THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE SCIENCES IN NEV'Ī EFENDI'S *NETĀYİCÜ'L FÜNUN*- AN ATTEMPT AT CONTEXTUALIZATION

DİDAR AYŞE AKBULUT

BOĞAZİÇİ UNİVERSITY

2014

THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE SCIENCES IN NEV'Ī EFENDI'S *NETĀYİCÜ'L FÜNUN*- AN ATTEMPT AT CONTEXTUALIZATION

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Arts
in
History

by
Didar Ayşe Akbulut

Boğaziçi University
2014

The Classification of the Sciences in Nev'ī Efendi's

Netāyicü'l Fünun- An Attempt at Contextualization

The thesis of Didar Ayşe Akbulut

has been approved by:

Assist. Prof. Derin Terzioğlu

(Thesis Advisor)

Assoc. Prof. Meltem Toksöz

Assoc.Prof. Cüneyt Kaya

August 2014

Abstract

Didar Ayşe Akbulut, "The Classification of the Sciences in Nevʿī Efendi's *Netāyicü'l Fünun*- An Attempt at Contextualization"

This thesis examines Nevʿī Efendi's (d. 1007/1595) Turkish treatise *Netāyicü'l Fünūn ve Mehāsinü'l-Mütūn* (*The Results of the Sciences and the Graces of Texts*) in its historical and contemporary intellectual context.

Firstly it has been emphasized that this work, that introduces twelve sciences and exemplary matters of them, should be treated as a classification of the sciences. *Netāyic*'s relationship with earlier classifications and particularly with those presented as its sources, as well as the points of divergence have been pointed out. Thus the main criteria of Nevʿī Efendi's classification have been determined. This historical analysis constituted an attempt to situate *Netāyic* within the due intellectual context, of which it was a continuation. Secondly, since historiography occupied the first place in Nevʿī Efendi's classification, the understanding of historiography as it was presented in *Netāyic*, has been compared with those that some of the contemporary Ottoman historians expressed in the introductions of their historical writings.

Tez Özeti

Didar Ayşe Akbulut, “The Classification of the Sciences in Nevʿī Efendi’s *Netāyicü'l Fünun*- An Attempt at Contextualization”

Bu tezde Nevʿī Efendi’nin (ö. 1007/1595) *Netāyicü’l Fünūn ve Mehāsinü’l-Mütūn* adlı eseri, tarihi ve çağdaş entelektüel bağlamı içerisinde incelenmiştir.

İlk olarak, on iki ilim dalının kısaca tanıtılıp, örnek meseleler üzerinden tartışıldığı bu eserin bir *ilim tasnifi* olarak değerlendirilmesi gerektiği vurgulanmış ve eserin kendisinden önceki yerleşmiş ilim tasnifleri, bilhassa da yazarın kaynak olarak belirttiği tasnif metinleri ile ilişkisi ve farklılaştığı noktalar gösterilmiştir. Böylece Nevʿī Efendi’nin tasnifinin ana kriterleri tespit edilmiştir. Bu tarihsel incelemeyle metin, devamı olduğu entelektüel bağlam içerisine yerleştirilmeye çalışılmıştır. İkinci olarak ise bir ilim dalı olarak tarihin, Nevʿī Efendi’nin tasnifinde ilk sırada yer almasından yola çıkarak, *Netāyic*’de serdedilen tarih ilmi anlayışı 16. yüzyıl Osmanlı tarihçilerinin eserlerinin mukaddimelerinde ifade ettikleri tarih anlayışı ile karşılaştırılmıştır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to many people for their support and help in the process of writing this thesis. For and foremost my adviser professor Derin Terzioğlu has been a source of inspiration since the beginning of my undergraduate years at Boğaziçi. I owe much to her constant support and encouragement as well as meticulous and insightful comments and guidance in the process of writing this thesis. I would also like to express my thanks to professor Cüneyt Kaya for his insightful comments and to professor Meltem Toksöz for accepting to serve as my committee members. I would also like to thank to professor Oya Pancaroğlu, who has read an earlier version of this study.

During my undergraduate and graduate studies I have been financially supported by TUBITAK-BiDEB. Moreover, I was fortunate enough to participate to ISAM's Researcher Project that immensely contributed to my academic development. I would also like to express my thanks to the staff of Boğaziçi University Library, İSAM Library as well as the manuscript libraries of Süleymaniye, Topkapı Palace and Istanbul University, that allowed me to use their collections.

I am delighted to remember and thank to teachers and friends that supported me and contributed to this thesis in various ways; professor Turgay Şafak, who was my Persian tutuor at Boğaziçi, provided me a copy of *Netāyicü'l Fünūn*'s most important source *Yavākit al 'ulūm*. I am thankful to professor Ertuğrul Ökten for his critical reading and insightful suggestions on this study. Sinan Kaya and Ahmet Tahir Nur helped me immensely with reading and critically commenting on my thesis. In this regard, I owe the greatest debt to my brother Mehmet Yılmaz Akbulut,

with whom I shared almost every detail of this study and benefited from his insightful thoughts and comments and who also cherished me with continuous and invaluable moral support. After all this help and support, all the faults and deficits of this study are surely mine only.

My greatest debts and gratefulness is, however, to my dear mother and father, whose encouragements helped me to develop my interests and whose love and prayers helped me to go on in the pursuit of them. It is to whom I dedicate this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION 1
The Sources of *Netāyicü'l Fünūn* 5
The Date of Compilation and the Earliest Manuscript Copies of *Netāyic* 7
CHAPTER II PORTRAIT OF A POLYMATH 10
Introduction 10
Family and Father 13
Istanbul-Edirne: Studentship Years 15
Gelibolu Years: An Aspirant Polymath 21
Back to Istanbul: *'İlmiye* Career and Patronage 24
Sufi Affiliation: from Ḫalvetī to Naḳşbendī 30
Tutorship to Princes and Relation with Murād III 34
Last Years: Death of Murād III and the Reign of Meḥmed III 43
CHAPTER III *NETĀYİC* AS A CLASSIFICATION OF SCIENCES 47
Introduction 47
From Knowledge to the Enumeration of Sciences: *'ilm, 'ulūm* and *iḥsāu'l 'ulūm* 49
The Classification of the Sciences in *Netāyic* 54
Conclusion 72
CHAPTER IV HISTORY AS A SCIENCE: *NETĀYİC* AND THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY OTTOMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY 74
Pragmatic and Epistemological Argumentations on Historiography 79
History as a Science: Non-historians on Historiography 88
Conclusion 97
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION 100
BIBLIOGRAPHY 104

Note on Transliteration

In the transliteration of Ottoman Turkish, Arabic and Persian, I used the following transliteration alphabet based on modern Turkish. For the transliteration of short vowels and the article ال , in Turkish quotations as well as in titles of Turkish books, I kept to the Turkish pronunciation (hence for example *Netāyicü'l Fünūn* and not *Netāyic al-Funūn* but *Miftāḥ al-Sa'āda* and *Yavāḳıt al'ulūm*). In references to published works, I maintained the transliteration of the title and the name of the author as it appeared on the book.

ء	ʾ	ط	ṭ
ب	b	ظ	ẓ
پ	p	ع	ʿ
ت	t	غ	ġ
ث	s̱	ف	f
ج	c	ق	ḳ
چ	ç	ك	k
ح	ḥ	ڭ	g
خ	ḫ	ل	l
د	d	م	m
ذ	ẕ	ن	n
ر	r	ه	h
ز	z	و	v/ ū
ژ	j	ى	y/ī
س	s		
ش	ş	Short vowels	a/i/u / also in Turkish e/ı/ o/ö/ü
ص	ṣ		
ض	ḍ / ż		

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Netāyicü'l Fünūn ve Mehāsinü'l-Mütūn (*The Results of the Sciences and the Graces of Texts*), written by Yaḥyā b. Pir ʿAlī (better known by his penname of Nevʿī) in 1571 is classified in library catalogues as an encyclopedia of sciences. In manuscript library catalogues, it immediately attracts one's attention with its unusually large number of copies (more than 170 copies). The content of *Netāyic* is not any less surprising and exciting. As an encyclopedic compilation, *Netāyic* comprises short introductions and discussions of exemplary issues in twelve "sciences", namely history (*tārīḫ)*, philosophy (*ḥikmet*), astronomy (*hey'et*), theology (*uṣūl-i dīn*), principles of jurisprudence (*'uṣūl-i fiḳh*), exegesis of the Quran (*tefsīr*), Sufism (*taṣavvuf*), dream interpretation (*ta'bir*-i *rü'yā*), incantation and medicine (*ruḳy ve ṭıbb*), agronomy (*felāḥat*), astrology (*nucūm*) and divination (*fāl ve zecr*).

As an essay in Ottoman intellectual history, the starting point of this study was the question of how to read such a pre- modern text in general and an encyclopedia of sciences in particular. The key concept in answering this question is undoubtedly "context". Hence, I attempted to read and make sense of the *Netāyic* with reference to two textual contexts. It is a personally experienced reality that, to the modern reader, a historical text seems either as something completely alien, abstruse – and maybe even nonsensical-; or as a boring repetition of run-of the mill sentences. A textual contextualization presents a remedy to both; on the one hand, it shows that every new text is the outcome of an intertextual dialogue and does not appear in an intellectual vacuum. On the other hand, it enables one to appreciate that seemingly inconspicuous details can entail striking "originalities". In this study, my aim has been to accomplish both of these, by situating *Netāyic* within the

classificatory tradition of Islamic intellectual history and then comparing and contrasting its approach to history as a science with other prevalent discourses on the nature of historiography.[1]

Before moving to the textual contexts however, in Chapter II, I attempted to present a biographical context. Yaḥyā Nevʿī Efendi was a member of the Ottoman *ʾulemā* elite, a scholar who completed his education in some of the highest Ottoman madrasas, and also like most of his peers he was a poet and indeed owed his most of reputation to his poetic skills. Moreover, he was a practicing sufi who had translated Ibn ʿArabī's *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam* into Turkish. He did neither remain far from the political center of the Empire; he served as tutor to three sons of Murād III from 1590 until their death in 1595; this was a position where he could yield "unofficial" though direct influence on the Sultan himself. Although it has not been possible to write a full-fledged intellectual biography of the author, nor can I claim that the life-story of Nevʿī, his social and political alliances as I presented here are indispensable for a due understanding of *Netāyic*, I consider the authorial context an appropriate starting point for a historical-intellectual contextualization of a text.

The heart of this thesis can be said to be Chapter III, which provides a historical treatment of the main classifications in the Islamic tradition and then turns to the analysis of the principles that Nevʿī employed for the categorization and the hierarchical ordering of the above- mentioned twelve sciences. A closer look at *Netāyic* reveals that Nevʿī's selection and ordering of the twelve sciences is not arbitrary but implies a deliberate classification of these twelve sciences. Therefore, the long and sophisticated literature on the classification of sciences constitutes the first textual context in which *Netāyic* needs to be interpreted. The classification of

[1] The interpretation of the large number of manuscript copies, and hence the reception of *Netāyic* and the reading practices around it or particular to it are beyond the scope of this study.

the sciences was a quite popular topic among Muslim literati from an early period onwards; and scholars and thinkers from various backgrounds put forth different classifications based on different philosophical, religious or practical principles and considerations. Thus determining the classificatory principles of Nevʿī and comparing his *Netāyic* with earlier and contemporary classifications constitute a principal focus of this thesis. .

A conspicuous feature of the classification in *Netāyic* is the place of historiography (*ʿilm-i tārīḫ*) at the very top of the hierarchical order of the sciences. Historiography could hardly find a place in conventional classifications and even if it found a place, then it was regarded as a "science" (*ʿilm*) only in the broadest sense of the word. Assuming that this shift in the position of historiography might have arisen from a new approach to history as a science, contemporary definitions of and intellectual discourses about historiography, propounded by historians and non-historians, constitute a second intellectual context for *Netāyic*. Thus in Chapter IV, I discuss a number of discourses on the definition and uses of historiography and eventually trying to demonstarte that this radical change in the place of historiography in the hierarchy of sciences was indeed brought about by Nevʿī's classificatory principles.

Netāyic has been previously transliterated in two master theses by Ömer Tolgay and Nadir İlhan, based on various manuscript copies, and Tolgay's study has been published also as a book. In this thesis, I availed myself primarily of Tolgay's book and unless otherwise stated, all my textual references shall go to this edition.[2] However, both of these studies lacked an analytical and historical analysis of the text.

[2] Ömer Tolgay, "Netayic el-Fünun ve XVI. Yüzyıl Türk Düşüncesi" (MA Thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 1989); Nadir İlhan, "Netayicü'l-Fünun ve Mehasinü'l-Mütun (giriş-metin-dizinler)", (MA Thesis, Fırat Üniversitesi, 1992). Ömer Tolgay, *İlimlerin Özü. Netâyic el-Fünûn"* (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1995). [Hereafter I will refer to as *Netāyic* only.]

Encyclopedic works and classification of the sciences –perhaps even as a genre- however, attracted the attention of scholars from an early date onwards and there is a considerably vast and varied literature both on single works as well as comparative studies.[3] Among this literature Osman Bakar's comparative study on the classifications of Fārābī, Ġazālī and Ḳutb al-Dīn Şīrāzī, is particularly remarkable. The classifications of these three thinkers constituted reference and basis for almost all of the later classifications in the Islamic world and Bakar's study is valuable for revealing the philosophical foundations of these three classifications and their centrality and significance in the general philosophical stances of the authors.[4] Apart from this, Gerhard Endress' article "The Cycle of Knowledge: Intellectual Traditions and Encyclopedias of the Rational Sciences in Arabic Islamic Hellenism" manifest the Hellenistic roots of the classification of the sciences and the various classificatory traditions evolved in Islamic world.[5] Lastly, Ömer Türker's "İslam Düşüncesinde İlimler Tasnifi" points to the main problematic of the classifications in Islamic intellectual tradition that arouse from the bifurcation of the source of knowledge as rational (*ʿaḳl*) and divine (*vahy*).[6]

---

[3] Probably the earliest systematic study is [Joseph] Hammer-Purgstall, "Über die Encyklopädie der Perser, Araber und Türken" Denkschrift der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Classe 7. 1856.; reprinted in *Studies in the Classification of Science in Islam,* ed. Fuat Sezgin, (Frankfurt am Main, Institute for the history of Arabic-Islamic Science.2005)], 1-90. Hammer cites 132 encyclopedic works in Arabic Persian and Turkish; however, *Netāyic* is not included in his list. For a comprehensive but not up-to-date bibliography see "Bibliographie selective-encyclopédisme et organisation du savoir en Islam" prepared as part of the project *Encyclopédies comme images du monde et comme vecteurs d'échanges intellectuels dans l'Islam et l'Occident au Moyen Age* Projet FSR de l'Université catholique de Louvain, availabale at http://cyclopes.fltr.ucl.ac.be/materiaux/biblioarabe.htm.

[4] Osman Bakar, "Classification of the Sciences in Islamic Intellectual History: A Study in Islamic Philosophies of Science" (Ph.D diss., Temple University, 1989),

[5] Gerhard Endress,"The Cycle of Knowledge: Intellectual Traditions and Encylopedias of the Rational Sciences in Arabic Islamic Hellenism" in *Organizing Knowledge: Encyclopedic Activities in the Pre-Eighteenth Century Islamic World* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

[6] Ömer Türker, "İslam Düşüncesinde İlimler Tasnifi" *Sosyoloji Dergisi*, vol.3 no.22 (2011): 533-556.

The Sources of *Netāyicü'l Fünūn*

In the introduction of his *Netāyic,* Nevʿī identifies three main sources from which he excerpted passages.[7] The foremost source is a Persian encyclopedia called *Yavāḳīt al-ʿulūm va Darārī al-nucūm* (*Rubies of the Sciences and Pearls of the Stars*) which was attributed to Ġazālī. The second source is *al-Fawāʾiḥ al-Miskiyya fī 'l-Favātiḥ al-Makkiyya* (*Fragrances of Musk in Conquests in Meccan Illuminations*) by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Bisṭāmī (d. 858/1454) and the third and last source is *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda va miṣbāḥ al-siyāda fī mavḍūʿāt al-ʿulūm* by Ṭaşköprüzāde.[8]

Yavāḳīt al-ʿulūm is a loosely organized encyclopedic work in the tradition of the Persian encyclopedias of the late medieval period.[9] It comprises mainly the religious sciences. It was written in the twelfth century for the ruler of Qazvin Muẓaffar al-Dīn Albarġū (d. 573/1177) by a little-known scholar called Shahab al-Dīn Ebū Muḥammad al-Ḳazvinī (d. 575/1179) [10]. *Yavāḳīt al-ʿulūm*'s attribution to

---

[7] *Netāyic*, 73.

[8] Nevʿī refers to this book as *Mawḍūʿāt al-ʿulūm* and he does not mention Ṭaşköprüzāde by name. Adnan Adıvar asserted that this *Mawḍūʿāt al-ʿulūm* shall be Mollā Luṭfallāh (Tokadī)'s (d. 900/1495) book *el-Maṭālib al- ilāhiyya fī Mawḍūʿāt al-ʿulūm* and Ömer Tolgay adhered to this view. However Mollā Luṭfallāh's text is strictly restricted to linguistic sciences and some religious sciences that have been included mainly for their relevance for linguistics. Moreover as I shall demonstrate below, in *Netāyic* there are passages that follow Ṭaşköprüzāde's *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda* remarkably closely. See Abdülhak Adnan Adıvar, *Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim*, (İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1943), 90-91. Ömer Tolgay, *Netāyic*, 57. For Molla Lütfü (Tokadi)'s work see Tokatlı Hasanoğlu Lütfullah, *Dil Bilimlerinin Sınıflandırılması: el-Metalib el-ilahiyye fi el-ulum el-luğaviyye*, ed. Şükran Fazlıoğlu (İstanbul, Kitabevi, 2012).

[9] Ziva Vesel, *Les Encyclopédies Persanes, Essai de Typologie et de Classification des Sciences*. Editions Recherce sur les Civilisations Bibliothéque Iranienne 31 (Paris: 1986).

[10] *Yavāḳīt al-ʿulūm* was published in 1966 in Tehran by Muḥammad Taqīh Dānish′pazhūh. Dānish-Pazhūh: *Yawāqīt al-'ulūm wa-darārī al-nucūm*, [Tehran] : Bunyād-i Farhang-i Īrān, 1345 [1966]. [Here cited as *Yavāqīt al-'ulūm*] Dānişẖ-Paẕẖūh noted that the work is attributed either to al-Ġāzālī or to Faḫr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, but he describes the work as anonymous. In 1999 Bahrūz Newrūzzādah Chagīnī introduced all the extant manuscripts of the work. Though there are obscurities about the author, in a note on the frontispiece of a manuscript dated 657/1259. (Çorum Library MN 3117), the name of the author is given as "Shahāb al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad Aḥmad al-Ḳazvīnī". .Chagīnī also discusses the historical sources that provide information on the author and the patron. B.N. Chagīnī "Yawāqīt al-ʿulūm we Darārī al-Nucūm wa Mu'allif-i an" in *Iṭṭılāʿ-rasānī wa Kītābdārī* [*Information and Library Sciences*] 1378/1999.

Ġazālī was erroneous, yet common.[11] The text covers thirty sciences and each science is illustrated by the discussion of twelve relevant problems following a brief description. Although *Yavāḳīt al-ʿulūm* is not a systematic work of classification, still the sciences are ordered in a meaningful sequence, starting with the religious sciences and then proceeding with the linguistic sciences (which were deemed auxiliary for the religious sciences), followed by the five sub-branches of physics (dream interpretation, healing incantations (*ruḳy*), medicine, agronomy, astrology), two sub-branches of mathematics (planimetric and arithmetic) and lastly by "occult" sciences (divination). Although this enumeration is not an elaborate classification such as that found in the authentic works of Ġazālī, it follows some of the main tenets of the Ghazalian classifications – such as the preponderance of the religious (but not exclusively *şarʿī*) sciences over the non-religious sciences.

Nevʿī's second source *Al-Favāʾiḥ al-Miskiyya* was a relatively better-known and popular work by the fifteenth century esoteric-*hurūfī* scholar and *sufi* ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Bisṭāmī (d.858/1454) *Al-Favāʾiḥ al-Miskiyya* was written between 1402 and 1440 and was dedicated to Murād II. It is an abstruse, esoteric work with an encyclopedic scope and coverage, discussing more than a hundred "sciences". [12] Though encyclopedic, *Al-Favāʾiḥ*'s thematic organization is hardly systematic. A noticeable feature of the text is the relatively extensive treatment of historical/ chronological themes. The historical section of *Al-Favāʾiḥ* starts with the Creation – as was quite common- and it is followed by an apocalyptic account. Thus not only

[11] For example see Katip Çelebi, *Keşfü'z- zunun ʿan esami'l-kütübi ve'l-fünun (Kitapların ve ilimlerin isimlerinden şüphelerin giderilmesi)* trans. Rüştü Balcı (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2011),1657. For a discussion of the authorship of the work see: Dānish-Pazhūh: *Yawāqīt al-ʿulūm,* xii-xiii.

[12] Mustafa Çağrıcı, "Abdurrahman b. Muhammed Bistâmî", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, v.6, 218. (Hereafter cited as *TDVİA*).

the past stories of man on earth but also his future is unfolded before the reader. [13] This attempt at covering "time" as a whole is of particular interest since in this way the chronological narrative (of profane history) –connecting, on the one hand, mystical cosmology, and, on the other hand, apocalyptic prophesies- was rendered into a mysterious and esoteric realm that needs to be deciphered. For *Netāyicu' Fünūn, Al-Fawāʾiḥ* constituted one of the main sources, particularly, in the passages on the stages of the Creation, cosmology and prophetic history.

The third source was Ṭaşköprüzāde's *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda va-miṣbāḥ al-siyāda fī mavḍūʿāt al-ʿulūm.* It is both an encyclopedic and a bibliographic work, which treats more than three hundred sciences systematically and provides extensive bibliographies. From the perspective of classifications, it can be regarded as the epitome of hundreds years of efforts and discussions of Muslim thinkers; it includes almost every single field of specialized knowledge organized within a scheme that incorporates the two main systems of classification, the philosophical tradition as it was especially elaborated by Ibn Sina and the Ġazālīan method of religio-judicial categorization.

The Date of Compilation and the Earliest Manuscript Copies of *Netāyic*

Nevʿī wrote *Netāyic* when he was a *müderris* at a provincial madrasa, at the beginning of a long scholarly career. According to one of the earliest extant manuscript copies of *Netāyic* (Istanbul University Library MN. 6768) Nevʿī began writing *Netāyic* at the beginning of the month of Cemāẓiyu'laḥīr in the year 979.

[13] Ömer Yağmur. "Terceme-i kitab-ı fevâ'ihü'l-miskiyye fi'l-fevâthi'l-mekkiyye (metin-sözlük- şahıs, yer, eser, tarikat ve kabile adları indeksi)", (MA Thesis İstanbul University), 2007. This is a late sixteenth century Ottoman Turkish translation of *al-Fawāʾiḥ al-Miskiyya.* I have not been able to consult the original text.

(October 1571) and completed it in Edirne towards the end of the month of Receb in the same year (December 1571), only two months before his return to Istanbul.[14] Unfortunately neither the name of the copyist nor the exact date of the completion of the manuscript is stated in the colophon; nevertheless, the copyist added a marginal note, stating that the present copy was copied in the same year of 979 (1571) directly from an autograph copy. This first version of *Netāyic* has at least one more copy (in Topkapı Palace Library, MN R. 1079) bearing the same colophon, however, without any additional note of the copyist. Unlike the later versions (including the printed version) neither of these two manuscripts has any dedicatory paragraph or poem for Murād III or anybody else, or the epitomic historical account following the chapter on history.

In the Preamble of his *Dīvān,* Nevʿī states that before the *Dīvān* he had already tried to present *Netāyic* and *Ḥasb-i Ḥāl* to Murād III; but was unsuccessful.[15] In a third manuscript of *Netāyic* (Atatürk Library 0728) copied on 23 Cemāẓiyu'levvel 995 (May 1st, 1587) [16], there is a dedicatory poem for Murād III, as well as the epitomic historical narrative beginning from the Creation up to the reign of Selīm II and clearly indicating that Nevʿī prepared a royal copy for the Sultan. This manuscript represents another version of the text, which was revised with minor additions in order to be presented to the Sultan.

The story does not end here since there is a third version that was dedicated and presented to an unnamed vizier probably before it was ultimately submitted to Murād III. This is the manuscript in the Süleymaniye Library (M. Hilmi F. Fehmi

[14] İstanbul University Library No. 6768.

[15] *Dīvān* 5.

[16] In the library catalogue, the date is mistakenly indicated as 975 H.

MN 181) indicating that Nevʿī prepared at least three versions of *Netāyic* that can be recapitulated in a table:

Manuscript	Version	Date	Dedication
Istanbul University Library MN 6768	1	Receb 979 (Oct./Dec. 1571	No dedication
Topkapı Palace Library MN R.1071	1	Not dated	No dedication
Atatürk Library MN 0728	2	23 C.E. 995 (May 1st 1587)	Dedication for Murād
Süleymaniye Library; M. Hilmi F. Fehmi MN 00181	3	997 (1588/1589)	Dedication for a vizier
Nurosmaniye Library MN. 4334	3	Not dated	Dedication for a vizier

To sum up, there are at least three version of *Netāyic*; as noted the first completed in 979 (1571). Then in the second earliest manuscript dated 995 Cemāẓiyu'levvel we find the dedication for Murād III. However in another manuscript dated 997[17], the work is dedicated to an unnamed vizier. The last two versions do not differ from each other in a considerable way except the dedicatees. However in the first version completed in 979 (1571), the chapter about history in which Nevʿī recaps world history from Creation to the reign of Selīm II, is not to be found and it is apparently a later addition to the second and third versions of the text. Speculatively, when Nevʿī wished to present his work to a grandee, he preferred to add some history.

[17] Süleymaniye Library, M. Hilmi F. Fehmi MN 00181. This is however a problematic manuscript. The folios 1b-8b are different form the rest of the manuscript. They are written with a much more careless hand, without red frames and other red-ink parts. However the folios are compiled on purpose because the pages 8b and 9a are connected with a catchword. Similarly, the manuscript Nurosmaniye MN 4334 is also of the same version.

CHAPTER II
PORTRAIT OF A POLYMATH

Introduction

If you shall ask who Nevʿī is

Oh thou, the erudite mind of the ages

A lover, ailing and repining, he is

Forsaken and lowly, moaning, groaning[18]

Nevʿī introduced himself in a couplet in his *Divān,* on the one hand underlining his sufi orientation and following the literary conventions of the time, but on the other hand expressing the dissatisfaction and uneasiness of a sixteenth-century Ottoman scholar and intellectual who had to struggle to build himself a respectable professional career, royal recognition and social respectability. His life had its ups and downs. The ʿ*ilmiye* constituted a promising yet highly competitive career opportunity and the patronage relations in this career path were no less important than in the military and the civil bureaucracy. Nevertheless Nevʿī's life was pretty typical for a middle to high ranking *müderris* except for the fact that in his late fifties he enjoyed the exceptional favor of Murād III as tutor to his princes for almost five years.

