



Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cicm20>

Historical Accounts of the Halveti Shaykh Bali Efendi of Sofia in a Newly Discovered Vita Dating from the Nineteenth Century

Maria Kalicin & Krassimira Mutafova

Published online: 14 Jul 2010.

To cite this article: Maria Kalicin & Krassimira Mutafova (2001) Historical Accounts of the Halveti Shaykh Bali Efendi of Sofia in a Newly Discovered Vita Dating from the Nineteenth Century, *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, 12:3, 339-353

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09596410120065886>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Historical Accounts of the Halveti Shaykh Bali Efendi of Sofia in a Newly Discovered *Vita* Dating from the Nineteenth Century

MARIA KALICIN & KRASSIMIRA MUTAFOVA

ABSTRACT *A study of a newly discovered vita of Shaykh Bali Efendi reveals many features typical of hagiographical literature, but a comparison with other sources helps untangle the historical from the mythical. The article points to the reasons for mythologization and suggests that, in its context, this was not only possible but to be expected.*

The first influx of heterodox Muslims in Rumeli dates back, in all probability, to the time when it was conquered by the Ottomans. There are claims that the *tekkes* and *zaviyes* built around the tombs of shaykhs and *babas* from the so-called first wave of dervish colonization quickly turned into centres of Muslim heterodox propaganda. However, the militant dervishes who were initially used by the central authorities as the only Muslim organization which contained dynamic elements, and was adapted to the conditions of constant warfare,¹ soon became not only inconvenient, but also even dangerous. They lost the support of the authorities and were considered a direct danger, both because of the heterodox trends they introduced, which led to religious and socially disruptive turmoil, and because they regarded Ottoman polity as a deviation from the principles of early Islam.² The orthodox dervish orders on the other hand enjoyed particular attention and protection from the central authorities, particularly as the new tendencies in the country's social and political life, and the explosion of religious fanaticism in the sixteenth century,³ considerably enhanced their role as disseminators of Sunnī Islam in the empire.

Thus, over several centuries, the variegated picture of orthodox and heterodox (in their majority) followers of Muslim mystical teachings was consistently 'adjusted', by elements that the central authorities found inconvenient being deported from Asia Minor and the capital, and by dervish orders, closely related to and in the service of those authorities, which were deliberately introduced into the Ottoman provinces.

Because of their geographical location, the Bulgarian territories not only became a stage for all these Muslim mystical orders, with all the contacts, interactions and contradictions between their doctrines, but were also very often and almost inevitably a point from which they were disseminated into the other Balkan countries.

By comparison with the numerous and well known works on Şūfism and the differentiation within the various sects and orders by west European, Russian, Balkan and US experts in Arab and Ottoman studies, the researches of Bulgarian historians are still fragmentary in character. Apart from some regional anthropological and archaeological works, it is only the studies by S. Dimitrov, M. Staynova and P. Paruşev that stand out in contemporary Bulgarian historiography as trying to set the problem of

Muslim sectarianism against the more general backdrop of the ethno-religious processes and changes following the Ottoman conquest.⁴

To provide a complete picture of the Muslim sects and orders in the Bulgarian lands during the period of Ottoman domination would obviously require multi-faceted, complex and continuous research which should include studies of individuals whose lives and activities were indicative of the ways in which Islamic propaganda advanced into the country. The need for this work is obvious for, with the passage of time, their true image is frequently lost in folklore and historiography and the amassed distortions sometimes lead to the emergence of rather false impressions and the consequent establishment of many of the modern mythologizations and strange modifications, as well as attempts to interpolate modern interpretations into an age long past.

All this gives us reason to turn once again to the well known Muslim mystic repeatedly mentioned in literature whose name is connected with Sofia, Shaykh Bali Efendi.⁵ The occasion for this is the recent discovery in the Oriental Department of the National Library of a yet unpublished *vita* of the mystic, contained in a copy of Mevlâna Shaykh Süleyman Küstendili's work, *Bahr'ül-velâye (Sea of Holiness)*,⁶ which is in itself interesting as a source with specific generic characteristics and should not be placed outside the context of other types of sources. The information it contains will therefore be complemented in this article with other data from published and unpublished Ottoman Turkish documentary material, mainly registers (*mufasssal, tahrir* and *mevkufat defteri*) and *kadi sicils* from the Sofia Sharī'a court. We shall also try to establish the place of this *vita* among other works of the same genre, taking advantage of N. Clayer's recently published work, *Mystiques, État, Société. Les Halvetis dans l'aire balkanique de la fin du XV^e siècle à nos jours*,⁷ which has given us access to Ottoman authors such as Taşköprüzade, Mecdi and Münîrî Belgradî,⁸ whose works are not available in Bulgaria.

Küstendili's work is a late expression of the tradition of compiling compendia of biographies of saints (*tabakat al-avliya*), which became extremely popular in the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth century. The noted scholar J. Trimmingham saw the reason for the flourishing and particular stability of this genre in Şūfī literature in the specific features of the development and decline of Şūfism as a mystical 'way', which led to the loss of its spiritual depth and originality. This was also how he explained its thematic shrinking within the framework of compilations, paraphrasing, endless corrections and repetitions of old stories from the works of the earlier mystics.⁹

This tradition remained stable to the extent that, several centuries later, our author would write in the introduction to his work:

Since the biographical books about most of the saints are read by every educated person, talented people and those who have good taste collect information about the lives of their holinesses, the brilliant *evliya*. And since there are collections of books and the continuation of every one of them is a standing order ... to the poor and unworthy, in other words Mevlânazade Shaykh Süleyman Küstendili, I felt I was obliged to carry out God's orders, to compile the written word and the stories from the numerous different works and biographies and put them all together in one book.¹⁰

In fact, although a provincial author, Küstendili was obviously familiar with and used the principal Ottoman biographical and hagiographical works of the sixteenth century, as is evidenced by the fact that his *vita* of Bali Efendi contains the basic elements found in *Hadaik'u şaka'ik (The Garden of Anemones)*,¹¹ the work of Mehmed Efendi, known as Mecdi. This, in turn, is a translation from Arabic into Ottoman Turkish, with

additions, of the impressive encyclopaedia by the great sixteenth-century Ottoman scholar Taşköprüzade, *Eş şaka'ik un-nümanîe* (*Red Anemones*), where Bali Efendi is listed among the Ottoman scholars and saints.¹²

It has not yet been definitely established whether the manuscript of Küstendili's work at the SS. Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia is an original or a copy. It is clear, however, that it is not the only one, for, in her work on the Halveti in the Balkans, N. Clayer used another copy that is housed in the Berlin City Library.¹³

It becomes clear from the notes about Shaykh Küstendili at the end of the work that he was born in the middle of 1163 (1750). He entered the Nakşibendi order in 1180 (1766–7) and became a preacher in that same order in 1193 (1779). An extremely prolific writer, he wrote a number of books from the viewpoint of the 'brilliant Nakşibendi movement', including *risales*, commentaries, poetry, a history of the town of Kyustendil and, towards the end of his life, *Bahrü'l velâye* (*Sea of Holiness*).¹⁴

There are other biographical and hagiographical works whose authors bear the surname of 'Küstendili', including a *Tezkeretü'l evliya* (*Biographies of Saints*), compiled in 1100 (1688) by Küstendili Arif, containing interesting data about Bali Efendi. According to Osman Keskioglu, this manuscript should be at the Oriental Department of the National Library,¹⁵ but it has not so far been located there.

