THE LEGITIMACY OF THE OTTOMAN DYNASTY IN MÜNECCİMBAŞI AHMED DEDE'S *CAMİU'D-DUVEL*

ŞEYMA NUR TEMEL

İSTANBUL ŞEHİR UNIVERSITY

JUNE 2017

THE LEGITIMACY OF THE OTTOMAN DYNASTY IN MÜNECCİMBAŞI AHMED DEDE'S *CAMİU'D-DUVEL*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
İSTANBUL ŞEHİR UNIVERSITY

BY

ŞEYMA NUR TEMEL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
HISTORY

JUNE 2017

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in History.

Examining Committee Members:

	DECISION	SIGNATURE
Assist. Prof. Abdurrahman Atçıl (Thesis Advisor)	Accepted	
Assoc. Prof. Abdülhamit Kırmızı	Accepted	
Assist. Prof. Ertuğrul İsmail Ökten	Accepted	

This is to confirm that this thesis complies with all the standards set by the Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences of İstanbul Şehir University.

Date

13.07.2017

Seal/Signature

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and standards, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

First Name, Last Name: Şeyma Nur Temel

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE LEGITIMACY OF THE OTTOMAN DYNASTY IN MÜNECCİMBAŞI AHMED DEDE'S
CAMİU'D-DUVEL

Temel, Şeyma Nur

MA in History

Thesis Advisor: Assist. Prof. Abdurrahman Atçıl

June 2017, 86 pages

This thesis aims at understanding the image of the Ottoman dynasty in the mind of a seventeenth-century intellectual, Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede (d.1702), based on his universal history, *Camiu'd-duvel*. It investigates the author's various discursive strategies in presenting the legitimacy of the rule of the Ottoman dynasty in the Ottoman historiography. Written in a period when the Ottoman state experienced crisis and transformation, and the Ottoman sultans was exposed to many criticisms and challenges, an intimate officer of the sultan, Müneccimbaşı's account provides an exciting opportunity to examine the attitude of the Ottoman elites about the roots of the Ottoman power and its future. In each chapter, I first offer an overview of the tools that the previous Ottoman historiographical tradition had made recourse to provide the Ottoman dynasty with legitimacy and then discuss Müneccimbaşı's innovative use of these tools and revision of the previous historical presentations in a way that would serve his own ideological purposes.

Keywords: Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede, *Camiu'd-duvel*, history writing, seventeenth century, legitimacy, Sufism.

ÖZ

MÜNECCİMBAŞI AHMED DEDE'NİN *CAMİU'D-DUVEL* ADLI ESERİNDE OSMANLI HANEDANININ MEŞRUİYETİ

Temel, Şeyma Nur

Tarih Yüksek Lisans Programı

Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Abdurrahman Atçıl

Haziran 2017, 86 sayfa

Bu tez, Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede'nin evrensel tarihi *Camiu'd-duvel* üzerinden, bir on yedinci yüzyıl entelektüelinin gözünden Osmanlı hanedanının meşruiyetinin nasıl göründüğünü anlamayı hedeflemektedir. Bu amaçla, hanedanın gücünün meşruiyetini sunarken yazarın kendinden önceki Osmanlı tarihçilerinin geleneğinden farklılıkları incelenmektedir. Osmanlı Devleti'nin kriz ve değişimlerle yüzleştiği bir dönemde yazan Müneccimbaşı'nın eseri Osmanlı gücünün menşei ve onun geleceği hakkında bir elitin görüşlerini incelemek için umut vaat eden bir imkan sunmaktadır. Bu anlamda, her bölümde, ilk olarak, Osmanlı tarih yazımı geleneğinde hanedana meşruiyet kazandırmak başvurulan kullanılan araçların genel bir çerçevesini sunulmakta, sonrasında Müneccimbaşı'nın önceki tarihlerim sunumlarında ufak değişiklikler yaparak bu sunumlara nasıl yeni bir form verdiği incelenmektedir. Münecimbaşı'nın müdahaleleri, varsa değişiklikleri yazarın bağlamına oturtularak yazarın kendi ideolojik amaçları keşfedilmeye çalışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede, *Camiu'd-duvel*, meşruiyet, tarih yazımı, on yedinci yüzyıl, Sufizm.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I want to express my gratitude to my advisor Abdurrahman Atçıl for his guidance throughout this process. I would not have been able to finish this project without his criticisms and encouragements. Also, I would like to express my gratitude to my committee members Abdulhamid Kırmızı and Ertuğrul Ökten for their careful examination of my thesis and constructive criticisms. I should also thank Jeff Turner for reading my text and editing parts of this work.

I want to acknowledge that I am grateful to Himmet Taşkömür. He first attracted my attention to *Camiu'd-duvel* and taught me to ask more questions and look for more answers in the Ottoman historical narratives. In addition to his classes, the other courses that I took from other professors at Şehir University helped me to deepen my historical understanding and to learn how a historian scratch the surface of the texts to acquire historical evidences. In this respect, I feel indebted to Mehmet Genç, Abdulhamid Kırmızı, Kahraman Şakul, and Günhan Börekçi.

I owe special gratitude to Murteza Bedir. He gave me the courage to take my first step as a historian by encouraging me to continue my academic career in the field of history. I also want to thank all my professors at the Center for Sciences and Arts (ISM), especially Muhammed Emin Kılıç. Thanks to his classes on classical Arabic grammar and reading texts in Arabic, I could have the confidence to study a text in Arabic.

I am grateful to my friends for their company in both the hard and good times of carrying out research for and writing the thesis. Birnur Deniz was with me in every phase of this process, providing me moral support whenever I needed and being an eager listener when I was confused in composing my narrative. Şeyma Özdemir was my first reader and shared her valuable comments. Halime Çınar was my most consistent partner on coffee breaks in the library. Having their company has been a source of motivation for me to continue.

Last but not least, I am extremely thankful for my family's continuous support and trust in me. Their prayers have kept me in track and played a major role in my progress from the very beginning of my education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede's historical account, *Camiu'd-duvel*, has a surprising detail in the introduction of the section on the Ottomans. He narrates a dialogue between Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi and Osman that heralds the Ottomans an ever-lasting state.[1] I thought that it was an extraordinary scene. This prompted me to examine *Camiu'd-duvel* and search for the motives behind Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede's inclusion of this story in his work. For this, I undertook the task of locating the author in his political, intellectual, and religious context in the second half of the seventeenth century.

1.1. Framework for the Studies on the Seventeenth Century

Seventeenth century was a time of change and transformation for the Ottoman Empire. It appears that the ruling authorities considered the previous institutions and practices outdated and changed many of them. For a long time, historians interpreted all of these variations from the past were interpreted as the signs of decline and adduced the contemporary literature that criticized the current state of affairs.[2] In fact, looking at turbulent atmosphere in the Ottoman realm in this period, it was clear that things were different from the previous centuries. For the seventeenth century, frequent changes of sultans, murders of three *şeyhülislam*s, public rebellions both in rural and urban areas, long wars with the Safavids and Venetians are indicators of an unrest. Still, subsuming a long-time period under the single concept of decline is not satisfactory and fruitful. Therefore, in the last few

---

[1] Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede, *Kitabu Camiu'd-Düvel kısmü's-selatin-i Al-i Osman ila sene 1083 h.*, trans. Ghassan b. Ali el-Remmal (Mekke: Şafak, 2009), 193.

[2] For a description of this discussion: Cemal Kafadar, "The Question of Ottoman Decline," *Harvard Middle Eastern and Islamic Review* 4 (1997-1998): 30-75. For a detailed scrutiny of its primary literature: Bernard Lewis, "Ottoman Observers of Ottoman Decline," *Islamic Studies* 1 (1962): 71-87; Douglas Howard, "Ottoman Historiography and the Literature of Decline of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," *Journal of Asian Studies* 22 (1988): 52-77; Erol Özvar, "Osmanlı Tarihi Dönemlendirme Meselesi ve Osmanlı Nasihat Literatürü," *Divan: İlmi Araştırmalar* 2 (1992): 135-151.

decades, more critical voices of this approach began to raise. As the first significant step, Halil İnalcık demonstrated that the anomalies at the time under study were signals of a transformation rather than a decline in economic and military levels.[3] From thereupon, this point of view inspired various historical studies in which transformation, crisis, and change were found more proper to characterize this period.[4]

Majority of the studies criticizing decline concerned political, military, and economic aspects. Intellectual sphere of the empire was also changing. However, just as all the variations from the past were interpreted as the signs of decline by the historians, the intellectual differences in this period were also seen as the reflections of the Ottoman intellectual decline. Even İnalcık accepts a deterioration of the scientific interest in the Ottoman realm in the period at stake. "The Triumph of Fanaticism" represented by rise of the fundamentalist group Kadızadelis caused a neglect and abandonment of the rational sciences which led to the deterioration of the science as a whole.[5] However, first the literature that questions decline paradigm since 1980s, and then, a study by al-Rouayheb on this particular issue signaled a reconsideration of the scientific decline in the seventeenth century.[6] Al-Rouayheb's study on the Islamic intellectual history deals with the Ottoman education and indicates the emergence of new approaches in the Ottoman education. He also shows that intellectuals began to undertake individual study to learn science and to

---

[3] Halil İnalcık, "Military and Fiscal Transformation in the Ottoman Empire, 1600-1700," *Archivum Ottomanicum* 6 (1980): 283-337.

[4] Linda Darling, "Ottoman Fiscal Administration: Decline or Adaptation?" *Journal of European Economic History* 26 (1997): 157-179; Baki Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Metin Kunt, *The Sultan's Servants, The Transformation of Ottoman Provincial Government, 1550-1650* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983); Şevket Pamuk, "The Price Revolution in the Ottoman Empire Reconsidered," *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 33 (2001): 69-89; Mehmet Genç, "Osmanlı'da 17. Yüzyılın Sosyal ve Siyasal Yapısında Değişmeler" in *İtri ve Dönemine Disiplinlerarası Bakışlar*, (Istanbul: Istanbul Kültür Sanat Vakfı, 2013), 13-18.

[5] Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300-1600,* trans. Norman Itzkowitz and Colin Imber (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973), 179-185.

[6] Khaled al-Rouayheb, "The Myth of "Triumph of Fanaticism" in the Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Empire" *Die Welt des Islams,* 48 (2008): 196-221.

contribute to it rather than following an established curriculum in an institutional framework.[7]

Recently, the role of the patrons in Ottoman scholarly production became point of interest. Fatih Çalışır, focusing on the Köprülü family's intellectual desires and attempts to incentivize scholars by patronizing them, shows that the seventeenth century was a prolific phase for the Ottoman scholarship. The polymaths such as Katip Çelebi (d.1657), Hezarfen Hüseyin (d. 1691), Ebubekir Dimaşki were not exceptions, but they were representatives of the scientific level of their period. The Ottoman capital, Istanbul, was a center where the different cultures share their scientific experience.[8] Bekar questions whether this rising interest in science, particularly in Western world was a result of an imperialist project driven by the Köprülü family in his study dealing with the history of Hezarfen Hüseyin, another scholar connected with the Köprülüs.[9] This question seems quite fair considering the consecutive military and political victories by the first two Köprülü viziers, Mehmed Paşa and Fazıl Ahmed Paşa. Together with this inherited prestigious position from his successors, Merzifonlu Kara Mustafa Paşa's own experience as the deputy of Fazıl Ahmed Paşa provided the continuity of this glorious days of the Ottoman rule vis a vis the European rivals during the incumbency of the third Köprülü grand vizier, as well as the necessary self-confidence to organize campaigns to Viena.[10] As the entrepreneurs of a project to obtain a worldwide power, it is understandable to assign scholars for examining the outside of the Ottoman realm. Production of new universal histories dealing with the European histories fits into this fashion very well.

---

[7] Al-Rouayheb, *Islamic Intellectual History in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

[8] Muhammet Fatih Çalışır, "A Virtuos Grand Vizier: Politics and Patronage in the Ottoman Empire During the Grand Vizirate of Fazıl Ahmed Pasha (1661-1676)" (PhD diss., Georgetown University, 2016).

[9] Cumhur Bekar, "A New Perception of Rome, Byzantium and Constantinople in Hezarfen Huseyin's Universal History" (M.A. thesis, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, 2011), 23.

[10] Yasir Yılmaz, "Grand Vizieral Authority Revisited: Köprülü's Legacy and Kara Mustafa Paşa," *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 31 (2016): 21-42.

In the frame of al-Rouayheb's and Çalışır's studies, Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede appears as one of the prominent actors among the Ottoman intellectuals. As a scholar who received his education not through the proper madrasa process, but following his personal scientific desires and as an author who writes not only on Islamic sciences, but also in rational sciences such as mathematics, astronomy, ethics, geometry, and medicine under the patronage of the Köprülü grand vizier Merzifonlu Kara Mustafa Paşa, and as a sufi royal favorite who has been in the palace in company with Mehmed IV during the Kadızadeli conflicts, Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede is a promising name who will help us to understand that controversial period. This thesis is a step to reveal Müneccimbaşı's perspective to his world relying on his universal history, *Camiu'd-duvel*.

1.2. Studies on *Camiu'd-duvel*

Müneccimbaşı's most well-known work*, Camiu'd-duvel* is a universal history beginning from Adam the prophet until his time. Müneccimbaşı introduced his book as a corpus of the historical information from numerous previous historical accounts, including Arabic, Turkish, Persian, and as a new fashion of his time, European sources. Although *Camiu'd-duvel* was used by several historians as a source, it has not been the subject of many scholarly studies so far. Hasan Fehmi Turgal paid the first attention to the book when he translated the chapter on the Seljukids into Turkish in 1935. Nihal Atsız published it by adding a short biography of Ahmed Dede to the translation of the chapter on Karakhanids by Mehmet Necati Lugal in 1940. As stated in the prologue, it was the first step of a larger plan, which is to translate the Turkish history in *Camiu'd-duvel* into Turkish completely and to publish it in small booklets section by section. When the translation is over, all the parts were supposed to be compiled in a single volume.[11] Obviously, things did not go as planned since we only have today the first step of this project. It was not until 1975 when Müneccimbaşı's historical account drew attention again. At that time, İsmail Erünsal translated a portion from the Ottoman section until the end of Süleyman's reign and it was

---

[11] Nihal Atsız, ed., *Karahanlılar ve Anadolu Selçükleri: Müneccimbaşı Şeyh Ahmed Dede Efendi'nin "Camiu'd-Düvel" Adlı Eserinden* (Istanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1939-1940.)

published in two volumes.[12] In 1983, Ahmet Ağırakça wrote a dissertation on the same chapter offering a critical edition and a translation.[13] Nuri Ünlü made another critical edition of the sections on the Bayezid II and Selim's reigns[14] and Ömer Tellioğlu did the edition of the chapter on Hamadanis[15]. Ali Öngül[16] translated again the Seljukid period in 2000. More recently, Hatice Arslan Sözüdoğru published the critical edition of the last chapter of the Ottoman history, from 1574 to 1672, in 2009[17] and Ghassan b. Ali er-Remmal published a critical edition of the whole Ottoman section in the same year.[18] The most recent study is by Fahri Oluk which is the translation of the chapter on Mehmed IV's reign.[19]

In this thesis, I will primarily use the critical edition by Ghassan b. Ali er-Remmal for Ahmed Dede's narrative on the formative period of the Ottoman political enterprise. Due to the several typing errors in this edition and for further analysis of the book I will also consult manuscripts of the work. *Camiu'd-duvel* has seven available copies for researchers, including the autograph copy. It is a two-volume copy in Nuruosmaniye Library no 3171/3172.[20] In addition to the autograph copy, I consult another copy in Esad Efendi Library.[21]

Considering that *Camiu'd-duvel* does not even have a complete published critical edition we can say that it requires much more scholarly attention. Present studies are valuable because they convey the text to the researchers for further analysis,

---

[12] İsmail Erünsal, trans., *Müneccimbaşı Tarihi* (Istanbul: Tercüman, n.d.)

[13] Ahmet Ağırakça, trans., *Camiu'd-düvel: Osmanlı Tarihi (1299-1481)* (Istanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1995).

[14] Nuri Ünlü, "Cami'ü'd-Düvel (II.Beyezid ve Yavuz Sultan Selim devri) Müellif Müneccimbaşı Ahmet Dede (Tenkidli Metin Neşri)" (PhD diss., Marmara Üniversitesi, 1990).

[15] Ömer Tellioğlu, "Müneccimbaşı Ahmed B. Lütfullah'ın Cami'ü'd-Düvel'inden Hamdaniler Kısmının Metin Neşri ve Tercümesi" (M.A. thesis, İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1994).

[16] Ali Öngül, *Camiu'd-düvel: Selçuklular Tarihi I: Horosan- Irak, Kirman ve Suriye Selçukluları* (İzmir: Akademi Kitabevi, 2000).

[17] Hatice Arslan Sözüdoğru, *Müneccimbaşı als Historiker: arabische Historiographie bei einem osmanischen Universalgelehrten des 17. Jahrhunderts: Ğāmi' ad-duwal (Teiledition 982/1574-1082/1672)* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2009).

[18] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-Düvel,* 209.

[19] Fahri Oluk, "Cami'd-düvel Sultan IV. Mehmed Dönemi Tercüme, Metin ve Değerlendirme" (PhD diss., Erciyes Üniversitesi, 2011).

[20] Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede, *Camiu'd-duvel*, Nuruosmaniye, 3171-3172.

[21] Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede, *Camiu'd-duvel*, Esad Efendi, 2101-2103.

close readings and comparisons. However, all the studies above on *Camiu'd-duvel* constitute a first step to examine the book since they generally do not go beyond providing presentations of parts of the text. As a result, this large comprehensive book remains undiscovered in many aspects. As we can see, modern scholarship has not dealt with it as a whole. Although *Camiu'd-duvel* contains a history of a large time scale and detailed narrative especially for Arabic and Mongolian pasts, the studies on it focuses on the Ottoman or Seljukid histories with the exception of Tellioğlu's translation of the section on Hamadanis. Therefore, closer studies do not only use the opportunity for reaching another Ottoman historian's mind as a piece of the Ottoman historiography puzzle, but also provide a new source for the histories of many rulers and states.

1.3. Approaching Sources

The discussions on the Ottoman historiography in the last twenty years have been illuminative for determining my approach to sources of this thesis.[22] The search for objectivity in historical researches dominated the scholarship for a long period of the last century of the Turkish historiography. Especially, after the opening of the Prime Ministry's Ottoman Archives to the researchers, the official registers and the possibility of scientific knowledge appealed the historians to focus on this material. However, after 1980s, the neglect in using the narrative sources and the preponderance of the archival material was questioned. I will primarily follow the approach that criticizes this positivist attitude against the narrative evidence. Cornell H. Fleischer offers one of the most prominent studies of the Ottoman intellectual history in this fashion. In his illuminating and stimulating study on Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali (d. 1600), he argues that confining to archival registers results in "dry and isolated entries." In order to bring them coherence, or in his analogy, to give flesh to the institutional skeleton of the state we should deal with the narrative sources.[23]

---

[22] For a survey of the both modern and Ottoman historiography see: Gabriel Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy – History and Historiography at Play* (London: University of California Press, 2003), 30-50.

[23] Cornell H. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: the Historian Mustafa Ali (1541-1600)* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1986).

Regarding with approaches to the narrative sources, Cemal Kafadar is another prominent name who conducted a study that constitutes a guide book for this thesis. In *Between Two Worlds*, he reestablishes the history of the formative period of the Ottoman State after he presents a detailed presentation of the previous literature on that issue indicating their methodologies and approaches to the narrative sources for a period for which researchers do not have a choice but relying on them.[24] He disapproves the idea of the previous historians about the chronicles as sources that include parts from the reality, but requires effort to extract it. Rudi Paul Lindner likens the act of reading these sources to watching a shadow play, and evaluates the historians craft which is to find the reality hidden in it as revealing the puppet-master.[25] Kafadar draws an analogy and instead of Lindner's method that is analogue to onion, he offers an alternative multiplex system which is represented by the garlic. He argues that the idea of a unidirectional development of the ideology is misleading. These sources should be scrutinized in the complex Ottoman social context.[26]

More recently, Kaya Şahin applied this method to Celalzade Mustafa's (d. 1567) *Tabakatu'l-Memalik.* He examined Celalzade's life and work in the context of the formation of the Ottoman imperial identity during the sixteenth century.[27] Cumhur Bekar also examined Hezarfen Hüseyin (d.1691), a contemporary scholar with Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede, and his universal history with the same method.[28]

Following the approach presented above, I will investigate how Müneccimbaşı saw the dynasty and presented them to his reader based on his universal history, *Camiu'd-duvel,* particularly the chapters on the formative period of the state. The primary focus of this thesis will be on exploring Müneccimbaşı's attitude towards the legitimacy of rulership of the Ottoman dynasty. I will investigate the tools that

---

[24] Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

[25] Rudi Paul Lindner, *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1983), 19.

[26] Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 99-101.

[27] Kaya Şahin, *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman: Narrating the sixteenth-century Ottoman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 5.

[28] Bekar, "A New Perception of Rome."

Müneccimbaşı chose to rely on as legitimizing bases and examine reasons for his choices. I will make a content analysis in order to see how Müneccimbaşı's construction of the formative history of the Ottoman state reveals his perspective to the dynasty and what is similar with the previous histories and what goes different from the other existing narratives. I will also contextualize *Camiu'd-duvel* by scrutinizing Müneccimbaşı's relationship with the contemporary power holders and conflicts. I should also note that such an attempt would be illuminative for the authors' contemporary atmosphere, rather than for the formative period.

1.4. Shift in the Argumentations on the Legitimacy of the Ottoman Dynasty

A significant change in the seventeenth century was the decrease in reputation of the Ottoman dynasty. Emecen argues that the political theories against the dynasty were first proposed in this period. He demonstrates the challenges that the dynasty faced. However, as a result, he argues that the dynasty was victorious since it got over this harsh process.[29] Tezcan deals with the same issue, however his comments are not that optimistic about the reputation of the dynasty. He argues that in the seventeenth century royal authority that belonged to the Ottoman dynasty began to fade as a sign of a more democratized "Second Ottoman Empire". He is also aware of that, although the dynasty lost its power, the throne belonged to them. To him, the dynasty gained its durability by losing its power through becoming subjected to the same law with the public. He presents it as a new way to legitimize the dynasty in a world where the ruling authority was out of sultan's autocracy and spread to a larger group of elites.[30] In other words, the sultan managed to find a way to turn current hard situation into an advantage for the dynasty.