An accomplished poet he was according to the assessment of an early twentieth-century historian of Turkish literature, second only to Bāḳī, the celebrated

[18]*Kimdir diyü Nevʿīyi sorarsan / Ey akil-i zu-funun-ı devran / Bir aşık-ı müstemend- ü bimar / Mahrum u zelil ü zar u nalan* Nev'î, *Dīvān* , (ed. Mertol Tulum, Ali Tanyeri.(İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası, 1977), 582. [Hereafter cited as *Dīvān* only.] A complete manuscript of Nevʿī's *Dīvān* has unfortunately is not been found out yet. This critical edition is based on several incomplete manuscripts and poetry compilations.

king of poets of the sixteenth century.[19] A literary assessment of Nevʿī's poetry is well beyond this study, but it must be underlined that he preferred to be known as a poet during his lifetime. Even in legal registers he is referred to as "Nevʿī Efendi"[20] and he is still remembered by his *nome de plume* Nevʿī, rather than by his given name Yaḥyā. Besides his literary identity, he was at the same time a member of the *ilmiye*, who eventually became the private teacher to the princes of Murād III. Moreover his scholarly interests were not merely restricted to the requirements of a professional career.[21]

In this chapter, I will present an account of Nevʿī's life, with special attention to his patronage relations. My main source will be the entry on *Nevʿī* in *Ḥadāiḳu'l Ḥaḳāiḳ,* (*Gardens of Truths*), the biographical dictionary of the Ottoman *ʿulemā*

[19] Tahir Olgun, *Şair Nevʿī ve Suriye Kasidesi*, (İstanbul: Aydınlık Basımevi, 1937), 11-12. This however was not only a modern assessment; the fact that Muṣṭafā ʿAlī often compared his literary skill with Baki and Nevʿī demonstrates that these two names were regarded together as the foremost poets of the age. Cf. Cornell H. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Muṣṭafā Âli* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 144.

[20] See for example the kadi registers Üsküdar 84, no.264 and Galata 05, no.40. Accessed from kadisicilleri.org.

[21] Nevʿī's son Nevʿī zāde Atāʿī provides a detailed account of his father's life in his bibliographic work; see: ʿAṭāʾī, Nevʿīzade Ataullah Efendi *eş-Şekaikü'n-nu'maniyye ve zeyilleri : Ḥadāʾiḳü'l-hakaik fi tekmileti'ş-Şekaik*, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan (İstanbul, Çağrı Yayınları, 1989), 411-423. See also Meserret Diriöz "Nevʿī" *Türkoloji Dergisi*, VII, (1977). Ömer Tolgay provides a list of Nevʿī's known works based on secondary literature and manuscript collections, see Tolgay, "Eserleri", *İlimlerin Özü,* 43-54. Some of the works counted here are apparently single poems or letters, however, apart from them the prepondarance of *sufi* works and commentaries on *kelām* classics are to be noted. 1) *Divān* 2) *Nevā-yı ʿuşşāḳ* 3) *Ḳasīde-i Gül Ṣad Berk*, 4) *Pendnāme-i Nevʿī*, 5) *Faṣlu'n fī fażīlet-i ʿIşḳ*, 6) *Ḥasb-i ḥāl*, 7) *Leylā vü Mecnūn baḥrinde mesnevī,* 8) Ḳasīde li- Nevʿī Efendi, 9) Ḳasīde-i tebrīkiyye berāy-ı sünnet-i Ṣultān Meḥmed ibn Ṣultān Murād, 10)Mersiyeler, 11) *Sāḳīnāme,* 12) *Gevher-i rāz*, 13) *Ṭūtī vü Zaġ Münāzarası*, 14) *Ḳasīde-i Sūriyye*, 15) Şerh-i dū beyt-i Mesnevī, 16) Divān-ı Münşeʾāt, 17) Ḫāce Cihā Münşeʾātı Tercemesi, 18) *Şerh-i Taʿlīm al-Müteʿallim*, 19) *Feżāilü'l vüzerā ve ḥaṣailü'l ʿümerā* 20) *Risāle-i şikāyet-i rūzigār,* 21) Sinān Paşaya Mektūb, 22) *Evāʾil-i Mevākıf Ḥāşiyesi*, 23) *Taʿliḳat ʿalāʾl Miftāḥ*, 24) *Taʿliḳat ʿalāʾt Telvīh*, 25) *Taʿliḳat ʿalāʾl Ḥidāye*, 26) *Ḥadīṣ-i Erbaʿīn Tercemesi*, 27) *Şūre-i Mülk Tefsīri*, 28) Ḫıżır ve Mūṣā Ḳıṣṣası Tercemesi, 29) *Muḥassal al- Kelām*, 30) *Taḥḳīk-i Mesele al-ʿİcāb ve al- ʿİḫtiyār*, 31) *Risāle fī Kelām al-Nefs*, 32) *ʿAḳāid Tercemesi*, 33) el-*Farḳ beyn meẕhab al-Eşāriyya va al- Māturidiyya*, 34) *Risāle-i ḳalemiyye* 35) Fenārī'nin (d. 834/1431) *Risāle-i Ḳudsiyye'sine Şerh*, 36) *Fuṣūs al-Ḥikam şerhi Keşfu'l Ḥicāb*, 37) *Ebyāt-ı Münciye min şerh-i Nevʿī ʿʿalā'l Fuṣūs*, 38) *Kenz al-Ḥaḳā'iḳ şerhi*, 39) Sühreverdī (d. 586/1191)'nin *Heyākīl-i Nūr* adlı eserinin Celāl al-Dīn Devvānī (d. 918/1512) tarafından *Şevākil al-Nūr* adıyla yazılan şerhine Ḫāşiye, 40) Hocāzāde'nin (d. 893/ 1488) *Teṭāhüt'üne Ḥāşiye*, 41) *Risāle-i ʿilmiye,* 42) *Risāle min al Manṭıḳ va al- Ādāb*, 43) *Risāle-i Manṭıḳ*, 44) *Risāle fī ʿilm-i cedel va al- munāzara*, 45) *İsāgūci şerhi*, 46) *Netāyīcü'l Fünūn*.

written by Nevʿī's son ʿAṭāʾī (d. 1045/1635). ʿAṭāʾī's entry on Nevʿī contains a relatively detailed chronological account and valuable anecdotal information and it will constitute the main frame of the present account.[22] Moreover, as a poet Nevʿī left behind another valuable source to reconstruct his social and professional network; his numerous odes (*ḳaṣīde*) dedicated to the grandees of the time. Written for the sultans, grand viziers and few other top-ranking members of the state and *ilmiye* hierarchy, these laudatory poems were *intended* either to express a specific request on the part of the poet, or to manifest his voluntary loyalty to the addressee – which could be expected to bring about benefits in the future. Compared to other types of poetry such as *ġazel*s, *ḳasīde*s offer richer material on the author's social circles because the immediate audience is specifically stated, and in some cases the specific occasion for the composition of the poem is identified.[23] Thus although a complete copy of Nevʿī's *Divān* has not come to light yet –though we know from his own testimony that Nevʿī had a complete (*müretteb*) *Dīvān*-[24] and the published edition is only a synthesis of the manuscripts available to the editors in the 1970s.[25] This edition and the supplementary notes regarding the addressees of some of the *ḳasīde*s provide a great deal of information about Nevʿī's patronage network. Indeed

[22] Nev'îzâde Atâî, *Şakaik-i Nu'maniye ve Zeyilleri: Ḥadā'iḳu'l Hakaik fi Tekmileti'i Şakaik* ed. Abdülkadir Özcan (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989), 418-427. (Hereafter cited as *Ḥadā'iḳ*) Unless otherwise specified, my main source for the biographical information is ʿAtāʿī's entry on Nevʿī. *Ḥadā'iḳu'l Hakaik* t is among the most important bibliographical source for sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Ottoman ʿ*ulemā* and is of special importance as being almost a first-hand account for the details of Nevʿī' family background, professional career and social connections. Olgun, *ibid*.; Meserret Diriöz, "*Nevʿī*" *Türkoloji Dergisi,* v. 7 no.83; and Ömer Tolgay. also presents a biography of Nevʿī based on ʿAtāʿī's narrative, in "Hayatı", *İlimlerin Özü,* 19-41.

[23] For a very brief discussion of the "historicity" of *kaside* see Selīm S. Kuru "Kasîdeden Kasıt Nedir?" *Eski Türk Edebiyatı Çalışmaları VIII: Kasîdeye medhiye: biçime, işleve ve muhtevaya dair tespitler*. Eds. Hatice Aynur et alia. Klasik Yayınları (İstanbul, 2013),

[24] *Dīvān* , Dibāce

[25] For instance some unknown pieces of poetry of Nevʿī have been published in İsmail Hakkı Aksoyak, "Nev'î'nin Bilinmeyen Şiirleri", *Erciyes*, no. 20/ 229.

except for ʿAṭāʾī's account and quite limited entries in the biographical dictionaries of poets, these odes constitute almost the only source of biographical survey on Nevʿī.

Family and Father

According to the biography provided by Nevʿīzāde ʿAṭāʾī, Nevʿī, or Yaḥyā by his given name[26], was born in 940 (1533-34) in Malkara, a small provincial town that between Edirne and Istanbul. Though small, Malkara was one of the first Ottoman strongholds on the European soil, has been conquered in the mid fourteenth century. Following the conquest, Murād I as well as other *aḳıncı begs* helped to flourish and "Ottomanize" the region through an intense building activity that made the region attractive especially for dervish groups migrating from Anatolia as well as from further east from Iran and Central Asia.[27] Nevʿī's maternal great- grandfather was one such dervish who had emigrated from Iran (*ʿAcem*) first to Anatolia and who had settled in Rumelia in the turbulent period following the defeat of Bayezid I against Tamerlane in 1402. This unnamed great-grandfather reportedly led a rather ascetic life in a self –dug cave at the outskirts of a village near Rodosçuk (modern day Tekirdağ). ʿAṭāʾī does not explicitly state whether this ancestor preached to the public or acted as a sufi sheikh during this life of seclusion, however he must have gained the regard and recognition of the local community. Thus after witnessing

[26] According to ʿAṭāʾī, Nevʿī's birth was heralded to Pir ʿAlī by his student Yaḥyā b. Derviş, therefore he named his son after him as Yaḥyā. Yaḥyā b. Derviş was particularly close to Meḥmed III and his mother Safiye Sultan. In 1003/1545-46 he became kadi of Mecca, as well as *hunkar şeyhi* to Meḥmed III. Later he became also military judge of Anatolia and Rumelia. *Ḥadāʾiḳ,* 520-522.

[27] Malkara was conquested by Evrenos Bey in 1361. See Fahamettin Başar "Evrenosoğulları" *TDVİA,* v. 11, 540. For the early conquest in Rumelia and the building projects in the towns see Halil İnalcık, "Murād I", *TDVİA* v. 31, 156-164. İnalcık notes that apart from the *ġāzi beġs* Murād I has endowed convents for dervishes in the Gelibolu-Malkara region; see p. 163.

some miraculous deeds of this ascetic sheikh, the judge of Malkara, a certain Karpuzcu Efendi, became his disciple and married off his daughter to him. Three daughters were born out of this matrimony and one of these married a certain Nasūḫ Ḫalīfe, the son a prosperous merchant named Hāce Kemāl, who had also emigrated from Ankara and settled in Malkara. ʿAṭā'ī states that Nasūḫ Ḫalīfe adhered to a sufi order yet he does not specify the name of the order.[28] Nevʿī's father ʿĀlī was born out of this marriage and after acquiring his primary instruction in the "exoteric" and "esoteric" sciences (i.e. religio-legal and mystical learning respectively) in his hometown, he moved to Edirne, the second center of the Empire. In Edirne he became affiliated with the Ḫalvetī sheikh Bāyezīd-i Rumī[29] (d. before 1512) and became his personal scribe. Bayezid-i Rumi or Bayezid Ḫalīfe himself was a disciple and successor of Cemāl Ḫalvetī (d. 899/1494) who had formed a close relationship with Bayezid II during his governorship in Amasya and upon the accession of Bayezid II to the throne Cemāl Ḫalvetī also moved to Istanbul and established the Ḫalvetī order in the new capital of the Empire.[30] Pir ʿĀlī's affiliation with Bayezid-i Rumi marks the first stage of the long lasting connection of the family with the Ḫalvetī order.[31] After the death of Bāyezīd-i Rūmī, in the first decades of the

[28] *Ḥadā'iḳ,* 68-70.

[29] Taşköprüzade, *eş-Şakaik'u n-Numaniye fi Ulema'i d-devleti -Osmaniye* ed. Ahmed Subhi Furat, Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi İstanbul, 1985, 368. Mecdî Meḥmed Efendi, *Ḥadā'iḳu'ş Şakaik* ed. Abdülkadir Özcan (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989), 371.

[30] John J. Curry, *The Transformation of Muslim Mystical Thought in the Ottoman Empire: The Rise of the Ḫalvetī Order, 1350-1650* (Edinburgh University Press, 2010), 31. For a life story of Cemal Ḫalvetī and his support of Bayezid during his struggle with his brother Cem Sultan see Hasan Karataş "The City as a Historical Actor", (Ph.D. diss., University of California, 2011) 94, 95-100, 109-113. Karataş interprets Cemal Ḫalvetī 's support to Bayzezid and his subsequent victory over his brother as the decisive event fort the firm establishment of the Ḫalvetī order within the Ottoman elite against the rivaling sufi order of Zeyniyye. Thus Cemāl Ḫalvetī becomes the central figure in the "Ottomanization" of the Ḫalvetiyye and the subsequent history of the order.

[31] ʿAṭā'ī underlines the family's early spiritual attachment to the Ḫalvetī order by an anecdote. Accordingly, Pir ʿĀlī', who was overwhelmed by the desire to visit İbrahim İbrāhim Gülşenī, the founder of the Gülşenī branch of the order; sets off on a journey to Cairo, where the great sheikh was

sixteenth century, Pir ʿĀlī returned to his hometown Malkara as the successor (*ḫalīfe*) of Bāyezīd-i Rūmī and married the daughter of another prestigious sufi family of the region, descending from the line Yazıcızāde Meḥmed of Gelibolu (d.855/1451). In Malkara, Pir ʿĀlī became imam and preacher at the largest mosque of the town, Ṭurhan Bey Mosque and at the same time until his death in 952/1545-46 he taught at the primary school attached to the mosque.[32]

Istanbul-Edirne: Studentship Years

Five years after his father's death, in 95 (1550-51) Nevʿī moved to Istanbul at the age of seventeen and entered the path of higher education, which would carry him to the highest echelons of the scholarly hierarchy. His first teacher was Aḫīzāde Aḥmed Ḳaramānī (d.974 /1566-67), who was teaching at this period in the Davutpaşa Medresesi in Istanbul. Sometime between 1552 and 1554, Nevʿī advanced to the Sahn-ı Ṣeman Medresesi and became the student of Aḥmed Efendi's brother Ḳaramānī Meḥmed Efendi (d. 974/1566). Meḥmed Efendi and his class at the Sahn Medresesi were immortalized by an ode by Bāḳī, who was also Meḥmed Efendi's student. In *Sünbül Ḳaṣīdesi (The Ode of the Hyacinth*),[33] Bāḳī eulogized Meḥmed Efendi because of the remarkable preponderance of poets around him: Ṣaʿaddedīn Efendi (d.1008/1599), historian, tutor to Murād III and Meḥmed III and *şeyhülislam*,

---

based. However, when he stopped over in Istanbul he chanced upon İbrāhim Gülşenī, who had recently arrived to Istanbul in (935-36/1528-29), upon the somewhat obliging invitation of Süleymān I. Pir ʿĀlī wished to accompany the sheikh back to Cairo but the aged sheikh rejected this offer and instead heralded the birth of a son to him.

[32] Turhan Bey Mosque was one of the oldest mosques and even by seventeenth century it was the largest congregational mosque of the town. Cf. Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*. Ed.Yücel Dağlı et alia. (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları), vol.5, 169.

[33] *Sünbül* means refers here both to hyacinth and to the Virgo constellation that is recognized by its nine bright stars.

the celebrated "king of the poets" of the Suleimanic age, Bāḳī Efendi (d.1008/1600), kadi of Bursa Remzizāde (d. 1006/1597), Ḫüsrevzāde, Üsküb ī Vālihī, Muhyiddīn Ḳaramanī, Meḥmed Mecdi Efendi (d. 999/1595), Cevrī Efendi and Camcızāde Cāmʿī Efendi and Nevʿī. While this ode is usually referred to as an important step for Bāḳī to consolidate his place in the literary circles[34] it also indicates that the other eight names, including Nevʿī, were already recognized for their poetic skills.

The professional career of a high-ranking scholar like Meḥmed Efendi was intimately related to his connections with the political elite and his patronage relations and Ḳaramanī Meḥmed Efendi's fortunes depended partly on his relation with the grand vizier Rüstem Pasha. Meḥmed Efendi was a native of Konya – Karaman and his advancement in the ʿ*ilmiye* bureaucracy was very much facilitated by his and his brother Aḥmed Efendi's affiliation with Kara Aḥmed Pasha, another protégé of Rüstem Pasha. While Aḥmed Efendi became tutor to Aḥmed Pasha, Meḥmed Efendi became a *bon companion* of the Pasha. This connection helped him to gain more powerful patrons, thus, around 960 (1552-53) he was attached to the household of Rüstem Pasha.[35] However, in the meantime, Kara Aḥmed Pasha's fortunes changed dramatically. In order to appease the discomfort in the army because of the execution of Prince Muṣṭafā in 960 (1553) Süleyman replaced the grand vizier Rüstem Pasha by Aḥmed Pasha. Aḥmed's grand-vizierate lasted only two years and with the intrigues of Rüstem Pasha and the latter's mother-in-law Ḫürrem Sultan, he was executed in 962 (1555) and Rüstem Pasha returned to the office of grand vizier.[36] When in the same year, Karamani Meḥmed Efendi was

[34] Mehmet Çavuşoğlu, "Bâkî", *TDVİA* v.4, 537-540.

[35] *Ḥadā'iḳ*, 57.

[36] Feridun Emecen, "Kara Ahmed Paşa" *TDVİA*, v. 24, 358.

appointed to the Bayezid Medresesi in Edirne with a salary of 60 aspers; this was supposed to be a promotion. But when it coincided with Rüstem Pasha's fierce and seemingly abrupt disfavor towards him, this appointment turned into an exile. The reason for Rüstem Pasha's disfavor can only be guessed at and it seems that Meḥmed Efendi's early connection to Kara Aḥmed Pasha played a role in it. In any case, Meḥmed Efendi remained in oblivion in Edirne until Rüstem Pasha's death in Şevvāl 968 (June 1561).

Nevʿī accompanied Meḥmed Efendi to Edirne –together with Vālihī Efendi (who would later be kadi of Skopje) and remained there for almost nine years. Unfortunately these nine years are almost completely obscure since ʿAṭā'ī does not provide much information. All in all while it seems that Nevʿī led a rather ascetic way of life based on sufi ideals and practice; in any case the material conditions would not allow another possibility since during his years in Edirne Nevʿī lacked a stable occupation and source of income; most probably he lived on a very humble student stipend or had minor employments.[37] The average duration of education at the 50-aspers Sahn-ı Ṣemān Medresesi and the 60- aspers *medrese*s like the Bayezidiye in Edirne was around one year.[38] Although we cannot ascertain Nevʿī's occupation in Edirne for all these years, to all appearances he remained closely attached to Meḥmed Efendi, maybe serving him as an assistant (*mu'id*).[39] It was also during his Edirne years that he wrote *Ṭūṭī vü Zāġ* (*Parrot and Raven*) [40], an allegoric

[37] ʿAhdī also confirms that he led an ascetic life (*ehl-i tecrīd*); see Süleyman Solmaz, *Ahdî ve Gülşen-i Şu'arâsı,*(Ankara: AYK Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı, 2005) ,549.

[38] Baltacı, *Osmanlı Medreseleri*, 41.

[39] For the function of *muʿid* see ibid., 33.

[40] Nevʿī, *Münāẓara-i Ṭūṭī vü Zāġ* ed. Hakan Taş, Ömer Zülfe (İstanbul: Kültür ve Turizm Baknanlığ,ı ,2009), e-book edition.

story in verse narrating a polemical discussion between a parrot and a raven.[41] The narrative discussion starts up with the raven's arrogant remarks on the parrot's poverty contrasting with his own wealth. The parrot responds to these remarks by underlying his submission to and compliance with God's will and his acceptance of inequality between one's qualities and material fortunes as God's will. Thereafter they continue to discuss the merits and demerits of an ascetic way of life for the sake of piety and love of God. The story ends with the raven's confession of his fault and striking up of a friendship between the two. [42]

As Nevʿī explicitly states at the end of the text, *Ṭūṭī vü Zāġ* was not dedicated to a grandee or anybody else. Nevertheless his odes indicate that during the long years in Edirne Nevʿī has tried to approach the Sultan through his poetic talent. Between 963-965 (1555-1558) Sultan Süleymān had started to spend most of the winter months in Edirne believing that the climate of the city was better for his

[41] In his biographical compendium of poets, ʿAhdī notes that he had met with Nevʿī in Edirne and İstanbul moreover he mentions of *Ṭūṭī vü Zāġ* in his entry on *Nevʿī*. ʿAhdī left Istanbul in 971/1562-63 for his hometown Bagdad, so *Ṭūṭī vü Zāġ* must be dated at a time earlier than this date. See Solmaz, *Ahdî ve Gülşen-i Şu'arâsı,* 3; 549-552.

[42] Such confrontations between sufis and their opponents did not result always peacefully. An anecdote related by ʿAṭā'ī implies that Nevʿī also had to deal with such disputes. The event occurred in the very first years of Nevʿī's arrival to Edirne between Nevʿī and a *müderris* at the Ḫalebiyye Medresesi called Manav Seydī (d.979/1571-72) who later became kadi of Bagdad. According to ʿAṭā'ī, although Manav Seydi was already a *müderris*, he continued to follow Meḥmed Efendi's classes. At the same time he tried to alienate Meḥmed Efendi from Nevʿī by slandering the latter of consuming wine and running after beautiful boys (*maḥbūb*) apparently because of his sufi affiliations. Although tired of this backbiting, Nevʿī did not respond to this open hostility for a long time. But at a point when he ran out of patience, he resolved to take his revenge against Manav Seydi and one day when they have met on an empty street Nevʿī pretended to be drunk and started to curse at him as well as beat him lightly. Thereafter Nevʿī returned to his room in the *medrese* and Manav Seydi rushed to Meḥmed Efendi to relate the event and complain about Nevʿī. Although Meḥmed Efendi could not believe Manav Seydi, upon his insistence he eventually sent someone to check the street and look after Nevʿī. Nevʿī, however, was found not in the street but in his room studying in tranquility. Expectedly, this event contributed to Manav Seydi's reputation as a liar. Although ʿAṭā'ī is quiet about Nevʿī's sufi affiliation during his stay in Edirne, this suggests that Nevʿī was subjected to Manav Seydi's assaults because of his sufi inclinations and possibly his connection to sufi circles (*ehl-i dil*) which were typically accused with wine-drinking and sodomy. Indeed ʿAṭāʿī refers to wine drinking and sodomy as an "ancient slander" (*erbāb-ı dile töhmet-i dīrīne olan mey ve maḥbūb müdāvemeti*) cast upon sufis. *Ḥadā'iḳ,*152-154.

health.[43] This presented a great opportunity for an aspirant young poet and a candidate to the ʿ*ilmiye* path and Nevʿī attempted to attract the attention of the Sultan with an ode upon his coming to Edirne.[44] Similarly, shortly before or after his departure from Edirne, he presented the grand vizier Semiz ʿĀlī Pasha (grand vizierate between 968-972 (1561-1565) with an ode expressing gladness about his recovery from an illness.[45]

Nevʿī returned to Istanbul together with Meḥmed Efendi at the beginning of the year 971 (1563). Meḥmed Efendi was appointed to one of the most high-ranking teaching positions in the Empire at the newly founded Süleymaniye Medresesi. In accordance with his teacher's advance, Nevʿī was also granted the position of *mülāzemet* by the chief military judge of Rumelia, Hamid Efendi (d. 985/1577-78). *Mülazamet* was practically a waiting period for the students (*dānişmend*) who had completed at least the Sahn-ı Ṣemān Medresesi and were entitled for an appointment as a *müderris* of the lowest rank or as a provincial kadi. Although *mülāzemet* was the first and most critical step at the beginning of a career in the *ilmiye*, it could take years until one received an actual appointment as a *müderris* or kadi Since 1530s both Ebūsuʿūd Efendi and later chief military judge of Rumelia Hamid Efendi have tried to regulate the *mülāzemet* system and in 968 (1560-61) Hamid Efendi had issued a codification stipulating the number of students that the high-ranking judges and *müderris* could propose and start waiting for an adequate and vacant position.[46] Although this regulation could not be implemented strictly enough and needed to be

---

[43] Feridun Emecen, "Kanuni Sultan Süleyman" *TDVİA*. v. 38, 70.

[44] *Dīvān* , 30-32.

[45] *Dīvān* , 120-123.

[46] Baltacı, *Osmanlı Medreseleri,* 35.

renewed after a while, the attempt still indicates the high degree of competition and density among the ranks of *medrese* graduates. Indeed the interval between completing the required *medrese* education and gaining a *mülāzemet* could take years, and even after then, one could wait for even longer until getting an actual appointment as a kadi or *müderris*. Social and family connections played a significant role in the process and belonging to a powerful family and being a descent of high-ranking scholars could accelerate this process considerably. As an ultimate example of this we can take Aḥmed Efendi, son of Ebūsuʿūd Efendi. Aḥmed Efendi was not even twenty years old when in 963 (1555-56) he was appointed to Rüstem Pasha Medresesi, directly by Rüstem Pasha himself. When he died at a very young age in 970 (1562-63), he had already attained a teaching position at Şehzade Medresesi.[47] At the other end of the spectrum, we can mention the poet Bāḳī Efendi (d.1008/1600) who could attain a *mülāzemet* and eventually a *müderris* position thanks to his exceptional poetic talents and royal interference. He came from a rather humble family based in Istanbul. But apparently he was both intellectually and poetically a gifted young man, so even before he was twenty he could attend Karamanī Meḥmed Efendi's lectures at the Sahn Medresesi. At the same time, his poems were extolled by the foremost poets of the age. Despite his talents and his constant efforts to build up a powerful network Bāḳī could attain a *mülāzemet* position only in 971 (1563-64) -shortly after Nevʿī- and was appointed to a teaching position of the lowest degree only through Süleymān I's direct intervention and despite the objections of Hamid Efendi, - the chief military judge of Rumelia.[48] Besides these individual cases a statistical survey also demonstrates that

[47] *Ḥadā'iḳ*, 33. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual*, 28. Rüstem Pasha Medresesi was a 50-aspers *medrese* and Şehzade Medresesi was a 60-aspers *medrese*, equivalent to Süleymaniye Medresesi.

[48] Çavuşoğlu, "Baki" Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual* 33. *Ḥadā'iḳ*, 435.

especially from the second half of the sixteenth century on, people from ʿ*ilmiye* families had a much better chance to reach to the top echelons of the hierarchy. Similarly, it seems that in this period, a provincial background decreased the chance of promotion to the top ranks rather dramatically.[49]

Gelibolu Years: An Aspirant Polymath

Nevʿī remained in the *mülāzemet* position for around two years until he was appointed to one of the lowest ranking *medrese*s, Balaban Pasha Medresesi in Gelibolu with a salary of twenty aspers per diem. This was a rather modest income, though it was preferable to a more lucrative position as a provincial kadi, because of future career opportunities. A provincial kadi position, though better-paid at the beginning, precluded the possibility of promotion to higher teaching and judicial positions[50] and an aspirant scholar who desired to rise in the *ilmiye* had to start his career at a teaching position of the lowest rank. Thus started Nevʿī's Gelibolu years which would last six years until early Ramazān 979 (1572). This period in Gelibolu is particularly of importance for our present concern since *Netāyic* was written at the very end of this six-year absence from the Istanbul. However, unfortunately these years are almost as much obscure as his years in Edirne. ʿAṭāʾī again does not provide any significant detail and all is known is that after two years at the Balaban Paşa Medresesi, Nevʿī was promoted to Mesih Pasha Medresesi in the same town, with five aspers promotion in his salary.

