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Introduction

Mu’in al-Din Ashraf Sharifi Shirazi (d. 1587), better known as Mirza Makhdum, enjoyed a rather short bureaucratic career in Safavid Iran in the 1570s. The few accomplishments of his most successful years he owed to Shah Tahmasp’s (r. 1524–76) son and successor Isma’îl II (r. 1576–77), under whom Mirza Makhdum was elevated from royal tutor to court astrologer to sadr, or head of religious affairs and endowments. These were positions that gave him a free hand in planning and executing, with approval and backing from the Safavid ruler, a series of pro-Sunni policies. Yet in the weeks leading up to Isma’îl II’s assassination
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(13 Ramadan 985/24 November 1577), when tensions at court flared into factional squabbles, Mirza Makhdum fell from favor and was imprisoned. On the eve of Muhammad Khudabanda’s (r. 1578–87) accession to the throne in Qazvin (3 Dhu l-hijja 985/21 February 1578), he was set free from prison and shortly afterwards fled for his life to the Ottoman Empire.1

In exile, Mirza Makhdum abandoned Twelver Shiism and started a new career as a Sunni judge. In the meantime, during his brief stays in Istanbul awaiting job renewal, he entered the entourage of Murad III (r. 1574–95) and tried to curry favor with a number of Ottoman court officials. These included the queen mother (vâlide sultan) Afîfe Nûr Banû (d. 1583), the şeyhûislâm, or head of the ilmiye (professorial/judicial sector of the Ottoman bureaucracy), Çivizade Muhyiddin Mehmed Efendi (d. 1587), and, more importantly, the influential royal tutor (hâc{-i sultanî) and Çivizade’s successor, Hoca Sâdeddin Efendi (d. 1599). The support and patronage provided by these officials helped Mirza Makhdum secure employment in the ilmiye. After about a decade of serving short rotational judicial postings in Diyarbakır, Bilad al-Sham, and Baghdad, he quit his ilmiye job in the mid-1580s to assume the post of nakibûl-êşraf, or head of the sayyid (descendants of the prophet) notables, in Mecca. This position put him under the patronage of the local ruler of Mecca Sharif Hasan (d. 1601), the father-in-law of his only daughter. Mirza Makhdum died in Mecca, aged forty-eight, in the late fall of 1587.2


2 For brief accounts of Mirza Makhdum’s life and career, see Muhammad Qazvini, “Sharh-i
The centralization of the *ilmîye* shaped the development of Mirza Makhdum’s career in the Ottoman Empire. The centralizing process, which gained momentum by the end of the century precipitating institutionalization of the culture of nepotism and cronyism prevalent among *uлема*, entailed the introduction of rotation system, a practice in full development around the time Mirza Makhdum landed employment as a judge. The rotation system was a dilatory mechanism intended to shorten tenures of early career judges and professors so that only a small fraction of them could reach to the top. Particularly, it was detrimental for those *ilmîye* recruits without close family or pupillage ties to high-ranking, Istanbul-based judges and professors, making their professional advancement slow-paced and eventually horizontal. So far as Mirza Makhdum is concerned, his early appointment to judge, however remarkable a feat it may seem for a non-native *ilmîye* employee at first glance, never evolved into a promising, tenured career enabling him to go up on the rungs of the *ilmîye* ladder beyond the rank of provincial judge. With a closed caste of learned aristocrats and the extended networks of their interconnected families, pupils, and cronies in Istanbul and beyond in control of the *ilmîye*, steady upward mobility for rootless scholars and bureaucrats such as Mirza Makhdum was no longer easily achievable.

In this present article, I examine Mirza Makhdum’s life and career with emphasis being placed on his years in service of the *ilmîye*, a milieu that was open on the one hand, but maintained ideological and institutional limitations on the other. I take the horizontality of his career as a lens through which to explore nuances and complexities of professional advancement among the Iranian recruits of the Ottoman bureaucracy during the 16th century.


Mirza Makhdom’s works are our main source of information on his life and career in Iran and abroad. Keen on casting himself as a productive Sunni scholar of unrivaled erudition and orthodoxy of faith, Mirza Makhdom wrote two volumes during his early years in the Ottoman Empire. Still unpublished, these two volumes are al-Nawqid li-bunyan al-rawafid and the hitherto unexplored Dhakhirat al-iqba fi dhamm al-dunya. While the former book is a harsh polemic against the ideological tenets of Twelver Shiism as practiced in Safavid Iran, the latter is a collected volume consisting of nine short scholarly essays on ethics and mysticism. It closes with an autobiographical chapter outlining Mirza Makhdom’s life, family background, education, travels, and career in Iran and the Ottoman Empire. Dedicated to Murad III and written at the end of an interval of temporary discharge from the ilmiye, the Dhakhirat al-iqba, despite what its title was originally meant to suggest (i.e. an asset for inducing God’s mercy in the afterlife), was in fact a direct plea for employment and upward mobility with the sultan. The epilogue to this volume clearly reflects the insecurity Mirza Makhdom felt in the extremely unpredictable ilmiye job market, where corruption in the form of institutionalized cronyism and nepotism soared amid an influx of new recruits from the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire. In any rate, both books, unusually for the genre, contain important, albeit fragmentary, historical tidbits that, if contextualized and placed in dialogue with other sources, could offer us a deeper understanding of events and trends in Safavid Iran as well as aspects of bureaucratic life in the Ottoman Empire during the closing quarter of the 16th century.


Preacher and Sadr in Safavid Iran

Born in the early part of 1540, Mirza Makhdum came of the Sharifi sayyids, a family of landed and learned notables based in Shiraz. When the Safavids rose to power, his paternal grandfather, Sharif al-Din ‘Ali, joined Shah Isma’i1l I (r. 1501–24) and helped the Safavids capture his native Shiraz from the Aqquyunlu Turkmens. As a reward for his collaboration with the Safavids, he held office as sadr twice, first between 1508–10 and then from 1512 until his murder on Ottomans’ hand during the Battle of Chaldiran in the summer of 1514. Mirza Makhdum’s mother was a granddaughter of Qazi Jahan Sayfi (d. 1553), scion of an influential family of Sunni notables in Qazvin with a long history of bureaucratic service datable back to the early years of the 14th century. Early in the reign of Tahmasp, Qazi Jahan was made a provincial vizier and posted to the shrine cities of Najaf and Karbala charged with supervising the dredging and revamping of two silted Ilkhanid-era irrigation canals diverted from the Euphrates, a project

6 On the date of his birth, see Mu’ in al-Din Ashraf Sharifi Shirazi, Dhakhirat al-‘uqba fi dhamm al-dunya (Ar. Ms. Nurussosmaniye Library 2328), 222b. Elsewhere, his birth is assigned to circa 1544, which is incorrect; see Stanfield, “Mirza Makhdum,” 32.

7 Ghiyath al-Din Kh’andamir, Tarikh-i habib al-siyyar fi akhbar-i afrad-i bashar, ed. Muhammad Dabir-Siyaqi, 4 vols. (Tehran: Kitabfurushi-i Khayyam, 1954): 4: 500, 534, and 547. Mirza Makhdum once refers to his paternal grandfather (Sharifi Shirazi, Dhakhirat, 222b), but is silent about his being killed by the Ottomans in 1514.

originally funded and initiated by the Aqquyunlu Uzun Hasan (r. 1452–78). Later on, Qazi Jahan was made grand vizier and remained in this post for more than a decade until shortly before his death in 1553. Early in the reign of Tahmasp, Mirza Makhdum’s father, Mir Sharif Shirazi, acted as kalantar, or ombudsman, in his native Shiraz. Subsequently, he was made judge, vizier, and grand vizier. The Sharifs had close ties to the Safavid royal family: one of Mirza Makhdum’s paternal uncles had married a sister of Tahmasp’s with whom he had a daughter.

Mirza Makhdum did his elementary and advanced studies in Shiraz and Kashan. In Shiraz, he studied the basics of Neo-Platonic philosophy, mathematics, and natural sciences with Mir Taqi al-Din Muhammad Farsi (fl. 1550), a locally prominent physician, astronomer, and mathematician. Mirza Makhdum’s paternal uncle, Mir Murtaza Sharifi (d. 1567), started him off on theology, hadith (study of prophetic traditions), and Arabic grammar and syntax. Later on, he went to Kashan to study Twelver Shiite jurisprudence (fiqh) with ‘Abd al-‘Ali Karaki (d. 1585), an émigré Arab scholar from Bilad al-Sham. Years later, writing from exile, Mirza Makhdum praised Karaki for his offering to take him under his wing in the face of growing hostility on the part of bigoted Shiite scholars and bureaucrats who suspected him of being a Sunni.

