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This dissertation explores the study and interpretation of the Divan (poetry collection) of Hafiz of Shiraz (d. ca. 1389), the most celebrated lyric poet of classical Persian, in the sixteenth-century Ottoman Empire and discusses the ways in which Hafiz’s Persian text was read, glossed and translated by Ottoman scholars. In terms of its scope, the dissertation focuses on a late sixteenth-century Ottoman Turkish commentary by Ahmed Sudi (d. ca. 1600), an Ottoman scholar of Arabic and Persian philology who is well-known primarily for his grammatical commentaries on Persian classics. The main concern of the dissertation is to explore and discuss the ways in which Sudi’s grammatical commentary on Hafiz’s Divan departs from the mystical/allegorical commentaries written by his predecessors Muslihiddin Süruri (d. 1561), an Ottoman Naqshbandi scholar renowned for his mystical commentaries on Persian classics, and Şem’ullah Şem’i (d. 1603), an Ottoman scholar affiliated with the Mavlavi order and the author of a number of allegorical/mystical commentaries on Persian classics.
Reading Sudi’s commentary against the background of his predecessors’ and paying attention to the critical tone underlying his work, the dissertation demonstrates how an Ottoman scholar with a disciplinary training in Arabic and Persian philology presents his commentary as a critique not only of the canon of mystical scholarship but also of the textual and interpretive practices associated with it. In this regard, the dissertation argues that the primary motivation behind Sudi’s writing a non-canonical commentary is his pioneering attempt at introducing a grammatical approach to textual interpretation into the sixteenth-century Ottoman mystical scholarship on Persian classics.
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INTRODUCTION

The Topic, Scope and Argument of the Dissertation

There are three sixteenth-century Ottoman Turkish commentaries on the *Divan* (poetry collection) of Hafiz of Shiraz (d. ca. 1390), one of the most celebrated lyric poets of Persia as well as of the late medieval and early modern literary world, by Ottoman commentators belonging to different schools of interpretation. These commentaries are written, respectively, by Muslihüddin Süruri (d. 1561), a Naqshbandi scholar renowned for his mystical commentaries on Persian classics, Şem‘ullah Şem‘i (d. 1603), a scholar affiliated with the Mavlavi order and the author of a number of allegorical/mystical commentaries on Persian classics, and, finally, by Ahmed Sudi (d. ca. 1600), an Ottoman scholar of Arabic and Persian philology who is well-known for his grammatical commentaries on Persian classics and on the major works of Arabic grammatical tradition.

Of the three commentaries on the *Divan*, the dissertation focuses on Ahmed Sudi’s late sixteenth-century commentary. In the first part of the dissertation, first I introduce Sudi’s life and works before discussing his commentary in terms of its content and structure. As part of my discussion of the commentary, I also explore and discuss its reception and circulation by drawing on the available manuscript copies. Following this discussion, I focus on a selected portion from the commentary and discuss the ways in which Sudi analyzes, translates and interprets the opening couplet of Hafiz’s *Divan*. In my discussion, I also situate Sudi’s treatment of Hafiz’s text within a comparative framework to explore and elaborate on the ways in which Sudi’s
approach and analysis depart from those of his predecessors. Third, I draw conclusions primarily from my analyses and supplement these conclusions with the ones drawn from my general discussion of Sudi’s life and works and of his commentary. Here I mainly contextualize Sudi and his commentary based on my findings and conclusions. In doing so, I place Sudi’s commentary in two main contexts: one involving the Ottoman commentary tradition on Hafiz and his text, the other related to the study of Persian grammar and Persian classical texts in sixteenth-century Ottoman scholarship. In the second part of the dissertation, first I present the transcribed text of Sudi’s introduction to the commentary and his commentary on the first five poems in Hafiz’s *Divan*, mainly because of the fact that a reliable text of Sudi’s commentary is still unavailable despite the wide popularity of the commentary. Second, I give the transcribed texts of Süruri’s and Şem’i’s introductory words to their commentaries and of their commentaries on the opening poem of Hafiz’s *Divan*, not only to make Süruri’s and Şem’i’s texts available but also to let readers compare and contrast Sudi’s text with those of his predecessors. Finally, I present translations of the three commentators’ introductions and their commentaries on the opening couplet of Hafiz with the goal that my discussion of the Ottoman commentaries on Hafiz’ text be more accessible to non-specialists, especially to scholars specializing in different textual and/or exegetical traditions.

The main reason why the dissertation focuses on Sudi’s commentary is that, in the corpus of writings on Hafiz’s poetry up to the end of the sixteenth century, it is the first and only text that does not approach Hafiz’s poems from a mystical and/or allegorical standpoint. Furthermore, the commentary is written as a critical response to the two preceding commentaries written in the same century, which is understood from the commentator’s introduction where he distances himself from his predecessors’ mystical/allegorical perspectives.
and expresses his interest in a grammatical analysis of the poet’s text. Taken together, these two intriguing aspects of the commentary present us with an interesting case that invites scholarly inquiry.

The main argument of the dissertation is that, as a critique of the mystical canon, Sudi’s commentary stands as a non-canonical commentary written by a scholar who takes a pioneering approach to Hafiz’s Divan. Accordingly, the dissertation contends that, as an Ottoman scholar with a disciplinary training in Arabic and Persian philology, Sudi presents his commentary as a critique not only of the canon of mystical scholarship but also of the textual and interpretive practices associated with it. In this regard, the dissertation particularly argues that the primary motivation behind Sudi’s writing a grammatical commentary is his pioneering attempt at introducing philological insights and methods of textual study into the sixteenth-century Ottoman canon of mystical criticism and interpretation.
PART I
CHAPTER I

Ahmed Sudi and His Commentary on Hafiz’s Divan

This chapter consists of two parts. I present the life and works of the sixteenth-century Ottoman scholar Ahmed Sudi (d. ca. 1600) in the first part, where I draw on the information found in primary and secondary sources as well as on the biographical anecdotes Sudi mentions in his own works.¹ In the second part, I introduce Sudi’s commentary on Hafiz’s Divan (poetry collection) and discuss its textual and contextual aspects. Placing a special emphasis on the textual history of Sudi’s commentary, my discussion in this second part is based on a manuscript corpus that comprises a range of copies of Sudi’s text including the oldest ones.

1. The Life and Works of an Ottoman Philologist

1.1 Sudi’s life, scholarly training and career

Born in Ottoman Bosnia at a village named Sudiçi, Ahmed Sudi received his early schooling in Sarajevo, which is understood from an anecdote he mentions in his commentary on Sa’di’s Gulistan (The Rose Garden).² To receive a higher education, Sudi came to the Ottoman capital

¹ The available information about Sudi’s biography and/or his works is very limited in scope. In terms of primary sources, it is only in the following two Ottoman sources that we find an entry on Sudi’s life and works: Nev’i-zade Atayi (1583–1635)’s biographical work titled Hadaiku’l-Hakaik (The Gardens of Truths) and Katib Çelebi (1609–1657)’s Fezleke-i Tevarih (The Epitome of Histories), a chronicle which covers the 1591–1654 period of the Ottoman history. For Atayi’s entry on Sudi, see Hadaiku’l-Hakaik fi Tekmileti’ş-Şakaik, ed. Abdulkadir Özcan (Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989), 332. For Katip Çelebi’s, see Fezleke-i Katib Çelebi, vol. 1 (Istanbul: Ceride-i Havadis Matbaası, 1871), 7. In terms of secondary sources, the only work on Sudi’s life and oeuvre is the following monograph by M. Nazif Hoca: Sudi: Hayatı, Eserleri ve İki Risalesi’nin Metni (Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1980). The most recent and complete source on Sudi and his works is the following encyclopedia article by Muhammed Aruçi: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Islam Ansiklopedisi, s.v. “Sudi Bosnevi”. The only biography of Sudi that is available in English is an encyclopedia article by Kathleen Burrell, where Burrell draws broadly on Hoca’s monograph in presenting the commentator’s biography. See Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd ed., s.v. “Sudi, Ahmed” [Leiden: Brill, 1997].

Istanbul during the ascendancy of the Bosnian-born Grand Vizier Sokollu Mehmed Pasha (r. 1565–1579). Although it can be said that Sudi benefited from the patronage of Sokollu Mehmed Pasha, we do not know the details regarding his relations with the Grand Vizierate. Nor do we have any information about his course of studies in Istanbul. It is certain, however, that Sudi left the city of Istanbul and travelled to the eastern parts of the empire to further his studies and research after he completed his higher education. This information is attested to by the fact that Sudi mentions the cities he stayed as well as the scholars he worked with in several places of his commentary on Sa’di’s Gülistan. First, Sudi travelled to the city of Amid, one of the major centers of learning and trade in the eastern lands of the empire. In this city Sudi studied under the renowned scholar of Persian grammar Muslihüddin-i Lari (ca. 1510–1572), who was appointed, by then the Ottoman governor of the city, İskender Pasha, as a müderris (professor) to the medrese (college of higher learning) named after Hüsrev Pasha. As understood from Sudi’s references in his commentary on the Gülistan, he regularly attended Lari’s classes at the medrese and consulted him for some difficult passages from Sa’di’s text. Following his stay in Amid, Sudi travelled to the Arab lands under the Ottoman rule. First he stayed in Damascus, where he found a chance to study under the famous Persian scholars Ahmed-i Kazvini and Sabuhi-i Bedahşani. Especially, Sudi read and studied the Gulistan under the guidance of these two scholars.

---

3 Hoca, Sudi, 12.
4 A native of Lar, al-Lari studied first in Shiraz under Mir Giyas al-Din Mansur Shirazi. After completing his early education, al-Lari went to India and was well received by Sultan Humayun (r. 1530-1556). On Humayun’s death, he went on the pilgrimage to Mecca and thence to Istanbul. As the Persian historian Hasan-i Rumlu (b. ca. 1531) notes in his history, al-Lari was well received and honored in Istanbul by the Ottoman Sultan Selim II [Ahsan al-Tawārīkh, ed. ‘Abd al-Husayn-i Nawā’ī (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Bābak, 1978), 586]. Al-Lari’s main work is his Mir’āt al-Adwār wa Mīrqāt al-Akhbār (The Mirror of the Times and the Ladder of the Histories), which is a general history from the Creation to the accession of Sultan Selim II. For further information on al-Lari, see Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd ed., s. v. “Muslih al-Din al-Lari” and C. A. Storey, Persian Literature: A Bio-bibliographical Survey, vol. 1 (London: Luzac, 1935), 116.
5 For Sudi’s references to Lari, see Yılmaz, 348, 650 and 688.
scholars. One scholar who played a particularly significant role in Sudi’s education in Damascus is Halimi-i Şirvani, who is, as understood from Sudi’s laudatory remarks in his commentaries, one of the distinguished Persian scholars and poets of the time. From the same remarks, it is also understood that Şirvani instructed Sudi in Persian classics including Sa’di’s *Gülistan* and Hafiz’s *Divan*. From an anecdote recorded in his commentary on the *Gülistan*, it appears that Sudi attended one of the *medreses* in Damascus and studied Arabic linguistics and grammar. As described in Sudi’s anecdote, it was a *medrese* that attracted many students from all over the Eastern world, from the land of Rum (Ottoman Anatolia) to Samarqand in Central Asia.

