INTRODUCTION

The present work has a two-fold purpose: to present in tabulated form the information contained in VP, and to analyze the careers of the Culemā detailed there in so as to allow the state of the learned profession in the mid-17th century to be deduced.

The first of these aims largely concerned devising a method of re-casting the details buried in Şeyhī's undistinguished prose into a form which probably is in rough conformity with the registers from which he drew them. One need hardly feel diffidence in so treating his work, nor hesitate for fear of depriving Ottoman literature of one of its monuments: Şeyhī's normal style is a cliché-ridden imitation of Nevīzāde Cətā'ī, and whenever it shows any imagination or invention it has almost invariably been plagiarized from CÜZ. This tedious quality of the writing probably explains, in part, why the work has not yet found an editor, and why, as a consequence, a book of such importance for Ottoman social and institutional history has hitherto had to be used through manuscripts. The tabulations, as presented in this thesis, will be given a further usefulness, when finally printed, by the addition of exhaustive indices of personal names and lakabs, medreses, kaazās, written works, etc.

The second purpose was to arrive at an objective presentation of the actual operation of the educational and judicial systems in a given period. It becomes observable as one seeks information on these matters how much reliance is placed on materials containing proposals for reform or the correction of abuses, and this may account for the general impression of corruption and
confusion so frequently given by works which touch on this subject. That the venality and nepotism which vitiated so many other Ottoman institutions penetrated here, also, is not to be denied, but there would seem to be a fundamental error in characterizing an entire system by its aberrations. Moreover, the very survival and expansion of the system imply an inherent vitality and worth not at all in keeping with the debased and moribund institution we are given to understand it to be. Whatever my be the truth or falsity of such views, they must be substantiated in one way or another by reference to the careers of the men involved, and the present study deliberately avoids commitment and pre-conception, seeking only to organize and classify the data pertinent to such judgments. There can be no more satisfactory way of arriving at such presentation than through the works of men such as Уседин-заде and Сейх, who saw the facts they recorded as the normal operation of the system and were not disposed to be critical of its manifest defects.

Practical considerations made it unfeasible to treat all the кулам included in the ВФ, and the careers of only about half (735 out of 1477) will be found outlined in the tables. In its future published form, of course, the entire work will be given, but for the purposes of the present study it was felt that the number chosen was sufficiently large, the individuals sufficiently representative, and the period sufficiently long to afford a valid impression of both the system and the class to which it gave rise.
A- The Biographies of the Ulema in Ottoman Literature.

Like other walks of life in Ottoman society in which the careers of the individuals involved extended from generation to generation, that of the Ulema, too, engaged the attention of biographers, and, as was invariably the case, the existence of one such work attracted continuations that would bring it down to the date of the person writing. Among the Ottomans the first such attempt at a biographical compendium of the Ulema was made by the famous scholar Taşköprü-zade Ahmed Ef., whose Saka'iku'n-Nu'mâniye was the foundation for all subsequent works of this nature.

1- Saka'iku'n-Nu'mâniye.

It was about twenty years after Sehl had completed his tezkere of the poets that Taşköprü-zade produced his biographical account of the Cilmîye class, including also the meşâvîh, from the origins of the state down to the middle of the reign of Süleyman Kanuni; however, it should not be thought that the one was of any influence on the other. In fact, tabakat biography such as that undertaken by Taşköprü-zade had a long history in

1. On Taşköprü-zade Ahmed Ef., cf. Münir Aktepe, İA, fasc.120, pp. 42-44, where all the relevant sources are mentioned. The Saka'ik, in its original Arabic, was published on the margin of the Bulak ed. of İbn Hallikân's Verâyätü'l-A'yun, (1310), and translated into German by Oskar Rescher (İstanbul, 1927).
Islamic literature, and one may assume that he wrote it in Arabic rather than Turkish because he felt it belonged to this class of learned writing. By this time the Turkish provinces of Anatolia and Rumili had produced sufficient scholars and men of religion to warrant the compilation of such a work. Of course, the materials on which he had to rely were of a very disparate nature, and for the earliest period his information is largely of the menkıbe form. However, after the establishment of the Şahın, the educational system of the Ottomans became regularized, and it was certainly from the official records that were kept since that time that he and his continuators derived the precise data on the appointments of the individuals include in the works.

The first of the continuations, also in Arabic, was made by Çâşık Çelebi, the author of the famous tezkere of the poets,

The elaborate Turkish version made by Mecnû was published in İstanbul in 1269. A bibliographical survey of the work and its continuations was made by Behçet Gönül, Türkîyet Mecmuası, vii-viii (1945), pp.136-168.

2. When Çâşık Çelebi showed his Turkish translation of the Şakâ'îk to Taşköprü-zâde, he was told that he should not have wasted his time, for the Arabic was as simple as Turkish (Çâşık, p.163) Probably, too, when one considers the still inchoate state of the Turkish literary language at that time, it may indeed have been easier for him to write in Arabic.
bringing the work down to the middle of the reign of Sultan Selîm II and including the biographies of forty-two individuals. However, neither this zeyîl, nor its continuation by a certain Gazâlî-zâde, has attracted much attention, and the standard sequel to the Sakâ'îk has always been al-ČÎkd al-Manzûm of ČAli b. Bâlî, known as Manîk ČAli. His work, also written in Arabic, contains the biographies of the scholars and holy men who died between the years 968 and 991, i.e. to midway in the reign of Murâd III. But although this must be regarded as the principal continuation, its reputation, was overshadowed by NevČÎ-zâde ČAtâ'I's Hadâ'îk al-Sakâ'îk, one of the great works of prose literature in Ottoman Turkish. The style of ČAtâ'I in many respects resembles that of the Turkish translation of the Sakâ'îk made by Mecdî Ef., and together they virtually displaced the Arabic works from general knowledge. While both accepted that the purpose of their work was to preserve the details of the lives of the men who contributed to the intellectual and spiritual development of the state, they none the less found this a favourable ground for the exercise of their talents as writers of exquisite prose, and in both these respects they have their

---

3. Gönül, 155-56. The work was published, along with the Sakâ'îk, in the margin of the edition of Ibn Hallîkân previously referred to (vol.ii, pp.91-424) and translated into German by Oskar Rescher (Stuttgart, 1934).

Mecdi Ef. of Edirne, a pupil of Kaf Ahmed Celebi, played no conspicuous part in the intellectual life of the sixteenth century apart from the translation of the \textit{\c{S}ak\c{a}ik}, which he completed in 995. He served as kazi in various places in Rumili, and during a period out of office died in Istanbul in 999/1590. He is buried in the Emir Bu\c{c}ar\i zaviyesi outside Edirne Kapusi. In his translation, he made some effort to supplement the data found in the original by information taken from other sources, especially the \textit{tezkeres} of Latifi and C\c{a}\c{s}ik Celebi. These additions are always given at the end of the notice, but without always mentioning the works from which they were drawn. Moreover, he added to the body of the work certain individuals whom Ta\c{s}kopr\u{u}-zade had omitted, and these must be regarded as individual contributions. In his introduction he explains that he made this translation at the request of certain friends, the conventional reason offered for most translations. He elaborates on the difficulty of the task set upon him, indicating clearly that he intended his work to be of high literary quality. He mentions the ease with which \textit{\c{C}al\i} b. S\u{a}li\c{n} could achieve elegance in his \textit{\c{H}umeyyn-name} by merely transferring the beauties of his original -- the \textit{Envar-\c{i} S\u{u}heyll} of H"us"eyn Va\c{c}ez Kasif\i -- directly into his own work. In the \textit{\c{S}ak\c{a}ik}, however, such elegancies did not
exist, and all such adornment had to be supplied by Mecdi himself who was thus obliged to create a new style for his text.

This style was to set the pattern for subsequent continuations, and its influence on Ata'i and U§§I-zade is clearly to be seen. In this quality, Mecdi may be regarded as the originator of a new phase in the development of Ottoman prose literature.


Ata'i wrote a continuation of Mecdi's translation, bringing the biographies of the ulema and sehys down to the deaths occurring in 1044/1634, in Reb.II of which year the work was completed. In many respects he disposes of more precise information than his precursors, obviously having access to official records. Also, he draws on a fund of anecdotal material and personal knowledge, which gives his work an intimate quality lacking in the others. Like his predecessors, he arranged his materials according to the date of death of the subjects, and the reign in which this occurred -- each reign being a tabaka. Thus, the Şaka'ık consists of ten tabaka, down to the middle of the reign of Suleyman I, and it is from here that Ata'i commences his biographies; he apparently did not regard the continuation of Ali b. Bâlî worth taking into account, most probably because he intended his work to be a zeyl to Mecdi rather to the Şakā'ık.

Ata'i appropriates the basic approach to his subject from Mecdi, but as a stylist he shows himself greatly superior, his work being one of the masterpieces of Ottoman literature.
Plan: The cemetery of Keskin Dede, opposite the Nişancı Mosque in Fatih. Tomb no. 1 is that of ʻUṣṣāği-zāde ʻAbdūhīm Ef.; no. 2 is that of his brother ʻAbdullāh Ef.

Plate: 1 The tombstone of ʻUṣṣāği-zāde ʻAbdūhīm Ef.

Plate: 2 The tombstone of ʻUṣṣāği-zāde ʻAbdullāh Ef.
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by tabaka, he brought his zeyl down to the middle of the reign of Murad IV (17th tabaka), and it was from here that Üşâkî-zâde commenced his zeyl.

3- Üşâkî-zâde İbrahim Ef.

The biography of Üşâkî-zâde İbrahim Ef., who used in

5. On ČAṭā'î, cf. Gönül, p.161;and J.R.Walsh, EI², i,732-3(s.v.ČAṬĀ'Ī)
6. This, and not Üşâkî-zâde, is the conventional form of the name and it is used with this value in the verses inscribed on his tombstone. As Kisleng omits these verses (giving only the ta'rîh misra, which is mistranscribed) they are given here in full:

Hayf ecel Üşâkî-zâde gibi zât-ı ekremün
Aşiyân-ı tenden itdi bûlbûl-ı rûhîn cûdâ
ČAlim-ü-fâzîl idi dânâ-ı şâhib-zeyl idi
Olamî idi hâkim-ü'ûş-ger-i Medîne ibtidâ
Ravza-ı Sultan-ı kevneyne olub şeyhü'1-harem
Devlet-i dâreyne mağhar eyledi anî Hûdâ
Kâzi-ı izmîr olub bâ-i tîbâr-ı Edrine
Ahîr oldî kâm-yûb-ı mânslîb-ı mûlîk-ı bekâ
Čeddî-ı pâki Fâhr-i mevcûdât olub anâ şefî
Kabri pûr-nûr u makâmî gülşen-i Firdevs ola
Xudsiyân tebûr idûb ta'rîh-ı fevîn didiler

However, in the form given above the ta'rîh yields 1127, and it should be corrected to
poetry the mahla of Hasib, is given in most detail in the third volume of Seyhi's VP, and in the tezkere of Selim. Kissling used only Seyhi for the biographical introduction to his photographic reproduction of Ussaki-zade's zeyl, but his transcription is so incorrect and his understanding of the text so confused that it must be given again here. Moreover, Kissling also omits the beginning of Seyhi's notice, in which the relation of O.UZ to other famous members of this family is shown.

He was the son of O. Abdulbaki Ef. (cf.VP,19/464), the grandson of the former Nakibul-Esraf Zeyrek-zade es-Seyyid O.Abdurrahman Ef. (O.UZ,p.424), and the younger brother of the kazasker O. Ussaki-zade es-Seyyid O. Abdullah Ef.

He was born in 1075. When in Rec.1090 his father was appointed k. of Mekke (to take effect from 1st Muh.1091), he received his mulazemet from him. Persons given this office were entitled which yields 1136, the date of his death. (Such is the form in which it appears on his tombstone; cf.plate I.) Kissling violates both rhyme and ta'rih by reading cah instead of ca.

