

## A LIFE IN BANISHMENT IN IZNIK: SHEIKH BADRADDİN SIMAWNİ /

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Recep ÇİĞDEM\*

### Introduction

In this symposium, the life of Badraddin, who was born in 760/1358, in a castle called Simawna, near Edirne, in Rumeli, and who was hanged in Serese, in Macedonia, in 823/1420,<sup>1</sup> upon a *fatwa* will be highlighted. The *fatwa* which brought about his death will be analysed in legal perspective. His works, particularly the one which shows his academic capacity will be introduced. His work named *Tashil*, a commentary on *Lataif al-Isharat* written in Iznik under physiological stress will be briefly looked at. Despite the negative view of the official historians and the positive one of the others about him, I will try to carry out this study under objective criteria.

### His Biography

#### His Life

Although it is claimed that Badraddin, or Mahmud b. Israil,<sup>2</sup> a veteran,<sup>3</sup> might have been born in a small town called Samawat in Iraq<sup>4</sup> or in a town named Simaw near Kütahya,<sup>5</sup> the sources state that he was born in a castle called Simawna in Rumeli where his father was a judge.<sup>6</sup> He was born in 760/1358<sup>7</sup> or in 1365.<sup>8</sup> He was the eldest son<sup>9</sup> of his family.<sup>10</sup> He had four sons.<sup>11</sup>

\* Lecturer in Islamic law, The University of Harran, The Faculty of Theology, recep@harran.edu.tr

<sup>1</sup> Some give the date of his death (capital punishment) as 1416. This is, however, not correct. For more, see Kurdakul, N. *Bütün yönleriyle Bedreddin*, (İstanbul: Döler Reklam Yayınları, 1977), p. 65

<sup>2</sup> His mother was a Greek convert carrying the name Melek. Kissling, H. J. 'Badraddin', *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition, vol. 1, p. 869; Kallek, C. 'Bedreddin Simavi', *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 5, p. 332

<sup>3</sup> His father was carrying the title *gazi*, the veteran as he participated in a war in Rumeli, in which the castle 'Simawna' was conquered. This was at the period of Sultan Murad Hüdavendigâr (1362-1389). He was first appointed as the governor and then the *qadi* to the castle. Mecdi Efendi, (translator), *Şahaiq al-Numaniya*, Özcan, A. K (edt.), (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, ), vol. 1 pp. 71

<sup>4</sup> 'Bedreddin', *Türk Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 6, p. 6

<sup>5</sup> Danişmend, İ. H. *İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi*, (İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1971), vol. 1, pp. 161-3

<sup>6</sup> Yalıtıkaya, M. Ş. 'Bedreddin', *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları), vol. 2, pp. 444-6

<sup>7</sup> Halil b. İsmail b. Sheikh Badraddin Mahmud, *Simawna Kadısoğlu Şeyh Bedreddin Manakibi*, Gülpinarlı, A & Sungurbey, İ. (translators), (İstanbul: Eti Yayınevi, 1967), p. 13

### *His teachers*

The following were his teacher along with his father:

Akmal al-Din al-Babarti

Mahmut Al-Rumi

Mawlana Fayzullah

Mawlana Shahidi

Mawlana Yusuf

Mubarak Shah<sup>12</sup>

Sheikh Hüseyin Akhlati<sup>13</sup>

Zaylai, not the famous one.<sup>14</sup>

### *His political career*

His political career starts with his appointment by the Mamluk Sultan Barkuk (d. 1399) to his son and successor Faradj (d.1412) as a tutor in 1383.<sup>15</sup> He kept this position for three years.<sup>16</sup> He reached the highest point in his career when he was appointed as the Military Judge in 1411 by the temporary Emperor or the claimant to the Sultanate, Musa çelebi (d.1413). He held this post until the victory of Mehmet çelebi I (1413-1421), near Çamurlu in 1413.<sup>17</sup>

### *In Exile*

1) A turning point in his life: Iznik

<sup>8</sup> Kissling, 'Badraddin', *EI*, vol. 1, p. 869; Esercan, Ş 'Şeyh Bedreddin Hayatı ve Eserleri' in *Şeyh Bedreddin (1358 ?-1420) Erciyes Üniversitesi*, (Kayseri: Gevher Nesibe Tıp Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1996), p.1; Yaman, A, 'Simavna Kadısı Oğlu Şeyh Bedreddin' on <http://www.alevibektasi.org/bedred1.htm>

<sup>9</sup> I could not find how many brothers and sisters he had.

<sup>10</sup> Kissling, H. J. 'Badraddin', *EI*, vol. 1, p. 869

<sup>11</sup> Kissling, H. J. 'Badraddin', *EI*, vol. 1, p. 869

<sup>12</sup> The famous Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413) was his classmate. Kallek, 'Bedreddin', *TDVİA*, vol. 5, p. 332

<sup>13</sup> He assumed the post of his diseased Sheikh Hüseyin Akhlati sometime in 1402-3. After six months, as a result of differences with his brethren he left Cairo and went to Rumeli. Mecdi efendi, *Şhaqaiq*, vol. 1 pp. 71-73; Kissling, 'Badraddin', *EI*, vol. 1, p. 869

<sup>14</sup> Mecdi efendi, *Şhaqaiq*, vol. 1 pp. 71-73; Bilmen, Ö. N. *Büyük Tefsir Tarihi, Tabakatul Müfessirin*, (İstanbul: Bilmen Yayınevi, 1974), vol. 2, pp. 588-89; Apaydın, Y. 'Bir İslam Hukukçusu olarak Simavna Kadısı oğlu Bedreddin (760-823/1359-1420)' in *Şeyh Bedreddin (1358 ?-1420) Erciyes Üniversitesi*, (Kayseri: Gevher Nesibe Tıp Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1996), p. 64

