

ONCE THE FIRST BUTTON IS PUT WRONG ...
AN ASSESSMENT OF A STUDY BY JUDITH PFEIFFER ON *KASHF*
***AL-ASRĀR FĪ ILZĀM AL-YAHŪD WA-L-AḤBĀR* BY YŪSUF IBN**
ABĪ ‘ABD AL-DAYYĀN

Fuat Aydın

Sakarya University, Sakarya-Turkey

faydin@sakarya.edu.tr

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5779-7741>

Abstract

Refutations by native or converted Muslims to reject religions other than Islam have been produced for ages, including during the Ottoman era. However, studies about such refutations have mainly focused on the Ottoman world from the 19th century until the 2000s. One of the exceptions is Judith Pfeiffer’s study on *Kashf al-asrār fī ilzām al-Yabūd wa-l-aḥbār* by Yūsuf Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān. This paper intends to demonstrate that the conclusion reached by Pfeiffer, i.e., that the text, which she dates to 17th century within the context of the Qāḏizādelis-Sivāsīs debate and uses as a reference, is actually a tract called *al-Radd ‘alā l-Yabūd* by Ṭāshkuprīzādah, is not accurate. This paper also aims to demonstrate that Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān actually lived in the 16th century and wrote this work in relation to the Jews who had become gradually more visible in the social and cultural life of Istanbul following their migration from Spain and that the use of the reference

İlahiyat Studies

p-ISSN: 1309-1786 / e-ISSN: 1309-1719

Volume 11 Number 2 Summer / Fall 2020

DOI: 10.12730/13091719.2020.112.207

Copyright © Bursa İlahiyat Foundation

Received: July 12, 2020

Accepted: September 30, 2020

Published: December 31, 2020

To cite this article: Aydın, Fuat. “Once the First Button is Put Wrong... An Assessment of A Study by Judith Pfeiffer on *Kashf al-asrār fī ilzām al-Yabūd wa-l-aḥbār* by Yūsuf Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān.” *İlahiyat Studies* 11, no. 2 (2020): 165-187.
<https://doi.org/10.12730/13091719.2020.112.207>

is actually the use of the book of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān by Ṭāshkuprīzādah.

Key Words: Yūsuf Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān, Ṭāshkuprīzādah, refutation, Judith Pfeiffer, *Kashf al-asrār*, *radd i’tiqādāt al-Yabūd*

Introduction

In Islamic literature, *raddiyabs* are defined as refutations against religions other than Islam; known in modern studies as religious polemics, these are texts written by followers of a certain religion to demonstrate the authenticity of their respective religion and the inauthenticity of any other religion. The second Vatican Council (1962-65) adopted an inclusive approach¹ towards non-Christian religions. In this context, following the call for *dialogue* as a new method of interreligious relations, such texts were considered examples of interreligious dialogue. Specifically, pursuant to this approach, the centers and institutes established by Catholic Church to pursue this form of dialogue began to carry out biographical works and relevant academic studies to identify the texts written by followers of three Semitic religions against one another.²

¹ For this inclusive approach, which includes Karl Rahner among its principal defenders, see Adnan Aslan, “Batı Perspektifinde Dini Çoğulculuk Meselesi,” *İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi* 2 (1998), 143-163.

² An indicator about the mentioned fact is that relevant studies were carried out in the wake of the Second Vatican Council in 1965. For these and earlier texts, see Moritz Steinschneider, *Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache, zwischen Muslimen, Christen und Juden, nebst Anhängen verwandten Inhalts* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms., 1966). Since the refutations in Christian and Islamic worlds are considered within the context of dialogue, a bibliography including them was published in the periodical *Islamo-Chrétien*: Robert Caspar et al., “Bibliographie Du Dialogue Islamo-Chrétien, Bibliographie (VII^e X^e siècle),” *Islamochristiana* 1 (1975), 125-176; Miquel De Epalza, Adel-Théodore Khoury, and Paul Khoury (Coordination: Robert Caspar), “Bibliographie Du Dialogue Islamo-Chrétien, Bibliographie (XI^e XII^e siècle),” *Islamochristiana* 2 (1976), 187-248; Robert Caspar, Abdulmajid Charfi et Khalil Samir, “Bibliographie Du Dialogue Islamo-Chrétien, Bibliographie (XI^e XII^e siècle),” *Islamochristiana* 5 (1977), 255-284; Robert Caspar, Abdulmajid Charfi et Adel-Théodore Khoury, “Bibliographie Du Dialogue Islamo-Chrétien, Bibliographie (XIII^e XIV^e siècle),” *Islamochristiana* 4 (1978): 247-267; Robert Caspar, Khalil Samir, and Ludwig Hagmann, “Bibliographie Du Dialogue Islamo-Chrétien, Bibliographie (XI^e XII^e siècle),”

To date, studies about Muslim polemic texts against Jews and Christians or vice versa have often focused on Arabic works from the Umayyad and Abbasid eras. Despite constituting an important six-century period in the 1500-year history of Islam and probably incorporating more diversity than any other era, the Ottoman era has long been overlooked by academicians in this regard. There are presumably two reasons behind this relative negligence. The first reason is the presupposition (especially, of Western academicians) that the glory of the Muslim world ended in the 12th century, that the ensuing periods were mere repetition and that there was be no original thought in any other matter from that point forward. The second reason is the indifference of the academicians from this very region regarding this subject until the 1980s, which was inherited from the Ottomans and can be attributed to reasons such as the scarcity of specialization and the abundance of other things to be done in the field of the history of religions.³

Islamochristiana 5 (1979), 299-317; Khalik Samir, "Bibliographie Du Dialogue Islamo-Chrétien, Bibliographie (septième partie), Auteurs arabes chrétiens du XIII^e siècle", *Islamochristiana* 7 (1981), 299-317. Studies on Jew-Muslim polemics are mostly carried out by Moshe Perlmann. Moshe Perlmann, "The Medieval Polemics between Islam and Judaism," ed. S. D. Goitein O, *Religion in a Religious Age* (Cambridge Association for Jewish Studies, 1974), 103-138. For a recent Turkish work about refutations by followers of three religions against one another, see Yasin Meral, "Yahudi-Hıristiyan-Müslüman Reddiye Geleneği," in *Dinler Arası İlişkiler El Kitabı*, ed. Ali İsra Güngör (Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2017), 161-176.

³ For a study about writings against Christianity not during the entire Ottoman era but only in the 19th century, see Mehmet Aydın, *Müslümanların Hıristiyanlığa Karşı Yazdığı Reddiiyeler ve Tartışma Konuları* (Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1989); for a bibliographical study about refutations written in Turkish, see Mehmet Aydın, "Hıristiyanlığa Karşı Yazılmış Türkçe Reddiiyeler," *Diyaret Dergisi* 19, no. 1 (1983), 15-23. The doctoral thesis by Mustafa Göregen on refutations against Jews does not include the Ottoman era except for a few texts. See Mustafa Göregen, *Müslüman-Yahudi Polemikleri* (Istanbul: Hikmetevi Yayınları, 2014); Mehmet Alıcı, "Osmanlı Son Döneminde Müslüman-Hıristiyan Tartışmalarına Dair Bir Karşılaştırma: Şemsü'l-Hakîka ve Râfi'u'ş-Şübûbât y'ani, Cevâb-i Risâle-i Şemsü'l-Hakîkat," *Mukaddime: Mardin Artuklu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 7, no. 1 (2016), 31-52, <https://doi.org/10.19059/mukaddime.26539>; İsmail Taşpınar, *Hacı Abdullah Petricî'nin Hıristiyanlık Eleştirisi*, 4th ed. (Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2014).

