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A Note on the Transliteration and Translation

This book draws on sources in Arabic, Persian and Old Anatolian Turkish. All have incompatible systems of transliterating the same word; for reasons of simpli-
city, for terms common to all three languages I have therefore adopted an Arabising transliteration throughout. Thus I spell consistently futuwwa, not fiituvvet or fotovvat, mathnawi not mesnevi and gasida not kaside, irrespective of the language of the source under discussion. Diacritics are only used in quota-
tions. Regrettably, standards for transliterating from Old Anatolian Turkish vary considerably. When citing from published texts, the transliteration of the original editor is respected and no attempt has been made to impose uniformity. For reasons of space, quotations from texts in the original have only been provided when the text is especially obscure or the original choice of vocabulary particularly important. Unless indicated otherwise, all translations are my own.
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Q. Qur’an, standard Egyptian edition.

Süleymaniye Süleymanîye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Istanbul (Süleymaniye Manuscript Library, Istanbul).

In around the year 732/1332, the Moroccan traveller Ibn Battuta visited Anatolia, or Rum, as it was known to Muslims after its Romano-Byzantine heritage. It was, Ibn Battuta said, ‘the finest region of the world, where God has gathered diverse fair points; its people are the most handsome in appearance, the cleanest in clothes, their food is the most delicious and they are the most solicitous of God’s people’. The Maghrebi was particularly impressed by the Islamic piety he found there, despite the substantial Christian population he also noted:

All the people of this land follow the lawschool of the imam Abu Hanifa, may God be pleased with him, and uphold the sunna. There is no Qadari, Shi‘i (rāfiḍi), Mu‘tazili, Khariji or innovator (muḥtadī’) among them, and that is a virtue with which God has singled them out; however, they do consume hashish without considering anything wrong with it.1

This impression of Anatolian Muslims’ unwavering devotion to Sunnism is reinforced by an anecdote Ibn Battuta recounts concerning his visit to Sinop on the Black Sea coast. When the locals saw him pray with hands downturned, not realising this was also a custom of the Sunni Maliki law school that predominated in Ibn Battuta’s homeland, they accused him of Shiism, whose adherents some of

1 Ibn Battuta, Rihla, ed. Kamal al-Bustani (Beirut, 1992), 283–4; translations are my own, but see also the English translation by Gibb: The Travels of Ibn Batṭūṭa A.D. 1325–1354, Translated with Revisions and Notes from the Arabic Text Edited by C. Defrémery and B. R. Sanguinetti by H. A. R. Gibb (Cambridge, 1962), II, 416–17 (henceforth, trans. Gibb). Ibn Battuta refers to the early Islamic groups whose names became synonymous with heresy in the eyes of later Sunnis: the Qadaris asserted human free will and rejected predestination; the Mu‘tazilis were rationalists who upheld the created nature of the Qur’an and the Kharijis rejected the arbitration between ‘Ali b. Abi Talib and his Umayyad opponents after the battle of Siffin in 657.
them had witnessed praying in the same fashion in Iraq and the Hijaz. Ibn Battuta was only saved from the accusation when the local sultan tested him by sending him a rabbit, forbidden to Shiites, which the Maghrebi traveller devoured, satisfying the doubters of his orthodoxy. Allusions to this commitment of rulers in Anatolia to upholding Sunni piety recur frequently in his account of his travels, which, owing to the region’s highly politically fragmented environment in this period, took Ibn Battuta into the presence of numerous different sultans, amirs, and governors. These are regularly depicted as enjoying a close relationship with the various religious officials who frequented their courts, such as faqih (specialists in Islamic jurisprudence), khatib (preachers) and qurrâ’ (Qur’an reciters).

Ibn Battuta was a learned qadi, and his account of his travels was doubtless influenced by his own pious agenda of seeking out the blessings of holy men and spiritual benefits, in common with most travellers from the pre-modern Islamic world who have left written records. Nonetheless, even if influenced by this pious perspective, his account stands in striking contrast to the consensus of modern scholarship, which has often seen medieval Anatolia as a barely Islamised frontier region, a ‘Wild West’, characterised, in the words of one scholar, by ‘the absence of a state that was interested in rigorously defining and strictly enforcing an orthodoxy’. Islam in medieval Anatolia is often described as ‘syncretic’ or ‘heterodox’, and even the Sunni piety that Ibn Battuta identified is often argued to represent a considerably broader tent than it became at a later date, incorporating elements redolent of Shiism or indeed ‘heterodoxy’. Certainly, Anatolia was distinguished from other parts of the Middle East by its late incorporation into the Muslim world, which was effected only in the wake of the invasions of the Turks.

2 Ibn Battuta, Rihla, 320; trans. Gibb, 468.
3 In Eğirdir and Birgi, the sultans had a faqih sitting at his side when he received Ibn Battuta (Rihla, 288, 301; trans. Gibb, 423, 441); in Ladiqqi (Denizli), the sultan sends the wâ’iz as his emissary to meet Ibn Battuta (Rihla, 291; trans. Gibb, 427); in Milas and Kastamonu the sultan is described as having faqih as his companions at the majlis (Rihla, 293, 317; trans. Gibb, 429, 463). In Girdebolu, he met an immigrant scholar from Damascus who served as the local sultan’s ‘faqih and khatib’ (Rihla, 310; trans. Gibb, 460).
5 For the notion of Anatolia as a ‘Wild West’ see, with further references, Charles Melville, ‘Anatolia under the Mongols’, in The Cambridge History of Turkey, vol. 1: Byzantium to Turkey, ed. Kate Fleet (Cambridge, 2009), 52.
6 Cemal Kafadar, Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State (Berkeley, 1995), 76.
in the eleventh century, after which a number of Muslim Turkish states emerged in the peninsula, most prominently the Seljuqs of Rum (r. 463/1071–708/1308). Yet despite the advent of Muslim rulers, it is likely that even in Ibn Battuta’s time Christians made up a much larger proportion of the population of Anatolia than most other parts of the Middle East, notwithstanding the survival of substantial Christian communities in Egypt and Syria. Although we have no reliable statistical information, such are the hints given by contemporary sources. Travelling through Anatolia in 1253, shortly after the region had come under the control of the Mongols who had recently invaded much of the Middle East, the friar William of Rubruck, an emissary to the Great Khan Möngke, calculated that only one in ten of the population was Muslim. Indeed, even at the end of the fourteenth century, there were some Christians who abandoned Byzantine territory to take refuge in Muslim-ruled Anatolia. Nonetheless, there is much evidence that by the time Ibn Battuta visited in the fourteenth century, Christians were increasingly converting to Islam or otherwise fleeing Muslim rule. While recent scholarship has affirmed that the Orthodox Church in Muslim Anatolia remained vital, albeit in difficult circumstances and perforce in collaboration with the new Turkish rulers, this does not change the fact that a wealth of evidence attests the decline in numbers of its adherents. Conversion is often explained by the activities of Sufi holy men, who, operating outside the framework of formal religion, are said to have been able to appeal both to Anatolia’s Turkish nomadic population and to its Christians by providing forms of syncretism between Islam and their previous beliefs while claiming to offer direct communication with the

---

11 Johannes Pahlitzsch, ‘The Greek Orthodox Communities of Nicaea and Ephesus under Turkish Rule in the Fourteenth Century: A New Reading of Old Sources’, in Peacock, De Nicola and Yıldız (eds), Islam and Christianity, 147–64; Tom Papademetriou, Render Unto the Sultan: Power, Authority, and the Greek Orthodox Church in the Early Ottoman Centuries (Oxford, 2015), chapter 2.
divine, in contrast to the legalistic religiosity of the educated ‘ulama’. Ibn Battuta’s reference to hashish may allude to such Sufis, some of whom regularly used the drug in their rituals.

To what then were Christians converting? To an almost unimpeachable ‘orthodox’ Sunnism, as described by Ibn Battuta, or to the ‘heterodox’ and ‘syncretic’ Islam propounded by much modern scholarship? As we shall discuss, recent research has underlined that all of these categories are problematic. The task of this book is to attain a more sophisticated understanding of the characteristics of Islam in Anatolia during the crucial period of the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries, when not only were increasing numbers of Christians embracing Islam, but Islamic society and culture in the peninsula were themselves undergoing profound changes. The invasions of the pagan Mongols in the early to mid-thirteenth century precipitated political, social and religious transformation across the Middle East and Central Asia. Lands that had long been Muslim for the first time came under the control of a non-Muslim empire, the centre of which was located thousands of miles to the east at the imperial capital of Qaraqorum in Mongolia, and in which Muslims initially lost the privileged status to which they had been accustomed (Map 1).

These developments are generally regarded as having strengthened the hand of non-Muslims and Shiites, the former in the short and the latter in the long term. The Mongols’ capture of Baghdad in 656/1258 and killing of the Abbasid Caliph is thought to have created a void of political legitimacy in the Islamic world. In the absence of the divinely ordained institution of the Caliphate as the ultimate, if theoretical, source of political authority, Sunni Muslims had to find new ways of structuring society and politics. This may account for the increasing importance of Sufism, which offered a hierarchy of authority that could, in part, fill the void left by the disappearance of the Caliphal order, and

---


MAP 1: The Mongol Empire, c. 1260
Sufis came to play an increasingly important political role. These dislocations, while especially intense within the Ilkhanid lands, were by no means restricted to them, and a comparable search for new forms of political legitimacy and societal order can be observed in the Ilkhans’ great rivals, the Mamluk sultanate of Egypt and Syria.

In around 1260, the Mongol empire ceased to be a unitary state controlled by a single ruler, the Great Khan, from Qaraqorum, and instead was divided into four principal successor states, the Yuan dynasty in China and Mongolia, the Chaghatayids in Central Asia, the Golden Horde in the South Russian steppe and the Ilkhanate of Iran. It was this latter state, founded by Hülegü, grandson of Chinggis Khan, and taking its name from the title īlkhān assumed by its rulers, that dominated Anatolia for most of the period (Map 2).

To assert their legitimacy, the rulers of all these Mongol successor states stressed their descent from Chinggis Khan, the great conqueror who was regarded by Mongols (and some non-Mongols) as possessing more or less divine status. A distinctive political culture developed in the Ilkhanate. The Ilkhans came to view themselves as inheritors not just of the legacy of Chinggis but also that of ancient Iran, while after converting to Islam in 694/1295, the Ilkhan Ghazan started to employ simultaneously a vocabulary of Islamic kingship, describing himself as pādshāh-i Islām, ‘king of Islam’. This model of political legitimacy that drew on steppe, Iranian and, from the end of the thirteenth century, Islamic elements accrued prestige to the Ilkhans, which enabled them to exert a broader cultural and political influence.

Anatolia was certainly affected by the broader developments in Middle Eastern society and politics precipitated by Mongol domination, which was established in

---


the peninsula after the Seljuqs’ defeat at the Battle of Köse Dağ near Sivas in 641/1243. However, it also experienced some distinct consequences. Mongol hegemony opened the way for a new political dispensation in Anatolia, even if the Seljuqs nominally retained the position of sultan until the early fourteenth century, although without being able to exercise effective power. The Mongols asserted suzerainty over all the Seljuq lands (as they did, in theory, over the entire world). In practice, this claim was contested by the numerous Turkmen lords, such as those encountered by Ibn Battuta, who first emerged as major political forces in the Mongol period, and who, with the decline of the Ilkhanate in the 1330s, became ever more powerful. The most successful of these Turkmen lords were the Ottomans, who expanded from a small base in north-western Anatolia to establish a great empire that absorbed its Turkmen rivals and both Christian and Muslim neighbours, lasting, in one form or another, until the First World War.

These political changes were accompanied by equally dramatic cultural ones. Towards the end of the thirteenth century, Turkish emerged as a literary medium, supplementing and eventually superseding Persian as the main literary and textual vehicle of Anatolian Muslims. This facilitated the composition and circulation of basic manuals of the faith as well as a pious literature that addressed the concerns of a recently converted or converting population, in contrast to the situation at the height of Seljuq rule in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries when almost all literary works seem to have been destined for a limited courtly or elite audience. From the mid-thirteenth century the religious, social and literary landscape was transformed by the spread of Sufism, which penetrated society from artisans’ guilds to the ruling elites, and introduced novel ways of conceptualising not just man’s relationship to God but also temporal power and authority, which became increasingly intertwined with Sufis’ spiritual claims. Konya, the old Seljuq capital, was fast becoming a major scholarly centre to which men migrated from other parts of the Islamic world to study Sufi thought, as well as to seek professional advancement. It was under Mongol rule that figures such as the major Sufi writers Jalal al-Din Rumi (d. 672/1273), his son Sultan Walad (d. 712/1312) and the leading interpreter of Ibn ‚Arabi, Sadr al-Din al-Qunawi (d. 672/1273), were active, as well as some of the earliest Turkish poets in Anatolia, such as Gülşehir (d. after 718/1318) and Aşık Paşa (d. 732/1332). Mongol domination thus facilitated the integration of Anatolia into the broader Muslim world, through the activities of migrant scholars, Sufis and litterateurs, all of whose presence becomes increasingly marked from the second half of the thirteenth century.

One of the aims of this book is to demonstrate how Mongol domination thus played an integral part in the process of Islamisation in Anatolia, but one which has not yet received due attention from scholarship. By Islamisation I mean not
simply conversion to Islam, but the processes by which Islam permeated politics, society and culture more generally. In most other regions of the Middle East, this process had taken place at a much earlier date, primarily the Umayyad and early Abbasid periods, and is thus often attested only by later Islamic sources. In Anatolia, however, we have a large body of contemporary texts in Arabic, Persian and Turkish. To date, this literature has been little studied and remains mainly unpublished, as will be discussed at more length in due course, but it can serve as a valuable first-hand source for understanding these religious and cultural transformations, forming a unique window into the process of Islamisation as it happened. Beyond the intrinsic interest of deepening our understanding of the evolution of Muslim society in Anatolia, this book thus also aims to enhance our understanding more generally both of processes of Islamisation and the consequences of Mongol hegemony in the Middle East. I hope also to address some of the issues highlighted by Ibn Battuta’s account, shedding light on the relationship between political power and religion, and assessing the effect of the political convulsions of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries on the social and religious structures of the Muslim community in Anatolia. I concentrate on the crucial period of cultural transformation and Mongol political and cultural dominance from c. 641/1243 to 783/1381, the former date marking the Mongol victory over the Seljuqs at the Battle of Kösedağ, which established their dominance over Anatolia, and the latter marking the demise of the last Mongol successor state in the peninsula, the Eretnids (c. 735/1335–783/1381). However, these dates offer only a rough framework: the pace of cultural and religious change, while certainly connected to broader political developments, is necessarily slower, so we will have cause on occasion both to look back and forward beyond these dates. This book will give particular attention to Central Anatolia. Its towns such as Konya, Kayseri and Sivas had been the cultural centre of Muslim Anatolia since the coming of the Turks and remained the heartland of the Seljuq sultans, the Ilkhanid governors of Anatolia and the Eretnids. It is also by far the best attested region in the historical


21 The term Middle East of course a neologism, invented in the nineteenth century; no comparable term is found in pre-modern sources, which merely differentiate between the dār al-harb (the abode of war, the non-Muslim world) and the dār al-Islām (the Muslim world). Nonetheless, by the period covered by this book the Islamic world encompassed a vast geographical area stretching from Mali to Sumatra, much of which had no contact with Anatolia. For this reason, although rejected by some modern scholarship, it seems useful to retain the term Middle East to describe the neighbouring, mainly Muslim-dominated regions with which Anatolia was in close contact, such as Egypt, Syria and Iran.
sources, most of which were produced there, a fact reflected in the coverage of this book too. Beyond, in the peripheries and coastal areas, the courts of the Turkmen chiefs produced no chronicles in our period, and our understanding of these polities is often limited; nonetheless, some played an important role in the patronage of literary texts and thus the broader cultural transformations of the period. Of course, this is not to say that literary texts are the sole possible source for interpreting the transformations of the Mongol period. Art history, epigraphy and material culture might all serve the historian, but this book deliberately limits itself largely to the textual sources as these are perhaps the least exploited, and, in tracing the changes in intellectual and literary history that are the book’s focus, the most relevant. Nonetheless, occasionally I will refer to epigraphic and architectural evidence where this seems relevant to my argument, but limitations of space have constrained me from exploiting such sources more fully.

The significance of the book’s argument that Mongol role played a crucial role in the Islamisation of Anatolia is severalfold. First, it draws attention to the importance of this era in the history of Anatolia, which has received very little scholarly attention, and brings a new understanding to the consequences of the Mongol conquests in a specific region. Secondly, it sheds light on the development and spread of Islam in this region against the broader political and intellectual background, based on contemporary Muslim sources. Thirdly, it obliges us to revise the scholarly consensus, discussed further later, that it was the high Ottoman period of the sixteenth century that saw the initiation of a process described as ‘Sunnitisation’ whereby, backed by the might of the state, a distinctively Sunni religiosity was increasingly propagated. Rather, we can see that many elements of this Sunnitisation must be traced back to the consequences of Mongol rule.

HISTORIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES ON ANATOLIA IN THE PERIOD OF MONGOL DOMINATION

Until recently, scholarship both inside and outside Turkey has tended to view Anatolian history as a neat sequence of Turkish dynasties leading from the Seljuqs (r. 463/1071–708/1308) to the Ottomans (r. 699/1299–1923) and thus ultimately to the Turkish Republic.22 Lately, however, aspects of medieval Anatolia have attracted increasingly scholarly attention in their own right rather than as merely a

---

22 Two well-known examples that illustrate this tendency in their titles are the standard surveys of the period in Turkish and English: Osman Turan, Selçuklar Zamanında Türkiye: Siyasi tarih Alp Arslan’dan Osman Gazi’ye (1071–1318) (Istanbul, 1971); Claude Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey: General Survey of the Material and Spiritual Culture and History c. 1071–1330 (London, 1968), revised version published as Claude Cahen, La Turquie pré-ottomane (Istanbul, 1988).
precursor to the Ottomans, and this research has underlined the political and cultural complexity of the region. Nonetheless, it is hard to escape entirely from the influence of the earlier approach and the underlying assumptions of its basic vocabulary. Even the word Anatolia, commonly used in modern scholarship as an equivalent for the classical Islamic term Rum, was first popularised by Turkish nationalist scholars in the early twentieth century, and especially after the establishment of the Republic in 1923, as part of a state-building effort that equated Anatolia with modern Turkey. Yet in reality, many of the south-eastermost parts of modern Turkey, such as Antakya, Urfa, Diyarbakır and Mardin, had a distinct history from the westerly and central regions, having been incorporated into the Islamic world at the time of the Umayyad conquests. Some of these areas were (especially in Ottoman times) considered part of the lands of Rum; but others would traditionally be categorised as part of other regions such as the Jazira or al-Sham.

No less nebulous than Anatolia is the Arabic, Persian and Turkish term Rum, and its adjective Rumi. Derived from Rhomaioi, the Greek term for Byzantine or Roman, Rum and Rumi could refer to the Byzantine Empire, to inhabitants of the lands of Asia Minor who were either Muslim or Christian, or at times specifically to Christians, and at times specifically to Muslims. The multiplicity of usages underlines the fluidity of identity in the period, the way in which it was possible for individuals to slip between ethnic and religious barriers. In our period, Rum could thus apply equally to the Muslim-ruled territories of central, southern and eastern Anatolia, and to those areas that were still under Christian control. The Byzantine empire, although much diminished after the sack of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusade (1204), continued to control substantial territories in western Anatolia, although these were increasingly being encroached on by the Muslims from the late thirteenth century. On the eastern Black Sea

---

23 For a sampling of some recent scholarship see A. C. S. Peacock and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds), The Seljuks of Anatolia: Court and Society in the Medieval Middle East (London, 2013); Peacock, De Nicola and Yıldız (eds), Islam and Christianity; Patricia Blessing and Rachel Goshgarian (eds), Architecture and Landscape in Medieval Anatolia, 1100–1500 (Edinburgh, 2017).


coast the Greek state of Trebizond (1204–1461) survived as a Mongol tributary, and the shores of the eastern Mediterranean were controlled by another Mongol ally, the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia (1198–1375). The population of all these areas might be considered Rumi for some purposes.

In this book, Rum and Anatolia are used interchangeably to refer to the parts of the peninsula that either came under Muslim control after the Turkish conquest or remained under Christian rule until the final Turkish conquest of the last Greek outpost of Trebizond in 1461. Broadly speaking, the south-easternmost regions of modern Turkey that were incorporated into the dār al-islām in the seventh century are excluded because of their separate history and the quite different progress of Islamisation in these areas. Even when limiting ourselves to the regions under consideration here which are defined as Rum/Anatolia we must be careful to avoid falling into the trap of conceptualising them as the direct ‘ancestor’ of modern Turkey. The neat teleology of Seljuq, Ottoman and Republican rule and an antithesis between Muslim and Christian Anatolia disguises a distinctly more complex situation. In the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, generally considered the height of the ‘Seljuq’ period, different parts of Anatolia were ruled by a variety of fractious Turkish dynasties, such as the Mengücekids (Erzincan and Divriği in Eastern Anatolia), the Saltukids (Erzurum) and the Danishmendids (Kayseri and Malatya, central and south-eastern Anatolia) in addition to the Seljuqs. The latter, moreover, themselves splintered with the emergence of a rival Seljuq line in Erzurum that replaced the Saltukids. Both ethnic and religious fault lines were rather more blurred than older scholarship might suggest. The Danishmendids struck coins in Greek, representing figures such as Jesus Christ and St George, while in the Seljuq case the sultans regularly intermarried with Christian (largely Byzantine and Georgian) princesses, who did not necessarily convert to Islam. Their offspring, the future sultans, were often brought up speaking Greek and were sometimes baptised (although it is not clear the ceremony would have had anything more than an apotropaic meaning). Churches were found even in Seljuq palaces. Moreover, a substantial Turkish population was also found in lands under Byzantine control, while Islamic culture exercised a strong influence on literature and socio-political

29 See Shukurov, The Byzantine Turks for a detailed discussion of this phenomenon.
institutions in Christian societies (above all Armenian and Georgian, to a much lesser extent in Greek).

This inadequacy of periodisation by dynastic names to capture the complexity of the period is also suggested by the fact that the Seljuqs were themselves tributary to the Mongols from 634/1236, while from 653/1255 to c. 735/1335 Anatolia was a province of the Ilkhanate. The Christian polities of Cilicia and Trebizond were also bound as tributaries to the Ilkhanate, with which Byzantium also enjoyed cordial relations that were cemented through imperial marriage alliances. The fact of the dominant role of the Ilkhanate in Anatolia in this period is swept under the carpet by much scholarship, especially, though not exclusively, in Turkey. Rather than the ‘Mongol’ or ‘Ilkhanid’ period, late thirteenth- to fourteenth-century Anatolia is generally known in scholarship as the beylik period, after the term for the small principalities ruled over by Turkmen (and occasionally Mongol) chiefs, although as we shall see the notion of a beylik is distinctly problematic.

With the benefit of hindsight, the most important of these beyliks was that of the descendants of the Turkmen chief Osman. Thus, the overwhelming bulk of scholarship concentrates on the emergence of the Ottoman state in the north-west of the peninsula, which has been the subject of scholarly research for a good century. Some scholars, such as Paul Wittek, writing in 1938, whose ideas remain influential even today, have seen the emergence of the Ottomans as propelled by their ‘ghazi ethos’, in which the commitment to holy war served as a means of acquiring legitimacy for an upstart nomad dynasty that possessed no antecedents. Others have seen the early Ottoman state as something akin to a joint

---


32 See the discussion in Chapter 1.

33 For the ghazi thesis see Paul Wittek, The Rise of the Ottoman Empire: Studies in the History of Turkey, Thirteenth–Fifteenth Centuries, ed. Colin Heywood (London, 2013). This edition also contains a useful overview of debates. For responses to Wittek see the work of Lowry (n. 34); Kafadar, Between Two Worlds; Rudi Paul Lindner, Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia (Bloomington, 1983); Linda T. Darling, ‘Reformulating the Gazi Narrative: When Was the Ottoman State a Gazi State?’, Turcica 43 (2011): 13–53.
Christian/Muslim enterprise, with unconverted Christians playing a formative role. In this view, the Ottoman empire was itself in many ways a continuation of Byzantium by other means, witnessed by the eventual adoption of Constantinople as the imperial capital after its conquest in 1453. \(^{34}\) The conquest of parts of the Balkans with their Christian populations, starting from the early fourteenth century, most probably gave the early Ottoman state a character quite distinct from the beyliks of Anatolia that existed on or on the peripheries of lands subject to Muslim rule for over two centuries. Yet the nature of the early Ottoman state remains opaque, in no small part owing to the lack of sources for the period before c. 1400. Contemporary chronicles from the Ottomans and other beyliks do not survive, nor is there much indication that other chronicles that have not come down to us were written, although there are traces of an earlier oral Ottoman historiographical tradition, which is partly preserved in histories that reached their current form at the end of the fifteenth century. \(^{35}\) Nor are significant archival records extant from this period, and there is very little evidence of any literary activity in the early Ottoman beylik, which represented something of a cultural backwater compared to Central Anatolia. As a result, research has focused on a very limited source base: the extensive debates on Witteck’s famous ghazi thesis have revolved around a single inscription, a brief passage from a poem by the Turkish writer Ahmedi (d. 816/1413) and supplementary material from Ottoman chronicles of the fifteenth century.

Scholarly interest in the early Ottoman state has rarely extended to the rest of Muslim-ruled Anatolia in the period, a handful of studies seeking to understand the Mongol influence on Ottoman institutions notwithstanding. \(^{36}\) Individual

---


\(^{35}\) For an attempt to reconstruct the history of the early Ottoman state using a wide range of available sources see Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire, 1300–1481* (Istanbul, 1990). For a recent translation of an early Ottoman history from the fifteenth century see Dimitri J. Kastritsis (trans.), *An Early Ottoman History: The Oxford Anonymous Chronicle (Bodleian Library Ms Marsh 313)* (Liverpool, 2017), and the comments on the early Ottoman historiographical tradition at ibid., 3–6, with further references.

beyliks have often received monograph treatment in Turkish (very rarely in any Western language), outlining their political history and principal monuments, but these are seldom integrated into a broader study of Anatolia, meaning each beylik is seen in isolation from the others.\textsuperscript{37} In more popular works, the Mongols are routinely ignored. Despite the fact that some of the most iconic medieval monuments of Anatolia were constructed by Ilkhanid patrons, such as the Çifte Minareli Medrese at Sivas, in Turkish scholarship the Ilkhanid connection tends to be played down and such monuments are subsumed under the catch-all terms Seljuq or beylik, even if in reality they have little or no connection with either.\textsuperscript{38} Meanwhile, historians of the Mongols have generally given little attention to Anatolia, despite a recent boom in studies of the Mongol empire, and the Ilkhanate in particular.\textsuperscript{39} As a result, with a few notable exceptions, the period of Mongol domination in Anatolia as a whole has been neglected in scholarship.\textsuperscript{40}


\textsuperscript{37} İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşı, Anadolu Beylikleri ve Akkoyunlulu, Karakoyunlu Devletleri (Ankara, 1937) remains a standard survey; for studies of some of the major beyliks see for example Himmer Akin, Aydınogulları Tarihi hakkında bir Araştırmada (Ankara, 1946); Mustafa Çetin Varlık, Germiyanoğulları Tarihi (1300–1429) (Ankara, 1974); Kemal Göde, Eratnalılar (1327–1381) (Ankara, 1994); a rare but pioneering work in a Western language is Paul Wittek, Das Fürstentum Mentesche, Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.–15. Jh (Istanbul, 1934); the studies of Elizabeth Zachariadou are also useful: Trade and Crusade, Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin (1300–1415) (Venice, 1983), and her collected articles, Studies in Pre-Ottoman Turkey and the Ottomans (Ashgate Variorum, 2007). In English an overview that emphasises the Ottoman role is Rudi Paul Lindner, ‘Anatolia, 1300–1451’, in The Cambridge History of Turkey, vol. 1: Byzantium to Turkey, ed. Kate Fleet (Cambridge, 2009), 102–37.

\textsuperscript{38} On Mongol-era architecture see Ethel Sara Wolper, Cities and Saints: Sufism and the Transformation of Urban Space in Medieval Anatolia (University Park, PA, 2003); Patricia Blessing, Rebuilding Anatolia after the Mongol Conquest: Islamic Architecture in the Lands of Rûm, 1240–1330 (Farnham, 2014).


\textsuperscript{40} The main studies are: Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, revised version published as Cahen, La Turquie pré-ottomane, 227–347; Linda Darling, ‘Persianate Sources on Anatolia and the Early History of the Ottomans’, Studies on Persianate Societies 2 (2004): 126–44; Muammer Gül, Doğu ve Güneydoğu Anadolu’da Moğol Hakimiyeti (Istanbul, 2005); Ruqiyyya Yusufi Halwa’i, Rawabišt-i Siyasi-yi
Given the focus of existing scholarship, it may seem perverse that Mongol-controlled Central Anatolia is in fact by far the best attested region of the peninsula in contemporary sources, much better than any beylik, including the Ottomans. All our extant chronicles from before the fifteenth century come from Central Anatolia and are in some way connected to Mongol rule. All too are in Persian. In chronological order, they are: Ibn Bibi’s al-Awamir al-‘Ala’iyya, a chronicle of the Seljuq dynasty in Anatolia written for the Ilkhanid bureaucrat ‘Ala’ al-Din Juwayni in or after 681/1282; a chronicle of Mongol rule in Anatolia, the Musamarat al-Akhbar, written by the bureaucrat Aqsara’i for the Ilkhanid governor Timurtash in 723/1323; a brief anonymous history of the Seljuqs, compiled in Konya by various hands between the end of the thirteenth and the mid-fourteenth century, one of the compilers of which was probably a member of the retinue of the Ilkhan Geikhatu; and the biography of the ruler of Sivas and successor to the Eretnid principality, Burhan al-Din Ahmad, the Bazm u Razm, by ‘Aziz b. Ardashir Astarabadi (d. 800/1398), which also gives much information about the later Eretnids. Mention should also be made of an encyclopaedic work produced by the qadi of the Central Anatolian town of Niğde in 733/1333, al-Walad al-Shafiq, which contains historical information. This historiographical tradition is well known to scholars, although only recently have efforts been made to treat these works as more than mines of historical data, dates and facts, and to understand the underlying political and legitimatory aims of their authors.41

The coverage provided by these chronicles is thus uneven, and the period between the end of Aqsara’i’s Musamarat al-Akhbar in 723/1323 and the collapse of the Eretnid state in 783/1381 is especially poorly documented. Their focus is


almost exclusively on political history, meaning that the insights they offer into broader processes of social change are limited. However, two Arabic sources by outsiders provide valuable portraits of Anatolia in the mid-fourteenth century: the relevant sections in the travel account of Ibn Battuta (d. 770/1368 or 779/1377) previously mentioned and the work of an Egyptian chancery official, al-‘Umari (d. 749/1349), the *Masalik al-Absar*, a vast encyclopaedia that includes a substantial description of contemporary Anatolia based on reports of travellers. These Arabic sources are especially important for the impression they give of the broader organisation of society beyond the immediate political and military concerns of the elite that form the focus of the Persian chronicles.

Despite the still substantial Christian population of Anatolia in our period, there seems to have been little textual production in Greek within the Muslim-ruled territories, perhaps because Greek literature was closely connected to court patronage. Armenian and Syriac, on the other hand, continued to be widely used as vehicles of literature, and indeed one of the most important historical sources not just for Anatolia but for the region more broadly in the period is the chronicle of the Syriac patriarch Bar Hebraeus (d. 1286), a native of Melitene/Malatya, which, together with its continuation, is a valuable first-hand source for the Mongol invasions and their aftermath. Texts were also produced in Armenian, and both original works and the colophons of copies of manuscripts made in the period can serve as valuable historical sources. Yet they are less useful for understanding the internal dynamics of Muslim society, which form the subject of this book; the same is true of the rich Greek literary tradition that continued to be composed by Constantinople-based authors. Christian views of Muslims have been studied by previous scholars, and their work will not be duplicated here.

42 On these see A. Miquel, ‘Ibn Battūta’, *EI*²; K. S. Salibi, ‘al-‘Umari’, *EI*².
43 The topic of Greek manuscript production in Muslim-ruled Anatolia has not, it seems, received much scholarly attention. See for now Sofia Kotzabassi, *Βυζαντινά χειρόγραφα από τα μοναστήρια της Μυράς Ασίας* (Athens, 2004). I am grateful to Rustam Shukurov for this reference and for discussion of this point.
44 Bar Hebraeus, *The Chronography of Gregory Abu’l-Faraj* ... Known as Bar Hebraeus, trans. E. A. Wallis Budge (London, 1936), and on the author see (listed under the Arabic version of his name), J. B. Segal, ‘Ibn al-Ibri’, *EI*².
46 A useful reference point for such works that also extends far beyond Anatolia is David Thomas (ed.), *Christian–Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History. Volume 4 (1200–1350)* (Leiden, 2012); for Christian views of Muslims in Anatolia see Balivet, *Romanie byzantine*; Alexander D. Beihammer, ‘Christian Views of Islam in Early Seljuq Anatolia: Perceptions and Reactions’, in Peacock, De Nicola and Yıldız, *Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia*, 51–75; Roderick...
While several previous studies have attempted to address the vexed question of Christian conversion to Islam in this period, and the broader Islamisation of Anatolia, these have largely been undertaken on the basis of the Christian sources by scholars of Byzantium. The seminal work on the process of Islamisation remains the great if problematic study by Speros Vryonis, first published in 1971, *The Decline of Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization*. Vryonis’s work represents a highly ambitious attempt to understand the entire period from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries, yet Vryonis relied predominantly on Christian sources and the relatively few Islamic ones available to him in translations into modern Turkish or Western languages. The book does what its title proclaims: the process of Islamisation is seen through the prism of the end of Greek civilisation in Anatolia, and destruction, violence and forced conversion feature prominently in its account of the transformations of the period. As a result, while providing a wealth of information, it presents a perspective determined by this lamentation for a lost Greek Christian Anatolia.

Much less attention has been devoted to the profound changes in Muslim society and culture during the same period, and in 2009 the leading Turkish scholar of Anatolian Sufism, Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, remarked that almost no new research has been carried out on the history of Islam in Anatolia since the famous article by the pioneering Turkish nationalist scholar Mehmet Fuat Köprülü, ‘Islam in Anatolia after the Turkish conquest’, first published in 1922. While this is something of an exaggeration, Ocak himself having provided some valuable studies of aspects of Sufism in the period, the broad picture remains correct, for the field is still dominated by many of Köprülü’s ideas. Alongside the aforementioned 1922 article, Köprülü’s *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*, which came out in 1918, shaped perceptions of the development of Islam in the region throughout the twentieth century. In both these works, Köprülü argued that the study of Islam in Anatolia must concentrate on the authentically Turkish elements that he believed could be detected among the Turkmen (i.e. the nomadic Turks), who ‘constitute the most important object of study in the religious history of Anatolia’. Köprülü saw the Turkmen babas (Sufi leaders) as ‘Islamized versions of the old Turkish kam/ozan [shaman]’ who ‘directed the religious life of the active and


warlike Turkmen’ and were ‘preoccupied with holy war’. Köprülü contrasts these heroic and militant Turkmen babas who ‘spread Islam in the lands of unbelief’ with the ‘Arab and Persian Sufis, who spent quiet and contemplative lives secluded in lodges’. In places, Köprülü seems strongly to disapprove of this ‘Arab and Persian’ Sufism, which he viewed as tantamount to Shiism. The idea of Turkish Sufis playing a crucial role in the formation of a Turkish identity expressed in the Turkish language, an identity that was translated from the Turks’ place of origin in Central Asia to Anatolia, was developed at greater length in his *Early Mystics*, which also emphasised the role of this literature in the spread of Islam. At the same time, Köprülü argued that Turkish Sufi literature, inspired by the eleventh- or twelfth-century Central Asian poet-saint Ahmad Yasavi to whom he attributed a crucial role in the original conversion of the Turks, ‘is so characteristically Turkish that nothing like it is found among the Arabs and Persians’. These Central Asian and shamanistic elements, he argued, underlie Alevism/Bektashism, the form of Sufism infused with Shiite elements that Köprülü saw as the main form of a ‘popular’ and ‘Turkish’ Islam in Anatolia.

Köprülü’s emphasis on a distinction between a ‘popular’ religiosity and a Persianate one of the towns was adopted by much subsequent scholarship, including the works of Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, and Irène Mélikoff, albeit without the nationalist undertones, and it remains prominent in some contemporary scholarship, especially that of Ahmet Karamustafa, who has investigated what he calls ‘vernacular Islam’ in medieval Anatolia. Köprülü’s description of the militant Turkmen babas also brings to mind Paul Wittek’s formulation a few years later of the ghazi ethos of the early Ottoman state, which was similarly based

---

48 Köprülü, *Islam in Anatolia after the Turkish Conquest*, 6, 27 ‘the Sufi movement’s introduction of the spirit of Shiism…’

49 Ibid., 6.


on ideas of ethnically determined militarism. Vryonis concurred that the militant proselytization of Sufis played a crucial role in the process of Islamisation. Likewise, Köprülü’s argument that the incorporation of pre-Islamic modes of religiosity played an essential part in the Turkmen’s own Islamisation was also influential in the widespread conceptualisation of Islam in Anatolia as highly syncretic, and was reinforced by the research of F. W. Hasluck that appeared in the same period, emphasising the shared shrines and popular religious beliefs of Muslims and Christians in medieval Anatolia. Syncretism could thus account for both the pagan Turks’ embrace of a militant Islam based on holy war, and at the same time the emergence of a society characterised by intercommunal harmony. Cemal Kafadar attempted to square this circle in his study of debates around the emergence of the Ottoman state, Between Two Worlds, arguing that

The people of the marches did not see a contradiction between striving to expand their faith and engaging in conciliatory (not necessarily insincere) gestures towards members of the other faith … Very probably they were aware of the wonders that syncretism could work.

Many of Köprülü’s ideas have been challenged of late. Ahmet Karamustafa and Ayfer Karakaya-Stump have criticised the idea of a Central Asian origin of Anatolian Sufism, while Devin DeWeese has reassessed Ahmad Yasavi’s own role in the Islamisation of the Turks, demolishing one of Köprülü’s major assumptions. The idea of a dichotomy between urban and rural, popular and elite religiosity has been argued to be simplistic by some scholars, and it should in fairness be noted that Köprülü did himself underline that one of the main heroes

56 Vryonis, Decline, 363–96.
58 Kafadar, Between Two Worlds, 72.
of *Early Mystics*, the (probably) fourteenth-century Turkish poet Yunus Emre, was also influenced by the Persianate Sufi culture around him, in particular Jalal al-Din Rumi.\(^6\) Syncretism, too, has been challenged as an explanatory device by a number of scholars from different perspectives. Reuven Amitai has argued on the basis of studies of other parts of the Mongol empire that there was in fact little similarity between the Sufi saint and the shaman (the latter itself a problematic category),\(^6\) and Tijana Krstić, who has studied the process of Islamisation in fifteenth- to sixteenth-century Anatolia and the Balkans, has argued that ideas of syncretism or heterodoxy are misleading. In fact, Krstić sees shared religious spaces as places of religious negotiation and dispute, not necessarily conciliation, and argues that historians need to take account of the ‘politics’ of religious synthesis and that many medieval Turkish texts demonstrate ‘ideological investment in a firm upholding of religious boundaries’.\(^6\) Nonetheless, syncretism remains a dominant idea in studies of medieval Anatolia, and underlies the highly influential analysis propounded by Kafadar, which it is worth quoting in full, standing in sharp contrast as it does to Ibn Battuta’s perception of the ‘orthodoxy’ of Anatolia:

The religious picture of Anatolia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries appears to be much more complex than the neat categorizations of a simple Sunni/Shi’i dichotomy would allow. In this context even if one were able to identify some particular item of faith as heterodox, this would not necessarily imply “Shi’i” as it is usually assumed; questions of orthodoxy and heterodoxy, even if they are meaningful, should not be formulated along the lines of a Sunni/Shi’i sectarianism . . . Maybe the religious history of Anatolian and Balkan Muslims living in the frontier areas of the period from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries should be conceptualized in part in terms of a ‘metadoxy’, a state of being beyond doxies, a combination of being doxy-naïve and not being doxy-minded, as well as the absence of a state that was interested in rigorously defining and strictly enforcing an orthodoxy.\(^6\)

In recent years, some scholars have become increasingly uncomfortable in framing the debate in such terms. The whole notion of ‘orthodoxy’ is problematic in Islam, given the lack of an authority to define or enforce it, and the lack of a single lexical equivalent in Arabic or other languages used by pre-modern Muslims. It

---

\(^6\) Köprüülü, *Early Mystics*, 309–12, 305, 320. For the dates of Yunus Emre, see p. 158 below.


\(^6\) Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 76.
has even been argued that Islam only prescribes practice, not belief. In its place, in studies of Anatolia the term ‘Sunnitisation’ or even ‘confessionalisation’ is sometimes preferred, although these processes are commonly argued only to set in with an increasing willingness on the part of the Ottoman empire to define and prescribe religious beliefs in the sixteenth century, a phenomenon which is argued to parallel the Reformation in Europe. Nonetheless, if orthodoxy may be in the eye of the beholder, Ibn Battuta’s response to the religious environment in medieval Anatolia suggests that at least in the view of this contemporary there was a clear distinction between both right and wrong belief and practice, and such concerns were shared by Anatolian rulers and people.

A recent discussion has suggested that ‘the Sunni enthusiasts encountered by Ibn Battuta were acting more out of an uninformed zeal than out of sound knowledge of Sunni Islam’. While, as noted above, Ibn Battuta’s perceptions were doubtless in some way influenced by his pious agenda and religious background, such a statement, for the moment, remains unproven, for we lack sufficient research on the history of Islam in Anatolia to even start to hypothesise about the characteristics of the faith in the peninsula. Such studies as do exist are often determined by an emphasis on the Ottomans and Turkish sources, and a narrow focus on Anatolia that often fails to take account of the broader Middle Eastern and Islamic environment in which the peninsula was located. Even beyond the strictly political field, studies often take as their starting point the emergence of the Ottoman state in c. 1300 and remain resolutely focused on the Ottoman context, such as a recent (and valuable) examination of the rise of the ulama. Yet religious, cultural and political change did not necessarily occur in synchrony, and taking c. 1300 as a starting point can obscure the nature of developments outside the political arena. Furthermore, despite their undoubted

66 See the discussion in McGregor, ‘The Problem of Sufism’, with further references; also Yıldırım, ‘Sunni Orthodox vs Shi’ite Heterodox?’.
67 See the discussion in Derin Terziolu, ‘How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization: A Historiographical Discussion’, Turcica 44 (2012–13): 301–38; also Derin Terziolu, ‘Where ‘İlîm-i Hâl Meets Catechism: Islamic Manuals of Religious Instruction in the Ottoman Empire in the Age of Confessionalization’, Past and Present 220 (2013): 79–114, for example p. 112: ‘This turn to a more shariah-grounded, this-world-oriented and austere Islamic piety among the Ottoman Muslim urbanites after the sixteenth century can be profitably compared with certain aspects of the transformation of Christian religiosity in Western Europe. In particular, the shift from a more ‘magical’ to a more rules-and-regulations-oriented mode of religiosity among early modern Western Christians would seem to have had a close parallel among their Ottoman neighbours.’
68 Terziolu, ‘How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization’, 308.
69 Abdurrahman Atçıl, Scholars and Sultans in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire (Cambridge, 2016). The Ottomanocentrism can be observed in some other important works dealing with the topic, e.g. Ahmet Yaşar Ocağ, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Marginal Sufilik: Kalenderiler (XIV–XVII. Yüzyıllar) (Ankara, 1992).
importance, the relatively few studies that have sought to address the religious situation in Anatolia in the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries—predominantly the works of Ocak, Mélikoff, Şevket Küçük hüseyin and Rıza Yıldırım—tend to rely on a small corpus of sources, usually in Turkish, mainly later hagiographies of earlier Sufis and popular romances such as the Battalname, written down in its current form in the fifteenth century. The utility of such sources for our period is questionable. For instance, according to tradition, Hacı Bektash, the founder of the Bektashi order, and a crucial figure in the development of Alevism, lived in the period, dying, according to the conventional date, in 1271. However, we actually possess no references to him of the period beyond passing allusions in works of the hagiographer Aflaki (d. 761/1360) and his contemporary Elvan Çelebi, which do at least affirm his historicity. The reports of his activities in the fifteenth-century Vilayetname, the main hagiography, reflect the preoccupations of a later age and offer a mythologised presentation of the saint, which cannot be balanced against any contemporary evidence. Such cases could be multiplied, for there is a tendency to overemphasise this Turkish language material of later date at the expense of contemporary Arabic and Persian materials, aside from the published chronicles and Aflaki’s well-known hagiography of Rumi and his descendants, the Manaqib al-Arifin. This is understandable, as much more Turkish material has been published, albeit largely for its philological interest, while the bulk of the contemporary Arabic and Persian material remains in manuscript, scattered across different libraries and inadequately documented in their catalogues and other reference works. Yet relying on the distorting lens of later texts may detract from our understanding of the period. In addition, owing to the excessive interest in detecting ‘heterodoxy’, scholarship has concentrated on rather marginal groups such as radically antinomian Sufis who rejected the need to adhere to the external forms of sharia. Both the importance and the ‘heterodoxy’ of such groups has sometimes been exaggerated.

Another problematic facet of existing scholarship is the tendency to conceptualise Islam in Anatolia in our period in terms that emphasise its distinctiveness from that of the surrounding region, as is suggested by the quote from Kafadar

70 See nn. 49–50 above and Küçük hüseyin, Selbst- und Fremd Wahrnehmung; Yıldırım, ‘Sunni Orthodoxy vs Shi’ite Heterodoxy’.
71 On him see Irène Mélikoff, Hadji Bektach, un mythe et ses avatars: genèse et évolution du soufisme populaire en Turquie (Leiden, 1998).
73 For comments on the overemphasis on the importance of the Qalandars see Karamustafa, ‘Origins’, 88.
given above. In reality some of the blurred boundaries he identifies are to be found more generally in Islam in this period. For instance, the tendency of certain Sunnis to sympathise with Shiite practices and even beliefs (known as *tashayyu‘ hasan*) is a feature of Islam in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries that can be observed elsewhere in Iran, Central Asia and the Levant. Figures key to Shiism such as the imams ‘Ali b. Abi Talib and Ja‘far al-Sadiq played a role in all circles of Muslim believers as gates to the ‘unseen world’ (*ālam al-ghayb*), the supernatural world belief in which was almost universal. Whether or not this deserves to be labelled *tashayyu‘* of any kind seems doubtful; but there is certainly firm evidence of the enduring attachment to these figures that some modern scholarship associates with Shiism long after the so-called Ottoman ‘Sunnitisation’ had set in during the sixteenth century. At the same time, as we shall discuss in Chapter 4, there seems to be evidence of a distinct Shiite presence in medieval Anatolia that was, to contemporary Sunnis, a theologically deviant path quite separate from such popular manifestations of Alid piety that could be accommodated within Sunnism.

The growing role of Sufism was also far from being a specifically Anatolian phenomenon; as Nile Green has observed, Sufism *was* more or less Islam in the medieval period. Although certainly Sufism possesses a rich textual tradition, its essence is a believer’s search for personal contact with the divine mediated through the intercession of a holy man. As Azfar Moin has explained, it was through the sacred presences of holy men, ‘whether alive in physical form, active in enshrined graves, apparent in dreams, or resurrected in blood descendants and anointed ancestors’ that Islam was experienced by most believers. The major social, political and religious role played by Sufism in medieval Anatolia thus suggests the region’s integration into the broader Islamic world, where the same phenomenon was equally widespread. Even the radically antinomian Sufis who have attracted much comment were far from being an exclusively Anatolian phenomenon.
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76 Green, *Sufism*, 126.

Where Anatolia may appear to differ from the neighbouring Muslim world in the paltry evidence for a class of ‘ulama’, the religious scholars who constituted the backbone of society and intellectual life in centres such as Damascus, Cairo and Tabriz.78 As Claude Cahen commented, the ‘ālim in Anatolia generally died unnoticed by his peers, whereas the lives of his counterparts in the centres of the Muslim world were lovingly documented in detailed biographies and obituaries either as independent works (tabaqāt) or inserted into chronicles.79 For Anatolia, there is no attempt to chronicle the lives of the ‘ulama’ before the biographical dictionary of Taşköprizade (d. 968/1561), al-Shaqa’iq al-Nu‘maniyya, produced at the height of the Ottoman imperial age, and which attempts to associate early scholars with the founders of the Ottoman imperial venture.80 Nonetheless, Taşköprizade’s coverage of the fourteenth century is very scanty, in part doubtless owing to the lack of earlier sources on which he could draw. Yet it is questionable whether the lack of this specific type of textual source can really lead us to assert the complete absence of a class of ‘ulama’. Tabaqāt seems to have emerged as a means of distinguishing between those scholars ‘who had the necessary qualifications to be authoritative, and those who did not. The motivation behind tabaqāt works was the empowerment of certain groups of scholars to the exclusion of others.’81 It has also been argued that these biographical dictionaries served as a sort of ‘social capital’ through which the intellectual elites of, for example, Damascus asserted their status.82 The absence, then, of biographical dictionaries of scholars from Anatolia may not reflect so much the complete lack of such scholars, as Cahen and others have believed, but rather the different social structures in which competition for rank, position and authority were articulated in different ways, for example through the conflicts between rival Sufi groups that are well attested in our sources, as will be discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. Certainly, provincial ‘ulama’ from Central Anatolia are attested through some of the literary works they have left us, such as the Persian encyclopaedia by Qadi Ahmad of Niğde, or the jurist Muhsin al-Qaysari who composed several Arabic works on

78 See for example Terzioğlu, ‘How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization’, 308: Islam ‘was initially represented more by antinomian wandering dervishes than by madrasa-trained scholars’; also Atçılı, Scholars and Sultans, chapter 1.

79 Cahen, La Turquie, 211.


inheritance law in early fourteenth-century Kayseri.83 However, rather than looking for the ‘ulama’, about whom the sources are so reticent, it makes more sense to focus on the texts themselves that have survived from our period, of which an enormous number in Arabic, Persian and Turkish have come down to us.84 These can help us understand the relationship of Islam in Anatolia to broader trends in the Islamic world as well as in its own right.

Apart from the handful of chronicles discussed above, which represent a rare form of secular courtly literature, the surviving texts that can be securely dated to our period comprise a predominantly religious literature dealing with diverse topics such as eschatology, stories of saints, hadith, belief (‘aqa’id) and Sufi texts, quite apart from the well-known hagiographies such as Aflaki’s Manaqib. Most of these works are didactic in intent, but it would be erroneous to exclude such works from a definition of pre-modern literature, which I use here to mean all texts composed without an immediate documentary or administrative purpose (such as tax documents or royal decrees). Much of this remains unpublished in manuscript form, with a handful of notable exceptions such as the works of Jalal al-Din Rumi and his son Sultan Walad, Sadr al-Din al-Qunawi, or Yunus Emre.85 Even studies of these figures, who are of major importance in the history of Islamic literature and thought, tend to lack adequate historical contextualisation in the light of texts produced by their contemporaries, and thus our understanding of the broader religious and literary environment of the region remains limited. In this book, therefore, I make use of selections from this vast and barely known corpus of lesser-known texts that can be reasonably securely dated to our period and which itself constitutes a vital source for the religious and intellectual history of Anatolia. As Norman Calder has argued, the corpus of

83 See p. 00.
84 For a survey of scholarship on the literature of the period see A. C. S. Peacock and Sara Nur Yıldız, ‘Introduction: Literature, Language and History in Late Medieval Anatolia’, in Peacock and Yıldız (eds), Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life, 19–45. There is no adequate survey of Arabic literary production in medieval Anatolia. For Persian, a useful if far from complete introduction is Muhammad Amin Riyahi, Zaban wa Adabiyyat-i Farsi dar Qalamwaw-i ‘Uthmani (Tehran, 1990); Turkish trans. Osmanlı Topraklarında Fars Dili ve Edebiyat (Istanbul, 1995); see also Ahmed Ateş, ‘Hicri VI.–VIII. Asrarda Anadolu’da Farsça Eserler’, Türkçî Mecmuan 7–8 (1945): 94–135. For Turkish a useful introduction is Gönül Tekin, ‘Turkish Literature: Thirteenth to Fifteenth Centuries’, in H. İnalcık and G. Renda (eds), Ottoman Civilization, vol. 2 (Istanbul 2003), 496–567. A database of texts in all three languages produced during the period can be consulted at http://www.islam-anatolia.ac.uk.
85 There is a huge literature on Rumi, very little of which takes serious account of the Anatolian context. The best starting place remains Franklin D. Lewis, Rumi, Past and Present, East and West (Oxford, 2007, 2nd ed.); for al-Qunawi see Richard Todd, The Sufi Doctrine of Man: The Metaphysical Anthropology of Sadr al-Din al-Qunawi (Leiden, 2014); on Yunus Emre see Abdülhak Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf (Istanbul 1992 [2nd ed.]).
religion texts dealing with themes such as qīṣāṣ al-anbiyā; hadith, Qur’an, tafsir and kalām is itself the pre-eminent repository of what it means to ‘orthodox’. Without necessarily subscribing completely to Calder’s definition of the Sunni literary corpus that defines orthodoxy, which I believe underestimates the importance of Sufism at least for our place and period and perhaps gives undue prominence to kalām, or indeed to the notion of ‘orthodoxy’ itself in an Islamic context, it is clear that without examining what people were actually reading and writing, rather than later depictions in hagiographies, any attempt to assess the nature of Islam in Anatolia is flawed.

Such literature of course presents problems of interpretation, but also opportunities. Treatises on topics such as sainthood or jihad present an ideal, not a reality, but their contents can give an insight into the changing roles and representations of Sufis. From the fourteenth century, for instance, motifs of conversion become widespread in Sufi literature, as we can observe in the vita of Rumi by Aflaki. To what extent this actually reflects an active role by these saints in promoting conversion to Islam is another question, for Rumi’s own works do not indicate this was a particular concern of his; but they certainly do reflect an atmosphere in which conversion to Islam was become increasingly widespread, and a role in conversion narratives served as a symbolic proof of the validity of a saint’s claims. Similarly, as will be discussed in Chapter 5, the eschatological literature, discussing what the believer needs to do to enter paradise, shows a distinct evolution over time, the bar being set increasingly high and thus reflecting greater expectations of the knowledge of Islam on the part of the average Muslim. This religious literature thus both contributed to and reflects the process of Islamisation, as well as the broader religious environment. Sufism will play a substantial part in this discussion, as Sufi texts represent some of the most widely circulated forms of literature in medieval Anatolia, and Sufis play an active role in all parts of social and political life, as we shall see. Despite Sufis’ prominence here, this is not a book about the theories of Sufism per se but rather the ways in which politics, religion, society and textual production were interlinked, and how developments in one area could affect the others.

The book comprises two parts. Part One, ‘Religion, Politics and Society’, examines the ways in politics and religion were intertwined in medieval Anatolia. Chapter 1, after laying out the political and intellectual background to the

formation of Islamic culture and society in Anatolia up to the fourteenth century, focuses on the ways in which both Mongols and Turkmen chiefs faced a crisis of political legitimacy with the fall of the Seljuqs, and argues that one major response was the adoption of a newly aggressive religious stance, centred around a rhetoric of unbelief, which was absent in earlier times. The following two chapters discuss the ways in which political elites sought to shore up their authority by patronising both elite and popular Sufism. Chapter 2 explores how Sufism and political power were closely linked by examining the relationship with rulers of prominent Sufis such as Jalal al-Din Rumi, his son Sultan Walad and the descendants of Baba İlyas, the thirteenth-century rebel who some sources claim sought the sultanate for himself. The chapter shows how Sufism could both support and challenge political elites. Chapter 3 studies one of the most influential forms of religious expression that rise to prominence in Mongol Anatolia, Sufi brotherhoods known as futuwwa. The chapter argues that these brotherhoods were nurtured by political elites, including the Mongols, for whom their leaders acted as de facto local governors. At the same time the growing political and economic importance of futuwwa won it further adherents, and seems to have sparked both imitations among Anatolia’s Christian communities and to have acted as an incentive to convert.

The rise of Sufism as a social force is reflected in the production of a large number of Sufi texts, which, from the Mongol period, become increasingly written in Turkish, the new vernacular literary language of Anatolia that emerged at this time. Part Two examines the new literary production of Mongol Anatolia and the ways in which it reflects the religious and political changes of the period. Chapter 4 considers the emergence of Turkish as a literary language over the late thirteenth to fourteenth centuries in its political and social context; this process allowed the emergence of a vernacular literature that inculcated the basics of Islam and in particular stimulated a cultural environment that was hostile to unbelief and promoted a culture of jihad, as is argued in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 considers the impact of the rising interest in apocalypticism among Muslims in Mongol Anatolia, arguing that this should not, as has generally been done, be viewed as an expression of a popular Shiite religiosity, but rather as an expression of an elite Sunnism. Apocalypticism, which highlighted the requirement for true sharia law to be imposed as one of the signs of the approaching end, further promoted a Sunni religiosity that was hostile to non-Muslims. In short, I hope to show how Mongol domination unleashed a complex sequence of reactions in various areas of society – language, literature and religion – that contributed towards Anatolia becoming a distinctly less welcoming place for its Christian population, precipitating a much deeper degree of Islamisation of the peninsula than had been the case under Seljuq rule.
Part I

Religion, Politics and Society
The Formation of Islamic Anatolia

Crises of Legitimacy and the Struggle against Unbelief

Over the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Anatolia, previously a peripheral and isolated part of the dār al-Islām, started to resemble more closely its Muslim neighbours, as its Muslim population grew and its infrastructure of buildings such as mosques, madrasas and zāwiyyas (Sufi lodges) developed. Although the foundations for this development were laid under the Seljuqs, paradoxically, this process of Islamisation in Anatolia was deepened and extended under non-Muslim rule. With the hegemony of the pagan Mongols, many of the architectural and literary achievements that subsequently came to represent the apogee of Seljuq rule were undertaken, and investments by members of the Mongol bureaucracy and army as well as their allies in the puppet Seljuq administration transformed the face of Anatolian cities. Simultaneously, the Mongols were themselves subject to a parallel process of Islamisation, as Islam spread among the Mongol soldiery and upwards, until the Ilkhan Ghazan himself converted at the end of the thirteenth century. Precisely at this juncture, Anatolia began to become detached from the political orbit of the Ilkhanate, although culturally and economically it remained closely bound up with it, and the domination of Central Anatolia by a dynasty founded by a former Mongol commander, Eretna, continued until 783/1381. Towards the end of the fourteenth century, Anatolia’s political landscape changed as the Ottomans made substantial advances into Central Anatolia, even if these were temporarily set back by their defeat by the Central Asian conqueror Timur at the Battle of Ankara in 804/1402. In this chapter I offer an overview of the Mongol impact on Anatolia, paying particular attention to two developments that were to be decisive in shaping the intellectual landscape of the fourteenth century – the crisis of political legitimacy that Mongol rule precipitated and the introduction of a new political vocabulary based around the jihad against unbelief, which seems to have emerged in the context of Mongol rule. To assess the transformative impact of Mongol rule, it is
vital to understand what was there beforehand. I therefore start with a brief overview of political and intellectual life in Anatolia in the pre-Mongol period.

**ANATOLIA UNDER THE SELJUQS: THE EMERGENCE OF AN ISLAMIC SOCIETY**

The beginnings of Muslim rule in Anatolia are conventionally dated to the Battle of Manzikert in 463/1071 at which the forces of the Great Seljuq sultan Alp Arslan, ruler of Iran, Iraq and Central Asia, defeated the Byzantine Emperor Romanus IV Diogenes.\(^1\) For decades before the conquest, however, Turkish nomads originating from Central Asia had been penetrating and raiding far into Anatolia, which provided them with an ecology particularly suitable for their pastoralist lifestyle, in contrast to the aridity of much of the rest of the Middle East. This process of westwards migration by the Turks, which is scarcely documented in the sources, was gradual, and into the Mongol period the Turkish population of Anatolia was being augmented with new arrivals from the East.\(^2\) Over the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries various Turkish-ruled polities emerged in Anatolia, such as the Danishmendid dynasty that dominated north-central and south-eastern Anatolia, the Saltukids, based in Erzurum in north-eastern Anatolia, and the Mengücekids of Erzincan and Divriği. The most important were the Seljuqs of Anatolia, the foundation of whose state is dated to the capture of the Byzantine city of Nicaea in the west of the peninsula – not far from the region that would also be the birthplace of the Ottoman state – by Sulayman b. Qurlumush, a cousin of Alp Arslan, in 1081. Forced from Nicaea by the First Crusade in 1096, the Seljuqs then established themselves in Konya (Byzantine Iconium), located in south-central Anatolia. Konya would become the leading political and cultural centre of Muslim Anatolia and had a special importance for the Seljuqs as their dynastic burial ground.\(^3\) The archaeological
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record, which has admittedly only been inadequately exploited to date for this period, suggests that there was little widespread disruption; there is no consistent and unambiguous evidence for the large-scale destruction of settlements for instance. The disruption was, at least at first, political rather than social or economic.

Initially, the Turks probably comprised a minor element in the population, constituting the ruling elite along with their accompanying nomadic followers. The sources point to a gradual separation between the nomadic Turks, or Turkmen, and the Seljuq rulers, who had themselves originally been nomadic chiefs, even if the dynasty maintained some connection to the nomads well into the thirteenth century. Urban Iranian immigrants seem to have accompanied the invaders from the start, according to inscriptions from late eleventh-century Nicaea. Yet our knowledge of this period is poor. From the early period of Islam in Anatolia we have no local Arabic or Persian texts at all, nor even the names of lost works, and our knowledge of the eleventh and twelfth centuries is based almost entirely on sources produced by Christians in Greek, Armenian and Syriac. It might be reasonable to assume then that Muslim intellectual life was negligible or non-existent, but the situation differed in Anatolia’s eastern peripheries. Our oldest Islamic manuscript from Anatolia, al-Akhawayn al-Bukhari’s Hidayat al-Muta`allimin fi`l-Tibb, a Persian textbook on medicine, comes from the Saltukid principality of Erzurum, and the manuscript was dedicated to the Saltukid ruler Diya al-Din in 510/1116 (Plate 1). The Saltukid land was not just in close proximity to the Caucasian amirates, which, after Central Asia, were one of the birthplaces of New Persian literature, but was itself tributary to the Seljuq sultanate of Iraq, whose sultans’ names were mentioned on its coins in recognition of his suzerainty. Erzurum, then, may be in a rather different category from the Danishmendid and Seljuq states in Anatolia, which were not tributary to the Seljuq sultanate of Iraq – indeed, relations between the Anatolian Seljuqs and their cousins were distinctly frosty. Although the Danishmendids are claimed to
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4 See Philipp Niewöhner (ed.), The Archaeology of Byzantine Anatolia: From the End of Late Antiquity until the Coming of the Turks (New York, 2017).
5 Peacock, ‘Court and Nomadic Society’.
7 Süleymaniye, MS Fatih 3646.
9 On the Saltukids see Faruk Sümer, Selçuklular Devrinde Doğu Anadolu’dan Türk Beylikleri (Ankara, 1990), 15–45.
have founded the first madrasas in Niksar and Tokat, in the absence of epigraphic or textual support such a claim remains highly speculative.\(^{10}\)

From the middle of the twelfth century, Islamic culture started to develop in the Seljuq lands, in particular during the reign of Kılıç Arslan II (r. 551/1156–588/1192). Fragments of a palace in Konya from this period survive, while construction began on the town’s congregational mosque, the Ulu Cami.\(^{11}\) It is in the later twelfth century that we have our first evidence for original literary activity in Anatolia. At the court of Kılıç Arslan, a certain Hubaysh-i Tiflisi (d. c. 600/1204), whose nisba suggests he was an immigrant from Tbilisi, composed several works, mostly in Persian – on dream interpretation, medicine, a Persian-Arabic dictionary, the Qanun al-Adab and a Qur’anic commentary.\(^{12}\) He also composed works dealing with the Qur’anic sciences, the Kitab Talkhis ’ilal al-Qur’an,\(^{13}\) and the Persian Kitab Wujub al-Qur’an, based on earlier tafsīrs by Tha’alibi and Muqatil b. Sulayman, which survives in a single autograph copy made in Konya in 558/1163.\(^{14}\) Meanwhile, Ankara, which was the appanage of Kılıç Arslan’s son Muhyi al-Din, was home to a circle of Persian poets, a handful of whose rubā’iyāt have come down to us.\(^{15}\)

The intellectual centre of Anatolia in this period, to judge by extant works and manuscripts, was not Konya but further east.\(^{16}\) Perhaps the earliest extant work from Anatolia, an Arabic compendium on materia medica entitled Taqwīm al-ʿAdwīya, was composed by a Maghrebi scholar, Ibrahim b. Abī Saʿīd al-Maghribi al-ʿAla’i and dedicated to a minor Danishmendid prince, Dhu’l-Qarnayn b. ʿAyn al-Dawla (d. 557/1162), suggesting a probable place of composition of Malatya or Elbistan, the main centres of this branch of the dynasty.\(^{17}\) This work soon became

13 Süleymanıye, MS Laleli 69, fols 85b–87b; this appears to be a surviving fragment of a much larger work, written in Arabic, unlike Teflisi’s other works.
16 Mikail Bayram has claimed that the Kashf al-ʿAgabu, a cosmological treatise, was composed for the Danishmendid ruler Malik Ahmad Ghazi. It is true that the text does seem to have been composed at the behest of a ruler; the latter’s titles, but not names, are given by the author, a certain Ilyas b. Ahmad al-Qaysari, but there is no indication as to date, and nothing to definitively associate this work with a Danishmendid patron. See MS Fatih 4562, fols 244a–261b; also published in facsimile: Mikail Bayram, Anadolu’da Te’lif edilen ilk eser Kef el-Akabe (Konya, 1981).
very popular in the broader Muslim world. Slightly later, the Mengücekid principality of Erzincan seems to have become a centre of intellectual activity. A copy of Bal'ami’s tenth-century Persian translation of al-Tabari’s Arabic classic, the Ta’rikh al-Rusul wa’l-Muluk (‘History of Prophets and Kings’) was made for the library of the Mengücekid ruler Bahramshah b. Da’ud in 586/1190–1, while the great Persian poet Nizami (d. 605/1209) dedicated his Makhzan al-Asrar to Bahramshah, and the philosopher ‘Abd al-Latif al-Baghdadi spent a considerable amount of time in Erzincan. In the Saltukid domains a mathnawī attributed to Khaqani (d. 595/1199), Khatm al-Gara‘ib, was copied for Nasir al-Din Muhammad b. Saltuk in 593/1197. Thus both classic and contemporary literature and scholarship in Arabic and Persian was patronised by the Muslim courts of eastern Anatolia in the late twelfth century.

Over the later twelfth century, the Seljuqs gradually absorbed the Danishmendids, but otherwise their attentions were mainly directed at their western neighbour, Byzantium. Sultan Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw I managed to capture Antalya and waged war on the western frontier region along the Maeander Valley. This may reflect the interests of the nomadic Turks for whom the valley formed an important winter pasture, but the area had also attained a new importance after the foundation of the Byzantine successor state of the empire of Nicaea in the wake of the Fourth Crusade’s conquest of Constantinople in 1204. Ghiyath al-Din’s death in battle outside Alaşehir (Philadelphia) in 607/1210 brought a halt to large-scale Seljuq interventions in this region, and despite periodic clashes with the Turkmen, the frontier settled on the Maeander river until the second half of the thirteenth century. As in most Turkish Islamic states, there was no fixed rule determining the sultan’s successor, and on Ghiyath al-Din’s death his two sons, ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad and ‘Izz al-Din Kayka’us, fought a bitter war for the throne. With ‘Izz al-Din’s victory, expansion continued, with regular campaigns launched against the Cilician kingdom of Armenia and on the
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18 For mss see ibid., 71–2.
20 A mathnawi (Turkish mesnevi) is a long poem in rhyming couplets. When spelt with an initial capital, Mathnawi, it refers to the famous poem also known as the Mathnawi-yi Ma‘nawi by Jalal al-Din Rumi.
21 The suggestion found in some literature (Özgünelenli, ‘İstanbul Kütüphanelerinde Bulunan Farsça Yazmaların Öyküsi’, 9, n. 35) that another text destined for a Saltukid dedicatee was a collection of excerpts from the Shahnama seems to be erroneous, as the description of the text indicates it was written for the Great Seljuq Malikshah II b. Muhammad. See Wilhelm Pertsch, Die orientalischen Handschriften der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Gotha (Gotha, 1859), I, no. 48.
Syrian frontier with the Ayyubids. The greatest success was the conquest of the Black Sea port of Sinop in 611/1214, meaning that the Seljuq state gained control of the cross-Anatolian trade routes for the first time. New silver mines in Anatolia opened, silver being a metal in short supply in the rest of the eastern Mediterranean in the period, and the production of silver coinage in thirteenth-century Anatolia far exceeded that of any previous period.\textsuperscript{22} Taken together, these two developments meant that the Seljuqs now commanded much greater resources than before.

