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THE TEKKE OF HACI BEKTAŞ: SOCIAL POSITION AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES

Throughout the Ottoman period, dervishes and their convents have played an important part in both towns and countryside. Yet they have not received the attention that their importance merits, and the religious aspect of their activities has attracted more interest than the social. In the latter area, one of the pioneer works has been Ömer Lutfi Barkan's study of the role of dervishes and their convents in the settlement of Anatolia and Rumelia,¹ and the present article was inspired by it. Barkan's emphasis was on how these convents, usually called tekkes and zaviyes, served as the nuclei around which future villages formed. It was pointed out how the dervishes guarded passes and caravan routes, introduced new crops and propagated more highly specialized agriculture.

In the present study the emphasis is somewhat different: it is an attempt to show how the dergâh or central monastery of the Bektashi order of dervishes related, economically, to its social environment. In this context, one of the key questions is how it assembled and maintained its considerable possessions, and who made donations at what occasions and for what reasons. Synthesizing the scattered bits and pieces of information that our sources have preserved, we may come to certain conclusions about the functioning of a major Anatolian tekke within Ottoman administration and society.

When the nucleus of the dergâh was founded is not known for certain. The Vilâyet-Nâme² of Haci Bektaş, which in its present form was probably composed in the late fifteenth century, claims that it goes back to the times of Haci Bektaş himself. According to the author, probably a certain Ilyas, son of Hızır, the türbe or mausoleum of the saint was built immediately after his death on the orders of a certain Gazi Murad. By Gazi Murad he apparently meant the Ottoman Sultan Murad I (1326–89), but since Haci Bektaş most probably died in 1270–1, this story cannot be quite correct. Either the mausoleum was built in the late thirteenth century and has nothing at all to do with Murad I, or else the present building was not erected immediately after the death of the saint. It is conceivable that Murad I rebuilt or restored an older structure, but that remains in the realm of conjecture.

There is, however, better evidence connecting Murad I with the dergāh. It consists of an inscription over the present meydān evi or meeting hall. Various readings have been proposed for this difficult text, but there seems to be general agreement that the Ahi Murad who proclaims himself the builder of what he calls an imaret is Sultan Murad I. From other documents we know that this ruler was in fact a member of the ahi-organization, and the date (769/1367–8) presents no difficulty. There is no evidence that the inscription is not in its original site. Franz Taeschner surmised that the imaret was originally connected with the ahi's rather than with the Bektashis, since the two organizations were reasonably close, they may very well have used the same building.

The oldest defter that gives us any information about the vakıfs pertaining to the dergāh was written in 881/1476, toward the end of the reign of Mehmed II. It is an overview of the pious endowments in the province of Karaman. While the bulk of the dergāh's vakıfs were located in the Kırşehir sancak and are thus not included in this text, a few villages in the Aksaray area also paid their dues to the tekke of Hacı Bektash and thus fall within the scope of this register.

A substantial part of the vakıf income contained in this register came from the salt mine in or near the village of Tuz, in the Aksaray area. The village paid 3300 (or 3600?) aḵes in dues from agriculture and salt mining, out of a total income of 5650 aḵes.

For a later period, the reign of Bayezid II, the Vilâyet-Nâmе can again serve as a source. Since it was written at this time, it is probably somewhat more reliable than for the fourteenth century. In a short paragraph at the end of the book we read that the Sultan had a great respect for Hacı Bektash, added to his vakıfs, and visited his türbe in person, having its cupola covered with lead. A vakıf-survey covering the province of Karaman and dated 906/1500–1 has been preserved, but unfortunately it does not allow us to check the information supplied by Vilâyet-Nâmе: the villages listed are the same as in the older defter, only the income has risen. How much of this rise was due to inflation and how much to an increase in productivity is difficult to say. The salt mine alone accounted for 1000 aḵes; the village of Tuz produced a revenue of 4877, while the total income amounted to 6977 aḵes.

1 I am indebted to Mr. Ibrahim H. Konyali, Istanbul, for help on this and other matters. See also Halim Baki Kunter, ‘Kitabelerimiz’, Vakıflar Dergisi, vol. ii (1943), p. 432.
3 Information kindly furnished by Dr. Ömür Bâker, Faculty of Architecture, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
4 Archive of the Tapu Kadastro Genel Müdürülüğü, Ankara (henceforth abbreviated TK), no. 564, p. 74 b. I am much indebted to Mr. Mehmet Önder and his staff for the kindness and patience they showed me while conducting this research. Published by Feridun Nâzî Üzülük, Fatih Deevinde Karaman Eyâleti Vakıflar Fihristi (Ankara, 1958), pp. 73–8.
5 The figures are written in išyakat.
6 Vilâyet-Nâmе, p. 90.
7 TK no. 565, p. 177 a/b.
8 TK no. 584, p. 80 b.
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Two inscriptions from the period of Selim I inform us about the further development of the vakhfs. Both of them are connected with Ali b. Şehsüvar, semi-independent ruler of the Dulkadırí principality from 1515 to 1520. Already under Alâüedddevle, Ali b. Şehsüvar's predecessor, some of the members of this family had accepted positions as sancakbegs within the Ottoman Empire, and Alâüedddevle's son Şahruh had been sancakbeg of Kirşehir. In an even earlier period, Kirşehir had formed part of the Dulkadırí beğlik, and Alâüedddevle established a large number of pious foundations in the area. One of these benefited the dergâh of Haci Bektas; it received half the income from property rights over the small settlement of Boyali Viran, while the other half went to the mosque which the Türkmen lord had founded in the village of Halifeli. Alâüedddevle must have owned substantial property in the area; even in the late sixteenth century, his vakifs provided an income of 5130 akça.

One of Ali b. Şehsüvar's inscriptions is located over the entrance to the mausoleum of Hızır Bah, better known under the name of Bahlı Sultan, and is dated 925/1519. The other one, situated over the door of the Friday mosque in the village proper, outside the dergâh compound, is dated 926/1520, during the reign of Sultan Selim I. The munificence of Ali b. Şehsüvar is all the more remarkable since Bektashi tradition has it that Selim I closed the dergâh, which was not allowed to reopen until 938/1551. The tradition does not report any reasons, but the connection of the dergâh with nomad uprisings may furnish a clue.

Ali b. Şehsüvar had fled to Bayezid II, and was in great favour with his son Selim. When the Sultan conquered the Dulkadırí principality in 1515, Ali b. Şehsüvar was appointed vassal ruler in Elbistan. In addition, he was made sancakbeg of Bozok, where many of his tribe lived. When a rebel leader by the name of Celal proclaimed himself Mehdi, the Dulkadırí prince was active in suppressing the revolt. However, he made an enemy of the beşlerbeg sent from Istanbul for the same purpose, who subsequently obtained permission to kill him. Thereafter, the Dulkadırí emirate was permanently incorporated into the Ottoman Empire.

Discontent arose when the tahrir (cadastre) for the new province was being compiled. A Türkmen uprising resulted which continued for several years. Its last leader was known as Kalender Şah, and Bektashi tradition sees him as a younger brother of Bahlı Sultan. The Dulkadırs's motives no doubt were primarily economic: when the Grand Vizier assured them that the land question

1 IA, article 'Dulkadir'.
2 So far, there is no reliable edition of the many inscriptions in the dergâh and the village itself. Mr Ali Sümer and Mr Abdullah Taşdelen, of the museum in Hacıbektas, were extremely helpful in locating them. See also Cevat Hakkı Taşım, Kirşehir Tarihi Üzerinde Araştırmalar (Kirşehir, 1938), pp. 183-7.
3 See Remzi Gürses, Hacıbektas Rehberi (Ankara, n.d.), p. 44.
would be solved to their satisfaction, they deserted Kalender. Left with only a few thousand followers, he was annihilated in 933/1526. According to local tradition, an unmarked grave in the mausoleum of Balum Sultan contains his remains.

The sources call the Kalender rebellion a Kızılbaş and not a Bektashi uprising, and it is difficult to say how far the dergâh as an institution was involved. But we do know that the dervishes were in contact with other Kızılbaş uprisings as well. In 1577 a member of the Şam Diyade tribe, impersonating Şah Ismail, gathered a large number of adherents in Malatya and the southeast, and then entered the sancak of Kırşehir. There he performed sacrifices in front of Hacı Bektaş's mausoleum and sent emissaries to the province of Bozok to gather further adherents.¹

The association of the dergâh with Türkmen tribes may go back to very early times, if the Vîliyet-Nâme is at all reliable. According to legend, one of Hacı Bektaş's earliest followers, a certain Hoca Idris, belonged to the Çepni tribe, and many Çepnis are Alevi to the present day.