<sup>15</sup> Kissling, 'Badraddin', *EI*, vol. 1, p. 869; Tekindağ, M.C. Ş. 'Berkük' Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi, vol. 5, pp. 511-2; Ünlü, N. *İslam Tarihi: I (Başlangıçtan Osmanlılara kadar)*, (Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1992), p. 527

<sup>16</sup> Kallek, 'Bedreddin', *TDVİA*, vol. 5, p. 332

<sup>17</sup> Mecdi efendi, *Şhaqaiq*, vol. 1 pp. 71-73; Hoca Sadeddin efendi, *Taj al-Tawarikh*, Parmaksızoğlu İ. (edt.), (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1992), p. 109; Bilmen, *Büyük Tefsir Tarihi*, vol. 2, pp. 588-89; Kissling, 'Badraddin', *EI*, vol. 1, p. 869; Özkan, A. (edt.) *Adım Adım Osmanlı Tarihi: İmparatorluğun Son Yılları, 1789-1922*, (İstanbul: Dosya Yayınları, no date), p. 74

After the victory of Mehmet çelebi I, Badraddin was dismissed and was banished to Iznik with his family with a 1000 akçe salary with a duty so-called *irshad* (teaching).<sup>18</sup> He was not free there; rather he was under observation.<sup>19</sup> In Iznik, he was respected as a sheikh and as an academician. It was there people joined his circle. This shows that he had a very influential personality. It was there, he wrote a number of books. Among them was the book called *Tashil*, a *sharh* on *Lataif al-Isharat*<sup>20</sup> whose introduction gives us a clue about the feelings and the psychology of Badraddin. It reads: '...Nowadays, my heart is burning and it is increasing day by day because of the trouble of imprisonment, and exile; and continuous sadness and distress. If my heart were to be an iron it would melt...O, he who has the secret graciousness (God)!...save us from the danger which we are frightened...'<sup>21</sup>

It, probably, was in Iznik, he became connected with a certain Börklüja Mustafa (d. 1419) and a certain Torlak Kamal (d. 1419).<sup>22</sup> As we shall see below, this connection cost him his life.

## 2) His involvement in the uprising

To begin with, although the rebellion is a fact, his involvement in it is not so clear. Before looking into his participation, it is worth seeing what the uprising was. The first rebellion started in Aydın under the leadership of Börklüja Mustafa. And then in Manisa by a certain Jew convert Torlak Kemal. The two uprisings were suppressed by the forces of Mehmet çelebi and their leaders were killed.<sup>23</sup>

The sources write that upon receiving the information of insurgence, Badraddin left Iznik. With the help of the prince of Sinop, he reached Rumeli.<sup>24</sup> Bayazıt pasha was sent to deal with him. In one report, he arrested him easily, as his followers had caught him and had handed him over to him. In another

<sup>18</sup> Hoca Sadeddin efendi, *Taj al-Tawarikh*, p. 109; Solakzade, *Solakzade Tarihi*, Çabuk, V. (edt.) (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1989), p. 182; Hammer Purgstall, Baron Joseph Von, *Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi*, Mehmet Ata bey (translator), (İstanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat, 1983), vol. 2, p. 419

<sup>19</sup> Mecdi efendi, *Shaqaq*, vol. 1 pp. 71-73

<sup>20</sup> *Tashil* is located in the library of Süleymaniye, in the section 'Fatih', No. 1749, Atif Efendi, No. 885 and in Şehit Ali paşa, No. 297

<sup>21</sup> Seyfullah, S., Gürkan, M., İltaş, D. (translators), 'Muhammed Şerafeddin'e Göre Şeyh Bedreddin', in *Şeyh Bedreddin (1358 ?-1420) Erciyes Üniversitesi*, (Kayseri: Gevher Nesibe Tıp Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1996), p.118

<sup>22</sup> Kissling, 'Badraddin', *EI*, vol. 1, p. 869

<sup>23</sup> Yaltkaya, 'İA', vol. 2, pp. 444-6

<sup>24</sup> Kissling, 'Badraddin', *EI*, vol. 1, p. 869

report, Bayazıt sent his men in disguise (undercover) and they caught him. He was taken to Mehmet Çelebi I.<sup>25</sup>

It is clear that the leaders of the uprising, namely Börklüja Mustafa and Torlak Kemal were the disciples of Badraddin. Moreover, Mustafa was his Kethüda (personal assistant)<sup>26</sup> when the Sheikh was the Military judge.<sup>27</sup> However, the sources do not agree on the question of whether he was aware of the unrest. Whilst on the one hand, the biographers of Badraddin assert his complete innocence the official Ottoman historians on the other hand suggest his active participation in the rebellion. To be precise, while his grandson Halil and following his view, Taşköprüzade (d. 1561) clearly state that he did not rebel,<sup>28</sup> the historian, Solakzade (d. 1658), presumably quoting Aşıkpaşa (d. 1481)<sup>29</sup> and Bitlisi (d. 1520)<sup>30</sup> writes that it is written in the books that he was in agreement with Börklüja Mustafa; that is to say, he took active part in the uprising.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, another historian, Hoca Sadettin efendi (d. 1599) asserts that he was the victim of the crime (rebellion) of his disciple, Börklüja; he did not rebel against the government.<sup>32</sup>

