

to bir otorite olması gerektiğine yoğunlaştırmaktadır. Cemaatin failliği, fiili bir iktidarın varlığı bağlamında, tenkit, ıslah ve ihya gibi sorumluluklarla tanımlanmıştır. Gerçi Ovamir Anjum sonuç yazısında bu eksikliği itiraf etmekten çekinmiyor ve İbn Teymiyye'nin "diri ve dayanaklı siyasal kurumları ayrıntılandıramadığı"nı, yalnızca "mevcut siyasal düşünceyi yapı-sökümüne uğratmaya çabaladığı"nı, dolayısıyla onun düşüncesinde "gerçek bir boşluğun bulunduğu"nu aktarıyor. Fıkhi görüşlerinin İbn Kayyim el-Cevziyye gibi yetkin halefler bulabildiğini, ancak siyasi görüşlerinin bulamadığını ifade eden Anjum, onun bazı görüşlerine kendi siyasal tavırları için sık sık başvuran modern Suudi-Vahhabi ve cihadi veya tekfirî Selefilikle ilgili ise (eserin kapsamını da aştığından olacak) uzun değerlendirmelerden kaçınıyor. En iyi ihtimalle bu modern yorumların onun gerçek siyasal fikirlerini deruhte edemediğine değinmekle yetiniyor. İbn Teymiyye'nin gerek kendi halefleri, gerekse modern İslamcı hareketler ve entelektüel yönelimler üzerindeki etkisi ise ciddi bir konu olarak araştırılmayı bekliyor.

Anjum'un çalışması Hasan Kunakata, George Makdisi ve Yahya Michot gibi İbn Teymiyye'yi yeni okumalarla anlamaya dönük çizgiye bir katkıdır. Onu hem ortaçağ fıkıh geleneğinin ağır yüküne hem de kimi modern İbn Teymiyye yorumcularının kendi mezhepsel, şiddet yanlısı, faydacı ve donuk okumalarının tehdidine karşı Selefi düşünceyi revizyona tâbi tutarak dinamikleştirme gayreti olarak da takdir edebiliriz.

**Ali Fuat Bilkan. *Fakihler ve Sofuların Kavgası: 17. Yüzyılda Kadızadeliler ve Sivasiler* (The Struggle of Jurists and Sufis: *Kadızadelis* and *Sivasis* in the Seventeenth Century). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2016. 207 pages.**

---

**Fatma Deniz**

Central European University  
Deniz\_Fatma@student.ceu.edu

---

141

Dîvân  
2016/2

Emerging in the seventeenth-century the Ottoman Empire, the puritan *Kadızadeli* movement had religious and socio-political dimensions. Ali

Fuat Bilkan's book, *Fakihler ve Sofuların Kavgası 17. Yüzyılda Kadızadeliler ve Sivasiler (The Struggle of Jurists and Sufis: Kadızadelis and Sivasis)*, is one of the rare works examining the movement with attention to the socio-political and social context in which it emerged. Relying on a host of primary and secondary sources, Bilkan's study fills a significant gap in the Ottoman historical scholarship. It analyses the debates between *Kadızadelis*, preachers who put emphasis on Islamic law (*fiqh*) and prioritize the external aspects of Islam over spiritual experience, and *Sivasis*, Sufis, who took mystical experience seriously in addition to performing external religious rituals. The author successfully shows that the *Kadızadeli-Sivasi* debate was one of many others that either had taken before or would emerge in the following period.

In a long introduction, the author gives valuable background information that helps the reader to see the developments in the Ottoman Empire as well as other parts of the world, in particular Europe, during the seventeenth century. He gives information about the transformation of the Ottoman social and political order and explores the intellectual and scientific developments and crises in Europe. The first chapter is devoted to *Kadızadeli* movement which consisted of Ottoman religious leaders supporting the purification of Islam from innovations, which were called *bid'a*. The members of the movement were giving sermons in mosques and had a considerable impact on society. Not only common people but also some powerful political figures (including the sultans) supported the movement. Thanks to the support of powerful political men, the members of the movement had the chance of being appointed to the largest mosques in the empire, and hence, enlarged their followers. In return, politicians benefited from the preachers' influence on society and had the chance to implement a number of policies that appeared religious but actually political. For instance, the actual motive behind the prohibition of coffee houses was to preclude the political opposition against the political authority in such social gathering places; however, rulers presented the prohibition as legitimate by leaning on views of *Kadızadelis* about the sinfulness of drinking coffee (p. 68).

