by utilizing the connections of his master, staying temporarily in the

[217] Ibid., pp. 118-119.
Honsâlâr bathhouse when winter threatened deadly exposure to the elements. Nevertheless, the branch of the Halveti order that Şa'bân established recognized meritorious service as an important part of progress in the acquisition of the order’s principles, and Muhyiddîn’s dedication to the path was impossible to ignore. Fu’âdî’s final exclamation emphatically celebrates the upward mobility that the order could encourage based on the hard work displayed by its adherents, and not necessarily in just the spiritual sense. It also demonstrates his recognition that this anecdote could serve as an important teaching tool for his audience about dedication to carrying out one’s assigned tasks within the order, and he appends an advisory note to emphasize the point further.

It is true that the great shaykhs help and make prayers for their dervishes and others, but they must make themselves deserving of their prayers and assistance. If it were only through the help of the prophets and shaykhs [alone], the prophets would have left no infidel or hypocrite in the world, but made them all Muslims, and the shaykhs would have left no corrupt person or censurer in the world, but would have made them pious and believing [people] through guidance!218

In other words, the great shaykhs are not placed on earth strictly for the purpose of saving mankind from his troubles and pains; one must also work to earn their intercession. Nevertheless, in addition to stressing the need for the followers of the order to hold up their end of the bargain vis-à-vis the shaykh, Fu’âdî also offers another explanation for the existence of those in his society who censured the cult of saints. By comparing them to those who are not deserving of the prayers of the great men, he relegates them to an inferior category of people who do not uphold their religious obligations.

218 Ibid., p. 119.
Based on what happened next, it is difficult to interpret how Şa'bân wanted to utilize his devoted recruit in building his order. After Muhyiddîn completed his training, Şa'bân resolved to send him not to the towns and villages in the area of Kastamonu and north-central Anatolia, as he had his previous three successors ʿOsmân (Amasya), Hayreddîn (Tokat) and Abdülbâkî (Çorum), but instead to the far-off city of Damascus. This may have demonstrated the ambition to which Şa'bân was aspiring by the end of his career, having established a somewhat stable base of followers within the immediate vicinity of the Anatolian part of the empire. In addition, Muhyiddîn’s devotion to the pillars of Islam and the ritual practices of the order may have made him a more attractive candidate to send to a predominantly Arabic-speaking part of the empire with a richer Islamic heritage than the Ottoman heartlands. Nevertheless, Şa'bân was sending his follower a great distance away from the order’s home base, rather than keeping him close to the seat of the order’s operations. This may reflect Muhyiddîn’s actual status within the order, in that he was viewed as an expendable member who could be sent on a relatively dangerous and difficult mission whose chances for success were at best uncertain. Within the narrative, other elements appear which imply that Muhyiddîn’s mission to the province of Şâm did not have any real success, and that even his eventual succession to the order was an ill-defined process.

...[Muhyiddîn] served the lord Şa'bân Efendi for a long time, and he sent [him] to Damascus on the completion of his training. He stayed there for a time and made the pilgrimage. Afterwards, it became clear and known to him by command of God that it would fall to him to give guidance in Anatolia, and that he would be the representative on Şa'bân Efendi’s prayer-rug....Because of this, he again came to Anatolia and increased his devotions in a cave of stone located in his own homeland in the environs of Kastamonu for the purpose of greater advancement, just as the Messenger of God did in
the cave on the mountain of Hirâ. While performing the pillars [of Islam], he was guided to the successorship on the prayer-rug of Şâbân Efendi by the command of God, according to what is explained in our more detailed hagiography, and began to give guidance.

Fu’âdi’s unwillingness to confide the details of his immediate predecessor and teacher’s accession to the leadership of the order in his abridged hagiography, and his use of the passive voice in saying that he was “guided to” (müyesser oldu) the position suggest that the succession to Abdülbâkî Efendi may have raised questions about Muhyiddîn’s suitability. It is also not specified how long Muhyiddîn actually stayed in Damascus, or in his cave, which was located outside his master Mahmûd Efendi’s base of Küre-i Hadîd. The lack of detail may just imply a lack of knowledge on Fu’âdi’s part, but this seems hard to believe since he became Muhyiddîn’s successor in the end. The lack of detail may be an attempt to mask or downplay a conflict over the succession at Abdülbâkî’s death, and one might speculate that Muhyiddîn could have been viewed as a compromise candidate when he was brought from his cave in the mountains to take over the guidance of the order’s followers.

---

219 The most widely accepted stories surrounding the first revelation to the Prophet Muhammad state that he frequently meditated in a cave on the mountain of Hirâ’ in the environs of Mecca, where he eventually received the first revelation from the angel Gabriel. For various interpretations of these elements of Prophetic biography, see Maxime Rodinson, Muhammad, trans. Anne Carter (New York: Pantheon Books, 1971), pp. 69-75; W. Montgomery Watt, Muhammad: Prophet and Statesman (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 14-22, and the analysis of the stories of this event in Rubin, pp. 103-108.

220 Menâkûb-i Şâbân, p. 119.

221 It is implied by this and other remarks appearing in the abridgment that the more extended Arabic text of the hagiography was kept in the lodge in a single copy under the guard of the heads of the order there, and its contents would be revealed only to those who were given permission, or that the text would be further directed through an oral interpretation in Turkish for the questioner.
Regardless of the reasons, it is still difficult to fathom how the order passed from a noted scholar like Abdülbâkî to a provincial hermit like Muhyiddîn. While the argument might be raised that Muhyiddîn may have been acting in the Halveti model established by Benli Sultan on İlgâz mountain, Benli Sultan and his followers at least established a building complex of some kind there for their activities, while as far as we can tell, Muhyiddîn just took up residence in a cave and did not even give guidance to anyone. These irregularities may explain why Fu’âdî did not consider himself active within the order for several years after Abdülbâkî’s death; he and others may have been looking for some form of stability before they resumed their full activities within the order. Nevertheless, a key to Muhyiddîn’s succession may be found by recalling the narrative in which the son of Şa’bân’s successor Hayreddîn visits a mosque in the district of the metalworkers’ shops. Both Hayreddîn and Muhyiddîn apparently had connections to the mining and metalworking industries in Kastamonu during this period. This might imply that a substantial faction within the Şa’bânîyye may have been made up of people involved in this trade; therefore, the man from the town of “Iron Forge” might not have seemed such a bad choice for them, despite the potential reservations that may have existed among the more scholarly followers of a leader like Abdülbâkî.

Unfortunately, much of this has to remain in the realm of speculation. What is clear is that Muhyiddîn slowly won back the followers of Abdülbâkî through his acts of grace, kindness and charity, although Fu’âdî hovers in the background to remind his audience that he insisted that these manifestations of spiritual power be kept secret “since all true friends
of God behave in this way.” Still, Fu’âdî is not as reluctant to discuss Muhyiddîn’s spiritual abilities as he is in the case of the more cautious Abdülbâkî. The two events that Fu’âdî goes on to describe deal primarily with the ability of the shaykh to sense the impending death of a fellow successor of Şa’bân Efendi, and to rush to the place in question to make sure he is present to perform the funeral prayers. The first anecdote describes a journey that the shaykh and some of his followers were making to the area of Çağâ, which is today Yeniçağâ, a small town lying to the west of Gerede on the road to Bolu. Due to the heat of the summer, many of the dervishes wanted to stop and rest a day’s travel from Çağâ, but suddenly Muhyiddîn ordered them to get up and continue the journey. While some of the dervishes dutifully struggled on at the side of their master, others refused to go on, and stayed where they were in the hope that they could catch up later. It was not until the traveling party reached Çağâ that the reason for haste became clear: Another of Şa’bân’s successors who had been sent to this region, Hayreddin Efendi, was about to die.

...When the noble one named Hayreddin was about to depart to the afterlife, that mine of grace said to those who asked, “Who will pray your funeral prayer?” “Complete the washing and wrapping [of my corpse], and then delay [the burial]; the noble one who will pray my funeral prayer will come.” They did [everything] in that way, and while [they were] waiting and saying, “I wonder who’ll come,” the shaykh [Muhyiddin] came hurrying to the settlement. Its inhabitants received him, and they prayed the noble one’s funeral prayer in purity. Those who did not follow the noble [Muhyiddin] and remained behind on the road were blocked from the noble [Hayreddin’s] funeral prayer and its merit and regretted [it], like the dervishes who are not obedient to the shaykh, fall behind on the road of the path of God, and remain blocked from achieving their wish and regretful. But last regrets have no benefit!

222 Menâkıb-i Şa’bân, p. 121.

223 Ibid., pp. 121-122.
Fu’âdî’s inclusion of this anecdote is no accident, as it could serve a reinforcing and didactic role for the audience. It meshes nicely with the events of Şa’bân’s funeral in emphasizing the twin requirements of obeying the leadership of one’s shaykh and taking part in the funeral prayers of the great Halveti leaders who had reached the final stages of the path. One might also read into it some of Muhyiddîn’s early trouble in establishing himself as the head of the order in its early years. We know from the language Fu’âdî employs that he himself was not present on this journey, because he reports everything with the dubitative Turkish verb suffix -miş. Nevertheless, the division of his following into those who passed the test and those who did not may have paralleled the division of the order’s followers into a group who followed Muhyiddîn and those who dropped out or moved on to other shaykhhs.

This was not the only funeral that Muhyiddîn Efendi rushed to preside over. He also had to take extraordinary steps to appear in Bolu for the funeral of his own brother and fellow successor of Şa’bân Efendi, Mustafa Dede.\textsuperscript{224} Apparently he had a garden or orchard (bağ) that he worked there. One day, he fell ill in his orchard, and just before he died, he told his immediate family members not to wash his corpse because his brother was coming. He also made an even odder request to the effect that “...my corpse not be taken out from the gate of the orchard; knock a hole in the wall of the orchard in such-and-such a place and you should carry [it] out from there. Because that which comes out from the orchard gate has to pass by the side of the infidels’ church and graveyard; be very careful!” After his death, though, the local religious dignitaries (ulemâ ve sulehâ) refused to honor Mustafa’s will,

\textsuperscript{224} The text refers to the name of the town where Mustafa Dede was living as “Borlû” or “Bûrlû,” but most assume that Bolu is the town that is meant. See the description of this anecdote in Abdulkadiroğlu, pp. 61-62.
because they knew it would take too long to bring Muhyiddîn Efendi from Kastamonu and it would violate the religious law to leave the corpse unwashed and unburied for so long. Still, when they tried to begin washing the corpse, their strength miraculously left them and no one could finish the job. Next thing they knew, they found Muhyiddîn arriving through a hole in the wall of the orchard with several of his dervishes in the exact place Mustafa had specified, having rushed from Kastamonu to get there. The funeral was then conducted according to Mustafa’s wishes, avoiding the Christian church and graveyard. As in the stories of the divine hand of protection, what we may be seeing here are multiple variations on a similar anecdotal theme. However, the more likely conclusion we have to draw from these stories is that Muhyiddîn saw it as important to travel around the area of Kastamonu to check up on the activities of Şâbân’s followers. His predecessor Abdülbâkî’s absences from Kastamonu also may have had less to do with homesickness than they did with the need to attempt some sort of centralized administration, in the person of the shaykh, for an order that had grown rapidly in the time just before and after Şâbân’s death. In fact, while noting the spectacular growth of the order during his lifetime at the end of the section describing Muhyiddîn Efendi, Fu‘âdî stresses that despite the various acts of grace that accompanied the careers of the first four successors to Şâbân, their greatest legacy was simply that they were able to guide and spread the principles of the order to such a great number of people.

225 Menâktb-ı Şâbân, pp. 122-123.

226 Ibid., p. 124.
Another piece of evidence corroborating this possibility and demonstrating the extent to which the Şa'bâniyye branch of the Halveti order had achieved regional power in the area of north-central Anatolia, is given from Fu'âdi’s own personal experience. After pledging his allegiance to Muhyiddîn, Fu’âdi fell into debt and needed to borrow money from his shaykh to keep from getting into trouble.

During the time of this poor one’s seeking and submission to [Muhyiddîn], an amount of gold coins came from the father of Sultan Ahmed Han, Sultan Mehmed Han [to Muhyiddîn].[and] I had [previously] taken several gold coins [from that sum] as a loan. One day, in order to comfort the noble heart and respect the sweet-smelling one’s feelings, I intended to say, “Don’t let the issue of the debt to you come to mind; it is possible that a necessary and willing postponement occur; let it be known by the esteemed one.” Before the poor one even spoke, [Muhyiddîn] was instantly aware through the inspiration of God, and he immediately looked the poor one’s way without reason and replied with a manifestation of nobility and charismatic grace, “Your wish is to postpone on the matter of that debt, but what kindness is there in postponing [it]? Never think of it again; let all of it be a gift to you.”

In addition to demonstrating how the Halveti shaykhs could secure the loyalty of their followers by acting as lenders of last resort in their times of need, this report also confirms in an indirect way that the order and its followers had attracted the attention of the Ottoman court in Istanbul. We know for a fact that Murad III contributed to the financial well-being of the order through his spiritual guide, Şeyh Şüca, but it is clear from this passage that contributions to the order also continued after Murad III’s death with his son Mehmed III. The money in question may have been part of Mehmed III’s accession gifts to various notable personages in the countryside. The wide growth of the order throughout the Anatolian countryside made it a ripe candidate for patronage by the Ottoman sultan and his

---

227 Ibid., p. 123.
court, since it was a useful tool in securing the loyalty and stability of the Anatolian population. Indeed, Muhyiddin’s travels should be placed in the context of the last decade of the 16th century, when revolts and disturbances rocked both urban and rural parts of Anatolia as the Ottomans were fighting on both their eastern and their western fronts, and destabilized the functioning of the empire almost to the breaking point as a result.228 When Fu’ad inherited the leadership of the Şa’bânîyye order from Muhyiddîn many years later, he inherited not just a spiritual role in the region but a political one with ties to the highest levels of government.

2.10 Conclusion: The Establishment of the Şa’bânîyye Branch of the Halveti Order in the 16th Century

In conclusion, Fu’ad’s great service for the historian of today was to illustrate, however indirectly in some cases, the origins, growth, and transformation of a major branch of the Halveti order during its formative period in the 16th century. We have learned a great deal about how the order continued to grow under Şa’bân’s successors to the point where it was a political, as well as spiritual, force in the Anatolian landscape. The diversity of his successors’ backgrounds also proves surprising; an important religious scholar like Abdûlbâkî was succeeded by an impoverished shaykh living in a mountain cave, and a reformed religious ecstatic like Ŭsmân was replaced by a down-to-earth businessman in the form of Hayreddîn Efendi. Unfortunately, we know for a fact that the hagiography that has come down to us does not tell us all of the aspects of the story: the contributions of Murad

228 For a summary of the rebellions and events that disrupted the Anatolian heartland between 1595 and 1610, see Colin Imber, The Ottoman Empire, 1300-1650, pp. 72-76.
III’s court and the Şa‘bâniyye successor Şeyh Şucâ’î in Istanbul are strangely absent from the text, in addition to the details which have disappeared with the original Arabic-language hagiography.

With this, the narrative of the life of Şa‘bân Efendi and his successors draws to a close with a final advisory note. Fu’âdî informs his audience that the purpose of all these stories and lessons is that the truly intelligent and perfected people listen to them and seek to emulate them in their own struggles on the Sufi path. By recognizing the characteristics and attributes that mark the great shaykhs, they themselves can one day find the guidance to take their places among their number.\(^{229}\) Still, Fu’âdî’s parting words remind us that he was not a passive recipient of the history he was recording, but an active participant in shaping and transforming how that history was to be received and used by future generations of the followers of Şa‘bâniyye shaykhs.

At the close of the 16th century, ‘Ömer el-Fu’âdî and other prominent figures within the Şa‘bâniyye branch of the Halveti order clearly sensed a need to reflect on the history of their order and make some attempt to codify it in writing, especially as it was expressed in the life of its founder, Şa‘bân Efendi. While their retrospective could not avoid being touched by contemporary concerns, especially since the spirituality inherent in the mystical path was not limited strictly to the domain of the past masters, Fu’âdî’s narration of this history nevertheless is not limited to providing us with important insights on the way he and his compatriots interacted with the legacy they had inherited. His record also illustrates for

\(^{229}\) Menâkîb-i Şa‘bân, pp. 124-125.
us a number of critical issues a Halveti shaykh faced in building the order in provincial Anatolia during the critical transitions of the 16th century.

To start with, Halveti shaykhs like Şa'bân Efendî did not enter a vacuum when they came to establish a new branch of their order in the places to which they were assigned. The legacy left by earlier figures like Seyyid Sünneti Efendi, along with a profusion of saints’ tombs from previous centuries, was not always easy to displace. In addition, the shaykhs of other orders, or even competing shaykhs from different branches of the Halveti order itself, might vie for the allegiance of the citizenry in a given region. Şa'bân’s life story does not indicate, even to the modern reader, a chain of triumphs based solely on the spirituality of the founder. Rather, Şa'bân’s life was often marked by setbacks and failures, and his establishment of what would come to be the branch of the order that bore his name was a long, drawn-out process that probably took decades. Halveti shaykhs, often contrary to their expectations, could not come into a community and simply begin recruiting men and women to the esoteric life; the impression we get from the early careers of Şa'bân Efendî and the other successors of Hayreddîn Tokâdî was that they had to build a community from the ground up, starting with the basics of Islamic law and practice. Only after they had won the trust of the local members of the community in which they resided were they able to pursue the broader goals with which they were charged. This suggests that the path to becoming a true Halveti shaykh did not end with the granting of a investiture by a given shaykh to a follower deemed to have reached a state of readiness for the giving of his own guidance to a broader public. Rather, the process of perfection continued for a number of years
afterward, as the aspirant to shaykh-hood struggled to build his own foundation and learn a new set of lessons that went beyond those of his training under his own shaykh.\textsuperscript{230}

Şa'bân’s life story also suggests a deep-seated mistrust of mystical movements in Ottoman society over the course of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century. Even Şa'bân himself expressed misgivings about the Halveti order before he was initiated into its ranks, and hostile figures like Evliyâ Şücâ were always lurking in the background to attack anything they viewed as a deviation from proper religious norms. Şa'bân’s watchful eye over his followers, and his desire to avoid building too visible a public presence in his community, indicate the degree to which the Halveti shaykhs of the first half of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century feared becoming a target for the political persecution of overzealous contemporaries. In addition, the weak positions of the shaykhs in terms of establishing a public presence suggest that they often had trouble dealing with rebellions and disobedience among some of their own followers and successors who, as the anti-Sufi persecutions of the early 16\textsuperscript{th} century receded, began seeking a more prominent leadership role in the community for the members of the Sufi orders.

This did not mean that a Halveti shaykh like Şa'bân would have lacked power or legitimacy, however. In Şa'bân’s case, part of what contributed to the long-term success of

\textsuperscript{230} We can see this process also in the career of the noted Sünbüliyye shaykh Ya'kube el-Germiyâni (d. 1571) in Istanbul, whom Merkez Efendi dispatched to the Albanian province of Yanya (modern day Ioannina) to establish a branch of the order there. After nearly two decades of building a religious community there from the ground up, Ya'kube was eventually tapped by notable Ottoman figures for a more important position as head of a tekke in Istanbul, from which he eventually acceded to the head of the order in place of his former guide in the Kocamustafapaşa headquarters of the order. However, we know that he stayed in Yanya long enough to leave behind a number of descendants there; the hagiographer Sinâneddin was born there and did not return to Istanbul with his father until he was four years old. See Tezkire\'l-Halvetiyye, fols. 32b-34a.
his branch of the order was his connections with key members of the learned hierarchy both in Kastamonu and in Istanbul. In fact, what may have inspired the creation of a new branch of the Halveti order based on Şaˈbânˈs legacy may have been not from Şaˈbânˈs own wishes, but the funeral oratory given by his friend Muharrem Efendi and the shared experience it provided for the community. In addition, Şaˈbân demonstrated a willingness to act as a bridge between the wealthier and poorer members of the community, in addition to assisting both segments in what were often turbulent times. His support seems to have been especially strong among the shopkeeper and mercantile class in Kastamonu, who relied on his spiritual protection in their travels and business dealings in the immediate region of the city. Indeed, some of his successors and contemporaries seem to have been drawn from this group. As the order began to expand, Şaˈbânˈs followers may have been able to find support and recognition in farther-flung places, as those who benefitted from the saintˈs generosity or guidance moved around to different locations in the Ottoman realm. In addition, we should not forget that while the narrative revolves heavily around the testimony and experiences of Şaˈbânˈs male followers much of the time, it provides evidence that his women followers were not insignificant in building and supporting his legacy.

In assessing the legacy of a figure like Şaˈbân Efendi, we must acknowledge that he had a group of talented successors who were able to build on the work that he had initiated. While the short-lived tenure of ʿOsmân Efendi indicates some difficulties in the transition to the post-Şaˈbân era, his successors Hayreddîn Efendi, Abdülbâkî Efendi, and Muhyiddîn Efendi were able to draw on the durable structure of an order that had spread over much of northern Anatolia to maintain and even extend the orderˈs influence during a period of increasing socio-economic and political strain in the Ottoman Empire. Nevertheless, what
strikes the historian about this group of successors is their diversity: they ranged from an upper-class notable to a prominent scholar to a middle-class merchant to an impoverished villager who was brought from a cave to take charge of the order. What the history of the order in the wake of Şābān’s death illustrates is that devotion to the order, its membership, and its principles was the deciding factor in who would take up leadership positions within it. Tenaciously true to its ideology, it did not tend to reward its wealthier members simply for their power and influence as a means of gaining an advantage; rather, the members of the order required that all of their candidates demonstrate the requisite service enshrined in Şābān’s path. All of this demonstrates the important role that Sufi orders like the Şābāniyye played in Ottoman civil society at the time that Fu’ādī and his contemporaries were reflecting on the legacy they had inherited in the first decade of the 17th century.

Nevertheless, perhaps the most important lesson that the historian can learn from the hagiography of Şābān’s life is that the hagiographer who creates it is as much a part of the story as the subject of the hagiography itself. ‘Ömer el-Fu’ādī takes an extraordinarily prominent role in commenting upon the events that he compiled from the oral traditions of his elders and contemporaries, and in transmitting these events and anecdotes to his audience. His inclusion of “advisory notes” at every turn warns the historian of Şābān’s life and times that the creation of his work also marked an important turning point in the history of the Şābānid enterprise. Therefore, to definitively understand and interpret the overall construction and contextual place of this hagiography at the turn of the 17th century, it is to the life of ‘Ömer el-Fu’ādī, and his critical place in the chain of Şābāniyye shaykhs that succeeded the founder of this branch, who we must now turn.
CHAPTER 3

DEFENDING THE CULT OF SAINTS IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY KASTAMONU: ʿOMER EL-FUʿÂDĪ’S TRANSFORMATION OF THE ŠAʿBÂNIYYE ORDER

The lives and careers of Šaʿbân-1 Veli and his successors illustrate how a sub-branch of the Halveti order in the Ottoman Empire could come into existence in a provincial setting. There can be no doubt that the contributions of Šaʿbân and his followers were essential to creating and maintaining the order during the first half-century of its existence among the people of Kastamonu. Nevertheless, one of the central arguments that I will advance in the present chapter is that the critical turning point in the history of this branch of the order may not have occurred during the career of its founder Šaʿbân-1 Veli in the mid-16th century, nor with its rise to greater power and social visibility in later 17th-century Istanbul. Rather, greater attention should be paid to a comparatively obscure successor to Šaʿbân-1 Veli who began his life’s work a generation after the founder’s death. What truly established the Šaʿbâniyye as a formidable force in the social, intellectual, and political context of the turbulent 17th century was the work of ʿÖmer el-Fuʿâdī (d. 1636), the primary hagiographer of Šaʿbân-1 Veli. As noted in the preceding chapter, the Menâkîb-1 Šaʿbân-1 Veli, along with a supplemental tract added a decade later, the Türbenâme, represent the only reliable extant
source for the history of the saint. Since he wrote the definitive hagiography through which the life and activities of the founder of the order came to be interpreted, no serious historian can ignore the impact of Ömer el-Fu’âdî in transmitting the legacy to subsequent generations. Even leaving this aside, however, it is also critical to note that he was a prolific writer who contributed a number of tracts on aspects of the Halveti path for the purpose of both educating the followers of the Halveti order and defining more clearly the philosophical and religious tenets on which it was based. Yet another important aspect of his life and legacy is that despite his provincial background, he achieved a remarkable degree of success in defending his order from growing threats to the Sufi way of life in multiple political arenas in the heartland of the Ottoman Empire. This chapter builds on the preceding chapter by placing the hagiographical writing we have already examined in the context of Fu’âdî’s life and career.

In order to better understand the important role that Fu’âdî played in transforming his order to meet the new challenges of his era, we must first examine the history of Şa’bân-ı Veli and the context in which he established the order in Kastamonu through the eyes of this remarkable hagiographer, whose career spanned 32 years as the de facto leader of the Şa’bâniyye (1604-1636). This means undertaking a detailed examination of the autobiographical information that Fu’âdî contributed about himself, in addition to the rationales he gave for the multiple projects that he undertook over the course of his long career. These included, but were not limited to, his struggles on a number of fronts to better

---

1 As in the previous chapter, I choose to rely on the late 19th-century printed text of the manuscript, Ömer el-Fu’âdî (d. 1636), Menâkîb-i Şerîf-i Pîr-i Halveti Hazret-i Şa’ban-ı Veli ve Türbenâme (Kastamonu, 1877/1294 H.), hereafter referred to as Menâkîb-ı Şa’ban.
establish Şa'bân-ı Veli as a saint of the highest and most respected rank in the Ottoman religious context of his day, a process that had him demand of his contemporaries a process of re-evaluating the very concept of sainthood itself. Finally, I will offer a few reflections on why ‘Ömer el-Fu’âdî proved so successful in his mystical career in a way that other contemporary hagiographers of his period were not.

3.1 Ömer el-Fu’âdî’s Early Life and Attachments to the Şa bâniyve Before his Accession to the Leadership of the Order

It is not surprising that a written hagiography for the Şa'bâniyye order was created by an individual like ‘Ömer el-Fu’âdî. In many ways, his accession to the leadership of the order represented the end of an era, as he was the first leader who had not been trained in the Sufi path by Şa'bân himself. We know that he was born around the year 1560, met Şa'bân Efendi through his mother and father when he was young, and witnessed Şa'bân’s funeral in the spring of 1569 at the age of nine. Still, his youth meant that he never had the chance to build a meaningful personal relationship with this towering figure, who was at the beginning of the seventeenth century beginning to recede from the living memory of the population in the region of Kastamonu. Some have suggested that Fu’âdî’s father, a man named Himmet Dede, was a follower of Şa'bân and lived close to where the Mûsâ Fâkih mosque is today, just to the east of the Şa'bân-ı Veli complex in Hisârardı. Thus, the

---

2 The information about Fu’âdî’s birthplace appears in both Abdulkadiroğlu, p. 61, and Demircioğlu, p. 18, but neither of them gives any source for this specific detail. For information on the Mûsâ Fâkih mosque, which was built at the end of the seventeenth century, long after Fu’âdî had died, see Eyüpğiller, p. 109.
Şa‘bâniyye order clearly played a role in his childhood, although it is not clear how his father responded to the death of the great saint or how long he survived the saint himself.

Our knowledge about ʻÖmer el-Fuʻâdî himself comes almost entirely from his own hand, although extremely brief references to him turn up in other sources from time to time. Based on the character of his writings, we can assume that he studied in the local medreses and learned Arabic and Persian, probably in the hope of acquiring some kind of salaried position as a part of the local scholarly hierarchy in his hometown of Kastamonu. It is not outside the realm of possibility that he aspired to emulate the career path of local notables like Şa‘bân and Abdülbâkî Efendi in pursuing his studies in Istanbul. Nevertheless, he followed the standard Sufi model of experiencing a crisis of doubt over the value and purpose of his acquisition of exoteric knowledge, and he withdrew from the company of his fellow men and the pursuit of worldly goals. His autobiographical contributions to his hagiography shed light on his self-identification as a citizen of Kastamonu.

This poor one, being among the people of Kastamonu, became a seeker of exoteric knowledge, and acquired an education in the rational and transmitted sciences with the desire for high-ranking positions which were given from the royal threshold and frequent in dismissal and notorious for [sudden] turnover. I had no urge or inclination toward esoteric and divinely-inspired

---

3 For example, a rather garbled rendition of the Şa‘bâniyye silsile found in a poorly-copied version of Sünbül Efendi’s Risâlatu‘t-tahqîqiyyah records that ʻÖmer el-Fuʻâdî was taught by Şa‘bân himself, omitting all four of the successors in between them. See Sünbül Sinân Efendi (d. 1529), Risâlatu‘t-tahqîqiyyah (Istanbul, Süleymaniye Lib., MS Kasidecizade 340), fol. 30b.

4 See Yılmaz, p. 94. Fuʻadi’s noted works include at least two surviving works written in Arabic: the Maqâlat at-tawthîqiyyah which will be discussed more fully subsequently, and the Risalat al-hayâtiyyah (Istanbul, Süleymaniye Lib., MS Hâcî Mahmud Efendi 2287/11). In addition, one of the stated motivations for a number of his writings was to translate the available Arabic and Persian language materials into Turkish.
knowledge which was obtained and perfected from the world of the heart and the station of the soul. With the will and guidance of God, by purity and relaxation coming to a neglectful heart, and burnishing and opening coming to a soul capable of spiritual enlightenment through the power of exoteric knowledge, a divine attraction manifested itself. According to the meaning of [the Arabic proverb] “A rapture among the raptures of the Merciful is equal to the work of [both] men and jinn,” I was overpowered by renunciation and annihilation and rejecting multiplicity through withdrawal and solitude. For a long time I remained in my own state, and like Küreli Mehmed Çelebi and Abdülbâkî Efendi [who were] mentioned in the anecdotes of Şa'bân Efendi, I examined closely the books of both the religious law and the [Sufi] path. My doubts and problems pertaining to the divine manifestations and the divinely-inspired knowledge were not resolved through a book or a tract. In the end, I came to know definitively by every method that I would not solve my problem or be satisfied until I undertook service to a perfected guide and a knowledgeable shaykh. When I had to seek out a guide, I wanted to follow Abdülbâkî Efendi, thinking that he who is a shaykh on the prayer-rug of Şa'bân Efendi must certainly be a perfected guide!\(^5\)

While much of his remembrance of the process of conversion to the Sufi path follows the prescribed script, Fu'âdî does offer some clues to his own particular experience. First of all, he implies that Kastamonu’s citizenry had a distinguished history of producing scholars in Islamic law, which was one reason he set out on that career path while he was a youth. However, he follows that statement with another, rather worldly expression of disillusionment with the life of a scholar of exoteric knowledge as an unstable series of rapid appointments and dismissals from governmental positions dependent on the whim of politics at the royal court. His disillusionment parallels that of Gelibolulu Mustafa ʻAli in assessing the shaky state of the Ottoman system’s traditional career paths, and it is notable that Mustafa ʻAli also periodically turned to Sufism and world-renunciation as a response to his

\(^5\) Menâkıb-i Şa'bân, pp. 113-114.
failures to obtain prestigious political posts. However, we know from Fu’âdî’s own admission elsewhere in the work that he had in fact secured fairly stable employment at a comparatively young age (perhaps as early as 1575, if we can believe his own recollection) as an assistant to the müfti of Kastamonu. Therefore, it is clear that his studies in the exoteric aspects of knowledge and Islamic jurisprudence paid off to some extent. In addition, probably as a result of his pledging his allegiance to Abdülbâkî Efendi several years before Abdülbâkî’s death in 1589, Fu’âdî served as the preacher of the Friday sermon at the mosque of Sa’bân-i Veli. In sum, his prompt turning to Sa’bân Efendi’s successor at the time that he chose the Sufi path reflects the impressions of his youth and the influence of his family members, and demonstrates that the Sa’bâniiyye branch of the Halveti order was never fully absent from Fu’âdî’s consciousness during his younger years.

We know that Fu’âdî first joined the order sometime in 1586, based on his own assertion that he first joined the order and pledged his allegiance to Abdülbâkî Efendi at the age of 27. When he first decided to consult with Abdülbâkî Efendi, Fu’âdî was frustrated

---

6 It is worth comparing Cornell Fleischer’s account of Mustafa ‘Ali’s disillusionment in the run up to the Islamic millennium in 1591-2 to the sentiments expressed here, although Mustafa ‘Ali’s relationship with Sufism was clearly more ambivalent than Fu’âdî’s. See Fleischer, Bureaucrat and Intellectual, pp. 133-137.

7 In a passage which I will discuss in more detail subsequently, Fu’âdî states that he pledged allegiance to Muhyiddîn Efendi around the year of the Islamic millennium (1591-92), and that he had been working 17 years among the müftis of the town at that point. See Menâkîb-i Sa’bân, p. 120, and also Demircioğlu, p. 18, who describes Fu’âdî as having held some kind of secretarial position (müsevvit) in the müfti’s office.

8 We know this from remarks Fu’âdî makes in the text of one of his later works, the Makâle-i Ferdivye ve Risâle-i Virdiyve, fol. 42b.
to find that his mentor-to-be was staying in İskilip rather than in Kastamonu, so he decided to talk to some of Şa'bân’s other successors in the area.

...My fervor’s being much increased, I couldn’t be patient and I made an explanation of the state [of affairs] to Hac Dede, who was well-known among the successors of Şa'bân Efendi. He said, “This problem is not that which is known or solved in a speedy manner, which are marks of rapture. It takes time and gradual advancement. If you set out on the path by renouncing all but God, a solution will occur through struggle and step-by-step progress.” But I was not able to delay on account of my restlessness, and he shrugged helplessly, saying, “He who will seek guidance in a hurry, we cannot guide [him] quickly.” After that, I explained the state to Himmet Efendi, famed for perfection and exalted favor, among the successors of Nüreddînzâde. He also responded in exactly the same way. He said, “Don’t suffer and be uncomfortable; these problems are signs of rapture and a cause of the appearance of the manifestations [of God], and its end will be blessing and perfection of mystical knowledge.” I came to Mahmûd Efendi in the hearth of Benli Sultan on İlgâz mountain, [Benli’s] son and representative, and he also sent the inconsolable [Fu’âdî] away to his station of hopelessness.

In describing his search for a guide in the absence of his first choice, Fu’âdî indirectly reveals that potential Halveti devotees had a range of options available to them. In fact, we can assume that Abdülbâkî had left another of Şa'bân’s followers operating in Kastamonu in his absence, either because the town had grown large enough to justify another successor’s presence (according to the guidelines that Şa'bân had laid down previously), or because Abdülbâkî himself was not frequently in residence at the lodge because he traveled and/or based himself in his home town of İskilip. In addition, successors of more powerful branches of the Halveti order operative in Istanbul were residing in the area in the form of the Halveti line descending from Sofyalî Bâlî Efendi (d. 1553) through Nüreddînzâde

---

9 Fu’âdî is probably referring here to one of the successors of the shaykh Nüreddînzâde Muslıhuddîn (d. 1574) of Istanbul, as referred to in chapter 2, n. 206.

Muslihuddîn (d. 1574); this line’s founder had once attracted the interest of Abdülbâkî Efendi himself. In addition, we also learn that during this period, the longstanding lodge of Benli Sultan out in the wilderness of İlgâz mountain was still functioning under the direction of his son Mahmûd Efendi. In sum, the young Fu’âdî had options in pursuing his Sufi inclinations, but his impetuousness led the various Sufi guides to treat him warily.

As a means of getting around his first master Abdülbâkî’s strict orders against discussing any of his acts of grace either before or after his death, Fu’âdî chooses to illustrate his first master’s spiritual powers through his own eventual assimilation into the Şâ’bânîyye branch of the Halveti order. When Abdülbâkî finally returned to Kastamonu, Fu’âdî was wrapped up in his own problems and did not immediately come to see him. However, when he came to the mosque for Friday prayers, he was able to listen to Abdülbâkî speaking to the congregation assembled there and discovered that the oratory solved several of his problems on the spot. Afterward, Fu’âdî expressed his desire to serve, and he contrasts the hesitation and reticence displayed by the other shaykhs whom he had consulted with the immediate acceptance he received from Abdülbâkî. In the end, Fu’âdî says, “If I had not come to a perfected guide...like him, I would have been diverted by divine rapture, remained in the form of madness and in the station of ecstatic unity (makâm-ı cem), and been blocked from coming to the second distinction (fark-ı sânî) and the unity of the unity (cem ʻîl-cem) which is the station of guidance.”11 In other words, the fact that Fu’âdî became the head of the order and a perfected guide himself is one of the acts of grace that his master bestowed,

11 Due to the linguistic complexity of the full account of Fu’âdî’s submission and allegiance to Abdülbâkî, which includes a number of embedded Persian poetic couplets from the poet Hâfiz, I have chosen to summarize its content rather than translate it in full. It appears in Menâkîb-ı Şâbân, pp. 115-117.
This bears a strong resemblance to the Nakşibendi doctrine of \textit{khalwat dar anjuman}, whereby a Sufi must maintain his links with everyday society while nevertheless feeling internal detachment from it. For the development of this concept in the formative period of the Nakşibendi order in Central Asia and Iran and the growing rejection of the type of 40-day retreats espoused by the Halveti order, see Paul, pp. 30-34.

What Fuˈādī is explaining here is that he was close to reaching the sixth stage of the Halveti path but failed to complete the process because he was once again drawn into worldly pursuits. Refer to the table in Oğuz, p. 26, to track the stages to which Fuˈādī refers.
Like many other Ottoman Muslims of his time, Fu’âdî was deeply affected by the worries that surrounded the coming of the Muslim millennium toward the end of Sultan Murad III’s reign, and this, along with the general instability of state employment at that time, proved to be the catalyst that drew him back onto the Sufi path after the death of his first guide. The conclusion of the Ottoman war with the Safavids in 1590 had also led to disruption and financial strain that fell heavily on the resources of the empire, leading to an upsurge in brigandage and other problems. The stress and strain of trying to function in an increasingly unstable world led Fu’âdî to long for the safety that the Halveti order could provide. By this time, Muhyiddîn had managed to secure his succession to the leadership of the Şâbâniyye. As the internal political situation increasingly worsened over the course of the decade, with multiple revolts threatening the sultan’s control, Fu’âdî’s commitment to the order became absolute. His guide, Muhyiddîn Efendi, took a liking to Fu’âdî, and predicted on the second day of a 40-day spiritual retreat that Fu’âdî undertook that he would gain mastery over the sixth stage from a dream-vision that he would have. It proved to be

---

14 Menâkıb-ı Şa’bân, p. 120.

15 Imber, Ottoman Empire, 1300-1650, pp. 66-67.
an accurate prediction, and Fu’ādī soon gained access to the seventh and final stage, which
gave him the right to give guidance of his own accord to others.¹⁶

Fu’ādī’s career differed significantly in a key respect from those of his predecessors, and indeed from that of his own master. While all of the other followers of Şa‘bân Efendi who eventually succeeded to leadership of the order performed service in other cities and towns in the region, there is no indication that Fu’ādī ever left Kastamonu during the period between the completion of his training on the path and his accession to the leadership of the order in 1604. Instead, we must assume that he continued his duties as a scribe for the Kastamonu müftülük while preaching at the Şa‘bân-1 Veli mosque on Fridays. The reason for this may have been grimly practical: from 1596 to 1610 Anatolia was racked by the Celâlî revolts, first under the aegis of the renegade Kara Yazıcı and subsequently under a number of other leaders. Much of the countryside was plundered, and roads were frequently unsafe to travel while marauding bands roamed the area of Kastamonu and other cities of the region.¹⁷ Muhyiddîn may have lacked the ability to send Fu’âdî too far afield after completing his training, and he may also have valued his preaching and his connections with the müfti of Kastamonu.

The chaos of the period probably forced Muhyiddîn to conserve resources and focus on maintaining the order’s following as best he could, and many of his plans for the development of the order and its institutions went unfulfilled during his lifetime.


¹⁷ For a brief summary of the Celâlî revolts, which occurred over the course of this 15-year period, see Imber, Ottoman Empire, 1300-1650, pp. 72-76; for more thorough coverage, see Mustafa Akdağ, Celalî İsyanları (1550-1603) (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basimevi, 1963).
Nevertheless, his talented follower Fu’âdî vowed to fulfill his shaykh’s vision. He recorded part of a conversation he was having with his master one day while he was in the process of completing his Sufi training. In a section he labels “a story” (hikâyet), he remembers what Muhyiddîn said to him.

When [Muhyiddîn] said, “I have three wishes in the world. If God most High were to satisfy those wishes, I would die, and if I were to pass on [to the afterlife], death would be a favor to my soul,” the poor one requested an explanation. He said, “The first is that the pulpit in the noble mosque is [too] long. It constrains the circle of the remembrance of God, and it is an obstacle to the zeal of those performing the zikr. [The second is that] two pillars in the mosque also block and cause difficulty in this manner. [The first two wishes] are to make the administrator [of the mosque] shorten the pulpit and to take out the pillars.” He was silent and did not explain his third wish. When I asked him for an explanation about his third wish, he said, “Since it is confidential (mahremleri olmaga), if it [can be kept as] a secret, informal revelation, and if my dream becomes reality by the grace of God independently, then if it were to appear in my time that an exalted tomb is built over the lord Şâbân Efendi, and if I were to cover the enlightened sepulcher with a wool [covering], and if I were to wrap his black turban [on it], then I would have achieved my final wish.” Several years later, his blessed soul passed on to the place of the mercy of God, and his body was moved to the area of the sepulcher of the lord [Şâbân]. The poor one was guided to the service of the order in its lodge and the guidance of mystical knowledge on its prayer-rug by the command of God, and while participating in the circle of the remembrance of God, the three wishes of the noble one came to my mind.19

Once again, Fu’âdî indirectly reveals several important things in this story. The first is that Muhyiddîn Efendi was not in charge of the mosque during the years of his guidance. If we can take Fu’âdî’s word for it, this conversation took place sometime around the year 1600, and Muhyiddîn plainly states that it is not in his power to make the administrator of the

---

18 This expression could also mean, “since it is forbidden,” which is not out of the question either.

19 Menâktî-ı Şâbân, pp. 147-148.
mosque undertake the necessary renovations to make the mosque more hospitable to Halveti practice. This implies that the mosque at the Şa‘bân-ı Veli complex fell under the control of the order only after ʻÖmer el-Fu’âdî came to power, even though Şa‘bân himself had played an important role in its conversion into a congregational mosque from the simple mescid, or a mosque built for daily prayer, constructed by Seyyid Sünnetî. This is perhaps because the mosque had been renovated and its status as vakf renegotiated with imperial intervention during the reign of Sultan Murad III at the instigation of Şeyh Șücâ, and therefore its administrator was appointed by official fiat. The fact that Muhyiddîn himself was not recognized as its administrator may have reflected problems with his succession, or the simple fact that leadership of the order did not indicate control over the mosque. The fact that the mosque was poorly designed to accommodate Halveti practices implies that others were in charge of the renovation. When Fu’âdî came to power, he must somehow have brought the complex fully under the control of the members of the order.

The Menâkıb-ı Şa‘bân offers another clue as to why Muhyiddîn and his followers might have had trouble building a tomb during this period. During the reign of Mehmed III (1595-1603), the şeyhülislâm Sa‘deddîn (d. 1599) apparently was asked to issue a fetvâ defending the practice of visiting the tombs of saints. We know that Sa‘deddîn had strong connections with Sultan Murad III, having become attached to his retinue as a teacher even before Murad’s accession to the throne in 1574, and was probably well-disposed toward

---

20 For more on the appearance of various renovations and alterations to the mosque circa 1560 and 1581, see Eyüpgiller, p. 107. See also Mehmet Behçet, Kastamonu Âsâr-ı Kadîmesi (İstanbul: Matba’-ı-ı Amire, 1925), p. 152-158, for a copy of the vakf deed of 1581.
most Sufi practices. In both the *Menâkıtb-ı Sa‘bân* and the *Türbenâme*, Fu‘âdî refers to this *fetvâ* as a defense against the anti-Sufi factions that were harassing the Sa‘bânîyye in his own time. In an introduction to the copy of the legal decision that Sa‘deddîn issued, Fu‘âdî describes the kind of trouble the order was facing in regard to its practice of revering the tombs of the Sa‘bânîyye’s founders.

Some of the people of vanity and conceit, [those] slow of understanding, ignorant ones posing as wise people, and uneducated people who follow the urging of Satan and the demands of the carnal soul from among the exoteric ulema and others, censure the visiting of the enlightened sepulchers for assistance and the assistance of the esteemed saints and noble shaykhs from among the Sunni tradition who manifest sainthood and acts of grace from their good souls on account of [their] not knowing anything. They say, “They are created beings like us also, and they were people of faith and trustworthy people. But it is not decreed in our sect that they die as believers [automatically]. They will also say, ‘My soul, my soul’ on the day of judgment like us; there is no benefit for anyone from them in this world. And it is not suitable to visit to seek help from their tombs. It is necessary to seek help and assistance from God Most High himself alone. It is polytheism to seek help from any other,” and they say many other things like this.

We know that the order had been challenged by multiple groups that had sprung up before and after Sa‘bân’s death, but by Fu‘âdî’s time, the greatest threat was not from groups composed of upstart or wayward Sa‘bânî dervishes, or even individual scholars like Evliyâ Şüca, but from organized groups that challenged the doctrinal bases of Sufi practice itself.

---

21 Sa‘deddîn’s biography, which contains an outline of his career and his rise to the position of Şeyhülislâm, can be found in ‘Atâ’i, v. 2, pp. 429-431.

Regarding the movement centering on and following the rise of Kâdızâdeli Mehmed (d. 1635) and his followers, Madeline Zilfi sees their uniqueness lying in both willingness to take a strongly activist approach toward suppressing societal practices that they viewed as innovations or deviations from scriptural norms, and their success in doing so. Unfortunately, the use of this term “Kâdızâdeli” is rather problematic in light of our evidence from this period, as it implies that the movement started with Kâdızâde Mehmed himself, a notion that Zilfi herself rejects as the movement was based in large part on the writings of the 16th-century scholar Birgili Mehmed Efendi (d. 1571). See Zilfi, “Discordant Revivalism,” pp. 252-253, and idem., Politics of Piety, pp. 143-146. Despite the Ottoman historian Naîmâ’s use of the term “Kâdızâdeli” to describe the movement, he also rejects the idea that they were a new phenomenon in Islamic history, suggesting instead that they were part of a long cycle of the conflict between exoteric scholars and Sufi leaders going back to the earliest periods of Islamic history; see Naîmâ, v. 6, p. 218. The question of how to define earlier manifestations of this phenomenon preceding the height of Kâdızâde Mehmed’s career is therefore very much open. For lack of a better term, I prefer to employ the term “proto-Kâdızâdeli” as a way of describing groups who espoused this ideology before Kâdızâde Mehmed made it his own.

To see a 20th-century interpretation of the scripture that denies the viability of any type of intercession, see Fazlur Rahman, Major Themes of the Qur’ân, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1994), pp. 31-32. As we shall see, it is interesting, in light of the debate in question here, that Rahman cites the well-known Hanbalî scholar Ibn Taymiyyah as one of the sources for his arguments.

These groups were forerunners to the Kâdızâdeli movement, which would dominate the religious politics and debates of the 17th century.23

Despite the insulting rhetoric of the hagiographer, we can conclude from Fu’âdî’s presentation that the individuals challenging the legitimacy of tomb visitation based their arguments on the concept of radical equality among all Muslims in their relationship to God, which allowed no one to act as an intermediary or intercessor with the divinity for his/her co-religionists. This simple idea, for which scriptural justification can be found in the Qur’ân,24 threatened one of the foundations of Ottoman Sufism. Fu’âdî and others knew that any failure to respond to the assault of the censurers on the practices and institutions of his order would mean trouble in the increasingly hostile environment that was building in the

---

23 Regarding the movement centering on and following the rise of Kâdîtâde Mehmed (d. 1635) and his followers, Madeline Zilfi sees their uniqueness lying in both willingness to take a strongly activist approach toward suppressing societal practices that they viewed as innovations or deviations from scriptural norms, and their success in doing so. Unfortunately, the use of this term “Kâdîtâdeli” is rather problematic in light of our evidence from this period, as it implies that the movement started with Kâdîtâde Mehmed himself, a notion that Zilfi herself rejects as the movement was based in large part on the writings of the 16th-century scholar Birgili Mehmed Efendi (d. 1571). See Zilfi, “Discordant Revivalism,” pp. 252-253, and idem., Politics of Piety, pp. 143-146. Despite the Ottoman historian Naîmâ’s use of the term “Kâdîtâdeli” to describe the movement, he also rejects the idea that they were a new phenomenon in Islamic history, suggesting instead that they were part of a long cycle of the conflict between exoteric scholars and Sufi leaders going back to the earliest periods of Islamic history; see Naîmâ, v. 6, p. 218. The question of how to define earlier manifestations of this phenomenon preceding the height of Kâdîtâde Mehmed’s career is therefore very much open. For lack of a better term, I prefer to employ the term “proto-Kâdîtâdeli” as a way of describing groups who espoused this ideology before Kâdîtâde Mehmed made it his own.

24 To see a 20th-century interpretation of the scripture that denies the viability of any type of intercession, see Fazlur Rahman, Major Themes of the Qur’ân, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1994), pp. 31-32. As we shall see, it is interesting, in light of the debate in question here, that Rahman cites the well-known Hanbalî scholar Ibn Taymiyyah as one of the sources for his arguments.
run up to his tenure as leader of the order. By issuing his fetvâ, Sâ’eddîn gave Ottoman Sufi leaders an important piece of propaganda that allowed them to use the power of the state against their opponents, a weapon that would be continually revived in later generations to oppose anti-Sufi attacks.\footnote{It is no coincidence that one of the prominent scholars who convinced the şeyhülislâm Bahâ’î Efendi (d. 1654) to countermand his own legal opinion condemning the practices of the Sufis during the height of the Kâdızâdeli disturbance of the early 1650s was the son of this scholar and former şeyhülislâm, Hoca Sâ’eddînzâde Ebû’s-Sa’îd. See Zilfi, Politics of Piety, pp. 142-143. It should also be noted that the Kâdızâdelis used the same tactic of employing selected legal opinions of an earlier era to make a case for more stringent prohibitions against their Sufi opponents.} After praising both Sultan Murad III and Sultan Mehmed III as prominent supporters of the mystical path, Fu’âdî includes the full text of the fetvâ in Ottoman Turkish. In response to the question, “If Zeyd, who is among the ulema, were to say ‘There is no benefit at all to a person who visits...the tombs of the saints and scholars and upright ones,’ what is legally required for the aforementioned Zeyd?” Sâ’eddîn’s response ran as follows:

> When considering the works, reports, and famous stories that the holy enlightened spirits of the pure ponds of the great saints are not cut off from connection [with existence], and when the suitability of visiting tombs full of lights is a chosen doctrine (mezheb-i muhtâr), it is necessary to choose it. The people of aptitude manifest foolish evil acts, ignorance and error in censuring the witnessing of works and the unveilings of the good men that have occurred in the tombs of the saints. It is also well-known that a shaykh of the people of faults, among the most extreme fanatics of the Hanbâlî [school], was a censurer of visitors of tombs. He even ventured to censure the tombs of the prophets! Since he wrote a book on that topic, and went wildly astray from the path of God, the ulema of his age vilified and betrayed him with attacks, accusations of ignorance, and an extended imprisonment. It is well-known that judgments of scholarly gatherings on religious problems occurred [when he] opposed the clarity of correct opinions. They accused people of error, and fetvâs were given saying, “If he doesn’t repent, let him be executed.” When the religious scholars were in unity, he repented and was saved by a confession of his ignorance. The letters and copies of the legal decisions of the scholars of that age are not recorded. And the saying,
“When you are perplexed, seek guidance from the people of the tombs,” is famous and accepted among the people of perception.\textsuperscript{26}

Sa\'deddin’s decision stresses two important points. The first is that the visitation of tombs is a lawful option for believers. Nevertheless, the şeyhülislâm offers no scriptural justification for this, instead holding that this represents a longstanding custom based on the experiences and reports of the Muslim community over the course of its history. For this reason, his opinion would not have been convincing to any of the anti-Sufi factions of his day who emphasized strict grounding in what they considered to be accepted scriptural texts.