In the sixteenth century some of the villages connected with the dergâh were inhabited by nomad communities. The tahvîr records Kızılvan and Durmuşça, both located in the vicinity of Kırşehir, and a place known as Araboğlu kişası. According to the tax survey of 1584, these communities were to pay their hakkı-ı şerîye — that is, the taxes prescribed by religious law — to the so-called 'sahib-i arz', while taxes imposed according to örfî law were to be paid to the official in charge of hâss. Since the tax records at the same time a duality of recipients by assigning the malikâne (revenue arising from private property rights) to one person and the divanî taxes to another, one feels tempted to equate the 'sahib-i arz' with the owner of the malikâne; yet this is by no means certain, since the word has also been used to designate the incumbent of a timar.² On the other hand, the term is used in the case of Durmuşça, where no timar existed, and malikâne and divanî were paid to the dergâh of Hacı Bektaş; in such a case, it is hard to imagine who else but the tekke could have figured as 'sahib-i arz'.

For the period of Kanuni Süleymân (1520–66), some of the most important sources are again inscriptions. Two of them name a certain Bahı Bey, son of Ali, from the family of Malkoçoğlu. One is connected with a water fountain that this gentleman donated; the date is 962/1554–5. In it, the donor calls himself the 'commander of gazis'. A second inscription is located over the entrance to the hall leading to the kitchen, and it says that Bahı Bey, son of Gazi Malkoç, had the building erected in 968/1560–61.

Bahı Bey can be identified with reasonable assurance. In a monograph on the noble family of the Malkoçoğlu family, Franz Babinger has gathered a vast amount

of material pertaining to its different members. The Malkoçoğlu family made a name as local administrators in Serbia, Bosnia and Hungary during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Two family members were named Bali Bey; the older one died about 1500, but the younger one did live during the period in question. He seems to have started his career as a military commander in Dióga, near Prozor, in modern Yugoslavia. Between 960/1553 and 963/1556 he became sancakbég of Bosnia. While in office he carried out unsuccessful attacks against the fortresses of Krupa and Kostajnica in the northeast of Bosnia. In 1557 he became commander of the castle of Klissa in Dalmatia. He may have retained this position until his death, which occurred some time around the year 1562, but it is also possible that he spent his last years as sancakbég of Temesvar in Hungary.

For a while the famous historian Ali of Gelibolu was his secretary; it is to him that we owe much of our knowledge. Yet none of the sources mentions a connection with the Bektashis or Hacı Bektaş; the Malkoçoğlu family seems to have come to the Balkans at a very early date, and none of its members is known to have exercised functions in Anatolia. Thus it is not possible to say what prompted the rather generous donations made by Bali Bey. The only clue possibly lies in the title 'commander of the gazis'. It is conceivable that Bali Bey and his entourage were still conscious of the connection between frontier warfare in the service of the faith, and the Bektashis; but why he did not prefer a tekké in Rumelia remains unexplained.

Considerable problems are posed by the inscription over the door leading to the Kirklar Meydam. This is a large hall, intended as a mosque, on to which open the mausolea of Hacı Bektaş and his disciple Güvenç Abdal. In a later period it was also used for important meetings and as a burial place for people connected with the order. According to the inscription, the mosque was built by Murad, son of Abdullah, sancakbég of Yasinabad (or Pasinbad?) in 970/1562-3. Ali, who visited the tekké in 1003/1596-97, reports that a certain Sultan Murad, governor of Kayseri, had the cupola of the mausoleum covered with lead. Later he became beşlerbég, and is possibly identical with a certain Şeytan Murad who retired after having administered Lahsa and Basra. 'Sultan Murad' and 'Şeytan Murad' may

2 The only further evidence that connects a member of the Malkoçoğlu family with the tekké dates from the nineteenth century: in 1229/1813-14 (or possibly 1227/1812) a Malkoçoğlu was mentioned in a document (Museum, Hacibektas) concerning a dispute about certain villages pertaining to the dervish community. He was not given any official title, but since his associates were the incumbent of a large military fief (saim) and a former commander, it is likely that Malkoçoğlu had a similar position, as well as some sort of property rights in the area. About this connection with the main branch of the family nothing is known.
3 Vülalet-Nâme, p. 134, and letter from the author referring to Ali, Kûnûnûl akbar, İstanbul Üniversitesi Kitüphanesi T.Y. 5650, pp. 166, and 353a/b. There also existed a governor of Karaman called Murad, but his néks were located in Konya and Antalya. See İbrahim Hakkı Konyalı, Abidekeleri ve Kitabeleri ile Konya Tarihi (Konya, 1964), pp. 692-6.
well be the same person as the ‘Murad b. Abdullah’ mentioned in the inscription, because the name ‘Murad’ was not very common among provincial governors of the period, and it is rather unlikely that two sancabbeğ of this name should have made additions to the mausoleum in the same period. According to Ali, Murad made his donation while still sancabbeğ of Kayseri, and advanced in his career by means of the spiritual powers of the saint. Translated into more worldly terms, this may well have meant that he secured the patronage of the ‘descendants’ of Haci Bektaş, or possibly of certain Janissary officers. It would be interesting to know whether Malkoçoğlu Bāli and Murad interceded with the Sultan to have the dergah reopened after it had been closed following Bālām Sultan’s death. Perhaps the construction of the mosque was even intended as an attempt to make the dergah and what it stood for more acceptable in the eyes of orthodox Sunni.

There is in fact some additional indication that the dergah was not exactly favoured by the Sultan’s administration during the period in question. A defter listing the evkaf in the Aksaray area, which comprised two villages and three mesraas (empty or very sparsely settled fields) at the end of the fifteenth century, now only listed the village of Tuz with its salt mine and two mesraas. It is not clear what happened to the remainder, since it has not been possible to find out whether they were reassigned. Possibly the compiler of the register was simply prevailed upon not to give a full picture of the dergah’s wealth. At the end of the sixteenth century the dergah had repossessed its sources of revenue in the area.

The period of Murad III is better documented than any other, for tahrir defterleri, or surveys of taxable subjects, were compiled in the provinces of Kırşehir, Aksaray and Kayseri in the year 992/1584, and for the same year we also have an evkaf defteri of the vilayet of Karaman, which included both Kayseri and Aksaray.

The main source of information is the mufassal tahrir of Kırşehir. As in all surveys of this kind, the taxable subjects are arranged by village, or by town-quarters in case of a city. It was compiled under the supervision of Mustafa b. Ahmed, former defterdar of Karaman, and written by a certain Kadri b. Mehmed. However, these two people also appended their names to the Aksaray and Kayseri tahrirs, and to the Karaman vakaf survey as well. This probably means that they had many subordinates for whose work they were held responsible, though it is also possible that they spent a fairly long period on the necessary research and appended the date when all was completed. As was customary, the two officials used an older tahrir as the basis for their work. Where it was not possible to do any actual counting, we find a note to the effect that the figures were taken from the old tahrir. Unfortunately, there is little scope for comparison, because no other survey of Kırşehir has been preserved, and that was where the majority of the dergah’s possessions was situated.²

¹ Bayvekâlet Arşivi, İstanbul (henceforth cited as BA): Tapu Tahrir no. 455, p. 631 a/b.
² TK no. 139 (Kırşehir), no. 131 (Aksaray), no. 136 (Kayseri), no. 584 (vakaf defteri of Karaman). It seems that the tahrirs were the original compilations, and the vakaf lists were
The surveys supply us with the names of the villages from which the tekke received its income. It can be assumed that the information for the Kırşehir and Karaman areas is reasonably complete, but we do not know exactly what the situation was with respect to other provinces. It is, however, very likely that the vast majority of the tekke’s possessions was in fact concentrated in this area and that only small, isolated vakıfs have escaped notice.

In thirty-six out of thirty-eight villages the dervish community only received the so-called malıkâne share, while the corresponding divâni rights were given out as timar.¹ The malıkâne was a form of property right, and we know the owners of malıkâne sometimes exchanged them for temliks, or regular landed property, as they moved from Anatolia into Rumelia. The malıkâne conferred fewer rights upon its owners than did the temliks in newly conquered lands, for the property could be entered by the Sultan’s tax collectors, which was not true in the case of the Rumelia temliks. Neither were the owners free to cultivate their holdings themselves: the land was given out to reyas for subsistence farming, as if it had been ordinary state land. The only right of the malıkâne holder was to collect certain specified dues, and these were always much lower than the divâni share accruing to the state. Thus, the village of Adkaya(? ) paid 1,500 akçes in divâni but only 580 in malıkâne dues, while for Kargincik (modern Kargın) the figures were 1,750 and 540 akçes respectively.