Bilkan also deals with Mehmed Birgivi's (d. 1573) and Ibn Taymiyya's (d. 1328) opinions, which have been considered as the source of inspiration for the *Kadızadelis*. Bilkan qualifies the idea that *Kadızadelis* followed Ibn Taymiyya. In his opinion, their mentality and methods were similar to Ibn Taymiyya's, but they differed from him in various ways. (p. 77) The author believes that the ideas of the *Kadızadeli* movement are closer to Birgivi's, however there are again some significant points separating them from him. Therefore, it is not exactly true to think that they carry the same men-

tality with Birgivi and Ibn Taymiyya. For example, Birgivi had a more congenial relationship with Sufis, while *Kadızedelis* violently opposed Sufis. Ibn Taymiyya's thinking had philosophical inclinations, while *Kadızedelis* focused on daily praxis. Moreover, the circumstances in which these three figures lived and their reasons for expressing purifying ideas varied. Thus, they must be evaluated with due attention to their own contexts and differences.

The first leader of the movement, Kadızade Mehmed Efendi (d. 1635), was an effective figure. According to Katip Çelebi (d. 1657), Kadızade had the ability to persuade people and played a critical role in gaining new followers. The second leader of *Kadızedelis*, Üstüvani Mehmed Efendi (d. 1661), helped the movement to develop a more aggressive attitude against Sufis. Due to this aggressiveness, some members of the movement provoked murders and attacked against Sufis. This could be considered as the most notable characteristic of the second era *Kadızedelis*. The movement continued the aggressive attitude under the leadership of Vani Mehmed Efendi (d. 1685), who was efficient in political circles and the society. For instance, Sultan Mehmed IV (r. 1648-1687) was very loyal to Vani Efendi. The name of the region "Vaniköy," which was given by the Sultan himself, in Istanbul indicates the close ties between the political authority and the movement. Furthermore, Vani Efendi persuaded the sultan for the Second Siege of Vienna, that resulted in the defeat of the Ottomans. This caused the exile of Vani Efendi and brought the end of the *Kadızedeli* era.

The second chapter is devoted to Sufis. It includes the discussion of the life stories and views of key figures such as Abdülmecid Sivasi (d. 1639), Abdülahad Nuri (d. 1651) and Niyazi-i Mısri (1694), who were actively engaged in the polemics with *Kadızedelis*. Although the discussion of the Sufis is not as detailed as that of *Kadızedelis*, the quotations from Niyazi-i Mısri shows well the heated polemics and the huge hatred between these two groups. Niyazi-i Mısri was angry with both the *Kadızedelis* and the sultan; he lived in exile for years because of his attacks toward *Kadızedelis*. The reader would benefit to learn about the response of the *Kadızedelis* and the sultan to the attacks of Niyazi-i Mısri to keep tracks of the debates.

The previous examples clearly demonstrate that there was a political support to the *Kadızedelis*. However, we are not informed about the relationship between the palace and Sufis during this period. It is known that Ottoman sultans usually supported Sufis and Sufi orders. Although the recent scholarship paid special attention to the topic of Sufis and rulers in the Ottoman Empire, the book disregards to delve into it. This prevents us

from seeing the whole political picture and insinuates the idea that Ottoman rulers supported only the *Kadıızadelis*.

The third chapter is dedicated to the issues of conflict between these two groups. These include twenty issues, related to mundane daily life and some others, related to religious ritual practices. The *Kadıızadelis* attacked, for example, reading the Qur'an and call to prayer with melody, minarets in mosques, the usage of spoons and drinking coffee. Their reason for this was that they considered these practices as innovations (*bid'a*). According to Bilkan, the authorities, when confronted with finding solutions for new problems, different ways of living, ideas and habits, which were the cultural products of new geographies, selected the easiest way, *puritanism*, and attacked these as *bid'a* (p. 120). Bilkan also indicates that the topics of conflict were not new in the Islamic scholarship; for instance, Molla Lütüfi was murdered because of being the pioneer of rational sciences and constructing an observatory in 1492 (p. 146).