9. From his own zeyl the following more-detailed genealogical tree can be drawn up.
Şeyh Husameddin Uğrakı
(d:1000; UZ, p.31; VF, 17/30)

Mustafa
(d:1037; Ata, I, p.733)

Abdul Aziz
(d:1045; UZ, p.31; VF, 17/30)

Abdurrahim
(d:1087; UZ, p.432; VF, 19/412)

Mehmed
(d:1065; UZ, p.219; VF, 19/84)

Daughter of Zeyrek-(a) Zahide Seyyid Abdulrahman Ef.
(d:1085; UZ, p.426; VF, 19/389)

Abdulbaki
(d:1090; UZ, p.477; VF, 19/464)

Ibrahim
(d:1136; VF, iii, 278)

Abdullah(b)
(d:1139; VF, iii, 304)

(a) In VF, this name is given as Seyrek-zade
(b) Kissling (p,xiv) reproduces in correctly the inscription from his tombstone, giving the date of his death as 1136. cf. plate 2.
to grant several mülâzemets on this appointment.

11 Cem.1,1098: the Muharrem Ağa, in grade of [ibtidâ-yî] hârîc
(Çâli Ef.).[he received the appointment from the Şeyhülislâm Ankarâvî Mehmed Ef.]

10 Reb.1,1101: the Ebûl-Paâl (Sâbi-zâde Mehmed Ef.)

16 Saf.1105: the Hammâmîye, in grade of ibtidâ-yî dâhil(Îshak-
zâde Nûr Mehmed Ef.)[Received appointment from Feyzullah Ef.]

6 Zil-H.1106: the âlâ of the Husrev Kethuda, in grade of dâhil
hareket-i misliyesi [hareket-i dâhil] (Tabîb Ebû '1-E8öad(sic. )Ahmed Ef.)(also from Feyzullah Ef.)

11 Şev.1107: in the same medrese given grade of musulîne-i Sahn. 

11 Zil-K.1110: the Sahn (Sadreddîn-zâde Ç Abdûlhayy Ef.)(also from Feyzullah Ef.)

22 Saf.1112: the âlâ of the Zekeriya Ef., in grade of ibtidâ
altmîslâ(Dendânî Ç Abdûlhâh Ef.)(also from Feyzullah Ef.)

14 Şev.1113: the Çâ'îşe Sultan, in grade of altmîs hareket-i
misliyesi[altmîslî hareket](Kevâkibi-zâde Mustafa Ef.)(also from Feyzullah Ef.)

Şev.1114: engaged in writing his seyl; given the kâzâ of a Şore as an arpaîk (Edirnelî Necîb Mehmed Ef.)

20 Reb.1115: the Hayreddîn Paşa again in grade of hareket-i

10. Kissling thinks his father was k. of Mekke between these dates.

11. Additional information from Sâlim is shown in square brackets.

12. Kissling thinks this is an appointment to the Sahn which ended in Zil-K.1110.
mislıye. (Sadreddin Mahmud Ef.) [received appointment from Mehmed Ef.]

Muh.1116: His arpalık of is given to Ebü İshak İsmail Ef.

20 Reb.II,1116: The şeyhül saray-i İbrahim Paşa, with the grade of müsulle-i Süleymaniye. (Kaba Külak-zade Mehmed Sa'd Ef.) [appointed by Başmakçı-zade Seyyid Çali Ef.]

3 Reb.II,1118: k. of Medine, to take effect from 1 Muh.1119 (Ra'di Mustafa Ef.) while k. he was also appointed Şeyhül 'l-Harum.

26 Zil-K.1119: ma'zul, to take effect from 1st Muh.1120: Silistreli Mehmed Ef., who was müderris at the Şehzade, with the grade of müsulle-i Süleymaniye.

4 Saf.1121: given the kazas of Mandaliyat (mandaliyat) and Ayazmend (ayazmend) [as arpalık]. The latter had been held by İbrahim Ef., who was ma'zul from the k. of Galata which he had held with the pâye of Bursa. [Sâlim mentions Midilli in place of Mandaliyat (mandaliyat)]

Şev.1125: k. of İzmir, to take effect from Zil-H.1125 (Re'isu'l Etibbâ Cömer Ef.) His arpalık of Mandaliyat is given to Vardar Şeyh-zade Mehmed Ef., who was ma'zul from the k. of Şam with the pâye of Edirne. That of Ayazmend is given Çeşm-i siyah Mustafa Ef., who was ma'zul from Medine.

Şa'b.1126: ma'zul, to take effect from 1 Zil-H.1126: Gümrukçı Hüseyn Paşa-zade Mustafa Ef., müderris at the Dârü 'l-hadâs of the Süleymaniye.
6 Rec.1127: given as arpalık the k. of Ǧedūs (کروس), which had been held by ǦAbdūlvehhab Ef., the k. of Ǧalaṭa.

1 Rec.1132: to the above arpalık is added the k. of Yeṇī Pazar (Medhī Muṣṭafā Ef., the former k. of Medīne), and he is given also the pāye of Edirne.[this was his position at the time Sālim wrote his tezkere].

Fri. 2 Șev.1136: died. Funeral service at the Fatih mosque, and buried in the cemetery of Keskin Dede opposite the mosque of Niğâncı Paṣa.

His arpalık of Yeṇī Pazar was given to Kūṭahyālī Ahmed Ef., the former k. of Ǧām; Ǧedūs was given to the ǦOmer Ef.-zāde Ǧibrāḥīm Ef., the former k. of Ǧalaṭa—this Ǧibrāḥīm was the son of the brother of the former Ǧeyhūlislām ǦAlī Ef.

His zeyl to ǦAṭā‘Ī was commissioned by the notorious Ǧeyhūlislām Payṣullāh Ef. and completed in 1114. Before a fair copy had been made, however, his patron died in the \"Edirne vak‘ası\" revolt (20 Reb.II,1115) and the work remained in rough draft until ǦAlī Paṣa became ǦSadr-Ăzām; it was to him that ǦUṣākī-zāde presented it, in hope of gaining favour. Of the two Paṣas of this name who held this post in the period from 1115 to 1136, the relevant dates for the completion of the work, it is certainly Ğorlīlī ǦAlī Paṣa who is intended; his sadaret ran from 1118 to 1122, and the

13. Silahdār ǦAlī Paṣa was ǦSadr-Ăzām between 1125 and 1128.
autograph manuscript of the work in the Gazi Husrev Mosque in Sarajevo has a note that it came into the possession of a certain Çelebi-zade İsmâ'îl Ğâsim in 1122. A certain confusion is created by the Hâtime which was transferred unaltered from the original draft; in this, Feyzûllâh is spoken of as still alive and the date of completion is shown by the chronogram: hatem-nâ bi-tîb. 1114.

In the Hâtime, he also mentions how the work tended to extend itself from one account to another:

\begin{verbatim}
hatîr-ı gağle-düğman\textsuperscript{14} dahi bu gül-zemînde secoâde-fers-i
ikâmât olub, yek-dü rûz sâha-gerd-i istîrâhat oldukda,
Kalem İncâ resid ü ser be-şikest
Kalem-i dîgerî be-dest-em hest
fehîvasîncâ, yine pey-efken-i rikâb-i ğazîmet olub,
mukaddemâ mûbâseret olanın tahrîrden raşam-zede-i hâmâ-i
uçûbe-zây olan vakâ'i\textsuperscript{c} bu şahîfe-i ra'nîda tamâm olub,
tanzîm-i tafsîl-i vakâ'i\textsuperscript{c} i dîger sahâ'îf-i dîgêrde
nivîste olmak üzre mûbâseret olûndi.
\end{verbatim}

Fortunately, this is not characteristic of the style used in the body of the work, and, as he informs us in the introduction, he was enjoined by Feyzûllâh to observe a bi-teklîfâne inşâ in his writing. Yet even his ordinary prose, when he departs from the mechanical enumeration of dates and situations, shows an awareness of stylistic effect which is not to be found in Şeyhî except as plagiarism. His biographical notices are brought down to the end of the reign of

\textsuperscript{14} Text:-dîğmen
Ahmed II in 1106, and are neither so numerous nor so detailed as in the VP; moreover, Uşşākī-zāde will very frequently refer to individuals merely by lakāb and without further specification, so that the reader can often be confused by references to a Mahmūd-zāde Efendi, a Kemāl Efendi-zāde, etc. Şeyhī speaks of Uşşākī-zāde's zeyl in the introduction to his own work, without, however, mentioning his name:

...baẓ-i hünermendān-i zemāne ol yektā-rev-i vādī-yi īrfāne (i.e. Ātā'I) peyrev olmağa, maḥcūba-i maṭılıbeye ḥuṭbe-senc-i şūrū, ve biṅ yūş altı sene sine gelince taṣāṭīr-i ahbār-ı culemā-yi kirām ile muʿaccele-dād-ı carūs-ı merām olduğu mesnū ol dukda, ʻirsāl-i vesāʾīt-ı enzār-ı şūr olma gb, manzūrum olan safahāt āyīne-i pūr-gubār-āsā keder-nāk-ı tesāmuḥ olduğunu ma-ʻadā, cümlenin ahvālin cāmī olmamağla, nā-sezā-yı ātinā ve nā-makbūl-i evliyā-yı nik-ū-bed-fehmān idūgī şurēt-nūmā ol dukda, ʻ......

The tesāmuḥ of which he complains probably refers to this use of incomplete names; and the work was certainly deficient in respect of content and accuracy as compared with his own. For the remainder of the 17th tabāka UZ has 29 individuals of the culemā class while VP has 75; in the 18th tabāka UZ has 43 to VP's 70; and in the 19th tabāka UZ has but 339 as compared with VP's 590. However, to claim that the work was not deserving of attention (nā-sezā-yı ātinā) is a gross injustice on Şeyh's part, and his own asiduous gleaning therefrom gives the lie to his detrac-
tion. Yet in attention to detail he shows himself temperamentally more suited to such a work of compilation than his predecessor, and the pains to which he went to assure accuracy was already commented on by his contemporary Sālim, who acknowledges his own indebtedness to him for much of the information in his own tezkīre:

Bu mecelle-i selileyi egnā-yi tahārīmüzde eserlerinden katı çok intifā olunub, ekser iṣḥahine ʿazm-ū-cezmümüz olmaga, taʾrīh ve ḥayāti ikṭīsā eyleyen kimeseleriʿn tercüməsi egnā-yi tahārīrde istiḥbāh itdükçe, enfās-1 tāyyibe-i ʾṣeyḥʿden istimdād, ve eser-i pākine nazar eyleyüb şahīfe-i bulde mērkūz olan ʾuḥbeleri dāʾīrē-i derūndan ibād iderdük. Selīkasi taʾrīh semtine düşmeglə, her ʾṣeyʿūn iṣḥahin bilməde ʿazīm ihtimām, ve defāṭir-i kādīme-i sultāniyelere ve ʾṣeyḥūliyeləm defterlerine dest-reside olmaga, emr-i tevārīhde saʿy-1 tām ve ʿhidmet-i mā-lā-kelâm idib, belki umūrdan baʿz-1 emrūn gereği gibi iṣḥahine vukuf içün ihtiyār-1 meşākk-1 sefer ve itʿāb-1 vūcūd idib, terk-i ḥuzūr itmeğle, elbette emr-i mūhimmüm iṣḥahine zafer bulub.16

15. ʿAlī Cūnib assumes that the similiarity between the two works was due to the fact that both used a common source, Tūrkiyāt Mecmūʿas,1,1 (1925),174. This, of course, could only apply to the factual materials; whenever any attempt at elegance is met with in ʾṣeyḥī the source is almost invariably ʿUṣgākī-zāde. Even in the biography of his own father, ʿHasan Feyzī Ef., ʾṣeyḥī borrows most of the elegance of language from the notice on him in ʿUZ.

