

Essays on Ottoman Historians and Historiography

Rhoads Murphey

Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi Kütüphanesi	
Dom. No:	189168
Tas. No:	956.07 MUR.E

MADDE YATIRILMIŞTIR
SONRA GELEN DOKÜMAN

02 EKİM 2012

 EREN
İstanbul 2009

Kuyucu Murad Paşa
(11631)

Rhetoric versus realism in early seventeenth-century Ottoman historical writing : on the creation and purpose of Kuyucu Murad Pasha's vaunted reputation as vanquisher of the *celalîs*

By any objective standard it is appropriate to regard the first two decades of the seventeenth century in the Ottoman lands as a time of considerable political uncertainty and dynastic upheaval. The inescapable facts were that the political leadership had been forced to acknowledge the reality of military stalemate both on the empire's western (Treaty of Zsitvatorok, signed with the Austrian Habsburgs in November 1606) and eastern (Treaty of Istanbul, signed with the Safavids in November 1612) frontiers. In addition, they were seemingly powerless in restraining the circulation of armed battalions of Celalî rebels who held sway in a wide band of the Anatolian homeland sometimes encroaching on the empire's former capital Bursa itself. Historians living and writing in those times can hardly fail to have been affected by the atmosphere of apocalyptic doom which undoubtedly hung over the Ottoman court in those years. However, despite its undoubted importance for formulating a balanced retrospective view of this troubled period of Ottoman history, surprisingly little attention has been paid to scrutinizing contemporary political perceptions and assessing the ways that they colored the historical record as created by leading literary and intellectual figures active at the height of the crisis in the reign of Ahmed I (r. 1603-1617). For the purpose of the present analysis we will focus on the accounts of the early phase of Ahmed's reign between his accession in December 1603 and the death of his first long-serving grand vezier Kuyucu Murad Pasha in August 1611.¹

By virtue both of his personal longevity and the relative security of his tenure of office Murad Pasha unavoidably occupies a dominant position in the record of Sultan Ahmed's reign.

The variations in the contemporary account of Murad Pasha's seemingly triumphant confrontation with the Celalîs offers a particularly clear illustration of

¹ Apart from Nasuh Pasha whose term of office ended with his execution, none of Sultan Ahmed's other six chief deputies remained in office for more than about 28 months, whereas Kuyucu Murad held his position for nearly five years (actual term of office, 4 years 8 months). See İ. H. Danişmend, *İzahlı Osmanlı Tarih Kronolojisi*, Vol. 5 (İstanbul, 1971), pp. 28-30.

161-178

- ²⁹ TESEV, 2004, s. 72
³⁰ TESEV, 2004, s. 74-75
³¹ Ayhan, *Türkiye'de Din Eğitimi*, s. 333-337.
³² Ali Ulvi Kurucu'nun "İmam Hatiplilere" adlı şiirinden

ABSTRACT

Secular Dilemma Of Imams And Hatibs Training High Schools

The IHL's (Imams and Hatibs Training High Schools), which are the main institution of religious education in Turkey, have been made the target of ideological and political arguments. In fact, these schools have not yet been carried out of ideological and political point of view towards a tradition of the assessment of these schools. The issue of IHL's has turned out to be a problem as it has been understood to a sufficient degree neither by supporters nor by opponents. Again, since - despite the fact that they are of those schools of ours that have developed within social dynamism and reflect this very dynamism in the best manner - IHL's have ever been considered as an object of ideological isolation, its definition with living identity has not interested anybody much. Accordingly, it is known as a most easily-reached symbol of ideological disputes and still remains such. The progression and change these schools have experienced have become the subject of this article as social concepts. Do IHL's represent a religious ideology or modern change better? This is the principal issue under consideration.

Key Terms:

Imams and Hatibs Training High Schools, Secularism, Religious Education and Training, Urbanization, University.

