

THE BALANCE OF TRUTH

by

KĀTIB CHELEBI

Hacı Halifa

||

Translated with an Introduction
and Notes

by

G. L. LEWIS

LONDON

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LTD

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	page 7
I <i>The Author and his Work</i>	14
II <i>The Islamic Background</i>	21
THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE	21
I <i>The 'Life' of the Prophet Khidr</i>	33
II <i>Singing</i>	38
III <i>Dancing and Whirling</i>	42
IV <i>The Invoking of Blessings on Prophets and Companions</i>	47
V <i>Tobacco</i>	50
VI <i>Coffee</i>	60
VII <i>Laudanum, Opium, and Other Drugs</i>	63
VIII <i>The Parents of the Prophet</i>	65
IX <i>The Faith of Pharaoh</i>	75
X <i>The Controversy concerning Sheykh Muhyi'l-Dīn ibn 'Arabi</i>	80
XI <i>The Cursing of Yazīd</i>	84
XII <i>Innovation</i>	89
XIII <i>Pilgrimages to Tombs</i>	92
XIV <i>The Supererogatory Prayers</i>	97
XV <i>Shaking Hands</i>	101
XVI <i>Bowing</i>	103
XVII <i>Enjoining Right and Forbidding Wrong</i>	106
XVIII <i>The Religion of Abraham</i>	110
XIX <i>Bribery</i>	124
XX <i>The Controversy between Abu'l-Su'ūd Efendi and Birgili Mehmed Efendi</i>	128
XXI <i>The Controversy between Sivāsī and Qādizāde</i>	132
CONCLUSION	135
INDEX	157

INTRODUCTION

I. THE AUTHOR AND HIS WORK

Mustafā son of 'Abd Allāh was born in Istanbul in the month Dhu'l-Qa'da of the year 1017 of the Muslim era, corresponding to February 1609. His father was a Silāhdār, a swordbearer in the Imperial service, a pious man with a fondness for listening to learned disputations. When the boy was five or six years old, he was taught to read the Koran, half of which he learned by heart. He then studied Arabic grammar and calligraphy. When he was fourteen, his father inscribed him in his own Corps and secured him a clerical position. He accompanied him on several campaigns, the last being the unsuccessful attempt in 1625-6 to recover Baghdad from the Persians.

'I suffered hardships for nine months during the siege, from warring and fighting and from hopelessness, brought on by the dominance of drought and high prices and by the enemy's military superiority. But affliction is palatable when everyone shares it; such is the decree of the Almighty, the All-Knowing. When we returned, in despair and disappointment, and entered Mosul, my father died in Dhu'l-Qa'da 1035/ July-August 1626, being aged about sixty. . . . My uncle died also, a month later. I went with a relative to Diyarbakr and stayed there a while. Mehmed Kalfa, a friend of my father, made me an apprentice in the department known as the Office of Audit for the Cavalry.'

This information about the author's early years is extracted from the autobiographical sketch in his

Sullam al-wusūl. His own account of his later life will be found in the Conclusion to the present work.

In brief, after ten years with the Army, during which he went on five campaigns and undertook the arduous duty of the Pilgrimage, he turned 'from the lesser struggle to the greater', and settled down to study. Two fortunate inheritances freed him from the need to take his profession too seriously and gave him the leisure to indulge his omnivorous taste for reading. Consequently he did not rise above the rank of Second Clerk, *Khalīfa*, or, to give the word its colloquial pronunciation, *Kalfa*.

Having made the Pilgrimage, he was known to his office colleagues as Hajji Kalfa. The learned men with whom he spent most of his time called him Kātib Chelebi. *Kātib* means scribe, government clerk. *Chelebi*, a term whose etymology is still obscure, was a title given (a) in the early days of the Empire to the Sultan's sons, and (b) to men of learning who were not members of the hierarchy of the Ulema.

During the twenty-three years before his premature death, he wrote at least twenty-three books, besides shorter treatises and essays. He died in October 1657, peacefully and suddenly, while drinking a cup of coffee.

Living at a time when the Ottoman Empire had lost its ancient military supremacy *vis-à-vis* Europe, Kātib Chelebi was probably the first Turk to see that at least part of the blame lay with the inadequacy of the traditional Muslim education. The only schools were the *medreses*, the mosque-schools. Learning meant religious learning; what the Ulema did not know was not knowledge.

But learning, even in this narrow acceptance, was at a low ebb in the Ottoman Empire of the seventeenth century. Kochi Bey, the confidant of Sultan Murad IV

(r. 1623-40), wrote a celebrated memorandum on the causes of the Empire's weakness. In it he described how the Ulema had forfeited the love and veneration of the people by following worldly ambitions to the neglect of scholarship. 'If, instead of regarding ignorant and learned as equal, preferment were to be given to men of learning and wisdom, they would speedily regain their earlier standard. It is not right for appointments in the hierarchy to depend on the candidate's having influential friends: posts must be given to those who have the greatest learning. The proper qualification for the office of judge is neither age nor pedigree, but learning. Nowadays . . . they give that office to the old. In the sight of God, senility is not an essential qualification for a judge. Schools too should be entrusted to those capable of elucidating the minutiae of learning. It is an injustice to scholarship to prefer an ignoramus, just because he is old, to a scholar. So long as a candidate for office is learned and pious, it does not matter if he is a beardless youth.'

But our author's criticisms of the existing order in education were more radical. The new learning that had begun to change Europe had passed the Ottoman Empire by. Even the great names in Muslim science were held in little regard. It was in no spirit of impiety that he inveighed against those who held that the religious sciences were all that a man need know: he was a sincere Muslim. He combined a complete acceptance of Islam with adherence to the Illuminationist (*Ishrāqī*) philosophy. The doctrines of this school derived from Neoplatonism, known to the Muslim world since the early ninth century A.D. through the so-called *Theology of Aristotle* and other portions of an Arabic paraphrase of the latter half of the *Enneads* of Plotinus. The founder of the Illuminationist school, the

man who gave Neoplatonism a distinctive Islamic-mystical colouring, was Suhrawardī, killed at Aleppo by Saladin in 1191. Our author's remarks in his *Kashf al-zunūn* on Shīrāzī's commentary on Suhrawardī's *Hikmat al-ishrāq* are worth quoting, both as evidence of his loyalty to his religion and to his philosophy, and as a sample of his pungent style: 'It has been said that this book contains certain statements that cannot be reconciled with the sacred law. I say that those who hold this view are perhaps incapable of reconciling them with the sacred law. They should not say, because they are incapable of doing it, that it is impossible.'

His criteria for the acceptability of a doctrine were Islamic. If it violated the principles of Islam, he rejected it. There is nothing in the law to condemn onomancy: his belief in onomancy is demonstrated in the Conclusion to this book. On the other hand, although he studied the mathematical side of astrology, he rejected the notion of foretelling events from it, because of traditions showing that the Prophet disapproved of this.

In matters on which the law is silent, his reason did not always guide him rightly. Here is his note on the 'Science of Disappearing' (*khafā'*) in the *Kashf al-zunūn*: 'It is a science from which one may learn how to make oneself vanish from the sight of the beholders, so that you can see them without their seeing you. Abu'l-Khayr mentions it as a branch of the science of magic, saying, "There are incantations and charms for it, but I rather think that it is not possible except to saints, as a miracle, and is not to be procured by physical means." I say that it is a science, a branch of magic, not a prerogative of saints, so he has no reason to "rather think" it impossible. For it is indubitably

possible by magic, indeed by incantations and charms too, as its practitioners claim. Invisibility is no proof of non-existence.'

It is largely on the *Kashf al-zunūn* that his fame rests. It is a vast bibliographical dictionary, in Arabic, and is still one of the research-tools of the Orientalist. Kātib Chelebi, working in the days before printed catalogues, simply made notes about all the books he had personally examined. They amount to close on fifteen thousand separate titles.

His other famous work is the *Jihānnumā*, which he thus describes in the *Kashf al-zunūn*: 'A Turkish book on geography, by the compiler of this dictionary. It is in two parts: the first on the seas, their configurations and their islands; the second on the land, its countries, rivers, mountains, and roads, in alphabetical order, with an account of the new lands discovered since the ninth century of the Hijra' (15th century A.D.).

The use of Western sources was essential to the completion of such a work, and Kātib Chelebi had been fortunate enough to meet 'Sheykh Mehmed Efendi Ikhlēsi', a former French priest turned Muslim, 'who was acquainted with the laws of the science of geography and well-versed in the Latin tongue.' This man had come to Turkey in order to study Islam for the purpose of confuting it. He had however been converted on reading verse 46 of the eleventh sura of the Koran: 'And it was said, "O Earth, swallow up thy water" and "O Heaven, desist!" And the water abated, and the decree was fulfilled, and the Ark settled upon al-Jūdī. And it was said, "Avaunt, ye tribe of evil-doers!"' The compelling power of this verse has been recorded in the case of other converts.

With Sheykh Mehmed's help, Kātib Chelebi completed his task. It was a landmark in Ottoman scholar-

ship and inspired several imitators. Its importance in opening Muslim eyes to the knowledge of the West cannot be overestimated.

The Balance of Truth was the author's last work, completed in November 1656. It consists of a number of essays on controversial points of Islamic doctrine and practice, and the largely autobiographical Conclusion. The constant theme of the book is the futility of trying to force people to abandon practices which, while not justifiable according to the strict letter of the law, do not seriously conflict with it either, and have become rooted in custom. It breathes a spirit of liberalism and good sense, enlivened with a mordant humour. The author is never afraid of speaking his mind: if he thinks that a Sheykh al-Islam is exhibiting raving lunacy, or if some other distinguished person is talking like a pompous prig or a gibbering idiot, he says so.

The Sheykh al-Islam 'Abd al-Rahīm Efendi was a close friend of his and publicly pronounced his approval of the book. Yet at least one part of it was capable of offending pious opinion over two centuries later: Chapter Eight, which gives a positive answer to the old question of whether the parents of the Prophet were infidels, was omitted from Ebuzziya's edition of 1888-9. The reason was partly that the orthodox view on the subject had changed since Kātib Chelebi's time, partly that the circle of literates had enlarged, to include many of the 'ordinary folk' who, the author always insisted, ought not to express themselves on learned matters beyond their comprehension.

The Balance of Truth is an uneven book: the author incorporated in it one or two of his essays, notably the long chapter on the 'Religion of Abraham', which could perhaps have done with pruning. But I have not presumed to prune it: the succinct curse which the

author calls down in his *Jihānnumā* on any scribe who may distort his work ('God punish him, and distort his life and his fortune') shows clearly that he would not have approved. Towards faults in the translation he would have been more tolerant; witness his words in the *Kashf al-zunūn*: 'The majority of books dealing with natural philosophy, metaphysics, and mathematics, are not Islamic but Greek and Latin, for the bulk of these have remained in the lands of the Christians and have not been translated into Arabic, with very rare exceptions. Nor have those that have been translated retained their original significance, because of the abundant distortions that occur through defective translation: this is an established fact in rendering books from one language to another. I have personal experience of this, having observed it when I was engaged in translating the *Atlas* and other works from Latin into Turkish.'

As the basis of my text I have taken the printed edition of Ebuzziya (Abu'l-Diyā), published in Istanbul in 1306/1888-9, collating it, and for Chapter Eight supplementing it, with the British Museum manuscript Add. 7904.

I have on occasion slightly expanded the author's words in order to avoid multiplying the notes. For the same reason I have inserted the Gregorian equivalents of all Hijrī dates, and references for Koranic quotations (in Fluegel's numbering).

Turkish words and names of Arabic origin have been transcribed as Arabic except (a) those which have accepted forms in English and (b) those whose transliteration would give no idea of their Turkish pronunciation: Mehmed not Muhammad; Kazasker not Qādī-i 'Askar. There is no hope of attaining a generally acceptable uniformity in the transliteration of Ottoman

Turkish; I feel that Kātib Chelebi would not have been over-harsh with my attempt at a compromise. 'Well, it is not the sort of thing to make him a rebel against God, and a sinner. There is no harm in it.'

II. THE ISLAMIC BACKGROUND

A. The science of the sacred law (*shari'a*) of Islam is divided into the studies of *usūl* and *furū'*, roots and branches.

(a) The roots of the law are four in number:

(1) Koran (*Qur'ān*), the Word of God as revealed to the Prophet Muhammad (d. 632).

(2) Tradition (*hadīth*), the oral transmission of the reminiscences of those who had known the Prophet, the 'Companions', about his sayings and doings. The body of precedents thus established is the *Sunna* ('practice'). There are three categories of *Sunna*:

(i) *Sunnat al-qawl*, that which the Prophet is reported to have enjoined.

(ii) *Sunnat al-fi'l*, that which he is reported to have done.

(iii) *Sunnat al-taqrīr*, things said or done by others with the Prophet's knowledge, which he is not reported to have disapproved.

The most renowned collection of *hadīth* is the *Sahīh* of Bukhārī (d. 870). But even after the corpus of tradition had been reduced to writing, the oral transmission of *hadīth* remained the rule: the right way to learn traditions was to hear them recited and expounded, not just to read them. Cf. pp. 140-1.

- (3) Analogy (*qiyās*): the Koran forbids the drinking of wine; so it is clear by *qiyās* that other intoxicants are equally forbidden. See also p. 55.
- (4) Consensus (*ijmā'*). The juridical basis for this is the following tradition: 'God has preserved you from three things. Your Prophet has not cursed you that you might be entirely lost; impostors shall not triumph over the speakers of truth among you; and you shall never fall together into a false doctrine.' Theoretically, the consensus is that of the learned, not of the common people. In practice, the 'consensus of the learned' has been used to ratify non-Islamic and even pagan practices which were too much a part of the ordinary man's life to be eradicated.
- (b) The branches are the systematic treatment of the several categories of practical law.

B. The Five Pillars of Islam. The five duties of the Muslim:

- (1) The recitation at least once in a lifetime of the profession of faith (*shahāda*): 'I testify that there is no god but Allah; Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.'
- (2) To pray five times a day. The midday prayer on Friday should be performed in congregation at a mosque, the other prayers may be performed at home or elsewhere.

We speak of performing rather than of saying the prayer, because it involves a number of motions of the body as well as the recitation of set formulae. Each of the five daily prayers consists of from two to four *rak'as*, a *rak'a* being a series of motions: first standing erect, then bowing, standing, prostration 'on the seven

members'—i.e. with the forehead, hands, knees, and feet touching the ground—then sitting on the heels, then another prostration. The congregation takes the time from the *Imām*, the prayer-leader.

At the Friday prayer, two addresses are delivered. The first, called the *khutba*, is a more or less set recital of praises of the Prophet and prayers for the reigning sovereign. It is delivered by a *Khatīb*. The other is the *wa'z*, a sermon composed and delivered by a *Wā'iz*.

The call to prayer, the *ezan* (*adhān*), is recited from the minaret by the muezzin (*mu'adhdhin*). In a small mosque the Imam may combine all these functions. Large mosques may have several muezzins, and during the service they chant the responses to the utterances of the Imam, the congregation remaining silent except to say *āmin* (Amen) in the appropriate places.

- (3) Almsgiving.
- (4) Fasting during the daylight hours of Ramadān, the ninth lunar month.
- (5) Pilgrimage to Mecca once in a lifetime, for those financially and physically capable.

To these five, some jurists would add that of *Jihād*, the holy war against infidels if they reject a summons to accept Islam. It is however a duty of the community, not of the individual, and it may be undertaken only if there is a reasonable chance of its success.

C. The five categories of action. Islamic law places every action in one of five categories:

- (1) Obligatory; the one who does them is rewarded, the one who neglects them is punished.
- (2) Recommended; the doer is rewarded but there is no punishment for neglect.

- (3) Permitted; legally indifferent.
- (4) Disapproved; but not punishable.
- (5) Forbidden under penalty.

D. Sunnite and Shiite. The great schism in Islam was over the question of who was to be the successor (*khalīfa*, 'Caliph') of the Prophet in his functions as leader of the people in prayer (Imam), as arbitrator in their disputes, and as military commander. His function as God's Messenger could not be assumed by anyone else: Muhammad is the last, the seal of the prophets.

The first four Caliphs (with the dates of their accession) were Abū Bakr (632), 'Umar (634), 'Uthmān (644), and 'Alī (656). Although there were quarrels and dissensions enough during their time, it seemed in retrospect, to those afflicted by the convulsions of the later Islamic world, to have been a Golden Age. These four men are consequently known as the *Khulafā' Rāshidūn*, the Rightly-Guided Caliphs.

In 661, the Caliphate was wrested from 'Alī by Mu'āwīya, the Governor of Syria, and it remained in the Umayyad dynasty, which he founded, until 750, when it passed to the 'Abbāsīd house. The Mongol conquest of Baghdad in 1258 put an end to the Caliphate as a political force, but the title was later revived by the Ottoman Sultans, as the effective rulers of the largest Muslim community.

But from the first there was a party who thought that the caliphate belonged of right to 'Alī, the Prophet's cousin and son-in-law, and to his descendants. This party, the *Shī'at 'Alī* (partisans of 'Alī) or 'Shiites', regarded and still regard the orthodox caliphs before and after 'Alī as usurpers. The orthodox majority, professing to be the only true followers of Muhammad, call themselves *Ahl al-Sunna*, the people of the Sunna, 'Sunnites'.

Shiites now form half the population of Iraq and almost the entire population of Persia.

E. The Four Schools. The task of building a complete system of law on the basis of the Koran, which was not designed as a legal manual and does not provide for all the contingencies of daily life, was carried out by a large number of scholars, who grouped themselves in various schools (*madhhab*, plural *madhāhib*). Among the Sunnites there are four schools of interpretation which had absorbed all their rivals by the early part of the fourteenth century. They are listed below, with the names of their founders and the main places where each predominates.

- (1) Hanafite: Abū Hanīfa (d. 767). Turkey, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, U.S.S.R.
- (2) Malikite: Mālik ibn Anas (d. 795). Upper Egypt, Sudan, North Africa, West Africa.
- (3) Shafiite: Shāfi'i (d. 820). Lower Egypt, Hejaz, Aden, Indonesia, Malaya.
- (4) Hanbalite: Ahmed ibn Hanbal (d. 855). Saudi Arabia.

These schools are not sects. Their interpretations of the will of God, which differ only on points of detail, are all equally valid and orthodox. Every Sunnite belongs by birth to one of the four, but it is legitimate to transfer allegiance from one to another.

F. *Ijtihād, Mujtahid*. The former word means 'striving'. As a technical term, it means the right of an eminent doctor of the law to follow his own judgment, on the basis of the Koran and Traditions, in arriving at the rules of law. Such a scholar is called *mujtahid*. The founders of the Four Schools were all *mujtahid*, as were certain early members of the schools. But by the

beginning of the tenth century it was decided that there were no matters outstanding on which agreement had not been reached: 'The Gate of *Ijtihād* was closed'. Since that time, it has not been permissible for any Muslim to go back to the Koran and Traditions in order to formulate new law. He can not go over the head of those who were *mujtahid* in the school of law which he follows. See, however, p. 55(6).

G. Ulema, Mufti, Sheykh al-Islam. The first of these words is an anglicised form of the Arabic '*Ulamā*', those who know, scholars. There is no ordination and no sacraments in Islam: the privilege of interpreting the law as formulated by the *Mujtahids* of old belongs to the Ulema; those who have had a training in the religious sciences. That is what is intended in the tradition 'The Ulema are the heirs of the Prophets'.

In the Ottoman Empire, the Ulema were a closely organized body with great influence and power. The Sultan's edicts and laws (*qānūn*) had, in theory, to be in harmony with the sacred law, and it was the job of the Ulema to show that they were. Not that their approval was to be taken for granted: there were occasions when a courageous member of the Ulema would defy the Sultan's wishes if they conflicted with the sacred law. Proposed legislation was always submitted to a mufti (*muftī*), a jurisconsult, who had to decide whether it was lawful. His reply was called a *fatwā*. The chief mufti of the capital had the title of Sheykh al-Islām, the Elder of Islam, and he was the head of the hierarchy. Immediately under him came the two Kazaskers (*qādi-i 'askar*), Judges of the Army, and below them were ranged all the judges (*qādi*), muftis, teachers, and other members of the learned profession.

H. The Orders. In addition to the official Islam of the Ulema, there is the Sufism of the Dervish Orders. Sufism is an ascetic and mystical movement within Islam, whose adherents practice poverty and are therefore called 'poor' (Persian *dervīsh*, Arabic *faqīr*). The pillars of their practice are *tawakkul*, reliance on God, and *dhikr*, mindfulness of God, the latter taking the form of religious exercises. Each Order has its characteristic method of *dhikr*, ranging from the stately cyclic dance of the Mevlevīs to the howling and self-mutilation of the Rufā'īs. The Orders are outlawed in modern Turkey.

THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE

In the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful.

Praise be to God, who made intelligence a proof in His creation, thereby reinforcing the revealed Law as a means of distinguishing between falsehood and His truth. And the blessing and the peace on Muhammad, who was sent with the miraculous and surpassing report and the perfect intelligence, and on his family and his Companions, so long as disputations continue in the gatherings of the eminent in learning.

Since the beginning of creation it has been acknowledged among the wise that intelligence and tradition are like a pair of twins, while the reports of intelligence and tradition are like two race-horses, and that logical proof is a staircase and a ladder to the heights of certainty, so that in matters of inquiry and speculation it is the basis of all men's speech and the referee of all things. Some men there are who, seduced by the Slinking Whisperer,¹ have laid aside proof and through ignorance and folly have deliberately set up surmise and conjecture as a rival to proof. In more questions than one they have fallen victim to the diseases of contention and vain bigotry. Like the fanatical wars in olden time, the futile wrangling of these stupid people has well-nigh led to bloodshed. For this reason these few lines have been drafted in order to demonstrate the method of proof in the questions at issue, and the name *Mizān al-haqq fi'khtiyār al-ahaqq* ('The Balance of Truth in Choosing the Most True') has been given to them, so that ordinary people may know what the

matters of strife and dispute are, and what manner of fruit they yield.

Prologue: On the Need for the Rational Sciences. The seeker after truth should understand that the ultimate referent of human knowledge, whether existent or non-existent, is absolutely unknowable: the intellect does not proceed in that direction.

If the existent is absolutely free from matter, investigation relating to that class of thing is called Theology: its branches are numerous. The investigator is either philosopher or dogmatic theologian.

If the existent dispenses with matter in the mind, but needs matter externally, the study of it is termed Mathematics. Its fundamentals are fourfold: the sciences of Arithmetic, Astronomy, Geometry, and Music. Each of these has many branches.

If the existent should absolutely need matter, both in the intellect and externally, they call that class of study Natural Science.² This science too has many branches.

All the speculative and rational sciences belong to one or other of these divisions. They are studied by the method of thought and speculation: for the sake of avoiding error in thought, men have formulated the law of deduction and speculation, and have named it the science of testing, and the science of logic. It is the balance and the touchstone of the sciences. As the great scholar the Sayyid the Sharīf Jurjānī³ says, no one will respect or rely on the knowledge of any scholar whose learning does not stand the test of this balance and touchstone. For this reason, most seekers after truth have held it to be essential. The science of logic is not sought after for its own sake, but as a means and an instrument for attaining knowledge. Since the

beginning of creation, it has been the pivot of the essential, true, and exact sciences amongst all peoples and nations.

The truths to which we are referring are the sciences of things. For the most part, the subjects mentioned in the revealed Books and the sacred sciences accord and coincide with the topics of these sciences, but in numerous instances there is a discrepancy between them. The Christian community have therefore rejected philosophy, whereas the Muslims have composed an answer to it, with subtlety, and have not rejected it outright.⁴ Those who study such things will understand these matters.

Now the sacred sciences, which in this age are the goal of Islamic learning, are divided into two classes. They are either sought after for their own sake, or as a means to the acquisition of such as are sought after for their own sake. We call the latter class the Arab sciences and the disciplinary sciences and the ancillary sciences, for they are not sought after for their own sake. Directly dependent on them is the discipline of study and, indirectly, the discipline of self. They treat of Arabic modes of expression. They are well known to be twelve in number, as is stated in the books of postulates.⁵

The sciences which are sought after for their own sake are distinguished one from another by their subjects. The science whose subject is the Word of God is the science of interpretation and the variant readings of the Koran, with its branches. That whose subject is the Word of the Apostle of God (God bless him and give him peace) is the science of tradition, with its branches.

The science which derives from these two and from subjects connected with them, and whose topics relate

simply to dogma, is the science of scholastic theology (*kalām*). Latter-day scholars have lumped philosophical questions in with this science, because, as the great Sa'd al-Dīn has said in his commentary on the *Maqāsid*, 'many writers have thereby found an escape from their difficulties'.⁶

If the science relates not solely to dogma but to practice, it is the science of law (*usūl wa-furū'*) and its related sciences of inducement and deterrent.

As was mentioned above, the intellectual and philosophical sciences have become involved in these sciences. The man who has no share in those sciences cannot become proficient in these.

Now let us come to the root of that denial of science which is so prevalent among the people.

In the beginning of Islam, the Companions of the Prophet applied themselves to the Book and the Sunna which they had received from him and handed on, and permitted no work on the sciences apart from a thorough grounding in the principles of the Faith. They showed the utmost rigour in prohibiting. 'Umar even went so far as to have many thousands of Greek books burned, at the conquest of Cairo and Alexandria, lest the people should neglect for them the memorizing of the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet of God, and the principles of the Faith be not so firmly rooted.⁷ Such was their view of the public interest, in the first generation. In the second and third generations, those who had known the Companions and were *mujtahid* codified the traditions they had handed down. They derived the Divine Ordinances, on the basis of the Roots and Branches, with legal proofs; they wrote them down and formulated them. After the Islamic sciences had been codified, and protected and safeguarded against any possible corruption, the leaders

of the Muslims realised that the first generation's prohibition had been for this very purpose. The danger once eliminated, this purpose was no longer valid. In the Umayyad and 'Abbāsīd periods, the prevailing view was that it was important for Muslims to know the science of the truth of things. Hence they translated the books of the ancient peoples into Arabic.

In every age, men of sound natural judgement and straight mind have not failed to read and study them. In every age, the works of scholars who have devoted themselves to both philosophy and sacred law have been widely known and esteemed and sought after. The great divines and scholars, the Imam Ghazālī, the Imam Fakhr al-Dīn Rāzī, the learned 'Adud al-Dīn and his followers, the Qādī Baydāwī, the learned Shīrāzī, and Qutb al-Dīn Rāzī and Sa'd al-Dīn Taftazānī, and the Sayyid the Sharīf Jurjānī and their learned follower Jalāl Dawwānī, and their disciples, reached the heights of study and investigation and did not confine themselves to one branch of knowledge only.⁸

But many unintelligent people, seeing that the transmission of these sciences had once been banned, remained as inert as rocks, frozen in blind imitation of the ancients. Without deliberation or consideration of the truth of the matter, they rejected and repudiated the new sciences. They passed for learned men, while all the time they were ignoramuses, fond of disparaging what they called 'the philosophical sciences', and knowing nothing of earth or sky. The admonition 'Have they not contemplated the Kingdom of Heaven and Earth?' (Kor. 7:184) made no impression on them: they thought 'contemplating' the world and the firmament meant staring at them like a cow.

From the beginning of the Ottoman Empire till the time of the late Sultan Suleyman,⁹ whose abode is

Paradise, scholars who combined the study of the sacred sciences with that of philosophy were held in high renown.

The Conqueror, Sultan Mehmed, had built the Eight Colleges, and had written in his *waqfiya* 'Let work be carried on in accordance with the *qānūn*', and had appointed lessons in the 'Notes on the *Tajrīd*' and the 'Commentary on the *Mawāqif*',¹⁰ Those who came after put a stop to these lessons, as being 'philosophy', and thought it reasonable to give lessons on the *Hidāya* and *Akmal*.¹¹ But as restriction to these was not reasonable, neither philosophy nor *Hidāya* and *Akmal* was left. Thereupon the market for learning in Rūm (Turkey) slumped, and the men of learning were nigh to disappearing. Then the novices of scholars who were working 'in accordance with the *qānūn*' in some outlying places, here and there in the land of the Kurds, came to Rūm and began to give themselves tremendous airs. Seeing them, some capable men in our time became students of philosophy. As a student, I, the humble writer of these lines, in the course of discussion and study, was encouraged by some men of talent, as Plato was encouraged by Socrates, to acquire knowledge of the truths of things.

