Zakir Hussein Gul

Harvard University, United States of America
zakir.hussein.gul@gmail.com

Persian Idiom, Ottoman Meanings: Introducing Kemālpaşazāde's *Nigāristān*

Abstract

Although Kemālpaşazāde (875–940/1468–1534) is recently being rediscovered for his works on lexicography and orthodox Sunnism in its Ottoman iteration, the strictly 'literary' output of the early modern polymath has not yet received its due attention. This paper seeks to introduce his literary masterpiece, the Persian language *Nigāristān*, composed only months before the demise of the *şeyḫülislām*, and situate his text in relation to Saʿdī's *Gulistān* and the *Bahāristān* of his Timurid contemporary ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī. I first seek to problematise 'dislocative nationalistic' discourse that writes-off Kemālpaşazāde's and similar works on the basis of a perceived lack of stylistic originality. I then investigate Kemālpaşazāde's choice of naming the text, and what this may tell us about China's vogue in his time, his metaphysical system, and ideas inherited from Jāmī's legacy on 'literary millennialism.' Then, building on the intertextual analyses of Paul Losensky, Benedek Péri and Murat Umut İnan on appraising Persianate texts through an 'emulatory' (rather than 'imatatory') lens, I demonstrate how Kemālpaşazāde's reworking of narratives from the 'canon' of Persian writing both complicates and enriches the originals, in addition to reflecting his own erudition in the *elsine-i ṣelāṯe*, all whilst being imbued with contemporary Ottoman meanings.

Keywords: Ottoman Persian literature, sixteenth century, imitation, emulation, millennialism, Mānī.

1. Problematising Imitation[1]

> [T]he translator is inherently dependent on the text he is rendering into his own tongue, and however skilfully he accomplishes his task, his dependence can be taken to imply inferiority. By contrast, the emulator may aspire to equality with the author of the work emulated, or even to superiority to him; and thereby to form the most recent link in a chain of emulation, notwithstanding the shift from Persian to Turkish.[2]

In a letter sent to Philip II (r. 1556–1598) dated 11 October 1552, the Venetian painter and contemporary of Kemālpaşazāde, Titian (1488–1576), wrote that he was gifting

1 I am grateful to Dr. Hajnalka Kovacs, without whose support and mentorship neither this article nor the academic journey that resulted in it would have been possible. I am also grateful to Shaffin Siddiqui for his comments on an earlier draft.

2 Algar 2018, 126.

his Spanish patron a painting by the name of 'La Sultana Rossa,' adding that it was a portrait of the 'Queen of Persia.'[3] The subject of the painting was Ḫürrem Sulṭān (d. 965/1558), or rather, Titian's impression of her: chief consort, close advisor to Süleymān I (r. 926–974/1520–1566), and, as I will later argue, the subject of many allusions in the *Nigāristān*. Ḫürrem Sulṭān, though married to one of the most powerful men in the world, ruling over an Ottoman Empire that at times included Tabriz and its Iranian north-westerly environs, was clearly not the queen of Persia. Otherwise condemned on positivist grounds to the footnotes of art history, Titian's reference is telling of an impression that the Ottomans were connected intimately with imaginations of Persia.

Labelled Persianate, Persophone, and Persographic,[4] scholars have debated the modes in which Persian language and literacy informed court and scholarly cultures of the greater Islamic (and to considerable extents, non-Islamic) world in the early modern period. What matters for the purposes of this article is that at the time of Titian's painting, and indeed that of Ottoman *şeyḫülislām* Kemālpaşazāde, the Ottomans were increasingly seeing themselves as inheritors – culturally, if not temporally[5] – to Persianate traditions, and indeed, such a perceived inheritance was part of broader claims to universal rule at the perceived end of history.[6] The desire to achieve universality, married with an acute awareness for the eschatological, manifested in a 'literary millennialist' bent in the idea that the major genres of Persian literature had reached full maturity during and after the life of another contemporary of Kemālpaşazāde, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (817–898/1414–1492). If the Persian literary tradition had reached its

3 Wethey 1971, 205.

4 For a genealogy of these terms, their usefulness, and limitations, see Green 2019, 1–9.

5 If Hamid Algar is tempted to deduce from Jāmī's poetic embellishments (declaring Bāyezīd II (r. 886–918/1481–1512) as having turned 'the land of Iran' into 'a bed of roses') an encouragement 'to expand the Ottoman realm eastwards, perhaps at the expense of the Aqqoyunlus in Azerbaijan,' then one is equally tempted to see in Kemālpaşazāde – having grown up in the eastern, Iran-facing borders of the Ottoman realm, and sharing Selīm I's criticism of Bāyezīd II's torpor vis-a-vis Ḳızılbaş incursions into Ottoman territory, with his general Persophilia and particular fatwas against the nascent Safavids in precisely such territories – a taking up of such an offer. See Algar 2018, 82.

6 One ought to be reminded that the *Nigāristān* was written a year before Kemālpaşazāde's demise; as such, many of Kemālpaşazāde's anecdotes are tainted with the ever-looming spectre of death, not only human and physical, but civilisational and of humankind altogether. See Kemālpaşazāde's comments in Gul 2022, 448: 'The epoch of time has come to an end, doomsday's portents have become manifest and its spectacular jurisdiction made apparent. Those of high station are left in the ranks of the base, and base rascals have taken up the ranks of the noble' (*dawrān-i zamān ba ākhir risīd va ʿālamat-i qiyāmat padīd shud va imārat-i bāhirash ẓāhir gasht, aʿālī-yi ahālī dar manzil-i sāfil mānd va asāfil-i arāzil manāzil-i afāżil girift*). For further discussion on the extent to which an awareness of an imminent end permeated Ottoman thought, see Hagen 2013, 441. For more tempering comments on how such sentiments from the same period were standard topoi, see El-Rouayheb 2015, 19–22.

telos, if not controversial 'seal' with Jāmī, it was also arguably due to the great Herati scholar and Naqshbandi Sufi that a renewed confidence in Turkic literary production, albeit copiously adorned with Persian, came about in Kemālpaşazāde's time.[7]

Kemālpaşazāde's immense literary oeuvre, spanning Arabic, Persian and Turkic[8] must likewise be understood in the context of Turkic-speaking and ethnically non-Persian scholarly communities who employed Persian literacy to express themselves and the world around them.[9] Such a concept of interconnectedness, wherein Persian was masterfully employed as a literary medium across geographically disparate and diverse communities, stands in stark contrast to echelons within Iranian scholarship (wherein is found an incredibly rich, albeit at times, regrettably insular discourse) encountered by the author whilst preparing a critical edition of Kemālpaşazāde's *Nigāristān* at the University of Tehran. At the time of preparing the various manuscripts, there existed only one Persian language academic article on the *Nigāristān*, written by a certain Aḥmad Riżā Yalama-hā.[10] The conclusions made by Yalama-hā are representative of the Iranocentric discourse prevalent in modern Iranian academia, the lens through which Ottoman and all '*other*' Persian literature is viewed.[11] That all 'good' Persian comes from within the borders of the modern Iranian state, or that Persian language and literature is and was always the sole inheritance of those who find themselves within those borders today would be disagreeable to many non-Iranians and Iranians alike.

7 Of interest is the seventh chapter of Jāmī's *Bahāristān* dedicated to poets and their craft, beginning with Rūdakī and covering the likes of Firdawsī, Saʿdī and Ḥāfiẓ, all luminaries of Persian literature, albeit ending with ʿAlī Shīr Nawā'ī, Jāmī's student more famed for his Chaghatay verse, see Lewis 2018, 473–9; 548. As David Morgan has pointed out, Ḥürrem's husband, under the nom de plume of Muḥibbī, like his analogues in the Safavid Shāh Ismāʿīl, Timurid Ḥusayn Bāyqarā, Crimean Meñlī Girāy, the Uzbek Muḥammad Shaybānī, Mughal Bābur, and even the Mamluk Qānṣūh al-Ghawrī, all tried their hands at writing Turkic poetry. See Morgan 2012, 175. For what Bert Fragner described as 'the emancipation of the Islamized daughter-languages from the Persian foundational pattern' in the post-Jāmī period, see Green 2019, 4.

8 It has been calculated, for example, that 183 of Kemālpaşazāde's works were written in Arabic, see Kirakosyan and Sargsyan 2022, 16.

9 An analogue can be found in the person of Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥaydar Dūghlāt (905–958/1499–1551), a military leader and governor of Kashmir. A non-ethnic Persian of the Mongol Dūghlāt tribe, the Chaghatay-speaking Dūghlāt, like Kemālpaşazāde, was also a litterateur and historian who wrote in Persian. Kemālpaşazāde wrote one of two fatwas that sanctioned war with the Ḳızılbaş and resulted in the battle of Çaldıran; only a few years later Mīrzā Dūghlāt wrote about the battle in his history *Tārīkh-i Rashīdī* (completed in 952/1545). A line can be drawn from Ottoman Istanbul to Dūghlāt's seat of power of Srinagar: two non-Persian litterateurs from opposite ends of a connected world in dialogue through the medium of Persian. See Dūghlāt 1383 [2004], 412.