Far more interesting, however, is the second point, which is an obvious condemnation of the life and works of the noted medieval scholar Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 1328), who has remained a controversial figure in both Muslim and non-Muslim scholarship down to the present day. What Sa\'deddin saw in the discourse of his anti-Sufi opponents was the legacy of this scholar among the Ottomans several centuries later, and he condemns its survival on historical grounds. In a statement that shows a remarkable understanding of the historical circumstances of the era in which Ibn Taymiyyah lived, Sa\'deddin cites Ibn Taymiyyah’s unpopularity amongst the Muslim scholars of his own time, brands him an extremist, and notes that he was imprisoned to force a recantation of his beliefs.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{26} See Menâkıtb-1 Şâbân, pp. 88-89 and 162-163.

3.2 Ömer el-Fu’âdî’s Struggle to Expand the Şâbânîd Legacy in the Early Seventeenth Century: The Writing of the Menâkıbnâme-i Şâbân-i Veli

Armed with this legal opinion and the vision laid out by his teacher Muhyiddîn, Fu’âdî was ready to pursue an activist path in building up the Şa’bânîyye branch of the Halveti order that he was to inherit upon the death of his master in 1604. His ambitions marked a turning point in the wider history of the Halveti order as well. He came to differ from his predecessors in a key respect: he was a prolific writer whose works have survived into modern times despite his being a provincial Kastamonu scholar for the duration of his life. This makes him an unusual figure worthy of attention, as he stands out in contrast to the multitude of big-city denizens who normally make up the ranks of ılema authors in manuscript library card catalogs. He also lived an extraordinarily long life and maintained his position at the head of the Şa’bânîyye in Kastamonu for nearly 33 years until his death at the age of 76 in 1636.

Unfortunately, we do not know very much about the first three years of Fu’âdî’s leadership of the order. However, the continuation of the Celâlî revolts until the decisive defeat of their most powerful leaders in 1607 and 1608 probably guaranteed that the new shaykh could not accomplish much more than establishing his position with his followers,

---

28 Fu’âdî confirms the year of his accession to the leadership of the order in ’Ömer el-Fu’âdi, Risâle-i Silsilenâme (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Ktp. MS Haci Mahmud Efendi #2287/13), fols. 258b-259a.

29 Necdet Yılmaz notes at least 28 other works penned by Fu’âdî in addition to the Menâkıb-i Şa’bân and its appended Türbenâme, although some of these are probably elements of the longer hagiographical work on which the two named works were based. Of course, not all of these have survived, and some of them may overlap. Due to time constraints, I myself was not able to consult all of Fu’âdî’s surviving works that were available to me, and had to settle for the representative sample in the bibliography. See Necdet Yılmaz, Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf, pp. 94-98.
many of whom no doubt began their training or service with Muhyiddîn. He may have faced a period of confusion during which the old devotees of Muhyiddîn Efendi mulled their options and either stayed in or drifted out of the order, as Fu’âdî had 15 years previously. These issues notwithstanding, the order that Fu’âdî inherited from his predecessors was now facing a new problem exemplified by the master himself. Many of his followers were people who had never known Şa‘bân Efendi, who had died over 35 years before. Fu’âdî himself had been only nine years old when he died. The number of people old enough to remember the events of a generation past was rapidly diminishing at this point, and Fu’âdî realized that he had to do something to preserve the order’s legacy for the immediate future. With his background in the Kastamonu müftülük’s scribal service, combined with his experience in delivering sermons at the Şa‘bân-1 Veli mosque, Fu’âdî was uniquely qualified to write the hagiography that came to preserve most of order’s known history. Still, he would need the help and encouragement of his contemporaries. In the introduction to the work, Fu’âdî explains the circumstances surrounding its composition.

Many noble men of God among the people of spiritual knowledge among the Sunnî sect wrote the anecdotes of the saints on account of belief being necessary and required in the acts of grace of the saints just as in the miracles of the Prophets. The anecdotes of every master and his followers being a written tract or a sought-after writing, they were read out in their lodges and in other noble gatherings, and the states full of perfection and sincerity and heart-ravishing acts of grace were known to everyone....On account of the exalted anecdotes and acts of grace of the esteemed Şa‘bân Efendi and the noble ones who were among his successors not being written in a tract, and on account of some of the trustworthy brethren sincerely requesting that a hagiography be written for these [people] as [they had been for] the other esteemed saints and noble shaykhs, it came to my mind to set out to write a hagiography on some sheets of paper in the year 1017 (1608). When [I was] guided to begin, it seemed [that I would] abandon it, thinking, “Be it little or much, this type of writing and official recording prohibits work and unity in the corner of solitude, and is a cause of many thoughts and multiplicity.” While [I was] on the brink of postponing and turning away, the noble ones
and gentlemen among the scholars and the masters of knowledge, especially the most noble of our brethren and greatest of his contemporaries, Şeyh Efendi, who is now the müfti in charge of Kastamonu,...said: “Although we read out and hear the hagiographies of so many noble ones among the masters of grace in other lands and the things pertaining to them in [Şa’bân’s] lodge and other gatherings, even though the true saint Şa’bân Efendi buried in Kastamonu was among the masters of sainthood and holders of grace, up to now his noble anecdotes and pleasant acts of grace have not been written in a tract or officially taken down in writing. We used to say in those places, ‘If a man of God...were to write [this] down, it would be most worthy and appropriate.’ Now we find you have set out this far, and it is not suitable at all that you should abandon the writing of the hagiography!”

By the time Fu’âdî set out to write the work, the cult of Şa’bân Efendi was securely established in Kastamonu. Nevertheless, Fu’âdî still wished to express his hesitation over the project, feeling that it diverted him from his devotions, and cited the urging of his contemporaries as the primary catalyst for the creation of the written record, perhaps as a form of apology for his action. He clearly recognized that the existence of hagiographical works played a vital role in transmitting the ideology and practice of the friends of God to a wider audience, and that if the Şa’bâniyye branch of the order was going to compete in the marketplace of holy personages in the region, it would have to produce a similar text.

Still, once Fu’âdî wrote the text, he made it very clear that his ambitions lay far beyond the immediate context of the people of Kastamonu. He proceeded to offer praises to Sultan Ahmed I (r. 1603-1617) in the form of his own poetry, lauding him in particular

---

30 Unfortunately, I have not to date been able to confirm the existence of this individual in any other source. This suggests that he was probably a prominent local figure only.

31 Menâkıb-ı Şa’bân, pp. 3-4.
This would not have been idle praise at the time Fu’âdî wrote his work. August 1608 marked the battle of Göksün Plateau, which saw the defeat of the Celâlî leader Kalenderoğlu at the hands of Kuyucu Murad Paşa (d. 1610), following the previous year’s defeat of Canbuladoğlu ʿAli Paşa. The timing of Fu’âdî’s work being sent off to Istanbul may not have been a coincidence. See Griswold, The Great Anatolian Rebellion, pp. 187-197.

In other words, since the original text was written in Arabic and covered a substantial amount of material, it was not achieving the desired circulation among Fu’âdî’s contemporaries, and his intended audience probably let him know about it. As far as we can

---

32 This would not have been idle praise at the time Fu’âdî wrote his work. August 1608 marked the battle of Göksün Plateau, which saw the defeat of the Celâlî leader Kalenderoğlu at the hands of Kuyucu Murad Paşa (d. 1610), following the previous year’s defeat of Canbuladoğlu ʿAli Paşa. The timing of Fu’âdî’s work being sent off to Istanbul may not have been a coincidence. See Griswold, The Great Anatolian Rebellion, pp. 187-197.

33 Menâkıb-ı Ṣâbân, pp. 5-6.
tell, Fu’âdî completed both texts in the year 1608, and the abridgment began to spread rapidly in the region shortly thereafter.

We know from the previous chapter that Fu’âdî’s aims in writing the work were not limited to helping his contemporaries. The hagiography displays his activist bent and his desire to interpret or even reinterpret key points in the narrative for his audience to channel their reception of the order’s legacy. In addition, he sought to deflect the criticisms of the anti-Sufi factions whose strength and numbers had begun to increase toward the end of the 16th century. Nevertheless, Fu’âdî’s work is even more troubled by another concern, a concern so important that he commenced the work not with the anecdotes of the virtuous men who were the subjects of his hagiography, or even with an explanation of the Halveti order’s chain of authority and founding figures. Instead, he begins his hagiographical work with a chapter whose title’s simple Turkish meaning speaks volumes about the issues that troubled the Ottoman society in which Fu’âdî and his contemporaries lived and worked: “Who Is a Real Saint, and Are Extraordinary Acts of Grace and Intuition Necessary for All of the True Saints, or Is it Enough to be Found in Some of Them?” The import of the subsequent narratives rest, therefore, on this framework created by Fu’âdî himself. For this reason, it deserves a closer examination.

Based on the remarks of the great Sufi scholar ʿAbdurrezzâk al-Kâshânî (d. 1330), Fu’âdî begins by informing his audience that not every pious individual can be esteemed a

---

34 For more on Kâshânî and his signature works, including the Íṣtihalât as-sufiyyah from which Fu’âdî is quoting, see D.B. Macdonald, “ʿAbd al-Razzâk Kamâl al-Dîn b. Abû’l-Ghanâʾim al-Kâshânî,” EI², v. 1, p. 377. He was also known as an important commentator on Ibn al-ʿArabi’s Fûsûs al-hikam; see Chodkiewicz, pp. 47-48, n. 2.
true saint. There are certain conditions that must first be fulfilled, and he focuses on three on them in particular. The first is that a true saint does everything for God; in other words, he does not engage in upholding Islamic norms or the principles of the order because he expects some kind of benefit from doing so. Rather, he avoids all activity which would draw him away from God. The second crucial characteristic is that the true saint does not seek refuge in anything or anyone other than God. Fu’âdî elaborates for his audience that this means the true saint will accept any calamity, pain or suffering. He will never complain about it, nor will he seek support from another person. Finally, he remains aloof from worldly affairs and never mixes worldliness with his actions or mystical states in any way. Without these three fundamental characteristics, the author informs his audience, no one can be considered a true saint. Based on our reading of both Şa‘bân Efendi and his successors, we can begin to see the criteria Fu’âdî establishes in the selection of his material for the hagiography. Nevertheless, this introduction is not just about establishing basic criteria for judging the acceptability of a claimant for sainthood. If he were asked by an audience member about the reasons for these three criteria, Fu’âdî had a ready response.

Because an action that is extraordinary appears and manifests [itself] also from a sorcerer, or the people of istidrâc, or someone other than a saint. It is on account of this that there is no difference in the apparent sense between an act of grace and magic. The two of them are both actions contrary to customary [occurrence]. But when [the difference] is perceived, it is perceived from the sign and the state of the person who manifests [it].

35 Menâktb-ı Şa‘bân, pp. 9-10.

36 The term ehl-i istidrâc in this context refers to evil people who lead others to perdition by deceptively appearing to be successful in their activities in the short run. One might loosely describe them as people who made a living from tapping supernatural forces outside of the bounds of religiously-accepted norms. Fu’âdî says that some define this practice as hâlet-i kâzibe, or a “state of being a liar.”
Meaning, if an action or state contrary to customary [occurrence] were to appear from the prophets, it would be a miracle. If the essence of the descriptions which were mentioned appears from a saint in whom are found these three signs, then it is [the power of] sainthood and an act of grace. But if the essence of the descriptions were to appear from people in whom are not found the three signs, or who are people of carnal passions and innovation, or who are not among the Sunnî sect, it is not sainthood or an act of grace. Rather, it is magic, or it appears through the power of cleverness, shrewdness or a desire to make a living (âkl-1 ma âş)....May God most High protect the community of Muhammad from rabble-rousers, tricksters, frauds and the evil of the evildoers!37

The abstract points of the introductory section thus take on a much more practical application—Fu’âdî is enjoining his audience to appreciate the difference between magic and religion, and not confuse the two. In other words, the only appropriate recourse for an Ottoman subject in times of trouble or need is to turn to God through the medium of his true saints, not to go to purveyors of magical spells, incantations or other competitors in the market of supernatural manipulation. Far from treating Sufi shaykhs as bastions of superstition and backwardness—the sort of accusation leveled against them in more recent times—Fu’âdî encourages his audience to eschew magical practices and other non-religious manifestations of supernatural provenance.38

The extraordinary acts of grace by saints like Şa’bân Efendi notwithstanding, Fu’âdî goes on to make it clear that aspirants on the Sufi path should not even place miraculous occurrences high on their list of important things to consider when assessing the legacies of

37 Menâkib-1 Şa’bân, p. 10.
38 While Fu’âdî is not advancing an entirely new argument here in regard to the validity of magical practices, his attempt to distinguish clearly between magic and mystical authority for a lay audience is very much in tune with a general transition that had been happening elsewhere in the world as well. See, for example, the process described in detail for England by Keith Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic (New York: Charles Scribners’ Sons, 1971).
pious figures in their society. Continuing to cite the Arabic work of Kâshânî, Fu’âdî argues that many saints have never manifested any acts of grace at all. This does not detract from their sainthood, however, and Fu’âdî once again translates the abstract point expressed in Kâshânî’s Arabic into a Turkish equivalent that implies the problem in society that the audience must defend against.

...When establishing the existence of a friend of God, it is necessary not to slander or disparage [him], saying, “If an extraordinary act of grace were never found in him, he has no act of grace, and those who have no act of grace are not among the people of God,” and it is necessary not to abandon him. But the state of the prophets is not analogous to this! A miracle is necessary for all of them according to their place, time, state and character, and according to the states and actions of the people of that time. It is a proof and power for the trustworthiness in their call to prophecy, meaning to their being real prophets. But if it is found in only some of the saints, it is sufficient....It is also established and known that they say, “Just as an act of grace is the menstruation of men to a novice, perfection is the menstruation of men to the saints (mübtedîye kerâmêt hayz-ı ricâl olduğu gibi kâmîl evliyâya dahî hayz-ı ricâldur).”^39 Because the perfected knower and the virtuous saint is he who is not devoid of advancement even after completing [his training]....[S]ince there is no end to the stages of the knowledge of God and the advancement of a state, if an act of grace which is an apparent unveiling appears, as opposed to a spiritual unveiling in a perfected knower who is able and capable of obtaining perfection, it is certain that the apparent unveiling blocks the spiritual unveiling which is obtained in the world of the mind, passions, heart, and soul, and prevents advancement.^40

In discussing these points, Fu’âdî tries to stress to his audience that they should not use miraculous occurrences as the yardstick by which to judge both the saints and their own progress on the Sufi path. In fact, he presents the manifestation of miraculous acts as a curse rather than a blessing, as they block advancement toward the goal of greater knowledge of

---

^39 This gender-based reference is used here to express impossibility of a given situation; its earthiness may reflect the rural environment and backgrounds of the audience to which Fu’âdî was delivering his message.

^40 Menâktb-ı Şa‘bân, pp. 11-12.
God. In addition, he reiterates the basic rule that prophets are not analogous to saints in terms of the production of extraordinary acts. By downplaying the importance of manifest acts of grace, Fu’âdî is arguing that his audience needs to take a more rigorous approach to their religious life, and not just go looking for miracle-workers to solve their problems. Only with constant work can one advance, and Fu’âdî even notes that the Prophet Muhammad beseeched God to grant him greater knowledge and understanding even after receiving the revelation of the Qur’ân. To back up this point, he later cites a point from the twelfth chapter of the Muḥimmāt al-wāsilīn of Ebû Șabît ad-Daylami (d. 589/1193), stating that the two things that adepts on the mystical path must beware of most are charismatic acts of grace (kerāmet) and extraordinary powers of discernment (firâset). Fu’âdî defines the kerāmet in question as a form of what he calls “apparent unveiling” (kesf-i sûrî): acts or states which most people are unable to accomplish and which contravene the customary mode of existence. Firâset, on the other hand, does not entail apparent unveiling; however, it does constitute the ability to know every potential state, whether hidden or apparent, through the purifying rituals and ascetic practices of the Sufi path, making it a form of perception achieved through hard work that sometimes resembles kerāmet. When either kerāmet or firâset takes on an apparent form in the worldly realm, it is a potential danger,

---

41 For this work on Sufism, see Kâtip Çelebi (d. 1656), Kesâfû’z-zunûn ’an esâmi ul-kutûb ve’l-funûn, 3rd ed. (Tehran: al-Maktabat al-Islamiyyah, 1947), v. 2, p. 1916. In addition, Fu’âdî informs us that he took information from the work of Abû’l-Faraj ʿAbd ar-Rahman b. ʿAlî b. al-Jawzî (d. 597/1200-01) entitled Irshâd al-murîdîn fî hikâyât as-sâlihîn, and a work called Irshâd at-tâlibîn, which was perhaps a commentary on the ʿAwârîf of Shihâb al-Dîn al-Suhrawardî by one “Ibn Ahmed al-Bursevî.” For these works, see Kesâfû’z-zunûn, v. 1, pp. 65 and 67. The predominance of early 13th-century works as his sources on these issues is a notable commentary on the intellectual bases of mysticism in Fu’âdî’s time and place.
for it distracts the seeker on the Halveti path from his goal of reaching the seventh and final stage of the process; in fact, manifestations of apparent unveiling such as these are almost guaranteed to keep the seeker at a lower stage of the process. Therefore, inner or spiritual unveiling is the goal of the seeker, for only rarely can both apparent and spiritual unveiling be combined by an individual of superior rank; one assumes that Fu’âtî would cite his hero, Şa’bân Efendi, as a prime example of such an individual.  

Fu’âtî also warns his audience to beware of two other kinds of skeptics, namely, people who have flirted with the Sufi path but have not given it their full effort, and resort to complaining about the shaykhs of their time rather than admitting their own failings. Recreating the chatter of these skeptics for his audience, he describes what type of people to watch out for.

Some people...don’t engage partially or fully in the struggle in the path of God, and they go around to strangers according to the needs of the passions of the carnal soul and satanic urgings. They never submit to the noble one whom they know, and they censure the existence of the perfected guide and the noble ones among the people of rapture whose prayers are accepted, saying, “None of the noble ones of the people of rapture and those whose prayers are accepted remains....If a real saint were to appear, I would join up and serve [him] with all my soul.” Some [others], with imagined reverence, also think badly [of the noble ones] without apprehending the true state, and become followers of Satan; they look down their noses at [the saint] and say, “If he were a real saint and a real noble one with acts of grace, he wouldn’t leave us to our own state; he would enter our dreams or impose rapture [upon us], or he would appear to us and make us dervishes without our needing to choose it; he would guide [us].” But this is not the speech of an intelligent person, nor the words of a righteous person! It appears from the trickery of the carnal soul and the urgings of Satan. It is absurd talk! But not every person understands the error and weakness of this talk.

42 The discussion of these issues appears in Menâktıb-ı Şa’bân, pp. 16-17.

43 Ibid., p. 13.
In this section, Fu’âdî squarely confronts the ever-present argument found in much of the religiously-inspired historical thinking of his contemporaries: that the present and the future represent merely a slow drift away from the perfection of the past. People who make the argument that their own time no longer produces religious greatness and that great saints are no longer available to them are making the grave error of insulting God’s friends who dwell in the present. In addition, it is not the saint’s job to go around saving people from their own vices; the initiative rests, as always, with the believer himself. In making this argument, the hagiographer must redefine the relevance and importance of many hagiographical anecdotes that present the saints as being able to bring about changes in people suddenly through the force of their own charisma. According to Fu’âdî’s argument, saints do such things not just because they can but because they are given a reason to do so by their followers. Otherwise, why would the prophets and saints of the past have left any infidels or censurers of their work in the world? Fu’âdî and his contemporaries desperately needed this argument at this point in Ottoman history, because after the Celâlî revolts, which had paralyzed and destroyed much of the Anatolian countryside, many had lost their faith not only in their governmental

---

44 It is instructive in this regard to consider the comments of Fazlur Rahman in the conclusion to his work on the history and development of Islam. He argues that the tendency to enshrine the actions and sayings of the founders of the faith as law, rather than treating them as an inspiring (and therefore more flexible) model, creates a situation whereby historically-based responses to problems become enshrined as religious dogma. However, he also condemns the roots of both Sufism and Shi’ism as responsible for enshrining this historical mentality of decline in the religious vitality of society in the medieval Islamic world-view! The views Fu’âdî expresses here indicate that we need to reassess such polemical viewpoints about the role of Sufis in shaping the history of Islam, and modify them accordingly to better reflect the nuances present within Sufism itself. See Rahman, Islam, pp. 235-254 and esp. pp. 244-246.

institutions but in the social institutions like sainthood that were supposed to protect them from the kind of evils they had witnessed.\textsuperscript{46}

After criticizing the common wisdom about the role of saints in society, Fu‘âdî goes on to explain that in fact, the majority of saints never publicly manifest any miraculous acts. The only reason they do so at all is to prove the correctness of their path and to periodically lead people to salvation, and even these noble goals may fall victim to the dangers inherent in the manifestations of kerâmet. As a result, true saints will manifest their knowledge and charismatic grace only in specific situations. To make his point, he draws upon an anecdotal reference in the life of Şa‘bân Efendi that does not appear in the hagiography.

...A person in a gathering asked Şa‘bân Efendi about something pertaining to the problems of exoteric law. The noble one replied by saying, “It is not necessary for us to respond to this problem. It is necessary [to submit it] to the müftî, who is the shaykh of the exoteric law. The great shaykhs replied to those who asked about this point by saying, ‘Go to the müftî.’” Another person in the gathering thought badly of the noble one and made a recollection, saying, “How can a knowledgeable shaykh who does not give a response to a problem of the exoteric law be a perfected shaykh and a true saint? Specifically, it is necessary to put a bridle from beyond on the day of judgment on the mouth of a scholar who doesn’t give an answer to a legal question and is stingy.” That mine of charismatic grace, in order to make that person understand what is correct and to guide him, said with the inspiration of God: “One does not place a bridle on our mouth from afar on judgment day because of our not giving a response to a problem whose response is incumbent on the müftî in the exoteric law. That meaning which was recalled is according to the supposition that no scholar is ever found who will respond to that problem, that its response is specific to a scholar, and that he also does not giving a response out of laziness, and he continues to hinder [the inquiry by saying] that the problem is not known. If a question were asked about the knowledge or problems of the order, spiritual knowledge, or the spiritual vision [of God]...then the response to this

\textsuperscript{46}It is worth considering some of the observations of William Griswold on the impact of the revolts on Anatolia in the conclusion of his monograph on the history of the Celâlí revolts; see Griswold, An{	extregistered}atolian Rebellion, pp. 212-214, and 220-221.
knowledge which is incumbent on the shaykhs, who make this secret clear, and who make manifest this state in order to guide that person.”

Of course, the offending individual was forced to apologize to the shaykh after getting this rebuke. The point of the anecdote, as Fu’âdî interprets it, is that Şâ’bân would not have answered any question posed in a public gathering that he felt had no value or benefit beyond increasing his standing in the eyes of the community; in other words, he refused to address any question on the exoteric law strictly for the purpose of showing off his level of knowledge, and instead referred the question to someone else who had equal competence to address the issue. However, Fu’âdî’s focus on this anecdote cannot help but draw interest. He was, after all, part of the müftülük himself, and he may also have wanted to stress that the saints did not threaten the realm of exoteric knowledge represented by the jurisprudents and legal scholars. Each of the religious figures in Muslim society should keep to his own sphere of influence, so to speak, and the public should not tax their shaykh’s patience by expecting him to fulfill every possible role when a more obvious alternative presented itself.

In illustrating this point more fully and elaborating for his audience the issues raised by the technical terms of apparent versus spiritual unveiling (kesf-i sürî vs. kesf-i ma’nevî), Fu’âdî inserts another of his advisory notes on “the example of the wandering dervish (abdâl),” aimed at clarifying the technical discussion for a less intellectually-oriented audience who struggled with the abstractions inherent in the technical terminology. He inserts it in response to a question he had heard from others about these issues that went something like: “What does the state...of a dervish look like who is blocked from spiritual unveiling and knowledge of God by the manifestation of this sort of apparent unveiling?”

47 Menâkıb-ı Şâbân, pp. 15-16.
The target of his subsequent rhetorical tirade is clearly the wandering dervishes like the Kalenders and others, well-known figures who had been an influential but potentially deviant force in Anatolian society for centuries.\(^{48}\) These figures roaming the countryside fit the model best, Fu’âdî argues, because if these types of people were asked about the divine manifestation, or the stages and stations on the path to true spiritual knowledge of God, they would become bewildered or speechless. They have a great deal to say only when asked about worldly issues and gossiping about their life stories.

\[\text{Such a dervish} \text{ fills up his gathering with storytelling of a pleasant and joking type like a raven of the people of leisure and a crow full of cackling. He begins to say things without substance that guide [one] to secrets of the causes of false ideas and transitory illusions that fill up the water bottle of the heart. He listens to words without substance from the jokers, lazy people, and the idle ones. After finding [them] idle and without shame like himself, he says: “I journeyed in the world of travel to great cities, towns, and fortresses such as so-and-so, and in those cities and fortress I saw such beautiful rarities and wonders of creation! I traveled in such-and-such mountains and deserts, and in those mountains and deserts I saw such great and venerable rocks, trees, and types of vegetation and blossoms, and such huge-winged and pleasant-voiced birds, and how many wondrous animals and strange things like this! I went around in such-and-such kingdom, and I visited in every province and every land such-and-such Sufi lodges and tombs of the shaykhs and people of God! I met with such-and such noble ones who were masters of grace and were among the people of sainthood, and was honored and filled with purity through conversing [with them], and was distinguished through their prayers of blessing and exalted favors!” He informs through such idle talk and chitchat! But he is accordingly without information about the state and reality of the things he traveled [to see], and the state and knowledge of those noble ones whom he visited. He passes the day with worthless claims and futile words, and doesn’t even know his own weakness and shame. He remains merely in the exoteric [world] and the}\]

\(^{48}\) For more on the diversity of the wandering dervish groups that roamed Anatolia from the 13\(^{th}\) century up to this period, see Ahmet T. Karamustafa, God’s Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Later Middle Ages (1200-1550) (Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1994). This issue has also been studied extensively by Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Marjinal Süfilik: Kalenderiler (XIV.-XVII. Yüzyıllar) (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1992).
apparent form of journeying, and by being uninformed in his journey, and not being a knower of the people of witnessing or the state, he remains in the valley of ignorance and behind the veil of multiplicity. While not even knowing his own state and value, he sponges off the people of God even as he says he is one of the knowers!\(^{49}\)

Despite his contemptuous dismissal of these contemporary figures, the vehemence of Fu’âdî’s denunciation indicates that the society of his time was rife with retired travelers or former \textit{abdâls} who were playing at being Sufi guides simply based on their worldly experience and their visits with various prominent spiritual figures. Since they had never properly embarked on the Sufi path by placing their training in the hands of reputable guides, and had instead merely wandered from place to place idly chatting up the prominent public figures of any given region, they must not be viewed as acceptable substitutes for the real struggles that the path required. Despite this, one must suspect that, from Fu’âdî’s standpoint, far too many people took part in and enjoyed these types of gatherings. He goes on to say that this is the reason why beginners on the Sufi path must not be exposed to obvious acts of grace and miraculous occurrences by the true saints and Sufi masters, for instead of engaging in the struggle required to attain the highest stations in their proper order, they would instead focus on the miracles and wonder how to channel such miracles for their own benefit, much as Sultan Murad III did in his attempt to combine the role of Ottoman ruler with that of mystical aspirant as seen his relations with the Halveti mystic \textit{Şeyh Şücâ'î}.\(^{50}\) Even if the seeker were to witness in his own master such acts of grace early

\(^{49}\) Menâkîb-\textit{i Şâbûn}, pp. 18-19.

\(^{50}\) This can be seen in the surviving correspondence between the sultan and his shaykh in the \textit{Kitâb-\textit{i Manâmat}, as he repeatedly requests the shaykh’s help in supporting his goals or identifying the trustworthiness of an individual at court.
in his training, he must not speak of it or pay it any heed, because it would be dangerous to do so; he might develop a taste for gaining worldly benefits through revealing the secrets of the saints. After all, Fu’âdî notes, there is a reason that the names of saints are followed by the Arabic formula, “May God make his secret holy,” rather than “May God have mercy on him.” By diverting the attention of his audience from the miraculous, he seeks to protect them from falling victim to alternate forms of spiritual manipulation, whether it be the smooth-tongued traveler or the worker of oracles and magic for the solution of worldly troubles.\textsuperscript{51}

Fu’âdî sums up the point of the first chapter of his hagiography by reiterating that the true saints in Ottoman society establish themselves secretly amongst the general population, and that the novices seeking out the Sufi path cannot tell the difference between the good and the bad. The dangers of this stage are many, and care must be taken to seek out the three characteristics that define any true saint.\textsuperscript{52} After this conclusion, Fu’âdî appends a second chapter that discusses the chain of authorities that produced the Halveti order, including its foundation myths as supposedly taught to the caliph ʿAlî by the Prophet Muhammad. While he does not elaborate extensively on most of the figures in the silsile, he does make special mention of how ʿÖmer Halveti’s (d. 1397) practices gave the order its name, and also includes a brief history of how Yahyâ-yt Şirvânî (d. 1464) and his followers worked to spread the order in Anatolia, thus completing the historical connections that allowed Şaʾbân

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., pp. 20-21.  
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., pp. 22-23.
to found his own branch of the order. The second chapter consists of the foundation myth of the Halveti order: ibid., pp. 24-29, followed by the silsile up to Öa‘bân Efendi’s life and career, and the colorful historical anecdotes that make up the remainder of the work fit nicely into the schema that Fu’âdî chooses.

A modern intellectual audience might find Fu’âdî’s historical schema and somewhat repetitive presentation style dull and uninteresting, and dismiss his hagiography as a second-rate, largely derivative work that does not deserve attention as an important literary contribution. On the other hand, the historian, now aware of Fu’âdî’s underlying motivations and how he structures his material, might be inclined to doubt the relevance of the material he presents. Through an extended analysis of the story of Ölüm Efendi and his contemporaries, I have taken issue with the former standpoint and argued against a rush to judgment in connection with the latter. Notwithstanding the validity of these viewpoints, however, the audience of Fu’âdî’s time appears to have made his work successful by the standards of his day. Many copies of the manuscript have survived to the present day, in addition to the more easily found printed copy. More conclusive evidence of the work’s popularity lies in the fact that Fu’âdî’s original, detailed Arabic hagiography has completely disappeared, a point which demonstrates the extent to which his contemporary audience was

53 The second chapter consists of the foundation myth of the Halveti order: ibid., pp. 24-29, followed by the silsile up to Şa‘bân Efendi and his four major successors, pp. 29-30, followed by an anecdote about Ömer Halveti, pp. 30-31, and rounded out with several anecdotes about Yahyâ-yı Şirvânî’s life and legacy, pp. 31-34.

54 Abdulkadir Abdulkadioğlu notes 13 copies of the manuscript in his bibliography alone, which is not a comprehensive list; one of those copies was sealed by Ömer el-Fu’âdî himself at the time it was put to paper, and was housed in the Istanbul University Library at the time Abdulkadioğlu published his monograph. See Abdulkadioğlu, pp. 119-120.
interested in it. Whether through oral transmission or in the form of written copies, the abridgment rapidly spread throughout the Ottoman domains wherever the Şaʿbâniyye branch of the order had a presence. Only a decade after writing his work, Fuʾâdî himself humbly revealed that copies of it were circulating in the hands of his scholarly contemporaries.\footnote{We know this from his remarks about the hagiography in the Türbenâme, which he wrote early in the reign of Sultan ʿOsmân II (r. 1618-1622); see Menâkıb-1 Şaʿbân, p. 143.}

\subsection*{3.3 Constructing a Tomb for Şaʿbân Efendi and Maintaining the Order in an Age of Growing Political Instability}

The work may have had an immediate impact upon the nature of the Şaʿbâniyye complex itself. The copy that arrived in Istanbul for Sultan Ahmed I may have sparked the enthusiasm of a Kastamonu native who had risen to a position of considerable power at that time, namely, ʿÖmer Kethübâ (d. 1611), steward to the powerful grand vizier Kuyucu Murad Paşa (d. 1611). ʿÖmer’s activities on behalf of the Şaʿbâniyye may have been approved by the grand vizier himself. According to Fuʾâdî, Murad Paşa had ties to the Mevlevî order and a love of Celâleddîn Rûmî’s works, a devotion that was repaid by his multiple victories during the course of his suppression of the Celâlî revolts.\footnote{Menâkıb-1 Şaʿbân, p. 145. William Griswold attributes the survival and recovery of the Ottoman state between 1607 and 1610 to the military genius of this remarkable individual, who served under five different sultans. See Griswold, Anatolian Rebellion, pp. 132 and 211, for example.} He also may have recognized the usefulness of an allied Sufi order in the region of Kastamonu in maintaining stability during his campaigns in the east. However, it seems most likely that ʿÖmer Kethübâ was acting of his own accord, as a way of making a pious donation to his hometown. His father,
Himmet Dede, had become a follower of Şa‘bân Efendi before the death of the great saint in 1560, so ʻOmer Kethûdâ had personal ties to the order and its leadership through his father. Nevertheless, Fuʼâdî himself seemed surprised by the sudden offer of assistance in building a tomb over the graves of Şa‘bân and his successors.

...When this caller of the race of mankind [Fuʼâdî] was the servant of the poor ones of the order on the prayer rug of the four corners of the world, a letter desirous in motive came in the manner of consultation and asking for permission [from ʻOmer Kethûdâ], saying, “Let an exalted and decorated tomb be built with a lively structure over the sepulcher full of light, to ennoble the holy soul and exalt and glorify the noble honor of the esteemed master [Şa‘bân]. I have just now vowed 3,000 gurûş. Let it be constructed from the revenue of my fiefs and other lawful [sources of income]. Let it be a beautiful and tall tomb, so that the noble name of the esteemed master will be recalled and praised among Arabs and Persians alike as worthy of praise and glorification. If my vow is not sufficient, however much money is expended until its completion, let my vow also be that much.”

At first surprised by this turn of good fortune, Fuʼâdî then recalled the wishes of his departed guide Muhyiddîn Efendi, and allowed ʻOmer to tithe the requisite amount to begin building the tomb. The money that ʻOmer gave was enough to get the tomb partially built, with the foundation laid and the walls reaching up to the windows which would one day have iron bars over them.

57 Menâktîb-ı Şa‘bân, p. 146. It is interesting that Fuʼâdî’s father was also named Himmet Dede, and one wonders whether or not there was a family tie of some kind between the two men. However, Fuʼâdî gives no indication of this, and since he doesn’t, we must assume that the two individuals named Himmet Dede are not the same person.

58 It is worth noting that the author here uses a title that expresses greater confidence in his position as head of the order, as he penned this particular narrative in the Türbenâme sometime after 1618, when he had been in charge of the order for nearly 15 years.

59 Or alternatively, “among Easterners and Westerners alike.”

60 Menâktîb-ı Şa‘bân, p. 146.
As a result, Fu’âdî soon found that writing the hagiography for Şa’bân and his successors was not the only project that he would be undertaking. Since ʿÖmer Kethûdâ was on campaign most of the time during and after the period of his donation, it is clear that Fu’âdî supervised most of the work himself according to his own vision. Unfortunately, the legitimacy of the project was called into question after it began when catastrophe struck in the year 1611. Kuyucu Murad Paşa, already in his eighties when he was appointed to the grand vizierate in 1607, died while on campaign against the Safavids in Diyarbekir. His equally unfortunate steward, ʿÖmer Kethûdâ, soon followed him as a result of the change of power. Murad Paşa’s death immediately transferred power into the hands of Nasûh Paşa, a military commander who had been serving on the eastern front of the Ottoman Empire for the past several years. In need of money to pay his troops in the aftermath of Kuyucu Murad Paşa’s campaigns he imprisoned ʿÖmer Kethûdâ, along with a number of other former associates and officers of the former grand vizier, for the purpose of acquiring their wealth. Soon after his imprisonment, ʿÖmer Kethûdâ died; his death was generally blamed on Nasûh Paşa as a result, whether or not he actually had the steward murdered.61 According to Fu’âdî’s recollection, all of the unfortunate ʿÖmer’s wealth was immediately impounded by the state, and even his heirs were not able to move quickly enough to lay claim to any of it. As a result, the tomb was left half finished and began to fall into ruin.62

61 William Griswold has suggested to me in an e-mail communication that ʿÖmer Kethûdâ probably died of old age, and that the myth of the murder had more to do with Nâsûh Paşa’s fearsome reputation for ruthlessly extorting and confiscating revenues from those whom he persecuted up until his execution by Sultan Ahmed in 1614. See also Griswold, Anatolian Rebellion, pp. 210-211.

62 Menakîb-i Şa’bân, p. 149-150. We understand from this that Fu’âdî, like many in his society, accepted the rumors about Nasûh Paşa’s treachery towards his former
The first instinct of some of the scholars and notables who were supporters of the order was to press a claim to some of the deceased kethüdâ’s wealth as a means of completing the tomb. It is instructive, however, that when they proffered the plan of acting as witnesses on behalf of Fu’âdî’s project, Fu’âdî’s response was rather pointed.

No! In our path there is no asking, laying claims, or requesting favors from anyone. From Şa’bân Efendi in particular there was never any demand or claim in worldly matters by requesting or asking from anyone else throughout his entire life. He never chose [to accept] the services of a pious foundation. In his human needs and livelihood he entrusted himself to God, saying, “The sustenance is God’s affair.” This poor one [Fu’âdî] seated on his prayer-rug follows his example, albeit with weakness and defects. Previously, we didn’t ask ‘Ômer Kethüdâ for the building of the tomb. He began this job himself, with the permission of God. This time also we commend it to God most High, with assistance from the spiritual power of [Şa’bân Efendi].

Fu’âdî’s refusal to even consider such an action probably reflected his fear of the new grand vizier, who was a known enemy of the order’s former benefactors. By not pursuing the issue, Fu’âdî was keeping a low profile to avoid getting the order and its followers into political difficulty, probably a wise choice under the circumstances. Still, political concerns did not appear to be the only considerations driving Fu’âdî’s response to the situation. His conduct also reflected a desire to avoid what he viewed as a mistake by one of his prominent predecessors, the controversial activities of Şa’bân’s successor Şeyh Şücâ’ during the reign of Sultan Murad III.

---

master’s colleagues—a suspicion that even extended as far as thinking that Nasûh Paşa had his predecessor as grand vizier, the hero Küyucu Murad Paşa, poisoned so he could take his place as grand vizier. See Griswold, Anatolian Rebellion, p. 297, n. 3, and p. 298, n. 8.

63 Menâkîb-ı Şa’bân, p. 150.
Some degree of confusion surrounds the inscriptions in the mosque at the Şa’bâniyye complex. Over the main entrance to the congregational mosque, an inscription was placed to mark the renovations that were made during the first decade of the reign of Sultan Murad III. We know that before his death, Şeyh Şüca’ had been funneling resources into the renovation out of devotion to his former master. He is recognized for this in the first two lines of the inscription, which read: “Şüca’ Efendi, spiritual guide to Sultan Murad • Renovated the building and made it into a mosque full of light.” What does not make sense, however, is the second half of the inscription. These two lines provide a jarring discrepancy from the first two, as they read: “Dervish 'Ömer Fu’âdî recited a chronogram (târîh) for the renovation • The mosque of Şa’ban Dede became more prosperous.”

64 This is found over the entrance to the mosque just across from the tomb of Şa’ban and his successors. For a reproduction of the inscriptions found in the mosque and tomb complex, see Demircioğlu, insert between pp. 18 and 19.

65 Ibid. Abdulkadiroğlu expresses greater reservation, as he believes the ebced calculation of the letters adds up instead to 982, or 1574; see Abdulkadiroğlu, p. 113. While this is not out of the question, it would indicate that the renovation began before Murad III acceded to the sultanate late that same year.

66 See Eyüpgiller, p. 107, and Behcet, p. 152.
period in which ʿÖmer el-Fuʿadī was active within the order. The earliest date of his involvement with the order as a novice dervish is around 1586, at least six years after the latest given date for the inscription. The only possible explanation for the discrepancy, therefore, is that either the second half of the inscription or the entire text of the inscription itself was added at a later period that we cannot date exactly. However, I would submit that Fuʿadī made the addition while overseeing the various construction processes that took place during the first decade or so of his tenure as head of the Şâbâniyye in Kastamonu. If so, this would demonstrate that Fuʿadī took the step of renaming the mosque after Şâbân Efendi in this subsequently added inscription, whereas previously the renovated structure had been named after Şeyh Şücâʾ.67 In other words, this chronogram represents a potential slight to the deceased Şücâʾ’s legacy by renaming the mosque after the founder of the order rather than its renovator. Given the sentiments that Fuʿadī expressed about involvement in state affairs, and fighting to reserve political and economic prerogatives for the benefit of one’s own faction, one senses that Fuʿadī may have had some reservations about the political

---

67 This would also explain why the mosque is known by both names in some works; see for example Abdulkadiroğlu, pp. 101-102, and Eyüpğiller, p. 107. In a paper I gave at the CIEPO conference in London in July of 2002, now published as John J. Curry, “Defending the Cult of Saints in 17th-Century Kastamonu: ʿÖmer el-Fuʿadī’s Contribution to Religious Debate in Ottoman Society,” in Frontiers of Ottoman Studies: State, Province and the West, eds. Colin Imber and Keiko Kiyotaki (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005), vol. 1, pp. 139-148, I had suggested that the second half of the inscription may have been added later as a way of contesting Şücâʾ’s legacy directly. However, after further reflection on the content of the inscription and additional evidence not available to me at the time of writing, I now think that Fuʿadī’s reservations about his predecessor were more limited in character.
connections embraced to some extent by Şeyh Şûcâ’, who regularly pressed Sultan Murad III for favors for himself and his followers.  

On the issue of Fu’âdî’s feelings toward the order’s former benefactor, the historian can only speculate, as Fu’âdî refers to Şûcâ’ only in passing and offers no details that allow us to assess Şûcâ’i’s relations with the order during his ascendancy in the first part of the reign of Sultan Murad III. Still, the combination of potential political dangers and Fu’âdî’s reservations about them led to an immediate halt in the building project. Unfortunately, this sign of ill-fortune soon gave rise to other, far more troubling problems. In observing the problems that the tomb construction had encountered, certain unspecified people began to mutter accusations against Fu’âdî himself, saying that he gave permission for the building of the tomb out of inattentiveness to Şa’bân’s will. As a result, ‘Ömer Kethûdâ’s death was caused by Şa’bân Efendi himself from beyond the grave on account of his anger at the building of the tomb he never wanted.  

More importantly, that year also saw the rise of groups to whom Fu’âdî refers as “censurers, fanatics, and ignorant people.” At first, Fu’âdî tried to ignore their carping about the project and those who were backing it, but their arguments began to gain strength among the local population, and they became increasingly persistent in arguing for abandoning the tomb project. Eventually, they began to have an impact even among Şa’bân’s admirers, which forced Fu’âdî onto the defensive against his own followers. Realizing the gravity of the situation, and that his defense of the project

---

68 In his correspondence with his shaykh, Murad III frequently makes reference to his inability to fulfill Şûcâ’i’s demands at the present time, and begs his indulgence in delaying the request. See Sultan Murad III (r. 1574-1595), Kitâb-ı Manâmât (Istanbul, Nuruosmaniye Lib., MS 2599), fols. 158a, 159a-b, 160b, and 165b-166a, among others.

69 Menâkıb-ı Şa’bân, p. 151.
based on the wishes of his master Muhyiddîn and a story discussing the construction of additional structures in Mecca by one of the Prophet’s companions would not be enough, he addressed his followers publicly one day while commenting on a tradition of the Prophet Muhammad.

Muslims! Just as everyone has the three levels of the carnal soul, soul, and heart in the knowledge of Sufism, the levels of intellect are also three: thought of the present state (‘ākl-1ma āş), thought of the future (‘ākl-1ma ād), and thought of the totality (‘ākl-1 küll). Whatever level one is on, it is the business of the upright and sound intellect to distinguish and discriminate between the true and the false, the trustworthy one and the liar, and the intelligent and the unintelligent. If something were to be said, the person who hears...must think and comprehend, and accept it according to that [process of discrimination], and speak out amongst the people. Every person, if he does not respect this point and speak out [anyway], the majority will regret it, and it is possible that they will also win shame and public disgrace! Among you, it is not on account of this issue or any state or wisdom that you give credence to the speech full of slander of the dissolute and uneducated who say, “Ṣa’bân Efendi didn’t want the tomb; he cut down and killed ʿÖmer Kethûdâ from beyond”....You dare to slander and falsely accuse the master, the Pole of the World! The situation is this: The deceased ʿÖmer Kethûdâ’s noble wish in building the tomb...was to respect and honor...the assistance [he received] from the holy soul of the master. It was not to denigrate and insult [ʿÖmer] that the attribute of divine wrath appeared from his spiritual presence and destroyed the deceased. If it were true that the master did not accept the building of the tomb and that the building of the tomb was begun out of inattentiveness, then this sign, with the power of his charismatic grace and insight into the attribute of divine wrath, would have appeared to the poor one [Fuʿâdî]...with a reproachful lecture, saying, “Hey inattentive one...lacking in state and perfection! Why did you permit the building without knowing that we didn’t accept it?”

Fuʿâdî concluded his speech with an appeal to his followers to trust him, as the spiritual presence of Ṣa’bân Efendi had gotten the order through many difficulties in the past and would eventually do so again. Rather than risk falling out of divine favor by trusting foolish...

---

70 Ibid., pp. 152-153.
religious scholars who used improper proofs to support their arguments, the order’s followers had to show courage.

This speech allowed Fu’âdî temporarily to regain control of the situation and still the misgivings of some of his wavering followers, but many still expressed doubts about the project. The more activist opponents of the tomb project were more forceful still, and confronted Fu’âdî and his followers with the following complaints:

Building tombs over the graves of the people of God and the shaykhs, and burning candles and lamps in the tombs is not appropriate. Wasteful expenditure is unlawful, and it is not appropriate to build it with the money of the Sultan, the viziers, or the administrators [either].

The language of this criticism is indicative of the rhetoric employed by proto-Kâdîzâdeli forces, anticipating the more forceful attack launched against Sufi beliefs and institutions that began several decades later. As noted previously, Fu’âdî found these criticisms sufficiently threatening that he insisted on including a legal opinion from the prominent şeyhülislâm Sa’deddin Efendi denouncing those who tried to declare tomb visitation illegal under Muslim law. In addition, he advanced his own argument that tomb visitation was a custom that had appeared long ago in Islamic history, and that as a longstanding custom of the Muslim community, it fell under the jurisdiction of the Prophetic tradition, “My community will never agree on an error.” If God had not accepted it, it would not have manifested itself as a consensus of the Muslim community. Responding to the arguments

71 Ibid., p. 153.

72 Ibid., p. 162-163.

73 Ibid., pp. 153-154. However, Fu’âdî’s argument does not reflect the fact that Muslim scholars have not always agreed on what the idea of “consensus” (icmâ) represents. See, for example, Joseph Schacht, An Introduction to Islamic Law (Oxford:
of his critics that lighting candles and putting lamps in tombs constituted a waste of useful resources, Fu’âdî fell back on the custom of seeking help from the people of the tombs when perplexed. Since this is a beneficial activity according to accepted tradition, expending resources in its cause would not be a wasteful expenditure. When his opponents attempted to quote a legal decision from the Hanefî scholar Kâdthân (d. 1196) which stated that excessive lighting in a mosque did in fact constitute a wasteful expenditure, Fu’âdî countered by asking if this also made heretical the custom of lighting the tombs of the Prophet and his companions in Medina and other places, a custom that had been practiced by so many prominent Muslims forebears and which made such an impression on the non-Muslim population. He then quotes the commentary of both Kâdî Beyzâvî and Ebûsü’üd Efendi on a Qur’ânic verse, in which they affirm that any act which beautifies a mosque or other religious structure is a laudable act. The most damaging accusation leveled by Fu’âdî’s detractors was that the sacrifices and lighting of candles and lamps in tombs made their practitioners infidels because they sought help from someone or something other than God. It resembled the bowing to idols condemned in the Qur’ân. However, Fu’âdî tries to dismiss this argument out of hand as being absurd, as the Muslims visiting the tombs did not


74 The fetvâs of Kâdthân were extremely influential among Ottoman jurists throughout the pre-modern period, and some scholars have claimed that his more flexible, real-world approach to issues of jurisprudence made him popular with subsequent generations. He was sometimes cited by hard-line jurists seeking to criticize various Sufi practices. For more on Kâdthân and his legacy, see Th. W. Juynboll and Y. Linant, “Kâdi Khân, Fâkhâr al-Dîn al-Hasan b. Mansûr al-Farghani,” EI², v. 4, p. 377.

75 Menâkıtb-1 Şâ’bân, p. 155-156.
in fact believe that they were worshiping the saints or their tombs in place of God. Still, the proto-Kâdtzâdelis may have hit dangerously close to home in their accusations, as even Fu’âdî had noted elsewhere in his hagiography that Muslims were not the only ones who were venerating the tomb of Şa‘bân Efendi.

But after his death, the seeking help and profiting spiritually from his spiritual influence was not cut off....Non-Muslims from the protected religions other than Islam come with candles and sacrifices, and they bring the sick and other people struck by calamity, and they visit and request things. Even this poor one [Fu’âdî] was himself aware [of this], by being the servant of the poor ones and the guide of the seekers on the path on his prayer rug of the dwelling of the worlds. When they prayed, I prayed for their faith and their submission [to Islam]. At present, they still have not stopped coming and going, and when the poor one asks them about their coming with candle and sacrifices to visit, they reply, “We request favor and help in our important affairs and in our times of confusion with pain and suffering, and we vow candles and sacrifices. We are satisfied through his sacredness, and our pain and suffering are taken away.”

The mixing of religions that was taking place at the tomb, a phenomenon that had been part of the Islamicization of Anatolia for centuries, was probably a lightning rod for the hardliners criticizing the tomb and the customs attached to it. In light of these issues, Fu’âdî’s arguments had the potential of appearing weak. In the case of lamps being used in

76 Ibid., pp. 157-158.

77 Ibid., p. 86.

78 See, for example, the linking of Christian shrines devoted to certain saints with the Muslim saint Khîdr which began during the post-Manzikert era and reached its height in the 13th and 14th centuries in Ethel Sara Wolper, “Khîdr, Elwan Çelebi and the Conversion of Sacred Sanctuaries in Anatolia,” Muslim World 90: 3-4 (2000), pp. 309-311. In her recent monograph, Wolper stresses that dervish and Christian communities during the Seljuk and Mongol periods in Anatolia were never exclusive, and were often joined through shared mercantile and shared sacred spaces; see idem., Cities and Saints: Sufism and the Transformation of Urban Space in Medieval Anatolia (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), pp. 74-81.
tombs, he had fallen back mostly on arguments that dealt with mosques, often of an exalted character, and simply applied them to Şa‘bân’s tomb through analogy, an argument that would not have convinced any serious legal scholar bent on criticizing the project and the Sufi order affiliated with it. Writing some decades later, Katip Çelebi expressed a degree of cynicism about the process of visiting tombs, even as he took his usual moderate position by also condemning the Kâdzâdelis for causing a ruckus by trying to prevent people from doing it. He noted that a whole industry had grown up around selling the lamps and supplies that went into the tomb-complex visitation and pilgrimage industry, and that it was hopeless to try and stop the foolishness.\(^79\)

Fu’âdî’s enemies still had one last argument against tomb visitation, which was that any benefit that one gained in the afterlife would be a result of one’s own actions, and that he could not gain any benefit from anyone else when it came time to be judged. In other words, the practice of tomb-visitation to seek assistance or intercession would accomplish nothing at best, even if it were not a violation of religious doctrine. Attributing this to the influence of the Hanbali legal school, and even going so far as to declare the Hanbalis a false mezheb, an argument that may have proved troubling to many scholars of his day, Fu’âdî once again went on the attack.\(^80\) Drawing from the Arabic-language work of a Shâfi‘î jurist,


\(^{80}\) After summarizing his opponents’ arguments on this point, Fu’âdî states, “They cannot distinguish between the Sunnî mezheb and another false mezheb. They go off to the mezheb of the atheists and the Hanbalis with this speech that is speculation [based on] censure and atheism;” see Menâkıb-1 Şa‘bân, p. 158. In theory, he would be treading on dangerous ground by accusing one of the four accepted legal schools in Sunnî Islam of trafficking in irreligious beliefs.
Najm al-Dīn Muhammad al-Ghaytî (d. 1576), entitled Well-Directed Answers to Numerous Questions (Al-ajwabat al-sadīdah ʿalā al-asʿilat al-adīdah) to support his argument,\(^{81}\) Fuʿâdî enumerates a whole list of Prophetic traditions that comment on the state of the dead. Addressing questions about whether or not the dead can hear and respond to the calls and greetings of the living, and whether or not they take delight in such visits, and what days are best to visit the tombs if the answer to these questions is affirmative, Fuʿâdî compiled the traditions that Najm al-Dīn gave in full. What makes this part of the work unusual is that Fuʿâdî does not bother to translate the materials for his audience, indicating that this part of the work was only for educated scholars.\(^{82}\) Needless to say, Najm al-Dīn’s compilation includes only traditions that indicate the favor of the Prophet Muhammad and his companions toward the visitation and greeting of the dead in their tombs.\(^{83}\) However, the

\(^{81}\) Najm al-Dīn Muhammad al-Ghaytî al-Shâfīʿī was a prominent Egyptian jurist of the 16th century who originally hailed from Alexandria. Given the prominence of tombs in the religious life of that region of the Ottoman Empire, it is perhaps not surprising that Fuʿâdî chose to draw on this individual as his source. See ʿUmar Ridā Kahhālah, Muʿjam al-muʿallīfīn: Tarājim musannifī al-kutub al-ʿarabīyyah (Damascus: Matbaʿat al-Taraqqī, 1959), v. 8, pp. 293-294. Kâtip Čelebi was aware of several other works by this individual when he compiled his Keşfūʾ-z-zunûn in the 17th century, but does not seem aware of this one, suggesting that the work was not necessarily widely known at the time; see Keşfūʾ-z-zunûn, v. 1, p. 336, and v. 2, p. 1068. Fuʿâdî describes the work as being a compilation of 39 questions, followed by the answers, and he cites materials from the work based on several of the questions which touched on the point he was addressing.

