



European Research Council

Established by the European Commission



Research and Open Access to this article has been funded by the European Research Council (ERC), under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 648498)

FROM *SHAHĀDA* TO '*AQĪDA*: CONVERSION TO ISLAM, CATECHISATION AND SUNNITISATION IN SIXTEENTH- CENTURY OTTOMAN RUMELI

Tijana Krstić

IN A RECENT ARTICLE, Derin Terzioğlu introduced a heretofore unknown seventeenth-century catechetical work in Ottoman Turkish by a certain Nushi al-Nasīhi. Hailing most probably from the Ottoman European domains (Rumeli) and writing in roughly the 1630s, Nushi lamented the state of basic religious instruction in the empire and blamed the woes of the Ottoman state on insufficient knowledge of faith and on laxity in the observance of religious laws. He went on to outline a detailed plan of how the condition should be remedied: the authorities should send out town criers to all neighbourhoods and announce that from that point on everyone over the age of seven regardless of their social status would be examined on their knowledge of 'faith and Islam and ablution and ritual prayer' (*īmāndan ve İslāmdan ve ābdest ve namāzdan su'āl idüp*).¹ He further enjoined that those who fail to show satisfactory knowledge should be 'publicly scolded, administered discretionary punishment or evicted from the neighbourhood'.² The effect of this expulsion of 'heretics', he suggested, would also be the conversion of non-Muslims, who would flock to the true faith upon this evidence of the Muslims' commitment to it.³

Nushi al-Nasīhi was not writing in the early days of Islam's spread in Rumeli; rather, his work dates to a different phase in the process of Islam's establishment in the Ottoman Empire, a phase that scholars have recently begun to refer to as 'Sunnitisation' and/or 'confessionalisation'.⁴ This phase seems to begin in the early sixteenth century and continues throughout the seventeenth, and is characterised by a greater concern within the Ottoman Muslim community about Sunni orthodoxy and orthopraxy according to the Hanafi legal tradition. In recent years, scholars have begun to point to the processes related to Ottoman state-building and the fashioning of an imperial ideology as central to this development. The rise of the rival Shi'a Safavid Empire and the theological and political challenge this posed has been cited as one of the key reasons behind the growing attention, beginning in the early sixteenth century, given to defining and policing the boundaries of a Sunni orthodoxy.⁵ At the same time, by the early 1500s the processes of urbanisation, bureaucratisation and institutionalisation launched in the 1450s resulted in a cadre of religious scholars (*ulama*) well

integrated with the Ottoman establishment, whose self-confidence grew in direct relation to the empire's increasing demand for textually grounded and law-centred interpretations of religion. Already prior to the Safavid challenge, the ulama had begun to covet and promote their own greater role in defining the boundaries of Sunni belief and unbelief.⁶ The convergence of these factors appears to be central to the growing 'Sunna-mindedness' (as Terzioğlu terms it) in the Ottoman Empire in the first half of the sixteenth century, but the various phases, aspects, agents and documentary evidence of Ottoman Sunnification between the 1500s and 1700s are yet to be comprehensively explored and explained.⁷

At the same time, by the mid-sixteenth century, the early phase of conversion to Islam in Rumeli, which began in the mid-fourteenth century and lasted until the early sixteenth, and during which the majority of converts appear to have come from local Christian elites and military households or were recruits into Ottoman military and administrative ranks through the *devşirme* system, gave way to a process that affected a wider social base.⁸ The Ottoman Muslim community graduated from the epoch of what Richard Bulliet and Anton Minkov have termed the 'innovators' and 'early adopters' to that of the 'early majority',⁹ or, as this study will suggest, from the period when a simple profession of faith (*shahāda*) was sufficient to be considered a Muslim to the era in which a more thorough knowledge of the tenets of faith ('*aqīda*') was expected from each believer.

The goal of the present chapter is to address this shift through the prism of the Ottoman catechetical or '*aqā'id*' literature, which sheds light on the changing religious climate and strategies of religious instruction in the empire starting in the early sixteenth century. The discussion will build on recent studies of various Ottoman narrative and legal genres, such as self-narratives of conversion to Islam, catechisms ('*ilm-i hāl*'), theological treatises and *fetāvā* literature, in which one can detect the increased concern with the issues of religious orthodoxy and orthopraxy in the Ottoman Empire of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹⁰ At the centre of the discussion will be another unknown Ottoman catechetical work titled (where a title is available) the *Cevahirü'l-İslam*, which, judging from numerous surviving manuscript copies, appears to have been one of the most popular texts for teaching children and converts the articles of faith and basics of religious practice since the sixteenth century. As this discussion will suggest, if there was a catechetical text on which all Muslims above the age of seven could be conveniently examined, following Nushi al-Nasîhi's proposal, the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* would have been the most suitable candidate, not least because of its question-and-answer format.

Catechisation and Conversion in Ottoman Rumeli, Fifteenth to Seventeenth Century

In the opening of his seminal study on early Muslim credal literature, A. J. Wensinck writes:

A creed may take various forms: it may consist only of a few words or may be a whole treatise; it may be a doxology, a short phrase, or a work on dogmatics. This is as true of Islam as of Christianity; moreover, in both religions the short formula is anterior to the creed which in its turn is anterior to the treatise in dogmatics.¹¹

Wensinck then goes on to contrast the simple confession of faith (*shahāda*) with the formulation of creed or articles of faith (*'aqīda*, pl. *'aqā'id*), arguing that, in the earliest decades of Islam, it was really only the formula 'There is no god but God; Muhammad is his Messenger' – and even this developed only progressively – that constituted the totality of what converts to Islam needed to know about their new religion.¹² As studies of early Muslim narratives of conversion also suggest, the key aspect of becoming Muslim was the act of submission (Ar. *aslama*) to Muhammad's political and military leadership (particularly the acceptance of fiscal duties) rather than adoption of an elaborate doxology.¹³ The main productive force behind the earliest *'aqā'id* literature were the early sectarian disputations in Islam that forced individuals, schools or sects to formulate their own positions on matters of doctrine, beginning with the appearance of the Kharijites. Texts that fit this genre can vary greatly in length, from simple enumerations of articles of faith to more elaborate theological treatises; in general, however, the goal of such texts is the formulation of the doctrine rather than an intellectual discussion of it or argumentation about it (which belongs more to the domain of *kalām*, or 'theology'), although there are certainly overlaps and intersections. Importantly, there is no credal statement that is accepted by all Muslims, not even all Sunnis.¹⁴

By the time the Ottomans appeared on the stage of history, numerous examples existed of creeds authored by individuals belonging to different legal and theological schools of Islam.¹⁵ However, on the basis of what can be gleaned from the sources, the early process of conversion to Islam in Ottoman Anatolia and Rumeli was not unlike that described by the early Islamic sources, in that it primarily entailed a submission to the Ottoman political power rather than to a well-explained belief system. In fact, many of the military recruits to the Ottoman cause kept their Christian religion, while the evolution of new converts into believers – and Turkish speakers – transpired over time, sometimes even over several generations.¹⁶ One reason for this, besides the fact that conquering and winning over followers in predominantly Christian lands dictated a certain pragmatism when it came to matters of religion, was also that the infrastructure of Islamic learning in Ottoman Rumeli, and the empire in general, was at an embryonic stage in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. A corollary of this was that before the early fifteenth century there hardly existed any credal literature in Turkish or other languages understood by the majority of the new converts that would help them to make the shift from, so to speak, the *shahāda* to the *'aqīda* stage. In those conditions, similar to other situations where Islam sought to establish itself in non-Arabic-speaking territories, preaching in Turkish by various Sufi shaykhs, itinerant preachers and storytellers was initially a major source of religious knowledge.¹⁷