[49] Abdurrahman Atçıl, "The route to the top in the Ottoman ilmiye hierarchy of the sixteenth century", *Bulletin of SOAS*, 72, 3 (2009), 493-496. Suraiya Faroqhi, "Social mobility among the Ottoman ʿUlema in the late sixteenth century", *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 4, 1973, 204–18; Faroqhi provides remarkable statistical data on late sixteenth century Ottoman *ulema* based on ʿAtāʿī's biographical accounts.

[50] Atçıl, "Ibid.", 499-500.

In the absence of explicit references it is hard to reconstruct Nevʿī's relationships in Gelibolu; however thanks to indirect evidence we may discern at least one person with whom Nevʿī met and formed a relationship during his stay in Gelibolu. The Ḫalvetī sheikh Meḥmed-i Daʿi (d. 1020/1611-12) was probably the most significant name in this line. According to his hagiography written by his fellow townsmen Muṣtafā ʿĀlī, Meḥmed was born in 944 (1537) in Gelibolu; thus he was a younger peer of Nevʿī. Like Nevʿī, Meḥmed Daʿi belonged to a family with an old Ḫalvetī pedigree, and he himself entered into the sufi path at a young age. According to the hagiography, the founder of the Ṣāʿbaniyye branch Ṣāʿban Efendi of Kastamonu (d.976/1569) became aware of Meḥmed's presence and sent to him Alaeddin Efendi as his deputy (*ḫalīfe*). Later just before his death, he sent him a letter, thus in a sense becoming a spiritual master to him. In 1002 (1593-94), Meḥmed-i Daʿi was invited to Istabul by Gazanfer Agha, the chief white eunuch of the court, who himself was a follower of him to Istanbul. He accepted the invitation, but refused to stay at the Palace and instead was accommodated at a private house. ʿAṭāʾī mentions that during his visit to Istanbul, Meḥmed-i Dai had honored them at home, so it is possible to speculate that Nevʿī had hosted this old acquaintance of him when he visited Istanbul.[51] Although Meḥmed-i Daʿi led a partly ascetic life, and although there is no direct evidence for their meeting in Gelibolu, their common sufi interests and Ḫalvetī background makes it rather plausible to suppose that Nevʿī and Meḥmed-i Daʿi formed a relationship.

[51] Reşat Öngören, "Osmanlılar'da Devlet Ricâli-Meşâyih Münâsebetlerinin Boyutlarını Gösteren Yeni Bir Kaynak: Âli'nin Şeyh Meḥmed-i Dâğî ile Alâkalı Menâkıbı" *İslâm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, no.1, 1997: 107-133. *Ḥadāʾiḳ*, 600-601. Aslı Niyazioğlu, "Ottomans Sufi Sheikhs Between this World and the Hereafter: A Study of Nevʿīzāde ʿAṭāʾī's Biographical Dictionary" Ph.D, Harvard University, 2003), 35.

Shortly before Nevʿī's appointment to Mesih Pasha Medresesi, the forty-six year reign of Süleymān I ended and Selīm II ascended to the Ottoman throne. (September 1566) This was a valuable opportunity for anybody seeking patronage at the court. Indeed as noted above royal intervention could be immensely effective in the fortunes of a poet- scholar and especially Bāḳī's extraordinary fortunes must be a striking example before Nevʿī. Thus he also tried his chance by presenting an ode dedicated to the new Sultan. Although it is impossible to determine the exact date or occasion for his poem, it seems quite probable that it was written, a few months after the enthronement and it clearly expressed Nevʿī's desire to enter into courtly service.[52] Whatever has been the contribution of this ode, Nevʿī was promoted to Mesih Pasha Medresesi in the same town.

ʿAhdī (d. 1002/1593), the author of a biographical dictionary of poets *Gülşeni-i Şuʿarā* (*Rose Garden of Poets*) and who had met Nevʿī personally in the early 1560s (960s and early 970s), introduces this young poet and aspirant on the *ilmiye* path with the following words:

> ...he is of a *dervish*-like temperament due to his origins and ancestry (…) his delicate element (i.e. his spirit) is endowed with the sciences of human perfection (…) among his peers, in respect to his mind and intelligences he is peerless among his contemporaries. His comprehension, his astuteness and (his qualities in) discipleship are acknowledged by the men of wisdom (*ehl-i ʿirfān*) and celebrated (praised) by all people. He has a natural integrity and he comprises (all) kinds of sciences and he is perfect in the study of every kind (*nevʿ*) of science.[53]

Because ʿAhdī was interested in Nevʿī primarily as a poet he devoted the substantial part of the entry to Nevʿī's poetic accomplishments and examples of his poetry. Nevertheless it is significant that ʿAhdī also underlines Nevʿī's sufi temperament and

[52] *Dīvān* , 88-90.

[53] Ahdî, *Ahdî ve Gülşen-i Şu'arâsı (İnceleme-metin)* 5ed. Süleyman Solmaz (Ankara: AYK Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı, 2005), 549.

the sufi background of his family, his scholarly distinction and lastly, with an elegant and playful allusion to his penname "Nevʿī", his sophistication in "all kinds of sciences". ʿAhdī's testament is particularly valuable because it is dated approximately to the same time that Nevʿī wrote *Netāyic* - an encyclopedia of the sciences. Moreover, ʿAhdī was not alone in his comments because other two biographical dictionaries of poets introduce Nevʿī with the more or less same adjectives.[54]

Back to Istanbul: *ʿİlmiye* Career and Patronage

Nevʿī returned to Istanbul in Ramażān 979 (January-February 1572) with an appointment to Şahkulu Medresesi, which he had attained with the help of Şeyhi Efendi, the chief military judge of Rumelia. Istanbul offered Nevʿī great opportunities to advance in his professional career and to form a powerful network thanks to his poetic skills. The most accessible method to trace the patronage relations is a study of the odes in Nevʿī's *Dīvān.* Shortly after arriving to Istanbul, Nevʿī seems to have built contacts with some courtiers and high-ranking bureaucrats and started attending the foremost literary circles and salons in the city. Sultan Selīm's *bon companion* Celāl Beġ and the *resiülküttāb* Feridun Beġ were among the leading connoisseurs of literature of the time and the odes dedicated to them demonstrate that Nevʿī did or tried to enter into their patronage as a gifted poet. Celāl Beg himself was a poet and had attracted Selīm's attention thanks to his literary skills and had served as a companion since his governorship in Manisa; after Selīm's

[54] Kınalızade Hasan Çelebi, *Tezkiretü'ş Şuarâ* v.2, 1009. Âşık Çelebi, *Meşâʿirü'ş- Şuʿarâ (inceleme – metin)*, ed.Filiz Kılıç (İstanbul: İstanbul Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, 2010), v. 2. Apart from *Netāyīc*, it is attested that Nevʿī also wrote his *Ḥadīṯ-i Erbaʿīn*, (*Forty Hadiths*) an in-verse translation of Cāmī's (d.1492) selection of forty hadiths with few additions. The work was written in 977 when Nevʿī was at the Mesih Pasha Medresesi. Diriöz, "Nevʿī", 89.

accession to the throne he was also settled in Istanbul. In the poem dedicated to Celāl Beġ, Nevʿī highlighted his own poetic talents, hoping to curry his patronage and to have his intercession to attract the Sultan's attention. Celāl Beġ's good fortunes however did not last long. He was a rather controversial figure because of his alleged sympathy for unorthodox "*ḥurūfī*" beliefs and his constant impugning of the grand vizier Sokollu Meḥmed Pasha and *şeyhülislam* Ebūṣuʿūd Efendi. Ultimately, he lost Selīm's favor and was sent to exile and died there in 980 (1572-23).[55] Similarly, Feridun Beġ was a generous patron of poets and polite society and used to organize gatherings of poets at his home and especially. Although he was famous in elaborate prose rather than poetry, his poems were nevertheless were appreciated by Bāḳī, another protégé of him. [56] Nevʿī's ode for Feridun Beġ was written when he was secretary-in-chief (*re'isülküttāb*) (between 978-981 /1570 - 1573). Although Nevʿī did not express a specific request in, his poem was a clear sign of a patronage relationship.[57]

Three years after his settlement in Istanbul, in 982 (1574-75), Nevʿī was promoted to a higher position at the Murād Pasha Medresesi with a forty-asper salary. Shortly thereafter, Murād III's accession to the throne meant a new opportunity for promotion and in the ode celebrating Murād's enthronement, Nevʿī expressed his expectation to be appointed to a higher medrese of 50 aspers.[58] However, he had to wait for six more years until he got an appointment to a 50-asper medrese. Meanwhile, Nevʿī continued to attend the foremost literary circles of the

[55] Muṣṭafā ʿAlī, *Künhül Ahbar'ın Tezkire Kısmı,* ed. Muṣṭafā İsen. (Ankara,: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi 1994), 299-301.

[56] *Ḥadā'iḳ,* 337.

[57] *Dīvān ,*144-145.

[58] *Dīvān* , 94.

time and started to frequent Şemsi Aḥmed Pasha's (d. 988/1580) salon. Şemsi Pasha belonged to the Isfendiyaroğlu family and his mother was a princess of the Ottoman dynasty. He had a notable literary production both in verse and in prose and his house in Üsküdar served as a salon for poets and other aspirants who sought for connection at the court. A successful commander and politically shrewd person Şemsi Pasha was recognized as the most important name in the anti-Sokollu camp. More importantly, he had a quite close and cordial relationship with Murād III.[59] Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī had also joined Şemsi Pasha's circle upon his return to Istanbul after a nine-year absence, though his efforts to gain Şemsi Pasha's protection at the court proved futile. In Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī's words, Şemsi Pasha was not keen at all to help his guests and promote their ambitions.[60] Indeed Nevʿī does not seem to have been more successful with Şemsi Pasha than was Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī. His protracted tenure at the 40-asper medrese ended in 1580 with his appointment to the 50-asper *medrese* of Cafer Ağa.

Meanwhile Nevʿī seems to have established himself among the elite of Istanbul so that in 982 (1574-75) he married the daughter of Nişancı Meḥmed Efendi.[61] Meḥmed Efendi had served as chancellor and "*defterdār*" during the reign of Süleymān I and had passed away in during the Sigetvar campaign (974/1566). Since the marriage was formed after Meḥmed Efendi's death, it probably came about

[59] Erhan Afyoncu, "Şemsi Ahmed Paşa" *TDVİA,* v. 33, 366-368. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual,* 71-75.

[60] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual,* 56, 74.

[61] ʿAtāʿī cites a chronogram fort Nevʿī's second marriage in 993. (1585), written by Seyfi Çelebi (d. 1006/1597), however the chronogram gives the date 982. (1574-5), so apparently this chronogram was written for the first marriage and ʿAtāʿī.

thanks to Nevʿī's relation to Meḥmed Efendi's sons.[62] Meḥmed Efendi's eldest son was Aḥmed Beġ, scribe at the *divān*, *müteferrika* at the court and a poet.[63] In 993 (1585), probably after the death of his first wife, Nevʿī married for a second time, but the identity of this second wife is unknown.

Nevʿī does not seem to have been involved in politics and factional struggles; however his failed relationship with Koca Sinān Pasha seems to have marked a turning point in this regard. Sinān Pasha was one of the most brilliant commanders of the Empire and head of a powerful political faction in Istanbul. In 988 (1580) when he was the commander-in-chief of the Ottoman army at the eastern frontier, he was appointed to the grand vizierate upon the death of Semiz ʿĀlī Pasha. He immediately returned to the capital, but the failure of the peace negotiations with the Safavids and the opposition of the queen mother Nūrbānū Sultan cost him the vizierate in less than two years.[64] Nevʿī had celebrated Sinān Pasha's appointment to the commandership of the eastern campaign in Şāʿban 987 (October 1579) with an ode[65] and probably after his appointment he wrote a brief treatise addressing Sinān Pasha on the importance and necessity of the office of vizier.[66] However, Sinān Pasha was by no means an admirer of poets and scholars. Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī notes that the poets of the time

[62] Based on a chronogram by poet Cinānī for the circumcision of Nevʿī's son, Aslı Niyazioğlu states that Nevʿī must have another son named Yahya who died too early to be mentioned in later sources, However, firstly it does not seem much plausible that Nevʿī named his son after his own name and secondly the boy's name is stated only in the title and not in the poem. Thus the circumcision was most probably ʿAtāʿī's circumcision rather than of another son. Niyazioğlu, "Ottoman Sufi Sheikhs",32.

[63] *Ḥadā'iḳ*, 59. Kınalızade, *Tezkiretü'ş Şuarâ*, vol.1, 145-146.

[64] Emine Fetvacı, "Viziers to Eunuchs: Transitions in Ottoman Manuscript Patronage 1566-1617", (Ph.D, Harvard University, 2005), 332. Mehmet İpşirli, "Koca Sinān Paşa", *TDVİA*, v.26, 137-9.

[65] *Dīvān* , 53-56

[66] The treatise is to be found in a Ayasofya no.2893 v.1r-8v. It is followed by a smaller treatise titles "Şikāyet-Rūzigār" Neither is counted in ʿAtāʿī''s list of works and as noted on the manuscript both must be copied from Nevʿī's *Münşeāt*.

did not refrain from expressing their joy when Sinān Pasha was dismissed from the grand vizierate.[67] Sinān Pasha had to wait for four years until he could gain favor again at the court and following a turbulent period, he was reappointed to the vizierate in place of Siyāvuş Pasha in 1589.

Shortly after Sinān Pasha's first dismissal from the vizierate in 990 Ẕilḥicce (January 1582), the relationship between the two turned sour. Following his dismissal, Nevʿī visited the Pasha on the occasion of the Feast of Sacrifice and to express his loyalty to the dismissed Pasha. Sinān Pasha however showed that he was not an admirer or patron of poets and did not refrain from stating that "poets cannot be scholars". This stinging and arrogant remark offended Nevʿī greatly and he responded to it with a harsh letter. The letter starts with logical and legal/religious evidence to prove the legitimacy of poetry and the inconsistency of the Pasha's claim, and then it takes a more personal tone implying and imputing ignorance and even obtuseness to the pasha. One cannot expect an agreeable relationship between the two after this letter; and although Sinān Pasha's immediate reaction of this letter remains unknown, it is certain that thereafter Nevʿī tried his chance in the anti-Sinān Pasha camp.

Siyāvuş Pasha was the most important personality in the anti-Sinān Pasha camp, and he became the most powerful and long-lasting patron of Nevʿī after Murād III. By the time of Murād's accession to the throne, Siyāvuş Pasha was *Beğlerbeği* of Rumelia and after Sinān Pasha's dismissal for his short grand vizierate in 1582, he replaced him in office. Nevʿī celebrated this appointment immediately

[67] Faris Çerçi *Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali Ve Künhü'l-Ahbarı'nda II. Selim, III. Murat Ve III. Mehmet Devirleri*, (Kayseri Erciyes Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2000.), v.3, 638-640.

with a chronogram.[68] Several odes in the *Divān*[69] clearly manifest that Nevʿī appealed to Siyāvuş Pasha quite often with requests of increase in salary and patronage. These appeals seems to have found answer on the part of Siyāvuş Pasha; one year after Siyāvuş Pasha's appointment to grand vizierate in Ẕilḥicce 991 (December 1583) Nevʿī was promoted to a teaching position at the medrese of Mihrimah Sultan with a 50 –asper salary.

This new political alignment with Siyāvuş Pasha seems to have brought new non-scholarly incumbencies to Nevʿī as well. In Ẕilḳaʿde 991 (October/December 1583), only one month before his appointment to the Mihrimah Sultan Medrese, Hasan Pasha, *Beġlerbeġi* of Şam, who participated in the eastern campaign demonstrated significant success in repairing the castle of Revan and in his expeditions into Georgia. To celebrate and reward these accomplishments Murād III sent him a jeweled sword and a robe of honor (*ḫil'at*). An ode in Nevʿī's *Divān* testifies that Nevʿī was entrusted with the duty of heralding the news to Hasan Pasha.[70]

Eventually in Ẕilḳaʿde 995 (October 1587) Nevʿī attained a position at one of the Sahn-ı Ṣemān Medrese. He remained in this position for around two and a half years, until Rebiʿü'levvel 998 (January 1590). At this point, before continuing with his subsequent career as tutor to princes, discussion of his sufi affiliation throughout these years in Istanbul might be in order. Sources on Nevʿī's life and character are all in agreement that he was of a sufi temperament and indeed sufi themes constituted a

[68] *Dīvān* , 165-166.

[69] *Dīvān ,63-64*; 68-70; 103-104; 112-115; 124-127; 146-147; 165-166.

[70] *Dīvān* , 138-139. ʿAṭā'ī does not mention any journey to the east; however this is not to discard this possibility completely.

substantial part of his literary oeuvre. Attachment to a particular sheikh or order was not only a spiritual phenomenon but it also meant inclusion in a social milieu and network that occasionally could function like a patronage relationship as well. ʿAtāʿī cites three names as Nevʿī's sheikhs, two of them were Ḫalvetī and the last one was a Naḳşbendī of Ḫalvetī background.

Sufi Affiliation: from Ḫalvetī to Naḳşbendī

Şeyh Bālī

ʿAṭāʾī states that Nevʿī has been introduced to sufi thought and practice at a very early age by his father, moreover it is understood that he led a pretty ascetic life in Edirne and was most probably connected to the Ḫalvetī sheikh Meḥmed-i Daʿī in Gelibolu. Nevertheless, it is only after establishing himself in Istanbul that we can track Nevʿī's affiliation with specific sufi sheikhs.

Soon after his arrival in Istanbul in 1572 he must have met with Sarhoş Bālī Efendi, whom ʿAṭāʾī' denotes as his first sheikh. Bālī Efendi came from a scholarly family, his father was tutor to Bayezid II's son Aḥmed, and Bālī Efendi himself had started with a career in the *'ilmiye.* According to ʿĀşıḳ Çelebi, Bālī Efendi owed his epithet *sarhoş* –drunkard- to the wild life that he led in his youth.[71] His "conversion" to Sufism was narrated with a dream-story, of which narrations by different people displayed some considerable changes in details.[72]

[71] Bālī Efendi's penname was Cevherī. Âşık Çelebi, *Meşâʿirü'ş- Şuʿarâ* ,v. 1, 498-501.

[72] Aslı Niyazioğlu analyzes and compares the four early biographical entries on Bālī Efendi and variations in his initiation story. Aslı Niyazioğlu, "Lives of a Sixteenth-century Ottoman Sheikh: Serhoş Bālī Efendi (d. 980/1572) and His Biographers" in *Şinasi Tekin'in Anısına Uygurlar'dan Osmanlı'ya* Simurg Kitapçılık, (İstanbul, 2005), 607-619. Nevʿī's Turkish allegoric story in verse, *Ḥaṣb-i Ḥāl* (*Conversation*), can be read as a rendition of Bālī Efendi's story. In this allegoric story

Bālī Efendi had met with his sheikh Ramażān Efendi (d. 963/1556) when he was still a young *müderris* in Istanbul, and became a disciple of him, abandoning his scholarly career. Ramazān Efendi was among the important figures of the Ḫalvetīye in sixteenth century Istanbul and was the founder of the Ramaẓāniye branch of the order. He gained a reputation by his miracles as well as his stringent attitude towards the critics of Sufism regarding some controversial issues such as Ibn Arabi and his teachings. Apparently Sarhoş Bālī Efendi continued his sheikh's rigorous attitude and his polemics with another Ḫalvetī *şeyh* Nūreddīnzāde Muṣliḥuddīn were fierce enough to cause a division among the Ḫalvetī s of Istanbul.[73] Sarhoş Bālī Efendi's death (980/1573) also caused some controversies among the Ḫalvetī community. As ʿAṭā'ī states, after his death, it was discovered that Bālī Efendi had actually accumulated a large wealth, although he was renowned for his contempt towards elite patronage. ʿAṭā'ī was among those who believed in the sincerity of his father's sheikh and he interpreted this as an evidence of the sheikh's miraculous powers. However, not everybody was content with such a favorable explanation and Muṣtafā ʿĀlī, a former disciple of Bālī Efendi, who later transferred his allegiance to Bālī Efendi's arch-rival Nureddinzāde, regarded the unexpected wealth to be a sign of the dishonesty of the sheikh.[74]

Nevʿī narrated the story of a lover who reached divine love with the help of a sheikh, after a period of suffering in the pursuit a worldly lover. Indeed the plot of the story displays a remarkable resemblance to Bālī Efendi's entrance to the sufi path as it was narrated by ʿĀşık Çelebi and Kınalızāde. According to ʿAṭā'ī, the title of the work was given by Bālī Efendi. Hande Özer, "Nevʿī'nin Hasb-i Hali" M.A. Thesis Marmara University Türkiyat Araştırmaları, 1994

[73] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual,* 57-57; *Ḥadā'iḳ*, 211-212.

[74] Niyazioğlu,"Lives of a Sixteenth-century Ottoman Sheikh", 613. Çerçi, *Künhü'l Ahbar* , 144-56.

Kurd Efendi

After Bālī Efendi, according to ʿAtāʿī, Nevʿī engaged himself with another Ḫalvetī sheikh Kurd Meḥmed Efendi. Just like Bālī Efendi, Kurd Efendi came also from a scholarly background and he met with Bālī Efendi of Sofia, who introduced him to the sufi path when he visited his hometown Tatarpazarcığı (modern day Pazarjik) in Bulgaria as a student at the Sahn-ı Şemān. After the death of Bālī Efendi in 960 (1553) he succeeded to the latter's place as sheikh. In 981 (1573) when Nureddinzāde who was likewise a disciple of Bālī Efendi of Sofia –and the above mentioned arch-rival of Sarhoş Bālī Efendi- died in Istanbul, Kurd Efendi came to the capital and succeeded his convent in Sokollu Meḥmed Pasha lodge. This time coincided with the death of Sarhoş Bālī Efendi, thus after Bālī Efendi, Nevʿī affiliated himself with this newly arrived Ḫalvetī heikh. Kurd Efendi did not remain as only the sheikh of the convent but he preached at the Mosque of Meḥmed II and Fridays at the Sokullu Meḥmed Paşa Mosque. Kurd Efendi lived in Istanbul for almost fifteen years and shortly before his death, he traveled back to his hometown and passed away in Sofia. (6 Şevvāl 996/August 29 1588). ʿAṭā'ī describes Kurd Efendi as well-versed in esoteric as well exoteric sciences, and he cites a number of books authored by him. He relates that Nevʿī wrote an exegesis of the *Ṣuretu'l Mülk* with the guidance of Kurd Efendi, however, the whereabouts of this text remains unknown.

Şāʿban Efendi

Nevʿī's third sheikh Şāʿban Efendi was, unlike the first two, a Naḳşbendī, albeit of Ḫalvetī background. He was a townsman and a disciple of Şāʿban-ı Veli

(d.976/1569) of Kastamonu, the founder of the Şāʿbani branch of the Ḫalvetī order and one of the most critical and influential figures in the history of the order. ʿAṭā'ī' states that Şāʿban Efendi had left Kastamonu in 970 (1562-63) and come to Istanbul; however, he does not elaborate on the possible reasons of this parting. In any case, upon his arrival to Istanbul, Şāʿban Efendi became a disciple of Hekim Çelebi (d. 974/1566-67) who was from the first generation of local Ottoman Naḳsbendīs, and a disciple of Emīr Buḫārī (d. 922/1516) who had introduced the order to Istanbul. At this time Ḥekim Çelebi was serving in his own convent in Aksaray-Koska, built for him by Rüstem Pasha, who was also one of his followers. After a few years Ḥekim Çelebi sent Şāʿban Efendi to Mudurnu to serve as his successor. Şāʿban Efendi remained in this small town for not much, and probably shortly after Selīm II's enthronement, -in the early 1570s- the sultan's tutor and a former clientele of Rüstem Pasha, ʿAtāullāh Efendi (d. 979/1571),[75] invited the sheikh back to the capital. Around the year 1000 (1591-2), he was appointed to the most important Naḳsbendī convent in the city, Emir Buhari Tekkesi in Fatih, and remained there until his death on 14 Rebiʿü'levvel 1002(December 8th 1593).[76]

The contemporary sources do not give the impression that Şāʿban Efendi was a particularly prominent figure. Nonetheless it seems that Murād III showed a remarkable interest in this Naḳsbendī sheikh despite his obvious preference for the Ḫalvetī order. ʿAṭā'ī notes that because of the "Great Fire" in Istanbul that broke out

[75] Although not mentioned explicitly neither by ʿAtāʿī nor by Muṣtafā Alī, Atāullāh Efendi was most probably follower or sympathizer of Şāʿban Efendi since he was buried in the cemetery of Şeyh Vefa lodge, the place preferred later by Şāʿban Efendi himself and Nevʿī. Çerçi, *Künhü'l Ahbār*, 2: 127. *Ḥadā'iḳ*, 149-151.

[76] Şāʿban Efendi's appointment to the Emir Buhari lodge may be at an earlier date, since in Murād's letters to Şeyh Şücaʿ, Murād inquired after Şeyh Şücaʿʿ's opinion about Şāʿban Efendi and refers to him as "sheikh at the Emir Buhari lodge". Şeyh Şücaʿʿ died at 996 (1587-88), so it seems that Şāʿban Efendi has become sheikh to the Emir Buhari lodge before 996. See: Özgen Felek, *Kitabu'l Menamat Sultan III. Murād'ın Rüya Mektupları*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2012), 248.

ravaged the city and between Cemāziyü'levvel and Cemāziyü'laḫīr (997March – May 1589) Murād III appealed to Şāʿban Efendi. Şāʿban Efendi claimed that the fires had broken out on account of the flaming lament of a sufi. ʿAṭā'ī does not comment on or explicate this remark or provide detail on Murād III's reaction to it. However, it apparently expressed a resentment on the part of Şāʿban Efendi, either his own resentment or of another fellow sufi. This was not the only instance that Murād III resorted to Şāʿban Efendi's counsel, since both ʿAṭā'ī notes that Murād visited the *şeyh* couple of times in his convent.[77] Due to his relationship with both Nevʿī and Murād III, Şāʿban Efendi was quite possibly a mediator in Nevʿī's appointment as tutor to Prince Muṣtafā. The relationship of the three continued up until Şāʿban Efendi's death. Nevʿī dedicated the Persian elegy that he wrote on the occasion of Şāʿban Efendi's death, to Murād III. Similarly when Murād ordered him a translation of Ibn al-ʿArabī's *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam* he appealed to Şāʿban Efendi for help and guidance.

Tutorship to Princes and Relation with Murād III

On Rebiʿü'levvel 26, 998 (February 2nd,1590) Nevʿī was appointed as a kadi for the first time, to Bagdad, a rather distant corner of the Empire, in which Ottoman rule had been consolidated barely thirty years ago. From the mid-sixteenth to the late seventeenth century, the kadis of Bagdad held the rank of "*mevleviyet*" and after a *müderris* position at the Sahn-ı Şemān Medresesi, one could be promoted to Süleymaniye Medresesi –or another medrese of 60-aspers- and then to a judgeship of

[77] *Ḥadā'iḳ*, 380. Peçevī notes that Şāʿban Efendi used to correspond with the Sultan particularly in matters related to Sufism. İbrahim Peçevi, *Tarih-i Peçevi*. (İstanbul: Matbaa-i Âmire, 1283[1867]) , 2: 60.