In this treatise I have mentioned and set forth several topics, by way of advice and counsel to all, so that they may strive to acquire as far as possible whatever absolute knowledge there may be. It will certainly prove necessary on some occasion; there is no harm in learning. Let them not censure and disapprove, for decrying a thing leads to estrangement from it and deprivation thereof.

First Topic. The fetwa of the mufti who is a geometer and of the mufti who is not. A man hired another for

check! in Turkish
Kutub is no

eight aspers, to dig a well, in length and breadth and depth four cubits. He dug a well whose length, breadth, and depth were two cubits, and demanded four aspers. They sought a fetwa. The mathematician-mufti gave this fetwa: 'His due is one asper.' And this is right, for a well two cubits each way is one-eighth of the required well.

Second Topic. The judgement of the geometer-qādī and of the qādī ignorant of geometry. A man sold another a field, one hundred cubits square. At the time of handing it over, he gave him instead two fields, each fifty cubits square. A dispute arose between them and they went to a qādī who knew no geometry. His verdict was: 'This is his due.' Subsequently they found a geometer-qādī, and let him hear the suit. 'It is half of his due', said he. And this is the right of it. Anyone who wishes to know the principle involved may care to study mathematics.

Third Topic. The sage Baydāwī, in his commentary on the Koranic verse 'And for the moon We have appointed mansions' (36:39), after explaining about the 28 mansions of the moon, says, 'The moon takes up its station every night in one of them, without missing the mark or falling short of it.' If the moon came to every mansion at the same hour, this account would be correct, but it is not so. Sometimes it moves in the middle of the night from one mansion to the next; sometimes it shifts to two mansions in one night. To every mansion there is a definite area of roughly 13 degrees, whereas the moon's nightly journey is now 11 and now 15 degrees. Those who wish to learn the principle involved may look into the sciences of astrology and astronomy.

There is another matter, the Rampart of Alexander.

In Baydāwī's commentary on the verse 'between the two barriers' (18:92), it is explained as being between the mountains of Armenia and Azerbaijan, which would put it in the region of Tabriz. This is not in accordance with the facts. Anyone who wishes for the knowledge to verify this may study the science of geography.

Fourth Topic. While engaged in the study of mathematics, three problems occurred to me. Regarding them as problems in jurisprudence, I asked for a fetwa from the then Sheykh al-Islam, Bahā'ī Efendi.¹² No answer was forthcoming. After I had composed a treatise containing an exposition of the problems, he wrote an answer to one of the three. This answer, in the Sheykh al-Islam's own handwriting, turned up in the possession of Sheykhzāde Efendi, the official responsible for reviewing and issuing fetwas. It was a piece of raving lunacy. I transcribed it and appended it verbatim to that treatise, under the heading 'Correction of Answer'. He who wishes may see the treatise. The problems are these:

- (1) Is the rising of the sun in the west reconcilable with the laws of astronomy?¹³
- (2) How does one perform the five daily prayers and keep the Fast in places where there are six months of daylight and six months of night?
- (3) Is there any place other than Mecca where the *qibla* can be any of the four directions?¹⁴

So you see that men of ability should make great efforts to understand abstract thought and mathematics, so that one may not be full of surmise and uncertainty on the road of speculation, and end up a misguided ass.

Admonition. Next, it is a fact that when disputation and

disagreement on any topic have once arisen among a people, it is not possible, even after they have reached agreement, for that disputation and disagreement to be entirely eradicated. If a warrior silences one side with force and conquest, it will not remain silent; it escapes and goes on its way. Now the purpose of the present work is to provide a test for men of ability, and a demonstration of the methods of deduction and disputation. For the rest, 'the masses are asses'; who cares about *their* discussions and disputations?

It must also be known that mankind, ever since the time of Adam, has been divided. Every division has its own tenets and its own mode of behaviour, which seem at variance with those of other divisions. As God Almighty says, 'Every party rejoices in its own' (Kor. 23:55): they all like their own ways and prefer them to any others. But after all, some men are intelligent: they ponder and observe the inner purpose of this divergence and find that many advantages underlie it, and they will not interfere with or attack anybody's tenets or code. If these seem wrong in the light of their own religion, they content themselves with disapproving of them silently in their own hearts. Other men are gibbering fools: they do not comprehend the inner purpose of divergence and hold the absurd notion that all mankind ought to share one creed and one code of behaviour. Although unprovoked contention in matters of religion is forbidden, they fall into the toils of interference and aggression, and will not leave well alone. It cannot be; they give themselves trouble to no avail.

Now the purpose of civilization and society, which is essential for mortals, demands that men of vision should acquire knowledge and become acquainted with the division of mankind into various sorts, and

with the state and condition of every part. After gaining acquaintance with the classes of city-folk and the manners and customs of every class, they should strive to acquire an outline knowledge of the nations of the inhabitants of the habitable quarter of the earth, and of their condition. Thereafter the secret of the purpose of civilization is gradually revealed; by degrees it becomes known that those who practise that kind of dispute and contention are as weak and as powerless as flies fallen into the spider's web.

NOTES TO PREFACE

¹ The Slinking Whisperer is Satan. The phrase is taken from Sura 114 of the Koran: 'Say, I take refuge with the Lord of men, the King of men, the God of men, from the mischief of the slinking whisperer who whispers in the hearts of men; from jinn and men.'

² For this threefold division of the sciences, compare Khwarazmī's *Mafātih al-'Ulūm* (written circa A.D. 980; ed. G. van Vloten, Leyden, 1895) p. 132: 'Speculative science is divided into three parts: one which investigates things possessing substance and matter, called 'natural science'; one which investigates things outside substance and matter, called 'divinity', or in Greek 'theologia'; and one which investigates not things possessing matter but things existing in matter, such as measurements, shapes, motions, and the like, called 'mathematics'.

³ 'Alī ibn Muhammad al-Jurjānī (1339-1413), a renowned writer on, *inter alia*, grammar, logic, and *kalām* (see next note). Author of a famous commentary on the *Mawāqif* of Ījī (see note 8). His titles *Sayyid* and *Sharīf* indicate respectively that his ancestors included Hasan and Husayn, the grandsons of the Prophet.

⁴ To the ordinary Muslim, 'philosophy', *falsafa*, con-

notes free-thinking. The 'answer' which the Muslims have composed to it is scholastic theology, *kalām*, the exponents of which are called *mutakallim*.

⁵ For the classification of the sciences, see J. Heyworth-Dunne, *An Introduction to the History of Education in Modern Egypt* (Luzac, 1938), pp. 41-2, 78.

⁶ Sa'd al-Dīn Mas'ūd ibn 'Umar al-Taftazānī (1322-89) wrote on law, tradition, grammar, logic, and *kalām*. He himself wrote the commentary on his own *Maqāsid*, a manual of *kalām*.

⁷ Alexandria was finally conquered by the Arabs in A.D. 646, during the caliphate of 'Umar. It is surprising that the author repeats the late fiction of the burning of the books.

⁸ On Ghazālī (1059-1111), greatest of Muslim theologians, who found a place within orthodoxy for the mystical experiences of the Sufis, see A. J. Arberry, *Sufism* (Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West, 1950), especially pp. 79-83, where a skeleton analysis is given of his *Ihyā' 'ulūm al-dīn*, 'Revival of the Religious Sciences'. A full analysis will be found in G. H. Bousquet, *Ih'ya' 'Ouloūm ed-Dīn: Analyse et index* (Paris, 1955).

Fakhr al-Dīn Muhammad ibn 'Umar al-Rāzī (1149-1209), author of a famous commentary on the Koran, and numerous works on mysticism and *kalām*.

'Adud al-Dīn 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Ahmad al-Ījī (d. 1355), author of the *Mawāqif*, on *kalām*.

Nāsir al-Dīn Abū Sa'id 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar al-Baydāwī of Shiraz (d.? 1286), author of *Anwār al-tanzīl*, the most popular Koran-commentary, as well as works on grammar, law, and *kalām*.

Qutb al-Dīn Mahmūd ibn Mas'ūd al-Shīrāzī (1236-1311), physician, astronomer, philosopher, and collector of traditions.

Qutb al-Dīn Muhammad ibn Muhammad al-Rāzī al-Tahtānī (1295-1364), wrote an unfinished Koran-commentary, and several works on *kalām*, law, and logic.

Jalāl al-Dīn Muhammad ibn As'ad al-Dawwānī al-

Siddīqī (1427-1501), Qādī of Fars, wrote on dogmatics, mysticism, and philosophy.

⁹ Sultan Suleymān Qānūnī, 'The Codifier' ('Soliman the Magnificent'), r. 1520-66.

¹⁰ Sultan Mehmed II (r. 1451-81), the conqueror of Constantinople, established and endowed eight schools (*Medāris-i Semāniye*) in the precincts of his mosque, and laid down regulations, *qānūn*, for their working.

A *waqfiya* is a document establishing a *waqf*, an endowment in perpetuity for a pious purpose.

The *Tajrīd al-kalām* is a famous treatise on dogmatics by Nasīr al-Dīn Muhammad ibn Muhammad al-Tūsī (1201-74), a Shiite politician, philosopher, mathematician, and astronomer, who founded the observatory at Marāgha in Azerbaijan for the Mongol conqueror of Baghdad, Hūlāgū. Dozens of commentaries were written on his *Tajrīd*. The 'Notes' here mentioned, like the Commentary on the *Mawāqif*, were the work of Jurjānī.

¹¹ The *Hidāya* is the standard manual of Hanafite law, by Burhān al-Dīn 'Alī ibn Abī Bakr al-Marghīnānī of Fergana (d. 1197).

The *Akmal al-atwal* is a Koran-commentary by Najm al-Dīn 'Umar ibn Muhammad al-Nasafī of Samarkand (1069-1142).

¹² Bahā'ī Mehmed Efendi (b. 1004/1595-6) was Sheykh al-Islam from 1649 to 1651 and again from 1652 till his death in 1654.

¹³ It is believed that the rising of the sun in the West will be one of the Signs of the Hour, the precursors of the Judgment. See A. J. Wensinck, *The Muslim Creed* (Cambridge, 1932), p. 197: '. . . the rising of the sun from the place where it sets, . . . as well as the other eschatological signs according to the description thereof in authentic Tradition, are a reality that will take place' (part of Article 29 of the *Fiqh akbar II*: see below, note 6 to Chapter Eight).

¹⁴ The *qibla* is the direction Muslims face when praying, towards the Ka'ba, the shrine at Mecca.

THE 'LIFE' OF THE PROPHET KHIDR¹

First, although the meaning of the terms 'life' and 'death' is plain and a matter of common knowledge, let us explain it here for the sake of completeness. Life, then, is the possession by an ensouled being of the attributes of breathing, feeling, and motion. Having the attribute of life, the ensouled being is also called a living thing. Because the beings which exist with this attribute are material, their original matter is composed and compounded of the four elements and principles of the universe. The constitution exhibited by every being is an intermingling of subjugation and being subjugated, of action and passion. After the mixture is produced, there is a state of readiness for life, and in the Bountiful there is no niggardliness.

The Bountiful Source gives soul. Thereby the body gains life and begins to feel and to move. The constitutions of the different kinds of living thing are various. The best-balanced constitution of all is that of man, which is at the centre of the whole range of constitutions.

The length of days of every species varies with its constitution. This they call the natural life. A constitution, being compounded of conflicting elements, cannot remain permanently in one form; symptoms of disharmony between the constituents, which are of varying natures, are bound to appear in it. The symptoms of disharmony are found at three stages. The first stage they call the time of growth, the second the

time of stasis, the third the decline. In these stages, the physical powers, which are a product of the constitution, are in different states. Moreover, the active and passive qualities, which are the mainstay of the constitution and produce the innate heat and the innate moisture, pass during these stages from strength to weakness; independently of any external influence, the innate heat is constantly annihilating the innate moisture, which forms the material of life and the animal spirit.

True, it is replenished by the moisture produced through the replacement of waste by means of food, but at the end of the years of decline there is little left of the innate moisture and it becomes insufficient to receive and accept external replenishment. Then life is at an end, and feeling and motion and breathing depart, and in that condition the living thing is characterized by the attribute of death; the attribute of life is gone. So it is proved that death is by nature inevitable for the living thing, and is of the class of unavoidable.

The categories of genus and species are common to all individuals and comprehend them all; they do not differ in anyone, unless a miracle is claimed, outside the order of nature, as in the case of the Prophet Jesus (peace be upon him). Such a claim needs the proof of a decisive scriptural text. It is incontestable, according to the rules of disputation, that no matter of certainty can be validly contradicted on the basis of one single story plus supposition.

Now if by the 'life' of Khidr we are to understand the sloughing of mortality and joining the ranks of the spiritual beings, the kind of evidence submitted in respect of him, as in the case of Jesus, may give validity to the claim. But Khidr must then be in the same state as Jesus was when he was raised up. Jesus held no

physical association or converse with the sons of his own kind, and no more could Khidr do so. Association and converse necessitate another claim, which demolishes the former claim.²

Someone may ask, Then are these people liars? What is behind these legends?

The honoured Sheykhhs of the mystic Orders have much traffic and commerce with the unseen world and many dealings with the realm of the spiritual, such as are not afforded to men of lower degree. Compare the words of Mahmūd Efendi of Scutari (God's mercy on him) in his *Jāmi' al-fadā'il* ('The Compendium of Virtues'):³

'Some mystics, when in a state of purity, see the dead before their eyes. A certain dervish relates: At the beginning of my spiritual progress I was in Bursa. In our quarter there lived one of the muezzins of the mosque of Mevlānā al-Fanārī. One day he died, and many days later, as I was going to see my Sheykh after the dawn prayer, I met that muezzin on the way, in the company of a person unknown to me. It was snowing, so I gave him greeting and went on. Later I told the story to my Sheykh, who said, "This is because you have been disciplining yourself for several days"—for at that period my diet was dry bread. Then the Sheykh said, "I myself once met one of the dead, in a street above the fish-market in Bursa."'

Sheykhhs, in the early stages of their spiritual progress, tame the young bull, which is the wilful soul, by arduous discipline, to such an extent that they see with the eyes of the spirit while in the world of bodies. So says the saint I have just mentioned, in his book:

'When one of their friends or loved ones has died, they may meet him some time later at the door of the hermitage, and give him greeting. On entering the cell

of a certain saint, one said to him, in wonderment, "I have seen the late Father So-and-so! He came out of your presence and went away!" The reply was, "My son, you have mastered your soul by discipline and this is the result. I myself have occasionally gone to the market and on entering have beheld the dead more numerous than the living."'

The fact of this matter is this: later narrators, through ignorance or wilful deceit, present spiritual visions as objective fact. The common folk do not know the real story, and think this to be true. Such is the erroneous origin of the tales in question. Some lying pretenders claim that these spiritual encounters and dealings are objective, and thereby they frequently attain corrupt ends.

Someone may say, But does not Ibn Hajar of Askelon, in his book on the Companions of the Prophet,⁴ refer to the bodily life of Khidr?

Ibn Hajar was a judge in Egypt and a narrator of traditions, a man of great influence and prestige. He wrote on Shafiite law and produced a volume of poems. He died in the year 852/1448. His chief talent lay in narrating traditions; he wrote some fifty huge books on the subject. The business of the traditionist is to record the traditions which he finds in reports and narratives. This meritorious man gave effect to the principles of this science and evaluated the truth of traditions. But insight is a matter of abstract thought; it is quite a different thing, quite unconnected with traditions. It would be folly to argue against the mixture of supposition and certainty which Ibn Hajar wrote; it would not convince one's opponent. To this subject the late Ibn Jawzī devoted a book,⁵ and Ibn Haydar composed an essay on it. I have not troubled to quote from these works: to the wise a word is sufficient.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

¹ Khidr, the patron of travellers in Turkish folklore, is generally identified with the mysterious Servant of God whose encounter with Moses is described in the Koran (18:64-81). For his identification with Elias and St. George, see F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans* (Oxford, 1929), pp. 319-336. He is said to have been the Vizier of Alexander the Great and to have discovered the Fountain of Immortality.

² Muslims, while believing in the Virgin Birth, reject the divinity of Jesus. The Koran (4:156) denies the Crucifixion: 'they did not kill him and they did not crucify him, but a likeness of him was made for them'—he himself being raised to heaven beforehand.

The argument is that as Jesus is the only man whom Muslims regard as having escaped death, Khidr's immortality, for which there is in any case no explicit Koranic warrant, would have to be subject to the same limitations as that of Jesus. His walking the earth and conversing with mortals is out of the question.

³ The *Jāmi' al-fadā'il wa-qāmi' al-radhā'il* is a work on morals, self-discipline, and mysticism, by Mahmūd Efendi al-Uskudārī (d. 1038/1628-9).

⁴ *al-Isāba fī tamyīz al-sahāba*, by Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad ibn 'Alī ibn Hajar.

⁵ *Ujjālat al-muntazir fī sharh hāl al-Khidr*, by Abu'l-Faraj 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn 'Alī, known as Ibn Jawzī (d. 1200), who wrote on most branches of learning. The main argument of this work is that Khidr's immortality is proved false by Koran 21:35, 'We have not granted to any man . . . eternity.'

SINGING

Singing, according to the laws of the science of music, means letting the voice trill in melody. It is agreed that voices have a definite effect on soul and body; this is undeniable. If the voice is inharmonious, the effect it produces is one of repugnance. If it is harmonious and agreeable, it produces liking and acceptance. While soul and spirit are influenced thereby, there is also an effect on the body, whose owner comprehends and knows that effect, unless the bodily temperament is upset and needs treatment.

The discussion relating to harmonious sounds is divisible into three parts. There is the sound that emanates from the throat of birds, the sound that emanates from the throat of humans, and that which is produced from an orchestra by beating or blowing on instruments.

People of other religions and creeds have used all of of them. In Islam, the exponents of the sacred law have categorized it as perfectly permissible to listen to the melodies produced by birds, and have allowed those produced by human throats, subject to certain conditions and rules. But, they say, to listen to instruments that are blown or struck is never permissible. That eminent savant and great scholar of Rūm, Qinalizāde 'Alī Efendi,¹ has written to this effect and has given a detailed account of the subject of music in his book *Akhlāq-i 'Alā'ī*. Our Muslim brethren who seek after truth should treasure this book and hold themselves bound to read it, as if it were their set readings from

scripture or the litany of the Names of God, so that they may know what is important in religious and mundane affairs and act accordingly. For it is a blessed book, which reconciles philosophy and the sacred law, and its author was one of the foremost men of his age.

Now the views of the leaders in the Faith are various on the subject of the sounds and melodies which come forth from the human throat. If these form verses and songs whose theme is wine, paramours, lewdness, and debauchery, it is absolutely not permissible to listen to them. If they form songs concerning the remembrance of God and the praise of the Prophet of God, and exhortation and admonition, the majority hold them permissible. Some lawyers have indulged in a deal of verbiage on this theme, but all it amounts to is frigid sanctimony.

All this is quite distinct from the recitation of the glorious Koran. In the case of the Koran, chanting is restricted and bound by the rule against impairing the clear enunciation of the letters and the breaks and liaisons between words; observance of the rules of musical modes must not lead one actually to make a tune of Koran-chanting. This is a special kind of singing, which does not conform to the rules of the science of music. They say that this is the kind of singing referred to in the tradition 'There is not one of us who has not sung when reciting the Koran.'

They have occasionally allowed the striking of certain musical instruments as being in the public interest; for example the drum and kettledrum to encourage the warriors in battle, and the tambourine without bells at wedding-processions.

Admonition. The prohibitions which are found in the

sacred law on this subject are based on sound wisdom. Their origin is as follows.

As has been said, songs definitely have an influence on bodies and play a great part in stirring up soul and spirit. For this reason the sages have said that the person whose spirit prevails over his soul should overcome his brute soul and should give the reins of government, in the kingdom of the body, into the hands of Sultan Spirit. Listening to the strains and notes of music will stir his spirit in the direction of the spiritual and inspire him to be devout, to acquire the qualities of the First Source and become like unto it. For this reason Aristotle invented the organ and had it played while giving instruction to the Peripatetics and Neoplatonists.²

But in the case of the person whose soul prevails over his spirit, and in whose body the brute soul holds sway, listening to music stirs him in some degree towards the brutish lusts. For sometimes a moody man, on hearing an amorous verse, may take wings and depart to the heights of passion and desire, without realizing it.

Thus in song benefit and harm are combined. To the favoured few it is beneficial, but in the case of the ordinary man its spiritual harm predominates. Therefore, although in the same clause in the principles of the sacred law it is spoken of as both dangerous and permissible, the rule is to give the greater weight to its inherent danger. Consequently it has been forbidden, for the laudable purpose of guarding the many from harm, regardless of the advantage that may accrue to the few.

Now what is incumbent on the many is obedience to the decree of the sacred law. Yet some great sheykhs have followed the lead of the pious philosophers, adopting their precedent in considering music as devoid of harm. Regarding it as effective in appealing

to aspirants whose spirits dominate their souls. some have employed the flute, some the drum, and some the double kettledrum. Most of them have listened to music under the name of *samā'*, 'listening', as the letter of the law allows. In acting thus, they have taken a leaf from the physicians' book: this corresponds to the use of poisonous drugs in medical treatment.

Most Sufis base themselves on the Neoplatonist philosophy and their practices are derived from it. But the orthodox in every age have hurled the stone of criticism at them and have consistently interfered with them and attacked them. Yet they, for their part, quite undeterred, have played and sung.

'You know not what the flute says, or the lute:

'O Love, Thou art enough for me; Thou sufficest me' has been their reply.

Every man has his opinion, as the saying goes: the words and deeds of both factions have always had a certain justification, yet the quarrel has never been resolved. The intelligent man will not be so stupid as to hope to decide a dispute of such long standing.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

¹ Qinalizāde 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī, d. 1575.

² This odd story is obviously based on a misunderstanding of the name of Aristotle's *Organon*, although the works comprehended under this name had long been known in Islam.

The word here translated 'Neoplatonists' is *ishrāqī*. See Introduction, pp. 9-10.

THREE

DANCING AND WHIRLING

The lexicographical meaning of 'dancing' is rhythmic motion. While many souls are influenced by listening to the rhythmic strains and melodies of musical instruments, the effect on the beholder of rhythmic motions is also considerable. In fact there are various forms of influence: one man is affected through hearing, another through sight, but what is necessary to this influence is rhythm. Non-rhythmic motion has no such effect.

Much has been said about the effect of dancing: the analysis of the results of watching it is comparable to the various views about singing.

Now let us come to the motions performed by certain Sufis in the course of their litany. The orthodox Ulema have classed those whirlings as 'dancing', and have pronounced it forbidden, branding as infidels those who hold it permissible. The Sufis begin by saying that the definition of dancing is not applicable to it. They continue thus: 'The cyclic motion is a form of motion distinct from dancing and for the good of mankind. If it is permitted, there is no harm in it from the point of view of the public good.' They adduce the examples of the Ethiopian dance and the whirling of 'Ali, and say: 'The man who takes one side in a dogmatic dispute is not to be declared an infidel.'

The real purpose of the Ulema's prohibition is to protect the State, for in the past States have suffered much from the Sufis: witness in particular the rise of the Safavids in Persia.¹ Consequently there has been harshness and severity, with the resultant advantage,

from the point of view of the State, that the spiritual ardour which tended to increase the number of disciples and to attract adherents has diminished.

If asked what the good of it is, the Sufi reply is as follows. If the adept performs the motions in the ritual, heat is necessarily generated. Thereupon coldness leaves his body, and the vital spirit is spread by the heat all over the body. The spirits and faculties are enlivened and the specific human soul is set in motion too in the measure of his concentration on the performance. Listening to the litany and the music helps in the process too, and the result is a degree of enthusiasm and vigour for motion in the direction of the spiritual world. Many adepts then attain a trance-like state and lose consciousness of the world. The body remains on earth but the soul takes wings towards its own kind. One develops a taste for this condition, as it is said, 'Who does not taste does not know'. It comes about more quickly with motion than without. By this means, the aspirant advances and soon attains his goal. How can it be denied that physical motion gives motion to spirits and faculties? Young students, when reciting, instinctively move and sway from side to side. For by the motion of the head the brain produces a certain warmth and equilibrium, which lead to an increase in the cogitative power. This fact is noted in some philosophical books.

The answer, not to what the Sufi says but to what he is and does, is this. Most of the Khalwatī Order² have based their rites and observances on the community of aspirants. They have founded lodges and have made the *Hay!* and *Hu!* which are the essentials of their vociferation, into the instrument of their society, the pivot of their livelihood, and the prop of their stumbling. Their hypocrisy has turned their

ordained music and their obligatory motions, which their ancient founders prescribed for a sound purpose and which ought to be freely permitted to those worthy, into bait for the trap of imposture and a snare for disreputable fools. This is the reason why the brutish common people flock to them, and votive offerings and pious gifts pour into their lodges. Since their gyrations play an important part in this, they will not abandon their spinning. Some fools become spectators, some become disciples and self-styled ascetics. There is no rhyme or reason to any of it; they falsely extol their sheykhs to the skies and put on an act for the sake of a dinner. They meet together and make their *Hay!* and *Hu!* an instrument of fraud, calling it 'Mindfulness of God and Declaration of His Unity'.

These people are mistaken for true disciples and genuine adepts. 'The tents are like unto their tents', as the saying goes: the identity of costume and outward appearance between these moderns and their ancient forerunners compels a verdict of approval for them, in accordance with the principle 'By their friends shall ye know them'. Hence nobody ventures to smash the snare of vociferation which for a long time now they have made the pivot of their livelihood, the instrument of their society, and the prop of their stumbling. Only the orthodox Ulema have interfered with them, as is their duty, writing many tracts against them. The dervishes reply, quite unabashed, 'Our profit and means of livelihood is the dervish lodge and the company of disciples. How is it possible for the practices and rites of an Order to be brought to naught? The rites and ceremonies which we have constantly performed for so many centuries are established among us. Though they be "innovation", yet we practise them.'

Thus they make it plain that their means of liveli-

hood is folly, which hostile criticism cannot induce them to abandon. Just as they do not desist from whirling, so some of the fanatically orthodox do not cease from carping at them: the tug-of-war between the two parties has brought them into a vicious circle. At no time has there been a break in the chain of contention; it has grown longer and longer.

The sensible man will neither fall victim to the disease of carping, nor follow their artful designs. He will perhaps read and ponder these verses of the poet, on those who are not true adepts but pretend to be:

No jewelled brocade the Sufi finds to wear:

A patched old cloak the wretch puts on, and sighs.

Their Sheykh, in envy of the thronèd king,

Sits dignified upon the preacher's chair.

Is dignity the pillar of their creed?

In none will you find dignity, or humility.

If the door of expectancy be opened they rejoice,

Saying the perfection of hope has been vouchsafed.

They pretend to be ablaze, but they've no spark;

May there be none whose state is false as theirs.

The man whose worth is high they denigrate,

That their own paltry value be enhanced.

So far do they carry their pretence

That their ragged cloaks and caps are wrought with
art.

Though a deed involve a thousand harms for man-
kind

They will do it, if it profit *them*.

They gather to perform their song and dance:

Some think it lawful; all Muslims know it is wrong.

They uncover their heads and cast away their shawls;

Then many a bald ringwormy pate appears.

Though the hypocrite Sufi cries the Holy Name,

The frog's croak is no less sincere.

Brother, do not prolong the tale with interrupting,
For this argument has already taken many verses.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

¹ The Safavid dynasty, which ruled Persia from 1502 till 1722, was helped to power by the fact that its founder, Shah Ismā'īl, was a descendant of 'Alī and was revered as a saint by the Shiites.

² The Khalwatī Order was founded at the beginning of the thirteenth century by Abū 'Abd Allāh Sirāj al-Dīn 'Umar ibn Akmal al-Dīn al-Ahjl.

