VERNACULARIZATION, SUNNITIZATON AND MARTYRDOM IN EARLY OTTOMAN LANDS: A TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE *EBŪ MÜSLİM-NĀME*

by
OĞUZHAN DURU

Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Sabancı University
September 2024

VERNACULARIZATION, SUNNITIZATON AND MARTYRDOM IN EARLY OTTOMAN LANDS: A TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE *EBŪ MÜSLİM-NĀME*

Approved by:

Assoc. Prof. Abdurrahman Atçıl ....
(Thesis Supervisor)

Assoc. Prof. Ayşe Ozil ....

Asst. Prof. Ferenc Péter Csirkés ....

Date of Approval: September 6, 2024

ABSTRACT

VERNACULARIZATION, SUNNITIZATON AND MARTYRDOM IN THE EARLY OTTOMAN LANDS: A TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE *EBŪ MÜSLİM-NĀME*

OĞUZHAN DURU

HISTORY M.A. THESIS, SEPTEMBER 2024

Thesis Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. ABDURRAHMAN ATÇIL

Keywords: *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, The Epic Tradition, Vernacularization, Martyrdom, 'Alid Loyalty

This thesis examines the 1590 Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in the context of vernacularization, martyrdom and sunnitization. Although there is data that the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was first translated in the centuries when Turkish literature developed, but the oldest copies we have belong to the sixteenth century. The 1590 text examined in this thesis shows commonality with other Turkish epics and texts in the context of the *Sunni-Kharijite* (Muslim/Infidel) distinction and in the context of '*Alid Loyalty.* Martyrdom, which is the most important theme of the text, was reshaped in the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, unlike the Persian original, in the context of late medieval Anatolia, such as the conversion events from Christianity to Islam. The term *Ebū Turābī*, which is used for Ebū Müslim and his companions who tried to avenge the Karbala Incident, means '*Alid Loyalty* and this concept is very difficult to come across in other texts. In addition to these, the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* also has an important place in the sixteenth century Ottoman-Safavid rivalry. While the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was banned in the Safavid world, the emergence of new translations and copies in the Ottoman world shows that the popularity of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* played a role in a confessional crisis of legitimacy.

ÖZET

ERKEN DÖNEM OSMANLI DÜNYASINDA DİLDE YERELLEŞME, SÜNNİLEŞTİRME VE ŞEHİTLİK: *EBŪ MÜSLİM-NĀME*'NİN METİN ANALİZİ

OĞUZHAN DURU

TARİH YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ, Eylül 2024

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Abdurrahman Atçıl

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, Destan Geleneği, Dilde Yerelleşme, Şehitlik, 'Ali Taraftarlığı

Bu tez 1590 yılında Türkçe telif edilmiş *Ebū Müslim-nāme* metnini dilde yerelleşme, şehitlik ve Sünnileştirme bağlamında incelemektedir. Türkçe *Ebū Müslim-nāme*'nin Türkçe edebiyatın geliştiği yüzyıllarda çevrildiğine dair veriler olsa da elimizdeki en eski nüshalar on altıncı yüzyıla aittir. Bu tezde incelenen 1590 tarihli metin diğer Türkçe destanlarla ve metinlerle *Sünnī-Ḫāricī* (Müslüman-Kafir) ayrımı ve *'Ali Taraftarlığı* bağlamında ortaklık gösterir. Metnin en önemli teması olan şehitlik Türkçe *Ebū Müslim-nāme*'de Farsça aslından farklı olarak Hıristiyanlık'tan İslam'a ihtida olayları gibi geç Orta çağ Anadolu bağlamında yeniden biçimlenmiştir. Kerbela Vakası'nın intikamını almaya çalışan Ebū Müslim ve yoldaşları için kullanılan *Ebū Turābī* kavramı ise *'Ali Taraftarı* anlamına gelir ve bu kavrama diğer metinlerde rastlamak çok zordur. Bunlarla birlikte Türkçe *Ebū Müslim-nāme*'nin on altıncı yüzyıl Osmanlı ve Safevi rekabetinde de önemli bir yeri vardır. Safevi Devletinde *Ebū Müslim-nāme* yasaklanmakta iken Osmanlı dünyasında yeni çeviri ve kopyalarının ortaya çıkması *Ebu Müslim-name*'nin popülerliğinin mezhepsel ayrışma bağlamında bir meşruiyet krizinde rol oynadığını göstermektedir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TRANSLITERATION LETTERS

ء, ا: ٔ	ب : B b	پ : P p
ت : T t	ث: Ṩ ṩ	ج: C c
چ: Ç ç	ح: Ḥ ḥ	خ: Ḫ ḫ
د: D d	ذ: Ẕ ẕ	ر: R r
ز: Z z	ژ: J j	س: S s
ش: Ş ş	ص: Ṣ ṣ	ض: Ḍ ḍ / Ż ż
ط: Ṭ ṭ	ظ: Ẓ ẓ	ع: ٔ
غ: Ġ ġ	ف: F f	ق: Ḳ ḳ
ك: K k	گ: G g, Ğ ğ	ڭ: Ñ ñ
ل: L l	م: M m	ن: N n
و: V v	ه: H h	ى: Y y

List of IJMES transliteration letters used in this thesis.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Historical and Cultural Framework of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*

The Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* is a four-volume translation of the Persian *Ebū Müslim-nāme* written in the medieval period. It is not only a translation but also an original/adaptation.[1] With the political and religious concepts used by the translator-author of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the historical narratives the author reinterprets, my thesis also discusses what kind of religious legitimization methods the Ottomans used.

Historians have for a long time been relying on the epic tradition of the Anatolian *beylik*s and the Ottoman world as represented by four important epic chains, the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, the *Dānişmend-nāme* and the *Saltuḳ-nāme*.[2] However, Turkish epics such as the *Oğuz-nāme,* the *Kitāb-ı Dede Korkut*, or epics such as the *Hamza-nāme* and the ʻ*Anter-nāme*, which are important parts of the Arabic epic tradition, are rarely mentioned. There has been little discussion of the literary ecosystem that characterizes the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, the *Dānişmend-nāme* and the *Saltuḳ-nāme*, even though they have the highest rate of circulation and reproduction. For example, although Cemal Kafadar points to a cultural world when he says that these epics are the primary and fundamental texts of the Byzantine-Turkish frontier world, he leaves the classification of these texts for later.[3] Of course, all these texts contain themes such as conversion, holy war and martyrdom, which include political and cultural expressions of the Byzantine-

---

[1] For a dating of the text and a review of the copies, see Irene Melikoff, *Ebū Müslim: la "porte hache" du Khorasan* (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1962): 74–76.

[2] For a summary of historians' basic approaches to Turkish epics, see Zeynep Aydoğan, "Representations of Cultural Geography in the Late Medieval Anatolian Frontier Narratives" (PhD Diss., Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 2018): 14–19.

[3] Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State* (Berkeley: University of California Press 2005): 54–95.

Turkish frontier world, but when we compare the texts with historical chronicles, Sufi hagiographies, *maḳtel* texts and other textual traditions (for example, *futuwwa* texts or political theory texts such as the *Kenzü'l-Kübera*) that do not belong to the epic genre, they have many common concepts and narratives that internally refer to each other (their names, characters, same narratives). In addition, many of these epics are written like an encyclopedia. Examples include Ahmedī's *İskender-nāme* at the beginning of the fifteenth century or the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in the sixteenth century. These texts include many different elements such as philosophy, geography, religions, heroes, prophets, supernatural places and beings, and present a multi-layered narrative.[4] On the other hand, these texts have a common politico-religious stance by containing implicit or very specific nuances and sections that we can define as the Sunni-Kharijite distinction, 'Alid Loyalty or Philo-'Alidism.[5] In particular, the *Ebū Müslim-nāme,* unlike other texts, refers to 'Alid Loyalty as the name of *Ebū Turābī.* This is a nomenclature that does not appear in other epics and suggests that the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* had a distinctive attitude of Ahl al-Baytism compared to other texts. The group that Ebū Müslim fights throughout the text is the Umayyad Caliphs, who are called Kharijites in the text.[6]

Another issue is whether the epic tradition has a lot of narratives of its own in the Anatolian context (for example: conversion, holy war, martyrdom). As will be emphasized in the following pages when we write about vernacularizaton and the the translation of epics into Turkish, it is important to note that the four most famous and influential Turkish epics in Anatolia (the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, the *Dānişmend-nāme* and *Saltuḳ-nāme*) was not translated from same languages. The *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was originally written in Persian and contains the elementary political, religious, and cultural elements of medieval Islamic history. In the epic there are many themes and political narratives of the Iranian-Islamic world, such as the Zoroastrians, the marriage of Husayn, son of Caliph 'Ali, the occultation of Mahdi Zayn al-'Ābidīn. However, we can also mention Persian epics such as Firdawsī's *Shāh-nāme*, which greatly influenced many texts, such as various versions of the *İskender-nāme.* Another example is the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, based on a medieval Muslim-Christian frontier epic called *Sīrat al-amīra Dhāt al-Himma* written in Ara-

---

[4]On how common narratives of supernatural regions are shaped in the epic tradition, see Marinos Sariyannis, "A Tale of Two Cities: Jābarṣā/Jābalqā and Their Metamorphoses," *Der Islam* 101, no. 1 (2024): 162–192.

[5]Although the Persian *Ebū Müslim-nāme* uses the word Kharijites for Marwanids, the word "mu'minīn" is used for Ebū Müslim and his followers: In the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the word "Sunni" is used, which is constantly used in other epic and literary texts. In the Persian *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, it is written as "mu'minun (believers) – for the use of kharijites see. Kathyryn Babayan, *Mystics, Monarhcs and Messiahs: Cultural Landscapes of Early Modern Iran*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press 2002): 124–125.

[6]Gottfried Hagen, "Heroes and Saints in Anatolian Literature", *Oriente Moderno*, LXXXIX, (2009): 2, 351.

bic.[7] At the same time, we can add the *'Anter-nāme*, a very famous Arabic epic that was translated, along with other epics, into Turkish during the reign of Meḥmed II (r. 1451-1481). The number of epics translated from Arabic and Persian into Turkish can be multiplied. At the same time, especially in the fifteenth century, we see the emergence of original Turkish epics such as the *Dānişmend-nāme*, the *Ṣaltuḳ-nāme* or the *Kitāb-ı Dede Ḳorḳud*, which became part of Anatolian context with some changes about characters, their religious identity, places ext. and narrative reconstructions, as I will explain in the chapters about martyrdom and Sunnitization later in the thesis.[8]

Thus, the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was translated in a way that had the same narrative style and language as the other epics, and removed many of the Shi'ite elements of the Persian original. Unlike other epics, the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* is neither a "frontier" narrative" narration, nor a conversion narrative. There are a few motifs of conversion and frontier in it, but its dominant themes are *futuwwa*, martyrdom, Sunnitization, and revenge. As Gottfried Hagen demonstrates, these themes create a pattern that we can call "chaos as order" which involves revenge on the one hand, and corruption, violence, and cruelty inherent in human nature and politics on the other. In the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, other epics, Sufi texts, and many other genres (*futuwwa* texts, *maḳtel*s etc.), fighting against the enemy (infidel), the use of coercion, martyrdom, and revenge become elements of legitimizing patterns. [9]

To discover and reveal the historical content of these patterns as a historian and the historical reality of the narratives, as Devin DeWeese says, the method of "demythologization" alone does not work. Although the fictional narratives and supernatural events in the text seem to surround the "historical core", the content of these narratives can help us clarify how the texts developed in the historical context and the different cultural elements of history which the epics were written in.[10] At the same time, the work of Stephanos Yerasimos is one of the references for how a mythical narrative can have many layers and how we can deal with narratives. Yerasimos does not consider a mythical narrative to be just a myth/legend. Instead, it re-

---

[7]Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State* ((Berkeley: University of California Press 2005), 63–73.

[8]For a general panorama of works translated into Turkish in the fifteenth century, see: Ferenc Csirkés, "Turkish/Turkic Books of Poetry, Turkish and Persian Lexicography: The Politics of Language Under Bayezid II", in *Treasures of Knowledge An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3–1503/4)* vol. 1, ed. Gülru Necipoğlu, Cemal Kafadar and Cornell H. Fleischer (Leiden: Brill 2019), 673–734. And also, Tim Stanley,"The Books of Umur Bey," *Muqarnas* 21 (2004): 323–31.

[9]Gottfried Hagen, "Chaos, Order, Power, Salvation: Heroic Hagiography's Response to the Ottoman Fifteenth Century," *Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association* 1, no. 1–2 (2014): 91–109.

[10]Devin Deweese, *Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde: Baba Tükles and Conversion to Islam in Historical and Epic Tradition* (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press 1994), 160–161.

evaluates texts in their historical context to see when and why the narrative might have been produced. He also showed that the parallels and differences that the narrative establishes with different texts and traditions can also explain the nature of the myth/legend and its allegorical layers.[11] When we look at the epics in this way, the ostensibly fictional aspects of the text can helps us discover the *weltanschaaung* of the world in which the text was written (or translated) in. For example, as I will explain in the following chapters, the author of the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* implements several changes to the narrative, such as featuring Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyya instead of Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn as the representative of the *Ahl al-Bayt* after the Karbala Incident, omitting to mention the marriage of Ḥusayn son of Caliph ʿAli to the Sasanian princess Shahrbanu or the occultation of the Mahdi, and turning Maḫyār, a Zoroastrian in the Persian original, into a Christian who converted to Islam. These differences are far more important than who Ebū Müslim historically fought or what ideas he actually had: because these differences served the function of legitimizing the political and religious struggle against the Safavids in the sixteenth century Ottoman world and setting the Ottoman religious and social context. This shows us that the historical core of the epic of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* is not found in the parts of the text that reflect the historical personality of Ebū Müslim, but in such changes and new additions.

The purpose of translating epics into Turkish or writing them in Turkish is not only to continue a cultural tradition in the Turkish language, but also to create a complex textual structure with political allusions. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, many texts (including epics), especially those containing accounts of ghaza and conversion, narrated the Christian-Muslim (Byzantine-Ottoman) wars. Although the theme of holy war is at the forefront, we can also see the traces of religious and cultural themes and cultural permeability in the late medieval Anatolian world in these texts. On the one hand, these texts could be read as allegory of a historical period, and on the other hand, they contained legitimizing themes parallel to the society and politics of the time when they were written.[12] This Christian-Muslim theme, which is very intense in the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, the *Dānişmend-nāme* and the *Ṣaltuḳ-nāme*, includes a lot of communities and identities as well as the construction of a complex identity: Rūmī.[13]

The *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was translated into Turkish in 1590, running to four volumes,

---

[11]Stefanos Yerasimos, *Kostantiniye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*. Tr. Şirin Tekeli (İstanbul: İletişim, 1993).

[12]Tijana Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011), 55.

[13]Cemal Kafadar, "A Rome of One's Own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum", *Muqarnas*, 24, 1 (2007): 7-25.

quite in contrast with the generic and short narrative we find in earlier versions. This text should be considered as a free adaptation, not just a translation. Many parts of the Persian text have been expanded, many additions and editions have been made. One of the methodological choices I made to understand the reason for these changes is to rethink the context of the text by examining the sixteenth century Ottoman-Safavid rivalry. In this period, which we define as the Age of Confessionalization, there are a lot of texts about the Sunni-Shi'i rivalry, such as the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the *Cenk-nāme-i 'Ali*.[14] In fact, the next century, the Ottoman-Safavid rivalry and the Celali Rebellion formed an important backdrop to the *Epic of Köroğlu*.[15]

As can be seen in the following chapters of the thesis, the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* can be contextualized against the background of the Ottoman-Safavid rivalry and the internal political dynamics of these two empires. In particular, the fact that the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was banned in Iran because it features Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya as the legitimate heir to Caliph 'Ali, this element is not allowed from the perspective of the Safavid Empire, such as Friday prayers.[16]

1.2 Literature Review

Irene Melikoff's *Abu Muslim: la "porte hache" du Khorasan* (1962) is still the only book work on this subject.[17] In this work, which will be criticized and evaluated at length in the following chapters of my thesis, Irene Melikoff, after examining the historical personality of Ebū Müslim, investigates how the epic was formed and how it was perceived in various circles in Anatolia. According to Melikoff, like other epics, it includes heterodox narratives and pre-Islamic beliefs such as shamanism, as well as pro-Ahl al-Bayt themes.[18] Leaving such generalizations aside, the theme of *futuwwa* emphasized by Melikoff in her book and articles on Ebū Müslim, and the small narratives in the text related to the Qaysaniyya sect, are still valid analyses. The most important problem that Melikoff makes in her analysis of the text are

---

[14] Tijana Krstič, "State and Religion, 'Sunnitization' and 'Confessionalism' in Suleyman's Time" in *The Battle for Central Europe* (Leiden, Brill, 2019): 65–91. Derin Terzioğlu, "Where 'ilm-i hal meets catechism: Islamic manuals of religious instruction in the Ottoman Empire in the age of confessionalization," *Past & Present*, 220, 2013: 79–114

[15] [1] Ali Aydın Karamustafa, "The Koroghlu Epics in Trans-Imperial Perspective: The Story of the Ottoman and Safavid Expansions and Crises" (PhD Diss., Stanford University 2019): 216–235.

[16] Kathyryn Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs*, 127–129.

[17] Irène Melikoff, *Ebū Müslim: "la porte haché" du Horasan* (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1962)

[18] Irene Melikoff, *Le port hache*, 62–65.

that she sees the existence of Shi'in the and syncretic folk Islam in Anatolia as a certainty.

Another feature of Melikoff's book is that it provides a summary of several copies of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, including the ones I examined in my dissertation, in a single chronology. Although this summary, which covers half of the book, accurately conveys the copies of *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, many important details and chapters have been omitted and some parts have been misquoted. Melikoff hardly mentions the differences between the manuscripts and does not specify whether the events he describes are present in every copy: this is a very big problem. For example, Melikoff does not cite the prelude to the history of Islam, which is a long part of the 1590 *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. However, this section is the part that shows us the leitmotive of the text. In describing the role of Marwan, the antihero of the epic, from the early years of Islamic history to the birth of Ebū Müslim, she cites many events related to Marwan that are known in oral and written culture, such as Marwan changing the name of a chapter in the Qur'an and Abu Bakr writing a death warrant for his son. On the other hand, it is surprising that Melikoff does not dwell on the fact that Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya was the legitimate heir of *Ahl al-Bayt* after the Karbala Incident. As I will explain in the martyrdom chapter of the thesis, Maḥyār is referred to as Christian Maḥyār in the Turkish version, while he was a Muslim in the Persian text and was martyred by his family. The fact that she is referred Maḥyār as a Jew in her book and on the other hand she says there is no information that he was martyred, but there is a long narrative in the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* about Maḥyār's martyrdom. Melikoff's book and its main theses will be discussed in the chapters below.

One of the most important works on *Ebū Müslim-nāme* is Kathryn Babayan's *Mystics, Monarcs and Messiahs: Cultural Landscapes of Early Modern Iran* (2002), written years after Melikoff's work.[19] In this work, Babayan describes the adventure of *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in the stage of confessionalization in Safavid Iran. In sixteenth century Iran, the cult of *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, or rather the cult of Ebū Müslim, was widely read during the reign of Shah Ismail (b. 1524) and banned during the reign of Shah Tahmasb (b. 1576) due to many religious and confessional elements such as the Qaysaniyya sect overtones and Friday prayer practices. Babayan examines the Persian and the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*s to explain how effective these prohibitions were with the content of the text. In this study, where we have obtained a lot of important information about the content of the Persian copy, unfortunately, we cannot obtain any new information about the Turkish text; because Babayan

---

[19]Kathyryn Babayan, *Mystics, Monarcs and Messiahs: Cultural Landscapes of Early Modern Iran* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press 2002).

takes the summary in Melikoff's book as a source for the Turkish text. This leads to the Sunni-Kharijites distinction used in the Turkish text or some unjustified or incomplete analyses of Maḥyār's life. Ignoring these, Babayan's analysis is crucial to see how *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the cult of Ebū Müslim have been received in the Persianate world and where they stood politically.

The other work in thes Rula Jurdi Abisaab's *Converting Persia: Religion and Power in the Safavid Empire* (2004), which like Babayan, deals with the issue of Shi'in thetization and the transformation of religious law in the Safavid Empire.[20] In the introduction to her book, Abisaab explains that the prohibition of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was related to the conflict between religious schools in the Safavid Empire.

There has not yet been a critical edition of the 1590 *Ebū Müslim-nāme* or the other early-modern *Ebū Müslim-nāme* copies. A few editions have been made on the copies of later periods from the nineteenth century.[21]

The reason why so little work has been done on the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* is probably that there is no reliable critical edition of the work, based on the sixteenth century copies. In particular, the BnF copies that are focused on in this thesis include material that can be the source of many historical and mythical phenomena such as conversion, martyrdom, supernatural beings and cosmologies, and Sunnitization, which have been on the agenda in Ottoman historiography for a while.

1.3 Primary Sources

We usually start the history of writing Turkish epics with the period with Turkish translations in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Based on the epics' references to characters in other epics, we assume that other epics were also written. Since the *Baṭṭāl-nāme* mentions Ebū Müslim, we think that the epic of Ebū Müslim was also translated at that time, but we do not have enough information or data to prove this. The earliest copies of epics such as the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, the *Dānişmend-nāme* and the *Saltuḳ-nāme* date back to the early fifteenth century. As A. C. S. Peacock argues, we do not have sufficient evidence to accept that these texts existed at the

---

[20]Rula Jurdi Abisaab, *Converting Persia: Religion and Power in the Safavid Empire* (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2004).

[21]Necati Demir, Mehmet Dursun Erdem and Sibel Üst, *Eba Müslim-nāme*, 2 vols. (Ankara: Destan Yayınları 2007). Mevlüt İlhan, "Hızır Şeyyad'ın Ebū Müslimnāme'si (İnceleme-Metin)" (PhD Diss. Ankara: Hacı Bayram Veli University, 2021).

time when Turkish literature emerged.[22] For example, since there are references to Ebū Müslim in the the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, the oldest copy of which we have identified in the early fourteenth century (1436–7), we cannot say that the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was translated at an earlier date. When we look at the dates of the extant manuscripts of the epic, it is not yet acceptable to say that the Turkish epic tradition has been present since the end of the thirteenth century and the fourteenth century with the vernacularization of the Turkish language.

We have no evidence that the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was translated into Turkish before the *Baṭṭāl-nāme* or in the fourteenth century. The oldest copies of the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* that we have access to all date from the sixteenth century. One volume of these copies is a 157-pages long version dated 1580, registered in the British Library: Asian and African Studies in England under the number Or.1128.[23] Another is the version numbered B0014 (Belediye 14) in the IBB Atatürk Library,[24] but this copy is undated and appears to be a copy from the seventeenth century. The other copies from the sixteenth century is the four-volume copies, located in Ancien Fond 57, Ancien Fond 58, Ancien Fond 59 and Ancien Fond 60 (AF) in the Biblioteqhue Nationale de France (BnF) in Paris.[25] These copies, dated to 1590, will be the ones discussed in the thesis. In the seventeenth century and later, especially in the nineteenth century, copies of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* multiplied and reached more than a hundred. I do not examine all these copies, both because were not the product of the centuries under discussion.

We know that the author of the original Persian text of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was Ebū Ṭāhir al-Tūsī. It was probably at the Ghaznavid court the Ghaznavids that he wrote or dictated his works in Persian and later wrote texts that have many copies and translations in the Islamic world. The text on which the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* is based is the Persian text, which is also in the Bibliotheque Nationale de France. The author of the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* frequently refers to Ebū Ṭāhir al-Tūsī in the work and classifies the narratives coming from him; he also mentions several times some narratives about the life of Sultan Maḥmūd, the Ghaznavid ruler,

---

[22]A. C. S. Peacock, *Islam, Literature and Society in Mongol Anatolia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2019): 151–157.

[23]Ebū Ṭāhir al-Tūsī, *Kitāb-ı Ebū Müslim,* trans. Anonymus, British Library: Asian and African Studies, Or.1128.

[24]Ebū Ṭāhir al-Tūsī, *Kitāb-ı Ebū Müslim*, trans. Anonymus, IBB Atatürk Library, Nadir Kitaplar, Bel_Yz_B.000014

[25]Ebū Ṭāhir al-Tūsī, *Kitāb-ı Ebū Müslim*, trans. Anonymus, Paris Bibliotheuqe Nationale, Département des Manuscrits. Turk 59. Also see: Edgard Blochet, *Catalogue des manuscrits Turcs: Tome I, Ancien fonds, nos. 1-396. Supplement: Nos. 1-572* (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale 1932): 24.

or about the life of Ebū Müslim he heard directly from Sultan Maḥmūd himself.[26]

On the other hand, the author of the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* he also mentions Ebū Ṭāhir al-Tūsī, the author of the Persian version, adding that he was blind and he praying for mercy to him.[27] He makes references to Tūsī in several places in the text, and reminds us that the original copy he used was the Persian copy of Tūsī.

The identity of the *Ebū Müslim*-nāme's translator is a more important question. Irène Melikoff, in her 1962 book and two articles written in 1966 states that the name of the Turkish author of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* is Ḥācı Şādī. Based on this, she states that Ḥācı Şādī was also the author of the text of the *Maḳtel-i Hüseyn* dated 1362. According to Melikoff, the fact that these two works have similar terminology and were written for a similar audience (for example, *Āhī*s) is proof that Ḥācı Şādī and Şādī Meddāḥ, the author of the *Maḳtel-i Hüseyn*, may have been the same person. Melikoff suggests that aside from their audience and terminology, the two works are connected by their common theme of the persecution of the *Ahl al-Bayt* and revenge for the Karbala massacre. However, as I will explain in the following chapters, the fact that *Ahl al-Bayt* adherence and Philo-'Alidism were an all-too-common and even dominant theme in Anatolia in the period significantly weakens assumptions that such works were written by the same person or even in the same geographical region.

Melikoff tries to justify the view that Ḥācı Şādī and Yūsuf-i Meddāḥ may be the same person in the way I mentioned above, especially because Yūsuf-i Meddāḥ calls himself Şādī Meddāḥ in the *Maḳtel*. Kenan Özçelik, who published the Maḳtel text of 1362, states that the word *şādī* in it is "Şādī" not a name, the word Meddāḥ is a name. One of the points I should mention here is that regardless of the forenames, the author refers to himself as *Meddāḥ* in both the Maḳtel text and the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* translation. In the text of the *Maḳtel*, the author says, "Yā ilāhī sen ki iş bu Meddāḥ'a / Raḥmet eyle iy ganī Allah anā," while in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* he says, "Meddāḥ eydür söz kısadur az olur."[28]

Although it is possible to think first that the two *Meddāḥ*s are the same person, new problems arise. The first is that while the *Maḳtel* text was written in Kastamonu, we do not know where the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was written, and the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* also refers to events that took place long after 1362. For example, in the third volume

---

[26] AF 57, 26b. "Sulṭān Maḥmūd öninde rivāyet iderler, rivāyet budur kim emīr ül-mü'minīn 'Aliye raḍiallāhu 'anhu kerramallāhu veche yitmiş iki yıl ana la'net itdiler adını *Ebū Turābī* kodular."