Although there are some examples from the fourteenth century, it was really only in the early 1400s that the agents of Islamisation in Ottoman Anatolia and Rumeli began to produce new texts in simple Turkish intended for the instruction of children and novices.¹⁸ These texts ranged from hagiographies and popular stories, bearing a strong imprint of the Sufi worldview, to heretofore largely unexplored catechetical literature that was often 'tradaptation', to use Peter Burke's term, of the texts originally composed in Arabic and Persian. However, in the early fifteenth century, we see the appearance of works concerned with religious instruction written

in Turkish that drew on older works, but whose exposition and emphasis catered more to the specific socio-religious conditions faced by the expanding Ottoman polity. Such works were, for instance, Kutbeddin İzniki's *Mukaddime* (c. 1403), Yazıcızade Mehmed's *Muhammediye* (1449), and his brother Yazıcızade Ahmed's *Envarü'l-Aşikin* (1449), all of which were specifically concerned with raising the level of religious instruction among Muslims – many of whom were new converts – in the Ottoman domains.¹⁹

Scholars (myself included) have been using the term *'ilm-i hāl* to refer to early Ottoman texts intended for imparting the basics of religious instruction; however, given that the research into Ottoman catechetical literature is still in its infancy, it is difficult to say precisely what exactly the features of an *'ilm-i hāl* are as opposed to *'aqā'id* texts in general, and whether fifteenth-century Muslims in Anatolia and Rumeli even conceived of such a genre per se, since the first explicit mention of the term *'ilm-i hāl* seems to date to the sixteenth century.²⁰ In its early phase of development in the fifteenth century, the Ottoman catechetical or *'aqā'id* literature encompassed a variety of texts in both prose and verse aiming to teach the basics of Islamic faith and worship. Many of these early Ottoman texts combined the exposition of the articles of faith (and, in some cases, Sufi tenets) with the basics of Hanafi law, and thus often doubled as both *'aqā'id* and *fiqh* primers, which is by no means a universal feature of the earlier *'aqā'id* literature and may represent a particularly Ottoman approach to the genre.²¹ In addition to enumerating the articles of faith (typically, belief in the unity of God, in his angels, his books, his messengers, his predetermination of both good and evil, and the Day of Judgement), early Ottoman *'aqā'id* texts put particular emphasis on correct performance of the ritual ablution (*ābdest*) and prayer (*namāz*), and devoted substantial attention to eschatology.²² Thus, although İzniki's *Mukaddime* is closer in terms of style and content to later Ottoman texts that have been labelled in the secondary literature as *'ilm-i hāls* (with Birgivi's *Vasiyetname* or *Risale-i Birgivi*, written in 960/1562–3, being the paradigmatic example), it shares many of its sources,²³ Sufi inclinations and concerns with eschatology with Yazıcızade Mehmed's *Muhammediye*. At first glance, this work in verse centring on the Prophet may not conform to what we think of today as a religious primer, but in terms of authorial intent it certainly belongs to the corpus of early Ottoman catechetical literature.

It would appear that these sources, along with hagiographical literature and other Sufi texts in both Turkish translation and Arabic and Persian, continued to be central to the education of converts to Islam throughout the first half of the sixteenth century. This is suggested by the personal testimony of an early sixteenth-century convert from Transylvania, Murad b. 'Abdullah, who in a polemical treatise he wrote in the 1550s cites various hagiographical and catechetical works central to his becoming a Muslim in the late 1520s and 1530s. Among these he mentions Yazıcızade Mehmed's *Muhammediye*, İzniki's *Mukaddime*, *Kısas-ı enbiya*, *Tezkiretü'l-evliya*, Rumi's *Mathnawi*, al-Ghazali's *Ihya' 'Ulum al-Din*, Lami'i Çelebi's *İbretname*, and Ibn 'Arabi's *al-Futuhāt al-Makkiyya*.²⁴

However, inspired by the new socio-religious climate, a whole new corpus of catechetical literature emerges by the second half of the sixteenth century. Recent research has pointed to the fact that this new literature shows a marked departure

in terms of emphasis and tenor from the earlier texts. For example, while İznîkî's *Mukaddime* exudes the notion of a new and expanding Islamic polity looking outwards, pays special attention to converts and allows for some leeway in practice, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century 'aqā'id works, such as Birgivi's *Vasiyetname* and the *Kitab-ı Ustüvani*, look inwards, focusing on the problems of an established Islamic society with many rivalling registers of piety, struggling to impose order on the diversity of practice. They seek to instruct Muslims on correct belief and practice of Islam, and delineate the boundaries of the Sunni community. They also show a tendency towards social disciplining and providing rules not only for worship and belief but also for proper speech and conduct.²⁵ Recent research indicates that the standard bearers of this new concern with building a Sunni confessional community were the members of the ulama, and especially a number of high-ranking Hanafi jurists (muftis) close to the Ottoman establishment such as Molla 'Arab (d. 1495/6), Sarı Gürz Hamza Efendi (d. 1521), Zenbilli 'Alî Cemalî (d. 1526), Kemalpaşazade (d. 1534) and Ebussuud Efendi (d. 1574), most of whom served as the chief jurisprudent of the empire at some point in their careers. Consequently, the tenor of the new concerns with orthodoxy and orthopraxy – as well as the claim that religious professionals, such as muftis and imams, were central to both – is first registered in the legal genres such as *fetāvā* (legal opinions) and various *risāles* (treatises) in the domains of *fiqh* and *kalām* authored by the Ottoman literati.²⁶

By the mid-sixteenth century, various Ottoman agents of confession building, both religious specialists of various ranks and administrators, began to pay more attention to how the new religio-political agenda was disseminated to the wider public, and to the methods by which a Sunni confessional community should be constituted and its purity maintained. This development, in addition to other factors driving the phenomenon of Sunnitisatıon discussed above, emanated from the dynamics of Sultan Süleyman's reign (1520–66) when the empire's ideologues, led by the chief jurisprudent Ebussuud Efendi (appointed to this post in 1545), refashioned it as the caliphate and the sultan as a universal caliph whose duty was to defend the holy law and enforce orthodoxy and orthopraxy.²⁷ But in order to convincingly project a universal religious authority, it was imperative to find a way to instil a sense of community into an empire that by the 1540s had come to include, in addition to numerous non-Muslims, various Arabic-, Persian-, Turkish-, Greek- and Slavic-speaking Muslim populations which often had little in common besides the central tenets of Islamic belief and worship. The answer from Süleyman and his advisers was the implementation of a uniform imperial sultanî law and the building of an unprecedented number of imperial mosques and *mescids* (also spurred by the desire to draw a contrast with the Safavids, who had shunned the Friday prayer), as both visual symbols of imperial and Sunni Muslim identity and spaces for the local re-enactment of the 'imagined community', especially in urban environments.²⁸ Regular performance of and attendance at congregational prayers throughout the imperial domains became the paradigmatic expression of this newly constituted community. As Gülrü Necipoğlu has demonstrated, the boom in construction of Friday mosques and *mescids* coincided with attempts to establish and stabilise local mosque congregations. To this effect, attendance at Friday prayers was to be monitored and, where necessary due to resistance from the local population or individuals, coerced by the prayer enforcers (*namāzıcı*)

appointed by the local judge (*kādī*). As *fetvās* of Şeyhülislam Ebussuud Efendi suggest, those who failed to attend or denied the necessity of performing the communal prayers were labelled infidels.²⁹