Another factor in the emergence of Seljuq Anatolia as a major power in the period was the collapse of the remnants of the Seljuq sultanate of Iraq with the death of Sultan Tughril III in 590/1194. Now only the dynasty in Konya could claim the prestigious mantle of being the heirs to the Great Seljuq empire of Iran and Central Asia, and this seems to have engendered a new confidence in a court that explicitly sought to adopt sophisticated Persian cultural models, as signified by the sultans’ use of regal names redolent of ancient Iranian legend as recorded in Firdawsi’s \textit{Shahnama}, such as Kaykhusraw, Kayka’us and Kayqubad. In the same period, Muhammad b. Ghazi of Malatya composed two edifying works for the court based on Iranian antecedents. His \textit{Rawdat al-‘Uqul}, a rewriting of the collection of edifying fables known as the \textit{Marzubannama}, was composed in an elaborate Persian prose and dedicated to Sultan Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw shortly after 597/1201. A few years later Malatyawi wrote the \textit{Barid al-Sa’ada}, a collection of enlightening stories for ‘Izz al-Din Kayka’us I, for whom he seems to have acted as tutor. Both these works represent attempts to adapt prestigious Iranian models for the Seljuq court in Rum, a trend continued by Rawandi, a Persian bureaucrat who had written a work of advice literature for the last Seljuq of Iran, Tughril III, the \textit{Rahat al-Sudur}. Rawandi rededicated the work to Sultan Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw I in 607/1210, claiming that in him the hopes of all the supporters of the Seljuq dynasty were fixed, although the work may also have been intended as a sort of job application for the post of \textit{nadīm} or boon companion, with the promise that Rawandi could acculturate the sultan to the ways of his distinguished relatives in Iran.\textsuperscript{23}

The new ambitions of the Seljuq court were symbolised by Sultan ‘Izz al-Din sending an embassy to Baghdad in the wake of his capture of Sinop to proclaim the victory and request formal investiture with rule of Rum from the Caliph.

\textsuperscript{22} Rudi Paul Lindner, \textit{Explorations in Ottoman Prehistory} (Ann Arbor, 2007), 88–9.

which he duly received. On 'Izz al-Din’s death, his brother and erstwhile rival, ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I (r. 616/1219–634/1237), acceded; he was recognised by posterity as the greatest of Seljuq sultans. His armies captured 'Ala'iyya (Alanya) on the Mediterranean coast, and absorbed most of the Mengücekid territories, although the latter dynasty held out in the remote outpost of Divriği at least into the middle of the thirteenth century. A further success was the defeat of the invading Khwarazmians under Jalal al-Din Khwarazmshah, the last ruler of the short-lived Khwarazmshah empire, at the Battle of Yassı Çimen near Erzincan in 627/1230. ‘Ala’ al-Din’s reign marked a period of centralisation, as the sultan sought to limit the power in the amirs who had played such an important role in the fighting over the succession. ‘Ala’ al-Din also invested in palace-building, creating the new palace-town of Kubadabad by the shores of Lake Beyşehir, and the Seljuq court became famous for its wealth and luxury. For later authors, ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad’s reign represented an ideal of good governance in the Perso-Islamic model. Ibn Bibi compared him to the Ghaznavid sultan Mahmud (d. 421/1030), a hero of Islamic legend, and the ruler-moralist Qabus b. Vushmgir (d. 402/1012), while he also praised the sultan’s reading of classics of religion and statecraft by Ghazzali and the famous Great Seljuq vizier Nizam al-Mulk:

[Kayqubad] spoke of the sultans of old with the most complete reverence and respect. He believed in the Islamic kings of the past, Sultan Yamin al-Dawla Amin al-Milla b. Sebüktegin (i.e. Mahmud of Ghazna) and Amir Shams al-Ma'ali Qabus b. Vushmgir. He imitated their virtues and never affixed his signature [to a document] without performing ritual ablutions. He constantly read the Kimya-yi Sā'adat [of Ghazzali] and the Siyar al-Muluk of Nizam al-Mulk.24

Over the early thirteenth century, increasing numbers of immigrants from the rest of the Muslim world made their way to Anatolia either in search of their fortune, attracted by the opportunities afforded by the ambitions of the court, or else fleeing the disruptions elsewhere in the Islamic world precipitated by the collapse of the Seljuqs of Iraq and the subsequent rise of the Khwarazmians and the Mongols. Bureaucrats, artisans and architects migrated to Konya and other cities that were developing under Seljuq rule, as did men of letters. The poet Qani’i from Tus in Khurasan composed a large verse Saljuqnama for Kayqubad that is now lost to us, one of the few indications we have of a tradition of historical and panegyric literature in pre-Mongol Seljuq Anatolia.25

24 Ibn Bibi, al-Awamir al-'Ala'iyya (Ankara), 228; (Tehran), 217.
25 On Qani’i see Dhabihallah Safa, Tarikh-i Adabiyyat dar Iran (Tehran, 1382), vol. 3/1, 487–506; Charles Melville, ‘The Early Persian Historiography of Anatolia’, 144; Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, The Seljuks of Anatolia: Their History and Culture According to Local Muslim Sources (Salt Lake City,
Among these migrants were several famous Sufis who made Anatolia their home in this period, such as Ibn ‘Arabi, Najm al-Din Razi and Baha’ al-Din Walad, father of Jalal al-Din Rumi. Ibn ‘Arabi (d. 638/1240) had close links with the Seljuq sultans, writing an epistle of advice to Sultan ‘Izz al-Din Kayka’us, for whom Ibn ‘Arabi’s son-in-law Majd al-Din Ishaq had served as ambassador to the Caliph.26 Although Anatolia was just one of the many locations throughout the Middle East in which the peripatetic Ibn ‘Arabi resided for a while, his Anatolian connection had a particularly profound influence through his disciple Sadr al-Din al-Qunawi, Majd al-Din’s son. Al-Qunawi, as his name suggests, was a resident of Konya, who wrote in both Arabic and Persian and was the leading exponent of Ibn ‘Arabi’s ideas to subsequent generations.27 Another influential Sufi who made his way to Konya in this period was Abu Hafs ‘Umar Suhrawardi (d. 632/11234), who inducted Kayqubad into the Sufi order of futuwwa that was being supported by the Baghdad Caliph al-Nasir as a way to build links with regional rulers and enhance his own authority, as we will discuss further in Chapter 3.

The activities of such migrants, whether their stay in Anatolia was short term (as for Suhrawardi) or permanent (as for Baha’ al-Din Walad) serve to enhance Anatolia’s integration into the broader Islamic world. Yet not every immigrant met with success, as can be seen from the fate of the Khurasani Najm al-Din Razi (d. 654/1256).28 Razi first sought his fortune at ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad’s court, where he had been encouraged to direct himself by Suhrawardi, whom he had met en route. It seems from Najm al-Din’s own account that his Mirsad al-Ibad, a book of Sufi advice for rulers, did not find favour with the sultan. The reasons for this are opaque, and Razi subsequently wrote a more traditional ‘mirror for princes’ for the Mengücekid Bahramshah. The latter survives only in a single manuscript, as is typical of the limited circulation of many works destined for a court audience. Indeed, the Mirsad al-Ibad circulated most widely not in the version dedicated to Kayqubad, but in an earlier recension dedicated to ‘a group of Sufis’; it was in this form that it subsequently became one of the most widely read and influential works on Sufism in medieval Anatolia, and was translated in Turkish in the fifteenth century.29

1992), 15–18. There was also a now lost epic poem written by a Nizam al-Din Ahmad Arzinjani, whom Ibn Bibi praises as second only to Firdawsi. Ibn Bibi, al-Awamir al-‘Ala’iyya ( Ankara), 202; (Tehran), 194.

MAP 3 Anatolia in the early thirteenth century
The fate of Razi’s Mirsad suggests the emergence of groups beyond the court who were an audience for textual production. In addition to those interested in Sufism, there seems to have been a growing audience of men who needed a grounding in the principles of Islamic law and had enough Arabic to read texts in them. Two works by eastern émigrés became especially popular, the compendia of fiqh by Yusuf b. Sa’d al-Sijistani (fl. 638/1240) and al-Ghazmini (d. 658/1260). Al-Sijistani’s Munyat al-Mufti (Plate 2), composed in Sivas in 638/1240, was intended as a travelling compendium for jurists to allow them to dispense with carrying lots of books, suggesting the spread of Islamic law in Anatolia. In addition, works from Central Asia became increasingly popular, such as the Sharh Adab al-Qadi of al-Sadr al-Shahid, a manual of fiqh. Easterners played an especially important role in the production of texts in Anatolia, as one important factor that it shared with these regions, but which distinguished it from Iran and the Levant, was an adherence to Hanafism, the prevalent legal school of Central Asia. Nonetheless, relatively few manuscripts even of these works that in later times were widely disseminated survive from before the mid-thirteenth century.

By the fourth decade of the thirteenth century, the main cities of Anatolia must have started to look increasingly familiar to visitors from elsewhere in the Islamic world. Ormented with mosques and madrasas, there was an infrastructure of qadis and ‘ulama’, and a literate elite that was interested in Sufism. Persian would have been the principal means of written, and in many urban areas also oral, communication (see Chapter 4, pp. 172–3), while the cosmopolitan as well as Islamic character of Anatolia was reinforced by the numerous migrants to whom the region gave shelter. Yet despite ‘Ala’ al-Din’s tremendous reputation in later times, the first signs of trouble were already apparent. His defeat of the Khwarazmians presaged several problems that would plague Anatolia after Kayqubad’s death. While the Seljuqs attempted to absorb Jalal al-Din’s defeated soldiers into their state, they only had limited success, and disaffected Khwarazmian soldiery played a major role in the Baba’i rebellion that shook the sultanate under ‘Ala’ al-Din’s successor Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw II. Moreover, towards the end of ‘Ala’ al-Din’s reign, in 634/1236, the first Mongol emissaries

arrived in Anatolia, demanding Seljuq submission. Kayqubad consented to accept *il* or subject status, doubtless mindful of the fate of those who opposed the Mongols, but died before his embassy to present his allegiance the Great Khan Ögödei could set off.\(^{33}\)

The sources are notably hostile towards Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw II, who acceded the Seljuq throne in 634/1237, and is accused of having poisoned his father. Mongol raids continued on the peripheries of Anatolia, in northern Iraq and the Caucasus,\(^{34}\) but the Seljuqs do not seem to have felt especially threatened, concentrating their efforts on expanding towards Syria at the expense of their Ayyubid rivals. The first disaster of Ghiyath al-Din’s ill-fated reign was the massive rebellion in 638/1240 of a religious leader, Baba İlyas, himself another migrant from Khurasan, which is discussed in more detail in Chapter 6. This revolt, attracting support from the Turkmen, was eventually crushed, but severely destabilised the Seljuq state. In 639/1242 a raid led by the general Baiju, sent by Batu Khan of the Golden Horde, the Mongol state that controlled the northern Black Sea steppes, briefly seized Erzurum; although Baiju retreated, the weaknesses in Seljuq defences must have been apparent. The next year Baiju was back, with a larger army. At Kösedag near Sivas, Baiju inflicted a humiliating defeat on the Seljuq army, and Ghiyath al-Din fled the field to save his skin.\(^{35}\) This time the Mongols stayed.

**ANATOLIA UNDER MONGOL RULE**

With Ghiyath al-Din’s retreat, it was left to his officials to make what terms they could. Anatolia was required to pay a hefty tribute to Batu Khan, who otherwise largely left the region to its own devices. Despite the heavy financial burden, Anatolia still appeared admirably prosperous to outside observers; evidently the damage done by Baiju’s invasion was limited.\(^{36}\) The Seljuq dynasty was maintained in office, although real power now lay with their officials who had picked up the pieces abandoned by Ghiyath al-Din and collaborated with the


Mongol regime. From Kösedağ until the 1270s, the most influential men in Anatolia were these men who were nominally Seljuq officials, but who owed their positions to their alliances with the Mongols — Shams al-Din Isfahani, Jalal al-Din Karatay, Fakhr al-Din ‘Ali and Mu’in al-Din Sulayman the Pervane. Struggling with one another for authority, they sought the backing of rival factions at the Mongol **ordu**, the court-camp that was the source of real power, and they promoted rival candidates for the position of Seljuq sultan of Anatolia, with the result that at one stage no fewer than three members of the dynasty claimed to be sultan. Numismatic evidence suggests on occasion considerable confusion as to who the Seljuq sultan actually was. It was these powerful officials who became the main patrons of architecture, underlining the broad irrelevance of the sultans.

As Baiju had been dispatched by Batu, Anatolia originally formed part of the Golden Horde, the descendants of Chinggis’s son Jochi, whose territories stretched across the Black Sea steppe as far as Transoxiana. Although both the western and south-eastern extremities of the Horde’s territories were subsequently lost to rivals within the Chinggisid house, with most of Central Asia reverting to the descendants of Chinggis Khan’s son Chaghatay and Anatolia being taken over by the Ilkhans, Anatolia retained enduring cultural links with the Horde and Central Asia, as part of a common Turkish-speaking world that adhered to the Hanafi legal school.

Anatolia’s Mongol overlords changed after the Great Khan Möngke appointed his brother Hülegü as ruler in the west at a **quriltai** in 1251. Hülegü did not set out from Mongolia until 1253, accompanied by a vast army, and in 1255 Batu Khan died. Batu’s successor, Berke, found himself at odds with Hülegü, who established a new de facto state based in Iran, the Ilkhanate. One of Hülegü’s first acts was to order Baiju to reconquer Anatolia, this time in his own name. Hülegü’s immense forces also required Baiju’s traditional pasturelands in the Caucasus for their own use, forcing him to seek new ones in Anatolia. Baiju was thus accompanied by a mass migration of his followers, and for the first time a substantial Mongol presence was established in Anatolia, although it is unclear in what numbers they remained after Baiju’s demise.

---

Anatolia obtained a new importance as a crucial frontier region between the Ilkhanate and their great enemies, the Mamluks of Syria and Egypt; the Golden Horde, did not, however, completely relinquish an interest in Anatolian affairs, urging their Mamluk allies to support the Seljuq sultan ‘Izz al-Din Kayka’us II, who eventually fled Anatolia and took refuge in first Byzantium, then Crimea, which was subject to the Horde.43 ‘Izz al-Din’s brother, Rukn al-Din Kılıç Arslan IV, who became sultan in 659/1261, seems to have been more closely associated with the Ilkhanid camp that actually controlled Anatolia, and his installation as ruler has been described as marking the end of the Seljuq sultanate’s aspirations for independence.44 In 664/1266 he was deposed by the Pervane, Mu’in al-Din Sulayman, who exercised effective power in the period from 659/1261 to 676/1277, and replaced by the infant Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw III. Although in theory the Pervane was responsible for approving the text of firman (the orders of the sultan), in the Ilkhanid system he functioned as a Mongol agent, representing Ilkhanid interests at the Seljuq court and thus wielding great power.45 In addition, the Mongols operated a parallel Mongol military administration in Anatolia.

In the midst of the collapse of the Seljuq sultanate as a serious political force, the Turkmen chief Muhammad Beg of Denizli sought to establish an independent principality, the first of the so called beyliks, as the Mamluk chronicler Baybars al-Mansuri recounts:

[In 659/1261] ... Sultan ‘Izz al-Din fled in defeat [at the hands of the Mongols] to Constantinople ... and his brother inherited his kingdom except for the frontiers, mountains and coastline which were in the hands of the Turkmen. The latter resisted giving allegiance to sultan Rukn al-Din [IV]; their leaders (kubara’uhum) were Muhammad Beg and his brother Ilyas Beg and his relative by marriage ‘Ali Beg and his kinsman Sevinj. They sent to Hülegü offering him obedience, and tribute, and asking from him to send a banner [sanjaq] and a decree [firmân] with their investment, as well as a shihna to reside with them. He agreed to this, and sent them a shihna named Qulshar, and wrote for them a decree investing them with the land they controlled, which was Denizli, Honaz, Talamani (Dalaman), and their surroundings ... [In 660/1262] Hülegü sent to Muhammad Beg the chief [amir] of the Turkmen in Anatolia, summoning him to the ordu. [Muhammad Beg] refused and did not go. Hülegü then sent an order to Sultan Rukn al-Din and the Mongols in Anatolia to go and fight Muhammad Beg and the Turkmen who were with him. His relative ‘Ali Beg betrayed him, and went to Sultan Rukn al-Din and strengthened the latter’s resolve to fight the Turkmen. He showed him their weak points and the entry points to their country ... [the Turkmen under Muhammad Beg are defeated] ... and ‘Ali

43 On Golden Horde backing for ‘Izz al-Din see Amitai-Preiss, Mongols and Mamluks, 159.
45 The most detailed study remains Nejat Kaymaz, Pervane Muinüddin Suleyman (Ankara, 1970); also Turan, Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye, 505–57.
Beg was established as chief over the Turkmen [amīrān ʿālā l-Turkmān] and the Mongols ruled those border lands up to the extremity of Istanbul.46

As Baybars al-Mansuri makes clear, the Mongols enjoyed an ambiguous relationship with the Turkmen. While Muhammad Beg evidently sought independence from the Seljuqs, he also required recognition of his authority from the Ilkhan and even the posting of an Ilkhanid agent (shihna) to legitimise his rule. Meanwhile, the Mongols sought to use their Seljuq henchmen to manage this frontier area, which was not, however, completely devoid of Mongol authority. In many frontier towns such as Eskişehir, Mongol or Seljuq officials invested heavily in building pious constructions, and in fact in this period these formerly peripheral regions became ever more closely integrated into Muslim Anatolia.47 At the same time, Mongol rule evidently provoked large scale dislocations of the nomadic Turkmen population.48

Despite the political convulsions, intellectual life continued to flourish at least in Konya, where Jalal al-Din Karatay and Fakhr al-Din ‘Ali (known to later generations as Sahib Ata) built madrasas, and Shams al-Din Isfahani patronised literature. A far greater number of manuscripts from Anatolia survive from the second half of the thirteenth century than the first. Despite the diminished importance of the Seljuq court, it continued to attract men of learning from abroad. The famous logician Siraj al-Din Urnawi, who had been working for the Ayyubids, found employment at the court of ‘Izz al-Din in 655/1257, serving as qadi and occasional ambassador, and dedicating a Persian ‘mirror for princes’, the Latayif al-Hikma, to the sultan.49 A wider literary and cultural circle also began to form outside the auspices of the court, in connection with Sufism. Sadr al-Din

al-Qunawi, as Ibn ‘Arabi’s leading disciple and interpreter, attracted scholars from across the Middle East to study with him in Konya, including the Persian poets Sa’id al-Din Farghani and Fakhr al-Din ’Iraqi. Al-Qunawi also maintained a correspondence with the leading Ilkhanid intellectual, Nasir al-Din Tusi. At the same time, Jalal al-Din Rumi was active in Konya, composing his Mathnawi, the great verse collection of moralistic and edifying Sufi stories. These Sufis were also intimately connected to political life, and Rumi’s letters show how he relied on the Pervane and other leading figures for financial support for himself and his followers. Even Sadr al-Din al-Qunawi is reported to have played a role in politics, mediating between the rival Seljuq sultans ‘Izz al-Din Kayka’us and Rukn al-Din. Intellectual life and politics were thus intertwined even when literary figures were not reliant on patronage.

This period was remembered by the fourteenth-century historian of Mongol Anatolia, Aqsara’i, as the zenith of Seljuq intellectual life. When in 672/1273 both Jalal al-Din Rumi and Nasir al-Din Tusi died, ‘the benefits of his correspondence and compositions were cut off from Anatolia and other parts of the world’; the following year, 673/1274, al-Qunawi also passed away. Aqsara’i links the loss of these leading intellectuals to the political disasters that beset Anatolia in the next few years.

When the affairs of Rum were about to change, first heavenly decree removed by their death the blessing of the ‘ulama’ and shaykhs whose knowledge and ritual practice was rooted in true belief, and expunged the legend ‘blessings are with your elders’ from the page of Islam. After that [Rum] was beset by disasters and calamities.

The main reason for the ominous atmosphere was the intensification of Mongol interest in Anatolia. After 669/1271, Samaghar was joined by a member of the Ilkhanid family itself, the Ilkhan Abaqa’s younger brother Eijei, who acted as the Ilkhan’s personal representative. The tensions between the Pervane and this parallel administration seem to have been one of the factors that pushed Mu’in al-Din Sulayman to enter into a treacherous correspondence with the Mamluk sultan Baybars. In 675/1277 Baybars invaded, briefly occupying Kayseri, while simultaneously his Turkmen allies in south-central Anatolia, the Karamanids,
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rebelled. The Karamanids seized Konya in support of an individual named Jimri whom they put on the throne, claiming him to be a member of the Seljuq dynasty. The Ilkhan Abaqa responded by invading Anatolia, and Mongol control of the region was restored and tightened. The minister Shams al-Din Muhammad Juwayni (d. 683/1284) was appointed to regulate the affairs of the province. Juwayni seems to have been responsible for increasing the Iranian influences in the administration of Rum, which were reinforced by his successor in charge of the civilian bureaucracy there, Fakhr al-Din Qazwini, who appointed ‘innumerable Tabrizis, Hamadanis, ‘Iraqis, Khushkanis, Khurasanis, Georgians, Alans, Marandis, Nakhjawanis, Tiflis and Arranis’. As a result, Anatolia was drawn more closely into contact with Iranian intellectual and literary life. The Anatolian poet Sayf al-Din Farghani addressed numerous poems to his famous contemporary Sa’di of Shiraz, and it was most likely Juwayni who appointed a friend, the noted scholar and astronomer Qutb al-Din Shirazi (d. 710/1310), to the office of qadi in Sivas at around this date; Shirazi had already spent time in Anatolia studying with Sadr al-Din al-Qunawi. Juwayni was a major literary patron, and brought with him in his entourage the well-known poet Humam-i Tabrizi, to whom he granted a pension out of the revenues of Rum. The well-known Sufi poet Fakhr al-Din ‘Iraqi also received Juwayni’s patronage.

Anatolia’s importance was connected not just to its strategic position as a borderland with the Mamluks, and its provision of the pastures vital for the Mongol military machine, but also its immense wealth. A third of vizier Rashid al-Din’s personal property was in Anatolia, Erzincan formed part of the personal property of Abaqa Khan, while the powerful Juwayni brothers also had major investments in the province, as exemplified by the Çifte Minareli Medrese in Sivas built on Shams al-Din’s orders, one of the most architecturally important buildings of medieval Anatolia to survive (Fig. 1.1).
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Trade played a major part in the region’s prosperity, and the main Ilkhanid imperial highway stretched from Tabriz through Erzurum, Erzincan and Konya to the Mediterranean, while Anatolia was also, as mentioned above, home to rich silver mines. It is against this background that we can understand the keen interest in the geography of Anatolia shown by Arghun, Abaqa’s successor, as the Ilkhanid historian Rashid al-Din describes:

FIG. 1.1 Shams al-Din Juwayni’s Çifte Minareli Medrese at Sivas. Photograph by Peter J. Lu, courtesy of Special Collections, Fine Arts Library, Harvard University

63 Ibid., 54. For a somewhat dated survey of the economic situation, although one which has yet to be superseded entirely, see Zeki Validi Togan, ‘Economic Conditions in Anatolia in the Mongol Period’, trans. Gary Leiser, Annales Islamologiques 25 (1991): 203–40; on trade see also Blessing, Rebuilding Anatolia, 173–9; Trépanier, Foodways and Daily Life, 46–8.
Qutb al-Din Shirazi arrived [in the khan’s presence] and showed him a map of the western sea, its gulfs and the coasts that comprise most of the western province. The sultan very much enjoyed talking with him when he explained the province of Rum; meanwhile, the eye of the sultan fell on Amorium, which is in Rum, and he ordered Shirazi to describe it.64

Arghun built a palace at Aladağ to the north of lake Van, where he would spend most of the summer, and which was later used by the Ilkhan Geikhatu.65 Thus Ilkhans regularly passed in close proximity to Anatolia on their itineraries and were intimately involved in its affairs, belying the province’s alleged status as the Mongols’ ‘Wild West’. Arghun even married a Seljuq princess, the daughter of Sultan Rukn al-Din Kılıç Arslan.66

Emblematic of this growing entanglement of Ilkhanids and Anatolia is the main chronicle of Seljuq Anatolia, Ibn Bibi’s al-Awamir al-‘Ala’iyya fi’l-Awamir al-‘Ala’iyya, dedicated to ‘Ala’ al-Din ‘Ata’ Malik Juwayni, governor of Baghdad and brother of Shams al-Din. Purporting to be a chronicle of the Seljuqs, in fact the work idolises ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I, presenting him as an exemplary ruler; but at the same time the work may also have been intended to present the argument for preserving the Seljuq sultanate, now viewed by many Ilkhanid officials as a breeding ground of trouble in the wake of the rebellions of 675/1277.67 Yet the real problems for the post-675/1277 Ilkhanid administration of Anatolia came not from the Seljuq court, but from the peripheries, where many Turkmen remained in a more or less permanent state of rebellion against Ilkhanid rule. The Ilkhans’ most significant enemies were the Karamanids of south-central Anatolia, who posed a constant threat to the old Seljuq capital of Konya. The chaos was compounded by the incompetence of the Mongol civil governor of Anatolia, Fakhr al-Din Qazwini, but the posting of Arghun’s brother Geikhatu to Anatolia in 1284 eventually restored some stability. Geikhatu regarded Anatolia as a personal power base, but he also seems to have been genuinely popular there. Yet when Geikhatu became Ilkhan on Arghun’s death in 690/1291, this relationship with Anatolia was a destabilising factor. Fractions within the Ilkhanate resented the prominence of Anatolians in the Ilkhan’s entourage, while the eruption of further Turkmen rebellions in the province meant Geikhatu was immediately forced to return and wage a brutal but ultimately futile campaign to suppress them.68
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The accession of Ghazan in 694/1295 marks a definitive change in the nature of the Ilkhanate. His path to power having been supported by prominent Muslims in the Mongol military, Ghazan himself converted to Islam and the Ilkhanate became a Muslim state. This is also generally regarded as a period of centralisation and consolidation of Ilkhanid control, yet in Anatolia chaos prevailed. Melville, following Faruk Sümer, argues that Ghazan’s reign marks the nadir of Ilkhanid rule in Anatolia, as Mongol commanders started to see it as ‘a place to make or restore their fortunes’. Many had long-standing family and personal connections to Anatolia, and they may have increasingly identified themselves as Anatolian. The Seljuq sultan Mas’ud, implicated in the revolt of the amir Baltu of the Mongol Jalayir tribe, was deposed in 697/1297 and replaced by his nephew ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad III. A more serious threat to Ilkhanid authority was the rebellion in 698/1298 of Baiju’s Muslim grandson and governor of Rum, Sülemish, who sought and received recognition from the Mamluks as their vassal. The leading Mongol amir Chopan was sent to defeat Sülemish, but the process of Anatolia’s gradual detachment from Ilkhanid control continued. The increasing weakness of Mongol authority is also suggested by the proliferation of mints in the year 699/1299, which may represent Ghazan’s attempt to buy Turkmen support by sharing the profits of silver coinage with them. At the same time, the value of Anatolian coins diverged from that of Iranian issues, indicating the continuing lack of integration of Anatolia in the Ilkhanate.

The defeat of Sülemish was followed by a lull in the cycle of revolt, and as a result the early years of the fourteenth century are poorly documented; Wing believes that Chopan continued to rule Anatolia ‘almost as an autonomous principality’. This collapse in central authority seems to be reflected in the proliferation of imitation coins in this period. The Seljuq sultanate was

---
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increasingly irrelevant even as a form of political legitimacy, and when the last sultan, Ghiyath al-Din Mas’ud II, died in 708/1308, the Mongols seem simply to have decided not to replace him. This was in keeping with the policy of centralisation that obtained across the Ilkhanate: local dynasties in Iran also disappear around this time. Yet the problem of the Turkmen was never resolved. At the slightest sign of weakness, the Karamanids were able to capture Konya, which they did repeatedly. In 714/1314, the Ilkhan Öljeytü dispatched Chopan to reimpose Ilkhanid authority, suggesting that its assertion after the Sülemish revolt had been short lived. Chopan managed to summon the leading Turkmen chiefs to offer allegiance; Aqsara’i lists as the chiefs who attended Chopan at Karanbük and showed their obedience Falak al-Din Dündar from Burghlu (Uluborlu), the Eshrefids from Gorgorum (Beyşehir), the grandsons of the Seljuq vizier Fakhr al-Din who controlled Karahisar Develi (Afyonkarahisar), the Germiyanids of Kütahya and the Candarid Süleyman Pasha from Kastamonu, none of whom had previously recognised Ilkhanid authority. The striking absence of the Ottomans from this list suggests that they were considered too insignificant to count. According to Aqsara’i, only the Karamanids refused to attend, but were chastened by Chopan’s forces; however, as soon as Chopan left, the Karamanids recaptured Konya, suggesting the enduring limitations of Ilkhanid authority.77

With the accession of the infant Abu Sa’id as Ilkhan in 716/1316, Chopan became the strongman of the Ilkhanate, and appointed his son Timurtash as governor of Anatolia. Timurtash would follow in the trajectory of so many other Mongol amirs, rebelling in 723/1323. Nonetheless, the weakness of the Ilkhan’s hand and the leading role of Chopan was such that Timurtash had to be forgiven, and reinstated. Timurtash prosecuted vigorous but ultimately unsuccessful campaigns against the Turkmen, but on the fall of his protector, his father, in 727/1327, he fled to the Mamluk sultanate where he was initially received as an honoured guest. Yet, suspected of having designs on the Mamluk sultanate itself, Timurtash was soon murdered at the Mamluk sultan’s behest.78

THE AGE OF ERETNA AND THE BEYLIKS

The exile and death of Timurtash marks a growing dissociation of Anatolia from Iran. Although power shifted back to Abu Sa’id after Chopan’s death, in Anatolia
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the Ilkhan’s influence continued to weaken. Shaykh Hasan Jalayir, a member of the Mongol tribe of the Jalayirids and a cousin of Abu Sa’id as well as Chopan’s son in law, replaced Timurtash as governor of Anatolia, where he set about establishing a power base. However, Shaykh Hasan was soon deeply immersed in politics in Iran, and he deputed the governorship to one of Timurtash’s officers, Eretna.\(^\text{79}\) Initially Eretna was thus an Ilkhanid governor, but as the Ilkhanate collapsed with the death of Abu Sa’id in 736/1335, he established himself as an effectively independent ruler, who, with his descendants, dominated Central Anatolia in the mid-fourteenth century, holding sway over Kayseri, Niğde, Sivas, Ankara and at times Erzincan.\(^\text{80}\) Although Eretna is identified as a Uighur, he seems to have emphasised his continuity with Mongol traditions of governance and to have relied for support on the substantial nomadic Mongol population of Central Anatolia.\(^\text{81}\) Mongols, referred to as the Qara Tatars in the sources, retained a distinctive identity in Anatolia until at least the end of the fourteenth century.\(^\text{82}\) One source describes these Mongols as comprising in the late fourteenth century a ‘huge, all-encompassing number’ (al-jamm al-ghafîr), and other sources give the figures of them having between 30,000, 60,000 or even 100,000 tents.\(^\text{83}\) If we use the conventional estimate that on average each tent would have housed five people, this gives a Mongol population of Central Anatolia of between 150,000 to half a million at the end of the fourteenth century.\(^\text{84}\) When Timur invaded, he sought to gain the loyalty of Anatolia’s Mongols by reminding them of their presently reduced status since the death of Eretna, ‘the last of your kings’, again suggesting Eretna’s close identification with the Mongols whatever his own ethnic origins.\(^\text{85}\) Nonetheless, other sources point to acute tensions between Eretna and his successors on the one hand and the Mongol chiefs within their territories on the other, persisting until the end of the

\(^{79}\) Wing, Jalayirids, 79.


\(^{85}\) Ibn Arabshah, \(Aja’ib al-Maqdûr,\) 321.
dynasty. Eventually, the Qara Tatars seem to have been deported to Transoxiana by Timur.

The Diyarbakır region was also heavily populated by the Oirat Mongol tribe, and was ruled by another Mongol family, the Sutayids, until the 750s/1350s, after which some of their supporters accepted Turkmen rule and others joined the Eretnids. Parts of Eastern Anatolia were under the control of the Jalayirids, a third Mongol family, but after the 1330s they were relatively rarely involved in Central Anatolian affairs. In the west and on the coasts, most regions were under the control of various Turkmen beyliks, although in Cilicia and Trebizond Christian kingdoms remained: the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia survived to 1375, while Trebizond outlasted Byzantium, falling to the Turks only in 866/1461. Byzantium gradually lost its outposts in Bithynia to the Ottomans in the early fourteenth century, with Bursa falling in 726/1326, but Philadelphia, near the Aegean, remained under Greek control until 1390.

Fourteenth-century Anatolia thus presents an extremely politically fragmented picture, so much so that even contemporaries were confused. The Mamluk author al-'Umari, who got his information about Anatolia from two different informants, one Anatolian and the other a Genoese merchant who had done business there, variously reported that there were eleven and sixteen different Turkmen kingdoms. One standard modern reference source enumerates twenty different beyliks; but in fact the question of what should be counted is a ‘beylik’ – a modern term not found in the primary sources – is far from clear. For instance, although the Sutayids of Diyarbakır are rarely counted as a ‘beylik’, there is little to distinguish them from the other polities. Meanwhile, within the Eretnid territories, Kayseri was ruled by a chief named Junayd who was reliant on Mongol soldiery, although it is unclear whether he himself was a Mongol, and has thus been described as a ‘Mongol beylik’. Indeed, the area that the Eretnid ‘state’ covered comprised at least ten other mini-‘beyliks’. Such a situation obtained
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91 Paul, ‘Mongol Aristocrats’, 152.
even on the peripheries still under Greek control. Byzantine-controlled Philadelphia in south-western Anatolia has been described as a ‘Greek emirate’; while the complex situation in the fourteenth-century empire of Trebizond, which was subject to large-scale seasonal Turkmen migrations, has been characterised as follows:

Two states (or rather the empire of Trebizond and a nest of emirates) could coexist on the same territory . . . in the absence of any major Turkmen leader or confederacy, the Grand Komnenos [the ruler of Trebizond] himself could assume a double role. At times, it is no exaggeration to say that he was simultaneously a Byzantine emperor and a Turkmen melik of a group of small emirates which he had a hand in creating. It is difficult to suggest how this situation can be depicted in a historical atlas, for Trapezuntines and Turkmens were doing different things on the same land, which they could equally claim.

The major Turkmen beylikS were, other than the Karamanids (c. 654/1256–880/1475) in south-central Anatolia, the Aydinids (708/1308–829/1426) on the Aegean coastal region, the Chobanids (prob. 680s/1280s–708/1309) and Candarids (691/1292–866/1462) in northern Anatolia, and the Germiyanids (c. 699/1299–832/1428) in western Anatolia. On the peripheries were the Ottomans, who first emerge into the light of history in the early fourteenth century, but whose early years are attested only by much later sources, with the exception of brief mentions in Ibn Battuta and al-‘Umari and occasional references in Greek sources. Despite the concentration in modern historiography on the Ottomans, the latter were far from being seen as the most important beylik even in the mid-fourteenth century. Al-‘Umari recounts that ‘The ruler of Germiyan is the greatest of the rulers of the Turks, and has control over all the others’, although admittedly, Ibn Battuta describes the second Ottoman ruler Orhan (r. 724/1324–761/1360) as ‘the greatest of the Turkmen kings, the richest and possessing of the most land and armies’. Even in the second half of the fourteenth century Germiyan, and to a lesser extent Aydin, were home to the most impressive courts where the early masters of Turkish literature wrote. It was only under Murad I (761/1360–791/1389) and especially the reign of Bayezid I (791/1389–804/1402) that the Ottomans began to expand substantially into
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94 I have largely drawn these dates from Bosworth, The New Islamic Dynasties, but it should be noted that the foundation dates are often very tendentious.
95 Al-‘Umari, Masalik, III, 244.
Anatolia, an expansion that was halted by Bayezid’s defeat at the Battle of Ankara by Timur in 804/1402. Although Timur briefly reconstituted some of the beyliks that Bayezid had abolished, such as Karaman, he had no interest in permanently occupying Anatolia, and the Ottomans were able to revive their power during the early fifteenth century with astonishing success, culminating in Mehmed the Conqueror’s conquest of Constantinople in 857/1453. The Ottomans had some competition in the east from the Aqquyunlu (798/1396–914/1508), another minor beylik that by the late fourteenth century had turned into a major power, then an empire, and from the Safavids, who traced their origins to a Mongol-era Sufi order based in Ardabil in Iran that intermarried with the Aqquyunlu and by the late fifteenth century were themselves seeking worldly power. By the early sixteenth century the Ottomans had absorbed or vanquished their rivals, even if they did not command the unquestioning support of all their subjects.

In short, throughout Anatolia, local lords, some of Turkmen, some of Mongol descent, and occasionally Greeks and Armenians, controlled varying amounts of often overlapping and sometimes seasonally changing territory. Although geography, environment and demography gave different regions of Anatolia distinct characteristics, some features can be discerned across the peninsula. Throughout Anatolia, the Turkmen seasonally migrated between pastures irrespective of the nominal political power, just as they had in the thirteenth century, and on occasion our sources allude to clashes over grazing rights resulting from these migrations. In the main towns, Islam was playing an ever more important part in occupying the public space, as both begs and members of the Mongol elite adorned towns with zāwiyas, their favoured form of architectural patronage. Guild-like fraternities known as futuwwa played a major role in social, economic and religious life across Muslim Anatolia, as we will discuss further in Chapter 3.

98 On the Aqquyunlu see John E. Woods, *The Aqquyunlu: Clan, Confederation, Empire* (Salt Lake City, 1999 [2nd ed.]).
MAP 4 Anatolia in the late fourteenth century, showing major beyliks
The countryside was dominated by fortresses, whose lords frequently switched allegiance.\textsuperscript{101} Trade passed freely across Anatolia, even between Mongol-controlled parts and their Mamluk rivals. The settlement of Gümüş, for instance, famous for the mines from which it took its name, was frequented by merchants from both Ilkhanid Iraq and Mamluk Syria even though it was in the Ilkhanid zone.\textsuperscript{102} Economically, Anatolia maintained an important role on the trade routes as one of the main conduits between the Mamluk lands and the Dasht-i Qipchaq (the northern Black Sea steppe) from which the supplies of slaves on which the Mamluks relied came; horses were also exported to Egypt via Kastamonu.\textsuperscript{103}

It seems that the beyliks were reliant above all for their prosperity from trade with the east, the Ilkhanid lands.\textsuperscript{104} The silk trade probably formed a major part of this; in Izmir, Ibn Battuta recounts that he was bestowed silk robes by the local Aydinid ruler that were manufactured in Baghdad, Tabriz, Nishapur and China, indicating the extent of Anatolia’s international trade connections;\textsuperscript{105} while he also mentions that carpets from Aksaray were exported to Syria, Egypt, Iraq, India, China and ‘the lands of the Turks’, meaning Central Asia.\textsuperscript{106} At the same time, routes for European merchants to the heart of the Mongol world lay through Anatolia too: the Genoese merchant Pegolotti describes a route from Cilician Armenia through Anatolia to Tabriz. Anatolia, despite its political fragmentation, thus served as a bridge between Europe, the Middle East and Central Asia.\textsuperscript{107} Nonetheless, not all was rosy. Several towns are mentioned by Ibn Battuta as ruined: Izmir, for example,\textsuperscript{108} and Ilkhanid-controlled Erzurum, much of which he describes as having been destroyed in fighting between rival groups of Turkmen.\textsuperscript{109} The Ilkhanid bureaucrat Hamdallah Mustawfi, writing in the 1330s, complains that the revenue from Rum had declined from 1050 tomans under the Seljuqs to 33 tomans in his own day,\textsuperscript{110} and there is some reason to


\textsuperscript{105} Ibn Battuta, \textit{Rihla}, 304; trans. Gibb, 446.


\textsuperscript{107} For a discussion of trade routes in the period see Blessing, \textit{Rebuilding Anatolia}, 173–9.


\textsuperscript{110} Mustawfi, \textit{Nuzhat al-Qulub}, 145. See also the discussion in Togan, ‘Economic Conditions’, 229–31, and also on these figures Paul, ‘Mongol Aristocrats’, 146, n. 153.
suspect that economic decline may have set in around the end of the thirteenth century. Nonetheless, in the mid-fourteenth century al-ʿUmari still noted the region’s prosperity, commenting that ‘Food and prices are both cheap for a variety of reasons, the lack of uncanonical taxes (mukūs), the multitude of available pasture, the extent of potential for trade, and the area being surrounded by the sea.’

If trade and people could pass freely, so too could scholars and texts. As we have seen, Anatolians sought their fortune in Iran, and Iranians in Anatolia, and it was possible, indeed easy, to serve both beyliks and Ilkhans. For instance, the astronomer and philosopher Qutb al-Din Shirazi wrote not just for his main patron, Shams al-Din Juwayni, but also dedicated various works on astronomy to the amir Muhammad b. Taj al-Din Muʿtazz b. Tahir and to the ruler of the Chobanid dynasty Muzaffar al-Din Yavlak Arslan. Ahmad of Niğde, an author from central Anatolia writing in Persian in the 1330s, dedicated his encyclopaedia of useful knowledge to Anatolia’s suzerain, the Ilkhan Abu Saʿid; but he also included lavish praise for the Ilkhan’s rivals, the Golden Horde ruler Özbek and the Mamluk sultan al-Nasir, reflecting the cultural and the political world of Anatolia in the period. Muhammad al-Tustari, who wrote an Arabic philosophical work, al-Fusul al-Ashrafiyya, for the Eshrefid Turkmen ruler of Beyşehir, Mubariz al-Din Muhammad b. Sulayman (r. 702/1302–721/1320), also dedicated a work to the Mamluk sultan al-Nasir Muhammad, and is said to have been a close confidant of the Ilkhan Öljeitü. The political fragmentation of Anatolia had little impact on its shared intellectual and literary culture.

The Ilkhanate’s legacy could be felt across fourteenth-century Anatolia, far beyond the Eretnid heartland, and bequeathed a common monetary, administrative and, to some degree, cultural system. Coins produced in Turkmen beyliks emulated Ilkhanid typologies. There are copies in Turkish libraries of Ilkhanid

111 Darling, ‘Persianate Sources’, 131–2; cf. Blessing, Rebuilding Anatolia, 179, 183. In contrast, Togan, ‘Economic Conditions’, believes there was continuous economic development throughout the Ilkhanid period.
112 Al-ʿUmari, Masalik, III, 230.
114 See Peacock, ‘Ahmad of Nigde’s al-Walad al-Shaḥīq’.
115 On him see Haji Khalifa, Kashf al-Zunun an Asami al-Kutub waʾl-Funun, ed. Şeferrêtin Yaltkaya (İstanbul, 1941), no. 540. Al-Fusul al-Ashrafiyya, dealing with metaphysics and cosmology, is preserved in an unpublished autograph, Süleymaniye, MS Ayasofya 2445; Tustari’s Sharh Manazil al-Saʿīrin was dedicated to al-Nasir Muhammad, Süleymaniye, MS Fatih 2707.
116 Remler, ‘Ottoman, Isfandiyarid and Eretnid Coinage’, 186–8; Lindner, Explorations, 96–7; Darling, ‘Persianate Sources’, 140. If this was indeed the case it would suggest a divergence from the height of Ilkhanid power under Ghazan when Anatolian coinage was significantly different metrologically from that of Iran, and Anatolia also enjoyed the unusual distinction of its vassal...
administrative manuals such as the *Sa’adatnama* and the *Jami’ al-Hisab*, and these were used as models in Anatolian beyliks, most notably the Ottomans. Such manuals show that the Ilkhanids perceived all of Anatolia as being subject to their sway, at least in theory. The *Risala-yi Falakiyya*, another mid-fourteenth-century accounting manual, divides Rum into al-Wustaniyya, the directly administered Ilkhanid province stretching from the region of Lake Van to Akşehir, Afyonkarahisar and Gümüşbazar in the west, and the al-újât, i.e. the frontier, the regions of which are listed according to either the names of the principal towns or the names of its rulers or dynasties: Karaman, the Hamidoğulları, the Aydınnid Umur Beg, Germiyan, the Ottoman Orhan, and the towns of Denizli, Gerede, Bolu, Kastamonu, Eğirdir and Sinop. Similarly, Hamdallah Mustawfi’s *Nuzhat al-Qulub*, composed no later than 741/1340, which offers a conspectus of revenue-producing areas, includes income from areas such as the Karamanid town of Ermenek, Candarid Kastamonu and Amorium. In neither case can we regard these entries as reflecting mid-fourteenth-century reality, but rather Ilkhanid aspirations of an earlier period to exert hegemony over all of Anatolia. Nonetheless, the fiction of Ilkhanid suzerainty was maintained in some beyliks, however distant or even hostile their relations with the Ilkhanate might have been in practice. In Candarid Kastamonu, Ilkhanid coins were minted until Abu Sa‘id’s reign; early Ottoman coins likewise were simply local Ilkhanid issues until 727/1327, and it is only after Timurtash’s rebellion that coins appear mentioning the names of Ottoman rulers. Even in a beylik known for its political hostility to the Ilkhans, Karaman, clear Ilkhanid influences can be detected in its court’s literary culture into the late fourteenth century, some four decades after the disappearance of effective Ilkhanid power in the peninsula.
All Anatolian rulers shared the problem of how to justify their rule. As discussed above, the Mongol invasions are often thought to have engendered a political crisis throughout the Muslim world by killing the Caliph, and the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries saw considerable experimentation with new forms of political legitimacy. The Ilkhans justified their rule with reference to their Chinggisid descent and increasingly, after their conversion to Islam, their role as defenders of Islam, perhaps even laying claim to the legacy of the Abbasid Caliphate.\(^{122}\) Although Mongol claims to legitimacy were never unequivocally accepted in Anatolia, it was also hard for the other political actors in the region to justify their own right to rule.\(^{123}\) The Anatolian Seljuqs had enjoyed the twin blessing of their prestigious name, which they had commemorated in works such as Qanî’i’s now lost Saljuqnama and recognition by the Caliph. In the absence of a Caliph, the last one having been killed in Hülegü’s conquest of Baghdad, the Seljuq name itself became an important source of legitimacy. The Karamanids thus portrayed themselves as Seljuq servants, and on seating the pretender Jimri on the throne in Konya, the Karamanid Mehmed Beg claimed to be acting merely as Jimri’s vizier. In numerous beyliks, the rulers purported to be themselves of Seljuq descent, while in fourteenth-century Anatolia neo-Seljuq names such as Kılç Aslan became popular.\(^{124}\) Even for an established outside dynasty, the Seljuq heritage had a certain allure. On the Mamluk sultan Baybars’ brief occupation of Kayseri in 675/1277, he seems to have done his best to portray himself as a legitimate Seljuq monarch. According to Ibn ‘Abd al-Zahir, who accompanied the invaders and left an account preserved by al-‘Umari, Baybars made a point of establishing his camp in the same place where the Seljuq sultan had encamped outside Kayseri, where he had the ceremonial drum roll performed in according to custom (\_duribat nawbat bani Saljūq \ldots \’alā al-‘ādā\); he had the ceremonial parasol of the Seljuqs set up (\_nuṣiba jāt bani saljūq) and when he entered Kayseri he sat on the Seljuq throne.\(^{125}\)


Rulers and rebels continued to use the Seljuq past as a source of legitimacy into the fourteenth century and beyond, and the claim to have been granted the symbols of rulership by the Seljuq sultan ‘Ala’ al-Din formed a crucial part of what has been called the Ottoman ‘dynastic myth’.126 Yet it was evidently a not wholly satisfactory solution. Why is unclear; possibly the sheer array of claimants to Seljuq descent, many of whom were evidently politically impotent, such as the otherwise unattested ‘Ala’ al-Din b. Saljuq who is mentioned in a chronicle of Konya in the 1360s, devalued the currency of kinship to some degree.127 At any rate, political elites also looked beyond Anatolia to validate their claims to rule. We can see this even in one of the earliest beylik, that founded at Denizli by Muhammad the Turkmen (pp. 43–4 above). Similarly, when Sülemin rebelled, he was keen to bestow symbols of authority on his Turkmen allies:

He summoned an army from the peripheries of Syria and the frontiers (uj), and gained the allegiance of the soldiers stationed in the Danishmendid province, in the plain of Kozova. He gathered countless ruffians (runūḍ u awbāsh), and gave the province’s wealth and lands to the army so that nearly 50,000 cavalry joined him, and the Syrians came with reinforcements 20,000 strong. He nominated amirs over them, to whom he gave the flag (sanjaq) and kettle-drum (naqqāra).128

Alternatively, the beys might seek legitimacy through connecting themselves to the Mamluk rulers of Egypt, as al-‘Umari describes:

The Mongols got control [of Anatolia], the kingship of the Seljuq dynasty declined until it fell from them, and groups of Turks there gained control over much of that country, except for a remnant, the east of which the Mongols have preserved, and have kept hold of its final vestiges. The groups of Turks surround the Mongol kings on account of what the latter have conquered. Some of the former still enter into obedience [of the Mongols] on condition they do not have to give anything up when they submit. This situation of obedience and rebellion, [the exchange of] tokens of friendship and forgetting [loyalty] continued until time drew on, and the tent of Chinggis Khan’s state collapsed or some of its pillars weakened. At that time [the Turks’] feet stood firm, and their days prospered. Since they gained control of Anatolia they have corresponded with the kings of Egypt, whom they have adopted as a form of assistance and whom they count as a provision against vicissitudes. If one of them desires a decree of appointment (taqlīd) to be written [appointing him] viceroy of the lands he holds, it is written for him, and standards, flags banners, full honours, a bejewelled sword, and a mounted horse are prepared for him. These people

are still in the present day friendly, pure, trustworthy and loyal. Due to the great number of them who have frequented [these lands], there are those who have adopted Egypt and Syria as a home and have taken positions of command and land grants there and have become subject to the [Mamluk] government. Their ambassadors until this day are never absent from Egypt and Syria, and letters and presents go back and forth.¹²⁹

For the Karamanids in particular this Mamluk connection was important, as they were always reluctant to recognise even nominal Mongol suzerainty (even if, in practice, they may have done so on occasion).

It was not merely the upstart Turkmen rulers who sought Mamluk recognition, but even Mongol rebels such as Timurtash and Süleimish. The coinage of Eretna, who was by no means a rebel, offers a good illustration of the fluctuating tendencies in the search for legitimacy by local rulers in Anatolia. Initially, Eretna’s coins are standard Ilkhanid issues, very similar to those issued in Iran.¹³⁰ However, after the collapse of the Ilkhanate, in 738/1337–8, Eretna sought Mamluk suzerainty of his own volition, not because he was compelled to by military force. As al-‘Umari puts it, ‘he sought an appointment from [the Mamluk sultan] al-Nasir as viceroy of Anatolia’.¹³¹ Al-‘Umari recounts how the qadi of Kayseri, Siraj al-Din, father of the later ruler of that town, Qadi Burhan al-Din, brokered the agreement with the Mamluks by which Sultan al-Nasir Muhammad’s name was mentioned in the *khutba* and struck on the coins.¹³² This seems to have been implemented the following year, when we have a coin struck in Sivas in al-Nasir Muhammad’s name. Coins continued to be issued in the Mamluk sultan’s name until 741/1341, when al-Nasir died.¹³³ There are nonetheless some indications that even before this Eretna had dropped al-Nasir’s name from the *khutba* and *sikka* in some places, prompting Mamluk reprisals,¹³⁴ and interestingly, in the same year that he first issued Mamluk coinage, 739/1339, Eretna also minted coins in Erzincan in the name of Tughay-Timur, a non-Chinggisid claimant to the Ilkhanate who ruled in Khurasan and had no control over Anatolia.¹³⁵ Finally, from 742/1341–2 onwards, Eretna ceased mentioning an overlord and issued coins in his own name, proclaiming himself ‘the just sultan’; many of these employed Uighur script to emphasise his Mongol heritage. On his building inscriptions, Eretna proclaimed himself to be ‘the great sultan’

from this date.\textsuperscript{136} This innovation can be seen as replicating the more general breakdown in the concept of Chinggisid legitimacy in the 1340s; rulers who had till then had sheltered behind the pretence they were ruling on behalf of a Chinggisid now sought other forms of legitimacy.\textsuperscript{137} Eretna’s repudiation of Mamluk sovereignty suggests that he felt he no longer had a need to seek external justification for his rule.

Eretna’s coinage reflects the complicated and uncertain position of rulers of medieval Anatolia, who experimented with different forms of legitimacy in a period when established modes, even the much vaunted concept of Chinggisid legitimacy, seem to have broken down. It cannot be said that Eretna’s methods were entirely successful. Although his immediate descendants adopted a similar strategy of calling themselves sultan, they were eventually overthrown by Qadi Burhan al-Din, the aforementioned Siraj al-Din’s son, who proclaimed his Seljuq descent on his mother’s side.\textsuperscript{138} This does not mean his own ascent to power was uncontroversial. Burhan al-Din still relied on the support of the various Mongol chiefs, many of whom evidently would have preferred an Eretnid on the throne.\textsuperscript{139}

It is perhaps surprising, given the importance political legitimacy evidently held, that it was rarely expressed, as in other parts of the Islamic world, in patronage of texts, despite the wealth of literary production in the period. Although Ibn Battuta tells us that Eretna knew Arabic fluently,\textsuperscript{140} there are very few texts that can be associated with the patronage of either Eretna or his successors. The only significant literary work dedicated to an Eretnid to be identified to date is a brief Persian work on 
\textit{tafsir}, the \textit{al-As‘ila wa‘l-Awjiba}, by Jamal al-Din al-Aqsara‘i, which was commissioned by the Eretnid amir of Amasya, Sayf al-Din Ṣadgeldi (d. 783/1381).\textsuperscript{141} There is also a \textit{taqwīm}, an astrological almanac, composed for the last Eretnid ruler of Sivas, ‘Ala’ al-Din ‘Ali, in 772–3/1371–2, but despite the elaborate decoration of this text, with extensive gold illumination (Plate 3), suggesting a willingness on the part of the Eretnid court to invest in at least some types of book art, little other evidence has yet come to light of Eretnid literary patronage.\textsuperscript{142} On occasion works may be

\textsuperscript{136} Göde, \textit{Eratnâlîlar}, 64, and on the Uighur coinage see Chapter 4, p. 184.
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\textsuperscript{139} On Qadi Burhan al-Din see Paul, \textquote{Mongol Aristocrats}, and Nagel, \textit{Timur der Eroberer}, 233–68.
\textsuperscript{141} See for example Suleymaniye, MS Ayasofya 71.
\textsuperscript{142} MS Nurusomanie 2782, discussed in Peacock, \textquote{Two Royal Almanacs}. One further text may be the history of Chinggis Khan composed possibly for a female Eretnid, but her identity is uncertain. See Charles Melville, \textquote{Genealogy and Exemplary Rulership in the \textit{Tarikh-i Chingiz Khan}}, in Yasir
dedicated to individuals bearing magnificent titles who are otherwise unattested in the historical record. One example is a poetic anthology entitled the *Anis al-Khalwa wa Jalis al-Salwa* compiled by Musafir b. Nasir al-Malatawi. It is dedicated to a certain amir Jalal al-Din and his son, but who they were is unknown. Only the quotation in the text of a qasida by a vizier of Eretna, Sayyid Abu Talib, dated 759/760, suggests it may have been compiled within the Eretnid lands for some Eretnid lord, otherwise unknown to us. Similar, although expensive illuminated manuscripts were produced in late thirteenth- to fourteenth-century Anatolia, especially Konya, their patrons are usually not identified or not known. In the Turkmen periphery the picture was slightly more varied, with substantial literary centres in the Aydınid and later Germiyanid states, as will be discussed in Chapter 4, but, on the whole, while occasional pieces may be found dedicated to one ruler or another, precisely one of the reasons for the difficulty of understanding this period is the lack of patrons interested in sponsoring the kind of historiographical or even poetic productions composed in contemporary Iran or the Mamluk lands. In the case of Eretna, his lack of literary patronage may be connected to the fact that ultimately his main concern was not the opinion of a courtly audience, versed in Arabic and Persian, but rather that of the Mongol amirs on whose loyalty he still needed to rely. This would explain why most of Eretna’s independent coinage uses Uighur script, which is not otherwise attested in Anatolian numismatics.

**ISLAM AND UNBELIEF IN MONGOL ANATOLIA**

Mongol rule thus eviscerated Anatolia’s traditional political system, and it had an equally severe impact on religious life, infusing religious discourse with an obsession with unbelief and jihad. This presents a striking contrast to the pre-Mongol situation, when the textual evidence presents surprisingly little indication of any interest in themes of either conversion or unbelief, despite Anatolia’s substantial Christian population and the adoption of a vocabulary of jihad in


Seljuk sultanic titulature. The interest does not on the whole seem to have gone any further than stylised titles proclaiming the sultan to be a mujāhid or warrior against infidels.\textsuperscript{147} Sultan Kılıç Arslan II was taunted by his rival, the Syrian ruler Nur al-Din b. Zangi, for being soft on Christians.\textsuperscript{148} Such rhetoric of course cannot be taken at face value, for Nur al-Din was attempting to burnish his own Islamic credentials and legitimacy; nonetheless, there are hints from sources originating in Anatolia that give a degree of credence to it. While Ibn ‘Arabi composed a treatise dedicated to Sultan ‘Izz al-Din Kayka’us I urging him to implement the shurūṭ ‘Umar, the restrictions on non-Muslims attributed to the Caliph ‘Umar b. al-Khattab, the very existence of the treatise suggests that they were not rigorously applied.\textsuperscript{149} A Persian epic poem on the history of the prophets, Burhan al-Din al-Anawi’s Anis al-Qulub, also dedicated to ‘Izz al-Din, does contain religious polemic against Armenians, but this seems to have been related to the specific historical circumstances of tensions with Armenian Cilicia, and other Christian denominations were explicitly excluded.\textsuperscript{150} The construction of religious buildings – such as mosques and madrasas – was only rarely undertaken by the Seljuq sultans, whose patronage of architecture concentrated on palaces, caravanserais and fortifications.\textsuperscript{151} Promoting conversion was not a priority for the Seljuqs, it seems.

The Mongol rulers did not, at least initially, directly seek to interfere with Islam in Anatolia, although Christianity prospered under the early Ilkhans, at least in Iran, where for the first time Muslims had to endure equality with non-Muslims.\textsuperscript{152} On the whole the official Mongol attitude was to tolerate all religions, and to seek their blessings.\textsuperscript{153} In Anatolia the impact is hard to measure, but Aqsara’i notes that under Fakhr al-Din Qazwini the jizya was no longer levied in Anatolia; his point seems to be that Qazwini’s Iranian administrators were so incompetent that they did not realise this was the most important revenue source in the province, rather than it being specifically rescinded for religious reasons.\textsuperscript{154} At the same time, significant numbers of Mongols were starting to convert to
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Islam, and some of the earliest evidence for this process in the Middle East pertains to Mongol soldiers stationed in Anatolia.\textsuperscript{155} The reasons for conversion are poorly understood, but given that it started with the common soldiery and then subsequently spread to higher echelons, a variety of factors must have been at work, including the Mongols’ sense of alienation in unfamiliar lands, and the concurrent process by which they were Turkicised and thus also Islamised through the influence of Turks serving in the Mongol armies.\textsuperscript{156} At any rate, it is clear there were acute tensions between the pagan and converted Mongols. Ibn Shaddad relates of two Mongol amirs from Anatolia, Sögedei and Ja’urchi, that

They had a pagan brother who came to them with a group of relatives and others, and demanded money from them saying, ‘You live in ease in urban dwellings and we suffer hardship in constant fighting, so give us money to help us, or come to the ordu so that Abaqa can decide between us.’\textsuperscript{157}

The two Muslim brothers consulted the Pervane on what to do, and were told to acquiesce and pay the money. When the pagan brother and his companions left, the Pervane feared they were nonetheless heading for Abaqa, ‘and we cannot be sure whether they may claim we behaved unjustly or whether he [Abaqa] will destroy [us]’. As a result, the Muslim brothers caught up with their pagan sibling and killed him and his party. These events are portrayed by Ibn Shaddad as one of the precursors to the Pervane’s involvement in the great revolt of 675/1277. This brief reference also indicates that the embrace of Islam might be associated not just with changing religion, but with sedentarisation, as suggested by the pagan sibling’s criticism of his brothers for ‘living in ease in urban dwellings’. It was doubtless among the Mongols who retained their nomadic lifestyle that pagan habits lived longest, even if the deficiencies in the sources, who are rarely interested in nomadic society, make this harder to appreciate. Also, however, as this case suggests, conversion could have implications for political allegiances: evidently the Mongol converts felt the Muslim Pervane of Rum was in a sense their advisor and protector, even though he was himself a Mongol ally, while their pagan sibling trusted in the traditional Mongol justice of the as yet unconverted ordu.

The role of the local religious elite in conversion is reflected in Astarabadi’s \textit{Bazm u Razm}. Discussing Qadi Burhan al-Din’s grandfather, Qadi Husam al-Din


\textsuperscript{156} Jackson, \textit{The Mongols and the Islamic World}, 337–9.

of Kayseri, who must have lived in the late thirteenth to the early fourteenth century. Astarabadi remarks that ‘some of the greatest Mongol amirs, who were destitute of the ornament of Islam, became Muslim at his hand and found the glory of belief’. It is unknown exactly how conversion occurred, but it is possible that a formal ceremony in front of the qadi was required, as is suggested by this passage. This is also indicated by the works copied in a personal manuscript compilation (majmū’a) put together by the famous Ilkhanid intellectual, Qutb al-Din Shirazi, the astronomer and philosopher, who held several senior posts as qadi in Anatolia where he composed several of his works. The majmū’a, held today in the Iranian city of Qum, was copied by Shirazi in Konya in 685/1286 and contains several philosophical works by the Jewish thinker Ibn Kammuna. In addition, Shirazi copied a famous denunciation of his former faith by an eleventh-century Jewish convert to Islam, Samaw’al al-Maghribi, the Ifham al-Yahud or ‘Silencing of the Jews’. Shirazi’s copy of this text was apparently made from an autograph manuscript, suggesting the importance Shirazi gave it, and Shirazi also included a copy of a letter from an anonymous accuser who doubted the sincerity of Samaw’al’s conversion, as well as Samaw’al’s reply. The question of the madhhab to which the convert belonged was identified by the accuser as a key pointer to the authenticity of the conversion, although Samaw’al in his reply argued that accepting any of the established madhhabs was acceptable. That Shirazi and subsequent copyists of his majmū’a in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries found this debate sufficiently important to be worth recopying, even divorced from the other contents of the manuscript, is testimony to the enduring relevance of its core question: how could one verify the veracity of conversion? Shirazi’s interest in Samaw’al’s work may reflect the sort of questions regarding the status of converts and the veracity of their adherence to given
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madhhhab that Shirazi was obliged to confront on a frequent basis as qadi in the religiously mixed environment of Anatolia, even if he served a pagan ruler.

The conversion of Ghazan in the year of his accession, 694/1295, while prompted by the prevalence of Islam among the Mongol soldiery, doubtless also contributed to the spread of the faith. Bar Hebraeus’s continuator, writing of events around this date states that,

at this time the MONGOLS, both the nobles and the inferior folk in their entirety, had become HAGARENES (i.e., MUSLIMS), and had already been circumcised, and had been well instructed in ablutions, and prayers, and the special customs and observances of the MUSLIMS.162

Yet there were probably some residual pagans, perhaps in rather greater quantity than our sources admit, and certainly there is plenty of evidence for the continuation of non-Muslim practices among the nominally converted Mongols.163 Ghazan’s great rival, the short-lived sixth Ilkhan Baidu, was less sympathetic to Muslims, and is described by Aqsara’i as having turned ḵāwīyas into the abode of bakhsīs (Buddhist priests) and mosques into idol temples.164 It is unlikely that Ghazan’s supporters all became Muslim overnight, and an Ilkhanid court document dated 699/1299 mentions the conversion that very year of an eighty-year-old Mongol named Murulay.165 This confirms that conversion was an ongoing process that continued for some time after Ghazan embraced Islam. Moreover, the Oirats who defected to the Mamluk sultanate around this date were still pagans, and Baybars al-Mansuri disapprovingly comments that they should have converted before being rewarded.166 Tensions between Mongols who enthusiastically embraced the new faith and those who held to their traditional forms of legitimacy and culture that were threatened by Islamisation are evident in Iran even in the 1330s,167 and the Ilkhan Arpa Keʿūn (r. 736/1335–6) initiated a return to traditional Mongol ways and is said by one source not to have been a Muslim.168 The memory of these infidel Mongols persisted long. The Turkish
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164 Aqsara’i, Musamarat al-Akḥār, 185–6.
165 Baybars al-Mansuri, Zubdat al-Fikra, 335.
166 Ibid., 309.
prose epic the *Battalname*, written down in the fifteenth century, recalls an ‘apostate (mürtedd) Haluq-i Tatari and an apostate Yalaman-i Turki’ who were attached to the ‘great infidel lords’ (*ulu kafir begleri*), while the fifteenth-century *Vilayetname*, the account of the deeds of the thirteenth-century saint Hacı Bektaş, also recalls the pagan Mongols.¹⁶⁹ We also know that the most unislamic of Mongol taxes, the hated *qubchur*, which was felt to resemble a sort of *jizya* imposed on Muslims, was only abolished in Ankara in 730/1330, and was still being collected in Niğde into the fifteenth century under Karamanid rule.¹⁷⁰

It may well be the presence of such unislamic practices as much as non-Muslims that prompted the poet Sayf al-Din Farghani, a resident of Anatolia, to write a *qaṣīda* to Ghazan even after the Ilkhan’s conversion, lamenting the prevalence of unbelief.

O east wind, if one day you blow to Tabriz, take news from me to the court of the just king
If you see the king of the age, Ghazan, tell him “O all your days are more fortunate than the day of victory,
The line of Chinggis Khan has not [previously] given birth to one of pure religion like you; the kingdom of sultans has not seen a just king like you...
But in these days Oh khaqan, Chosroe of justice, in Rum there is the oppression of Hajjaj not the justice of ‘Umar
You have become a Muslim, but our rulers are not Muslim; there does not remain a trace of Islam in this land
Sufis are without shelter or clothes, the learned are without bread or water; the *khānqāh* is without furnishings, the roof and madrasa are without roof and door.¹⁷¹

On one level, Farghani complains of the disappointment that, despite the Mongols’ conversion, Anatolia still suffered the oppression of pagan Mongol governors. More specifically, he complains of the neglect of the Sufis and the ‘ulama’. At the same time, Farghani, whose name suggests his origins in Central Asia, is alluding in this poem to a famous original, Anwari’s ‘Tears of Khurasan’ *qaṣīda*, written after the Turkish Ghuzz nomads had destroyed the Seljuq state and ravaged Khurasan in 1155. The pagan Mongols, who did away with the Seljuq state in Anatolia, are thus implicitly compared to barbarous Ghuzz nomads.¹⁷² At the same time this unflattering comparison also points to the

¹⁷¹ Sayf al-Din Farghani, *Diwan*, I, 179, 180–1.
deep-rooted links between Anatolian and Iranian literary traditions. Thus if Farghani’s *qaṣīda* is in part a rhetorical conceit rather than historical evidence of enduring paganism, it also points to a crucial dynamic in Mongol Anatolia, the tension between unbelief and Islam, which we find repeated throughout our texts.

Ghazan’s conversion brought about an increasingly tense religious atmosphere, with campaigns, albeit sporadic, of persecution of non-Muslims, Christians and Jews as well as pagan or Buddhist Mongols and their bakhshis. Armenian scribes, who often alluded to contemporary historical events in the colophons of manuscripts they copied, directly associated the conversion of the Mongols with their persecution of Christians:173

The Ishmaelites [Muslims] became so powerful that they succeeded in converting to their vain hope the entire nation of archers [the Mongols], so that none among them remained who did not confess their fallacious and false faith [Islam], which will lead them directly into perdition. They harass all the Christians to convert to their false hope; some they molest, some they torture, some they kill, and they confiscate the possessions of all others. Not contented with all these, they also levied taxes upon all the Christians and made them wear symbols of opprobrium, a black linen over their shoulders, so that whoever saw them would recognise that they are Christians and would curse them; and they make every effort to efface Christianity from the earth.174

Similar complaints can be found in colophons throughout the fourteenth century, while we know that in 1322–3, the Mongol governor Timurtash launched a major campaign of persecution, as is discussed in Chapter 6. Such events also seem to have affected the Greek Orthodox communities as well as the better-documented Armenian ones. The research of Dimitri Korobeinikov has confirmed that our period was a key one for the decline of Greek Orthodox, Christian communities in Anatolia, and this was most pronounced in the cities of central and eastern Anatolia such as Kayseri, Sivas and Erzincan – precisely the areas under Mongol and Eretnid control.175 Korobeinikov connects this decline with the sedentarisation of the Turks, the political instability of the period and the constant fighting between warlords.176 However, it is clear that the Mongol-sponsored persecutions would also have contributed to these dynamics, although it would be unwise to attempt to limit conversion to a single cause.