The indifference about refutations in the Ottoman era underwent a change as early as the 2000s. A series called *Christian-Muslim Relations, A Bibliographical History*,⁴ which was part of a broader project focusing on the history of Christian-Muslim relationships initiated by a group of academicians including David Thomas, dealt with these relations on a global scale, whereupon individual polemics or even polemical texts on Muslim-Christian relations began to be

⁴ In 2013, I served as a guest lecturer for two months at the Center for Muslim-Christian Relations at Birmingham University, where David Thomas is also an academician. I told Thomas that as a part of this project, I planned to compile polemical texts against Christianity in Ottoman era. Upon my return to Turkey, I browsed all the manuscript catalogs and identified texts by Ṭāshkuprīzādah, Yūsuf Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān, and ‘Abd al-Salām al-Muhtadī al-Muḥammadī against Judaism that were attained and published within the scope of the project initiated by Adang, the text of Muḥammad of Athens studied by Tijana Krstić, and the text of Aḥmad al-Trabzūnī. Accordingly, I wrote and realized the introduction and translation of the work of Ṭāshkuprīzādah, as well as the translation of al-Trabzūnī’s text. Among them, however, I only completed the paper about Yūsuf Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān and his text, benefiting also from the studies of Pfeiffer and Krstić (for instance, I have to express my gratitude, for she mentioned the Kepenekçi/Kepenkçi record in the copy of manuscript in Sofia and helped me with the correct reading of Ganjizādah in the copy of manuscript in Giresun), which I presented as a communique at the International Congress on Ottoman Studies held by Sakarya University Center of Ottoman Studies on 14-17 October 2015. This paper was eventually published in pages 199-245 of “Konjonktürün Ürettiği Yahudi-Karşıtı Bir On Altıncı Yüzyıl Reddiyesi: *Kitābu Keşfu’l-Esrār fi İlzāmī’l-Yebûd ve’l-Abbâr*,” *Osmanlı’da Felsefe, Tasavvuf ve Bilim*, ed. Fuat Aydın and Mükerrrem Bedizel Aydın (Istanbul: OSAMER & Mahya Yayınları, 2016). In addition, the conversion narrative-refutation text of Muḥammad of Athens was presented under the title “Hristiyan Din Adamlığından Osmanlı Kadılığına (!): Bir On Yedinci Yüzyıl İhtida Anlatısı Üzerine” at Symposium on Scholars, Institutions and Intellectual Works from Saḥn-i Thamān to Dār al-Funūn, held by Istanbul University Faculty of Theology on 22-23 December 2017. Later, this communique was published together with İrfan İnce as “Bir 17. Yüzyıl İhtida Anlatısı: Bir Atinalı Mühtedî, Bir Osmanlı Kadısı,” in *Sabn-ı Semân’dan Dârülfünûn’a Osmanlı’da İlim ve Fikir Dünyası: Âlimler, Müesseseler ve Fikrî Eserler XVII. Yüzyıl*, 507-578 (Istanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2017). Some texts mentioned herein or discovered recently are now being prepared for publication independently of Thomas’ projects, and they will be gradually published at an appropriate occasion and time.

studied separately with regard to each century, in such a manner as to incorporate the Ottoman era.⁵

Thanks to the project initiated by Thomas, the field of Muslim-Christian relations in the Ottoman era finally began to attract the attention it deserves. In addition, the concept of Muslim-Jew relations during the Ottoman period, which had never drawn significant interest in terms of religious polemics despite abundance of studies on Ottoman Jews in historical context,⁶ gradually became a more popular topic during the same period of time. Within the framework of a project developed by Camilla Adang, Sabine Schmidtke, and Judith Pfeiffer, some refutations against Jews during the Ottoman era were studied, and their edited versions and translations were subsequently published. According to statements made by these authors, there are some other ongoing studies situated in the same context. A total of four texts, three from the 16th century and one from 17th century (?), were initially published in the form of individual papers; later, three of them were included in *Contacts and Controversies between Muslims, Jews and Christians in the Ottoman Empire and Pre-Modern Iran*, a book edited by Camilla Adang and Sabine Schmidtke and published by Würzburg Ergon Verlag in 2010.⁷ Moreover, the same scholars indicate

⁵ Eleven volumes have been published in this series so far. For further information about these books and their content, see <http://www.brill.com/publications/christian-muslim-relations-bibliographical-history>.

⁶ For studies about Ottoman Jews, see *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*, ed. Benjamin Braudel and Bernard Lewis (New York: Holmes-Meier Publisher, 1982), I-II; Minna Rozen, *Jewish Identity and Society in the Seventeenth Century: Reflections on the Life and Work of Refael Mordekhai Malki*, translated from the Hebrew by Goldie Wachsman. Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism, 6. (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992); id., *A History of the Jewish Community in Istanbul: The Formative Years, 1453-1566* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2002); Avigdor Levy (ed.), *The Jews of the Ottoman Empire* (Princeton: Darwin Press & Washington, D.C.: Institute of Turkish Studies, 1994); Yaron Ben-Nach, *Jews in the Realm of Sultans: Ottoman Jewish Society in the Seventeenth Century* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); Hatice Doğan, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Habambaşılık Müessesesi* (Istanbul: Gözlem Gazetecilik Basın Yayın A.Ş., 2003); Ahmet Hikmet Eroğlu, *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Yabudiler (XIX. Yüzyılın Sonuna Kadar)* (Ankara: Berikan, 2013).

⁷ Judith Pfeiffer, "Confessional Polarization in the 17th Century Ottoman Empire and Yūsuf İbn Ebī 'Abdü'd-Deyyān's *Keşfü'l-esrār fî ilzāmi'l-Yebūd ve'l-ahbār*," *Contacts and Controversies between Muslims, Jews and Christians in the Ottoman*

that these texts will be republished in the projected book *Ottoman Intellectuals of Judaism: A Collection of Texts from the Early Modern Period*.⁸

Selected from the articles published within the scope of the project headed by Adang and Schmidtke, this paper will focus exclusively on the study by Pfeiffer that examined *Kashf al-asrār fī ilzām al-Yahūd wa-l-aḥbār* (herein after referred to as *Kashf*), which was written by Yūsuf Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān (herein after referred to as Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān). The study by Pfeiffer was the first ever text written and published within the scope of the mentioned project. Indeed, all subsequent studies –as will be seen below– refer to her work in terms of the date, religious-social context, and references of the book in question, which was authored by Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān. Accordingly, explanations provided by Pfeiffer about the date and religious-social context of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān’s work will be analyzed herein. For this purpose, we will initially touch upon the statements and evaluations provided by Pfeiffer in regard to *Kashf*, as written by ‘Abd al-Dayyān, before trying to demonstrate whether these statements and evaluations are accurate.

Empire and Pre-Modern Iran, ed. Camilla Adang and Sabine Schmidtke (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Kommission, 2016), 15-56, <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783956506826-15>; Camilla Adang, “Guided to Islam by the Torah: The *Risāla al-bādiya* by ‘Abd al-Salām al-Muhtadī al-Muḥammadī,” *Contacts and Controversies*, 57-72, <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783956506826-57>; Sabine Schmidtke, “Epistle forcing the Jews [to admit their error] with regard to what they contend about the Torah, by dialectical reasoning (*Risālat ilzām al-yahūd fīmā za‘amū fī l-tawrāt min qibal ‘ilm al-kalām*) by al-Salām ‘Abd al-‘Allām, a critical edition,” in *Contacts and Controversies*, 73-82, <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783956506826-73>.