FOUR

THE INVOKING OF BLESSINGS ON PROPHETS AND COMPANIONS

By this is meant the use of such expressions as 'God Almighty bless him and give him peace', or 'The blessing and peace of God be upon him', or 'God bless Muhammad', when any of the honoured prophets is mentioned, or 'God be pleased with him' when any of the honoured Companions of the Prophet is mentioned.

It has been handed down on the authority of the chosen one of the Imams of the Faith¹—God's approval be on them all—that it is a religious duty to say 'Blessings on the Prophet' once in a lifetime. According to the rest, it is only canonically laudable to do so. But some people say that the tradition makes the use of the formula compulsory after every mention of the Prophet. There is certainly no unanimity on this point.

Now for the vexed question of the muezzins' crying in unison 'God bless him' and 'God be pleased with him' during the *khutba*. That silence is obligatory during the *khutba* is clear from the dictum 'If, while the Imam is delivering the *khutba*, you so much as say to your neighbour "Be silent!", you are at fault.' As this is generally agreed, whereas there is some dispute about the obligatory nature of such blessings, it is established that silence during the *khutba* is preferable.

But although the course favoured by common usage may be based on mere partiality for one particular view, and may be wrong and sinful, yet men having grown accustomed to certain practices and having learned to regard them as obligatory will not abandon

them. Most things which have become usual and customary among the generality of the people have arisen through choice, unquestioned by young or old: therefore let them stand. Though they be 'innovation' and 'sin', to trouble oneself with the vain notion of stopping them results only in demonstrating one's stupidity and ignorance, for, as the old saying goes, 'He who does not recognize the usage of his contemporaries is an ignoramus.'

If one goes deeply into such practices and tries to deter people from them, talk and disputation with the tongue leads to battle and fighting with sword and spear, and the result is wars of fanaticism such as our forefathers saw. For it is against human nature to accept easily any criticism, however well justified, of common usage. The more opposition, the more eagerness. If there is to be any opposition at all, it should certainly be of the sort indicated in the verse 'Speak you then to him mildly, that perchance he may be admonished or fear' (Kor. 20:46). Kindness and gentleness may bring some fruitful end to the dispute. Further, in such matters of worship, subtle analysis and hair-splitting are out of place: having set the people on the way of sincerity in service to God, rulers and preachers should maintain things in that state, and none should pay any attention for reasons of his own to such trifling faults.

Is mortal man's worship as it ought to be, as laid down in the books? Great men such as the Imam Ghazālī have humbly confessed their own inadequacy, saying, 'In all our life we have not performed two *rak'as* of prayer fit for the Almighty' and 'O Thou who art extolled, we have not worshipped Thee fittingly'.

'The Lord Creator is the God who finds excuses for His creatures; He does not exact payment in full.'

His goodness and grace are as vast as the ocean of His mercy; there is no end to them, nor is there any boundary or limit to His beneficence.

The duty of His slave is to conform, so far as in him lies, to His exalted command, to humble himself and make confession of his weakness and shortcomings, in words such as these:

O King! I seek refuge at the foot of Thy throne.

I turn in shame to the sanctuary of Thy majesty.

Four things I bring which are not in the treasury
of Thy bounty:

Destitution, want, impotence, and sin.

It is said that the wretch who confesses his sin is better than the man who is ever obedient to God.

As for the fact that some preachers enjoin the people to bless the Prophet during their sermons, while others do not: this hardly merits much discussion but is simply a matter of custom. It arises from the differences of opinion that are current among the learned; differences from which they derive much benefit, as will be explained.²

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

¹ The chosen Imam of the Ottoman Turks was Abū Hanīfa. See Introduction p. 18.

² For the benefit to be derived from controversy see Chapter Twenty-one.

TOBACCO

At one time I drafted an essay on the tobacco-smoking now practised by all mankind, but I never made a fair copy of it. What is offered here is a rough draft embodying the gist of that essay. Before we examine the matter, what was the cause of the appearance of this practice? Let us explain this in a didactic passage.

The Facts. Some time in the latter half of the ninth century of the Hijra, after some Spanish ships had discovered the New World, the Portuguese and English were exploring its shores to find a passage from the Eastern to the Western Ocean. They came to an island close to the mainland, called in the *Atlas* 'Gineyā'. A ship's doctor, who had been smitten with a lymphatic disorder, due to the influence of the sea air on his natural temperament, decided to try and cure it with hot and dry things, in accordance with the laws of treatment by opposites. When his ship reached that island, he noticed a kind of leaf was burning. He smelled it, and as it was hot of scent he began to inhale it, using an instrument resembling a pipe. It did him good, so he took a large quantity of the leaf and used it throughout their stay. The ship's company saw this and, regarding it as a beneficial medicine, followed the doctor's example and loaded themselves up with the leaf. One saw another and they all began to smoke. When the ship arrived in England, the habit spread, through France to the other lands. People tried it, not

knowing its origin, and not considering that it was smoked for a serious purpose. Many became addicts, putting it in the category of stimulating drugs. It has become a thing common to East and West, and no one has succeeded in suppressing it.

From its first appearance in Turkey, which was about the year 1010/1601, to the present day, various preachers have spoken against it individually, and many of the Ulema have written tracts concerning it, some claiming that it is a thing forbidden, some that it is disapproved. Its addicts have replied to the effect that it is permissible. After some time had elapsed, the eminent surgeon Ibrāhīm Efendi devoted much care and attention to the matter, conducting great debates in the Abode of the Sultanate, that is, in the city of Islambol,¹ giving warning talks at a special public meeting in the mosque of Sultan Mehmed, and sticking copies of fetwas onto walls. He troubled himself to no purpose. The more he spoke, the more people persisted in smoking. Seeing that it was fruitless, he abandoned his efforts. After that, the late Sultan Murad IV, towards the end of his reign, closed down the coffee-houses in order to shut the gate of iniquity, and also banned smoking, in consequence of certain outbreaks of fire.² People being undeterred, the imperial anger necessitated the chastisement of those who, by smoking, committed the sin of disobedience to the imperial command. Gradually His Majesty's severity in suppression increased, and so did people's desire to smoke, in accordance with the saying, 'Men desire what is forbidden', and many thousands of men were sent to the abode of nothingness.

When the Sultan was going on the expedition against Baghdad, at one halting-place fifteen or twenty leading men of the Army were arrested on a charge of

smoking, and were put to death with the severest torture in the imperial presence. Some of the soldiers carried short pipes in their sleeves, some in their pockets, and they found an opportunity to smoke even during the executions. At Istanbul, no end of soldiers used to go into the barracks and smoke in the privies. Even during this rigorous prohibition, the number of smokers exceeded that of the non-smokers.

After that Sultan's death, the practice was sometimes forbidden and sometimes allowed, until the Sheykh al-Islam, the late Bahā'ī Efendi, gave a fetwa ruling that it was permissible, and the practice won renewed popularity among the people of the world. Occasional reprimands from the Throne to smokers have generally been disregarded, and smoking is at present practised all over the habitable globe. Such are the vicissitudes undergone by tobacco.

Now there are a number of possible ways of considering the subject, which we shall briefly set forth.

(1) The first possibility is that the people may be effectively prevented from smoking and may give it up. This possibility must be set aside, for custom is second nature. Addicts are not made to give up in this way. The suggestion should be put to them. If they say 'And what purpose will prohibition serve?'—great men have recommended 'Let the rulers not stint the rod on the backs of the common people.' Consequently it is the rulers' duty publicly to prohibit and chastise; thus do they perform their part. As for the people, their duty, if they are addicted to such things, is to refrain from committing a breach of good order by using them in the streets. But in his own house every man may do as he pleases. Then, if the rulers interfere,

they will be taking upon themselves more than they should:

‘What work for the censor within a man’s home?’

(2) Is this tobacco found to be good or bad by the intelligence? If we set aside the fact that addicts think it good, common sense judges it to be bad. The criterion of goodness and badness may be either the intelligence or the sacred law. By either criterion it is bad, for the conditions necessary for intellectual approval are lacking in it, while the grounds for canonical disapproval are present in it. Yet if certain of the lacking conditions are fulfilled, it may then be found good; for example, if it be used medicinally. The fact that it is not used by judges in law-courts, at council meetings, in mosques or other places of worship, is a consequence of its being found bad by the criterion of intelligence.

(3) Its good and harmful effects. As to its harmful effects there is no doubt. It ends by becoming a basic need of the addict, who does not consider its evil consequences. Its harmful physical effect too is established, for tobacco is medically noxious in that it makes turbid the aerial essence. Eventually, to him who is habituated to its use, custom becomes second nature, and thus he keeps its noxious effects at bay. The craving of addiction and nature’s disposition towards the use of tobacco have a protective quality whereby, when the defiled air is sniffed up, it does not affect the heart. So when certain invalids eat the noxious food they crave it does not harm them so very much, and may even work an occasional cure. Craving and desire give a strength which repels the disease. The influence exerted on the body by such things depends on the nature’s disposition or aversion. If a man does not use tobacco,

declares it to be harmful and feels a natural repugnance towards it, the inhaling of tobacco-smoke does him more harm and has a greater effect.

Apart from the noxious effects of the corruption of the aerial essence, the smoker must belong to one of two classes: he is either of moist temperament or of dry. In either case his temperament may be either healthy or out of sorts. If the man of moist temperament is healthy, smoking is suitable and agreeable to him. But certainly for most people some dryness is necessary. If he be out of sorts, and if this be due to excessive moisture, smoking will act as a remedy for him. For the man of dry temperament, however, it is in no wise permissible. It will increase his dryness and will constantly desiccate the moisture of his lungs. There is absolutely no foundation for the claim some people make that it is good for scurvy; this is idle chatter which has no point of contact with the circle of the laws of medicine.

(4) Is it innovation? It may be conceded that it is innovation in the eyes of the sacred law, for it appeared in recent times, nor is it possible to class it as 'good innovation'. That it is innovation in the light of intelligence is sure, for it is not a thing that has been seen or heard of by the intelligent ever since the time of Adam. There is a tale that it first appeared in the hallowed time of 'Umar (God be pleased with him) and that many thousands of men were killed because of it. This is without foundation, a fiction of the fanatical.

(5) Is it abominable? There is no word of justification for this, in reason or in law. This view is accepted by the generality of people. For a thing to reach the stage of the abominable, it is an essential condition

that it be used to excess. The scent of tobacco-smoke and the scent of the tobacco-leaf are not intrinsically abominable. It is perhaps not irrelevant to point out that the scent of burning tobacco has curative uses as an inhalant. But an evil odour arises in the mouth of the heavy smoker, by comparison with which, in the nostrils of the non-smoker, halitosis is as aloes-wood and ambergris.

To sum up, just as there is abomination in the eating of raw onion, garlic, and leek, which inevitably produce an abominable odour in the mouth, so also heavy smoking is disapproved as producing a smell in the mouth, the body, and the clothing. And the reason is that there is incontestable offence in both cases. Just as the prohibition against sexual intercourse during menstruation, on account of uncleanness and offensiveness, has given rise to an analogous prohibition against pederasty, so too the use of such foods and of tobacco comes under a common disapproval.

The conclusion must be to recommend abstention. The fact that addicts do not concede this scent to be disapproved is irrelevant and not to be taken into consideration. For they are at liberty not to disapprove the smell of one another's mouths.

The purpose of all this is to demonstrate the facts: there is no question of interference with those who have the addiction. To try to put them off is not a practical possibility, and is generally agreed to be in the category of preaching to the winds.

(6) Is it canonically forbidden? It is written in the manuals of jurisprudence that in any particular matter where there is no decisive ruling in the law, the juriconsult may exercise his own discretion. He may, according to one point of view, bring together all relevant circumstances, consider them, and make his

own deductions. Yet the following course is preferable: not to declare things forbidden, but always to have recourse to any legal principle that justifies declaring them permitted, thus preserving the people from being laden with sins and persisting in what has been prohibited.

(7) Is it canonically indifferent? As the rise of smoking is of recent occurrence, there is no explicit treatment or mention of it in the legal manuals. This being so, some say that in accordance with the principle that permissibility is the norm—i.e. that in the absence of a clear prohibition things are permitted—smoking is permitted and lawful.

The great doctors of the law have in former times pronounced it disapproved, while certain provincial muftis have declared it forbidden. More recently, the late Bahā'ī Efendi pronounced it lawful, not out of regard for his own addiction but because he considered what was best suited to the condition of the people and because he held fast to the principle that permissibility is the norm. For the rule about fetwas is to base them on a tradition from one of the four Founders of the Law. In the absence of such a tradition, it is necessary to go back to first principles.

Although the prevalence of smoking, together with all the attendant circumstances, does not suffice to put it in the class of permissibles, yet an objection arises against pronouncing it forbidden or disapproved, which overrides any consideration of its undesirable qualities. And what is that objection? It is that the people will persist in using the forbidden thing, with baneful results. Further, declaring it to be lawful is in the general interest, as being an act of compassion towards the addict and protecting the public from sin.

For this reason the preference has been given to declaring it permitted. As most Muslims are addicted to it, they have become inseparably attached to the practice, and will in no circumstance be deterred from it or abandon it, and it has taken hold of the whole world. In matters of this kind, judge and mufti must give their decisions and rulings according to what the sacred law allows, so that men be not driven into sin. For a fetwa has been given which says 'Persistence in a practice which is adjudged by contemporary authority to be forbidden and disapproved, is canonically indifferent'; it is not like persistence in a practice expressly prohibited by the sacred law. The latter is pure bane, but in the former there is no harm.

The judge who decides on the basis of some such legal principle as 'Choose the lesser of the two evils' is committing no sin and may perhaps acquire merit and reward for delivering a believer from sin.

The late Bahā'ī Efendi was a man of right nature and sound sense. Had he studied hard 'in accordance with the *qānūn*', and had he not been addicted to narcotics, he would have become one of the most eminent scholars in Turkey. But he did have a talent for deduction, and by his natural ability he used to display his cleverness everywhere. In the matter under discussion he had regard for the condition of mankind and was compassionate. May God be compassionate to him. There has never been a mufti like him since the late 'Abd al-Rahīm Efendi.³

Admonition. Some may ask, Can one thing be simultaneously indifferent, disapproved, and forbidden? Is this not self-contradictory? The answer is that it is possible, with a change of aspect and viewpoint. For example, while it is permissible to eat *baklava*, it is for-

bidden to do so when one is sated, as this is harmful.

Hereafter the most necessary and useful thing for the rulers of the Muslims to do is this: they should farm out exclusive concessions to deal in tobacco-leaf in every part of the Guarded Domains, appointing custodians. Tobacco will bear a fixed contribution to the Treasury of 20 piastres per *okka*. It should be sold in one appointed place in every city and should not be allowed in the markets at large. This will yield 100 million aspers a year.

During the rigorous prohibition enforced under the late Ghazi Sultan Murad, many people, not daring to smoke tobacco in pipes, used to repel the craving by crushing the leaf and snuffing it up their noses, but subsequently they have abandoned this foolishness, for smoking without fear has become possible. Next, there are certain God-fearing men who themselves piously refrain, but do not interfere with smokers. Some again find that it does not agree with them, and for that reason do not smoke, like the present writer.

The fool may interfere, saying:

‘Scatter the stupidity of smoking with the wind of fortitude

For it has obstructed with its heat the sun of the mind.’

The addict replies:

‘The joy and savour of tobacco are not found in honey and sugar’,

and goes on smoking, quite undismayed. The best course is not to interfere with anyone in this respect, and that is all there is to it.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

¹ Islambol is Turkish for 'Islam abounding' and was a common punning variant for the name of the Ottoman capital.

² Murad IV (1623-40) had come to the throne when barely 12 years old, in a period of anarchy, and had been obliged to take ruthless measures against the mutinous Janissaries. He closed the coffee-houses and forbade smoking on pain of death, on 16 September 1633, a fortnight after the great fire which destroyed one-fifth of Istanbul. The coffee-houses were breeding-places of disaffection. The reason for the Sultan's objection to smoking is less obvious: some say he was persuaded to outlaw tobacco by Qādizāde Mehmed Efendi (see Chapter Twenty-one), who regarded it as a sinful innovation. According to the historians, the great fire was not due to a careless smoker but started in a shipyard where caulking was going on.

³ Hajji 'Abd al-Rahīm Efendi was Bahā'ī Efendi's immediate predecessor as Sheykh al-Islam, 1647-49. The compliment is not so empty as it may seem: there had been six other incumbents of the office between Bahā'ī Efendi's first dismissal, in May 1651, and November 1656, when the *Balance of Truth* was completed.

COFFEE

This matter too was much disputed in the old days. It originated in Yemen and has spread, like tobacco, all over the world. Certain sheykhs, who lived with their dervishes in the mountains of Yemen, used to crush and eat the berries, which they called *qalb wabūn*, of a certain tree. Some would roast them and drink their water. Coffee is a cold dry food, suited to the ascetic life and sedative of lust. The people of Yemen learned of it from one another, and sheykhs, Sufis, and others used it.

It came to Asia Minor by sea, about 950/1543, and met with a hostile reception, fetwas being delivered against it. For they said, Apart from its being roasted,¹ the fact that it is drunk in gatherings, passed from hand to hand, is suggestive of loose living. It is related of Abu'l-Su'ūd Efendi that he had holes bored in the ships that brought it, plunging their cargoes of coffee into the sea. But these strictures and prohibitions availed nothing. The fetwas, the talk, made no impression on the people. One coffee-house was opened after another, and men would gather together, with great eagerness and enthusiasm, to drink. Drug-addicts in particular, finding it a life-giving thing, which increased their pleasure, were willing to die for a cup.

Since then, muftis pronounced it permissible. The late Bostānzāde delivered a detailed fetwa, in verse.² Thus coffee-houses experienced varying fortunes for several years, now banned, now permitted. After the year 1000/1591-92, they ceased to be prohibited. They

were opened everywhere, freely: on every street-corner a coffee-house appeared.

Story-tellers and musicians diverted the people from their employments, and working for one's living fell into disfavour. Moreover the people, from prince to beggar, amused themselves with knifing one another. Towards the end of 1042/1633, the late Ghazi Sultan Murad, becoming aware of the situation, promulgated an edict, out of regard and compassion for the people, to this effect: Coffee-houses throughout the Guarded Domains shall be dismantled and not opened hereafter. Since then, the coffee-houses of the capital have been as desolate as the heart of the ignorant. In the hope that they might be reopened, their proprietors did not dismantle them for a while, but merely closed them. Later the majority, if not all of them, were dismantled and turned into other kinds of shops. But in cities and towns outside Istanbul, they are opened just as before. As has been said above, such things do not admit of a perpetual ban.

Now let us come to the description of coffee itself. Coffee is indubitably cold and dry: Dā'ūd of Antioch's statement, in the *Tadhkira*, that it is hot and dry, is not generally accepted.³ Even when it is boiled in water and an infusion made of it, its coldness does not depart; perhaps it increases, for water too is cold. That is why coffee quenches thirst, and does not burn if poured on a limb, for its heat is a strange heat, with no effect.

But a certain abatement comes to its dryness: for instance, in itself it is of the third degree of dryness but, when mixed with moisture of the second degree of cold, one degree of its dryness goes, leaving it in the second degree of dryness. By the dryness it repels sleep. It has a positive diuretic effect, varying with the temperament.

To those of dry temperament, especially to the man of melancholic temperament, large quantities are unsuitable, and may be repugnant. Taken in excess, it causes insomnia and melancholic anxiety. If drunk at all, it should be drunk with sugar.

To those of moist temperament, and especially to women, it is highly suited. They should drink a great deal of strong coffee. Excess of it will do them no harm, so long as they are not melancholic.

NOTES TO CHAPTER SIX

¹ Part of one of these fetwas, quoted in R. E. Koçu's *Osmanlı Tarihinde Yasaklar* (Istanbul, 1950), runs: 'Whatsoever reaches the level of carbonization, that is, becomes charcoal, is absolutely forbidden.' An *ad hoc* rule?

² Bostānzāde Mehmed Efendi was Sheykh al-Islam from April 1589 to May 1592 and again from July 1593 till his death in April 1598. He wrote verses in Arabic and Turkish.

³ *Tadhkirat uli'l-albāb* ('Reminder for People of Understanding'), a celebrated treatise on medicine by Dā'ūd ibn 'Umar al-Antākī (d. c. 1597).

SEVEN

LAUDANUM, OPIUM, AND OTHER DRUGS

Even though the addict may say 'What a curse these words are!', because they go into the heart of the matter, here is the true doctrine and best statement on the subject.

A man should remain in his original nature, which is best suited to his condition and most appropriate to his state, and should not alter his sound constitution.

Opium, laudanum, and other drugs belong to the category of remedies. When no illness or disease necessitates their use, one should not resort to medicine rather than to diet. Even if there is a need, treatment by diet is to be preferred: to proceed over-rapidly from that to medicine is contrary to the laws of medical treatment. 'But it is hardly necessary to say that even when no condition exists that necessitates and requires their use, there is still the pure pleasure of them.' So saying, a man may become familiar with these things, take them a few times, and make a habit of them. Then it may prove impossible to break himself of the habit, and he will suffer for it till the end of his days. As the years go by, it will grow stronger; his frame will be distorted and in aspect and dress he will come to resemble an old fresco on a church wall, effaced here and there. When he is under the influence, he retrogresses in an instant: his faculties and senses are interrupted and his comprehension and consciousness depart. He becomes a vacillating thing, neither

To those of dry temperament, especially to the man of melancholic temperament, large quantities are unsuitable, and may be repugnant. Taken in excess, it causes insomnia and melancholic anxiety. If drunk at all, it should be drunk with sugar.

To those of moist temperament, and especially to women, it is highly suited. They should drink a great deal of strong coffee. Excess of it will do them no harm, so long as they are not melancholic.

NOTES TO CHAPTER SIX

¹ Part of one of these fetwas, quoted in R. E. Koçu's *Osmanlı Tarihinde Yasaklar* (Istanbul, 1950), runs: 'Whatsoever reaches the level of carbonization, that is, becomes charcoal, is absolutely forbidden.' An *ad hoc* rule?

² Bostānzāde Mehmed Efendi was Sheykh al-Islam from April 1589 to May 1592 and again from July 1593 till his death in April 1598. He wrote verses in Arabic and Turkish.

³ *Tadhkirat uli'l-albāb* ('Reminder for People of Understanding'), a celebrated treatise on medicine by Dā'ūd ibn 'Umar al-Antākī (d. c. 1597).

SEVEN

LAUDANUM, OPIUM, AND OTHER DRUGS

Even though the addict may say 'What a curse these words are!', because they go into the heart of the matter, here is the true doctrine and best statement on the subject.

A man should remain in his original nature, which is best suited to his condition and most appropriate to his state, and should not alter his sound constitution.

Opium, laudanum, and other drugs belong to the category of remedies. When no illness or disease necessitates their use, one should not resort to medicine rather than to diet. Even if there is a need, treatment by diet is to be preferred: to proceed over-rapidly from that to medicine is contrary to the laws of medical treatment. 'But it is hardly necessary to say that even when no condition exists that necessitates and requires their use, there is still the pure pleasure of them.' So saying, a man may become familiar with these things, take them a few times, and make a habit of them. Then it may prove impossible to break himself of the habit, and he will suffer for it till the end of his days. As the years go by, it will grow stronger; his frame will be distorted and in aspect and dress he will come to resemble an old fresco on a church wall, effaced here and there. When he is under the influence, he retrogresses in an instant: his faculties and senses are interrupted and his comprehension and consciousness depart. He becomes a vacillating thing, neither

dead nor alive, neither asleep nor awake. Can it be doubted that those who arrive at this position of their own free choice do themselves monstrous harm?

If one manages to break oneself of the habit somehow, that is great good fortune and an opportunity to be snatched at. If not, it is dangerous to give it up suddenly. What method can one employ?

There is no sanction in the sacred law for abandoning it. To interfere with seasoned drug-addicts is folly and error. Our words are but a caution to those who have not yet fallen into the snare of addiction, and a piece of good advice, lest they heed the friendly offer and importunity of the addict. As the saying goes, 'Dear to the destroyed, the sight of others in like case.'

'Give thy brother dates, and if he refuse them, coals of fire.'¹

NOTE TO CHAPTER SEVEN

¹ *i.e.*, this is good advice I give you, which you reject at your peril.

THE PARENTS OF THE PROPHET

This topic has been included because it is yet another battlefield of opinions.

Admonition. First, some unfortunates, destitute of intellect, think that such discussion as this is not permissible, as involving depreciation of the Prophet and diminution of his glorious state. They transfer to his family the immunity from criticism that is his prerogative, and because of this fallacy they desire to close the door of discussion. They are insufficiently informed to debate the matter properly; it is mere talk and chatter. There are perilous topics connected with the essence, attributes, and acts of the Creator, by the side of which such topics as the present one pale into insignificance.

The great scholar Sa'd al-Dīn Taftazānī won fame by showing, in his commentary on Nasafī's '*Aqā'id*' ('Dogmas'), that there is a decisive proof for the unity of God in the Koranic verse 'Had there been gods other than God in heaven or earth, both would have crumbled in corruption' (21: 22). But the narrow specialists of his time declared that the proof was not decisive; that there could be no decisive proof of the Unity, and they all fell on him and called him infidel.¹ He silenced them with many compelling arguments.

In every age, warriors fought each other with sword and spear. Just so have the exponents of controversy and speculation incessantly warred with pen and tongue. The man who thinks that discussion is not permissible in matters of this sort is a pusillanimous

fool, who ought not to meddle in controversy, for in the rough and tumble of debate he will be trodden under-foot.

Now let us begin on our subject. The Glory of the World (God bless him and give him peace) was born in the year 881 of the era of Alexander and 578 of the era of Jesus. His father 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Muttalib went with a caravan from Mecca to Gaza and died on the way back, at Medina, or, as some say, at al-Abwā'.² About the date of 'Abd Allāh's death there are various stories. The historians say that he died before his son was born, but in the same year. Other versions put his death at anything from two to twenty months after the birth of the Prophet. One account says that he died when the Prophet was two years old.

The Prophet's mother was Āmina, daughter of Wahb ibn 'Abd Manāf. She survived her husband, dying at al-Abwā' in the fourth or sixth year of the Prophet's life. Their lifetime was the time of the *jāhiliyya*, the pagan ignorance, and the *fatra*, the interval between prophets.³

The most noble Prophet received his mission at the age of forty. Between the time of his call and the time of his death, over twenty years elapsed, at the lowest estimate.

So much is established by unanimous and unimpeachable tradition. For the rest, let us give the gist of the matters in dispute, in the form of question and answer.

Q. Must the parents and children of prophets be believers?

A. Āzar, the father of Abraham, also called Tārah in the histories, and Canaan son of Noah were not of the faithful. Quite apart from the fact that this is

recorded and clearly indicated in the Koran, anyone who declares that the parents and children of prophets must be believers shows his ignorance of what is permissible for a prophet, what is mandatory, and what is impossible for him. If he is not ignorant of these matters, then the claim is mere contentiousness. When all is said and done, the words 'He brings forth the living from the dead and He brings forth the dead from the living' (Kor. 10: 32 and 30: 18) have a particular application here. They demonstrate His omnipotence and consummate wisdom. Prophecy is simply a gift from God: there is no possible shadow of doubt that birth and pedigree have no part in it. It is a mighty boon, in comparison with which the boon imagined by those who take the contrary view is of no consequence.

Q. What is the state of those who died before the mission of the Prophet, in the interval between prophets?

A. As to these, the Imams have disagreed. The Ash'arite theologians⁴ and Shafiite lawyers say that they are excused and not punished, on the evidence of the words 'We have not punished a people before sending a prophet to them' (Kor. 17:16). The Maturīdites⁵ and Hanafites say that they are in torment, for it was possible for them to observe and deduce the unity of the Creator but they neglected to do so. According to some accounts, several classes of people will beg to be excused on Judgment Day, and their excuses will be acceptable to God; for, as the saying goes, 'Excuses are accepted by God and by generous men.' There will be a testing, whereby the blessed will be separated from the damned; namely, they will be ordered to take their souls and cast them into Hell. The blessed will do so, albeit hesitantly, and will find

salvation, whereas the damned will not venture to cast them, so their rebelliousness and disobedience will be established and they will be herded into Hell.

