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dece metni koymayı yeterli gördüğümüzden İngilizce özeti yapmadım. Elimizdeki bu tek nüsha bir çok yanlış ve atlamalar ihtiva etmektedir. Başka nüshalar ortaya çıkmadıka bir düzeltme imkâni yoktur fakat bazı açık hatalara notlarda işaret olundu.

In paper presented to the VIIIth International Congress of Turkish History the question of the authorship of the ten telhîs taking up folios 96b - 106b in the mecmua of the Bayezid Devlet Library, Velîyyuddin collection number 3205, was briefly discussed. The purpose of the present paper is first of all to present the complete text of the telhîs, excluding the three telhîs which appear in Aksüt’s publication of Koçî bey, accompanied by an annotated English summary outlining in brief the main topics dealt with by the author. Secondly, by indicating in detailed notes accompanying the text parallel passages in advice literature of a nearly contemporary date which address the same questions raised in the Velîyyuddin telhîs, to establish at least a primitive means of tracing through what sources and channels various reform sentiments found their final expression. The real comparative work however can only begin when all of the available texts are published.

SUMMARY OF THE VELIYYUDDIN TELHİS

Telhîs No. I: On the Measures which God Willing are most beneficial and best for the State.

1 — No more than four senior vezirs should be appointed at the same time.

A partial description of the contents of the Velîyyuddin Manuscript number 3205 follows below:

Folios 1-33B Kitab-i nurnasne, al-mutercim ‘an kitâb-i mişkât al-envâr. According to Babinger, *Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke*, Leipzig 1927, p. 123, this was translated into Turkish in 1012/1604 from an original work of Ghazali in Arabic by a certain Çâfer Bey.

Folios 34b-160b, short selections from Mustafa Âli, Sarı ‘Abdullah and others mostly in the form of proverbs or passages excerpted from longer works of Advice to Kings.

Folios 160b-171b; Münseât-i Veysi Efendi
Folios 171b-203a: Münseât-i Ilahi Efendi

See below note twenty.
2 — The imperial council (divan) should be convened four times a week, with the Sultan in attendance at least once every two or three weeks.

3 — Suitable husbands should be found for each of the Sultan’s daughters. What the author implies here is that while the Sultanas remained at court they were both a burden on the treasury and liable to interfere in matters of state.

4 — The number of imperial gatekeepers (kapucu hast) should be reduced from seven to four.

5 — The coinage should be standardized and new mines be opened to production.

6 — Ostentation should be forbidden. Each class should dress according to its station and swords should be made not of silver but ordinary sharp steel.

Telhis No. II — On the Assigning of Offices to their proper owners and the necessity of refraining from excessive reassignment or changing of offices 3.

1 — Provincial governor generals should be given long term appointments. Without permanent secure positions, the beys are liable to resort to injustice and when injustice prevails the people are in discomfort and the country is in distress and disorder.

2 — The governor generals should be guaranteed the revenues assigned to them in the accounting registers (icmal defteri) and protected from the diversion of these revenues to other purpose whether through assignment as freehold property (mülk) or to meet the expenses of maintaining a garrison (ocaklık). The author argues that if the governors were given back their traditional means of support, with

---

3 This question of frequent transferal and short tenure of office continued to be a main grievance among the so-called “rebel governors” and the reformist group throughout the period which followed the composition of Koçi Bey’s Risale. For two instances where the principle of minimum three year terms for beylerbeyis was proclaimed see Naima IV, 274, Istanbul 1283, in connection with Varvar Ali Paşa’s “rebellion in” 1058/1648, and Naima V, 199, Istanbul 1283 referring to İbîr Mustafa Paşa’s “kanunname” from the year 1062/1652. In addition Ali devotes a section of his Nasihatı’s Selatin to this question. The on altına lazım, (Fatih MS, fol. 63a-65a) begins with the following words: “erbab-i menasibin ‘azıl ve hidemât-ı mebrurenin refi’ mukarrer olduktan sonra ekabir ricasıyle yine menasib verilme...”
strong warnings to refrain from the practice of devir to supplement their incomes, their revenues would be sufficient to meet their expenses and they would not be tempted so much to extort from the peasantry.