The main income of the malıkâne holder consisted of half the dues on wheat and rye, in some cases supplemented by half the dues on bee-hives and vegetables. The divâni, or sum of taxes collected by the administration, consisted of the other half of these dues. In addition, it included the resm-i çift, which was a tax paid by all Moslem peasants who held a family-sized farm in reaya-tenure, while landless labourers and peasant soldiers who followed the timar-holders to war paid lower rates. The sheep tax was also part of the divâni share, and so were fines for various misdemeanors. Peasants marrying off their daughters or acceding to a holding that had not previously belonged to their fathers also paid special taxes forming part of the divâni.²

Barkan has attempted to explain the malıkâne-divâni system as a compromise between pre-Ottoman owners of the land and the demands of the Ottoman
derived from them. One such vakıf list is appended to the tahir of Kırşehir. A probable sequence can be established by checking the figures given for the revenue of Bayındır, vicinity of Eyübeli, sancak of Aksaray. In all three lists (Kırşehir, Aksaray, Karaman Evkaf Defteri) this amounts to 560 akçes, but the Aksaray tahir gives the component figures as well. A mistake was made in adding; since the wrong result appears in all three defters, the Aksaray tahir is most probably the source. In some cases, however additional checking seems to have taken place: the mevraa of Kaysarvan was omitted in the Aksaray tahir but included in the two vakıf surveys.

fiscus. If this is true, the malikâne should originally have been in the hands of private persons or pre-Ottoman rulers. In the area under consideration, however, most malikânes had by the end of the sixteenth century been turned into vakîfs, which makes it impossible to directly check this assumption. It is, however, remarkable that malikânes survived mainly in the shape of vakîfs, often established in pre-Ottoman times, while very few remained in the shape of mülk.

In the case of the province of Kırşehir we can go as far as to say that malikânes survived almost only where they were, so to say, petrified in this manner. The outlying Çiçekdağı and Günyüzü areas show hardly any at all, while they are frequent in the immediate vicinity of Kırşehir and Hacıbektaş, where a large amount of land was tied up in pious foundations. Unfortunately, most of the few remaining mülk owners are identified by name only, which makes it impossible to draw any far-reaching conclusions. But since the income involved is very modest, it is probably safe to say these properties belonged to ordinary townpeople. With the information available at present, it is impossible to say whether these properties were the remnants of previous larger holdings.

Towards the end of the fifteenth century some larger properties must still have existed in the area. The estates of the Dulkadirli prince Alâüedddevle have already been mentioned. Besides, there was the family of Muhterem Hatun and Ahmed Çelebi. In 926/1519-20 Muhterem Hatun turned the malikâne incomes from seven properties into a foundation for the benefit of her sons. Local tradition connected the family with the Mevlevî establishments in town; in the second half of the eighteenth century, the foundation was still in existence, and its beneficiaries were considered seyyids.\(^1\) The income of almost 6,000 akçes, while not large, compared favourably with many timar holdings in the area.

It seems that in many cases the malikânes were not full, unencumbered property; according to the survey, which in this section is based largely on an older defter, many proprietors were obliged to send one or more peasant soldiers if the Sultan went to war. It is not clear what became of these obligations when the property was turned over to a foundation.

The tekke received donations from these minor property holders; but this is only visible in the tahrir when the malikâne was not given away in its entirety. In such cases, part of the holding remained in the hands of the donor and was registered as such. Thus the family of Sari Ahmed Çelebi turned over to the tekke of Hacı Bektaş half of the malikâne rights to the mezraa of Kızılviran near Kırşehir. At the time the tahrir was written the other half was in the hands of a certain Mehmed b. Lutfullah, but nothing at all is known about the family.

An interesting problem is posed by a group of people registered in the tahrir as hizmetkarîn-i dergâh. It is possible that these were not the dervishes themselves, since the text says that they were to be exempt from the resm-i çift and resm-i

---

\(^1\) Cevat Hakkı Tarım, Kırşehir Tarihi Üzerinde Araştırmalar (Kırşehir, 1938), vol. 1, 86. For information about Muhterem Hatun’s descendants see TK no. 139, p. 280a and BA, Cevdet Evkafoğlu no. 10261 and 21008.
bennak as long as they served the tekke well; thus, one might imagine that they were people who performed special services, most likely as farm hands. On the other hand, the term hismetkâran-i dergâh and similar expressions were often used in other documents to denote dervishes. Eighty-one adult men were thus occupied, but since no particulars are given, we do not know whether the tekke already managed its own agricultural enterprises, as it did in the nineteenth century.

If the hismetkâran-i dergâh were in fact not identical with the dervishes, then the latter are not registered in the tahrir. If this is true, the reason may have been that they were tax-exempt, but the same thing was also true of the so-called descendants of Haci Bektaş, who have resided in the village for centuries and can still be found there today; of these, fourteen names are given in the tahrir. The historian Ali, who visited the tekke in 1005/1696-97, reports having conversed with one of them; this person, a certain Iskender Çelebi, could trace his descent back to Hizir Bâlim.

The founder’s family had a special importance, because management of the tekke and its properties was largely in their hands. This is true of large establishments such as the Mevlevi dergâh in Konya, but also of innumerable smaller tekkes. Extracts from vakif surveys published by Barkan give a vivid picture of how such tekkes came into being: a certain person known as Kızıl Deli participated in the conquest of Rumelia and was granted a temlikname in return for his services by Sultan Yildırım Bayezid. The property included the villages of Büyûk Viran, Dari Bükü, and Tırifili, which the new owner then transformed into a vakif possessed in common by his descendants. By the time of Kanuni Süleyman’s rule, the documents had been checked several times and found in order. Thus did the celebrated tekke of Kızıl Deli come into being, and many others were established along similar lines.

In certain cases, family vakıfs were established basically to guard the property from confiscation and fragmentation among a multitude of heirs, and whatever charitable or religious purpose there was remained very much in the background. A survey of Istanbul vakıfs compiled in the middle of the sixteenth century

---

1 The most interesting figure among the ‘descendants’ of Hacı Bektaş in the late sixteenth century is Bektaş Efendi, son of Mahmud, who is probably identical with a şeyh of the same name and patronym whose mausoleum can still be visited in the village of Hacibektaş. The date in the inscription over the door is 1012/1603-4, and in the same text Bektaş Efendi is mentioned as deceased. According to Abdullah Gölpinarlı [Alevi-Bektashi Nefiseleri, (Istanbul, 1963), p. 11], certain poems commonly attributed to Haci Bektaş are probably the work of a homonymous descendant of his, a certain Bektaş b. Yusuf Bali (died 1580); Bektaş b. Mahmud seems to be another possibility.

2 Ali, Küniḥ il-Akbah, Istanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, T.Y. 5959, p. 16b. The tahrir lists a person named Iskender Çelebi, but there he is considered to be the son of Hüdâdad, and not the grandson, as Ali has it.


contains a reference to the zaviye of Müslüman Dede. The founder established some residential property as a vakıf, with first himself and after his death a descendant of Hacı Bektaş as beneficiaries. Only when the family of Hacı Bektaşoğlu Mahmud died out was the property to pass into the possession of the ocak of Hacı Bektaş, and when the tahrire was being written, this had not yet happened. It is possible that the property was never actually transferred; certainly the Hacı Bektaş records make no mention of it.