Tezcan's arguments indicates a shift in the legitimizing tools of the Ottoman rule in the seventeenth century. Before that, the indispensability of the dynasty was based on points that reveal the superiority of the members of the Ottoman family over others, such as descending from a tribe destined to rule, Oğuz, and being enthusiastic

---

[29] Feridun Emecen, "Osmanlı Hanedanına Alternatif Arayışlar," in *Osmanlı Klasik Çağında Hanedan, Devlet ve Toplum* (Istanbul: Timaş, 2011), 37-60.

[30] Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire*, 237-38.

devotes of holy war. These points were concluded to a large extant from the works of the first Ottoman historians. In the twentieth century historians read these books as objective sources, therefore, the narratives on legitimacy of the Ottoman dynasty and the stories of the Ottoman success overlapped in the Ottoman histories. They constituted a base for the discussions on the rise of the Ottoman state.[31] After a while, some scholars questioned authenticity of these points and argued that they were artificial tools produced by subsequent needs, thus, should be read critically.[32] Colin Imber conducted a thought-provoking study in which he shared his formulation of legitimizing tools that he named as "the Ottoman dynastic myth" connoting that they did not represent historical reality but composed by the subsequent historians retrospectively to demonstrate Ottomans' right to rule. The elements of this myth are war in the name of faith, inheritance to Seljukids, divine approval of the dynasty, and Ottoman genealogy.[33] Ottoman historians claimed superiority of the Ottoman sultans over their rivals relying on these ideas. In the last decades, historians conducted more studies on legitimizing the Ottoman dynasty that were aware of the relationship between the narratives and narrator.[34]

One of the main factors of legitimizing process of the Ottoman rule, Sufis, serve as the transporters of divine approval of the dynasty through dreams, advises, and prophecies.[35] Still, none of these studies mentions a relationship between Osman and

---

[31] Two fundamental studies in this discussion are: M. Fuad Köprülü, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Kuruluşu* (Ankara: Başnur Matbaası, 1972), and Paul Wittek, *The Rise ofThe Ottoman Empire* (London: The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1958). Chapter two deals with this literature in a larger scale.

[32] Halil İnalcık read one of the founding names of the Ottoman historiography in this fashion: "How to read Ashık-Pasha-Zade's History" in *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V. L. Menage*, ed. Colin Heywood and Colin Imber (Istanbul: Isis Press, 1994).

[33] Colin Imber, "The Ottoman Dynastic Myth," *Turcica* 19 (1987): 7-27.

[34] A compilation of valuable essays on narratives of legitimacy from different periods of the empire's history: Hakan T. Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski, eds., *Legitimizing the Order, The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power* (Leiden: Brill, 2005); Hasan Basri Karadeniz, *Osmanlılar ile Beylikler Arasında Anadolu'da Meşruiyet Mücadelesi (XIV-XVI. Yüzyıllar)* (Istanbul: Yeditepe Yayınevi, 2008); Ömer Cide, "Osmanlı Devleti'nin Kuruluş Döneminde Meşruiyet Sorunu ve İlk Kaynaklara Yansıması," *Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dersgisi* 2 (2015): 105-126.

[35] Emecen gives a good description of relying on Sufi groups as a source of legitimacy by the Anatolian principalities in formative period of the Ottoman state. Particularly the section on the intimacy between Saruhanoğulları and Mevlevilik depicts how the power holders sought to benefit from the reputation of established orders due to the rivalry

Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi, or any other Mevlevi authority. In fact, historians writing on Mevlevis argue that there was no intimacy between the first Ottoman rulers and Mevlevis.[36] In this context, Müneccimbaşı's presentation of the relationship between two sides arises as a question mark. The primary focus of this thesis will be on exploring Müneccimbaşı's attitude towards the legitimacy of rulership of the Ottoman dynasty. I will investigate the tools that Müneccimbaşı chose to rely on as legitimizing bases and examine reasons for his choices. I will question whether there were any changes in the Ottoman dynastic myth in the seventeenth century. For this purpose, I will compare Müneccimbaşı's narrative with Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri's historical accounts, as the representatives of earliest examples. By doing so, I hope to find an explanation for Mevlana's appearance in the history of the construction of the Ottoman state.

To that end, first chapter will be a general analysis of the legitimizing elements of the Ottoman rule. In this chapter, I will question whether the Ottoman dynastic myth preserved until Müneccimbaşı's period or not. In the second chapter, I will dwell on one aspect of these elements. Müneccimbaşı's text has a special emphasis on devotion of the Ottoman sultans to Islam. He empowers this emphasis by Islamicizing sultans' relationship with non-Muslims and alienating the sultans from friendly relationships with non-Muslim neighbors. A comparison of his text with Aşıkpaşazade's and Neşri's narratives will provide a chance to provide this argument. The last chapter will narrow down the emphasis on Islam to Sufism and be devoted to explain Mevlana's mysterious appearance in an Ottoman history. In addition to inclusion of Mevlana, some sufi characters were overemphasized, while others were excluded. It seems a productive step to begin with establishing Müneccimbaşı's Mevlevi bonds and his contemporary intellectual atmosphere heated by the conflicts between Kadızadelis and Sufis.

---

between them after fall of Seljukids. Feridun Emecen, *İlk Osmanlılar ve Batı Anadolu Beylikler Dünyası* (Istanbul: Kitabevi, 2003).

[36] Abdulbaki Gölpınarlı, *Mevlana'dan Sonra Mevlevilik* (Istanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 1953)

CHAPTER II

SUBSTANTIATING THE LEGITIMACY OF OTTOMAN IMPERIAL CLAIMS IN THE LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Müneccimbaşı's extended historical account deals with many states beginning from the time of the first man, Adam, which makes it "a compiler of the states" (*Camiu'd-duvel*). Compared with other states in Müneccimbaşı's account, the Ottoman state occupies a significant position in various respects. First of all, the Ottoman dynasty did not claim superiority all of a sudden, but was instead endowed its authority by God. Secondly, they obtained their power without any disloyalty to the previous Muslim rulers. In addition, Müneccimbaşı frequently highlighted that the Ottoman dynasty held an everlasting political authority. He was so certain about the endurance of the Ottoman dynasty that he devoted the epilogue of his sizeable work to the section on them.

Was Müneccimbaşı's presentation of the political legitimacy of the Ottoman dynasty related to the trends in his period? In accordance with the political crisis at that time, intellectual production in the seventeenth century was generally pessimistic. It was a period when the great Ottoman dynasty faced many external and internal challenges and worried many intellectuals with its course. During the century, five sultans were dethroned, and two of them were killed.[37] Keeping faith in the endurance of the Ottoman State became increasingly difficult. This lack of confidence in the Ottomans prompted alternative sultan candidates to be proposed from other families.[38] This atmosphere led to a rise in the number of the works that were critical of the administration, and the sultans in the second half of the sixteenth century and the seventeenth century. Müneccimbaşı's contemporary authors mostly devoted their works to complaints about the current situation of the state and the efforts to

---

[37] For additional examples of the hard times for the Ottoman dynasty in the first half of the seventeenth century see Günhan Börekçi, "İnkirazın Eşiğinde Bir Hanedan: III. Mehmed, I. Ahmed, I. Mustafa ve 17. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Siyasi Krizi," *Divan: Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi* 45 (2009/1): 45-96.

[38] Feridun Emecen, "Osmanlı Hanedanına Alternatif Arayışlar," 38.

identify the mistakes of the Ottoman administration. Such accounts subsequently constituted the main sources for the argument of an Ottoman decline.[39]

Considering Müneccimbaşı's context, his confidence in the Ottoman dynasty seems outdated. The image of the Ottoman dynasty that he proposed in his history does not give the impression of their afflicted position at all. If a curious reader about the seventeenth century only read *Camiu'd-duvel,* s/he would think that the authority of the Ottoman sultans was as firm as it used to be and that would continue to be so. Müneccimbaşı's frequent emphasis on the persistence of their rule until the end of time is the biggest sign of this approach. This chapter will be devoted to exploring the position of the Ottoman state among the other states in Müneccimbaşı's work focusing on the sources of rulers' power. I will look for possible answers to the question of what provided the Ottoman State its legitimacy to make Müneccimbaşı think that it would continue until the end of the time. To do that I will try to understand his conception of the Ottoman dynastic myth which is a composition of the main elements of the Ottoman legitimacy in the Ottoman chronicles. His presentation of it might provide his personal attitude towards the dynasty in the seventeenth century.

2.1. Müneccimbaşı's Rearticulation of the Ottoman Dynastic Myth

Ottoman historians relied on several themes in presenting the superiority of Ottoman power over other contemporary power holders. Colin Imber argues that the first Ottoman historians created an Ottoman dynastic myth to provide legitimacy to Ottoman authority in front of both Muslim and non-Muslim rivals. The myth had its most popular form until the sixteenth century with the contributions of several authors. To him, the authors of the first Ottoman historical accounts, Ahmedi, Enveri, Aşıkpaşazade, and Neşri, presented several elements of the myth in the guise of historical fact. These elements, which were preserved until the twentieth century,

---

[39] For a description of these works see: Douglas A. Howard "Genre and Myth in the Ottoman Advice for Kings Literature," in *The Early Modern Ottomans Remapping the Empire,* eds. Virgina H. Aksan and Daniel Goffman (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007) and Howard "Ottoman Historiography and the Literature of Decline," 52-77.

were the sultan's zeal in holy war, their Seljukid heritage, their Oğuz genealogy and the divine support they enjoyed.[40] In other words, this myth presented the Ottoman rulers as Muslim sultans descendent from Oğuz Turks, and heir to the Seljukids, and they fought against the infidels in order to elevate the name of God and fulfill the command of the Sharia which was a mission implied by adopting the *gazi* title, as heralded and attested by religious authorities and holy men.

Müneccimbaşı began his chapter on the Ottomans with a section on the merits of the Ottomans in which he shared his main ideas about the position of the Ottoman state among its predecessors and contemporary counterparts. It begins as follows:

> Be it known that the Ottoman dynasty—may God make it everlasting with his support—is the greatest of all sultanates in its magnificence, expanse of its realm and size of its territory, sublime power, wealth of goods, beneficence, glory, zeal and power, sharpness of its sword and spear, plenty of money, troops, and weapons, and in the proper exercise of reason and righteous practice. They became the sultans of east and west, kings of the two lands and the two seas, protectors of the sacred cities. Those well-versed in the books of history know that such land as God has granted them He has not granted to anyone after Solomon. This noble family has obtained the sultanate [not through] wrongdoing to anybody else [but] seized all its territory from unbelievers, rebels, and evildoers. Their emergence took place in the most agreeable form, like the emergence of the great caliphs from the noble companions and followers [of the prophet]. They spent their greatest efforts exalting the word of God by campaigning against the polytheists and heretics. Thus, God granted them this great kingdom gradually, and inspired them to promulgate laws (*kanun*) and to consolidate its pillars. It had happened to oppressive and wicked men like Jangiz and Timur that great kingdoms were granted to them not gradually but all at once, and this way they were lured into ultimate perdition. To sum up, this noble dynasty's virtues are numerous, and its laudable features innumerable, so that I restrict myself to this much, admitting my inability to enumerate and comprehend them all, seeking forgiveness for this.[41]

After he praised the Ottoman sultans for their military skills, wealth, and the expanse of their lands by comparing them with the rulers of the rest of the world, he indicates at several points their virtues (*fazilet*). Hagen describes two elements of Ottoman

---

[40] Imber, "The Ottoman Dynastic Myth," 7-27.

[41] Gottfried Hagen, "Ottoman Understandings of the World in the Seventeenth Century," in Robert Dankoff, *An Ottoman Mentality: The World of Evliya Çelebi, Ottoman Empire and its Heritage* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 235.

legitimacy that are highlighted in this part: "ultimate justice which leads to a stable rule" and "zeal in the holy war." These are two of the fundamental points for understanding Müneccimbaşı's perspective and how he integrated the Ottoman dynastic myth into his text. I will deal with these elements as presented by Müneccimbaşı below.

2.2. Genealogy

Following the section on the virtues of the Ottoman family, Müneccimbaşı added another one on the glad tidings that occurred during the formation of the state and after. In this section, he shared seven auspicious events that heralded the emergence of the ever-lasting Ottoman state by holy or respected men. Just as in the first section, this one also provides cornerstones for Ottoman legitimacy. One of them is the supremacy provided by the lineage of the Ottoman dynasty which goes to Kayı.

Müneccimbaşı, depending on Ruhi's history, transmitted a report by Korkut Ata that reveals Oğuz Han's will for the rulership of the Kayı tribe. In this report, Korkut Ata articulated that Oğuz Han had willed that the khanate and sultanate belong to the people of Kayı Han and this would continue until end of the times. Müneccimbaşı added that Osman Gazi was one of the sons of Kayı Han, and that his tribe was called Kayı Hanlı among the Turkmens due to the fact that their headman was descended from Kayı Han. By doing so, he did not leave establishing a connection between them and the Ottomans to the reader.[42]

In this short report, the Ottoman dynasty gets consolidation from a powerful Turkmen tribe: Oğuz. First of all, the precursor is a man who is recognized by all the Turkish tribes to arise from Oğuz Han. Korkut Ata, also known as Dede Korkut, is a semi-legendary storyteller in Turkish literature who comes from Oğuz origin. He is depicted as a wise man who knows the rules of life in the steppes of Anatolia and tries to preserve them.[43] Therefore, his sayings correspond with the oral laws of those lands. What he said in this chapter disqualifies any Turkish rulers other than Kayıs by

---

[42] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 198.
[43] Orhan Şaik Gökyay, "Dede Korkut," TDVIA.

forcing them to admit that the Kayıs were the real rulers who were supposed to hold that position until the last day. In short, a respected Turkish wise man declared that the rulership belongs to the Kayı family. This was obviously included in order to demonstrate Ottoman supremacy. To make sure his message was conveyed to the reader, Müneccimbaşı repeated the same report in the section where he narrated Osman's lineage with the various versions that existed in Ottoman histories.

The first appearance of connecting the Ottoman lineage to Oğuz through the Kayı branch was in Ahmedi's, then more elaborately in Yazıcıoğlu Ali's works in the reign of Murad II in the first half of the fifteenth century. Imber evaluated these as an artificial attempt to glorify the dynasty in front of the neighboring rulers by discrediting their lineage, and therefore treated it as an element of the dynastic myth.[44] This genealogy was adopted by the subsequent Ottoman historians with slight differences until Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede who also found it a useful base for establishing Ottoman supremacy in the seventeenth century. Even if it was not a way to obtain benefit anymore in his time due to fact that the main target of this argument, Turkish principalities was not a big threat anymore, one can at least argue that he chose to follow his predecessors.

2.3. Seljuk Inheritance

Another chief element in the legitimation of Ottoman power in *Camiu'd-duvel* is the emphasis on the alliance with the Seljuks. The first Ottoman ruler, as well as their Oğuz ancestors to some point, was presented as the loyal vassal of the Seljukid sultans. When Seljukid rule completely faded away because of the Mongols, the loyal Ottomans inherited their power, and the Ottoman State thereby became a successor

---

[44]Imber, "The Ottoman Dynastic Myth," 16-20. It is a contradictive topic that the Ottomans really came from Oğuz origin or not. Although it would be exciting to answer that question, this study will not focus on answering that since it requires particular emphasis. For an illuminative and compact study on it see: Feridun Emecen, "Kayılar ve Osmanlılar: Sahte Bir Kimlik İnşası mı?" in *Oğuzlar, Dilleri, Tarihleri ve Kültürleri: 5. Uluslararası Türkiyat Araştırmaları Sempozyum Bildirileri* (Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Yayınları, 2015). Emecen prefers to read Yazıcızade Ali's work not as an invention, but as a reformulation of a known reality in a written form, in case of need. Relying on the cadastral surveys from sixteenth century, he argues that the Ottoman family descended from the Oğuz.

of the Seljuk State. Such a position was used by the Ottomans to claim hegemony over the Anatolian principalities. More importantly, Bayezid I used it in order to rally supporters against Timur, who declared authority on the basis of his connection with the Ilhanids.[45] In other words, it was targeted at Muslim rivals in Anatolia whom the Ottomans needed to have a reason to fight against. While they chose *jihad* as a sufficient ground against the non-Muslims, when it come to the Muslims, the Ottomans attacked them by charging them with disobedience to the sultan.[46]

How did Müneccimbaşı approach the relationship between the Ottomans and Seljukid sultans? In his narrative, the first Ottomans adopted quite a courteous manner towards the Seljuks, even though the latter were on the verge of collapse. On various occasions, he highlights their respect for Seljuk authority. The first one is in the section on the merits of the Ottomans, which indicates that the respect was one of the points that elevated the Ottomans over their counterparts. After eulogizing the Ottoman sultans for their virtues, Müneccimbaşı adds that despite their praised power, they never betrayed their forerunners, unlike many of the previous rulers had. He described two ways of obtaining authority: one by rising against the current authority, the other by their consent and resignation. The first one provides a rapid way to become a powerful ruler; however, it is temporary. Müneccimbaşı names this method by a Qur'anic terminology, *istidraj* which stands for God's carrying the infidels, the unruly and oppressor slaves to calamity after providing them temporary and rapid successes.[47] It was represented in the Qur'an by accursed characters such as Firavun and Karun who could not manage to maintain their power. In this dichotomy, the Ottomans were the ones loyal to the Seljuks and obtained the rule to govern step by step, as opposed to Cengiz and Timur who were also achieved a great a power in a short span of time, however that power did not go on after their reign.[48]

---

[45] Emecen, "İhtirasın Gölgesinde Bir Sultan: Yıldırım Bayezid," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları/The Journal of the Ottoman Studies* 43 (2004): 70.
[46] Imber, "The Ottoman Dynastic Myth," 15.
[47] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 190.
[48] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 189-90.

After sharing this idea in the introduction, Müneccimbaşı refers to it again in his discussion of Ottoman history. He begins with the departure of the Oğuz tribes from Turkistan to come to Transoxiana simultaneously with the Seljuks' cross. Then, they went to Horasan, again, with the Seljuks, by courtesy of the Ghaznevid sultan, Mahmud b. Sebüktekin (d.1030). For some reason –Müneccimbaşı does not mention any- the sultan imprisoned the leader of the Oğuz tribes, Israil b. Selçuk b. Yukak, which lead those tribes to an unrest. During this period of unrest, the Kayı tribe stood out among others for its loyalty to the Seljuks. While the other tribes seized the opportunity, and plundered Seljukid lands, Osman's ancestors remained loyal. They did not claim independent power until the Seljukid rule had disappeared completely after the Mongol invasion. Then, everyone who did not want to obey Mongolian authority gathered around Osman.[49] To Müneccimbaşı, what made Osman worthy of leadership among the other frontier lords and the male members of his family is that he did not declare independence until Seljukid power had disappeared completely; he was noble, and brave, and respected to the scholars and wise men and asked for their prayers.[50]

This affinity was not one-sided. Seljukid sultans also used to love and appreciate the Kayıs. When Ertuğrul intended to go to Rumelia from the plain of Pasin in 1233, he approached the Sultan Alaaddin I b. Keyhüsrev (d. 1237). The sultan gave them the region of Karacadağ gladly because the Kayıs were famous for their courage. He appointed Ertuğrul as *uçbeyi* (lord of a frontier region who was endowed a piece of land to rule in exchange for providing security there).[51] In addition, in 1299, another Seljukid sultan Alaaddin Keykubad III (d.1303), appreciated Osman's bravery and loyalty to the sultan unlike the other *uçbeyi*s who took the advantage of Seljuk

---

[49] At this point, Müneccimbaşı gives various dates for Osman's takeover of the ruling power. They span from 1286, when Karacahisar was conquered, to 1308, when the last Seljukid sultan died. What does not change in these various reports is that all of them demonstrate the consent of the Seljukid sultans. Although Müneccimbaşı does not make a clear choice among these dates, we can deduce his preference from his organization and titles. He calls the period of Osman's rulership before Gazan Han's dethronement of the last Seljukid sultan in 1299/1300 as *kıyam* (resurrection). After that, Osman became a sultan.

[50] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 217

[51] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 208.

weakness because of the Mongols to attack their lands. The sultan awarded Osman by sending him the signs of sultanate, *alem (*banner*)*, *tabl* (drum), and *nakkare* (a large kettle drum) in addition to announcing him as the head of the frontier lords.[52]

There is an irony about the relationship between the Ottomans and Seljuks. No matter how much respect the Ottomans showed to the Seljuks, Müneccimbaşı makes it clear that the Seljuks were not in a level to compete with the Ottoman sultans, either genealogically or religiously, in terms of having the right to rule. This might seem a contradiction, since the Ottomans connected themselves with the most powerful previous authority, while at the same time arguing their superiority over them. As presented above, the Ottoman family was endowed an authority by God as the descendants of Kayıs. Moreover, God gave the Ottomans power like the way he gave to the great king and prophet Süleyman. Also, they were directly compared with the prophet Muhammad and his caliphs by likening the Ottoman emergence to the theirs. On the other hand, the Seljuks were descended from the Kınık branch of Oğuzs. Müneccimbaşı does not make any additional comment on their merits. The section on the Seljukid State also reveals his point of view. He located them in an ordinary chapter entitled "states of the fifth century," without any comments or compliments on their success, leadership, religiosity, etc.[53]

How did Müneccimbaşı solve this contradiction or did he even try? How can we think of these two elements of Ottoman legitimacy together? The Ottoman authors apparently managed to reconcile them because it is a common theme in accounts of the Ottoman dynastic myth. The Ottoman genealogy and loyalty to the Seljukids were presented as complementing each other. In Müneccimbaşı's narrative, the Ottomans were far ahead of the Seljuks, since he stated that God had not given such rulership to anyone but them since the prophet Solomon. However, due to the fact that they were not rebellious to the current authority, they did not rise until the Seljuk state had completely fallen. Thereby, while the Ottomans obtained a praised quality, the image of weakness in front of the Seljuks was also eliminated. The loyalty to the

---

[52] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 232.
[53] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-Duvel*, Nuruosmaniye, 3171, 324a.