3 — There should be checks on the orders of the defterdars. Traditionally each order was received by at least three defterdars, and then recorded in the divan registers by mukataacilar and muhasebeciler (tax-farm accountants and finance department clerks). However since the year 1015/1606-7 when Sultan Ahmed named Ekmekci-zade Ahmed Paşa defterdar with the rank of vezir, defterdars were empowered to issue orders without any checks, a fact which grave rise to many abuses. The author therefore concludes that henceforth defterdars should not be granted the rank of vezir. Like the defterdar, the Nişancı (Chief of Chancellery) should be appointed not by virtue of his position or rank but for his understanding of the spirit of the law. (ser-i şerife ve kanun-i münifeye mugayir olan evamiri teşhis edip istaha kadır olan kimesne...). The nişancı should be chosen from among those having served either as secretaries in the imperial divan or from among the former reis al-kuttab (chief secretary in charge of foreign affairs). As in the case of the defterdar, the rank of vezir should not be granted to nişancı since as the author states these are high offices in which to serve is honor enough without need for false elevation.

Telhis No. III — On the Importance of detailed registry (Ru'us) of all assignments to posts of former pages in the Sultan's Privy Chamber.

1 — To avoid disputes and unjust dismissals the former positions and exact date of promotion of all the Sultan's palace staff should be carefully recorded in the appointments register.

2 — No dismissal should be made without good cause before the allotted term has expired. Whereas the proper term for kadıs normally should have been two years the author complains that they were commonly changed every eighteen months.

3 — The number of timarlı Müteferrika (sons of the Elite), şavuş (imperial messengers) and divan katibleri (council secretaries) should

4 "devir". For a more complete documentation of exactly what forms this abuse took see H. İnalçik, "Adaletnâmeler", No. X dated Receb 1 1018/September 30, 1609, in Belgeler II/3-4, (1967), pp. 49-142.
be frozen at between six and seven hundred, and their berats should also be duly registered by the governor generals.

The subject of complaint in this telhis is the serious lack of order which existed in the records of timar assignments. Taking advantage of the confusion vezirs were able to assign timars to members of their own household even when these timars were not vacant or when their tenure was disputed. Examples of simultaneous claims to identical timars and the loopholes in their registry through which false claims were made can be found in abundance in the yoklama and tahvil kalemi regisiters of the period housed in the Başbakanlık archives in Istanbul. The prevention of these false claims and the organization and updating of the confused timar records was a major policy goal during Murad IV’s reign. Some of the measures which were taken to achieve this goal will discussed along with the summary of telhis numbers six and seven.

Telhis No. IV — On the Necessity of Reassigning to their just possessors the Properties unlawfully converted into private freehold (mültk) and mortmain Estates (Evkaf)

The question of illegally acquired estates was foremost in the minds of writers of advice to kings. The reason for its importance goes back to the Persian theory of the circle of justice which holds that the state is upheld by justice and justice by soldiery, which depended on a full treasury for its support. Therefore the process of diversion of properties formerly belonging to the Imperial Domain (Hevass-i Hümayun) into private hands was a phenomenon which caused these authors great concern. In this telhis the problem of palace favorites taking an inordinate share of the state’s sources of revenue is emphasized. It is the author’s contention that the properties would be better used to maintain troops. In other words the integrity of the kilçe timars should be preserved and not be allowed to be assigned as retirement settlements (arpalık) to former kapucu başı (Gatekeepers at the Imperial Palaces) or as pocket money (paşmaklık) for other palace favorites. To underline his point the author gives the example of four estates whose excess revenues after expenses alone would be sufficient to arm and maintain a force of three thousand fighting men. The four estates singled out for comment by the author were:

1 — The vakf of Mihrimah Sultan whose excess revenues (zevaid) amounted to ten million akçe.
2 — The vakf of Rustem Pasa whose zevald also amounted to ten million akçe.