[27] Af 57, 2b.

[28] Kenan Özçelik, Yusuf-ı Meddāḥ ve Maḳtel-i Hüseyn, 78. Af, 57, 131a.

of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the author mentions that the Ottoman sultan Murād II (r. 1421-1444, 1446-1451) sent an envoy to Ibrahim II (r. 1424-1464), the ruler of Karamanids. The diplomatic relationship between these two people were in the middle of the fifteenth century. came almost a hundred years after the *Maḳtel* text, which had been completed in 1362.[29] Even if Melikoff claims that this information is mentioned in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, she disregards the information she gives about the author of this work at the beginning of her book; she does not even hint that this contradiction creates an anachronism, continuing to make statements as if it does not exist. At the very least, Melikoff could have said that the Turkish version of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* received additions in later copies. Another problem is that it is important to remember that the word *meddāḥ* is not a proper name directly, but the general name of storytellers and the name their profession.

As a result, it is very unlikely that the 1590 translation of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the *Maḳtel-i Hüseyn* came from the same pen. It is important that we have information other than that given in the text from the middle of the fifteenth century, according to which *Meddāḥ* was a common name at the time. For now, we do not have an older copy of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. However, the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in Umur Bey's library is recorded as a single volume, while the copy we have is four volumes. Perhaps the text was indeed translated by Yūsuf-i Meddāḥ, and his translation may have been expanded and retranslated in the sixteenth century. evidence to substantiate However, at this point it would be very difficult to claim this with any degree of certainty.

1.4 Research Aims and Questions

The most important theme of the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* (translated into Turkish in 1590) is martyrdom. In the epic, which starts with the effect and revenge of the Karbala Incident, many characters are martyred. While conversion has an important place in other epics as Muslim-Christian wars are depicted, conversion events are very few in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. All of the characters in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* are found within the Islamic world. The main antagonism in the epic is established by the Sunni-Kharijite (Muslim-Infidel) dichotomy, which became evident with the Karbala Incident. In the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, unlike the Persian *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the religious identities and roles of some characters change in the Anatolian

---

[29]Af, 59, 73a. "Sultan Murad sent an envoy to Ibrahim Beg, the son of Karamanoglu, to the mercy of God. A messenger came from Sultan Murad."

context. Therefore, the fundamental question that needs to be asked is: What kind of martyrdom narrative does the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* establish? While constructing this martyrdom narrative, what kind of representation does the Turkish the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* constitute in the Anatolian context? What is the equivalent of the concepts used in the text in the Anatolian emirates and the Ottoman world? Does the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* have a common narrative with the others compared to other epics and textual traditions? These questions will be answered in the first two chapters.

Along with the Sunni-Kharijite distinction in the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the theme of 'Alid Loyalty in the text is one of the most important features of the text. The concept of *Ebū Turābī*, which is used in the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in the sense of 'Alid Loyalty, is not found in other texts. However, the Sunni-Kharijite dichotomy and the Islamic historical narrative that the text tries to construct are also parallel to some Turkish texts. Is it because all these texts have a similar politico-religious outlook? Is there a continuity of narrative between the epics and other textual traditions other than the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*? Can we better understand the religious identities in these texts by comparing them with each other? How does the Ottoman-Safavid rivalry in the sixteenth century, the period in which the text was translated, fit into understanding the context of the emergence and production of the text? In order to answer all these questions, it is necessary to make an analysis of the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. In the last chapter, based on these questions, an analysis of the concepts in the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* will be made, and the political context of the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in the sixteenth century will be emphasized by making comparisons with other textual traditions.

1.5 Outline of Chapters

This thesis, which is a textual analysis of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in Turkish, written in 1590, is organized in three chapters.

The first chapter consists of two parts. It is devoted to criticisms of the formation of historiography on the Anatolian religious world and its main arguments. I have tried to summarize that the basic concepts and models of this powerful paradigm, which is called *The Köprülü Paradigm* and has continued to be influential in the twentieth century, such as the concepts of orthodoxy-heterodoxy, syncretism, or the existence of Turkish beliefs that continue from Central Asia to Anatolia, are no longer valid and that these models lead to many methodological problems. In the second part,

after examining where the formation process of Turkish literature stands in the vernacularization debate, I argued that the epic tradition and the translation of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* are one of the factors in the development of Turkish literature.

In the second chapter, after examining the structures of the phenomenon of martyrdom in Islam, I explained the importance of Christian martyrdom cults in Anatolia. In addition, I tried to explain what common themes and concepts the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* used with the *maḳtel* tradition, which is at the forefront of martyrdom literature in Muslim Anatolia. I explained the original aspects of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*'s narrative of Islamic history and how it relates to other textual traditions. In this chapter, which is the longest chapter of the thesis, I tried to reveal the Anatolian context of the text by tracing the three important martyrdom narratives in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*.

In the third chapter, after examining contemporary methods and models on Ottoman religious history, I tried to draw analogies on the reasons why the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was banned in Iran and retranslated in the Ottoman world. I examined the politico-religious context of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*'s use of Sunni-Kharijites and how the elements of Philo- 'Alidism and 'Alid Loyalty in the text should be understood by comparing them with different epic and textual traditions. In this way, the similarities and differences between the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and other texts could be seen better.

In the conclusion part, I summarized the main findings of the thesis. On the other hand, I conclude by emphasizing that the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and other epics should be studied not only from a few themes, but also from the perspective of many subjects such as vernacularization, martyrdom, Sunnitization and Islamic history, and that these studies should be carried out with comparative methods.

2. PARADIGMS, METHODS, AND CONCEPTS: VERNACULARIZATION AND THE KÖPRÜLÜ PARADIGM

2.1 Ottoman Translation Culture and Culture in Translation

I have tried to put Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* into a historical framework, which we can define as "vernacularization literature", considering the political and cultural layers of the rise of Anatolian Turkish as a language. Vernacularization is "the transposition of texts from a high-status language... into a vernacular language that typically has lower prestige as a written language."[1] While looking for answers to the question of why and how Turkish original and translated works, which started to develop with a few examples at the end of the thirteenth century but increased in number in the fourteenth century, we are trying to explain the rise of Turkish Literature with a common consciousness in all of Anatolia, not at all randomly or a singular example of any Anatolian emirates. After the Mongol Invasion and the collapse of the Seljuks empire in Anatolia, Aydınoğlu, Candaroğlu and the Ottoman and other *beyliks* rose in power. In the fourteenth century, it is seen that Turkish literature developed rapidly in these Turkish-speaking *beyliks* and many translations and originally written in Old Anatolian Turkish texts emerged. In *beyliks*/emirates such as the Aydınoğlu Emirate, the encouragement for literature is noticeably high. Under the patronage of the Aydınoğlu begs, many Turkish text appeared in the fourteenth century. In particular, the "adab" literature, which aimed at regulating the behaviour of administrators and social mechanisms, began to gain a very important place in the emirate of Aydınoğlu.[2]

---

[1] Richard Bauman, "The Philology of the Vernacular," *Journal of Folklore Research* 45, no. 1 (2008): 32, quoted by, A. C. S. Peacock, "Introdiction", in *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Anatolia* (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Komission, 2016), 30.

[2] For the most comprehensive study on the development of Turkish Literature in Anatolia so far, see A. C. S. Peacock, *Islam, Literature and Society in Mongol Anatolia*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2019) especially fourth chapter: *The Emergence of Literary Turkish*, 147–187. For examples of Vernacularization in Aydınid Beylik, see: Sara Nur Yıldız, "Aydınid Court Literature in the Formation of an Islamic Identity in Fourteenth-Century Western Anatolia," in *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Anatolia* (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Komission, 2016), 197–242.

Poets, such as Yunus Emre and Aşık Paşa, Gülşehrī and Ahmedī as well as prose writers such as Şeyhoğlu and Ahmed-in the Dai, produced their works in Turkish. On the other hand, it is very difficult to make a list of those who wrote translations and original books in many different fields, such as hagiography written by authors such as Elvan Çelebi and later the example of the Yazıcızade Brothers.[3]

In the process of the formation of Turkish literature, it is necessary to draw attention to the circulation of authors and texts. Although writers often seem to write their books in one city and under the patronage of a court, we see that Yūsuf-i Meddāḥ, the author of *Maḳtel*, and Ahmedī wandered not only in the patronage of a single city and palace, but also in the influence and dominion of different cities and emirates throughout their writing lives. For example, the author of *Maḳtel* Yusuf-i Meddāḥ traveled to Erzincan, Sivas and Kastamonu and wrote his works in different cities and under the patronage of the emirates. On the other hand, Ahmedī was also writing his works in Germiyanid Beylik and after the Germiyanid's he went to realm of Ottomans and completed his work *İskendernāme* under their patronage. At the same time, the assumption that all early Turkish books were written in a court patronage is seen as a quick decision. We are not yet sure what kind of patronage network Elvan Çelebi's *Menakıb-ı Kutsiyye* was written in.[4]

In the work of Sheldon Pollock, who is one of the main reference sources fort he vernacularization debate, he draws importance to the phenomenon of "increasingly powerful royal courts" as one of the most important factors in the spread and development of vernacular literature. A. C. S. Peacock, on the other hand, states that the royal courts are not as effective as it is thought when we talk about the development phase of Turkish literature. It is not known under what kind of patronage most of the works discussed in the development phase of Turkish literature were written, or even whether they were written under a patronage.[5] Although the presence of many emirates in Anatolia and their open support of the translation activities, we cannot fully agree with Pollock. An example of this is the text *The Alexander Romance*, introduced by Dimitris Kastritsis. The Turkish notes, which are placed around the Greek text and provide a summary of the events in the text, are the main feature of the text, but it is not clear under whose patronage the text was written or even by whom.[6]

---

[3]Carlos Grenier, "The Yazıcıoğlu Brothers and Vernacular Islamic Apologetics on the Fifteenth-Century Mediterranean Frontier." *Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association* 6, no. 2 (2019): 131–54.

[4]A. C. S. Peacock, *Islam, Literature and Society in Mongol Anatolia*, 150.

[5]A. C. S. Peacock, *Islam, Literature and Society in Mongol Anatolia*, 150.

[6]Dimitri Kastritsis, "The Alexander Romance and the Rise of the Ottoman Empire", *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Anatolia* (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg

As Cemal Kafadar points out, instead of reducing text production or intellectual networks to a single city or court, we should consider mobility and fluidity in Anatolia. One of the groups of writers in which this mobility stands out is the Sufi/dervish groups, and the dervishes of the late medieval Anatolian world are also warrior dervishes.[7] As another example, the Sufi-poet Kaygusuz Abdal can be mentioned. Kaygusuz Abdal, a wandering dervish, does not appear to work in any patronage network or in just one city. Kaygusuz Abdal, who had books such as *Budalā-nāme*, *Vücūd-nāme*, *Dilgūşā*, *Kitāb-ı Maglata*, did not write his books under a certain patronage, just like Yunus Emre and Aşık Paşa.[8] Based on these and many other examples, we see that Pollock's emphasis on the court effect of vernacularization is not completely valid in the vernacularization process of Turkish. As an interesting example here, we can look at Gülşehrī's *Felek-nāma* dedication. While Gülşehrī dedicates his Persian *Felek-nāma* to Ghazan Khan, there is no dedication in his book such as *Mantiku't-Tayr*'s free adaptation to Turkish. Gülşehrī, who completed his *Felek-nāma* two years after Ghazan Khan's death in 1304, may have sought the patronage of a Turkic-speaking ruler, according to Selim S. Kuru, instead of dedicating his *Mantiku't-Tayr* to the new Ilkhanid ruler and seeking the Ilkhanid patronage.[9]

Pollock's three-stage process of vernacularization includes: *literisation* as the emergence of written language for documentary reasons, then *literisation* through poetry and literature, and *superimposition*, in which the vernacular now dominate all discourse. Peacock lists these items and states that this process does not apply in the context of the vernacularization of Turkish. We cannot say that documentary reasons are valid because Turkish has risen directly as literature in Anatolia. As Peacock argues this *superimposition* stage is actually valid in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries when the Ottomans were dominant. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Persian still continued to influence as the dominant language.[10]

For Turkish literature that develops outside the world of court patronage, Lādikī Mehmed Çelebi's *Zeynü'l-Elḥān* is a very good example in this regard. In the early sixteenth century, Ladiki Mehmed Çelebi was a musician and wrote music theory

---

in Komission, 2016): 243–284.

[7]Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 110.

[8]Ahmet T. Karamustafa, "Kaygusuz Abdal: A Mediaval Saint and the Formation of Vernacular Islam in Anatolia" in *Unity in Diversity Mysticism, Messianism and the Construction of Religious Authority in Islam* ed. Orkhan Mir Kasimov (Boston: Leiden 2014): 329–342. Zeynep Oktay Uslu, "The Saṭḥiyye of Yunus Emre Ḳaygusuz Abdal: The Creation of a Vernacular Islamic Tradition in Turkish", *Turcica*, 50, (2019): 9–52.

[9]Selim S. Kuru, "Portrait of a Shaykh as Author in the Fourteenth-Century Anatolia: Gülşehri and His Falaknama" in *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Anatolia* (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Komission, 2016), 182–183.

[10]Peacock, *Islam, Literature and Society in Mongol Anatolia*, 150–151.

works. Ladiki Mehmed Çelebi wrote his works in Arabic. Later, realizing that his Arabic work did not generate as much interest as he expected, Lādikī Mehmed Çelebi translated his work into Turkish Mehmed Çelebi translated his work into Turkish not only for Turkish readers, but also for listeners who did not know any other language. While the early music theory and lyrics books and compilations contain Arabic and Persian music lyrics, we see that Turkish music also took place later.[11] This also shows that vernacularization lies at the bottom of an artistic transformation that Cem Behar calls "the transition from usūl-i Fārsī to tarz-i Osmānī" in Ottoman music history studies.[12] Cem Behar mentions Abdulkādir Merāgī as an example of this issue. Merāgī was brought to the Ottoman court in the fifteenth century during the reign of Mehmed II and wrote lyrics in Persian. In his late book, he lamented that he was not read and listened to as he had been used to. Cem Behar states that Persian and Arabic music had a very important place in the first period of Merāgī in the Ottoman world, but later on, Turkish music was preferred more than other music, and the transformation of interest in Merāgī coincided with this period.[13]

2.1.1 Early Translations of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*

We have some information about dating the Turkish translation of *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. The first of this information is a data mentioned in *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, while the second is a library information. The information about Umur Bey's library, which was mentioned by Mehmet Fuad Köprülü in his *History of Turkish Literature* published in 1926 and an article published by Tim Stanley, records that the Turkish translation of *Ebū Müslim-nāme* is also in then this library. According to Tim Stanley who stated that Umur Bey who died in then 1361, he patronized the translation of many Arabic and Persian books into Turkish. Tim Stanley also added a catalog of the Library to his work. There are works such as the history of the prophets, Qur'anic commentaries, hadith books, hagiography, *mesnevi*s, Sufi books and music theories, while the *Baṭṭāl-nāme* and a Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* are also recorded.[14] It is also surprising that in 1926 Mehmet Fuad Köprülü mentioned the library record of Umur Bey but he did not write the names of all the books. Never-

---

[11]Ahmed Pekşen, "Zeyn'ül-Elhan İsimli Eserin Metin ve Sözlük Çalışması: Ladikli Mehmed Çelebi" (M.A. thesis, Istanbul University, 2002): 12.

[12]Behar, *Orda Bir Musiki Var Uzakta*, (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi 2020): 106–111.

[13]Cem Behar, *Orda Bir Musiki Var Uzakta, XVI. Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda Osmanlı/Türk Musiki Geleneğinin Oluşumu*, 13-14.

[14]Mehmet Fuad Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* (İstanbul: Alfa Yayıncılık 2014): 455–456. Tim Stanley," The Books of Umur Bey"." Muqarnas 21 (2004): 323–31.

theless, he mentioned *Ebū Müslim-nāme*; but his important follower Irene Melikoff did not dwell on this issue.

This record shows that the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was translated into Turkish before its translation in 1580-90. The other information is that in the Turkish text we have, the author states that he was not the first person to translate the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, but that it was also translated by others before him (*mukaddem*). The translator Meddāḥ said: "Ben faḳīr ü ḥaḳīr bu kitābı Farsī'den Türkī'ye tercüme kılam gerçi muḳaddemler itmişler illa biz dahī küstāḫlık idüb ayak basdık el-ḥaḳḳ 'avn-i ināyetiyle ve Muḥammed'in mu'cizātıyla ve evliyānın himmetiyle."[15] Thus, he declared that the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was translated before him and that he himself undertook the work of translating this work again.

Both Umur Bey's library record and the information provided by Meddāḥ in the the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* prove that the translation of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* existed in Anatolia before the sixteenth century. However, as I will discuss in the Sunnization chapter below, after the sixteenth century, the copies of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* proliferated and gained political importance. On the other hand, we learn from a library catalogue that there were also a the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in the libraries of Mehmed II and Bayezid II in fifteenth century Ottoman Istanbul.[16] We became aware of an entry of the existence of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in the appendix of a library catalogue written in the sixteenth century. [17]

As a result, it is very unlikely that the 1590 translation of *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the 1362 text of *Maḳtel-i Hüseyn* came from the same pen. It is important that we have information other than the information given in the text from the middle of the fifteenth century and "Meddāḥ" as a common proper name. For now, we do not have an older copy of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, and the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in Umur Bey's library is recorded as a single volume, while the copy we have is four volumes. Perhaps the text was indeed translated by Yusuf-in the Meddāḥ, expanded and retranslated in the sixteenth century; for now, we do not have enough information to say that.

---

[15] Af 57, 2a–2b.

[16] Ferenc Csirkés, "Turkish/Turkic Books of Poetry, Turkish and Persian Lexicography: The Politics of Language Under Bayezid II", in *Treasures of Knowledge An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3–1503/4)* vol. 1, ed. Gülru Necipoğlu, Cemal Kafadar and Cornell H. Fleischer (Leiden: Brill, 2019): 721.

[17] İsmail E. Erünsal, "Bir Defterdeki/Katalogdaki Saray Hazinesinde Bulunan Türkçe Kitaplar," in *Edebiyat Tarihi Yazıları: Arşiv Kayıtları, Yazma Eserler ve Kayıp Metinler* (İstanbul: Timaş, 2024): 393.

2.2 Debates on the Ottoman Religious World: the *Köprülü Paradigm*, Concepts and Models

The history of academic debates on religious thought and practice in Anatolia has been going on and developing for more than a century. One of the names that can be considered the founder of this field is Mehmed Fuad Köprülü. In his book *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*, which he wrote in 1918,[18] and in his subsequent books and articles, Köprülü used a distinctive model of the Ottoman religious world and practice and built an important corpus. Afterwards, these studies continued with the books and articles written by one of his students, Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, on Sufism and literature in the Middle Ages and the Ottoman world. Gölpınarlı wrote works in his own style, as he did not use models such as "orthodox-heterodox" or "High Islam – Popular Islam" as decisive elements like his predecessor Köprülü, and at the same time wrote works such as the history of the sect (e.g. the history of Mevleviyya). One of the important people in this paradigm is Irene Melikoff, whose name I often mention in this thesis. Melikoff, who closely followed Köprülü's models, also carried out many studies on speculative subjects such as Alevi-Shaman synthesis and carried out studies as a continuation of Köprülü.[19] Although Claude Cahen also has an important place in the subject of religious beliefs and transformations in medieval Anatolia (especially in his article on Shi'ism), he is not generally considered to be an essential element of this paradigm.[20] After Melikoff, the corpus of Melikoff's student Ahmet Yaşar Ocak occupies an important place. Ocak, who focused all his studies on religious thought and practice in medieval and Ottoman Anatolia, produced a really large corpus.[21]

Although this literature, which we call the "Köprülü Paradigm" in academia in recent years, has many variability, important information and discussions within itself, the main criticisms of the Köprülü Paradigm are actually about the models and concepts used in this field. These models can be summarized as the development of religious thought and practice in the context of the orthodoxy-heterodoxy dichotomy in the Islamization process of Anatolia, the fact that Shi'ism had an important influence in Anatolia during the institutionalization of Sunnism, and the interaction

---

[18]Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*, translated by Gary Leiser (London: Routledge, 2006).

[19]Dressler, *Writing Religion: The Making of Turkish Alevi Islam* (New York: Oxford University Press), 2013, 256-260.

[20]Claude Cahen, "Le Proble'me du Shi'isme dans l'Asie Mineure turque pre´ottomane" in *Le Shi'isme Imaˆmite: Colloque de Strasbourg (6–9 mai 1968)*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1970, 115-129.

[21]Dressler, *Writing Religion*, 260-268.

and synthesis of religious communities and Islamized people with various religious traditions (shamanism, Iranian religious cults, Christian cults in Anatolia, etc.). While the process of Islamization continues, Sunnism (orthodoxy according to this paradigm) is institutionalized in the classical sense in the literate world, while the above modeling and explanations are valid at the grassroots: this is called the High Islam-Folk Islam (popular Islam) modeling according to the *Köprülü Paradigm*. There is a premise that popular Islam has always had a heterodox religious practice. According to Köprülü, Anatolian Turks, who had just become Muslim, were not very observant of Sunni-Orthodox practice. The religious elements and religious practices they believed in before Islam had an important place in their lives after they were Islamized, and on the other hand, they did not fulfill practices such as praying.

One of the important issues that should be mentioned here is that Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's works, like all historians, were written under the influence of the political and cultural (and of course academic) context, intentions, and limitations of the period in which he lived. While Köprülü focuses on topics such as the origin of Turkish literature, the origin of Anatolian Sufism or the origin of the Ottoman state. He was trying to construct an Anatolian narrative as a historical continuation of Turkish culture and civilization begins from Central Asia.[22] The historical analysis, which he tried to deal with and explain in his Early Mystics in Turkish Literature and other works, emerged as a result of a nationalist historiography he developed under the influence of Emile Durkheim and Ziya Gökalp.[23] Therefore, while making a historiographical critique of Köprülü's corpus, we need to take into account that he had a symbiotic relationship with Ziya Gökalp and that he tried to build a continuous historical process from Central Asia to Anatolia, and that the main purpose of this construction was to have a political basis such as "nation-building".[24] In his important works such as *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature and Islam in Anatolia After Turkish Invasion*,[25] Fuad Köprülü constructs arguments that would serve

---

[22] For the political context of the narrative of Turkish History in Köprülü and early Republican historiography: Erdem Sönmez, "A Past to Be Forgotten? Writing Ottoman History in Early Republican Turkey.", *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 48/4 (2020): 753–69.

[23] Dressler, *Writing Religion: The Making of Turkish Alevi Islam* 186–189.

[24] Dressler, *Writing Religion*, 163. Köprülü explains the purposes of writing Early Mystics in Turkish Literature as follows: "Nobody has as of yet been able to understand that the literary evolution of the Turkish nation as a whole, from inner-Asia to the shores of the Mediterranean, which has a history of at least thirteen to fourteen centuries, has to be studied as a whole. In the hands of researchers who regard the different Turkish branches as distinct nations unrelated to each other, who do not understand the various connections between them, and who do not understand the necessity of studying the General Turkish history as a whole this important part of world history will forever remain an enigma." I took the quote from Dressler's *Writing Religion*, 190.

[25] Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, *Islam in Anatolia After the Turkish Invasion: (Prolegomena)*, translated by Gary Leiser (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1993).

the abovementioned nation-building project. In Anatolia, the Turks, who became Islamized according to the Sunni sect, continued to live and preserve their own pre-Islamic national culture, originated in Central Asia. This view was institutionalized and took on a national Islamic form as "popular Turkish Islam" in popular practice, apart from the practice that would be seen as "high Islam". In this respect, while the institutionalized high Islam represents the "orthodox" religious doctrine, national beliefs such as shamanism, as well as mystical groups outside of Sunni Islam such as Hurūfiyya and Qalandariyya, and different sectarian influences such as *Futuwwa* and Shi'ism have affected popular Islam, resulting in a "syncretism". Thus, a "heterodox" Islamic thought and practice has emerged.

According to Köprülü, the religious practice that was institutionalized in Transoxiana through the Sufi order was already Sunni. Since the Islamization process of Turks in Anatolia was due to the influence of Iran and the influence of Shi'ism, a heretical popular Islam emerged due to these various influences, instead of the development of a fully Sunni (orthodox) popular Islam.[26] One of the arguments here is to give more weight to what they see as the Shiitization process,[27] instead of considering that there was a "Sunnitization process" with the Islamization process of Anatolia.[28] The view that shamanism and other religious cults had a great influence on the process of Islamization in Anatolia has been subjected to many criticisms, and there are criticisms that are still valid, especially in the foreword of Devin Deweese's to Köprülü's book *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature.* In particular, Deweese, who is an expert on the history of Central Asia, has shown that the influence of Yasawism in Anatolian Islam was not that significant, as claimed by Köprülü and later researchers based on Köprülü, while there is no strong evidence for the influence of Yasawism in medieval Anatolia.[29] In addition to these, Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's concepts and models such as orthodoxy-hetorodoxy, syncretism and shamanism were used according to a political agenda in 20th century Turkey. It is also worth remembering that historiography was not so developed at the time Köprülü wrote his works. One of the main problems of the Köprülü Paradigm is to

---

[26] Dressler, *Writing Religion* 193.

[27] Derin Terzioğlu, "How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization" *Turcica*, vol. 44 (2013–2012): 302.

[28] See, Köprülü, *Islam in Anatolia.* Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, "İslam ve Türk İllerinde Fütüvvet Teşkilatı," *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 11 (1949–1950), 62–63. Claude Cahen, "Le Proble'me du Shi'isme dans l'Asie Mineure turque pre´ottomane" in *Le Shi'isme Imaˆmite: Colloque de Strasbourg (6–9 mai 1968)* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1970), 120–123. For a new interpretatiton of Shi'itization process case see; Rıza Yıldırım, "Shi'itisation of the Futuwwa Tradition in the Fifteenth Century,"*British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 40 no. 1 (2013): 53–70.

[29] Devin Deweese "Foreword," in Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*, translated by Gary Leiser (London: Routledge 2006) vii–xxvii. However, for one of the most important studies criticizing Köprülü's theses on the emergence and formation of Sufism in Anatolia, see: Ahmet T. Karamustafa, "Origins of Anatolian Sufism," in *Sufism and Sufis in Anatolian Society*, ed. Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2005) 67–96.

criticize and correct Köprülü's models empirically and to accept Köprülü's models as presuppositions, instead of discussing Köprülü's concepts and models with new studies.