Q. Is the *Fiqh akbar* not the work of the Greatest Imam, Abū Hanīfa?⁶

A. It is agreed to be so in the reports of those who sat at the feet of the Imam. The *Tabaqāt Hanafīya*⁷ expressly states that Abū Mutī' of Balkh, who died in 199/814-5, transmitted the text of the *Fiqh akbar* which he had heard from his master, the Greatest Imam. In my own *Taqwīm al-tawārīkh*,⁸ I at first erroneously wrote that Abū Mutī' of Balkh was the author of the *Fiqh akbar*. Subsequently I corrected 'author' to 'transmitter'. My original copy had gained wide circulation, and one of the preachers of our city pointed out that it was a powerful weapon in the hands of those bigots who wished to discredit the *Fiqh akbar* because of its stand on this question, and he begged me to correct it. So I wrote in the original copy that Abū Mutī' was the transmitter, and gave it to that preacher.

Apart from those who have handed down the text, men of learning, in ancient as in modern times, have commented on the *Fiqh akbar* as the work of Abū Hanīfa. Among them, that model for all virtuous followers of the Way, Sheykh Muhammad ibn Bahā' al-Dīn, who died in 956/1549, proposed, after thirty years of retirement and worship, to write a commentary on the *Fiqh akbar* in order to revive interest in Muslim dogmatics. He sought the advice of my cousin Pīr 'Alī Efendi, who was the father of Birgili Mehmed Efendi, discussed it with him, and with his approval and encouragement wrote a useful and popular commentary which is still in use and in favour among the learned.

The allegation that the *Fiqh akbar* is not the work of Abū Hanīfa is false, a product of fanaticism, a simple denial with no foundation. They offer certain vague and fantastic notions in support of it, but these are indubitably to be rejected, as testimony conflicting with the words of an unimpeachable witness.

Q. Does Abū Hanīfa not say in the *Fiqh akbar*, 'The parents of the Prophet died as unbelievers'?⁹

A. Sheykh Bahā' al-Dīn-zāde¹⁰ said that the reason for the inclusion for this clause in the articles of the creed was that some people had gone to the extreme in denying that the Prophet's parents were infidels. As this denial was obviously contrary to the principles of the Faith, Abū Hanīfa made this clause one of the tenets of Islam and included it in the *Fiqh akbar* in order to confute those who showed too much respect for the Prophet's parents and too little for the principles of the Faith. As the Imam Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī mentions in his great Koran-commentary, this excessive respect originated with the Rāfidite Shiites in the old days, just as they preached the doctrine of the sinless state of the Prophet. Later some Sunnites imitated them in this.¹¹

Q. What is the criterion of unbelief?

A. Unbelief and belief are two inward things, of which no one has knowledge but God alone, though they may be inferred from certain outward indications. But these indications may be at variance with the facts. For example, if the outward signs are trusted, a hypocrite may be deemed a true believer. So when anyone dies it is not possible to say definitely that he died a believer or that he died an infidel, unless there has been a clear scriptural reference to him. If a

believer is afflicted with an evil state, he may die as an infidel, while an unbeliever may win a good end. Genuine belief and unbelief are what is written in the heart. In legal definitions, however, the outward signs are taken into consideration. If the outward signs are indicative of faith, faith is presumed and he is considered a believer. If they point to unbelief, unbelief is presumed and he is considered an infidel. So belief and unbelief may be real or only presumptive, and these are poles apart. The question of the Prophet's parents is settled on a basis of presumption: to arrive at the truth, a decisive scriptural text is necessary, but there is no such text. This argument is taken from Bahā' al-Dīn-zāde.

Sheykh Maqdisī, who was the greatest scholar in Egypt and a man unique in his time, said in his treatise: 'The commentators have given two different accounts of the circumstances of the revelation of the verse "It is not for the Prophet, and those who believe, to ask pardon for idolaters, though they be their close kin, once it has become clear that they are bound for Hell" (9:114). One account, given by a large body of commentators and traditionists on the authority of Ibn 'Abbās,¹² makes it refer to the parents of the Prophet. This has reached the status of a generally accepted tradition and is therefore preferred by Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī and other later scholars. Some even say that this was the sole intention of that particular revelation. According to the second account, it was revealed in connection with Abū Tālib. The learned Jār Allāh¹³ and others reject this explanation, but Sheykh 'Abd al-Qādir Jurjānī, Shaykh of the East and West, combined it with the other. He said, If varying traditions exist, on reliable authority, they must be reconciled as far as possible. Though the verse may have been revealed

with reference to an individual, the consensus is that its application is general: it amounts to a universal admonition and there is no reason to particularise it. Moreover, the terms "idolaters" and "close kin" are general, comprehending father, mother, uncle, and others beside.'

Sheykh 'Alī Maqdisī's verdict was this: anyone who asserts the truth of the tradition that the Prophet's parents were believers, must deny the truth of this Koranic verse, for applicability to all mankind is one of the characteristics of Koranic ordinances, though not of traditions. If we accept this view of the purpose of revelation, the tradition mentioned above must be devoid of truth.^{13a}

The author of the *Multaqā*¹⁴ and others were of the same opinion.

Q. Why do people dispute about this topic?

A. The Imam Qurtubī related numerous traditions in his *Tadhkira*.¹⁵ Some traditionists, whose interest did not run in the direction of ascertaining the facts, like Suyūti,¹⁶ simply took these truths at their face-value and recorded them. Their writings showed a lack of critical perception and were based on mere hearsay and blind following of their predecessors. Some of these writers were bigots and fanatics who did not consider what they were writing or give ear to what they themselves were saying: they chose the path of error, off the road of speculation and remote from the region of accuracy. Many again thought it right to hold a good opinion of the Prophet's parents, and related one or two worthless tales based on politeness, making no attempt to arrive at the truth—Kemāl-Pasha-zāde, for example.¹⁷ The general observation is that the works of these people were not devoid of purpose.

Q. What is the best and most proper view to take in this matter?

A. The learned few, who know the origin of the conflict and are capable of arriving at the truth, will know the answer for themselves, and will decide as they choose and as circumstances require. The duty of the ordinary believers is to refrain from idle talk and discussion of the matter. They should think the best, and say 'It is to be hoped that the Prophet's parents were believers' (on the basis of the weak traditions). They should not be mannerless and hurl imputations of infidelity. Such words; if they are meant as an insult—Heaven forbid!—are great sin. The Hanbalite Imam Ibn Qudāma said in his *Muqni*¹⁸ that if a man combines sectarianism with the rebellious doctrine of the Khārijites¹⁹ he is to be judged as having calumniated the Prophet, and put to death.

So the best course for them is not to meddle in this controversy but to hold themselves aloof from it.

NOTES TO CHAPTER EIGHT

¹ Similarly Ahmad ibn Hanbal, hearing that a scholarly opponent shared his views on one particular point of dogma, declared that the other's opinion was sinful innovation (*bid'a*), as he had arrived at it by reason and not by following traditional authority.

² Midway between Mecca and Medina.

³ Koran 5: 22—'O People of the Book! Now has Our Messenger come to you to give you a clear declaration during a cessation (*fatra*) of messengers, lest you should say, There has come to us no bearer of good tidings nor any warner: for now a bearer of good tidings and a warner has come to you, and God is mighty over all things.'

⁴ Followers of Abu'l-Hasan 'Alī ibn Ismā'il al-Ash'arī of Baghdad (d. 935), the theologian who delivered orthodoxy from the inroads of the rationalism of the Mu'tazilites. The Ash'arite theology is the recognized theology of Sunnite Islam.

⁵ Followers of Abū Mansūr al-Māturīdī of Samarkand (d. 944), a leading orthodox theologian, whose teachings agreed in essentials with those of al-Ash'arī, although their followers diverged on some questions.

⁶ *Fiqh akbar* ('Greatest Wisdom') is the name given to two famous creeds. Translations and full commentaries will be found in Wensinck (see note 13 to Preface). Kātib Chelebi has fallen into the common error of confusing the two. Wensinck has shown that whereas the *Fiqh akbar I* is derived from the genuine utterances of Abū Hanīfa, the *Fiqh akbar II*, which is the one to which our author is referring, dates from about two centuries after Abu Hanīfa's time.

⁷ There are several works of the name, on the lives of the leading men of the Hanafite school.

⁸ See below, p. 143.

⁹ In some texts of the *Fiqh akbar II*, Article 27 begins with these words, adding the Prophet's uncle Abū Tālib too (Wensinck, pp. 197, 239-40). Later Islam however has come to reject this doctrine, which is why the present chapter is omitted from the Istanbul edition of the *Balance of Truth* (1888-9).

¹⁰ Bahā' al-Dīn-zāde is the same as the Muhammad ibn Bahā' al-Dīn mentioned above: the Persian suffix *zāde* means 'son' and so is equivalent to the Arabic *ibn*.

¹¹ The Prophet never claimed to be divinely inspired, except when delivering the revelations, or to be perfect in his everyday life. His followers however have come to credit him with a sinless state and even the power to work miracles, to which he never pretended.

¹² Ibn 'Abbās, the cousin of the Prophet, renowned as a narrator of traditions.

¹³ Jār Allāh ('God's neighbour') is the great gram-

marian and interpreter of the Koran, Abu'l-Qāsim Mahmūd ibn 'Umar al-Zamakhsharī (1075-1144), so called because of his long residence in Mecca.

^{13a} This 'Alī Magdisī is possibly the Hanafite theologian and grammarian known as Ibn Ghānim (1514-96), who lived in Cairo.

¹⁴ *Multaqa' l-abhur* ('Confluence of the Seas'), a compendium of Hanafite law by Ibrāhīm ibn Muhammad of Aleppo (d. 1549).

¹⁵ The *Tadhkira* of Shams al-Dīn Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Andalusī of Cordova (d. 671/1272-3) is a collection of traditions concerning death and the hereafter.

¹⁶ Jalāl al-Dīn of Assiut (1445-1505), a prolific writer on all manner of subjects. General Muslim opinion of him is far more appreciative than the author's.

¹⁷ Kemāl-Pasha-zāde, Sheykh al-Islam from 1526 to 1534, was a considerable poet and a many-sided scholar. His prose works total close on 300, and deal with history, literature, and lexicography, as well as the 'religious sciences'.

¹⁸ The *Muqni'* of Muwaffiq al-Dīn 'Abd Allāh ibn Qudāma (d. 1223), on the branches of the Hanbalite school.

¹⁹ The Khārijites were originally supporters of the Caliph 'Alī but abandoned his cause when he agreed to submit his quarrel with Mu'āwiya to arbitration, as they regarded this as evidence that he was no less impious than Mu'āwiya who had taken up arms against him. For centuries afterwards the Khārijites warred against all established authority.

THE FAITH OF PHARAOH

'Pharaoh' is the title applied to the kings of Egypt. In olden times every Egyptian sovereign was called Pharaoh. The tyrant who reigned in the time of Moses (the blessing of God be upon our Prophet and upon him), and whom Muslim historians name Walīd, is distinguished from the rest by the appellation 'the Pharaoh of Moses'.

Three, or by another account seven, of the Pharaohs were tyrants and oppressors, and the last and greatest of these was the Pharaoh of Moses. His story is current and celebrated, and is recorded in the histories. He is notorious among the Jews for his unjust treatment and oppression of the Children of Israel. Among the community of Islam too he has become a byword: if anyone is notorious for cruelty and tyranny, and is to be exposed to blame and censure and regarded as corrupt, they say, 'He is like Pharaoh'. In all Koran-commentaries and histories he is described as a misguided infidel, and people at large have adopted this view.

On the basis of his own spiritual vision and insight, Sheykh Muhyi'l-Dīn ibn 'Arabī writes, in the story of Moses in his book *Fusūs al-hikam*,¹ that Pharaoh was a believer and assured of salvation. There is clear confirmation of this assertion and of Pharaoh's faith, in the Koranic verse 'Pharaoh said, I believe that there is no god save Him in whom the Children of Israel believe, and I am of the faithful' (10: 90). Now the state of drowning is not like the state of imminent death, that this should be regarded as the declaration

of faith of one in total despair. The words 'Now? when formerly you disobeyed and were of those who deal corruptly?' (10: 91) are a kind of reproach for his having deferred his faith till then, but are not evidence of his non-acceptance of faith. The verse 'He shall precede his people on the day of resurrection and he shall bring them to hell-fire' (11: 100) does not necessarily indicate his infidelity.

The scriptural evidence for his salvation is the verse 'This day We shall rescue your body that you may be a sign to those who shall come after: indeed many men are heedless of Our signs' (10: 92). Ibn 'Arabī explains this, as meaning 'Today I shall grant you bodily salvation by casting you up on the shore, and I shall also grant salvation to your soul in the next world, so that you may be a great sign of My power among the people who shall come after you, and none shall despair of mercy.' He goes on to say that Pharaoh's case is to be referred to God, for the conviction of his wickedness is rooted in the souls of the generality of mankind, yet they have no scriptural authority for this.

The commentator on the *Fusūs* says: The Sheykh is the saintly heir of Muhammad. The saintly heirs take cognizance of scriptural passages and apply them to the facts, in deductive form. As this adducing of scriptural authority is a process superficially similar to deductive analysis, people regard the saintly heir as a *mujtahid*, whose methods are scientific and logical. So one commentator explains away Ibn 'Arabī's view of Pharaoh by saying that he is to be excused for it as he is acting under God's orders. Certain Ulema, on the other hand, have concocted a story that the whole passage is spurious, interpolated by a Jew.

People in general have fallen into the snare of finding fault with the Sheykh in this matter, and have swarmed

about his head like ants and hornets. Yet they have not succeeded in finding any text as decisive and clear as that quoted by the Sheykh: they have simply scribbled away, on the strength of Pharaoh's reputation for wickedness.

The Sheykh wrote in the *Fusūs* according to the compulsion of his own insight, but one of those scholars who use the method of speculation and deduction, the learned Jalāl Dawwānī, wrote an independent essay on this subject, in which he proved the Sheykh's assertion by regular and correct deduction from the scriptural texts.

The controversy has lasted till our own day, some denying, some accepting. The result of the discussion is as follows. First, a distinction must be made between the method of speculation and the method of purification.² The method of speculation is based on deduction, from evidence intellectual and traditional. The method of purification is based on insight and vision by spiritual exercise and the ascetic life. The terms used in each are different. When an inquiry is founded on one method, its rules and its terms, regard must be paid, in the course of discussion, to the rules and terms of the other method, so that there may be no confusion of the questions or upsetting of the proofs. In all such investigations, this fact is the source of dispute and strife, and the origin of contention.

The exponents of speculation and deduction, following their own rules, criticize and find fault with the exponents of purification. The method of the latter is based not on speculation and deduction but on vision and insight. Their technical terms are quite different, being taken from the Illuminationist philosophy. Though insight is not legally evidence, and proves nothing in the eyes of those who practise specu-

lation, yet for its own practitioners it is proof. Even the exponents of speculation grant that the insight and inspiration of God's saints are a proof of their saintliness, which dictates their actions.

Therefore the rules of the speculative method cannot be used to confute claims and arguments put forward in accordance with the principles of purification; any confutation must use the rules and terms of that same method. Now all attempts to confute Ibn 'Arabī in this matter are by means of speculation and deduction. Therefore they are invalid and unacceptable. On the other hand, in this matter the scriptural texts confirm the Sheykh's assertion, as does Jalāl's deduction by the rules of the speculative method.

Now that these two different planes of investigation are known, if any man disputes this matter is he not a fool? Would he withhold God's mercy from His creatures? What harm does it do him if Pharaoh is a believer? What good does it do him if Pharaoh is an infidel? Certainly if the Jews maintain the latter thesis they have a right to do so, in revenge, because their forefathers suffered great wrong at Pharaoh's hands. But what reason is there for people of other creeds to follow them?

Now the best course for those responsible for the education of students is this: if they will not call Pharaoh a believer, then let them not find fault with those who do, especially the Sheykh. Let them not quit the middle course.

NOTES TO CHAPTER NINE

¹ See Arberry, *Sufism*, pp. 97-104, and Chapter Ten *infra*.

² Compare the author's note on Sufism in *Kashf al-zunūn* (Istanbul, 1941), Vol. I, column 413: 'It is also termed "the knowledge of truth". It is the knowledge of the Way, that is, purging the soul of bad qualities and purifying the heart of base desires. The knowledge of the sacred law without knowledge of the truth is idle, and the knowledge of the truth without knowledge of the sacred law is vain.'

THE CONTROVERSY CONCERNING SHEYKH MUHYI'L-DĪN IBN 'ARABĪ

1. *His biography*

He was Muhyi'l-Dīn ibn Muhammad ibn 'Alī ibn Muhammad 'Arabī al-Tā'ī al-Hātimī of Murcia in Spain, the Malikite. He came into the world on 27 Ramadān, 560/7 August 1165, in the city of Murcia on the Mediterranean shore of Spain, and died on 22 Rabi' II 638/9 November 1240, in the Sālihiya district of Damascus, at the age of 78. He roamed the lands of the West acquiring learning, and perfecting his powers of reason and comprehension. He followed the spiritual way and by spiritual striving he attained the highest grades. Thereafter he came to the Hejaz. After a long sojourn in the Holy Cities he went to Syria, where he stayed till his death. He won renown in his lifetime for his many books and his holy power, and became famous under the title of 'The First Sheykh'. He wrote some six hundred books and essays. His insight compelled him to choose the doctrine of the absolute unity of existence. In such books as the *Fusūs* and the *Futūhāt* he recorded his mystical experiences in the terms peculiar to that doctrine. On the esoteric science of the letters of the alphabet, he composed and wrote the *Jafr kabīr* and the *Miftāh al-jafr*, thereby becoming the matchless superior of his contemporaries. Great sheykhs such as Sadr al-Dīn of Konya¹ came to sit at his feet. In most of his works he stressed the gentler aspects of divinity rather than the sterner ones, and this has caused much dispute ever

since, and ordinary people have fallen into variance concerning him.

2. *Those who disapprove of him.*

After his death, some of the partisans of purification and most of the partisans of speculation examined with the eye of speculation the books he had written in terms of the doctrine of purification and on the basis of the principle of the unity of existence, and they rejected them. Nor was this rejection quite unjustified; by the laws of speculation it seemed to be merited.

Some confined themselves to a refusal to accept them, without positively refuting them. Others carried their non-acceptance to the extreme of writing refutations and lampoons, branding the Sheykh as an infidel. Some fanatics of this sort went so far as to distort his appellation of 'First Sheykh' into 'Worst Sheykh'. But, as we indicated above, this disputation and strife rested on an unsound foundation, so their inordinately savage attacks on him, their declarations that he was an infidel, seemed of as little weight as the creaking of a door or the buzzing of flies. Fair-minded men paid no attention and would not listen. But some, too stupid to know their right hand from their left, were taken in by the hubbub and were brought by bad judgement into great guilt. Those who led them on, in accordance with the maxim 'The one who begins is most to blame', saw nothing for their pains but even greater guilt. The only people who did not incur guilt and perhaps even acquired merit were those who opposed him on the basis of the rules of his own doctrine, and did their duty towards their own school simply by a gentle refusal to accept his views.

3. *Those who accept him.*

The majority of the exponents of purification, and a number of the exponents of speculation, who understood the origin and principle of the Sheykh's doctrine, or who looked at his outward state and judged correctly, never rejected him but accepted all his words. Some even said, 'He is the Seal of the Saints and heir to the caliphate of Muhammad.' They wrote refutations of those who impugned and maligned him, and they showed them up as fools.

Neither party was free from excess or from shortcomings, but most Sufi sheykhhs after his time followed him in the matter of the unity of existence. That illustrious seeker after truth, Mevlānā Jāmī,² who was one of those who combine the methods of speculation and purification, wrote a treatise in which he set forth and expounded this problem, in detail. Those who wish may study it.

4. *Those who suspend judgement about him.*

There is one party, including partisans of both doctrines, who have suspended judgement about the Sheykh, and have not looked at his books. They have committed themselves neither to rejection nor to acceptance, saying that it is best not to come to the abyss of altercation, but to stand on the sideline of neutrality, where safety lies. These have acted rightly and have suffered no harm. This view may in essence be inferred from the *Wasīyetnāme* ('Testament') of Sadr al-Dīn of Konya, for among his injunctions he includes this: 'Hereafter let not every man seek to learn from the writings of the Sheykh or from mine, for that gate is barred to the majority of mankind.'

The best course therefore for the seeker after truth is to be reasonable and, if he is incapable of under-

standing the abstrusities of the Sheykh's words, not to prate on the subject at all, thus safeguarding himself against falling into the abyss of doubt and uncertainty and involvement. It is best to think well of the Sheykh; if one does not do so, one should not think badly of him. This is the attitude proper to the generality of believers. May God Almighty aid them to think well.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TEN

¹ Sadr al-Dīn of Konya (d. 1273) was the stepson and disciple of Ibn 'Arabī.

² For Jāmī (d. 1492), see Arberry, *Sufism*.

THE CURSING OF YAZĪD

This too is a battlefield of opinions and is of greater antiquity than the other topics. It is a topic that was current between Umayyad and 'Abbāsīd, between Sunnite and Shi'ite, and has survived to the present day. Its origin is as follows.

By the mission of the Glory of the World (God bless him and give him peace), the Islamic State came into being. In order to set in motion the affairs of the Faith Manifest, he laid the foundations and fixed the practices of the State, thus combining during his blessed lifetime the functions of prophet and sultan. In accordance with his saying, 'The caliphate will last for thirty years after me', for thirty years the Rightly-guided Caliphs executed the ordinances of the Faith. At the expiry of the term of the caliphate, in conformity with his words, 'Then it will be kings, tyrants', aspirants to power began to act on the principle that might is right. Self-interest became evident. Men adhered to various causes, ostensibly connected with points of religion, and thus there were many quarrels and battles in the days of 'Uthmān and 'Alī (God be pleased with both). The victors set up the Umayyad dynasty at Damascus. Differences arose among the Muslims and they split into various factions. The sovereignty being disputed between Umayyads and Hāshimites,¹ the Imam Hasan abandoned his claim, and the power was left in Umayyad hands. This position displeased the Hāshimite party and became a source of bitter vexation to them. Being unable to stomach it, they prevailed on the

Imam Husayn (God be pleased with him) to leave Medina and go to Arab Iraq, in order to seize power. The Umayyads becoming aware of this, their supporters, as was to be expected, prepared to defend them by every available means. The Kerbelā incident took place, in the course of which the Imam Husayn and his followers lost their lives.² That was in the year 61/680, when Yazīd son of Mu'āwiya was reigning at Damascus. The Hāshimites were sorely grieved, but vengeance by the sword was out of the question, so they took to using their tongues to abuse and execrate Yazīd and his followers, thus slaking their burning anger. Ever since then, this grieving and this cursing has been customary among the Shiites and has gradually spread to the Sunnites too. In the year 132/750, the 'Abbāsīd family arose, from the Hāshimite clan, and the Umayyads were exterminated.³ The vilification and cursing increased. Many of the Shiites joined the Rāfidite sect and began (God forbid!) to vilify the first two Caliphs, Abū Bakr and 'Umar.⁴ Just as the Khārijite sect thought too little of 'Alī and the descendants of Alī, so the Rāfidite sect thought too much.

During the 'Abbāsīd period there was much dispute on this subject between the Sunnite and Shiite Ulema. When the tenets of Islam were written down and the books of theology composed, the Sunnite doctrine about the Companions of the Prophet, which is binding on all Muslims, was thus formulated: 'Let the Companions be universally mentioned for good and let no word of evil be spoken concerning them. Let them all be well thought of. In the matter of the dissension and strife that befell amongst them, let this be said, that they were all *mujtahid*. It is possible for a *mujtahid* to err. If he is right, he has a twofold reward; if he errs, a single reward. In the sight of God they are all meritor-

ious and deserving of reward. Of 'Alī and Mu'āwiya let this be said, that Mu'āwiya exercised his personal opinion, but erroneously. Right was on the side of 'Alī.'

About Yazīd, however, there is no unanimity. He was not one of the Companions, being born in the year 25/645-6 and dying in 64/683. The body of Shiite Ulema, because of their ancient grudge against him, have declared it lawful to curse him. Some Sunnite Ulema have followed them, saying, 'Yazīd was a profligate and an unbeliever: certain of his poems give proof that he was an infidel.' Among these Ulema are Abu'l-Hasan 'Alī ibn Muhammad al-Kiyā al-Harrāsī, the Shafiite lawyer, who died in 504/1110-11, and, of more recent scholars, Sa'd al-Dīn Taftazānī. The majority of Sunnites, however, do not deem it lawful to curse him.

The Imam Ghazālī gave a detailed fetwa, declaring it to be unlawful, and forbade the practice, saying, 'It is better to refrain from cursing anyone, be he infidel or devil'. The Imam Sirāj al-Dīn 'Alī 'Uthmān al-Ūshī⁵ too said in *Yaqūl al-'abd* ('Thus Says the Slave'), his versified treatise on the principles of religion:

'And after death Yazīd was no more cursed'.

But since his time, the practice of thinking ill of Yazīd, as of Pharaoh, and regarding him as damned, has taken root among the common people: his name has become a byword in abuse and vituperation. The original passions are disregarded, and through sheer imitation expressions such as 'Neither for love of 'Alī nor hatred of Mu'āwiya' have become current, and most people have fallen into the way of cursing. They have not taken to heart the words of Ghazālī, nor have they heeded the admonition of *Yaqūl al-'abd*. A few brutish individuals, execrating Mu'āwiya, have even

refused to wear blue.⁶ Debate on this subject with them is meaningless, for their motives are vain fanaticism or ignorance, and imitation of others. The man who seeks the middle course will choose, without rancour, the way of the Sunnite Ulema and will follow the fetwa of the Imam Ghazālī. He will fall in with the notion that has prevailed these thousand years, and will not indulge in futile stupidity.

The fetwa in question is recorded in the *Wafayāt* of Ibn Khallikān, in the biography of al-Kiyā al-Harrāsī, under the letter 'ayn.⁷

NOTES TO CHAPTER ELEVEN

¹ The Hāshimites are the descendants of Hāshim, great-grandfather of the Prophet and his cousin 'Alī, and grandfather of 'Abbās, ancestor of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphs. Umayya, great-grandfather of Mu'āwiya I, was Hāshim's nephew.

² Kerbelā, 55 miles south-southwest of Baghdad, where the Umayyad forces massacred Husayn and his small group of supporters, is the holiest place of the Shiite world.

³ An exaggeration: one Umayyad, 'Abd al-Rahmān, escaped to Spain, where he founded the Caliphate of Cordova (756-1031).

⁴ The Rāfidites were a heterodox offshoot of the Shi'a, who abandoned Zayd, grandson of Husayn, when he refused to abuse the memory of Abū Bakr and 'Umar. 'Uthman escaped their cursing because he had been murdered, with the acquiescence of 'Alī. The term Rāfidite is often applied by Sunnites to Shiites in general.

⁵ al-Ūshī, a Hanafite lawyer of Fergana, d. 575/1179-80.

⁶ The objection to blue was presumably that the Turkish name of the colour, *mavi*, is reminiscent of the

Turkish pronunciation of the Caliph's name, *Muaviye*.

⁷ Ibn Khallikān (1211-82) wrote a famous biographical dictionary, *Wafayāt al-a'yān* ('Obituaries of the Eminent'). The article on al-Kiyā al-Harrāsī will be found on p. 229 of Vol. II of the English translation by MacGuckin de Slane (Paris, 1842-71).

TWELVE

INNOVATION

By 'innovation' (*bid'a*) is meant any new development in matters sacred or mundane, appearing during or after the second age; that is, anything which did not exist in the time of the Prophet (on him be the peace and the blessing of God) and his noble Companions (God be pleased with them), and of which there is no trace in any of the three categories of Sunna and concerning which there is no tradition.

Such things are of two kinds. The first is called 'good innovation': that which was not known in the time of the Prophet but which the leaders of the Faith have subsequently allowed as filling a need. Examples are the building of minarets and the manufacture of books. The second is 'bad innovation': for example, in matters of faith, the beliefs of misguided schismatics who differ from the followers of the Sunna, and, in matters of practice, the forms of worship invented by the common people on no authority but their own.