3 — The evkaf property of Mehmed III’s Dar al-Sa’adet ağası (Chief Eunuch of the Harem) Mehmed Ağă assigned from the customs revenues of Silistre which amounted to one and a half million to two million akçe.

4 — The evkaf property of Mehmed III’s kapu-agası (Chief Gatekeeper) Gazanfer Aga assigned from the revenues in Kesendire near Selaniki which amounted to thirteen million akçe.

In addition the author complains of the practice of assigning former timars as private freehold to the Sultan’s favorites (mukarrib) and members of various vezirs’ households, stating that merely to satisfy the whim of two hundred men it was not right to put into jeopardy the military preparedness and financial solvency of the whole empire.

Telhis No. V: On the Importance of Securing the Confidence of the People in the Firmness of the Ruler’s Decisions.

The underlying subject of this telhis is again the reform of the corrupt timar system. As indicated in the telhis by the phrase—

“sepetlerde olan ziamet ve timarları erbab-i istihkaka tevzi’ eylemesine ve gediklüler’in ref‘ine ve sefare me’mur olmalara ferman-i ali-anları sadır edip—”.

Sultan Murad IV had already taken affirmative action to try to remedy the situation, but the author was concerned lest he waver in his purpose and make exceptions to the guidelines set forth in his ferman thus undermining the effectiveness of the new regulations. The author therefore lays great emphasis on the Sultan’s standing by his word and being firm (sabit-kadem). He further praises the Sultan for his refusal to be influenced by the requests of Cafer Paşa, Chief Admiral 1632 - 1634. Cafer Paşa had apparently asked that an
exception to the rules governing timar assignments be made in favor of his kethuda (steward). The author points out the dangerous precedent which an exception in this case would have set. In the remaining part of this telhis the author returns to the subject of the importance of reforming the timar system by making reference to the necessity of maintaining the strength of the provincial timar-based army as a balance to the growing influence and numerical strength of the Janissaries in the capital. The author points out that when the provincial timar-based army was maintained at a minimum level of seventy to eighty thousand men the Janissaries, amounting to no more to ten thousand infantry men, were of necessity obedient to the wishes of the army commanders. However once the timar-based army was allowed to deteriorate and through misappropriation of timar revenues and other causes its numbers declined, the army commanders had no numerical force to back up their orders and were obliged to cater to the wishes of the now dominant Janissaries. It was therefore imperative claimed the author that the sultan remain firm in his intention to reform the abuses in the timar system and stand firm by the decisions already promulgated in his ferman. The content of this ferman is spelled out in telhis numbers six and seven dealing with the orders sent to Hüseyn Paşa for the inspection of Rumelia.

Telhis No. VI: On the Imperial Order to be sent to the local timariots (ocak-oglu) of Rumelia.

Timars should be granted as a reward for faithful service to the sons of local sipahis and not set aside as favors to personal acquaintances.

hicce 1042/June 27, 1633, while the second register, Maliyeden Mudewver Tasnifi No. 980 covers the period gurre-i Receb 1043/January 1, 1634 to gurre Zi'l-hicce 1043/end of May 1634. According to Naima, Vol. III, 211-12, Istanbul 1280, he continued to hold the post of chief admiral until Safer 1044/late June or early July 1634. His mediterranean campaign is briefly described by Katib Çelebi in Tuhfat’ul-kibar fi esfari’-l-bihar, Istanbul 1329, p. 112.

* This Hüseyn Paşa is referred to in Naima III, 134, Istanbul 1283, as having been entrusted with the general inspection of Rumeli in the year 1042/1632. According to Topçular Kâtibi, fol. 272b, he was assigned to this duty at the time of the ayak divan in May 1632 although he did not begin fulfilling the office until his arrival at Sofya after having summoned all of the timar and ziamet holders into his presence at the beginning of Rebiü’l-ahir 1042/mid-September 1632. For further detail on the exact nature of his instructions see note twenty-four below.
of influential men at court or other unqualified persons. The author suggests that in order to prevent unjust dismissal from a timar living, the travel expenses to Istanbul (harc-i râh) of legitimate claimants should be met by the divan and furthermore the governor general responsible for unjustly disposing of a rightful timar holder should be properly punished. Also in order to insure that those who were assigned timars were indeed local sipahi’s sons each assignment should be witnessed by the local commander (alay-bey) and a number of legitimate timariots and zaims of the same region.