Mihaila Staynova refers in *Opis na osmanskite biblioteki v bulgarskite zemi prez XV–XIX v.* to a copy of the work of a Shaykh Küstendili, *Rûḥ al-abḥâr wa subul al-asrâr* (*Soul of the Seas and Ways of Secrets*),¹⁶ also housed at the National Library.¹⁷ The copy, made by Ali ibn Hüsein Samokovi, was completed on 20–30 *Receb* 1197 (21 June–1 July 1783). The special interest in the Nakşibendi order, displayed in the first chapter of this religious and mystical work, is an indication, albeit indirect, of the connection between its author and Shaykh Süleyman Küstendili, who is definitely known to have belonged to that order.

And finally, still another person bearing the name of Küstendili is mentioned in the text about Bali Efendi we are discussing—the author's son, Mustafa Arif, who, at least according to the *vita*, became a follower of the mystic from Sofia.¹⁸

None of this allows us to claim with certainty that the above-mentioned persons belonged to the same family of Muslim writers and mystics, followers of the Nakşibendi order. Küstendili, the common epithet they all share, may only mean that they were from the same town and that, in addition to being a well developed administrative, economic and political centre, Kyustendil was also a centre of Muslim religious propaganda during the period of Ottoman domination.¹⁹

Bali Efendi's *vita* in *Bahrü'l velâye* follows the recognized features of the hagiographical genre, influenced mainly by the Arab literary tradition. The reason for this lies basically in the fact that the biographical genre in the Muslim world was closely related to theology and, before the Safavid age, Arabic was the language of theology and science.²⁰ As the well known Arabist, F. Rosenthal, has pointed out, biography had its place in Muslim historiography from the very beginning and won itself a dominant position there.²¹ Discussing the different types of biographies, he has also indicated the specific features of those that deal with theologians and scholars. The emphasis was on the history of their education, their teachers, the places they visited and the traditions they followed, while little attention was paid to 'external' events. A typical feature of all types of biography is the inclusion of the date of birth and the obligatory presence of moral and intellectual qualities, while a portrait of the person is in most cases omitted.²²

This tradition was continued in the Ottoman Empire and its most outstanding representatives in the sixteenth century, Lami, Taşköprüzade, Mecdi and Lâîfi,²³

created exceptionally stable prototypes. The special mixture of biographical, hagiographical and historical information about scholars and saints included in Taşköprüzade's encyclopaedic compendium is the result of his using his personal experience and observations when he served as *müderri* and *kadi* of Istanbul, extracting part of the information he needed from the memoirs and experiences of the members of his own family and the descendants of the people he wrote about and, finally, using information from other works of that type.²⁴ In this way, he created a specific type of hagiography that combined the strong and the weak points of writing from the position of an eyewitness, mystic and historian.²⁵

Being written within the framework of this prototype, Shaykh Bali Efendi's *vita* is marked by fragmentation, chronological and thematic inversions, a lack of logical connection between the passages and imbalance in the scope and detail of the biographical elements. Another important characteristic feature of the structure is the introduction of direct speech, which gives grounds for different interpretations of the text.

The author does not mention the name of the order or sect to which Bali Efendi belonged, providing only indirect information about it. What he tells us is that Bali Efendi was one of the followers of Shaykh Kasım Çelebi,²⁶ who in turn is known to have been a Halveti, follower of the famous Çelebi Halife.²⁷ It then follows that Bali Efendi also belonged to the Halveti order.

Küstendili has described and assessed Shaykh Bali in accordance with tradition and through the prism of his own scale of values. At the very beginning, before providing the sparse biographical data, he puts forward the two principal themes that form the basis of the whole story—the mystic's erudition and holiness. According to him, the Shaykh 'worked diligently in the service of God' all his life.²⁸

The author of the *Sea of Holiness* stresses the position of the Shaykh and its social impact: 'The result of his virtuous service was his disciples, many of whom showed themselves as excellent and perfect people. He left an endless number of noted adherents. He sent this out into the world to improve the people.'²⁹

Coming to the biographical data, Küstendili first records where and how Bali Efendi died, and where he was buried: 'He died in the heart-warming Rumeli city called Sofia. He was buried at Salahiyye, a place [located] near the town. He expired during the Friday prayers on the last Friday of the victorious month of *Safer* in the year 960 from the emigration of the Prophet, or the 16th of *Kânun-i sani*' (10 February 1553).³⁰ This date, which was first reported by Taşköprüzade, was given to him personally by Bali Efendi's associate, Rusuhi Süleyman Efendi.³¹ It was also adopted by the Shaykh's other biographers, Mecdi,³² M. Sürreya and M. Tahir.³³ Evliya Çelebi in the seventeenth century gave a different year. He deciphered the chronogram encoded in the inscription above the main door of the Shaykh's *türbe* as 958 (1551).³⁴ The same date in the same chronogram is also reported by Keskioglu.³⁵

The place name 'Salahiyye' remains somewhat vague, for it is not clear whether a locality or a settlement was meant, i.e. whether what is today Knyazhevo already existed as a village, or whether it was only a locality appropriate for the construction of the *türbe*, which was to be settled later. Neither Bali Efendi's biographers nor modern scholars comment on the name itself. Keskioglu alone discusses its etymology, connecting it with the person of Yüsuf Salahaddin, an associate of Taşköprüzade, who ordered the building of a mosque on whose foundations the present Knyazhevo church was later built.³⁶

Although the time of construction of the mosque has not been determined and the

sources for this statement are not particularly concrete, this etymology may be possible, particularly as the dictionary meaning of the word *salahiyye* (appropriateness, expedience, authority, completeness of power, prerogative, competence and jurisdiction³⁷) hardly explains the name. Only F. Devellioğlu's encyclopaedic dictionary contains the expression *Salahiyye-i Halvetiyye*, meaning one of the branches of the Halveti order whose founder was Balıkesirli Abdullah Salahaddin.³⁸ This last takes us back to Keskiöğlu's explanation, whose confirmation is most probably to be found in Taşköprüzade's inaccessible work.

