

PART ONE

Pan-Eurasian Expansions,  
ca. 1400–1600



# Imperial Ambitions, Mystical Aspirations

## *Persian Learning in the Ottoman World*

Murat Umut Inan

The preface to the 1504 commentary on the introduction to the *Gulistan* (Rose Garden) of Sa'di (d. 1292) of the Ottoman scholar Lami'i Çelebi (d. 1532), a Naqshbandi Sufi translator of the Timurid-era Sufi poet 'Abd al-Rahman Jami (d. 1492), begins:

It should be known that Persian is a language built upon beauty and elegance. Dari is another name of Persian. Lexicographers explain the reason [why Persian is also called Dari] as follows: Bahram Gur forbade the people in his palace to speak in Persian and to write the letters and edicts in Persian. Because at that time the language became associated with his palace, people called it Dari. . . . Since this language is founded on elegance, its alphabet does not include many letters [that are found in the Arabic alphabet]. First, it does not have the letter “s” [ث]. Second, it does not have the letter “h” [ح]. The words that are pronounced in this language with “h” [ح] are either of Arabic origin or borrowed from another language or have been corrupted by common use. The word “hiz” [حيز], which is a common word in Persian, means catamite. This word was originally spelled with “h” [ه], but people have corrupted the word, pronounced it harshly and spelled it with “h” [ح]. As a matter of fact, if one looks at Asadi Tusi's [d. 1072–73] *Mustashhadat* [Evidences], Hindushah Nakhichawani's [d. ca. 1375] *Sihah al-Furs* [Correct Meanings of Persian Words], or at the works of Qatran Urumawi [d. ca. 1072] and Shams Fakhri [d. unknown], may God have mercy on them, one can see that these scholars note that the original word is “hiz” [هيز].<sup>1</sup>

Designed as a textbook for Ottoman students, Lami'i's text is an early example of a growing corpus of commentaries produced for the teaching and study of Persian language and belles lettres in the Ottoman Empire. The passage above reflects Lami'i's erudite engagement with Persian language: his references to the oldest dictionaries of Persian are eye-catching in terms of showing the way an Ottoman scholar of Persian language and literature connects his work to the

scholarship produced in Central Asia and Iran. Based in Bursa, the first Ottoman capital, which was the final destination of the trade caravans coming from Tabriz, a city in the northwest of Iran, Lami'i Çelebi enjoyed and was influenced by the Persian atmosphere in the city, which gave him access to many Persian artifacts and books, including fine copies of Persian literary classics. As such, Lami'i Çelebi's life and work present a telling example of the close literary, cultural, and scholarly ties the Ottomans had with the broader geographies of "Persographia," a world interconnected by Persian literacy.<sup>2</sup>

The wide presence and influence of the Persian language in the Ottoman Empire is well known and has been repetitively pointed out in scholarship, from Orientalist philology to modern studies.<sup>3</sup> Some basic, yet critical, questions have remained largely unexplored, however. For example, what interested a scholar like Lami'i Çelebi, or the Ottomans in general, in Persian? How and for what purposes did they study or teach the language? And on a larger scale, how and why was Persian gradually incorporated into Ottoman language, literature, scholarship, and culture? This chapter explores these questions by mapping out the reception of Persian in the Ottoman world between 1400 and 1800, an overarching period during which Persian learning gradually gained momentum in various circles in the Ottoman capital and beyond. In charting a history of Ottoman engagements with the language, the chapter focuses on the work of major Ottoman Persianists, namely those scholars who devoted most of their time to the study and teaching of Persian and produced a range of learning materials for Ottoman students and readers, and particularly seeks to shed light on the contexts of Persian learning and to understand the motivations of the teachers and students of Persian.

The following pages argue that the Ottoman interest in Persian went beyond a fascination with the richness and beauty of the language but was rather informed predominantly by imperial intentions and mystical aspirations. For the flowering of Persian learning in the Ottoman world coincides with the launching of literary, artistic, and intellectual projects in the fifteenth century by Murad II (r. 1421–51) and his son Mehmed II (r. 1451–81) who, along with the imperial elite, not only showed particular interest in Persian but also encouraged and sponsored the study and appropriation of the language and its culture by scholars and literati. Pursued by the Ottoman dynasty for generations, these projects arguably contributed, among other things, to creating and cultivating an imperial language, identity, and culture for an empire both modeled on and in competition with the Arabic and Persian worlds, and particularly with the latter. Alongside this imperial reception, there developed a mystical interest in Persian, which is perhaps the second major phenomenon that paved the way for the efflorescence of Persian learning in the Ottoman world. On the one hand, Ottoman mystical orders took the Persian tradition as a model and established close relations with Persian schools of mysticism, which gave rise to an exchange of texts and scholars between the Ottoman lands, Iran, and Central Asia. This vibrant mystical network contributed to,

and kept alive, a broader Ottoman interest in the language as well as in Persian mystical literature and culture. On the other hand, within the Ottoman mystical canon itself, the Mawlawi and Naqshbandi orders, in particular, took the lead in promoting the study of the language through instruction in the classics of Persian mysticism.

The next section begins by discussing the imperial aspects of the appropriation of Persian in the Ottoman world with examples from the mid-fifteenth to the late sixteenth century, a period during which the Ottoman state became an empire. On the one hand, the discussion draws attention to the way in which Persian, along with Arabic, was increasingly integrated into Turkish in the making of an imperial language. On the other hand, the discussion highlights how mastery of Persian reading and writing became an indispensable component of Ottoman imperial identity. Finally, the chapter turns to the careers and works of a sample selection of Ottoman Persianists, placing an emphasis on their connections with imperial and mystical circles of Persian learning.

#### A NEW LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY FOR A NEW EMPIRE

The rise of Persian in the *diyar-ı Rum* (Land of Rome), which is to say Ottoman Anatolia and Rumelia (i.e., the Balkans), begins in the second half of the fifteenth century, when Sultan Mehmed II, following in the footsteps of his father, Murad II, encouraged the crafting of an Ottoman imperial identity, designated as *Rumi* (literally, “the one from Rum”) and *Rumiyan* (plural of *Rumi*, “people of Rum”).<sup>4</sup> This identity-making process involved a language inspired by the literary and bureaucratic vernacular of Persia. Determined to foster the creation of a new language and literary-artistic culture for his blossoming court in Istanbul, Mehmed II urged those under his patronage to engage with the models offered by Persian cultural capitals such as Shiraz and Tabriz, and particularly by the Timurid court of Husayn Bayqara (r. 1469–1506) in Herat in what is today northwestern Afghanistan. The writings of two famous Timurid figures associated with Bayqara’s court held sway on the Ottoman court and high culture as well as on Istanbul’s mystical scene: the language and style of the bureaucrat, scholar, and poet ‘Ali Shir Nawa’i (1441–1501) were perused and emulated by court literati, and those of the Naqshbandi scholar and poet ‘Abd al-Rahman Jami, who was invited to Istanbul by Mehmed II, were widely embraced in Sufi circles.<sup>5</sup>