For this reason, later researchers consider that the identification of Islamization and religious mindsets is not as straightforward as Köprülü paradigm wants us to believe. They also consider that the historical and religious practice (as well as doxa) of Anatolia in the thirteenth-fifteenth centuries was much more complex. As I noted in the chapter on martyrdom, according to a Sunni or Shi'in the doxa, how can we judge whether a particular text was perceived as Sunni or Shi'in the from the perspective of those who read and listened to it? When we look at the *maḳtel* and *futuwwa* literature, can we say that the presence of Caliph 'Ali and cursing Yezid is a Shi'in the, or that it is in a syncretic doxa category with Shi'in the beliefs, as claimed by Köprülü, Gölpınarlı and Cahen? Or is the Sunni-Kharijite dichotomy and the Ebū Turābī nomenclature often used in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* sufficient for us to conclude that this text is a Shī or Sunni text? In fact, at first glance, we seem to be able to decide this, and even within the Köprülü Paradigm, there may be findings that support the paradigm. However, when we see that these concepts and nomenclature are used in many Turkish texts that we are sure are Sunni in Anatolia, [30] the orthodox-heterodox modeling of the Köprülü Paradigm becomes very challenging for us to make sense of this issue. As Cemal Kafadar emphasizes, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Anatolia was in the process of a great transformation: the political, cultural and religious transformation (fall of Seljukids, rise of emirates, Byzantine frontiers, rise of the Ottoman power, sufis, guilds, Islamization ext.) had so many different dynamics that when we look at it as a panorama, the explanation of these structures in Sunni-Shi'i or orthodox-heterodox tries to simplify the situation and because of this simplification, it leads to misunderstandings.[31]

Just like in the work of Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, we see a similar simplistic approach in the work of Irene Melikoff. Irene Melikoff, after doing her early studies on the epic tradition, she focused on Alevism and Bektashism. The origins of these Sufi traditions in Central Asia began to be examined, and the syncretic connections they established with non-Sunni beliefs in Anatolia. According to Melikoff, when the Turks came to Anatolia and started the Islamization process, they were still strangers to Islam. Even after Turkmens became Muslims, they lived and understood the religion in a superficial way. Like Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, Irene Melikoff argued that

---

[30] For example, Eşrefoğlu Rūmī, a Sunni Sufi, uses the Sunni-Kharjite emphasis in his *Tarīkat-nāme* (Book of Sufi Path).

[31] Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 75–76.

nomadic or semi-nomadic Turks were never fully Islamic, nor could they abandon their pre-Islamic beliefs and rituals.[32]

One of the reasons why heterodoxy became equivalent to the Turkmens in Anatolia in Melikoff's work was that she thought that there was an exclusion against Turks and Turkish language in Anatolia. The famous lines in Aşık Paşa's *Garib-nāme*, which states that the Turkish language is not popular with anyone, are seen as evidence to Melikoff that Turks were excluded by the orthodox circles in Anatolia (one of the examples he gave for the elite-orthodox part is Celaleddīn Rūmī). According to Melikoff, these lines are proof of the marginalization of Turks; so why are Turks marginalized? According to Melikoff, the fact that Turks are not fully Muslim, that they have beliefs originating from Central Asia (e.g., death customs, newborn children and women are haunted by demons, that Turks celebrate according to their old calendars), and that they continue shamanic customs cause this marginalization.[33] By mentioning this heterodox element, which Melikoff describes as "unconventional popular Islam", she makes the mistake of oversimplifying the subject, just as I mentioned above.

Was there really a Sunni tradition in Anatolia that we could call orthodox during the Islamization of the Turks? As for the Yasawiya order, Bektashi and other religious elements that led to the Islamization of Anatolia, if the tradition was already established according to this structure, what we call orthodox and what we call heterodox begins to become extremely complicated. In addition, one of the problems is that the authors of the *Garib-nāme* or Ottoman chronicles and Sufi hagiography used as sources do not give information about such marginalization, but about how difficult it was for Turkish to rise as a literary language. In their works, the author of *Garib-nāme*, Aşık Paşa, the author of *Kenzü'l-Küberā* Şeyhoğlu, Ahmedī and Gülşehrī mention the difficulty of writing Turkish and the fact that Turkish was despised because it was not a literary language, but they do not mention that they were excluded by the institutionalized religious practices or institutions that preceded them in Anatolia.[34]

Melikoff, who agrees with Köprülü in the context of models and continuities such as shamanism, syncretism, heterodox-orthodox and popular Islam, on the other hand, argues that there are important influences from religions and cults in Anatolia by

---

[32] Irene Melikoff, "l'Islam hétérodoxe en anatolie: non-conformisme – syncrétisme – gnose" in *Sur les traces du soufisme turc* (İstanbul: ISIS Press 2011) 68.

[33] Melikoff, "l'Islam hétérodoxe en anatolie", 69–70.

[34] A. C. S. Paacock, *Islam, Literature and Society in Mongol Anatolia* (New York: Cambridge University Press 2019) 157–161.

expanding the religious practices influenced by Alevism and Turkmen heterodox groups to include the Central Asian practice of the Turks: The religions of *Yazidism* and *Ahl-i Haqq* also influenced Alevism and Bektashi beliefs and practices, according to Melikoff. On issues such as the narrative of the ascension (*mīraj*) of the Prophet Muhammad, the transformation of dervishes into animals, and the Alevi creation narrative, Melikoff argues that these are common narratives, and that these beliefs were the source of the doctrine of beliefs such as Alevism in the early periods of Muslim religious practice in Anatolia and turned into a syncretic and heterodox belief system.[35] In making these determinations, Melikoff does not dwell on exactly when these beliefs may have encountered each other, or what period in the historical process this may have corresponded to. Of course, there may be encounters with religious groups and cults that have existed in different parts of Anatolia for centuries, intermingling, and transformations in religious practice or creed under the influence of each other. As Melikoff points out, or as Martin van Bruinessen has shown in his work, these cults can sometimes be intertwined or have common narratives.[36]

The main methodological problem here is to generalize the beliefs of religious groups such as Alevism or Bektashi to the whole Islamization process and to treat the cults that these beliefs later included in their creeds by being influenced by different geographies as if they were an element of the formative period of these groups and creeds. For example, when Melikoff writes on Bektashism, she says that Bektashism is a religious structure that appears to have had Shi'ite tendency, but when you dig deeper (she says), it has pre-Islamic shamanic remains, intertwined with neo-platonist, manichaean, Buddhist and Judeo-Christian eclecticism.[37] Trying to establish creedal continuities through such *ex post fact* generalizations and parallels in narratives creates many anachronistic problems as well as methodological problems. In the same way, one of the problems is the poems she uses in her studies on Turkish sects and especially Alevism, while trying to reveal the heretical and non-religious discourses of the Alevis that go beyond the Sunni-Shi'i identity debate. Melikoff, for example, sees no methodological problem in using the verses of a folk song sung in the twentieth century to support his views that Caliph 'Ali was considered a god by the Kızılbaş groups. On the basis of these poems, Melikoff argues that Alevism

---

[35]Melikoff, "reserches sur les composantes du syncrétisme Bektachi-Alevi" in *Sur les traces du soufisme turc* (İstanbul: ISIS Press 2011) 53–56.

[36]Martin van. Bruinessen, "Haji Bektash, Sultan Sahak, Shah Mina Sahib and various avatars of a running wall," in *Mollas, Sufis, and Heretics: The Role of Religion in Kurdish Society: Collected Articles*, 271–294.

[37]"Those who have studied the problem of Bektachism have recognized an eclectic belief system in which they have noted various influences: shamanic survivals, neo-platonic and gnostic elements that have penetrated through Sufism, but also Manichean and Buddhist elements, as well as Judeo-Christian interferences, all covered with a Muslim veneer with a Shi'ite tendency." Melikoff, "Syncrétisme Bektachi-Alevi" 52.

in its formative period has the same extreme religious creedal position.[38] Although she did not make such speculative assessments in his early epic research, Melikoff nevertheless made evaluations without making comparative studies, without basing the orthodox-heterodox distinction in a similar way to his later works.

The basic problematics of Melikoff's work were also the basic problematics of the Köprülü Paradigm. To use sources in an anachronistic way, to oversimplify the political, economic, cultural and religious variables of Anatolia from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries. To put forward a very narrow category of orthodoxy and to create a very broad category of heterodoxy without explaining what kind of phases Islamic practice and Islamization have gone through. Perceiving the standardized Karbala narrative, Philo-'Alidism, and Sufi hagiography, which are already present in Sunnism, as examples of Shi'i tandency against Sunnism. These models and concepts serve to simplify religious practice in Anatolia rather than explain it, which takes the form of what Ahmet T. Karamustafa calls "methodological poverty of the two-tiered model of religion".[40] At the same time, Markus Dressler, writing on Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, asks whether the concept of syncretism is dynamic or static between orthodoxy and heterodoxy, with what combinations they interact with each other, and the complete stabilization of certain groups with heterodoxy will cause a methodological vicious circle.[41]

---

[38]Melikoff, "les fondements de l'Alevisme," [39] (İstanbul: ISIS Press 2011) 27–29.

[40]Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1200–1550* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994) 10.

[41]Dressler, *Writing Religion*, 267.

3. CASE OF MARTYRDOM: THE *MAḲTEL* TRADITION AND THE *EBŪ MÜSLİM-NĀME*

3.1 Martyrdom and Martyrdom Narratives in Islam

The theme of martyrdom is of central importance in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. The first parts of the text describe the history of Islam up to the Karbala Incident. After the Karbala Incident, the martyrdom of the Ebū Müslim's family and Ebū Müslim's childhood and youth began to be told. The narrative that the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* takes as leitmotive is the Case of Karbala. In the early Islamic history part of the epic, the theme of martyrdom becomes an event that legitimizes revenge against the Umayyads. The Sunni-Kharijite distinction, which began to be used in the pages where the Case of Karbala is described, turns into a religious classification to be used throughout the text. So how should we understand the martyrdom narratives in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*? In this chapter, I will compare the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* with other texts in order to understand the context in which many narratives are used, such as the Sunni-Kharijites distinction used by the Turkish the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the identity of *Ebū Turābī* used in the sense of 'Alid Loyalty, and the narratives about Marwan ibn Hakem. What kind of literature on martyrdom was there in Anatolia between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries? What are the parallels of this literature with the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*? In particular, when we look at the *maḳtel* tradition, we see that there are common conceptual uses and narratives with the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. In this section, I will examine how martyrdom narratives took shape in Anatolia and how the theme of martyrdom in the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* can be understood.

Martyrdom narratives are important features in Mediterranean cultures and religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Martyrdom is very much present in Judaism, while Christianity builds its central narrative on the martyrdom of Jesus Christ and martyred saints. Likewise, Islam has many martyrdom narratives from

its emergence to the present day, the most important one being the Battle of Karbala. When we generally examine the discourse of martyrdom in Islamic history, we often encounter the issue of "holy war/*gaza*". Through an abundance of legends about martyrs, the Qur'an and other texts always encourage Muslims to fight, thus giving believers a catharsis through martyrdom narratives. While these narratives create an enthusiastic mood among believers towards *jihad*, at the same time, narratives such as the Case of Karbala function as social tragedies through historical and literary texts.

When we look at early Islamic history, we see dozens of martyrs' narratives. The first martyrs of Islam included such figures as Sumayya bint Hayyat, or Hamza bin Abd al-Muttalib, the Prophet's uncle who was martyred during the wars against Meccan polytheists, and Caliphs 'Umar and 'Uthmān, who were martyred during their caliphate. The people that the martyrdom narratives and literature in Islamic history focus on are 'Ali, the Prophet's nephew, and son-in-law; the grandsons of the prophet, Hasan and Husayn; and a lot of members of the House of 'Ali. The most important reason for this is that, with the emergence of Islamic sects, these martyrdoms became symbols in the search for historical legitimacy. As David Cook points out, the literature about the martyrdoms of the first Muslims and the first caliphs and the Household of the Prophet/*Ahl al-Bayt* differ between Sunnism and Shi'ism. Especially focusing on the martyrdom of "Umar and 'Uthmān is valid in Sunnism, and those who focus on the martyrdom of the *Ahl al-Bayt* are Shi'ites. While Sunnis care about the martyrdom of the *Ahl al-Bayt*, Shi'ites question the caliphate of 'Umar and 'Uthmān and do not pay attention to their martyrdom in their texts and the ceremonies dedicated to martyrdom.[1] Michael Bonner compares the approach to martyrdom in Islam and Christianity as follows: "If the Christian Church was built over the bones of its martyrs, the Islamic community admired its martyrs as models of physical courage, relentless striving (*jihad*), and the individual internalization of norms.[2]" I said above that martyrdom and holy war should generally be evaluated together. While historical events, such as the Case of Karbala, in which both sides are Muslims, turn into a narrative of a martyrdom tradition, the religious identity of the other side is rejected, providing a parallelism between *jihad* and martyrdom. This is where the paradigmatic difference in the approaches of Sunnis and Shi'ites to the Karbala Incident lies.

The Karbala Incident was one of the fundamental narratives of the Shi'ite legitimacy. According to Shi'ites, the rightful rule of Caliph 'Ali and the *Ahl al-Bayt* was usurped

---

[1] David Cook, Maryrdom in Islam, (New York: Cambridge University Press 2007) 41–43.

[2] Michael Bonner, *Jihad in Islamic History: Doctrines and Practice* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press 2006): 76.

by the first three caliphs. We see that the Karbala Incident is both a result of these events and a reason for irreversible sectarianism in Islam. We can say that after the Karbala ethos was built, many historical and epic characters such as Ebū Müslim are depicted in the Islamicate literary and religious tradition as having tried to take revenge for Karbala, been martyred on this path, and bequeathed this aim of revenge to the next hero. The ethos of Karbala, combined with the theme of revenge, turned into a literary narrative as well as a historical event. I call this literary narrative and the ethos that started with the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and continues in many epics as "culture of revenge".

The Karbala narrative is not just a narrative among Muslims; it is a symbolic historical event in sectarianism, which led to many rituals, called "redemptive suffering" by Mahmoud Ayoub. This is the most important point of social catharsis in the Islamicate tradition. The rituals around it include inflicting self-harm, cooking foods like Ashura, and mourning for the *Ahl al-Bayt*, called the House of Sorrows (*bayt al-ahzan*). David Cook suggests that the Karbala Incident is more important than other martyrdom events because Huseyn and his followers were descendants of the Prophet, those killed included women and children, and those put to the sword were more pious than the Umayyads.[3] Of course, the reason why the Karbala Incident is so important is that the martyrdom of women and children alone is not enough: as it is known, the *Ahl al-Bayt* could not take over the political power after the death of the Prophet, and the "fitna" process that started with 'Ali becoming the caliph continued with the killing of 'Ali and then his family with the Karbala Incident. These events led to the division of Islamic society into many parts, and a few centuries later to the formation of two great Islamic sects.[4]

Going back to Bonner's definition quoted above, we need to point out that Sunnis and Shi'ites have different attitudes towards martyrdom. While holy war and martyrdom in Islam are rewarded with heaven. For Sunnis, martyrdom is met primarily with joy, while for Shi'is, martyrdom is a drama that traumatizes society and is accompanied by mourning and sorrow[5]. In the wake of Marshall G. S. Hodgson, Keith Lewinstein suggests the following with regard to martyrdom in Christianity and Islam: while Christians are content to mourn for the martyrdom and persecution that befell them, Muslims were constantly working and striving. Invoking Hodgson, he says that Muslims sought the guidance of their faith rather than console themselves

---

[3]Cook, *Martyrdom in Islam*, 167.

[4]Aaron M. Hagler, *Echoes of the Fitna: Accumulated Meaning and Performative Historiography in the First Muslim Civil War* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2023): 131.

[5]Cook, *Martyrdom in Islam*, 58–59, Michael Bonner, *Jihad in Islamic History*, 77.

with the process of mourning[6].

We need to emphasize that in Sunnism, martyrdom should be considered alongside with *jihad*[7]. However, the phenomenon of a Muslim killing another Muslim, which is also the main issue in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, is much more complicated. As I mentioned, early Islamic history and the Karbala Incident are full of examples involving this complicated debate. Although the killing of a Muslim by a Muslim has opened space for theological debates in Sunnism, in Shi'ism, as David Cook states, martyrdom is more suitable for building a schismatic historical practice.[8] The Sunni texts that give as much importance to the Karbala Incident as Shi'ite ones also focus on the issue of martyrdom. This issue should be approached by taking into consideration the difference in the attitudes of Sunnis and Shi'ites to martyrdom.

Finally, martyrdom is also related to the issue of the Kharijites. The Kharijites, who murdered 'Ali and many other Muslims, had an extremely aggressive and divisive view of Islamic jihad, different from that of Sunnis and Shi'ites. The Kharijites saw their opponents as apostates. In my discussion of Sunnitization, I will talk about the importance of the emergence of Kharijite as a category in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the tradition of the *maḳtel*, rather than the historical position of the Kharijites.

3.2 Martyrdom Narratives in Anatolia

In the previous part, I mentioned the differences between Christian martyrdom and Muslim martyrdom. Christian martyrdom narratives and cults were highly prevalent in Islamized Anatolia, where the tradition of the *maḳtel* and epic was widespread. Basic narratives such as war, conversion, and death while fighting in the name of religion were transforming into a new form and narrative in Byzantine Anatolia in the fourteenth century. Parallel to Islamization, Orthodox Christian martyrdom narratives were changing and narratives that would later be conceptualized as neo-martyrdom were becoming widespread. The basic structural feature of neo-martyrdom narratives is that Christians who had been Islamized by the Ottomans

---

[6]Keith Lewinstein, 'The Revaluation of Martyrdom in Early Islam', *Sacrificing the Self: Perspectives on Martyrdom and Religion* ed. Margaret McCormack (New York: Oxford University Press 2001): 80.

[7]Bonner, *Jihad in Islamic History: Doctrines and Practice*, 74–79

[8]Cook, *Martyrdom in Islam*, 167.

remained crypto-Christians and were killed when this was found out.[9] According to Buket Kitapçı-Bayrı, hagiographies of hundreds of saints were written between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries, thirty-two of whom were martyred under Muslim, Latin, or Lithuanian domination. [10]

Many of these martyrdom narratives feature saints who were tragically martyred after facing the oppression of an unjust power or the harshness of a new power. One example is the martyrdom of Niketas the Younger. During the Rum Seljuk period (the narrative text places the event in December 1282), Niketas the Younger was caught drinking alcohol in the month of Ramadan and was brought before the governor along with some of his companions. Niketas the Younger did not repent and insulted Muslim law. Thence, he was burned to death.[11] This and many other martyrdom narratives portray the image of a tragic figure rather than the image of a martyr who fights and dies with glory. As is known, the martyrdom ethos of Christianity is based on the suffering of Jesus and other tragic deaths in church history.

While the ordeal narratives common in Anatolia do not fit well with the theme of martyrdom in Sunnism, they have structural parallels with the Karbala ethos. The most important parallel is the oppression inflicted by the usurped administration against its rightful owners. The Sunni *maḳtel* tradition, which was reshaped in thirteenth-century Anatolia and the Ottoman period, emerges as texts aimed at synthesizing and using the ethos of tragedy, unlike the classical Sunni martyrdom narratives. While the *maḳtel* tradition and the martyrdom narratives in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* are based on the Karbala ethos, Turkish Islamic epics such as the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, the *Dānişmend-nāme* and the *Saltuḳ-nāme* are shaped as glorious martyrdoms gained after *jihad*/*gaza*/holy war, in accordance with the classical Sunni martyrdom narratives. These structural differences, which I will discuss in the section on Sunnization, are related to the Sunnization of the *maḳtel* tradition and the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, which are essentially Shi'ite narratives. One of the reasons why *maḳtel*s and the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, which were shaped according to the tragic ethos, were widely read and had many copies not only in Anatolia but all over the Ottoman lands, was that the newly converted and Islamized Muslim groups in the Empire's lands were already familiar with the tragic martyrdom narratives. As will be detailed below, local martyrdom narratives are a very old tradition in Anatolia.

---

[9]Tijana Krstič, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Stanford University Press 2011).

[10]Buket Kitapçı-Bayrı, *Warriors, Martyrs, and Dervishes Moving Frontiers, Shifting Identities in the Land of Rome (13th–15th Centuries)* (Leiden: Brill 2019), 98.

[11]Kitapçı-Bayrı, *Warriors, Martyrs and Dervishes*, 104.

Byzantine orthodox saint cults and archaic period myths in different parts of Anatolia are encountered. For example, St. George, whose tomb is located in Anatolia, is known as an important cult figure among Muslims in Anatolia after Islamization. The name "Circīs/Cercīs" is found in the poems of Aşık Paşa and in the books on the history of the early Turkish prophets, and there is also an undated and anonym text called *Hikāyet-i Cercīs Prophet*. On the other hand, there is St. George in the *Saltuḳ-nāme* too.[12] Martyrdom and tragic cults also have transformative elements locally, such as ruins and regional conditions. They may make evaluations based on the tragedy paradigm I mentioned above.

Another interesting point is that in the sixteenth century, neo-martyrdom narratives intensified and new conversion narratives emerged.[13] There are many religious and cultural events such as the translation of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* into Turkish, the emergence of neo-martyrdom narratives of dervishes and scholars that would rival the official religious and political institutions in the Ottoman center, and the emergence of eschatological texts. All these religious and political narratives, debates and events were intertwined. While the Ottoman Empire was fighting the Habsburg Empire in the west and the Safavid Empire in the east, there was also a war of religious ideology. This issue, which will be focused more on in the next chapter, is related to martyrdom: On the one hand, Sunni Ottomans were fighting in the Christian frontier, just like in the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, the *Dānişmend-nāme* and the *Saltuḳ-nāme*, and they were martyred in a glorious way. On the other hand, he found himself in a much more complicated situation than the conflicting religions within the same religion and the Muslim/Infidel (Kharijite) dichotomy, as in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. In this very period, we see the *maḳtel* tradition, which used sectarian vocabulary in a very pragmatic way, and the translation of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*.

3.3 The *Maḳtel* Tradition

As I mentioned above, *maḳtel* is the name of the literary genre that deals with the martyrdom of Caliph 'Ali by Kharijites and generally the Karbala Incident. Those who focus on the Karbala Incident are generally called the *Maḳtel-i Hüseyn*. Until the genre of maḳtel was formed, we can mention the sections about the martyrdom of *Ahl al-Bayt* in many odes or history books. The *maḳtel*s, which became a new

---

[12]Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Sarı Saltık: Popüler İslamın Balkanlar'daki Destani Öncüsü*, (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi 2016): 78–79. Yusuf Ataseven, "Hristiyanlıktan Müslümanlığa Akseden Bir Azizin Serencamı: Hikayet-i Cercis Peygamber", *The Journal of Academic Social Sciences* 63 2017: 565–576.

[13]Tijana Krstič, *Contested Conversions to Islam*, 121–142.

genre by carrying the name *maḳtel* after the eighth century, were reproduced in the ninth century by writers such as Minqari, Mada'ini, al-Qummi and a-Thaqafi. Ebū al-Ferec Āl-isfahani's *Kitab Maqatil al-Talibiyyin* in the tenth century brought about the crystallization of the *maḳtel* literature.[14]

Additionally, there are records that the *maḳtel*s played an important role in the Shi'itization of Iran in the late ninth and tenth centuries. However, the revival of the *Maḳtel* tradition and its transformation into an important political canon took place during the Safavid period in the sixteenth century.[15] When we look at Anatolia, we know that the Turkish Maḳtel tradition emerged with the *Maḳtel-i Hüseyn*, written by Ṣādī Meddāḥ in 1362. Along with this work, which has seven copies, there are many Turkish *Maḳtel*s such as Lami'i Çelebi's *Maḳtel-i Āl-i Resul*, Fuzūlī's *Hadikatü'ş-Süeda*, Aşık Çelebi's *Terceme-i Ravzatü's-Süeda*. Last two texts were translated from Kashifi's *Ravzatü's-Süeda*. Among these texts, the most read and copied is undoubtedly Fuzūlī's *Hadikatü'ş-Süeda*. All the texts I mentioned, except Ṣādī Meddāḥ's *Maḳtel*, were written in the sixteenth century.

Maḳtel texts, as expected, have a very tragic tone and agitation. He was enthusing the religious and sectarian identities of his readers and listeners by putting them into a great social catharsis through the Karbala ethos. The fact that the *Maḳtel*s were so influential in Anatolia and the Ottoman geography caused the anger of Molla 'Arab, who was against Shi'ism and Safavid ideology. Molla 'Arab argued that the *maḳtel*s should be banned in the early sixteenth century.[16]

Textual analysis of the *maḳtel* texts will not be done here. In order to better analyze the common themes in the other *maḳtel*s such as martyrdom and Sunnism in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the *maḳtel* texts in Anatolia and the theme of martyrdom will be emphasized. In this way, I will be able to re-examine the context of the *maḳtel* tradition in Anatolia and explain how the concepts and themes in the text are understood in other texts while doing a textual analysis of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* .

---

[14]Sebastian Günther, "'Maqâtil' Literature in Medieval Islam." *Journal of Arabic Literature* 25, no. 3 (1994): 209–210.

[15]Ertuğrul Ertekin. "Arapça, Farsça ve Türkçe Maḳtel-i Hüseyn"ler". *Aşina Dergisi.* 7/23–24, (2006): 85. Sebastian Günther, "'Maqâtil' Literature in Medieval Islam.", 210.

[16]Mustafa Altuğ Yayla, "Lamiî Çelebi ve Onun Maḳtel-i Âl-i Resûl'u: 16. Yüzyıl Vaizlerinden Molla 'Arab'ın Maḳtel Karşıtlığına Yakından Bakmak," *IV. Türkiye Lisansüstü Çalışmalar Kongresi* vol 3, (İstanbul: İlem, 2015), 155–162.

3.4 Problem of Banning of the Maḳtels in the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Lands

Molla 'Arab's attitude towards the *maḳtel* tradition is an important event in the sixteenth century related to the issue of sunnitization. The radical attitude of Molla 'Arab (b.1464 – d.1531), about whom we can find a lot of information, was not only about the *maḳtel* texts. Molla 'Arab, who came from an ulema family in Antakya, received education in Diyarbakir, Tabriz, in Jerusalem and Mecca. Then, he then stayed with Kayıtbay in the Mamluk court for a while during his formative years. After the death of Kayıtbay (1497-8), he came to the Ottoman lands and began his career as a preacher. After a short stay in Bursa, he settled in Istanbul and managed to attract the attention of Bayezid II. Molla 'Arab, who went on expeditions with Bayezid II, was understood to be valued by the Sultan. After a while, Molla 'Arab moved to Aleppo as an instructor. We see that Molla 'Arab preached anti-Safavid sermons in Aleppo, made anti-Shi'ite propaganda, continued these activities when he returned to Istanbul, and then encouraged Selim I to fight the Safavids. It would be an understatement to describe Molla 'Arab only as an anti-Shi'a-Safavid figure, he was also one of the important puritanists of the Ottoman world in the sixteenth century. In the Ottoman lands, he also opposed the performative religiosity of Sufi and mystical traditions.[17]

When we look at the portrait of Molla 'Arab, we can understand the main motivations for trying to ban the *maḳtel* tradition. Most of the researchers write that the *maḳtel* tradition was intended to be banned during the Ottoman-Safavid rivalry period due to its Shi'ite character, and that this may have been for the Sunnitization purposes of the Ottomans.[18] In the competition with the Shi'ite Safavid state, the fact that a work centered on the Karbala Incident was being read could have meant that the Sunni-Shi'ite distinction was not sharp enough. These views are not wrong. Of course, this was one of the main issues of the Ottoman world in the sixteenth century. When we consider that Molla 'Arab wrote a work called *as-Sadad fi fazli'l-jihad* to put the war with the Safavids on a legitimate basis, we can begin to identify Molla 'Arab with an anti-Safavid identity. While I agree with the results of other studies listed above, the criticism I would like to add is that Molla 'Arab should not only be considered as an anti-Safavid persona, but also as someone

---

[17]Tahsin Özcan, "Molla 'Arab,"in TDV Islam Encyclopedia (Ankara: TDV, 2005)

[18]See, Ertekin "Osmanlı Sünnileştirmesi Bağlamında Lâmii Çelebinin Maḳtel-i Âl-i Resul'ü", *İRTAD* 1 (2018): 50–51. Vefa Erginbaş, "Problematizing Ottoman Sunnism: Appropriation of Islamic History and Ahl al-Baytism in Ottoman Literary and Historical Writing in the Sixteenth Century," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 60, 5 (2017): 625, Yayla, "Lamii Çelebi", 156.

with a broader agenda. What Molla 'Arab opposed was not only Safavid-influence or what Shi'ism represented, but he also opposed the performative religiosity of the Halwatiyya order, including vocal invocation of God, whirling and dancing–performances that had a great influence in the Ottoman lands. Molla 'Arab saw these acts as false innovations opposing to the essential tenets of Islam. Molla 'Arab openly criticized the practice of whirling (*devran*) and vocal invocation (*dhikr*) in his sermons. He also wrote a treatise to argue that "devran" was a false innovation. The Halwatiyya sheikh Cemal Khalifa reponded to Molla 'Arab's criticisms. In addition, Molla 'Arab had a debate with Cemal Rashid al-Din Karamanī on this issue through letters[19]. Based on this and many other information, we need to think that Molla 'Arab was one of the pioneers of religious puritanism, which started in the sixteenth century and caused important events in the seventeenth century Ottoman lands. Of course, he was not as influential as Çivizāde or Birgivī and was not mentioned by the seventeenth century Kadızadeli groups.