10 Yalama-hā 1390 [2011], 57–170.

11 For a genealogy of 'Persocentric' ideas in modern Iranian scholarship, see Zia-Ebrahimi 2016.

Yalama-hā, for instance, first attempts to ascribe Kemālpaşazāde's mastery over Persian to his potential Iranian ancestry on his mother's side.[12] This 'potential' must be emphasised here, as we know that both Kemālpaşazāde's parents came from prominent Turkic scholarly and military families; his father, Süleymān Çelebi (d. after 896/1490–1491) was governor of Amasya and later district governor of Tokat, whereas his mother, according to Christine Woodhead, was either sister or daughter of İbn Küpeli (d. c. 872/1467–1468), who briefly served as chief military judge under Meḥmed II (r. 848–850/1444–1446, 855–886/1451–1481).[13] Later acknowledging that Kemālpaşazāde was indeed a Turk, Yalama-hā concludes that the *Nigāristān*, though patently inferior to Saʿdī's *Gulistān*, ought to be counted from amongst its more successful imitations, especially remarkable, in his view, when given the fact that a Turk, i.e., a non-native Persian speaker, took on the herculean – if not icarian – task of engaging Persian language and literature.[14]

Yalama-hā's elaboration of the work being an 'imitation' are likewise worth noting. 'In relation to the *Gulistān* of Saʿdī,' he writes, 'literary innovations and novelties are not to be found'[15] in the *Nigāristān*. Rather, 'it has an overbearing and artificial prose style, laden with motley verbal and rhetorical artifices, often dragging the text into tedious long-windedness and [producing] a sense of inauthenticity.'[16] Murat Umut İnan, in his article 'Rethinking the Ottoman Imitation of Persian Poetry,' traces such modern conceptions, Iranian and otherwise, to anachronistic analogisations of Greek and Latin literature unto pre-modern Persian and Turkish literature by eighteenth-century European orientalists. The famous British orientalist William Jones, for example, wrote that 'in the same manner as the Greek compositions were the models of all the Roman writers, so were those of Persia imitated by the Turks.'[17] Indeed, as Hamid Algar likewise points out, 'insistence on radical originality as the primary criterion of literary excellence is a relatively recent phenomenon. There is pleasure to be had in encountering the familiar, artfully reworked; this at least was the belief of the late Timurid period.'[18]

Kemālpaşazāde, as a contemporary and inheritor of Jāmī, was likewise a product of the late Timurid period. An important step in the rediscovery of Kemālpaşazāde's literary legacy in particular and that of Ottoman Persian literature in general would be

12 Yalama-hā 1390 [2011], 169.

13 Woodhead 2021.

14 '*Valyakun bā tawajjuh ba Turk-zabān būdan-i nivīsanda, mī-tavān ān rā dar bayn-i bīsh az 50 taqlīdī kih az Gulistān-i Saʿdī ṣūrat girifta, juz-i taqlidhā-yi muwaffaq mahsūb kard*.' See: Yalama-hā 1390 [2011], 169.

15 Yalama-hā 1390 [2011], 169.

16 *ibid*., 163. Translations are my own. Interestingly enough, this was also the main critique levelled at the text by academic examiners at the author's thesis defence, echoed by the committees of various Iranian publishing houses courted thereafter: that the text has nothing *new* or *exciting* to offer; rather, it is mere medieval literary one-upmanship of an inferior sort.

17 İnan 2017, 672.

18 Algar 2013, 63.

to detach it from the biases and tastes of contemporary critics, who, in Algar's words, condemn them to 'gross mediocrity or even complete worthlessness,'[19] and to instead assess this corpus according to the standards of the world that produced it. Indeed, there is a place for the immutable simplicity of Saʿdī, just as there is for the rich, labyrinthine complexity of Khāqānī (c. 520–595/1120–1199). Ultimately, however, apples ought not be compared to pears. İnan's words on why such a discourse that condemns pre-modern texts with labels such as *mutakallif*, *muqalladāna* and lacking in *ibtikār* and *naw-āvarī*[20] is so damaging are worth mentioning: '[w]hat is particularly striking about the prevailing discourse of imitation is that it not only places a negative connotation on the concept of imitation but also obscures any discussion of imitation as a practice associated with literary production and creativity.'[21]

2. What is the *Nigāristān*?

2.1 What's in a Name?

That all said, what is the *Nigāristān*? In choosing such a title, Kemālpaşazāde is evoking the metaphor of the *nigāristān-i chīn*,[22] or 'the picture gallery of China,' whose mention is peppered throughout the text. In connecting his work to China, Kemālpaşazāde is at once appealing to the traditional exoticism associated with China in Persian literature, but also to the contemporary cessation of China as a literary trope and its beginning as a tangible entity in the Persianate world – beginning with the Mongol movement of Chinese scholars, astronomers, physicians and artisans, and later intensified during the Timurid period whose exchanges with Ming China intro-

19 *ibid*., 63.

20 Yalama-hā 1390 [2011], 163 and 169.

21 İnan 2017, 673.

22 Gul 2022, 12; 49–51; 153–5. A quick *Ganjoor* search compromising of the words 'نگارستان چین' or 'نگارخانهٔ چین' demonstrates the 'picture galley of China' to be a stock metaphor in Persian poetry. This also appears to be the case in the Ottoman literary tradition. Whilst reading Robert Dankoff and Sooyong Kim's translation of excerpts from Evliyā Çelebi's (1020–1095/1611–1682) *Seyāḥatnāme*, I found no less than three references to Chinese picture galleries, from a description of the stall arrangements in a Viennese market (*sāʿatçiler ve ḳuyumcular ve kitāb basmacılar ve berberler ve derzilerin çārsāları eyle müzeyyendir kim gūyā naḳş-ı nigārḫāne-i çindir*), the fine wares available at the annual fare at Doyran in modern North Macedonia (*niçe bin gūne cevāhir-i kāmyāb maḳūlelerin bu meydān-ı maḥabbete ḳoyub her dükkānçenin rūy-ı bezekistān-ı arūsek naḳş-ı nigārḫāne-i çīn-miṣāl olub her metāʿ-ı nādirāt girānbahālara fürūḫt olunur*), to the stone copulas above the Prophet Muḥammad's tomb in Madīna (*ammā bunların daḫı içleri eyle nakş olınmışdır kim gūyā nigārḫāne-i naḳş-ı çindir*). The latter instance is worthy of notice, for it (as with the other examples) reinforces the Chinese picture gallery's subsuming of particulars of physical/ manmade beauty as the ideal form thereof. See the translations for the above in Dankoff and Kim 2011, 226; 299; 354.

duced innovations in fields as diverse as medical theory and visual arts (including, for our purposes, miniature painting).[23]

Indeed, in Kemālpaşazāde's day, all things Chinese were vogue in Ottoman scholarly circles. An early example of contemporary scholarly interest in China is that of the Persian work *Khatāy-nāma* (The Book of China), completed in 922/1516 by a certain Iranian merchant ʿAlī Akbar (fl. 907–922/1500–1516) and dedicated to Selīm I (r. 916–1924/1512–1520) and his successor Süleymān I.[24] Of the 20 chapters detailing aspects of contemporary Chinese life, the final one is dedicated to Chinese temples.[25] Whether the 'picture gallery of China,' already a stock metaphor in Persian poetry by Kemālpaşazāde's time, was inspired by the descriptions from the last chapter is uncertain, but we do know that Murād III (r. 982–1003/1574–1595) ordered for the work to be translated into Turkish, which, according to Gottfried Hagen, became the basis for contemporary Ottoman knowledge of China.[26] Outside of literary and scholarly circles, the fascination with China made its way to Ottoman folk culture too, as reflected in a collection of legends and fables – authored by Sehī Çelebi (d. 955/1548) and presented to the same Sultan Murād III – composed in simple Turkish on the history of China, often exaggerated and endowing unto the Chinese magical and supernatural qualities.[27] Owing to China's immense physical distance from the Ottoman world, such folk narratives had more room for magical and supernatural embellishments, a vogue reflected in *Nigāristān* anecdote 4.24, wherein the *Qayṣar-i Rūm* (the title of the Ottoman sultan), Raja of India and Chinese Emperor all convene to discuss virtue.

But why the *Nigāristān*? Why a *Chinese* picture gallery? Considering the Ottoman expansion in Kemālpaşazāde's time to three continents and beyond, one might ask, why did he choose a metaphor that is Chinese and not a locality such as those of the Ottomans' equally fascinating Christian neighbours to the West? The answer may be found in the first few pages of the *Nigāristān*, wherein Kemālpaşazāde describes the visit of a shaykh and his disciples to church,[28] in which an image of Jesus had been engraved onto the iconostasis around which congregants were paying their devotions.[29] The shaykh then speaks to the icon, invoking Jesus' own words from the Qur'ān, '[And when God shall say: O Jesus, son of Mary,] Didst thou tell mankind to

23 Jackson 2017, 240.
24 Hagen 2013, 425.
25 Kauz 2012.
26 Hagen 2013, 426.
27 *ibid*., 426.
28 Interestingly enough, the authoritative Ottoman commentator of Persian classics, Sūdī-i Bosnevī (d. c. 1005/1596) in his commentary of Saʿdī's *Gulistān* defines a Chinese picture gallery (*çīn nigārḫānesi*) as 'a large church.' The extent to which this may be influenced by Kemālpaşazāde's anecdote at the beginning of his *Nigāristān* (in addition to the place of Kemālpaşazāde and his Persian oeuvre in Sūdī's works in general) is yet to be determined. See Erkal 2021, 1101.
29 This particular anecdote is mentioned in the Berlin, Cambridge, Manchester and Manisa manuscripts, but is omitted in the base manuscript (IR5639), copied 20 years after Kemālpaşazāde first wrote the *Nigāristān*. See Gul 2022, 479.

worship me and my mother as deities in derogation of God?,'[30] upon which '[t]he icon immediately fell from the wall in terror of such speech, the shards thereof scattering like dust, with each particle of the obliterated icon proclaiming aloud that '[God is] One, sans partner' as it mixed in with the earth.'[31] Considering Kemālpaşazāde's extensive education in and commitment to Islamic theology and jurisprudence and thus apophatic knowing and insistent iconoclasm, it would have been important to establish that his *Nigāristān* is not a later-described 'house of worship laden with graven images and icons' (*kinisht-i pur naqsh va nigār*)[32] nor a run-of-the-mill 'Hindu idol temple' (*butkhāna-yi hindū*),[33] lest it be tainted or besmirched with accusations of association with God. The icons of Kemālpaşazāde's *Nigāristān* are not earthly representations. They are instead, I argue, perfect representations of beauty, truth, virtue, and other universal forms.[34]