Küstendili's source for Bali Efendi's birthplace was the Shaykh's disciple, Rusuhi Süleyman. It is strange that, having this first-hand source, our author skips over an entire period of Bali Efendi's life—his sojourn in Constantinople where, as is well known from his other biographers, the Shaykh received his education. Küstendili only mentions that 'Shaykh Bali Efendi, may his memory be blessed, was born near Stroumika and when he grew up, he settled in Sofia.'³⁹

Referring to other biographers, Clayer writes that in Constantinople the Shaykh went through several grades of the established educational system and, in his pursuit of self-perfection, expressed the wish to be guided by a Şūfī teacher. He found such a teacher in Shaykh Kasım Efendi, a disciple of the noted Çelebi Halife, who directed Atik Ali Pasha's *zaviye* in Constantinople. According to Clayer, Bali Efendi's sojourn in Constantinople and his initiation into the Halveti order occurred in the first two decades of the sixteenth century. She dates to the same period the episode described in identical words by Mecdi and Küstendili Süleyman Şeyhi and which relates to the reasons underlying Bali Efendi's decision to undertake the compilation of a commentary on Ibn 'Arabī's famous work, *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*.⁴⁰

This episode has been repeated in detail in our manuscript but without relating it to a specific place and time. It deserves more detailed discussion because it is interesting both as a source of reliable facts and as a brilliant illustration of the intertwining of the generic features of biography and hagiography. The only historical fact in the episode is that Bali Efendi undertook a commentary of Ibn 'Arabī's work, but this alone says much about the personality of Bali Efendi.

A commentary on this, the most famous and one of the most difficult of Ibn 'Arabī's works, was considered an obligation as well as a great honour for every educated mystic. Ibn 'Arabī's works attracted the attention of the Şūfī intellectual elite and, after the thirteenth century, as the Russian Arabist, A. Knysh, has pointed out, it is difficult to find an educated Şūfī Shaykh who did not turn to Ibn 'Arabī's teaching and form an attitude towards it.⁴¹ According to modern scholars, the Şūfīs themselves were not unanimous in their assessments of his heritage. Some directly rejected him and others insisted that his works should be studied, while the vast majority adopted a position of compromise. In recognition of the genius of one of the greatest mystics and theoreticians of the Muslim world, they suggested that the general public be forbidden to read his books (for they were not equipped to appreciate them), leaving them to be studied only by the intellectual elite of the brotherhoods.⁴²

It is not clear what the fate of Ibn 'Arabī's teaching would have been in the Muslim world had it not attracted the Ottoman elite. Selim I (1512–20) not only ordered the building of a beautiful mausoleum over his tomb in Damascus, as well as a mosque nearby, but he also insisted that the *Şeyhü'l islâm* Ibn-i Kemal (Kemalpaşazade Ahmed Şemseddin Efendi), 1468–1534, should issue a *fetva* forbidding criticism of Ibn 'Arabī under the threat of severe punishment.⁴³

Thus, Bali Efendi belonged to that part of the Ottoman intellectual elite that gave

due attention and recognition to the ideas of the famous mystic. This attitude to him is also illustrated by the surname Muhieddin (Muḥī al-Dīn), meaning literally 'giving life to the faith', in sharp contrast to the names used by his opponents, like Mahiddin ('digressing from faith'), and even Musituddin ('killing the faith').⁴⁴

The newly-discovered manuscript presents this information by the means typical of the hagiographical literary tradition, i.e. miracles and supernatural reincarnations. Ibn 'Arabī appeared before Bali Efendi in the flesh, and before Kasım Çelebi 'in the world of visions' and that in the company of the Prophet. The introduction of a hagiographical element into this episode was not an original idea of Küstendili's, for it had a long tradition. In fact, various orders considered Ibn 'Arabī a miracle worker who bore eternal truths—truths that he could reveal only to the most worthy, appearing to them both sleeping and waking.⁴⁵

Bali Efendi attained this level of knowledge and initiation and wrote the *Sarh-i Fusus al-hikām*,⁴⁶ a commentary in which he managed to 'uncover the hidden treasures and veiled symbols and to remove ... the doubtful and controversial points' in Ibn 'Arabī's work.⁴⁷ This commentary was acknowledged as his most profound work and was the only one to be printed.⁴⁸ In it he outlined the basic principles for the development of the Halveti order, along with practical instructions to the Halveti, based on Ibn 'Arabī's theosophical concept of 'mystical monism'.⁴⁹

Bali Efendi's literary works are introduced by Küstendili with the words: 'He created wonderful works and various noble books, *risale* and highly appraised, competent commentaries.'⁵⁰ This statement may be justified by reference to the titles of some of his famous works: *Etvar-i sitte* (*Six Ways of Conduct*), *Risale-i kaza ve kader* (*Risale on Predestination*), *Mecmuat u'nmasaih* (*Collection of Instructions*) and *Menzume-i varidat* (*System of Revelations*).⁵¹ Küstendili also touches, albeit briefly, upon another aspect of Shaykh Bali's spiritual and intellectual writings by quoting one of his didactic poems.⁵²

Against the background of his rather comprehensive portrait of Bali Efendi as a *mürīd*, *mürşīd* and writer, Küstendili provides only a cursory sketch of the Şūfī Shaykh's association with state policy: 'Truly, he rose and achieved the possible limit in the improvement of the human race and the limit in state affairs.'⁵³

This estimation may be flowery, but it is devoid of facts and skips over the Shaykh's connections with the official authorities. The only information Küstendili provides pertains to Bali Efendi's contacts with Sultan Süleyman I Kanuni (1520–66). With typical disregard for concrete information, he only says in passing: 'When he accompanied Sultan Süleyman Gazi in some campaigns, in blessed moments he prayed for conquest and victory.'⁵⁴

The memory of their relationship subsequently reflected on local toponymy. When Evliya Çelebi visited Sofia and the surrounding area in 1653, he mentioned, among numerous others, local names related to Bali Efendi, such as 'Bali Efendi's bath' and 'Bali Efendi's forest', as well as 'Sultan Süleyman's bench'.⁵⁵ Eloquent, but with a taste for hyperbole and for his own interpretation, the Ottoman traveller always mentioned something about the places he visited, frequently borrowing from the sphere of imagination. One of the most popular legends tells about Sultan Süleyman I wanting to visit the Shaykh before the Szegedvár campaign, though they did not actually meet—nor could they have, for by the time of the Sultan's proposed visit Bali Efendi was dead!