Molla 'Arab's above-mentioned characteristics and his idea of puritanism paved the way for him to be given important opportunities by the palace during the reigns of Bayezid II (r. 1481-1512) and Selim I. (r.1517-1520) Molla 'Arab's favor in the Ottoman lands was thanks to his potential to keep the people within the Sunni paradigm during the period when the Safavids were influential in Anatolia. Molla 'Arab, who did not tolerate different religious interpretations even within Sunnism, already had anti-Shi'ite rhetoric when he came to the Ottoman lands. Even after Çaldıran (1514), Molla 'Arab continued to preach anti-Shi'a in Tabriz for some time. Based on all these, we can say that Molla 'Arab's main motivation was religious puritanism and the biggest political reflections of this was his opposition to Shi'ism and Safavidism. Having explained the main motivation of Molla 'Arab, we can concentrate on the case of the prohibition of the *maḳtel* genre.

The information we have about Molla 'Arab's prohibition of reading the *maḳtel* genre comes from the title of Lami'i Çelebi in the *Tezkire* literature. We learn about the views of Lami'i Çelebi's *Maḳtel-i Āl-i Rasul* and Molla 'Arab's views on the *Maḳtel*s only from these *Tezkire* texts. This event is first mentioned in Aşık Çelebi's *Tezkire*. It is also mentioned in other *Tezkire* texts, but they also took Aşık Çelebi's narrative as a source. In Aşık Çelebi, the incident is as follows:

> And his work is called *Maḳtel-i Huseyn*: When Molla 'Arab the Preacher banned the *Maḳtel-i Huseyn* texts, which were specific to "the lights", Lami'i Çelebi wrote his text according to the true histories. In Bursa

---

[19]Reşat Öngören, *Osmanlı'da Tasavvuf: Anadolu'da Sufiler, Devlet ve Ulema (XVI. Yüzyıl)* (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık 2022): 35.

[Lami'i Çelebi gathered], the judge of that period Aşçı-zade Hasan Çelebi, Molla 'Arab and other scholars and read to them the *Maḳtel*, and the ulema accepted it.[20]

Molla 'Arab did not have the *maḳtel*s officially banned, but he said that it was infidelity to recite the *maḳtel* in his sermons in the mosques Molla 'Arab had no official influence in the ulema class and bureaucracy; he was just a preacher preacher. If the maḳtel texts had really been banned, we would have information other than a small *Tezkire* note. In his article on the issue of sunnitization in the case of Molla 'Arab and Lami'i Çelebi, Ertuğrul Ertekin suggests that the group that Molla 'Arab called "Işıḳlar" was the Abdal dervish groups. Based on Ahmet T. Karamustafa's definition of "Işıḳlar/The Lights", Ertekin says that the circles that read the *maḳtel* had Shi'ite tendencies, and that Molla 'Arab sees reading the *maḳtel* as an infidelity for anti-Shi'ite sentiment. From this point of view, Ertekin imagines a period when the *maḳtel*s were forbidden, while Lami'i Çelebi, to protest such a ban, wanted to prove to Molla 'Arab that the *maḳtel*s could also be written in a Sunni character, and by succeeding in this, he convinced all scholars. Then, he writes that the ban was lifted. We can see parallel arguments in Vefa Erginbaş's article. First, Erginbaş confuses Molla 'Arab with Alaaddin 'Ali Efendi, one of the chief jurists of the Bayezid II period. He probably made such a mistake because they had the same nickname. He wrote that Alaaddin 'Ali Efendi banned the *maḳtel*s with a legal opinion (*fatwa*).

There are several problematic points here: the first is to accept that the event in *Tezkire* happened *mot à mot*. A narration about this incident does not exist in Lami'i Çelebi's the *Maḳtel-i Āl-i Resul*, so we have to approach Aşık Çelebi's narration with caution. The only thing that overlaps with the event is the issue of "true histories". Indeed, while writing the *Maḳtel-i Āl-i Resul*, Lami'i Çelebi used historical sources written by authors from the Sunni tradition, such as *Fasl al-Hitab* and Waqidi's *Tarikh*, rather than the classical *maḳtel* texts I wrote above. However, this does not mean that the texts that preceded Lami'i Çelebi's *Maḳtel* emerged from Shi'a historical narratives. Although Ertekin discussed Lami'i Çelebi's sources in depth in his article, he tried to present Lami'i Çelebi's text as a break in terms of the Sunnization of the *maḳtel* tradition by not mentioning that the previous *maḳtel*s did not create a Sunni-Shi'ite conflict in terms of content.

The second problematic is to accept that Molla 'Arab sees the *maḳtel* literature as a tradition peculiar to the "heterodox" dervish groups called "Lights". This discourse of Molla 'Arab is most likely the construction of Aşık Çelebi. By attributing such

---

[20]"ve Maḳtel-i Huseyn: Va'iz Monla 'Arab Burusa'da Işıḳlara mahsus Maḳtel-i Hüseyn okınmagı men' it-dükde merhum Lami'i Çelebi Tevārīh-i sahīhadan cem' ü tertīb idüp Burusa'da kazi-i vakt Aşçı-zāde Hasan Çelebi'yi ve Monla 'Arab-ı Va'izi vesair 'ulemāyı cem' idüp Maḳtelin okıdup 'ulemā kabul itmişlerdir." *Aşık Çelebi*,Meşā'irü'ş-Şu'ara, ed. Filiz Kılıç. Vol. 2. (istanbul: Suna ve İnan Kıraç Vakfı, 2010), 749.

a discourse to Molla 'Arab for the legitimacy of Lami'i Çelebi's text, he must have tried to create a contrast between Lami'i Çelebi and Molla 'Arab. However, the two reasons why Molla 'Arab opposed this *maktel* tradition/genre are, we can say that the catharsis and religious performance created by the *maktel* reading is false innovation (*bid'at*) and that it is one of the most widely read texts of the Shi'a-Safavid world, with which he has clashed for many years. In other words, there is no need to think that Molla 'Arab had a view of the Shi'ism of the Abdals based on his use of the word "Lights". It was probably Aşık Çelebi himself who thought of this and added the phrase "Lights" to make Molla 'Arab's discourse more understandable.[21] Finally, in his article, Ertuğrul Ertekin argues that Molla 'Arab's *Mevlīd-i Şerīf* text was written to be read in assemblies instead of *maktel* texts. We do not know the exact dates of writing of the texts, so we need to make a periodization by reviewing the biographical information before we can talk definitively about whether they were written alternately to each other.

Since Molla 'Arab settled in Bursa after the Battle of Mohács, which he participated in with Süleyman the Magnificient in 1526, and died there in 1531, Lami'i Çelebi's text must have been written in the five-year period between 1526-31. In addition, it is mentioned in Aşık Çelebi's *Meşa'irü'ş-Şu'ara* that Molla 'Arab showed the *Mevlid* text to Üskülüplü Ata after writing it, and Ata criticized the text by not liking it at all. Also Molla 'Arab wrote a new *Mevlīd* text while he was a preacher in Skopje years before he came to Bursa, and the reason for its writing according to Aşık Çelebi; was due to Molla 'Arab's desire to write a rival text to Süleyman Çelebi's *Mevlid* text.[22] When we ask why Molla 'Arab wanted to write a new alternative to the *mevlid* text, we can think that he was uncomfortable with the mystical dimensions of the religious emphases in Süleyman Çelebi's text. We can understand from this kind of information that Ertekin, Erginbaş and others are incomplete in considering the Molla's attitude towards the *maktel*s only in the model of Shi'ite representation of the *Ahl al-Bayt*. The Molla's religious puritanism should not be underestimated.

After all this close reading, I come to two conclusions: first, as different from generally accepted, the *maktel* texts were not prohibited in the Ottoman lands. The second is that Lami'i Çelebi's emphasis on Sunnism was not just a reaction against Molla 'Arab. It is not as effective as one might think. Based on what I have written

---

[21] For using "ışıklar/lights" in Aşık Çelebi's Tezkīre, see: Helga Anetshofer, "Meşair'üş-Şuara'da Toplum-Tanımaz Sapkın Dervişler", in *Aşık Çelebi ve Şairler Tezkiresi Üzerine Yazılar*, ed. Hatice Aynur and Aslı Niyazioğlu (İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları 2011): 85–102.

[22] Aşık Çelebi. *Meşa'irü'ş-Şu'ara* II, transliterated by Filiz Kılıç. Vol. 2 (İstanbul: Suna ve İnan Kıraç Vakfı, 2010): 1092.

above, the main factor is none other than the bureaucratic apparatus transformed by the Ottoman-Safavi rivalry of the sixteenth century. Here, the image of Lami'i Çelebi, the "savior" of the *maḳtel* tradition, must be reversed. Lami'i Çelebi says that instead of the *maḳtel* tradition, which already includes Sunni discourse, he uses Sunni sources as "true histories" as if he was dismissive of his predecessors. Here, Lami'i Çelebi's move is extremely critical, there is an effort to recreate a literary genre in the sixteenth century Ottoman-Safavi/Sunni-Shi'ite conflict with a purely Sunni representation.

Vefa Erginbaş makes a comparison of all the works of Lami'i Çelebi in his article on Lami'i Çelebi in the context of Sunnitization. The historical narrative of Lami'i Çelebi's texts is inclusive rather than exclusive. The narrative of Islamic history includes twelve imams. Here, Lami'i Çelebi makes critical comments on Shi'ite ideas on the disappearance of the last Imam and his Mahdiyyat, with a historical construction that includes the four caliphs, Hasan and Husayn. These views, which Erginbaş discusses in detail, are actually to present a more inclusive Sunni historical model by Sunnitizing the historical figures of Shi'ite history in the Ottoman-Safavid rivalry that was born in the sixteenth century. The importance of the text of *Maḳtel-i Āl-i Rasul* stems from this. The *maḳtel* texts that preceded Lami'i Çelebi were not texts with a Shi'ite vision, but they were not written according to the Sunni paradigm either. Many of them are titled as *Maḳtel-i Huseyn*, and even the use of *Āl-i Resul* instead of Huseyn in the title of Lami'i Çelebi, this is the product of the inclusiveness of the text and an orientation towards Ahl al-Baytism, as Erginbaş has determined.[23] Some researchers see the use of Sunni naming for *Ahl al-Bayt* and Muslims in Lami'i Çelebi's text as an act of Sunnitization unique to Lami'i Çelebi and see it as a different orientation. However, many texts, such as the early *maḳtel* texts and the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, used the word Sunni in the same style. From this point of view, it is necessary to dwell on the reception of the *Maḳtel* texts in the previous century.

3.5 The *Maḳtel* Texts

It is known that the *Maḳtel* texts had been in circulation and were read since the late fourteenth century. The oldest known *maḳtel* text in Turkish was written by Ṣādī Meddāḥ in 1362 in Kastamonu. In those years, Anatolia had not yet been completely conquered by the Ottomans, and the Beylik of Candaroğlu ruled in Kastamonu. We

---

[23]Erginbaş, "Problematizing Ottoman Sunnism," 622–626.

know that in the following years, Yusuf-i Meddāḥ's the *Maḳtel-i Hüseyn* text was copied and read many times. After the sixteenth century, the most copied *maḳtel* text is the text of Lami'i Çelebi. Thus, the *maḳtel* texts were as popular in Muslim Anatolia as they were in other parts of the Islamic world. Although we do not know exactly by which circles the work was widely read, it would not be wrong to state that it was read in Anatolian cities and communities where we know that the Ashura culture is intense on the anniversary of the Karbala Incident. For example, when Ibn Battuta stopped by Bursa during his journey to Anatolia, he gives information that the Ahī had the Ashura culture:

> We lodged in this city at the hospice of the Young Akhī Shams al-Dīn, one of the leaders of the *fityān*; and happened to be staying with him in the day of 'Ashūra. He made a great feast to which he invited the principal officers of the army and leading citizens during the night, and when they had broken their fast the Qur'an-readers recited with beautiful voices.[24]

In her study of Yusuf-i Meddāḥ's *Maḳtel-i Hüseyn*, Irene Melikoff makes some speculations about the possibility of reading *Maḳtel* in guilds, based on the emergence and daily practices of *futuwwa* during the Abbasid period. Melikoff, who argues that *Maḳtel* tradition emerged as a propaganda literature during the Abbasid period, argues that the text of Yusuf-ı Meddāḥ is a continuation of this tradition (Melikoff, 2011, 54). [25] However, she tries to solidify his view by hypothesizing that the author of the *Maḳtel*, Yusuf-i Meddāḥ, and the author of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* are the same person. On the other hand, the teleological solutions that arise from thinking of the author of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the author of the *Maḳtel* as the same person also pose many problems.

The advantage of speculating that *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the text of *Maḳtel-i Hüseyn*, written in Kastamonu in 1362, were written by the same person, makes it certain to say that these two texts were addressed to the same audience, and that a part of this audience was the *Ahi*s. Melikoff argues that the name of Hacı Şādī, the author of the volumes of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* referred to in 1590, belonged to the same person as Yusuf-i Meddāḥ, based on the fact that Yusuf-i Meddāḥ sometimes referred to him as Şādī Meddāḥ. She also argues that the occurrence of the phrase "dinle Ahī/listen Ahī" in the *maḳtel* text proves that the audience is the *Ahi*s. As Irene Melikoff points out, there is information about Sultan Murad and the Kara-

---

[24]Ed. H.A.R. Gibb, *The Travels of Ibn Battuta: A.D. 1325–1354*, vol 2 (London: Hakluyt Society, 1959): 450.

[25]Irene Melikoff, "Ebū Müslim, patron des Akhis" in *De l'Epopée au Mythe* (İstanbul: The Isis Press 1995): 36.

manoğlu İbrahim in the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. Based on this information in the text, we can say that the copy we have was not written before the fifteenth century. The information that *Maḳtel-i Hüseyn* was written in 1362 already refutes this view. It is clear that Yusuf-i Meddāḥ did not live until 1451, so he could not have been Hacı Ṣādī.

Her speculation that Ṣādī is a pseudonym does not lead us to a correct conclusion based on this. In addition, it has already been stated that Melikoff's reading of the phrase "dinle Ahī/listen Akhī" in the text is not correct. Kenan Özçelik, in his critique of the aforementioned *Maḳtel* text, convincingly proves that the word "ahī", is not a noun, but is used as an adjective throughout the text.[26] Özçelik is right to say that Melikoff, who said in her review that the work was dedicated to Bayezid, ruler of Candaroglu Beylik, claimed this with a wrong misreading.[27] Although Özçelik is right about the reading error, the expression Celaleddin Shah Bayezid is directly mentioned in other copies. However, we know that the work was written in Kastamonu, which was under the rule of Candaroğlu, and that it produced many works under Candaroğlu's patronage.

Melikoff's reason for making these speculations is her haste to prove that the models, such as heterodoxy and Shi'a-centrism, are clearly observable in her studies of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the *Dānişmend-nāme*, and the *Maḳtel*. On the other hand, it is because she wants to date the translations of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* to an earlier period than the sixteenth century. Although we could date the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* to an early date, according to Melikoff's model, we would have obtained evidence of the existence of non-Sunni communities in Anatolia in the fourteenth century and later. Being too hasty for this purpose and making teleological interpretations closes the way to better understanding the texts with models such as cultural translation, continuity, Sunnitization and vernacularization, which I mentioned throughout the thesis.

The fact that the Case of Karbala is the main theme of revenge in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* already shows the continuity that Melikoff is trying to reject. As Babayan put it: "The death of the prophet's grandson Husayn at Karbala is the drama that sets the tone for the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. The martyred family of Muhammad is portrayed as the victim of the aggression of the qawm (Umayyads), who had usurped the right of leadership of the Muslim community of 'Ali and his children."[28]

---

[26]Kenan Özçelik, "Yusuf-ı Meddāḥ ve Maḳtel-i Hüseyn" (İnceleme-Metin-Sözlük), Master Thesis (Ankara: Ankara University 2008): 70–72.

[27]Kenan Özçelik, "Yusuf-ı Meddāḥ ve Maḳtel-i Hüseyn", 73.

[28]Kathyryn Babayan, *Mystics, Monarcs and Messiahs: Cultural Landscapes of Early Modern*

Already *maḳtel* tradition and the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* have a common leitmotive and conceptual scheme. When I refer to the use of the terms "Sunni-Kharijite" in the following pages, the main continuity and hints of a common audience will emerge.

The reason why I have not studied the *maḳtel* texts other than Yusuf-ı Meddāḥ and Lami'i Çelebi is that they do not bear any similarity with the martyrdom narratives I have gathered around the *Ebū Müslim-nāme.* The production and distribution of *Maḳtel* texts in Anatolia and Turkish in general is very high. The text of Yusuf-i Meddāḥ is less known among the other *Maḳtel*s, while Yusuf-i Meddāḥ's *Varqa and Gulshah* poem is a widely read text, his works such as *Hikayet-i Yemame* and *Sehavet-i Imam 'Ali* are little known.[29] When we come to the sixteenth century, Lami'i Çelebi's *Maḳtel-i Āl-i Rasul*, whose story I have examined above, is due to both Lami'i Çelebi's fame and the fact that it was written at a time when the Sunni ideology of the empire was strong. There are many reasons why Fuzūlī's *Hadīkatü's-Süedā* is a famous Maḳtel text. The work is a translation of Kashifi's *Ravzatü'ş-Şüheda*, written in Persian, and Kashifi's work is already famous in the *Maḳtel* tradition. *Hadīkatü's-Süedā* is not a complete translation. It is a work of Fuzūlī's own, although it follows Kashifi in terms of subject matter. While Fuzūlī, who was a famous poet in his time, produced a very literary translation, one of the chances of this work is that it was written in Najaf, where the spread of the *Maḳtel* tradition was very fast. In addition to Fuzūlī, Kashifi's *Ravzatü'ş-Şüheda* was also translated into Turkish by Aşık Çelebi, but it was not as famous as Fuzūlī's text. After the conquest of Baghdad by the Ottomans, Fuzūlī gave his text to the Ottoman patrons. The work became a bestseller in Anatolia and Iran, and it is extremely difficult to identify this text as Sunni or Shi'ite. Although there is a Sunni/Kharijite dichotomy in Yusuf-i Meddāḥ's text, it is difficult ot classify it, like Fuzūlī's text.

I can state here that these texts are perhaps part of the discursive tradition analysed by Shahab Ahmed based on Talal Asad's analysis.[30] Discursive tradition is a comprehensive model of traditionalization that seeks to regulate present practice, institutions, and social conditions by taking basic texts such as the Qur'an and Hadith as a past and claiming to build a future. There is, of course, a sect to which the authors of their texts belonged, and they thought according to certain preconceptions and prejudices when constructing their texts. However, based on the theme

———————————————————

Iran(Cambridge: Harvard University Press 2002): 126.

[29]Ed. İlyas Kayaokay, 14. Asrın *Yeni Keşfedilen İki Eseri, Yusuf-ı Meddāḥ: Hikayet-i Yemame ve Sehavet-i İmam 'Ali (İnceleme-Metin-Tıpkıbasım)* (Istanbul: Dün Bugün Yarın Yayınları, 2022).

[30]Shahab Ahmad, *What Is Islam: Importance of Being Islamic* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016): 270–273.

of "cursing" in the *Maktel* texts, it is not quite correct to say that they are a Sunni or Shi'ite text, because "cursing" is not a sufficient element on its own. *Maktel* as a literary genre is a tradition that preserves its own style of form and content.

The fact that the *Maktel*s consist of ten chapters (*majlis*) shows that these texts are recited on the ten days of the month of Muharram, although we cannot dismiss the possibility of them being read in other occasions. Based on the presence of curse phrases in the texts, we cannot perceive these texts as strictly Shi'ite texts. On the other hand, Yusuf-i Meddāḥ praises Caliph 'Uthmān, and Lami'i Çelebi praises all four caliphs, because the readers of both texts were Sunnis. Contrary to the prevalent view, the *Maktel* of 1362 is not a Shi'ite-dominated text. Lami'i Çelebi's reason for writing his text was not to come up with a Sunni version to replace the Shi'ite Maktel text.).[31] When we see that the sectarian expressions in these texts have contradictions, we must first consider the historical background. When the question of whether the Turkish Maktel texts are Sunni or Shi'ite is asked, the answers to be given by the texts can of course be determined by the vocabulary of the texts and then how the narrative develops, after determining the historical ground. The same problems arise regarding the religious-political tradition in which the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was written. When I refer to the subject of martyrdom in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in the following pages, it will become visible how close the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* is to the vocabulary of the *maktel* texts as well as to other Turkish-Islamic epics.

Finally, I need to mention a few more conceptualizations. The answers given in response to the questions of which of these texts are central to the Sunni-Shi'ite discourses say that the texts are contradictory and ambiguous. For example, Rıza Yıldırım, in his article on Yusuf-ı Meddāḥ's the *Maktel-i Hüseyn* writes that the text is "an Alevi interpretation from inside and a Sunni Turkmen interpretation from outside".[32] He comments that there was an "Alevi content" (perhaps it would be more accurate to say proto-Alevi) in the text at a time when there was no religious-political community called Alevism yet. When he tries to historicize the text through the Candaroğlu Beylik and asks if it is of Shi'ite origin, his answer is negative. Instead of Rıza Yıldırım's definition of the 1362 Maktel, Stefan Winter's

---

[31] Derin Terzioğlu, "Confessional Ambiguity in the Age of Confession-Building: Philo-Alidism, Sunnism, and Sunni Islam in the Ottoman Empire 1400-1700" in *Entangled Confessionalizations? Dialogic Perspectives on the Politics of Piety and Community-Building in the Ottoman Empire, 15th–18th Centuries* edited by Tijana Krstić and Derin Terzioğlu (New Jersey: Gorgias Press 2022): 569–570.

[32] Rıza Yıldırım, "Beylikler Dünyasında Kerbela Kültürü ve Ehl-i Beyt Sevgisi: 1362 Yılında Kastamonu'da Yazılan Bir Maktel'in Düşündürdükleri", in Kuzey Anadoluda Beylikler Dönemi Sempozyumu Bildiriler, Çobanoğulları, Candaroğulları, Pervaneoğulları, 3–8 Ekim 2011 Kastamonu-Sinop-Çankırı (Çankırı: Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2012): 372.

definition may be more descriptive: "formally Sunni but affectively 'Alid."[33]

At the same time, we should keep in mind that in the middle of the fourteenth century, there was not yet a polarized religious discourse or a confessionalist state-building process, and we should remember that the Shi'ite presence in Anatolia was not very prominent.[34] When we see that there are a few passages in the text that curse Yazid, we should not rush to see the text as a Shi'ite text. This text, which is part of the *Maḳtel* tradition, will of course contain the words "curse", which is somewhat unavoidable in the nature of this genre. If we recall the discursive tradition model, we can think of the Karbala Incident as a common social discourse, as a text that states that *justice* (restitution of the usurped right of administration) is the future, and therefore the *present* should be organized with this truth in mind. The words "curse" in this text must also be part of the tradition, the curse to Yazid is a reminder to the people at the time the text was written. The discourse of curse is not common in the whole Islamic world, so perhaps we can come up with a concept that is not as generalizing as the discursive tradition model.

In the process of Islamization, we can call the groups that legitimized their religious practices with texts such as *mesnevi*s, epics and *Maḳtel*s "discursive communities" when ortho-praxy had not yet taken its full form. In the fourteenth century, when the orthodox tradition had not yet been fully established and there were communities with different religious and social identities, these texts were created in a way that all these communities would adopt in common. The *Maḳtel*, written in 1362, was read in the Candaroğlu Beylik in Kastamonu, while many texts with similar themes could be read in Western Anatolia in the Aydınoğlu Beylik.[35] On the other hand, when we say that *Maḳtel* texts were in circulation at a time when Sunni and Shi'ite narratives were intertwined, Cemal Kafadar's concept of "metadoxy"[36] can be seen as very useful for our historicization of the Turkish *Maḳtel* tradition. However, this time, we have to overlook the fact that the literate mass in Anatolia may be a Sunni mass, and that there is no Shi'ite orientation in the Candaroğlu Beylik. Although Rıza Yıldırım considers the use of Sunni-Kharijite in the *Maḳtel* text as a superficial conceptualization similar to the good-evil dichotomy, he does not dwell on why the words Sunni and why the words Kharijite are used. Bearing in mind that these terms are not used randomly, the Sunni-Shi'ite distinction has no effect as Yıldırım

---

[33]Stefan Winter, The Shi'ites of Lebanon under Ottoman Rule, 1516–1788 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2010): 9.

[34]Derin Terzioğlu, "Confessional Ambiguity", 571.

[35]Tim Stanley,"The Books of Umur Bey." *Muqarnas* 21 (2004): 323–31.

[36]Kafadar defines metadoxy as "a state of being beyond a bookish and rigid adoption of an established orthodoxy or heresy". Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 127

thinks. In the context of the sixteenth century, it may seem easier to make such an interpretation for the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, but it is not very convincing to say that there is a Sunni-Shi'a distinction in a text dated 1362. As I wrote above, these texts construct a "discursive community" and subsequent texts become products of this discursive community.

