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ABSTRACT

Although it has a particular importance concerning the detailed information on the history of the Persian campaign under Lala Musṭafā Paşa, the Nusret-nāme of Gelibolulu Musṭafā ‘Ālī (1540-1599) still remains unedited. The author held the post of secretary in the eastern campaign under Lala Musṭafā Paşa as serdär, the events of which are written in the first section of the Nusret-nāme, to which the second section entitled "The rebuilding of the Kars fortress" is added by ‘Ālī as the events of the following year. This present thesis provides an edition of the first section of the Nusret-nāme dealing with the events of the years 1577-and the winter of 1578-79, drawn from all the known mss, and is intended to be the basis for a critical edition of the entire work in the future.

Ascertainable details of ‘Ālī's life as a living protagonist in the campaign are presented; followed by giving an outline of his works and a description of the language and style of his Nusret-nāme as well as a comparison between Nusret-nāme and Künhû'l-Ahbar. After this an introductory survey of the
political development of Ottoman-Safavi relations as a historical background is presented in which we have tried to provide the main cause of the conflict in Ottoman-Safavi relations in order to understand the following events.

This present section of the Nusret-nâme is analysed in respect of its historical value. It represents an eye-witness account of the author himself and a collection of official letters as well as reporting the events from envoys. Finally in this study the variation of present manuscripts of Nusret-nâme is analyzed as well as the method of edition followed
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PREFACE

Nusret-nâme, Zafer-nâme, Gazavât-nâme, almost in the same genre take their place among works of a historical nature which describe the military details of victories as sources. Mostly they complete a gap which is not filled by the narrative chronological or general histories of such writers as Peçevi and Selanikî. As historical investigation through archival materials and narrative histories becomes familiar to the Turkish historian the value of the histories of a single action such as the Persian campaign has tended to decrease despite the aim of the authors of these works to win favour from royal patronage. Nevertheless some of these have been studied with critical editions recently and have been incorporated into the historical tradition.

Although the Nusret-nâme of Mustafâ 'Alî occupies a highly important position in giving an account of the history of Safavi and Ottoman relations for the special period it has so far not been available to historians in an edited study version; even though it has been utilised by historians in a general way, they have not analyzed many aspects of it. However, in fact, after composing the original work 'Alî commissioned the calligrapher Fakir Şeyh to copy the manuscript
now held in the British Museum of the Musret-nime which is the oldest existing copy, and this was followed by another production in the following year which consisted of a lavish Ms which was made at the request of Sulthan Murad III under 'Ali's supervision, but it can be demonstrated by comparative study that apart from the author himself no historian has derived information from it.

'Ali attained the rank of secretary to the army commander, Lala Mustafa Paşa, having contact with all the principal participants in addition to being witness of the events of the Persian campaign of which he wrote in verse and prose. This work is a valuable source for the way in which the Ottomans saw their action against another Muslim country. In it the Ottomans depict a historical personality, creating the example of such heroic figures as Lala Mustafa Paşa. The letters in this work provide detailed information in the way in which they present the development of the campaign. Apart from this they offer an example of Ottoman diplomacy and reflect the decisions of the council of campaign under the leadership of Lala Mustafa. Moreover it is significant that they show the dimensions of Ottoman policy and 'Ali's epistolary style in the context of late sixteen century correspondence.
There is no doubt that one of the famous authors and historians of the 16th century Ottoman Empire is Muşafā 'Āli who wrote many books in several fields which are main sources for information about his life. So far some of them have been examined and published, while the remainder are still unpublished and remain to be studied. When they are thoroughly analysed many unknown aspects of his life may be cleared up. However it is certain that recent work indicates that many scholars have attempted to carry out studies on him. In the first place the information given by Cemaleddin in Osmanlı Tarih ve Müverrihleri is of the scantiest, while Mehmed Tahir’s introductory note on him in the 'Āli ve Kātip Çelebi’nün Tercüme-i Halleri is also very brief. Despite the fact that it is a graduation thesis, the first independent work on 'Āli’s biography is in fact 'Āli Ahter’s Gelibolulu Muşafā 'Āli. Five

1-In Aşsız’s 'Āli Bibliyografyası give the number of his works as 55 of which 13 are historic works, 20 literary works and 22 written on social topics.


years later the first scientific study on 'Ali's biography is that of Mahmut Kemal who studied the *Menâkıb-i Hünerverân* of 'Ali and produced a great mass of material which following scholars have used; for example Bursalı Tahir in his introduction on 'Ali Efendi in *Osmanlı Müellifleri* frequently gives citations from it as well as introducing a second comprehensive study on him in *'Ali Bibliografyası* written by Nihal Atsız who criticized 'Ali harshly. In 1980 Turkish biographical works and articles on 'Ali were analyzed by Mehmet Şeker in an article of his own, where the first section is devoted to him. The most serious article on him is in the *İslam Ansiklopedisi*. In Cornell H. Fleischer's *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*, in which the preceding works have been criticized, unknown aspects of his life have been illuminated from his works and contemporary sources. However in addition to the above mentioned works, from Cemalettin to Fleischer, many another

4-p.12-19

5-Atsız, N: op.cit. pp.6-7.


individual has discovered previously unknown information on him and has expanded the information which they provide when they have undertaken the study of his works.9 These works show that scholars have studied his work to illustrate his life and examine unknown episodes in Ottoman history, but it is certain that if every work of his is examined, more aspects of his career and his era will be illustrated, as we hope to show from his eastern campaign in 985-987/1577-1579, which was an important phase of his life in which ascertainable details of 'Ālī's life will be clarified as the main aim of this section rather than repeating the data of preceding works on the entire life of 'Ālī.

Muṣṭafā bin Ahmed (1541-1600), known under his pen-name 'Ālī, was born to a father probably of Bosnian descent on 28 April 1541 in Gelibolu, which had been an important settlement and cultural centre since the Turks conquered it, and in which many endowments had been founded by the army chiefs of the

early Ottoman period who had used their booty to create Turkish culture there, as a result of which, since the early fifteenth century, Gelibolu had produced significant mystics, scholars,¹⁰ and poets, one of them being 'Ālī.

'Ālī's father Ahmed was a prosperous merchant who had the honorific title of hoca. His mother was descended from Şeyh Muslihuddin Mustafă who was the spiritual successor of the Nakşbendi Şeyh Seyyid Ahmed Buhari (d. 1516-17). The cultural background of his family and of Gelibolu encouraged him to get the best education possible for a member of the common people. When he was six years old he began his studies at elementary school. He studied the basic Ottoman educational curriculum including Arabic and Persian, and then studied advanced Arabic grammar with Habib-i Hamidi as well as Persian with Surürlî.¹¹ After this he completed the medreses of Rüstem Paşa, Haseki and

¹⁰-İsen, Mustafa: Rûnhü‘l-ahbârîn Tezîkîre Kîsmî p.7: Gelibolu produced 31 scholars and poets in 15th and 16th century, and according to İsen it was in the eighth rank among the cities which formed the Ottoman cultural mosaic at that time.

¹¹-Babinger F: Osmanlı Tarih Yazaları ve Eserleri p.142: Although he states that 'Ālī studied Persian from Surürlî Fleischer says that from an early age he studied Persian with a private teacher. However İbnü‘l-Emin M. Kemal indicates that he studied religious subjects (fükh, hadis etc.) with him in his Menâkib-i Rûnërverîn p.4.
During these school years in Istanbul, 'Ali met many people who, like himself, were becoming the core of the Ottoman nation, and in the later days of the reign of Sultan Süleyman (1520-1566) they were on their way to the top of the system, and would form the next generation of Ottoman scholars, judges, bureaucrats, and literary figures under Süleyman's successors. After he had finished his medrese education in Istanbul he presented to Prince Selim Mihr ü Mäh, his own first work, with which he hoped to press for quick assignment to a teaching post. However Prince Selim offered him a post as a chancery secretary instead of the career of an alim. Thus he entered bureaucratic service, and 'Ali remained at the court of Prince Selim until 1562-63, when during his duty in Kütahya he hoped to gain entry into a career at the capital with the help of his patron, Prince Selim. However Sultan Süleyman rejected this petition.

After this rebuff and the appointment of Tütünsüz Hüseyin Beg

---

12- On the education of 'Ali in Gelibolu and Istanbul see Cornell Fleischer: Bureaucrat and intellectual in the Ottoman Empire pp.18-30.
as lala for Selim, life at Kütahya was becoming uncomfortable,\textsuperscript{13} so he left Selim to go to Damascus on the invitation of Musâfar Paşa who was beglerbegi of Aleppo. There is a question about how 'Ali had made the acquaintance of Selim's previous instructor (Lala) Musâfar Paşa, and how the two men met is unclear\textsuperscript{14} but it is assumed that as several nationalities lived with each other in the Ottoman community nationality was a very important way to gain promotion in political life, and both men were of Bosnian origin. As a result of this they may have met socially to shape their political future. This was an important means by which a good patronage relationship could have been set up.

'Ali served as both chancery and confidential secretary to Lala Musâfar Paşa for around six years from 1563-1568 in Damascus. When his patron was appointed as serdâr (field-marshall) with the rank of vizier to undertake a campaign against a rebellion of Bedouin Arabs in Yemen, 'Ali went with his patron to Cairo to prepare for the campaign in Egypt, but because of the machinations of Mustafâ Paşa's rival and enemy, the Albanian

\textsuperscript{13}-For extensive information on 'Ali's life in Kütahya see Fleischer, C.H:op.cit. pp.32, 40; Ibnişl-Emin M.Kemal:op.cit. (1928) pp.5,7.

\textsuperscript{14}-Fleischer C.H:op.cit.pp. 39-40:According to him Kurd Beg, with whom 'Ali was on good terms, and who was the son of Lala Musâfar Paşa's older brother, Divane Hüsrev Paşa, could have established contact between his uncle and 'Ali.
Sinân Paşa, then the governor of Egypt, and the conflict between Lala Muştafâ Paşa and Grand vizier Sokullu Mehmed Paşa (d. 1579) Lala Muştafâ Paşa was dismissed from office\textsuperscript{15} while still in Egypt, and both he and 'Âli were now without employment. After an investigation by the authorities 'Âli did not return to Istanbul with Lala Muştafâ Paşa, but went to Manisa, the residence of Şehzade Murâd, (1562-74) son of Sultan Selîm, in December 1568. He presented Mihr ü Vefa and Nâdirü'1 Mehârib to the Şehzade, and moreover he translated Râhatü'n-nûfus, and rearranged and annotated the translation of this Arabic work at the Şehzade's request. 'Âli returned to Istanbul through the Şehzade's intercession. He presented Heft Meclis to Sokullu Mehmed Paşa hoping to gain the position of ze'âmet but was disappointed because Sokullu Mehmed Paşa appointed him as chancery secretary to Gazi Ferhâd Beg (1570) with whom 'Âli worked in Banya Luka on his becoming beglerbegi of Bosnia. 'Âli describes his service in the following words.

"In short, for eight full years I pitched my tent in the wilderness of warfare and for nine months in every year I stood up to perform the prayer of the campaign. Together with the fighters for the faith I made

\textsuperscript{15}On Muştafâ Paşa's promotion to serdâr (field marshal) to reconquer Yemen and the relations between him and Sinân Paşa see: Şerafetdîn Turan: "Lala Muştafâ Paşa Hakkında Notlar ve Vesikalar" in Bel 22. 1958 pp.560-572 and Fleischer C.H: op.cit pp.45-55.
indescribable efforts for the Holy War and strove to climb up the ranks with the help of my blood-dripping sword. Thus waiting for the nights and days to pass by, I made it up with this kind of service to a ze'met of 60,000 aspers, and serving with sword and pen I became a famous champion that has few equals on the frontier of the sancak of Bosnia.16"

During his years in Bosnia, he attempted to open channels to government circles in Istanbul. One of them was intended to improve his strained relation with his former patron. 'Allî wrote a congratulatory letter to Musţafâ Paşa who had conquered Cyprus, (1571), in addition to reminding his former master of their close ties and citing the lies of other members of the Paşa's retinue as the cause of their estrangement.17 Secondly 'Allî addressed an appeal in verse to the Re`isü’l-Küttab Ferîdûn Ahmed Beg, to be admitted to the ranks of the central bureaucracy. These attempts brought 'Allî nothing in the short term but they may be regarded as an important step to improving relationships with the bureaucrats of the central government in the longer term. In addition he wanted to draw their attention to his proven experience and skill.


17-Fleischer, C.H: op.cit. p.61: Also gives extended information concerning the life of 'Allî in Bosnia between 1570-77 see; Fleischer C.H: op.cit. pp. 59-70
'Ālī remained in Bosnia until the accession of Murād III (21 December 1574) to the throne. He hoped that the new sultan would take him under the protection he had enjoyed in Manisa and he came to the capital in order to present a springtime accession-poem but as no reward came forth in response to this kaside, following this he presented four kasides again to no avail, which were called Kayık, Sünbul, Tığ and Uyur.\(^\text{18}\)

The death of Selim II on 28 Ṣaʿbān 982/13 December 1574 brought about a change in the balance of the administrative apparatus which had been increasingly dominated by the powerful Grand vizier Sokullu Mehmed Paşa and his party. The new situation gave an opportunity to the anti-Sokullu movement to voice their resentment. In their forefront were Şemsi Ahmed Paşa, Gazanfer Aga, Kadi Zade, the chancellor Kara Üveys and Şeyh Şuca who were allied against him. They were stronger in the beginning because the teacher of the sultans, Hoca Sa'deddin Efendi joined with them.\(^\text{19}\) Later on Canfeda Hatun and Gazanfer

---

\(^{18}\)On the kasides of 'Alī which were presented to Sultan Murād III on his accession to the throne, see Tietze, Andreas: Muṣṭafā 'Ālī's Counsel for Sultans of 1581, (translation) volume II p.76; İbnü'l-Emin M. Kemal, ed., Menakib-i Hünerveran pp.17,8.

\(^{19}\)On "Sa'deddin" see Ş. Turan in İA; A. Refik: Sokullu İst. 1924 p.257. He was an influential person in education and
Aga were allies of Sokullu's rival Lala Muştafa Paşa, together with the new queen-mother, Nurbanu. As a result of this from the very beginning of Murad's reign, Sokullu and his party lost their power so that several members of his party like Feridun Ahmed Beg were dismissed from office.  

It can be seen from the development of events during the reign of Selim II (1566-1574) that 'Ali tried to get close to the grand vizier, Sokullu Mehmed Paşa and members of his party like Feridun Ahmed Beg, but as soon as the new government was shaped up 'Ali quickly changed his allegiance. Having come to Istanbul he presented odes (kasides) requesting patronage to the members of the anti-Sokullu group at the court whose failure to assist him was explained later by himself in the following words:

"In short, not a single individual would help me, not one of the great who are listened to by the Sultan showed me loyalty. All they are striving for is to fill their pockets with dinars and drachms, to construct gold-ornamented galleries and painted vaults and to lead the policy and attained virtual control of the entire ilmiye hierarchy.

20-Gökbilgin T: "Mehmed Paşa, Sokullu" İA

21-For 'Ali's odes to Şems Paşa, Hoca Sa'deddin and Şeyh Şuca, see Tietze, A: Muştafa 'Ali's Counsel for Sulţans of 1581 (translation) volume II pp.87-89.
edifice of generosity to destruction." 

Although 'Ali's efforts did not bring positive results he continued to curry favour with the new palace powers. Finally he was able to achieve success in late 1577. Sulṭān Murād's pir, Şeyh Şüca, was interested in Sufism, so he charged 'Ali to translate the Faslu'l-Hikāb. He completed this translation, which was called Hilyetü'r-ricāl which was presented to the Sulṭān.

No doubt the most important source for the two years (1577-1579) in 'Ali's life is the Nusret-nāme. When the vizier and future conqueror Lala Muṣṭafā was appointed Serdār (field marshal) on 22 Şevval 985/2 January 1578, 'Ali was looking for employment, so he presented an ode to Sulṭān Murād on the festival of Eid, 10 Zi'l-hicce 985/18 February 1578. Soon afterwards 'Ali was appointed campaign secretary by an imperial rescript (Haṣ-ı Humāyun) through the help of Hoca

---


23-Fleischer, C.H:op.cit. p.75;Tietze, A:op.cit. volume II (translation) p.58.

24-B:4b

Sa'deddin Efendi. However 'Ali gives more information about his charge and appointment in the following paragraph. According to a letter from Mustafà Paşa quoted in the Nusret-nâme,

"'Ali was an excellent man as a secretary. He was able to convey his power in the use of oratory and his skill was in accordance with the eloquence of a secretary and he was more important than the equipment of all the army. The book of Battle (Nusret-nâme) was written from dictation in description of the campaign. 'Ali is one of the people of Gelibolu, a slave of the Sulţân. The rank of his knowledge is high and the rank of his title is as low as ze'āmet. His presence on the campaign was worth as much as half of the army and his appointment to serve is to be regarded as a great favour on the part of the Sulţân." 27

'Ali fulfilled the duties of Lala Mustafà's chamberlain and secretary, who advised the commander on the reception of dignitaries and petitioners. 28 Thus, when most probably between 10 Zî`l-hicce and 21 Zî`l-hicce/18 February 1578 and 1 March 1578, Mustafà Paşa made preparations for the campaign, he required 'Ali to write letters 29 to Ottoman vassals, beglerbegis

---

27-B: 5a
28-Fleischer, C.H: op.cit. p. 80
29-See chapter IV for detailed information concerning letters.
and Safavi vassals. He used both Persian and Turkish for these letters.

After all these preliminary processes for the campaign had been completed, on 27 Muharrem /29 April the army departed from Istanbul for the east. During the march of the army, 'Ālī was witness to many events. On Thursday 29th May the army reached Konya. During the two days of their stay there, they visited the tomb of Mevlānā to listen to the sufis’ music on the ney with delight and to draw an omen from the Mesnevi of Mevlānā covering their arrival at Iskender in the mountains of Caucasia. About this a portion of the Mesnevi of Mevlānā was quoted in his work. In addition on Friday they visited the tombs of Şemş-i Tebrizi, Şeyh Sadreddin Konevi and Selahaddin and asked for help from them.30

Between 7-18 of Cumāda‘l-ūlā (12-23 of July), the army was quartered in Çermik, where the beglerbegis joined the army while the army was resting there. They waited to complete their supplies and equipment and to discuss the route to the border. At the same time the Serdar received a reply from the rulers of Caucasia to the letters he had sent them while

30-B:34a-35a
preparing for the campaign in Istanbul. So 'Ālī wrote letters again to them.

In early August the army camped at Ardahan, "the gateway to Georgia", from where on 5 Cumāda‘l-Āhir 986/9 August 1578, the Ottoman army left and crossed the borders of Meshiya and very soon reached the plain of Çıldır, where it won a victory over a major Kızılbaş force. As a result of this, Menuçehr declared his allegiance to the Ottomans. Despite the negative effect of geography and climate, the Ottoman army reached and occupied Tiflis with the help of Menuçehr in late August.

During the march of the army to Tiflis, they suffered hardship which 'Ālī narrates as well as describing the geography and history of the region, in which he was interested, so that he researched the history of the castle and city of Tiflis for which he used history books which are unknown to us.11 Moreover 'Ālī studied the history of the Elbruz mountain in Caucasus while coming near the River Kabur which was under the control of Aleksandr, who declared his allegiance to the Ottomans like Menuçehr. 'Ālī referred to the Şehnâmes to illustrate the history of this region as a result of this, and quoted two verses from

11-B:78a-80b
Mevlânâ Hafız-ı Şirâzî to explain the occupation by İskender of Giremi.\textsuperscript{32}

On 6 Receb 986/8 September 1578 the battle of Koyun-geçidi was won by the Ottoman army, and on the next day, 7 Receb 986/9 September 1578, the news of the conquest of Ereş reached Lala Musafâ Paşa from Aleksandır. At this stage in Şirvan 'Ālî continued to send gazels to the Sultan in order to make use of this opportunity. One of them was sent to him a day before the battle of Çıldır\textsuperscript{33} and another one was sent after the battle of Koyun-geçidi\textsuperscript{34} to win the heart of the Sultan. As a result of his efforts, by early October 1578 'Ālî's new appointment as māl-defterdar of Diyarbekir or Aleppo was forwarded to the Sultan via the Serdar because the defterdârs of Timars were directly appointed by the Sultan.\textsuperscript{35} It may be assumed that at the beginning of 1579 'Ālî started to work as a registrar of Timars in the financial branch of Aleppo.\textsuperscript{36} However he did not take up

\textsuperscript{32}-B:83b-84a
\textsuperscript{33}-B:96a
\textsuperscript{34}-B:107b-108a
\textsuperscript{36}-Fleischer:op.cit. p. 82:Although Fleischer gives the date of the appointment of 'Ālî as early October of 1578 his guess on the date of his appointment is certainly incorrect on
this duty in Aleppo for another two years.

The army stayed for 24 days in Ereş during which time 'Âli established a good relationship with Mevlânâ Valihi, who preached to the people of Ereş at the Friday prayer in Ulucami on 18 September. Very soon after that he was appointed to Şemṣeddin Sadr Medresesi in Şemâhi as müderris as well as Müftî of Şirvan. To these newly conquered territories, Lala Muṣṭafâ Paşa's old friend and ally Özdemiroğlu Osmân Paşa was appointed as governor-general of Şirvan. When the bulk of the army under the command of Lala Muṣṭafâ Paşa left Şirvan for Erzurum, Âli visited Osmân Paşa and also made his farewells to his close friend and pupil in imâşa composition, Dal-Mehmed Çelebi, also known as Asafi, one of the proteges of Lala Muṣṭafâ Paşa who was appointed as private secretary to Özdemiroğlu Osmân

this point because he used Bekir Kütükoğlu's work as his main source. However in 1958 J.R. Walsh published: "Müverrih 'Âlî'nin Bir İstidâ-nâmesi" in Türikât Mecmuasi 13 pp.132-140 in which 'Âlî gives the beginning of 987/1579 as the date of his appointment to this post. This result is confirmed by the evidence which was written by 'Âlî in B.129b when the army came to Ardahan. His letter of appointment was sent to confirm the appointment of 'Âlî as defterdar of Diyarbekir or Aleppo (Müellif-i Kitâba mahmiyye-i Halebûn veyâhud Diyarbekirülın mül-derpherdârlügî rica olmub kavi-i arz gönderilmiştir.)

37-B:105b
38-B:113b
He was interested in studying the history of the region so he researched the geography and history of Derbend on the basis of unknown history books. After Çerag-Halife, the Safavi ruler of Derbend, was killed by the Sunni people of Derbend, whose leader with the respected leaders of the region came to Ereş to declare his allegiance to Lala Musţafă, 'Alî witnessed his behaviour, clothing and action, and provided exotic information about the folklore of Dagistan and Şirvan. Moreover, when the army reached Sultancık on Wednesday 15th October 1578, the Emir Şemhâl declared his obedience to the Serdar, as shown in a miniature of Hazine 101a. 'Alî held interviews with knowledgeable inhabitants of the region, including the Emir Şemhâl and the rulers of Dagistan, in which they narrated the history of the region to him.

After passing deep valleys and high mountains the army arrived in Ardahan where the scattered army was fed and at the next stop at Köprübaşî the Serdar looked for a reliable envoy to
carry the news of the campaign to Istanbul. Although 'Ālī had been appointed in Ereṣ for this duty Güllü Zade Mehmet Beg was sent to Istanbul instead of 'Ālī because if a letter was needed to be written to Iran or if an envoy came from there to Erzurum there was nobody in the army apart from 'Ālī who had the skill to make use of the art of epistolography, of which 'Ālī was proud as an excellent secretary, in order to respond in an appropriate and diplomatic manner. Thus 'Ālī thought a post of münṣîl as springboard to promote his ambition for the post of Nişancî which has been his main goal for a long time. Therefore he dictated Nusret-nâme from this perspective.

The army reached Erzurum after suffering hardship. 'Ālī and his patron spent the winter of 1578-79 in Erzurum. After the long rest of the Ottoman army and the gathering of beglerbegís in Erzurum on 1 Cumāda 1-ahir 987/26 July 1579 the army reached the ruined castle of Kars on which the new castle was built by the Ottoman army in 28 days. During this time 'Ālī researched the history of the Castle of Kars, and gives information about the restoration of the castle in the Selçuk period, because an Arabic inscription was found in the ruined foundation of the

---

42-B:129b

43-Kirzioglu Fahreddin: Kars Tarihi volume I. Istanbul 1953 p.526
castle.\textsuperscript{44} In the meantime a rumour about the coming of the Şâh to the region of Kars circulated among the people, so 'Ălî composed a letter to Şâh Muhammed Hüdâbende asking for acceptable peace terms and warning of an Ottoman attack if these were not accepted.\textsuperscript{45}

Toward the end of the autumn of 1579 the death of Sokullu Mehmed Paşa and the dismissal of Lala Muşafâ Paşa brought a new shape to the central government and the border. Ahmed Paşa became grand vizier instead of Sokullu. When this news reached Erzurum 'Ălî immediately presented an ode of congratulations to him in which he offered his services and also expressed his hope that the new grand vizier would honour people of learning for their accomplishments rather than their connections and links with vælîs of major provinces.\textsuperscript{46} From mid-July 1580 to the end of 1580 'Ălî served as a secretary to the new serdâr, Sinân Pasa.\textsuperscript{47} After that he left for Aleppo as defterdâr of

\textsuperscript{44}-B:197a;Kirzioglu F:op.cit. pp.526-27.

\textsuperscript{45}-B:212a-214a and 233b-235a.

\textsuperscript{46}-Fleischer C.H:op.cit p.86.

Timars in the winter of 1581, where he completed Nusret-nâme.\textsuperscript{48}

In the early spring of 1583 he came to Istanbul and presented Nusret-nâme and Câmi'ü'l-Buhûr to the Sultân who was very impressed with the work and assigned him to oversee the production of the manuscripts of Nusret-nâme. In the meantime he remained in Istanbul trying to obtain a position by which to advance his career along one of the established employment routes. He hoped he could gain royal help and attempted to gain Murâd's favour, by presenting Câmi'ü'l-Kemâlât\textsuperscript{49} to him. As a result of his attempts he was appointed as defterdâr to Erzurum, and after eight months his appointment was made to Baghdad. 'Âli was glad at this appointment but it did not last for long. After a short tenure he was dismissed in 1585. Although he was well-known by the 'ulema' and bureaucrats in Istanbul, he did not receive any post until late in February of 1588 when he was appointed to Sivas\textsuperscript{50} again as defterdâr.


\textsuperscript{49}-'Âli wrote this work between 13th February and 12th March 1584 in Istanbul.Gelibololu Muşafâ 'Âli:Câmi'ü'l-Kemâlât, Scottish National Library Oriental Catalogue 18.7.3 pp.2-3.

\textsuperscript{50}-See for the life of 'Âli in Erzurum, Baghdad and Sivas:Fleischer, C.H. op.cit. pp.115-123;Moreover during 'Âli's stay in Sivas he wrote Nevâdirü'l-Hikem which was introduced by C.H.Fleischer in his "Mustafa 'Âli's Curious Bits of Wisdom"
Between 1590 and 1595 he spent most of his time in the capital, without employment, and during this time he worked hard on the Künhü’l-Abbâr. However after 1595 he spent several very short periods in Sivas and Kayseri as Sancakbegi.

Finally, after three years without an official position, he was appointed emir and emin of Jedde, the harbour of Mecca. In July 1599 he left Istanbul for the last time and travelled to Egypt by sea, and shortly afterwards he left for Jedde. After visiting the holy places in Mecca, he returned to Jedde and died there during the first half of 1600 at his post on the Red Sea.

---


52- During his stay for two months in Egypt ‘Âli wrote Halatu’l-Kâhire which was edited by Tietze, A: Vienna 1975. It was reviewed under its English title Description of Cairo of 1599 by Heywood, C. J. in BSOAS 40/2 (1977) 392-95.

53- When ‘Âli travelled to Jedde and during his stay there before the hajj, he wrote Mevâ’idü’nin-nefâ’si fi kavâ’idi il-Mecâlis, which was introduced by Cavid Beysun in his article "Müverrih ‘Âli’nin Mevâ’idü’n-nefâ’is fi kavâ’idi il-Mecalisi hakkında" in TD, Istanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi, March 1950 Istanbul.
It is seen from the above short biography that two imposing factors had a negative effect on his chequered career as an Ottoman bureaucrat. One of these was the institutional and social system of the Ottoman State which was starting to break down, as a result of which a breaking of the established standards in career lines was made and the appointments of official employees were changed very frequently in a short time, as was the case with 'Ālī. The second was his temperament and ambition; although he had a wide variety of knowledge in different fields he did not find a place in any job which suited his experience in and knowledge of the institutions of the Ottoman State. 'Ālī considered that he was born at the wrong time. If he had lived in the reigns of Mehmed II, (1451-81) Selîm I (1512-20) and Kânûnî Sulṭân Süleymân, (1520-66) he could have reached high rank. Moreover he did not admire anyone who was proud and haughty. This made it difficult for him to get on with colleagues and friends in bureaucratic circles. Even according to Bekir Kütükoglu, his flattery was unmeasured when he expected advantage.

54-Isen, Mustafa: op.cit. p.10

55-Bekir Kütükoglu: "'Ālī Mustafâ Efendi" in DVIA.
THE WORKS OF 'ÂLÎ

a- a brief survey of his works

One of the most famous Ottoman historians and authors was 'Âlî whose political life had its high and low points as can be seen from his biography. The situation of the Ottoman state and community and his own extensive knowledge encouraged him to write many works in different fields about which there is no doubt that the first source of information is his own writings. In particular Nushatû‘s-selâţûn and Kûnhû‘l-ahbûr contain much information about his works and his own life.¹ Moreover there is extensive information about his works in the Sadef-i Sad-Gûher and his Mûnîşat.² Only Kûnalî-zâde Hasan Çelebi among contemporary tezkîre writers has illuminated us about the works of 'Âlî.³

Altogether 'Âlî is known to have composed more than fifty works

¹-Ibnû‘l Emin M. Kemal: op.cit. p.49; Atsîz, N: op.cit. (1968) p.10.
in verse and in prose; however although we know their titles some of them have not been found yet. His works have been divided into eight groups by Mehmed Şeker according to their topics.  

1-Historical works  
2-Mysticism  
3-Literary works  
4-Social Criticism  
5-Calligraphy  
6-Brief works  
7-Logic  
8-Other topics

Among recent studies, firstly Nihal Atsız has done serious work on the classification of 'Alî's works with his 'Alî Bibliyografyası, and secondly Mehmed Şeker has analyzed his life and works in his article and study of 1979, and 1980. Finally Cornell Fleischer has given extended information on his works in his monograph of 1986.

On the other hand 'Alî's historical works are of great importance among contemporary works. These consist of thirteen works, only three of which according to Fleischer

4-Şeker, Mehmed: "Gelibolulu Mustafa 'Alî'nin eserlerinin yeni bir tasnifi ve Mevâ'idû'n-Nefâis fi Kavâ'dîl-Mecâlis" in İslam Medeniyeti Mecmuası 4 1979 p.82; M.Kemal İnan: op.cit. p.49. His works are divided by M. Kemal İnan into four groups in accordance with the topic 1-Historical works 2-Literary works 3-Mystics 4-Ethics. However according to N. Atsız his works can be divided in three groups in accordance with the topic 1-Historical works 2-Literary works 3-Works on other topics.