Strange as it may seem, Evliya Çelebi's illogical account has been accepted at face value. P. Deligradev, for example, who pays special attention to the 'Knyazhevo saint',

is inclined to doubt the authenticity of the inscription above the main door of the *türbe*, rather than Çelebi's tale.⁵⁶

Küstendili also omits to mention the obvious involvement of the Halveti Shaykh in some of the pressing problems of the empire which found expression in several of Bali Efendi's works. One of these problems was the controversy over the monetary *vakıfs*, which was part of the debate that arose between the Ottoman *ulema* regarding the *vakıf* endowment of movable and immovable property. A leading figure among the opponents of the monetary *vakıf*, who undertook energetic action for their abolition, was Koca Çivizade Shaykh Mehmed Muhiddin Efendi (1476–1547), *kadiasker* of Anatolia, *Şeyhü'l islâm* from 1538 and *kadiasker* of Rumeli from 1545 until his death.⁵⁷ One of the main reasons for his losing the post of *Şeyhü'l islâm*, three years and nine months after his appointment and in violation of the principle of lifelong tenure, was his open opposition to the philosophy and ideas of Ibn 'Arabî and Jalâl al-Dîn Rûmî. As *kadiasker* of Rumeli he issued a *fetva* on the uselessness of monetary *vakıfs* and banned them. The response came from those of the *ulema*, led by *Şeyhü'l islâm* Mehmed Ebusuud Efendi (1490–1575),⁵⁸ who realized how beneficial the monetary *vakıfs* were for the state. They included Shaykh Bali, who declared himself against the abolition of monetary *vakıfs* in a letter to Sultan Süleyman I.⁵⁹ His arguments were so convincing that later they formed the basis of the newly established *vakıfs*.⁶⁰

In another work on the same subject, Bali Efendi launched an attack against the *kadiasker* of Rumeli, Çivizade, who opposed the monetary *vakıfs*. It contains an exclamation that shows another side of Bali Efendi: 'Oh, had Çivizade Efendi known how Islam is established in the Balkans, he would have known whether the monetary *vakıfs* were bad or not!'⁶¹ What better illustration of the principal mission of one of the representatives of orthodox Islam in Rumeli!

Being a Halveti Shaykh, closely connected with the interests of the central authorities, Shaykh Bali became one of the people who spread Sunnî Islam in the regions where it was not yet dominant. It was from this position that he sharply opposed all heterodox tendencies, which found fertile soil in various parts of Rumeli, and particularly in the Deliorman, Dobroudja and Thrace. This aspect of his activity is not reflected in Küstendili's biography, but his other biographers have given it attention, even if not going into detail. Taşköprüzade and Münîrî Belgradî point out the Shaykh's orthodoxy, stressing the fact that, following the way of Şûfism, Bali Efendi strictly respected the Sharî'a.⁶² Münîrî Belgradî writes: 'The greatness of this man's deeds is indescribable and the Sunnism of his conduct goes beyond anything one can think of.'⁶³ This fanatical defence of the Sunna clearly implies extreme intolerance for all deviations from orthodoxy, even in representatives of his own order.

Bali Efendi's own reports to the sultan and highly placed representatives of the central authorities are the best illustrations of his position in this respect. They best reveal Bali Efendi's militant attitude to those whom he considered heretics, but we refer to them only briefly here because they are well known to historiography and are repeatedly published either entirely or in part.

V. Minorsky has published a full translation into English of his report to the Grand Vizier, Rüstem Pasha, on the Safavid influence and its possible unfavourable consequences.⁶⁴ There the Shaykh lists all the details his informants had provided regarding the 'immoral' Kızılbaşı—'those sons of evil'.⁶⁵ He dwells in detail on the reasons that brought about the diversion of the Safavid dynasty—whose founder, Shaykh Safi, was an irreproachable leader—from 'the right way', placing its members under the influence of the heretics. His advice to the Grand Vizier was to eliminate physically anyone who

recognized the Shah as a *mürşid* and 'to defeat by the sword and destroy by force that tribe ... its property and women, with the exception of the children.'⁶⁶ According to him 'alive or dead, in the Islamic territory they are nothing but harm, and their removal from it is very happiness'.⁶⁷ There are no clear indications in the text of whether this severe attack on the Kızılbaşı, who were a serious threat to the stability of the Ottoman state in Anatolia, was also aimed at the heretically minded populace of Rumeli.

The other report, sent to the sultan, focused on the followers of Shaykh Bedreddin Simavi in Dobroudja and the Deliorman, and particularly on one of his spiritual disciples, Çelebi Halife.⁶⁸ Bali Efendi gives a detailed description of all his violations of the Shari'a: drinking wine, nightly vigils at which men and women met in social gatherings, revering the Lord as a man generally and in the face of the Shaykh particularly, and negligence towards the prayer rituals.⁶⁹ The punishment that Shaykh Bali demanded for the followers of Bedreddin was very severe. Since these heretics were, according to him, causing 'a rupture in the broad expansion of the Muslim world', 'all lances and spearheads at the disposal of the authorities' should be used against them to erase the actions of the enemy 'with the sharp sword and the blood-shedding dagger'.⁷⁰

On the basis of those two reports Minorsky estimates Bali Efendi's work as a prime example of close collaboration between the spiritual powers and the civil and military authorities in the context of a 'secret intelligence service' that had to control public opinion in the empire,⁷¹ and his view is supported by other scholars.⁷² Münîrî Belgradî, Bali Efendi's most thorough biographer, called him the 'Shaykh-agent'⁷³ when describing his role in the notorious trials against latitudinarian Halveti Shaykhs.⁷⁴

Reviewing the political activity of Bali Efendi one cannot ignore the fact that some of the studies represent him as the *kadi* of Sofia.⁷⁵ Unfortunately, however, this author has been unable to find any confirmation that he held such a position in the existing *kadi* registers preserved in the Oriental Department at the National Library. Any conclusions regarding the instigation or prevention of confessional conflicts and the advancement of Islamization during his alleged term as *kadi* remain conjectural.

Another historical event mentioned by Küstendili is the founding of a village around Bali Efendi's tomb, although he does not give the information systematically. At the beginning of the *vita*, where he reports on the death of the Shaykh, he mentions that '*kadi* Abdurrahman, son of Abdulaziz and descendant of Mevlâna Ali Kuşçu, built a mosque and a *zaviye* on [his grave] and made that place livelier'. Further on in the text and without any clear connection with the preceding passage this information is complemented with 'Now they call that village "Bali Efendi's village". A caravanserai, baths and work shops were built there in his honour.'⁷⁶

The Sofia *kadi* register preserved in the Oriental Department at the National Library does not record the term of office of the Abdurrahman, son of Abdulaziz, mentioned in the biography, nor is his name included among the known *ulema* whose biographies are contained in the prestigious biographical dictionaries. However, the section on *vakıf* properties, in the detailed register of the Sofia district dating from the end of the sixteenth century, records a mill with three millstones and two pastures turned into a *vakıf* by the already deceased Ali Kuşçu zade Abdurrahman efendi.⁷⁷ This is obviously the same person as the one whose name was associated with the foundation of the *zaviye* erected over Bali Efendi's tomb, which in its turn became a new centre for the order and a nucleus around which the future village emerged. The properties transformed into *vakıfs* by him are only part of the *vakıfs* of the *zaviye* recorded in the same *defter* under the title '*Zaviye* of Bali Efendi near the fountain in the pass'. Its other

properties were mainly sums of money, bequeathed by various people, including: the deceased Mustafa Pasha, the murdered *mir-i miran* of Budin (Buda)—200,000; the deceased Mesih voyvoda—40,000; the deceased *akıncı subaşı*—25,000; Veli Bey—6000; the deceased *solak* Mehmed—3000; the deceased Ilyas, son of Turgud—1200; the deceased Turgud dede—1200. In addition to all these *vakıf* endowments and monetary donations, the record also shows the *zaviye* to have possessed ‘a mill with two millstones, according to the old *defter*; a mill with one millstone and a *vakfiye* of Bali Efendi, 8’.⁷⁸ And a *tapu ve tahrir* register of 978 (1570–71) contains a record of ‘a mill with two millstones belonging to Bali Efendi within the village of Boyana and a pasture’.⁷⁹

