

chapter did indeed discuss the limits of political authority: the standards of Sunna-abiding political conduct and the parameters of public administration as applied to the relations between Muslims and non-Muslims, and laws about taxation and ownership of land.

The preceding chapters sought "political thought" in the works written either by the theoretically-minded moralists hailing from the Perso-Iranian traditions or by the practically-minded Ottoman bureaucrats who focused on the day-to-day problems affecting the Ottoman treasury. Most of the writers studied here, however, were sheikhs, preachers, disciples, and lower-ranking ulema, some of whom were willingly accommodated, others uncomfortably tolerated by the political establishment. The texts produced by this diverse group would defy any genre-related categorization. The reigns of Ahmed I (1603–17) and Murad IV (1623–40) both produced a wave of political treatises in the *nasihatname* style, addressed to the sultans.⁴ Yet, more often than not, these works of advice transmitted the voices of the preachers who authored them, and lectured their readers on religious and moral duties. In that sense they resemble the catechistical *ilm-i hal* literature from the same period. Some even formulated issues in the form of questions and answers, similar to fatwa manuals.⁵

It would also be wrong to conclude that the Kadızadelis and their Sufi opponents monopolized intellectual discussion about the Sharia and the Sunna in the seventeenth century. There were participants in the debate from all across the Ottoman confessional spectrum, including bureaucratically-minded Melamis such as Sarı Abdullah Efendi (1584–1660) and radical Sufis such as Niyazi-i Mısrî (1618–94).

1 The Controversy of the Century? The Kadızadelis

Salafism is the most widely-used generic term to describe a range of ideological/theological movements that emerged in the long period between the fourteenth and the nineteenth centuries. In spite of the much-disputed ambiguities and anachronisms it evokes, the term has three components that are crucial

4 For a discussion of the political literature produced by the Sufi sheikhs and preachers of the time, see Terzioğlu 2010, 247–250.

5 For a discussion of the seventeenth-century *ilm-i hal* literature and how it represented the religious counterpart of the political advice literature of the period, see Terzioğlu 2013. For the role of preachers and the tradition of preaching in medieval Islamic history, see Berkey 2001 and more recently Jones 2012. Another discussion on the genre-related categorizations of Ottoman "advice literature" can be found in Şen 2011.

in defining these diverse historical movements: the primacy of the prophetic Sunna as a model for public behavior; the inherent belief in the corruption of the times as a result of "innovations" (*bida*) that contradict the practices of the earliest Muslims (*ehl-i salaf*); and a strong demand for the Muslim authorities to regulate, discipline, and improve public morals and practices.

The Kadızadeli movement has been widely accepted as a manifestation of this "Salafi reformism."⁶ One of the earliest sources to mention the contentions of "Birgivi followers" (*Birgivi hulefası*) in Istanbul is the fatwa collection of the chief mufti Esad Efendi (in office 1615–22 and 1623–25).⁷ Other sources refer to the adherents of the Kadızade movement sometimes as the Kadızadeliler and sometimes, using a popular corruption of *faqih*, as "*fakular*."⁸ The message voiced by the Kadızadelis found many adherents among the ulema as well as some individual Sufis. However, those who most enthusiastically embraced the message were the mid-to-low ranking mosque preachers, public lecturers, and lesser religious functionaries.⁹ The very public nature of their preaching and lecturing rendered the Kadızadeli cause highly visible and further augmented the impact of their message. As will be discussed in the following pages, they managed to attract a very mixed social group as followers. The heterogeneous nature of their adherents must have magnified the Kadızadeli voice and carried it to audiences it would not otherwise have reached. As a result, the Kadızadeli controversy occupied a significant place in contemporary writings and continues to do so in modern scholarship, perhaps disproportionately to its actual historical importance. Nonetheless, it is true that the rift between the followers of Kadızade Mehmed Efendi and those of the Halveti Sheikh Abdülmecid Sivasi created a large degree of socio-political tension in the capital, one which could only be curbed by the interventions of the high-ranking ulema and other political dignitaries. While the degree of political violence created by this rift never matched that of the janissary and cavalry uprisings, the Ottoman court was subject to constant manipulation from each side, both of which successfully commissioned judicial opinions and decrees for a series of executions and banishments.

The entire Kadızadeli vs Halveti rift emerges in the sources as an issue-based controversy centered on contemporaneous socio-religious practices. One of the earliest issues that emerged on the Ottoman public scene was the legality of cash *vakfs* and Birgivi Mehmed Efendi's challenging of the chief

6 Terzioğlu 1999, 194.

7 Terzioğlu 1999, 200.

8 Öztürk 1981, 200.

9 Zilfi 1986; Terzioğlu 1999, 194.