In order to prevent illegitimate claims from outsiders gaining credency the further precaution of listing the physical characteristics of the timar holder in his berât of assignment was practiced.


7 That revenues set aside for advancing the progress of the gaza should be thus misappropriated was considered a grave sin. This concept of mal-i mukatele is referred to in the Fatih 3497 manuscript of Ayn-i ‘Ali in a fetva of the Seyhü’l-Islam Sunullah Efendi:

"Bu mesele beyanında cevap ne vechiledir ki ba<z kimesneler mal-i mukatele ‘add olunan ziamete ve timarlârın nicesin birer tahrik ile alıp zabt edip her sene mahsullarını ekli u bel’ eyleyip, mukabelesinde ne se'ere gidip ve ne halife ve ve- kilin rizasıyle seferden kalıp beytüll- mala hiyanet eylese — timarlârın ihrac edip ahara verdirmeye sebeb olsa nice kimesnenin ol surettin rizkin kat’ etmeye sebeb olmagla ‘indallah âsim olur mu? El - Cevab: Olmaz. Ihmal ederse âsim ve hain olur. Öyle zalim ve hainlerin rizki değil irki kat’ olunmak gerekir. Aldıkları dahi beytüll - mala redd olunmak lazımdır’.”

This concept of timars granted in return for fighting for the faith was also known under the name of mal-i mukabele. See Ayn-i Ali Kavanin — page 61.

8 According to the author of the Kanun-i Sultani folio 135a, the traditional number of witnesses was twelve, two zaims and ten timariots residing in the same district.

9a It is clear by the tenor of the discussion in the ayak divans of May 1632 (see note 10 below) that Murad IVth was determined to make an attempt empire-wide at reforming the corrupt timar system. With this view in mind, in addition to Hüseyn Paşa’s inspections in Rumeli, wide ranging inspections were carried out in Anatolia as well under the guidance of the Beylerbeyi of Anatolia Mehmet Paşa. Tapu Defteri number 750 in the Başbakanlık Archives in Istanbul indicates that 5,312 timar holders’ berâats were renewed at that time. According to Koçi Bey (Aksüt, p. 99) the Eyalet of Anadolu should have contained 7,300 kılıç timars. Nevertheless, that extensive inspections were indeed carried out is demonstrated clearly by a passage in Topçular Kâtibi’s history which lists the areas which were covered during the Anatolian timar inspections of 1632:
In conjunction with the inspection of Rumelia plans were also made for a yoklama in Anatolia. However in view of the powerful position of certain groups, in particular the Janissary clique in Istanbul, who were opposed to these measures, the author recommends that the inspections be undertaken progressively rather than simultaneously. He argues that after having ordered the timars in the Rumelian provinces during the first part of the year, that is until the first part of May, the Ruz-i Ḫdr, the governor General of Rumelia could then proceed with a trustworthy and full troop of men to attend to the affairs of Anatolia without fear of opposition.

Having thus summarized seven of the telhis of the Veliyyuddin manuscript, a word should also be said about the common goals and intellectual biases shared by seventeenth century Ottoman writers of Advice literature. The inescapable fact of Ottoman decline and the general military setbacks beginning at the first part of the century gave rise to what can be referred to as a kind of “crisis atmosphere”. The climate of self-criticism and reassessment of basic values which dominates the reform literature of this period is strongly influenced by these political developments.