The entries in the two *defter*s show that, for a period of some 30 years, there was a considerable increase in donations to the *zaviye*. On the other hand, the names and titles of the benefactors are evidence that the order was tolerated by the representatives of the official authorities. It is appropriate to refer here to the information provided by Evliya Çelebi—though considered apocryphal by most scholars—about what Sultan Selim II (1566–74) did in Bali Efendi’s memory. According to the traveller, on his way back from Szegedvár, the sultan raised a high dome over the Shaykh’s tomb and built a dervish *tekke*.⁸⁰ The fact that the *zaviye* was already registered at the time of Selim II’s reign makes Evliya Çelebi’s claim less dubious. Although this is not definitive evidence, it supports the view that orthodox orders were supported by *vakıf* incomes provided by the sultans and senior officials.⁸¹ And this pattern continued through the seventeenth century. Again according to Evliya Çelebi, in 1035 (1626) one Etmekçizade Ahmed Pasha, *defterdar* under Ahmed I (1603–17) and Osman II (1618–22),⁸² built in Bali Efendi’s village ‘a large caravanserai, covered with lead, with 50 rooms and 40 to 50 workshops with which he adorned the village.’⁸³

Returning to the information from the registers, we should also make clear that they record Bali Efendi as an owner and benefactor, for this contradicts the information that the *zaviye* was founded after his death. It is probable that during his life he had a connection with the locality where he was later buried. This is not only logical, but may also be deduced from the toponyms and their related legends. We refer here to the locality known as ‘Bali Efendi’s forest’, famous for its centuries-old woods, where Bali Efendi’s *türbe* is located. According to the legend mentioned by Keskiöglü, the Shaykh used to drive into the ground burning sticks from which the present ancient trees grew.⁸⁴

There is no doubt that Sofia remained the centre of Bali Efendi’s activities as a preacher and instructor until his death and there, as his other biographers have pointed out, he founded a *zaviye*.⁸⁵ It is recorded on the list of *mahalles* in Sofia in the above-mentioned registers from 1570–71,⁸⁶ and the end of the sixteenth century as the ‘*Zaviye* of Shaykh Bali Efendi’.⁸⁷ The information in the two registers is identical and an additional entry in the later register even points out that the names of the dervishes there are listed ‘according to the old *defter*’.⁸⁸ There are no other notes apart from the list of names of the fourteen dervishes.

It is impossible to trace the fate of that centre chronologically or comprehensively, or its relationship with the new cult centre of the order, but some new data may, however cursorily, reveal glimpses of its spiritual and economic life. The minutes of a Sofia *kadi* of the second decade of the month of *Rebiülevvel* in the year 1029 (15–24 February 1620) provide indirect information about the state of Bali Efendi’s *vakıf* in Sofia.⁸⁹ We learn from the suit that the *vakıf* had extended a credit of 10,000 *akçe* to a millet-ale maker, Ali Beşe, son of Abdullah, from the Sofia *mahalle* of Alaca Mescid,

which reveals the role of the *vakıf* as a creditor as well as its considerable financial resources.

Additional notes in the *mevkufat defteri* of 1054 (1644) make it clear that the residents of the Sofia *mahalle* in which Bali Efendi's *tekke* was located were exempt from paying *avariz*.⁹⁰ The reluctance of the residents of the surrounding neighbourhoods to pay these taxes under collective responsibility and the resulting incidents caused the issuing of a special order of the sultan that read: 'since it is not included in the *avariz*, this neighbourhood should not be entered in the *avariz defter*. Its residents should be left alone in the future.'⁹¹ This fact alone is indicative of the ways in which the order continued to maintain its influence and authority among the populace through the seventeenth century. The manner in which the *tekke* was registered gives an echo of the respect attributed to the personality of the Shaykh: 'Tekke of the revered and respected Shaykh Bali Efendi, may his memory be blessed, the greatest of the mystic scholars, let his cherished secrets be sacred.'⁹²

There is no doubt that there was a mosque connected with the name of Bali Efendi in the city of Sofia itself and we have some indication of its location. E. Ayverdi has entered Bali Efendi's mosque under no. 2316 in the catalogue of Ottoman architectural monuments in Europe.⁹³ He reports that, in 1159 (1746), the mosque was registered under no. 20630 among the Kepeci *vakıfs* and was located near Saraçhane.⁹⁴ The author stresses that this mosque was different from the one in the village of Bali Efendi where Bali Efendi's tomb and *zaviye* were. Two mosques of the Halveti Shaykh are also recorded in the report of Ali Ferruh Bey, *imaret* commissioner in Bulgaria in 1902.⁹⁵ The Sofia mosque was located in the Imaret neighbourhood.⁹⁶

The information in the above-mentioned registers of 1570–71 and the end of the sixteenth century about the dervishes listed by name with Bali Efendi's *zaviye* in Sofia is interesting in several respects. First, there are the indications of family ties between the dervishes and the handing down of seniority from father to son, according to the tradition established in the Şüfî brotherhoods.⁹⁷ The list of the dervishes begins with 'Hacı Musa—brother of the deceased Efendi; Orhan—brother of the deceased; Ishak Çelebi—son of the deceased.'⁹⁸ As for Bali Efendi's other *zaviye* in present-day Knyazhevo, the register of the end of the sixteenth century features the entry: 'Mustafa—shaykh of the *zaviye* of the above-mentioned.'⁹⁹ Since there are no other data about family members, we can only assume that this person is identical with Seyid Mustafa Çelebi,¹⁰⁰ the son of Bali Efendi mentioned by Evliya Çelebi. The fact that in 1570–71 Bali Efendi's close relatives were registered in the Sofia *zaviye* and not in the Knyazhevo *zaviye* (with one possible exception) indicates that the former was still of prime importance at that time.