⁸ For these promises, see Schmidtke and Adang, “Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā Ṭāshkubrīzāde’s (d. 968/1561) Polemical Tract Against Judaism,” *Al-Qantara* 29, no. 1 (enero-junio de 2008), 79, <https://doi.org/10.3989/alqantara.2008.v29.i1.50>; Adang, “A Polemic against Judaism by a Convert to Islam from the Ottoman Period: *Risālat Ilzām al-Yahūd Fīmā Za‘amū fī l-Tawrāt min qibal ‘Ilm al-Kalām*,” *Journal Asiatique* 297, no. 1 (June 2009), 131, <https://doi.org/10.2143/JA.297.1.2045785>; Schmidtke, “Epistle forcing,” 79.

I. Date of *Kashf* According to Pfeiffer

Pfeiffer tries to determine the actual date of the writing of *Kashf* by Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān by relying on five extant copies. The first copy is registered at “Giresun Yazmalar 3610/2” in Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, between folios 30^a-45^b, and has no date of writing or copying. The second is also registered at Giresun 3574/12, between folios 133^a-164^b. The name of the copyist is not indicated; nevertheless, the date of the copy is given as Dhū l-qa‘dah 1245/1830. The third copy is registered under no. 2022 in the section of Bağdatlı Vehbi Efendi, in Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library again, between folios 101^b-120^b. There are two dates on this copy. The first date is recorded just after the end of the text and reads: *ḥurrira fī Şafar al-khayr li-sanat ihdā wa-sittin wa-alf/1061* [1651] (Written in the month of Şafar al-khayr in the year 1061 [1651]). The second date record is partially deleted and provided in a box following a line drawn beneath the page: [...] *waqa‘a l-farāgh ‘an yad al-faqīr Nadīmī sanat 1177* [1763]. (Completed by the hand of *al-faqīr Nadīmī* in the year of 1177 [1763].)⁹

Pfeiffer takes the text that bears the earliest date as the point of departure. Among the mentioned dates, she considers the one recorded with the word *taḥrīr*, which is the infinitive of the verb *ḥar-ra-ra* and means “to review and correct (a book), edit, write, put (something) onto paper,”¹⁰ as the date when the text was written, and she considers the second one including the word *farāgh*, which is a term for “habendum” commonly used among copyists, as the date of the copy.¹¹

II. Context and Reason behind the Writing of *Kashf*

After determining the date of the writing as 1061/1651, Pfeiffer asserts in consideration of this date that the text was written because of the Qāḍizādelī movement, which led to religious and social havoc in the 17th century.¹² She describes the followers of this movement as an ill-trained group of preachers who advocated the return to pure

⁹ For further information about these copies, see Aydın, “Konjonktürün Ürettiği Yahudi-Karşıtı Bir On Altıncı Yüzyıl Reddiyesi,” 217-219.

¹⁰ Serdar Mutçalı, “ḥar-ra, ḥar-ra-ra,” *Arapça-Türkçe Sözlük*, (Istanbul: Dağarcık, 1995), 157.

¹¹ Pfeiffer, “Confessional Polarization,” 37.

¹² *Ibid.*, 20.

Islam; forbade the use of then-new crops such as tobacco, coffee, and opium; the visitation of the tombs of saintly personalities (*awliyāʾ*); and the participation in order ceremonies and the recital of *ṣalāt wa-salām* after mentioning the name of the Prophet Muḥammad. According to Pfeiffer, the individuals tried to dismiss the Sufi and madrasah-based preachers from the pulpits of Friday mosques in Istanbul. She claims that these persons, who were so harsh even towards Muslims, could easily unite any debates against non-Muslims and participate in activities to make non-Muslims convert to Islam.¹³ In the eyes of Pfeiffer, it was a very common attitude to associate political, military and social failures with religion in those days. For instance, according to the Qāḍīzādelīs, the difficulties experienced in the Ottoman Empire, such as the loss of territory, were because of the Sufi personality of Grand Vizier Boynueğri Meḥmed Pasha; likewise, Vānī Meḥmed Efendī argues that Muslims went astray from authentic Islam because of their extreme coalescence with non-Muslims.¹⁴ For Pfeiffer, in 1651, when the book was written, the Qāḍīzādelīs led by Üstüvānī Meḥmed Efendī encouraged their community to attack visitors of the tekkes and to demolish the Khalwatī tekke in Demirkapı.¹⁵ Pfeiffer allocates a great deal of her article¹⁶ to this incident, trying to show that *Kashf* was written by Yūsuf Ibn Abī ʿAbd al-Dayyān in an environment where the polarization arising from these interpretations of religion brought about a hostile look at non-Muslims and where even the Muslims underwent more severe religious debates between themselves, since the emphasis was on differences rather than similarities.¹⁷

III. Sources Used to Create *Kashf*

After her depiction of the environment in which the text was written, Pfeiffer deals with the question of the sources used by Ibn Abī ʿAbd al-Dayyān to create *Kashf*; according to Pfeiffer, the main source for this work was *Risālah fī l-radd ʿalā l-Yahūd* by Ṭāshkuprīzādah (d. 968/1561), which is almost identical to Ibn Abī ʿAbd al-Dayyān's text in terms of structure, content, and reasoning. Indeed, what Ibn Abī ʿAbd al-Dayyān did was only to add his own story of conversion to

¹³ Pfeiffer, "Confessional Polarization," 20-21.

¹⁴ Ibid., 22.

¹⁵ Ibid., 24.

¹⁶ Ibid., 20-26.

¹⁷ Ibid., 25.

Islam, as well as some additional examples, to detail the evidence provided by Ṭāshkuprīzādah and to translate his text into Turkish.¹⁸

IV. Criticism on Pfeiffer's Statements and Suggestions for a New Context, Reason for Writing, and Reference for *Kashf*

Pfeiffer tries to show that Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān wrote his work in the 17th century when the tolerance towards both Muslims and non-Muslims was minimal. Nevertheless, Pfeiffer cannot actually overlook certain inconsistencies, such as the date of the refutation and its connection with the referential text by Ṭāshkuprīzādah, as well as the discrepancy regarding the persons whom Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān indicates that he is in a relationship with.

1. In his work, Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān says nothing about using the text of Ṭāshkuprīzādah as a source, even though it is completely identical with the former text, except for several added examples and his personal story of conversion. Moreover, even though Pfeiffer suggests on several occasions that the text is entirely plagiarized, Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān does not seem to say so.

2. If the text of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān is nothing but a literal translation of the Arabic refutation of Ṭāshkuprīzādah, then the presence of Shaykh al-Islām Sa‘dī Efendī on the two following occasions in the text of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān seems remarkably problematic:

¹⁸ Pfeiffer, “Confessional Polarization,” 25. Pfeiffer published her study about Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān and his work in *Contacts and Conversions* in 2016. Nevertheless, she presented another relevant study at an earlier date, at The European Science Foundation Workshop on “The Position of Religious Minorities in the Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Iran, as reflected in Muslim Polemical and Apologetical Literature” held by Istanbul German Oriental Institute on 14-16 June 2007 (see Pfeiffer). As for Schmidtke and Adang, they published Ṭāshkuprīzādah’s text in 2008. Since I did not have the opportunity to read the communique of Pfeiffer in Istanbul, I cannot say whether she expressed therein her conviction that the text of Ṭāshkuprīzādah served as a reference for Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān. Nevertheless, since Adang and Schmidtke published the text of Ṭāshkuprīzādah the year following this communique in 2007, Pfeiffer might have reviewed it after the current edition was published in 2016.