5-Atsız, N: op.cit. p.11
Mehârîb, Nusret-nâme, Künhûl-ahbâr—"fit generically into the category of historiographical literature." Among these historical works some parts of Künhûl-ahbâr, and Fursat-nâme, have recently been produced in a critical edition or have been edited. The remaining historical works still wait for researchers in the library for critical editions as well as comprehensive studies in the future, and one of them is Nusret-nâme.

b-Nusret-nâme

Like Gazavat-nâme, Zafer-nâme etc., historical sources describing military details of victory in a battle or a campaign—which can be the account of one action or series of actions—started to be produced in the fifteenth century and with the changing of the structure of the Ottoman state they began to appear in large numbers in the sixteenth century with descriptions of the campaigns of Sulţân Selîm I and Sulţân Süleymân which are models for similar related works among which Nusret-nâme was mentioned as a work of the same genus.

---

6-Fleischer C: op.cit. pp.235-36

by A. Levend. Moreover 'Alî's other two historical works - Heft-Meclis, Nâdirî'l-Mehârib - take their place in the historiography of this type.²

This work deals with the campaigns of the Ottoman army in Caucasia under the command of the serdâr, Lala Muṣṭafâ Paşa. The work commences on 22 Şevvâl 985 (2nd January 1578) and ends with the death of Lala Muṣṭafâ Paşa in Şevvâl 988 (January 1580).

The main text is divided into two parts in accordance with the development of the topic. It is very clear that there are two different parts in the copies H and N. The first part ends with short note as a Hâtime and the second part begins with a new title page as if it were the start of a different book, and we may assume that after returning to Erzurum from campaigning 'Alî composed the first draft of the Nusret-nâme during the winter of 1578-1579 in Erzurum. The following summer saw the rebuilding of the Kars fortress and at this time he composed material which was added to Nusret-nâme and revised in

²-Levend, A.Sirri: Gazavat-nâmeler ve Mihaloglu 'Alî Bey'in Gazavat-nâmesı, T.T.K. Ankara 1956 p.4 and p.86
³-Fleischer:op.cit. p.240
Aleppo.\textsuperscript{10} The first part of the text is presented in this study to which I have not appended the rebuilding of the Kars fortress which is added to the Nusret-nâme.\textsuperscript{11}

Even though this part of the text may be divided in a way which may be useful from a modern historian's point of view, we have divided the text according to Ālî's organisation in chapter four. After giving the historical background of events in his introduction he organises his work according to the meetings of the council of campaign under the leadership of Lala Mustafâ. These chapters of the text start with the words \textit{Bu meclis}. When the army camped at a given place the council of campaign met to discuss the progress of the campaign, the route, the problems of provision for the army and regional problems. In these meetings of the council of campaign as the Seždar 's münşi 'Ālî was charged with communicating the decision of the council, and thus he wrote many letters to Istanbul and local governors on the Ottoman-Safavi border as well as in Caucasia, as a result of which when he recorded them he arranged every meeting of the council as a chapter. It is this possible that

\textsuperscript{10}-"Kars kal'asını¥ ta'miri ve ba'zi havâdîgû¥ ägär-i tagtiri hususûnda mûtâ'allikdir ki, sene-i şâniyede zâhir olmuşdur tafsîli kitâb-i nusret-nâmede nihiyet ü encâm bulmuşdur."KA 529b.

\textsuperscript{11}-"Tezyîl-i latîf-i bî-'adîl" H.186b.
he may have thought that the phase of campaign presented a better framework of organisation rather than using a general method which could reflect his münsi's skill in correspondence.

Although we are not informed about the method followed by 'Ālī in his writing of Nusret-nāme, it is possible that he may have kept a notebook when he was a witness to many of the events as the campaign developed; under the decision of the council he wrote letters to the rulers of the region and the central government in Istanbul from whom he received letters and kept copies of these letters among his notebook which he reproduces in verbatim form so that there is no doubt that Nusret-nāme is an original source.

Apart from the official correspondence and his own full eyewitness account of the campaign there is no doubt that there were oral sources for Nusret-nāme. When the army arrived at Sultancık 'Ālī interviewed Emir Şemhāl from whom he reported information concerning the historical background of the region. Moreover after the army returned to Erzurum from Şirvan they did not receive information regarding the situation of the newly installed Ottoman government of Şirvan. On this occasion he mentions the name of the person from whom he recorded information about the defeat of the Khan of Crimea and
the withdrawal of Osmân Paşa to Derbend. One of his oral sources is Hâsbeğ who related the events of Şirvan up to the festival of Eid\textsuperscript{12} and it seems that another is Ebu'l-Kasm from whom he reported the following days' events in Şirvan until 6 Şevvâl.\textsuperscript{13} However sometimes he does not mention his sources and he only says "spies came".\textsuperscript{14}

The text is similar in style to that of 'Âli's other works, and represents the classical works of the sixteenth century, the narrative account of 'Âli and the letters being occasionally interrupted by snatches of Persian and Arabic poetry and quotations from the Quran and Arabic proverbs. Moreover a letter (178a-180a) in the text is written in Persian and was sent to Muhammedi Khan, while another letter (188-189b) written in Arabic which came to the Serdâr from Emir Seccâd, the ruler of Baghdad, is recorded by 'Âli (Emir Seccâdu'n bu mektûb-\textsuperscript{i} mergûbu bi-t-temâm nakl olındu).

Although a certain part of 'Âli's account in the text is

\textsuperscript{12} - "Hâs Beğ nâm çâvuş kûllari dahi Şîrvân cânûbiinden gelûb mirûran vâki' olan ceng ü cidûlûn keyfiyyeti istihbûr oldûkda, şöyle takrîr eyledi ki" B 163b

\textsuperscript{13} - "Mezbûr Kûsûrm kûllari 'ûryanen kurtûlbû bu vechle takrîr-i kelâm eyledi ki" B 167a

\textsuperscript{14} - "Câsûs gelûb, câsûs-\textsuperscript{i} mezbûr" B 165b
written in a dry basic language,\(^{15}\) it should be noted that
the epistles and berats in the text, of which some parts are
written in a mixture of Arabic, Persian, West Turkish and
Cagatay Turkish, as a result of which they are difficult to
comprehend, are full of such grammatical features as the
Persian-style izāfe, rhyme, rhythm, alliteration, homonymy etc.
These characterize inşā prose as well as 'Ālī\(^{'}\)s special skill
which he was proud of perfection in mastering, and was able
to use elaborated inşā in his prose with an abundance of
structural features without at the same time making use of
mere empty verbosity.\(^{16}\) The fact is that official correspondence
of this type was written by state secretaries and Kātibs of
Divān which culminated in works such as those of Idris Bidlisi
and 'Ālī\(^{17}\) who had used mastery in epistolography, which
"concerned the overall layout of each type of document and the
standard formulae for titles, and styles of address for
addressees ranging from foreign rulers to local begs and kadis

\(^{15}\) "Bu kitāb-i belāgat edā-yı terk-i san'atla inşā olundı." B.5a.

\(^{16}\) Tietze, A: "Mustafā 'Ālī\(^{'}\)s Prose Style" in Archivum
Ottomanicum 5, 1973 p.298

\(^{17}\) Schmidt Jan: Pure water for thirsty Muslims Leiden 1991
p.107
of remote imperial towns."^{18}

According to Mehmed Çavuşoğlu 'Ālī preferred to use style rather than contents in his works as did the preceding scholars Celal Zade, Ramazan Zade and Hoca Sa'eddin Efendi.^{19} On the other hand, although Fleischer says "'Ālī intended to write a coherent history rather than to create a display of his literary talents"^{20} 'Ālī explains the aim in writing this book as being that "it was written to teach the subject to the student and to explain the method of epistolography and the art of literary composition to the scribe."^{21}

Although 'Ālī's Nusret-nâme can be appreciated as a history intended to win royal patronage it is a primary source for its period and thus had a particular value so that it was copied or used towards the end of the sixteenth century. However unfortunately after he completed his Kühü'l-ahbâr in

---


^{20} Fleischer C: op.cit.pp.235-36

^{21} "Tullab-ı ātiyeye ta'lim ve küttâb-ı râğibeye uslûb-ı inşâyi tefhim niyyetine bu kitâb-ı belagat" B. 5a
1599 Nusret-nâme was not used by contemporary and following historians, and it remained under the shadow of Künhü‘l-aḫbâr.

A close examination of certain events clearly shows that the contemporary historians Selanîkî, Lokmân, and Ebubekîr, in Şark Seferleri, Hüseyn in Çazavât-i Özdemiroğlu Oğmân Paşa, and Harîmî in Zafer-nâme who were in service in parts of the eastern campaign like 'Âlî and were witnesses of the campaign under Lala Muṣṭafâ Paşa and events in Şîrvan, though covering the same period in part or in whole, are quite different from Nusret-nâme, both in respect of information and the style of narration. Moreover following scholars, like Hasan Beg Zade, Mûneccim-başî, Solak-zâde and Kâtib Çelebi22 in Fezleke did not use Nusret-nâme as a source, though it seems that Peçevî used extracts from the history of the eastern campaign in Künhü‘l-aḫbâr in his work with critical analysis.

c-Künhü‘l-aḫbâr

As mentioned above the Nusret-nâme was firstly used as 'Âlî's own source in writing Künhü‘l-aḫbâr which was written between 1591-1599 and consisted of four rûkûns dealing with the

22-Kütükoglu B: (in Katib Çelebi 'Fezlekesinün kaynakları' p.53) states that Kâtib Çelebi preferred to use Peçevî as his main source rather than 'Âlî's and Hasan Beg Zade's texts.
following topics: the first concerns the creation of the world and geography. The second contains the history of the prophets and the Islamic Arabic dynasties, the third rüken deals with Turkish and Mongol history and the last rüken contains Ottoman history from the beginning (Osmân I) to October 1595 (Mehmed III). The passages covering the period from the creation of the world to the conquest of Istanbul in Künhü'l-ahbär, were published in Istanbul (1861-1869), while the remaining part which is unpublished is located in several libraries in the world.23

23—Recent works show that the study of the Künhü'l-ahbär is being deepened by the contribution of a few scholars, such as Cornell Fleischer: Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire. It was based on an intensive reading of the author's works and related sources, in which he examined 'Ālī and also discusses some aspects of 16th century Ottoman society as seen through 'Ālī's eyes. This work made a breakthrough in 'Ālī studies. Moreover he tried to establish a link between Ibn Ǧaldūn and 'Ālī on the basis of the ideas of Künhü'l-ahbär in his "Royal Authority, Dynastic Cyclism and Ibn Ǧaldun in sixteenth century Ottoman letters", Journal of Asian and African studies 18/3-4 1983 (198-220). Mustafa Isen studied and edited the tezkire part of Künhü'l-ahbär and mentioned 38 copies of Künhü'l-ahbär in several libraries in Turkey in his Künhü'l-ahbär'm Tezkire Kismi Ankara 1994. When Rana Von Mende compared Künhü'l-ahbär with Fursat-nâme, she mentioned some copies of it following Atsiz's 'Ālī Bibliyografyası in her Mustafâ 'Ālī's Fursat-nâme, Edition und Bearbeitung einer Quelle zur Geschichte des persischen Feldzugs unter Sinân Paşa 1580-1581 Berlin 1989. Finally Jan Schmidt according to him his own study could hardly have been written without Fleischer's recent works—firstly has produced an edition of the preface of the Leiden manuscript and has examined its main source in his Mustafâ 'Ālī's Künhü'l-ahbär and its preface according to the Leiden Manuscripts Istanbul 1987. A second work is a brave attempt at a systematic study
When 'Āli started to write his great world history, he was not commissioned by any statesman whom he needed to praise in order to win favour for the promotion of his bureaucratic career, in contrast to his preceding ambition, since he had now reached mellow old age, and thus he was not led to any sort of official history. According to Fleischer "'Āli's mission in composing the Kühü'l-ahbâr was cultural and intellectual rather than political; he designated himself, it will be remembered, the continuator of the historiographical tradition established by his mentors Celâlзаде and Ramazan Zade."24

Kühü'l-ahbâr contains his world history, a critical edition of which has not yet been done. This important work would require the energies of several historians because its great length and the mass of historical information; contained together with epistolography and artistic literary

of Kühü'l-ahbâr which is an important step in leading toward to a critical edition in which he discusses the place of the work in the current debates among historians of the Ottoman Empire; the author's historical methods; and description of the contents and style of the book as well as describing the extant Mss. Finally he gives a survey of its textual history in his Pure water for thirsty Muslims: a study of Muṣṭafâ 'Ālî of Gallipoli's Kühü'l-ahbâr Leiden 1991.

24-Fleischer, C.H: Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire, Princeton, 1986 p.242
composition. However much of the unpublished part of the Künhü'l-ahbär contains information about historical events dealt by other historical works of 'Ālī,²⁵ so that these, including Nusret-nâme, will be able to contribute to a critical edition of the entire work when this is undertaken at a future date.

**d—Comparison between Künhü'l-ahbär and Nusret-nâme**

At this point there is a question as to what percentage of the Nusret-nâme was used or how it was used as a source by the writer in his later famous book. I think that the answer can be provided by close examination of examples from the texts given below which show that 'Ālī quotes his description of the

²⁵—Schmidt Jan: op. cit. p. 46-52: he states that the prose works of 'Ālī's own composition used for Künhü'l-ahbär were in the order in which they were written as below:

1- Nādirū'l-muhārib of 1567/68  
2- Heft-meclis of 1569/70  
3- Zübdetū't-tevārih of 1579  
4- Nusret-nâme of 1578/80  
5- Fursat-nâme of 1580/81  
6- Nushatu's-selātın of 1581/85  
7- Cāmi'ül-buhūr der mecalis-i sūr of 1583  
8- Mir'ātū'l-'avālim of 1587  
9- Mirkatū'l-cihād of 1589  
10- Mahasinü'l-ādāb of 1596  
11- Fusūl-i hall ū 'akd fi usūl-i harç u nakd of 1598/99
comet in the prose section in B5ab with little alteration as a summary, and quotes a poem which is completely the same in between the prose. The following passages are clear examples of this.

Sene-i hams ve şemânın ve tis 'a-mi'e Ramaţânu'1-mübahîkenu'n evvelki evvelki gicesi idi. Nâ-gehân evc-i asmânûn maţla'-1 hilâl-i rahşan olan semtinde bir seyyâre-i gîsû-där, mânend-i âtespâre-i pûr-şerâr zâhir ü be-çindâr oldu. Hattâ şirâ-yi Rûmdan menla sâ'i be ne makûle bir târîh düşûrûdû.

(KA.508b)

Some passages from B.58a in Nusret-nâme are summarised very briefly as it contains just the head-line of the topic from ‘Allî in KA 509a and 509b. By contrast a letter (from B.58a to B.62a) in Nusret-nâme written to Muhammedi Khan at the request of Lala Mustafâ Paşa is copied exactly the same as in KA (510a-512a). Moreover although some passages in Nusret-nâme are
very short, the same topic when discussed in KA is given in greater detail. It can be estimated that 'Ali added some information regarding the details of the context when he started to write on the eastern campaign under Lala Musafar Paşa in KA. The following passage is a very clear example of this.

 olan guz̄ata dȧhī bȧllū Hacı Sulṭân nâm müfsidan yedi
hâllerince iltifât û riʿâyet bin surh-serân ile Vân kalʿasına
kilîndî, ve bu ahbârdañ kibâr ü muhâsara itmek kasdana
sigâra bir meserret-i ġânimet-
yûrûmişler, kâne mübtelâ
şiʿâr vâkiʿ oldu ki, "inşâʿ-
Allâh taʿâlâ 'uğûrmuz envâʿ-î nusret û zaferlerle
ğıttîriʿ olduklari renc-i inhizâm
fikran itmişler.
Allah taʿâlâ 'uğûrmuz envâʿ-î
hûveydâdur" diyû düşman

Pes Hasan Beg didükleri şûr-
vilâyetine doğru bulsalar
uçarlardı ve (B.65a) atları
i jiyân rûbâh u fettân misâli
düşînverse şeb û rûz dimeyûb
kâr-âgahân lisânından bu ahvâl
göçerlerdi. Nazm:
ki yüzûz güzide adam ile bir
Hâkk taʿâlâ işlerin âsân ide
ki üçûz güzide adam ile bir
Hâkle düşmanlarnın yeksân ide
nefer münhezim inmiş üçûz
(B.64a,b)

kelle daхи bu muhârebède
kesilüb muhassal el-merâm
dârûʿl-mûłk ve ana gelmiş ve bu
zîkr olunan gazâlarda saʿâdet
şehâdet ancak on beş mücâhide
şehâdet ancak on beş mücâhide
nasîb olmuş mâʿadâsî bi-zâhm ve
nasîb olmuş mâʿadâsî bi-zâhm ve
inhizâm bâhîrûʿl-iğtînâm ve şâd-
inhzâm bâhîrûʿl-iğtînâm ve şâd-
kâm yerlû yerine 'avdet kîlmûş
çûnki kelleler ile Yusuf
çûnki kelleler ile Yusuf
Kethûdâ sipahsâlar-ı mûlûk-ârâ
cenābīna vūsūl buldu. Aksā-yı murādī olan Erçiș Sancaği ile kendüye ri'āyet olındu. Ve sä'ir bahādirlara daḥi yollu yollarmıca terakkīler 'ināyet kılındı. Fī-mā ba'd basīret ve intibāḥ üzere olmaları fermān olmub bir vech istīcāl 'avdetlerine emīr-i şerifleri vārīd oldu. Nazm:

Hakk ta'alā işlerin âsân ide
Hākle düşmanların yeksân ide

(KA.512a,b)

Although an account of the Ottoman attack made by the Ottoman force on the border fortresses and the description concerning the conquest of Meshīya country in west Georgia as well as the Çıldır battle which is covered in B.65a-67b is summarised to KA 512b-513a, the letters sent by the serdār Lala Muṣṭafā Paşa to Istanbul regarding the defeat of the Safavi army in the Çıldır plain in B.68a-B 74a are exactly the same in KA 513a-516a. In addition the conquest of Tiflis castle in B. 81b-84a is quoted with some alteration and shortened to KA 517a-517b. These passages are a clear example of these abbreviations.
... mäh-ı mezbürün yigirminci günü _ ki yevmü'l-ahaddür _ kütüb-i tevarthinde meşur ve Nüşirevân-i 'Adil binâsından beru ma'mûr olan kal'a-i Tiflîse gelinûb feth ü teshûri, niçe demler ceng-i keşri ve kal' ü temûri, niçe günler Şirvân tedûrûkini 'avk ü te'hûri müstevcib iken, mahz-ı eljâf-ı ilâhi ve kerâmet-i bi-gâyet-i pâdişâhi birle 'asâkir-i nusret-me'âşirdaki kegretden kalblerine havf ü haşyet ve mutâsara olandukdan soňra halâs u rehâ bulmayaçaklarına i'tikâd-ı külli ve ducret-i müstevlî olmâğın içindeki sükkâne, hân nâmünâ olub, Gürcistân meliklerinden iken tâc giyûb, kendû zu'munca "Müslûmân oldum" diyû Kızılbaş-ı evbâşa baş egüb, zulmet-i küfr ü nekBêtten dalâlet raft u ilhâda belki dâ'îre-i melâlet ve irtîdâda düşmiş idi. Men-necâ bi-re'sihi  fakad rebiha maüzûnuna rağbet göstermiş ve kendû zu'munca "Müslûmân re'âyânı etjâf-ı memâlikdeki oldum" diyû Kızılbaş-ı evbâşa cibâl u tilâla kaçrub
baş egüb, zulmet-i küfr ü mutahassın olmalarına ruhsat nekbetden dalâlet-i rafl ü virmiş idi. (KA.517a)
ilhāda belki dā‘ire-i melâmet ü irtidāda düşen ha‘ın-i bed-
girdâr ü nā-dān; ya‘ni, Davud Hān kal’a bıragüb, re‘ayāsi kulle-i cibâle ve Kızılbaş ğāifesinden olan tevâbi-yle kendüsi (H.80b) (H.81a) kal’a-i mezbüre serhaddinden ğaşra, ba‘zı be-vâdî vü tilâle kaçub; men-necā bi-re‘sihi fakad rebiha ma‘zmûnunca berr ü beyâbanda ser-gerdân ve surh-serler mâbeyninde envâ‘-
i gaflet ü hecâletle (B.82a) ser-girân olduğu mukarrer olub.

The following passage concerns the arrival of the Ottoman army at Kanık river, the battle of Koyun-geçidi and the building of the Ereş Castle B. 95a-99a, B. 102a-103a, B. 115a-116b which is abridged to KA 518b-520b. The following example is an illustration of this:
Pes yevm-i gulasanu gulg-i evveli guzeran ve zevv-i eserleri gun gibi nûmâyân oldukda şäh-i bi-intiibâha vezir-i nâdire dân ve muhârib ü ma'ârikde kâ'im makâm-i şeçâ'at-nişân olan Emir Hân kende-i hûcûm ile leşker-i İslâm sâbûkâ Şokmak Sultanûnû başına dokunan gevzenden haberdâr ve zûmre-i surh-serân lâle-i hazân dûde evräki gibi târ [u] mûr oldûguna haylice perişân rûzgâr olub, da'vâ-yi merd ü istid'â-yî ceng ü neberd ile firka-i revâfiizden otuz biî dinç leşkere ser-dâr ve Şokmak Hanûnî intikâmûn alûaga fûrmân-berdâr olub,

(B.97a)

Moreover 'All abridged some passages which belong to B to KA. B. 115a-116b the building of Ereş castle KA 520a-520b. B. 116b-118b the authority of Derbent declared to be dependent
on the Serdar KA 520b-521a.

B. 118a-120a Şirvan becomes an eyalet to which Ogmân Paşa is appointed vizier KA 521a 522a.

B. 120a-131a These passages concern the arrival of the Serdar from Ereğ to Erzurum KA 523b-525b.

B. 154b-156b Text of a letter sent to the beglerbegi of Baghdad.

B. 162a-170a this passage concerns the defeat of Aras Khan KA 528b-529b.

Finally a letter sent to Istanbul by Ogmân Paşa in B. 133a-135b is copied in KA 526a-527a. Moreover a berat written to Şeref Khan from the Serdar, Lala Muştafâ Paşa B.139b-140b is also copied in KA 527a-527b.
a- A survey of Ottoman-Safavi relations until the treaty of Amasya 1555

After the mid-thirteenth century Sunni or orthodox Islam found its dominant position broken by the Mongols who created conditions which facilitated the development of popular religious beliefs of every kind in the Islamic world.\(^1\) Some of these affected the Anatolian Türkmens. After the peasant and nomadic Türkmens including other named Turkish tribes had come to Anatolia they continued to believe in the preceding religions under the guise of superficial Islam, which is described as folk Islam by M. Mazzaoui. Among such groups folk Islamic ideas flourished, as opposed to the more sedate religious practices in the urban centres of Anatolia,\(^2\) because the majority of the Türkmens did not come under the influence of medrese training.\(^3\) In addition, throughout the two and half

\(^1\)- Savory Roger: *Iran Under the Safavids*, Cambridge 1980 p.23


centuries which we are considering here there were no political boundaries in the strict sense of the word between Iran, Iraq, and Anatolia; and finally political unrest and the nomadic structure of large sections of the society in Anatolia can be viewed as a significant factor in explaining the confusion at the religious level. From time to time the Türkmens showed themselves as a political alternative by rebelling against the central state authority during which they contributed to a political and social process of transition led by such men as Baba Işak and Şeyh Bedreddin (1358–1416) in Anatolia as well as the Hurufi sect in Syria. The rebellious teaching survived among their followers who flourished especially among the Türkmens of Anatolia and embraced movements such as militant Shi'ism.

The Safavi state derived its title and descent from Şeyh

---

4-Mazzaoui M.M:op.cit. p.5, p.59

5-Köprü Lu-Zade Mehmed Fuat:Baba Işak's rebellion took place in 1239-40 under Selçuk rule which provided a model later on for similar religious uprisings such as that of Şeyh Bedreddin. See his "Anadolu'da İslamiyet Türk istilasından sonra Anadolu tarih-i dinisine bir nazur ve bu tarihin menbalan" in Darü'l-fünün Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası, sene 2 no. 4 (1338) p.297; Kissling: "Bedre'd-dîn":EI2 p.869; Cahen Cl: "Bābāl" EI2 843-844.

Saffüddin (AD.1252-1334) who founded his order as a Sunni tarikat in Erdebil which spread into Iran, Iraq and Anatolia in a very short time, and to which the Ottoman Sultan sent several gifts and sums of money regularly every year. In Erdebil these gifts were called Çerag Akçesi and served to bring the sufi tarikat under the Ottoman umbrella. During the reign of Murad II (824-55/1421-51) this gift was not sent to Erdebil and Şah Isma'îl’s grandfather Şeyh Cüneyd complained to Bursa. According to Babinger the Ottoman Sultan probably was aware of the new situation of the Safavi tarikat and Şeyh Cüneyd’s behaviour, and he cut his support because Şeyh Cüneyd had converted the once purely spiritual sufi order into a political and military force to combine the formal sultanate with the spiritual sultanate.

The political status quo in Iran and east Anatolia and the religious background in Anatolia and Syria encouraged Şeyh Cüneyd to realize his ambition in spite of his uncle being

---

7-Savory, R: "Safavi" Eİ2; Yazıcı, Tahsin: "Safaviler" İA


9-Babinger, F: op.cit. p.202-204

10-Allouche Adel: op.cit. p.38
leader as senior Şeyh of the Erdebil order. So he made a tour to Karaman in 852/1448 in order to propagate his extremist Shi'ite views, from where the theologians of Konya drove him toward Syria where he settled. After a short time he and his followers were driven by the Mamluk ruler from their country. Finally he met Uzun Hasan, the leader of the Akkoyunlu state in 861/1456, because of new conditions in the region. During his stay in Diyarbekir he married Uzun Hasan's sister, thus directly involving the Safavi order in Persian politics. When Cüneyd fell in battle in 804/1460 some of his followers began to call him God and his son Haydar the son of God; this formed part of the development of the process of transforming the Safavi sufi order into the gulat extremist Şi'a which culminated with Şah Isma'Il.

When Haydar was nine he was installed in Erdebil by his maternal uncle Uzun Hasan who married him to his daughter. A majority of Türkmen converged on the seat of the new Şeyh to whom these followers became an organized militant and

---

11-Asık Paşaazade: Tevarih-i 'Ali Ogmân, Istanbul 1332 p.266
13-Fazlullah b.Ruzbihan: Tarīh-i Ālem ārā-yı Emnî, translated by V.Minorsky, London 1957: This primary source gives extended information about Şeyh Haydar and Şeyh Cüneyd's work with their
aggressive force which was known as the Kızılbaş\textsuperscript{14} because they wore red caps (tāç-i Haydarî).

Like his father Haydar sent his representatives (Halifa) to the Türkmen tribes as well as leading his predominantly Türkmen following with the consent of the Akkoyunlu Sultān Yakub against the unbelievers in Caucasia, but as the growing Safavi power became a dangerous threat to the Sunni Islamic rulers, the Akkoyunlu Yakub and the ruler Şirvan Şah made an alliance against the Şeyh who was killed in a battle in 893/1488\textsuperscript{15} with which Bayezid II was delighted because he was afraid of the troubles which might be caused by the Halifes of Şeyh Haydar. Unfortunately his relief did not last long because Haydar's followers, for example Hasan Halife and Karabirik, scattered in Anatolia and north Syria to spread the halifes in Anatolia and Syria pp.61-78; Woods John E: The Akquyunlu Clan, Confederation, Empire, Chicago 1976 p.119.

\textsuperscript{14}Gölpmarlı Abdülbaki: "Kızılbaş" İA pp.789-795. Moreover Irena Melikoff added new data to Gülpmarlı concerning the military organization of the Kızılbaş in which she gives an answer about how the Kızılbaş came to this point and she claims that the Kızılbaş religion, which was certainly no Shi'ite Islam, was Türkmen paganism which was provided with an Islamic varnish. See her "Le Probleme Kızılbaş" in Turcica 1975 (6) pp.49-67.

\textsuperscript{15}Halm H: (editor C. Hillenbrand) Shiism, Edinburgh 1991 p.80
Safavi revolutionary movement.\textsuperscript{16} Safavi proselytism among the Türkmen was at best disorganized and erratic, led by local Şeyhs whose religious views were not susceptible to definition, but their role in these agitations must have been considerable and they enjoyed support among all sections of the people.\textsuperscript{17}

According to Savory the militant sufì spirit or as Savory paraphrases, "the dynamic ideology of the early Safavi movement" was composed of three principal elements among the Türkmen. Firstly, there were the sufì disciples (murids) of the Safavi order who owed unquestioning obedience to their Murşid-i Kāmil, the head of the order, who was their spiritual director. Second, there was the apotheosis of the Safavi leader as a living emanation of the godhead. Already in the time of Cüneyd the Safavi murids "openly called" their leader "God" and his son "the son of God". Such a deviant doctrine placed the Safavis squarely in the camp of the ġulāt or Shī'ī extremists, such as the Ahl-i Hakk. Third, which assumed greater importance after the establishment of the Safavi


\textsuperscript{17}Walsh J.R.: "The Historiography of Ottoman-Safavi Relations in the sixteenth and seventeenth Centuries" in Historians of the Middle East. ed. Bernard Lewis and P.M. Holt London 1962 pp.202-204
dynasty as the Şahs strove to give legitimacy to their rule, was their claim to be the representatives on earth of the Twelfth Imám or Māndi of the Ithnā 'Asharīs known as the "Lord of the Age" (Sāhib-i Zamān).18

In the meantime the new Safavi da'vā made Haydar's son Isma'īl leader in 1499. The struggle among the Akkoyunlu princes for the succession to the throne allowed him to realise the political front of the new Safavi da'vā to which the life of his predecessors had been devoted. When he invited his adherents to Erzinçan in March 1500, many Turkish tribes from Anatolia, Ustaclu, Karamanlu, Tekelū, Bayat, and Varsak19 converged upon the new leader. In 1501 Isma'īl succeeded in defeating Alvand Mirza, one of the Akkoyunlu petty rulers, whereupon he entered the capital city of Tebriz to declare the birth of the Safavi dynasty and Twelver Shi'ism as the ruling faith. On the first Friday of his reign the names of the Twelve Imams were read despite the Sunni population of Tebriz, after which a wide sweeping campaign against the first

---

18-Savory R.M.: "The Safavid State and Polity" in Iranian Studies 7 1974 pp.188-200; he explains that Safavi leaders succeeded in translating the ordinary pir-murid relationship into something outside the range of usual mystical experience and in arrogating to themselves quasi-divine prerogatives.

three Caliphs started with the cursing which was required of everyone in the whole country and if anyone refused to do it he must be killed.\(^20\) By the end of 1503 Isma'Il was the master of Azerbaijan, Fars and most of Irak-i Acem with the fanatical sense being the bodyguard of the Safavi revolution movement, and he marched through Ottoman territory against 'Alu'd-devle who was defeated in 1505. As a result of Ismā'Il's imperial and anti-Sunni actions, Bayezid II garrisoned his eastern frontier by force\(^21\) as Isma'Il's annexation of Diyarbikir had brought the Safavis into closer contact with their followers in Ottoman territory.\(^22\)

Although by the beginning of the reign of Şāh Isma'Il I, Kızılbaş followers had gnawed away at the religious and political structure of the Ottoman state, Bayezid II's reaction to them was flexible and he merely had some of them deported to Rumeli from Anatolia.\(^23\) In spite of the threat to Ottoman territorial integrity from Şāh Isma'Il I with whom Bayezid II

\(^{20}\) Halm H:op.cit. p.84

\(^{21}\) Parry V.J: "Bayezid II" EI2 p.1120

\(^{22}\) Savory, R.M: "The Consolidation of Safavid Power in Persia" in Der Islam 41 1965 pp.71-76

preferred to avoid a direct confrontation, both sides tried to protect the existing peace by sending letters to each other.\footnote{One of the first works concerning Ottoman-Safavi relation is the work of S.N. Fisher: *Foreign Relations with Turkey* which has extensively drawn from written general history regarding Turkey and Iran and narratives written in Western languages. In that work, Turkey’s relations with Iran are treated briefly pp. 90-102. Secondly we may mention Selahattin Tansel: *Sultan Bayezid Siyasi Hayati*, (Istanbul 1966) in which Safavi-Ottoman relation are illustrated with archive material pp. 226-257.}

But from day to day the Kızılbaş problem grew during the struggle among the Şehzades for the succession to the throne. They seem to have been instigated to rebellion by the leader of the Şah-kulu who brought bloodshed and chaos to central Anatolia toward the end of Bayezid II’s reign\footnote{Çağatay Uluçay examined the rebellion of the Şah-kulu with archive material in his “Yavuz Sultan Selim Nasıl Padişah Oldu” TD sayi 9 pp. 62-76 sayı 10 pp. 127-131.} because of his passive policies.