After staying in Amid and Damascus, Sudi went to Baghdad and continued his training and studies. One particular scholar Sudi met in this city was Mevlana Efdalüddin, whom Sudi asked for assistance in the interpretation of some couplets from Hafiz’s *Divan*. In Baghdad Sudi also held conversations with some of the knowledgeable merchants from Persian lands and asked them their opinions about some aspects of Persian material culture and practices that are mentioned in Sa’di’s *Gülistan, Bustan* (The Orchard) and Hafiz’s *Divan*. The last city Sudi visited during his travels across the Arab lands is Egypt, though we have almost no information about the details regarding his scholarly work there. The only piece of information that indicates Sudi’s stay in Egypt for a while is a few anecdotes that he mentions in his commentary on Sa’di’s *Bustan* as well as in his commentary on Hafiz. Finally, it should be noted that Sudi did not travel to Persian lands or visit the city of Shiraz, the hometown of Sa’di and Hafiz. The reason for thinking so is that Sudi makes it clear, in his commentary on Hafiz, that all the

---

6 For Sudi’s references to Kazvini and Bedahşani, see Yılmaz, 348 and 650.
7 For Sudi’s references to Şirvani in his commentary on the *Gülistan*, see Yılmaz, 588 and 650. For the reference in his commentary on Hafiz’s *Divan*, see Şerh-i *Divan-i Hafiz*, vol. 2 (Istanbul, 1834), 190.
8 Yılmaz, 700–701.
9 Şerh-i *Divan-i Hafiz*, vol. 2, 191.
10 Şerh-i *Bustan*, vol. 1 (Istanbul, 1871), 482.
information he gives about Shiraz and Hafiz’s tomb is based not on his personal observations but on the written and oral sources which he had access to.\footnote{Şerh-i Divan-ı Hafız, vol. 2, 105 and 331.}

Taken together, it is obvious that the various scholars whom Sudi met with and studied under in a wide range of cities across the eastern lands of the empire provided him with a thorough education in Arabic and Persian grammar, instructed him in the classical texts of Persian language, and expanded his acquaintance with Persian literary and cultural tradition. In addition, it is also clear that Sudi’s travels to and stays in these cities brought him in close contact with the scholarship on his subject. Last but not least, it is also evident that his travels enabled Sudi to have access to the knowledge that he later incorporated into the commentaries he began writing upon his return to Istanbul. This is understood especially from a couple of remarks that he makes in his commentaries on the \textit{Gulistan}, \textit{Bustan} and Hafiz’s \textit{Divan}.\footnote{For Sudi’s remarks about the consultations he had with a variety of Persian scholars to discuss the grammatical and semantic aspects of a particular passage from Sa’di’s \textit{Gulistan}, see Yılmaz, 339. For a series of consultations he had with scholars in different cities to discuss the meaning of a specific couplet from Hafiz’s \textit{Divan}, see Şerh-i Divan-ı Hafız, vol. 2, 190–191.}

Returning to Istanbul, Sudi continued his studies and attended the \textit{medrese} lectures of some famous scholars of the reign of Murad III (r.1574–1595).\footnote{In his monograph, Hoca notes that Sudi does not mention the names of these scholars in any of his commentaries. However, based on the available information on the reign of Murad III, Hoca argues that these scholars include, among others, Hoca Takiyyüddin (d. 1585), the scholar who founded an observatory in Istanbul at the behest of the Sultan, and the famous historian Hoca Sa’düddin (d. 1599). See Hoca, \textit{Sudi}, 14. For information about the reign of Murad III, see Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd ed., s.v. “Murad III”} During the ascendancy of the Bosnian Grand Vizier Sokollu Mehmed Pasha (r. 1565–1579), Sudi was appointed to the Ibrahim Pasha Palace to teach Persian to the \textit{gilman-ı hassa} (selected slave-boys).\footnote{For more information on the \textit{gilman-ı hassa}, see Mehmed Zeki Pakalın, \textit{Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü}, vol.1 (Istanbul,1993), 665.} Given that Sokollu Mehmed Pasha was “the man who in fact had virtually total control over appointments,” it can be said that Sudi had close relations with Mehmed Pasha.\footnote{Cornell H. Fleischer, \textit{Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Âli} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 55.}
strengthened by the fact that Mehmed Pasha was notorious for “reserving discretionary appointments for certain relatives and adherents.” This prestigious position given to Sudi involved the training of those slave-boys selected for administrative services in the Ottoman palace. As Yusuf Halaçoğlu notes, the İbrahim Pasha Palace, along with the palaces in Edirne and Galata, was one of the primary centers of royal education, where those Christian boys converted to Islam were raised and educated according to the Turkish and Islamic traditions. Sudi held his position for a while, until he was finally divested of his position and was forced to retirement. Sudi’s exact date of death is unknown, but he is believed to have died shortly after 1599.

Before looking at Sudi’s works, what is especially significant to note regarding Sudi’s life story is that it presents us with an Ottoman scholar of language and literature who undertook scholarly travels spanning the major centers of learning in the sixteenth-century Ottoman Empire, where he was trained primarily in Arabic and Persian linguistics and conducted detailed research on the texts he later wrote commentaries on.

1.2 Sudi’s works

Ahmed Sudi is noted mainly as a commentator on Hafiz’s Divan and Sa’di’s Gülistan and Bustan. On a general look, one can see that Sudi’s available works are divided into three groups. The first group consists of his large-scale commentaries on three Persian classics, namely the Divan, Gülistan and Bustan. The second group includes his three small-scale commentaries: two on Ibn Hacib (d. 1249)’s Arabic grammars and one on İbrahim Şahidi (d. 1556)’s Persian-Turkish dictionary. What is common about these three works is that they are the standard texts used in language instruction, inside or out of the classroom. In the final group, we have Sudi’s

---

17 Fleischer, 56.
19 Hoca, Sudi, 16.
two lengthy treatises on two particular couplets, one from Hafiz’s *Divan* and the other from Sa’di’s *Gulistan*.20

### 1.2.1 His commentaries on Persian classics

1.2.1.1 Şerh-i Dīvān-i Hāfīz (Commentary on the *Divan* of Hafiz)21

1.2.1.2 Şerh-i Gülistān (Commentary on the *Gulistan*)

Completed in 1595, Sudi’s commentary on Sa’di’s *Gulistan* is one of his most widely read works, which is understood by the fact that the commentary has a large number of manuscript copies, that it was printed five times in Istanbul between the years 1833–1876, and that it was translated into Persian.22 As his introductory words to the commentary inform us, Sudi wrote this commentary on demand of his dear companion and patron Ömer Efendi, the governor of the city of Madina, who, as Sudi writes, asks for a Turkish commentary that would elucidate the grammatical, lexical and stylistic features of this masterpiece of the Persian language.23 The several remarks Sudi makes in his commentary serve to highlight his main concern in writing a commentary on the *Gulistan*, that is, to provide students of Persian language with a book that

---

20 The critically edited texts of both treatises are published by Nazif M. Hoca in his monograph on Sudi. Besides the works mentioned above, there are a couple of other works that are attributed to Sudi in some secondary sources. But given that there are no available copies of these works, we do not have any information about them. For the names of these works see Hoca, *Sudi*, 33–34. Also, it should be noted that in his detailed work on Turkish translations of and commentaries on the *Mesnevi*, Ismail Güleç writes that Sudi has a commentary on Mevlana Celaleddin-i Rumi (d. 1273)’s six-volume *Mesnevi*. As Güleç informs us, however, a large portion of Sudi’s commentary is missing. The extant portion contains only Sudi’s elucidation of a section from the last volume of the *Mesnevi*. For further information about Sudi’s commentary, see Güleç’s *Türk Edebiyatında Mesnevi Tercüme ve Şerhleri* (İstanbul: Pan, 2008), 181–182.

21 Detailed information about this commentary is presented in the third section of this chapter.


23 Sudi, *Şerh-i Gülistan* (İstanbul, 1833), 2. It should be noted that Sudi’s introduction to the commentary is missing from the critically edited text given in Yılmaz’s dissertation.
would serve as a comprehensive grammar of Persian. This is also clear from Sudi’s grammatical approach to and literal interpretation of Sa’di’s text throughout his commentary.

1.2.1.3 Şerh-i Būstān (Commentary on the Bustan)

Completed in 1598, printed twice in the nineteenth century (in 1871 and 1876) in Istanbul, and later translated into Persian, Sudi’s commentary on Sa’di’s Bustan is one of his well-known works. As is the case with his works on the Gulistan and Hafiz’s Divan, the commentary is a grammatical elucidation and interpretation of Sa’di’s text and is composed at the request of Sudi’s patron and close companion Ömer Efendi, about whom Sudi says laudatory words in his introduction to the commentary. In the same introduction, Sudi reveals the main intention behind his commentary and writes that the content and scope of the commentary is designed in such a way that “those interested in learning Persian can easily use it.”

1.2.2 His commentaries on philological works

1.2.2.1 Şerh-i Kāfiye (Commentary on the Kāfiye)

Composed in 1588, this is a commentary on the famous Arabic grammarian Ibn Hacib (d. 1249)’s book on Arabic syntax (al-nahv) titled al-Kāfiye (The Sufficient). What is significant about the commentary is that in the introduction Sudi presents a historical survey of the Arabic grammatical tradition and highlights the works and contributions of major Arabic grammarians.

---

24 See especially Sudi’s remark at the beginnings of his commentary, where he makes it clear that this commentary is intended for the “talib-i tahsil-i Farsi” (learners of Persian). See Yılmaz, 324.
25 For a discussion of Sudi’s approach to the Gulistan, see Yılmaz, 254–264.
28 Ibid., 2–3. The translation above reads: “Farsi ta’lliüümüne raqib olanlar eshel vech ile istifade ildp...”
29 For the life and works of Ibn al-Hacib, see Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd ed., s.v. “Ibn al-Hajib” and Carl Brockelmann, Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur, vol. 1 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1943), 367–373. Sudi’s commentary is printed as part of a three-volume edition that brings together the three major commentaries on al-Kāfiye, one in Arabic, one in Persian, and one in Ottoman Turkish (the one by Sudi). See Şuruh’i’-Kāfiye Se Zeban: Arabi, Farsi, Türki, ed. Osman Hilmi Karahisari, Istanbul, 1894. For manuscript copies of the commentary, see Hoca, Sudi, 32–33.
30 MS Atif Efendi 2449, Süleymaniye Library (Istanbul), fols. 1b–3b.
1.2.2.2 Şerh-i Şafiye

This is a commentary on Ibn Hacib’s other book on Arabic grammar, al-Şafiye (The Satisfactory), which is about Arabic morphology (al-sarf). The commentary survives in only one manuscript, which does not feature an introductory section and has no date of composition at the end.  