The primary source for the biography of Mehmed Şeyh Ef. is to be found in the Şeyh to the VF. written by Fındıklı İsmet Ef. under the title Tekmîletü'l-Sakâ'îk fi Î hakki Şâli'îl-Hâkâ'îk and the notice is here given in full:

His name is sometimes given as Şeyh Mehmed Ef. (e.g. COM, iii, 74), but he identifies himself in the introduction to VF as Mehmed Şeyh Ef. In COM, iii, 74, the date of his death is given as 1145.

19. Gönül, p.168. A start was made to the publication of his work in serial form in the TTEM, nd.12-15(1289-1292), but discontinued.
Pederi müşärün ileyh Hasan Feyzi Efendi, Sımkeğ-başı Mehmed Ağanun sulbinden Daru’s-Saltanada tevellüd, ve tarıka-1 Halveti’nnin hezret-i Şems-i Sivası Koli Cüzamısin-
dan küth-1 devrân Şeyh CAbdülahad en-Nürî Haşretlerinden intisâb-u-istihlâf ve Culema-yî kiramdan istihsal-1 Culum itmişdür. Çok vakt sonra Laleli kurbinde Koska( قوسق)da Hekim Çelebi tekyesinin şeyhi,tarıka-1 Nakşbendi ricaîlinden Bosnavî Şeyh COnman Efendi Haşretlerinden de müntesib-ü-
mütehallif olmışdur. Simî mahlası-yle parlak eşcârî, ve funûn-1 mütedâvilenin çoğunda iktidârî vardur. İrtihâli 1102 dedür.

Şahîb-i tercüme Şeyhî Efendi müşärün ileyh Hasan Feyzi Efendin sulbinden Darü’l-Hilafede 1078 Recebi evasıntıda tevellüd itmişdür. Peder-i ma’arif-perverinden ve sâ’îr Culema-yî a’lâmûn mecâlis-1 Cilmîyelerinden istifadê-vü-
istifâzâ eyledügi esnâda, Hâse Sa’dedîn Efendi ahfadîndan Ebû Sa’d-ızade Feyzullâh Efendi Haşretlerinin ikinci defo

after the biographies of only sixty five individuals had been completed. The original work in eight volumes was destroy by fire, and Cîşmet Ef. had to re-write it as best he could. What survives, a manuscript of 1039 pages, is preserved in the Museum Library of Istanbul University, Türkçe, no.9290, and the notice on Şeyhî is found on pp.480-485.

20. The date of death is incorrect; Mecdi Ef. died in 1128 according to the notice in VF. Moreover, it was his sister, and not his daughter, who was Şeyhî’s mother.

Hezret-i Emir fehâmet-semîr dergân-1 fuyuzat-penâhînda Calîmânâ-û-ârifânî vezâ'îf-î meşihatî ifâ itmekde 1144 Mu'ârremînîn on beşinde şâkî-kâr-1 bekâya intikâl eylemişdir.

Edirne Kapusî härîcinde seccade-nîsîn olduğu dergân ile Şeyhûlislâm Kemâl Paşa-zade Hezâretlerinîn türbe-i şerîfleri miyânîndaki küçük makâbirde ve dergânîn minâresine yakın olan tarafında pederinîn yanına defn ile rahmet-î Rabb-i rahîme veđî'î idildi.

Câbd-î huçeste (Abd-û-Jâhîzî) Zaman hâteme (Zaman Xââmî) 1144 1144
tarîhleri o tarîhlerde bulunmuş olan tarîhlerdür.21 Kemâl-î fažl-u-kemâl ve efkâr-1 bi-miğâl ile nâm-1
tämm olmığ, Şeyh Efendi diyü müğärün bi-’l-benân olmığ. Ma’arif-perveran-ı zaman mıyanında, ve merasim-i inşâ-
perdâz-ı-vü-sühan-arâ’ıde pesendîde-i ğârîfân dînmege
şâyân, Câlî-iktidâr bir mîrâşd-ı mahâsin-ğîår idîler.

Sultan Süleyman Hân-ı Evvel Hzâretrlerinî n zaman-ı
salânât-ı hâkânîleri aç-зам-ı Culemsîndan ve süür-ı
çîm-ı fażâ’îl-ittisâmîdân mü’alîfat-ı kemâlât-perve-
râne sâhibî olan Taş Köprü-zâde Mevlânâ Ahmed Cîsâm-
dîn Efendi Hzâretrlerinî n Sultan Cîsmân Hân-ı Evvel
ibn-ı Ertuçrulu Hzâretrlerinî n Câsr-ı Macâ’îl-âsâr-ı
hûmâyûnîlîrînîn bêd’ iderek 960 ta’rîhînî kadar yazdıği
ve Mehmed Efendinî n ve Edirnelî Meodî Efendinî n ve Neçî
–zâde Cîtî’î Efendinî n ve Cûşşâkî-zâde ibrâhîm Efendi-
inî n 1111 ta’rîhînî kadar birbirîne gezlen tahrîr itdük-
leri Şâkâ’iç-ı Nûcâm-îye nâm ta’rîh-i nefsî 1111
 ta’rîhînîn 1143 ta’rîhînîn evâ’ilînî kadar belîgînê
müdekkîkâne tezyîl eyledi.22

Megahîr-ı müverrihînîn Kâtib çeleinînî hübüt-ı
Hzâretr-ı Âdem’den 1060 senelerine degin müferredât-ı
tevârîhi beyân ider fihrîst kîlikli yazdıği Takvimü
’ t-Tevârîh isimî ta’rîhî 1144 senesine kadar gezîl itdi.

22. This is, of course, incorrect. The VF is not a zeyîl to CÜZ,
and it begins in the year 1040 and not in 1111.
Cihan-nümä-yi Avrupa ismi altında yazdığı (ve) neşr itdiği ta'rîhde o zamanda neşr idilen bu misillî ta rîhlerün mu'âteberlerindendir.


Esersê gûlçen-i sebz-î dile nesîm-i umîd (text: جَذَّبَتْ )  Hayât-1 tâze virûr câ-be-câ şemîm-i umîd

Döner pîyâle şaf-î hûdmetinde sâkî(-yi) hûş

Olursa bezm-î şâm-î yârda nêdîm-i umîd

Irîr tecellî-yi maksûda Şeyhiyâ bir gün

Gelûrse Tûr-î niyaza eger Kelîm-i umîd

As was pointed out in the note, the information given here in respect of his maternal line is incorrect, and his descent should be shown as follows:

Simkeş-baği Mehmed Âğâ

Ahmed Ef., b. âAli b. âmûmer (d:1053)

I

Hasan Peyri Ef., (SIMÎ) = daughter Mecêî Mehmed Ef.
(d:1102)

Mehmed Şeyhi Ef. (d:1144)

I

Hasan
The biography of his maternal grandfather, Ahmed Ef. b. Câli b. Çümer is given in 18/23: he was born in 998 in the kasaba of Kule in the sancak of Kütahya. Having moved to İstanbul, in 1035 he received his mülazemet from Kudßî-zâde Şeyh Mehmed Ef. No details of his teaching career are given, but apparently he chose to enter the judicial branch, for in 1048, while holding the grade of 40 ak, he was appointed kâisi of Maçin in Rûmîlî. He had not been here long when he fell ill, and returned to İstanbul, where he died in 1059 at the age of 55, and was buried outside Edirne Kapusi. He was survived by a son, Mecûl Mehmed Ef., the future kâisi-âker of Anatolia, and a daughter who was to become the mother of our author.

Mecûl Mehmed Ef., the maternal uncle of Şeyhî, is the subject of a notice in Tabaka 23 of the VF. ²³ He was born in İstanbul in 1047, and consequently must have been only six years of age when his father died. The latter had been a retainer of the Nakîbû'l-Êgrâf. Kudßî-zâde Şeyh Mehmed Ef., and when the boy became an orphan his mother entrusted his upbringing to their patron. When Kudßî-zâde was appointed kâisi-âker of Anatolia in Şev, 1060, he granted him mülazemet, and shortly afterwards took him into his employment mektûbî. He probably held the usual minor teaching posts, after which, in Cem. II, 1079, he received his first hâric appointment to the medrese of Çivaç Ef., where he replaced Elmas Ağa Hâcibessi Câli Ef. His subsequent career is as follows: Muh. 1083: the Fâizma Hanîm (Hâcib-zâde Mehmed Ef.)

²³. cf., also, Salim, p. 608.
Rec.1084: the Hâşş Ota Başlı (Elmas Ağa Hâceti Câlî Ef.)
Rec.1086: the Çafer Paşa (Kaplan Paşa İmâmi Cümer Ef.)
Şa'c.b.1088: the HaçTel Hasan-zâde (La'îî-zâde Şeyh Mehmed Ef.)
Rec.1089: the Koca Mustafa Paşa (Kadrî-zâde Ahmed Ef.)
Rec.1092: the Sahn (Üskûdarî Kara Bacak Mehmed Ef.)
Muh.1094: the Pîrî Paşa (Dâvud-zâde İbrahim Ef.)
Cem.II,1095: the Siyavuş Paşa Sultanî (Hifzî Mustafa Ef.)
Muh.1097: the Saînîye of the Saray-ı Galâta (Hifzî Mustafa Ef.)
Muh.1099: promoted to the Ulâ of the same medrese (Cîmâd-zâde eş-Seyyid Mehmed Ef.)
Rec.1102: the Süleymânîye (Kadrî-zâde Câbullah Ef.)
Şev.1104: k. of Yeni Şehr-i Penîr (Şemsettin-zâde Mehmed Ef.) —— ma'zul, Zil-K.1105: İmâm Dâmâdî Cebî Hasan Ef.
Muh.111024: k. of Edirne (Hâmîd-zâde Câbullah Ef.) —— ma'zul,
Cem.I,1112: given the arpalik of ملوع (ملوع) which had been the ma'âlîyet of the children of Râfî Mehmed Ef.
Reb.II,1115: his arpalik increased by the addition of Lefke (Ahmed Ef.), and in addition he was given the pâye of Mekke
Cem.I,1116: Manyas added to his arpalik (Hattât Câbullah Ef.) with the pâye of Istanbul.
3 Şa'b.1116: ka of Anatoll (CĄta'ullâh Mehmed Ef., who received his successor's arpalik) as the result of injuries suffered in a fall he had to give up this office,

24. in Selim, the date is given as Muh.1111
28 Şa"b.l116: Kara Ebû Bekr Ef. He was given Marşag as an arpalık (Kara Hâmil Ef.)

Zil-K.1120: ka. of Anatoli for 2nd time (Menteş-zâde Câbûrrahîm Ef., who received his successor's arpalık) --- retired. Muh.1122: Dâmâd Ef.-zâde Ahmed Ef. He was given as arpalîks: Kütahya (Dâmâd Ef.-zâde Ahmed Ef.), İzniq (îmâm-i Sultânî el-Hâcc Mehmed Ef.), and Kete which was the maşîyet of the children of the Emîr-i Fetvâ Mahmuîd Ef.

Cem.II,1122: the arpalık of Kete is given to the former Şeyhülis-lâm Ebe-zâde Câbulâh Ef., and he receives Gemlik which had been held by the latter.

Cev.1123: Konya given to him as an arpalık (Menteşîlî Mehmed Ef., who had held it as a mevleviyyet. His arpalık of Kütahya was offered to Cîlmî Ahmed Ef. as a mevleviyyet, but when he refused it was given to Kara Murâd Ef. His arpalık of İzniq was given to Ak Mahmûd Ef. -zâde es-Seyyid Mehmed Zeynül-Çâbidîn Ef.

Thurs 9 Reb.II,1128: died at the age of 81 in his yali in Üsküdar. He was buried here in the courtyard of the mosque of Hasan Paşa. His arpalık of Konya was given as a mevleviyyet to Bosnavî Ahmed Ef; that of Gemlik to another kâzî.

He was especially learned in fîkh and inşâ. Under the mahlabî he composed a diwan from which extensive quotations are given.