Selîm I (918-26/1512-20) adopted an offensive policy toward the Kızılbaş in Anatolia and Şah Isma’îl\footnote{Tansel Selahattin: *Yavuz Sultan Selim* (Ankara 1969). This respected work, which was produced with archive material kept in Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi Arşivi, contains pp. 20-80 which deals with Ottoman-Safavi relations. Secondly Ş. Tekindag examined the campaign of the Ottomans against Iran in the light of the archival material of Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi Arşivi in his “Yeni Kaynak ve Vesikalar Işığında Yavuz Sultan Selîm’in Iran Seferi” in TD 17, sayi 22 pp. 49-78. Thirdly Adel Allouche commented on the results of preceding works in his work *The Origin and Development of Ottoman-Safavi Conflict* pp. 65-} instead of placating the
Safavis as Bayezid had done. Furthermore, during his governorship of Trabzon (probably 892/1487-917/1511) which was near the north-west frontier of the Safavis he had observed the effect of Safavi da'wa on the religious life of the Anatolian people, about which he had tried to warn the central government, but because of the lack of response of the central government he had shown the first signs of his reaction against his father's policy toward the Safavis and had ordered raids on the environs of Erzincan and Bayburd which lay in the dominions of Şâh Isma'îl.27

After Selîm's accession to the throne he eliminated his brothers, and then ordered repression of the Kızılbaş. Anyone who was known or suspected to be a member of the movement was registered, and extremist members of them were executed.28

Having consolidated his power in Ottoman territory Selîm I turned to the east, ordered an embargo on silk traffic from


27-Allouche Adel: op.cit. p.108

Persia to Europe and compelled the Şah to become involved in war, conducting a frequent correspondence in order to achieve a settlement which was realised finally in the Çaldiran plain where Şah Isma'il and his army were defeated with artillery (23rd August 1514). The Safavis fled, and Selim entered Tebriz, their capital, on 5th September 1514.

The primary consequence of this victory was the Ottoman conquest of all eastern Asia Minor which had been under the domination of the Safavis, from Erzincan to Diyarbekir. Most of the Sunni local lords under the leadership of Idris-i Bitlis declared their loyalty to the central government in Istanbul; the Akkoyunlu princes in the regions also cooperated with the Ottomans. According to Savory, as a result of their defeat

---

29-Inalcik Halil: "Bursa and the Commerce of Levant" in JESHO iii 1960 131-47.

30-Browne E G: History of Persian Literature in Modern Times Cambridge 1924, gives all the correspondence between Şah Isma'il, Selim, the Memluks and Özbek before Çaldiran pp.73-75.


at Çaldıran, the Safavis were thrown on to the defensive in their long-drawn-out struggle with the Ottomans, and did not regain the initiative for three-quarters of a century, until the reign of Şah 'Abbas the great. This evolution is very important for my present work which covers a part of this period.

The reign of Selîm I's successor Süleymân I (1520-1566) almost coincided with that of Şah Ṭahmâsb I (1524-1576) in Iran both of their reigns being marked by divergence of policy between Ottomans and Safavis while the main aim of Ottoman policy toward the Safavis was to contain and isolate Iran rather than to conquer it (as by the offensive of Süleymân I). As for the Safavi policy vis-a-vis the Ottomans, Ṭahmâsb avoided engaging the Ottomans in pitched battles and had to fight defensive wars and wars of attrition in the newly conquered areas on the border. Because of the civil war among the Kızılbaş clans in

---

33-Savory R:op.cit. p.45; Halm Heinz:op.cit. p.85: Another result of the defeat of Çaldıran which destroyed the "Mehdi" aura of Şah Isma'îl appears to have been to make a new orientation and the creation of new form of authority necessary i.e. alleged descent from the Prophet in the Seyyid line, despite the preceding claims of himself and his grandfather Şeyh Cüneyd.


35-Savory R:op.cit. p.58; Süm'er Faruk:op.cit. p.67.
Iran and Özbek raids in the east the Ottomans were able to strike deep into Safavi territory.

Within this framework, Süleymân I conducted three campaigns against the Safavis of which the first invasion in 1534-35 came about as the result of intrigues by the defecting Ulema of the Tekkelu tribe and in which the Ottomans brought Tebriz and Baghdad under their control, along with the important trade routes that passed through those cities. In the second campaign (1546-48) Azerbaijan was invaded and Tebriz retaken when the Şâh's brother Alkas allied himself with Ottoman troops. In the third (1554) Süleymân I burned Nahcivan. Although his aim was largely achieved with this expedition, geography and military organization set the limits to Ottoman expansion in the East so that he agreed to make a truce with Tahmäsb. Formal peace was signed in Amasya in May 1555. As a result the Safavis recognized Ottoman sovereignty over Arab Iraq, East Anatolia and North Azerbaijan.

---

36-Inalcik, Halil: *The Ottoman Empire (The Classical Age 1300-1600)*, London 1995 p.38.

37-Browne: op.cit. p.93

b- Ottoman-Safavi relations from the Amasya Treaty to the death of Şah Tahmāsb

The new status quo with the Amasya treaty started new friendly terms in the Ottoman-Safavi relation which both sides tried to keep until the death of Şah Tahmāsb. Thus Tahmāsb sent valuable gifts to Istanbul and congratulated Süleymān I when the Süleymaniye Mosque was opened on 15 August 1556. The treaty was kept so strictly that when Süleymān I's son Bayezid fled to Iran after the struggle with his brother Selīm I in the plain of Konya, Beyazīd attempted to persuade Tahmāsb to lead an army against the Ottomans but the Şah acted in a dignified fashion because Sulṭān Süleymān made it clear that the continuance of existing peace was dependent upon the case of Bayezid. Therefore Beyazīd and his four sons were handed over to the Ottoman delegation. According to Savory, the terms of the treaty of

---

39-Kütükgolu, Bekir: "Şah Tahmāsb I" in Vekayi'ndvis Makaleler, Istanbul 1994 p.312: Moreover, making use of the Mühimme defters Bekir Kütükgolu gives all the hüküms which were written to beglerbegi's on the border between Ottomans and Safavis to escort Safavi envoys to Istanbul. The central government warned them to avoid damaging the peace. See his: Osmanlı-Iran Siyasi Münasebetleri, Istanbul 1993 p.4.

Amasya were reconfirmed with this new agreement in 1562. Moreover, towards the end of the reign of Süleyman I even though Kasım Mirzā, the son of the preceding ruler of Şirvan wished to invade North Şirvan with Ottoman support during the third campaign of Süleyman I and the local ruler of Azerbaijan had wanted the Ottomans to help and finally Levent Khan the king of East Georgia sent his envoy to Istanbul for help against the Safavi invasion in Azerbaijan and Georgia, the central government in Istanbul preferred to console them with diplomatic correspondence to keep the status quo.\(^4^1\)

\(^{41}\)Kirzioglu, Fahredin: Osmanlılarm Kafkas-ellerinin Fethi, Ankara 1993 p.254; Browne E.G: op.cit. pp.95-96. During the reign of Şâh Tâhmâsb after the Amasya treaty the Safavis were at war with the Caucasian rulers such as the king of Georgia and the ruler of Şirvan in 1560-61, 1556, 1568-69. These wars were also fought with great ferocity but great states such as the Ottomans and Özbeks did not interfere with the situation in the area.
Şah Țahmâsb, and Sulṭān Selîm (1566-1574), both stood by keeping the peace terms. Thus when Selîm II ascended the throne, a large delegation led by Şah-kulu Khan, the Safavi governor of Çukur Saʻad, came with a weight of valuable gifts to congratulate Sulṭān Selîm in Edirne in February 1568.42 His viziers treated them with respect and the preceding agreement was reconfirmed again from both sides.43 As a result not even the most unimportant border-case at the frontier occurred in the reign of Selîm II.

Şah Țahmâsb sent an embassy headed by Şah Kulu's son, Muhammedi Sulṭān, the governor of Çukur Saʻad, whose title was Țokmak Khan, to Istanbul to congratulate Murâd III (1574-1595) as well as to reconfirm the preceding treaty at the beginning of the new reign. The beglerbegî of Rumeli Siyavuş Paşa welcomed the envoys who were put up at the Behrâm Paşa and Hançerli Sulṭān Palaces44 and on 13 May 1576 Sulṭān Murâd received them and they

---


43-Kirzioglu, Fahrettin: op.cit. p.255.

44-Selanîkî: op.cit. pp.112-113
presented the message and gift of the Şâh.\textsuperscript{45} Finally on 31 May the Safavi envoy left Istanbul to return to Kazvin.\textsuperscript{46}

During the stay of the Safavi envoy in Istanbul, there was speculation about whether the death of Şâh Tāhmasb had occurred or not because of the rivalry among tribes in Kazvin. It seems that after the envoys had left Üsküdar the news of the death of Şâh Tāhmasb was heard in Istanbul and they reached Kazvin on the third day of the accession of Şâh Isma'îl II to the throne on 30 Cumâda'î-ülâ 984 (25 August 1576).\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{45}-Uzunçarşı: I.H: Osmanlı Tarihi, volume III p.244: He says that the Ottomans made magnificent meeting ceremony for the envoy of the Safavîs, in a way in which no foreign envoy in Istanbul had been treated before. Kütkooglu, Bekir: "Şâh Tâhmasb'în Murâd III'î Cûlûs Tebriki" in Vekayi'nüvis Makaleleri Istanbul 1994 pp.375-385: gives the Şâh's letter which is kept (evrak nr.3161) in the archive of Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi in which the Şâh explains that he had learnt from merchants and visitors the news of the death of Sulûn Selîm II so that the delegation under the leadership of Tôkmak Khan was sent to Istanbul to congratulate the new sultan as well as to confirm the existing peace. Moreover Bekir Kütkooglu gives details concerning the travel of the Persian envoy to Istanbul in accordance with the hûkûms in Mûhimme Defters and also details the gifts of both sides in the light of the data of contemporary writers such as Lokmân and Selanîkî.


\textsuperscript{47}-Kütkooglu, Bekir: "Şâh Tâhmasb'în Murâd III'î Cûlûs Tebriki" in Vekayi'nüvis Makaleleri Istanbul 1994 p.382
c-The political development between both states prior to the war in 1577 and the outbreak of the Ottoman-Safavi conflict

As the Ottomans and the Safavis wished to direct their main military effort elsewhere the peace of the Treaty of Amasya was maintained up to the death of Şâh Ṭahmâsb which marked the conclusion of the preceding period and the commencement of a new era of Ottoman-Safavi conflict which lasted more than twelve years (985-998/1577-1590). After the death of Ṭahmâsb the Safavi state was involved in internal problems connected with the succession the throne. Tribal chiefs tried to impose to their own candidates among Ṭahmâsb's sons. In the ensuing struggle, the backers of Haydar son of Ṭahmâsb and a Georgian mother and Ismâ'îl Mirza, son of Ṭahmâsb and a Türkmen mother brought the matter to a rapid conclusion. The pro-Ismâ'îl supporters were victorious. Haydar Mirza was slain but under the drunken and dissolute Isma'îl II (1576-1577) and the weak and halfblind Muhammed Hüdâbende (1577-87), the sovereign became a mere puppet. Tribal leaders used their forces in order to fight each other instead of keeping the army as a

---

means of defence against external foes.\textsuperscript{49} This situation continued until the beginning of the reign of Şâh 'Abbâs I (1587-1629).

Although both states took care apparently to maintain the peace, in reality they did not avoid creating new plans in their own interest which foreshadowed the future development of new events in the region so that soon after the treaty of Amasya expired wars were waged by the Safavi army with great ferocity in Georgia and Şirvan in 1560-1, and 1568-69\textsuperscript{50} to keep the centre of production of silk in Şirvan as well as to open a northern window to the world for the Safavis because the price revolution forced Şâh Ţahmâsib I to find new routes which bypassed the Ottoman lands.\textsuperscript{51} In the meantime English merchants hoped to obtain spice directly and more cheaply. They sought other routes, particularly the road from Moscow through Iran to Hurmuz.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{49}-Lockhart, L: "The Persian Army in the Safavi Period" in Der Islam 34 p.91

\textsuperscript{50}-Browne: op.cit. p.95


In the meantime the Ottoman state devised two direct actions on the northern and the southern flank of the Safavi state, to be organised as a pincer movement.\textsuperscript{53} On the one hand after the conquest of Baghdad and Basra, Ottoman control was well established on the north-western shores of the Persian Gulf where the beglerbegilik of Lahsa had just been created as a basis for further invasion. In the reign of Selim II and Murad III there followed other attempts whose aim was conquer Bahrain as well as to drive back the Portuguese forces from the Persian Gulf to the Indian Ocean. As a result of these attempts the Ottomans hoped to establish themselves on Hormuz.\textsuperscript{54}

On the other hand Ivan IV, the ruler of Moscow, took control of Kazan in 1552 and Astrakhan, advancing as far as the river Terek in Northern Caucasus in 1556\textsuperscript{55} which almost coincided with the invasion of the southern region of Caucasus carried out by Şah Tahmāsb.\textsuperscript{56} As a result of the invasions, the pilgrimage

\textsuperscript{53}\textsuperscript{53}Itzkowitz, Norman: \textit{Ottoman Empire and Islamic Tradition}, London 1980 pp.70-71


\textsuperscript{55}\textsuperscript{55}Inalcik Halil: op.cit. p.39

\textsuperscript{56}See above p.72
traffic through Astrakhan and the lucrative northern trade routes were disrupted. The silk producing provinces in northern Azerbaijan fell into the hand of the Safavis whereas, in fact, since Selim I's time, the Ottomans had established political and trade links with them in order to provide the silk industry with a main source of raw material. Thus the direct control of the silk producing provinces in Şirvan must have been on Ottoman objective.\(^{57}\) The local dynasties in Dagistan, Şirvan and Gilan and the Muslim rulers in Türkistan pleaded to the Sultan as Halife of Islam to assist them in opposing the aggressor but after the campaign of the Habsburgs in 1566, the Ottomans were able to turn their attention to the north-east and adopted the canal project which was intended to link the Don and the Volga rivers, thus creating an all-water route from the Black Sea to the Caspian Sea. An obvious aim of this plan was to make possible a sea and river-borne attack on Persia, bypassing the barely penetrable uplands of Armenia and Azerbaijan.\(^{58}\) It would also have been able to extend Ottoman

\(^{57}\) Inalcik H: *An economic and social history of the Ottoman Empire* volume one 1997 Cambridge p.229

\(^{58}\) Imber, C:*The Persecution of the Ottoman Shi'ites* According to the Mühimme Defters 1565-1585 in *Der Islam* 56 1979 p.254; Inalcik, Halil:*The Ottoman Empire: The classical age (1300-1600)* London 1973 p.39; Kurat, A.N:*"The Turkish expedition to Astrakhan in 1569 and the Problem of the Don-Volga Canal" in The Slavonic Review* p.14
control over the northeast of Black Sea. According to Halil Inalcık this plan united the Tsar and Şah to make an alliance against the Ottomans and at the same time Pope Gregory XIII included the Tsar and the Şah in his plan for a crusade against the Ottomans Allen confirms that "Safavi Persia [was] well disposed equally to the Portuguese and to the Muscovites, [and] was a potential link between the two vast areas of the Portuguese oceanic front and the Russian 'fluvial' front" but because of the rivalry among the dignitaries of the central government in Istanbul it failed. However after the Ottomans controlled the most part of the Caucasus between 1578 and 1590, they established a naval force on the Caspian Sea.

Apart from competition between both states for the economic resources, minerals and manpower of the lands and the sea from

59-Woodhead, C: "Selim II" EI2 p.131-132
60-Inalcık, H: op.cit p.39
61-Allen W.E.D: The Problems of Turkish Power in the Sixteenth Century, London 1963 p.33; Goyung, N: "Engelbert Koempler ve Iran'da gördükleri" in Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi, sayı 15 Istanbul 1997 p.381: He indicated that for the following events at the end of 16th century the political and military alliance between the Safavis and several European states _ England, Austria, Moscow and Rome _ against the Ottomans diplomatic circles were dense with going and returning envoys in order to encircle the Ottomans.

62-Kortepeter C. Max: Ottoman Imperialism During the Reformation London 1973 p.45
the Caucasus range to Hormuz, as we mentioned before, the
Ottoman state had faced a treat of Shi'a doctrine spreading and
affecting their internal security for many years. Although
an effective Safavi fifth-column had lost much of its strength
with the blow of the Ottoman state which was carried out by
Sultan Selim I and Kannun Sultan Suleyman, after this its
continued presence had been demonstrated very weakly by the
spread of Safavi propaganda in a few instances in Asia Minor;
thus it was reduced after the treaty of Amasya and official
records in Mühimme Defterleri show a sudden reduction, even
if a few individuals involved in their jurisdiction, were
either deported to Cyprus or were executed.

63 Kütükoglu, B:op.cit. p.8;Walsh, J: "The Historiography of
Ottoman-Safavi Relations in the Sixteenth and Seventh
Centuries" in Historians of the Middle East. ed. Bernard Lewis

64 Kütükoglu, B:op.cit. pp.8-14;Imber, C:op.cit p.254;Refik
Ahmet:On Altinci Asirda Rafizilik ve Bektaşilik, Istanbul 1932
p.12-37:According to him after 1558 religious revolts were
reduced in Anatolia and even if a few incidents took place
they had showed themself as a part of the Suhte revolt which
happened in Amasya, Merzifon and Bozok about which hâkim
were sent to sancakbegis or beglerbegis to eliminate existing
problems in 1568 and 1570. However even if Mustafa Akdag
(Cellâî İsyâncı: Ankara 1963 pp. 114-118) did not give
information concerning heretic activities in Anatolia he
adds that people in Anatolia were involved in great fear
because under the shadow of the Suhte revolt many revolts
occurred preceding the beginning of the Persian campaign for
which sancakbegis required the central government to remain
more on guard in the existing situation rather than the
former situation in the sancak.
After the death of Şâh ʿTâmhâsb the change of power in the Safavi state emphasised internal and external traditional policies of the Safavi state which affected many areas including Ottoman-Safavi relations. After his ascent to the throne in 1576, Ismail's two year's reign was one of incredible violence, in which he killed practically all the possible rival candidates for the throne and many of the preeminent figures of state to maintain his position at all costs. In addition he favoured the Sunnis such as Mirza Makhdum and Şeref Khan who rose to high rank in the central government instead of the Kizilbaş tribe; as a result of this among the people Isma'Il is alleged to have been less than an enthusiastic twelver Shi'ite. Confusion in the internal political situation of the Safavi

65-Hinz, V. W: "Schah Esma'Il II", in Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Safawiden in Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachenstudien 36 1933 pp.67-75; Savory, R: Iran under the Safavids Cambridge 1980 p.69


67-Hinz, V. W: op.cit. pp.76-77; Savory, R: "Isma'Il II" ET2 p.188; Stanfield Rosemary: op.cit. pp.104-105: Although the latter states that Ismâ'îl was led by Sunni bureaucrats to avoid a confrontation with the Ottomans, we should act prudently with regard to this information, even if they urged Ismâ'îl or kept him distant from anti-Sunni policy in sympathy with its Sunni neighbour state, this superficial factor in Kazvin might have not affected subsequent events on the border.
state was also taking place and affected the external policy of Iran. As he did not avoid action to harm the peace treaty of Amasya damage was done and a number of serious consequences followed as will be seen below.

Firstly when an Ottoman caravan was coming from Gilan to Erzurum it was raided in Zengan by Safavis who killed most of the merchants whose possessions were plundered. Two Çavuşes were sent to investigate this case but they were imprisoned as well as a man of the beglerbegi of Van who had come to ask them about the cause of this incident.68

Secondly the Safavis tried to get political information from their proselytism in Anatolia as a result of which in October 1576 emissaries were sent to Corum to draw up a register of Kızılbaş. This case was followed by another which took place (in November) in the fortress of Hınıs near the frontier where twenty Çepni had entered the frontier garrison to 'lead astray' the fortress guards. In the following year 1577, another group of missionaries was despatched to another region in Anatolia.69

68-Rüükoğlu, B:Osmanlı-Iran Siyasi Münasebetleri Istanbul 1993 p.19
69-Imber C:op.cit. pp.257-58
Thirdly when Isma'Il became Şah a number of seditious Kurds, notably Gazi Beg and other sons of Şah-Kulu Balilan who lived between Van and the Tebriz border sent envoys to Kazvin to congratulate him and the former was given an appointment to the governorship of Selmas and Tasuj. After the flight of the sons of Şah-Kulu which was followed by the defection of Behrām Beg the son of Hüseyin Beg because he was in dispute with his brother Kubad Beg, the ruler of Imadiye, forty men and he arrived in Tebriz from where having been welcomed they were sent to Kazvin.

On the other hand at the same time the internal political situation in the Ottoman state led to a further increase of outside political tension. Murâd III did not congratulate Isma'Il II when he ascended the throne. This case was first official mark of the hostility of the central government in Istanbul against the Safavi state and showed that the sovereign rights of the Safavi state were not officially recognized; in fact this was supposed by the Ottomans to be a reason for

---

70-Hasani Rumlu: op.cit p.213; Roemer; op.cit p.28; Kütükoglu B:op.cit p.20

71-Kirzioglu F: op.cit. p.259; Kütükoglu B:op.cit. pp. 20-21

72-Hinz V.W.:op.cit. p.63
war against its enemies following earlier practice.

As the Ottomans become heavily engaged on their eastern flank, they had renewed existing treaties with Venice in 1575 and with Poland. Finally at the end of 1576 they renewed existing treaties with the Habsburg Emperor Rudolf II for eight years.73

We can see that soon after the death of Şâh Țahmâsb a new political situation in the Safavi domains was observed from the direction of the Central government in Istanbul. They requested the beglerbeks on the frontier to complete the equipment of the soldiers and the fortresses. At the same time they urged that the treaty of Amasya should be observed, and said that merchants should not be prevented from travelling to Ottoman domains from Iran. However they suggested in a memoir that they should stop all merchants for a short time if the developments on the frontier deteriorated.74

It seems that on the subject of entering a Safavi-Ottoman war, the Ottoman dignitaries were divided into two groups, one of

73-Hammer, Joseph Von: Osmanlı Tarihi cilt II (Tercüme Mehmet Ata) Istanbul 1991 p.149; Roemer: op.cit p.43

74-Kütükoglu, B: op.cit p.13; Hinz V.W: op.cit p.65: After the death of Şâh Țahmâsb, the troops were alerted on the eastern flank.
which favoured war against the Safavis, among who were such figures as Hoca Sadeddîn, Lala Mustafâ Paşa, Sinân Paşa and Hüsrev Paşa who belonged to the anti-Sokullu faction. They regarded the situation in Safavi territory as a historical opportunity. Thus they encouraged public opinion to support war and in particular the reports of Hüsrev Paşa concerning political and religious developments in the Safavi state played an important role in the decision to go to war against the Safavids.

On the other hand Sokullu Mehmed Paşa, who had held his high post under the reign of three Sulţans: Kânûnî Sulţân Süleymân (1520-1566), Selîm II (1566-1574), and Murâd III (1574-) uttered words of caution concerning war against the Safavis. His experience with Ottoman campaigns, placed him in a position to know the problems ahead even if the campaign was a success. He said to the Sulţân, as quoted by Peçevî, and translated into English by Kortepeter as below:

"Those paid troops will get out of hand and the trimonthly (mevâjîb) salary obligations and other expenses will increase. The peasants will be oppressed by taxes (tekalîf) and the incursions of the army and even if Persia is conquered, its peasantry will not accept becoming subjected

---

75-Kortepeter, C. Max:op.cit. 45
76-Peçevî:II pp.36-37; Kortepeter:op.cit. pp.45-46;Danişmend, L.H:op.cit p.14
to our rule. As to the expenses of the campaign, the collection of revenue from the provinces will not be sufficient. What difficulties even your illustrious grand father, the late exalted Sulṭān Sulaymān, experienced! And when peace between the two parties was concluded, what indignation and what anxiety he suffered. Those who put forth this [project] are those who do not know the Persian campaign, [and] who, leaving aside horses and pack animals, do not [even] ride oxen.

Despite Sokullu's cautionary warning against Ottoman-Safavi war contemporary near-eastern sources describe the Sulṭān as the lord of all the frontier principalities, a status which encouraged him to a policy of aggression. Thus after the conquest of Constantinople the Ottomans had been opposed to the development of any powerful state on their eastern flank and the subsequent expansion of the empire in Anatolia resulted in the reduction of the power and quasi-independence of the Türkmen tribes, and the religious propaganda in these conditions was favourable for success, which bore political overtones. This policy was used often when they attacked Muslim neighbours in the east. They later to used the same tactics against Uzun Hasan, the Mamluks of Egypt and the Safavids of Iran, making extensive use of fetva announcements to the entire Islamic World. 77

77-Inalcık Halil: op.cit p.14; Itzkowitz, N: op.cit. pp.68-69
Apart from the fully justified feeling, as far as the Ottomans were concerned, concerning restarting war, the political and religious situation in Şirvan become critical when Ebu Bekir Mirzâ, a descendant of the former kings of Şirvan who was in exile in Dagistán and Circassia, was persuaded to put himself at the head of a force of several thousand Lezgis and men of the Karâ Burak tribe. They began to ravage the borders of provinces under Safavi dominion and also sent an envoy to seek the aid of the Ottoman Sultân, asking him to install Ebu Bekir as vassal ruler in Şirvan. Their delegation in Istanbul made the most of their common faith with the Ottomans as they sought help against the Kızılbaş.\textsuperscript{78}

Finally Şâh Isma'îl II's sudden death and Hüsrev Paşa's report concerning the situation of the frontier regions and the political and religious situation in Iran\textsuperscript{79} accelerated the decision of the Ottoman military elite to resort to war at the end of the year 1577.

\textsuperscript{78}Iskender Münşî (Savory): op.cit. p.349

CHAPTER IV: AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

The historical narrative of the Nusret-nâme is presented below in the form of a chapter summary. Additional information from contemporary and secondary sources has been added where appropriate, and references have also been shown here in order to enable the reader to appreciate the value of Nusret-nâme as a historical source as well as to facilitate the understanding of the picture of Ottoman-Safavi conflict under its light.

The text begins on folio 2a, giving the title of the work as Nusret-nâme. After a usual Bismillâh formula, the preface starts with the expression "bekere-i Nusret-nâme-i cûnüd-i nebbâle" and goes on to explain the circumstances of the believers and the unbelievers and other people who are on the wrong path. This is followed by an explanation of why the holy war (cihâd) is important to force them to the right way, which led to the campaign of the army of Islam against them; this is illustrated by verses of the Koran. 2b contains an invocation to the prophet and salutation, followed by a prayer to God that the army of Islam may find special prosperity in its campaign on sea and land to protect themselves from evil or minority infidels. This section ends with an account of the prophet's
warriors, whose rank the unbelievers would attain if they converted to Islam. The linking phrase to the new section "Bu mikdârla iktifâ ve sebel-i te'îf ve terkâb olan, gazâ-yi garrâ inşâsinâ işaret ü mâ olmdu" opens the introductory section (3b-15a) in which background information is given in order to introduce the main topic.

This section begins by describing the appointment of Lala Muştafa Paşa to lead the campaign as Serdar in order to conquer Azerbaijan, Georgia and Şirvan on 22 Şevval 985 (2 January 1578) as well as the appointment of our author Gelybolulu 'Ali as a campaign secretary to the Serdar after this appointment. 5b describes events following the appearance of a comet over Istanbul on 1 Ramazan 985/12 November 1577, which reduced its light over one and half months. This is commented on with an ebced calculation made by the corps of astrologers who predict the "clashing of armies proceeding from east and west and the shedding of blood" and a date for the defeat of the Şâh (Dîdî tarihî: 'Acem Şâh ola nâ-gâh mât) (985). At the same time the

1-See above pp.14-15

2-See also Selanîkî Muştafa Efendi (ed. Mehmed İpfirli): Tarih-i Selanîkî, Istanbul 1989 v.1 p.115, which contains the same poem concerning the defeat of the Şâh which was written by the corps.
astronomer Mevlānā Takiyye‘d-dīn commented on a comet which would bring the death of the Şāh and trouble and agitation to Iran. People in Istanbul believed in this afterwards because Şāh Ismā‘īl II died on 24 November 1577, on the information of some spy on the frontier, which confirmed the Ottoman observation, so that war was opened against the Safavis.\(^4\) (7a-10a) presents a summary of historical relations between the Ottomans and the Safavis as background information, in order to facilitate the understanding of the coming chapter. Although 'Ālī did not mention the source of this section it seems that it is based on the work of the previous historians, Nişancı Ramazan Zade and Kemal Paşa Zade. Thus it starts with the beginning of the Safavi state after Şāh Ismā‘īl had established his sovereignty in accordance with the doctrines of

\(^1\) Takiyye‘d-dīn Mehmed bin Ahmed (1521-1585): see Mordtmann, J.H.: "Das observatorium des Takiyye‘d-dīn Zu Pera", in Der Islam 13. 1923, pp. 82-96; Advar, Adnan added some data from Turkish sources to Mordtmann’s article and added some information concerning Takiyye‘d-dīn’s risale concerning his life and work which is located in the Paris National Library in his work Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim, Istanbul 1970 pp. 87-96.

\(^4\) KA 508b-509a and Fursat-nāme 4b-5a both have Takiyye‘d-dīn’s comment as well as a comment by Şeyhülislām Kadızade Mevlānā Şemseddin Ahmed. According to him, this comet had appeared for the twelfth time over the world. The first appearance occurred during the fighting between Kābīl and Hābīl and the last one was seen by the sons of ‘Ālī bin ‘Abdu’l-Muqṭalib who was martyred by Yeṣīd, the Umayyad caliph. These examples showed that it was a sign of trouble to the world which would happen again.
the Ithnā 'Asharis on the ruins of Uzun Hasan's state of the Akkoyunlu, after which he challenged the rulers of the region and became supreme, (7b) but according to 'Ālī, Şāh Ismā'īl had the following beyt written his grave stone in which he epigrammatises powerful rulers as follows:

Ger-kuned bedraka-i luṭf-i tu hemrāhī-yi mā
Çerh berdūş keşed gāşiye-i şāhī-yi mā
(If the kindliness of your protection accompanies me
The heavens will carry on their shoulders obedience to our kingship)

Selīm I succeeded in defeating Şāh Isma'īl at Çaldırān in 1514 and his son Sūleymān I conquered east Anatolia and Irak-i 'Arab. After the treaty of Amasya in 1555, neither the Sulṭān nor the Şāh were desirous of provoking open conflict. This status quo existed until the death of Şāh Ṭahmāsb in 1576 which brought chaos to the Safavi state and affected Ottoman-Safavi relations as well as internal political developments within Iran. Thus Şāh Ismā'īl II who acceded to the throne gave up his father's traditional policy concerning religious and political and military matters. The following events were given as an example for the cause of the outbreak of Ottoman-Safavi conflict by 'Ālī; that he did not send an envoy to reconfirm the treaty of Amasya, and that in spite of it
he accepted some rebel tribal chiefs on the frontier so that when Şâh Ismâ'îl II was murdered the central government in Istanbul had already been preparing for war against the Safavis (9b).