1.2.2.3 Şerh-i Lugat-i Şahidi (Commentary on Şahidi’s Dictionary)

This is a commentary on perhaps the most popular and widely used Persian-Turkish dictionary in the sixteenth-century Ottoman Empire, which was written in 1515 by the Ottoman scholar İbrahim Şahidi (d. 1556) and was followed by many commentaries. Sudi’s commentary is extant only in one undated manuscript, which does not contain an introduction. What is significant to note regarding Sudi’s commentary is that he gives the Turkish as well as the Arabic equivalent of each Persian word given in Şahidi’s dictionary. In addition, he explains the phonological aspects of each word listed in the dictionary and occasionally analyzes the morphological and grammatical aspects of certain words.

1.2.3 His treatises

Sudi’s first treatise is a close reading of the second couplet of Hafiz’s first poem in his Divan, where Sudi presents a grammatical analysis of the couplet as well as comments on its prosody, rhyme structure and the poetic devices used by the poet. In the introduction, Sudi mentions that he decided to write this treatise after a class session on the poetry of Hafiz, in which the discussion, led by one of his mentors in Istanbul, was centered on the grammatical and

31 See MS Darülmesnevi 530, which is located in Suleymaniye Library.
32 MS Suleymaniye 866, Suleymaniye Library. For Şahidi’s life, works, and his dictionary, see Yusuf Öz, Tarih Boyunca Farsça-Türkçe Sözlükler (Ankara: TDK, 2010), 138–143. For the available commentaries on Şahidi’s dictionary, see the same author’s Tuhfe-i Şahidi Şerhleri (Konya: Selçuk University, 1999).
33 See, for instance, MS Suleymaniye 866, fols 2a–4a.
semantic intricacies of the opening poem and especially of its second line. In the same introduction, Sudi also presents a brief biography of Hafiz, a lengthier version of which is found in his introduction to his commentary on the Divan. In his second treatise, Sudi studies a couplet from Sa’di’s Gülistan from the same grammatical point of view.

Taken together, what these two treatises show us is that Sudi wrote preliminary pieces prior to working on his voluminous commentaries and that these pieces laid the foundation for his future work. The same treatises also indicate that Sudi continued his research on the Divan and Gulistan after returning to Istanbul and attended those scholarly gatherings where Persian classics were read and discussed.

2. Sudi’s Commentary on Hafiz’s Divan

Completed in 1595, Sudi’s Ottoman Turkish commentary on Hafiz’s Divan (poetry collection) is acknowledged as his most widely read and famous work. In the vast scholarship on Hafiz, the commentary is well received and unanimously accepted as the “most useful” commentary on Hafiz’s poetry. The usefulness of the commentary hinges on the fact that Sudi gives, in Annemarie Schimmel’s words, “sober, grammatical explanations” and thus renders Hafiz’s intricate poems clear, comprehensible and accessible to a broad spectrum of readers. This also hints at the reason why, echoing Schimmel, this “dry but useful” commentary found a

---

35 It is important to note in this connection that Sudi mentions his treatises in his commentaries on the Gulistan and Divan and refers his readers who are interested in learning more about these two couplets to them. For Sudi’s reference to his treatise on Hafiz’s couplet, see the critically edited text I present in the appendices of the dissertation. For the reference to his treatise on Sa’di’s couplet, see Yılmaz, 376.
36 For more information about these two treatises, see Hoca, Sudi, 35–47.
37 That the manuscript copies of Sudi’s text exist across a wide range of repositories located from Eastern Europe to Arab lands is an indication of the widespread fame of the commentary (For a discussion of the manuscript corpus of the text see section 3.2). Also, the commentary was printed twice: first in 1834 in Bulak, Egypt, and then in 1872 in Istanbul. Moreover, it was also translated into Persian in 1962 and was printed four times. See, for instance, the following fourth edition of the Persian translation: Ismat Sattarzadah, Sharh-i Sudi bar Hafiz, 4 vols. (Urumiyah: Intisharat-i Anzali, 1983).
wide readership in both Ottoman and modern times. A cursory look at Sudi’s voluminous commentary is enough to see that the commentator elucidates Hafiz’s verse in a methodological manner and with an emphasis on the grammatical aspects of his poems. Given this general picture, Sudi’s work can be considered as a grammatical/philological commentary, in which the principles of language and grammar are used to elucidate the meaning of the source text. In this regard, the way in which Sudi elucidates Hafiz’s poetry is in contrast to the one found in moral/allegorical commentaries, where attempt is made to uncover the hidden meaning, wisdom or morality lying under the surface of the source text. Considering the historical trajectory of Hafizian hermeneutics, one can even argue that, as a grammatical and literal interpretation of Hafiz’s poetry, Sudi’s commentary presents us with an interpretive shift and therefore departs from the preceding commentary tradition which approaches Hafiz’s poetry through mystical interpretations and allegorical explanations.

The mystical/allegorical orientation of the Hafiz commentaries springs mainly from the poet’s recognition as “the Tongue of the Unseen” and “the Interpreter of Mysteries.” Combined with the legacy of his Divan as “the Persian Qur’an” used for bibliomancy, it can be said that Hafiz’s established recognition has preconditioned most of the commentators to focus more on the mystical and/or allegorical aspects of his poems. It would be reductive, however, to suggest that commentators’ preoccupation with the esoteric aspects of Hafiz’s poems can be ascribed only to the legacy of the poet and his text. The reason for thinking so is that the common exegetical tendency toward unveiling the secret or hidden meanings in Hafiz’s poetry is also related to the scholarly backgrounds and concerns of the commentators and to the needs and interests of their audiences. Beginning with the first partial commentaries in Persian and

---

continuing with the complete ones in Ottoman, one can see that the majority of Hafiz’s commentators come from a religious background and are affiliated to certain mystical orders or schools of Islamic philosophy. Consequently, their scholarly oeuvres reflect a theological and/or mystical orientation. One can see the same orientation in the readers’ perceptions of and interests in Hafiz. The poet attracts various audiences mainly as a mystical guide and spiritual master, and his poems are sought after especially by seekers of spiritual enlightenment and wisdom. In this regard, it can be said that the audiences’ tendency toward esotericism have led commentators focus more on the mystical/allegorical aspects of Hafiz’s verses and delve into deeper levels of reading. Accordingly, this tendency has resulted in less focus on the explicit aspects that are accessible on the surface level of the same verses.

In the triangle of poet–commentator–audience, the role of audience is especially significant. If one remembers the advice that “when speaking of commentaries, which cannot escape the fundamental need to be useful, the concept of ‘audience’ is a particularly pressing one,” then, the readerly orientation of the Hafiz commentaries becomes noteworthy. In this respect, it is important to pay attention to the introductory sections of the commentaries on Hafiz.

---

39 One of the earliest commentators on Hafiz’s poetry, the Persian scholar Jalal al-Din Davvani (1427–1502), was trained in Islamic theology and philosophy. The author of several commentaries and treatises on the major texts of Islamic philosophy, Davvani was the supreme judge at the court of the Aqqoyunlu ruler Uzun Hasan and then of Sultan Ya’qub. Davvani wrote, beginning with the second half of the fifteenth century, “half a dozen short untitled texts commenting on various verses by Hafiz.” Davvani’s interpretation of Hafiz is one of the first theological/mystical readings of Hafiz’s poetry and his method depends, in the words of Carl Ernst, “upon reading individual words and coded symbols that metaphorically represent unstated realities” (Carl W. Ernst, “Jalāl al-Dīn Davvānī’s Interpretation of Hāfīz” in Hafiz and the Religion of Love in Classical Persian Poetry, ed. Leonard Lewisohn (London: I.B.Tauris, 2010), 198–199). On Davvani, see also Bahadur Baqiri, Farhang-i Sharbha-yi Hafiz (Tehran: Intisharat-i Amir Kabir, 2008), 30 and A History of Muslim Philosophy, vol. 2, 883–888. The same mystical/religious orientation is also evident in the scholarly background and hermeneutical approach of the first two Ottoman commentators of Hafiz. Süruri (d. 1562), the first commentator, was a renowned scholar of tafsir (Quranic exegesis) and hadith (Prophet’s traditions) and had strong affiliations with the Naqshbandi order (cf. İsmail Güleç, “Gelibolulu Musluhiddin Sürûri,” Osmanlı Araştırmaları 21 (2001): 211–215). In the same vein, the second commentator, Şem’i (d. 1603), belongs to the Mavâvî order and is the author of the first complete Turkish commentary on Rumi’s Masnavi (cf. Şeyda Öztürk, “Şem’î’nin Mesnevî Şerhi,” (PhD. Diss., Marmara University, 2007), 57–63).

where commentators underline the fact that it is their audience who leads them to write a commentary. As their introductory words clearly indicate, commentators decide writing a commentary on Hafiz to respond to the importunities of their audiences. In the same introductory remarks, we also see that the several queries commentators receive and respond to before they begin their work on Hafiz focus, almost exclusively, on the mystical meaning and/or interpretation of Hafiz’s certain lines, couplets or poems. In other words, Hafiz’s readers seem to be uninterested in the explicit aspects of his text, such as linguistic, formal or rhetorical structure of his poems. Facing such a predominant readerly interest to know about the implied aspects, commentators turn their focus toward exploring the mystical grounds of Hafiz’s text. Since this is the case, it can be argued that audiences do not only inspire the commentators but also shape the content and direction of their work.

Returning to Sudi’s commentary, it would not be inaccurate to argue that Sudi’s work can be described as a non-canonical text given the predominant mystical/allegorical interpretive framework through which Hafiz’s text has been perceived, read, studied, commented on and decoded. What distinguishes Sudi’s commentary from his predecessors’ is that it neither attempts at a mystical/allegorical interpretation of Hafiz’s text nor proposes to address some mystical or theological issues raised by Hafiz’s readers. Completely uninterested in disclosing the underlying meanings of Hafiz’s verse or untangling the mystical/allegorical texture of his words, Sudi does not structure his commentary as a response to the needs of those seeking for spiritual guidance or moral help from Hafiz. Accordingly, he does not employ the common interpretive strategy of metonymy or poetic symbolism in elucidating Hafiz’s poetry along the lines of mysticism. In

---

41 See, for instance, Davvani’s introductions to his several treatises on Hafiz: Jalal al-Din Davvani, Naqd-i Niyazi, ed. Husayn Mu’allim (Tehran: Intisharat-i Amir Kabir, 1995), 41–43; 172–180, and 267. Similarly, for the queries of the Ottoman readers of Hafiz, see Süruri’s introduction to his commentary: MS Ayasofya 4056, Süleymaniye Library (Istanbul), fol. 1b.
addition, contrary to most commentators of Hafiz, Sudi does not intend to make connections between Hafiz’s text and the fundamental texts of Sufism, nor interweaves his commentary with mystical allegories or doctrines that are common to Sufi hermeneutics.