Likewise, modern researchers on Badraddin have conflicting views about his involvement in the uprising. While Hammer and Yaltkaya accuse him of playing active role in the mutiny,<sup>33</sup> Köker denies it.<sup>34</sup> Severcan denies the claim of the sociologists, which he calls Marxists, that the uprising was the result of a social conflict and he claims that it was a rebellion in which the religious identity of the Sheikh was used.<sup>35</sup>

There is no documentary evidence indicating that he personally rebelled or conducted the uprising. Although there is possibility that he had in mind to take revenge for his dismissal from the post of Military Judge and being sent to

---

<sup>25</sup> Hoca Sadeddin efendi, *Taj al-Tawarikh*, pp. 112-3; Solakzade, *Solakzade Tarihi*, p. 183; Hammer, *Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi*, vol. 2, p. 419

<sup>26</sup> Sami, Ş. *Kamusu Türki*, (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1987), p. 1145

<sup>27</sup> Hoca Sadeddin efendi, *Taj al-Tawarikh*, pp. 112-3

<sup>28</sup> It is to be noted that there is a contradiction in the report of his grandson regarding his rebellion. In one place, he states that his grandfather did not rebel, in another he reports that when the Emperor asked him 'why did not you obey the ruler?', he said: 'why did not the ruler obey God?'. This suggests that he rebelled or had the intention of civil strife. Halil concludes that the death warrant was politically motivated (*urfi*). Halil, *Manakib*, pp. 119-120, 122, 130; Mecdî Efendi, *Şaqaîq*, vol. 1 p. 72; Yaman, 'Simavna Kadısı Oğlu Şeyh Bedreddin', <http://www.alevibektasi.org/bedred1.htm>

<sup>29</sup> Derviş Atmer Aşıkı, *Aşıkpaşaoğlu Tarihi*, Atsız, N. A. (editor and abridger), (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1985) p. 90

<sup>30</sup> For an examination of their views, see Esercan, 'Şeyh Bedreddin', p. 5

<sup>31</sup> Solakzade, *Solakzade Tarihi*, p. 185

<sup>32</sup> Hoca Sadeddin efendi, *Taj al-Tawarikh*, p. 114

<sup>33</sup> Hammer, *Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi*, vol. 2, pp. 419-20; Yaltkaya, 'İA', vol. 2, pp. 444-6

<sup>34</sup> Esercan, 'Şeyh Bedreddin', p. 5

<sup>35</sup> Esercan, 'Şeyh Bedreddin', p. 17

Iznik in rather humiliating circumstances, it seems to me that he was not the leader of the insurgence. This is due to the fact that when the uprising broke out he was 62 (1420-1358=62) years old. It is not expected from such an old religious man to rebel. Furthermore, he was under observation in Iznik. How could such a man who is under house arrest rebel or conduct a rebellion?

### 3) The Death warrant (The Fatwa)

When he was taken to Mehmet çelebi I by Bayazıt pasha, he ordered a meeting to be held by the *ulama* for a trial.<sup>36</sup> The sources do not agree on the question of whether this was a trial for his involvement in the uprising or a trial for his views. In order to be able to give an answer to this question we need to look at his views. An examination of his works, particularly, the *Warıdat*, clearly shows that he was influenced by Ibn Arabi (d. 1240) and had controversial views.<sup>37</sup> Although it is possible to reconcile his views with the principles of Islam, they are not so in the views of the jurists. This is due to the fact that they look at *zahir* (what is uttered) but not to *batın* (what is intended) and it is not their business to reconcile them with the *shari'a*. The views expressed in *Warıdat* are sufficient to put him to the trial for apostasy. Some of them are:

- 1-There is no problem in saying I am God (*Ana Allah*),
- 2-No bodily resurrection,
- 3-No paradise or hell (in the orthodox understanding),
- 4-Alcohol is not forbidden.<sup>38</sup>

It is also attributed to him that he defended<sup>39</sup> common ownership,<sup>40</sup> except for women.<sup>41</sup>

He contradicted himself in his book *Jami' al-Fusulayn*. For instance, he writes, "if a person says, '*Haram* (forbidden) is better to me (or I like *Haram*

<sup>36</sup> Yaman, 'Simavna Kadısı Oğlu Şeyh Bedreddin', <http://www.alevibektasi.org/bedred1.htm>

<sup>37</sup> Yaman, 'Simavna Kadısı Oğlu Şeyh Bedreddin', <http://www.alevibektasi.org/bedred1.htm>

<sup>38</sup> Badraddin, 'Warıdat' in the Library of Süleymaniye, in the section 'Yazma Bağışlar', No.1463; Balaban, M. R. *Varıdat: İzmir Salepçioğlu kütüphanesindeki arapça el yazma nüshasından tercüme*, (İstanbul: Gayret Kitapevi, 1947), pp. 1-40; Seyfullah, 'Şeyh Bedreddin', p.114; Kallek, 'Bedreddin', *TDVİA*, vol. 5, p. 333-410; Yaman, 'Simavna Kadısı Oğlu Şeyh Bedreddin', <http://www.alevibektasi.org/bedred1.htm>

<sup>39</sup> I need to mention that although I have done a comprehensive research, I am not able to verify that he had such a view. This might have been the view of his followers.