176 Ibid., 18.
Some Christian authors had a positive view of Ghazan, continuing to regard him as pro-Christian perhaps because of his continuing war against the Mamluks.\textsuperscript{177} Nonetheless, the Ilkhanid-Mamluk hostilities further fuelled the use by both sides of a political vocabulary that emphasised the war against unbelief. One example of this is the Mamluk decree (\textit{taqlid}) appointing Sülemish over Anatolia.\textsuperscript{178} Although Sülemish was already a Muslim, the decree repeatedly links his embrace of Mamluk overlordship to conversion to Islam. He has been appointed over 'weighty affairs which cannot be implemented except by a sultan in whose heart God has implanted faith and has led him to the faith of Islam . . . and has led him from the part of Satan to His [God's] party'. God has 'taken him, by the light of his guidance, from the ranks of his enemies' and Sülemish has, by asking to join the Mamluk armies, 'joined the party of Islam'. The Ilkhans responded in kind. In a 	extit{fīrmān} issued to commanders of Syrian forts shortly after Sülemish's rebellion, Ghazan remarks that 'in our time have appeared polytheists and pagans (\textit{al-mushrikūn wa-`abdat al-awthān})'. The Ilkhan describes how he has converted 'not at [someone else's] instigation but because the light of God's guidance appeared . . . God entrusted us with jihad in killing polytheists, pagans and enemies and destroying the houses of idols, repelling the evil of oppressors and commanding right and forbidding wrong.'\textsuperscript{179} Ghazan has expended money 'for the benefit of the armies of Islam fighting in God's path' ('\textit{inda al-mujāhada fī sabīl allāh}'), and (inaccurately) points to his own name as being derived from the Arabic \textit{ghazw}, holy war. The Mongol invasion is a response to the Mamluks' mistreatment of the Muslims of Syria and Egypt, and Sülemish's rebellion therefore is nothing less than an assault on Islam:

Sülemish rebelled against us and joined the rebels and proceeded to harm the Muslims in part of the land of Rum, destroying their houses, looting their possessions and fleeing from our victorious army to that land.\textsuperscript{180}

The Mamluks, as Muslims, should have sent Sülemish in chains back to the Ilkhanate but instead they have sent him back at the head of a mass of Turkmen 'so that there will be fighting between our Mongol soldiers and the inhabitants of the land of Rum; perchance they [the Mamluks] have not heard that all our army,
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Moghul, Uighur, Qipchaq, Khita’i, Bakhshi and adherents of all different beliefs have all without exception sincerely converted to Islam.\(^1\) Religious tensions seem to have intensified under Öljeitü (704/1304–716/1316), the Ilkhan who famously converted from Buddhism to Sunnism to Shīʿism and back to Sunnism. Colophons of Armenian manuscripts from the reign of Öljeitü record his persecution of Christians and his enforcement of sumptuary restrictions.\(^2\) Yet these tensions may also have been the result of the actions of enthusiastic Mongol converts on the ground as much as any centralised policy. A suggestive case is the clash between the king of Cilician Armenia, Het’um, and the local Mongol governor Bularghu. In 707/1307 Bularghu, inspired by fervour for Islam, was intending to build a madrasa in Adana with a minaret, an idea which displeased Het’um, who presumably saw it as an unwelcome Muslim intrusion on his borders. Het’um attempted to complain to Öljeitü, accusing Bularghu of being in cahoots with the Mamluks; Bularghu was informed by his allies at the ordu of this, and tried to pin the same charge on Het’um, whom he murdered. Öljeitü eventually executed Bularghu for this offence.\(^3\)

The details of the affair are somewhat murky, but for our purposes the interesting point is that it was the religious enthusiasm of a Mongol Muslim that disrupted the equilibrium between Cilicia and her Muslim neighbours.

Thus both before and after Ghazan’s conversion, the Mongol soldiery in Anatolia played a crucial role in promoting a tense religious atmosphere. The battle between believers and unbelievers, suggested by the clash between Sögedei, Ja’urchi and their pagan brother, subsequently spilled over more broadly, introducing an anti-Christian (or at least, anti-\(kāfīr\)) note into political discourse largely absent in Seljuq times. Anatolia was not the sole region to be affected in this way. The Mongol presence in Syria and the ongoing wars with the Mamluks seems to have led to an increasingly religiously tense atmosphere there, with Mamluk rulers seeking to prove their Islamic credentials in their competition with the Mongols through promoting the Islamisation of the regions none Muslims.\(^4\) Indeed, the Mongol period more broadly witnessed a marked advance in the spread of Islam across Eurasia, in regions as distant as China.

---
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and Central Asia, although the reasons for this are complex and need further investigation.185 Similarly, in Anatolia, the Mongol impact can be observed beyond the immediate Mongol sphere, in both epigraphic and literary evidence. The inscriptions on the mosques and madrasas erected at the expense of the vizier Fakhr al-Din ‘Ali in the 1270s in Konya and Sivas are decorated with an inscriptional programme celebrating the vanquishing of unbelievers.186 On the western frontiers of Anatolia, in Kütahya, the capital of the Germiyanid principality, the ruler Mubariz al-Din Umur b. Savji had an inscription placed on the madrasa he built there in 714/1314 announcing its construction was funded from the jizya of the Christian population of Alaşehir (Fig. 1.2). There is no precedent for such an inscription in Anatolia, which is evidently intended to assert publicly the supremacy of Islam.

The Arba’un Majalis, a collection of hadith made for the Pervane Mu’ın al-Din Sulayman, gives prominence to themes of unbelief (Plate 4). The author, ‘Abd al-Rahman b. ‘Amr b. Ahmad al-Karaji al-Qazwini, another migrant from Iran, related hadith on the authority of his father. The collection begins with a famous hadith related from Abu Bakr, who recounts how, when fleeing Mecca with the Prophet, he hid in the cave with Muhammad, fearful of being caught by the unbelievers. The Prophet admonishes him for his fearfulness and assures him of God’s presence.187 The second chapter (majlis) opens with a hadith concerning the Prophet’s confronting the vastly superior army of polytheists (mushrikūn) at the battle of Badr. When he sees his opponents’ numbers, Muhammad prays, ‘Oh God, fulfil what you have promised; if you let this group of the people of Islam be destroyed, you will not ever be worshipped on this earth!’188 God, of course, fulfils his promise and gives Muhammad victory. The significance of the emphasis on the fight against unbelief in such prominent parts of a text dedicated to the Pervane, the servant of the pagan Mongols who also seems to have played a role in encouraging converts to Islam, is obvious.

---
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Similar concerns can be detected in the religious culture of the Candarid beylik in north-central Anatolia in the early fourteenth century. Ibn Battuta tells us that Sultan Süleyman of Kastamonu would attend the mosque every Friday in the company of the leading men of the state, the fuqahā’, the qadi, the soldiers and members of the royal family, and the Qur’an reciters would ‘read out the surat al-Kahf with fine voices and repeat the verses with an amazing arrangement (tartīb ‘ajib)’. The choice of al-Kahf is a particularly telling one, for the sura starts off with a condemnation of Christianity:

Praise be to God who has sent down upon His servant the Book and has not assigned unto it any crookedness; right, to warn of the great violence from Him, and to give Good tidings unto the believers, who do good works, that theirs shall be a goodly wage therein to abide for ever, and to warn those who say, ‘God has taken unto Himself a son’, they have no knowledge of it, they nor their fathers, a monstrous word it is, issuing out of their mouths they say nothing but a lie.\(^{190}\)


Al-Kahf was said by traditional Muslim exegetes to have been sent down in response to the Jews questioning of the truth of Muhammad’s Prophethood, and as we shall see this was an important theme of fourteenth-century Anatolian religious literature (Chapter 5, p. 192). The sura has also been interpreted as apocalyptic, presaging the coming of the Antichrist, a major concern of Anatolian elites, as discussed in Chapter 6; it also recounts the story of Alexander the Great (Dhu’l-Qarnayn)’s encounter with Gog and Magog ‘doing corruption in the earth’ whom Alexander confines behind a barrier. It is perhaps significant that the Mongols too were commonly identified variously with the Antichrist, and Gog and Magog, and al-Kahf ends by resuming its polemic against unbelievers, relating how they will be condemned to hell while the believers will be saved. The Candarid court’s interest in this sura suggests how the new religious and political discourse on unbelief that emerged in the wake of the Mongol invasions and conversion penetrated areas not directly subject to Ilkhanid rule. However, al-Kahf was also a crucial sura for Sufis, telling of how Moses was brought to occult knowledge of the divine by an unnamed individual identified by the exegetes as Khidr. The story of Khidr and Moses became the classic metaphor for the search for knowledge of the divine through a spiritual guide, the purpose of Sufism. The interest in al-Kahf may also signify the growing concern of Anatolian courts with Sufism, and the complex relationship between power and Sufism that developed over the Mongol period, as we shall explore in Chapter 2.


192 See Chapter 6, pp. 219–20.
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Suﬁsm and Political Power

Since early Seljuq times in the eleventh century individual Suﬁs had developed close relations with political elites, but this phenomenon greatly intensified in the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries. Suﬁs’ status was enhanced by the inﬂuential theories of Ibn ‘Arabi, who asserted that the awliyā’ (sing. wali, the Friends of God, or Suﬁ saints), were no less than the means by which Prophecy was continued after Muhammad, and by the formation of ṭariqas, the Suﬁ orders, generally known after their putative founder. These ṭariqas became increasingly prominent and well organised, giving Suﬁsm an institutional structure and hierarchy that facilitated its propagation. The process of the emergence of ṭariqas is obscure, but by the late thirteenth century they possessed features such as characteristic ceremonies, physical structures and distinctive clothes worn by their adherents. The relationship between the Suﬁ guide (called the murshid, pir or shaykh) and the disciple (the murid) was constituted by a formal oath and often governed thereafter by strict rules. The principal physical structure was the Suﬁ lodge (known variously in Anatolia as khānqāh, zāwiya or tekke), which might serve as accommodation for adepts as well as a place for the performance of the ṭariqa’s rituals such as its speciﬁc style of dhikr (chanting the name of God) or samā’ (mystical dancing). The most notable ṭariqa in medieval Anatolia was the Mevlevi order, headed by the descendants of Jalal al-Din Rumi (d. 672/1273),

1 Omid Safi, The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam: Negotiating Ideology and Religious Enquiry (Chapel Hill, 2006); Peacock, The Great Seljuk Empire, chapter 5; Green, Sufism, 94–8.
3 See Green, Sufism, 81–91 for an overview.
who was known as Mawlana or in Turkish Mevlana (‘our lord’). The Mevlevis enjoyed not just wide popularity but also produced a mass of literature, predominantly in Persian, which makes them by far the best attested ṭarīqa of medieval Anatolia. The Mevlevis became so tightly intertwined with power that in later times many Ottoman sultans and viziers themselves became Mevlevi murīds, and the Mevlevi ṭarīqa has been described as constituting virtually an Ottoman ‘state institution’ from the seventeenth century. Indeed, a genealogical table of the Ottoman family, probably composed in the sixteenth century, names Jalal al-Din Rumi among the dynastic ancestors.

Elites of the Mongol period evinced a similar enthusiasm for the company of Sufis. The Ilkhanid vizier and historian Rashid al-Din depicts the Ilkhan Ghazan as isolating himself for the forty-day-Sufi retreat (chilla), while in his letter demanding the obedience of Syrian garrisons in 699/1299, the Ilkhan remarks that ‘we have adopted the company of qadis, ‘ulama’, righteous men, shaykhs, sayyids, and faqīhs, being guided by them to the blessed burial places of saints [mashāhid al-awliyā’] and the resting places of prophets [mawāqif al-anbiyā’].

The Ilkhanid viziers Sadr al-Din Zanjani and Ghiyath al-Din Muhammad patronised works by Sufis such as Mu’ayyid al-Din Jandi and Da’ud al-Qaysari, two influential members of Ibn ‘Arabi’s school from Anatolia who were active in the late thirteenth to early fourteenth centuries. Members of the Anatolian political elite did likewise, as is suggested by a few prominent examples. Ibn ‘Arabi himself had been received at the court of the Seljuq Sultan ‘Izz al-Din Kayka’us I, to whom he wrote an epistle of advice, while Rumi’s correspondence reveals his close links to numerous influential figures, such as the Seljuq sultan and the Pervane Mu’in al-Din Sulayman, as we will discuss further in due course. The qadi-sultan of Sivas, Burhan al-Din, who succeeded the last Eretııds in 783/1381,
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was also a committed follower of Rumi and the school of Ibn ‘Arabi, who and wrote both legal and Sufi texts to bolster his claim to power.\textsuperscript{11} Political patronage of Sufism was expressed both through financial grants and tax breaks given to Sufis, and the construction of dedicated buildings such as the \textit{khānqāh}.

While figures such as Ibn ‘Arabi and Rumi are famous to a modern Western audience for representing a spiritual, ecumenical religiosity, hagiographies make it clear there was nothing cuddly about \textit{awliyā’}. They were imbued with knowledge of the future, endowed with personal communication with God; and hagiographical texts are full of tales of worldly kingship being brought to a premature end by a ruler’s failure to recognise their claims. This was not merely a literary topos. Ilkhanid historians record attempts by Sufis to place a favoured candidate on the throne: Rashid al-Din tells us that Sufis in Tabriz, motivated by ‘love of position and money’ (\textit{hubb-i jāh u māl}), promised the prince Ala Fireng that they would make him king in Ghazan’s place.\textsuperscript{12} In Anatolia, too, there are hints of such ambitions. One source on the great rebellion of 675/1277 against the Mongols, for which the Seljuq pretender Jimri was a figurehead, claims that the latter was himself a dervish gone amok:

In recent times there was a man who always purported to be a dervish
His custom was always silence, he was righteous, a follower of the [Sufi] path, a
weaver of the \textit{khirqa} [the robe worn by Sufis]
People all liked him, and grew believing and trusting in him.
They all saw him as a Bayazid [Bistami],\textsuperscript{13} a group became his disciples
Despite his pure religion and his wholesome life, his heart was not satisfied with
these inner truths.
He suddenly went out of his mind, and his tongue pronounced erroneous words.
He claimed that ‘I am the sultan of Rum, O disciples. Henceforth know for sure
that I am the sultan.’
A group spread this news and became convinced that he was sultan
They called him Jimri and proclaimed him to be sultan of the earth.\textsuperscript{14}

Although the veracity of this account is doubtful, it is intriguing that it is found in
a text, the verse \textit{Khamushnama} of Yusufi, composed in 699/1299, which was
written to inculcate Sufi virtues. Yusufi’s tale points to the fact that by the end of
the thirteenth century some Sufis were intimately associated with political power

\textsuperscript{11} Discussed in Peacock, ‘Rulership and Metaphysics’.
\textsuperscript{12} Rashid al-Din, \textit{Jami’ al-Tawarikh}, II, 1318. See also the discussion in Brack, ‘Mediating Sacred Kingship’, 60ff.
\textsuperscript{13} Bayazid Bistami, a famous Iranian Sufi of the ninth century.
as much as piety, and that there was suspicion of the motives of such men even in Sufi circles.\(^{15}\)

Leaving aside the dubious case of Jimri, no other Sufi succeeded in seizing political power in Anatolia during the Mongol period; yet there were others who tried, such as the holy man Baba Ilyas, who led the great revolt of 638/1240 that shook the Seljuq sultanate on the eve of the Mongol invasions. Thus as well as supporting worldly authority, Sufis could represent a challenge to it, and this chapter focuses on two families of Sufis, those of Jalal al-Din Rumi and of Baba Ilyas, who illustrate the different aspects of this relationship. Evidence for Rumi and the early Mevlevi is provided not just by the fourteenth-century Persian hagiography by the Mevlevi disciple Aflaki (d. 761/1360), the Manaqib al-‘Arifin, but also Rumi’s own works, especially his surviving letters, as well as the poetry of Rumi’s son Sultan Walad.\(^{16}\) These contemporary or near-contemporary sources allow us a unique insight into a family of awliyā who succeeded in establishing themselves as the pre-eminent figures in Anatolian Sufism. We also examine the formation of the very different line of awliyā descended from Baba Ilyas, as illustrated by his great-grandson’s verse hagiography in Turkish, the Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye by Elvan Çelebi, completed in 760/1358–9, which reflects some of the same politico-religious ideas that are attested in Mevlevi circles. This allows us to understand how, despite the defeat of Baba Ilyas’s military challenge to the Seljuq state, his descendants were able to harness the charismatic power of his memory to assert their own position in Central Anatolia, despite the lack of a formally organised ṭariqa (or at least, one that is recognised as such today).

It should be noted that these were not the only Sufi organisations in medieval Anatolia. In addition, there were holy men who adopted a path of extreme renunciation and asceticism, rejecting the conventions of society. Known as muwallalahs or Qalandars, this movement seems to have originated in the early thirteenth century Levant and, believing that social conventions put a barrier between them and God, its adherents thus deliberately engaged in outrageous behaviour, including, in some


cases, rejecting the divine law itself. As a result, they attracted considerable criticism from some quarters, but there were many Qalandars who were also Mevlevis. The boundaries between the groups were fluid, as is suggested by a vast mathnawi composed by a Mevlevi disciple, Abu Bakr Rumi, the Qalandarnama, which advocates the way of the Qalandar within a Mevlevi framework. In addition, other, more formally organised tariqas spread to Anatolia from elsewhere in the Middle East: by the mid-thirteenth century the Rifa’iyya tariqa of Iraqi origin was present in the Amasya region, and slightly later in Konya and Kayseri. Najm al-Din Razi, whose works circulated widely in Anatolia, was an adherent of the Central Asian Kubrawi order, but his presence in the peninsula does not seem to have been accompanied by any wider diffusion of the Kubrawiyya. Indeed, apart from the Mevlevi, most tariqas are extremely poorly attested in Mongol-era Anatolia. For instance the Wafa’iyya, followers of the eleventh-century Iraqi saint Sayyid Abu’l-Wafa, are claimed by some modern scholars to have been an important tariqa in medieval Anatolia but in fact there is little evidence for their activities before the fifteenth century; the same is true of the Kazaruniyya from Iran. It seems that some tariqas spread west from Central Asia in the wake of the dislocations of Timur’s rule in the late fourteenth century. Thus by the fifteenth century
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17 See Karamustafa, God’s Unruly Friends, for a discussion of these groups, esp. pp. 61–3 for Anatolia; also Ocak, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nda Marjinal Sufilik: Kalenderiler.


21 Mustafa Tahrali, ‘Rîfâ’îyya’, TDVA, vol. 35, 99–103; the best contemporary source for the Rifa’iyya in the region is Ibn Sarrj’s Tuffih al-Arubh, which, however, concentrates on the Kurdish awliya’ of the Jazira. See the study by Eyüp Öztürk, Velîlî ile Delîlî Arasında: İbnû’s-Serrac in Gözümden Muvelleh Derişiler (Istanbul, 2013).

22 Hamid Algar, ‘Kobrawiyya.ii. The Order’, EI.


a rich array of ṭariqas and other less formally organised Sufi groups was present in Anatolia. It would be mistaken, however, to project the variety of later times back to the Mongol period, when, even if other ṭariqas were present in limited numbers, the Mevlevis enjoyed a position of dominance in the peninsula, even if this was challenged by other individual Sufis.

As a result, Anatolian Sufism of the Mongol period is largely a home-grown phenomenon, although as we shall see that does not mean it existed in isolation from wider currents. The reasons for Mevlevi dominance are complex, but one reason for their appeal, as I shall argue, is that the Mevlevi ṭariqa offered rulers not just their saints’ baraka (blessings), but also provided a theoretical justification to ideas of sacral kingship that were emerging in this period. Although scholarship has drawn attention to the importance of these ideas for the Ilkhanids as well as later empires such as the Timurids, Safavids and Ottomans, the ways in which they were developed in medieval Anatolia have not previously been adequately studied and as a result the early history of their diffusion is obscure. This chapter sheds light on these processes, and shows that ideas of sacral kingship could appeal to provincial audiences of minor rulers and amirs far beyond the imperial centres on which scholarship has concentrated to date.

**RUMI, HIS SUCCESSORS AND THE POLITICAL ELITE SEEN THROUGH MEVLEVI SOURCES**

Although some Sufis rejected the corrupting associations of worldly power, Sufi texts frequently acknowledge the existence of a relationship between holy men and the Mongols. They do so for their own reasons rather than simply to record factual information. In Sufi literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth century, not just in Anatolia, but also in other areas affected by the Mongol invasions such as India and Khurasan, the emergence of the Mongols from their weakness and
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26 E.g. Green, *Sufism*, 96.


destitution to become a major power is attributed to divine favour, and the Mongols and Sufis are seen as allies.29 As Devin DeWeese has pointed out, the motif of the Sufi alliance with the Mongols functions in a variety of ways. The notion of the Mongol conquests as a punishment from God is common in the Muslim (and non-Muslim) literature of the period, and the willingness of Sufis to imagine themselves as participating in them may reflect both Sufi views of the worthlessness of material existence as well as the actual alienation of some Sufis from the mainstream of the Islamic community, in the destruction of which they remembered themselves as complicit. On another level, such tales ensure that God’s providence is seen as having been effected not simply through the agent of a bloodthirsty foreign tyrant, but also through the means of one of God’s Friends, thus asserting the position of the awliyā’. We can see these features in the Qalandarnama, the long Persian mathnawi composed in Crimea in the middle of the fourteenth century for the region’s Golden Horde governors, by the Anatolian author Abu Bakr Rumi. The poem relates that it was a Sufi holy man who led Chinggis Khan to the great Central Asian city of Marw, which the Mongols then destroyed.30 Abu Bakr makes no bones about the fact that Chinggis killed innumerable ‘ulama’, muftis, ascetics (zāhidān) and servants of god (‘ābi-dān).31 Chinggis was a sign of God’s wrath (mażhar-i qahr-i khudā), but it was in the works of his descendants that God’s will could be seen at work:

Some of his sons were believers; they were good, pious kings.
They were both a refuge and a way for the Holy Law, they made their wealth and kingship a means for the faith.
In regions they rule in this way, and destroy the unbelievers.
This purpose (ma‘āni) did God inaugurate, when he showed the way to Chinggis Khan.
Every king who has paid attention to pirs, must have the door of truth opened for him in this way.32

---

31 Abu Bakr Rumi, Qalandarnama, Tashkent, Beruniy Institute of Manuscripts, MS 11668, fols 193a–b. Praise of Uzbek Khan at fol. 193b. A facsimile of the manuscript has also been published: Qalandar-name, prepared by Ilnur M. Mirgaleev (Kazan’, 2015) (non vidi).
32 Abu Bakr Rumi, Qalandarnama, fols. 193b; Persian text given in DeWeese, ‘Khāns and Amīrs’, 56.
Similarly, an anecdote in Aflaki’s *Manaqib* attributed to Rumi states that Hülegü had successfully conquered Baghdad in 656/1258 because he and his men had fasted and prayed for three days beforehand, whereas the caliph’s arrogance led to his downfall. Thus the Mongols, even if not technically Muslims, are depicted as acting in a more *muslim* way (in the sense of showing their innate religiosity and submission to God) than the leader of the *umma*, justifying their victory. If Mongol rule could ultimately be seen as divinely ordained, then this was doubtless to the advantage of Sufis who, like Abu Bakr Rumi himself, were dependent on the patronage of Chinggis Khan’s descendants and their deputies.

These Sufi texts thus portray an intimate relationship with the political elite, and the Mongols in particular, as part of a strategy of emphasising Sufis’ enduring importance in the divine plan. A more complex picture emerges from Rumi’s correspondence, which addresses sultans, amirs and viziers – the network attached to the Seljuq court through which the Mongols ruled Anatolia up to the 1270s. Rumi is on occasion deeply critical of the Mongols. Thus, for example, a letter to Mu’in al-Din Sulayman, the Pervane, complains bitterly of the Mongols, with their incessant demands for loans and camels. A missive to Amin al-Din Mika’il (d. 676/1277), who held the senior posts of *nāʿīb al-saltāna* and *malik al-umara’ wa’l-nuwwāb*, is even stronger; Rumi writes that ‘since this group [i.e. the Mongols] have gained power over us, fear has prevailed; if it has abated for a moment, it is like a viper reposing in a house, sleeping in a corner.’ The letter then goes on to allude to the security problems in Konya in the absence of Amin al-Din Mika’il, which were presumably caused by the Mongol soldiery: houses were broken into in the night, women and children killed and property stolen. Rumours swept the town, for every day a new piece of bad news came and people were slaughtered like cattle. Both this letter and that to the Pervane constitute


34 For a similar claim for the divinely decreed nature of the Mongol invasions see Elvan Çelebi, *Mehmedhü’l-Kudisiye fe Menashi’l-ʿUnsiye (Baba Ilyas-i Horasânî ve Sudâleisinin Menkâbevi Tarihi)*, ed. İsmail E. Erünsal and Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (Ankara, 2014), l. 1845ff. Such views were not restricted to hagiography: for a discussion of the historian Aqsarai’s treatment of the infidel Mongols as more pious than the Muslims see Anooshahr, *The Ghazi Sultans and the Frontiers of Islam*, 130–1.


37 Ibid., 139, no. 61.
pleas for help and protection from the Mongols. Elsewhere, in *Fihi ma Fihi*, Rumi directly criticises the Pervane for his links with the Mongols.38 Nonetheless, Rumi’s correspondence offers clear testimony to his reliance on Ilkhanid allies such as the Pervane, Amin al-Din Mika’il and Fakhr al-Din ‘Ali, who was *amir-dād, malik al-umarā*’ and *nā’ib al-saltana*, and who acted as vizier from 659/1260 until his death in 688/1288. Rumi interceded with this political elite to secure worldly advancement for relatives and associates. A letter to the Pervane’s father, Muhadhdhab al-Din, who had been Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw II’s chief minister and was responsible for the surrender to Baiju, requests employment for one Shams al-Din.39 Letters to the Pervane also beg him to find a job for Shams al-Din because, as Rumi puts it, ‘he desires, one way or another, to be honoured by serving this court’.40 Rumi’s intercessions also frequently aimed to secure the forgiveness of various associates of his, some of whom seem to have been embroiled in political disputes. A letter to Fakhr al-Din ‘Ali raises the case of Najm al-Din b. Khurram b. Chawush, imprisoned for some kind of involvement in civil disturbances (*ātish-i fitna*).41 Rumi writes to the Pervane relaying the gratitude of the sons of one Sayf al-Din, whose pardoning had allowed them to start a new life.42 A certain Karim al-Din Mahmud had been accused on account of greed for, presumably, some unspecified financial offence; the Pervane is asked to issue a decree (*yarlīgh*) exonerating him.43

Perhaps the majority of letters are essentially those of recommendation: Rumi starts with a formulaic expression of desire to see the addressee, who is usually given his full titles. After Rumi’s greetings, the candidate for patronage is introduced, with comments as to how deserving and pious he is; then the specific request is made. The letter concludes with a reminder to the addressee of the eternal rewards his generosity will bring. Many of the requests are for stipends or loans,44 but others are direct appeals for commercial or financial privileges for members of Rumi’s circle. One letter to the Pervane introduces *fakhr al-tujjār*, ‘the glory of the merchants’, Shihab al-Din, who was apparently engaged in trade with Sivas and for whom Rumi asks for an exemption from customs tolls (*bāj*).45

40 Ibid., 187, no. 101: ‘arzā-yi ān as kih bih wasla az wasā’il bih khidmati-yi ān bārgāb musharraf shawd’.
41 Ibid., 76, no 10.
42 Ibid., 81, no. 16.
43 Ibid., 126, no. 51.
44 Ibid., 78, no. 12; p. 98, no. 29; pp. 141–2, no. 63; pp. 196–7, no. 108.
Another letter, to Fakhr al-Din ‘Ali, refers to the exemption of a number of Rumi’s associates from government levies (muşâlabât and muşâdarât) and requests the privilege be extended to others of his circle. Various letters request the investigation of cases of muşâdarâ, or state expropriation of property, and on one occasion Rumi asks the Pervane to assist Husam al-Din who overspent on rebuilding the wall of an abandoned garden. In another, the Pervane is asked to assist the heirs of Salah al-Din, who had purchased a garden for 500 dirhams but fallen into arrears with the payments.

Rumi emerges from his correspondence as the pivot of a system of patronage whereby his followers benefited from the protection and favour of the elite, including worldly benefits, such as tax breaks and positions at court. Rumi’s behaviour was not atypical of at least some Sufi saints. For instance, the corpus of letters of the fifteenth-century Central Asian Naqshbandi Khwaja ‘Ubaydallah Ahrar and his associates bears many similarities to Rumi’s. Consisting largely of petitions, the Khwaja Ahrar correspondence demonstrates the crucial role this saint played in mediating patronage relationships between his followers and the Timurid court, on which they relied for material support, protection, appointment to office, tax relief, waqf and property. Indeed, saints also played a more general role mediating between society and its lords.

Rumi’s behaviour was emulated by his son and eventual successor, Sultan Walad, who continued to enjoy the patronage of some of the same patrons, judging by the dedicatees of poems in his Persian Divan. This contains a qaṣīda addressed to the Pervane, one to Fakhr al-Din ‘Ali, and one to Majd al-Din Muhammad, who served as mustawfi, or chief financial official. The Seljuq family itself features prominently among the dedicatees, with several poems addressed to Ghiyath al-Din Mas’ud II (d. 708/1308), the last Seljuq sultan. Sultan Walad’s closeness to the Seljuq court is illustrated by a qaṣīda written to commemorate the entry of the sultan into Konya on 25 Rabi’ II 680/13 August 1281. It was perhaps composed on the occasion of Ghiyath al-Din Mas’ud’s accession to the throne, and extravagantly praises the sultan and the leading amirs of Konya. The stock epithets of panegyric
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46 Ibid., 104–5, no. 36.
47 Ibid., 91, no. 23; p. 231, no. 135.
48 Ibid., 80, no. 15.
49 Ibid., 165–6, no. 83.
51 Divan Sultan Veled, ed. F. Nafız Uzluk (Istanbul, 1941), 201.
52 Ibid., 182.
53 Ibid., 143.
54 Ibid., 131–3, 144, 247, 466–8.
are pulled out in order to praise him: the sultan resembles Rustam in his courage, Anushirwan in justice, the amirs are like stars and the sultan like the moon. Another poem addressed to the sultan requests aid for Sultan Walad’s followers:

You are the pivot of life and the world, O dear being; you were the purpose of the creation of the whole world, Life, were it even in heaven, would be hell if you were not present

... I have two requirements of your Majesty, that you should do what is customary for your family [to do].

A pension was settled on us by your grandfather and father; such a son as you should give a hundred such [pensions].

Fourteen of our lord [Rumi]’s disciples (‘āshiqān) were exempted and relieved of government tax by that generous king.

In your epoch, O king, it should be so, such that everyone profits without loss from your generosity.

Instruct the sahib [-diwān] to do this, so that everyone may sincerely say his heart is at rest ...

Other poems address royal Seljuq women, such as Rukn al-Din Kılıç Arslan IV’s wife Gumaj Khatun and his daughter Saljuq Khatun. The princess Gurji Khatun, said by Aflaki to have been a devotee of Rumi’s, is also mentioned warmly in a poem addressed to one Husam al-Din, a notable of Kayseri where she was apparently living. A poem to Taj al-Din, the za’īm al-jaysh (commander of the army) requests this amir’s assistance in restoring to Sultan Walad and his followers a waqf that had been unjustly taken from them. After an introduction comparing Taj al-Din to stock heroes of Perso-Islamic culture (in beauty like Joseph, chivalry [jawānmard] like Hatim Tayyi, bravery like ‘Ali b. Abi Talib and justice like Anushirwan), Sultan Walad begs:

I pray to you every evening and morning to bestow on me that village called Kara Arslan.

It is certain, there is no doubt, that Badr al-Din Gawhartash made it a waqf for this group who pray for him (bikarda bâd waqf ânrâ barin jam’i du’â gûyân).
Najib seized it from him [to finance] fighting on the frontier (barā-yi jang-i sinūrī), but just two days later he saw his recompense from God for that.

O lord, protect the religious scholars (faqīhān) in this respect: make flourishing a charitable donation that was destroyed by his oppression... 

Sultan Walad also seems to have had links with the Germiyanid dynasty of Kütahya. The story related by a much later Mevlevi writer, Esrar Dede (d. 1796), that Sultan Walad’s daughter Muttahara Khatun married the Germiyanid Süleymanşah and gave birth to a daughter, Dawlat Khatun, who herself married the Ottoman sultan Yıldırım Bayezid, is probably a fiction, although it is itself instructive that even after so many generations authors were still seeking to link rulers and Sufi lineages. Clearer evidence of some kind of association between Sultan Walad and the Germiyanids comes in the form of a poem in the Diwan praising Kütahya’s natural beauty, its gardens and rivers, and its strong fortress, while Aflaki also records that a gift of a basin of white marble was sent to Sultan Walad from Kütahya. Aflaki also records the close relationship between Sultan Walad and another Turkmen lord, the Aydūnid Muhammad Beg.

The Mongols themselves also became the subject of the holy men’s attentions, at least according to the hagiographies. Aflaki depicts Sultan Walad as instrumental in converting to Islam the Mongol commander in Anatolia, Irenjin Noyan, and of exerting great influence over Ghazan’s deputy, Oposhgha Noyan, who became a disciple. The conversion of Mongols is doubtless intended to be read as a miracle, affirming Sultan Walad’s credentials as his father’s successor, but some confirmation of this picture is afforded by Sultan Walad’s Diwan, which contains a poem dedicated to Samaghar Noyan, Mongol military governor of Anatolia from between roughly 1271 and 1296, his wife Qultaq, his son ‘Arab and his daughter Nawuqi. Although the Mongol names of Samaghar’s family differ from those given in the Manaqib al-‘Arifīn, the poem does at least confirm
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62 Divan Sultan Veled, 226. Samagar is also praised by Aqsara’i for his justice; see Musamrat al-akbhar, 104.

63 Esrar Dede, Təzkire-i Şurar-yi Mevleviyye, ed. İlhan Genç (Ankara, 2000), 137, 325–6; Varlık, Germiyan-oğulları Tarihi, 64.


65 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:52, p. 906; Feats, 633.

66 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:82, pp. 948–9; Feats, 663–4.

67 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 7:12, p. 797; 7: 29, pp. 818–19; Feats, 556–8, 571.

that Aflaki’s tale of Sultan Walad’s links with senior Mongols is correct. Sultan Walad’s dependence on the Mongol order is strikingly suggested by the poem’s radīf (refrain) in Turkish, the language of the Mongol armies, begimiz bizi unutma, ‘our lord, do not forget us.’

After Sultan Walad’s death we are largely reliant on Aflaki’s Manaqib al-Arifin, the great hagiography of Rumi and his descendants, for information about the relations between Sufis and elites. Such a source clearly has its own agenda, as with the Sufi writings described above. Nonetheless it is worth drawing out some of the main elements of the relations between awliyā’ and ruling elites as these form such an important part of Aflaki’s theme.

According to Aflaki, the intimate relationship between power and Sufis continued under Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi, Sultan Walad’s son, although Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi’s extant Divan contains no examples of panegyric comparable with those composed by Sultan Walad. Aflaki gives special attention to Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi, who was his own murshid (spiritual guide), devoting more space to him than any other member of Rumi’s family apart from Mawlana himself. Aflaki relates that when Ghazan acceded to the Sultanate, Ulu Arif Çelebi ‘felt a desire to see the kingdoms of Persian Iraq and to meet the notables of that land. Having decided to make for the ordū with a fortunate company, we set off.’ On the road to Erzurum, they encountered a group of falconers attached to the Ilkhanid court, led by a certain Tuman-Beg son of Qalawuz, chief huntsman to Ghazan (amir-shikār-i khān) and in charge of all other falconers. Tuman-Beg is described in terms that suggest that he is already inclined to Sufism (bi-ghāyat mu’taqid wa ṣādiq wa ‘arif) and asceticism (amir-i faqīr-nihād) as well as being a Seljuq prince (az amir-zādagān-i sultān-i rūm). The chief huntsman immediately shows his respect for Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi going out, falcon perched on his arm, to greet the holy man and kiss hands.

Yet Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi seizes the falcon and releases it into the sky. Fearful for his fate at the hands of the khan for losing this valuable bird, Tuman-Beg begs Çelebi to get it back, which, by invoking Rumi, he does, and the falcon comes to land on
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69 Divanı Sultan Veled, 306. ‘Arab Noyan son of Samaghar is identified by Aflaki as governor of Sivas and a devoted disciple of Çelebi Amir ‘Arif (Manaqib, II, 8:23, p. 855; Feats, 597). Further on the place of the Turkish in the Mongol armies see Chapter 4.

70 See also the discussion in Yılmaz, Caliphate Redefined, 112–19, which focuses on Aflaki’s depiction of Rumi’s father Baha’ al-Din Walad.


72 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:19 p. 844; Feats, 589.
Çelebi’s hat. Aflaki relates that “The son of Qalawuz [Tuman-beg], like one out of his senses, bowed his head and became a murid, and bestowed a gift of three fine horses and two thousand dinars in cash’ on Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi. The huntsman’s devotion to the saint met a material reward on his arrival in Tabriz, where Ghazan was so delighted with the bird that he immediately granted Tuman-Beg thirty horses and 60,000 dinars, gave him his own drink to drink as a sign of his favour and gifted him several villages in the Danishmendid province (North Central Anatolia). Aflaki concludes that Tuman-Beg ‘sacrificed everything for the lord Çelebi, sending him a pension and rendering service until the end of his life’.73

Thus Aflaki shows how the combined supernatural powers of Ulu Arif Çelebi and Rumi not merely rescue Tuman-Beg’s falcon, but ensure that he receives a generous present from Ghazan; devotion to saints is not merely spiritually but also financially rewarding. In the next anecdote, Aflaki recounts how Tuman-Beg told the tale of Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi’s miracle with the falcon at court; ‘the khan greatly desired to see Çelebi, and ordered, “If you can, seize him and bring him”’. Yet Çelebi would not consent to go to see the khan however much Tuman-Beg insisted, saying, ‘It is in his interests that we do not see him, and that we pray for the continuation of the fortune of the just sultan (du‘ā-yi dawlat-i Sulṭān-i ‘ādil) from afar, for “the swiftest prayer to be answered is the prayer of the brother for his brother from the unseen” and we should be preoccupied with our poverty (darwīshī)’.74 Iltermish Khatun, the queen, devised a plan to satisfy the khan’s desire by inviting Çelebi to a session of samā’, the ritual dance of the Sufis (and especially Mevlevis). To this Çelebi consented, and at the samā’ session, held in the tent of Queen Iltermish, the khan

became a devotee (muhībb) of that sultan [Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi]; he observed him from afar and was greatly amazed. In the end, Iltermish Khatun ordered many gifts and honours [to be given] and became herself a disciple (murid) . . . The pādshāh-i İslām [Ghazan], having conceived a great desire for the dynasty of Mawlana because of his love for them, awoke [spiritually]. He would constantly ask Qutb al-Din Shirazi, Humam al-Din Tabrizi, Khwaja Rashid al-Din and the great shaykhs of that land, as well as shining Baraq the rider of Buraq the rider of Buraq [i.e. the holy man Baraq Baba], may God have mercy on them, about Mawlana, and asked for an explanation of his verses. When the late leader of khalīfās, Majd al-Din Atabak-i Mawlawi, came to the sultan’s court and explained the greatness of Mawlana’s proximity [to God] and revelations, he showed proofs, and made the khan’s heart in its entirety thirsty for Mawlana.75

73 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:19, p. 846; Feats, 591.
74 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:20, p. 847; Feats, 591.
75 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:20, p. 848; Feats, 592.
Aflaki shows not merely the intensity of Ghazan’s devotion to Mawlana (not, incidentally, attested in any other sources), but also affirms the unique ability of Mevlevis to interpret the master’s work and thus reveal the divine truths contained therein. The leading intellectuals of the Ilkhanid state, the philosopher Qutb al-Din Shirazi, the poet Humam al-Din Tabrizi and the vizier Rashid al-Din himself, as well as the Anatolian Qalandar Baraq Baba, are all apparently stumped; it is only when the Mevlevi khalīfa (deputy, discussed on pp. 103–4) Majd al-Din appears that Ghazan is able to understand properly. According to Aflaki, Ghazan was so delighted with Majd al-Din’s explanation of one of Mawlana’s ghazals that he had it embroidered on a mantle. The poem started:

When I bring a cup of manliness from the beloved’s vat, I put out of action two worlds and the hidden.
You fear the Tatars [Mongols] because you do not know God, but I will bring two hundred banners of faith to the Tatars.

Aflaki quotes Ghazan as connecting this poem to his conversion:

When [Ghazan] sat on the throne, he wore [this cloak with the ghazal embroidered on it] and he was proud to say, ‘Mawlana of Rum composed this ghazal for me, for I spread the banner of faith now among the Mongols, and they have now become Muslims.’

Clearly, we are not meant to take this statement literally, for Rumi died a good twenty years before Ghazan converted, and there is no other evidence for any association of Ghazan with the Mevlevis, who are rarely mentioned in Ilkhanid sources from the court in Iran. Aflaki’s aim is to assert the role of the Mevlevis in bringing Ghazan to true Islam through the teachings of Rumi’s successors, Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi and Majd al-Din, and thereby to validate the claims of the Mevlevis to spiritual dominion. Aflaki claims Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi’s influence continued under Ghazan’s successors, and says that he himself accompanied Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi on another journey to the Ilkhanid heartland in Azerbaijan, this time to Sultaniiyya, the Ilkhan Öljeitü’s capital. According to Aflaki, this journey was ordered by Sultan Walad, who was furious that preachers in Anatolia had been forbidden from mentioning the names of the Companions of the Prophet after Öljeitü’s embrace of Shiism. Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi was charged with travelling to the ordu to convert Öljeitü back from Shiism, although the sultan died while he was en route – an event foretold by Çelebi. Nonetheless, the party continued to
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Sultaniyya, where, Aflaki claims, they were greeted with every respect by the leading figures of the Ilkhanid state. It is not clear whether this refers to the same visit, suggesting it was greatly extended, or another journey – Aflaki mentions Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi’s regular travels. On two other occasions, Aflaki mentions travelling to Tabriz with Çelebi, where samā’ sessions were held with numerous prominent men in attendance, in addition to Sultaniyya.

As well as underlining Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi’s purportedly close relationship with the Ilkhanid house, Aflaki discusses his influence on leading figures in Anatolia. Several anecdotes mention Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi’s presence at court drinking parties. Aflaki even sought to claim for the Mevlevis credit for the installation of the Seljuq sultan ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad III b. Faramarz (r. 697/1297–701/1301). He alludes to the grant of the position by the Ilkhan, writing that the aforementioned Majd al-Din having procured the sultanate of Rum for sultan ‘Ala’ al-Din son of Faramarz, himself became his atabeg and subdued the entire kingdom of Rum. He sat ['Ala’ al-Din] on the throne of Konya, the abode of kingship. Out of gratitude for this, ['Ala’ al-Din] showed his devotion in various ways to Sultan Walad, Çelebi ‘Arif and their noble disciples.

In addition, Aflaki claims that the ruler of the Turkmen principality of Menteşe in western Anatolia, Mas’ud Beg (r. c. 695/1296–717/1319), was one of the devotees of Mawlana’s family (az jumla-yi muhibbān-i khāndān būd). He describes how Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi travelled to Menteşe where Mas’ud Beg arranged a samā’ session for him. After Çelebi saw off a challenge from a rival Turkish shaykh, the people of the province became his disciples, and Mas’ud Beg presented him with splendid presents – slaves, horses, cloaks and cash. Similarly, the Eshrefid ruler of Beyşehir, Mubariz al-Din Çelebi Muhammad Beg, patronised Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi. The Aydıniş ruler Mubariz al-Din Muhammad Beg (r. 708/1308–734/1334), and the Germiyanid Yakub I ((c. 699/1299–c. 727/1327) are also

78 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:20, pp. 858–862; Feats, 600–2.
79 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:47, p. 896; Feats, 627.
80 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:34, p. 873; Feats, 611.
81 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:45, p. 894; Feats, 625–6.
82 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:76, p. 932; Feats, 652.
83 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:38, p. 885, 8: 40, 887; Feats, 619, 620–1.
84 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:20, p. 849; Feats, 593.
85 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:22, pp. 851–2; Feats, 595.
86 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:20, pp. 924–5, 8: 85, pp. 944–5; Feats, 647, 661.
mentioned among his devotees, as is Shuja’ al-Din Inanj Beg (fl. c. 714/1314–734/1334), the ruler of Ladhiq/Denizli. Aflaki often emphasises the hereditary nature of these loyalties. Sons of disciples of Mawlana become in turn devotees of Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi. ‘Arab Noyan, the Mongol governor of Sivas and son of Samaghar, the Mongol governor who was Sultan Walad’s disciple, is himself described as a disciple (murid-i mukhlis) of Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi. 89 The son of Nur al-Din b. Jaja, Mongol commander of Kırşehir, Pulad Beg, was both a courtier of Ghazan and a devotee of the family of Mawlana. 90 Likewise, ‘Ayn al-Hayat, daughter of Gurji Khatun, a devotee of Mawlana, was herself a disciple of Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi.91

Aflaki also associates the line of Mawlana with the conquests of Umur Beg, the second Aydıniid ruler (r. 734/1334–749/1348), famous for his exploits against the Christians, commemorated by the Ottoman poet Enverî and also mentioned by Ibn Battuta. 92 Aflaki gives Umur suitably heroic epithets, immortalising his role as a warrior for the faith: ‘the king of amirs, the model of the heroes, the second Hamza, the divine ghazi’. 93 Aflaki records that on several occasions when the emir was in distress at sea, Mawlana appeared to Umur and saved him. Likewise, when waging war against the Christians, on several occasions Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi appeared to him:

Several times when fighting against the infidel [Umur Beg] saw that Çelebi Arif was fighting too. [The infidel] hung their heads in shame and their defeat became apparent. That unique man [Umur Pasha], because of his faith, strove to fight until the final moment when he attained the rank of martyr and became one of the people of felicity. They say that one night he saw Çelebi in a dream, saying this verse to him,

‘Whoever has our patent of protection in the hem of his cloak, is bold and respected if he travels on land and sea.’

And so it was that he decided to conqueror the island of Chios, from which they brought back more mastic than can be said. He imposed tribute and made the island his private estate (khāṣṣa). 95

87 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:86, pp. 945–7; Feats, 661–3. The Germiyanid is referred to only as ‘son of Alishir’, but is evidently meant to be the Germiyanid Beg; of the several different sons of Alishir mentioned in the sources, Yakub is firmly epigraphically attested in this period. See Varlık, Germiyan-oğullar Tarihi, 23–4, 31.
88 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:30, 81 pp. 864, 939; Feats, 604–5, 657.
89 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:23, p. 855; Feats, 597.
90 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:38, p. 885; Feats, 619.
91 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:62, pp. 915–16; Feats, 640–1.
93 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:89, p. 949; Feats, 664.
94 Kharāj, an ambiguous term that, by the Ottoman period, could be synonymous with jizya, the poll-tax on non-Muslims, or tribute paid by non-Muslim vassals; it seems this is what is intended rather than its Abbasid meaning of land-tax. See Cengiz Orhonlu, ‘Kharāj’, EI².
95 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:89, p. 949–50; Feats, 664–5.
Thus the blessing-power of Mawlana and Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi are portrayed as efficacious long after their deaths. Umur Beg’s devotion to the house of Mawlana ensures that at critical moments its leading members step in to save him from disaster at sea and ensure his victory over unbelievers.

Aflaki is quite open about Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi’s alliance with the Mongols, reflecting the Sufi tendency to identify the Mongol invasions as a sign of divine will discussed above, writing that:

In the time of the Karamanids when the city of Konya was in their hands, and because Çelebi was a supporter of the Mongol army (khuwāhān-i lashkar-i Mughāl), the [former] group [i.e. the Karamanids] were annoyed. They continually protested, saying, ‘You do not desire us who are your neighbours, and devotees of Mawlana, but you desire the foreign Mongols.’ He answered, ‘We are dervishes, we look to see whom the will of God desires, and to whomsoever he bestows his kingdom, we are on his side and we want him . . . Now God exalted does not want you but wants the army of the Mongols, and He has taken the kingdom from the hands of the Seljuqs and entrusted it to the descendants of Chinggis Khan, “for God gives rule to whomsoever he desires” (Q. 2:248). We also want what God wants.’ The Karamanids, even though they were sincere devotees and disciples were offended, and were wary of Çelebi.96

Under Ulu Arif Çelebi’s successor, Çelebi ‘Abid, the relationship between Mongols and the line of Mawlana continued. When the Mongol governor (and self-proclaimed messiah; see Chapter 6) Timurtash reconquered Konya from the Karamanids in 722/1322–3, he sought an association with Çelebi ‘Abid: ‘In absolute love Timurtash very much wished that Çelebi ‘Abid and all the family’s offspring would enter the train of that company [those who swore allegiance to him] as well and would attend on him in circumstances of hardship and ease, at home and abroad.’ However, Çelebi ‘Abid consented only to ‘display affection a distance’.97 Aflaki may be seeking to express disapproval of Timurtash’s messianic pretensions. Indeed, Aflaki records that Eretna sought to use Çelebi ‘Abid as an intermediary with the commanders of the āj, the Turkmen-populated peripheral regions, who had not yet submitted to Timurtash. Çelebi ‘Abid apparently asked Aflaki himself to dissuade Eretna from imposing this task on him. Although Aflaki’s account is somewhat ambiguous – doubtless deliberately – it seems that despite his protests Çelebi did undertake this task, for Aflaki refers to travelling to the āj in his company. Similarly, Aflaki records a visit by Çelebi ‘Abid to the imperial ordu in Tabriz.98 This visit, it seems, was less successful, for the vizier, Rashid al-Din’s son, Shams al-Din amir Muhammad, failed to show the dervishes
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the respect they were due – resulting, Aflaki hints, in the collapse of Abu Sa’id’s realm.

Aflaki’s extensive treatment of the close relations between the Mevlevis’ leaders on the one hand and Turkmen and Mongol rulers on the other is evidently intended to establish the credentials of Rumi’s descendants as men whose writ extended over the earthly domain as well the spiritual, a gift granted to them by their proximity to God that was also demonstrated by the miracles they performed. This saintly power could thus be used in ways both positive or negative, assisting Umur Beg in his jihad against the unbelievers and handing ‘Ala’ al-Din b. Faramarz the throne, or bringing down the very kingdom of the Ilkhan. This latter assertion in particular may seem little more than the extravagant literary conceit of a Mevlevi anxious to assert the authority of his order. Yet to contemporaries, who generally accepted the claims made for saints’ power (at least on a general level, even if specific instances were debatable), Aflaki’s statement may not have seemed so tendentious, especially against the background of a world from which the Ilkhanate’s power had disappeared on Abu Sa’id’s death with a rapidity that defies ready explanation even today.99 As Azfar Moin has put it of a rather later period, ‘the cadences of social and political life were linked to the rhythms of a cosmos kept in balance by the efforts of holy men’.100 Successful engagement with the awliyā’ was essential for upholding a ruler’s reputation, rather than directly bestowing legitimacy through association, as is sometimes argued in modern scholarship;101 Rumi and his circle, for instance, seem from his letters to have been considerably less widely popular than Aflaki would have us believe.102 Moreover, rulers both Ilkhanid and Turkmen patronised the muwallah or Qalandar holy men who were regarded by many with disapproval for their rejection of societal and juridical norms. Sources record the devotion of Ghazan and Öljeitü to Baraq Baba (d. 707/1307–8) from Tokat, who was famed for feats of taming tigers as well as for his outlandish appearance, filthy and naked.103 Similarly, Ibn Battuta recounts how the Aydinid amir of Izmir, Umur Beg, patronised muwallah dervishes.104 Given the Ilkhanids’ well-attested patronage of holy men, it is entirely possible that contemporaries could be persuaded that a rift with the latter explained the former’s demise.
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Although rulers’ interest in Sufism was complex and cannot be reduced to a single cause, Mevlevi texts offer reasons both practical and theoretical why the saints deserve elite patronage. Rumi himself at several places in his letters argues that his patrons should support him in return for receiving du’ā-yi dawlat, a phrase that crops up in almost every letter, and which we may roughly translate as meaning ‘praying for your prosperity’. To give one extreme example, Rumi requests a tax exemption for some dervishes ‘because they have been preoccupied with praying [for your prosperity] which has kept them from earning a living’.105 A request to Majd al-Din asking for Kamal al-Din’s exemption from taxes is explained by the fact that Kamal al-Din had become too preoccupied with the afterlife, which had resulted in his financial problems; if these were solved then he could devote himself to ‘praying for your prosperity’.106 Fakhr al-Din ‘Ali, asked to extend the tax privileges he has already granted, is assured that ‘our disciples (jamā’at-i yārān-i mā), since they have been freed from concern about taxes and expropriations in these difficult days by your efforts, have been preoccupied with praying for you’.107 Nor were these prayers always bland supplications for the soul of the patron. An unnamed amir is recommended one Baha’ al-Din as the object of his patronage. If he granted him a madrasa, people would pray for the amir, which would be ‘a reason for the continuation of your prosperity, happiness and the crushing of your enemies’.108 A letter to an amir named Nizam al-Mulk even more explicitly links the patron’s charity, the resulting prayers and worldly success: Nizam al-Mulk had taken such good care of dervishes and the poor, it was said, that their prayers had been accepted by God, which gave Nizam al-Mulk the victory on the occasion when this congratulatory letter was written.109

In addition to these material benefits, the claims of awliyā’ to authority little less than that of prophets (anbiyā’) demanded the attention of rulers. While the relationship between the awliyā’ and anbiyā’ had been debated since the origins of Sufism, most of the classical Sufi thinkers such as Tirmidhi in the ninth century put the awliyā’ one step below the Prophets.110 However, in the thirteenth century, this changed with Ibn ‘Arabi’s vastly influential claim that the awliyā’ were no less in rank than the Prophets. Ibn ‘Arabi himself claimed to be the Seal
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of the awliyā’, much as Muhammad had been the Seal of the anbiyā’. In the wake of Ibn ‘Arabi’s teachings, other saintly families started to assert a similar status for themselves; thus comparable claims were made in the fourteenth century by the leaders of the Wafa’iyya Sufi order in Egypt, Muhammad Wafa’ and his son ‘Ali. The idea of sainthood expounded by Sultan Walad in his works seems to owe much to the reformulation of Ibn ‘Arabi in which sainthood and prophecy merge, even if Sultan Walad, like his father, avoids much of Ibn ‘Arabi’s technical vocabulary and abstruse phraseology. The status of the awliyā’ is the principal concern of Sultan Walad’s three Persian mathnawis, the Ibtidanama, Rababnama and Intihanama, and in all of them the awliyā’ are equated with prophets. At the beginning of the Ibtidanama, composed in 690/1291, a prose heading announces ‘an explanation of how the anbiyā’ and awliyā’ are of one breath and one light, both speaking from one God and both having from him the mercy of being released from existence’. Sultan Walad also offers an extended discussion of the story of Moses and Khidr, the verses in the sura of al-Kahf that since Ibn ‘Arabi had been used by Sufi writers to elucidate the relationship between prophecy and sainthood, with Moses representing prophecy and Khidr saint-hood. For Sultan Walad, the story also functions as a metaphor for the relationship between Mawlana and his controversial murshid Shams-i Tabriz, with
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Mawlana acting as Moses (recognised in the Qur’an as a nabi) to Shams’s Khidr or wali. Although he does not explicitly apply the term nabi to Mawlana, Sultan Walad exalts ‘unequalled, peerless’ Rumi above any other wali: ‘His relationship to the noble awliya’ is like that of the elite to the common people; they are all like children before him . . .’. The distinction between the anbiya’ and the awliya’, Sultan Walad suggests, is that the mission (da’wat) of the anbiya’ is for everyone, just like a shepherd who is the guardian of his flock, they summon to God both elite and ordinary people (khawass wa ‘awamm) out of nobility (karam’). In contrast, the wali ‘seeks a lover drunk like himself so that he can say the secret of his heart; his summoning is for the elite of God . . . he has not a word for the ordinary people’.

In the concluding sections of the Ibtidanama, Sultan Walad returns to this theme, discussing how ‘God’s friend is the Noah of his time’, whose miracle (mu’jiza) is speech. The Prophet Muhammad is quoted as describing his inheritors as the awliya’; ‘they can intercede among people, and the shaykh among his people his like the prophet in his community’ (wa-lahun shafa’a fi ‘l-nas wa’l-shaykh fi qaumih ka’l-nabi fi ummatih). The Rababnama also mentions the relationship between awliya’ and anbiya’, claiming that both are a ‘manifestation of God’ (mazhbar-i baqq), and that the awliya’ fulfil the task of guiding the people to the truth and law previously undertaken by the anbiya’.

Sultan Walad suggests the prophets and saints differ in the audience to whom their actions are directed, but prophecy is continuous and its current vehicle is the awliya’ – Rumi, and by implication Sultan Walad himself. When Sultan Walad discusses his own installation as head of the Mevlevi and the reasons for the start of his proselytising, he writes:

This is the constant practice of God, in every epoch he sends a messenger (rasul) For not everyone has the strength to bear God’s mercy without a prophet (nabi) . . . Every prophet became a means that His advice and warnings are brought forth.

The context in which this description of continuous prophecy is expounded, that of the foundation of the Mevlevi mission by Sultan Walad, leaves little room for doubt that these prophets are to be found among the Mevlevis.
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If prophecy is real and present in the world, it is unsurprising that the *awliyā'* share many of the characteristics of the *anbiyā’*, first and foremost the receipt of direct revelation from God. Rumi believed his *Mathnawi* was a form of divine revelation, an idea supported by Sultan Walad who alludes to his father’s works and his own as ‘sent down’ (*nazzalnā*), a word usually used of the Qur’an (Q. 15:9). Indeed, Sultan Walad explicitly claims in the *Intihanama* that the ‘poetry of the saints is the explanation (*tafsīr*) of the Qur’an.*A further quality of the *anbiyā’* that is shared by the *awliyā’* is the ability to prophesy; both the *Manaqib al-Arifin* and Elvan Çelebi’s *Menakıbu’l-Kudsiyye* are replete with examples of the holy man foretelling the end of a dynasty or the death of a political leader; and as we have seen, the *awliyā’* can also perform miracles.

Sultan Walad’s concept of the role of the *awliyā’* had plenty to attract rulers beyond admiration for their Prophet-like status. In his *Rababnama*, Sultan Walad acknowledges the criticisms that were made of his close relationship with power, but explained how temporal rulers could actually hold the status of *quṭbs*, the heads of the hierarchy of saints:

One of [our] believers who was an amir came to visit me. He had previously given money and favours, and I had at that time praised him excessively [dar mad̲h̲-i ʿān dām mubālaqga kardam]. A disciple [murīd] said, ‘These praises are fitting for prophets and *quṭbs*, for they are pure souls [rūḥ-i mab̲d̲] and the light of God. How can it be right to be so excessive about a corporeal being?’ I replied, ‘As my gaze perceives that light which God placed in that amir, for “He created man in darkness then sprinkled his light upon him” (*khalaqa al-khalq fi _zulma*) and the truth of man is that light (*ḥaqqīqat-i adami khwud ān nūr ast*), and the saints always perceive that light, all their praise of created beings is in reality praise of the creator. Every veneration which they offer, when the object is God, is not an excess . . . Another interpretation is that that amir may be one of the *quṭbs* and the perfect [az quṭbān wa kāmilān].

Sultan Walad elaborates this argument in verse:

Know that in every community is a chosen man who is the intimate and trusted of God [*khāṣ u amīn*]  
He appears in different clothes, although all are one before God  
Mostly he sows obedience [to God] in the world in the form of piety and law.

---

In contrast, one may have his external appearance dark in wrongdoing, but his inner self is light itself. Just like a sultan who travels the land in lowly clothes to remain hidden, He is hidden from bad and good, elite and common people just like the moon in the clouds.

God makes his creation hidden out of jealousy [zi ghayrat] in lowly clothes and great men.

‘My saints are in my domes [awliyā’ī fī qibābī] said God.131 Understand, oh man of the [Sufi] path, what the dome is. He places a disagreeable characteristic [khuslat-i makrūh] in a king, so that king escapes from the ordinary people. No one except the saint [walī] recognises him, because he is God’s inviolable secret. When [the saints] see, they do not look on his external appearance, but their eyes falls on his pure secret.

The ignorant people, if they deny that, will all go to hell. Because of their blindness they do not see what is visible, out of ignorance they remain behind that leader.

In the first explanation was a general secret, that the saint sees God in everything all the time...

In the second explanation is a more special [khāṣtar] secret which I have explained so you know

God puts a hidden good in an evil form so that it is hidden from the people of the world.132

Thus Sultan Walad’s conception of sainthood provides for a special relationship between walī and ruler. It is the walī’s unique knowledge that allows him to realise that the ruler may himself be one of the qutbs, a term adopted from Ibn ‘Arabī that we shall explore further. Sultan Walad’s theory of sainthood offered a solution to the crisis of legitimacy of the Mongol period. If the ruler himself could be the leader of the spiritual hierarchy, albeit hidden from plain sight, except to the awliyā’, then further justification for rule was hardly required; and if his harsh behaviour made his identification as a spiritual leader unlikely, this too was part of the divine design. Moreover, the awliyā’ are given a privileged status as the only ones privy to divine plan and the ruler’s place in it.

The merging of the interests and identities of awliyā’ and rulers had started to permeate Anatolian Sufi writing and political practice even before Sultan Walad. As noted, the earliest antecedents seem to be the works of Ibn ‘Arabī, who
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developed a theory of man as the vicegerent (*khilāfa*) of God; the man who is a vicegerent is the perfect man (*al-insān al-kāmil*), endowed with divine knowledge modelled on the Prophet Muhammad himself. The perfect man or vicegerent was also identical with the *quṭb*, the leader of the saintly hierarchy. Although in own Ibn ‘Arabi’s conception the perfect man or vicegerent seems to have been identified with the Prophet Muhammad or *quṭb*, in works of his school a broader definition is found. The status of vicegerency can theoretically be attained by through justice, restraint, courage and wisdom, and as in Sultan Walad’s argument, this vicegerent might be unknown even to those around him. This idea of vicegerency was not specifically political in its original formulation. However, Najm al-Din Razi’s *Mirsad al-‘Ibad*, which was dedicated to ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayquabad in 620/1223, and also influenced writers at Ghazan’s court as well as circulating among the begs of fourteenth-century Anatolia, draws on the idea of *khilāfa* to express a theory of sacral kingship:

Kingship (*salṭanat*) is the vicegerency (*khilāfat*) and deputyhood of God Almighty on earth . . . God Almighty showed how kingship over men may be joined to the station and degree of prophethood (*nubuwwat*), so that the king both fulfils his duties of rule and conquest, of diffusing justice and caring for his subjects, and also travels with care the path of religion and the observance of the law, observing all the custom of sainthood (*marāsim-i wilāyat*) and the conditions of prophethood (*sharāyišt-i nubuwwat*).

Najm al-Din Razi thus gives expression to the idea of the unity of prophethood and kingship.

Similar ideas were propagated by the Ilkhanid vizier Rashid al-Din, writing at the beginning of the fourteenth century, who in his *Kitab al-Sultaniyya* argued that the Ilkhan Öljeitü was endowed with sainthood (*wilāyat*). It is unclear whether Rashid al-Din was aware of Sultan Walad’s work, which certainly goes a step further than Rashid al-Din by making the ruler not merely a saint but the

---


135 Brack, ‘Mediating Sacral Kingship’, 205–17; see also Brack, ‘Theologies of Auspicious Kingship’, esp. 1153. The *Rahabnama* was composed in 700/1301; the *Kitab al-Sultaniyya* was composed in 706/1307, shortly after the Ilkhan’s accession.
head of the whole hierarchy of saints. Most probably both authors reflect theories that were circulating more widely in the Ilkhanid territories as intellectuals and political elites sought to make sense of, and profit from, the new order established by Ghazan’s conversion. Some Muslim sources indicate that Chinggis Khan himself was regarded as a prophet by the Mongols, and the Persian chronicler Shabankara (d. 759/1358) also comes close to accepting such claims, writing that ‘God bestowed on this man’s [Chinggis’s] soul a quality of divine favour and inexhaustible beneficence. If he had acquired the honour of Islam [i.e. converted], it could be said that he had a share of Prophecy.’ Shabankara also describes Chinggis as enjoying a special friendship with God (bā ḥārāt-i izad źidqī dāšīt). Similarly, Ghazan seems to have laid claim to unmediated divine knowledge, much as the Prophet Muhammad had. It is perhaps in this context that we should understand Shabankara’s statement that Eretna himself was popularly known as the ‘beardless prophet’ (köse payghambar) owing to his reign of justice. According to Aflaki, Oposhgha Noyan, one of Ghazan’s governors of Anatolia, and a disciple of Sultan Walad, was known by the same title; the baldness doubtless referring to the Mongols’ lack of hair. If the pagan Chinggis could not quite be considered a prophet, his descendants’ converted deputies in Anatolia could.

The political elite took such ideas seriously. Jalal al-Din Karatay, the amir who was effective ruler of Anatolia in around 1249–54, was renowned for his piety, and is proclaimed on his wāqfyya to be ‘one who establishes the Sufi path, the source of truth, who imitates the awliyā’ (wādīh al-ṭariqa, mānba’ al-haṣiqqa, muṭtadī al-awliyā’). Moreover, Karatay’s signature on official documents proclaimed him to be no less than God’s walī on earth (walī allāh fi’l-arad).
Evidence that Karatay’s claim met with some acceptance by Sufis is provided by Elvan Çelebi, who also calls him veli (i.e. wālī); Elvan credits him with saving the defeated supporters of Baba Ilyas from Sultan Ghiyath al-Din’s vengeance, which may account for his positive view.144 Elite interest in Sultan Walad’s works in which he propagated these theories is suggested by the extant manuscripts. Sharaf al-Din Sati, who was both a Mevlevi and an amir from Erzincan, probably of Mongol origins, commissioned a luxury edition of the Rababnama and the Intihanama, elaborately covered in gold and completed in 767/1365 (MS Vienna Cod. Mixt. 1594) (Plates 5a–d).145 The lavish illumination of this expensive manuscript indicates the book’s importance to its patron; it is itself a statement of Sati’s commitment to the ideas expressed by the author. Sati was also the patron of illuminated manuscripts of Rumi’s Diwan and his Mathnawi, and was himself the author of a history of Chinggis Khan, a highly abridged version of Rashid al-Din’s chronicle, which was intended to act as a sort of mirror for princes for its dedicatee Islamshah Khatun, who, it has been suggested, was probably a female member of the Erehnids dynasty of Chinggisid descent.146 Sati’s work and dedicatee, considered alongside the Mevlevi manuscripts dedicated to him, suggest the convergence between the interests in Sufism, especially Mevlevism, and Mongol rule.

Another work, composed at around the same time, is even more explicit in this connection. Abu Bakr’s Qalandarnama, the imitation of earlier Mevlevi mathnawis composed in fourteenth-century Crimea by a personal acquaintance of Sultan Walad,147 contains extensive praise of the Golden Horde rulers Özbek Khan and Jani Bek, whose justice and piety is mentioned. Less formulaic are the sections lauding the Golden Horde amirs of the Crimea where the work was composed, Tülük-Timur and Qutlugh-Timur. Tülük-Timur is praised for his knowledge of the sharia and his own devotion to the Sufi path:

That amir knew the sharia, he was an unequalled traveller (ṣālik) on the mystical path (ṭariqat)
In higher truths (ḥaqiqat) he knew God and was a spiritual guide (murshid)…148

144 Elvan Çelebi, Menaksbu’t-Kudsiyye, l. 636.
145 For discussions of his patronage of Mevlevi manuscripts Zeren Tanrıdd, ‘Seçkin bir Mevlevi’nin Tezhipi Kitapları’, in Irvin Cemil Schick (ed.), M. Ügür Derman 65 Yaş Armağanı (Istanbul, 2001), 513–36; Cailah Jackson, ‘Patrons and Artists at the Crossroads: The Islamic Arts of the Book in the Lands of Rum, 1270s–1370s’, DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 2017, I, Chapter 4, which also contains a fuller discussion of Sati’s background and descendants. My assumption that he may have been a Mongol is based purely on his name Sati, which is Mongol rather than Turkish; this may, however, be misleading.
147 For his relationship with Sultan Walad see Chapter 3, p. 125.
148 Abu Bakr Rumi, Qalandarnama, fol. 362b.
Tülük-Timur was martyred in circumstances that are unclear, and the second amir, Qutlugh-Timur, was most probably his son and successor. He too is described as a knower of the sharia, a traveller on the _tariqat_ and a devotee of the _ḥaqiqat_ – the traditional tripartite Sufi division of knowledge.\(^{149}\) The _Qalandarnama_ thus confirms the appeal of Mevlevi ideas, as interpreted by Sultan Walad, to a Mongol political elite.

Alongside manuscripts, Anatolian rulers also patronised buildings for Sufis, in particular the _zāwiya_ or dervish lodge, which seems to have been the main form of monumental architecture in Mongol Anatolia. Research on the Central Anatolian cities of Sivas, Tokat, and Amasya between c. 1250 and 1350 has drawn attention to the transformation of urban space through these constructions, which seem to have largely replaced madrasas as the primary form of religious building in this period. It has been proposed by Wolper that dervish lodges ‘provide[d] an alternative space for many of the same services as provided by the madrasas . . . the increase in the number of dervish lodges relevant to madrasas reflects in part the incorporation of diverse religious elements into urban life and in part the parallel increase in the isolation of people and practices associated with the madrasas’.\(^{150}\) The motives of the patrons are argued by Wolper to have been practical: _zāwiyas_, which were relatively cheap to build, offered a means by which patrons could protect their own property by endowing it as _waqf_ for the _zāwiya_ they founded.\(^{151}\) Similarly, Judith Pfeiffer has argued that the Mongol commander (and Mevlevi devotee) Nur al-Din b. Jaja, who founded a _zāwiya_ and other religious building in Kirşehir in the 1270s, was motivated by the desire to establish _waqfs_ that would keep his property in his family, circumventing Islamic inheritance law.\(^{152}\) Doubtless such practical motives should not be dismissed, but the appeal of Sufism as a means of justifying and asserting political authority should also be taken into account when assessing the motives of patrons, which, in the absence of unambiguous evidence, will always be subject to speculation. It might be equally possible to associate the rise of the _zāwiya_ with the patronage of elites to whom links with Sufi organisations were both spiritually and politically rewarding. Certainly, the patronage of lavish books such as those of Sati Beg attests that practical considerations such as _waqf_ were not the sole motivation. Moreover, on occasion we know that _zāwiyas_ were the places of copying of treatises that promoted the conjunction between Sufi and political interests.
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\(^{149}\) Deweese, ‘Khâns and Amîrs’, 63–5.

\(^{150}\) Wolper, _Cities and Saints_, 69.

\(^{151}\) Ibid., 66–9; Blessing, _Rebuilding Anatolia_, 183, but see also ibid., 31–2 for comments on Wolper.