The ordinances relating to both kinds are set forth explicitly and in detail in the law-books; we do not propose to describe them here. All we wish to say is this: these innovations are all firmly based on custom and habit. Once an innovation has taken root and become established in a community, it is the height of stupidity and ignorance to invoke the principle of 'enjoining right and forbidding wrong'¹ and to hope to constrain the people to abandon it. People will not give up anything to which they have grown accus-

tomed, whether it be Sunna or innovation, unless some man of blood massacre them all. The Sunnite sultans, for example, have fought many wars and battles over innovations in doctrine, but to no avail. Over innovations in practice also, law-abiding and God-fearing rulers and preachers in every generation have worn themselves out for years, without making the people give up one single innovation.

People will not abandon custom. Whatever it is, it will last until God decrees otherwise. For the rulers, what is necessary is to protect the Muslim social order and to maintain the obligations and principles of Islam among the people. As for the preachers, they will have done their duty if they gently admonish and advise the people to turn towards the Sunna and to beware of innovation. The duty of complying belongs to the people; they cannot be forced to comply.

In short, there is no point in conducting profound researches into this subject, for if the people of any age after that of the Prophet were to scrutinize their own mode of life and compare it with the Sunna, they would find a wide discrepancy. If everybody were to carry out an honest self-examination, nothing approaching conformity with the Sunna would be found. Scarcely any of the sayings or doings of any age are untainted by innovation.

We can but hope that Muhammad, the Perfection of Nobility, who intercedes for the community, will overlook the many sins of innovation committed by his weak and helpless people, and will let the fact that they are of the Faith, believers in the One God, induce him to intercede for them and bring them forgiveness. Otherwise, if it is required that the community live up to his standard of perfection, their case is hard

indeed. May the Majesty of God Most High grant us grace and guidance. Amen.

NOTE TO CHAPTER TWELVE

¹ See Chapter Seventeen.

PILGRIMAGES TO TOMBS

Former peoples paid great attention and devotion to visiting graves. One account makes this practice the source and origin of the worship of idols. At the beginning of Islam, for this reason, the Glory of the World for a while absolutely forbade visits to tombs, but subsequently allowed them, in these words: 'I had forbidden you to visit tombs, but now you may visit them.' Visiting tombs and addressing supplications to the dead then became lawful.

The point now at issue is the practice of appealing to the dead for help, and on this the Ulema have disagreed. Sheykhs have allowed it, saying, 'When you are perplexed, seek help from those in the grave.' They have said too, 'Inasmuch as the soul is attached to the body, it is also not without attachment to the grave. In the tombs of the great there is a vestige of spirituality. Seeking access to God in such places is preferable to prayer and appeal anywhere else. Has it escaped notice that certain of the great Naqshibendī¹ sheykhs have frequented the tombs of their predecessors and so have borrowed of their spirituality and have taken the Way?'

But most lawyers have said, 'To allow the asking of aid from the dead is to slacken the reins of the common people. From this arose idolatry in olden time. First they sought to approach God through the spirits of prophets and saints. Gradually they began to make images of them and to worship them, saying that they were their intercessors with God. It is with this inten-

tion that tomb worshippers frequent graves for fasting and prayer.' Hence they have absolutely forbidden asking help from the dead.

And indeed, they say, this practice is rank polytheism. Do we not see that when Abraham (on whom be peace) was cast into Nimrod's fire, and Gabriel (on whom be peace) came and said, 'Have you anything to ask?' Abraham replied, 'Of you, no.' 'Then ask of your Lord', said Gabriel. But Abraham refused to express his need or to pray, saying, 'God knows my state; why should I ask Him?'² Now the people have been taught the principle of strict monotheism; they must seek help and favour from none but God. The implication of the maxim 'Seek to draw nigh unto God' is that one should perform acts of obedience and works of piety.

Of those who held this view, Ibn Taymīya³ went so far as to forbid visiting even the tomb of the most noble Prophet himself. It was he who said, 'The fact that 'Umar, when it was desired to pray for rain, would not appeal at the tomb of the Prophet but sought instead the mediation of 'Abbās, is proof that it is best to seek the mediation of the living.'⁴ His extremism in several matters of this kind caused him to fall foul of the Ulema in Egypt and Syria; they subjected him to many inquisitions and brought him to trial before the Sultan of Egypt. The public were divided, both sides writing numerous broadsheets. Ibn Kathīr and Ibn Qayyim were his disciples: in their writings they deal exhaustively with these inquisitions. His opponents declared Ibn Taymīya an infidel and eventually imprisoned him. He died in prison in 728/1328. Then, as the question of pilgrimage to tombs had become hotly disputed, both parties found it necessary to resort to arbitration. At the arbitration, the middle course was chosen, and this ruling given:

Those who understand the subtleties of the attachment of the soul to the body and to the tomb, and who find a difference between appeals made at tombs and those made elsewhere, may address themselves to the tombs, subject to certain conditions. This some sheykhs have done, and their doing so is not polytheism. There are even degrees of monotheism. The monotheism of Abraham was pure monotheism. Those who devote themselves to God 'heart and body and soul' pay no heed to mediation. Most possessors of spiritual power are of this kind, whereas men of lower degree find it necessary to provide themselves with intermediaries and go-betweens, in seeking and avoiding, in matters spiritual and physical. So long as there is no intention of worshipping the intermediary, no polytheism is involved.

The proper behaviour for those who take the middle course is this: when they reach the goal of their pilgrimage they should do no more than recite a *Fātiha* to win the approval of God (glorious is His splendour), and dedicate the reward thereof to the soul of the occupant of the grave.⁵ They should have no other idea; they should neither kiss the tomb nor cling to it. If fortunate enough to visit the hallowed tomb of the lord of men, the Prophet, they should stand before it with hands clasped in front of them, in the prescribed manner, in heartfelt devotion and prayer. They should not be guilty of the indecorum of clinging to the grille or kissing it. This is the form laid down in the holy law. Any other mode of behaviour is evidence of disrespect. The best course is not to incur any such risk. Let no one think that by any such pointless action he draws nearer to the spirits.

In this way a balance is struck between the extremes of the two factions; on the one hand the people are not

absolutely forbidden to visit tombs, on the other the reins are not slackened by giving the common folk absolute licence to ask help from the graves.

And yet it is a fact that among mankind generally lamps are placed in graveyards and that women and children and men of weak intellect have made it their habit to go to graveyards and rub their faces and eyes on the tombs and to anoint themselves with the lamp-oil. This they will not abandon. Caretakers of graveyards and sellers of lamps make their living thereby.

To quarrel and argue with people about this is stupid and futile. They will not be deterred. Apart from tombs, some brutish people tie bits of linen to big trees by the roadside and also reverence certain stones. Leaving aside medical treatment by natural remedies, and with the exception of the Black Stone,⁶ which is a part of Islam, stones and trees are not to be honoured and revered. For this there are sound reasons.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THIRTEEN

¹ The Naqshibendī Order was founded in Central Asia by Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshibend of Bukhara (1318-89) and came to Asia Minor with Timur's armies. It is one of the Orders closest to Sunnite orthodoxy.

² This story is told by the commentators but is not found in the Koran.

³ Ibn Taymīya (d. 1328) preached against the adoration of saints and against all other accretions to the pristine Sunna. Ironically, his own tomb became a place of pilgrimage because he was a saintly man who had died for the Faith.

⁴ 'Umar, in time of drought, used to pray for rain in the name of 'Abbās ibn 'Abd al-Muttalib, saying, "O God, we used to ask Thee for rain in the name of

our Prophet, and Thou wouldst send rain. Now we ask Thee in the name of the uncle of our Prophet, so send us rain." And they were sent rain' (Bukhārī, *Abwāb al-istisqā'*).

⁵ It is a pious duty to recite the Fātiha, the first sura of the Koran, when passing a grave, for the repose of the dead.

⁶ The Black Stone is set in the south-east corner of the Ka'ba, four or five feet above the ground. Europeans who have seen it describe it as an irregular oval, some 7 inches in its greatest width, composed of over a dozen small stones perfectly cemented together. See T. P. Hughes, *A Dictionary of Islam* (W. H. Allen & Co., 1885, reprinted by Luzac, 1935), pp. 154-5. A sketch will be found in P. K. Hitti's *History of the Arabs* (Macmillan, 1937), p. 101.

THE SUPEREROGATORY PRAYERS OF RAGHĀ'IB, BERĀT, AND QADR¹

It should be known that the lawyers have handed it down, in the canonical books, that with the exception of one or two kinds of prayer the performance of supererogatory prayers in congregation, by prior arrangement, is abominated.

By the end of the third century after the Flight of the Prophet, however, the Raghā'ib prayers had arisen in Jerusalem and had won great popular esteem. Subsequently it became customary to perform the prayers of Berāt and the Night of Power in congregation, and customary it has remained. Some Ulema spoke against them, saying that they were innovation and that the performance of supererogatory prayers in congregation was abominated. All to no purpose; the people's enthusiasm increased. Legal opinions were sought and the elders of Islam gave their fetwas, some declaring the practice disapproved, some saying 'Let them make their vow and pray'.²

But custom was on the side of their performance, and the law ordains respect for custom, and it is agreed that there is certain harm in trying to prevent any innovation or disapproved practice. The fetwas therefore mostly chose the lesser of the two evils. The civil authorities were not usually obliged to prevent these prayers, and, when they were so obliged, knowing that the people would not be prevented, they turned a blind eye.

In this matter too, however, the common people fell

into fanaticism, and split into two factions. One faction went to one extreme, declaring in the strongest and roughest terms that these prayers ought not to be performed. The second faction went to the other extreme, saying that they certainly must be performed. Neither side was right; both diverged from the just mean.

The correct decision and reasonable course in this matter is this: there is nothing to choose between performing them and not performing them. If a man wishes, he may make his vow and pray. If he does not, he may perform the night prayer in his own home, or go to a mosque where only the night prayer is performed and not the supererogatory prayers. If he finds himself among people performing them, let him perform them too: he should not commit the stupidity of going against the congregation by walking out. If he thinks about it, he will see that the prayer he performs there, with or without a vow, is better than either of the two possible alternatives, which are to set himself against the congregation by getting up and walking out, or to sit still without joining in.

Otherwise the emotion of fanaticism comes into action, and self-importance and rancour blindfold the eye of discernment. The plain middle way becomes invisible and a man goes to extremes, while acting reasonably by his own lights. The poor wretch does not realize that he deserves to be upbraided for his obstinate priggishness, and is laying himself open to the charge of being hateful to the people and rejected of God. Fool! Would it hurt you to pray at home just this one night, and avoid creating such a displeasing and indecorous situation? Have you invariably prayed in a congregation all your life? Or if you were to perform that prayer in the mosque with your brother-

Muslims, would you be committing a sin that would make you an infidel? I suppose you are equally careful, in all your words and deeds, to avoid what is disapproved? It may be that if you honestly compared your behaviour with the law you would find a great deal of difference. Your own tutor Qādizāde Efendi³ used to say, in his lectures on Ghazālī's *Revival of Religious Sciences*, 'All we can derive from these lectures is a knowledge of our own nature and our inadequacy.' In these words he freely and fairly confessed his own shortcomings. Why should *you* be so arrogant and puffed up?

Now the preachers must cite the above decision at the time of these prayers; that is the duty of their office. They must not spread extremist notions and so provoke the people and sow dissension among the community of Muhammad. This is not a subject either for excessive subtlety or for excessive crudity. It is better not to forbid any custom that takes the shape of worshipping God, for that would give rise to zeal and persistence. Perhaps they might try encouraging the practice; then people would become slack and gradually abandon it, as they have done with other religious duties: does one not see those who are usually assiduous in non-attendance at prayer flocking to the mosque on those nights, since prohibition has brought forth enthusiasm?

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOURTEEN

¹ Raghā'ib. The eve of the first Friday in Rajab, the seventh lunar month, believed to be the night on which the Prophet was conceived.

Berāt. The night following the fourteenth day of Sha'bān, the eighth lunar month. Prayers recited on that night are thought to be certain of acceptance.

Qadr. 'The Night of Power'; the night following the twenty-seventh day of Ramadān, the ninth lunar month. Traditionally the night on which the Koran was revealed to Muhammad.

² Every act of worship must be preceded by a clear formulation of one's intention to perform it. The 'vow' is the expression of intention voluntarily to perform the supererogatory prayer.

³ These words make it plain that the whole of this blunt message is directed against one specific prig who ostentatiously walked out of the mosque after the night prayer, while the congregation was beginning the supererogatory prayer. It is not possible to identify him.

SHAKING HANDS

Shaking hands was originally the Sunna when paying homage or on meeting. The noble Companions (the approval of God Almighty be on them one and all) used to shake hands when they met one another, and to say 'God pardon me and you!' There are many traditions of the Prophet to this effect. He who wishes may consult the *Adhkār* of Nawawī,¹ one chapter of which is devoted to traditions about hand-shaking. Later the practice fell into desuetude, and people came to do it only after prayer; in Turkey, mostly after the Friday prayer. As this was an innovation based on custom and use, certain preachers forbade it as being a heretical Shiite practice. A fetwa was sought, and the reply was this: the heretical Shiite practice is to shake hands after all five prayers every day. The shaking of hands after the Friday prayer is a special case. For it is better in the case of firmly-rooted innovations to temporize as far as possible, and to put people in the right.

On this matter also discussion arose, though not to such an immoderate extent, and a few people abandoned the practice. Most people however regard it as a religious duty, particularly at festivals.

The reasonable middle course here is that a man should not be the first to shake hands on Friday in the mosque, but if his neighbour offers his hand what can he do but take it? Otherwise his neighbour will be mortified or vexed; certainly he will feel some disagreeable emotion. To practise this innovation is less

grave than to hurt the feelings of a believer. And if from that moment on he conforms with custom and takes the initiative in shaking hands—well, it is not the sort of thing to make him a rebel against God, and a sinner. There is no harm in it.

As for shaking hands at festivals: to shake hands on meeting somebody is Sunna; to confine it to festivals is a matter of custom and use, not Sunna. But then not every facet of behaviour can be Sunna, you know.

NOTE TO CHAPTER FIFTEEN

¹ The full title of this collection of traditions is *Hilyat al-abrār wa-shi'ār al-akhyār fī talkhīs al-da'awāt wa'l-adhkār*. The author was Muhyi'l-Dīn Abū Zakarīyā Yahyā ibn Sharaf al-Nawawī (1233-77).

BOWING

There is some dispute about bowing, or motioning with the head and hand by way of salutation, on the ground that it is innovation. Members of other nations and faiths have their individual modes of greeting, and it has become customary for the various classes within Islam to have different forms of salutation according to their station. True, in the early days of Islam the universal salutation was the word 'Peace', but afterwards the dynasties of Islamic monarchs arose, each with its own manners and customs, and the diversity of States and the variety of lands and customs militated against things' remaining as they had been in the time of the Prophet and his noble Companions. Most things that had been the practice among them were forgotten, and it became contrary to usage to do and observe them all, so that they survived only as words in the books of tradition.

Laxity has come to be permitted even in the observance of religious duties. This has been true of former nations and faiths also; such has ever been God's custom. No prophet's people have ever been able to carry out every detail of his practice from beginning to end. Nothing is immutable in the world of genesis and corruption. In conformity with the Koranic injunction 'and when you are given greeting, reply with a better or return the same' (4: 88), during the lifetime of the Prophet, even a small boy who entered his noble presence would say 'Peace be upon you', and the Prophet would reply, 'And on you be the peace and

the mercy and the blessings of God'. In the time of the first four Caliphs, all the Companions and ordinary Muslims used to greet each other in this fashion. Later, in the period of the Islamic kings, certain customs appeared; different forms of greeting arose and became established in every people.

Now, for example, in the Ottoman Empire, it is customary to kiss the ground in the Sultan's presence by way of salutation, and to incline and bow before the great ones of the Faith and the State, particularly the Ulema. Of lesser men, some hail each other with 'Good morning!', others with 'Lord love you!', but many do say 'Peace!' in conformity with the Sunna.

Now to dispute and contend with the people, on the grounds that these customs are contrary to the Sunna and should be abandoned, is pure folly, for as has frequently been said it is difficult to change a people's customs. In matters of this kind, one should see if there is any public evil or any breach of order.

In the first place, some humble folk salute their superiors, sovereign or otherwise, by kissing the ground, whereupon certain men of arid piety make a great fuss, saying, 'You have made yourself an infidel; you have brought a bane upon us!' and make the poor fellow burn with shame. Here is no question of infidelity or bane. The prerequisite condition for infidelity is that one prostrate oneself 'on the seven members'¹ with the intention of worshipping a created thing, for as long as it takes to say three times 'Glory be to God'. The 'prostration of salutation' was held lawful in former ages, but was abrogated under Islam. The obvious course is that anyone who kisses the ground should not prostrate himself for that much time. How are infidelity and bane involved? The most there is in kissing the ground and kneeling and bowing and using

different expressions of greeting, is opposition to the Sunna, which is excusable on the grounds that there is no contravention of custom and use. For if one enters the presence of the great, and merely says 'Peace be upon you!' it is usual among them to put it down to disrespect. Therefore people observe custom and usage and the rules of politeness.

So if students, on entering the presence of their teacher, fail to incline and bow, he ought to remain silent. For in these days the mere salutation 'Peace' is a sign of equality of rank and age, and they will have failed to observe the etiquette customary nowadays between inferiors and superiors, and will thus have affronted their master.

The learned gentlemen who practise 'enjoining right and forbidding wrong' must understand these subtle truths: they must not waste their time in vainly trying to divert the people from their accustomed course. They may make their point once: that is sufficient to invalidate the offender's plea of ignorance. If that has no effect, any further remonstrance is idle chatter which serves no purpose.

NOTE TO CHAPTER SIXTEEN

¹ See Introduction, pp. 15-16.

ENJOINING RIGHT AND FORBIDDING WRONG¹

The Ulema of Islam have differed, some saying it is absolutely obligatory and some saying it is not. But the fact is that it all depends: in matters obligatory or prohibited, it is obligatory; in matters merely disapproved or recommended, it is recommended.

The late Imam Sayf al-Dīn al-Āmadī, in his *Abkār al-afkār* ('First Fruits of Thought'),² mentions seven rules for obligatoriness, which are also given by the great scholar 'Adud al-Dīn al-Ījī in his *Mawāqif* ('Stations') and the Sayyid the Sharīf Jurjānī in his commentary on the latter work. Both these last give prominence to two of the rules as being over-riding conditions.

The first rule is that both the giver and the receiver of the injunction must be *mukallaf*—having reached the age of discretion and fully subject to the sacred law—and capable of understanding speech.

The second rule is that the enjoiner must know that what he enjoins is right and what he forbids is wrong, but he himself does not have to act accordingly and need not be respectable. For instance, a profligate at a debauch may, while drinking himself, tell the others not to drink. It is obligatory for him not to drink, and it is likewise obligatory for him to tell others not to drink. Abandonment of one obligation does not necessitate the abandonment of the other. Evasion of one duty is not incompatible with the performance of another duty. Of course, if he carries out both obliga-

tions he will have attained respectability and his words will carry more weight. If the rest of these rules and conditions are fulfilled, this is obligatory.

The third rule is that the thing one enjoins must be something obligatory, and the thing one forbids be something prohibited; otherwise enjoining and forbidding are not obligatory, as we have said.

The fourth rule is that the obligatory nature of the object of the injunction must be absolutely certain, such as the obligation to pray or the prohibition of wine, and not just a matter of opinion.

The fifth rule: there should be no one capable of enjoining and forbidding but oneself; if there is, it ceases to be an individual duty and becomes the joint responsibility of the community. If there is one capable person in every district, that is enough. Yet if somebody sees a wrong being done, he may not pass it by (if the other requirements are satisfied), saying 'Someone else can deal with it', for it may be that no one else will happen to notice it.

The sixth rule, which is the first overriding condition, is that if right is enjoined and wrong forbidden, the coming forth of the right and the disappearance of the wrong may be reasonably expected: that is to say, one should regard it as a prior duty not to provoke people into stubborn persistence or stir them up to break the peace. If that is likely to happen, there is no obligation to enjoin or to forbid. The practice is commendable only if one does it without quarrelling and strife, for the purpose of giving effect to the cardinal ordinances of the Faith and on condition that there is no breach of the peace.

The seventh rule and second overriding condition is that there be no inquisition and prying; that it be done without spying and peeping. For prying means taking

pains to bring foul calumny to light, and that is prohibited. God Almighty says in His honoured Book, 'Do not pry' (49:12) and speaks of 'those who love foul calumny to spread abroad' (24:18). The Prophet (God bless him and give him peace) said, in a tradition, 'Whoso seeks to expose the shame of his brother, God will expose his shame', and, in another, 'If any man has committed any such vileness, let him conceal it and God will conceal it. If he reveal unto us his secret sin, we shall inflict upon him the punishment ordained by God.'³

It was his noble habit to command that misdeeds be not pried into but concealed, and treated with kindness and generosity. He would not endure the meddlesome publication of calumny. He used to say, 'Regard the exposure of misdeeds as abominable, and conceal them', and, 'When hearing suits wherein calumny plays a part, find an excuse for concealment, with a "perhaps" or a "possibly".'

Such are the rules and conditions required to make obligatory the enjoining of right and the forbidding of wrong. If a single one of them is not fulfilled, there is no obligation; it remains a matter of desirability, which may well be left undone if there is any risk of civil strife, in which case silent disapproval is enough.

Now we see how arrogant they are who assert that they enjoin right and forbid wrong. The most noble Prophet used to deal kindly and generously with his community. The arrogant men of later time, not seeing the disgrace of running counter to him, label some of the community as infidels, some as heretics, some as profligates, for trifling reasons, without fear of God or shame before His Prophet. They bring the people to the grievous state of fanaticism, and cause dissension. Ordinary folk know nothing of these rules

and conditions; thinking that it is obligatory in every case to enjoin right and forbid wrong, they quarrel and are pertinacious with one another. The baseless wrangling in which they engage, with stone-like stupidity, sometimes leads to bloodshed. Most fighting and strife between Muslims arises from this cause.

NOTES TO CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

¹ For the scriptural basis of this principle, see Koran 3:100.

² *Abkār al-afkār*, on *kalām*, by Abu'l-Hasan 'Alī ibn Sayf al-Dīn al-Āmadī, originally a Hanbalite, later a Shafiite, who died at Damascus in 1233.

³ These words were spoken by the Prophet after he had ordered a self-confessed adulterer to be flogged.

THE RELIGION OF ABRAHAM

It should be known that although there is a distinction, if one considers the matter, between the ideas of religion (*milla*), faith (*din*) and code of revealed law (*shari' a*), their import all goes back to the concepts brought to his community by one of the great prophets, lords of resolve. One speaks of the religion of such-and-such a prophet, or his faith, or his law. All the prophets are in agreement about God's unity: at the roots there is no divergence; divergence comes in the branches.

The faith and religion of Islam agree, in the roots and in most of the branches, with the faith and religion of Abraham, and the terms have therefore come to be associated. In our own day, some revered men of the great Ulema have been asked if it is permissible for a member of the community of Muhammad to speak of himself as belonging to the religion of Abraham; they have replied that it is not permissible. They have written detailed and comprehensive treatises and have elucidated the matter with citations drawn from the books of theology and the Koran-commentaries. Other sheykhs have written treatises purporting to refute them.

The humble author too has produced three essays on the subject. In the first he summarizes the views of the commentator Fādil, in the second he gives the conclusions reached by Sheykh Mūjib, and in the third he sums up.

The first essay. In his treatise, Fādil states his case thus.

The law-books mention three possible attitudes towards the codes of revealed law of former peoples:

- (1) We must comply with the laws of an earlier prophet; that prophet's law stands unless it has been abrogated.
- (2) We need not comply with the laws of an earlier prophet unless there is evidence that it still stands.
- (3) We must comply with the law of an earlier prophet, but only by virtue of its being the law of our Prophet, not *quâ* the law of the earlier prophet; this provided that God the Blessed and Most High or the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace) has declared that law to belong to that prophet, and that the declaration is not in terms of disapproval.

The Glory of Islam, al-Bazdawī, said in his *Usūl*,¹ 'This is, in our view, the correct attitude to adopt'. This is in fact the attitude chosen in theological books generally, and various logical arguments have been set forth in support of it. One such argument is this: Muhammad, the Messenger of God, is the compiler of the beauties of the law. He is the heir of the past. The books and laws of former peoples have come down to him and his followers by inheritance; in matters not abrogated they must be complied with as being the law and religion of our Prophet. The law and the religion having come down by inheritance, the legacy which formerly belonged to the legator and was counted his property now becomes the property of the heir; it is not counted as belonging to the legator, who no longer has any interest in it.

So this law is the religion of Abraham; that is, it belonged to him. Being true, it still stands. It passed to Muhammad and became his, and Abraham (peace be upon him) has no further interest in it.

Such is the argument as set forth in detail by the commentator Bazdawī, author of the *Kashf al-astar* ('Unveiling'), and by Akmal al-Dīn, author of the *Taqrīr* ('Confirmation')². In the *Tawdīh* ('Explanation')

and other theological works a summary of this argument is given.

In consequence, the great scholar Bāydāwī and Abu'l-Su'ūd Efendi, in commenting on the verse 'So follow the religion of Abraham', (3: 89), explained it as meaning 'follow the religion of Islam, which is in origin the religion of Abraham'. So it is not permissible for anyone to say 'I belong to the religion of Abraham', for the outward significance of these words is that the religion is still that of Abraham, and that the religion on which one's actions should be based relates to him. And if one says that, it follows logically that the religion belongs to Abraham and not to Muhammad in his own person, so that Muhammad and all of us are subject to Abraham and count as his community. It is not permissible to tell that to the common people. To the chosen few it is still permissible to say that the religion of Muhammad is in origin the religion of Abraham, but that the religion on which one's actions should be based is that of Muhammad, not of Abraham. But one should not quote the superficial implication of the words as being dogma; for that, a rider is necessary. Let those who hear understand; let the few not speak those words before the many, or they will go off and repeat the superficial sense of them as dogma. In short, every saying is taken literally; it is not permissible for us to utter words whose superficial sense must not be taken as dogma. We must first put them in a form acceptable as dogma.

Next he adduces and explains various logical arguments, the purport of which is well known, to reinforce his case and to resolve any doubts or objections that may be raised. There is no need to detail them, but among the principles he cites as proofs there are a number of noteworthy points:

(1) As the Sun of the Imams³ says, an indication that the law of Muhammad is the fundamental law of laws is to be found in the verse, 'And when God entered into covenant with the prophets' (3: 75).⁴ For the fact that a covenant was entered into, to confirm the former prophets, shows that they must be inferior to Muhammad and rank as members of his community. Now it cannot be right for Muhammad to be subject to the law of any former prophet, for that would make him an inferior, like one of that prophet's community, which would be to reduce the Apostle in rank. Now Muhammad is prime in his prophethood and in his law, and all others are secondary. The detailed discussion by the author of the *Unveiling* is on these lines, and the same argument is summarized in the *Confirmation*.

(2) On the verse 'The closest of mankind to Abraham are those who follow him, and this Prophet, and those who believe' (3: 61), the revered Kāzirūnī⁵ says, 'The Prophet Muhammad is the law-giver in his own right; that is, independently of any other man, but his law corresponds in most details to that of Abraham. Proof of his complete independence is afforded in the tradition "Were Moses alive, he could do nothing but follow me".'

(3) *Explanation of the arguments about which the people are doubtful:*

'Then We revealed unto you that you must follow the religion of Abraham the Hanif' (Kor. 16:124).⁶

'Say, God deals truly. Follow then the religion of Abraham the Hanif' (Kor. 3: 89).

Those addressed in these verses were ordered to

follow the religion of Abraham. That being so, it would seem permissible to say that we are of the religion of Abraham. The answer however is that what is meant by the order to follow is an order to follow the religion of Islam, which is fundamentally the religion of Abraham. The late Sa'dī Efendi⁷ said, 'In the words "We revealed, etc." there is evidence that inasmuch as Muhammad the Chosen was not ordered to follow Abraham but to follow the religion of Abraham, Muhammad is not subject to Abraham. Rather, as Muhammad took the religion from the same source that Abraham took it from, Muhammad is independent.' In some theological works, the following interpretation is given as a summary of Sa'dī Efendi's words. The verse implies that one must act in accordance with the religion. As the law belongs to our Prophet, and he had it at first hand, it does not imply 'following' in the sense of inferiority.