The information from the Sofia *mufassal* register of the end of the sixteenth century, however, already reveals a rather different picture regarding the priority of the Knyazhevo *zaviye*. The list of its inhabitants brings to light the structure of the dervish brotherhood that included: a shaykh of the *zaviye*; an *imam* who on occasion acted as deputy of the shaykh; two *müezzins*; a servant; a special person who had the task of reading the names of the benefactors in the mosque (*muarrif*); the manager of the caravanserai; a man responsible for the readers of the prayer (*reis i'z zâkirin*); a water-carrier; a cook; and novices (*suhte*).¹⁰¹ Compared with the data about the *zaviye* in the 1570–71 register, where it is recorded as having only one shaykh and one *müezzin* among the ten dervishes listed by name, this indicates how established the *zaviye*'s structure became in the course of 30 years.

The data from the two *defters* and from the *sicils* of the Sofia *kadis* from the middle

of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century reveal the presence of *yürük* in Sofia and the surrounding villages.¹⁰² We also find them among the dervish brotherhoods of Bali Efendi's two *zaviyes* at the end of the sixteenth century. There were three *yürük*—Nazir *yürük*, Akbaş *yürük* and Musa *yürük* among the fourteen dervishes registered at the Sofia *zaviye* in the *mufassal defter* from the end of the sixteenth century, and only one, Memi *yürük*, at the Knyazhevo *zaviye*, who was the manager of the caravanserai.¹⁰³ The presence of *yürük* among the Shaykh's followers explains to a certain extent the portrait of Bali Efendi by Evliya Çelebi as a 'great teacher of the *Yürük* tribes',¹⁰⁴ which is otherwise strange, though repeated by some scholars.¹⁰⁵

Being an experienced compiler, Süleyman Küstendili made a more or less accurate summary of all he knew about Bali Efendi's life and personality from earlier authors. To this, however, he added an episode that undoubtedly bridged the distance between the times of the Shaykh and his early biographers and Küstendili's own:

At the time when I moved to Sofia, my son, Mustafa Arif, with the pure thoughts typical of youth saw that high-ranking person two or three times in his dreams. This man kindly condescended to adopt my son and, saying 'This is my son', he made him live there. Later, in several appearances, he also turned to me, the worthless, with the words 'Even if he is your son, he is also mine!' Then I, the worthless, accepted with great joy.¹⁰⁶

This passage provokes the question of consistency in the affiliation to the dervish brotherhood and the desire to hand down seniority in the order by heredity. Apparently, Küstendili aimed at raising the prestige of his own son, presenting him as the spiritual son and heir of the famous mystic. In addition, since it is known with certainty that Küstendili himself belonged to the Nakşibendi order, the episode could also be interpreted as a hint at the ideological closeness between the Halveti and the Nakşibendi order, which has been recorded by some well known scholars of Şūfism in Islam.¹⁰⁷ We may, however, suggest an even more daring interpretation—the adoption of the *zaviye* by the Nakşibendi order.

Küstendili presents the report of the miraculous cures that occurred at the Shaykh's tomb in a way typical of hagiographical literature. Bali Efendi's reappearance after his death, as well as his help to the sick and the weak, are undoubtedly a purely generic feature. This, however, provides the author with an occasion to refer to the undeniable fact that the Shaykh's tomb became a place of veneration for Muslims, Orthodox Christians and Gypsies.¹⁰⁸

In this perusal of the newly discovered *vita* of the Halveti Shaykh Bali Efendi of Sofia we have attempted to reveal the true dimensions of the image, interpreted through the prism of centuries-old literary traditions, and to see the extent of the author's information as well as his own perspective. We have mentioned, if only briefly, the specific generic features of the source in order to elucidate them by referring to items of verifiable information that are either included or omitted. We have concluded that the omissions were the result of an attempt to incorporate the biography into the hagiographical genre rather than of any conscious and intended suppression. However, the inaccessibility of the manuscripts that served as sources for the *vita* limit our comparisons to those fragments of them that have been published and we are therefore unable to establish the balance between the facts included in the *vita* and those left out.

In our quest for the historical authenticity of the protagonist we have used data from archival documents which allow us to amplify what we already knew, as well as to add new information.

From the *vita* and the additional sources, Shaykh Bali emerges as a Şūfī mystic and preacher, an outspoken and extreme supporter of orthodox Islam and a typical representative of Muslim sectarian propaganda closely involved with the institutions of the central authorities. His biography, however, has been ‘complemented’ with the passage of time. Distortions consistently attached to his memory have gradually transformed him into his own antipode: a holy man who desired religious and social equality and was equally revered by both Muslims and Christians. To investigate the reasons for this stark contrast, as well as the mechanisms and intentions behind the mythologization of the image, is a project that it would be interesting to pursue at a future date.

NOTES

1. J. Trimmingham, *Sufiyskiye ordeny v Islame* (Moscow, 1989), 65.
2. On the early dervish colonization see Ö. L. Barkan, ‘Osmanlı imparatorluğunda bir iskân ve kolonizasyon metodu olarak vakıflar ve temlikler. I. İstila devirlerinin Kolonizatör Türk dervişleri ve zâviyeler’, *Vakıflar Dergisi*, 11. Ankara, 1942, 279–386; M. Staynova, ‘Islam i islamskaya religioznaya propaganda v Bolgarii’, in: *Osmanskaya imperiya: sistema gosudarstvennogo upravleniya, sotsial'nye i etnoreligioznye problemy* (Moscow, 1986), 86–92.
3. On the Arabization and Islamization of the Ottoman state in the sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, see H. Inalcık, *The Ottoman Empire; the classical age 1300–1600* (London, 1972), 179–85; M. Kunt, ‘Transformation of Zimmi into Âskerî’, in: B. Braude & B. Lewis (Eds), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: the functioning of plural society*, Vol. 1, ‘The Central Lands’ (Cambridge, 1980), 63–4; M. Meyer, ‘O sootnoshenii svetskoy i dukhovnoy vlasti v Osmanskoy politicheskoy sisteme v XVI–XVIII vv.’, in: *Islam v istorii narodov Bostoka* (Moscow, 1981), 58–61.
4. P. Paruşev, *Sheykh Bedreddin Yeretika* (Sofia, 1982); M. Staynova, *Osmanskite biblioteki v bulgarskite zemi XV–XIX v.* (Sofia, 1982); *eadem*, *Islam i islamskaya*, 83–103; S. Dimitrov, ‘Kum demografskata istoriya na Dobrudzha prez XV–XVI v.’, *IBID*, 35, 1983, 27–61; *idem*, ‘Nyakoi problemi na yetnicheskite i islyamizatsionno-asimilatsionnite protsesi v bulgarskite zemi prez XV–XVII v.’, in: *Problemi na razvitieto na bulgarskata narodnost i natsiya* (Sofia, 1988), 33–57; see also K. Deribeyev, *Akhrida Sofiya*, 1986.
5. M. Sürreya, *Sicill-i Osmani, yahud Tezkere-i müşahir-i Osmani* (Dar’üt-teba’amire, 1311), C. I, 4–5; M. Tahir, *Osmanlı Müellifleri* (Istanbul, 1334–43 (1915–25)), C. I, s. 42; O. Keskioglu, ‘Bulgaristan’da Bazi Türk Âbideleri ve vakif eserleri’, *Vakıflar Dergisi*, s. VIII, 1969, 309–22; *idem*, ‘Bulgaristan’da Türk vakıfları ve Bâli Efendi’nin vakıf paralar hakkında bir mektubu’, *Vakıflar Dergisi*, s. IX, 1971, 81–94; E. H. Ayverdi, *Avrupa’da Osmanlı mimari eserleri*, C. I–IV (Istanbul, 1977–82), C. II, 99–100; Dž. Čehajić, *Derviški Redovi u Jugoslovenskim zemljama* (Sarajevo, 1986), 104–5, 119; A. Tietze, ‘Sheykh Bâli Efendi’s report on the followers of Sheykh Bedreddin. Osmanlı Araştırmaları’, *Journal of Ottoman Studies* (Istanbul), VII–VIII, 1988, 115–22; N. Clayer, *Mystiques, État, Société. Les Halvetis dans l’aire balkanique de la fin du XIV^e siècle à nos jours* (Leiden/New York/Köln, 1994), 70–81. See also the literature listed there.
6. The manuscript copy is presented by Z. Ivanova, who kindly allowed us to consult her forthcoming article, ‘About a copy of *Bahr’ül-velâye* kept at the SS. Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia’. Here we shall quote from her archaeological description of the manuscript. ‘The copy was made in the period 11–20 *Rebiülevvel*, 1230 (20 February–2 March, 1815)—year of completion of the work—and 7 *Rebiülevvel*, 1235 (24 December, 1819), the date of the note for *vakıf* record of a donation on f. 1a. The codex is well preserved, with cardboard covers held together by a latch, and average thick cream paper with watermarks. It consists of 312 folios measuring 205 by 150 millimetres, text field measuring 160 by 95 millimetres, number of lines—21, type of script—*nesih*. The names, the serial numbers and the superscriptions are in red ink.’
7. Clayer, *op. cit.*, 70.
8. Taşköprüzade, *Şakâyik-i Numaniye* (Istanbul, 1269 (1822–23)), 521–2; Mecdi (Mehmed Efendi), *Hadâiku’ş-Şakâik*.—*Şakâik-i Nu’maniyye ve Zeyilleri* (Ed. Abdülkadir Özcan), C. 1,