From the earliest examples in Middle Eastern literature of Advice to Kings moral ethics and political theory were closely bound one to the other. The fate of the state was thought to have been dependent on the moral virtues of the ruler. The just ruler's state flourished while the state ruled by a tyrant was doomed to destruction. A similar moral overtone dominates the Ottoman reform literature of the seventeenth century though in this case it seems that the authors concentrated not only on the moral qualities of the rulers, but also bemoaned the general decline in public moral standards. The revulsion against ostentation (ziynet) and bribery (rüşvet), and the expression of the desirability of maintaining social distinctions (yerlu yerinde) which are repeated over and over again in the reform literature are further indications of this moral emphasis. There seems to be a con-

sensus among the authors that in addition to administrative reforms there existed an equal need for a spiritual reformation. The gazi ethic which had so strongly motivated the consciousness of the people during the age of expansion, was now eclipsed after the setbacks in the wars with Austria and Persia. As a result the authors of this period were seeking a kind of spiritual regeneration, a new ideal to bind society together. Interestingly enough, the historian Solakzade wrote a book of advice to kings around 1640[^9] in which he gives voice to the complaint that the values of the past had been lost and that his contemporaries were concerned only with personal advancement and the amassment of wealth rather than with the interests of the Muslim community as a whole. This sense of loss vis à vis the Golden Age of the past is also evident in the constant appeal among writers of Advice literature for a return to the “kanun-i kadam”, the old order of the time of Süleyman the Magnificent when society functioned as a harmonious whole, each citizen performing his allotted task without undue ambition to rise beyond the limitations of his class. This concept of had, a carefully defined hierarchical station in life for all, the observation of which caused society to function harmoniously, and the transgression of which caused the unbalancing of the spheres, social unrest, loss of discipline and social disorder, is the central governing philosophy of the Ottomans formulated by the Sultan’s advisors belonging to the professional secretarial (katib) class. The normative intellectual predispositions of this class of advisors to men in authority gives a characteristic stamp to the numerous works on reform in seventeenth century Ottoman literature.

This ayak divanı took place on the twentieth of Zi'il-Kade 1041/May 10, 1632 and is described by Naima III, 106-113, Istanbul 1283, and by Topçular Katibi, fol 272b et. seq. A copy of the Hat-t Humayun issued at the conclusion of this meeting is recorded by Naima III. 113-115, Istanbul 1283.

In this passage the author makes reference to an earlier report submitted to the Sultan. Since Koçi Bey was one of several authors all drawing on the same reform ideas and stemming from the same intellectual milieu it is difficult to establish with certainty to which report the author is referring. The author alludes to his old age (pir i nekdar kul) in this passage in a way reminiscent of the passage at the beginning of Aziz Efendi’s Kanun-i Sultani, who also refers to a second report submitted to the Sultan in the following words:

“bundan akdem vüzera-i a'zam hususu ve ba'zı ahval-i paye-i serir-i devlet... tahrir olunmuştur.” (Kanun-i Sultani, fol. 124a).

According to Röhrborn’s analysis of the Kanun-i Sultani in Untersuchungen zur Osmanischen Verwaltungs geschichte Berlin 1974, p. 11 this work was also written in the year 1042, but as in the case of Koçi Bey the identity of the author is unclear. Although we have insufficient evidence at present to establish the exact date and authorship of the various reports it is clear that they emit from close associates in
government circles and represent perhaps even the co-operative efforts of several officials who discussed together cures for the empire’s administrative ills and submitted their recommendations for the Sultan’s consideration.

12 The sense here requires that one read “dört vezir” rather than the “dört divan” which is written. That the copyist of the Veliyüddin telhis was extremely careless is immediately clear from a comparison of the text of the three additional telhis as published by Aksüt and as they appear in the Veliyüddin manuscript. On folio 97a of the Veliyüddin text for instance (see Aksüt Telhis No. 11, pp. 61-62) the copist leaves out an entire phrase which renders the meaning of the sentence unintelligible. Even the title at the beginning of the Veliyüddin telhis on folio 96a reads “bin otuz iki senesinde olan telhisat” whereas it is clear from the references to Câfer Paşa and Hüseyin Paşa (see notes four and five above) that it cannot have been presented before 1042. An additional place in the text requiring emendation is indicated in note number seventeen below.
Aziz Efendi expresses his thoughts on this subject in the following way:

"dört vezirin hassaları bugün, Vân ve defter-i icmalde mastur ve mukayyed...olup." (Aziz Efendi, fol. 129b).