Although the subject of "curse (Muawiyah and Yazid)" is one of the subjects that is not normally accepted by the Sunni sect and differs from the Shi'a, the use of the concepts of curse in these texts, which have a Sunni bag of concept and *weltanschauung*, can be seen as a contradictory, but it is also used due to the nature of the *maḳtel* genre. Shabab Ahmad also calls this situation a "coherent contradiction", saying that the contradiction created by an act that is not normally accepted in the tradition can take place in the tradition and become a part of it over time if it is used coherently and continuously. With this model, instead of explaining all kinds of contradictions with "ambiguity", we can think that this coherency and continuity are used by people consciously within the tradition, not unconsciously.[37] Cursing Yezid and emphasizing him as an infidel is absent only in the text of 1362. It is also stated in Lami'i Çelebi that scholars doubt Yezid's faith, but that the curse on him is positive, and that those who do not curse him are not responsible for any responsibility, as well as in the *Maḳtel* text of Hacı Nureddin Efendi, also written in the sixteenth century. Rıza Yıldırım argues that the 1362 *Maḳtel* is a Shi'ite text and cites the distinction between "cursing" and "Sunni-Kharijites" as evidence, but the same emphasis is found in these texts too. In Lami'i Çelebi, he writes the following verse about Yazid's infidelity: "There is a word (hadith) from the prophet that he is an infidel."[38] Hacı Nureddin Effendi also says in the text of the Maḳtel that the crimes committed by Yazid made him an infidel. In this text, just like the *Maḳtel* of 1362, there is Sunni-Kharijites dichotomy.[39]

3.6 Epic Tradition

In the upper part, I tried to explain how the theme of martyrdom was shaped in terms of content and context in the *Maḳtel* tradition in the early Ottoman world.

---

[37] Ahmad, *What is Islam*, 405–406.

[38] Lami'i Çelebi, *Maḳtel-i Āl-i Resul*, (İstanbul: Kevser 2012): 65. "küfrü haḳḳında nebīden var ḥadīs/marikindir diye ol ḳvm-i habīs".

[39] Hacı Nureddin Efendi, *Maḳtel-i Hüseyin* (İstanbul: Önsöz 2012): 130. For Sunni-Kharijites dichotomy see, Hacı Nureddin Efendi, *Maḳtel-i Hüseyin*, 34–35.

Now, I will first try to explain how the Turkish epic literature deals with the theme of martyrdom. Thus, he explains that the narrative of martyrdom is also present in the epics in parallel with the models in the Turkish principalities of Anatolia and the Ottoman world, and that the theme of martyrdom is a common narrative and an ideology-forming narrative among the texts.

As it is known in the epic tradition, the most important theme is the theme of conversion. Muslim warriors, who are the protagonists of the epics, fight against the infidels, and during this war, conversions take place by force or voluntarily. Parallel to this narrative, the infidels also martyred the characters of Muslim epics. In these holy war narratives, the catharsis revealed by the conversion of Islam as the true religion is also a touching narrative with the martyrdom of Muslims. It contributes to increasing the margin of justification. Sometimes these two themes are intertwined and appear with the martyrdom of a converted epic character. Both the comrades-in-arms of the main hero of epics such as the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, the *Dānişmend-nāme*, the *Saltuḳ-nāme*, the *Cenk-nāme-i 'Ali* and the protagonists of this epics are martyred at the end of the epics. While the theme of martyrdom is historically real in the Islamization movement, it also appears as a narrative that provides continuity in the texts.

The Case of Karbala is not only included in the *maḳtel* texts; epic narratives are part of a great narrative tradition in written literature such as Sufi hagiographies, *cenk-nāme*s, and historical texts, as well as in oral rituals. The most visible reason why this narrative is widespread in all texts is to reflect the attitude of the texts and societies towards the *Ahl al-Bayt* and to remind the society. Although it constantly appears before us with the same function in the epic tradition, the theme of martyrdom through the Case of Karbala builds a legitimate ground and continuity.

As I explained above, the tragic situation of the Karbala Incident emerges as a leitmotive that legitimizes waging war against "illegitimate powers" in Muslim societies and is one of the few most important factors in legitimizing holy war in the Islamic epic tradition. It is a basic starting point in questioning the religious legitimacy of the opposing group, especially in epics such as the *Müseyyeb-nāme* and the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, which are fought against the Umayyad powers. It is also possible to see references to the Karbala Incident in epics such as the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, the *Dānişmend-nāme*, the *Saltuḳ-nāme*, where the main antagonism is represented by Christians and other religious groups. For example, in the text of *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, Ishaq-i Kūfī, one of the enemies of Battal Ghazi, during a war[40] states that the

---

[40]"Benüm ceddim idi kim Hüseyn-i 'Ali Mekkeden ḥileyile çıqārdılar iltediler deşt-i Kerbelā'da şehīd eylediler dedi." Dedes v.2 468 v.1 201

43

Karbala Incident is an important line in determining the religious position of groups within the Islamic society. In the same paragraph, the identity of "Sunni" is also used for the Muslim side.

The Sunni emphasis is that the war is not between Muslims. It makes us feel that it is taking place between Muslims and those who are against Islam, that is, Sunnism. After Ishāq-i Kūfī said these words to Musa Khwarazmī, who is considered among the Sunnis, threw his spear at him by saying "you, dog, son of a dog! here take this",[41] but he was martyred by Ishāq-i Kūfī and died by bearing witness (*shahadah*). The emphasis on Muslim equals in these paragraphs, on the other hand, the remembrance of martyrdom and the Karbala Incident, shows that the ethos of martyrdom is built with a strong affect. The martyrdoms of these characters are examples of the theme of honorable martyrdom in the Turkish-Islamic epic tradition. Instead of their deaths being a painful one, these characters die in a glorious way, revealing a catharsis that encourages holy war for Anatolian society. This may be one of the main reasons why the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in Turkish narrates the martyrdom of the Christian Maḫyār and his family, which I will give an example from the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* below. [42]

There are also references to the Karbala Incident in the the *Dānişmend-nāme* and the *Saltuḳ-nāme* texts. Along with these, it is necessary to add another epic: the *Kitab-i Müseyyeb-nāme*. Even if we think that the earliest extant copy of the *Müseyyeb-nāme* belongs to the end of the eighteenth century, we can think that the *Müseyyeb-nāme* is also a link in the chain of Turkish-Islamic epic tradition, since there are many references to *Müseyyeb Ghazi*, who was the pratagonist of the *Müseyyeb-nāme*, in the *Saltuḳ-nāme*. since there has been no reference to him outside the Turkish epic tradition so far, we can consider *Müseyyeb-nāme* as an original part of the Turkish-Islamic epic tradition.

There is no other epic in which the theme of revenge for the Case of Karbala is so intense. Like the other epics, the Müseyyeb-nāme has a common discursive tradition: martyrdom, holy war, the Sunni- Kharijite dichotomy, and the surrender of justice to the legitimate caliph. According to the epic, Müseyyeb Ghazi lived during the period of the Karbala Incident, but we cannot talk about such a historical reality. On the other hand, the fact that he is Turkish is an important detail. According to the chronology of the epics, although Ebū Müslim started a revolt against the Umayyads, his emphasis on Turkishness (Turkmen) is reminiscent of the *Dānişmend-*

---

[41] "iy kelb bin kelb imdi al ha" Dedes, *Battalname*, Vol 1, 201 and Dedes, *Battalname*, Vol 2, 468.

[42] On the other hand, one of the dominant elements in all epics, along with the theme of the revenge of the Karbala Incident, is the protection and respect of the power of the Sunni caliph. This issue can be discussed in detail in the future and it can be determined how the emphasis on the caliphate in the Turkish epics took place in the sixteenth century caliphate debates.

nāme and the *Saltuḳ-nāme*. One of the references to Müseyyeb Ghazi is mentioned in Fuzūlī's *Hadikatü's-Sueda* text, which I mentioned above in the section on the maḳtel tradition. Among the names who rebelled (*hurūj*) against the enemies of the *Ahl al-Bayt*, the name of Müseyyeb Ghazi is also listed. "Mukhtar bin Ebū Ubaidah al-Saqafī, and Musayyib bin Ka'ka-i Huzaī and Ibrahim bin Malik Ashter Naha'ī and Ebū Müslim-i Marwāzī they destroyed most of the enemies of the prophet's family by starting one rebellion after another."[43] Müseyyeb Ghazi and Ebū Müslim are listed consecutively. These riots, of course, take place to avenge the Karbala Incident.

According to the references in Ebū'l Hayr-i Rūmi's *Saltuḳ-nāme* and Fuzūlī's *Hadīkatü's-Süeda*, we can assume that the narrative of Müseyyeb Ghazi was known in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. We can assume that it is known, but is it an epic text in its own right? Or we do not yet know if it was shaped by an oral narrative that could be the source of other epics. Despite these, the basic conceptual and thematic framework such as martyrdom and the Sunni-Kharjite distinction suggest that this text is a link in the chain of epics.

In the narration of the *Müseyyeb-nāme*: first of all the martyrdom of Caliph 'Ali by Ibn Muljam is described. Here it is narrated that Ibn Muljam assassinated Caliph 'Ali on the orders of. The murder of Caliph Hasan and the subsequent Karbala Incident are described. Then it is told that Husayn's son Zayn al-'Ābidīn was held captive by and that the legitimate caliph was Zayn al-'Ābidīn. Meanwhile, Müseyyeb Ghazi is still in his infancy. After a while, Müseyyeb Ghazi, along with seven of his comrades, started a rebellion against. Although titles such as "şāh-i sünnīyān" are used for him in the text,[44] these texts belong to late dates such as the late eighteenth and mid-nineteenth centuries. Therefore, trying to solve the mentality of the early modern epic world based on the details in the texts will cause many problems. Müseyyeb Ghazi fights the Kharijites throughout the text, and part of the text includes an epic character named Muhammad Hanafī (historically Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya), who occupies an important place in the Turkish epic tradition but is treated as if he did not exist during the Safavid confessionalization period (I will return to the subject of Müseyyeb and Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya after I finish the narrative of Müseyyeb Ghazi).

Throughout the text, Yezid's tricks are dealt with, many battles are fought, and at the same time, the word "la'īn" is used repeatedly as a phrase of curse against

---

[43]Fuzuli, *Hadikatü's-Sü'eda*, ed. Seyma Güngör (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı 1987), 81. For another reference to Müseyyeb Ghazi in Fuzūlī's text, see p.454.

[44]Derya Karataş, "Müseyyeb-nāme(1b–133a Varakları Arası) Dil İncelemesi-Metin-Dizin", Master Thesis (Ankara: Gazi University, 2020), 107.

Yezid, as seen in other epics and in the tradition of the *maḳtel*. The use of the curse adjectives for Yezid continues to show that there is a discursive tradition in this literary eco-system that has continued for centuries, as I mentioned above. Later in the text, Yezid and Marwān are killed, and Husayn's son Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn becomes caliph, but the epic does not end there because a motive of revenge is required to be inherited. After the success of Müseyyeb Ghazi, the Kharijites became strong again, seized power, and began to martyr the entire group of "Turābī (Supporters of Caliph ʿAli)". At the end of the epic, Müseyyeb Ghazi is also martyred and this text is referred to as a "text of revenge".[45] At the end of another copy, the text ends by saying that the revenge of the martyrs of Karbala will be taken by Ebū Müslim. [46] Thus, *Müseyyeb-nāme* becomes a prelude to the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in the epic chronology. If there had not been a reference to Müseyyeb Ghazi in the *Saltuḳ-nāme* and Fuzūlī's *Hadikatü's-Süeda* would not have been able to find a legitimate ground to discuss this text.

It is as doubtful as the narrative of Müseyyeb Ghazi was before the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, according to the chronology of the epic. Both the fact that we have a late edition of the text and the fact that the themes are handled as they emerged after the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* are important clues. Above, it does not appear in Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, whom Müseyyeb Ghazi considers to be the legitimate caliph; Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya is mentioned instead. Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya's position and the rejection of Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya's narrative occupy a very important place in the sixteenth century. First, I will explain the outline of the historical construction that legitimized the caliphate of Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya in the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. The prelude to the epic describes the crisis of legitimacy that will lead to a series of wars that will continue throughout the entire epic.

3.7 Reconstruction of the Islamic History Against Umayyads

The prelude of the epic of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* takes very long pages. Here the narrative begins with the lineage of the prophet of Islam. [47] The Hashemite family and the children of Abd al-Muttalib are mentioned here. According to the *Ebū*

---

[45]Neslihan Semerci Elmas, "Dastan-ı Müseyyeb Gazi(s.2–130) Giriş-İnceleme-Metin-Dizin, Master Thesis" (Bingöl: Bingöl University, 2019): 189.

[46]Necati Demir, *Müseyyeb Gazi Destanı* (İstanbul: Hece Yayınları, 2007): 155.

[47]Af 57, 2b

Müslim-nāme, only two of the ten sons of Abd al-Muttalib became Muslims; one is Hamza and the other is Abbas. Hamza's Muslimness is undisputed, but Abbas' conversion to Islam is towards the end of the prophethood. [48] The emphasis on Abbas' Islam at the very beginning of the text is to establish the role that Ebū Müslim al-Khorasani would play in the overthrow of the Umayyad state and the emergence of the Abbasid caliphate as the legitimate caliphate. Then the prophet's scribes of revelation are mentioned; "It is narrated from Ebū Ṭāhir al-Tūsī that the Prophet had three scribes of revelation: first of all 'Uthmān, second one Abu Salim and third one was Marwan bin Hakem." [49] Marwan bin Hakem is one of the most important villains who played a role in the Karbala Incident and its aftermath in the epic tradition. Marwān ibn Ḥāmār occupies as much space in both historical and literary narratives as Yezid, and he is always cursed. From the written and oral traditions in different parts of the Ottoman world to the present day, it is still possible to come across criticism of Marwan bin Hakem, especially in Alevi-Bektashi literature and rituals.

In the first pages of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, there is an important narrative that the Prophet also testified that Marwan ibn Hakem was not a sincere Muslim and was a deceitful person. As I mentioned above, Marwan ibn Hakem was a scribe of revelation along with 'Uthmān and Ebū Salim. According to the narration, when the chapter "Āl İmrān" was completed, the prophet asked the scribes of the revelation to show him the text he had written in order to verify it. After checking the texts of 'Uthmān and Ebū Sālim, it is time to check the text written by Marwan ibn Hakem. The Prophet (peace be upon him) saw that the name of the chapter "Āl İmran" was written by Marwan ibn Hakem as "Āl Mervān/Marwan Family". [50] Thereupon, the prophet mentions that after him, his fights for the sake of the caliphate will grow and there will be wars, and then he begins to describe the periods of the caliphs. Marwan ibn Hakem, who was not treated well during the reign of Caliph Abu Bakr, came to 'Umar when he became caliph and told him that Abu Bakr had persecuted him and asked 'Umar to treat him well and give him properties. After 'Umar's violent reaction, Marwan ibn Hakem began to cause "fitna/mischief." [51]

Then, the subject of the martyrdom of Caliph 'Umar while praying and the replacement of Caliph 'Uthmān as caliph is passed. Here, after a disturbance caused by

---

[48]Goerke EI3 al-'Abbās b. 'Abd al-Muttalib 2-3

[49]Af 59 v3a. "Ebū Ṭāhir-i Tūsī'den şöyle rivāyet gelir kim: Resūl haẓretinin üç yazıcısı vardı evvel biri 'Osmān ve ikinci Ebū Sālīm ve üçüncü Mervān bin Hakem"

[50]Af 57 v4a "Bu sūre Āl-i Mervān haḳḳında gelmişdür."

[51]Af 57 v5b–6a.

Marwan bin Hakem, 'Uthmān was killed and his caliphate ended. According to the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* account, Caliph Abu Bakr had a son named Muhammad who participated in wars for many years. Years later, when he returned to Medina, he learned that his father, Abu Bakr, had died, and that 'Umar had succeeded him, and after 'Umar, 'Uthmān had ascended the throne of the caliphate. Muhammad first went to his father's grave and then came to the presence of Caliph 'Uthmān and pledged allegiance to him. He asks the Caliph for property because he has served the Caliphate in war for years. Caliph 'Uthmān, in turn, accepted the properties that Muhammad asked him for and asked Marwan ibn Hakem, the clerk of the caliphate, to write a document confirming it. Meanwhile, Muawiyah served as governor of Damascus, and it is likely that Abu Bakr's son Muhammad would be given the governorship of this region. Marwan ibn Hakem wrote this text, but changed the content of the text, as in the case described above. [52] Marwan ibn Hakem writes that Muhammad should be killed (*uḳtulū*) instead of writing that his demands should be accepted (*uḳbulū*), and a campaign to kill Muhammad begins.

There was a lot of confusion and Muhammad went to Caliph 'Uthmān with this document. Not believing that Caliph 'Uthmān was innocent, they started a war. Finally Muhammad, the son of Caliph Abu Bakr, entered the house of Caliph 'Uthmān and martyred him while reciting the Qur'an. [53] Thus, Marwan ibn Hakem's change of the name of the surah in the Qur'an, which was described earlier, begins to be perceived as only the beginning of his deceit. According to the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the main reason for the martyrdom of Caliph 'Uthmān was due to a manipulation that was the result of the interests of Marwan ibn Hakem and indirectly the interests of Mu'awiya, the governor of Damascus. In *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, Caliph 'Uthmān is also among the martyrs. Thus, Caliph 'Uthmān is not considered among the symbols of the Umayyad power that Ebū Müslim fought against.

After the martyrdom of Caliph 'Uthmān, the martyrdom of Caliph 'Ali and Hasan is described. Here, Marwan ibn Hakem and Muawiyah are in the background. In the part on Husayn's caliphate, Marwan ibn Hakem, Muawiya and Yazid are cursed and begin to be mentioned abundantly as Kharijites. When Husayn's caliphate began, strife continued among the Muslims, and Husayn's caliphate was opposed by and Marwan ibn Hakem. In the epic of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, this chapter proceeds in parallel with the narrative of Karbala and ends with the martyrdom of Husayn and the Muslims. [54] The continuation of the Karbala Incident tells the

---

[52] Af 57, v7a–7b. "nağmeyi eline virdi gördi ḥaẓret-i şāh ki uḳbulū yerine uḳtulū yazılmış idi."

[53] Af 57, 8a.

[54] Af 57, 13a.

story of the disappearance of Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya, whose name we do not come across much in other epics, but whose name is mentioned a lot in Anatolia, especially in the *Cenk-nāme-i 'Ali*s, during the Karbala Incident. Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah, who was born to a different mother than Hasan and Husayn and was the son of Caliph 'Ali, was fighting against the Kharijites. They talk to 'Umar ibn Umaya about how difficult it is to prevent this tragedy. Caliph Husayn also handed over his brother Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya to the safekeeping of 'Umar ibn Umaya. Especially in the epic tradition such as the *Müseyyeb-nāme*, this event is not mentioned when Zayn al-'Ābidīn replaced Caliph Husayn after the Karbala Incident. Instead, Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya plays an important role in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*.

Before I come to the Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya part, I should mention that the incident of Marwan changing the name of a chapter in the Qur'an, which I have summarized above, is mentioned in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* as well as in Ahmedī's *İskender-nāme*. İskender-nāme, of which there are various copies from 1390 to 1410 and was completed in 1410, has the same vocabularies and similar narratives just like the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. In the parts of the text where he mentions the historical personality of Ebū Müslim and the Umayyad dynasty, he also mentions the historical personality of Marwan. Here he narrates the narration "Al Marwan" in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. I should also mention that Marwan and Muawiya are confused in Ahmedī. It can be understood from this that the oral and written culture in which the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and *İskender-nāme* are fed are parallel to each other. Ahmedī says "vahy yazarken hıyanet düzdi ol / Āl İmrān'ı Āl Mervān yazdı ol, çün peygamber hıyānet gördi anı / lā cirem kim ol yöreden sürdi anı" with this he narrates the same incident as in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. In fact, a few pages after narrating the martyrdom of Ebū Müslim, he begins to use the term Sunni, just as it is used in other epic texts: "sünnī olana olur ol hak mu'in / mübtedī olan gişi hor u la'in" and "mübtedi olma ki manṣūr olasın / sünnī olgıl ta ki nuṣret bulasın".[55] This proves that the word Sunni was used in both the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries just as it was after the fifteenth century. In the *Saltuḳ-nāme*, written in the fifteenth century, just as it is written in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, Marwan changes the name of the Qur'anic chapter and writes the edict for the murder of Muhammad, the son of Caliph Abu Bakr. [56]

---

[55] Ahmedī, *İskendernāme*, ed. Robert Dankoff (Ankara: TÜBA 2020): vol 2, 261, 283.

[56] "Kuran'ı yanlış yazup "El-' İmran" süresinde "El-' İmran"ı kendü adına yazup "El-Mervan" yazdı. Cebra 'il Resül aleyhiselama bildürdi. Pes emr itdi resul hazretleri 'Ali, Mervan' ı döğe döğe mescidden taşra çıkardı şehirden kovdılar." Ed. Necati Demir, *Saltık-nāme Cilt I–II–III* (Ankara: Destan Yayınları, 2007): 153.

3.7.1 Case of Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya

It is necessary to dwell a little on Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya. Although he appears in several wars in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, [57] Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya was not martyred, but instead went into a cave and disappeared. The translator/author of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* specifically states that he received these narrations from Ebū Ṭāhir al-Tūsī. For the first time, the section where the identity of the Kharjite is placed against the identity of the Muslim is on these pages, and the word Sunni will be used instead of Muslims later in the text. Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya's disappearance in a cave after his dialogue with Caliph Husayn and 'Umar ibn Umaya is similar to the theme of the Mahdi, the last Imam in the Shi'ite tradition, entering the cave and disappearing and returning to save the Muslims during the apocalypse. Irene Melikoff does not dwell on this subject in her work. In her book on Ebū Müslim, she begins his work with the end of the Karbala Incident, skipping the series of events I have listed above and the themes that stand out in the text. Melikoff dismisses this incident by saying that Hanafiyya was confused with Zayn al-Abidin. [58]

Kathryn Babayan evaluates the importance of Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya in the history of Islam and the context of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* text. Caliph Husayn's request for the protection of Muhammad al-Hanafiyya and Hanafiyya's disappearance in a cave is seen as an event that heralds his imamship. Babayan argues that one of the reasons for the creation of this eschatological theme of salvation in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* may have been to justify Ebū Müslim's revenge for Karbala. [59] Given the continuity of the text, this is a logical interpretation. As I have pointed out in this chapter, *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and other epics contain a theme of "vengeance culture". This revenge is a legacy both within the text and the texts left to each other.

The fact that the Case of Karbala is so much emphasized, as well as the oppression of the Kharijite forces represented by Marwan ibn Hakem and in the first chapter, is the main legitimating force of Ebū Müslim's heroic story. It cannot be said that Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya will be able to take revenge in the future through Ebū Müslim, as Babayan said. [60] But Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya also has a few important features historically. There is also a sect called Qaysaniyya that emerged within the Shi'a that awaits Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya as an eschatological mahdi. This

---

[57] Af 57 13a 17a.

[58] Melikoff, *le port hache*, 92.

[59] Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs*, 126.

[60] Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs*, 126.

sect rejects Hanafiyya's death and claims that he will return in the Resurrection. [61]
We do not know whether Qaysaniyya was influential in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, but
we do know that Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya was an important figure in Sunnism
in the early modern period, especially in the Turkish written tradition, because of
the chapters reserved for him in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the *Cenk-nāme-i'Ali*.

By the time we arrived in the sixteenth century Safavid world, the position of
Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya would have been questioned when it was accepted
that the influence of sects such as Qaysaniyya and the official lineage of the *Ahl
al-Bayt* came from Hasan and Husayn. 'Ali Karaki, who issued a fatwa banning the
Ebū Müslim-nāme during the reign of Shah Tahmasb, also considered Muhammad
ibn al-Hanafiyya's position problematic. With the fatwa of 'Ali Karaki, the *Ebū
Müslim-nāme* was banned for a period of time in Safavid Iran. One of the reasons
for this is the view that the official *Ahl al-Bayt* lineage of the Safavids continues from
Hasan and Husayn. We know that at that time, not only in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*,
but also the name of Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya was erased from tradition. Thus,
in all historical chronicles and official Shi'ite tradition, we see that Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn
is mentioned as the legitimate heir of Husayn, while Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya is
removed from the canonical narrative and even erased. [62] The issue of Muhammad
ibn al-Hanafiyya would be one of the main reasons for the prohibition of the *Ebū
Müslim-nāme* during the reign of Shah Tahmasb. In addition, it should be reminded
that in the bureaucratic practice of the world of Beyliks in Anatolia, Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn
was a person known for religious legitimacy. In 1349, the names of the prophet
Muhammad, caliph 'Ali, Hasan, Husayn and Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn are mentioned in the
text of an agreement made by Hızır Bey in the Aydınoğlu Beylik.[63] This shows us
that in the fourteenth century the name Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn predominated: Muhammad
ibn al-Hanafiyya's name is found mainly in the sixteenth century translation of the
Ebū Müslim-nāme and in the *cenk-nāme*s.

3.7.2 Case of Asad

Let us return to the theme of martyrdom in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. The text of Ebū
Müslim-nāme initiates the revolt of Ebū Müslim in pursuit of a line of martyrdoms
as I have described above. The *Ahl al-Bayt*t were massacred by the Umayyads,

---

[61]Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs*, 127.

[62]Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs*, 127.

[63]Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds* 75.

Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya disappeared, and a period of great persecution began. Ebū Müslim, who comes from a holy lineage, is given good news to his family in his dreams and his father is martyred. Afterwards, the life story of Ebū Müslim until his death and his struggle with Nasr-ı Seyyār are told. The version of *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, which holds four volumes, is summarized in Irene Melikoff's book. Therefore, there is no need to summarize the entire text. Although the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* legitimizes himself with the revenge of the Karbala Incident and the *Ahl al-Bayt*, Ebū Müslim also has an individual legitimizing leitmotive. That is the martyrdom of his father, Asad.

Kathyryn Babayan makes an important observation about the parallelism between the names and usages of Asad and his father Junayd in relation to the genealogy of Shah Ismail. Ebū Müslim's father, Asad, and grandfather, Junayd, are important characters in Persianate epic tradition. In particular, Junayd has an epic in which he is the main character, independent of Ebū Müslim. In this epic, called Junayd-nāme, the theme of war and martyrdom for the sake of *Ahl al-Bayt* takes place, while Junayd is martyred by the Circassians. Shah Ismail's father's name was Haydar, and Haydar means "lion". Asad also means "lion". On the other hand, Shah Ismail's father Haydar was martyred by the Circassians, just like Junayd. [64] Let us remember that Caliph 'Ali also has the title of "lion of god". Such similarities and parallels may be one of the reasons why the Persian Ebū Müslim-nāme was not banned during the reign of Shah Ismail and was a widely read text.

During the caliphate of Marwān ibn Hakem, a war was waged against him by the Umayyads, claiming that Sahr ibn Abdullah, the ruler of the city of Merv, was a supporter of 'Ali (Turābī). Sahr bin Abdullah was killed and replaced by Nasr-ı Seyyār, who would become Ebū Müslim's archenemy. Ebū Müslim's father, Asad, was also one of Sahr bin Abdullah's assistants, and he managed to escape from Nasr-ı Seyyār's hands. Ebū Müslim's grandfather Junaid is mentioned here. Junayd was the son of 'Ali's companion Abd al-Wahhāb. Thus, the lineage of Ebū Müslim is traced back to the time of 'Ali. Halime, who is pregnant with Asad for Ebū Müslim, meets the "Sunni" Qays bin Amr while trying to flee from Merv to Isfahan. Meanwhile, the ruler of Isfahan, Ḥajjāj, is looking for Asad and his family to kill him. After spending a long time with Qays bin Amr and Asad, Qays learns Asad's true identity. Saying, "You are Asad, the son of Junaid," he gives Asad gold and belongings and helps him hide his identity. [65]

Abdullah ibn Qays had the newborn Ebū Müslim look at his fortune and said that

---

[64] Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs*, 140–141.