25. in Sâlim the cause of this accident is given in detail.
Sālim, however, makes no mention of this dīvān, but says instead
that in his later life he gave up writing poetry; yet he confirms
that Mecdi enjoyed a certain reputation among the poets of the age.

Şeyhî's father, Hasan Feyzi Ef., 26 is also included in the VF,
under the şeyhs of the 20th tabaka. He was born in Istanbul in
1036, the son of a silversmith. In his early life he followed his
father's craft, but at the age of eighteen he associated himself
with the famous Şeyh Ğabdulahad Nūrī Ef., and was initiated by him
into the disciplines of tasavvuf. For a while he served as kethuda
in his master's home; then he took up residence in the tekke where
eventually he replaced Bolbolci-zâde Ğabdûlkerīm as head. His early
education was derived from Nūrī Ef., but later he received instruction
from Fāzîl Menlâ Çelebi, Ders-i Ğâmî Şâlih and Bıçakçi Mehmed Ef.
and was granted mülâzemet by the Nakİbû'l-Eqrâf Kudsî-zâde Şeyh
Mehmed Ef. He entered the teaching career, but after attaining the
grade of 40 ak. he turned to preaching. As credentials for this
calling, he had in addition to the approval of his former master,
the Ğalvetİye şeyh Nūrî Ef., that of the Nakşbendi şeyh BosnaVî
Ğosmân Ef., the head of the Hekîm Çelebi tekke, and of the Mevlîvi
şeyh El-hācc Ahmed Dede, the head of the mevlevi-hane outside
Yeîî Kapu. In 1062 he replaced Seyyid Yağkûb Efendî as the Friday
şeyh (cumî'seyhî) in the mosque of Ğarakiyyecî İbrâhîm Çavuş
outside Top Kapusî; in Rebi,1079(8) he replaced the above-mentioned
Mevlevî şeyh Ahmed Dede as Sunday preacher (yeYMül-ahad vaçaîzî)in
the Kiliç Ğâlî Paşâ mosque in Tophane; in Sev,1086 he replaced

26. cf.also, ĞUZ, p.650, p.559; ĞOM,1,139.
Şeyh Mehmed Emin Ef. as head of the Emir Buhari tekke outside Edirne Kapusı. After having spent forty years of his life in teaching and preaching, he died on Tues. 2 Şaf.1102, and was buried in the vicinity of the tekke. Hüşdî Ahmed Ef. wrote the inscription on his tombstone:

Cihandand gidüb Şeyh Feyzi Hasan
İdince kaža-yi bihişti mekân
Dili hâtîf ol demde ta'rlhini
Ola cay-i Feyzî, ilâhi canân.

(1102)

At the time of his death he was sixty-five years of age. He was proficient in the Arabic sciences and in Persian; he could write in the three languages, whence he took the mahlas Feyzi. Earlier in his life, he had been given the mahlas Simî (in reference to his father's trade) by the Şeyhülislâm Yahya Ef.; but Nurî Ef. changed this to Feyzi. His works include: a monograph on a section of Beyzavi's tefsir on a certain ayet in the sure-i Bakara; Turkish verses with the titles: Gamze vül Dil, Micrâc-nâme and Cevap-nâme; a dîvan in Turkish, from which extensive quotations are given.
In the introduction to the VP, Seyhî writes that he had for a long time intended to write a zeyl to Ğâta'I that would include, in addition to the qulemâ and the meşâyîn, various other classes, notably the poets. Before he had begun this work, however, Üşşâkî-zâde’s zeyl appeared; but the low opinion he formed of it on reading convinced him that there was still a need for the type of work he had been contemplating. Thus, commencing from 1043, the last year treated by Ğâta'I, he brought the biographies of the qulemâ and sêyha down to 1130, the date of the completion of his work. The work is dedicated to that great patron of learning and literature, Dâmâd Îbrâhîm Paşa, who was şadr-a şam at the time.

Of the two works other than the VP which are attributed to him, the zeyl to the Kâtib Çelebi’s Pâkvîmû’t-Tevârîh in which he brings the events down to the year 1144, has been published in the Mûteferrika edition of work (İstanbul, 1146). According to Babinger, it is not certain whether or not the Cîhân-nûmâ-yi Avrupa in the Hamîdiye collection (no. 932/3), now in the Murad Mollâ

27. The title نقل العالمية is a chronogram for the year 1129; it is mentioned in the kaside of dedication to Dâmâd Îbrâhîm Paşa:

Bu zeyl-i câmî-i ahbârü'n olâsa nâme sezâ
Lisânî ehl-i siyerde (Vâkâ'i'û'l-Fužalâ) = 1129
If the final hemze of the last word is regarded as an elif, the sum 1130 is arrived at.
section of the Süleymâniye, is the work of our Şeyhî\textsuperscript{29}. It is dated 1145 - one year after his death; and it is not improbable that it may have been a work found among his miscellaneous papers after his death and copied out on the instruction of his heirs.

The VFi is certainly his most important work, and indeed indispensable for the history of the Culema and the tarikât in the 17th-18th centuries. It was originally written in two volumes, the first covering the deaths which fell between the years 1042-1098\textsuperscript{30} and the second 1099-1130\textsuperscript{31}. A third volume, containing the years 1131-1143, was compiled after his death by his son\textsuperscript{32}, from the information his father had collected but had not had time to put into order. The first two volumes had been dedicated to Sultan Ahmed III, and his sadr-ə zam Dâmid İbrâhîm Paşa, the third likewise makes its dedication to Sultan Mahmûd I (1143-1168) and his sadr-ə zam Hekîm-oğlu ʻAlî Paşa. This is the only indication of the date of writing of vol. iii, and of the

\begin{itemize}
  \item 29. GOW, p.268.
  \item 30. Actually the work includes some individuals omitted in ʻAtâ‘î, going back to 1040.
  \item 31. Vol.i, as has already been mentioned, was completed in 1130; vol.ii, according the author's colophon which is given in the Velîyüddîn ms., was completed in 1134.
  \item 32. Babinger, GOW, is alone in giving the son the name Hasan; he
two terms as sadr-ə zam served by Əli Paşa in this reign — Ram.
1144-Şaf.1148; Şaf.1155-Şa' 1156-- it would appear likely
that it was during the first that the work was produced; otherwise,
we would expect the son himself to attempt to bring the work up
to date33.

Like his predecessor, Şeyhİ organized his materials into
tabakat corresponding to the reigns of the Sulţans in which the
deaths took place, beginning where Ətă'I breaks off in the
17th tabakat (Sultan Murad IV) and continuing down to the
middle of the 23rd (Sultan Ahmed III). The third volume,
completed by his son, brings the work down to the end of the
23rd tabaka (Sultan Ahmed III). In each tabakat, Şeyhİ follows
the same order of presentation: the əlema are entered first,
in a strict chronological sequence according to the month and
year of the death, and this section is followed by one on the

himself does not mention his name, nor do any other of the
sources.

33. Earlier in the introduction, the son says that he was
requested to complete his father's work by someone identified
only as müdebbir-i memâlik-i Devlet-i Əliye, ve museyyid-i
saltanat-ı senîye, lücee-i bahr-ı cüd-u-kerem, mürebβî-yi
ashâb-ı seyf-ü-kalem hazretleri, which may well be this same
Əli Paşa. Əli Cânib (Hayat, iii, no.75,p.3) omits this
section in quoting from the Aya Sofya ms. of vol.iii.
dervîş şeyhâ, also in the same sequence. Thus far, the work
more or less corresponds to its models; but in addition to these
two classes it adds further sections containing the deaths of
vezîrs and other statesmen, and of the poets. However, between
the last two sections, Şeyh-I provides tables of the occupants of
the important judicial posts in the Empire, starting with the
şeyhüislâmâmate and descending to the kaţâ of Ankara; and, in
addition, the occupants of certain important secular positions,
such as the hâns of the Crimea, the Vâlâs of Misr, the Kapudans,
and the Janissary Ağas are likewise tabulated.

Of all the authors who had written in this field, Şeyh-I is,
without doubt, the most systematic, and possessed of the kind
of mind most suited to the nature of the work. While he cannot
be regarded as a great writer, he was clearly a man much interested
in literature, and his sections on the poets are often superior
to what we find in certain tezkeres. The poets are here included
in an alphabetical rather than a chronological order.

Special mention should be given to the tables at the end of
each tabaka, and in particular to that in which the occupants of
each of the highest judicial posts are detailed, enabling us,
for instance, to determine who was kâî of Tokat or Sâkîz at
any given time of this reign.

Manuscripts of the VP are not rare; in the Istanbul librari-
es alone, there are eight copies of vol i., eight copies of
vol ii and five copies of vol iii, bound either together or
individually. For the present work vol. i was used in the Beşir Ağa ms. no.479 (Süleymaniye Library), and vols ii and iii in the Veliyüddin Ef. ms. no.2362, the only criterion for selection being completeness and legibility. In a work of this nature, abounding in dates, names and other matters of detail, it is inevitable that there would be countless errors made by either the author or the copyist, and the task of establishing a corrected text would not have been worth the time and effort involved. For, in fact, once the work has been provided with an index it will be self-correcting; and, without an index, even the most carefully established text would abound in factual error.

34. cf. İstanbul Kütüphaneleri Tarih-Coğrafya Yazmaları Katalogları vol i, pp.743-47. For the İstanbul University mss. not in this catalogue, cf. Gönül, p.166. Another copy containing vol iii in Vienna is described by C.Flügel, Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Hand schriften der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hofbibliothek zu Wien, Vienna (1865-1867), ii, 396; and one is also said to be in the former Khedival collection in Cairo (cf. Gönül, op.cit)

35. cf. T-CY Katalogları, i, pp.743-44, where these manuscripts are described.
B- The ʻilmîye in the mid-17th Century.

Judging by the information provided in VP and ʻUZ, this does not seem to have been a universal system of primary education in the Empire in the mid-17th century. If a child was from the cülemâ class, his early instruction usually was received at home from his parent, but this probably did not go beyond learning to read and write. The stereotyped language which both sources use to describe this period of an individual education can be taken to indicate a lack of information or interest in this stage of his life; and very exceptionally is mention made of the teachers under whom he then studied. Virtually no information

36. Those schools known as dârû't-taʻlîm and mekteb-i sibyan were an integral part of every important mosque, but the instruction here was mainly concerned with reading the Kur'ân in Arabic and learning the ways of performing the various prayers and other rites. (cf. Ergin, pp. 68-71). For their numbers in Istanbul in the 17th century, cf. Evliyâ Çelebi, i, 318-19; but see, also, Ergin's remarks on this, p. 75.

37. E.g. Abdurrahîm-zade Mehmed Emîn Ef., the son of the Şeyhülislâm Abdurrahîm Ef. (19 Jil): ...vâlid-i mîcidlerinden iktîbâs-1 envâr-1 fâzîl-u-ʻîrfân kilub... Statements such as this are common throughout both works.

38. Typical examples of the language used in description of this period of education are: baʻde taḥsîlî'l-istiʻdad..., mukaddemât-ı ʻulûmdan hissedâr oldukdan sonra ..., and variations too numerous to mention.
is supplied about the preparatory studies which would qualify a student for entry to a medrese, and even the classification of the low-ranking medreses (medāris-i reşmīye, with a stipend of from 20-40 ak. a day) which Uzunçarşılı takes from ʿAlı (I.T, pp. 11-22) finds no reflection in either work. Although we again lack specific statements, the impression is given that entry into such schools were by the personal recommendation of the young student's teacher to a friend or acquaintance who was in charge of a medrese; and, of course, if the student was from a family of the ġulemā such recommendation was readily acquired. Thus, even in its earliest phases the system of education was controlled in such a way as to make it the special and exclusive preserve of a self-perpetuating class of society.

In the medrese to which he gained admission the student would begin the study of the elementary works of Islamic learning, such as the Hāgiye by Cürcānī to the Tecrid of Nasīreddin-i Tūsī, on theology, proceeding on to another commentary by Cürcānī on the Miftāḥu’l-ʿUlūm by Sekkākī, on rhetoric 40.