"hala nagah yeniden üç vezir dahi nasb olunub, halen hilâf-i kanun yedi vezir..." (Aziz Efendi, fol. 130a).

Just before the accession of Murad IVth the number of kübbe vezirs had risen to eight. In the year 1030/1621 Topçular Katibi lists the following personages as vezirs:


In describing the convening of the divan on the 6th. of Rebiül-evvel 1038/November 14, 1628 Naima lists nine vezirs not including the Nişancı Yusuf Paşa and the defterdar Bekir Paşa. See Naima II, 440, Istanbul 1282.

A similar sentiment is expressed in Hirz al-Mülük:

"laзиm olan dahi budur ki eger keri ne-i mu`azeme ve eger hemşire-i mufaherelerirdir, aslen ve kat‘en vezir ve beylerbeyilere tevzi buyurulup, onun dahi vezir ve hemşire-i mufahereleridir. (Hirz al-Mülük, fol. 1a)."
It should be read olup.

Parallels—

a) “ve rical’den zib u ziynet ref’ olunmak evlä ve enfä’ dir” (Aziz Ef. 130a)
b) “ve vuклela-i devlet’te ve ‘asker’de gümüştü raht ve ziver yok idi. Her birinin... iyi at ve keskin kilicz...” (Aksüt, p. 25).

Parallels—

a) “ve bin beş tarihinden beru cem’ an memâlik-i Islamiyye’den on dokuz eyalet yer edden gitti”. (Aksüt, p. 50)
b) “bin tarihinden beru Nemçe Kirâhi memalik’ten otuz kirk pare kale ile palanka alıp, haz’el- an ellerindedir. Şah-i ‘ümrah dahi bunca eyaletleri kahz edip yalnız Gence ve Şirvan memlekétinden beri Misr hâzinesi sen’de der-i devlet’e gelip vasi olurdu”. (Cevdet Telhis, See text supra).

c) Pages 11 - 13 in Yucel’s edition of the Kitab al - Müstetab, list all the Ottoman losses on the eastern borders with Iran.
Since Ahmed reigned from 1012-1026/1603-1617 it is again clear that the copiest made an error here in writing “bin beş” instead of “bin on beş” tarihinde.

More precisely the date of the defterdar Ahmed Paşa’s elevation to the vezirate should be sometime in the previous year, 1014. He is mentioned as holding that rank by Topçular Kâtibi in the following passage:

A further reference to this method practiced by the beys and their agents to gain control over a large number of timars is made in an appendix (lahika) to Ayni 'Ali taken from an iemal register from the sancak of Niğbolu:

"ve subaşıların ve sipahilerin evlilerine, herhangi bir timarın onayını almak veya sefer-i Hümayun'a gitmeyeler veya yahud Padişahn emrine muhalif edeler veya katlı nefs etmiş olalar, Katlı nefs ettikleri hakkında sancak beyi ve kadi ile ma'lum olmuş ola" (Risale., p. 104).
See my comments in the English summary for the reasons why such importance was attached to this question. Several other authors writing at almost the same time also devote long sections of their works to this question and while choosing different points of emphasis arrive at much the same conclusions. While the author of the Veliyüddin telhis chooses as his target primarily the Darüş-Sa'det ağa ları and their excessively large estates, in Hırzü'l-muluk the vezir-i a'zams, particularly Sokollu Mehmed Paşa, are singled out for blame. (See Hırzü'l-muluk, p. 12b-17b). In Aziz Efendi likewise (fol. 129b-130a) it is the vezirs who are principally blamed. Aziz Efendi recommends that the vezirs be reduced to the traditional number of four and that hâss revenues be assigned to these four vezirs only (see above note thirteen). There are also passages in Koçi Bey's risale which closely parallel the ideas expressed in this telhis from the Veliyüddin mecmuası.