2.1.1 Like Mānī's Album on Light Blue Paper

An aside on picture galleries in Persian literature is at hand here. When contemplating the meaning of Kemālpaşazāde's picture gallery, a precedent and possible source of inspiration from the poet Niẓāmī of Ganja (c. 535–611/1141–1209) comes to mind. Commenting on Kemālpaşazāde's Turkish reworking of Jāmī's *Yūsuf va Zulaykhā*, Hamid Algar has already established the sense of indebtedness the Ottoman *şeyḫü-*

30 Sūra al-Mā'ida, verse 116.
31 Gul 2022, 479.
32 *ibid*., 277–9.
33 *ibid*., 122–7.
34 The influence of Kemālpaşazāde's metaphysics on the *Nigāristān* is beyond the author's current expertise. Future research into the matter will be especially fruitful, not only due to Kemālpaşazāde's personal contribution to the school of Ibn ʿArabī, which, according to İbrahim Kalın, anticipated Mullā Ṣadrā's (c. 979–1050/1571–1635) theories by over 60 years, but also due to his role in a (perhaps apocryphal) chain of transmission linking the thirteenth-century Andalūsī mystic to the first sultans and fountainheads of Ottoman pedagogy. ʿOṣmān I (d. c. 724/1323) was mentored by ʿİmād al-Dīn Muṣṭafā al-Ḳirşehrī (603–726/1206–1326), also known as Shaykh Edebāli, the first *qāḍī* of the nascent Ottoman state and himself a student of Ibn ʿArabī's adopted son, Ṣadr al-Dīn Qunawī (606–673/1207–1274). The second sultan, Orḫān (r. 724–763/1324–1362), invited Dāvūd al-Qayṣarī (656–751/1260–1350), a disciple of Kamāl al-Dīn al-Qāshānī (d. 737/1330), himself the disciple of Qunawī, to be director and principal of the first Ottoman madrasa in İznik. Kemālpaşazāde's more consummatory role in the Ottoman romance with Ibn ʿArabī can be seen in his issuing a fatwa in defence of Ibn ʿArabī upon Selīm I's conquest of Damascus in 1516. With Kemālpaşazāde's legal approval, Selīm I rebuilt the neglected mausoleum of Ibn ʿArabī, thus fulfilling a prophecy attributed to the Andalūsī mystic and made over 250 years prior in the apocryphal work *al-Shajara al-Nuʿmāniyya fī al-Dawla al-ʿUthmāniyya* (no copies attributed before the sixteenth century). Historical credentials aside, this narrative puts Kemālpaşazāde in the centre of the Ottoman coming full circle to their intellectual ancestor.

lislām expressed towards Niẓāmī, declaring him (in an apparent snub to Jāmī) as the fountainhead of the romantic couplet form and himself as his spiritual disciple (*murīd*).[35] As such, it is wholly conceivable that the picture gallery of Kemālpaşazāde is informed by the portraits discovered by the titular character of Niẓāmī's *Bahrāmnāma* or 'Seven Beauties.' As the story goes, the Sassanid emperor, Yazdigird (r. 399–420) sends his son, Bahrām (400–438) to be raised by his Lakhmid vassal al-Nuʿmān b. Imruʾ-l-Qays (r. c. 390–418), who has a majestic palace by the name of Khavarnaq fitting for the heir apparent built near his capital of al-Ḥīra. Bahrām's heroic exploits are later painted onto the walls of the palace:

guft Munẕir ba kār-farmāyān
tā ba pargār-i ṣūrat-ārāyān
dar Khawarnaq nigāshtand ba zar
ṣūrat-i gūr zīr va shīr zibar
shahzada tīr va jasta zi andū shikār
dar zamīn gharq gasht tā sūfār
chūn nigāranda īn raqm bingāsht
har kih ān dīd jānvar pindāsht[36]

The important verb here, linking to the title of Kemālpaşazāde's work, is *nigāshtan* (conveying meanings of painting, portraying, and drawing).[37] Here, Mundhir has 'image adorners' (*ṣūrat-ārāyān*, with the verb *ārāstan* entailing building onto already-created matter, translated by Hayyim as '[t]o decorate, to adorn' and '[t]o arrange, to put in order, to tidy'[38] i.e., something very physical) engrave the images. The iconographer (*nigāranda*) of such images is so skilled that onlookers perceive his icons to be living.[39] Later in the story, upon returning from the hunt one day, Bahrām chances upon a locked room in the palace, in which he finds beautiful images likened to a hundred Chinese temples (*khushtar az ṣad nigārkhāna-yi chīn*). An important difference exists however: though Niẓāmī suggests that the images are pointing to something beyond the material (*har yakī bā hazār zibāʾī/ gawhar-afrūz nūr-i bināʾī*),[40] their physicality cannot be denied ('all/ That finest art and skill could form/ of pictures, did its wall adorn').[41] Whilst each of Niẓāmī's icons depicts a princess that Bahrām must find and

35 Algar 2018, 100.

36 Niẓāmī 1390 [2011], 71. Emphasis my own. See Meisami's translation thereof in Meisami 2015, 47: 'Munzir then gave command to seek/ skilled painters to record that feat/ In Khavarnaq they limned in gold/ the line above, the ass below/ The prince's shot, the bolt which found/ both beasts, and lodged deep in the ground/ This work completed, all who saw/ thought that it lived.'

37 Hayyim 1934–1936, 1107.

38 *ibid*., 10.

39 See section 10, entitled 'Of Simnâr and the Building of Khavarnaq' in Meisami 2015, 36–7.

40 Meisami 2015, 52. Meisami's translation thereof: 'Each [image], with a thousand beauties bright,/ kindled the gem of vision's light.'

41 *ibid*., 51.

later marries (*haft paykar nigāshta khūb/ har yakī zān ba kishwar mansūb*),[42] the same cannot said for Kemālpaşazāde's.

I argue that Kemālpaşazāde's picture gallery returns to an older precedent in which natural phenomena stand for their metaphysical analogues. The Ghaznavid poet Manūchihrī (d. c. 433/1040), for example, in his poem *In Praise of Khwāja Abu-l-ʿAbbās*, likens the pleasant rains, breezes and new verdure of spring to the *Book of Pictures* (as pointed out by Werner Sundermann, named *Nigār* in Middle Persian, an analogue to the Parthian '*Ārdhang*,' or *Arzhang*, and the Greek *Eikō'n*, or icon), sacred text of Iranian prophet Mānī (216–274),[43] the pictures of which were 'no end in themselves,' but rather 'were meant to elucidate and embellish the divine message of gnosis':[44] 'Look how the world has become at Nawrūz/ Like the album of Mānī on light blue paper,'[45] proclaims Manūchihrī. Several mentions of the term *Nigāristān* in Kemālpaşazāde's own text likewise support such a reading.[46] In anecdote 1.127 for example, an idyllic meadow 'at the time of the first month of spring, full of colourful roses, the paddock thereof abounding with flowers in full blossom' is identified metaphorically with the *nigāristān-i chīn*. An earlier anecdote describing the decision to make Iconium, the Seljuq capital, is more telling in this regard: upon laying eyes upon the beautiful city, Sultan ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kayqubād (616–634/1220–1237) declares that it 'transmits something of the picture gallery of China' (*chunīn shahrī rā kih az nigāristān-i chīn khabar dahad*).[47] Perhaps the most telling example is found in the already alluded to debate between the *Qayṣar-i Rūm*, Raja of India and Emperor of China, for it is the Chinese emperor, who, due to his possessing the *nigāristān-i khayāl* or 'picture gallery of imagination' overcomes his Rumi/Ottoman and Indian peers and ultimately wins the debate.

Following on from Manūchihrī's precedent of likening natural phenomena and instances of manmade beauty to the *Arzhang*, Kemālpaşazāde himself likens Jāmī's *Bahāristān* to the *Picture Gallery* of Mānī in his introduction to the text:

42 *ibid*.: 'Seven beauteous images there hung [*nigāshta*],/ each one connected with a realm.'

43 As Robert Dankoff and Sooyong Kim point out in the introduction to their translation of selections from Evliyā Çelebi's *Seyāḥatnāme*, Evliyā, writing roughly a hundred and fifty years after Kemālpaşazāde, is unable to distinguish between Mānī and the *Arzhang*, assuming the latter to be 'the name of another painter.' Whether such a confusion is limited to Evliyā Çelebi or indicative of a general seventeenth-century Ottoman trend is yet to be ascertained. See Dankoff and Kim 2011, 113; 231; 334; 354.

44 Sundermann 2009.

45 Manūchihrī 1338 [1959], 48.

46 Indeed, outside of Kemālpaşazāde's text, it is clear that the term 'Nigāristān' is intimately connected with Mānī's work, as evinced by Steingass's dictionary entry thereof under the title '*nagāristān*': 'A picture-gallery the house (or book) of Mānī; title of several celebrated works.' See Steingass 1892, 1423.

47 Gul 2022, 50.

Bahāristān Nigāristān-i Mānīst
valīkun chūn Nigāristān-i mā nīst
Gulistān-i kitāb mā zi har bāb
pur az gulhā-yi rangīn maʿānīst[48]

The Bahāristān is the icon gallery (Nigāristān) of Mānī
Though it is not like our icon gallery[49]
In every chapter, the rose garden (Gulistān) of our book
Abounds with roses bearing motley meanings[50]

2.2 What is the Nigāristān Doing?

The above poem provokes one to ask why Kemālpaşazāde wrote the *Nigāristān*. The answer (or several) may be found in the manuscript variants of a particular word. In his introduction, Kemālpaşazāde writes that he is writing the *Nigāristān* in order to abrogate something. The question, therefore, is: what? According to the base manuscript (IR5639, dated 12 Ṣafar 959/ 18 February 1552, which is in this instance identical with the Manisa variant 45 Hk 6445, dated 981/ 1572) and that of Berlin (Ms. or. quart. 1983, undated, albeit similar to, if not written by the same scribe as the Manisa variant), Kemālpaşazāde declares that he is abrogating certain vague and obscure 'scattering manuscripts' (*nusakh-i pāshān*) and 'ancient transcripts' (*nusakh-i bāstān*) respectively. However, according to that of Cambridge (X.13, dated 973/ 1565–1566), 'the text of the *Nigāristān* has abrogated copies of the *Bahāristān*' (*nuskha-yi nigāristān kih nusakh-i bahāristān rā naskh karda ast*) and in that of Manchester (MS 327, likewise undated, although completed *terminus ante quem* 983/ 1574, based on two seal impressions of Sultan Selīm II therein), it is the *Bustān* that is being abrogated.[51] In all

48 *ibid*., 13.