18

Seljuks was not due to their virtues, but because of the Ottomans' respect for their predecessors. The combination of the two elements of the Ottoman case proved the Ottomans most legitimate. In this respect, this might be a representation of Emecen's evaluation: "The Ottoman success lay in their ability to reconcile different sources of legitimacy."[54]

The diversity of the elements of the legitimation also indicates that in Müneccimbaşı's perspective, there was a hierarchy between the legitimacy of rules. He did not think that legitimate rule was dependent on specific sources, but it was possible to increase or decrease it by having them. More elements a power relies on, more legitimate it becomes. For instance, as apparent in the case of the Seljukid sultans, descending from a family that is divinely chosen as rulers is not necessary to become a ruler. Although the Seljuks were not a family who had inherited rulership, they were still legitimate for Müneccimbaşı. We can conclude that looking at Osman's wait for their fall to claim an independent authority. It is only necessary in order to obtain legitimacy at the same level with the Ottomans.

Despite the difference between the Ottomans and Seljuks, Müneccimbaşı's attitude towards them is quite respectful, especially, compared with the one of the founder names of the Ottoman dynastic myth, that of Aşıkpaşazade's; Müneccimbaşı's style appears to be more submissive to the Seljuks. The conquest of Karacahisar castle is where their distinctiveness is most explicit. In both texts, this is a critical point for the establishment of the Ottoman state.[55] It was the first time that Osman was mentioned in the Friday sermon which was one of the signs of the rulership. In Müneccimbaşı's version, the preacher, Tursun Fakıh, gave Osman's name after he mentioned the Seljukid sultan's name. Aşıkpaşazade in contrast told a completely different story. When Tursun Fakıh told Osman that they needed to have Seljukid sultan's permission to appoint a *kadı*, Osman got angry and said,

> I captured this castle with my own sword. What does sultan have to do with it that I have to ask his permission! The God who gave him sultanate (*sultanlık*), endowed me [power of] *gaza* and khanate (*hanlık*). If this

---

[54] Emecen, "Osmanlı Hanedanına Alternatif Arayışlar," 65.

[55] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 225.

obligation is because of *sancak*, I did not fight against infidels with a *sancak*. If he says that he was from Selçuk descendants, I would say I am son of Gök Alp. If he says I came to this land before them, I would say my grandfather Süleyman Şah came before them.[56]

They both represent two extreme attitudes towards Seljukids. Neşri afforded a milder account of the same event. In his book, the sermon was given under the name of the Seljukid sultan for the sake of propriety. However, this did not mean that Osman waited the until fall of the Seljukid state to claim power. Neşri stated that Osman's rise was during the reign of Seljukids.[57]

2.4. Religious Authorization

Another source of legitimation in Müneccimbaşı's work, connected to the earlier discussion of genealogy, is divine approval of Ottoman political power. To Müneccimbaşı, Allah endowed the Ottoman dynasty with a power that had not been given to anyone since the time of the prophet Süleyman, who was a great king in the Jewish, Christian, and Islamic traditions and was known for his great wealth, realm, and wisdom. He was thought to live in the tenth century BC.[58] Müneccimbaşı argued that the Ottomans were also a divinely chosen family who were promised a long and prosperous reign. In his narrative, the prophet Süleyman appears as a perfect model for Ottoman power. He was divinely appointed, and was the son of another ruler who was also divinely appointed, Davud. He thus encapsulates the main elements of its legitimacy: divine approval and genealogy.

Müneccimbaşı develops his emphasis on divine approval mostly in the chapter on the glad tidings and true reports about the emergence of the Ottoman state.[59] One of them was that of Korkut Ata, emphasizing genealogy, which was presented above. Müneccimbaşı's account includes seven more auspicious events each of which had a prophecy about future everlasting Ottoman power from mystical authorities.

---

[56] Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman*, ed. Kemal Yavuz and Yekta Saraç (Istanbul: Gökkubbe Yayınları, 2007), 289.

[57] Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihannüma,* ed. Faik Reşit Unat and Yekta Saraç (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2014), 109.

[58] Ömer Faruk Harman, "Süleyman," TDVIA.

[59] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 192-199.

Müneccimbaşı divided them into two categories, based on their sources. If it was derived directly from Ertuğrul or Osman, it was good news (*büşra*). The ones by respected holy authorities such as Ibn Arabi, and Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi were named as true reports (*haber-i sadık*). Their common gist was that Allah blessed the Ottoman dynasty with a great and everlasting authority.

Müneccimbaşı relies on several methods to support the idea that the Ottoman dynasty enjoyed. The first one is dreams. On one occasion, Ertuğrul dreamt that water surged from his chest and filled the whole world. On another, after spending hours paying homage to the Qur'an, Allah addressed him in his dream heralding a continuous state for his progeny. Müneccimbaşı relates that Osman had also been through a similar experience. When he spent the night in the house of a prominent sheikh, Ede Bali, he dreamed that a big tree grew from his body until its shadow covered the whole world.

The second way Müneccimbaşı explains the delivery of the divine message to our world is through mystical characters who were known as men of God. In addition to the report by Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi, to which I devote a separate chapter in this study, and the one by Korkud Ata, shared above, Müneccimbaşı narrated another one in which Kumral Abdal was the messenger. Hızır gave him the divine message of the emergence of an everlasting Ottoman state. Although not in this section, the mystical experience of Şemseddin Muhammed Buhari, or Emir Sultan (d. 1429?), constitutes a good example of the divine endowment of the rulership. In the turmoil caused by the imposter Mustafa (d.1422), who put in a claim for the throne, the sultan Murad II (d. 1451) asked for Emir Sultan's help and prayers. Emir Sultan consoled the sultan and tied his sword to him with his hand as a sign of sultanate. The most interesting part is a transmission from Emir Sultan. It was narrated that he saw in the world of visions (*alem-i mana*) the prophet Muhammad informing him that the rulership had passed to Mustafa from Murad II. Emir Sultan did not consent to it and asked from the prophet it to turn back to Murad II three times. On the third time,

he approved. Following that, Müneccimbaşı wrote a couplet highlighting the power of the saints in changing the course of events.[60]

Müneccimbaşı's last method is using the old sciences to learn about the future. He offers a number of examples such as astronomy, and science of onomancy (*el-cifru'l-cami)*. Depending on the findings of onomancy and the verses of the Qur'an, Ibn Arabi (d.1240), seventy years before the emergence of the Ottomans, wrote about the grandness and permanence of their state in his book *ed-Dairetu'n-Numaniyye*. The monks of the Margrid church in Siroz also predicted the same future thanks to their abilities in the ancient sciences. Therefore, when they heard about Osman they asked for a document ensuring their safety from him as a precaution about the future Ottoman conquests. When the third Ottoman sultan, Murad came to their land, they kept their territory by submitting that document.

Highlighting the role of the mystical figures and religious wise men dates back to earlier times, to the Central Asia Turkish and Mongolian writing tradition. It had been a common belief since then that the authority to rule was given by God to rulers by means of the mystical characters, saints, and shamans. When the Ottomans faced off against their rival dynasties, the Timurids, Karamanids, and Kadı Burhaneddin (d. 1382), they chose to defend themselves with this old tactic, as did their rivals, and revealed the source of their authority as the divine sanction.[61] Dreams and unexpected outcomes in battle were also understood as signs of divine support.[62] Based on gospels and reports, Müneccimbaşı's account also follows the path of the previous Ottoman historians.

Considering all the elements above, it appears that in Müneccimbaşı's presentation, the main idea is divine endowment of the power to rule to the Ottomans and the permanence of that power until the end of the world. Reading between the lines, we can conclude that the saints are the sources who provided this approval to the

---

[60] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 398.
[61] İnalcık, "How to Read," 147.
[62] Hagen, "Ottoman Understandings of the World," 237.

sultans. Divine approval is significant, but what is more significant is the people who brought it. We should bear in mind that Müneccimbaşı fulfils the conditions of the last two methods, being a saint and having the knowledge of an ancient science, as a Mevlevi disciple and an astrologer which is a significant point that I will dwell upon in a separate chapter.

2.5. Islamic/Mamluk Legitimacy

I mentioned above that Emecen finds the key to the Ottoman success in their ability to reconcile various notions of legitimacy. He names two: the Central Asian and Mongolian idea of the divine endowment of rulership to a family, and the Islamic political concept.[63] The two points that I presented above relying on *Camiu'd-duvel*, the genealogy and religious authorization, seem to belong to the former. What can we find in Müneccimbaşı's text about the latter? To answer that, I will briefly introduce the Mongolian style and, as the contemporary Islamic political model, the Mamluk style of obtaining legitimacy.

It is possible to differentiate between the Mongol and Mamluk styles of legitimation. The former fundamentally depended on the lineage of the rulers and the laws that the first Mongol ruler Cengiz made. In addition, as the Mongols conquered Muslim lands and became Muslim, they began to adopt Muslim ideas, institutions, and practices, keeping the utmost emphasis on lineage and law. On the other hand, the Mamluks had no claim on genealogy, most probably due to their slave origins. Instead, they focused on Islamic ideas, such as being the guardians of the holy cities of Islam and patrons of Muslim scholars, which made it less appealing for universal claim, as opposed to the Mongolian way since it only addresses to the Muslim as the target audience.[64]

The emphasis on the adherence to a particular family in the Ottoman histories indicates that the Mongol political conception was adopted by the Ottoman authors.

---

[63] Emecen, "Osmanlı Hanedanına Alternatif Arayışlar," 38.

[64] Abdurrahman Atçıl, *Scholars and Sultans in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 17-19.

Considering the religious context of Ottoman lands in the fourteenth century, it is not surprising to find the Mongolian political legacy useful. Kafadar describes the *uç* atmosphere as follows: "Unorthodox, syncretistic, or even heretical ideas did find more-fertile ground in the unstable frontier areas, where the authority of the central governments and their versions of Islam could hardly be enforced."[65] In this context, Mamluk way would not be as useful since its target audience was limited to Muslims.

Ironically, despite the fact that Müneccimbaşı rigorously tried to convince the reader that the Ottoman rise was completely the opposite of the Mongols' by putting great emphasis on the Ottoman genealogy, he actually relied on a source from the Mongol origin. It was not a conscious choice because the Mongolian ideologies integrated into the Islamic world permanently.[66] On the other hand, he could not establish the legitimacy of the dynasty solely on Islamic basis, since Islamic tradition does not have the notion of the supremacy of any particular race or family but being a Muslim. In fact, if someone insists on finding a base for the sake of a dynasty, it would go against him because of a saying of the prophet Muhammed that make the caliphate dependent on his tribe, Quraysh. Therefore, Müneccimbaşı, as well as all the previous Ottoman authors, had to combine Islamic and other elements to provide a basis for Ottoman legitimacy.

The reflection of the Islamic political conception in the Ottoman example appears in the desire of the Ottoman rulers for the title of Sultan endowed by the caliph from the Mamluks. Even though the Mamluk power had been on the wane during the fourteenth century, it was still meaningful to obtain a title from them indicating the legitimacy of Ottoman rule. The Mamluk caliph was the representative voice of the Islamic approval. Therefore, the first leaders of the Ottoman state, as well as their neighboring rival principalities like the Karamanids, also attempted to achieve a title including *sultan* based on their ample petitions to the Mamluk administration. The

---

[65] Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds,* 56.
[66] Atçıl, *Sultans and Scholars*, 27.

Ottomans were successful since we know that Murad I was granted the title *Sultanu'l-guzat ve'l-mücahidin*.[67]

Müneccimbaşı's text shows that he internalized the idea of entitling the rulers as sultans, which was actually meant to relying on the Mamluk authorities. Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri both entitled the first two Ottoman leaders with the mere title of "*gazi*." In their section on Murad, they used both titles: Sultan Murad Gazi. Müneccimbaşı, in contrast did not have such reservations. In *Camiu'd-duvel*, all Ottoman leaders were named sultans beginning from Osman and Orhan. This might simply be anachronism on the part of an author in the seventeenth century who wrote about the fourteenth century. It is also a likely possibility that by the seventeenth century, the sultanate titulature was settled enough that the author found it natural that all the Ottoman leaders were sultans. Müneccimbaşı presented the first two rulers as if they were also approved by the caliph. This means that the first Ottoman ruler, Osman's rulership, was as legitimate as the subsequent ones, for instance one of the most powerful ones, Süleyman I.

2.6. Reconception of the Ottoman Sultans' Relationship with Their Subjects

Up until now, I have tried to demonstrate Müneccimbaşı's conception of the source of the Ottoman sultans' legitimacy as rulers. What about the image of the Ottoman dynasty in the perspective of his contemporaries? Although the Ottoman state stands as a unique example in the Islamic history thanks to the success of the Ottoman dynasty in maintaining hold of the authority for a long time, it appears that the rulership of the Ottoman family did not always seem so firm. Several events indicate that at some point, the Ottoman subjects thought that the end of Ottoman dynastic power was at hand.

Especially in the seventeenth century, the Ottoman dynasty's reputation declined and several alternative names for the dynasty were being mentioned in different corners. The Ottoman dynasty was reduced from being representatives of the

---

[67] Atçıl, *Sultans and Scholars*, 21.

absolute religious and political authority, derived from divine and genealogical roots; to being mere rulers. The powerful aristocratic families became potentially viable alternatives to the Ottoman dynasty.[68] Emecen enumerates several examples. A historical work from the seventeenth century narrates a conflict between Âl-i Osman and Âl-i Cengiz. Although the story was from the fifteenth century, the author's presentation made Emecen think that the Crimean khans were still a potential threat to the Ottoman dynasty in the seventeenth century, long after the establishment of the imperial order. Müneccimbaşı's patron, Merzifonlu Kara Mustafa Paşa, is also presented as a potential alternative for the Ottoman sultan Mehmed IV by Dimitri Kantemir. He recorded that Merzifonlu had a mind to ascend the throne and to found a western empire after conquering Vienna. Other names mentioned as alternatives to the Ottoman sultan in the seventeenth century included Şeyhulislam Sunullah Efendi (d.1612) during the Celali revolts, the grand vizier Davud Paşa (d.1623) when Osman II was dethroned. In addition, a small part from the itinerary of Evliya Çelebi summarizes the damaged image of the sultans. He narrates that when Mehmed IV addressed the audience as *kullarım* (my slaves) during a speech, the crowd responded by saying *"kul Allah'ındır sen bir mütevellisin"* (slaves belong to Allah, you are a deputy). [69]

Tezcan's formulation of the new phase of the seventeenth century bureaucratic structure complements the scene. He argues that after the regicide of Osman II, the state entered a new phase during which the monarchic nature of the administration began to fade. He points at the political reflection of decline in the absolute power of dynasty. He says this was the beginning of an Ottoman proto-democratization process with the dynasty becoming weaker while the ruling elite became stronger.[70] In other words, although the sultans were still head of the empire, their ruling authority weakened, which means that they were not as reputable as they used to be before the seventeenth century. Emecen does not evaluate the material above in

---

[68] Hasan Basri Karadeniz, *Osmanlılar ve Rumeli Uç Beyleri* (Istanbul: Yeditepe, 2015), 406, 407.

[69] Emecen, "Osmanlı Hanedanına Alternatif Arayışlar," 41, 54.

[70] Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire*, 43-45.

the same way as Tezcan. He reads the challenges in the seventeenth century as steps to empower the idea of the indispensability of the Ottoman dynasty as rulers since they managed to hold it for three more centuries. Although the two scholars differ from each other in interpreting the outcomes of these events, they are in agreement that the dynasty faced serious challenges in the seventeenth century. This is sufficient for this study, since it aims at shedding light on Müneccimbaşı's time.

Historians abandoned this old emphasis on the indispensability of the Ottoman family, in particular the claim that they were descendants of Oğuzs not necessarily because of the negative image of the Ottoman dynasty, but also because of the change in the potential threats to the dynasty. The emphasis on the Oğuz lineage in the Ottoman histories was thought to be derived from the attempts to glorify the dynasty in the eyes of the neighboring Turkish principalities. When this atmosphere began to fade with the elimination of their treat and the Ottoman state was transformed into an imperial state -with the inclusion of non-Turk officials in the Ottoman aristocracy- the Oğuz lineage lost its significance. Imber presents Hoca Sadeddin's (d. 1599) skepticism towards the origins of the Ottoman family as evidence of this.[71] In this respect, Müneccimbaşı's confidence about the validity of the Ottoman lineage becomes a contradiction. We know that he showed respect to Hoca Sadeddin and frequently referred to his history, *Tacü't-tevarih* in his own work. Despite his awareness of opposing ideas, then, Müneccimbaşı consciously chose to present the Ottoman family as a noble ruling family.

2.7. Argument for the Eternity of the Ottoman Dynasty

In a world that began to question the patrimonial nature of the Ottoman state, Müneccimbaşı's account constitutes argument in support of the Ottoman dynasty's right to rule. He made use of numerous opportunities to emphasize the durability of the rulership of the descendants of Osman. Obviously, Müneccimbaşı was not alone in qualifying Ottoman rule as an ever-lasting state (*devlet-i ebed müddet*). However, in his context, doing so must have meant something else than it did in the fifteenth

---

[71] Imber, "The Ottoman Dynastic Myth," 20.

century. Müneccimbaşı's, together with Hezarfen Hüseyin's historical account and the others who kept reproducing the Ottoman dynastic myth, might have been a response to contemporary critics. Tezcan's explanation of this contradiction is that it marks a continuation of the earlier pluralistic historiographical tradition. Even though the prevalent fashion was critical of the royal absolutism, there were still the examples of the old fashion.[72] In this respect, *Camiu'd-duvel* belongs to the second group.

Müneccimbaşı revealed his point of view about the authority of the Ottoman dynasty right in the invocation section, by qualifying Mehmed IV as "the owner of the throne of the caliphate by inheritance and qualification."[73] He obviously did not agree with the idea that the Ottoman dynasty had lost its chance to claim authority on the basis of their lineage. To consolidate this patrimonial image of the Ottoman state, he based this idea on two grounds: family on an ideological level, and qualification and experience, a factual point.[74] When it comes to the section on the Ottomans, his attitude becomes more apparent. All of the glad tidings by the holy and respected names -Korkut Ata, İbn-i Arabi, Ede Bali, Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi, Kumral Abdal etc.- show that the rulership belongs to the sons of Osman till the end of time. On every single occasion, Müneccimbaşı added a word stressing this permanence.

Another concept in Müneccimbaşı's work is also illuminative for his approach in question. It is to introduce the Ottoman state as the seal for Islamic history. Müneccimbaşı wrote the histories of the previous dynasties in order to provide the necessary ground for the comparison. In other words, he compiled the states in *Camiu'd-duvel* (Compendium of the States), arguably, in order to demonstrate the difference between the Ottomans and the previous states. Placing the chapter on the Ottomans at the end of the work was the first step for comparison. It was not simply

---

[72] Tezcan, "Politics of the Early Modern Historiography," 180.

[73]"*Maliku seriri'l-hilafeti bi'l-irsi ve'l-istihkak*" Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, Nuruosmaniye, 3171, 1b.

[74] Karateke divides the elements of legitimacy into two groups: factual and ideal. While the former corresponds with the appreciated practices of the sultan by his subjects, the second is an ideological framework consisted of the respected components. Hakan Karateke, "Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate: A Framework for Historical Analysis," 15.

a result of the chronological order, but it was because the Ottomans was the ultimate power to rule the Muslim world. Tezcan makes same evaluation for another general history from the late sixteenth century, *Tomar-ı Hümayun* (the Imperial Scroll). In this scroll, the history after the Prophet Muhammad is a prediction of the ultimate arrival of the Ottomans. The author of the imperial scroll, Lokman b. Hüseyin (d. after 1601) implicitly assimilates the position of the Ottomans to the Prophet Muhammad's, and wants the reader to think of the Ottoman dynasty as the seal of the all dynasties, just like Muhammad was the seal of the prophets.[75] Müneccimbaşı followed this Ottoman historiographical style a little more directly. Unlike the author of the *Imperial Scroll*, Müneccimbaşı clearly articulates his purpose, which was to hope for the continuity of Ottoman rule until the end of time.

Even in the first histories there was the idea of the Ottomans' being the seal for Islamic history. The author of one of the earliest examples of Ottoman historiography, Ahmedi (d. 1413), formulated this idea by likening the position of the Ottoman state to Islam's place among the other religions. He says for the Ottomans:

> What comes at the end is better than what comes at the beginning.
> ….
> The Prophet (Muhammad) came after the others.
> He became the definitive (prophet), and was honored more than all the rest.
> Kur'an is the last of the four revealed books.
> It has canceled the validity of the others with (its) superiority.
> Because the human being came (into the world) later than everything else,
> He became the leader of all.
> The Padishah is the banner everywhere.
> Can the sovereign become less valuable than that banner?
> The resplendent pearl is formed in the depths of the sea,
> The thorn, straw, and chip are all on the surface.
> Tebbet and Kul huvallahu ahad
> Are the irrefutable proofs of this judgement.[76]

---

[75] Tezcan, "The Politics of Early Modern Historiography," 174.

[76] Kemal Sılay, "Ahmedi's History of the Ottoman Dyansty," *Journal of Turkish Studies* 16 (1992): 129-200.

"Sonra gelen ön gelenden yeg olur.

…

Sonra geldi enbiyadan ol resul,

Hatem oldu vü kamudan eşref ol.

Dört kitabun sonu Kur'andur gelen,

Fazl ile oldur anlara nasih olan.

Kamudan çün sonra geldi hatemi,

In a similar fashion, in the second half of the fifteenth century, Nişancı Mehmed Paşa prayed for the Ottoman family to rule for eternity over Muslim lands. "Oh God, just as you ornamented the throne with them, make them perpetual; and just as you filled the land of caliphate with their virtues and grace, make it everlasting."[77] These two records, especially Ahmedi's, demonstrate that Müneccimbaşı was not unique in locating the Ottoman section in the conclusion in a way to imply that they were the last rulers of all times.

By declaring the eternity of the Ottoman dynasty, Müneccimbaşı followed an older fashion. The common points between Ahmedi, Rumi Mehmed Paşa, and Müneccimbaşı might provide us the motives behind the emphasis on eternity. The first affinity is in their profession. Although coming from different backgrounds, Müneccimbaşı, Ahmedi, and Mehmed Paşa all held official positions. Ahmedi died as a scribe of council (*divan katibi*) in Mehmed I's reign. Before his submission to Mehmed I (d.1481), he was under the patronage of Mehmed I's brother, Süleyman Çelebi. Nişancı Mehmed Paşa served to Mehmed II first as his chancellor (*nişancı*), then as grand vizier.