[65] Af 57, 35b.

his nicknāme would be Ebū Müslim, which means "father of Muslims", and that he would "slaughter the Kharijites" and revive the religion. [66] Qays ibn Amr takes Ebū Müslim's father, Asad, with him in the palace under a secret name. Four years later, an uprising begins, Asad being its leader. During this uprising, Hajjaj noticed that things were being done secretly from him and summoned Qays bin Amr to his presence, exposing Qays bin Amr by saying, "You secretly bring Turābīs with me, and you are Turābī." [67] Later the conflict escalated, and Marwan joined the conflict, beheading the Muslims they captured and telling Ebū Müslim to surrender to his father, Asad. While Asad continued to fight, the Muslims next to him were killed, and finally he himself was captured and humiliated Marwan and his supporters, after which Asad was martyred by beheading. Ebū Müslim's mother, Halime, also had her eyes gouged out. [68] These events have parallels with the Karbala Incident. This is one of the data showing that the text has a cyclical time layer, just like other medieval texts. [69]

A small group of Muslims fighting a large army of outsiders, killing everyone and beheading Asad. This is how the individual aspect of Ebū Müslim's revenge is constructed. Aside from Ebū Müslim's origin in the epic, his historical origin is parallel to these events. One of the concepts that continues in martyrdom narratives is ghaza.[70] In the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the word *ghaza* is used in wars against this group, since the opposing group is not Muslim, but Kharijite, which is used in the sense of infidel. As Cemal Kafadar has determined, the main reason why the theme of *ghaza* is so dominant in the epic tradition is that the Anatolian principalities and the Ottomans were Muslim groups fighting the infidels.[71]

The most prominent of these epics are, of course, the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, the *Dānişmend-nāme* and the *Saltuḳ-nāme*. The *Baṭṭāl-nāme* describes the Byzantine-Arab wars; the *Dānişmend-nāme* is about a lord who fights Christians, and *Saltuḳ-nāme* is about a warrior-dervish who fights infidels. It is quite natural that the themes of

---

[66] AF 57, 37b.

[67] Af 57, 38b.

[68] Af 57, 39a–41a

[69] The *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, like other epics, has both chronological (Prophet-Caliphs-the Karbala Incident-Umayyads) and cyclical temporality. While the characters have similar names and purposes, the events are similar to each other. In addition, since the fictional layer is stronger than the historical layer in the epics, it may be that the events that happened in other epics can be repeated, and some characters are also seen in other epics. See also temporality in Islamic texts: Shahzad Bashir, "On Islamic Time: Rethinking Chronology in the Historiography of Muslim Societies", *History and Theory*, Vol. 53, 2014: 519–544.

[70] For example; Ebū Müslim's father Asad says before he was martyred in the war "Oh God! I intented to the holy war.". Af 57 39b.

[71] Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 62. "historical narratives that represented the frontier society's perception of its own ideals and achievements."

ghaza/holy war and conversion are used in these works. In the texts of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the *maḳtel*, both groups are historically Muslim, but the internal dynamic of the texts justifies itself by not seeing the other side as Muslim. This legitimation is achieved through usurping the right of leadership given by the God and martyrdom of Muslims at the hand of oppressors. Thus, the use of ghaza in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* reminds us of how the Ottomans justified themselves in their war with other Muslim principalities, and thus also reminds us of the way in which the war with the Safavids was legitimized. In narrative texts such as epics, *menākıbnāme* and historical chronicles, they justified fighting other principalities "because they prevented the war against the infidel", while by the sixteenth century, the Ottoman ulama were legitimizing the war against the Safavids. [72] For example, Molla 'Arab, to whom I devoted a section at the beginning of this chapter, played a very important role in the war against the Safavids by writing a treatise (as-Sadad fi fazli'l-jihad) in which he stated that the Safavids were infidels and how important it was from an Islamic point of view to fight them.

Although the word holy war (*ghaza*) is not used in the *Maḳtel* text written in 1362, holy war is used abundantly in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. [73] The concept of holy war, which is used throughout the text, reminds us that there are judgments about the religious legitimacy of fighting the infidel in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, translated in the sixteenth century. In the text, the concept of "ghazi" is used for both Ebū Müslim and his comrades, and when wars are about to begin, Ebū Müslim shouts a war cry for "I intented to undertake ghaza!".[74] At the same time, the use of the Sunni-Kharjite dichotomy in parallel with the Maḳtel text makes us think that the concept of "confessional ambiguity" used by John E. Woods for the world of principalities is also valid in these texts. The discussion of Sunnitization, which I will focus on after the martyrdom part, will be helpful in understanding the religious concepts used in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* text, especially in the models of "confessional ambiguity" that we discuss as "philo-'Alidism" or "'Alid Loyalty". [75]

_____

[72] Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 109–114, Abdurrahman Atçıl, "The Safavid Threat and Juristic Authority in the Ottoman Empire During the 16th Century" *International Journal of Middle East Studies 49, no. 2* (2017): 308

[73] Af 57, 39b.

[74] Af 57, v143a.

[75] John E. Woods, *Aqqoyunlu: Clan, Confederation, Empire*, (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press 1999): 4., Derin Terzioğlu, "Confessional Ambiguity in the Age of Confession-Building: Philo-Alidism, Sunnism, and Sunni Islam in the Ottoman Empire 1400-1700" in *Entangled Confessionalizations? Dialogic Perspectives on the Politics of Piety and Community-Building in the Ottoman Empire, 15th–18th Centuries* ed. Tijana Krstić and Derin Terzioğlu (New Jersey: Gorgias Press 2022): 568, Stefan Winter, The Shi'ites of Lebanon under Ottoman Rule, 1516–1788 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2010): 9

3.7.3 Case of Maḥyār

Here I will mention another incident of martyrdom that took place in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme.* This martyrdom differs from other martyrdom events in several ways. This epic character, named Maḥyār, a Christian, is first converted and then martyred. While Maḥyār's being both a converted Christian and his martyrdom is an important combination. Another important part is that Maḥyār is a Zoroastrian in the Persian text and has a Christian religious identity in the Turkish text. This is an important clue that the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in Turkish may be aimed at readership in parallel with other Turkish epics in our understanding of the Anatolian context. Even though his martyrdom is directly mentioned in other copies of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the martyrdom of him and his family is implicitly passed over in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* that I have examined, instead of being described. Irene Melikoff speculates about the reason why the moment of the martyrdom of Maḥyār the Christian and his family is not emphasized. She says that the story was omitted because it was too dramatic and sorrowful.[76] There seems to be no important reason why the moments of the martyrdom of Maḥyār the Christian and his family are found in Persian and the other Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*s and are not found in the copies we have. In fact, in the text, Maḥyār the Christian and his family's conversion to Islam, their relations with Ebū Müslim, and the process of their arrest are explained at length. The lack of moments of martyrdom does not mean that the text constructs an alternative narrative to martyrdom. Although there are some manuscripts in which Maḥyār the Christian is saved instead of this narrative, Irene Melikoff tries to establish a common narrative by mixing all the manuscripts with each other, while inevitably covering up the unique features of the texts.[77] The main reason why the moment of the martyrdom of Maḥyār the Christian and his family is not described in the text is that the author is aware that he has extended this part too long. When we compare it with the Persian text, although the moment of martyrdom (burning to death) of Maḥyār and his family is missing from the text, the scenes of torture and long speeches reminding us of the moment of death should make us think that this is a moment of death. The chapter on Maḥyār the Christian and the Battle of the Mosque, which is dealt in the other the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* texts consisting of a single volume, takes up dozens of pages in this manuscript. There is a statement in the text that the author has extended this part too much. Immediately after describing Ebū Müslim's refuge in Maḥyār the Christian's house, the author says, "And finally (Meddāh) says, the word is short, it should be few."

---

[76]Melikoff, *le port hache*, 106.

[77]Melikoff, *le port hache* 105–106.

[78] He states that he has made this chapter too long. Indeed, this copy of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* is in fact four times larger than the Persian copy, which is a single volume, and instead of containing new chapters and information about the context of the sixteenth century, it is merely a gross extension of the events that happened to Ebū Müslim, a repetition of the same events, and a repetition of the chain of events.

I will first summarize the account of Maḥyār and his family's conversion and martyrdom in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, and then try to explain why this narrative is important. From now on, I will refer to him only as Maḥyār, and after presenting a summary of the narrative in the manuscript, I will examine a historiographical problem about what religion Maḥyār belonged to.

In the city of Merv, a great battle (*cenk*) begins between the comrades of Ebū Müslim and the men of Nasr-ı Seyyār. For a long time, the two sides attack each other, and the war does not stop. Nasr-ı Seyyār is told by his men that all hell is breaking loose.[79] Ebū Müslim is surrounded while fighting against Nasr-ı Seyyār's soldiers. There is nowhere left for him to run, he will be captured and killed. He climbs to the top of a minaret and shouts war cries against his enemies. With divine help, a storm breaks out outside, many pigeons distract them, and Ebū Müslim takes advantage of this confusion and begins to flee. For a while, he seeks a place to hide. [80] Meanwhile, a woman calls out to Ebū Müslim and tells him that she can hide in their house, and she starts hiding Ebū Müslim.[81] This woman is Maḥyār's wife: her name is not mentioned in the text. Maḥyār's wife brought wine to Ebū Müslim to drink, but Ebū Müslim said that he did not drink wine, so Maḥyār's wife brought a drink and Ebū Müslim drank it this time. Nasr-ı Seyyār's twenty-eight soldiers searched the streets for Ebū Müslim day and night. Meanwhile, Ebū Müslim said; hee recites the Qur'an and prays for his comrades fleeing from enemies. When the dust settled, Ebū Müslim came out of the house, killed twenty-six enemies, and returned home. In this episode, Ebū Müslim constantly hides in the house, secretly raids Nasr-ı Seyyār's soldiers and returns home. For example, after killing twenty-six people on the first day, he killed forty-eight of the fifty people sent by Nasr-ı Seyyār in the dark of night. Thus, Nasr-ı Seyyār realizes that Ebū Müslim is hiding in someone's house in Merv and tries to find out who is hiding Ebū Müslim. When Nasr-ı Seyyār placed nearly a thousand soldiers in Merv, Maḥyār returned home

---

[78]Af 57, 131a. "nihāyet Meddāḥ eydür ki söz kısadur az olur".

[79]Af 57, 134b

[80]Af 57, 130a.

[81]Af 57, 131b.

and told Ebū Müslim about the situation. Since Maḥyār is one of the people Nasr-ı Seyyār trusts, he does not think that he is spying and continues to search other houses.[82]

That night, Ebū Müslim recited the Qur'an, prayed, prayed and supplicated to God, and went out and continued to fight.[83] The next day, Nasr-ı Seyyār began to complain about this situation at length in his council, where Maḥyār was also present. He tells him that if he had not had so many soldiers, Ebū Müslim would have killed him alone, but even though he had so many soldiers, he still could not catch him. He says that if the Caliph knows about these events, bad things will happen to them and their honor will be broken. Thereupon, he stated that the hiding place of Ebū Müslim should be found as soon as possible, and that he could easily find his location if Ebū Müslim followed which side of the city he came out of at night and which way he fled. Nasr-ı Seyyār equipped every corner of the city of Merv with guards to watch over the place where Ebū Müslim came from. Immediately afterwards, Maḥyār returned to his house and informed Ebū Müslim of this situation.[84] Ebū Müslim did not stay at home that night. He reads the Qur'an, prays to God, and leaves the house, as he had done on the previous nights. He sneaks around the city and comes to the place where Nasr-ı Seyyār is, but everywhere he sees soldiers with torches in their hands. This time, Nasr-ı Seyyār's soldiers noticed Ebū Müslim. Ebū Müslim said, "I intented to the holy war! (ghaza)" and killed thirty of the enemy Kharijites.[85] Nasr-ı Seyyār escaped from his palace when he learned that Ebū Müslim had come to kill him. After fighting a great battle inside the city, Ebū Müslim kidnapped Nasr-ı Seyyār and went back to hide in Maḥyār's house. Then the same events continue to occur. As I mentioned above, this section is overextended and the same events keep repeating over and over again. The author must also be aware that he is unnecessarily prolonging this chapter, because he now tries to advance the subject by saying that "these events went on for a month".[86]

One day, a man of Nasr-ı Seyyār told him that Ebū Müslim had gone to Maḥyār's house and disappeared, so he was hiding in Maḥyār's house. Because Nasr-ı Seyyār trusted Maḥyār very much, he told his spy, "Don't lie, Maḥyār will never betray

---

[82]Af 57, 132b.

[83]Af 57, 132b. "Maḥyār gelüb Ebū Müslime ne olmuşdur ḥaber virirdi. Bin kişiyi koduklarını beyan itdi. Ol gice yine Ebū Müslim ḳırḳ rek'at namaz ḳılub en'am okyub ḥatm-i Kur'an ḳıldı. Münācāt idüb yerinden durub evvelki ḳāide üzere gelüb yine anlarunla cenk eyledi. nice ademlerin helāk itdi."

[84]Af 57, 133 a–b.

[85]Af 57, 134a

[86]Af 57, 135b.

us".[87] Nasr-ı Seyyār begins to be convinced, and then Maḥyār comes to the council and salutes, but Nasr-ı Seyyār does not reply. When Maḥyār told Nasr-ı Seyyār why he did not accept his greeting, he said, "That enemy was in your house, you were hiding him and you were informing him of everything that was discussed here," Maḥyār was frightened and said, "That can never happen, sir. He is Ebū Turābī and I am a Christian. How can I have a relationship with him? and convinces Nasr-ı Seyyār, but Nasr's spy Zerkī is not convinced.[88] Maḥyār then swore on his life that Ebū Müslim was not in his house. Maḥyār's words are not effective against Zerkī's insistence. Zerkī takes Maḥyār's ring from her hand and sets off for Maḥyār's house. According to Zerkī's plan, he will be able to take Ebū Müslim out of the inside with Maḥyār's ring.

At this very moment, a small note is made in the text about a dream that Maḥyār had. In his dream, Maḥyār sees that he is surrounded by many dogs and then he is torn to pieces by these dogs. Maḥyār acknowledges to himself that this dream is a sign.[89] The text goes on to describe the spy Zerkī's departure home immediately after mentioning Maḥyār's dream. Zerkī goes home and says that Maḥyār has sent him and that he has called the men in the house to him, and he has called him immediately. He deceives Maḥyār's maid, but Maḥyār's wife realizes Zerkī's trick and tells him that there are no guests in his house, only his son inside. Zerkī took Maḥyār's son and brought him to Nasr-ı Seyyār. When Maḥyār's son was asked if there were any guests in the house, he replied that he did not know. Nasr-ı Seyyār tortured his son to make him confess that Maḥyār had hidden Ebū Müslim, and handed him over to the executioner: if Maḥyār did not tell him where Ebū Müslim was, they would execute his son. When Maḥyār was in a very difficult situation, he said, "No matter how much you persecute me, damn you! My goal was to help that warrior, and I succeeded in doing so. Whatever I have, let it be sacrificed to the cause of Muhammad and 'Ali! I have one life and nothing else! I became a Muslim! You don't even know your religion, you are a Kharijite!"[90] On hearing this, Nasr-ı Seyyār made sure that Ebū Müslim was in Maḥyār's house and sent his soldiers to his house. This time, along with the soldiers, Zerkī takes Maḥyār's ring with him. According to Zerkī's plan, when Maḥyār showed his ring to the people in the house, there was no possibility that the people in the house would suspect him. This time, Zerkī deceives the concubine and goes to summon Ebū Müslim.

---

[87] Af 57, 136a.

[88] Af 57, 136b. "ḫāşā sulṭānımız ol nesne ben bendeden ṣādır ola! Ol Ebū Turābīdür ben Naṣrāniyüm. Anın ile nice nisbetim vardır?"

[89] Af 57, 136b–137a.

[90] Af 57, 137b–138a.

Here again, the text mentions a dream: Ebū Müslim dreamed that he was surrounded by fires on all sides and that the fires never subsided, he woke up in the morning and prayed: just then, when he saw that the concubine came to call him, he realized that bad things would happen to him.[91] He tells him that he will not go out, and that the enemies should come to take him out if they can afford it. Nasr-ı Seyyār sent his most powerful men to Maḥyār's house to fetch Ebū Müslim. Ebū Müslim took his axe in his hand and left the house and entered a mosque. Nasr-ı Seyyār's men came to the house and searched for Ebū Turab in Maḥyār's house, but they could not find Ebū Müslim. They took Maḥyār's wife, son, concubine, and whoever they found in the house captive, and continued to search for Ebū Müslim. [92] They tortured Maḥyār's family to tell them where Ebū Müslim was, but Maḥyār's wife made a speech against Nasr-ı Seyyār: "O enemies of the Prophet! you kill whoever mentions the name of 'Ali! Is there a higher honor for us than martyrdom? I saw the Prophet in my dream and we all became Muslims!" [93] After these words, the search for Ebū Müslim by Zerkī and his men, Ebū Müslim's hiding in the mosque and the beginning of the war between them begins. This war with the Kharijites goes on for pages. It is stated several times that Ebū Müslim had previously hid in Maḥyār's house and has now appeared.[94]

This is how the story of Maḥyār is generally told in the version of the epic of *Ebū Müslim-nāme* that we have examined. In other Turkish copies, it is mentioned more briefly or the burning of Maḥyār and his family is added to the story.[95] In the Persian version of the work, Maḥyār's religious identity is Zoroastrianism rather than being Jewish or Christian.[96] Maḥyār's story is different and multi-layered compared to many of the stories and events found in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. Maḥyār was both a companion of Ebū Müslim, a convert and a martyr. The story of Maḥyār and his family has been summarized and briefly discussed by Irene Melikoff and Kathyryn Babayan, but it has been dealt with in a very problematic way.

Irene Melikoff does not consider Maḥyār's martyrdom to be an important issue, nor does she accurately convey Maḥyār's religion, let alone the fact that Maḥyār and his family were Muslims. Kathyryn Babayan, on the other hand, focuses on the

---

[91] Af 57, 138a.

[92] Af 57, 139b.

[93] Af 57, 140a.

[94] Af 57, 142a.

[95] Melikoff, *Le port hache*, 106.

[96] Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs*, 137.

issue of Zoroastrianism and makes determinations because she examines the Persian version of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. When she makes comments and comparisons with the Turkish version of the the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, she uses Irene Melikoff's book as a source: this is why Babayan's comparisons are problematic.

Let me begin with comments on Maḥyār's religious identity. Irene Melikoff uses the term Maḥyār the Jew for Maḥyār throughout her examination. She does not mention on what basis Maḥyār said she was a Jew, or from which version of *Ebū Müslim-nāme* she got it.

However, in the four-volume Turkish version of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* that we have examined, Maḥyār refers to himself as a Christian. In another version of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* that Melikoff examines, although there is no reference to Maḥyār's religious identity, he says that as soon as he met Ebū Müslim, he saw the Prophet in a dream, showed him Ebū Müslim, and after this dream he became a Muslim.[97] The chain of events I outlined above then lasts six pages and ends in a much shorter manner. Maḥyār, who was interrogated by Nasr-ı Seyyār, does not mention his religious identity before he became a Muslim in the version I have outlined above.[98]

Since Maḥyār's Christian identity is ignored by Melikoff in the Turkish version of *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the significance of conversion from Christianity to Islam and how the Turkish version occupies an important place in the epic is not mentioned. However, the fact that Maḥyār, who is Zoroaster in the Persian text, is referred to as a Christian in the Turkish text is a very important information about the characteristic features of the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. It should be remembered that Kathyryn Babayan also thinks about Maḥyār's Jewish and Zoroastrian religious identity, since she got her knowledge of the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* from Melikoff's works. According to Babayan, Maḥyār's variability between these two religious identities is understood through a synthesis narrative of mixed cultural spheres in Iran and the symbol of Judaism. She even mentions Kafadar's views on the existence of a similar Christian emphasis and population on the Anatolian frontier on the issue of conversion, but he does not dwell on this issue because he does not know that Maḥyār was already defined as a Christian in Anatolia.[99]

One of the important emphases in the Persian version is that Maḥyār remained

---

[97]Belediye, v52b.

[98]Belediye, v57a.

[99]Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs*, 136–137 "There is no need for conversion, given that both 'Alids and Mazdeans are implicated in a combined genealogy that justifies each of them to keep his own faith. Maḥyār the Zoroastrian instead vows his loyalty but not his faith, providing grounds for future resistance to conversion."

in the Zoroastrian religion instead of converting. While hiding Ebū Müslim in his house, he says that he wants to sacrifice himself for his sake, and states that Maḥyār gave Ebū Müslim his loyalty but not his faith. He states that this information in the text is an allegory of Muslims and Zoroastrians living together in Iran. Ebū Müslim and Maḥyār say that although they are from two different religions, there is an important emphasis on coexistence and partnership against evil.[100] Although this analysis based on the Persian version is important for understanding the unifying power of *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in the Persianate World, the same cannot be said for the Turkish version and the Ottoman world. We see that conversion occupies a very important place in the two different Turkish texts I quoted above. In addition, although the Persian text mentions the marriage of Shahrbanu and Husayn, which is parallel to this allegory, and mentions the meeting and brotherhood of Ebū Müslim and Maḥyār, such a narrative is not found in the two copies I have mentioned. The marriage of Shahrbanu, a Persian princess, and Husayn, a member of the *Ahl al-Bayt*, appears to be an Iranian-Arab union reminiscent of the friendship of Maḥyār and Ebū Müslim. Most likely, in the Turkish versions of *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, such Persianate themes are replaced by themes that show the characteristics of Anatolia and the Ottoman world (ghaza, conversion from Christianity to Islam, Sunni-Kharijite dichotomy).[101]

The *Ebū Müslim-nāme* is not an epic of conversion like other Turkish epics (the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, the *Dānişmend-nāme*, the *Saltuḳ-nāme*, the *Cenk-nāme-i'Ali* and the *Gazavat-nāmes* are many Sufi hagiographies). The main theme of these epics is the process of Islamization in Muslim-Christian frontier regions such as Christian Anatolia and the Balkans and deals with numerous conversion events and types of conversion. The enemies are usually Christian rulers, and therefore the Muslim-infidel distinction is very prominent. These conversion events take place by coercion, voluntarily, by the killing or conversion of lords, as well as by the conversion of the lord's subjects, or by dreamlike motives.[102] On the other hand, as Tijana Krstic points out, unlike the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the fact that conversion narratives had an important place in the Ottoman lands in the sixteenth centuries has an important place in the context of the subject of confessionalization. One of the results of this process may be that the copy of *Ebū Müslim-nāme* that we have examined was written in the sixteenth and that dozens of copies of the *Ebū*

---

[100]Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs*, 137.

[101]Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs*, 137.

[102]Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs*, 73, 83, 145.

Müslim-nāme were written afterwards.[103] In the chapter on Sunnitization, I will discuss the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* again in this context.

Based on this information, in the Persian *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, Maḥyār's conversion to Zoroastrianism and his non-conversion to Islam emphasizes the theme of "living together", while in the Turkish version, contrary to what Melikoff and Babayan think, it has a different narrative. Maḥyār is a Christian, not a Jew or a Zoroastrian. Maḥyār's conversion and martyrdom had an important role just like the case in Turkish epic tradition shaped after the fourteenth century, in the context of the forced or voluntary conversion of Christians to Islam still offers a panorama of Islamized Anatolia in the sixteenth century. As I mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, it can also be understood as a response to the narratives of Christian martyrs, as well as the narrative of a respectable Christian who converted to Sunnism, which was used in the same sense as Islam in the Ottoman-Safavid rivalry. From this perspective, while the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* reconstructs Maḥyār with a Christian identity, Shahrbanu-Husayn externalizes his narrative and enters the same literary ecosystem as other Sunni-minded Turkish epics.

When viewed through the theme of martyrdom in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, narratives such as the Karbala Incident are considered with events such as the martyrdom of Asad and Maḥyār, which are both parallel to other epics and have many parallels with the *Maḳtel* tradition, which is one of the important texts of martyrdom literature. Factors such as the fact that it includes a lot of space in the Karbala narrative and that it has a common vocabulary with the *Maḳtel* of 1362 indicate that these texts were read by similar groups and that the martyrdom events led to an important social catharsis. At the same time, with the changes he made in the narrative of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* Maḥyār in Turkish, he is included in the same literary ecosystem as other Turkish epics. It is also very important that the martyrs of Karbala, like other epics and texts, are one of the main starting points of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, and that he reinterprets this event by constructing a different Islamic history. This reconstruction became a much more acceptable version in the Ottoman world. The *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in Turkish, In the sixteenth century, the Shi'ite Safavids used to legitimize their power, such as the issue of Caliph 'Uthmān, the murder of Caliph 'Ali, the Case of Karbala, and the Mahdiyyat of Zayn al-'Ābidīn, and by re-evaluating the issues such as the Kharijites (Marwani), he was able to declare the Kharijites (Marwani) as the main enemy and legitimized Ebū Müslim's war against the Umayyads as *mutatis mutandis* for the Ottoman world.

---

[103]Krstic, *Contested Conversions to Islam*, 123.

4. PHILO-ALIDISM, ALID LOYALTY DISCUSSIONS AND THE *EBŪ MÜSLĐM-NĀME*

This chapter will explain what the emphasis on Sunnism and Philo-'Alidism is in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and what context it has. After examining how the literature and new models of Ottoman religious practice developed and what kind of problems they had, it will be explained how the states put forward laws regarding *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in the Ottoman-Safavid rivalry. While the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* we examined did not yet exist, the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was banned in Safavid Iran due to various legitimacy conflicts. Here I will speculate about that process and the reasons why the Turkish text might have been translated in the sixteenth century. I will try to explain how the Sunni-Kharijite distinction, which is abundantly used in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, and the emphasis on Philo-'Alidism and 'Alid loyalty (also Ahl al-Baytism), should be understood by the term Ebū Turābī. Nevertheless, how the Sunni-Kharijite dichotomy fits into other epics is an important issue, but a long study of these texts should be the subject of a larger study, so I will dwell on these texts very briefly. Thus, it will be revealed how the Sunni-Kharijite emphasis fits in the context of confessionalization and the importance of the term Ebū Turābī as an original contribution to the literature of Philo-'Alidism and Ahl al-Baytism. It will turn out that the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* can be considered within the "Ottoman ortho-praxy" rather than outside the "Ottoman orthodoxy".