<sup>40</sup> Seyfullah, 'Şeyh Bedreddin', p.114; Kallek, 'Bedreddin', *TDVİA*, vol. 5, p. 333-410; Yaman, 'Simavna Kadısı Oğlu Şeyh Bedreddin', <http://www.alevibektasi.org/bedred1.htm>

<sup>41</sup> A *fatwa* of Ebu'ssuud indicates that his followers also saw women as common. Question: When a group of people from the order (*tarikât*) of Simawni drink alcohol and have sex with the wife of one another with permission, what it is required to them? Answer: Capital punishment is required. Düzdağ, M. E. *Şeyhülislam Ebussuud Efendi Fetvaları İşığında 16. Asır Türk Hayatı*, (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1972), p. 193

more than licit), ' he is *kafir* (apostate)"; 'if a person says, 'there no nass in the prohibition of alcohol,' he is *kafir*'.<sup>42</sup>

Having seen a summary of his views, it is worth mentioning here that we see in the history of the Ottoman Empire, several men being hanged for their thoughts. Among them was Molla Kabız (d. 1527), who was condemned to death by Kamalpasha zade (d.1534) for his view that Jesus was superior to the Prophet Muhammad. He also condemned to death the Sheikh of a certain Bayrami-Melami *tarikât*, İsmail Maşuki known as oğlan Sheikh (d. 1529)<sup>43</sup> for his view that when a person reaches to a certain level, the *halal* and the *haram* become equal.<sup>44</sup> Similarly, the Sheikh al-Islam Fahreddin Acemi (d.1460) condemned to death by burning,<sup>45</sup> the followers of Fazlullah Hurufi (d. 1394) for their thoughts. Taşköprüzade reports that he personally lit the fire.<sup>46</sup>

Having seen the victims of thought, let us examine the *fatwa* condemning Badraddin to death. To begin with, there is no agreement between the historians. Some, such as Aşıkpasha, claim that he was killed for his thoughts (*murtad*). In their words, in the view of the jurists who conducted the trial, Badraddin had a guilty conscious deserving death. The wording used by his grandson Halil and the historian Aşıkpasha and their followers 'his blood is *halal* and his property is *haram*'<sup>47</sup> suggest that Hayreddin-i Herevi (d. 1426)<sup>48</sup> found him guilty for the apostasy. This statement fits the definition of apostasy in the *Hanafi* law. This is due to the fact that in the view of Muhammed al-Shaibani (d. 805) and Abu Yusuf (d. 798), although the apostasy of a man makes the blood of the apostate *halal*, it does not turn his properties into

---

<sup>42</sup> Badraddin Simawni, *Jami' al-Fusulayn*, (Cairo: Matba'a al-Azhariyya, 1979), vol. 2, p. 308. For more, see the pages pp. 296-317; See also Taftazani, *Sharh al-Aqaid*, (Bahar Matbaasi, 1973), pp. 189-92; Kastali, Muslih al-Din, *Hashiya Sharh al-'Aqaid al-Taftazani*, Istanbul: Dersaadet (1326/1908), pp. 311-3

<sup>43</sup> There is possibility that the *fatwa* was issued by Çivizade (d.954/1547). 'İsmail Maşuki' Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi, vol. 23, pp. 112-4; Düzdağ, Ebussud, pp. 85-6, 196

<sup>44</sup> Özen, Ş. 'Kemalpaşazade', *TDVİA*, vol. 25, p. 241

<sup>45</sup> Although the Ottomans punished wrongdoers by burning in some cases, there are several *hadiths* forbidding punishment by burning. See Bukhari, Muhammed b. İsmail, *Sahih al-Bukhari*, (İstanbul: Maktaba İslamiyya.), *jihad*, 149 (vol. 4, p. 21); Tirmizi, Muhammad b. İsa, *Jami' al-Sahih*, (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya , 1987), *siyar*, 20, (vol. 4, pp. 117); Abu Davud, Sulayman b. Ashath, *Sunan*, (Beirut: Dar al-Janani, 1988), *jihad*, 112, (vol. 2, p. 61); Ibn Hajar al-Askalani, *Fath al-Bari*, (Maktaba al-Salafiyya, 1407), vol. 6, pp. 173-6. For the prohibition of *musla* (punishment by the mutilation of body), see Abu Davud, *Sunan, jihad*, 110 (vol. 2. p. 59). For the punishment by burning in the Ottoman Empire, see Heyd, U. *Studies in old Ottoman Criminal Law*, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1973), pp. 262-64

<sup>46</sup> Meccid efendi, *Shaqaik*, vol. 1 pp. 71-3; Baltacı, C. 'Fahreddin-i Acemi', *TDVİA*, vol.12, p. 82

<sup>47</sup> Halil, *Manakib*, p. 130, Derviş Ahmet Aşiki, *Aşıkpaşaoğlu Tarihi*, p. 91

<sup>48</sup> Solakzade, *Solakzade Tarihi*, p. 185

*halal*.<sup>49</sup> In other words, the apostate faces the death penalty and his properties go to his heirs.<sup>50</sup>

On the other hand, some historians report that he was condemned to death as a traitor but not as an apostate.<sup>51</sup> For instance, Solakzade states that the *ulama* reported to the Sultan that he needs to be killed as he humiliated the religious scholars by rising up against the government. He continues to state that the student of Taftazani (d. 1391), Mawlana Haydar-ı Herevî issued a *fatwa* on the ground that 'whoever comes to you and encourages you to rebel against your leader, kill him'.<sup>52</sup> In order to preserve the unity of the nation and to protect the law and order, he was condemned to death.<sup>53</sup>