One cannot consider the writings of an author divorced from his official position, especially if he was an intimate servant to the sultan while writing about him. We know that Ahmedi used his pen effectively to ingratiate himself with power holders. In thirty years, he acquired three patrons by offering them poems. Respectively, they were Süleymanşah, the leader of Germiyanids, Süleyman Çelebi, son of Bayezid I, and lastly Mehmed I. Therefore, it would not be unfair to think of his work as a way of

---

Fazl ile oldu kamunun hatemi.
Padişah aşağa, yukaru alem.
Ol alemden padişah olur mu kem?
Dürr-ü meknun bahr ka'rında olur.
Üş has ü haşak yukaru gelür.
Tebbet ile kul huvallahü ahad
Bu söze höccet ki yokdur ana red." Ahmedi, "Tevarih-i Mülük-i Al-i Osman," ed. Nihal Atsız in *Osmanlı Tarihleri 1* (Istanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1947), 7.

[77] *"Tanrım! Saltanat tahtını onların vücudlariyle süslediğin gibi onları müebbed kıl, darü'l-hilafeyi onların fazl ü keremleriyle doldurduğun gibi sonsuz et."* Nişancı Mehmed Paşa, "Osmanlı Sultanları Tarihi," in *Osmanlı Tarihleri 1*, 343.

pleasing the sultan. Even if he did not write at the request of a patron, it is still an example of the state's influence on literature.

Müneccimbaşı's world witnessed more direct control over the historiography by the state. Beginning from the second half of the sixteenth century, the Ottoman administration made an attempt to control the historiography through official court historiographers.[78] However, it did not succeed until the eighteenth century.[79] Although not a court historiographer, Müneccimbaşı wrote his work at a time when the palace was aware of the power that histories had on the people and wanted to use historical production for their sake. Müneccimbaşı must have written with an awareness of his relationship with the head of this project, the sultan. After all, it is not surprising to find a state official writing for the benefit of the current head of the state.

Another noteworthy similarity between Ahmedi and Müneccimbaşı is that they both wrote during a difficult period for the dynasty. Ahmedi witnessed the chaotic period after the Ottoman defeat by Timur. The Ottoman sultan faced a severe setback, which harmed the idea of having divine support. Moreoever, a long conflict occurred between the four sons of Bayezid I for the throne, which almost drove the state into the fall. In this atmosphere, Ahmedi held the belief in the durability of the Ottoman rule. The seventeenth century was also a troublesome period for the dynasty which led to the questioning of the dynasty's indispensability. Nevertheless, Müneccimbaşı, in addition to the others, was hopeful about the future of the dynasty.

This parallelism between the two authors from two different centuries prompts me to think that this similar attitude cannot be a mere coincidence. Karateke states that the tactics of legitimation are not static, and can be reshaped based on new needs.[80] On this point, Hagen seems right about the seventeenth century in arguing that the

---

[78] For more information on this point, see: Christine Woodhead, "Reading Ottoman Şehnames: Official Historiography in the Late Sixteenth Century," *Studia Islamica* 104/105 (2007): 67-80.
[79] Tezcan, "The Politics of Early Modern Historiography," 175-177.
[80] Karateke, "Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate," 14.

31

contemporary political situation -in which the Ottoman dynasty faced many challenges- might be the reason for the frequent references to the certainty about the rulership of the Ottoman dynasty.[81] On this view, Müneccimbaşı intentionally ignored the tough situation and drew a completely opposite image of the dynasty by highlighting the dynasty's substantiality. As a result, there was a more powerful and stable Ottoman dynasty in his accounts than the ones in works written in the brighter days of the state. Neither Aşıkpaşazade nor Neşri, the founding fathers of the Ottoman dynastic myth, put as much emphasis on the indispensability of the Ottoman family as Müneccimbaşı did. The hard times of the dynasty produced loyal defenders such as Ahmedi's, Nişancı's accounts, and Tomar-ı Hümayun, as well as many critical voices. The ones who wanted to write in favor of the dynasty had more challenges in front of them, therefore, had to be more eager to eulogize them. In the same fashion, Müneccimbaşı's certainty about the continuation of the dynasty was a defensive reaction to the threats that it faced.

Another question must be raised about how Müneccimbaşı's context would have affected on his writing, which is his connections with the Köprülü family. Considering that Müneccimbaşı stated that he wrote his work at the request of the grand vizier Merzifonlu Kara Mustafa Paşa's, son-in-law of Köprülü Mehmed Paşa, it makes the reader question whether it was a part of Merzifonlu's request to absolve him of the claims that Kantemir mentioned in his book regarding grand vizier's plans to become a sultan. Although Kantemir's book alone is not enough to argue Merzifonlu's desire for throne, it is not a fantastic idea; especially if we bear in mind the prominence of the Köprülü family in the Ottoman state. The seventeenth century Ottoman administration witnessed five Köprülü grand viziers. Their tenure constituted a turning point for the great Ottoman historians.[82] However, the most we can say about possibility of grand vizier's assignment Müneccimbaşı to write in an optimist way is

---

[81] Hagen, "Ottoman Understandings of the World," 238.

[82] Hammer made Köprülü Mehmed's assignment a level in his periodization. Joseph Von Hammer-Purgstall, *Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi: Sultan İbrahim'in cülusundan Köprülü Mehmed Paşa'nın Sadrazamlığa Tayinine Kadar (1640-1656)*, trans. Mehmed Ata (Istanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat, 1985). İnalcık also devoted the third volume of his *Devlet-i Aliyye* to the period of the Köprülüler. Halil İnalcık*, Devlet-i Aliyye Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Üzerine Araştırmalar III: Köprülüler Devri* (Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2015).

that the grand vizier faced such rumors and could have wanted to deny it. On the other hand, we should bear in mind that it might simply have been Müneccimbaşı's own choice. To answer this question more accurately requires more research into books written at the request of the Köprülü family.

2.8. Conclusion

Ottoman political legitimacy depended on several cornerstones. Primarily due to the rivalry between the Mamluks and Safavids, the Ottomans argued their superiority over the other Muslims on genealogical and religious bases. When it comes to Müneccimbaşı's period, the seventeenth century, an Ottoman dynastic myth that consisted of these points had already become prevalent in the Ottoman histories. In general, the Ottoman dynastic myth was adopted by Müneccimbaşı with slight insertions. In addition to his focus on Oğuz genealogy, inheritance of Seljukid power, and divine approval of the Ottoman family, he placed a special emphasis on the endurance of the Ottoman dynasty as the rightful rulers of the Muslim world. Müneccimbaşı's certainty about the rulership of the Ottoman dynasty seems contradictory to the contemporary political situation in which the Ottoman dynasty faced many challenges. The harsh conditions that the Ottoman dynasty had been through in his time were likely the reason for Müneccimbaşı's additional stress on the significance of the Ottoman family and made him even more enthusiastic defender of the dynastic myth than its composers. His connections in the palace and submission to the Köprülü family in the context of the seventeenth century must have come into play in his formulation of these legitimizing tools.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF THE RELATIONS WITH CHRISTIANS

Müneccimbaşı's way of presenting the interactions between Christians and the Ottoman sultans in his *Camiu'd-duvel* is revealing about his history writing. He differs from Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri with his critical attitude against the Ottoman sultans' close relationships with Christians. For example, in one occasion, he avoids relating an event that indicates the presence of amity between Osman and a Christian ruler, *tekfur* of Bilecik. In cases of contact between the Ottomans and Christians, Müneccimbaşı resorts to different solutions: Instead of excluding the Christian allies from the text, he either puts them in a culpable position and labels them as the reasons for failure of the Ottoman state, or feels a necessity to find an excuse to legitimize this intercourse for a Muslim reader, as will be demonstrated below.

It seems ironic to a reader from twenty-first century to find Müneccimbaşı writing in a bigoted way about members of different beliefs, considering that he is a devotee of Mevlevi tradition which is today famous for the tolerance and inclusiveness. The present motto of the Mevlevis is a sentence from Mevlana's *Mesnevi* that shares this blanket image: "Come, whoever you are!" If we consider this super-tolerant image as a recent development, we should question: coming from a Mevlevi origin, why would Müneccimbaşı act in such an intolerant manner to the friendship and alliance between the sultans and non-Muslim rulers? To answer that question, first I will introduce how the nature of the relationship between the sultans and the non-Muslims was introduced in the formative period and in Müneccimbaşı's time.

The confessionalization paradigm in the Ottoman Empire as discussed by Krstic and Terzioğlu. Confessionalization, here, signifies privileging a particular religious understanding of the religion while marginalizing the other in order to establish an integration between religion and politics, provides a good theoretical base for this chapter. This is a process that ends with the foundation of a religious orthodoxy. Krstic deals with the different religious groups in the Ottoman realm in its every stage

adopting the confessionalization paradigm from the European religious history. In this respect, not all the members of every religious group were in the same position due to the fact that certain groups sought to advance their political interests using religion. In the Ottoman context, it corresponded with the Sunnitization. Beginning from the sixteenth century when the rivalry with the Habsburgs and Safavids paved the way for an Ottoman Sunnitization as a way to build a distinct identity, the efforts were undertaken to make Sunni Islam the basis of the state ideology. Its coincidence with the Shiitization of Safavids reveals that the Sunnitization was not a merely religious thing, it was also project planned and conducted by the politicians with political aims.[83] Terzioğlu also scrutinizes the same issue as an older and more permanent situation. She highlights the various motivations of the subjects of the Sunnitization and argues that the new Sunni orthodoxy in the sixteenth century was not only a response to the Shi'i threat by the Safavids, but also it served to force the power of ulema and to increase Islamic literacy. The efforts in the sixteenth century produced more varied agents for Sunnitization in the seventeenth century. Sufis, particularly the Halveti and Celvetis played a more significant role even than the ulema did.[84] Confessionalization paradigm presents a shift in the Ottoman religious context from the metadoxy appeared in the formative periods and consolidated in the beginning of the imperial state, to a uniformed way of understanding religion.

On the other hand, some scholars disagreed the idea of explaining the seventeenth century events by depending merely on the rising piety.[85] They drew attention to the

---

[83] Tjana Krstic, *Contested Conversions to Islam Narrative of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (California: Stanford University Press, 2011).

[84] Derin Terzioğlu, "How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization: A Historiographical Discussion," *Turcica* 44 (2012-2013): 301-38.

[85] The attitude of attributing every major event of the seventeenth century to the piety, almost an Islamic fanaticism is represented by Marc Baer. He argues that the top-ranking administrators of the Ottoman State conducted an Islamicizing project by forcing non-Muslims to conversions or trying to exclude them from official positions. Marc D. Baer, *Honored by the Glory of Islam: Conversion and Conquest in Ottoman Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011). For some scholars, this approach seemed inconsistent to the other aspects of the same century. Özcan demonstrates several mistakes in the information that constitute evidence in Baer's thesis. Abdulkadir Özcan, "İstanbul'un Eminönü Semti VII. Yüzyılda mı İslamlaştırıldı?" *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 37 (2011): 206-213; Çalışır indicates the openminded approach of the grand vizier, Fazıl Ahmed Paşa in patronizing the non-Muslim scholars and benefiting from their intermediary between the

new ways of interpretations and highlight the fact that it was when the Ottomans began looking at the Occident with respect and learning about the Occident. The leading actors of this universalist project were the very same leaders of the so-called Islamicizing attempts. Although completely opposite to the frame presented above, considering the evidences that these scholars relied on, this approach seems quite reasonable for the seventeenth century Ottoman history. While contextualizing Müneccimbaşı's narrative, these two approaches will provide the ground.

The interactions between the Christian groups and the Ottomans in the first episode of the Ottoman history is dealt with under the criteria of how much they involved in the Ottoman success to become a great empire. In fact, the whole history of the early Ottoman empire is formed around questioning how the Ottomans stood out amongst the other Turkish *beylik*s and became a great empire to rule in the three continents.

This issue was first scrutinized by Gibbons and Lybyer in the beginning of the twentieth century. They put special emphasis on the role of Christians in the Ottoman enterprise. As Osman attacked the Christian neighbors and defeated them, Ottoman society began to include new Christian members. Their main argument is that these new Ottoman-Christians were the heroes of the subsequent Ottoman success.[86] In this respect, the Ottoman state was originated from Christian tradition in the guise of Islam. These arguments on the origins of the Ottoman power became prevalent in the historical studies until they were criticized by two prominent names of the Ottoman historiography: Köprülü and Wittek.

Fuad Köprülü gave a lecture in 1934 in France about the formation of the Ottoman State which was subsequently compiled in a book. He mainly criticizes Gibbons' religion-based arguments. Instead, he offers a nation-based schema which

---

Eastern and Western accumulation of knowledge. Çalışır, "A Virtous Grand Vizier," 119-169. Kenan Yıldız, "Doğruluğu Tartışmalı bir Tartışma: 1660 Yangını İstanbul'un İslamlaşmasına Etki Etti mi?" *Osmanlı İstanbulu I. Uluslararası Osmanlı İstanbulu Sempozyumu, Bildiriler* (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi, 2014), 197-242.

[86] Albert Howe Lybyer, *The Government of The Ottoman Empire in the Time of Suleiman the Magnificent* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913); Herbert Adams Gibbons, *The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire* (New York: The Century Co., 1916), 26-32.

constitutes the key-stone for the Turkish national historiography. He argues that the number of the converted Ottoman warriors was quite few. The real heroes, the members of the Ottoman bureaucracy in the fourteenth century, were Turks who moved to Anatolia before the Mongol invasions.[87]

The second antithesis that is generated against Gibbons' thesis is by Paul Wittek. He finds Köprülü's explanation relying on tribalism unsatisfactory. Just as Köprülü grounds on the nation, Wittek bases his theory on the religion. Relying on Ahmedi's *İskendername* and an inscription on a mosque from 1337 in Bursa which titles the sultan as *Gazi*, he argues that the Ottoman state was established thanks to the motivations to *gaza*, holy war, in Islam.[88] He does not attribute the victory to the Muslim Turks per se, but all the Muslims, including both innate-Muslims and converts, were motivated by Islam to be a march-warrior, i.e. *gazi*.

The latter two approaches predominated the field in the twentieth century until Kafadar criticizes it at the end of the century. He basically rejected the idea of dichotomist explanations of all the previous methods. Instead, relying on a more generic premise, which humans are complex creatures, he argues that one should approach them from various angles and look for complex answers in order to understand them. In this respect, he sees the success of the Ottoman enterprise as a result of multiple factors considering parallelisms between different nations, geography, and religious incentives. The Ottoman sultans managed diversity in their subjects well which constituted an Ottoman society religiously dominated by metadoxy instead of supremacy of a particular belief.[89] In other words, Christians and Muslims were the parts of a world where they shared the experience of coexistence.

This open-minded approach is more or less adopted by the following studies on the formative period. In the last twenty years, historians conducted studies dealing with

---

[87] Köprülü, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Kuruluşu*, 35-49.
[88] Wittek, *The Rise of The Ottoman Empire*, 15. Another significant study putting the largest emphasis on religion is by Osman Turan, *Türk Cihan Hakimiyeti Mefkuresi Tarihi: Türk Dünya Nizamının Milli İslami ve İnsani Esasları* (Istanbul: Nakışlar Yayınevi, n.d.).
[89] Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds,* 138-150.

the question of the Ottoman state formation outside the dichotomist paradigms. For example, Heath Lowry reexamines the gaza ethos and argues that instead of conceiving the word of gaza in its literal meaning, we should contextualize the sources that uses this word. As a result, he argues that the gaza ethos mentioned in the Ottoman histories was not representative of the past, but it is a tool to compare the past and present used by the author to deliver the message to his target audience. His alternate version of the Ottomans in the period at stake is, in his words, a religio-social hybrid Islamochristian entity.[90] Similarly, Barkey is also aware of the variety of members of the Ottoman society. To her, this very point is one of the two keys of the Ottoman success. She defines empire as the political entities that maintain people from various origins regardless of their nation or religion. Because the Ottoman administrators managed to maintain a society that is consisting of diverse nations and religions they became an empire as they were.[91]

Another study concerning the non-Muslims and state relationship was undertaken by Marc Baer . He deals with the issue focusing on conversion in accordance with the role of administration. He articulates his main question as how the process of conversion relates to the relation between the sultans and non-Muslims. He argues that the inclusive policy of Mehmed II towards Christians and Jews began to fade by a turn to piety in the seventeenth century. In this period, the state began to intervene in converting non-Muslims, in addition, Sufis were punished under the name of practicing heretic activities.[92]

The studies on this subject can be multiplied. However, the ones that I mentioned above suffice to summarize the main attitudes towards the relationship between Christians and the Ottomans. Briefly, and quite roughly, on the one hand, there are dichotomist perspectives represented by Gibbons, Köprülü, and Wittek that divide the people into two categories based on either their religions or nations. On the other

---

[90] Heath W. Lowry, *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), 137-143.
[91] Karen Barkey, *Empire of Difference* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 34.
[92] Marc D. Baer, "Honored by the Glory of Islam," 105-21.

hand, there are the studies that read a shared life experience between the two groups, instead of locating them in two opposite sides.

After presenting a short introduction about the current understanding of this issue I should state that this chapter does not aim to shed light on the nature of the relationship between Christians and the Ottomans. Rather, it concentrates on Müneccimbaşı's point of view in this debate. In other words, its purpose is not to make an argument about it, but to reveal how Müneccimbaşı approached it. My method will be to compare his narrative with Aşıkpaşazade's and Neşri's histories.

I should also remark that Müneccimbaşı's narrative does not allow making an analysis on this subject at a social level. All the example cases are about sultans. Therefore, Müneccimbaşı's anecdotes would seem incoherent with the approaches presented above that deal with the status of the crowds under the Ottoman rule. Though all the authors approach the problem of different levels, for the purpose of this chapter, they gather under the same question: how did they read the connection between Christians and the sultans?

3.1. The Hostility with Non-Muslims as a Sign of Piety

The first remarkable difference between Müneccimbaşı's, Aşıkpaşazade's and Neşri's accounts is Osman's attitude towards the *tekfur* (Byzantine lord) and the infidels of Bilecik. Although the structure of Müneccimbaşı's narrative is common with the latter two, he differs from them in significant details. The shared course of the events begins with the peace between Osman and the *tekfur*. After a while, the *tekfur* betrayed Osman and laid an ambush for him. Thanks to Köse Mihal's information, Osman heard about it and responded with another ambush which provided him the death of the *tekfur* and the capture of Bilecik castle.

Müneccimbaşı's version of the events is nearly identical to what is mentioned above with only an extra emphasis on the ambush. Still, the length of his narrative is not the reason for contemplating on it. Considering that Müneccimbaşı planned to write a compendious volume, it should not be. However, what he chose to sacrifice from his

narrative is intriguing enough to explore. Aşıkpaşazade, and, especially Neşri, to a large extent following Aşıkpaşazade, narrate a more detailed, also in several aspects a different, story. As a result, the lacking parts, in addition to Müneccimbaşı's small comments in *Camiu'd-duvel,* draws a more hostile picture between the *tekfur* and Osman.

The division between their approach begins right from the first step of the reconciliation between Osman and the *tekfur*. In the accounts of Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri, Osman willfully shuns from attacking the Bilecik castle. Both authors introduce two reasons for Osman's behavior. Firstly, Osman ideologically did not approve assaulting on the neighbors in the name of respecting the rights of neighborhood (*hakk-ı civariye riayet*). In fact, Osman designated his policy towards neighbors as *mudara* which means to dissemble in order to maintain good relationships. In this respect, they did not confine their peaceful attitude only to the Christians in Bilecik, but expanded it to all non-Muslim neighbors. Neşri explicitly states that Osman used to act in a peaceful manner in order to be on good terms with all the infidels around (*ve bi'l-cümle çevre yanındaki kefere ile müdara iderdi*).[93] The second reason for Osman's tolerance towards Christians was related particularly with the Christians of Bilecik. It was the gratitude to the people of Bilecik due to their hospitality when Osman and his tribe came to Söğüt first. When Osman was asked about his clemency to the infidels of Bilecik in contrast with the other infidels, he answered "They are our neighbors. We came to this land needy, they treated us well. Now, we should respect to them." As this passage indicates, there was a mutual trust between the two sides which allowed Christians to send their women to Osman's market on their own, just as Osman and his tribe used to entrust their belongings to the *tekfur* of Bilecik when they went to mountains to spent the summer.[94]

The good relationship between them degenerated in time. At this point Neşri gives more details. First step to that was *tekfur*'s arrogant attitude towards Osman's men. When Bilecik was sieged by the infidels of Köprühisarı, *tekfur* of Bilecik asked for

---

[93] Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihan-Nüma*, 88-89; Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih*, 282.
[94] Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih*, 284.

Osman's help. After Osman came with his gazis and helped the *tekfur* to break the siege, the *tekfur* exulted and let the gazis kiss his hand. This offended Osman and decided to kill the *tekfur.* However, his uncle Dündar advised him not to do because they already had many enemies around them. The disagreement between the two resulted in Osman's execution of his uncle.[95] The next step of the corruption was the *tekfur'*s betrayal. With the request of all the other *tekfur*s around because of their fear of Osman, the *tekfur* of Bilecik attempted to ambush Osman. Osman reversed the situation and killed the *tekfur*, thanks to Köse Mihal's notification.[96] At this point, Aşıkpaşazade differs from Neşri. Unlike Neşri, he introduced the peaceful attitude of Osman to the *tekfur* of Bilecik as a trick in order to beat them one day after obtaining their full trust. Although he did not mention it in the text, he added several couplets in this meaning right after the chapters, even after Osman revealed that his good manners were derived from the hospitality of the Bilecik folk's. One of them is: "Deceive the enemy till he trusts / In order to get a chance to behead.*"97*

The couplets in the same manner with the one above seem like a manifestation of Aşıkpaşazade's apologetic style of the combatant *gazi* character of the Ottomans. While he was writing his history in the fifteenth century, religion was a significant motivation for the campaigns, or, at least, historians liked to depict so. In this respect, Islam became highly emphasized and the *gaza* was praised as one of the fundamental reasons for the recognition of the Ottomans.[98] In this atmosphere, Aşıkpaşazade must have wanted to protect the powerful Ottoman image against the infidels exonerating them from naively believing in Christians, in contrast, he implied that Ottomans were the ones who were always one step further. Although not as powerful as Aşıkpaşazade, Neşri also presents an Ottoman sultan image that is a proud warrior who cannot even bear to see his men kissing *tekfur*'s hand. However, he does not give the deceitfulness as an excuse for the alliance with the Christians. It might be derived from the difference between the two authors in terms of life style.