The arrangement prevailing in the case of the Müslüman Dede Zaviyesi shows us that the descendants could control property which had been turned over to them personally, not to the tekke. Another example can be found in a vakıf survey pertaining to the Ankara area compiled in 979/1571–2.1 Here mention is made of a mezraa in the vicinity of Ayaş (situated today on the outskirts of Ankara), which was vakıf land belonging to the small dervish community (zaviye) of Safet Bah(?). For several generations, 'descendants' of Hacı Bektaş had been şeyhs of this zaviye; they were presumably subordinate to the head of the family, or Çelebi, in Hacıbektaş. Such sources of income and power were apparently independent of the tekke and thus of the dervishes and their spiritual leader, the dede baba. Thus, the Çelebis may well have been in a strong position relative to the dervish community. How much conflict there was in this period we do not know. More will have to be said on this subject when dealing with the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Interesting conclusions can also be drawn from the tahrire regarding the geographical distribution of the Hacı Bektaş vakıfs: there are two main areas of concentration, one around Hacıbektaş itself and another in the area known as Suleymanlı.2 In addition there were scattered outlying possessions in the vicinity of Kırşehir and even as far afield as Kayseri.3 Another group, going back at least to the period of Mehmed the Conqueror, was to be found in the sancak of Aksaray. These vakıfs were all situated in the vicinity of the tekke, and they were all rural. The dervish community received no income from house property or shop rents, which was a favorite source of income with more urban establishments. Certainly the area in which the tekke was situated was predominantly rural, but still Kırşehir was a town, even though far less significant in the sixteenth century than it had been in the thirteenth. It is interesting to compare the distribution to that of the main Mevlevi tekke in Konya. In this case also, by far most of the vakıf properties were located in the sancak of Konya. Within the town, the

1 I am obliged to the staff of the Tapu ve Kadastro Arşivi for pointing out this reference to me: TK no. 558, p. 136a.
2 Today there is no administrative unit nor settlement by that name. Even in the sixteenth century it seems to have been the name of an area rather than of a specific settlement. The name still appears in early nineteenth-century documents, but no longer in the earliest yearbooks published in the republican period. Older natives of the region have not been able to identify it either.
3 We do not know who donated the Kayseri village (malikâne of Seydî Bâlûk). It is not included in the Evkaf Defteri of 906/1500–1 (TK no. 565).
tekke received income from a vast number of sources, but their average yield was far less than that of a typical vakif village. A glance at the tekke of Şeyh Buhari in Istanbul1 shows that a similar pattern probably prevailed there: a large number of small vakifs were located within the city, but since the survey is only concerned with Istanbul, nothing can be said about vakif villages.

On the other hand, pious foundations established by viziers and other important members of the Ottoman administration usually had their sources of income spread out over the entire countryside: Davud Paşa, when he founded his complex of pious foundations in Istanbul, endowed it, among other things, with the income from villages in the following areas: Varna, Edirne, Tatar Pazari, Üsküb, Bursa, Yenişehir, Beypaşar, and Iznik. Many other examples of this type of geographical distribution could easily be found.

In spite of all the uncertainties due to the incomplete character of our sources, it is possible to estimate the income that the tekke received from its endowment. The villages in the Kırşehir area produced an income of 87,000 akçes, of which 40% consisted of dues on wheat and 29% of taxes on barley. The outlying vakifs produced 12,000 akçes. Taken together that means a yearly income of 99,000 akçes. Certain types of income certainly went unrecorded in this type of source, so the figures have to be accepted with some caution. But still, they give us some idea of the order of magnitude involved.

If we compare this income to the great sultan and vizier vakifs in Istanbul and elsewhere it may seem rather small. The complexes of Davud Paşa, Ali Paşa and others1 were worth three to four times that sum, to say nothing about great foundations endowed by the Sultans. On the other hand, these complexes, or külliyes, usually comprised more than one institution, and often the vakif income provided for isolated establishments in provincial towns and villages as well. Thus, the foundation of Piri Mehmed Paşa with a yearly income of 3,116,641 akçes provided for a Friday mosque, a medrese, a meşid, and a dervish community in Istanbul and besides for a mosque, an imaret, and a medrese in Silivri.4 The vakif of Koca Mustafa Paşa, whose yearly income was as high as 558,041 akçes, supported a mosque, an imaret, a medrese and a primary school near Sulu Manastır in Istanbul, another mosque in Eyüp, an imaret in Yenice Karasu and another complex in Nevekob (Rumelia), consisting of a mosque and primary school.5 If we consider that the tekke of Haci Bektaş only supported one mosque aside from its own activities,6 the relative wealth of this establishment becomes apparent—even if we take into consideration that a large number of visitors had to be received and food passed out to the needy.

1 Barkan-Ayverdi, pp. 204–6. It was also called the tekke of Şeyhi Mahmud after its first head.
6 The larger of the two mosques in the compound was only built in the middle of the nineteenth century, when the tekke was in the hands of the Nakşbendis.
The relative wealth of the tekke stands out even more if we compare it with the other vakıfs in the vicinity. It is true that the Mevlevi dergah of Konya was even more richly endowed,¹ but within the sancak of Kırşehir the tekke of Hacı Bektaş was by far the most wealthy vakıf. Only three other institutions had an income of more than 10,000 akçes: the medrese of Caca Bey (23,673 akçes), the zaviye of Ahi Evran (32,790 akçes) and the zaviye of Aşık Paşa (31,038 akçes), all three of them in Kırşehir. All the vakıfs in the town of Kırşehir taken together had only as much income as the tekke of Hacı Bektaş, and the sum of all the vakıfs in the sancak barely surpassed it. None of the mülks was even remotely comparable, and the tunars in this area were usually very modest, not yielding more than 3,000 akçes in most cases. Thus probably only the sancakbeğ of Kırşehir received a larger income.

All this must have made the tekke one of the largest economic units in central Anatolia. The main question is obviously in what way this wealth was used; unfortunately no fortunate have come to light that might help us answer it. The Istanbul vakıf survey often gives us lists of people employed in a given foundation, lists their salaries, and enumerates payments to be made for foodstuffs. The Konya tahrir of 996/1587–88 gives some incomplete data on the subject of the Mevlevi dergah, but for the Hacı Bektaş tekke not even approximate figures are available.

No later tahrirs or evkaf surveys are extant, so for the seventeenth and earlier eighteenth centuries we are again forced to rely on isolated inscriptions. The most important one that has come to light so far is on the silver door to the mausoleum of Hacı Bektaş. It is in verse, and since neither the author nor the silversmith were masters of their crafts, the interpretation of certain sections must remain doubtful. We know only that the donor was a certain Ezrad b. Ali, governor of Kırşehir, and the date Muharram 1019/March–April 1610. A silver door being quite a precious gift, it would be interesting to find out why it was made; whether the governor was one of the rich and powerful local people, whether he was an outsider trying to establish good relations in the area, or what other reasons he had for making such an expensive present.

Another inscription is located on top of the conical roof of the mausoleum;² it is one of the very few sources that documents the connection of the tekke with the Janissaries. Dated 1028/1618–19, it commemorates the vakıf made by a kethuda of these troops who probably paid for certain repairs. According to local tradition,³ the Janissaries occasionally sent gifts to their patron saint; the most famous among them is the so-called Black Kettle, which was, at least in recent periods, used only for the ceremonial preparation of sweet rice pudding (asare). The Black Kettle bears the name of Sersem Ali Baba, the first dede baba of the dervish community after it was reopened in the middle of the sixteenth century.

¹ TK no. 584 and TK no. 104 give lists of the tekke's possessions.
² Because of its location, I was unable to see it in person, and the rendition in Gürses, Haçebektaş, p. 15, is rather less than reliable.
³ Gürses, Haçebektaş, p. 30.
The lack of records for the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries is remarkable; if it were not for the lists of dede babas officiating throughout this period, one would be tempted to assume that the tekke was temporarily closed. Apparently little or no building was done, or what has survived was not dated by inscriptions; and while earlier travellers like Ali or the explorer Seydi Ali perfunctorily recorded visits to the tekke, no such references have been found for the subsequent period. Evliya Çelebi, who made a point of visiting many venerable places, did not seem to have considered it worth his while to see it, even though he travelled quite a bit in the Ankara area, nor did Kâtip Çelebi mention it in his survey of the geography of Asia Minor. It is probably safe to assume that the tekke was less active than it had been in the sixteenth or was to be in the late eighteenth century, but it is still too early to say how much of this impression is due to simple loss of source material. In the second half of the eighteenth century, documentation improves again. To a large extent, this seems to have been due to the activity of the sheyhs of the time, especially Feyzullah and Abdüllatif. The correspondence with the central administration which they initiated has been partly preserved in the Evkaf section of the Başçekâlet Arşivi. Using these materials it is possible to draw a fairly clear picture of the economic and political position of the dergâh, and more particularly of the Çelebi family.

Three petitions by the seccadenişin Şeyh Feyzullah, dating from 1154/1741–2, 1165/1751–2 and 1173/1759–60, respectively request payment of the so-called huka bahası to himself. In every case the petition was granted, and similar wording of the three texts makes them appear to be part of an established routine. This payment amounted to 5000 şirûk akses every year, that is, it was to be made in debased coin. The petitioner claimed that such a payment had been customary ever since the life-time of the founder. In the absence of earlier documents there is no need to accept this claim at face-value, but the gift may well go back to an older period, because if it had been made in more recent times payment in şirûk akses would probably not have been stipulated.