\(^{82}\) It is perhaps for this reason that the modern Turkish interpretation of the Türbenâme part of the Menâkıb-ī Şâʿbān-ī Veli by Muhammed Sağî omits this Arabic-language part of the work entirely and skips directly to the next section of the work; compare Safî, p. 153, with Menâkıb-ī Şâʾbān, pp. 158-161.

\(^{83}\) This may indicate that al-Ghaytî was struggling with similar problems involving attacks on tomb visitation in the Egyptian context in the latter half of the 16th century, and that Fuʿâdî recognized the utility of this source in addressing his own problems as a result.
lack of translation demonstrates that the Türbenâme section of the work that came to be appended to the hagiography of Şa‘bân Efendi served different and more urgent purposes.

At this point, we should note once again that most of our information concerning the reception of the original hagiography and the building of the tomb which followed comes not from the Menâkîb-ı Şa‘bân-ı Veli itself, which cuts off at the end of the life of Muhyiddîn Efendi in 1604. Instead, it comes from a separate tract written by Fu‘âdî over a decade later entitled the Risâle-i Türbenâme, after the reign of Sultan Ahmed I had given way to that of Sultan ʿOsmân II after an intense period of political jockeying that surrounded the enthronement and deposition of Sultan Mustafa over the course of several months at the end of 1617 and beginning of 1618. Most subsequent copyists and compilers of the two manuscripts, including those who saw to their first printing in Kastamonu in 1894, appended this second, shorter tract to the end of the first. Nevertheless, the historian should not lose sight of the fact that the two works do not necessarily form an organic whole. The Risâle-i Türbenâme was penned sometime in 1619 at the conclusion of the tomb’s construction and ornamentation, and even a cursory reading indicates that its tone and content are considerably more defensive than the celebration of Şa‘bân Efendi’s and his successors’ lives in the earlier hagiography. Over one quarter of the tract is devoted to the criticisms of tomb building and visitations, along with the refutation of those arguments through the methods previously described. In addition, the work heaps praise upon those who were involved in the tomb project as a way of rehabilitating their names in the face of criticism aimed at them as well. In sum, at the beginning of ʿOsmân II’s reign, it seems that Fu‘âdî and the order’s followers had reason to feel nervous about the enthronement of a new ruler.
who may not have been as sympathetic to the cause of Sufism and its practices. By addressing Sultan ʿOsmân II directly with his work, Fuʾâdî may have also been trying to deflect renewed criticism of his project in influential circles in the capital. The inclusion of a large numbers of Arabic hadiths from a respected Shâfiʿî scholar supporting the customs surrounding tomb visitation was intended as an arsenal with which pro-Sufi forces could wage the struggle in the capital to defend projects like the one Fuʾâdî had been undertaking for the past decade.

Keeping all this in mind, we note that the Türbenâme, after issuing this extensive defense of the role of tomb visitation in Islamic history and tradition, goes on to address what allowed the tomb to be built in the end. At the time Fuʾâdî wrote, the potential failure of the project due to the loss of its financial backing, combined with the concerted arguments advanced by the proto-Kâdztâdeli faction, had put him into a bind. If the tomb construction remained in limbo, this would be interpreted by the local community as a sign from both God and Şâbân Efendi that the practices and institutions associated with the cult of saints were unacceptable. At the same time, however, Fuʾâdî had also ideologically painted himself into a corner by forbidding any active attempts to request money or support from prominent figures in Ottoman society. As a result, the tomb remained uncompleted for two

---

84 Baki Tezcan suggests in his dissertation that ʿOsmân II was the first Ottoman Sultan to have been educated by a preacher, ʿÖmer Efendi. While we cannot ascertain ʿÖmer’s political and religious leanings, there seems to be evidence that links both ʿÖmer and ʿOsmân II to a favorable view of much of what would later emerge as the Kâdztâdeli program. In fact, Kâdztâde Mehmed himself penned a tract on horses and presented it to ʿOsmân II as a way of currying favor with the royal household, just as Fuʾâdî attempted to do with his production of the Risâle-i Türbenâme. The evidence is nicely summarized in Baki Tezcan, “Searching for Osman: A Reassessment of the Deposition of the Ottoman Sultan Osman II (1618-1622)” (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton University, 2001), pp. 186-194.
years, with no progress, leaving Fu’âdî with little option but to pray to God for some means by which it could be completed. Nevertheless, in spite of Fu’âdî’s reticence in seeking funding from the state, the solution to the dilemma was to come partially through the agency of local notables who had connections with the Ottoman government in Istanbul. One day, Mehmed Ağâ, a future head of the palace guard (kapîcbâşı) under ʿOsmân II arrived in Kastamonu, in conjunction with his duties as overseer of the nearby mines in Küre-i Nühâs (maʿden kethüdâst). Accompanying him was Hibetullah Efendi, a local figure who was also known by the nickname “Akkâş” (white eyebrow), who was at that time a judge appointed to the mining town of Küre-i Nühâs along with Mehmed Ağâ. The two men inquired about the incomplete state of the tomb, and asked Fu’âdî what they could do to rectify the problem. Initially, Fu’âdî was not forthcoming with any ideas, claiming that he commended his affairs to God. When they once again offered to act as intermediaries to free up the money pledged by ʿÖmer Kethüdâ to complete the project, Fu’âdî declined, saying that it was not acceptable in Şaʿbân’s branch of the order to actively seek assistance for a project in this manner. However, Mehmed Ağâ and Hibetullah Efendi, perhaps aware of the damage that could occur if the tomb were to go unfinished, were determined to see the problem circumvented. So they cleverly said to Fu’âdî that although he was correct in his assessment of the order’s traditions, “Freely willed acts are a cause of the manifestation of the eternal will [of God].” Therefore, he should let them seek the money from other sources. Fu’âdî still refused, however. The two dignitaries were then struck by a flash of inspiration. What if the completion of the work on the tomb were to be financed by the vows and payments for

---

85 Menâkîb-ı Şaʿbân, pp. 165-166.
candles by the local businessmen who regularly sought the assistance of Şábân Efendi? After some thought, Fu’âdî agreed that there was nothing to stop them contributing funds of their own accord; they would merely be following in the steps of Ömer Kethûdâ and would therefore not be contravening Fu’âdî’s prohibition on attempts to seek investment. Accordingly, a sum of gold coin was submitted by the two dignitaries, and following their lead, others who were present at the gathering also contributed small sums, although they were probably not enough to cover all the expenses of completing the tomb.\footnote{The story of these events occurs in ibid., pp. 166-167.}

Despite these humble beginnings, the modest actions of these local dignitaries released an avalanche of effort to complete the tomb. Part of this seemed to be the result of a decision that Fu’âdî made rejecting the final request of his initial benefactors, as he explains in his description of the events that followed.

When they requested the announcement and public exposure of this beginning to the people, I [Fu’âdî] said, “A record should not be made in writing and remembrance of the names of those who vow and the givers of blessings; let everyone bring either a little or a lot through his [or her] own will, acceptance, desire and sincerity and submit it, and afterward let a record be made of income and expenditures.” The wealthy and notables among the timâr-holders, having taken part in the campaign against Persia in the year that Ömer Kethûdâ was martyred, fixed and confirmed their promises and vows, saying, “If the tomb remains incomplete and we are not on campaign in the coming year, and if you are present in our lands in the days of the government of the Sultan (eyyâm-i devlet-i pâdişâhî)\footnote{Probably referring to a time frame in which the holders of fiefs were informed by the Sultan of their obligations toward any campaign or the treasury, meaning that they would be able to determine what income would remain for discretionary purposes such as contributing to Fu’âdî’s project.} [during which] our vows take place, each of us shall give from our personal wealth to the extent we are able, and the tomb shall be built.” All of the sipahi grandees and the other noble people and notables from the people of the province agreed, and
each of them brought their vows with sincerity without being requested or implored [to do so]. They made this poor one trustee for all of it.\(^{88}\)

By not tying the project to any one personality within the structure of power in the region, Fu’âdî would not repeat the misfortunes and mistakes of the past. In addition, the open character of the project allowed any dignitary to take part in the spiritual rewards of contributing to the project without risking a documented connection to what had become a potentially controversial flashpoint in local religious and political contexts.\(^{89}\) However, the support of the politically and financially powerful was not the only factor that brought the tomb to fruition, according to the author. Fu’âdî also stresses, in exultant language, how it was not only the wealthy and powerful in Ottoman provincial society who made contributions to the project. Şâ’bân Efendi’s other spiritual descendants in the area also contributed to the project by sending parties of their followers in groups of ten, fifteen, or twenty at a time to the lodge to give their time and labor at the construction site. In addition, the poorer members of the community also gave what service they could toward completing the project. A teacher at a local school by the name of Elmâctzâde Muhyiddîn Efendi sent his children and students to work on the project with the intent that they receive spiritual education for their service. Not to be outdone, the women of the community, young and old

\(^{88}\) Menâktb-ı Şâ’bân, p. 167.

\(^{89}\) Interestingly enough, however, Fu’âdî partially reneged on these conditions after the tomb had been completed and renovated in 1618. He recorded in a scroll defter the names and amounts contributed to the building of the tomb over the course of its construction and had the scroll placed inside the tomb itself. This way, he argued, it could serve as a record on the day of judgment of those who had done good works for the building of the tomb. However, it does not appear to have been an open record that anyone could have gone in and looked at. See the remarks in Menâktb-ı Şâ’bân, pp. 185-186.
alike, joined together to produce linen cloth that could be sold to help support the project. What could not be sold on the market was given to the poorest of the workers laboring on the completion of the tomb. Through the community, there was a unified force of purpose that made the long-delayed completion of the tomb an idea whose time had come. This resurgence in effort may also have coincided with the growing weakness and eventual execution of the hated Nasûh Paşâ in 1614; as the local supporters of the Şâbâniyye realized that the problems that had originally derailed the building of the tomb were not going to have a long-term effect on local politics, they moved to make the project their own.

The story reached its triumphant conclusion with the placement of a plaque over the northern entrance to the tomb crediting ʻÖmer Kethûdâ for initiating the project, and praising the community for finishing it: “The Kethûdâ Bey whom they called ʻÖmer • Began the tomb with sincerity • Because he departed to the realm of mercy • The people of generosity gathered together and constructed it • For its commencement date, Dervish ʻÖmer spoke a chronogram • The sepulcher of Şâbân, Sultan of eternal union.” When the last stone was about to be put in place in the dome, a massive Halveti zîkr ceremony took place that sent Fuʻâdî into such a powerful mystical state that he was unable either to speak or to move, but was frozen in place gazing upwards. In view of the ruckus caused by the celebration, the head architect noted Fuʻâdî’s state and worried that his reaction meant that the new building was about to fall down. However, his doubts were assuaged by Fuʻâdî’s brother Hacı

90 Ibid., p. 168.

91 Abdulkadiroğlu, p. 114. The ebced, or numerical value of the Arabic letters in the poem, add up to the number 1020 in the last line, which translates to the year 1611, the date when ʻŌmer Kethûdâ initiated the project.
Mehmed Dede, and the keystone was lowered into place amid sacrifices and cries of joy. The successful completion of the project, along with the attendant celebrations, spread throughout the region and increased the fame of the tomb, and greatly lowered the stock in trade of the tomb’s detractors.\(^{92}\)

There was still one problem left to be solved. The stone construction of the tomb had been completed, but the edifice was not structurally sound, perhaps as a result of its remaining unfinished for a long time. In inclement weather, the roof of the tomb would leak, and the decorative elements added by the tomb’s builders were being worn away or otherwise damaged. Luckily, a number of additional benefactors stepped in to complete the final additions to the project. The first person to help out was a local figure who had made good by securing a position in the imperial chancery (divân-ı hümâyûn) in Istanbul: one Kastamonulu Kâtib Mehmed Efendi. Fu’âdî implies that this official, who was also known by the name Şekerzâde, had been one of his teachers and benefactors in his younger days and had also served under the ill-fated ʿÖmer Kethûdâ before the latter’s death in 1611.\(^{93}\)

He provided the funds to add a symmetrical overhang (turre) to the edge of the tomb to better protect the structure. In addition, he donated a green wool covering for Şaʾbân Efendi’s tomb. Fu’âdî took great pleasure in the gift because it allowed him finally to wrap Şaʾbân Efendi’s sacred black turban at the head of his sepulcher, thereby fulfilling the third

\[^{92}\text{Menâkıb-ı Şaʾbân, pp. 170-172.}\]
\[^{93}\text{To date, I have not found any additional records documenting the existence of this individual in the sources at my disposal. He was later promoted to the post of mûteferrika, a military scribe for one of the Ottoman elite regiments, a post which he was holding at the time Fuʾâdî wrote the Tûrbenâme.}\]
and final wish of his spiritual guide, Muhyiddîn Efendi. Fu’âdî extols the virtues of his benefactor extensively in Menâkîb-1 Şâbâın, pp. 175-177, which suggests a certain degree of apologetic aimed at protecting the tomb complex and its denizens from another failed benefactor.

Following the completion of the lead cap on the dome, a gilded cap was engraved and placed at the top of the dome by a local artisan by the name of Şâh Mehmed Efendi, also known as Emir Kadî because of his service as kadî of Kastamonu during those years.

94 Menâkîb-1 Şâbâın, pp. 172-173.

95 Süreyyâ, v. 2, p. 286. Baki Tezcan also remarks in his dissertation on the near-disaster at Ardabil that almost cost the life of the Crimean Khan; see Tezcan, p. 196. See also Imber, Ottoman Empire, p. 77.

96 Fu’âdî goes out of his way to stress the exalted lineage of this individual, stating that he was among the children of Seyyid İbrâhîm Tennûrî (d. 887/1481?), who was the first successor of the Bayrâmîyye shaykh Akşêmseddîn, and whose tomb was located in Kayseri. His second successor,
Muslihuddin ibn-i ‘Attar el-İskilibi, established himself in İskilibi, and given our knowledge of Abdülbaki Efendi’s presence in the region later, this suggests good relations between these two orders. Evliya Çelebi comments on this line of Bayramiyye shaykhs in his descriptions of Kayseri and İskilibi; see Buğday, ed., Evliya Çelebi’s Anatolienreise aus dem dritten Band des Seyhâtname, pp. 132 (fol. 67b) and 284 (fol. 92a).

For a brief and clearly incomplete biography of Kurşuncuzaade Mustafa Paşa, see Süreyya, v. 4, pp. 388-389. He was subsequently appointed governor of Bosnia a third time from 1627-1628, and again in 1632 or 1633. He was called up for Sultan Murad IV’s campaign against Baghdad in 1636 and lost his life in battle. Süreyya describes him as the vâli of Bosnia and Fu’âdî described him as being the beylerbeyi, essentially the same position: Menâktb-ı Şabban, p. 178.

For more on these events and their importance in the trajectory of ‘Osmân II’s reign, see Tezcan, pp. 196-203.
themselves, reflecting the key mystical goal of knowing oneself. This last addition led Fu’âdî to compose the poetic inscription that was placed over the eastern entrance to the tomb: “Kûrşûncuzâde, vizier full of nobility • Built a gate and harem for the tomb • A mirror from the secret of the soul was placed at the door • So that the knower shall see the honored soul • Fu’âdî saw the chronogram in the mirror • The mirror of nobility was opened for the builder • 1028 H. (1618).” When Fu’âdî wrote the Risâle-i Türbenâme a few years later in 1620, mentioning the assistance of Kûrşûncuzâde Mustafa Paşa as the final actor in the completion of the tomb complex would have proved useful, for he had recently been named governor of Bosnia, thus placing him on a more solid footing with the royal household than the recently dismissed and unsuccessful grand vizier Halîl Paşa. Fu’âdî concludes the narrative by reiterating the aforementioned anecdote about Şa’bân Efendi’s recognition by the unknown saint in Khurasan, and the story of the dervishes who came to take the mirror from him, which ties in nicely with theme of the mirror that Mustafa Paşa had installed at the entrance to the tomb.

By the time Fu’âdî completed his tract on the circumstances surrounding the construction and development of the Halveti tomb complex in Kastamonu, the historian might think that he had reached the height of his career. Over the course of his fifteen-year

---

100 The account is rather vague about where the repairs and additions were made; see Menâkib-i Şâbân, pp. 177-180, for the full text. However, I suspect that the harem being referred to is the small prayer room on the north side of the tomb adjoining the library that is still used today, and the second gate was probably added on the eastern side of the tomb where the inscription crediting Mustafa Paşa is located. See the diagrams in Demircioğlu, insert between pp. 18 and 19.

101 Abdulkadiroğlu, p. 114. The ebced in the last line actually adds up to 1027 (1617), suggesting that the building might have been completed a little earlier.
tenure at the head of the Şâbâniyye, he had seen the complex undergo substantial improvements that made it into one of the premier pilgrimage sites in the region. While the order’s leaders had always had good relations with the central government, important personalities in the power structure of the Ottoman Empire were now coming to pay their respects to the great saint and his followers, and making contributions for their benefit. In addition, by completing the project despite myriad difficulties and setbacks, Fu’âdî had delivered a powerful blow to his anti-tomb and anti-Halveti antagonists in the community. Still, the work’s troubled and defensive tone, and a palpable sense of discomfort about the political situation of the previous years, makes it read more like an apologia for the activities of the order than a celebration of the order’s success.

In addition, the Risâle-i Türbenâme was not the only letter Fu’âdî would send to Istanbul. In fact, one gets the distinct feeling that the reign of ʿOsmân II was viewed with some misgiving by Fu’âdî, as he also fired off another tract entitled Risâletü’l-müsellesât (The Treatise on Groups of Three) as an advisory letter to the Sultan. Building on a story about the Prophet and his companions in which each of them in turn relates the three things he loves most, Fu’âdî sought to demonstrate to ʿOsmân II what values the leader of the Muslim community should emulate. He then concludes by warning the Sultan to emulate the Prophet and his successors in wielding “both the manifest and the spiritual sword,” and not just the former. Even more cryptically, he alludes to events at the time by saying that “it is not a good thing to kill some of the men of the state; the edifice of God will collapse.” This seems to indicate that Fu’âdî, along with many other religious and political notables of
his time, did not like ʾOsmān II’s attempts to shake up the power structure of the empire. ¹⁰²

Given the aftermath of ʾOsmān II’s reign, which ended in a regicide and a distinctly uncomfortable historiographical debate about its significance that continues even in modern times, we can conclude that Fuʿâdî’s efforts to influence the political context during this turbulent period did not prove terribly successful. ¹⁰³

3.4 Refining the Concepts of a Sufi Order: The Doctrinal Writings of Ömer el-Fuʿâdî

The issues that appear in the Risâletü ’l-Müsellesât are a good introduction to another important aspect of Fuʿâdî’s career that has not attracted much notice to date. His didactic works, aimed at instructing his audience on various religious points so as to introduce them to basic concepts, would prove to be an important contribution to the members of his own order. I argue in this section that Fuʿâdî’s didactic works and tracts were aimed not only at his own following within the order, but also sought to reach a broader audience to educate them more fully about the best way to pursue the Sufi path. It is important to remember that these works still sought to address different types of audiences based on their subject matter. While some texts may have discussed the simplest aspects of the path and how the novice

¹⁰² Ömer el-Fuʿâdî, Risâletü ’l-Müsellesât er-reşâdî (Istanbul, Süleymaniye Lib., MS Hacı Mahmud Efendi 2287), fols. 282b-283a. Fuʿâdî does not explicitly state what he is referring to here, but the extortionate activities of the Sultan and his grand vizier, ʿAlî Paşa, against some of the grandees of the empire who might have been friendly to the Şaʿbâniyye cause might be inferred. Also, the general reticence of key scholars to condone ʾOsmān II’s attempt to have his brother killed may have played into the mix. See Tezcan, pp. 99-100, 198, and 201. This might allow us to date this letter to 1620 or 1621.

¹⁰³ For a historiographical analysis of ʾOsmān II’s reign and its implications for both the early modern and modern historians who wrote about it, see Tezcan, pp. 1-27.
should pursue it, others dealt with complex problems in Sufi hermeneutics and referred the readers to complex writings of past generations on Islamic theology and philosophy. In spite of this diversity, however, the texts all had one thing in common: they were aimed at encouraging and educating their Turkish-speaking audience to seek a deeper understanding of the principles of the Halveti path, which drew upon the legacy of Şâbân Efendi and his successors.

Unfortunately, one problem that confronts present-day scholars is that it is difficult to date these didactic and polemical tracts with any certainty, because the manuscript copies that have survived are often cryptic about the dates of production, insofar as they give any dates at all. Nevertheless, the course of Fu’âdî’s career suggests that he focused much of his energy on producing Şâbân’s hagiography first, and then establishing the tomb complex as a center for the activities of the Şâbânîyye branch of the Halveti order. It is perhaps instructive that the earliest letter that I have been able to date with some degree of certainty, the Arabic-language Statement of Certainty and Treatise on Proclaiming God’s Unity (Maqâlat al-tawthîqiyyah wa risâlat al-tawhîdiyyah), was completed roughly at the time that the tomb was entering its final stages of construction in 1618.\textsuperscript{104} In addition to being written in Arabic, it deals largely with rather esoteric aspects of advanced Sufism, suggesting that

\textsuperscript{104} This treatise exists in multiple copies scattered amongst different manuscript libraries, at least in Istanbul. The copy dating its completion to 1028 H. (1618) is Ömer el-Fu’âdî (d. 1636), Maqâlat al-tawthîqiyyah wa risâlat al-tawhîdiyyah (Istanbul, Süleymaniye Lib., MS Es’ad Efendi 1734/1), fol. 16a, which is mistakenly and confusingly labeled in the Süleymaniye’s card catalog as Maqâlat al-tawashshaqiyyah. However, a mostly identical second copy that does not give the original date of composition was made by a Nakşibendi dervish shortly before the establishment of the Turkish republic in 1338 H. (1922). It is far clearer and easier to understand, and it can be found in the Istanbul Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 1514. It is from this copy that citations from this work will be taken.
it was not intended for consumption by the less-advanced members of the order. Taking as
his starting point the proclamation of God’s unity embodied in the statement of witnessing,
“There is no god but God” (là ilaha illà Allah), Fu’âdî illustrates how each of the letters in
this statement, which includes five alifs (ا), five lâms (ل), and two hâ’s (ح), indicates
particular meanings on various stages of the path. Perhaps tellingly, he addresses the
audience directly, stating, “O my brother, seeker of the highest stages of the path, know that
I was among the people of exoteric knowledge [once]....Hear from me an exoteric
interpretation (ta’wil) [for these letters].” He goes on to explain that the 12 letters of the
tawhîd formula break down in such a way that the five alifs represent the five pillars of
Islam, while the lâms represent the five graces (altâf) of God granted to the believer through
the mastery of the exoteric aspects of the path, and the two hâ’s represent the guidance of
belief (al-hidâyah al-i’tiqâdiyyah) and guidance of action (al-hidâyah al-amaliyyah).105
Fu’âdî does not dwell much on these issues, however, but promptly launches into a
discussion of how he joined the order and began pursuing a different stage of the process at
a more esoteric level. As one proceeds on the mystical path, Fu’âdî instructs his audience,
an additional interpretation for the meanings of the letters of the tawhîd takes its place
alongside the first. In this interpretation, the five alifs represent the first five stages of the
Halveti path of the atvâr-ı sa ḃah (the seven levels), in the form of attaining the various
stages (maqâm). These include conquering the carnal soul (nafs) and its negative attributes
(sifât-ı dhamîmah); the stage of the heart (qalb) in which additional vices are conquered; the
two stages of the soul (rûh) and secret (sîr), in which praiseworthy attributes are mastered;

105 Maqâlat al-Tawthîqiyyah, fols. 4a-b.
and, when these are complete, the stage of the hidden secret (sîr al-khâfî) which brings the seeker to the brink of the most advanced levels of the mystical path. Therefore, the five lâms represent the five graces of God that accompany each level of success that the seeker attains in passing through each of these stages by achieving the necessary goals. Finally, the two hâ’s represent what Fu’âdî calls “the two essences” (huwiyyatayn): the fixed (mutlaqah) essence, and the pervading (sâriyyah) essence. These two advanced stages are revealed to the seekers after they complete the first five stages on the path.  

The remainder of the treatise is given over to explaining how to approach these advanced stages on the path. While Fu’âdî draws heavily on ʿAbdurrezzâk al-Kâshânî’s Istilâhât as-sûfiyyah as a primary source for explaining the concepts that the dervishes must learn in order to deal with these advanced states, he also shows his intellectual breadth by quoting from the works of authors like Ak Şemseddîn Hamidî Çelebî (şeyhülislâm under Sultan Mehmed II), Cemâl el-Halveti, and the poetry of Mevlânâ Celâleddîn Rûmî and ʿAbd al-Rahman Câmî, among others. Still, it is not surprising that he concludes the treatise with a warning to his audience not to reveal these advanced states to anyone who is not also in an advanced stage of mystical progression, as those who are not may be prone to censuring and attacking them if they understand anything about them at all. Since those at the exoteric level of understanding are at a stage of ignorance on the mystical path, they must be left out of the discussion on these matters. He also warns the potential censurer who does become

---

106 Ibid., fols. 4b-6b.
apprised of these things that he does not understand the issues involved, and that he should refrain from causing trouble.\textsuperscript{107}

Yet the very nature and tone of this warning indicate that the treatise was intended for circulation among a wider audience to assist them in their own mystical endeavors. Its comparative success among the limited circle in which it could circulate (it is telling that a Nakşibendî dervish over three centuries later saw it as still worth copying) suggests that Fu’âdî may have sensed a broader and more important gap that needed to be filled after the turbulent decades at the turn of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century. In contrast to the material covered in the \textit{Risālat al-tawthīqiyyah}, his other works tend towards assisting beginners in mastery of the path, rather than aiming at the upper levels of mystical contemplation. One reason for this may be inherent in Fu’âdî’s well-worn admonition that the path cannot be undertaken successfully without the guidance of a shaykh; therefore, he would argue for letting the shaykh, rather than a written text, do the guiding. Yet the extent of his surviving written work points to a more substantial project that intertwined with the construction of the tomb complex and the writing of his hagiography: to educate the general population about the order and its principles as a way of sparking their interest in and support of their local branch of the Halveti order.

For this reason, he followed this short Arabic tract with a much more extensive project which he entitled the \textit{Tract on the Reforming of the Carnal Soul} (\textit{Risâle-i muslihu’n-nefs}). Fu’âdî launches the tract with a story about how God brought man into the world of existence, stating that when he did, he created him with two parts: the soul (\textit{rûh}) and the

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., fols. 21a-22a.
carnal passions (*nefs*). When he brought them both into existence within man, he asked the soul who he was, and the soul promptly replied, “You are my Lord; there is no God but you.” As a result, God accepted the soul immediately and sent it down to earth to take residence in man. However, when he got to the carnal passions and repeated his question, the carnal soul was stubborn and insolent, and refused to respond. Thus, to cleanse the *nefs* of its evil urges, he sent it to roast in hellfire for 700 years, and then brought it back and repeated his question. The *nefs* persisted in its defiance, so God returned it to the fire for another 700 years. Broken at last, the *nefs* finally gave the appropriate response and was allowed to take up its place in mankind, having undertaken the necessary discipline to break it of its negative qualities. The moral of the story, however, is that in every person on this earth, the soul and the carnal passions coexist, and it is the duty of every seeker to root out the negative attributes of the latter in favor of the good qualities of the former. Nevertheless, not everything can be revealed to the novice hearing or reading these words. Fu‘âdî warns his subsequent transmitters that if someone asks why God created these negative attributes in people, they should follow the example of the Prophet, who responded to a woman who asked him the same question with the evasive answer, “It was indicated to me [thus],” since this is a question whose answer is reserved for those at the advanced stages of the path. This tactic serves the dual purpose of catching the audience’s attention and developing their interest by sparking their curiosity about one of the basic questions of existence, i.e., what is the root cause of evil in the world? In the end, the work also seeks to encourage a desire to initiate the mystical process to learn more about these issues. 

---

108 Ömer el-Fu‘âdî (d. 1636), *Risâle-i muslihu‘n-nefs* (Istanbul: Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 614/25), fols. 174a-b. There seems to be a lacuna in the final
sections of the manuscript, especially that which discusses the fifth stage of the Halveti path. Other manuscript copies of this unpublished work also seem to have this lacuna. Nevertheless, enough of the work is intact that I was able to reconstruct its general tactics and format.

On account of its being necessary to give great struggle and attention on the point of the carnal soul, while this poor one...Dervish Ömer el-Fu’âdî...was the servant of the dervishes on the prayer rug of the recourse of all the people of Shaykh Şâbân Efendi...I explained and taught orally to the trustworthy seekers in the place of guidance the stages of the soul and the attributes of the soul, both praiseworthy and blameworthy. In order to make it easy to remember and know, I organized the steps and names of each of them one by one into poetic segments, with the sign and favor of the soul full of inspirations of the noble lord [Şâbân], with divine blessing. I had [also] explained and recalled the seven praiseworthy or blameworthy attributes in those poetic segments.

Fu’âdî goes on to recite this poetic composition in its entirety; it is a rhyming couplet that was probably easy for his audience to memorize and transmit to others. However, this couplet was apparently not enough, giving rise to other questions regarding the specifics. So Fu’âdî once again rose to the challenge of his audience by writing a treatise aimed at

sections of the manuscript, especially that which discusses the fifth stage of the Halveti path. Other manuscript copies of this unpublished work also seem to have this lacuna. Nevertheless, enough of the work is intact that I was able to reconstruct its general tactics and format.

109 Ibid., fol. 174b.

110 For example, the first line runs as follows: Evvelâ nefs-i emmâre sifât heftâr • kibir ve hırs ve hased ve şevvetâr • Dördü bu üçüncü dâhi diñe • buhl ve hıkd ve gazab ve hiddetâr, meaning roughly, “First of all the characteristics of the imperious carnal soul are seven: • they are self-importance, greed, envy and lust. • Listen to the four and also this group of three: • avarice, malice, and violent rage.”
giving them the necessary specifics to understand the finer points of these components of the Sufi path, a treatise once again written in a simple Turkish that eschewed overly eloquent constructions.

Taking this action, however, did not mean that he was comfortable with the idea, and he issued a strong warning, spread over several pages, aimed at preventing people from trying to undertake the requirements of the Halveti path without the guidance of a proper shaykh. Here, he once more raises the example of the wandering abdâl who may have traveled extensively but who has learned little about the fundamental mechanics of mysticism in the process. He also makes an analogy that may have been even more effective, likening the person who learns about Sufism only from books to someone who learns the Arabic language only from the books of grammarians. While he may be able to understand the parts of speech and the construction of the language, when placed in an environment with people who have been trained properly by a teacher, he will mangle the language in speaking, making “clucking sounds” like a chicken that are unintelligible to the true speakers of the language. In the process, his ignorance will be exposed. In fact, Fu’âdî argues, during his own training with Abdülbâkî Efendi and Muhyiddîn Efendi, he experienced mystical states at the more advanced levels that could not even be expressed in spoken language, much less written down on paper.¹¹¹

Fu’âdî had to stress this point simply because without it, the very act of writing a book would slide into the same ideological trap into which his opponents among the

¹¹¹ Ibid., fols. 175a-b.
Kâdîtêdelis\footnote{I use the term “Kâdîtêdeli” rather than “proto-Kâdîtêdeli” here, since this work was completed around the year 1625, by which time the influence of Kâdîtêdê Mehmed and his followers had begun to be felt in the politics of the empire; see Tezcan, pp. 191-192. However, the Halveti-Kâdîtêdeli debates reached their crescendo toward the end of the 1620s and continued into the 1630s. See Zilfi, “Discordant Revivalism,” p. 256.} had fallen. Stressing that reading books that discuss the problems of Sufism is not enough to guarantee the reader the solutions that he or she seeks, Fu’âdî points out that the Prophet himself had said, “[First] the companion, then the road” (\textit{Al-rafiq thumma at-tarîq}), along with “He who has no shaykh has no religion” (\textit{Man lâ shaykh lihi lâ dîn lihi}) and “The shaykh is to his people as the prophet is to his community” (\textit{Al-shaykh fî qawmihi ka’il-nabî fî ummatihi}).\footnote{\textit{Risâle-i muslihu’n-nefs}, fol. 178b. It should be remembered that Fu’âdî’s opponents might have argued that these statements originated in contexts that were somewhat different from the interpretation that Fu’âdî wishes to give them here.} According to these Prophetic traditions, one must beware of the logic employed by those who seek to eliminate the influence of the saints.

In making this statement, Fu’âdî appears to be on slippery ground. A modern scholar might have more sympathy with his opponents, who appear to be opening up religious action and
This work by Najm al-Dīn Abī Bakr b. `Abdullah b. Muhammad b. Shāhādar al-Asad al-Rāzî (d. 654/1256-57) had a long and distinguished presence in Turkish intellectual history, according to Kâtib Çelebi. The first known text dated from the year 620/1223 in Sivas during the height of the Seljuk period, and it was later translated into Turkish from Persian during the reign of Murad II by one Kâsim b. Mahmûd al-Karâhisârî. For more on this work and its contents, see Keşfi‘z-zunûn, v. 2, pp. 1655-1656. Najm al-Dīn al-Râzî was one of a number of important Sufi intellectuals who fled the advance of the Mongols to settle in Anatolia in the first part of the thirteenth century and had a major influence on the development of Islamic mysticism among the Anatolian Turks. See Wolper, Cities and Saints, pp. 18 and 21. The work to which Fu’ādî refers has been published as Najm al-Dīn Râzî, Mersâd al-ebâd men al-mabdâ‘ elâ‘l-ma‘âd: The Path of God’s Bondsmen from Origin to Return, trans. Hamid Algar (Delmar, NY: Caravan Books, 1982). Fu’ādî also made no secret of the importance of Najm al-Dīn’s works to the Şa‘bâniyye branch of the Halveti, as he included several manuscripts of these works within the vakif‘ deed that established the complex so that Râzî’s works would be available in the library for the use of the educated Sufis there. See ‘Omêr el-Fu’ādî (d. 1636), Makâle-i ferdiyye ve risâle-i virdiyve (Istanbul, Süleymâniye Lib., MS Es‘ad Efendi 1734/3), fol. 54a.
the written word, or in restricting religious interpretation and doctrine to elites in society.

Yet this extensive discourse raises a thorny question for the modern reader, if not the audience of Fu’âdî’s own time: Why, then, produce a written work at all? One reason for writing the work, at least according to Fu’âdî, was that while the great masters of mysticism did not need to look at books and tracts in order to benefit from them in giving their guidance to others, they read them “to correlate their own mystical states with the mystical states of other perfected ones, to speak and converse with their spiritual presence in the world of meaning and the unseen, and to be spiritually and secretly purified.”

While Fu’âdî himself might not have put it in these words, this could be interpreted as his wanting to leave a legacy whereby future generations of the Şâbânîyye branch of the order could access his spiritual presence and guidance. Another reason for writing the work is, however, more clearly stated.

While the esteemed shaykhs and noble scholars have pleasant and excellent books and tracts pertaining to the soul and the characteristics of the soul...they did not show consideration to the stages of the seven levels (atvâr-ı sa̲b̲ah), and they arranged and explained with another pleasant [type of] organization and with another means of consideration that was unrestricted or haphazard (âlâ’l-itlâq wa kayfa mâ ittifaqa).

The noble one who expressed the level of the stages did not mention each level according to this format, or at the point that he mentioned the levels, he did not mention the seven attributes along with the names of the characteristics of the soul.

---

116 Risâle-i Muslihu’n-Nefs, fol. 176a.

117 Some examples of the works to which Fu’âdî is referring here might be that of his illustrious Halveti predecessor Cemâl el-Halveti (“Çelebi Halife,” d. 1499), Risâlah fî’l-atwâr wa’l-marâtib (Istanbul, Süleymaniye Lib., MS Hkm. 438/3). We know, of course, that Fu’âdî was acquainted with a number of his other works. Another example of an earlier, sixteenth-century atvar-ı sa̲b̲a work is that of Sofyal Bâlî Efendi (d. 1553), Atvâr-ı Sab̲a̲h (Istanbul, Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 1213). Earlier works addressing the concept, most of which would have been written in Arabic or Persian, also might have been known to him.
according to the organization mentioned in these poetic couplets...and they chose to summarize or abridge considerably. Although abridgment is desirable, in expressing the praiseworthy and blameworthy characteristics of each stage of each level of the soul... [and] in distinguishing with close examination every position and every level, and in being detailed and by inclusion of an explanation, making it easy and beneficial for the seeker and traveler on the path is intended....The guidance and process of guiding in the honorable silsile...of Şâbân Efendi and his pleasant principles up until now is according to this path, and this letter of ours was brought forth to gather together and explain [it] according to this means by being a friendly exposition (hasb-i hâl) of these points and meanings.\(^{118}\)

In other words, Fu‘âdî needed a work that was more accessible to the audience of early 17\(^{th}\)-century Kastamonu, and earlier works had been produced in a language or manner of expression that was not accessible to most Turkish-speaking people, or were arranged in a way that did not fit the Halveti teachings that had been passed down through Şâbân Efendi and his successors. In aiming for a middle path between arbitrarily abridged mentions of concepts and excessively detailed works that would be inaccessible to all but the most advanced scholars, the author likened the work to a travel guide carried by people who had to travel for a living, such as merchants, that would detail the inns and way-stations on the roads that they would follow.

Fu‘âdî goes on to demonstrate for his audience how he ties this new presentation of the seven stages of the soul to the bases of the Halveti order through the establishment of basic everyday practices a novice could follow to initiate his mystical training. There were five practices, consciously echoing the five ritual pillars of Islamic belief. First of all, the novice should not eat too much and get filled up with food, as such activity would disrupt the elemental composition of the body in favor of fire, raising the human and carnal passions.

\(^{118}\) Risâle-i muslihu’n-nefs, fol. 176a.
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to the point at which they interfere with the “fire of divine love.” Fu’âdî goes on to complain that too many novice dervishes fail in their observance of even this most basic of practices. Yet Fu’âdî does not want the potential seeker to go too far in the opposite direction either, for some might take their asceticism to an extreme, so he argues that it is best if the dervish maintains a state of being neither full nor completely hungry. Related to this was the third of the five requirements, which was to limit one’s amount of sleep—a problem if one had overeaten. The reason for this stricture was simple: in an order that placed a high priority on the interpretation of dreams, too much sleep would lead to neglect and an inability to remember details for interpretation later. The second and fourth requirements were also related to each other: avoid speaking as much as possible and avoid mixing with others as much as possible while seeking solitude. The reason for this was that social intercourse would require many of the activities proscribed by the first three recommendations. This indicates that much of the audience that Fu’âdî was trying to reach lived active social lives that the requirements of the Halveti path tended to challenge. The fifth and final requirement was, of course, to be engaged in remembrance of God at all times, preferably through the vocal zikr of the name of God with which the dervish had been charged. However, Fu’âdî also warns against getting out of hand with the vocal zikr and enjoined restraint in its practice, not surprising in light of the social context manifested in his other works.¹¹⁹

After establishing his reasons for writing this work and the basic requirements for initiating the journey on the mystical path, Fu’âdî describes the vices to be avoided at the

¹¹⁹ Ibid., fols. 177a-178a.
initial two stages of conquering the “commanding soul” (*nefs-i emmâre*) and the “resisting soul” (*nefs-i levvâme*). The first set of vices represents the passions of the carnal soul run amuck, while the second group are vices that appear when the obvious attributes of the carnal soul have been subdued but are still manifesting resistance in the inner consciousness of the seeker. In order to combat each of the seven vices in each of these two stages of the path, the seeker has to exchange these vices for corresponding virtues of the later stages of the path; for example, the vice of pride (*kibîr*) has to be combated with the virtues of humility (*huzûf*) and modesty (*tevâzu*). In addition, Fu’îdî sometimes offers qualifications on how to avoid turning attempts to be virtuous into vices; for example, people who became too impressed with their own humility and modesty will fall into the trap of pride and self-conceit.\(^\text{120}\)

What probably caught the attention of the audience, however, was not technical discussions like these as much as the anecdotes that Fu’îdî mixes in with each description as a way of illustrating his point. These short narratives range from explanations of Prophetic traditions to apocryphal narratives to folktales. He illustrates the best way to avoid falling into the trap of pride by explaining the background behind the hadith “Verily God most High loves kindness in all affairs” (*inna Allah Ta’âlâ yahabbu al-rifq fî-l-amr kullihi*). Fu’îdî explained that according to a work he consulted, *The Places of the Rising of the Lights* (*Meşârku’l-envâr*), the Prophet was once accosted by a Jewish scholar who wished to defeat him in theological debate.\(^\text{121}\) The Prophet’s wife ‘Â’îshah watched from behind a

\(^{120}\) Ibid., fol. 179b.

\(^{121}\) The work referred to is probably the *Mashârîq al-anwâr al-qudsiyyah fî bayân al-‘uhûd al-Muhammadiyyah* of Shaykh ‘Abdu’l-Wahhâb b. Ahmad al-Shârînî, written
curtain as the Jewish scholar proceeded to behave insultingly and insolently towards Muhammad, but Muhammad never wavered in his friendly demeanor. When the man had left, ʿĀʾishah, thinking that her husband had gotten the worst of the encounter by not standing up for himself, asked him why he had behaved in this way. He responded by saying that since he behaved properly while his detractor had not, he had in fact triumphed in the encounter. The audience would have been able to relate the kibir (overweening pride) of the Jewish scholar to the anti-Sufi agitators of their own times.

Perhaps more moving still is the following story that Fuʿādī adds to these remarks.

God most High, to teach and test Moses, said, “O Moses, find an insignificant and despicable thing from among the whole of creation and bring it to me, such that at the level of creation a more insignificant and despicable [thing] than it shall not exist. Moses found a mangy dog that was the most insignificant and despicable in all of creation, and that [all of] creation despised. Thinking that there wasn’t a meaner and more despicable thing than this, he took it to the mountainside. As they were going along, God gave that dog a tongue, and he said, “Moses! Where are you taking me and forcing me to go?” As soon as he said, “I’m taking you and forcing you to go to the mountainside to God Most High,” [the dog] said, “O interlocutor of God, how can you take and make me go into the presence of the Lord of the Worlds and the Exalted House in this state of meanness and lowness?” When Moses knew what had come [down] on his head and reflected on his own soul with the rejecting of inattentiveness and witnessed [his] state, he removed the leash that he had put around the neck of the dog and put it around his own neck. When he came to the mountain, he said, “O Lord, I went around all of creation and however insolent I might have been, in the end I couldn’t find anything lower and more despicable than myself....” God [then] preached to Moses..., “I knew that dog was [appearing to be] more...
abject than his soul, and had you brought him to me, I would have removed you from the record of prophecy!”

Other stories illustrating the vices include that of a “black Arab” in the city of Cairo who is humiliated by a young boy when his greed (htrs) for sweets leads him to let the boy ride him around in the marketplace like a donkey, only to be rewarded with oats and grass by the boy afterward. This is followed by a story about a conversation between a dervish and Satan in which Satan explains that the one thing more wicked than himself is a person whose envy (hased) is so great that he asks Satan to kill his wealthier neighbor’s donkey even though his neighbor’s wife has been instructed to give half the profit the donkey brings to his own family. Finally, there is an odd narrative about how the prophet Moses, after killing a person in the land of Egypt, has to learn to conquer his anger (gazab) with the help of the prophet Shu’ayb. Afterwards, he is tested by a wayward sheep who attempts to frustrate Moses by not allowing him to catch it for a number of days. When Moses proves able to contain his anger and show forgiveness to the sheep, he is then guided to the gift of prophecy by God. Such narratives could illustrate for a diverse audience of various levels of education the traps of the carnal soul that every seeker on the path has to avoid, thereby broadening the various communities’ access to the basic precepts of Halveti Sufism.

To conclude his discussion on the lowest levels of the carnal soul, Fu’adî once again raises the distinction between the šerîī’āt and tarikat (meaning, the exoteric scholar’s versus the order’s) interpretations of a person’s actions. As in the previous discussions, he once again chooses to address the issue by means of a story.

122 Risâle-i muslihu’ n-nefs, fol. 180a.

123 Ibid., fols. 180b, 181a, and 184b.
A dervish of one of the noble [Sufi masters], while carrying the staff out in front of his horse and walking along, saw a single grape on the ground. When he picked it up and ate it, the noble one said to the dervish, “What did you just do?” As soon as the dervish said that he had picked up and eaten a single grape, thinking that it was an unimportant thing, he said to the dervish, “What a pity that you are a dervish...[supposedly] giving extreme importance to etiquette and avoiding the needs of the blameworthy attributes....If you deem one grape unimportant, then it [might as well be] one thousand!” In reality, it is like this, because these sorts of things are acceptable in the ğeri'āt, but not acceptable in the tarikat because the noble one placed importance on guidance, and [failing to follow the rules of the order] is a breach of etiquette. Now, however much the trustworthy dervish abstains from types of disobedience to the ğeri'āt, he needs to give that much time and importance to avoiding also those things which are breaches of etiquette in the tarikat....

The point of the discussion is simple: when the dervishes took on the responsibilities of pursuing the mystical path, they had to attune themselves to the minutest aspects of their conduct and actions. In addition, they were to superimpose a new set of laws and restrictions over and above those imposed by the standard Islamic religious laws and prohibitions; these new laws were to be tied closely to the guidance of a perfected shaykh.

Once the basic vices had been conquered, however, the dervish would face a second set of more subtle forms of vice that also had to be conquered. The problem with the vices of these “carnal desires within the conscience” (nefs-i levvâme) was that they were often difficult to spot within oneself, which was why the guidance of a master became increasingly important during this stage. Many of the vices treated in this section, such as vanity (ʻucb), desire to subjugate (kahtr) and blaming others (levm) could result from success on the first stages of the path, as the dervish came to see himself rising above the mass of ordinary people in spirituality. Without the careful oversight of a more advanced guide to cut off

124 Ibid., fol. 185a.
these traps that rose from within the mind to disrupt the spiritual advancement of the seeker, he or she could very well fall back to the beginning of the path, as these vices were ultimately derived from those at the lowest levels of advancement. Interestingly enough, these vices often mirror the accusations that Fu’âdî and others made against their Kâdîzâdeli opponents.

Another prominent problem that Fu’âdî and other Halveti guides clearly struggled with in trying to keep their dervishes in line was the blameworthy attribute of “revelry” (İşret). While the path enjoined quiet and solitude as the preferred state of existence, many dervishes also relished the social activity that the Sufi community provided and would get together to eat, drink and make conversation. Since interaction was in and of itself capable of generating negative attributes and feelings, it was a serious struggle for both shaykh and dervish alike to get past this vice. After all, it was for this very reason that Şâbân Efendi’s companions had been drawn to the zikr recitations of the Halveti order so many years before.

Once the seeker moved beyond the first two phases of the path, however, the goal of the process changed from avoiding the negative attributes to personification of the positive elements. There was a danger in this for Fu’âdî, however, in that too many seekers sought to rush the process after their struggles with the negative elements inherent in the carnal soul. As a result, no one should be allowed to go forward without consulting a qualified individual who could properly judge his state. This clearly raised questions among the contemporary following of the order, and indirectly leads Fu’âdî to give us another reason for the composition of his work.

---

125 Ibid., fol. 185b.
O seeker, be you on whatever level or at whatever station, if you want to
know whether or not you have struggled on your mystical journey, or if you
have favor, or if you have moved on to become [one of] the people of the
state, make a presentation to a perfected guide and noble one with complete
submission, trustworthiness, and seriousness. If you cannot find [such a
person], then look at his books and tracts full of perfection and the state,
[which] stir up mystical knowledge and truth, and listen and understand with
full comprehension their words pertaining to the state and perfection in their
guidance....Look in their mirror by this means, until you see all of your states
in the mirror of their attributes, and know your good qualities and faults as
they are. If you have a fault, you should correct it, because how can seekers
perfect a station, [if they] become conceited with lack of knowledge, thinking
“I became [one of] the people of the states,” and remain deficient and
ignorant? In the end, you’ll obtain this state and meaning in the attribute of
detailing of knowledge which is explained, and you’ll benefit.\footnote{126
Ibid., fols. 189a-b.}

In this admonition, Fu’âdî confesses the important role that books and tracts had come to
have in his society. This represents an admission that the perfected guide-to-disciple ratio,
in his opinion, had reached a level at which there weren’t enough guides to go around–hence
his warnings to beware of imposters looking to fill the gap. The goal of books and tracts that
Fu’âdî and others like him were producing was to provide a temporary stand-in for the
perfected guide in situations in which one was not available, or in which the seeker could
not obtain the one-on-one training that marked the ideal mystical relationship. In other
words, why should a seeker be limited in his or her pursuit of mystical knowledge simply
because of a shortage of mystical guides? Even without having a guide present, one could
still make progress by tapping into the store of knowledge that the great guides’ written
works represented in the hope of completing the full process later when he or she could gain
proper access to a shaykh who could tie up the loose ends. While it was an imperfect and
potentially troubling situation even by Fu’âdî’s own admission, he sensed that having

\footnote{126 Ibid., fols. 189a-b.}
seekers making imperfect progress on the path would be preferable to their making no progress at all.

Fu’âdî then moves on to the latter stages of the path, in which the seeker tries to acquire virtues while avoiding the traps of the vices that he or she has tried to defeat during the earlier stages. Backsliding was a constant worry for those who had reached these more advanced stages of the path, and it is interesting that Fu’âdî chooses to stress this in his section on the virtue of enduring suffering (tahammül).

When the people curse and get angry [at the seeker], by not knowing their own state, fault, and ignorance, they do not protect the zeal of God and the zeal of the path, they are attracted to the powers of the carnal soul and the passion of the deceptive multiplicity, and a dervish is not presented, concerned with reputation, or respected at the level of the people. Shame and honor don’t appear when one thinks, “We received criticism about that.” But this state is from great ignorance and misguidedness. For a dervish to receive true criticism, there is no protecting of reputation and honor. But it is not connected with the world and the multiplicity of the horizons. For example, to be one in the face of blame and praise, and to choose to be criticized is to choose poverty and the abandonment of the world with asceticism and piety, meaning that when [the dervish] abandons sumptuous clothes and the esteem of the people, dons the cloak and tassel, and enters the path and state of the impoverished dervishes, it is enduring the curses of the fanatics and censurers and the uneducated ones without knowledge of the state of the shaykhs and dervishes, and not taking offense at their words.  

Once again, Fu’âdî stresses that one of the greatest threats to the progress of the seekers on the path is the growing power of the censuring faction, and that all devotees of the order have to be aware of this danger to avoid being deterred from the path.