- 1989, 521–2; Müniri Belgradî, *Silsiletü'l Mukarribin ve Menâkibü'l Müttakin*, Şehid Ali Paşa, No. 2819/3, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi. İstanbul, vrk. 119b–123a.
9. Trimmingham, *op. cit.*, 67.
10. NBKM, Or. otd., rukopis No. 893, f. 1b.
11. Mecdi, *Hadâiku's* ...
12. B. Flemming, 'Glimpses of Turkish saints: another look at Lami'i and Ottoman Biographers', *Journal of Turkish Studies*. Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları, 18, 1994, 61. An indirect indication that Küstendili had had the opportunity to refer to Taşköprüzade is that, at least according to its first handlist of the principal funds of Mehmed Hüsrev Paşa's Samokov vakıf library, registered under signature mark Op 1121 at the Oriental Department of the National Library, section 'History', it contained his *Eş şaka'ik un-nümanie*. See M. Staynova, *Osmanskite biblioteki*, 39–44.
13. Köstendilli Süleyman Şeyhi, *Bahr-ül velayi*, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz. Berlin, Ms, orquat 1683, 164a–164b, Clayer, *op. cit.*, 70.
14. NBKM, Or. otd., rukopis No. 893, ff. 311b–312b
15. The manuscript of *Tezkeretü'l evliya* was discovered by the Turkish emissary in Sofia, Ali Ferruh Bey (1865–1907), and part of it was published by Osman Nuri Peremeci. See O. N. Peremeci, 'Hazret-i Bâli', *Bulgaristan Türk Muallimler Mecmuası*, I/2, 1 Kânûn-i sâni, 1924, 55–61. Quoted from O. Keskiöglü & A. T. Özyaydin, 'Bulgaristan'da Türk İslâm Eserleri', *Vakıflar Dergisi*, XVII, 1983, 122.
16. M. Staynova, *Osmanskite biblioteki*, 121–3.
17. NBKM, Or. otd., rukopis No. 2063.
18. NBKM, Or. otd., rukopis No. 893, f. 259b
19. M. Staynova, *Osmanskite biblioteki*, 120–3, 136–7.
20. W. A. Gibb, *Arabskaya literatura* (Moscow, 1960), 147.
21. F. Rosenthal, *A History of Muslim Historiography* (Leiden, 2nd edn, 1968), 101.
22. *Ibid.*, 103; see also Gibb, *op. cit.*, 135.
23. Flemming, *op. cit.*, 59–73.
24. *Ibid.*, 61–2.
25. *Ibid.*, 64.
26. NBKM, Or. otd., rukopis No. 893, f. 258b.
27. Čehajić, *op. cit.*, 106; Clayer, *op. cit.*, 71.
28. NBKM, or. otd., rukopis No. 893, f. 258b.
29. *Ibid.*
30. *Ibid.*
31. Ayverdi, *op. cit.*, 100.
32. Clayer, *op. cit.*, 73.
33. Sürreya, *op. cit.*, 4–5; Tahir, *op. cit.*, 42.
34. Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, İstanbul, 1896–1928, C. 3, 417.
35. Keskiöglü, 'Bulgaristan'da Bazi Türk', 316.
36. Keskiöglü, 'Bulgaristan'da Türk vakıfları', 90.
37. H. B. Baranov, *Arabsko-russkiy slovar*. Sost. (Moscow, 1958); *New Redhouse Yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük* (İstanbul, 1968); Samy-Bey Fraschery (Comp.), *Dictionnaire Turc-Français* (Constantinople, 1885).
38. F. Devellioğlu, *Osmanlica-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lügat* (Ankara, 1962).
39. NBKM, Or. otd., rukopis No. 893, f. 258b. Stroumice is a small village in the south-west of what is today Macedonia, 150 km straight southwest of Sofia.
40. Clayer, *op. cit.*, 71.
41. A. D. Knysh, 'Ucheniye Ibn 'Arabi v pozdney musul'manskoy traditsii', in: *Sufizm v kontekste musul'manskoy kul'tury* (Moscow, 1989), 16.
42. *Ibid.*, 16–17; Inalcık, *op. cit.*, 199–200.
43. *Ibid.*
44. See the articles on Ibn 'Arabî in *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. *İslâm Âlemi*, Tahir Coğrafya Lügatı (İstanbul, 1960), C. 8, 533–41; see also M. T. Stepanyants, *Filosofskiye aspekty sufizma* (Moscow, 1987), 3.
45. Knysh, *op. cit.*, 10–11.
46. Tahir, *op. cit.*, 42; Sürreya, *op. cit.*, 4–5.
47. NBKM, Or. otd., rukopis No. 893, f. 259a.
48. Tahir, *op. cit.*, 42.