Damascus, Aleppo or Bagdad.[78] Compared to a teaching position, the kadiship of Bagdad was far better paid, and presumably offered better prospects for rising in the *ilmiye* hierarchy.[79] Thus, formally this appointment was a promotion; however, it was far from Nevʿī's expectations. ʿAtāʿī relates that this appointment made him cry because of his fear from the heavy responsibility of judgeship and he immediately started writing letters nominating a deputy in place of himself. Perhaps because of his deep unwillingness or with some other considerations on the part of Murād III, in a couple of days he received the news of his designation as tutor to Prince Muṣtafā ; Murād III's second eldest son. ʿAtāʿī is silent on the possible intercession of any patron or friend, but two names come forward as potential patrons who may have supported Nevʿī's cause. The first of them is Bostanzāde Meḥmed Efendi (d. 1006/1598), who had been *şeyhülislam* barely one year ago. Nevʿī has two odes dedicated to Boṣtanzāde, both of them expressing relatively friendly relations and attachment.[80] Moreover, ʿAtāʿī notes that Bostanzāde wrote an approbatory review (*taḳrīẓ*) for Nevʿī's work on Islamic theology, *Muḥaṣṣılu'l Kelām*.[81] From a political perspective it is worth remembering that Bostanzāde and Murād's tutor Hoca Ṣaʿādeddīn, were bitter rivals and were involved in a fierce struggle over the appointments in the ʿ*ilmiye* as well as in political competitions of the time.[82] Tutorship to a prince who resided at the Palace was a position that potentially

[78] Cited in İsmail Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devletinin İlmiye Teşkilatı*, (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1984), 58, 89. The kadi of Bagdad came roughly in the fourth rank in the hierarchy of provincial kadis. Ibid.,98, 102.

[79] Atçıl, "The route to the top in the Ottoman ilmiye hierarchy of the sixteenth century", 501.

[80] *Dīvān ,* 65-67; 160-161.

[81] *Ḥadā'iḳ,* 413.

[82] Fleischer, *Bureucrat and Intellectual,* 159-161. Çerçi, *Künhü'l Ahbār,* 3: 635-638. Muṣtafā Âli relates also Murād III's grievance over Boṣtanzāde and Hoca Sadeddin's nepotism.

enabled rather close contact with the Sultan and it is worth speculating that Boştanzāde wished to introduce Nevʿī into the court in order to curb Hoca Saʿadeddīn's influence over Murād III. The second name that may have played a role in Nevʿī's appointment as tutor is his sheikh Şāʿban Efendi. As noted above Murād was used to correspond with and consult him on various matters and Şāʿban Efendi may have recommended his disciple, Nevʿī, as a man of both scholarly and sufi learning.

Tutorship to princes was a prestigious and perhaps more importantly a promising position. Under normal circumstances when a prince ascended to the throne, his tutor also rose to the office of the royal tutor, a position that was only second, if not equal to the position of *şeyhülislam.* The legal codes of Meḥmed II and Süleymān I help to determine the relative position of the tutor of princes and sultan in the *ilmiye* hierarchy. The quota reserved for the high-ranking ʿ*ulema* in *mülāzemet* appointments is one of the indicators of scholars' hierarchical position and according to the code of Süleymān I, it was stipulated that *şeyhülislam* and the royal tutor were allowed to register twenty *mülāzım*s each, whereas the tutors of princes were allowed only two. In 1556, by the request of Princes Selīm (II) and Bayezid this number was increased to three.[83] In the same vein, according to the codification of Meḥmed II, sons of higher *ilmiye* members were allowed a certain salary; sons of the *şeyhülislam* and the royal tutor receiving sixty, sons of the chief military judges forty-five, sons of kadis of major cities (*taḥt ḳādısı*) and tutor of princes thirty-aspers a day.[84] In the case of Nevʿī, the tutorship to Prince Muştafā was not an eminently promising post, since Prince Muştafā 's chance to ascend to the Ottoman throne was

[83] Uzunçarşılı, *İlmiye,* 47.

[84] *Ibid*., 74.

less than that of his elder brother Prince Meḥmed who was fourteen years older than him and son of Murād III's favorite, Safiye Sultan; moreover, he had already been granted the governorship of Manisa as the heir-apparent of the throne.[85] Yet Nevʿī's situation had other advantages, namely since he was not obliged to leave the Palace he could gain a powerful position at the court and form a close relationship with Murād III.

Like his father Selīm II, Murād III did not participate in any military campaign, and lived a rather secluded life in the Topkapı Palace so much so that after a while he did not leave the Palace even for the Friday prayers.[86] Furthermore he by-passed the normal functioning of the imperial bureaucracy and grand viziers' authority by issuing imperial decrees for appointments; this enabled the courtiers and companions great opportunity to have influence on the sultan and direct involvement in appointments.[87] Besides this relatively arbitrary way of ruling, Murād's remarkably intense correspondence with his sheikh Şücāʿ demonstrates that he often sought political counsel from the people outside of the state bureaucracy. ʿAṭāʾī 's note that when Nevʿī passed away, more than a thousand personal letters of the Sultan were found out in his drawer, implies a very intense relationship between the Sultan and Nevʿī during the last five years of Murād's reign. According to ʿAṭāʾī the content of the letters encompassed a wide spectrum ranging from military and political issues to inquiries in a number of scholarly/scientific and mystical matters; moreover Nevʿī had authored a great number of short treatises upon the request of Murād III.

[85] Feridun Emecen "Meḥmed III", *TDVİA,* v. 28, 408.

[86] Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi,* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1988) v. 3/1, 114-115.

[87] Çerçi, *Künhül Ahbār*, 2: 243. Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī was one of the most emphatic critics of Murād III's company with this type of people.

The most important political decision in which Nevʿī was involved in this period was Ferhad Pasha's grand vizierate in 1591. It seems that shortly after his appointment as tutor, Nevʿī gained enough regard in the eyes of Murād III to counsel him on the choice of grand vizier. In his second vizierate that started in 1589, Sinān Pasha managed to take important and efficient monetary measures and also to put an end to the wars at the eastern front. Nonetheless, these did not ensure him to keep his position for slightly more than two years. On the one hand the fires that ravaged the city in the first weeks of his vizierate, on the other hand Ferhad Pasha's prestige as the commander-in-chief of the campaign at the eastern frontier, coupled with the maneuvers of the clique formed against him and led by Ferhad Pasha undermined Sinān Pasha's grand vizierate. According to ʿAṭā'ī', Nevʿī also played a decisive role in Murād III's decision in favor of Ferhad Pasha.[88] Hesitating about whether to retain Sinān Pasha at the grand vizierate or to replace him with Ferhad Pasha, Murād III asked Nevʿī's opinion on the matter. As mentioned above Nevʿī had fallen out with Sinān Pasha long before this date; thus in some successive letters he emphasized Ferhad Pasha's virtues and suggested him for the post. However, Murād III was not to be persuaded easily, besides he reported that he had had a couple of dreams that presented Sinān Pasha as a more suitable and auspicious choice. In answer, Nevʿī's reportedly claimed that these dreams were merely a result of carnal sentiments and evil delusions, and thus could not be regarded reasonably and religiously acceptable.

[88] The enmity and rivalry between Sinān Pasha and Ferhad Pasha goes back to some political dissidence and factional divergence. Nevertheless, Peçevi relates an event that constitutes at least the external beginning of this animosity. Accordingly during the circumcision festival of Prince Meḥmed when the fun and games were continuing in full career when the *subaşı* of Istanbul came to know that a group of the cavalry of the Porte (*bölük halkı)* organized their own entertainment and has brought prostitutes to their rooms. Thus the *subaşı* took along a group of janissaries and busted onto the cavalry, however another group of cavalry got the wind of this surprise attack and ran to help their fellow comrades. Thus the event turned into a clash between the Janissaries and the Cavalry of the Porte and resulted in the death of two cavalrymen. The grand vizier Sinān Pasha hold the then-agha of the Janissaries Ferhad, responsible for this fiasco and this event allegedly marked beginning of a years-long enmity between the two. Peçevi, *Tarih-i Peçevi,* 2: 72-73.

Murād was apparently persuaded by this answer, and he appointed Ferhad Pasha to the grand vizierate.[89] Despite this emphatic support of Nevʿī for Ferhad Pasha, he does not seem to have been openly a member of the Ferhad Pasha's clique, or at least part of a group that schemed plans against Sinān Pasha. After his appointment, Ferhad Pasha sent to Nevʿī twenty *dirhem*s as an acknowledgement of his support, however, Nevʿī rejected this gift with the words that "being merely a weak sparrow, he shall not be ambitious for the prey of eagles" indicating his reluctance to be involved in an open political struggle and rivalry.

This was the most significant but reportedly not the only instance in which Nevʿī exerted an influence on Murād III. Apart from Ferhad Pasha, ʿAṭāʾī states that Nevʿī had been influential in the appointments of Ciġalizāde Sinān Pasha as grand admiral, of Sokolluzāde Hasan Pasha's (d. 1010/1602)[90] appointment as *beġlerbeġi* of Rumelia, Boṣtanzāde Meḥmed Efendi's (d. 1006/1598) reappointment as the chief military judge of Rumelia immediately after his dismissal from the post of *şeyhülislam* in 999 (1591), as well as in Sunullah Efendi's (d. 1021/1612) extremely rapid advance in the career path, becoming the chief military judge of Rumelia in 1001/1593, (he was only kadi of Bursa in 1590). Lastly he was influential in the appointment of Remzizāde Meḥmed (d. 1006/1597-98), who was a classmate of his at the Sahn-ı Ṣemān Medresesi, as kadi of Bursa in 1591.[91] Unfortunately ʿAṭāʾī's assertion about Nevʿī's influence on Murād and on appointments cannot be verified from other sources, and ʿAṭāʾī' underlines that although his father used to be quite

[89] Murād III was used to ask for political counsel from the people he trusted. For instance, before the campaign against the Safavids in 985/1577-78, Murād asked Sheikh Şücaʿ whether Sinān Pasha or Lala Muṣtafā shall be appointed as the commander-in-chief of the campaign. Felek, K*itabu'l Menamat*, 268.

[90] Erhan Afyoncu, "Sokulluzade Hasan Paşa" *TDVİA* v. 37, 366-368.

[91] *Ḥadā'iḳ* , 414-415.

secretive and taciturn about his relationship with the Sultan, he could acquire this information only from the gossips of the dignitaries of the time. Nevertheless, Murād III also publicly displayed his esteem for Nevʿī when he stood up before him during the celebration ceremonies of religious festivals although according to courtly protocol, he was to stand up only before the members of the *ilmiye* who held the rank of *mevleviyet* and the tutors of princes were not of this rank.[92]

Apart from this political involvement, ʿAṭāʾī discloses only a very small portion of Nevʿī's correspondence with the Sultan, but even this fragmentary information is very helpful to conceive of Nevʿī's as well as Murād III's characters, and the nature of their relationship. In a correspondence on mystical matters Murād criticized Nevʿī for being an externalist (e*hl-i ẓāhir)* and hooked on scholasticism (*rübūde-i maʿālim ve maẓāhir*) and added to his letter a censuring couplet:

Oh thou Murād, you need a companion of a sublime temperament

Not of the kind (Nevʿī), that we need, of motley penchant[93]

Nevʿī's response to this reproachful couplet was by no means less censuring, though slightly more humble:

Some have discovered a hoard some know of alchemy

Some know the manner of music, the ways of melody

No way to gain the favors of his Excellency, for Nevʿī

Neither sheikh of fame you are, nor do you know the effective prayers [94]

---

[92] Uzunçarşılı, *İlmiye,* 97.

[93] Murādey saña hem ṣohbet gerek ber -meşreb-i ʿālī /Gerekmez bize ol Nevʿī ki ola elvān meyāli. *Ḥadāʾiḳ,* 420.

[94] Kīmī defīne buldı kīmī kimyā bilür /Kīmī ʿuṣūl ü nağme vü naḳş bilür

Maḳbūl-i haẓret olmaġa yoḳ çāre Nevʿīye / Ne şeyh-i şöhre olur ne mücerreb duʿā bilür. *Ibid.*

These couplets expressed an often times criticized feature of the company and courtiers around Murād III and of his fondness for money, entertainment[95]and extraordinary attachment to some sufi sheikhs of suspicious sanctity- perhaps including sheikh Şücāʿ. These critiques were put into words by contemporary chroniclers like Muṣtafā ʿĀlī, who were severe critics of Murād's avarice for wealth and his cupidity. Muṣtafā ʿĀlī charged Şemsi Pasha for getting the Sultan accustomed to bribery and for his avarice as the primary reason behind the monetary devaluation which eventually resulted in a Janissary revolt in 1588.[96].

Interest in sufis was not something to be criticized on its own; however, Sultan Murād's interest in the occult and in popular manifestations of sufism was considered to be well-known by his contemporaries and even Muṣtafā ʿĀlī had tried to curry his interest by presenting him with some minor esoteric works.[97] Moreover it seems that Murād also feared of sorcery against him and probably because of this fear resorted to people that could repeal the spells. [98] At the same time, Murād III's reign was the apex of the official and royal favor that the Ḫalvetī order enjoyed in the Ottoman capital and Murād III's attachment to Sheikh Şücaʿ was exceptionally

[95] With regard to the fondness of Murād for entertainment Peçevi, for instance, describes Murād III as a man keen on every kind of entertainment and used to invite singers, musicians, storytellers and every kind of performers from all over the Empire and even from the Persian and Arab lands and paying them lavishly. Peçevi, *Tarih-i Peçevi*. v. 2, 283.These critiques later become an established part historical narrative so that they later found way even in popular historical literature. For a discussion of Murād III's image in modern historical and fictional literature see Felek, "Recreating Image and Identity", 15-19.

[96] Çerçi, *Künhü'l Ahbar*, 2: 249-251; v. 2. 256-258. The specific reference to alchemy in this couplet reminds one, another name that was at least equally fond of money that managed to accumulate great wealth, namely Sinān Pasha. Peçevi notes that, due to his immense wealth- it was believed and gossiped about that Sinān Pasha knew the art of alchemy. Peçevi, *Tarih-i Peçevi*. v. 2, 283.

[97] Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual*,109-110; 126.

[98] He corresponded with him on a regular basis, sent him his dreams to be interpreted and eventually had his more than two thousand letters compiled in a book called *Book of Dreams* (*Kitāb al-Menāmāt*), in 1001/1591-92I. n a note to Sheikh Şücaʿ, Murād states this fear as hearsay. It seems however Sheikh Şücaʿ did not consider this as a serious threat. Felek, "*Kitābü'l- Menāmāt"*344.

strong; eventually this favor created for the Sheikh an immense freedom of action that drew the anger and reaction of some statesmen and observers like Muṣtafā ʿĀlī. As noted, Sheikh Şücaʿ's reception in Istanbul seems to have been very contradictory. On the one hand Muṣtafā ʿĀlī's description of Sheikh Şücaʿ is extremely harsh and he characterizes him as an ignorant and vile person that abused his influence on Murād to have his acquaintances appointed to offices in turn of large sums of bribery and as a heretic who indulged in sinful deeds. Despite the warnings from many dignitaries, Murād however, never ascribed him any impropriety. On the other hand of the spectrum there is ʿAṭā'ī's account, who seems to share Murād III's good faith about the Sheikh. According to ʿAṭā'ī, despite the all the slanders of people he was a mystically elevated sheikh.[99] To what degree does this account reflect also Nevʿī's view of sheikh Şücāʿ is not easy to determine. Nevertheless, even if Nevʿī had a positive opinion of Sheikh Şücaʿ the above couplets imply that he was more critical of the later sheikhs who frequented Murād III's presence thanks to their "effectual prayers."

Next to Sheikh Şücāʿ a number of other Ḫalvetī sheikhs found a favorable patron in Murād, including Sināneddin b. Yusuf b. Yakub who authored a small hagiography of three sheikhs of the Sünbüliye branch of the order. In the same vein, the son-in –law of the Ḫalvetī - Gülşenī Sheikh in Cairo Muḥyī-i Gülşenī was also welcomed by Murād III who ordered him a Turkish treatise on ethics. [100]John Curry points to a "sustained campaign on the part of Murād III to inject a strong Sufi element into his style of ruling."[101] It seems that Nevʿī's influence on Murād III can

[99] Çerçi, *Künhü'l Ahbar*, 245-249. *Ḥadā'iḳ*, 464.

[100] Curry, *The Transformation of Muslim Mystical Thought*, 76-77.

[101] *Ibid*., 77.

also be viewed from this perspective. As his works prove, next to his esteemed position as a scholar, Nevʿī had a strong sufi sensibility that he had brought from his family background and which he had sustained thereafter by his allegiance to at least three Ḫalvetī sheikhs. At the same time, as his correspondence with the Sultan proves, he was watchful in preserving sobriety and was critical of the group that had gathered around the Sultan and manipulated him with fraudulent wonderwork.

Last Years: Death of Murād III and the Reign of Meḥmed III

Murād III died on Cemāziyu'levvel 6, 1003 (January 17th 1595); and was succeeded by his eldest son Meḥmed III who came from Manisa and ascended to the throne. The death of Murād and the subsequent execution of the princes who Nevʿī had tutored had a dramatic effect on Nevʿī as well as on his political and social position. The execution of Murād's twenty-three sons – partly because of the sheer number and the young ages of them- was considered one of the most tragic events in the whole dynastic history and caused serious discomfort among the people. According to the report of a foreign observer, after the enthronement, the eldest four brothers came before their newly-enthroned brother and Prince Muṣtafā asked him to spare their lives. But the sultan responded only with silence and the princes were executed that night.[102]

The death of the princes also meant the end of Nevʿī's official service at the court. Sultan Meḥmed's own tutor Nevâyi had died shortly before his accession to the throne, so Meḥmed III preferred to retain his father's tutor Hoca Saʿadeddīn as

[102] The death of Prince Muṣtafā must have been traumatic for Nevʿī's son ʿAṭā'ī as much as it was for his father, since the boys were almost of the same age and they used to correspond and exchange poems with each other. According to ʿAṭā'ī', upon the death of his father and seeing his imminent doom the prince had sent a couplet to his friend ʿAṭā'ī as a keepsake. *Ḥadā'iḳ*, 385.

royal tutor. Nevertheless, the new Sultan was generous towards Nevʿī and he was allotted the pension of military judge in addition to his existing salary. Moreover shortly thereafter he was granted with 50 more aspers as the *müderris* of the *medrese* founded by his father-in-law Nişancı Meḥmed Efendi.[103] Retirement, however, was not what Nevʿī hoped for, and he immediately started seeking a position at the court in the service of the new Sultan. However, even gaining acceptance to the presence of the new Sultan was not easy; in various poems addressed to the Sultan he complained of the situation.[104] In order to receive an acceptance he also resorted to the mother of Meḥmed III, Safiye Sultan, one of the most powerful figures of the time who had immense influence on her son. In Nevʿī's *Divān* there are two odes dedicated to Safiye Sultan. Both of the odes were written during the reign of Meḥmed III, when Safiye Sultan as queen mother was at the height of her power.[105]

The western campaign in which Meḥmed III participated personally and the consequent conquest of the castle of Erlau in Hungary seem to have increased Nevʿī's hope for again attracting the attention and interest of the court so that he wrote a number of odes and poems celebrating the victory addressed to Meḥmed III as well as the grand vizier Damad İbrahim Pasha and Ciġalizāde Sinān Pasha who was grand vizier for a very short time after the campaign. In an ode written to celebrate Meḥmed III's victory in the conquest of the castle of Erlau in 1004 (1596)

[103] This medrese was in Altımermer district and not to be confused with Cedid Nişancı Medresesi in Fatih, founded by Boyalı Meḥmed Pasha. (d. 1001). ʿAtāʿī, 59, 421. *Cf.* Baltacı, *Osmanlı Medreseleri*, 175-177; 575.

[104] See *Dīvān* , 225-226; 227-228.

[105] *Dīvān* , no. 24. While Nevʿī appealed to Safiye Sultan and expressed his requests he recognized and in sense legitimized Safiye Sultan's influence on his son and her political role. These two odes dedicated to Safiye Sultan are among the very few examples of odes written for female patrons and they provide quite an important clue to assess Safiye Sultan's political and social significance. For a discussion of the *kasides* written to female addresses and their functionality as a tool of legitimization of political status and power see Hatice Aynur, Didem Havlioğlu, "Medhiyenin Cinsiyeti: Kadınlara Yazılmış Medhîyeler (1566-1603)" *Kasîdeye Medhiye*: 77-120

Nevʿī expressed that he desired to enter in courtly service again.[106] But all these efforts remained futile. Moreover it seems that there appeared problems in the payment of his salaries as *müderris*, or they were insufficient or inadequate for the life that Nevʿī used to live. In the *Divān* there are at least two explicit odes addressed to grand vizier Damad İbrāhim Paşa, in which Nevʿī complained about shortages or failing of his salary (*vazīfe*).[107] Nevʿī's feeling of disregard increased in this period of retirement. In another highly reproachful ode addressed to İbrahim Pasha on the occasion of the Feast of Sacrifice in 1597, Nevʿī stated that he was left destitute and in a forlorn state. [108] Another patron whom Nevʿī lost in this period was Siyāvuş Pasha, who was sent to exile in 1001 (1593). Upon return to Istanbul, he retired to his palace in Üsküdar, and lived in political isolation until his death in 1011/1602. Similarly, Ferhad Pasha, whom Nevʿī had suggested for the grand vizierate, was executed in 1004 (1595), because of a plot of Sinān Pasha and Damad İbrahim Pasha. In a few months (1004/1596) Sinān Pasha also died a natural death. Thus in a year following the death of Murād III, the leading figures of the political scene were replaced by new actors such as Damad İbrahim Pasha.

Nevʿī died on Ẕilḳaʿde 30th 1007 (June 23th 1595) and the funeral prayer was led by ʿArabzāde ʿAbdurrauf Efendi, kadi of Istanbul, in the Mosque of Meḥmed II. He was buried next to his last sheikh, Şāʿban Efendi, in the cemetery of the Şeyh Vefā convent.[109] According to ʿAtāʿī, his father lived especially in his last years a

[106] *Dīvān* , 32, 102.

[107] *Dīvān* , 131-132; 162

[108] *Dīvān* , 126-127.

[109] The Şeyh Vefa lodge seems to be of particular value for the Naḳsbendī of Istanbul. When Emīr Buḫārī (d. 922/1516), who introduced the Naḳsbendī order to Istanbul, arrived for the first time, he visited Şeyh Vefa first of all, and was entertained in Şeyh Vefa's convent. See: Mustafa Kara, "Emir Buharî" *TDVİA*, v. 11, 126.

strictly ascetic life, committed himself to sufi practice and died in poverty, so that the funeral expenses had to be covered by the Sultan. It is hard to decide to what degree this account can be attributed to a *topos* of poverty, but it is clear thaṭ Nevʿī's last years after the death of Murād III passed in a forlorn state; as he described himself once : *A lover, ailing and repining, he is , forsaken and lowly, moaning, groaning.*[110]

[110] Nevʿī's failure to build up an advantageous network in his last years, during the reign of Meḥmed III, had also consequences for his son ʿAṭāʾī. He seems to have started to strive for a position for his son at an early date, however these efforts remained futile and ʿAṭāʾī did not start his career in a particularly advantageous position. In an ode Nevʿī asks for a position for his son. The dedicatee of this ode is stated in the heading as Murād III, , however according to another version in some manuscripts, it was written for a vizier. See *Dīvān,* no. 152-153. Niyazioğlu, "Ottoman Sufi Sheikhs", 39-41.

CHAPTER III
NETĀYİC AS A CLASSIFICATION OF SCIENCES

"The impossibility of penetrating the
divine pattern of the universe cannot stop us
from planning human patterns, even though we
are conscious they are not definitive."
J.L. Borges, *The Analytical*
Language of John Wilkins

Introduction

Franz Rosenthal designates *ʿilm* –knowledge- as the key abstract concept around which Islamic civilization has evolved.[111] Beyond its tremendous "symbolic significance" and the centrality of this single concept in the intellectual history of the Muslim world, the concept of *ʿilm* constituted the principal subject of the "human patterns" devised by Muslim thinkers in order to penetrate "the divine pattern of the universe". A classification of sciences is basically such a "human pattern"; however, differently from ontological taxonomies, classifications of the sciences take into consideration the cognitive relationship of man to the universe. (For instance, the celestial bodies constitute a single category of being but because the cognitive relationship of man to them can be at least two-fold, we have both astronomy and astrology as two distinct disciplines.) Because of the very nature of this key concept - *ʿilm*, epistemological patterns played a central role in Islamic intellectual history. Thus the classifications of sciences -epistemological patterns- remained an emphatic pursuit of Muslim intellectuals for centuries.

[111] Franz Rosenthal, *Knowledge Triumphant: The concept of knowledge in medieval Islam* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 1-2. In classical Arabic as well as Ottoman usage *ʿilm* corresponds to both "knowledge" and a "branch of knowledge" in the sense of German "Wissenschaft". In this thesis I preferred "science" to express this second meaning, albeit preserving all the reservations that modern usage of the term causes.

It is possible and quite legitimate to write a more or less linear history of the classification of sciences in the Islamic world starting with the introduction of classifications contemporaneously with the Greco-Arabic translations and culminating in Ṭaşköprüzāde's (d.968/1561) *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda va-miṣbāḥ al-siyāda fī Mavḍūʿāt al-ʿulūm* (Key of Happiness and Candle of Greatness in Subjects of the Sciences) in a rather detailed and elaborate system that combines several trends of the centuries-old tradition.[112] However, on the fringes of this main line there are remarkable "deviations" that embodied alternative epistemological patterns for construing the universe and man's relationship to it.

Ṭaşköprüzāde's younger contemporary Nevʿī's (d.1007/1599) *Netāyic* is one such text that propounds a partly unique classification of the sciences. *Netāyic* stands out particularly for the unusual primacy it accords to history as a discipline. Moreover the hierarchical order of beings that it proposes as the underlying principle of classification of sciences differs also from the conventional ontological hierarchies. Nevʿī underlines the absolute otherness of God from the rest of the beings with the dichotomy of the creator and the created. Then he hierarchically classifies the created beings in three categories as humankind, terrestrial nature and the celestial bodies. Although these categories were not unique to Nevʿī, the hierarchical order was unconventional. This chapter is thus an attempt to analyze the principles and methodology that underlies this classification of sciences together with a diachronic contextualization relating it to the earlier classifications. After a brief and rough recapitulation of some of the cornerstone classifications until

[112] For a general overview of *philosophical* classifications of Muslim thinkers in the medieval period see: Jean Jolivet, "Classifications of the sciences" *Encyclopedia of the History of Arabic Science*, ed. R. Rashed and R. Morelon (London: Routledge, 1996), 3: 1008-1025 and Türker, "İslam Düşüncesinde İlimler Tasnifi", 533-556.

Netāyic, I will turn to an in-depth analysis of the text with constant references to the texts that Nevʿī explicitly states as his sources.