The extent to which this drive to impose compliance with a newly (re)articulated Sunni Hanafi orthodoxy and orthopraxy was successful is a matter for further research and debate. However, as Necipoğlu's research indicates, there was a deliberate policy emanating from the empire's leadership that religious services and places of worship should be *available* and religious messages *legible* and *comprehensible* to the widest possible Muslim audience.³⁰ We see a sort of programmatic statement to this effect in a catechetical work titled the *Tuhfetü't-Talibin* by Lütfi Pasha, a prominent Ottoman statesman (c. 1488–1563, grand vizier 1539–41) and one of the most vocal promoters of Sunnification in the 1540s and 1550s.³¹ In this *fiqh* compendium written in simple Turkish and designed for teachers and students alike, Lütfi Pasha puts particular emphasis on the elements of belief and worship, mosque attendance and performance of prayers. Supporting his argument with the Prophet's saying that 'seeking knowledge is obligatory for every Muslim man and woman' and that 'people should be addressed in the language they can understand', Lütfi Pasha states that jurists should issue their opinions, teachers explain their lectures, interpreters of the Quran explain the Quran and preachers deliver their sermons in Turkish, so that people can understand them and be edified.³²

In the second half of the sixteenth and in the seventeenth century, the corpus of catechetical literature exponentially grew as a number of 'Sunnā-minded' authors began to assert their specific ideas about orthodoxy and orthopraxy as well as strategies for achieving them, resulting in a new variety of instructional texts of different length, format, emphasis and method of exposition. Until now, the best known among these new catechetical texts has been Birgivi Mehmed Efendi's *Vasiyetname*, which was, judging from the number of surviving copies, by far the most popular Ottoman 'aqā'id work that influenced many others subsequently produced.³³ However, my research suggests that in addition to this and other texts that by the late seventeenth century seem to constitute the canon of Ottoman 'aqā'id literature – such as the *Risale-i Rumi (Ahmed) Efendi* (by Ahmed Rumi Akhisari, d. 1632) and *Risale-i Kadızade* (by Kadızade Mehmed, d. 1635), all of which are short- or mid-length narratives – another type of short 'aqā'id work in question-and-answer format achieved enormous popularity.

A Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Question-and-Answer 'Aqā'id Work and its Intertextual Context

Although we are only familiarising ourselves with the variety of the Ottoman 'aqā'id literature, there is an anonymous text (sometimes) titled the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* that can be tentatively dated to the second half of the sixteenth century (with 991/1583–4 as *terminus ante quem*) which seems to stand out in this textscape.³⁴ On the face of it, it is an unremarkable work: it is only several folios long and consists of forty-something short questions and as many succinct answers about the nature of faith and practice of Islam, with questions beginning with *eğer sorsalar* (if they ask you) and answers with *eyit* (answer [them]). In Turkish manuscript libraries alone, it exists in over fifty

copies, which suggests that it was a very popular 'aqā'id work, most likely because of its question-and-answer format. This format in itself was not a rarity in Islamic religious literature, and several possible influences come to mind. One is the hadith literature in which the Prophet answers the questions of his followers. The second is the *fatāwā* literature where jurists answer the questions of the faithful. The third are various Sufi genres in which the disciple asks questions of his master (*sohbetnāmes*, dream interpretations, *malʿuzāt* and so on). There are also other Ottoman texts of catechetical character in the question-and-answer format, most notably the popular work titled *Kırk Su'al* (*Forty Questions*) by Mevla Furati or Fıraki Abdurrahman Çelebi (D. c. 1580), a Zeyniyye Sufi shaykh from Kütahya, inspired by the well-known exchange between the Prophet and the Jewish delegation led by 'Abdallah b. Selam, who posed Muhammad a series of questions about Islam before submitting to him.³⁵ However, this text bears no structural or content resemblance to our anonymous work.

A much closer 'cousin' to this text is another question-and-answer catechetical work, authored by Lütfi Pasha and titled the *Risale-i Su'al ve Cevap* (The Question-and-Answer Treatise).³⁶ Originally a *devşirme* recruit (most likely from Shkodra in Albania), and thus a convert himself, after a successful political career Lütfi Pasha turned to writing and the study of Islamic law and theology.³⁷ He wrote several catechetical works: three texts of different lengths in Turkish (including the *Tuhfetü't-Talibin* mentioned above), and a voluminous one in Arabic, which he listed in the preface to his *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman* (*The Chronicle of the House of Osman*).³⁸ Based on the date of his *Tevarih*, it would appear that Lütfi Pasha wrote the *Risale-i Su'al ve Cevap* prior to 1553. In the brief preface to this work he identifies himself, Lütfi b. Abdü'l-Mu'in, as the author, and introduces the questions to follow as something that every believer should know.³⁹ The structure of his catechism and the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* is identical: they both consist of (roughly) forty very short questions that start with 'If they ask you . . .' and succinct answers that start with 'Answer them . . .' Several of the questions and answers in the beginning of the catechisms are the same; however, on closer inspection, the differences between the two texts outnumber the similarities.

First, in its earliest surviving copies, the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* does not have an introduction or a named author, and starts with questions directly. Second, the questions and answers in the two catechisms are for the most part different (as will be discussed below). Third, there is a difference in the identity of the questioner and responder. In Lütfi Pasha's text, the responder seems to be the imam and the questioner(s) his flock.⁴⁰ However, in contrast to both the *Risale* and other relevant Muslim genres, which envision an authority figure in the role of the responder, in the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* the roles are reversed – the questioner is a teacher (an imam, parent or other) while the responder is a student or novice.

The *Cevahirü'l-İslam* and Lütfi Pasha's *Risale* are not the first Muslim catechetical texts to adopt the structure of succinct questions and answers. It is possible that they, or another unidentified source they were using, were inspired by a very important and yet unstudied early example of 'aqā'id literature authored by the Hanafi jurist Abu al-Layth al-Samarqandi (d. 983), who was immensely influential in the development of the Ottoman catechetical literature.⁴¹ Although it is rarely mentioned in the discussions of early Islamic credal literature, this 'aqā'id text, titled the *Bayan 'Aqidat*

al-Usul, appears to have been a much more significant tool of Islamisation than previously recognised. A. T. W. Juynboll published it in 1881 upon realisation that it was one of the most important – if not *the* most important – Islamic catechisms in Malaysia and Indonesia, to which local Muslims referred simply as *Samarqandi*.⁴² It is structured in the same 'If they ask you'/'Answer them' format, and focuses exclusively on faith (*īmān*), with a teacher questioning a novice. It opens with, 'If they ask you: "What is faith?" Answer them: "Faith is belief in God, his angels, his books, his messengers, his predetermination of good and evil, and the Day of Judgement."' Subsequent questions (eighteen in total) deal with each of these articles of faith in detail, without going into the issues of practice of Islam or reflecting on the relationship between *īmān* and *islām*.⁴³ In contrast, both the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* and Lütfi Pasha's *Risale* pose questions and offer answers on the topic of *īmān*, *islām*, *ābdest* and *namāz*, enumerating religious duties, and describing and explaining their correct practice.

Interestingly, although there are numerous manuscripts of Samarqandi's other works in Ottoman libraries, as well as numerous manuscripts of other medieval Islamic creeds in Arabic copied both before and during the Ottoman period, so far I have been able to identify only one copy of Samarqandi's catechism. It is catalogued as the *Risaletü'l-Es'ile ve'l-Ecvibe el-İ'tikadiyye* (The Treatise of Questions and Answers about Creed) and exists in a *mecmû'a* that is copied after 1470, most probably in the sixteenth century.⁴⁴ This suggests that the text in Arabic was not popular in the Ottoman Empire, but also, seemingly, that the text was not widely copied in the Arabic-speaking Muslim world either. Despite this, it is possible that Lütfi Pasha, who was familiar with Samarqandi's opus and based one of his other catechetical works, the *Kitab Tenbihü'l-'Akılın ve Tenkidü'l-Gaflin*, on Samarqandi's *Tanbih al-Ghaflin*, was aware of this text and adopted its structure, although not its contents, and adapted it for his own purposes. In terms of other sources, both Lütfi Pasha's *Risale* and the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* seem to draw on a *fiqh* work dealing with the performance and validity of the prayer (*salāt*). Although there were such works prior to the sixteenth century, not least of all Samarqandi's own very popular *al-Muqaddima [aṣ-ṣalāt]*, short works on prayer in Turkish also began to proliferate in the sixteenth century under the generic name of *Risaletü's-Salat*, reflecting the general interest in and concern with this central aspect of being a Muslim.