Likewise, the modern researchers differ on the same question. Some claim that he was killed on the ground of apostasy. Whereas, the others, such as Kallek, assert that he was killed purely on the ground of his involvement in the uprising.<sup>54</sup>

The views expressed by the succeeding *ulama* and the *fatwas* delivered by the jurists about Badraddin suggest that he was considered as *murtad*. For instance, Bali Efendi (d.1552/1553) in a *layiha*<sup>55</sup> submitted to the Sultan Süleyman, the lawgiver, (1520-1566) describes him as an apostate who offers alcohol to his pupils when they met saying 'alcohol in the paradise is this alcohol'. He goes further by saying that his pupils worship him as he says 'I am the Lord (*Ana al-haqq*)'.<sup>56</sup> Similarly, Mahmut Hüdai (d. 1628) who submitted a

<sup>49</sup> Al-Marghinani, Burhan al-Din, *Al-Hidaya*, (Egypt: Matba'a Mustafa al-Halabi, 1971), 2, p. 165-6; Ibn Humam, Kamal al-Din, *Fath al-Qadir*, (Egypt: Matba'a Mustafa al-Halabi, 1970), vol. 6, pp. 73-6; Al-Halabi, Ibrahim, *Multaqa al-Abhur*, (Istanbul: Guryay Matbaasi, 1981), pp. 220-2; Qadikhan, Hasan b. Mansur, *Al-Fatawa al-Qadikhan* in the margins of *Al-Fatawa al-Hindiyya* (Egypt: Kubara Amiriyya, 1310), vol. 3, p. 580; Damad efendi, Abdurrahman Gelibolulu Sheikh zade, *Majma' al-Anhur fi Sharh al-Multaqa al-Abhur*, (Istanbul: Matba'a Amira, 1316), vol. 1, p. 682

<sup>50</sup> In the view of Abu Hanifa (d. 767), his belongings earned in his apostasy is *fay* (belong to the government. *Hidaya*, *Marghinani*, vol. 2, p. 165-6; Halabi, *Multaqa*, pp.220-2; Qadikhan, *Fatawa*, vol.3, p. 580

<sup>51</sup> Hammer, *Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi*, vol. 2, pp. 419-20

<sup>52</sup> This is a quotation from the combination of several *hadiths*. One goes: 'Different evils will make their appearance in the near future. Anyone who tries to disrupt the affairs of this *Umma* while they are united, you should strike him with the sword whoever he be'. Another goes: 'When you are holding to one single man as your leader, you should kill who seeks to undermine your solidarity or disrupt your unity'. Muslim b. Hajjaj, *Jami' al-Sahih*, (Istanbul: Maktaba Islamiyya, 1955), *imarat*, 14-5, (vol. 3, pp. 1479-80)

<sup>53</sup> Hoca Sadeddin efendi, *Taj al-Tawarikh*, pp. 114-115

<sup>54</sup> Bilmen, *Büyük Tefsir Tarihi*, vol. 2, pp. 588-89; Ünal, H. 'Bedreddin Simavi ve Camiul Fusuleyn adlı Eseri' in *Şeyh Bedreddin (1358 ?-1420) Erciyes Üniversitesi*, (Kayseri: Gevher Nesibe Tıp Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1996), p. 45; Altun, K. 'Şeyh Bedreddin ve Düşüncelerinin Edebiyatımıza Yansımaları' in *Şeyh Bedreddin (1358 ?-1420) Erciyes Üniversitesi*, (Kayseri: Gevher Nesibe Tıp Tarihi Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1996), p. 88; Kallek, 'Bedreddin', *TDVİA*, vol. 5, p. 332

<sup>55</sup> Memorandum expressing one's view on a subject. Sami, *Kamusu Türki*, p. 1236

<sup>56</sup> Yaman, 'Simavna Kadısı Oğlu Şeyh Bedreddin', <http://www.alevibektasi.org/bedred1.htm>

*tezkere* (letter) to the Sultan Ahmet I (1603-1617), describes him as a *mulhid* and *zindiq* (apostate), because of his denial of bodily resurrection and seeing everything licit.<sup>57</sup>

The Sheikh al-Islam Ebu's-suud (d.982/1574) responds to the question: 'What is required to Zeyd who says that the one who does not curse and does not see him as an apostate is the *kafir*?' It is to be said that the ones who are from his disciples are the *kafir*...<sup>58</sup>

There is a Firman issued on 18 *Dhu'l-hijja* 1022/29.01.1614 and sent to the judges of Sivas which describes the followers of Badraddin as *mulhid* (apostate).<sup>59</sup>

The different reports of the different historians suggest that they did not know the reason on which he was killed; rather they were speculating about it. Since we have no documentary evidence, there is no way of discovering the ground on which he was killed. It, however, seems to me that he was killed for the uprising in the disguise of apostasy. He was the victim of the political turmoil of his time. Because of the political circumstances of the time and the conflict between the rival princes,<sup>60</sup> Mehmet çelebi I became vigilant against any conflict or unrest. It may not be possible to say that Mehmet çelebi I was able to put up with a statement or a single word which implies or encourages uprising as he was fed up with the turmoil and the insurgencies of his time. Mehmet çelebi I might have wanted to get rid of him, as he was an influential man; he might have seen him as a threat to his power. This is why he eradicated him in the disguise of *irtidad*. In short, to preserve the unity of the nation and to warn the others not to dare the uprising, he was hanged.