In the earlier days, a prominent Jewish rabbi chanced upon me on his return from a visit to the estate of Sa‘dī Efendī. He told me about the conversations therein and indicated that for Sa‘dī Efendī, the term *olam* within the mentioned Biblical paragraph does not mean any assertion about the eternal or timeless character of the Shabbath. Thereupon, I asked, “What about the verse where the Lord says, “Shabbath is for the Lord wherever you reside”¹⁹ in the Torah [...].²⁰

Indeed, Sa‘dī Efendī, who was appointed Shaykh al-Islām after Kamālpashazādah, passed away during his tenure in 1539.²¹ Therefore, Yūsuf Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān must be telling about an incident in which he was involved in person but which took place about a century earlier. This would be an evident anachronism. The only way to avoid such an anachronism would be to show that Ṭāshkuprīzādah actually mentioned Sa‘dī Efendī in his text, which was the source for the literal translation (!) by Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān. However, even though Ṭāshkuprīzādah knows and mentions Sa‘dī Efendī in *al-Shaqā’iq*,²² he never mentions him in the refutation.²³

3. The phrases, which are as long as a proper paragraph, are present in the text of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān but not in that by Ṭāshkuprīzādah; in addition, explanatory and supportive side notes, as well as similar references, are given within the text rather than in the form of actual side notes or footnotes.²⁴

¹⁹ Leviticus 23/3.

²⁰ In original language: *Evā’ilde aḥbâr-ı Yebūd’un müte’ayyinlerinden biri bir gün Şeyhülislām Sa‘dī Efendi’nin âsitâne-i şerifleri ziyâretinden gelür iken bende-i ḥaḳîre buluşub meclisde cârî olan mubâverelerin naḳl idüb aytdı ki Sa‘dī Efendi âyet-i mezkûrede olam lafzından sebtin te’bîdine delâlet yokdur, buyurdılar ve ben dabî bu âyete ne dersiz ki Ḥaḳḳ Te’âlâ Tevrât’da buyurub şebbet bî lezûnây beḥal mesyûteh, am demişdir, didim. [...]. Yūsuf Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān, *Kitâb Kashf al-asrâr fî ilzâm al-Yabūd wa-l-aḥbâr* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Bağdatlı Vehbi, MS 2022), fol. 110³.*

²¹ Regarding the life of Sa‘dī Efendī, see Ṭāshkuprīzādah Aḥmad Efendī (as Taşköprülüzâde), *Osmanlı Bilginleri: eş-Şakâiku’n--Nu’mâniyye fî ulemâi’l-Devleti’l-Osmâniyye*, trans. Muharrem Tan (Istanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2007), 321-233; Mehmet İpşirli and Ziya Demir, “Sâdî Çelebi,” in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXXV, 404-405.

²² Ṭāshkuprīzādah, *Osmanlı Bilginleri*, 321-322.

²³ Pfeiffer, “Confessional Polarization,” 29.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 34.

Among the above mentioned issues, Pfeiffer explains the second and third issues as insertions by subsequent copyists, without providing any reasonable explanation for this argument;²⁵ however, she adds that there is no such practice present in the tradition of Islamic writings.²⁶ Once these problematic questions are nullified by the assumption of subsequent additions, it becomes clear that the text of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān was written in the 17th century, i.e., at a time when the Qāḏīzādeli movement and religious polarization were at their peak.

The study by Pfeiffer on *Kashf* written by Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān serves as a point of departure for those who study Ottoman texts against Jews. Schmidtke and Adang, who actually informed Pfeiffer about *Kashf*²⁷ and prepared the publication of Ṭāshkuprīzādāh’s *Risālah fī l-radd ‘alā l-Yahūd* one year after she presented her initial study about the book as an academic paper,²⁸ also consider the first date at Bağdatlı Vehbi 2022, 121^a as the true date of the writing of *Kashf*, is consistent with the argument of Pfeiffer.²⁹ Nevertheless, both scholars read the date on the text as 1016/1607, despite Pfeiffer’s 1061/1651; accordingly, they claim the text was written in 1607. Interestingly, Pfeiffer, who read the date correctly, read the relevant article containing the date misread, and she even made some useful remarks about their study. In a footnote in the introduction of the paper, Schmidtke and Adang express their gratitude for her

²⁵ Pfeiffer, “Confessional Polarization,” 28.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 35. As the author puts forth, in Islamic literary tradition, the original text was clearly separated and never mixed with additional elements such as gloss, footnotes, additions, etc.; *ibid.* On this occasion, Pfeiffer does not refrain from ascribing a feature hitherto unseen in Islamic literary tradition to the text of Yūsuf in order to legitimize her argument that the text was written in the 17th century.

²⁷ Pfeiffer says: “I am indebted to Sabine Schmidtke who directed me to the relevant manuscripts; and to Tijana Krstić, who in 2008 made available to me a copy of the Sofia manuscript of Ibn Ebī ‘Abdū’d-Deyyān’s treatise, which I had not seen up to that point,” “Confessional Polarization,” 15, fn. 1.

²⁸ Judith Pfeiffer, “The View of an Insider: Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān’s [*Kitāb*] *Kashf al-asrār fī ilzām al-Yahūd wa al-aḥbār*,” *communiqué* presented at The European Science Foundation Workshop on “The Position of Religious Minorities in the Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Iran, as Reflected in Muslim Polemical and Apologetical Literature,” German Oriental Institute, Istanbul: June 14-16, 2007.

²⁹ Schmidtke and Adang, “Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā Ṭāshkuprīzādāe’s Polemical Tract,” 83.

contributions.³⁰ Apparently, however, these expressions do not extend to the section that includes the misread date or else they would have corrected the date.

The latter two scholars, who published the text of Ṭāshkuprīzādah together with an introduction, did not refrain from pointing out this evident similarity between the text of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān and that of Ṭāshkuprīzādah. Nevertheless, there is a situation that requires further explanation, i.e., the issue of how could Ṭāshkuprīzādah, who was an Ottoman scholar with no reported knowledge of Hebrew present in his intellectual biography, literally translate and transfer expressions from medieval Jewish exegesis classics and the Talmud that were published in Istanbul, probably thanks to the contribution of Jews from Andalusia? According to the authors, this fact can be explained by his use of secondhand references.³¹ Pursuant to another explanation, since they definitively accept the obvious similarities between the texts of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān and Ṭāshkuprīzādah in terms of structure, content, and argumentation,³² and they consider 1607 (?) as the actual date of the work, they argue that either Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān had the work of Ṭāshkuprīzādah at his disposal while writing his own work or both men made use of a common reference that remains unknown to us. Nonetheless, despite their awareness of the complications related to the acceptance of 1651 as the writing date, Schmidtke, who prepared *Risālat ilzām al-Yabūd fīmā za‘amū fī l-Tawrāt min qibal ‘ilm al-kalām* of Salām (?) ‘Abd al-‘Allām for publication,³³ and Adang, who published the English translation of the latter in 2009,³⁴ apparently insist that Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān wrote his text in the 11th/17th century.