Called alternatively *lisan-ı Türki*, *zeban-ı Türki* (both meaning “Turkish language”), *lisan-ı Rum*, or *zeban-ı Rum* (both meaning “the language of Rum”), the new language of the Ottomans was infused with extensive borrowings from Arabic and especially from Persian. It functioned as an imperial language in the sense that it served for centuries as the language particularly of the Ottoman court, bureaucracy, diplomacy, and literature.<sup>6</sup> Beginning in the mid-fifteenth century,

the language was gradually developed in the hands of Ottoman bureaucrats, historians, and literati, who turned to Persian models to create and enrich a literary and chancery language through lexical appropriations, syntactic adaptations, and stylistic reworkings. The outcome was an amalgam of Turkish, Arabic, and Persian that was celebrated as a language fit for an empire that laid claim to the heritage of the Arabo-Persian world. “The language of Rum is the most beautiful, ornate, sparkling, and elegant of all languages,” the Ottoman court historian Ta’likizade (d. 1606?) states in the preface to his *Şehname-i Hümayun* (Imperial Book of Kings). This, he implies, is thanks to its reception and blending of the rhetorical and artistic resources of Arabic and Persian. Drawing a parallel between the language and its users, Ta’likizade adds that the “Rumiyan” (meaning learned Ottomans) are “adorned” with the intellectual heritage of the “Arabs” and “Persians” because they are “in between.” The Ottoman world is thus tied to and draws upon the Arabic and Persian worlds. Ta’likizade goes on to say that Murad III (r. 1574–95) had particularly asked him to write, not in Persian, but in the “pleasing language of Rum,” which suggests that by the late sixteenth century, Ottoman Turkish, the language of Rum, was prestigious enough to compete with Persian.<sup>7</sup>

Ottoman Turkish is similarly portrayed in the writings of Ta’likizade’s contemporaries. In biographies of Ottoman poets in his *Künhü’l-Ahbar* (Essence of Histories), for instance, the bureaucrat, historian, and litterateur Mustafa ‘Ali (d. 1600) frequently touches on the significance of the hybrid language of Rum, of which he clearly saw Persian as a key component. One of the poets ‘Ali discusses at length is Mehmed II’s favorite vizier, poet, and adviser Ahmed Pasha (d. 1496), who, to quote the Ottoman literary critic Latifi (d. 1582), “studied books and *diwans* [poetry collections] in the Persian language carefully and extensively” in honing his poetic style and constructing a literary language furnished with “Rumi words.”<sup>8</sup> A poet himself, ‘Ali introduces Ahmed Pasha as the “forerunner of [Ottoman] poets and rhetoricians” and agrees with his contemporaries that he pioneered in adapting Persian language and poetry into the vernacular. ‘Ali celebrates Ahmed as a skilled panegyrist, but nonetheless finds him insufficiently eloquent, arguing that he fails to articulate a language in which Turkish, Persian, and Arabic are harmoniously intertwined with each other. Since “the Turkish language is harsh by nature and is in every respect hardly eloquent, it should always be blended with the honey-sweet words of the Persian language and should sometimes be intermingled with the sugary expressions of the Arabic language,” ‘Ali says.<sup>9</sup> The language of Ahmed Pasha, a poet of the previous century, seemed unrefined to late sixteenth-century imperial elites, who frequently sprinkled their writings with Persian words and phrases.

By the sixteenth century, Persian increasingly permeated Ottoman Turkish, and the consensus among learned Ottomans was that the less Persianized Turkish of the preceding eras had been uncourtly and unsophisticated. Reviewing the works of the early fifteenth-century poet Şeyhi (d. after 1429) in his *Tezkiretü’ş-Şu’ara*

(Biography of Poets), for example, Latifi writes that Şeyhi's *Hüsrev ü Şirin* (Khusraw and Shirin), a romance modeled on Nizami's (1141–1209) famous romance of the same title, features some “Oghuzid [Turkic] and nomadic” words and expressions, which he finds “strange” and even “barbaric.” Şeyhi should be excused for this, Latifi adds, since “at that time the Turkish language was not as elegant as it is now, and the style of the poets of the era was hardly eloquent.”<sup>10</sup>

As Turkish was elaborated with Persian and Arabic and began to establish itself as an imperial language, there emerged a growing need to teach this language to budding scribes, secretaries, and bureaucrats of the empire. Beginning especially in the mid-fifteenth century, a series of chancery manuals appeared, featuring refined samples of letter writing in Persian as well as in the language of Rum. Highlighting the style and conventions of chancery prose, these manuals were composed by Ottoman scholars proficient in Arabic, Turkish, and especially Persian. One famous example is the *Gülşen-i İnşa* (Rose Garden of Prose Writing) by Mahmud ibn Edhem (d.?), an Ottoman Naqshbandi scholar of Arabic and Persian, written in 1496 and presented to Sultan Bayezid II (r. 1481–1512). In the preface to his manual, Mahmud ibn Edhem remarks that he studied all the “major books” and “famous letters” by the masters of chancery writing in preparing his work, an indication that he was inspired by Persian and Arabic chancery models.<sup>11</sup> Unsurprisingly, those who became famous for their skills in bureaucratic and diplomatic language were often promoted. One important example is the case of Karamani Mehmed Pasha (d. 1481), one of Mehmed II's favorite bureaucrats, who later became his grand vizier. For many years, Mehmed Pasha worked closely with the sultan, and advised him on the making of laws and on structuring the empire's bureaucracy, playing a key role in the early stages of the making of a bureaucratic language and culture for the emerging empire. Also a trilingual poet with lineage ties to Jalal al-Din Rumi, Mehmed Pasha patronized literary composition, which spurred the poets in his entourage to hone a poetic language interwoven with Persian. Mehmed Pasha was noted by his contemporaries for his dexterity with the language of Rum and for his mastery of prose writing. In particular, the style and language of a diplomatic letter he composed in Turkish and sent on behalf of Mehmed II in response to a Persian letter from the Aqqoyunlu ruler Uzun Hasan (r. 1453–78) was greatly admired by courtiers and bureaucrats, so much so that he was promoted to the grand vizierate.<sup>12</sup> Mehmed Pasha's enviable command of the language had a long-standing impact on later generations of Ottoman bureaucrats. A century later, for instance, the Ottoman bureaucrat and historian Feridun Ahmed (d. 1583) included a copy of Mehmed Pasha's ornate letter in bureaucratic Turkish in his *Münşeatü's-Selatin* (Correspondence of Sultans), a collection of writings presented as exemplars of high-style Turkish and Persian prose, including diplomatic letters, imperial edicts, and warrants. Even a fastidious figure like Mustafa 'Ali welcomed Mehmed Pasha's rich, flowing language and applauded his letter as an “eloquent” piece of writing, embellished with “artistic words.”<sup>13</sup>