---

<sup>57</sup> Yaltkaya, 'r, *İA*, vol. 2, pp. 444-6; Seyfullah, 'Şeyh Bedreddin', pp. 140-1; Kallek, 'Bedreddin', *TDVİA*, vol. 5, p. 333; Yaman, 'Simavna Kadısı Oğlu Şeyh Bedreddin', <http://www.alevibektasi.org/bedred1.htm>

<sup>58</sup> Düzdağ, *Ebussuud*, p. 193

<sup>59</sup> Yaman, 'Simavna Kadısı Oğlu Şeyh Bedreddin', <http://www.alevibektasi.org/bedred1.htm>

<sup>60</sup> It was not easy for Mehmet çelebi I to assume the power. It took several battles to take the control of the country. Initially, he made an agreement with Musa çelebi in order to end the power of İsa çelebi (d. 1405) in Bursa. After a successful battle, they eliminated him. Afterwards, Musa çelebi ended the power of his brother Süleyman çelebi (d. 1411) in Edirne. Contravening the agreement, Musa çelebi declared his kingdom which brought about another battle with Mehmet çelebi. Mehmet won the battle and became the supreme ruler of the Otoman Empire. Derviş Ahmet Aşiki, *Aşıkpaşaoğlu Tarihi*, pp. 80-9; Solakzade, *Solakzade Tarihi*, pp. 122-51; Özkan, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, pp. 70-75



### His works:

Badraddin has been a prolific writer. He extensively wrote on law. His works on law indicates his academic capacity. Furthermore, the following statement in the introduction of his book *Tashil* evidently shows that he was seeing himself as a *Mujtahid* (the one who is able to produce independent reasoning on the law): 'The statement beginning with *Aqulu* (I say) belong to me unless otherwise stated. These are the ones which distinguish between a wise from the foolish, but not the report of the narrations or their memorisation'.<sup>61</sup>

#### 1) Legal works

##### 1-*Lataif al-Isharat*

According to Katip çelebi (d. 1658), he wrote this book in Iznik while he was under observation.<sup>62</sup> It is related to the positive law (*furū'*) of the *Hanafi madhab*. It is an abridgment of four main legal text comprising *Mukhtar* of Mawsili (d.1284), *Majma al-Bahrayn* of Ibn al-Sa'aati (d. 1285), *Kanz al-Daqaq* of Nasafi (d.1310), and *Wiqaya* of Taj al-Shari'a.<sup>63</sup>

##### 2-*Tashil*:

This is a *sharh* on his earlier law book *Lataif al-Isharat*. As stated in the introduction, he started to write it on 8 *Shawwal* 616/01.01.1414 and completed it on 27 *Jumad al-Akhira* 818/03.09.1415 in Iznik.<sup>64</sup>

##### 3-*Jami' al-Fusulayn*:

This will be examined below.

#### 2) Grammar books

##### 1-*Uqud al-Jawahir*,

##### 2-*Charagh al-Futuh*.<sup>65</sup>

##### 3) Tafsir (exegesis) work

<sup>61</sup> Seyfullah, 'Şeyh Bedreddin', pp. 117-8

<sup>62</sup> This may not be correct, as his grandson Halil mentions it as the first law book of Badreddin. It might have been written in Rumeli but not in Iznik. Halil, *Manakib*, p. 202

<sup>63</sup> Katip Çelebi, *Kasf al-Zunun*, (Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, 1982), vol. 2, p. 1551; Apaydın, 'Bedreddin', p. 66; Kallek, 'Bedreddin', *TDVİA*, vol. 5, p. 334

<sup>64</sup> Mecdi efendi, *Şaqaq*, vol. 1 pp. 71-73; Apaydın, 'Bedreddin', p. 69; Kallek, 'Bedreddin', *TDVİA*, vol. 5, p. 334

<sup>65</sup> Bilmen, *Büyük Tefsir Tarihi*, vol. 2, pp. 588-9; Kallek, 'Bedreddin', *TDVİA*, vol. 5, p. 334

1-*Tafsir Ayat al-Kursi*,

2-*Nur al-Qulub*.<sup>66</sup>

4) Tasawwufi works

1-*A hashiya on Fusus al-Hikam*,

2-*Masarrat al-Qulub*,

3-*Waridat*.<sup>67</sup> It was written in 1407.<sup>68</sup> This is a very important book as it contains controversial views.<sup>69</sup> A number of *sharhs* have been written on this book.<sup>70</sup> One of them is the work of Muhammad b. Mustafa known as Nureddin zade (d. 1573).<sup>71</sup>

### Jami' al-Fusulayn

This is the first book of Badraddin, started in *Jumad al-Ula* 813/September 1410 and completed on 28 *Safar* 814/21.06.1411, less than 10 months. He wrote it while he was the military judge. This work indicates his academic capacity. His *ijtihadi* views can be seen in this particular book.<sup>72</sup> As he states in the introduction, this book is a combination of *Fusuli Imadi* of Zayn al-Din Marghinani al- Imadi (d. 1271) and *Fusuli 'Ushrusheni* of Muhammed b. Mahmut al-'Ushrusheni (d.1234)'. While the former has 30 chapters, the latter

<sup>66</sup> Bilmen, *Büyük Tefsir Tarihi*, vol. 2, p. 588

<sup>67</sup> For an academic study on *Waridat*, see Dindar, B. *Şayh Badr al-Din Mahmut et ses Waridat*, PhD, (Paris, 1975)

<sup>68</sup> Although his grandson Halil attributes it to him, Kurdakul claims that it was not written by Badraddin and that it was his views that were compiled by his pupils after his death. Halil, *Manakib*, 202; Kurdakul, *Bedreddin*, p. 152