Towards the end of the reign of Tahmasp, Mirza Makhdum became a close protégé of Pari-Khan (Pari-Jan/Pari-Jahan?) Khanim (d. 1578), the oldest of the

13 Sharifi Shirazi, *Nawaqid*, 94b–95a. Expanding on his debates with Mirza Makhdum on the issue of imamate, Karaki is reported to have compiled a volume to prove ‘Ali’s right as Muhammad’s sole legitimate successor; see ‘Abd-Allah Afandi Isfahani, *Riyad al-‘ulama wa hiyad al-fidala’*, ed. Ahmad al-Husayni, 7 vols. (Qum: Kitabkhana-yi Ma’rashi, 1981–94), 3: 134. For more on Karaki, who at the time was widely considered the most learned of jurists in Safavid Iran, see Munshi Turkman, *’Alam-ara*, 154; trans., 244–45; Husayni Qumi, *Khulasat*, 773.
Safavid ruler’s daughters and one of the most influential members of the royal family in court politics in the years immediately preceding Isma’il II’s succession. In the winter of 976/1569, Pari-Khan Khanim helped Mirza Makhdum gain appointment to judge in Shiraz, but internal family feuds in his native Fars forced him to step down and return to Qazvin in the same year. Shortly afterwards, he started preaching in Qazvin and before long, achieved popularity and fame as a gifted preacher. In the spring of 984/1576, Pari-Khan Khanim asked Mirza Makhdum to officiate at Tahmasp’s funeral at a local Shiite shrine outside Qazvin.

Within a few weeks of his enthronement (27 Jumada I 984/1 September 1576), Isma’il II hired Mirza Makhdum as his tutor and then appointed him to court astrologer. The Safavid ruler is alleged to have been in the know, since the final years of his confinement at Qahqaha Castle in Qarajadagh, about Mirza Makhdum’s pro-Sunni inclinations. Yet the truth is that Mirza Makhdum’s success arose primarily from his closeness to the Safavid princess Pari-Khan, the real kingmaker, whose political maneuverings in the heat of the bloody clashes that broke out at court immediately after the death of Tahmasp, paved the way for Isma’il II’s ascent to the throne. Nine months after Isma’il II’s rise to the throne, on 26 Rabi’ I 985/23 June 1577, Mirza Makhdum was made sadr sharing this post with the incumbent military judge (qazi-i mu’askar) Mir ‘Inayat-Allah Mir-Miran (Shah-Shahani) Isfahani, who at the same time acted as naqib al-ashraf, or head of sayyid notables.

14 Sharifi Shirazi, Nawaqid, 99a; idem, Dhakhirat, 224b.
16 For his appointment to royal tutor and court astrologer, see Husayni Qumi, Khulasat, 663; cf. Jalal al-Din Muhammad Munajjim Yazdi, Tārikh-i ʿAbbasi, ed. Sayf-Allah Vahidnia (Tehran: Vahid, 1987), 34–35. On the claim that Isma’il II had long been in the known about Mirza Makhdum’s pro-Sunnism, see Sharifi Shirazi, Nawaqid, 79a, 117b.
17 Her close involvement in bloody skirmishes in Qazvin that broke out immediately after Tahmasp’s death is detailed in a letter she wrote to Isma’il II around the summer of 985/1577, when she fell from favor and put under house arrest; for which, see Jung (Pers. Ms. Majlis Library 2457), 88a–b.
18 Munshi Turkman, Alam-ara, 148–49, 207; trans., 237–38, 308. For the date of his appointment to sadr, see Husayni Qumi, Khulasat, 648. Mir ‘Inayat-Allah’s close relatives were affiliated with the Nurbakhshi Sufi order and Isma’il I put a group of them to the sword for supporting Muhammad Kurra, a Nurbakhshi claimant to Mahdship in Yazd. See Qasim Beg Hayati Tabrizi, Tārikh (Pers. Ms. National Library of Iran 15776), 187a; cf. Kioumars Ghereghlou, “Chronicling a Dynasty on the Make: New Light on the Early
During his tenure as sadr, Mirza Makhdum was instrumental in enforcing a ban on the practice of tabarra, or ritual cursing of a long list of notable Sunni caliph, imams, Sufis, poets, and religious scholars. He also pressed criminal charges against high-ranking Shiite clerics involved in the anti-Sunni excesses committed under Tahmasp. One of their victims was Mirza Makhdum’s own grandfather, Mir Sharaf Jahan Sayfi (d. 1561), an accomplished poet and literary scholar. When Tahmasp decided to transfer his capital from Tabriz to Qazvin, Mir Sharaf Jahan and his cousin Mir Yahya Sayfi (d. 1555), the renowned chronicler, came under persecution. They both were forced to leave their native Qazvin during the anti-Sunni pogrom that preceded immediately the relocation of the Safavid royal court from Tabriz to Qazvin: the former to rural suburbs of Sultaniyeh and the latter to Isfahan. More than two decades later, Mirza Makhdum retaliated. In his capacity as sadr, he brought to punishment Mir Hasan Karaki (d. 1593) and his cousin Ali, two of the most bigoted Shiite jurists under Tahmasp. As the result, both clerics were stripped of their privileges, one being put under house arrest and the other one being forced to flee for his life to Arab Iraq.

The ban on tabarra, the removal of the names of the Shiite imams from the face of newly minted coins, and the disbursement of generous amounts of cash among Sunni worthies of Qazvin and Shiraz occasioned a series of anti-Sunni mob outbreaks in Qazvin. It is reported that Amir Khan Mawsillu, an influential Turkmen warlord and the Safavid ruler’s maternal uncle, who at the time held office as the shah’s deputy (vakil), was behind the riots that erupted in Qazvin in 1577. As the pressures mounted on Isma’il II, he caved in and began to make a series of concessions. First and foremost, he dismissed Mirza Makhdum and shortly thereafter ordered his arrest and imprisonment.


21 Mirza Beg Junabadi, Rawzat al-Safawīyya, ed. Ghulam Riza Tabataba’i-Majd (Tehran: Bunyad-i mawqafat-i Afshar, 1999), 546, 586; Asaf Khan Qazvini and Ahmad Tatavi,
In the chaos that ensued following the assassination of Isma’îl II, Pari-Khan Khanîm intervened to let Mirzâ Makhdêm out of Istakhîr Castle in Fars, where he spent his prison time. He soon returned to Qazvîn, but in the winter of 1578, a group of religious zealots, whom Mirzâ Makhdêm believed to have been paid by the newly appointed grand vizier Mirzâ Salman Jabîr Isfahânî (d. 1583), stormed his house. The attackers destroyed his library and murdered a paternal cousin of his. Following this incident, Mirzâ Makhdêm left Qazvîn for Shahr-i Zur in Arab Iraq and eventually made it to Diyarbakîr, where he put himself under Ottoman protection.  

Opinions on the Iranian Recruits of the Ottoman Bureaucracy

New arrivals from Iran in the Ottoman emerge in secondary literature as a group of elite bureaucrats distinguished for their smooth integration and remarkable success in attaining quick visibility and decisive upward mobility in the receiving society. While this might have been the case for a select group of late 15th- and early 16th-century Iranian recruits of the Ottoman bureaucracy, by the end of the 16th century finding employment and then settling into a career promising professional advancement was by no means an easy task for émigré bureaucrats and scholars from Iran. If, in the early years of the 16th century, fluency in scribal prose skills and basics of Sunni scholarship was assumed enough to open doors for professional success in the Ottoman Empire, by the time Mirzâ Makhdêm made it there, job market in the ilmiye and kalemiye sectors had become extremely tight and fiercely competitive.

Fears of foreign elements’ taking advantage of opportunities and resources in the Ottoman bureaucracy constituted the background against which Mirzâ

---


22 Sharîfi Shirazi, Navaqid, 5b–6a, 144b. See also Hasan Burini, Tarajim al-a’yan min abna’ al-zaman, ed. Salah al-Din al-Munjid, 2 vols. (Damascus: Majma’ al-‘îlmi al-‘arabi, 1959-63), 2: 53. At the time a certain Mahmud Pasha was reportedly governor of Shahr-i Zur; see Nev’izâde Atâî, Hada’iq al-haqa’iq fi takmilat al-shaqa’iq, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan (İstanbul: Çağrî Yayınları, 1989), 299.

Makhdum started his employment in the ilmiye. These fears found their expression in the nasihat-nâme literature, which, within the temporal scope of the latter part of the 16th century, focused on the political pathology of the bureaucratic stasis and decline that engulfed the Ottoman Empire under Kanuni Sultan Süleyman’s (r. 1520–66) immediate successors.24 Officials in charge of bureaucracy were target of veiled but harsh attacks. They were chided for their dispensing with merit-based vetting and recruitment of bureaucratic staff, a move that, according to late 16th- and early 17th-century nasihat-nâme writers, had resulted in an unprecedented increase in the number of social climbers without education and proper background employed by the Ottoman bureaucracy.25

The most outspoken of this cohort of late 16th- and early 17th-century political commentators was Gelibolu Mustafa Âli (d. 1600), the celebrated bureaucrat and chronicler. Writing diagnostically about the internal crises eroding the foundations of the Ottoman sultanate at the turn of the 16th century, he singled out outsiders for the weakening of the empire’s central authority. Âli railed against those “unqualified” and “inexperienced” (acemi) outsiders (ecnebi) who


had taken over positions of political trust and administrative privilege. In particular, he despised new hires from Iran and eastern Anatolia, whom he lumped together as “a bunch of ne’er-do-wells” (her ne kadar nekbet). Áli held the view that the Iranian aspirants for bureaucratic career lines had been provided with gainful employment and easy promotion in the Ottoman Empire so that native medrese-trained bureaucrats of Áli’s ilk could be easily thwarted in their quest and ambition for upward mobility. Áli warned that:

Those who come from the outside have to be honored to the extent that they would not regret having come and be sorry, and as to appointments to offices and positions that much obligingness should be shown that they would not die of joy because it were more than they can digest.