Not only was Persian mined to make Turkish an imperial language, but Ottoman royalty and the elite developed a growing interest in both reading and writing it. Starting especially with the fifteenth century, Persian learning became one of the integral components of imperial training. As candidates for running a fast-growing empire with ties and networks with the Persianate and Arabic worlds, Ottoman princes were schooled in Arabic and particularly in Persian. During his princely education, Murad II regularly studied Persian with his tutor Ahmed-i Da'i (d. after 1421). Early schooling in Persian spurred Ottoman sultans to internalize the language, which they incorporated as part of their imperial identity. 'Abdülhamid-i Sivasi's *Şahname* (Book of Kings), a Persian grammar and glossary he prepared for Murad II, says that the sultan was "very enthusiastic about using Persian words in his writings and correspondence as well as in his daily speech."<sup>14</sup> Indeed, Ottoman sultans' interaction with the language went beyond memorizing vocabulary and learning grammar rules. Most of them developed a keen interest in Persian poetry and experimented with the works of the master poets of Persia, leading them sometimes to compose Persian verses, sometimes to incorporate Persian into their Turkish poetry, and sometimes to do both. Some Ottoman sultans, like Selim I (r. 1512–20) and his son Süleyman I (r. 1520–66), went further: they adopted pen names, regularly composed poetry, and compiled *diwans* of their poems. Fashioning themselves as poets skilled in Persian, they frequently compared their poetry to that of Persian masters. Persian literary language and culture defined their poetic identity, which was also one of the key constituents of their imperial identity.

With the accession of Mehmed II, royal interest in Persian increased dramatically. Mehmed's reign was a time when "Persians were sought after and deeply respected," Latifi writes. The new sultan invited Persian men of letters and scholars to his court, and "on hearing this, many well-educated people from Persia came to the land of Rum."<sup>15</sup> As Istanbul attracted more and more Persian speakers, knowledge of the language gradually spread into all venues of the city, from the imperial palace to elite households and gradually to the wider society. One particularly significant venue of Persian learning was the palace school established by Mehmed II, the *Enderun*, where a select body of students was trained for high-rank bureaucratic, administrative, and military service. As the seventeenth-century British diplomat and historian Paul Rycaut (1628–1700) informs us, Ottoman students read Farid al-Din 'Attar's (1145–1221) *Pand-nama* (Book of Advice), Sa'di's *Gulistan* (Rose Garden) and *Bustan* (Orchard), and the *Diwan* of Hafiz of Shiraz, which were the most popular texts in the royal curriculum.<sup>16</sup>

Mehmed's successors followed the imperial tradition of Persian learning. Selim I and his son Süleyman were particularly ambitious to read and write in Persian. Selim was bilingual to the extent that he composed a Persian *diwan*. He was also "very fond of speaking Persian," Latifi tells us.<sup>17</sup> Inspired by his father, Süleyman was an avid reader of Persian literary classics and composed poetry in both

Turkish and Persian. According to Mustafa 'Ali, the sultan tried his hand in Persian poetry to acquire "a refined disposition," both as a poet and as a member of Ottoman royalty, which implies that in the eyes of a member of the Rumi elite like 'Ali, Persian learning was seen as essential for courtliness.<sup>18</sup> The extensive military campaigns in Persia launched by Selim and Süleyman opened the door to a significant number of Persian-speaking scholars, artists, and literati, who relocated to the Ottoman capital particularly from Tabriz and its environs. As more and more Persian speakers moved in, Istanbul became a full-fledged imperial metropolis, where Persian enjoyed wide usage and prestige.<sup>19</sup> In the case of both sultans, the interest in Persia and Persian was driven by, among other things, an imperial ambition to create a Rumi language, literature, and arts that were meant to supersede the Persian models. Sultan Selim's intention to make Istanbul a center of Persian learning and of craftsmanship inspired by the Persianate world is shown in an anecdote recorded by the sixteenth-century Ottoman poet and biographer Aşık Çelebi. Visiting the sultan after his return from the Tabriz campaign, Hayali Çelebi, one of Selim's close companions, found him downhearted and asked him why he was low-spirited. "We arrived in the land of the Persians and forced the talented ones to emigrate to the land of Rum," the sultan replied angrily. "My goal was that the talented men of Rum would surpass the Persians and achieve high rank in arts and crafts. But I hear that people still consult Persian masters, and that they feel ashamed to consult the Rumis. . . . It seems there is no one [among the learned Rumis] who can beat the Persians as I beat the [Safavid] king." Upon hearing these words, Hayali cited many examples to prove that Ottomans had produced works that would rival and even outshine those of the Persians, saying: "Oh my sultan, under the shadow of your felicity, Istanbul is now like Tabriz."<sup>20</sup> With Istanbul turning into a Persian city like Tabriz, knowledge of Persian became almost a necessity, and a cadre of scholars specializing in Persian grammar, literature, and rhetoric emerged, who produced a spectrum of texts tailored to diverse needs and interests.

#### OTTOMAN PERSIANISTS: CANONIZATION AND DIVERSIFICATION

Ahmed-i Da'i (d. after 1421), a gifted writer of both Persian and Turkish poetry, joined the Ottoman court at Edirne (formerly Adrianople) in eastern Thrace during the reign of Mehmed I (r. 1413–21). The first major Ottoman scholar of Persian, Da'i was responsible for the education of Mehmed's son, the future Murad II, and inspired the latter's deep interest in Persian language and literature.<sup>21</sup> Da'i's *Müfredat* (Basics), one of the earliest Ottoman Persian manuals, was intended as an elementary textbook. It consists of two main parts, which are preceded by a preface, in which Da'i observes that "in the cities of Rum" knowledge of Persian grammar is poor, both lexically and semantically. A common complaint of the learned men of

the time is that few people care about the correct use of Persian, he adds, and his friends and colleagues had therefore encouraged him to write this textbook illustrating correct Persian grammar and including a glossary of words frequently used in the works of Persian men of letters, which he hopes “beginners” (*mübtediye*) will find helpful.<sup>22</sup> The first part of the manual features two Persian-Turkish glossaries, a thematic glossary followed by a glossary of the most common Persian verbs, while the second part is devoted to the rudiments of Persian grammar. Da’i concludes: “This much is enough for beginners. If they would like to acquire more information, they should study the works of men of eloquence and the *diwans* of poets, so that they can advance [their Persian].”<sup>23</sup> Textbooks and glossaries are for novices, he observes; Persian poetry and rhetoric are for advanced students.