Continuity in the legal status of the tekke is emphasized by a hikem made out in 1143/1730–1. The seccadenişin Şeyh Feyzullah petitioned for a confirmation of the ruling that the population of village of Hacibektas be exempt from all kinds of avariz-i divaniyye and tekâlif-i ırfiyye, which were originally extraordinary taxes levied in time of war. According to the tahvir of 1584, this did in fact constitute one of the tekke’s prerogatives, and the privilege was confirmed upon his request. He had apparently received an earlier fermân to the same effect, issued most likely in 1106/1694–5. This document had stipulated that xaviye and
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1 Ibid., p. 40. It is not clear from what source the list of dede babas reproduced there has been taken. In the museum, no such list is known.
2 Kâtip Çelebi, Cihannîme (Istanbul, 1145/1732).
3 I am indebted to the personnel of the Başçekâlet Arşivi for the help given to me when consulting these materials.
4 BA Cevdet Evkaf nos. 6662, 6449 and 859.
5 BA Cevdet Evkaf no. 6850.
evkaf were to be exempt from avans, or more particularly, from the obligation to furnish grain to the army (müzul), to sell grain to the army at fixed low prices and at a place convenient to the administration (sürsat), and to deliver potash, and other responsibilities of this kind.

A dergâh was also issued stipulating that provincial administrators did not have the right to enter the vakīf, thereby giving the dergâh of Hacı Bektaş a status comparable to that of the great Sultan and vizier vakīfs in the Balkans. Apparently this document was not very effective, for encroachments continued. The secadenişin responded with a new petition to the central administration. His claim was checked against the mevdufat defterleri and found valid, whereupon an order was issued forbidding the ehli-i orf (that is, the sancakbəğ and his men) to collect the avans. In 1179/1756–7 the ferman was reconfirmed by a short note added at the bottom. No indication is given as to whether the second rescript was any better obeyed than the first.

None of the offending ehli-i orf is mentioned by name, nor is the extent of the exemption quite clear.1 In certain parts of the text the zabīye and its evkaf villages are supposed to be exempt, while in other sections the exemption is limited to the reaya of the kaza of Hacıbektaş. The survey of 1584 also describes the exemption in this more limited sense, and it is probable that something similar was intended here. However, it is possible that the changing formulations reflected some genuine fluctuation with respect to the number of people covered.

Tax exemption was also the subject of a petition by Şeyh Abdülâtif, one of Feyzullah’s successors as secadenişin.2 The vakīf administrator claimed that the tekke had a right to collect penalties in case of crimes. Invoking a hatt-i himayun supposedly granted to the institution, Abdülâtif even included cases involving capital punishment in his area of competence: ‘evkaf . . . kuralarımın . . . serbestiyet ve misİllem-i cürüm u cinayet be salb-ı siyasetleri ber mucib-ı defter-i hakani vakıf-ı mezbûr mütevellî yerdenine tasarruf ve icra-i ceza meşru olunub . . .’. His complaint was directed against a number of unnamed persons appointed by the governor of Karaman. Incapable of achieving anything in the positions they had been appointed to, they preferred to remain as uninvited guests in the Hacıbektaş area, collecting dues from which the local people were traditionally exempt, and oppressing the reaya with their bands of armed horsemen. Abdülâtif asks the Sultan to earn himself prayers for his welfare from all the inhabitants by ordering the intruders out of the area.

The Sultan’s answer, dated 1193/1779, is not very specific, so that it is not clear whether the administration fully recognized the wide prerogatives that the tekke arrogated to itself. The petition carries a note to the effect that a hûkm was to be made out according to the wishes of the petitioner, which means that the tekke’s privileges were at least not formally repudiated. Reference was made

1 It is possible that the dergâh was surreptitiously trying to attain recognition of its extended claims.

2 BA Cevdet Evkaf no. 18673.
to the 1584 survey which granted the tekke both malikané and divani rights in the adjacent village, and exempted it from avariz-i divanîiyê as well. Now the divani included the right to collect fines for various misdeeds which may have been the root of the prerogatives that the tekke assumed in the course of time. After all, the second half of the eighteenth century was the period of ayan power, and enterprising vakif administrators may well have striven to attain a similar position.

The income of the tekke was based on dues from the inhabitants of its vakif villages. Thus, it was bound to be affected when these settlements became depopulated. Now the population of Central Anatolia declined heavily during the Celâlî uprisings of the early seventeenth century. The survey of 1584 reports 837 families for the village of Hacibektaş, while in the early nineteenth century it counted barely 100; apparently even the tax privileges were not enough to hold an impoverished peasantry. Flight to towns or other sanâacs continued to occur in the eighteenth century. A petition bearing the signature of Şeyh Feyzullah and probably dated 1173/1759-60 had apparently brought forward a complaint on this score. It was answered by a hikim-i himayun ordering the reaya from towns, villages, and askeri çiftlik back to their assigned places on the vakif, with the exception of those reaya who had become part of an avarizhane in their new place of residence. It would be interesting to know what were the specific reasons for this flight; many reaya apparently preferred to settle on land not belonging to the vakif but situated in the immediate vicinity.

The tekke was not only powerful in the region where it was located, it also exercised considerable control over other Bektashi establishments. Several documents demonstrate the importance of this protection: a complaint was directed by Feyzullah against the holders of timars and zemanets who interfered with the tekkes of the area in which they exercised their functions.1 Tekke positions were being held by incompetent personnel, while many dervish communities had become impoverished and were no longer capable of fulfilling their duties. Referring to entries in the hasine registers to prove his claim, the şeyh desired confirmation of his right to present candidates for all tekke positions, except kadis, naaps, provincial governors and foundation administrators. The petition was granted.

The second petition came from the seccadenişin Şeyh Abdullatif. It was written immediately after he assumed office, and answered in 1177/1763-4. From the text it becomes clear that the seccadenişin were, in this period, confirmed in office by a special berat of the Sultan. Referring to earlier orders from the central administration (1144/1731-2 and 1147/1734-5), the şeyh asked for confirmation of the privilege granted to his predecessors, that is, to present candidates for vacant positions in tekkes with no interference from kadis, provincial governors or vakif administrators permitted. The petition was again granted, and even without
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1 See Akdağ, Celâlî Işyanları, pp. 250-7.
2 BA Cevdet Evkaf no. 11795.
3 Ibid. nos. 23695, 886, 31650.
having seen the entries in the hazine registers of 1144/1731–2 and 1147/1734–5 we can assume that by that time the privilege was recognized as a customary right. It was reconfirmed in 1222/1807–8.

The şeyh-family seems to have controlled sources of income not directly connected with the tekke, just as it had done in the sixteenth century. Two documents refer to the settlement of Göregide (?), situated in the nahiye of Karadere in the province of Bozok (modern Yozgat). This settlement and the area surrounding it constituted the summer pasture of the Ağcuş (?) tribe. Both malikhane and divanlı taxes had been granted to members of the ‘Hacı Bektaş family’, on condition that they serve travellers passing by, that is, open a zaviye. One of the incumbents was a son of Şeyh Abdüllatif, the head of the family, and it was by recommendation from the şeyh that his son was installed in his place after he had died.

Several documents show that the tekke also had dealings with the Cebbarzade dynasty, better known as the Çapağulları. The center of influence of this famous derebey family lay in the province of Yozgat, but they apparently were powerful in the entire surrounding area as well. The first piece was the draft of a hikm-i hümâyun, dated 18 Muhamrrem 1196/4 January 1782 and addressed to the dergâh-ı ali kaptuhaşı Süleyman Bey, provincial governor of Bozok. It referred to the fact that the mausoleum, the tekke building and a han also belonging to the vakıf had fallen in ruins. Süleyman’s deceased brother Mustafa had received an order from the Porte to take care of their reconstruction. Unlike the provincial governors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Çapağulları apparently felt no particular devotion towards the tekke. They did not respond in any way. Thereupon the seccadenişin Abdüllatif, the postnişin Ali Baba and another şeyh sent letters of complaint to the Porte. The matter was re-examined, and it was found that the money set aside for the repairs had been spent by the deceased Mustafa Bey, whereupon his brother was enjoined to regard the repair of the tekke as both a duty and an honour.