In the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire, too, scholars and bureaucrats from Iran were often treated with suspicion and contempt in the ilmiye and kalemiye milieus. In Bilad al-Sham, where Mirza Makhdum spent an important part of his tenure as a judge, Arab jurists and hadith scholars looked down at their “eastern,” i.e. Iranian and east Anatolian, counterparts, branding them as mere dabblers in Islamic scholarship, if not opportunist charlatans. This stemmed mainly from the fact that the Iranian recruits of the ilmiye rarely had proper education and background in fiqh and hadith, the two fields of academic expertise that in the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire had long been recognized as definitive prerequisites for any appointment and promotion not only in the judiciary, but also in professorial positions. From dozens biographical entries given in the works of late 16th- and early 17th-century local historians of Aleppo and Damascus, it can be argued that only a small fraction of the Iranian employees of the ilmiye posted by the Ottomans to Bilad al-Sham had proper education in fiqh and

28 Áli, Counsel, 1: 63.
hadith. It was under these circumstances that several Aleppo- and Damascus-based Iranian scholars and bureaucrats achieved notoriety as Twelver Shiite turncoats embezzling public funds and tax revenues. These trends and events informed Mirza Makhdum’s unrelenting efforts to picture himself as an established scholar of fiqh and hadith. Not surprisingly, much of his autobiographical writings pivot on careerist themes such as academic excellence and noble descent.

The Art and Pitfalls of Self-Promotion

After Mirza Makhdum’s arrival in Diyarbakir, local authorities, nonplussed by the escape of such a high-ranking bureaucrat and scholar from Safavid Iran, detained and interviewed him. His own account of the early weeks of his presence in the Ottoman Empire is laconic and garbled, but from his fragmentary comments, it is obvious that his arrival had aroused immediate interest among the Ottoman authorities in Istanbul. Murad III’s mentor, Hoca Sâdeddin, who hailed from immigrant parents from Safavid Iran, intervened and ordered local authorities in Diyarbakir to make Mirza Makhdum compose a detailed account of his life and career as well as the circumstances under which he had escaped to the Ottoman Empire. The result was al-Yusr ba’d al-’Usr (The Comfort after the Misery), a short autobiographical treatise dedicated to Hoca Sâdeddin, which is yet to be found.

Drafted in the early 1580s, i.e. approximately three years after his escape from Iran, the epilogue to Mirza Makhdum’s Dhahirat al-‘uqba is in fact an updated version of his vita, previously filed in the form of the treatise al-Yusr ba’d al-’Usr with the Ottoman authorities in Diyarbakir and Istanbul. This epilogue focuses on not only Mirza Makhdum’s life and career but also on his ancestry. His ancestors claimed descent from the Prophet Muhammad through blood relatives of the famous Timurid-era Sunni scholar Mir Sharif al-Din ‘Ali b. Muhammad Jurjani (d. 1413). Jurjani, in turn, traced his ancestry back to the medieval Zaydi ruler of Mazandaran, Abu Muhammad Hasan b. Qasim (d.

31 Sharifi Shirazi, Nawaqid, 5a, 112a–b, 175a.
915–28), also known as Da‘i al-Saghir. There are references in Mirza Makh
dum’s account to several high-profile marriages, all intended to build up his
claim to noble descent as a sayyid and a sharif. On the patrilineal side of his
family, an ancestor of his is said to have married daughter of a Ma‘rashi ruler
of Mazandaran. Mirza Makhdum’s other ancestor is reported to have wed a
daughter of the storied Ilkhanid-era bureaucrat and polymath, Rashid al-Din
Fazl-Allah Hamadani (d. 1318). The last Sarbadarid ruler of Khurasan, Kh‘aja
‘Ali Mu‘ayyad (d. 1386), is also listed among his ancestors on the matrilineal
side of the family. In later generations, Mirza Makhdum mentions Mir ‘Abd
al-Baqi Kirmani (d. 1514), who under Isma‘il I held office as grand vizier and
vakil while presiding over the Ni‘mat-Allahi Sufi order, and Mir Fakhr al-Din
Dashtaki, who came from a prominent Shiraz-based family of sayyid notables,
as two of his great-grandparents.32 Mirza Makhdum’s mention of the Dashtakis
among his blood relatives is important as in the latter part of the 16th century
the Dashtaki grandees were of good reputation among the ilmiye elites in the
Ottoman Empire as promoters of Sunni scholarship in the fields of dialectic
theology and Neo-Platonic philosophy in Safavid Iran. Relatedly, as we shall
see later in this article, during Mirza Makhdum’s years in the Ottoman Empire
a number of Ghiyas al-Din Mansur Dashaki’s (d. 1541) pupils held well-paid
professorial positions in Istanbul, Diyarbakir, and Damascus.

In his biographical writings, Mirza Makhdum emphasizes exceedingly his
sayyid background. By doing so, he sought to establish his entitlement to the
same privileges the educated sayyids benefited from in the Ottoman Empire. In
those years, the sayyid recruits of the ilmiye were granted occasional cash gifts
and tax exemptions. Even in case of committing felony, they were brought to
special courts presided over by nakib-ul-‘esrāf; one of their own.33 Accordingly,
during the years Mirza Makhdum worked for the ilmiye there had been an un-
precedented increase in the number of müteseyyids, or false claimants to sayyid
status.34 In his polemical writings, Mirza Makhdum admits encountering several

32 Sharifi Shirazi, Dhakhirat, 220a; idem, Nawaqid, 170b, 191a. ‘Abd al-Baqi Kirmani is cited
here as maternal grandfather of Mirza Makhdum’s father.
33 İsmail H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlının Devletinin İlimiye Teşkilâtı (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu,
1965), 164, 167–68.
34 See Hülya Canbakal, “The Ottoman State and Descendants of the Prophet in Anatolia and
the Balkans (c. 1500-1700),” Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient, 52, no.
müteseyyid impostors of acemi background in the Ottoman Empire. He warned his readers in the Ottoman Empire that even the Tabataba’i “sayyid” households, who largely lived in Iran and Arab Iraq and claimed uninterrupted descent from the prophet on both patrilineal and matrilineal sides of their families, were in fact a bunch of thieving and swindler commoners. By pushing their false claims to sayyidship, Mirza Makhdum states, the Tabataba’is had managed to dupe the Ottoman authorities in Baghdad and the shrine cities of Najaf and Karbala into providing them with a steady stream of cash gifts and tax immunities. He then added that many claimants to sayyidship in Iran were in fact descendants of the medieval prostitutes and concubines impregnated by Arab drifters and tricksters who had managed to deceive Persians into venerating them as true descendants of the prophet. Skepticism of claimants to sayyid descent was widespread in 16th century Iran. It bears noting here that early in the 16th-century, when the Sunni Uzbeks brought Khurasan under their control, Muhammad Khan Shibani (d. 1510) urged his bureaucratic underlings in Herat and Mashhad to systematically investigate the pedigree of all “sayyid” families and purge müteseyyids so that they could not strain the new regime’s financial resources to the limit. Under Shah Tahmasp, the Nurbakhshis of Rayy and Tehran and the Musha’sha’is of Huvayzah, who ranked among major families of landed notables in Safavid Iran, were widely known to have been false claimants to sayyidship.

In the Ottoman Empire, the imperial nakibül-şiraf was charged with implementing systematic surveillance of claims to sayyid status based on registers


36 Sharifi Shirazi, Nawaqid, 111b.

37 This is based on an unpublished nishan, or official appointment letter, dated 22 Rabi’ II 913/10 September 1507 and issued by Muhammad Khan Shibani (d. 1510) in the name of Mir Nizam al-Din Abd al-Qadir Mashhadi, the Uzbek judge in Tus. The contents of this nishan suggest a rise in the number of false claims to sayyid status in Khurasan during the interregnum that ensued following the death of Sultan Husayn Bayqara in the spring of 1506; see Muhammad Sharifi Nasafi, Safina (Pers. Ms. National Library of Iran 1194423), 147b–149b; cf. Kioumars Ghereghlou, “Muhammad Khan Shibani in Tus (915/1509),” Manuscripta Orientalia 22, no. 2 (2016): 56–57.

38 Kami Qazvini, Nafa’is, 329.
of imperial deeds.\textsuperscript{39} Understandably, Mirza Makhdom's interest in the post of nakibü'l-eşraf in Istanbul and Bilad al-Sham, a honorary position at the time normally assigned to low-ranking bureaucrats of sayyid ancestry,\textsuperscript{40} helped him define and promote his profile as a true descendant of the prophet. To be considered a true sayyid in the Ottoman Empire, one had to provide the office of incumbent nakibü'l-eşraf with the certificate issued by former nakibü'l-eşraf or an affidavit signed and sealed by a group of local notables who personally knew and could confirm the sayyid background of the claimant’s family on patrilineal side. If the name of claimant’s any other patrilineal relations had already been recorded in official registers as sayyid then these two conditions were waived, and he could automatically be granted the sayyid status.\textsuperscript{41}

In Safavid Iran, it was widely known that, irrespective of their country of origin, the Sunni worthies of sayyid descent enjoyed elite status in the Ottoman Empire and benefited from the Ottoman authorities’ generous patronage. The Sunni poet and scholar Kamal al-Din Husayn Abivardi (fl. 1492), who visited Istanbul and provincial centers of the Ottoman Empire under Bayezid II (1481–1512), praised the Ottomans for their unwavering support of émigré Sunni scholars, especially those descended from the prophet Muhammad. For instance, he brings up a certain Ahmed Paşa, “a native of Hormuz” possibly of sayyid descent with a history of bureaucratic service in India, who under Bayezid II was ranked among bureaucratic elites in Tokat and Amasya.\textsuperscript{42} Interestingly, later Persian writers took up the same roseate view of the Ottoman patronage of sayyids and Sunni ulama.