From Knowledge to the Enumeration of Sciences: *ʾilm, ʾulūm* and *iḥsāu'l ʾulūm*

When we discuss the epistemological classifications in the Islamic tradition, we have to first acknowledge their late antique Aristotelian origins and, secondly, elaborate on a very basic but essential terminological subtlety: the meaning –or rather English equivalent- of the word *ʾilm* (pl.*ʾulūm*). The earliest extant classification by a Muslim thinker, al-Kīndī's (d. 252/866) *Treatise on the Number of Aristotle's Works and On What is Needed To Learn Philosophy*, illustrates both of these issues. In the fifth and sixth centuries B.C., Alexandrian thinkers had developed a classificatory scheme of the sciences based on the ordering of the Aristotelian treatises, in the order in which they should be studied. In this schema, the mathematical sciences (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music) as well as the logical and linguistic sciences are propaedeutic for philosophy *per se*. Philosophy is divided into theoretical and practical philosophy. Theoretical philosophy comprises physics and metaphysics and practical philosophy corresponds to ethics. (This scheme remained the main framework of philosophical classifications with some changes such as the inclusion of the mathematical sciences under the category of theoretical philosophy, in the middle place between physics and metaphysics and the extension of the practical philosophy to include household management and politics).[113] It must be underlined that this was a "classification of philosophy" and philosophy was not simply

[113] Dimitri Gutas, "Medical Theory and Scientific Method in the Age of Avicenna" *Before and after Avicenna* : *Proceedings of the First Conference of the Avicenna Study Group*. Ed. Reisman, David C.; Al-Rahim, Ahmed (Leiden, Boston: Brill 2003), 145-146.

knowledge or the sum of sciences, but it was a kind of "meta-knowledge": science of universal-philosophical sciences. Thus, apparently, it could not include all the already known, specialized fields of knowledge because they were not considered *philosophical*. For example medicine was excluded because it was not a theoretical science but a practical *art,* and history was excluded because it dealt with the particulars instead of the universals. The exclusiveness of this classification would be a problem for later thinkers, but it was not yet for al-Kīndī. However another problem that would occupy a central place in all classificatory efforts thereafter appears also in this earliest work of classification: the proper place of the revealed religion as a source of knowledge.[114] Kīndī's solution was simple; he distinguished between the *ʿulūm al-başariyya* (the human sciences) and the *ʿilm* (divine knowledge). The human sciences comprise the philosophical sciences as discussed by Aristotle and they need "research and industry and tools". Divine Science, on the other hand, is described as "not the prerogative of all men, but only of prophets". [115] This distinction illustrates also the ambiguity in the meaning of *ʿilm* at this early date. The Arabic root *ʿ-l-m* corresponds in English both to "knowledge" and "science", and based on later literature, the following distinctions can be made tentatively: when the word is used as singular or in an adjective clause it means knowledge (like *ʿilm -i ilāhī*, divine knowledge) and when it is used in plural form (*ʿulūm*) or in a noun clause it means science or discipline (as in *ʿilm -i tārīḫ*).[116] Although we cannot

[114] Türker, "İslam Düşüncesinde İlimler Tasnifi", 534.Türker describes the classifications of sciences in the Islamic tradition as a repercussion of the dichotomy between rational (*ʿaḳlī*) and traditional (*nḳlī*) knowledge and he states that they can be fully understood only when this underlying issue is recognized.

[115]Ahmad Abdulla al-Rabe "Muslim Philosophers' Classifications of the Sciences: al-Kīndī, al-Fārābī, al-Ghazali, Ibn Khaldun" (Ph.D Thesis Harvard University), 1984, 35.

[116] It is usually accepted that the plural form *ʿulūm* was not to be found in the early Arabic usage (including the Quran) and in the usage of early Muslims *ʿilm* did not denote a specific discipline but a

impose this distinction on a ninth-century text without reservation, we can surmise that al-Kīndī makes a two-fold classification. Firstly, he defines the revealed knowledge as a completely separate class of knowledge (not science!) that is closed to ordinary men; then he treats human knowledge on its own terms, abiding by the imported late antique schema.

This duality in the source of knowledge as revealed (*vaḥy*) and rational (*ʾaḳlī*) continued to be the central problem of epistemological classifications in the Islamic world. In this regard, the philosophical trend that was represented by Fārābī (339/950) and Ibn Sīnā (d. 428/1037) attempted to integrate the religious knowledge into the general scheme of rational knowledge. Fārābī defines the knowledge acquired by the prophets as a rational knowledge that was translated by the special capacity of the prophet into a form that was conceivable by those who are not able to conceive the supreme rational knowledge directly.[117] Thus revelation was not essentially different from the rational knowledge which could be acquired by philosophers as well, but it needed to be "translated" into religion for the practical benefit of ordinary people. Therefore the disciplines that appeared by virtue of the revealed religion were not related to theoretical knowledge but they were only sub-disciplines of practical knowledge. Consequently, although revelation was the highest source of knowledge, the "external and exoteric" religious sciences (*kelām* and *fiḳh*) were inferior to Metaphysics (*al-ʾilm al-ilāhī*) and even to politics (*al-ʾilm al-madanī*) which incorporated both intellect and revelation.[118]

---

type of cumulative knowledge. See Rosenthal, *Knowledge Triumphant,* 41-45; Türker,"İslam Düşüncesinde İlimler Tasnifi", 538.

[117] Bakar, "Classification of the Sciences in Islamic Intellectual History", 112-121. Ömer Türker,"İslam Düşüncesinde İlimler Tasnifi" , 542

[118] Bakar, "Classification of the Sciences in Islamic Intellectual History", 131.

The critical turning point in the history of the classification of sciences in the Islamic tradition was Ġazālī (d.505/1111). As mentioned above, until Ġazālī the Aristotelian scheme of classification maintained its preponderance in philosophical classifications and the religious sciences were included into the classifications at an inferior position to the rational sciences or at best in separate, supplementary categories. Ġazālī preoccupied himself extensively with the classification of sciences and he proposed several classifications based on various principles.[119] Like the philosophers, he also attempted to propound an integrative system of classification; however, this time based on religious principles and categories. Whereas he maintained some of the principles of Aristotelian classifications such as the degree of abstraction of the subject matter as a hierarchical principle, his main contribution was the introduction of classifications based primarily on religious criteria. Accordingly, he divided the sciences into two categories with respect to their degree of pertinence: those that are incumbent on each and every member of the Muslim community (*farḍ ʿayn*) and those that are incumbent on the collective entity of the community and hence can be fulfilled by some of the members in the name of the whole community. (*farḍ kifāya*). The latter category was divided again into religious (*şarʿī*) and non-religious (*ġayr şarʿī*) sciences. The religious sciences were defined rather narrowly according to the source of knowledge and thus were restricted to those that were "acquired from the prophets and [are] not arrived at either by intellect like arithmetic or by experimentation like medicine, or by hearing like language." Then the non-religious sciences were divided into three categories as praiseworthy (like medicine),

[119] See, Alexander Treiger, "Al-Ghazâli's Classifications of the Sciences and the Descriptions of the Highest Theoretical Science", *Dîvân*, vol. 16 no. 30 (2011/1), 2. Treiger counts seven different classifications in his authentic works.

blameworthy (judicial astrology) and permissible sciences (like poetry and history).[120]

In "non-philosophical" classification such as al-Ḫwārazmī's *Mafātiḥ al-ʾulūm* (written in 365-81/976-91),[121] on the other hand, (and even in Iḫvān al-Ṣafā) we do not see such a concern with unifying all types of knowledge under a single classificatory system; instead the dual system where the sciences are divided as philosophical and religious sciences continued.[122] The encyclopedic *summae* of the late-medieval period also did not elaborate systematic classification but were additive in nature and implied a loose categorization; especially in terms of religious (*şarʾī*) - non-religious (*gayr- şarʾī*) and theoretical-practical sciences. [123] The most important example of this new type of encyclopedic work was *Cāmiʾ al-ʾulūm* by Faḫr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209) written in Persian.[124] In this text, the order of the philosophical sciences follows the early scheme without major changes, and in the category of religious sciences we see a new hierarchical order that comprised disciplines that arose directly from the study and interpretation of the religious sources for doctrinal and judicial purposes as well as the linguistic and literary

[120]Cited in Che Zarina Sa'ari "Classification of Sciences: A Comparative Study of *Iḥyāʾ ʿulūm al-Dīn* and *al-Risālah al-laduniyyah*" *Intellectual Discourse* Vol.7 No. 1 (1999), 63; Treiger, "Al-Ghazâli's Classifications of the Sciences and the Descriptions of the Highest Theoretical Science", 6.

[121]This work represented a slightly different genre that was addressed to the secretarial classes which were expected to be endowed with encyclopedic knowledge. Ziva Vesel, *Les Encyclopédies Persanes,* 21-22.

[122] The term "religious sciences" needs clarification. "*ʿal-ulūm al-dīniyyah*" was not a prevalent denomination for the disciplines that we consider today as "religious". *sharʿiyyah* or *wāʾḍiyyah* (traditional) were a much more common adjectives. In this thesis when I use the term "religious sciences" I refer to the disciplines that were necessitated because of Islam, and its sources; Quran and the Prophetic Tradition.

[123] Endress "The Cycle of Knowledge", 106.

[124] Ibid., 128. *Cāmiʾ al-ʾulūm* contained sixty sciences. In fifteenth century Ottoman scholar Meḥmed Şah Fanārī (d. 840/1437?) added forty more sciences to those in *Cāmiʾ al-ʾulūm* and wrote another encyclopedic work in Arabic called *Enmūzec al-ʿulūm.* Kemal Faruk Molla, "Meḥmed Şah Fenâri'nin *Enmûzecu'l Ulûm* adlı esrine göre Fetih öncesi döneminde Osmanlılar'da ilim anlayışı ve ilim tasnifi" *Divân* 18 (2005/1), 245-273.

disciplines (including history) that were deemed indispensable for the study of these sources.

By the sixteenth century, the system was rather established as illustrated by the most inclusive classification of the Islamic tradition, Ṭaşköprüzāde's *Miftah al-saʿāda*. *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda* can be regarded as the epitome of hundreds years of classification efforts by Muslim thinkers; it includes almost every single field of specialized knowledge organized within a scheme that incorporates the two main systems of classification, the philosophical tradition as it was elaborated by al-Fārābī and Ibn Sina and the Ġazālī an tradition. *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda* is both an encyclopedic and a bibliographic work, which treats more than three hundred sciences systematically and provides extensive bibliographies. Ṭaşköprüzāde divided the sciences firstly according to the method of acquisition as theoretical sciences and as sciences that are acquired by way of mystical purification. Then the theoretical sciences are categorized under four main classes, according to the ontological status of their subject matter (*merātib al -vucūd*, ranks of being): as scriptural sciences, linguistic sciences, conceptual sciences and sciences that deal with actual (*ʿaynī)* beings.[125]

The Classification of the Sciences in *Netāyic*

Nevʿī describes his work as a compilation (*mecmuʿa*) and a compendium (*muḫtaṣar*) that introduces several esteemed (scientific) disciplines so that his readers can taste

[125] İlhan Kutluer, "Miftâhu's Saâde" *TDVİA* v. 30: 18-20. The history of this ontological categorization can be traced back to Ibn Sīnā and Ġazālī; eventually however it became an established theological (*kelamī*) categorization. See, Şükran Fazlıoğlu, "Language as a Road to the Being: Language Analysis and Practice of Arabic in the Ottoman Period" Paper delivered at the panel: The Arabic Linguistic Tradition: Methodology and Paradigm. MESA 2002, November 22. http://www.ihsanfazlioglu.net/Sukran_Fazlioglu/LanguageRoad-EN.pdf.

"a drop from each river of art".[126] Then, he explains that he chose twelve sciences so that they are congruent with the twelve celestial constellations and the twelve months. He also adds that he discussed three exemplary problems for each science so that they illustrate their essence and principals.[127] Accordingly the main part of the work is divided into twelve sections, each devoted to a discipline: history (*ʿilm i-tārīḫ)*, philosophy (*ʿilm –i ḥikmet*), astronomy (*ʿilm –i heyʾet)*, principles of religion (*uṣūl-i dīn*) [128], principles of jurisprudence (*ʿilm –i fiḳh*)[129], Quranic exegesis, (*tefsīr*), Sufism (*taṣavvuf*), dream interpretation (*taʿbir*-i *rüʾyā*) incantation and medicine (*ruḳy* ve *ṭıbb*), agronomy (*felāḥat*), astrology (*nücūm*) and divination (*fāl* ve *zecr*).[130] The internal organization of each section is also pretty much uniform; emulating the organization of *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda,* each chapter begins with a rather standardized definition and description of the science in question. Then Nevʿī gives bibliographic information and mentions names and titles that are important in the literature of the discipline in question. Thereafter he discusses three problems of this discipline that he apparently deems as exemplary and illustrative. For history, however, he narrates a super-quick world history starting with the Creation and ending in his own time. Each section concludes with a quatrain by the author himself which points -in a *sufi*

[126] *Netāyic,* 72.

[127] *Netāyic*, 73.

[128] In general usage as well as in *Netāyic ʿilm-i kelām* and *ʿilm-i ʿuṣūl-i dīn* are used synonymously denoting the science of doctrinal tenets that a Muslim must believe. See. D. Gimaret"Uṣūl al-Dīn" *Encyclopedia of Islam, second Edition.*

[129] After *ʿuṣūl-i fiḳh* Nevʿī opens a new chapter for *ʿilm-ḫilāf.* This chapter is devoted to the three exemplary questions of controversy among the Shāfʿī and Ḥanefī legal schools; selected among the twelve questions in *Yavāḳīt al-ʿulūm.*(However unlike in *Yavāḳīt al-ʿulūm,* in *Netāyic* the Ḥanafī tone is much more underlined.) This thirteenth science needs to be regarded not as separate science but as a corollary and derivative of *ʿuṣūl-ı fiḳh* and *fiḳh.*

[130] Nine of the twelve sciences (principles of religion, principles of jurisprudence, Quranic exegesis, Sufism, dream interpretation, incantation and medicine, agronomy, astrology and divination) are selected among the thirty sciences of *Yavāḳīt al-ʿulūm* and the content thereof consists of loose and abridged translations from the *Yavāḳīt al-ʿulūm*.

manner - to the eventual benefit that must be attained by means of the science in question.[131]

In a paragraph at the beginning of the text, Nevʿī elaborates the reason of the selection and ordering of the first three disciplines. This paragraph clearly demonstrates that *Netāyic* is not a disorganized compilation but a deliberative classification of sciences. As I will discuss below, the classification and ordering of the last nine sciences follow the conventional classifications rather closely. However the selection and ordering of first three sciences require a special justification which Nevʿī expounds as follows: [132]

> The opening (chapter) of this delightful book is the science of the histories of prophets, saints, kings and the mentioning of the outstanding philosophers (*ḥukemā*). The core of entire cognizance (*maʿārif*) is the cognizance of the essence of God and the principle of all the sciences (*ʿulūm*) is the knowledge (ʿ*ilm*) of the attributes of God. However the perfect comprehension of this enigma is (possible) by way of inferring the Eternal Mover (*müʾessir-i ḳadīm*) from (His) works of creation. (*āṯār-ı bedīʿa*). The science of history is committed to the genesis of the universe and to the beginning of the emergence of mankind. Secondly, the science of physics (*ʿilm-i ṭabāyiʿ*) pertains to the three groups of compound beings (*mevālid-i ṯelāṯe)* (i.e. minerals, plants and animals), the elements (*ummehāt*) and the ordering of the species and various kinds of sublime and inferior beings. And thirdly the science of astronomy pertains to the celestial bodies and the spheres of fire, air, water and earth. Therefore, the science of history is followed by philosophy (*ʿilm-i ḥikmet*) and astronomy. Thereafter the science of the principles of the religion (*ʿuṣūl-i dīn*) – which is the arch of the sciences (*fünūn*) is presented. The other sciences then, follow each other in some order. However the purpose of all of them is the cognizance of the essence of God (*maʿbūd*). God says: *And I did not create the jinn and mankind except to worship Me*. (Quran, 56:51); that means except to know Me (*li-yaʿrifūn*). It is well known that the honor of a science is due to the honor of its subject (*maʿlūm*).[133]

---

[131] For example with regard to history Nevʿī underlines the lesson (*ʿibret*) that one should derive from the study of history and with regard to *ʿilm-i-fiḳh* he points to the importance of religious deeds and practices that should follow the knowledge of the religious jurisdiction.

[132] *Netāyic*,76.

[133] The propositions that the purpose of life is attaining the cognizance of God and that the honor of a science is due to the honor of its subject are also to be found in *Yavāḳīt al-ʿulūm.* However, there the highest science is theology (*ʿuṣūl-i dīn*) which described as presenting "evidences of the oneness of God (*tevḥīd*) and proofs of God's (existence)" *Yavāḳīt al-ʿulūm*, 8.

This paragraph powerfully illustrates that *Netāyic* is not a *potpourri* of sciences but rather presents a deliberate ordering and classification of sciences. It also implies an epistemological and an ontological assumption that will constitute the main principle and method of Nevʿī's classification of the sciences. Epistemologically Nevʿī provides an indirect answer to the problem of the nature of knowledge, but instead of defining knowledge with reference to a more general concept, he tries to illustrate it teleologically. Accordingly the ultimate essence and goal of any epistemic activity (*maʿrifet* or *ilm*) is the cognizance of God.[134] This epistemological principle implies also an ontological stance. Nevʿī differentiates God from all other beings with the absolute dissociation between the creator and the created. The subject matter of "scientific" activity is then the created universe but not the Creator i.e. God Himself. The knowledge of God is set apart from the knowledge of the rest of the beings and it is defined as their ultimate goal. The method for obtaining this ultimate knowledge is, in turn, defined as "inference (*istidlāl*) of (the knowledge of) the Creator from the created (universe)"[135].

Thus after delineating the knowledge of God from the knowledge of the created universe, Nevʿī sets forth the principle of his classification in a single sentence: "the honor of a science is due to the honor of its subject (*maʿlūm*)." As stated above, the subject of sciences was propounded as the created beings. Then the hierarchical ordering of the sciences must reflect the hierarchical ordering of the beings. Therefore let us remember the first three disciplines together with their

[134] Knowledge or (cognizance) of God by man, its possibility at all, and if possible its degree, was a topic of contention among Muslim thinkers. Generally mystic approaches accepted the "possibility of knowing God through some sort of essential knowledge or gnosis"; Ibn ʿArābī for example made a distinction between the knowledge of the essence of God and His attributes and stated that whereas "His essence is unknowable [and] only the attributes of ideas and perfection ascribed to Him can be known." Rosenthal, *Knowledge Triumphant,* 129-42.

[135] *Netāyic*,76.

subject matter as enumerated by Nevʿī: history that deals with human beings, philosophy that deals with the three kingdoms of nature and lastly astronomy that deals with the celestial bodies.

In the rest of this chapter, I shall investigate the twelve sciences of *Netāyic* in four categories. The paragraph cited above already implies a tripartite categorization consisting of natural history, philosophy and astronomy. Moreover, the analogy with the twelve constellations and months makes such a tripartite classification even more attractive. The first category (history, philosophy and astronomy) constitutes the most original contribution of Nevʿī to the classificatory tradition. This classification is by no means comprehensive (it contains only three disciplines) but it enables Nevʿī' to illustrate the *telos* of epistemic activity and it reflects a particular classification and hierarchy of beings. For the classification of the other nine sciences I will relate them to earlier classifications and try to determine the classificatory principles that constituted these three remaining categories. As noted above, the order and content of the last nine sciences follow *Yavāḳīt al-'ulūm* very closely; therefore the analysis of their classification is relevant for *Yavāḳīt al-'ulūm* as well.

Universal Sciences: History, Philosophy and Astronomy

The first category consists of history, philosophy and astronomy. These three sciences are placed at the top of Nevʿī's enumeration and clearly delineated from the religious sciences that follow them. A brief description and analysis of each chapter with reference to other prominent classifications as well as those in Nevʿī's sources will help to ascertain the rationale behind this particular categorization.

The most remarkable and surprising science in *Netāyic* is evidently history, placed at the top of the enumeration. In the Aristotelian tradition history was defined

as an inferior discipline that deals with the particulars as opposed to philosophy (i.e. sciences) which pertains to the universals.[136] Thus in earlier classifications –like that of al-Fārābī - which were essentially built up on this tradition, history was excluded from the scheme by its very definition. When, however, the religious (and linguistic) sciences were included into classifications more systematically –though still in completely separate sections- history accompanied the religious and linguistic sciences as a bearer of the tradition that was essential both for language and religion. Thus both Iḫvān al-Ṣafā's *Epistles* and al-Ḫwārazmī's *Mafātiḥ al-ʿulūm* incorporated history (or historical sciences like genealogy) together with the religious and linguistic sciences.[137] History was akin or auxiliary to the religious sciences together with the linguistic sciences, because the acquisition of historical knowledge was ensured by tradition like the religious sciences. Ġazālī's definition of the religious sciences (*şarʿiyya*) was more specific and restricted to the sciences that were "acquired from the prophets and [are] not arrived at either by intellect like arithmetic or by experimentation like medicine, or by hearing like language."[138] Accordingly, history (together with poetry) was among the non-religious yet permissible sciences.[139]

In *Yavāḳīt al-ʿulūm* which concentrates on the linguistic and religious sciences, "the science of history and genealogies" is placed between the literary

---

[136] In Aristotle's words "Poetry, therefore is a more philosophical and a higher thing than history: for poetry tends to express the universal, the history the particular . *Poetics* IX.l–liv (3rd century B.C.), trans. S. H. Butcher.

[137] Ziva Vesel, *Les Encyclopédies Persanes,* 21-22. Godefroid de Callataÿ, "The Classification of the Sciences according to the Rasa'il Ikhwan al-Safa" The Institute of Ismaili Studies (http://www.iis.ac.uk/SiteAssets/pdf/rasail_ikhwan.pdf)

[138]Cited in Che Zarina Sa'ari "Classification of Sciences: A Comparative Study of *Iḥyā' ʿulūm al-Dīn* and *al-Risālah al-laduniyyah*", 63.

[139] Ibid., 67.

sciences and *physical* sciences like the science of dream interpretation and *ruḳy.* This implies an intermediary position between religious and non-religious sciences. The treatment of history in *Yavāḳīt al-ʾulūm* is remarkably terse and confined to riddle-like questions about some exceptional kinship relations –all but one being related to Islamic history- that do not provide any chronology let alone a historical outlook.

In *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda*'s ontological categorization of sciences, history predictably belongs to the literary sciences. At the beginning of the chapter on history Nevʿī also notes that history belongs to the literary sciences *(ʾulūm-ı edebiyye*) and he inserts the whole section in *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda* on the definition, subject, object and the usefulness of history with only minimal omissions. Accordingly, history is defined as the knowledge of the conditions, mores, customs, crafts and (outstanding) individuals like the prophets, philosophers and kings *et alia.*[140] Overall, the chapter on history presents a comprehensive historical overview on the history of the universe and mankind from Creation up until Nevʿī's own time. Moreover, the narrative is not restricted to prophetic or dynastic histories; but indeed the history of the (pre-Islamic) philosophers supported the *universal* conceptualization of history which pertains to the fate of mankind from the beginning.

In Nevʿī's enumeration, philosophy (*ʾilm-i ḥikmet*) is presented in the second place after history. In the Aristotelian scheme, philosophy itself was not a specific discipline but it was an overarching term for denoting the disciplines that dealt with the "universals". Philosophy, as it is defined in *Netāyic,* is much narrower in scope; it is defined as a discipline that "examines the conditions of the external beings as they really are. (*nefsül- emrde vakʾi olduğu üzre*) [and] to the extent of human

[140] *Netāyic*, 85.

capability."[141] Philosophy as a separate discipline is not treated in any of Nevʿī's acknowledged sources. Apparently this particular definition was drawn from another unmentioned source; *Aḫlāḳ-i ʿAlāʾī* by the sixteenth century scholar Ḳınalızāde ʿAlī Çelebi (d. 979/1571). In the introduction of this book of ethics, or rather practical philosophy, Ḳınalızāde provides almost the same definition for philosophy, except for some minor differences in expression. Moreover in the rest of the chapter where Nevʿī discusses the division of Philosophy into two branches as practical and theoretical philosophy, as well as in their sub-branches, he follows the first chapter of *Aḫlāḳi-i ʿAlāʾī* quite closely.[142] In the above quoted passage Nevʿī uses the terms physics (*ʿilm-i ṭabaʿī*) and philosophy (*ʿilm-i ḥikmet*) interchangeably. When thought together with this particular definition of philosophy and the three questions discussed in the chapter of philosophy in *Netāyic* (one question on the composition of bodies and two questions on the nature of human spirit) it seems that philosophy was understood and treated as a science devoted exclusively to physics- the knowledge of the created universe. Thus metaphysics -the knowledge of the Creator- was excluded from of the scope of philosophy. However in "classical" definitions like that of al-Fārābī or Ibn Sīnā-, knowledge pertaining to God's essence, was a subject of metaphysics which was in turn a sub-branch of theoretical philosophy.[143]

In the third place, Nevʿī discusses astronomy (*ʿilm-i heyʾet*). This time, the definition and the presented bibliography, are almost word by word translations of

[141] *Ibid*., 133.

[142] Kınalızade Ali Çelebi, *Ahlâk-ı Alâî* ed.Mustafa Koç.(İstanbul: Klâsik Yayınları, 2007), 47. Ḳınalızāde wrote this book during his judgeship in Damascus between 1563 and 1566. In "Introduction";6.

[143] İbn Sina, "Akli Bilimlerin Bölümleri" trans. Hasan Akkanat, *Dini Araştırmalar* vol. 11 no. 31 (May-August 2008), 196.

the relevant chapter on astronomy in *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda.*[144] In *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda,* astronomy is classified as the second of the mathematical (*riyāḍī*) sciences, which are, in turn, discussed as a sub-category of the sciences that are related to actual (*ʿaynī*) things.[145] Principally in the Aristotelian scheme astronomy belonged to the *quadrivium* that was preparatory for Philosophy *per se*. However, influenced by the Neo-platonic tradition, the early Islamic classifications of sciences –such as that of Ibn Sīnā in the *Isagoge* to his *Şifā* -[146] incorporated the mathematical sciences into the philosophical sciences, assigning them an intermediary place between physics and metaphysics according to the degree of abstraction of its subject.[147] According to the definition at the beginning of the chapter on astronomy in *Netāyic,* the subjects of astronomy are simple celestial bodies (*ecrām-ı basīta*),which are a third category of creation different from mankind and terrestrial/physical beings. [148]

What was then the classificatory principle that raised history's status in this way? As noted above, for Nevʿī the classification of sciences reflected the classification of the created beings. Therefore each discipline was assigned to a particular class of beings which it treated as a universal category: history to man, (natural) philosophy to physical beings (*mevcūdāt-ı ḫāricīyye*) and astronomy to celestial beings (*ecrām-ı basīta*). Natural philosophy and astronomy were regarded

[144] Ahmed b. Muṣṭafā Taşköprüzade, *Miftāh as-Sa'ādah wa Misbāh As-Sıyādah fī Mawḍu'āt al-ulūm*, (ed.) Kamil Kamil Bakry and Abdel Wahhab Abu'l- Nur (Cairo: Dar El Kotob el-Hadissa, 1968), 322-323.

[145] The fourth part of *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda* that is related to actual things and indeed comprised the "philosophical sciences" and it the division of the Theoretical Philosophy in three main branches as Metaphysics Physics and Mathematics and in their derivatives. Although Ṭaşköprüzāde named the fifth part as Practical Philosophy (*ḥikmat ʿamalī*) he preferred not to use the word *philosophy* (*ḥikmat*) for the chapters of theoretical philosophy.

[146] Micheal E. Marmura "Avicenna on the Division of the Sciences in the *Isagoge* of His *Shifā*" *Journal of the History of Arabic Science*, 4 (1980).

[147] Endress, "The Cycle of Knowledge", 107-111.