\(^{152}\) Pfeiffer, ‘Protecting Private Property vs Negotiating Political Authority’, esp. 156.
Working in a ḥāwiya, perhaps in Ankara,\footnote{This is attested by ʿAli b. Dustkhuda’s copy of Najm al-Din Razi’s Mirsad al-ʿIlbad, Süleymaniye, MS Serez 1497, copied in 722/1322.} the copyist ʿAli b. Dustkhuda b. Khwaja b. al-Hajj Qumari al-Anqari, whose grandfather was from Ahlat and who seems to have been a member of the Rifâ’i ʿtariqa, compiled in 726–7/1327 a majmūʿa of treatises dealing largely with Sufism (Süleymaniye, MS Fatih 5426), in which he included several works by the Neoplatonic Illuminationist philosopher Shihab al-Din Yahya b. Habash al-Suhrawardi (d. 587/1191) (Plate 6). One of these was Suhrawardi’s Partawnama, a rare work existing in only one other manuscript, which portrays the ideal ruler as endowed with universal cosmic and mystical knowledge.\footnote{Süleymaniye, MS Fatih 5426, fols 53a–80a. For a discussion of the importance of Illuminationist philosophy in Ilkhanid political culture see Kamola, ‘Rashid al-Din’, 176–86; see also Yılmaz, Caliphate Redefined, 109–12, and with regard to the Seljuqs of Anatolia, Suzan Yalman, ‘ʿAla’ al-Din Kayqubad Illuminated: A Rum Seljuq Sultan as Cosmic Ruler’, *Muqarnas* 29 (2012): 151–86.} The other copy of this work is in majmūʿa put together by Yar Ali Divriki (d. 814/1415), an author in the tradition of al-Qunawi, and close friend of the successor to the Eretnid kingdom, the qadi-sultan Burhan al-Din Ahmad.\footnote{Bursa, İnebey Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, MS Hüseyin Çelebi 1138, fols 26b–48a, discussed further in Peacock, ‘Metaphysics and Rulership’, 128–30.} The copying of these texts in these different environments, the former by an otherwise unknown Sufi scholar working in a ḥāwiya, the latter by a prominent member of the political and religious elite, suggests the appeal of the idea of the conjunction between Sufism and worldly rule in both ḥāwiya and courtly circles.

### The Spread of Mevlevism

The Mevlevis exercised a broad appeal beyond the ruling circles. While offering the supreme status of qutb to rulers, Sultan Walad also held that association with awliya’ was enough to make anyone a wali, while a moment in the company of a wali was better than a hundred years’ worth of prayer and fasting.\footnote{Sultan Walad, Rababnama, 130, 132–3.} The spread of the Mevlevi, and doubtless the ideas they propagated, was also facilitated by a deliberate policy of proselytisation, for which Sultan Walad (referring to himself in the third person) claims responsibility:

When he [Sultan Walad] sat on the throne of the father, he gave each [follower] gold treasure [of Sufi knowledge], the lowest in intelligence became wise and knowledgeable.
Countless men and women became murīds, each one becoming unique in skill (hunar).

He made khalifas in the way of his father, he appointed a leader in each place, because people of each city far and wide were thirsty for this river [of knowledge]

... It was necessary that a khalifa of ours went from here to every place. So that the thirsty for meeting did not remain parched and lacking the water of such a sea.

Rum was filled with khalifas so that no one should be deprived of us. Not just Rum, but the whole world was filled; a drop from this ocean became a pearl.

The world caught the light of this sun, everyone who breathes could see it.157

This would date the formation of a coherent Mevlevi organisation to 1282, the date when Sultan Walad succeeded to the leadership; the order was based around Sultan Walad himself in Konya, with his deputies spreading the faith throughout Rum and beyond. As Sultan Walad indicates, the key to Mevlevi proselytisation was the appointments of khalifas, deputies. The head of the order, who bore the title Çelebi, and in later times was known as the past-nishin, remained based in Konya.

The establishment of the Mevlevi hierarchy was beset by disputes. Rumi had himself appointed Salah al-Din Zarkub, the illiterate artisan, to be his successor, and the latter was succeeded by Husam al-Din Çelebi, neither of them blood relatives of Rumi. The early sources suggest some sort of dispute or confusion as to the succession at this point. While Aflaki has Sultan Walad as Husam al-Din’s successor, according to Sultan Walad’s own testimony, a certain Karim al-Din preceded Husam al-Din.158 In the Ibtidanama, Husam al-Din appears after his death to Sultan Walad in a dream, warning him of the numerous enemies with which he will have to contend, as Husam al-Din himself has (parda-yi mā zi dushmani bidurand). He compares these sufferings to those of Joseph, of Cain and Abel, to the prophets rejected by the Qur’anic people of ‘Ad and Thamud, to the sufferings of Jesus and Muhammad’s rejection by the Meccan polytheist leader Abu Jahl.159 It seems likely that this actually refers to disputes within the Mevlevi community. Sultan Walad’s account of his accession after Husam al-Din’s death merely indicates he acceded to popular demand that the community needed a leader. However, it is easy to imagine that in fact this genealogical connection to...
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157 Sultan Walad, Ibtidanama, 158.


159 Sultan Walad, Ibtidanama, 131–2.
Rumi was one of the reasons, if not the main one, for his promotion, for it seems Mawlana during his lifetime had conspicuously avoided giving Sultan Walad this position.\footnote{Lewis, *Rumi, Past and Present*, 227.}

Sultan Walad’s *Ibtidanama* ends with an extraordinary dream description where one of the Mevlevi disciples, Siraj al-Din ‘the mathnawi-reciter’, sees Husam al-Din Çelebi dancing on Rumi’s grave chanting verses from the *Ibtidanama* (*mathnawi-yi Walad*), which he declares to be ‘the way of the faith’ (*râb-i din*). Sultan Walad proclaims that the fact of such a pure disciple having had this dream as proof of its qualities:

> O Walad, your mathnawi became a leader, your name is exalted over the firmament.\footnote{Sultan Walad, *Ibtidanama*, 376–7.}

Sultan Walad thus uses the device of the mathnawi-reciter’s dream to assert his own superiority over his father, and uses his predecessor Husam al-Din, in whose favour he had been passed over for leadership of the order, as a device to do this. This represented not merely a way of rewriting the doubtless embarrassing history of Rumi’s attitude to his son, but also a clear assertion of Sultan Walad’s own status as divinely inspired.

Henceforth, the leadership of the Mevlevi community was largely restricted to Sultan Walad’s – and hence Rumi’s – descendants. Aflaki stresses the intimate relationship between Mawlana and his bloodline, and portrays Sultan Walad’s life and acts as mirroring those of his father.\footnote{Ambrosio, “The Son Is the Secret of the Father”, 312–15.} He describes how Sultan Walad was even suckled by Rumi, an anecdote intended to denote the physical transmission of spiritual power from father to his son, and to show that Sultan Walad was destined to be his father’s successor.\footnote{Ibid., 311–12 for an analysis.} Aflaki is at particular pains to describe how Mawlana recognised that his infant grandson Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi possessed his ‘light’ (*nûr*), and how Mawlana taught him to say Allah Allah in the cradle, which Mawlana declared meant ‘From today onwards our ‘Arif will be a true shaykh and is worthy to be head and leader, and he will proceed in perfection from the cradle to the grave.’\footnote{Aflaki, *Manaqib*, II, 8:6, 830; *Feats*, 580. Cited from the translation by O’Kane.}

Yet the Mevlevi community was not yet at ease. Aflaki’s account of the careers of Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi and ‘Abid Çelebi is replete with tales of them defeating false claimants to Rumi’s legacy:
The noble [disciples] relate that one day a great dispute arose between Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi and Çelebi ‘Ala’ al-Din Qirshahri. ‘Ala’ al-Din the kinsman said, ‘I too am of the line of Mawlana, why do you see me as a stranger and do not pay attention to me, nor do you recognise my authority? The sin of the father is no reason to ignore the due of the son.’ Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi replied, ‘You have absolutely no connection to Mawlana, and you are like a dead member of this family, and your branch has been broken from that tree of fortune and abandoned. The Qur’anic verse, “he is not of your people, for his works are not righteous”... ‘Ala’ al-Din said, ‘Who are you to lecture me and to seek precedence over me?’

Notwithstanding numerous disputes within the Mevlevi community, the order’s headship, and with it saintliness itself, had come to be regarded as hereditary by Aflaki’s time. Although little else is known of the Mevlevi leaders in the decades after ‘Abid Çelebi, it seems they were infants. Nonetheless the institutional structures of khalīfās Sultan Walad claims to have created must have been strong enough to sustain the order even in this period, for it was precisely then that Melevism started to expand far beyond Anatolia. By the early decades of the fourteenth century migrant Rumis were bringing Melevism to distant parts of the Islamic world. One of these was Abu Bakr Rumi, whose activities in Golden Horde-controlled Crimea have already been mentioned. From his own account, he seems to have been joined by others, for he recounts how at the court of the martyred amir Tüllük-Timur

Anatolians (rūmiyān) were elevated by his good fortune, each one was like an amir here and there.

The Rumi, the Syrian, the man of the steppe: renown opened up for them all because of him.

Ahmad-i Rumi, of whom we know little more than his name and that he was active in roughly the same period, also composed long mathnawīs modelled on Rumi’s. His travels took him as far as India where he is said to have been offered the patronage of the king of Awadh. Like Abu Bakr Rumi, despite his role in spreading Mevlevi teachings, he remained largely unknown in Anatolia, where very few copies of his major work the Daqa’īq al-Haqa’īq (also known as Haqa’īq
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165 Aflaki, Manaqib, II, 8:59, 912–13; Feats, 638.
166 On the hereditary nature of sanctity, see in general Catherine Mayeur-Jaouen and Alexandre Papas (eds), Family Portraits with Saints: Hagiography, Sanctity and Family in the Muslim World (Berlin, 2015).
167 Abu Bakr Rumi, Qalandarnama, fol. 362b, trans from DeWeese, ‘Khâns and Amîrs’, 63.
The works of Mawlana, however, circulated widely in India, presumably thanks to the activities of men such as Ahmad-i Rumi. Indeed, Mevlevism became in many ways the major export of fourteenth-century Anatolia.

RESISTANCE AND REVOLT: THE DESCENDANTS OF BABA İLYAS

The story of Baba İlyas’s descendants provides an instructive example of a different trajectory that a politically active Sufi family could take, and an alternative means by which Sufism was spread. We are fortunate to have the evidence of Elvan Çelebi’s Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye, a Turkish mathnawī of some 2,000 lines treating the deeds of the poet’s ancestors. The Menakib was composed in 760/1358–9, making it roughly contemporary with Aflaki’s work, and portrays the struggle of Baba İlyas and his descendants against the Seljuq rulers. We will discuss elsewhere (Chapter 6) Elvan’s account of Baba İlyas and the latter’s role in the rebellion against the Seljuq Sultan Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw II of 638/1240, which is at least partially attested in other sources. Here we will concentrate on how the descendants of Baba İlyas succeeded in positioning themselves as politically and religiously relevant without giving rise to an organised ṭariqa on the model of the Mevlevis, relying on Elvan Çelebi’s testimony in the Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye.

Elvan’s story is often allusive and hard to follow, couched as it is in often obscure verse and aimed at an audience, probably devotees of his family, who enjoyed a background understanding and assumptions to which we have little access. Elvan’s main theme is the continuing persecution of the followers of his great-grandfather Baba İlyas by Sultan Ghiyath al-Din after the rebellion had been crushed, and the role of the saint’s halifes (i.e. khalifes) or appointed deputies in ensuring the survival of the saint’s legacy. Baba İlyas had himself been the murid of a certain Dede Garkin, and each had 400 disciples (hadim, halife), but in each generation four seem to have to have been singled out for a special status. Dede Garkin had chosen four halifes, ʿAyn Dövle, Ulu Hacı, Mihman and Baba İlyas. İlyas’s halifes were his sons ʿÔmer Paşa, Mahmud Paşa, Yahya Paşa and

169 One rare such copy is Istanbul University Library, Farsça Yazmalar 942 (probably 17th–18th century). The text has been published: Shaykh Ahmad-i Rumi, Daqayiq al-Haqayiq, ed. Muhammad Rida Jalali Na’ini and Muhammad Shirwani (Tehran, 1354).

170 For preliminary surveys see Lewis, Rumi, Past and Present, 468–70; Anna Suvorova, ‘The Indian-Turkish Connections in the Field of Sufism’, in Nuri Şimşekler (ed.), III. Uluslararası Mevlana Kongresi (Konya, 2004), 125–8.

171 Elvan Çelebi, Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye, ll. 234, 1643.
Muhlis, all of whom Elvan describes as the ‘axis of sainthood and centre of chivalry’ (medar-i velayat ve merkez-i fütüvvet).172 Thus just as İlyas rose from being the halife to being a shaykh, so too did Muhlis, whom Elvan seems to indicate headed the group after İlyas’s demise. Although he gives many pious epithets and praises to his uncles, it is far from clear what role they actually played. Of the first generation of halifes, we are told only of the fate of Ayn Dövle, who was imprisoned in Tokat and finally publicly flayed alive by Ghiyath al-Din’s men.173

Much more detail is given about Muhlis, Elvan’s grandfather. Elvan claims that after the zāwiya at Çat near Amasya that had been Baba İlyas’s base had burned down in fighting with the forces of the Seljuq Sultan Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw, his grandfather, still a child, was brought up in the household of none other than the Qadi Köre, who had been Baba İlyas’s great opponent. After seven years he moved to Egypt, where he was afforded the protection of the Mamluk Sultan al-Malik al-Zahir (Baybars) and lived in the royal palace. Although recognised for his great learning, his true identity was secret. Eventually he was ordered by Khidr to return to Anatolia, saying, ‘Do not stay, go to Rum and conquer it. Call [to the true faith] that malign group.’174

When Muhlis reached Rum, he found it full of oppression, for ‘that despicable sultan Ghiyath al-Din was khan of all of Rum; in the dār al-Islām his name was sultan, but he lived the religious life of a Satan’175. When Muhlis reached Konya, he found the city in a state of civil strife (fitna), its citizens fighting with one another. When Muhlis revealed himself, the fitna ceased and ‘Man and woman, the great and the lowly, master and servant all accepted his kingship and shaykhdom’.176 The people compared him to a ‘second Joseph’ and accepted him as their ruler. When Sultan Ghiyath al-Din learned of these events, he ordered Muhlis to be thrown in prison in Gevele castle outside Konya, deprived of food and water. However, Khidr and İlyas assisted Muhlis, and in the end Ghiyath al-Din was forced to negotiate with the holy man, saying:

172 Ibid., ll. 298–312.
173 Ibid., ll. 1643–730.
174 Ibid., l. 830. Some scholarship has identified Muhlis with an individual sent by Sülemish to seek Mamluk aid; however, given Baybars died in 675/1277, twenty-two years before the revolt of Sülemish, this seems to be a chronological impossibility, although it is possible that such stories reflect a vague memory of some association between the Mongols and Muhlis. See, with references, Tezcan, ‘The Memory of the Mongols’, 36, n. 30.
175 Elvan Çelebi, Menakıbu’l-Kudsiyye, ll. 849–50.
176 Ibid., l. 872.
What is this tasbīḥ, dhikr and prostration? Give them up, be free from them. I will give you a province, a town and wealth, and whatever else is missing I will see to it . . . A chieftainship [beylik] would be suitable for you, you look like a chief.177

Muhlis then installs himself in the royal palace in Konya:

The shaykh [Muhlis] for six whole months made his residence in the sultan’s palace . . . It was 672 hijri, the same year that Jalal al-Din went on his way [died].178

Elvan’s narrative is not supported by any other sources, with the exception of Ottoman historian Oruç, writing in 908/1502, who offers a short summary of these events explicitly based on Elvan’s Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye. Oruç goes on to add one detail not mentioned elsewhere. He claims that a certain Nureddin Sufi, who was active in İç-il (south-central Anatolia), was halife of both Baba Ịlyas and Muhlis. Nureddin had a five-year-old son called Karaman, and Oruç tells us that ‘Muhlis Paşâ raised that boy called Karaman to the throne with his own hand and made him king in the year 679 of the hijra. And Muhlis Paşâ said, “May his descendants hold this land and be kings”.’179 Nureddin is attested in other sources as the ancestor of the Karamanid dynasty, but nowhere else is he associated with Baba Ịlyas and Muhlis.180

The modern Turkish scholar Ocak, following Oruç, interprets this peculiar story literally, suggesting that Elvan Çelebi is claiming his grandfather Muhlis had actually seized power from the Seljuqs, just as his great-grandfather Ịlyas had challenged them, and traces the origins of the Karamanid dynasty to this revolt. It is true that these sections of the Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye are suffused with the vocabulary of kingship, with Muhlis repeatedly referred to as sultan, padişâh and şâh. Yet the use of such vocabulary was very widespread in Sufi circles, with Sufi ‘kingship’ of the esoteric realm paralleling secular kingship in this world.181 Aflaki calls Mawlana khudawandigar, Mawlana’s son is Sultan Walad and terms such as mir, pâdişâh and sultân are repeatedly used by Aflaki to describe the leaders of the Mevlevi community.

The account in the Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye of Muhlis’s contest with Sultan Ghiyath al-Din is evidently meant to parallel Ịlyas’s struggles. However, it seems
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177 Ibid., ll. 962–3, 966. Tassib is a form of dhikr, the ritual recitation of God’s name.
178 Ibid., ll. 991, 993.
180 For example, see the dynastic history of the Karamanids preserved by a sixteenth-century Ottoman author, Şikari, who claims that Nureddin was a Turkmen chief. Şikari, Karamannname, ed. Metin Sözen and Necdet Sakaoğlu (Karaman, 2005), fol. 103b.
181 Cf. Green, Sufism, 99; Yılmaz, Caliphate Redefined, 123.
unlikely that Elvan wanted to portray his grandfather as seeking secular power. Ghiyath al-Din’s blandishments of the offer of a beylik and a province in return for Muhlis abandoning his Sufi ways are clearly meant to suggest the corruption of worldly kingship, a temptation which Muhlis rejects. Although the tale of Muhlis’s six-month occupation of Konya may contain a distant reminiscence of Jimri’s anti-Mongol rebellion, of much greater significance is the year in which Elvan states it occurred – 672/1273, which, as Elvan points out, the year of Rumi’s death. One cannot escape the suspicion that, for all Elvan’s praise of Mawlana, the intention is in fact to establish that Muhlis is his true successor – not through being a khalifā, but in the sense of being the leading holy man of Rum. The passage mentioning Mawlana and his death is immediately followed by much more lavish praise of Muhlis. Elvan’s aim, then, rather than to portray Muhlis’s seizure of worldly power is to assert his hold on spiritual power. Nonetheless, Oruç’s story of the Karamanids’ connection to the line of Baba İlyas represents an intriguing comment on the ways in which these two types of power were seen as being closely linked.

Eventually, Elvan tells us, Muhlis retreated to the zāwiya of his father’s halife Osman-i Kırşehir. Osman seems to have been appointed as successor by Muhlis, and was given the title seyyidül-hülefa, or chief deputy. After ten years, Osman sent ten of his devotees to Arapgit, taking with them Muhlis’s son Aşık Paşa, to whom Şeyh Osman married his daughter. It was from this marriage that Elvan was born. It seems that the move to Arapgit is likely to have been for the safety of the family; after eleven years Aşık Paşa returned to Kırşehir, where he probably spent the rest of life, composing one of the first great works of Sufi literature in Turkish, the Garibname (discussed in more depth in Chapter 4). Elvan praises Aşık Paşa’s morals in extravagant terms, but there is little concrete information that can be gathered from the Menakib at this point.

Elvan makes ambitious claims for Aşık Paşa’s status. He points to the efficacy of Aşık’s prayers, and also to his God-given ability to explain (tefîr) religious knowledge, which, Elvan claims, attracted to him “ulama”, leading men, and

182 Elvan Çelebi, Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye, ll. 994–6.
183 Ibid., ll. 1012–66.
185 Ibid., l. 1175.
186 Ibid., ll. 1415–517.
187 For the careers of Aşık Paşa and Elvan, the best source is now Ethem Erkoç, Aşık Paşa ve oğlu Elvan Çelebi (Çorum, 2005).
188 Elvan Çelebi, Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye, ll.1480–4, e.g. l. 1483: ‘Indeed, his prayers are answered, who is indeed Aşık and truthful’ (Müstecabı’d-du’a olan bayık/kim ola bellü aşık u şâddîk). There is a play on the word aşık, signifying both a Sufi devotee and the saint’s name.
This confirms the impression given by the register and vocabulary of the Garibname that Aşık Paşa was aiming above all to appeal to an educated audience, rather than his work being a popularisation aimed at the uneducated. However, Elvan’s praise of his father goes beyond his virtues as a shaykh. The ninth and tenth chapters of the praise of Aşık are devoted to his heavenly ascension (mi’râj) and his book (kitâb), which emulate those of the Prophet Muhammad:

This [mi’râj] was the very thing that God Almighty granted to Muhammed
That is, praise be to Him who made [his servant Muhammad] travel by night [to heaven], in truth he granted this to this soul [Aşık Paşa]
He showed him that place by Him, that proximity to God, up to the highest parts of paradise
The All-Knowing God showed him the skies and gave him knowledge of them one by one, name by name
Kawthar, Salsabil, Tasnim – He gave him knowledge of them, and showed him their inner nature.
In this form did he perform the mi’râj; to some it is a mi’râj, to some a method [of life, minhâj].

Aşık Paşa also brings a ‘great book’ (kitab-ı ‘azim), by which the Garibname is meant, although the term is redolent of the Qur’an, brought by Muhammad. Elvan praises the Garibname’s division into ten chapters, each with ten sub-chapters, containing both esoteric and exoteric (zâhir and bâtin) truths, stating ‘It contains the secrets of knowledge and the lights of knowledge.’ Like Sultan Walad, Elvan emphasises the claims of the awliyâ’ to equality with Prophets: ‘The awliya’ are sentient prophets (evliya enbiya-durur buş-dar).’ The account of Aşık’s mi’râj and ‘great book’ is intended to establish a parallel if not an equivalence between the Anatolian holy man and the Prophet Muhammad.

189 Ibid., l. 1488: ‘ulema vü fuhûl u danîşmand/Bülhdlar anda daniş u pend.
191 These are the names of springs and rivers in Paradise.
192 Elvan Celebi, Menaksibu’l-Kudsiyye, ll. 1497–1503: Şoldur kim Müheymîn ü Subhân/Şol ki ilden Muhammed’e ihşân
Yâ’ni subhâne’lezî esrá/Ma’inde ruzî ilden bu cânâ
Ol maşâm-1 denâ vû kurb-1 yakîn/Cümle gösterdi tâ be-illiyîn
Gökleri czû ü czû nâm be-nâm/Gösterûp bildürüþ-durur ‘Allâm
Keşer u Selsebil ü Tesnîmi/Bildürür ‘ilmi gösterür ‘âynî
Zâhiren bâtînen beyân eylet/Åkibet kendüyi ‘ayân eylet
Uşbu sûret bu sûrete mi ‘râc/Kime mi’râçdur kime minhâc.
193 Ibid., l. 1511.
194 Ibid., l. 762
The praises of Aşık finish with a section on his death in Safar 733/1333, describing how he was universally lamented:

All his companions, the great and the lowly, elites and commoners, dervishes, shaykhs and youths, Armenians, Jews and Christians, lamented crying ‘Where is our Shaykh? Where is that light of faith, that lamp of fidelity? Where is that candle of the soul, that world of purity?…
Where is he who brings the unbeliever to the path [of faith]? Where is he who leads the lost to the path?
Where is that mine of knowledge, that mine of the unseen? Where is that soul of discernment, that rose garden of the unseen?
Townsman and countryman, Turk and Mongol burned and burn mind, soul and heart.’

This lamentation went on for three years, says Elvan, until he was persuaded by all Aşık Paşa’s deputies (bişefs) that he was the only true successor.

The appeal to non-Muslims is not a sign of the ecumenical nature of Sufism, but rather of the charisma of the holy man that is so strong it can pass over religious and ethnic barriers. Indeed, conversion narratives play a role in establishing Aşık’s credentials; Elvan suggests how his eloquence caused unbelievers to convert:

Who is there like him in Rum, Syria, Iraq and the world? An [unbeliever] who hears his words will cut the zunnar [belt worn by non-Muslims] and tie to his waist [the belt of] belief.

Conversion need not necessarily be from Christianity, for belief in the holy family of awliya’ descended from İlyas is repeated conflated with true belief. Elsewhere, Elvan Çelebi describes how a certain Sufi shaykh came to Rum and was ‘converted’ at the hands of Baba İlyas. It is clear that the Sufi is a learned Muslim, being described as ‘like an Abu Hanifa of Kufa’, expert in knowledge, asceticism and fasting. He travels round Rum with his forty disciples, being warmly received by the locals and visiting holy men. Yet when the Sufi came to the tekke of Baba İlyas, the latter’s disciples ripped up his khirqa and jubba, the Sufi’s characteristic cloak, Baba İlyas declares ‘He is an infidel, this is not the custom of Sufis.’ The Sufi repented and removed his cloak (‘aba). The Persian heading to the section

195 Ibid., ll. 1545–7, 1541–53. ‘Şehr vü ecnebi vü Türk ü Moğul/Yandırı yanı [u] akl u cân [u] gönül.’
196 Ibid., ll 1494–5.
Rüm ü Şâm u ‘Irâk u ‘âlemde/aña benzer kim ola âdemde.
Kim sözin işiden kişi zünneri/kesdi bağlandi biline iktar.
affirms the Sufi’s essential non-Muslimness, ‘he ripped off his zunnä[r] [a belt worn by non-Muslims] and became a Muslim at the hands of the shaykh [Baba İlyas].’ In other words although dressed in the garments of a Sufi, at heart he is an infidel, for until coming to Baba İlyas he has not yet understood the higher truth. The parallels with Aflaki’s account of Ghazan’s ‘conversion’ at the hands of the Mevlevis are obvious.

A similar motif appears towards the end of the Menakib, where Elvan alludes again to the aftermath of the great rebellion of 638/1240.

When people talked of the army, fighting, war and bloodshed, it was like a stone [i.e. very serious]
After this, foolish deniers, plotters, ill-doers full of [false] claims
Had seen so many evident things, that you would suppose them not to be believers but infidel [for not believing]
Is someone who denies the truth/God a Muslim? Is there belief in someone who refuses to call God God?198

It is clear from the context that the unbelievers are those who denied the validity of Baba İlyas’s claims, and those of his descendants. Belief in God is inextricably linked to belief in his holy men, without which true Islam is not attained. Thus there can be only the harshest of punishments for unbelievers. Just as in the Manaqib al-‘Arifin, Abu Sa’id’s state collapsed when his minister failed to render due respect to Ulu ‘Arif Çelebi, so in the Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye does the Seljuq state collapse as a result of sultan Ghiyath al-Din’s treatment of Baba İlyas.

Apart from the Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye, some architectural remains and the accounts of some later travellers constitute our main external evidence for the fate of İlyas’s line. Aşik Paşa is commemorated in a magnificent, marble-fronted mausoleum at Kirşehir that was built some time shortly after his death (Fig. 2.1). The inscription on Aşik Paşa’s tomb gives his dates of birth (670) and death (733), his ancestry back to İlyas and describes him as ‘the possessor of divine knowledge, the unique pole (qutb), the man of God’.199 We know almost nothing of Elvan’s career, but he built a modest zāwiya complex at Mecitözü just
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197 Ibid., ll. 270–97.
198 Ibid., ll. 1617–20.
199 Erkoç, Aşık Paşa, 66; sâhib-i ‘îlim-i hadun qutb-i yakına, mard-i ḥaqiq/shaykh Pâshâ b. Mukhliş b. shaykh İlyäs dân/ândar akh’ bi-‘alam baz shud andar dh.İ/ṣâṣdah mât-i Şafâr rûz-i sîh şanha ay fulân. A legend related by the notoriously unreliable nineteenth-century historian Hüseyin Hüsameddin suggests that both Aşık’s and Elvan’s tomb were erected by the Eretnid
outside Çorum, in the village that today bears his name, and where he was himself buried.\footnote{Benjamin Anderson, ‘The Complex of Elvan Çelebi: Problems in Fourteenth-Century Architecture’, \textit{Mugarnas} 31 (2014): 73–97, esp. 85.} An inscription put up after his death (which probably occurred in 770/1368) is dated 780/1380.\footnote{Ibid., 83, suggests the reading of the date is unclear, but it is evident from the photo published by Anderson that it says 780.} Both the mausoleum of Aşık Paşa and Elvan’s \textit{zâwiya} seem, according to the epigraphic evidence, to have been erected without the support of any patron. Yet while the family of İlyas did not attract the patronage of elites in the same way that that of Rumi did, it was nonetheless able to dispose of significant resources. If Elvan’s \textit{zâwiya}-mausoleum is architecturally less impressive than Aşık Paşa’s, it is clear that lands accrued to Elvan, who was able to turn substantial landholdings into \textit{waqf} on his death, comprising seven villages and three farms. The revenues were to support the \textit{zâwiya}, but also Elvan’s descendants, who had the rights of use (\textit{taşarruf}) of the endowment.\footnote{Adnan Gürbüz, ‘Elvan Çelebi Zaviyesi’nin Vakıfları’, \textit{Vakıf Dergisi} 23 (1994): 25–30.} Thus even without becoming a formal \textit{tarıqa}, a saintly family could rise to a position of considerable local power, presumably supported by donations from their followers.

We know little of Elvan’s descendants, but by the end of the fifteenth century one of them, Aşık Paşa’s great-grandson Aşık Paşazade, who had probably been born in Mecitözü in 798/1398, had decided to make peace with worldly power.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{mausoleum.png}
\caption{The mausoleum of Aşık Paşa at Kırşehir.}
\end{figure}

\textit{Photograph by Tevfik Teker, source Wikimedia Commons}

At the start of his history of the Ottoman dynasty, Aşık Paşazade tries to link the fortunes of his ancestors with those of the Ottomans:

My lineage and genealogy were born with this family [the Ottomans]; each one of us who was born witnessed this family.
We pray openly and in secret [for the Ottomans]; we are saved by service to them.
The Ottoman house call my lineage and genealogy Aşık and grant favours
Of old we are Aşiks who pray; known that [our] our prayer is a cure for sins
First let us pray for this house, then let us mention their virtues.\(^{203}\)

With these verses, Aşık Paşazade seeks to offer exactly the same bargain to the Ottomans as Rumi had his Seljuq patrons: prayer (\textit{du'a}), the \textit{baraka} brought by his saintliness, in Aşık Paşazade’s case reinforced explicitly by his lineage, in return for material favours (\textit{ihsan}). To a degree, he may have achieved this: it has been suggested that Aşık Paşazade’s very presence in the army of the Ottoman sultan Murad II ‘was believed to be a support for his cause’ owing to Aşık Paşazade’s distinguished lineage.\(^{204}\) However, in his history, Aşık Paşazade went further and tried to show how one of Baba İlyas’ \textit{halifes}, Shaykh Edebali, who is briefly mentioned in the \textit{Menakib}, had played a major part in the establishment of the Ottoman state. He claims Edebali gave his daughter in marriage to Osman Ghazi, the founder of the Ottoman dynasty, while Osman used to consult Edebali on matters of Islamic law. He also states that Orhan Beg sought the blessing of Geyikli Baba, another \textit{halife} of Baba İlyas.\(^{205}\) Thus while Aşık Paşazade may have conferred a modicum of \textit{baraka} on the sultan’s armies, at the same time, his history, which is addressed to a dervish audience, uses this supposed association of the Ottomans with the \textit{halifes} of Baba İlyas to magnify the status of his ancestors. This strategy may not have been wholly successful. There is no evidence of significant sultanic patronage of the \textit{zāwiya} at Mecitözü, although it certainly continued to prosper into the sixteenth century and beyond, when travellers record the devotion of villagers to Elvan Çelebi, remembered as a special friend of Khidr, the embodiment of being a \textit{wali}.\(^{206}\)

Despite the intimate involvement of both the lines of Rumi and Baba İlyas with political life, even in the fragmented political environment of fourteenth-century Anatolia, these saintly families never actually seized temporal power, unlike some of the small religious dynasties that emerged in Iran in roughly this
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\(^{205}\) İnalck, ‘How to Read Ashik Pasha-Zade’s History’, 40–6.

period, such as the Sarbadars of Khurasan. Yet the successor to the Eretnid state, the qadi-sultan Burhan al-Din Ahmad of Sivas, did just that. Steeped in the philosophy of Ibn ‘Arabi and Sadr al-Din al-Qunawi, on which he wrote his own exegesis, the *Iksir al-Sa‘adat*, Burhan al-Din claimed to embody Ibn ‘Arabi’s ideal of sainthood and of the ‘perfect man’. Yet it seems this was not enough. Nearly a century after the demise of the dynasty, the qadi-sultan also emphasised his own Seljuq ancestry on his mother’s side.207 Royal lineage was also claimed by Shaykh Bedreddin, who led a revolt against the Ottomans in 819/1416. It is far from clear what exactly Shaykh Bedreddin was seeking to achieve, but it seems he too asserted he was both a *wali* and a *nabi*; according to his grandson Halil Hafiz, he was also a descendant of both Jalal al-Din Rumi and the Seljuq Sultan ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad.208 For all the claims of the *awliyā*, and the undoubted interest that they provoked from the political elites, the power of sanctity, it seems, could only effectively be harnessed for political gain when linked to both the prestigious figure of Mawlana and the lustre of the dynastic name of the Seljuqs.

207 Peacock, ‘Metaphysics and Rulership’, 102, 103.
Sufism spread not only through the activities of holy families and their khalifas. Perhaps the most important way in which it permeated Muslim, and non-Muslim society was as an organised form known as futuwwa. Some of our most detailed descriptions of the practice of futuwwa are provided by the Moroccan Ibn Battuta, who encountered it during his travels in Anatolia. Futuwwa evidently being an organisation unfamiliar to him, Ibn Battuta gives some detail of its adherents, known as fityān (sing. fatā, lit., ‘youth, young man’), and its leaders, called akhīs, a word probably derived from the Turkish for ‘generous’, although it bears a close resemblance to the Arabic for ‘brother’ (akh).

Ibn Battuta describes them in the following terms:

The singular of akhīyya is akhī, pronounced like the word for brother (akh) with the first person [Arabic akhī = my brother]. They are in all of the Turkmen, Rumi land, in every town, city and village. There is no one in the world like them for great kindness to strangers, nor anyone quicker to offer food and satisfy [the traveller’s] needs, or to admonish the oppressors, kill the police and their evil accomplices. The akhī among them is a man whom artisans and other unmarried, single young men make their leader. This is also [called] ‘futuwwa’. He builds a lodge [zāwiya] and places there furnishing and lamps and other necessary equipment. He serves his companions during the day while they seek their living, and in the afternoon they bring him what they earned and buy with it fruit and food and other such things which are used in the zāwiya. If a traveller comes that day to a city, they put him up with them, which is their [form of] hospitality, and they do not leave him till he departs. If no one comes, they gather together over food, and they eat, sing and dance, and leave to do their trades the
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next day. In the afternoon they bring their leader what they have earned. They are called the *fityan*, and their leader is called the *akhī*, as we mentioned.\(^2\)

*Fityan* communities were also marked out by their emphasis on hierarchy, their elaborate initiation rituals, their use of distinctive ceremonial clothes (the *libās al-futuwwa*, in particular a belt and trousers),\(^3\) and, as Ibn Battuta notes, their propensity to violence. *Futuwwa* constituted a dominant force in Anatolian urban life from the late thirteenth century, with *akhīs* on occasion acting as the effective rulers of cities: as Ibn Battuta puts it, ‘It is one of the customs of this land that in places that do not have a sultan, the *akhī* is the ruler.’\(^4\) Turkish scholars have even described Ankara as an ‘*akhī* republic’\(^5\). That is a contention based on little evidence, but contemporary sources do describe the wealth and power of some *akhīs* in terms redolent of kingship. The *Diwan* of Sultan Walad contains numerous poems dedicated to the *akhīs* who are depicted as virtually monarchs in their own right. One, addressed to a certain Akhi Muhammad, starts each of its twelve lines with the refrain ‘Akhi Muhammad is the king’ [*shāb-ast*].\(^6\)

Akhi Muhammad is the king, famous and happy; there is no great man like him in the land

Akhi Muhammad is the king alone in this age, he is great among the *fityan* like the moon among the stars.

Akhi Muhammad is the king, magnificent thanks to God.

Ibn Battuta’s unfamiliarity with the organisation suggests that *futuwwa* was unique to Anatolia. However, there are a few hints that elsewhere in the Ilkhanid territories, something resembling Anatolian *futuwwa* may have existed. For instance, the south Iranian fortress of Bam in the early fourteenth century was governed by a certain Akhi Shuja’ Shah,\(^7\) and Ibn Battuta mentions a *futuwwa*-type organisation in Isfahan, although he does not give it that name.\(^8\) In


\(^6\) *Divan of Sultan Veled*, ed. F. Nafız Uzluk (Konya, 1941), 150.

\(^7\) Mihran Afshari and Mahdi Madayini, *Chahardah Risala dar Bab-i Futuwwat wa Asnaf* (Tehran, 1381), 20–1.

\(^8\) Ibn Battuta, *Rihla*, 200; trans. Gibb, 295–6: ‘the artisans of every craft appoint as their leader one of their senior members, whom they call *kule*; likewise the other city notables who are not artisans. They form a group of unmarried young men, and the groups vie with each other in pride and showing off with as much hospitality to each other as they can, holding great parties with food and so on’ (my translation).
fourteenth century Hilla in southern Iraq a futuwwa group is recorded, the leadership of which traced their lineage back to ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, whom adherents of futuwwa claimed as its founder. The very fact these groups are such a shadowy presence in our sources suggests that even if inspired by the same ideals as the Anatolian fityân and perhaps possessing comparable institutional organisation, they did not play same sort of role in political and social life. There are also references to fityân and futuwwa in late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century Egypt, but these mainly seem to have been the dregs of the community of immigrants of Oirat Mongols who had fled the Ilkhanate; here the term had connotations of gangsterism. Various treatises composed in Mamluk Syria and Egypt suggest the existence of futuwwa, usually criticising it, but again its limited attestation in the copious Mamluk historical sources suggests it was a comparatively marginal aspect of urban life. In later times, futuwwa organisations are widely attested in Iran and the Ottoman empire. In other words, if in the medieval period futuwwa did have certain parallels elsewhere and as an ideal was espoused by a broad range of Sufis, as we shall see, it was only in Anatolia that it attained such an important social and political role.

Unsurprisingly, then, the akhis of Anatolia have attracted considerable scholarly attention in Turkey ever since Muallim Cevdet prepared his ‘appendix’ to Ibn Battuta in 1932, outlining the supplementary evidence for futuwwa. Scholars such as Claude Cahen, Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, Franz Taeschner and more recently Lloyd Ridgeon have analysed the literary evidence, which was also the subject of a useful doctoral dissertation by Breebaart, while some research addresses the

13 Muallim Cevdet, İslam Fütüveti ve Türk Ahiliği: Ibn-i Battuta’ya Zeyl, trans. Cezair Yarar (İstanbul, 2008). The work was originally published in Arabic. In fact interest in futuwwa had an even older pedigree, stretching back to 1913 when the Committee for Union and Progress commissioned a study of it. See Yusuf Turan Güneydin, Abilik Araştırmaları 1913–1932 (Ankara, 2015). However, Cevdet’s was the first full-length monograph, and the most serious early study.
architectural remains of akhi lodges. Nonetheless, these studies have concentrated largely on a small number of normative manuals of futuwwa (futuwwatnāmas), which describe its rituals and hierarchy. While these give us a clear picture of how akhis were supposed to act, little work has addressed their social and political role in medieval Anatolia more generally. In Turkey, scholarship’s emphasis on the akhis as an authentically ‘Turkish’ group has stressed that they played a pivotal role in opposing the Mongols, taking on the role of a defunct Seljuq state as the authentic representatives of an Anatolian Turkish identity. Western scholars agree that the rise of futuwwa organisations is a consequence of ‘political confusion’ or an absence of strong local power structures, and futuwwa is often seen as part of a more general trend in the later medieval Islamic period towards the emergence of localised centres of power and authority after the collapse of the Abbasid Caliphate. In contrast, I shall argue in this chapter that, at least in Anatolia, futuwwa did not emerge as a political force so much as in a power vacuum but in close connection to the ruling elites, firstly Seljuq, later Mongol.

Futuwwa was not just a socio-political but also an intellectual phenomenon. The ideals of futuwwa, discussed further later in the chapter, influenced a wide range of literature produced in Anatolia in Arabic, Persian and Turkish. Manuals known as futuwwatnāmas exist in all three languages detailing the practice of futuwwa. The best known of the Anatolian futuwwatnāmas are one written in Arabic by Ahmad b. Ilyas Naqqash of Harput shortly after 611/1215 entitled the Tuhfat al-Wasaya; one in Persian verse by Nasiri, probably active in the Tokat-Sivas area, composed in around 689/1290; and a Turkish futuwwatnāma by
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16 Neşet Çağatay, Bir Türk Kurumu olan Abilik (Ankara, 1974); Mikail Bayram, Sosyal ve Siyasi Boyutlarıyla Abi Esren-Mevlâna Mücadelesi (Konya, 2005).


Burghazi, which seems to have been written in Antalya after c. 1365. 19 Two treatises on futuwwa by Abu Hafs ‘Umar Suhrwardi (539/1145–632/1234) composed in the early thirteenth century were also probably destined for an Anatolian audience. 20 Two other fourteenth-century poetical works, Gülşehri’s Turkish Mantıku’r-Tayr (718/1318) and Abu Bakr Rumi’s Persian Qalandarnamâ (c. 1360), contain significant passages expounding futuwwa. Indeed, despite Ibn Battuta’s characterisation of futuwwa as an artisans’ association, it also appealed to royal courts. The ideals of futuwwa are advertised in an occult text written in 670/1272 by Nasiri Sijistani for the Seljuk sultan Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw III, the Daqâ’iq al-Haqa’iq, 21 while an author in Erzincan, Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Tusi, composed a treatise on futuwwa for the dignitary Sa’d al-Din, who is addressed in terms that suggest he was already one of its adherents. 22 To understand futuwwa’s widespread appeal, we must first analyse its relationship to Sufism and its place in the religious and intellectual landscape of medieval Anatolia, suggesting how futuwwa contributed to the process of the social and religious transformation of Anatolia during this period. I will then examine futuwwa as a political and social phenomenon, exploring the complex relationship between the fitâyân and the existing political order.

THE THEORY OF FUTUWWA

In a treatise probably composed for an Anatolian audience, in Konya, in the early thirteenth century, Abu Hafs ‘Umar Suhrwardi explains the nature of futuwwa:

Futuwwat is the essence of these four roads [of Holy Law (shari’a), the Way (tariqa), the Reality (haqîqa), and Gnosis, and in truth not everyone can follow it. However, the Arab, Persian, Turk and Tajik, and the common people, the soldier, the tradesman, [in fact]
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19 Breebaart, ‘Development and Structure’, 90, 116. These treatises have been published as follows: Ahmad b. Ilyas’s Tubfiat al-Wasaya is available in Turkish translation with a facsimile of the Arabic text in Gölpinarlı, ‘İslam ve Türk İllerinde Fütüvet Teşkilatı’, 121–32, 205–31; Nasiri has been published with an edition of the Persian text and a German translation in Franz Taeschner, Der anatolische Dichter Nâşiri (um 1300) und sein Futuwetnâme (Leipzig, 1944); Burgazi is published by Abdülbaki Gölpinarlı, ‘Burgazi ve Fütüvetnamesi’, İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası 15 (1953–4): 163–251.


21 Nasiri Sijistani, Daqâ’iq al-Haqa’iq, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS persan 174, fol. 89a. Further on this manuscript see Chapter 6, pp. 235–7.

22 Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Tusi, Al-Hadiyya al-sa’diya fi ma’ani al-vaqidiyya, Süleymaniye, MS Ayasofya 2049, fol. 241a: he is described as sadr-i muhtarim wa akhi-yi mukarram şâhib-i dil şâhib-i safât şâhib-i mawwûwa şâhib-i wafâ – all typical akhi virtues. His title sadr could suggest he was a senior figure in either the religious or bureaucratic hierarchy.
everyone can follow the form of this road [of futuwwa], but no one can follow the reality of futuwwa. The perfection of futuwwa, which is the right of the Truth (haqiyyat-i haqq), is for God Most High, and for the elect of God Mustafa [i.e. the Prophet Muhammad].

Nonetheless, the nature of futuwwa is extremely elusive, as the term can describe several related but distinct concepts. The idea of futuwwa had been espoused as early as the tenth century by the leading Khurasani Sufi theorist al-Sulami, and means essentially the ideal conduct of the Sufi: generosity, humility, loyalty and turning a blind eye to others’ faults. Al-Sulami does not seem to have envisaged futuwwa as providing any kind of institutional framework for living; that seems to have come much later, in the twelfth or even thirteenth century. Al-Sulami’s ideals were also all advocated by the futuwwa manuals that describe the institutionalised form of futuwwa; our major collection of futuwwa texts from medieval Anatolia, a manuscript probably of the late thirteenth century, contains both practical treatises prescribing the nature and organisation of the futuwwa institution and those dealing with the theory of the Sufi ideal of futuwwa such as the works of al-Sulami.

The defining feature of futuwwa – theoretically – was altruism and generosity. When Ibn Battuta travelled across Anatolia, he was a recipient of the sometimes overwhelming hospitality of akhi groups that vied with one another to demonstrate their generosity. Showing hospitality was thus a way of demonstrating one’s credentials to be an akhi. As Nasiri writes at the beginning of his futuwwatnāma:

When the Prophet and friend of God ordained that in futuwwa ‘there is no fatā except ‘Ali,’ generosity [sakhā] was bestowed on ‘Ali [b. Abi Talib]. Know that paradise is the Abode of the generous [dār al-askhiyā’].

The ideal of service and generosity is emphasised in Nasiri’s accounts of the early Sufi teachers of futuwwa:

One possessor of futuwwa was Harith [al-Muhasibi, a prominent ninth century Sufi], who encourages generosity and liberality [jūd wa sakḥāwat].

He said, ‘Do you know what futuwwa is, and who is a person who possesses futuwwa? It is he who has bound himself firmly to service, who exercises justice of his own accord and seeks nothing from anyone.’

---

23 Trans. Ridgeon in Jawamardi, 47, with minor alterations.
24 Süleymaniye, MS Ayasofya 2049 contains the works by Sulami and Suhrawardi on futuwwa, as well as the Anatolian futuwwatnāmas by Khartbirdi, Nasiri and Tusi.
26 Taeschner, Der anatolische Dichter Nasiri, Persian text, p. 6, ll. 14–15.
27 Ibid., 8, ll. 39–41.
The same point is repeated at the beginning of Nasiri’s description of the fatā leader:

In both worlds [this and the next] the akhi should be the sort of person who with his heart and soul is generous. For a wrongdoer who is generous may enter heaven, but an ascetic who is mean is an evil thing.28

Similarly, in Abu Bakr Rumi’s story of Akhi Evren, the tanner from Kirşehir traditionally alleged to be the founder of futuwwa in Anatolia,29 the first point he emphasises is his generosity:

There was in Rum an akhi who was more generous than anyone else...

He was a good akhi; a generous friend (walī) was he too. He loved the way of ’Ali in futuwwa.

From what he earned, he offered people a table (sufra) for the sake of God.30

For Suhrawardi, one of the great early theorists of futuwwa, and a major figure in the establishment of an institutionally based Sufism, futuwwa was essentially a parallel structure to the tariqa. In his most famous work, the ‘Awarif al-Ma’arif, Suhrawardi sought to regularise and ritualise the relationships between the Sufis who in many parts of the Middle East were already living communally in institutions known variously as khānqāhs, zāwiyas or ribāṭs.31 Meanwhile, the hierarchy of initiate, apprentice and master that he describes in the ribāṭ is mirrored by that of the futuwwa lodge.32 Yet Sufi ribāṭ regulations often left a considerable part of the day free, and if resident Sufis did not earn a living this was because they had no need to, receiving generous stipends as determined by the waqfiyya – making them the butt of criticism on occasion.33 In contrast, the requirement for the fatā to perform a trade was a crucial part not just of the practice of futuwwa, as

28 Ibid., 14, ll. 127–8.
29 Akhi Evren has been the subject of much speculation in Turkish scholarship, in particular in the works of Mikail Bayram, which have attempted to ascribe to his authorship some of the most significant works of Arabic and Persian philosophical and theological literature. These ascriptions are usually demonstrably inaccurate, and the name of Akhi Evren does not appear on a single manuscript text known to me. See Mikail Bayram, Abî Evren ve Abî Teşkilatı’nın Kuruluşu (Konya, 1991). It is the view of the present author that the existing Turkish scholarship on Akhi Evren constitutes a large red herring. Nothing certain is known of his life beyond the fact he was probably an older contemporary of Gülşehri’s (see n. 133) and the references in Abu Bakr Rumi’s work.
30 Abu Bakr Rumi, Qalandarnama, Tashkent, Beruniy Institute of Manuscripts, MS 11668, fol. 24a.
32 Ohlander, Sufism in an Age of Transition, 286–7.
33 Homerin, ‘Saving Muslim Souls’, 69, 76; Hofer, Popularisation, 79.
described by Ibn Battuta, but also its theory. Suhrawardi conceives of *futuwwa* is a body of knowledge and behaviour bequeathed by Adam’s son Seth, the first human to practise a trade. This idea of the importance of conducting a trade is reflected in subsequent *futuwwa* manuals.

*Futuwwa* is often seen as a simplified or ‘less arduous’ version of Sufism designed to appeal to those who did not have the stamina to adopt the full Sufi path, and in Suhrawardi’s theory the *fitiyān* were excused from the more rigorous requirements of the *tarīqa*. Lloyd Ridgeon has observed that while *futuwatnāmas* share many common points with Sufi treatises, they lack the theological and philosophical passages dealing with the unity of God (*taḥwīd*). Ridgeon argues that ‘this belief that *futuwat* was a less arduous form of Sufism is supported by the lack of anything intellectually taxing, philosophically or theologically.’ However, this is only true of *futuwatnāmas*, which are intended to prescribe how a *futuwwa* group should function, who is entitled to join, the stages of training they should go through, the ritual of initiation and the duties of the trainee (*tarbiya*), the full member of the order (*fatā*) and its master (*akhī*). Other Anatolian texts dealing with *futuwwa* certainly have an intellectual dimension. Nasiri, the author of the Persian verse *futuwatnāma*, also composed a verse Sufi treatise entitled *Ishraqat*. The work’s title recalls the Illuminationist philosophy of Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawardi *maqtūl* (d. 587/1191), while its contents show the influence of Jalāl al-Dīn Rumi, Sultan Walad and Ibn ‘Arabī. Gülşehrī’s free adaptation of ‘Attar’s *Mantiq al-Tayr*, which evinces a strong interest in *futuwwa*, and was written in part to guide would-be *akhīs* on the true path, is, like the original Persian, a philosophically minded Sufi allegory. Part of the point of the allegory is precisely to demonstrate *taḥwīd*, as the thirty birds of the story turn out to be identical with the Simurgh they seek. In Gülşehrī’s *Keramat-i Ahi Evren*, he refers the reader back to his highly theoretical verse treatise the *Falaknama*, suggesting he expected the readers of his Turkish-language account of this famous Akhī’s miracles to be conversant with his much more elaborate Persian work. Likewise, Abu Bakr Rumi’s *Qalandarnama*, a work also profoundly concerned
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34 Ohlander, *Sufism in an Age of Transition*, 284.
with futuwwa, starts each of its book with a section entitled ‘tawḥīd’ in praise of God’s unity.\(^{41}\)

Thus the absence of discussions of tawḥīd or other philosophical speculation from futuwwatnāmas suggests that this is a function of the genre, not a reflection of the nature of futuwwa or, necessarily, the interests of its adherents. There was a considerable overlap between adherents of Rumi and ḵaṭyān, who evidently shared the same spaces and rituals such as samā’,\(^{42}\) while Rumi counted akhbūs among his disciples.\(^{43}\) Similarly, Abu Bakr Rumi’s Qalandarnama advocates both the way of the Qalandar and futuwwa, while its author considered himself to be a devotee of Jalal al-Din Rumi, and Abu Bakr tells us at length of his personal relationship with Sultan Walad whom he regards as the great inspiration for his work.\(^{44}\) A good example of how these various ideals could be combined in one individual is Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Iraqī (d. 688/1289), the famous Persian poet who spent some time in Anatolia, where he received the patronage of the Pervane as well as Shams al-Dīn Juwaynī. The Ilkhanid biographer Ibn al-Fuwati describes ‘Iraqī as a fatā – one of the ‘literary ṣiyān’ (min udābāʿ ḥ-ṣiyān),\(^{45}\) he was also a Qalandar, noted for his uncouth behaviour, and one of the leading exponents of the ideas of Ibn ‘Arabī as interpreted by Sadr al-Dīn al-Qunawī. ‘Iraqī’s major work, the Lamāʿāt, was inspired by al-Qunawī’s lectures on Ibn ‘Arabī.\(^{46}\) Thus, rather than differentiating between sharia-compliant Sufism as represented by Jalal al-Dīn Rumi and Sultan Walad, Qalandari-style renunciant Sufism and futuwwa, we should see them as different articulations of the same phenomenon, as overlapping, sometimes mutually inclusive categories, not binary opposites.\(^{47}\) This is also suggested by architectural and epigraphic evidence, which indicates the close relationship between Sufis, ḥ-ṣiyān and commercial activity.\(^{48}\) Even if futuwwa did not require its adherents to travel to the furthest stages on the spiritual journey such as the final stage described by Suhrawardi in which ‘the fully-actualized Sufi comes to
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\(^{41}\) Abu Bakr Rumi, Qalandarnama, e.g. fols 1b–2a, 26b–27a.

\(^{42}\) For samāʿ in futuwwa ceremonies see for example Taeschner, Der anatolische Dichter Nasiri, Persian text, 52–3.

\(^{43}\) Jalal al-Dīn Rumi, Maktubat, 184–6.

\(^{44}\) Abu Bakr Rumi, Qalandarnama, fol. 95a, section entitled dar sitāyish-i awṣáf-i Sulṭān Walad ṭabmat Allāh ‘alayhi and the following section on fol. 95b entitled dar bayān-i ʿān Shāykh Abū Bakr Qalandar-i Rūm-ī Umī bi-lḥadrat-i Sulṭān Walad ṭabmat Allāh ‘alayhi dar šahir-i Qvīyya chūn birāsid wa ʿaẓār-i ‘imāyat daryāfī.

\(^{45}\) Ibn al-Fuwati, Majmaʿ al-ʿAdab fi Muʿjam al-ʿAlqāb, ed. Muhammad al-Kazim (Tehran, 1995), No. 2208.

\(^{46}\) William C. Chittick, ‘Fakr al-Dīn Ḵuraqqi’, EIr.

\(^{47}\) A point made by Hofer with regard to the Qalandariyya, see Hofer, Popularisation, 252.

\(^{48}\) Wolper, Cities and Saints, 75–8.
resemble the Prophet’, 49 neither did it preclude an interest in intellectually challenging Sufism, which it is quite clear many of its adherents did indeed share.

Another Sufi text of the period to treat futuwwa along with metaphysical topics is Ibn al-Sarraj’s Tashwiq al-Arwah. Ibn al-Sarraj, an early fourteenth-century author active in the Jazira, Syria and in Konya, 50 strongly defends futuwwa against its detractors. Arguing that the Prophet Abraham himself donned the sarāwīl, the ritual trousers of the fatā, he justifies futuwwa in the following terms, saying that even if it is not found in the compilations of the muhaddiths, it is not an innovation (bid’a); and even if it is something new, it is not an error (dallāla). The concept of it is correct. They began with teaching virtues and rejecting vices, and they called that ‘futuwwa’. There is no difference in the meaning. The Prophet and his Companions, the peace and blessings of God be upon them, used to speak of it, encourage adherence to it. It is the correct religion (al-dīn al-qawim) and the straight path, and a large group of the notable figures of Islam and religious authorities of the human race (aḥbār al-anām) have established that . . . this futuwwa affirms brotherhood (ukhuwwa); the Prophet treated his Companions like brothers (ākhā . . . al-ṣahābā) and adopted ‘Ali as his brother . . . All this is a search for affection (ulfā), love (mawadda) and the ties of the beauty of companionship. From this result great benefits which cannot be obtained from what we or others know of the science of fiqh or usūl al-dīn or similar sciences. 51

Rather than representing an alternative form of Sufism, futuwwa was a part of Sufism, fulfilling the same function of offering an alternative to the legalistic religiosity of the fuqahā’.

Futuwwa could also appeal to a non-Muslim audience. Although Nasiri’s futuwwatnāma specifically excluded Christians from membership and even from entering futuwwa buildings, 52 and a similar prohibition is made by Burghazi, 53 the fact these prohibitions are emphasised – in both cases standing at the beginning of the treatise after the disquisition on the origins of futuwwa – itself suggests the very popularity of futuwwa among non-Muslims. An inscription from Konya mentions a Greek akhi, 54 while Aflaki records the existence of Armenian fiṭyān. 55 The Armenian priest Hovhannes Pluz (d. 1293) from Erzincan in north-eastern Anatolia composed two treatises in Armenian modelled

49 Ohlander, Sufism in an Age of Transition, 183.
50 On Ibn al-Sarraj see the study by Öztürk, Velilik ile Delilik Arasında.
51 Ibn al-Sarraj, Tashwiq al-Arwah, Süleymaniye, MS Amcazade Hüseyin 271, fol. 212a.
52 Taeschner, Der anatolische Dichter, Persian text, p. 10, ll. 85–6.
54 Taeschner, ‘Beiträge zur Geschichte der Achis in Anatolien’, 20; Vryonis, Decline of Hellenism, 401.
55 Aflaki, Manakīb al-ʿĀrifīn, 1, 3:463, p. 489; trans. O’Kane, Feats, 337 (the fiṭyān are here described with their alternative, and less complimentary, name, runiād).
on Islamic futuwwa-manuals. Ibn Mi’mar (d. 642/1244), who wrote the first futuwwa manual in Baghdad, envisages that non-Muslims should be allowed to ‘mix with the fityān; perhaps they will convert, and that [mixing] will be the reason for their hearts’ becoming inclined [to Islam]. The true fatā, however, had to be a Muslim. Other futuwwa manuals, citing the hadith ‘respect the guest even though he is an unbeliever’, left open the doors of futuwwa to non-Muslims. One might interpret Hovhannes Pluz’s treatises as an attempt to establish a Christian alternative to this Islamic institution at a time when the latter was attracting increasing numbers of adherents and thus ultimately converts, in line with Ibn Mi’mar’s intention. On the other hand, some futuwwa manuals suggest a relationship between futuwwa, conversion and coercion. In the futuwwa manual of Najm al-Din Zarkub of Tabriz (d. 713/1313), three categories of initiates into the futuwwa are described, one of which is described as the sayfi, ‘of the sword’: the sayfi adherents of futuwwa are those people whom the sword has brought to Islam, become Muslim; in the end they get a taste for Islam, serve the commander of the faithful ‘Ali, may God honour him. They become ghazis (ahl-i ghaza) and fight with the unbelievers outwardly, and fight with themselves inwardly. It has been suggested that a group of converts from Christianity to Islam associated with the Ottoman ruler Orhan were in fact akbīs. In 1354, they debated religion with the bishop Palamas, who left an account of his encounter with these mysterious chiones, as he calls them. However, it must be said that the identity of this group is far from certain.

Futuwwa, then, could be many different things to different people, and it is against this background that some of the controversies surrounding it should be understood. Among the opponents of futuwwa were the Mamluk scholars Ibn Taymiyya and his pupil Ibn Bidqin, who wrote treatises on the subject. Ibn Taymiyya accepted the ideals of futuwwa behaviour as incumbent on all Muslims, but rejected precisely the symbols and institutions that made futuwwa a distinctive organisation, such as the libās al-futuwwa and the shurb al-futuwwa, the ritual
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58 See Ridgeon, Javanmardi, 141–6.


drink at initiation and the oath of loyalty to *futuwwa*. Ibn Bidqin went even further and condemned *futuwwa* as a *bid’a*, innovation, accusing its adherents of sodomy.⁶² Clearly, in assessing the views of such scholars we must also take account of Ibn al-Sarraj’s explicit statement that *futuwwa* offered benefits that could not be obtained from the traditional legal and religious sciences. It is, then, perhaps unsurprising that the *fuqahā*’s should have had limited sympathy for it. Yet there is evidence even from texts sympathetic to *futuwwa* that the *fiṭnān* did not always live up to their ideals, and the *fiṭnān* are commonly referred to as *runūd*, meaning roughly ‘thugs’. Aflaki repeatedly points to a tension between some *akbis* and Rumi’s followers. In one instance, Aflaki reports how the amir Taj al-Din Mu’tazz decided to appoint Mawlana’s disciple Husam al-Din Çelebi as shaykh, and obtained a royal decree (*firmān-i humāyūn*) to that effect. However, when Mawlana and his circle attempted to enter the *khāngāh* to bestow the gift of a new prayer rug, they were confronted by an angry *akhi*:

Akhi Ahmad who was one of the tyrants of the age and the head of the register of *runūds* of the prison was present at that occasion. From excess of hatred, chauvinism (*ta’āṣub*) and envy, he did not want Çelebi to become shaykh of that *khāngāh*. He suddenly arose and folded the prayer rug, giving it to someone else, saying, ‘We cannot accept him as our shaykh here.’ Immediately the people of the world were thrown into confusion. Notable *akbis* who were attached to the house of the fathers and grandfathers of Akhi Turk and Akhi Bishara, like Akhi Qaysar, Akhi Chupan and Akhi Muhammad Sayyidwari and others put their hand on their swords and knives, and the commanders who were *murids* sought to kill the rebellious *runūd*. Strife burst out and on account of the situation many of the heart-wounded dervishes said, ‘Strife is sleeping, may God curse whoever awakes it’, and, according to the saying ‘strife is worse than killing’, a tumult broke out.⁶³

While *futuwwa* treatises emphasise the virtues of avoiding gossip and of *khāmūshī*, of being silent about others’ faults, in practice rivalry between *akhi* groups often resulted in public disturbances. Ibn Battuta notes how rival *akbi* groups in Ladhiq/Denizli came to blows over which of them was to have the honour of hosting him,⁶⁴ and how the *akbis* and *fiṭnān* all bore weapons in public.⁶⁵ Gülşehri in his *Mantiku’l-Tayr* also alludes to these problems in the chapter (not paralleled in ‘Attar) entitled ‘A questioner asks the hoopoe about the correct behaviour on the [Sufi] way and *futuwwa*’.⁶⁶ Gülşehri describes the three
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⁶⁶ This passage is discussed in Ahmet Kartal, ‘Gülşehri’nin Mantiku’l-Tayr’nda Yer Alan Füriyet ve İlgili Manzumesi’, in Ahmet Kartal, *Şiraz’dan İstanbul’a: Türk-Fars Kültür Coğrafyası Üzerine Araştırmalar* (Istanbul, 2011), 793–802. Kartal identifies Gülşehri’s source as the Qabusnama of
conditions necessary to be an *akhī*: one should be blameless, ‘shining like the sun on the earth’, and one’s table and door should both be open – i.e. one should be generous and hospitable; but the opening verses of this chapter go on to suggest that not all *akhīs* adhered to these precepts:

Someone asks, ‘What is *futuwwa*, and what do these *akhīs* do?
What should one do to be a possessor of *futuwwa*, what should one do to be successful on this path?
Other than the table [i.e. offering hospitality], is there any other condition? Explain to us the difference between the true version and the false.
Does one avoid saying bad things about others; or does being an *akhī* mean fighting, rioting and evil?
Can someone who has torn the veil [of secrecy] from another’s [misdeeds] ever become an *akhī*?67

Gülşehri aims to show who a true *akhī* is and what being an *akhī* (*ahilik*) comprises. After his passage explaining *futuwwa*, Gülşehri then introduces another story not found in ‘Attar, that of Bishr of Hamadan, a man in search of knowledge and love. Gülşehri relates Bishr’s efforts to find a woman he fell saw passing by, her face suddenly unveiled by the wind. After many travels and travails, including falling in with a would-be philosopher woman, Yamliha, whose arrogant belief in the superiority of her knowledge causes her death, Bishr embraces the way of the *akhīs* and becomes a merchant, settling down and marrying Yamliha’s serving girl, whom on marrying he discovers to be the woman he sought. Thus it is only with the embrace of *ahilik* that Bishr is able to abandon his vain wanderings and find his heart’s true desire. At the end of the story of Bishr, Gülşehri gives the moral:

Akhi Bishr is one of those who is aware of *ahilik*; whoever calls you an *akhī* is stupid.
He through being an *akhī* went to God; your work is all tricks and hypocrisy.
As you have not cleaned manliness’s lake (*mürvvet gölini*), what do you know of the way of *futuwwa*?
There, they eat the stew of any cock; in vain do they call you *akhī*...
There everyone seeks his own way; strange it is that they call you *akhī*.
Your true words are all lies; to call you an *akhī* is a lie.
What sort of a person are you to be an *akhī*, or even to be the slave of *akhīs*?
If you know the *Futuwwatnama* and read and explain it,

Kayka’us b. Iskandar, a well-known Persian mirror for princes of the eleventh century that became popular in fourteenth-century Anatolia.
Then, my friend, you know that in *ahlīk* you are not even a night-watchman [i.e someone who can tell well from bad in the dark].

Beyond the ideals, then, many *fītān* were involved in violence, and debates raged as to who a true *akhī* was, which are reflected in Gülşehri. While theorists such as Suhrawardi insisted that *futuwwa* meant renouncing violence, in reality the opposite was often the case. It is to this more murky side of *futuwwa* that we now turn.

**THE SPREAD OF FUTUWWA FROM BAGHDAD TO ANATOLIA**

By the tenth century, there were groups in Baghdad and other cities of the Islamic east that identified themselves as *fītān*, or in another term ‘*ayyārs*; in the jaundiced view of the ‘*ulama*’ who wrote most of our historical sources for these cities, they are portrayed as thugs and ne’er-do-wells. Despite the involvement of many ‘*ayyārs*/fītān in activities such as highway robbery and theft, it does seem that some also espoused a code of chivalric conduct that overlapped with the Sufi ideals of al-Sulami. Indeed, it has been argued that the association of *fītān* with violence is far from being as contradictory as it might appear, for early Sufis had played a prominent role in jihad on the frontiers. A *ribāt* could thus mean both a frontier fortress and a Sufi lodge. While chronicles condemn ‘*ayyārs* as bandits, *jawānmard/futuwwa* is praised as the highest form of chivalry in courtly sources, such as the *Qabusnama*, an eleventh-century work of advice literature from the Southern Caspian hinterland written by the Ziyarid prince Kayka’us b. Iskandar to advise his son and heir. These ‘*ayyārs* play an increasingly important role in urban life in the twelfth century as a sort of paramilitary or auxiliary force. Our sources on Baghdad mention them frequently, and there are sporadic references to them in the other great cities of the Islamic east, such as Nishapur; they seem to have been entirely an eastern phenomenon. There is no evidence of their existence in, say, Fatimid Egypt or Syria. Among these groups, *futuwwa* took on an increasingly institutional form, with its own hierarchy and rituals.
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68 Ibid., l. 2990–3000, pp. 444–5.
70 Tor, *Violent Order*, 234–41. See also Harry Neale, *Jihad in Premodern Sufi Writings* (Basingstoke, 2017), which underlines that Sufis were interested in jihad not just as the ‘greater jihad’ against the self, but also the lesser jihad of warfare.
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The contested nature of *futuwwa* that Gülşehri identifies is thus not an aberration but a long-standing feature. However, thanks to the efforts of the Abbasid caliph al-Nasir li-Din Allah (r. 575/1180–622/1225), a new synthesis of Sufi, chivalric and institutional forms of *futuwwa* emerged as part of the Caliph’s efforts to reassert Abbasid authority both in Iraq and beyond. Futuwwa was to be harnessed to the Caliph’s own ends. Al-Nasir took the existing institutions of the *futuwwa*, its initiation rights and ceremonies, and tried to weld them into a form whereby the Caliph himself would be the focus of loyalty, arrogating to himself the prerogative of investing new members of the *futuwwa* – the leading princes of the Middle East. Ayubid, Ghurid, Zangid and ultimately Anatolian Seljuq rulers were all initiated. In 1207 he issued a decree abolishing all other forms of *futuwwa*, signalling his aim to concentrate authority in his own hands. Thereafter *futuwwa* largely disappears as a popular social phenomenon in Baghdad. One of al-Nasir’s allies in this project of reform was the leading Sufi theorist Abu Hafs ‘Umar al-Suhrawardi, although it has been suggested that his agenda was rather different from al-Nasir’s, seeking to assert the authority as heirs to the Prophet of the group of Sufis for which he was the self-appointed spokesman.

In its exported form, it was this court-centred chivalry that first took hold in Anatolia, which sources trace back to the aftermath of sultan ‘Izz al-Din Kayka’us’s capture of the Black Sea stronghold of Sinop from its Greek defenders in 611/1214. ‘Izz al-Din sent an emissary to Baghdad to announce his triumph, bearing rich presents of textiles, slaves and horses. The ambassador was Majd al-Din Ishaq of Malatya, a distinguished scholar, adviser to the Seljuq sultan and previously his father, and friend of Ibn ‘Arabi. According to Ibn Bibi, along with announcing the victory over the infidel, the embassy was to ask for ‘Izz al-Din to be invested into *futuwwa*. In response, the Caliph sent Kayka’us a letter inducting him into the *futuwwa*, as is also recorded by a poet at Kayka’us’s court, Qadi Burhan al-Din al-Anawi, himself a former ambassador to Baghdad.
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75 On this project see Ohlander, *Sufism in an Age of Transition*, 140–2, 271; Ridgeon, *Morals and Mysticism*, 64–6.
includes the Arabic text of this letter in his chronicle. In it, the Caliph describes
the lineage of futuwwa from ‘Ali b. Abi Talib,
who asked from his excellency the Prophet for the honour of brotherhood (ukhuwwa) and
was singled out apart from other people by the glories of futuwwa. [The angel] Gabriel,
peace be upon him, announced the excellence God had given him: ‘There is no fatā except
Ali and no sword except Dhu’l-Faqar.’