³⁰ “The present writers wish to express their gratitude to Judith Pfeiffer for her helpful remarks on this article,” Schmidtke and Adang, “Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā Ṭāshkuprīzāde’s Polemical Tract,” 79, fn. 1.

³¹ Schmidtke and Adang, “Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā Ṭāshkuprīzāde’s Polemical Tract,” 83.

³² Schmidtke and Adang show in a comparative manner the similarities of the thematic and chapter divisions in the three available copies of Ṭāshkuprīzādah and Ibn ‘Abd al-Dayyān; “Aḥmad b. Muṣṭafā Ṭāshkuprīzāde’s Polemical Tract,” 85. As for Pfeiffer, she provides the respective translations of the works and tries to point out similarities between the two. i.e., that both make use of biblical texts; Pfeiffer, “Confessional Polarization,” Appendix III: Sample comparison, 44-51.

³³ Schmidtke, “Epistle Forcing the Jews,” 73-82.

³⁴ Adang, “A Polemic against Judaism,” 134.

As a natural consequence of this dating of the work of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān, the leaders of the project that focused on Ottoman texts against Judaism opted for grounding this work in the context of the 17th century Qāḏīzādelī movement and for making relevant explanations. Nevertheless, these efforts are not limited to the mentioned scholars. Tijana Krstić, who also included Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān in her doctoral dissertation about conversion narratives during the Ottoman era, accepts the dating of 1651 by Pfeiffer as it is and provides detailed information about the Qāḏīzādelī movement, which is the presumed context of the work.³⁵ However, the explanation provided by Pfeiffer that the work of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān is a complete translation of Ṭāshkuprīzādah’s text except for the presence of a conversion story and additional provided examples apparently does not satisfy Schmidtke and Adang based on the fact that an Ottoman scholar would not be so profoundly familiar with Jewish literature. Nevertheless, since they agree with Pfeiffer about the date of the writing, they cannot help but assert that while writing his work, Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān either had the text of Ṭāshkuprīzādah at hand or that both authors made use of a common but hitherto unknown reference. Since Krstić accepts 1651 to be the exact date, she righteously finds strange the lack of any information about the Sabbatai Zvi case, which was crucially important to the Jewish world and caused a stir in both Ottoman and Jewish societies at the time.³⁶

In brief, concerning the evident anachronism in the text between the date indicated by Pfeiffer for the work of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān and the mention of Shaykh al-Islām Sa‘dī Efendī, who reportedly lived in the mid-16th century, Pfeiffer’s argument is that the name was subsequently added to the text. In contrast, the theory of Schmidtke and Adang concerns the use of secondhand references or a hitherto unknown common reference used by both authors, since it is impossible to clarify the familiarity of Ṭāshkuprīzādah with Jewish religious literature through his intellectual background. Finally, Krstić finds the absence of any mention of Sabbatai Zvi to be odd, as it was one of the most notable religious incidents in 17th century. All of these thoughts and theories came about because of the *hurriya* and the date indicated with it (1061/1651) in the Bağdatlı Vehbi copy, 120.

³⁵ Tijana Krstić, *Osmanlı Dünyasında İbtida Anlatıları: 15.-17. Yüzyıllar*, trans. Ahmet Tunç Şen (Istanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2015), 172-173.

³⁶ Krstić, *Osmanlı Dünyasında İbtida Anlatıları*, 173, 175.

Ḥar-ra-ra, the *ma'lūm* pattern of *ḥur-ri-ra*, means “to carry out a book or another thing in a correct, appropriate, honest, and pure manner,” and the verb was initially used for “writing in a good and correct manner, or fulfilling a task properly;” over the course of time, however, the verb became specialized as a term for books.³⁷ Accordingly, as the following examples reveal, the pattern of *ḥar-ra-ra/ḥur-ri-ra* is another common style of wording in the Islamic tradition of writing,³⁸ and it is not literally used in the sense of the actual

³⁷ In *taf'īl* meter. This means the flawless and fine accomplishment of a book or another object; *ḥarrara* is used when a book or another thing is carried out in appropriate manner. In the essence, it means making something *ḥurr*, namely, pure. The word was eventually employed in the sense of the appropriate fulfilment or realization of writing or other affairs, before being exclusively used for writing (literary composition). In *Asās [al-balāghab, al-Zamakhsharī]* says that a book or another beautiful object is called *ḥarrār* when it is accomplished and corrected in appropriate way; Mütercim Âsim Efendi, *Kâmûsu'l-Mubîṭ Tercümesi: el-Okyânûsu'l-Basîṭ fî Tercemeti'l-Kâmûsi'l-Mubîṭ*, ed. Mustafa Koç and Eyyüp Tanrıverdi (Istanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2013), 2:1869. [al-tahrîr], in *al-takrîm* meter. The term is also applied to the adornment of the writings in a book or the liberation of a slave. It is also used for giving a child to the service of Allah, by giving him to the service of the House of God or masjid. Vankulu Mehmed Efendi (Mehmed b. Mustafâ el-Vânî), “Tahrîr,” Vankulu Lügati, ed. Mustafa Koç and Eyyüp Tanrıverdi (Istanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2014), 2:727.

³⁸ In Giresun Yazmalar copy, 164^b, the text of Ibn Abî 'Abd al-Dayyân, *tahrîr*, the infinitive form of *ḥarrara*, is used in the sense of “copying.” The copyist is also the copyist of the copy of *al-Risālah al-bādīyah* of 'Abd al-Salām al-Muhtadī available at Süleymaniye Library, Esad Efendi MS 225 6/5, fols. 203-210. The same person is also the copyist of Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Anṣārî's, *Maqāmi' bāmāt al-ṣulbān wa-rawāti' rawḍāt al-īmān* available at Esad Efendi 225, 6/4: *Ḥarrarabū al-faqîr Fayḍ Allāh al-'Aḫfîf al-mudarris bi-Dār al-salṭanab al-'ulyā fî sanat kbams wa-mi'atayn ba'd al-hijrah ... sanat 1205*. The name of author is mentioned on the first page after the expression “*wa-ba'd*,” and even at the end, as in the available copies of *Kashf*, after the word “*tamma*,” following the verbs *na-ma-qa-bū* or *aw-ḍa-ḥa-bū*. For use of “*ḥar-ra-ra*” and “*tahrîr*” in the sense of copy and other meanings, see Adam Gacek, *Arapça Elyazmaları İçin Rehber*, trans. Ali Benli and M. Cüneyt Kaya (Istanbul: Klasik Yayınları, 2000). For *ḥarrara* in the sense of copy and relevant examples, see p. 68, 72, 138; 286, 331, 346.

writing of a book.³⁹ Moreover, the presence of two dates at the end of the Bağdatlı Vehbi copy does not mean that the first date points out the time of the writing while the second date indicate the date of the copying. Indeed, some copyists have preserved the date of the previous copy of the text.⁴⁰ If the problem was seen in this way, then there would be no necessity or place for strained interpretations regarding which of the abovementioned dates is the actual date of the text or discussion regarding the identification of the context and sources in consideration of the mentioned date.