It is impossible to say conclusively whether the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* came into existence before or after Lütfi Pasha's work, and whether one derives from the other or they share a common source. Despite important structural similarities and several shared questions, originally these were two independent works with different tenor and emphasis. At the same time, however, the texts' audiences and copyists clearly made the link between them, as in some of the seventeenth-century manuscripts the two texts are merged, with editors picking and choosing various sections from both, thus giving rise to other, hybrid versions.⁴⁵ In this process of merging of the two textual traditions, it seems that the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* won the battle of titles, as copyists evidently preferred it to the *Risale-i Su'al ve Cevap*, even when the manuscript contains the preface naming Lütfi Pasha as the author.⁴⁶ It also won the popularity contest, as it exists in dozens of copies in Ottoman manuscript collections worldwide, unlike the *Risale* of which only a few complete copies seem to survive. As this short manuscript history suggests, the two texts clearly have to be considered together.

‘What Every Believer Should Know’

The two texts open in a similar fashion, but not identically. The *Cevahirü'l-İslam* begins like this:

If they ask you: ‘Are you a Muslim?’

Answer them: ‘*Elhamdülillāh*, I am a Muslim.’

If they ask you: ‘What is the meaning of *Elhamdülillāh*?’

Answer them: ‘To praise and give thanks to Allah.’

If they ask you: ‘What do you understand Allah to be?’

Answer them: ‘He is without beginning or end, he does not resemble anything, and he does not have anything. He is eternal and independent of cause, time and place.’⁴⁷

Lütfi Pasha’s *Risale*’s opening question is ‘If they ask you: “Whose servant (*kul*) are you?” Answer them that you are the servant of God.’ Then the text switches to the same question as the opening of the *Cevahirü'l-İslam*, but only to go off in a different direction again with the third query: ‘If they ask you: “Since when are you Muslim?” Answer them: “Since *Qālū Belā*,”’ after which he proceeds to explain the meaning of this Quranic reference.⁴⁸ After this, the texts briefly come together for four common questions that seek to define the believer beyond the label of ‘Muslim’.

If they ask: ‘Whose offspring (*zürriyet*) are you?’

Answer: ‘I am the offspring of the Prophet Adam.’

If they ask: ‘Of whose people (*millet*) are you?’

Answer: ‘I am of the Prophet Abraham’s people.’

If they ask you: ‘Of whose community (*ümme*) are you?’

Answer: ‘I am of the Prophet Muhammad’s community.’

If they ask you: ‘Whose doctrine (*mezhep*) do you follow?’

Answer: ‘I follow the Great Imam Abu Hanifa’s doctrine.’

In this way, our Muslim disciple is very precisely identified as a descendant of Adam and Abraham, a member of Muhammad’s community and a Hanafi. As recent research on Ottoman Sunnification suggests, adherence to the Hanafi doctrine or school of law was particularly central to the Ottomans’ confessional and imperial identity as it was articulated in the first half of the sixteenth century.⁴⁹ Faithful to his reputed interest in Hanafi law, Lütfi Pasha’s catechism exhibits an exacting commitment to the legal principles of religious practice. Thus, after enumerating six articles of faith (the same as Samarqandi) and stating that they must be known by heart and articulated by tongue, Lütfi Pasha states that a person who says that he or she does not know them is (or becomes, if he or she is already a Muslim) an unbeliever (*kāfir*). Such a person must (newly) profess their faith by saying the *shahāda*, must be taught the basics of faith and, if they are married, his or her marriage must be renewed.⁵⁰ This stipulation of the renewal of faith and marriage appears to have been a legal innovation developed by the Ottoman Hanafi jurists, most probably in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century, and is very common in the opinions (*fetāvā*) issued by the Ottoman Hanafi jurists. According to Guy Burak, this innovation not only departed from the

earlier Hanafi tradition, but was not accepted at the time by scholars from the other schools of law or by Hanafi jurists who were not closely integrated into the Ottoman establishment. It represents a prime example of how the Ottoman ulama close to the government asserted their own authority in the debate on the boundaries of belief and unbelief that intensified during the age of Sunnitisatation in the Ottoman Empire.⁵¹ Thus, according to Lütü Pasha, only those whose *shahāda* is complemented by 'aqīda are to be considered true Muslims and believers.

Interestingly, although the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* also emphasises that the articles of faith must be known by heart and articulated by tongue, its definition of *īmān* is much more 'popular' in flavour and heavier on eschatological elements than Lütü Pasha's: it lists them as belief in the unity of God, the reality of the Prophets, Heaven and Hell, the Bridge (*as-Sirāt*)⁵² and the Trumpet (*as-Sūr*),⁵³ the Reckoning (*Hisāb*) and the Balance (*Terāzi*), the Torments of the Grave (*Kabr Azābı*), and the Saints.⁵⁴ Furthermore, it seeks to visually illustrate the importance of various aspects of faith by developing an anthropo-arboreal metaphor and defining through question after question faith's head (*shahāda*), soul (five daily prayers), heart (the Quran), word (the mention of God), light, leaves, bark, root, and so on. The *Cevahirü'l-İslam* does not refer to the necessity of the renewal of faith and marriage for the ignorant ones, but it refers to a Hanafi jurist Şemsü'l-Eimme⁵⁵ who declared that every man and woman should be taught the basics of faith, and that if a woman's husband fails to teach her, she is entitled to seek instruction with a *faqīh* without her husband's permission, which is a precept featured in other Ottoman catechisms as well.⁵⁶ However, it appears that in some manuscripts this section is further elaborated, stating that the prayers of those who do not know the articles of faith will not be heard and that neither their fast nor their marriage is legitimate. Furthermore, it states that it is every man's duty to teach his wife and children the basics of faith and Islam. A punishment in hell is reserved for those who neglect to educate their daughters, sisters and wives in matters of faith.⁵⁷ Nushi al-Nashihi, the author mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, also reflects on the duties of the heads of households in religious instruction of their dependants, seeing the households as the basic building blocks of a pious community in pursuit of salvation.⁵⁸

After the section on the articles of faith and their enforcement, the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* and Lütü Pasha's catechism continue to diverge in tone, and the difference in their intended audiences becomes more apparent. While Lütü Pasha switches to a detailed and systematic explanation of the ritual ablutions and prayer, the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* continues with a medley of questions about angels, divine books, conditions of Islam (it lists twelve of them), the nature and number of religious duties (*farz*), the number of prayers and the technicalities of performing ritual ablutions and prayers. Interestingly, the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* shows great concern with the things that invalidate the prayers and ablutions, of which the believer should beware – something we do not see in Lütü Pasha's text. The endings of the two Ottoman catechisms gesture towards their different intended audiences: while Lütü Pasha's text simply ends after the exhaustive instructions, the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* concludes in the manner of other widely popular Ottoman texts, by promising particular spiritual privileges for those intimately familiar with its contents. Specifically, it states that God will halve the number of sins and give endless blessings to the person who performs his or her prayers, knows the answers to the questions in the catechism and is sincere in his or her religion (*dininde dürüst olursa*).⁵⁹

Interestingly, in some later manuscripts of both works, the text is followed (after *temme'l-kitāb*) by an additional four questions, which are not found in the oldest versions, but were evidently added later and then copied together with the rest of the text by subsequent copyists, thus becoming part of the work(s).⁶⁰ These four questions are said to have been formulated by Abu Hanifa, the founder of the Hanafi school of law, and it is emphasised that the answers to them must be known by anyone aspiring to the post of an imam. This section reads:

The Great Imam [Abu Hanifa] said: 'Those who are imams are [to be] asked four questions. If they can answer them, it is permissible for them to hold this position; if they cannot answer, they are ineligible.'