49. Ćehajić, *op. cit.*, 119. On the philosophical essence of Ibn 'Arabī's teaching and the variety of its interpretations in modern studies, see Trimmingham, *op. cit.*; Stepanyants, *op. cit.*; *Sufizm v musul'manskoj kul'tury*; A. B. Smirnov, *Vlekikiy sheykh sufizma: Opyt paradigmal'nogo analiza filosofii Ibn Arabi* (Moscow, 1993), 10–126.
50. NBKM, or. otd., rukopis No. 893, f. 259a.
51. Tahir, *op. cit.*, 42.
52. NBKM, or. otd., rukopis No. 893, f. 259a.
53. *Ibid.*, f. 258b.
54. *Ibid.*, f. 259a–259b.
55. D. G. Gadzhanov, 'Putuvane na Yevliya Celebi iz bulgarskite zemi prez sredata na XVII vek', *Per. Sp BAN v Sofiya*, LXX (XXI), 1909, 9–10, 702–3.
56. P. Deligradev, 'Knyazhevskiyat svetiya Bali Yefindi', *Serdika*, V, 1941, No. 2–3, 72–4; see also B. Tsvetkova, *Sofiya prez vekovete*, Vol. 1, *Drevnost, Srednovekovne, Buzrazhdane* (Sofia, 1989), 82.
57. A. Altunsu, *Osmanlı Şeyhülislamları* (Ankara, 1972), 22–3; concerning this incident see M. Pixley, 'The development and role of the Şeyhülislam in early Ottoman history', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (Baltimore), 96, 1976, no. 1, 94.
58. Altunsu, *op. cit.*, 28–34.
59. The letter is recorded in Küstendili Arif's work. See n. 15.
60. Keskiöglü, 'Bulgaristan'da Türk vakıfları', 92.
61. Clayer, *op. cit.*, 75–6, n. 22, 76.
62. *Ibid.*
63. Müniri Belgradi, f. 119b—quoted after: Clayer, *op. cit.*, 76.
64. V. Minorsky, 'Shaykh Bāli Efendi on the Savafids', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, XX, 437–51; C. A. Danon, 'Un interrogatoire d'hérétiques musulmans (1619)', *Journal Asiatique*, 11ème série, XVII, janvier—mars, 1921, 281–93. These authors are quoted after Clayer, *op. cit.*, 77–8.
65. Minorsky, *op. cit.*, 443.
66. *Ibid.*, 445.
67. *Ibid.*, 447–8.
68. This letter is discussed in M. F. Köprülüzade, 'Bemerkungen zur Religionsgeschichte Kleinasiens', *Milt. Osm. Gesch.*, I, 203–22, 1921–22, 212; A. Refik, 'Osmanlı devrinde Ratizilik ve Bektaşılık (1558–91)', *Darülfünun Edebiyat Fakültesi*, 1932, IX/2 (Istanbul), 22; Minorsky, *op. cit.*, 437–51. A full translation of one copy of the letter dating from the seventeenth century appears in Tietze, *op. cit.*, 115–22. The report was also discussed in Clayer, *op. cit.*, 78–9.
69. Tietze, *op. cit.*, 117.
70. *Ibid.*, 118.
71. Minorsky, *op. cit.*, 441.
72. Clayer, *op. cit.*, 79.
73. Müniri Belgradi, f. 119b.
74. What is meant here is the refutation of Gülşeni and the interrogations of shaykh Daud. For more details on them see Clayer, *op. cit.*, 79–81.
75. Tietze, *op. cit.*, 115.
76. NBKM, Or. otd., rukopis No. 893, f. 258b, 259b.
77. The *defter* entitled *Defter-i Mufasssal-i Sofya ve Tevabi'ha* is registered under No. 61 at the Ankara Tapu ve Kadastro Genel Müdürlüğü kuyud-i kadime Arşivi. The data pertaining to the Sofia *kaza* were published by N. Genç, whose edition we have used. See N. Genç, *XVI Yüzyıl Sofya Mufasssal Tahrir Defteri'nde Sofya Kazası*, (Eskişehir, 1988), 662 (vrk. 351a–b).
78. Genç, *op. cit.*, 662–3 (vrk. 351 a–b; 352a–b).
79. İstanbul, Başbakanlık Arşivi, TTD, No. 492, 672. A copy of the *defter* was kindly provided to us by S. Ivanova, to whom we express our particular gratitude.
80. Gadzhanov, *op. cit.*, 703.
81. Inalcık, *op. cit.*, 190–1.
82. About him, see Clayer, *op. cit.*, 74.
83. Gadzhanov, *op. cit.*, 703.
84. Keskiöglü, 'Bulgaristan'da Bazi Türk Âbideleri', 315.
85. Clayer, *op. cit.*, 72.
86. TTD, 19.
87. Genç, *op. cit.*, 126 (vrk. 5a).

88. *Ibid.*
89. *Die Protokollbücher des Kadiamtes Sofia*, bearbeiten von Galab D. Galabov, herausgegeben von Herbert W. Duda, 1960, Südosteuropäische Arbeiten 55, 345.
90. Istanbul, Başbakanlık Arşivi, Mevkufât Defteri no. 27434/16, 10.
91. *Ibid.*
92. *Ibid.*
93. Ayverdi, *op. cit.*, 99.
94. The Saraçhane marketplace has not been located.
95. The full report is published in *Tarih Dergisi*, Istanbul, 1979, sayı 32, 381–402. Here we have used a summarized version of it, as included in M. İpşirli, 'Bulgaristan'daki Türk vakıflarının durumu (XX Yüzyıl başları)', *Belleten*, C. LIII (Ankara), 1989, 679–707.
96. Today the neighbourhood in Sofia closed between Slaveykov Square and the streets Graf Ignatiev and General Parensov.
97. On this tradition, see Trimingham, *op. cit.*, 68.
98. TTD no. 492, 19; Genç, *op. cit.*, 126 (vrk. 5a).
99. Genç, *op. cit.*, 663 (vrk. 352a).
100. Gadzhanov, *op. cit.*, 705.
101. Genç, *op. cit.*, 663 (vrk. 352a).
102. *Ibid.*, 121 (vrk. 3b–4a); 471 (vrk. 71b–72a); *Die Protokollbücher*, 60, 71, 150.
103. Genç, *op. cit.*, 126 (vrk. 5a); 663 (vrk. 352a).
104. Deligradev, *op. cit.*, 705.
105. Gadzhanov, *op. cit.*
106. NBKM, or. otd., rukopis No. 893, f. 259b.
107. Trimingham, *op. cit.*, 83–5; Čehajić, *op. cit.*, 185–7.
108. Ayverdi, *op. cit.*, 100.