39. In the VP, there are only a few instances in which the subjects early teachers are mentioned, and these would usually seem to be scholars of same reputation. E.g. Şāmī ʿUsuf Ef. (18/60) was the pupil of Şeyh Hasan Būdīnī, who was the ders-i ġāmm in the mosque of Damascus. When the subject was from one of the provinces, the formula used is: esātīze-i kirāmdan istifāza-i envā ġārif-ū- ġulūm (eyleyüb) ..., etc.
The medreses were actually classified by the level of instruction given therein, and the lowest actually known by the names of the texts used in teaching, i.e., a ḥāğiya-i Tercīd or a Miftāh.

From here he would proceed to medreses of higher levels, presuming that such existed in the city where he lived. Otherwise, he would come to Istanbul to study in one or more of the numerous institutions existing there, and our texts have reduced this move to a conventional statement, such as: "tahsil-i cilm-ü-ma‘ārifê himmet ve Dārūl-Mülk-i İstanbul'a hicret eyledi, (18/38); diyar(inun) Culeməsindan tahsil-i Cilm-ü-Cīrân eyledükden sonra, Dārūl-Mülk-i İstanbul'a cazīmet ve Culemə-yi kirāman birinden ihrāz-i şeref-i mülāzemet eyledi, (18/51). It was, of course, almost only in Istanbul that a scholar would be able to form an association with those individuals who could grant mülāzemet, and when our texts speak of a person's moving to the Capital to complete his education, it is this ultimate aim that is usually meant; e.g. Beyânî Ahmed Ef. (19/232), the son of a kâzî, after studying in Bursa, Dārūl-Mülk-i İstanbul'a duhûl ve Culemənun birinden mülāzemeti vusul bulmuş idi...

It should be pointed out that neither the VP nor CÜZ show any particular interest in the details of the education of the individuals they deal with, presumably taking it for granted that such information would be known to their readers. This, in turn, implies that the curriculum through which a student passed was uniform throughout the medrese system at this time and all its graduates could be assumed to have had the same instruction.
but the implication does not always hold; for example, Hafiz Mehmed Ef. (19/357) seems only to have qualified in Qur'anic sciences before beginning his teaching career; Şâmi Hüseyn Ef. (19/152) had been a preacher in the mosques until the accession of Sultan Ibrahîm, when he was appointed imâm-ı Sultanl and given the medrese of Sultan Ahmed (with the pâye of kâzi'asker of Anatolia!); Zamîrî Ahmed Ef. (18/68) had studied under private tutors and had never received a formal education before receiving his mülâzemet and entering a teaching career.

Whereas our texts, and indeed all the biographical works on the Câlemâ, are, in default of others, to be regarded as primary sources for the history of Ottoman education, their authors regarded these individuals of whom they wrote primarily as representatives of a special class in the society whose careers were of interest only because of their belonging to this class. It is, indeed, exceptional that an individual from another level of society, whatever his scholarly attainments, finds mention; Kâtib Çelebi (1/148) and the commentator of the Mesnevî, Re'sü'l-Kütâb Câdullah Ef. (1/175) may be mentioned as examples of such exceptions in our texts, just as the Nişancî Ferîdûn Ahmed Bey figures thus in Câtû'I, p. 336. 41

After a student had completed his studies at the Sahn or

41. Cebî Müstafâ Ef. (19/512) the author of a famous commentary on the Multakâ, also, seems to have been outside the Culemâ class. He was brought up in the Palace, and left there as
the Süleymanîye with the status of danîşmand, he was eligible to apply for entry into the teaching career. This required that his name be entered into the register of the Cûlemâ, but in order to achieve this he had first to associate himself with some individual of high rank in this class who, when from time to time on being promoted to an important office, would he entitled to grant this privilege to certain of his retainers. This formal inscription of a danîşmand's name into the register was known as mûlîzemat. 42

The theory underlying this practice was designed to give the graduate from the medrese a period of practical work under the supervision of a senior scholar before allowing him to enter upon the duties of the teaching or judicial career 43. Most danîşmand would already have had some teaching experience during their last years in the medrese, where they would act as assistants (mu'âid) to their masters; and, occasionally, when the

42. IT, pp. 45-53. Here the system of mûlîzemat is described, and the number of such privileges that were accorded to the various grades of the upper echelons of the Cûlemâ on promotion detailed. The corruption that soon entered into the practices of awarding mûlîzemets is, also, mentioned in some detail.

43. Very few examples of concern for the academic qualities of a
latter received a promotion that allowed him to grant mülāzemet, they would confer it upon these muʿīds. This could be regarded as the operation of the system as originally conceived, but in most cases it is not at all clear on what basis the mülāzemet was granted. That corruption entered into the system is not to be doubted; earlier in the century Bakkāl-zāde Hilmi Ef. (d.1014) could write:

44. For example, Tātār ʿAbdullāh Ef. (19/354) received his mülāzemet when the teacher whom he had served as muʿīd in the Şehzāde, Şeyh-zāde Mehmed Ef., was promoted to the Sūleymānīye; the Şeyhulislām Muʿīd Ahmed Ef., (18/61), received his mülāzemet from Kınalı-zāde Pehmî Mehmed Ef. on the occasion of his being appointed to the Sahn. cf., also, Hammānci-zāde Mehmed Ef. (19/304); ʿAlāʾİyeli ʿAlî Ef. (19/273); etc. It does not mention that such promotions within the academic structure had the privilege of conferring mülāzemet attached to them.

45. Riyāzī, Riyāzuʾs-Ṣuʿārā, Nuruosmaniye, 3724, f.53 a.
In the kasıde of a certain dervish named Üveys, written in the period of Murad IV, we find, after accusations leveled against the civil officials, the lines:

Bulardan dahi azledmür, efendim, kâzî-câskerler
Cihenî Şimdi ruşvetle harraba virdiler, va'-llüh
Fakîr Câlimlerüñ Cömrü geçer Cuzletde zilletle
Olursañ mürteşi câñil bulursîñ hem üzzet hem câñ.

It may be that many of the individuals who came from the commercial classes achieved thus mülázemets through bribery, and the example of disregard for the standards of the profession was set by the throne itself, when the Sultans would distribute these promotions as favours.

46. Gibb, History of Ottoman Poetry, iii, 217; vi, 181. His translation does not quite catch the sense of the original.
47. For example, Tulumci Hüsameddin Ef. (18/38), and ʿAlî el-ʿĀmidî (19/98) Miḥā Mehmed Ef. (19/501), a protege of the Sultan, received his first teaching appointment without having been granted mülázemet, Mehmed IV ordering the Şeyhülislâm Husân-zâde ʿAbdurrahmân Ef. to give him a medrese. The earlier case of the poet Bâki's promotion by Sultan Süleyman is, of course, famous; cf. ʿAtâʾî, p. 435.
The fact that both VP and UZ make a particular point of mentioning the name, whenever known, of the person from whom a young scholar received his mülazemet indicates the importance with which this phase in his career was regarded, and the relationship thus established was as that between patron and protégé which was to persist throughout the lives of both. Thus, it was greatly in the interest of a dânişmend to receive his mülazemet from the person of the greatest influence to whom he could win access, and this explains why the names of dignitaries such as Şeyhülislâm Yahyâ Ef. and Ebû Sa'îd Ef. appear so frequently in this connection in our texts. In İT, this period between graduating from a medrese and receiving the mülazemet is described as the nevbet, although this term is never met with in our texts, where the usual formula is: (fülanın) aşitânesine intisâb ile cennâlinden ihrâz-ı şeref-î mülazemet eyleyub... , or simply: (fülanın) hizmetlerine vâsil ve ondan şeref-î mülazemeti nâ'il olub ... or variations of such expressions.

The length of this period of waiting would depend, of course, on the number of graduates, and, one suspects, on the amount of the bribes being offered to the servants in the secretariat of the influential man. To the extent that the information given in our texts allows for such deduction, it would appear that the average age of a dânişmend on receiving his mülazemet was in the late twenties, but this cannot be demonstrated rigorously, for it is very seldom that the date of birth of an individual is given, nor is the date on which this rank was received usually recorded.
Both VP and ÜZ regard as deserving of precise record that period in the life of an individual subsequent to his entering the "career" grades of the academic or judicial profession, i.e., appointment to a 50 ak. (ibtidā-yī hārīc) medrese, or to a kāseh of the third rank. This accounts for the selectivity of both authors; and, as promotion to these grades was normally only to be achieved through contacts which could be made in the Capital,48 gives to both a local character, focused on the administrative centre of the Empire.

For this same reason we are given very little information about the first teaching appointments to medreses below the 50 ak. class. These were called the medāris-i resmīye, and this phase of a teacher's career is almost invariably summarized by such expressions as: devr-i medāris(-i mutāde) ederek 40 ak. medrese-den maṣūl ve muntazır-i neyl-i me'mūl iken ...; rāh-i tedrīse Cazīmet ile 40 ak. medreseye vāsīl ve ondan dahi munfasıl oldudan sonra ..., etc. Like many other of the cliché expressions found in VP and ÜZ, these probably originated in Āta'ī's work. After receiving an appointment to a hārīc (or 50 ak.) medrese, the

48. For example, ʿilāhī-zāde Ef. (19/399), while müderrīs at the Yıldırım Han in Bursa, taraf-ı Devlet-ı Ālīyeve rūy-māl sebep-i vūsūl-ī āmāl olmak mülāḥaṣa-īyle dārū'n-nāṣr ve-l-meysen mahmīye-ī Edirneye (where the court was at the time) Cazīmet, ve Şeyhulislām Minkārī-zāde Ef. āsītanīesine duḥūle ruhsat bulub ....
Aalim was on the first rung of the ladder which could lead to the highest offices in the academic or judicial career.

In the mid-17th century, the medreses above the 40 ak. rank were classified in order of precedence as follows:

1. ibtidā-yi hāric (or hāric elli)
2. hareket-i hāric
3. ibtidā-yi dāhil
4. hareket-i dāhil
5. mü‘alle-i Sahn
6. Sahn (8 medreses)

The stipend in each of these medreses were 50 ak., and promotion with in them meant an elevation in status rather than an increase in salary. One might expect that with so much detail about these appointments provided in the texts it would be possible to identify the grades of each of the medreses through which an aalim passed in his career, but for a variety of reasons this has proven almost impossible. The number of müderris awaiting promotion always was in excess of the medreses available, and it was not uncommon for an individual to be promoted to a higher rank within the same institution, the term for such a promotion being miali (or hareket-i mialiye). Whether or not this altered the status of the institution, or changed curriculum is never indicated.

49. Halil İnalık, The Ottoman Empire, p.168, mistakenly includes the medaris-i resmiye (i.e. those of the 20-40 akçe class) among the hāric medreses.
and this, also, is evidence that our texts are more concerned with the social class of the culemā rather than the function it was supposed to serve.⁵₀

According to the system, each individual would have to pass through five grades of higher medrese before reaching the Sahn, but it is not uncommon for this rank to be reached in fewer stages and, because an ʿālim might move from one medrese to another on the same level, as many as seven or eight appointments may have been held before attaining this position. Presumably the appointment held immediately before the Sahn must have had the rank of müsīle and in our texts 56 medresas are mentioned as being the previous appointment of the 288 individuals who attained this grade.⁵¹ However, of these medresas only fourteen⁵² figure more than ten times in this position, and would appear to be regularly regarded as müsīle; but, again we have the complication that they may equally well appear in what would apparently be lower grades than this— or as higher! This can be seen as illustrating the wholly perfunctory character of these appointments, in which the

⁵⁰. Cf., for example, Kurd Mehmed Ef. (19/57) who passed through all the stages preliminary to the Sahn in the same medrese, the Veliyeddin-zade Ahmed Paşa in Bursa.