The first question is: 'Do you perform these prayers for yourself or for the congregation?'

Answer them: 'I am performing them for myself, but I also intend them for the congregation.'

The second question is: 'The congregation follows [conforms to] you, but whom do you follow [conform to]?'

Answer: 'I follow the Quran.'

The third question is: 'You are our prayer leader, but who is yours?'

Answer them: 'Muhammad Mustafa.'

The fourth question is: 'Our prayers are completed with you, but with whom are your prayers completed?'

Answer them: 'My prayers are completed with the Prophet's (peace be upon him) custom.'⁶¹

In terms of tone, these questions seem to be a better fit for Lütü Pasha's *Risale*, which by the virtue of its disciplined and systematic exposition, *fiqh*-mindedness and authoritative tone appears to be a more likely candidate for an imam's manual than the *Cevahirü'l-İslam*. However, this seems to have been a seventeenth-century addition to the text that by this time in many manuscript copies displayed hybrid features of both the *Risale* and the *Cevahirü'l-İslam*. The fact that the *Risale/Cevahirü'l-İslam* appears most often in the miscellanies that also contain other key Ottoman 'aqā'id texts mentioned above suggests that it became part of the 'aqā'id canon by the mid-1600s.⁶² As such, it was evidently considered useful not just by individuals at large, but by imams themselves for refreshing their own knowledge and imparting the essentials of belief and practice to their congregations.

From the perspective of the converts to Islam, the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* appears to have been an essential text as well – in fact, one of the earliest versions of the work, dated c. 1588, is found in the miscellany (*mecmū'a*) of a Slavic-/Hungarian-/German-speaking Protestant who embraced Islam somewhere in the Ottoman–Hungarian borderlands in the mid-sixteenth century.⁶³ The linguistic and orthographic features of this copy suggest that the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* was typically transmitted orally, as many of the suffixes are those of spoken Turkish. Furthermore, there are many mistakes in the ligatures between the letters, indicating that the author, still not proficient in writing in Arabic script, was either not careful enough while copying the text or he was recording it from memory. The evidence of the text's ubiquity and status as one of the most recognisable – if not *the* most recognisable – Ottoman 'aqā'id texts is also found tucked away in

one of Antoine Galland's (1646–1715) private (and heretofore unpublished) notebooks dating to his stay in Istanbul in 1672–3. In his notebook, Galland translates, apparently for his own eyes only, the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* (including the four questions for imams!) into French, referring to it simply as 'Catechisme Turc'.⁶⁴

Galland's usage of the word 'catechism' to describe the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* raises an important question about our analytical terminology for studying texts like these and the 'translatability' of such texts in terms of content and intention across religious boundaries. However, this is a question for a different study in the context of a larger enquiry into the place of Ottoman Sunnitisat in an early modern age of confession-building that appears to have spanned Europe and parts of the Middle East.⁶⁵ Research into the motivation for the production and usage of Ottoman catechetical literature, its role in the process of Islamisation and education of Muslims (including converts) in the Ottoman Empire, and both its indebtedness to and departure from older Muslim 'aqā'id literature is central to elucidating the dynamic and rationale of Ottoman Sunnitisat. In order to advance this research agenda, it is essential that we expand our familiarity with the variety of primary sources and provide a close and contextualised reading of them. The simplicity of the *Cevahirü'l-İslam*'s content as well as its format and manuscript history suggest that it was one of the central texts for making Muslims in the Ottoman Empire aware of their *imān*, *islām* and Sunni Hanafī identity, and it is thus a major source for the study of conversion, catechisation and Sunnitisat in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Notes

1. Note: the terms and passages in Ottoman Turkish are transliterated according to the rules of Modern Turkish, marking the long vowels and the letters 'ayn and hamza, except for personal names and titles of the works, which, due to publisher's style, are transliterated without any accents. Terms in Arabic are transliterated according to the *IJMES* transliteration system. I would like to thank Derin Terzioğlu, Brett Wilson and Tolga Esmer for their helpful suggestions while writing and revising this article, and Ahmet Bilaloğlu for his help with obtaining some of the primary sources used in the chapter.
2. Derin Terzioğlu, 'Where 'İlm-i Hāl Meets Catechism: Islamic Manuals of Religious Instruction in the Ottoman Empire in the Age of Confessionalization', *Past and Present* 220 (August 2013), p. 99. For the particular section in Nushi al-Nasīhi's text, see his *Mebhas-ı İman*, Süleymaniye Library, Istanbul, MS Yazma Bağışlar 5563, f. 75b. I thank Derin Terzioğlu for sharing her copy of the manuscript with me.
3. Terzioğlu, 'Where 'İlm-i Hāl Meets Catechism', p. 107.
4. See Tijana Krstić, 'Illuminated by the Light of Islam and the Glory of the Ottoman Sultanate: Narratives of Conversion to Islam in the Age of Confessionalization', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51, no. 1 (January 2009), pp. 35–63; Derin Terzioğlu, 'Sunna-Minded Sufi Preachers in Service of the Ottoman State: The *Nasihatnâme* of Hasan Addressed to Murad IV', *Archivum Ottomanicum* 27 (2010), pp. 243–59; Derin Terzioğlu, 'Sufis in the Age of State-Building and Confessionalization', in Christine Woodhead (ed.), *The Ottoman World* (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 86–99; Guy Burak, 'Faith, Law and Empire in the Ottoman "Age of Confessionalization" (Fifteenth to Seventeenth Centuries): The Case of "Renewal of Faith"', *Mediterranean Historical Review* 28, no. 1 (2013), pp. 1–23; Derin Terzioğlu, 'How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnization: A Historiographical Discussion', *Turcica* 44 (2012–13), pp. 301–38.

5. See, for instance, Nabil Al-Tikriti, 'Kalam in the Service of the State: Apostasy and the Defining of Ottoman Islamic Identity', in H. Karateke and M. Reinkowski (eds), *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 131–50; Marcus Dressler, 'Inventing Orthodoxy: Competing Claims for Authority and Legitimacy in the Ottoman Safavid Conflict', in H. Karateke and M. Reinkowski (eds), *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 151–76.
6. On this issue, see in particular Burak, 'Faith, Law and Empire', and Terzioğlu, 'How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization'. On the process of institutionalisation of the ulama, see Snježana Buzov, 'The Lawgiver and His Lawmakers: The Role of Legal Discourse in the Change of Ottoman Imperial Culture', doctoral thesis, University of Chicago, 2005; Abdurrahman Atcll, 'The Formation of the Ottoman Learned Class and Legal Scholarship (1300-1600)', doctoral thesis, University of Chicago, 2010.
7. This is the goal of the team project I am heading together with Derin Terzioğlu, called 'The Fashioning of a Sunni Orthodoxy and the Entangled Histories of Confession-Building in the Ottoman Empire, 15th-17th Centuries' (OTTOCONFESSION), which is funded by the European Research Council and will run from 2015 to 2020. This study reflects the early stages of my research.
8. Anton Minkov, *Conversion to Islam in the Balkans: Kisve Bahası Petitions and Ottoman Social Life, 1670-1730* (Leiden: Brill, 2004) pp. 28–63.
9. Richard W. Bulliet, *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period: An Essay in Quantitative History* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1979); Minkov, *Conversion to Islam in the Balkans*, p. 63.
10. See Al-Tikriti, 'Kalam in the Service of the State'; Krstić, 'Illuminated by the Light of Islam'; Terzioğlu, 'Where 'İlm-i Hāl Meets Catechism'; Burak, 'Faith, Law and Empire'.
11. A. J. Wensinck, *The Muslim Creed: Its Genesis and Historical Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932), p. 1.
12. Ibid., pp. 8–16.
13. See Richard W. Bulliet, 'Conversion Stories in Early Islam', in: Michael Gervers and Ramzi J. Bikhazi (eds), *Conversion and Continuity: Indigenous Christian Communities in Islamic Lands, Eighth to Eighteenth Centuries*, Papers in Mediaeval Studies 9 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1990), pp. 123–33; Giovanna Calasso, 'Récits de conversions, zèle dévotionnel et instruction religieuse dans les biographies des "gens de Başra" du Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt d'Ibn Sa'd', in Mercedes García-Arenal (ed.), *Conversions islamiques: Identités religieuses en Islam méditerranéen / Islamic Conversions: Religious Identities in Mediterranean Islam* (Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 2001), pp. 19–48.
14. Montgomery W. Watt, 'Aqīda', *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn (Leiden: Brill, 1960–2005); Jon Hoover, 'Creed', *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 3rd edn (Leiden: Brill, 2007–).
15. For a selection of the most important Islamic creeds, see Montgomery W. Watt, *Islamic Creeds* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994).
16. Halil İnalcık, 'Stefan Dušan'dan Osmanlı İmparatorluğuna: XV. Asırda Rumeli'de Hristiyan Sipahiler ve Menşeleri', in Halil İnalcık, *Fatih Devri Üzerinde Tetkikler ve Vesikalar* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1954), pp. 137–84; Heath W. Lowry, *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003); Melek Delilbaşı, 'Christian Sipahis in the Tırhala Taxation Registers (15th and 16th Centuries)', in A. Anastasopoulos (ed.), *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire* (Heraklion: Crete University Press, 2005), pp. 87–114. For *devşirme* recruits, the process of conversion to Islam and learning of Turkish was, typically, much faster.
17. On narrative and interpretative communities in fifteenth-century Ottoman Rumeli, see Tijana Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011), pp. 26–50.