'Álî next refers to some views on the killing of Şâh Ismâ'îl, that he indulged the Sunni people rather than Shi'â people and that he also banned the cursing of the first three caliphs as a result of which he was assassinated in his palace, but 'Álî disagrees with this view and he tries to answer the religious view of Ismâ'îl II with questions of his own, whether he banned the curse, whether he was Sunni or whether he wished to reduce the Ottoman aggression against the Safavis

---

5-We should not examine here the cause of the outbreak of Ottoman-Safavi conflict again; for extended information on this, see pp.48-79.

6-Although 'Álî was suspicious of the religious actions of Ismâ'îl II such as his alleged favouring of the Sunnis, Stanfield Rosemary: *Mirza Makhdum Sharif: A 16th century Sunni Sadr at the Safavi court* (unpublished thesis) New York University 1992 pp.106-116: devotes one chapter (95-119) to the events of the reign of Şah Ismâ'îl and explains that Ismâ'îl's religious policies consisted of three elements: First, he censured Shi'i ulama and abolished the ritual cursing of the first three caliphs by prohibiting it. Secondly he planned to mint new coins with an inscription of which the Shi'i ulama disapproved. Ismâ'îl encouraged the regular attendance of Sunni scholars at court. Thirdly there was the prohibition of temporary marriage. See also above p.76.
or whether he wished to win favour from the Sunni people? But unfortunately he did not give an answer to this question, on which he acted politically rather than realistically and said that the details of this question and the good deeds of making wars against the Safavis were notified in the fetva of the Şeyhüislâm.7

After the political structure in Iran became suitable for the Ottomans it was analysed as historical opportunity by pro-war parties in Istanbul to open war on them. The religious situation was very important in order to prepare Islamic soldiers and public opinion in accordance with spiritual values for an attack against an Islamic country, and for this the broadcasting of fetvas was used as had happened in preceding practice in order to answer Ottoman public opinion which would need to know whether the soldiers would be martyrs or not when they were killed in battle, and whether they would gain good deeds

7-Although 'Āli did not give the name of the source of the fetva in Nusret-nâme he quoted it in the following passage:

when killing the Kızılbaş, and finally whether booty and slaves would be lawful according to Islamic law for them; all these questions including the religious aspect of the Safavis are answered in (10b-12b) concerning the fetvās of the Şeyhülislâm Kadızade Ahmed which were derived from the fetvās of Şeyhülislâm Ebiusuud Efendi which were given against the Kızılbaş during the reign of Süleyman I.8

When the Ottoman dignitaries decided to wage war on Persia on 22 Şevvāl 985 (Wednesday 2 January 1578) Lala Muşafā Paşa was appointed as Serdār,9 together with which certain beglerbegis

8-See Abdülkadir Altunsu: Osmanlı Şeyhülislamları Ankara 1972 pp.37-38: He says that Kadızade Mehmed attached himself to Ebüsuud Efendi as a young man, and the latter educated him and gave him a diploma to appoint him as professor at the Medrese of Bursa. After Murād III ascended the throne his good fortune was opened and suddenly he was appointed to the post of Şeyhülislâm of the Ottoman state in 18 October 1577 and remained at the fetvā post for more than two and a half years. Moreover a close examination shows that this part of the text was quoted from the fetvā of Şeyhülislâm Ebiusuud Efendi whose fetvās have been examined by M. Ertugrul Düzdağ: Şeyhülislâm Ebiusuud Efendi Fetvaları, Istanbul 1983 pp.109-112. Finally Imber CH: Ebiusuud: The Islamic legal tradition Edinburgh 1997 pp.86-89: has translated the four important clauses of these fetvās into English and they are evaluated in terms of their historical and legal aspects. In addition he compares the practise of fetvās of the same type on the western flank and the eastern flank of the Ottoman state.

9-Although 'Āli just says that Lala Muşafā Paşa was appointed as sole Serdār in Nusret-nāme, KA 508 a,b; Peçevi pp.36-38: Both sources indicate that it was decided to wage war against the
were placed under his command by a hükûm of the Divân and commanded to present themselves to the Serdar. At the same time according to 'Âli the Serdar firstly resigned himself to God with a pure secret intention; he was cautioned about the situation with the Kızılbaş and drew an augury from the Quran which coincided with Süretü'l-Embiya 77 and indicated the crushing of the Kızılbaş. Then two famous Şeyhs who were skilled in predicting all future events extracted several Arabic verses which predicted the success of the Ottoman army despite some difficulties which are recorded (11a-15a).

Safavis and to request beglerbegis on the border to make raids into Iran. This was followed by appointments to the posts of Serdar for which Lala Muşafâ Paşa the conqueror of Cyprus and Sinân Paşa the conqueror of Yemen were chosen to undertake campaigns in two directions against Iran. Lala Muşafâ Paşa with his army were to march from the North (Erzurum) and the other army was to march from the South (Baghdad); but because of his rivalry with Lala Muşafâ Paşa and lack of cooperation, Sinân Paşa's position was to be eliminated by Sokullu Mehmed Paşa, who urged the Sulţân to appoint Lala Muşafâ Paşa as the sole Serdar. Hammer Joseph Von: (tercüme Mehmet Ata) Istanbul 1991 p.161; even if he states that Lala Muşafâ Paşa in the direction of Baghdad and Sinan Paşa in the direction of Erzurum were chosen as separate Serdars it must be confused. See also Kütûkoglu B. (1993) op.cit. pp.27-28. On the basis of the Mûhimme defter he gives details of which beglerbegis were commissioned under the Serdars such as deputy commanders and how many yenicheris and artillery pieces were provided. Mûhimme 32 50 (4 Zi‘l-ka‘de 985). These two hükûms contain information concerning which beglerbegis were appointed to Lala Muşafâ Paşa and Sinan Paşa. Turan Şerafettin: op.cit. pp.581-584.
This chapter deals with the preparations for the campaign, beginning with a command of the central government in Istanbul which was sent to beglerbegis who were employed in the campaign under the Serdar and ending with a congratulation letter which was sent to Hüsrev Paşa. In this chapter 'Ālî includes official correspondence which was sent from the Serdar to the governors of the eastern provinces about which however contemporary sources remain silent except for the Mühimme defters. Our source, Nusret-nâme, gives details of the letters which were written to the sovereigns in Caucasia as well as to governors on the frontier between the Safavis and the Ottomans.

During the preparation of the campaign, the route and the billeting of the army were chosen according to the condition of the territory for supporting the soldiers as well as to arrange the cost of provisions, for which commissioners and orders were sent so that necessary supplies could be collected at the designated billet, and the feeding and supply of the
army would be provided by local rulers on the campaign route and on the border, to which, if supplies for the army were not sufficient, transports would come from other parts of the Ottoman domains in accordance with local conditions.

According to C. Finkel, "In administrative terms, there were three formal methods by which the provisions for the Ottoman army were obtained from the producers; in Turkish these are known as Nüzul, Sursat and İştirâ" under which supplies of provision such as grain, oats, barley, oil, honey, flour, meat and fodder were collected to be sent from Anatolia, Rumeli, Cyprus and Egypt to make pre-spring preparations before the army moved. This was essential as a contribution to the success of the summer's campaign. About these supplies of provision the central government in Istanbul would have to send extensive hüküms to the local governments in Anatolia, Rumeli, Cyprus and Egypt because of the scarcity in Diyarbekir, Haleb, Crimea and the worsening economic situation of the Ottoman state at the beginning of 1578. Thus apart from provision collected at

---


11 Finkel, C: op.cit. p.130

12 A close examination of B. Kütükoglu, op.cit. pp.32-39 shows that he used a large number of hükûms in the Mühimme defters concerning the campaign preparations. The remaining
designated billets the Danubian, sancaks of Nigbolu and Silistre were sending wheat and barley by sea to Trabzon and Batum; in addition an important amount of grain was transported from Cyprus and Egypt via the ports of south Anatolia, after which land routes were used to Erzurum.

Lala Musţafă Paşa, an experienced campaigner in the Ottoman tradition, continued to make preparations for the war including the use of Ottoman propaganda and diplomacy against the enemy. As a result, he caused his münşi, Gelibolu 'Ali, to write eleven letters which were sent to the local rulers on the border and in the Caucasian region, asking them to present themselves for duty in 985 Zi`l-hicce (February–March 1578). The first letter of encouragement (yahişi-nâme) (14b-18a) was sent to Tatar Khan (the Khan of Crimea); in it the Serdär explains that he will leave Istanbul for the campaign on Evvel-i Muharrem (at the beginning of April) and adds that during the reign of Sultan Selim II (1566-1574) his son-in-law, Ebubekir Mirzâ came to Istanbul and presented his obedience to the Sultan, in return for which a regular salary was given from Hazine-i Amire and that he wished for the conquest of Şirvan, which was the main goal for him, but this hüküms do not change his conclusions.
request was refused because that time was not suitable for conflict with the Safavis, for which at the present the Sultan’s respect for Ebubekir Mirzâ would be assured if he or one of his brothers and Ebubekir Mirzâ himself would come to Şirvan. Moreover the Yaka Türkmen were very pious, had been opposed to the Kızılbaş and had remained faithful to the Sünnet until now and an envoy should be sent to them to encourage them against the Kızılbaş. As a result of these attempts, he says, if we here and you in Şirvan and the Yaka Türkmen in their area attack the Kızılbaş, victory will be easy. The second letter (18a-20a) was addressed to Ebubekir Mirzâ who was the son of Burhān, the preceding ruler of Şirvan, and was respected by the people of Şirvan, and in this letter, after mentioning Ebubekir Mirzâ’s preceding respect and obedience to the Sultan, 'Âli repeats his historical wish which was the conquest of Şirvan and requests him to encourage the lord of Şirvan to obey the Sulţān and make preparations and to join the Khan of Crimea before the arrival of the army in Şirvan, if conditions were possible for the conquest of Şirvan, and makes him promises concerning the future that his future rank will be

---

13-Zeyneloğlu, Cihangir: Şirvanlar Yurdu, Istanbul 1931 pp.150-154: He states that after Şirvan was invaded by Şāh Ţahmāsb, the governor of Şirvan, Burhan and his sons retreated to the interior of Dagistan where Ebubekir Mirzâ grew up and married the daughter of Devlet Giray, the Khan of Crimea in whose palace in Bahçe Sarayı, he spent most of his life.
assured in return for his works. The third letter (20a-21a) was dispatched by the envoy Mirzâ Ali Çavuş to Şahruh Mirzâ, descendant of the rulers of Şirvan; the Şemhâl, ruler of the Kumuk and Kaytaks of Northern Dagistan, Gazi Salih, the ruler of Tabasaran (Southern Dagistan); and Toca-lav Beg, the ruler of the Avars. This letter starts to praise them as they were honoured through the protection of the Islamic faith and adds that they were enemies of the Sulţân’s enemy and were friends of his friends and had always been in a state of obedience, and friendship. He follows by mentioning some princes of Georgia and people who live near the mountain of Elburz in Azerbeycan and “who have been opposed to us” and that the Serdar requested them to eliminate their opposition. The Serdar promised that in return for their work, they would be treated with kindness and would not be regarded with suspicion. Finally, he mentions the participation of the Khan of Crimea, Circassian troops and Ebubekir Mirzâ, inviting them to participate with their own armies in the campaign of the Khan of Crimea.

As can be seen from the content of the three letters, the Ottoman plan was to use a pincer movement against pro-Safavi governments as well as the princes of Georgia connected by several bonds to the Safavis so that they would be forced to be obedient to the Ottoman side. Apart from the general aim of
these letters, they provide important details of factual information, and also are vehicles of diplomacy in which 'Álî shows the approach of the Ottomans to them; this is very polite, the main theme being a promise of conquest and a wish to placate them. Moreover the linguistic style and vocabulary of these documents are not varied, so that it can be seen that they are often quoted verbatim.

The fourth letter (21a-22b) and the fifth letter contain different themes and styles from the preceding letters. These letters have threats and intimidation addressed to the Princes of Georgia, Başaçuk Gorgi, Gûryel, Dadyan, Levendoğlu and Libâdiyân. Here 'Álî uses a writing style that can be described as between dry Turkish and elaborated imşa, contrary to the above letters. In the fourth letter, after repeating that the Serdar will march to the east on his campaign, he mentions that Başaçuk had been a friend of the Sultan's friends and had become an enemy against the Sultan's enemies; he particularly requests Başaçuk Gorgi to make the Georgian princes - Varazaoglu, Levend, Gûrgur the son of Keyhusrev - obey the Sulţân. It is followed by another letter (22b-24b) which was sent to Ahmed Beg, sancakbegi of Şavşad, requesting him to persuade Aleksandır Khân Levendoğlu, who was the father-in-law of Ahmed Beg, to obey the Ottomans. In this letter 'Álî makes an announcement of the
Serdâr’s move to the east on campaign which will be followed by
over one hundred thousand troops under the Sulṭān with whom the
obedience of the Princes of Georgia and the plundering and
conquest of their country could be accomplished. After these
threats the Serdâr reminds Ahmet Beg, "you are honoured by
Islam among equals, with which you have reached how many
desires in return for this good fortune," requesting him send
a letter to his father-in-law asking him to obey the Ottomans,
with which Levend will reach all his desires and thus his
country will be protected from the fire of weapons; otherwise
it will be plundered and burned with his people. Therefore the
Serdâr requests Ahmet Beg to work hard to persuade Levend and
Varazaoglu to obey the Ottoman Sulṭān.

Although 'Ālī says that his letters contain the same style as
addressed to the Princes of Georgia, it can be seen from the
content of these letters that they are not addressed directly
to opposing princes of Georgia who are sympathetic to the
Safavi side or connected by several bonds of marriage to the
Safavis. From the Serdâr’s approach to them we can see that he
tried to contact them indirectly rather than directly, hoping
to use the influence of those who are respected and have
familial bonds with them. In fact this method is one of the
diplomatic routes which is used often in the modern era.
The remaining letters in this chapter are addressed to Ottoman local governors near the borders between the Safavi and Ottoman states, except for one sent to Eburişoglu Mehmed Beg. The first of these (24b-26a) was despatched to Behram Paşa, beglerbegi of Erzurum, firstly requesting him to aggregate provision in Erzurum and secondly asking him to inform the Central government how many weapons and pieces of equipment and ammunition had been assembled in Erzurum and in its district, and if there were not enough to ask what could be done to complete them, thirdly requesting him to invite the Kızılbaş Beys and the Georgian princes on the border in Caucasus to obey the Ottomans, followed (26b-27b) by a warning to Derviş Paşa, beglerbegi of Diyarbekir, to gather at least 15000 infantrymen and requesting him to give information about what could be sent to the border from Istanbul in order to complete preparations. On the other hand he asks Mirzâ 'Ali Beg, Pasin Beg and Şahruh Beg the son of 'Ulâma', on the border with Azerbeycan, both of whom were experienced in dealing with Kızılbaş action on the frontier. They are requested to drive the Georgian princes to the Ottoman side, and he particularly asks Mirzâ 'Ali Beg, sancakbegi of Pasin, to inform the Serdar about the passes through Georgia stage by stage. In addition (27b-28b) other letters with almost the same meanings were sent by the envoy Üveys Çavuş to Hüsrev Paşa the beglerbegi of Van and Özdemiroğlu
Osman Paşa the former beglerbegi of Diyarbekir. The first of these asks Hüsrev Paşa to attend to guarding the region of Hoy and Tebriz and requests him to assemble equipment and ammunition as well as watching the Kızılbaş side (28b-29b). The second is to the former beglerbegi of Diyarbekir, who was famous for his bravery on the battlefield, and who was going to Istanbul in order to be appointed to a new post, asking him to remain where he was with his army to facilitate the preparations (30a-31b). Finally the Serdar sent a letter (31a-32b) to Eburişoglu Mehmed, who is one of the Kabâ’il Begs and wished to establish his authority over the quarrelsome Arab tribes, regarding his revolt against the Sultan in the previous year which could be forgiven in return for his service to the Sultan, and asking him to send 3-4000 rented camels and cereal (nearly all of it barley) to the Serdar as a mark of his obedience to the Sultan.

As a result these letters of ‘Ali, apart from the transportation of provisions from other regions of the empire to Erzurum and

---

14 In Muharrem 986 (29 March 1578) the Divân-ı Hümâyûn sent a hükmûm to Osman Paşa requesting him to complete his preparations with excellent equipment and join the Serdar as soon as possible in Çermik, see Abdurrahman Şeref: "Özdemiroğlu Osman Paşa" TOEM, 4, 1353.

15 Kütükoglu, B: op.cit. p.40 He identifies Eburişoglu Mehmed as a sancakbegi of Ane and Hadise
the collection of provisions in the billets on the campaign route, the Serdar prepared to store provisions for the army in depots in the fortresses on the border. Thus campaign supplies for the forward operation were prepared during the active campaign, and provision in the fortresses on the border, or as Finkel paraphrases it "magazine supply" relieved the logistic need of the army so that the troops could fight profitably in the theatre of war.

From the appointment of the Serdar on 22 Şevval 985 (2 January 1578) to his departure from Istanbul on 27 Muhtarrem (5 April 1578), many events took place on the border about which contemporary scholars and Mühimme defters are more accurate than Nusret-nâme which contains just a congratulation letter (Tehniyyet-i feth) (32b-33b) which was written to Hüsrev Paşa, beglerbegi of Van, when his envoy had brought news (feth nâmeler) to the Sulṭān and the Serdar regarding the success of the Ottoman combat force against the Safavi governor of Hoy in March 1578. This letter, after mentioning the success and bravery of Hüsrev Paşa, deals with the conquest of Hoy by the Ottoman army and the plunder taken from the inhabitants who

---

16-Finkel, C: op.cit. p.154
were under the control of the Safavis on the border.17 The letter ends by sending gifts and a sword to Hüsrev Paşa.18 It can be seen from the above letter that 'Ali's information on border

17-Iskender Münşi: op.cit p.347; Lokmân: 93b; Hasan-ı Rumlu: Ahsan-ı-Tevarikh, translated by C.N. Seddon, Baroda 1926 pp.213-214. After the hüküm of the central government was sent to Hüsrev Paşa concerning the attack against the Safavis, he sent a force composed of Ottoman troops which made a sudden attack on Hoy, where Mahmûd Beg Rûmlû was the governor. Although according to Hasan-ı Rumlu "Mahmûd Beg was against him with two hundred horse and they met near the village of Wuldiyan, and Mahmûd fled without fighting" this information is not confirmed from any other source, and Iskender Münşi is silent; however according to Lokman among Turkish sources, quoted by Kütükoglu "the head of Mahmûd was cut off and around five hundred of his troops were killed". After remaining for a day in Hoy, the Ottomans attacked Hûseyin Can Suljân Khunuslu who was holding the area of Toprak Kal'a-Urumî-Salmas and was besieged in a village with approximately twelve hundred horse for more or less a month. They fought to protect themselves but they were wiped out, and their women and children were taken prisoner and their belongings plundered. The Ottomans also ravaged the surrounding area. Moreover Lokmân adds the information that Hûseyin Khan Suljân was killed by Şâh-Kulu oglû Koçu who had been with Zeynel Beg the governor of Hakkari on this raid. Although Bekir Kütükoglu says that the heads of Hûseyin Can and his two sons were cut off and another son was taken prisoner, it seems possible that he reached this decision because he did not see Mühimme 32, 253 (27 Muḥarram 986) which was sent to the beglerbegi of Van concerning the son of Hûseyin Suljân who was been in the Castle of Gülverginlik and to whom a flag was sent by the Kethûda of Hûseyin Khan, Halîl, to persuade him to submit to the Ottomans without fighting. Finally there is speculation on the names of the persons involved; see for these names: Kütükoglu B.: op.cit. pp.43-44.

18-When Hüsrev Paşa's envoy brought news concerning the victory of the Ottoman force to the Divân as well as to the Serdâr the Divân sent a hüküm to the beglerbegi of Van (4 Muḥarram 986) Mühimme 32. 173, to congratulate him with two hilâ'ât and a sword and also sent a flag to the two sons of Şâh-Kulu, Koçu and Gazi, in return for their service: Kütükoglu B: op.cit. p.44.
events at this stage is very scant. He does not need to fill out any events on the border from other sources since contemporary sources are accurate as seen from our footnotes and the following pages.

This attack was in accordance with the instructions of the Divan which had requested frontier beglerbegis to mount raids against the Safavids, so that the beglerbegi of Erzurum sent a force of some six or seven thousand men under the command of Mirzâ 'Āli Beg, the ruler of Pasin, to Şüra Gel and they attacked and burned the tents of Kara Sulṭân Bayburtlu in this battle. Ninety soldiers of Karahan were killed but he counter-attacked with two or three thousand men and the Ottoman force suffered some three hundred casualties, so the central government requested the beglerbegi of Erzurum to reinforce the frontier region against counter-attacks of the Safavids until the Serdar reached Erzurum.

---

Although Kütükoglu estimates Safavi casualties as nine hundred (900) soldiers in the first attack, Mühimme 32. 208 (11 Muharrem 986) gives it as ninety (90) soldiers. This number of Safavi casualties is near the data of Safavi sources which give them as forty (40) or fifty (50). Moreover Ottoman sources are silent on the casualties of the Ottomans in the second attack, so the number of Ottoman casualties may be approached with caution in Safavi sources, but there is a likelihood in that it was quite high even if it did not amount to three hundred soldiers.
The Safavis took counter-measures against the raids of the combat forces of the Ottomans which were devised in two ways; firstly in the diplomatic arena they complained that the raid of the Ottomans had broken the peace and in addition they tried to restore the peace by sending envoys to Istanbul.\footnote{Kütükoglu B.: (1993) op.cit. p.46: He analyses almost all hüküms concerning the return of Çavuş to the beglerbegi of Erzurum by Türkmen Khan and the detention of an envoy of the Şâh in Van. According to him since the Safavis were looking for peace, they sent back the caravan as well as sending an envoy under the leader of Ustaçlı Kara Veli, the Kethüdâ of Türkmen Khan to Istanbul to make peace but since the Ottomans were not prepared to entertain overtures for peace, Kara Veli and his delegation were detained in Van.} Secondly there was a reorganization of the military on the Ottoman frontier, so that the Şâh appointed the Türkmen Emir Khan to the position of governor of Tebriz and Türkmen Khan was appointed to the position of governor of Çukur Sa'ad (Revan)\footnote{Iskender Münşi (Savory): 1978 op.cit.p.348} to form a frontier force against the Ottomans after the fall of Hoy-Selmas-Urumi into Ottoman hands. As a result of this reorganization of the Safavi frontier, the governor Emir Khan came to Maraga, seized possession of the royal stud at Karaca, went off with nearly ten thousand Beduin Arab stock-stallions and mares and rushed off in pursuit, but succeeded
only in recovering and taking Tebriz.\textsuperscript{22} This result created delight in the hearts of the Ottomans.

Bu meclis ser-dâr-i büzürg-vâruñ dâru`d-devlet`ü`s-seniyye mahmiyye-i Konstanjiyyeden irtihâli ve cümle-i erkânla Üsküdâra varılab, otâğ-ı sa`âdetlerine nuzûl-ı iclâli, ûsûsâ `asâkir-i mansûreye žiyâfet-i ri`âyet-me`âli ve besâ-ı `işret-inbisâlarmuñ nefâ`is-i deryâ-nevâli vâsifında tahrîr olunmuşdur. (B: 33b-34b)

This short chapter describes the departure of Lala Muştafa Paşa from Istanbul, on 22 Muharrem (Monday 31 March). The serdâr Lala Muştafa was received by Sulân Murâd III and having been congratulated by the state dignitaries he embarked on the galley of Kılç 'Âli Paşa, the Kapudan Paşa, with pomp and ceremony \textsuperscript{23} in Eminönü, crossed the Bosphorus and reached

\textsuperscript{22}Iskender Münshi (Savory): 1978 op.cit. p.348: However Kütükoglu B:(1993) op.cit. p.47 refers the force of Emir Khan as 30000 in accordance with Mühimme 35, 357.Iskender Münshi gives it as 15000.

\textsuperscript{23}see alsoEbubekir b. Abdullah:Şark Seferleri .1a:Lokmân:Zübdeťi`t-tevarih, 93b;Kütükoglu B:op.cit. p.48;Harimî, Rahimi Zade İbrahim Çavuş:Zafer-name 8b.Harimî gives extra information about the departure of the Serdâr from Istanbul where cannon and guns were fired and a big festival was held; moreover according to him when the Serdâr was received by the Sulân the meeting took two hours.Hüseyin b.Mehmed:Gazavat-nâmeler 23b.Although Hüseyin narrates the account of the departure, Harimî's information is confirmed, except that he gives the departing day wrongly as Çarşanba instead of Perşenbe.
Üsküdar with the force on Perşenbe 27 Muharrem (Saturday 5 April), 24 This was the traditional starting-point, the first billet on the road to war in the eastern part of the empire.

Bu meclis ser-leşker-i bahtiyar hâzretlerinü aç Üsküdar'dan teveccüh-i şerifleri ve İznik mid nam kasabada der-gâh-i mu'allâ Yeğiçerilerini ziyâfetle tespîfleri, ûsûsâ gazâ semtini tergibâ ol menzilde ba'zi virgüler ile klub, talîfleri beyânundadur. (B: 34b-39a)

After staying for twenty four days in Üsküdar to complete the remainder of the provisioning for the campaign in the set billets, on 20 Sefer 25 (Monday 28 April 1578) he departed from Üsküdar to Izmit; when he reached it the Yenigârîs were feasted and some of them were given special posts. During the stay there the senior officers of the army with the Serdâr decided that Yenigâri Ağası Ibrahim Kethûda with his force should follow the Bolu-Çorum-Sivas road to meet with the Serdâr in

24-Ebubekir b. Abdullah: Şark Seferleri 1a: He gives details about the number of the force with which the Serdâr crossed to Üsküdar with three thousand (3000) yenîçeris and three hundred cannons. Hüseyin: 23b gives the number of yenîçeris as six thousand (6000). Kuzioglu F. op.cit. p.281. and Münecimbağî: op. cit. p.537 give it as five thousand (5000). Don Juan of Persia, Shi‘ah Catholic :London 1926, p.136 states that the Serdâr reinforced his artillery with 500 pieces of small cannon.

25-In Zafer-nâme; 9b it is given as 21 Sefer.
Erzurum while the Serdär should follow the Konya road\textsuperscript{25} in order to visit the tomb of Mevlânâ Celâleddin Rûmî. The army reached İlgın on 18 Rebi‘ü‘l-evvel/25 May where they halted for six days to feed the camels and horses as well as to visit Lala Musţafâ Paşa’s pious foundation. Three days later, the army arrived in Konya on Thursday (36b).\textsuperscript{26} Here they visited the tombs of Mevlânâ, Şems-i Tebrizî and Sadreddin Konevi to seek their spiritual help on Thursday and Friday; on the eighteenth stage they reached Sivas.\textsuperscript{27}

During his stay with the army for a day in Sivas the Serdär

\textsuperscript{25}-\textit{Zafer-nâme}:10a-b; Harîmî gives the detail that when the Serdär came to Yenişehir, the sancakbegi of Bursa welcomed him, and that at Sakâ, a village near Kütahya, the beglerbegi of Anatolia Çafer Paşa welcomed him with a crowd of notables of the region where an exciting festival was held and the army and people of the region were feasted and at the same time the Serdär give gifts to the notables in return for their assistance and some of them were also promoted in their bureaucratic career. I think that one of them was Harîmî who entered the army there for special service because his father had been a close friend of Lala Musţafâ during his duty as Lala in Kütahya.

\textsuperscript{26}-See above p.15

\textsuperscript{27}-\textit{Zafer-nâme}, 10b. He says that when the army came to Konya the beglerbegis of Karaman, Mehmed Paşa, welcomed the Serdär together with the notables of Vilayet-i Yunan (Karaman) and during their visit to the tombs at Konya many sacrifices were made, and in addition when the Serdär arrived at İncesu near Kayseri, the sancakbey of Kayseri welcomed the Serdär. Eighteen days later they arrived at Sivas from Konya. Kütükoglu B: op.cit.p.49. He determines the arrival of the Serdär at Konya as being Perşenbe 22 Rebi‘ü‘l-evvel in accordance with the development of stages.
received letters concerning the scarcity in their region from the beglerbegis of Erzurum, Van and Diyarbekir, and he particularly received information from Hüsrev Paşa about the Kızılbaş action on the frontier. Thus Serdar told 'Ali to write two letters which are in (36b-39a). The first one was addressed to Hoca Sa'deddin Efendi, in which complaints from Erzurum, Haleb and Diyarbekir concerning the shortage of cereals and scarcity are expressed and he requested him that the transport of cereal should be made by sea to Trabzon and Batum. The second letter was sent in reply to a letter from Melik Gürel in response to a previous letter sent by the Serdar in Istanbul; in this second letter 'Ali quotes some information from Melik Gürel's letter in which Melik Gürel complains of the attack of Circassians and Abkhazians against his country and offers his submission. In return for this 'Ali pacifies him and offers to take revenge on them with Ottoman artillery after which he requests him to participate in the campaign in a very sensitive diplomatic way. Otherwise, 'Ali explains, the Ottoman army with its artillery will be sent by sea and his region must be damaged or plundered. (39a)

Bu meclis-i leşker-keş-i nâm-ver räh-i cadde-i müsâferetde cilve-ger olub, şehr-i Sivasdan arayâtı Koç-hisâra vâsîl ve anda dahî oturak (H.39b) ṭarîki-yle bir gün nâzîl olub, andan İğnâvûd-
On 19 Rebl’ü'l-âhir (26 May) the army arrived at Koçhisar and a day later reached Ignavûd-özü, where strong rain caused losses to the treasury of the army; therefore they moved and camped at the foot of the mountain, where the Serdar received a letter from the beglerbegi of Zulkadriyye, Ahmed Paşa and the judge of Elbistan, Mevlânâ, who gives him information concerning the beginning of the revolt of the Şam-Bayat Turkmens (39b). Also in this place a letter (40a-42b) was sent to Hoca Sa'deddîn Efendi and Şemsi Ahmed Paşa, whom the Serdar informed about the progress of the campaign in the light of letters from the frontier beglerbegis. In addition in this letter 'Âli quoted a report from the beglerbegi of Zulkadriye and the judge of Elbistan that someone among the Şam Bayat tribes had revolted in the name of the false Şâh Isma'îl and plundered the provisions of the inhabitants in Sultan Korusu and Arslantaş. He had made an alliance with Bozok Halife and they killed beasts for a sacrifice at Hacı Bektaş and Eshâbu’l Kehf. After this they communicated with the famous rebel, Eburişoglu and attacked the Alaybey of Hîsn-ı Mansûr whose horses they seized. This revolt was growing day by day; he added that if only a few sipahis remained there for the defence of the province the repelling of them would not possible". In this manner Muşafâ Paşa sent
the sultan's order to the sancakbegi Türkmen Şah Murad, Bozok Mirlivasi Çerkes Bey, and Rum Defter Kethüdasi Mahmud to present themselves at court, saying that if they continued to rebel against the state, they must be killed. At the end of this 'Ali says," we do our best in this campaign", requesting Hoca Sa'deddin Efendi's forgiveness even though failures in the campaign had taken place.