Maintaining the order’s numbers and base of support was important to Halveti leaders like Fu’âdî by the mid-1620s. With the rising power of Kâdızâde Mehmed and others like him who threatened many Ottoman Sufi orders with accusations of innovation

---

127 Ibid., fol. 190b.
and corruption, closing ranks against the threat was critical. It is perhaps instructive that another of Fu’âdî’s shorter tracts, the Risâle-i gülâbiyye (Rose-Water Tract), was aimed specifically at dervishes who had entered the third and fourth stages of the Halveti path and were seeking to master its virtues. Drawing on an extended interpretation of a metaphor expressed in one of Mevlânâ Celâluddîn Rûmî’s couplets from the Mesnevî about the scent of roses and rose-water, Fu’âdî stresses that far too many dervishes fail to stay on the path and slip back into worldly pursuits once they have experienced some form of divinely-granted ecstatic state on the more advanced stages of the path, based on their frustration at being unable to repeat the experience. Perhaps recalling his own experience temporarily slipping off the path after the death of his first guide, Abdülbâkî Efendi, Fu’âdî encourages his audience to keep advancing with the help of their guides, and concludes his presentation with an anecdote of how the first in the line of shaykhs in the Halveti silsile, Hasan al-Basrî (d. 728), defeated the censure of his opponents at the court of the Umayyad caliph ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz (d. 720) on the matter of predestination (qadar) by offering a persuasive reply and standing firm in the face of the criticism. As a result, the caliph ʿUmar reaffirmed his fervent support for him.

---

128 Ömer el-Fu’âdî (d. 1636), Risâle-i gülâbiyye (Istanbul, Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 614/17).

129 Ibid., fol. 92b.

130 Ibid., fols. 95b-96a. In fact, Fu’âdî may be confusing the caliphate of ʿAbd al-Malik (d. 705) with that of the more pious ʿUmar, who was acknowledged by later Muslims to be an exceptionally religious figure among the otherwise problematic Umayyads. See Knysh, p. 12, and Marshall G.S. Hodgson, The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), v. 1, pp. 248-249. However, it is also known that Hasan al-Basrî served briefly as a judge under ʿUmar when the latter first ascended the throne in 717, and ʿUmar’s mixed
positions on various political and doctrinal controversies during his lifetime give this story a ring of accuracy. See the analysis of Hasan’s life in W. Montgomery Watt, The Formative Period of Early Islamic Thought (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1980), pp. 77-81, and al-Basri’s position on various aspects of the Qadarite doctrines on pp. 99-104. See also the study of the issue of free will in early Islamic doctrine by W. Montgomery Watt, Free Will and Predestination in Early Islam (London: Luzac & Company, 1948), esp. pp. 54-55 and 165. The acceptance of Hasan al-Basri’s doctrines by the caliph Umar is also affirmed by Josef van Ess, “Umar II and His Epistle against the Qadarîya,” Abr-Nahrain 12 (1971-72), pp. 24-25.

131 Compare, for example, the later Şa'bâniyye work on the attributes of the various stages compiled by Ünsî Hasan Efendi (d. 1723), Mecmûât al-rasâ'il (Istanbul, Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 1508), fols. 8a-13b, where the attribute of “anxiety” is not even mentioned at any of the stages.

132 Risâle-i muslihu’n-nefs, fols. 194a-b. One could read the nature of the “anxiety” described here as related method of the attribute of “action,” in the sense that the seeker must always be pushing toward the goals of the path, and never flagging in his struggle. Still, the choice of words seems distinctly less positive in its implication.
that the copyist of Fu’âdî’s work chose to illustrate the point further by adding in the margin of the manuscript a passage from another of Fu’âdî’s works discussing how the stage of the “tranquil soul” was a dangerous time for dervishes, as they were prone to fall into laziness and an attenuation of their struggles to advance.133

A possible indication of how successful Fu’âdî’s textbook became is the existence of the Mother-of-Pearl Treatise (Risâle-i sadefiyye), a short tract that reiterates the basic points about the blameworthy attributes of the nefs-i emmâre, along with an enumeration of the seven stages of the Halveti path, that he had discussed in the Risâle-i muslihu’n-nefs. The first several folios are written entirely in verse, indicating that the treatise seeks to provide a brief summary that can be easily memorized for oral recitation among the general public. However, he also includes several of the short anecdotes that he mentioned in his previous treatise. One of these deals with his dream of having met the second caliph, ʿUmar b. al-Khattâb (d. 644), in a great mosque and listened to him deliver a sermon, a mystical experience which Fu’âdî describes entirely in Arabic. In this dream, once Fu’âdî realizes who the preacher is by asking the person next to him in the mosque, he turns to look and finds ʿUmar lecturing the audience to beware the tricks of the carnal soul and Satan’s calls to lead them astray, and to struggle to replace their blameworthy characteristics with praiseworthy ones.134 It is interesting that the caliph ʿUmar takes the role of a mosque

133 Ibid., fol. 194a, margin. According to the late eighteenth-century copyist, it was taken from the “vîrd-i şerîf commentary of ʿÖmer el-Fuʿâdî,” which must refer to the Şerh-i Vîrd-i settâr, which will be discussed shortly.

134 ʿÖmer el-Fuʿâdî (d. 1636), Risâle-i sadefiyye (Istanbul, Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 614/16), fols. 188b-189a. The odd title of the work in fact refers to a quote from the work al-Manârât (The Lighthouses) by Najm al-Dîn al-Râzî (d. 1256-57) with which Fuʿâdî opens the work. See also Risâle-i muslihu’n-nefs, fol. 177a. Interestingly
enough, Fu’âdî indicates through this presentation that he sees the language in which the
dream took place as significant. He does not translate it for his audience, either,
indicating that it was not to be made readily available to those who did not have some
form of education in Arabic. This demonstrates both the importance of this event in
shaping Fu’âdî’s mystical outlook and activities, and its sacred character to him, which
perhaps led him to restrict its accessibility, but not its spread to a wider audience.

By the close of his second decade as head of the Şa‘bânîyye order in Kastamonu and
eenvrons, Fu’âdî had already authored a considerable body of work aimed at educating his
compatriots, predominantly in their own language, about both the history of the order and
the basic beliefs and requirements involved in following the Halveti path as expressed by
the founder of that order, Şa‘bân Efendi. These works appear to have been successful, and
this may have encouraged Fu’âdî to take up another ambitious project. One of the
foundations of the Halveti path was, of course, the text of the Vird-i settâr that had been
instituted by Yahyâ-yî Şirvânî as a basic recitation for the Halveti dervishes during the time
of the Akkoyunlu sultanate. However, by Fu’âdî’s time, many dervishes lacked the
familiarity with the Arabic language that would have allowed them to understand much of
the prayer. More importantly, they may have failed to grasp why it was even important for

Halveti ritual and practice. As a result, sometime during 1628, Fu’âdî undertook a commentary on the Arabic text of the Vird-i settâr, breaking it up piece by piece and explaining each element in turn. However, he did not limit his exposition to this particular aspect of the Halveti path. Instead, he made it the central part of a five-part treatise entitled The Catalogued Discourse and the Tract on the Recited Prayer (Makâle-i ferdiyye ve risâle-i virdiyye).

Perhaps influenced by the early example of Mahmûd Efendi, Fu’âdî begins this work on a defensive note by seeking to establish historical and religious justifications for the clothing and headgear that Halveti dervishes wore. Interestingly enough, the most prominent source he uses to establish the canonical respectability of the Sufi path is an Arabic tract, the Risâle-i nûriyye of Sultan Mehmed II’s favored Bayrâmî shaykh Akşemseddîn Mehmed Efendi (d. 1459?). The text of Akşemseddîn’s treatise, dealing with the canonical

135 This text has survived in at least three copies, the earliest included in Ömer el-Fu’âdî (d. 1636), Makâle-i ferdiyye ve risâle-i virdiyye (Istanbul, Süleymaniye Lib., MS Es’ad Efendi 1734/3), with the commentary on the Vird-i settâr running from fols. 48b-94a. On fol. 48b is an indication that the author commenced the work on 10 Zi’lhicce 1038/1628. However, at another point in the text, Fu’âdî informs us that he is writing during the year 1040/1630-31, indicating that the text took some time to reach its final form; see his brief remark on fol. 69b. Fu’âdî may have subsequently reorganized this text, along with additional materials, to form the longer tract of the Makâle. See also idem., Serh-i Vird-i settâr (Istanbul, Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 484/2), fols. 79a-141a, which is much easier to work with and has better handwriting, but dates from a later time and lacks the supporting apparatus of the other parts of the Makâle-i ferdiyye found in the Süleymaniye text (in fact, it inserts the first fast of the Makâle after the commentary on the Vird-i settâr). The same text inserted in another manuscript compilation of Fu’âdî’s works can also be found in Süleymaniye Library MS Hac Mahmud Efendi 2287, fols. 173b-238b, but my cursory examination of this text suggests that it omits certain sections found in MS Es’ad Efendi 1734.

136 For more on Akşemseddîn and his career, including his involvement with the siege and conquest of Constantinople and the discovery of the reputed burial place of the early Islamic martyr Ayyûb al-Ansârî (d. 674), see Lâmi’î Çelebi (d. 1532), Nefehâtü’l-
respectability of Sufi clothing and translated into Turkish, was interspersed with observations based on the teachings of Şâbân Efendi, and it forms the foundation for the defense of Sufi practices that opens the work. This indicates that the problem of defending Sufi clothing and practices predated the era in which Fu’âdî lived; however, a new generation of attackers now had to be confronted, and Fu’âdî needed to broaden the base of his order’s defensive ideology to incorporate respected earlier Ottoman religious figures beyond just Mahmûd Efendi. In addition, when discussing certain traditions of the Prophet Muhammad that could potentially uphold Sufi practices, Fu’âdî indicates some of the problems that Sufis encountered in their society by comparing them to narratives about the ahl al-suffah of early Islamic times. Elaborating on the commentary provided by Ebûsu’ûd Efendi on the relevant Qur’anic verses, he likens the events of the Prophet’s lifetime to the situation that prevailed in his own time, which led many dervishes to be treated poorly.

The great chiefs and elegant members among the unbelievers of the Quraysh tribe, in order to sit with and get closer to the esteemed [Prophet Muhammad], came into his noble presence and said: “O Muhammad...you are a master of grace and states, gentle of action and condition. But when we come into your noble presence, we don’t find you alone, we find [you] with a disagreeable group, a company whose bodies are stinking with sweat and

---

137 Makâle-i Ferdiyye, fols. 23b-27b.

138 The ahl al-suffah, or the “people of the bench,” were a group of Muslims who supposedly lived near the Ka’bah in Mecca and devoted their entire existence to prayer and devotion except at the times when the Prophet called upon them to join one of his campaigns. Sufi biographers of medieval times like Sulamî, Hujwîrî and Abû Nu’aym incorporated histories of the members of this group and established them as a model for later adherents to the Sufi path. Even Ibn Taymiyyah cites them as laudable exemplars for the Muslim community; see W. Montgomery Watt, “Ahl al-Suffah,” EF², v. 1, pp. 266-267.
full of dirt, and whose clothes are stinking and impure with this dirt, and because of this their scent resembles the scent of a dervish house (tekke), and [they] are repulsive to us. If you leave this type of people, all of us will come and we shall sit and speak with you.

This placed Muhammad in a difficult situation in that he was bound to try and convert as many people as possible to Islam. As a result, he considered the possibility of heeding the Quraysh’s wishes by trying to spend part of his time with the ahl al-suffah and part of it with the wealthy members of the Quraysh. Yet before he was able to decide, God intervened with a command that he should not heed the wishes of these people.

[God] said: “O Muhammad! Do not leave the people of the bench! Be always steadfast with them, and stand firm, since they are resolved and continuous in weeping, prayer and worship both day and night, and at the times of prayer and all religious holidays.” On this point God most High expressed his zealous nature, and he commanded...with the intent of establishing and giving importance once more to not leaving them, “Make your soul (nefs) so resolved and firm on the matter of not leaving them that you shall never be separated from them, ever!”

By likening the state of the ahl al-suffah to that of the Halveti dervishes who abandoned high-class Ottoman society to live in an impoverished and decrepit state, Fu’âdî draws on a powerful example from the earliest period of Islamic history to shield the behavior of his followers from the criticism of outsiders. It also placed his critics in the uncomfortable position of emulating the Meccan unbelievers who tried to get the Prophet to reject his most pious followers.

139 The full narrative occurs in Makâle-i ferdiyye, fols. 33b-34b. The story is a variation on narratives of a similar nature that appear in the Arabic traditions. See, for example, the variations on this story that appear in a work by an Egyptian scholar: Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Rahman as-Sakhâwî (d. 1496), Ruhbân al-kaffah fî bayân nubdhatin min akhbâr Ahl al-Suffah (Riyadh: Dâr al-Salaf, 1995), pp. 125-130.
The first chapter of the work, after the defense of Sufi clothing and practices, deals with the interpretation of dreams. Fu’âdî stresses that the advancement of the seeker’s soul along the various stages of the path requires the assistance of a guide in interpreting the seeker’s dreams, which give clues to the direction his path should take. Quoting a work of Dâvud Mahmûd al-Kayserî (d. ca. 1350) known as the Muttali’, he explains how the dream-world represents a meeting point between the spiritual and corporeal worlds. As a result, a guide is critical for the seeker because he can interpret the complex messages that emanate from this state. However, the guide will usually not give an objective interpretation of a dream to the seeker; instead, he will give a subjective interpretation that will force the seeker to know his soul better. Fu’âdî reveals to his audience that even before he read these remarks of Dâvud Kayseri, he had experienced this himself when he first joined the order at the age of 27 under Abdülbâkî Efendi. In addition, to illustrate for his audience just what he means by the subjective nature of the shaykh’s interpretation of dreams for the seeker, he gives an example of what once transpired between his own guide, Muhyiddîn Efendi, and Şâbân Efendi.

140 Dâvud Mahmûd al-Kayserî was a follower and student of Kâshânî, and his work Muttali’ khusûs al-kalim min ma‘anî Fusûs al-hikam (which was also known in Ottoman circles as the Muqaddimat sharh al-Fusûs) was a guide to understanding some of the basic precepts that underlay Ibn al-‘Arabi’s cosmology. A discussion of its contents can be found in Keşfi‘z-zunûn, v. 2, p. 1720. Dâvud himself was an important figure in Ottoman history, as he was considered to be the first scholar whom the early Ottomans appointed to the first medrese that they built in İznik during the reign of Sultan Orhan (d. 1362), see Taşköprüzâde (d. 1561), Al-Shaqâ‘iq al-nu‘mânîyyah fi ‘ulamâ‘ al-dawlat al-‘uthmânîyyah wa ya‘lîhi al-‘aqd al-manzûm fi dhikri afâdil al-Rûm (Beirut: Dâr al-Kitâb al-‘Arabî, 1975), p. 8.

141 Makâle-i Ferdiyye, fols. 42a-b.
Muhyiddîn Efendi related: “One day I told the esteemed master about a carnal dream [that I had]. He said, ‘How nice!’ To make a long story short, when he approved [of this], I said, ‘My lord, how can it be nice? It is carnal!’ He said, ‘Its goodness is this: It is said that the negative attributes in the mirror of your heart and the purity of your body should be removed. If you had not seen that dream, regression and deficiency would not have appeared in you. Since it appeared, go and work [on solving it]!’”142

The point of the narrative is that even a negative sign might have a positive consequence in the long run; thus a seeker should not assume he will understand the import of his visions in the world of dreams.

Only after explaining these two fundamental pillars of Halveti practice does Fu’âdî turn to his commentary on the Vird-i setṭâr. He stresses that the prayer is a critical part of the order, and that every part of it has meaning and relevance for each seeker based on his station on the path, so he should not fall asleep or show neglect in his concentration while listening to it, even if he cannot understand all of the words. In addition, proper posture, style, and etiquette have to be followed when reading the prayer, and any mystical states that occur during its reading have to be carefully monitored by the shaykh.143 Nevertheless, what is distinctive about the commentary is its emphasis on certain elements within the text of the prayer. Certain elements are glossed over with little more than a basic definition of the Arabic terms involved, while other brief elements within the prayer generate several folios of discussion. While the length of the text and the complexity of its exposition do not allow me to tackle these elements in their entirety, it is worth looking at a few of Fu’âdî’s more involved discussions to demonstrate which elements he felt required both his and his

142 Ibid., fol. 43b.

143 Ibid., fols. 43b-44a.
audience’s special attention. It is perhaps telling that nearly a seventh of the commentary (fols. 50a-57a) consists of an explanation of the subtle points underlying just two verses in the Vird-i settâr. The first, “Glory be to you (God), we cannot serve you properly, O one who is served,” is followed by several related statements, the first of which is, “Glory be to you (God), we cannot know you properly, O one who is known.”

It becomes clear that the first verse raises some key problems that Fu’âdî worries will mislead the seekers on the path. The crux of the issue is maintaining proper belief on the Sufi path despite the ecstatic states and other reactions that the path can provoke in the seeker. Beginning with the time-honored distinction between the type of prophecy given to the prophets (nübüvvet-i teşrî ïyye) and that given to saints (nübüvvet-i ta ūrîfîyye), and stressing that the latter can be achieved only through strict obedience to the commands and laws of the former, Fu’âdî explains that the true Sufi saint will never deviate from Islamic religious law until the time of his death. The greatest danger, however, is that in the latter stages of the path, the manifestations of unity to the seekers will place them in a dangerous position between the rapture of divine unity (telvîn) and the need to maintain control of one’s senses (temkîn). The successful seeker on the path will recognize the need to chart a balanced course between the two, for to slide too far into ecstasy would lead to rejection of religion (zendaka), while failing to achieve sufficient perception of the divine unity would

144 In Arabic, Subhânaka mâ ābadnâka haqqa ībâdatika yâ ma ūdu, subhânaka mâ ārafânâka haqqa ma ūrfatika yâ ma ūrîfî. A good copy of the text of the Vird-i settâr, fully voweled, can be found in Ahmed Nezih Galitekin, Gölcük Örcün Köyü ve Baba Sultân Zâviyesi (Gölcük: Gölcük Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları No: 1, 2000), pp. 186-193, followed by a Turkish translation on pp. 194-197.

145 Makâle-i ferdiyye, fol. 50a.
rob the Sufi of the necessary experience (*cehâlet*) and render him incapable of being a good guide to others. The only way to avoid tipping the balance too far in one direction or another is to hew close to the *serî'at* and never to deviate from the basic pillars of the faith in one’s actions, even while in a state of rapture. ¹⁴⁶ But the verse raises other problems for Fu’âdî’s audience, for if the human being could not serve God except in a deficient way, what would be the point of serving him at all? Would one’s deficient attempts at worship therefore be abrogated? These questions suggest that a hostile critique was being advanced in some circles that this verse created a sort of conundrum whereby the very foundations of Islamic worship were being disparaged; this suggests that the *Vird-i settâr* posed the threat of leading the seeker into unbelief. On this point, Fu’âdî drew on his former career as a jurist and used the *Fiqh al-akbâr* of Abu Hanifah and later commentaries on it to demonstrate that despite man’s deficiencies, he must still obey God to the extent that he is able. ¹⁴⁷

The suspicion that Fu’âdî is once again focusing on the defense of his order’s basic foundations is confirmed by the stress in the second part of the formula on not being able to know God properly. Fu’âdî begins by citing his old standby Najm al-Dîn al-Râzî once more, with an Arabic passage describing how God’s scope is too great for the intellect to comprehend, and that the greatest minds of Islam were never able to maintain their senses in the face of God’s awesome transcendence. ¹⁴⁸ He then cites a passage from Ibn al-ʿArabî’s

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., fols. 50b-51b.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., fols. 52a-53a.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., fols. 53b-54a. Fu’âdî makes a point of stressing that the work he cites, the *Mañâzîl al-Sâ’îrîn*, is available in the tekke’s library and that it should be consulted if the audience wants further information on the subject.
Futûhât al-Makkiyyah that comments directly on the verse in question: here, Ibn al-ʿArabî acknowledges that some scholars, especially among the philosophers, found the statement to be erroneous, foolish, or even a manifestation of unbelief, and criticizes scholars such as al-Ghazâlî who tried to defend its validity. More troubling to some would be the fact that Abû Hanifah made the exact opposite claim—that “we know God properly” in his Fiqh al-akbâr. Since this contradicted the basic sense of the statement in the Vird-i settâr, it challenged the believer to choose between two widely-respected Muslim authorities, as this statement would also contradict the Prophet Muhammad himself. Fuʿâdî demonstrates how the apparent discrepancies can be resolved by explaining that the “knowledge” (maʾirfah) to which the two statements refer is not the same thing in both verses. The spiritual knowledge of God’s essence (ʿîrân-1zât), which includes the description of God’s attributes and his 99 names, for instance, is what Abû Hanifah is referring to; these qualities are, of course, knowable. On the other hand, the true nature of God’s essence (kûnh-i zât) is an unknowable thing, and it is to this that the text of the Vird is referring. Therefore, there is no real conflict between the statements of the great jurist and the text of the Vird-i settâr, so people should not feel that there is an inherent conflict between their adherence to the Hanefî school of law and the principles underlying the Halveti litany.

All of these discussions hint at the fact that some intellectuals outside the Halveti membership were looking for ways to undermine the doctrinal foundations of the order, which led Fuʿâdî to craft a coherent defense which would protect these texts from

149 Makâle-i Ferdiyye, fol. 54a-b.

150 Ibid., fols. 55a-56b.
insinuations of unorthodoxy by the order’s enemies. The commentary on the Vird-i settâr is clearly aimed at a more intellectual audience who wanted to be informed of the best ways to defend their practices in the theological arena of their times. Therefore, we should not assume that this text was a strict commentary on the components of the Halveti prayer litany as espoused by the Şa’bâniyye branch of the order; it also offered tools with which the order’s leadership could withstand the growing danger of the Kâdtzâdeli-inspired forces that challenged their legitimacy.

At one point, Fu’âdî even inserts some political commentary into his discussion of the prayer litany. Over a quarter of his work is given over to discussion of the anecdotes surrounding the lives, careers and virtues of the four rightly-guided caliphs and their immediate successors, based on the mention of them and their attributes in the prayer. At one point, during his discussion of the various references to the first caliph Abû Bakr, Fu’âdî addresses the virtue of compassion (şefkat) as a touchstone of faith (îmân) by digressing into a story about how the Prophet Mûsâ once asked God which group among his servants were most beloved to him. God responded by saying, “If a thorn were to sink into the foot of a faithful servant in the east, and if a faithful servant in the west were to apprehend his pain and suffering, and his heart grieve and be pained with compassion for this particular thing, the most beloved and dearest to me among all of my servants would be that servant.” These ideas needed to have relevance for the contemporary audience that Fu’âdî was addressing.

Let this be known also: If a tyrant without faith and lacking in generosity were to oppress and torment unjustly a victim deserving of mercy and compassion, the oppression of that tyrant is because of his lack of religion and his faith, or it is on account of great weakness in his faith, since compassion [derives] from faith....But now we live in a time, in the year 1040 (1630-1631), when if they were to see this oppression face-to-face, unlike the thorn which hurt the foot of [the person] in the west, the person who would
Ibid., fol. 69a-b.

The expression Fu’âdî uses here, Ûer Ûeriﬁde hürmeti nass-t kâtíla sâbît olan, probably implies that people who are suspicious and always looking for heresy will end up twisting the sacred law to do the exact opposite of what it really says. 152

While this remark is carefully worded to avoid specifics and is extremely opaque in its language, one suspects that Fu’âdî’s audience would readily have interpreted this comment as a censure of abuses by the Ottoman state and an expression of dissatisfaction with the prevailing order of the times. Moreover, this dissatisfaction lurking behind the anecdotes of the virtuous caliphs went beyond condemning the standard oppressive behavior that had come to characterize too much of the Ottoman leadership. In fact, Fu’âdî decisively states that the reason he chose to devote so much of his commentary on the Vîrd-î settâr to the lives of the caliphs was to rebut the accusations of those who censured the Halveti order.

...[T]he people who follow false ideas and vicious, unsolicited and unfounded opinions are hostile to the knowledge that they do not know and to the people of knowledge that they do not know. They do not beware of suspicion, slander and thinking badly [of someone], by which someone who is canonically lawful becomes an unbeliever, and that which is fixed in a sacred text become prohibited in the noble law. 152 They do not see and they do not know their own shameful faults. Talking about what they do not know, and saying, “The origin of the Halveti Sufis is Persia (Âcem),” they dare to make attribution to the evil sect of the Shi’ah (rîfz) and other slander that is not in the essences or person of the pious ones, God forbid and forbid again, and they make other baseless attributions. In particular, they do not look at the prayers, recitations and worship that these [people] perform at all times, whether externally, internally, secretly or openly....The creator of the Vîrd recited and recalled the four esteemed caliphs and the honored companions in the noble prayer with praiseworthy and beautiful attributes suitable to their

151 Ibid., fol. 69a-b.

152 The expression Fu’âdî uses here, ûer’i ûerîfde hürmeti nass-t kâtîla sâbît olan, probably implies that people who are suspicious and always looking for heresy will end up twisting the sacred law to do the exact opposite of what it really says.
noble honor and appropriate to the Book and the Sunnah, in order to incline to reference to righteousness and to prefer this state.  

By focusing on both the *Vird* and his own commitment to the description of all four of the rightly-guided caliphs, Fu’âdî is easily able to deflect the notion that the order’s origins in Iran would tie it to Shi‘ism. Since a strong strain of anti-‘Âcemî criticism present in some Ottoman circles throughout the sixteenth century remained during Fu’âdî’s time, this strategy could insulate the order and its followers from the worst accusations implied in those criticisms. It also alerts the audience to the fact that many of the order’s detractors have made their accusations without even looking at any of the order’s founding principles, thereby rendering their opinions unjustified and invalid.

Fu’âdî concludes his work with two chapters dealing with two critical elements of the Halveti path: the practice of seclusion (*halvet*) and the remembrance of God through prayer (*zikr*). Both of these short concluding chapters also illustrate the defensive tone of the work as a whole in that each devotes much space to developing arguments aimed at repelling the attacks of those who censure the order and its practices. Fu’âdî defends the practice of seclusion, firstly by dividing it into its *şeri‘at* and *tarikat* forms. The former is defined by the Arabic term *i‘îkâf* (a form of retreat devoted to the assiduous worship of God), while the latter is subsumed under the term *halvet*, from which the order takes its name. Fu’âdî goes on to tie the activities of the Prophet Muhammad in the cave at Mount

---

153 Makâle-i ferdiyye, fol. 86b.

154 Gelibolulu Mustafa ‘Alî is an example of a political figure who actively criticized and insulted the “eastern” figures who worked their way into the government, especially during the reign of Murad III. See Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual*, pp. 154-159.
Hirâ’ to the story of the ostensible founder of the Halveti order, Pîr ‘Ömer Halveti, who also withdrew from society to meditate and worship in the hollow of a plane tree in the wilderness.\textsuperscript{155} However, the censurers attacked the practice by claiming that the Halveti dervishes were following a practice identical to that of Christian monks in a monastery, whereas the Prophet had said that there should be no monks in Islam. Fu’âdî’s irritation at these claims comes through in his response to the charge, wherein he claims that understanding the difference between halvet and monasticism is as simple as opening a dictionary.

It isn’t like that; [this] statement is a lie and a false slander full of weakness! The retreats of the shaykhs that the dervishes perform, [when examined] according to the dictionary, they are behaving like monks. According to the serî ât there is monkhood. But according to the dictionary...it is [also] not monkhood. Monkhood pertains specifically to monks; it is certain that this state doesn’t exist [among the] shaykhs and dervishes like the attributed characteristic of connection? and fasting, and the wearing of sackcloth and abandonment of eating meat, and other conditions. But this [is the reason that] it is not monkhood according to the serî ât: Among the monks there is no religion or sacred law of Islam or action according to the order, and although they exert great struggle, it is not for God or for the sake of God (lillah wa fî Allah değildir). Because God’s noble statement, “Those who struggle for our sake, we shall guide them on our path” is not absolute [in nature]. It is written with “for our sake,” and it means “those who struggle with respect to us.” Now, according to this reading, as soon as there is no religion of Islam among them, and their actions are not for God or for the sake of God, their struggles don’t benefit them one bit. This is the original meaning of “monkhood” that they speak of.\textsuperscript{156}

Since the Halveti custom of seclusion is grounded in Islamic principles rather than those of the Christian monks, Fu’âdî argues that it is silly to link the two based on a superficial similarity in some of their practices. He concludes the chapter with a condemnation of the

\textsuperscript{155} Makâle-i Ferdiyye, fols. 95b-98a.

\textsuperscript{156} Ibid., fols. 98b-99a.
simpleminded thinking that some scholars apply to such problems, with the result that they unjustly criticize perfectly orthodox members of the Muslim community who have done nothing wrong.\textsuperscript{157}

The final chapter concerns the Halveti practice of recitation (zikr), which Fu’âdî considers to be the fourth pillar upon which the practice of the order is based. The major argument leveled against the Halveti order is that the vocal zikr is not an appropriate form of worship, and that no form of movement should take place in conjunction with it. As a rebuttal, Fu’âdî offers the example of Junayd al-Baghdâdî (d. 910), considered among the most sober of mystical thinkers in Islamic history. While at Mt. Sinai, according to the relation of Ja’far b. Muhammad, Junayd defended the practice of movement during the zikr when a Christian monk asked him about it after observing the practice.\textsuperscript{158} Other complaints seem to revolve around whether the utterance of the zikr could be anything other than the statement of tevhîd, or “There is no god but God,” in response to which Fu’âdî cites the Qur’ânic verse “O you who believe, remember God frequently.”\textsuperscript{159} The term for “frequent remembrance” (dhikran kathîran) in this verse could also suggest multiple means of recollection, a point backed up by Najm al-Dîn al-Râzî in his Qur’ânic commentary, which Fu’âdî cites in full without any translation from the Arabic. In response to the criticism, Fu’âdî concedes that the tevhîd recitation is most appropriate, especially for beginners on

\textsuperscript{157} Ibid., fol. 99a-b.

\textsuperscript{158} On the importance of Junayd al-Baghdâdî to the history of Islamic mysticism and his doctrine of “sobriety,” see the remarks of Knysh, pp. 52-56. Fu’âdî refers to this anecdote on several occasions in the Makâle-i ferdiyye; see fols. 34b-35b in addition to fol. 100b.

\textsuperscript{159} Al-Qur’ân, 33:41.
the Sufi path, to allow them to break away from the manifestations of multiplicity (kesret) that distract them. However, this was not the only form that a zikr can take, especially as mystics reach the later stages of the path. To conclude, he describes the narrative that explains the foundation of the Halveti path through the guidance that the Prophet Muhammad offered to his son-in-law, the future caliph ʿAlî, with the implication that the practice of zikr that the Halveti order followed is derived from the most impeccable of authorities.

Of course, such arguments were not enough for the ever-present censurers lurking in the background. They cited a tradition about the companion of the Prophet Ibn Maʾṣûd, who saw people performing a zikr in the mosque and responded by accusing the practitioners of innovation and ejecting them from the mosque. Since the tradition was considered a sound one in all circles, the threat was raised that this objection could be applied by analogy to those who pursued Halveti rituals in the mosques as well. In addition, the censurers also cited another tradition in which the Prophet criticized his followers for calling out loudly to God in their prayers, since there was no need to do so as he was never absent from them. In response, Fuʿâdî produces counter-traditions in which the Prophet defended the practice of a vocal zikr as the closest thing on earth to the gardens of paradise. In addition, Fuʿâdî argues that in the tradition about not calling out loudly in prayer, the Prophet was responding to a specific situation when the Muslims were on campaign; he feared that the enemy would hear them and learn their position if they did not keep quiet. Therefore, the injunction

\[160\] Makâle-i ferdiyye, fols. 100b-101b.
applied only to a specific situation, rather than denying the legitimacy of the practice in general.¹⁶¹

3.5 Doctrine and Political Life: Ömer el-Fu’âdî’s Role in Countering the Kâdîtâdeli Criticisms of the Halveti Semâ and Devrân

The issues raised by this final chapter of the Makâle-i ferdiyye may have taken on added urgency in the final years of Fu’âdî’s life. At the beginning of the 1630s, when Fu’âdî was completing his final lengthy defense of his order’s practices, the debates between the followers of Kâdîtâde Mehmed (d. 1635) and ʿAbdülmeçîd Sivâsî Efendi (d. 1639) over the issue of Sufî practices had spilled over into the public sphere in the Ottoman capital, with the combatants articulating their ideas before gatherings of royalty and commoners alike.¹⁶² As a result, Fu’âdî generated several short tracts aimed specifically at defending the practice of the Halveti semâ and devrân, which were central to the public presence of the Halvetis in Ottoman society. The ceremonies were undoubtedly important for the recruitment of the order’s members and the maintenance of their support among the wider public; after all, we have seen how Şa’bân Efendi himself had been brought into the order through his participation in a public gathering like this. Since I have not been able to date Fu’âdî’s shorter treatises defending the semâ and devrân with any accuracy, it cannot be ruled out

¹⁶¹ Ibid., fols. 103a-104b.

that he wrote them at earlier points in his career, or in conjunction with his more extensive tracts on Halveti ritual and practice. Nevertheless, one suspects that the growing power of Kâdtzâde Mehmed and his followers among the upper echelons of the Ottoman power structure led Fu’âdî to attempt a public response in the last decade of his life.

This response took the form of three separate treatises that deal with the same general thesis in varying levels of detail. The first and shortest of these, entitled A Tract Pertaining to the Permissibility of the Sufi Devrân, may have been the first that Fu’âdî produced, since he offers a short warning at the end that he wrote it hurriedly as an abridgment of the more extensive arguments found in other works, and that it should be handled only by those who are competent to expound on its basic points. In it, Fu’âdî describes three particular groups that he saw as being at the root of the problem.

The first of these are those who lack capability in the detailed explanation of opinions and correct ascertainment of conditions, since they cannot follow a career in the knowledge of Sufism and are incapable of disciplining their carnal souls, purifying their hearts, or polishing their souls, because they are extremist scholars in exoteric knowledge and the reason of their existence is exoteric knowledge. Another are those who are scholars but have no perfection or virtue with the annihilated state in knowledge, and only see and read the opinions and legal decisions of other scholars and interfere and criticize [using] those [sources]. Another has no knowledge themselves; they hear from the mouths of scholars and they don’t know their state and limit and faults out of ignorance, and they pass themselves off as pious and do not examine their error [born of] ignorance, and they interfere and criticize.

---

163 The three works that Fu’âdî wrote on the subject were all compiled into a defter that has been preserved in the Atatürk Kitaplığı in Istanbul. The shortest of the three is only a couple of folios long, and is placed between the longer tracts. See Ömer el-Fu’âdî (d. 1636), Devrân-ı süfiyye’nin cevâzına müte’ällik risâle (Istanbul, Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 781/2), fols. 39a-41b.

164 Ibid., fol. 40a-b.
In describing the problem, Fu’âdî reveals that the challenge facing the Halveti order applied to every level of society, and could not be fought only at the level of the elites. Unlike the situation that had obtained for earlier generations of Halveti leaders, who had debated these issues in Arabic mostly at the level of high culture and scholarship, Fu’âdî’s generation increasingly had to provide basic instruction to a broad swath of Turkish society in their own language as a means of defending the practices of Sufism against their detractors. Kâdzâdeli scholars were no longer content to challenge the Halvetis and other Sufis at the level of the imperial fetva; they were recruiting rank-and-file members among the populace who had an interest in religious issues to support their political agenda in reforming Ottoman society. The only way to counter this challenge, as Fu’âdî’s career so richly illustrates, was to make the basic elements of defense for the philosophy, thought, and practice of Halveti Sufism available to the same broad audience in their own language.

Part of Fu’âdî’s critique implies that a growing class of scholars had achieved a basic level of competence at which they could read legal decisions and opinions from various texts but lacked the intellectual background and/or extensive source base to interpret them in appropriate ways. As a result, they were misusing materials that they drew from these earlier sources by reading them in isolation for the purpose of censuring the members of the Halveti order. Recognizing the problem, Fu’âdî proceeded to write two longer, more extensive treatises that could articulate for the contemporary audience the line of defense that the Halveti forefathers had established. Part of Fu’âdî’s project, therefore, was to extend the availability of the earlier works of Halveti notables like Cemâl el-Halvetî and Sünbül

---

165 One of the three tracts that Fu’âdî produced on the subject is devoted entirely to explaining and commenting on Cemâl el-Halveti’s writings on the topic of the Halveti
Sinân Efendi\textsuperscript{166} that explained the textual supports for the permissibility and laudability of the Halveti zikr and its components. Another importance document to which Fu’âdî devotes attention is a renowned fetva that later grew into a short treatise of defense articulated by Zenbillî ʿAlî Efendi (d. 1525), the long-serving şeyhülislâm under the Ottoman sultans Bayezid II, Selim I and Süleymân I.\textsuperscript{167} Fu’âdî comments on the text of the legal decision, making the ideas of the Arabic original available to his audience. Some of the counter-arguments in the various commentaries that Fu’âdî produced were innocuous enough, such as the citation of a counter-tradition about Yahyâ b. Muʿadh, who successfully defended his practice of the vocal and moving zikr against the scholars of his day who challenged its

\textit{semâ} and \textit{devrân}, which apparently appear in Cemâl’s Arabic-language work \textit{Rawdât al-ulumâ’ wa jannât al-urafâ’}. I have not been able to find a copy of this work to date. See ʿÖmer el-Fuʿâdî (d. 1636), \textit{Risâle fî hakk ed-devrân es-sûfiyye} (Istanbul: Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 781/3), fols. 42a-60b.

\textsuperscript{166} As we have seen previously, Sünbül Sinân Efendi was the author of an unfinished tract in Arabic that defended Halveti practices and that was translated into Turkish by subsequent generations, including a recently published facsimile with a modern Turkish translation. See Yusuf Sünbül Sinân, \textit{Sünbül Efendi: Risâle-i Tahkîkiyye}, ed. Müfti Yüksel and Ali Toker (Istanbul: Fulya Yayınları, 2001). See also the aforementioned \textit{Risâle-i devrân-i sûfiyye min te’lîf-i Zenbillî ʿAlî Efendi}, fol. 3a.

\textsuperscript{167} The longest of the three tracts that Fu’âdî compiled took the form of a commentary on this decision by Zenbillî ʿAlî Efendi defending Sufi practices early in the 16th century. See \textit{Risâle-i devrân-i sûfiyye min te’lîf-i Zenbillî ʿAlî Efendi}, fols. 2a-38b. Halveti defenders of their practice often cited the arguments advanced in this text in their writings and compilations. A copy of it appears in Zenbillî ʿAlî Cemâf Efendi (d. 1525), \textit{Devrân-i sûfiyenin cevâzına dâ’ir risâle} (Istanbul, Süleymaniye Lib., MS M. Arif-M. Murad 221/2). In addition, copies of his fetvas sometimes appear in other compilations of Halveti works; see, for example, those contained in Süleymaniye Library, MS Hkm. 438. For more on the life and career of Zenbillî ʿAlî Efendi, with discussion of some of his connections to the notable Sufi figures of his era, see Repp, pp. 197-224.
legitimacy, and subsequently drew them into his circle.\textsuperscript{168} However, at least one part of this project created a firestorm of controversy among the educated Muslim community that could not be ignored. Much of Fu’âdî’s criticism of the order’s detractors was aimed at a specific set of sources that they cited as grounds for prohibition of Halveti and other Sufi public practices. The first and perhaps most prominent of these was an entry in a compilation of judicial opinions that played a significant role in the formation of Ottoman Hanefî jurisprudence, the Fatâwâ al-Bazzâziyyah compiled by the renowned Hanefî scholar Hafız al-Dîn Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Shihâb al-Kurdařî al-Bazzâzî (d. 1424).\textsuperscript{169}

It is difficult to piece together a clear picture of Bazzâzî’s activities during his lifetime, as he was a product of an era in Islamic history that suffers from both limited documentation and scholarly neglect. Nevertheless, it is worth making a brief digression to summarize what we do know about how he came to be a prominent member of the early Ottoman scholarly establishment. He was born in Kurdar, a town in the area of Ürşen near

\textsuperscript{168} Devrân-ı süfiyyenin cevâzın da’ır risâle, fols. 40b-41a. The similarities of this story to that of Sünbül Sinân Efendi and his detractor Sarî Gürz are striking, with the exception that Sarî Gürz himself was not drawn into the zîkî circle, unlike his companions, who had previously lined up in support of his challenge to Sünbül Sinân Efendi. Compare to the account in Hulvî, pp. 448-449.

\textsuperscript{169} This work survives in multiple copies in Ottoman libraries, testifying to its perceived importance among the scholarly community. The oldest of the group is the Safed manuscript dating from the year 1516; see Hafız al-Dîn Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Shihâb al-Kurdařî al-Bazzâzî (d. 1424), Al-Fatâwâ al-Bazzâziyyah (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Lib., MS Amcazade Hüseyin Paşa 245). The collection is also printed in the margin of the last three volumes of the Fatâwâ al-‘Alâmgûriyyah, a collection of Hanefî legal decisions which the Mughal ruler Awrangzeb (d. 1707) had his scholars compile in the latter half of the 17th century; see Bazzâzî, Al-Fatâwâ al-Bazzâziyyah, included in the margins of Mawlânâ al-Shaykh Nizâm, et al., Al-Fatâwâ al-hindiyyah wa ta’arafa bil-fatâwâ al-‘Alâmgûriyyah fi madhhab al-Imâm al-‘Azam Abî Hanîfah (Beirut: Dâr al-Mârifah, 1973), vols. 4-6.
We are able to trace this genealogy from the 19th-century biographical work of the Indian Muslim scholar Muhammad ʿAbd al-Hayy al-Laknawî (d. 1886-87), Al-Fawâʾid al-bahiyyah fî tarâjim al-Hanafiyyah (Beirut: Dâr al-Arqam, 1998), which is based on a compilation of earlier biographical sources. Through the various biographical entries under the following names, the educational genealogy extending from Kâdîkhân runs as follows: Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Sattâr b. Muhammad al-Kurdarî (d. 642/1244) → Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Nasr, Abû’l-Fadl Hâfiz al-Dîn al-Kabîr Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Bukhârî (d. 693/1294) → Husâm al-Dîn al-Hasan al-Sighnaqî (d. 711 or 714/1311 or 1314) → the aforementioned Jalâl al-Dîn b. Shams al-Khwarizmî al-Karalânî. The latter two scholars in the chain seem to have had connections with the nomadic outskirts of the Islamic realms in Central Asia; see al-Laknawî, pp. 100-101 and 106-107.

Unfortunately, he was born in an inauspicious age for the people of Khwarizm, for when the followers of Timur first began their expansion, Khwarizm and its capital Ürgenç were one of the first targets. After enduring multiple raids over the course of the 1370s, Ürgenç fell and was destroyed in 1379, and it is likely that at some point during this conflict the young Bazzâzî was forced to flee the carnage. One might speculate that these early traumatic experiences gave him a lifelong hatred of Timur, and we know that he at one point issued a fetva declaring Timur an infidel, based on his continued adherence to the yasa of Chinggis Khan. However, we
also know that Timur had a habit of extensively patronizing the prominent Sufi shaykhs of Transoxiana and other places, and this may have been an additional source of friction with fuqahā’ like Bazzâzî. Bazzâzî was able to find temporary refuge in the Golden Horde capital Saray on the lower Volga, which subsequently came under the rule of Timur’s eventual rival Toqtamish (d. ca. 1405), and he was able to interact with a community of Muslim scholars there for an undetermined period of time. However, the continuing pressure of the Timurid advance against the Kipchak steppe may have led Bazzâzî to seek refuge even farther to the west in the Crimean peninsula, where he supposedly stayed for two years training Islamic scholars and jurisprudents before finally returning to his home region, perhaps around the year 1403. Unfortunately, the limited details provided by the biographical sources do not give us a good sense of where Bazzâzî was at what time, but we do know that he was dissatisfied enough to leave his homeland once again to travel to the Ottoman Empire toward the end of his life. At the time of his arrival, the collection of legal opinions and decisions for which he would become known was already in his possession; he had apparently completed this work in the year 1403, the same year he ostensibly returned.


173 Manz, pp. 16-18. See also Köprüllü, p. 40 and n. 166.

174 These details on Bazzâzî’s early life and career are pieced together in al-Laknawī, p. 309. It should not be surprising that a scholar like Bazzâzî had a successful career in these regions, as the process of Islamization had begun there several generations before his arrival, first with the nominal conversion of Berke (d. 1266), and later with the long reign of Özbek Khan (d. 1341). See Deweese, Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde, pp. 67-158.
to Khwarizm. He also wrote a sort of biographical work which has survived, describing the life and jurisprudence of Abû Hanifah, founder of the Hanefî school of law. Since his work spread into regions as diverse as India and Egypt, in addition to Anatolia and Central Asia, his impact on the history of Hanefî jurisprudence in the Middle Ages must have been significant.

According to Tâşköprüzâde, when Bazzâzî established himself in the Ottoman domains, he met with the prominent Ottoman scholar Molla Şemseddîn Mehmed al-Fenârî (d. 1431). Since Molla Fenârî did not live in Bursa until around 1421, this suggests that Bazzâzî did not encounter him until late in his life when he seems to have settled there as well. The only record we have of their encounter, in any case, is the remark that in the course of their discussion, Bazzâzî demonstrated his superiority in the practical application of Islamic law (furû') while Fenârî proved superior in his knowledge of the sources of

---

175 We know of Bazzâzî’s departure date from the Crimea from the biographical entry about one of his students, Ahmad b. ʿAbdullah al-Qirîmî; see al-Laknawî, p. 49.

176 Ibid., p. 309. Bazzâzî’s biographical work has now been published as the second half of a compiled work; see Hafız al-Dîn Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Shihâb al-Kurdařî al-Bazzâzî (d. 1424), Manâqib Abî Hanifah (al-Cuz’ al-Thânî) (Beirut: Dâr al-Kitâb al-ʿArabî, 1981). It seems probable that Bazzâzî’s work was intended as a supplement to an earlier biographical work written by al-Muwaqqaf b. Ahmad al-Makkî (d. 1172-73) that is published as the first half of the work.

177 Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Rahman as-Sakhâwî (d. 1496), Al-Daw’ al-lâmiʿ li-ahl al-qarn al-tâsiʾ (Beirut: Dâr Maktabat al-Hayât, 1966), v. 10, p. 37. Among the significant scholars whom Sakhâwî links to Bazzâzî are Ibn Ṭarabshâh, who studied with him for four years, and one Qâdî Saʿd al-Dîn b. al-Dayrî who spoke highly of his knowledge. Al-Ṣuyûṭî, a noted Egyptian scholar, also relates an anecdote to the effect that when all of the books that he had committed to memory were piled up on both sides of him, the stacks drew level with his ears; see Mecdî, v. 1, p. 54, margin.

178 For a synopsis of Molla Fenârî’s life and career see Repp, pp. 73-98.
Islamic law (*usûl*) and other branches of knowledge. However, this squares fairly well with what we know of Bazzâzî’s *fetvas*, which focus specifically on offering practical definitions and guidelines for proper behavior in various aspects of social and religious life. While it seems that Bazzâzî did not live long enough to take up a serious position in the Ottoman learned hierarchy for any length of time, his writings lived on long beyond him as a reference for future generations of Ottoman legal scholars. In addition, al-Laknawî records biographical entries for at least four noted Hanefî scholars who trained either directly under his supervision while they were living in the Crimea and the Kipchak steppe, or under his successors in later generations, some of whom had migrated to various regions in the Ottoman realm.

The sticking point that later came to torment relations between the hardliners in the Kâdzâdeli movement and the Halveti leadership was a series of decisions that appear in the ninth part of a chapter of Bazzâzî’s collected *fetvas* on what types of utterances constitute manifestations of Islamic belief, unbelief, or simply erroneous thinking. The section in question, entitled “On what is said about the Qur’ân and recitations (*adhkâr*) and prayer,” includes two decisions that seem to be central to the debate. The first one states that “[whoever] recites the Qur’ân with the striking of a tambourine and a rod, commits unbelief because of taking it lightly (*istikhfâf*); the etiquette of the Qur’ân is not to recite [it] in these types of gatherings.” The second follows with, “The gathering which assembles for singing

---

179 Taşköprüzâde, p. 21.

180 See al-Laknawî, pp. 49, 143, 278-279 and 374-376. Mecdî also includes a biographical entry on Ibn ´Arabshâh, who was captured by Timur during one of his campaigns but subsequently escaped and studied with Bazzâzî in the region of the Kipchak steppe for four years; see Mecdî, v. 1, pp. 73-74.
and dancing should not recite the Qur’ân, just as it should not be recited in selling (bayû) or churches (kinâ’is) because it is a point of conjunction with the devil....”

Since both of these two opinions contain points which could be interpreted as condemning Halveti practices, they and decisions like them presented opportunities for Kâdızâdelis in subsequent centuries who sought to repress the Sufi orders, despite the fact that they had been issued many centuries earlier. Another early fetva collection compiled during the reign of Murad II under the direction of Ktrk Emre el-Hamîdî, a jurist who lived at the court of the Ottoman Sultan Murad II, shows the influence of Bazzâzi’s work, similarly criticizes the semâ’ and zikr ceremonies in a chapter on reprehensible things (kitâb al-karâhah). Here, Ktrk Emre censures the raising of voices and the “sounds of sa’q and za’q” (approximations of the noises that came from the throats of those who participated in it) emitted during this type of ceremony, in addition to reiterating criticism of the use of tambourines in the context of religious recitations. Finally, some proffered the accusation that in a work on the sources

---


182 Bazzâzi was not the only source of potentially anti-Halveti decisions. Others included Ebûsu’ûd Efendi, Kemâlpașazâde, and others who were often quoted by the sixteenth-century jurist Mehmed Birgivî (d. 1571), one of the inspirational figures for the Kâdızâdeli movement. See the remarks about the debate over music, dancing and zikr between the Kâdızâdelis and Halvetis in Semiramis Çavuşoğlu, “The Kâdızâdeli Movement: An Attempt of Şeri’î-at-Minded Reform in the Ottoman Empire” (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton University, 1990), pp. 187-213.

183 One of a number of copies of this collection of fetvas can be found in Ktrk Emre el-Hamîdî, Jâmi’ al-fatâwâ (Istanbul, Süleymâniye Lib., MS Îzmir 247), fols. 156b-157a.
of law (*usûl al-fiqh*), the noted Hanefi scholar al-Pazdâwi (d. 1089) said that the Sufi *devrân* was “a repugnant act, and its forbidden [character] is confirmed by a clear proof-text.”

These were not new accusations. The question of how the great jurists of the past had handled the issue of music and dance, both in regard to the activities of the Sufis and as a general rule, had never definitively been settled, and different jurists at different times and in different places had offered wildly divergent decisions on various aspects of the issue. Fu’âdî himself had recourse to a pre-existing tradition of defense of *semâ* and *devrân* in any case. The primary texts on which he would, by his own admission, base his own defense and commentary, however, also deserve our attention. The first was the aforementioned short work by Zenbillî ʿAlî Cemâlî Efendi defending the Sufi *zikr* and *devrân* against the accusations leveled by the compilers of the *fetvâ*-collections; the second was the famous *Risâlat al-tahqîqiyyah* of the founder of the Sünbüliyye branch of the Halveti order, Şeyh Sünbül Efendi. Both of these texts emerged out of the turbulent politics of the reign of Sultan Selim I and the early part of the reign of his successor, Süleyman, when Sufi movements as a whole came under suspicion in the context of the rise of the Safavids on the Ottoman Empire’s eastern frontiers. Interestingly enough, Fu’âdî’s historical contextualization of Sünbül Efendi’s text in particular seems problematic when compared

---

184 Fu’âdî recounts these accusations in his commentary on the *fetva* of Zenbillî ʿAlî Efendi; see *Risâle-i devrân-i süfiyye min te’lîf-i Zenbillî ʿAlî Efendi*, fols. 8b-9a. For a brief biographical entry on Muhammad b. Muhammad b.ʿAbd al-Karîm b. Mûsâ Abû’l-Yasar al-Pazdawî, see al-Laknawî, pp. 309-310.

185 This point is effectively and succinctly made in Süleyman Uludağ, *İslâm Açısından Musikî ve Semâ*, 2nd ed. (Bursa: Uludağ Yayınlari, 1992), pp. 171-203.