Apparently this appeal made no impression at all, because the whole matter is repeated almost word for word in a correspondence dated 1202/1787–8, that is a full five years later. No repairs had been executed yet, and the tekke buildings were about to fall into complete ruin. From a petition by the seccadenişin and the draft of a ferman to Süleyman Bey the latter’s approach is apparent: he felt that the money for repairs would have to come out of state funds, and thus disclaimed all responsibility. The matter seems to have dragged on for many more years, because a bureaucratic correspondence mentions the affair again in 1218/1803–4.

---

1 BA Cevdet Evkaf nos. 23568 and 17919. The Çelebi family claimed both malikhâne and divanlı shares, but the central administration insisted that they were entitled to the malikhâne only.  
2 BA Cevdet Evkaf no. 32879.  
3 I have not been able to locate this han in the modern village.  
4 This is the only instance in which the dede baba was found mentioned in an official document.  
5 BA Cevdet Evkaf no. 6683  
6 Ibid. no. 19357.
Apparently by then an agreement had been reached with the Çapanoğlu, because the 19,500 esatı guruș considered necessary had been made available with the knowledge of the Cebbarzade. The central administration took it upon itself to nominate an architect from among the hasca minarları, as well as pay his salary and travelling expenses. No record survives of the repairs actually undertaken, but when the dergâh was described a few years later there was no indication of its being in particularly ruined condition. It is remarkable that the central administration should have shown such favour to the Bektashis a few years before the abolition of the order; but we do not know to whose influence they owed this consideration.

The dergâh sometimes solicited gifts from private persons as well.1 A letter to an unnamed addressee survives, signed by Şeyh Abdûllâhit and dated 1228/1813. This addressee must have been an important personage, since the seccademisîn sent him four horses as a gift. He explained how the tekke, in fulfilling its duties of hospitality, had contracted debts, payment of which was quite beyond its power. He spoke in flattering terms of the interest that the addressee had always shown the dergâh, and hoped that he would give a good reception to the men bringing him the horses. Unfortunately not enough is known to make a guess at the identity of this person. All we can say is that most likely he did not belong to the Çapanoğlu family.

For the following years, documentation becomes much more sparse. However, we are able to fill in the gap with material from other sources, though it is neither as varied nor as interesting. One of them is a ferman bearing the taşra of Selim III, the remainder are hücme - that is, documents made out by the kâdi at the request of one of the interested parties in a dispute. All these materials have come to light in Kirşehir.2 The oldest of these texts, which today is kept in the Hacıbektaş museum, dates from the year 1209/1794-5. The ferman responded to a petition from Şeyh Abdûllâhit which claimed that according to the old mufassal tahrir, the incomes from the villages and mezaras of Kohaci, Öcák, Barbaşviran, and Kozca were to be divided between the dergâh as malikâne holder and whoever had a right to collect the divânî. The divânî was in the hands of timar-holders who were trying to appropriate the malikâne as well, and Şeyh Abdûllâhit turned to the Sultan for redress. The mufassal, icmal and vâkif defterleri were checked, and it was established that the dergâh's claims were well founded. Thereupon, the petition was granted, and a hizb-i hümâyûn addressed to the governor of Karaman and the kâdis of Mucur, Süleymanû and Hacıbektaş, enjoining them to protect the dervishes in their rights.3

1 Ibid. i. 6. 11767.
2 Until recently kept in the Kirşehir Turizm Derneği, where I was able to consult them through the kindness of Mr Haşmet Üzbilek. They have now been transferred to the museum in Hacıbektaş.
3 It has not been possible to locate this Evkaf defteri. The identity of the mufassal tahrir with the tahrir of 1584 is extremely likely since the figures for taxes demanded and number of families resident tally.
It is likely that the *tahrib* of 1584 was the last survey ever made of the region; it was used as a proof for claims pertaining to land-holdings until the twentieth century. The revenue figures were quoted again and again, although by the turn of the nineteenth century they had lost all practical meaning. *We do not know how much money the dergâh could actually raise from its possessions in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.*

The seven *hiçcets* are today glued into a defter compiled at the beginning of this century. The oldest bears the date of 1228 or 1229/1812 or 1813–14, the most recent one 1244/1828–9. Since all the rulings were in favour of the *dergâh* and all the *hiçcets* were made out at its request, it is likely that these documents were originally kept among the possessions of the *tekhe*.

The documents are all roughly similar in content, so only one example will be summarized here. According to a text dated 1231/1815–16, Şeyh Hamidullah, 'descendant' of Hacı Bektaş and *mütevelli* of the foundation, appeared before the *kadi* seeking his decision in a dispute with the Çapanoğlu. These had not appeared in person, but had appointed a certain Mustafa Ağa b. Halil Efendi, from the village of Divanlar, to act as their representative. The dispute arose from the fact that the *malikâne* of the *mezraas* of Zanik (?) Kavak, Kuşçuoğlu and Kuyuncak was a *nakaj* of Hacı Bektaş, but the fields were being worked by peasants who resided in territory held by the Çapanoğlu. These local magnates refused to allow the dervishes to collect their share of the dues. The governor of Kişcehir thereupon appointed two persons to investigate the matter, who after examination of the document brought forth by both sides established the borders of the *mezraas*. The *kadi* decided in favour of the *tekhe*, decreeing also that the dues so far collected illegally were to be repaid to the dervish community.

These documents are mainly valuable because they make it possible to establish the names of villages and *mezraas* that belonged to the *tekhe* at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Except for one instance, all the disputed villages and *mezraas* already had been in possession of the *tekhe* from the sixteenth century onwards. The exception may denote a change of name or a later acquisition. It is obviously risky to generalize from the relatively small number of villages occurring in the *hiçcets*, but one might venture the assumption that the *dergâh* made the bulk of its acquisitions in the period preceding the survey of 1584. After that there were probably minor losses and gains, but the main lines of the picture had been drawn.

It is worth noting that most of these disputes were with the incumbents of *tumar* in the vicinity. This seems to indicate that in this rural and relatively isolated area the *tumar* system continued to exist after it had been superseded in many other parts of the Empire. In some cases the names and titles have been
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1 Found in the Cica Bey medrese in Kişcehir.

2 This place was called Inpinari or Alınpinari. According to the 1584 survey there were several places by this name in the *sancak* of Kişcehir.
recorded: Humbaracı Abdullah, son of Yusuf, Humbaracı Alemdar Ali Sipahi b. Süleyman, Miralay-i Sabik Bekir Ağa, son of Abdullah Alemdar. The administration of the Sultan’s hāss is also mentioned, which means that it had not totally been taken over by concessionnaires who purchased their right to collect taxes. In fact, the institution of itiṣsam is mentioned very rarely, which indicates that the dergāh did not farm out its revenues in this fashion, while large vakṣf’s with widely scattered possessions, such as the Süleymaniye in Istanbul, had used this method of collection even in the sixteenth century. Unfortunately we have very little information on how the tekke did in fact receive its revenue. An important role was played by the mütevelli who was taken from among the ‘descendants’ of Hacı Bektaş. He was in turn supervised by the seccadenişin or şeyh. It is unclear what function, if any, the dede babası had in the administration of the vakṣf. In the nineteenth century, relations between the Çelebis and dede babası were far from cordial, leading to literary feuds and complicated intrigues.

In spite of the association between Janissaries and Bektashis in the capital, the military seems to have interfered very little in the affairs of the dergāh. Among the documents in the Başvekâlet Arşivi, only one text mentions the intervention of the Ağa of the Janissaries, and that in a very minor matter. We never hear of open interference by Janissary commanders in the various quarrels which the tekke was involved in. That does not necessarily mean that no such thing ever happened, only that such protection as there was was practiced discreetly and maybe all too infrequently. It is also possible that the commanders preferred to favour the tekkes in and around Istanbul.

For the important question of how the dergāh fared during Mahmud II’s campaign of repression after the elimination of the Janissaries, the most easily accessible source is the Üss-i Zafer by Esad Efendi. This is a piece of official historiography, with all the failings that are all too often inherent in that type of literature. The author has included a chapter proposing to explain the reasons for the suppression of the order, but it is little more than a piece of hostile gossip. More valuable is the inserted firman decreeing the abolition of the order, with detailed instructions relating to the fate of its possessions.