\textsuperscript{40} Uzunçarşılı, \textit{Ilmiye Teşkilâtı}, 166.


\textsuperscript{42} Kamal al-Din Husayn Abivardi, “Du athar az Husayn Abivardi: Char-takht wa Anis al-‘Ashiqin (ed. Irj Afshar),” Farhang-i Iran Zamin 15 (1968): 12–13. Abivardi is reticent about Ahmed Paşa’s background. Yet his reference to Hormuz on the one hand, and that the renowned late 16th-century Ottoman chronicler and jurist Cenâbî Mustafa Efendi (d. 1590) came from an Amasya-based family of sayyid bureaucrats originally from southern Iran (from Ganava or Janaba, a small port town on the Persian Gulf coast some 250 miles west of Shiraz) on the other, can be taken to suggest that the person whose professional success in the Ottoman Empire is highlighted in Abivardi’s account was in fact a Cenâbî sayyid. Cenâbî has given the name of his paternal grandfather as Ahmad. On Cenâbî’s life and work, see Mehmet Canatar, “Mustafa Cenâbî,” \textit{Osmanlı Tarihçileri}, ed. Cemal Kafadar,
Writing from the Deccan in the early 1560s, an Iranian chronicler of Isma‘ili background praised the Ottomans for their support of Sunni scholars and descendants of the prophet, claiming that they awarded all sayyid notables with cash gifts and generous stipends. In the same vein, the Herat-based chronicler Ghiyas al-Din Kh’andamir (d. 1535) represented the Ottoman bureaucracy as a milieu rich in opportunities of professional success and material gain for Sunni scholars in general and those with sayyid descent in particular. Focusing on the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire and playing his topographical knowledge into a scenario of anti-Safavid political double-entendre, Kh’andamir described Aleppo as the site of “a spring the water of which is known to heal those bitten at by rabid dogs in less than forty days.” He also called Damascus “one of the four paradises on earth,” where Sunni Muslims could attain “wealth and prosperity.” Likewise, Mirza Makhdum admired the Ottomans for their unswerving support of scholars and bureaucrats putting them in stark contrast with the Safavids, who, according to him, never cared about the well-being of religious scholars and learned notables. He believed that the privation and maltreatment suffered by scholars and learned notables under the Safavids was a clear sign that the downfall of the Safavid regime of tyranny and injustice in Iran is impending.

During Mirza Makhdum’s time in the ilmiye, a handful of müteseyyids of Iranian background risen up to the rank of vizier in the Ottoman Empire. Evidence for this comes from Áli’s Kühbül-abbâr, who singles out two impostors. One of them became court registrar in 1589 under the patronage of the Ottoman grand vizier Farhad Pasha, a position that put him in charge of tutoring a group ofdevşirme recruits. Áli adds that before landing a job with the Ottoman bureaucracy, this Iranian müteseyyid made his living as a cook and itinerant storyteller, or kissa-hân, in eastern Anatolia. He started his career in Mardin as a çavuş, or military adjutant. This post brought him enough cash to purchase a shop in the local bazaar and help his relatives move from Iran to the Ottoman Empire, where they were to live a prosperous life under the patronage of high-ranking court bureaucrats.
Another Iranian müteseyyid, whose name Āli omits, held office as vizier of Egypt, a job Āli deemed suitable only for the experienced Ottoman bureaucrats, thanks to the Ottoman authorities’ ineptitude and lack of professionalism. According to Āli, while Selim I and Süleyman recruited talents such as Idris Bitlisi (d. 1520) and Muslim al-Din Lari (d. 1572), under their successors, the high standards of bureaucratic erudition and scholarly excellence were readily flouted. As the result, “every Iranian, Arab, Kurd, and Daylamí villager … and cook” including those of dubious sayyid descent was able to occupy gainful and important positions of provincial vizier and registrar (defterdar).46

The non-native sayyid recruits of the Ottoman bureaucracy, broadly speaking, faced mistrust and suspicion among their peers. For instance, Ahmad Sa’idi (d. 1559), a Sunni jurist and high-ranking Naqshbandi Sufi from Qazvin who was not a sayyid but claimed descent from Sa’id b. Zayd, a companion of the prophet Muhammad, is reported to have been interviewed regarding his noble lineage by the Ottoman registrar of Aleppo Iskender Paşa.47 Similarly, it was de rigueur for Muhammad Husayni (d. 1555), scion of a family of notable sayyids in Tabriz who had been posted as a Shafi‘i judge to Aleppo in 1543, to prove, based on evidence from genealogical, or ansab, manuals, the truth of his sayyid descent for a group of Aleppine learned notables.48 Likewise, Mirza Makhdum faced widespread suspicion regarding his claim to sayyid descent. This seems to have been the case particularly in the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire. From a Palestinian chronicler, who knew Mirza Makhdum in person, we know that during his time in Bilad al-Sham and the Hijaz, he had the names of all his ancestors embroidered in white and gold all over his black turban. This way his peers in those parts of the Ottoman Empire could know of his noble descent without further ado.49

That Mirza Makhdum’s family and relatives had close ties to the Safavids had the potential to tarnish his hardly won reputation as a trustworthy Sunni fugitive in the Ottoman Empire. In the sixteenth century, some fugitives from Iran were

47 Radi al-Din Muhammad b. Ibrahim Halabi also known as Ibn al-Hanbali, Durr al-habab fi ta‘rikh a’yan Halab, ed. Muhammad H. Fakhuri and Yahya Z. ‘Abbara, 2 vols. in 4 (Damascus: Wizarat al-irshad wa l-thaqafa, 1972–74), 1, pt. 1: 275. Sa‘id b. Zayd was one of the ten companions of the prophet who had had been promised paradise (al-‘asharat al-mubahshira) in the Qur’an.
49 Burini, Tarajim al-a‘yan, 2: 56.
either marginalized or mistreated in the Ottoman Empire given their family’s alleged involvement in supporting the Safavids. A case in point is Zahir al-Din Ardabili, a Shafi’i Sunni scholar and bureaucrat from Ardabil, who after being first employed by the ilmiye as a college lecturer on a daily stipend of eighty akçes, was elevated, early in the 1520s, to vizier of Cairo under Hain Ahmed Paşa (d. 1529), Süleyman’s pick as governor of Egypt. When Ahmed Paşa’s revolt in Egypt was quelled, the Ottoman authorities accused Ardabili, whose family in Iran affiliated with the Safaviyya Sufi order, of plotting to put Ahmed Paşa in contact with Shah Isma’il. Ardabili was beheaded early in March 1530 as a Safavid agent and propagandist.50 Another Iranian fugitive, whose family’s pro-Safavid tendencies seems to have worked against him in the Ottoman Empire, was ʿAbd al-Rahim Amidi (d. 1556). A Khalvati Sufi and bureaucrat from Diyarbakır, Amidi came from a family of local bureaucrats and his father, ʿAbd al-Karim, held office as provincial vizier under Shah Isma’il. Yet, shortly thereafter, he fell from favor and was executed. Amidi, the son, escaped from Safavid Iran on the eve of the Ottoman annexation of Bilad al-Sham and ended up in Aleppo. The Ottomans never employed Amidi notwithstanding his background as the son of a locally prominent bureaucrat in Diyarbakır. Instead, he started a small business as a silk and fabrics merchant in Aleppo, where he at the same time acted as head of the Khalvatiyya cloister.51

There is little in Mirza Makhdum’s autobiographical writings to reveal his family’s close links to the Safavid regime. He is vague in his description of his paternal grandfather, Sharif al-Din ʿAli’s bureaucratic service under the Safavids. He only reminds his readers that while Sharif al-Din ʿAli was always unwilling to work for the Safavids “the sword and coercion” finally forced him to cooperate. Mirza Makhdum then prays to God that his services to the Ottoman throne may absolve the sins his grandfather might have committed under the Safavids.52 Elsewhere, Mirza Makhdum points to his success in prevailing on Isma’il II to massacre all his brothers and cousins, representing his role in this incident as a redress for his forefathers’ wrongdoings under the Safavids. He further tells us that


51 Ibn al-Hanbal, Durr al-habab, 1, pt. 2: 774–76.

52 Sharifi Shirazi, Dakhirat, 217b; cf. idem, Nawaqid, 170b.
he had authorized these murders based on the victims’ being born out of short-term marriage (nikah al-mut'a), a Twelver Shiite practice, which for mainstream Sunni jurists was (and is) tantamount to adultery.\(^{53}\)