186 *Risâle-i devrân...min te’lîf-i Zenbillî*, fols. 2b-3a.
with the hagiographical accounts of the Sünbüliyye branch of the order. At one point, he suggests that the text was written after Sünbül Efendi defeated his nemesis, Molla ‘Arab, in open debate before the sultan himself, who judged the Sünbüliyye leader to be in the right.187 However, the actual text of the Risālat al-tahqiqiyah remained unfinished at the time of Sünbül Efendi’s death in 1529, indicating that he commenced this project at a much later date. In addition, the anti-devrân leader against whom Sünbül Efendi defends his order in the hagiographies about him is Sart Gürz Nûreddîn (d. 1520-21), a high-ranking jurisprudent who had clear linkages to anti-dervish and anti-Safavid activities during the reign of Selim I in particular.188 The unfinished state of the work, upon which few scholars seem to have commented, combined with Sart Gürz’s death shortly after Selim I, suggest that Fu’âdî relied on a historical understanding that connected these two texts of Zenbili ‘Alî’s fetva and

---

187 Ibid., fol. 3a. The question of who Molla ‘Arab was, however, is not entirely clear. One might suggest that he was the short-lived head of the Istanbul müftülük during the reign of Sultan Bayezid II, Molla ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn ‘Alî al-‘Arabî (d. 1496). However, the various biographical accounts of his career suggest that he in fact established close ties with the Halveti order through the person of Şeyh ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn Halveti comparatively early in his life (and early in the history of the Halveti movement into Ottoman domains). See Repp, pp. 174-187. Şeyh ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn is also mentioned as having had connections with Cemâl el-Halveti as well, see Taşköprüzâde, p. 162. In fact, this individual instead seems to be Mehmed b. ʻÖmer b. Hamza, who was also known as “Vâʻiz Molla ‘Arab” (d. 1531-32); see idem., pp. 247-249.

188 Sinâneddîn Yûsuf b. Yaʻkûb el-Germiyânî, Tezkîretü’l-Halvetiyye, fol. 23a, and Hulvî, pp. 448-450. For more on Sart Gürz, an enigmatic figure who was tied closely to Sultan Selim I’s campaigns against the Safavids and their supporters in Anatolia; see Taşköprüzâde, p. 181, and the remarks on the issue of Sart Gürz’s involvement in the mass killing of Safavid sympathizers during the campaign against the Safavids in 1514 given in Repp, pp. 218-220.
The most recent editors and translators of Sünbül Sinân’s Risâle al-tahqîqiyyah as an organic whole that worked to turn Sultan Selim I away from his persecution of the Halveti Sufi order during his reign.\(^{189}\)

Sarî Gürz, however, may have taken his cue from the activities of the aforementioned Molla ʿArab Mehmed b. ʿÖmer, who had an interesting career, spanning over four decades across the Mamluk, Akkoyunlu, and Ottoman realms, that is worth another brief digression. He came from a long line of scholars dating back to the noted Hanefî scholar Taftâzânî, who was his grandfather’s teacher while the two lived in Transoxiana. Sometime before his death, his grandfather migrated from that region to Antakya (Antioch), which was Mehmed’s birthplace. After living in various parts of the crumbling Akkoyunlu sultanate in the waning years of its existence, including the southeastern Anatolian cities of Diyarbekir and Hasankeyf, along with Tabrîz and Aleppo, he eventually made the pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina. Rather than returning to his homeland, however, he chose to go to Egypt, and enter the service of the Mamluk Sultan Qâytbây, serving as both a jurist and a preacher until that ruler’s death in 1496. Rather than remain in Egypt, he traveled to the Ottoman domains and settled in Bursa. He later produced a biography of the Prophet Muhammad and a work on Sufism at the court of Bayezid II in Istanbul. But he truly distinguished himself in Ottoman

\(^{189}\) The most recent editors and translators of Sünbül Sinân’s Risâle, Ali Toker and Müfti Yüksel, do not note that the work remained unfinished; see Yüksel and Toker, p. 20. In addition, there is the curious phenomenon of later copyists of the text trying to impose their own structure upon the work as a way of getting around the fact that the second chapter of the work, rejecting the claim that dancing was universally forbidden in Islamic law by consensus, was never completed, and a projected third chapter involving Sünbül Efendi’s commentary on a Qur’ânîc verse was never written at all. See, for example, Sünbül Sinân Efendi (d. 1529), Risalât al-tahqîqiyyah (Istanbul, Süleymaniye Lib., MS Lâleli 3731/2), which rearranges the table of contents by breaking the unfinished second chapter into two parts to create a chapter two and three that have titles entirely different from the original text.
military campaigns; during the storming of one fortress, he was reportedly the second or third fighter to break through the defenses. After this campaign, he came back and settled in Istanbul, where he took up “enjoining the right and forbidding the wrong.”\textsuperscript{190} It was at this time that he must have locked horns with the noted Halveti leader Cemâl el-Halveti (d. 1494), perhaps towards the end of the latter’s life.\textsuperscript{191}

Therefore, Fu’âdî may have not be completely out of line in recognizing Mehmed b. ˙Ömer as the primary villain against whom the defense of semâ ˚ and devrân was originally aimed, especially seeing as he outlived Sünbül Efendi himself. Yet the cases of these earlier scholars suggest that attempts to categorize “Ottoman schools of thought” during the medieval and early modern periods into two groups consisting of 1) the great ˚eyhûlisâms and other prominent religious scholars who were grounded in a Maturidî and Hanefî tradition originating in Central Asia and Iran (what Ahmet Yaşar Ocak has recently dubbed the “Fahr-i Râzî school”), and 2) other, less prominent scholars whose thought tended to be

\textsuperscript{190} The outlines of his life and career up to this point can be discerned primarily from the biography provided by Taşköprüzâde, pp. 247-248. The expression “enjoining the right and forbidding the wrong” (al-‘amr bil-ma’rif wa’l-nahy án al-munkar) often seems to serve as a coded phrase describing individuals who sought to impose more stringent levels of “orthodoxy” upon their communities. See Michael Cook, Commanding the Right and Forbidding the Wrong in Islamic Thought (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), esp. pp. 316-330, for a brief discussion of the phrase in the Ottoman period.

\textsuperscript{191} This raises a problem of chronology with our sources. According to recent scholarship, Cemâl el-Halveti died as early as 1493, but this doesn’t square with the information given by Taşköprüzâde on the conflict sparked by Mehmed b. ˙Ömer. Therefore, it must be assumed that Cemâl el-Halveti’s death occurred at a later date, perhaps between 1497 and 1507, the date given by various primary sources. For scholarship offering contested information on Cemâl el-Halveti’s date of death, see Hulvî, p. 435; Öngören, pp. 42-45 and 52; and Küçükdağ, II. Bâyezid, Yavuz ve Kanûnî Devirlerinde Cemâlî Ailesi, pp. 28 and 33.
more influenced by scholarly traditions emanating from the Arabic-speaking heartlands of the Islamic world and who espoused a more literalist viewpoint rooted in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth-century teachings of Ibn Taymiyyah, should probably be reassessed.\(^{192}\) While we know from elements of Fu’âdi’s work that Ibn Taymiyyah’s thought was not unknown among the Ottomans, most of the scholarly debates on the points cited above seem to revolve around other works, both collections of legal decisions like those of Bazzâzi and works focusing more on doctrinal matters, that both preceded and succeeded Ibn Taymiyyah’s work. Attempting to draw a line of transmission from Ibn Taymiyyah’s anti-heterodox and anti-Mongol activities directly to the doctrines of the Kâdîzâdeli movement seem to be at best premature, and at worst completely lacking any justification in the sources despite Ibn Taymiyyah’s perceived similarities to the approach of the Kâdîzâdelis.\(^{193}\)

In any case, Fu’âdi’s tract takes the form of a translation of the treatise of Zenbillî ‘Alî Efendi, liberally supplemented with the evidence compiled and proffered by Sünbül Efendi in his Risalat al-tahqîqiyyah. Since both of these texts were originally in Arabic,

\(^{192}\) This type of historiographical construction of the Ottoman ʿulema has increasingly been advanced in Ocak’s recent work. However, there is no evidence that any of the scholars I have mentioned so far had anything more than the most passing connection or resemblance to Ibn Taymiyyah and his teachings; in fact, the scholarship of many of them seems rooted in Central Asian and the Crimea, rather than the Arab lands. See Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, “Ulema in Ottoman Empire,” Ottoman Civilization, ed. Halil İnalcık and Renda Günsel (Ankara: Republic of Turkey Ministry of Culture, 2003), esp. pp. 260-265.

\(^{193}\) In fact, recent scholarship seems to indicate that Ibn Taymiyyah’s greatest revival has taken place not during the Ottoman period but in modern times, as radical Islamist movements have appropriated and redirected his teachings to fit their perceived modern historical context. See, for example, Emmanuel Sivan, Radical Islam: Medieval Theology and Modern Politics, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), esp. pp. 94-107.
Fu’âdî clearly sought to broaden their accessibility by translating them. However, it is also evident upon closer reading that he sought to amplify the original accusations that the head mûftî Zenbillî ʿAlî in particular had leveled at the three commentators who had criticized the semâ ʿ and devrân ceremonies. These original criticisms are summed up by Zenbillî ʿAlî as follows: “The author of the Bazzâziyyah is not among the mujtahidîn (a founding expounder of Islamic law) and the same goes for the author of the Pazdawiyyah...and as for the author of the Jâmiʿ al-Fatâwâ (Kırk Emre), he came in the time of Sultan Murad II to the city of Edirne and wrote his book there.”

While Zenbillî ʿAlî is content to leave it at that, and Sünbül Efendi does not openly criticize Bazzâzî, and even draws on some of his other fetvâs to support his arguments on various matters pertaining to the issue at hand, Fu’âdî takes a different approach. Drawing on one of the well-known juridical treatises of the famed Ottoman şeyhülislâm Kemâlpaşazâde (d. 1534), he advances the following argument.

Know that the jurisprudents are [arranged] according to seven levels: The first [is] the level of the mujtahidîn on the noble law, such as the four masters, and on the authority of the path of their endeavor on the establishment of the foundations of the basic principles and the deduction of the cases of application from the four proofs of the Book, the traditions, the consensus of the Community, and analogy based upon those foundations, without any imitation [of others], and having no limitations either in the practical application [of the law] or the sources [of law]. The second is the level of the mujtahidîn within the school of law, such as Abû Yûsuf and

194 Risâle-i devrân...min teʾlîf-i Zenbillî, fol. 28b. Zenbillî ʿAlî’s curt dismissal of Kırk Emre as being a product of Sultan Murad II’s court in Edirne may suggest that the intellectual production of his era was viewed as suspect by many scholars, and Kırk Emre’s lack of legitimacy would thus have been adequately conveyed to his audience by simply noting the period of his activity.

195 Yüksel and Toker, pp. 21, 32, 39 and 46.

196 Meaning the four founders of the classical schools of Islamic law, the imams Malik, ash-Shâfiʿî, Abu Hanifah, and Ibn Hanbal.
Muhammad...and the other companions of Abû Hanifah...among those capable of the extraction of judgments according to the aforementioned principles in the manner of a follower of the principles whose supports Abû Hanifah imposed. Although they differ in some of the practical applications of the law, they are relying on the basic principles of the law, or distinguished ones from the opponents of the school of law... such as al-Shâfi’î...and his counterparts opposed to Abû Hanifah. There is doubt in cases where imitators follow [their decisions] in the sources [of law]. The third is the level of the mujtahidîn in regard to the problems where no precedent is cited from the leader of the school of law, such as al-Mudâf and Abû Ja’far al-Tahâwî and Abû’l-Hasan al-Karkhî and others. They do not go contrary to the shaykh in either the sources [of law] or the practical application, but they derive the cases on problems for which there is no provision....The fourth is the level of the masters of derivation (takhrîj) among the imitators (muqallidîn) such as al-Bazzâzî and his followers.¹⁹⁷

Rounding out the final three categories are two lesser classes of “imitators” (muqallidîn) and a final class of people who lack the proper skills to be of any value to the field of jurisprudence at all. Skillfully welding together the arguments crafted by Zenbillî ‘Alî and Sünbül Efendi, Fu’âdî goes on to demonstrate how the great jurists of the first three classes never issued any criticism of the semâ and devrân ceremonies of the Sufis, and that al-Shâfi’î and the Imam Malik even endorsed it. Therefore, anyone who declared that these Sufi ceremonies were unlawful and condemned those who allowed them was in fact censuring the founders of the great Islamic schools of law.¹⁹⁸ By taking this approach, Fu’âdî boldly elaborates upon the more basic and innocuous refutations given by the scholars of an earlier era by explicitly taking the matter a step farther: he seeks to relegate

¹⁹⁷ Risâle-i devrân...min te’lîf-i Zenbillî, fol. 7a-b. The work on which Fu’âdî draws here is probably an Arabic treatise entitled Risâlah fi tabâqat al-a’immat al-Hanafiyah wa risâlah fi tabâqât al-mujtahidîn, although he also wrote a Tabâqât al-fuqahâ’. See Şamil Öcal, Kemal Paşazâde’nin Felsefi ve Kelâmi Görüşleri (Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2000), pp. 36 and 46.

¹⁹⁸ Risâle-i devrân...min te’lîf-i Zenbillî, fols. 8a and 15a-b.
Bazzâzî, upon whose opinions so many of his opponents relied, to the level of a second-class intellectual upon whose individual opinion no one should rely. In other words, he could be trusted only insofar as he derived his work from the more accepted jurists of other eras.

Fu’âdi’s arguments, which were perhaps advanced by others as well, clearly infuriated his Kâdûtâdeli opponents, perhaps not least because it was well-known that Kemâlpaşazâde had also issued a legal decision against groups of Sufis during his era who performed the devrân in mosques. In a series of fetvâs that came to be appended to the oldest copy of the Fatâwâ al-Bazzâziyyah in our possession today, an otherwise anonymous “Kâdt Ahmed” issued a series of legal decisions on his own authority denouncing the claims of Fu’âdî and others like him.

What is commanded in response to this problem? If a prayer-leader (imâm) were to enter the zikr-circle of the Sufis and do however much semâ ’and dancing (raks), and fall over while turning around repeatedly, and if a scholar (âlim) were to say to him, “This act that you are doing is forbidden in the legal decisions of the Bazzâziyyah and the Jâmi` al-Fatâwâ,” and if he were to respond, “I do not act [in accordance] with those books,” then is the leadership of a prayer leader like him suitable for the Muslims now?....The response (and God knows best): He is an infidel. His wife is divorced [from him].

199 Öçal, p. 410. See also the remarks of Çavusoğlu, p. 194. Hulvî, perhaps as a means of downplaying the existence of such decisions, claims in his hagiography that Kemâlpaşazâde actually performed the semâ ’and devrân in joy and thanks to God after being granted the solution to a particularly difficult intellectual problem that had bothered him for quite some time, and also explains how Sart Gürz’s attempts to get a fetva out of him ordering the killing of Sufis for performing their ceremonies ended up backfiring on him when Sünbül Efendi influenced Kemâlpaşazâde to reject this course and destroy the hostile fetva he had prepared on a piece of paper tucked into his turban. See Hulvî, pp. 448-451.

200 These fetvas were appended as a sort of subsequent introductory text to the oldest extant manuscript of the Fatâwâ al-Bazzâziyyah, the Safed manuscript dated 1516. This particular fetva appears in the copy of the Fatâwâ in the Süleymaniye Library, MS Amcazade Hüseyin Paşa 245, fol. VI(a). The folios in question were labeled by the
Such ruthless attacks, aimed as they were not only at the offending personality but also at his immediate family members, indicate to us the degree to which discounting the viewpoints of Bazzâzî and like-minded scholars was viewed as threatening by the anti-
*devrân* jurists as the seventeenth century wore on. What is even more interesting is that subsequent decisions express the Kâditzâdelis’ increasing frustration with the responses to their attempts to deal with the problem. In one decision, it is asked whether it is legitimate for a judge to remove the offending prayer-leader from his position, but then restore him to his position without forcing him to renew his profession of faith and reaffirm his marriage. Of course, the answer was negative, but such decisions illustrate the type of passive resistance the Kâditzâdeli activists would have faced from others in society who may have looked askance at the extreme punishments they took in order to advance their agenda at the expense of their opponents. The frustration built up even further in response to the following situation: “If a judge were not to act [in accordance] with the legal decision that conforms to the law and is agreeable to the decision of the giver of the *fetva*, what does that judge deserve?” The response was that he should be removed from his position and that his decisions should henceforth not be obeyed.\(^{201}\) Yet these punishments pale in comparison to the outrage with which the arguments advanced by Fu’âdî are met in some of these *fetvas*.

If some people among the Sufis were to say [that] Bazzâzî and the Jâmi’ al-
*Fatâwâ* and Havî and the Tühfet and Bağvî and Qurtabî and the Kassâf are

\[^{201}\text{Ibid., fols VI(a-b).}\]
not accepted books, and they conflict with and oppose the scholars, then are these aforementioned books accepted books or not, and also what is legally necessary for the person who speaks like this?...The response (and God knows best): They are accepted. It is necessary to apply a severe chastisement (ta’zîr-i belîg) to those who take [them] lightly, and force them to renew [the profession of] their faith.

In a subsequent decision along similar lines, Kadî Ahmed suggests that if such Sufis continue to insist on defaming these works in this manner, they should be executed for their recalcitrance. It is clear that Fu’âdî had hit a nerve, and that this would exacerbate his conflicts with the opponents of his order. In sum, the argument he advanced suggests that the Sufis of his day were seeking to reorient the juristic heritage of the Ottomans, a course of action that proved unacceptable and repugnant to his opponents among the Kâdîzâdeli movement. However, the existence of their angry denunciations demonstrates that Fu’âdî’s attempts to revive and propagate the intellectual defenses of the Halveti and other Sufi orders from centuries past achieved a wide hearing and a good deal of success during the final two decades of his life.

---

202 The arguments set out in Sünbül Efendi’s Risâlat al-Tahqîqiyah and Zenbillî Efendi’s defense of Sufi practices, and by extension in the works of later translators and commentators like Fu’âdî, single out remarks made in works by these authors that attack Sufi practices for refutation, thus the questioner here sought to build a catch-all consensus of all the works whose passages were coming under question.

203 This term might also be interpreted as “a severe flogging,” suggesting a publicly-administered whipping.

204 Bazzâziyyah, fol. VI(b).
3.6 The Problem of Sources and the Mixed Reception of Ömer el-Fu’âdî’s Legacy in the Final Years of His Life

The controversy over Sufi practices and Fu’âdî’s textual responses to it are not the only evidence we have for the effectiveness of his teaching among his contemporaries in Anatolia. Shortly before Fu’âdî’s death, other contemporary authors and scholars had begun to register a vague awareness of his prolific output. Although the biographical dictionary produced by Fu’âdî’s Istanbul-based contemporary Nevîzâde ʿAtâʾî (d. 1635) makes only cursory references to ʿSaʿbân and Fu’âdî, his brief description of ʿSaʿbân’s character and Fu’âdî’s successorship bears witness to the stir Fu’âdî had created outside of Istanbul.

[ʿSaʿbân] was a master of the power of guidance with the pearl of independent thought (ijtihād), and he built a lodge in his home region. When the lodge became a place of gnosis, the Kaʾbah of the lovers and the pilgrimage place of distant horizons, he departed the world of bodily forms and set out for the world of souls in the year 977 (1569). The aforementioned noble one was the chief of the shaykhs of the region of Rûm, the virtue-filled one of the wineshop of love and affection, the basis of skilled guidance, and the drinking place of the sweetness of virtue. The wisdom of his path was the vocal zikr and devrân, the manifestation of ecstasy (vecd), and invoked blessings of the love of God; he was a noble one who quickly attracted people. He used to accept neither gifts or positions, and made do with farming, cultivation and whatever he could get by the sweat of his own brow (kesb-i yedleri). At present, his tomb is a pilgrimage place, and his successor, a knowledgeable one named ʿÖmer el-Fuʿâdî, is watching over it.

• Poetic couplet: The lovers who are enervated by the wine of divine love
• Draw an arrow and cry out from the straight talk hitting the mark. No gathering or council is free from the reverberating clamor of [the following]
• Poem: Fuʿâdî oh Fuʿâdî oh Fuʿâdî • Fuʿâdî distracted with love in every valley!205

---

205 ʿAtâʾî, v. 2, p. 199. It is difficult to interpret ʿAtâʾî’s use of poetic expression here, as there are multiple ways of interpreting the allusions. Despite the positive tone of ʿAtâʾî’s report as a whole, since Fuʿâdî consistently used his own name in his poetry, one could suggest that the final line was ʿAtâʾî’s way of subtly making fun of someone he thought was a bit overbearing in his literary self-promotion. For comments on the nature of ʿAtâʾî’s work that lean toward corroboration of this interpretation of the text, see Tezcan, p. 115.
The report adds very little to our knowledge about Şaʾbân, aside from the fact that he engaged in farming and agriculture, a point that Fuʿâdî apparently never touched upon. However, ʿAtâʾî does indicate the popularity of the Şaʾbâniyye leader and the scope of his following, implying through his choice of words that Fuʿâdî was fairly successful in spreading Şaʾbâniyye’s legacy.

We also have a seventeenth-century copy of Sünbûl Sinân Efendi’s Risâlat al-tahqîqiyyah in Arabic, that extends the discussion of the silsile of the Halveti order in the original text of the work into the time of Fuʿâdî’s immediate successor in Kastamonu, Çorumlu Şeyh Ismâʿîl Efendi (d. 1644). Nevertheless, it is curious to note that many non-Şaʾbâniyye works that include biographical information about the various notables of the Halveti order in the Ottoman domains ignore the Şaʾbâniyye branch of the order altogether, instead focusing primarily on either the Istanbul-based Sünbûliyye and Sivâsiyye branches or the Egyptian-based Gülşeniyye branch of the Halveti order. Given Fuʿâdî’s prolific

---

206 Sünbûl Sinân Efendi (d. 1529), Risâlat al-tahqîqiyyah (Istanbul, Süleymaniye Lib. MS Kasdecizade 340), fol. 30a-b. The inclusion of Fuʿâdî and his immediate successor strongly suggests that the text was copied by a member of the Şaʾbâniyye branch of the order between 1636 and 1644.

207 See, for example, the hagiography of Cemâleddin Mahmûd Hulvî, whose goal in producing his hagiography was to combine the Sünbûliyye and Gülşeniyye branches into a unified whole, but who completely ignores the Şaʾbâniyye in the process: Hulvî, esp. pp. 628-631, describing the circumstance surrounding the composition of the work. More telling is the monumental seventeenth-century work of Hacı ʿAlî, Tühfetü’l-mucâhidîn, which devotes an entire chapter to a variety of Halveti leaders from the time of the order’s inception up through the same branches as those covered in Hulvî, and adds some of the leaders of the Sivâsiyye branch of the order, along with several unaffiliated Halvetis. Nevertheless, ʿAlî completely ignores the Şaʾbâniyye branch, despite being of provincial background himself (based in Sîgetvar in Hungary). See Hacı ʿAlî, Tühfetü’l-Mucâhidîn, fols. 517b-608a. In the biographical supplement compiled by ʿUşakîzâde (d. 1724), Sufis from various branches of the Halveti order appear but not from the Şaʾbâniyye branch, despite the prominence of several Şaʾbâniyye shaykhs
output, and the growing respect accorded to Şa'bân Efendi’s legacy and tomb complex at the
time these works were produced, the branch’s absence from the historical record raises
questions about its wider relevance. One could suggest an Ottoman intellectual bias against
provincials not from the religious establishments of the three big cities of Istanbul, Edirne,
and Bursa, at least in the case of someone like Nev'izâde 'Atâ'i, yet 'Atâ'i saw fit to mention
several shaykhs in his exposition who had Şa'bânîyye roots, especially during the time of
Murad III. Moreover, this fails to explain the case of someone like Hulvî, whose work is
littered with shaykhs from such backwaters as the villages of Cavdar, Şeyhlû, and
Hayrebolu, to name but a few. The fact that Şa'bân’s spiritual descent did not pass
through someone who could have been considered a more notable successor to the Ottoman
Halveti founders, Yahyâ-ı Şirvânî and Cemâl el-Halveti, may have caused some of the
Halveti hagiographers from the other branches of the order to dismiss the Şa'bânîyye as of
lesser importance.

However, it is also possible that until the time of 'Ömer el-Fu'âdi’s accession to the
leadership of the Şa'bânîyye, the followers of Şa'bân-i Veli had a dubious reputation among
the broader Sufi communities of the empire, including even their own Halveti cousins. The
reasons for this must remain speculative, but it could be suggested that the legacy of another,
earlier Şa'bânîyye dervish, Şeyh Şüca', may also have had an impact on the perception of
the Kastamonu-based branch of the order as well. During the governorship of the future

---

208 See, for example, Hulvî, pp. 456, 459-460 and 477.
sultan Murad III in the sanjak of Manisa, Şeyh Şüca’, who was reportedly of Albanian origin, came to be patronized by Murad’s sister Râziye Hâtûn. On Râziye Hâtûn’s suggestion, he offered what Murad considered a successful interpretation of some of the odd dreams that Murad had been having. Murad eventually became one of his devotees.\(^{209}\) This relationship continued through Murad’s accession to the sultanate in 1574, and the shaykh became a powerful and influential member of the court until his death in 1588. This was not viewed positively by many Ottoman notables; Gelibolu Mustafa ‘Alî in particular argues that this was one of the factors which led to the failure of Murad’s reign and the subsequent weakness of the Ottoman state.\(^{210}\) Even Sinâneddin Yûsuf b. Ya’kûb, author of the Tezkiretül-Halvetiyye, a copy of which was presented to Murad III himself, contents himself solely with noting Şa’bân-ı Veli’s existence through the chain of authority passing through Cemâl el-Halveti and Hayreddîn Tokâdî, and pointing out that “the Shaykh Şüca’ that came with the sultan [from Ma’nisa] is from the silsile of Şa’bân Efendi.” This seems out of place given the level of influence that Şeyh Şüca’ had attained by 1576-77, when this particular work was submitted, and may reflect the ambivalence of an established Sünbüliyye hagiographer about an upstart dervish whose political success and attachment

\(^{209}\) For a brief description of the development of these connections from the point of view of a Halveti dervish from the Imrahor tekke who later compiled Murad III’s correspondence with Şeyh Şüca’, spanning a period both before and after Murad’s accession to the Ottoman throne, see Sultan Murad III’s Kitâb-ı Manâmât, fols. 2a-b, and also the biographical entry by ‘Ata’î, v. 2, p. 365.

\(^{210}\) Gelibolu Mustafa ‘Ali (d. 1601), Kühü’l-Ahbar (Istanbul, Süleymaniye Lib., MS Es‘ad Efendi 2162), fols. 497a-498a. See also the observations about Murad’s relationship with Şeyh Şüca’ in Fleischer, Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire, pp. 75 and 296. There seems to be some substance to Mustafa ‘Ali’s complaints as Murad III’s correspondence with his shaykh in the Kitâb-ı Manâmât frequently reflects tensions over Şüca’s attempts to place his followers in state positions.
to circles of power indicated questionable character, or even a source of potential competition for Sinâneddîn’s own ambitions.\footnote{Sinâneddîn Yûsuf b. Ya’kûb el-Germiyânî, Tezkîretü’l-Halvetiye, fol. 17a. For more information on the structure and importance of this work for the development of Halveti hagiographical literature, see Curry, “The Growth of a Turkish Hagiographical Literature in the Halveti Order,” pp. 912-915.}

While this interpretation of the omissions in the biographical and historical literature must remain speculative given the present state of our knowledge, one final point worth noting is that Ömer el-Fu’âdî had a son who became a poet of at least minor reputation. We know him only by his pen name, Kalbî Efendi.\footnote{A reference to Kalbî Efendi in an entry about Ömer el-Fu’âdî and his output appears briefly in Bursalt Mehmed Tâhir (d. 1926). Osmanlı Mühellileri I-II-III (Ankara: Bizim Büro Bastmevi, 2000), v. 1, p. 119. It seems that some of Fu’âdî’s poetry was preserved in a divân of his son Kalbî Efendi that I have not yet been able to locate in Istanbul’s manuscript libraries, assuming it has survived at all. See also the brief remarks of Necdet Yılmaz, p. 98. Unfortunately, we cannot be entirely sure whether Kalbî had come to live in Istanbul himself, or if he was merely dispatching this writing from his father’s side in Kastamonu.}

Shortly before his father’s death, he composed a starkly critical poem lambasting the people of Istanbul for their moral failures in the wake of a great fire that destroyed much of the city in 1633.\footnote{According to some reports, which perhaps exaggerate the scope of the destruction, the fire destroyed nearly 20,000 homes and was centered in the areas of Galata and Pera. See Robert Mantran, Histoire d’Istanbul (Paris: Fayard, 1996), p. 262.}

The poem is written in a simple, rhyming meter that would have been easy to memorize and transmit even among the least literate members of society; its broad accessibility is obvious even to a modern audience. Even a cursory examination reveals the strong Sufi influences Kalbî had acquired through his father.

\begin{center}
\begin{quote}
Come, let’s recall the Creator from the heart.
Let us be happy with the remembrance of God.
\end{quote}
\end{center}
Kalbî is a man who is one with God. Anxiety and happiness are at every moment one to him. Devotion to [God] the Guider is required of us, Submission and acceptance no matter what comes. If you were to deserve the manifestation of divine wrath, Repent of all your insubordinations, And think of the goodness of divine perfection that is esteemed And recall and give thanks for however many of these favors. This time a lapse came over the people. The majority found renown with insubordination. The ignorant ones assumed the form of scholars. Be they judges or ministers of state, By finding plenty they became corrupt; Their eyes filled with the smoke of tobacco. O what shall the rest of the multitude of the people do But follow the example of the scholars?

In the opening lines of the poem, we can see elements of the Halveti path of resigning oneself to anything that comes, with a warning to the public to repent of their sins. More interesting, however, is the growing political tone of the poem, criticizing the scholars and governing classes as having given in to their own baser instincts. In addition, Kalbî’s negative view of tobacco demonstrates that it was not just the Kâdzâdelís who disapproved of smoking, but many of the Sufis themselves. Kalbî does not limit his criticism to the scholars’ social practices, however.

There is no obedience to the command of the sultan, Nor is there assistance for God’s side. They were the universal curse of corruption and immorality. They filled the city with turpitude and abasement. There is no victory for the enjoiners of right.

214 For the Kâdzâdeli movement’s position on tobacco and its association with the policies of Sultan Murad IV, see Zîltî, “Discordant Revivalism,” pp. 256-257, and idem., Politics of Piety, pp. 138-139. See also the remarks on the issue of tobacco by Katib Çelebi, Balance of Truth, pp. 50-59. Even foreign observers like the Frenchman Jean Thévenot had reservations about the smoking of tobacco and the dangers it could cause during the dry season in Istanbul’s densely packed urban environment; see Mantran, pp. 261-262.
The majority are for the corrupt, and also so many censurers. . . .
These ones took the face of darkness as sunlight,
As if adultery and drinking of wine were permitted..., While the pious ones were preaching and admonishing
And persevering in the forbidding of wrong.
They recited so many [Qur’anic] verses and traditions.
They entreated, saying, “Don’t do it!”

Kalbî implies that in the beliefs that the scholars had embraced, they were in fact not
upholding the proper distinction between right and wrong, rather the opposite. Here, one is
reminded of Fu’âdî’s and his predecessors’ arguments that the scholars who criticized their
practices would have been censured by the great scholars of earlier generations. As a result,
the poem concludes by arguing that the punishment for this type of behavior was made clear
to everyone by God himself, although Kalbî implies that salvation from the catastrophe was
obtained by recourse to an unnamed Muslim saint.

Pious reverence came to the heart of no one,
Nor did [anyone] make recourse to God at any moment.
The fire reached out with the anger of God.
The inner part of Istanbul was a fearful hell.
All of it had been ordered to burn.
This calamity was distressing for them.
When one of the secret men interceded–
An unassailable prohibition when [the fire] had gotten this far.
God Most High granted [his wish] and favored [him].
The fire departed with this intercession.
Could any other person ever have done it?...
Who among you has a remedy for the violence of God
Since everyone’s face is also blackened?215

215 The full text of Kalbî Efendi’s poem, which I have not translated or presented
in full, can be found appended to a volume containing a number of his father’s works in
the final folios. See Kalbî Efendi, Bin Kirk Üç Senesinde İstanbul’dan Vâkı’ Olan İhrâk
Since the job of fighting the 23 or so serious fires that broke out in Istanbul between 1600 and 1800 often fell to officials like the grand vizier and the ağa of the janissaries, the crack about the blackened faces of the elites struggling to contain the blaze perhaps had a populist resonance among the people of Istanbul.\textsuperscript{216} Kalbî, who was probably following the lead of his father, sought to reorient the population’s devotions away from more stringent ideas about the reform of society and towards the Sufî leaders instead. The fire, which in a pre-modern urban context could have devastating indirect consequences such as famine and extreme privation through exposure to the elements, clearly represented an opportunity for political literati like Kalbî to step in and attempt to convince his contemporaries that it marked a time for a reassessment and a new direction in their actions.\textsuperscript{217} By pointing out that the population had been saved from a worse fate by the very people whom their leaders had heretofore been oppressing, Kalbî through his poetry defends the cult of saints in the public arena by following the example of his father’s illustrious career.

3.7 Conclusion: Interpreting the Life and Legacy of Ömer el-Fu’âdî

Sometime in 1636, Ömer el-Fu’âdî’s long career finally ended with his death at the age of 76 solar years. He was buried on the northern side of the tomb that he had struggled so hard to construct, between his immediate guide Muhyiddîn Efendi and Şâbân himself.

\textsuperscript{216} Mantran, pp. 261-262.

\textsuperscript{217} Several decades later, the traumatic and even more destructive impact of the great fire of 1660 provided prominent Ottoman political actors the opportunity to take the much more drastic step of displacing entire non-Muslim communities as a way of restructuring the social space of the city, with important consequences. See Marc David Baer, “The Great Fire of 1660 and the Islamization of Christian and Jewish Space in Istanbul,” International Journal of Middle East Studies 36: 2 (May 2004), pp. 159-181.
Yet unlike the subject of his hagiography, Şâbân Efendi, we do not have any extensive historical record of the circumstances surrounding his death and burial, or of the choice of his successor. All we know is that Çorumlu Şeyh İsmâ‘îl Efendi (d. 1644), by virtue of his natural talents, was considered the best replacement. While he authored several tracts of his own, he did not have the broader impact that his mentor and immediate predecessor did. However, given the many issues raised by the sampling of Fu‘âdî’s output provided in this chapter, one might suggest that İsmâ‘îl Efendi and his eventual successors in the Şâbânîd silsile did not feel an urgent need to be prolific when they could rely on the work of their illustrious predecessor.

Şâbân-ı Veli’s chain of succession after Fu‘âdî’s tenure would extend all the way into the early years of the Turkish Republic, when Atatürk’s cultural reforms would critically weaken the influence of the Sufi orders and transform the parameters of Turkish religious life. While the theoretical head of the order was always based at the tomb complex in Kastamonu, other illustrious successors, whose legacy in the historical records at our disposal surpasses that of their ostensible masters in this silsile, came to establish themselves in Istanbul and elsewhere. The prominent religious leader Karabâş ʻAlî Veli (d. 1686), who will be discussed further in the next chapter, was initially trained and sent to Istanbul as an approved successor by Şeyh Mustafa Çelebi Efendi (d. 1660), who was seventh in the line

218 Ziya Demircioğlu claims that he wrote several commentaries and treatises on other topics that were preserved in the Şa‘bân-ı Veli tomb complex library; see Demircioğlu, p. 26.

219 For a list of the Şâbâniye shaykhs who have served in the two major sub-branches of the order into modern times, see Musa Seyfi Cihangir, Şeyh Şa‘bân-ı Veli Hazretleri’inin Hayatı ve Manevi Silsilesi (Kastamonu: Bilgi Kastamonu Gazetesi, 1997), pp. 10-11.
of successorship to Šaʿbân-ı Veli. A substantial part of the training of these individuals would have been grounded in Fuʿâdî’s writings, and his example of broadening the popular base of the order would bear rich fruit in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries at the heart of the empire’s political and religious circles.

In the preceding chapter, I focused on the narrative portrait that Fuʿâdî painted of the founder of his branch of the Halveti order, Šaʿbân-ı Veli. I sought to demonstrate that Fuʿâdî generally sought to direct and interpret, rather than whitewash or invent, the oral materials on which he based his history of the order’s founders. Nevertheless, our survey of Fuʿâdî’s extensive literary output reveals that the construction of his hagiography was irrevocably bound to the events of his own life and times, and constituted a response to historical processes and events that marked the troubled age in which he lived. Recent research has shown that the historical context for the composition of Fuʿâdî’s works went hand-in-hand with periods of demographic crisis and the endangerment of much of urban life in the Anatolian countryside. His own recollections and reflections on joining the Šaʿbânîyye branch of the Halveti indicate a lesser notable in a provincial city who established his career in the field of jurisprudence but was perhaps frustrated in his long-term goals. As a result, he applied his talents to the more readily available field of Sufism, to which his immediate

---

220 Demircioğlu, p. 28.

221 Recent research has endorsed the view that the end of the sixteenth century saw a demographic crisis in the overall population of the Ottoman Empire which fueled Celâlî disturbances that threatened Fuʿâdî and many of his contemporaries struggling to uphold the institutional framework of Ottoman society. See, for example, Oktay Özel, “Population Changes in Ottoman Anatolia during the 16th and 17th Centuries: The ‘Demographic Crisis’ Reconsidered,” International Journal of Middle East Studies 36: 2 (May 2004), pp. 183-205.
family had been connected in the past. Yet he did not abandon his legal training entirely, and he continued to weld together the exoteric and esoteric aspects of Islamic religious life in his writings and teachings. Given the disruptions in Anatolian provincial life during the period of his early career, which continued intermittently throughout the century, the iron discipline in both exoteric and esoteric observance that he enjoined may have struck a chord among his contemporaries.

Perhaps more important, however, was Fu’âdî’s recognition that in an age of demographic and political crisis, a broader section of the empire’s population needed access to the religious scholarship of the past. Most scholars of medieval Islamic civilization would consider most of Fu’âdî’s work derivative and unoriginal, but as I have hoped to illustrate by a close examination of his writings, such a view misses the point. First of all, Fu’âdî demonstrates the capacity to reorient or expand the scholarly apparatus he had inherited from earlier periods of Islamic history to address the pressing problems of his own time. More critical, however, is the fact that he expands the accessibility of key works, or sections of works, that had previously been limited to the best-educated scholars in a given area who had backgrounds in Arabic or Persian. In the transition between the medieval and early modern periods of world history, such a step had consequences not unlike the impact that vernacular translations of the Bible during a roughly contemporary period had on European religious and intellectual culture.  

In addition, we know that the successors of Ša’bân-1

---

222 Recent scholarship on the events leading up to the Reformation in Europe has argued that broadening access to issues raised in sacred texts by making them more easily available in the vernacular led to increasing involvement of everyday people in the controversies surrounding religious affairs. See, for example, Richard Duerden, “Equivalence or Power? Authority and Reformation Bible Translation,” in The Bible as Book: The Reformation, ed. Orlaith O’Sullivan (London: The British Library & Oak
Veli built up a library, perhaps under the initial auspices of the founder, containing a number of important works that formed the backbone of the community’s educational resources.\textsuperscript{223} By broadening the accessibility of various works in this library, Fu’âdî worked to augment this collection as well.\textsuperscript{224}

It is important to recognize that Fu’âdî’s projects over the course of his life intertwined with his history of the order’s founding and development. Since the hagiography proved to be, and was probably intended partially as, a catalyst to the permanent construction of much of the tomb complex, its content reflects the goal of making Ša’bân a laudable, respected religious figure in his society, and Fu’âdî’s choice of material to represent Ša’bân to a wider public undoubtedly reflected that goal. While we do not know the broader narratives contained in the more extensive and now lost Arabic version of his hagiographic work, it is highly probable that the material we have reflects Ša’bân and his successors as Fu’âdî wanted them to be remembered in the rapidly-changing world of the early seventeenth century. I would not, however, go so far as to say that Fu’âdî “invented” Ša’bân

\textsuperscript{223} The library, which was attached to the tomb building itself and may have been established as early as 1611, was still functioning as late as 1922 and included a number of rare manuscripts at the time it was catalogued, mostly dealing with religious subjects. See Abdulkadiroğlu, p. 110.

\textsuperscript{224} In dealing with the centuries before the introduction of the printing press in the Islamic world, a recent monograph confirms that papermaking continued in the Ottoman Empire even after 1500. Unfortunately, the focus has always been placed squarely on why Muslim peoples did not adopt the printing press until a much later period, rather than what uses the produced paper was being put to. See Jonathan M. Bloom, Paper Before Print: The History and Impact of Paper in the Islamic World (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), pp. 216-225. Our investigations here might suggest some answers to the latter question.
as a “founding father” around whom his followers could rally as a way of buttressing Fu’âdî’s branch of the order. He seems remarkably honest about his saint’s own failings and problematic aspects, even as he works to explain to his audience why they exist. In fact, we might see in Fu’âdî’s efforts an attempt to build an institutional framework at the expense of the individual charisma of any given pious figure–Sha’bân comes across as a figure who achieves the status of the Pole of his age not through a random act of God’s beneficence but as a result of his struggle to overcome his own weaknesses and failings, in conscious reflection of the struggle of the Sufi adepts who sought to emulate his example. After all, the critical framework governing Fu’âdî’s hagiography is not the narrative itself, but a discussion of the criteria that allow his audience to recognize the real saints among them, along with a discussion of the chain of authorities that link his branch of the order in Kastamonu to the founding fathers of Islam and its mystical tradition. In the end, the success of the hagiography, along with the building of the tomb complex and the spectacular growth of the order that went with it, may have convinced Fu’âdî of the utility of a wider range of projects aimed at building a more institutionalized mysticism that would be accessible to an audience beyond the better-educated elite scholars of the realm.

The extent to which Fu’âdî sought to extend his educational message to all levels of society must, by reason of the nature of our sources, remain speculative. After all, Fu’âdî did not intend for his works, especially the more polemical ones against the critics of Sufi ritual and practice, to be transmitted to just anyone. Nevertheless, the circumstances of the time dictated that a certain degree of popular mobilization in the service of defending the cult of the saints was necessary. The Kâdtzâdeli movement and other critics of Ottoman Sufism used preaching to the Muslim community at large, in addition to their political
connections, as a means of putting pressure on the ruling class and their supporters. Without their own base of support in their respective communities, Ottoman Halvetis ran the risk of falling into isolation and remaining at the whim of the constantly changing spectrum of political leadership. By reviving the defenses of the early Halveti community under Cemâl el-Halveti and Sünbül Efendi, along with the helpful decisions of key Ottoman scholars such as Saʿdeddin Efendi and Zenbillî ‘Alî, and even making aggressive counterstrikes against the scholarly foundations of his opponents’ arguments that ran the risk of disrupting the Ottoman framework for Islamic jurisprudence and religious life, Fuʿâdî proved a formidable opponent to the enemies of the order. Nevertheless, the defensive and increasingly strident tone of much of his work foreshadows the greater threats that the order would face in the decades after his death.

In the end, Fuʿâdî proved to be a highly successful Halveti leader who played a key role in firmly establishing, if not actually founding, an institutionalized branch of the order that would survive him in various forms by almost three centuries. Yet his greatest success, ironically enough, may have been eventually to obscure his own contribution in favor of that of the subject of his hagiography, Șaʿbân-i Veli. Despite occasional recognition of Fuʿâdî by later generations of Șaʿbâniyye leaders like Karabâş ʿAlî Veli in Istanbul,²²⁵ most subsequent leaders tended to follow Fuʿâdî’s lead by looking back to the inspiring story and character of the founder of the order as Fuʿâdî had presented him. This is a trend that has

²²⁵ Karabâş ʿAlî indicates Fuʿâdî’s work as an inspiration for his own version of a work entitled Miyâr-i Tarîk; however, this work was also seen as having its origin in Șaʿbân-i Veli himself by others. See Mustafa Tatci and Cemâl Kurnaz, eds., Tasavvufî Gelenekte Miyârlar ve Karabâş-ı Veli’nin Miyârî (Ankara: Bizim Büro Basım Yayın Dağıttım, 2001), pp. 26-29 and 119.
continued in modern times, and only comparatively recently have there been signs of willingness to look beyond the big names in the historical record of Ottoman mysticism to inquire about those who took upon themselves the devotional task of preserving their memories.226

In the subsequent chapter, I will examine and compare the case of an interaction between a Şa‘bâniyye saint of a later era in Ottoman history, Ünsî Hasan Efendi, and his 18th-century hagiographer, İbrâhîm el-Hâs. While they were somewhat less influential, and perhaps even unsuccessful in their respective endeavors, when compared with their predecessors in the previous century, their interaction will demonstrate once again the importance of historical context and intellectual agenda as they attempted to shape both the historical presentation and political agenda of the order when it was on the cusp of change. Similar to the relationship that emerged between Şa‘bân-ı Veli and ʻÎmâr el-Fu‘âdî, İbrâhîm el-Hâs sought to recast Ünsî Hasan’s life and career to meet a new set of challenges emerging in the decades after his death. Yet in casting one final glance in Fu‘âdî’s direction, it is perhaps with some degree of irony that I suspect that he would probably have found my attempts to return him to a prominent place in the history of Ottoman religious life embarrassing at best and misguided at worst, in that they would detract from the very legacy of Şa‘bân-ı Veli that he had so successfully established. They would have established for him the sort of legitimacy and respected presence that he feared would distract him from the

226 See, for example, the work of Abdülkerim Abdulkadiroğlu, pp. 61-64 and 69-71, whose discussion of Fu‘âdî’s contributions to the order merits only a couple of short sections. However, recent prosopographical catalogs like Necdet Yılmaz, Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf, are starting to map, albeit at the most basic level, a foundation for the further study of lesser-known figures in Ottoman Sufism.
greater goal of annihilating all worldly concerns in favor of the remembrance of God by tempting him with the sin of vanity. Nevertheless, after evaluating his legacy, the historian must in the final calculation contravene his wishes. The local Muslim community and religious pilgrims who have continued to seek the intercession of the great saint Ṣaʾbân-ı Veli up to the present day should also offer thanks to the intercessor who devoted his life to granting them the historical link to his legacy, lying just beyond the wall of the room they enter to offer their prayers.
CHAPTER 4

THE CURIOUS CASE OF ÜNSÎ HASAN EFENDÎ: A FAILED HALVETÎ CANDIDATE FOR SAINTHOOD?

We have seen how the continuation and intensification of the raucous debates that marked much of the first half of the 17th century forced the Şa'bâniyye branch of the Halveti order onto the defensive in their literary production. This chapter will focus on the life and career of a peculiar shaykh who came of age during the height of the controversies over the issue of the semâ and devrân, and whose career was irrevocably affected by those controversies in a way that would have horrified ʿOmer el-Fuʿâdî and his contemporaries. This shaykh, Árec Ünsî Hasan Efendi (d. 1723), seems to be a rare example of a failed saint, in contrast to many of the other Halveti figures we have examined so far. Despite the problematic nature of his career, however, we are lucky to have a considerable body of material documenting aspects of his life and the difficulties his successors faced in maintaining his legacy in the capital city during the eighteenth century.

1 This chapter draws on a presentation first given on May 10, 2003, at the 38th International Congress on Medieval Studies in Kalamazoo, Michigan. The paper, originally entitled “The Curious Case of Ünsî Hasan: An Unsuccessful Muslim Saint in the Ottoman Empire,” was part of a panel dealing with “fake, failed, or would-be saints.” It was later published as John J. Curry, “Hagiography as a Source for Women’s History in the Ottoman Empire: The Curious Case of Ünsî Hasan,” The Electronic Journal of Middle Eastern Studies 4 (2004), pp. 50-58. I wish to thank the participants in that panel, and also Prof. James Grehan for evaluating and offering insightful comments in the course of its evolution.
In the course of analyzing this figure, this chapter will address several questions. First, to what extent did Ünsî Hasan actually “fail,” and by what criteria can we judge his career as unsuccessful vis-à-vis those of both his contemporaries and his predecessors? Second, to what extent did the circumstances of his lifetime and the historical context of that period contribute to his failure and that of his followers to establish a successful branch of the order? In addition, how does this later eighteenth-century hagiography reflect changes in Ottoman society in a post-Kâdîtâdeli era? Finally, special note should be made of the importance of the sources connected with Ünsî Hasan for the valuable insights they can provide on the context of the connections of Ottoman women with a Halveti shaykh.

4.1 Shaykh Ünsî Hasan and His Relations with His Hagiographer, İbrâhîm el-Hâs

In 1645, in a small town near Kastamonu, a son was born to Receb Efendi, a shaykh of the Bayrâmî order. About Ünsî’s father we know very little, although the hagiographer implies that he was the victim of anti-Bayrâmî persecution during Ünsî Hasan’s youth. We have even less information about his grandfather, whose name is given only as Şeyh Şehîd

---

2 The hagiographer remarks that “...the carnal passions (hevâlar) of the Sufis of that time being dominant, many of them were forcibly seized (selb ederler idî). They even called the Mevlevîs ‘pearl-sellers’ (lü’lüvî).” See İbrâhîm el-Hâs (d. 1175/1761-2), Risale-i menâkîb-i Ünsî (Istanbul, Süleymaniye Lib., MS Haci Mahmud Efendi 4607), fols. 5b-6a (hereafter referred to as Menâkîb-i Ünsî). I do not understand the reference to the Mevlevîs here, but it must be some kind of derogatory shorthand for the followers of that order. It may refer to a famous anecdote told by Mevlâna about Adam’s having to choose among the three pearls of reason, faith, and humility. God eventually granted him all three after he chose reason, with the justification that the other two qualities are inseparable from reason in the noble descendants of Adam’s line. See Shams al-Dîn Ahmad-e Aflâkî, The Feats of the Knowers of God, p. 160.
Mehmed Efendi. The young man, known as Aʿrec Hasan Efendi (his poetic pen-name, Ünsî, would come later), acquired a knowledge of Islamic religious law very quickly, and while still a teenager, began teaching Qur’anic exegesis and mystical philosophy at the great Ayasofya mosque in Istanbul. However, after meeting one of the great religious leaders of his time, Karabaş Ali Efendi of the Şa’baniyye branch of the Halveti order, he left his position to become a full-time mystic in Üsküdar on the Asian side of the Bosphorus. By the time he was twenty years old, Karabaş Ali had annointed him as one of his successors and given him permission to teach independently in the capital. He even sent Ünsî Hasan in his place to Sultan Mehmed IV to read prayers and bring about a divine cure for one of his favored attendants. It would seem at this point that despite the turbulent times, Ünsî Hasan was destined for a distinguished career as one of the greatest mystics of his era. Yet he died in relative obscurity some six decades later, having alienated or lost many of his followers, and was known only as a local saint tied to the mosque of the Aydınoğlu Tekke in the area of Tophane in northern Istanbul.

Complicating the matter is the fact that we draw almost all of our information about Ünsî Hasan’s life and character from a single source, the Risâle-i menâktb-1 Ünsî, of which

---

3 Menâktb-1 Ünsî, fol. 2a.

4 Necdet Yılmaz, Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf, p. 111.

5 The great work cataloguing the mosques and other religious structures of the Ottoman capital of Istanbul, the Hadîkatü’l-cevâmi’, mentions Ünsî Hasan in conjunction with its entry on the Aydınoğlu Tekke, where he is buried. See Ayyansarāyī Hüseyīn Efendi, et al., Hadîkatü’l-Cevâmi’: İstanbul Câmileri ve Diğer Dînî-Sivil Mi’marî Yapıtları, ed. Ahmed Nezih Galitekin (İstanbul: İşaret Yayınları, 2001), p. 71 (hereafter referred to as “Ayyansarāyī”). It mentions him only as being a contemporary of the better-known Nasûhî Efendi, however.
only a few copies exist. Its author, İbrâhîm el-Hâs (d. 1761 or 1762), is a very mysterious figure. I have found no mention of him in any biographical dictionary or historical chronicle, and most of what we know about him comes from allusions or remarks he made in his own hand in this hagiographical work. We do know that when he finally wrote the work, his shaykh had been dead for at least twenty years, and in the intervening period, he had, “by reason of his scribal skills (kitâbet),” left the order and taken up some kind of position. The fact that he was offered a house, a slave girl, and other things as compensation for his work implies that the position entailed status and power, and İbrâhîm laments the political intrigues that came with the job at one point in his writing. He claims he did not again achieve happiness until he finally was able to return to Sufism as a way of life. His stated aim in writing the work is to stimulate interest in his shaykh by creating a simple work that could be read aloud at the tomb of his master as a remembrance of the shaykh’s life and deeds, and as a stimulus to visitation of the tomb. He compiled anecdotes about the shaykh and those associated with him from oral accounts by various members of the order, many of whom eventually left the shaykh’s service. In addition, he did not limit himself to the exploits and sayings of Ünsî Hasan alone. He also penned a work entitled Tezkiretü’l-Hâs

6 For this source, I refer to the original text of the manuscript written by its author during the 1740s, as cited previously in n. 2, in Istanbul’s Süleymaniye manuscript library, MS Hact Mahmud Efendi 4607.

7 Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fol. 92b-94a.