Instead, similar to historical criticism, it would much more accurate to base decisions regarding the date of the text on exact and definite data, such as dates and the names of persons and places. For instance,

³⁹ In addition to the abovementioned examples of the use of *ḥar-ra-ra* in the sense of “copy,” we have also seen it used for “author” in a text. This text is the conversion story of Meḥmed of Athens, even though it is referred through different names in various editions. There is an inscription at the end of this text: “*Fa’llāb al-mu‘in wa-‘alaybi l-taklān wa-buwa l-musta‘ān. Ḥarrartuhā bi l-ibrām fī shabr min shubūr arba wa-tbalāthīn wa-alf min al-bijrab al-nabawiyyab ‘alaybi afḍal al-taḥiyyab wa-ana l-faqīr Maḥmūd ibn Ḥasan al-Qāḍī mu’allifubū.*” Here, Qāḍī Maḥmūd uses *ḥar-rar-tu* and includes the word *mu’allif* (author) in order to clarify his point. This record can be apparently read as if Meḥmed of Athens, a converted man, educated himself and became an Ottoman qāḍī. Nonetheless, since the protagonist of the story is called Meḥmed, whereas the author calls himself Maḥmūd, and since Meḥmed converted to Islam at a relatively later age, it becomes unlikely that a converted Muslim trained himself to attain the post of qāḍī. İrfan İnce puts forth the following suggestion about the author of mentioned text; the difference between the protagonist and the author of the text arises from the fact that Meḥmed of Athens, who was not fluent in Turkish, told his story to Qāḍī Maḥmūd, who transformed the story into a text for Ottoman luminaries making use of his own cultural background. Therefore, the words *ḥarrartu* and *mu’allif* herein apparently do not mean writing of an original text by thinking, studying, and building it in person. Rather, pursuant to the meaning given in *Qāmūs*, it seems more appropriate to accept it in the sense of “good, correct, and appropriate writing” of the story told by Meḥmed. It is possible to liken this manner of writing to transformation of a story or text, which is apparently told or written by some famous personalities, into a literary text by an editor in the modern sense. For detailed information about Meḥmed of Athens and the book, see İnce and Aydın, “Bir 17. Yüzyıl İhtida Anlatısı,” 507-578.

⁴⁰ Orhan Bilgin, “Ferâğ Kaydı,” in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XII, 355.

Shaykh al-Islām Sa‘dī Efendī is mentioned in all four available copies, which were obviously copied from different versions, as well as in the fifth Sofia version,⁴¹ which was available for examination by Pfeiffer. It is impossible that any common name is wrong or, as Pfeiffer puts forth, was subsequently added to the text by another copyist, as these texts have different copy dates and locations.⁴² As we have already indicated above and as Pfeiffer also puts forth, Sa‘dī Efendī was an Ottoman Shaykh al-Islām who passed away in 945/1539. Once it became definite that Sa‘dī Efendī was the essential element of the text and that *Kashf* was therefore written in 16th century, it would be unnecessary to seek any further strained explanation, such as the argument that Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān actually just translated the text of Ṭāshkuprīzādah and only made a few of his own additions.

If the foregoing fact were accepted in the first place, then *Kashf* would accurately be considered a continuation of the tradition, including earlier Jewish-based authors such as ‘Abd al-Salām al-Muhtadī, Salam (?)⁴³ ‘Abd al-‘allām, who made use of Hebrew Bible

⁴¹ This Sofia copy and the one registered under no. 3574/12 at Giresun Yazmalar might be copied from the same copy/version or from one another. Indeed, only two of five available copies mention him as Kepenekçi/Kepenkçizâde. See Yūsuf Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān, *Radd ‘itiqādāt al-Yabūd* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Giresun Yazmalar, MS 3574/12), fol. 134^b.

⁴² By providing information about Sa‘dī Efendī in *al-Sbaqā’iq*, Ṭāshkuprīzādah indicates that he was interested in odd/rare books (see Ṭāshkuprīzādah, *Osmanlı Bilginleri*, 322). Based on this fact, Pfeiffer claims that it is possible to accept it as an implication about interreligious discussions; nonetheless, this implication remains a speculation since Ṭāshkuprīzādah does not inform the reader about these books. However, even if both the mentioned expression of Ṭāshkuprīzādah and the reference to Sa‘dī Efendī in *Kashf* indicate that the question about eternal character of Judaism is discussed through the word “Olam” in Torah, they can be considered as information that does not refute but rather supports each other; consequently, even this fact ensures acceptance of the text as a work from 16th century. For the statement by Pfeiffer, see “Confessional polarization,” 29.

⁴³ The word “Salam” herein is not the name of the author and it is given in the catalog as “‘Abd al-‘Allām;” nevertheless, in their studies about the refutation by mentioned author, Joseph Sadan, Camilla Adang, and Sabine Schmidtke gave his name as “Salam Abdulallām.” Sadan, in particular, puts forth numerous grounds in order to justify this choice. The question is dealt in the following paper: Fuat Aydın and Halim Öznurhan, “Bir Nev-Müslimin Yahudilik Reddiyesi: *Risāletü İlzāmi’l-*

exegeses that became available in Istanbul in 1504. A comparison between the texts of these authors reveals an expansion and complexification from ‘Abd al-‘Allām, who adopted a simpler approach, to ‘Abd al-Salām and then to Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān in terms of the division of subjects into chapters and the style of explaining these subjects. The first work consists of two chapters, whereas the second and third texts comprise three and four chapters, respectively. Therefore, Schmidtke is right to assert that ‘Abd al-Salām cannot be the reference for Ṭāshkuprīzādah, despite similarities between the two texts.⁴⁴ Indeed, the text of Ṭāshkuprīzādah consists of four chapters and gives a more detailed account of the references available in the of ‘Abd al-Salām. Consequently, it seems reasonable to assert that the text of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān must have served as a reference for that of Ṭāshkuprīzādah, whose work comprises four chapters and gives a more detailed account of the mentioned references than does the text of ‘Abd al-Salām.

Thus, all seems to fall in place. The text was put on paper in a time and environment when Andalusia-based Jews became gradually more apparent and prominent in Ottoman territory. As of 1492, Jews began to be more involved in the public life in Ottoman cities, including Istanbul. In addition, the Andalusia-based intellectual Jews used to discuss religious issues with the highest level of Muslim scholars (for example, Shaykh al-Islām Sa‘dī Efendī) at this time and argued that Judaism was an eternal religion not abolished by Islam. Moreover, a Muslim group called the Lovers of the Messiah (*Ḥubmesīḫīler*)⁴⁵ defended the idea that the Old and New Testaments were still in effect. In such an environment, Ottoman Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent ordered Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān to write a work about the Jews. Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān wrote the text and submitted it to the Sultan.⁴⁶ Ibn

Yebūd fī mā Ze‘amū fī’t-Tevrāt min Kibeli ‘İlmi’l-Kelām, *Darulfunun Ilabiyat* 30, no. 2 (2019), 457-498, <https://doi.org/10.26650/di.2019.30.2.0032>.

⁴⁴ Schmidtke, “The Rightly Guiding Epistle (*er-Risāla al-bādiya*) by ‘Abd al-Salām al-Muhtadī al-Muḥammadī: A Critical Edition,” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 36 (2009), 444.

⁴⁵ Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülbidler (15.-17. Yüzyıllar)* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998), 228-230.