For instance:

a) on the vezirs he makes the following comments:

“onlar dahi nice umura muda kaleye başlayıp, guzat ve mukatele hakkları olan nice yüzyl mukaddem feth olumuş kura ve mezari’ birer tarik ile kimin paşmaklık ve kimin arpalık ve kimin temlik ettirip... sonra her bir tevabi’ine nice timarlar ve zemeliter ettirip, erbab-i seyfin diirlklerin kat’ ettiller.” (Aksüt, p. 31).

b) on the subject of using these revenues to support troops rather than on satisfying the whims of a few:

“Havass-i Hümayun karyeleri ve hilaf-i şer temlikler ve vakıflar mahsulati—ulufelu kül taifesine tevzi’ ve taksim olunsu 40,000-50,000 nefer ulufelerin hazineye köyup timara çıkarlardı. 40,000 nefer yevmiyesi yirmiş açkandan... senevi 2,000 yük akçadan ziyade hazineye sai olup, irad masrafa galip olur.”

(Aksüt, p. 56)

20 Compare Aziz Efendi folio 130a - “ol makule hilaf-i şer u kanun olan vakıflarda sevab ihtimali yoktur. ’The similarity of the language here and in the passage which follows (see note twenty - two below) shows how closely associated
the authors of these various telehis and books of Advice to Kings were. The authors sometimes quoted almost verbatim from each others' works and often pirated their own phraseology repeating a similar idea in different contexts. However until the extent texts have all been published there can be no thought of solving the problems of authorship, origin of the reform ideas and the historical development of the genre.

21 Such a measure was indeed carried out by the order of the defterdar Emir Paşa in the year 1061/1651. Naima states, vol. V, p. 70, Istanbul 1283, that Emir Paşa confiscated the salaries (vazife) of 30,000 such dudugiyan thus considerably reducing the financial burden on the treasury amounting at that time to seventeen million akca yearly. Although the figure of 30,000 is an exaggeration, the figures provided in register 6367 of the Maliyeden Mudever Tasnifi in the Başbakanlık Archives in Istanbul indicates that though their number amounted to only 7,088, the yearly expenses for the year 1064/1054 exceeded thirty-three million akca.
In a telhis from Koçi Bey's first risale the same idea is given the following expression:

"ve ziamet timari eshabna tevzi'e mani olup, vilayetin harabna ba'is olanlar hala add olunmak lazuı gelirse ancak otuz kark adam olur ziyyade olmaz. Oyle olsa otuz kark adamın hatırını ria'yet için böyle bir devlet muhtel ve müşevveş olmasın hași ki sa'adetli Padıșahım ca'iz göre." (Aksüt, p. 52)
VI

The question of preventing illegitimate outsiders (ecnebi) from attaining a timar assignment through false pretences is taken up in the following places to name a few only:

a) Ali, Nasihat al-Selatin, 89a-92a
b) Cevdet Telhis (see text supera).

23 The prevention of inaccurate or falsified records of timar assignments was naturally the first step in reviving the timar-based provincial army and thus is fully treated by most of the reform group authors of Advice to Kings.

The prevention of inaccurate or falsified records of timar assignments was naturally the first step in reviving the timar-based provincial army and thus is fully treated by most of the reform group authors of Advice to Kings.
The most typical of the five documents copied in this *meemaa* is the appointment berat granted to Hüseyn Paşa (Reis’ül - Küttâb 1004, f. 158a - 159b) in the first part of Muharrem 1042/late July 1632, a short quote from which follows:

"ve hin-i yoklamada ve su'alde ahar berat ile gelip hile ve al edenlerin ve ecnebiliklerin zahir olanlar ve yoklama ahirine degin mahalline varıp yoklamayanlar ve tevaif-i mezbureden fevt olanlar Rumilinde sakin ulufelu kullarından talib olanlara ulufeleri bedeli... üzere tevcih edip,—."