Instead, Mirza Makhdum cast his relations and grandparents as victims of Safavid oppression knowing that this might make his Ottoman patrons readily sympathize with him. Contextualizing Mirza Makhdum’s emphasis on the “hardships” his relatives suffered under the Safavids was the Ottoman authorities’ tendency to provide special help and support for those Sunni immigrants whose opposition to the Safavids had been proven beyond any doubt. There is evidence to suggest that in the 16th century, the Ottoman officials suspected of the true motives of the “Sunni” fugitives from Safavid Iran. In the mid-16th century, when Burhan-'Ali Sultan, a descendant of Sunni rulers of Sharvan, wrote to the Ottoman authorities in Istanbul to ask for their assistance against the Safavids, Kanuni Sultan Süleyman urged his underlings to make sure whether these anti-Safavid rebels are firm in their Sunnism before offering them any cash and logistic support.\(^{54}\) Relatedly, spying for the Safavids was another concern that made Ottoman authorities mistrust immigrants and fugitives from Safavid Iran. For instance, Ali warned Ottoman authorities that should they deem the hiring of new arrivals from Iran necessary, “the offices granted to them should be on the very opposite side in relation to the border they have quitted so that for some time they may not exchange news with their people.”\(^{55}\)

Mirza Makhdum omits his grandfather Sharif al-Din ‘Ali’s involvement in anti-Sunni politics in early Safavid Iran. Sharaf al-Din ‘Ali is cited in contemporary sources as a relentless harasser of Sunni Muslims under Isma’il I. An early 16th-century Istanbul-based Sunni physician and tazkira writer from Qazvin noted that Sharif al-Din ‘Ali’s violent death, which took place in the Battle of Chaldiran, was a divine punishment for his crimes against Sunni Muslims in Iran.\(^{56}\) Further misleading his readers, Mirza Makhum writes of his father, Sayyid

\(^{53}\) Sharifi Shirazi, Nawaqid, 107a.


\(^{55}\) Ali, Counsel, 1: 62.

Sharif, as a distinguished and respected Sunni scholar. Nonetheless, there is evidence that he was regarded by his contemporaries more as a second-rate poet than a religious scholar. The Safavid prince Sam Mirza (d. 1567), who knew Mirza Makhdum’s father in person, points with a hint of sarcasm to his lack of expertise in “the sciences passed on to him by his ancestors,” attributing it to his quest for administrative power and material gain in the Safavid bureaucracy. Even after becoming grand vizier, Mirza Makhdum’s father was still notorious for his crave for power and wealth, which led him to mastermind a series of court intrigues to ruin the lives and careers of his rivals and detractors. Even on his deathbed, he is reported to have been plotting against his enemies at court.

What is more, Mirza Makhdum tries to confuse and obfuscate his Ottoman readers regarding his father’s zealotry as a Twelver Shiite. This is important, as by Mirza Makhdum’s own testimony, we know that Sayyid Sharif was so firm in his devotion to Shiite imams that after his death, Tahmasp ordered the deceased vizier’s widow and brother, Mir Murtaza, to bury his remains inside the shrine of imam Husayn in Karbala. Mirza Makhdum’s account of this incident, as laid out in Dhakhirat al-‘uqba, is rather vague. He just tells that he had once travelled to Karbala “charged by the shah with transferring the remains of the man who had shouldered the weight of his vizierate.” A similar tendency to hide and distort facts regarding his family’s beliefs and actions under the Safavids is also detectable in Mirza Makhudm’s account of his paternal uncle Mir Murtaza’s life and career, whom he portrays as a respected Sunni jurist victimized as a result of anti-Sunni persecution in Safavid Iran. Yet the fact is that Mir Murtaza held office as sadr in Khurasan taking over this post from the Lebanese émigré Shiite jurist, Husayn b. ‘Abd al-Samad Harithi (d. 1576) in circa 1553. Later on, Mir Murtaza was appointed to military judge by Tahmasp. He remained close to the Safavids thereafter and was posted to Fars as a judge towards the end of his life. Mirza Makhdum’s account contains none of these details.

57 Sam Mirza Safavi, Tazkira-yi tuhfa-yi Sami, ed. Muhammad Hasan Vahid-Dastgirdi (Tehran: Armaghan, 1936), 29: Mir Sharif al-Din ‘Ali “strives hard in studying the sciences passed on to him by his forefathers; yet he finds no time to focus on his studies as without him the administrative affairs of a major provincial capital like Shiraz can never be put in order.”

58 Husayni Qumi, Khulasat, 455–56.

59 Sharifi Shirazi, Dhakhirat, 223b.

As to his own education, Mirza Makhdum plays up his studies with some of the most distinguished Sunni scholars and jurists in Safavid Iran and the Ottoman world. Ghiyas al-Din Mansur Dashtaki, a renowned professor and scholar of Neo-Platonic philosophy, Islamic ethics, and mathematics in Safavid Iran, emerges as a main figure in Mirza Makhdum’s educational pedigree. The inclusion of Dashtaki’s name in Mirza Makhdum’s vita was intended to impress his Ottoman superiors. Eminent among Dashtaki’s former pupils recruited by the ilmiyye was Muslih al-Din Lari, who had a stint of service in Mughal India, where he worked as emperor Humayun’s (r. 1530–40, 1555–56) private tutor. After his arrival in the Ottoman Empire from India, Lari was primarily made a professor at the Hüsrev Paşa College in Diyarbakir. He soon risen up the ranks thanks mainly to the grand vizier Rustam Paşa’s (d. 1561) support, taking over a highly-paid teaching post in Istanbul as professor at one of the eight imperial colleges, or sahn-i semâl. Later on, Lari was appointed to professor and superintendent of religious endowments, or awqaf, in Damascus.\(^{61}\) Another scholar with close pupillage ties to Dashtaki who ended up in the Ottoman Empire was Abu Sa‘id Kuzakunani (d. 1572), whose family in Iran led the Naqshbandi Sufi order in Azerbaijan and Kurdistan at the close of the 15th century. Forced to leave Iran in the early 1540s, Kuzakunani was eventually elevated to professor at one of the eight imperial colleges in Istanbul on a daily stipend of one hundred akçes. During his years in Istanbul, Kuzakunani ranked among Kanuni Sultan Süleyman’s boon companions.\(^{62}\)

---


Mirza Makhdum's autobiographical writings contain several references to his studies in the Ottoman Empire. In 1566–67, he claims, he had studied parts of the Six Compendiums of Sunni *hadith* with the Mecca-based Egyptian jurist and *hadith* expert Shihāb al-Dīn Abū l-ʿAbbas al-Ḥayṭami (d. 1566), also known as Ibn Hajar. A bigoted enemy of Twelver Shiites Muslims, Ibn Hajar owed his fame almost exclusively to having written, in 1543, an anti-Shiite polemic. Mirza Makhdum tells us that Ibn Hajar had issued a certificate of transmission, or *ijāza*, in his name, but it was destroyed together with his books shortly before his escape to the Ottoman Empire. There is also a terse reference in Mirza Makhdum's autobiographical writings to his being educated in the field of Sunni *fiqh* in Safavid Iran as part of a group of scholars studying “in underground circles” (*fī duwrayrat taḥt al-ʿard*). This was meant to imply his early conversion to Sunnism, which in turn can be taken to suggest several years of study in the Sunni *fiqh*. Nevertheless, there is evidence that that as late as 1570 Mirza Makhdum was still a staunch Shiite Muslim. This is corroborated by a short treatise he penned on the principle of imamate for his younger brother, Mir Nur al-Huda Sharifi. Dated 10 Muharram 978/24 June 1570, this treatise concludes with disparaging comments on the Umayyad and Abbasid caliphs. Quoting from the Sunni imam al-Shāfīʿi (d. 820), Mirza Makhdum berated anti-Shiite caliphs for hiring and supporting successive generations of Sunni jurists and scholars to forge *hadiths* and attribute these false statements to Twelver Shiites sources in order to discredit Twelver Shiite imams and scholars. [Fig. 1]


66 *Majmūʿa* (Ar. Ms. Markaz-i Iḥyāʾ Miras-i Islami 2560), 52a. In the colophon to this short treatise on imamate, Mirza Makhdum clarifies that he had written it by request of his brother. Elsewhere, it is stated that he had one brother named Nur al-Huda, who late in the reign of Tāḥmāsp held office as a judge in Shiraz (see Kami Qazvini, *Nafāʾis*, 404). Once again, my thanks go to Mohammad Kazem Rahmati for sharing a copy of this unpublished manuscript.
Fig. 1. Mirza Makhdum’s short treatise in defense of the imamate.