49 The original orthography, as maintained above, retains the duplicity of 'the picture gallery of Mānī' and 'not our picture gallery,' both contained within 'نگارستان مانیست,' a subtlety which lost when re-written according to modern orthographic conventions that seek to separate every phoneme with a half space, resulting in 'نگارستان مانی‌ست' and 'نگارستان ما نیست.'

50 Hamid Algar has written about this passage to argue that Kemālpaşazāde is seeking to undermine Jāmī. Indeed, the *Bahāristān* starts with a very similar poem linking Jāmī's work with the *Gulistān*; whereas Jāmī humbles himself before Saʿdī, Kemālpaşazāde appears to be criticising Jāmī. What seems to have escaped Algar, however, is Kemālpaşazāde's implicit praise of Jāmī through the platonic imagery in the paronomasia of 'is Mānī's' and 'is not ours,' both of which Algar reduces to the latter meaning (his translation: 'The *Bahāristān* is not for us a picture gallery [*Nigāristān*]; nor does our *Nigāristān* in any way resemble the *Bahāristān*'). See Algar 2018, 97. An analogous couplet composed by Salmān Sāvajī (d. 778/1376) contains the same apposition: '*hama īvān Nigāristān-i Mānīst/ darīghā kān nigāristān-i mā nīst*.' See Sāvajī 1348 [1959–1960], 26.

51 Amidst all these differing variants, one thing is for certain: later scribes themselves were not certain as to what Kemālpaşazāde was seeking to surpass in his *Nigāristān*.

likelihood, the competing text is the *Bahāristān* by Jāmī, written for the instruction of his son Żiyā al-Dīn Yūsuf and, in Hamid Algar's estimation, 'much inferior to the *Gulistān* in both content and style.'[52] Indeed, Jāmī, a contemporary of Kemālpaşazāde who died when the writer of the *Nigāristān* was roughly 23 years old, was undoubtedly, besides Saʿdī, Kemālpaşazāde's biggest literary influence, whom he sets up as a literary competitor.[53] Jāmī's legacy is thus crucial to understand the *Nigāristān*, especially considering millennial discussions and the idea of Jāmī being a 'seal'[54] of the poets [with the first to suggest that Jāmī was such a seal, or *khatm*, being his nephew and another contemporary of Kemālpaşazāde, Hātifī (858–927/1454–1521)].[55]

It was in Jāmī's Timurid milieu that, according to Hamid Algar, the canon of Persian poetry was further standardised, turning 'Persian literacy into the ultimate model for generating new literary idioms in Islamicate domains.'[56] Indeed, as established by Nile Green, it was Timurid Herat that served as the model for Meḥmed the Conqueror's new imperial capital,[57] a model also inherited by Ottoman literatuers (in Kemālpaşazāde's *Nigāristān*, for example, mentions of Herat exceed mentions of all Ottoman/Rumi localities put together). On several occasions, various Ottoman sultans invited Jāmī to Istanbul. The first major attempt was made by Meḥmed II during Jāmī's sojourn in Aleppo.[58] The second great attempt came with Bāyezīd II, who, after sending two letters to Herat to invite him to his court in Istanbul,[59] in 895/1490 sent a delegation to the Timurid realms with one thousand ducats as upfront money for Jāmī in Herat.[60] While he may have politely rejected these offers, Jāmī nevertheless dedicated several of his works and poems to Ottoman sultans. But while popular discourses exalted Jāmī as having summated all literary traditions that came before him, Kemālpaşazāde finds Jāmī's *Bahāristān* lacking in the totality that he seeks to account for in his *Nigāristān*. Affirming Algar's words, Kemālpaşazāde likens Jāmī's *Bahāristān* to 'ants as seen through slanted eyes.'[61] Two pages prior to this comparison, Kemālpaşazāde describes his *Nigāristān* in the following terms: 'Unlike Jāmī's *Bahāristān*, the fruits of this delightful orchard display no signs of unripeness, nor do the sour

52 Algar 2018, 109.
53 This should not be read as arrogance or one-upmanship, for a reading of the *Nigāristān*, full of excerpts and resonances from Jāmī's oeuvre, not at the least his *Bahāristān*, shows how indebted Kemālpaşazāde is to whom he calls '*shaykh-i ajall marḥūm-i Jāmī*,' (see: Gul 2022, 264), *shaykh-i ajall* being the title Saʿdī gives to his esteemed *Niẓāmiyya* tutor from Baghdad, the younger Abū-l-Faraj ibn al-Jawzī (d. 635/1238) in the *Gulistān*. See: Thackston 2018, 56.
54 For discussions on the origin of the title *Khatm al-Shuʿarāʾ*, see: Algar 2018, 97; Lewis 2018, 473.
55 Algar 2018, 97.
56 d'Hubert and Papas 2018, 11.
57 Green 2019, 24.
58 Algar 2018, 68.
59 Richard 2018, 27.
60 Algar 2018, 82.
61 Gul 2022, 15.

grapes of this fair garden, like a [bright] lamp, bear the mark of incompleteness. These newly wedded brides of virginal ideas, like peacocks full of images (*pur nigār*) manifesting their full beauty in the flower garden, have neither a cold deportment nor a stray gait.'[62]

3. Persian Idiom, Ottoman Meanings

3.1 Imitating Saʿdī

The Ottoman biographer and poet, ʿĀşıḳ Çelebi (926–979/1520–1572), writing a generation after Kemālpaşazāde, commented in his biographical dictionary of poets *Meşāʿir ül-Şuʿarāʾ* ('Senses of the Poets') that Kemālpaşazāde liked Saʿdī's *Gulistān* so much that 'he reproduced exactly the stories of the *Gulistān* and slightly changed the arrangement and themes'[63] in his *Nigāristān*. A more careful look, however, at the structure and content of Kemālpaşazāde's *Nigāristān* reveals a deeper level of intentionality in Kemālpaşazāde's dialogue with Saʿdī. Let us take a look at anecdote 1.40. It is worth reproducing the entirety of the anecdote below to demonstrate Kemālpaşazāde's masterful employment of Saʿdī.

chūn sālār-i jaysh-i bad-kīsh-i Tātār Hūlāgū-yi kīna-jūy-i bad-kirdār ba changāl-i jidāl va chang-i jang khalʿat-i khilāfat rā az Āl-i ʿAbbās khalʿ kard, va ba nīrū-yi bāzū-yi qahr va bī-dād shahr-i Baghdād girift, va bīkh-i sakht va rakht-i bakht-i khalīfa-yi zamān al-Mustaʿṣim bi-llāh rā az bustān-i jahān qalʿ sākht, dar bayān-i ān muṣībat-i qiyāmat-nishān haẓrat-i Shaykh Saʿdī qaṣīdaʾī gufta ast kih maṭlaʿash īn ast:

rubāʿī

āsmān rā ḥaqq buvad gar khūn bigiryad bar zamīn
bar zavāl-i mulk-i Mustaʿṣim amīr al-muʾminīn
ay Muḥammad dar qiyāmat gar bar ārī sar zi khāk
sar bar āvar va īn qiyāmat dar miyān-i khalq bīn

naṯr

daftar-i mihtarī-yi ū rā ba qalam-i khaṭṭī khaṭṭ-i buṭlān kishīd, wa kāna dhālika fī al-kitābi masṭūra. Az raqm-i dabīr-i tadbīr-i ū aṯarī dar daftar-i ʿālam namānd, faṣāra kaʾan lam yakun shayʾan madhkūra. Mazbūr khalīfa dar ān zamān kih bakhtash rā munkūb dīd va rakhtash rā munhūb, īn bayt rā inshād kard va inqilāb-i asbāb-i dawlat rā yād:

bayt-i tāzī

wa aṣbaḥnā lanā dār ka-jannāt wa firdaws
wa amsaynā bilā dār kaʾan lam tughna bil-ams

62 Gul 2022, 13.
63 Çelebi 2010, f. 38b, quoted from Algar 2018, 114.

naṯr

chūn shahr-i Baghdād ba nahr-i fasād va jū-yi bī-dād-i Hūlāgū-yi tund-khūy-i bad-nahād gharq shud, sīlāb-i kīna-yi ān bād-farjām Madīnat al-Salām kih qubbat al-Islām būd, kharāb va yabāb gasht. Kār va bār-i ahālī-yi ān ḥavālī ba nār-i ghārat va khisārat-i Tatār ḥarq shud.

bayt

khūn-i farzandān-i ʿamm-i Mustaṭfā shud rīkhta
ham bar ān khākī kih sulṭānān nahādandī jabīn

naṯr

shamʿ-i dawlat-i Āl-i ʿAbbās ba sar-i āstīn-i qahr kushta shud, va rūz-i bakht-i ʿālī-shān-i īshān bar-gashta

tāzī

khalat al-manābir wa al-asirra minhum
faʿalayhim ḥattā al-qiyām salām

tārīkh

sāl-i hijrat-i shishṣad va panjāh-o shish
rūz-i yakshamba chahārum az ṣafar
shud khalīfa pīsh-i takht-i pādshāh
dawlat-i ʿAbbāsīyān āmad ba sar

When the vengeful and evil-doing Hulagu, commander of that most impious Tatar army, having torn from the Abbasid family the caliphal mantle with the claws of discord and talons of war, seized the city of Baghdad by force of the flanks of oppression and injustice, and uprooted the firm root and fortuitous splendour of the caliph of the age – al-Mustaʿṣim bi-llāh – from the orchard of this world, his eminence Shaykh Saʿdī composed a *qaṣīda* elucidating such a doomsday-portending catastrophe. Its opening lines are as follows:

Quatrain:

The heavens have a right to shed tears of blood upon the land
Over the downfall of the kingdom of Mustaʿṣim, commander of the faithful;
O Muḥammad, should you raise your head from the earth on the day of resurrection
Raise ye your head now and witness this doomsday amongst the people!