Standing outside of the religio-mystical circle of the Hafizian commentary tradition, Sudi’s text presents a new path to reading and interpreting Hafiz’s poetry. Unlike the common path of mysticism, this new path leads the readers to the explicit aspect(s) of Hafiz’s text through a grammatical analysis and literal interpretation of the poems. The question of what drives the commentator to embark on such a new path should be explored by paying special attention to the triangular framework of commentary production. As is the case in mystical/allegorical commentaries, the determinant component of the triangle is the audience at which the commentary is aimed, although the role of the commentator’s scholarly background and interests cannot be underestimated. Sudi’s audience-oriented approach can be inferred from his following introductory words to the commentary, which he puts in the mouth of his companion and patron Ömer Efendi, the governor of the city of Madina:

[T]his is what I ask of you: you should write a commentary on Hafiz’s Divan in such a way that it would be useful to seekers and beneficial for beginners. In short, it would not suggest any extended meaning or mystical interpretation but just explain the grammar [of the text] following the methods of Arabic language study and restrict itself to the basic meaning of the verses.42

Here Ömer Efendi’s request for a non-mystical commentary on Hafiz’s text reflects an audience-oriented concern. Based on Ömer Efendi’s words, it can be said that, unlike the typical Hafizian audience, which consists mainly of seekers of mystical guidance, the one referred to in Sudi’s passage is not mystically or spiritually inclined or motivated. Rather, Sudi’s audience seems to

cover those aspiring yet beginning students of Persian language, who are acquainted with Arabic language and grammar and interested in studying a Persian text composed by a poet who is renowned for his command of the language. Seen in this light, the implied audience seems to be interested in Hafiz’s Divan not as a book of mystical secrets but as a text-book for grammatical study. As a literal interpretation based on close grammatical analysis, Sudi’s commentary is intended to supplement this text-book and thus be “useful” to these students who are going to study the language of Hafiz’s text following Arabic grammatical methodology. One significant aspect of the above-quoted passage is Ömer Efendi’s reference to Arabic grammatical tradition, which, one can argue, gives some clues as to the nature of the audience. That Sudi undertakes a grammatical and literal analysis of Hafiz’s Persian text following the methods and terminology employed by Arabic grammarians can be taken to argue that Sudi’s intended audience already has an established background in Arabic grammatical tradition. If we also take into account that Sudi often explains the various grammatical aspects of Hafiz’s Persian couplets by making use of Arabic grammatical rules, definitions and terms, then, the audience’s Arabic background becomes salient.\textsuperscript{43} When we correlate the Arabic underpinnings of Sudi’s commentary with the audience’s background and knowledge in Arabic, then we can propose that, in Sudi’s case, the audience of Hafiz’s text is the members of a classroom community, where Arabic is the principal language used for Islamic higher education. In such a scenario, Sudi’s commentary can be envisioned as a text designed to serve the needs of the students who receive a formal education and study Hafiz’s Divan as part of the curriculum. Taken as a whole, these textually verifiable assumptions indicate that Sudi’s commentary is the product of a language scholar who, upon requests from his students and following the advice of his dear patron, composes a philological

\textsuperscript{43} For Sudi’s references to Arabic grammar, see, for instance, his elucidation of the first and fourth couplets of Hafiz’s opening poem (the transcribed texts are given in the second part of the dissertation).
commentary that will accompany the text book (namely, Hafiz’s Divan) he uses for teaching Persian language and grammar. Accordingly, the classroom environment in which Hafiz’s text and Sudi’s commentary co-exist presents a shift from the common religio-mystical milieus where the ‘mainstream’ commentaries on Hafiz are produced and used.

As an ‘exception’ to canonical readings of Hafiz, Sudi’s commentary presents us with an intriguing situation and invites further exploration. In what follows, first I delineate and discuss the structure and content of the commentary based on a selected portion. Then I focus my attention on the textual history of the commentary and explore the reception, transformation and circulation of this non-canonical commentary in Ottoman and modern times.

2.1 Laying out the commentary: structure and content

Aside from the textual evidence, the following biographical information can be used to substantiate the classroom hypothesis: as repeated in most of the sources, Sudi taught Persian to the “ghilman-i kхassa” (slave boys) at the Ibrahim Pasha Palace, which was one of the primary centers of royal education where the young Christian boys levied from the European provinces of the empire were educated (Atаі, Hadaiku’l-Hakаikt, 332). One other information related, albeit indirectly, to the teaching of Hafiz’s text in a classroom setting comes from an introductory passage prefixed to Sudi’s treatise on the second couplet of Hafiz’s first ghazal, which Sudi wrote before his commentary on Hafiz. In this passage, Sudi mentions that he wrote this brief piece while attending the classes of his master, who was one of the famous scholars of the time of Murad III (r. 1574–1595). Sudi also adds that the idea for writing on this second couplet came one day after a class session, when his master told him that it would be good to have a Turkish treatise that will elucidate the intricacies of this couplet (Risale-i Sudi Efendi, 3–4). Although limited in scope, Sudi’s anecdote can still be relied on to argue that Hafiz’s text was in circulation at least in some of the educational institutions of the late sixteenth-century Istanbul. Given that Sudi expanded his treatise into a complete commentary on Hafiz, it can be therefore assumed that, as a junior scholar attending the classes of senior scholars and studying Hafiz’s poetry, he felt the lack of a ‘classroom-friendly commentary’ and thus produced a grammatical commentary that will serve as a handbook for students of Hafiz.

Edited based on the two oldest extant copies of the commentary, MSS 1641 and K.933 respectively, the selected portion includes Sudi’s elucidation of the first five poems in Hafiz’s poetry collection. My discussion of Sudi’s commentary is based on this sample text, which is presented in the second part of the dissertation. Throughout my discussion, I will refer to this (transcribed) text following a certain pattern of abbreviation and numbering, which can be explained as follows: in the transcribed text, the poems, abbreviated as G, are numbered in Roman letters. The couplets of a poem are consecutively numbered in Arabic numbers. Thus the “GІ:2” reference stands for the second couplet of the first poem in the transcribed text. If necessary, the line of a couplet is referred to as “а” or “b”, depending on whether it is the first or second line. Accordingly, “GІІ:2а” indicates, for instance, the first line of the third couplet of the first poem. Finally, the lemmata given by the commentator under each couplet (or sometimes line) are numbered consecutively and indicated within square brackets. Consequently, “GІІІ:2:[1]”, for example, refers to the first lemma listed under the second couplet of the third poem. This pattern of abbreviation and numbering also applies to the transcribed texts of the commentaries of Süruri and Şem’i, which are presented in the second part of the dissertation as well.
Considered as a text in its own right, Sudi’s commentary consists of two major divisions: the source text (Hafiz’s poetry collection) and the commentary text (Sudi’s explanatory text on this collection). This division is clearly visible in the page layout of the manuscript copies of the commentary as the source text is always overlined in red ink and thus separated from the commentary text on every manuscript page. In terms of the general layout of Sudi’s text, therefore, one can observe a bipartite pattern, in which the source text, in its original language, is given first and then followed by the commentary text. Since the source text is a poetry collection where poems follow each other according to an order, in his treatment of the source text, Sudi follows the order of the poems as they appear in the available manuscript copies of Hafiz’s poetry collection and takes each poem couplet by couplet, with the exception of some occasions when a couplet is divided to provide contextual information on one of its lines.\textsuperscript{46} It is significant to note in this regard that Sudi does not cite the poems from a standard or commonly used version of Hafiz’s poetry collection. Rather, based on the available versions of Hafiz’s text, each poem of Hafiz is critically edited couplet by couplet before they appear in the commentary. This is understood from Sudi’s comments on the textual variants he identifies in the manuscripts he had access to.\textsuperscript{47} Therefore, taken as a whole, the source text given in Sudi’s commentary serves as a critical edition of Hafiz’s Divan and, as such, the commentator appears as a textual critic that establishes the text on which he comments. Besides editing Hafiz’s poems, Sudi occasionally provides information on some individual couplets or lines and thereby brings the textual contexts of the Divan to the readers’ attention.\textsuperscript{48}

Following the source text, the commentary text consists of three sections, each section corresponding to one of the following three modes of exegesis: exposition, translation, and

\textsuperscript{46} For example, GI:1a.
\textsuperscript{47} See, for example, GI:7, GH:11, and GIII:9.
\textsuperscript{48} See, for instance, GI:1a.
annotation. Among the three sections, the first section is the longest and most detailed one. What is indicative of the first section is its fragmented composition, which results from the process of segmentation. Rather than elucidating a given couplet as a whole, Sudi segments each couplet into units. Thus, through this process of segmentation, a given couplet is parsed into its lexical components following the order in which they occur in the couplet. Treated as a lemma, each lexical item employed in the couplet is then explained in terms of meaning, grammatical function, derivational pattern, and if necessary, of spelling, pronunciation, and usage. Consisting of lemmas overlined in red, the first section serves as an index of a given couplet. Regarding the segmentation of the couplets into lemmas, it should also be stressed that the lexical items of a given couplet are not listed as isolated units. Rather, the commentator pays full attention to grouping certain lemmas together by considering their syntactic and semantic functions. Thus Sudi carefully distinguishes between main lemmas and sub-lemmas. That is to say, after the items grouped together are overlined in red and listed as main lemmas, the commentator proceeds to a further segmentation and divides these lemmas into sub-lemmas to be able to focus on each of them individually.\(^\text{49}\) In terms of content, the first section presents the reader with a rich repertoire of Arabic grammatical terms and concepts and a set of rules of Arabic and Persian grammar. The predominance of Arabic grammatical terminology can be explained by Sudi’s training in Arabic linguistic tradition.\(^\text{50}\) Given his scholarly training, it is not surprising to see that Sudi widely employs Arabic grammatical terms and concepts in his exposition of Hafiz’s Persian couplets. Besides this rich grammatical repertoire, in the same section one is also exposed to various references and citations made to a broad range of primary and secondary

\(^{49}\) See, for example, GI:4:[4], GI:6:[4], GII:3:[5], and GII:5:[8].

\(^{50}\) Sudi’s commentaries on Ibn al-Hajib’s *al-Shafiya* and *al-Kafiya* and his training in the cities of Damascus, Najaf and Kufa are revealing in the sense that they illustrate both his deep familiarity with the two major texts of the Arabic grammatical tradition and his training at the centers of Arabic linguistic studies.
sources. Finally, the commentator also intersperses his critical comments on the points made by the previous commentators on Hafiz as he moves through this first section.