---

[95] Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihan-Nüma*, 95.

[96] Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih*, 285-287; Neşri*, Kitab-ı Cihan-Nüma*, 95-103.

[97] "*Hile et düşmene ta kim vire el*
    Ki fursat bulasın zinhar başın al." Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih*, 282.

[98] İnalcık, "How to Read Ashık-Pasa-zade," 152.

While Aşıkpaşazade wrote in a warrior frontier culture, Neşri was a townsman and a religious scholar.[99]

As for Müneccimbaşı's narrative, first of all, there was not a friendly atmosphere between the two sides, but there was only a reconciliation. To Müneccimbaşı, Osman did not have the idea of that one should maintain good relationship with the neighbors regardless of their religions. Therefore, there is no mention of Osman's ideology about the neighbors, which is to get along well with the neighbors hiding negative feelings. Likewise, the hospitality by the people of Bilecik is also missing in his narrative. Still, they were not hostiles for a while. The stability of the relationship between Osman and the *tekfur* of Bilecik was provided by Köse Mihal's mediation. In the two previous narratives, Osman consulted with his brother, Gündüz, after the capture of Karacahisar castle. Osman stated his grateful and tolerant ideology towards their non-Muslim neighbors as a response to Gündüz's advice to attack on them. However, in *Camiu'd-duvel* they maintained their conquests of Sorgun, Mudurnu, Tarakçıyenicesi.[100] About Bilecik, he confines to say that Osman agreed with the *tekfur* of Bilecik after he presented his obedience. Then, the stability of their relationship has nothing to do with Osman's appreciation of their hospitality by the time they arrived in Söğüt. It was due to the submission of the Christians. Müneccimbaşı does not differentiate between the Christians of Bilecik and the others. They could have been attacked if they did not show respect to Osman.

Another difference in the same chapter is the appearance of the Germiyanoğlus in Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri's narrative, while Müneccimbaşı did not mention about them at all. The first two authors narrate a story in which a Germiyanoğlu was unfair to a Christian in the market, Osman protected the Christian and punished the other saying that no one will hurt any infidels of Bilecik. Both Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri stated that while Osman maintained the good relations with Bilecik Christians, he constantly

---

[99] Gottfried Hagen and Ethan L. Menchinger, "Ottoman Historical Thought" in *A Companion to Global Historical Thought*, ed. Pransenjit Duara and others (West Sussex: Wiley and Blackwell, 2014), 105.

[100] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 227.

fought with the Germiyanoğlus. This was presented as a sad reality for them since all the infidels were grateful for the enmity within the Muslim powers.[101] Müneccimbaşı does not give any detail about the relationship between the Germiyanoğlus and the Ottomans in this chapter.

Why would Müneccimbaşı hide both of these situations regarding with the people of Bilecik and Germiyanoğlu? Can we think these two missing parts together? I argue that Müneccimbaşı wanted to reinforce the Islamic emphasis of the sultans in the Ottoman enterprise in order to create a Muslim sultan image who set his goal as war against the infidels and saw the infidels nothing but a group to fight. Therefore, he hides the friendship with non-Muslims, and puts the hostility with other Muslims out of sight. Although Neşri, and especially Aşıkpaşazade made emphasis on the holy war, they still narrated stories on the friendship between two sides. Müneccimbaşı did not recount it even as a trick. In this respect, one can argue that Müneccimbaşı's emphasis on the sultan's enthusiasm in being a good Muslim was more powerful than presented by Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri.

In the same manner, Müneccimbaşı read Osman's intimacy with a former Christian Köse Mihal under the pretext of the sake of the religion. Since Köse Mihal was an indispensable figure of the Ottoman formative history, Müneccimbaşı could not leave him out of the text. Köse Mihal was a guide for many campaigns for his familiarity with the territory, in addition to being an intermediary and a messenger between Osman and the Christian lords. While fulfilling these duties, he was still a Christian until 1317/1318 which makes an alliance between him and Osman at least for fifteen years. However, it seems contrary to the sultan's image who considered infidels as the potential enemies. Therefore, Müneccimbaşı raised an excuse for their friendship. After the capture of Mudurnu and its environs, Köse Mihal's loyalty became definite, to the point that Osman began to call him my brother. Müneccimbaşı must have found it extraordinary and felt a necessity to offer a holly reason, which is consolidating the situations of the religion and sustaining the holy

---

[101] Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihan-Nüma*, 89; Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih*, 282.

warriors.[102] As if Osman would not prefer to be in such an intimacy with Köse Mihal if it was not for the religious benefit. One cannot conclude it from this section in *Camiu'd-duvel* as a historical fact, however, it can still be alleged that Müneccimbaşı wants to emphasize that possibility. It is also possible that what provided Köse Mihal this concession among was his subsequent conversion to Islam. If he remained in his belief, he would have been in the same position with the *tekfur* of Bilecik who was nothing but an enemy for Osman.

The reactional attitude of Müneccimbaşı towards non-Muslims fits well in the confessionalization paradigm. Although Sufism is highlighted today for its tolerance towards the difference, in the seventeenth century context, the prominent Ottoman Sufi groups were the leading actors of the confessionalization[103] which is, in a sense, hardening the boundaries between members of different religious groups. The rise in the exclusive approach to the non-Muslims is a representation of it. For example, in the sixteenth century, the employment of the recent converts seemed to the Ottoman authors contradictory to the traditional ways of the career path.[104] It is also noteworthy that while Sufis put the Kadızadelis and non-Muslims almost in the same category, which is being the outside the Islamic line, Kadızadelis did the same to the Sufis. Their target, as presented in the next chapter, was both the Sufi lodges, and the non-Muslims. The last leader of the Kadızadeli movement, Vani Efendi, effected Mehmed IV and his mother, a powerful political character Turhan Sultan (d. 1683), in "turning to piety". In this respect, the conversion became a political tool. In addition, several novelties appeared such as converting publicly wearing Muslim turban, clothing and compelled conversions by the sultan or his mother.[105] To demonstrate Turhan Sultan's piety, Kurdish Mustafa declares that she did not allow a Jewish physician, who was not clear of the dirt of the unbelief, to serve the sultan until he converted to Islam.[106] Kürd Hatib introduces the dichotomy between Muslims and

---

[102] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 228.
[103] Terzioğlu, "How to Conceptualize," 319.
[104] Krstic, *Contested Conversions to Islam*, 169.
[105] Baer, "Honored by the Glory of Islam," 322.
[106] "Padişah-ı adalet-intibah hazretlerinün nabz-ı şeriflerini dutup teşhis-i marazlarına razı olmayup buyurmuşlar ki madam ki tac-ı Islam-ı der-ser ve hilat-ı imanı der-ber itmedükce ol padişah-ı pak-nijad ve şehriyar-ı pür-adl ü dada tedbir-i ilac-ı sıhhat itmesine ruhsat

non-Muslims in analogy of Islam to the cleanness. Non-Muslims are deprived of the purity of Islam and contaminated by the dirt of non-belief. Therefore, a grimy Jewish doctor should not touch the sultan who had a pure lineage. Although in the previous century, the Jewish doctors dominated the medicine in the palace.[107] Ottoman people in the seventeenth century found it inconvenient. In short, there was an enterprise to purify the religion in the last quarter of the seventeenth-century and not being in company with non-Muslims was regarded a sign of enthusiastic Islam. In this fashion, Müneccimbaşı showed that it was also the same in the case of the previous sultans.

3.2. The Outcome of the Trust in the People of Blasphemy

Müneccimbaşı uses another incident to reveal his ideas about the intimacy with non-Muslims. Towards the end of the reign of the third Ottoman Sultan, Murad I (d. 1389), it had been a while since they kept proceeding in the West. The sultan either made agreements with the Christian landlords on various conditions such as providing military support, paying taxes etc., or captured their castles in case of resistance. The ruler of the Las (Serbian) lands, Susmanos, was one of the allies. However, in 1387/1388 he rose against Orhan and occupied some Muslim lands. Moreover, he distorted several other submitted lords. In response, the sultan sent the governor of Rumelia, Timurtaş Paşa (d.1461) to deal with it . One of the allied Christian leaders, the ruler of Iskenderiyye, Arnaud, hid his disloyalty and asked from Timurtaş Paşa backup force in his siege of the lands of Serbia and Hersek. Timurtaş Paşa who was unaware of the ambush, joined him with his men. At the time of battle, Arnaud's army left Timurtaş Paşa and reported to the ruler of Bosna and Hersek Timurtaş Paşa's situation. Therefore, he stood alone with his small troop in front of the crowded army. In the end, the governor survived, however fifteen thousand soldiers were killed. When the sultan heard about the defeat, he was in the middle of a ceremony in which he was getting married with a daughter of the Byzantine Emperor, and marry his sons Bayezid and Yakup with emperor's other two daughters. What

yokdur." H. Ahmet Arslantürk and Murat Kocaaslan, eds., *Dördüncü Mehmed Saltanatında İstanbul Risâle-i Kürd Hatîb* (Istanbul: Okur Akademi, 2014) 39-40.
[107] Baer, "Honored by the Glory of Islam," 200.

makes this story worth to be mentioned is the sultan's response to the governor's failure. He got upset and repented for his sins, which were asking for the help of the people of the blasphemy and campaigning with them. [108]

This section is interesting in several ways. First of all, in *Camiu'd-duvel*, it is the story of how *Devlet-i Aliyye* witnessed its first defeat since its formation. Müneccimbaşı introduces the first failure of the increasing Ottoman power as a result of the alliance with non-Muslims. Who gives voice to this idea is the sultan himself with his regret of establishing relationship with non-Muslims to the point that relying on their military support in critical missions. Surprisingly, unlike the previous image of the Christian neighbors who had always been an enemy to be killed in the name of gaza, in this section, the two Christian groups arise with two different occasions as intimate associates: first one is the Serbian ruler Susmanos as a military ally, second is the Byzantine Kaiser as a father-in-law. Soon after, we see that Müneccimbaşı does not change the previous negative image of the non-Muslims. The relationship with the non-Muslims immediately becomes a reason for the failure and, therefore, regret. Müneccimbaşı, most probably, included them in order to demonstrate how wrong and harmful it was to be allies with them. In this section, although the Serbian ruler is included in the text as an ally, what is emphasized about him is his betrayal. In short, Müneccimbaşı consolidated the enthusiastic Muslim sultan image by highlighting the remorse of Murad about the alliance with them. Although a bit late, he had the idea that the victory of Islam needs to be pure of the relationship with non-Muslims.

After nearly twenty-five years from the first disloyalty, another Serbian ruler, Vılakoğlu, appear in the text, in the Arnaud ruler's position. Before that, Bayezid I got married with his sister and fell in love with her. She deviated him from his ancestors' way and made the sultan neglect the state business and holy war (*jihad*). In the Ankara war against the Mongol Army in 1402, the Serbian ruler took side with the Ottomans. When all the support forces went to Timur's side and left Bayezid I alone

---

[108] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 307-308.

with the salaried troops of the court *Kapıkulu*, they were the only Christian vassals who still stood with him, however, eventually, they also withdrew their support.[109] It was a huge disaster for the Ottomans for it caused a 11 year-long civil war after Bayezid I was imprisoned in the battle field. The state suffered from the civil war among the sons of Bayezid for the throne. Müneccimbaşı imagined this period almost as a collapse looking at the title of the subsequent sultan Mehmed I as *muceddidu'd-devleti'l-Osmaniyye*, the renovator of the Ottoman State.[110] While looking for the reasons for this huge upset, Müneccimbaşı indicates various mistakes of Bayezid I. One of them regarding this chapter is to trust the people of blasphemy and hypocrisy. Second time, not long after the first one, another Serbian ruler gave the impression of being trustworthy and deserted the sultan when he needed his support most. In this way, in *Camiu'd-duvel* it is consolidated that the alliance with non-Muslims is sentenced to defeat.

The second noteworthy point in these two sections is that although Müneccimbaşı aims at building the idea of the harm of the intimacy with the Christians, it also reveals that the sultans had such relationships with them. Moreover, what he regretted for is not only the military alliance, but also friendship (*musadaka*) with non-Muslims. While empowering the idea of that the sultans tried to keep their distance with non-Muslims, Müneccimbaşı, at the same time, gives away that they used to be allies, and relatives.

Indeed, the coexistence that Kafadar introduces[111] for this period corresponded with a quite large collaboration between different religious groups. At this point, in addition to the Ottoman histories, despite their emphasis on the *gaza*, the chronicles written by the foreign observers, and archival records had been illustrative. This cooperation appears especially in the Ottoman military. First of all, the Ottoman army in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was comprised of both Muslim and non-

---

[109] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 336.
[110] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 370.
[111] Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 19.

Muslim soldiers.[112] Moreover, many Christian leaders in Rumelia and Balkans supported the Ottoman military powers in case of need, as their vassals. To illustrate, in 1396, a vassal of the Ottomans, Stefan Lazarevic (d. 1427) fought with them against the crusaders. Most of the vassals did not betray the sultan even in the interregnum after the defeat in Ankara.[113] The good relationship with the Christians went on in the fifteenth century. In Murad II's army, there were 3000 *sipahi*s who were sent by the Serbian despot, in addition to the many other Christian soldiers from Bulgaria.[114]

Among the pool of incidents regarding with the non-Muslims, Müneccimbaşı chooses the ones that would create a negative non-Muslim neighbor image who does not deserve to be trusted. Even so, the signs of a continuous relationship leak from his narrative. Just as in the example of the relationship with Serbia, the sultans kept in touch with the Christian lords even after their betrayal. After a Serbian ruler, Susmanos deceived Murad I, his son, Bayezid I, could count on the subsequent one, Vılakoğlu, and got married to his sister. Still it is not contradictory to Müneccimbaşı's purpose in his composition. I argue that his main theme in the chapters dealing with the interactions between two groups is demonstrating that the sultans were distant to non-Muslims. If there was an inconsistent situation, Müneccimbaşı, one way or another, makes it suitable with the rigorous Muslim Sultan image. If they had a Christian friend, either there was definitely an Islamic motivation behind it, just as in Köse Mihal's example. Somehow if they had intimacy, the sultans eventually repented to do such a thing again, just as in the case of the betrayal of the Serbian ruler. Choosing the betrayal stories, Müneccimbaşı wants to use the opportunity to

---

[112] Lowry, *Early Ottoman State*, 52,53.

[113] Gürkan shows that, on contrary to the common assumption which sees the Ottomans and non-Muslim cultures as two opposite sides that should fight, the Ottomans both competed and cooperated with the Christian rivals. He introduces various ways for how they interacted. He argues that there was a *modus vivendi* between two sides. Emrah Safa Gürkan, "Christian Allies of the Ottoman Empire" *European History Online*, 21. http://ieg-ego.eu/de/threads/modelle-und-stereotypen/tuerkengefahr-exotismus-orientalismus/emrah-safa-gurkan-christian-allies-of-the-ottoman-empire#

[114] İnalcık, relying on the archival records, as well as Ottoman and western chronicles, argues that there was definitely not an Islamization attempt by the Ottoman administration, instead he introduces that the cooperating relationship that existed during the fourteenth century, continued in the fifteenth century. Halil İnalcık, *Fatih Devri Üzerinde Tetkikler ve Vesikalar* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1954), 144.

show that the outcome of the intimacy with Christians would be a failure. Otherwise, he simply excludes these relations as in the case of Osman and the *tekfur* of Bilecik.

3.3. The Christian Wives

The association between the Ottomans and Christians was not confined to the military. The Ottomans and the Christian rulers consolidated their bonds through royal marriages, as *Camiu'd-duvel* introduced. However, Peirce argues that one should not look at the Ottoman histories to learn about the matrimonial records of the dynasty because they were written to glorify them, not to provide accurate historical knowledge. As for the imperial marriages, they had "a monogamizing and Islamicizing" selectivity which ignored the concubines and alliance with the Christians.[115] Therefore, while dealing with the Ottoman marriages in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries focusing on the shift from marriage to concubinage, she relied on the archival records. They reveal that the existence of the marriages to the royal Christian women were made either thorough raids and conquests, or based on a mutual consent by the two sides.

Müneccimbaşı, included some marriages in his history while he ignored some others. After a close examination, it appears that his choices to narrate the sections regarding with the Ottoman-Christian marriages consolidates Müneccimbaşı's discrediting attitude towards them. He included them in order to demonstrate how harmful that idea was to the Ottoman enterprise. In his narrative, just as the military alliances, marriages also turned out to be the reasons for the disasters.

The first marriage of the sultan with a Christian woman in *Camiu'd-duvel* is Murad I's and his two sons', Bayezid and Yakub. It was when the Serbian ruler Susmanos played a trick on the governor of Rumelia, Timurtaş Paşa, as presented above.[116] The sultan found out the bad news in his wedding ceremony with the daughter of the Byzantine emperor. When he was allied with the two different Christian powers, facing

---

[115] Leslie P. Peirce, *The Imperial Harem Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 31-32.
[116] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 307-8.

disloyalty from one of them drove the sultan to conclude that he needed to pray for forgiveness because of expecting help from relationship with any Christians.

Interestingly, Neşri also narrates the marriages of Murad I and his two sons with the daughters of the Byzantine emperor, however following a different sequence of the events than Müneccimbaşı. In *Kitab-ı Cihan-nüma*, the sultan organized a great wedding ceremony before the rise of Serbian leader and the treason of the ruler of Iskenderiye. He informs the reader that they got married and the section on it ends. Then, the military developments went on without any relevance with these marriages.[117] As for *Camiu'd-duvel*, it presents the events in a more dramatic way. Locating the marriage section right after the betrayal of a Christian ally renders the marriage one of the condemned actions of the sultan. Although Müneccimbaşı does not directly argue that the sultan was regretful for these marriages, he evokes this impression in the reader's mind. In Neşri's account also the Christian leaders betray the sultan and Murad I got upset but he did not make an overriding conclusion about trusting Christians and forming friendship with them, as Müneccimbaşı did.

The second royal marriage is Bayezid I's with the sister of the Serbian ruler Vılakoğlu, Maria. She was pictured as an adorable and flirtatious woman who enamored the sultan and occupied him with her love, and held him off dealing with the holy war and taking care of the other state businesses. In addition to his affection to his Christian wife, drinking alcohol and listening vain words opened the gate of corruption in the Ottoman realm. On the top of it, the defeat in the Ankara war in front of the Timur's army put Bayezid I under harsh criticisms. Before the two armies met in Ankara, Timur sent letters to Bayezid I for conciliation many times, however as the sultan received more letters, he got more arrogant in front of Timur's softness. Then the great war took place. Müneccimbaşı makes a long list of the sultan's mistakes: neglecting justice, sending away the reasonable advisors, keeping dissipate ones, trusting the people of blasphemy and faction, etc.[118]

---

[117] Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihan-Nüma*, 237-39.
[118] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 336-37.

50

Although, at first glance, the sultan appears as the responsible for the failure, there are several points that acquit him, at the same time, accuse the others. As stated before, sultan's Christian wife is presented as a seducing image. Müneccimbaşı included all the mistakes that caused the failure in Ankara War in the same category: to leave his ancestors' path. It was previously attributed to his Christian wife when she was first introduced to the reader in the text. In this scheme, she made the sultan made those mistakes. Still, she was not the only culprit person in his narrative. Sultan's number one partner in his sinful acts and his motivator, his grand vizier Çandarlı Ali Paşa (d. 1406) was as guilty as Maria. He encouraged the sultan for wasting his time in amusement and pleasure.[119]

Just as the sections including the Christian allies, the ones on the Christian wives demonstrate that if Müneccimbaşı includes a Christian ally, it ends with a disappointment. In case of a happy ending with a Christian wife, Müneccimbaşı excludes that section. For instance, Orhan's Christian bride is lacking in his narrative. In 1346, Orhan married the daughter of Byzantine ruler John VI Kantakuzenos, Theodora who gave birth to Orhan's youngest son, Halil.[120] It was because the Byzantine Emperor sought Orhan's military support who was sufficiently powerful by the middle of his reign. Indeed, after his daughter became the wife of the Ottoman Sultan, he sieged the palace in Istanbul and became the partner of the young Byzantine emperor in the throne. Orhan's marriage with Theodora and alliance with his father maintained for a while, at least for six years. After six years from the wedding, Orhan still supported his father-in-law in the battlefield. He sent an army of 10.000 or 12.000 solider commanded by his son Süleyman to the battle against the Serbian and Bulgarian army.[121]

Despite the strong and continuous relationship with Theodora and her family, among the Orhan's wives, only Nilüfer (Lülüfer) appears in the chronicles. Peirce argues that

---

[119] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 325.
[120] Peirce, *The Imperial Harem*, 34.
[121] Halil İnalcık, "Orhan," TDVIA.

it is due to her being the mother of the third Ottoman Sultan.[122]. As for Theodora's exclusion, she suggests that it is because the Ottoman chronicles privileged the mother of the succeeding sultans. In this respect, she also shows that Orhan's eldest son Süleyman, who was most likely to be the third sultan had he survived, was also depicted as the son of Nilüfer while it was unlikely. Moreover, although Nilüfer was also a daughter of a Christian *tekfur*, the *tekfur* of Yarhisar, she subsequently became Muslim and had endowments. She built a *tekke* and a bridge on the river in Bursa.[123] With Islam and endowments, the mission to privilege Nilüfer is completed.

This is also valid for *Camiu'd-duvel*. In the case of Theodora, Müneccimbaşı is not the only one who excluded her. However, as I presented above, Neşri and Aşıkpaşazade are not as rigorous as Müneccimbaşı in discrediting the Christian allies. In this respect, Müneccimbaşı does not differ from the previous approach of the Ottoman historiography, but takes a step further in divorcing the sultans from relationships with the Christians. He adds the regret and repentance of Murad I and puts the words in his mouth revealing that he was aware of the danger of being in company with the Christians.