18. For a preliminary review of the development of the 'ilm-i hāl literature in Ottoman Turkish, as well as on the evolution of the term 'ilm-i hāl itself, see Hatice Kelepetin Arpağuş, 'Bir Telif Türü Olarak İlmihal Tarihî Geçmişi ve Fonksiyonu', *Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 22 (2001–2), pp. 25–56.
19. See Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam*, pp. 29–35.
20. Hatice Kelepetin, 'İlmihal', *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 22, pp. 139–41. The earliest work that bears this title appears to be *Mızraklı İlmihal*, most probably a sixteenth-century work. However, it is only much later, mainly in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, that this term comes into a common usage among the Ottomans. For instance, writing in the 1630s, Nushi el-Nasîhi himself provides a list of texts on which he based his *Mebhas-ı İman*, which includes Birgivi's *Vasiyetname* and *Risale-i Rûmî Efendi*, but describes these books, as well as his own, only as 'akā'id dîniye ve i'tikādât-ı islâmiye makkûl ve mergûb olan kitâplar (accepted and desirable books on articles of faith and tenets of Islam) (61a). In the absence of a more detailed understanding of the evolution of the term 'ilm-i hāl and its usage, and in order to underscore the continuity with the older 'aqā'id literature projected by the authors themselves, in this chapter I will use the phrase 'aqā'id literature'. However, this is not to detract from the evident difference between the Ottoman and medieval Islamic catechetical literature.
21. See Kelepetin Arpağuş, 'Bir Telif Türü Olarak İlmihal', and Mediha Aynacı, 'Osmanlı Kuruluş Dönemi Türkçe İlmihal Eserleri Çerçevesinde İlmihallerin Fikhî Yönden Değerlendirilmesi', doctoral thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2009.
22. Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam*, pp. 34–7.
23. Most importantly, al-Ghazali's (d. 1111) *İhya' 'Ulum al-Din*, Ibn Arabi's (d. 1240) *al-Futuhāt al-Makkiyya* and various *fiqh* and 'aqā'id works by Abu al-Layth as-Samarqandi (d. 983).
24. Murad b. Abdullah, *Kitab Tesviyetü't-Teveccüh*, British Library, MS Add 19894, ff. 27b, 36b, 39b, 46b, 81a, 107b, 128b, 138a.
25. Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam*, pp. 31–2; Terzioğlu, 'Where 'İlm-i Hāl Meets Catechism'.
26. See Al-Tikriti, 'Kalam in the Service of the State'; Burak, 'Faith, Law and Empire'; also see Elke Eberhard, *Osmanische Polemik gegen die Safawiden im 16. Jahrhundert nach arabischen Handschriften* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Schwarz, 1970).
27. Colin Imber, *Ebu's-su'ud: The Islamic Legal Tradition* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997); Gülrü Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan* (London: Reaktion, 2005), p. 48.
28. Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan*, p. 48; on this process of constituting a community of believers through law, see Buzov, 'The Lawgiver and His Lawmakers', pp. 135–89.
29. Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan*, pp. 48–9.
30. See, for instance, Gülrü Necipoğlu's study on 'The Süleymaniye Complex in Istanbul: An Interpretation', *Muqarnas* 3 (1985), pp. 92–117 (especially the section on mosque inscriptions, pp. 107–11).
31. I am preparing a separate study on Lütü Pasha as an agent of confession-building in the sixteenth-century Ottoman Empire.
32. Süleymaniye Library, Istanbul, MS Fatih 1507, f. 3a.
33. For a detailed discussion of another very popular text of this genre from the 1540s, Abdurrahman b. Yusuf Aksarayî's *İmadü'l-İslam*, see Hatice Kelepetin Arpağuş, *Osmanlı ve Geleceksel İslam* (Istanbul: Çamlıca, 2014), pp. 65–112.
34. The earliest copy I was able to find so far is dated 991/1583–4 and is located in the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin (see Wilhem Pertsch, *Verzeichniss der Türkischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin* [Berlin: A. Asher, 1889], entry nos 3, 6 [Ms. Or. 4, 151]). The second oldest copy seems to be in the Österreichischer National Bibliothek in Vienna (A. F. 437 [282], ff. 22a–28b), which dates to 1588–9 (see G. Flügel,