02036



MADDE 71'İN İSPATINA
SONRA KULLANILAN

07 ARA 2008

KUYUCU MURAD PAŞA'NIN İRAN ŞAHINA GÖNDERDİĞİ MEKTUP

Mehmet Günay*

Ertan Gökmen**

Giriş

Devletler arası anlaşmazlıkların çözümünde tercih edilen yollardan birisi elçiler vasıtasıyla mektup teatisidir. Osmanlı-İran siyasi münasebetlerinde genellikle meseleleri barışçı yollardan çözmek amacıyla elçiler gönderilmiştir. Arşivlerimiz ve kütüphanelerimizde bu tür elçilik faaliyetlerine dair birçok belge ve bilgi yer almaktadır. Manisa şehrinin merkez kütüphanesi olup içerisinde bulundurduğu önemli miktardaki yazma ve basma eserlerle ülkemizin nadir kütüphanelerinden birisi olan Kitapsaray'da 5683/2 numarada "Sadrazam Kuyucu Murad Paşa'nın İran Şahına Gönderdiği Mektup" ibaresiyle kayıtlı 1017 tarihli ve ta'lik yazılı sekiz varakdan oluşan bir mektup da bu elçilik faaliyetlerinin bir örneğini teşkil etmektedir.

Mektup, her ne kadar yazma eserler kataloğunda yukarıdaki ibâre ile kayıtlı ise de mektubun ilk satırında "*Murad Paşa'nın Sultan Ahmed'e Olan Mektubu*" şeklindeki başlık dikkati çekmektedir. Anlaşıldığı kadarıyla bu mektup Murad Paşa'nın İran Şah'ına gönderdiği mektubun Padişaha bilgi amacıyla takdim ettiği sûreti olmalıdır. O dönemde Reis'ül-küttâplık makamında bulunan Abdullah Efendinin kaleme aldığı "*Düstûr'ul-İnşâ*" adlı eserde de bu mektubun bir sûreti bulunmaktadır. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi Es'ad Efendi Bölümü 3332 numarada kayıtlı bulunan eserde yer alan mektup sûretlerinin büyük bir bölümünde kırmızı mürekkeple yazılmış başlıklar yer almakta ise de bu mektubun baş kısmı boş bırakılmıştır.

Tanıtımını yaptığımız ve Osmanlı-İran siyasi ilişkileri açısından önemli olduğuna inandığımız bu mektubun metni ile *Düstûr'ul-İnşâ*daki metin arasında çok önemli olmasa da bazı farklılıklar mevcuttur. Bu farklılıklar mektubun transkriptinde dipnot olarak gösterilmiştir. Yine mektupta verilen bilgilerin daha iyi anlaşılması açısından Kuyucu Murad Paşa ve dönemiyle ilgili bilgilerle Osmanlı-İran ilişkilerinin seyri hakkında bazı bilgiler verilmesi uygun olacaktır.

youngest son of the Mughal Emperor Shāh Djahān [q.v.], born on 25 Dhu 'l-Hijjā 1033/28 September 1624 and died 1072/1661. He was given a *mansab* of 10,000/4,000 in 1048/1639, and after a year, of 10,000/7,000, being promoted in 1051/1641 to 12,000/8,000 (2,000 × 2-3h). His first important assignment came in 1052/1642 when he was appointed *šubadār* of Multān [q.v.]. In 1055/1645 he received the rank of 12,000/10,000 (2,000 × 2-3h). He led the Mughal army to Balkh and Badakhshān in Djumādā I 1056/June 1646, but after a successful campaign abandoned his command without permission and returned to India in Radjab 1056/August 1646. He was deprived of his rank and dismissed from the governorship of Multān, but the same year was pardoned and restored to his rank. In 1057/1647 he was appointed as *šubadār* of Kashmīr and in 1058/1648 as *šubadār* of the Deccan. His term there was short, and in 1060/1650 he was appointed *šubadār* of Kābul and in 1061/1651 of Mālwa. In 1064/1654 he received appointment to Guḍjarāt and was promoted to the rank of 12,000/10,000 (5,000 × 2-3h). Shāh Djahān fell ill in Dhu 'l-Hijjā 1067/September 1657, and Murād Bakhsh crowned himself Emperor in Šafar 1068/November 1657 at Aḥmadābād. In 1068/1658 Awrangzīb and Murād Bakhsh entered into an agreement in which Awrangzīb promised his brother the Pandjāb, Multān, Thaffa, Kashmīr and Kābul in the event of success. In Radjab 1068/April 1658, their joint armies united to inflict a defeat on the Imperial force at Dharmat. This was followed by Dārā Shukūh's [q.v.] defeat at Sāmūgarh. The two brothers occupied Agrā, the capital, but Murād Bakhsh was treacherously seized by Awrangzīb at Mathurā [q.v.] and sent as captive to Salīmgarh fort (Dihlī) then in 1069/1659 to Gwāliyār [q.v.]. In 1072/1661 he was executed on the charge of having murdered his *diwān* 'Alī Naḳī in 1067/1657. Murād Bakhsh was reputed for his dash and bravery, but was apparently a poor administrator.