[148] *Netāyic*, 141.

as universal sciences almost since their formation as separate disciplines, because they treated their subject matter as universal categories. The inclusion of history in this line implied a redefinition of its subject matter as a universal category. Consequently history could not be a narration of the particulars related to words and deeds of individuals. Instead it treated man as a universal category as manifested in the words and deeds of prophets, philosophers and kings. An astronomer could observe a single planet and draw tables for its movement, but this planet did not interest him for and in itself but his eventual objective remained to reach universal and categorical conclusion about the celestial bodies. Similarly a historian would study and narrate stories of individuals but his main interest was *man* as a universal category of being.

The enumeration of the universal sciences as history, philosophy and astronomy must reflect a hierarchical ordering of beings in the order of man, natural beings and celestial beings. However apart from this hierarchical ordering, the cognitive principle of *homoion- homoiôi* can be perceived in this particular ordering. Accordingly true knowledge of the beings of a certain category is comprehensible only to those of the same category. Ġazālī, for example, has interpreted this principle in an absolute sense and expanded its validity to conclude that a true knowledge of ants is only attainable by an ant.[149] In the context of the tripartite classification of the universal sciences in *Netāyic,* we can surmise this principle as an underlying notion: the three disciplines are ordered according to the proximity of their subject matter to the knower. The knowledge of man as a universal category, i.e. history, takes first place because the knower is a member of this very category. Then the subject matter

[149] Rosenthal, *Knowledge Triumphant*, 136-137.

of astronomy is –at least physically- more remote with respect to the knower than the subject matters of natural philosophy.

The Fundamental Religious Sciences: Principles of Religion, Principles of Jurisprudence, Quran Exegesis

According to the order mentioned in the paragraph quoted in the previous section, this first category of "universal" sciences is followed by "religious sciences"; the science of the principles of the religion (*ʿilm-i ʾuṣūl-i dīn* or *ʿilm-i kelām*) being the first of them and followed by the principles of jurisprudence (*ʾuṣūl-i fiḳh*) and the science of Quran interpretation (*tefsīr*). Nevʿī denotes the science of *kelām* as "the pillar of religious sciences".[150] It is defined either as a discipline that proves the religious doctrine with regard to the essence of God and His attributes or as a discipline that studies beings in their absolute existence. Therefore the cognizance of the necessary attributes (of God) is unattainable without the art (*fenn*) of *kalām*"[151] and hence it is an essential and primary religious science. Thus the main subject of *kelām* is knowledge pertaining to God. However, *kelām* is not directly a science that provides knowledge on the attributes and essence of God, but it is rather a scientific tool to prove the Islamic doctrines by way of argumentation and elimination of doubts. (*īʾrād-ı ḫucac ve defʾ-i şubuhāt*) .Thus the first of the religious sciences -*kelām* -was required for ensuring doctrinal clarity and certitude, which shall assure epistemological validity for all the religious sciences. After *kelām* the science of the principles of jurisprudence (*ʾuṣūl-i-fiḳh*) comes in the second place. Nevʿī describes

[150] *Netāyic* ,76.

[151] *Ibid.*, 155.

ʾuṣūl-i fiḳh as the principal among the exoteric religious sciences (*ʾulūm-ı resmiyyeye ser-defter*). Moreover, in the chapter on *ʾuṣūl-i fiḳh* he provides a minor classification of sciences in three categories: firstly rational sciences such as the mathematical sciences, secondly traditional sciences such as the science of Quranic exegesis and lastly sciences that are both rational and traditional such as the science of *ʾuṣūl-i-fiḳh*. As a discipline that combines two legitimate sources of knowledge, *ʾuṣūl-i-fiḳh* excels over the disciplines that are based only on revelation or rational knowledge.[152] Like *kelām*, *ʾuṣūl al-fiḳh* is also an instrumental science, a science of principles; and whereas *kelām* assures the doctrinal validity of the religion, *ʾuṣūl al-fiḳh* is required to assure the legitimacy and validity of Islamic religious and legal practice.

The supremacy of *kelām* among the religious sciences was a common trait of almost every classification that included the religious sciences. Ġazālī's classifications constitute the most explicit model for the ordering in *Netāyic.* In the exordium of *al- Muṣtasfā min ʾilm al-ʾuṣūl* (Distillation of the Science of the Principles of Jurisprudence) Ġazālī proposes two slightly different classifications of sciences. According to the first classification the sciences were divided into three main categories: purely rational (*ʾaḳlī)*, purely traditional (*naḳlī*) and those that combine reason and revelation, hence being both rational and traditional. This last category is the most exalted of all three of them and it contains the science of jurisprudence (*fiḳh*) and the science of principles of jurisprudence (*ʾuṣūl-i fiḳh*). Nevʿī also quotes this classification at the beginning of his chapter on *ʾuṣūl-i fiḳh*.[153] In his above mentioned book Ġazālī propounds a second classification in which the

[152] The same classification of the sciences is also to be found in *Yavāḳīt al-ʾulūm*, however, as different from the *Netāyic,* here *kelām* is given as the example of purely rational sciences. Dānish-Pazhūh: *Yawāqīt al-ʿulūm*, 23.

[153] *Netāyic*, 167.

sciences are divided firstly into two categories as rational (*ʿaḳliyya*) and religious (*dīniyya*). Then he notes that within each category the sciences are classified as universal and particular sciences. According to Ġazālī the only universal religious science was *kelām*, whereas all other sciences (i.e. jurisprudence, or interpretation of Quran) were particular. Whereas the particular sciences were grounded on postulates that were accepted as true, the validity of these postulates is demonstrated by *kelām*.[154] Thus the ordering in *Netāyic* reflected the combination of these two classifications: *Kelām* came in the first place because it was the only universal and demonstrative religious science that provided religion with argumentative ground. Then *ʿuṣūl al-fiḳh* precedes *tefsīr*. While the former is a science that combines revelation and reason; the latter is a purely traditional science.[155]

Corollary Religious Sciences:

Sufism, Interpretation of Dreams and *Ruḳy*

This second group of religious sciences comprises Sufism, science of dream interpretation and lastly *ruḳy* and medicine. Unlike the first group of religious sciences none of these three pertains to the principles of religious knowledge. But they are practical sciences that draw on religious knowledge; yet unlike the first

[154] Treiger, Al-Ghazâli's Classifications of the Sciences and the Descriptions of the Highest Theoretical Science", 17 -19. Treiger points out also the Avicennian influence in Ġazālī's universal/particular distinction and its implications for his definition of *kelām.*

[155] With regard to the supremacy of *kelām* over all the other religious sciences the early Ottoman scholar Meḥmed Şah Fenārī (d. 839/1436) states that he was asked for the reason of the supremacy of *kelām* although *tefsīr* should be the highest science by virtue of its subject (namely the Quran). Meḥmed Şah answers that the superiority of *kelām* is rather due to the generality and comprehensiveness of the subject and not due to its superiority in subject. Cited in Molla, "Meḥmed Şah Fenâri'nin *Enmûzecu'l Ulûm* adlı serine göre Fetih öncesi döneminde Osmanlılar'da ilim anlayışı ve ilim tasnifi", 264.

group their ultimate purpose is not the perpetuity of religious knowledge itself – hence they are the corollary religious sciences.

Sufism as a mystical dimension of religion began to be included into the classificatory schemes quite early. Iḫvān al-Ṣafā included Sufism (*taṣavvuf*) as well as asceticism under the category of religious sciences. Similarly Abū Ḥayyān al-Tavḥīdī (d. 414/1023) incorporated in his treatise *Epistle on the Sciences* (*Risāla fi'l 'Ulūm*) both religious and philosophic sciences and ended the treatise with a section on Sufism.[156] Sufism, as such, appears only in one of Ġazālī's classifications, in the *Epistle on the Knowledge from on High* (*al-Risāla al-Lāduniyya*).[157] However, in Ġazālī's classifications the recurring highest theoretical science was *sufi* in nature. It was termed as the "science of unveiling" (*'ilm al-mukāşafa*) or the "science of the cognition of God" (*'ilm ma'rifat Allah*) and it was "revealed through Divine Illumination to prophets and "saints" (*avliyā*) who have purified their hearts with ascetic practice". Ġazālī's definition of methodologically mystical but philosophically inspired type of knowledge and its ordination as superior to all other types of knowledge and sciences had a decisive effect on the evolution of "practical Sufism" into a philosophically inspired "theosophical Sufism".[158] In *Yavāḳīt al-'ulūm* too, Sufism was placed directly after the jurisprudential sciences like the sciences of the distribution of inheritance (*'ilm-i ferāyıḍ*) and the law of contracts (*'ilm-i shurūṭ*) and before the Quranic sciences. Thus, it was fully included among the religious-jurisprudential sciences. Ṭaşköprüzāde, however, treated the mystical or esoteric

[156] Endress, *Organizing Knowledge*, 113.

[157] Treiger, "Al-Ghazâli's Classifications of the Sciences and the Descriptions of the Highest Theoretical Science", 22. For a discussion of the authenticity of this work see, Bakar, "Classification of the Sciences in Islamic Intellectual History", 262-272.

[158] Treiger, "Al-Ghazâli's Classifications of the Sciences", 30-31.

sciences in a separate part, devoted exclusively to the "esoteric sciences" (*ʿulūm al-bāṭın*)-which corresponds to one-third of the whole book and which follows very closely Ġazālī*'s Iḥyā 'ulūm al-Dīn* (*Revival of the Religious Sciences*), both in structure and content. In *Netāyic,* Nevʿī described sufism as an essential complement to the exoteric (religious) sciences in one's efforts for the cognizance of God. Moreover unlike exoteric sciences that are related to communal affairs, sufism i.e. esoteric science (*'ilm*-i *bāṭın*) is related to the purification of one's own heart or soul. [159]

The place of the last two sciences of this category seems a little more complex. The first notable inclusion of the science of dream interpretation is to be found in the classification of Iḫvān al-Ṣafā. In the *Epistles,* dream interpretation was included among the religious and conventional sciences (*al-'ulūm al-şar'iyya al-vaḍ'iyya*).[160] On the other hand in Ibn Sīnā's classification in *Risāla fī Aksām al 'Ulūm*, dream interpretation -together with medicine, astrology, physiognomancy, talisman, magic and alchemy -was classified as a corollary physical science.[161] In Ṭaşköprüzāde's classification that followed the Avicennian scheme concerning the classification of the non-religious sciences, dream interpretation as well as esoteric or occult sciences such as judicial astrology, talisman and alchemy were comprised under the category of natural sciences.[162] In Ġazālī's *al-Risala al-Lāduniyya*, however, the status of the sciences of dream interpretation and talismans were elevated so that they were categorized under the rational –metaphysical science (*'ilm*

[159] *Netāyic*, 191.

[160] Godefroid de Callataÿ, "The Classification of the Sciences according to the Rasa'il Iḫwan al-Safa'" The Institute of Ismaili Studies (http://www.iis.ac.uk/SiteAssets/pdf/rasail_ikhwan.pdf).

[161] İbn Sina, "Akli Bilimlerin Bölümleri" trans. Hasan Akkanat, *Dini Araştırmalar* vol. 11 no. 31 (May-August 2008), 199-200.

[162] Bakar, "Classification of the Sciences in Islamic Intellectual History", 402-403.

al-tavhīd). They were rational (*ʿaklī*) because they were cultivated by philosophers too; and they were metaphysical since they were sciences that "pertain to the world of the unseen" together with the sciences of prophecy and sainthood and hence akin to the religious sciences.[163]

In *Netāyic,* however, the science of dream interpretation is introduced as an occupation highly esteemed by prophets and saints and Nevʿī mentions the Tradition which states that a true dream is equal to one forty-sixth of prophetic revelation.[164] Thus although it was not a religious science *per se* it was religiously sanctioned both because it was a prophetic pursuit and because of the divine origin of true dreams.

A similar complication is prevalent with regard to the classification of *ruḳy* and medicine. *Ruḳy* means –roughly put- a kind of spiritual medicine and healing by way of reciting the names of God or passages from the Quran. Healing by enchanting methods was a pre-Islamic Arabic tradition so that even bewitchment and illness could be used synonymously. Moreover, the Prophet sanctioned it with some reservations, and in the literature on the Traditions *ruḳy* and medicine were usually treated together in a single chapter. [165] As mentioned above, following the Avicennian tradition, Ṭaşköprüzāde had classified both *ruḳy* and medicine as derivative physical sciences. Whereas *ruḳy* was not included in al-Ġazālī's classification as a separate science, medicine was described and classified as a praiseworthy non-religious science. The content of the chapter and the integration of *ruḳy* and medicine in a single chapter demonstrate that these two methods of healing were regarded as being quite close to each other. Interestingly, on the one hand, the

[163] Ibid., 335, 354-356. Treiger," "Al-Ghazâli's Classifications of the Sciences", 23-24.

[164] *Netāyic*, 197-198.

[165] İlyas Çelebi, "Rukye" *TDVİA* v. 3, 219-222.

veracity of *ruḳy* was attested by the approving testimony of Galen and on the other hand, medicine was discussed with constant reference to prophetic traditions and prophetic medicine (*ṭıbb-ı nebevī*). Thus both *ruḳy* and medicine were religiously and philosophically/traditionally sanctioned sciences, resorted to for a single purpose.

In this third category of religious-corollary sciences the internal hierarchy of the three sciences is apparently determined by their proximity to religious sources. Whereas Sufism is an esoteric supplement of the fundamental religious sciences and herewith it is placed on the top of the present category, the science of dream interpretation is esteemed because of its place in the prophetic tradition and fractional affinity to the revelation. Lastly, *ruḳy* and medicine are included in this category because they are explicitly sanctioned by the Prophet and they employed the Quran and the Tradition as their source.

Practical Sciences: Agronomy, Astrology and Divination

The last category comprises agronomy, astrology and divination. In earlier classifications that followed the Aristotelian scheme more closely -like that of al-Fārābī - both occult sciences like astrology and divination as well as practical crafts like agronomy were excluded from systematic classifications for the reason that they were non-syllogistic sciences.[166] However in the Avicennian classification, both occult sciences and practical arts like medicine and agronomy were categorized as corollary physical sciences. Whereas Ṭaşköprüzāde's classification upheld this categorization explicitly, in Ġazālī's classifications judicial astrology and other

[166] Bakar, "Classification of the Sciences in Islamic Intellectual History", 201-202.

occult sciences were deemed useless and religiously blameworthy.[167] In *Yavāḳīt al-ʿulūm* and hence in *Netāyic* they differ from all of the other sciences as purely practical, utilitarian disciplines. Accordingly, the criterion for their internal ordering was also different than that of other categories. The criterion was not that of the nobility of the subject but the degree of usefulness and religious permissibility. Consequently, agronomy, which is the "reason for the survival of the human race and the cause of life on Earth" justifiably, deserves the first place.[168] As for astrology, it is divided into three types; computation (*hisābiyyāt*), presumption (*ẓanniyāt*) and fantasy (*vehmiyyāt*). The first deals with computation related to the celestial bodies and it is useful in the sense that observations of the heavenly bodies manifested numerous proofs for the unity of God and reminded one of the existence of God. The second type served to make seasonal predictions according to the movements of the celestial bodies; although the usefulness of this one was not as sublime as the first one, and its results were not completely accurate, still it was religiously permissible. However, the third type - fantasy (*vehmiyyāt*)-, which means deducing interpretations about the auspiciousness of earthly events with reference to the astral conjunctions, are completely unreliable and religiously disallowed. Consequently, astrology was only partly acceptable and useful and thus occupied a secondary place. When it comes to divination and its various types, Nevʿī states that only one of them, *fâl* (soothsaying), which entailed predicting auspicious events (e.g. by way of interpreting the verses on a randomly opened page of the Quran), is acceptable because it results in thinking hopefully about God and His Providence. However, the other types of divination such as auspice (*ṭıyāre* or *zecr*) in which the symbols could

[167] Ibid., 343-346;

[168] *Netāyic*, 211.

be interpreted auspiciously as well as ominously were religiously illegitimate and therefore could not be of any benefit. Thus divination was acceptable with the condition of auspicious interpretation and even then this served merely to soothe one's anxieties and concerns about the future. [169]

Conclusion

Based on the above discussion of the sciences, we can summarize the classification of sciences in *Netāyic* in the following table:

Theoretical/Universal	Theoretical/ Religious	Practical/(Corollary) Religious	Practical
History	Principles of the Religion	Sufism	Agronomy
(Natural)Philosophy	Principles of Jurisprudence	Interpretation of Dreams	Interpretive Astronomy (Astrology)
Astronomy	Quranic Exegesis	*Ruḳy* and medicine	Divination

Accordingly the sciences were grouped in four categories in a hierarchical order both vertically and horizontally. The horizontal hierarchy –i.e. the hierarchy among the four categories- was determined by the degree of relevance for the ultimate purpose of scientific pursuit, namely the cognizance of God. Nevʿī determined the method that enables this purpose as the inference (*istidlāl*) of the Creator through the created universe (which was evidence (*delīl*) to the Creator); the first category pertains directly to the knowledge of the different classes of creation as universal categories.

[169] *Ibid.*, 235-239.

The category of religious sciences is secondary because religious knowledge is more particular and contingent on the revelation whereas the knowledge acquired from the first category is essential and categorical. While the sciences of these two categories were theoretical in nature, the last two categories pertain to practical knowledge and they are ordered among themselves according to the degree of religious sanction and to the benefits that they procure.

This classification displayed two critical features that reflected a certain religious/metaphysical assumption and attitude regarding the nature of knowledge and hierarchy of beings. The first of them was the exclusion of the knowledge or cognizance of God from the category of "scientific" knowledge. Differentiating the religious sciences from the more superior theoretical and universal sciences was certainly not a novelty on the part of Nevʿī. Ḳuṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī (d. 710/1311), for example, had divided sciences into two categories as philosophical and non-philosophical and he defined philosophy as a timeless, essential and universal knowledge of the existents "as they really are." [170] The existents, however, included God also and hence philosophy had a claim to acquire the knowledge of God just as acquiring the knowledge of all the other existents. In Nevʿī's schema, however, the sciences were restricted to the knowledge of the created beings and the knowledge or cognizance of God was not a subject of science but it was set extraneously, as the ultimate purpose of scientific pursuit.

[170] Bakar, "Classification of the Sciences in Islamic Intellectual History", 398-400.

CHAPTER IV
HISTORY AS A SCIENCE: *NETĀYİC* AND THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY OTTOMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

One of the most remarkable features of Nevʿī's classification of the sciences is the elevation of historiography (*ʿilm-i tāriḫ*) to the top of the classificatory scheme. [171] As I have tried to elucidate in the previous chapter, this scheme implies that Nevʿī conceived of historiography, philosophy and astronomy as "universal" sciences, each assigned to one of the three main categories of Creation. Again as demonstrated in the second chapter classification and conceptualization of historiography in that way was a completely unconventional venture. In this chapter, I will try to situate this approach to historiography in the context of sixteenth-century Ottoman historiography. This unusual elevation in the status of historiography leads one to wonder whether it arose from a shift in the definition of the content and scope of historiography. Since Nevʿī is rather taciturn in elaborating his intentions, I will try to address this question with a reference to the contemporary historiographical context. Firstly, I will try to ascertain and categorize contemporary discourses on the nature and status of historiography, and then situate and interpret *Netāyic* and Nevʿī's concept of historiography within this framework.

The question of how Ottoman writers in general and historians in particular conceived of history as a science is, to my knowledge, not a question that has been

[171] At this point I need to clarify that with historiography I try to translate the term *ʿilm-i tāriḫ* i.e. "science of history". This is also Rosenthal's preference in *A History of Muslim Historiography*. Here *ʿilm* is used without implying any theoretical or methodological content,- this was a usage quite unlike the use of 'science' in modern English. Nevertheless, as stated above preserving this and all the other relevant reservations, I preferred to translate *ʿilm-i* as 'science' for the sake of convenience. Thus my concern here is not the study of a philosophy of history in the sense of an overall theorization on the course of events, or of a search for a metaphysical meaning of the past. Indeed from the mid-twentieth century on, the prevalent Anglo—Saxon philosophy of history too embraced a more epistemological approach instead of metaphysical speculations on the meaning of the past. See, William Dray, "Philosophy and Historiography" in Michael Bentley, *Companion to Historiography*. (London: Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group 2001 reprinted), 763-766.

adequately addressed in the modern literature on Ottoman historiography. The Ottoman chronicles and histories constitute the backbone of modern historical and especially political narratives; hence they have attracted modern scholarly attention primarily as source material. Therefore source-critique type of studies aiming at establishing a sound corpus of historical writings as source material have been an indispensable need and have occupied a great part of the modern literature on Ottoman historiography. At the same time, however, modern historians have also been aware that Ottoman historical narratives were not dull recordings of events, but contained an important degree of political and ideological commentary.[172] While textual continuity between various works, context and audience issues, literary processes, stylistic features, discourse analysis, and even personal considerations of historians and the historiographical ramifications of political and social discourses, have all been addressed to a certain extent in the recent studies on the Ottoman historical corpus, the very concept of history and the epistemological properties of history-writing have not been problematized substantially.[173] As for the analytical readings of Ottoman historiography, they are almost all concerned with Ottoman political thought and political discourse analyses. Usually in connection with this

[172] For pioneering examples of historiographical studies that analyzed historiographical material politically and ideologically Victor Menage, "The Beginnings of Ottoman Historiography" in *The Historians of the Middle East*, (Oxford University Press, 1962), 168-179. Halil Inalcık, "The Rise of Ottoman Historiography, 152-167.

[173] History in the meaning of a universal thinking on the course of events and the fate of political entities was discussed for example by Cornell Fleischer in the last chapters of his *Bureaucrat and intellectual* with specific reference to Muṣṭafā Âli and within a more general scope, in "Royal Authority, Dynastic Cyclism, and" Ibn Khaldûnism" in Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Letters." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 18.3-4 (1983): 198-220. Moreover a remarkable discussion of the relationship of history and geography, "time and space" is to be found in Gottfried Hagen, "Überzeitlichkeit und Geschichte in Kātib Čelebis Ğihānnümā" *Archivum Ottomanicum* 14. (1995-96), 133-159.

type of analytical reading, we come across studies that analyze and historicize some –mostly political- concepts and notions. [174]

The omission of the study of history as a science is partly related to the nature of the sources. Quite expectedly, not every Ottoman chronicler felt the need to undertake a theoretical discussion of what he was doing. Moreover monographs on the theory and methodology of historiography are apparently rather rare, and did not attract much attention from modern historians. Whereas the classifications of the sciences are quite adequate places for a discussion of history as a "science", most of the studies on classifications are either overly descriptive or deal with classificatory schemes in a general manner instead of undertaking a more detailed study of the conceptualization of particular sciences. Moreover, the quite subsidiary position of history in conventional classifications did not inspire its detailed study as a science. However, I believe that the unique position of historiography in Nevʿī's classification calls for such a theoretical and comparative treatment of historiography.

Thus, the attempt to *synchronically* contextualize *Netāyic* in general and its notion of historiography in particular necessitates ascertaining the contemporary Ottoman notions of history and historiography. The term "contemporary" is, however, a very ambiguous and hard to define term for the reason that it presupposes a historical periodization. A definitive periodization of Ottoman historiography is far

[174] A recent volume titled *Writing History at the Ottoman Court: Editing the Past, Fashioning the Future* ed. H. Erdem Çıpa, Emine Fetvacı (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013) exemplifies the general trend in the literature on Ottoman historiography. Historiographical works are valuable narrative sources to historicize concepts like authority and identity and they are mostly perused as such.

beyond the scope of the present study.[175] Nevertheless, the "sixteenth century" –with a powerful connotation of "the classical" - has been a relatively meaningful term in modern Ottoman studies, and although my selection of texts slightly exceeds its limits, I will refer to the period as the "sixteenth century." In chronological order, the first work of history that I will deal with will be the late fifteenth century universal history *Cihānnümā,* written by Neşrī. The second work will be Hoca Saʿadeddīn's *Tācü't Tevārīḫ* (*Crown of Histories*) and lastly I will dwell on Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī's *Künhü'l Aḫbār* (*Essence of History).* The sixteenth century was a period in which the Ottoman historiography flourished and proliferated particularly and in this abundance my selection may seem somewhat arbitrary. The most important criterion in this selection was the availability of introductory material in which the author discussed his concept of historiography; it is for this reason, for example, that Selānikī was eliminated from this discussion. Moreover, with the considerable influence of the Persian historiographical tradition[176], for many authors history-writing was at the same time a literary activity of the highest register, so that modern generic distinction between history and literature is not always easily applicable to the sixteenth-century Ottoman context.[177] This understanding of history was reflected

[175] A useful periodization of the Ottoman historiography between 1400 and 1700 has been presented by Rhodes Murphey with regard to stylistic and thematic features of the historical works. According to Murphey from the early sixteenth century to the seventeenth century, Ottoman historiography can be generally classified as "eulogistic, dynastic history" written in high stylistic register. Rhodes Murphey, "Ottoman historical writing in the seventeenth-century: a survey of the general development of the genre after the reign of Sultan Ahmed I (1603-1617) in *Essays on Ottoman Historians* (İstanbul: Eren Yayınları, 2009).

[176] The so called "Herat tradition" of historiography that was distinguished by a high and ornate literary style was a source of emulation for both Safavid and Ottoman historiography. "Sholeh A. Quinn *Historical Writing during the Reign of Shah 'Abbas: Ideology, Imitation and Legitimacy in Safavid Chronicles,* Salt Lake City, The University of Utah Press, 2000), 23.

[177] Cornell H. Fleischer *Bureaucrat and Intellectual*, 236. For instance the early sixteenth century scholar and historian Kemālpaşazāde does not distinguish history and historiographical works from the epic and literary works. He propounds that the written records of the deeds and glory of the kings bestow on them a second life in this world and with reference to Firdevsī's *Şāhnāme* he further exemplifies how the name and fame of the kings and heroes of the past have been lost in oblivion if

also in conventional classifications of sciences, in which historiography was categorized together with disciplines like poetry and genealogy and as a literary science.[178] The officially commissioned *şehnāme* -type works which were usually preserved in very few, highly ornamented and valuable copies- best exemplify this generic blurring; they were commissioned to people that were recognized as "poets" rather than historians. Moreover the exclusive material properties of their manuscripts also demonstrate that they were considered as "monuments" on paper.[179] Therefore I also excluded the *şehnāme*s*;* primarily because of this generic complication that they presented and also due to more practical limitations such as the availability of printed copies.

All in all, these three selected authors and texts have been particularly influential in Ottoman historiography and they constitute a balanced cross-section view of the sixteenth-century Ottoman discourses on history and hence help to envisage a general intellectual context in which Nevʿī's conceptualization of history can be placed. Although the details of actual historical accounts are also relevant and helpful for a discussion of the concept of history as a science, in this chapter I will limit the scope to the material in the introductory sections of the works, where the

---

they have not been immortalized in written word. Ahmed Şemseddin Kemalpaşazade, *Tevarih-i al-i Osman :I. Defter*. Ed.Şerafettin Turan (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1970),

[178] However the importance of literary qualities was not a cause but rather a result of the historiography's classification as a literary science. I will return below to what I describe as "the conventional type of classification" with reference to the classification of Ṭaşköprüzāde and elaborate on the epistemological reasons of the classification of historiography as a literary science.