Prose:

His [Hulagu's] ink pen crossed-out the ledger of his [al-Mustaʿṣim's] precedence with a strike of annulment, *and this was written in the Book*. Not a trace of the secretary of prudence's figures remained in the account book of the world, *such that he* [al-Mustaʿṣim] *became as if he was nothing, (not even) mentioned*. The aforementioned

caliph, realising that his fortune was vanquished and his vestments ravished, and recalling the alternation of the means of fortune, composed this couplet:

Arabic Couplet:

We awoke possessing a garden-like, paradisal abode
And we slept sans abode, as if it had not flourished just the day before

Prose:

When the city of Baghdad drowned in the river of depravity and oppressive miasma of the irascible and ill-natured Hulagu, the torrent of that accursed one's vengeance reduced the City of Peace, also known as the Dome of Islam, to ruins and smithereens. The livelihoods of those environs' inhabitants were burned in the fires of Tatar looting and damage.

Couplet:

The blood of the progeny of the prophet's uncle has been shed
On the very same earth upon which sultans would prostrate their heads

Prose:

The candle of the Abbasid line was extinguished with the cuff of the sleeve of violence, and so retired the day of their glorious fortune.

Arabic:

The podiums and thrones are vacant of them
Peace, then, upon them all till death come!

Chronogram:

In the six hundredth and fifty sixth hijrī year
Sunday, fourth of the month of Ṣafar
The caliph went under the emperor's throne
The fortune of the Abbasids lapsed

The subject of the anecdote is Saʿdī's response to the horror of the Mongol sack of Baghdad in 656/1258. Kemālpaşazāde begins with the opening two lines of Saʿdī's famous elegy on the murder of Caliph al-Mustaʿṣim (r. 640–656/1242–1258) and the extinguishment of his Abbasid line. Saʿdī's tone is jeremiad; he likens the calamity before him to the apocalypse. Just as the Shirazi poet begins to call upon the prophet Muḥammad to physically intercede in his sorry circumstances as he will on the day of resurrection, Kemālpaşazāde interrupts the poem with a reminder that such an event, far from being unique, was ordained by God. In opposition to Saʿdī's eschatological airs, Kemālpaşazāde employs excerpts from Qurʾānic verses (underlined in the text above) that emphasise the cyclicality of time, from Q 17:58: 'there is no community We shall not destroy, or punish severely, before the Day of Resurrection – *this is written in the Book*,' to Q 76:1: 'Has there not been over man a long period of time, *when he was nothing, (not even) mentioned?*'

Kemālpaşazāde further interrupts the flow of Saʿdī's narrative by inserting the voice of the caliph himself in the form of an Arabic couplet attributed to him in the *Jāmiʿ al-Tawārīkh* (Compendium of Chronicles) by another contemporary of Saʿdī, Rashīd al-Dīn al-Hamadāni (c. 645–718/1247–1318).[64] As if to confirm Kemālpaşazāde's Qurʾānic interjections on the cyclicality of civilisational rise and fall, al-Mustaʿṣim's couplet itself contains a portion of verse Q 10:24: 'But when the earth has taken on its finest appearance and adorns itself, and its people think they have power over it, then the fate We commanded comes to it, by night or by day, and We reduce it to stubble, *as if it had not flourished just the day before*.' The anecdote thereafter returns to Saʿdī's elegy, with the Shirazi poet decrying how '[T]he blood of the progeny of the prophet's uncle has been shed,' only, again, to be interrupted with yet another couplet of Arabic poetry. At an initial reading, the tone of the couplet may seem to affirm Saʿdī's elegiac tone and black despondency, but its authorship by al-Sāʾib b. Farrūkh (d. c. 91/753), the fiercely anti-Alid and Umayyad partisan poet, suggests a challenge to Saʿdī's interpretation thereof on Kemālpaşazāde's part. It is worth replicating the entirety of the poem as can be found in Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī's (c. 574–626/1179–1229) *Muʿjam al-Udabāʾ* (Encyclopedia of Literatuers):

آمت نساء بني أمية منهم
وبناتهم بمضيعةٍ أيتام
نامت جدودهم واسقط نجمهم
والنجم يسقط والجدود تنام
خلت المنابر والأسرة منهم
فعليهم حتى الممات سلام[65]

Widowed are the Umayyad women
And their daughters, orphaned in loss,
Their good fortune slept as their star was felled
Their star (now) is fell, their fortune (now) asleep,
The podiums and thrones are vacant of them
Peace, then, upon them all till death come![66]

Though such a couplet immediately follows Kemālpaşazāde's remarks that 'the candle of the Abbasid line was extinguished,' it merits attention that every biographical dictionary entry containing the poem mentions how al-Sāʾib wrote it to immortalise the grief of the Umayyad women who lost their menfolk in the massacres of the Abbasid revolution. Kemālpaşazāde then concludes the anecdote with a chronogram by yet another Saʿdī contemporary, Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī (597–672/1201–1274) recalling

64 Quatremère 1844, 168.
65 al-Ḥamawī 1993, 1341.
66 Translation my own.

the sack,[67] as if to mirror the intensity of the anecdote's opening poem, in a manner that can only be described as cold and verging-on-indifferent.

A mere look at Kemālpaşazāde's intersplicing of Saʿdī's versions of events (the subject matter of the anecdote) betrays the uncharitability of ʿĀşıḳ Çelebi's remarks.[68] Kemālpaşazāde is clearly not simply parroting or rearranging Saʿdī. Though not present at the event, or rather, because of that fact, he is able to paint a fuller picture than Saʿdī himself. Firstly, he gives Saʿdī a voice that the Shirazi poet could not have himself exhibited in his own time. Though Saʿdī laments the ransacking and blood-shedding, he is unable to condemn those at whose hands it was wrought. To do so would be politically inexpedient at the least, if not mean the persecution and potential death of the poet in a world now under the yoke of the Mongol Ilkhanate. The Iranian scholar of history and literature, Muḥammad Qazvīnī, in his *'Mamdūḥīn-i Shaykh Saʿdī*,'[69] established that the 'Ilkhan' to whom Saʿdī's *qaṣīda On the Transfer of Fortune from the Salghurids to Another People*[70] is dedicated is none other than Hulagu himself, meaning that Saʿdī even wrote in praise of the man responsible for the destruction that he elsewhere bemoans. Kemālpaşazāde, not restricted by the same dangers, relieves Saʿdī of such ambiguity with an abundance of adjectives of clear condemnation: the Mongol army, having overcome the City of Peace with 'oppression and injustice (*qahr va bī-dād*) and corruption (*fasād*), is evil-natured and impious (*bad-kīsh*). The lion's share of condemning attributes, verging on comically superfluous, clearly goes to Hulagu: vengeful (*kina-jūy*), evil-doing (*bad-kirdār*), irascible (*tund-khūy*), ill-natured (*bad-nahād*) and accursed (*bad-farjām*).

In addition to giving voice to Saʿdī, Kemālpaşazāde enhances Saʿdī's narrative with other voices, some of whom are Saʿdī's own contemporaries, and all of which qualify or temper Saʿdī's own claims in his poem. Through such insertions, Kemālpaşazāde is grappling and, at times, disagreeing with Saʿdī. Whereas the sack of Baghdad was the end of a world for Saʿdī, Kemālpaşazāde's responses through the likes of Ilkhanid vizier (Rashīd al-Dīn) and scholarly retinue of Hulagu's council (Ṭūsī), subsumes it into a greater schema of rise and fall, even going as far as to supplement Saʿdī's lamenting the end of the Abbasid line at the hands of the Mongols with a couplet lamenting the end of the Umayyad line at the hands of the Abbasids written by an anti-Abbasid poet. If the whole anecdote starts intensely subjective and passionately with Saʿdī's eschatological evocations, Kemālpaşazāde's insertions make it increasingly

67 Though I was not able to source the exact location of the poem, Ḥasan Mursilvand, in his encyclopaedic work on famous contemporary and historical Iranians, identifies its source as Ṭūsī's poesy manual *Miʿyār al-Ashʿār*. See: Mursilvand 1379 [2000], 249.

68 Such uncharitability is further betrayed by accounts of the *Nigāristān*'s popularity for another three centuries, such as Bosnian Persophile litterateur Fevzī Mostārī's (d. 1160/1747) appraisal of the best Persian works of his day 'consisting of edifying or amusing anecdotes,' wherein he places Kemālpaşazāde's literary masterpiece third only to Saʿdī's *Gulistān* and Jāmī's *Bahāristān*. See: Algar 2018, 114.

69 Qazvīnī 1317 [1938], 58.

70 Saʿdī 1385 [2006–2007], 975.

dispassionate and contextualised, ultimately ending with reference to the sacking in terms as clinical and disinterested as Marco Polo's contemporary description thereof.