Bu meclis Salar-ı kârânun ı ol menzilden irtihâli ve on ikinci günde Erzurum sahrasında Çermik nâm mahalle ittisâli ve on iki gün temâm (H.43a) ba'zî mesâlih ve mühimmâtla takâ'üd-i istirâbat-me'âli, husûsâ Dâgîstan hâkimlerinden (B.43a) ve

**28**-Although on the subject of the false Şah Isma'il, Nusret-nâme contains limited information, many hüküms in Mühimme Defters were exchanged between the central government and provincial governments; some of them were examined by Bekir Kütükoğlu and Ahmet Refik in their work Kütükoğlu, B:op.cit. p.13;Refik, Ahmet:Onaltinci Asırda Rafızilik ve Bektaşilik Istanbul 1932 p.37 and the remaining part of them was examined by Imber, C.H. in his "The persecution of the Ottoman Shi'ites according to the Mühimme Defterleri 1565-1585" in Der Islam 56 1979 pp.251-254. According to them the false Şah Isma'il arrived in Elbistan in May and by September of 1578 he had gathered a band of followers among the tribes of Bozok in one of the summer pastures of Yeni Il to whom many tribes in the sancak of Malatya sent an offering, but the Ottoman government kept as close a check as possible on the region and the false Isma'il and his followers were prevented from spreading sectarian propaganda. Finally they fled to Persia through the province of Baghdad. The sancakbegi of Bozok succeeded in capturing one of his halifes in the summer pastures of Boybey called Yunus who described the false Isma'il as being tall, blue-eyed, with a thick blonde beard and long locks. He spoke Persian.
Gürcistan meliklerinden ı'at-nameleri gelüb,... (B:42b-62a)

Twelve days later\textsuperscript{30} the army reached Çermik near Erzurum (43a) where the Yeniceri Ağası arrived by way of Bolu, and the beglerbegi of Diyarbekir, Derviş Paşa; the beglerbegi of Rum, Mahmûd Paşa; the beglerbegi of Karaman, Mehmed Paşa;\textsuperscript{31} the beglerbegi of Zulkadriyye, Ahmed Paşa; the former beglerbegi of Diyarbekir, Oğmân Paşa;\textsuperscript{32} and the beglerbegi of Erzurum, Behrâm Paşa met with the Serdâr\textsuperscript{33} during their stay there. (43a-b) At this time the sancakbegi of Kars, Yusuf Beg, defeated Mahmûd

\textsuperscript{30}-When we add twelve days to the departure date (23 Rebi‘ü’l-âhir) of the Serdâr from İgnavûd-özû in accordance with the stages the arrival date of the army Çermik could be set in 7 Cemâzû’l-evvel 986. Damşmend, Ismail: Izahlî Osmani Tarihi Kronolojisi 1972 İstanbul volume 3 p.18: Although he records the arrival date of the Serdâr Çermik as 26 Rebi‘ü’l-âhir, this must be wrong, as noted by Kırzioglu in his work p.283.

\textsuperscript{31}-Zafer-nâme. 10b. According to Harîmü the beglerbegi of Karaman had been together with the Serdâr since Konya.

\textsuperscript{32}-Abdurrahman Şeref; "Özdemiroğlu Oğmân Paşa." TOEM 21 p.1329; Damşmend Ismail Hami: op.cit. p.18; Zafer-nâme. 11a: He says that Özdemiroğlu Oğmân Paşa joined the Serdâr in Cinis which is near Erzurum as quoted by Kütükoglû and Kırzioglu in their work. Blackburn, J.R: "Oğmân Paşa" EI2 p.183-185: indicates that Oğmân Paşa was commissioned for the campaign on 20 Muharram 986.

\textsuperscript{33}- see also Kütükoglû B: op.cit. p.50; Damşmend I.H: op.cit. p.19; Zafer-nâme 11 ab; Kırzioglu F: op.cit. p.283; Gazavât-nâme 26b. Although Hûseyîn does not give the name of the beglerbegis he gives details concerning the ceremony of the army in Çermik.
Khan, the governor of Canbaz-çukuru. After collecting over one thousand Georgian slaves he joined the Serdâr in Çermik and as a result of his service he received valuable gifts and honours from the Serdâr (43b). 34

During the stay of the army in Çermik it took around twenty days to assemble the remaining forces and to transport ammunition from Trabzon to Erzurum. The Serdâr received letters of submission as a result of the letters the Serdâr had sent from Istanbul, one of which was sent with the envoy Hüseyin Beg from Şemhâl the ruler of Kumuk and Kaytâk and was addressed to Sultan Murâd. 'Ali copied it in (44a-45a), from which it can be seen that it does not belong to 'Ali, its style and form being different from the preceding letter in which elaborated inşâ and Çagatay Turkish are used. In this letter Şemhâl informed the Serdâr that the Kizilbaş in Şirvan had been scattered and that the plucky men of Dagistan, over 30000, were ready to fight against the Kizilbaş together with the army. This was followed by letters of reply from the Serdâr to Şemhâl (45a-46b) and to Gazi Salih, Toca-lav Beg and Mirzâ Şahruh (46b-48a) in answer to their request from the Serdâr to send Özdemiroğlu Ogmân Paşa with a combat force. Both letters contain the same thema and

34- see also Kütükoglu B: op.cit. p.51; Kirzioglu F: op.cit. p.284; Danişmend I H:op.cit. p.19.
style. In these letters the Serdar asked them how many men, cannon, and guns should be sent and when and where they would join them when Özdemiroğlu Oğmân Paşa was appointed as Serdar, at the end of which he requested them to discuss the plan with Şemhâl and said that details on the subject must be clarified with the envoy of Hüseyin Beg.

As can be seen above the letters were addressed to the rulers in Caucasus, while the following letters were sent to the regional governors on the eastern border of the empire, these being the letters of reply from the Serdar which were addressed to Hüsrev Paşa the beglerbegi of Van and Zeynel Beg sancakbegi of Hakkari (49a-53a). On 10 Cumâda’l-ülâ (15 July) the envoy of Hüsrev Paşa, Hüseyin Kethûdâ, brought the request of Hüsrev Paşa to Çermik concerning the sending of a few Kurdish sancakbegis and the beglerbegi of Diyarbekir to the frontier at Van in order to fight against the combined forces of Emir Khan in Tebriz. However 'Âli in his letter of reply advised him to use the forces at his disposal because all the beglerbegis gathered in Çermik were needed to put into effect the plan concerning the conquest of Azerbeycan and Georgia. Moreover he drew the framework of the administrative method which should be followed: Firstly the commander must treat his soldiers well. Secondly, the commander must be seen as a friend. Thirdly, the
commander must make good use of their skill. A second letter (51a-51b) was dispatched by his envoy Huseyin Kethuda to Hüsrev Paşa because he had complained to the Serdâr about the insubordination of some Kurdish Begs and senior officers, asking him to dismiss them from their duty. Finally having received a letter of complaint concerning the negligence of Zeynel Beg in his service on the border to help Gazi Beg, sancakbegi of Selmas, the Serdâr asked him not to build new fortifications during the war and advised him to be on his guard against the Kızılbaş and to help Gazi Beg(52a-53a).

It seems that although The Serdar raised forces on the north east flank of the empire for his campaign, the west flank of the Safavi borders remained empty which caused a gap of authority; thus many Kurdish tribes were sympathetic to the Safavis and did not obey orders.

After the gathering of the army and the collection of its ammunition over twenty days in Çermik they left and reached Şehitler Türbesi near Erzurum where the envoy of Tokmak Khan Mihmân-dâr Murâd Ağa brought a letter to Behrâm Paşa in which he asked the latter why the events of Canbaz-çukuru and the arrival of the Serdâr in Erzurum had occurred in spite of the Safavis' respect for the treaty of Amasya. Thus Behrâm Paşa
sent a letter of reply to his questions (53a-55a) It is not clear who wrote this letter but it is probable that 'Ali wrote it, in which he explained that the raid on Canbaz-çukuru had been mounted because of the act of plunder by the Safavi army against the sheep of the Ulus Türkmen and also because it was on the route of campaign for the conquest of Georgia.35

As 'Ali arranged chapters in accordance with the meetings of the council of campaign, he recorded his letter of reply to Melik Başaçuk in Nusret-nâme as having been written in Çermik. In fact Though according to Harîmî after passing Hasankale the army arrived at Basmalî where a few men of Melik Başaçuk and letters came and they presented a few falcons and offered their submission to the Serdâr36 Therefore 'Ali wrote a letter of reply (48a-48b) which was sent with his envoy to Melik Başaçuk Gorgi on 28 Cumâda’l-ülâ (1 August) from Allahî Ekber mountain, in

35—see also; Şark Seferleri, 2a: According to it Tokmak Khan’s envoy brought this letter to Lala Muşafa Paşa in contrast to Nusret-nâme and it adds that When Lala Muşafâ Paşa enumerated the causes of the campaign to the Safavi envoy, Murad Ağa went on to the rebuilding of Kars Castle in this year at the request of the Sultan which was itself a breach of the treaty of Amasya. Thus Iskender Münşî (Savory) p.349; It seems that Iskender Münşî gives the date of the rebuilding of Kars Castle as 1578, claiming that it was done before the conquest of Georgia, because of the information given by the Safavi envoy mentioned above.

36—Zafer-nâme: 12b; Kurzioglu F: op.cit. p.286
which the arrival of the army at Allahu Ekber mountain is mentioned, and requesting him to join them from the North when the Serdar arrived at Ardahan if Davud Khan and Dedisimed were opposed to the Sultan. At the end of this according to 'Älî diplomatic procedure had been completed after which he requests the prince of Georgia to act in the light of preceding letters. As a result of this we can say that all letters in this chapter were not written in Çermik, but were written in accordance with conditions and needs between Çermik and Ardahan, and it seems that he arranged letters according to the geographical aspect thus Melik Basaçuk's letter was recorded at the end of the letter to the rulers of Dagistan.

It is not clear but probably when the army arrived on 1 Cumâda’l-ãhir 986 (5 August 1578) at Ardahan, there followed another mutual exchange of correspondence (55a-58a) between Behrâm Paşa and Tôkmak Khan, when the Safavi and Ottoman sides engaged in a propaganda war, exchanging their rival claims with each other. Tôkmak Khan mentions the bravery of the Kızılbâş soldiers and the genealogy of the Şâh who was descended from the Prophet, in accordance with the Şia belief, which he uses to demonstrate the superiority of the Safavis over the Ottomans and he asks the Ottoman side; "A few campaigns have occurred so far, and what result and advantage have
they brought for you?" On the other hand the Ottomans described this letter as containing nothing but sometimes warlike language, sometimes criticism and sometimes praise. This is followed by information concerning the genealogy of the Ottoman family and the historical background of Lala Müşafâ Pasa; finally Behram Paşa gives as another reason for the campaign the breach of their treaty, since the Safavis had given refuge to some tribal chiefs who had fled from the Ottoman side of the frontier with Şehrizol and Van to the Safavi side, and also that he wished to punish the Georgian people because they had given Mehmed Ağa and his men pork to eat in the winter time, and finally because of the opposition of Georgia to the Ottomans whereas west Georgia had been allotted to the Ottomans but had gone over to the side of the Safavis. The delegation were given the answer that the Georgian people must be treated as Daru’l-harp in accordance with Islamic law. It is significant that according to the content of the last letter and the preceding letter between Behram Paşa and Tokmak Khan, both sides attempted to exchange letters instead of notification and investigation.

During the encampment of the army at Ardahan, which was the gateway to Georgia, the Serdar heard reports from spies who revealed that Tokmak Khan planned to cut the communications of
the Serdar and plunder the region of Ardahan with thirty thousand troops.\(^\text{36}\) As a result of this a threatening letter (58a-62a) was addressed to Tokmak Khan in the name of the Suljân. It starts with the insulting expression "Re'isü'l-refāviz ve'l-mülhidün". After reminding him of the peace of Amasya, and the preceding victory of the Ottomans, the causes of the campaign are mentioned including the breaking of the peace by the Safavis, and they are finally warned that the Ottoman army consists of the forces of the Serdar, the beglerbegis and special artillery and guns, and thus victory over the Kızılbaş will belong to the Ottomans.\(^\text{37}\)

Bu meclis ser-där-i mülk-ārā ve sipahsālār-i āsaf-rānuñ yollarda ki, hūsn-i tedbīrleri ve Çermik nām menzile gelince, leşkerūn hayātına bā'īg olan zād ü zevāda kışmi tekgüzler ve dilîr ü dilâverlerūn cümüş ü harekâta sebeb olan Hāzîn-i 'Āmire-i cem' ü tevfârlerı, ...... (B:62a-64a)

\(^{36}\)-Kortepeter Carl Max:Ottoman Imperialism During the Reform, New York p.52; Hammer V.J:op.cit. p.152: Although Tokmak Khan's plan concerning the plunder of Ardahan and the cutting of the army's passage are shown in other sources to have been under consideration, on this subject Hammer is decisive that the sancak of Ardahan and the region of Çıldır were plundered and were under the attack of Tokmak Khan with his thirty thousand soldiers.

\(^{37}\)- see also Kütükoglu B:op.cit. p.53; KA 510a 512a
This short chapter describes 'Ali's observations on developments and activities of the Serdar which took place between Çermik and Ardahan. The army did not suffer need for cereal on the campaign road to Erzurum, where much cereal was stocked and the price of barley and wheat in the camp of the army was cheaper than in village or town, for which 'Ali gives the example that the Keyl of barley was twenty or thirty akçe in the village but it was five or six akçe in the billet of the army, despite the scarcity and inflation in the villages of Anatolia\(^\text{39}\) caused by the collection of ammunition from Diyarbekir and Erzurum. When the army reached Şehitler Türbesi and Hasan Kale, the Serdar appointed the beglerbegi of Sivas, Mahmûd Paşa, to guard the region of Erzurum so that the ammunition and the rear of the army would be held in

\(^{39}\) Akdağ, Mustafa: \textit{Celâli İsyânları} Ankara 1963 pp.55-57: indicates that since 1574 people in the country had been in scarcity as a result of which even the food of Istanbul had to be brought from distant regions of the country for which hundreds of cereal officials (zahire mübaşiri) were sent to the regions of Anatolia, Karaman, Rum and Erzurum provinces to gather more of the needs of the people at the daily prices of the state (narb-i rızî). According to Suraiya Faroqhi in her \textit{Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia}, Cambridge 1984 p.218, wheat prices in KONYA which was the granary of the country, increased from 7 to 120 akçes between 1566 and 1651. Although this city had exported grain to Europe in preceding years, it provided for military needs when supplies drawn off, particularly when the army was on campaign in Iran.
security. In addition on 18 Cumâda’ı-ülâ 986/23 July 1578 pompous ceremony was shown to the envoy of Tokmak Khan, Mihrâm-dâr Murâd Ağa, who expressed his concern that "Bu leşker-i zafer-peykara Şâh-ı kerem bile mukâvemet idemez" (64a). After resting there the army reached Ardahan.

Bu meclis kâr-üzmüde-i dâna Vân Beglerbegisi Hüsrev Paşa zu’âmadan Yusuf Kethûdâ nâm vekilini bir mikdâr 'askerle gönderüb, Vân serhaddinde ser-dâr olan Emir Hân leşkerinînî dûn-dârîna mukâbi bolub, ekeri kılıçdan geçirilüb, Ardahan nâm menzilde kelleleri ve dilleri geldügi, âhusû-ı şecâ’at-ı nusûs beyânundadur. (B:64a-65a)

This chapter just contains a letter which Hüsrev Paşa’s

---

39-Zafer-nâme: 12a: The appointment of the beglerbegi of Rum, Mahmûd Paşa was made to guard Erzurum in Hasan Kale. The writer says that Behrâm Paşa beglerbegi of Erzurum was sent with the artillery train on the road for Oltu before the Serdâr left. Gazavât-nâme: op.cit. 27b; When the army arrived at Hasan Kale its beg welcomed the Serdâr and saluted him with forty rounds of artillery. Danışmend I.H: op.cit. p.19.

40-Gazavât-nâme: 27 a,b; Zafer-nâme: 11b: When the army arrived at Şehitler Türbesi after Erzurum a big ceremony was held which was watched by the envoy of Tokmak Khan, Mihrâm-dâr Murâd Ağa. In addition the army was feasted with over 150 dining tables (sofra) and some of them were appointed as Çavuşbaşi, Bölükbaşi etc. Şark Seferleri; 1b: The author adds some details about the army leaving Erzurum; After passing Deveboynu, they arrived at Şehitler Türbesi. A ceremony also took place in which Osmân Paşa’s troops seemed to have been supplied with perfect equipment. This case was quoted by Kütükoğlu p.52.
Kethūdā, Yusuf Sinān Ağa brought with three hundred heads of Kızılbaş to the Serdâr during the camp of the army at Ardahan. Therefore the council of campaign under the leadership of Lala Muṣṭafā Paşa met to discuss Hūsrev Paşa’s information which was the Ottoman victory over twenty thousand soldiers of Emir Khan. In return for their service the Serdâr conferred the sancak of Erciṣ upon their leader Yusuf Sinān and three hundred thousand akçes to encourage the army. (65a) This event was considered lucky by the soldiers who took courage against the enemy.

Bu meclis sene-i sitte ve gemânın ve tis'a-mi'e Cumāda'lı- ğhiresinü'n dördüncü günü, ki yevm-i cum'a idi, dahân-ı Gürçistan olan Ardahan nam kal'a kurbinden göçülub, bi-'inâyeti'lı-llâhi'lı- mennân sipahsâlar-ı nusret-nişân 'azim-i teshîr-i Gürçistan olub;...(B:65a-79b)

On 4 Cumāda'lı-āhir 986 (Friday 8 August 1578) the Ottoman army left Ardahan and camped at Begrehatun where the conquest of the fortresses of Georgia was decided by the Ottoman

---

41-KA 512a-512b; Peçevi:op.cit. p.29; both contain the same account .Gazavât-nâme: 28b:The Beg of Ardahan Castle welcomed the Serdâr and twenty five rounds of artillery were fired after a hil'at was given to the Kethūdā of Hūsrev Paşa, and he gave the Yeniçerî a reward to encourage them.
dignitaries. At the same time the ruler of Altunkale Dedis-imed, the widow of Keyhüsrev,\(^{42}\) sent an envoy with a letter of submission to the Serdar to whom she promised that her son Menuçehr would be sent as a hostage and that she would give tribute for her eldest son Gurgur.\(^{(66a)}\) However it seems that she preferred to wait until the stronger side would become clear. Accordingly by consensus of the dignitaries in Beğrehatun Bekir Beg, the Alaybeg of Bayburd was sent to conquer Vale from the country of Varazaoglu Mahmūd Khan. The next day, Saturday, the army of the Serdar besieged Yeni Kal'a which fell into Ottoman hands a short time later. During this time forty or fifty Rumeli soldiers made contact with the army of Ṭokmak Khan including men of Imam-kulu Khan, Karahan's men and nine lords of the Kızılbaş, all of whom are described by ʿĀlī as twelve lords of the Kızılbaş. He also gave the number of the

\(^{42}\)-Iskender Münşi: op.cit. p.144:Although Keyhüsrev II inclined toward the Ottomans according to the treaty of Amasya, the regions of Kartlı, Kalheti and Meshiya were allotted to Iran. The state of Meshiya continued as explained by Allen: op.cit. pp.153-155. Dedis-imed the dowager of Keyhüsrev II, was daughter of Vahtangi, Prince of Muhrani, who had been very close to Simon and Dedis-imed ruled in Samtzkhe with her favourite Varaza Şalikaşvili, brother to Şah Ṭahmāsb's wife. As Şah Ṭahmāsb was not satisfied with her rule he raked all the Meshian country with fire and sword, then on a passing understanding with the Turks, and he withdrew Dedis-imed's country and then he took her son as prisoner in the fortress of Achara. It is assumed that after the death of Şah Ṭahmāsb they could have returned to their native land.
Kızılbaş as thirty thousand⁴³ in the Çıldır plain.(67a)

Although Ottoman sources give details concerning the Ottoman side of the events, first there is a gap on the opposite front which is filled in by the information of Iskender Münşi, the official former historian of the Safavi state:

"when the Ottoman army left Ardahan, Muhammedi Tokmak Khan the beglerbegi of Çukur-Sa'ad reported the approach of Lala Muşafa Paşa to the Şâh, who ordered the beglerbegi of Karabag to mobilize the troops from Azerbaijan and move against the enemy. After several meetings of the council Hamza Mirzâ was ordered to mobilize the troops of Irak and Fars, and to join forces with the Azerbaijan army. Meanwhile, Muhammedi Khan had written to Emir Khan and Imam Kulu Khan, bidding them to join him in Çukur-sa'ad, but Emir Khan, because of the quarrel between The Türkmens and the Ustaclu, did not want any member of the Ustaclu tribe to hold any post of importance and delayed his departure beyond all reasonable bounds. Imam Kulu Khan joined Muhammedi Khan at Çıldır but there was no sign of Emir Khan"⁴⁴

⁴³-See for comparative information about the number of the Kızılbaş force which was given by contemporary Ottoman and Safavi sources B. Kütükoglu op.cit. p.55.Moreover Kurzoglu F:op.cit p.290, later gives the names of begs who fought on the Safavi side at Çıldır.

⁴⁴ -Iskender Münşi (Savory ):op.cit. p.350: We should act prudently on the information of Don Juan of Persia concerning this case, Don Juan:op.cit. p.137:According to him the Persians now set out in haste, having received news concerning the departure of the army from Ardahan. To Tokmak Khan it had been
Having given a short general account of the Battle of Çıldır (66a-68a) \textsuperscript{45} Nusret-nâme goes on to give details about it in a letter (68a-74a) which was sent to give news concerning the Ottoman victory to Istanbul. In this letter after the account above concerning the conquest of the fortresses of Georgia by the Ottoman forces there follows an account of Çıldır, (69a) when the Ottoman vanguard fought with the Kızılbaş for three hours; when they realized the large number of the Safavi army, which consisted of twenty or thirty thousand men, they sent a messenger to the Serdâr. Thereupon he commissioned Derviş Paşa to drive the enemy away but he did not take any measures and entered the battle with his three or four hundred men. Although he fought gloriously with his men, many of whom were killed, \textsuperscript{46} when the Serdâr learned about this he firstly sent falsely reported that the Turkish army did not exceed some 40,000 men, being made up of soldiers of many nationalities, none of them over well armed. We can see that Don Juan tries to hide the failure of Tokmak behind the false reports of his spies, as is commonly believed.

\textsuperscript{45}-KA 512b-513a

\textsuperscript{46}-Çazavat-nâme: 30a-34b: gives detailed accounts concerning the brave battle of Derviş Paşa and Ogmân Paşa against Ƭokmak Khan and Karahan in the epic style. Artillery was not used in this battle because of the strong rain, which is referred to with the expression (tüfenk atılmadi ol günde asla) by Şemsi Paşa 116b as is confirmed by Kirzoglou op.cit. p.290; Danismend: op.cit. p.22; Peçevi: op.cit. p.40; Moreover we must act prudently on the dates of Don Juan or Çazavat-
Ogmen Paşa and secondly Behram Paşa and Ahmed Paşa to help Derviş Paşa. Ogmen Paşa showed bravery in the face of the destiny of war, for which this beyt was recorded: (70a)

Merd imiş hâsîlı hûnerver imiş
Ferd imiş migli yok dilâver imiş.

From morning to the 'Ishâ prayer the battle continued until the Ottoman force won victory with the arrival of new reinforcements against the Safavis. Although 'Allî gives the number of the Ottoman casualties as two hundred soldiers with five tribal chiefs (73a) he states that five hundred Kızılbaş were taken prisoner and five thousand Kızılbaş soldiers were killed. (72a)47

As a result of this battle much booty remained in the hands of

nâme. According to the first source, Mustafâ Paşa made a sudden attack on the Persian right flank which is not confirmed by any contemporary source. However according to Peçevî p.40, the position of Derviş Paşa against the Kızılbaş is illustrated by two beyts which are quoted from Lam'î by Peçevî:
Neylesün bir can bu deñlû tîz ile
Şîr-i tenhâ bir sûrî hûn-riç ile.

47-Ottoman and Safavi sources give many different figures concerning the casualties and prisoners of both sides Kütükoğlu B: op.cit. p.56; Kırzıoğlu op.cit. p.290: Both compare the casualties and prisoners of both sides in accordance with data of contemporary sources.
the Ottoman soldiers (gazi)\textsuperscript{49} and Ottoman victory in the Çıldır plain opened the gate of Georgia to the Ottomans. Now Menuçehir submitted to the Serdar with five or six thousand men a day after the battle of Çıldır. On the one hand the sancakbeyi of Ardahan, Abdurrahman Beg, conquered the fortresses of Çıldır and Tumuk, and on the other hand the fortresses of Ahil Kelek and Hırtız were taken and annexed with the aid of cannon by the army of the Serdar.\textsuperscript{(73a)} Finally the Hatime of this letter ends by spreading the news of the victory with the sending of a Feth-nâme to East and West (74a).\textsuperscript{50} Moreover as a result of the Çıldır victory the Serdar sent ɭokmak Khan a letter which was written in secret and expressive language (esrâr-ı nikât setîre-i iş'ar) (74b-76a) in which the Serdar promised him to make him the ruler of all Azerbeycan if he took part on the side of the Ottomans; such men as Tekelî 'Ulâma Paşa and Dulkadırlî Mehmed Paşa were given as examples. It seems

\textsuperscript{49}-Lokmân op.cit. 94a: After the victory of the Ottoman army over the Safavis special booty was loaded onto a galley in Trabzon and then was sent by sea to Istanbul where all booty was to be presented to the Divân.

\textsuperscript{50}-Ka 513a-516a: adds the information that this letter was sent with Mûsâ Ağa, who was from the Dergâh-ı All Müteferrika, to give news concerning the victory of the Ottomans to Istanbul. However although Lokmân 93b gives the outline of the Battle of Çıldır, he says that on Cumâda'î-āhir the Selam Çavuş of the Serdar, Hüseyin Çavuş, brought the news of the battle of Çıldır to Istanbul at the same time. The Ottoman dignitaries decided that the children of Ottoman martyrs were to be given the ocaḵ of their father.
that the Serdâr used an important tactic of diplomacy to win over the regional governor of the Safavis for whom Azerbeycan, being an important region, should be the main goal rather than a small region.

Although Ottoman sources portray the cause of the success of the Ottoman army as the brave and experienced struggle of Derviş Paşa, Oğmân Paşa and Behram Paşa, the reasons for Safavi failure are given objectively by Iskender Münşi:

"The first crime of which the Qızılbaş were guilty was intertribal bickering, which prevented them from working harmoniously together. Their second fault lay in their taking on an Ottoman army of one hundred thousand men with their own force of fifteen thousand, without waiting for other contingents to arrive. The result of their folly was that Lala Muṣṭafâ Paşa was encouraged, and the slight apprehension he had left in regard to the Qızılbaş was removed. If all the forces of Azerbaijan and Şirvan had assembled at one rendezvous they would have numbered more than fifty thousand men. If the Georgian Princes had joined them, Lala Muṣṭafâ Paşa's task would have been difficult. As it was, because of Qızılbaş disunity, their strength in Azerbaijan was gradually frittered away. Their leaders were killed one after the other, and the financial resources they had built up over the years were dissipated.\(^{51}\)

\(^{51}\)-Iskender Münşi (Savory): op.cit.p.351
After the account of the victory of Çildır, the end of this chapter in Nusret-name is principally concerned with events in Meshiya where the princes of Georgia waited to see which side would gain supremacy. Thus it starts to give information about correspondence (76a-79a)\(^\text{52}\) between the Serdār and Menuçehr, the youngest prince of Meshiya although three letters were written after Çermik. The first one written in Cumādaʾ-ülā/July (76a-77b) contains information concerning the requests and threats of the Serdār from Menuçehr demanding that he prepare ammunition and equipment for the army. The second one (77b-78a) was written at the request of Menuçehr to be given a promise of the conferring of his country up on him, as a result of which a letter of reply was sent to him at the beginning of Cumādaʾ-ülā/July. It has the same theme concerning preparation as the preceding letter. Finally the third letter (78a-79a) was addressed to him as a reply to his letter of submission at the end of Cumādaʾ-ülā/July. They are given with the titles "Tetimme-i Kelam Der-Menâkib-i Menuçehr-i itāʾat encām" as the events of the sequence of the victory of Çildır. It seems that 'Ālī tried to fill in a gap concerning relations between Menuçehr and the Serdār as a background to events since Çermük to complete later political

\(^{52}\)-Kütükoglu B: op.cit. p.42
developments concerning Menuçehr and his family which occurred as a result of the effect of Çıldır. Lala Muṣṭafā Paşa, having accepted the submission of Menuçehr on 6 Cümāda’1-āhir 986 (10 August 1578)⁵³ assigned to him Azgur Sancak, and to his brother Gurgur, Oltı Sancak, and specific fiefs to other members of his family, and finally three towns to his mother.⁵⁴ Moreover according to 'Ālī the serdār sent a horse, a pavilion and ħil'at to him as the mark of his loyalty, after which Menuçehr guided the army in the company of the serdār on the way to Şirvan and on the return journey (79b).

Bu meclis Çıldır sahrasindaki neberd ü heycadan sörüra surh-serlerUNIX vaki' hålleri ve anlara tabi' olan Gürçiyanuñ ahväl-i bime'allari zikrinedür. (B:79b-103a)

After the conquest of some fortresses and the submission of

⁵³- Zafer-nâme 14b: When Melik Menuçehr was received, the Divân (staff meeting) was convened and a ceremony was held where the beglerbegis were received by the serdār who gave valuable gifts to them. Finally the Kızılbaş prisoners were killed to draw a lesson. Gazavat-nâme (33b-36a) gives details concerning the friendly approach of the serdār to Osman Paşa at the ceremony when also Menuçehr and his brother were received by the serdār. This case is quoted by Kütükoglu p.57.

⁵⁴- see also KA 517a; Kortepeter C. Max: op.cit. p.53; Kirzioglu F: op.cit. p.290; Kütükoglu B: op.cit. p.57; Danışmend I.H: op.cit. p.22: According to the latter source the principality of Mahmūd Khan was conquered and the principality of Altinkale was annexed.
the princes of Mashiya, the Ottoman army proceeded against the ruler of Kartli, Davud Khan, the brother-in-law of Şäh Ẓahmāsb, the ruling prince of this realm, who resided in Tiflis. So far he had not answered the request for submission and so having passed through high mountains and valleys under the mostly strong rain the army reached Tiflis on 20 Cumāda’l-āhir (24 August 1578). Before the vanguard force under the leadership of Osman Paşa reached Tiflis Davud Khan and his subjects had withdrawn to the mountains. During the stay of the army for 5 days in Tiflis the supplies and the cannons were settled in the ramparts of the Citadel (81a) about which Istanbul was informed by a letter (81a-84a), which having mentioned information concerning military action since the Cildır victory gives details concerning the work of the Serdār in Tiflis who appointed the sancakbegi of Kastamonu, Mehmed Paşa, to the governership of Tiflis. A total of one thousand five hundred soldiers, and one hundred and fifty thousand

55-Allen W.E.D: A History of the Georgian People London 1932 pp.152-155: says that in 1569 Simon the brother of Davud Khan had been made an outlaw by Şäh Ẓahmāsb who had set in his place Davud, a worthless wastrel son of Luarsab, who had become a Muslim, as Davud Khan had curried favour in Kazvin and married a close relative of Aleksandir, the Prince of Kalheti. However although Allen indicates that Davud the creature of Şäh Ẓahmāsb went cringing to Istanbul, this information is not confirmed from any other sources.