4.1 Understanding Ottoman Sunnism: Methods and Concepts

When we think of fourteenth century Anatolia in general, was a panorama; We should visualize a world in which many emirates, including the Ottomans, were on the rise, Turkish was beginning to take shape as a literary and political language, many sects such as the *Futuwwa*, *ghazi*s, *Babaīs, Malāmatīs* were in circulation,

*madrasa*s and scholars wrote and translated texts at the same time.[1] In addition, cultural interactions emerged by both fighting and trading with Byzantium. In this world, we can talk about a reality in which Shi'ism does not yet have a visible influence and there is no sectarian grounding in the texts written at that time, as in the sixteenth century.[2]

In fact, if we look at Şeyhoğlu Mustafa's *Kenzü'l-Küberā*, which was written in 1401, we can make inferences that instead of the nomadic Turkmens who could not become fully Muslim and continued their pre-Islamic remnants in their religious practice, as conveyed by the Köprülü Paradigm of fourteenth century Anatolia and Muslim society, they may now be continuing their lives with a systematized Islamic practice and belief structure.[3] Since this book is also the first political philosophy (*siyāset-nāme*) book written in Anatolian Turkish, it also has an important place in the context of vernacularization. There is a lot of information about the rulers, scholars, preachers and how the people should behave in *Kenzü'l- Küberā*, and these also give us information about the way of life of the society of that period. For example, in the text, after prayer, the Prophet Muhammad tells Muslims to say "subhanallah", "alhamdulillah" and "allahu akbar" a total of ninety-nine times in the rosary section.[4]

This example shows us a lot. One of them is the observance of religious practices in fourteenth century Anatolia. In fact, there is no need to even mention this, because fourteenth century Anatolia was not a newly Islamized region. It was a region that had been Muslim for several centuries, and the Turks who came here from outside during the Mongol Invasion did not come from a region where there was no Islam and they are not belonged to another religion. In the fourteenth century, when *Kenzü'l- Küberā* was written, mosques and religious institutions had already been built and institutionalized in Anatolia, and preachers and clerics were fulfilling their duties. In fact, while talking about these institutions, sultans, the power elite, the classification of the clergy and their duties, Şeyhoğlu Mustafa was also criticizing the mistakes of the preacher class. [5] One of the points to be noted here is that in the texts of the fourteenth century (*Kenzü"l-Küberā* is a good example of this), there is

---

[1] Nor were they merely religious or political texts. I am talking about a literary production in which works in many different genres such as eloquence, poetry, and music books are produced and translated at the same time.

[2] Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 73–76.

[3] Şeyhoğlu Mustafa, *Kenzü'l-Kübera ve Mehekkü'l-Ulema*, edited by Kemal Yavuz (İstanbul: Büyüyenay Yayınları 2013).

[4] Şeyhoğlu Mustafa, *Kenzü'l-Kübera*, 222.

[5] Şeyhoğlu Mustafa, *Kenzü'l-Kübera*, 367.

no sectarian attitude or Sunni-Shi'i distinction or "orthodox-hetorodox" masses. As Cemal Kafadar points out, it is as if these texts already have a common discursive tradition, even though they were written in different emirates, rather than being doxa-minded texts, pointing to a common religious practice.

We know what kind of religious panorama prevailed in Anatolia in the fourteenth century, both from poems, and chronicles, and from the observations of travelers. We also know what kind of religious panorama Anatolia had in the thirteenth century through Seljukid chronicles, waqf documents and hagiography, and architectural works. Coins also explain to us where religious practice was carried out.[6] I will not dwell on Ibn Battuta, as I have focused on it in the chapter on martyrdom, and Ibn Battuta's accounts on f the extent of Islam in Anatolia have already been discussed a lot.[7] On the other hand, the work of Derin Terzioğlu and Tijana Krstić, and more recently Baki Tezcan, on *'ilm-i hāls,* shows that there was a strong construction of religious practice from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries (beginning with Ḳutbuddīn İznīkī).[8] In addition to these, it is useful to mention that there were many different sects and guilds, and although they did not always have parallel creeds, they played important roles in the emergence of the Ottoman state and lived in a common political and cultural world. For example, we are talking about a world in which many of the dervishes and ghazis mentioned in Ahmet T. Karamustafa's book were in different sects. But this did not create political and social problems, although they had an "anti-nomian" religious practice in Karamustafa's words according to the world of that day.[9]

The examples I have mentioned above can be expanded, or we can examine at length how religious theory and practice worked in Anatolia in the thirteenth-fifteenth centuries with different sources, but we have seen a little bit of the picture that Kafadar wanted us to see. Now we can turn to Cemal Kafadar's modeling. According to Kafadar, trying to understand Anatolian society with the Sunni-Shi'i dichotomy

---

[6] For architecture see: Patricia Blessing, *Rebuilding Anatolia after the Mongol Conquest Islamic Architecture in the Lands of Rum, 1240–1330* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishers 2014).

[7] See, Terzioğlu, "How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization", 317. Derin Terzioğlu, "Confessional Ambiguity in the Age of Confession-Building: Philo-Alidism, Sunnism, and Sunni Islam in the Ottoman Empire 1400-1700" in *Entangled Confessionalizations? Dialogic Perspectives on the Politics of Piety and Community-Building in the Ottoman Empire, 15th–18th Centuries* edited by Tijana Krstić and Derin Terzioğlu (New Jersey: Gorgias Press 2022): 569–570.

[8] Derin Terzioğlu, "Where 'ilm-i hal meets catechism: Islamic manuals of religious instruction in the Ottoman Empire in the age of confessionalization", *Past & Present*, 220, 79–114, 2013. Tijana Krstić, "You Must Know Your Faith in Detail: Redefinition of the Role of Knowledge and Boundaries of Belief in Ottoman Catechisms ('İlm-i Hals)," in *Historicizing Sunni Islam in the Ottoman Empire, c. 1450 - c.1750*, ed. Tijana Krstić and Derin Terzioglu (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 155–95. Baki Tezcan, "Esrarını yitiren İslâm, ya da erken modern bir sıryitimi: Modern ilmihalin Birgili, Akhisarlı ve Kadızade izleğinde gelişen erken modern tarihi", *Tarih ve Toplum*, 19 (2022): 9–74.

[9] Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1200–1550* (Salt Lake City: University of Utay Press 1994).

means oversimplifying the issue. This social structure of the time was so complex that trying to explain it with classical sectarian dichotomies will inevitably lead us to misinterpret the issue. Moreover, neither the state policies nor the military elite, which we centered on the Islamization of Anatolia and the subsequent establishment of the Ottoman state, did not seem to have established an orthodoxy. At the same time, the theme of the holy war (ghaza) of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries should not be forgotten, because the emirates we are talking about was ultimately maintaining its existence with frontier societies, fighting the Byzantines, and converting large and small masses to Islam. It was much more natural for them that the state structure did not insist on exclusionary categories such "us" and "other" or orthodox-heterodox. Therefore, we can talk about a panorama that can be defined as metadoxy beyond doxas in a "combination of being doxy-naïve and not being doxy-minded" in these periods, where the state has not yet entered a doxa-minded construction process.[10]

4.2 'Alid Loyalty and Philo-'Alidism: Confessional Ambiguity in the Early Modern Anatolia

From here on, we can talk about many concepts and models that have been put forward to understand religious practices in Anatolia and the Ottoman world. For example, although the Anatolian Beyliks hashads the creed and practice that we can define as Sunni, they exhibited 'Alid Loyalty in a way that is similar to the Shi'ite creed when viewed from the outside. As I discussed in the martyrdom section above, the texts written on *Ahl al-Bayt* Loyalty and the Case of Karbala reveal a kind of "confessional ambiguity" in John Woods' words.[11] Although what we call 'Alid Loyalism or Philo-'Alidism seems to have a Shi'i character, it would be misleading to say that it developed in Anatolia or Sunnism under the influence of the Shi'ite creed. The prestige of Caliph 'Ali and *Ahl al-Bayt* in the Islamic world, the sadness caused by the Karbala Incident, and the fact that Caliph 'Ali was one of the two sources of Islamic mysticism (the other Abu Bakr) are names that are accepted and respected in both sects. Therefore, it is not very convincing at first glance that the attitude of 'Alid Loyalty or Philo-'Alidism is seen as Shi'i tendency, but also seen as

---

[10]Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, 76.

[11]John E. Woods, *Aqqoyunlu: Clan, Confederation, Empire* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press 1999): 4. "Paralleling the flowering of Imami Shi'ism in the highest levels of the Ilkhanid state, many of these popular movements were strongly colored by extreme 'Alid concepts, so that it is no exaggeration to say that the prevailing religious winds during this period were popular, Shi'i, and 'Alid, even in circles nominally Sunni. This confessional ambiguity may be seen in many faces of life in the central Islamic lands before the rise of the Safavids."

in the confessional ambiguity, because the position of 'Ali is central to the formation of both sects (Sunnism and Shi'ism).[12]

Here it is worth remembering Marshall G. Hodgson's excellent statement on 'Alid Loyalty in his *opus magnum*: *The Venture of Islam*.[13] In *The Venture Islam*, there is a sub-chapter titled *Sunni and Shi'i images of Islamic history*, Hodgson states that in the medieval world, 'Alid Loyalism' was an element accepted and adopted by both Sunnis and Shi'ites, and that 'Ali was a major hero in Islamic history, and that the differences between both sects blurred when it came to 'Alid Loyalism and Ahl al-Baytism.[14] Therefore, as I mentioned in the martyrdom chapter, the fact that a *Maḳtel* text was written in fourteenth century Anatolia is not because it is a Shi'ite tendency text or because it is a Shi'ite influence that we cannot trace in Anatolia, but because it is an indication of an 'Alid Loyalism or Ahl al-Baytism that is already structurally present in Sunnism. It should be noted here that Philo– 'Alidism is a common discursive tradition, rather than a orthodoxy or heterodoxy or a Sunna-minded/Shi'te-minded.

Another important debate is that after John E. Woods used the concept of "confessional ambiguity", the concepts and models of "confessionalization" and parallel "sunnitization" began to be used in the construction of the Ottoman religious world and to understand religious policies in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. Based on Heinz Schilling and Wolfgang Reinhard's works in the 1970s on how sectarian conflict took place in political practice in Europe during and after the Reformation, Tijana Krstič and Derin Terzioğlu use concepts such as "confessionalization", "confession-building", "age of confessionalization" and "sunnitization" to define both Ottoman religious practice and state policies in the Ottoman-Safavid rivalry with models such as Sunni-Shi'ite confessional polarization. They were intended to provide coherent explanations.[15]

---

[12] Vefa Erginbaş, "Reading Ottoman Sunnism through Islamic History: Approaches toward Yezid b. Muʿāwiya in Ottoman Historical Writing" in *Historicizing Sunni Islam in the Ottoman Empire c.1450-c.1750* ed. Tijana Krstič and Derin Terzioğlu, (Boston: Brill 2020): 472-–473. Also for an analysis of *Sunnitization, 'Alid loyalty, and translation culture in the early Ottoman world* through the Aca'ib tradition, see: Selman Bilgehan Öztürk, *Marvels of Creation and Oddities of Existence in Early Fifteenth-Century Ottoman Literary Culture: A Study of the Tercüme-i 'Aca'ibü'l-Mahlukat ve Gara'ibü'l-Mevcūdat* (Unpublished MA Thesis, İstanbul, Sabancı University, 2023).

[13] Marshall G. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization: The Expansion of Islam in the Middle Periods* (London: The University of Chicago Press, 1977): 445-–455.

[14] Marshall G. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam*, vol. 2, 452.

[15] Tijana Krstić, "Illuminated by the Light of Islam and the Glory of the Ottoman Sultanate: Self-Narratives of Conversion to Islam in the Age of Confessionalization," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, no. 51/1 (2009): 35–63; Tijana Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011); Derin Terzioğlu, "How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization" *Turcica*, vol. 44 (2013–2012): 301–338. Guy Burak, "Faith, Law and Empire in the Ottoman 'Age of Confessionalization' (Fifteenth– Seventeenth Centuries): The Case of "Renewal of Faith," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 28, 2013, 1–23. Vefa Erginbaş ed. *Ottoman Sunnism: New Perspectives* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press 2019).

However, such similar and interchangeable concepts cause significant confusion in the field and make all politico-religious theory and practice seem to have no function other than to justify a political conflict (Ottoman-Safavid, Ottoman-Habsburg or Sunni-Shi'ite, Muslim-Christian and so on). However, just like Kafadar's metadoxy model, these concepts should be used by considering many nuances. For example, is Philo-Alidism an example of confessionalization or sunnitization? Or is it an example of confessional ambiguity? If we take the example of *Maḳtel* written in 1362, s; Should we treat a text written at a time when there was no rivalry in Sunni-Shi and when we are not yet sure whether there was Shi'i influence in Anatolia as a representation of confession-building? These create big problems and lead us back to the orthodoxy-heterodoxy circularity. Early texts, such as the *Maḳtel* tradition, epics, and Sufi hagiography, are inherently readable by members of both sects, so it is more difficult to understand which sect they are closer to. The concepts they use are generally not used in their classical terminological meanings (*istilahi*) and they differ in each copy and in each period. On the other hand, legal texts, *qanūn*s, texts written by the state elite and bureaucrats are more helpful in understanding how confession-building developed and transformed.[16]

At the same time, one of the issues we need to consider is that during this: in the period we call the age of confessionalizaton, both the Ottomans and the Safavids may seem to have made some prohibitions or provisions in opposition to each other, but these may sometimes be events related to the internal dynamics of both empires. For example, the case of the prohibition of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in Safavid Iran, which I will focus on in a moment. The *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, which was widely read during the reign of Shah Ismail, was banned during the reign of Shah Tahmasb, and the copies we have in the same period were written in Turkish. On the other hand, the *Maḳtel* tradition is tried to be banned in Bursa by Molla 'Arab, and immediately after that, Lami'i Çelebi writes a "Sunni" *Maḳtel* text. When we read the events with such a scenario, we come across a really big story of confessional polarization and sunnitization, but exaggerating this series of events makes us miss something. While the issue of the *Maḳtel*, as I explained in the chapter on martyrdom, was related to the emergence of a puritanist wave in the Ottoman world, the prohibition of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* may have been excluded from the legal construction of the Safavid state, that is, its constitution, which was probably still taking shape and being institutionalized. These may be related to the internal dynamics of countries,

---

[16]Tijana Krstič, State and Religion, "Sunnitization" and "Confessionalism" in Süleyman's Time" In *The Battle for Central Europe* (Leiden, Brill, 2019): 65--91. Abdurrahman Atçıl, "The Safavid Threat and Juristic Authority in the Ottoman Empire During the 16th Century" *International Journal of Middle East Studies 49, no. 2* (2017): 295--314.

a Politische Theologie legalization process in Carl Schimitt's terms.[17]

4.3 Banning of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in the Sixteenth-Century and the Ottoman-Safavid Rivalry

In the sixteenth century, as two major Muslim states, the Ottoman and Safavid states were great rivals to each other. The struggle for who would hold political power in the Middle East was constantly on the agenda between the Safavids and the Ottomans. However, these two states were in a rivalry not only in politics, but also in cultural and religious discourses. The two states had similar messianic and apocalyptic ideals, and Sunni-Shi'ite rhetoric was used against each other in political debates as "heretical." It is certain that these discourses have something to do with the process of confessionalization. The ulama of both states attempted to explain why it was legitimate to fight each other with religious motives, wrote fatwas that considered the opposing state to be infidels, and declared war on each other on religious grounds.[18] On the side of the Ottoman ulama; t The fatwas of the trio of Sarıgörez Efendi, Kemalpaşazade and Ebusuud Efendi,[19] as well as the treatises of preachers such as Molla 'Arab[20] represented bureaucratic and military attitudes towards the Safavids and caused this rivalry to deepen the confessional polarization. The situation in the Safavid world was no different from the Ottoman world. Scholar 'Ali Karaki (one of the few Arab Twelver clerics), who had political authority in the Safavid State, wrote similar fatwas and tried to regulate the politico-religious legitimacy of the Safavid state.[21]

This period (sixteenth century) was still the period of the transformation of the

---

[17]I would like to thank İlker Evrim Binbaş, who advised me to look at the Ottoman-Safavi rivalry from this point of view and to think about the constitutional-law.

[18]Kaya Şahin, *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World*, (New York: Cambridge University Press 2013): 209–211.

[19]Atçıl, "The Safavid Thread", 209–300. Sarıgörez Efendi's fatwa on the Safavids "They disdain sharia and the tradition of our Prophet, prayer and peace be upon him. They also disdain the religion of Islam, religious knowledge, and the unambiguous Qur"an. In addition, they deem permissible and take lightly the sinful acts that Allah, who is exalted, prohibited. They. scorn and burn the noble Qur"an, scriptures, and books of shari!a. They despise and kill scholars and pious people, in addition to destroying places of worship. Moreover, they take their accursed leader as a god and prostrate themselves before him. They curse Abu Bakr and "Umar, may God be pleased with them, and reject [the legitimacy of] their rule as caliph. They swear against thewife of the Prophet, our mother 'Aisha, may God be pleased with her. They intend to erase the religion of Islam and shari!a, which our Prophet, prayer and peace be upon him, established."

[20]Tahsin Özcan, "Molla 'Arab," in *TDV Islam Encyclopedia* (Ankara:Istanbul: ISAM TDV, 2005),

[21]Andrew J. Newman, *Safavid Iran: Rebirth of a Persian Empire*, (New York: I. B. Tauris 2006): 24. Rula Jurdi Abisaab, *Converting Persia: Religion and Power in the Safavid Empire*, (New York: I. B. Tauris 2004): 3–5, 12–13.

Safavid State into an empire, and this period was a period of transformation in religious institutions as well as a period of transformation in the administration. During this period, which can be called the Shi'itization period, there was no single Shi'i state model or group of Shi'i scholars. Within the Safavid state, we can see a lot of controversy and schism: for example, in the early Safavid state, we see the ruler attending Friday prayers, which was not in accordance with Shi'ite religious practice, but was seen as a work that had to be done in order for the ruler to consolidate his rule. Later, debates arose between the rationalist (Usulis) ulema and the traditionalist (Akhbaris) ulema about the legitimacy of Friday prayer.[22] Again, when we look at the sixteenth century, there is still a *naturliche* presence of the Sunni community in the Safavid state*,* and even according to the information given by Abisaab, the Shi'ite community and the Sunni community were acting in an overlapping way in the matter of *Ahl al-Bayt* devotionalism.[23] By providing this information, I wanted to strengthen the observation that every political and legal act of states that are in the process of building constitutional-law, which develops independently of the Ottoman-Safavid rivalry I mentioned above, should not be perceived as a movement against the state it is a rival of.

Let us come to the issue of the prohibition of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme.* First, I should mention that the epic of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* is one of the most popular epics of the sixteenth century Safavid world. The *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was popularly narrated both in text form and through storytellers, and he was seen as a *futuwwa* hero and a mythical savior who overthrew the Sunni state of the Marwanids and avenged the Karbala Incident. At the same time, during the reign of Shah Ismail, he was identified with Ebū Muslīm. Like Ebū Muslīm's father, Asad, Shah Ismail's father and grandfather had been martyred, and both were fighting for the administrative right of *Ahl al-Bayt.*[24] Also, when it came to the issue of Ebū Muslīm's martyrdom, there was also a group in Iran that believed that Ebū Muslīm was not killed, but fled to a mountain and hid there, and that one day he would return. Thus, Ebū Muslīm was seen as a savior, a bringer of justice, and sometimes a mahdi not only for the mainstream Shi'i society, but also for the Shi groups outside the mainstream, called ghūlat. This was a very important detail for Shah Ismail to identify himself with Ebū Muslīm. In any case, their biographies were similar to each other, and on the other hand, their political and religious goals coincided with each other. The Ebū Muslīm tradition, which contained many heretical elements for the ulema, was

---

[22]Abisaab, *Converting Persia*, 20-–21.

[23]Abisaab, *Converting Persia*, 4-–5.

[24]Kathyryn Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs: Cultural Landscapes of Early Modern Iran* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press 2002): 141.

seen as a legitimating factor for Shah Ismail.[25]

Despite all this, why was the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* banned? In fact, many of the reasons for the prohibition of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* were none other than the many elements I have listed above, which worked during the reign of Shah Ismail. 'Ali Karaki, while banning the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, stated that Ebū Muslīm's historical personality was not at all positive by saying, "Treacherous opportunist who struck a temporary friendship with the 'Alids to guarantee their support of the 'Abbasids against the Umayyads."[26] In fact, to abolish the reading of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and this tradition was to abolish a cult, and with it to eliminate the groups that legitimized it and gathered around that cult. Chief among these groups was the *futuwwa* community (later different Sufi communities). 'Ali Karaki and the other jurists were uncomfortable with the fact that such local guilt had its own laws and rules.[27]

'Ali Karaki writes in his fatwa: "Yes, not only is it lawful to curse him [Ebū Müslim], but it is legitimate to curse anyone who is attracted to him, and it is necessary to distance oneself from him; for he was the leader of the opposition to the Imams, those whom God has made it incumbent on mankind to be enemies with their enemies and to love those who loved them. Do not listen to the fast stories about Ebū Müslim, for these have been concocted by storytellers". This also prevented the spread of the legitimizing discourses of groups such as Khurramiyya and Qaysaniyya, who saw the cult of Ebū Muslīm as their mainstay. As I explained in the chapter on the martyrdom, one of the important changes in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*"s narrative of Islamic history, which differs from other epics, is that Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya became the heir of Caliph 'Ali. The succession of Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya, who later became an important figure in Qaysaniyya theology, was a heretical view for Twelwer imamid Shi'ism, because according to twelwer imamid Shi'ism, Zayn al-'Ābidīn was the heir of Caliph 'Ali. By banning the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, 'Ali Karaki eliminated all elements that would undermine the legitimacy of Twelwer Imamid Shi'ism.[28] It should not be forgotten that Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya is an important historical figure and source of legitimacy in Islamic history, especially in Shi'i history. Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya played a role of legitimacy that, as Hodgson points out, was the basis for the continuation of *Ahl al-Bayt* not only with the children of Fatima, that is, with the lineage of the Prophet Muhammad, but

---

[25]Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs*, 138.

[26]Abisaab, *Converting Persia*, 24.

[27]Abisaab, *Converting Persia*, 25-–26.

[28]Babayan, *Mystics, Monarchs and Messiahs*, 127.

also with the lineage of Caliph 'Ali.[29] As it is known, Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya was the son of Caliph 'Ali, born to a woman other than Fatima. Hanafiyya, who was present at the Karbala Incident and survived, then rallied around the Alid-loyal groups and was declared the successor of Caliph 'Ali. It was not only Qaysaniyya and the late Khurramiyya who considered Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya to be the Mahdi, but there were also groups such as the *Hashimiyya*, and these groups played an important role in the formation of the Shi'a.[30] There were even those who argued that Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya had a divine role among the *ghulat*.[31] In sixteenth-century Safavid Iran, the Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya faith had a theological and political position against Twelwer Imamiyya, especially during the period of collaboration between Shah Tahmasb and 'Ali Karaki. The reason why Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya is not found in early texts, except for texts such as the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the *Müseyyeb-name*, and the *Cenk-name-i 'Ali*, may be due to the fact that he is the symbol of Shi'a radical groups. By the sixteenth century, it must have been Sunnitized in the Ottoman world, along with texts that mention Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya.

The reasons for the prohibition of *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the cult of Ebū Muslīm in Safavid Iran were entirely the result of internal dynamics and the Shi'itization process and an attempt to block the way for an epic culture in Iran that Sunni groups also listened to. It was precisely during this period that the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was expanded and translated into Turkish in the Ottoman world. Why was the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, which had already been translated into Turkish,[32] translated or rewritten into Turkish in the sixteenth century? The answer to this question is not easy at all.

The fact that the epic of Ebū Muslīm was previously known, that it was the first epic in the chronology of the Anatolian epic world. O, on the other hand, that it offered an alternative narrative to *futuwwa*, the cult of Karbala, Twelwer Imamid Shi'ism. It could be a unifying narrative in Anatolia as a creed due to the high Philo-Alid themes. A, all of the answers may be correct. One of the interpretations that can include all of these is that in this period when there was a lot of polarization in Sunni-Shi (Ottoman-Safavid), we can say that the volumes of the *Ebū Müslim-*

---

[29]Marshall G. Hodgson, "How Did the Early Shia Become Sectarian?", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 75, No. 1 (1955), 1–13.

[30]Wilferd Madelung, "The Hashimiyyat of Al-Kumayt and Hashimi Shi'ism", *Studia Islamica*, XXL (1989), 5–26.

[31]Marshall G. Hodgson, "How Did the Early Shi'a Become Secterian?", 5–6.

[32]In the Introduction, evidence was presented from Umur Beg's library catalogue that the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* had already been translated.

nāme in Turkish were written as a unifying element for people from different sects and communities, just as we saw in the *Velayetnāme-i Hacı Bektaş*.[33] Also, in the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, unlike the case of the Persian *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, for example, the question of the marriage of Sharbanu and Husayn is not mentioned. This belongs to the Iranian tradition. In the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, Maḥyār is referred to as a Christian, not a Jew, converted to Islam and was martyred with his family. One of the important changes is that there is no mention of Ebū Müslīm's occultation, Ebū Muslīm is martyred and avenged by his companions *(futuwwa/ahīs)* as I explained at length in the martyrdom chapter.

Now I will give a few examples of the use of Sunni-Kharijite in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* from the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, and then talk about the importance of the use of Ebū Turābī in the text as an adjunct to the Philo-'Alidism debate.

4.4 Sunni-Kharijite Distinction and *Ebū Turābism* as 'Alid Loyalism in the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*

The most important religious identity distinction that we see in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* is the Sunni and Kharijites distinction. At first glance, it is quite normal to think that Sunni in general represents not Sunni in the classical sense, but good people, and Kharijites represent bad people.[34] However, as Rıza Yıldırım determined in the examination of Sunni *Maḳtel* text, *Ahl al-Bayt* is used for those who are adherents (i.e., 'Alid-loyalty), while Kharijites are used for those who are enemies of *Ahl al-Bayt*.[35] The Sunni-Kharijite contrast seems to be the main antagonism of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the 1362 Maḳtel text, but in fifteenth century works such as the *Dānişmend-nāme*, the *Saltuḳ-nāme*, or *Tevarih-i Āl-i Selçuk*, the use of Kharijite is similar to that of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the *Maḳtel*.

Along with Kharijite in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the term Marwānī is sometimes mentioned, and sometimes the term Yezidī is mentioned. Likewise, Muslim and *Ebū Turābī* are used instead of Sunni. As an addition here, I have to say that *Āl Rasūl*, that is, *Ahl al-Bayt*, is also referred to as *Āl Mervān*. According to the structure of the text, it is probable that Marwan ibn Hakem was the real villain of Islamic

---

[33]Derin Terzioğlu also thinks that Philo-Alidism texts can be a unifying element in this period of confessional polarization. See. Terzioğlu, "Confessional Ambiguity", 566.

[34]Irene Melikoff, *Abu Muslim: la "porte hache" du Horasan* (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1962): 62.