⁵¹. This will exclude those appointments which are described as tahille, in which the individual skipped one or more of the intervening grades in reaching the Sahn. (IT, p. 72; the term tafra is never met with in our texts). It should be noted
status of the individual determined that of the medrese, rather than otherwise; and what implications this had for the quality of education given under such a system are all too obvious.

According to the system, after reaching the Şahn, the Şâlim would now proceed on to the medreses of the 60 ak. class (altmişli), and culminate eventually in one of the four medreses of the Süleymaniye. The grades were:

1. İbtidâ-yi altmişli
2. Hareket-i altmişli
3. Musille-i Süleymaniye
3a. Hâmis-i Süleymaniye
4. Süleymaniye
5. Dârü'l-Hadîs of the Süleymaniye

With fewer intervening grades involved, it would be expected that this term is used only in connection with appointments affecting the Şahn, and can sometimes indicate, also, the by-passing of this grade into an altmişli medrese. Cf. for example, Çavuş-zade Muştafa Ef. (19/448).

52. These are, with the number of instances in which they appear as müsille: Gazanfer Ağa (26); Muştafa Ağa (22); Murâd Paşa-yı cedîd (19); Hâdîce Sultan (19); Mihrmah in Üsküdar (15); Mihrmah Sultan in Edirne Kapu (13); Murâd Paşa-yı ğâtit (13); Siyavuş Paşa Sultanı (12); Sinân Paşa (13); Koca Muştafa Paşa (12); Zâl Paşa (11); Şâh Sultan (10); Hayreddîn Paşa (10); Nişancı Paşa-yı cedîd (10).

53. Although IT (p.58) speaks of the hâmis of the Suleymaniye as
the confusion here would be less than in the 50 ak. grades, but such is not wholly the case. Lateral movement within the same grade is common, for clearly certain medreses (e.g. royal foundations) enjoyed greater prestige than others. Of the 118 individuals who reached the Süleymānīye 19 medreses are mentioned as their previous appointments, and presumably of the rank of ṭūble. However, very few individuals actually passed through the three previous grades and our texts rarely mention ṭūbarī promotions at this level. As will be seen below, it was usually after attaining the altmīalla grade that an ālim would choose to enter the judicial branch, so the pressure for places at the Süleymānīye not appearing until the 18th century, our texts mention it several times; e.g. Kara Cafer Ef. (19/423); Tösyalı Mehmed Ef. (19/373); Halil Ef. (19/436), etc. all of these appointments were ṭūbarī, and most were given to the holders of the Vâlide Sultan in Üsküdar. It may be that such a medrese still did not exist, and that the title was purely figurative to allow the holder to hold a slightly higher rank than that of ṭūble.

54. The medreses which most figure in the position of ṭūble-i Süleymānīye are: Sultan Selim-i koń (28); Şehzade (26); Ebû Eyyüb Anṣārî (21); Hākanīye in Vefa (17); Vâlide Sultan in Üsküdar (12).
was not so great; indeed, the nature of the teaching which the
four medreses of this foundation were expected to provide would
disqualify most of the culemā of the period55.

Although the Suleymāniye was—excluding its dārū’l-hadīṣ—the highest rank in the teaching career—from which one normally
passed into the judicial branch—there are instances in which the
c-ulim passed from here to another medrese. The motive for this is
never indicated in our texts, but the assumption is that the vakf
endowment for such institutions provided for an excess over
normal in the daily stipend.

While in the teaching phase of his career, there were certain
other employments (with income) which the c-ulim might combine
with his official duties. The most important of these was that
of imām to the Sultan or to a Şehzāde, to the Sadr-ā‘zam or to
some other individual of high rank (Şeyhülislām, Nakib-‘l-Esrāf,
etc.), and in this post he would normally act, also, as tutor
to the children of the family56. However, we usually find
these private imāms performing this service before receiving

55. Here the physical sciences and medicine were taught, with
the Dārū’l-Hadīṣ in the position of an institute of higher
thetheological studies. (IT, p. 33 sqq.).

56. In our texts three individuals held the post of İmām-ı Sultanī,
and 24 are mentioned as serving some high state official in
this capacity. It may be inferred that when an individual is
mentioned in the text only as the tutor to some important
personage, he was, also, his private imām; e.g. Süleyman Ef.
(18/67); Şari Oğmān Ef. (19/449), etc.
mülazemet, and in many instances they are men from the provinces who, having studied in their own lands, came to the Capital where their first employment was in this capacity. The chief qualities looked for in such an individual were piety and a good knowledge of Arabic, which probably explains why so many of them are men who had passed through a derviş training in one or another of the provinces of the Empire, especially where Arabic was the spoken language. Their teaching would be of a religious nature, especially of the Kur'ân, and one such individual is even called hâfîz rather than imâm: Seyrek-zâde Hâfizî Muştafa Ef.(19/582). It was through this connection with a man of influence that most of them received their mülazemet and entered upon a teaching career. What such appointments to teaching posts of men who had not themselves passed through a medrese implied for the standard and uniformity of education is apparent.

57. Cf., for example, Abdurrahîm Ef.(19/334), who having been imâm to the former Şadr-âzâm Civan Kapucî Başî Mehmed Paşa, vezîr-i mezburûn himmeti-yle culemâ-yi kiramûn birinden mülazim olub ... .

58. Cf., Parsa Mehmed Ef. (19/470) of Gelibolî, who although a dervish by training, was transferred to a teaching career by Şeyhülislâm Minkârî-zâde.
Even when the texts do not mention the matter specifically, there are indications that many of the teachers in the medrese, also, held employment as tutors to private families. In the notice on Seyyid Mesud Ef. (19/486), mention is made of a certain Kürd Mehmed Ef. who was tutor to the servants of his family while, also, müderris at the Şahn 59, and there are various references to associations between the ulema and influential men in the city which were probably based on such an employment.

The tutor to a Prince of the royal family was obviously in an important position, and this would become even more influential if his pupil became Sultan, as in the case of Seyhüislam Feyzullah Ef. and Mustafâ II 60. While acting as tutor he normally held some medrese or other, presumably as an additional source of regular income. Other tutors were employed in the palace service to teach the pages, and these, too, combine this duty with that of a medrese 61.

59. The fact that this Kürd Mehmed Ef., who died in Cem.1091, is not given a notice in either VF or ÜZ, even though he was at the Şahn, must raise a question as to how complete these texts are.

60. He was proceeded as tutor to Prince Mustafâ by Seyyid Mehmed Ef. (19/307).

61. The mansion of İbrâhîm Paşa in At Meydanı seemed to have been used as a school for the palace servants, cf. Kaba Sakal Ahmed Ef. (19/446); the circumstances under which Celb İbrâhîm Ef. (19/443) held the post of palace tutor are not clear.
One of the highest and most influential employments which an 'alim could achieve while still in the lower grades of the teaching career was that of fetvā-emīnī, where not only would he have access to men of importance in the profession but, also, opportunity to improve his practical knowledge of fīkh. This office, too, was frequently combined with that of a medrese, but we find certain instances of men of the kāzī class, also, holding it. Ankaravī Mehmed Emīn Ef. (19/590), was allowed to perform its duties through a nā'ib while he himself was k. of Bursa. It is frequently found that individuals who held this post are, also, the authors of collections of mesa'il, which are more or less case-books of Islamic law, and described authorities on sakk. Our texts rarely mention the other officials.

62. In the summary of the character and reputation which Şeyhī gives at the end of each notice, men who had held this office are usually described as experts in fīkh and sakk; e.g. Asamm Tezkereci Mehmed Ef. (19/103); Kara İbrahim Ef. (19/136); Muṣṭafā Ef. (19/145); Çavuş-zāde Muṣṭafā Ef. (19/441), and very frequently they are credited with compilations of mesa'il, i.e., examples of legal problems and points of law. Şari 'Abdullah Ef. (19/172); Edirneli Ahmed Ef. (19/400), etc.

63. Cf. Şari 'Abdullah Ef. (19/172); Muṣṭafā Ef. (19/318); Muvezzî Ahmed Ef. (19/435).

64. Cf., also, 'Abdülfettah Ef. (19/180) who was appointed to this office by Şeyhülislâm Ebū Sa'id Ef. in 1061, while he was maʻzūl from the kāzī of Selânik.
in the department of the fetvā emāneti, but it must be assumed that most of these would have the status of culema, or, at least, dānimend.

Another post of great importance which was opened to a medrese teacher was that if tezkerci to either the Şeyhülislām or to one of the kazaskers. The function of such an individual was more or less that of private secretary, and he is said to had been in charge of the other individuals employed by his master. The advantages which would accrue to a person holding such an office are apparent; not only did he himself have access to the highest men in the profession, but his closeness to the source from which all advancement and promotion came gave him an influence over all the other culema who would be anxious to cultivate his good-will. In our texts 13 individuals are mentioned as having held this office, and although few of them seem

65. Mehmed Ef. (19/103) is mentioned as having been mukabeleci; Mustafā Ef. (19/402) who was himself later to become Şeyhülislām, was müsevvid to Şeyhülislām Yahyā Ef.; Ahmed Ef. (19/435) was known by the lakab, müvezzî.

66. Thus, Ahmed Ef. (19/195), seems to have become fetvā emīni to the Şeyhülislām Bâlî-zâde Mustafā Ef. immediately after receiving his mülazemet. It is not clear at what period of his career Asâmî Mehmed Ef. (19/103) served as mukābele, nor when Ibrâhîm Ef. (19/300) was müsevvid.

67. İT, p.154, 198.
to have reached the highest levels of the profession, this is no doubt due to other factors. The fortunes of such a person would be tied to that of the master he served, and as the period of tenure of office in the meşihat or the sadaret was usually not very long, the time when the tezkereci would enjoy his greatest power was equally limited. The rivalry and competition for high office among the upper echelons of the Cülemin was such that once one of them had been replaced in office, his successor was little disposed to show favour to his predecessor’s retinue.

Under the supervision of the tezkerecî were certain other minor officials: the mektübecî (correspondence clerk), of which there are two individuals mentioned in our texts as having held this employment; the şeri‘atcî (legal researcher) of which we have two examples; the kethuda (steward) is mentioned only once. The office of kassâm (of Üçak) turns up once. We


70. CAbdurrahim Ef. (ly/228) and Mustafâ Ef. (ly/383). In both these cases, the individual is mentioned as filling both the office of tezkerecî and şeri‘atcî.

71. Kaba Şakal Mehem Ef. (ly/433) seems to had served the ka. minkârî-zâde as kethuda before receiving his mülazemet.

In the notice of CÖmer Ef. (ly/507) there is incidental
have no information about the salary paid to any of these employees; or, indeed, if their post were salaried at all. The practice seems to have been that a fee was paid directly by the applicant for the work which each such individual performed.

Another employment open to the müderris was that of müfettiş of the pious endowments, particularly of the evkâf-ı Haremeyn, of which there are nine instances in our texts. There would appear to have been no particular qualification or experience required for this post; some of the individuals to whom it was given being of the 50 ak. grade, while others had passed the Sahı and belonged to the higher levels of the profession. In İT, p. 208, it is stated that the Haremeyn müfettiş was, also, empowered to supervise the legacies of the women of the Palace and to make judgment about their distribution, but of this our texts say nothing. It would, indeed, be surprising if such an authority would have been conferred on a man of junior rank.

There is one instance of a müderris being appointed każi to the Imperial Army, but this seems to have been exceptional.

72. Hasan Ef. (19/517) held this office under the każi. Cîsmetî Ef.

73. Şehzade Ef. (19/253) was given this post, with the rank of the Sahı, by his patron Tabani Yassi Mehmed Paşa in 1043.
for in the other cases where this employment is mentioned the incumbent is already of the kāl class 74.

When a müderris was appointed to a medrese in the provinces he was sometimes authorized to act as müfti for the region -- me' zün bi'-l-iftā 75. Otherwise, the appointment as müfti to some city was usually given to a man of the lower ranks of the judicial class, and within the period covered by our texts we find mention of such appointments becoming ever fewer.