3.4. Conclusion

This chapter demonstrates that Müneccimbaşı held a conservative attitude about religion. This gives the impression of that he kept up with the confessionalization fashion in the seventeenth century putting special emphasis on Islam. In this section, I used examples regarding the relationship with non-Muslims, especially Christians in order to explore his attitude towards non-Muslims. Looking at the examples with the *tekfur* of Bilecik, Murad I's alliance with the Christian rulers, and the marriages of Murad I and Bayezid I, I can conclude that in Müneccimbaşı's eye, it was hard to accommodate association with the Christians to being a Muslim who had to fight against the infidels in the name of *gaza*. Therefore, Müneccimbaşı Islamicized the Christian engagements narrated in the Ottoman histories. He only shared the instances that ended with the treason by Christians and regret, or he organized the

---

[122] Peirce, *The Imperial Harem,* 35.
[123] Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihan-Nüma*, 105; Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih*, 287.

events to end in that way. He actually articulates his point of view in the beginning of the Ottoman chapter when he eulogized the Ottoman sultans. One of their virtues that differentiate them from the other rulers is the zeal in the holy war against the infidels. He states that their primary objective was to elevate the word of Allah through fighting against the unbelievers and polytheists.[124]

Indeed, these examples give the impression of a rising piety. On the other hand, before rushing to come to this conclusion, one should bear in mind that Müneccimbaşı was also part of Köprülü's universalist project to know the world around them. This project prompted them to establish partnerships between non-Muslims and the Ottomans. Müneccimbaşı used Western sources in his account for the first time and wrote an extended European history which is a new fashion in the Ottoman historiography. Considering these points, remaining limited to confessionalization paradigm for the seventeenth century Ottoman world appears insufficient. Müneccimbaşı's example itself constitutes a call to produce new approaches to reconcile these two opposing arguments. A possible explanation for Müneccimbaşı's attitude might be found in Tezcan's idea of expansion of the political nation. Müneccimbaşı's emphasis on the piety might be derived from his desire to please new members of the rising political power.[125] Obviously, this is a speculation that requires more examination. As Kafadar names it, seventeenth century was the stiffest century of the Ottoman history.[126] Surely, it needs more scholarly interest by contemplating on the existing approaches and crosschecking them with works of the witnesses of that period.

---

[124] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 189.

[125] Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire*, 182-191.

[126] Cemal Kafadar, "İmparatorluğun En Çetin ve En Çelebi Yüzyılında Kültür ve Düşünce Hayatı Üzerine Mülahazalar" (Sahn-ı Seman'dan Darü'l-Fünuna Osmanlı'da İlim ve Fikir Dünyası-17. Yy, İstanbul, December 12, 2016).

CHAPTER IV

THE EARLY OTTOMANS AND SUFIS IN MÜNECCIMBAŞI'S ACCOUNT

In the first chapter I scrutinized what Müneccimbaşı relied on to legitimize Ottoman authority. One source, a very prominent one, was the Sufis who were in touch with the Ottoman rulers. In this chapter, I will dwell on how and why did Müneccimbaşı choose the Sufis as powerful legitimacy tool. While discussing Müneccimbaşı's distinctiveness in the Ottoman historiography I will point out the Sufi elements in his narrative. I will underline the relationship between the Ottoman dynasty and the dervish orders in order to demonstrate Müneccimbaşı's special emphasis on Sufis in the beginning of the Ottoman history. They appear in the most critical instances and play pivotal roles by consolidating the power of the rulers and guiding them to the right path. However, not all the sufis deserve to be dignified equally. In comparison with Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri's narratives, several differences shine out in Müneccimbaşı's history. *Camiu'd-duvel* attaches importance to a specific group of sufis. Mevlevi figures are repeatedly put forward in every sultan's period until Mehmed II. Either a prominent Mevlevi name appears and blesses the sultan as the holder of a permanent authority until the end of days, or the sultans follow the Mevlevi traditions in their clothing. He even establishes connection between Osman and Mevlana (d. 1273) which is not mentioned by any previous Ottoman author. Not only the Mevlevi dervishes are the ones in the privileged positions. Emir Sultan (d. 1428/1429) is also highly praised as a guide and is used as a tool to legitimate the sultan's authority in a spiritual level. Meanwhile, Müneccimbaşı excludes some mystical characters even though the prominent sources of the early Ottoman history lay stress on them. Among them Geyikli Baba and Ahi Hasan.

Based on Müneccimbaşı's attitude towards Sufis, one can say that he attempts at after consolidating the sufi position in front of the sultans. This effort is considerably relevant in the seventeenth century context bearing in mind the unrest caused by the Kadızade followers in the name of purifying the religion. They argue that every change in the religion is deterioration therefore they must

be left. Sufism is one of these alterations and constitutes a dangerous path to blasphemy. Müneccimbaşı rejects the Kadızadeli accusation of the Sufism as an innovation and writes an Ottoman history that demonstrates a long-established connection between Sufism and the Ottoman dynasty. This chapter is an effort to reveal how he does it. Moreover, it also scrutinizes the reasons for the exclusions of certain dervishes as well as inclusions. If the author aims at strengthening the Sufi emphasis then, why does he exclude powerful examples and includes new ones instead of including every existing material for the benefit of his argument? To answer this question is another purpose of the current chapter.

4.1. Kadızadeli Challenge

Müneccimbaşı, quite intriguingly, includes in his narrative several Mevlevi elements which do not exist in the most prevalent sources of the history of the Ottoman formative period. These points are worth to reflect upon when we consider that Müneccimbaşı himself was a Mevlevi disciple and subsequently a Mevlevi *dede* before going over the points that he emphasized I will give a small picture of the the political, intellectual, and religious context of the seventeenth century.

The seventeenth century scholarly milieu n the Ottoman capital was marked by a fundamentalist movement by a group of people who call themselves Kadızadelis.[127] Briefly, it was an effort to clean the religion from innovations, *bid'at*s, in order to render it to the most purified form. They considered every change in the religion a deterioration. What they fought against was embodied

---

[127] For a detailed description of the movement see Madeline Zilfi, "The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 45 4, (1986): 251-269; idem, *The Politics of Piety* (Minneapolis: Biblioetheca Islamica, 1988); Dina Le Gall, "Kadızadelis, Nakşibendis, and Intra-sufi Diatribe," *The Turkish Studies Association Journal* 27 1-2, (2004): 1-28. Zilfi, and following her Le Gall deals with the movement as a political debate instead of presenting it as a mere sufi vs. *selefi* dichotomy. More recently Mariyos Sariyannis searches for the economic incentives in this debate in his "The Kadızadeli Movement as a Social and Political Phenomenon: The Rise of a 'Mercantile Ethic'?" in *Political Initiatives 'From the Bottom Up' in the Ottoman Empire,* ed. Antonis Anastasopoulos, (Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2012), 263-89.

in the Sufi practices such as whirling, musical rites which the Sufi lodges performed periodically under the name of *zikr* to remember and cite Allah, or several substances which were related with Sufi communities such as tobacco and coffee.[128] For this purpose, they declared the Sufis as unbelievers and almost started war against every Sufi organization, particularly two most popular Sufi organizations, the Halveti and Mevlevis.

Although Islam in Anatolia had been combined with mystical religious beliefs since its first emergence in this geography, the Kadızade movement achieved to have a large impact both in the palace and the society. They managed to impose ban on coffee houses and tobacco, and even to attack the Halvati and Mevlevi gathering houses and declared Sufis as unbelievers.[129] Their impact also took hold of the society. In 1656, when a *muezzin* (reciter in the mosques) chanted a rhythmic poem for the prophet Muhammad, Kadızadelis protested and the two groups began to fight in the community. In response, the Kadızadelis convinced a group of people to join them with weapons, in order to demolish the dervish lodges and kill every dervish if they did not accept what they offered.[130]

Müneccimbaşı's work in the palace coincided with the last wave of the Kadızadeli confrontations which expanded the whole century. Still, he never hid his Mevlevi identity. In the beginning of the *Camiu'd-duvel,* he introduces himself as Ahmed bin Lutfullah al-Mevlevi.[131] Instead of any other quality such as place of birth, or profession, he chooses to define himself as a member of Mevlevi order. He shared the company of the sultan in the palace with the contemporary Kadızadeli leader, Vani Efendi (d. 1685), during his presence in the palace. Vani Efendi became the personal sheikh of the sultan in 1665 by the recommendation of the grand vizier Köprülü Fazıl Ahmed Paşa (d. 1676) and got to be very intimate to the sultan to accomplish the renewal of the prohibition of

---

[128] Zilfi, *The Kadızadelis*, 254.

[129] Naima Mustafa Efendi, *Tarih-i Naima: Ravzatu'l-Hüseyn fi Hülasa-i Ahbari'l-hafikayn*, ed. Mehmet İpşirli (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2007), 590-92, 633-38.

[130] Naima, *Tarih*, 638.

[131] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, Nuruosmaniye, 3171, 1b.

the whirling, musical ceremonies and even the closure of the most prominent lodge of the Mevlevis, Galata Mevlevihanesi.[132]

4.2. The Central Role of Mevlevis in the Foundation and Continuation of the Ottoman Political Enterprise

When this context is considered, the Mevlevi factors in Müneccimbaşı's narrative become more meaningful. The most striking one appears right in the beginning of the Ottoman history. He embarks on the Ottoman history with a section on the gospels and glad tidings (*beşair*) about the formation of the Ottoman State. One of them which Müneccimbaşı categorizes as a true report (*haber-i sadık*), is a dialogue between Osman and Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi. According to this section, Ertuğrul Gazi used to visit Mevlana with his son Osman every time he went to Konya. One of these visits occurred at the same time when Mevlana was angry with the Seljukid sultan because the latter followed a Kalenderi person. In response, Mevlana decided to adopt Osman as his son instead of the sultan, since the sultan found a new father in place of Mevlana. Then, he prophesied Osman a great continuous state as long as Osman's descendants believed Mevlana's descendants.[133]

It is a common style in the Ottoman histories to include mystical experiences and glad tidings before the foundation of the Ottoman State. For example, Osman's dream of a big tree and its interpretation as the establishment of a great state by Ede Bali is quite famous both in the Ottoman and present histories.[134] However, a glad tiding by Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi, as presented above, is mentioned only by Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede. In fact, a Mevlevi biographer who complies the mystical stories of the eminent Mevlevis, Eflaki (d. 1360), also narrates almost the same anecdote, nevertheless he mentions

---

[132] Zilfi, "The Kadızadelis," 263.
[133] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 195.
[134] Elizabeth A. Zacharidaou, "İlk Osmanlılara Dair Tarih ve Efsaneler," in *Söğüt'ten İstanbul'a Osmanlı Devleti'nin Kuruluşu Üzerine Tartışmalar*, ed. Oktay Özel and Mehmet Öz (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2000), 341-94.

neither Ertuğrul nor Osman.[135] Müneccimbaşı's book is the only one who argues a communication between the two side among the Ottoman historians and other Mevlevi sources. In the studies of the prominent historians which deal with the history of the Mevlevis, the earliest relationship between the Mevlevi authorities and the Ottomans dates back to the reign of Murad II. It is when the sultan ordered Muradiye Camii to be built with a *zaviye* beside it in the first half of the fifteenth century. Before that, Mevlevis did not find the Ottomans worthy of attention just as the Ottomans were not interested in Mevlevis' business.[136] At this point two options arise: either we read Müneccimbaşı's narrative as a historical fact relying on the assumption that he read a book which did not reach us and argue that it constitutes a counter argument to the current approach about the first Mevlevi-Ottoman interaction, or we receive his story as an intended change and argue that Müneccimbaşı included Mevlana into the Ottoman formation story on purpose. It would be exiting to argue for the former one. However, to do that we should look for a source that Müneccimbaşı relies on since there is no other way for him to know a dialogue from five centuries ago. Although he states his sources in many cases, in this particular section he gives no specific name. Indeed, in the very same section which presents the five "true reports" about the emergence of the Ottoman polity including Mevlana's report, he provides references for the three of the five reports.[137] Therefore, if he had seen it in any source, he would have shared it in his narrative, especially for this significant occasion. His writing style only even in this particular chapter removes the possibility that Müneccimbaşı read it in a book that does not come to the present day. We can only assume that he relies on the Eflaki's version and

---

[135] Ahmed Eflaki, *Menakıbu'l-Arifin* (Istanbul: Kabalcı, 2006), 166.

[136] Gölpınarlı, *Mevlana'dan Sonra Mevlevilik*, 269; Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, "Türkiye Tarihinde Merkezi İktidar ve Mevleviler (XIII-XVIII. Yüzyıllar) Meselesine Bir Bakış," *II. Milletlerarası Osmanlı Devletinde Mevlevihaneler Kongresi Bildirileri - Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 2 (1996) 17-22. Relying on the cadastral records of a *zaviye* in Serez, only Göyünç refers to an earlier period, the second half of the fourteenth century, still not as early as in *Camiu'd-duvel*. Nejat Göyünç, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Mevleviler," *Belleten* 213 (1991): 351-58.

[137] The sources he relies on in this section are *ed-Dairatu'n-numaniyye* by İbn Arabi, *Heşt Bihişt* by İdris-i Bidlisi, and Ruhi's historical account known as *Ruhi Tarihi*.

made slight alterations.[138] Surely such an inclusion must have been on a purpose. Next step will be scrutinizing what his purpose might be.

Hasan Basri Karadeniz also asks *Camiu'd-duvel* the same question and argues that Müneccimbaşı's effort was to gain the sympathy of the Mevlevi followers. Since the most respected sheikh of the Mevlevi order, Rumi, declared the legitimacy of the Ottoman rule, the disciples were naturally expected to accept it.[139] However, this answer is not completely satisfactory since it inevitably leads to another question: Why would Müneccimbaşı think that the Ottoman family needs the approval of the Mevlevi community? Especially, after establishing an imperial state and witnessing the Ottoman golden age, to have such a concern seems confusing. Although Karadeniz does not have an answer in the chapter dealing with Mevlana's report, another study of his provides a clue for his vision of the Ottoman power relations. According to him, the powerful families who stood by the sultan since the Osman Gazi's rule were seen as the alternatives or rivals of the Ottoman sultans. This idea did not change until the beginning of the eighteenth century.[140] In this respect, we can assume that in Karadeniz's perspective, Müneccimbaşı also felt the danger that surrounded the sultan and made an effort to consolidate the legitimation of the Ottoman rule depending on a respected reference point in the eyes of the society against the potent families around the sultan. In short, Karadeniz argues that Müneccimbaşı's target audience is the Mevlevi disciples and his emphasis is on the indispensability of the Ottoman family as rulers.

Karadeniz is fairly admissible in arguing a decline in the Ottoman dynasty's reputation in the period at stake. As I discussed in the first chapter, in the seventeenth century Ottoman dynasty faced many challenges such as

---

[138] There is another source next to Eflaki's narrative. As Gölpınarlı indicates, there were three legends in the Mevlevi tradition which attributes authority to Mevlana or his son in Osman's acquisition of the rule. Gölpınarlı, *Mevlana'dan Sonra Mevlevilik*, 274. One of them is quite similar to the one in Müneccimbaşı's narrative. In this case, Müneccimbaşı might have included a story from the oral Mevlevi tradition.

[139] Hasan Basri Karadeniz*, Anadolu'da Meşruiyet Mücadelesi*, 77.

[140] Karadeniz, *Osmanlılar ve Rumeli Uç Beyleri*, 406-407.

dethronements and regicide. However, to argue that the dialogue between Mevlana and Osman is included in order to consolidate the dynasty in front of the Mevlevis, one should be certain that the target audience of Müneccimbaşı as the society. Did Müneccimbaşı really intend to be read by the common readers?

It is easy to admit that Müneccimbaşı's inclusion of Mevlana is based on the Mevlevi influence in Anatolia. However, several points move one to reconsider the idea of that target audience in *Camiu'd-duvel* is common readers. The first point is size of *Camiu'd-duvel*. Considering the reading practices in the seventeenth century, it was a remote possibility to copy a book as large as 842 folios and to circulate it. Indeed, the number of the available copies of the *Camiu'd-duvel* in Anatolia is only seven. Apart from the size of the book, Müneccimbaşı's language choice is also contradictory to presenting it to the society. A simple Turkish would had been much more functional to convey a message than Arabic.

In these two aspects, a booklet written by Katip Çelebi shortly before Müneccimbaşı's work, *Mizan'ul-hakk fi ihtiyari'l-ehakk*, is a perfect example of a book written aiming at the society, as the author puts himself. He intends to warn the public against the debate between the Kadızadelis and Sufis. Looking at the number of its manuscripts, we can see Katip Çelebi managed to reach his target audience. *Mizanü'l-hakk* has more than forty copies in Istanbul libraries alone. Also, a request for *fatwa* about the book from the *Şeyhülilsam* of that time reveals that people read and reflected on it.[141] In comparison with Müneccimbaşı's account, his booklet is observably short. Its folio numbers vary from 30 to 50 based on the several copies in Süleymaniye Library. As for the style, Katip Çelebi's main theme and message is direct. In the introduction, he explicitly states that his aim is to show everyone the subject of the debate and

---

[141] Katip Çelebi, *Mizanü'l-hak fi ihtiyari'l-ahak*, ed. Orhan Şahin Gökyay (Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1972) VII.

to deter him or her from being a part of it.[142] Briefly, considering the style and the length of the two works in addition to their popularity, it is hard to think that Müneccimbaşı had the same purpose as Katip Çelebi. Instead, the members of the Ottoman elites are more plausible as target audience. This might have included the grand vizier since Müneccimbaşı compiles the book at his request, or perhaps the sultan due to the endowment record by the grandson of Mehmed IV in the autograph copy. Another possibility is that Müneccimbaşı might simply have desired to leave a record from his point of view, regardless of the audience, without any intention of it being read.

I claim that the intended message is the significance of the Mevlevi saints (*evliya*), not the legitimacy of the Ottoman dynasty. Bearing in mind the context in which Müneccimbaşı wrote his work, as an officer in the palace coming from Mevlevi origins he could have been trying to dignify Mevlevis. Even though Müneccimbaşı's position in the palace, a *müneccimbaşı* (the chief astrologer of the sultan) and a *musahib* (a gentleman in waiting on the Sultan: usually selected for his wit and power to amuse) nearby the sultan who was fond of learning what the stars said, would have made him feel safe, there is a reality that the sultan also liked the company of Vani as much as that of Müneccimbaşı's. Moreover, there were several events that would worry the Mevlevis, such as closure of the Galata Mevlevihanesi.

By putting special emphasis on Mevlevis, Müneccimbaşı shuns explicitly giving advice to warn the reader, probably the sultan, which is not to hurt the Mevlevi saints. Instead, he makes necessary changes in an old story, hoping that the reader takes the lesson. In other words, what Mevlana tells Osman is what Müneccimbaşı wants Mehmed IV or other current powerholders to hear. For example, when Mevlana prophesizes that Osman will rule over a long-lasting state, he makes the prophecy dependent on belief in his followers. This detail renders his statement from being merely a gracious glad tiding to a warning

---

[142] Katip Çelebi, *Mizan*, 4.

against any kind of disrespectful behavior towards Mevlevis. Müneccimbaşı counsels the sultan to believe Mevlevis no matter what is said against them, otherwise his reign will come to an end. Since Müneccimbaşı thinks that the history is a noble science which provides a deep understanding of the present,[143] the sultan can look at the earliest version of the Ottoman-Mevlevi relations as provided by Müneccimbaşı, to decide how to act on issues in his own time including those concerning Mevlevis. The answer hidden in the history is to believe Mevlevis. As an intimate Mevlevi to the sultan, he probably indicates himself.

Müneccimbaşı's admonition to the sultan to "believe" is worth dwelling on. Though he could give any message he wished, he did not choose to say respect, obey, or commit. Instead, he wanted the sultan to believe Mevlevis, or him. Although he probably had many chances to get the sultan's attention he could not have managed to convince him again in front of his tough opponent Vani Efendi. Such a warning from a powerful religious authority, Rumi, not from an ordinary disciple, could provide the justification Müneccimbaşı sought.

Compared with the other prophecies and "true reports" in *Camiu'd-duvel*, Müneccimbaşı's favorable attitude towards Mevlevis becomes more apparent. Apart from Mevlana's good news, there are seven more events of which five episodes foresee a state that lasts until the end of the time.[144] Ede Bali interprets Osman's dream of an expanding tree as continuous state till the doomsday just as İbnu'l-Arabi (d. 1240), Kumral Abdal, Korkud Ata, and a *faqih* do on other occasions. Among the eight, only Mevlana's tiding is conditional. He lays down Osman's descendants' belief in Mevlevis as a condition.

4.3. Emir Sultan

Apart from Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi, another significant Sufi figure for the endurance of the Ottoman power appeared in *Camiu'd-duvel* is Şemseddin

---

[143] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, Nuruosmaniye, 3171, 1b.

[144] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 192-199.

Muhammed el-Buhari, known as Emir Sultan. He was a prominent dervish of Bursa whose memory continues to be influential and whose tomb is a place of visit and respect for the Muslims even today. There is a contradiction about his order (*tarikat)*. Some records correlate him with the *İmamiyye* (a common name for the Shiite orders), some say that he is a member of the *Kübreviyye* order.[145] Although his sufi affiliation is not clear, we know that he is not a Mevlevi. Still, Emir Sultan occupies a distinguished place among the other fellows of the sultan. He appears several times in Müneccimbaşı's narrative and makes pivotal interventions for the sake of the Ottoman dynasty.

Emir Sultan's first appearance in Müneccimbaşı's narrative is when he engages in a dialogue with Bayezid I during the construction of Ulu Cami in Bursa. Before their conversation, Bayezid is denigrated because of his sinful habits. As a result of the temptation of his grand vizier Çandarlı Ali Paşa (d. 1406) and his love for the daughter of Serbian leader Vılakoğlu, he got into the habit of drinking alcohol and listening to idle talks which distracted him from ruling. The sultan's negligence of his official affairs dragged his lands into the disorder and oppression; corruption and bribery became widespread. His predicament continued until God granted him a victory against the Hungarian infidels and Bayezid abandoned his sinful acts. Müneccimbaşı adds another report that reveals that the sultan repented from his wrongdoings under Emir Sultan's guidance. While they were walking around the building of Ulu Cami the sultan asked Emir Sultan his opinion about the building. He answered that the only missing thing is the taverns around it. Bayezid bewilderedly opposed the idea of such sinful places around the house of Allah. Emir Sultan used the opportunity to warn the sultan. He answered: "the real house of Allah is the heart of a believer. Why do you keep polluting it by drinking alcohol and amusement?" Bayezid regreted his previous doings and woke up from the "sleep of heedlessness" and never committed the same sins.[146] In this small section, we

---

[145] Hüseyin Algün, Nihat Azamat, "Emir Sultan," *TDVIA*.
[146] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 325-29.

see that a dervish comes onto the scene when welfare and justice are in peril in the Ottoman realm, and leads the sultan to the true path.