In the mid-to-late fifteenth century, men sponsored by Mehmed II and his son Bayezid II come to prominence in Ottoman scholarship. Lütfullah Halimi (d. shortly after 1497), who in his youth traveled to Iran to receive his scholarly training in Islamic jurisprudence and mysticism and to improve his Persian and acquire familiarity with Persian scholarship, was perhaps the most celebrated Persianist of the time. Upon his return, Halimi began working on his *Bahrü’l-Garayib* (Ocean of Subtleties), a three-part compendium of the Persian language, which he completed in 1446. The first part is a dictionary in verse where 2,930 Persian words are followed by their Turkish equivalents. The second part is a concise handbook that covers a variety of topics, ranging from the Persian calendar and astrology to literary genres and figures of speech. The last part features a manual of Persian prosody, to which is appended an elementary grammar of the language. As such, *Bahrü’l-Garayib* is a multifaceted text and the first of its kind in the Ottoman world, aiming to provide a basic yet thorough guide to the language for students of Persian, whom Halimi calls “nightingales in school gardens.” Besides the dictionary he included in his *Bahrü’l-Garayib*, Halimi compiled the first comprehensive Persian-Turkish dictionary in alphabetical order, *Lügat-i Halimi* (Halimi’s Dictionary), listing 6,060 Persian words with Turkish glosses. His works, particularly his *Lügat*, quickly enjoyed popularity and wide circulation, and Halimi attracted the attention of court circles, whereupon Mehmed II appointed him to tutor his son Bayezid (1447–1512), then the governor of Amasya, a city in northern Turkey. In 1467, Halimi prepared an abridged version of his *Lügat* for Bayezid. As the abundance of the manuscript copies suggests, the reception of Halimi’s *Lügat* went well beyond his own time. It became not only a major scholarly text, frequently referenced by later generations of Ottoman Persianists, but also a canonical textbook that would be used by teachers and students of Persian for centuries.<sup>24</sup>

In the first half of the sixteenth century, Persian learning spread well beyond the courtly and princely setting and thrived mainly in three sociocultural spaces. The first was the Naqshbandi community based in the city of Bursa. This vibrant community of Persian learning formed around the Naqshbandi poet, transla-

tor and scholar Lami'i Çelebi (d. 1532), who was inspired by the writings of 'Abd al-Rahman Jami. For readers who lacked knowledge of Persian, Lami'i translated a series of Persian literary and mystical classics including Jami's hagiographical compilation *Nafahat al-Uns* (Breezes of Intimacy), and his allegorical romance *Salaman and Absal*. The text Lami'i used for Persian instruction was the introductory portion of Sa'di's *Gulistan*, on which he wrote a commentary designed specifically to assist his students working with Sa'di's text and, more generally, to cater to those studying Persian grammar and vocabulary. For elementary classroom instruction, Lami'i compiled a Persian-Turkish glossary in verse form to help schoolboys memorize basic Persian vocabulary, *Lügat-i Manzume* (Glossary in Verse).<sup>25</sup>

The community gathered around the Mawlawi Sufi master and scholar Şahidi İbrahim Dede (1470–1550) was the second major Ottoman focus of Persian learning. In a range of Mawlawi circles, from Muğla, his native town located in the southwest of Turkey, to Konya, the hub of the Mawlawi order in central Anatolia, Şahidi regularly taught Rumi's *Masnawi* (Spiritual Verses) and interpreted the text for audiences eager for spiritual growth. In 1515, Şahidi prepared a Persian-Turkish glossary in verse for schoolboys and beginning students receiving a Mawlawi education, *Tuhfe-i Şahidi* (Gift of Şahidi), which contains a significant number of words from *Masnawi*. After the glossary, as a guide for advanced students and readers of Persian wanting to get into Rumi's text, Şahidi started working on *Gülşen-i Tevhid* (Rose Garden of Unity), a commentary in verse on selected parts of *Masnawi*, which he composed in Persian and completed in 1530. For the same students and readers, Şahidi authored another Persian commentary, this time on *Gulistan*, in which he glossed and annotated Sa'di's text in Persian. Among his works, it was *Tuhfe* that brought Şahidi recognition in the Ottoman world of Persian learning and had an influence far beyond his own time: it remained a popular work that attracted commentaries from instructors and scholars and was eventually printed in the nineteenth century.<sup>26</sup>

Madrasa-based circles formed the third strand of Persian learning in the early sixteenth-century Ottoman world, a strand in which the works of the polymath Kemalpaşazade (1469–1534) loomed large.<sup>27</sup> A preeminent scholar and madrasa professor, Kemalpaşazade was born into a distinguished family with Iranian roots on his mother's side. He began learning Persian at an early age in Amasya, where he was taught by notable scholars and studied *Gulistan* and presumably Halimi's *Bahrü'l-Garayib*, which was already circulating in the city at that time. Given that one of his Persian works, *Nigaristan* (Garden of Images), draws the inspiration for its title and content from *Gulistan*, Sa'di's text seems to have had an enduring influence on Kemalpaşazade's immersion in Persian learning. As we can also tell from the preface to his *Risale-i Yaiyye*, a treatise on the Persian letter *ç* (the long *i*), the Persian language remained an integral aspect of Kemalpaşazade's scholarly life: he not only engaged in discussions with his colleagues about grammatical issues,

but devoted part of his oeuvre to Persian linguistics. His most famous work in this regard is *Dakayıku'l-Hakayık* (Subtleties of Truth), a handbook of Persian homonyms, synonyms, and antonyms, where each entry is amply glossed in Ottoman Turkish, with examples from Persian poetry. Halimi's *Bahrü'l-Garayib* was one of the main sources Kemalpaşazade relied on in preparing his handbook, though we frequently find him criticizing his predecessor's semantic glosses. One particular feature of *Dakayık* is that, while explaining the phonetic, semantic, and morphological aspects of the Persian words, Kemalpaşazade employs Arabic grammatical terms freely and frequently. Presented to Süleyman I's grand vizier Ibrahim Pasha (ca. 1493–1536), the handbook remained in high demand not only by courtly audiences but by madrasa scholars and students of Persian, such that in 1550 a new edition was prepared by a scholar from Skopje in Macedonia, who now organized Kemalpaşazade's text alphabetically for easy reference. The second text Kemalpaşazade compiled for Persian instruction was a manual entitled *Kava'idü'l-Fürs* (Rules of Persian), which is the first Persian grammar written in the Ottoman world not in Turkish but in Arabic. Besides these two texts, Kemalpaşazade also wrote two treatises on Persian, *Risale-i Yaiyye* (Treatise on the Letter Y) and *Maziyyat al-Lisan al-Farisi 'ala Sair al-Asinat ma Khala al-'Arabiyyat* (Virtues of Persian over Other Languages except Arabic). The former, written in Ottoman Turkish and replete with Arabic terms, is an in-depth study of the diverse and often puzzling grammatical functions of the Persian adjective suffix *-i*, while the latter, penned in Arabic, presents an overview of the history, culture, and languages of Persia and argues with examples that the world's most important and richest lingua franca after Arabic is Persian. Obviously, Kemalpaşazade's Ottoman Turkish titles presumed an audience familiar with Arabic grammatical terminology, and presumably his Turkish-speaking madrasa students were acquainted with Arabic. His Arabic titles, on the other hand, seem to be introductory works intended for madrasa students and scholars from the Arab lands now claimed by the empire, who were new to Persian but eager to study the language out of personal interest or for intellectual reasons.<sup>28</sup>