Rather than an innovation, al-Nasir’s promotion of the order is described as the
Caliph ‘reviving, through the example of his sacred behaviour, the effaced struc-
tures of futuwwa’ (jaddada bi-maarāshid siratihi al-muqaddasa hayākil al-futuwwa
al-tawāmis). The idea that futuwwa had a long tradition dating back to the time of
the Prophet was frequently employed by later writers defending the institution
against detractors. The letter goes on to describe how ‘Izz al-Din Kayka’us, as a
sign of his loyalty to the Caliph, had requested ‘to be granted of the honour of
futuwwa and to be armed with its glorious garments, and its long, loose trousers’.
This honour, the letter notes, ‘is only granted to one whose loyalty is deeply
rooted’. The grant of these garments (the libās al-futuwwa) was more than just a
signal honour to a loyal vassal. In al-Nasir’s letter, it is claimed that wearing them
will act as ‘protection from the torment of hellfire’ (junnatan wāqiyyatan min
‘adhāb al-nār). This courtly futuwwa also had a more practical appeal for rulers,
for hunting – ever the favoured sport of pre-modern elites – was ritualised and
incorporated into the requirements of courtly futuwwa. The hunting of certain
birds with a crossbow – a weapon for which al-Nasir had a particular enthusiasm –
was to be done in the name of the Caliph.

Some years later, ‘Izz al-Din’s successor sultan ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I also
sought Caliphal recognition of his rule. Al-Nasir sent Suhrawardi to Konya along
with symbols of legitimate rule such as the decree recognising ‘Ala’ al-Din as
Sultan of Rum and deputy of the Caliph there (manshūr-i saltanat wa niyābat-i
ḥukumat-i mamālik-i rūm). On the basis of the presumed Anatolian provenance
of the extant manuscripts, it has been suggested that the two futuwwatnāmas he
wrote were composed for the benefit of the fityān of Konya, but they clearly
circulated more widely and were known to later authors in Iran. Although it
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remains unclear to what extent he was pursuing his own or the Caliph’s agenda, Suhrawardi met a rapturous response in Anatolia, according to Ibn Bibi, who devotes a whole chapter of al-Awamir al-‘Alā’iyya to the shaykh’s visit to Konya. Ibn Bibi indicates a particular interest on the part of the political elite in Suhrawardi, specifically mentioning the great amir Jalal al-Din Karatay’s role in the welcoming ceremony for the shaykh. Ibn Bibi alludes to Karatay participating in what might be a ceremony initiating the sultan into the futuwwa, or perhaps some sort of murshid–murid relationship with Suhrawardi.

Widely praised in the sources for his piety, Karatay is also said to have paid for the construction of Suhrawardi’s tomb in Baghdad. The amir’s interest in the shaykh is confirmed by a Persian translation of Suhrawardi’s treatise Risala fi’l-Faqr which was made for Karatay, preserved in an unpublished manuscript. In contrast to the grandiose titles usually given to senior Seljuq amirs, in the translation of the Risala fi’l-Faqr Karatay is entitled simply the amir-i faqir-sirat, qāyid-i din u dawlat – ‘the amir with the dervish’s life-style, the leader of faith and state’. Renouncing worldly goods by becoming a dervish (faqir) is portrayed in the text as the sole path to salvation. The inscriptive programme on the madrasa he built is further indication of Sufi interests. Karatay also built a zāwiya, the waqfyya of which survives. Although the term zāwiya can have a variety of nuances and does not necessarily imply a lodging places for ṣālīḥ, it is notable that the titles Karatay is given in this document (and only this document – they do not appear in the same form in his endowments of a caravanserai and madrasa that also survive) attribute to him the typically futuwwa virtue of generosity. He is described as nāhil al-sakhibāyā, wāhib al-‘aatāyā (‘the bestower of gifts’), and mention is made of taking care of passing travellers who will stay at the zāwiya (maṣāliḥ al-wārīdin wa’l-nāzilin bi’l-zāwiya), reminding one of the fatā’s duty of ___
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generosity to strangers. The appeal of futuwwa to the elite of the Seljuq realm is also suggested by an early waqfiyya from Antalya, where one of the witnesses, all of whom were apparently senior officials and amirs, describes himself as ‘Akhi Amin al-Din Mahmud b. Yusuf al-Qaysari.

There was, then, a close interest in the ideals of poverty and renunciation that Suhrawardi expounded among the highest echelons of the Seljuq state. Ibn Bibi tells us that Kayqubad hastened to see the shaykh in person ‘because he had shown the late sultans the way from the threshold (barzakh) of the day of judgement and made possible their return to the Abode of Eternity’. We should not dismiss the possibility that such motives did indeed play a part in Kayqubad’s thinking, as they seem to have for Karatay, and as al-Nasir’s letter to ‘Izz al-Din Kayka’us also stresses. Studies of the Seljuqs’ contemporaries, the Ayyubid and Mamluk dynasties of Egypt and Syria, have emphasised how these rulers showed great concern for the fate of their souls, which was an important reason for their patronage of Sufism. From a slightly later period, the letters of Jalal al-Din Rumi reveal that for the political elite of Anatolia, having prayers said for them by Rumi and his fellow dervishes (‘du’ā-yi dawlat) was motive in their patronage, as was discussed in Chapter 2. The genuine conviction that the intercession of holy men might bear direct spiritual and even material reward cannot be underestimated.

The earliest Anatolian futuwwa manual, composed around the time of Suhrawardi’s visit, suggests that futuwwa had already begun to appeal beyond court circles. The Tuhfat al-Wasaya was written by Ahmad b. Ilyas al-Naqqash al-Khartbirdi, of whom we know nothing other than the information provided by his name: the descriptor ‘al-naqqāsh’ suggests he was a painter, while the nisba Khartbirdi indicates that the author was a native of Harput, the largely Armenian town on the northern peripheries of the Artuqid state in south-east Anatolia. The Tuhfat al-Wasaya, according to Khartbirdi’s introduction, was in fact itself an abridgement of a work written by the Caliph al-Nasir’s son ‘Ali, entitled the Umdat al-Wasila. Khartbirdi describes futuwwa ceremonies: when the fityan are gathered in their meeting place known as the daskara, their leader (naqib) should pronounce
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the basmala and give a sermon (khutba) on futuwwa. The text also gives information about the initiation ceremony for a new fatā; by this point, then, futuwwa organisations possessed buildings and hierarchy, and Breebaart suggests that it was intended as a practical guide for fizyan groups. Nonetheless, the fact of the work being written in Arabic would have limited its circulation among the largely Persian-speaking artisans of central Anatolia, and the fact that it is based on the ‘Umdat al-Wasila by al-Nasir’s son suggests its proximity to the court-centred futuwwa the Caliph promoted. The Tuhfat al-Wasaya formed the basis of Burghazi’s Turkish futuwatnâma, written sometime after 1365. Breebaart suggests that Burghazi acquired his copy of the Tuhfat al-Wasaya from the Franks who had plundered Alexandria, from whom he mentions buying a number of books. However, the work is found in a major manuscript collection of futuwatnâmas, MS Ayasofya 2049 (Fig. 3.1), which is evidently of Anatolian provenance.
In sum, the reigns of ‘Izz al-Din Kayka’us I and ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad I saw the penetration of al-Nasir’s court-centred futuwwa, which was accompanied by a growing interest on the part of the elite in ideas of renunciation and the composition of the first Anatolia futuwwa treatises. There is very little evidence of any other kind of futuwwa activity in Anatolia at a more popular level. It is striking that the waqfiyya of 1205 from Konya, which presents a very detailed picture of land ownership in the city, listing at length all the merchants and small businessmen who are later typically members of futuwwa groups, contains not a single mention of an akhi or fitâ.96 It is true that Ibn Bibi does list akhîs among the groups commanded by Kayqubad to show their respects to Suhrawardi in 1220. He writes that ‘the qadis, imams, Sufis, shaykhs, Sufis, notables, akhîs and fitiyan (ikhwân wa fitiya) of Konya’ were ordered to receive the shaykh.97 Yet it does not sound as if these groups were craftsmen. Rather they are ranked alongside the elite of Konya society. It is only with the coming of the Mongols that we have clearer evidence for the growth of futuwwa at a more popular level.98

FUTUWWA AND POLITICS UNDER THE MONGOLS

While the akhîs and fitiyan of pre-Mongol Anatolia are a shadowy presence, barely discernible beyond Ibn Bibi’s account of ‘Izz al-Din’s induction into the Nasirian futuwwa, after the Battle of Kösedağ they start to emerge into the light of history. By the mid-thirteenth century, Anatolian futuwwa had been transformed from the elitist, courtly version propagated by al-Nasir, to a popular movement embracing relatively humble professions, with strong connotations of thuggery. The pious yet worldly Jalal al-Din Karatay, who carefully navigated the treacherous waters of Seljuq and Mongol politics to be one of the rather few leading political figures of this period to die of natural causes, played a crucial role in this transformation.

As we have noted above, the textual evidence suggests Karatay’s interest in Suhrawardi and futuwwa, but the fitiyan were also Karatay’s close allies, and played a crucial part in supporting his political aims. Our major source is Ibn Bibi, who relates how fitiyan were employed by Karatay as hired assassins. As ever, Ibn Bibi is vague about the chronology, but the events described must have happened shortly after the death of Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw II, in or around 644/1246. During
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these first years of Mongol dominion in Anatolia, the Horde’s hegemony was light and distant, but the sultanate’s loss of authority and power meant that rival political factions in Anatolia fought for supremacy.99 Slowly, the Sahib-Diwan Shams al-Din al-Isfahani and his ally Jalal al-Din Karatay sought to consolidate power in their hands. The runūḍ of Akşehir and Abgarm were employed to murder Shams al-Din Khass Oghuz and Asad al-Din Ruzbah, two powerful amirs, in Isfahani’s palace.100 The cry of one of the victims, recorded by Ibn Bibi, reveals the identity of the runūḍ. Khass Oghuz cried out, ‘Lord, this profession is not that of men of loyalty and futuwwa and is not the way (tarīqat) of those possessing honour and muruwwa.’101 Muruwwa was paired with futuwwa in futuwwatnāmas as a parallel virtue, and the two words were almost synonyms. Thus the assassins are accused of letting down the standards of the futuwwa organisation to which their victim recognised them as belonging.

Shortly after this, Isfahani and Karatay sought to destroy the orchestrator of these murders, their former ally Fakhr al-Din Abu Bakr the Pervane. The latter tried to seek the assistance of the akhīs of Konya:

In secret he summoned the akhīs and the chiefs of the fītyān of Konya who are the source of strife [fīrina] and immorality, and who from time to time assist in suppressing the rabble of evil-doers by their ardour. He asked them for help in rebelling against the sultan, after he had made them dependable with promises and expending money. They replied, ‘The šāhib-divān [Shams al-Din al-Isfahani] is ruler of the kingdom by the bequest of sultan Ghiyath al-Din, and he is the administrator of the affairs of sultan ‘Izz al-Din. Thus he has complete control of affairs of faith and state, and the sultan, who is the possessor of the kingdom, is in his hands. We cannot rebel against the sultan because the dust of hostility has been stirred up between the two of you, nor can we show disloyalty (kufr-ni-nimat) to our lord.102 Isfahani appointed as commander of Konya Shams al-Din Yavtash, who was warmly welcomed by the ikhwān and a’yān (i.e. the akhīs and the notables), and organised the murder of the Pervane Fakhr al-Din.103 The major beneficiary of the removal of this rival was Karatay, who was appointed to further senior positions under Isfahani’s dictatorship.104 In 646/1248, however, a rival claimant to the sultanate, Rukn al-Din Kūlç Arslan IV, came to Konya with a yarlağh from
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Güyük Khan announcing his appointment as sultan and Isfahani’s execution. Karatay attempted to warn Isfahani of the danger, and his ally Najm al-Din pisar-i Tusi called on the fityaän to protect the vizier:

Najm al-Din son of Tusi the za‘im al-dār summoned the akhīs of Konya. He ordered that with their fityaän they should arm themselves, and together with a detachment of cavalry [mafārīda] and ghulāms from the sultan’s guard, they should stand watch over the door to the house of the sāhib [Isfahani] and his servants.

Shams al-Din al-Isfahani was duly killed, but Rukn al-Din did not win the unambiguous victory he was expecting owing to Güyük’s death. Rather Karatay managed to manipulate the situation to his own advantage and from 647/1249 until his death in 652/1254 was the effective ruler of the Seljuq lands on behalf of the triumvirate of Seljuq child-sultans who nominally held office. We hear little of the fityaän in the historical sources for this period, but it is clear enough that throughout the crisis of 1246–9 they operated as an armed group in the service of Shams al-Din al-Isfahani and his ally Karatay. It seems that Karatay’s patronage was a crucial factor in the emergence of a popular futuwwa. Alongside its elevated ideals, futuwwa could also have practical uses for its patron.

Nothing is known about the identity and background of these early fityaän. We cannot say for sure whether their depiction as low-life thugs, runūd, is accurate or a literary fiction on the part of that notoriously partial historian Ibn Bibi. Our first indications as to the identity of the Anatolian fityaän come from the biographical dictionary of Ibn al-Fuwati, written in the early fourteenth century. He records that in 660/1261, a certain fatā and butcher (qašāb) from Tabriz, Karim al-Din Abu ‘Ali, was witness (min shuhūd al-sijill) to the record on the register made by the Qadi of Konya, Siraj al-Din Urmawi, for the chief akhī (fatā al-fityaän), Shams al-Din Muhammad al-Sarwi. Both Karim al-Din Abu ‘Ali the witness and Shams al-Din Muhammad the chief akhī are specified to be immigrants to Anatolia (nazil al-Rūm). The latter also had links with Tabriz, where Ibn al-Fuwati met him when he came to buy books in 675/1276–7. Shams al-Din is further described as ‘a leading religious authority’ (min al-ṣudūr al-kubbār).

These brief references are intriguing. First, both fityaän are described as immigrants to Anatolia from Iran, and are closely connected to Tabriz. We know from the Altun-aba waqqfiyya written in 1205 that several of the merchants and small

---

105 See Yıldız, ‘Mongol Rule’, 206–9; also on these events Turan, Selçuklu Zamanında Türkiye, 463–9; Cahen, La Turquie, 230–5.
106 Ibn Bibi, al-Awamir al-‘Ala‘iyya (Ankara), 585; (Tehran), 510.
107 Turan, Selçuklu Zamanında Türkiye, 466–72; Cahen, La Turquie, 235–41.
109 Ibid., No 3434.
tradesmen of Konya were immigrants from Iran, especially Tabriz,\textsuperscript{110} and the evidence of Ibn al-Fuwati suggests that half a century later the same processes were in operation, with a presumably relatively humble profession such as butcher still being occupied by migrants. This suggests that the pattern detected by Robert Irwin in Cairo,\textsuperscript{111} where the fityān were immigrants from the Ilkhanid lands, may obtain for Anatolia too. Such an impression is confirmed by a source that originates from a futuwwa milieu, the genealogical chart of an akhī family from Ankara dating probably to the mid-fourteenth century. According to this document, the ancestors of the prominent Ankara akhī Muhammad b. Akhi Husam al-Din al-Husayni had lived in the Iranian town of Khuy before migrating to Anatolia in the time of Kılıç Arslan.\textsuperscript{112} Thus studies that consider the akhīs and fityān to be specifically ‘Turkish’ are wide of the mark. Nonetheless, whereas external sources emphasise the relatively humble occupations in which the fityān engaged, in the genealogy this akhī family remembered its ancestors as noble warriors, as befits descendants of ‘Ali b Abi Talib, which they believed themselves to be literally (while all fityān see themselves as spiritually connected to ‘Ali).\textsuperscript{113} However, it provides no concrete information about the occupations of members of the family since their migration to Anatolia.

Ibn al-Fuwati’s remarks also give us some insight into the operation of futuwwa groups, offering a rather different picture from the normative futuwwatnāmas. It is intriguing that Karim al-Din Abu ‘Ali is specified to be a butcher, because that profession was excluded from membership of futuwwa by futuwwatnāmas such as that of Nasiri,\textsuperscript{114} suggesting the danger of making claims about practice on the basis of normative sources. Secondly, Ibn al-Fuwati indicates that the fityān had formal structures such as a register (of membership?) which were validated by state-appointed officials such as the qadi. Moreover, such events were sufficiently noteworthy to make it into a chronicle composed in distant Iran. All this suggests a close relationship between fityān and the Ilkhanid regime.

Another view of the fityān is given by the anonymous history of the Seljuqs composed in Konya in the mid-fourteenth century, referred to henceforth as the
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Anonymous Chronicle. The author (or possibly one of the authors, as it may be the work of more than one hand) seems to have been closely associated with the akbīs, as well as having had a close relationship with the Mongols – Melville suggests he may have been part of the retinue of Khwaja Nasir al-Din Mustawfi, the deputy (nā’ib) of Geikhatu, the Mongol prince who was governor of Anatolia at the end of the thirteenth century before becoming Ilkhan (r. 690/1291–694/1295). The second half of the text deals with the Seljuq sultanate in Anatolia. Its treatment of the first sultans is brief and schematic, but it gains in depth toward the end of the thirteenth century, treating Mongol rule in some detail, while narrowing its focus from the Seljuq dynasty to deal with events in Konya. Indeed, the final fifteen or so pages of the printed text basically represent a city history of Konya, which, at the time of the work’s composition, would have been under the control of the Karamanid dynasty, to whom the author or authors evince a distinct hostility. The Anonymous Chronicle generally portrays the Seljuqs in positive terms, but the author’s attitude towards the Mongols is also quite nuanced. Geikhatu is lavishly praised for his good works. Throughout, though, the ātrak, or ‘Turks’ as the Karamanids are contemptuously called, are portrayed as circling the city, ever ready to pounce as soon as the Mongols’ backs are turned. The author delights in telling us how the heads of Karamanids are brought back by Mongol and Seljuq armies from campaigns and hung from the city walls. Alongside the fityān, another powerful urban group, the īğiş (Arabic pl. akādisha), is mentioned, although exactly who or what they are is completely unclear.

The akbīs first appear in the Anonymous Chronicle in 676/1277–8, in the wake of the Pervane’s failed revolt when they are mentioned alongside other notables and the amir al-akādisha of the city urging the nā’ib Amin al-Din to make war on the Turkmen of Karaman, Eşref and Menteş who were besieging the city. As the city was abandoned by the Seljuq sultan and administration, the akbīs and akādisha seized control of its defences, warding off the Turkmen attack. Eventually, Seljuq/Mongol authority was restored, but power seems to have passed from the akādisha. The historian notes of Fakhr al-Din, the ra’īs al-akādisha, that when he died in 678/1279 ‘he was the last ra’īs of Konya’, leaving a power vacuum filled by chaos.
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For the next ten years we hear little of the fityân. Then in 688/1289, a group of runūd (also referred to as jawānān, the Persian equivalent of fityân) are recorded as causing chaos in Konya. Other akhis and fityân (akhiyân wa jawānān) came to the rescue and were rewarded by the sultan for aiding him. The runūd are mentioned again after Geikhatu’s departure from Konya, rioting in the city again, and allying themselves with sultan Mas’ud’s brother to attempt to overthrow the sultan. These runūd appear to have been allied to the Karamanid Turkmen: we are told that their rebellion intensified when they learned of the Karamanid capture of Beyşehir, and no one would leave their house ‘for fear of the Turkmen and runūd (i.e. fityân)’.124

From the rioting of 688/1289 onwards, akhis feature prominently in the Anonymous Chronicle. Their leader Akhi Ahmad Shah is depicted as interceding for the townspeople with the tyrannical Ilkhanid viceroy, Fakhr al-Din Qazwini, who preceded Geikhatu and Nasir al-Din,125 and chasing out another unjust Mongol envoy.126 The text includes stories of Akhi Ahmad Shah’s generosity, while hinting at his rivalry with other akhi leaders.127 On the death of his brother in Muharram 691/December 1291–January 1292, 15,000 men are said to have bared their heads in sorrow and the shops did not open for forty days in mourning.128 Akhi Ahmad Shah’s power is confirmed by Aflaki, who describes him as ‘the king of the fityân, the rarity of the age, the late Akhi Ahmad Shah, who was commander of the futuwat-dārs [holders of futuwa] of the abode of kingship, Konya, possessor of ease and wealth, with so many thousand soldiers and runūd under his command’.129 Akhi Ahmad is portrayed as the leader of the party that received Geikhatu when he besieged the city – although in Aflaki’s account, while Akhi Ahmad did the negotiating, it was the intervention of Rumi from beyond the grave that saved the city through terrifying the Ilkhan in his dreams. Despite Akhi Ahmad’s exalted role, there are still suggestions of the akhis continuing their old role as hit men. As the Anonymous Chronicle records: ‘Monday 6 Muharram 698 [October 1298]: killing of the sharābsālār [chief wine steward of the court] by the order of sultan ‘Ala’ al-Din Faramarz by the hand of Akhi Jaruq, with the agreement of the notables of the city of Konya.’130
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The evidence of the Anonymous Chronicle thus indicates that the akhīs’ rise to political prominence coincided with the collapse of the Seljuq state after the disaster of the Pervane’s failed revolt. There was a power vacuum, and while such figures as the Seljuq sultan and the rest of the Ilkhanid administration in Konya made themselves scarce as the Turkmen marauded at the gates of the city, it was the akhīs and the akādishā who led the defence. Henceforth, it is the akhīs that in this sympathetic account speak to power, representing the populace of the town. This literary picture of the growing importance of fityān in the late thirteenth century is confirmed by epigraphic evidence. The earliest inscription to mention the fityān comes from Ankara, recording that in 689/1290 a local akhī leader constructed the mosque of Akhi Sharaf al-Dīn.131 However, the view that the akhīs filled a power vacuum left by the collapse of other authority does not find universal confirmation in the other sources; possibly it was a situation specific to Konya, or possibly the depiction of the situation there is determined by the agenda of the anonymous authors with their pro-akhī sympathies.

It is important to remember that the akhīs did not represent a single unified group with common interests. Clearly there were groups of fityān of whom the anonymous author did not approve, calling them runūd, and some of these seem to have favoured the Karamanids, while others collaborated with the Mongols. Some, such as Akhi Ahmad Shah and Akhi Muhammad, the object of Sultan Walad’s panegyric, were figures of immense power, wealth and influence, virtual rulers within their domain, but not all akhīs possessed political power or wealth. The most famous fatā of the late thirteenth century was the dyer (dabbāgh) from Kırşehir, Akhi Evren, who was regarded as a sort of ‘patron saint’ of Turkish guilds and crafts132 and was the subject of a brief Turkish mathnawī by his deputy (halife) Gülşehri.133 At least some akhīs, then, continued to adhere to the ideal promoted by the futuwwatnāmas.

A similarly varied picture is given by Ibn Battuta, writing of the 1330s. In Konya, he stayed in the zāwiya of the qadi, Ibn Qalāmshah, ‘who was one of the

133 Gülşehri’s Mesnevi auf Achi Evran. Some doubts have been raised by Turkish scholars about the attribution of the *Keramat-i Ahi Evran* to Gülşehri, even though the latter’s name appears in the text (l. 150, 158). Given the mention of Gülşehri’s *Falaknama* (l. 159, see p. 163) and the interest in futuwaw and ahilik shared with Gülşehri’s Mantuk’u’-Tayr, the attribution seems credible. See also the discussion and revised edition of the text in Ahmet Kartal, *Keramat-i Ahi Evran Üzertime Notlar*, in Ahmet Kartal, *Şiraz’dan İstanbul’a: Türk-Fars Kültür Coğrafyası Üzerine Araştırmalar* (İstanbul, 2011), 759–79.
fitūn, and his was one of the greatest ṣāwīya’s, confirming the relationship between the governing elite and the futūwwa. Elsewhere, in Antalya and Sivas, the fitūn appear more as tradesmen. Ibn Battuta indicates that the akhīs’ power was especially strong in the directly Ilkhanid-controlled territories of Anatolia. Fitūn appear throughout his account, but in the Turkmen periphery – the nascent Ottoman state in Bursa, Aydı̇n and Karaman – the rulers are the Turkmen chiefs. In Aksaray, however, the Ilkhanid governor was himself one of the fitūn:

We stayed there [in Aksaray] in the ṣāwīya of Sharīf Husayn, the deputy of the amir Eretna. This latter is the deputy of the king of Iraq [the Ilkhan] in the parts of Rum he controls. This Sharīf is one of the fitūn, and has a large following.

It was the same story in Niğde, where Ibn Battuta stayed in ‘the ṣāwīya of the ḍāt Ākhi Jaruq who was the amir there, and honoured us according to the custom of fitūn’. In Kayseri, the capital of Eretna where the Ilkhanid military forces were based (bihā ‘askar ahl al-‘irāq), Ibn Battuta again stayed in a ṣāwīya, this time that of the ḍāt Ākhi Āmir ‘Ali, who is a great amir of the leading akhīs in this land, and his followers comprise the notables and elite of the town (wujūḥ al-madīna wa-kubārubā) . . . It is one of the customs of this land that in places that do not have a sultan, the akhī is the ruler. It is he who gives a mount to the incoming traveller, gives him clothes of honour and is good to him as far as he is able. In commanding and forbidding and riding, he is like a sultan.

Far from being an anti-Mongol force, the fitūn thus appear as a key part of the Ilkhanid governing structures. Indeed, futūwwa’s links with the Mongols seem to have even outlasted the Ilkhanate, as is suggested by a telling anecdote in Yazdi’s Zafarnama discussing Timur’s dealings with the leaders of the Mongol nomads of Anatolia, the Qara Tatars. Timur is depicted as negotiating with two Qara Tatar leaders who bear the names Akhī Tabarruk and Muruwwat, names that are redolent of futūwwa. Moreover, the alliance between fitūn and Mongol power also extended to the more intellectual wings of futūwwa. The poet ‘Iraqi, for instance, received patronage from the Pervane Mu’in al-Din Sulayman who is said to have built him a khānqāh in Tokat. According to Ibn al-Fuwati the Ilkhanid
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134 Ibn Battuta, Rihla, 293; trans. Gibb, 430.
138 Ibid., 434.
139 Yazdi, Zafarnama, II, 359; cf. Paul, ‘Mongol Aristocrats’, 125 for the identity of these individuals.
chief minister, the Sahib Diwan Shams al-Din Juwayni brought ‘Iraqi from Rum in 666/1267–8 to serve as his nadim or boon companion. One further piece of evidence for fityān attitudes towards the Mongols is provided by the short Persian mathnawi by Yusufi, composed in 699/1299, entitled the Khamushnama, which is preserved in a manuscript (MS Fazil Ahmed Paşa 1597, fols 100b–106b) concerned with Sufism and futuwwa, and containing the text of Nasiri’s Futuwwatnama. ‘Ali b. Abi Talib is mentioned at the start of the Khamushnama along with his sword Dhu’l-Faqar, highly symbolic of futuwwa, and is praised as an intercessor; the theme of the poem, on the virtues of silence, suggests the self-control of the tongue required of fityān. Much of the poem consists of fairly conventional tales and stories exhorting the necessity of silence and condemning the tongue (dar malāmat-i zabān). In the final sections of the work Yusufi turns to contemporary politics. He denounces the false Seljuq claimant Jimri, around whom the great anti-Mongol revolt 675/1277 had coalesced; he condemns too the Hātirogulları, the governors of Niğde who had sided with the Karamanids during the revolt; loyalty to the ruler is praised. Conventional though they are, these sentiments mirror those of the anonymous historian of Konya, with his vehement hostility to the Karamanids and enthusiasm for at least certain aspects of Mongol rule. Many fityān evidently cooperated enthusiastically with Ilkhanid authorities – indeed, sometimes were themselves those very authorities.

Futuwwa, then, represented an important means by which Sufism penetrated the Muslim population beyond the elite, even if not all its adherents lived up to its lofty ideals. Given the power and status that some fityān attained, it is hardly surprising that non-Muslims should have sought to join them, and one can assume that futuwwa did, as its proponents intended, act as a vehicle for conversion. At the same time, while the rise of fityān as a political force may have been encouraged by the collapse of Seljuq authority, it was subsequently fostered as part of a deliberate strategy through which the Ilkhanid rulers of Anatolia sought to govern, drawing on the presence of immigrant fityān from Tabriz and Iran, as well as the precedent set by Karatay for employing them in political enterprises.

140 Ibn al-Fuwati, Majma’ al-Ansab, no. 2208.
Part II

Literature and Religious Change
The Emergence of Literary Turkish

In the year 675/1277, in the midst of the massive revolt against the Mongols, the Turkmen warlord Mehmed Beg, founder of the Karamanid beylik, rode into the old Seljuq capital, Konya. After seizing the various insignia of authority, Mehmed Beg issued a startling decree, according to the contemporary historian Ibn Bibi:

After today no one in the government administration (diwān), the court (dārgāh u bārgāh), the assembly or in public (maydān) shall speak anything but Turkish.1

Mehmed Beg’s decree has been much celebrated in modern Turkey as marking the first establishment of Turkish as an official language, replacing Persian.2 Since 1961 Mehmed Beg’s home town of Karaman has commemorated it with an annual Dil Bayramı or language festival, an event that has become intimately bound up with contemporary Turkish politics.3 The local Council has recently decided to celebrate Karaman’s status as the ‘capital of the Turkish language’ by erecting rather incongruously in the main square a replica of the earliest surviving monument of written Turkish, the runic Orhon inscriptions from eighth-century Mongolia. Although this is doubtless intended to signal the continuity of Turkish literature, the development of Arabic-script Turkish in the Islamic lands has little to do with these pre-Islamic precedents.

In reality, the Karamanid ruled territories, as far as we can judge on the present evidence, were one of the last areas of Anatolia to adopt Turkish as a literary
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1 Ibn Bibi, al-Awamir al-‘Ala’īyya (Ankara), 696; (Tehran), 597.
2 See for instance Köprülu, Early Mystics in Turkish Literature, 208.
medium, probably towards the middle of the fifteenth century. Rather than reflecting a decisive moment in the history of Turkish, the story of Mehmed Beg owes more to Ibn Bibi’s desire to depict the Karamanid rebels in negative terms, emphasising their barbarity through their abolition of the language of culture and civilisation, Persian, in favour of Turkish, a language with little literary pedigree or prestige in the thirteenth-century Middle East. Yet, if not literally true, Ibn Bibi’s story of the decree reflected a more general situation that made the accusations against Mehmed Beg credible. The late thirteenth century is exactly the period when Turkish appeared as a written language in Anatolia, above all although not exclusively as a vehicle for religiously inspired texts. It was not completely without precedents: a handful of Turkish literary texts were produced in or by authors from eleventh- and twelfth-century Central Asia, but these do not seem to have been known in Anatolia, and their influence over the later formation of Turkish there is thought to have been negligible. The language that emerged in Anatolia in the thirteenth century is known as Old Anatolian Turkish, from which Ottoman developed in the fifteenth century. The dividing line between the two is not always clear, but in general Old Anatolian Turkish is distinguished by its orthographic conventions, a tendency to use a higher proportion of Turkish vocabulary as opposed to Arabic or Persian, a greater lexical and sometimes grammatical influence from Eastern Turkish dialects, and above all by the fact that its earliest centres of literary production lay outside the Ottoman realm; to use Ottoman for this earlier period of the language is thus anachronistic.

Although a good number of Turkish texts from the fourteenth century have been edited, they have usually attracted attention from the point of view only of grammar and philology; rarely has there been much study of the broader historical or literary context. Modern studies of the rise of Turkish, usually written by Turkish scholars espousing a nationalist perspective, tend to be full of tendentious claims, taking Mehmed Beg’s proclamation at face value and failing to problematize why and how Turkish suddenly emerged. It is often asserted early Turkish works were composed out of linguistic necessity for an uneducated audience, a


claim that sits uneasily with the complex and sophisticated contents of many of the early works. One rare exception is a short article by Uli Schamiloglu that attempts to relate the rise of Turkish to the Black Death which struck Anatolia in around 1347–8. Schamiloglu argues that the Black Death had both political and cultural consequences, weakening Byzantium and leading to the rise of the Ottomans, and also resulting in an increase in religiosity that prompted the development of Turkish as a literary language. Although Schamiloglu acknowledges the existence of Turkish texts from earlier in the century, he argues that there was a shift towards Turkish after 1347.

Certainly, it was in the later fourteenth to early fifteenth centuries that the writers today considered the early classics of Turkish literature flourished, such as the poets Ahmedi and Şeyhi, both working at the Germiyanid and then Ottoman courts, and Qadi Burhan al-Din, the ruler of Sivas, who left us a Turkish Divan alongside Arabic legal and Sufi works. Whether this literary upsurge can be linked to the plague is more doubtful. Most of these authors were active in a court environment and their works represent less a new religiosity than a Turkicisation of the forms of courtly Persian literature, whether the ghazal, as in the case of Burhan al-Din, or verse universal history, as in the case of Ahmedi’s masterpiece the Iskendername. Indeed, for an event that is said to have had such dramatic consequences, there is a striking absence of references to the Black Death in the contemporary Anatolian sources. Whatever the causes of the increase in literary production in Turkish in the later fourteenth century, which certainly need further research, the plague thesis does not address the emergence of a Turkish literary language in the first place.

Anatolia was not the only region where Turkish developed as a literary language in this period. Turkish was also used for official and literary purposes in the Golden Horde from the thirteenth century, while from the late fourteenth century the Mamluk courts of Egypt and Syria offered patronage to Turkish language writers from both Anatolia and the Golden Horde. Although these developments have been inadequately studied, it is clear that they also had an impact on Anatolian Turkish, as will be discussed below. At the same time, the rise of Turkish can also be seen in the context of what Sheldon Pollock has


8 See further the discussion in Chapter 6, pp. 239–40.
described as the ‘vernacular millennium’ – the rise of vernaculars that occurred in both South Asia and Europe in approximately the same period. Pollock sees these vernaculars, which supplemented and eventually supplanted cosmopolitan languages such as Latin and Sanskrit, as constituting a discourse of power, part of a process in which writers deliberately chose a more limited local idiom for political reasons. The case of Turkish offers interesting parallels to, as well as substantial divergences from, the process of vernacularisation described by Pollock, which has become widely influential. It is worth briefly pointing to how the case of Anatolian Turkish diverges from his scheme.

First, Turkish supplemented a language that was simultaneously both cosmopolitan and vernacular – Persian, which, as we will see, was both a spoken language in medieval Anatolia as well as the language of what could be termed the greater Persian cosmopolis embracing the entire eastern Islamic world from Anatolia to Central Asia and India. Secondly, Pollock insists on the role of ‘increasingly powerful royal courts’ in the growth of the vernacular, but in Anatolia we seem to have the opposite phenomenon, the rise of Turkish coinciding with a time of intense political fragmentation. Much early Turkish literature seems to have been written without any obvious patrons at all. Thirdly, Pollock describes the process of the emergence of the vernacular as a three-stage process comprising literisation (the emergence of a written language for documentary and practical purposes), which is followed, often only after a long gap, by literarisation (the emergence of a literary language in which poetry and literature is composed) and by the final phase superimposition, when the vernacular becomes the dominant form of discourse. Superimposition can be observed after our period, in the fifteenth and even more the sixteenth centuries, as Ottoman becomes the dominant, but never the only, literary and administrative language of that dynasty’s lands. However, it is curious that there is no evidence at all for a preliminary stage of literisation; rather Anatolian Turkish seems to emerge as a literary, not a documentary language. There are no texts, inscriptions or fragments or even passing references in texts indicating the written use of Turkish in Anatolia for practical purposes before its emergence as a literary language, which considerably pre-dates its first use for administrative and documentary purposes. This might, of course, reflect the disappearance of evidence, although that is less likely in the case

11 On this see Bert Fragner, Die "Persophonie": Regionalität, Identität und Sprachkontakt in der Geschichte Asiens (Berlin, 1999).
of epigraphy; more probably it is a result of its absence in an environment where Persian remained both cosmopolitan and vernacular.

To investigate these problems, I will first address the question of when Turkish did emerge in Anatolia. I will then consider the nature of the literary production that emerged, and the question of patronage and audience for Turkish texts. Finally, I consider the question of the relationship between Turkish literary production in Anatolia and that of the Golden Horde and the Mamluk sultanate.

**EARLY TURKISH TEXTS FROM ANATOLIA AND THE PROBLEM OF DATING**

Scholarship on the date of the emergence of Turkish emerges as a literary medium in Anatolia is fraught with difficulties. While many scholars, especially in Turkey, have enthusiastically dated Turkish texts to the first half of the thirteenth century or even earlier,13 most works only survive in much later manuscripts and their dates can only be estimated on the basis of their linguistic characteristics — something that it is, of course, hard to establish definitively without securely dated texts. As so often, the tendency can be traced back to Köprüülü, who wrote that ‘after the establishment of the Seljuq state in Anatolia, Turkish became a written language, but we cannot determine when’. This initial note of caution is abandoned a couple of sentences later, as Köprüülü continues: ‘It is quite natural, therefore, that Turkish works began to be written down from the earliest period of the Seljuqs, but it is true they were very few in number and quite elementary in scope.’14 Köprüülü believed such works comprised ‘simple religious tracts’ and popular stories such as the legend of Battal Ghazi, the Arab frontier warrior of early Islamic times said to be buried in western Anatolia. Köprüülü goes on to pinpoint the thirteenth century as the date for the emergence of a broader Turkish literature, encompassing poetry and Sufi orientated works.15 A similar claim was made by Mecdut Mansuroğlu, who describes thirteenth-century Turkish literature as ‘quite rich’.16 More recently, Ahmed Yaşar Oçak has suggested that a mass

---


15 Ibid., 208.

of older Turkish literature in Anatolia was destroyed by the Mongols, while the attribution of early Turkish poetic and Sufi works to the thirteenth century has been repeated by Gönül Teken.

The evidence for such claims is extremely tenuous. Köprülü and Mansuroğlu named the poets Ahmed Fakih, Şeyyad Hamza and Dehhanı as the major thirteenth-century authors whose works have come down to us. More recent research has put all these authors firmly into the fourteenth century, if not later. Ahmed Fakih’s Çarname, a poem on fate and the last judgement, has now been dated on linguistic grounds to the second half of the fourteenth century or even the fifteenth century; similarly his mathnawi on the hajj, Evasfü‘l-Mesacîd, cannot be earlier than the fourteenth century. Şeyyad Hamza, author of the poem Yusuf u Züleyha, must have died after 749/1348–9, for that date is mentioned in one of his poems; and since the recent discovery of a previously unknown copy of his Divan in Medina, Dehhanı can now be securely dated to the late fourteenth or early fifteenth centuries, a contemporary of Ahmedı to whose poems he wrote nazires (verse imitations or replies). Later scholars identified other texts and authors as belonging to the thirteenth century on flimsy grounds. The
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21 For Şeyyad Hamza see Orhan Kemal Tavuşçu, Şeyyad Hamza’, TDVİA, vol. 39, 104–5; Tezcan, ‘Anadolu Türk Yazının Başlangıç Döneminde bir Yazar’, 82–6: Tezcan had already expressed doubts about Dehhanı’s dates, suggesting a confusion with the Persian poet Qâni‘î is behind his erroneous dating to the thirteenth century, see ibid., 83–5. For an edition of the recently discovered Divan together with a facsimile of the Medina manuscript see Hoca Dehhanı Divanı, ed. Ersen Ersoy and Ümran Ay (Ankara, 2017).
22 In his classic study of early Turkish mathnawi, based on his doctoral thesis and published posthumously, Amil Çelebioglu listed a number of works as thirteenth century: Ahmed Fakih’s Evasfü‘l-Mesacîd; Şeyyad Hamza’s Yusuf u Züleyha and his Dasitan-Sultan Mahmud and Şeyyad Isa’s Ahval-i Kiyamet. However, his handwritten annotations to the thesis that are noted by the book’s editors indicate that he actually considered them (or came to consider them) as fourteenth century. He may have dated them earlier in the thesis to avoid being seen to disagree with
Salsalname, a Turkish epic on the battles of 'Ali b. Abi Talib against a giant named Salsal, has been dated rather precisely to 643/1245; but this date seems to be simply wishful thinking, and is not supported by any evidence in the sole manuscript that has come to light. The text as it stands represents an undated reworking by an Ibn Yusuf of an earlier tale by Şeyyad İsa, whom Ibn Yusuf criticises for its poor style, and is preserved in a seventeenth- or eighteenth-century manuscript. If the author of the Salsalname was Şeyyad İsa, he must have been active no earlier than the fourteenth century, for we have another work by him, the Ahval-ı Kiyamet, which mentions Rumi’s son Sultan Walad (d. 712/1312) and grandsons Ulu Arif Çelebi and 'Abid Çelebi (d. 739/1338).

The Turkish prose epics of the Battalname and Danışmendname, which both recount tales of frontier life and the Muslim struggle against unbelievers, have also been given early dates by some scholars. Legends of Battal Ghazi certainly did circulate on the frontier with Byzantium in the thirteenth century, and elsewhere in the Middle East, but that is not to say the epic was written down in Turkish then. The oldest extant manuscript dates to 840/1436–7, and was evidently a copy of an earlier version, but it is not possible to be sure how much earlier. The Danışmendname is claimed to have its roots in the Seljuq period, recounting the exploits of the hero Danışmend, identified as the founder of the Danishmendid dynasty that ruled central Anatolia in the twelfth century. The extant text of the Danışmendname purports to be a modernisation of a version that was found in a ‘confused manuscript’ (müşevve yazı), ‘so difficult to read that if anyone who saw it, he would say “this isn’t Turkish”’. In two places, the author of the work, whose name seems to have been Ibn ‘Ala, states that stories were recited (rivayet

Köprülü or other greats. See Amil Çelebioğlu, Türk Edebiyatı’nda Mesnevi (XV. yy’a kadar) (Istanbul, 1999), 34–40.

29 His name is mentioned just once: Danışmendname, ed. Demir, vol. 1, 110.
ederler/kılarlar) in front of Shah ‘Izz al-Din, and on one occasion it is specifically mentioned that they were later written down (bu kısayı andan yazıp yadigar kodılar). This ruler is presumed by modern scholars to be the Seljuq sultan ‘Izz al-Din Kayka’us II, although given the tendency of later sources to bandy around the regnal titles of Seljuq sultans fairly freely, we can hardly be sure that it represents a real individual. According to the sixteenth-century author Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali, who wrote an adaptation of the text, the Mirkâtü’l-Cihâd, Ibn ‘Ala composed the Danişmendname in 642/1244–5. However, it is far from clear that Mustafa Ali is a trustworthy source. While Ibn ‘Ala may have composed an epic on Melik Danişmand, perhaps even putting it into writing for ‘Izz al-Din, the text might also mean simply that individual stories were circulated and written down at the Seljuq court, not the whole composition. Either way, there is no reason to think they were originally written in Turkish. In fact, the earliest version of the text is explicitly stated by Mustafa Ali to have been written in Persian, which was then adapted into Turkish by Ala Beg Munshi (possibly identical with the Ibn ‘Ala of the Danişmendname’s text). Ala Beg’s version was then updated by a certain Arif Ali, garrison commander (dizdar) of Tokat in 762/1361 on the orders of Ottoman Sultan Murad I. Similarly, the early fourteenth-century poet Gülşehri, who wrote in both Persian and Turkish, mentions in his Turkish poem Mantıkt-Tayr that he had taken one of the stories from an earlier Ḍā'ī Şeyh Sanan. As with the previous two texts, Gülşehri emphasises the poor style and linguistic difficulties of his exemplar, but it is not clear that it was written in Turkish. It is possible that rather than reflecting the genuine preservation of much earlier works (although this cannot be ruled out), authors employed the

30 Danişmend-name, ed. Demir, vol. 1, 102, 137.
31 See Peacock, ‘Seljuq Legitimacy in Islamic History’.
35 Gülşehri tells us that ‘someone made this story, but said it in a way that was very difficult to understand’ (bir kişi bu dastanı eylemiş/illa lafzin key çepürdük söylemiş; see Mantıkt-Tayr, vol. 1, p. 110, l. 748); therefore Gülşehri has beautified it and put in the correct metre. However Gülşehri does not say that his model was written in Turkish (or indeed written at all; it could equally have been an orally transmitted legend he heard). On earlier versions of the story of Shaykh San’an see Yıldız, ‘Batting Kufr,’ 341–2, and ibid., 341 n. 75 for the reading of çepürdük in place of şöpürdek in Yavuz’s edition, and for a full translation of the verses see Köprülü, Early Mystics, 251–2.
topos of an earlier text that they were rewriting for a modern audience to lend authenticity and the respectability of age to the topics they were treating.

The only poets cited by Köprülü and Mansuroğlu who can be securely placed in the thirteenth century are Jalal al-Din Rumi (d. 672/1273) and Sultan Walad (d. 712/1312). Both are considered as early Turkish writers on the basis of the presence of Turkish phrases and verses in their works.36 Indeed, Mansuroğlu even extracted the Turkish lines from Sultan Walad’s works, and published them as his Turkish poems.37 Yet the use of Turkish with Rumi is restricted to individual words or lines, or else short blocks of lines inserted in the Persian poems, not stand-alone poems, and on occasion Rumi indicates his comparative ignorance of Turkish.38 With Sultan Walad, there are a few complete short poems, but Turkish mainly occurs inserted into the midst of his long Persian mathnawīs. Sultan Walad also emphasises his inability to compose in Turkish.39 In addition to Turkish, both Rumi’s and Sultan Walad’s works contain Greek and Arabic verses, and Sultan Walad has a complete poem in Greek and several in Arabic.40 Thus Rumi and Sultan Walad are no more or less Turkish poets than they are Greek ones. However, the choice of language was not necessarily inspired simply by a desire to communicate. Rather, the use of Arabic, Turkish and Greek in addition to Persian forms part of the poetic design, with different languages being used to unveil different stages of

36 For Turkish in Rumi see M. Şerefettin [Yaltkaya], ‘Mevlana’da Türkçe Kelimeler ve Türkçe Şiirler’, *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 4 (1934): 111–68, which is based on editions of Rumi that have now been superseded and a rather unsystematic use of manuscripts available to the author; as was admitted by even Mansuroğlu, ever anxious to find early examples of Turkish verse that he was, some of the verses attributed by Yaltkaya to Rumi cannot be by him. See Mecdut Mansuroğlu, ‘Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi’de Türkçe Beyit ve İbareler’, *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı* (1954): 207–20; see also the discussion in Lars Johanson, ‘Rumi and the Birth of Turkish Poetry’, *Journal of Turkology* 1, no. 1 (1993): 23–37. Johanson does not discuss the presence of Turkish verses in Rumi’s works, but remarks of Sultan Walad that his works ‘comprise the earliest important specimen of Turkish poetry’.


Sufi knowledge. Ultimately, the comparatively small quantities of their verse in the Anatolian vernaculars do not form part of a project to communicate Sufi knowledge to those who would otherwise fail to understand it, but rather serve a symbolic purpose within a hierarchy of knowledge.

Thus the traditional dating of Turkish works to the thirteenth century is generally uncertain, and in many cases improbable. In fact, the fragments in Rumi and Sultan Walad apart, our earliest credibly dated Turkish work from Anatolia is not one of the well-known epics, but rather an obscure and still unpublished religious text, the Behçetü’l-Hadayik. This manual of the basic elements of the Muslim faith is preserved in several manuscripts, one of which states that it was compiled in the late thirteenth century:

I saw many brothers, who desired this science of preaching, and studied it, but preferred Turkish to Persian. They asked me to write a book on this science in their tongue, and that I should compose it with subtle points and fine parallelisms so that their wish would be accepted. I saw their desire for this science, I accepted their wish and made this book, I named it the Behçetü’l-Hadayik fi Mel’izetü’l-Halayik ... I started to write it in Karahisar Develi, in 669/[1270–1], finishing it in 685/[1286–7]; may God forgive [me], Fakhr al-Din b. Mahmud b. al-Husayn b. Mahmud al-Tabrizi, my parents, and all the believers...

The manuscript containing this passage with the name of the author is rather later, dating to 930/1524; confirmation that the text was circulating in the period comes from the Bursa manuscript dated 703/1303, written in Eastern Turkish, but which omits reference to the translator al-Tabrizi.

The translator’s name al-Tabrizi suggests his association with the Ilkhanid capital. Tabriz had long been a principal conduit of Islam into Anatolia. In the early thirteenth century Tabriz merchants and artisans had played a prominent role in the pious bourgeoisie of Konya who promoted the Islamisation of the city through the construction of mosques and caravanserais, while in the mid-thirteenth century we find Tabriz artisans participating in Konya’s futuwwa organisations, which
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41 See Virani, “‘I am the Nightingale of the Merciful’,” Chapter 7.
44 Bursa, İnebey Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, MS Kurşunluoğlu 99.
functioned as another means by which Islam spread. There is, then, nothing especially surprising about a Tabrizi playing such a role in spreading Islam in Anatolia, but his location in Karahisar Develi is intriguing. Far from the traditional political and cultural centres of Anatolia, Karahisar Develi (modern Afyonkarahisar) was a fort on the western frontier, incorporated into the Seljuq state only at the beginning of the thirteenth century. During the 1270s, the surrounding region had been convulsed by fighting between Mongols and the Turkmen rebels who supported Jimri, while the Seljuqs’ Germiyanid allies had settled in the vicinity. Yet there was also development in the region as a result of the investment of various members of Ilkhanid Anatolia’s political elite. Karahisar’s Ulu Cami was only built in 1272, during the period when the Behceti‘l-Hadayik was being composed, and the vizier Fakhr al-Din ‘Ali and his descendants, whose appanage it was, sponsored other building works there. Moreover, Nur al-Din b. Jaja, the Mongol governor of Kirçehir in central Anatolia owned agricultural estates on the western frontier region and had invested in caravanserais in nearby Eskişehir. The Behceti‘l-Hadayik, our earliest known Anatolian text, thus points to two factors that were important in the development of Anatolian Turkish, which we will see reflected in other works: the formation of new cultural centres in obscure, hitherto peripheral locations, and the background of Ilkhanid political domination.

EARLY FOURTEENTH-CENTURY TURKISH LITERARY CENTRES AND PATRONS

The early fourteenth century witnessed the emergence of a substantial Turkish literary tradition. One of its most famous representatives, the wandering minstrel

46 Feridun Emecen, ‘Afyonkarahisar’, TDVI A, vol. 1, 443–6. Karahisar Develi was identified by Koç (‘Anadolu‘da ilk Türkçe Telif Eser’, 167) with a town that bore that name in Ottoman times outside Kayseri. However, it is clear from Ibn Bibi that in the thirteenth century by Karahisar Develi modern Afyonkarahisar is meant. See Ibn Bibi, al-Awamir al-Ala‘iyya (Ankara), 657; (Tehran), 567, where Karahisar Develi is mentioned as a town in the region of Honaz and Ladhiq; also ibid., 599, 625; see also Aqṣa‘i, Musamatt al-Akhbar, 311, where Karahisar Develi is mentioned as the appanage of the sons of Fakhr al-Din ‘Ali, which we know to have been at Afyonkarahisar.
Yunus Emre, is also associated with the western frontier region in the early fourteenth century, in particular the area around Eskişehir or Bolu. Yunus Emre’s poems were orally transmitted, the earliest manuscript dating to the mid-fifteenth century, and our main sources for his life are Bektashi traditions about him that formed only in the fifteenth century. Indeed, his dates are far from certain. While some Ottomans in the sixteenth century remembered him as an early fourteenth-century poet, Taşköprizade, the sixteenth-century biographer, made him a contemporary of Bayezid I, putting him in the late fourteenth century. The aim of these later authors was to associate prestigious figures from Anatolia’s literary and intellectual history with the early Ottoman state, making any dates they give highly suspect. Nor is it clear how much of the extensive corpus of poetry attributed to Yunus Emre is actually by him. Rather than seeing the poems as the work of a single individual, his Divan may represent more a sort of popular collection of Sufi poetry dating to broadly the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It is similarly hard to date or place Kaygusuz Abdal, another of the early Turkish poets, although he was probably active in the late fourteenth to early fifteenth centuries, and although the attribution of the substantial corpus in his name is less problematic, it unquestionably also reflects elements of oral transmission.

We are on firmer ground with the written literary tradition that certainly did emerge in the early fourteenth century, and was concentrated in two regions, Kırşehir and Aydın. Kırşehir, located in the semi-steppe of central Anatolia, was

48 Most early manuscripts are undated, but none appear earlier than the fifteenth century. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, MS Or. Oct. 2575 probably represents one of the earliest manuscripts.


home to the poets Gülşehrî and Aşık Paşa, who both composed long *mathnawîs* on Sufi themes in Turkish (and in Gülşehrî’s case in Persian as well), while in Aydın, Turkish translations of Arabic and Persian religious texts were sponsored by the local Turkmen dynasty. We will examine the formation of Turkish literature in each of these regions in turn.

Prior to the emergence of Turkish textual production in Kırşehir, there is some evidence of literary activity in the town under Ilkhanid rule (but no earlier) in the form of the copying of texts. A number of Arabic manuscripts have colophons stating they were copied in Kırşehir, including *fiqh* texts such as the introductory work on jurisprudence by the well-known Transoxianan jurist al-Sadr al-Shahid, *Sharh al-Jami’ al-Saghir* (copied 671/1272 for a *faqih* from Akşehir) (Plate 7), and a work on the differences between madhhab (dated 663/1264-5) (Fig. 4.1).

The latter is a particularly finely written manuscript by a scribe from Erzurum; this suggests that Kırşehir was becoming a cultural centre that could attract talent from elsewhere in the region. Persian is less well attested, but we do have a manuscript of Zawzani’s *Masadir al-Lugha*, a work in Persian on Arabic vocabulary, copied in Kırşehir in 707/1307–8. Interestingly, this manuscript has a few interlinear and marginal translations in Turkish as well, although they are less easy to date and were clearly added by a second hand. It seems likely that other Persian literary texts circulated in Kırşehir, as Gülşehrî and Aşık Paşa were influenced by Persian originals and in 701/1301–2 Gülşehrî composed a long Persian *mathnawi*, the *Falaknama*, which deals with Sufi themes and was dedicated to the Ilkhan Ghazan.

The earliest datable original work from Kırşehir is Gülşehrî’s Turkish *Manṭık-ka’t-Tayr*, composed 717/1317, which is loosely based on Attar’s Persian Sufi *mathnawi* of the same title, but so many alterations are made by Gülşehrî that his

---

53 Gülşehrî, which the poet’s *nisba* suggests was his home town, is now a village in the region, but in the middle ages it also seems to have been used near-synonymously for Kırşehir. See Elvan Çelebi, *Menaksbu’l-Kudsiyye*, l. 1175; Cevat Hakkı Tarım, *Tarihte Kırşehir-Gülşehrî ve Babailer-Abiler-Bektasiler* (İstanbul, 1948), 18–19.

54 Süleymaniye, MS Fatih 1545. This work was copied by Abu’l-Hasan Nu’man b. Mursal al-Rifqî for the library of al-mawla al-ṣadr al-kabîr al-imâm b. al-imâm malik al-fuqaha’ mafqhar al-’ulamâ’ majma’ al-faḍa’îl Abîl-’Ala Mähmûd b. Ghiżî al-Aqshahrî. Despite his grandiose titles, this work is copied in an unattractive cursive naskh.


56 Süleymaniye, MS Çelebi Abdullah 380, copied by Musa b. al-Khalîl.

poem must be considered more than simply a translation. Only nine of the thirty-one tales are directly derived from the Persian original, with most of the rest drawing on stories in the works of Sana’i, Rumi, Nizami and Sa’di. Güleşhri’s authorial voice is ever present, reminding his audience of his claims to be considered a classic poet, an equal to these Persian-language predecessors, and a great shaykh in his own right. Nor is there a single obvious model for Aşık Paşa’s Garibname (composed 730/1330); while doubtless the idea of writing a long Sufi poem is inspired by Rumi’s great work, in contrast to the diffuseness of the Persian Mathnawi, with its profusion of stories, both pious and ribald, and lack of apparent organisation, the Garibname is tightly structured into ten sections each subdivided into ten subchapters, which are generally arranged around ethical advice that is delivered direct without the sugaring of anecdotes.

Contrary to the arguments of those who would propose a long tradition of Turkish written literature, our early fourteenth-century writers vigorously assert
that they are doing something new. Appealing to his audience not to criticise him for writing in Turkish, Aşık Paşa writes:

Although this book has been composed in Turkish, the stages of the innermost meanings (ma’ni menzilli) have become known.

For you should know the stages of the road (yol menzilleri). Do not criticise the languages of the Turk and Tajik.

Every language had its own rules and principles; all minds were concentrated on them. Previously no one paid attention to the Turkish language, no one ever had affection for the Turks.

The Turks did not know those languages, nor the narrow path and the great stages. This Garibname was composed so that people of this language would also know the innermost meanings,

So that they would find the innermost meanings in Turkish, and so that Turk and Tajik would become travelling companions.

‘For we have not sent a prophet save with the tongue of his people’ [Q.14.4]

So that they do not criticise each other on the way, and looking at the language [alone] disapprove of the meaning.

So that ‘Turks should no longer be deprived, they should understand God through the Turkish language.59

Thus Aşık Paşa’s project is to make Sufi knowledge accessible to those previously deprived of it, revealing the yol menzilleri, the stages of the road (tariqa), in other words the stages on the Sufi journey to union with the divine. As he puts it in the prose introduction to the Garibname:

Know that in our time, most of the people do not understand the innermost meanings as they should and cannot pick a rose from the garden of knowledge, nor can they hear the song of the nightingale in the rose garden. Necessity obliged that a book be composed in Turkish and arranged in verse, so that it benefit both the ordinary people and the elite (‘amm u has). Verse:

Although it was composed in Turkish, nonetheless the stages of innermost meaning have become known;

In order that you know the stages of the way, do not criticise the Turk and Tajik (Persian) languages.60

At the same time Aşık Paşa should not be taken completely at face value, for he had been preceded by Gülşehri, whose Mantiku‘t-Tayr was composed in the same place some thirteen years previously. Despite Aşık Paşa’s insistence on the use of Turkish, his vocabulary is often highly Arabised, and the text is furnished with


60 Ibid., I/i, pp. 6–7.
numerous Qur’anic quotations that are often left untranslated. This is, then, not simply a question of linguistic necessity, for the work would only have been comprehensible to an audience with sufficient education to understand at least the Qur’an and the numerous Sufi technical terms. Gülşehir is rather less forthcoming about his reasons for choosing to write in Turkish, although he claims it to be superior even to Arabic. In neither case is there evidence of any patron for these works, which raises the question of the intended audience. Although this is at no point made absolutely explicit by our texts, the contemporary social setting in Kirşehir is suggestive.

Prior to the Mongol period, Kirşehir had been a place of little to no significance, first appearing in the historical record among the estates given to the deposed Mengüce kid ruler Bahram Shah in 1228. Otherwise, the sources are largely silent over its history in the first half of the thirteenth century, and it certainly played no role as a cultural or literary centre. After the Mongol invasions, Kirşehir’s surrounding steppe-lands provided a winter pastureland for the Mongol armies, which were posted there in large numbers, and as a result this previously insignificant town rose to a status of some importance. The economic development of Kirşehir was encouraged by the Ilkhanid governor, Nur al-Din b. Jaja, a devotee of Rumi who endowed religious buildings in the town. These are attested by his famous waqf, which concludes with a Mongolian-language summary, probably written to deter Mongol soldiers who might try to seize parts of the waqf. Kirşehir’s prosperity continued well after Ibn Jaja’s death; writing in 740/1340, Hamdallah Mustawfi described it as ‘a large town with great buildings and an excellent climate’.

Islam spread rapidly among the Mongol soldiery, many of whom embraced Islam long before the Ilkhans themselves, and the Mongol military’s role in the process of Islamisation is also suggested by Nur al-Din’s pious activities

63 On Ibn Jaja’s affiliation to Rumi see Aflaki, Manaqib, I, pp. 495–6; on his building activities see Judith Pfeiffer, ‘Mevlevi-Bektashi Rivalries and the Islamisation of Public Space in Late Seljuk Anatolia’, in A. C. S. Peacock, Bruno De Nicola and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds), Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia (Farnham, 2015), esp. 310–12, 326–7.
64 Temir, Kirşehir Emiri Nur el-Din’ in 1272 Tarihi Arapça-Moğolca Vakıflyesi.
65 Hamdallah Mustawfi, Nuzhat al-Qulub, ed. Muhammad Dahir-siyaqi (Tehran, 1381), 151.
patronising religious buildings in this previously insignificant and remote region. Given that Turkish was the lingua franca of the Mongol armies, it is possible soldiers based in the Kırşehir region may have constituted part of the audience for these early Turkish works. This might explain Aşık Paşa’s insistence on martial values such as heroism (alplık), where the true Sufi is enjoined to be an alp, and both Turks and Mongols are mentioned among the groups who mourned Aşık Paşa’s death by his son Elvan Çelebi. Gülşehri’s dedication of his Persian Falaknama to Ghazan also suggests the positive relationship between local Sufis and Mongol authorities.

A further audience may have been futuwwa groups, of which Kırşehir was also one of the main centres. Akhi Evren, patron-saint of the fitiyân, was from Kırşehir; we have little verifiable historical information about him beyond this, other than the reputation he left in the memories of later generations. Gülşehri, his disciple who spent fifty years in the saint’s presence, dedicated a matnawi to his vita, and the fitiyân are clearly a major component, if not the major component, of Gülşehri’s audience in the Mantiku’t-Tayr (see Chapter 3). Futuwwa circles, which particularly valued multilingual communication, may well have been attracted to this new literary use of Turkish. Suhrawardi, for instance, remarks in his futuwwa-manual that the man of futuwwa should endeavour to learn different words in different languages such as Arabic, Turkish, Persian, Greek, Hindi and other languages because the wise men have taken into account all human languages, and this is worthwhile knowledge. It happens many times that a man needs to know a single word, and he gets much benefit if he knows and understands [the meaning] of that word. And there are many occasions that through a single word he is able to save his soul from the hands of a tyrant or an impure person. But if he does not know that word then he may be in danger and [he may] lose his life.


69 Aşık Paşa, Garib-name, II/2, p. 549ff, also 573.


Choice of language was also closely connected to the claims of Sufis. Rumi, like earlier mystics, had argued that divine revelation was a continuous process, and that God remained in direct communication with his Friends on earth in a variety of languages.\(^73\) Rumi challenged the traditional primacy of Arabic, although the idea that God’s communication with this world had not come to end with Muhammad but continued was widespread (if contested) among earlier Sufis. Rumi’s *Mathnawi*, which is evidently intended to represent part of this continuous communication from God, merely draws this argument to its logical conclusion through being written in Persian, the colloquial language of Konya, and thus was intended to be a ‘Qur’an in Persian’.\(^74\) Rumi’s influence on both Gülşehri and Aşık Paşa is clear. Gülşehri invokes Rumi and Sultan Walad as his inspiration among the six great shaykhs beside whom he aspires to be counted, along with ‘Attar, Nizami, Sana’i, and Sa’di.\(^75\) Some stories in both his Persian *Falaknama* and his Turkish *Mantziku’t-Tayr* are adapted from Rumi’s *Mathnawi*.\(^76\) Aşık Paşa was also strongly influenced by Rumi,\(^77\) and some verses have been identified as more or less direct translations of lines from Rumi’s *Mathnawi*.\(^78\) The *Garibname* is written in the same metre as the *Mathnawi*, *ramal musaddas*.\(^79\) Thus the use of Turkish by Aşık Paşa and Gülşehri can be seen as simply an extension of Rumi’s argument for the continuity of divine revelation in the vernacular. Aşık Paşa quotes exactly the same Qur’anic verse as Rumi to justify his use of the vernacular:

‘God has not sent a prophet but with the tongue of his people.’

Similarly, in the work by Aşık Paşa’s son, Elvan Çelebi’s *Menakıbu’l-Kudsiyye*, composed in 758/1360, the poet’s great-uncle, the saint Halis Paşa, is praised as ’knowing the language of the peoples of this world, giving guidance to the people of the world’.\(^80\) Elvan even quotes the prophet Abraham [Khalil] as talking in Turkish.\(^81\)

The use of Turkish was thus consistent with a long-standing train of thought in Sufism, and Mevlevism and *futuwwa* in particular. It is not merely – or even

\(^73\) On this subject see, with detailed quotations from the *Mathnawi* and other texts by Rumi and his circle, Javid Mojaddedi, *Beyond Dogma: Rumi’s Teachings on Friendship with God and Other Sufi Theories* (Oxford, 2012), 63–90.

\(^74\) See further Chapter 2.


\(^78\) Aşık Paşa, *Garib-name*, vol. 1/1, pp. li–lii.


\(^80\) Elvan Çelebi, *Menakıbu’l-Kudsiyye*, l. 742 ‘Bu cihân halkınunу bilen dilini/Ol cihân halkınunı viren yolmın’.

\(^81\) Ibid., p. 110, and p. 114, ll. 1315, 1328.
necessarily mainly – a tool of communication with a local audience, but rather the author’s means of testifying to his own unique relationship with God as a channel of his communication – to be, in Gülşehri’s words, an ‘alem şeyhi (world shaykh) not simply a şar şeyhi (town shaykh).82 Thus even in the lack of any patronage, the choice of a vernacular can serve a role in discourses of power – indeed, in asserting the most important form of power of all, religious power.

Simultaneously with the development of this Sufi vernacular literature, elsewhere in Anatolia Turkish started to be patronised by Turkmen rulers. The most significant of these early patrons of Turkish was the beylik of Aydin in southwestern Anatolia.83 The first Muslim ruler of Aydin, Mubariz al-Din Mehmed Beg (r. 708/1308–734/1334), originated from the western frontier region, having served the Germiyanids – roughly the area where the Behçetü’l-Hadayik was written. In around 1308, Mehmed Beg seized Ayasuluk (modern Selçuk) from its Turkish ruler Sasa Beg, who had himself only recently captured it from the Byzantines, in 1304. Mehmed Beg himself ruled from the town of Birgi, but Ayasuluk remained an important city under Aydinid rule, especially in the later fourteenth century. By the second decade of the fourteenth century, Aydin had emerged as a significant power in the region. Its close commercial ties with the Mediterranean and Aegean world did not stop its rulers from representing themselves as ghāzīs, warriors for the faith. They also patronised the production of literary works in Turkish, above all translations.

Given its very recent incorporation into the dār al-Islām, there is no earlier evidence for copying or literary activity in Aydin before the translation of Abu Ishaq al-Thaʿalabi’s (d. 427/1035) ‘Araʾis al-Majalis fi Qisas al-Anbiya’, a collection of stories of the Prophets, composed in around 712/1312–719/1319.84 Several more works were commissioned by Mehmed Beg’s son and successor Umur Beg (r. 734/1334–748/1348). A Turkish version of ‘Attar’s stories of Sufi saints, the Tezkiretüʾl-Evliya, was translated for Umur Beg, who, like his father, was a devotee of Rumi.85 These works resemble in theme the Sufi literature of north-western Anatolia, but other works produced under Aydinid patronage are quite distinctive and reflect the court milieu in which they were composed. A medical treatise, the Tühfe-i Müberizi, which summarised Galenic-Avicennan medicine, was translated from the Arabic by a certain Hekim Bereket and dedicated to Mehmed Beg, and may thus be considered an early representative

84 Ibid., 201–2.
85 Ibid., 202–3; see also Chapter 2, p. 00.
of an emergent Turkish-language courtly literature.\(^86\) Umur Beg evinced similar interests, and a translation of Ibn Baytar’s compendium of pharmacological-botanical information, the Müfredat, was compiled for him.\(^87\) A Turkish translation of the moralistic fables of *Kalila wa Dimna*, which often served as a mirror for princes, was dedicated to Umur Beg. Under one of Umur Beg’s successors, İsa Beg (r. 760/1360–792/1390), another such work of courtly literature, Nizami’s Persian poem *Khusraw u Shirin*, was adapted into Turkish by the poet Fahri in 768/1367.\(^88\)

Some evidence of the circumstances under which the Aydınoğlu Turkish works were composed is given by Ibn Battuta, who visited the Aydınoğlu court at Birgi in the 1330s. He portrays Mehmed Beg as profoundly pious, and recalls how he was called on to explain hadith for the ruler, who immediately commissioned a translation:

[Mehmed Beg the ruler] came to us one day in the afternoon, and the *faqib* sat at the centre of the majlis, and I to his left, and the sultan to the right of the *faqib*. This was because of the esteem of the *faqib* among the Turks, and he asked me to write for him some Prophetic hadith. I wrote them for him, and the *faqib* showed them to him immediately. [Mehmed Beg] ordered him to write a commentary [sharh] on them in Turkish.\(^89\)

It is interesting that the commentary is written, not simply orally explained, reflecting the general enthusiasm for translation in Aydınoğlu. The beylik’s links across the Mediterranean, especially with Mamluk Egypt, must have encouraged and facilitated the adoption and adaptation of classics of Islamic literature in Aydınoğlu. There seems to have been strong Mamluk influence on local culture, both in terms of architecture and also scholarship. One local scholar, educated in Cairo, was Hacı Paşa, who in the late fourteenth century returned to Aydınoğlu from the Mamluk realm and composed a rich array of scholarly treatises on medicine, logic and *kalâm* in both Arabic and Turkish.\(^90\)

That this translation movement was about more than simply making knowledge accessible is indicated by the fact that throughout the Aydınoğlu period we know works continued to be composed in Persian and Arabic, both for the court and beyond.\(^91\) For instance, Yusuf b. Muhammad b. Ibrahim al-Nuri, author of a

---

\(^86\) Ibid., 206–10.

\(^87\) Ibid., 210–12.

\(^88\) Ibid., 205.


\(^91\) Yıldız, ‘Aydınoğlu Court Literature’, passim.
work entitled *Kashf al-Asrar ‘ala Lisan al-Tuyur*, tells us that he translated it from Arabic into Persian at the request of the Aydınıd İsa Beg. Similarly, a court poet, ʿImad b. Masʿud al-Samarqandi, composed panegyrics in Arabic and Persian for İsa Beg that draw on models from the Injuid successor state to the Ilkhans. Al-Samarqandi’s poems are collected in a *majmū’a* destined for İsa Beg’s attention (MS Tire Necipoğlu Kütüphanesi DV 812, late fourteenth century), which also contains extracts of prose works of interest to the Aydınıd court, such as the sayings of ʿAli b. Abi Talib, Sufi and medical texts. Although there are a handful of Turkish glosses, Persian predominates as the language of explanation, and the Arabic verses are accompanied by Persian interlinear translations. Persian thus remained the principal literary language of the Aydınıd court even in the late fourteenth century.