Bibliography: 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Lāhōrī, *Bādshāh-nāma*, ed. Maulvi Kabiruddin and Maulvi Abdur Rahim, Bibl. Ind. Calcutta 1867-8; Muḥammad Wārith, *Bādshāh-nāma* (continuation of 'Abd Hamīd Lāhōrī's *Bādshāh-nāma*), ms. I.O. Ethé, 329; Muḥammad Šāliḥ Kānbū, *Amal-i Šāliḥ*, ed. G. Yazdani, Bibl. Ind. Calcutta 1923-46; Muḥammad Kāzim, *Ālamgīr-nāma*, Bibl. Ind. Calcutta 1865-73; *Ruk'at-i Ālamgīr*, ed. Sayyid Naḍīb Ashraf, A'zamgarh 1930; Jadu Nath Sarkar, *History of Aurangzeb, mainly based on Persian sources*, i-ii, Calcutta 1912; M. Athar Ali, *The Mughal nobility under Aurangzeb*, Bombay 1966; idem, *The apparatus of empire*, Oxford 1985. (M. ATHAR ALI)

MURĀD HĀDJĪ [see SHĀMIL].
MURĀD PASHA, KUYUDJU, KODJA, (ca. 928-1020/ca. 1520-1611), Ottoman Grand Vizier under Sultan Ahmed I.

A *dewshirme* [q.v.] boy of Croat origin, he received his education in the imperial palace. His career began under patronage of Maḥmūd Pasha, the *beglerbegi* of Yemen and Egypt. Between 1560 and 1565 he was the latter's *ketkhudā*. In Egypt, Murād also held the office of *amīr al-ḥādīdī*, which opened the way to public high office. In 983/1576 Murād (Pasha) became *beglerbegi* of Yemen himself for about four years. Dismissed in 988/1580 because of corruption, he was summoned to the capital and landed in Yedi Kule prison for a short time. Afterwards, he was appointed *beglerbegi* of Tarābulus-Shām. In 993/1585 he joined the Tabriz campaign, being *beglerbegi* of Karamān and second-in-command to the *serdār-i ekrem* Özdemir-oghlu

'Oḥmān Pasha [q.v.]. In a battle with the troops of the Persian commander Ḥamza Mīrzā, he was taken prisoner. He was set free at the conclusion of peace in 998/1590 and was made governor-general of Cyprus (999/1590), of Tarābulus-Shām (1000/1592), of Damascus (Shām) in 1001/1593 and of Diyār Bakr in 1003/1595 (Selānikī gives 1005/1597). In this capacity, he took part in the Eḡri campaign of 1596. He distinguished himself in the Battle of Mezö-Keresztes [q.v.] in Hungary (1005/1596). He remained at the front and on 21 Rabī' I 1008/11 October 1599 was a member of the Ottoman delegation holding peace talks with the Imperial envoys, together with the *šadāret ketkhudāsī* Mehmed Agha and a representative of the Khān of the Crimea at Vác (Waitzen) and at Parkanzy (Čiğerdelen).

After the accession of Sultan Ahmed I (17 Radjab 1012/21 December 1603 [q.v.]), Murād Pasha was appointed *beglerbegi* of Rumeli and given the function of military governor of Buda (T. Budīn [q.v.]). On 28 Djumādā II 1014/12 October 1605 he became as Fourth Vizier a member of the imperial *diwān*. When the Grand Vizier and *serdār* of the Western Front Lala Mehmed Pasha [q.v.] died (15 Muḥarram 1015/23 May 1606), Murād Pasha, by now one of the most experienced commanders in the field, was made Commander-in-Chief in Hungary (*Engürüs Serdārī*). In this capacity he began to work towards peace. As a result, a treaty of peace was negotiated at Zsitvatorok on 17 Djumādā II-10 Radjab 1015/20 October-11 November 1606. Peace in the West made it possible for the Ottoman government to direct its forces to the East, where Anatolia was ravaged by the so-called *Djelālī* revolts [q.v. in Suppl.] and where the Šafawid Shāh 'Abbās I (996-1038/1588-1629) had started a war in 1603. A month after concluding the peace in Hungary, Murād Pasha received his appointment as Grand Vizier (10 Shā'abān 1015/11 December 1606). The advice of the *shaykh ūl-islām* Šun'ullāh Efendi seems to have been decisive in the matter. "Old" (*Kodja*) Murād Pasha immediately left his headquarters at Belgrade and arrived at Istanbul on 15 Shawwāl 1015/13 February 1607: "this man hath continued ever since to the greater good of that estate raised from death to life by his wisdom and good fortune being indeed wise and an ancient souldier", was the commentary of the English ambassador Henry Lello.