Separated from the section of exposition by the uniform title “Mahsul-i Beyt” (the outcome of the couplet), the second section is the one in which Sudi gives a grammatically literal translation of Hafiz’s couplets. Overlined in red ink in manuscripts of the commentary, the section title is suggestive of Sudi’s method of analysis and interpretation. Considering the fact that Sudi conceives translation as an “outcome” of the analysis he makes in the first section, we come to see that there are two interrelated processes through which each couplet of Hafiz is analyzed and interpreted: in the first process, that of segmentation, a given couplet is divided into its component words and phrases. That is to say, the input couplets go through text segmentation, which is intended for detailed exposition of the components. In the second process, that of integration, individually analyzed segments are integrated, through translation, into a semantic whole that forms the “outcome” of the couplet. Therefore, although separated from each other by manuscript marks, the first two sections of the commentary text (namely those of exposition and translation) are connected by the consecutive processes of segmentation and integration. It should be also noted that the first process bears a critical significance in shaping the nature, direction and focus of Sudi’s commentary. On one hand, the exposition of the source text through segmentation gives the commentary a fragmented nature, which leads us to consider it as a lemmatic commentary in terms of textual composition. On the other, the segmentation of the source text shapes the focus of the exegesis. Through segmentation, attention is directed to the constituent lexical items of a given couplet, which further helps the commentator focus on the lemmata for close semantic and grammatical analysis.

51 I should note that the title “Mahsul-i Beyt” appears as “Mahsul-i Kelam” (the outcome of speech) when Sudi translates only a line of a couplet: see, for instance, Gl:1a.
In terms of illustrating Sudi’s approach to translation, it is important to note finally that Hafiz’s couplets (namely the source text) are rendered into simple Ottoman Turkish prose in literal translation and without giving any extended meaning to the poet’s words. Sudi’s literal translations are again related to the way he elucidates each of the individual lemmas in the first section. While giving the definition of each lemma, Sudi restricts himself to their primary or explicit meaning. Given Sudi’s avoidance in going beyond the literal level of interpretation, it is natural to expect that the “outcome” of the literally defined lemmas would be a literal translation. Besides literalness, Sudi’s translations also involve the translation of Hafiz’s Persian text into vernacular language. This becomes visible when Sudi inserts Turkish idiomatic expressions, common sayings, and proverbs in his literal translations to better illustrate the meaning of Hafiz’s words. These strategic insertions point to Sudi’s awareness on the issue of translating a fourteenth-century Persian text into the sixteenth-century Ottoman vernacular.

In the third and last section of his commentary text, Sudi annotates those semantic or syntactic aspects of Hafiz’s couplets that need further clarification. Titled alternatively “Hasıl-ı Kelam” (the result of speech) or “Ya’ni” (that is to say), this section is usually intended to supplement the translations given in the previous section. Therefore, Sudi’s elucidative notes in this section serve as interpretive annotations, in the sense that they help the readers to better interpret and contextualize the thoughts and emotions expressed in the words of Hafiz. The section is mostly a short one but might expand occasionally, especially when the commentator

52 See, for example, GII:4, GII:6, and GII:12.
53 Besides the above-mentioned two regular titles, the final section can sometimes be introduced by the title “Hasılı” (cf. GII:1), which is an abbreviated form of the title “Hasıl-ı Kelam”. It is also significant to note that in a large number of instances the commentator starts the annotative section without putting a title (cf. GI:1b, GI:2, GI:3, GII:2, GII:9, GIV:6, GV:2). In addition, as seen in the translation section, Sudi changes the section title to “Fehva-yı Kelam” (the meaning of speech) when he annotates only a line of a couplet (cf. GI:1a).
54 See, for instance, GI:1a–b, GI:3, GI:6, and GII:1.
prefers to provide a thorough explanation or description on the translated couplet. I should also note that this section is an optional one, because, upon exposing and translating a couplet, the commentator sometimes goes on to the next one without opening any annotative section. Thus, considering the fact that this last section is variable in extent and occurrence, we come to discover that it is primarily attuned to address the needs of the commentator’s assumed audience. In other words, far from being random, Sudi’s annotations are deriving from the need to avoid those ambiguous aspects in Hafiz’s text that might create confusion in the minds of his readers. In this regard, one further aspect of Sudi’s annotations is worthy of notice. As in the case of his translations, Sudi makes use of some proverbial and idiomatic expressions to better convey the meaning of Hafiz’s couplet. Thus the commentator’s pointed use of these expressions reflects, again, his readerly intentions.

It would be misleading, however, to conclude that Sudi’s annotations are limited only to the third section. On the contrary, one can identify several annotative notes both in the first and second sections of the commentary text. Unlike the interpretive annotations grouped in the third section, annotations in the first two sections appear as interspersed glosses. In terms of the way they are organized and function, however, one can make a distinction between these annotative glosses. In the exposition section, annotations are given under the title “Ma’lum ola ki” (be it known that) and are either inserted between lemmas or appended to the final lemma. These annotations are what might be called lemma-specific “informative annotations”, because, unlike the interpretive annotations, they are targeted at providing further grammatical, cultural or

---

55 See, for example, GI:6. It should be noted that in the case of expanded annotations Sudi does not give the translation of the whole couplet all at once. Rather, he translates each line separately and appends to each translation his annotations. As is the case with GI:6, the longer annotations therefore expand into the translation sections and divide them into two subsections.
56 See, for instance, GI:5.
57 See, for example, GI:6 and GV:6.
thematic information on a specific lemma.\textsuperscript{58} Annotations made in the translation section, however, are mostly brief paraphrases embedded within Sudi’s literal translations. These paraphrases are either inserted following the translation of the first line of a given couplet or attached to the translation of the couplet as a whole.\textsuperscript{59} Intended to simplify and illustrate the poetic language and expressions used in Hafiz’s couplets, Sudi’s paraphrases thus turn some of his translations into annotated translations.

What can be inferred from the general observations made so far is that Sudi’s commentary engages with Hafiz’s text through the following four means: critical edition, lemmatic exposition, literal translation, and interpretive annotation. Among the four, Sudi’s editing of Hafiz’s text falls under the category of textual criticism. As an act of interpretation, each of the remaining three means of textual engagement is a distinct yet interrelated component of Sudi’s commentary, forming together a tripartite exegetical framework of exposition, translation, and annotation. These three modes of textual engagement can be considered as interpretive practices belonging to the commentary genre. Seen in this light, the variety and complexity of Sudi’s text as a commentary becomes striking, which leads us to analyze the mechanisms through which these interpretive practices operate and intersect with one other within Sudi’s exegetical framework. Before focusing on the selected sample to embark on such an analysis, however, attention needs to be devoted to the two hallmarks of Sudi’s commentary.

The first is the frequent occurrence of references and citation, which plays a significant role in supplementing and cementing Sudi’s tripartite exegetical framework. The commentator’s

\textsuperscript{58} For the informative annotations made in passing from one lemma to another, see GI:2:[8], GI:3:[3], GI:4:[8], GII:4:[9]. For the ones appended to the end of the lemmata, see, for instance, GI:1a and GIV:1. Besides the above-mentioned title, the informative annotations might also be occasionally given under the title “Hasıl-ı Kelam” (cf. GIV:2:[1]). Although not common, when the annotation involves more than one specific lemma and thus requires more space than the one provided between lemmas, then, the commentator moves his informative annotation to the end of the third section of his commentary text (cf. GI:2).

reference to other sources serves to substantiate the explanations or interpretations presented throughout the commentary. Far from being random or bound by convention, explicit or implicit references made by the commentator to a variety of sources are intentional and systematic in that they address those aspects related to his grammatical and literal reading of Hafiz’s text and only occur when exemplification, additional information, further clarification or contextualization is needed. Among the three sections, it is the exposition section where Sudi frequently draws on a wide range of sources in substantiating his explanations. Consequently, the number of references and citations increases in this first section. In terms of the nature of the sources cited in the commentary, Sudi’s textual repertoire consists mainly of those standard scholarly texts and reference works included in the curriculum of Islamic higher learning, that is to say, in the madrasa curriculum. Given the hermeneutic tradition on Hafiz’s poetry, Sudi’s repertoire is in contrast with the one commonly used in elucidating Hafiz’s poetry; namely, the standard repertoire which consists of the major texts of Islam and Islamic mysticism. Unlike this standard repertoire of religious texts, Sudi’s rich repertoire features major works of Arabic and Persian philology, classics of Arabic and Persian literatures, and standard dictionaries of Arabic and Persian. By citing and referring to the texts of an established scholarly tradition and literary canon, Sudi not only presents a corpus of reference texts which he has access to and considers relevant, but also provides a list of the texts he studied and mastered.\footnote{For a list of the sources either explicitly or implicitly referred to in the sample, see the appendix of the chapter.} Taken as a whole, the items constituting the repertoire give clues as to Sudi’s scholarly background and training as well as to his ‘study room’ where the commentator, surrounded by dozens of books, worked on his commentary.

The second hallmark of Sudi’s commentary is the criticism directed primarily against the commentaries by Süruri and Şem‘i, the two predecessors of Sudi’s work. A reader who pages
through Sudi’s commentary can see that in elucidating a given couplet the commentator refers to, quotes and critically evaluates the comments made by his predecessors on the same couplet. Interspersed throughout the commentary, Sudi’s critical notes address those grammatical or interpretive problems he identifies in his predecessors’ exposition of Hafiz’s text. Taken as a body of critical responses, these notes introduce a further dimension to Sudi’s commentary by bringing it into relation with two commentary texts written on the same source text. Seen in this light, Sudi’s commentary can be perceived in two different ways: first, as a commentary that edits, elucidates, translates and annotates Hafiz’s text; and second, as a collection of critical scholia written on the two preceding commentaries. If we take into consideration the textual history of the manuscript corpus of the commentary, it becomes clear that the perception of Sudi’s work as a set of scholia is not historically inaccurate or misleading. The reason for thinking so is that the page layout of almost each manuscript features brief notes of “refutation” (redd) in the margin. Written by either scribes or readers, these marginal notes number nearly a thousand, occur consistently throughout the commentary and are keyed by textual marks to the lines of the commentary in which Sudi refutes his predecessors’ elucidations. As such, the notes in the margin serve as a practical index for those interested in, or in pursuit of, the commentator’s critique of his predecessors. Taken as an indication of the ways in which the commentary was read and used, it can be argued that these notes not only demonstrate Ottoman readers’ broad interest in the critical side of Sudi’s work but also reflect their perception of his work as a critical commentary on previous readings of Hafiz’s text. One final consideration regarding the critical nature of Sudi’s text relates to the scholarly context in which the commentary was written. The question of context leads us to the Ottoman commentary tradition.