The rescript as incorporated in Esad Efendi’s book does not bear a date. It is addressed to the governors of all places in which Bektashi communities could be found, as well as to the kādis, aynās and others. The former mirahur Hacı Ali Bey is specifically entrusted with the necessary administrative work, a representative of the Şeyhülislām and a scribe of the baş muhâsebe acting as his assistants. As a reason for repression emphasis is placed on the heterodox beliefs of the Bektashis, while, contrary to Esad Efendi’s own account, the connection to the Janissaries is little stressed. Therefore the Sultan has called a session of all the high-ranking iṣla ms and representatives of the ‘unobjectionable’ dervish orders and decided that the order was to be dissolved, the more prominent members executed, and the less important ones banished to places where

1 [Mehmed Esad Efendi, Üst-i Zafer (Istanbul, 1293/1876), pp. 199–212.]
they could be supervised by the *ulema*. A *hatt-i hümâyûn* was promulgated and promptly acted upon, so that no Bektashi *tekkes* and *sâbiyes* were left in the capital and its immediate environment by the time the rescript published by Esad Efendi was being issued. Now it remained for the provinces to follow suit, and that was the purpose of this second *hatt-i hümâyûn*.

The Sultan now had to decide what to do with the vast *vakıfs* of the order. In order to justify their confiscation, different types of arguments were put forth. First of all, if state land (arazi-i mîriye) had been made into a *vakif*, an endowment of that kind could not be a true *vakif* (*vakıf-i sahih*), because mîri land could not be possessed as normal property, and even if their *vakıfs* were true *vakıfs*, the Bektashis would have forfeited all claim to them because of their heterodox views. Besides, two fetvâs by the Şeyhülislâm were quoted stating that if a person received a grant from the Sultan and turned it into a *vakif*, the ruler had the right to confiscate the land if, after the donor’s death, the dervish community lapsed into unbelief. Thus the Sultan decided to appoint officials who were to make an inventory of all the Bektashi *tekkes* and their possessions and send it to the central administration. There a decision as to their future use was to be made. Besides, these officials were to find out which Bektashis were prominent enough to be subjected to the penalties foreseen in the decree. Those *tekkes*, old and new, for which a new use could be found, were to be turned into Friday mosques, *mescid*, or *medreses*, or they could be turned over to one of the ‘approved’ orders. The *ulema* of every region were to send in applications for these buildings stating how they planned to use them. Those *tekkes* recently built for which no new use could be found were to be destroyed, the older ones, however, were to be preserved in all cases. The mausoleums that contained generally venerated saints were to be assigned to the care of non-heterodox *türbêdês*.

The text published by Esad Efendi then goes on to give details about measures to be taken against the *tekkes* of Rumellî, especially the famous convent of Kızıl Delî. A parallel *ferman* dealt with the Anatolian *tekkes*, but so far it has not been possible to locate it.

It is apparent from the text that the central administration was trying to justify itself in the eyes of devout Moslems for confiscating *vakıfs*, which was a measure rarely resorted to, and was therefore adducing arguments to cover all legal possibilities. Thus it is not possible to draw any conclusions as to the legal status of Haci Bektâş *vakıf* lands, whether they had originally been state lands, whether they had been granted as mülûk before they were given to the dervish community, or how much the Sultan’s administration was involved in these grants at all. The reports elicited by the *ferman* might somewhat elucidate this matter, but so far they have not yet come to light.

The two reports about the situation of the *tekke* which have been preserved were both written somewhat later. One of them is undated, and signed by the governor of Kırşehir. By that time, the *tekke* had been turned over to the
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1 BA Çevdet Evkaf nos. 23489 and 1294.
Nakşbendis, and the former seccadenişin had been banished to Amasya. The Çelebis, however, still had their friends and well-wishers, among whom figured the governor of Sivas and the author of the report himself.

The Sultan apparently had sent a ferman enquiring about the banished şeyh and the state of the vakıfs after his departure. He had also demanded information about the income situation. The governor had made the necessary inquiries and found that of the twenty-six dervishes formerly present in the dergâh, eight had departed. The others claimed to have abandoned their former heresy, and the author does not question the seriousness of their conversion. They had removed their traditional headgear and proclaimed their adherence to the Nakşbendi order.

In the presence of the hadis, a register was made of all the effects found in the tekke, and a collection of defters was sent to the central administration. Upon the banishment of Hamidullah, the post of şeyh and mütevelli had become vacant; in 1243/1827–8 a certain Velieddin received the office. His income was to be 4,200 gurus from various mukhtaras and iltizams connected with the vakıf, along with 168 müdas of grain, and he had received the order to hand over the possessions of the tekke to the Nakşbendis.

At the time, the village of Hacıbektaş contained 100 families. Its ancient tax exemption seems to have lapsed with the dissolution of the order, for the governor says that the inhabitants were willingly paying their share of the tekâlîf. They also seem to have performed services to travellers on the road. According to the governor, the former Şeyh Hamidullah had never been very popular in the village; so there was no risk in allowing him to return. Since no remarks were attached to this document in the various halems of the central administration, it is impossible to say how it was received by the Sultan.

The second document is dated 1258/1842–3; it is the draft of a petition to the Sultan, unfinished and unsigned. The şeyh and mütevelli Kayserilli Mehmed Said had just died, and the anonymous author was engaging in an intrigue to prevent his son from inheriting his office. This text is mainly valuable because it gives various educated estimates of the income that could be drawn from the vakıfs still attached to the tekke of Hacı Bektaş; in 1256/1840–1, the vakıfs in the Kırşehir area produced 19,747 gurus. For the vakıfs in the Nevşehir and Aksaray areas he only gives the figures for 1257/1841–2; they amounted to 7880 gurus 24 akçeş and 205 gurus 24 akçeş respectively. As a total, the anonymous author gives us the sum of 27,833 gurus 9 akçeş, invoking the authority of an unspecified defter. His opponent supposedly had reported the income from the Kırşehir vakıfs as amounting to 12,738 gurus only. It would be a mistake to place too much reliance on these figures, since the letter was written with such a definite purpose in mind, but they do give us some idea of the order of magnitude involved. The other interesting feature is that the author proposes to pay the deposed former
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1 These did not exist at the end of the sixteenth century, for there is no reference to them in the tahrib of Nigde (TK no. 135). The only list that survives was compiled in the early twentieth century.
Şeyh Hamidullah a pension from the vakif income; this shows the continuing connection of the Çelebi family to the tekke.

For the latter part of the nineteenth century, we have the account of the French geographer Vital Cunet which has formed the basis for much subsequent writing in European languages. Unfortunately it is not possible to check his data, since he does not state his sources. According to the information relayed by this author, the tekke received the income from forty-two villages at the end of the nineteenth century. Originally, there had been 362 of them because a Sultan had once been cured by a Bektashi dervish who 362 times applied his foot to his patient's chest. But later the administration had supposedly taken away village after village, in order to finance improvements in towns and villages in the area.

This account poses several problems: first of all, no document records that the dergah ever received income from much more than forty villages. In the 1584 tahrir the tekke is credited with forty villages in addition to twenty mezraas, even if it is assumed that the revenue registered formed but a small proportion of the dergah's total wealth. Besides, the relatively abundant documents from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries yield only very few names that we do not already know from the 1584 survey. Finally, the anonymous letter BA Cevdet Evkaf 1294 reports vakifs in the Kırşehir, Nevşehir and Aksaray areas, the Kırşehir group being by far the most important one. In short, 320 additional villages, as enormously wealthy as they would have made the dergah, could not have passed unnoticed by all administrators. Therefore, it is probably justified to dismiss this part of Cunet's account. It is surprising that the account refers to a gradual process of attrition, and not to a sudden loss in the period of Mahmud II. One hesitates to place too great an importance in this fact, since the whole account is unreliable; but if this part of the story has some foundation in fact, it might indicate that the vakif was not broken up after its confiscation.

The contemporary data recorded by Cunet are mostly probably not as legendary as the historical part of this story, and are well worth some attention. The division of the dergah's income again shows the strong position of the Çelebi family: the income of twenty-one villages was assigned to them, and of the 1,435 kg of salt that the administration of the Dette Ottomane allowed the dergah, 615 were allotted to the 'descendants' of the saint. This salt came from the mine in Tuzköy and was probably handed over in recognition of the ancient rights of the tekke over the salt mine of Tuz near Aksaray. When the German traveller Mordtmann visited the area around the middle of the nineteenth century, the director of the mine sent the dergah 6,000 okkas a year and sold the remainder on the open market.