- Arabischen, Persischen, und Türkischen Handschriften der Kaiserlich-Königlich Hofbibliothek zu Wien*, vol. 3, no. 2006 [Vienna: K. K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1867]). I am using the copy from Vienna, which does not have a title.
35. On related texts in Arabic and Persian, known as the *Book of Thousand Questions*, and their role in Islamisation of South and Southeast Asia, see Ronit Ricci, *Islam Translated: Literature, Conversion and the Arabic Cosmopolis of South and Southeast Asia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).
 36. Lütü Paşa, *Risale-i Su'al ve Cevap* [catalogued as: *Sual ve Cevaplı İlmihal*], Süleymaniye Library, Istanbul, MS Kılıç Ali Paşa 378 (the folios are unnumbered and, although the catalogue says the work is located between folios 64 and 73, according to the existing pagination it is between 71b and 79b). Another copy is in the same library (catalogued as: *Sual ve Cevab Risalesi*), Reşid Efendi 1215, ff. 271b–276b. Neither copy is dated.
 37. Colin Imber, 'Lütü Paşa', *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn (Leiden: Brill, 1960–2005).
 38. He wrote *Kitab Zübdetü'l Mesayil fi'l-İtikadat ve'l-İbadat* in Arabic and three works in Turkish: *Kitab Tenbihü'l-Akılın ve Tekidü'l-Gafilin*, *Kitab Tühfetü't-Talibin* and *Risale-i Su'al ve Cevap*. See Lütü Paşa, *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman* (Istanbul: Matba'a-yi 'Amire, 1922), p. 4.
 39. Süleymaniye Library, Istanbul, MS Kılıç Ali Paşa 378, f. 71b.
 40. This is suggested by a series of questions on f 73a.
 41. On Samarqandi, see Ahmad Pakatchi and Azar Rabbani, 'Abü al-Layth al-Samarqandi', *Encyclopaedia Islamica*, ed. W. Madelung and F. Daftary (Brill Online, 2015), http://referenceworks.brillonline.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/entries/encyclopaedia-islamica/abu-al-layth-al-samarqandi-COM_0099 (accessed 9 September 2015). On his impact on early Ottoman catechetical literature, see Kelepetin Arpaguş, 'Bir Telif Türi Olarak İlmihal', and Aynacı, 'Osmanlı Kuruluş Dönemi'.
 42. A. W. T. Juynboll published the text in both Arabic ('Samarkandi's Catechismus: Opnieuw Besproken', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 29, no. 1 [1881], pp. 267–74.) and with an interlinear translation into Javanese (as 'Een Moslimsche Catechismus in het Arabisch met eene Javaansche Interlineaire Vertaling in Pegonschrift uitgegeven en in het Nederlandsch vertaald', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* 29, no. 2 [1881], pp. 215–27, 229–31). See also Michael Laffan, *The Makings of Indonesian Islam: Orientalism and the Narration of a Sufi Past* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), pp. 33–4.
 43. Juynboll, 'Samarkandi's Catechismus'. I thank Sona Grigoryan for reading the Arabic text with me. On the relationship between *imān* and *islām* see Wensinck, *The Muslim Creed*, pp. 36–57.
 44. Süleymaniye Library, Istanbul, MS Ayasofya 2300/1.
 45. A version of *Cevahirü'l-İslam*, under the title *Mesail-i Şer'iyye*, was published in German translation as *Gesetzfragen* by Heinrich Friedrich von Diez in his *Denkwürdigkeiten von Asien* (Berlin: In Commission der Nicolaischen Buchhandlung, 1811), pp. 230–8. This version mostly follows the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* textual family, but includes several questions that appear in the *Risale*, plus the four additional questions the knowledge of which, according to Abu Hanifa, qualifies one for the post of imam. The author did not specify the manuscript that served as the basis of his translation. For another example of blending of the two texts, see British Library, Or. 1165, ff. 58b–61b. This manuscript is dated 1092/1681.
 46. The undated manuscript of the *Risale-i Sual ve Cevab* in Süleymaniye Library, Kılıç Ali Paşa 378, which contains the preface identifying Lütü Paşa as the author, is named in the *mecmû'a* table of contents as *Cevahirü'l-İslam*.
 47. My translation; Österreichischer Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, A. F. 437 (282), ff. 22a–22b.
 48. Quran 7: 172. Süleymaniye Library, MS Kılıç Ali Paşa 378, ff. 72a.

49. See Guy Burak, *The Second Formation of Islamic Law: The Hanafi School in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
50. Süleymaniye Library, Kılıç Ali Paşa 378, ff. 74b.
51. For this argument, see Burak, 'Faith, Law and Empire'.
52. The hair-narrow bridge that every person must pass on the Day of Judgement to enter paradise.
53. The trumpet into which Angel Israfil will blow on the Day of Judgement.
54. Early Islamic creeds have smaller or greater emphasis on the eschatological elements in which one must believe. However, few omit to mention the books and angels. It is a curious omission, but the books and angels are mentioned in the following two questions.
55. It is a reference either to 'Abd al-'Aziz b. Ahmad al-Hulwani (d. 1056–8) of Bukhara, a great Hanafi jurist who had the title *Shams al-A'imma* (splendour of religious authorities), or to his pupil, Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Abi Sahl Abu Bakr al-Sarakhsi (D. C. 1096), who inherited the title after his master's death. See Rume Ahmed, *Narratives of Islamic Legal Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 162.
56. On the references to women's instruction in other Ottoman 'ilm-i hāls, see Terzioğlu, 'Where 'Ilm-i Hāl Meets Catechism', p. 90.
57. von Diez, *Denkwürdigkeiten von Asien*, p. 234.
58. Terzioğlu, 'Where 'Ilm-i Hāl Meets Catechism', pp. 98–9.
59. Österreichischer Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, A. F. 437 (282), f. 28b.
60. For instance, the copy of the *Risale* at Süleymaniye Library, MS Reşid Efendi 1215, does not have these additional questions, while MS Kılıç Ali Paşa 378 does have them. The same questions appear in some seventeenth-century manuscripts of the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* (see, for instance, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MS Supplement Turc 1209, ff. 41r–51v, which dates to 1081/1670–1), although they are not featured in the two sixteenth-century versions of the text that I have consulted.
61. Süleymaniye Library, MS Kılıç Ali Paşa 378, f. 80a: 'İmām-i Ā'zam hazretleri eydür: İmām olan kişiye dört suāl iderler. Eğer cevāp virürse imāmeti cāizdür. Ve eğer cevāp virmez ise, imāmeti cāiz değildir. Evvel suāl budur ki: bu namāzı senün için mi kılırsun yohsa cemā'at için mi, diseler? El cevāp vir kim: benüm için kılarım, amma cemā'at için dahī niyyet iderem, deye. İkinci suāl oldur ki, cemā'at sana uyar, sen kime uyarsın? Cevāp vir kim, ben Kur'an'a uyaram, deye. Üçüncü suāl oldur ki, bizim [sic] imāmımız sensin, senün imamun kimdür? Cevāp vir kim, Muhammad Mustafā'dur, deye. Dördüncü suāl oldur ki, bizüm namāzımız seninle tamām olur, senün namāzun kimünle tamām olur? Cevāp vir kim, benüm namazum Peygamber 'aleyhi's-selāmın sünnetiyle tamām olur. Temme.'
62. *Mecmū'as* containing Birgivi's *Vasiyetname*, *Risale-i Rumi Efendi*, *Risale-i Kadızade* and *Cevahirü'l-İslam*, by themselves or in addition to some other texts, abound. For instance, see MSS British Library, Or. 1165; Bibliothèque Nationale, Supplement Turc 479; Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig, B. or. 177; Süleymaniye Library, Hacı Mahmud Efendi 1407; Laleli 02463, etc.
63. Österreichischer Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, A. F. 437 (282), ff. 22a–28b. For a detailed table of contents of this miscellany and its authorship, see Eugen Mittwoch and J. H. Mordtman, 'Die Wiener Sammelhandschrift', in F. Babinger et al. (eds), *Literaturdenkmäler aus Ungarns Türkenzeit* (Berlin and Leipzig: W. de Gruyter, 1927), esp. pp. 76–87.
64. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MS NAF 1845, ff. 14r–16v. For manuscripts Galland collected during his stay in Istanbul, see Antoine Galland, *Journal d'Antoine Galland pendant son séjour à Constantinople: 1672–1673* ([Reprod.] publ. et annot. par Charles Schefer (Paris: Leroux 1881).
65. I am currently working on a different article that puts Ottoman catechisms in general, and the *Cevahirü'l-İslam* in particular, in a comparative and 'entangled' early modern perspective.