56-Gazavat-nâme 36a; Kütükoglu B: op.cit. p.58
akçes were placed under his responsibility. Moreover in this letter 'Ālī illustrates the historical background of the castle of Tiflis as well as churches of which two famous churches were converted to mosques where the name of the Sultan was mentioned in the Friday prayer. This was ended by a three-day march out of Tiflis, making camp by a stream called Kabūr Suyu where Aleksandıır the prince of Kalheti sent his vizier Yuram Beg. This was followed by the reception of Aleksandıır Khan and his men by the Serdar. (83b) 58

Nusret-nâme continues with the letters to the princes of Georgia to illustrate events in Georgia as background information. Although they were written on several dates before the entry of the Ottoman army into Georgia, 'Ālī records these letters at this stage of the Nusret-nâme as had happened in the case of Meshiya. The first one (84b-86a) was sent to Davud Khan in

57-Don Juan: op.cit. p.143: gives the number as six thousand men and one hundred cannon, which were placed in the castle of Tiflis for defence. However Von Hammer J.: op.cit. p.163 gives it as two thousand soldiers and one hundred cannon, which were placed under the responsibility of the beglerbegi of Tiflis. It seems that both pieces of information must be supposition.

58-KA 517a; Gazavāt-nāme 37ab: gives information concerning Aleksandıır’s gifts to the Serdār. He was received by the Serdār who presented gifts to the men of Aleksandıır. Moreover Kütükoglu B: op.cit pp.58-59: quotes the number of Aleksandıır’s men and gifts from Gazavāt-nāme and Şark Seferleri.
the middle of Zi‘l-hicce 985 (February 1578) calling on him to submit to the Ottoman side, and the second one (86a–87a) was addressed to Başaçuk Gorgi in the middle of Cumāda‘l-ūlā (July) in return for his letter in Çermük in which the Serdâr promised him to give the Sancak of Tiflis to his son if he supported the Ottoman army with his troops, and the conquest of Tiflis was realised (87a).

As it can be seen from the text, although 'Āli makes a general statement concerning the progress of events in the bold caption before the letters or his own narratives, except for the introduction two thirds of the text consists of letters. The question remains as to why he includes so many. It seems that firstly he may have wanted to enrich his work with them, and thus may have wished to create new genres which could lie between Gazavât-nâme and Münşêât. Secondly, they were written to eulogize Lala Mustafa Paşa's military exploits and the Sultân, through which he wished to prove his skill as münşi and with which he hoped to gain the post of nişanci as preceding nişancıs had done, such as Feridun Ahmed Beg and Nişancı Celalzade

'Āli gives the history of Levend Khan (Aleksandır) with this

59 see above p.20
title Der-zikr-i menâkb-i veled-i Levent Hân şeyvedâ’l-llâhu bunyân iţâ’atihi fi-l-abyan. During the preparations for the campaign in Istanbul a letter of advice (87b-89b) had first been addressed to Aleksandr Khan, son of Levent, calling him to obey the Sultan like his son-in-law Mehmed Beg. Secondly at the beginning of Cumâda’l-ülâ/July during the stay of the Serdâr in Çermik he had sent two letters (89b-92a) to Aleksandr Khan, Both have the same theme as preceding letters concerning preparation; the former had requested the latter to support the conquest of Şirvan, asking him for details about the fortresses in the hands of himself and his opponents and also asking him to join with Başaçuk Melik (92a).

After the conquest of Tiflis Aleksandr Khan realised that the Ottoman army was close to his border and thus he declared his submission to the Serdâr, and he escorted him with his army up to the Kanûk river (93b). As a result of his obedience to the Ottomans The Serdâr gave him a berât (92a-93b) which was written in an eloquent manner (fasâhat-me‘äl). This letter is a good example of the diplomatic manner in which ‘Âli shows how the Ottomans approached regional rulers outside

60-Although ‘Âli mentioned the title of Aleksandr’s son-in-law as Ahmed in the preceding letter, this time he gave it as Mehmed.
their dominions. In this letter 'Āli praises him, and his capital is mentioned as Zeg-Girim. Moreover he received rich gifts and the rank of beglerbegi over his own domain in return for cizye (93b)\(^{61}\)

Another letter (93b-94b) was written to Hacı Ahmed Cân and the dignitaries of Ereş in order to buy grain for the army when the army arrived on 5 Receb 986/8 September 1578 at the Kanik river, which is on the border between Şirvan and the Kvelheti principedom of Georgia, because the army had suffered great scarcity in the Şırnak Steppe which is between the Alazan and the Kabur Rivers. The equipment and food needed for each person was loaded onto transport animals at Ardahan but was exhausted during the long march of the army between deep valleys and high mountains because of misinformation about the number of stages required for the army.\(^{62}\) As a result of the lack of supplies for the army the price of provisions and grain suddenly increased further and the greater part of the items required was not to be found, which made it urgently necessary for the

\(^{61}\)-KA 517b-518b; contains the same account. see also Kütükoglu B: op.cit. p.59.

\(^{62}\)-Kütükoglu, B: op.cit. p.59
soldiers to return to Ardahan without going on to Ereş. Describing the hardship of the army 'Ali uses tragic language in which he gives many examples concerning the rise of the price of provisions. Thus on the morning of 9 September/6 Recep some of the Yeniceris and Sipahis came to the tent of the Serdar (96b) and said "Elbette döner giderüz muhalefet iden yoldaşlarımızı katl iderüz, evvel cân, andan cihân, ne Karuk Suyundan güzeran ne feth-i diyär-i Șirvân." Thereupon the Serdar concluded the Divân and tried to persuade them with exhortation and favours.64

'Ali gives details concerning the account of the battle of Koyun-geçidi from his own narrative (97b-99b) as well as a letter (99b-102a)65 which was addressed to the central government in Istanbul. It can be seen that after the Ottoman victory, as happened in Çıldır 'Ali sent detailed information instead of using a diplomatic approach. When Emir Khan the

63-Although 'Ali narrated the hardship of the army, Gazavat-name:38a-39b exaggerates this. According to him countless men and horses died from hunger

64- see also Kutukoglu B:op.cit. p.59;Kirzioglu F:op.cit.p.298;KA 518b.

65 KA 518a-b; Zafer-name 19a-20; Şecaat-name 18a-b; Şark Seferleri 3b; Gazavat-name 39b-40a Although they contain the account of the battle of Koyun-geçidi correctly they give it more briefly than 'Ali
beglerbegi of Tebriz heard that Muhammedi Khan had been defeated and that Lala Mustafa Pasha had gone on to Sirvan, he marched to Karabag\(^66\) where he gathered around twenty or thirty thousand Kizilbash soldiers including Murad Khan, the ruler of Mugan, Seref Khan, the ruler of Nahcivan, Halife Ensar and Abagay, the tribal chief of Karacadag, Dumbilli Haci Beg, the ruler of Caldiran, Sahverdi Beg, the garrison commander of Cukur-saad, Niyaz Beg, the commander of Pazuki, Mirza Ali Beg, Beg of Kapan, and Ahmed Beg, the ruler of Dizmar, who were ordered to follow the movements of the Ottoman army to take revenge at an opportune moment\((97b)\).\(^67\)

After the Ottoman army had pitched camp on the intersection of the rivers of Kabur and Kalak\(^68\), the Kizilbash army secured the

\(^{66}\) Kütükoglu, B: op.cit. p.60, Kortepeter C.Max: op.cit. p.53

\(^{67}\)-KA 518b; See for comparative information on the data of the Safavi-Ottoman sources concerning the total number of Emir Khan's forces Kütükoglu B:op.cit. p.60; Iskender Münşi (Savory) op.cit. p.553, although he does not mention the names of the tribal chiefs. Imam-kulu Khan joined forces with Emir Khan and Don Juan: op.cit. p.145: According to him the tribal chief of the Safavis joined Tokmak Khan because "the latter had devised a plan whereby he hoped to deprive the Ottomans off their mounts and supplies and then massacre them", as quoted by Carl Max Kortepeter:op.cit. p.53.

\(^{68}\) Kütükoglu, B:op.cit.60, Kortepeter C.Max:op.cit. p.53

Both give this region as Alazan
head of a ford across the Alazan which was called Koyun-geçidi, where they could pass over the narrow neck of land between the rivers, and took away some of the camels and other animals which were grazing behind the camp. Lala Mustafā Paşa learned of the action of the Safavi army and sent Osmān Paşa, Mehmed Paşa, beglerbegi of Zulkadriyye, Behrām Paşa, beglerbegi of Erzurum, and Derviṣ Paşa, beglerbegi of Diyarbekir to repulse the already attacking Kızılbaş. (97b, 101a)

69- Although about the initial confrontation of both sides in Koyun-geçidi contemporary sources approach the subject with little alteration. Iskender Münşi (Savory) p.353: "The Kızılbaş force fell on a detachment of some four or fivethousand Ottoman troops who had left the main body to forage, slew two thousand of them and carried off their horses and possessions. A number of Ottoman emirs were taken in this engagement." On the other hand Don Juan:op.cit. p.145: states that when the Ottoman army suffered scarcity, under advice from the inhabitants, in order to procure most necessary provisions, Muṣṭafā Paşa proceeded to despatch a body of 12 000 of his men with some squadrons of cavalry under their several commanders, for the Paşa had been informed that beyond the marsh which lay at the junction of the Kanik river with the Araxes, there were great pastures, with corn lands where wheat, barley and rice might be obtained, also many flocks and herds. This information was believed to be reliable by the Paşa and the foraging groups departed, and were followed by the united forces of Emir Khan including Tokmak 'Alī Kulu Khan. When they had separated from the main body of their fellows, falling on them unexpectedly, they put them completely to rout so that hardly a man of the foraging parties escaped with his life. Unfortunately this information is not confirmed by the contemporary sources.

70- see also Damşmend I.H:op.cit. pp.24-25; Peçevi:op.cit p.46; Şark Şefeleri 3b; Gazavat-nime 40a, b; Don Juan:op.cit.p.446; the latter source gives the information that Lala Muṣṭafā Paşa later marched up with the remainder of his forces, and Tokmak Khan and his fellow commanders were
Emir Khan's force held the head of the ford, and his son Murād succeeded in gaining a foothold on the peninsula after they had crossed the ford, but those troops already on the peninsula had to face a counter attack from the Ottoman force so that they had to withdraw across the ford, during which time Ahmed Paşa, the beglerbegi of Haleb, and Derviṣ Paşa crossed the river and entered bravely into the ranks of the Kızılbaş, who resisted them for two hours and then fled in defeat, but many were killed and many more were drowned, for they missed the ford in the din and confusion, specially Dünbilli Haci Beg and Mirzā 'Alī Beg, beg of Kapan, who were imprisoned and then executed as an example (102a). 71 One tenth of the Kızılbaş only escaped in scattered condition to Nahcivan and the region of Gazvin. On this occasion 'Alī sent an ode to the Suljān 99b.

forced to give battle and defend themselves at a disadvantage. On the other hand Hammer, Joseph von: op.cit. p.163 quoted the same information from him but this is not confirmed by any other source.

71-Zafer-nâme 20a; Mehmed Zillioglu Evliya Çelebi: Evliya Çelebi Seyahat-nâmesi, Istanbul 1986, volume. II pp.605-606: He indicates that when he arrived at Koyun Köprü after a century he saw a mass of bones of dead people under the ground like a hill which consisted of these bones of the forty thousand soldiers of Emir Khan. Moreover see for comparative information about the total number of the Ottoman and Safavi casualties in this battle Kütükoglu B: op.cit. p.61; Kirzioglu F: op.cit. p.299.
On the same day as the battle of Koyun-geçidi (7 Receb/9 September) the Serdar received news from Aleksandır Khan who had been sent with a special Ottoman force and his three hundred men including sancakbegi Mûrzâ 'Ali and Ahmed Beg, during the stay of the army on the Kanik river. When they arrived at Şeki Ahmed Beg, the Safavi Beg of Şeki,72 fled and this made the people happy. Ergela, Mûrzâ Aleksandır's brother was appointed as a sancakbegi and in addition a judge was appointed (103a).73 Thus as H.İnalçık says "the conquered land was preserved in its pre-Ottoman administrative boundaries."74

This chapter starts with an account concerning the crossing by

---

72-İskender Münşi: (Savory) op.cit. p.352: Although he gave the name of the former Safavi ruler of Şeki as 'Ali Khan Gorgi the brother of Aleksandır, 'Ali mentioned it as Ahmed Beg.


the army of the Kanik river. On 9 Receb/ 12 September from morning to afternoon the troops of Diyarbekir and Erzurum crossed the river after which the river rose and some soldiers were drowned. Therefore the remaining soldiers rebelled against the Serdar under the leadership of Mustafâ Paşa Beglerbegâ of Zü'l-kadriyye, demanding to return home. On the morning of the next day as some yeniçeris crossed the river without any casualties, the alliance among the rebellious soldiers was broken and they started to cross the river, during which many possessions of yeniçeri and sipahi were lost in the deep river. About this case, although 'Ali gives details, he does not mention the reason for this rebellion in contrast to other sources.

'Ali gives details concerning the events from the army's

75-Zafer-nâme 21a; Şark Seferleri 3b: Although 'Ali says that the Serdar dissuaded a rebellion by the bulk of the army with advice and favours, Harîmî and Ebubekir bin Abdullah mention the rebellion of the soldiers and explain the cause of their opposition. In addition they give details about how the Serdar persuaded the commander of the army in a staff meeting to cross the river.

76-However 'Ali says that during the passing of the river the army suffered trouble Zafer-nâme 21b; Şark Seferleri 4a; Gazavât-nâme 41a: These remaining Ottoman sources agree about the loss of many soldiers and the supplies of the soldiers who fell in to the river but Don Juan the Safavi source just gives the losses of the Ottoman army as over 8000 men, Don Juan op.cit. p.147 which is quoted by Kütükoglu op.cit. p.63.
crossing of the Kanık river to their arrival in Ereş including the activities of the Serdar there about which a presentation letter (Süret-i 'arız-ı makhül) (106a-111b) containing a massive amount of information was sent to Istanbul on 13 Receb/16 September. During the battle of Koyun-geçidi Aras Khan the governor of Şemahî and Ahmed Khan the former governor of Şeki together with eight lords of the Kızılbaş and twelve thousand men came to the Kanık river to prevent the passage of the Ottoman army to Şirvan, (106a) but they did not offer any resistance against the Ottoman army because on the one hand the Ottoman force had already crossed, and on the other hand the Ereş Sunnis attacked the Kızılbaş force in the rear so that their troops were driven to flee to the direction of the bridge. As they crowded over it, it collapsed and as a result many soldiers met their death, and other soldiers were forced to flee to Karacadag and Karabag for safety with the following expression (hâlâs yakâsidur) (107a). 77

The Ottoman troops reached Ereş where the people welcomed them and held a big festival on 16 Receb 986 (18 September 1578), during which many Kızılbaş were killed by local detachments as well as the Ottoman troops. This was the first Friday prayer

77- KA 519 gives short account from which it quoted by Peçevi: op.cit. p.47; Kortepeter M: op.cit. p.54
to be held for fifty years in which the name of the Sultan as well as the first four Halifes (Çar-yar) were mentioned. Mevlânâ Valihi the preacher gave advice to the people of Ereğ in accordance with the Sunni traditions of Anatolian culture (108a). After this he gives information concerning the conquest and the administration of Şirvan established by Mustafâ Paşa who divided his conquests into four governorships: Özdemiroğlu Osman Paşa as a serdar to the government of Şirvan, Mehmed Paşa to the government of Tiflis, Aleksandr Khan to the government of Gürçistan (Kalheti) and Haydar Paşa to the government of Sukum (Abkhazia). There followed the conquests of Şemahi, Kabala, Baku, Şaburan and Derbend, made by Ottoman detachments and Sunni forces of the region (110b). Thus the Ottomans completed their first aim. After this it is assumed

78 - see also Şark Seferleri 4a; Zafer-nâme 22b

79- The Serdar had considerable trouble persuading any of his staff to assume the duties of the governor of Şirvan in the staff meeting (Divân) so much so that neither Derviş Paşa beglerbegi of Diyarbekir nor Ahmed Paşa (beglerbegi of Haleb) accepted this proposal about which the Zafer-nâme 24a-25a; Şecaat-nâme 24a-25a; Şark Seferleri 4a: give details rather than 'Āli as examined by Kütükoglu pp. 65-66; Kurzioglu F.: op. cit. pp. 302-303. Moreover Iskender Münşî (Savory): op. cit. p. 352: adds the information that Ebubekir Mirzâ, the son of Burhan who had expected to be appointed as governor of Şirvan on the condition that he send tribute to the Ottoman Sultan was left behind in Şirvan to cooperate with the Ottomans in administering the province. Mustafâ Paşa pacified him by promising on his return to Istanbul, to obtain from the Sultan letters appointing him as the governor of Şirvan.
as Allen says that "the long-term aim of the Ottomans was to construct ships at Derbend, the historical gateway from Caucasus to the Northern Steppes, to make conquests on the shore of the Caspian Sea."^80

When 'Ali sent his letter to Istanbul he used this opportunity very well as he had done previously. Now he sent verses again to bring his poetic skills to the attention of Sultan Murad III (ve ol hinde müellif-i kitab nazm idüb, sa'adetlü padişâha gönderdiği müsemmendür) (111a-111b).

'Ali detailed in his account the activities of the Serdar and his army during their stay for twenty days in Ereğ (111a-119b).^81 Lala Mustafa Paşa devised a plan which can be analyzed into two parts. On the one hand he established administrative measures in Şirvan to keep the region for the long term during which it could be incorporated into the structure of the

---

^80-Allen W.E.D:op.cit. (1963) p.34

^81-Çark Seferleri: 4a: He says that the Serdar stayed for twenty days in Ereğ. In addition, according to Don Juan, the Serdar remained for twenty-two days in the town of Ereğ. p.147;Danışmend I.H:op.cit. p.25: The army stayed in Ereğ for twenty-six days.
Ottoman state. As a result of this policy Mevlânâ Valihi was appointed to Şemseddin Sadr Medrese in Şemahi with a berât (111a-112a) as a preacher and judge to give the ḥuğbe as well as give fetvâs in accordance with the Sunni law on religious problems.

On the other hand he sought to gain by conciliating the more flexible commanders of the Safavis in a diplomatic way. Firstly he sent a letter of invitation (112a-113b) to Cemşid Khan the ruler of Gilan who was a Sunni Muslim. We can see from this letter that there were two important points which he used to attract Cemşid Khan to the Ottoman side. One was the Sunni aspect under which Şah Ṭahmâsb’s invasion and plunder of his country is related and he asks why Ṭahmâsb did this and answers that it is because he is a Sunni Muslim. Second is the history of the submission of Aleksandır Khan which is mentioned to him to take as an example. Thus ‘Ali uses the sensitive points of these regional governors in a diplomatic way in order to draw attention their submission to the Ottomans. In a similar way another letter of release and protection (113b-115a) was sent

---


83 Although ‘Ali gives his name as Mevlânâ Valihi in (107b) his name is mentioned as Mevlânâ Ilâhi in Berât(111b)
to Şeref Khan the ruler of Nahcivan who was also a Sunni Muslim. The Serdâr urged that the sancak of Bitlis had been possessed by Şeref Khan’s father Emir Şemseddin but that it had not been given to him in spite of him application because of the treaty of Amasya which had been agreed between both states, but stated that this time it would be approved if he and his clan declared their submission to the Sultan again.

After marching to Ereğ the army was provided with an abundance of provisions from the prosperous region of Ereğ. According to Kortepeter, “Ereğ has its strategic position, commanding the Persian approaches to Derbend and Central Georgia, and it was to be much fought over before the war in Transcaucasia ended.” Apart from this the potential of the region for provisioning the army encouraged the building here of a fortress. According to ‘Ali the fortress was built with adobe and was started in the place which is called Şahbagı on 28 Receb/25

---

84-Kortepeter M: op.cit. p.55
September and was completed within a week with the cooperation of all the army. He describes it as having three doors and four towers and furnished with cannon, being planned to accommodate thirty thousand soldiers (116a). This was followed by rebuilding the bridge on the Alazan (Kür) (116) for which the reason is explained by Kortepeter as their concern about the approaching winter.

The achievements of the Ottoman army spread in a short time to all Şirvan, and thus the Ottoman detachment, as well as Sunni forces and the Sunni people of Şirvan, tracked down the Kızılbaş to kill them. As a result, the Sunni people of Derbend rebelled against the Persian governor, Çerag Halife, killing him and a garrison of three hundred men, after which eight respected men with two thousand soldiers came to Eres to appoint an Ottoman ruler in Çerag Halife’s stead (118a). About this narrative

85-KA 520 a,b; Zafer-nâmé 23a; Peçevî: op.cit. p.48
86 Kortepeter, M: op.cit.p.55
87-Şerafettin Erel; Dagistan ve Dagistanlılar, Istanbul 1961 p.95 in which he indicates the cause of killing Çerag Halife as being that he took an extra poll tax which was called the sect tax (mezhep tax). He won the abhorrence of the people of the region. KA 520b; Peçevî: op.cit. p.49 Zafer-nâmé 38b narrates this as having happened after the departure of Ogmân Paşa from Eres to Şemahi. In addition according to him having killed Çerag Halife the respected men of Derbend came to Zerdav where Ogmân paşa received them. Şecâ'at-nâmé; 43a-43b gives this as having happened when the Ottoman force arrived in Derbend. It
'Ali gives exciting information about the customs of these people and the history of Derbend.

Bu meclis mülk-i Şirvân mühafazasına konulan 'asâkir-i mansûre (H.116b) ve cebhâne ve Hzâne-i 'âmireden virilen mühimmât-i mevfüre tefsîlîinde tertîb olunmuşdur. (B:118a-120a)

This brief chapter gives an account of the Serdar's measures taken to protect the new Ottoman government before returning to Erzurum, thus a thousand janissaries, equipment, the soldiers of Erzurum and 3 thousand men of Şirvan, sixty-six cannons, and two hundred cannon balls were alloted to Ogmân Paşa. Moreover as the former rulers in the region had helped the Ottoman force to conquer all of Şirvan in return for their services, and they were appointed to each sancak as a sancakbegi. Finally Mustafâ Çelebi who had joined the campaign as Defterdar Kaymakam

is seem that both give a confused sequence of events.

88-KA 521-522a; Peçevi: op.cit p.49-50: 'Ali divided all the region of Şirvan into two groups: the province of Derbend and the province of Şemâhî; Kütükoglu B: op.cit. pp.67-68 and Kurzioglu F: op.cit. pp.305-306. Both give the names of the sancaks in the province of Derbent and the province of Şemâhî in accordance with the KA and the Nusret-nâme. Moreover Kurzioglu F: op.cit. p.303 and Kütükoglu B: op.cit. pp.65-66 both quote information about how much equipment, pay, suplies and soldiers were given to Ogmân Paşa, Serdâr of Şirvan and to Kaytas Paşa, the beglerbegi of Ereş and the appointment of the former begs to each sancak in the region from Nusret-nâme and KA.
was appointed as Hazine Defterdar to Shirvan and the author of Şecâ'at-nâme, Dal-Mehmed Çelebi was appointed to the private service of Özdemiroğlu Osmân Paşa, to whom he became recording secretary and administrative assistant (tezkereci) (119b). Moreover the Şah’s taxes from Shirvan and income from the fishmarket in Salyan, the saltworks around Derbent and Baku, the ricefields and silk production of Shirvan and the petroleum of Baku were allotted to the new Ottoman government. In this section it can be seen that 'Ali detailed the names of Sancak begs and places as well as the amount of equipment and the number of soldiers in contrast to other contemporary sources; with this property, Nusret-name occupies a unique position.

Having taken measures for a new government in Shirvan, Mustafâ Paşa departed from Ereş with the bulk of the Ottoman army on 6 Şaban 986 (8 October 1578), crossing the Alazan six days

89- Although 'Ali does not give any information concerning the income of these regions in Nusret-nâme, he adds above information in KA 521b. See also Kütükoğlu, B: op.cit. p.66

90- Şark Seferleri:4a: This shows the cause of the Serdar’s return from Ereş to Erzurum which was decided because they thought that the Kızılbaş could have attacked Erzurum during the winter time, if they had information concerning the forces of Mahmûd Paşa who had remained with a small garrison in Erzurum to guard the region.
later 91 on 13 Şaban. They camped in Sultancık.

During the camp of the army in Sultancık the Serdar learnt that Emir Şemhâl the ruler of Dagistan was coming with forty men, passing over the mountain of Kuh-i Elburz to meet him, for whom a special ornate tent was prepared near the tent of the Serdar. The Ottoman dignitaries welcomed him, and he was settled in his tent on the night of the holy Berat on 16 Şaban 986/18 October 1578 and on the following morning he was received by the Serdar who assigned him to Şaburan as sancakbegi and also assigned his brother Toca-lav Burhâneddîn to Ahtî and Ihr (121a). 'Alî also reported Şemhâl’s information concerning the traditions and origins of the people called It-tebl who are related to the Georgians. Moreover he reported concerning the two people in Kaytak that they have strong bodies and are the origin of the Kaytak Usumi clan and of the rulers of Tabesaran. They believed that they traced their

91-Kortepeter M: op.cit. p.56: He give the time wrongly as eight days.
origin to Hazret-i Hamza the uncle of the Prophet. Finally he added at the end of his report that Usumi in Kaytak, his son Hân-i Mehmed in the castle of Kureyş, Adigörklu in Zâhû and Gâzi Salih in Tabesaran declared their submission to the Serdar who thus assigned them their former places as rulers (123b).92 Having finished the meeting the Serdar left for Tiflis and Şemhâl left for Şirvan.

According to 'Âlî the army hunted abundantly and drank compote (hoşâb) among the vineyards until the army arrived from Sultancik to Tiflis (123b). On 22 October/20 Şa'bân they arrived near Tiflis where they stayed for five days93 during the severe Georgian winter when it was swept by high winds and a snowstorm which gave hardship to the army, as a result of which

92-KA 523b-524b: It contains the same information as Nusret-nâme, Schmidt Jan: Pure water for thirsty Muslims Leiden 1991 p.48: he states that the conversation of 'Âlî with Şemhâl which occurs in KA is not included in Nusret-nâme, but this is incorrect. Zafer-nâme 26a-26b. Although the latter source only gives the number of Şemhâl's army as seventy or eighty thousand like 'Âlî it must be exaggerated and it also adds that when Şemhâl met the Serdar in Sultancik the bulk of his army were dealing with the conquest of Circassia. Even Şark Seferleri 12b only mentions that the Serdar married Ogmân Paşa to the daughter of Şemhâl's brother, Toca-lav which is quoted by Kütükoglu B: op.cit. p.71 and Kürzioğlu F: op.cit. p.308. Moreover Peçevi: op.cit. pp.50-51: refers to the Künhû`1-ahbâr of 'Âlî for the covering part of the report concerning the history of Şemhâl, the Kumuk and the Kaytak nations.

93-Don Juan of Persia: op.cit. p.148: Ottoman troops took two days rest in Tiflis but it must be wrong.
five or ten thousand tents were destroyed and two hundred men were killed. (124)  

After suffering hardship in the deep valleys the army reached Gori where the Serdar received Baş-açük Gorgi's brother Mamia as well as the envoy of Aleksandir Khan who was called Emin Ağa, to whom he entrusted a letter conveying kindly sentiments (sipahsālār-i nām-dār cenāb-ı a'lālarından bu tarıkle nevāzişt-nāme gönderilmiştii) (125a-126a). In this letter the Serdar requested Aleksandir Khan to catch Davud Khan as well as to provide grain to the beglerbegi of Tiflis.

Bu meclis ser-leşker-i ḥaţr-nevāz kāş'-i nişb ü firāz ve ḫayy-i bevādī ṭihlet-i nā-sāzla Gori kal'asından kalkub, vādī-i Sūrem nām (H.125b) ma'bere ve andan menzil be-menzil sa'b dağlar aşarak ve cîsrleri kesilmişt geçid virmez sular geçerek,... (B:126a-133b)  

During the stay of the army in Gori for a day, sixty yeşičeris, sufficient gonüllü and tîmareri and four Georgian Begs - Emlâhur, Erestāv, Vâhtang and Suçyunu - under the

94-KA 524b; Although Kütükoglu B: op.cit. p.71 gives the number of losses of the army as five or six thousand men, it seems that he has confused it with the number of tents.
leadership of Arnavud Hüseyin Beg\textsuperscript{95} were charged with the duty of guarding Gori castle as well as providing cereals for the needs of the region.\textsuperscript{(126b)}

After the defeat of Simon prince of Georgia in Gori by Şâh Ţahmasb in 1569 Simon was put in prison in Kahkaha and at the beginning of the reign of Ismâ'îl II he was released in exchange for Aleksandır and Davud Khan. When Şirvan was conquered by the Ottomans he was charged with recapturing Gori.\textsuperscript{96} 'Āli refers to the background of Simon very briefly and then mentions his plundering the surroundings of Gori; according to him despite his threat to the region Simon applied to the Serdâr to take the rule of Gori with an edict of the Sulţân,\textsuperscript{(127a)} but Lala Musţafâ Paşa pretended to ignore it because of his distrust for Simon.\textsuperscript{97}

\textsuperscript{95}Kütükoglu B:\textsuperscript{op.cit.} p.71: He read Arnavud Hüseyin Beg wrongly as Mirliva Hasan Beg.

\textsuperscript{96}Allen, A: \textsuperscript{op.cit.} p.130-156

\textsuperscript{97}'Āli is silent about Simon’s attacks on the Ottoman army during the return to Erzurum in \textit{Nusret-nâme}. However he indicates that Simon attacked the Ottoman army at the time and hardly escaped being captured at the hands of the Ottomans in his \textit{KA} 524b. Moreover Iskender Münşi:\textsuperscript{op.cit.} p.352: states that when the Ottomans withdrew İmamkulu Khan joined forces with Simon Khan and on several occasions they suddenly emerged from the forests of Georgia and achieved notable successes against the Ottomans.
During the march of the army on the Sürem Valley they experienced difficulties as a result of which many soldiers remained without horses. This hardship rose later on because the bridges on the Kür river had been cut by Georgians opposed to the Ottomans. However finally they reached Azgur, losing supplies or soldiers, and here the Serdar received Dedis-imedi the ruler of Meshiya and her two sons Menuçehr and Gurgur (128b). After they reached Ardahan the food stores were distributed to the soldiers to relieve the scarcity of food. A stage after in Köprübaşi Gülül Zade Mehmed the sancakbegi of Beyşehir was sent instead of 'Ali ⁹⁸ as a herald to Istanbul to give information concerning the conquest of Şirvan and Georgia. Finally on 21 Ramaţan (21 November) the army reached Erzurum (131a).⁹⁹

During this long campaign from Istanbul through Ereş to Erzurum, the army was billeted in a number of place which are

⁹⁸- see above p.20

⁹⁹-see also KA 525a; Kütükoglu B:op.cit. pp.71-72; Don Juan:op.cit p.148:Although he does not give the number of Ottoman losses, according to him when they were passing these districts the Georgians assembled, plundering their rearguard, composed of the baggage train and the sick and wounded of which Hasan Paşa was in command. However, they came through without disaster and vanquishing a thousand dangers and difficulties. On the other hand Iskender Münfi:op.cit. p.352 gives the number of the losses of Ottoman army as twenty thousand men in the course of this whole campaign.
named and numbered as a hundred and thirty four by 'Āli. (131a) It can be seen that for the account of the army's return from Ereṣ to Erzurum Nusret-nāme occupies a unique position. Although other historians participated under the service of Ogmān Paşa in Şirvan, they ignored these developments.