⁴⁶ “Having minimized earthly affairs, I sat alone during my old age in a corner of departure distant from the world in order to allocate rest of my life to obedience and worship of God. (...) All of a sudden came an offer for service at the discretion of corporals and sergeants and providence of God; I, however, felt incompetent of

Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān mentioned Sa‘dī Efendī on two occasions; these two references makes it reasonable and even necessary to date his text to sometime between 1533 and 1539, i.e., the period of his tenure as Shaykh al-Islām until his demise. If the work were written afterwards, then Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān would have used, at the very least, the term *marbūm* [the late], as they do when the name of a dead person is mentioned in a text.

Once we accept Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān’s text as the reference for that of Tashkoprizādāh, then it becomes clear why, to the surprise of Schmidtke and Adang, Tashkoprizādāh was so familiar with Jewish literature. This acquaintance is owed to the text of *Kashf* by ‘Abd al-Dayyān, who was noticeably familiar with and made use of the Jewish literature available in Istanbul at the time. In fact, we can reverse the argument made by Pfeiffer about the work of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān and assert that the text of Tashkoprizādāh is a complete translation, and maybe –pursuant to the modern perspective– a plagiarism of the work of Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān.⁴⁷

Such an argument will also make it easier to answer the question posited by Krstić about why Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān never mentions the name of Sabbatai Zvi or his movement; i.e., a text written in one century obviously cannot talk about an incident yet to take place a century later.

Conclusion

Muslim refutations against Judaism and Christianity in the Eastern and Western Islamic worlds began to be published and studied in academic spheres particularly after the Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican. Even though Mehmet Aydın dealt with some anti-Christian

fulfilling this service since I neither had the power nor the will for it,” In original: “Ve dünya meşgalesin takhîf idüb pîrlik ‘âleminde baqıyye-yi [omrumı] tã‘ata ve ‘ibâdete sarf itmek niyyeti ile zâviye-i ferâgatde münzevi olub oturdum. (...) [Nâgah taqdir-i rütebâni ve qaqlâ-yı sübhan ile quvette ve qudrette imtisâline istiñâ‘atım, ityânına tãqatım hakkında gönlüme ehliyetim olmayan bir khidmetin teklifi nazil oldu. Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān, *Radd ‘itiqâdât al-Yahūd* (Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Giresun Yazmalar, MS 3610), fol. 32^b.

⁴⁷ According to Pfeiffer, the additions made by Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān to the literally translated sections of Tashkoprizādāh’s work have complemented the text to make in more persuasive; thus, she admits that the contributions by Yūsuf extend beyond the translation; “Confessional Polarization,” 36.

texts written in the 19th century in his earlier study, another forty years would pass before the classical Ottoman era became the subject of more widespread attention and interest. In 2003, we conducted a literature review to identify texts against Judaism and Christianity during the classical Ottoman age, and we carried out translations and studies about some of them, albeit they were not published. Later, refutations by Jewish-based authors from the Ottoman classical period against Judaism were studied, and relevant editing and publications were carried out within the scope of the research project led by Camilla Adang. One of the first and most comprehensive studies was that by Judith Pfeiffer, which focused on *Kashf al-asrār* by Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān. Among the two recorded dates (1061/1651 and 1177/1763) found in the copy available at Süleymaniye Library, Bağdatlı Vehbi collection, Pfeiffer considers the first date as the date of the writing and the second date as the date of copy; as a result, she argues that the context of this work is related to the debate between the Qāḍīzādeli and Sivāsī movements in the 17th century. Thus, Pfeiffer associates refutation with this dispute and displays significant and lengthy effort to justify her argument. The acceptance that this work was written in the 17th century makes problematic the meeting of the author with Shaykh al-Islām Sa‘dī Efendī (d. 945/1539), who is mentioned in each copy of the text; it also makes problematic the lack of mention of Sabbatai Zvi, one of the most important phenomena of the time, as noted by Kristić. Likewise, *Risālah fī l-radd ‘alā l-Yabūd* by Ṭāshkuprīzādah, which has been considered as the source for and original text of ‘Abd al-Dayyān’s text, sparked about additional problems and questions. The most important question concerns the abundance of quotations from Hebrew Bible literature –particularly from Talmudic texts–present in the tract of Ṭāshkuprīzādah, as well as etymological analyses of these quotations and numerous nominal references to medieval Jewish authors. Indeed, relevant biographies provide no information that Ṭāshkuprīzādah had the necessary background to carry out such analyses or to refer to the mentioned medieval Jewish exegetes.

As we have demonstrated above, all these problems are solved once we admit the correctness of the common use of *ḥurrira* in the sense of copying and the identical mentions of Shaykh al-Islām Sa‘dī Efendī in all the texts copied from different versions. Accordingly, since it is definitely known that Sa‘dī Efendī lived in the mid-16th century, the text must have been written in the 16th century and not in the 17th

century. In addition, that text was written not because of the Qāḏizādelī-Sivāsī debate but as a consequence of the unease caused by the ever-growing presence of Jews in Ottoman public life starting in the 15th and 16th centuries; this unease was due to the multiplication of the Jewish population by six or seven times in major Ottoman cities such as Istanbul and Thessaloniki and the rising involvement of Jews in religious discussions with Muslims. Therefore, when the text is definitively dated to the mid-16th century, it is clear why it does not mention Sabbatai Zvi. Indeed, any mention of his name would be meaningless/problematic under these circumstances. Then, again, it would be a more reasonable explanation that *Risālah fi l-radd ‘alā l-Yabūd* by Ṭāshkuprīzādah, who does not come from a background that is able to justify his competence about Jewish religious literature, is not a reference literally translated into Turkish but instead is the Arabic translation of *Kashf* by Ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Dayyān.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude for Yasin Meral for reading and reviewing this text, as well as to Feyza Betül Aydın, Muhammed Mücahit Dünder, and Süleyman Akkuş.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adang, Camilla. "A Polemic against Judaism by A Convert to Islam from the Ottoman Period: *Risālat ilzām al-yabūd fīmā za‘amū fi l-Tawrāt min qibal ‘ilm al-kalām*." *Journal Asiatique* 297, no. 1 (2009): 131-151. <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783956506826-57>.
- . "Guided to Islam by the Torah: The *Risāla al-hādiya* by ‘Abd al-Salām al-Muhtadī al-Muḥammadī." *Contacts and Controversies between Muslims, Jews and Christians in the Ottoman Empire and Pre-Modern Iran*. Edited by Camilla Adang, Sabine Schmidtke, 57-72. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Kommission, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783956506826-57>.
- Adang, Camilla, and Sabine Schmidtke, eds. *Contacts and Controversies between Muslims, Jews and Christians in the Ottoman Empire and Pre-Modern Iran*. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Kommission, 2016.