In the second half of the sixteenth century, the Ottoman interest in Persian continued to flourish, but now with an unprecedented momentum, particularly thanks to three teachers of Persian specializing in commentary writing, Muslihüddin Süruri (1491–1562), Şem'ullah Şem'i (d. ca. 1603), and Ahmed Sudi (d. ca. 1600), who resided in Istanbul, authored commentaries devoted to the analysis and translation of Persian classics, and became canonical voices in circles of Persian reading and learning across the empire. A madrasa professor with a Naqshbandi Sufi affiliation, Süruri focused on a set of four classics, Sa'di's *Bustan* and *Gulistan*, Hafiz's *Diwan*, and Rumi's *Masnawi*. In all of his commentaries, Süruri concerned himself less with Persian instruction and more with mystical education. Şem'i, a reputed Mawlawi who enjoyed close relations with the Ottoman court, not only shared the same concerns as Süruri and revisited the texts he expounded, but

also expanded his predecessor's repertoire by writing mystical commentaries on new texts including Jami's *Baharistan* (Garden of Spring), 'Attar's *Mantiq al-Tayr* (Conference of the Birds) and *Pand-nama*, and Nizami's *Makhzan al-Asrar* (Treasury of Secrets). Unlike Süruri and Şem'i, Sudi did not come from a mystical milieu and was exclusively trained in Arabic and Persian philology. Born in Bosnia and educated in Istanbul, Sudi traversed the empire from Anatolia to the Arab lands to study further Arabic and Persian literary and philological works under the guidance of established scholars such as the Persian historian and philologist Muslih al-Din al-Lari (ca. 1510–72), who was then based in Amid (Diyarbakır) in southeastern Turkey. Returning to Istanbul, Sudi worked on Sa'di and Hafiz only and approached their texts from a purely grammatical perspective, immersing his readers in a thorough analysis of the phonetic, morphological, semantic, and syntactic features of *Bustan*, *Gulistan*, and *Diwan* while criticizing his predecessors' interpretations. Once a Persian tutor at the Ibrahim Pasha Palace School in Istanbul, one of the leading imperial institutions where outstanding slave boys recruited into the Ottoman service were educated, Sudi constructed his commentaries in such a way that learners of Persian as a second language could acquire a good grasp of grammar through reading the works of classical authors. He was acclaimed, contemporaneously and posthumously, as one of the authoritative scholars of Persian, inasmuch as his texts proved accessible and appealing to a wide audience, whether beginning or advanced, mystical or not. Perhaps one of the most noteworthy things about Sudi's commentaries is that they provide a framework with which to map the diverse contours of Persian learning in the Ottoman world up to the 1600s, since his texts include references to and citations from predecessor scholars, including not only Süruri and Şem'i but also almost all the other Persianists traced here so far.<sup>29</sup> What is also noteworthy about his commentaries is that they were well received particularly in the Balkans, which constituted one of the vibrant frontiers of the Ottoman world of Persian learning. Before moving on to the post-1600s, it is therefore worth pausing here to take a brief look at the spread and influence of Persian in the Ottoman Balkans, which the Ottomans called Rumili (Rumelia).

Though Persian learning was widespread across the Balkans, certain cities were distinguished by their long-standing traditions in the study of the Persian language and classics. One of these cities was Sudi's hometown, Saraybosna (Sarajevo), where he first encountered the Persian language as a young boy while attending a local school, as revealed by an anecdote found in his commentary on *Gulistan*.<sup>30</sup> Sudi's case was far from being unique: a significant number of Ottoman Persianists who made their careers in Istanbul received their early Persian training in Saraybosna.<sup>31</sup> Located to the southwest of Sarajevo, the town of Mostar was the second major locus of Persian learning, which owed its status mainly to the patronage of Derviş Paşa (d. 1603), one of Sudi's students from Mostar who graduated from the Ibrahim Pasha Palace school and became an imperial bureaucrat

under Murad III. In particular, the *waqf* (pious endowment) complex established by Derviş Paşa in the heart of Mostar attracted students and scholars of Persian from across Rumelia: the madrasa attached to the *waqf* offered Persian classes, and its library was famous for its rich collection of Persian classics and learning materials, including Sudi's commentaries.<sup>32</sup> On the other hand, the Mawlawi lodge in the same complex offered instruction in Persian grammar and mystical literature. One notable teacher who created a legacy that lasted for generations was Shaykh Fevzi of Mostar (d. 1747), who completed his Sufi training in Istanbul before returning to elucidate and translate the *Masnawi* for the Mawlawi community in his home town. Vardar Yenicesi (or Yenice-i Vardar, now Giannitsa, in northern Greece), on the other hand, was a city where Persian was not only taught and studied but was also widely spoken.<sup>33</sup> The Persian spoken in the town and across Rumelia differed from formal Persian in accent and vocabulary, to such an extent that the Ottomans called it *Rumili Farsisi* (Rumelian Persian).<sup>34</sup> Since Vardar Yenicesi was frequented by students, scholars, and literati, a rich Persianate linguistic and literary culture quickly sprang up there. Aşık Çelebi (1520–72), an Ottoman poet and literary scholar from Prizren in what is today Kosovo, was very impressed by the Persian-speaking and -writing communities of the city, which he called a “hotbed of Persian.”<sup>35</sup>

The post-1600 era saw no decline in the Ottoman interest in Persian. New scholars appeared and new materials were produced for contemporary learners and readers, gradually creating a new canon. Representatives of the pre-1600 tradition nevertheless continued to have an influence, providing models for new teachers of Persian, who not only studied and taught their works but drew on them in writing their own books. Audiences, too, remained under the spell of some, if not all, texts of the pre-1600 era. As we learn from the preface of an eighteenth-century manuscript, for instance, Sudi's commentary on Hafiz remained unmatched as late as 1794, when it was considered “the best commentary” providing a full discussion of all aspects of the Persian language.<sup>36</sup>

The post-1600 era opens with the writings of the Mawlawi scholar Isma'il Ankaravi (d. 1631) who was famed for his commentary on *Masnawi*, which played a central part in his teaching and scholarship. Ankaravi first experienced Rumi's text through Şahidi's *Tuhfe*, a *Masnawi* glossary he studied at an early age. Later he read and lectured on *Masnawi* to audiences attending Mawlawi gatherings in Ankara, his hometown, and Konya. During his twenty-one-year career as the chief shaykh of the famous Mawlawi convent in the Galata district of Istanbul, he regularly taught and discussed *Masnawi* in his classes, wrote treatises focusing on selections from it, and finally embarked on an extensive commentary on the whole text. Completed in 1627, the commentary quickly became a canonical text in the literature on *Masnawi*, not only remaining in vogue among Mawlawi readers and reciters across the empire but also engaging the interest of the courtly community and finally of Sultan Murad IV (r. 1623–40) who requested a fine copy of the text in 1629. Ankaravi's commentatorial approach is along the same lines as that of

Süruri and Şem‘i, the two former commentators of Rumi whose writings formed a backdrop to Ankaravi’s text. Interested in unearthing the esoteric meanings and divine messages layered in *Masnawi*, Ankaravi, too, concentrated his and his readers’ attention not so much on the grammar of the text but rather on its translation and mystical interpretation.