Mirza Makhdum’s account of his studies with Ibn Hajar, mentioned above, is chronologically flawed. It bears noting here that his paternal uncle, Mir Murtaza Sharifi, who late in the reign of Tahmasp traveled to Mughal India, had mentioned Ibn Hajar’s name as the authority with whom he had studied hadith.67 From Mirza Makhdum’s account, we know that he and Mir Murtaza left Safavid Iran in Ramadan 973/April 1566 charged with burying the remains of Mirza Makhdum’s father in Karbala. That Ibn Hajar died in Mecca in Rajab 973/February 1566, i.e. two months before the Sharifs’ arrival in the Ottoman Empire, makes the claims regarding their being taught by Ibn Hajar in the spring or summer of 1566 quite implausible. Mirza Makhdum further claims that in the same year he had studied with the Shafii judge of Sana’a ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Ziyad al-Zubaydi (d. 1567), contradicting his own statement elsewhere that he had spent several months in Baghdad in 973–74/1566–67 as a guest of honor with the Ottoman governor of

67 Kami Qazvini, Nafis, 515. Mir ’Ala’ al-Dawla Kami Qazvini (fl. 1589) was a cousin of Mirza Makhdum’s mother and as such, knew the Sharifs well.
the province, Çerkez İskender Paşa (d. 1571). Mirza Makhďum’s trip from Arab Iraq to the Hijaz, which seems to have started no later than late in the spring of 1566, was seaborne. The ship they boarded at Basra set sail first to Gujarat and thence to the port city of Mocha in Yemen. It was while sailing through the Gulf of Aden that the ship broke down and Mirza Makhďum had to have a stopover in coastal Ethiopia before making it to Yemen.68

Mirza Makhďum’s claim that he had been asked by the Ottoman governor of Baghdad İskender Paşa to stay longer than originally planned in Baghdad can be ruled out as falsehood. He states that considering Mirza Makhďum’s anti-Safavid views, İskender Paşa feared for his life in Safavid Iran. That being the case, the Ottoman governor of Baghdad is said to have expressed his willingness to grant him asylum in Baghdad. Mirza Makhďum adds that during a meeting convened in the presence of İskender Paşa, he had fearlessly attacked a group of Twelver Shiite notables of Baghdad for their deviation from the path of true, Sunni Islam.69

It is safe to assume Mirza Makhďum’s account of his closeness to İskender Paşa doubtful—given the simple fact that the latter had been posted to Baghdad in Muharram 975/July-August 1567, i.e. almost two years after Mirza Makhďum’s arrival in Arab Iraq. That İskender Paşa was no longer alive at the time Mirza Makhďum wrote Dhakhrat al-iṣqa enabled him to face no ill consequences for feeding his Ottoman hosts with these fabrications.70

Mirza Makhďum converted to Hanafi Sunnism upon his escape to the Ottoman Empire in 1578. He tells us that it took him about two months to master the Hanafi fiqh as good as expected from a judge and a mufti.71 He represents his conversion as being driven by internal pursuit of religious orthodoxy. To brush aside any doubts about non-opportunistic nature of his conversion to Hanafi

68 Sharifi Shirazi, Nəwəqid, 172a. For more on al-Zubaydi’s life and career, see Ibn al-‘Imad, Shadbarat, 10: 552–53. The approximate date for their departure from Basra can be inferred from Kami Qazvini’s account. According to Kami, Mirza Makhďum’s uncle arrived in Gujarat shortly after his hajj pilgrimage in 973/1566 (he died in Agra on 21 Jumada II 974/13 January 1567); see Kami Qazvini, Nafā‘is, 515. On İskender Paşa’s life and career, see Áli, Künbül-abbâr, 1: 367a; cf. Abdülkadir Özcan, “İskender Paşa,” TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi, https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/iskender-pasa.
69 Sharifi Shirazi, Dhakhrat, 223b.
70 On the date of İskender Paşa’s appointment to governor-general of Baghdad, see Kâtip Çelebi, Tuhfetü-l-kibar fi əsfarîl-bihar (Deniz savaşları hakkında büyükler armağan), ed. Orhan Şâık Gökyay (İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Basmevi, 1973), 123.
71 Sharifi Shirazi, Dhakhrat, 222a.
Sunnism, Mirza Makhdum linked this incident to his celebrated ancestor, Sayyid Sharif Jurjani, a Shafi‘i Sunni, who, more than three centuries earlier, had prophesied the conversion of one of his descendants to Hanafi Sunnism.⁷²

Conversion to Hanafi Sunnism was not uncommon among Iranian exiles in the Ottoman Empire, most of them being originally of Shafi‘i background. For Iranians recruited by the ilmiye converting to Hanafi Sunnism was normally conducive to professional success. A case in point is Muhammad Husayni Tabrizi, an accomplished Shafi‘i hadith scholar and notable jurist with short stints of teaching service in various institutions of higher education in Istanbul and the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire. Tabrizi was made judge in Aleppo and Damascus immediately after converting to Hanafi Sunnism.⁷³ Husayni Tabrizi’s appointment to Hanafi judge in predominantly Shafi‘i-populated cities like Aleppo and Damascus made him a close, trustworthy ally of the Ottomans vis-à-vis the local ulema. Likewise, Ahmad al-Iji (d. 1653), a native of Ij in Fars, is reported to have been promoted to in-absentia chief judge (qadi al-rikab) in Damascus upon his embracing Hanafi Sunnism.⁷⁴

Mirza Makhdum’s conversion to Hanafi Sunnism took place in the presence of şeyhülislâm Çivizâde, who had reportedly tested Mirza Makhdum’s expertise in Hanafi fiqh. To this purpose, the Ottoman scholar commissioned Mirza Makhdum to write commentaries on the basics of Hanafi Sunnism based on the fatwas issued by Ebüssuûd Efendi. The result was a short treatise titled al-Ummudhaj al-Muradiyya, which Mirza Makhdum dedicated to Murad III.⁷⁵ Implicit in Çivizâde’s asking Mirza Makhdum to sit for a test on the basics of Hanafi fiqh was the Ottoman authorities’ skepticism and distrust of the Iranian exiles’ expertise

⁷² Sharifi Shirazi, Nawaqid, 145a.
in Sunni scholarship. Incompetence and eccentric behavior of a number of the Iranian recruits of the *ilmiye* had already caused scandal and outrage among local *ulema* in the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire. These Arab jurists and scholars were mostly followers of Shafi‘i Sunnism and as such readily accused the Hanafi Ottomans and their bureaucratic cronies of ineptitude and ideological corruption. One scandal in Aleppo involved an Iranian bureaucrat called Ruh-Allah b. ‘Abd-Allah Qazvini (d. 1541). Local notables in Aleppo loathed Qazvini for his lack of proficiency in the basics of Sunni *fiqh* and *hadith*. A fugitive from the Safavids, Qazvini was notorious for bribing *ilmiye* authorities into appointing him to judge in Aleppo. Instead of focusing his research on jurisprudence and *hadith* scholarship, Qazvini is reported to have spent his time in Aleppo writing two polemical volumes against Ibn al-‘Arabi (d. 1240) and Nur al-Din ‘Abd al-Rahman Jami (d. 1429), the two Sunni mystics widely favored by local scholars and bureaucrats in Bilad al-Sham.76 This tendency to bribe one’s way into the *ilmiye* is also visible in Mirza Makhdum. Shortly after his arrival in the Ottoman Empire, he started presenting officials in charge of the Ottoman bureaucracy with gifts. The most expensive of his gifts, a beautiful hand-made prayer rug, was offered to Murad III.77 [Fig. 2]

At least two other 16th-century Iranian recruits of the *ilmiye* are known to have widely been criticized not only for their lack of academic expertise in the fields of *fiqh* and *hadith*, but also for their pro-Shiism. Ahmad Lala Tabrizi (d. 1530), who held office as superintendent of the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus under Selim I and Kanuni Sultan Süleyman, is reported to have been a source of disgrace for his Ottoman superiors as several locally prominent Sunni notables

76 Ibn al-Hanbali, *Durr al-hubab*, 1, pt. 2: 641-43; Qazvini had composed a chronicle in verse of the reign of Selim I. In the opening part of the 16th century, the reign of Selim I was the subject of several Persian chronicles. Šehr Čelebi (d. 1520) refers to them as a major source of inspiration for his chronicle of the reign of Selim I (see Šehr Čelebi, *Salim-Shahnama* [Pers. Ms. Topkapi Palace Museum 1432], 21b).

77 Approximately 163 by 110 cm, the prayer mat Mirza Makhdum presented to Murad III was put up for sale in Istanbul in the 18th century and was eventually purchased by Rudolf Martin (1864–1925), a Zurich-born professor of physical anthropology at the University of Munich and the founder of *Anthropologischer Anzeiger* (for more on him, see Bruno Oettekking, “Rudolf Martin,” *American Anthropologist*, 28, no. 2 [1926]: 414–17). The same prayer mat was auctioned off on 7 October 2009 at Sotheby’s in London for £2,729,250 (US$4,334M), a price that given the mat’s tiny size makes Mirza Makhdum’s gift to Murad III one of the most expensive pieces of oriental rug ever sold; see http://www.alaintruong.com/archives/2009/10/08/15360515.html (accessed 26 July 2018).
accused him of being a Shiite heretic.78 Similarly, Muhammad b. Zayn al-Din al-Nakhjavani (d. 1646), who served the Ottomans as judge in Damascus and Erzurum, was rumored to be a Twelver Shiite.79

Fig. 2. The prayer rug Mirza Makhdum presented to Murad III.