With the exception of the translation of Ibn Baytar’s *Miṣfredat*, all these Aydınıd texts, whether in Arabic, Persian or Turkish, exist in very few manuscript copies, indicating they were never destined for a wide audience, but rather were restricted to the court, in contrast to the Kırşehir works that were widely copied, especially Aşık Paşa’s *Garibname*, which survives in over 100 manuscripts. Thus the choice to commission Turkish translations was not simply about making knowledge comprehensible, otherwise the same rulers would not have also commissioned Persian versions of some texts. However, there does seem to be a difference in the type of text selected for translation or composition in each language. While the Turkish works from the Aydınıd court were all translations or adaptations of classics of Persian and Arabic literature, the Persian compositions tend to be extremely obscure, little-known texts. Al-Nuri’s *Kashf al-Asrar*, mentioned above, is a work describing how the tongues of animals recognise the unity of God, and thus is distinctly Sufi in inspiration. Yet if the text does have an Arabic original as al-Nuri claims, and this is not simply a literary fiction, it must be a little-known, largely forgotten text. Samarqandi’s own poems are unknown from any source other than the sole extant *majmū’a*, apparently in his own hand, that preserves them. Although none of the Turkish works gives much detail as to the circumstances of its composition, it seems clear that what we have here is a conscious attempt to appropriate knowledge, to put a Turkish and Aydınıd stamp on Persian and Arabic literary classics and thus to signify the Aydınıd rulers’ participation in and support for mainstream Islamic civilisation and literary

---

94 The *Garibname* survives in at least 116 copies, see Aşık Paşa, *Garib-name*, vol. I/1, lvi.
culture. The composition of the Turkish works in this instance thus seems to support Pollock’s argument that vernacularisation was a conscious political choice. Elsewhere in the courts of early fourteenth-century Anatolia, the use of Turkish seems to have been sparse. Just to the north of the Aydıniid realm, Yakub b. Yaḥṣi Beg, of the Karasi dynasty that controlled Bergama, commissioned a work on the basic elements of Islam in Turkish in around 1328–42. Possibly the employment of Turkish here may reflect a practical desire for an accessible version of a religious work. There is rather little evidence for Turkish literature at the early Ottoman court. A certain Tursun Fakih, whom the fifteenth-century writer Aşık Paşažade describes as a contemporary of the first Ottoman ruler Osman (r. c. 699/1300–724/1324), and was thus active in the first years of the fourteenth century, penned Turkish mathnawīs orientated towards a jihad theme, which are discussed in Chapter 5, although their precise dating and attribution remains uncertain. It is not until the second half of the fourteenth century that the courts of beyliks elsewhere in Anatolia regularly started to patronise Turkish. One of the earliest of these works was written in 762/1362, a Maktel-i Hüseyin, a mathnawī dealing with the death of the Prophet’s grandson Ḥusayn, for Bayezid Şah, ruler of the Candarid beylik of Kastamonu in north-central Anatolia. Slightly later the Germiyanid beylik became a centre of a literary production, patronising writers such as Şeyhhoğlu (742/1341–1409), who translated the Qabusnama into Turkish, and Ahmedi. It was here too that that we have the first unambiguous evidence for the use of Turkish as an administrative language.

THE EMERGENCE OF TURKISH AS AN ADMINISTRATIVE LANGUAGE AND THE RESILIENCE OF PERSIAN AND ARABIC

Two Germiyanid inscriptions are the earliest ones to employ Turkish in Anatolia. One is the so-called Taş Vakfiye, a thirty-line inscription dated 817/1417 recording the Germiyanid bey Yakub II’s endowment of a Külliye in Kütahya (Fig. 4.2). More recently, a second, earlier inscription has come to light, also from the Germiyanid territories. This is also a waqfiyya, albeit highly abridged,

98 Varlık, Germiyan-oğulları Tarihi, 111, 147–9.
consisting of only eight lines, recording the endowment by Kurd Abdal, son of the Germiyanid bey Süleyman Şah, of lands to the shrine at Seyitgazi, the cult centre of Battal Ghazi. Dated 770/1369, this appears to be not only the oldest Turkish inscription in Anatolia, but also the oldest inscription in Arabic-script Turkish.
anywhere.\textsuperscript{99} It is striking that both Germiyanid documents are \textit{waqfiyyas}, a type of legal document that would normally be composed in Arabic, not Turkish, as it was to the end of the Ottoman empire. In addition to later Arabic copies of other Germiyanid \textit{waqfiyyas}, we also have an original manuscript Arabic \textit{waqfiyya} by Yakub dating to 825/1422, suggesting that the epigraphic use of Turkish may have been an exception to normal Germiyanid practice.\textsuperscript{100} A roughly contemporary \textit{waqfiyya} from Ottoman Bursa is also in Arabic.\textsuperscript{101} The use of Turkish for a type of document that would conventionally be written in Arabic (or occasionally in Persian) is a striking assertion of Turkish’s claims to now be a full equal of the classical Islamic languages, as well as a deliberate appropriation by the Germiyanids of the classical Islamic idiom.

Turkish also started to be used in the Ottoman \textit{beylik} as an administrative language, although not for \textit{waqfiyyas}. Here, however, problems of dating the extant documents complicate matters. The earliest dated document from the Ottoman \textit{beylik} is a \textit{waqfiyya} in Persian of 724/1324.\textsuperscript{102} We do have a Turkish language document, a \textit{mülkname} issued by Orhan Beg, dated 749/1348. If authentic this would be the oldest use of Turkish for administrative purposes to survive from Anatolia, but it is preserved only a later copy, clearly influenced by the language of later times, and there are doubts about its authenticity.\textsuperscript{103} Other Turkish-language documents purportedly from the early Ottoman period preserved by the sixteenth-century Feridun Beg seem to be translations or adaptations from the famous Khwarazmshah chancery manual, \textit{al-Tawassul ila’l-Tarassul}, and are thus not authentic fourteenth-century Ottoman documents.\textsuperscript{104} More convincing in terms of their authenticity, although again transmitted to us only in later copies, are Ottoman documents (\textit{nizans}) issued by Orhan in 754/1353 and 759/1358,\textsuperscript{105} and a decree issued by Bayezid I dated 793/1390.\textsuperscript{106} Thus by the middle of the fourteenth century, the Ottomans were using Turkish for at least some

\textsuperscript{104} Beldiceanu-Steinherr, \textit{Recherches}, 43–4, 59–60.
\textsuperscript{106} Lowry, \textit{The Nature of the Early Ottoman State}, 62–3.
administrative purposes. In short, by the second half of the fourteenth century, Turkish was sometimes employed as an administrative language in the Ottoman and Germiyanid beyliks in the far west of Anatolia; whether it was used for such practical purposes elsewhere, such as Aydın, is unknown, as is the regularity with which documents were written in it in the west.

In all cases, the use of Turkish up to the late fourteenth century was restricted to these previously peripheral areas of Anatolia, places which in one way or another had suddenly risen to prominence as a result of the Mongol invasions. In central Anatolia, Persian remained the main literary language, with Arabic reserved for more scholarly theological, legal or philosophical works. This was the case even in the Turkmen principalities of central Anatolia; for example, the wandering Ilkhanid litterateur Muhammad al-Tustari in 710/1310 dedicated an Arabic synopsis of cosmology and philosophy, *Al-Fusul al-Ashrafiyya fi l’-Qawa’id al-Burhaniyya* to the Eşreferred to the Beyşehir, Mubariz al-Din Muhammad b. Sulayman (r. 702/1302–721/1320).107 Equally, the petty amirs of the Hamidid beylik in south-central Anatolia commissioned magnificent copies of Najm al-Din Razi’s Persian Sufi guide *Mirsad al-Iltiad*.108

Persian (and to a lesser extent Arabic) dominated even, if not especially, in the Karamanid territories. When an anonymous citizen of Karamanid-controlled Konya, in the mid-fourteenth century, compiled notes on his town’s history, he did so in Persian.109 Even at the Karamanid court, an astrological almanac produced in 771/1369–70 was written in Persian,110 and other works copied in Konya and Karaman are all in Arabic or Persian until the fifteenth century.111 Although one well-known Turkish writer, Erzurumlu Darir, was resident in Karaman for four years, in around 1391–5, he did not compose any works there: in fact all his patrons were at the Mamluk courts of Syria and Egypt.112 Thus even at the end of the fourteenth century, evidently a Turkish language writer still had difficulty establishing any interest in his work in Karaman, the alleged heartland of the Turkish language; the only exception may be a single qaṣida by Dehhani that seems to be dedicated to the Karamanid ‘Ala’ al-Din (r. 762/1361–8001398).113 The first substantial work in Turkish dedicated to a Karamanid is Hattiboğlu Mehmed’s (c. 777/1375–after

---

107 The manuscript survives in an autograph: Ayasofya 2445.

108 Peacock, ‘The “Mirrors for Princes”’, 290; Jackson, ‘Patrons and Artists’, I, 183–204; for further examples of Persian texts from the period see Ateş, ‘Hicri VI.–VIII. (XII.–XIV.)’.


110 Leiden Or 563.

111 This is represented by the standard corpus of legal texts, e.g. al-Bazdawi, *Kanz al-Wusul ila Ma’rifat al-Usul*, copied in Larende in 733 by Harun b. Rumba b. Siraj b. Ya’qub al-Gurgurumi (Süleymaniye, MS Fatih 1219).

112 On Darir’s works see Leyla Karahan, *Erzurumlu Darir* (Istanbul, 1995), and on his residence in Karaman, ibid., 9.

838/1435) Ferahname, composed in 829/1426, some versions of which mention the Karamanid İbrahim Beg as patron, but the author seems to have been born in the Germiyanid lands. The earliest Turkish writer known from Karaman seems to be the poet Karamanlı Aynī, born in Konya in around 839/1435 to 844/1440, long after the emergence of Turkish at the courts of the Ay短信nd and Germiyanids.

There are few exceptions to this dominance of Persian in central Anatolia. A Mevlevi writer, Yusuf-ı Meddah, composed a Turkish religious epic, Varka ve Gûlşah, which according to one eighteenth-century manuscript was composed or copied in Sivas in 743/1342; however, the date of 770/1368 is given in other manuscripts, which do not all mention any place, and one of which gives Bursa instead of Sivas. Although it is clear that Yusuf-ı Meddah was active in the mid-to late fourteenth century, the location of his activities must be regarded as uncertain. The only other significant evidence for composition in Turkish in central Anatolia are the poems of the ruler of Sivas and Kayseri, Qadi Burhan al-Din Ahmad. Qadi Burhan al-Din’s Turkish Divan survives in a single manuscript, despite his modern fame, although it seems his Arabic writings on Sufi philosophy and fiqh were more widely circulated. It is telling that while his biographer Astarabadi lavishly praises Qadi Burhan al-Din’s writings in Arabic and Persian (the latter now lost to us), he makes no mention at all of his compositions in Turkish. Moreover, even Qadi Burhan al-Din’s Turkish poetic works do not represent simply an attempt to compose in the colloquial language of the region. In fact two distinct dialects are used in his Divan, the tuyuğ (quatrains) being written in a distinctly more Eastern Turkish-influenced dialect.

As late as the closing years of the fourteenth century, after roughly 100 years of Turkish literary production, Astarabadi explained at the end of his biography of Burhan al-Din Ahmad why he had composed the work in Persian:

Since the people of the country of Rum prefer the Persian language (zabān-i fārsī) and like it, and all the inhabitants of this land speak Dari (dari qāyîl wa nātīq), and all the proverbs, orders, correspondence, accounting, registers, laws and so on are in this language...

---


118 Ibid., 127–8; Astarabadi, Bazm u Razm, 488–9, 531–2.

119 Astarabadi, Bazm u Razm, 537.
The persistence of Persian was thus thanks to more than simply its status as a prestige language in central Anatolia, although that aspect cannot be neglected: Turkmen amirs such as the Hamidid or Karamanid rulers doubtless did patronise works in Persian because they wished to associate themselves with the language of Islamic culture. The crucial difference between central Anatolia and the newly conquered frontier regions such as Aydın was that Persian seems to have actually been the spoken language in many core areas of the old Seljuk state, just as Astarabadi indicates. This should not surprise us, for there is clear evidence that much of the Muslim bourgeoisie of towns such as Konya in the early thirteenth century was Persian-speaking, being themselves recent immigrants from Iran. A manuscript dated to 723/1323 indicates that in a madrasa in Antalya the Arabic poetry of Ibn al-Farid was being explained in Persian, not in Turkish. Ibn Battuta also indicates that Turkish and Persian were both spoken. He recounts encountering a faqih who claimed to know Arabic, and who explained his inability to communicate with Ibn Battuta to his friend in Persian, suggesting that was his colloquial language. Persian shared space as a spoken language alongside others – Greek, Turkish and Armenian – and how long its status as an Anatolian lingua franca survived is in need of further research. Devletoglu, a Turkish language author writing at the court of Murad I in 1424, indicates that texts were being explained in Turkish in madrasas in his day. Yet even in the early sixteenth century, Selim I sent a Persian-language decree, which was read out to the citizens of Bursa at Friday prayers. The pace of change was doubtless uneven, but Persian clearly remained a spoken, or at least an understood, language for a long time in some areas.

Arabic never enjoyed the status of a spoken lingua franca that Persian had in Anatolia; Ibn Battuta’s account of his journey is replete with references to his linguistic misadventures as an Arabic-speaking outsider, and the late thirteenth to fourteenth century witnessed an increasing number of translations of scholarly works from Arabic into Persian in fields such as astrology, medicine and Sufism. Nonetheless, it is clear that among scholarly circles, in particular the more advanced Sufis as well as the ‘ulama’ (who were often of course one and the

120 See pp. 138–9.
121 In Ateş, ‘Hicri VI.–VIII. (XII.–XIV.),’ 125, 135.
125 For astrology note Nasir al-Din Tusi’s Persian translation of pseudo-Ptolemy’s Kitab al-Thamara (e.g. Leiden University Library, MS Or 96; Süleymaniye, MS Ayasofya 2695; also the Persian
same), Arabic was widely understood. Arabic works aimed at advanced students of Sufism that originated both from Anatolia and beyond, such as those by Ibn ʿArabi and Sadr al-Din al-Qunawi, were widely copied and recopied.\textsuperscript{126} Especially popular was the \textit{Diwan} of the Egyptian Sufi poet Ibn Farid, of which the earliest manuscript, which had been in Sadr al-Din al-Qunawi’s possession, is preserved in Konya,\textsuperscript{127} while a luxury copy was made for the library of the vizier Fakhr al-Din ʿAli (Plate 10).\textsuperscript{128} Ibn Farid’s mystical \textit{khamriyyas} (wine poems) were the subject of several commentaries by Anatolian authors, of which the best known was by Da’ud al-Qaysari, who composed his works exclusively in Arabic. Despite Da’ud’s Anatolian origin, he seems to have spent his career largely at Sawa and Tabriz in Iran, in the retinue of various Ilkhanid viziers, most notably Ghiyath al-Din b. Fadlallah.\textsuperscript{129} Even if Da’ud al-Qaysari did not in reality spend much or any of his working career in Anatolia, despite efforts by sixteenth-century scholars such as Taşköprizade to associate this prestigious ‘ālim with the early Ottoman venture, his works certainly circulated widely in Anatolia, showing the enduring appetite for Arabic works among an educated audience. In addition, the classical Islamic scholarly literature from outside Anatolia dealing with subjects such as medicine, philosophy and astronomy continued to circulate in Arabic throughout our period, as attested by copies that have come down to us.\textsuperscript{130} Colophons indicate that madrasas, in particular the Nizamiyya madrasa in Konya, were one of the main places in which such Arabic works were copied, even when they covered fields such as philosophy that lay outside the normal madrasa curriculum.\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{126} Some impression of the early circulation of Arabic texts by Ibn ʿArabi and others can be obtained from Sadr al-Din al-Qunawi’s list of the books he studied. See the analysis in Gerald Elmore, ʿṢadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī’s Personal Study-List of Books by Ibn al-ʿArabī’, \textit{Journal of Near Eastern Studies} 56 (1997): 161–81.


\textsuperscript{128} Süleymaniye, MS Aya sofya 3879; identified in A. Süheyl Ünver, ‘Anadolu Selçukluları Zamanında Umumi ve Hususi Kütüphaneler’, in \textit{Atatürk Konferansları (1964–1968)} (Ankara, 1970), 10; for another example of a Sufi manuscript, a \textit{Mathnawi}, connected with the circle of Fakhr al-Din ʿAli, see Jackson, ‘Patrons and Artists’, I, 89, 92, 97.

\textsuperscript{129} On Da’ud al-Qaysari and his Ilkhanid connections see Peacock, ‘Two Sufis of Ilkhanid Anatolia and their Patrons’.

\textsuperscript{130} E.g. for medicine see Ibn Sina’s \textit{al-Qanun fi ʾl-Tibb}, Süleymaniye, MS Fatih 3602, copied in Konya in 691; for philosophy see n. 131.

\textsuperscript{131} E.g. Ibn Kammuna’s \textit{Sharh al-Talwihat}, Süleymaniye, MS Şehid Ali Paşa 1740, copied in the [Konya] Nizamiyya in 686/1287; al-Raghib al-Isfahani’s \textit{Dhariʿ ila Makarim al-Shariʿa}, copied at the Konya Nizamiyya in Safar 711/1311, copyist Muhammad al-Tustari, probably identical with
Arabic works composed in Anatolia rarely attracted the patronage of rulers from the second half of the thirteenth century onwards, with a couple of exceptions such as the philosophical encyclopaedia *al-Fusul al-Ashrafiyya* dedicated to the Eshrefid ruler Mubarak al-Din or Qazwini’s hadith collection composed for the Pervane (discussed earlier, p. 72). Even a scholar such as Qutb al-Din Shirazi who chose to write on technical subjects, for example astronomy, would change to Persian when dedicating his work to a royal patron, as he did with his *Ikhtiyarat-i Muzaffari* written for the Candarid amir Muzaffar al-Din Alpyürek. A similar trend existed in Sufism. The famous student of Sadr al-Din al-Qunawi, Sa’id al-Din Farghani (d. 699/1300), wrote a Persian commentary on the poems of Ibn Farid, the *Mashariq al-Darari*, which was dedicated to the Pervane Mu’in al-Din Sulayman; however, his expanded version of the *Mashariq*, which he wrote in Arabic and gave the title *Muntaha al-Madarik* has no dedicatee, suggesting it was perhaps intended for the eyes of advanced students of Sufism only.132 Similarly, another disciple of al-Qunawi, Mu’ayyid al-Din Jandi, wrote in Persian for a local audience of political leaders, as well as Arabic, which he used in his more technical exegesis of Ibn ‘Arabi.133 The same trend prevailed in other fields of knowledge. The late fourteenth-century scholar Jamal al-Din al-Aqsarai was capable of writing in Persian, as he did with his *al-As’ila wa’l-Awjiba*, a summary of basic problems of Qur’anic interpretation (tafsir) and fiqh composed at the request of the Eretnid emir of Amasya, Şadgeldi. Jamal al-Din’s other compositions, which are of a more technical character and do not mention any patron, were written in Arabic, such as his book on rhetoric, *Sharh al-Idah fi’l-Bayan wa’l-Ma’ani*, which was based on the famous works by al-Jurjani and al-Sakkaki in this field,134 and his *Hall al-Mujaz*, a super-commentary on Ibn al-Nafis’s commentary on Ibn Sina’s famous medical encyclopaedia, *al-Qanun fi’l-Tibb*.135 Nonetheless, it is intriguing to note the distinct absence of panegyric poetry (madh) in any language, despite this being the major genre in court literary life in both the Persianate and Arabophone worlds. It is not until Ahmedi that we have any significant panegyric qasidas in Turkish, and those in Persian and Arabic are almost non-existent, with the exception of the handful in each language composed


132 On Farghani see Mahmut Kaya and Sâmi Şelhub, ‘Fergâni, Saidüddin’, *TDVA*, vol. 12, 378–82. An early manuscript of the *Muntaha al-Madarik*, copied in Konya in 724/1324, has extensive Persian marginalia at the beginning, underlining the fact that the two languages coexisted and complemented each other. See Süleymaniye, MS Fatih 3966.

133 On Jandi and his patrons see Peacock, ‘Two Sufis of Ilkhanid Anatolia’.

134 For the autograph manuscript see Süleymaniye, MS Damad İbrahim 1020, dated 776.

135 Süleymaniye, MS Ayasofya 3666.
by ‘Imad al-Din b. Mas’ud al-Samarqandi and dedicated to the Aydinid beg. Anatolian patrons, it seems, were interested in localisations, translations or popularisations of classical Islamic works but not original panegyrics.

Despite the growing translation movement, the supremacy of Arabic remained unchallenged for legal purposes, and both copies of classic fiqh works and original compositions from Anatolia circulated widely. Perhaps the most important Anatolian fiqh author in our period, after the success of Yusuf al-Sijistani in the early thirteenth century, was Muhsin al-Qaysari. Muhsin, a Hanafi faqih from Kayseri, composed in 736/1335 an Arabic verse summary of al-Sajawandi’s famous textbook of Hanafi law, *al-Fara’id al-Sirajyya*, to which he gave the title *Jami’ al-Durar*. Muhsin also composed commentaries on literary works, such as the poems of the Great Seljuq poet Abiwardi (d. 507/1113), under the title *Sharh al-Najdiyyat*, and the well-known work on prosody by Abu Jaysh al-Andalusi. In his introduction, Muhsin explains that mastery of Arabic can only be attained through practice of the ‘rules of literature’ (*mumārasat qawānīn al-adab*) and study of the *diwāns* of its poets. The aim, then, behind these literary commentaries is practical, to raise the standards of knowledge of the Arabic language, as would be useful to a faqih.

A similar purpose lies behind the popular hadith commentary by the early fourteenth-century ‘ālim from Erzincan, Wajih al-Din al-Arzinjani, who was active around 713/1313 to 717/1317. Al-Arzinjani’s best-known work was his *Hada’iq al-Azhar fi Sharh Mashariq al-Anwar*, a commentary on the Indian scholar al-Saghani’s (d. 650/1252) abridgement of the hadith collections of Bukhari and Muslim. Al-Saghani, born in Lahore, had resided in Baghdad, whence his work had been transmitted widely over the Middle East – it was also popular in Mamluk Egypt. As in India and Egypt, the *Mashariq* became a standard part of the medieval Anatolian madrasa curriculum. According to the colophon of one early manuscript of the *Mashariq*, it was copied in the madrasa of the Ottoman sultan Orhan in İznik (Fig. 4.3), while a copy of al-Arzinjani’s

---

137 See Recep Cici, ‘Muhsin-i Kayseri’, *TDVIA*, vol. 31, 48.
139 The colophon of his *Mukhtasar al-Mukhtar fi Manaqib al-Akhyar* tells us the work was completed in Erzincan on 15 Sha’ban 713 (Süleymaniye, MS Carullah 1623); he was apparently still alive in Jumada I 717, for he is named in an *ijāza* written in that year with epithets indicating he was living (Süleymaniye, Fatih 119, fol. 156a).
140 On al-Saghani’s *Mashariq*, a work also very popular in medieval India, see Annemarie Schimmel, *Islam in the Indian Subcontinent* (Leiden, 1980), 15; see also Ramzi Baalbaki, ‘al-Saghānī’, *EF*.
142 Süleymaniye, MS Mahmud Paşa 140.
commentary dated 769/1367–8 states it was copied in ‘the town of İznik, the gathering place of students and great imams in the province of Orhan Khan, the fighter of the infidel’.143

Al-Saghani’s *Mashariq* comprised a linguistic commentary on 2,225 hadith, and al-Arzinjani’s *Hada’iq* concentrated on linguistic and grammatical elucidation of the *Mashariq*. Doubtless its appeal to madrasa teachers in both Anatolia and India derived from this combination of hadith with grammar, thus allowing the text to serve a dual purpose of inculcating both religion and the Arabic language – especially useful in those regions in the process of conversion where Arabic was less widely spoken.

143 Süleymaniye, MS Fatih 985.
The Arabic texts circulating in Anatolia were not limited to those of purely practical or technical use, and other works by al-Arzinjani suggest that there was an audience for works in Arabic outside the formal madrasa curriculum. He wrote two abridgements of popular Arabic works, a hagiography of Abu Hanifa, his students and followers (Mukhtasar fi Manaqib Imam al-Muslimin ... Abi Hanifa)\(^{144}\) and al-Jazari’s biography of Sufis, entitled the Mukhtasar Kitab al-Mukhtar fi Manaqib al-Akhyar.\(^ {145}\) Both works are written in a fluent Arabic, without any kind of grammatical commentary, although the abridgement of al-Jazari is lightly vocalised. The Manaqib Abi Hanifa contains extensive selections of Arabic poetry in praise of Abu Hanifa (fols 8a–9b, end), and the Mukhtasar Kitab al-Mukhtar also contains frequent poetic citations (e.g. fols 65a, 280b). These were works for reading, or listening to, not for madrasa teaching, nor were they aimed at the scholarly elite, their abridged form suggesting they are popularisations. They indicate the existence of a pious Muslim public in Erzincan (where we know from its colophon that the Mukhtasar Kitab al-Mukhtar was composed, and most probably the other works too) that was sufficiently acquainted with Arabic to appreciate them.

Other Arabic texts circulated that had no obvious local or pious interest. In Jumada II 714/September 1314, a volume of the chronicle of the Baghdad historian Ibn al-Jawzi (d. 597/1201), al-Muntazam fi’l-Tarikh (Plate 8) was copied in the Aminiyya khānqāh in Kayseri.\(^ {146}\) The extant volume covers the years 257–334 hijri, and although theoretically the Muntazam surveys the whole Islamic world, in practice it is very much Baghdad-centred, usually only giving scant coverage to events outside Iraq. Ibn al-Jawzi’s chronicle, which focuses on the deeds of the political elite and death-notices of notables, has little obvious relevance to a Sufi audience, despite the fact that the copyist goes to considerable lengths to emphasise his Sufi affiliation, giving his name as ‘the servant of the people of the heart, dust beneath the feet of the Sufis, Ibrahim b. Yusuf b. ‘Abd al-Samad, the aspirant Sufi, whose father is from Shirwan’.\(^ {147}\) The manuscript suggests the broader role of the khānqāh, like the madrasa, the functions of which in many ways replicated, as an educational centre, library and scriptorium, the intellectual horizons of which could extend beyond Sufism.\(^ {148}\) Another classic Arabic historical work that circulated in Anatolia was Ibn al-Athir’s al-Kamil fi’l-

---

144 Süleymaniye, MS Ayasofya 1938.
145 Süleymaniye, MS Carullah 1623.
146 Süleymaniye, MS Fazıl Ahmed Paşa, 1174.
The range of Arabic and Persian texts circulating in Anatolia emphasises the peninsula’s integration with the broader intellectual culture of the Islamic world. These transregional connections are also reflected in the Turkish textual production of the period.

**A COSMOPOLITAN TURCOPHONE WORLD**

Anatolian Turkish did not develop in isolation. From the 1280s Turkish also started to be used for official purposes on the opposite side of the Black Sea in the Golden Horde. The dialect used, however, was distinct from that employed in Anatolia, reflecting a Central Asian or Eastern variety of Turkish, known to modern Turkology as Khwarazmian. This probably reflects less the spoken language of the Horde (which would have probably been Qipchaq), but rather the fact that to administer their vast empire the Mongols employed Uighur secretaries and scribes (*bakhshi* and *bitiqchi*), who introduced the Uighur script and the Eastern Turkish literary language. Indeed, the association between the Mongols and Turkish was such that on occasion Eastern Turkish was called *Tatar dili*, ‘the language of the Tatars (i.e. Mongols)’. No early original document survives from the Golden Horde, although the medieval translations of letters into Russian and other languages has enabled their diplomatics and main linguistic features to be reconstructed.

The rise of Turkish in the Golden Horde reflected the dual processes of Turkicisation and Islamisation, with the Mongols elite intermarrying with the local Qipchaq population and adopting their language, and both gradually converting to Islam. Our earliest surviving evidence comprises outlines of Muslim faith and practice, as well as works dedicated to members of the Mongol ruling

---


151 I. Vásáry, ‘The Role and Function of Mongolian and Turkic in Ilkhanid Iran’, in Éva Á. Csató, Lars Johanson, András Róna-Tas and Bo Utas (eds), *Turks and Iranians: Interactions in Language and History* (Wiesbaden, 2016), 141–53.


family. Destined for a steppe audience who needed to be inculcated with the rudiments of Islam were primers on Islam, the *Mu‘in al-Murid*, probably composed in Khwarazm in 709/1309, and an adaptation of the Qur’anic Joseph story, *Yusuf ve Züleyha* by Kul Ali, which is perhaps our earliest literary text from the Golden Horde, which we know was used in later times to promote conversion to Islam. Another such text was very likely Rabghuzi’s Turkish *Qisas al-Anbiya*, composed in 710/1310 and dedicated to the Jochid ruler Tok Bugha. The simple poems that summarise the contents of the prose narrative may have helped new Muslims memorise the tales of Prophets. In 761/1360 the *Nehcü‘l-Feradis* was composed by Mahmud b. ‘Ali, being an Eastern Turkish collection of hadith aimed at inculcating the main tenets of Islam. Towards the mid-fourteenth century, a courtly literature in Turkish started to emerge, patronised by members of the Jochid house, of which the outstanding remains are Qutb’s eastern Turkish adaptation of Nizami’s *Khusraw and Shirin*, composed c. 1341–2, and Khwarazmi’s bilingual Persian-Eastern Turkish *mathnawī*, the *Muhabbatname*, written in 1353.

The scholars and literary culture of the Golden Horde had a profound influence in Anatolia, and both regions shared commercial as well as linguistic, cultural and political ties, Anatolia having briefly formed part of the Golden Horde’s territories in the 1240s. The Crimea, one of the main cultural and political centres of the Golden Horde, was a short sea voyage from the Black Sea Coast of Anatolia, and considerable trade in slaves, grain and horses linked the two.

---

155 On this work see Bodrogligeti, ‘On the Authorship’; despite alternative arguments for the authorship of this work, discussed by Bodrogligeti, his attribution seems entirely convincing. The unique manuscript of the *Mu‘in al-Murid* is preserved in Bursa, but there is no evidence that the text ever circulated in Anatolia in our period. Other works in the codex all seem to have been copied in Central Asia, and were probably brought to Anatolia in the late fifteenth century or later. The west Turkish annotations to the text of the *Mu‘in al-Murid* were probably added at this point. The text itself states it was composed in 630/1234, but a manuscript variant gives a different date (609AH), meaning it is hard to have much confidence in this. See Ali Cin, *Turk Edebiyatının İlk Yusuf ve Züleyha Hikayesi: Ali’inin Kısası-ı Yusuf’u* (Ankara, 2011), 59–60, 410, l. 1243. There is no information about place of composition, but given that many surviving manuscripts seem to be associated with the Kazan’ region (ibid., 60–2), it is possible that it was compiled there. On the use of the story in the nineteenth-century Kazan’ region see Agnès Nilüfer Kefeli, *Becoming Muslim in Imperial Russia: Conversion, Apostasy, and Literacy* (Ithaca, 2014), 65–7.


157 Kefeli, *Becoming Muslim*, 68.


159 See Chapter 1.

between the two regions are suggested by the strong similarities in the architecture of Golden Horde-controlled Crimea and Mongol-ruled Anatolia. It is thus natural that numerous scholars from the Golden Horde also made their way to Anatolia, and the shared Hanafi law school that prevailed in both regions seems to have been an important factor in these migrations. Several generations of scholars from the Hanafi East had sought their fortunes in the Middle East, where Anatolia was the main Hanafi region, and this process seems only to have intensified under Mongol rule. Khwarazm, one the main strongholds of Hanafi learning in Central Asia, formed part of the Horde’s territories, and its scholars had a particular renown. As Ibn Battuta recounts, men from Khwarazm enjoyed a particularly honoured place at the courts of the Turkmen principalities of south-west Anatolia:

The sultan of Milas is Shuja’ al-Din b. Orhan Beg b. Menteshe, who is the best of kings, with fine features and behaviour. His companions are fuqabā’, who are held in great esteem by him, and there is a group of them at his court, among them the faqih al-Khwarazmi, who knows [various] sciences and us excellent. When I met him, the sultan was angry with him because he had travelled to the town of Ayasuluk [modern Selçuk, the Aydinid capital] and reached its sultan from whom he accepted gifts.  

Khwarazmi, the poet of the Eastern Turkish Mukhabbatname, refers at the end of his poem to having travelled the length and breadth of Rum (zi sar ta pây mulk-i Rûm gashtam), and the connections between the two regions are also suggested by the numerous manuscripts in Turkish collections originating in the Golden Horde.

The most famous of these eastern scholars to move to Anatolia was Hafiz al-Din Muhammad b. Shihab al-Kardari al-Khwarazmi al-Bazzazi (d. 827/1424) from Khwarazm, author of a famous work on Hanafi fiqh al-Fatawa al-Bazzaziyya. Al-Bazzazi was educated in the Golden Horde capital of Saray, and settled in Crimea before coming to Anatolia, where he debated with the famous Ottoman scholar Molla Fenari. His Fatawa, completed in 812/1410 shortly before his move to Anatolia, became immediately massively popular there with over ninety manuscripts in the Süleymaniye library in Istanbul alone, most dating to the fifteenth century, and his vita of Abu Hanifa, Manaqib al-Imam al-A’zam

---


164 Khorezmi, Mukhabbat-name, ed. E. N. Nadzhip (Moscow, 1961), 49.

Abi Hanifa was translated into Turkish for the benefit of the Ottoman sultan Murad II in the early fifteenth century.\(^\text{166}\)

The path of these eastern scholars was doubtless eased by their common Turkish language, for the eastern variety of Turkish started to be used for composing works in Anatolia. For instance, the Qalandar Baraq Baba (d. 707/1307–8), who was from Tokat in central Anatolia and never set foot in the Dasht-i Qipchaq, used Qipchaq for writing his _shaṯhiyya_ [ecstatic utterances].\(^\text{167}\)

The orthography of Old Anatolian Turkish, for instance its tendency to write vowels _plene_ unlike later Ottoman, also suggests a strong Eastern Turkish influence.\(^\text{168}\) A few fragments of evidence suggest that on occasion the eastern Uighur script was used in Anatolia. Many of the coins of Eretna are inscribed _sultan adil_ in Uighur (Fig. 4.4),\(^\text{169}\) doubtless because of its prestige as the script used also for Mongolian, the language of Chinggis Khan, and served to assert Eretna’s legitimacy to the substantial Mongol population of central Anatolia.\(^\text{170}\)

---


\(^{167}\) See Gölpınarlı, _Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf_, 252–72, 455–72 and ‘Baraq Baba’, _Elr_.

\(^{168}\) Schamiloglu, ‘Rise of the Ottoman Empire’, 268–69.


\(^{170}\) For examples of the Uighur script in Anatolia mainly from the time of Mehmed the Conqueror but also with reference to some earlier instances, see Osman Sertkaya, ‘Some New Documents
Verses in Uighur-script Eastern Turkish, as well as Mongolian, Arabic and Persian, were appended to an older manuscript of the great history of the Mongols by ‘Ata Malik Juwayni, the Tarikh-i Jahan-gushay, at Mardin in 724/1324. One emir, Şerefeddin Çakırca, in 726/1326 established a waqf in Sivas in which the endowment was not only written in Eastern Turkish but was even composed in Uighur script. Doubtless its use was more widespread than these few examples that have come down to us. Eastern Turkish elements are also found in many works written in Anatolian Turkish – the so called ‘olga-bolga dili’ mixed language.

Although the Eastern and Anatolian dialects thus seem to have been mutually comprehensible, there was also demand for Anatolian Turkish recensions of Eastern Turkish works. For instance the Güzide, a work on the basics of religion by a scholar named Abu Nasr b. Muhammad al-Sarakhsi, written in Eastern Turkish, was transmitted to Anatolia and then later in the fourteenth century translated into Anatolian Turkish by Muhammed b. Bali. An Anatolian Turkish version of Kerderli Mahmud b. ‘Ali’s hadith collection, the Nehcü’l-Feradis, was also made. Other works inculcating the basics of religion exist in both western and eastern Turkish versions, such as the Behçetü’l-Hadayik; in this case the oldest extant manuscript, dating to 702/1302, is written in Eastern Turkish. It is possible that later manuscripts reflect a reworking of the text into Anatolian Turkish, or that the work circulated in both varieties of Turkish. Other examples of texts with both western and eastern Turkish versions are the Siraj al-Qulub, a Turkish version of a Persian manual of responses to challenges to the


Ergün Acar (ed.), Eski Anadolu Türkçesi Dönemine Ait Bir Nehcü’l-Feradis (Giriş-Metin-Tıpkıbaşım) (Ankara, 2018). The manuscript of the Anatolian Turkish version, which has recently come to light in a private collection in Kastamonu, bears the completion date of 869/1465, but it is unclear whether this refers to the composition or the copying of the text.
Prophethood of Muhammad, and the *Cümcümenname*, a narrative poem offering a parable to encourage conversion, the Qipchaq original of which was composed in 770/1368.177 In both Anatolia and the Golden Horde, the story of Joseph seems to have been massively popular. With its tale of the infidel Zulaykha embracing Islam and Joseph’s vanquishing of the idols, it seems to have been widespread in a broad range of Muslim societies undergoing Islamisation in all periods. It plays a prominent role in the *Behcetü’l-Hadayik*, and there are at least five other versions of the story known to have circulated in fourteenth-century Anatolia, quite apart from references and sections that appear in numerous other works. The author of one of these versions of the Joseph story tells us that he translated it into Anatolian Turkish from the ‘deș dili’, the language of the steppes, in which it had been written by a certain Kırlı Mahmut, Mahmud of the Crimea:

The translator of this book, who got rid of its Crimean language
And turned it into Turkish, exerting much effort
Is Halıoloğlu Ali, author of seven divans
He fixed the Turkish, translating it from the language of the steppe.178

The cultural influence of Anatolia also extended in the opposite direction, across the Dasht-i Qipchaq. Here it is harder to trace the role of Turkish texts, but scholars from Anatolia played a part in forming the intellectual culture of the Golden Horde. For instance, ‘Ala’ al-Din Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Sarayi, a Golden Horde scholar who was a student of the leading Shams al-A’imma, tells us that for his hadith compilation, the *Siraj al-Abidin fi Sharh al-Abidin*, itself based on al-Saghani’s famous *Mashariq al-Anwar*, his principal source was an Anatolian work, Wajih al-Din al-Azjinjani’s commentary on al-Saghani, the *Hадa’iq al-Azhar fi Sharh Mashariq al-Anwar*.179 In the Crimea, the poet Abu Bakr Rumi from the central Anatolian city of Aksaray composed his vast


177 On this text and its Anatolian Turkish translations see F. A. Tansel, ‘*Cümcümê Sulthan*: Ottoman Translations of the Fourteenth Century Kipchak Turkish Story’, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 2 (1970): 252–69. Another variant of this story is the Kesikbaş Hikayesi attributed to Kirdeci Ali, which also exists in east and west Turkish versions.

178 Ismail Hikmet Ertaylan (ed.), *Yusuf ile Züleyha* (Istanbul, 1960), pp. 13, 16:

Bu kitabi döndüren, Kırm dîlin gideren
Türkî dîle götüren, çözh zahmet görmeye diyü
Ol Halıoloğlu Ali yedi divandur eli
Ol düzdî Türkî dîli deș dilinden dönderü.

Qalandarnama commemorating the lives of Anatolian saints and promoting the Sufism of the Qalandars, which he dedicated to some leading amirs in the Golden Horde.180

Scholars and litterateurs from the Golden Horde were also active in the third main region of literary production in Turkish, the Mamluk empire of Egypt and Syria. Although the population spoke Arabic, the Mamluk rulers were by origins slaves from the Dasht-i Qipchaq – the Golden Horde lands. In addition, politics linked them closely to the Golden Horde, with whom they formed an alliance against the Ilkhans. Although Arabic remained the language of the Mamluk realm for official purposes, it is clear that many of its Turkish rulers were uncomfortable in it. Works in both Eastern and Anatolian Turkish were read at the Mamluk court, and from the late fourteenth century original works started to be composed in Egypt in Turkish, largely in Qipchaq.181 The study of Turkish literature in the Mamluk realm is in its infancy, and here we can only make some general points regarding its relationship to the literary production of Anatolia.

The earliest phase of this literature in the first half of the fourteenth century was the composition of Turkish-Arabic dictionaries.182 One of these, a Turkish-Arabic and Mongolian-Arabic dictionary composed for a qadi of Cairo in the 1340s, was written by an Anatolian from Konya – it is interesting that although it is a handbook of Qipchaq Turkish, an Anatolian author is responsible, again suggesting that the dialect boundaries erected by modern scholarship were much weaker in the fourteenth century.183 The appearance of literary works in Turkish is a development of the late fourteenth century, patronised particularly by Sultan Barquq (r. 784/1382–791/1389 and 792/1390–801/1399) and his circle.184 Literary men from far afield migrated to Egypt to seek their fortune there, such as the Golden Horde poet Seyfi of Saray, who composed in 793/1391 a translation of Sa‘di’s Gulistan for Barquq’s minister, the ḥājjb al-ḥujjāb Batkhas al-Suduni.185 As well as the commissioning of original works, Turkish literary

180 See Chapter 2, pp. 81, 101–2.
182 In general see Robert J. Ermers, Arabic Grammars of Turkic: The Arabic Linguistic Model Applied to Foreign Languages & Translation of ‘Abū Ḥāyān Al-‘Andalusi’s Kitāb Al-‘ıdrāk Li-lisān Al-‘Atrak (Leiden, 1999).
183 On this work see Barbara Flemming, ‘Ein alter Irrtum bei der chronologischen Einordnung der Tārīḫ mān turki wa aḡāmī wa muqallī’, Der Islam 44 (1968): 226–9; Ermers, Arabic Grammars of Turkic.
classics from the east were also copied in Egypt. Many of the manuscripts of our Turkish literary monuments from the Golden Horde were written in Egypt, although some were re-exported to Anatolia, Istanbul or the Dasht-i Qipchaq at various points, and of course a good number were taken wholesale to Istanbul after the Ottoman conquest. Some poems by Seyfi, for instance, were the subject of nazires by the Germiyani poet Ahmed-i Da’i. Moreover, Anatolian authors also made their fortune at the Mamluk court. Darir, for example, the Erzurum litterateur who had failed to find patronage in Karaman, composed his Siyer-i Nebi and a translation of the Fustuh al-Sham for Barquq. The wealth and facilities of Cairo also attracted Anatolian scholars such as Hacı Paşa who studied there before returning to Rum, capitalising on the expertise in Islamic sciences they had acquired there to find patrons, for example the Aydınıds. Some never returned, and a sizeable community of Rumi students developed in Cairo.

By the later fifteenth century the dynamic had started to change. This interest in Turkish literature continued among the Mamluk elite into the fifteenth century, but gradually the Anatolian dialect came to supplant Qipchaq in Egypt and Syria. Mamluk sultans such as Qaytbay and Qansuh al-Ghawri composed poetry in Anatolian Turkish; again linguistic necessity was not an issue, for they also wrote in Arabic. A Turkish translation of Firdawsi’s Shahnama by the poet Şerifi of Amid was dedicated to Qansuh al-Ghawri and significantly, it was done in Anatolian Turkish, not an eastern dialect. Meanwhile, the Turcophone Mamluk elite started to evince an interest in some of the early-fourteenth-century Anatolian Turkish classics. A luxury copy of Aşık Paşa’s Garibname was produced for the Mamluk amir Yashbak min Mahdi in Syria in around 1477; and a collection of poems made for the Mamluk sultan Qaytbay includes Gülşehri’s verses. The library of Qaytbay also contained a collection of the poems of Yunus Emre and another fourteenth-century Anatolian Sufi, Kaygusuz Abdal.

---

188 Yıldız, ‘From Cairo to Ayasuluk’, 265–9.
190 Ibid., 275; also noted by Kuru, ‘Gülşehri, Seventh Sheikh’, 281.
The shift from Qipchaq to Anatolian Turkish as the Mamluk courtly language probably reflects shifting power dynamics, with the rise of the Ottoman empire in the period bringing a greater prestige to the previously reviled Anatolian dialect. Yet the choice to write in Turkish was not simply a question of authors deliberately settling for a limited, provincial audience. While the horizons of the Turcophone literary world were of course narrower than those of the dār al-Islām itself, they still encompassed a vast geography stretching from Khwarazm to Cairo. Texts such as Behcetü’l-Hadayik or Sarakhsi’s Güzide, translated or composed for the purposes of communicating knowledge, above all religious knowledge, to an audience who did not have access to it, were often transmitted across large parts of the Turcophone world. However, the majority of the examples discussed in this chapter suggest that rather than linguistic necessity, the employment of Turkish was a deliberate strategy motivated by political and religious reasons, above all the assertion of new forms of authority. In the case of the translations made for the Aydınid amirs, cultural appropriation as a form of political legitimation seems likely to be at work, while with the Germiyanids’ employment of Turkish for epigraphic and legal purposes we have an even more radical attempt to assert publicly the adaptation of conventional forms of Islamic discourse into a local idiom. Similarly, the Sufi works of Gūlşehri and Aşık Paşa, while inspired by Sufi and especially Mevlevi ideas of multilingual communication, represent attempts by the authors to assert their status as shaykhs and their personal access to divine knowledge as well as to communicate to a local Turcophone audience. At the same time, the use of Turkish for such purposes, whether in support of dynastic legitimacy or Sufi claims to sainthood, was possible only in frontier areas of Anatolia where the conventions of Islamic civilisation as understood in Konya did not apply. In this sense, the rise of Turkish is a direct consequence of the Mongol invasions, for it was only with the collapse of traditional forms of political legitimacy in central Anatolia that places such as Aydın, the Germiyanid lands and Kırşehir started to emerge as alternative centres of power, whose rulers or leaders required a new vocabulary and language in which to assert their authority and legitimacy.
The rise of Turkish as an Anatolian literary language was accompanied by the emergence of new types of religious literature. Dealing with subjects such as the basic requirements of Islam and popular religious tales of the heroes of early Islam, especially the deeds of ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, these works were written in a simple, accessible style in the two main vernaculars of Muslim Anatolia, Persian and Turkish. One such work is the earliest Anatolian Turkish vernacular text that can be credibly dated, the Behectü’l-Hadayik, discussed in Chapter 4, which opens with a section on *tawhid*, the unity of God, explaining the basic Muslim catechism, the *shahāda*, emphasising that ‘saying *lā ilāh illā allāh* is the key to heaven’.\(^1\) Subsequent sections use narratives of the careers of the Prophet and his family, as well as the story of Joseph, to teach the elements of Islam, but overall the emphasis is more on right practice rather than belief. This emphasis characterises much of this new, popular religious literature, but at the same time the texts show a particular interest in stories of conversion and battling unbelief, and a decidedly polemical tone largely absent in the earlier thirteenth-century literature seems to emerge.

These popular religious texts circulated in a variety of genres, which are examined in this chapter – catechisms, eschatological works and epics in both prose and verse. Information about the audience, and often the authorship, of these various works can only be inferred from their content. By describing them as ‘popular’ it should not be inferred that they were necessarily aimed at a certain social class, for the distinction between an elite and non-elite culture could be highly fluid in the pre-modern Islamic world. For example, philosophically

\(^1\) Süleymaniye, MS Yazma Bağışlar 4040, fol. 6a.
complex ideas permeated into widely circulated poetry, above all via Sufism. Similarly, while the cult of saints is often taken as a typical expression of ‘popular’ Islam, it occupies a crucial place in the highly complex systems of thinkers such as Ibn ‘Arabi, which were explicitly aimed at a limited elite audience. However, medieval Muslim texts also draw attention to the sway held over the masses by popular preachers (wu‘âz, quṣṣâs), of whom a hallmark was their interest in eschatology; the common concern with this theme shared by the works under consideration here suggests they belong to this tradition. They are popular in that they were written in a simple, accessible language, and were aimed at a wider audience than the Anatolian religious textual production of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries when works in Arabic or Persian were composed either for limited circles of educated, philosophically inclined Sufis, such as the works of Ibn ‘Arabi, or at the behest of the ruler, such as Anawi’s verse ḡiṣṣaṣ al-anbiya’ the Anis al-Qulub, and the compositions of Hubaysh-i Tiflisi. In contrast, the vernacular works under consideration here seem to have been widely circulated. Many of our popular vernacular texts exist in different versions, often with substantial differences and frequently in different languages too, with the same or closely related works circulating in Persian, Eastern Turkish and Anatolian Turkish. The plethora of variant versions may suggest the existence of orally transmitted works, which were subsequently put into writing. It is suggestive, for instance, that the Behçetü’l-Hadayik is arranged into divisions called meclis (‘sitting, assembly’), indicating that each section may have been read aloud, although this subject needs further research.

The wide transmission of the vernacular works considered here, at least in contrast to the court works, is testimony to their influence on the development of Islam in Anatolia. They cannot, however, be wholly dissociated from the learned tradition of religious literary production. The name of one author of medieval Anatolian epic, Tursun Fakih, indicates that he himself was one of the ‘ulama’, a jurisprudent (faqih), while several of our authors, texts and manuscripts are associated with Sufism, especially Mevlevism. Evidence from the Mamluk lands

---

3 E.g. Shoshan, ‘High Culture and Popular Culture in Islam’, 83.
5 For a preliminary survey of the relationship between written texts and orality in medieval Anatolia see Dedes, Battalname, vol. 1, 51–84; in general see also Hirschler, The Written Word in the Medieval Arabic Lands, 12–17.
indicates that popular preachers performed in formal locations such as mosques and madrasas as well as in informal settings such as cemeteries. Although we have little specific information about the circumstances in which popular preaching was undertaken in Anatolia, it is likely that a similar range of locations was used, including, in all probability, Sufi zāwiyas, given the association of several of these texts with such an environment.

Although written in the vernacular, it is important to distinguish these works from the ‘vernacular Islam’ that some scholars, in particular Ahmet Karamustafa, have identified in medieval Anatolia. Expressed predominantly in Turkish, rejecting the formal urban traditions of sharia-minded piety, ‘vernacular Islam’ is characterised as both ‘latitudinarian’ and ‘provincial’, and is said to form the basis for Alevism. The existence or otherwise of such a ‘vernacular Islam’ and what its attributes might be is a controversial subject, and the idea of a rural–urban split in religiosity has been criticised.

Research on Ottoman Syria has argued that in fact the distinction between urban and popular religion is unsatisfactory, but instead has pointed to the existence of ‘agrarian religion’ – a common core of popular belief, distinct from the piety of the learned ‘ulama’ who constituted only a tiny proportion of the population. Agrarian religion transcended sectarian divisions and was shared by townspeople too, for towns were not isolated from the surrounding countryside but rather were ‘sunk in an essentially agrarian milieu’ upon which they relied for both labour and produce. This was doubtless true of medieval Anatolia too, with its small towns and large Christian population which certainly shared elements of belief and practice with Muslims.

In both formulations, ‘vernacular’ and ‘agrarian’ religion are conceived as in some sense opposed to the religion of the learned. Yet the texts considered here are entirely compatible with the faith of the ‘ulama’, who on occasion were their authors; they reveal little evidence of either syncretism or rejection of sharia-based

---

7 Karamustafa, ‘Kaygusuz Abdal’, 330–1; see also the discussion in Rıza Yıldırım, ‘Sunni Orthodox vs Shi’ite Heterodox? A Reappraisal of Islamic Piety in Medieval Anatolia’, in Peacock, De Nicola and Yıldız (eds), *Islam and Christianity*, 289–90.
8 Yıldırım, ‘Sunni Orthodox vs Shi’ite Heterodox’; Oktay Uslu, ‘The Şâhiyye of Yûnus Emre and Kaygusuz Abdal’.
piety, even if the latter does not constitute their main concern. This is not to dismiss the possibility of the existence of either ‘vernacular’ or ‘agrarian’ religiosity in medieval Anatolia. However, the popular texts examined here, which have rarely been discussed by the existing scholarship on medieval Anatolian Islam, suggest the spread of a piety based on a sense of sectarian distinctiveness, both of Muslims defined in opposition to Christians, and increasingly of Sunnis in contrast to Shiites. We can see this across the three main genres considered here. First, I examine catechisms, known to later authors as ‘ilm-i hâl, in which the elements of belief are inculcated by a question and answer format; this is closely connected to the second type of literature I study, works dealing with eschatology, in which the dead are examined on their faith by angels to determine whether they enter heaven or hell. Thirdly, I look at some of the popular religious epics of fourteenth-century Anatolia, which exhibit a particular interest in the battle against unbelief. Finally, I consider the extent to which this new religious atmosphere can be associated with the changed political situation in Mongol-ruled Anatolia.

A MEDIEVAL ANATOLIAN CATECHISM: THE SIRAJ AL-QULUB

The *Siraj al-Qulub* is the title of a set of texts in Persian and both Eastern and Anatolian Turkish that circulated in Iran, Anatolia and probably the Golden Horde lands in the fourteenth to fifteenth centuries, and is said to represent a

---

11 The only significant study known to me to make use of comparable sources is Tijana Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Stanford, 2011), which concentrates on the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries.


13 For information on the various *Siraj al-Qulub* manuscripts see *Sirâcü‘l-Kulûb: Gönüllerin İpiğt*, ed. Yakub Karasoy (Ankara, 2013), 17–20. In addition, on the Budapest manuscript not discussed in this publication see Yakub Karasoy, *Sirâcü‘l-Kulûb’un Budapeşte Nushası*, Gazi Türkiye Mecmuası 18 (2016): 51–9. According to Karasoy, much of the text of the Budapest manuscript is common to that of the Konya Kuyunoglu manuscript published in his earlier edition. Hajji Khalifa refers to three different texts bearing the title *Siraj al-Qulub*, the first of which is described as a Persian text of questions and answers, which may be the same as the one under consideration here. The second is an Arabic work by Qaraqush al-Mansuri, apparently related to the famous anthology *al-Iqd al-Farid*, and the third is the Arabic ethical work by al-Tabrizi discussed in n. 14 below (*mushtamal ’alâ maqâmât al-khaωû̇s wa’d’awwâm*). See Katip Çelebi, *Kashf al-Zunun*, ed. S. Yaltkaya, vol. I, p. 983. A Persian text entitled *Siraj al-Qulub* attributed to Abu Nasr al-Sa‘id b. Muhammad Abîl-Qasim al-Ghaznavi is preserved in two Istanbul manuscripts (Istanbul University Library, Farşça Yazmalar 203 and Beyazıt Devlet Kütüphanesi, MS No. 3703). This is based on the question and answer format representing Muhammad’s responses to the Jews’ questions, and is divided into a varying number of chapters, twenty in the University MS, forty in the Beyazıt one. However, the text appears quite distinct from the Kütahya manuscripts examined here, and the manuscripts are rather
translation of an Arabic original. Although the substantial variations between the various Persian and Turkish versions make it hard to pin down a single prototype, the inspiration was evidently the Arabic *Book of a Thousand Questions*. This widely circulated text, composed no later than the tenth century and translated into languages as diverse as Latin, Urdu, Tamil, Malay and Javanese, deals with the story of a conversion to Islam at the hands of Muhammad. After the Prophet’s hijra, the Jewish community of Medina, led by ‘Abdallah b. Salam, posed Muhammad questions designed to show the falsity of his pretensions to Prophethood. Muslim tradition asserted that his ability to answer the Jews’ questions proved the veracity of his claim, and this was also the occasion on which *al-Kahf*, the sura recited on Fridays in Candarid Kastamonu, was revealed (see pp. 73–4). On one level, the *Thousand Questions* thus asserts the truth of Muhammad’s mission and of Islam itself, but on another it serves as a primer of the basic beliefs of a Muslim. The *Thousand Questions* seems to have been intended to inculcate the basics of Islam, to provide believers with a ready primer of responses to challenges from non-Muslims and to demonstrate the superiority of Islam over other faiths. It thus addressed not just newly converted Muslims, but also could affirm the Islam of established Muslim communities. As Ronit Ricci, who has studied the transmission of the text in South and South East Asia, puts it,

late, the University copy dating to Ramadan 1083/December 1683–January 1684 while Beyazıt 3703 dates to Rabî’ I 985/1577. For that reason, it is excluded from consideration here although its relationship to the other *Siraj al-Qulub* texts would merit further examination.

This is explicitly stated in the Eastern Turkish Moscow manuscript (*Sirâcü-Kulûb*, ed. Karasoy, 21), and the work has been identified with a *Siraj al-Qulub* by a certain Abu’l-Mahamid Ahmad b. Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Malik al-Ash‘ari al-Tabrizi of which manuscripts survive in Istanbul, Vienna and Manisa. See Ayşegül Sertkaya, ‘Horezm Türkçesi ile yazılan Sirâcü’l-kulub ve dil özellikleri’, *VI. Uluslararası Türk Dili Kurultayı*, 20–25 Ekim 2008, Bildiriler (Ankara, 2012), 3865–75, at p. 3865; G. W. Flugel, *Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hofbibliothek zu Wien* (Vienna, 1865), pp. 374–5; Manisa Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, MS 1168, fols 15a–25a. Istanbul manuscripts include: Süleymaniye: Yazma Bağşalar 3952/1, Ağır Efendi 443/12, Carullah 1084/7, Carullah 2061/42, H. Hüsnü Paşa 631/2, Hacı Mahmud Efendi 2758/2, Hacı Mahmud Efendi 2249/1, İ. Ismail Hakki 1189/2, Kasıdecizade 685/4, Laleli 3648/4, Laleli 3680/5, Tahir Ağ Ağ Tekke 84/1, Hüdai Efendi 485/3, Kemankes 245, Kemankes 36/4, Hacı Ahmed Paşa 329/16; in addition four more manuscripts are recorded in the Beyazıt Devlet Kütüphanesi, Istanbul: Beyazıt MSS 3703, 3541, 7937 and Veliyüddin Efendi 1889; see also Istanbul University Library, Arapça Yazmalar 3145. The text consists of forty-one chapters (bâb), mostly only a few lines long, on pious topics, with a distinctly Sufi flavour: repentance (*tawba*), jihad, modesty (*hayâ*), for example, while more detail is given to sainthood (*wilâya*). However, the work by Tabrizi seems to diverge too far from the Persian and Turkish *Siraj al-Qulub* texts to be related, lacking their question and answer format; in addition, all manuscripts I have been able to examine are fairly late, seventeenth or eighteenth century.

For a study of this text see Ronit Ricci, *Islam Translated: Literature, Conversion, and the Arabic Cosmopolis of South and Southeast Asia* (Chicago, 2011), esp. 34–41.
The Book of a Thousand Questions offered guidance, restated the justifications for becoming or remaining a practicing Muslim, and propagated a model of embracing Islam by persuasion; it addition it enhanced community building by supplying a complex web of intertextual sources in the local language to which local people could relate, and which tied them to the broader cosmopolis in their part of the world and beyond it, to the universal umma. All these roles – effected and enhanced by the translation of this and similar texts – contributed to a process of ongoing Islamization.16

The Persian and Turkish versions of the Thousand Questions, the Siraj al-Qulub, offer similar insights into the process of Islamisation. The earliest surviving copy of the Siraj al-Qulub is a Persian version, held in the Vahid Ali Paşa Library in Kütahya as MS 1415, copied in Sha'ban 731/May–June 1331 (Fig. 5.1).17

---

16 Ibid., 214.
17 The Vahid Ali Paşa library in Kütahya holds one other version of the Persian text, which differs considerably, Vahid Ali Paşa, MS 1465; this was copied in Astarabad at an unknown date so is excluded from consideration here. See M. Toker, ‘Furâtî Sirâcü‘l-Kulûb’unun Yeni Bir Nüshası Üzerine’, 2007 Unesco Mevlâna Yılında Uluslararası VII. Dil, Yazın, Deyişbilm Sempozyumu (2–5 Mayıs 2007) Bildiri Kitabı I (Konya, 2007), 545–56, at p. 547.
The next earliest manuscript of the text, held in the Topkapı Palace as MS Koğuşlar 1057, is dated 763/1362, and is written in Eastern Turkish;\(^{18}\) two other Eastern Turkish versions survive, the best-known one in Uighur script written in Yazd in 835/1431,\(^{19}\) while a Moscow manuscript dates to 961/1554, although this text has been attributed on linguistic grounds to the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century.\(^{20}\) Six Anatolian Turkish versions are also attested, although the whereabouts of one of these, formerly in the possession of the well-known Istanbul bookseller and bibliophile Raif Yelkenci, is currently unknown. Unfortunately, none of the Anatolian Turkish versions of the text is dated, and the most that can be said for sure is that they were composed between the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. While a more detailed study of these texts is required, it is clear that they exhibit substantial differences. The number of questions varies greatly in the texts, in the various Turkish versions from as few as nineteen up to forty-one, while the Persian text contains many more, most of which are given only very brief treatment. Almost every \textit{Siraj al-Qulub} manuscript thus seems to represent an independent ‘translation’ of the putative Arabic original, as the editor of one version remarks: ‘Each of the extant manuscripts of the \textit{Siraj al-Qulub} was translated by a separate translator.’\(^{21}\) Yet a comparison of passages from the oldest Eastern Turkish manuscript and an Anatolian version held in Konya, the manuscript of which probably dates to the fifteenth century, indicates that this is exactly the same text, written in two different dialects, with only minimal differences of phraseology between them.\(^{22}\) The relationship between the various manuscripts needs further work, as does the connection of the \textit{Siraj al-Qulub} to another widely circulated text, the Turkish \textit{Kırk Su’al} of the sixteenth century.\(^{23}\) Most probably, we are dealing with a free adaptation rather than a literal translation of an Arabic prototype.

The Kütahya Persian version is worth lingering on, as it gives us a securely dated text from Anatolia. The copyist gives his name as Shadi b. Khwajaki, and he

---

\(^{18}\) See Fehmi Edhem Karatay, \textit{Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Türkçe Yazmalar Kataloğu} (Istanbul, 1961), II, p. 390, no 3081; see ibid., I, 129, no. 380 (MS H. 323) for another copy of an Anatolia Turkish version, dated 1160/1747.


is known to us from copies of other Persian works held in the Vahid Ali Paşa Library, the Persian dictionary by ‘Abd al-Mu’min al-Khu’i and a Persian *fiqh* work to be discussed below. All three manuscripts were bequeathed by Ahmad-i Khass, who describes himself as ‘one of the descendants of Mawlana’ (*mān awlād mawlānā*), to the Mevlevi *khānqāh* in Kütahya named after Rumi’s descendant Celaleddin Ergun Çelebi (d. 775/1373), a native of the town. Like the other works copied by Shadi b. Khwajaki, the initial folio of the text contains annotations in Eastern Turkish, most likely reflecting the prestige status of that dialect in early fourteenth-century Anatolia. Although none of Shadi b. Khwajaki’s manuscripts contain information about the place of copying, the fact that all are found in the Vahid Ali Paşa Library in Kütahya, and are associated with the Erguniyye Mevlevihane, suggests that they were copied in Kütahya, then capital of the Germiyanid beylik.

There is no direct relationship between the Persian and Turkish texts, as can be seen from a comparison of the Kütahya manuscript with the Konya Turkish version published by Karasoy. The Persian text opens with a long passage setting out the background to the questions, which is entirely absent from the Konya text. It starts:

They relate from Hasan al-Basri, who said that it is related from the Prophet that when he made the hijra from Mecca to Medina and summoned the people of Medina [to Islam], the people of Medina became Muslim, responding favourably to the Prophet and accepting the religion of truth, repenting of unbelief. Thus did the Prophet summon to the religion of truth; but the Jews of Medina did not reply favourably for a while. As much as they recognised the Prophet [text missing] and saw his signs and miracles and his Prophethood was proved to them, they nonetheless denied him.

As the Kütahya manuscript goes on to explain, the Jews of Medina then sent to their co-religionists in Khaybar, who advised them to consult ‘Abdallah b. Salam, ‘the most learned of the Jews’, so that he ‘debates and fights with Muhammad and breaks and shames him so that we and you and all the Jews of the world will be rescued from him’. At this juncture God revealed to the Prophet the Qur’ānic verse (Q.3:67) ‘Abraham was not a Jew or a Christian but a monotheist Muslim’ (*mā kāna Ibrāhīm yaḥūdiyyan wa lā naṣrāniyyan wa-lākin kāna ḥanīfīn musliman*). God warns Muhammad of the Jews’ plan and assures him He is with him. ‘Abdallah b. Salam comes before the Prophet claiming that,

26 *Siraj al-Qulub*, Kütahya, Vahid Ali Paşa Kütüphanesi, MS 1415, fol. 1b–3a (unfoliated).
I am the most knowledgeable of the Jews of the world of the Torah; I am trusted by them, and I read all the Torah and give its interpretation (tafīr). I have come before you as a messenger of the Jews. I shall ask you 1400 questions, if you give the right answer I will enter your religion, all the Jews of the world will believe you, and strife will disappear.27

The Konya Turkish text, in contrast, contains none of this, but rather starts:

This book mentions the tales and stories of by-gone people, and why the heaven and earth were created; it also mentions the wonders and marvels that there are on earth and in the heavens, so that readers and listeners take a lesson from them. This is mentioned in seventy questions and answers. We arranged the literary composition of this book in the form of questions and answers and we have made difficult questions clear. The circumstances of one these questions are that the Jews consulted the Torah, and our Prophet answered them. We selected these words and made it into a book which we called the Siraj al-Qulub.28

While the questions in the Kütahya text start with ‘Abdallah b. Salam asking Muhammad what sort of prophet he is (a nābi or a rasūl), in the Konya text the opening question is ‘In how many days did God create the world?’ The Konya text contains far fewer questions, but its answers tend to be much more extensive, whereas in the Kütahya manuscript the Prophet’s answers are often extremely brief; for example:

Question: ‘Inform me what Islam is?’ Answer: The Prophet said, ‘Believing in the oneness of God, his prophets, the Day of Resurrection, and everything God has created.’ He said, ‘You spoke the truth, Muhammad.’29

Indeed, in places the answers are but a single word, reading more like the answers to a riddle than a theological work:

Question: ‘What is stronger than iron?’ Answer: he said, ‘Fire.’ Question: ‘What is stronger than fire?’ Answer: He said, ‘Water.’ . . . Question: ‘Why do they call Adam Adam?’ Answer: he said, ‘Because Adam was created from the skin (adīm) of the earth.’ . . . Question, ‘What is that thing which is small and will never get big?’ Answer: ‘Stone.’ He said, ‘You spoke the truth Muhammad.’30

Yet on other questions the Kütahya manuscript offers quite detailed answers, some which may have been of direct relevance to the religiously mixed environment of western Anatolia. For instance, both sides of a full folio are devoted to the question of the fate in the hereafter of the children of unbelievers.31 The text also

27 Ibid., fols 5a–b.
30 Ibid., fols 25b–26a, 31a.
31 Ibid., fols 33b–34b. For a similar concern see Niğdeli Kadı Ahmed, El-Veledü’-Seftık ve’l-Hāfidü’l-Halîk, ed. Ali Ertuğrul (Ankara 2015), I, 472, according to whom they go to heaven.
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exhibits an interest in basic questions of cosmology, such as how many stars there are, and the breadth of the heavens. The question of where Noah’s ark came to rest is also addressed (the answer given is at the Ka’ba) and what happened to Jerusalem during the flood (the angel Gabriel picked it up and took it to heaven, where the angels perambulated around it and it formed the basis of the Ka’ba).

Beneath the earth there is said to be a great fish called Bahluth, whose head is in the east and tail in the west, while one section discusses briefly God’s throne (‘arsh), the Tablet on which God’s decrees are preserved (lawh) and the Divine pen (qalam), Qur’antically derived concepts that all played an important role in Sufi cosmology. The final sections of the work describe heaven and hell and the Day of Resurrection, the text concluding with the observation that ‘believers go to heaven and unbelievers go to hell; one party is in heaven, one party is in hell’.

Much more detail is given in the Konya Turkish text, with its twenty-five questions and answers. The first theme to be dealt with the Konya text is creation – in how many days God created the world and what he created before the world. It then discusses the names of God’s creation – the name of the seven heavens that comprise the firmament and of their angels and of the seven earths; the questions of why God created heaven and hell and where they are located; of why God created the throne (‘arsh and kursî) and what its attributes are. The next set of questions in the text move on to the topic of the angel of death and the Day of Judgement, emphasising that only the believer will enter heaven. Alongside the repeated injunctions against unbelief, much of the Konya Turkish text emphasises popular belief with a series of riddle-like questions: ‘Inform me Oh Muhammad! Which grave moved and travelled with a person inside it?’ (The answer is the whale that carried Jonah.) The moral of the story is summed up as ‘Oh beloved and faithful people (‘aşıklar ve sadıklar), do you desire that God save you too from what you fear? The proclamation of God’s unity là ilâh illâ allâh should be always on your tongue.’ While this story may be seen as an opportunity to reinforce the message of the shahâda, a point that is stressed elsewhere in the Konya version of the Siraj al-Qulub, including its end, other riddles and their responses have a less obvious message. For instance, the longest single response in the Konya text replies to the question: ‘Inform me, Oh Muhammad, what is that creature who once gave advice to a man; the creature was not man, angel or fairy?’ The answer is

33 Ibid., fols 23b–24a.
34 Ibid., fols 32b–33a.
35 Ibid., fols 38a–b.
36 Ibid., fol. 62a.
38 Ibid., 41.
the ant; in the Qur’an (Surat al-Naml), Solomon is said to have nearly crushed an ant who warned his fellow ants to escape back to their homes; the Qur’an concludes that ‘Solomon smiled at [the ant’s] speech’. But while the Konya text gives an elaborate description of Solomon’s court, its points to quite a different moral:

The ant said, ‘Oh prophet of God! Do you not know why they call you Solomon (Süleyman)?’ Solomon said, ‘I don’t know.’ The ant said, ‘Although your heart was sound (selim) and you know the circumstances of the next world, you have accepted the few pleasures of this world and have been deceived by its possessions and kingship; therefore you are called Solomon.’ The ant went on: ‘Do you know why God has subdued this wind?’ ‘I don’t know,’ said Solomon. The ant said, ‘He has subdued it for this reason: that which you have accepted is nothing. Just as the wind passes, the world’s wealth and kingship pass too. In other words, it is a sign to you that while you were a prophet in this world you were deceived by something that perishes.\(^{39}\)

The ant’s wisdom is something emphasised by the scholarly tafsīr tradition, but is not part of the Qur’an itself. The exegetes Fakhr al-Din al-Razi and al-Qurtubi particularly emphasised the wisdom of the ant, whom they elevated to the level of an exemplar for humans to follow.\(^{40}\) The passage suggests how it is erroneous to make a hard and fast division between a ‘popular’ Islam and a ‘scholarly’ tradition: the Konya text harnesses aspects of the learned exegetical tradition to teach what is ultimately a simple moral about the vanity of this world.