---

61 I should note here that it is also possible that the refutations in the margins were placed there by Sudi himself. What leads one to think so is that same refutations are found in the autography copy of Sudi’s commentary on the *Gulistan* (cf. MS Veliyüddin 2693, Beyazıt State Library, Istanbul.)
on Hafiz’s poetry, against which Sudi positions himself and takes a critical stance. Seen as a response to an established tradition, Sudi’s critique can be relied on to gain insight into the commentator’s objective and concern in writing a philological commentary on a text that has long been read and interpreted through the medium of mystical allegorism. Therefore, the critical dimension of Sudi’s work plays an important role in bringing light to the contextual underpinnings of the text and its tripartite exegetical framework.

3. The Reception, Circulation, and Transformation of Sudi’s Text

In modern scholarship on Hafiz, Sudi’s commentary is unequivocally seen as the most famous and authoritative text among the commentaries written on the poet’s Divan. The commentary is especially celebrated as one of the principal sources consulted for the edition of Hafiz’s text as well as for the interpretation of his poetry. The celebratory remarks noted by modern scholars can be dated back to the years shortly following the printing of the commentary in 1834, for it is after this date that Sudi’s text became easily accessible and thus achieved widespread recognition especially among the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Western scholars of Oriental literatures. The significance of Sudi’s commentary to the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Western scholarship becomes clear if one takes into account that the earliest Western editions of Hafiz’s Divan were based on the text given in the commentary. In addition, if one also considers the fact that most of early Western translations and interpretations

---


63 For the early editions prepared on the basis of Sudi’s commentary, see, among others, the Brockhaus edition (Die Lieder des Hafis, 3 vols., 1854–1860) and the one by H. S. Jarrett (Diwan-i Hafiz, Calcutta: Urdu Guide Press, 1881).
of Hafiz’s poetry relied on Sudi’s commentary, the extent of the reception of Sudi’s text in Western scholarly circles becomes considerable. As for the reception of Sudi’s commentary before the year 1834, one does not have much data to explore the extent to, and the ways in, which the text circulated among Ottoman readers except for the information that comes from the available manuscript copies.

In what follows, therefore, attention is focused on the manuscript corpus of the commentary with an attempt to discuss the reception of Sudi’s text by Ottoman readers of Hafiz as well as to shed light on the ways in which it was read or used by the same readers. Accordingly, first I will present some general information about the manuscript copies of the commentary. Second, I will focus on a selected group of manuscripts to discuss the issue of readerly reception in some detail. But before looking at the manuscripts, it should be noted that there are few anecdotes that show us, albeit limitedly, the popularity of Sudi and his commentaries, including the one on the Divan, among the seventeenth-century Ottoman readers. Those anecdotes come from a diary kept by the French Orientalist Antoine Galland (1646–1715) during his stay in the Ottoman capital for two years (1672–3). Interested in the study of the Persian language and texts, Galland purchases one copy of each of the three Persian classics (the Bustan, Gulistan and Divan) from the booksellers in Istanbul. Later on, looking for books that would help him with his study of these classics, Galland comes across “a commentary written on Sa’di’s Bustan by an author named Sudi” and inquires about the commentator and his works.

On November 14, 1672, Galland visits one of the largest mosques in Istanbul, the one named

---

64 In this regard, it is also noteworthy to mention Annemarie Schimmel’s observation that Sudi’s commentary laid “the basis for most European interpreters of the Shirazi poet” (“Hafiz and His Contemporaries,” 939). For translations that draw on Sudi’s text, see, among others, Herman Bicknell’s Hafiz of Shiraz: Selections from His Poems (London: Trubner & Co., 1875) and W. H. Lowe’s Twelve Odes of Hafiz (Cambridge: Guildhall Place, 1877), where Lowe not only consults the commentary for his translations but also presents a translation of the corresponding portion of Sudi’s commentary for each poem he translates.

after the Grand Vizier Hafiz Ahmed Pasha (d. 1632). Here Galland finds out that the mosque’s library, established as part of the mosque complex, owns copies of Sudi’s commentaries on the three classics and that these copies are in such demand that they are available for loan or purchase. Apparently impressed with the popularity of Sudi’s commentaries, Galland decides to purchase a copy of Sudi’s commentary on the *Bustan*.\(^{66}\) Taken together, Galland’s anecdotes reflect not only that Sa’di’s and Hafiz’s texts were in wide circulation in the seventeenth-century Ottoman Istanbul but, more importantly, that Sudi’s commentaries established themselves as texts that were well received by general readers as well as by readers of Persian. In terms of the textual history of the commentary, Galland’s writings also point out that the commentary achieved mass circulation well before the advent of printing in the Ottoman Empire.

### 3.1 Observations on manuscripts of the commentary

Sudi’s commentary survives in ninety nine manuscripts that are found in libraries stretching from Eastern Europe to the Near and Middle East.\(^{67}\) Varying significantly in both length and scope of content, these manuscripts appear in the following five textual forms:

- a. Complete copies (i.e., those featuring the full text): e.g. MS K. 933–934 located in Topkapı Palace Library, Istanbul.
- b. Incomplete copies (i.e., those missing some parts of the text either from the beginning or end): e.g. MS 23988 located in Erzurum Public Library, Turkey
- c. Partial copies (i.e., those featuring only a part of the text): e.g. MS 370 located in the Hafid Efendi collection at Süleymaniye Library, Istanbul.
- d. Abridged copies (i.e., those featuring a concise version of the text): e.g. MS 577 located in the National Library, Ankara.
- e. Anthological copies (i.e., those copies that are portions of larger manuscripts and contain only selected parts of the text): e.g. MS 2982/4 located in Manisa Public Library, Turkey.

---

\(^{66}\) Schefer, Antoine Galland, 204–205. For information about Galland and his writings, see *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, vol. 366: Orientalist Writers, 100–106.

\(^{67}\) Of the total ninety nine manuscript copies, only twenty eight are dated. And out of the same total, only seventeen are complete copies. The oldest copy is MS Feyzullah Efendi 1641, located in Fatih Millet Library, Istanbul. The second oldest copy is MS K. 933–934, which is a two-volume manuscript located in the Hazine Collection of the Topkapı Palace Library, Istanbul. While the oldest copy is dated 1598, which is three years after the completion of the commentary, the second oldest copy carries the date of 1599.
Obviously, the multiplicity of the manuscript copies is an indication of the popularity of Sudi’s commentary. Considering that the available copies are dispersed in libraries located over a wide geographic range, one can say that Sudi’s text circulated widely throughout the empire. In addition, the diversity in the textual forms reflects the different ways in which the commentary was treated and/or used throughout its textual history. Furthermore, given that out of the ninety nine copies only seventeen feature the complete text of the commentary, one can contend that Sudi’s text existed, for the most part of its history, in pieces, that is to say, not as a full-fledged text, at least until its printing in 1834. That the text existed mostly in fragments can be ascribed either to the differing decisions of the scribes who were overwhelmed by the length of Sudi’s work or to the readerly interest that focused on certain parts of the work, or to both.

With these general observations in mind, we can have a closer look at some manuscripts to have a better idea about the ways in which the commentary was received and used by readers as well as to see how Sudi’s text was transformed in time in relation to the changing needs of audiences. The first manuscript, MS 1675, an undated copy located in the Diyarbakır Ziya Gökalp Manuscript Library (Turkey), provides us with the information that, as a book featuring the complete text of Hafiz’s *Divan*, Sudi’s commentary was used for bibliomancy by many readers. What inclines one to think so is the quatrain recorded on the very first page of the manuscript, which is a standard quatrain recited by every single reader of Hafiz who consults the poet’s collection of poetry for bibliomancy.\(^{68}\) That the Diyarbakır manuscript is not an exception is understood when one considers that the same quatrain, now accompanied by an explanatory note, appears on the first page of a seventeenth-century manuscript found in the Konya

Manuscript Library (Turkey). One other intriguing aspect of the Diyarbakır manuscript is that it allows us to see that certain parts of Sudi’s commentary attracted particular attention from readers. Looking at the layout of the text in the manuscript, one can notice that those parts where Sudi provides lengthy grammatical and/or contextual information about certain words of Hafiz are highlighted by rubrical headings added in the margin. Entitled *matlab* (a topic/issue of interest), the headings in the margin serve to frame Sudi’s text. Therefore one can say that the headings helped Sudi’s readers easily navigate through the commentary.

Another manuscript that offers some clues about readers’ interaction with the commentary is MS Feyzullah Efendi 1641 in the Fatih Millet Library (Istanbul), the oldest extant copy dated 1598. As understood from several notes and annotations recorded in the margin, readers of this manuscript were especially interested in Sudi’s grammatical explanations and definitions of Hafiz’s words. Based on the same annotations, one can also say that some readers elaborated and commented on Sudi’s explanations about the grammatical aspects of certain words. What is also interesting about this oldest manuscript is that the marginalia also include some glosses of the Arabic grammatical terms frequently used by Sudi, where the annotator explains Sudi’s words in terms intelligible to general readers. Considering the various annotations in the marginalia together, it can be said that the manuscript circulated mostly in the hands of readers who read, studied and discussed Hafiz’s text from a grammatical standpoint. In this regard, a manuscript copy dated 1645 provides us with further insight regarding readers’ approach to Sudi’s grammatical analysis of Hafiz’s text. Located in the National Library, Ankara (Turkey), MS 3106 features marginal notes where readers focus and comment on Sudi’s

---

69 MS 3724, fol. 1a. The manuscript is dated 1675.
70 See, for instance, the folios 3a, 4a, and 6b of MS 1675.
71 See, especially, the folios 1b–2b, 129b, 307b, and 328a. For readers’ explanatory notes on the terminology, see, for instance, fol. 9a.
objections to his predecessors’ grammatical explanations of some of Hafiz’s words. What is especially noteworthy about these notes is that they let us see that readers find the way Sudi brings contrary evidence to refute his predecessors’ grammatical points convincing. Therefore, generally speaking, this manuscript shows us not only that some of Sudi’s readers are especially interested in the critical side of his commentary, but also that these readers appreciate the commentator’s knowledge in grammar and grammatical analysis. It would not be misleading, therefore, to contend that this readerly appreciation of Sudi’s grammatical approach to Hafiz’s text gradually led to the establishment of Sudi’s recognition as a grammatical commentator, that is to say, as a commentator well versed in grammatical knowledge and analysis.