At any period in his career the müderris could pass into the judicial branch of the profession, the grade of the appointment given him being determined by the status he held as a teacher. The table of correspondences given by Halil inalcık 76 represents the system as ideally conceived, but corruption, nepotism and simony were so widespread that virtually any post was open to one

74. E.g. Ahmed Ramaşān Ef. (19/267) and 3 Abdūllestīf Ef. (19/220); the latter, while ma'zūl from a 40 ak. medrese in 1028, had been appointed kāl to the Pilgrim Caravan of Syria, and muhāsebe for the evkāf of Cairo.

75. E.g. Seyyid Behmed Ef. (17/74) for Mağnisa; 3 Abdūrrahmān el-Kūrdī (19/101) for Diyarbekr; İbrāhīm Ef. (19/104) for Ağrās; Süleymān Ef. (19/271) for Belgrade.

76. Cf. İnalçık, op.cit.
with the proper connections and enough money. Yet we do find that when a person mazul from a 40 ak. medrese enters the ranks of the kuzat, his early appointments are not specified, being passed over by a formula phrase such as: ba\-z-1 kasaba-1 ce\-lilede mutasaddi-\-yi icra-\-yi ahkâm olmiş idi(19/70; Rūmili kalem-revinde bir ka\-f manşaba ka\-zi\-i oldukdan sonra ...(19/123). All such ka\-z\-\-s were below the career grades of the profession, and in order to advance to a higher status there ka\-z\-\-s had to receive appointment to a city in the third of the three classes of mevlevi yet. A list of these cities, all of which were of equal standing, is given.

77. Cf. the amusing story of G\-Abdurrahmân(19/263), known as the "Thief of Selenik", because he purchased this ka\-zi\- with purses of money half-filled with nails. The deduction to be drawn from this account is that if his payment had been correct, the incident would not have been mentioned at all! Cf., also, İplıkçı Şiyâm Ef. (19/2), who, through the influence a woman of the Palace, Çâme-gûy Hatun, became k. of Filibe while mazul from a 40 ak. medrese. Other examples are common; and even when the circumstances are not mentioned, it can be assumed that every such appointment to a disproportionate grade was influenced by considerations outside the profession.

78. It is exceptional that the names of the early ka\-z\-\-s held by a person who entered the judicial career from a low grade of the teaching branch are mentioned; cf. Mustafâ Ef. (19/54).
in IT (p.98-99), but like much of the information given in this work, it bears no strict relation to what was actually practiced. Again, there is not a single mention in our texts of the monetary value of any of the kazas, nor of their classification into the various grades.

At the end of each tabaka, Şeyhī gives a list in descending order of the occupants of all the highest judicial offices, without grouping into classes. These are as follow, in tabaka 19 (and 20):

| 1. Şeyhülislām | 13. Ḥaleb | 25. Şofya |
| 3. ka. of Anatoli | 15. Yeğişehir(fenar) | 27. Bosna |
| 4. İstanbul | 16. Ǧalaṭa | 28. Sākīz 79 |
| 5. Nakībūl-Eṣraf | 17. Ǧizzīr | 29. Erzurum |
| 10. Şām | 22. Diyarbekr | 34. Kūtahya |
| 11. Madīne | 23. Ḫayṣerī | 35. Tokat |
| | | 37. Ankara. |

79. In tabaka 17, Sākīz preceedes Bosna.
80. In tabaka 17 and 18, the sequence is: 32, Maraqṣ; 33,Kūtahya; 34, Tire. Lefkoṣe and Tokat are omitted; 17 also omits Ankara.
The same external factors which vitiated the operation of the medrese system also prevailed here, and nepotism, simony and favouritism were as influential as any personal quality of the individual in securing such appointments. Every such appointment had, of course, to be ratified by an official document from the court, and it sometimes happened that the appointment itself was initiated from here rather than from the meşihat or sadaret. There is a very interesting example of this in the notice on Seyyid Muştafa Ef. (19/551) who at the age of royal kadin, and, apparently, without the knowledge or approval of the Şeyhülislam. Though such cases may be thought of as exceptional—and, indeed, such explicit mention is rarely found in our texts— all those individuals who are mentioned as having a particular connection with some influential person can be assumed to have used this connection to advance their own careers. There was a fixed correspondence between the rank of a müderris and the status of the kaža to which he would be entitled should he wish to enter the judicial career. It is, without question, one of the reasons why so many müderris chose to continue in teaching until attaining the status of Şahn, from where they would have claim to a kaža of higher revenue. Moreover, after a müderris had achieved a hâric (50 ak.) medrese he was assured of almost continues employment and, consequently, a steady income while progressing upward in his profession. This did not apply to kažâls, however, for these appointments were
usually of limited duration, and after being dismissed from office—if they were not of the rank to merit an arpalık—they would be without a substantial income until their next appointment.

The correspondences between grades of the teaching profession and kazas are tabulated in İnalcık’s Ottoman Empire p.170, the information here being driven principally from İT. However, comparison of this table with the evidence afforded by our texts for the grades of the Şahin and above show the following.

Only seventeen individuals entered the judicial career from the Şahin in the period covered by our texts and the highest appointment received was that of Galaşa (19/1, Cinci Hüseyn Ef., an obvious case of favouritism). Usually the appointment was to a kaža which İT would regard as of the 2nd or 3rd class. The table is here misleading, seeming to indicate that an alim of Şahin status could receive one of the highest appointments and classifying these cities as appropriate to the hareket-i dâhil

81. while out of office every individual who had passed the mülazemet grade was given a proportional stipend usually an amount insufficient to allow him to maintain the level of living to which he had become accustomed.

82. Apart from Galata, the following figure twice in the appointments: Belgrad, İzmir, Konya, Diyarbekr, Bosna; figuring only once are: Tire, Mağusa, Mağusa, Gelibolu, Kütahya, Bağdad.
and the müsâle-i Sahn grades.

The fact that so few individuals choose to enter the judicial branch at this stage would indicate that there was clear advantage in remaining a müderris until passing into the almîgli Süleymanîye levels. Of the 34 individuals who received a kaza while teaching at one of the medreses which could be regarded as müsâle-i Süleymanîye, 18 went to cities of the first class, i.e. Haleb and higher, the distribution being:

2 to Mekke, 6 to Medîne, 8 to Kuds-i Şerîf and 2 to Haleb. 16 went to cities of the 2nd class, that is Belgrad and higher, the distribution here being 1 to Selanik, 1 to Yeşişehr, 2 to Filibe, 2 to Ebû Eyyûb, 2 to Üsküdar, 4 to İzmir, 3 to Bağdâd and 1 to Mâgnîsa.

When we compare these appointments with those made to men who had reached the Süleymanîye, one can not notice any particular difference in the grade of appointment made. Indeed the number of appointments to cities of the first class made from almîgli medreses is proportionally much higher than those made to occupant of the Süleymanîye itself. Thus 112 müderris at the Süleymanîye entered the kaza branch, going to 14 cities: 28 to Yeşişehr (tirhala), 27 to Haleb and 20 to Selanîk. These three cities

83. 8 appointments were made to İzmir and 6 to Kuds-i Şerîf, Mekke and Galâita, 3 to Şam, 2 to Edirne and Üsküdar, and one each to Medîne, Şofya, Filibe and Eyyûb.
should consequently be taken as the normal expectation of a müderris of this grade and be regarded as püveli, i.e. providing an access to the very highest grades of the profession. Again the table is misleading, allowing the impression that a müderris at the Süleymaniye might directly receive an appointment as kâşî of İstanbul or even higher, or else go to cities such as Mekke, Medine etc.

The pârû'î-sadî of the Süleymaniye, the highest level in the academic career, also does not show any marked difference from the above in the quality of the kâşî to which it afforded entitlement. Of the 20 appointments made from this grade, Selanik and haleb each appear seven times, with Şâm being given three times and Yenisehr, Kuds-i Şerîf and Bursa one time each.

Having entered the kâşî career at one another of the higher grades, the cûlim could now normally expect to progress upwards to the higher levels of the profession. However, there was no strict sequence of appointments followed until Mekke had been reached, after which the kâşî would almost invariably expect his next appointment to be İstanbul, and after that the kâşî askerli of Anatóli and then Rûmîli. Before reaching Mekke, the actual movement of a kâşî need not correspond to the grades of the various cities as shown in the list given by Şeyhi, but it is observable that when a man was moved to a city lower in rank than the one he previously held he was normally given, at the same time, the püve of a city which he might, in principal, have expected to receive at this stage. The person to whom
the *każā* of *Kuds-i Şerif*, Mecca or Medina were given was expected to fill the post in person\(^{84}\), but as such appointments would invariably be given only to those senior in rank and age, not a few instances are recorded of such a *każī* dying enroute to his post or while returning from there\(^{85}\).

The normal tenure of any of the higher offices, excluding those of Şeyhülislâm and Nakibül-Eşraf, rarely exceeded one year; and after demitting office the *każī* would have to wait for some time until his next appointment. So great was the competition for the highest offices that not all the aspirants could hope to achieve them, and it is not uncommon to find a man who had been *każī* of Istanbul being given this office once or twice again before he proceeded on the *każas**kerlik** of Anatolia. The great influence wielded by the *ulema* of these grades demanded that appointments should have some political sanction, but, unfortunately, our texts do not give us any clear information as to how this was exercised.

Every grade of the learned profession after receiving *mülażemet* was pensionable, i.e., when out of office the individual

---

84. Cf. İlahi-zade Mehmed Ef. (19/416), who was punished for attempting to exercise his *każas**hip** of Medina through a *nâ'îb*.
85. Cf., Seyyid ʿAbdülbâkî Ef. (19/464); İbrâhîm Ef. (19/508); Mustafâ Ef. (19/509), etc.
would received a daily stipend proportionate to his rank. When a kazi at one of the higher levels lost office this stipend was usually supplemented by the revenues from one or more of the smaller kazas, and our texts are always specific in identification of these arpaliks. Sometimes, too, the income of such a person could be augmented by monies from one of the highly endowed vakfs, such as the Süleymanîye.

There is no specific information given as to how these kazas, which were given as arpaliks were administered, but it is almost certain that the holder was represented in them by a nā'ib. He was not obliged to go there in person, as can be judged from the

86. A few instances occur of an ālim being demoted in grade as a punishment for his conduct. The son of the Nakibü'l-Eşraf Esad-zade Seyyid Mesud Çel. (19/486) was actually deprived of his status as ālim, which implied that his mülazemet was voided. Ebu'l-beka Eyyüb Ef. (19/533) was demoted in rank down to the level of mülazemet for some misdeed he had committed while kazi of Pilibe. Muṭahher Ef. (19/568) was deprived of his status of ālim and for ten years he remained mağzul.

87. In 1063 Şeyh Mehmed Ef. (19/385), who had reached the grade of kazi asker of Rûmîli, was given 120 ak. daily from the vakf of the Süleymanîye in addition to his arpaliks Peravadi and Yeşî Bazar. In 1056 Mehmed Şâlih Ef. (19/83), also received a pension from the same vakf, being given it in succession to the Re'isü'l-Şibbû Müsû Ef.
fact that in certain instances individuals are mentioned as being exiled from Istanbul and commanded to live in their arpaliks. There are a few instances of highly endowed medreses (viz, the Darü'l-hadis of the SULEYMANİYE) being conferred on some eminent scholar as a sinecure, and in such cases the term applied to the post is buk’alik.