Before the army returned to Erzurum the central government in Istanbul had requested the Serdār to accommodate the army near the Ottoman-Safavi borders for the following campaign in the spring for which necessary provision began to be collected in the set billet100. In connection with this order the Serdār sent a letter (132a-133b) to Istanbul after they arrived in Erzurum. This letter contain intelligence information concerning the situation of the Safavis and events on the border. According to this letter the Serdār had requested Mirza Ali Beg to produce honest spies; therefore he brought one of Tokmak Han's men to Erzurum on 4 Şevval 986 /4 December 1578 from whom 'Āli mentioned that Şah Hudabende had mobilised a new army under the leadership of the Vezir Selman, and his son Hamza consisting of thirty thousand soldiers. This army arrived in Karabag, and later on, passing the river of Kanik, they fought an Ottoman detachment in Şirvan. Despite the loss of a few men from both

100 Kütkükoğlu, B: op.cit. p.73
sides, victory remained in the hands of the Ottomans. Moreover, he refers to the militarisation of the Safavis - Tokmak Khan in Revan, Şeref Khan in Nahcivan and Solak Hüseyin in the region of Bagdad - on the border (132b). It is assumed that as a result of this information as well as the Sultan’s order the Serdâr sent Mahmûd Paşa the beglerbegi of Rum to Pasin to protect the region against the attacks of the Kızılbaş and sent the remainder of the beglerbegis to Sivas, Diyarbekir and other regions. (133a) 101 Though they were near the border we can see that they faced difficulties in finding safe inteligencers and spies in contrast to the Safavis. Two years later on, speaking about the intelligence policy of the Serdâr, 'Ali makes the criticism that he did not treat the spies too kindly and did not reward them with presents. 102

Bu meclis ser-dâr-i nâm-dâr kışlak niyyeti-yle Erzurûm havâlisine güzar itdükden sonra ve ilâ memâlik-i Şirvân vezîr-i şeci'-i şehâmet-nişân a'ni-bih Ogmân Paşa-yi kârdân ve mühâfaza hidmetinde kalan kihan ü mihan üzerine varan Aras Hân, ki sâbîkâ Şemâlıda fermân-rân ve 'âmme-i memâlik-i Şirvanda mir-i mîrân idi..... (B:133a-154b)

101 KA 525b
After Lala Mustafâ Paşa left Ereş with the bulk of his army on 6 Şaban /8 October Ogmân Paşa remained without sufficient troops, about which like other historians,\textsuperscript{103} 'Ali censures the Serdar's policy in his Nushatu's-selâfîn in contrast to Nusrat-nâme in which he illustrates the development of events in Şirvan with a letter(133a-135b) which was sent to Istanbul. According to this letter a letter with Ogmân Paşa's men came to Erzurum on 16 Şevval/25 December, from which 'Ali derived the information that after the Serdar had arrived in Erzurum Ogmân Paşa and Kaytas Paşa had built a bridge on the river Kür and that they had led a very successful raid around Gence and Karabag(133a)\textsuperscript{104} but they had heard that Aras Khan had passed the fort of Kür near Saliyan and was marching on the capital, Şemahî, with fifteen thousand men.(133b)\textsuperscript{105} Thus Kaytas Paşa had remained in Ereş and Ogmân Paşa went to Şemahî with his force to protect it against the Kızılbaş attack.\textsuperscript{106} On this point from

\textsuperscript{103} Kütükoglu, B: op.cit. p.83

\textsuperscript{104} KA 526a; Peçevi:op.cit. p.52; Şecâ'at-nâme:39b-41a; Gazavât-nâme: 42a; Zafer-nâme: 27b-28a; Şark Seferleri:11:As Asafî, Ebubekir and Hüseyin had been in Ogmân Paşa's service, they give details concerning the attack of the Ottoman force under the command of Kaytas Paşa on Partal-oglu Ahmed Beg, Beg of Gence..

\textsuperscript{105} Kütükoglu, B:op.cit. pp.84,85:He compares the number of the Kızılbaş force in accordance with the data of Ottoman sources.

\textsuperscript{106} Kütükoglu, B: op.cit. p.84 Zafer-nâme: 28a; Şecâ'at-nâme: 42a-46b: deal with the account concerning events prior to the
the Safavi side Iskender Münşi only gives the cause of Aras Khan's marching on Şemahî as being that:

"Aras Khan had heard of the approach of the royal army under the command of Prince Hamza Mirzâ and Mirzâ Salman. They feared that they might be criticized by the officers of the central administration and censured by the Kızılbaş for failing to give battle to the Ottomans and for abandoning Şirvan." ¹⁰⁷

Before the army left Istanbul the central government as well as the Serdâr in Istanbul had requested the Khan of the Crimea to participate in the Persian campaign for which sufficient equipment and provision had been sent, but as the Crimean Khan was engaged on raids on Poland his troops were not available to participate in the Persian campaign. After peace was concluded between Crimea and Poland in September 1578 a Crimean force marched to Şirvan. ¹⁰⁸ In the meantime the central government requested the local governors of Circassia and Dagîstan to participate with their own armies in the campaign of the Khan battle of Şemahî, stating that when Aras Khan came with thirty thousand men to near Sâlyân Osmân Paşa was in Ereş and heard of this matter. Thereupon he sent two or three hundred men under the command of Hürrem Ağa to drive away the Kızılbaş force. At midnight, Ottoman forces raided them inflicting two or three hundred casualties. Aras Khan's son Erdogdu was wounded, and in addition many of his force were killed so that Hürrem Aga left the battlefield.

¹⁰⁸-Kortepeter C: op.cit. p.57
'Ali's account of the battle of Şemahı is scant, being based only Osman Paşa's letter in contrast to Ottoman historians who had participated under the service of Osman Paşa. According to 'Ali the battle of Şemahı commenced on the afternoon at 9 Ramazan 986 (3 November 1578) and continued for three days at the end of which the Tatar force under the Crimean Khan's brothers - Adil Giray, Gazi Giray, Saadet Giray - and the Khan's son Haci Mustafâ including Ebubekir Mirza appeared on the theatre of war. In the course of the battle many lords and fifteen thousand men were killed and Aras Khan was taken alive (135a).

109-About the number of the Khan of Crimea's force contemporary sources give different data which vary between twenty and thirty thousand including the forces of the Şirvan Şah Ebubekir Mirzâ and the Beg of Azak which were compared by Kütükoglu B: op.cit pp.86-87. Moreover from close examination it can be seen that he examined hüküms in Mühimmâ defter 32 concerning the preparation of the Crimean force, and equipment and who was to join the Khan of Crimea, which had been sent to them by the central government.

110-Although Safavi sources remain silent on the siege by the Safavi army under the command of Aras Khan of Şemahı, among Ottoman sources Asafi, Ebubekir and Harîmî were witnesses of this battle, so that they give a detailed account of the battle of Şemahı to which Harîmî dedicates a chapter which contains information about the preparations of Osmân Paşa for defence, the names of the Ottoman commanders in the defence line and their defence against the Kızılbaş siege. Asaflı: 52a-58a; Zafer-nâme: 27b-32a; Şark Seferleri: 4b-5a.

111-Şark Seferleri: 5b; says that during the siege of Şemahı which lasted for three days many Kızılbaş and Ottoman troops
After this Osmân Paşa thanked the Crimean khan's brothers, his son and Ebubekir Mirza to whom he presented horses, swords and Hil'at; finally all the army were feasted for three days (135a).\textsuperscript{112}

'Âli quotes information about the defence of Ereğ in accordance with the letter of Aleksandir Khân who had sent it to the beglerbegi of Tiflis. According to this letter, during the battle of Şemâhû, at about the same time Imam Kulu Khan, the governor of Gence and Emir Khan the ruler of Gilan besieged Ereğ with a force of fifteen thousand against whom Kaytas beg sallied forth in excessive pride but he and his men fell were killed but after the Khan of Crimea entered the battlefield the Kızılbaş force were caught between the Crimean force and Osmân Paşa who killed all the Kızılbaş (Kızılbaşlar cümlə külçəndən geçirdiler). However Zafer-nâme:39b states that only one thousand Kızılbaş fled, and the remaining Kızılbaş were killed. He gives the names of the Kızılbaş lords who were taken as prisoners to Osmân Paşa by the Khan of Crimea. Şecâ'at-nâme: 61a: Only Erdogdi beg the son of Aras Khan escaped this battle for which the following verse are proof:

Olmadi Erdogdidan gayri halâs
Katlı olundu surh serden hâg u 'âm.

Finally according to Münecim-başı: op.cit. p.543; 8620 Kızılbaş were killed and Aras Khan's family and his son were taken prisoner; Kütükoglu B: op.cit. p.88; Kortepeter C.M: op.cit. p.58; Kirzioglu F: op.cit. p.331.

\textsuperscript{112} see also Kütükoglu, B: op.cit. p.88, Kirzioglu, F: op.cit. p.331 Kortepeter, M: op.cit. p.58
into the hands of the Kızılbaş who entered the city,\textsuperscript{113} which was plundered and many Sunni people were brought to death or humiliation (135b).\textsuperscript{114}

It can be seen from the contents of this letter and the following section that 'Ālī acted in accordance with the post of münși rather than that of the historian. He did not need to fill a gap concerning events in Şirvan, the border and Erzurum. He was contented with his official duty as a result of which

\textsuperscript{113}-Don Juan: op.cit. pp.150-151: Although he says that Prince Hamza had news on his march of the disaster of Aras Khan as he was approaching the city of Ereş. His army had recently been augmented by a reinforcement of some 10 000 cavalry and he now learnt that Kaytas Paşa had gone out from the fortress on an expedition for plundering and laying waste the country around. Hamza Mirzā therefore determined to seize the occasion if possible to surprise the city; making a sudden attack he slew some 7 000 Turks of the garrison and immediately became possessed of the city of Ereş, where he found the 200 pieces of artillery left there. This account is not confirmed by contemporary sources.

\textsuperscript{114}-Şark Seferleri: 7a; Zafer-nāme: 31a-31b: give detailed information concerning the defeat at Ereş stating that when Imam Kulu besieged Ereş, Kaytas Paşa sent an envoy to Şemähi asking for reinforcement. Thereupon seven hundred men under the command of Hamit Aga were sent to Ereş but as Kaytas Paşa was not a clever military commander despite his bravery, he accepted battle with ten thousand (10 000) Kızılbaş in front of the city despite the opportunity of returning to the fortress until reinforcements could come. The Kızılbaş killed all his force and the bulk of the reinforcements. When Osman Paşa heard of the fall of Ereş to the Kızılbaş he did not announce it to his soldiers for fear of panic. Moreover about the number of Kızılbaş sources give different data, between ten and fifteen thousand as showed by Kütükoglu B: op.cit. p.85; Kortepeter C.M: op.cit. p.58; Kurzioğlu F: op.cit. p.331.
he wrote the following letters. After the above letter came to Erzurum, 'Ali wrote congratulatory letters (135b-137a) to Osman Paşa and the Khan of Crimea to congratulate them on the outcome of the battle of Şemahi.

Şeref Khan was one of the Kurdish Begs, whose father Şemseddin had remained in Bitlis as ruler under the Ottoman domination. After Sultan Süleyman's campaign against Irak his ancestors' homeland Bitlis was conferred upon Ulâma Paşa; thus he and his clan fled to Şâh Tahmâsb whom he served as local governor in several places. After the death of Şemseddin his son Şeref Khan was the beg of Ruzagi tribe. During the reign of Şâh Ismâ'îl II Şeref Khan's star was set to rise in the service of the Safavis, and he was one of the important figures who held a high post; however after the death of Ismâ'îl II Hudâbendê, the fanatic Şii groups' anti-Sunni policies may have affected Şeref Khan who thus may have appealed to the Ottomans to give him his ancestor's home. It is possible that the Ottomans could have been informed concerning the dissatisfaction of Şeref Khan so that they tried to gain him over by a conciliation policy, as a result of which, during his stay in Ereş, the Serdar had

115-Kütükoglu, B: "Şeref Hân" in Vekâyi'nüvis Makaleler pp.363-365
116-Stanfield, R: op. cit. pp.102-104
sent a letter of invitation to Şeref Khan, the ruler of Nahcivan; thus two months later he accepted submission to the Sulṭān, about which the Şerdar sent a presentation letter (137a-139b) to Istanbul.

This letter contains historical information which occupies a unique position on the return of Şeref Khan to his ancestor’s homeland. According to it after the letter of protection, Bitlis was confirmed as an Ocaklık in accordance with the order of the central government, after which he requested Hüsrev Paşa’s small force to escort him until he arrived in Van. Therefore Hüsrev Paşa arrived in Ercek three days before a festival and (138) he sent a combat force from Hakkari and Mahmudi to Nahcivan in order to escort him. They reached Nahcivan on 5 Şevval/5 December, but during Şeref Khan’s departure from Nahcivan, the Safavi frontier warlords heard of this and entered into battle with the Ottoman force and Şeref Khan’s men in front of Nahcivan. Here they were defeated and many of them were killed. On 10 Şevval/10 December, Şeref Khan arrived in Van with three thousand men and his possessions (139). 117 As a

117- see also Kırızoglu F:op.cit. p.306;Danışmend I.H:op.cit. p.36;Şeref Han:op.cit. p.344:Although he played a leading role in the events he gives only a short account compared to 'Ālī and Lokmān. He does not mention the battle in front of Nahcivan and gives the date on which he left Nahcivan as 3 Şevval/3 December. B. Kütküoglu examined hüküms in Mühimme defter
result of his submission to the Sultan the Serdar sent a berät (139b-140b) concerning the giving of Bitlis to him as an ocaklık. 118 As can be seen from the preceding berät 'Ali used, "complexity of language [which] varied according to the standing of the addresses" 119 Thus he used more elaborate inşa in Şerefi Khan and Mevlâna Valih's berät rather than Aleksandir Khan's berät as happened in the letter sent to the princes of Georgia.

Until now according to Ottoman conciliation policy the Serdar tried to gain by using a letter which was a vehicle of

... concerning the granting of Bitlis to Şerefi Khan which were sent to Hüsrev Paşa, beglerbegi of Van on Gurre-i Muharrem 986 and 8 Muharrem 986.

118-KA 527a-527b; Lokman: 94a: The sancak of Bitlis was given to him with 600 000 akçes and the sancak of Muş was given with 200 000 akçes to his son Ahmed and the central government requested Derişi Paşa to give his men ze'ämets and Tmars in Van. Kütükçüloğlu B: op. cit. p. 69: mentions the above information and he adds the data which is based on the correspondence that Bitlis was given 505 564 akçes as a has (yielding an annual revenue of more than one hundred thousand akçes) but he omits the hüküm which was sent to Şerefi Khan (Mühimme defter 32, 281 22 Zi'il-ka'de 986) in which, after information about the preceding hüküms is mentioned, he requests him to settle in the Sancak as soon as possible. However according to N. Göyünç, ten days later on, he was given a sword and hil'at which shows that after a very short time from his application to join to the Ottoman side he must have returned to his sancak. see his "XVI. Yüzyılarda Doğu ve Güney-Dogu Anadolu'da Yönetim ve Nüfus" in Türk Kültürü, sayı 370 1994 p. 81.

diplomacy. This policy was specially to be focused on Şeref Khan and Tokmak Khan. The question remains as to why the serdar insisted in gaining these two men rather than other begs. The answer may be given that these two men's domains were on the north-west flank of the Safavis which had a strategic position in the protection of the north-east flank of the Ottoman as well as being on a passing route from Erzurum to Sirvan. Apart from this the influence of Şeref Khan on the Kurdish tribes affected this policy. As Şeref Khan changed sides it caused a weakness of this front line which must have made the Serdar very happy, so that the Serdar sent a friendly letter (140b-142a) to Şeref Khan to placate him as well as to show the friendly approach of Ottoman policy to him, in which the noble descent of Şeref Khan is also mentioned. 'Ali praised him very often with verses. This letter is concluded with Lala Mustafa Paşa's gift to Şeref Khan which consisted of a hil'at, a sword and two roan horses (142a). Moreover the Serdar sent a bread-and-butter letter (142a-143a) in appreciation of Hüsrev Paşa's hospitality in which he says that the gift and the sword have not been sent as a present to Şeref Khan because of the winter, requesting him to send a valuable gift and sword, and two attractive horses to Şeref Khan as though they were coming from the Serdar. (143a)
During the stay of the army in Erzurum for the winter the Serdar continued to seek to gain by conciliation what [the Safavi frontier rulers] had not as yet taken by force. Although some of them had not yet been persuaded by preceding letters of invitation from the Serdar, the passing of Şeref Khan to the Ottoman side had encouraged the Serdar in this way. As a result of this policy Mustafa Paşa sent another advice letter (143a-144a) to Muhammedi Khan to whom Şeref Khan was held up as an example, but as Muhammedi Khan was a strong Kızılbaş he refused the proposal of the Serdar and in addition showed in his letter that the Safavis were proud of their military prowess in Georgia and Şirvan, giving as an example of this the defeat of Kaytas Paşa. According to 'Alī this letter consisted of two parts containing meaningless details, and although it came under the name of Tokmak Khan, in fact the contents came from the Şâh (144a) Thereupon 'Alī wrote letters of reply (144b-151a); according to 'Alī this eloquent letter was written with full enigmatical expression, and its content and tone contained challenges to Muhammedi Khan as the preceding letter gives all the victories of the Ottomans in Şirvan and Georgia as examples. He tried to prove that the Şâh's power was exhausted, which meant that Tokmak Khan position would be favourable if

120-Kortepeter, C: op.cit. p.53
he joined the Ottoman side; moreover he was also told that this invitation had been made only to him in order to show his privilege over other people. On this subject Veli Beg, who had been kept in Van, was given as an example to emphasise. (150b) Apart from their content and tone these letters are written in more elaborate inşa than other letters because he thought that the post of münşi was very important; as he says "His presence on the campaign was worth as much as half of the army". 121

On the one hand Mustafâ Paşa continued to congratulate Ottoman beglerbegis and sancakbegis. After the defeat of Aras Khan Osman Paşa’s men and letter came to Erzurum, as a result of which Handan Ağa was sent to Istanbul as herald concerning the defeat of Aras Khan. When he reached Erzurum from Istanbul on 4 Zi‘l-hicce986/1 February 1579 he brought valuable gifts and hil’ats with imperial rescripts and bozdoğanı (maces) from the Sulân to the rulers of Dagistan, and Menuçehr and Aleksandir Khan at the same time. The Serdâr also sent with the same envoy valuable gifts and a letter of delight (nâme-i meserret-‘învan) (151b-152b) to them because of their assistance to the army of the Tatars and Osmân Paşa in which they are promised that

121- see above p.14
when the region of Çukur-sa'ad which was still under the control of Tokmak Khan, is conquered with their support, as well as that of the Sultan's large army, the rule of this region will be conferred on them. In the meantime Şeref Khan's men, who were in Erzurum, requested the Serdar for an imperial rescript (Der-i devletden emr-i şerif-i 'alişan ve fermân-i münif-i inâyet-'ünvân irâd idüb). Thereupon the Serdar sent him a letter bearing good news (nâme-i beşârat-resân) (153a-154a).

Although Ottoman and Safavi contemporary sources give information concerning the development of events in Georgia and Şirvan in the winter of 1578-1579, except for Nusret-name none of them deals with events on the south west flank of the Safavis. After the Serdar's return to Erzurum Lala Muşafâ Paşa must have realized that the conquest of Azerbeycan would not be accepted easily by the Safavis because of its strategic and
economic potential. Therefore during the winter in Erzurum he had to carry out a plan to prevent any attack of the Safavis on newly conquered land. Thus he requests the beglerbegis of Şehrizol and Baghdad to strike against the south-west frontier of the Safavis, opposite Şehrizol and Baghdad, in order to reduce the resistance of the Safavis against the Ottoman invasion on the northern frontier. According to 'Ali after coming to Erzurum the Serdar sent Cafer Çavuş as an envoy to Mahmud Paşa the beglerbegi of Şehrizol this was because Hüseyin Paşa, beglerbegi of Baghdad, had not attacked across the frontier of their region during the invasion of Georgia and Şirvan as had been requested from them when the army was leaving Istanbul. The Serdar asked him why they had not attacked the south-west frontier of the Safavis during the campaign of the Ottoman army in Şirvan despite having thirty or forty thousand soldiers. (154b) According to this final order on 2 Şevvâl 986/2 December 1578 the beglerbegis of Baghdad and Şehrizol both attacked the region of Bilâver which was ruled by Rüstem Halife. The Ottoman force defeated and plundered this area and they continued to attack in the direction of Dİmâver which was under the control of Solak Hüseyin who did not resist the Ottoman attack and fled

122 Kortepeter C;op.cit. p.55
from his capital Çem-Çam towards Gazvin and it was plundered by the Ottoman force. The news of this came to the Serdar and was recorded by the author in 154b-156b to forward it to Istanbul.

As a result of the above development on 15 January 1579 the Divân sent a conciliation letter to tribal begs and local Safavi governors near the border to confirm their domination of the area as an Ocaklık. However during the attack of the Beglerbegis of Şehrizol and Baghdad on Dinaver and Bilaver Muhammedi Beg, who was Kurdish, had changed to the Ottoman side from the Safavi and did not participate in the force of the beglerbegs of Şehrizol and Baghdad, so the Serdar sent a letter (156b-158b) to him and tribal begs like himself with Katib Hüseyin. In this letter 'Ali encourages tribal begs to holy war against the Safavis, as a result of which much booty would be available, finally promising them the kind treatment of the Sultan if they obeyed his order in winter and summer (158a)

There is no doubt that all these attempts were bringing positive results to establish Ottoman dominion in the region as well as to thwart Safavi attacks.

123-Kirzioglu F:op.cit. p.320:According to the hükmüms in Mühimme defter he gives the name of the Safavi governor on the frontier to whom the central government sent letters of invitation.
Gibbe zalik: under this heading 'Üll here illustrates events in Georgia from the correspondence which took place between Aleksandır, Simon, and the Serdär. Having described the origin of Simon 'Üll explained the reason why Simon launched attacks with Başaçuk's help against the Ottoman ruler and the country of Menuçehr there. (159a) Thereupon the Serdär sent a letter (159b-160b) to Aleksandır Khan, the son-in-law of Simon, in which 'Üll accuses Aleksandır Khan of neglecting the attacks of Simon because of which his loyalty aroused suspicion. After this he requests him to cooperate with the beglerbegi of Tiflis and Hüseyin Beg the sancakbegi of Gori. He moreover promises him that he will be given the lands of Simon as an ocaklık if he brings him alive or makes him flee. Thus it may be assumed that as Simon was forced to sue for submission to the Ottomans, he wanted the Serdär's promise or guarantee ('ahd ü emâne mâkrûn nâmê-i inâyêt-meşhûn taleb itdikde) concerning giving the region to him. Therefore a letter of undertaking (161a-161b) was sent to him according to which his former territory would be given to him as an ocaklık if he was obedient to the Suljân as well as joining his alliance.

The correspondence between Osmân Paşa and the Serdär was cut because of the pressure of the Kızılbaş on the new government
under the leadership of Osmān Paşa and the severe winter. Therefore 'Ālī gives information intermittently about events in Şirvan. According to 'Ālī After the defeat of Kaytas Paşa in Ereq Kabala Beg, Bahaeddin Beg and Kerem Ali Beg fled to Tiflis and Defterdar Hızır fled to Gori where they caused panic to the inhabitants of the region with false rumours concerning the recapture of Şirvan by the Kızılbaş. Therefore he wrote a letter (162-170) to Istanbul to inform them of developments concerning events in Şirvan in the light of these letters, envoys and spies who came to Erzurum from different directions. Although this letter is significant for its historical value 'Ālī as münşī had not informed Istanbul concerning events in Şirvan for a long time, and he explains why he could not give information concerning developments in Şirvan. It seems that he wanted to seem to have acted as an excellent münşī to Istanbul. He tried to illustrate developments through witnesses of events. He explains as a starting point of events that a man and a letter came from Tiflis, narrating such events as the recapture of Şirvan by the Safavis as being a false rumour which had caused the people to panic. Thus this man and Kalender Çavuş were sent to investigate the rumour, but while 'Ālī denies having received any information from Aleksandır Khan or any responsible person in Georgia since the end of Ramazan, he gives the name of his source as follows: At the
begining of Zi`l-kade/January a man of Hüsrev Paşa, and a letter and on 27 Şevval /7January spies from Erdebil and Tebriz came to Erzurum. Finally a letter written by Mahmut and Muhammed Erzurum Çavuş from Erdebil to their home, although they described the defeat of Kaytas Paşa, did not say anything about events in Şirvan.

Finally according to Ālî Has Beg Çavuş came to Erzurum from Şirvan on 7 Zi`l-kade/14 January and reported to him what had happened in Şirvan before the date he left Şemahî which is given as īd-i Şevvâl. In this report Has Beg gave an account concerning the Crimean troops' raid in Halu and the battle between the Crimean force and Osman Paşa and the Safavi army under the leadership of Hamza Çelebi. Having recorded reports from two spies 'Ālî finally received a message from Ebu`l Kasm one of Çavuş of Erzurum who had came to Erzurum on 18 Zilkade. 'Ālî explains the cause of his quotation of Ebu`l Kasm's report as being that Has Beg had left Şemahî on īd-i Şevvâl whereas Ebu`l Kasm left Şemahî 6 Şevval with Osman Pasa Kethûda but the Kızılbaş captured them in Ereş and than released them almost stark naked (167a). After this he reported an account of the defeat of Aras Khan and the Crimean army's plundering of Aras Khan's booty; Ebu`l Kasm also gives details about how Uzun Hızır defterdar of Erzurum fled in fear of the Kızılbaş when they were
beseiged by the Safavis in Ereş and Şemahi. According to Ḍūlī when Ebuʾl Kasım told the account of the escape of Uzun Hızır and his friends he was brought face to face with Uzun Hızır, and after this on 28 Zilhicce 986/24 February he was executed as an example. (169b)

Despite the information of spies and envoys concerning events in Şirvan the Ottoman dignitaries were not satisfied with this information as a result of which, according to Ḍūlī, Kapucis and Çavuş came to Erzurum for true information at the same time; when Uzun Hızır was executed in Erzurum a letter came to the Serdar from Osmân Paşa for him to forward to Istanbul, which is recorded by Ḍūlī (Süreti nakl olındu), according to which after the defeat of the Kızılbaş in the Battle of Şemahi the main
Persian army numbering fifty thousand men \(^{124}\) moved in the direction of Şemahî where it was besieged. After fighting bravely against the Kızılbaş for three days and nights, \(^{125}\) according to Has Beg, Oğmân Paşa attempted to send a letter to the Tatar Khan but his envoy was intercepted. \(^{164b}\) Selman Khan

\(^{124}\)-Although the Ottoman sources give the number of the Kızılbaş army at 100 000 in Şecâ'at-nâme (69a-70a), 80 000 in Zafer-nâme, 80 000 in Şark Seferleri (7b), over 60 000 in Zübtedi't Tavârîh (94b), 30 000 in Abdurrahman Şeref (1367), 30 000 or 40 000 in Peçevel (54) and 40 000 in Müneccimbaşî (535) İskender Münüşî p.383 says that Sültân Hamza Mirzâ, accompanied by the chief officers of the state and by his mother, Mohde Olya sent royal mobilization orders to all parts of the empire. Finally according to Don Juan when the Prince Hamza was approaching the city of Erêş his army had recently been augmented by a reinforcement of some 10 000 cavalry.

\(^{125}\)-For more information about the siege of Şemahî under the leadership of Selman Khan see Zafer-nâme 34a-35b; Şark Seferleri 7b-8a; Şecâ'at-nâme 65a-69b. As they lived during the event they give more detail than anyone else. According to Harîmî Oğmân Paşa in Şemahî was not aware of the siege force which consisted of 80 000 Kızılbaş. On the first day of the battle 5000 Kızılbaş were killed, in the second day of the battle hundreds of men from both sides were killed among the streets of Şemahî. However Müneccimbaşî op.cit. p.542 says that in the narrow streets of Şemahî 20 000 Kızılbaş were killed. Ebubekir gives a living picture of the siege of Şemahî saying that as a result of the pressure of the Kızılbaş’s attack many parts of Şemahî fell into the hands of the Kızılbaş apart from Oğmân Paşa’s Palace, and the people of Şemahî and their animals suffered hardship because the water canal was cut by the Kızılbaş. Finally Âsafî (69a-71a) illustrates the conditions of Oğmân Paşa’s army in his verses which were quoted by Abdurrahman Şeref Beg in "Özdemiroğlu Oğmân Paşa" TOEM sayi 21 1329 pp.1368-69.

The following verses are among them:

\begin{verbatim}
Kesret-i düşmandan oldu pür-melâl
Cengden oldukça kati azûrde hâl
Hakk cenâbîndan idi ümûdimiz
Yogidi andan velî ümûdimiz.
\end{verbatim}
led the bulk of his army against the Tatars who were in a scattered condition on the battlefield because they had plundered the possessions of Aras Khan despite Osman Paşa’s restriction. In this condition, although the Tatars fought bravely against the Kızılbaş force, because of a terrible rainstorm the Tatars were defeated, and their leader Adil Giray fell into the hands of the Kızılbaş as a prisoner. Thus Osmân

126-After the Kızılbaş army left the siege of Şemahı, they went in the direction of the Tatar army, being aware of their position about which sources contain different information. Şecâ’at-nâme 70a-72b: gives the information that the Tatar army was relaxing and amusing itself. Don Juan: op.cit. p.151: states that when the Kızılbaş appeared in sight of the camp of the Tatar Khan, the Tatars were at the moment in some disorder for people making war on a potent enemy. They had been strangely negligent of precautions. Their campaign ground here was ill chosen and no sentinels were posted on guard. Zafer-nâme 36a-36b belittled the Kızılbaş because they were proud of having won victory over Aras Khan and as a result Adil Giray only kept two thousand forces near himself while the remaining force was engaged in looting on the battlefield. However Şark Seferleri (9a) says that when Adil Giray was going towards Şemahı they met the Kızılbaş army. Iskender Münşî op.cit. p.355, indicates that Adil Giray was confident of his ability to repeat his recent victories over the Kızılbaş, and moved toward Şemahı in support of Osmân Paşa. The two armies met at the village of Molla Hasan, and Adil Giray drew up his forces, consisting of twelve thousand Tatars and four or five thousand Lezgi, Kara Burak and Şirvan rebels. Peçevî: op.cit. p.54. The two armies met in the plain which was called Mahmûd Abâd, as related by Mûneccim-başî op.cit. p.543. see also Kortepeter, C: op.cit.pp.58-59, Kütükoglu, B: op.cit.pp.87-89

127-Don Juan: op.cit. p.151: says that more than half of their number had been killed and that their prince Adil Giray was a prisoner. Zafer-nâme: 36b-37a: Adil Giray and Piyale Beg were prisoners, two hundred Tatars were killed and the remaining Tatars fled towards the mountains and much loot fell into
Paşa in Şemahı remained under the pressure of the Kızılbaş. The Defterdar Hizir and his friends' escape without offering any defence had a negative effect on the troops. Apart from this as the water was cut in Şemahı he moved in the direction of Derbend with his possessions and the treasure of the province (172b).  The Kethüda of Oğmân Paşa remained in Şemahı with a

the hands of the Kızılbaş. Şark Seferleri: 9b: many of them were killed and many fled. Iskender Münşî: op.cit. p.355: Although he does not give the number of Tatar casualties, he says that Bâbâ Halife Dâmkarâlî un horsed Adil Giray with a thrust of his spear when the Khan disclosed his identity, and took him prisoner. The Tatars broke and fled and the gazis in their pursuit slew many of them but many Lezgis and Şirvanis escaped because they knew the land. Kütükoglu B: op.cit. p.90; Kortepeter M: op.cit. p.59; Kirzioglu: op.cit. p.332.