79 Muḥībbī, Khulāṣat: 3: 449–50. According to Muḥībbī, the Sunni scholar who had spread the rumor that Nakhjavani was a nafīdi was arrested and executed by the Ottomans.
There are references in Mirza Makhdom’s autobiographical writings to his close relatives’ affiliation with the Naqshbandiyya, a major Sufi order with strong following among Sunni learned notables in Iran, Central Asia, and the Ottoman Empire. The Naqshbandiyya, unlike almost all other major Sufi tariqas in the central lands of the Islamic world, who claimed spiritual descent from the first Shi‘i imam ‘Ali, considered the first Sunni caliph Abu Bakr as their first mentor. The Sunni background of the tariqa made its followers, including Mirza Makhdom’s family and relatives in Qazvin, an easy target for persecution and harassment under the Safavids. While the Naqshbandiyya notables were persecuted in Safavid Iran under the first two Safavid rulers, their counterparts in the Ottoman world and Central Asia benefited from state patronage and support. Sayyid Sharif Jurjani, the eponymous ancestor of the family, is claimed to have been a Naqshbandi Sufi. Even though Mirza Makhdom is reticent about them, we know from other sources that in the early part of the 16th century the Sayfi sayyid notables of Qazvin, from whom his mother hailed, were actively involved in the Naqshbandi propaganda and Sufi indoctrination activities in Iraq-i ‘Ajam and Azerbaijan. The renowned Persian historian, Mir Yahya Sayfi had been initiated into the Naqshbandiyya under the tutelage of Mir ‘Ali ‘Ammadi (d. 1518), a Naqshbandi mystic from Kurdistan who supervised the tariqa’s affairs in Azerbaijan. Furthermore, under Tahmasp, the Khalidis, another household with close ties to Mirza Makhdom’s mother and her relatives, led the Naqshbandiyya in Qazvin. In the early 1550s, the Sayfi and Khalidi notables of Qazvin were persecuted for their Naqshbandi leanings.

Mirza Makhdom’s allusion to his family’s Naqshbandi background and inclinations was aimed to help him get closer to Murad III, a pro-Sufi sultan who

---

80 Sharifi Shirazi, Dhakhran, 218b, 221a.
81 Muhammad b. Husayn b. ‘Abdallah Qazvini, Sisila-nama-yi khvajagan-i Naqshbandi (Pers. Ms. Süleymaniye Library Laleli 1381), 11b. On Qutb al-Din Abu Sa‘id Khalidi (d. 1562), a cousin of Mirza Makhdom’s mother and the last known leader of the Naqshbandiyya in Qazvin under the Safavids, see ibid., 13b; and Kami, Nafa’is, 199. On Mir Yahya Sayfi see Kami, Nafa’is, 623–28. Under Tahmasp, many of the Khalidi notables of Qazvin, who claimed descent from the Umayyad emir Khalid b. al-Walid (d. 642) and since the latter part of the fourteenth century controlled the judicial system in Qazvin, were rounded up and put to the sword together with their families. For more on the Naqshbaniyya in Qazvin under the Safavids, see Algar, “Naqshbandis and the Safavids,” 21-22; Dina Le Gall, A Culture of Sufism: Naqshbandis in the Ottoman World, 1450–1700 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 26.
all his reign looked to Naqshbandi and Khalvati mystics for inspiration and guidance. Under Murad III, a number of Naqshbandis and their sympathizers held positions of administrative trust and political privilege in Istanbul and provincial capitals across the Ottoman Empire. What is more, in Safavid Iran, the general impression among local scholars and learned notables was that being a Naqshbandi meant easy access to state patronage in the Ottoman Empire. Around the time Mirza Makhudm escaped from Iran, according to a chronicler close to Shah Tahmasp, it was widely rumored in Qazvin that the Ottoman sultan not only had funded the establishment of a stately Naqshbandi Sufi convent in Bukhara, but also distributed generous amounts of cash gifts among followers of the tariqa in the Ottomans Empire itself. Expectedly, those aspirants for bureaucratic career lines who had a Naqshbandi background had a better chance to get recruited and promoted in the ʿilmīye.

Employment and Career Mobility in the ʿilmīye

Scholarly literature has shown that during Mirza Makhudm’s years in the Ottoman Empire the ʿilmīye sector underwent depersonalization and centralization of career mobility among its recruits. Mirza Makhum’s account of the ʿilmīye has nonetheless an upbeat tone highlighting the privileges bureaucrats and

82 On Murad III’s mystical predilections, see Özgen Felek (ed.), Kitābūl Menāmāt: Sultan III. Murad’ın Rüya Mektupları (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 2014). She has been translating these letters into English as well. The first 100 letters were published digitally under the title, “The Sultan’s Dreams Project,” Newbook Digital Texts Project, HYPERLINK “http://depts.washington.edu/ndrtwp/sultansdreams/”http://d.
83 Sharaf Khan Bidlisi, Sharaftnama, ed. Vladimir Veliaminof-Zernof, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1860-62), 2: 154. Sharaf Khan was a maternal cousin of Tahmasp and Isma’il II (see ibid., 1: 448).
scholars in the Ottoman Empire benefited from compared to their counterparts in Safavid Iran. He praises the Ottomans for their generous support of the **ilmiye** employees ascribing the longevity and legitimacy of the Ottoman dynasty to the well-being of its servants from Sunni jurists and professors to bureaucratic elites to the descendants of the prophet. As a case in point, he makes mention of Şeyh Şüca, Murad III’s Khalvati mentor, who, according to Mirza Makhdum, had once been paid 20,000 akçe, an amount equal to 1,500 tümens in Safavid currency - ten times the stipend Mirza Makhdum received as sadr under Isma’il II. The salary of the grand vizier in Safavid Iran, Mirza Makhdum points out, equaled a quarter of the monthly earnings of a judge in the Ottoman Empire, which at the time amounted to 500 akçe. He also admired the leadership of the Ottoman bureaucracy for their professionalism and efficiency relative to those at the helm of the Safavid bureaucracy. Relatedly, he admits that while all state employees in Safavid Iran were constantly at risk of abuse and disgrace, tenured bureaucrats in the Ottoman Empire by and large enjoyed career stability and were favored with the sultan’s generous patronage.85

It took Mirza Makhdum less than a year to get employment in the **ilmiye**. He was first offered a judicial position, his name being put on payroll as a 60-akçe recruit replacing Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Awwal Qazvini, who had just retired.86 In 1578, he was made judge in Diyarbakir succeeding Molla Bâli b. Şemsi al-Aydînî (d. 1582). This appointment seems to have been arranged locally with the recommendation and approval of the Ottoman governor of Amid, Derviš Paşa.87 His time in Diyarbakir was cut short in the same year as authorities in charge of the **ilmiye** decided to post Mirza Makhdum as judge to Tripoli in Bilad al-Sham.88 It was the same Derviš Paşa who arranged for Mirza Makhdum to have a meeting with Hoca Sâdeddin Efendi in Istanbul. In this meeting, Mirza Makhdum gave a detailed account of his life and career in Safavid Iran as well as the circumstances under which he managed to escape from Qazvin to Diyarbakir in the early winter of 1578. Shortly afterwards, Mirza Makhdum drafted a written account of his life and career titled **al-Yusr ba’d al-‘usr** and submitted it to the office of **şeyhülislâm**. Based on his vita (and Hoca Sâdeddin’s recommendation), the **ilmiye** officials

decided to recruit Mirza Makhdum. He then traveled to Istanbul, where he was admitted to the Ottoman court for further interviews and eventually granted an appointment degree sealed by Murad III.\textsuperscript{89}

According to the Damascus-based Palestinian historian Hasan b. Muhammad Burini (d. 1615), who knew Mirza Makhdum in person, the latter’s tenure as judge in Tripoli lasted two years at the end of which he returned to Istanbul to become a \textit{mülâzim} waiting for a job offer. After a while he was made \textit{na-kibîl-êşraf}, a not so important position that until the end of the 17th century was normally held by low-ranking religious scholars.\textsuperscript{90} It happened that Mirza Makhdum’s stay in Istanbul coincided with the outbreak of drought in the city. One day Murad III decided to appoint Mirza Makhdum as prayer imam to lead the \textit{salat al-istiga’}, or prayer for rain, held in the Ottoman capital. Within a few days of the prayer led by him, it started raining and the drought season thus came to an end. This incident brought Mirza Makhdum popularity at the Ottoman court prompting the sultan and his underlings to present him cash and various gifts.\textsuperscript{91} During his time as \textit{nakibîl-êşraf} in Istanbul, Mirza Makhdum began preaching at a local mosque, but it is alleged that his bad Turkish forced him to discontinue his sermons.\textsuperscript{92} In the spring of 989/1581, he was eventually reinstated as judge and posted to Baghdad. He immortalized his reinstatement in the \textit{ilmiye} in 1581 on the margins of the last folio of a medieval manuscript of \textit{Nahj al-balagha}, a collection of articulate sermons attributed to imam ‘Ali selected and edited by the renowned Shi`ite scholar al-Sharif al-Radi (d. 1015), which he had purchased on 15 Rabi’ II 989/29 May 1581 on his way from Istanbul to Baghdad as judge in Arab Iraq.\textsuperscript{93}

Nev’îzâde Atâî states that Mirza Makhdum had been made chief judge of Baghdad in Rajab 987/September 1579, adding that the appointment was withdrawn within a few days and a certain Martoloszâde Efendi was posted to Baghdad

\textsuperscript{89} Sharifi Shirazi, \textit{Nawaqid}, 11b.

\textsuperscript{90} See Uzunçarşılı, \textit{Ilmiye Teşkilâtı}, 166.