(4) The great Sa'd al-Dīn Taftazānī said in his marginal note to the commentary on the words 'follow therefore their guidance' (Kor. 6: 90), 'The purpose in relating the religion to Abraham is to honour Abraham and is a declaration that the religion is true and is in conformity with indications rational and traditional. But the duty of following the religion of Abraham does not derive from any importance it may have as being *his* religion.'

The great 'Isām al-Dīn⁸ said, in connection with this note, 'The words are an allusion to the idolaters who imitate their ancestors. The meaning is that one must follow the prophets, not one's pagan forefathers. In following the prophets, one abandons the blind imitation of one's pagan forefathers and seeks to establish the truth on a basis of reason and revelation.'

(5) Although the Jews and Christians and pagan Arabs were opposed to the religion of Abraham root and branch, it was still their greatest boast to claim connection with Abraham and the faith of Abraham. Now while the verse contains an order to follow that religion, the interpretation may be that it is because they are the ones who ought most of all to obey the order, on account of their claim to belong to Abraham. Or that he is the chief of monotheists and the root and origin of this religion. Or that the religion is not a new-fangled religion but a familiar one that has come down from the old days. Although there may seem to be a conflict between the two religions on account of the ages to which they belong, in reality there is no conflict; both are valid inasmuch as the ordinances of each are true for their own time.

(6) The meaning of the order to follow the religion of Abraham may be to exhort men to follow the religion of Islam, which is remote from false creeds and is founded on truth, containing no hardship or difficulty, as it is said in the commentary on the words, 'and He has laid upon you no hardship in the Faith, the religion of your father Abraham' (Kor. 22: 77); that is, He has made your faith ample.

Hanīf means one who turns away from false creeds and is firmly based on truth. Just as the religion of Abraham was easy, and devoid of hardship and difficulty, so is Islam.

(7) *The meaning of 'faith', 'religion', and 'law'*. The late Birgili Mehmet Efendi,⁹ following al-Zajjāj,¹⁰ said in his treatise: "Religion" and "faith" are one, namely that relating to belief which Muhammad brought from God Almighty. "Law" is that which he

brought relating to practice.' So it is permissible to say that we are of the religion of Abraham, for in matters relating to belief the prophets are in accord. Nevertheless this is not the way ordinary people see it.

The Imam Rāghib said, 'The word *milla*, religion, is derived from the Arabic *amalla*, to dictate a book; it means "dictation".¹¹ It is the name applied to those things which God promulgated for His slaves by the mouth of his prophets. "Faith" is similar. "Religion", if you weigh it up, refers to God's summons to mankind and His sending down the Books. "Faith" refers to mankind's response and obedience to God's summons.' From this we understand that the three terms are essentially one but differ in their precise references.

The Qādī Baydāwī mentions this sense also in his commentary on the words 'until you follow their religion' (Kor. 2:114). Other writers of commentaries and annotations say that 'religion', 'faith', and 'law' are essentially one. They are all made up of what God has ordained by the mouth of His prophets. Some define them all as 'divine ordinance'. They differ in their application in that the term 'religion' refers to a prophet's dictating to his community, 'faith' to the state of obedience to Almighty God, and 'law' (*sharī'a*, which etymologically means 'way') to its being a path to the cooling streams of God's mercy towards those who thirst.

So the general concept of religion must comprehend beliefs and practices. The description of religion and faith, in the Koranic verse cited earlier, as involving no hardship, shows that religion must include practice, for 'hardship' cannot be understood as relating to belief. The *Fiqh akbar* says 'Religion is a noun covering faith and Islam and all the commandments of the law.'¹²

Then, as it comprehends beliefs and practices, no question arises. At the end of the treatise the matter is disposed of, at great length.

The second essay: a summary of Sheykh Mūjib's treatise. This Mūjib wrote a treatise in Arabic, weak in matter and composition, beginning with a few roughly-drafted lines purporting to be addressed to the Sheykh al-Islam. I have thought it desirable to omit them, as they are a mass of immoderate confutations and inventions. After that, the treatise is a jejune compilation of Koranic verses and traditions relating to religion and faith, the superficial meaning being given every time. From these he ostensibly draws conclusions and with tremendous foolhardiness shows no respect or regard for the words of commentators or theologians, not understanding what any given scholar's argument is or on what it is based, or whether it is refutable.

Here is one of his repetitious incoherencies: 'He who denies the ascription of the religion to Abraham is guilty of betraying and ill-using that honoured man.' Some scholar has written this refutation on the margin of the treatise: 'The religion originally belongs to Abraham; when one says so, the ascription is quite positive. This talk of "denying" it is a lie and a fiction.'

Yet the writer of this reply, whoever he was, has not replied to the three points subsequently made by Sheykh Mūjib: 'The conclusion of my treatise is three-fold. (1) They say that to belong to the religion of Abraham means being outside the religion of Muhammad and being an unbeliever. (2) They say that if Muhammad were a follower of the religion of Abraham, he would not be the Messenger of God but the Messenger of Abraham, so that anyone who says that the Prophet followed the religion of Abraham is

an unbeliever. (3) They say that to ascribe the religion to Abraham is not permissible, for Abraham's interest in the religion has been severed and Muhammad has become his heir.

To these three conclusions does he reduce the import of his treatise, and—God preserve us!—denies each. Of the third he says 'The analogy of inheriting the religion is false, for Abraham's religion cannot become the religion of Muhammad, unless he is one of the Ulema; for the Ulema are the heirs of the prophets. Their inheritance is the religion, and the one they inherit it from is the prophet to whom it belonged. If it is permissible to call the inheritance theirs, the religion cannot be the religion of Muhammad, in which case the analogy is unsound.' Such is his so-called logic.

To begin with, the first two of his 'three conclusions' are pure invention; the text of his treatise does not justify them. Next, his assertion that the third is a piece of false analogy is based on false premisses; it is his own analogy that is false, for what is claimed for the prophet is that he is independent, whereas no such claim is made for the Ulema, who submit to traditional authority.

The prophets inherit the religion in the sense of the words 'Moreover We have given the Book as a heritage to such of Our servants as We have chosen' (Kor. 35: 29), and there is no comparison with the Ulema's status as heirs of the prophets.

In short, as Sheykh Mūjib has no share of dialectic ability or vision, it is vain to attach any substance to his words. We have devoted so much discussion to them only in case men of little understanding should happen upon a treatise on this subject and use his a standard by which to judge it.

The third essay, which sums up the discussion. To leave the function of the prophet aside for a moment, there is in human nature a natural tendency towards domination, individualism, and independence. This is an innate thing, created for the good of mankind in accordance with the divine purpose of civilization. For instance, it is an accepted and undeniable fact that children at play show a tendency to dominate each other. This being granted, the various classes of mortals all show a desire to have no partner in domination, and to be independent, according to their place and rank. The loftier their rank and station, the greater their regard for their own position, and the more shameful they find it to follow their contemporaries and equals.

This is not confined to worldly matters but is also common and general in religious leadership. For example, in worldly matters, every age sees sovereigns fight and make war and quarrel over their various claims to independent rule. In religion, if at any one time there are two sheykhs, followers of the Way, who have attained spiritual perfection, each will avoid being subordinate to the other, just as Mevlānā 'Abd al-Ghafūr wrote in his *Life of Molla Jāmī*. A pair of scholars of the same rank are always at variance and strife. For this characteristic is something innate.

As far as human affairs are concerned, this is allowable in the case of the prophets too, and although their rank is superior to all other mortal ranks, attention must be paid to this point even among that glorious band, according to their various stations. Particularly in the case of two prophets of the first rank, by comparison with whom any two majestic and well-starred sultans are low and base, the degree of leading and following may be judged by analogy.

More particularly, we say that our Prophet, the glory of the world, the seal of the prophets, is best of all prophets. He, after giving all preceding prophets their due, in his statements about their virtues, made known his judgement that his own rank was matchless in independence, in these words: 'Were Moses alive, he could do nothing but follow me.' It is incumbent on his community to bear this judgement in mind and to observe it. True, it may be assumed that the communities of earlier prophets each regarded its own prophet as best and foremost, but the correct belief for Muslims is that Muhammad is better than all the other great prophets. That has been the point at issue in this discussion. To preserve and establish this doctrine, commentators and theologians have interpreted and explained away those scriptural texts which, taken at their face-value, imply subordination to Abraham. They have arrived at this formula: 'The religion of Islam, which was originally the religion of Abraham. Following this religion does not involve following Abraham.'

In his treatise, Fādil has related their proofs and arguments. According to the rules of discussion, the one who relates other people's arguments cannot be refuted; all that can be done is to seek verification of his account. On the other hand, Sheykh Mūjib's argumentation and refutation are not in accordance with the rules of debate and disputation; they are a mass of incoherencies. On this topic no attention need be paid to him.

Now even if the religion of Islam were identical with the religion of Abraham, there would be a contrast between them and no unity, in so far as they belong to two different prophets of the first rank. But they are not identical, for there are many points of difference

between them, in secondary matters if not in principles.

In consequence of this, that is, because of the difference in their founders, if anyone should say, 'I belong to the religion of Abraham, not the religion of Muhammad', the position is clear. But it has become a widespread and regular habit among the people to say simply 'I belong to the religion of Abraham'. Though eighty treatises be written and the Government ban the use of this expression, it is no good; they will still say it. And those who say it never think of adding, 'not the religion of Muhammad', which would be foul error. So we must take the expression in the good sense, and explain it as meaning 'Having regard for origins, we belong to the religion of Abraham.'

It would mean imposition of hardship to declare 'No, these words are wrong. The educated, who know the origin of them, may use them, but the common people must not.' No one would pay any attention anyway; it would mean irritating the people and provoking them to contention, to no purpose.

Such are the facts of the matter. Those competent to understand know well that the disquisitions and arguments written on the origin of the expression are not out of place but are acceptable from the point of view of scholarship, theology, and jurisprudence. Here we bring the discussion to a close; the topic is ended.

NOTES TO CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

¹ 'Alī ibn Muhammad al-Bazdawī, Hanafite theologian, died 1089 in Samarkand. His *Usūl* was renowned for its subtlety and abstrusity. Among his other works was a Koran-commentary, the *Kashf al-astār* mentioned below.

² Akmal al-Dīn Muhammad ibn Mahmūd al-Bābirtī (d. 1384) wrote *al-Taqrīr*, a commentary on Bazdawī's *Uṣul*.

³ The Sun of the Imams, Shams al-Ā'ima Abu'l-Qāsim Ismā'il ibn al-Husayn al-Bayhaqī (940-1011), a Hanafite writer on law and tradition.

⁴ The verse runs: 'And when God entered into covenant with the prophets, saying, Whatever book and wisdom I give unto you, there shall come hereafter a messenger confirming what you have: then shall you believe in him and aid him. God said, Are you resolved, and do you accept My compact on that? They said, We are resolved. He said, Then bear witness, I being also a Witness with you.'

⁵ Nūr al-Dīn Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Khidr al-Kāzirūnī of Fars (d. after 798/1395-6) wrote a Koran-commentary entitled *al-Sirāt al-mustaqīm li-tibyān al-Qur'ān al-kerīm*.

⁶ *Hanīf*. This still mysterious term is used in the Koran to mean a pre-Islamic non-Jewish and non-Christian monotheist. For a full discussion see N. A. Faris and Harold W. Glidden, 'The Development of the Meaning of Koranic *Hanīf*' in *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, Vol. XIX, 1939. The conclusion there reached is that the word 'must have come from the dialect of the Nabataeans, in whose language it meant a follower of some branch of their partially Hellenized Syro-Arabian religion.'

⁷ Probably Sa'd Allāh Sa'dī Chelebi Efendi, Sheykh al-Islam 1534-39, who annotated the Koran-commentary of Baydāwī.

⁸ 'Isām al-Dīn Ibrāhīm ibn Muhammad ibn 'Arab-shāh al-Isfarā'inī (d. 1537 in Samarkand), a Hanafite theologian, logician, and grammarian.

⁹ For Birgili Mehmed Efendi, see Chapter Twenty.

¹⁰ Ibrāhīm ibn al-Sarī al-Zajjāj, a grammarian of Basra, d. 923.

¹¹ Abu'l-Qāsim Husayn ibn Muhammad, known as

Rāghib al-Isfahānī (d. 1108), author of *Mufradāt ulfāz al-Qur'ān* ('The Singularities of Koranic Vocabulary').

The etymology is false: *milla* is a borrowing from Aramaic or Syriac. See Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Koran* (Baroda, 1938), pp. 268-9.

¹² From Article 18 of the *Fiqh akbar II*. See note 6 to Chapter Eight.

² Akmal al-Dīn Muhammad ibn Mahmūd al-Bābirtī (d. 1384) wrote *al-Taqrīr*, a commentary on Bazdawī's *Usul*.

³ The Sun of the Imams, Shams al-Ā'ima Abu'l-Qāsim Ismā'īl ibn al-Husayn al-Bayhaqī (940-1011), a Hanafite writer on law and tradition.

⁴ The verse runs: 'And when God entered into covenant with the prophets, saying, Whatever book and wisdom I give unto you, there shall come hereafter a messenger confirming what you have: then shall you believe in him and aid him. God said, Are you resolved, and do you accept My compact on that? They said, We are resolved. He said, Then bear witness, I being also a Witness with you.'

⁵ Nūr al-Dīn Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Khidr al-Kāzirūnī of Fars (d. after 798/1395-6) wrote a Koran-commentary entitled *al-Sirāt al-mustaqīm li-tibyān al-Qur'ān al-kerīm*.

⁶ *Hanīf*. This still mysterious term is used in the Koran to mean a pre-Islamic non-Jewish and non-Christian monotheist. For a full discussion see N. A. Faris and Harold W. Glidden, 'The Development of the Meaning of Koranic *Hanīf*' in *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, Vol. XIX, 1939. The conclusion there reached is that the word 'must have come from the dialect of the Nabataeans, in whose language it meant a follower of some branch of their partially Hellenized Syro-Arabian religion.'

⁷ Probably Sa'd Allāh Sa'dī Chelebi Efendi, Sheykh al-Islam 1534-39, who annotated the Koran-commentary of Baydāwī.

⁸ 'Isām al-Dīn Ibrāhīm ibn Muhammad ibn 'Arabshāh al-Isfarā'inī (d. 1537 in Samarkand), a Hanafite theologian, logician, and grammarian.

⁹ For Birgili Mehmed Efendi, see Chapter Twenty.

¹⁰ Ibrāhīm ibn al-Sarī al-Zajjāj, a grammarian of Basra, d. 923.

¹¹ Abu'l-Qāsim Husayn ibn Muhammad, known as

Rāghib al-Isfahānī (d. 1108), author of *Mufradāt ulfāz al-Qur'ān* ('The Singularities of Koranic Vocabulary').

The etymology is false: *milla* is a borrowing from Aramaic or Syriac. See Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Koran* (Baroda, 1938), pp. 268-9.

¹² From Article 18 of the *Fiqh akbar II*. See note 6 to Chapter Eight.

BRIBERY

Of latter-day scholars, that meritorious lawyer the late Ibn Najīm al-Misrī wrote a successful treatise on this subject. As bribery is in such wide vogue at the present time, I give here an abridged translation of that treatise.

The strict definition of a bribe is anything given to a judge or other person in order to secure a favourable verdict or any other desideratum.

Abū Nasr al-Baghdādī drew a distinction in his *Commentary on Qudūrī*¹ between bribes and gifts: 'A bribe is something given to win help. This condition is lacking in a gift.'

Now bribery is prohibited by the Book and the Sunna. The scriptural passage is the verse 'And do not consume your wealth amongst yourselves in vanity, or offer it to judges that you may consume a portion of other men's wealth sinfully, knowing well what you are doing' (2:184). As for the Sunna, there are traditions on the subject such as these: 'God's curse on the giver of bribes and the taker of bribes', and 'God's curse on the giver of bribes, the taker of bribes, and the agent who goes between.'

There are several categories of bribery. Among other lawyers, the Imam Qādikhān² in his *Fatāwā* ('Fetwas'), in the section on the office of judge, speaks of four:

(1) Prohibited for both parties. For example, if a judge obtain his appointment by giving a bribe he cannot be a judge; he has committed a forbidden deed by giving it. To the recipient also it is forbidden.

(2) The bribing of a judge to give a favourable verdict. For example, if one gives the judge a bribe to decide the case in one's favour: both giving and taking are prohibited, whether the judgement is in fact just or unjust, and the verdict is invalid.

(3) The bribe permissible to the giver but not to the taker: for example, if someone gives a bribe to avert the risk of harm to himself or to his property. This category of bribe is permissible to the giver but prohibited to the taker. Thus if a tyrant covets one's property it is no sin to give him a part of it that he may spare the rest.

(4) The bribe given to gain a favour from the ruler. This too it is permitted to give but forbidden to take. If the recipient wishes to escape the evil consequences of his action, the two parties must take an 'oath of hire' for one day from morning till evening. This oath is lawful and valid. Then if the 'hirer' wishes he may employ the other for that work, or not, as he pleases. This legal device is agreed to be valid if used when the bribe is given in advance in order to secure a particular favour. But if the bribe is given without coming to an understanding, and after the favour has been granted, the Imams differ. Some say that even if given in this way it is lawful, others say it is not. The former are right, for it is allowable to give a recompense for a favour received.

This ends the summary of Qādikhān's remarks. The gist of the *Khulāsa* and of the *Bazzāziya*³ is the same. Ibn Hammām, the commentator of the *Hidāya*, gives a different classification in his *Fath al-Qadīr*,⁴ as follows:

(1) The bribe given to secure a judicial or other office.

(2) Bribery for the purpose of winning a favourable verdict from a judge.

Both of these are unlawful for both parties.

(3) The bribe given to a ruler to avert harm or secure advantage.

(4) The bribe given to avert the risk of harm to oneself or one's property.

In both the latter cases it is permissible to give but unlawful to receive.

So much for the summary of the treatises. Now for our own view.

It is a widespread belief among the common people that bribery is absolutely unlawful; this is a parrot-cry which they repeat without knowing what class of bribe it is. Even those who do know, say, 'What's the use of arguing? It is unlawful', and they give and take bribes stealthily. Even where there is no earthly reason for payment, no one hesitates to accept bribes. Those who do not take bribes are moved not by piety and fear of God, but by a consideration of the difficulty of hiding it and by fear of gossip, for they regard a bribe as rather a pleasant and agreeable thing. The facts are so; there is no aversion from bribery at the present time.

The best course is this. In bribery of the third and fourth categories, the parties should employ the 'oath of hire' for which Ibn Najīm quotes Qādikhān, and so save themselves from evil consequences. That is how bribery is conducted nowadays in government departments in all matters except appointments to the office of judge.

Now there is a risk of disruption to the existing order if men persist in nullifying the true and regularising the false. The judges of Islam and sultans in the past, in order to prevent that danger and to eliminate the potential causes of the State's decay, shut tight the door

of bribery, transacted their business in accordance with the law, and kept their people under the law too. Now also, compliance with the law is necessary. Regrets later on will not help. It is no use saying 'We have employed a legal device'; there are many actions which can be dressed in the garb of legality but are not acceptable to the reason, because of the manifold corruptions lurking beneath.

NOTES TO CHAPTER NINETEEN

¹ The *Mukhtasar al-Qudūrī* is a famous manual of Hanafite law by Ahmad ibn Muhammad al-Qudūrī of Baghdad (d. 1037), which attracted many commentators, including Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn al-Aqta' Abu Nasr al-Baghdādī (d. 1081).

² Qādikhān Fakhr al-Dīn Hasan ibn Mansūr al-Uzjandī of Fergāna (d. 1196).

³ The *Khulāsa* ('Summary'), whose author is unknown, is based on the *Bazzāziya*, a collection of fetwas by Hāfiz al-Dīn Muhammad ibn Muhammad, known as Ibn Bazzāz (d. 1521).

⁴ For the *Hidāya* see note 11 to the Preface. The *Fath al-Qadīr* is a commentary on it by Kemāl al-Dīn Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wāhid of Sivas, known as Ibn Hammām (d. 1457).

THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN
 ABU'L-SU'ÜD EFENDI AND
 BIRGILI MEHMED EFENDI

The late Abu'l-Su'üd Efendi was born in 896/1491 and after passing through the regular stages of a learned career succeeded Muhyi'l-Dīn Efendi as Sheykh al-Islam in the month of Sha'bān 952/October 1545. He died on 5 Jumādā I 982/23 August 1574, having given fetwas for fully 30 years. Just as the blessed Sultan Suleyman Khān, whose abode is Paradise, was sole master of the Ottoman Empire throughout his life, so did that reverend man occupy the supreme position in the hierarchy throughout his life.¹ He and Kemāl-Pasha-zāde harmonized most of the man-made legislation of the Ottoman State with the sacred law, and remedied the defects in both the civil and the religious administration. Thus they put the State in order.

Birgili Mehmed Efendi was the son of Pīr 'Alī Efendi, a teacher of Balikesir. After finishing his schooling, he came to Istanbul and joined the staff of the Kazasker 'Abd-al-Rahmān Efendi as a Novice. He obtained an appointment to the tribunal at Edirne which dealt with the estates of deceased soldiers. There he entered the service of the Perfect Guide of the Bayramī Order,² Sheykh 'Abd al-Rahmān of Karaman, and busied himself for a while with spiritual purification. He went to Edirne to hand over the funds he had received from the sale of deceased soldiers' property, to those entitled to them. Having distributed these funds according to the register, and settled all lawful claims, he engaged

upon the imparting of the advantageous sciences, at the Sheykh's suggestion, and won that holy man's approval by teaching traditions and Koran-commentary.

Mevlānā 'Atā' Allāh, tutor to Sultan Selim II,³ having regard to his remarkable qualities and the fact that they were brothers, conferred on him the headship of the medrese which he built at Birgi:⁴ hence his appellation 'Birgili'. Students came from all around, and he became much sought-after, a man of great ability and spiritual worth. Sometimes he preached, sometimes he taught, ever zealous to revive the Sunna of the Prophet by enjoining right and forbidding wrong. He passed away in the month Jumādā I 981/September 1573, at the age of 55. God's mercy on him.

Towards the end of his life he came to Istanbul and met the Grand Vizier Mehmed Pasha,⁵ whose ear he won, so that he was able to right a number of injustices. He was the author of many books and treatises, among them a treatise called *al-Sayf al-sārim* ('The Sharp Sword'), in which he declared that it was unlawful to accept payment in return for reciting the Koran, or for teaching, or indeed for any act of worship, and that it was not permissible to make a *waqf* of movable property or coin.⁶ Therein he set forth arguments based on tradition, in contention with the great Imams.

The famous Qādī Bilālzāde Efendi wrote a refutation on behalf of Abu'l-Su'ūd Efendi, and the discussion and controversy on these matters, and the arguments used on both sides, reached the highest levels in the State.

Abu'l-Su'ūd Efendi refused to cause dissension, following the lead of recent Ulema. But Bilālzāde, in accordance with the old saying, 'Oppose, and you will win fame', used the opportunity of publishing a fetwa against Birgili Mehmed Efendi to ascribe his assertions, which he had put forward in good faith, to a hypo-

critical desire to make himself conspicuous: these assertions he castigated in ugly detail.

Thus far the story has been taken from the *Appendix* to the *Shaqā'iq*.⁷ Now the narrative is carried on by the humble author.

Birgili Efendi was a sound scholar in the legal sciences and, as certain sheykhs have informed me, he acquired a perfect knowledge of one of the rational sciences, that of logic, to which he devoted half his life. But the other philosophical sciences did not suit his temperament and he expressed his disapproval of them in his writings. Nor did he study history so as to learn of the customs and conditions of mankind; he was a pious expert in the sacred law. In his *al-Tariqat al-Muhammadiya* he wrote as his nature dictated, on the subjects mentioned above, on the dancing and gyrations of the Sufis, and on the corruptness of human transactions that are undertaken for the sake of that vicious thing, coined money. He attached no importance to custom and usage. In *The Sharp Sword* he begins his refutation by saying, 'This is a treatise designed to show the illegality of creating a *waqf* of cash unless one is making a will or at the point of death. For the Mufti of the age, Abu'l-Su'ūd Efendi, has written a treatise, containing numerous blunders, on the necessity of the practice; hence it is necessary to explain why that is to be rejected, lest those making a *waqf* should take it as trustworthy and fall into sin while wishing to acquire merit, and lest judges be deceived by it and have recourse to it when delivering judgement. For it is not trustworthy, and will not serve as an excuse on the day of resurrection; it contradicts the law, root and branch, and is contrary to reason and tradition. I regard it as a source of discord for mankind, an evil thing which everyone who can should alter. Yet I do not think that

anyone else will undertake to do so, because of ignorance or cowardice. So it is incumbent on me to forbid the people this wrong, with pen and tongue, thus cautioning them against a doctrine that were better suppressed.'

My purpose in reproducing here the words of that reverend man is to make known the degree of fortitude he displayed in standing up to a person like Abu'l-Su'ūd Efendi. But after so much contention and strife his injunctions achieved nothing, as they were opposed to custom and usage; he had no success with the common people. Most of his disciples and followers after him trod the same road, expressing extreme views on a number of subjects.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWENTY

¹ Suleyman came to the throne in 1520 in his twenty-sixth year, and reigned till his death in 1566: his was the longest reign of any sultan, and Abu'l-Su'ūd held office as Sheykh al-Islam longer than any other incumbent.

² The Bayramī Order was founded by Hajji Bayram-i Veli of Ankara, about the beginning of the fifteenth century.

³ Sultan Selim II r. 1566-74.

⁴ Birgi is a small town near Ödemish, south-east of Smyrna.

⁵ Sokollu-Mehmed Pasha was Grand Vizier from 1565 to 1579, under Suleyman, Selim II, and Murad III.

⁶ The objection to making a *waqf* of movable property or coin was that this was inconsistent with the perpetual nature of *waqf*.

⁷ The full title of the work is *al-Shaqā'iq al-Nu'māniya fi 'ulamā' al-dawlat al-'Uthmāniya* ('The Crimson Peonies, concerning the Ulema of the Ottoman Empire'). Its author was Ahmad ibn Mustafā Tashköprüzāde (d. 968/1560-61). Several writers added appendices to it, the latest bringing it down to 1143/1730-31.

critical desire to make himself conspicuous: these assertions he castigated in ugly detail.

Thus far the story has been taken from the *Appendix* to the *Shaqā'iq*.⁷ Now the narrative is carried on by the humble author.

Birgili Efendi was a sound scholar in the legal sciences and, as certain sheykhs have informed me, he acquired a perfect knowledge of one of the rational sciences, that of logic, to which he devoted half his life. But the other philosophical sciences did not suit his temperament and he expressed his disapproval of them in his writings. Nor did he study history so as to learn of the customs and conditions of mankind; he was a pious expert in the sacred law. In his *al-Tarīqat al-Muhammadiya* he wrote as his nature dictated, on the subjects mentioned above, on the dancing and gyrations of the Sufis, and on the corruptness of human transactions that are undertaken for the sake of that vicious thing, coined money. He attached no importance to custom and usage. In *The Sharp Sword* he begins his refutation by saying, 'This is a treatise designed to show the illegality of creating a *waqf* of cash unless one is making a will or at the point of death. For the Mufti of the age, Abu'l-Su'ūd Efendi, has written a treatise, containing numerous blunders, on the necessity of the practice; hence it is necessary to explain why that is to be rejected, lest those making a *waqf* should take it as trustworthy and fall into sin while wishing to acquire merit, and lest judges be deceived by it and have recourse to it when delivering judgement. For it is not trustworthy, and will not serve as an excuse on the day of resurrection; it contradicts the law, root and branch, and is contrary to reason and tradition. I regard it as a source of discord for mankind, an evil thing which everyone who can should alter. Yet I do not think that

anyone else will undertake to do so, because of ignorance or cowardice. So it is incumbent on me to forbid the people this wrong, with pen and tongue, thus cautioning them against a doctrine that were better suppressed.'