25 The same abuse is referred to in *Hirz al - muluk* on f. 46a in the following passages “Mesela bir kimesne hem yaar ve hem sahîh sipahizade olsa amma fakir olup beleybeyi’ye murad üzere rüyvet vermege kudreti olmaza ömrü mülazimet ile geçer, timar almak ihtimali yoktur Amma bir maldar ecnebi timara duhul etmek dilerse, beleybeyi ve defterdar kethudas, ve defterdar hallu haline göre rüyvet” and “Ecenibler mal kuvveti ile timara duhul edip, sipahizadelerin ve el emirlerin ekseri fakir olmağa, fakir na - murad gezerler”. On the question of weathly timar holders sending others in their place to do their required military service see Gevdet Telhis (lines 20-28) and ‘Ayni’ Ali, Fatih 3497 MS, fol. 33a-33b.

26 Compare Aziz Efendi, folio 135a where rather than openly accusing Hüseyn Paşa of deliberately misappropriating timars for family and personal friends, says rather that he put too much trust in the claims of and reports of his *alay* beys.

27 To show the extent of the favoritism and nepotism practiced by many beys in the assignment of timars, ‘Ali gives the example of the Beleybeyi of Aleppo who assigned timars to his retinue totaling to a value almost as great as his own income:
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"Bu fakir... Halebin on kerre yüz bin ile kendi vilayeti mukarrer iken, ikinci seneye var sadece sekiz kere yüz binle adamların timar ve ziameti mükemmel oldu. (‘Ali - Nasıhettu’s seldin, folio 89b)
Compare Aksüt, pp. 49-50:

"ve Karadeniz tarafından dahi Kazak bi-‘ak zuhur edip". Yeniköy ve nice bahçeleri ihrak-i bi’n-nar ve emval-i müslimin garet ve hasaret eyledi ve serrar şūrurları def ile Boğazda kaleler yapılp, İstanbul etrafı muhafaza olunmak lazım geldi."
The wholesale "borrowing" in this passage again shows how interdependent the authors of Advice literature were. (See note twenty above). The passage in Aksüt beginning on page 53 with the phrase: "Hatta 1011 tarihinde Yemişçi Hasan Paşa vezir-i a'zam" iken, ba'dehu 1022 tarihinde Nasuh Paşa vezir-i a'zam iken zemzet ve timar sepetlerinden ihraç, ve erbab-i istihkaka tevzi' olunması babında hat-i hümayun-i sa'âdet-makrun sadir oldu... cümlesi mevcud yoklama bir timar zuhure gelmedi"

and ending on page 54 with the words:

"bir timara on adem yazılp., inşallah... bir timar saklanmayıp cümlesi zuhura gelir".

follows almost word for word the corresponding passage in the Cevdet Telhis, See supra lines 23-38).
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ديكير تلخيص:

سامولو ويوه هناف باشاهم صاغ اولانون بوشكلا فناني وحزيتهح وراعاية
ووكالة تلفته مهب رشوت اولندر. رفع اولاني عدناء وعام تصحيح اولانز. وارتثالك
فذي ورضي انشاء انتمال بوجوده مسر اولور كمثال محورنهه وافق اولان ابتث
وتحدث الکليه مستقيم اولوب يوليه كش راز وانامدار اولان بكاريكي وتنجاج بكاريكي
مؤيد احسان اولوه بعده ركاب ابايونانده بر كنهاي وعظم جرى صادر اولندرك بحس
الشرع والقانون ضيح حقلنيدن كلها ومواه عظام وقضايا اندلاع داعم داعم انتخان ابليه
ولا اهل اولندرك اخراج ومنصبارة اهل علمه واهل قضية وبرهيه ومدلالنده والا بر كنارى
التي دو فرمان واخيرا بوريلور ايسه راشير ارتشاء كيماره وورور وياخود مرتشير
رشيو كيمدن الابلور. بو تقدرجه ارتشا بالكليه دفع ورفع اولور. وحلافكر دغي
عادل اولور. وحلافكر مسلال اليكين رعانيه ذم وتعده اولانز. ويكري اوتوز سعدن
برى خروحة استانوب وادره ويروه ورسار شمار وقصادن كلوب تونثن ايدن رعانيا
ورانيا ك finanzi وطنريه عودت ايدرر وولاد انسابر ابليه كيجه وكندز دولت
پادشاهيه يه خير دعاير ايدرر... مسير ابليه.
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