Neşati Ahmed (d. 1674) followed Ankaravi as the second major Mawlawi scholar of the century. Neşati taught Persian language and poetry for many years in the Mawlawi convent in Edirne, where he compiled a concise reference grammar for his students. A poet himself, he was particularly accomplished in Persian poetry and influenced by ‘Urfi of Shiraz (1555–91), whose poetry suited the taste of most seventeenth-century Ottoman poets and triggered nearly a hundred commentaries. Neşati was no exception: he compiled a commentary to translate and interpret a selection from ‘Urfi’s nuanced poems for Ottoman readers and students of Persian poetry who were now interested in the works of poets like ‘Urfi writing in the so-called Indian style, as noted by Mirak Muhammad Naqshbandi, a Persianist from Tashkent (d. after 1613), who visited Istanbul at the turn of the seventeenth century.<sup>37</sup>

As the eighteenth century unfolded, a number of commentators appeared on the scholarly stage, where Isma‘il Hakkı Bursevi (1653–1725) and Ebubekir Nusret (d. 1793) distinguished themselves. A Sufi exegete steeped in Islamic sciences, Bursevi came to the fore with his detailed commentary on ‘Attar’s guidebook of morality, *Pand-nama*. Unlike Şem‘i, the former commentator of ‘Attar, Bursevi paid special attention to the grammatical texture of *Pand-nama*, translated the text, and elaborated on the mystical teachings interspersed in it. Perhaps this is why Şem‘i’s commentary was overshadowed and gradually replaced by Bursevi’s work, which became a popular classroom commentary among students and teachers of mysticism who looked for a thematic and grammatical analysis of a mystical classic like ‘Attar’s text. The mystical scholar and poet Ebubekir Nusret established himself as a sought-after teacher of Persian language and literature in Istanbul after 1750. Like Neşati, Nusret made an effort to move scholarship in a new direction: he focused, not on the works of poets that had been heavily studied, but on poets like Saib of Tabriz (d. 1676), whose poetry was gaining a readership in Istanbul’s poetic circles, but was still left largely unexplored. Perhaps more significantly, what motivated Nusret to devote his scholarly energy to the study of Saib’s poetry is better explained by the fact that Saib served as a source of inspiration for Nusret’s poetic creativity and deeply shaped the language and style of his poems. As with Neşati’s approach to ‘Urfi, Nusret’s emphasis was predominantly on the mystical meanings and imagery in Saib’s poems, which he translated and explicated for the growing number of students coming to his classes, in his three commentaries on selections from the poet’s *Diwan*.<sup>38</sup>

While almost all Persianists of the post-1600 era preferred commentary writing and were concerned less to teach their readers Persian vocabulary and grammar

than to furnish them with—mostly mystical—tools of reading and interpretation, a small number of scholars adopted a different approach to Persian learning and compiled reference works with a broader audience in mind. Notable among these scholars were Hasan Şu'uri (d. 1694), Sünbülzade Vehbi (d. 1809), and Ahmed 'Asım (1755–1819), whose works on Persian-Turkish lexicography filled a long-existing lacuna in the tradition of dictionary writing, which had dwindled away since Halimi's *Lügat* and Şahidi's *Tuhfe*, the two representative lexicographical works of the pre-1600 period.

Şu'uri's comprehensive Persian-Turkish lexicon *Lisanü'l-'Acem* (Persian Language), better known as *Ferheng-i Şu'uri* (Şu'uri's Dictionary), was compiled between 1662 and 1681, drawing on a range of dictionaries from Anatolia, Iran, Central Asia, and India. One of the largest compilations in the history of Persian-Turkish lexicography, *Ferheng-i Şu'uri* was also the first Persian-Turkish dictionary to be printed in the Ottoman Empire, appearing in two volumes in Istanbul in 1742. As part of the short-lived but pioneering venture of Ibrahim Müteferrika (1674–1745), it was also one of the earliest Muslim-printed books anywhere.

Vehbi's Persian-Turkish verse glossary, *Tuhfe-i Vehbi* (Gift of Vehbi), compiled in 1783, a much smaller-scale work, reminiscent of Şahidi's 1515 glossary, reflects Vehbi's experiences and work in Isfahan and Shiraz, the two cities he visited as the Ottoman ambassador to Iran. It became immensely popular shortly after it was printed in 1798. Reprinted more than fifty times until 1909, the glossary brought Vehbi a reputation that eclipsed that of Şahidi.

Completed in 1797 and presented to Sultan Selim III (r. 1789–1808), 'Asım's translation of *Burhan-i Qati'* (Definitive Proof), a famous Persian dictionary compiled in the southern Indian city of Hyderabad in 1652 by Muhammad Husayn of Tabriz (d. unknown), made its debut in print in 1799. 'Asım's work is hardly a word-for-translation: he expanded on Muhammad Husayn's dictionary by adding new entries selected from a pile of dictionaries on his desk, including Şu'uri's *Ferheng* and Halimi's *Lügat*. With 'Asım's translation, one of the landmarks of Persian lexicography now became a text available to a broader community of learners rather than one used only by scholars. Printed four more times by 1885, the lexicographer's work captivated the Ottoman world of Persian learning for almost a century.<sup>39</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS

The history of Persian in the Ottoman lands is intertwined with multiple histories of the empire: the language left its imprint on the linguistic, literary, and cultural histories of the Ottomans who, torn between admiration and envy, looked to Persia in the making of an empire, particularly after the conquest of Constantinople in 1453. As the Ottoman Turks learned Persian, the language and the culture it carried seeped not only into their court and imperial institutions but also into their

vernacular language and culture. The appropriation of Persian, both as a second language and as a language to be steeped together with Turkish, was encouraged notably by the sultans, the ruling class, and leading members of the mystical communities. Persian learning sometimes had much to do with personal curiosity, but it was mostly interwoven with imperial ambitions and mystical aspirations. The imperial and mystical underpinnings of the Ottoman world of Persian learning were far from excluding each other. Rather, the two spaces often appeared as intersecting and interrelated, each influencing and influenced by the other. In this regard, Ottoman commentarial circles present us with a venue where the imperial and mystical spaces of Persian learning more visibly converged and intertwined: major Ottoman commentators on Persian belles-lettres, like Şem'i, were mostly steeped in mystical tradition or had mystical affiliations, but they were also closely involved with court circles. Accordingly, works of these commentators appealed to a diverse range of audiences, including members of the imperial elite and Sufi orders.