With the frequent annotations recorded in the marginalia of the second oldest copy of the commentary, MS Hazine K. 933 of the Topkapı Palace Library, one comes to see a vivid picture of the readerly reception of Sudi’s text. Based on the consistency in the handwriting and spelling, it is possible to say that a certain reader of this copy read and annotated the entire text of Sudi’s commentary. On a closer look, one also finds that the same reader often supplements the commentator’s explanations with additional yet relevant information that he quotes from various sources. As such, the manuscript stands as an early example of a close reading of Sudi’s commentary by a knowledgeable reader who actively participates in the text and shares his own background and perspective. In a late seventeenth-century manuscript copy of the commentary, we also see that some readers are interested in reading Sudi’s text comparatively. In the marginalia of this manuscript, one can notice that a certain reader quotes from Süruri’s commentary on Hafiz’s *Divan*. The reader quotes especially Süruri’s remarks about the mystical

---

72 For readers’ evaluation of Sudi’s analyses, see, for instance, fol. 2a.
73 For the reader’s glosses, especially see fols. 3a, 4b, 12b and 158a.
significations of the couplets of Hafiz’ first and second poems. That Süruri’s text is juxtaposed to Sudi’s can be interpreted as an indication that readers compared Sudi’s literal renderings with Süruri’s mystical readings and discussed these two different interpretations. Before looking, finally, at a late eighteenth-century manuscript that gives us significant clues about the textual transformation of the commentary, the last copy that should be considered with regard to the reception and use of Sudi’s text is MS 7259/1, which is an undated copy of Hafiz’s *Divan* in the Konya Manuscript Library. What is significant about this manuscript is that every page of the *Divan* is surrounded by marginalia that present lengthy quotations from Sudi’s commentary. Introduced by a scribe or reader, these quotations feature Sudi’s translations of Hafiz’s couplets and continue throughout the whole *Divan*. As such, the manuscript stands as a volume that contains not only Hafiz’s text but also its translation. One other significant aspect of this manuscript is that every page also features interlinear notes and glosses that draw, again, on Sudi’s commentary. Taken together, one can say that this manuscript copy makes it clear that Sudi’s commentary was used extensively by readers of Hafiz’ *Divan* who studied the text minutely and/or by scribes who were assigned to copy and edit the text.

Though the manuscripts considered so far present us with insights regarding the reception of the commentary by Ottoman readers, they do not provide us with specific answers to the questions of how Sudi’s text was perceived by these readers and to what extent its reproduction was guided by the demands of the same readers. One manuscript that answers such questions is MS 577 of the National Library, a copy dated as late as 1794. Titled “An Abridged Commentary on the *Divan* of Hafiz,” the manuscript contains an abridged version of Sudi’s commentary. What is unique about this manuscript is that it features a brief introduction written by the

---

74 Dated 1690, MS Safranbolu İzzet Paşa 212 is kept in the archives of the General Directorate of Pious Foundations in Ankara. For quotations from Süruri, see, for instance, the marginalia of the folios 3a–8a, which correspond to Sudi’s elucidation of the first poem in Hafiz’s *Divan*. 
abridger himself. As the abridger’s introductory words inform us, Sudi’s commentary is considered as “the best of the commentaries,” for it is a book that “includes all aspects of the Persian language.” “Because it is rather lengthy,” however, adds the abridger, readers of the commentary now express the need for an abridged version.75 Taking readers’ remarks into consideration, the abridger omits most of Sudi’s explanations and includes, in this abridged version, only the commentator’s translations of the couplets and his explanations of some of Hafiz’s words, especially the ones where Sudi touches on certain aspects of Persian grammar. Taken together, this manuscript informs us of not only the extent of the recognition of Sudi and the wide use of his text at the end of the eighteenth century but also the primary reason behind Ottoman readers’ interest in the commentary: as a book that covers “all aspects of Persian,” the commentary is sought after by many students of Persian grammar, to such an extent that the need for a new, handy version arises to meet readerly demand.

75 MS 577, fol. 1b.
APPENDIX

The Sources Cited or Referred to by Ahmed Sudi

a. The ones cited:

1.1 the Qur’an
1.2 Kashshaf: the well-known commentary on the Qur’an by al-Zamakhshari (d. 1144)
1.3 Gulistan of Sa’di (d. 1292)
1.4 Risala-i Qafiya: Jami’s (d. 1492) extensive commentary on the Kafiya, Ibn Hajib’s (d. 1249) famous work on Arabic syntax
1.5 al-Tarikh: the famous encyclopedic history by Aqil al-Baghdadi (d. 513)
1.6 Qamus al-Lughat: the famous Arabic dictionary by Firuzabadi (d. 1415)
1.7 Risala-i Aruz: Rashid al-Din Watwat’s (d. 1182-3) short treatise on meter
1.8 Sharh al-Mu’allaqat: a commentary by al-Zawzani, the famous philologist who died in 1093, on al-Mu’allaqat, a collection of seven pre-Islamic Arabic poems [Sudi specifically refers to Zawzani’s commentary on Labid’s (d. 660-61) panegyric poem.]
1.9 Sihah-i Jawhari: a comprehensive Arabic dictionary by Isma’il al-Jawhari (d. ca. 1003–1009), a.k.a. al-Sihah fi al-Lughat
1.10 Nafahat al-Uns: a large collection of Sufi hagiographies by ‘Abd al-Rahman Jami (d. 1492)

b. The ones referred to:

2.1 Arabic, Persian and Turkish poetry collections (divans) by:
   2.1.1 Yazid bin Mu’aviya (d. 683)
   2.1.2 Ahli of Shiraz (d. 1535)
   2.1.3 Katibi of Nishapur (d. 1435)
   2.1.4 Jami (d. 1492)
   2.1.5 Asafi (d. 1517, the pupil of Jami and the friend of Mir Ali Shir Nawa’i)
   2.1.6 Salman (d. 1366)
   2.1.7 An unspecified Turkish poet
   2.1.8 Hilali (d. 1532-33)
   2.1.8 Baki (d. 1600)
   2.1.9 Bushaq (d. 1423 or 1427)
   2.1.10 Bisati Samarqandi (d. first half of the 15th century)

2.2 Alfiyya: the famous grammar of Arabic by the Arabic grammarian Ibn Malik (d. 1274)

2.3 The following dictionaries of Arabic and Persian:
   2.3.1 Unspecified dictionaries (as referred to by the generic word lughat)
   2.3.2 Tuhfe-i Şahidi: Persian-Turkish dictionary by Ibrahim Shahidi (d. 1550)
2.4 *Risala-i Sudi*: Sudi’s treatise on the second couplet of Hafiz’s first ghazal
2.5 A collection of manuscript copies of Hafiz’s *Divan*
2.6 Hafiz’s poems in his *Divan*
2.7 Hafiz commentaries by Süruri and Şem‘i
2.8 The following commentaries on Sa‘di’s *Gulistan*:
   2.8.1 Süruri’s Arabic commentary
   2.8.2 Şem‘i’s Turkish commentary
   2.8.3 Lami‘i’s (d. 1532) Turkish commentary on Sa‘di’s preface to the *Gulistan*
   2.8.4 Hasan Kafi’s (d. 1616) Turkish commentary
   2.8.5 Yakub bin Sayyid Ali’s (d. 1525) Arabic commentary
2.9 *Subhat al-Abrar*: Jami’s famous masnawi on the Sufi path, written in 1482 in honor of Sultan Husayn Bayqara
2.10 *Kitab al-Hayawan*: a bestiary by al-Jahiz (d. 869), the famous Arab prose writer
2.11 *al-Izah*: al-Mutarrizi’s (a noted jurist and Arabic grammarian, d. 1213) famous commentary on the *Maqamat*, a compendium of fifty short stories by al-Hariri (an Arabic poet and philologist, d. 1122)
CHAPTER II

A Comparative Reading and Analysis of Sudi’s Commentary

1. The Sample: Hafiz’s Opening Poem

Consisting of seven couplets, Hafiz’s first poem in his Divan is one of his well-known poems. The poem has received special attention as the opening poem of Hafiz’s poetry collection and been frequently quoted, or referred to, in the vast scholarly corpus on Hafiz, which can be dated back to as early as 1680, the year that marks the translation of the opening poem as the first translated poem of Hafiz in the West.\(^{76}\) Especially, the poem has caught attention and been largely studied in modern scholarship as a text blending together a range of vivid imagery and metaphors and interweaving a spectrum of meanings.\(^{77}\) Beyond scholarly history, as one of Hafiz’s enigmatic and intriguing poems, this opening poem has long appealed to poets, readers, listeners and fortunetellers of different times and places.\(^{78}\) Furthermore, as we are informed by a treatise on the life of Hafiz and the legends that collected around him, the opening poem is seen particularly as a mystically significant poem and as such is distinguished from Hafiz’s other poems, for it is, as the treatise puts it, a poem that Hafiz first recited, in a state of mystical

\(^{76}\) In 1680 the opening poem was translated into Latin prose by F. Meninski (1623–1698), which was published in Vienna. Also, the poem translated by the second Western translator of Hafiz, Thomas Hyde (1636–1703), is again the opening poem. For a list of the early Western translators of Hafiz and their translations, see The Divan-i Hafiz, vol. 1, trans. Wilberforce Clarke (Calcutta, 1891), xviii.

\(^{77}\) For analyses of the opening poem, see, among others, M. Hillmann, Unity in the Ghazals of Hafiz ( Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1976), 116–125 and J. S. Meisami, Structure and Meaning in Medieval Arabic and Persian Poetry (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003), 418–426. The ‘popularity’ of the poem in modern scholarship is also understood by the fact that the poem is almost always included in the selections made from Hafiz’s Divan. See, for instance, Muhammad Ali Islami-Nudushan’s Te’emmol der Hafiz (Tehran: Intisharat-i Asar va Yazdan, 2003), where the anthologist calls attention to the significance of the poem (cf. 49–59) and Muhammad Ali Zibayi’s Sharh-i Sad-ghazal az-Hafiz (Tehran: Pazhang, 1988, 7–17).

elation, at a gathering headed by his spiritual master, an occasion marking his initiation into the path of mysticism. Given that this treatise widely circulated in various mystical circles stretching from Hafiz’s hometown, Shiraz, to the lands of Rûm, the Ottoman Anatolia, the significance of the opening poem in the eyes of medieval and early modern readers of Hafiz becomes remarkable, leading one to argue that the poem circulated in the same circles as the epitome of Hafiz’s mystical poetry.

Within this broad Hafizian community, Hafiz’s commentators are no exception in terms of paying attention to the opening poem, which is included in a majority of both medieval and modern commentaries on Hafiz’s poetry. As the majority of the commentaries are mystical and/or allegorical, it follows that the same mystical significance of the poem prevails in the hands of the commentators. In terms of showing the significance of the opening poem in the eyes of both commentators and their audiences, the commentaries by the three sixteenth-century Ottoman commentators of Hafiz are especially revealing, because, as complete commentaries, they allow us to observe that, compared to the other poems of Hafiz, the first poem attracts more attention and spawns lengthy expositions. This is evinced by the fact that the commentators write lengthy accounts for the elucidation of the opening poem. It is not only the commentators who

---

79 Cevri, *Tercüme-i Ahval-i Hace Hafız-ı Şirazi* (Istanbul: Mekteb-i Tibbiye-i Şahane Matbaası, 1286 [1870]), 6. Written (or collected) by an unknown author (or editor), this Persian treatise is translated into Ottoman Turkish by the seventeenth-century Ottoman Mevlevi poet and calligrapher Cevri Ibrahim (d. 1654). For Cevri’s life and works, see Huseyin Ayan, *Cevrî: Hayatı, Edebi Kişiliği, Eserleri ve Divannının Tenkidli Metni* (Erzurum: Atatürk University Press, 1981), 4–30. As Ayan notes, one copy of Cevri’s treatise is MS 611 (Istanbul University Library, Collection of Turkish Manuscripts). As Ayan informs us, this copy does not include Cevri’s name. This is why Ayan holds the idea that it might be the case that this treatise is not penned by Cevri. But there are other manuscript copies of the treatise which bear Cevri’s name (cf. MS Y-287, Süleymaniye Manuscript Library, Tercüman Gazetesi Collection), which leads us to conclude that the work can be ascribed to Cevri.