Emir Sultan's second interference in the course of the Ottoman history is more fundamental. After the death of the fifth Ottoman Sultan, Mehmed I, Murad II succeeded to the throne in 1421. After a little while, a man named Mustafa appeared, claiming that he was the rightful heir to the throne as the son of Bayezid I who was lost during the Timur incidence. Although Müneccimbaşı qualifies him as an unknown man and presents him as a imposter[147], Mustafa managed to influence many neighboring leaders and became a threat to Murad II's rule. Since another possible legitimate claimant to the throne and a member of the Ottoman dynasty showed up, Murad's II's rule became questionable.

Müneccimbaşı argues for the legitimacy of Murad II's rule by a divine confirmation through Emir Sultan. When Murad II was informed about Mustafa, Allah showed him the truth and he went to Emir Sultan in order to ask him to pray. He consoled the sultan and prayed him while binding his sword. This is the Emir Sultan's mundane support for the sultan. However, his major support occurred on a spiritual stratum. Based on what is reported from Emir Sultan, the rulership passed to Mustafa in the celestial world. Emir Sultan did not comply with it and in his dream, requested from the Prophet Muhammad that authority be transferred to Murad II three times. Eventually, his prayer was accepted.[148]

This section is quite descriptive of the necessity of the saints for the legitimacy of the sultans in Müneccimbaşı's perspective. It demonstrates, first of all, that the rulership of a sultan must be granted by God. Secondly, the saints are the agencies which transport the knowledge to the rulers that the power to rule is a

---

[147] The Ottoman history writers share same attitude towards Mustafa. Therefore, he was dubbed *Düzmece* (imposter) Mustafa. However, the scholars in the twentieth-century argue that he was really Murad II's uncle based on foreign histories, and that the Ottoman authors introduced him as an imposter because they did not want to weaken the sultan's position. Mustafa Cezar, *Mufassal Osmanlı Tarihi,* I (Istanbul: İskit yay., 1957), 257; İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, I (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1982), 375.

[148] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 397.

divine endowment. Ordinary people reach a transcendental level of information by means of the Sufis' guidance. Thirdly, they are not only messengers of the divine orders, but sometimes also way of changing godly commands. Emir Sultan managed to return the rulership to Murad II. In a sense, they are the source of the legitimate power either as a messenger or a builder. Müneccimbaşı empowers this idea with a Persian couplet right after the anecdote. The couplet alone is an evidence for the primacy of the subject to Müneccimbaşı, since he does not include poems in his historical account although he is also known as a poet with the nickname Aşıki. This is the only couplet in the section that I scrutinize. Its translation is: "The saints have a power given by Allah which enables them to be able to return the arrow after it has left the bow."

Another incident concerning Emir Sultan occurred when Murad II was about to die. While walking, Murad came across an exalted person. He declared to the sultan that his time in the world was ending and warned him to get ready for the afterlife and to repent. After a time, the sultan learnt that the man is one of Emir Sultan's disciples.[149] Müneccimbaşı elevates the trustworthiness of Emir Sultan by attributing to him another mystical prophecy. By dignifying him, he dignifies all the sufis and draws attention to their primacy and proficiency as advisors.

4.4. The Clothing of the Ottoman Rulers

The Mevlevi signs in the formative period are not limited to Osman's era. Müneccimbaşı argues that every Ottoman ruler until Mehmed II used to wear a Mevlevi headgear (*külah)*. It is a style that is settled step by step. Firstly, Osman interacted with a Mevlevi sheikh in a way that refers to the deep Ottoman respect for Mevlevi authority. The next step reveals that in the course of Osman's reign Mevlevi traditions became so familiar in the Ottoman realm that the sultan adopted their style in his casual attire. His son, the second Ottoman ruler, Orhan, is also described as wearing a conical hat similar to a Mevlevi *külah*, moreover, he allowed the notables to wear it.[150] For the next sultan Murad I, the

---

[149] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 449.
[150] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 259.

son of Orhan, Müneccimbaşı clearly states that he wore Mevlevi *külah* under a round head-piece. Müneccimbaşı adds that just like the Mevlevi disciples, Murad's *külah* peeps out of his cap by a finger length.[151] By likening it to the Mevlevi disciples' style, he makes sure to deliver that the rulers' choice of a Mevlevi suit was not a coincidence. He wears the same clothing in the same way that the Mevlevi members do. For the subsequent rulers, Müneccimbaşı contents himself by saying that after Murad I, his successors Bayezid I, Mehmed I, and Murad II all followed their ancestor's style in clothing and headgear.[152]

When it comes to Mehmed II's reign, the Mevlevi influence in the rulers' attire disappears. Müneccimbaşı states that Mehmed II abandoned his ancestors' fashion and replaced it with the scholarly style. What is striking here is not the sultan's style change, but its reason. Mehmed enjoyed the company of the scholars and spent most of his time with them. Although Müneccimbaşı does not say explicitly that this is the reason, he definitely associates his love with his clothing style. Indeed, as for Mehmed II's son Bayezid II, he uses the same reasoning, for this instance in the opposite way. Bayezid II's formal suit is like his father's. However, when he is on his own, he prefers to wear in the *fukara* and *sulaha* style i.e., dervish clothes. In his case, Müneccimbaşı declares that it is derived from Bayezid'd fondness of sufism and sufis.

Looking at Müneccimbaşı's interpretation in both cases we can conclude that in his narrative, the choice of a group's style indicates his affection for them. If we apply the same logic to the earlier rulers it means that the first five Ottoman rulers after Osman were sympathizers of the Mevlevi order. Just as in Osman's example, he does not directly attribute a Mevlevi relationship to any of the sultans. He does not mention any Mevlevi companions or any events including Mevlevi actors. Instead, he shares a small detail that leads to a larger conclusion. Although the rulers are not associated with the Mevlevis, they know them and care about them. Only Orhan's oldest son Süleyman Paşa (d. 1360) is explicitly

---

[151] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 278.
[152] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 319, 372, 455, 530.

qualified as a Mevlevi disciple.[153] He wore the Mevlevi *külah* and was a disciple of several Mevlevi *halife*s. He was a powerful soldier and a favorite leader with his numerous victories and conquests including Gelibolu. However, he died before his father and therefore never became a sultan.

Turning back to Gölpınarlı and Ocak's arguments presented above regarding with the sultans' earliest interaction with Mevlevis, it is again impossible to accept Müneccimbaşı's narrative as a historical reality. Then, what can his aim be in saying that the sultans used to wear Mevlevi hats? Probably, he tries to make the reader question whether the sultans were Mevlevis or not. He cannot dare to declare that they were Mevlevis since there is no evidence for it. At this point, Müneccimbaşı takes advantage of the obscurity of the early Ottoman history. Although the lack of evidence deprives us of the reality, it can also be a good chance to include things that will be useful for the author since we cannot know what did or did not happen. Still, anyone who intends to do so should be careful to stay in the the borders of the reason. Despite all the existing sources, it is hard to attribute someone a membership, especially if the actors are the sultans. Müneccimbaşı's statements about Süleyman Paşa's case can be evidence for it. In his case, Müneccimbaşı explicitly states that Süleyman Paşa was a Mevlevi on the contrary to the other princes who got to be sultans. Arguing that all the five sultans were Mevlevis is not reasonable. Instead, Müneccimbaşı leaves question marks about the commitment of the sultans. In other words, whether the sultans wore the Mevlevi *külah* or not is nothing but a speculation. What is obvious here is that Müneccimbaşı wants the reader to know that the sultans used to have respect for the Mevlevis.

Müneccimbaşı's indirect style is not confined only to subjects related to the sultans. He chooses not to mention Vani Efendi at all in *Camiu'd-duvel*. We know that Vani Efendi was appointed as *Hace-i sultani* (imperial master) in 1665, which is seven years before the last event Müneccimbaşı includes in his book. He also

---

[153] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 272.

does not refer to any contemporaneous Kadızadeli event with his duty in the palace. The only appearance of the Kadızadeli group is in the year 1656 when Kadızade followers gathered with their weapons and attempted to attack the sufi lodges and to kill the dervishes if they did not leave their sufi practices.[154] Naturally, a reader who does not have a chance to read any other book than *Camiu'd-duvel* about the last thirty years of the seventeenth century will not be able to learn anything about the third wave of the Kadızade movement with the leadership of Vani Efendi. However, it is obvious that Müneccimbaşı was well aware of Vani Efendi's actions since he was responsible for many events that would give Müneccimbaşı a deep shock. He caused the prohibition of the public performance of the sufi rituals. Moreover, probably one of the most offensive acts of him with regard to Müneccimbaşı was the closure of the Galata Mevlevi lodge which is the first place where Müneccimbaşı adhered in Istanbul.[155]

Presumably, Müneccimbaşı's attitude in both cases is a conscious avoidance. In fact, his abstaining from a direct defense of the Mevlevis against the Kadızadeli challenge, or particularly Vani's challenge, forges him to put words into another Mevlevi's mouth or to criticize another Kadızade leader. In other words, because he does not say what he thinks to whom he intends, he finds a similar case in the history and seizes the opportunity to do that.

Why does Müneccimbaşı avoid articulating his ideas? What makes him hold back while he has many chances to do that in front of the sultan who gives credit for him? The stories of his counterparts seem to be an answer. Another contemporary sufi, and a Halveti sheikh in the midst of the heated Kadızade debates, Niyazi Mısri (d. 1694) was quite rigorous in responding to Vani's attacks. Since Vani was the mentor of the sultan, Mısri was also directly critical

---

[154] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'duvel* in Hatice Arslan Sözüdoğru, *Müneccimbaşı als Historiker: arabische Historiographie bei einem osmanischen Universalgelehrten des 17. Jahrhunderts*, 343.
[155] Zilfi, "The Kadızadelis", 263.

of the sultan's decisions.[156] Looking at both Vani's and Niyazi Mısri's aftermaths, one cannot blame Müneccimbaşı's attitude. After the defeat at Vienna in 1683 Vani was exiled because of his encouragement of the campaign.[157] Niyazi Mısri was also exiled because of his political affiliations and critical comments.[158] Moreover, Müneccimbaşı had a terrifying example in front of him. In 1649, Müneccimbaşı Hüseyin Efendi, Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede's penultimate predecessor, was executed because he was overly involved in the state affairs.[159] Such a close example was likely worrying for Müneccimbaşı and caused him to distance himself from political affairs.

4.5. The Suppression of Memories of Certain Sufi Groups

As well as the additions and highlights of an author, the exclusions and neglects of him is also revealing for his concerns and point of view in writing. So far, Müneccimbaşı's favoring attitude towards the sufis is presented primarily based on his sufi bounds in the face of the Kadızade confrontations against sufism. In *Camiu'd-duvel*, the dervishes and sheikhs appear in the harsh times and offers the sultans their wisdom and prays. Nevertheless, although there are more records on dervishes that will support Müneccimbaşı's argument, he does not narrate all the dervish-sultan stories existed in the present Ottoman histories at his elbow. Especially for the formative period of the Ottoman history, it is easy to detect those abandoned parts since the sources are limited. Compared with Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri's accounts, two sufi characters are missing in *Camiu'd-duvel*.

Aşıkpaşazade and, probably deriving from him, considering the similarity of the two texts, Neşri report an anecdote between Orhan Gazi and a sufi dervish known as Geyikli Baba in which the dervish is praised and respected by the

---

[156] For a detailed description of the confrontation of Mısri in general with Kadızadelis, in particular with Vani, see Terzioğlu, "Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyazi Mısri (1618-1694)" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1999).

[157] Sakıb Dede, *Sefine-i Nefise-i Mevleviyan* (Kahire: Mektebetu Vehbe, 1866/1283), 43.

[158] Terzioğlu, "Sufi and Dissident," 92-180.

[159] Salim Aydüz, "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Müneccimbaşılık," *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları* I (1995): 159-207.

sultan. According to that, after conquering the land of Karesi in 1334/1335, Orhan returns to Bursa, builds a place for distributing food to the poors (*imaret*) and begins to investigate (*teftiş*) the dervishes. When Turgud Alp (d. after 1334/1335) hears that, informs the sultan about Geyikli Baba that he is highly sacred. He has been affectionate to him and kept his company for a while. The sultan questions his order and the dervish answers that he is a disciple of Baba İlyas (d.1240) and in the order of Seyyid Elvan (d. after 1358-1359,) or in a copy of Aşıkpaşazade Seyyid Ebu'l-Vefa (d. 1107.) When the sultan learns it, he orders the dervish to be brought. However, Geyikli Baba does not accept. After another request by the sultan and the rejection of Geyikli Baba, he says to the messengers of the sultan that the dervishes go to someone when their prays will be accepted. After a while, he visits the sultan with a poplar tree and plants it in the palace yard and prays for the sultan after saying that the prays of the dervishes for the sultan and his generation are accepted. In response, Orhan persistently offers him land and he accepts a small part for the benefit of dervishes. After Geyikli Baba's death, Orhan builds him a tomb, a *zaviye* and a *cami* in Geyikli Baba's name.[160]

Similarly, Ahi Hasan is another neglected character in Müneccimbaşı's narrative. He does not completely ignore Ahi Hasan, still does not mention as much as Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri do. They depict him as a brave warrior who fights nearby Orhan. When Osman sends Orhan to the conquest of Bursa, he prefers Ahi Hasan, the son of Ede Balı's brother, to be in the sultan's company together with the other two fellows of him, Köse Mihal and Turgut Alp.[161] Müneccimbaşı does not include Ahi Hasan in the conquest of Bursa or in any other events of the period, but, almost reluctantly, adds his name to the list in the supplementary of the Osman's section on the scholars and viziers of his time.[162] All he says about him is that Ahi Hasan was a person who had many miracles.

---

[160] Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih*, 318-19; Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihan-Nüma*, 170-71.
[161] Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih*, 299.
[162] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 250.

Since there is no such possibility that Müneccimbaşı did not read Aşıkpaşazade or Neşri, it would not be wrong to argue that he does not choose Ahi Hasan to involve in Ottoman history as he does for the other saints. However, these two characters would be suitable to support Müneccimbaşı's highlights on the dervishes. Geyikli Baba's event displays the sultan's respect towards the saints and the importance that the sultans attach on the prayers of them. Similarly, Ahi Hasan's being among the prominent companions of the sultan is another positive image that Müneccimbaşı would benefit. The absence of these two characters in *Camiu'd-duvel* in spite of the advantages of them must be derived from a conscious avoidance.

What would be the reason for Müneccimbaşı's exclusion of Geyikli Baba or Ahi Hasan? To contemplate on this question, it would be useful to identify the common characteristics of the two-neglected people and their difference from the included names. The first one, Geyikli Baba, is a disciple of the *Vefai* order, which is also related with the Babai movement, and *Bektaşi* order in Anatolia. These are Turkmen organizations that played a significant role in the establishment of the Ottoman rule with their military power in addition to providing social centers with their tekkes in Anatolia and Rumelia.[163] *Ahilik* was another mystical (also economic) Turkmen order related with the *Vefais* and *Babais*. Ahi Hasan, as his title indicates, is a member of *Ahis* which makes the two excluded characters in *Camiu'd-duvel* part of the Turkmen dervish organizations. In this respect, it would not be wrong to argue that Müneccimbaşı was not enthusiastic to share Turkmen dervish stories as much as he was in sharing Mevlevis.

After determining that Müneccimbaşı excluded Geyikli Baba and Ahi Hasan because they were Turkmen dervishes, the question above must be updated. Why did Müneccimbaşı censor *Vefai* and *Ahi* dervishes in his narrative? It is most

---

[163] These groups used to arrive the borderlines before the Ottoman army and paved the way for the conquests. Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "İstila Devirlerinin Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zaviyeler," *Vakıflar Dergisi* 2 (1942): 10-11.

probably related with Müneccimbaşı's Mevlevi attachment. The turbulent relationship between Mevlevis and Turkmen dervishes is a long-held discussion in the Ottoman historiography.[164] The literature on the Sufism in Anatolia differentiates between Mevlevis and the other Anatolian Sufi organizations, generally named as *Rum Abdalları* or *Kalenderiler,* based on their differences in conception of religiosity, life style, and intimacy to the rulers. Religious emphasis and rituals were interpreted more crucial for Mevlevis than the Turkmen sufis. Second variance is that Mevlevilik has a more urban character that is located in the centers and has mostly elite members. On the other hand, Turkmen Sufis is humbler in terms of living standards, and the members of this group are mainly enthusiastic warriors for the holy wars.[165] In addition, their attitude towards political developments constituted another point for division. While Mevlevis acted in a submissive manner to the current political authorities, the Turkmen dervishes were more critical, even rebellious as in the example of Babai revolt.[166]

Their involvement into politics led several historians to interpret this difference more than a fruitful variety, but as a hostility.[167] Mikail Bayram is the most rigorous advocate of the conflict among them. In fact, he argues a Mevlevi animosity towards the Bektaşis, Ekberis (the followers of Sadreddin Konevi's (d. 1274) order,) and Ahis. In Bayram's narrative, Mevlana is a jealous person who bears grudge towards Bektaşis, Ekberis and Ahis which are the pivotal elements in the construction of the Ottoman polity. He particularly puts special emphasis on the opposition between Mevlana and Ahi Evran, primarily because of the

---

[164] F. V. Hasluck, *Bektaşilik Tetkikleri*, trans. Ragıp Hulusi (Istanbul: Devlet Matbaası, 1928); Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri* (Istanbul: Hamle Basın Yayın, n.d.).

[165] Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Türk Sufiliğine Bakışlar* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2009), 156.

[166] Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Babailer İsyanı: Aleviliğin Tarihsel Altyapısı yahut Anadolu* (Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1996).

[167] This is not the only attitude in the relationship between Mevlevis and Ahis. Franz Taeschner presents a more friendly picture between the two groups indicating the connections. He reads their distinctiveness as a blessing and argues that these two groups complemented each other. While Ahilik constitutes the mundane and social part, Mevlevilik represents the religious side. Zehra Göçer, "Franz Taeschner'in "Das Anatolische Achitum des 13./14. Jahrhunderts und seine Beziehung zu Mevlâna Celâleddin Rumi" Adlı Bildirisinin Çevirisi," *Mevlana Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1 (2007): 169-175. However, the conflictive approach became more prevalent in the studies on the Anatolian Sufism rather than Taeschner's argument.

Mevlana's intimacy with the Mongols. When the Seljukid sultan Gıyaseddin II is dead in 1246, his sons Izzeddin Keykavus II (d.1279) and Rükneddin Kılıçarslan IV (d.1265) began to fight for the throne. Ahis supported the former while Mevlevis gave their support to the latter. In the end, Rükneddin IV succeeded and Mevlana is promoted by the *Şeyhu'r-rum* title.[168] Likewise, Bayram attributes the subsequent sympathy towards Mevlevis to their compliance with the political authority. The Ottoman Sultan, Bayezid II, ran a campaign to reconcile the opposition between Mevlevis, Ahis and Bektaşis. He argues that the Ottoman rulers wanted the Mevlevis to be distinguished in the society hoping that his subjects got influenced from Mevlevis' submissive manner. [169]

Geyikli Baba and Ahi Hasan both belonged to the Turkmen dervish groups. As a Mevlevi disciple, Müneccimbaşı's exclusion can be derived from the Mevlevi position against them. Although it does not implicate a hostility as much as Bayram presents, still it gives the signals of a conflict and discontent. This can also be a reflection of the disagreement in Müneccimbaşı's time as well as in the formative era. It proves that the competition between the two groups continued from the beginning of the empire to the present day of Müneccimbaşı's time. Actually, Barkan argues that it went on after the seventeenth century. Then, it is quite possible that Müneccimbaşı was affected by a confrontation that spanned the whole history of the empire.[170] In this fashion, Müneccimbaşı situates Mevlevi elements and excludes the others in order to consolidate the former.

---

[168] Bayram also argues that the Mongol authorities tried to erase Ahi Evran's legacy and looking at the Mevlana sympathy they managed it. Mikail Bayram, *Sosyal ve Siyasi Boyutlarıya Ahi Evren-Mevlana Mücadelesi* (Konya: Nüve Kültür Merkezi, 2012), 58-61. Similarly, Akkuş deals with the relationship between a prominent Bektaşi figure Hacı Bektaşi Veli (d.1271) and Mevlevis right before the Ottoman enterprise because of the same reason. Mustafa Akkuş, "Hacı Bektaş Veli'nin Moğol Tahakkümüne Bakışı," *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Veli Araştırma Dergisi* 66 (2013): 157.

[169] Bayram, *Ahi Evren-Mevlana Mücadelesi*, 262-63.

[170] When the sultan Mahmud II (d. 1839) made reforms in the military system in the first half of the nineteenth-century, he acted in accordance with his Mevlevi sympathy and entourage. Therefore, he condemned the Bektaşi groups together with the Janissaries when he abolished the Janissary army. Ömer Lütfi Barkan, *Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri*, 26.

Looking at Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri, Geyikli Baba and Ahi Hasan were intimate to the sultans or elites. Orhan's loyal friend and companion Turgud Alp was a follower of Geyikli Baba. Ahi Hasan was a close friend who was called for a tough mission as a fellow. Narrating these realities would describe a past intertwined with the Vefai and Ahi traditions. They would appear as holy warriors and, especially in Geyikli Baba's case, sources for religious legitimacy. Indeed, historians appreciate the Vefai and Ahi contribution to establishing the Ottoman authority. The presence of the Vefai disciples around the sultans Osman and Orhan, choosing the Ahi suits for the first infantries, and for the Janissary headpiece are the evidences for this relationship.[171] However, this image of intimacy is what Müneccimbaşı desires for Mevlevis. Therefore, despite the other existing histories and reports, he added Mevlana into the foundation history of the Ottoman Empire and eliminated other powerful rival targets. Moreover, he included small details that indicate the sultans' choice of Mevlevi style in their clothing.

On the other hand, another prominent Vefai follower, Ede Bali appears in Müneccimbaşı's narrative. His presence seems contradictory to Müneccimbaşı's conscious avoidance of the members of this group. Ede Bali occupies a significant position in the Ottoman history by providing a prophecy of the establishment of a great state to Osman. He spent a night in Ede Bali's home and dreamt that a light came out of Ede Bali's pocket and got in Osman's, then, a tree grew on his body shadowing the whole world. Ede Bali interpreted this dream as having the Ottomans worldwide authority and married his daughter to him.[172] Apparently, this record attributes to Ede Bali great importance in terms of genealogy and prophecy. To this account, he was the grandfather of the second Ottoman sultan and the motivator of the first one. Most probably that is why Müneccimbaşı does not exclude him from his narrative. As he states in the beginning of this part, this is a well-known story in the most of the historical accounts. Instead, he divorces Ede Bali from his Vefai identity. He does not say

---

[171] Barkan, *Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri*, 4.
[172] Müneccimbaşı, *Camiu'd-duvel*, 193.

anything about the dervish bonds of Ede Bali aside from narrating that he had a *zaviye* (a convent of dervishes) and he confines to introducing him as a sheikh from the sheikhs of his time. In other words, the reputation and significance of Ede Bali does not allow Müneccimbaşı to totally ignore him, therefore the author does not make reference to the unfavorable part for him.