Despite the Konya Turkish text’s ability to draw on these learned traditions, neither it nor the Persian Kütahya version evinces much concern for the practice of the formal requirements of Islam: beside the emphasis on heaven and hell, there is little direct exhortation to conduct prayer or fast in Ramadan, for instance. However, other versions of the text took a different approach. We can see this in another manuscript copied by Shadi b. Khwajaki in 731/1330–1, Vahid Ali Paşa Library, MS 1414. The initial folios of this Persian manuscript are missing so we do not know how much of the text has been lost, but it is clear from the first couple of folios that it contained another Persian Siraj al-Qulub manuscript, albeit one of very different contents and presentation. The same question–answer format is maintained, but the questions are first given in Arabic, then in Persian, with, as before, the questioner recognising the rectitude of the Prophet’s answer (rāst guftū/sadaqta). The questions seem to have been calculated to elicit the opportunity to teach not just doctrine (‘aqīda) but also practice. For example, the question ‘What is Islam?’ (mā al-islām) is interpreted in its Persian translation

\(^{39}\) Ibid., 46.

\(^{40}\) Sarra Tlili, Animals in the Qur’an (Cambridge, 2012), 184–91.
What is the basis of Islam? (qā’ida-yi islām chīst), which is then used as an opportunity to introduce the five pillars of Islam – saying the shahāda, prayer, charity, fasting and the hajj - the basics of practice that a Muslim should observe, which are so absent from the versions of the Siraj al-Qulub discussed above. From fol. 4b onwards the work becomes an abridged Persian synopsis of fiqh according to the Shafi’i law school. The text states,

I shall briefly explain these five pillars, by God’s grace, in accordance with the Sunnis and the Shafi’i madhhab; that which is an obligation incumbent on every Muslim I will bring [forth], so that everyone who reads this book and knows, will be clear-sighted in the faith and ritual practice (’ibādat) he performs.41

In contrast to almost all fiqh manuals, which are written in Arabic for legal specialists, this one is written in Persian, suggesting a more popular audience. The use of what seems to be the Siraj al-Qulub as a sort of framing device to introduce this primer on Muslim practice suggests the wide applicability of various versions of this text to introducing Islam to the newly converted, or the only nominally Muslim. Ultimately, then, the great variation in the texts of the Siraj al-Qulub suggests that it was the very flexibility of the theme of the Prophet’s defeat of ‘Abdallah b. Salam that gave it its great appeal. The question–answer format it embodied could be used in a variety of different circumstances, from reminding the Muslim of his obligations, to asserting the superiority of Islam in debate, from outlining the essential practices of Islam to asserting the truth of Muslim cosmology. However, the fact that Vahid Ali Paşa MS 1415 and the Konya Turkish text actually put very little emphasis on practice, and in terms of belief tend to stress what we might be tempted to dismiss as the inessential elements of Islam – the names of the angels, the ordering of the heavens – is suggestive of a religious environment in which belief was tested and demonstrated through one’s understanding of God’s creation and the names one used to describe it rather than any sort of rigid creed expressed through a catechism based on the acceptance or rejection of given theological concepts. It was less the common belief in theological concepts then this shared body of cosmology that gave shape to the religious identity of fourteenth-century Islamic Anatolia.

**ESCHATOLOGY AND ISLAMISATION**

The requirements to be considered a Muslim are illustrated by a key theme in eschatological literature, the interrogation of the dead by the two angels Munkar

41 Kütahya, Vahid Ali Paşa Kütüphanesi, MS 1414, fol. 4a.
and Nakir. Tijana Krstić suggests that the bar was raised increasingly high over time, noting that in the mid-fourteenth-century Turkish text *Risaletü l-Islam*, probably from Karasi, converts are allowed to go to paradise without having to answer any questions at all, whereas in the fifteenth-century *‘ilm-i ğal* by Kutbeddin İzniki a believer was required to pronounce the six articles of faith (belief in one God, God’s angels, in divinely revealed books, prophets, the day of Resurrection and that all things are lawful because of God), to believe from the heart and to perform the obligatory duties (hajj, fasting, almsgiving, prayer and saying the *shahāda*). In the sixteenth century, these obligations were elaborated further.

Our texts support this conclusion. Vahid Ali Paşa Library MS 1415, despite its extensive discussion of heaven and hell, does not raise the topic of what one has to do to get there or Munkar and Nakir at all, merely noting that ‘unbelievers, Jews, innovators, and those of ill belief’ will go to hell. The definition of Islam is simply ‘bearing witness to the oneness of God, belief (*i̇mān*) in his Prophet, the Day of Resurrection, and everything He created’. The Konya Turkish version of the *Siraj al-Qulub* does discuss Munkar and Nakir at some length, but is scarcely more demanding:

The two angels enter the tomb; they sit up [the dead] as if he is alive and say, ‘Who is your God, what is your religion?’ The person should reply, ‘My God is Allah, my religion is the religion of Islam and the person God Exalted has given us is Muhammad Mustafa.’ Then they say, ‘What is your knowledge?’ And that servant [of God] replies, ‘The Qur’an’. Then a call comes from God, ‘O my angels! Put down my servant and open one of the gates of heaven before his grave so that the peace of heaven reaches him.’

It would be wrong to consider this simply a difference between a folk religiosity and a sophisticated urban one. The qadi Ahmad of Niğde, a descendant of a distinguished line of scholars, does discuss Munkar and Nakir’s questioning of the dead, but is equally undemanding. According to him, the two angels ask, ‘Who is your creator, which is your prophet and what is your religion?’, and to get

---

45 Ibid., fol. 6a.
into heaven all the dead need do is to affirm belief in ‘the creator of man, the name of the religion of Islam, and the prophecy of Muhammad’.48

Ultimately the division that these texts stress is less between sinner and righteous, but between the believer who will go to heaven and the unbeliever who is condemned to hell, a division that is if anything underlined by the claim that the unbeliever’s pre-pubescent children will be saved. However, these eschatological themes may have served not just to promote conversion, but also moral renewal among the Muslims through an emphasis on the punishments of hell and the rewards of heaven. For example, the third volume of Ahmad of Niğde’s encyclopaedic al-Walad al-Shafiq is divided into two ‘branches’ (far’); the first deals with cosmology at length, starting with a description of the physical world, then the heavens, the Antichrist, Mahdi and the Day of Resurrection.49 The second far’ is devoted to death, heaven and hell, but inserted in between these two far’ is a long diatribe against the evils of people of Qadi Ahmad’s age ‘and the people of Niğde, the place of composition of this book in particular’. These comprise both failure to adhere to the precepts of Islam in terms of performing prayers correctly, and also more general wrongdoing – lying, accepting bribes, shedding blood, or as Qadi Ahmad puts it, ‘choosing the perishing world over the enduring end’.50 Qadi Ahmad portrays a society in which ‘everyone is settled on his own religion and faith, and the righteous have fled with their religion from towns and cities and have established themselves on mountains ravines and the bottoms of valleys... Only the name of being Muslim [muslimān] is heard, and despite the Qur’an being much studied, the meaning of it has gone to oblivion.’51 The following second ‘branch’ on death and the afterlife thus serves as a warning to the wrongdoers of the present age as to the fate that will await them, as well as the rewards for the believers.

The idea that eschatology might form part of a more general programme of moral renewal, of strengthening Islam’s identity in Anatolia, is reinforced by the fact that both the Kütahya Persian Siraj al-Qulub and Ahmad of Niğde stress the connection of Anatolia with paradise. Ahmad relates how Kawthar, the river of Paradise, watered six earthly rivers, four of which he connects explicitly to Rum: the Mihran, the Jayhun, the Euphrates and the Tigris.52 The relationship is made even more explicit in the Kütahya text, where ‘Abdullah b. Salam asks:

49 Ibid., 385–435.
50 Ibid., 436–7.
51 Ibid., 468.
52 Ibid., 464.
‘Which are those four countries that tomorrow will be in paradise?’ [The Prophet] replied, ‘One is Rum, the second is Egypt, the third is Qiban [Qitban?] and the fourth Qali [Erzurum?].’ He asked, ‘What are those four cities which belong to heaven?’ [The Prophet] replied, ‘One is Bab al-Abwab [Derbent], the second is ‘Abbadan, the third Qayrawan, and the fourth Valashkird.’ He asked, ‘What are those four cities which belong to hell?’ [The Prophet] replied, ‘One is Constantinople, the second is Antioch, the third Ahwaz and the fourth Medina.’

The idea that this world and the next are intertwined is a common theme of eschatological literature. ‘Abbadan, in Khuzistan, is called one of the two ‘open gates of Paradise’ in a hadith, while Qayrawan was considered to have a sacred character, and the association of Medina with hell as well as heaven was common in the eschatological literature. Both Bab al-Abwab and Valashkird were frontier fortresses, famous for their role in jihad, which explains their association with Paradise, the same may be true of the more local reference to Erzurum, on the frontier with both Georgia to the east and the Christian Kingdom of Trebizond to its north. Similarly, Antioch and Constantinople, cities associated with unbelief, are placed in hell. The Siraj al-Qulub thus reflects a general tendency in Muslim eschatological literature to associate certain earthly places with heaven and hell, but gives it a local twist by introducing Anatolian localities and Rum itself. Promoting a view of Muslim Rum as intertwined with heaven served to stress the region’s Islamic character and define it in opposition to hellish infidel lands such as Constantinople.

The interest of these Anatolian texts in heaven and hell is also reminiscent of the approach of some of the eighth-century hadith collectors interested in eschatology, who, as Christian Lange has pointed out, were often active in frontier areas of the dār al-islām, ‘places where the interaction with the eschatological thought of other religious communities may have been more open-ended, while

53 The Qiban of the text is hard to identify; it might be an error for Qitban, near Aden, perhaps playing on the similarity between Aden and Eden, which are identical in Arabic script; for Qali as an abbreviation of Qaliqala, the Arabic name for Erzurum, see Zakariyya b. Mahmud b. Muhammad al-Qazwini, Athar al-Bilad wa-Akhbar al-Ibad (Beirut, 1998), 551.
54 Siraj al-Qulub, Kütahya, Vahid Ali Paşa Kütüphanesi, MS 1415, fols 40a–b.
57 On Bab al-Abwab as a centre of jihad see al-Qazwini, Athar al-Bilad wa-Akhbar al-Ibad, vol. 5, 383 s.v. Walāshgird. There are several locations bearing this name, the most relevant to us being probably the Valashgird, described as ‘a place in the region of Balkh where the Muslims undertook raids; it is a frontier fortress (ṭaghr)’. However, there is also a Valashgird near Akhlat in Anatolia, and it is possible that the Siraj al-Qulub reflects an attempt to transfer the fame of the former Valashgird to the latter. On Anatolian Valashgird see also Hamdallah Mustawfi, Nuzhat al-Qulub, 155.
58 Lange, Paradise and Hell, 255.
the frontier situation made war, death and the afterlife a daily preoccupation.\textsuperscript{59} Themes of eschatology and conversion mingle in the two related tales of Cümcüme Sultan and Kesikbaş, which became popular in Anatolia from the fourteenth century. The legend of Cümcüme was widely read across the Muslim world from the thirteenth century onwards, circulating in Arabic, Persian and, at least from the fourteenth century, Turkish versions.\textsuperscript{60} Although the earliest extant version of the text is attributed to 'Attar, it has been argued that it ultimately derives from a Central Asian version that may date back to pre-Islamic times.\textsuperscript{61} The tale recounts how one day Jesus came across a skull, which came back to life. This skull started to talk, and related how when alive he had been a powerful infidel king who possessed great wealth and was called Cümcüme Sultan. He suddenly died and the Angel of Death came to take his soul, and Munkar and Nakir interrogated him about his faith. As an unbeliever, the king was condemned to hell, which the skull then graphically describes. Then the skull was allowed by God to emerge from hell and return to earth, where, after the encounter with Jesus and the restoration of life, the newly embodied skull converts to Islam and lives out his days as a Muslim.\textsuperscript{62}

The oldest securely dated Turkish version of the text was composed in Eastern Turkish by Hüsam Katib in 770/1368, and we know that there was a copy in the Uighur script in the library of the sixteenth-century Crimean Khan Sahib Giray. Fuad Köprüli assumed that the original was composed under or even for the Golden Horde rulers, who were Sahib Giray’s ancestors.\textsuperscript{63} The work also circulated in an Anatolian Turkish version by a poet named Hasan (which still exhibits Eastern dialect features), which has been published by F. Tansel.\textsuperscript{64} Although the work is undated, the presence of the mixed Eastern and Anatolian language is characteristic of fourteenth-century texts.\textsuperscript{65} Thus the tale of Cümcüme Sultan was

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 80.


\textsuperscript{63} Köprüli, Early Mystics, 185, n. 20.


one of those texts that circulated in various versions, both prose and verse, on both sides of the Black Sea, in the Golden Horde as well as Anatolia, in this period.

A closely related story also circulated in both Anatolian and Eastern Turkish variants, known as the Kesikbaş Destanı or ‘Tale of the severed head’. The author identifies himself as Kirdeci Ali, a devotee of Mawlana (Mevlana kulı) from Konya, and the same name is found in some (but not all) of the Eastern Turkish manuscripts, which do, however, all allude to the author’s Mevlevism.66 As with so many of these authors of popular literature, we know nothing of Kirdeci Ali from other sources, and his dates are guesswork based on linguistic evidence; the consensus view is that he wrote in the fourteenth or at any rate no later than the early fifteenth century. In the Kesikbaş Destanı, the severed head of a believer meets ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, not Jesus. The head describes how he was severed from his body by a demon (dev) who also killed his son and seized his wife. ‘Ali then goes on a journey to the underworld in search of the infidel demon, whom he finds has not just captured the head’s wife, but also 500 Sunni Muslim ghazis. Deciding it would be cowardice to confront the sleeping demon, the heroic ‘Ali wakes it up, ‘Ali declaring to it his intention to kill it. The demon replies:

‘I will eat you, I will not leave a Sunni Muslim in the world,
I will rid the world of your name, I will leave neither learned man nor qadi
I will go out and destroy your mosque, and tear down your home leaving it deserted
I will leave neither you nor your Prophet, I will destroy the towns of Mecca and Medina.’67

Naturally, ‘Ali kills the demon, rescues the captive Muslims, restores the severed head to life and gives him back his wife, and also resurrects the child eaten by the demon. With the victory of what is described as ‘Ali’s ghaza against unbelief the story concludes. The tales of Cümçümë and Kesikbaş thus use eschatological legends to promote conversion and the battle against the unbelievers. Perhaps equally telling of the religious environment is the use of Sunni as a synonym for Muslim, a tendency that can also be identified in Abu Bakr Rumi’s Qalandarnama.68 This intra-Muslim sectarian antagonism can also be identified as a component of some texts that ostensibly focus on the battle against unbelief.

**THE BATTLE AGAINST UNBELIEF**

Similar themes were adopted in different forms in the extensive Turkish-language verse literature that targeted unbelief and unbelievers and urged the audience to

---
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abandon ‘idol-worship’. The earliest example of this trend is Gülşehri’s Mantiku’t-Tayr, his adaptation of ‘Attar composed in the early years of the fourteenth century. ‘Attar’s original presents an allegory of the journey of the soul toward divine union through its narrative of the quest of the birds for the mysterious Simurgh bird. In Gülşehri’s adaptation, material is rearranged and added to emphasise themes of conversion, the battle against unbelief and the destruction of unbelievers’ idols. For instance, in the introductory parts of the poem, in the conventional section dealing with praise of the Prophet that tends to preface almost all mathnawis in Persian and Turkish, Gülşehri inserts a long passage dealing with the conversion of Safwan b. Umayya.69 Safwan had been one of the Prophet’s most vehement opponents, a vigorous defender of idol-worship and pagan belief. When Muhammad started destroying the idols of Mecca, Safwan set out to kill him; but when he finally saw Muhammad for the first time, Safwan was immediately enraptured by his appearance and recognised him as the true Prophet. Although Muhammad’s uncle, the notorious Abu Lahab, who died an infidel, tried to persuade his former ally Safwan that the Prophet was but a sorcerer, Safwan remained resolute:

Trembling, [Safwan] entered the Prophet’s presence, declaring, ‘Oh messenger of God, I have made a mistake. Unknowingly, I came to hunt you, but I became your prey; I do not have the strength to go [from you].’

He bowed his head, saying, ‘I believe in you and your religion.’

Mustafa said, ‘Go, stay in your land, bring faith in me into your heart. When the way of being a Muslim is secured, then believers will defeat infidels in this game.

Then the chief who becomes a Muslim will become in faith one of the people of belief.

You will be the one who arranges the way of holy war [gaza], go to your native land and await us!’70

The passage concludes by mentioning the glories of paradise, which are ‘the reward of those who do good works’ (ni’ma ajr al-āmilin, Q. 3:136, 29:58). The narrative of Safwan’s conversion is in fact the second longest story in Gülşehri’s Mantiku’t-Tayr, and its positioning right at the start of the poem suggests its importance. It is also interesting that the role of the converted infidel in waging ghaza, holy war, is mentioned; as Yıldız points out, these themes must have had an obvious relevance in contemporary Anatolia.71

70 Gülşehri, Mantiku’t-Tayr, I, 32–3, ll. 211–17.
Gülşehirî’s narrative then leads immediately on to another conversion-related story, the longest in both ‘Attar’s poem and the Turkish translation, the story of Shaykh San’an and his love for a Christian girl. Although the story is present in ‘Attar, Gülşehirî asserts that in fact his source is an unreadably corrupt text, which he has rewritten to allow its beauty to be appreciated. While ‘Attar’s story describes how shaykh San’an (probably based on the historical figure of the famous muḥaddith ‘Abd al-Razzaq al-San’ani, d. 211/827) is driven mad by his love for the Christian girl, Gülşehirî adapts the story to emphasise the conversion theme and to explicitly situate the story against an Anatolian backdrop, which is absent from ‘Attar. In Gülşehirî’s version, the learned shaykh falls in love not just with any old Christian girl, but a Rumi one, of whom he has a vision while in Mecca. He travels to Rum, where, besotted with the girl, he himself converts to Christianity, abandoning his mystic’s cloak (khirqa) and burning his Qur’ān. Horrified, Shaykh San’an’s disciples retreat to a cave to devote themselves to prayer, to which God ultimately responds. He restores the shaykh to his senses, and the latter renounces his apostasy and returns to Islam. At the end of the story, even the Rumi Christian herself has a deathbed conversion to Islam before Shaykh San’an:

She uttered the shahāda before the shaykh, the shaykh lay her on his knees for some time.  
God gave the Christian girl faith, she prostrated herself before God and died  
The shaykh and his disciples all wept in grief at this strange affair  
Together they said their prayers and understood the faithlessness of the world  
When they had arranged everything they placed her in the grave and departed…

When her family learned this secret, seventy houses all became Muslim  
A Muslim became an infidel one day so that a girl would suddenly become a Muslim.  
A great light descended upon her grave for the All-Munificent had mercy upon this girl.

Thus ultimately the Christian girl’s bewitchment of Shaykh San’an is seen as part of a divine plan that leads to her own conversion and that of her people, and the extension of God’s mercy upon these erstwhile infidels. In this instance, the explicitly Rumi/Anatolian backdrop that Gülşehirî gave the story can only have reinforced its message to his audience: while infidels may abound in the land of Rum, their conversion was inevitable.

73 Ibid., 110–33, ll. 748–53. See Chapter 4, p. 00.  
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In Gülşehri’s narrative, the battle against kufr only forms one part of a broader adaptation and rewriting of ‘Attar’s Sufi allegory, which, as discussed in Chapter 3, also focuses on futuwwa. However, Sufis elsewhere in Anatolia were evidently preoccupied by kufr. This is suggested by an anonymous Persian treatise copied in 730/1330, possibly in Tire in the Aydınlı beylik, the Jihadnama. This work is included in a collection of various Sufi treatises, including works by Najm al-Din Kubra and Shihab al-Din Suhrawardı maqtil. The text conveys the Sufi interest in al-jihād al-akbar, the greater jihad against the self, but it is also deeply concerned with the battle against kufr and turning to Islam. Here kufr is depicted as immoral behaviour, but the fact that the turn to the Sufi life is depicted in terms redolent of an infidel’s conversion to Islam is strongly suggestive of both the Sufis’ view of themselves and the attitudes of the age.

A concern with kufr can also be observed in numerous other poetic works of the period. One example of this is the poem Yusuf u Züleyha by Şeyyad Hamza, an early fourteenth-century poet from Akşehir. This is the most famous of the several poems dealing with the story of Joseph that circulated in fourteenth-century Anatolia. The story, with its tale of Joseph’s vanquishing of the idols and conversion of the beautiful infidel princess Zulaykha, has appealed to numerous Muslim communities and is known in versions in every major Islamic language. Yet Şeyyad Hamza adds the occasional additional detail to reinforce the message to his audience: Zulaykha’s father, the infidel Pharaoh, for instance, is explicitly (if ahistorically) described as a Christian who ‘wasted his life for nothing at all’ in worshipping the cross.

The most striking demonstration of this growing popularity of these anti-Christian themes in popular texts is the emergence of a literature specifically devoted to glorifying holy war and conversion of infidels/Christians to Islam. One such work was the Hamzaname, the epic of the Prophet’s uncle Hamza b. ‘Abdallah, who distinguished himself in battle against the Jews and polytheists. Hamza had originally been a staunch opponent of Islam, but on his conversion he became one of its doughtiest champions. Epics based around his legendary exploits, including his battles in Rum, India and other such frontier regions, became popular across the Muslim world, but had an obvious relevance in particular to areas undergoing processes of conversion and Islamisation, and were certainly circulating in Anatolia. Ahmad of Niğde tells us of the ‘invented fables’

75 Jihadnama, Süleymaniye, MS Ayasofya 4819, fols 42a–55b.
77 On Hamza and the epic cycle see G. Meredith-Owens, ‘Hamza b. ‘Abdallāh’, EI².
that were attached to Hamza b. ‘Abd al-Muttalib and ‘Ali b. Abi Talib, which were so popular in his hometown that ‘if the master of this town of ours, the lord Badr al-Din, the divine imam, may God perpetuate his virtue, were to deny the truth of a single line of these lies before the ordinary people, the ignorant ones would consider trying to kill him licit’. Ibn Taymiyya, writing in the same period, also refers to the popularity of tales of Hamza’s battles (maghāzi) among the Turkmen. Although libraries in Turkey contain a enormous number of manuscripts of Turkish Hamzanames, few are earlier than the eighteenth century and no single complete copy survives of this vast and as yet largely unstudied work. The earliest Anatolian author attributed with a Hamzana, in this case in twenty-four volumes, is Hamzavi (d.815/1412–13), brother of the more famous Ahmedi, but it is far from certain whether any of the surviving texts is actually by him. Thus although it is clear from Ahmad of Niğde’s evidence that this text was popular in Mongol Anatolia, we do not have a reliable text from the period that we can examine. Themes of holy war, the battle against unbelief and the presence of crypto-Christians are also present in the well-known Turkish prose epics the Battalname and the Danışmendname, although the uncertainty of their dates, as well as the fact that they are already well known, makes it unnecessary to discuss them here.

We are on somewhat surer ground with the tales of the exploits of ‘Ali b. Abi Talib referred to by Ahmad of Niğde, which served a similar function. A whole genre of works called Cenkname, books of ‘Ali’s battles, circulated widely in Anatolia. If we discount the extremely dubious if not impossible dating of the Salsalname to the mid-thirteenth century, the earliest such work in Anatolia that we can date with some precision is in Persian, not in Turkish. This is the ‘Alinama of an eleventh-century Khurasani poet named Rabi’, which was copied, probably in Konya, most likely in 702/1302, by a certain Muhammad Mahmud b. Mas‘ud al-muqaddam al-Tustari, and is today preserved in a unique manuscript.

79 Ibn Taymiyya, Minhaj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyya fi Naqd Kalam al-Shi‘a wa’l-Qadariyya (Cairo, 1321), IV, 12: yazunu ta‘ifa min al-turkmān anna Hamza lahu maghāzin ’azīma wa yanqulūnūhā baynahum.
80 Lutfi Sezen, Halk Edebiyatında Hamzanameler (Ankara, 1991), 27 claims to have examined seventy-two different Hamzana manuscripts in Turkish libraries. See also Dedes, Battalname, vol. I, 77–8.
81 For the dates, see Chapter 4, pp. 153–4; also on the battle against unbelief in these texts, see Mélikoff, La Geste, I, 139–40, 167–70; Küçükhuseyin, Selbst- und Fremdwahrnemung, 293–9.
82 See the discussion in Chapter 4.
83 The colophon reads simply Thursday 7 Ramadan, which must correspond to either 702 or 795 hijri (see Rabi’, ‘Ali-nama: Manzuma-yi Kahan, ed. Rida Bayat and Abu‘l-Fadl Ghulami (Tehran, 2010), introduction, 40). However, the script would seem to suggest the earlier date.
in the Mevlana Museum in Konya as MS 2562. The focus of Rabi’s *Alinama* is on the Battle of Siffin; unbelievers feature relatively rarely, although Rumis (i.e. Byzantines) are identified as the allies of ‘Ali’s enemy Mu‘awiya, with whom they have made a compact ‘to destroy Islam’. Interestingly, the passage describing the Rumis’ alliance with Mu‘awiya, which originally occurs roughly in the middle of the text, is repeated almost word for word right at its end.

\[\text{[Mu‘awiya] sent men to Rum to seek help from that accursed, low infidel...} \]
\[\text{When [Mu‘awiya] son of Sufiyan sought help from the Rumis,} \]
\[\text{The Christians destroyed forty Muslim towns by their power} \]
\[\text{Every town was adorned, they gave over all the possessions to pillage} \]
\[\text{When the lion of God [‘Ali] heard of this, he sprang up from his place like flashing lightning.} \]
\[\text{With so many horsemen of the faith, he emptied the land of those Rumis.} \]

The repetition of this passage at the end of the poem does not sit easily with its narrative contents. The preceding passage describes ‘Ali’s preaching in Kufa after Siffin, and his installation of perfect Islamic rule (*hami kard abad bunyad-i din*); the topic of his death is avoided entirely, although the text following the Rumi passage briefly alludes to his great victories over the Kharijites, the rebels who in fact killed him. It is thus probable, although impossible to prove in the absence of other manuscripts, that this awkward repetition of the Rumi passage reflects not Rabi’s original text but an interpolation by a copyist who was particularly keen on emphasising the association of the Rumis with war against Islam, with enmity to ‘Ali and thus to the true faith of Islam. It therefore seems likely to have been introduced into the text in Anatolia and suggests, perhaps, a degree of discomfort felt by the copyist – most likely a migrant from Iran given his nisba – at the predominantly Sunni environment in which he found himself. Certainly the Ilkhans, especially around the beginning of the fourteenth century when this text was copied, showed an increasing interest in experimenting with Shiism as a mains of supporting dynastic legitimacy, which may form another part of the background to this manuscript’s copying.

84 A facsimile has been published in addition to the edition: *Alî-nama (Manzuma-yi Kuhan), suruda bih sal 482 hijri az surâyandayi mutakhllus bih Rabi*, introduced by Muhammad Rida Shaf‘i Kadkani and Mahmud Umidsalar (Tehran 1388).
86 Ibid., ll. 11192–8.
87 Ibid., l. 11188.
88 Ibid., ll. 11201–3.
These sectarian tensions are also reflected in the religious literature of the Ilkhanid period. A compilation of predominantly Sufi texts made, possibly in Ankara, in 726–7/1327 by an copyist of Akhlati origins, ‘Ali b. Dustkhuda, whom we encountered in Chapter 2 (p. 103), contains two treatises that are intended to defend Sunni beliefs, both written in Persian – which suggests they were aimed at a wider audience than religious scholars.\(^90\) The first, the ‘Aqayid-i Abl-i Sunna, was compiled by an author who visited Anatolia and professed to be horrified at the waywardness of its people and their inclination towards astrology (‘ilm-i nujūm); however, the target of his treatise is predominantly Mu‘tazili doctrines such as the createdness of the Qur’an.\(^91\) Given the common association of Mu‘tazilism with Shiism, it is possible that the latter is his real target. The second short treatise, the ‘Itiqad-i Abl-i Sunnat wa Jama‘at,\(^92\) also singles out for attack the beliefs of the Mu‘tazila and the rawāfid, the common term given to Shiites by their enemies.\(^93\)

Further indications of these religious tensions come from a verse work composed in 763/1362 in Kastamonu by the poet Şâdi Meddah, possibly at the Candarid court. His Turkish Maktel-i Hüseyin is in some ways comparable with the ‘Alinama. The poem takes as its theme the Umayyad Caliph Yazid’s cruel suppression of the ‘Alids. The poem is in many ways a diatribe against unbelief, for the audience is repeated told that Yazid is lower than an infidel, a Jew or a Christian for his treatment of the Prophet’s family: \(^94\) at one point he is explicitly accused of apostasy when the Imam Zayn al-’Abidin addresses him saying, ‘You learned faith and religion from our grandfather [the Prophet Muhammad]; then you apostatised and became opposed.’\(^95\) Moreover, the allies of the ‘Alids are explicitly described as martial heroes (pehlivan).\(^96\) Here, then, a pro-‘Alid stance also seems to have a distinctly anti-Sunni tinge. It is perhaps not coincidental that around this period Shiite doctrines can also be detected in the more popular literature. For instance, the works of Kaygusuz Abdal, a Sufi poet who wrote in Turkish and probably lived in the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, refer

\(^90\) Süleymanîye, MS Fatih 4426.
\(^91\) Süleymanîye, MS Fatih 4426, fols 182b–192b.
\(^92\) Süleymanîye, MS Fatih 4426, fols 291a–297b.
\(^93\) Süleymanîye, MS Fatih 4426, fols 296b, 297a.
\(^95\) Şâdi Meddah, Maktel-i Hüseyin, p. 460, l. 3080.
\(^96\) Ibid., p. 64, l. 179, p. 80, l. 297, p. 82, l. 311, p. 100 l. 437, etc.
to the Shiite doctrines of the Twelve Imams and *tabarra*, dissociation from ‘Ali’s enemies. It is true that such beliefs could exist in the broad confines of Sunnism in this period, but the polemical rhetoric employed in both literary and religious works suggests an atmosphere of sectarian tension. The early history of Shiism in Anatolia cannot at present be traced with any certainty, but it seems that something more than a generally pro-‘Alid stratum or *tashayyu* _hasan_ existed. The ambiguities of the situation are reflected in the genealogical chart (_shajara_) of an Akhi family of Iranian origins from Ankara, which reached its present form in around the mid-fourteenth century. Here the Four Rightly Guided Caliphs are briefly acknowledged, but much more attention is devoted to ‘Ali, his descendants and specifically the Twelve Imams. As Mélikoff notes, the _shajara_ is a Shiite document and the Akhi family is a Shiite family, whose ancestors are explicitly identified as such, but after their migration to Anatolia they are no longer described as Shiites. This is perhaps testimony less to a process of Sunniitisation than of sectarian tension, as suggested by our texts, whereby a Shiite identity remained important but is less publicly acknowledged.

However, pro-‘Alid literature by no means necessarily reflects Shiite sympathies, as can be seen if we consider the Turkish _Cenknames_, the earliest of which can be dated with any probability to the fourteenth century, although further work is needed to confirm this. Whereas the Persian _Alinama_ is based loosely around broadly historical events, the Turkish _Cenknames_ deal with entirely legendary battles. One of the earliest _Cenname_ writers, if we accept the dating given by Ottoman sources, was Tursun Fakih, who is said by the fifteenth-century historian Aşık Paşazade to have served the Ottomans in the later thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Aşık Paşazade recounts how Tursun Fakih was appointed imam of the frontier town of Karacahisar after its conquest by Osman Gazi in 699/1299–1300:

100 Ibid., 268.
When [Osman] captured Karahisar, its houses were empty, and many people came from the province of Germiyan, asking Osman Gazi for houses. Osman Gazi gave the incomers empty houses and in a short time the town’s houses were filled and the town flourished. They made the churches into mosques and built a market. And the townspeople agreed that they should perform the Friday prayer and ask for a qadi. There was a holy man called Tursun Fakih who was prayer leader [imam] to these people.\textsuperscript{103}

In Aşık Paşazade’s narrative, Tursun Fakih’s appointment is emblematic of Osman’s declaration of independence. When Tursun asks for a decree from the Seljuq authorising his appointment, Osman replies by asserting that

‘I have taken this town with my own sword; your sultan has nothing to do with it that I should seek permission from him. God who gave him the sultanate has given me the khanate through holy war [\textit{gaza}] . . . If he says he is from the House of Seljuq, [then] I myself am the son of Gök Alp [a legendary Turkish hero]. If he says he came to this land before me, my ancestor Sulayman Shah in fact came before him.’\textsuperscript{104}

Tursun Fakih accepts Osman’s arguments and proclaims the \textit{khutba} in his name, signifying the assertion of sovereignty.

Despite the importance of Tursun Fakih in the Ottoman historical imagination, as well as to modern nationalist scholars such as Köprülü, a measure of scepticism must be applied to his authorship of the four poems attributed to him. These are a \textit{Cenkname} on the Prophet and ‘Ali’s battles (referred to variously as the \textit{Gazavat-i Resulallah} and the \textit{Kissa-i Mukaffâ}), the account of ‘Ali’s wars against infidels in the Indian Ocean (the \textit{Kissa-i Umman} or \textit{Cumhurname}) and a poem on the heroic deeds of ‘Ali’s son Muhammad Hanafi. A further short \textit{mathnawi} deals with the Prophet’s struggle with the unbeliever Abu Jahl, one of his principal Qurashi opponents.\textsuperscript{105} While the closing lines of the poems refer to Tursun Fakih’s authorship (except in the case of the \textit{Cumhurname}), it is entirely possible the attribution was made to enhance their reputation and circulation, a suspicion that is strengthened by the fact Tursun Fakih is not mentioned in two of the four manuscripts of the \textit{Cumhurname}.\textsuperscript{106} The \textit{Cumhurname} manuscripts are also very varied in length, one having 1,111 verses, another 1,366 and one 646 verses.\textsuperscript{107} The significant textual variants may suggest a corpus of orally transmitted texts that later were attached to the name of Tursun Fakih, although caution is


\textsuperscript{104} Ibid., 339–40.

\textsuperscript{105} Çelebioğlu, \textit{Türk Edebiyat’ında Mesnevi}, 72–6, 102.


\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., 39–40.
necessary on this point. Substantial textual differences may also exist in works that are thought to have been circulated pre-eminently in manuscript form.  

Be this as it may, the works attributed to Tursun Fakih reflect a preoccupation with the wars of ‘Ali (and, to a lesser extent Muhammad) that the testimony of Ahmad of Niğde allows us to characterise as typical of the early fourteenth century, and which certainly may have circulated in the early Ottoman territories. The central theme of all these stories is the battles of the believers, led by ‘Ali, against the infidel, and the defeat and conversion to Islam of the latter. The works are also rich in exotic, legendary motifs such as talking animals. For example, in the Kissa-i Mukaffa the anti-hero, the pagan Muqaffa’, summons his lion to fight against Ali, the lion of God. ‘Ali, however, takes both Muqaffa’ and his lion captive and brings them before the Prophet:

‘Ali the friend of God took the lion and the man and brought them before the Prophet
They both stood before the Prophet, who cried out to the lion,
‘Who am I oh lion, say! Confess my prophethood!’
God gave the lion a fluent tongue, he said right away just like a human,
‘You are the Prophet and the Beloved of God, Oh Muhammad b. ‘Abdallah.’
The Prophet said, ‘Oh lion, were you not ashamed? Did you not think of God’s fire?
You attack ‘Ali, that cousin of mine who is God’s friend.
He is God’s lion, you are just a mountain dog! You did not show reverence, uncouth beast.’
The lion immediately put his head on the floor and begged the Prophet’s forgiveness.
Muqaffa’ heard that speech and was greatly astonished.
He said, ‘This lion was in the mountains, I found him abandoned in his mother’s nest.
I fed him till today. Oh Muhammad, how did he know you?’

Predictably, Muqaffa’ is so impressed by the lion’s recognition of the Prophethood of Muhammad that he too converts to Islam, while his people also embrace the true faith on his death.

Similar themes are covered in the narrative poems of Beypazarlı Maazoğlu Hasan, who has also been dated to the fourteenth century. One of these, treating ‘Ali b.

111 As is almost always the case with fourteenth-century Old Anatolian Turkish verse, the manuscript is of much later date, perhaps eighteenth or nineteenth century.
Abi Talib’s conquest of the ‘Castle of the Chains’ (Kal’e-i Selasil) in Iraq, and another detailing with his assault on the castle of Cenadil,\textsuperscript{112} are preserved in the same manuscript as Tursun Fakih’s \textit{Kıssa-i Mukaffa} (Istanbul Millet Library, MS Ali Emiri Manzum 1222). The language and orthography of Maazoğlu’s works suggest an early date of composition. In both numerous infidels are killed, while others accept the true faith, but there are fewer exotic elements than in Tursun Fakih’s works. In the account of Selasil, the Muslims are portrayed as threatened by the unbelieving idol-worshipping king of Iraq, while the ‘Muslims’ are consistently identified as Sunnis. The emphasis on the role of ‘Ali thus has no Shiite implications:

The three hundred thousand strong Sunni army advanced; when the unbelievers saw them they fell to pieces [lit. melted]  
Unbeliever and believer mixed [in the fighting] at that time; the Sunnis do not give quarter to the unbelievers!  
Mustafa [Muhammad] cried out, ‘Destroy these unbelievers,  
Give them no quarter, destroy them!’ The Prophet’s friends heard him and killed thirty thousand unbelievers…\textsuperscript{113}

The theme of conversion is as well as victory over unbelievers is emphasised in Maazoğlu’s \textit{Cenadil Kalesi}. The action is placed in the lifetime of the Prophet, but military operations are directed by ‘Ali; eventually the conquest of the castle is achieved by the aid of the angel Gabriel. At the end of the poem, Maazoğlu recounts how

‘Ali inspired such awe that all the unbelievers lost their minds and fell to the ground.  
When they heard ‘Ali’s shout, they said in their hearts seven times over ‘it is wonderful’.  
‘Ali called out, saying, ‘Come to the faith! Do not begrudge saying the praises of Mustafa [Muhammad]  
If not I’ll turn you upside down, I’ll send the lot of you to Hell.’  
A hundred thousand infidel soldiers all sought safe conduct, they decided to enter the faith.  
Falling to their knees all became Muslim, before ‘Ali they entered into belief  
They opened the gate of the castle completely, the imam [‘Ali] entered accompanied by three thousand warriors of the faith.\textsuperscript{114}

\textsuperscript{112} On Maazoğlu see Çelebioğlu, \textit{Türk Edebiyatı’nda Mesnevi}, 86–7.  
\textsuperscript{114} Millet Library, Ali Emiri Manzum 1222, fol. 33a:  
Heybetinden ‘Ali’niñ kâfir kamû’/aḵ gîdüp yere düşdiler ‘amû  
‘Ali’niñ naɾsûn işîdiler/yêli kat göñûldê tâşûn itdîler  
‘Ali çagûrdî dîdî geliñû dine/Muṣṭafâ tahammûde ṭutmañî kîne
It seems, as far as can be judged from our current state of knowledge, that the works of Tursun Fakih and Maazoğlu Hasan represent original Anatolian compositions, rather than adaptations of popular Arabic narratives, although further research may alter this view. These poems, which must have been publicly performed by professional storytellers, served a ritual function by ‘invoking the past to endow the present with meaning’. Gottfried Hagen regards such works as a form of epic, writing that, ‘The performance of pseudo-historical epics, the chronicles, and hagiographies, on the other hand, clearly advocates a specific ideology, perceived as their form of Islam, against an enemy who does not have a share in it.’ Hagen notes that in this Anatolian epic literature centralised power is absent or else depicted negatively, and argues that this was a result of the political fragmentation of Anatolia in the period. It is true that Anatolian literature lacks a royal epic such as the Shahnama and the heroes are largely figures from early Islam, or, from the fourteenth century, holy men (awliyā’). One exception is the famous Book of Dede Korkut, the tales based around the eponymous hero’s exploits in north-eastern Anatolia, which may have reached its current form at the Aqquyunlu court in the fifteenth century. It is also possible that an epic cycle devoted to the Seljuq family may have existed, for the poet Qani’i who served Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw II refers to his own massive composition, and there is evidence for other Saljuqnamas devoted to the deeds of the dynasty that are now lost to us. The limited circulation and loss of these texts indicates they had little purchase on the popular imagination, and this may reflect not just the political but also the religious background. The ‘Alinama singles out Firdawsi’s Shahnama as exactly the sort of work one should avoid reading, claiming it was forged by the Karramites to divert people from the true faith. Rabi’ writes:

If you want more news of heroes [mardān] read the story of the battle of Siffin
Do not boast of reading the Shahnama, but look at the deeds of the noble.
Thus don’t speak of Rustam and Tus, don’t run after these chanters of vain tales.

Yoğsça altın üstine dönürem/kamuñuzı Sengiye gönderem
Yüz bi'n er käfir kamu aman diler/dine gelmege dışın biler
Tız çöküp kamu Müslüman old[lar]/‘Ali onünde imâna geldiler
Ağdilâr kal'e kapusn tâmâm/iç bi'n er gaziyle girdi imâm.
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119 Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, The Seljuks of Anatolia: Their History and Culture according to Local Muslim Sources, trans. Gary Leiser (Salt Lake City, 1992), 15–21.
Reading the pagan book [mugh-nāma] is no virtue, but reading the book of ‘Ali [‘Ali-nāma] is pride and glory
Desire not the way of heroes of old [pahlawānīn], but turn your face from the road of unbelief [bi-dīn]...120

The heroic age in fourteenth-century Anatolia was thus not so much one of the Turkish heroes of Dede Korkut, but of the family of the Prophet and particular ‘Ali and his progeny, who led the battle against the ever-present unbelief. Such poems would have been publicly declaimed, as the terms Meddah and Şeyyad attached to two of our authors suggest; a şeyyad had been defined as ‘a public teller of tales who spoke or narrated in a loud voice’,121 while a meddah also means a public storyteller.122 Indeed, Şeyyad Hamza’s poem has been described as ‘a Turkish morality play’ and translated in dramatic dialogue form.123 Similarly, we can suppose that the simple verses of poets such as Tursun Fakih, Maazoğlu Hasan and Şadi Meddah were intended for public performance,124 to which the dialogue format of the various Siraj al-Qulub texts would also have lent themselves equally well. With the exception of Şadi Meddah’s Maktel-i Hüseyn, there is no evidence for court patronage of any of these works. The public performance of such works with their consistently anti-Christian tone, and the obsession with conversion and holy war they exhibit, must have combined to make life as a Christian among Muslim neighbours increasingly uncomfortable. The adaptations of these tales to an Anatolian background must have made the argument yet more pointed. At the same time, the low bar set on the requirements for conversion, as demonstrated by the Siraj al-Qulub texts, may have made the simple step of embracing Islam an increasingly attractive option to many. Yet Christians were not the sole target. In addition to the anti-Christian tenor, an increasingly sectarian one can be identified too.125 In Maazoğlu Hasan’s work and Kirdeci Ali’s the Muslims are consistently qualified as Sunnis; in contrast, in the Maktel-i Hüseyin, the Sunni Muslims are the allies of the despicable Yazid. The growth of the heroic cult of ‘Ali, revered by all Muslims, did not prevent the tone of sectarian tension that is increasingly evident in these works.

The texts’ lauding of violence against unbelievers and promotion of the conversion of the infidel might be read as reflecting a ghazi mentality, as has
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121 The Story of Joseph, trans Hickman, 7.
122 For a discussion of the term meddah see Dedes, Battalname, vol. 1, 54–61.
123 The Story of Joseph, trans Hickman, 7.
124 On the public performance of poetry, drawing almost entirely on post-sixteenth-century evidence owing to the lack of any for earlier periods, see Dedes, Battalname, vol. 1, 61–8.
125 Cf. Trépanier, Foodways and Daily Life, 120.
famously (if controversially) been associated with the early Ottoman state. However, questions of conversion and the battle against *kufr* remained a central concern of intellectuals in the Ilkhanid heartland of central Anatolia, such as Gülşehri. *Ghaza*, then, was not a specifically or even largely Ottoman concern, but rather was part of a broader phenomenon, enthusiastically espoused by Sufis. This should not surprise us. The hagiographical sources repeatedly emphasise the role of Sufis in conversion, and although this may be a topos, an indication to the contrary comes in some of the dicta of the Anatolian Qalandar – and associate of Ghazan – Baraq Baba that have come down to us. These Qipchaq Turkish statements were elaborated with a Persian commentary in 756/1355 by a certain Qutb al-'Alawi, who took Baraq’s terse and obscure proclamations and interpreted them with reference to classics such as the *Shahnama*, Rumi, the Qur‘an and hadith. Yet some of Baraq’s utterances also suggest not simply a Sufi piety but also an anti-Christian agenda. He declares, ‘Strengthen your religion, soothe your donkey, kill the rulers of Istanbul and Trebizond, throw them into the sea, put their youths in the army. Blessings upon Muhammad.’ Like the epics discussed here, such dicta fostered a sense of a distinct Muslim identity defined against unbelief, and both contributed to and are products of the Islamisation of Anatolia more generally rather than a particular frontier region.


Apocalyptic Thought and the Political Elite

Since the beginnings of Islam, parts of the Muslim community had been convinced that the end of the world was imminent, including, in all likelihood, the Prophet himself, to whom hadith attribute the statement that his followers would themselves witness it. Such apocalyptic expectations were equally prevalent in medieval Anatolia. The thirteenth-century Syriac chronicler Bar Hebraeus recounts how in 1186 the Seljuq sultan Kılıç Arslan II sought to escape from the predicted end:

All the astronomers predicted that a universal flood and a mighty whirlwind would take place in the world, and that all mankind would perish, even like that which took place in the days of Noah, through the approach of the Sign of the Zodiac of the Fishes, and that all the waters would swallow up the whole earth. Now Kelej Arslan, the Sultan of Iconium [Konya], more than any man believed this silly talk. And he spent large sums of money wastefully, and made excavations in the ground, and built strong houses in the depths thereof.2

The failure of the astrologers’ prediction on this occasion does not seem to have reduced their popularity in the long run. Apocalyptic and astrological interests are evident from some our earliest works from Anatolia. Hubaysh-i Tiflisi, who wrote a work on astrology for Kılıç Arslan II, referred to visions of the Antichrist (dajjāl) in his book on oneiromancy, Kamil al-Ta’bir, suggesting that such apocalyptic dreams were widespread.3 Tiflisi also composed a Malhamat Daniyal,4 an account

1 David Cook, Studies in Muslim Apocalyptic (Princeton, 2002), 4.
3 Tiflisi interprets dreams of the antichrist (dajjāl) as symbolising āfina, strife: Kamal al-Din Abu’l-Fadl Hubaysh-i Tiflisi, Kamil al-Ta’bir-i Tiflisi, ed. Sayyid Husayn Radawi Buqra ‘i (Tehran, 1388), 170.
4 Süleymaniye, MS Ayasofya 2706.
of the apocalyptic prophecies of the Prophet Daniel. Such works circulated amongst both Muslims and Christians, as the Lombard envoy to Constantinople, Liudprand of Cremona, remarked as early as the tenth century, and perhaps to some degree reflect the tensions of a frontier society. Yet apocalypticism was not restricted to Anatolia, or Islam. Several Jewish Messiahs emerged in the twelfth century proclaiming the imminent end, while both Shiite and Sunni communities across the Middle East were also prone to outbreaks of Mahdism – claims of individuals to be the messiah (mahdi) sent at the end of time. In Muslim tradition, the Mahdi will defeat the Antichrist (dajjal) in the wars at the end of time, vanquish religions other than Islam and initiate a reign of perfect justice and Islam that will precede the last hour and the resurrection of the dead (qiyaama). The Nizari Ismaili state of north-east Iran proclaimed in 559/1164 the coming of the qiyaama.6

Such apocalyptic concerns intensified during the thirteenth century. A long tradition in Muslim thought dating back to at least the mid-eighth century associated the ‘Turks’ (a term that could be generally used for any steppe people) with invasions that would be one of the portents of the Final Hour,7 and in the thirteenth century these traditions were readily associated with the Khwarazmians, and above all Mongols.8 In Syria, Ibn Talha, a religious scholar and briefly a vizier who served both the Ayyubids and the Artuqids, wrote a famous book on jafr (divination of the future) that predicted the imminent coming of the Last Hour, which seems to have been prompted by the Khwarazmian invasions.9 Ibn Talha’s text on jafr was to be massively influential, being adapted and updated by the famous and highly influential early Ottoman occultist ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Bistami (d. 858/1454) and transmitted from him into the popular Turkish piety-minded
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6 For a survey of some of these apocalyptic and mahdist tendencies in the twelfth century see Peacock, The Great Seljuk Empire, 264, 275–9.
7 Cook, Studies in Muslim Apocalyptic, 84–91.
text, the Dürr-i Meknun of Ahmed Bican (d. 870/1466). From India to Spain, thirteenth-century ‘ulama’ such as Juzjani (d. after 658/1259), al-Sulami (d. 660/1261) and al-Qurtubi (d. 671/1272) composed apocalyptic works that give a prominent role to the ‘Turks’, suggesting an intimate connection between the nomadic invasions of the period and the rise of apocalypticism.10

Nature itself seemed to confirm that the end was nigh. Islamic tradition had long associated the coming of the Mahdi with the portent of comets,11 and the thirteenth century witnessed especially intense planetary action. Halley’s Comet appeared in 1222, just as the first Mongol armies advanced through Iran,12 while in 1264 a great comet, observed in Europe, the Middle East and even China and apparently one of the brightest ever sighted, lingered in the skies for some three months, spreading consternation among many. In Europe it was held to presage disasters such as the death of Pope Urban, who sickened with its appearance and died when it disappeared.13 Chronicles also record the sighting of a comet from Egypt or Syria the following year, 1265, as well as earlier in 1202, 1205, 1223 (perhaps actually Halley’s Comet of 1222) and 1233, as well as 1285 and 1299.14 A preoccupation with this planetary activity may be reflected in the widespread astrological imagery that appears on coins and other objects produced in the thirteenth century.15 Coins struck by Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw II even contained the astrological lion and sun image, which was probably a reference to the sultan’s own horoscope as well as alluding to his sovereignty (see also Plate 11a).16

Apocalypticism could be intensely political. In Islamic tradition, the Mahdi will establish God’s law and a reign of justice as one of the final acts before the Hour, and apocalypticism could thus be used by religious and political reformers. In North Africa, the claims of Ibn Tumart (d. c. 524/1128) to be the Mahdi facilitated his establishment of the Almohad dynasty; likewise, in late fifteenth-/early sixteenth-century Anatolia and Iran, the Safavid Shah Ismail (907/
1487–930/1524) portrayed himself as a Mahdi, while similar claims circulated at the Ottoman court in the same period. The messianic self-identification of the political leader could serve to justify not only religious reform but also dynastic change. Ibn Tumart used his status as Mahdi to overthrow the Almoravid dynasty, whose religious orthodoxy he questioned, while Shah Ismail’s identification as Mahdi seems to have appealed particularly to the Turkmen that formed the backbone of the movement that swept away the Aqquyunlu, installed the Safavid dynasty and ultimately resulted in the conversion of Iran to Shiism. On a smaller scale of change, Ghazan’s accession represented a challenge to the traditional patterns of seniority among the descendants of Chinggis Khan and was contested by his relatives. As Jonathan Brack has outlined, historians such as Qashani and Rashid al-Din responded by depicting Ghazan as a mujaddid, a renewer of Islam, and Brack argues that Qashani drew on an adapted version of Najm al-Din Razi’s apocalyptic descriptions of the Mongol invasions to present a new image of the Ilkhan as Mahdi. Ultimately, Ghazan’s identification as the mujaddid-Mahdi was intended to consolidate his precarious political position.

There is also evidence that Ghazan’s messianic claims were recognised in Anatolia. In his ‘Tears of Rum’ qasida, the Anatolian Persian poet Sayf al-Din Farghani alludes to the imminent apocalyptic expectations of the return of Jesus to earth at the end of time (a common trope of Muslim apocalyptic) and the Ilkhan’s messianic status: ‘Because the descent of Jesus may occur in our age, the justice of Ghazan is for us like the awaited Mahdi.’

Mahdism is argued by the leading contemporary Turkish scholar of religion in medieval Anatolia, Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, to have been the moving force behind a whole series of rebellions that occurred in Anatolia over the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries, in particular the Baba’i revolt against the Seljuqs of 638/1240 and Shaykh Bedreddin’s revolt against the Ottomans in 819/1416. In Ocak’s view, these Mahdist revolts are intimately bound up with Shiism, and the Baba’i rebellion, named after its leader, Baba İlyas (also known as Baba Rasul), has been

---

19 Sayf al-Din Farghani, Diwan, I, 182.
seen as a crucial moment in the formation of Alevism, the branch of Shiism that accounts for around 15–20 million of modern Turkey’s population. Ocak completed his doctorate on the Baba’i rebellion at the University of Strasbourg, and the Turkish version of his thesis, which has been reprinted many times in revised and expanded form, has remained the seminal work on the subject; its perspective is indicated by its subtitle: ‘The Historical Foundation of Alevism or the Formation of Islamic-Turkish Heterodoxy in Anatolia’. According to Ocak, Baba İlyas’s claims to be the Mahdi gave the revolt its appeal to the Turkmen, who were already attracted to Shiite ideas, of which the Mahdi was a key one. Mahdism is thus inextricably linked in much contemporary scholarship on Anatolia to both a form of Shiism and to ‘popular’ forms of belief – a sort of ‘folk Islam’ in which the simple-minded nomad was likely to be convinced by the claims of a messianic figure, perhaps partly because of his enduring shamanic heritage, which demanded a direct interlocutor between God and man. As Ocak puts it:

En tenant compte des éléments shiites et des substrats chamaniques, on peut aisément comprendre la croyance en l’idée de mahdi des Turcomanes, partisans de Baba Resül, qui savait que ses prétentions seraient acceptées sans hésitation.

Assessing the beliefs of the nomads is clearly problematic, given the lack of evidence; Kafadar has argued that the Baba’is’ appeal to the nomads was based on their supposed openness to syncretism, although the evidence he presents of this is tenuous. Whatever their beliefs, the idea that the Turkmen were so dim that they would willingly accept pretty much anyone’s claim to be a Mahdi ‘without hesitation’ is problematic. Moreover, while Ocak claims antecedents for such rebellions among the Iranian revolts of the early Abbasid period in which

21 Published as Ocak, La Révolte de Baba Resul.
23 Ocak, La Révole de Baba Resul, 76, 78.
25 Kafadar, Between Two Worlds, 74. Kafadar’s evidence for the Baba’is’ ‘syncretism’ consists of Elvan’s reference to Christians mourning his father Aşık Paşa’s death (see Chapter 2, p. 112), and the identification of Elvan Çelebi as the special friend of St George reported by a sixteenth-century German traveller. The former is a common motif in hagiographies, while the latter is evidently an allusion to Elvan’s claim to an intimate relationship with Khidr, a major figure in the Sufi concept of sanctity (see Chapter 2).
he believes Turks participated,27 in reality, as Cemal Kafadar has pointed out, his vision of Mahdi-obsessed Anatolian nomads seems to have much more in common with the Safavid Shah Isma’i’ll’s movement, projecting the circumstances of the late fifteenth century onto thirteenth-century Anatolia.28 Yet Kafadar too remarks of the Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye’s account of the revolt that ‘it contains motifs that fall beyond the purview of Sunni orthodoxy and are part of the Alevi/Shi’i worldview’,29 although he does not say what they are. Although Ocak’s ideas have been criticised by certain Turkish scholars, these too have been very obviously motivated by their own sectarian agendas, and have essentially sought to affirm that the Baba’is were Sunnis with equally little evidence.30

The assumption that Mahdism and Shiism are necessarily associated is fraught with difficulties. Although some modern scholarship tends to emphasise the Shiite associations of Mahdism,31 as we have seen there was no shortage of Sunni Mahdis. In itself, an interest in these themes points categorically neither to Shiism nor to Sunnism, as both Sunni and Shiite apocalypticism emerged out of the same early Islamic corpus of traditions.32 Secondly, the idea that either Mahdism or Shiism were closer to some sort of putative ‘folk Islam’ that appealed to the Turkmen needs questioning, for as has been discussed in Chapter 5 there is little textual support for this in the vernacular works examined there. Instead, in this chapter I will present the hitherto neglected evidence for a courtly, elite and Sunni interest in Mahdism and apocalypticism in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Anatolia, linked intellectually to the legacy of Ibn ‘Arabi and a Maghrebi Sunni tradition of Mahdism, as well as politically to reactions to the Mongol invasion and occupation. I reconsider the revolt of Baba Rasul/Baba İlyas in the light of this evidence, and also examine two mahdist revolts of the Mongol period, that of a certain Musa in Kurdistan and the messianic claims of the rebel Mongol governor Timurtash.

**MAHDISM IN MEDIEVAL ANATOLIAN TEXTS**

Although the twelfth-century author Hubaysh-i Tiﬂisi showed a distinct interest in apocalypticism, perhaps in accordance with the preoccupations of his patron,

27 Ocak, La Révolte de Baba Resul, 77–8.
28 Kafadar, Between Two Worlds, 75.
29 Ibid., 75.
30 See ibid., 171–2, nn. 42–3.
31 For example, Abbas Amanat, Apocalyptic Islam and Iranian Shi’ism (London, 2009); see the well-founded critique of this position in Fleischer, ‘A Mediterranean Apocalypse’, 41–2.
32 Cook, Studies in Muslim Apocalyptic, 192.
Kıлич Arslan, he does not discuss the Mahdi. The earliest references to the Mahdi in texts produced in Anatolia can be found in the works of the Sufi Najm al-Din Razi, a refugee to Anatolia from the depredations of the Mongols, in the face of whose advance Razi had lost most of his family. In his best-known work, the *Mirsad al-’Ibad*, a collection of Sufi advice originally dedicated to Sultan ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad, he warns that the Mongol invasions ‘resemble only the catastrophes that shall ensue at the end of time, foretold by the Prophet’, and goes on to quote the well-known traditions that associate the Turks with the end of time. The *Mirsad* calls on the rulers of the age to unite to ‘sacrifice their lives, their riches and their kingdoms to repel this catastrophe, [otherwise] one must fear that Islam will be totally destroyed’. Razi is even more explicit in associating the current situation with the end days in his Mirror for Princes written for the Mengücekid ruler of Erzincan, Da’ud b. Bahramshah. He writes:

Now, let us begin with other Signs of the strife of the End of Time (*fitnah-ye akhir-zamānī*) most of which have appeared (*zābīr shuda ast*). Just as the Prophet – Peace be upon him – through the light of Prophethood discerned these realities (*ma’ānī*) and heralded them; this reality is a miracle (*mu’jiza*) that after one hundred years shall become apparent . . . Just as at the beginning of Time the Arabs went to Turkestan and brought back slaves, and the extent of the sea of Islam turned back from Turkestan, now these Turks come and seize the Arabs as prisoners they take to Turkestan. This is one of the Signs of the resurrection and the Strife of the End of Time which the Prophet – Peace and Blessings upon him – foresaw.

Further hadith describe these Turks: they fight the Muslims, they have faces like shields coated with leather, they have small eyes, snub noses, and long hair – the common stereotypes of the steppe peoples in Islamic apocalyptic literature. Razi reiterates that most of these signs have now appeared; all that remains is for the appearance of the Antichrist (*dajjāl*) and Jesus who will defeat him, resurrect the dead and bring about a final reign of justice.

Other Sufis such as Ibn ‘Arabi and his followers also discussed the Mahdi. Ibn ‘Arabi had written of his coming, associating him with the idea of the vicegerency of God (discussed in Chapter 2, p. 99):

Know – may God support us! – that God has a vicegerent (*khalīfa*) who will come forth when the earth has become filled with injustice and oppression, and will then fill it with justice and equity. Even if there were only one day left for this world, God would lengthen it so that he (i.e., the Mahdi) could rule . . . He will wipe out injustice and its people and

---


uphold Religion (al-Din), and he will breathe the spirit back into Islam . . . He will . . . call (mankind) to God with the sword, so that whoever refuses will be killed, and whoever opposes him will be forsaken. He will manifest Religion as it (really) is in Itself, the Religion by which the Messenger of God would judge and rule if he were there. He will eliminate the different schools (of religious law) so that only the Pure Religion (Q. 39:3) remains and his enemies will be those who follow blindly the ‘ulama’, the people of ijtihad, because they will see the Mahdi judging differently from the way followed by their imams (i.e., the historical founders of the schools of Islamic law). So they will only accept the Mahdi’s authority grudgingly and against their will, because of their fear of his sword and his strength and because they covet (the power and wealth) that he possesses. But the common people of the Muslims and the greater part of the elite among them will rejoice in him, while the true Knowers of God among the People of the (spiritual) Realities will pledge allegiance to him because of God’s directly informing them (of the Mahdi’s true nature and mission), through (inner) unveiling and immediate witness. . . .

This passage reflects a vision of a clash between the official ulama, and the true Sufis who are acquainted with the truth of the appearance of the Mahdi. This is not though, a fissure between popular and formal religion; Ibn ‘Arabi is hardly a popular writer. Rather it reflects a dispute over who is the true guardian of sharia and religion.

The precise meaning of Ibn ‘Arabi’s concept of the Mahdi is debatable, given the allusive and difficult nature of his writings. It is entirely possible that he did not envisage the Mahdi as a political-military leader at the end of time, but rather used the concept to try to express a type of internal spiritual development. On the other hand, Ibn ‘Arabi may have identified himself with the eschatological figure of the fabulous gryphon arising from the west who has the characteristics of the Mahdi and was the theme of Ibn ‘Arabi’s enigmatic work ‘Anqa Mughrib. There is evidence that at least some of Ibn ‘Arabi’s followers did see the Mahdi in conventional terms as the hero of the apocalypse, and thought that the end of days was already nigh. The Mattali‘ al-Iman, a Sufi treatise possibly by al-Qunawi, Ibn ‘Arabi’s leading disciple, but more probably a certain Nasir al-Din Khü’i, which was copied at Ladhiq (Denizli) in 660/1262, makes this point in its introduction: With the remoteness of the era of prophecy, God’s carpet was rolled up and the foundation of religion was destroyed. Hence the sun of faith turned toward eclipse . . . The fog of error filled every direction and the darkness of innovation and sectarian caprice spread to all the

37 Elmore, Islamic Sainthood in the Fullness of Time, 85–9, 189ff.
regions of East and West. A cry from the unseen voiced the situation with the words, Corruption has appeared in the land and the sea (Q.30:41)

If you want enemies, Mahdi
Come down from the sky
If you want helpers, antichrist,
Show yourself at once!38

The Matali’ shows a strong interest in eschatology, and is a learned work showing the strong influence of Ibn Sina and Ibn ‘Arabi.39 This sense of an imminent apocalypse is even clearer in a contemporary Arabic work, the Risala fi Amr al-Mahdi, a short Arabic treatise on the Mahdi attributed to Sadr al-Din al-Qunawi. The attribution has been questioned and must be regarded as unresolved, but the vocabulary and contents of the work certainly do have affinities with al-Qunawi’s other works and those of Ibn ‘Arabi.40 These can be clearly seen in the short passages discussing how the Mahdi’s spirit (rūḥāniyya) comes into communication with individuals, and in the discussion of the Mahdi’s viziers, even if some of the details differ.41 At any rate, the early date of one of the surviving manuscripts, Ayasofya 4849, which is most likely thirteenth century, confirms the text’s circulation in this period.42

The treatise deals less with Ibn ‘Arabi’s spiritual Mahdi but rather with a saviour whose coming is imminent. It starts by describing how the Mahdi is a son of Fatima, from the line of al-Husayn, who will be the seal of the Hashimite Muhammadan caliphs (khatam al-khulafā’ al-muhammadīyīn al-hāshimiyyīn), but denies the Shiite claim that he is the son of the Eleventh Imam. There follows a detailed description of the physical characteristics of the Mahdi, who, it is predicted, will emerge in disguise in the furthest reaches of the Maghreb, on the Atlantic coast near Salé. Now the tense suddenly shifts to the past, and it is stated that the Mahdi has already emerged three years earlier on 7 Safar 654/
8 June 1247, giving us a date for the work’s composition of c. 1250.\textsuperscript{43} The Mahdi, who remains in disguise, is accompanied by a few followers ‘who know now where he is and how much time remains until his complete appearance’.\textsuperscript{44} In other words, although the Mahdi has reappeared the world must wait for his ‘complete appearance’ (zuhūruhu al-kāmil). This, however, is also expected to be nigh. The text describes how he will receive allegiance (bay’ā) in Mecca, but the king of Syria will hear of him and send an army against him. In the margins, at this point the copyist has written the words 2 Safar 660/27 December 1261, followed by another, somewhat unclear word, the most likely reading of which seems to be jā’ānā: ‘he has come to us’ (Fig. 6.1). The Mahdi will emerge

\textsuperscript{43} I follow here the account in Süleymaniye, MS Ayasofya 4898; the other manuscript, Häzi Mahmud Efendi 2415, fols 161a–163b, contains gaps where the dates are in Ayasofya, suggesting they were omitted from the manuscript tradition after the non-appearance of the Mahdi in the thirteenth century. This is further evidence for the antiquity of Ayasofya 4849.

\textsuperscript{44} Süleymaniye, MS Ayasofya 4849, fol. 169a.
victorious conquering all the lands up to Constantinople, but at the same time he will also unify the umma by getting rid of madhhabs and eliminating the differences between fiqhā’ī. Finally, he will conquer not just the Christians but also Gog and Magog, installing his reign of justice.