[179] Christine Woodhead, "Reading Ottoman "Şehnames": Official Historiography in the Late Sixteenth Century" *Studia Islamica,* No. 104/105, 67-80. Woodhead points out that the primary criterion to be appointed to the office of *şehnameci* was literary abilities. These texts were panegyric by nature but since they were preserved in single copies in the treasuries of the Palace, and were accessible only by very few courtiers, it is hard to conceive them as propaganda texts and even as trying to "establish an acceptably "correct" Ottoman historical record", as Woodhead propounds. Indeed they were probably not "read" in the common sense of the word. Ibid., 68; 70, 71.

authors developed their ideas on their concept of history as a science most concretely and explicitly. The study of history as a science entails also methodological considerations on the practice of this science; however, I will not dwell on such methodological issues or epistemological discussion on the nature of historical knowledge. In terms of the organization of the chapter, I need to underline that I preferred a thematic partition over a chronological order for the reason that for the approaches of the authors discussed here, I do not assume a historical line of development or evolution. On the contrary, I treat them as more or less contemporarily existing discourses on historiography. Thus, firstly, I will discuss Hoca Saʿadeddīn and and Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī's rather pragmatic understanding of historiography, then with return to late fifteenth century, and address Neşrī's brief discussion of history as a science. Then, secondly, I will treat Nevʿī's theoretical approach to historiography together with three other fourteenth century monographs on historiography as well as Ṭaşköprüzāde's classification of historiography in *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda.*

Pragmatic and Epistemological Argumentations on Historiography

To introduce a particular science, Nevʿī in *Netāyic* as well as Ṭaşköprüzāde in *Miftāḥ al-saʿāda* follow a systematical framework consisting of four points: definition, (*taʾrīf*), subject (*mevżuʾ*), objective (*ġaraẓ*) and the use (*fā'ide*) of the science in question. These four points, and especially the "subject" and the "uses" are helpful categories to classify the discourses on historiography. With "discourse on history" I refer to argumentations brought forward in order to explain the rationale (*raison d'etre*) of the science of history and likewise to justify the practice of history. These

argumentations can be of two types; 1) epistemological argumentations that designate historiography primarily as a form of knowledge particular to a specific type of subject, and 2) pragmatic argumentations that explain the practical uses and necessity of history-writing. Argumentations of the first type are centered on the "subject" of historiography and assert that the subject of historiography necessitates it to be considered as a separate science. Pragmatic argumentations, on the other hand, are based on the pragmatic advantages, on the "uses" of reading and writing history. Although none of the four texts that I will treat here can be categorized as propounding a purely epistemological or pragmatic argumentation, practicing historians generally, laid emphasis on pragmatic argumentations. On the other hand, as Nevʿī's treatment of historiography within a classification of the sciences exemplifies, non-historian scholars approached historiography as a form of knowledge delineated from others by its subject matter. In the rest of this chapter, I will firstly discuss Hoca Saʿadeddīn and Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī's pragmatic approaches to historiography and Neşrī's concise but interesting definition of historiography. As for the epistemological argumentation on historiography, firstly I will provide a brief summary of three monographs on historiography written in late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Lastly, I will analyze Nevʿī's understanding of historiography on the basis of his classification of the sciences.

Hoca Saʿadeddīn and *Tācü't Tevārīḫ*

As a scholar-cum-statesman and tutor to Murād III, Hoca Saʿadeddīn's (d. 1008/1599) primary interest was the writing of an Ottoman dynastic history comparable to the earlier dynastic histories that were immortalized in works of highest quality. *Tācü't Tevārīḫ* is regarded as a continuation of the highly

ornamented and sophisticated literary style of İdrīs Bidlīsī's Ottoman history in Persian and became an influential work that was copied many times and also constituted an important source for later historians. The work is organized as a dynastic history, encompassing Ottoman history until the death of Selīm I, and it was presented to Selīm I's son Murād III in 992 (1584), who was a sultan personally interested in historiography.[180] In the introduction to *Tācü't Tevārīḫ,* Hoca Saʿadeddīn explains his approach to historiography in the following words:

> The most perfect lot and the most extensive share of God's infinite benevolence and of the divinely-ordained sovereignty (*ḫilāfet-i ilāhiyye*) have been allotted to the prophets and the kings. Formerly, scholars and virtuous people have successfully compiled, arranged and written down, both in verse and prose, the blissful exploits of and stories about these two classes that are full of lessons. As the Qur'anic verse *And ordain for me a goodly mention among posterity* (26:84) testifies, collecting and studying what remains from good memories is something covetable for dignitaries. Thus if the praised deeds of a fortunate person, which he brought about during his life full-of goodness, is set forth and put into writing, then these become like ornamented earrings (i.e. admonitions) [for other people]. It is a grace of God that since years and centuries these good memories are unfolded before the commoners as well as the noble. In this way, the written word (i.e. historiography) becomes an equivalent of the sublime king (who is the subject of historiography) in virtue and honor; and thus the prosperity and honor of the king is also increased.[181]

In this short paragraph which is the only relevant section in the introduction of *Tācü't Tevārīḫ* for a discussion of the necessity and place of historiography, Hoca Saʿadeddīn is apparently not interested in the position of historiography as a form of knowledge and he regards history only as a commemorative and instructive narrative. He classifies humankind into three categories as prophets, kings and scholars. (He apparently ignores the "rest", as they were neither writers, nor patrons,

[180] Mehmet İpşirli,"Tâcü't-Tevârîh" *TDVİA* v. 39, 357-359.

[181] Hoca Ṣaʿadeddīn Efendi, *Tācü't Tevārīḫ*, (İstanbul: Tabhane-i Amire, 1862) v.1, 7. This translation of mine is a very simplified and free rendition of the original text, translating this highly embellished language full of successive metaphorical phrases into English in a readable and meaningful way is a very hard task that is not indispensable for the present purposes.

nor readers of history). Accordingly, while God's grace and favor is manifested most perfectly in the prophets and kings, scholars are expected to compile and write down the consequences of this divine favor; i.e. the life- stories of prophets and kings. In this way, they both disclose the lessons to be learnt from these narratives and also help to perpetuate the name and glory of the prophets and kings, as it is commanded in the Qur'an as well. Moreover, from such a perspective, the patronage of historians and the reading of histories are considered almost as natural and necessary accompaniments of kingly presence and activity. Accordingly, it is desirable for kings to patronize history-writing and to read histories because histories perpetuate their name and fame, while at the same time providing them with invaluable life-experience and good lessons. Hence historiography is a useful and necessary occupation for kings, and scholars (i.e. historians) are responsible for ensuring these benefits for their patrons. The responsibility of historians also has a religious and moral dimension, since what they record in historiography does not represent merely the mundane struggles of kings, but also the divine mercy that was manifested in the kingly victories and accomplishments.

Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī and *Künhü'l Aḫbār*

Unlike Hoca Saʿadeddīn's *Tācü't Tevārīḫ,* Muṣtafā ʿĀlī's *Künhü'l Aḫbār* is a universal history that encompasses the whole of human history from Creation, up until the reign of Murād III and which also refers to a number of societies in different geographies.[182] As Cornell Fleischer states, with such a universal history, ʿĀlī expressed on the one hand his fascination with historical continuity and attempted to

[182] For the global trend of universal histories in the sixteenth century see Sanjtay Subrahmanyam, "On World Historians in the Sixteenth Century" *Representations* Vol. 91 No. 1 (Summer 2005): 26-57.

situate his own political, religious and literary culture in this historical continuity and on the other hand, with a presentist approach, he resorted to the prestigious past as an ideal model to emulate or to procure remedies for the defects of the present time.[183] In line with his fascination about history and his disillusionments regarding his own time, the notions of remembering and taking lessons from the past dominate Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī's discussion of historiography. Although his arguments on the necessity and usefulness of history do not essentially differ from that of Hoca Saʿadeddīn, his account is much more detailed and elaborate.

At the very beginning of the Introduction to *Künhü'l Aḫbār,*[184] Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī recounts the main tenants of his understanding of historiography:[185]

1. Invocation of the names of the prophets, saints, and gnostics, scholars and poets is a cause for receiving the grace and mercy of God. Moreover, God also points to the exemplary qualities and instructiveness of the stories of past generations in the Quranic verse 12/111 (*Assuredly, in their narrative is a lesson for men of understanding*). The lives of kings and khans and their victorious holy wars are proof of this divine sentence.
2. The Prophet's exhortation "Remember your deceased ones with goodness" is another indication for the necessity and uses of history. This hadith can be understood in two ways, as; a) pray for the souls of the death whenever they are remembered or mentioned; b) cite their good works that cause for their remembrance with goodness.
3. Humans are distinguished from the animals by the faculty of speech (*nuṭḳ*) - which practically corresponds to language. Likewise a perfect man (*insān-ı kāmil*) is distinguished from other people by his superior literary capacity. Thus, history that is expected to be a literary product of high register is a means of demonstrating this superiority.

These three points clearly represent that ʿĀlī conceived of historiography primarily as an act of remembrance (*ẕikr*) that may serve as a service to God bringing out His

[183]Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual*, 242.

[184] This introduction is dated to two years after Muṣṭafā Âli's start with writing the *Künhü'l Aḫbār,* to early 1000/1592. Ibid.,, 245.

[185] Gelibolulu Ali Mustafa Efendi, *Künhü'l Aḫbār*, (Istanbul : Takvimhane-i Amire, 1277[1861-2]), v.1, 3-4.

benevolence, as well as prayers for the souls of the people of the past. Moreover historical stories are repositories of morals and lessons. Lastly, Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī underlines the literary nature of history; accordingly, lucid and eloquent language is a virtue that distinguishes a perfect man from the rest of humankind. Thus eloquent language increases the value of historiography. Further below, he elaborates on the uses of historiography and enumerates seven points that can be paraphrased as follows:[186]

1. Reading history is akin to invocation of and prayer for the antecedents. Historical narrative is a type of counseling and preaching because it constitutes a mirror to the events of the world and thus a source of caution and awakening with regard to them.
2. It is like a conversation with predecessors and enables one to draw lessons from their stories and realize that this world is transitory.
3. One can draw lessons from the experiences of the predecessors, to which one can then resort in difficult times.
4. History can be a source of consolation in difficult times, because the stories of the prophets and saints and the hardships that they had to endure and from which they were eventually released, testify to the fact that hardships are not everlasting.
5. History is useful in scholarly disputations; because a scholar who is knowledgeable about history and who can draw on it, can easily convince and quieten his opponents.
6. Man's knowledge about the world and worldly events comes either by way of seeing (direct learning) or by way of hearing (indirect learning). The range of direct learning is too restricted and one is utterly in need of transmitted accounts, i.e. (contemporary or distant) history.
7. Whereas the study of the science of history is religiously recommended (*müsteḥab*) for ordinary people it is almost obligatory (*farż ve vācib mertebesinde*) for rulers and statesmen in that way they observe the deeds of the just and unjust rulers draw lessons from their life-stories and check their own deeds according to these examples. Moreover history demonstrates that neither justice nor cruelty are ever forgotten but are recorded and perpetuated in works of history.

As these arguments demonstrate, Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī's concept of historiography was centered on the notion of "history as an act of remembrance" that was valuable and

[186] *Künhü'l Aḫbār*, I: 40-42.

beneficial both for the writer, reader and patrons who were usually the subject of historical texts. Although ʿĀlī did not develop any epistemological argumentation that treated history as a form of knowledge and knowledge production, as an erudite historian he was well aware of the epistemological problems and concerns with regard to the practice of history. Nevertheless, he seems to have been assured – almost in a positivistic attitude- that these problems could be remedied with a righteous and scrupulous attitude and objective inquiry on the part of the historian. Consequently, in the Introduction of *Künhü'l Aḫbār*, he included also a section on the four requisites of history-writing as: 1) the religious and moral propriety of the historian 2) a just, fair and righteous attitude on the part of the historian who "shall represent the situation accurately", 3) the need to avoid hiding valuable information and exaggerating unimportant events, 4) the need to ensure diversity in sources.[187]

Hoca Saʿadeddīn and Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī's pragmatic approach to historiography and their emphasis on its edifying character and its uses as a medium of recording and recollecting, represents the predominant approach in sixteenth-century Ottoman historiography, which may also have been the prevalent approach in other contexts and in other centuries. This stress on the immediate and manifold practical uses of history was meant also as an encouragement for the rulers to patronize historiography. Although historians like Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī could be quite aware of the epistemological problems involved in the practice of history, historiography's position as a science was not an issue that was particularly addressed by practicing historians. To present a remarkable exception to this tendency however, we need to go back a little further to the late fifteenth century, to the universal history of Neşrī (d. 926/1520).

[187] *Künhü'l Aḫbār*, I: 42-43.

Neşrī and *Cihānnümā*

Although Neşrī's identity is almost completely obscure, his scholarly background can be inferred from his work with some degree of certainty. *Cihānnümā* is usually considered to be a direct continuation of the fifteenth century chronicles on account of its great indebtedness to them and its unadorned and direct style; it was apparently originally designed and probably written as a universal history. Although today only a brief introduction and the last section devoted to late Seljuk and early Ottoman history are extant, it was used as a direct or indirect source by almost all the major sixteenth-century historians, so it is legitimate to regard it as a relevant text also for the sixteenth century.[188]

In his rather brief introduction to *Cihānnümā*, Neşrī incorporated historiography into an epistemological scheme as a member of a three-partite classification of sciences:

> […] It is testified by the self-evidence of reason that knowledge, life and existence [each] are merely [and absolutely] good and ignorance, death and nonexistence are merely evil. Although life is (a) cause for knowledge, one should make knowledge the cause of life because life without knowledge is like death.
>
> But the most exalted of all the sciences (*ʿulūm ve meʿārif*) are those that are confirmed by the divine scriptures (*ṣuhūf-ı semāvī*) and reinforced by the divine books. Divine scriptures and divine books avouch three things: the dogma of the oneness of God, (*ʿilm-i tevhīd* i.e. theology) [189], [religious] jurisprudence (*ʿilm -i şeriʿat*) and history *(ʿilm -i tevārih*). The noblest classes of the humankind are also three: prophets, scholars and rulers. […] If anyone of the most honorable kings or the most sublime sultans knows theology and jurisprudence and become aware of the history of (past) events; (…) he

[188]The exact date of the writing of *Cihānnümā* is not known, but for the last and only extant part relating to the Ottoman history, historians have proposed dates between 1470s and 1512. See Abdülkadir Özcan, "Neşri", *TDVİA* v.33, 20-22.

[189] *ʿİlm-i tevhīd* is the specific discipline of the Islamic theology that focused on the dogma related to oneness of God and His attributes. For the relation between *ilm-i tevhīd, ilm-i ʿakāid,* and *kelām*, see Muṣtafa Sinanoğlu, "Tevhid İlmi" *TDVİA*, v. 41, 26-27.

> receives the prophetic provisions and the secrets of prophethood (*risālet*) are revealed to him.

In this paragraph Neşrī builds up a philosophical argumentation. The first metaphysical postulate of that argument is that knowledge (*'ilm*) is an absolute good, and therefore, it is something to be esteemed and pursued for its own sake. It is observed that knowledge branches out into various disciplines (*'ulūm*) and these sciences are not equal to each other but are ordered hierarchically. Then a second postulate is introduced, which is that the supremacy of a science is determined by the inclusion of its subject into the divine texts and indeed accounts in the divine scriptures relate either to the oneness of God, or to jurisprudence or to (prophetic) histories.[190] Thus the content of the divine books is covered in three sciences: theology, jurisprudence and history. In this way Neşrī situates historiography within an epistemological scheme, of which scope and hierarchy was determined by the content of the divine revelation.

After classifying the highest echelon of the sciences in this way, Neşrī moves on to classify humankind and touches also upon the uses of historical knowledge. Accordingly, humankind is also divided into three classes as prophets, scholar and rulers. These three classes also gain their supremacy with regard to their relationship to the three above-mentioned sciences as well as according to their power to enforce the practical requirements of their knowledge. Therefore, since prophets are both knowledgeable in the divine scriptures and possess worldly power to practice and lead other people according to this knowledge[191] they constitute the highest class of humankind. Scholars are also knowledgeable in these three sciences; however, they

[190] At this point it would be adequate to remind the principle that "the honor of a science is due to the honor of its subject (*ma'lūm*)." See Chapter II.

are incapable of enforcing the requirements of their knowledge upon others. Rulers, on the other hand, hold the power of execution in their hands by definition and if they acquire also the knowledge of the divine scriptures –which are carried by the above-mentioned three sciences- they combine the dual-capacity of the prophets, and have a position close to them. Consequently, knowledge of history is especially required for rulers and it is a means to elevate their rank in the hierarchy of humankind.[192]

Although eventually like Hoca Saʿadeddīn and Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī, Neşrī also regarded the writing of history as primarily intended for kings and as an instructing and edifying pursuit, he nevertheless conceived of history not as a repository of stories but as a distinct form of knowledge, as a science that was demarcated from other sciences by its subject matter and not by any methodological difference.

History as a Science:
Non-historians on Historiography

In Islamic historiography, it is possible to bring forward some few instances at which the superiority of history over all the other sciences has been asserted; for instance the prominent medieval historian Masʿūdī (d. 345/956) stated that history, which recorded the "prudence engendered by experience", constituted the main source of the principal scientific method of *baḥṯ* (*inquiry*); therefore, history was the necessary condition and the source of all the sciences. Unlike Nevʿī, however, Masʿūdī was a practicing historian and the influence of this unprecedented elevation in the status of

[192] The ideal type of ruler who unites in himself both worldly power and knowledge-wisdom was an ancient theme that was also well represented in later Islamic literature on good governance. The affinity between prophets and kings was one of the staple themes of the medieval advice literature. Louise Marlow, "Kings, Prophets and the 'Ulamā' in Mediaeval Islamic Advice Literature" *Studia Islamica* no.81 (1995), 101-120.

history was reflected in his own historical work, which offered a more "abstract" conception of history, supplemented with cosmology and geography. Moreover, this integrated history of Masʿūdī aimed to demonstrate the "wise system" and "regularity of disposition" which shall point to the wisdom of the Creator.[193] From another perspective in *al-Favāʾiḥ al-Miskiyya* history also occupied a leading and prominent place, but it was treated not only as a narration of the past but as a temporally integrated realm, similar to cosmology and apocalyptic prophesies, that contained esoteric mysteries to be deciphered.

Beyond this however, probably the most articulate theoretical approach to history-writing and to history as a distinctive form of knowledge rather than an act of remembrance was elaborated by Ibn Ḫaldūn, whom I will only briefly touch upon in this thesis. In the foreword of *Muḳaddima*, Ibn Ḫaldūn states that although at a superficial level, history is understood as an elegantly presented and entertaining recount of events, at a more profound level history can be accounted a branch of philosophy [*al-ḥikmat*]" because it requires theoretical thinking (*naẓar*), verification (*taḥkīḳ*) and causality (*taʿlīl*), which are the distinguishing features of the philosophical sciences.[194] Moreover Ibn Ḫaldūn as a practicing historian also developed new working concepts like (*al-ʿumrān al-başarī*) and (*al-ʾumam*) which enabled him to build a theoretical grand-narrative about the history.[195]

Moreover, neither then nor today, theoretical thinking on historiography was in the monopoly of historians. From the late fourteenth century on, in centers of

[193] Tarif Khalidi, *Arab Historical Thought in the Classical Period*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1994), 133-136.

[194] Ibn Khaldun, *The Muqaddimah*, trans. Franz Rosenthal (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul 1958), v., 6.

[195] Abdesselam Cheddadi, "L'encyclopedisme dans l'historiographie : reflexions sur le cas d'Ibn Khaldun" in *Organizing Knowledge: Encyclopedic Activities in the Pre-Eighteenth Century Islamic World*, (Leiden; Boston : Brill, 2006), 195-198.

Islamic learning like Cairo, historiography had become the subject of non-historian scholars who transmitted their theoretical knowledge in the religious sciences to the field of historiography and who portrayed historiography as a universal form of knowledge instead of a particularistic narration of the exemplary tales of individuals and individual events. Therefore before continuing with Nevʿī and his concept of historiography as a non-historian, I will briefly touch upon three other theoretical texts that dealt with history. The texts in question were introduced by Franz Rosenthal in *A History of Muslim Historiography,* and date from the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.[196] Although it is not probable to build a direct link between *Netāyic* and these texts, they are still worth considering in order to illustrate other theoretical and philosophical approaches to historiography.

The first monograph titled *Tuḥfat al-faḳīr ilā ṣāhib as-sarīr* (*Gift of the Poor Man to the Lord of the Throne*) was written in 783/1381-82 by a non-historian scholar called Muḥammed b. İbrāhim el-Īcī; an obscure name except that he was a student of the famed theologian ʿAḍud al-Dīn el-Īcī (d. 756/1355).[197] In this small text, Īcī follows the classificatory scheme that places history under the category of literary sciences, and he defines history as prose that is practiced and preserved for the sake of its content (not for its literary qualities). Īcī's approach to historiography is based on two main considerations, one philosophical and one methodological. Firstly, according to him, principally all created things can be the subject of history although human beings constitute its particular subject. This is due to the fact that unlike the primeval Creator, all created beings are created *in time* and time-bound,

[196] Franz Rosenthal, *A History of Muslim Historiography* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968), 40.

[197] Rosenthal provides an abridged English translation as well as introduction of the text in *A History of Muslim Historiography*, 201-244. The title of the book indicates that it was intended to be presented to a ruler, and maybe to Tamerlane.

hence *historical.* Therefore history "provides proof of the createdness of the world and the world's need for a Creator"[198]. Secondly, he underlines the historical character of the religious sciences which are obliged to resort to historical and biographical material. Thus, after establishing the position and value of history as a particular form of knowledge, i.e. as a science that needs to be founded on sound methodology, Īcī devotes a substantial part of the work to a detailed methodological discussion about ascertaining the truth of various historical accounts (*aḫbār*).[199]

After Īcī, in the fifteenth century two more monographs were written in historiography. The first, *al- Muḫtaṣar fī 'ilm al-tārīḫ* (*The Short Work on Historiography*)[200] was written in 867/1463 in Cairo, by Meḥmed Kāfiyecī (d. 979/1474), a scholar who was educated in Anatolia and who later settled and taught in Cairo. Kāfiyecī conceives history as "a codified branch of knowledge" [201] that deals with a particular category of being from a universal and theoretical perspective. Accordingly;

> Things are either primeval or created. Created things are either celestial or terrestrial. The basic objective [of the historian] is the accurate, well-organized treatment of man [which denotes a created and terrestrial category of being]. There are three classes of men, the high class, the middle class and the low class. It is impossible to attain knowledge about each individual from? each of these classes. The historian who wants to write about an individual from any of these classes, will acquire in the process (the knowledge of) certain notions (*i'tibārāt*) and conditions which are thinkable and theoretically possible." [For] The notions acquired by a historian who intends to write about an individual of any class are five theoretical

[198] Ibid., 205.

[199] Ibid., 208- 211

[200] Rosenthal included an abridged translation of this text, as well as the original text Ibid., 245-262; 547-580. This text is studied and translated into Turkish by Kasım Şulul, See Kasım Şulul, *Kāfiyecī 'de Tarih Usulü,* (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2003).

[201]Rosenthal, *A History of Muslim Historiography*, 251.

> possibilities. They are the result of a contemplation of the universal and general structure of these three classes.[202]

Thus although historiography ultimately narrates the stories of individuals, knowledge about these individuals must be based on universal notions, particular to the class to which this individual belongs to. Then the ways through which one acquires knowledge of these notions constitute the methodology of historiography. Moreover he denotes historiography as "the best available method of establishing the chronology of the whole course of human affairs, including the other life" and as a "yardstick and standard of events, measured on it the [events] take on the right proportions and become acceptable to the thoughtful" and without it people "would not be able to make a distinction between sound and corrupt (information)";[203] implying that historiography is a discipline providing general notions about life and the course of events through which the veracity of the accounts on particular events can be checked.

This verifying nature and use of historiography was also emphasized by Kāfiyecī's younger contemporary and student Seḫāvī (d. 902/1497) in his *al-I'lān bi-t tavbīh li-man ḏamma ahl- al-tavārīḫ* (*The Open Denunciation of the Adverse Critics of the Historians*)[204]. This voluminous work was an apology that argued for the legitimacy and even necessity of history as a branch of learning. Seḫāvī's treatment of history was less systematic and theoretical compared to Kāfiyecī; instead he preferred to bring together as many sources as possible on the issues he discussed. In all this, however, his main concern was to prove the legitimacy and

[202] *Ibid*., 255-257. This paragraph is extracted from Rosenthal's translation. For the sake of legibility, I did not indicate the omitted parts. The parenthesis belong to Rosenthal, the square brackets are mine.

[203] *Ibid*., 252, 254.

[204] For the introduction and an abridged translation of the text see Ibid., 263-529.

necessity of history-writing and to call attention to its role as a medium of verification of the information necessary for the religious sciences. Hence the primary use of historiography was its instructiveness in the sense that it provided "the knowledge of matters as they actually are;" for example, with regard to ascertaining the soundness of the chains of transmission of the Prophetic traditions.[205]

Classification of Historiography as a Universal Science

As briefly outlined above, from the late fourteenth century onwards, historiography became the subject of some theoretical perspectives in Muslim scholarly circles. These texts underlined the epistemological legitimacy of historiography not as an edifying literary story-telling but as an independent science; either as a discipline specific to a category of being or as an auxiliary science to provide reliable information on the general rules of events. *Netāyic* can also be considered in the same line, although its actual discussion of historiography is quite brief and indeed conventional. In the chapter of historiography, Nevʿī, introduces the science of history as follows:

> Historiography manifests admonitions concerning the world (*ʾibret-nümā-yı ʾālem)* and it increases the foresight of humankind. It makes one experienced in the affairs of the [past] ages (*duhūr*) and experienced in the [course] of events and thus prudent in the proper governance of the affairs of the people. There are no limits to its benefits. It belongs to the literary sciences.

Thereafter he provides also a systematic definition of historiography that follows almost word by word the relevant section in Ṭaşköprüzāde's introduction of history

[205] Ibid., 273-274.

in *Miftāḥ al-Sa'āde* in which historiography is classified as a branch of the linguistic sciences together with sciences like grammar, literary composition and poetry [206]

> Definition: It is the knowledge (*ma'rifa*) of the conditions of peoples, their traditions, customs and the crafts of their leading figures, their genealogies and their dates of birth, etc.
> Subject: Conditions of the leading figures from the past among the prophets, philosophers (*ḥukemā*), kings etc.
> Objective: Comprehension of these (above counted) conditions
> Benefit: Admonition and good counsel

Considering that Nevʿī and Ṭaşköprüzāde were seemingly congruent on the formal definition of historiography, how could they classify historiography so radically differently from each other? In this case, we need to seek the difference not in their definition of historiography in the strict sense, but in their classificatory schemes.