8 Ibid., fol. 4b.
in which he addressed the life of the prominent Halveti shaykh Niyâzî-i Misrî (d. 1694),
among others.  

It is especially noteworthy that one of these informants was İbrâhîm’s own mother,
a devotee of the shaykh who was instrumental in bringing her son into Ünsî Hasan’s service.
İbrâhîm has nothing but praise for her and speaks of her spiritual prowess.

My mother was a female initiate of the shaykh....She was a master of ascetic exercises. She never used to get undressed, and never used to stretch out and lie down. She always used to sit up day and night. She used to sleep in the place where she sat during the day. She never slept at night, nor did she light a candle. She always abstained from forbidden things. Her tongue was always offering prayers, and she passed 60 years in this fashion. She was among the noted female Sufis of the shaykh, and she manifested acts of grace; in fact, even after her death her acts of grace manifested themselves. Alas and alack for me that I was not able to be that which she was!  

Indeed, we should not dismiss the possibility that İbrâhîm was given a special place in the hierarchy of the shaykh’s followers as a result of his mother’s privileged status among his female followers. When İbrâhîm was still young (he gives the date of this occurrence as the 15th of Ramadan in the year 1117, or January 1, 1706) and had only just begun his Sufi training, he often slept during the day on account of his ascetic exercises at night. While he was napping one day, his mother heard him muttering in his sleep. After telling her son

9 Unfortunately, I was not aware of the existence of this manuscript until after I had completed my research in Turkey. Nevertheless, it is referred to in Derin Terzioğlu, “Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyâzî-i Misrî (1618-1694)” (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University, 1999), pp. 56-57.

10 Ibid., fol. 94b-95a.

11 In the text, İbrâhîm describes himself as being only in the stage of tevhîd, which is the first of the seven stages of the Halveti path, as described in Şeyh Ünsî Hasan Efendi (d. 1723), Mecmû’âtu’l-resâ’îl (İstanbul, Atatürk Kitâplığı, MS Osman Ergin 1508), fols. 8a-13b. The presence of an exact date indicates his estimation of the impact of this event on his life.
what he had said, she offered to go to the shaykh on his behalf and have these words interpreted. Her son flatly refused and swore her to secrecy. Nevertheless, when she went to the shaykh to have her own dreams interpreted, he demanded that she reveal her son’s words and then corrected her when she forgot or omitted several of the things he said, much to her surprise. Still, the biggest surprise was yet to come, as İbrâhîm’s mother later related to her son in the aftermath of this encounter.

...I said, “I was inattentive; please forgive [me].” Then he said, “He’ll also put on this turban,” and pointed to the black turban upon his head with his blessed finger. Furthermore, he said, “He’ll also be like this,” and pointed to his blessed breast with his blessed hand. He spoke good tidings and said so many words connected with this, but I couldn’t understand and couldn’t be impertinent enough to ask again...

Of course, this event sparked İbrâhîm’s curiosity, and he went to see the shaykh right away. In the process of relating what happened, he reveals for us the transformative effect of this meeting upon himself.

Such joy, happiness, and purity were obtained that their interpretation is beyond compare. Because I never liked myself. Being like this, I used to say, “If only I should have knowledge of the truth one day, and would that I should be a man one day.” When these good tidings came to the poor one, it was the cause of my joy....The day following this joyful occurrence, I came to the shaykh....He showed good cheer and once again gave good tidings to

---

12 The shaykhs of the Halveti order often wore black turbans as a way of marking the completion of their training and the granting of the right by their shaykh to act as a teacher in their own right.. However, practice varied widely from place to place and branch to branch of the order. Some branches of the Şa'bâniyye are described as wearing green turbans with a piece of white cloth sewn into them in the form of the number 7. See Clayer, Mystiques, état et société, pp. 45-46, for a description of some of the characteristics of dress that marked the various branches of the Halveti order.

13 Menâktb-1 Ünsî, fols. 96a-b.
An awkward young boy thus found himself remade into one of the future pillars of this branch of the Şa'bâniyye order. By having him skip directly from the first stage of *tevhîd* to the more advanced stage of *maʿrifet*, Ünsî Hasan had shifted İbrâhîm’s training from focusing on overcoming his vices to focusing on the acquisition of virtues. This transformed his follower’s confidence and ultimately led him to claim a position of authority in the hierarchy of this local branch.

This did not mean, however, that İbrâhîm was not in need of training and admonition. Perhaps reflecting the broader spectrum of Ottoman society, he engaged in popular religious practices that drew the disapproval of his master. As a youth, he had picked up the practice of completing his ablutions before prayer by picking up a bowl of water and reading the Qur’anic Surah of al-Ikhlâs over it three times, then dumping it over his head and allowing it to run down his body to the ground. He thought nothing of this and didn’t even bother to inform anyone that he was doing it. But after İbrâhîm joined the ranks of his followers, Ünsî Hasan soon put a stop to his secret ritual.

He then said, “You have a custom; you read the chapter of al-Ikhlâs to the water whenever you go to the bathhouse, and you dump it over your head.

---

14 This statement implies that Ünsî Hasan sought to accelerate İbrâhîm’s spiritual state directly from the first stage of being to the third (skipping the second stage of *tarikat*). The text implies that he changed the color of his follower’s tassel from red to green; see *Mecmûatu’l-Resâ’il*, fols. 8a-13b.


16 Al-Qur’ân, chapter 112.
This is not appropriate. Because it is water that has been read to (okunmuş su). It is not something which falls down and spills on the ground. It is a sin. Don’t do that anymore; abandon this custom of yours. Wash and go out right away.”

The young İbrâhîm promptly asked who had told him about this, but he was too young to understand the shaykh’s somewhat playful response to his query, which was that a heart at the most advanced stage of development could gain access to information like this from God; or rather, God had told him! The basic message that İbrâhîm took away from this experience, at least at the time, was that his shaykh had extraordinary abilities that allowed him to receive secret information.

Despite his labors on Ünsî Hasan’s behalf, İbrâhîm’s relationship with his shaykh was still somewhat troubled, even by his own admission. He was repeatedly admonished for his preference for fine clothes, and he presents as miraculous his shaykh’s ability to catch him in a lie or an attempt at deception. One such attempt to temporarily evade the restrictions and rules of the order led to great embarrassment for İbrâhîm and his friend Üsküdarlı Derviş Ahmed. On religious holidays, he was accustomed to getting a new suit and cloak, but he knew that the shaykh disapproved of wearing fine clothing and would not give him permission to wear it publicly. Thus, he consulted with his friend Derviş Ahmed, and the two of them decided to meet at the perfume seller’s shop just below the tekke early the following morning. From there, they could sneak off to Üsküdâr, far from the tekke, and promenade in their new clothes. But the plan fell apart early the next morning before they could even get together.

---

17 Ibid., fols. 38a-39a, for the full anecdote.
I approached the door of the tekke. I saw that a 10-year-old female servant of the shaykh’s family by the name of Zeyneb was there. She had covered her head with a piece of cloth and stood at the tekke door and looked at me. As for the poor one, it was necessary in any case to pass by the door of the tekke if I were to go to the perfume-seller Derviş Halil’s shop. Then I approached the door and the girl Zeyneb motioned with her hand, “Come here.” The poor one came and said, “Young lady, what are you standing naked at the street door for; isn’t it shameful?” She said, “I’m looking out for you.” I said, “Why are you looking out for me?” She said, “The shaykh wants you....[He] called me and said ‘Come, stand at the street door; İbrâhîm Çelebi is coming; he is passing by in front of the Hoca Paşa mosque; he’s coming now; call and let him come; go to the door quickly.’” When I heard this, a state immediately came over me that left me bewildered. Then the girl Zeyneb drove me before her and brought me to the shaykh. It was a sin to appear before the shaykh wearing new clothes for the holiday, and it was especially a sin that I had done it in a premeditated manner, thinking, “Let the shaykh not see me with new clothes on”....I was so regretful, so regretful at this sin that I said, “Would that I had restrained myself, would that I had never been born!”

Despite İbrâhîm’s clearly being caught in an act of deception, the shaykh’s response was surprisingly restrained. After an admonition that attempting to hide things from one’s shaykh was not appropriate behavior for a Sufi, Ünsî Hasan pressed two zolta coins into his hand and told him to have a good time in Üsküdâr. İbrâhîm and his friend Derviş Ahmed spent the rest of the day wandering about in a haze, trying to comprehend what had just happened to them.

Despite his own weaknesses in this area, İbrâhîm did speak with admiration of his shaykh’s ascetic example, describing how he would wear only used slippers and gave no value to showy garb. İbrâhîm was put in charge of a yearly ritual whereby the saint would construct a new set of clothes from unwanted leftovers in the textile markets of Istanbul. He

---

18 Ibid., fols. 53a-54a.

19 The Redhouse *Turkish-English Lexicon* of 1890 defines a zolta (or zloty in Polish) as being a silver coin worth 30 para.
would then wear this amalgam of leftover bits of cloth until it fell off of his back. In addition, İbrâhîm was ordered to pay whatever the merchant wanted for these poor-quality materials, without haggling. This did not mean, however, that his shaykh was willing to accept being cheated. He once sent İbrâhîm out with Üsküdarlı Derviṣ Ahmed with a warning to keep a close eye on a non-Muslim dealer in furs who had been hired to mend his coat. Despite the best efforts of his two followers, they returned with a coat that had some of its fur secretly removed, which led to a confrontation in the marketplace.

Just as I set foot inside the door of the [shaykh’s] room, he said, “The fur dealer stole the fur. Bring this to the head of the fur dealers, and the head fur dealer will make him produce the part that he stole. Take and bring that piece...That piece is in the fur dealer’s drawer. The head fur dealer will want to close the fur dealer’s shop, but don’t let him close it.”...The head fur dealer was a Muslim, and we put the fur in front of him along with the bundle. He opened it and looked, and pointed out a part of the fur with his hand and said, “The fur dealer removed an entire fox fur from here.” He appointed a man to us...that man took the fur dealer and brought him to the head fur dealer. He showed the fur to the fur dealer and said, “Where’s the fur that was here?”

After many apologies from the offending fur dealer and the expression of the shaykh’s wishes not to be the cause of the non-Muslim’s store being closed, the head fur-dealer allowed the matter to drop. The hagiography presents the incident as an object lesson for İbrâhîm and Ahmed about the perils of inattention (gaflet) and the importance of the shaykh in keeping his followers informed of the unseen.

______________________________

20 Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fols. 49b-50b.

21 Ibid., fols. 99b-101a. It is interesting that Ünsî Hasan does not seek to punish the non-Muslim in this case for his crimes, nor does the incident result in his conversion, a frequent topos in some of the earlier hagiographical literature examined in this thesis.

22 Ibid., fol. 101b.
In spite of these life lessons, İbrâhîm’s obsession with clothing, manifest in the hagiography, was one of his major obstacles on his path. He mentions at one point that he kept for himself some of his master’s old clothing as relics after his death, including a kisve-tassel that he wore for 45 years until his death, along with his staff and turban. Even more central is his attribution of his twenty-year “exile” to a worldly position after his shaykh’s death to his disobedience to the order’s prohibition on wearing fine clothing instead of ascetic garb. Since the shaykh was in the habit of not speaking to anyone who was wearing showy clothing or making an ostentatious display, it is interesting that his most powerful reproach of İbrâhîm on this matter was initially directed to his mother and not to him personally. While looking out the window, the shaykh saw İbrâhîm digging a ditch to drain the excess rainwater out of the courtyard of the tekke. However, he had put on a coat made of fox fur before going out in the cold weather. Ünsî Hasan pointed at İbrâhîm from his vantage point and asked his mother about the ağa who was digging a ditch outside, implying that the clothing indicated someone of high status. İbrâhîm was aware of his transgression only after his mother called him inside to explain what had happened, and only then did he come to the shaykh and try to make amends for his action. Unfortunately for him, the excuse that the inside of the fur coat was old, even though it didn’t appear so from the outside, was not accepted by the shaykh.

23 Ibid., fol. 50b.

24 Ibid., fol. 90b-91b.
4.2 The Purpose and Method of İbrâhîm el-Hâs’s Hagiography of Ünsî Hasan

Despite their conflicts and his errors in the pursuit of the Sufi path, İbrâhîm el-Hâs clearly revered his shaykh, and sought to affirm his sainthood. While some of the shaykh’s followers, after his death, had written down some of the miraculous occurrences they had witnessed, it seems to have been a somewhat uncoordinated project. İbrâhîm suggests at one point that he wanted to bring order and harmony to the mishmash of oral traditions that had begun to spring up around his shaykh’s life and career. In addition to his hagiography, he compiled the remarks that his shaykh made to guide his adepts during their meetings. He also compiled his poetry in Turkish, Arabic and Persian in some 25 folios, which has survived in two known copies. According to İbrâhîm, several of these poems constituted the shaykh’s predictions of the year of his own death. Nevertheless, one cannot help but sense a certain level of impropriety in this particular hagiographical project. At times, the reader senses that İbrâhîm is trying to explain away some potentially negative aspects of his

---

25 Ibid., fols. 71b-72a.

26 This manuscript survives in several copies, including one in the Ataturk Kitaplığı in Istanbul: İbrâhîm el-Hâs (d. 1175/1761-2), Kelâm-i ‘Azîz (İstanbul, Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Osman Ergin 413). It is a compilation of the shaykh’s utterances, both in public settings and to İbrâhîm el-Hâs personally, and represents a useful counterpart to the hagiography. It periodically allows the historian to flesh out the stories in the hagiography with longer, more detailed utterances by the shaykh himself.

27 Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fols. 48a-49b. A copy of this compilation has survived, İbrâhîm el-Hâs, Divan-i Ünsî (İstanbul, Süleymaniye Lib., MS Naﬁz Paşa 867). I was not able to consult this manuscript but learned it from its citation in Yılmaz, p. 115, n. 3. Yılmaz also cites Mehmed Tâhir Bursali’s Osmanlı Mü‘ellifleri as referring to another work entitled Sîr-ı chadiyyet, which another recent publication listed as having survived in the National Library, MS Ali Emîrî Arabî 4495. See Ramazan Muslu, Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf [18. Yüzyıllı] (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2003), p. 180, n. 748. It is not clear if İbrâhîm el-Hâs compiled of these works in addition to the others.
shaykh’s life. Perhaps the most gripping anecdote in the entire text is an account of the birth of Ünsî Hasan’s daughter and first child, Fatima. The narrative is worth considering in its entirety.

When the shaykh moved to Tophane at the age of around forty, his followers and supporters wanted him to marry, as he had been single for many years as a result of ascetic exercises tied to the Halveti path. They found a pious woman, and in short order the two were married and Ünsî Hasan’s wife became pregnant. The female Sufis (bâcîlar) were excited by this development, especially as the pregnancy became more and more advanced, until one day one of the women could restrain her exuberance no longer. Perhaps narrating on the authority of his mother, İbrâhîm describes the result of this encounter:

[She] entered upon the shaykh out her own great joy and said, “Your wife’s pregnancy became visible, praise be to God. All of us rejoiced!” The shaykh replied, “How would it have been had she not come forth? How would it have been had I not married? Does one praise a calamity?” and made an angry face. That woman regretted that she had spoken...and went back inside.

When word of this began to spread amongst the dervishes, men and women alike, a great sense of unease developed amongst the community. This was not helped by the fact that the shaykh withdrew from public view, and often looked sad and angry. When a baby girl was born, a woman came to the shaykh to give him the glad tidings.

[She said.] “My Lord, you have a daughter.” The shaykh replied in turn, “Would that she had given birth to a stone in place of her; it would have been

---

28 The symbolism of the age of 40 should not be lost on the reader, as it links Ünsî Hasan’s career with that of the Prophet Muhammad, who first began receiving revelation at the same age. The age of 40 was also thought to mark the peak of a man’s physical and intellectual powers. See Uri Rubin, The Eye of the Beholder, pp. 196-197.

29 Menâkıb-i Ünsî, fol. 32b.
more auspicious! Look at this; her life is also a long one!” That woman was troubled, and said, “My Lord, what name will you give her?” He replied, “That kind of child is no good to me; whatever name you give her, so be it.” The male and female Sufis were astonished at these words of the shaykh. They used to say amongst themselves, “The shaykh spoke these kinds of words to a little angel of paradise; what kind of talk is this?”

The problems only got worse. The shaykh would not acknowledge the presence of his daughter, and as she grew older they always fought if they were brought together. Despite the best attempts of the women of the order to advise her on how to become a pious Muslim, the daughter rejected all advice and upon reaching maturity promptly left the shaykh’s household. What happened next would have been shocking to any pious Muslim.

...[S]he left the shaykh and went to become a masseuse in a bathhouse. The shaykh publically disowned her. She worked as an attendant in the Yamalu bathhouse in Tophane; they called her “Fatima Usta.” When the shaykh departed for the afterlife, she put in an appearance and sought her inheritance. After taking that which was her legal right, she started major fights and harassed and annoyed the Sufis greatly. She lived until the year 1154 (1741)–to a ripe old age.

When the shaykh died in 1723, one of the stipulations of his will was that his daughter (to whom he referred as “that procuress,” or in Turkish, “ol dellâk”) was not to participate in his funeral proceedings in any way. He even went as far as to command that if she tried to visit his tomb, she should be thrown out on the spot. Such an account would have been

30 Ibid., p. 33a-b.

31 This term implies that she became one of the primary people responsible for the functioning of the bathhouse. The narrative perhaps implies, by naming the actual bathhouse, that her place of employment had a sketchy reputation.

32 Menaktb-1 Ünsî, fol. 33b-34a. Dates in the narrative would imply that Fatima was born sometime around the year 1685, meaning she was well into her 50s when she died--a fairly long life in a pre-modern society.

33 Ibid., fol. 109b.
difficult to reconcile with the ideal portraits of saints and their family members that Ottoman listeners might have recognized from earlier generations. It is clear from İbrâhîm’s own narrative that these events caused a great deal of discomfort amongst his followers. İbrâhîm seems to be stretching credibility by setting up the narrative as an example of the shaykh’s power to predict the future—one can hear the potential objections lurking in the background even centuries later. After all, a more successful saint would have been able to save his daughter from such a fate, would he not?

One wonders how this traumatic event would have affected the shaykh’s wife, but unfortunately, the hagiography does not dwell on that issue. However, it is clear from other parts of the narrative that Ünsî Hasan was a very stern authority figure who quickly disciplined his followers, male and female alike, for offenses. A Halveti dervish by the name of ‘Ömer related a story about his mother to İbrâhîm that suggested the short temper of their spiritual guide. Some relatives were visiting their home, and there was an infant among them who became sick. Dervish ‘Ömer’s mother suggested that they bring it to Ünsî Hasan to receive his prayer, and when they arrived at the lodge, Ünsî Hasan agreed to help. After reading a prayer for the infant, he puffed up his cheeks and blew air on the child. The child was cured shortly thereafter. Later on, while having fun with her relatives, ‘Ömer’s mother made fun of the shaykh by puffing up her cheeks and blowing air at everyone, which drew a lot of laughs. But this proved to be an ill-advised bit of humor. After everyone went to sleep in the evening, the family was awakened in the middle of the night by a commotion.

______________________________

34 See, for example, the description of the female members of the family of the noted Egyptian shaykh İbrâhîm-i Gülşeni and his son Ahmed el-Hiyali in Muhyi-yi Gülşeni, Menakîb-i İbrâhîm-i Gülşeni, pp. 15-16.
Lighting a candle, they realized it was ‘Ömer’s mother. She had turned purple in the face and was thrashing around in apparent agony on the floor. The family didn’t know what to do, and only after several hours did her condition improve and she come to her senses. In response to their worried questions, she replied:

...I still had not closed my eyes when I saw that the shaykh who had read to the child yesterday had come forth. He immediately grabbed my neck forcefully and said, “Why did you make fun of me? Am I your fool?” He squeezed my throat so firmly that I wanted to cry out, but I couldn’t; I wanted to be saved, but I couldn’t be saved until I passed out and knew no more.

The following morning, the terrified woman brought a gift to the shaykh in an attempt to make amends. Before she could even make a proper entry to greet him, the shaykh asked her whether or not she had come to make fun of him again. After a promise to repent and much embarrassment on her part, the shaykh let her go with a firm warning: “Watch it, and beware! Don’t make fun of anyone. Even if it is an unbeliever, it is a reason for regret.”

Yet in comparison with some of the shaykh’s male followers, Dervish ‘Ömer’s mother got off comparatively easy. After a warning, the shaykh threw one of his followers, Tavşan Dervish Mustafa, out of the lodge for missing morning prayers. When his colleagues tried to intercede on his behalf, the shaykh said, “Three days he has not come to morning prayers. We warned him; he was not attentive. Tomorrow it will spread to all of you. A man who prefers his own comfort over the command of God Most High is not appropriate for our lodge; let him come no more.” Some 30 years after this incident, İbrâhîm ran into

---

35 The full anecdote occurs in Menakib-ı Ünsî, fols. 69a-71b.
Tavşan Dervish Mustafa at the gate of a garden in Istanbul and found that he was a homeless vagrant.36

Another follower, Sîdî Abdullah Efendi, also managed to get himself thrown out of the order. After the shaykh warned him about following the longings of his carnal soul, he sent him to Kefe in the Crimea to act as his deputy there. Abdullah was fairly successful there and attracted a number of followers, but after a year he longed to return to Istanbul, so he appointed one of his Crimean followers in his place and returned to the capital. However, after he was seen by one of the Sufis of Ünsî Hasan’s lodge, it became known that he had returned without permission. When he tried to pay a visit, the shaykh rejected him and refused to accept his excuses. He subsequently became a judge, and lamented his failure to Îbrâhîm some years later.37 A second disciple who refused, largely at the instigation of his mother, to travel to the Black Sea coastal city of Sinop to spread the order, died shortly after his refusal. These stories suggest that in the early 18th century, Halveti shaykhs were finding it increasingly difficult to recruit followers who were willing to spread the order’s teachings to far-flung locales, in accordance with the order’s early pattern of development.38

Furthermore, by comparing theses stories of male transgressions with the case of Dervish

36 Ibid., fols. 51b-52a.

37 Ibid., fols. 56a-58b. The position of kadi, or Islamic judge, is often presented in Ottoman literature as being a fount of corruption and an impediment to spiritual progression in Sufi circles; thus Abdullah’s fate was a serious one.

38 Yahyâ-yi Şirvâni, one of the critical founders of the Ottoman branches of the Halveti order, was said to have trained thousands of successors and sent them all over the Islamic world: B.G. Martin, “A Short History of the Khalwâti Order of Dervishes,” pp. 276-278. This pattern continued to replicate itself, particularly in the Balkans, well-documented in Nathalie Clayer, Mystiques, état et société.
'Ömer’s mother, one might also infer that female indiscretions were treated less sternly than those of the male members of the order.

İbrâhîm makes it clear that Ünsî Hasan tended to be rather reclusive. After moving to the Aydınıglu Tekke in Tophane, he left its confines only three times in 41 years. The first time was after a devastating earthquake destroyed the tekke and forced the shaykh and his followers to move to the Ahmed Paşa mosque until the necessary repairs could be completed. The second was to pay a visit to the tomb of the noted Celveti shaykh ʻAzîz Mahmûd Hüdâyî (d. 1628) of Üsküdar, an event which is not described in further detail in this hagiography. Since the Celveti order was an offshoot of the Bayrâmî order, of which his father had ostensibly been a member, this reverence for a shaykh of another order seems reasonable. 39 Finally, he was once invited by the sultan to an imperial feast in the district of Ok Meydant by means of an imperial rescript, another event about which İbrâhîm offers no further comment. 40 This is rather unusual, as most hagiographers would have taken

---

39 Reşat Öngören breaks the Bayrâmiyye into three branches, the Şemsiyye, the Melâmiyye, and the Celvetiyye. See Reşat Öngören, Osmanlılar’da Tasavvuf: Anadolu’da Sûfîler, Devlet ve Ulemâ, pp. 155-184, and esp. pp. 178-184 for his remarks on the establishment of the Celveti branch of the order by ʻAzîz Mahmûd and his predecessor, Mehmed Üftâde (d. 1580). For the best study to date of ʻAzîz Mahmûd Hüdâyî, a critical figure in the history of Ottoman Sufism who lived from the time of Sultan Süleyman through the reign of Sultan Murad IV, see H. Kâmil Yılmaz, Azîz Mahmûd Hüdâyî: Hayatt, Eserleri, Tarîkâtî, 4th ed. (İstanbul: Erkam Matbaacılık, 1999). In addition, ʻAzîz Mahmûd’s preaching to his followers has recently been published as Aziz Mahmud Hûdâyî, Söhbetler, ed. Saﬁ Arpaguş (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınlari, 1995), which includes a brief description of his life and activities. Most of the lectures that ʻAzîz Mahmûd delivered were elaborations on Qur’anic verses, often combined with stories of the menâkîbînâme genre that illustrated his points further. İbrâhîm seems to struggle with his own shaykh’s legitimacy vis-à-vis that of ʻAzîz Mahmûd, as we shall see subsequently.

40 The three events appear in Menâkîb-i Ünsî, fols. 3a-b. The trip to the Ok Meydant is reminiscent of the events surrounding Ya’kub el-Germiyânî and his son
advantage of such an event to stress the effect that their shaykh had upon the sultan and his retinue. The impression one gets is of a Sufi shaykh that was rather disengaged from society outside of his immediate circle of followers and the local milieu in which his home was located.

Finally, the most notable aspect of this hagiography is its author’s involvement in the events surrounding the succession to the leadership of the order in the aftermath of Ünsî Hasan’s extended illness and death. The death of the primary subject of any hagiography is invariably one of the most critical events in the narrative, and İbrâhîm’s work is no exception (the anecdotal material involving the death of the shaykh exceeds 20 pages, more than double any other event that occurs in the work). The narrative focus, however, is not invariably on Ünsî Hasan himself. Other actors perform critical roles in the drama of the saint’s death and funeral, and in the course of telling this story, İbrâhîm implicitly criticizes the subsequent history of the order and indirectly alludes to the real reason that he compiled his work.

The death of Ünsî Hasan initially united his followers in grief, and his funeral rites were carried out exactly according to his wishes. İbrâhîm recalled that the participants in the funeral rites and burial went to great lengths to maintain their unity for years after their shaykh’s passing.

After the shaykh was buried, a powerful affection appeared among the older companions (pîrdâşlar). It was such that if we were not to see each other, we were unable to endure it. We used to make difficult journeys to

Yusuf Sinâneddîn; see my analysis in Curry, “Growth of Turkish Hagiographical Literature,” p. 915.

41 Ibid., fols. 105b-116b.
Büyükçekmece (Çekmece-i Kebîr)\textsuperscript{42} to see them. They in turn used to come posthaste to Istanbul to meet. This state persisted among all of us for a period of six years. It still remains in the poor one.\textsuperscript{43}

İbrâhîm’s final statement conveys the nostalgia he felt in his old age for the past and implicitly suggests that the bonds that had held the order together had begun to dissolve in the two decades following the shaykh’s death. Indeed, much of İbrâhîm’s work reads like an elegy for good friends lost from the path, as in the cases of Stdkt Abdullah and Tavşan Derviş Mustafa described above. The historian reading these lines, despite being over 250 years distant from these events, can’t help but feel some compassion for its author, who seems to represent the last man standing from a forgotten age, still struggling with its legacy.

It is no accident that the final anecdote before the saint’s passing represents the author’s attempt to grapple with the loss of his lifelong friend and companion on the path, Üsküdârlı Derviş Ahmed. İbrâhîm was first aware of trouble when his shaykh saw Ahmed coming one day and remarked to him, “Whenever I see that Üsküdârlı Ahmed, I don’t know. I’ll just say that to dress that vainly, it is necessary to be a “market-goer (pâzâra giden).” İbrâhîm was silent, for he looked and saw that the shaykh was right, and he knew that the remarks that Ünsî Hasan made usually came to pass in the future. This did not stop him from trying to save his friend from impending disaster, however.

I was very sad. The aforementioned Derviş Ahmed had a passion for chess...Over the course of several days I related what the shaykh had said to Üsküdârlı Derviş Ahmed. I said to him, “O brother, it is you who must take heed of these words of the shaykh, since he spoke in this way. You know that the shaykh’s utterances shall come to pass. The interpretation is this, that you must repent of playing chess. Renew your oath of allegiance (bî āt)

\textsuperscript{42} A town to the west of Istanbul.

\textsuperscript{43} Menâktb-ı Ünsî, fols. 115b-116a.
once more, and you must come frequently to the shaykh; let it be that he will treat you leniently!” Derviš Ahmed thought for a while. I said, “Come, brother, listen to my words; it is best for you!” He didn’t listen....A while after the shaykh’s death, Üsküdarlı Derviš Ahmed met the financial trustee of the imperial dockyard (tersâne emîni), el-Hâc Murtezâ Efendi from the chancery, through playing chess. After that, he was a “market-goer.” He became addicted to tobacco, and he couldn’t stay away from chess. He struggled mightily for salvation from these bonds; there was no remedy. He was a “market-goer” until his death. He used to say with a sad countenance, “This is a calamity for me. I didn’t stay away from chess; I didn’t renew my allegiance. I wasn’t obedient to the things that I knew; it is because of that.” The aforementioned el-Hâc Murtezâ Efendi is buried in the Nakşibendi tekke that he built himself in the cemetery in Eyüb-i Ensârî.44 And Derviš Ahmed is buried in the place they call Ak Yâpû in the area of Karaca Ahmed Sultan in Üsküdâr.45

Notwithstanding Derviš Ahmed’s regrets about his own failings, this particular career move was not insignificant. El-Hâc Murtezâ Efendi (d. 1747) was a powerful figure during the decade in which İbrâhîm was writing his hagiography.46 In discussing the building of the mosque and tekke that İbrâhîm describes, which bore el-Hâc Murtezâ’s name, Ayvansarâyî explains his strong links with the Nakşibendi order at the time. He constructed the mosque and tekke for Kaşgarî Seyh Abdullah Efendi (d. 1760), who had arrived in Istanbul sometime around 1743 after spending his early years in Central Asia.47 He was the

44 The area surrounding the mosque of Eyüp just northwest of the old city walls. Much of this cemetery still survives today.

45 Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fols. 104b-105b.

46 The existence of el-Hâc Murtezâ is attested by Mehmed Süreyyâ, Sicill-i ʿOsmânî, v. 4, p. 361, as he became the head of the district of Tophane in 1146 H. (1733) and became financial trustee for the imperial dockyard the following year. He moved in and out of the position several times, also serving as the chief accountant for Anatolia and overseer of the collection of the head tax on non-Muslims.

47 For more on this tekke, see the short article by Klaus Kreiser, “Kaşgarî Tekyesi–Ein Istanbuler Nakşbandî-konvent und sein Stifter,” Naqshbandis: Cheminements et situation actuelle d’un ordre mystique musulman (Historical
first shaykh to be appointed head of another institution known as the Kalenderhane tekke soon after its construction was finished earlier that year. El-Hâc Murtezâ Efendi had originally become a follower of the Nakşibendi order while on pilgrimage to Mecca, where he took the oath of allegiance to a Mujaddadî shaykh by the name of Yekdest Ahmed Efendi (d. 1707), and subsequently become a follower of Kaşgarî Abdullah.\textsuperscript{48} Ayvansarâyî, in reference to the Murtezâ Efendi Tekyesi mosque, remarks:

Its builder was Yekçeşm el-Hâc Murtezâ Efendi, one of the great senior chancellery officials of the government service, in service as financial trustee of the imperial dockyard and other positions, who died after he was removed from the position of secretary of the treasury (ruznamçe-i kebîrilik). Kaşgarî Şeyh Abdullah Efendi came to Eyüb previously, and while living there he was acting as shaykh at the Kalenderhane that Lâîlizâde Seyyid Abdülbâkî Efendi built and restored. On account of the Kalenderhane’s position of shaykh being reserved for single men, and Şeyh Abdullah Efendi’s desire to raise a family, he left the position of shaykh at the aforementioned lodge. When Murtezâ Efendi was commissioned in a dream to build this noble mosque and pleasant cells in its vicinity, and dedicated it to the Nakşibendis, Şeyh Abdullah Efendi became the first shaykh at this tekke. The date of the start of the tekke’s construction was 1157 H. (1744) and its date of finishing was 1158 H. (1745); it was completed in one year.\textsuperscript{49}

Given his connections with such powerful figures, we might wonder whether Derviş Ahmed were crying crocodile tears to his old friend İbrâhîm about drifting away from his

\textsuperscript{48} Ayvansarâyî, p. 346. A variant in another manuscript of the text suggests that it was in fact el-Hâc Murtezâ’s shaykh, Kaşgarî Abdullah, who joined the Nakşibendi order while in Mecca; see p. 347, n. 2. However, one might be skeptical of this report; seeing as Kaşgarî Abdullah was born no earlier than 1698, Yekdest Ahmed would have died when he was a mere nine years old. For more on Yekdest Ahmed see Muslu, pp. 243-244.

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., p. 346.
old circle. Leaving this speculation aside, however, the incident may point to a more serious problem for the shaykhs of the Halveti order, which was the growing intrusion of Nakşibendi shaykhs coming from Central Asia and India into the religious environment of Istanbul from the mid-18th century onward.\(^{50}\) While Halveti shaykhs continued to be the most widely represented group in Ottoman Sufi circles, it is clear that Mujaddādī shaykhs were making inroads among the population; they represented more than 30% of all Nakşibendi shaykhs recorded in various prosopographical works during the 18th century.\(^{51}\) Nevertheless, this process was still incomplete during this period, as both el-Hāc Murtezâ and Kaşgarî Şeyh Abdullah are linked with the Nakşibendi order through both the Mujaddādī and Central Asian Kāsānī lines, demonstrating that they did not recognize an important distinction between the two branches into which later scholars came to group the order.\(^{52}\) While

\(^{50}\) Dina La Gall sees the period of the 18th and 19th centuries as marking a critical transition from an older form of Nakşibendi tarikat, primarily rooted in a Central Asian ethic, to a more austere Indian/Mujaddādī form that established itself in the Arabian peninsula from the 17th century onward, see Dina La Gall, “The Ottoman Naqshbandiyya in the Pre-Mujaddīdī Phase: A Study in Islamic Religious Culture and its Transmission” (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton University, 1992), pp. 174-177. The problems this has caused in the historiography of that order for the early modern period are further elaborated in the monograph that grew out of this dissertation; see Dina Le Gall, A Culture of Sufism: Naqshbandis in the Ottoman World, 1450-1700 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), pp. 4-7.

\(^{51}\) Muslu, pp. 308-309.

\(^{52}\) Yekdest Ahmed was reported to have received an icazet from an Ahrārī shaykh, and Kaşgarî Abdullah initially was a shaykh at a Mujaddādī-sponsored lodge despite being of the Kāsānī branch of the order. See Muslu, pp. 243-244, 277-278, and 286-287. Another scholar argues that during this period, most Nakşibendi shaykhs were more interested in establishing themselves among the various orders and ʿulema groups in Ottoman society rather than establishing a united and politically-influential front. Nevertheless, the shaykh played an expanded role, and we have at least one example of an extremely influential 18th-century Halveti shaykh who was strongly influenced by the Nakşibendi doctrine of Mustafa b. Kamāl al-Dīn al-Bakrī (d. 1748). See David W.
İbrâhîm implies his old friend’s shift in Sufi ties rather than address them directly, he could not have seen this departure as beneficial for his own order. Indeed, the way the anecdote is structured seems designed to paint the followers of the Nakşibendi order as being too involved with the world and financial transactions.

The loss of Derviş Ahmed could have been overcome. Nevertheless, other problems were clearly lurking under the surface even before Ünsî Hasan died. Some of these problems may have been triggered by İbrâhîm himself as he failed to heed the wishes of his shaykh in regard to taking over the leadership of the order, perhaps due to his own lack of confidence.

He made a formal offer (teklîf buyûrdular) of the aforementioned lodge to the poor one. I made excuses because at that time I was set upon leaving (terk üzere muhkem idi). The shaykh accepted my excuses. He said, “You didn’t accept the lodge, so shall we put no one in our place?” I said, “My lord, we think the head of the order Mehmed Efendi is the choice of all of us, and the most suitable of all of us. But you know best.” He said, “So be it. But he is a poplar tree (kavâk); he won’t bear fruit; he is good for nothing.” Within one or two days he conferred the tekke on Mehmed Efendi and gave him the black [turban]. Mehmed Efendi didn’t wear the black turban until his [own] death. He put it into a box after [the shaykh’s] death. Mehmed Efendi lived at the aforementioned tekke for 20 years....He followed his own carnal desires. He didn’t produce a successor, and he didn’t confer the tassel of the order (kisve) on anyone. He always passed his life in satisfying his own hopes, may God have mercy on him.53

The political motivation behind the writing of this work thus becomes clear. In the aftermath of Mehmed Efendi’s death, after 20 years of failing to maintain the order built by his master,

---

İbrâhîm is taking a bold step on his own initiative: making his own claim to leadership of the order. The stories of his mother’s learning of his success in the order from the shaykh while he was still young, his “punishment” of twenty years’ exile for wearing fancy clothes, and his special place in the story of the shaykh’s illness and death all point to a careful literary intertwining of İbrâhîm’s own life with that of his master. This is not just a straightforward hagio-biography of a Halveti shaykh; it is a carefully constructed polemic whose point would not have been missed by anyone who happened to listen to or read it while visiting the saint’s tomb. Since this branch of the Şâbâniyye never really acquired a significant place in the historical record, İbrâhîm’s potential audience probably never accepted this claim. The eventual successor to Mehmed Efendi, who died no later than early 1743, was one Seyyid Muhyiddîn Efendi, son of Köstendîlî ‘Alî Efendi, who died in 1760 and was buried in Ünsî Hasan’s tomb along with Mehmed Efendi.54 The hagiography may indicate, in an indirect way, İbrâhîm’s dissatisfaction with this individual as a successor to the head of the order, for internal evidence suggests that it could not have been written before June of 1746, a considerable time after Mehmed’s death.55

The audience for whom İbrâhîm was writing may have had good reason to be skeptical. The lodge was racked by a power struggle at some point after the shaykh’s death. At this point, İbrâhîm still supported the choice of the order, Mehmed Efendi, although Ünsî Hasan’s power from beyond the grave proved more decisive in the contest in his presentation of the conflict. The primary detractor who aimed to have Mehmed Efendi removed as leader

54 Ayvansarâyî, p. 71.

55 This is suggested by a reference to the period of Pîrzâde Mehmed Sâhib Efendi’s service as şeyhülislâm from 1745-1746, which will be discussed subsequently.
of the tekke was Tâtâr Derviş Ahmed, who was the guardian of the shaykh’s tomb after his death. He also had a servant, ʿAlî, whom he enlisted to help him in attacking Mehmed Efendi along with the latter’s close friend and assistant, Haddâd Derviş Hüseyin. Unfortunately for the insurgent Ahmed, his servant ʿAlî already had a troubled reputation within the order after the shaykh’s death. He often tried to go into the tomb when the weather was hot and the fleas were bothersome so he could lie down and sleep but always came running out again shortly thereafter. When İbrâhîm asked him why, he replied that whenever he was about to fall asleep, the shaykh would appear and begin beating him with a rod and walking on him while criticizing him for his inappropriate behavior. He would have to get up and run out.\(^56\) Still, İbrâhîm stresses that ʿAlî was not the only one who had this problem. One Derviş Yûsuf, who periodically took over tomb-keeping duties as a deputy and lived in the area of the tomb, would periodically leave his job for several days, only to return eventually. When asked why, he told a story similar to ʿAlî’s, which was that whenever he committed a sin, the shaykh would attack him in his sleep and chase him into the mosque. He would have to run away for several days until he repented of his sins, and then he would return.\(^57\)

The bulk of İbrâhîm’s criticism is directed at Tâtâr Derviş Ahmed, rather than at his servant ʿAlî, who is otherwise portrayed as a decent individual. Part of İbrâhîm’s disapproval lay in the fact that Derviş Ahmed was ignorant (ümmî), unstable in character (meçûb-1 meşreb), and prone to inventing false stories of the shaykh’s acts of grace after

\(^{56}\) Menâkıb-1 Ünsî, fols. 79a-80a.

\(^{57}\) Ibid., fols. 80a-81b.
his death, which he would then tell to the people for the purpose of enhancing his own
stature within the order.\footnote{Ibid., fols. 81b-82a.} However, his attempts to get Mehmed Efendi and Haddâd Derviş Hüseyin, the leaders of the lodge, to endorse these visions were rejected out of hand. The struggle also engendered hostility towards the insurgent faction from some of the other dervishes among the rank-and-file. Still, the challenge was not insignificant, for Derviş Ahmed had acted as the tomb-keeper for 17 years.\footnote{Unfortunately, this does not necessarily allow us to clarify exactly when matters came to a head. If the tomb-keeper position was established immediately after the shaykh was interred in the tomb, these events would have taken place around 1740. But the tomb’s construction began many years before the shaykh had died, and at one point the hagiography attests that it was partially complete at least five years before his death, as evidenced by the remarks of Nasûhî Efendi (who died five years before Ünsî Hasan in 1718) on its construction. See Menâkîb-ı Ünsî, fols. 47b-48a. This might indicate that the revolt may have occurred at an earlier time, perhaps during the first half of the 1730s.} Matters came to a head when Tâtâr Derviş Ahmed tried to use his servant ʿAlî’s visions as a means of challenging the leadership of the lodge.

One day Derviş Ahmed said to this poor one, “Our ʿAlî this evening witnessed that there were two good men in this lodge; they were walking around, one big and one small. Suddenly the shaykh appeared from the noble tomb. There was a wooden cudgel (yârma) in his blessed hand; he marched on those two good men with an angry countenance. He beat them, pushed them out the tekke door, made them depart, and closed the door. After that he disappeared.”

The two insurgents then likened the big and small man to Mehmed Efendi and his assistant, Haddâd Derviş Hüseyin, and predicted that they would soon be unable to spend time at the lodge anymore but would have to depart. Their thinking on the matter proved to be premature, as the vision subsequently backfired on them. After several days, Derviş Ahmed...
and ‘Alî were the ones who ended up fleeing the tomb. When İbrâhîm encountered them some time later wandering the neighborhood, he asked them what had happened. Initially, he received no answer, but then the servant ‘Alî exploded.

...‘Alî pointed at Derviş Ahmed with his finger and said, “Look here, it is this one. Recently he sinned in many forbidden acts (muharremât), and began to engage in immoral behavior (fuhsiyât). I used to say, ‘There’s no acceptance for this, don’t do these acts here, a calamity will come upon us, don’t do it.’ He didn’t listen. In the end, this event came upon us.” And he displayed great sorrow. Derviş Ahmed and ‘Alî could never come to the noble tomb again. What’s more, they couldn’t even stay in Istanbul. Derviş Ahmed wanted to go to other lands....In the end he sold everything to Gülşeni Hâfiz and betook himself to Yânbolû, and he died there. ‘Alî also fell into darkness (karâya düșûb), he became one of the people of the wastelands (ehl-i bâdiye)....

Despite all the entreaties of İbrâhîm and others to wait and see what happened, the two chose to remain outcasts, and the tekke remained in the hands of Mehmed Efendi. Still, the split and its nasty aftermath probably left a bitter taste among many of the lodge’s followers, although the hagiography gives no indication of what happened to the other members of the faction who followed the renegade tomb-keeper.

In the end, İbrâhîm’s hesitations and his lack of confidence in taking over the lodge when he was given the chance may have led to its undoing, despite his best efforts in the last 20 years of his life. Even after he had reached the highest level within the lodge’s hierarchy, he still struggled with his own fears, and often failed to relate to his shaykh personally. We get the sense at times that İbrâhîm’s mother was the strongest figure in his life and that she was the crucial glue that continued to bind İbrâhîm to the order. At one point, after the death of a Kadızâdeli-influenced former follower to whom Ünsî Hasan had once granted a tassel

60 For the full text of the anecdote surrounding the attempted coup, see Menâktb-ı Ünsî, fols. 81b-84a.
(kisve) of the order, İbrâhîm annoyed his shaykh by implying that he had made an error in judgment many years ago by doing so. After receiving the brusque explanation that the shaykh had been pressured to do so by others within the order, İbrâhîm began to worry that he might also be such a follower. Only after a visit from his mother did the shaykh command that İbrâhîm abandon such fears and calm his agitated soul. One can’t help but wonder whether her death played a critical role in İbrâhîm’s subsequent difficulties in decisively acting to fulfill the role that his shaykh had intended.

As we have seen from the previous collection of anecdotes, the tone and content of this particular hagiographical work are somewhat different from those of earlier examples of the genre. The day-to-day relationship of a Halveti shaykh with his closest followers in the urban context of the Ottoman’s capital city is evoked in a remarkably detailed and personalized way. In addition, unlike most of the other figures we have examined in previous chapters, a powerful aura of failure and missed opportunities pervades the hagiographer’s consciousness, even though he tries to explain such doubts away with various excuses. İbrâhîm’s relationship with his master therefore falls outside of the master narrative of Ottoman history to a great extent. Nevertheless, it does so in a spectacular manner that provides remarkable insight into what it meant to be a lower-echelon Ottoman notable grappling with the twin pulls of religious devotion and the norms of Ottoman society during a period of flux in the empire’s history.

The historian must therefore take into account the personal stresses of the hagiographer in analyzing the life and career of Ünsî Hasan, as it is impossible to separate

---

61 Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fols. 102b-103b. The Kadızâde-p-period context of this anecdote will be discussed in more detail subsequently.
their close and troubled relationship from the hagiography İbrâhîm sought to create. Nevertheless, this should not stop us from taking a closer look at the anecdotes İbrâhîm uses to illustrate the life and career of this unusual Halveti figure and assessing what his experiences can tell us about the development of the order in the years following the heyday of the Halvetis’ adversaries.

4.3 The Early Stages of Ünsî Hasan’s Career: His Training with Karabâş ‘Alî and His Life at the Âcem Ağa Mosque in Istanbul

The first key event in Ünsî Hasan’s life occurred when he was just twenty years old. One of the other scholars living in the area of the Ayasofya mosque, where Ünsî Hasan was teaching at the time, ‘Alî Efendi, personally described the events that he witnessed to İbrâhîm el-Hâs many years later. While Ünsî Hasan had periodically paid visits on other Sufi shaykhs during his period of residence at the mosque, he had not declared any direct adherence to Sufism. Still, when Ünsî Hasan learned that ‘Alî Efendi had heard reports of the spiritual power and writings of Karabâş ‘Alî Efendi, who had taken up residence at the Eski Valide Tekke in Üsküdar on the other side of the Bosphorus, the two decided to go there and pay the esteemed shaykh a visit. Upon their arrival at the Eski Valide Tekke,

62 Ünsî Hasan’s residence at the Ayasofya mosque placed him among a select group of students and scholars in the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, his break with this career path in favor of world-renouncing Sufism becomes more dramatic in retrospect.

63 Karabâş ‘Alî was not only an important religious figure during the latter half of the seventeenth century; he was also an important political actor who had extensive influence over much of the population of Istanbul. For more on Karabâş ‘Alî, who came to be considered a founder of a separate branch of the Halveti order, see Necdet Yılmaz, pp. 102-110. See also the remarks of Muhammed İhsan Oğuz, Hazret-i Şâbân-i Velî ve Mustafa Çerkeşî, pp. 67-69. We may be able to date roughly the appearance and career of Karabâş ‘Alî Efendi in Üsküdar, which would have been around 1664 (Ünsî Hasan
Karabâş ʿAlî immediately addressed Ünsî Hasan, saying, “I had hoped for you for a long time. Thanks be to God Most High, that meeting was divinely ordained.” He then called for one of his trusted followers, ʿAsâdâr ʿOsman Efendi, and when he arrived, told him, “This is the one I spoke to you about,” and pointed to his visitor. While his friend spoke with the shaykh a while, Ünsî Hasan was silent. After half an hour, the two friends got up and departed to pray. However, when ʿAlî Efendi wanted to return to the Ayasofya, he discovered that Ünsî Hasan did not want to return with him. Pointing out that Ünsî Hasan had a residence in the mosque, a great number of books, and a substantial number of students, ʿAlî Efendi tried to drag his recalcitrant friend to the docks to return to Istanbul. He was shocked to have his companion will all of his possessions to him on the spot, hand him the keys to his room in the mosque, and depart. All of ʿAlî’s entreaties to reconsider proved to be in vain.\textsuperscript{64}

Karabâş ʿAlî Veli was a prominent figure in both religious and political circles during the latter half of the seventeenth century. He was born in a village called Arapgîr in the area of Diyarbekir in 1611; he and his family came to the province of Kastamonu when he was seven years old and settled in a village near Çankırı, north of the city of Kastamonu. Despite obtaining some education in Istanbul and perhaps Ankara as well, he returned to Kastamonu to begin his training as a shaykh of the Şaˈbâniyye order under Çorumlu İsmâˈîl Efendi (d. was born in 1645). Necdet Yılmaz was unable to date his establishment there any earlier than 1674, five years before his exile to Lemnos, while Oğuz claimed he first came to Üskûdar in 1669. However, a more likely explanation may lie in miscalculations committed by İbrâhîm el-Hâs in establishing the chronology of his shaykh’s life, perhaps so the auspicious age of forty marking the move of the shaykh to Tophane, as mentioned previously, could be established.

\textsuperscript{64} \textit{Menâktîb-i Ünsî}, fols. 6a-8a.
1648), the successor to İÖmer el-Fu’âdî. However, he was unable to complete his training until many years later under the guidance of the son and successor of Çorumlu İsmâ’il, Mustafa Muslihiddîn Efendi (d. 1661). His gravitation toward the Halveti order reportedly began with a meeting of the Sivâsiyye-branch Halveti shaykh Abdülahad Nurî during the 1640s in Istanbul, but he spent some time living in the Hacı Bayrâm-ı Veli complex in Ankara (the major center for the Bayrâmî order in the Ottoman realm) as well. After a long period of service in Çanakkale, Karabâş ‘Alî was ordered to go to Istanbul to propagate the tarikat there. He became a prolific writer and influential Sufi figure there during the 1670s and continued to give guidance to the people until his death while on pilgrimage in 1686. According to our hagiography, Ünsî Hasan proved to be an outstanding follower among the crowds of Ottoman subjects who attached themselves to Karabâş ‘Alî. According to İbrâhîm, Karabâş ‘Alî once remarked that out of the 32,000 people whose hands he had shaken, and the 680 people who had become his successors, Ünsî Hasan was the best of them all. Leaving hagiographic license aside, we understand that Ünsî Hasan was just one of a substantial number of people claiming their spiritual descent from the great master in Üsküdâr.


66 Mustafa Tatci and Cemâl Kurnaz, Tasavvufî Gelenekte Miyârlar ve Karabâş-1 Veli’nin Miyârî, pp. 7-12.

67 Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fols. 8a-b.

68 Kerim Kara argues that İbrâhîm el-Hâs’s historical understanding of Karabâş ‘Alî’s life and career is extremely flawed and cannot be trusted. This would suggest that
The large number of people attached to this important Sufi personality place Karabâş ‘Alî firmly in the tradition of the founder of the Halveti order, Yahyâ-yi Şirvânî. In contrast to the subsequent methods employed by his own shaykh, İbrâhîm stresses that Karabâş ‘Alî never rejected anyone from his service on account of his corrupt nature or bad behavior. Instead, he accepted all comers and proved extraordinarily adept at converting them into good Sufis who struggled to reform their characters. However, he did not try to poach the disciples of other Sufi orders. When they tried to convert to his path, he would refuse, although this did not stop him from offering them guidance according to their own order’s path. A prominent Mevlevî shaykh, Şînecâk Mustafâ Efendi, once tried to renounce the Mevlevî order in favor of the Halveti, only to be informed by Karabâş ‘Alî that this would be improper, as his initial choice of tarikat was the will of God. He also adhered to the rules of the ṣeri āt and the tarikat to a fault: an aged disciple of the shaykh once told İbrâhîm

Ünsî Hasan either did not know or did not teach his follower a great amount about his predecessor in the Şa‘bâniyye chain of authority; Kerim Kara, pp. 64-65 and 71.

69 Ibid., fol. 8b. The large number of followers to whom Karabâş ‘Alî granted permission to carry on his legacy bears a strong resemblance to the strategy employed by Yahyâ-yi Şirvânî to spread the order in the fifteenth century. The threatening historical context at the time probably had something to do with this; the context of the late Kadızâdeli period will be discussed below.