According to Cunet the dergah had a further source of income in the extensive

gardens which the dervishes worked themselves. In the twentieth century, novices received into the *dergâh* first formed part of the *oceâk* of the Dedebağ, Hanbağ, and Atevi, which were mainly concerned with agricultural production. Besides, the dervishes also received presents from visitors, especially Bektashis from other *tekkes*, but on the other hand, these visitors were housed and fed free of charge throughout their stay in the *dergâh*, there even being a special building for the purpose. Cimen does not mention the *hirka bahâsi* and other direct gifts from the central administration, but these payments had probably ceased in the period of Mahmud II.

A document dating from the last years of the nineteenth century has been preserved in a *muhasebe deâfteri* of the Diyarbakir area. It deals with the sale of a piece of land in the village of Akubar/Taburoğlu, in the province of Kırşehir. Since this land was far removed from the *tekke*, it had not been possible to make use of it, and in fact certain parts had been illegally appropriated by outsiders. Therefore the administrators decided to sell the land before they lost all control over it. They received a price of 4,250 *guruç* for approximately 9,500 *dönüm* of land, the buyer being a certain Hûseyin Ağa b. Haydar Ağa, resident of the village of Taburoğlu. In this period, sales of *vakıf* land apparently became quite common; the local landholding records kept in the town of Hacibektas were compiled at about the same time, and make frequent references to such sales.

So far, remarkably few documents concerning the Bektashi dating from the twentieth century have become known. The most interesting material is contained in a *deâfter* compiled in 1320/1903 and presented to the administration of the province of Kırşehir. In a document written the year before, old and new names of the village that formed part of the Haci Bektas endowment had not been mentioned, and upon request, such a list was furnished by an anonymous official. Without this material it would be impossible to identify the names given in the 1384 survey and the *evkaf deâfteleri*. Besides, it is the only text that gives us a more or less complete overview of the *dergâh*’s possessions after 1384. However, the source value of this document is fairly limited, since the amounts of income derived from the *vakıf* villages have simply been copied from the older *tahrir*. *Vakıfs* later acquired are included in the text, but nothing is said about the circumstances of their acquisition. Besides, it does not solve all problems of identification. Some settlements, when they grew to be a certain size, split up and adopted different names, so that one name in the *tahrir* may correspond to several villages in the modern list.

The most remarkable part of this source is a short document glued in after
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2. According to BA Cevdet Evkaf no. 10776, Said Efendi, when appointed *şeyh* in 1250/1834–5, received a travel grant, but he does not seem to have been a Bektashi.
3. Copy received through the courtesy of the Museum in Hacibektas (date: 1299/1881–2).
4. 1 dönüm: 939.3 m².
5. Found in the Caca Bey Medrese in Kırşehir and today kept in the Hacibektas museum.
completion of the original. It purports to be a record of the tekke vakıfs in the Avanos area.¹ These must have been located in very minor settlements, part of whose income had been given to the dervishes. Very likely these donations had been made by minor owners in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, but in the present state of documentation nothing more can be said about them.

Even less illuminating is the other manuscript source that has come to light so far: a document establishing a vakif in favour of the tekke, dated 1330/1911-12.² Its only remarkable trait is that it is the only vakıfnâme of the dergâh’s that has come to light so far, and deals with some property in the mahalle of Bâlâ, located in the nahiye of Haci Bektaş. So far, no documents pertaining to the abolition of the dervish orders and the closure of the main tekke have been found; as far as the movable property was concerned, this was disposed of in the most haphazard fashion. In recent years the administration of the museum, which was established in the buildings in 1964, has had a great deal of trouble locating even a fraction of the dergâh’s possessions. No records dealing with the disposal of the dergâh’s land have been published either. They are bound to be an interesting source for the modern social history of the area.

As summary and conclusion, we can say that the dergâh of Haci Bektaş probably existed in the period of Murad I, and was well established in the second half of the fifteenth century. Its possessions were concentrated in the province of Kırşehir, especially around Haci Bektaş and in the area known as Silivymanlı; but from the period of Mehmed the Conqueror onward, if not earlier, it also possessed vakıfs in the Aksaray area. While the dergâh received donations from different Sultans down to the period of Bayezid II, we have no further record of such gifts until the eighteenth century. It has not been possible to prove the Bektashi tradition that the tekke was closed by Selim I. But since certain vakıfs villages show up in the defters compiled under Mehmed Fatih and Bayezid II, and then again in the late sixteenth century, while they are absent from the records of Süleyman Kanuni, there is some reason to assume that the dervish community at least suffered temporary losses.

On the other hand, we find that the tekke profited from the munificence of the Dulkadırlı princes Alâüddevle and Ali b. Şehsüvar. The contact with nomadic tribes continued after this period, as shown by the fact that the tekke participated, at least indirectly, in the Dulkadırlı rebellion and the uprising of pseudo-Şah İsmail. At the same time, the dergâh also maintained other ties: it obtained the support of Bah Bey Malkoç, and of provincial governors like Murad b. Abdullah and Ezrad b. Ali. These more ‘respectable’ patrons may well have interceded for the community with the Sultan.

But the most important family connected with the vakıf is that of the so-called descendants of Haci Bektaş. The documents make very scant reference to the

¹ Probably identical with vakıfs in the Nevşehir area mentioned in BA Cevdet Evkâf no. 1294.
² Copy preserved in the registers of the Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara.
dede babas, while the şeyhs played an extremely active role. They controlled the wealth of the tekke; it was possibly their activity which rescued the dergâh from obscurity in the second half of the eighteenth century. They defended the tekke’s possessions in court, solicited funds from the central administration and from private persons, saw to it that necessary repairs were made, and controlled appointments in subordinate Bektashi establishments. They were tax-exempt, and donations like the hurka bahast, a customary gift to dervish communities, was received by them and not by the dede baba. The mütevelli was chosen from the same family, so that on the whole the dervish community must have been firmly subordinate to their control. From the outside there seems to have been remarkably little interference; even the highly formalized list of expenses that most other religious establishments submitted for the 1584 survey is lacking in their case. Nor is there any mention of nazirs – that is, supervisors called in from outside.

It is also remarkable that aside from the drastic action taken by Mahmud II, scarcely any official decisions prejudicial to the dervish community have been preserved. This is to be expected in the case of materials which probably formed part of the dergâh archives, but it is also true for the documents preserved in the hand of the central administration: the şeyhs received their subsidies whenever they asked for them, the tekke could count on official support in its conflict with the powerful Çapanoğlu family, ancient tax-exemptions were confirmed, although the central administration apparently resisted attempts to capture the divanı where previously only the malikâne had been held. Fugitive peasants were ordered back to the vakif so long as the treasury’s interests were not directly involved. The extensive claims of jurisdiction that the şeyhs brought forth in the late eighteenth century were at least not rejected outright; and their control over mütevellis and subordinate tekkes was confirmed. It seems that we can here discern a policy of letting established local powers administer the countryside as long as they did not disturb the peace. Was this policy limited to the eighteenth century or was this manner of administration common in earlier periods as well?

It is remarkable that Janissary-Bektashi relations have been documented very scantily in the materials that have come to light so far. Probably it is still too early to draw far-reaching conclusions from this fact; new documents may yet come to light, but it can be said that the ‘family’ of Haci Bektâş had much more immediate influence on the life of the dergâh than did the Janissary establishment.

It has already been stated that the Haci Bektâş endowment was of medium size: smaller than the great complexes established by viziers and sultans, smaller than the tekke of the Mevlâna, but by far the largest in the area in which it was located. The backbone was formed by numerous malikânes, donated, except in very few cases, by persons unrecorded and thus unknown to us. It would be crucial for our understanding of Ottoman provincial administration to find out how provincial governors and other centrally appointed officials related to such an established continuous unit, doubtlessly commanding a considerable degree of
local loyalty, over whose income they could have but little control. It should also be kept in mind that the "family" of Hacı Bektaş was only one of the better-known among the many şeyh-families established in Anatolia. But many more monographs on such families will have to be written before any valid generalizations can be possible.

The source material concerning the dergâh is of the greatest diversity, which makes comparisons between different periods always hazardous and in many cases impossible. More texts may come to light especially from the Başvekâlet Arşivi and from private collections, but they are not likely to remedy the main difficulty: what is really needed is materials that would allow comparison with the 1584 tahâir, and it is very likely that no such documents were compiled in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The very scantiness of sources is in itself remarkable; much was doubtlessly lost, yet one cannot but suspect that in a disturbed period like the seventeenth-century official record-keeping itself declined. This in turn indicates a lessening of central control, and it was most likely in this void that the şeyhbs were able to rise to the position they held a century later.
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