Looking back at my survey of teachers and learners of Persian, some general conclusions can be drawn regarding different aspects of Persian teaching and learning in the Ottoman world. First, teachers of Persian came from a miscellany of backgrounds ranging from royal tutors and madrasa professors to Sufi masters, and they specialized mostly in commentary writing and translation. Secondly, learners of Persian, too, formed a diverse community, which included members of the dynasty, the imperial elite, students studying at various institutions, from palace schools and madrasas to Sufi lodges, and, last but not least, interested readers and listeners particularly inclined toward mysticism. Thirdly, Persian learning materials spanned a variety of texts, each reflecting different concerns, needs, and teaching methodologies. Grammars, glossaries, and commentaries were the most popular texts for learning and teaching Persian. Often treated as supplementary materials, these texts were devised to help students who studied or were taught Persian classics, among which the *Gulistan*, *Bustan*, *Masnawi*, *Pand-nama*, and Hafiz's *Diwan* formed the core of the Ottoman curriculum. Fourthly, the contexts of Persian teaching and learning present us, again, with a spectrum of practices and goals. Sometimes, as in the cases of Ahmed-i Da'i, Kemalpaşazade, and Sudi, the context was a classroom setting, where the main purpose was to teach Persian grammar and vocabulary. Sometimes Persian learning came to mean mystical learning, as in the case, for instance, of Şem'i or Ankaravi, who sought to edify their students, readers, or listeners morally by introducing them to the seminal texts of Persian mysticism. And sometimes these two purposes overlapped, as in the case of Bursevi. Though in most cases, students of Persian learned the language through texts and textbooks, in some cases, like those of Şahidi and Ankaravi, learning was mainly an oral activity, in which the audience was exposed to the recitation, performance, or discussion of a text in a less formal and more interactive setting.

Historically speaking, there seems to be no clear-cut difference or contrast between the pre- and post-1600 periods in the Ottoman Empire, particularly considering that there is a continuity of texts and transmission of pedagogical practices between the two periods. Nevertheless, perhaps one can make a general, if not definitive, distinction by saying that while the former period can be characterized as an age of Persian grammatical learning, the latter period presents itself more as an age of Persian mystical learning, an age brimming more with mystical readings and interpretations than with grammars and glossaries. This distinction can be explained by arguing, first, that in the post-1600s there was mostly no need for new grammars and glossaries, since those produced between 1400 and 1600 continued to be relevant and popular with students and readers, and, second, that the interests and concerns of the audiences shifted from the grammatical to the mystical, inasmuch as mysticism was in higher demand and a dominant discourse in Ottoman centers of Persian learning after 1600.

Finally, it is worth highlighting the place of the Ottoman world of Persian literacy in the broader Persographia world. On the one hand, standing at the intersection of Eastern and Western geographies of Persographia, the Ottoman world, and particularly Istanbul, seems to have functioned as a diverse hub in which students, poets, and scholars from Persia, Anatolia, and the Balkans crossed paths and influenced one another. On the other hand, the same hub also seems to have provided a network through which a range of texts, ideas, and practices circulated and were exchanged among readers, authors, and scholars of Persian. Ottoman scholarship, too, seems to be nourished and framed by this diversity, especially by the influx of philological traditions from Persia and the Arab lands. As Ottoman Persianists benefited from Arabic and Persian philological models, they introduced new works and approaches, which, in turn, traveled across the interconnected terrains of the Persianate world. This brought recognition and prestige, not only to some Ottoman scholars, like Sudi from Sarajevo, but also to the cities where they were based, among which Istanbul, unsurprisingly, ranked first. The imperial capital of the Ottomans gradually established itself as a Persographic center that exported learning and teaching materials to the wider Persianate world, as exemplified by the wide reception and influence of Ottoman scholarship in the Balkans.

#### NOTES

1. Lami'i, *Şerh-i Dibace-i Gülistan* (MS Hacı Selim Ağa 956, Hacı Selim Ağa Manuscript Library, Istanbul), folios 4a–b. Unless noted otherwise, all translations from Ottoman Turkish are mine.
2. On the term “Persographia,” see Nile Green’s Introduction to this volume.
3. For the ways in which the Persian influence in the Ottoman world is treated in Orientalist scholarship, see Murat Umut Inan, “Rethinking the Ottoman Imitation of Persian Poetry,” *Iranian Studies* 50, 5 (2017): 671–89. For modern scholarship, see, among others, Muhammad Amin Riyahi, *Zaban wa Adab-i Farsi dar Qalamraw-i ‘Usmani* (Tehran: Pazhang, 1990), 225–37, and Ilhama Miftah and Wahhab

Wali, *Nigahi ba Rawand-i Nufuz wa Gustarish-i Zaban wa Adab-i Farsi dar Turkiya* (Tehran: Shura-yi Gustarish-i Zaban u Adabiyat-i Farsi, 1995), 161–216.

4. For the terms “Rum” and “Rumi,” see Cemal Kafadar, “A Rome of One’s Own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum,” *Muqarnas* 24 (2007): 7–25.

5. For the influence of Timurid literary culture in the Ottoman world, see Michele Bernardini, “Ottoman Timuridism: Lami’i Çelebi and His *Şehrengiz* of Bursa,” in *Irano-Turkic Cultural Contacts in the 11th–17th Centuries*, ed. Éva M. Jeremiás (Piliscsaba, Hungary: Avicenna Institute of Middle Eastern Studies, 2003), 1–16. For the ways in which the works of ‘Ali Shir Nawai were appropriated by Ottoman literati, see Yusuf Çetindağ, *Ali Şir Nevai’nin Osmanlı Şiirine Etkisi* (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2006). On the Ottoman reception of Jami, see Hamid Algar, *Jami* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2013), chap. 7. For the intellectual connections between the Ottomans and the Timurids, see İlker Evrim Binbaş, *Intellectual Networks in Timurid Iran: Sharaf al-Din ‘Ali Yazdi and the Islamicate Republic of Letters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), chap. 4. On the development of a Persianate court culture in the reign of Mehmed II, see Franz Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror and His Time*, trans. Ralph Manheim and ed. William C. Hickman (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978), 467–77.

6. For a history of the Turkish language under the Ottomans, see Linda Darling, “Ottoman Turkish: Written Language and Scribal Practice, 13th to 20th Centuries,” in *Literacy in the Persianate World: Writing and the Social Order*, ed. Brian Spooner and William L. Hanaway (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum, 2012), 171–95.

7. Christine Woodhead, *Ta’liki-zade’s Şehname-i Hümayun: A History of the Ottoman Campaign into Hungary, 1593–94* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 1983), 134.

8. Latîfi: *Tezkiretü’ş-Şu’ara ve Tabsiratü’n-Nuzama*, ed. Rıdvan Canım (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı, 2000), 155–56.

9. *Künhü’l-Ahbar’ın Tezkire Kısmı*, ed. Mustafa İsen (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, 1994), 131.

10. *Latîfi*, ed. Canım, 339–40.