3.1.1 The Past as a Mirror unto the Present

Though the above example displays Kemālpaşazāde's wide reading of Persian and Arabic sources, including those that are strictly historical and literary (i.e., beyond the purview of a legal and theological syllabus in whose context Kemālpaşazāde is often discussed),[71] he also lived in a time and place. As a soldier, scholar and, later, *şeyḫülislām*, who – like his muse Saʿdī – was well-travelled, his own context, poetry, and anecdotes from the masterpieces of Persian literature that he so quotes, despite their textual and often fictional bases, had real and contemporary meanings. Seeking to understand what Kemālpaşazāde's sources meant to him and his immediate audience is a far more fruitful task than simply identifying the sources and subsequently writing-off such 'copies' as slavish imitation. So, when he describes the ruins of Khosrow's palace in the aftermath of the Rashidun conquests and quotes the following *qiṭʿa* attributed to Saʿdī: *parda-dārī mī-kunad dar ṭāq-i kisrā ʿankabūt/ būm nawbat mī-zanad bar qalʿa-yi Āfrāsyāb*[72] (the spider performs chamberlainry[73] in Khosrow's Arch/ the owl keeps watch in Āfrāsyāb's castle'), what resonance would such a verse have to contemporary Ottoman ears, knowing that it was the same verse that Meḥmed the Conqueror supposedly recited upon alighting his horse and entering the ruins of the Palace of Boukoleon in Constantinople?[74]

The tradition of referring to well-established literary and historical tropes to buttress contemporary events (or *literary teleologies*, if I might term them so) is, of course, not without precedent in Persianate writing. The Ghaznavid secretary and historian Abū l-Faẓl Bayhaqī (385–470/995–1077), when writing of the conquest of Ghur, embellishes Maḥmūd of Ghazni's (r. 388–421/998–1030) victory with a teleological bent, arguing that his patron has done what Rashidun armies could not:

> This story about Ghur has been mentioned because, in the times of Islam and of unbelief, no monarch had extended such conquering power over Ghur as did the martyred Sultan Masʿud. In the first conquests in Khorasan, God, His mention is exalted, sought to make the Islamic faith more clear and evident through the agency of those great figures from the early years of Islam. They defeated the Persians and drove them out of Madaʾen, and when Yazdagerd fled, he was killed at Merv. But in spite of those mighty and celebrated deeds, they were unable to penetrate into

71 Kalın 2015, 199.

72 Gul 2022, 69–71.

73 The verb *parda-dārī kardan* here has two meanings, from 'being a doorkeeper' to a spider's 'spinning a cobweb,' thus also giving the meaning of 'the spider spins its cobwebs in Khosrow's Arch.'

74 Meḥmed's recitation of this verse can be found in Ṭursun Beg's (d. 896/1499) *Tārīḫ-i Ebü-l-Feṭḥ*; see references thereto in Lewis 1963, 8 and Öztürk 2003, 141.

> the heart of the land of Ghur… In the time of the Samanids, a commander who was called Bu Jaʿfar Ziyadi and who regarded himself as on a par with Buʾl-Hasan, son of Simjur, regarding troops, weapons and equipment, attacked Ghur on several occasions at the behest of the Samanids. The governor of Herat provided assistance in the shape of a locally-raised militia and men from his own following. Abu Jaʿfar Ziyadi tried valiantly and showed great courage, but he was not able to penetrate beyond Kheysar and Tulak. No-one penetrated into the Ghur heartlands to achieve these great deeds in the manner of this august monarch Masʿud; and all have now passed on, God's mercy be upon them all! [75]

The historian ʿAṭāʾ Mālik Juwaynī (623–681/1226–1283), likewise portends the coming Mongol invasions by referring to the breaching of the legendary Wall of Alexander and Gog and Magog (as iterated in the Qurʾān and Hadith corpus, later embellished in the Alexander Romance genre) by Khwarezmshah ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad's (d. 596/1220) breaking of Qara Khitai (Western Liao) power, i.e. the buffer state between his realm and the Genghis Khan's burgeoning Mongol polity, thus leaving it exposed to attack.

> With some others I called on my master Sayyid Murtaza the son of Sayyid Sadr-ad-Din (may God clothe them both in the raiment of His mercy). I found him sitting sad and silent in a corner of his house. We asked the reason for his grieving on so joyous an occasion. 'O men of little heed' he replied, 'beyond these Turks are a people stubborn in their vengeance and fury and exceeding Gog and Magog in the multitude of their numbers. And the people of Khitai were in truth the wall of Zul-Qarnain between us and them. And it is unlikely, when that wall is gone, that there will be any peace within this realm or that any man will recline in comfort and enjoyment. Today I am in mourning for Islam.[76]

3.1.2 Literary Geographies Subsumed into Political Geographies

Just as Ṭursun Beg brought the ruins of Yazdigird's palace and that of Āfrāsyāb, legendary archenemy of Iran, into the Constantinople of 1453, thus intimately connecting Saʿdī and his legacy to a new Byzantine-Ottoman context, so too does Kemālpaşazāde appeal to several locations from the Persian literary precedent in general and Saʿdī in particular to highlight contemporary points. In anecdote 1.97 Kemālpaşazāde includes a poem describing Saʿdi's meeting with an 'elder' in the 'Furthest Reaches of Greece' (*aqṣāy-i yūnān*).[77] We know that Saʿdī travelled a great deal, but we have no

75 Bosworth 2011, 205.

76 Boyle 1958, 347.

77 This curious term also appears in Jāmī's *Iskandarnāma* to denote the westerly edge of the world in contradistinction to China (*sikandar zi aqṣāy-i yūnān-i zamīn/ sipah rānd bar khāqān-i chīn*). See Jāmi 1375 [1996], 972. Andrew Peacock suggested to me that 'Furthest Greece' could be the traditional Arab-Byzantine frontier roughly corresponding to

accounts of Saʿdī travelling to such a place that was during his time either a marchland between various Muslims polities and Armenian Cilicia or altogether outside of *dār al-Islām* and in the Byzantine realm. At the time of the composition of the *Nigāristān*, however, the same region had been politically incorporated into the greater Islamic ecumene and thus accessible to the likes of fictional personalities of Saʿdī. Saʿdī's literary persona in the *Gulistān* may have been able to go to the likes of Kashgar and even Somnath, but the Saʿdī of the *Nigāristān* is now enabled to walk in further climes.

A further example can be found in Kemālpaşazāde's retelling of the *Gulistān* anecdote of Saʿdī's sermon before an uninterested audience in the Friday Mosque of Baalbek.[78] Twenty years had barely passed since the city's incorporation into the Ottoman realm (a conquest in which Kemālpaşazāde himself participated). Baalbek, therefore, was no longer only in the Ottoman imaginative geography but now in its territorial geography. Thus, it is not inconceivable that Saʿdī's description of 'a group of unfeeling, dead-hearted people' (*jamʿī afsurda va dil-murda*), with its language mirroring the sentiment of Kemālpaşazāde's anti-Shiite fatwas, would be a snide remark at the Shiite Arabs of Jabal ʿĀmil, also identified as Ḳızılbaş by Ottoman authorities.[79] Moving further south, much like Bayhaqī's harkening back to failures of earlier generations to subdue Ghur so as to highlight the prowess of his patron Maḥmūd, Kemālpaşazāde singles out the conquest of Nusaybin in the time of the third caliph ʿUmar to highlight the glory of its recent conquest by Selīm I that he himself partook in.[80]

Some periods and places appear in Kemālpaşazāde's work that rarely appear in Persian poetry and historical writing. Whereas the term *Zang* and adjective *Zangī* have a long and established precedent in Persian poetry as a metaphor for black skin, darkness, and the homeland of the likes of the 'foul-coloured negro' from the final chapter,[81] or Saʿdī's '*zangī* with a drooping lip' from the *Gulistān*, Kemālpaşazāde's move from using *zangī* as a literary trope to the mention of *Zangibār*[82] also indicates the entering of a tangible location, both literary or poetic, into the Ottoman horizon. Indeed, the island was visited by Kemālpaşazāde's contemporary, Piri Reʾis (d. 960/1553), and thereafter tussled over between the Ottomans and Portuguese for the next few decades. *Zang* and Zanzibar for Kemālpaşazāde's readers thus was not simply a literary trope thought-up of in the salons of Saʿdī's Shiraz, but rather, just like Tabriz, Buda, Sanaa and Fez, within reach of their ever-growing horizons. Abyssinia

modern Turkey's southern borders. Whether or not it be this or somewhere closer to modern Greece, Saʿdī, or even the fictional character thereof who visited Kashgar and Gujerat, did not travel there.

78 Saʿdī 2018, 51.

79 Whereas Kemālpaşazāde indicated in various fatwas that the Ḳızılbaş are not limited to Anatolian tribes and could include the Shiites of Jabal ʿĀmil and its environs, the label seems to have stuck after Ebūssuʿūd Efendi's (896–982/1490–1574) fatwas conflating both parties a few years after Kemālpaşazāde's death. See Winter 2010, 16.

80 Gul 2022, 117–8.

81 *ibid*., 449.

82 *ibid*., 418–24; 287–9; 311.

is also worth mentioning, for it was also in the Indian Ocean theatre in a pre-modern 'World War' between the Ottomans and Portugal. An anecdote enumerating the difficulties faced by the prophet Muḥammad's companions in their migration to and settling in 'the kingdom of goodly repute of the Negus' (*pādshāhi-yi nikūnām-i Najāshi*) in anecdote 3.8 reflect the difficulties of Ottoman soldiers and migrants in the same land in Kemālpaşazāde's day. With the final defeat of the emperor Dawit II (r. 1508–1540) at the battle of Amba Sel in 1531, the majority of the Ethiopian highlands were under Muslim control of Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm al-Ghāzī (d. 949/1543) of the Ottoman tributary Adel Sultanate, who, seeking to mirror what Meḥmed the Conqueror did in Constantinople in 1453, made Axum (capital of the Islamic Negus from the prophet's day) his new capital. Seeking to connect the prestigious history of the earliest Islamic days with his Ottoman universalist, if not literary millennialist project,[83] Kemālpaşazāde wrote the *Nigāristān* and lived the rest of his life with the knowledge that the Ottomans had succeeded in annexing the ancient Christian kingdom of *Najāshī*. It was only six years after Kemālpaşazāde's death (and an ironic 90 *hijrī* years after the conquest of Constantinople) when the tide turned when Imam Aḥmad was killed, and the Ottoman-Adel forces were driven out of Axum and the Ethiopian highlands.