\textsuperscript{92} Burini, \textit{Tarağim}, 2: 55.

in his stead.\textsuperscript{94} In Shawwal 988/November-December 1580 Mirza Makhdum left Istanbul for the Hijaz, apparently to serve as chief judge in Medina.\textsuperscript{95} Burini clarifies that Mirza Makhdum traveled from Istanbul to the Hijaz via Egypt and Red Sea and that he remained in the same post for three years.\textsuperscript{96} This is, however, contradicted by Mirza Makhdum’s own account, mentioned above, that he started working as chief judge of Baghdad late in the spring of 989/1581. It is plausible that he held office as chief judge of the holy cities of the Hijaz only for a few months. Shortly after his arrival in Medina, Mirza Makhdum took over as Hanafi chief judge of Mecca. Nev'izâde Atâî assigns this appointment to Rabi’ I 991/April 1583, adding that within a year he was made nakîbü'l-esrâf of Mecca, a post that helped him forge close ties with the Sharif of the city.\textsuperscript{97} In 1585, Mirza Makhdum was summoned to Istanbul and appointed to chief judge of Istanbul, while acting as the city’s nakîbü'l-esrâf. Some eight months later, he was promoted to the post of military judge of Rumeli. This marked the apogee of Mirza Makhdum’s career in the ilmiye.

Yet the appointment to military judge of Rumeli was revoked within a few weeks, leaving him unemployed for a while. The cancelation of his appointment to military judge of Rumeli put an end to Mirza Makhdum’s ilmiye career. Late in 993/1585, he traveled to Mecca, where he assumed the post of nakîbü'l-esrâf. The news of Mirza Makhdum’s death reached Istanbul less than two years later, on 30 Du‘l-hajja 995/1 December 1587. Around the same time a certain Sayyid Yahya Efendi was made nakîbü'l-esrâf of Mecca.\textsuperscript{98} Back in Safavid Iran, it was rumored that after his relocation to Mecca Mirza Makhdum had converted to Twelver Shi’ism and was deeply remorseful for his collaboration with the Ottomans.\textsuperscript{99} One daughter is known to have survived Mirza Makhdum. She reportedly wed a son of Sayyid Hasan, the Sharif of Mecca and Mirza Makhdum’s patron in the Hijaz.\textsuperscript{100}

Mirza Makhdum’s hectic, though not unsuccessful, career in the ilmiye was not an isolated case. Rather, it epitomized the increasing centralization of bureaucratic career paths and the institutionalization of rotation system under Murad

\textsuperscript{94} Nev'izâde Atâî, \textit{Hada'iq}, 270, 413.

\textsuperscript{95} Nev'izâde Atâî, \textit{Hada'iq}, 298.

\textsuperscript{96} Burini, \textit{Tanajim}, 2:54.

\textsuperscript{97} Nev'izâde Atâî, \textit{Hada'iq}, 282, 298.


\textsuperscript{100} Burini, \textit{Tanajim}, 2: 54.
III. In the closing quarter of the 16th century and even later, there were several new arrivals from Iran who like Mirza Makhdum ended up working on tenures that were rotational and brief. Muhammad Amin Abhari (d. 1608), who claimed descent from imam ‘Ali’s brother, Ja’far Tayyar and came from a family of bureaucrats in Safavid Iran, arrived in the Ottoman Empire in 1575, i.e. two years before Mirza Makhdum’s escape from Iran. An accomplished scribe and poet in Persian and Arabic, Abhari landed a kalemîye job in Istanbul as superintendent of Sultan Bayezid II’s endowments. Like Mirza Makhdum, Abhari was a protégé of Hoca Sâdeddîn Efendi, who himself came from a family of Iranian descent. Abhari worked in Istanbul for a few years, but in the winter of 1582 was transferred to Damascus, where he lost his employment shortly thereafter. After attending two more brief stints of bureaucratic service in provinces, Abhari eventually retired from the ilmiye in the spring of 1591.101

Anecdotal evidence indicates that around the time of Mirza Makhdum’s retirement to Mecca, in the ilmiye milieu too professional instability had exacerbated, making career mobility among an increasing number of professors and judges take a horizontal turn. Muhammad b. Sulayman Lahiji (d. 1617), who had studied for several years with Muslih al-Din Lari, started his ilmiye career under Selim II as a teaching assistant to prince Murad’s (later Murad III) private tutor, Molla Ibrahim. It was this minor teaching position at court that enabled Lahiji to eventually land a professorial job at the newly founded Osmân Paşa College in Istanbul in 1589. His influential contacts at court later helped him switch easily to a judicial career.102

Like Lahiji and Mirza Makhdum, there were a few Iranian religious scholars whose closeness to the ilmiye elites in Istanbul helped them achieve upward advancement. A case in point is Tevfîkîzâde Molla Ahmed (d. 1641), a Zaydi Shi’ite fugitive from Gilan who had married a granddaughter of Hoca Sâdeddîn Efendi and converted to Hanafi Sunnism. Tevfîkîzâde completed his studies with his father, Mulla Tawfiq (d. 1601), a Zaydi Shi’i religious scholar from Rasht, who had converted to Hanafi Sunni Islam upon his arrival in the Ottoman Empire in the closing decades of the 16th century, and in due course became a boon companion

102 Muhibbi, Khulasat al-athar, 3: 457–58.
of Mehmed Efendi, Hoca Sâdeddin Efendi’s son. Mulla Tawfîq, who had formerly studied with Muslih al-Din Lari, held office as private tutor of Hoca Sâdeddin Efendi’s children. The private tutorship of Sâdeddin’s children seems to have been instrumental in his promotion to professorship at various colleges in Istanbul, including Dar al-Hadith at the Sulaymaniyya, one of the most prestigious institutions of higher education in the Ottoman Empire. His son, Tevfikizâde started his ilmiye career as chief judge of Thessaloniki in Greece and was later held the same position in Damascus, Cairo, and Edirne.

Mulla Tawfîq’s background and connections and the upward trajectory of his ilmiye career bring into clearer focus the impact of the unprecedented centralization of career mobility in this sector toward the end of the 16th century, when limited access to the sultan and court officials left very few opportunities for decisive upward career mobility in the ilmiye. From the horizontality of Tevfikizâde’s career mobility in the ilmiye, it is clear as well that during Mirza Makhdum’s years in the ilmiye, upward mobility in judicial career lines, even for the most influential recruits of the sector such as Mirza Makhdum, was no longer easily possible. Writing in the early 1580s, the Bijapur-based Mir Taqi al-Din Muhammad Kashani (fl. 1613), who knew Mirza Makhdum in person, refers to him as an “unfulfilled” (nakam) careerist. Pointing disparagingly to Mirza Makhdum’s collaboration with the Ottomans, Kashani claims that soon after his escape to the Ottoman Empire, Mirza Makhdum found out that going to the top in the ilmiye was by no means as easy as he expected at the outset. As the result, he always regretted his entering the service of the Ottomans, and shortly after his retirement in Mecca, he reconverted to Twelver Shiism and was ready to return to Iran as early as possible.

---

103 On Mulla Tawfîq, see Burini, Tarajim, 2: 118–19; Muhibbi, Khulasat al-athar, 1:529; Nev’îzâde Atâî, Hadâ’îq, 451.
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Conclusion

In his autobiographical writings in the Ottoman Empire, Mirza Makhdum portrays himself as a sayyid and high-ranking Sunni jurist best fitted for a leading position in the ilmiye. He managed to find employment as a judge, but his career mobility was slow-paced and never took a decisively upward turn. During Mirza Makhdum’s years in the Ottoman Empire the ilmiye witnessed an unprecedented increase in the number of false claimants to sayyidship, making it difficult for sayyid recruits such as Mirza Makhdum to easily benefit from the privileges the native sayyid notables in the Ottoman Empire enjoyed. Mirza Makhdum never achieved full acceptance in the Ottoman Empire as a true sayyid. In the Ottoman Empire, Mirza Makhdum converted to Hanafi Sunnism, a decision that helped him land employment in the ilmiye.

Mirza Makhdum was successful in achieving recognition in the Ottoman Empire as a devout Sunni Muslim and unforgiving enemy of the Safavids and their Twelver Shiite followers. Yet his autobiographical writings contain a series of unfounded claims about his education, religion, family background, and career in Safavid Iran. There is no reference in Mirza Makhdum’s autobiographical writings to his family’s close ties to the Safavid regime. Nor does he tell his readers in the Ottoman Empire about the part played by his close relatives in the persecution of Sunni Muslims in early Safavid Iran. Remarkably, Mirza Makhdum’s statements about his education in Safavid Iran and abroad are flawed. However distorted and inconsistent, Mirza Makhdum’s attempt at self-promotion was fruitful, enabling him to become close to Ottoman authorities in Istanbul and provinces. Even so, the realities of bureaucratic life in the Ottoman Empire in the closing decades of the 16th century worked against him. Mirza Makhdum’s career as a judge was rotational and non-tenured, forcing him to serve short stints of service in various provincial centers. His upward mobility in the ilmiye being thus frustrated, Mirza Makhdum sought patronage of the local ruler of Mecca Sharif Hasan shortly before his death.
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Abstract

This present article examines Mirza Makhdum Sharifi Shirazi’s (1540–87) life and career in the Ottoman Empire. Mirza Makhdum was a high-ranking Twelver Shiite bureaucrat in Safavid Iran, but after taking refuge with the Ottomans, he converted to Sunnism and started a new career as a judge in Diyarbakir, Bilad al-Sham, Baghdad, and the holy cities of the Hijaz. In this article, emphasis has been on his employment and professional advancement in the ilmiye, a milieu that was open on the one hand, but maintained ideological and institutional limitations on the other. I take the horizontality of his ilmiye career as a lens through which to explore nuances and complexities of professional advancement among the Iranian recruits of the Ottoman bureaucracy during the 16th century.
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