Appointed *serdār* in the East, the new Grand Vizier left Uskūdār on 6 Rabī' I 1016/2 July 1607 for his campaign against the rebels in Anatolia and Syria; Kālanderoghlu Mehmed Pasha [q.v.] near Ankara, Muslu Čawush at Silifke and the main target, the insurgent Djanbulātoghlu 'Alī Pasha, who dominated an area from Aleppo to Adana. Having put out of action Djanbulāt's follower Djemshīd near Adana, Murād Pasha met the chief rebel pasha himself in battle in the Oruç Owasi near Baylān in the region of Anṭakya (2 Radjab 1016/23 October 1607). The united forces of Djanbulāt 'Alī Pasha and the other renowned rebel Fakhr al-Dīn Ma'n [q.v.] were defeated and for the greater part massacred. 'Alī Pasha managed to escape, at first to Aleppo and then to Istanbul, where he received a pardon from the Sultan and was made *beglerbegi* of Temeshwār (Temesvár), but Murād Pasha had him executed soon after at Belgrade. One prominent prisoner, Djanbulāt 'Alī Pasha's treasurer, the young Abāza Mehmed [q.v.], was spared upon the intercession of the Janissary Agha, Khalīl Pasha Kaşariyyeli [q.v.], who took him into his personal service.

Murād Pasha re-established government control in

08 TEMMUZ 1987

E1,7
 Kuyudju Murad
 Pasha

مدخل

در حل مشکلات بین دولت‌ها یکی از راه‌های ترجیح داده شده؛ فرستادن نامه توسط ایلچیان و تعاطی نامه است. معمولاً "برای حل مسائل موجود در مناسبات سیاسی بین دولت ایران و عثمانی و نیز صلح، ایلچیان فرستاده می‌شد؛ در آرشیو و کتابخانه‌های ترکیه در خصوص این نوع فعالیت‌ها، با اسناد و معلومات زیادی روبرو می‌شویم. کتابخانه‌ی مرکز شهرمانیسا که یکی از کتابخانه‌های مهم کشور ترکیه است دارای تعداد زیادی اسناد با محتوای مهم و کتب چاپ سنگی نایاب را دارا است رساله‌ی نامه‌ی قویوچی مراد پاشا به شاه ایران به شماره‌ی ۵۶۸۵/۲ در لیست این کتابخانه قید شده است. تاریخ آن ۱۰۱۷ ه.ق، به خط تعلیق و شامل ۸ ورق می‌باشد. این نمونه، نوع فعالیت‌های ایلچی‌گری را به ما نشان می‌دهد. نامه هر چند در فهرست آثار نسخه‌های خطی با عبارت فوق‌الذکر قید شده است لکن در تیتیر نامه، نام مراد پاشا و سلطان احمد، توجه ما را به خود جلب می‌کند. واضح است، نامه‌ی فرستاده شده‌ی مرادپاشا به شاه ایران، یک صورت اطلاعاتی است که برای پادشاه ارسال شده است. صورت این نامه نیز با همین محدوده‌ی تاریخی در اثر نوشته شده‌ی عبدالله افندی، رئیس‌الکتاب به نام دستورالانشاء، موجود است.

صورت دیگری از این نامه در قسمت اسعد افندی در کتابخانه‌ی سلیمانیه به شماره‌ی ۳۳۳۲، موجود است. تیتیرهایی به رنگ قرمز در این نامه وجود دارد ولی جای تیتیر ابتدایی نامه خالی گذاشته شده است. ما با متن نامه‌ی مورد ذکر، این نامه را معرفی می‌کنیم و باور داریم که این نامه یکی از اسناد بسیار مهم در زمینه‌ی روابط سیاسی ایران و عثمانی است.

و اما متن این نامه با متن قید شده در اثر دستورالانشاء، تفاوت‌های زیادی ندارد و اندک تفاوت‌های موجود میان این دو متن نیز در پاورقی قید شده است. همچنین برای تفهیم بیشتر نامه، اطلاعاتی در خصوص تصحیح متن؛ چون زندگی نامه‌ی افراد، اوضاع آن زمان و نیز درباره‌ی سیر علایق دول عثمانی و ایران در آن زمان، ارائه شده است.

