One-day Workshop
State, Religion, and Authority in the Post-Mongol Persianate World and Beyond

**Date and Time**: March 19 (Sun) 10:30-18:30

**Venue**: Room 303, Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia, The University of Tokyo

**Program**

**Session 1: Aspects and Manifestations of Political Authority in Mongol and Post-Mongol Periods (13th-15th c.)**

10:30-10:40 Opening remarks
10:40-11:25 Hiroyuki Ogasawara (Kyushu University): Solving the Ottoman Genealogical Puzzle
11:30-12:15 İlker Evrim Binbaş (The University of Bonn): The Qaraqoyunlu, Shi‘ism, and the Idea of Confessional Ambiguity

Lunch

13:30-14:15 Judith Pfeiffer (The University of Bonn): Spiritual Authority, Political Hierarchy, and Social Order in the Works of Rashīd al-Dīn
14:15-14:45 Discussion (chaired by Kazuo Morimoto, The University of Tokyo)

Coffee break

**Session 2: Confessionalization in Global Context: The Ottoman Empire, Europe, and Japan**

15:15-15:25 Opening remarks
15:25-16:10 Derin Terzioğlu (Boğaziçi University/Freie Universität Berlin): The Uses and Limits of the Confesionalization Paradigm in Making Sense of the Social and Political History of Islam in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire
16:15-17:00 Tomoji Odori (Musashi University): Confessionalization and Religious Minorities in Early Modern Europe and Tokugawa Japan

Coffee break

17:15-18:00 Masayuki Ueno (Osaka City University): Another Case of Confessionalization?: Ottoman Armenians in the 18th Century
18:00-18:30 Discussion (Chaired by Jun Akiba, Chiba University)
Abstracts

Solving the Ottoman Genealogical Puzzle
Hiroyuki Ogasawara
Kyushu University

Early Ottoman chronicles present different dynastic genealogies for the Ottomans, consisting of the names of over fifty people. Though nearly all researchers of Ottoman history must know of the existence of these genealogies, they have not been subject to serious research to date. One of the reasons for the neglect is that none of the genealogies the Ottoman historians present is historically plausible in content. This seems to have deprived researchers even the motive to consider those genealogies as discourse. However, analysis of the genealogy of the Ottoman dynasty provides valuable information for the understanding of how that dynasty claimed its legitimacy and what self-identification it held at different junctures. This paper clarifies the evolution of the Ottomans’ genealogical discourse as observed in their early chronicles and discusses its causes and significances.

The Qaraqoyunlu, Shi‘ism, and the Idea of Confessional Ambiguity
Evrim Binbaş
The University of Bonn

Unlike the neighboring Aqqoyunlu, Timurid, and Mamluk dynasties, the Qaraqoyunlu rulers left behind no ‘official’ account of their dynasty. This makes it difficult to discuss the confessional identity of specific Qaraqoyunlu rulers. In the past various scholars argued for the heterodoxy (à la Minorsky) or Shi‘ism (à la Köprülü). In my presentation, I will review the existing literature, and supplement the discussion with newly published literary and historical sources and unpublished manuscripts. I will argue in my paper that none of the conventional denominations, such as Shi‘i, Sunni, or heterodox, would explain the complexity of the Qaraqoyunlu religious life.
Spiritual Authority, Political Hierarchy, and Social Order in the Works of Rashīd al-Dīn
Judith Pfeiffer

When the Ilkhanid vizier and intellectual Rashīd al-Dīn was executed in 718/1318, the dynasty that he served had reached and arguably just passed the zenith of its aspirations to political and spiritual authority and centralized rule. Hülegüid succession was increasingly challenged by the rise of non-Chinggisid warlords, local notables, Sufi socioreligious networks, and competing millenarian, mahdist, letrist and occult ideologies. Rashīd al-Dīn’s views, developed at the height of centralized Ilkhanid power, are therefore representative only for a very specific point in time, and some of his writings evoke ideals more than they describe realities. That said, Rashīd al-Dīn’s writings remain unmatched in the detail of description, breadth of vision, and the unique insights that they afford into the inner dynamics of Mongol politics and political thought. The latter in particular was formative for several centuries to come and has had a lasting impact on Islamic political thought until today.

This lecture investigates the taxonomies of prophets, kings, and scholars that Rashīd al-Dīn established in his theoretical works, which he wrote largely during the reign of the Ilkhan Öljetū (r. 703-716/1304-1316). It argues that in portraying Öljetū as the enlightened ruler, he used and fused models of political thought that were well established in the Mongol and Muslim contexts respectively, which he knew equally well. Based on a close textual analysis of Rashīd al-Dīn’s largely unpublished theoretical works, this paper analyses some of the propositions that Rashīd al-Dīn made to the re-organization of existing taxonomies during Öljetū’s reign.

The Uses and Limits of the Confessionalization Paradigm in Making Sense of the Social and Political History of Islam in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire
Derin Terzioğlu
Boğaziçi University/Freie Universität Berlin

This paper aims to take stock of the potential uses and limitations of the confessionalization paradigm in analyzing the social and political history of Sunni Islam in the Ottoman Empire from the late fifteenth to the early eighteenth century. It is argued that the dynasty’s creation of a hierarchical learned establishment, its promotion of the Hanefi legal school in its courtrooms and madrasas and its promotion of mosques as central spaces of religious life provided an institutional framework for this process. Yet
the state was not only actor in this process, and the opinions of the top-ranking ulema did
not always carry the day when it came to articulating the fine points of Sunni orthodoxy.
This became especially evident in the seventeenth century, when greater numbers of
provincial scholars, Sufis and preachers joined the discussions, and at times effectively
reshaped the scholarly consensus, by bringing alternate Sunni (both Hanefi and
otherwise) scholarly traditions to bear on the Ottoman learned establishment. Whatever
the prevailing interpretation of Sunnism among the religious and political authorities, the
degree of success of its implementation also depended on the consent and cooperation of
Muslim laymen and women, and this, in turn, ensured that the process of Ottoman
Sunnitization/confessionalization had a rather varied record in different parts of the
empire.

Confessionalization and Religious Minorities
in Early Modern Europe
and Tokugawa Japan
Tomoji Odori
Musashi University

This paper deals with the early modern confessional differentiation and diversification,
focusing on the persecuted religious minorities in Europe and Japan, namely the
Anabaptists and the Kakure Kirishitan or hidden Christians. Their emergence was caused
by the epochal religious reforms that brought about missionary activities, proliferation of
popular religious movements, and greater magisterial controls over religious life and
morality. I will compare these two cases and argue that there are some interesting parallels
in terms of official religious restrictions, on the one hand, and confessional differentiation
or so-called "micro-confessionalization" in the unofficial or private sphere, on the other.

Another Case of Confessionalization?:
Ottoman Armenians in the 18th Century
Masayuki Ueno
Osaka City University

If confessionalization is a development urged by the necessity to respond to the challenge
of the other, Ottoman Armenians had considerable experience of it in the 18th century
due to their growing rivalry with the Catholic missionaries. My paper focuses on this case
of Ottoman Armenians. It briefly discusses the publication of catechisms by
Armenian high clergymen in vernacular languages as a response to those published by the Catholic missionaries in classical Armenian. Then, it deals with the Armenian Patriarchate’s relation with the Ottoman state through the analysis of charters of appointment granted by the latter to the former, arguing that the competition with the Catholics augmented the patriarchate’s necessity to depend on the state authority.