4.6. Conclusion

The primary purpose of this chapter is to question the reasons for Müneccimbaşı's involvement and suppression of the Sufi characters in *Camiu'd-duvel*. I explored Müneccimbaşı's Mevlevi connection and his motivations derived from being a member of that group. Compared with two fundamental Ottoman histories, several differences arise providing opportunity to reveal Müneccimbaşı's concerns. First of all, his involvement of Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi in the Ottoman history is quite striking. I believe that Müneccimbaşı's inclusion of Mevlana is not simply a result of benefiting from Sufi authorities to consolidate the Ottoman dynasty. Considering Müneccimbaşı's context, the scholarly and political milieu of the seventeenth century, I read this inclusion as an effort to promote Mevlevis against the discrediting Sufi groups at the time, especially by the Kadızadelis. The presence of their current leader, Vani Efendi, in the sultan's court together with Müneccimbaşı must have made the situation more serious for him. By establishing a connection between the Ottoman roots and Mevlana, and attributing him an authority to declare Osman as a sultan of a sultanate holding on as long as they believed in Mevlana's followers, Müneccimbaşı puts the Mevlevis in an indispensable position.

Another evidence for that he wrote based on his concerns derived from being a Mevlevi, is his attitude towards the Turkmen dervish groups. Mevlevis and Turkmen dervish orders are presented as the two rivals since the time of Seljukids until the last century of the Ottomans. As a member of one side of the conflict, Müneccimbaşı acts partially and excludes two characters although they exist in Aşıkpaşazade and Neşri's accounts as the sultan's companions or a source for religious support. In the same manner, Müneccimbaşı ignores the

previous reports on the clothing of the sultans which argue that, for example, Orhan used to wear the headgear of Ahi organizations in addition to assigning it as the part of the uniform for Ottoman army. Instead, Müneccimbaşı narrates that Orhan wore a hat similar to the ones that Mevlevi disciples used. He adds that Orhan's descendants, the subsequent sultans, followed his style until Mehmed II. However, he does not only credit the Mevlevi saints. Emir Sultan is another exalted character in the chapter at stake. Then, it is better to say that Müneccimbaşı is not aiming at elevating only the Mevlevi dervishes, but his primary purpose is to highlight the significance of the sufis for the endurance of the state in general, except from the ones that have been against the Mevlevis.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, my primary purpose was to reveal Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede's approach to the Ottoman dynasty by examining his universal history *Camiu'd-duvel* and political and intellectual context of the author and his work. I tried to determine the connections between the author's personal concerns and particular section of his book. To do so, first I looked for the parallelisms and divergences between his text and the Ottoman historiographical tradition as regards the presentation of the Ottoman dynasty's early history and its right to rule.

Müneccimbaşı followed his forerunners in adopting the Ottoman dynastic myth into his text; however, he differed from them by being a more enthusiastic devotee of the dynasty. The Ottoman dynasty faced many challenges and was criticized a lot, as embodied in the works of Müneccimbaşı's contemporaries. Surprisingly, his description of the dynasty appeared contrary to the fashion prevalent at the time. He demonstrated a powerful image of the sultans whose authority was unquestionable, emphasizing on the elements of the Ottoman dynastic myth more than its composers. In addition to this emphasis, Müneccimbaşı's insistence on declaring eternity of the Ottoman state prompted me to conclude that due to the challenges that the dynasty faced, Müneccimbaşı adopted a defensive manner and emphasized the dynasty's authority more than previous authors did. This indicates that although the reputation of the sultans was questioned, this period also witnessed more devoted subjects which is against the idea of the steady decline of sultan's reputation vis-a-vis their people.

Müneccimbaşı chose to empower the emphasis on sultans' commitment to Islam in order to enhance sympathy towards sultans. I believe, the religious atmosphere in the seventeenth century made Müneccimbaşı see that as the most powerful element. It was when a piety rose in the public and palace. The previous heterogeneity of the society and officers in the palace began to disappear due to

articulation of a uniformed way of understanding religion. In this respect, even the different sects within Islam itself considered each other heretic. In this context, it is easy to understand Müneccimbaşı's effort to depict sultans as the followers of the mainstream perception of religion. However, his other intellectual interest renders this argument questionable since he was also interested in European history more enthusiastically than his previous colleagues were.

Certainly, one of most exciting parts of his book was his presentation of Sufism and Sufis, particularly Mevlevis. In general, he presented Sufis as tools that convey divine approval to the Ottoman sultans. However, his stress on the importance of Sufi characters makes one think that his primary purpose was not to underline the legitimacy of the sultans, but to prove the indispensability of the Sufis by indicating to their authority. After a small investigation, it appears that he uniquely included Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi into the history of foundation of the Ottoman state. Suffice it to look at his period to understand his motive. The seventeenth century religious atmosphere in the Ottoman realm was dominated by the conflict between Kadızade followers and Sufis. Sufis were under attack of the Kadızadelis and there were instances that the sultan listened to their advices against Sufis. Therefore, Müneccimbaşı had to defend his group by attributing the most important duty to them. They constituted the intermediary between celestials and mundane world to transport divine approval of the rulers. He even implied a possibility of first sultans' being Mevlevis by declaring that they used to wear pieces of Mevlevi clothes. By doing so he also emphasized his own significance, as well as announcing indispensability of Sufis for the endurance of the Ottoman state.

This examination on a section of Müneccimbaşı's massive work demonstrates the dynamism of the mechanisms to legitimize the political authority of the Ottoman dynasty in historical works, which in most cases reflected the *zeitgeist* of the time when they were produced. Accordingly, Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede gave voice to some of the concerns of a part of the Ottoman elite in the seventeenth century Ottoman capital. He articulated the anxieties of Sufis in the face of the Kadızadeli challenges; he reflected the diminishing self-confidence of the Ottoman dynasty and

administration during the turbulent years after a period of revival and military victories led by the Köprülü grand-viziers. At the time when Müneccimbalı composed his work, the Ottoman dynasty was not as indispensable as it had used to be. Under these circumstances, Müneccimbaşı produced a more substantial dynastic image that is more respective of and depended on the Sufis.

Due to the large size of *Camiu'd-duvel*, unfortunately, I had to be content with reading a small section of it. There are other questions that remain to be answered with a reading with a broader perspective. For example, I would like to know why Ahmed Dede wrote a universal history after a contemporary scholar Hezarfen Hüseyin compiled one dedicating to Mehmed IV in the same period. Considering that these two authors were both under the patronage of the Köprülü family, it would be fair to think that this might be related with their expansionist policies. The military victories beginning from incumbency of Köprülü Mehmed must have provided them a self-confidence that led to the campaign to Vienna. In this victorious atmosphere, the patrons who attached great importance to the intellectual production incentivized scholars to write histories that embrace the whole world, indicating their sense of ownership. In this respect, Müneccimbaşı also appears as a part of the project that proves the fallacy of the idea of intellectual decline in the seventeenth century. Still, a deeper understanding of his intimacy with his patron, Merzifonlu Kara Mustafa Paşa would be illuminative for explaining the significance of Köprülü family in political, intellectual and religious milieu. Moreover, Müneccimbaşı's choice to write in Arabic rather than in Turkish is still a question mark. These questions can be multiplied. To conclude, written in a period when the Ottomans faced with the challenges and changes, *Camiu'd-duvel* constitutes a powerful witness of that period. To explore its story might be offering another gate opening to that controversial phase.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Unpublished Primary Sources in Manuscript Libraries

Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede. *Camiu'd-duvel*. Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi, no. 3171, 3172.

Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede. *Camiu'd-duvel*. Esad Efendi, no. 2101, 2102, 2103.

Published Primary Sources

Ahmed Eflaki. *Menakıbu'l-Arifin.* İstanbul: Kabalcı, 2006.

Ahmedi. "Tevarih-i Mülük-i Al-i Osman." In *Osmanlı Tarihleri 1*, edited by Nihal Atsız, 3-35. Istanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1947.

Aşıkpaşazade. *Osmanoğullarının Tarihi,Tevarih-i Al-i Osman*. Edited by Kemal Yavuz and Yekta Saraç. Istanbul: Gökkubbe, 2010.

Katip Çelebi. *Mizanü'l-hak fi ihtiyari'l-ahak*. ed. Orhan Şahin Gökyay. Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1972.

Kürd Hatip. *Dördüncü Mehmed Saltanatında İstanbul Risâle-i Kürd Hatîb*. Edited by H. Ahmet Arslantürk and Murat Kocaaslan, Istanbul: Okur Akademi, 2014.

Mehmed Neşri. *Kitab-ı Cihan-nüma, Neşri Tarihi*. ed. Faik Reşit Unat and Mehmed A. Köymen, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2014.

Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede. *Kitabu Camiu'd-duvel: kısmü's-selatin-i Al-i Osman ila sene 1083 h*. Trans. Ghassan b. Ali er-Remmal. Mekke: Şafak, 2009.

Nişancı Mehmed Paşa. "Osmanlı Sultanları Tarihi." in *Osmanlı Tarihleri 1*. Edited by Nihal Atsız, 322-369. Istanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1947.

Sakıb Dede. *Sefine-i Nefise-i Mevleviyan*. Kahire: Mektebetu Vehbe, 1866/1283.

Secondary Sources

Ağırakça, Ahmet. trans. *Camiu'd-düvel: Osmanlı Tarihi (1299-1481)*. Istanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1995.

Akkuş, Mustafa. "Hacı Bektaş Veli'nin Moğol Tahakkümüne Bakışı." *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Veli Araştırma Dergisi* 66 (2013): 147-168.

Atçıl, Abdurrahman. *Scholars and Sultans in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Atsız, Nihal. ed. *Karahanlılar ve Anadolu Selçükleri: Müneccimbaşı Şeyh Ahmed Dede Efendi'nin "Cami'üd-Düvel" Adlı Eserinden.* Istanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1939-1940.

Aydüz, Salim. "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Müneccimbaşılık." *Osmanlı Bilimi Araştırmaları* I (1995): 159-207.

Baer, Marc D. *Honored by the Glory of Islam: Conversion and Conquest in Ottoman Empire.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Barkan, Ömer Lütfi. *Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri*. Istanbul: Hamle Basın Yayın, no date.

Barkey, Karen. *Empire of Difference*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Bayram, Mikail. *Sosyal ve Siyasi Boyutlarıya Ahi Evren-Mevlana Mücadelesi*. Konya: Nüve Kültür Merkezi, 2012.

Bekar, Cumhur. "A New Perception of Rome, Byzantium And Constantinople In Hezarfen Huseyin's Universal History." M.A. thesis, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, 2011.

Börekçi, Günhan. "İnkirazın Eşiğinde Bir Hanedan: III. Mehmed, I. Ahmed, I. Mustafa ve 17. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Siyasi Krizi." *Divan*: *Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi* 45 (2009/1): 45-96.

Cezar, Mustafa. *Mufassal Osmanlı Tarihi,* I. Istanbul: İskit Yayınalrı., 1957.

Cide, Ömer. "Osmanlı Devleti'nin Kuruluş Döneminde Meşruiyet Sorunu ve İlk Kaynaklara Yansıması." *Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 2 (2015): 105-126.

Çalışır, Muhammet Fatih. "A Virtuos Grand Vizier: Politics and Patronage in the Ottoman Empire During the Grand Vizirate of Fazıl Ahmed Pasha (1661-1676)." Ph.D diss., Georgetown University, 2016.

Darling, Linda. "Ottoman Fiscal Administration: Decline or Adaptation?" *Journal of European Economic History* 26 (1997): 157-179.

Emecen, Feridun. "Osmanlı Hanedanına Alternatif Arayışlar." in *Osmanlı Klasik Çağında Hanedan, Devlet ve Toplum,* 37-60. Istanbul: Timaş, 2011.

— — —. "Kayılar ve Osmanlılar: Sahte Bir Kimlik İnşası mı?" *Oğuzlar, Dilleri, Tarihleri ve Kültürleri: 5. Uluslararası Türkiyat Araştırmaları Sempozyum Bildirileri*, 237-244. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Yayınları, 2015.

— — —. "İhtirasın Gölgesinde Bir Sultan: Yıldırım Bayezid." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları/ The Journal of the Ottoman Studies* 43 (2004):67-92.

— — —. *İlk Osmanlılar ve Batı Anadolu Beylikler Dünyası.* Istanbul: Kitabevi, 2003.

Erünsal, İsmail, trans. *Müneccimbaşı Tarihi*. Istanbul: Tercüman, n.d.

Fleischer, Cornell. *Bureaucrat and intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: the historian Mustafa Ali (1541-1600).* Princeton: Princeton University, 1986.

Genç, Mehmet. "Osmanlı'da 17. Yüzyılın Sosyal ve Siyasal Yapısında Değişmeler." in *Itri ve Dönemine Disiplinlerarası Bakışlar*, 13-18. Istanbul: Istanbul Kültür Sanat Vakfı, 2013.

Gibbons, Herbert Adams. *The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire*. New York: The Century Co., 1916.

Göçer, Zehra. "Franz Taeschner'in "Das Anatolische Achitum Des 13./14. Jahrhunderts Und Seine Beziehung Zu Mevlâna Celâleddin Rumi" Adlı Bildirisinin Çevirisi." *Mevlana Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1 (2007): 169-175.

Gölpınarlı, Abdulbaki. *Mevlana'dan Sonra Mevlevilik.* Istanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 1953.

Göyünç, Nejat. "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Mevleviler." *Belleten* 213 (1991): 351-58.

Gürkan, Emrah Safa. "Christian Allies of the Ottoman Empire" *European History Online* .http://ieg-ego.eu/de/threads/modelle-und-stereotypen/tuerkengefahr-exotismus-orientalismus/emrah-safa-gurkan-christian-allies-of-the-ottoman-empire# (accessed June, 2016)

Hagen, Gottfried. "Ottoman Understandings of the World in the Seventeenth Century." in *An Ottoman Mentality: The World of Evliya Çelebi, Ottoman Empire and Its Heritage*, Robert Dankoff, Leiden: Brill, 2006.

— — — and Menchinger, Ethan L. "Ottoman Historical Thought." in *A Companion to Global Historical Thought*, edited by Pransenjit Duara and others, 92-106. West Sussex: Wiley and Blackwell, 2014.

Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph Von. *Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi: Sultan İbrahim'in cülusundan Köprülü Mehmed Paşa'nın Sadrazamlığa Tayinine Kadar (1640-1656)*. Trans. Mehmed Ata. Istanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat, 1985.

Howard, Douglas A. "Genre and Myth in the Ottoman Advice for Kings Literature." in *The Early Modern Ottomans Remapping the Empire* edited by Virgina H. Aksan and Daniel Goffman, 137-166. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

— — —. "Ottoman Historiography and the Literature of "Decline" of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." *Journal of Asian Studies* 22 (1988): 52-77.

Imber, Colin. "The Ottoman Dynastic Myth." *Turcica* 19 (1987): 7-27.

İnalcık, Halil. "How to Read Ashık-Pasha-Zade's History." in *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professore V. L. Menage*. Ed. Colin Heywood and Colin Imber. Istanbul: Isis Press, 1994.

— — —. *Devlet-i Aliyye Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Üzerine Araştırmalar III: Köprülüler Devri*. Istanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2015.

— — —. *Fatih Devri Üzerinde Tetkikler ve Vesikalar*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1954.

— — —. "Military and Fiscal Transformation in the Ottoman Empire, 1600-1700." *Archivum Ottomanicum* 6 (1980): 283-337.

— — —. *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300-1600.* trans. Norman Itzkowitz and Colin Imber. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973.

Kafadar, Cemal. *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

— — —. "The Question of Ottoman Decline." *Harvard Middle Eastern and Islamic Review* 4 (1997-1998): 30-75

Karadeniz, Hasan Basri. *Osmanlılar ve Rumeli Uç Beyleri*. İstanbul: Yeditepe, 2015.

— — —. *Anadolu'da Meşruiyet Mücadelesi*. İstanbul: Yeditepe, 2008.

Karateke, Hakan. "Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate: A Framework for Historical Analysis." In *Legitimizing the Order, The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power*, edited by Hakan Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski, 13-52. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Krstic, Tijana. *Contested Conversions to Islam Narrative of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire.* California: Stanford University Press, 2011.

Köprülü, M. Fuad. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Kuruluşu*. Ankara: Başnur Matbaası, 1972.

Kunt, Metin. *The Sultan's Servants, The Transformation of Ottoman Provincial Government* 1550-1650. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

Le Gall, Dina. "Kadızadelis, Naksibendis, and Intra-sufi Diatribe." *The Turkish Studies Association Journal* 27:1-2, (2004): 1-28.

Lewis, Bernard. "Ottoman Observers of Ottoman Decline." *Islamic Studies* 1 (1962): 71-87.

Lindner, Rudi Paul. *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia.* Bloomington: Indiana University, 1983.

Lowry, Heath W. *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003.

Lybyer, Albert Howe. *The Government of The Ottoman Empire in the Time of Suleiman the Magnificent.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1913.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. "Türkiye Tarihinde Merkezi İktidar ve Mevleviler (XIII-XVIII. Yüzyıllar) Meselesine Bir Bakış." *II. Milletlerarası Osmanlı Devleti'nde Mevlevihaneler Kongresi Bildirileri- Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 2 (1996): 17-22.

— — —. *Babailer İsyanı: Aleviliğin Tarihsel Altyapısı yahut Anadolu*. Istanbul: Dergah , 1996

Oluk, Fahri. "Cami'd-düvel Sultan IV. Mehmed Dönemi Tercüme, Metin ve Değerlendirme." PhD diss., Erciyes Üniversitesi, 2011

Öngül, Ali, trans. *Camiu'd-düvel: Selçuklular tarihi I: Horosan- Irak, Kirman ve Suriye Selçukluları.* İzmir: Akademi Kitabevi, 2000.

Özcan, Abdülkadir. "İstanbul'un Eminönü Semti XVII. Yüzyılda mı İslâmlaştırıldı?" *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 37 (2011): 206-13.

Özvar, Erol. "Osmanlı Tarihi Dönemlendirme Meselesi ve Osmanlı Nasihat Literatürü." *Divan: İlmi Araştırmalar* 2 (1992): 135-51.

Pamuk, Şevket. "The Price Revolution in the Ottoman Empire Reconsidered." *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 33 (2001): 69-89.

Peirce, Leslie P. *The Imperial Harem Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Piterberg, Gabriel. *An Ottoman Tragedy – History and Historiography at Play.* London: University of California Press, 2003.

al-Rouayheb, Khaled. "The Myth of "Triumph of Fanaticism" in the Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Empire." *Die Welt des Islams* 48 (2008): 196-221.

— — —. *Islamic Intellectual History in the Seventeenth Century.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Sariyannis, Marinos. "The Kadızadeli Movement as a Social and Political Phenomenon: The Rise of a 'Mercantile Ethic'?" *Political Initiatives 'From the Bottom Up' in the Ottoman Empire,* ed. Antonis Anastasopoulos, (Rethymno: Crete University Press, 2012), 263-89.

Sılay, Kemal. "Ahmedi's History of the Ottoman Dyansty." *Journal of Turkish Studies* 16 (1992): 129-200.

Sözüdoğru, Hatice Arslan. *Müneccimbaşı als Historiker: arabische Historiographie bei einem osmanischen Universalgelehrten des 17. Jahrhunderts: Ğāmi' ad-duwal (Teiledition 982/1574-1082/1672).* Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2009.

Şahin, Kaya. *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Tellioğlu, Ömer. "Müneccimbaşı Ahmed B. Lütfullah'ın Cami'ü'd-Düvel'inden Hamdaniler Kısmının Metin Neşri ve Tercümesi*." M.A., İstanbul Üniversitesi, 1994.*

Terzioğlu, Derin. "How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization: A Historiographical Discussion" *Turcica* 44 (2012-2013): 301-38.

— — —. "Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyazi Mısri (1618-1694)." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1999.

Tezcan, Baki. *The Second Ottoman Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

— — —. "The Politics of Early Modern Historiography." In *the Early Modern Ottomans, Remapping the Empire*, edited by Virginia Haksan and Daniel Goffman, 167-198. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Turan, Osman. *Türk Cihan Hakimiyeti Mefkuresi Tarihi: Türk Dünya Nizamının Milli İslami ve İnsani Esasları*. Istanbul: Nakışlar Yayınevi, n.d.

Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi. http://www.tdvislama nsiklopedisi.org Online.

Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. Osmanlı Tarihi, I Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1982.

Ünlü, Nuri, trans. "Cami'ü'd-Düvel (II.Beyezid ve Yavuz Sultan Selim devri) müellif müneccimbaşı Ahmet Dede (tenkidli metin nesri)." Ph.D. diss., Marmara Üniversitesi, 1990.

Wittek, Paul. *The Rise of The Ottoman Empire.* London: The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1958.

Woodhead, Christine. "Reading Ottoman Şehnames: Official Historiography in the Late Sixteenth Century." *Studia Islamica* 104/105 (2007): 67-80.

Yıldız, Kenan. "Doğruluğu Tartışmalı bir Tartışma: 1660 Yangını İstanbul'un İslamlaşmasına Etki Etti mi?" *Osmanlı İstanbulu I. Uluslararası Osmanlı İstanbulu Sempozyumu, Bildiriler.* İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi, 2014.

Yılmaz, Yasir. "Grand Vizieral Authority Revisited: Köprülü's Legacy and Kara Mustafa Paşa" *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 31 (2016): 21-42.

Zacharidaou, Elizabeth A. "İlk Osmanlılara Dair Tarih ve Efsaneler." in *Söğüt'ten İstanbul'a Osmanlı Devleti'nin Kuruluşu Üzerine Tartışmalar*, ed. Oktay Özel and Mehmet Öz, 341-394. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2000.

Zilfi, Madeline. "The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 45/4 (1986): 251-69.

— — —. *The Politics of Piety.* Minneapolis: Biblioetheca Islamica, 1988.