70 Ibid., fols. 8b-9b. Earlier scholarship sometimes advances the notion that the earliest generations of Sufis in Islamic history took a more informal approach to mystical education similar to that displayed here; however, they then argue that the rise of the institution of Sufi orders by the 12th century established formal links between master and disciple that usually did not allow for multiple relationships. See the remarks of Alexander Knysh, Islamic Mysticism: A Short History (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000), pp. 172-173, and J. Spencer Trimingham, The Sufi Orders in Islam (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), p. 13. These types of remarks in the sources, however, indicate that the strict territorial jealousy that many scholars have assumed among the Sufi orders in later Islamic history may be overstated; see Knysh, p. 177 and Terzioglu, pp. 50-51.
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that despite his best efforts and those of his companions to rise early to perform the supererogatory midnight prayer (tahaccud) before Karabâş ‘Alî, they always found him at the ablution fountain before they could even put on their slippers.71

Karabâş ‘Alî was also a prolific writer whose output included a commentary on Ibn al-‘Arabî’s Fusûs al-hikam, a commentary on the ‘Aqâ’id of ‘Umar al-Nasafi, and other works on mystical subjects, including the ubiquitous defense of the Halveti practice of the semâ ‘and devrân. Many of these works have come down to us, often in multiple copies, testifying to their popularity.72 He seems to have been regarded as an important commentator on the works of Ibn al-‘Arabî in particular, and İbrâhîm el-Hâs even claimed that Ibn al-‘Arabî predicted the appearance of Karabâş ‘Alî via an esoterically calculable method nearly 500 years previously in the Futûhât al-Makkiyyah.73

71 Menâktb-i Ünsî, fols. 10a-b.

72 Nevertheless, several of the works İbrâhîm el-Hâs mentions in the Menâktb-i Ünsî, fols. 11a-b, were not found in the list of 14 works noted in Istanbul’s manuscript libraries by Necdet Yılmaz, pp. 108-109. A more thorough study of these works, including several which have historically been wrongly attributed to Karabâş ‘Alî, can be found in Kerim Kara, pp. 125-156. Among them are works entitled Şerh-i Ebtes, Risâle-i Şurût-i İslâm, and a commentary on the Atvâr-i sa’bah which may have been similar to that which Ünsî Hasan himself outlined; see A’rec Ünsî Hasan Efendi, Risâle-i atvâr-i sa’bah (Istanbul, Atatürk Kitaplîğı, MS Osman Ergin 1508), fols. 1-13.

73 Menâktb-i Ünsî, fol. 12b-14b. İbrâhîm goes on to stress how the words in the text can be numerically calculated to refer to aspects of Karabâş ‘Alî’s life, such as the age to which he lived, the date of his banishment to Lemnos, and the year in which he received his permission to spread the order from his Şâbâniyye predecessors. This discussion becomes downright eschatological by the end of all these mathematical exercises, predicting the arrival of the Mahdî in the year 1203 H. (1789). Even odder, İbrâhîm reports that Karabâş ‘Alî himself used to say these things. A measure of İbrâhîm’s literary knowledge of the history of Sufism might be inferred from the fact that he refers to Ibn al-‘Arabî’s great work, the Futûhât al-Makkiyyah, as the Futûhât-i Mawsulîyye (sic!) on 12b. Still, his strategy here is similar to that used by another Halveti hagiographer, Muhyi-yi Gülşeni, who linked the coming of the founder of the
Yet what made Karabâş ʿAlî a critical figure during the late seventeenth century was not so much his writings but the great influence he wielded over the general public on both sides of the Bosphorus. When he led Friday prayers at the mosque, anyone who did not arrive at least an hour early could not get inside as Karabâş ʿAlî’s preaching was so popular that it drew massive crowds. He was clearly a very effective public speaker and was able to bring the crowds to tears. Several sources attest to Sultan Mehmed IV’s affinity for his sermons, which attracted a good deal of negative attention in the political atmosphere of that period. After the Sultan remarked that he felt he should emulate the famous ascetic Sufi of the early Islamic period, İbrâhîm Edhem, and renounce his throne to go and live in the mountains, the Kadźadeli leader Vanî Mehmed Efendi successfully moved to have Karabâş ʿAlî banished to Lemnos.\[74\]

Still, one senses from the hagiography that relations between Karabâş ʿAlî and his successor Ünsî Hasan were not always perfect. When Karabâş ʿAlî explained the mathematical calculations predicting his coming in Ibn al-ʿArabî’s work, Ünsî Hasan used to ask him why he spoke like this. He invariably received the reply, “I know the power of

---

\[74\] Menâkıb-1 Ünsî, fols. 12a-b. This is corroborated by the account of ‘Abdurrahman Ābdî Paşa, a member of Mehmed IV’s court who generally leaned towards the Kadźadeli position of Vanî Mehmed Efendi; see Fahri Çetin Derin, Abdurrahman Abdî Paşa Vekayi’namesi: Tahil ve Metin Tenkidi (1058-1093/1648-1682) (Istanbul University: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Istanbul University, 1993), p. 420. I am indebted to Günhan Börekçi for the reference. Kerim Kara, after analyzing the various accounts, also comes to the conclusion that Karabâş ʿAlî’s exile had more to do with political concerns about his growing influence than the actual religious ideas he advanced; see Kerim Kara, pp. 87-89. See also the remarks of Çavuşoğlu, pp. 6-7.
Another point of tension can be ascertained in an event that occurred while Ünsî Hasan was still a disciple of the shaykh. When Karabâş ʿAlî suddenly requested his appearance, Ünsî Hasan was wearing a black turban. Since appearing in the shaykh’s presence wearing a black turban was a violation of the order’s rules, Ünsî Hasan tried to cover up his turban with a piece of white linen rather than removing and rewrapping his entire headgear with material of a different color. Karabâş ʿAlî saw through this ruse, however, and exposed what Ünsî Hasan had done. However, he was not angry with his follower but issued him a standing permission to come into his presence wearing a black turban if he so desired. But Karabâş ʿAlî did not stop there. He then granted Ünsî Hasan blanket permission to do as he wished, saying, “permission [is granted] to you, whatever you do in the tarikat, do it.”

Still, Ünsî Hasan’s subsequent warning to his own followers qualified this remark of his teacher.

The Sufi who does things that are not part of the tarikat is among the people of carnal passions, meaning, he adds any number of things connected with the passions of his/her carnal soul from his own self. Those who say, “This is also part of the path,” and those who omit some of the requirements like obedience, ascetic exercises, the names [of God], proper etiquette, and basic doctrine, which are required in the tarikat, and those who undertake action contrary to the şerîât and contrary to the tarikat like these things, are acting according to violent impetuosity and error (ḥzlân ve hasrân). On the day of judgment, they shall answer to the saints of God who are the masters of the tarikat. The road of those who follow their like departs to atheism and heresy. This person goes contrary to the path of God....Not to do things which are not part of the tarikat, and to be cautious of doing [such things] is a guide to finding perfection in the tarikat. And to do whatever is part of the tarikat is the source of the journey on the path [ayn-ı sülûk]. The poor one

---

75 Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fol. 15a.

76 Ibid., fol. 15b.
himself, whatever I do in the tarikat, I'll do it; I'm permitted [to do so] by God; it is not forbidden to me. Because permission was given to me. But I don't do anything that is not in the tarikat!77

The tension in Ünsî Hasan’s remarks is clear. While he might have been granted a blanket permission to act as he saw fit under the more liberal philosophy of his teacher, Karabâş ʿAlî, this was only because he never went outside the bounds of proper etiquette laid out by the order. It would not be a permission that he was willing to pass on to any of his followers!

This is made even more explicit by the events that followed Ünsî Hasan’s taking of permission to guide others from Karabâş ʿAlî and the beginning of his own career as a teaching Sufi. After being ordered to return to Istanbul to spread the teachings of the order, supposedly around the year 1075 H. (1664-65), Ünsî Hasan returned and settled in the ʿAcem Ağa mosque in the area of Ayasofya.78 He soon acquired a number of followers, some of whom were widely considered to be suitable to receive teaching privileges of their own. Nevertheless, Ünsî Hasan refused to grant any such privilege, which sparked a conflict with his own shaykh, who had different goals from those of some of his followers.

...[Ünsî Hasan’s] own contemporaries were astonished, thinking, “Why doesn’t Hasan Efendi produce a successor?” One day the Sufis said to Şeyh el-Hâc ʿAlî Efendi [Karabâş ʿAlî], “My lord, Ünsî Hasan Efendi is not producing a successor. What’s going on? His hardworking and suitable followers on the path are many. If you were to make contact, he would produce a successor and the order’s [members] would multiply.” So el-Hâc ʿAlî said to ʿAsâdâr ʿOsmân Efendi, “Go to Istanbul, and say to Hasan Efendi, along with the greeting, ‘Send forth the young one, send forth the young one’

77 Kelâm-ı Azîz, fols. 20b-21a. Elements of this argument also appear following the story of Karabâş ʿAlî’s granting this permission in Menâkîb-ı Ünsî, fol. 16a.

78 This mosque was originally the site of a church that was turned into a mosque in the year 1484, according to an inscription on the fountain in its courtyard in a neighborhood called Paşakapt. See Ayvansarâyi, p. 206. We have good reason to question the accuracy of Ünsî Hasan’s return to Istanbul: see n. 63 above.
(yavrû çikarsın).” So ʻOsmân Efendi came to Istanbul, expressed the greetings of the shaykh to Hasan Efendi, and said, “the shaykh said, ‘Send forth the young one, send forth the young one.’” Hasan Efendi then said, “Is it like their distinguished one, is it like their distinguished one (güzînleri gibi mı)?” So when ʻAsâdâr ʻOsmân Efendi came and spoke these words to el-Hâc ʻAlî Efendi, the shaykh again offered a prayer for Hasan Efendi. He said, “ʻUnsî Hasan Efendi is the most distinguished (mümtâz) of my successors; all of you are in need of him.”

We should leave aside the hagiographical aim of the anecdote for the moment, which is clearly to establish Ünsî Hasan’s credentials among a rather crowded field of candidates who could claim the right to be Karabâş ʻAlî’s successor, and examine the underlying tensions. During Karabâş ʻAlî’s time, the Halveti order was battling Kadîzâdeli elements under the leadership of Vani Mehmed Efendi. One suspects that the large numbers of successors produced by Karabâş ʻAlî were a response to this challenge, an attempt to spread the message and leadership of the order throughout Ottoman society in an attempt to counter the growing power and influence of Kadîzâdeli-inspired detractors of the Halvetis. Ünsî Hasan’s rejection of the means to reaching this end, despite the use of deferential language respectful to his teacher, was a challenge to the political aspects of the Halveti project during this period.

A large part of Ünsî Hasan’s reticence to anoint successors in great numbers probably lay in his own experiences on the path. Compared to many other Halveti leaders, he underwent a fairly rigorous period of training before he felt himself to be prepared and perfected. In a conversation he had with his followers, recorded by İbrâhîm el-Hâs in his Kelâm-1 ʻAzîz, the shaykh discussed his own training as a way of illustrating for his followers the amount of suffering and humility the journey could impose.

---

79 Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fols. 19b-20a.
For exoteric knowledge (îlm-i zâhir), I went through so much hardship and difficulty that it cannot be conveyed. Likewise, for esoteric knowledge (îlm-i bâtin), I was afflicted with so many troubles, misfortunes, hindrances and torments. It was such that I left off eating and drinking. I was constantly in a state of abstinence. I abandoned sleeping, and was occupied with utmost effort in my work, day and night. From time to time, I would get sleepy and fall asleep. I entered into a period of hardship, how many years I was in a period of hardship! I became accustomed to hardship; I began to expect it. At this point, I left hardship behind. I allowed my hair to grow out. I tied my hair to a ring attached to the ceiling with a string, and I used to attend to my work. When sleep came and my head nodded, that string used to pull my hair and my eyes would open. Many years I was in this state. I got accustomed to this. It was such that my head would be hanging by my hair and I would sleep comfortably.

Things reached a point at which Ünsî Hasan bought an arrow and propped it up in such a way that it would poke him if he fell asleep. But even this didn’t work out well over the long run because the place in which the arrow poked him became calloused! Despite his struggles, he was adamant in avoiding the assistance of others, convinced he must complete the path on his own.

...While in the ‘Acem Ağa mosque, I performed the devrân for twenty years. Seven days I went hungry. My students and dervishes and successors were many. The majority of them were wealthy. I never sought anything from them. It was such that I couldn’t stand upright to perform the prayers. I looked for small dried up things left by a mouse on the shelf of the room that I was in, but I couldn’t find any.80 And I never revealed this state to anyone. Above and beyond this I suffered so much privation that I remained one step short of extinction. God Most High granted us sustenance thereafter. I reached the secret of God in this way with so many privations and struggles. Now may you all employ complete perseverance with serious effort in finding union with God as well. But may you not boast or make claims to comprehension of critical understanding (da‘â-yî fehm-i mülâhâzâtîn

80 These remarks about food shortages and mice are perhaps knowing echoes of the hagiography of Şâbân-î Veli, as discussed in Chapter 2.
A person does not boast or make claims to speak for encouraging his own state. It is a warning [to you].

We learn a number of things from these remarks. The first is that Ünsî Hasan did not view his training as having been completed by his master, Karabâş ‘Alî. He continued to subject himself to numerous privations while serving in the ‘Acem Ağa mosque for years after having left his own shaykh’s service. In addition, he set himself apart from most of his wealthier protégés, who did not undergo anything resembling the same level of privation that he reserved for himself. A more potent criticism on this point occurs in the Menâkıb-ı Ünsî when İbrâhîm el-Hâs notes that whenever the Sufis under his master’s direction slacked off in their struggles along the path, he recited the story of his own privations, concluding with the remark, “And you say, ‘Let’s find the truth while staying comfortable’ (sizler râhatda olalm ve hakk bulalm dîrîsiz).” Finally, he made it clear that emphasizing one’s own struggles on the path for the purpose of self-promotion was an unacceptable violation of the rules of the path, closing the door to any misinterpretation or misuse of his own statement for the purposes of allowing his order’s followers to promote him or themselves in public.

Ünsî Hasan’s concerns about his followers extended beyond these issues, however. Echoing the frustrations expressed by his predecessor ‘Ömer el-Fu’âdî nearly a century
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81 The entire text of Ünsî Hasan’s admonitions regarding his own struggles can be found in Kelâm-ı ‘Azîz, fols. 30b-31b.

82 Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fol. 22b.

83 See also Kelâm-ı ‘Azîz, fols. 12b-13a, where the shaykh tells his followers that anyone who publicly claims to have attained closeness to God knows nothing because anyone who has achieved this knows better than to make it public. These types of rejection of the practices employed by his predecessor may indicate a distance and estrangement between the two that would explain why İbrâhîm was not so well-informed about some of the details of Karabâş ‘Alî’s life and career.
before, he warned his followers about the debased state of Sufism in their own time, and the caution they must exercise in assessing claims to mystical leadership. At the simplest level, the seeker on the path must avoid the shaykh who does not abstain from reprehensible or discouraged acts (makrûhât). Nevertheless, according to Ünsî Hasan himself, most of his contemporaries failed to do so.

Those who seek God need to have the greatest degree of fear of people who are the highwaymen [blocking the path]. For they are not recognizable by their countenance (sûret). You see him as an authoritative shaykh. But he is acquainted with so many lewd words of corruption and various forms of wickedness contrary to the law (ṣer'). He esteems the secret of God to pay close attention to carrying out the wish of the carnal soul (nefs-i hevâ) and to pay special concern to food and beverages while in seclusion and 40-day retreats. He says that this is what is called a “secret.” The people are deprived (mahrûmlar) of this secret. The people do not know what prayer, fasting, pious acts and obedience mean. By taking firm hold of the states of the experts of intoxication (erbâb-ı seker), and getting accustomed to heresy and unbelief, saying, “So-and-so shaykh acts like this, and so-and-so shaykh spoke like this,” they lead so many unfortunate ones with so many lying words tied to the carnal soul into error, and they go astray. Those who seek God think of him as among the people of God. They assume that the path is like this. They follow him. And their own souls are completely drawn to him....If they set out according to this state, on the day of judgment the situation will be dire. The state of the mystic who is close to these people will be ruined. It is necessary to avoid at all costs those who are like this. I did not speak of them before. But there is a danger to the order!

Having seen these critiques before, one might easily dismiss Ünsî Hasan’s comments as a standard warning or trope conveyed to all seekers on the path. Nevertheless, many of the teachings that İbrâhîm el-Hâs records demonstrate Ünsî Hasan’s obsession with insulating his followers from the corruptions of the outside world. At one point he commands that his

---

84 Ibid., fols. 6b-7a.

85 Ibid., fols. 8a-9a. See also fol. 23a, where after discussing the importance of a follower’s attentiveness to his shaykh, he remarks, “But under the headgear and cloak (tâc ve hr̤ka) there are so many debased people who claim to give guidance.”
followers try to spend as little time as possible in the company of non-dervishes and in particular to avoid the gatherings of commoners (āvâmm meclisi) as they will drag those who speak with them down to their level.\textsuperscript{86} In sum, Ünsî Hasan imposed some radical measures to physically insulate his followers from what he viewed as the rampant corruption of the world around them. This places him in contrast with Sufi shaykhs like those of the Nakşibendi order, who had developed over the course of the Timurid period the idea of “solitude within society” (khalvat dar anjûman).\textsuperscript{87}

Complicating matters is the fact that Ünsî Hasan’s early career was very much tied to the highest levels of politics in the Ottoman capital. İbrâhîm relates a story about Kara Mehmed Ağa, one of the çuhadars of Sultan Mehmed IV.\textsuperscript{88} One day, Kara Mehmed’s foot began to hurt to the point where he could not walk, and because the sultan considered him one of his most essential servants, he brought in a doctor to try every possible remedy to cure the man’s distress, to no avail. Finally, the sultan paid a visit to his sick follower and asked

\textsuperscript{86} The shaykh stressed this on two separate occasions to his followers, see Kelâm-i ʿAzîz, fols. 21b-22a and 27a-b.

\textsuperscript{87} This seemingly contradictory Persian phrase expressed the idea that Sufis should not refrain from participating in everyday life in their communities under the pretext of achieving proximity to God. Instead, their internal lives should reflect their closeness with God, while their external existences should be no different from those of their contemporaries; see Svat Soucek, \textit{A History of Inner Asia} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 138.

\textsuperscript{88} First appearing in the time of Sultan Mehmed Čelebi (d. 1421), the çuhadar was originally employed to carry the sultan’s rain gear, cloaks, and furs while he was on campaign. By the seventeenth century, he was a palace official extremely close to the sultan. Mehmed IV seemed to consider his çuhadars very important, as we know he promoted at least four of them to governorships of distant provinces near the frontiers of the empire after their palace service. This may perhaps explain the great concern that the sultan shows for his protégé. See İsmail Hakkı Uzuncaşıl, \textit{Osmanlı Devletinin Saray Teşkilâtı} (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1945), pp. 348-350.
if any of the treatments was helping. In response, Kara Mehmed asked him to bring a prominent mystic in the hopes that he might find a cure and suggested Karabâş ʿAlî as a candidate whom they both knew. Upon hearing of the sultan’s request for assistance, Karabâş ʿAlî declined to come personally, perhaps out of deference to the Sufi practice of keeping one’s distance from the ruling class.\(^9^9\) However, he did agree to send in his stead Ünsî Hasan, who proved to be a smashing success.

The aforementioned Kara Mehmed Ağa began to cry at the moment he saw Şeyh Hasan Efendi enter that sick çuhadar’s room. When he said, “My lord, I am unable to rise and honor you, forgive me,” Ünsî Hasan Efendi gave many consolations and good tidings to him, and said, “Don’t be sad and anxious; you’ll get better; stretch out your legs in front of me; it’s not forbidden.” So he stretched out his feet by some means in front of the shaykh. Şeyh Hasan Efendi read [the Qur’ân] over the çuhadar’s feet, and blew air on them, and recited the Fatiha. And he again offered his condolences and said, “God willing there won’t be a need to read again.” Just as the shaykh left through the door of the room, the pain left the çuhadar’s foot, and he was relieved. The next day he got up and began to walk around in the room. The following day strength came back to his foot, and he went outside and walked around.\(^9^0\)

Needless to say, Sultan Mehmed was grateful for the rapid recovery of his servant and offered Ünsî Hasan the prize of preaching in the imperial harem as a reward for his services. After insisting dutifully that the sultan secure the permission of Karabâş ʿAlî, the young shaykh agreed. For two years he preached there, and after his sermons the devrân and zikr

\(^{9^9}\) A brief outline of the controversies among Ottoman Sufis over the legitimacy of Sufi masters’ associating with the men of the state is given in Öngören, pp. 237-240. Some declared such association to be an unwarranted innovation, while others saw it as potentially beneficial provided it was done with certain motivations in mind. As implied by Sultan Mehmed IV’s reference to emulating the example of İbrâhîm Edhem previously, the duties of political rule and Sufism were widely assumed to be incompatible. For a brief sketch of the life and career of İbrâhîm Edhem, see Knysh, pp. 19-20.

\(^{9^0}\) Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fols. 17a-18a.
were performed. The eunuchs of the *hâs oda*, treasury (*hazine*), and pantry (*kilâr*) were reportedly among his followers, and Ýbrâhîm related this tale on their authority many years later, as they used to come to the tekke in Tophane to pay their respects.\(^{91}\)

It is difficult to judge the extent to which Ýnsî Hasan established his influence within palace circles, and one questions to what extent he could have had such an extensive impact during a period in which Vanî Mehmed Efendi and other Kadzadeli-influenced personalities had such a high stature in government.\(^{92}\) It is likely that Ýbrâhîm deliberately sought to exaggerate the impact and role of Ýnsî Hasan among the denizens of the imperial palace, along with the number of Ýnsî Hasan’s followers, in an attempt to establish the standard hagiographical trope of the saintly figure demonstrating his superior spiritual powers in the service of the ruler of the time. In fact, Muhyi-yi Gülşeni had portrayed Süleyman I’s encounter with Ýbrâhîm-i Gülşeni in a similar vein at the end of the sixteenth century.\(^{93}\) Regardless of the nature of his newfound connections, they did not prove to be strong enough to insulate him from the traumatic religio-political environment that marked the final decades of Mehmed IV’s reign.

---

\(^{91}\) Ibid., fol. 18b. For more on the responsibilities of the imperial personnel attached to the royal ward, royal treasury, and royal pantry, see Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devletinin Saray Teşkilâtı*, pp. 313-335.

\(^{92}\) This event would have occurred around 1664-65 according to Ýbrâhîm el-Hâs’s chronology, but given other considerations, it may not have occurred until the mid-1670s. See n. 63 above.

4.4 The Conflicts Between Ünsî Hasan and the Kadızâdeli Movement at the End of the Seventeenth Century

Ünsî Hasan’s somewhat paranoid outlook on the wider world is perhaps more understandable in light of his experiences while residing at the ʿAcem Ağa mosque in Istanbul. The hagiography makes it very clear that Ünsî Hasan was a target of the rank-and-file theological students (sühteler) who made up the ranks of the Kadjâdeli movement, and whose grievances reflected the stiff competition among a large number of religious preachers for a rather limited number of posts.⁹⁴ One of the biggest blows delivered to Ünsî Hasan’s life and career came from these censuring attacks, probably during the 1670s and 1680s. The word sühte, which İbrâhîm uses to describe these students, can be a catch-all term for a theological student, but can also connote a religious fanatic or bigot. This alternative meaning comes out clearly in the description of Ünsî Hasan’s conflict with these students.

In these times the people of censure (ehl-i inkâr) had multiplied in number in Istanbul. They seized the people of remembrance⁹⁵ by force, and they wished to forbid the remembrance of God in mosques, and ruin the mosques. They had astonishing insurrections. The sühtes in the ʿAcem Ağa mosque also began to interfere and assault Ünsî Hasan in this manner. As there was no possibility of creating a dispute with the shaykh on account of his being a virtuous person, they banded together in order to kill the shaykh and forbid the remembrance of God, and began to subject [the shaykh] to many cruelties and vexations. They left no calumny untried in their insulting of the shaykh and the order. And wouldn’t you know it, most of those sühtes were once pupils (Şâgîrdlar) of the shaykh.⁹⁶

---

⁹⁴ For information on the composition of the Kadjâdeli movement, and its role in the politics of the scholarly hierarchy during the seventeenth century, see Zilfi, Politics of Piety, esp. pp. 130-131 and 163-167, and also idem., “Discordant Revivalism,” pp. 266-268.

⁹⁵ The term ehl-i zikr here refers to Sufis who performed the vocal zikr publicly.

⁹⁶ Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fols. 22b-23a.
Most likely, the pupils referred to here were Ünsî Hasan’s students at the Ayasofya mosque before he gave up teaching in favor of pursuing his Sufi training. Disillusioned students from a previous era may have been seeking to punish him for abruptly abandoning them.97 Things continued to deteriorate, and the breaking point was reached one day when one of the fanatics confronted Ünsî Hasan and began to say nasty things that embarrassed him, and accused him of unbelief (küfr). After Ünsî Hasan attempted to read a verse from the Qur’an to advise him, the student only increased in insolence. The shaykh then lost his patience and responded, “How many negative words you say about us and our path! You censure the order and are cruel to the people of the path! And you say, ‘Let’s kill,’ well then, we won’t protect you!” The offending student suddenly dropped dead from the force of Ünsî Hasan’s outburst. Over the course of the next week, the other sühteş began to meet the same fate, suddenly dying on the road or in the market or in their rooms at the mosque. Notwithstanding the force of the divine intervention, the degree of passion that this conflict stirred even among the supposedly passive Sufi masters is evident from Ünsî Hasan’s lack of compassion for the dying students. One of the shaykh’s disciples, Kebâbî Ahmed Dede, recounted to İbrâhîm a terrifying experience he had when he tried to intercede on a dying sühteş’s behalf.

...[I] came to the shaykh and said, “My lord, over there a molla has fallen and is dying; please read a prayer for him.” The shaykh spoke to him in great anger, “Go and busy yourself with your work!” The aforementioned Ahmed Dede was shaking all over, his face went white, and he went away only with difficulty. The shaykh said, “I say let them die, let them not remain; this fool

97 In this case, the Turkish word șâgîrd must refer to the students that he had in his previous job as a teacher at the Ayasofya mosque, otherwise İbrâhîm would have employed the term mürid to refer to former would-be Sufis who turned against their master.
says ‘Please read a prayer for the dead!,’” and they were silent. The poor ones who were there knew then what had happened to the sūhtes. There would be no salvation [for them].

Within a week, the remainder of the fanatical students had died, often while carrying out their everyday activities in public, and the cells of the mosque in which they had resided were completely empty. The shaykh then sealed the episode by remarking, “Thanks be to God Most High that this mosque has been purified of the people of censure!”

This type of anti-Kadizadeli polemic is not unusual in Halveti hagiographical texts; indeed, it begins to occur as early as the last decades of the sixteenth century. Nevertheless, the vehemence of the denunciations issued against the renegade students and the vengeful attitude of the shaykh towards them are worthy of note.

Nor was the harassment limited to the denizens of the mosque in which Ünsî Hasan resided. İbrâhîm refers to the clients and followers of mysterious groups whom he calls the Altıparmak Oğulları and the Beyâzi Oğulları, who were perhaps janissary or mercenary elements spread throughout the city that had become powerful enough to effect the banishment of numerous Halveti leaders throughout the realm, including Ünsî Hasan’s own teacher, Karabaş ‘Ali Efendi. Some of these elements managed to manipulate the

---

98 Menâkıb-1 Ünsî, fols. 24b-25b.

99 See, for example, the divinely-ordained destruction of a noted anti-zikr and devrân zealot through the sinking of his boat described in the early influential Halveti hagiography by Yûsuf Sinâneddin b.Ya’kub, Tezkireti’l-Halvetiyye, fol. 35b.

100 Menâkıb-1 Ünsî, fol. 27a. The most prominent Kadizadeli leader of the era and spiritual advisor to Sultan Mehmed IV, Vanî Mehmed Efendi, had Karabâş ‘Ali Efendi exiled from Istanbul for four years during the 1670s, supposedly on account of the influence of his preaching on the sultan. See Derin, “Abdurrahman Abdi Paşa Vekayi’namesi,” p. 420.
kâ’immakâm (governor) of Istanbul, Kara Hasanoğlu Mustafa Paşa, into issuing an order for the banishment of Ünsî Hasan, as well. But the unwary kâ’immakâm soon found that he could not sleep at night, for whenever he laid his head down on the pillow, he would see it erupt into flame around his head. Convening an emergency meeting the next day of his household and followers, he implored them for their ideas on the meaning of this inauspicious event. Among them was one of the followers of Ünsî Hasan, who correctly diagnosed the source of the problem. In this way, Ünsî Hasan managed to avoid banishment, unlike so many of his colleagues.

Nevertheless, Mustafa Paşa’s eventual role in the removal of Ünsî Hasan from the ‘Acem Ağa mosque to the Aydınoğlu Tekke outside the city walls in the aftermath of the failed 1683 Ottoman siege of Vienna may suggest a desire to marginalize a source of controversy during that period. When the position at the lodge was left vacant after its previous occupant had lost his mental faculties, the kâ’immakâm turned to Ünsî Hasan to replace him. However, when Mustafa Paşa sent him an imperial order appointing him to the open position, Ünsî Hasan politely declined, saying he had stayed in the ‘Acem Ağa mosque for twenty years, was happy where he was, and didn’t see going to another place as suitable. Mustafa persisted, sending the order once again with a person renowned for his powers of eloquence and persuasion. But the shaykh rejected the order once more, this time somewhat more firmly. As a result, Mustafa Paşa began to get worried. At that moment, an official, referred to in the hagiography as a vezirağa by the name of Kadioğlu Mustafa, came forward and offered to make a third attempt to get the shaykh to accept the appointment. His offer was quickly accepted, and when he came to the shaykh, he placed the order before him.
[He said.] “The world-protecting sultan commands you to take over that lodge,” and he sat down. When the shaykh did not accept, as he had not from the beginning, Mustafa Âغا said, “Efendi, Efendi, is there obedience to those in authority (ülül-emr)?” The shaykh said that there was. He said, “If there is obedience to the highest command, then you’ll accept the lodge.” The shaykh smiled and said, “let me accept both you and the lodge,” and he took the [text of] the order and put it at his side.

Gaining the shaykh’s acceptance cost the kâ’immakâm a follower shortly thereafter, as Kadıoğlu Mustafa Âğa soon followed the shaykh to the Aydınoğlu Tekke. After completing his training with the shaykh, he was sent to the small town in the vicinity of Kastamonu from which he came and died there after a period of teaching. Still, one can’t help but feel that the kâ’immakâm breathed a sigh of relief to have the situation finally resolved. The fact that Kadıoğlu Mustafa had to invoke the name of the sultan himself to goad the shaykh into accepting his position overshadows the shaykh’s recognition of the emissary as a future follower as the argument that finally decided the matter.

These bitter conflicts, which clearly put the life of Ünsî Hasan and his followers in danger and represented a constant source of harassment, would come to have a decisive impact upon his psychological outlook. Indeed, we might trace his austere and intolerant manner towards his followers to the events of this period. Once, while he and his fellow dervishes were sitting with the shaykh, İbrâhîm recorded the following command of his master:

May [all of] you never ask a question of anyone. Because to ask questions makes it clear that you are censuring them. A Sufi who has report of this from you, he too shall find a share in it. Let him ask a question to shame [you]...This group that busies itself with the secrets of God, their deeds are secret in nature. And their secrets are the secret of God. But there is another group as well who apply themselves diligently to censuring. They are

---

101 For the full anecdote, see Menâktb-ı Ünsî, fols. 29b-32a.
insistent in the vanity of impertinence. They are forsaken from the tasting of God the Guider. He who censures one of the friends of God Most High, his worst tortures are such that not a thing is given to him of the grace and favor give to that individual....Those who insist on censuring and asking questions, they are far from the secret of God.  

It is easy to guess who the “other group” is, and it is remarkable that Ünsî Hasan banned his followers from making any type of inquiry into doctrinal issues as a response! In another conversation the shaykh had with his followers, he forbade the practice of the Halveti semâ and devrân if any Kadızâdeli-type people were present, insisting that the rituals could not begin until they were thrown out of the mosque or lodge where it was taking place.

The shaykh’s problems with those who censured and persecuted the Halveti order and its followers were not limited to renegade sühtes, however. In at least one case, one of his own followers turned against him. Despite an apparent reconciliation between the two men late in life, it was still a situation about which the shaykh felt very defensive.

There was a kisve-wearing Sufi by the name of Ahmed Dede among the lieutenants (münlâzimler) of the shaykh. He used to do auctioneering (dellâllk) in the marketplace. He used to sit around with the people of censure most of the time. Due to that, he used to make all kinds of harassment without cause for the shaykh, and annoy him at every moment. The shaykh used to bear this, and even gave him permission. He acted like this for thirty years; for this reason, the Sufis didn’t look kindly on him. The shaykh’s older Sufis used to say about the aforementioned wearer of the kisve that Ahmed requested the kisve from the shaykh for a long time, but the shaykh didn’t give it. In the end, he hesitated on account of the poor ones

---

102 İbrâhîm el-Hâs, Kelâm-ı Aziz, fols. 25b-26a.

103 Ibid., fols. 52b-53a.

104 Meaning one who wore the tassel indicating a certain rank in the Halveti order conferred upon him by his shaykh, as discussed previously.
This probably refers to the hesitation Ünsî Hasan felt about anointing successors to perpetuate the order, as noted above, and may imply that Ahmed Dede’s motivation for turning on his former master was the latter’s lack of acceptance. After a period of time, Ahmed fell into censure. He began to interfere with God’s saints and oppose their pure speech. He busied himself with auctioneering once more. But he never removed the tassel from his head. And he came to the shaykh on very rare occasions.

İbrâhîm’s misguided attempt to ask Ünsî Hasan about his rationale for granting a tassel to this person led to a reprimand, as we have seen. Still, it also indicates that Sufis exposed to the pressures of anti-Sufi propagandists, who seem to have been especially influential amongst the classes involved in trade and the market, were often caught in the middle of the religious conflicts that characterized Ottoman life during this period. Paul Rycaut, an English observer of Ottoman society during the latter half of the seventeenth century, suggested that the Kadîzâdeli “sect,” as he called it, was “...for most part Tradesmen, whose sedentary life affords opportunity and nutriment to a Melancholly, and distempred fancy.”

---

105 This probably refers to the hesitation Ünsî Hasan felt about anointing successors to perpetuate the order, as noted above, and may imply that Ahmed Dede’s motivation for turning on his former master was the latter’s lack of acceptance.

106 Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fols. 102a-b.

107 Paul Rycaut, The Present State of the Ottoman Empire (New York: Arno Press & The New York Times, 1971), pp. 130-131. One must exercise caution in using Rycaut as a source due to the effects of seventeenth-century English politics and government upon his treatise. In this case specifically, the way in which he presents the Kadîzâdeli movement owes a good deal to his dislike of the Puritans who had overthrown the royal house in his native England. A good introduction to the problems inherent in Rycaut’s work can be found in Linda T. Darling, “Ottoman Politics through British Eyes: Paul Rycaut’s ‘The Present State of the Ottoman Empire’,” Journal of World History 5: 1 (1994), pp. 71-97. See esp. pp. 91-94, where she sums up Rycaut’s work as exploiting the Ottoman system as a way of providing a “negative ideal” of absolutism that the British system should not emulate. While Darling does not discuss the religious aspects of Rycaut’s work, it is clear that he sees in the Kadîzâdeli partisans echoes of the Puritan religious radicals who played a big role in the chaos of the English Civil War and the failure of the Commonwealth; see pp. 76-78 in particular.
Ahmed Dede’s career as an auctioneer would have placed him squarely in one of the strongest centers of anti-Sufi polemic on a daily basis. His ambivalent relationship with his shaykh, whereby his shaykh tolerated his excesses while Ahmed occasionally snuck back to visit him and refused to relinquish the very symbol of his attachment to the Halveti order, may be emblematic of the plight of ordinary subjects caught in the middle of an intractable political dilemma.

Ünsî Hasan’s experience suggests a promising Sufi career that was partially derailed by an ambiguous relationship with the founder of his branch of the Halveti order, combined with the escalation of anti-Sufi rhetoric and actions during the ascendancy of Vanî Mehmed Efendi, religious advisor to Sultan Mehmed IV. While he was able to ride out the political storm in the end, he was displaced from his preferred position in old Istanbul to a new, unfamiliar area in its northernmost suburbs. The experience seems to have left a scar on his psyche and a deep suspicion of both the outside world and even his own followers. Ünsî Hasan’s experiences during the remainder of his career in Tophane continued to illustrate the shaykh’s troubled relations with others.

4.5 Ünsî Hasan’s Relations with his Followers and Ottoman Statesmen at the Aydmoğlu Tekke in Tophane

Despite the adverse circumstances in which Ünsî Hasan’s career developed over the course of the first 40 years of his life, he clearly did not lose all of his contacts with circles of power in the capital. Following the decline of the Kadžâdelis and their supporters in the aftermath of the siege of Vienna, Ünsî Hasan and other Halveti shaykhs regained a measure of stability and respect that had been threatened in previous decades.
İbrâhîm personally witnessed the development of Ünsî Hasan’s relationship with one of the early grand viziers of Sultan Ahmed III, Çorlulu ʿAlî Paşa (d. 1710). Çorlulu ʿAlî first came to prominence in the palace hierarchy when he reached the rank of silâhdâr under Sultan Mustafa II in 1700 (1112 H.). Three years later, married the ruler’s daughter, Emine Sultan. Before Sultan Ahmed III promoted him to the rank of grand vizier in 1706, he served as governor of Aleppo and Damascus. He went on to serve four years and three months as grand vizier until his deposition and subsequent death in June 1710, building a mosque that was named after him, along with a theological college (medrese), soup-kitchen, fountains, a library, and other public works.

According to İbrâhîm, Çorlulu ʿAlî Paşa and his retinue were attracted to the shaykh, and made attempts to secure his goodwill. Still, once Çorlulu ʿAlî Paşa became grand vizier, Ünsî Hasan chose to keep his distance and limit the extent to which he would accept favors from him. When ʿAlî Paşa tried to invite him for a meeting, Ünsî Hasan complained of an injured foot as a way of avoiding the obligation. Not taking the hint, the Paşa insisted on coming to the lodge himself, which triggered a firmer warning from the shaykh.

The shaykh forbade it, saying, “He is an agent (vekîl) of the ruler. To be close friends with the poor ones doesn’t seem proper. Let him be kind and do us a favor, and let him excuse us. We pray for him always.” The grand vizier said, “Our request was to speak with him, at least let him accept our gifts.” He sent many purses of money and gifts to the shaykh and set aside a daily stipend of 35 akçes from the Istanbul customs revenue. They brought the berât for the stipend, the gifts, and the purses of money to the shaykh.

---


109 In addition to the information found in the Sicill-i ʿOsmânî, details of Çorlulu ʿAlî Paşa’s life can be gleaned from the entry describing the mosque that he built in the old Darbâne quarter while he was grand vizier in 1707 or 1708; see Ayvansarâyî, p. 120. One of the inscriptions on the mosque dedicates its use to ecstatic Sufis (ehl-i ʿâşk).
The shaykh accepted the gifts and purses, but he did not accept the stipend, and he sent the berât back.¹¹⁰

Ünsî Hasan’s ethical practice in dealing with these gifts from a member of the ruling class is interesting. It was considered acceptable to take cash and movable gifts, probably because they could be immediately disbursed for the support of the impoverished members of the tekke and the neighborhood who needed help, which was one of the important roles Halveti shaykhs like Ünsî Hasan were supposed to play in their society. However, the shaykh would have nothing to do with a government-disbursed stipend from the customs revenues. Ünsî Hasan may have viewed dependence on state revenues as contrary to the philosophy of the Halveti order. However, the fate of the rejected berât, which never made it back to its issuers, suggests another, more secular reason for the shaykh’s suspicions.

While that man was bringing the berât back, the mother-in-law of the shaykh came out of the harem gate and said, “Bring that berât and give it [to me]; we’ll take it,” and took it from the man’s hand. She said, “If anyone asks about it, we’ll answer [for it].” They used to take his salary from the customs revenue every month via the harem. The shaykh never used to take anything from his stipend. They used to take his stipend from the harem and spend it on their own affairs. The shaykh ordered and admonished the poor ones just before his death, “This stipend belongs to us; when it goes vacant, please, none of you accept anything from it; it is state property (mîrî); let it go to the state treasury once more.”¹¹¹

While the shaykh, perhaps grudgingly, accepted his mother-in-law’s ploy in assisting his followers by diverting the money through the imperial harem, he did not want any part of it himself and demanded that it revert to the treasury upon his death rather than be tied to the order. Such behavior suggests that Ünsî Hasan was deeply suspicious of any involvement

---

¹¹⁰ Menâḵtb-i Ünsî, fol. 62a.

¹¹¹ Ibid., fols. 62a-b.
in the finances of the state, and preferred to keep it at arm’s length. Perhaps more importantly, he was even more suspicious of his followers’ becoming dependent on state revenues and positions, and sought to prevent this from occurring outside of this one instance. Such thinking is no surprise, given Ünsî Hasan’s insistence on asceticism and the Halveti tendency to break worldly ties. Nevertheless, Ünsî Hasan’s mother-in-law is an equally interesting figure in this regard as she refused to obey the shaykh’s orders and insisted that the money not go to waste. Her behavior suggests that in the economic context of early eighteenth-century Istanbul, a blanket prohibition on all government-sponsored salaries was not viewed as a realistic option by many of the shaykh’s followers, despite his admonitions. In addition, we must not dismiss out of hand the possibility that İbrâhîm sought to explain away an embarrassing element of his shaykh’s history that did not fit in well with the philosophy of the order as a whole.

Çorlûlû ‘Alî Paşa did not limit his gift-giving to this one occasion, in any case. At the instigation of his seal-bearer (mühûrdâr), a strong supporter of the shaykh by the name of Kîrîmî ʿAbdülnebî Ağa, he also renovated the harem of the Aydınoğlu Tekke. Nevertheless, trouble loomed on the horizon, as Çorlûlû ‘Alî Paşa was deposed from the grand vizierate in 1710. After an abortive attempt to send him to administer the urban center of Kefe, he was imprisoned on the island of Lesbos, and the sultan then demanded that he pay 2000 purses of gold (kese). After failing to remit the desired amount, he was executed some years later. While Çorlûlû ‘Alî undertook serious attempts to reform the

---


113 For a brief description of the machinations of Çorlûlû ʿAlî Paşa’s enemies, both within the palace and among the foreign ambassadors agitating for Ottoman
Ottoman army, improve the condition of the Ottoman navy, and reduce some of the drain on the state treasury during this era, conventional wisdom holds that Sultan Ahmed III was displeased by his grand vizier’s unwillingness to take advantage of the War of the Spanish Succession to make an expedition to retake the Morea from the Venetians and his unwillingness to support the Swedish King Charles XII in his struggle with the Russians.114

In the end, Çorlûlû ‘Ali’s hapless follower would suffer the consequences of his dismissal as well. Despite his actions in support of the tekke, and perhaps recognizing the potential dangers threatening his follower’s future, the shaykh continually warned Kîrîmî ‘Abdûlnebî that his desires were getting in the way of his advancement on the path, and that he should abandon his desires and concentrate his efforts. In the aftermath of his master’s dismissal, both ‘Abdûlnebî and the head treasurer (hazinedar) were arrested, probably to recoup the resources amassed by their master during his tenure in office. ‘Abdûlnebî suffered all kinds of interrogations and tortures until his questioners finally accepted that he was not guilty, and released him. He promptly went to the shaykh, and they met for several hours along with his other followers. Afterward, İbrâhîm and his companions asked about the secret reason behind the shaykh’s repeated warnings to curb his desires. ‘Abdûlnebî’s involvement in bailing out the Swedish monarch Charles XII’s failed campaign against the Russians, see Akdes Nimet Kurat, Prut Seferi ve Bartişî 1123 (1711) (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1951), v. 1, pp. 136-139.

114 The entry for Çorlûlû ‘Ali Paşa in the Sicill-i ‘Osmânî does not explain the reasons for his dismissal from the grand vizierate, but a basic analysis of his life and career can be found in EI², v. 1, p. 394. For the diplomatic events of this period told from an exclusively European perspective, see the extended discussion in volume III of David Jayne Hill, A History of Diplomacy in the International Development of Europe (London: Longman’s, Green and Co., 1914).
By this, ʿAbdülnebi means the ability to turn base substances into gold or other valuable metals by some means. The supposed power of great shaykhs to do these kinds of things had often led to trouble in other cases, as evidenced by the fate of the Nakşbendî shaykh ʿAzîz Mahmûd of Rûmiye, who was executed in Diyarbekir by Sultan Murad IV on his return from the Baghdad campaign of 1638, partially as a result of the sultan’s suspicions about the political potential of this supposed ability. However, this was probably only a pretext as the shaykh’s potential political power in the region was probably more suspect from Murad IV’s standpoint. See Martin van Bruinessen and Hendrik Boeschoten, ed., Evliya Çelebi in Diyarbekir (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988), pp. 50-52 and 185-191. See also the substantially more detailed analysis of this event in Martin van Bruinessen, “The Naqshbandî Order in 17th-Century Kurdistan,” in Naqshbandis: Cheminements et situation actuelle d’un ordre mystique musulman, pp. 340-353 and especially pp. 345-348, where Bruinessen links the narrative of the sultan’s having eaten little gold pills provided by the shaykh and his follower to aspects of the wahdat al-wujûd (oneness of being) doctrine of the great 13th-century mystic Ibn al-ʿArabî.

Despite the shaykh’s admonitions, it took the threat of prison and execution to finally force ʿAbdülnebi’s repentance. The shaykh appeared to him in a dream and demanded that he make the choice between repentance and death, and upon pledging repentance, he was suddenly released the following day. The story probably reflects the difficulties Çorlûlû ʿAlî Paşa and his followers faced in trying to cut back state finances without alienating others in answer is reflective of the political and economic environment in which state functionaries lived at the time.

He said, “In the beginning, when I first pledged allegiance to the shaykh, I was a seeker of alchemy (kîmyâ). In my depths, I used to seek out alchemy more than the shaykh, because I had heard that they said alchemy was among the miracles of the saints of God. I used to know that the shaykh was someone who could produce things at will (mutasarrîf), my desire was alchemy, by way of becoming a Sufi follower (miinîh)...One day I was sitting alone with the shaykh, and he said, ʿAbdülnebi, a member of the order must be purified of the world and its wishes....Now, either you repent of alchemy, or you’ll be killed. Because this is the path of God, there is no desire other than God. What is this alchemy stuff anyway? God save us!”

Despite the shaykh’s admonitions, it took the threat of prison and execution to finally force ʿAbdülnebi’s repentance. The shaykh appeared to him in a dream and demanded that he make the choice between repentance and death, and upon pledging repentance, he was suddenly released the following day. The story probably reflects the difficulties Çorlûlû ʿAlî Paşa and his followers faced in trying to cut back state finances without alienating others in

115 By this, ʿAbdülnebi means the ability to turn base substances into gold or other valuable metals by some means. The supposed power of great shaykhs to do these kinds of things had often led to trouble in other cases, as evidenced by the fate of the Nakşbendî shaykh ʿAzîz Mahmûd of Rûmiye, who was executed in Diyarbekir by Sultan Murad IV on his return from the Baghdad campaign of 1638, partially as a result of the sultan’s suspicions about the political potential of this supposed ability. However, this was probably only a pretext as the shaykh’s potential political power in the region was probably more suspect from Murad IV’s standpoint. See Martin van Bruinessen and Hendrik Boeschoten, ed., Evliya Çelebi in Diyarbekir (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988), pp. 50-52 and 185-191. See also the substantially more detailed analysis of this event in Martin van Bruinessen, “The Naqshbandî Order in 17th-Century Kurdistan,” in Naqshbandis: Cheminements et situation actuelle d’un ordre mystique musulman, pp. 340-353 and especially pp. 345-348, where Bruinessen links the narrative of the sultan’s having eaten little gold pills provided by the shaykh and his follower to aspects of the wahdat al-wujûd (oneness of being) doctrine of the great 13th-century mystic Ibn al-ʿArabî.

116 Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fols. 44b-45b.
the structure of power, followed by the unrealistic request of the sultan, aimed at having an excuse to execute a grand vizier he had come to dislike intensely.\textsuperscript{117}

The dangers in being involved in government service, as illustrated by these events, may also explain why the shaykh sought to avoid long-term entanglements with government finances. Still, it is also interesting to note that he does not automatically rise to the defense of his followers against their oppressors in the government, unlike many earlier Halveti leaders. While ʿAbdülnebî Ağa managed to escape with his life, other followers of the shaykh were not so lucky. During the war with the Russians in 1711, the grand vizier’s kethûdâ, ʿOsmân Ağa, was suspected of some offense against the state and imprisoned by Sultan Ahmed III in a place called the Kavâk fortress. He sent one of his retinue, a moneychanger from the Istanbul customs bureau by the name of Ahmed Efendi, who lived near the Aydınıoğlu Tekke, with 200 gold pieces and a request that shaykh Ünsî Hasan inform him of his fate by means of a dream (istihâre).\textsuperscript{118} But when Ahmed Efendi arrived and explained the situation, the shaykh attempted to avoid involving himself in the issue.

As for the shaykh, being completely secretive, he did not say anything outside of the speech of the şerîʻat.\textsuperscript{119} He said, “We are not among the masters of this matter that you speak of; you give these gold pieces back to their owner.” When Ahmed Efendi pressed his face to the blessed noble foot of the shaykh, and insisted and pleaded saying, “You must do an istihâre,” the shaykh said, under duress, “Ahmed Efendi, I cannot do an istihâre. But

\textsuperscript{117} Kurat, v. 1, p. 139.

\textsuperscript{118} ʿIstihâre involves lying down to sleep after offering the proper prayers in the hope that God will grant guidance by means of a dream. If the person performing the act is not a qualified shaykh, then any visions obtained must subsequently be interpreted by someone who is knowledgeable.

\textsuperscript{119} Meaning he did not say anything that could be construed as esoteric or lying outside of the bounds of basic orthodoxy.
let’s give permission to you; you do an *istihâre*, and I’ll interpret it. Let these gold coins stay with you, and whatever I say, you act accordingly,” and he submitted the gold to Ahmed Efendi.\(^{120}\)

On account of his experiences with the Kâditzâdelis, Ünsî Hasan was clearly wary of performing esoteric rituals for this outsider. By forcing him to perform the ritual, rather than doing it himself, Ünsî Hasan was protecting himself from potential accusations should his predictions not generate the response his client was seeking. In light of the end result, this was probably a wise decision. Ahmed Efendi proved unable to sleep until morning, when he dozed off only briefly just before morning prayers. He had a vision in which a stone was being pulled up to the dome of a high mosque while many people stood and watched. Just as the stone neared the top of the mosque, it suddenly fell to earth with a deafening crash, which startled him out of his sleep. At first, he tried to hide this from the shaykh on the grounds that he had not slept enough to complete the *istihâre* process. But Ünsî Hasan would have none of this and repeated his dream to him, explaining that there was nothing the doomed *kethüdâ* could do, and that he should prepare for the afterlife by distributing his gold to the poor. Ahmed Efendi departed, weeping piteously.\(^{121}\) As usual, İbrâhîm felt the need to question his master in regard to his actions.

One or two days later I said to the shaykh under some pretext, “My lord, why did you give the gold back?” He said, “Osmân Kethüdâ will be killed; his wealth belongs to the state revenue. Or should I be a thief?” After several days, they brought ʿOsmân Ağa and executed him in the palace square.\(^{122}\)

---

\(^{120}\) *Menâkıb-i Ünsî*, fol. 40b.

\(^{121}\) Ibid., fols. 41a-42b.

\(^{122}\) Ibid., fol. 42b.
Once again, we see that Ünsî Hasan insisted on following the law to the letter, both in the religious and secular senses. He did not want to give any powerful political figure an opportunity to investigate or challenge his legitimacy. In addition, Ünsî Hasan was probably aware of the growing discomfiture among the ruling class at the conclusion of the Pruth campaign of 1711 that the Ottomans undertook against the Russians under Peter the Great. 'Osmân Kethûdâ had played a critical role in persuading the grand vizier Baltact Mehmed Paşa to allow the Russian army to escape destruction as a way of advancing his own ambitions, and this shortly came to be viewed as a disastrous missed opportunity.\footnote{For an analysis of 'Osmân’s actions during the negotiations with the Russians, and a critical assessment of his personality and ambitions, see Kurat, v. 1, pp. 150-152, and v. 2, pp. 516-517 and 543-544. Kurat places responsibility for the negative result of the campaign directly upon 'Osmân, labeling him the worst kind of “careerist” in the palace hierarchy despite being a brilliant tactician.}

Knowing a losing bet when he saw one, Ünsî Hasan wisely dismissed the attempt to secure his intervention in 'Osmân’s fate, and İbrâhîm stressed the shaykh’s foresight in this matter.