[35]Rıza Yıldırım, *Bektaşiliğin Doğuşu*, (İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık 2019): 50–51.

history and that he also established an antagonism with *Ahl al-Bayt* as a family. Based on the incident of writing *Āl Marwan* instead of Surah *Āl Imran*, which is one of the subjects I have quoted at length in the martyrdom section, *Āl Mervān* (Marwans Family) against *Āl Rasūl* (Prophets Family). We can talk about the Kharijite antagonism against the Sunni.[36]

In the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, the term Kharijite is used after the Case of Karbala. Thus, just as in the text of the *Maḳtel-i Hüseyn*, the term Kharijite is used for those who are no longer among the Sunnis and who have become enemies of *Ahl al-Bayt*.[37] Sunni does not only mean a "good" person, it also means the adherent of *Ahl al-Bayt*. As Sunni Yıldırım also noted in his essay on the *Maḳtel* text, there is a use of Muslim-Kharijite instead of Sunni-Kharijite somewhere. "So many believers and Muslims were destroyed by the hands of the Kharijites."[38] In the same way, the Kharijites call the other side Sunni. In other words, the Marwanis (the wicked in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*) do not consider themselves Sunni. For example, during a chase, when they learn that a man named Abdullah is a Sunni, they attack him, saying, "This is also a Sunni!"[39] What is to be understood from this is not that Sunnism is used as a substitute for proto-Shi'ism or for groups outside of Sunni orthopraxy. Both the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the *Maḳtel* text of 1362 have the same set of concepts as the other Turkish epic, chronicle, and political texts, and the sum of these texts are not Shi'ite tendency texts, but Philo-'Alid models written in Sunni orthopraxy. The text also uses the term "Ebū Turābī", i.e. Philo-'Alid, for Sunni-Muslim groups.[40]

In the text, he says that Abdullah İbn Haris is a Sunni Muslim, and then adds that "he is a pious person."[41] In fact, the Kharijites are also used for the "rafizi" who have converted from religion at some point. In fact, later in the epic, in the chapter where Maḥyār and his family are tortured, Maḥyār's wife cry out to Nasr-ı Seyyār and the other Kharjites: O enemies of god, enemies of the prophet, you are born Muslims, but you will destroy those who mention the name of 'Ali, the master of the believers. ('Ali's) Enemies of your children and your dynasty, I am not afraid

---

[36] Af 57, v4a. "Resūl ḥażreti 'ammi eline aldı gördi kim Āl İmrān Āl Mervāñ yazılmış. eydür niçün böyle yazdın eydür yā resūlallah anın çün yazdım ki bu sūre Āl Mervān haḳḳına gelmişdür."

[37] Af 57, v16a'da After the fled of Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyya from the hands of the Marwanis "ġāzīlere vedā itdiler süvār oldılar. kendüleri ol üç bin ḥaricīyye urdılar. "

[38] Af 57, 16b. "Bu kadar mü'mīnler Müslümanlar ḥaricīler elinden helak oldu."

[39] Af 57, 24a. "bu ḥod Sünnī imiş diyüb 'Abdullah'a ḥamle kıldılar mescidün içinde bir aca'ib ceng peydā oldu."

[40] Af 57, 25b.

[41] Af 57 27a. "Abdullah ibn Hāriṣ dirlerdi. Sünnī Müslümandır: dindār kişidir."

74

of you! Is there a higher rank than martyrdom!".[42] Here we see that the Kharijites left the religion with the enmity of *Ahl al-Bayt*. In fact, we can even talk about the possibility of a speech act in the sixteenth century directed at people who claimed to be Muslims but did not call themselves Sunni Muslims.

The Sunni-Kharijites distinction and Ebū Turābī nomenclature continue to be used in other volumes.[43] Ebū Turab is the epithet of Caliph 'Ali and is used in the context of 'Alid Loyalty or Philo-'Alidism, as used in the examples I gave above in *Ebū Müslim-nāme*.[44] However, I am currently skeptical as to whether these usages can be considered within the confessional ambiguity. In addition, when we consider that the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* we have examined was published in the sixteenth century, we should not forget that the name "Sunni" was used in a pejorative way by the Bektashis, who are frequently encountered in narrative texts, as quoted by Derin Terzioğlu.[45] Of course, this concept may have created a confessional ambiguity that Philo 'Alidism made possible or, as Marshall G. Hodgson said, that could minimize Sunni-Shi'ite differences for a moment, but if, as Rıza Yıldırım expresses, these texts were written with a kind of Shi'ite tendency, why is the concept of Sunni, which was used pejoratively in the same century, one of the main concepts of the work? There is an Ebū Müslim tradition in the Turkish epics and written culture: in the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, the *Dānişmend-nāme*, the *Salṭuḳ-nāme*, and even in texts such as the *Müseyyeb-nāme* after it. In addition, in most of the futuwwa literature, Ebū Muslīm is found as *raison d'etre*. Despite all this, the fact that Ebū Müslim is also included in Ahmedī's *İskender-nāme* and the use of terms such as Sunni/Kharijites/Marwanid should at least make us think that:[46] First of all, the attribution of Ebū Müslim does not prove that such a cult or written epic existed in the regions where the works were written, as is supposed. Ebū Muslīm, after all, is not a mythical character, but a truly important figure in the history of Islam. The use of common words (Kharijites, Marwanid) in these works may be due to the fact that they were written by people who had the same concepts and mind-sets or doxa-sets that we see as ortho-prax in Anatolia or that belonged to a literature roughly created by Sunni-minded people.

---

[42] Af 57, 40a.

[43] Af 59, 259b.

[44] Rıza Yıldırım, "Shī'itisation of the Futuwwa Tradition in the Fifteenth Century", *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 40 no. 1 (2013) 61–62.

[45] Derin Terzioğlu, "Confessional Ambiguity in the Age of Confession-Building," 590.

[46] Ahmedī, *Iskendernāme*, ed. Robert Dankoff (Ankara: TÜBA 2020): vol 2, 283. For an example of Sunni usage, see Ahmedī, Iskendernāme, 301.

5. CONCLUSION

The four-volume *Ebū Müslim-nāme* of 1590 was translated from Persian into Turkish by Ḥācı Meddāḥ. The present thesis uses the second oldest copy of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* which is the also the the largest one in the sixteenth-century. The *Ebū Müslim-nāme* has been understudied compared to other epics, and conceptual and thematic studies comparing it with other texts and epics of the fourteenth-sixteenth centuries have been left incomplete. In this study, I have made an overture that the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* and the world of epic should be understood through these comparisons. At the beginning of the thesis, I tried to show how Turkish-Islamic epics vary not only according to their content, but also according to the period and region in which they were written. I also suggested that the religious jargon these epics use and the differences between the various texts have to the with political legitimacy and contemporary political and religious debates.

In the introduction and the vernacularizaton section, I evaluated the data indicating that the first translations of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* were made before the sixteenth century. I concluded that there is a lot of evidence for the existence of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in the library records of Umur Bey, Bayezid II and Süleyman the Magnificient, and that the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was already included in the literary ecosystem of the early Ottomans. However, I suggest that the fact that the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* existed a hundred years before the 1590 version does not mean that it had the same conceptual content as the text we have. However, as can be understood from the comparisons I made with other texts throughout the thesis, the religious-political concepts used in this textual tradition or within the literary ecosystem and the written-oral tradition that were transmitted overlap with each other.

Although epics are perceived as texts that are read and circulated among common people, this leads us to simplify the reception of epics. It should be noted that the translation and original writing of many epics and texts in Turkish is the result of the support of the administrative elite and the work of bureaucrats. Not only epics,

but also many other genres such as hagiographies, *mesnevi*s and *Maḳtel* narratives were translated into Turkish around the Ottoman court or by bureaucrats. Epics were much more complex than we thought. Most likely, just as the *'Anter-nāme* was translated into Turkish as three volumes under the patronage of Mehmed II, or the four-volume the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* under the patronage of a court elite, the *Saltuḳ-nāme* was also written under the patronage of Cem Sultan. As a final example, the *Mirḳātü'l-Cihād* by Gelibolulu Mustafa Ālī was also written in the sixteenth century as a new version of the fourteenth century *Dānişmend-nāme*.

In the chapter on martyrdom I focused on the massacre at Karbala. Karbala is one of the main leitmotives of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, and the *Maḳtel* texts in which this case is discussed. Then, I focused on some cases of martyrdom in the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*. The focus in this chapter was on the cult of Karbala in Anatolia. I also concluded that the early *Maḳtel* tradition should be considered as part of Sunni orthopraxy, just as it was in the sixteenth century and later. I have also refuted the commonly held opinion that the *Maḳtel* text of 1362 and the *Maḳtel* tradition was banned by the Ottoman ulama. It should be taken into account that the reason why Molla 'Arab, a sixteenth-century preacher, opposed the *Maḳtel* tradition, was not that the *Maḳtel* literature was Shi'i, but that Molla 'Arab had puritanic, puristic religious views—also shared by intellectuals like Birgivī, Çivizāde and Kadızāde —sixteenth and that Süleyman Çelebi, a Sunni intellectual, was consistently against the text of the *Vesīletü'n-Necāt* (Mevlīd-i Şerīf). After the *Maḳtel* text, I explained that there were references to the Karbala Incident in epics such as the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, and that the "cursing Yazid" and other features were part of the Sunni discursive tradition in Anatolia. Here, I have tried to elaborate that the "culture of revenge" or "chain of revenge" that connects all epics begins with the Karbala Incident.

After dwelling on the opening part the of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, which has hitherto been neglected in the relevant literature, and arguing that some of the narratives on the Marwanids could also be found in other texts of the Ottoman world, I discussed the narrative about Maḥyār the Christian on the Christian Maḥyār. Contrary to what the literature assumes, Maḥyār was Christianized in the Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, which likely fit the Anatolian context better, that is, the Muslim-Christian frontier.

The Turkish *Ebū Müslim-nāme* uses new concepts and identities, such as the Sunni-Kharijites opposition, *Ebū Turābī* for 'Alid Loyalty. The Sunni-Kharijites opposition is not simply a "good-bad" distinction as it is often supposed, but it is part of the discourse about the *Ahl al-Bayt* and Philo-Alidism. The Ebū Müslim-nāme calls devout Muslims Sunni and uses the term Kharijite for people who are hostile to

Islam or who have apostatized. In the context of 'Alid loyalty, the concept of *Ebū Tūrabī* is used in a way that we do not find in other texts. I then examined why the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was banned in Safavid and whether this event could be considered a case of confessional polarization in the Ottoman-Safavid rivalry. The answer to this question is no. The prohibition of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* in Safavid Iran was not related to the Ottoman-Safavid rivalry, but to the inward-looking confessional policy or Shi'itization in the Safavid empire in relation to its own religious-political policies.

While I have dealt with these issues in general in the thesis, I need to repeat the potentials of the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* for later studies. The biggest reason why the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* was not studied as a book or dissertation until 1962, when Irène Mélikoff turned to examine it, may be the difficulty of accessing the text. The text was not digitized for many years. For this reason, while scholars have addressed such subjects as conversion, the supernatural, Sunnism and Sufism as they appear in the *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, the *Dānişmend-nāme*, and the *Saltuḳ-nāme*, the *Ebū Müslim-nāme*, which has the same richness as these other texts, has not been subject to such an analysis, even if it contains. Supernatural places, *ajā'ib* creatures, religious and political themes, conversion narratives, passages about the *futuwwa*, as well as martyrdom narratives. In this respect, the *Ebū Müslim-nāme* can is a field of study as wide as other epics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Unpublished Primary Sources in Manuscript Libraries

Ebū Ṭāhir al-Tūsī, "Kitāb-ı Ebū Müslim." Unpublished Manuscript. trans. Anonymus, IBB Atatürk Library, Nadir Kitaplar, Bel_Yz_B.000014.

———, "Kitāb-ı Ebū Müslim.", Unpublished Manuscript. trans. Anonymus, Paris Bibliotheuqe Nationale, Département des Manuscrits. Turk 57. 1590.

———, "Kitāb-ı Ebū Müslim.", Unpublished Manuscript. trans. Anonymus, Paris Bibliotheuqe Nationale, Département des Manuscrits. Turk 58. 1590.

———, "Kitāb-ı Ebū Müslim.", Unpublished Manuscript. trans. Anonymus, Paris Bibliotheuqe Nationale, Département des Manuscrits. Turk 59. 1590.

———, "Kitāb-ı Ebū Müslim." Unpublished Manuscript. trans. Anonymus, Paris Bibliotheuqe Nationale, Département des Manuscrits. Turk 60. 1590.

Primary Sources

Ahmedī, *İskendernāme*, ed. Robert Dankoff, 2 vol. Ankara: TÜBA, 2020.

Aşık Çelebi. *Meşa'irü'ş-Şu'ara II*, ed. Filiz Kılıç. Vol. 2. İstanbul: Suna ve İnan Kıraç Vakfı, 2010

Elmas, Neslihan Semerci. Dastan-ı Müseyyeb Gazi (s.2–130) Giriş-İnceleme-Metin-Dizin, Master Thesis. Bingöl: Bingöl University, 2019.

Ibn Baṭṭūta. *The Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūta.* Edited by Charles Defrémery and Beniamino Raffaello Sanguinetti. Translated by Hamilton Alexander R. Gibb. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Hakluyt Society at the University Press (coll. Works issued by the Hakluyt Society 117), 1962.

Hacı Nureddin Efendi, *Maḳtel-i Hüseyin*, ed. Mehmet Karaaslan. İstanbul: Önsöz, 2012.

Özçelik, Kenan. "Yusuf-ı Meddāḥ ve Maḳtel-i Hüseyn (İnceleme-Metin-Sözlük). Master Thesis, Ankara University 2008.

Karataş, Derya. Müseyyeb-nāme (1b–133a Varakları Arası) Dil İncelemesi-Metin-Dizin, Master Thesis. Ankara: Gazi University, 2020.

Kayaokay, İlyas. *14. Asrın Yeni Keşfedilen İki Eseri, Yusuf-ı Meddāḥ: Hikayet-i Yemame ve Sehavet-i İmam 'Ali (İnceleme-Metin-Tıpkıbasım).* Istanbul: Dün Bugün Yarın Yayınları, 2022.

Lami'i Çelebi, *Maḳtel-i Āl-i Resul*, ed. Ertuğrul Ertekin. İstanbul: Kevser, 2012.

Şeyhoğlu Mustafa, *Kenzü'l-Kübera ve Mehekkü'l-Ulema*, ed. Kemal Yavuz. İstanbul: Büyüyenay Yayınları, 2013.

Secondary Sources

Abisaab, Rula Jurdi, *Converting Persia: Religion and Power in the Safavid Empire.* New York: I. B. Tauris, 2004.

Ahmad, Shahab. *What Is Islam: Importance of Being Islamic.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016.

Anetshofer, Helga. "Meşair'üş-Şuara'da Toplum-Tanımaz Sapkın Dervişler", in *Aşık Çelebi ve Şairler Tezkiresi Üzerine Yazılar*, ed. Aynur and Niyazioğlu, 85–102. İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2011.

Ataseven, Yusuf, "Hristiyanlıktan Müslümanlığa Akseden Bir Azizin Serencamı: Hikayet-i Cercis Peygamber". *The Journal of Academic Social Sciences*, 63 2017: 565-576.

Atçıl, Abdurrahman. *The Safavid Threat and Juristic Authority in the Ottoman Empire During the 16th Century.‖* International Journal of Middle East Studies 49, no. 2 (2017): 295–314.

Aydoğan, Zeynep. "Representations of Cultural Geography in the Late Medieval Anatolian Frontier Narratives", PhD Diss.. Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 2018.

Babayan, Kathyryn. *Mystics, Monarcs and Messiahs: Cultural Landscapes of Early Modern Iran.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Behar, Cem. *Orda Bir Musiki Var Uzakta, XVI. Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda Osmanlı/Türk Musiki Geleneğinin Oluşumu.* İstanbul: Yapı Kredi, 2020.

Blochet, Edgar. *Catalogue des manuscrits Turcs: Tome I, Ancien fonds, nos. 1-396. Supplement: Nos. 1-572.* Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale 1932.

Bonner, Michael. *Jihad in Islamic History: Doctrines and Practice.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Bruinessen, Martin van.. "Haji Bektash, Sultan Sahak, Shah Mina Sahib and various avatars of a running wall," in *Mollas, Sufis, and Heretics: The Role of Religion in Kurdish Society: Collected Articles*, 271–294. İstanbul: The ISIS Press, 2000.

Burak, Guy. "Faith, Law and Empire in the Ottoman 'Age of Confessionalization' (Fifteenth– Seventeenth Centuries): The Case of "Renewal of Faith," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 28, 2013, 1–23.

Cahen, Claude. "Le Proble'me du Shi'isme dans l'Asie Mineure turque pre´ottomane" in *Le Shi'isme Imaˆmite: Colloque de Strasbourg (6–9 mai 1968)*, 115-129. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1970.

Cook, David. *Marytrdom in Islam.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Csirkés, Ferenc. "Turkish/Turkic Books of Poetry, Turkish and Persian Lexicography: The Politics of Language Under Bayezid II", in *Treasures of Knowledge An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3–1503/4).* vol. 1, ed. Necipoğlu, Kafadar and Fleischer, 673-734. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Demir, Necati, Erdem, Mehmet Dursun and Üst, Sibel. *Eba Müslim-nāme*, two volume. Ankara: Destan Yayınları, 2007.

Deweese, Devin. *Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde: Baba Tükles and Conversion to Islam in Historical and Epic Tradition.* Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994.

Dressler. Markus. *Writing Religion: The Making of Turkish Alevi Islam.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Erginbaş, Vefa. "Problematizing Ottoman Sunnism: Appropriation of Islamic History and Ahl al-Baytism in Ottoman Literary and Historical Writing in the Sixteenth Century," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 60, 5 (2017): 614-646.

———. ed. *Ottoman Sunnism: New Perspectives.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2019.

———. "Reading Ottoman Sunnism through Islamic History: Approaches toward Yazīd b. Mu'āwiya in Ottoman Historical Writing." In *Historicizing Sunni Islam in the Ottoman Empire, c. 1450 - c.1750*, ed. Tijana Krstić and Derin Terzioğlu. Leiden: Brill, 2020.

Ertekin. Ertuğrul. "Arapça, Farsça ve Türkçe Maḳtel-i Hüseyn"ler". *Aşina Dergisi.* 7/23–24, (2006): 79-108.

———. "Osmanlı Sunnileştirmesi Bağlamında Lâmii Çelebinin Maḳtel-i Âl-i Resul'ü", *İRTAD* Issue: 1 (2018): 43-70.

Erünsal, İsmail E.. "Bir Defterdeki/Katalogdaki Saray Hazinesinde Bulunan Türkçe Kitaplar," in *Edebiyat Tarihi Yazıları: Arşiv Kayıtları, Yazma Eserler ve Kayıp Metinler*, 387-398. İstanbul: Timaş 2024.

Grenier, Carlos. "The Yazıcıoğlu Brothers and Vernacular Islamic Apologetics on the

Fifteenth-Century Mediterranean Frontier." *Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association* 6. no. 2. (2019): 131–54.

Günther, Sebastian. "'Maqâtil' Literature in Medieval Islam." *Journal of Arabic Literature* 25, no. 3 (1994): 192–212.

Hagen, Gottfried. "Heroes and Saints in Anatolian Literature*", Oriente Moderno*, LXXXIX, (2009), 349-361.

———, "Chaos, Order, Power, Salvation: Heroic Hagiography's Response to the Ottoman Fifteenth Century,"*Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association* 1, no. 1–2 (2014): 91–109.

Hagler, Aaron M.. *Echoes of the Fitna: Accumulated Meaning and Performative Historiography in the First Muslim Civil War.* Leiden: Brill, 2023.

Hodsgon, Marshall G.S.. *The Venture of Islam, Conscience and History in a World Civilization: The Expansion of Islam in the Middle Periods.* Vol. 2.. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997.

İlhan, Mevlüt. Hızır Şeyyad'ın Ebū Müslimnāme'si (İnceleme-Metin), PhD Diss. Ankara: Hacı Bayram Veli University 2021.

Kafadar, Cemal. *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State* . Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T.. *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1200–1550.* Salt Lake City : University of Utah Press, 1994.

———. "Origins of Anatolian Sufism", in *Sufism and Sufis in Anatolian Society*, ed. Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, 67-96. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2005.

———. "Kaygusuz Abdal: A Mediaval Saint and the Formation of Vernacular Islam in Anatolia" in *Unity in Diversity Mysticism, Messianism and the Construction of Religious Authority in Islam* ed. Orkhan Mir Kasimov, 329-342. Boston: Leiden, 2014.

Karamustafa, Ali Aydın. "The Koroghlu Epics in Trans-Imperial Perspective: The Story of the Ottoman and Safavid Expansions and Crises", PhD Diss.. Stanford University 2019.

Kastritsis, Dimitri. "The Alexander Romance and the Rise of the Ottoman Empire", in *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Anatolia*, 243-284. Wurzburg: Ergon Verlag Wurzburg in Komission, 2016.

Kitapçı-Bayrı, Buket. *Warriors, Martyrs, and Dervishes Moving Frontiers, Shifting Identities in the Land of Rome (13th–15th Centuries)*. Leiden: Brill 2019,

Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad. *Islam in Anatolia After the Turkish Invasion: (Prolegomena)*, tr. Gary Leiser. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press 1993.

———. *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*, tr. Gary Leiser. London: Routledge 2006.

———. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Alfa Yayıncılık 2014.

Krstič, Tijana. *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011.

———. State and Religion, "Sunnitization" and "Confessionalism" in Suleyman's Time" In *The Battle for Central Europe: The Siege of Szigetvár and the Death of Süleyman the Magnificent and Nicholas Zrínyi (1566)*, 65-91. ed. Pal Fodor. Leiden, Brill, 2019.

———, and Derin Terzioğlu, eds. *Historicizing Sunni Islam in the Ottoman Empire, c. 1450 - c.1750*. Leiden: Brill, 2020.

———. "You Must Know Your Faith in Detail: Redefinition of the Role of Knowledge and Boundaries of Belief in Ottoman Catechisms ('İlm-i Hals)," in *Historicizing Sunni Islam in the Ottoman Empire, c. 1450 - c.1750*, ed. Krstić and Terzioglu, 155–95. Leiden: Brill, 2020.

Kuru, Selim S.. "Portrait of a Shaykh as Author in the Fourteenth-Century Anatolia: Gulşehri and His Falaknama" in *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Anatolia*, 173-196. Wurzburg: Ergon Verlag Wurzburg in Komission, 2016.

Lewinstein, Keith. 'The Revaluation of Martyrdom in Early Islam', *Sacrificing the Self: Perspectives on Martyrdom and Religion* ed. Margaret McCormack, 78-91. New York: Oxford University Press 2001.

Madelung, Wilferd. "The Hashimiyyat of Al-Kumayt and Hashimi Shi'ism", *Studia Islamica*, XXL, (1989), 5–26.

Melikoff, Irene. *Abu Müslim*: la "porte haché" du Horasan. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1962.

———. "l'Islam hétérodoxe en anatolie: non-conformisme – syncrétisme – gnose" in *Sur les traces du soufisme turc*, 67-78. İstanbul: ISIS Press 2011.

———. "reserches sur les composantes du syncrétisme Bektachi-Alevi" in *Sur les traces*

du soufisme turc, 51-66. İstanbul: ISIS Press 2011.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. *Sarı Saltık: Popüler İslamın Balkanlar'daki Destani Öncüsü*. İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi 2016.

Öngören, Reşat. *Osmanlı'da Tasavvuf: Anadolu'da Sufiler, Devlet ve Ulema (XVI. Yüzyıl)*. İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2022.

Öztürk, Selman Bilgehan. Marvels of Creation and Oddities of Existence in Early Fifteenth-Century Ottoman Literary Culture: A Study of the Tercüme-i 'Aca'ibü'l-Mahlukat ve Gara'ibü'l-Mevcūdat. Unpublished MA Thesis, İstanbul, Sabancı University, 2023.

Peacock, A. C. S.. *Islam, Literature and Society in Mongol Anatolia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

———. and Sara Nur Yıldız, eds. Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Anatolia. Wurzburg: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2016.

Pekşen, Ahmed. Zeyn'ül-Elhan İsimli Eserin Metin ve Sözlük Çalışması: Ladikli Mehmed Çelebi, Master Diss. Istanbul: Istanbul University 2002.

Sariyannis, Marinos. "A Tale of Two Cities: Jābarşā/Jābalqā and Their Metamorphoses," *Der Islam* 101, no. 1 (2024): 162-192.

Sönmez, Erdem. "A Past to Be Forgotten? Writing Ottoman History in Early Republican Turkey." *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 48/4 (2020): 753–69.

Şahin, Kaya. *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Terzioğlu. Derin. "How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization" *Turcica*, vol. 44 (2013-2012), 301-338.

———. "Where 'ilm-i hal meets catechism: Islamic manuals of religious instruction in the Ottoman Empire in the age of confessionalization", *Past & Present*, 220, 2013: 79-114.

———. "Confessional Ambiguity in the Age of Confession-Building: Philo-Alidism, Sunnism, and Sunni Islam in the Ottoman Empire 1400-1700" in *Entangled Confessionalizations? Dialogic Perspectives on the Politics of Piety and Community-Building in the Ottoman Empire, 15th–18th Centuries* ed. Krstić and Terzioğlu, 563-624. New Jersey: Gorgias Press 2022.

Tezcan, Baki. "Esrarını yitiren İslâm, ya da erken modern bir sıryitimi: Modern ilmi-

halin Birgili, Akhisarlı ve Kadızade izleğinde gelişen erken modern tarihi", *Tarih ve Toplum*, 19 (2022): 9–74.

Stanley, Tim. "The Books of Umur Bey." *Muqarnas* 21 (2004): *323*-331.

Uslu, Zeynep Oktay. "The Saṭḥiyye of Yunus Emre Ḳaygusuz Abdal: The Creation of a Vernacular Islamic Tradition in Turkish", *Turcica*, 50, (2019): 9-52.

Winter, Stefan. *The Shi'ites of Lebanon under Ottoman Rule, 1516–1788*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Woods, John E.. *Aqqoyunlu: Clan, Confederation, Empire*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1999.

Yerasimos, Stefanos. *Kostantiniye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*. Tr. Şirin Tekeli. İstanbul: İletişim, 1993.

Yıldız, Sara Nur. "Aydınid Court Literature in the Formation of an Islamic Identity in Fourteenth-Century Western Anatolia," in *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Anatolia*, 197–242. Wurzburg: Ergon Verlag Wurzburg in Komission, 2016.

Yıldırım, Rıza. "Beylikler Dünyasında Kerbela Kültürü ve Ehl-i Beyt Sevgisi: 1362 Yılında Kastamonu'da Yazılan Bir Maktel'in Düşündürdükleri", in *Kuzey Anadoluda Beylikler Donemi Sempozyumu Bildiriler, Cobanogulları, Candarogulları, Pervaneogulları, 3–8 Ekim 2011 Kastamonu-Sinop-Cankırı, Cankırı*: Cankırı Karatekin Universitesi Yayınları, 2012.

———. "Anadolu'da İslamiyet: Gaziler Çağında (XII.-XIV. Asırlar) Türkmen İslam Yorumunun Sünni-Alevi Niteliği Üzerine Bazı Değerlendirmeler". *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* Issue 43, (2014): 93-124.

———. "Shī'itisation of the Futuwwa Tradition in the Fifteenth Century", *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, (2013) Vol. 40, No. 1, 53–70.

———. *Bektaşiliğin Doğuşu*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık, 2019.