In the last chapter, Bilkan gives a short review of the views of some intellectuals of the period, namely respectively Katip Çelebi, Bahayi Efendi, Şeyhülislam Yahya, Solakzade Mehmed, Naima and Evliya Çelebi. The author does not mention whether those intellectual figures are the only ones who make a remark about the polemic in their writings or the author himself, intentionally selected only these figures but not the rest. This unstated detail gains importance when we see that most of those figures advocates Sufis and criticizes the *Kadıızadelis*. Thus, it is not possible to make a general conclusion about the attitude of the intellectuals toward the polemics. However, Bilkan states that intellectuals of the time were divided into two groups: those who supported Sufis and those who believed that both sides must be punished equally (p. 167).

There are two points, which I want to attract attention to, in the book. First, the author gives examples of various scholars such as Ahmet Yaşar Ocak and Naima who believes in *Kadıızadelis* as figures seeking to gain political control rather than concerned about religious matters. Nevertheless, on the basis of the details in the book, it is difficult to decide and be convinced about the given argument as regard the main intention of the *Kadıızadelis*. Secondly, as Bilkan complains about the historical repetitiveness of these debates, he successfully indicates with some concrete examples that these topics were discussed many times before. He asserts "what is interesting is that even the answers of those old topics are old as well." (p. 166) Therefore, the author remarks how old these re-emerging topics are and how much repetition was hidden within them. As he targets to fill the gap of absence of a comprehensive book in this issue, his endeavour is

worth to congratulate. He benefits from numerous primary and secondary sources and draws a general framework of the discussions. He approaches the issue from many different dimensions and gives the general framework to understand the *Kadızedeli-Sivasi* struggle in the Ottoman Empire during the seventeenth century.

**Mostafa Minawi. *The Ottoman Scramble for Africa: Empire and Diplomacy in the Sahara and the Hijaz.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2016. 219 sayfa.**

---

**Hatice Uğur**  
Leipzig Üniversitesi  
haticeugur@gmail.com

---

Ortadoğu ya da Yakın Doğu coğrafyaları üzerine yoğunlaşan Osmanlı tarihçilerinin yolu bir şekilde Osmanlı Afrika'sı'na çıkabiliyor. Özellikle imparatorluk tarihini küresel perspektiften ele almaya çalışan ve bu nedenle karmaşık ilişkiler ve sınır ötesi bağlantı ağları üzerinden iz süren tarihçiler kendilerini çoklukla araştırma konularının başladığı coğrafyadan başka bir yerde bulabiliyorlar. İmparatorluk içindeki yerel bir noktaya odaklanmışken, bazı açılardan araştırmanın başka bir yerel ağın sınırlarına girebilecek (translocal- transnational) bir nitelik kazanmış olması, aslında son dönemlerde tarih yazıcılığı alanında özellikle tercih edilen bir yaklaşım olarak karşımıza çıkıyor. Minawi'nin *The Ottoman Scramble for Africa* başlıklı çalışması da hem Osmanlı Arap hem de Osmanlı Afrika coğrafyalarının böyle bir perspektifle ele alınabileceğini gösteren ender çalışmalardan biri. Yazar, Şamlı Osmanlı memuru Sadık el-Müeyyed Azmzâde'nin biyografisi gibi mikro bir alanda çalışırken, kendi deyimiyle "pandoranın kutusu" açılır ve kendisini geç XIX. Yüzyıl Osmanlı tarihinin makro ölçekteki gelişmeleri ile paralel değerlendirmeler yaparken bulur. Bu çerçevede de eser bir "İmparatorluk biyografisi" olarak okunabilir.

Bir yandan Balkanlardaki Sırp ve Bulgar isyanları, Rusya ile girişilen 93 Harbi ve ağır sonuçları, öte yandan Batılı devletlerle imzalanan ve toprak