The conclusion of the Risala suggests that for its author the appearance of the Mahdi was imminent, a mere decade away:

Between our present time and 683/[1284–5], which is when Jesus will appear, but before that, there will appear the portents of the Mahdi as God wills. We have only mentioned the portents of Jesus, blessings be upon him, most of which will come after that. As for the precise time of the appearance of the Mahdi, it is known but cannot be openly declared. However, in 666/[1267–8] there will appear a great sign (āya ‘azīma) which will cause most of those who deny the resurrection and what we have mentioned of the portents of the Mahdi to believe. Also in the year 666 will the people see signs that they did not recognise and they will realise the presence and appearance of the Mahdi, and other signs which are announced by the tongue of prophecy and verification.⁴⁵

Most of the elements of the Risala fi Amr al-Mahdi resemble those found in the extensive apocalyptic literature produced by both Shiites and Sunnis. In two respects it seems to be exceptional. First, the discussion of the imminence of the apocalypse is unusual. The main contemporary author dealing with apocalyptic themes, the Syrian Ibn Talha, writing shortly after 644/1246, dates the coming of the Mahdi to a safe distance in the future, at some point after year 718/1318–19.⁴⁶ The Risala fi Amr al-Mahdi, however, strongly suggests that its readership can expect to witness the signs of the Mahdi themselves, and thus by implication the wars of the end of time and the apocalypse itself are nigh. The second respect in which the Risala is distinctive is in its emphasis on the Maghrebi origins of the Mahdi, which runs counter to classical Islamic apocalyptic, where the Mahdi is described either as originating in the East or in the Hijaz.⁴⁷ The Maghrebi origins of the Risala’s Mahdi strongly suggests a western inspiration for the text, or at least parts of it. Mahdist claimants commonly appeared in the Maghreb, perhaps most spectacularly in the twelfth century with Ibn Tumart’s rebellion, and a rich vein of literature produced in the Muslim West elaborated the classical apocalyptic traditions to tailor them to Maghrebi audiences.⁴⁸

---

⁴⁵ Ibid., fols 178b–179a.
⁴⁶ See the discussion in Peacock, ‘Politics, Religion and the Occult in the Works of Kamal al-Din Ibn Talha’.
⁴⁷ See Cook, Studies in Muslim Apocalyptic, 137ff.
However, the *Risala fi Amr al-Mahdi* differs from the best known of these traditions in locating the place of emergence of the Mahdi as the Salé region; normally the Maghrebi tradition associated him with Massa, far to the south near Agadir.\(^49\) Whatever the precise origins of these Maghrebi messianic legends, it seems likely that that their transmission to Anatolia can be associated with the West’s most famous émigré, Ibn ‘Arabi. Their origin was certainly recognised in medieval Anatolia, for the letrist ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Bistami, active at the court of Murad II, specifically identified the Maghrebi tradition of occult thought as a major source.\(^50\)

**IBN BARRAJAN AND HIS *TAFSĪRS***

The influence of this Maghrebi tradition of apocalyptic in thirteenth-century Anatolia can be seen in the works of the celebrated Andalusian Qur’ān commentator Ibn Barrajan of Seville (d. 563/1141), which circulated in Anatolia, including among the Seljuq elite. Ibn Barrajan, who exercised an influence on Ibn ‘Arabi, was according to later sources himself executed for his part in a mahdist uprising against the Almohads.\(^51\) Although the historicity of this claim is dubious, and the evidence of his own writings and early sources suggests he eschewed political involvement, he developed an esoteric interpretation of the Qur’ān based on astrology that predicted the future and saw the coming of the Mahdi as imminent. Ibn Barrajan’s work immediately became extremely influential. The contemporary Egyptian author ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Najir al-Sadid claimed that if one understood Ibn Barrajan’s *tafsir* accurately, one could predict the future up to the day of resurrection.\(^52\) For some, then, Ibn Barrajan’s work offered more than just a Qur’ānic commentary, and the famous fifteenth-century occultist ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Bistami also cites Ibn Barrajan as one of his main sources for occult

\(^49\) García-Arenal, *Messianism and Puritanical Reform*, 202–8. The appearance of a Mahdi from Salé does not appear to be a mainstream Maghrebi tradition. Michael Brett (personal communication, 28 December 2016) suggests that the reference may be to Ribat al-Fath, across the river from Salé, built by Ibn Tumart’s successor ‘Abd al-Mu’min (d. 1198).


knowledge, especially that of hurūf, the secrets encoded by the numerical values of the letters of the Arabic script.53

Ibn Barrajan was the author of two Qur’anic commentaries, the *Idah al-Hikma* and the better-known *Tanbih al-Afham* (often mistitled *al-Irshad*),54 but his fame derived from his commentary on the sura of *al-Rum* (Q.30) in which he was later claimed to have accurately predicted the date of Saladin’s recapture of Jerusalem. Ibn Barrajan’s interpretation is given both in the *Tanbih* and also, more briefly, in the *Idah*.55 The commentary focuses on the phrase ‘ghulībat al-rūm fī ahdāl-arḍ wa-hum min ba’d ghulabihim sayaghlibūnā fī bī’d sinīn’, ‘The Rum are defeated in the lower part of the earth and after the victory over them, they will be victorious in a few years’. Whereas most exegetes took these verses as referring to the Byzantine-Sasanian wars of the early seventh century, Ibn Barrajan insisted they contained a prognostication of the future, and discussed the alternative vocalisation of the last verb as ‘sayughlabūnā’, giving the meaning ‘they will be defeated’.56 These verses with their allusions to a victory of or over ‘al-Rum’ (depending on one’s interpretation) were to exercise a lasting attraction for political propagandists in Anatolia. Writing of Timur’s victory over the Ottomans at Ankara in 1402, the Timurid chronicler Nizam al-Din Shami gleefully quoted them, associating the vanquished Ottomans with the defeated al-Rum,57 while later in the late fifteenth century the Aqquyunlu ruler Uzun Hasan claimed the verse presaged his victory over his Qaraquyunlu rival Jahanshah at Muş in 872/1467 – the numerical value of the letters of *bid’ sinīn*, the last two words of the verse, adding up to 872, the hijri year of the battle.58 Ibn Barrajan’s commentary on Surat *al-Rum* also attracted the attention of Ibn ‘Arabi, who discussed it at length in his *al-Futuhat al-Makiyya*.59 The significance of Ibn Barrajan’s commentary on *al-Rum* for a thirteenth-century audience is indicated by its special treatment in a manuscript of the *Idah al-Hikma*, MS Murad Molla 35 (fols 186a–188a) (Fig. 6.2). Here the commentary on the sura, this sura alone, is surrounded by an additional commentary in red ink taken

54 For a survey of his works see Casewit, *The Mystics of al-Andalus*, 128–70.
FIG. 6.2 Ibn Barajan, *Idah al-Hikma*. Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, Süleymaniye Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, MS Murad Molla 35 (fols. 186a–188a)
from the Tanbih al-Afham, highlighting its importance above all other suras for the reader/copyist.\textsuperscript{60}

While the political and historical implications of Ibn Barrajan’s commentary on Surat al-Rum have attracted much attention, the extant texts of his commentaries are actually rather imprecise. However, it seems clear that he saw the famous verses 2–4 of the sura as presaging the coming of the Mahdi and referring to the Christian-Muslim wars at the end of time. Ibn Barrajan regarded history as determined by cyclical spheres of predestination (\textit{dawāʿir al-taqdīr}) to which God has provided clues in the Qur’an. As he writes:

So the One who makes evolve (\textit{yudabbiru}) the cyclical spheres causing the determination of the succession of night and day, the succession of times and the reception in creation of changes in the states such as the transference of power, increase and decrease can bestow to a few knowledge of that. What is obtained thereof is one of the most useful benefits [to attain] certainty in the accomplishment of the time limits, the fulfilment of the appointed times, the unavoidable manifestation of the last day, the verification of the knowledge regarding the resurrection, the promised rewards and menaces, and so forth.\textsuperscript{61}

Although Ibn Barrajan’s text was later read as predicting the recapture of Jerusalem, this is not explicitly mentioned. Ibn Barrajan rather is seeking to pinpoint the time left to the world before the end of time and the appearance of the Mahdi; a victory over al-Rum will be one of the signs of this. Ibn Barrajan views time as made up of seven thousand-month cycles, the last of which he hints will come to end in 583/1187 – some sixty years after he was writing – when he seems to suggest (although does not explicitly state) that the signs of the Mahdi will become evident.\textsuperscript{62}

Ibn Barrajan’s works became far more popular in the eastern Mediterranean region than in al-Andalus and the Maghreb: just one single manuscript of his Tanbih al-Afham is preserved in the Maghreb today, in Rabat, and his other works not at all.\textsuperscript{63} The overwhelming majority of extant manuscripts of Ibn Barrajan’s works are held in Turkish libraries and are associated with either Anatolia or north Syria. Of the twenty-one manuscripts of Ibn Barrajan’s various works held in the Süleymaniye Library, eleven can be securely dated to the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries,\textsuperscript{64} underlining its popularity during our period. It seems likely that the

\textsuperscript{60} The text of the marginal commentary is published in A Qur’an Commentary, ed. Böwering and Casewit, 906–13.


\textsuperscript{62} Ibid., 265–6. Ibn Barrajan repeats his ideas of the \textit{dawāʿir al-taqdīr} and the seven cycles more briefly in the Idah, see A Qur’an Commentary, ed. Böwering and Casewit, 558–9.

\textsuperscript{63} Ibn Barra’yân, \textit{Sharh Asma’ Allâh al-Husnâ} (Comentario sobre los nombres mas bellos de Dios), ed. Purificacion de la Torre (Madrid, 2000), 79.

\textsuperscript{64} The following early manuscripts of Ibn Barrajan’s works in Istanbul collections are known to me: \textit{Sharh al-Asma’ al-Husna}: Sehid Ali Paşa 426 (copied in Aleppo, 598); Ayasofya 1869 (copied
circulation of Ibn Barrajan’s works in Anatolia and the east is connected to his influence on Ibn ‘Arabi, a long-time resident of Anatolia, and there survives to this day in Konya a finely written three-volume copy of the *Tanbih al-Afham* that was bequeathed as waqf by Sadr al-Din al-Qunawi, Ibn ‘Arabi’s disciple (Fig. 6.3).

We also know that Ibn Barrajan’s *tafsir* was consulted at the highest levels of the Anatolian political elite. One surviving copy of Ibn Barrajan’s *Tanbih al-Afham*, dated Ramadan 667/May 1269, comes from the library of a senior official in the Ilkhanid administration of Anatolia, Majd al-Din Muhammad b. al-Hasan, a *mustaufi* (revenue official) who became vizier after Fakhr al-Din ‘Ali was deposed (Plate 12). According to a note beside the colophon, the copy was collated with the autograph (*qubila bi’l-āṣl*), as was Sadr al-Din al-Qunawi’s copy. It seems, then, that an autograph copy of the *Tanbih* was circulating in thirteenth-century Anatolia, probably in Konya. At any rate the existence of a copy in Majd al-Din Muhammad’s personal library suggests the interest in Ibn Barrajan among members of the political elite of late thirteenth-century Anatolia, and the copy bequeathed by al-Qunawi confirms his *tafsir*’s importance for members of the circle of Ibn ‘Arabi.

Dhu’l-Qi’dâ 608); Nuruosmanîye 2876 (copied 732); Nuruosmanîye 2877 (copied 733); Carullah 1023 (copied 795); *Tanbih al-Afham*: Reisülküttab 30 (copied 667/1269); Damad İbrahim 25 (copied 677); Carullah 53M (copied 738); Darulmesnevi 42 (undated but clearly 13th–14th century); *Idah al-Hikma bi-Akhâm al-Ibra*: Mahmud Paşa 3–4 (copied 596/1200) and Murat Molla 35 (copied 612/1217). For a description of the two manuscripts of the *Idah al-Hikma* see Böwering and Casewit, *A Qur’ân Commentary*, 29–33. Of course, the mere presence of the manuscripts in Istanbul libraries does not prove they were copied in Anatolia, and most lack colophons, but nonetheless the presence of such a number of early manuscripts in the Istanbul collections does suggest Ibn Barrajan’s popularity in the region, and all are in eastern, rather than Maghribi hands. In the case of Reisülküttab 30 and Konya Yusuf Âğa 4744–6, discussed below, we have unambiguous evidence connecting them to Anatolia. A similar pattern of diffusion can be observed with Ibn Barrajan’s *Sharh al-Asma’ al-Husna*. Of the fourteen extant manuscripts of this work, nine are held in Istanbul libraries, with one each in London, Paris, Berlin, Konya and Medina. See Ibn Barra’yân, *Sharh Asma’ Allâh al-Husnâ*, 77–9.

Konya, Yusuf Âğa Kütpûhanesi, MSS 4744, 4745, 4746.

Süleymanîye, MS Reisülküttab 30. The inscription on the shamsa reads: *bi-rasm khizânat kutub al-mawâli al-sâhib/makâzan al-makârim wa’t-fâda’il malik al-sudâr wa’t-âfâdîl/dhi’l-makârin wa’t-ma’âthir wa’t-ma’âlî wa’t-mâfâkhbir Majd al-Dawla wa’t-Din/sharaf al-islâm wa’t-mulûmin ‘uddat al-mulûk wa’t-salâtîn/Abî’t-ma’âlî Muhammad b. al-Hasan ad-dâma Allâh fa’lîahu wa-zillahu wa-a’lā fi dhurrawat al-ulâ maqâmahu wa-maballahu wa-sâbgha’/’alâyhi wa-’abdanahu wa’-zillahu âmnin. He is mentioned by Ibn Bichi, who calls him *sad-r-i kabîr wa amîr-i jâli Majd al-Din Abûl-Mahamid Muhammad-i al-Hasan al-mustawfî al-Arzinjani (Ibn Bichi, al-Awanir al-Ala’iyya (Ankara), 656; (Tehran), 566). Aqsara’i gives his name as Majd al-Din Muhammad b. al-Husayn and records how he became *mustaufî* under Rukn al-Din Qiliq Arslan IV and Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusrâw, before becoming vizier after Fakhr al-Din ‘Ali’s fall (Aqsara’i, *Musammatat*, 73, 89, 93) Although sacked as vizier on the instructions of the *ordu* in 672/1273–4 to make way for the return of Fakhr al-Din ‘Ali, he was given the title of atabak as a consolation prize, and Aqsara’i praises his abilities highly. He died in 676/1277–8 (ibid., 95, 100, 102, 116).
Further evidence for apocalyptic interests at the very summit of the Seljuq court comes from a work by the émigré occultist, Nasir al-Din Muhammad b. Ibrahim al-Sijistani, known by his pen name of Nasiri (not to be confused with the writer on *futuwwa*). Nasiri has left us a compilation of several Persian works on magic and astrology, preserved in a single manuscript (probably the autograph), in the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris, MS persan 174 (Plate 11), composed in Kayseri and Aksaray around the years 670/1273 and 671/1273. Most of these magical works are incomplete and the manuscript has suffered damage from both a botched rebinding and water, but two are preserved more or less intact, the *Daqaiq al-Haqa’iq* (which was, however, never completed) and the *Mu’nis al-’Awarif*. It is the latter work, a long poetic composition written in Kayseri in 671/1273, that is relevant to our investigation of Mahdism.

Nasiri appears to have been the court geomancer. Although he complains in the *Mu’nis al-’Awarif* of his wretched situation, a short *mathnawi* earlier in the *majmū’a* makes it clear he was well connected at court. In it he addresses his ‘friends in Aksaray’, the military commanders ‘Izz al-Din Fakhr al-Din Ahmad ‘shir-dil’ (lion-heart) and some scholars whom he asks to convey his greetings to the sultan. The richly illustrated nature of the manuscript (although not the *Mu’nis al-’Awarif* sections) also suggests that it was produced for a court milieu (Plate 11a).

The *Mu’nis al-’Awarif* is an eclectic collection of poems of different metres and rhyme schemes (Plate 11b). After invoking God, the first section deals with the theme of the Day of Judgement and Resurrection (*andar hashr wa ahuwāl-i rūz-i qiyām wa ahuwāl-i mardum dar...*). Reflecting on the vanity of this world, the poet urges himself to abandon it for he too is due to die (*Naṣiri ba’d az in tark-i jahān kunfā ‘umīr-i tū rasad rūzī bi-pāyān*), and then embarks on an *ubi sunt* lament: where are the sages of old like Daniel, kings like Kaykhusraw and his wise

---

67 For an overview of this manuscript see Peacock, ‘A Seljuq Occult Manuscript and its World’.
68 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS persan 174, fol. 142b.
69 Ibid., fol. 129a.
70 Many of the illustrations were dated much later in one of the few studies of this important manuscript: Marianne Baruccand, ‘The Miniatures of the *Daqaiq al- haqa’iq* (Bibliothèque nationale, pers. 174): A Testimony to the Cultural Diversity of Medieval Anatolia’, *Islamic Art* 4 (1991): 113–42. However, consideration of the manuscript by a group of art historians at a workshop held at St Andrews in 2017 and Paris in 2018 threw into doubt Barrucand’s datings, with several scholars suggesting that most illustrations were in fact contemporary with the text.
men (pīrān-i ‘āqīl) or rulers like Sanjar?72 The following section discusses the six signs of the end of time (ākhīr-i zamān) on the basis of hadith.73 The manuscript is somewhat damaged at this point, but these signs comprise oppressive rulers, ahl-i ḥikam (?), the abandoning of asceticism (zuhd) and of holy war (ghazā), seeking positions from the unbelievers, women acting without shame and lewd behaviour (fisq) being done openly. A further sign is that unbelievers will seize the whole world, but a man will arise from Rum with a great army and do battle with the Franks. In addition, during these latter days the wolf and the sheep will lie together, one of the numerous unnatural portents that other writers commonly identified as apocalyptic.

Two chapters then describe the Mahdi, who is identified with none other than the Seljuq sultan Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw.74 The first is entitled Praise of the Great Sultan, the Pride of the Seljuq Dynasty, Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din Kaykhusraw . . . and the Rule of the Mahdi and its Signs (madḥ-i sultān-i a’ẓam iftikhrār-i Āl Saljuq Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa’l-Din Kaykhusraw . . . wa ḥukm-i Mahdī wa rumūz-i ān dar in bāb wa allāh a’lam). The second is more explicit: The Rules of the Mahdi and his being named the King of Time, Ghiyath al-Dunya wa’l-Din, may God lengthen his life (akhām-i Mahdī wa takhallūs bi-padishāb-i waqt Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa’l-Dīn atāla allāh baqā’ahu). The text is somewhat damaged on these folios, but enough is clear to confirm the identification of the child king Ghiyath al-Din with the Mahdi and to situate the apocalyptic vision of the author formerly in the context of Mongol-dominated late Seljuq Anatolia, where the Seljuqs are Mongols are identified with the sheep and wolf of the earlier apocalyptic prophecy:

‘This very king is the Mahdi oh wise one!
He will seize the world by God’s command,
The Mongols are the wolf and we are the sheep’.
Thus said the Ustad Shams-i Khujand.
Another said ‘Realise the Mongols are the antichrist
Curses be upon him for eternity!’
It is correct that the Mahdi is that very king,
who ascended to the throne from his cradle.75

72 Ibid., fol. 135a.
73 Ibid., fol. 135b.
74 Ibid., fols 137a–b.
75 Ibid., fol. 137b:

Hamīn shāh mahdīst ay nīḵ-rāy, bigīrd jahān-rā bi-amr-i khudāy
būd gurg tātār u mā gusfand, chūnīn guft u斯塔d-i Shams-i Khujand
digar guft dajjāl tātār dān, lā’nat bār-ū bād tā jāwīdān
chū mahdī hamīn shāh bāshad durust, ki az mahd bāshad bi takhtash nishast.
Thus in Nasiri’s pun, Ghiyath al-Din’s minority, in which he ascended from the cradle (mahd), is one of the proofs that he is indeed the Mahdi.

Nasiri’s comparison of the Seljuq ruler to the Mahdi is not unique. In mid- to late twelfth-century Iraq both Caliph and Seljuq sultans were occasionally branded by their court poets as Mahdis, as was the Ilkhan Ghazan, as discussed earlier. In the early fifteenth century, the poet Abdülvasi’ Çelebi described the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed I as a Mahdi, and the tradition continued in the sixteenth century with Süleyman the Magnificent. Nasiri’s description of Ghiyath al-Din as the Mahdi was perhaps less shocking for a contemporary audience than it might seem today, although given our almost total lack of other panegyric poetry from Seljuq Anatolia it is hard to be sure. Nonetheless, Nasiri’s Mu’nis al-Awarif confirms that apocalypticism attracted the Seljuq court, offering a means of justifying its present circumstances (after all, if servitude to the Mongols was ordained in the divine plan for the end of days it was hardly the Seljuqs’ fault) and hope for the future in the form of the Seljuq sultan who would ultimately defeat the Antichrist to install the Mahdi’s reign of justice.

Fourteenth-Century Anatolian Apocalyptic

Interest in apocalyptic themes can also be seen in works originating in pious circles in the fourteenth century. An apocalyptic appendix occurs in the colophon of a manuscript of al-Saghani’s hadith collection, the Mashariq al-Anwar (Süleymaniye, MS Fatih 1159), which was transmitted by the Erzincan scholar Wajih al-Din al-Arzinjani, who appended some short works of his own to it, copied in 716/1316, followed by an Arabic text dealing with the circumstances of the Day of Resurrection – no author is specified but it is in the same hand as Arzinjani’s works and is probably an autograph. This day is felt to be imminent, with signs such as the emergence of the army of the ‘Turks’ as a sign of God’s wrath, suggesting the Mongols, who were often conflated with Turks in the apocalyptic literature. The text describes the battles between the dajjal (Antichrist) and Jesus at the end of time, followed by the reign of justice Jesus will initiate. Jesus’s reign of justice is strikingly anti-Christian. ‘He will be a just judge, an imam dispensing justice and will crush the cross, kill the pigs, impose the jizya . . . the earth will fill

76 Peacock, Great Seljuk Empire, 278.
with Islam and the unbelievers will depose their king and there will be no king but Islam.’ Interestingly, despite its apocalyptic tendencies, the text nowhere mentions the Mahdi.

Early Turkish works of the period, presumably destined for a more popular audience, also indicate some interest in apocalypticism, usually in the context of a more general concern with eschatology (as discussed in Chapter 5). The Saatname of the Sufi shaykh Hibetullah b. Ibrahim, a massively popular Turkish text surviving in numerous manuscripts that may date to the fourteenth century, describes what the believer must do at each hour (saat) so as to ensure a place in paradise at the final hour (saat) of judgement. Although Hibetullah’s work is thus preoccupied with the kiyamet, Day of Judgement, it offers no indication of when this will occur. More apocalyptic in tone is a poem dealing with the Day of Judgement composed by a certain Şeyyad İsa, who was evidently associated with the Mevlevis, for he invokes Sultan Walad, ‘Arif Çelebi and ‘Abid Çelebi. At the start of his poem, the 344-line Ahval-i Kiyamet, Şeyyad Isa declares that:

Because in the end the world is impermanent, say your prayers and save your soul from hell.
Listen to the story of the day of mustering (mahyer) when the time of final evil has come
Let me tell you what day the day of Guidance (yevmu’l-huda) will be, it will be the festival of the hajjis, O wise man!
On the Friday the signs (alamet) will become clear, listen to how the Day of Judgement (kiyamet) will happen!

Although Şeyyad İsa gives no precise indication of when the last hour is to be expected, his audience is evidently intended to understand it will not be too far off. An apocalyptic atmosphere is also reflected in the roughly contemporary Çarhname by Ahmed Fakih:

Come to your senses, know the resurrection is near, when you will come face to face with the Creator! . . .
The sky and earth will be destroyed, everything will be entirely ruined.

79 For the date see Krstić, Contested Conversions, 35–7 with a description of this work.
80 See Hibetullah ibni Ibrahim, Sā’tānāme, ed. Ahmet Buran (Ankara, 2011), fol. 4a, and see kiyamet in index. Although in places the text refers to the Day of Judgement as taking place yarın it seems this means ‘in the future’ rather than ‘tomorrow’ as in modern Turkish.
81 Cem Dilçin, ‘XIII Yüzyıl Metinlerinden Yeni Bir Yapıt: Ahval-i Kiyamet’, in Mustafa Canpolat et al. (eds), Ömer Åsm Aksay Armağanı (Ankara, 1978), 49–75, for its dates see Chapter 4, p. 153. Dilçin’s dating of the poem to the thirteenth century is not acceptable.
82 Ibid., p. 51, ll. 6–12.
The day will come when the mountains will break from the earth, mountain and
countryside will become completely flat. . .
Everything created shall die, only the unique Merciful one will remain!83

One reason for the interest in apocalypticism shown by these Turkish works,
evidently aimed at a wider audience than the Arabic and Persian thirteenth-
century texts discussed above, may have been the Black Death, the swift spread
of which to the Middle East and Europe is often attributed to the Mongol
Empire. Şeyyad Hamza, best known to us as the author of a verse Yusuf u Zuleyha,
also wrote an apocalyptic poem dated 749/1348 in which he refers to the plague.
The poem starts:

Muslims, it seems it is the end of time; will doomsday come, what will its sign be?
The signs have become clear one by one. Come let us repent, for it is the time . . .

One of these signs is the plague:

Today, the seventy two sects [of the Muslim community] are in pain and suffering. What
can be done about death, for it is divine decree? What can be done about the plague, for it
is ordained by the heavens? Some rend their clothes and lament for their son; some bewail
their brothers; some weep for their fathers; some are separated from their little daughters.84

The impact of the plague on Anatolia has only recently become the focus of
scholarly attention, but it is clear enough that from 1347 many Anatolian towns
were badly affected by it, including Trebizond, Karaman and Kayseri.85 It has
been argued that Christian areas, in particular Armenian Cilicia and
Constantinople itself, were especially badly affected, whereas nomadic areas such
as the Ottoman polity remained largely unaffected, leading to Byzantium’s
ultimate fall and the rise of the Ottomans.86 It has also recently been proposed
that the plague may have contributed to a decline in the production of luxury
manuscripts in Anatolia, as well as possibly the rise of Turkish literature,87 but as
yet the radical claims made for its impact remain unproven. If the impact of the
Black Death was so severe, one might expect to find rather more mention of it in
our substantial literary corpus from the period, but with the exception of Şeyyad

85 Schamiloglu, ‘The Rise of the Ottoman Empire’; also Yaron Ayalon, Natural Disasters in the
Ottoman Empire: Plague, Famine and Other Misfortunes (Cambridge, 2015) 48–53, who is mainly
reliant on Schamiloglu for this period.
86 This argument, put forward by Schamiloglu, is followed by Ayalon with a handful of additional
references. However, the case is not yet compelling, largely owing to the lack of evidence.
87 For manuscript production and the plague see Jackson, ‘Patrons and Artists’, I, 208–10; for Turkish
literature see Chapter 4, p. 149.
Hamza’s poem it seems largely to have been ignored. Nonetheless, it may well have contributed to the general atmosphere of apocalyptic expectation, and, if the plague did affect Christian communities more severely than Muslim ones, this may have provided an incentive for conversion.

The language and form of these fourteenth-century Turkish works suggests they were intended for a popular, uneducated audience, although the apocalyptic manuscript notes appended to Wajih al-Din al-Arzinjani’s works indicated that members of the learned ‘ulama’ classes also retained an interest in the theme. These works do not, however, go much beyond a conventional pious interest in eschatology based on the Qur’an – that the Muslim must prepare himself for the Final Hour, the time of which was unknown or even imminent, was and is an entirely conventional Muslim belief. It is striking that, although discussed in the Arabic notes to al-Arzinjani, the Turkish works are uniformly silent on the dramas of the end of time, the battle between the dājjāl and the Mahdi. Indeed, the Mahdi does not feature at all in these fourteenth-century Turkish works. It is not until the fifteenth century that we find extensive discussions of the Mahdi and dājjāl in Turkish, in the Dürr-i Meknun of Ahmed Bican (d. c. 870/1466). Bican’s account is explicitly based on the Arabic works on jafr of ‘Abd al-Rahman Bistami, who himself drew on the thirteenth-century Ayyubid author Ibn Talha and thus is derived from the elite intellectual tradition of apocalypticism. Some scholars have argued that Ahmed Bican incorporated this material into this Turkish encyclopaedia out of a sense of apocalypticism prompted by the political and social disorders of the early fifteenth century and the conquest of Constantinople in 1453, seen by some as an apocalyptic event. More recent

88 The evidence for the impact of the plague on the Middle East comes almost entirely from Mamluk sources, especially chronicles. See further Ayalon, Natural Disasters, 21–30, with references. Ayalon, however, argues that the plague was considered ‘just another natural occurrence’ in Muslim societies, ‘an event people expected and were trained to deal with’ (ibid., 46). This may explain the relative dearth of evidence from Muslim Anatolia. Apart from Şeyyad Hamza’s poem, I am aware of two references to the plague in near-contemporary Anatolian sources: Turan, Taribi Takvimler, 70–1 citing the Eretnid taqwim from Sivas of 772/1371–2 (MS Nuruosmaniye 2782), and Aşık Paşazade, Osmanoğlu Taribi, 372 (chapter 37), mentioning the death of the lord of Karasi from the plague. I am grateful to Dimitris Kastritis for alerting me to this last reference.


research by Laban Kaptein has suggested that Bican was averse to speculating about the end of times. Kaptein argues that the eschatological and apocalyptic materials in his Dürr-i Meknun ‘are so general, timeless and interchangeable that there is no basis for the view that an anxious Bican wrote this text in response to a supposed decaying society in the first half of the 15th century’.

91 The same could be said of most of our Turkish texts from the fourteenth century. Judging by the literary remains that have come down to us, while eschatology was of broad interest, apocalypticism and the associated Antichrist and Mahdi were more a concern of courtly and intellectual elites, influenced by the ideas of Ibn Barrajan and Ibn ‘Arabi, than of popular religiosity.

MAHDISM AND REVOLT

To what extent did the elite tradition of apocalypticism outlined above translate into practical political consequences? Laban Kaptein has rightly cautioned against the tendency among some scholars of Islamic and Ottoman history to view persons and events ‘through apocalypse-coloured spectacles’. In almost any era of pre-modern Islamic history both revolt and apocalypticism can be observed, but it is dangerous to assume a connection without sufficient evidence, even if the examples of Ibn Tumart and Shah Ismail show that such a connection certainly could exist, with momentous consequences. Only careful analysis will allow us to trace the existence of any relationship between apocalypticism and revolt. Yet the evidence for the three allegedly mahdist-inspired revolts that occurred in or near Anatolia in our period has not yet been studied in sufficient depth. Ocak, as we have seen, identified the 638/1240 Baba’i revolt as the first in a series of mahdist and Shi’ite-influenced revolts that led ultimately to the Safavid revolution, but it is not in fact directly associated with Mahdism by the sources. Curiously, however, at no point in his voluminous works does Ocak discuss two subsequent revolts that the sources do represent as having espoused Mahdism.

These are the Kurdish rebellion against the Mongols of 707/1307-8, and the revolt of Timurtash in 722/1322–3. It is to the task of understanding these three revolts that we now turn.

The 638/1240 Baba’i revolt broke out in Kafarsud, in south-eastern Anatolia, shortly after Seljuq forces conquered the region from the Ayyubids in one of their great successes in their long-term policy of expanding the sultanate towards Syria and the Jazira. The importance of the revolt is reflected in the relatively numerous,
if all too brief, references in the sources of the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The Syriac chronicler Bar Hebraeus, the Persian chronicler of the Seljuq dynasty Ibn Bibi and the Latin chronicler Simon de St Quentin all mention the rebellion, and the most detailed account is given in the Turkish verse hagiography composed in 758/1360 by one of the rebels’ descendants, Elvan Çelebi, the \textit{Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye fi Menasibi’l-Ünsiyye}.

Despite its attestation in numerous sources, these are confused even over the question of the identity of the leader of the revolt. It seems that there was a leader in south-eastern Anatolia named Baba Ishaq, who was a Turkmen; when the revolt subsequently spread to the Amasya region, its leader became Baba Rasul, whom Baba Ishaq seems to have recognised as his spiritual guide.\footnote{Ibn Bibi, \textit{al-‘Awamir al-‘Ala’iyya} (Ankara), 498–504; (Tehran), 440–3; Bar Hebraeus, \textit{Chronography}, 405. For a full discussion of the sources and details of the revolt see Ocak, \textit{La Révolte de Baba Resul}, 1–17, 58–72.} This Baba Rasul, as most of the thirteenth-century sources call him, was identical with the Khurasani shaykh and immigrant to Anatolia Baba İlyas, who was Elvan Çelebi’s great-grandfather.\footnote{This identification was first made by Ocak, \textit{La Révolte de Baba Resul}, 47–51.} The details of the relationship between Baba İlyas/Baba Rasul on the one hand and Baba Ishaq on the other, and of the revolt itself, are hard to discern from the limited sources, and the motives of the rebels are equally opaque. Simon de St Quentin depicts Baba Rasul’s aim as to become sultan himself, and there are even some indications that this was how the revolt was perceived by the Seljuq authorities, according to the \textit{Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye}.\footnote{Elvan Çelebi, \textit{Menakibu’l-Kudsiyye}, ll. 486–9: the Seljuq sultan Ghiyath al-Din says of Baba İlyas: ‘tahtuma tacuma nazar kılmış, ‘you have envied my throne and crown’.} However, Elvan Çelebi portrays the revolt as a struggle between his saintly ancestor and the evil official ‘ulama’ of the Seljuq state, led by the Qadi Köre of Çat, near Amasya, who felt threatened by Baba İlyas who had built his zâwiya in the vicinity. The qadi therefore told lies to the sultan, claiming that Baba İlyas and his followers were planning to revolt.\footnote{Ibid., ll. 359–70, 477–84.} Ghiyath al-Din’s inadequacies as sultan are seen as presaging the demise of the dynasty at the hands of the Mongols, which Baba İlyas predicts:

\begin{quote}
They shall take the sultan’s name from the \textit{khuṭba}, and read the name of the khan there instead. A people will come and seize this kingdom, of the kingdom but a sign of evil will be left to you. They will mount your horse and wear your robes, seize your kingdom and exile you...\footnote{Ibid., l. 521–3.}
\end{quote}

Elvan Çelebi also alludes to the rumours that Sultan Ghiyath al-Din had come to power by poisoning his father,\footnote{Ibid., ll. 359–70, 477–84.} the great Sultan ‘Ala’ al-Din, represented as a
pious sultan who provided Baba İlyas with the respect he was due, in contrast to his son.  

In Elvan’s narrative, Ishaq is İlyas’s halife, and revolts immediately after the confrontation between İlyas and the sultan were precipitated by the Qadi Köre’s meddling. The revolt is thus seen as provoked by the evil qadi and by Ghiyath al-Din’s loss of legitimacy. In reality it may also have been connected with the destabilising presence of the Khwarazmian military, who had taken refuge in Rum after the collapse of the short-lived empire of Sultan Jalal al-Din Khwarazmshah in the face of the Mongol advance. The heartland of the revolt around Kafarsud had been settled by leaders of the invading Khwarazmians, left leaderless after the death of Jalal al-Din Khwarazmshah, and Baba Ishaq sent missionaries to the Khwarazmians persuading them to join the rebellion.  

They would have needed little encouragement: one of Sultan Ghiyath al-Din’s first acts on becoming sultan had been to arrest their chiefs, fearing they would revolt. However, all but one escaped, leaving a resentful and powerful military force on a sensitive frontier region. It seems unlikely that without Khwarazmian support the revolt would have caused such difficulties for the Seljuq state.

Even if the Khwarazmians’ role was motivated simply by a desire for revenge against a political enemy, the revolt evidently also had a religious motive. What exactly this was is harder to discern. Ocak states that ‘all the sources are unanimous on the fact that he [Baba Rasul] was proclaimed prophet (or Mahdi),’ and on the assumption that Mahdism is distinctively Shiite attributes to the revolt both its Shiite character and its significance in the formation of Alevism. Yet the term Mahdi is not applied directly to Baba İlyas (aka Baba Rasul) by any of the primary sources. Ibn Bibi remarks that his followers claimed that ‘the Baba is the messenger of God’ (bābā rasūl allāh). The clearest statement of Baba Rasul/ Baba İlyas’s claim comes from the contemporary Syrian chronicler Sibt b. al-Jawzi, who writes:

99 Ibid., ll. 338–53.
100 Ibn Bibi, al-Awamir al-Ala’îyya (Ankara), 499; (Tehran), 441.
102 Ocak, La Révolte de Baba Resul, 74.
103 Ocak writes (La Révolte de Baba Resul, 75) that the Mahdi ‘est une idée qui convient, en Islam, beaucoup mieux aux croyances shiites que sunnites’.
104 Ibn Bibi, al-Awamir al-Ala’îyya (Ankara), 502; (Tehran), 443.
There appeared in Anatolia a Turkmen man called Baba, who claimed prophecy (nubuwwa) and used to say, ‘Say there is no God but God, Baba is the friend of God (wali allâh)’. A great group of people joined him, and the ruler of Anatolia sent an army against him. They met and 4000 of them were killed; they also killed the Baba.105

A different slant is given by Bar Hebraeus, who describes how ‘[Baba Rasul] called himself “rasul” that is to say “One who is sent” (i.e. Apostle), for he said that he was the Apostle of God in truth, and that Mahamad [Muhammad] was a liar, and not the Apostle [of God]’.106 According to Bar Hebraeus, the rebels executed anyone ‘who did not confess with his tongue that the Baba was a divine Apostle and Prophet’. Elvan Çelebi himself never directly calls his ancestor a prophet, although he comes close. He does use the term in describing how Baba İlyas’s arch enemy, the Qadi Köre of Çat, composed a petition to the sultan describing how

There has come a man in this form, whom people call a prophet. Everyone prays in his name, man and fairy, plain and mountain. Strife (fitna) has arisen, people have turned to him. He has got control over us, he is making for you. His army is innumerable...107

Elvan also hints at Baba İlyas’s superior status:

Whether he is one of the resolute (ulu'l-azm, i.e. a prophet), a prophet (nebi) or a saint (veli), know the reason for his coming and going.108

The term ulu'l-azm refers to the five (or in some versions six) great prophets who brought divine law recognised by Islam: Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Muhammad. Shi'ite tradition compares the Mahdi to these prophets,109 while for Sunnis one of these ulu'l-azm prophets, Jesus, will serve as vizier to the Mahdi at the end of time.110 The suggestion that Baba İlyas might have been an ulu'l-azm prophet is certainly a bold one, and it is possible that apocalyptic significance was attached to it, although this not directly evident from Elvan’s account.

There are a few other allusions in Elvan that might be perceived as apocalyptic. Baba İlyas is repeatedly referred to as ‘the possessor of the grey horse’ (boz atlı). It is

---

106 Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, I, 405.
107 Elvan Çelebi, Menakibu'l-Kudsiyye, l. 461–4:
    Kim gelüpdür bu şüreter bir er/Kim hâlâyık dir aşa peygâmber
    Şalavat adina virür enbûh/Âdemî vü perî çu deşt ü çu küh
    Fitne oldî bu halk döndi aşa/Bizi başardî çaşd kıldı saña
    Leşkeri bi-hisâb-dur cengi...
    See also ibid., ll. 490ff.
108 Ibid., l. 320: ger ulu'l-azm ger nebi vü veli/Gelmegi gitmegi bilün sebebi.
110 Discussed in Elmore, Islamic Sainthood, 542.
on this horse that Baba İlyas escapes from prison in Amasya, when ‘the promise of God to us is fulfilled; we reach [him], farewell to you’. Various traditions associated the Mahdi with a grey horse. Bar Hebraeus, writing in the thirteenth century, recorded that the eighth-century Central Asian pseudo-Prophet Muqanna believed he would return as a messiah, embodied as a ‘grizzled-haired man riding on a grey horse’. However, the implications of the grey horse in our case are extremely unclear, for Elvan claims that not only Baba İlyas, but also the latter’s spiritual guide Dede Garkın and son Muhlis Paşa were boz atlu (possessing a grey horse). Possession of the grey horse was also one of the attributes at Khidr, so the motif may therefore in some way signify continuity of sanctity without necessarily having apocalyptic implications, although this needs further research.

Even if Baba Rasul/Baba İlyas did not claim to be a Mahdi, it is not impossible that some at the time and subsequently interpreted the revolt in an apocalyptic framework as Elvan Çelebi may occasionally hint. The outbreak of the revolt in south-eastern Anatolia, which is described as Syria (Şam) by Elvan Çelebi and its leader as Ishak-ı Şami, may have been seen by some to have had an apocalyptic significance. Syria/al-Sham was traditionally closely associated with apocalypse, the land in which some of its key events would unfold. These traditions were emphasised in texts that circulated in Anatolia such as Ibn Barrajan’s Qur’an commentary and the Risala fi Amr al-Mahdi. Moreover, such a rebellion might even have been interpreted as a sign of the imminent apocalypse by those who did not accept the claims of the Baba. The Risala fi Amr al-Mahdi attributed to al-Qunawi stresses that one of the signs of the appearance of the Mahdi will be the emergence of false claimants to this status; this idea derives from the hadith that thirty dajjāls will appear before the last hour, each claiming to be a prophet. The Risala describes how shortly before the apocalypse a man will emerge in the al-Zab region near Mosul, claiming to be a Mahdi and attracting the allegiance of a great multitude of supporters. He is lying, but this lie is compared to a ‘false dawn’. Other sources also attest the existence of false prophets and Mahdis, as we can see in a text written in 629/1232 for al-Malik al-Mas’ud Mawdud b. Salih
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Nasir al-Din, the Artuqid ruler of Amid and Hisn Kayfa – very close to the region in which Baba Ishaq started his revolt. The book, al-Jawbari’s *al-Mukhtar fi Kashf al-Asrar wa Hatak al-Astar*, deals generally with imposters, but its very first chapters are devoted to false prophets.118 Most of these examples come from earlier Islamic history, but in his second chapter, on false shaykhs, al-Jawbari mentions a recent occurrence in the reign of the Ayyubid al-Malik al-‘Adil: in Damascus there had appeared a man named ‘lost’ (*al-mafqūd*) ‘claiming to be a prophet and Jesus son of Mary, who attracted a group of leading men of the town’.119 Given Jesus’s association with the apocalypse in Islamic thought, this may well have constituted a messianic or at least apocalyptic claim.

Thus we cannot totally dismiss the possibility that Baba Rasul/Baba İlyas’s revolt may have been perceived by some as having an apocalyptic significance, even by those who did not believe his claims, and even so they would fit into a general pattern of apocalyptic activity in the region. However, it is striking that none of our contemporary sources attributes a messianic claim to Baba Rasul/İlyas or Baba Ishaq. Rather, as Sibt b. al-Jawzi, Ibn Bibi and Bar Hebraeus stress, Baba Rasul/İlyas claimed to be either a *wali*, a friend of God, or a *rasūl*, or prophet, two ideas which were closely linked.120 As we saw in Chapter 2, Sufis had a long-standing tradition of claiming the saints (awliyā’) were not just the heirs of the prophets, but that sainthood (being a *wali*) was tantamount to prophecy, or the ‘inner dimension and guarantor of prophecy’.121 Elvan’s studied ambiguity in referring to his grandfather as ‘one of the resolute (*ulu’l-ʿazm*)’, a prophet (*nabī*) or a saint (*velī*), noted earlier, may reflect the idea that he was both simultaneously a *wali* and a *nabī*, as does Sibt ibn al-Jawzi’s information that the Baba claimed *nubuwwa* and was called *wali allāh*. It is possible, then, that Baba Rasul/İlyas’s claim to prophethood was rather less radical at the time than it appears with hindsight.

A few shreds of additional information are given by Ibn Bibi, who tells us that the Baba won over the Turkmen by his expertise in sorcery,122 and that he gained support from the people of Amasya by his life of piety and asceticism (*tawarruḍ wa tazahhud*) and his successful role in resolving their marital disputes.123 Given the
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implacable hostility of all these sources to the Baba, one would expect that if he had claimed to be the Mahdi they would mention it. A conspiracy by three independent sources in different languages to affirm the Baba’s claim to be a prophet, but hide that of Mahdism, seems unlikely. Even if Baba Rasul/Ilyas had claimed to be the Mahdi, it does not follow that he was a Shiite. Rather, in the context of the information we have about Mahdism in medieval Anatolia from the texts, it would suggest he would be more likely to be a follower of Ibn ‘Arabi or his school. Evidence for the revolt’s Sunni character is strengthened by Ibn Bibi, who remarks that Baba Ishaq sought to persuade the Khwarazmians to participate by claiming Sultan Ghiyath al-Din had departed from the path of orthodoxy by drinking wine, ‘deviating from God’s path and following the Rashidun Caliphs’ (inhirāf-i ʿū az jādda-yi rabb-i ʿālamīn wa ʾiqtidā-yi khulafā-yi rāshidin). It is inconceivable that a Shiite revolt would have employed a slogan advocating following the Rashidun Caliphs, who are recognised only by Sunnis.

There is one final piece of evidence adduced by Ocak that needs to be addressed, as it is key to his argument. Ocak notes that Aflaki claim that Baba Rasul had a special deputy (khulafā-yi khāṣ), Hacı Bektaş. Later tradition credits Hacı Bektaş with being the founder of Alevi/Bektashism, suggesting the revolt’s Shiite connection. Yet we have no reliable contemporary or near-contemporary detail as to what Hacı Bektaş actually believed; only passing references such as that in Aflaki allow us to be reasonably confident of the existence of such an individual in the thirteenth century. Although Aflaki criticises Hacı Bektaş for his lack of adherence to sharia, it is far from clear that actually implies Shiism, or can be taken at face value, given the competition between rival Sufi groups reflected in the Manaqib al-Arifin. Moreover, Elvan Çelebi, writing at around the same time as Aflaki, is none too keen on Hacı Bektaş despite the latter’s supposed close relationship to Baba Rasul/Ilyas. Elvan remarks on Hacı Bektaş’s ignorance of the esoteric secrets (Hacı Bektaş srrimm bilnez). Hacı Bektaş’s own relationship with Alevism is thus itself a considerable problem that has scarcely been broached by scholarship.

As discussed in Chapter 2, Baba Ilyas’s legacy was perpetuated most directly by his descendants the poets Aşık Paşa and Elvan Çelebi. In their works there is little trace of Shiism, but rather a Sunni esoteric religiosity. The Baba’i revolt does not therefore represent popular apocalypticism, Mahdism or Shiism. If anything, it suggests the enduring appeal of a religiosity based on the power of prophecy and

124 Ibn Bibi, al-Awamir al-ʿAla’yya (Ankara), 499–500; (Tehran), 441.
125 Aflaki, Manaqib, I, 381; Feats, 263–4.
126 Elvan Çelebi, Menaksbu’l-Kudsiyye, l. 2003.
127 See also the remarks in Yıldırım, ‘Sunni Orthodox vs Shi’ite Heterodox?’, 295–6.
the *sunna* of the Prophet and the first Caliphs. It was only in the Mongol period that appeals to *sunna* and apocalypticism were harnessed to a political revolt of a different character.

**MAHDIST REVOLTS UNDER MONGOL RULE**

Mongol rule witnessed a number of messianic revolts in territories as far apart as Bukhara and Iraq, although it is hard to be sure whether their quantity and nature represents much departure from the numerous messianic incidents that proliferated in earlier and later periods. The Sufi author Mu’ayyid al-Din Jandi, a member of al-Qunawi’s circle who spent much of his career in Anatolia, gives us an impression of quite how widespread Mahdist claims were when recounting his stay in Baghdad:

A person entered the house and claimed he was the Mahdi, and asked me to bear witness to the claim. I said, ‘Before God, I bear witness that you are not the Mahdi and you are a liar.’ He became hostile and aggressive with me, and gathered a group off heretics and Nusayris and instructed them to harm me.

In this instance the reference to Nusayris may suggest the interest of extremist Shiites in messianism, but it was certainly not restricted to them. Our first evidence in the period for a popular mahdist revolt in our region comes from the Ilkhanid chronicler Qashani who records how in the year 707/1307–8:

One of the events of this year was the appearance of an individual named Musa who emerged from the mountain of Kurdistan, and asserted a claim to be the Mahdi. Thirty thousand men of the misguided Kurdish soldiery joined with him, and from an excess of ignorance and misguidedness swiftly accepted his meaningless claim, so that during the year 707/1307–8 his mission appeared and spread among the people and the fame of his claim reached far and near, Turk and Persian. When a group of Mongol amirs who were living in that district heard of this outbreak of strife (*fitna*) and corruption, they mobilised to fend off his evil.

Qashani goes on to describe how the Mongol army succeeded in suppressing the revolt, executing Musa and sending his head to the *ordu*. Qashani’s account ends with exactly the same verses quoted in the *Matali al-Iman*:

If you want enemies, Mahdi
Come down from the sky
If you want helpers, antichrist,
Show yourself at once!

---
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So little information survives about this revolt that its interpretation is extremely difficult. It cannot even be said for sure that Musa was a Muslim, or where exactly his revolt originated. It is possible that he was a member of a sect such as the Yazidis who inhabited the Kurdistan mountains. Moreover, it is possible that Qashani’s narrative of a false messiah from the provinces should be read in the context of the increasing interest in Mahdism at the Ilkhanid court where Qashani was writing in the wake of Ghazan’s conversion. The verses shared with the Matali ’may be intended to suggest that in an age of false Mahdis such as this, a true one – the Ilkhan – is required to crush them.

The second and most dramatic of these mahdist revolts in the period was that of Timurtash, the Ilkhanid governor of Anatolia in the reign of Abu Sa’id, as the Ilkhanid historian Hafiz-i Abru relates:

In the year 722/1322, the amir Timurtash son of amir Chopan rebelled in the kingdom of Rum. He had the khutba and the sikka done in his own name, and called himself the Mahdi of the end of time (Mahdi-yi âkbir-i zamân).

The Anatolian historian Aqsara’i, whose Musamarat al-Akhbar was dedicated to Timurtash, confirms this. In the opening dedication of his work he gives Timurtash the title (among others) of mahdi-yi zamân. Later, in his discussion of Timurtash’s rule, he also alludes to his claim, writing that:

he strengthened Islam and the protection of Muslims so much that as a result of his charity, his prevention of injustice and hostility, his suppression of aggressors and rebels, the deeds and conditions of the Mahdi appeared.

One of the signs of the appearance of the Mahdi was his banning of alcohol, which Timurtash undertook with alacrity, Aqsara’i tells us, forbidding not just Muslims but also non-Muslims from its consumption.

Timurtash’s rebellion against Ilkhanid authority and his self-proclamation as Mahdi were doubtless bound up with practical political concerns. Timurtash fought ferociously against the various Turkmen beylikts to consolidate his control over Anatolia, in particular battling the Karamanids, Eshrefids and the Hamidoğulları. At the same time, his quest for unfettered power led him to negotiate with the Ilkhans’ arch-enemies the Mamluks. His embrace of the title of Mahdi may

---
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have seemed a useful way of asserting authority and legitimacy. While the Turkmen begs emphasised their connections to the Seljuq house or their appointment by the Mamluks to support their claims to rule, Timurtash had no such expedient, and he lacked a lineage to allow him to assert legitimacy as a Chinggisid ruler, despite Aqsara’i giving him the title of shahriyār (king). Mahdiship thus offered an alternative vocabulary of legitimate kingship. Such claims, however, had to backed up by actions, and Timurtash sought to assert his mahdiship through the rigorous implementation of the sharia. Not only was alcohol banned, but according to Aqsara’i the sumptuary laws restricting Christians’ dress were also imposed on the ‘Jews and Christians who had previously been accustomed to dressing in the clothes of Muslims’. Indeed, Aqsara’i implicitly compares Timurtash favourably to the Seljuq Sultan ‘Izz al-Din Kayka’us I, quoting Ibn ‘Arabi’s letter to the latter criticising him for failing to impose the shurūt ‘Umar, the restrictions on non-Muslims attributed to the Caliph ‘Umar. It is on this note, with a substantial quotation from Ibn ‘Arabi’s letter demanding the restriction of Christian practices, that the Musamarat al-Akhbar ends. That these were not purely rhetorical claims is confirmed by an Armenian source, the account of the martyrdom of St Gregory Karninci, Bishop of Erzurum, which documents Timurtash’s assaults on Christians across the region – his attack on Armenian Cilicia, his burning down of churches in Edjmiadzin and Kayseri, culminating in the forced conversion and circumcision of the bishop of Erzurum. Colophons of Armenian manuscripts from the period confirm this picture of persecution, as do decrees of the Orthodox Patriarchate.

It seems that Timurtash’s strategy succeeded in ingratiating himself with the elites of Anatolia. Aflaki recounts how Timurtash asserted his mahdiship in 723/1322–3 in the wake of his capture of Konya from the Karamanids:

He proclaimed, ‘I am the Lord of the Conjunction, indeed I am the Mahdi of the age [man šāhib girān-am, balkih Mahdi-yi zamān]’. As he had no equal in the amount of money he spent, and was a second Anushirwan in justice, he was a truly pious and pure-hearted youth, all the leading ulama, elders, amirs, notables and army chiefs of Rum, and others, gave him their allegiance and were obedient to him. They formed an alliance with him, and
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a group of the leading men of the age, like our lord Najm al-Din Tashti, shaykhzada-yi Tuqati, the late Zahir al-Din khaṭīb of Kayseri, shaykh Nasir-i Sufi, our lord Amir Hasan-i tabī, the qadi Shihab of Niğde, the chief military qadi [qāḍī-lashkar] Vighani, and the preacher [wā‘īz] Husam-i Yarjanlaghi, and the other qadis and ulama from every town followed him and approved of him, and exaggerating in praising him in order for him to achieve his objectives. They got others to pledge their allegiance to him.144

Far from appealing to the marginalised of society, Timurtash’s mahdist claims were evidently designed to assert his legitimacy among the elite of Ilkhanid Anatolia. Most of the figures named by Aflaki cannot be identified beyond the references in his text, but Najm al-Din Tashti is known to have been chief qadi of Rum (qāḍī-yi qudat-i Rum), an associate of Qutb al-Din Shirazi and a man who enjoyed such close links to the Ilkhanid court that he was employed by them as an envoy to the Chagatayid rebel Yasawur.145 Evidently the others were senior members of the religious classes.

Both the literary and the historical evidence thus indicates that apocalypticism was overwhelmingly the concern of the Sunni intellectual and courtly elite. It resonated with those steeped in the influential philosophy of Ibn ‘Arabi, which drew on a tradition of Maghrebi apocalypticism, as well as Sufi authors such as Najm al-Din Razi who wrote for courtly audiences. In Nasiri’s Mu’nis al-Awarif we have seen how the Seljuq sultan’s claims to be the Mahdi could justify the political impotence of the sultanate under Mongol hegemony, while Mahdism also served as a tool for the Mongol court as the Ilkhan Ghazan sought to establish a new basis for the legitimacy of his dynasty. This is not to say that apocalypticism and Mahdism were purely a political tool. The Risala fi Amr al-Mahdi suggests that some believed that the apocalypse was imminent, or even had already started. What is doubtful is the extent to which apocalyptic beliefs were widespread. With the exception of the rebellion of the Kurdish chief Musa in 707/1307, about which we know too little to comment further, apocalypticism and Mahdism do not seem to have formed a major concern of popular religiosity, in so far as we can judge from the extant Turkish texts, which exhibit a pious interest in eschatology but little sense that the Turkish-speaking masses were credulously waiting for a Mahdi. In the long term, though, this elite apocalypticism may have had a broader social impact by the actions of Timurtash in attempting to create the Mahdi’s perfect Muslim society on earth by persecuting Christians.
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The Mongol invasions coincided with a process of Islamisation that had been gathering speed in Anatolia since the second half of the twelfth century. This was accelerated both directly, if not necessarily always intentionally, by Mongol policies and indirectly by the changes Mongol rule wrought on Muslim society. Mongol rule redrew the political landscape of Anatolia, with the collapse of Seljuq authority leading to the emergence of new powers such as the beyliks. From the 1270s, Anatolia became increasingly integrated into the Ilkhanid empire, both through the Mongol military presence there but also the residence of scholars, bureaucrats and even relatively humble artisans such as members of futuwwa organisations from Iran. The marginalisation and eventual abolition of the traditional source of political authority in Anatolia, the Seljuq sultanate, in addition to the broader crisis of authority brought about by the end of the Abbasid Caliphate, forced Anatolia’s new rulers, both Turkmen and Mongol, to seek alternative means to justify their rule. A political rhetoric centred on belief and unbelief took hold, and with the Mongol conversion to Islam its use only increased. Incidents of persecution of non-Muslims, although not systematic, begin to be attested in the sources as the Mongols sought to assert their adherence to the new faith and justify their rule in Islamic terms.

Sufism offered a further means of resolving the crisis of legitimacy, in particular through the theories of sainthood propagated by Ibn ʿArabi on the eve of the Mongol invasions, which formed the basis for the concepts popularised in Anatolia through the works of Najm al-Din Razi, Jalal al-Din Rumi and Sultan Walad. The awliyāʾ offered rulers not merely spiritual benefits through their prayers (duʿā-yi dawlat), but also potentially a place in the new spiritual hierarchy. Sultan Walad legitimised even harsh rule not simply by explaining it as divine will, but by identifying the ruler himself as a potential quṭb, the pinnacle of the
hierarchy of beings endowed with knowledge of God. Sufism, especially the Mevlevi order, became increasingly associated with members of the political elite, who patronised lavish manuscripts of Sufi works as well as Sufi lodges.

Developments in the Mongol period laid the ground for the emergence in the early modern period of forms of Muslim sacral kingship. The *Iksir al-Sa’adat*, a text composed the end of the fourteenth century by the qadi-sultan of Sivas, Qadi Burhan al-Din Ahmad, who had overthrown the Mongols’ Eretnid governors and seized power for himself, sought to promote an image of the sultan as a perfect man (i.e. a *quṭb*) and a holy warrior in a jihad that aimed to utterly ruin Christians.¹ Such concepts of the identification of the *quṭb* with the ruler were to have a long trajectory. Timur’s soldiers are said to have considered him as the *quṭb*,² suggesting the popular penetration of the idea, which survived into the high Ottoman period. In the sixteenth century, Mevlena İsa, a poet-historian at the court of the Ottoman Sultan Süleyman the Magnificent, identified the sultan, endowed with saintliness (*velayet*) as not just *quṭb*, but also *mujaddid* and Mahdi, the renewer of the age and the saviour.³ The popularisation of this idea was no doubt one result of the successful spread and proselytisation of Mevlevism, and it is a striking testimony to the Mevlevis’ influence in later times and outside Anatolia that Ibn Bazzaz, the hagiographer of Shaykh Safi (d. 735/1334), founder of the Safavid line, starts his account by claiming that the emergence of Shaykh Safi had been foretold and ordained by none other than Jalal al-Din Rumi.⁴

In these ways, the Anatolian *awliyā‘* continued to exert a political influence long after their deaths. It is, however, significant that such ideas of sacral kingship exercised such an appeal beyond the great imperial centres such as Ilkhanid Tabriz, to provincials such as the Mevlevi Mongol amir Sati Beg and copyists such as ‘Ali b. Dustkhuda, of whose careers we know little. Beyond justifying imperial rule, these theories of sacral kingship evidently helped members of lower social echelons make sense of the post-Abbasid order and their place in it. At the same time, the revolution in Islamic political thought that the Mongols precipitated was also of profound relevance to the local lords of Anatolia who needed to find a new idiom of rulership, one based to some degree on their relationship with the holy men that Ilkhans and Turkmen begs alike patronised.

Political power and Sufism also conjoined in the most widespread popular articulation of Sufism, *futuwwa*, which in Mongol Anatolia developed in a
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distinctive form. *Futuwwa* encompassed both the theoretical embrace of Sufi ideals and the practice of violence. The latter aspect endowed the *fitrān* with a considerable political importance, and *futuwwa* formed a crucial part of the Ilkhanid strategy for controlling Anatolia, with *akhīs* effectively delegated responsibility for governing towns that lacked a Mongol garrison. Thus while the weakening of earlier structures of authority certainly created the space in which the *fitrān* could emerge as a force, the growth of politically active *futuwwa* seems to have been if anything a development encouraged by the Mongols and their local allies such as Karatay rather than the wholly autonomous, ethnically Turkish, anti-Mongol force envisaged by much scholarship to date.

Together both the saintly and *futuwwa* manifestations of Sufism contributed to an environment that was increasingly conducive to conversion, even if exact details of the processes are hazy. The association of both articulations of Sufism – despite their theoretical (and sometimes practical) insistence on the virtues of poverty – with political and even financial success was doubtless a major attraction. This is suggested particularly by the appeal of *futuwwa* to non-Muslim communities, which becomes evident in the Mongol period. These developments also affected Turkmen-ruled areas too. The nexus between the ruling elites, *fitrān*, Sufi piety and conversion on the Turkmen periphery is suggested by Ibn Battuta’s account of his sojourn in Bursa, which had just been incorporated into the Ottoman realm in 1326, a few years before the Moroccan’s visit:

There is a *zāwiya* to accommodate travellers who are given food for the length of their stay, which is three days, which was built by one of the Turkmen kings [i.e. the Ottoman ruler Orhan]. We stayed in the *zāwiya* of the *fitrān* leader Akhi Shams al-Din, and our stay coincided with ‘Ashura’.5 [Akhi Shams al-Din] made a great feast to which he invited the leading soldiers (*wujūh al-‘askar*) and the people of the city that night, and they broke their fast with him. The Qur’an reciters recited with fine voices, and the *faqīh* Majd al-Din al-Qunawi, who was a preacher (*wāʾiḍ*), was also present. He preached and admonished very well, and then everyone started the *samāʾ* and dance. Marvellous was that night. The preacher [Majd al-Din] was one of the righteous, he continually fasted and only ate every three days. [When he did so], he ate only what he himself obtained by the toil of his hand and did not eat anyone else’s food. He had no dwelling place or possessions except the clothes that covered him, and he slept only in cemeteries. He preached in assembles (*majālis*) and admonished, and numerous people repented (*yatūb*) before him in every assembly.6

Ibn Battuta shows how the infrastructure for Majd al-Din’s preaching, the *zāwiya*, is provided by the ruler, and his audience comprises in part the military elite.

---
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Majd al-Din is evidently a muwallah or Qalandar Sufi, shunning society to reside in the cemeteries, but he is at the same time described as a faqih, a specialist in religious law. Ibn Battuta thus underlines how the two categories of ‘ālim and Sufi could overlap and complement one another, even if there could also be tensions between them, as suggested by Elvan Çelebi’s account of the struggle between Baba İlyas and Qadi Köre.

The repentance (tawba) which Majd al-Din inspired could refer to Muslims’ inner turning from their sins, and their embrace of Sufism; but in the environment of Bursa, presumably still overwhelmingly Christian some six years after the conquest, it might also suggest the repentance of unbelievers from unbelief and their embrace of Islam. Quantifying this process of conversion remains challenging in the face of the body of evidence largely comprising such indirect hints. When exactly Anatolia became majority Muslim is unknown. Although some estimates suggest that by the sixteenth century Anatolia was some 90–5 per cent Muslim, these rely on a rather more optimistic view of the reliability of figures provided by Ottoman archival documents than is fashionable today. The evidence adduced by scholars of Byzantium strongly points to the late thirteenth to fourteenth centuries as a turning point, the date by which the Orthodox Church in Anatolia had gone into decline, coinciding with the period of Mongol rule. This point corresponds to a new interest on the part of rulers in Muslim Anatolia in propagating Islam through sponsoring an infrastructure of zāwiyyas and patronising Sufis such as Majd al-Din. The immediate effect of these policies was not mass conversions, as far as we can tell, but rather the creation of an atmosphere in which it was simply more uncomfortable not to be Muslim, an atmosphere where a rhetoric centred on unbelief was propagated not just by rulers and Sufis but by popular preachers and storytellers, many of whom were themselves also Sufis. The insistence in futuwwa manuals on excluding Christians from their buildings must have also contributed to this unwelcoming environment to non-Muslims, creating a further incentive to conversion. If Mongol rule did accelerate the process of Islamisation – both in terms of the absolute number of converts and Muslims and the increasing cultural dominance of Islam – this was probably not the consequence of a deliberate policy, the persecutions of Ghazan and Timurtash aside, or

---
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even the work of individual proselytisers, but rather the combination of factors that created this new atmosphere.

A crucial tool for the propagation of Islam was the new literary language that emerged in our period. It is clear that the development of Old Anatolian Turkish was indebted to models pioneered in the Golden Horde that underwent a parallel if distinct process of Islamisation in the same period. Much further work is necessary to understand the circulation of scholars and texts between the Horde, Anatolia and Egypt, the three main regions where Turkish developed as a literary language over the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries. At least in the Anatolian case, it seems that the new literature in Turkish emerged partly through the aim of Sufis to assert their own status as unique intermediaries with the divine through multilingual communication. In addition, a courtly literature of much more limited circulation came into existence in principalities such as those of the Aydnids and the Germiyanids, where it seems to have served to support those nascent dynasties’ credentials as patrons of Islamic scholarship and civilisation. Nonetheless, in all cases the emergence of the new literary language of Turkish again seems to reflect the breakdown of traditional models of authority: it is far from coincidental that its initial centres in Anatolia are previously marginal areas such as Kirşehir on the semi-steppe and the Turkmen periphery.

Whatever the reasons for vernacularisation, by the early fourteenth century popular texts such as the Siraj al-Qulub and the Behceti’l-Hadayik circulated widely in both Persian and Turkish, in contrast to the court-centred literature of Seljuq times, which is attested in few manuscripts. These writings offer a window into the possible preachings of men such as Majd al-Din. Heterodoxy or syncretism are hardly reflected in the vernacular literature of Mongol Anatolia, which rather emphasises the common core of belief to which Muslims were expected to adhere, in particular through its emphasis on eschatology. This literature consistently returns to themes of belief and unbelief, which sometimes becomes increasingly defined in sectarian terms as texts identify true believers as Sunnis rather than simply Muslims. If the texts studied here do not show a detailed knowledge of the works of Sunni theologians, that is perhaps as much a function of their genre and their purpose as the intellectual level of their authors. As in the case of the Konya Siraj al-Qulub text, there are indications this literature was not composed in isolation from learned exegetical and textual traditions.

Indeed, the wide circulation of works such as Ibn Barrajan’s tafsirs is testimony to the fact that thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Anatolians had access to learned Islamic texts from distant parts of the Islamic world, and doubtless future work on the largely unexplored mass of medieval Anatolian manuscripts can further elucidate this picture. Even from the inevitably limited corpus of material examined in this book, it should be clear that Anatolians read a wide range of
literature in Arabic and Persian. Standard legal texts such as those by al-Sadr al-Shahid circulated, and indeed even before the coming of the Mongols there were convenient local legal manuals such as al-Sijistani’s *Munyat al-Mufti*. There were commentaries on classical Arabic works by authors such as Muhsin al-Qaysari designed to improve Anatolian Muslims’ knowledge of Arabic, and locally produced works on hadith such as al-Arzinjani’s commentary on al-Saghani, which was evidently also known in the Golden Horde. More literary works such as histories by Ibn al-Athir and Ibn al-Jawzi and the poems of Ibn Farid were read and copied in madrasas, *khângâhs* and at court. Patrons such as Sati Beg and Fakhr al-Din ‘Ali were prepared to invest large sums in lavishly illuminated manuscripts, while the upstart Turkmen rulers also commissioned Turkish versions of Arabic and Persian classics to show their participation in Islamic culture. Far from being an isolated Wild West, Anatolia was integrated into literary and intellectual networks that stretched both east and west from Central Asia to Spain. If the ‘ulama’ have featured rather rarely per se in our account, that was not because they were absent, as some scholarship has assumed, but rather because they are often identified first and foremost under other categories in the sources such as Sufis or even *fitâyân*, as with Majd al-Din. However, their existence cannot be doubted, given the evidence of much textual production that was evidently designed to meet their needs and interests.

In many ways, then, Anatolia was not so very different from surrounding Muslim societies in the Mongol period, at least in terms of its intellectual life. To be sure it had certain peculiarities, such as a larger Christian population and apparently an absence of patrons interested in listening to panegyrics. Yet it evidently provided an environment where migrant scholars could make a career, such as the Khwaramian we encountered in Ayasuluk, and locals such as Hacı Paşa could return from studies in Cairo confident of a warm reception at court. One element of this common Islamic tradition was the espousal of philo-‘Alidism or *tashayyu*’*hasan*, which was quite separate from Shiism and was shared by many Sunnis of the period, as is shown by the enthusiasm for epics relating to ‘Ali, such as those composed by Beypazarı Maazoğlu and indeed the celebration of ‘Ashura’ in Bursa noted in Ibn Battuta’s account mentioned earlier. Yet although some hints do exist of the presence of Shiite beliefs in *futuwwa* and Sufi circles, the main form in which Shiism is generally thought to have been manifested in this period, messianism, can be seen on closer examination to be a reflection more of Sunni apocalypticism, influenced in Anatolia by Maghrebi models in particular. With

---

9 See the discussion in the Introduction, pp. 25–6.
10 See Chapter 3, e.g. the examples of the *fitâyân* ‘ulama’ Muhammad al-Sarwi and Ibn Qalamshah on p. 138.
Ghazan’s conversion, ideas of the ruler as Mahdi, ever present in the Muslim polity, and already current at the Seljuq court in Anatolia, became influential in the Ilkhanate. The power of such claims is suggested by the ability of Timurtash, the Mongol governor of Anatolia, to mobilise support around his claim to be the messiah, which evidently met with enthusiastic acceptance on the part of members of the religious elite as well as bureaucrats such as Aqsara’i. These messianic claims were further accompanied by acts of persecution of non-Muslims in keeping with the Mahdi’s task of installing perfect Islamic rule before the end of days.

A good illustration of the piety-minded Islamic environment that prevailed not just in the Mongol centre, but also at Turkmen courts on the periphery, is provided by Ibn Battuta’s account of the Turkmen ruler of Eğirdir:

The sultan of Eğirdir, Abu Ishaq Beg b. Dündar Beg, is one of the great sultans of that land [Anatolia]. He dwelt in the land of Egypt in the time of his father and undertook the hajj. He has a praiseworthy lifestyle, and one of his customs is to come every day to afternoon prayer (ṣalāt al-‘asr) in the congregational mosque. When prayer is over, he leans against the qibla-facing wall, with one of the Qur’an readers before him seated on a high wooden bench. They read suras al-Fath and al-Mulk, and their fine voices have such an effect on the soul that people’s hearts are afraid and they shudder and weep. Then [the sultan] departs to his palace. We spent the month of Ramadan with him, and every night he sat on a carpet that was fixed directly to the floor, without a throne, and rested against a great cushion while the faqih Muslih al-Din sat to one side and I sat next to the faqih, the courtiers and palace amirs behind us. Food was served, and the first dish that was taken to break the fast was soup in a small bowl, on which were lentils in fat and sugar. The soup was presented as a form of blessing, for they said, ‘The Prophet, peace and blessings be upon him, preferred it to all other food, so we begin with it because of the Prophet’s preference for it.’ Only after that is the rest of the food brought. That is their custom in the month of Ramadan.11

A hajji, brought up in Egypt, who recites the Qur’an and consciously emulates the behaviour of the Prophet Muhammad, Abu Ishaq Beg is a ruler who represents perhaps the antithesis of the ‘state that was [not] interested in rigorously defining and strictly enforcing an orthodoxy’ that Kafadar has identified as characteristic of medieval Anatolia.12 We should perhaps drop the problematic term orthodoxy, but across Anatolia rulers, Turkmen and Mongol alike, were certainly concerned with promoting a piety- and sharia-minded Muslim religiosity, as were Sufis. Of course, there were no doubt other forms of piety: the intense interest in magic evinced by Nasiri Sijistani, who dedicated his majmū’a of works on the topic to the by now marginalised and politically irrelevant court of the child-sultan

12 Cf. Introduction, p. 21; Kafadar, Between Two Worlds, 76.
Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw III, reminds us that the Mongol period also produced losers who sought alternative means of calling on divine support. The alienated doubtless provided a ready constituency for the self-proclaimed prophets and messiahs who frequently emerged, ranging from the obscure who are recorded only in passing references in chronicles to Baba İlyas, who was remembered by his descendants for his role in bringing down the Seljuq state. Yet the texts examined here suggest that it was the Sunni pietism of men such as Timurtash and Abu Ishaq, even if framed sometimes in messianic terms, that became the dominant religious discourse by the early fourteenth century. Even according to their enemies, the Baba’s framed their revolt as a call for a return to the ways of the Rashidun Caliphs, recognised by Sunnis but rejected by Shiites. The Ottomans, then, did not suddenly discover or invent Sunnitisation in the sixteenth century in response to their new imperial destiny, as sometimes argued, but rather it was the dominant feature of the religious landscape in which the Ottomans themselves emerged.

Yet to assess the significance of the Mongol period in Anatolia only through the lens of its implications for Ottoman history would be misleading. Not only did Anatolia become more integrated into the broader Islamic world, as attested by the circulation of texts and scholars from places as diverse as Khwarazm and the Maghreb, and rulers such as Abu Ishaq Beg performing the hajj, but its scholars and litterateurs started to exert a broader influence beyond the confines of the peninsula. While some of the texts considered here had a limited, probably purely local, circulation in Anatolia, others became international bestsellers across the Islamic world. Most famous in this respect were the works of Rumi, and Mevlevi texts were by the fourteenth century being exported to regions such as the Golden Horde lands and even distant India. Future research must paint a more detailed picture of these exchanges and their influence, but the general pattern is clear. Anatolia, then, should not be considered the passive recipient of external influences, but from the Mongol period onwards, through exports such as its religious traditions and the Turkish language, it started to play its own role in shaping the broader intellectual culture of the Islamic world.

14 Yıldırım, ‘Sunni Orthodox vs Shi’ite Heterodox?’, esp. 305–7; see the discussion, with references, in Terzioğlu, ‘How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization’, 311–18.
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