My purpose in reproducing here the words of that reverend man is to make known the degree of fortitude he displayed in standing up to a person like Abu'l-Su'ūd Efendi. But after so much contention and strife his injunctions achieved nothing, as they were opposed to custom and usage; he had no success with the common people. Most of his disciples and followers after him trod the same road, expressing extreme views on a number of subjects.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWENTY

¹ Suleyman came to the throne in 1520 in his twenty-sixth year, and reigned till his death in 1566: his was the longest reign of any sultan, and Abu'l-Su'ūd held office as Sheykh al-Islam longer than any other incumbent.

² The Bayramī Order was founded by Hajji Bayram-i Veli of Ankara, about the beginning of the fifteenth century.

³ Sultan Selim II r. 1566-74.

⁴ Birgi is a small town near Ödemish, south-east of Smyrna.

⁵ Sokollu-Mehmed Pasha was Grand Vizier from 1565 to 1579, under Suleyman, Selim II, and Murad III.

⁶ The objection to making a *waqf* of movable property or coin was that this was inconsistent with the perpetual nature of *waqf*.

⁷ The full title of the work is *al-Shaqā'iq al-Nu'māniya fi 'ulamā' al-dawlat al-'Uthmāniya* ('The Crimson Peonies, concerning the Ulema of the Ottoman Empire'). Its author was Ahmad ibn Mustafā Tashköprüzāde (d. 968/1560-61). Several writers added appendices to it, the latest bringing it down to 1143/1730-31.

THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN SIVĀSĪ AND QĀDIZĀDE

Sheykh 'Abd al-Majīd ibn Sheykh Muharram ibn Mehmed Zīlī, known as Sīvāsī Efendi, was the deputy of Sīvāsī Shams Efendi, the Sheykh of the Khalwati Order. Coming to Istanbul, he became Sheykh in the retreat which was widely known by his name. When Sultan Ahmed built his new mosque,¹ he gave Sīvāsī the position of preacher in it. He died in Jumādā II 1049/October 1639, a saintly septuagenarian of illuminated mind. He was the author of some treatises in Turkish and he wrote poetry under the pseudonym of Sheykhī.² When he used to recite the *Fātiha* in his sweet voice, before delivering his sermon, it gave delight to his hearers. His friends relate many stories of his miracles.

The Imam Qādizāde was Sheykh Mehmed Efendi, son of Toghānī Mustafā Efendi, a Qādī of Balikesir. Having acquired the rudiments of knowledge in his native town, from the disciples of Birgili Mehmed Efendi, he came to Istanbul and became a student-instructor under the teacher Tursunzāde. He then chose the career of a Sufi sheykh, entering the service of 'Umar Efendi, Sheykh of the Terjumān lodge (*tekke*), and occupying himself with spiritual purification. Finding however that the Sufi path did not suit his temperament, he adopted the way of speculation. For a long time he taught in the mosque of Murad Pasha, and then succeeded Fadl Allāh Efendi, son of Birgili Efendi, as preacher in the mosque of Sultan

Selim. At the same time, he continued to teach in the little mosque near his house, and was renowned as preacher and teacher. He was subsequently appointed preacher at St. Sophia, and died in 1045/1635-6, a famous and saintly man in his fifties.

These two sheykhs were diametrically opposed to one another; because of their differing temperaments, warfare arose between them. In most of the controversies I have mentioned in this book, Qādizāde took one side and Sīvāsī took the other, both going to extremes, and the followers of both used to quarrel and dispute, one against the other. For many years this situation continued, with disputation raging between the two parties, and out of the futile quarrelling a mighty hatred and hostility arose between them. The majority of sheykhs took one side or the other, though the intelligent ones kept out of it, saying, 'This is a profitless quarrel, born of fanaticism. We are all members of the community of Muhammad, brothers in faith. We have no warrant from Sīvāsī, no diploma from Qādizāde. They are simply a couple of reverend sheykhs who have won fame by opposing one another; their fame has even reached the ear of the Sultan. Thus have they secured their own advantage and basked in the sunshine of the world. Why should we be so foolish as to fight their battles for them? We shall get no joy of it.'

But some foolish people persistently attached themselves to one side or the other, hoping to become famous like them. When the cut and thrust of verbal contention from their several pulpits was near to bringing them into real warfare with sword and spear, it became necessary for the Sultan to discipline some of them and administer a box on the ears in the shape of banishment from the city. It is among the duties of the

Sultan of the Muslims to subdue and discipline ranting fanatics of this sort, whoever they may be, for in the past manifold corruption has come about from such militant bigotry.

No importance should be attached to the apparent righteousness of the fools on either side; neither side should be allowed to triumph. The order of the world is achieved, under God, by not letting the people go beyond the bounds laid down for them. 'God's mercy on a man who recognized His decree and does not transgress His limits.'

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

¹ Construction of the mosque of Ahmed I, the 'Blue Mosque', began in 1609 and finished in 1616.

² Not to be confused with the famous fifteenth-century poet Yūsuf Sinan, who also used the pseudonym of Sheykhī.

CONCLUSION

RECITAL OF GOD'S BOUNTY TO THE AUTHOR, AND A FEW RECOMMENDATIONS

Recital of God's bounty. The author of this work, Mustafā ibn 'Abd Allāh, called Hajji Kalfa and known among the learned as Kātib Chelebi, was born in Constantinople. His father being a soldier, he too entered that profession, according to the law. Under the influence of his ascendant and his star, he showed an inclination towards the art of reading and writing. In 1032/1622-3 he entered the Army Board of Audit for Anatolia as an apprentice, and in the following year went on the Terjan campaign.¹ In 1035/1625-6 he accompanied the Baghdad expedition,² becoming apprentice to the Chief Clerk of Audit. He seemed to have an instinct for the sciences of penmanship, accountancy, and *siyāqat*,³ which are generally considered difficult. In 1036 and 1037/1626-7 he was at the siege of Erzurum,⁴ returning with the Army to Istanbul in the following year.

This was at the height of the late Qādizāde's fame, of whom we have spoken above. One day the author happened to be passing the mosque of Sultan Mehmed and went in to hear the sermon. Qādizāde was a good and effective speaker whose sermons never failed to move his hearers. For the most part his words were an encouragement to the people to acquire religious knowledge, and an exhortation to strive to escape from ignorance. On that occasion it was as if he had taken hold of the reins of his hearer's mind and driven him

off in the direction of work and study. As this was also his father's wish, he began to revise the elements of the ancillary sciences which he had previously studied, and soon mastered Arabic grammar and composition. He went to the Sheykh's lecture-room and attended his lessons and sermons until Khusrev Pasha went on campaign.⁵ In 1039/1630 he took part in the Hamadan and Baghdad campaigns, returning to Istanbul in 1041/1631 to resume his attendance at the Sheykh's lectures. The subjects taught were Koran-interpretation, the *Revival of Religious Sciences*, the Commentary on the *Mawāqif*, and the *Durar* and the *Tarīqat*.

The Sheykh's lectures were generally simple and superficial, for he had no acquaintance with the natural sciences, and whenever in Koran-interpretation some question arose that bore on them he would sophistically quote such sayings as

'Who'd give a farthing for philosophy?

Before it what shrewd banker bows the knee?'

and

'Who sheds a tear if a logician dies?'

Thus he illustrated the truth of the maxim 'Everyone hates what he does not understand'. Over several topics he was at loggerheads with the people of the world, and he had read a great many books, from which he memorized most of the points that agreed with his own views, and he could call them to mind and quote them in appropriate contexts. 'A ready reply is the best ally': he was expert at silencing an opponent. He resuscitated the ancient objection to dancing and gyrating, and won the enmity of the entire Khalwatī and Mevlevī Orders, as well as of the cemetery-care-takers. Every single one of his sermons contained some jibe or sneer, like 'O you holy ones, who kick the floor-boards and blow the whistle; come, Toqlu

Dede, come, Buqaghili Dede!'⁶ On the other side, Sīvāsī Efendi, Ismā'il Efendi, and others used to abuse him for a heretic and an infidel who denied the Saints.

For some time such problems as that of invoking blessings on prophets and Companions, and that of the supererogatory prayers were canvassed, giving rise to much argument and controversy and strife. He himself being an intelligent man with all his wits about him, used such polemics as a trap for fools. On the principle of 'Oppose, and win fame', his fame even reached the Throne, and he achieved his purpose of distinguishing himself above his contemporaries. All the fools earnestly tried to emulate him, and through imitation fell into the sorry state of fanaticism and were afflicted with profitless brawling. It is unnecessary to point out that the followers of Qādizāde at the present time are notorious for their extremism and have earned general reproach. The author has before now guided many of them towards the frontier of moderation, and is writing the present summary in order to free them from those fetters.

In 1043/1633, in which year the Grand Vizier Mehmed Pasha became Commander-in-Chief, while the Army was going into winter quarters at Aleppo the author set out again with the intention of going on the holy Pilgrimage.⁷ He succeeded in reaching the Hejaz and performed the Pilgrimage and the visit to the tomb of the Prophet at Medina. He then rejoined the imperial Army at Diyarbakr. That winter he consorted with and learned much from some of the scholars in that city.

In 1044/1635 he went on the Erivan campaign with Sultan Murad,⁸ returning in the next year. He had faithfully carried out his resolve: for ten years he had

spent his time in campaigning and marching, had witnessed many battles and actions, and had performed the duties of pilgrimage and of war against the infidel. In conformity with the saying, 'We have come back from the lesser struggle to the greater', he thenceforth applied his soul to fatigue on the road of study, and devoted the remainder of his life to the acquisition of learning, resolving that he would spend his allotted portion of wealth on the means of attaining knowledge.

Coming with this intention to Istanbul, he began to compose a bibliographical dictionary, at the Divine suggestion, having examined the stocks of the booksellers during his stay in Aleppo. After his return to Istanbul he inherited a little money, which he gave for books, setting to work on them with great enthusiasm. In 1046/1636-7 he completed his study of them and then, thanks to his natural bent, found pleasure in working on histories and on biographies of notables.

The next year another relative died, a wealthy merchant from whom he inherited several hundred thousand aspers. By the blessings of honesty of intent and sincerity of resolve, the gate had been opened to him and ease of circumstances had been attained. Heaven facilitating his task of acquiring the sciences, he succeeded in it, and with his affluence aiding his natural inclinations he covered a great deal of ground in a short time. He spent 300,000 aspers of his legacy on books and with part of the remainder bought a new house and provided himself with the requirements of domesticity. The rest he put aside as capital for living-expenses and maintenance of his new-found state of well-being.

In 1048/1638, when Sultan Murad left for Baghdad,⁹ the author, in accordance with his previous resolve,

dismissed all thought of campaigning from his mind and stayed at home, with the plea that he was busy.

At that time, A'rej (Lame) Mustafā Efendi, a man famed for his virtue and the penetration of his intellect, had given up his work as a judge and, having a taste for teaching, had begun to give lessons. I attended his lectures on Baydāwī's *Commentary* from the first, and as I found that he had more knowledge of the sacred and profane sciences than any other of the scholars whose lectures I attended, I chose him for my master. He for his part showed the utmost favour towards me, regarding me differently from his other pupils. A true friendship grew up between us, and for many years I enjoyed his teaching and his company. In 1049/1639-40, I attended the classes of Kurd 'Abd Allāh Efendi, Lecturer (*Ders-i 'āmm*) at St. Sophia, and the next year those of Kechi Mehmed Efendi, Lecturer at the Suleymāniye. 'Abd Allāh Efendi was a master of the sacred and profane sciences. Mehmed Efendi was a consummate Arabic scholar. Whenever he touched on the profane sciences, he would always say fairly, 'If I don't know a thing and someone else does, let him speak up.' Unlike Qādizāde, he did not disparage and reject what he did not know.

In 1050/1640-41 Veli Efendi came, the pupil of Sahrānī Ahmad Haydar, and with him the author discussed logic, lexicology, and style.

In 1051/1641-2 the author wrote a summary account of 150 dynasties mentioned in the history-books, in a list which he entitled the *Fadhlaka* ('Compendium'). The Sheykh al-Islam, the late Yahyā Efendi, told him to prepare a fair copy for presentation to the Sultan, but it was neglected,

The following year, in order to carry on the chain of oral teaching, he began to attend the preacher Veli

Efendi's lectures on the *Nukhba* and *Alfiya*,¹⁰ and in two years had completed the study of the principles of tradition. This teacher had studied under Sheykh Ibrāhīm Laqānī in Egypt;¹¹ they were two links in the unbroken chain which began with the most noble Prophet (God bless him and give him peace) and to which the humble author's link was added.

Meanwhile he had begun to write out a mixed Koran-commentary, Baydāwī and Sheykhzāde, in the style used by Kara-Kemal for his *Commentary on Sadr al-Shari'a*, at the rate of one page a day.¹²

The years 1053 and 1054/1643-5 also passed in attendance at lectures and in study. Having worked night and day for ten years, he had succeeded in reading numberless books and studying most of the sciences. Sometimes, when he was eager to read a particular book, he would burn candles from sunset till dawn. He was never weary or bored.

For close on ten years, pupils had been coming to study under him. First they had lessons in the elements of the sciences. The late Yahyā Efendi used to say, 'You speak of lessons, but do you study commentaries?' The humble author used to say, 'They do lessons, but rarely bother about commentaries.' For my method was to enter every plurality by way of unity, and to master first principles by comprehending universals. I had long decided that it was a waste of time to aim at occupying oneself with minutiae and at acquiring proficiency in the details of one subject. Confinement to one science has never satisfied the man of lofty aim.

In 1055/1645 the Cretan expedition took place.¹³ About that time I turned my attention to the terrestrial globe and outlines of land and sea, for which I had acquired a taste. I learned how the drawing known as 'chart' is done, and examined all the illustrated

treatises written on the subject, every single one of them.

Meanwhile I had a quarrel with the Chief Clerk of Audit, arising out of my professional career. I said, 'It has previously been the rule that after twenty years' service one has a turn as Clerk. Am I not going to have a turn?' But he stuck to his assertion that there was no vacancy, as the post was for the lifetime of the holder. So I bade him good day, and took leave of absence.

This circumstance was convenient for my studies, and enabled me to work the more. For three years I lived without employment, in seclusion, busy with my writing and teaching. By the end of that time I had read, with the late A'rej Efendi, half of 'Adud's commentary on the roots of the law, the commentaries on *Ashkāl al-ta'sīs* ('The Fundamental Figures') and Chaghmīnī,¹⁴ and the 'Arūd ('Prosody') of Andalusī,¹⁵ and had learned how to work out a calendar from Ulugh Beg's *Zij* ('Almanac').¹⁶ I had previously heard lectures on the *Tawdīh* on Koran-interpretation, Isfahānī, Qādī-Mīr,¹⁷ the *Ādāb al-bahth* ('Rules of Disputation')¹⁸, Fanārī,¹⁹ the commentary on the *Tahdhīb*, and the *Shamsīya*.²⁰

Meanwhile my pupils had been having lessons on the elements of accidentence, Fanārī and the *Shamsīya* on logic, Jāmī,²¹ the *Mukhtasar*, the *Farā'id*, the *Multaqā*, and the *Durar*. Some had completed the course. They read Qādī-Mīr and the general sections of the commentary on the *Maqāsīd*.²²

About this time, the author's constitution was upset, and he occupied himself with the science of medicine in order to rectify and restore it. To be able to treat it by spiritual means, he read books on onomancy and the special advantages that accrue through reciting the Names of God. Thus his constitution was restored.

During 1057/1647, Mevlānā Mehmed, son of Ahmed Rūmī of Aqhisar, one of the original thinkers of the time, came to live near the author's house and attended his lectures on mathematics. On geometry he read the commentary on the *Ashkāl*, and on arithmetic 'Alī Kushju's *Muhammadiya*,²³ and learned the rules for working out a calendar from the astronomical tables. He had an instinctive aptitude for examining the abstrusities of science. At this pupil's request I wrote an eclectic commentary on the first half of the *Muhammadiya*, but it was apparent in him and in the author's son that excessive intelligence is fatal: they both died, and the commentary was left unfinished, as I did not feel inclined to complete it. Thereafter ten more pupils read the *Muhammadiya* and asked me to finish the commentary, but their abilities were not of the standard of the deceased, and my enthusiasm and interest flagged.

When my leave of absence was drawing to its close, I wrote in two months the *Taqwīm al-tawārikh* ('Calendar of Histories') to serve as an index to my earlier *Fadhlaka*, partly in Turkish, partly in Persian, well tabulated and in an attractive style. At the end of 1058/1648, the Sheykh al-Islam 'Abd al-Rahīm Efendi sent it to the Grand Vizier Koja Mehmed Pasha, with the following note: 'This man well deserves high rank. He is quite devoid of worldly ambition and does not ask for position and honours. Whatever action is due in the furtherance of his official career, let it be done.' For I had attended his lectures, had some scholarly discussions with him, and had given him some of my writings. He had a full appreciation of my worth and would sometimes invite me to confer with him on historical matters. On history he regarded me as sufficient authority.

Some scoundrelly enemies of mine spared no effort to turn the Pasha against me: they spent money lavishly and wrote unfavourable reports, but without success: he gave me the diploma conferring on me the position I had chosen, Second Clerk. The blessing of learning and of favour defeated their money. Before very long those God-forsaken creatures were ruined.

I was satisfied with this promotion as it provided me with a living, and since it would have been unreasonable to ask for more it seemed best to rest content with this rank.

In 1059 and 1060/1649-50 I read books on the foreign sciences,²⁴ and my pupils had lessons in medicine, mathematics and philosophy. On astrology they read the *Sī fasl* ('Thirty Sections'), and on the astrolabe the *Bīst bāb* ('Twenty Chapters'),²⁵ with Qādizāde Rūmī's commentary on Chaghminī and the lectures on the *Fathīya* of 'Alī Kushju, many times over.

In 1061 and 1062/1651-2 the first volume of my biographical dictionary of scholars, *Sullam al-wusūl ilā tabaqāt al-fuhūl* ('The Ladder Leading to the Strata of the Eminent'), was completed as far as the letter *tā*, and a fair copy was made.²⁶ In it are given the histories of the great, ancient and modern. In 1063/1653 my alphabetically-arranged commonplace book, *Tuhfat al-akhyār fi'l-hikam wa'l-amthāl wa'l-ash'ār* ('The Precious Gift of the Elect, on Maxims, Proverbs, and Poems'), reached the letter *jīm*, and a fair copy was made.

The bibliographical material I had so far collected, from histories and biographical dictionaries, I set in the proper order, and moreover the names of the many thousands of volumes in the libraries I had personally examined, and the books which for twenty years the book-sellers had been bringing to me in a steady stream—all were recorded in their appropriate place, and I

added over three hundred articles on the various branches of knowledge, taken from the textbooks on the axioms of the sciences, all in alphabetical order, and I discussed many topics and unusual questions. I designed it to be a comprehensive work on the knowledge of the sciences and of bibliography, and I called it *Kashf al-zunūn ‘an asāmi’l-kutub wa’l-funūn* ('Opinion's Scrutiny of the Names of Books and the Sciences'). At the request of those scholars who had seen it in draft, when it had reached the letter *hā* fair copies of the first volume were prepared and presented to the leading Ulema. They liked it and approved it.

Earlier I had begun to put together a work on geography, called *Jihānnumā* ('View of the World'). As the lands of the infidels are not discussed in Muslim books, I wanted to take the maps from the Frankish *Atlas Minor*²⁷ and to have it translated.

A former French priest who had become a Muslim, Sheykh Mehmed Ikhlasī, was skilled in the Latin tongue, and in a year and a half the translation was done, entitled *Lawāmi’ al-nūr* ('Flashes of Light'). After that I began the fair copy of the *Jihānnumā*. The *Frankish History*²⁸ was also translated, a history of the infidel kings, as well as the *Rawnaq al-Saltana* ('Splendour of the Sultanate'), a history of Constantinople. The translation of the *Fadhlaka*, arranged by years and in great detail, was written a little at a time.

When the late Bahā'ī Efendi was Sheykh al-Islam, he was asked for a fetwa on three unusual questions. As no answer was forthcoming, I explained them in an essay. Another essay I wrote was the *Dastūr al-'amal fī islāh al-khalal* ('Code of Practice for the Rectification of Defects'), on the conduct of the State.

In 1064 and 1065/1653-6 there came the *Qānūnnāme-i tashrifāt* ('Code of Ceremonies') and the *Rajm al-rajim*

1
bi'l-sīn wa'l-jīm ('The Stoning of the Accursed with *Sīn* and *Jīm*'), a collection of fetwas transcribed from the muftis' own autographs, explaining a number of unusual problems.²⁹ A start was made on a selection in index form giving the main points of some four thousand treatises, bound in three hundred volumes in the <author's> library. Two sections were completed, summarizing the contents of many volumes. In a further section an abridged compilation was made, of out-of-the-way facts and anecdotes, on the lines of the *Nigāristān-i Ghaffārī*.³⁰

In 1066/1656, when naval affairs caused discomfiture,³¹ I drafted the *Tuhfat al-kibār fī asfār al-bihār* ('Precious Gift of the Great, on Maritime Expeditions') concerning the sea-battles and voyages of the captains, with some information on naval construction and the sea. This work was transcribed in Safar 1067/November-December 1656.

So far I have been going to the office for a day or two each week, for the sake of my salary. The rest of the time I have fortunately been able to spend in discussion, reading, and writing. It is my hope that the rest of my life may pass in just this way.

Glad Tidings. While I was beginning the fair copy of the present treatise on the eve of Sunday 24 Muharram 1067/22 November 1656, the Glory of the World (God bless him and give him peace) appeared in a dream to my unworthy self. He was in an open field, garbed as a warrior, girded for battle and wearing a sword. He was in a remote spot, surrounded by his aides and helpers. I stood in his august presence and asked him about certain problems of the sciences, and he answered me. The one thing I clearly remember is that he was standing and I was half standing, half

sitting. In the course of my questioning him, I kissed his blessed knees and said, 'O Prophet of God, suggest a name with which I may occupy myself.' He replied, 'Occupy yourself with the name of the Prophet', in a great voice, so that my ears were full of it and I awoke with it still ringing in my head.

In this dream he pointed out and guided me to many things. First, his appearing dressed for war, girded and wearing a sword, showed the manner of defeating the abject infidel and was an indication to prepare for the holy war by occupying certain islands. As I was engaged in writing of some of the ancient campaigns for the Faith, that notion had become fixed in my mind. The interpretation of his bidding me occupy myself with the name of the Prophet is this: I had previously made a certain enigmatic remark at the end of the *Dastūr al-'amal*. At this time some ideas relating to that were of necessity in my mind. In his words there was a joyful presage which fitted in with my ideas. Implicit also was this clear direction: I had formerly occupied myself with some lessons on the legal sciences; I had studied the roots and branches of jurisprudence, and had discussed Koran-interpretation and tradition with certain sheykhs. Lately, the students who came to me had been having lessons on mathematics and natural science, religious studies being shelved. His order meant this: 'Resume work on those lessons; that is a means of conformity with my way of life. To arrive at your goal, take me as your intermediary: that is to say, if you seek the name of God, you may attain that end by my intervention, for you are of my people, so busy yourself with seeking access by means of your Prophet.'

For two wings are necessary for flying; with one, no progress is possible. Natural science and religious

science are, as it were, two wings. Thereafter I resolved to occupy myself with religious studies. May Almighty God grant me success.

Once before, on the eve of Wednesday 4 Muharram 1061/7 January 1651, the honour of seeing him had been granted to me, so it has happened twice in my life, and to God be praise and thanks.

Here ends my recital of God's bounty. Now let me set forth my recommendations.

1. First, this is the recommendation addressed to the Sultan of mankind—God strengthen him and perpetuate his empire till the day of resurrection. In the matter of science and religion, he should be content with as much as enables him to perform the ordinances and duties of the Faith and to understand the doctrines of Islam, and should strive to know the minute details of the condition of his treasury, his army, and his subjects, for these details are his Catechism.

Like his mighty ancestors, he should read history, and draw the moral from the story of their illustrious deeds. He should study the customs of men, and give effect to the ancient law of the sublime Empire, with such gentleness or severity as the times may demand.

All the ministers of the dynasty and great men of the realm should assist and aid their beneficent master in this, expending all their efforts on doing good. Towards differences among the Muslims they should not be complaisant, but should kindly and gently eliminate such strife as arises among them. They must never show neglect in carrying out the ordinances of God and the command to make war on the infidel, the holy war.

2. Recommendations for the learned preachers. We here insert these recommendations comprising an exposition of some rules for preaching and admonition,

so that congregations may observe decorum and attend to the sermon.

Rule *i*. Let your sermons contain no remarks that go against the customs and conventions of the citizens, for that causes dissension and insurrection.

Rule *ii*. If any conflict of opinion exists among the Muslims, let your sermons be designed to reconcile their hearts and eliminate enmities and grudges, with gentleness, fair words, and winning counsel. Do not, taking one side, speak maliciously in reproach of the other, for that will exacerbate hostilities.

Rule *iii*. Be sage and temperate about urging the common people to comply with what is commanded, to avoid what is prohibited, and to perform the ordinances and obligations of the Faith, as well as about frightening them by the mention of God's promises and threats. Avoid both extremes: let the people not fall into a feeling of security or one of despair. Let them go between fear and hope. If fear predominates, so be it.

Rule *iv*. Let the sermon always be suited to the time and place. Whatever reports and traditions there may be on the virtues of particular days and months, and on things to be done on every day or night, relate them, translating and expounding them for the benefit of the common people. There is no harm in relating weak traditions that are not canonically authentic. Encourage such supererogatory prayers and practices as have the backing of tradition, and make no mention of those that are based only on custom; indeed, it were best to keep silent about these even if expressly asked for a sermon about them.

Rule *v*. Do not speak of subtle questions beyond the understanding of ordinary people, nor utter words inappropriate to the majority of your audience, using such impressive Sufi terms as 'the world of majesty and

divinity'. Rather give admonitions and parables that are clear and easily understood. The Imam Rāghib Isfahānī said, in his *al-Dharī' a ilā makārim al-sharī' a* ('Means of Attaining the Glories of the Law') and in his *Tafsīl al-nash' atayn wa-tahsīl al-sa' ādatayn* ('Exposition of the Two Causes and Acquisition of the Two Felicities'): 'Sermons are for the commons, not for the few.' So do not fail to observe the tradition which runs 'Speak to men according to their understanding.' For as most of your hearers have no aptitude for understanding, their rational soul will not be inclined to make ignorance into knowledge, but will turn away in aversion. That aversion causes the animal spirits to become introspective, and sleep supervenes. That is why most people sleep during the sermon and the *khutba*: the *khutba* is in Arabic, and even if they have any comprehension they are still not conversant with the meaning.

Rule *vi*. Occasional anecdotes, stories, pleasantries, and verses bearing on the subject of the sermon may be introduced, but only as salt to the food.

Rule *vii*. Be not eager to recount the controversies described in this book, and similar subtleties, for the sake of obtaining a larger audience and becoming well known. Speak rather of matters useful and instructive to the common people: things lawful and unlawful, prayer and fasting, the summary of doctrine, the roots and pillars of Islam. They will listen to the man who has a pleasant delivery and an attractive style. If the preacher is without learning, at least let him not pain people by departing from the rules of good preaching.

3. This is the recommendation for all the ordinary Muslims. Now that God Almighty and the true Prophet have spoken, they must obey the Word: pray at the five stated times each day, keep the Fast of Ramadan,

give alms, go on pilgrimages if they can afford it, and tell no lies. They must assault no one's honour or property, and deal honestly. These matters apart, let them attend to their own job, whatever it may be. If they hear a sermon once a week, on Friday, it will suffice. Let them be content with as much of it as they can understand, with no unnecessary talk on the lines of 'The preacher So-and-so spoke about such-and-such today; he said that the problem of this and this was thus and thus.' Being untutored, let them not engage in learned controversy.³²

4. This is for those students in particular who have learned from the humble author, and for other students in general. Here I emulate the eminent scholar Qādī-Mīr and give advice such as he gives at the end of his *Jām-i gūṭinumā* ('The Magic Mirror on the World').