3.2 Terken Khātūn and Ḥürrem Sulṭān

When Kemālpaşazāde brings up countless, and understandably misogynistic, stories about women in political power, how many of these historical anecdotes are mirrors – or perhaps picture galleries even – condemning the nascent sultanate of women that began to take shape in the latter years of his life when he wrote the *Nigāristān*? Anecdote 1.71 is dedicated to the latter days of Seljuk vizier Niẓām al-Mulk and how he did not allow Terken Khātūn (d. 487/1094), wife of Sultan Malikshāh (r. 465–485/1072–1092), 'to stick her nose into the affairs of state.' Terken, given the epithet 'the cunning' (*nayrang-jūy*) thereby plotted such that she 'cast Niẓām al-Mulk, once the sun in the sky of the palace of the royal court, from viziership and the pedestal of safeguarded premiership to the ground of humiliation and dust of misfortune.'[84] Terken Khātūn's plotting is immediately followed by Niẓām al-Mulk's demise at the hand of Ismaili assassins, as if to postulate a link between the two events. How would Kemālpaşazāde's retelling of the Seljuk Niẓām al-Mulk's conflict with and later fall from grace at the hands of Terken Khātūn strike resonances between vizier Pargalı İbrāhīm Paşa (d. 942/1536), to whom the *Nigāristān* is dedicated, and his conflict with Ḥürrem Sulṭān, the aforementioned 'Queen of Persia' of Titian, who ultimately plotted his downfall and assassination? The fate met by Pargalı İbrāhīm Paşa is indeed uncannily similar to that of Niẓām al-Mulk.

83 See the latter part of footnote 5.
84 Gul 2022, 82–4.

3.3 Ne Mutlu Türküm Diyene

Other examples from the repository of Persian poetic idioms that Kemālpaşazāde uses have different contemporary meanings, such as the repeated motif of 'marauding Oghuzes' (*Ghuzz-i Turk-tāz*) and 'Turkish wolves' (*gurgān-i Turkān*) seeking pillage and plunder,[85] perhaps best encapsulated in a poem at the conclusion of the final chapter of the *Nigāristān*:

ān shinīdastī kih Turkī vasf-i jannat chūn shinīd
guft bar vāʿiẓ kih ānjā ghārat va tārāj hast
guft nī guftā battar bāshad zi dūzakh ān bihisht
kih andarū kūtah buvad az ghārat va tārāj dast[86]

Have you heard of the Turk when he heard a description of paradise?
He asked the preacher: will there be pillage and plunder there?
He [the preacher] said no; the Turk said: such a 'heaven' is worse than hell,
That one's hand therein should be powerless to ravage and ransack!

In a similar anecdote (4.20), an astrologer presents a calendar to 'one of the great witless Turkish emirs,' who, seeking to interpret the strange document presented to him, goes on to misreading the names of the months, identifying himself with Timur (read: *Tammūz*), his slave boy with *Ayāz* (read the month *Ayyār*, misread as the famous slave-beloved of Maḥmūd of Ghaznī), though he is unable to identify the person of a certain 'flying donkey' (*khar-i parān* in the Persian, a humorous misreading of *Ḥazīrān*).[87] Again, the Turks here are worlds apart from the refined and gentile Ottomans of Kemālpaşazāde's context, the usage being more in line with what David Kushner has identified as a 'derogatory reference to the ignorant peasant or nomad of Anatolia'[88] predating the rise of nationalism in the nineteenth century. Who then, are Kemālpaşazāde's Turks and why do they receive such a bad reputation in the *Nigāristān*? The answer may be found in Kemālpaşazāde's description of local Anatolian rulers: 'the evildoing Karamanid family' (*āl-i bad-fiʿāl-i Qarāmān*);[89] is this due to their siding with the Mamluks and repeated conflicts with and rebellions against his Ottoman patrons, which led to their conquest in 1487? Or because of the fact that Selīm I had to buy their loyalty with money and land during his succession crisis 25 years later against his brother Şehzāde Aḥmed (d. 919/1513)?[90] Or is it due to Kemāl-

85 *ibid*., 77–8; 110–1; 122–7; 157–8; 213–4; 350–1.
86 *ibid*., 348.
87 The humour here arises from the similarities in the orthographic skeleton between the words تموز and تمور, ایاز and ایار, and حزیران and خرپران.
88 Kushner 1997, 219.
89 Gul 2022, 284–5.
90 Mikhail 2020, 88.

paşazāde's own experiences during his appointment to the land survey of Karaman, during which point he 'either dismissed or resigned' from his post as military judge?[91]

4. Concluding Remarks

Though this article has only sought to introduce the *Nigāristān*, much more work is needed on the text, not at the least because it was one of the final works produced by Kemālpaşazāde at the end of a long and extraordinary life. Contrary to the remarks of certain modern critics, Kemālpaşazāde isn't merely copying-and-pasting the works of his predecessors or trying to slavishly imitate an ossified style attributed to them. As we have seen, when Kemālpaşazāde takes from Saʿdī, his narratives are supplemented with a wider variety of sources and are even problematised, if not criticised. If Jāmī can be seen as the *telos* of all existing genres in Persian literature, the text of the *Nigāristān* is a clear challenge, seeking to surpass the example of Kemālpaşazāde's Herati contemporary. The *Nigāristān* is incredibly rich in intertextuality, every *nigār* in this picture gallery (or speculum, in the medieval European understanding) is a window and reference unto the complex web of Islamicate learning, from pre-Islamic *Jāhilī* and Persian poetry, prophetic *sīra* literature, hagiographies of kings and saints, etiological myths, historiography, Alexander Romances, epistolary manuals, theological diatribes and illuminationist writing, love stories, animal fables, debates between inanimate objects reminiscent of Abū-l-Majd Muḥammad b. Masʿūd Tabrīzī's *Safīna-yi Tabrīz* (completed in 723/1323), and even parodies of Persian and Arabic poetry from '*mashnaw az nay chūn shikāyat mī-kunad*' to '*fa-lā tabki min dhikrā ḥabīb wa-manzil*'[92] in what one might consider a literary arm to the Ottoman universalist project.

With the title's Chinese origins, flaunting not only the geographic breadth and ambition of the text, but Kemālpaşazāde's erudition in creating a magnum opus that is comprehensive, the *Nigāristān* is indeed the picture gallery of Persianate literary traditions. Such comprehensiveness can be seen in that, whilst Muḥammad Javād Mashkūr's edition of Saʿdi's *Gulistān* is 195 pages and Aʿlākhān Afṣaḥzād, Muḥammad-Jān ʿImrān and Abū Bakr Ẓuhūr al-Dīn's edition of *Bahāristān* is 155 pages, the *Nigāristān* is an astounding 470 pages.

Bibliography

Published Primary Sources

al-Ḥamawī, Yāqūt. 1993. *Muʿjam al-Udabāʾ*. Vol 1. Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī.
Çelebi, ʿĀşıḳ. 2010. *Meşāʾir ül-Şuʿarāʾ*. Vol. 1. Kılıç, Filiz (ed.). Istanbul: İstanbul Araştırmaları Enstitüsü.

91 Woodhead 2021.
92 Kemālpaşazāde is negating the imperatives in the original Persian and Arabic, 'بشنو' and 'قفا نبك' respectively.

Dūghlāt, Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥaydar. 1383 [2004]. *Tārikh-i Rashīdī*. Ghaffārī-Fard, ʻAbbās-Qulī (ed.). Tehran: Mirāṣ-i Maktūb.
Gul, Zakir Hussein. 2022. *The Nigāristān of Kamālpāshāzāda: A Critical Edition of an Early Modern Persian Language Speculum Principum from the Periphery of the Persianate World*. MA dissertation. University of Tehran, Tehran.
Jāmi, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. 1379 [2000]. *Bahāristān va Rasāʾil-i Jāmi*. Afṣaḥzād, Aʿlākhān, ʿImrān, Muḥammad-Jān and Ẓuhūr al-Din, Abū Bakr (eds.). Tehran: Mirāṣ-i Maktūb.
–. 1378 [1999]. *Diwān*. Afṣaḥzād, Aʿlākhān (ed.). Tehran: Mīrāṣ-i Maktūb.
–. 1378 [1999]. *Maṣnavi-yi Haft Awrang*. Aḥrārī, Ṭāhir, Dādʿalīshāh, Jābulqā and Jānfidā, Asghar et al. (eds.). Tehran: Mirāṣ-i Maktūb.
–. 1375 [1996]. *Maṣnavī-yi Haft Awrang*. Mudarris-Gilāni, Murtaḍā (ed.). Tehran: Mahtāb.
Juwaynī, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAṭāʾ Malik Muḥammad. 1391 [2012]. *Tārikh-i Jahāngushāy*. Qazwīnī, Muḥammad (ed.). Tehran: Muʾassasa-yi Intishārāt-i Nigāh.
Manūchihrī, Abū Najm Aḥmad ibn Qawṣ ibn Aḥmad. 1338 [1959]. *Dīvān-i Ustād Manūchihrī-yi Dāmghānī*. Dabīr-Siyāqī, Muḥammad (ed.). Tehran: Zavvār.
Niẓāmī, Jamāl ad-Dīn Abū Muḥammad Ilyās Ibn Yūsuf Ibn Zakkī. 1390 [2011]. *Haft Paykar*. Dastgardī, Ḥasan-Vaḥīd. Tehran: Qaṭra.
Saʿdī. 1386 [2007]. *Būstān*. Khaṭīb-Rahbar, Khalīl (ed.). Tehran: Ṣafī ʿAlī-Shāh.
–. 1385 [2006–2007]. *Kulliyāt-i Saʿdī*. Furūghī, Muhḥammad-ʿAlī (ed.). Tehran: Hermes.
Sāvajī, Salmān. 1348 [1959–1960]. *Maṣnavī-yi Jamshīd va Khurshīd*. Asmussen, J.P., Vahman, Ferīdūn (eds.). Tehran: Bungāh-i Tarjuma va Nashr-i Kitāb.
Yāḥaqqī, Muḥammad Jaʿfar and Sayyidī, Mahdī (eds.). 1390 [2011]. Dībā-yi Dīdārī: *Matn-i Kāmil-i Tārikh-i Bayhaqī bā Muqaddama, Tawẓīhāt va Sharḥ-i Mushkilāt*. Tehran: Sukhan.