<sup>69</sup> Katip Çelebi reports an anecdote from *Şaḡaiḡ al-Numaniyya*: "A person called 'Ala ud-Din Ali al-Arabi, who had a good knowledge of *zahir* and *batin* sciences, was sitting in a mountain in Manisa. An Imam of a village visited him. He said to the Imam: 'A bad smell is coming from you'. The Imam checked his clothes and found nothing. When he wanted to sit down, he dropped a book. It was the *Waridat* of Badraddin. The said Sheikh looked into it and found the views which are against the *ijma*. The smell was from this book. He ordered the Imam to burn it. The Imam opposed it. The Sheikh said to him: 'Burn it, it does not give you benefit'. While they were on the conversation, they saw the smoke of a fire. The Imam stared at it and said this is coming from my house. He regretted for the opposition and run to his house." This means that his opposition cost him his house. We do not know whether this really took place. However, this was reported or made up to warn the readers that the *Waridat* is not a good book and does not deserve reading. Katip Çelebi, *Kasf al-Zunun*, vol. 2. p. 1995

<sup>70</sup> This contradicts the claim that his books were not in circulation in the Ottoman Empire as they were prohibited from being read. In addition, the referrals to *Jami' al-Fusulayn* by the scholars such as Mehmet Amin Efendi (d. 1098/1687 and Salih b. Ahmed al-Kafawi establish as a fact that his books were in circulation. Mehmet Amin Efendi, *Fatawa-i Ankarawi* (Istanbul: Matba'a Amira, 1281), vol. 1, pp. 339, 343-4; Salih b. Ahmed al-Kafawi, *Fatawa Ali Efendi ma'a Nuḡul lil Kafawi*, (Istanbul: Matba'a 'Amira, no date), vol. 1, p. 522

<sup>71</sup> Katip Çelebi, *Kasf al-Zunun*, vol 2. p. 1995; Bilmen, *Büyük Tefsir Tarihi*, vol. 2, pp. 588-89; Kallek, 'Bedreddin', *TDVİA*, vol. 5, p. 334

<sup>72</sup> Katip Çelebi, *Kasf al-Zunun*, vol. 2, p. 1995; Danişmend, *Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi*, vol. 1, pp. 161-3

has forty. Following, Muhammed al-'Ushrusheni, Badraddin divided his book into forty sections. His section called 'inheritance' comes from Sirajuddin Sajawandi.

Several *sharhs* have been written on this work. Among them was the *Nur al-'Ayn fi Islahi Jami' al-Fusulayn* of Muhammed b. Ahmet, Nişancızade (d. 1621). As named, his aim was to respond to the criticism of Badraddin to his *Hanafi* predecessors. He rewrote the section called '*alfaz al-kufr*' in accordance with the orthodox *Hanafi* principles. Badraddin's criticism was also responded by the Sheikh Suleyman b. Ali al-Karamani (d. 1518), Zayn al-Din b. İbrahim b. Nujaym al-Misri (d. 1552), and Fadil Jamali efendi (d. 1583).<sup>73</sup>

In order to give the reader an idea about the content of the book, it is worth giving some information about it. Badraddin enumerates the *fasls* (chapters) and their content one by one. As he writes, the first chapter is about the appointment and the dismissal process of the *qadis* and the *wasis* (guardians) and the *wakils* (agents). Here, the author also deals with the concept of *Dar al-Islam*. The second and the following several *fasls* (divisions) are attributed to the procedure of judgment. The author deals with many sorts of issues such as sale, rent, marriage, dower, maintenance, *jihaz* (trousseau) *talaq* (unilateral divorce), *khul'* (bilateral divorce), *fudhuli* (transactions of an unauthorised person). He devotes the nineteenth *fasl* to the rent transactions between the lender and the borrower in Samarqand/Uzbekistan. The writer examines the conditions which make the contracts invalid in the *fasl* twenty six. The thirtieth chapter is devoted to the *tasarrufat al-fasida* (invalid transactions). The next *fasl* is about *shuyu'* (undivided shares). Afterwards, the sale of usurped objects comes. An examination of *tazminat* (compensation) follows. The chapter thirty eight called '*alfaz al-kufr aliman biha aw ghayr alimin*' is attributed to the words or expressions which make a person *murtad* (apostate). He closely examines the expressions leading to apostasy. The last *fasl* is devoted to the problems of registers and records.

Having enumerated the *fasls*, he starts his book with the statement, 'I start with what makes a *dar al-Islam* a *dar al-harb* and a *dar al-harb* a *dar al-Islam*, as there is a need for this in our time and place'.<sup>74</sup> This shows that there was a discussion whether the Sultanate of Musa çelebi was the de jure one and the abode was the Islamic one. He justifies that they were the legal ones. Afterwards, he brings a criticism to the established principle, 'when a Mufti of

<sup>73</sup> Katip Çelebi, *Kasf al-Zunun*, vol. 2, p. 1995; Apaydın, 'Bedreddin', pp. 64-65; Bardakoğlu, A. 'Camiul Fusuleyn', *TDVİA*, vol. 7, pp. 108-9