The ulama as a social class

The one dominant fact observable from our texts is the social cohesion of the ulama throughout the entire period covered. Of the 735 individuals treated therein, the profession or occupation of the father is mentioned in 279 of cases, and of these no less than 219 belong to the ulama. Of these 19 had a grandfather who was also of the ulama class. After three or more generations the learned career became virtually a family profession, and on the assumption that all male children of the family would enter this career, it is not uncommon to find

83. Memek-zade (19/106) was exiled to his arpalik of Peravadi in 1064; Şihab Ahmed Ef. (19/155) was actually given the arpalik of Hankah in Egypt so that he could be exiled to Cairo. An unusual case is that of Şamil Nu’mân Ef. (19/158) who, on being exiled to the island of Sakiz, orders were sent to the civil authorities there, instructing that they should provide for his maintenance, the same individual was later exiled to his arpalik at Atranos.
mülâzemet being granted to very young children of such descent. The solidarity of the class was assured by inter-marriage among themselves, and this is most notably attested by the number of individuals who are identified as being the dâmâd of one or another famous ğalîm.

The exclusiveness of the class may be estimated by the number of individuals who were allowed to enter it from other walks of life. Only 15 cases are recorded of mülâzemet being granted to men whose fathers were sâyhs of the târîkât, the class most closely associated with the ûlemâ in respect of their concern with religion. The fact that 17 men came from the commercial

89. E.g. Şâ crâni-zâde Ef. (19/349) was given the Darûl-hadîs of the Sûleymânîye in this way in 1066; Hanî-zâde Ef. (19/554) was given it under the same condition in 1091.
90. There are two instances in which the father is described as a vâcîz, and presumably these also belonged to one or another târîkât. It is very difficult to assign a definite social status to the members of the dervîş orders; their activities brought them into contact with all the major social groups, but the general tendency was to find their closest association with the ûlemâ. There are six instances of an ğalîm marrying the daughter of a dervîş sâyîh.
classes is probably attributable to the venality of the age, and one feels little hesitation in regarding such admissions to the Culemā class as having been achieved by bribery.

Very few members of the sipahi class entered the profession in this period, and it may be taken as presumptive evidence of the social stratification of the empire at this time that there was such little interchange between these two classes. The biography of Katib Çelebi is a striking example of this; although his learning was sufficient to earn him inclusion in the texts, he still does not qualify for membership within the Culemā. It was easier for a person whose background was other than that of the Culemā to gain entry to this class by the route of the tarıkat as in the case of Parsa Mehmed Ef. (19/470) who, from being sevha of a tekke in Geliboli, was appointed to a medrese during the period when Minkari-zade was seyhülislam. Although the texts do not specifically mentioned it, it can be presumed that mülazemet was granted at the same time.

The whole structure of the Culemā was controlled by the individuals who had most interest in preserving the exclusiveness of the class, i.e. the Şeyhülislam, the Kaşıkaskers and the holders of the pāye grades. It was in their power to make those appointments which would effect, for better or worse, the career of the Câlim and by these means they could create for themselves a personal following which would support them in the rivalries inseparable from high office. As the older Culemā families (those going back for three or more generations) would have
gained a respected position in the society and probably enjoy the confidence of the people, it was only prudent to assure support from this quarter and thereby build up a popular basis for their own authority.

In the period covered by our texts, 16 individuals held the office of the Şeyhülislâm, and of these 9 were of the Cülemâ class for at least two generations. Yahyâ Ef. (18/25) and Ebû Sa‘îd Mehmed Ef. (19/203) held this office on three occasions, while Behâ’î Mehmed Ef. (19/65) held it twice. The first two, moreover, were themselves the sons of men who had held this office. This period is so bedeviled by political upheaval that no thoroughly consistent pattern can be discerned amongst the other occupants of the office: Hâwięzâde Kesûd Ef. (19/105), for example, was made Şeyhülislâm on the insistence of the janissaries before he had held the post of the ka. of Rûmîli. One suspects, also that a rich man such as Ankaravi Mehmed Emin Ef. (19/590) would have used his wealth to advance his career and attain this highest of offices. The inference however, seems valid that the Cülemâ were careful to assure that the individual at the summit of the hierarchy was from their own background.

In the same period 20 individuals reached the office of ka. of Rûmîli as their highest appointment, and here, too, the pattern is that mentioned above, no less than 15 of these being definitely indicated as the sons of Cülmâ. All the occupants of this office were, of course, candidates for the Şeyhülislâmê and their background must be taken into consideration in describing
those of the holders of the meşihat.

In this period, only 10 individuals achieved ka. of Anaṭolı as their highest office; and the pattern is again repeated, seven being of an Üblemä background. The one exception in this group, Mehmed Ef. (19/566) is very interesting, in that his father is mentioned as being a janissary—one of the few instances of such a transference from this class to that of the Ülemä. The six nukâbâ'u'l-eşraf in the period were, of course, all of the Ülemä class, and the very nature of the office imposed an exclusiveness on its holders.

The ranks of the Ülemä below these grades, descending down to that of każı of Haleb, would show this same pattern repeated over and over, illustrating the defensive mechanism of a class that was bent on assuring its perpetuation as a force in the society. And it was as a social group that the Ülemä must be seen in this period; though its members filled the ranks of educational and judicial administration, the proper functioning of such institutions was vitiated by the excessive numbers of Ülima expecting office. Appointments were, therefore, of short duration and were seen as merely temporary stages in advancement within the career, rather than opportunities for the holder to show his merits and thereby qualify for promotion. As nepotism was already beginning to swamp the civil bureaucracy with a surplus of useless office-holders, encumbering and impeding the efficient functioning of government business, so too were the swollen ranks of the Ülemä destroying the very institutions
they had originally represented.

Within the period covered, one can notice continuous activity in the founding of new medrese, no less than 112 new hāric medrese being mentioned in our texts. These of course, would hardly suffice to absorb the number of young teachers in the lower medrese, and consequently did very little to alleviate the pressure of demand for office. In such a situation of scarcity it was inevitable that favouritism and nepotism and indeed bribery would influence appointments.

Appointments to career grades of the judicial profession were influenced by similar conditions of scarcity, and here the consequences must have been more serious for the society as a whole, for it was through the kažīs that the provinces had their most immediate contact with the Sultan's government; and their behaviours would influence the attitude of the people to the supreme authority in the state. Because of the numbers of candidates for office at the higher levels, these appointments could only be given for a short period of time, one year being usual. The man to whom such an appointment was given would have, consequently, as his first objective to collect as much money as possible during this brief term of office in order to provide for the period when he was without a post, and the means by which he obtained this money were not always such as to reflect credit on either himself, his office, or the government. The evil reputation of the kažī has lived on down to the present day, among the Turkish people, and much of the distrust of law and
the courts of law which is still to be found in Anatolia can probably be traced back to these origins. It is evident that a person holding such a transitory position would not have developed any local sentiments nor felt any particular attachment to the people of a region. In this way the central government could be sure that he was working ultimately in its interest, but this was achieved only at the expense of the loyalty and support of the people.

These conditions within the learned profession contributed also to a decline in learning at these times. Neither the intellectual qualities of an ʿalim, his breadth of learning or depth of scholarship could influence the advancement of his career, and the very struggle for promotion distracted his mind from academic pursuits. We can safely ignore the formulaic praises which both Şeyhī and ʿUṣṣālī-zāde bestow on virtually every individual they deal with; the fact is that hardly a single work of importance in the field of Islamic learning appeared in this period — the works of Kātib Çelebi on bibliography, geography etc., were, like the man himself, outside the concerns of traditional Islamic education. One wonders what were the qualities that allowed a person to be described as an authority in fikh, tefsīr or maṣūni, when no original works on the subjects are credited to him. The characteristic learned production was the şerh or more usually the hüsāle and taṣīkat, which probably represents nothing more than the lecture-notes used by an ʿalim in his early teaching; these would be little more than lexical glosses to one or another
of the prescribed texts rather than interpretative or critical studies.

Given this situation, the display of an exceptional degree of knowledge or concern with learning might have seemed a reproach on the part of an aspirant to office towards the persons on whom his advancement depended, and this may be one reason why the writing of poetry seems a more characteristic activity of the ʿulema than academic investigation. No less than 94 individuals are credited with poetic ability and have specimens of their verses quoted; and of these 26 are actually said to have compiled diwāns. Great masters of Turkish prose such as ʿAtāʾī, Nergisī and Veysī are truly exceptional; but it was their ability to use language imaginatively and entertainingly that formed their appeal, rather than any specifically scholarly distinction. The inference is unavoidable that a man could achieve advancement more rapidly by being amusing than by his scholarship.

The texts present to us a picture of institutions in decay, with the skeletal structures of the originals only occasionally perceptible. The various projects for reform of the system which are mentioned throughout İT were, it can be seen, doomed to failure, mainly because they missed the true location of the malaise. It was the relentlessly proliferating numbers of ʿulema that overcame the capacity of the institution to absorb them that bedeviled the situation and each new generation further complicated the problem. Much the same condition prevailed in the civil bureaucracy, where the ever-growing numbers of clerks impeded the
efficient conduct of state affairs; but this did not have such detrimental consequences for society as a whole as did the creation of a social elite which contributed ever less beneficially to the well-being of the community. We are fortunate in being able to follow stage by stage the development and growth of the Culemā class from the earliest years of the Ottoman state. The biographical works of Taşköprü-zāde and ʿAtā’ī show a wholly different conception of the function of this class from that which is presented to us in VF and CUZ, where the perpetuation of the class and its prerogatives was the primary purpose of the Ottoman Culemā.
C- Organization of the entries in the present work.

In the presenting the information contained in the VP, the following system has been used:

The subjects of biography are numbered according to their occurrence in the tabaka in which they figure; there then follows dates of birth and death, including any incidental information relevant to these given in the text; and below the birth-date, all the details of the subject's descent (father, grandfather, etc.) and of the masters under whom he studied and the person from whom he received his mülazemet are set out. When information on any of these individuals is to be found in other biographical works (Ata'i, Belig Ef., etc. or in the VP itself), the reference is given in square brackets after the name. Next the dates of the academic and judicial appointments come, and in each of these both the individual whom the subject replaced as well as the one who replaced him are shown thus:

§ev.1048: k. of Edirne (Edhem-zade Mustafä Ef.) and his arpalık was given as a mevleviyet to Başmakci-zade Mehmed Ef. --- ma'zul, §ev.1049: Menlâ Ahmed-zade Ef.

This indicates that the subject (Kaba Kulak-zade Mehmed Ef.) was appointed kâzî of Edirne in the month of Şevvâl 1048 in succession to Edhem-zade Mustafä Ef., and the arpalık which he held was given to Başmakci-zade Mehmed Ef. at this time. He held the office until Şevvâl 1049, when he was dismissed and
replaced by Mənəd Ahmed-zade Ef. If the text contains any additional information about these appointments, this is given in its entirety within the pattern just described. At the end of the notice, any significant observations made on the subject by Şeyh-H are given; however, the stereotyped clichés in praise of the subject's learning and piety are omitted, as these are not matters of which Şeyh-H could have factual knowledge. If there are verses attributed to him mention is made only of the number of beyts cited. Finally, the writings with which the subject is credited are given.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ju.</td>
<td>Judicial appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>kazî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka.</td>
<td>kažC asker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZ</td>
<td>Katib Çelebi, Keşf uz-Zunûn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZ-zeyl</td>
<td>Bağdâlî İsmâGîl Paşa, Keşf uz-zunûn zeyli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mülâz</td>
<td>mülâzemet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Naṣīm Taʾrīh-i Naṣīm
Taḥir, Osmanlı Müellifleri.
Rāgid Taʾrīh-i Rāgid
Riḍā, Tezkeret uguṣarā.
Sālim Sālim, Tezkeret uguṣarā.
Süreyyā, Sicill-i Osmanlı.
Mecdi Mecdi, W. Hadā'ik el-Şakā'ik.
Tuhfe-i Hattâtin (Mustakīm-zâde Suleyman Sa'deddin Ef.)
Türkiye Tatvamasi.
Türk Tarih Encımeni Mecmuasi.
Uşakī-zâde, İbrāhīm Hasīb, Şakā'ik un-Nuṣmāniye.
Seylinin Seyli.
Şeyhî, M., Vakā'ı 'ul-Pužalā.