Secondary Sources

Acar, Cafer. 2022. 'İbn Kemal'in Şah İsmail'e Yönelik Tekfirinin Siyâsî Boyutları Üzerine'. *Danişname Beşeri Ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5. 105–131.
Algar, Hamid. 2013. *Jami*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
–. 2018. 'Jāmī and the Ottomans'. In d'Hubert, Thibaut and Papas, Alexandre (eds.). *Jāmī in Regional Contexts*. Leiden: Brill. 63–135.
Bekir, Özcan. 1992. 'İnsana Verdiği Önem Yönünden İbn Kemal'in Nigâristân'ı'. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 7. 243–256.
Browne, Edward G. 1928. *A Literary History of Persia*. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dankoff, Robert and Kim, Sooyong. 2011. *An Ottoman Traveller: Selections from the Book of Travels of Evliya Celebi*. London: Eland Publishing Ltd.
Demirkol, Murat, Canikli, İlyas, and Kıyak, Sever (eds). 2022. *Kemalpaşazâde Felsefe-Din-Edebiyat Araştırmaları*. Vol 1. Ankara: Fecr Yayınları.
d'Hubert, Thibaut and Papas, Alexandre. 2018. 'Introduction'. In d'Hubert, Thibaut and Papas, Alexandre (eds.). *Jāmī in Regional Contexts*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill. 1–26.
Edmund, Bosworth C.E. 2011. *The History of Beyhaqi: The History of Sultan Masʿud of Ghazna, 1030–1041, Volume I: Introduction and Translation of Years 421–423 A.H. (1030–1032 A.D.)*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
El-Rouayheb, Khaled. 2015. 'Kurdish Scholars and the Reinvigoration of the Rational Sciences'. In *Islamic Intellectual History in the Seventeenth Century: Scholarly Currents in the Ottoman Empire and the Maghreb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 13–59.

Erkal, Abdülkadir. 2021. 'Klasik Türk Şiirinde Mazmunlaşan Mekanlar: Puthâneler'. *Uluslararası Anadolu Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 5.3. 1094–1108.

Green, Nile. 2019. 'Introduction: The Frontiers of the Persianate World (ca. 800–1900)'. In Green, Nile (ed.). *The Persianate World: The Frontiers of a Eurasian Lingua Franca*. Oakland: University of Carolina Press. 26–71.

Gulácsi, Zsuzsanna. 2015. *Mani's Pictures*. Leiden: Brill.

Gürbüzel, Aslıhan. 2021. 'Bilingual Heaven: Was There a Distinct Persianate Islam in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire?'. *Philological Encounters* 6.1–2. 214–241.

Hagen, Gottfried. 2013. 'The Order of Knowledge, the Knowledge of Order: Intellectual Life'. In Faroqhi, Suraiya and Fleet, Kate (eds.). *The Cambridge History of Turkey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 548–592.

Hayyim, Sulayman. 1934–1936. *New Persian-English dictionary, complete and modern, designed to give the English meanings of over 50,000 words, terms, idioms, and proverbs in the Persian language, as well as the transliteration of the words in English characters. Together with a sufficient treatment of all the grammatical features of the Persian Language*. Vol. 2. Tehran: Librairie-imprimerie Béroukhim.

İnan, Murat Umut. 2019. 'Imperial Ambitions, Mystical Aspirations: Persian Learning in the Ottoman World'. In Green, Nile (ed.). *The Persianate World: The Frontiers of a Eurasian Lingua Franca*. Oakland: University of Carolina Press. 75–92.

–. 2020. 'Ottomans Reading Persian Classics: Readers and Reading in the Ottoman Empire, 1500–1700' In Hammond, Mary (ed.). *The Edinburgh History of Reading: Early Readers*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 160–181.

–. 2017. 'Rethinking the Ottoman Imitation of Persian Poetry'. *Iranian Studies* 505. 671–689.

İzmirli, Betül. 2022. 'Kemâlpaşazâde'nin Nigâristân'ında Sûfî Tipolojileri'. In Demirkol, Murat, Canikli, İlyas, and Kıyak, Sever (eds.). *Kemalpaşazâde Felsefe-Din-Edebiyat Araştırmaları*. Vol 1. Ankara: Fecr Yayınları. 393–411.

Jackson, Peter. 2017. *The Mongols and the Islamic World, from Conquest to Conversion*. London: Yale University Press.

Juwaynī, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAṭāʾ Malik Muḥammad. 1958. *The History of the World-Conqueror*. Andrew Boyle, John (transl.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kalın, İbrahim. 2015. 'Ibn Kemal (873–940/ 1468–1534)'. In Leaman, Oliver (ed.). *The Biographical Encyclopedia of Islamic Philosophy*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing. 199.

Kauz, Ralph. 2012. 'Ḵeṭāy-nāma'. *Encyclopædia Iranica Online*. URL: https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ketay-nama (accessed 10 October 2023).

Kirakosyan, Hasmik and Sargsyan, Ani. 2022. 'On the Appropriation of Lexicographic Methods of Kemālpaşazāde's (1468–1534) Glossary Daḳāyiḳu l-ḥaḳāyiḳ'. *Diyâr: Journal of Ottoman, Turkish and Middle Eastern Studies* 3.1. 14–26.

Kuru, Selim Sırrı. 2013. 'The Literature of Rum: The Making of a Literary Tradition (1400–1650)'. In Faroqhi, Suraiya and Fleet, Kate (eds.). *The Cambridge History of Turkey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 548–592.

Kushner, David. 1997. 'Self-Perception and Identity in Contemporary Turkey'. *Journal of Contemporary History* 32.2. 219–233.

Lewis, Bernard. 1963. *Istanbul and the Civilization of Empire*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Lewis, Franklin. 2018. 'To Round and Rondeau the Canon'. In d'Hubert, Thibaut and Papas, Alexandre (eds.). *Jāmī in Regional Contexts*. Leiden: Brill. 463–567.

Meisami, Julie Scott. 2015. *The Haft Paykar: A Medieval Persian Romance*. Oxford: Hackett Publishing.

Miftāh, Ilhām and Valī, Vahhāb. 1374 [1995]. *Nigāhī ba Ravand-i Nufūẕ va Gustarish-i Zabān va Adab-i Fārsī dar Turkiya*. Tehran: Shūrā-yi Gustarish-i Zabān va Adabiyāt-i Fārsī.

Mikhail, Alan. 2020. *God's Shadow, The Ottoman Sultan Who Shaped the Modern World*. London: Faber & Faber.

Morgan, David. 2012. 'Persian as a Lingua Franca in the Mongol Empire'. In Hanaway, William L. and Spooner, Brian (eds.). *Literacy in the Persianate World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 171–195.

Mursilvand, Ḥasan. 1379 [2000]. *Zindagīnāma-yi Rijāl va Mashāhīr-i Īrān*. Vol. 4. Tehran: Elham.

Öztürk, Said. 2003. 'İstanbul'un Fethinden Sonra Ayasofya'nın Camiye Çevrilişi'. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 14. 133–142.

Qazvīnī, Muḥammad. 1317 [1938]. *Mamdūḥīn-i Shaykh Saʿdī*. Tehran: Majalla-yi Taʿlīm va Tarbiyat.

Quatremère, Étienne. 1844. *Extrait de l'Histoire des Mongols de Raschid-Eldin*. n.p. Firmin Didot Frères.

Richard, Francis. 2018. 'A Case of Literary Success'. In d'Hubert, Thibaut and Papas, Alexandre (eds.). *Jāmī in Regional Contexts*. Leiden: Brill. 27–41.

Ṣafā, Ẕabīḥullāh. 1342–62 [1963–1983]. *Tārīkh-i Adabiyāt dar Īrān*. Tehran: Kitābfurūshī-yi Ibn-i Sīnā.

Schmidt, Jan. 2014. 'The Importance of Persian for Ottoman Literary Gentlemen: Two Turkish Treatises on Aspects of the Language by Kemal Pashazade (d. 1536)'. In Aynur, Hatice, Aydın, Bilgin, and Ülker, Mustafa Birol (eds.). *Kitaplara Vakfedilen Bir Ömre Tuhfe: İsmail E. Erünsal'a Armağan*. Istanbul: Ülke Armağan. 851–865.

Steingass, Francis. 1892. *A Comprehensive Persian-English dictionary, including the Arabic words and phrases to be met with in Persian literature*. London: Routledge & K. Paul.

Sundermann, Werner. 2009. 'Mani'. *Encyclopædia Iranica Online*. URL: https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/mani-founder-manicheism (accessed 10 October 2023).

Thackston, Wheeler. 2018. *The Gulistan of Saʿdī: Bilingual English and Persian Edition with Vocabulary*. Bethesda: Ibex Publishers.

Wethey, Harold Edwin. 1971. *The Paintings of Titian: The Portraits*. London: Phaidon Press.

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

Winter, Timothy. 2007. 'Ibn Kemāl (d. 940/1534) on Ibn 'Arabī's Hagiology'. In Shihadeh, Ayman (ed.). *Sufism and Theology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 137–157.

Woodhead, Christine. 2021. 'Kemalpaşazade'. In Fleet, Kate, Krämer, Gudrun and Matringe, Denis et al. (eds.). *Encyclopaedia of Islam Online*. Leiden: Brill. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_35404 (accessed 10 October 2023).

Yalama-hā, Aḥmad Riżā. 1390 [2011]. 'Nigāhī ba Nigāristān-i Ibn Kamāl Pāshā: aṣarī nāshināKhta ba taqlīd az Gulistān-i Saʿdī'. *Faṣlnāma-yi ʿilmī-yi zabān va adab-i Fārsī-yi Dānishgāh-i Āzād-i Islāmī-yi Sanandaj* 3.8. 157–170.

Yazıcı, Tahsin. 2010. 'Persian Authors of Asia Minor'. *Encyclopædia Iranica Online*. URL: https://iranicaonline.org/articles/persian-authors–1 (accessed 10 October 2023).

Zia-Ebrahimi, Reza. 2016. *The Emergence of Iranian Nationalism: Race and the Politics of Dislocation*. New York: Columbia University Press.