First let those who have the ability learn the elements of knowledge, and then let them acquire the substance of the propositions of Islamic dogmatics. Then they should occupy themselves with the various branches of knowledge, methodically, entering every plurality by way of unity, and perfecting their knowledge of one branch before starting on another. They should decide on how they are going to earn their living, and should completely master the relevant branches of knowledge. Then if time allows they may study the other branches. Until their education is complete let them not seek after any post or appointment in the learned hierarchy. For the offices of judge, of mufti, of preacher, of imam, of khatīb, of clerk, are all barriers to methodical work: they require a preoccupation with the duties of the post, which erases the fugitive products of ratiocination. For being occupied with such matters means being occupied with the details of one particular branch of knowledge, not however in a methodical or systematic

fashion, but at the dictate of anyone with a cause to plead or a question to put.

That is why Khojazāde Efendi of Bursa, that eminent scholar of Rūm,³³ wrote in his notes on the *Shaqā'iq*, 'Indirectly, my master is al-Jurjānī. All my education comes from his books. Apart from his works, and those of Sa' d al-Dīn, I have never looked at a book on the speculative sciences with the intention of learning from it. I too might have matched the attainments of the Sayyid the Sharīf, had several obstacles not stood in my way. First, he was healthy, whereas I am an invalid. Next, he worked methodically from the beginning to the end of his life, writing lectures. My working time was encroached on by extraneous obligations: that is to say, I was afflicted with the duties of judge and mufti, and so could not work.'

Now if the devoted student really wishes for a sound education, he should have nothing to do with judge-ships but seek his livelihood elsewhere. Having fully mastered the doctrines of the Sunnites, let him enter the citadel of the Book, the Sunna, and the Consensus of the Community. Let him take as his standard of measurement the Koran, the Traditions, and the sayings of the masters of jurisprudence and the saints. Then let him study the works of the philosophers and speculative theologians, and the words of the Sufis. Let him profit by them, accepting from each that which thought and reason show to be profitable, on the principle 'Take the clear and leave the turbid.' Let him deny and reject none of them, avoiding the pitfall of bigotry, in accordance with our earlier warnings.

Here I finish what I had to say, and my treatise is ended. May the God of Truth, Extolled and Almighty,

give alms, go on pilgrimage if they can afford it, and tell no lies. They must assault no one's honour or property, and deal honestly. These matters apart, let them attend to their own job, whatever it may be. If they hear a sermon once a week, on Friday, it will suffice. Let them be content with as much of it as they can understand, with no unnecessary talk on the lines of 'The preacher So-and-so spoke about such-and-such today; he said that the problem of this and this was thus and thus.' Being untutored, let them not engage in learned controversy.³²

4. This is for those students in particular who have learned from the humble author, and for other students in general. Here I emulate the eminent scholar Qādī-Mīr and give advice such as he gives at the end of his *Jām-i gītūnumā* ('The Magic Mirror on the World').

First let those who have the ability learn the elements of knowledge, and then let them acquire the substance of the propositions of Islamic dogmatics. Then they should occupy themselves with the various branches of knowledge, methodically, entering every plurality by way of unity, and perfecting their knowledge of one branch before starting on another. They should decide on how they are going to earn their living, and should completely master the relevant branches of knowledge. Then if time allows they may study the other branches. Until their education is complete let them not seek after any post or appointment in the learned hierarchy. For the offices of judge, of mufti, of preacher, of imam, of khatīb, of clerk, are all barriers to methodical work: they require a preoccupation with the duties of the post, which erases the fugitive products of ratiocination. For being occupied with such matters means being occupied with the details of one particular branch of knowledge, not however in a methodical or systematic

fashion, but at the dictate of anyone with a cause to plead or a question to put.

That is why Khojazāde Efendi of Bursa, that eminent scholar of Rūm,³³ wrote in his notes on the *Shaqā'iq*, 'Indirectly, my master is al-Jurjānī. All my education comes from his books. Apart from his works, and those of Sa'd al-Dīn, I have never looked at a book on the speculative sciences with the intention of learning from it. I too might have matched the attainments of the Sayyid the Sharīf, had several obstacles not stood in my way. First, he was healthy, whereas I am an invalid. Next, he worked methodically from the beginning to the end of his life, writing lectures. My working time was encroached on by extraneous obligations: that is to say, I was afflicted with the duties of judge and mufti, and so could not work.'

Now if the devoted student really wishes for a sound education, he should have nothing to do with judge-ships but seek his livelihood elsewhere. Having fully mastered the doctrines of the Sunnites, let him enter the citadel of the Book, the Sunna, and the Consensus of the Community. Let him take as his standard of measurement the Koran, the Traditions, and the sayings of the masters of jurisprudence and the saints. Then let him study the works of the philosophers and speculative theologians, and the words of the Sufis. Let him profit by them, accepting from each that which thought and reason show to be profitable, on the principle 'Take the clear and leave the turbid.' Let him deny and reject none of them, avoiding the pitfall of bigotry, in accordance with our earlier warnings.

Here I finish what I had to say, and my treatise is ended. May the God of Truth, Extolled and Almighty,

grant all of us a good ending, and may He not let us depart from the road of reason and His merciful favour, of His grace and bounty. Amen.

NOTES TO CONCLUSION

¹ The campaign of 1624, undertaken to suppress the revolt of Abaza Pasha, Governor-General of Erzurum, who wished to destroy the unruly Corps of Janissaries as a danger to the State, in particular because of their part in the murder of Sultan Osman II in May 1622. The campaign was inconclusive: Abaza Pasha was confirmed in his governorship on condition that he admitted 2,000 Janissaries to the citadel of Erzurum, as previously.

² This was an unsuccessful attempt in 1625-6 to recapture Baghdad from the Persians, who had occupied it in 1624.

³ *Siyāqat* is 'Treasury cipher', the deliberately crabbed form of script used exclusively by the financial administration of the Ottoman Empire.

⁴ Abaza Pasha had profited by the distraction of the Baghdad campaign to massacre a force of Janissaries who had been ordered to dispose of him. He was consequently besieged in Erzurum from 12 September to 25 November 1627, but the fortress held out. He surrendered in September 1628, on condition that no harm should come to him or his followers. The bargain was kept, and Abaza thereafter served the State with distinction, but was executed in August 1635, apparently because Sultan Murad IV was suspicious of his ambitions.

⁵ Khusrev Pasha, Grand Vizier and Commander-in-Chief 1628-31, led another unsuccessful expedition against Baghdad from June 1629 to November 1630. The city was not recovered until December 1638.

⁶ Toqlu Dede was an apocryphal saint, whose name, a corruption of (Saint) Thekla, was further corrupted to Toqmaq ('Mallet'). A mausoleum (*türbe*) in the neighbourhood of Ayvansaray on the Golden Horn, in the north of Istanbul, was regarded as his burial-place. Marriageable girls used to walk three times round the tomb, carrying on their shoulder a mallet which was kept there, and then say, 'My luck, my fortune, wherever you be, come to me.' They would then leave the mausoleum without looking back. Their future husband would follow the same occupation as the first man they met on the road (Mehmet Halit Bayrı, *Istanbul Folkloru*, Istanbul, 1947, p. 154; Hasluck, *op. cit.*, p. 18). Buqaghili Dede was presumably another local saint of the same sort. Qādizāde's sneer no doubt referred to festivities in the saints' honour.

⁷ Tabani-yassi Mehmed Pasha was Grand Vizier from 1632 to February 1637. The Army reached Aleppo in Jumādā II 1043/December 1633. The Pilgrimage was in July 1634.

⁸ Erivan had been seized from the Persians in 1583 but was lost to them again in 1604. The expedition mentioned here succeeded in recovering it in little over a week, after rejecting an optimistic and sporting invitation from the defenders to an eight-day armistice: if Persian reinforcements had not arrived by the end of that time, they would surrender.

⁹ Murad IV actually left for Baghdad at the end of 1047/May 1638.

¹⁰ Two works on tradition: *Nukhbat al-fikr fī mustalah ahl al-ithr*, by al-Hāfiz Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad ibn 'Alī al-'Asqalānī (d. 852/1448-9); *Alfiyat al-'Irāqī fī usūl al-hadīth*, by al-Hāfiz Zayn al-Dīn 'Abd al-Rahīm ibn al-Husayn al-'Irāqī (d. 806/1403-4.).

¹¹ Ibrāhīm ibn Ibrāhīm al-Laḡānī (d. 1631) taught at the Mosque of al-Azhar in Cairo.

¹² Sheykhzāde Muhyi'l-Dīn Mehmed Efendi (d. 1544) wrote a scholarly supercommentary on Baydāwī.

Kara-Kemal, Kemāl al-Dīn Ismā'īl of Karaman (d. 1514), wrote a number of theological commentaries. Mahmūd ibn Sadr al-Sharī'a (d. c. 1275) wrote a book called *Wiqāyat al-riwāya fī masā'il al-hidāya* ('The Protection of Tradition in the Problems of Guidance'), on which many commentaries were written, the most famous being that of its author's grandson, 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Mas'ūd Sadr al-Sharī'a II (d. 1349). What Kara-Kemal wrote was a commentary on this commentary, using differently coloured inks to distinguish the texts.

¹³ The expedition which seized Crete from the Venetians set sail in May 1645, and the conquest was completed by the end of August.

¹⁴ The *Ashkāl al-ta'sīs* was a geometrical work—35 propositions of Euclid—by Shams al-Dīn Muhammad ibn Ashraf al-Samarqandī (d. c. 1203). Mahmūd ibn Muhammad al-Chaghmīnī of Khwarazm was the author of the *Mulakhkhas* ('Summary') on astronomy, completed in 808/1405-6. Commentaries on both these works were composed by Mūsā ibn Muhammad Qādizāde (d. after 1413).

¹⁵ Abū Muhammad 'Abd Allāh ibn Muhammad al-Andalusī, d. 549/1154-5.

¹⁶ Ulugh Beg (d. 1449) was the scholarly grandson of Timur and ruler of Transoxania. His *Almanac* was a series of astronomical tables, a Latin translation of which, by Thomas Hyde, was published at Oxford in 1665, with the original Persian text.

¹⁷ Husayn ibn Mu'īn al-Dīn al-Maybadī al-Qādī-Mīr (d. 910/1504-5), a pupil of Dawwānī, wrote a commentary on the *Hidāyat al-Hikma* of Athīr al-Dīn Mufaddal ibn 'Umar al-Abharī (d. ? 663/1264-5). This is a treatise on logic, natural science, and theology. Qādī-Mīr's commentary was in use as a textbook in Turkish medreses up to the twentieth century.

¹⁸ *Ādab al-bahth*. There are several works of the name, including one by Ījī.

¹⁹ Molla Fanārī—Shams al-Dīn Muhammad ibn Hamza (1351-1432), a versatile scholar, was author of a work on logic which also remained in use till the present century. He was noted for his intellectual curiosity.

²⁰ *al-Shamsīya*, a manual of logic by Najm al-Dīn 'Umar ibn 'Alī al-Qazwīnī (d. 693/1293-4).

²¹ Jāmī is possibly a mistake for *Jāmi'* ('Compendium'), a common name for scholarly manuals.

²² These words are not clear. There were many books called *al-Maqāsīd* ('Objects of Search'), among them a manual of astrology by Mīrim Chelebi Mahmūd ibn Muhammad (d. 1525), author of a commentary on Ulugh Beg's *Ẓīj*. If this is the work here intended, the words must mean 'the sections on general events (as opposed to personal matters). For Kātib Chelebi's views on astrology, see p. 10 of the Introduction.

²³ 'Alī Kushju was one of Ulugh Beg's pupils and collaborators, director of his observatory and part-author of his *Ẓīj*. After Ulugh Beg's death he entered the service of Uzun Hasan, the Akkoyunlu ruler of Azerbaijan (1466-78), who sent him on an embassy to Mehmed II in Istanbul, where he eventually settled down as a teacher. He died in 1474. *al-Risālat al-Muhammadiya* was his Arabic translation of his Persian treatise on arithmetic. His *Fathiya*, mentioned below, is a simple introduction to astronomy.

²⁴ The foreign sciences (*al-'ulūm al-gharība*) are those not included among the religious and the ancillary sciences: medicine, geography, geometry, etc.

²⁵ The author of the *Sī faṣl* and *Bīst bāb* was Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūsī.

²⁶ *Tā* is the fourth of the 31 letters of the Ottoman alphabet. This dictionary is unique among similar Ottoman works in including biographies of Greek as well as of Muslim scholars.

²⁷ Atlas Minor Gerardi Mercatoris, a J. Hondio plurimis aeneis tabulis auctus atque illustratus. Hondius (Judocus), Arnhemii, 1621.

The full title of Kātib Chelebi's translation rhymes, like so many Arabic titles: *Lawāmi' al-nūr fī zulumāt Atlas Mīnūr* ('Flashes of Light on the Darkneses of the Atlas Minor').

²⁸ *Frankish History*, a translation of the *Chronicles* of Johann Carion of Frankfort, first published in 1531 and expanded in subsequent editions.

²⁹ The stoning of the Accursed (Satan) is the name of one of the rites of the Pilgrimage. The numerical values of the letters *Sin* and *Jim* are 60 and 3 respectively. The work is lost: probably it contained 63 fetwas.

³⁰ The *Nigāristān* of Ahmad ibn Muhammad Ghaffārī was a Persian collection of historical tales and anecdotes, completed in 1552.

³¹ On 26 June 1656, the Ottoman fleet sailed out to meet the Venetians in the Dardanelles and was routed. The enemy occupied the islands of Lemnos, Tenedos, and Samothrace, establishing a blockade of Istanbul that was not broken till August 1657. For the impression this made on the author, see the account of his vision on p. 146.

³² Compare the closing words of the Reverend H. H. Rowley, D.D., Professor of Hebrew at Manchester University, in his broadcast talk 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins' (*The Listener*, 1 November 1956): 'Serious scholars do not close their eyes to either similarities or differences between the scrolls and the New Testament, and have no reason to be afraid of either. So far as the general reader of the Bible is concerned, he may rest assured that there is nothing whatever here which touches the authority of the Bible or which affects any Christian doctrine.'

³³ Khojazāde Muslih al-Dīn Efendi died in 1488, while Mufti of Bursa.

INDEX

[The Arabic definite article *al-* has been ignored in the alphabetical arrangement of the Index. 'Efendi' has been abbreviated to Ef., 'ibn' to b.]

- Abaza Pasha, 152.
 'Abbās b. 'Abd al-Muttalib, 87, 93, 95-6.
 'Abbāsids, 17, 85, 87.
 'Abd al-Ghafūr, 119.
 'Abd Allāh (the author's father) 7.
 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Muttalib, 66.
 'Abd al-Rahim Ef., 12, 57, 59, 142.
 'Abd al-Rahmān, Caliph, 87.
 'Abd al-Rahmān Ef., 128.
 'Abd al-Rahmān, Sheykh, 128.
 al-Abharī, 154.
 Abraham, 12, 66, 93, 94, 110-21.
 Abū Bakr, Caliph, 17, 85.
 Abū Hanifa, 18, 49, 68, 69, 73.
 Abu'l-Khayr, 10.
 Abu'l-Su'ūd Ef., 60, 112, 128-31.
 Abu Muti' al-Balkhī, 68.
 Abū Tālib, 70, 73.
 al-Abwā', 66, 72.
 action, five categories of, 16-7.
 'Adud *see* al-ījī.
 Ahmad b. Hanbal, 18, 72.
 Ahmed I, 132, 134.
 Ahmad Rūmī, 142.
 Akmal al-Dīn al-Bābirtī, 111, 122.
 Alexander the Great, 37, 66;
 Rampart of, 27-8.
 Alexandria, 24, 31.
 'Alī, Caliph, 17, 42, 46, 74, 84-7.
 'Alī Kushju, 142, 143, 155.
 'Alī Maqdisī, 70-1, 74.
 al-Āmadī, 106, 109.
 Āmina bint Wahb, 66.
 analogy, 15, 55, 118.
 al-Andalusī, 141, 154.
 Arberry, A. J., 31, 78, 83.
 A'rej Mustafā Ef., 139, 141.
 Aristotle, 40, 41; *Theology of Aristotle*, 9.
 al-Ash'ari, 73.
 Ash'arites, 67, 73.
 al-Asqalānī, 153.
 astrology, 10, 143, 155.
 'Atā' Allāh, 129.
 Baghdad, 7, 17, 32, 51, 87, 135, 138, 152, 153.
 al-Baghdādī, 124, 127.
 Bahā' al-Dīn-zāde *see* Muhammad b. Bahā' al-Dīn.
 Bahā'i Mehmed Ef., 28, 32, 52, 56, 57, 59.
 al-Baydāwī, 25, 27, 31, 112, 116, 122, 139, 140, 153.
 al-Bayhaqī, 113, 122.
 Bayrī, M. H., 153.
 al-Bazdawī, 111, 121, 122.
berāt, 97, 99.
bid' a, *see* Innovation.
 Bilālzāde Ef., 129-30.
 Birgili Mehmed Ef., 68, 115, 128-31, 132.
 Black Stone, 95, 96.
 Bostānzāde Mehmed Ef., 60, 62.
 Bousquet, G. H., 31.
 bribery, 124-7.
 al-Bukhārī, 14, 95-6.
 Buqaghili Dede, 137, 153.
 Caliph, Caliphate, 17, 82, 84-7;
 of Cordova, 87; Rightly-Guided Caliphs, 17, 84-6, 104.
 al-Chaghminī, 141, 143, 154.
chelebi, 8.
 Christians, 23, 115.
 coffee, 8, 60-2.
 Companions of the Prophet, 14, 24, 36, 47, 85-6, 89, 103, 104, 137.
 consensus, 15, 151.
 Crete, 140, 154.
 Damascus, 80, 84.
 Dā'ūd al-Antākī, 61, 62.

al-Dawwānī, 25, 31-2, 77, 78, 154.
ders-i 'amm, 139.
dhikr, 20.
dīn, 110.
drugs, 60, 63-4.

Ebuzziya, 12, 13.
Elias, 37.
Erivan, 137, 153.
Erzurum, 135, 152.
Euclid, 154.

Fādīl, 110-7, 120.
Fadl Allāh Ef., 132.
Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, 25, 31, 69.
falsafa, 30-1.
Faris, N. A., 122.
fātiha, 94, 96, 132.
fatra, 66, 72.
fetwa, 19, 26-7, 28, 60, 86, 97,
101, 124 ff., 144, 145, 156.
Fiqh akbar, 32, 68-9, 73, 116, 123.
furū', 14, 15.

Gabriel, 93.
al-Ghaffārī, 145, 156.
al-Ghazālī, 25, 31, 48, 86, 87, 99.
Glidden, H. W., 122.

hadīth, see Tradition.
Hanafites, 18, 32, 67, 87, 122, 127.
Hanbalites, 18, 109.
hanīf, 113, 115, 122.
Hasan b. 'Alī, 30, 84.
Hāshim, 87.
Hāshimites, 84-5, 87.
Hasluck, F. W., 37, 153.
Heyworth-Dunne, J., 31.
Hitti, P. K., 96.
Hughes, T. P., 96.
Hülāgū, 32.
Husayn b. 'Alī, 30, 84-5, 87.
Hyde, T., 154.

ibn, 73.
Ibn 'Abbās, 70, 73.
Ibn 'Arabī, 75-8, 80-3.
Ibn Bazzāz, 127.
Ibn Hajar, 36, 37.
Ibn Hammām, 125, 127.
Ibn Jawzī, 36, 37.
Ibn Kathīr, 93.

Ibn Khallikān, 87, 88.
Ibn Najīm al-Misrī, 124-6.
Ibn Qayyim, 93.
Ibn Qudāma, 72, 74.
Ibn Taymīya, 93, 95.
Ibrāhīm al-Laḡānī, 140, 153.
Ibrāhīm Ef., 51.
Ibrāhīm b. Muhammad al-
Halebī, 74.
al-Ījī, 30, 31, 106, 154.
ijmā', see Consensus.
ijtihād, 18-9.
Illuminationism, 9-10, 77.
imam, 16, 17, 47.
innovation, 54, 72, 89-91, 101.
intention, 100.
al-'Irāqī, 'Abd al-Rahīm, 153.
al-Isfahānī, Rāghib, 116, 122-3,
141, 149.
al-Isfarā'īnī, 114, 122.
ishrāqī, see Illuminationism.
Islambol, 51, 59.
Ismā'il Ef., 137.

jāhiliya, 66.
Jāmī, 82, 83, 119, 141, 155.
Jār Allāh, see Zamakhsharī.
Jeffery, A., 123.
Jerusalem, 97.
Jesus, 34-5, 37, 66.
Jews, 75, 76, 78, 115.
jihād, 16.
al-Jurjānī, 22, 25, 30, 32, 70, 106,
151.

Ka'ba, 32, 96.
kalām, 23-4, 30-1.
kalfa, 8.
Kara-Kemal, 140, 154.
kātib, 8.
kazasker, 13, 19, 128.
al-Kāzirūnī, 113, 122.
Kechi Mehmed Ef., 139.
Kemāl-Pasha-zāde, 71, 74, 128.
Kerbelā, 85, 87.
khafā', 10.
khalīfa, 8; see also Caliph.
Khārijites, 72, 74, 85.
khatīb, 16.
Khidr, 33-7.
Khojazāde Ef., 151, 156.
Khusrev Pasha, 136, 152.

- khutba*, 16, 47, 149.
 al-Kiyā al-Harrāsī, 86, 87, 88.
 Kochi Bey, 8-9.
 Koçu, R. E., 62.
 Koran, 14, 39, *et passim*; *quoted*, 11,
 27, 29, 37, 48, 67, 70, 72, 75,
 76, 103, 108, 112, 113, 114, 115,
 116, 118, 122, 124.
 Kurd 'Abd Allāh Ef., 139.
- madhhab*, 18.
 magic, 10-1.
 Mahmūd Ef. al-Uskudārī, 35-6,
 37.
 Mālik b. Anas, 18.
 Malikites, 18, 80.
 al-Marghīnānī, 32.
 al-Māturidī, 73.
 Māturīdites, 67, 73.
 Mecca, 16, 28, 66, 72.
 Medina, 66, 72, 85, 137.
medrese, 8, 154, 155.
 Mehmed II, 26, 155.
 Mehmed Ikhlasī, 11, 144.
 Mehmed Kalfa, 7.
 Mehmed Pasha, Sokollu, 129, 131.
 Mehmed Pasha, Tabani-Yassi,
 137, 153.
milla, 110, 116, 123.
 Mirim Cehelbī, 155.
 Molla Fanārī, 141, 155.
 Mongols, 17, 32.
 Moses, 37, 75, 113, 120.
 Mu'āwiya, 17, 74, 84-8.
 muezzin, 16, 47.
 mufti, 19, 26-7, 145.
 Muhammad, 14, *et passim*.
 Muhammad b. Bahā' al-Dīn, 68,
 69-70, 73.
 Muhyi'l-Dīn Ef., 128.
 Mūjib, 110, 117-8, 120.
mujtahid, 18-9, 24, 85-6.
mukallaf, 106.
 Murad III, 131.
 Murad IV, 8-9, 51, 58, 59, 61,
 137, 138, 152, 153.
 Mu' tazilites, 73.
- al-Nasafī, 32, 65.
 al-Nawawī, 101, 102.
 Neoplatonism, 9-10, 40, 41.
 Nimrod, 93.
- onomancy, 10, 141.
 Orders, 20, 35, 92, 95, 136;
 Bayramī, 128, 131; Khalwatī,
 43-6, 132, 136; Mevlevī, 20,
 136; Naqshibendī, 92, 95;
 Rufā'ī, 20.
 Osman II, 152.
- Parents of the Prophet, 12, 65-74.
 Pharaoh, 75-8, 86.
 pilgrimage, 8, 16, 137, 150, 153,
 156; to tombs, 92-5.
 Pillars of Islam, the Five, 15-6,
 149-50.
 Pir 'Alī Ef., 68, 128.
 Plato, 26.
 Plotinus, 9.
 prayer, 15-6, 28, 97-100, 101, 137,
 149.
- qādī*, 19.
qādī-i 'askar, *see kazasker*.
 Qādikhān, 124, 126, 127.
 Qādī-Mīr, 141, 150, 154.
 Qādizāde Mehmed Ef., 99, 132-4,
 135-7, 139, 153.
 Qādizāde Rūmī, 143, 154.
qadr, 97, 100.
qānun, 19, 26, 57, 128.
 al-Qazwīnī, 155.
qibla, 28, 32.
 Qinalizāde, 38-9, 41.
qiyās, *see* Analogy.
 al-Qudūrī, 124, 127.
- Rāfidites, 69, 85, 87.
raghā'ib, 97, 99.
rak'a, 15-6.
 Ramadān, 16, 28, 100, 149.
 Roots and Branches, 14, 24, 146.
 Rowley, H. H., 156.
 Rūm, 26.
- Sa'd al-Dīn, *see* al-Taftazānī.
 Sa'di Ef., 114, 122.
 Sadr al-Dīn Qonawī, 80, 82, 83.
 Sadr al-Sharī'a, 140, 154.
 Safavids, 42, 46.
 Sahrānī Ahmad Haydar, 139.
 St. George, 37.
 Saladin, 10.
 al-Samarqandī, 154.

- samā*¹, 41.
sayyid, 30.
 Schools, the Four, 18.
 Selim II, 129, 131.
 al-Shāfi'i, 18.
 Shafiites, 18, 36, 67, 86, 109.
shahāda, 15.
 Shams al-Dīn al-Qurtubī, 71, 74.
shari'a, 14, 110, 116.
sharīf, 30.
 Sheykh al-Islam, 12, 19, *et passim*.
 Sheykhī, 132, 134.
 Sheykhzāde Ef., Fetva Emīni, 28.
 Sheykhzāde Muhyi'l-Dīn Ef., 140,
 153.
 Shiites, 17-8, 69, 84-7, 101.
 al-Shīrāzi, 25, 31.
 singing, 38-41.
 Sīvāsī Ef., 132-4, 137.
 Sīvāsī Shams Ef., 132.
siyāqat, 135, 152.
 Slane, MacG. de, 88.
 Socrates, 26.
 Sufis, 20, 41, 42-6, 60, 77, 79, 132,
 148-49; *see also* Orders.
 al-Suhrawardī, 9-10.
 Suleyman I, 25, 32, 128, 131.
sunna, 14, 17, 24, 89, 90, 95, 101,
 102, 124, 129; three categories
 of, 14, 89.
 Sunnites, 17, 84-7.
 al-Suyūti, 71, 74.

 al-Taftazāni, 24, 25, 31, 65, 86,
 114, 151.
 al-Tahtāni, 25, 31.

 Tashköprüzāde, 131.
tawakkul, 20.
 Timur, 95, 154.
 tobacco, 50-9.
 Toghāni Mustafā Ef., 132.
 Toqlu Dede, 137, 153.
 tradition, 14, 18, 19, 23, 36, 73,
 89, 117, 129, 139-40, 146, 151.
 Tursunzāde, 132.
 al-Tūsī, 32, 143, 155.

 Ulema, 8, 9, 19, *et passim*.
 Ulugh Beg, 141, 154, 155.
 'Umar, Caliph, 17, 31, 85, 87, 93,
 95-6.
 'Umar Ef., 132.
 Umayya, 87.
 Umayyads, 17, 84-8.
 al-Ushī, 86, 87.
usūl wa-furū', 14-5.
 'Uthmān, Caliph, 17, 84, 87.

 Veli Ef., 139-40.

waqf, *waqfiya*, 26, 32, 130-1.
wa'z, *wā'iz*, 16.
 Wensinck, A. J., 32, 73.

 Yahyā Ef., 139, 140.
 Yazid, 84-7.

 -zāde, 73.
 al-Zajjāj, 115, 122.
 al-Zamakhsharī, 70, 73-4.
 Zayd, 87.

BP

HACI HALIFA

163

The Balance of Truth

.H151

Tr. by G. L. Lewis

**THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY**



12 261 719

ORIENTAL INSTITUTE



12:261 719