Taşköprüzāde's Classificatory Scheme

As I have briefly mentioned in the previous chapter, Ṭaşköprüzāde had a bi-partite classificatory scheme. In the first part, the sciences were divided into two groups according to the methodology to be followed in order to acquire them: as a) sciences that require rational contemplation only and b) sciences that require both contemplation and practice, and which eventually lead to spiritual purification. Then the first group –i.e. the theoretical sciences- is divided into four categories with regard to the form of existence of their subject matter: as scriptural, linguistic, and conceptual and those that deal with actual (*'aynī*) beings. It must be underlined that

[206]Taşköprüzade, *Miftahü's-saade ve misbahü's-siyade fî mevzuati'l-ulum*, eds. Kamil Kamil Bekri, Abdülvehhab Ebü'n-Nur. (Qairo : Dârü'l-Kütübi'l-Hadise, 1968.) vol. 1, 251. For the English translation of the relevant section see Franz Rosenthal, *A History of Muslim Historiography*, 531. Rosenthal notes that Ṭaşköprüzāde's treatment of history can be regarded as a late expression of the understanding of history as expressed in the monographs on history by Kāfiyecī and Sehāvī.The fact that Nevʿī preferred to leave it in Arabic (only in syntax indeed, otherwise all of the vocabulary is easily intelligible for a Turkish speaker) is also an indication that he quoted this paragraph directly from an Arabic source.

these four categories did not designate exclusive and independent existing beings, but rather the ontological forms in which a particular being was "experienced" at a particular time and context. To illustrate the point let me cite a common example, namely "fire". First of all, fire has an actual existence that heats, illuminates and burns. Secondly, fire has a conceptual existence, i.e. one can think of fire, as well as of its heating and burning qualities but the concept of fire neither heats nor burns one *actually*. Thirdly, one can linguistically (orally or in written form) reproduce "fire" and thus transmit this concept to others and make it known by them. And lastly fire can have a scriptural existence; i.e. when one sees some particular signs (the letters f-i-r-e for example), one can know of fire. Thus the "knowledge of fire" can be of four different forms and each form constitutes the subject of a different science such as orthography, lexicography or physics. Apparently these four forms of existence are determined according to man's relationship to the existing being. Scriptural representation, language and mental concepts are eventually media (in the order of increasing degree of abstraction), through which one can acquire knowledge about an existent being. Consequently, the process through which one knows something is a critical consideration in Ṭaşköprüzāde's classification and definition of the sciences. From this point of view, it can be argued that this four-partite categorization is a cognitive as much as ontological and Ṭaşköprüzāde's classification of the sciences is founded on these cognitive-ontological categories.

Moreover, although in its formal definition, the subject of historiography is stated as human beings and their deeds, practically the "access" of the historian to this subject material is not direct. This means that when studying history, one does not get know the kings and prophets *actually*, but one gets to know narratives (*rivāyet*) about them that are transmitted linguistically; and one gets to evaluate and

reorganize these narratives in order to establish a new narrative. Accordingly, historiography belongs to the category of linguistic sciences because all of the methods and processes in the practice of it (such as recording, re-collecting, organizing and narrating) are fundamentally linguistic. Indeed, from this perspective this conceptualization of historiography is in congruence with the conditions of practiced historiography.

Nevʿī's Classificatory Scheme

Nevʿī's categorization of the subjects of the sciences, by contrast, is a much more strictly ontological one. As mentioned in the previous chapter, he divides the created beings into three categories as humankind, natural beings and celestial beings. These three categories together constitute the created universe as perceived by man. Thus the starting point for the conceptualization and then the classification of these three sciences is a simple act of matching subjects and sciences with each other. Namely, to know about the natural beings and their properties one has to resort to (natural) philosophy and to know about the celestial beings one has to resort to astronomy and eventually there is no other science except history that deals with humankind. Moreover, at least with regard to these first three sciences, Nevʿī did not consider any epistemological or methodological difference in acquiring the knowledge as a criterion for his classification. Thus although, for example, he would accept that historiographical knowledge is primarily of literary form whereas the knowledge on natural and celestial beings can be derived from the observation of their actual existence, this would not be of relevance for his classification. Thus the starting point of Nevʿī's definition of history was the question "what is the science, with which one knows about the humankind".

The supremacy of history among other universal/theoretical sciences, however, arose only and merely from the supremacy of its subject, humankind, in the hierarchy. Nevʿī does not elaborate this idea substantially, but in the chapter on philosophy he touches upon the supremacy of man in the created universe and he describes "man" (as a universal category) as "the perfect existent (*mevcūd-ı kāmil*) which is potentially capable of being the existent that represents the whole of existence. (*mevcūd-ı mevcūd-nümā*).[207] The supreme position of man among all the other created beings was a pervasive notion in the Islamic tradition and it was also a ubiquitous idea that was expressed in various contexts from cosmography and natural history to poetry and Sufism.[208]

Conclusion

In this chapter I attempted to situate the remarkable shift in the place of historiography in the classification of the sciences in *Netāyic* within the context of sixteenth-century Ottoman historiography. *Netāyic* was written in a period that was particularly significant in terms of historiography. During this period, some of the most distinguished examples of Ottoman historiography were produced, and state patronage of various forms of historiography attained such a systematic character that some modern observes pinpointed the birth of Ottoman "official historiography". In such a context, the apotheosis of historiography in Nevʿī's classification was even more remarkable. This necessitated comparing Nevʿī's concept of historiography with other contemporary discourses on historiography.

[207] *Netāyic*, 136.

[208] Meḥmed ʿĀşıḳ's *Menāzıru'l Avālim*'s "last section is devoted to man as the noblest being and the most perfect and most beautiful creature". Gottfried Hagen, "The order of knowledge, the knowledge of order", *The Cambridge History of Turkey : the Ottoman Empire as a world power, 1453-1603*(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 430.

The main discourse of the sixteenth century historians emphasized the instructive and edifying nature, immortalizing capacity and literary qualities of historiography, while the late fifteenth -century historian Neşrī constituted a remarkable exception to the general trend. The historians who brought up arguments to provide justification for the practice of historiography emphasized particularly two points. First of all, historiography was conceived as a medium of commemoration, and in some cases, monumentalization of the deeds and words of some outstanding people. Secondly, it was argued that while historical narratives perpetuate the name and fame of their subjects, readers of history benefit from remembering these names and their deeds by inferring lessons and spiritual blessing. A great portion of the sixteenth century Ottoman historiography can be understood as such immortalizing and monumentalizing activities. With such an approach, history-writing is primarily a recording activity, and especially in those works that aspire to monumentalize these recordings, the literary qualities of works come into particular prominence. Not only *şehnāme*-type works that remained rather marginal in the sense of their range of accessibility and influence-, but also the most distinguished and well-read historiography of the sixteenth century, namely Hoca Saʿadeddīn's *Tācü't Tevārīḫ* and Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī's *Künhü'l Aḫbār,* can be referred to demonstrate how historiography was conceived primarily as commemorative and from the perspective of its immediate uses that were expected to be acquired from patronizing and reading history.

Nevʿī', however, was not a practicing historian, so he was not concerned with ushering a new type of historiography or with providing a theoretical structure that lacked earlier historians. As I have mentioned in the previous chapter, *Netāyic* was based on an almost existential proposition stating that the goal of life is attaining the

knowledge of God's attributes and this is possible only by way of attaining the knowledge of His creation. Therefore, the superiority of history in *Netāyic* arose from a re-definition of history as a universal science that treated mankind as a universal category comparable to the physical beings and celestial beings; which were respectively subject of (natural) philosophy and astronomy.

Nevʿī's understanding of historiography differed from the understanding of practicing historians with regard to the primarily intended audience of historiography as well. Hoca Saʿadeddīn Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī and Neşrī were all in agreement that historiography, principally, is expected to serve the interest of kings and rulers. In conventional historiography the subjects and the primary audience of historiographical works are not much different from each other; it is usually the stories of kings and rulers for the use of kings and rulers. However it seems that the audience of the historiography as defined by Nevʿī could be conceived much broader and comprehensive compared to the intended audiences of historical works. While these books of history were primarily meant for rulers and the ruling elite at best, Nevʿī apparently had in mind almost each and every person who sought the knowledge of his or her Creator.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

Netāyic is a small, seemingly unpretentious text that brings together translated excerpts from several sources to form an encyclopedic compendium for those who are unable to embrace all of the sciences. Nevertheless, Nevʿī's choice of sources demonstrates that he was aware of the classificatory tradition and consciously modified some of the conventional orderings. Moreover, his unconventional classificatory scheme also determined his understanding of the classified sciences in general and of history in particular.

By the late sixteenth century, when Nevʿī wrote *Netāyic*, the classification of knowledge and sciences was a well-established pursuit in Islamic intellectual history with its roots in the Aristotelian philosophy and it was usually a scheme that epitomized the views of its author in a number of crucial issues such as the source of knowledge, the position of divine revelation and even the relationship between existence and knowledge. Nevʿī's classification in *Netāyic* also expressed his stance on the goal of man's existence as well as the method to attain it. Accordingly, the human being was created to know his Creator and this was possible only by way of acquiring the knowledge of created beings. Nevʿī categorized created beings in three categories as human, terrestrial and celestial beings and then assigned a particular science to each of these categories; history, natural philosophy and astronomy respectively. These three sciences constituted a category of "universal" sciences that provide theoretical knowledge on the nature of the three ontological categories, which eventually carried one to the knowledge of the Creator.

Secondly, Nevʿī classified the so-called religious sciences; the sciences that were based on divine revelation and ensured sound and true belief (theology), correct

regulation of one's relationship to God and to other people (principles of jurisprudence) and a thorough understanding of God's word (exegesis). These three disciplines were ordered among each other according to the degree and universality of the knowledge that they provided. The third category included the practical sciences that contributed to the well-being of man in the broadest sense of the word. They were *practical* also because they pertained to one's *spiritual* activities. Lastly, Nevʿī formed the fourth category of sciences from the practical disciplines that provided the knowledge required to interpret and manipulate the non-human, physical world. The hierarchy among these three sciences was determined according to their degree of religious permissibility. Thus whereas agronomy was allowed, interpretive astronomy was deemed permissible only partly and divination was labeled a pursuit completely banned.

Theoretical/ Universal	Theoretical/ Religious	Practical/ Religious	Practical
History	Principles of the Religion	Sufism	Agronomy
Natural Philosophy	Principles of Jurisprudence	Interpretation of Dreams	Interpretive Astronomy (Astrology)
Astronomy	Quranic Exegesis	*Ruḳy* and medicine	Divination

A classification of sciences is a normative structure that organizes the otherwise chaotic sphere of knowledge into separate and legitimized compartments through defining their relationship with each other. Thus, as I have tried to demonstrate in the comparison of Ṭaşköprüzāde's and Nevʿī's classifications and understandings of historiography, each classification implies also a reconceptualization of the relevant disciplines. Although the literal definition of historiography in the *Netāyic* did not differ from other contemporary definitions, Nevʿī's inclusion and placement of

history at the top of the hierarchy of the sciences implies such a reconceptualization of history. Accordingly, historiography was conceived not as recounting the exemplary stories of individuals and individual events but as a *universal* science about man. Nevʿī's concept of history was not formulated in a vacuum; historians and non-historians have propounded a number of approaches to the science and craft of history. Thus, I tried to indicate the place of historiography in Nevʿī's classification of the sciences with reference to other contemporary discourses on historiography. However, Nevʿī was not a practicing historian and quite expectedly the causes of his interest in historiography differed from historians.

With regard to Ottoman historiography, the sixteenth century was a particularly fruitful period, a certain historical consciousness both on the part of the dynasty as well as the intellectual elite manifested itself both as a concern with recording the immediate past and the lived experiences as well as a more universalist glance towards the human experience. All this historiography was grounded on a number of approaches to history; these approaches did not entail only the terms and requirements of the practice of history but at a more foundational level, they included also explicit or implicit arguments on the legitimacy (validity) and necessity of history as a separate field of knowledge, as a science. According to the classificatory scheme of *Netāyic*, the necessity and legitimacy of historiography as a science were derived from its designation as the science of a particular ontological category; the human being.

Still, a question can be raised about the practical implications of the notion of historiography propounded by Nevʿī. As an answer to this speculative question I can only suggest that these implications would not be in the "craftsmanship" of historiography, but could contribute to a kind of metaphysical conception of history

that was centered on man as the epitome and the highest being of the created universe.

As I have stated in the Introduction, the aim of this study was reading a historical text in its intellectual context. For sure, by tracing the travel of ideas and notions from text to text –with regard to classification of the sciences or historiography- I did not intend to build up definitive chains of approbation or influence. Nevertheless, even if such direct transmissions between texts were not always present or demonstrable, this does not preclude the fact that the structure that we call "intellectual context" is a complex network woven from many such texts; hence in such a network, texts are connected to each other both directly and indirectly; diachronically and synchronically. It is in this sense that this study has attempted to situate *Netāyic* in its intellectual context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Afyoncu, Erhan. "Sokulluzade Hasan Paşa." In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Istanbul, 1988-. v. 33; 366-368.

———. "Şemsi Aḥmed Paşa." In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Istanbul, 1988-.

Aksoyak, İsmail Hakkı. "Nev'î'nin Bilinmeyen Şiirleri." *Erciyes* 20, (1997): 17-18.

al-Rabe, Ahmad Abdulla. "Muslim Philosophers' Classifications of the Sciences: Al-Kīndī, Al-Fārābī , Al-Ghazali, Ibn Khaldun." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1984.

Ali, Mustafa. *Künhül Ahbar'ın Tezkire Kısmı.*Edited by Mustafa İsen. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, 1994.

Aşık Çelebi. *Meşâ'irü'ş- Şu'arâ (Inceleme –Metin)*. Edited by Filiz Kılıç. Istanbul: Istanbul Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, 2010.

Atâî, Nev'îzâde. *Şakaik-ı Nu'maniye Ve Zeyilleri: Hadaiku'l Hakaik Fî Tekmileti'i Şakaik*. edited by Abdülkadir Özcan. Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989.

Atçıl, Abdurrahman. "The Route to the Top in the Ottoman Ilmiye Hierarchy of the Sixteenth Century." *Bulletin of SOAS* 72, (2009): 493-96.

Bakar, Osman. "Classification of the Sciences in Islamic Intellectual History: A Study in Islamic Philosophies of Science." PhD diss., Temple University, 1989.

Baltacı, Cavit. *XV-XVI. Asırlarda Osmanlı Medreseleri*. Istanbul: İrfan Matbaası, 1976.

Başar, Fahamettin. "Evrenosoğulları." In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Istanbul: 1988-. V. 11; 539-541.

Baykal, Bekir Sıtkı. *Peçevi Tarihi. / İbrahim Peçevi Peçuylu İbrahim*. Vol. 1, Ankara Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları 1981.

Butcher, Samuel H. *The Poetics of Aristotle*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1961.

Chakīnī, Bahrūz Newrūzzādeh. *Yawāqīt Al-'ulūm We Darārī Al-Nucūm Wa Mu'allif-I An*. Merkez-i Tahkikati Ulum-ı İslami, 1378.

Cheddadi, Abdesselam. "L'encyclopédisme Dans L'historiographie: Réflexions Sur Le Cas D'ibn Khaldūn." In *Organizing Knowledge: Encyclopaedic Activities in the Preeighteenth Century Islamic World*. 187-98. Boston: Brill, 2006.

Curry, John J. *The Transformation of Muslim Mystical Thought in the Ottoman Empire: The Rise of the Halveti Order, 1350-1650*. Edinburgh University Press, 2010.

Cyclopes. "Bibliographie selective-encyclopédisme et organisation du savoir en Islam". Availabale at http://cyclopes.fltr.ucl.ac.be/materiaux/biblioarabe.htm.

Çağrıcı, Mustafa. "Abdurrahman b. Muhammed Bistâmî". In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Istanbul, 1988-. V.6; 218-219.

Çavuşoğlu, Mehmet. "Bâkî." In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Istanbul, 1988-. V.4; 537-540.

Çelebi, İlyas. "Rukye." In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*,. Istanbul, 1988-. V.35;219-222.

Çelebi, Kınalızade Hasan. *Tezkiretü'ş-Şuara*. Edited by İbrahim Kutluk. Ankara Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1978.

Çerçi, Faris. *Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali Ve Künhü'l-Ahbarı'nda II. Selim, III. Murat ve III. Mehmet Devirleri*. 3 vols. Vol. 1,2,3, Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2000.

Dānish′pazhūh, Muḥammad Taqī. *Yavāqīt al-ʻulūm wa-darārī al-ncūm*. Tehran: Bunyād-i Farhang-i Īrān, 1345 [1966]).

De Callataÿ, Godefroid. "The Classification of the Sciences According to the Rasa'il Ikhwan Al-Safa' " In *The Institute of Ismaili Studies- Department of Academic Research and Publications Lecture Series*, 2003.

Diriöz, Meserret. "Nev'i." *Türkoloji Dergisi* 7, (1977): 83-100.

Dray, William. "Philosophy and Historiography." In *Companion to Historiography*, Edited by Michael Bentley. 763-66. London: Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group 2001.

Emecen, Feridun. "Kanuni Sultan Süleyman." In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Istanbul:, 1988-. V. 38; 62-74.

———. "Kara Aḥmed Paşa." In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Istanbul, 1988-. V. 24; 357-358.

———. "Mehmed III." In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Istanbul, 1988-.V. 28; 407-413.

Endress, Gerhard. "The Cycle of Knowledge: Intellectual Traditions and Encyclopaedias of the Rational Sciences in Arabic Islamic Hellenism." In *Organizing Knowledge. Encyclopaedic Activities in the Pre-Eighteenth Century Islamic World*. Edited by Gerhard Endress. 103-33. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Evliya, Çelebi. *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*. Edited by Yücel Dağlı et alia. Vol. 5, Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2006.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. "Social Mobility among the Ottoman ʿulema in the Late Sixteenth Century." *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 4 (1973): 204–18.

Fazlıoğlu, Şükran. "Language as a Road to the Being: Language Analysis and Practice of Arabic in the Ottoman Period." Paper presented at the Paper delivered at the panel: The Arabic Linguistic Tradition: Methodology and Paradigm, MESA, 2002.

Felek, Özgen. *Kitabu'l Menamat Sultan III. Murad'ın Rüya Mektupları*. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfi Yurt Yayınları, 2012.

Fetvacı, Emine. "Viziers to Eunuchs: Transitions in Ottoman Manuscript Patronage 1566-1617." PhD diss., Harvard University, 2005.

Fetvacı, Emine; Çıpa, H. Erdem. Edited *Writing History at the Ottoman Court: Editing the Past, Fashioning the Future* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Fleischer, Cornell H. *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*. The Historian Mustafa Ali (1541-1600). Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

———. "Royal Authority, Dynastic Cyclism, and" Ibn Khaldûnism" in Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Letters." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 18, (1983): 198-220.

Gelibolulu Ali Mustafa, Efendi. *Künhü'l Aḫbār*. Istanbul Takvimhane-i Amire, 1277[1861-2]).

Gimaret, See. D. "Uṣūl Al-Dīn." In *Encyclopedia of Islam, Second Edition* [online]. Leiden: Brill.

Gutas, Dimitri. "Medical Theory and Scientific Method in the Age of Avicenna." Paper presented at the Before and after Avicenna : Proceedings of the First Conference of the Avicenna Study Group, Boston, 2003.

Hammer-Purgstall, [Joseph]. "Über die Encyklopädie der Perser, Araber und Türken" *Denkschrift der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Classe 7.* 1856. Reprinted in Sezgin, Fuat, edited. *Studies in the Classification of Science in Islam,* Frankfurt am Main, Institute for the history of Arabic-Islamic Science.2005.

Hagen, Gottfried. "The Order of Knowledge, the Knowledge of Order." In *The Cambridge History of Turkey the Ottoman Empire as a World Power ,1453-1603*. Edited by Suraiya Faroqhi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

———. "Überzeitlichkeit Und Geschichte in Kātib Čelebis Ğihānnümā." *Archivum Ottomanicum* 14 (1995-96): 133-59.

Havlioğlu, Didem; Hatice Aynur. "Medhiyenin Cinsiyeti: Kadınlara Yazılmış Medhîyeler (1566-1603)." In *Eski Türk Edebiyatı Çalışmaları VIII: Kasîdeye Medhiye: Biçime, İşleve Ve Muhtevaya Dair Tespitler*. Edited by Hatice Aynur. 77-120. Istanbul: Klasik Yayınları, 2013.

Hoca Saʿadeddīn Efendi. *Tācü't Tevārīḫ*. Istanbul: Tabhane-i Amire, 1862.

Ibn Khaldun. *The Muqaddimah*. Translated by Franz Rosenthal. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958.

Ibn Sina, translated by Hasan Akkanat. "Akli Bilimlerin Bölümleri." *Dini Araştırmalar* 11, (2008): 195-234.

İlhan, Nadir. "Netayicü'l-Fünun ve Mehasinü'l-Mütun (Giriş-Metin-Dizinler)". MA Thesis, Fırat Üniversitesi, 1992.

İnalcık, Halil. "Murad I." In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Istanbul, 1988-

———. "The Rise of Ottoman Historiography." In *The Historians of the Middle East.* Edited by Bernard Lewis. Oxford University Press, 1962.

İpşirli, Mehmet. "Koca Sinan Paşa." In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Istanbul: 1988-. V. 26; 137-139.

———. "Tâcü't-Tevârîh." In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Istanbul, 1988-. V. 39; 357-359.

"Istanbul Kadı Sicilleri ". Online: *http://www.kadisicilleri.org/*. Istanbul, İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2010-.

Jolivet, Jean "Classifications of the Sciences." In *Encyclopedia of muqathe History of Arabic Science*. Edited by R. Rashed and R. Morelon. London: Routledge, 1996.

Kara, Mustafa. "Emir Buhari." In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Istanbul, 1988-. V. 11; 125-126.

Karataş, Hasan. "The City as a Historical Actor." PhD diss., University of California, 2011.

Katip, Çelebi. *Keşfü'z- Zunun 'an Esami'l-Kütübi Ve'l-Fünun (Kitapların Ve İlimlerin Isimlerinden Şüphelerin Giderilmesi)*. Translated by Rüştü Balcı. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2011

Kemalpaşazade, Aḥmed Şemseddin. *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman:I. Defter*. Edited by Şerafettin Turan Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1970.

Kınalızade Ali, Çelebi *Ahlâk-ı Alâî: Kınalızâde Ali Çelebi*. Edited by Mustafa Koç Istanbul: Klasik Yayınları, 2007.

Kuru, Selim S. "Kasîdeden Kasıt Nedir?". In *Eski Türk Edebiyatı Çalışmaları VIII: Kasîdeye Medhiye: Biçime, Işleve Ve Muhtevaya Dair Tespitler*. Edited by Hatice Aynur. Istanbul: Klasik Yayınları, 2013.

Kutluer, İlhan. "Miftâhu's Saâde." In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, 18-20. Istanbul, 1988-.V. 30; 18-19.

Marlow, Louise. "Kings, Prophets and The'ulamā'in Mediaeval Islamic Advice Literature." *Studia Islamica* 81 (1995): 101-20.

Marmura, Michael E. "Avicenna's Proof from Contingency for God's Existence in the Metaphysics of the Shifā'." *Mediaeval Studies* 42 (1980): 337-52.

Mecdî Mehmed, Efendi. *Hadaiku'ş Şakaik*. Edited by Abdülkadir Özcan. Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989.

Menage, Victor. "The Beginnings of Ottoman Historiography." In *Historians of the Middle East*. Edited by Bernard Lewis. Oxford University Press, 1962.

Molla, Kemal Faruk. "Mehmed Şah Fenâri'nin Enmûzecu'l-Ulûm Adlı Eserine Göre Fetih Öncesi Dönemde Osmanlılarda İlim Anlayışı Ve İlim Tasnifi." *Dîvân İlmî Araştırmalar Dergisi* 18, (2005): 245-73.

Murphey, Rhodes. "Ottoman Historical Writing in the Seventeenth-Century: A Survey of the General Development of the Genre after the Reign of Sultan Aḥmed I (1603-1617)." In *Essays on Ottoman Historians*. Istanbul: Eren Yayınları, 2009.

Nev'î. *Divân*. Edited by Ali Tanyeri ,Mertol Tulum. Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası, 1977.

Nev'î. *Münāẓara-i Ṭūṭī vü Zāġ*. Edited by Ömer Zülfe, Hakan Taş. Istanbul: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2009. E-book edition.

Niyazioğlu, Aslı. "Lives of a Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Sheikh: Serhoş Bali Efendi (D. 980/1572) and His Biographers." In *Şinasi Tekin'in Anısına Uygurlardan Osmanlıya*. Edited by Günay Kut, Fatma Büyükkarcı Yılmaz. 607-19. Istanbul: Simurg Kitapçılık, 2005.

———. "Ottomans Sufi Sheikhs between This World and the Hereafter: A Study of Nevʿizade ʿAṭāʾī's Biographical Dictionary." PhD diss., Harvard University, 2003.

Olgun, Tahir. *Şâir Nev'î ve Sûriye Kasîdesi*. Aydınlık Basımevi, 1937.

Öngören, Reşat. "Osmanlılar'da Devlet Ricâli-Meşâyih Münâsebetlerinin Boyutlarını Gösteren Yeni Bir Kaynak: Âli'nin Şeyh Mehmed-i Dâğî ile Alâkalı Menâkıbı." *İslâm Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1 (1997): 107-33.

Özcan, Abdülkadir. "Neşri." In *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Istanbul, 1988-.

Özer, Hande. "Nevʿi'nin Hasb-ı Hali." MA Thesis, Marmara University, 1994.

Peçevi, İbrahim. *Tarih-i Peçevi*. Istanbul: Matbaa-i Âmire, 1283 [1867].

Quinn, Sholeh Alysia. *Historical Writing During the Reign of Shah 'abbas: Ideology, Imitation, and Legitimacy in Safavid Chronicles*. Salt Lake City: Utah University Press, 2000.

Rosenthal, Franz. *A History of Muslim Historiography*. Brill Archive, 1968.

———. *Knowledge Triumphant : The Concept of Knowledge in Medieval Islam*. Brill Classics in Islam. Boston ; Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Sa'ari, Che Zarrina. "Classification of Sciences: A Comparative Study of Iḥyā''Ulūm Ai-Dīn and Al-Risālah Al-Laduniyyah." *Intellectual Discourse* 7, (1999): 53-77.

Sinanoğlu, Mustafa. "Tevhid İlmi." *Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Istanbul, 1988-. V 41; 26-27.

Solmaz, Süleyman. *Ahdî ve Gülşen-i Şu'arâsı*. Ankara: AYK Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı, 2005.

Subrahmanyam, Sanjay. "On World Historians in the Sixteenth Century." *Represantations* 91, (2005): 26-57.

Şulul, Kasım. *Kafiyeci'de Tarih Usulü*. Istanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2003.

Taşköprüzade. *Eş-Şakaik'u -Numaniye Fi Ulema'i Devlet-i Osmaniye.* Edited by Aḥmed Subhi Furat. Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi 1985.

Taşköprüzade, Aḥmed b. Mustafa. *Miftāh as-Sa'ādah Wa Misbāh as-Sıyādah Fī Mawḍu'āt Al-Ulūm*. Edited by Kamil Kamil Bakry and Abdel Wahhab Abu'l-Nur. Cairo: Dar El Kotob el-Hadissa, 1968.

Tolgay, Ömer. "Netayic el-Fünun ve XVI. yüzyıl Türk düşüncesi". MA Thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 1989.

Tolgay, Ömer. *Nev'i Efendi: İlimlerin Özü: Netayic El-Fünun*. Istanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1995.

Treiger, Alexander. "Al-Ghazâli's Classifications of the Sciences and the Descriptions of the Highest Theoretical Science." *Dîvân* 16 (2011/1): 1-32.

Türker, Ömer. "İslam Düşüncesinde İlimler Tasnifi." *Sosyoloji Dergisi* 22 (2011): 533-56.

Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. *Osmanlı Devlet'inin İlmiye Teşkilâtı*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1965.

———. *Osmanlı Tarihi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1988.

Vesel, Živa. *Les Encyclopédies Persanes: Essai De Typologie et de Classification Des Sciences*. Editions Recherce Sur Les Civilisations Bibliothéque Iranienne 31. Paris: Recherche sur les civilisations, 1986.

Woodhead, Christine. "Reading Ottoman Şehnames: Official Historiography in the Late Sixteenth Century." *Studia Islamica*, 104/105 (2007): 67-80.