Bibliography

- Ahmed, Rumei, *Narratives of Islamic Legal Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Al-Tikriti, Nabil, 'Kalam in the Service of the State: Apostasy and the Defining of Ottoman Islamic Identity', in H. Karateke and M. Reinkowski (eds), *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 131–50.
- Anon., *Cevahirü'l-İslam*, MS Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MS Supplement Turc 1209, ff. 41r–51v; British Library, London, MS Or. 1165, ff. 58b–61b; Österreichischer Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, MS A. F. 437 (282), ff. 22a–28b.
- Atçıl, Abdurrahman, 'The Formation of the Ottoman Learned Class and Legal Scholarship (1300-1600)', doctoral thesis, University of Chicago, 2010.
- Aynacı, Mediha, 'Osmanlı Kuruluş Dönemi Türkçe İlmihal Eserleri Çerçevesinde İlmihallerin Fikhî Yönden Değerlendirilmesi', doctoral thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2009.
- Bulliet, Richard W., *Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period: An Essay in Quantitative History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979).
- Bulliet, Richard W., 'Conversion Stories in Early Islam', in Michael Gervers and Ramzi J. Bikhazi (eds), *Conversion and Continuity: Indigenous Christian Communities in Islamic Lands, Eighth to Eighteenth Centuries*, Papers in Mediaeval Studies 9 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1990), pp. 123–33.
- Burak, Guy, 'Faith, Law and Empire in the Ottoman "Age of Confessionalization" (Fifteenth to Seventeenth Centuries): The Case of "Renewal of Faith"', *Mediterranean Historical Review* 28, no. 1 (2013), pp. 1–23.
- Burak, Guy, *The Second Formation of Islamic Law: The Hanafî School in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- Buzov, Snježana, 'The Lawgiver and His Lawmakers: The Role of Legal Discourse in the Change of Ottoman Imperial Culture', doctoral thesis, University of Chicago, 2005.
- Calasso, Giovanna, 'Récits de conversion, zèle dévotionnel et instruction religieuse dans les biographies des "gens de Başra" du *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt* d'Ibn Sa'd', in Mercedes García-Arenal (ed.), *Conversions islamiques: Identités religieuses en Islam méditerranéen/Islamic Conversions: Religious Identities in Mediterranean Islam* (Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 2001), pp. 19–47.
- Delilbaşı, Melek, 'Christian Sipahis in the Tırhala Taxation Registers (15th and 16th Centuries)', in A. Anastasopoulos (ed.), *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire* (Heraklion: Crete University Press, 2005), pp. 87–114.
- von Diez, Heinrich Friedrich, *Denkwürdigkeiten von Asien* (Berlin: In Commission der Nicolaischen Buchhandlung, 1811).
- Dressler, Marcus, 'Inventing Orthodoxy: Competing Claims for Authority and Legitimacy in the Ottoman-Safavid Conflict', in H. Karateke and M. Reinkowski (eds), *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 151–76.
- Eberhard, Elke, *Osmanische Polemik gegen die Safawiden im 16: Jahrhundert nach arabischen Handschriften* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Schwarz, 1970).
- Flügel, G., *Arabischen, Persischen, und Türkischen Handschriften der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hofbibliothek zu Wien*, vol. 3 (Vienna: K. K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1867).
- Galland, Antoine, [Notebook in manuscript] Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, NAF 1845, ff. 14r–16v.
- Galland, Antoine, *Journal d'Antoine Galland pendant son séjour à Constantinople: 1672–1673 ([Reprod.]) publ. et annot. par Charles Schefer* (Paris: Leroux 1881).
- Hoover, Jon, 'Creed', *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 3rd edn (Leiden: Brill, 2007–).
- Imber, Colin, 'Luṭfī Pasha', *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn (Leiden: Brill, 1960–2005).

- Imber, Colin, *Ebu's-Su'ud: The Islamic Legal Tradition* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997).
- İnalcık, Halil, 'Stefan Dušan'dan Osmanlı İmparatorluğuna: XV. Asırda Rumeli'de Hristiyan Siphahiler ve Menseleri', in Halil İnalcık, *Fatih Devri Üzerinde Tetkikler ve Vesikalar* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1954), pp. 137–84.
- Juynboll, A. W. T., 'Een Moslimsche Catechismus in het Arabisch met eene Javaansche Interlineaire Vertaling in Pegonschrift uitgegeven en in het Nederlandsch vertaald', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* 29, no. 2 (1881), pp. 215–27; 229–31.
- Juynboll, A. W. T., 'Samarkandi's Catechismus: Opnieuw Besproken', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 29, no. 1 (1881), pp. 267–74.
- Kelepetin, Hatice, 'İlmihal', *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 22, pp. 139–41.
- Kelepetin Arpağuş, Hatice, 'Bir Telif Türü Olarak İlmihal Tarihi Geçmişi ve Fonksiyonu', *Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 22 (2001–2), pp. 25–56.
- Kelepetin Arpağuş, Hatice, *Osmanlı ve Geleneksel İslam* (İstanbul: Çamlıca, 2014).
- Krstić, Tijana, 'Illuminated by the Light of Islam and the Glory of the Ottoman Sultanate: Narratives of Conversion to Islam in the Age of Confessionalization', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51, no. 1 (January 2009), pp. 35–63.
- Krstić, Tijana, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011).
- Laffan, Michael, *The Makings of Indonesian Islam: Orientalism and the Narration of a Sufi Past* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011).
- Lowry, Heath W., *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003).
- Lütfi Paşa, *Risale-i Su'al ve Cevap* [catalogued as: *Sual ve Cevaplı İlmihal*], Süleymaniye Library, Istanbul, MS Kılıç Ali Paşa 378, ff. 71b–79b.
- Lütfi Paşa, *Sual ve Cevap Risalesi*, Süleymaniye Library, MS Reşid Efendi 1215, ff. 271b–276b.
- Lütfi Paşa, *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman* (İstanbul: Matba'a-yı 'Amire, 1922).
- Mesail-i şer'iyye (Gesetzfragen)*, ed. and trans. Heinrich Friedrich von Diez in *Denkwürdigkeiten von Asien* (Berlin: In Commission der Nicolaischen Buchhandlung, 1811), pp. 230–8.
- Minkov, Anton, *Conversion to Islam in the Balkans: Kisve Bahası Petitions and Ottoman Social Life, 1670-1730* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Mittwoch, Eugen, and J. H. Mordtman, 'Die Wiener Sammelhandschrift', in F. Babinger, R. Gragger, E. Mittwoch and J. H. Mordtman (eds), *Literaturdenkmäler aus Ungarns Türkenzeit* (Berlin and Leipzig: W. de Gruyter, 1927), pp. 70–87.
- Murad b. Abdullah, *Kitāb Tesvīyetü't-Teveccüh*, British Library, London, MS Add 19894.
- Necipoğlu, Gülrü, *The Age of Sinan* (London: Reaktion, 2005).
- Necipoğlu, Gülrü, 'The Süleymaniye Complex in Istanbul: An Interpretation', *Muqarnas* 3 (1985), pp. 92–117.
- Nushi al-Nasihi, *Mebhas-ı İman*, Süleymaniye Library, Istanbul, MS Yazma Bağışlar 5563.
- Pakatchi, Ahmad, and Azar Rabbani, 'Abū al-Layth al-Samarqandī', *Encyclopaedia Islamica*, ed. W. Madelung and F. Daftary (Brill Online, 2015), http://referenceworks.brillonline.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/entries/encyclopaedia-islamica/abu-al-layth-al-samarqandi-COM_0099 (accessed 9 September 2015).
- Pertsch, Wilhem, *Verzeichniss der Türkischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin* (Berlin: A. Asher, 1889).
- Ricci, Ronit, *Islam Translated: Literature, Conversion and the Arabic Cosmopolis of South and Southeast Asia* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2011).
- al-Samarqandī, Abu al-Layth, *Risalat al-As'ila wa'l-Ajwiba al-I'tiqadiyya*, Süleymaniye Library, Istanbul, MS Ayasofya 2300.

- Terzioğlu, Derin, 'Sunna-Minded Sufi Preachers in Service of the Ottoman State: The *Nasihatnâme* of Hasan Addressed to Murad IV', *Archivum Ottomanicum* 27 (2010), pp. 243–59.
- Terzioğlu, Derin, 'Sufis in the Age of State-Building and Confessionalization', in Christine Woodhead (ed.), *The Ottoman World* (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 86–99.
- Terzioğlu, Derin, 'How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization: A Historiographical Discussion', *Turcica* 44 (2012–13), pp. 301–38.
- Terzioğlu, Derin, 'Where 'İlm-i Hāl Meets Catechism: Islamic Manuals of Religious Instruction in the Ottoman Empire in the Age of Confessionalization', *Past and Present* 220 (August 2013), pp. 79–114.
- Watt, Montgomery W., 'Akīda', *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn (Leiden: Brill, 1960–2005).
- Watt, Montgomery W., *Islamic Creeds* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994).
- Wensinck, A. J., *The Muslim Creed: Its Genesis and Historical Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932).