128-Şark Seferleri: 9a-10a; Şecât-name: 75-80: They give further information concerning the movements of Oğmân Paşa from Şemahı to Derbend to which they devote a special chapter because they were witnesses of the events according to Şark Seferleri 9a-10a. After the defeat of the Khan of Crimea a few of his soldiers came to Şemahı a day before Eid-ul-Fitr and conveyed information about the situation of the Khan of Crimea to Oğmân Paşa who would have fired artillery and would have displayed the heads of Kızılbaş on long stakes to hide the bad news from the despairing soldiers as if the Khan of Crimea had won a victory but the soldiers learned the truth at midnight. They were in fear of a Kızılbaş raid which had a negative effect on the Ottoman soldiers as a result of which many of them fled under the leadership of defterdar Hizir who was followed by another group, whose number is given as 2000-3000 by Harîmî in his Zafer-name 37b. At this point Oğmân Paşa decided to leave the ruined castle of Şemahı for Demir Kapu (Derbend) on the morning of Eid-ul-Fitr. Zafer-name 38a-39 mentions that the treasure of the province was loaded onto camels of which İbrahim Beg, Mustafa Çelebi Mal defterdar, Kethüda Ahmed, Hüsev Ayğa, the Kapukulu Ayğa, Mehmed Çelebi Reisul Kütâp were appointed as the guard. Oğmân Paşa and his 500-600 men suffered hardship in the icy part of the Elbruz mountain during the passage about which details are given by
small garrison and Sancak beg was appointed to Kabale. (72b)

On the other hand in this letter 'Ali gives information concerning events in Georgia which is quoted from a letter which came to the Serdar from Mehmed Paşa, the beglerbegi of Tiflis on 15 Zi`l-hicce 986/12 February 1579, whom Davud Khan had attacked many times, but was defeated each time. Despite the success of the Ottoman force, two thousand more men under Mirzâ 'Ali Beg, sancakbegi of Pasin were sent to Tiflis in command of a relieving force. (173a)

Although the content and tone of Osman Paşa's letter seem to Ebubekir and Asafi who say that he fought with highwaymen of Şirvan to protect the treasure for four days and nights. Finally they arrived in Demir Kapu in a scattered condition in twelve days. However Ebubekir mentions that he arrived in Demir Kapu in four or five days. Iskender Münşi op.cit. p.356: indicates that Osman Paşa retreated in the direction of Derbend. A detachment of Kızılbaş emirs pursued him as far as Şaburân and captured a number of Ottoman guns and a quantity of equipment. According to Asafi 77a: before leaving Şemahi Osman Paşa sent a messenger to take information about the situation of Derbend Castle saying that the flight of the Tatar army incited the guard of Derbend and that the latter fled instead of defending it. Thus they fled to the interior of Dagistan because of their fear of the Kızılbaş. Then the people of the region occupied the castle themselves, and did not open the gate when Osman Paşa arrived because they knew that they would be a target for the revenge of the Kızılbaş as had happened before. Although Osman Paşa gave a guarantee to protect them against the Kızılbaş they were not persuaded, and as a result the people of the castle were forced to beg for mercy. Kütükoglu: op.cit. p.93-94; Abdurrahman Şeref Beg: "Özdemiroğlu Osman Paşa" TOEM sayı 21 1329 pp.1368-69.
have created delight in the hearts of Istanbul and Erzurum, in fact the content of following letters in this chapter shows the predicament of the new Ottoman administration in Şirvan and Georgia. Even though the Serdar sent a letter (173a-175b) to Ogmân Paşa to congratulate him on the defence of Şemahi as well as to give him information concerning new developments on the frontier, the aim is to prepare the local governor under Ogmân Paşa for the coming spring. He thus requests Ogmân Paşa to establish good relations with the respected people of the region and Aleksandır, to be cautious against the enemy and to act treat his troops very congenially. Finally the Serdar informed him concerning a new campaign by the Sulṭân and the Crimean Khan in the spring. A second letter (175b-176b) was addressed to the Khans of Crimea, brothers of Adil Giray, to console them because Adil Giray had become a prisoner of the Safavis, in addition to promising them to take revenge for Adil Giray on the Kızılbaş. A third letter (176b-177b) was addressed to Aleksandır Khan. He was warned that although he had sufficient troops he had withdrawn to his capital, and therefore he was accused of neglecting the attacks of Simon and the Kızılbaş. Finally Emir Şemhal and the ruler of Tabarsaran’s assistance to Ogmân Paşa is given as an example to encourage him against Simon and the Kızılbaş force in Şirvan.
In the meantime Hüseyin Ağa the envoy of Muhammedi Khan came to Erzurum to look for a peace agreement, whereupon the council of campaign under the leadership of Lala Mustafâ Paşa met to discuss the proposal of the Safavi delegation. It seems that they decided to reply to the letter instead of negotiating. Thus 'Ālî wrote a letter (178a-180a) in Persian to him in which he indicated that peace would not be available given the attack of the Kızılbaş on Şirvan and Georgia. On this occasion we can say about this case that there is no mention of this in the Ottoman and Safavi sources.

This later portion of the text (from folio 179b and onwards)
deals with conditions during winter in Erzurum and correspondence which was taking place between the Serdâr and the frontier rulers of the Ottomans and the Safavis; it is assumed that 'Ālî composed the first draft of his text during the winter of 1578-79.

This section starts to describe conditions in Erzurum where a very severe winter was experienced. Meanwhile Menuçehr and his brother Gurgur with El-pâksud who was the brother-in-law of Şâh Ṭâhмâsb, came to Erzurum for the journey to Istanbul. The Serdâr sent a letter (181b-182b) with them under the supervision of Yunus Çavuş to the Sulṭān. This letter can be described as a reference in which the Serdâr requested the Sulṭān to give Menuçehr’s region to him as beglerbegi and his brother’s castle as ocaklık to him. Then Melik Menuçehr’s name was converted to Musṭafâ and their request was accepted by the Sulṭān (182a). Moreover only Lokman among Turkish historians indicates that after coming to Istanbul Menuçehr and his brother Gurgur rested in the palace of Atmeydani where a magnificent circumcision feast was held for these princes of

129-Kortepeter ,M: op.cit. p.56 Although he shows the journey of theses princes of Georgia to Istanbul as happening before the army arrived Erzurum, according to above it is not correct.
After the recapture of Şirvan by the Safavis they attempted to attack in a diplomatic way as well as mounting a military attack on Georgia. As a result of these planned policies Adil Giray's letter (183a-184a) came to Erzurum with Mirzâ Hüseyin, the envoy of Adil Giray (27 April 1578) who also brought a letter from the Şâh to the Sultan in which he requested the Serdâr to send the Safavi envoy to Istanbul in order to negotiate peace with Ottoman senior officers in Istanbul.

It can be seen that after Tokmak Khan's envoy Hüseyin failed to make peace with the council of campaign in Erzurum the Safavis tried to use Adil Giray as mediator to force the Ottoman to the negotiation table because they believed that they had two trump cards to play against the Ottoman. One is Adil Giray who was compared to the case of Şehzade Bayezid, another was Şirvan. Thereupon the Serdâr forwarded Hüseyin Mirzâ with the letter of the Şâh to Istanbul, but according to 'Älî the Safavi delegation were not allowed to go to Istanbul because the

---

130-Lokmân:94b, Allen W.E.D: A History of the Georgian People, London 1932 p.155: adds some information given by a German diplomat in Istanbul that Gurğur (Qwarqware) was given a watch of which he could not understand the works, so he asked for another present; later the Sultan was pleased at his prowess as a wrestler.
content of Muhammed Khan’s letter was confirmed by the Crimean envoy Mirzâ Hüseyin who analysed the secret plan of the Safavis for Şirvan and Georgia. Therefore the Serdar sent another letter (184a-185b) to Muhammedi Khan in which he asked him “Although you want peace already in your letter why do you send troops to Tumuk and Tiflis? It can be assumed that you are opposed to the peace request of the Şâh. If you would like peace you must withdraw your troops near Tiflis; otherwise I will convey the situation to the Şâh.” In his letter of reply Muhammedi Khan said that Tiflis and Gori had been attacked by Davud Khan and Mahmûd Khan Varazaoglu because Gori and Tiflis had been inherited by them from their ancestors. Thereupon the Serdâr sent him another letter of reply (186a-188a) which contains sincere advice, according to 'Ālî, in which he asked, “Why do you help them and do you not stop their attacks?” Although they continued to exchange correspondence in which they accused one another. It can be assumed that apart from the fear of the senior officers concerning the loss of their post, pro-war parties in Istanbul and Kazvin may have affected the decision of the council of the campaign. In fact troops were dissatisfied by the long campaign in addition to the economic and social problems of the late sixteenth the country both countries, which forced Suljân and Şâh to stop the war. However pro-war parties in both countries continued to offer
reasons for war.

Finally this last portion of the text finishes with a letter of submission as a hātime of this section which came to the Serdâr from Emir Seccad and Muhammedi Beg the ruler of Baghdad, written in Arabic at the beginning of Rebi‘ûl-evel 987/April 1579 (188b-189b).

**Conclusion**

It can be seen that the above summary of the historical content of the Nusret-name has a unique value in giving detailed information concerning the Persian campaign under the leadership of Lala Mustafa Paşa as well as the historical background of the region of Caucasus. Apart from these it occupies an important position in identifying the persons, places and dates mentioned in the text. If letters or berâts in the text are left out of the account, the remaining parts are comparable with works in the Zafer-name, Gazavât-name etc. genre, and at the same time they present a balanced record of events. However its aim like that of similar works in the same genre was to win the favour of the Serdâr or the Suljân so that it praised the Suljân as well as the Serdâr through the commendation of his army.
There is no criticism of the Serdar or any other responsible person as was done in a general history like that of Peçevi or 'Ālī himself in Nushatū's-selāfīn, whereas in the case of Uzun Hızır or the rebellion of some Yeğniçeri or Sipahi against the Serdar during the army's crossing of the river of Kanık, they are criticised harshly to give a lesson as an example without referring to human suffering.

On the other hand the letters in the text have historical significance as Ottoman sources for the various phases of the campaign and illustrate the diplomatic aspects of this matter which led to the exchange of correspondence. Apart from this they offer a valuable corpus of the late sixteenth century epistolary style of 'Ālī. They were sent as diplomatic measure to represent the Ottoman idea of the campaign. The content and tone of these letters is not only propaganda; they sometimes make announcements of the next steps to be taken in which the begs, emirs, chiefs, and the governors of the region are given a perfunctory apology, threat or a promise of conquest of some of the regions which are usually attractive to them. Moreover in these letters there is a mention that the Sulṭān will march with his immense army to conquer Georgia and Şirvan as well as to put the Şâh in his place. This action could happen after the departure of Lala Muṭafā
Paşa’s army or could take place next spring, depending on the condition of the people to whom these letters are addressed.

Finally although the value of Nusret-nâme as an eye-witness account, and a collection of official letters and details concerning the campaign has been highly judged here 'Ālî avoided comparing the general result of the campaign and the Serdâr’s failings, whereas a short time after the campaign, in his Nushatũ's-selâfin, the Serdâr’s mismanagement and some aspects of the campaign were criticized by 'Ālî himself on the following grounds.\(^\text{131}\)

Firstly, any information concerning Tac-zade Isma'ïl’s brothers is not found in Nusret-nâme but 'Ālî, in Nushatũ's-selâfin censures the Serdâr on the grounds that Tac-zade’s brothers were taken into service as private secretaries (esrâr-katibi) despite their evil nature and misbehaviour which led to the defilement of the honour of the Empire when he became Serdâr for the region of Şirvan, which showed that the Serdâr continued to persist in his neglect and foolishness.

\(^{131}\) Tietze A: Musťafâ 'Ālî's counsel for Sultans of 1581 Wien 1979 v.1 pp.17-19
Secondly, the conquest of Tiflis is appreciated as satisfactory but, he says, sufficient measures were not taken to complete the conquest there, and thus the Serdār immediately rushed towards the conquest of Şirvan, and his proceeded into the middle of the lands before he could extinguish the fires that were burning around him, these were actions that led to erroneous decisions and to definite mistakes.

Thirdly although 'Alī gives detailed information concerning the Serdār's fine action in the conquest of Şirvan in Nusret-nāme, his treatment of Aleksandır Khān, his neglectful waste of the public treasury and his return with the bulk of the army to Erzurum are censured in his general evaluation of the conquest of Şirvan as seen in the following translation:

"When Aleksandır Hān and Şemḥāl offered their friendship and submission, it would have been a requirement of enlightened statesmanship and an exigency of good policy to send the old ones and the children, the sick and baggage with one of the beglerbegis to Erzurum and remaining unencumbered like the plundering Tatars and not letting Aleksandır Hān go upon giving his treacherous word like Mirzā 'Alī Beg, they should have rested on those shores until spring and gained experience, securing the provisions and pay of the army from the grains in the storehouses of the misguided Şāh and from the revenues for three years already collected from the population of Şirvan. In this way the face of the fair youth called victory and conquest would have shown in many ways in the mirror of thought and perspicacity, and the Serdār would thus have made fine efforts in favour of the public treasury, the
Sultan would have rewarded him, and he would have gained great merits in this world and the next. Though his excuse was that he did not have with him enough funds for the pay of the janissaries but the taxes of the Şah imposed upon the population of Şirvan and the enormous sum which the merchants of that land had undertaken to provide by way of a loan would have been enough for the salaries of one year and perhaps there would not even have been need of taking up a loan, derelict property and the revenues sufficient for that necessity. However the preparations were neglected and under the influence of that inauspicious sancakbegi called Gülî-zâde Mehmed Beg the plan was abandoned. When Gülî-zade said "If you stay there through the winter, they will order you to remain there as the beglerbegi of Şirvan and your enemies in the capital will send you royal decrees to this effect", the mighty Serdâr’s apprehensions doubled and he completely abandoned all plans of staying.\textsuperscript{132}

Fourthly, during the return of the army, the suffering of the army in high mountains and deep valleys are mentioned from Şemahi and Georgia through to Erzurum in \textit{Nusret-nâme} but in \textit{Nushatü’s-selârin} ‘Alî suggests an alternative route so that their return route would pass through Azerbeycan and they would have the plunder of the lands of the heretics in the areas of Berdaa, Ardabil and Karabag-Mughan so that the Muslim soldiers would be to some extent recouped by booty for all the hardships, if they had to go to Erzurum.

Fifthly, after the return of the army to Erzurum, where they stayed for the winter, at the same time small garrisons and

\textsuperscript{132}-Tietze,A: op.cit. p.18
necessary spies were kept on the frontier, one of them being Mirzâ 'Álî Beg, sancakbegi of Pasin about whom there is no censure for the Serdâr in Nusret-nâme though in Nushatu's-selâfn 'Álî criticised the Serdâr, who did not treat the spies too kindly and did not reward them properly with gifts or favours.

These comments by 'Álî certainly throw a new light on his description of the campaign but do not affect the value of Nusret-nâme as a detailed description of events which can be used as a source by historians in order to supplement the information of the general histories such as that given by Peçevî and Iskender Mûnsî. A detailed comparison of Nusret-nâme and Nushatu's-selâfn lies outside the scope of the present study, but would provide the basis for a detailed study of 'Álî's historical thinking, which the author hopes to be able to undertake at a future date.
Eight Mss of Gelibolulu 'Ali's Nusret-nâme have been located in the libraries of Europe and Istanbul as well as the Egyptian national library (Dâru'l-Kütûb). 'Ali completed the first draft of his Nusret-nâme in Erzurum and later on in Aleppo he revised it and commissioned a special calligrapher to make a new edition of it and submitted his work to Sulṭân, together with a covering letter signed by Sokullu Mehmed Paşa. It can be seen that two years later, the earliest copy of this Ms was made from the original text.

The Mss used in the present study are as follows:

1-The four copies of Nusret-nâme in the libraries of Istanbul are mentioned by Nihal Atsiz in 'Ali Bibliografyası, Istanbul 1968, and the copy of Esad Efendi is referred to in Istanbul Kütüphaneleri Tarih Cografya yazmaları catalogları, Istanbul 1943. Moreover the three copies of Nusret-nâme in the libraries of Europe and the four copies in Istanbul are mentioned by Franz Babinger in his Osmanlı Tarih yazarları ve Eserleri (çev) Prof. Coşkun Üçok Ank. 1982, p.145. Finally the German Scholar Rana Von Mende added an unknown copy of Nusret-nâme found in the national library, Cairo to the other seven copies of Nusret-nâme which are referred to in her edition of 'Ali's Fursat-nâme, Berlin 1989 p.17.

2-Fleischer C:op.cit p.91
1-B (British Museum Add.22,011. in the catalogue of Turkish manuscripts in the British Museum 61-2 [61b-62a]) This Ms on which the present edition is based contains 281 folios (254mm x 177mm) written in a elegant nesh hand with 17 lines to a page. There are 13 lines on the first page because of the gilding at the top of the page, where the title of the Ms is written in gold. Frames are ornamented with gold. Bound in gilt and stamped leather, it is ornamented with five double-page miniatures, folios, 70, 81, 97, 103 and 198, representing scenes of the campaign and there is a comet in the margin of (6b).

The first word of every page b is written on the bottom margin of page a. There are many extensive marginalia, some of which are in the form of a title, the red captions being intended to restore a missing word or phrase.

One may speculate that these marginalia in the same hand as the text were sections inadvertently omitted by the copyist and added when he reviewed his work; while the others may have been added by later owners on the bases of different copies of the work.

During his work in Aleppo in 1581 'Āli commissioned
calligrapher to produce the special illustrated manuscript of Nusret-nâme which is held in the British Museum. According to the end note of B 281a, this Ms was completed by El-Fakir Şeyh Cum'a in Rebi'ü'l-ähir H.992 (Wednesday 25th May, 1582). It seems that after 'Alî had gone to Istanbul in 1583 he may have presented this volume to the Sultân.

2-H (Hazine 1365, in Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi:TSTYK;pp.230-1) It contains 272 folios, (285 mm x 230mm) written in a nesh hand with vowelling. There are 19 lines to a page. The frames are ornamented with gilt decorations which consist of circles and several shapes like flowers etc. The tuck of the binding of the book and bind is ornamented on red velvet with gilt figures such as the sun and it is glued onto brown leather.

After 'Alî came to Istanbul 1583 he established a good friendship with Gazanfer Ağa who helped him to present the illustrated manuscript of Nusret-nâme to the Sultân with which Murâd III was very impressed and ordered the preparation

---

3-Fleischer C:op.cit p.105

4-In TSTYK it is erroneously given as 257 and 41 miniatures; in addition 265 pages are mentioned by N.Atsiz in the 'Alî Bibliyografyası, Ank.1965.
of a lavish edition of this present manuscript of Musret-name in the royal workshop.\(^5\) This Ms is the second earliest of the dated Mss that were copied in 1584 by Musafä bin Abdülccelil who was the special clerk of Suljân Murad III. Moreover 'Ali himself was assigned to oversee the production of the manuscript; thus it was completed by artists and clerks under 'Ali's supervision for nearly a year.\(^6\)

Although it is written in a good nesh hand and is the second earliest copy, it has been so badly damaged in the past that many pages have been lost: for example pages 2a, 82b, 83a, 94b, 95a, 257b, 258a, 260b, 261a, 268b, 269a, 270b and 271a have disappeared and moreover some lines or half pages on have disappeared, including the left side of 197a, at the top of 198b, three lines at the top of 135a and at the top of 101a. At the top of 36a according to F.E Karatay the first page was lost but later on somebody copied it from another copy with the same handwriting but I did not see this page when I was checking the book in the library.

This valuable copy is ornamented with ten double-page

\(^5\)-Fleischer C:op.cit p.110

\(^6\)-Fleischer C:op.cit p.110
miniatures, twenty nine one page miniatures and nine half-page miniatures, representing scenes of the campaign.

The topic line in the table of contents of this Ms differs very little from the other Mss. Three letters sent to the king of Georgia, Menuçehr, one of them written at the beginning of Cumâda'lı-ülâ and another at the end of Cumâda'lı-ülâ are written in accordance with the chronological arrangement in H (64b-67a) despite the title of the letters which is given as Tetimme-i Kelâmdir and means "completion". However these letters were written during the course of the campaign and were responses to events which took place at the time. By putting these at the end of the narrative the copyist has taken them out of their chronological contexts, making it impossible to describe them as Tetimme-i Kelâm since they do not complete the narrative, whereas they are written in accordance with the title heading as the events of sequence of victory of Çıldır in (B76a-79a), and are identical in content to following Mss and consequently belong to B.

There are 13 lines to the page in H, and at the top of 188a the title is written in gilt. Moreover 'ĀlÎ gave it a new introduction here to cover a new topic, the establishment of Kars castle. It contains the events of the year 1580. So far as
we can see from the circumstances, there are two sections in this book, the first of which contains the campaign in Georgia and Şirvan and starts in 985/1577 and finishes in 987/1579 and runs from page 1a to page 188b in H. The second section describes the rebuilding of Kars castle. It contains 84 folios from page 188a to page 272a including some miniatures.

Finally, there are some figures such as circles at the end page of these Ms, in which the conquered places are written in gold. On the evidence of the paper, the miniatures, the orthography and the ornamentation, the work is characteristic of the second half of the sixteenth century.

3-R (Revan 1298 in Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi TSTYK p.231) contains 229 folios (272mm x 175mm) written in a nesh hand with 21 lines ⁷ to a page. The tuck of the binding of the Ms and the bind are ornamented on brown velvet with for example a figure of the sun. There are 16 lines in page 2a where the title and the author's name are written in gold, the margins have been eaten by worms, and on the first folio there is a seal, which belongs to Muṣṭafā III (1757-74) and some

⁷-In TSTYK it is erroneously given as 31 lines to a page.
figures such as a circle at the end page of the Ms, in which conquered places are written in gold as was done at the end page of H. Moreover the first word of every page b is written at the bottom margin of page a. The last two results show that it is similar to H: it is like H rather than B, without the omission of text and some lines. Whereas the topic line in the table of contents of this Ms is similar to B: it is like B rather than H and from comparison we can see that it seems that it is like B but the end page was added from H.

Although R was copied fairly late (most probably in the eighteenth century), it still represents one of the most complete versions, which was copied by Abdullah Ibnü'l-Hāş Dürūs Muhammed as is written on the first folio.

4-N (Nuri Osmaniye Kütüphanesi 4350) contains 263 folios (16.5mm x 270mm), written in a fine nesh hand, with 19 lines to a page. The frames are ornamented with gold. The binding is brown as the previous binding was worn and the cover of it was split. There are two seals on the first page; it seems that one of them is the seal of Ogmān III (1754-57). The second one is small, and is also an endowment seal. There are 14 lines on page 2a because toward the top of it is gilding, in which the title of the Ms and the author's name are written in gold.
The contents of this copy are very similar to B, R and except for some added or omitted lines and some passages of text which are in R, it represents a correct text. There is a comet in the margin of 6a as in the margin of B(6a). There are no marginalia in this Ms except for folio 157 in which supplementary information is given by the copyist to explain the topic. One may assume that it was copied in the middle of the eighteenth century.

5-V (Vienna National Bibl.1017, Flügel. Katal.II.F.238) contains 141 folios, written in a nesh hand, 20 lines to the page, except for page 2a which has 15 lines because it has gilt toward the top. There are many extended marginalia one of which is written as a restored note, and the first word of every page b is written at the bottom of every page a as is the case in H, B and R. There are two seals which are illegible, one of which is the endowment, and the second probably is the monogram of Mustafä II (1695-1703). It may be confidently assumed that it was written at the beginning of the eighteenth century.

It has suffered water damage, V is unfortunately most carelessly written and often illegible. It omits much of what
is found in B, H, N, R, and rearranges meaninglessly many of the events. The same remarks also apply to E, the contents of this copy being very similar to N, R, B.

6-E (Es'ad Efendi 2433, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi) contains 149 folios 8 (198mm x 135mm) written in a very fine divâni kurna hand with 17 lines to a page except for page 2a. The tuck of the binding of Ms and bind is ornamented on red carton with gilt and its edge is black leather. The first folio (1b) contains a register roll about the Valide Sulṭân who came to Istanbul from Edirne in 1677. Moreover in the last folio (149a) a few verses are written about the war between the Ottomans and Russia in 1768-1769. At the top of the second folio (2a) there is the endowment seal of Mustafâ III (1757-74). According to the colophon and the last two verses this particular Ms was copied in 1768-1769 by Hüseyin Kâtib.

This Ms is incomplete, lacking 149 folios, and various other sections, too, have been omitted, and it compresses some of the longer narrations and frequently omits words and phrases. There are many marginal additions throughout which are incorporated into the text of other Mss. The first word of every page b is

8-In TCYK it is given as 144 folios.
written at the bottom of page a as in R, B, H. The content of this copy is the same as V, R, N, B. Its variations are shown quite widely in the footnotes to the edited text. It certainly related to V.

7-P (Paris Bibliothèque Nationale 1134, Blochet cat II, p.175) contains 86 folios (135mm x 200mm) written in a nesh hand, 23 lines to a page. The title is written in red ink and all phrases of the Quran are underlined with red ink. The frame is damaged by water. There is a tear in folio 62a. Finally the binding is made with leather.

This book consists of two parts each of which is a completely different book, the first one being Nusret-nâme which starts from the first folio and finishes with folio 78b and is incomplete. The second part starts with Asaf-nâme which was written by Lütfi Paşa, the grand vizier of Kânûnî Sulţân Süleyman. This second part starts with folio 79a and finishes on 84b. Finally at the end of this book there is a history of the Persian campaign under Lala Musţafâ Paşa which is added again as very briefly in an note by the copyist, under the title of risale from 84b to 86b. This final short risale is written in divânî hand. The book was copied by Zakir Mehmed who was a Katip of the Divân and was a member of the Hanbeli
mezhep in creed and of the Hanefi mezhep in practice. The copy was made at the request of the Vezir-i A'zam Mehmed Paşa in 1206 (1791).

The content of this copy is similar to B, R, N, V E. However it is incomplete and various paragraphs and phrases and words have been omitted as in E, V but its variation is quite different from the E, V's variation.

8-C (Darul-Kütüphane, Cairo National Library No TK 237f)

Although we have attempted to obtain this last manuscript in Cairo it has not been available for this study because of official problems. It seems that it may be lost or, at least, undiscoverable at present.

The interrelation of most of the copies of the manuscripts is of such a nature that historians cannot use them with entire confidence since they belong to a distinct tradition. For example major exemplars modify to some degree the language of the text which may originally have been written in the form of hasty notes. Where one copy inspires sufficient confidence in its accuracy that one can draw deductions from the detailed variants which it records, it is safe to rely on the critical apparatus. Thus it seems most probable to
construct, on the basis of content and scope, the following schema for the manuscripts:

![Diagram]

We do not possess the author's own draft but from all the evidence, it would seem that B contains the earliest recension of the text, there being a particularly close resemblance in language and orthography as well as date between B and H. B was an early, clean copy made to present to the Sulṭān with some illustrated miniatures which are dated, and it has survived in an excellent condition. Although H is dated and was produced lavishly at the request of Murād III in the second following year, it has lost some pages because of its preceding poor condition and it has seemed preferable to use
B as a basis for the present edition.

It can be shown that with the exception of C the remaining manuscripts used in this study are somehow based on B as various copies were made from it at various stages, in which the additions that already existed at that particular time were included in the text. The aim behind this reconstruction of the text is the desire to present it in a new form to researchers as well as readers that would be most convenient if they are interested in studying a primary historical text.

A second group of Mss is represented by R, V, E, N of which P contains the final version. C was not available but indications are that it too should be included in this group. Although they exhibit the same sequence of events in content with B, in fact they add some passages of substance to the content of the text which is B (33a, 64b, 80a, 95a, 97b, 113a, 138b) as can be seen in the critical apparatus.

This group are all of a later date. They bear close resemblance although minor variations in orthography and omissions as well as modifications occur among them, and they exhibit almost the same addition in the content, apart
from 143b in V, E. However one branch of this group consists of V, E, P which represents an uncompleted manuscript and are very careless. They also can be dated to the middle of the eighteenth century and represent the same content and sequence of events. Finally E, V, make the same omissions and additions as well as identical errors in orthography. Thus there is no doubt that E is directly based on V. But P's omission, additions and identical errors as which are seen in its variation indicates that there is no similarity.

**Technique of Editing**

The system of transcription for passages in Persian and Arabic as well as Ottoman used in this edition of the text is based upon that employed in the İslâm Ansiklopedisi which can be regarded as standard, and the form with which all scholars in the field of Ottoman studies can be presumed to be familiar.

In the treatment of Turkish vowels, concerning the suffixes of declension and conjugation, an archaic pronunciation has been preferred, as being more in accordance with the vowelled (harekeli) text H. Although its vowels are irregular for example olun-olum and some parts of it are not vowelled, we have tried to create an original vowel harmony in accordance
with harekeli text which is not presented in the modern form. Thus, paşanuñ-paşanuñ; sulţanuñ, sulţanum-sulţanm; the 3rd person possessive suffix is always -i, -i, -si, -si, (eg. hocasi). The passive is generaly -il, -il, the reported past generaly -miş, -miş etc. The personal endings of verbs are: -dur, -dur ( -durur , -durur); -dün, -düni, -di, -di, -dum, -duañ, similarly the factative always -dür--dur and so with the plurals; the 1st person plural of the optative is -lüm, -lum, and the 1st singular sometimes -(y)in, -(y)ın. The first person plural of the future/subjunctive is frequently -vüz, -vuz. Other usages will be deducible from these examples. Apart from these we face a few unfamiliar words which might have been used in the sixteenth century.

1- 40b guzbeş  غر بش
2- 44b kaytub  قبطوب
3- 74a liyuş  لبوب بش
4- 173b ullümün  اوولومين

The persian iżafe is indicated by vowel i/ı, the back being determined according to general rulers. e.g.

leşker-i cerrär-i düşman-şikarla

and long (ā-ī) following, y e.g.

'ulemā-yı 'izām.

Finally, Arabic expressions and phrases are treated in the
following way. e.g.

lāzīmu `l-hāl

gevī `l-iclāl;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Letter</th>
<th>English Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a, A</td>
<td>j, J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ā, Ā</td>
<td>k, K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b, B</td>
<td>l, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c, C</td>
<td>m, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ċ, Ĉ</td>
<td>n, N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d, D</td>
<td>ñ, Ñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f, F</td>
<td>o, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g, G</td>
<td>p, P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ġ, Ġ</td>
<td>q, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h, H</td>
<td>r, R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĕ, Ė</td>
<td>s, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, I</td>
<td>s, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ë, Ë</td>
<td>t, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ū, Ū</td>
<td>u, U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v, V</td>
<td>y, Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z, Z</td>
<td>ẓ, ẓ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð, ð</td>
<td>s, S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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