11. Mahmud bin Edhem, *Gülşen-i İnşa* (MS A2276, National Library, Ankara), folio 3a.

12. *Latîfi*, ed. Canım, 528–29.

13. *Künhü’l-Ahbar’ın Tezkire Kısmı*, ed. İsen, 146.

14. Yusuf Öz, *Tarih Boyunca Farsça-Türkçe Sözlükler* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2010), 91.

15. *Latîfi*, ed. Canım, 474.

16. Paul Rycart, *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*, 3rd ed. (London: John Starkey and Henry Brome, 1670), 31.

17. *Latîfi*, ed. Canım, 150.

18. *Künhü’l-Ahbar’ın Tezkire Kısmı*, ed. İsen, 187. For Süleyman’s interest in Persian poetry, see Inan, “Rethinking the Ottoman Imitation of Persian Poetry,” 674–84.

19. Ahmet Kartal, *Şirazdan İstanbul’a: Türk-Fars Kültür Coğrafyası Üzerine Araştırmalar* (Istanbul: Kurtuba, 2011), 447–48. For a detailed study of the cultural networks between the Ottomans and the Safavids, see Sinem Arcaç, “Gifts in Motion: Ottoman–Safavid Cultural Exchange, 1501–1618” (PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2012). The Mughal capital Lahore presents a case similar to that of Ottoman Istanbul. For comparison, see Purnima Dhavan’s chapter 5 in this volume.

20. ‘Aşık Çelebi: *Meşairü’ş-Şu’ara*, ed. Filiz Kılıç, 3 vols. (Istanbul: İstanbul Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, 2010), 3: 1538–40.

21. On Da’i and his works, see İsmail Hikmet Ertaylan, *Ahmed-i Da’i: Hayatı ve Eserleri* (Istanbul: Üçler Basımevi, 1952).

22. Abdülbaki Çetin, “Ahmed-i Da’i’nin Farsça Öğretmek Amacıyla Yazdığı Bir Eser: *Müfredat*,” *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 20 (2006): 119.

23. *Ibid.*, 123.

24. On Halimi’s works, see Öz, *Tarih Boyunca*, 94–100 and 103–9. Halimi’s *Lügat* is one of the early examples of Ottoman lexicography modeled on the Persian lexicographical tradition. For a history

of Persian lexicography, see Solomon I. Baevskii, *Early Persian Lexicography: Farhangs of the Eleventh to the Fifteenth Centuries*, trans. N. Killian and ed. John R. Perry (Folkestone, England: Global Oriental, 2007).

25. On Lami'î Çelebi's life and works, see Günay Kut Alpay, "Lami'î Çelebi and His Works," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 35, 2 (1976): 73–93.

26. On Şahidi and his works, see Öz, *Tarih Boyunca*, 138–43. For commentaries on Şahidi's glossary, see Yusuf Öz, *Tuhfe-i Şahidi Şerhleri* (Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, 1999).

27. Though Persian, unlike Arabic, was not included in the typical curriculum of an Ottoman madrasa, the language was offered as an elective course or recommended for study in some madrasas. For those Ottoman madrasa curricula featuring Persian, see Cevat İzgi, *Osmanlı Medreselerinde İlim*, 2 vols. (Istanbul: İz, 1997), 1: 167–69.

28. For the *Dakayıku'l-Hakayık*, see MS Amcazade Hüseyin Paşa 372, Süleymaniye Manuscript Library, Istanbul. On the *Kava'idü'l-Fürs*, see Éva M. Jeremiás, "Kamalpaşazada as Linguist," in *Iran-Turkic Cultural Contacts*, ed. id., 79–110. For the Turkish and Arabic treatises, see, respectively, MS İzmir 704 and MS Murad Molla 1831, folios 352b–54b, Süleymaniye Manuscript Library.

29. On the life and works of Süruri and Şem'i, see İsmail Güleç, "Gelibolulu Musluhiddin Süruri: Hayatı, Kişiliği, Eserleri ve *Bahrü'l-Mâârif* İsimli Eseri," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 21 (2001): 211–36, and Şeyda Öztürk, *Şem'i Efendi ve Mesnevi Şerhi* (Istanbul: İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2011). On Sudi, see Murat Umut Inan, "Crossing Interpretive Boundaries in Sixteenth-Century Istanbul: Ahmed Sudi on the *Divan* of Hafiz of Shiraz," *Philological Encounters* 3, 3 (2018): 275–309.

30. Nazif M. Hoca, *Sudi: Hayatı, Eserleri ve İki Risalesi'nin Metni* (Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi, 1980), 12.

31. On the lives and works of the Ottoman scholars from Sarajevo, see Sabaheta Gačanin, "Persian Language as Vehicle of Islamic Cultural Memory in Ottoman Bosnia," *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi* 31, 1 (2016): 165–75. For a survey of the reception of Persian language and literature in Bosnia, see *Danishnama-yi Adab-i Farsi: Adab-i Farsi dar Anatuli wa Balkan*, ed. Hasan Anusha, vol. 6 (Tehran: Wizarat-i Farhang wa Irshad-i Islami, 2005), s.v. "Busni wa Hirziguwin."

32. Gačanin, "Persian Language," 167.

33. On Fevzi's life and scholarship, see Hamid Algar, "Persian Literature in Bosnia-Herzegovina," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 5, 2 (1994): 260–61.

34. For references to the Persian spoken in Rumelia, see *Latifi*, ed. Canım, 541–42; *Aşık Çelebi*, ed. Kılıç, 1: 205.

35. *Aşık Çelebi*, ed. Kılıç, 2: 904. For a history of the city of Vardar Yenicesi, see Heath W. Lowry and İsmail E. Erünsal, *Yenice-i Vardar'lı Evrenos Hanedanı: Notlar ve Belgeler* (Istanbul: Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2010).

36. *Muhtasar-ı Şerhü's-Sudi* (MS 577, National Library, Ankara), folio 1b.

37. On the life and works of Ankaravi, see *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Science, and Technology in Islam*, s.v. "Anqarawi, İsmâ'il." For Neşâti, see Bayram Ali Kaya, *Neşâti* (Istanbul: Şule, 1998). For Mirak Muhammad's observations, see *Mirek Muhammed-i Taşkendi: Şehri ve Güli, Bir Şehir Bir Gül*, ed. Bahattin Kahraman and Yusuf Öz (Ankara: Akçağ, 2012), 216–17.

38. For Bursevi's commentary, see Kezban Paksoy, "Bursevi İsmail Hakkı: *Şerh-i Pend-i Attar* (İnceleme-Metin-Sözlük)" (PhD diss., Erciyes University, 2012). For Nusret's, see Osman Ünlü, "Ebubekir Nusret'in Saib-i Tebrizi Şerhleri," *Turkish Studies* 4, 6 (2009): 442–55.

39. For the works of the three lexicographers, see Öz, *Tarih Boyunca*, 204–9, 245–49, and 251–53.