- Alici, Mehmet. "Osmanlı Son Döneminde Müslüman-Hıristiyan Tartışmalarına Dair Bir Karşılaştırma: Şemsü'l-Hakîka ve Râfî'u's-Şübühât ya'ni, Cevâb-i Risâle-i Şemsü'l-Hakikat". *Mukaddime: Mardin Artuklu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 7, no. 1 (2016): 31-52. <https://doi.org/10.19059/mukaddime.26539>.
- Aslan, Adnan. "Batı Perspektifinde Dini Çoğulculuk Meselesi." *İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi* 2 (1998): 143-163.
- Aydın, Fuat. "Konjonktürün Ürettiği Yahudi-karşıtı Bir On altıncı Yüzyıl Reddiyesi: *Kütâbu Keşfi'l-Esrâr Fî İlzâmî'l-Yebûd ve'l-Abbâr*." In *Osmanlı'da Felsefe, Tasavvuf ve Bilim*, edited by Fuat Aydın and Mükerrerem Zülfişar Bedizel, 199-245. İstanbul: OMAMER & Mahya, 2016.
- Aydın, Fuat and Halim Öznurhan. "Bir Nev-Müslimin Yahudilik Reddiyesi: *Risâletü İlzâmî'l-Yebûd fî mâ Ze'amû fî't-Tevrât min Kıbeli 'İlmi'l-Kelâm*." *Darülfunun İlahiyat* 30, no. 2 (2019), 457-498. <https://doi.org/10.26650/di.2019.30.2.0032>.
- Aydın, Mehmet. "Hıristiyanlığa Karşı Yazılmış Türkçe Reddiyeler." *Diyanet Dergisi* 19, no. 1 (1983): 15-23.
- . *Müslümanların Hıristiyanlara Karşı Yazdıkları Reddiyeler ve Tartışma Konuları*. Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1989.
- ben-Naeh, Yaron. *Jews in the Realm of Sultans: Ottoman Jewish Society in the Seventeenth Century*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Bilgin, Orhan. "Ferâğ Kaydı." In *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XII, 354-356.
- Braudel, Benjamin, and Bernard Lewis, eds. *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*. 2 vols. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1982.
- . *History of the Jewish Community in Istanbul: The Formative Years, 1453-1566*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Caspar, Robert, et al. "Bibliographie Du Dialogue Islamo-Chrétien, Bibliographie (VII^e X^e siècle)." *Islamochristiana* 1 (1975): 125-176.
- . "Bibliographie Du Dialogue Islamo-Chrétien, Bibliographie (XI^e XII^e siècle)." *Islamochristiana* 5 (1977): 255-284;
- . "Bibliographie Du Dialogue Islamo-Chrétien, Bibliographie (XIII^e XIV^e siècle)." *Islamochristiana* 4 (1978): 247-267.
- . "Bibliographie Du Dialogue Islamo-Chrétien, Bibliographie (XI^e XII^e siècle)." *Islamochristiana* 5 (1979): 299-317.
- De Epalza-Khoury et al. "Bibliographie Du Dialogue Islamo-Chrétien, Bibliographie (XI^e XII^e siècle)." *Islamochristiana* 2 (1976): 187-248.
- Doğan, Hatice. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Habambaşılık Müessesesi*. İstanbul: Gözlem Gazetecilik Basın Yayın A.Ş., 2003.
- Eroğlu, Ahmet Hikmet. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Yahudiler: XIX. Yüzyılın Sonuna Kadar*. Ankara: Berivan Yayınları, 2013.

- Göregen, Mustafa. *Müslüman-Yahudi Polemikleri*. İstanbul: Hikmetevi Yayınları, 2014.
- Ibn Abî ‘Abd al-Dayyân, Yûsuf. *Kitâb kashf al-asrâr fî ilzâm al-Yabûd wa-l-aḥbâr*. İstanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Bağdatlı Vehbi, MS 2022, fol. 112a-121a.
- İnce-, İrfan, and Fuat Aydın. “Bir 17. Yüzyıl İhtida Anlatısı: Bir Atinalı Mühtedî, Bir Osmanlı Kadısı.” In *Sabn-ı Semân’dan Dârü’fünûn’a, Osmanlı’da İlim ve Fikir Dünyası: Âlimler, Müesseseler ve Fikrî Eserler XVII. Yüzyıl*. 507-578. İstanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2017.
- İpşirli, Mehmet, and Ziya Demir. “Sâdî Çelebi.” In *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXXV, 404-405.
- Krstić, Tijana. *Osmanlı Dünyasında İbtida Anlatıları: 15-17. Yüzyıllar*. Translated by Ahmet Tunç Şen. İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2015.
- Levi, Avigdor, ed. *The Jews of the Ottoman Empire*. Princeton/Washington: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Meral, Yasin. “Yahudi-Hıristiyan-Müslüman Reddiye Geleneği.” In *Dinlerarası İlişkiler El Kitabı*, edited by Ali İsra Güngör, 161-176. Ankara: Grafik Yayınları, 2017.
- Mutçalı, Serdar. *Arapça-Türkçe Sözlük*. İstanbul: Dağarcık Yayınları, 1995.
- Perlmann, Moshe, “The Medieval Polemics between Islam and Judaism.” In *Religion in a Religious Age*, edited by S. D. Goitein, 103-138. Cambridge: Association for Jewish Studies, 1974.
- Pfeiffer, Judith. “Confessional polarization in the 17th century Ottoman Empire and Yûsuf Ibn Ebi ‘Abdü’l-Deyyân’s *Keşfü’l-esrâr fî ilzâmi’l-Yebûd ve’l-aḥbâr*.” In *Contacts and Controversies between Muslims, Jews and Christians in the Ottoman Empire and Pre-Modern Iran*, edited by Camilla Adang and Sabine Schmidtke, 15-56. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Kommission, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783956506826-15>.
- Rozen, Minna. *Jewish Identity and Society in the Seventeenth Century: Reflections on the Life and Work of Refal Mordkhai Malki*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992.
- Samir, Khalil et al. “Bibliographie Du Dialogue Islamo-Chrétien, Bibliographie (septième partie), Auteurs arabes chrétiens du XIII^e siècle.” *Islamochristiana* 7 (1981): 299-317.
- Schmidtke, Sabine. “Epistle Forcing the Jews [to admit their error] with regard to what they contend about the Torah, by dialectical reasoning (*Risâlat ilzâm al-yabûd fî mâ za’amû fî l-tawrât min qibal ‘ilm al-kalâm*) by al-Salâm ‘Abd al-‘Allâm. A Critical Edition.” In *Contacts and Controversies between Muslims, Jews and Christians in the Ottoman Empire and Pre-Modern Iran*, edited by Camilla Adang and Sabine Schmidtke, 73-82. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag Würzburg in Kommission, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783956506826-73>.
- Schmidtke, Sabine, and Camilla Adang. “Aḥmad b. Muştafâ Tâshkubrîzâde’s (d. 968/1561) Polemical Tract against Judaism.” *Al-Qantara* 29 no. 1 (2008):79-113. <https://doi.org/10.3989/alqantara.2008.v29.i1.50>.

- . “The Rightly Guiding Epistle (*er-Risāla al-bādiya*) by ‘Abd al-Salām al-Muhtadī al-Muḥammadī: A Critical Edition.” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 36 (2009): 439-470.
- Steinschneider, Moritz. *Polemische und apologetische Litarature in arabischer Sprace, zwischen Muslimen, Christen und Juden, nebst Anhängen verwandten Inabts*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlansbuchhandlung, 1966.
- Ṭāshkuprīzādah Aḥmad Efendī (as Taşköprülüzâde), *Osmanlı Bilginleri: eş-Şakâiku'n-Nu'mâniyye fî ulemâi'd-Devleti'l-Osmâniyye*. Translated by Muharrem Tan. Istanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2007.
- Taşpınar, İsmail. *Hacı Abdullah Petrici'nin Hristiyanlık Eleştirisi*. Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı, 2014.
- Vankulu Mehmed Efendi (Mehmet b. Mustafa el-Vânî). *Vankulu Luğatı*. 2 vols. Edited by Mustafa Koç and Eyyüp Tanrıverdi. Istanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2014.