۱- قویوچی مراد پاشا و جلالیان

ایشان اهل دوشیرمه کرووات^۱ بود و در اندرون آموزش دیده است. مراد پاشا قبل از اینکه به منصب صدراعظمی منصوب شود، در ایلات و سنجاق‌های گوناگون دولت عثمانی به شغل مدیریت اشتغال داشت. وی طی سال ۱۵۷۶ م بیگلربیگی یمن بود. در سال ۱۵۸۵ م بیگ قرامان بود و اثنای جنگ تبریز با فرو رفتن پای اسبش در یک گودال، زمین افتاد و اسیر ایرانیان شد. سال ۱۵۹۰ م به علت صلح دولت عثمانی با دولت ایران به استانبول بازگشت و به بیگلربیگی قبرس منصوب شد. سال ۱۵۹۵ م. در حالی که بیگلربیگی دیاربکر بود در سفر اتریش شرکت کرد.^۲ در طول سفر اتریش در سال‌های متمادی وی در جبهه مجارستان

1. Cengiz Orhonlu ,Kuyucu Murat Paşa,İA, VIII (İstanbul,1993 s 651 ,İsmail Hakki Uzunçarşılı,Osmanlı Tarihi,III,KısımI,Ankara ,1988) s.363.

2. idib.



D3632

(111631)
Kuyucu Murad Paşa

نامه قویوچی مرادپاشا به شاه ایران^۱

محمد گنای^۲

ارتان گوکمن^۳

مترجمان^۴: اسری دوغان،^۵ مهری آریانفر^۶

1. Mehmet Günay Kuyucu Murat Paşa'nın İran Şahı'na gönderdiği Mektup, Ertan Gökmen, (Akademi Araştırmalar Dergisi, Yıl 10 sayı 38 2008 Ankara), s 99-124.

۲. استادیار دانشگاه جلال یایار دانشکده علوم انسانی، عضو هیئت تاریخ.

۳. استادیار دانشگاه جلال یایار دانشکده علوم انسانی، عضو هیئت تاریخ.

۴. خوانندگان عزیز در نظر داشته باشند که این سند، سند تاریخی ارزشمندی است به زبان ترکی قدیم استانبولی که خود به یک متخصص زبان ترکی عثمانی قدیم با اطلاعات افزون تاریخی، نیازمند است. حال آنکه مترجمان حاضر (اسری دوغان و مهری آریانفر) هر دو طلاب تاریخ هستند؛ لکن متخصصان آن متن نیستند. ابتدا هدف تحویل یک اثر تاریخی به پژوهندگان و علاقمندان به تاریخ بود. پس سعی شد جهت حفظ شکل سند؛ لغات فارسی قدیم عیناً نوشته شود. لذا برخی جملات طولانی و گاه نامفهوم هستند. اگر چه یکی از مشخصات اسناد و کتب قدیم ترکی استانبولی، طولانی بودن جملات آنهاست که مترجم را با دشواری روبرو می‌کند؛ چنان‌که مترجم برای ترجمه نیازمند روشن کردن جمله و کوتاه‌تر کردن آن است. این مسأله، موضوعی بغرنج در جمله سازی است، بنابراین هر اشتباه یا نقص جمله ناشی از این مورد می‌باشد.

نکته ی دوم اینکه، به دلخواه مترجمان، قسمت آخر توضیحات نویسندگان مقاله، تحت عنوان «محتوای نامه» پس از متن نامه قید و سپس متن نتیجه‌گیری اضافه شده است. پاراگراف با عنوان مدخل نیز تلخیصی از یک قسمت مقاله است که برای روشن‌تر شدن مقاله ترجمه و با این عنوان قید شده است.

و اما، این اثر اولین ترجمه و راهنما از سندی ارزشمند است و اثری پیشرو محسوب می‌شود. راه دوباره بازبینی این اثر باز است و انتقاد منتقدان بزرگوار، کمکی بزرگ در راستای تاریخ و مترجمان این اثر می‌باشد.

۵. دانشجوی دکتری تاریخ تمدن دانشگاه تهران.

۶. فارغ‌التحصیل گرایش آسیای مرکزی و قفقاز دانشگاه تهران.