<sup>74</sup> Badraddin, *Jami' al-Fusulayn*, vol.1, p. 13

our time is asked, he issues his *fatwa* in accordance with the view of our masters if it is reported as a unanimous view in authentic books. He does not disagree with them even if he was a *Mujtahid*. This is because the right is with our masters and it does not go beyond them. Because his *ijtihad* does not reach their *ijtihad*. The ones who oppose them are not taken into account. His reasoning is not accepted. They knew the evidences and distinguished between the authentic and the un-authentic evidence.' He expresses his criticism as: 'This is nothing more than a good presumption. Malik is earlier than them. There is no evidence that they [the *Hanafi* jurists] are more *azbat* (preserver) and *ahraz* (protector) and did more research regarding the *akhbars* and *asars* (*hadiths*) than the *Shafi'is* and the *Malikis*. In addition, the *hadiths* were not collected at the time of Abu Hanifa and his two disciples, as it is the case afterwards. This is due to the fact that the books like the *kutub al-sitta*<sup>75</sup> (six authentic books) were collected after them. Likewise, a *Mujtahid* needs to follow his own view even if it is the opposite of their view, unless it does not disagree with the Qur'an, the *Sunna*, the *Ijma*, the view of the Companions of the prophet or the immediate succeeding generation (*tabi'i*) whose view is accepted as authoritative at the time of the *sahaba* like Shuraykh (d. 697). It is not *halal* for such a *Mujtahid* to follow the view of the others [*Hanafi Mujtahid*]. This is due to the fact that he [the *Mujtahid*] presumes that his right is superior to the others...<sup>76</sup>

This is a clear criticism of orthodox understanding of the *Hanafi* jurists and represents a deviation from the tradition. In addition, this suggests that he was seeing himself as qualified to carry out *ijtihad*.

Having said that, I would like to quote the important principles which appear under the section called '*alfaz al-kufr*'. These principles might have been the reason for his signing his own death warrant.

He begins with a quotation from Tahawi (d.321/933) that what makes a person apostate is his denial of what has made him a Muslim. 'If there is a certainty that it [the word, expression etc.] has made him an apostate, a decision can be made for his apostasy. If there is a doubt about it, [a *fatwa* for his apostasy] cannot be issued (*la yuhkamu bih*). This is because the established Islam (his religion) does not fade away because of a doubt and the

<sup>75</sup> This refers to six authentic works; *Jami' al-Sahih* of Muhammed b. İsmail (d.870); *Jami' al-Sahih* of Muslim b. al-Hajjaj (d.875), *Sunan* of Abu Abdurrahman Ahmed b. Shuayb al-Nasai (d. 915), *Sunan* of Abu Dawud Sulayman b. al-Ashath (d. 888), *Sunan* of Muhammad b. Isa al-Tirmizi, (d. 892) and *Sunan* of Muhammed b. Yazid b. Abdulhah b. Maja (d. 886).

<sup>76</sup> Badraddin, *Jami' al-Fusulayn*, vol. 1, p. 15

Islam is superior [to other religions]. When it is raised to him, it is required for a scholar not to hurry on pronouncing *ahl al-Islam* to be blasphemy.<sup>77</sup> On the ground on which he introduced this subject with this statement, he states, 'I have given priority to this [report] so that it becomes a scale for the reports which I am going to make in this section...'<sup>78</sup> Having introduced the subject, Badraddin embarks on examining the individual statements which might make a Muslim an apostate. As an example, 'if a person utters a *kalima al-kufr* with his own free will, he becomes an apostate even if he does not know that it was for blasphemy or does not have the intention for it. His ignorance is not an excuse...if a person utters a word of apostasy but still has the belief in his heart, he is a blasphemer. What he keeps in his heart does not give benefit to him, this is because an unbeliever can only be known with his statements.'<sup>79</sup> This statement might have been shown to him in order to make him sign his own death warrant as this clearly shows that uttering such a word puts a man out of the religion regardless of his intention.

For the *alfaz al-kufr*, it is worth mentioning the following:

1-*Khamr* is not forbidden'.<sup>80</sup>

2-Denial of one *ayah* of the Qur'an.<sup>81</sup>

3-Denial of doomsday, paradise, hell, and so on.<sup>82</sup>

### Conclusion

We get the impression from his works that he was an eminent scholar on law and mysticism. Although his *ijtihad*s were criticized by the classic and the fanatic *ulama*, they were respected by the moderate ones.

Although, not much known about his involvement in the uprising, we know that the leaders of the uprising, Börklüja Mustafa and a Jew convert Torlak Kamal were his disciples. Their disturbances put their teacher to the lime light.

He became the victim of the political turmoil of his time. In other words, he was condemned to death in the disguise of *irtidad*, as he was seen as a

---

<sup>77</sup> Presumably influenced by Badraddin, Damad (d. 1667) states 'I promised to myself not to accuse anyone of blasphemy, if there is a weak view regarding his Islam. Damad, *Majma' al-Anhur*, vol. 1, p. 688

<sup>78</sup> Badraddin, *Jami' al-Fusulayn*, vol. 2. p. 296

<sup>79</sup> Badraddin, *Jami' al-Fusulayn*, vol. 2. p. 297

<sup>80</sup> Badraddin, *Jami' al-Fusulayn*, vol. 2. p. 308

<sup>81</sup> Badraddin, *Jami' al-Fusulayn*, vol. 2. p. 305

<sup>82</sup> Badraddin, *Jami' al-Fusulayn*, vol. 2. p. 307

threat to the power of Mehmet elebi I. In short, an educated man was lost forever and his capital punishment is not justifiable.

One last point is that a lot needs to be done in order to reach a comprehensive conclusion about his religious and political views. In addition, a comparative study on his *Waridat* and *Tashil* may provide valuable information and establish whether or not the *Waridat* which contains controversial views belongs to him.