One must also not discount the possibility that Ünsî Hasan’s actions reflect a pre-modern form of patriotism, a way of setting an example toward maintaining the financial support of the Ottoman state in its conflicts with non-Muslim powers. The campaign that succeeded in repulsing Peter the Great’s invasion of the Ottoman Empire in 1711, despite the Ottomans’ inability to capitalize on their success, forms the backdrop for another anecdote involving the shaykh’s relations with the men in power. The aforementioned 'Osmân Kethûdâ’s immediate superior was the grand vizier Baltact Gazi Mehmed Paşa, who also reportedly attempted to meet with the shaykh after being assigned to defend the empire against the invading Russian army. Just as he had with his predecessor Çorlûlû 'Alî Paşa,
the shaykh refused to meet with him, offering a similar set of excuses. Unlike his predecessor, however, Baltacı Mehmed Paşa would not be so easily deterred from his goal.

He sent word [to the shaykh] and said, “We’ll go to the shaykh ourselves; let them leave the door ajar at night.” The shaykh stated the excuse more firmly. That man came once more and told the vizier the excuse of the shaykh. Mehmed Paşa said, “I am also among the children of the poor ones of the order; our coming to them is not forbidden; I’ll go. There isn’t a single reason to forbid it; I’ll definitely go!” That night, the aforementioned [Mehmed Paşa] came to the lodge with two çuhadars in disguise after the evening prayers. When the grand vizier met with the shaykh, he showed great humility and kissed the blessed knee and sat with the proper etiquette in his presence.\textsuperscript{124} He said, “My father was among the shaykhs of the Halveti path; he used to wear a black turban, and he used to wear a white sash upon him like you.”\textsuperscript{125}

It is certainly conceivable that Baltacı Mehmed Paşa had Halveti connections in his immediate family. He was originally from Kastamonu, home to the founders of the Şâbânîyye branch of the order; his family’s extended household went by the name of ʿOsmânc.\textsuperscript{126} He may have sought out Ünsî Hasan on the basis of family connections, both in Kastamonu and in Istanbul. Baltacı Mehmed Paşa had good reason to be nervous about the coming campaign. He had made his way into palace circles by means of a good singing voice, which attracted him to music, and he also served as a caller to prayer. He was first

\textsuperscript{124} The devotees and followers of the shaykh always performed a ritual whereby they would bend down to kiss the shaykh’s knee upon opening a formal conversation with him or upon leaving his presence after he had given them advice or help. İbrâhîm stresses this throughout the hagiography, which suggests that part of the purpose of his work is to drill into its readers and hearers the proper etiquette and conduct for meeting with Halveti shaykhs like his master. Having a grand vizier like Baltacı Mehmed Paşa respect these rules allows İbrâhîm to demonstrate that even the most powerful members of society must still obey the basic rules of etiquette in dealing with the Sufi masters.

\textsuperscript{125} Menâktb-i Ünsî, fols. 63a-b.

\textsuperscript{126} Sicill-i ʿOsmânî, v. 4, p. 208.
appointed to the scribal service of the palace in 1115 H. (1703), and after serving in several other positions, he was named grand vizier for the first time three years later. He did not serve long in this position, however, but was dismissed and exiled to Chios less than a year later. Through the intercession of the palace scribe Nevşehirli İbrâhîm Paşa, he was appointed governor of Erzerum, and later served as governor of Aleppo as well. He became grand vizier just before the Russian invasion began, and went out as commander-in-chief of the army to face them.127

Baltacı Mehmed Paşa’s reason for coming was simple: he wanted to know what the future held in store for him. He asked Ünsî Hasan to help him in the coming campaign with his spiritual powers. Despite the flouting of his commands not to come, the shaykh was won over and proceeded to explain to Baltacı Mehmed the exact day on which he would inflict defeat upon the Russian army, the manner in which the two sides would negotiate a treaty, and how many years the resulting peace would last. The new grand vizier would go on to defeat the Russians, just as the shaykh had predicted. Interestingly enough, İbrâhîm el-Hâs was not a direct witness to these events. They became known because some women Sufis who happened to be present at the lodge overheard the conversation between the shaykh and the grand vizier. By the following morning, the story had spread among the shaykh’s followers. They had to warn the women not to spread the story outside of the members of the lodge and to promise to keep it secret until after the shaykh’s death.128

127 Ibid., v. 4, pp. 208-209.
128 Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fols. 63b-64a.
Unfortunately, the shaykh did not get much in return for his help, despite the success of his powerful protégé in defeating the Russian tsar and his army. Shortly after his triumphant return, he was once again dismissed from office, and bounced around from Lesbos to Lemnos, where he died one year later, leaving behind a daughter who later married into a high-ranking family in the palace scribal service. Subsequent Ottoman historians suggested that his allowing Peter the Great and his army to slip away had something to do with his fate. On these issues, however, the hagiography is silent. The failure of Baltacı Mehmed to capitalize on his victory over the Russians is a contentious issue in Ottoman historiography to this day, but İbrâhîm presents his shaykh’s involvement in the event as setting up a smashing success for the short-lived grand vizier.

Ünsî Hasan had excellent relations with a third grand vizier during the reign of Sultan Ahmed III. After a disastrous earthquake that occurred sometime during the last five years of the shaykh’s life, much of the Aydınoğlu Tekke lay in ruins and the shaykh was forced temporarily to move out of the complex. Fortunately for the lodge and its followers, Ahmed III’s grand vizier and son-in-law, Nevşehirli İbrâhîm Paşa (d. 1730), agreed to provide the

---

129 Sicill-i ʿOsmānî, v. 4, p. 209.

130 For a recent example of the “missed opportunity” mentality that characterizes much of modern Turkish historiography on the issue, see M. Alaaddin Yalçınkaya, “The Eighteenth Century: A Period of Reform, Change, and Diplomacy (1703-1789),” The Turks, ed. Hasan Celal Güzel, et al. (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Press, 2002), v. 4, pp. 93-95. Rumors from that time that Baltacı Mehmed had been bribed by the Russians and seduced by the Tsarina Catherine continue to dog the historical memory of this grand vizier; see for example Metin Kunt, “Siyasal Tarih (1600-1789),” Türkiye Tarihi: (Osmanlı Devleti 1600-1908), ed. Sina Akşin (İstanbul: Çem Yayınevi, 1988), v. 3, pp. 49-50. Turkish friends have informed me that even in modern times, references to the weakness of Baltacı Mehmed persist in the form of unkind references to Turks who chase after Russian prostitutes.
resources necessary to rebuild the structure.\textsuperscript{131} As his envoy, he sent a \textit{müderris} (teacher) by the name of Pîrizâde Efendi. On account of his respectful demeanor and his personal attention to his wishes, Ünsî Hasan took a liking to the young man. He once called him back for last-second instructions after Pîrizâde Efendi saddled up his horse and prepared his retinue to depart, an annoyance that he took with good humor and humility. After witnessing the noble behavior of the grand vizier’s liaison that day, Ünsî Hasan predicted to his followers that since Pîrizâde had sat at his feet as he lay on his mattress, he would one day become the leader of the scholars.\textsuperscript{132} Sure enough, many years after the shaykh died, Pîrizâde became \textit{şeyhülislâm} for 13 months, from May of 1745 to June of 1746, after a distinguished career as the sultan’s prayer leader and filling the position of both the Rumeli and Anadolu \textit{kaz’asker} (chief military judge). Unfortunately, he grew ill and was forced to resign from the post, and after completing the pilgrimage to Mecca, he died in 1749.\textsuperscript{133} He has also left records of his presence in Istanbul preceding his appointment as \textit{şeyhülislâm} in

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{131} We know that this event occurred late in the shaykh’s life because İbrâhîm Paşa did not become grand vizier until 1718, and the shaykh died in 1723; see \textit{Sicill-i Osmanlı}, v. 1, pp. 123-124 for the life and career of the grand vizier. The biography mentions that İbrâhîm was a patron of Sufi shaykhs and ʻulema throughout his career. The hagiography also refers to the advanced age of the shaykh, and his inability to do much but lie on a sort of mattress (\textit{döşek}) while meeting with the grand vizier’s representative; see \textit{Menâktb-i Ünsî}, fols. 75a-b.

\textsuperscript{132} \textit{Menâktb-i Ünsî}, fol. 75b.

\textsuperscript{133} For the life and career of Pîrizâde Mehmed Sâhib Efendi, see İsmail Hakki Uzunçarşılı, \textit{Osманlı Tarihi} (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Bastımevi, 1959), v. 4, part 2 “XVIII. Yüzyıl,” pp. 473-474. The fact that he had been removed from the post of \textit{şeyhülislâm} by the time İbrâhîm was writing indicates that we must date the final redaction of the hagiography to the years after 1746.
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the form of a chronogram for a Qur’anic primary school (*mekteb*) and soup kitchen (*İmâret*) attached to the Ayasofya mosque complex.\textsuperscript{134}

The impression one gets from the hagiography is that Ünsî Hasan had good relations with the men in power and that they viewed him and his establishment as worthy of their patronage. Nevertheless, the lodge struggled towards the end of the shaykh’s life. In addition to the problems with the successorship that İbrâhîm described in such detail, the lodge had financial problems. While the lodge was able to weather the damage caused by the great earthquake with outside help, İbrâhîm el-Hâs refers indirectly to financial difficulties the lodge experienced in other areas. Towards the end of his life, the shaykh was able to realize a lifelong dream by securing funds from the sultan’s *imâm*\textsuperscript{135} to build a pulpit (*minber*) and a gallery (*mahfil*) in the lodge so that the Friday prayers and sermon could take place there, thus relieving the shaykh and his followers of the obligation of going to a nearby mosque. A five-*akçe* daily stipend was endowed to pay a Friday preacher (*hâtîb*) and prayer leader. However, these funds never materialized, and the appointed preacher never put in an appearance. In the end, Ünsî Hasan was forced to appoint his successor, Mehmed Efendi, to fill the position at a salary of only half the original sum, paid from the lodge’s *vakîf* revenues.\textsuperscript{136}

\textsuperscript{134} This inscription can be dated to 1742 or 1743, roughly twenty years after the shaykh’s death. See Ayvansarâyî, p. 43.

\textsuperscript{135} The text doesn’t make clear the exact identity of this prayer leader during Sultan Ahmed III’s reign; see *Menâkîb-ı Ünsî*, fol. 76b.

\textsuperscript{136} Ibid., fols. 76b-77a.
A more disturbing event took place shortly before the shaykh’s death. A notable by the name of Mustafa Ağə, who was the son of another notable whom İbrâhîm’s friend Üsküdârlı Derviş Ahmed had previously served, came to Ünsî Hasan hoping to secure a loan without interest to help him through his financial difficulties. Ünsî Hasan agreed to help but was forced to take extreme measures to assist the financially-strapped notable.

The shaykh said, “We don’t have any akçes; whatever comes in for our tomb, we made it vakf, so that it is necessary to purchase real estate and to make it vakf for the servants of our tomb and the apothecary’s shop (eczâhane). We have no access to it, it is vakf.” Mustafa Ağə said, “My lord, look here, give this vakf in the form of akçes; whenever you say, I’ll pay it back then; there’s a great need for it. If I sell my things, they’ll go for half the price; it would be unjust to me.” The shaykh said, “Because it is like that, let it not be unjust for you, let me give an amount of akçes to you. Go and let them come to Üsküdârlı Ahmed and ʿAttâr Halîl with the news....ʿAttâr Halîl counted the akçes; it came to 500 kuruş.”

Ünsî Hasan let Mustafa Ağə go under the condition that he pay the money back as soon as possible and that he not do anything contrary to the religious law in the process. Nevertheless, this proved to be an unwise choice. Mustafa Ağə refused to pay back the money, even when he had successfully paid off his debts and regained fiscal solvency. The attempts of the dervishes to demand the return of the vakf’s money were met with derision, and he said insulting things about the shaykh. Over the course of two years, the situation steadily worsened. The houses that were endowed to the vakf fell into disrepair from a lack

---

137 The tax revenue from the sales in the apothecary’s shop from remedies and perfumes were probably endowed to the lodge’s vakf, a pious endowment meant to support the expenses of the lodge and its members in the community.

138 Menâktb-i Ünsî, fols. 84b-85a. What Ünsî Hasan and his companions seem to be doing here is borrowing money against the future revenues of the endowment (vakf).
of money, and the property values dropped. Finally, Ünsî Hasan lost his patience, and said that all the insulting things that Mustafa Ağa had said about him would be visited upon his own head. From that point on, Mustafa’s life fell apart until he tripped over a stone on the road to Büyükçekmece and died from the injury. According to İbrâhîm, his family recognized the reason for his death and subsequently repaid the stolen money to the vakf.\footnote{Ibid., fol. 86a.}

While İbrâhîm el-Hâs tries to tack a happy ending onto the story, it seems that the order’s finances were in rather bad shape, and he struggled to keep the foundation he had endowed solvent in the face of such challenges. The failure of Mehmed Efendi to propagate the order in the decades after the shaykh’s death, and İbrâhîm’s criticisms of him, may thus be unfair in that Mehmed may have inherited a situation that forced him to turn most of his attention to fiscal matters. His lack of connections to the wealthy and powerful, in contrast to those of his predecessor, may have led to the decline of this particular branch of the order. Even during the shaykh’s lifetime, many of his supporters failed to endure in political office for long periods, with the possible exception of Nevşehirli İbrâhîm Paşa, and even he met a decidedly nasty end in the Patrona rebellion of 1730 that ultimately deposed Sultan Ahmed III himself.\footnote{Ibid., fol. 87a-88a.}

\footnote{The reasons behind İbrâhîm Paşa’s eventual downfall included extravagance, unpopular reforms of the military institutions of the empire linked to the dominance of a “peace party” at Sultan Ahmed III’s court that kept the military relatively idle, and later failure on the Iranian front at the end of the 1720s; see Yalçınkaya, pp. 100-101.} While the hagiography does not really focus directly on these fiscal matters in such a way that we can reach a definitive conclusion on this issue, some of İbrâhîm’s anecdotes suggest that there were serious fiscal problems within the order’s finances, and
this also underscores the importance of such resources in keeping a given branch of the Halveti order stable in this era.

4.6 Ünsî Hasan’s Strained Relations With His Contemporaries in the Early Eighteenth Century

While Ünsî Hasan seems to have had generally positive, albeit cautious and distant, relations with the men of state, his relations with his notable Sufi contemporaries were considerably more strained. One can compare him with another contemporary successor of Karabaş Ali Veli, Nasûhî Efendi (d. 1718), who was far more successful at winning a following and whose literary legacy has survived into modern times.¹⁴² It may be telling that İbrâhîm’s hagiography tells of an argument that broke out between the two saints shortly before Nasûhî Efendi’s death, when Ünsî Hasan criticized his fellow shaykh for permitting his followers to drink coffee and smoke tobacco, practices that Ünsî Hasan personally detested. When Nasûhî Efendi came to Tophane for a visit, bringing along with him a group of his dervishes, Ünsî Hasan noticed that one of Nasûhî’s dervishes pulled out a pipe and began to smoke. He then asked Nasûhî Efendi if he smoked. Unaware of the import of the question, Nasûhî Efendi replied in the negative. Ünsî Hasan then asked whether their master Karabaş ‘Ali had ever smoked. Nasûhî Efendi again replied in the negative. “Should I smoke?” asked Ünsî Hasan. “No,” replied Nasûhî Efendi. Ünsî Hasan then rebuked his fellow saint.

¹⁴² For more on the life, career, and literary works of Muhammed Nasûhî Efendi, see Kemal Edib Kürkçuoğlu, Şeyh Muhammed Nasûhî: Hayatı, Eserleri, Divânı, Mektupları (İstanbul: Alem Ticaret Yayıncılık, n.d.).
“Then what is a tobacco pipe doing in the hand of one of your Sufis? Why do you give permission for tobacco? Why are you allowing license to something that is not in the tarikat? Shame, shame on you!” When he said this Nasûhî Efendi fell totally silent. But he had an offended expression on his face. At that time the enlightened tomb of the shaykh was being built. Because it was close to morning, when Nasûhî Efendi was going to pray, while bidding farewell to the shaykh, he looked into the tomb from the window. Nasûhî Efendi, being an individual endowed with wit and wisdom, said, “This is a really nice tomb. But it is not appropriate that it be without a resident!”

İbrâhîm feels compelled to look for an esoteric meaning in the unfriendly words between the two, arguing that Nasûhî Efendi was merely alluding to the fact that he would die several years before Ünsî Hasan would. However, it is hard for the audience to miss the potential for serious conflict between two competing personalities who had been declared successors of the same noted saintly figure but manifested markedly different levels of tolerance for the failings of their followers and the pace of social change. Nasûhî Efendi’s tolerance and broad appeal may have led to his more successful career. Ünsî Hasan, in contrast, often criticized and punished his followers for the smallest failings.

The issue of tobacco clearly aroused Ünsî Hasan’s ire, making him almost exactly like his Kadźâdeli critics in his attacks on the practice. İbrâhîm el-Hâs records a stern warning that the shaykh issued to his followers one day about their visits to the local barbershop:

When one of you goes to the barbershop, get your shave, get up, and leave. Don’t sit and talk with your acquaintances. Because today the majority of the people are addicted to tobacco. The smoking intoxicates you, and the tobacco smell gets on you. If you were to come to the side of another person, the smell that is upon you would certainly reach him. That person will say, “That person is both a person of the [Sufi] path and a user of tobacco.” Then this reflects badly on you. May you not be a reason to have the people think
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143 Menakîb-i Ünsî, fols. 47b-48a.
badly [of us]. For this reason, don’t be a cause of the people becoming sinners. In addition to this, you’ll be the cause of making talk about the path. May you not cause the people to throw stones.\textsuperscript{144}

Once again, we can see the shaykh’s obsession with his Sufis not attracting negative attention to themselves, and his determination not to give the general public a reason to censure him and his order, even if they were not guilty of the offense with which they might be charged! The anecdote also demonstrates that more than a century after tobacco was introduced into the Ottoman Empire, it remained a controversial issue among Sufis themselves, not just among their puritan critics. This passage also unintentionally gives us insight on social life and practices in the capital city during these years. Barbershops, it appears, were considered places to sit around and trade the latest news and stories. It is also interesting that Ünsî Hasan’s attacks even extended to the drinking of coffee, which had been well-established in the Ottoman Empire for a long time.\textsuperscript{145} He also scolded his followers about this habit.

I never saw a coffee cup in my shaykh’s hand. Among the shaykhs of our silsile also, those who drink coffee do not appear. If one of you were to get white (sâde) clothes, and coffee was spilled on them, nothing would be necessary. You’ll perform prayers in [the stained clothes]. It doesn’t give corruption to the prayers because it is [ritually] pure. But the coffee stain on your white clothes brings sorrow to your soul. As soon as those white clothes get stained, you don’t have patience that you wash them [later] when they get dirty. You’ll wash that stain out immediately. So as soon as that

\textsuperscript{144} Kelâm-i ‘Aziz, fols. 54a-b and 59a-b.

\textsuperscript{145} Kâtib Çelebi remarks on the intellectual disputes over the permissibility of tobacco and coffee in the Ottoman Empire since their introduction in the sixteenth century. He tends to view tobacco as being more questionable than coffee but accepts the permissibility of both as an alternative to trying to stamp their consumption out through coercion, as Murad IV had attempted to do during the 1630s. See Kâtib Çelebi, \textit{The Balance of Truth}, pp. 50-58 and pp. 60-62. He was, however, a potentially biased source on the question, for he allegedly died while drinking a cup of coffee.
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stain comes out of your white clothes, your soul will be comfortable. Now, your heart is whiter and purer than those white clothes. For this reason the great shaykhs forbade the Sufi from coffee. And one should especially fear addiction, if one should be addicted, it is a veil [blocking one from God].

One might wonder whether some of Ünsî Hasan’s troubles with his followers might have stemmed from fighting against established popular practices. His own comments indicate that most people fulfilling their daily prayer obligations didn’t concern themselves with coffee stains on their clothing, despite the annoyance the stains may have caused. Many of his followers, from Üsküdarlı Derviş Ahmed to ʿAbdülnebi Efendi to his own hagiographer, all suffered from some form of addiction and are portrayed as suffering grievously for their failings. Other, more forgiving shaykhs may not have struggled so much to keep their followers in line, if the case of Nasîh Efendi’s legacy is any indication.

Nasîh Efendi was not the only Sufi shaykh with whom Ünsî Hasan had troubled relations. Another famous Sufi of the era, Temeşvârî Selim Dede, came to Istanbul during the later years of Ünsî Hasan’s life. Unfortunately, İbrâhîm doesn’t give us much information about this notable figure, informing us only that he was living in the fortress at Temeşvâr in what was then Hungary (and is today in northern Romania), and that he was a noted Sufi whose acts of grace were well-known among both Muslims and non-Muslims alike. We are not even sure that he belonged to the Halveti order, and I have yet to find any reference to him in the biographical compilations. However, we might be able to infer

\[\text{146 Kelâm-i ʿAziz, fols. 59a-b.}\]
\[\text{147 Menâkib-i Ünsî, fols. 59a-b.}\]
\[\text{148 There is a record of a Selim Dede who headed the Mevlevî tekke in Galata during the eighteenth century, but since he died in the 1770s after taking over from another Mevlevî shaykh roughly a decade previously, it is safe to say the two figures are}\]
a few things from Selim Dede’s arrival in the capital during the early decades of the eighteenth century. After the failed Ottoman siege of Vienna in 1683, much of Hungary was lost. By the early eighteenth century, Temeşvâr was periodically attacked by Hapsburg armies as well. This led to the destruction of many Muslim houses of worship, be they mosques, Sufi lodges, or otherwise, and after the Hapsburg defeat of the Ottomans in August 1716, Temeşvâr fell decisively into non-Muslim hands. As a result, we might guess that Selim Dede was a refugee from Hungary, and/or was lobbying the Ottoman rulers to commit the necessary forces to defend his homeland. Regardless of the reason for it, his visit posed problems for Ünsî Hasan that clearly offended some of the sensibilities of people at the time.

The people of Istanbul, saying, “Selim Dede came; let’s go see; let’s meet with whomever,” entered all together; it was a huge gathering. At this point, Selim Dede said to one of his close dervishes, “You go to shaykh Ünsî Hasan and give greetings, this poor one wants to go to him and honor his noble countenance with a visit, and to talk a while....The shaykh said, “We make our greetings to Selim Dede; let him be kind and do [us] a favor and not honor [us]. In honoring and entertaining him, one commits transgressions (taksîrât). If it be foreordained, we’ll meet in another place. Let him be kind, and not criticize [us] and do us a favor,” and sent that dervish back to Selim Dede and forbade it.

Selim Dede was able to accept all this, but some of his followers criticized Ünsî Hasan for the perceived slight. Selim Dede defended the shaykh, remarking sadly that “we are known and talked about (fâş olmuşuz).” As usual, the hagiographer İbrâhîm was troubled by the outcome of the incident, and wanted to know why his shaykh had rejected such a notable person. Probably not the same. See Muslu, pp. 342 and 356-358.


Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fols. 59b-60a.
religious personality, perhaps thinking of the advantages he and the shaykh’s other followers might have reaped from the honors such a personage might have bestowed upon their master.

The poor one said, “My lord, when Selim Dede said, ‘Let me come to you, our efendi,’ you forbade him. No one was able to know what the reason was, and no one could give an interpretation.” He said, “Selim Dede is a knower of God, and a master of the stage of cem ğ‘l-cem151 and a person well-known to have moral qualities. There isn’t anyone who doesn’t know Temesvârî Selim Dede. If Selim Dede were to have come here, the people of the world would have come to pay their respects to us, thinking, ‘Selim Dede came to the foot of Hasan Efendi.’ They’ll make ceremony (teklîf iderler) and give [us] fame. God save us! It is known that fame is a calamity. It is necessary to leave the country [to escape] from the respect of fame. In this old age of ours, where shall we go? Selim Dede knows why we forbade it...”152

Ünsî Hasan clearly feared the fame attached to associating with the powerful. He insisted on keeping a low profile, even if he risked offending respected contemporaries. While his logic was internally consistent and may have reflected ideal Halveti principles, many of his followers and contemporaries found his behavior strange, if not reprehensible. It may also have limited the legitimacy his successors would have had in propagating his legacy among broader sections of Ottoman society.

Perhaps the oddest and most difficult anecdote in the entire hagiography revolves around Ünsî Hasan’s relationship with the deceased Celvetî shaykh ʾAzîz Mahmûd Hûdâyî

151 This stage of mystical consciousness was said to be the highest that any mystic could attain on the path, and those who achieved it were among the select few in the world. It is defined as being “a stage which is obtained by means of the spiritual vision of God overcoming the Sufi, in this state the Sufi can perceive nothing from the world,” as opposed to just reaching the station of cem’, which was “to see the whole of the essence and created things as inseparable from God.” See Mahir İz, Tasavvuf, 9th ed., ed. M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ (Istanbul: Kitabevi, 2000), p. 156. For Ünsî Hasan to admit this was a compliment of the highest order in mystical terms.

152 Menâkıb-i Ünsî, fols. 61a-b.
(d. 1628). As noted previously, one of the three events that caused Ünsî Hasan to leave the confines of the Aydınoğlu tekke was a visit to the tomb of this famed figure. Still, İbrâhîm’s attempt to link the legacy of the two shaykhs lacks coherence. The problem started several years after Ünsî Hasan’s death, when İbrâhîm realized that his neighbor’s 12-year-old son Mustafa, to whom he was teaching grammar, was having dream visions. One Thursday, Mustafa had a dream that especially intrigued his teacher.

...[Mustafa related:] “I had apparently come to the esteemed Hüdâyî Mahmûd Efendi’s tekke in Üskûdâr. Many shaykhs had gathered before the outer gate of the tekke. I said to someone, ‘Who are these people, what are they standing here for?’ He said, ‘It is the shaykhs who have passed over this threshold; a guest shaykh came to the lodge and Mahmûd Efendi will emerge out of respect for him; they are awaiting him.’ Suddenly they went in the door, saying, ‘Look, he came out,’ and I also went; we entered the tekke. I saw that Mahmûd Efendi was sitting in the prayer- niche with his blessed back turned to us. He had on a green turban, a green tassel, and a white cloak....That guest shaykh was apparently among the great saints of God....I saw that [he] came and that Mahmûd Efendi and the shaykhs who were there rose to their feet. He wore a giant black turban on his head and had a black staff. Mahmûd Efendi honored the shaykh; [then he] went to the prayer-niche. We prayed, and afterwards we did the devrân. However, in Mahmûd Efendi’s order there isn’t any devrân, [but] in that shaykh’s order there was; they performed the devrân in his memory to honor him. While I was performing the devrân with those shaykhs also, I woke up.”

From the details that Mustafa provided, İbrâhîm guessed that the visiting shaykh had been a Halveti of the highest rank, and probably suspected that his young charge had seen a vision of his now-deceased master, perhaps seeking to give him a message. He resolved to go to Mahmûd Hüdâyî’s tomb in Üskûdâr the following Friday to follow up on the matter, but the real intervention was yet to come.

...[İbrâhîm related:] “While going to Üskûdâr, I came to the enlightened tomb of Shaykh Ünsî, and I went in. I recited the Qur’ân for a while and

\footnote{Ibid., fols. 77a-78a.}
performed the remembrance of God. I saw that the shaykh appeared with his clothes on from the left-hand side of the noble casket. The poor one immediately jumped to his feet and made obeisance. The blessed vision shook his finger at me three or four times, I knew that he was forbidding [me] to go to Üskübâr. Then he was gone.

Changing his plans, İbrâhîm went instead to the nearby Valide mosque to pray the Friday prayers and then returned home. There, he began to ascend the stairs to the living quarters, where he could smell the food his mother was cooking. But the numinous state into which he had entered had not ended, and he had another vision, frozen in place halfway up the staircase in his own home.

At the head and foot of the staircase footsteps were echoing. I saw that it was the guest shaykh that Mustafa had seen in the dream; he was coming. [Ünsî Hasan] came to the head of the stairs to honor him. That guest shaykh passed by in front of me. He didn’t take any notice of the poor one. Then he reached the top of the stairs and kissed the blessed hand [of Ünsî Hasan]. The [visiting] shaykh also kissed his tassel, and they talked a little bit. That guest shaykh bade farewell to [Ünsî Hasan], and while coming down the stairs, when he came abreast of me, he gave greetings but didn’t look at me. I thought that it was for the remembrance of [Ünsî Hasan], at whom he wasn’t looking. He disappeared without reaching the bottom of the stairs, and [Ünsî Hasan] also disappeared at the top of the stairs. The poor one was dumbstruck and astounded. My mother came to the stairs and said, “What are you standing there for?”

We witness here additional examples of İbrâhîm’s lack of confidence in interpreting his own visions, as shown by his inability definitively to interpret the mystery’s shaykh’s greeting and his failure to interpret the dream vision of his young charge appropriately. Furthermore, the anecdote creates an aura of ambiguity around the figure of ʿAzîz Mahmûd Hûdâyî, whom is assumed to be the visiting mystery shaykh. While we know that Ünsî Hasan viewed Mahmûd as an important enough figure to justify breaking his self-imposed isolation to visit
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154 Ibid., fols. 78b-79a.
his tomb, İbrâhîm here implies that Mahmûd honors a prominent Halveti shaykh, and even
deigns to perform his rituals with him.\textsuperscript{155} This figure then honors İbrâhîm’s own master in
turn, emphasizing Ünsî Hasan’s superiority. The whole anecdote suggests an attempt to
downplay his master’s own reverence for Mahmûd Hüdâyî, perhaps to prevent other
dervishes from breaking away to join the Celvetî order. This would also explain why
İbrâhîm neglects to describe Ünsî Hasan’s visit to the tomb, an otherwise significant event
for the shaykh’s followers at the lodge during those years. At the time of Ünsî Hasan’s
death, the Celvetî order in Üskûdâr was flourishing under the leadership of İsmâ‘îl Hakki
Bursevî (d. 1724), a prolific author and Sufi master who propagated the order throughout the
Ottoman realm and left many successors.\textsuperscript{156} In addition, Hüdâyî had acted as advisor to a
number of sultans up to his death during the reign of Sultan Murad IV, beginning with
Sultan Ahmed I, whose dreams he interpreted and whom he reportedly initiated as a
follower.\textsuperscript{157} His legacy and power loomed large among all of Istanbul’s Sufi orders in the
centuries after his death.

\textsuperscript{155} The Celvetiyye under Mahmûd Hüdâyî, although they did not perform the
devrân, had much in common with the Halveti, from aspects of their silsile to aspects of
their zikr. Hüdâyî himself once remarked that his path was both Halveti and Celveti, and
one of his close followers composed poetry stressing the order’s full acceptance of other
paths; see, for example, H. Kâmil Yılmaz, pp. 234-237. For Hüdâyî’s remarks about the
importance of the semâ in Celveti ritual and his dismissal of those who criticized its
permissibility, see İz, pp. 147-150. In fact, one of Mahmûd’s early shaykhs was in fact a
Halveti shaykh by the name of Bâbâ Yûsuf in Bursa; see the last work completed by
İsmâ‘îl Hakki Bursevî (d. 1724), Silsilenâme-i Celvetiyye (Istanbul: Haydarpaşa

\textsuperscript{156} For the legacy of this important literary and religious figure in the eighteenth-
century Ottoman context, see Muslu, pp. 442-462. Muslu has catalogued over 120 works
that reportedly were written by him.

\textsuperscript{157} Silsilenâme-i Celvetiyye, pp. 83-84.
Ünsî Hasan did not tolerate his followers’ dividing their attention among multiple shaykhs, a point implied in the previous anecdote. This eventually led to the demise of one of them, Yâycı Mustafa Dede. Despite having a good moral character, he had a habit of visiting any shaykh of whom he received word. He then used to come and tell Ünsî Hasan about the various people he had met, which made the shaykh uncomfortable. Eventually, his habit sparked a lecture in the presence of a number of the shaykh’s followers, although they were unaware of the individual to whom the shaykh was referring.

The Sufi’s heart must not be a fork. Because duality in the heart is a manifestation of polytheism (şırk), there is no doubt. A Sufi’s belief in his shaykh must be so firm that if the world were full of guides, he’d say, “Divine blessing for me is my shaykh alone.” He won’t be disappointed. If the shaykh whom he calls “my shaykh” is assiduous and persevering in the pure sacred law, and something from the forbidden acts is not appearing in him, it is a shaykh like this that I have spoken of. Otherwise, he is among the people of carnal passions who appear in the form of a shaykh.  

At a subsequent meeting, the shaykh spoke to Yâycı Mustafa Dede once more without directly addressing him, saying that a Sufi should always ask whether he gains divine benefit from his shaykh or from some other person. He warned, “That Sufi doesn’t gain benefit who says ‘If I find it any given place, I’ll take it from there;’ he remains disappointed, even if he were to split in two with the effort!” The tension between the two mounted, until one day the shaykh took the unusual step of breaking his secrecy about the direction of his advice in the communal setting, and yelled at his wayward follower.

\[158\] Menâkib-i Ünsî, fols. 65a-b. I have rendered the final two sentences in the form in which I believe İbrâhîm wished to express them; the wording of the original is problematic.

\[159\] Ibid., fols. 65b-66a.
Yâyc! This practice that you are thinking about is against God! No way, absolutely not! A guide will not come to you who will let you have a share in that. There is no benefit in regret afterwards. It is necessary to beware of becoming one of the groups of the unbelievers and bandits of old whom God and his messenger [Muhammad] Mustafa, on him be peace, opposed due to [their] making changes and substitutions in the divine word, God save us! [Beware also] of thinking that the secrets of gnosis are words contrary to the law and the path which come out of your mouth with the impulsive following of passion, in the manner of a Bektaşi.\(^{160}\)

Disregarding this warning and the entreaties of the other followers of the shaykh, who urged him to repent, Yâyc Mustafa insisted on bringing another shaykh to the tekke to meet with Ünsî Hasan. Despite the fact that the visitor wore a black turban and appeared to be a Halveti shaykh, Ünsî Hasan would not come out to greet him. After some delay, the mystery shaykh asked to perform the ritual ablution, and Yâyc poured the water for him with all the necessary ritual observance that should have been paid one’s own shaykh. This proved to be the last straw for Ünsî Hasan. He told his former follower that he had chosen a new path and could no longer stay with him, after which Yâyc left, somewhat dejected. He disappeared soon after, and İbrâhîm and the others more or less forgot about him until some years after the shaykh’s death, when a chance meeting clarified the shaykh’s previous warnings from many years before.

One day this poor one ran into Yâyc in the head flax-seller’s [shop] in Istanbul. I saw that he had taken on the form of a Bektaşi and that his color had changed. I said, “What is this form; did you become a Bektaşi?” He said, “I came to the Bektaşi Azbî Dede in the village of Nerdibânlû in the area of Üsküdâr; I’m in his service...I composed an imitative piece of poetry (\textit{nazîre})\(^{161}\) for the Qur’ânic chapter of al-Ikhâs.” I said, “Is it a piece of

\(^{160}\) Ibid., fols. 66a-b.

\(^{161}\) It is not clear to me what the practice referred to is, seeing as the hagiography provides us only with a hostile view of it as transgressing proper etiquette in respect to the sacred text.
It is not clear whether ‘Azbî Dede (d. 1747) was the mystery shaykh whom Yâycı Mustafa brought to the Aydınoglu tekke so many years before. Still, Yâycı’s eventual attachment to this shaykh illustrates a trend among the Misrî branch of the Halveti order during the eighteenth century that clearly did not sit well with traditionalists like Ünsî Hasan. ‘Azbî Dede was a well-known Halveti shaykh who started his career as one of the messengers (çavuş) of the Ottoman government. However, when he was charged with the duty of sending the great Sufi shaykh Niyâzî-i Misrî (d. 1694) into exile on Lemnos during the 1680s, he abruptly resigned his commission and pledged himself to Misrî. After training for seven years with the influential shaykh, he was made one of his successors, and upon Misrî’s death he returned to the Istanbul area and took up residence in the Şahkulu Sultan Tekke in the village of Nerdiban, clearly the location to which Yâycı refers. Nevertheless, his Halveti connections did not stop him from serving as the head of a Bektaşi lodge in the area after the death of its shaykh, Elvân Çelebi (d. 1729/30), and this was the connection to
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162 Ibid., fols. 68a-b.

163 For the life, career, and writings of ‘Azbî Dede, which include a poetic divân and a sort of poetic commentary on Niyâzî-i Misrî’s gazel-couplets called a tahmîs, see Muslu, pp. 136-137.
which İbrâhîm perhaps referred.\textsuperscript{164} It is important to note, however, that what may have made Ünsî Hasan and his followers uncomfortable was not ʻÁzbî Dede’s being an actual Bektaşi, but a Halveti shaykh’s affiliation with a branch of the order that had been embroiled in controversy over prophecies its founder, Niyâzî-i Misrî, made in regard to the Prophet Muhammad’s grandsons, Hasan and Husayn. While the branch of the Halveti order that Misrî founded may not have been as concerned about blurring the lines between the Bektaşi and Halveti paths, the more conservative branches of the Halveti, which Ünsî Hasan exemplified, probably regarded them as a scourge attracting the censure he so dreaded.\textsuperscript{165}

Despite his strained relations with other notable Sufis, both within his order and outside it, and his problems with maintaining the loyalty of some of his more spiritually weak followers, Ünsî Hasan sometimes did receive credit for divine assistance. One follower, a military fief holder (zâ ʿım) by the name of Mehmed Ağa, was sent to a place in a far-off part of Rumeli to perform some type of service. Unfortunately, Mehmed Ağa and his followers were ambushed in a forest while returning to Istanbul, and he alone survived. İbrâhîm learned much later that Mehmed Ağa had survived by bringing the shaykh into his mind during the attack. The shaykh miraculously appeared, led him out of the slaughter, and somehow transported him to a town over three hours distant from the forest in a matter of minutes. Before he could even greet the shaykh upon his return, however, the shaykh


\textsuperscript{165} For Niyâzî-i Misrî’s life and teachings, and the controversy they engendered that may have weakened the spread of his order after his death, see Terzioglu, pp. 463-495, esp. pp. 484-486 for her remarks about his posthumous popularity among the followers of the Bektaşi order.
warned him via an allusion not to tell the others what had happened and reveal his secret. It was only well after Ünsî Hasan’s death that Mehmed finally revealed the secret to the curious hagiographer and his friends, suggesting that perhaps it would be best if the story of this miraculous event were finally made public.\textsuperscript{166}

The shaykh’s female followers seem to have been better treated and more easily forgiven than the male ones. Notwithstanding the tragic story of the shaykh’s wayward daughter, the women of the tekke are often presented as being closer to the actual person of the shaykh than some of his male followers. Many of the anecdotes İbrâhîm collects in his hagiography came to him via the bâcîlar, his own mother among them. At one point, İbrâhîm commented that his shaykh used to put on an appearance of stinginess to hide his good moral qualities and generosity, a tactic that put him squarely among the practitioners of the doctrine of melâmet.\textsuperscript{167} To illustrate this, İbrâhîm recalls an impoverished Bosnian woman named Bâdemli Uzun Havvâ, who lived as a renter in the bottom floor of the house where İbrâhîm and his mother resided. This woman survived by doing errands for her better-off neighbors in the quarter for a small fee. One day, one of the women of the neighborhood entrusted her with a sick infant and asked her to take it to Ünsî Hasan’s lodge for a reading in the hope of finding a cure, entrusting her with a sum of money to give to the

\textsuperscript{166} Ibid., fols. 34a-37b. Compare this anecdote with that of Muhyi-yi Gülşeni’s brother in Curry, “‘Home is Where the Shaykh Is’,” pp. 47-60.

\textsuperscript{167} Menâkılb-i Ünsî, fol. 72a. The Melâmî movement originated in the eastern reaches of the Islamic world during the formative period of Sufism. Its adherents acted in blameful ways in public so as to draw censure upon themselves, while privately adhering scrupulously to the religious law in every way. The objective was to prevent themselves from gaining a reputation for moral superiority, and to keep themselves from becoming vain. For an overview of the Melâmî movement and its impact on the history of Sufism, see Knysh, pp. 94-99.
shaykh for his services. Before bringing the infant in for treatment, Uzun Havvâ set aside two para from the sum for herself. The shaykh was not amused.

The shaykh said, “Come on, bring out those two para!” That Bosnian woman said, “It is this much, they gave this much.” When the shaykh said, “Look here, the two para are in your right pocket, didn’t I see how much para she gave you, don’t I know? Take out the para; you want to lie to me; you’re testing me,” that woman was trembling and she took out the money she had set aside and put it in front of the shaykh. The shaykh said, “You did this by reason of poverty, but don’t tell a lie again, and don’t test anyone again, and endure poverty. Let God Most High increase your worldly possessions!” He gave that woman 40 para, and even gave her those two para also.\textsuperscript{168}

The woman returned to the neighborhood praising her sudden escape from poverty, and telling all the neighbors in detail about the events that had transpired. While İbrâhîm and his mother tried to hush up the story before it began to spread, it nevertheless reached the ears of several of the shaykh’s male followers in the tekke. They began to wonder why the shaykh, who was normally very secretive about his acts of grace and good deeds, had manifested his abilities so openly. The shaykh’s response was not long in coming. Singling out a woodcutter by the name of Hüseyin Dede, he told his followers that Hüseyin’s faith had started to waver, and he had taken this step in order to set it right. He also warned the others not to let their faith waver as well, lest they fall into ruin.\textsuperscript{169} The subtext behind the anecdote is that while the shaykh revealed his acts of grace to the women, and humored their inability to keep this a secret, the men were held to a much tougher code of conduct.

İbrâhîm’s narrative doesn’t really offer much information about the shaykh’s relations with non-Muslims, although we have already noted that he declined to punish the

\textsuperscript{168} Menâkıb-ı Ünsî, fols. 72b-73a.

\textsuperscript{169} Ibid., fols. 73b-74a.
non-Muslim fur dealer who tried to cheat him. Still, the hagiography does point to one relationship with a non-Muslim that was surprisingly symbiotic.

Across from the door of the aforementioned tekke was a Christian doctor. They called him Miykal. He was a skilled expert in the science of medicine. His custom was that whenever a sick person came to him, if he were unable to cure him, or if a remedy for him was not possible, he would say to that person, “The remedy for this illness is in that lodge. Go into the lodge...The doctor for this illness is the shaykh.”

One day a sick man who had come from the provinces of Anatolia arrived at the lodge, and when he removed his headgear, the group saw that he had horrible boils all over his head. When the man told the shaykh that Miykal had sent him, saying that the cure would be found at his hands, Ünsî Hasan praised the doctor and assured the sick man that he had been well-advised. The shaykh then spit into his hands and rubbed them on the man’s head. Within two days the man returned, completely cured. Once again, the shaykh swore those who witnessed the act to secrecy.

Where other hagiographies might conclude this type of narrative with the conversion of the Christian to Islam, no such event occurs here, and both Ünsî Hasan and his Christian friend seem happy with the arrangement. It raises the fascinating possibility that interfaith relations during this period were not limited to secular pursuits alone, but could also cross the line into other areas of life as well. Nevertheless, we cannot make a judgment based on this isolated incident alone, and Ünsî Hasan may well have been unique in this regard. Indeed, it is odd that a shaykh who seemed so stern in regard to following the sacred laws in terms of his own followers didn’t seem to show much interest in converting non-Muslims.

---

170 Ibid., fols. 88a-b.

171 Ibid., fols. 90a-b.
While it is possible that İbrâhîm simply neglected this aspect of his shaykh’s activities in his collection of anecdotal material, one would think that this aspect pointing to the sacredness of a holy personality would otherwise not have been neglected. On the other hand, a more ready answer might be found in the discrepancy between Ünsî Hasan’s time and that of some of the earlier hagiographies. While the environment in which Şa‘bân-ı Veli or even ʿÖmer el-Fu’âdî worked may have had significant numbers of Christians among the population in Kastamonu, making conversion a more pressing concern, Ünsî Hasan’s district of Istanbul may have had a comfortable Muslim majority by the early eighteenth century. A perhaps more convincing explanation may lie with the cultural makeup of the two urban centers: Istanbul had become a fairly cosmopolitan place by the early eighteenth century, and even devout Muslims may have been more tolerant of diversity in their community.

4.7 Conclusion: Was Ünsî Hasan Really a Failed Saint?

To return to the questions raised at the beginning of this chapter, I must conclude this presentation of Ünsî Hasan and his hagiographer İbrâhîm on an ambiguous note. First of all, is it fair to say that our saint, Ünsî Hasan, was a complete failure? After all, the Islamic world is full of tombs about whose occupants we know far less than we know about Ünsî Hasan, even though few of our sources for the period mention him. In addition, unlike many of the Sufis of his generation, young and old alike, he managed to survive the attacks of groups opposed to the practices of the Sufis in the latter half of the 17th century, despite attempts to assassinate or banish him. His hagiographer felt there was already an audience for his material in the form of visitors to the tomb and also believed that there was scope for a revival of his saint’s cult, perhaps under his own guidance. Other authors of hagiographies
during this era saw the end of the first generation of successors after the death of a shaykh as a good time to compile hagiographical works that could control or defend the tradition of the personage in question.\textsuperscript{172} In addition, there are hints that Ünsî Hasan’s brand of spirituality may have resonated more with female followers than with the men attached to his branch of the order. In İbrâhîm el-Hâs’s hagiography, might we then be witnessing the revival of a saint rather than textual proof of his failure?

Indeed, Ünsî Hasan’s “failure” consists primarily in his low level of posthumous fame, combined with his loss of followers owing to his perfectionist attitudes. Furthermore, İbrâhîm’s hagiography never really seemed to take flight among the wider Ottoman public of his era. A second manuscript copy of his work found in the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul shows signs of having not impressed its copyist.\textsuperscript{173} İbrâhîm himself readily admits that few of Ünsî Hasan’s followers succeeded in propagating the order after his death. So on the whole, this manuscript suggests that we have been left a rare source describing the anatomy of a failed candidate for sainthood among the early modern Ottomans.

This suggests that popular opinion played a powerful role in the creation of branches of the Halveti order of Sufi leaders. In the case of Ünsî Hasan, austere piety and a short list of miraculous events of somewhat limited scope were not enough to assure the survival of

\textsuperscript{172} A good example is the first hagiography dealing with the life of Niyâzî-i Misrî, which was written shortly after the deaths of the first generation of Misrî’s successors, largely as a means of addressing or deflecting controversial aspects of the founder’s legacy. See Terzioğlu, pp. 472-473.

\textsuperscript{173} See İbrâhîm el-Hâs, \textit{Menâkıb-i Ünsî} (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Lib., MS Hac\textsuperscript{1} Mahmud Efendi 4718), which shows signs of having been hastily copied with little regard for accuracy or clarity towards the latter half of the manuscript, as if the copyist were in a hurry to get an unpleasant or boring job over with.
his branch. This biographical work suggests that to cement his cult among subsequent
generations, a saint had to have a certain degree of “people skills” and be able to establish
personal bonds both with and among his followers. Ünşî Hasan comes across in this work
as a stern and unforgiving personality who, perhaps intentionally, sought to alienate both
respected members of Ottoman society and the rank-and-file of his lodge’s own members.
Even his own daughter rejected him in a most spectacular manner. Believers among the
Ottomans of Ünşî Hasan’s time, the sources suggest, ultimately favored the friendlier, more
accommodating form of piety that figures like Nasûhî Efendi, along with Ünşî Hasan’s own
spiritual master, Karabâş ‘Alî, represented. The characters in İbrâhîm’s narrative, in
contrast, often find their saint’s behavior strange and inappropriate, and clearly clash with
him on many of the more inflexible aspects of the spiritual path he advocated. The situation
suggests that Ottoman religious life by the 1720s had grown more relaxed, perhaps as a
result of the decline in the fortunes of the Kadtzâdeli movement. The more successful
Halveti saints were those who were able to come to terms with some of the less pious aspects
of their followers’ cultural milieu. In addition, we must not dismiss the importance of
successful and lasting political connections with key elites in Ottoman society. While we
can deduce from the narrative that Ünşî Hasan had good connections in circles of power
during Sultan Ahmed III’s reign, he seemed loath to exploit these connections, and few of
them seem to have survived his death.

The importance of the Kadtzâdeli movement and its impact upon Ünşî Hasan’s life
and career cannot be underestimated. The deep social wounds that the movement inflicted
among the religious communities of seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Istanbul
clearly left the shaykh suspicious and paranoid about gaining any kind of fame or
notoriety—even if it was in the form of good publicity. His fears caused him to limit the extent to which his followers could educate themselves about doctrinal issues, and caused him to toe a very strict line on adherence to the exoteric law (ṣeriʿat) whenever he was confronted with people whom he didn’t know well. He clearly struggled with other shaykhs during the latter period of his life who were not so reserved in their dispositions, perhaps basking in a more friendly atmosphere. While his turn to a form of Sufism that valued adherence to exoteric law mirrored trends amongst many of the Sufi orders during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Ünsî Hasan seemed to take his hardline position on the matter to extremes that others did not yet find appealing. In that respect, he may have been a figure ahead of his time when many of his contemporaries interested in mysticism could not understand, including many of his own followers.

A question remains as to whether the shaykh’s female followers might have responded to these problems more successfully than their male counterparts. Perhaps because of the feeling of alienation that Ünsî Hasan generated amongst his male followers, we have been left with an unusually vivid depiction of women’s lives in his order. In addition, the role of a woman, İbrâhîm’s own mother, as a major informant for the hagiography, allows us critical insight into the participation of women in a Halveti lodge—a topic that most other sources neglect. The stories often imply that the shaykh acted as a surrogate provider for women who did not have husbands, or who would otherwise have struggled to survive. A rare register that has survived in the Atatürk Kitaplığı in Istanbul documents the various types of contributions various benefactors made to the foundation of the shaykh of another branch of the Halveti order. Even a cursory glance at the entries reveals that the majority of the bequests were made by female supporters of this particular
shaykh. Ünsî Hasan’s acceptance of gifts in return for services in curing children and helping with women’s problems reinforces the impression such sources give us, and demonstrates how women could often act as an important conduit in directing their children toward the following of a shaykh. Furthermore, the portrait of the lives of women outside the narrow courtly elite suggests that hagiographical works may be rich sources for the history of gender during the pre-modern period.

In many ways, Ünsî Hasan comes across as a much more realistic figure than some of his predecessors in the Şa‘bâniyye silsile. His miraculous deeds seem somewhat tame and generally tied to everyday life, as opposed to those that earlier examples of the genre attribute to their subjects. In addition, it is hard not to have feelings for his hagiographer, İbrâhîm el-Hâs, who is clearly struggling with the legacy of his shaykh in a way that a more typical hagiographical writer would not. İbrâhîm seems to represent a less educated and less well-connected personality than even a provincial figure like his distant spiritual ancestor ‘Ömer el-Fu’âdî. He is beset with doubts and problems that he seems to be trying to excise from his own troubled soul in the course of writing. One wonders whether the suddenly-emergent confessional nature of the quasi-autobiographical character of the work represents part of a broader literary legacy of this period.

---

174 Şeyh Mustafa Sinânzâde (?), Evkâf Defteri (Istanbul, Atatürk Kitaplığı, MS Muallim Cevdet O. 21). The register is only partially complete, and in the brief time I had to peruse it on microfilm, I could ascertain only that the records in question were linked to a branch of the order whose members defined themselves as the descendants of the Halveti shaykh İbrâhîm Ümmî Sinân (d. 1568). For more on this place of this shaykh in the pantheon of the Halveti dignitaries, see Sâdik Vicedâni, Tarikatler ve Silsileleri (Tomâr-ı Turûk-ı ‘Aliyve), ed. İrfan Gündüz (İstanbul: Enderun Kitap ve, 1995), pp. 238-239, and Ahmet Ögke, Ahmed Şemseddin-i Marmaravi: Hayatt, Eserleri, Görüşleri (İstanbul: İnsan Yayıncılık, 2001), pp. 48-49.
In the final analysis, we must be grateful to the otherwise unknown and unheralded Îbrâhîm el-Hâs, despite the aura of failure and inferiority that surrounds his hagiographical work and his unwillingness to connect his narrative as firmly as we would like to the broader historical context of the early eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire. This is because through his eyes, we see a spiritual figure who perhaps did not rank among the Ottoman Empire’s spiritual elite, portrayed in a manner that humanizes him in a way that is uncommon among sources for Islamic history. We can see a world in which contemporary observers of the events outlined in this chapter, whose views are now lost to us, saw Sufi leaders as having the flaws that make us all human beings.
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