80 For references to the wide circulation of the treatise, see the narrator’s introductory words between pages 2 and 5.


82 When we consider the manuscript sections devoted, in each of the three commentaries, to the exposition of the first and second poems, for instance, we see that the section reserved for the first poem is the same length as the one reserved for the second poem. Given the length of the two poems, however, the difference in the extent to which the two poems are elaborated on by the commentators becomes remarkable. As a thirteen-couplet poem, the second poem is nearly twice the length of the first one, which consists of seven couplets. Despite its being relatively short,
have a deeper interest in the poem but also the readers/scribes who make frequent notes in the margins. In one of the oldest copies of Şem’i’s mystical commentary, for example, the marginalia corresponding to the commentary section reserved for the first poem include, in addition to several notes, seven exegetical statements, each of which is keyed by red markers to one of the seven couplets. Beginning with the words “this couplet,” each statement briefly explains the allegory in a given couplet of Hafiz according to the principles Islamic mysticism. Noted by a certain reader/scribe who writes his comments along with, yet independently of, the commentator, these seven statements reflect the readerly interest in the poem, which can therefore be taken to argue that the poem incites interpretive curiosity in Hafiz’s readers, who wonder and seek to know about this appealing yet elusive poem.83

Sudi’s perusal of such a widely recognized and extensively interpreted poem differs in two main respects from that of his Persian and Ottoman predecessors. To begin with, Sudi devotes one of the lengthiest sections of his commentary to the elucidation of the opening poem and thereby presents a detailed exposition that has no precedent in either partial or complete commentaries on Hafiz. Not only does Sudi differ from his predecessors in terms of the scope of his exposition, but he also departs from them in terms of the way he approaches and perceives Hafiz’s poem. Far from perceiving the poem as an esoteric text that contains mystically encoded information, Sudi conceives it primarily as a linguistic structure woven out of lexical and grammatical units that are combined into a semantic whole following certain rules of language.

83 For the exegetical statements, see the marginalia in MS 1142, fols. 2a–b and 3a. The readerly interest in the opening poem becomes distinct when we see that the marginalia corresponding to the commentary section reserved for the second poem do not include any exegetical statement, either on individual couplets or on the poem as a whole (cf. MS 1142, fols. 3b–5a). Accordingly, it follows that the reader/scribe who actively participates in the elucidation of the first poem does not seem to be so interested in the second poem as he does in the first one. It is worth noting also that the same reader/scribe does not comment on any couplet of Hafiz’s third poem either (cf. MS 1142 fols. 5a–6a). Albeit limited, this tendency shows that it is the first poem that attracts most of the readerly curiosity and active involvement in exploring the mystical world of Hafiz.
Accordingly, Sudi’s approach diverges from the religio-mystical attitude common to the previous commentators, who come to Hafiz’s poem with the preconception that it has an inherent mystical structure through which the poet speaks beyond the literal words. Sudi’s perspective, on the other hand, focuses exactly on the literal words of Hafiz and deals with the question of how Hafiz grammatically relates these words to form a semantic unit that expresses a literal meaning. Thus, by taking Hafiz’s words literally, Sudi avoids the commonly employed allegorical interpretation, by which each poetic statement of Hafiz is mystically decoded and substituted for veritable mystical information through metonymy. And, as a result, Sudi’s grammatical approach and literalist attitude to the poem leads him to a grammar-based text parsing, a process by which each poem is grammatically decoded and literally interpreted.

Having pointed out the main differences between Sudi and his predecessors in their approach to the opening poem, we can have a closer look at how Sudi analyzes, translates and interprets this poem from a comparative perspective that places Sudi’s interpretation within the framework of his predecessors’ interpretations. Before moving further, however, as a general observation, it should be noted that throughout his commentary Sudi’s analysis of Hafiz’s poems proceeds couplet by couplet, except for cases where he divides couplets to provide further information on one of its lines. Unlike his two Ottoman predecessors, who regularly fragment Hafiz’s poems into lines, Sudi’s couplet-based approach to textual analysis indicates his perception that each couplet of Hafiz is a self-contained linguistic unit that needs to be grammatically analyzed, which is in line with the general conception of the ghazal as a poetic form whose structural unity consists of linguistically independent couplets. Given his overall adherence to the explicit sense of Hafiz’s text, Sudi’s couplet-oriented focus can also be
considered as another display of his concern for the formal, in other words, explicit aspects of the poems he analyzes and interprets.  


2.1 Sudi’s intriguing prelude to Hafiz’s opening line

The way Sudi treats the first couplet is somewhat atypical: on the one hand, Sudi chooses to break the couplet into individual lines instead of quoting it as a whole; and on the other, he does not hasten to parse the line into grammatical units and embark on his analysis. Unlike his “standard” approach, Sudi postpones his analysis for a while and opens up a brief section immediately after quoting the opening line in Arabic, which is as follows:

ألا يا أيها السائل أدر كأسا و ناولها

Hey there, you the cupbearer, pass around a cup and hand it (to me).  

Sudi begins his section with a brief yet striking note on the textual origins of this line and writes the following: “this line [originally] belongs to the second couplet [namely, the last two lines] of a quatrain composed in the hazaj meter by Yazid bin Muaviya” (GI:1a). Since Yazid, the second Umayyad caliph (r. 680–683), is one of the notorious figures in Islamic tradition, Hafiz’s

---

84 In this regard, the following observation is worth noting: the very first place the word ghazal occurs in the Divan is the final couplet of Hafiz’s famous “Shirazi Turk” poem, which is the eighth poem in Sudi’s commentary. When we look at the three commentators’ accounts on this final couplet, we see that neither Süruri nor Şem’i make any explanation or comment on this word as the name of a poetic genre or form. (cf. Süruri, MS 4056, fol. 8b and Şem’i, MS 1142, fol. 10a). Sudi, however, begins his analysis of the couplet by mentioning the word ghazal as the name of a poetic form, writing that it cannot be “less than five couplets” and adding that the upper limit is not so strictly defined: “some scholars say that it cannot be more than nine couplets, others argue that it cannot exceed eleven couplets, and still others contend that thirteen is the limit” (cf. Sudi, MS 1641, fol. 17a). Here Sudi’s stress on the ghazal as a poetic form consisting of a certain number of couplets can be keyed not only to his couplet-centered textual analysis but also to his view of Hafiz’s text primarily as a formal entity featuring certain grammatical rules and definitions.

85 All translations from Hafiz’s Divan are mine unless the notes indicate otherwise.

86 Refer to the translation of Sudi’s text (given in the second part of the dissertation) for the meaning of the italicized words.
recourse to Yazid as a source of inspiration becomes something striking and intriguing.\textsuperscript{87} Although Sudi provides this information, he neither speculates about Hafiz’s choice nor attempts to explain his choice by referring to a religio-mystical context. As with his usual disinterest in anything beyond the written text, Sudi interprets Hafiz’s choice simply as a pragmatic move driven by the poet’s concern for finding a line that would suit the overall rhyming structure of his poem. Accordingly, Sudi turns his attention to the formal aspects involved in Hafiz’s appropriation of the last two lines in question. Thus, in an attempt to illustrate the poet’s concern for rhyming, Sudi first quotes Yazid’s four-line quatrain and then explains how Hafiz transposes the order of the last two lines of the quatrain and combines them in a single line.\textsuperscript{88} Following this illustration, Sudi directs attention to how Hafiz’s appropriation of Yazid was received by later Persian poets and quotes in this regard two quatrains, one by Katibi of Nishapur (d. 1434-5) and the other by Ahli of Shiraz (d. 1535). The two quatrains express, openly and intensely, the surprise and disappointment occasioned by Hafiz’s drawing on Yazid in articulating the opening couplet. As two pieces composed by poets separated by time and distance, the quatrains stand as evidence attesting to the extent and significance of the puzzlement and disappointment that ensued among Persian poets of the post-Hafizian period. Given that Hafiz’s use of Yazid’s words is a puzzling literary event with wide resonance, it is not hard to see why Sudi brings the Yazid issue to the fore. Seen in this light, Sudi’s selection of the quatrains does not seem to be a

\textsuperscript{87} For a concise sketch of Yazid’s life and rule, see: \textit{EI}, 2nd edition, s.v. “Yazīd (I) b. Mu‘āwiya”. Here I should also note that I was not able to identify the quatrain quoted by Sudi in the following edition of Yazid’s poetry collection: \textit{Dīvānu Yazīd bin Mu‘āviye}, ed. Vāzīh al-Samad (Beirut: Dar Sader, 1998).

\textsuperscript{88} It is significant that Sudi, rather than simply mentioning the poetic source, focuses on the way in which the poet Hafiz reworks this source and shapes it into a new line. The significance of this observation lies not only in that it reveals Sudi’s concern for the formal aspects of Hafiz’s text, but also in that it indicates the commentator’s presenting Hafiz primarily as a poet who meticulously works on his poems and creatively draws, at times, on the poems of those poets he read and studied. It is relevant to keep in mind in this connection that Sudi’s portrayal here is reminiscent of his introductory words to the commentary, where his depiction of Hafiz leans more toward positioning him as a poet, rather than as a mystic. Specifically, Sudi’s remark, in the same introduction, that Hafiz had an “admiring interest in the works of the Arab poets” is telling, because it not only contributes to Sudi’s portrayal of Hafiz as a poet, but also provides a context for his later discussion of Hafiz’s appropriation of a line from the Arab poet Yazid.
random choice. Nor is his bringing the later interpretations of Hafiz’s invocation to Yazid to his readers’ attention.

Before looking at the way Sudi analyzes the line, it would be worth reflecting more on his initial section about the Yazid-Hafiz connection, for this section lets us attain some significant clues as to Sudi’s attitude and approach as a programmatic commentator. It would be useful; therefore, to make a couple of inferences in passing.

To begin with, although Sudi’s concern with Hafiz’s text is basically formal, this does not lead him to ignore the contextual dimensions of the textual aspects he explains and demonstrates. As seen in his touching on the Yazid issue, Sudi sometimes takes step toward pointing his readers to what is beyond the text by providing a window into the intertextual aspects of Hafiz’s text and its reception and interpretation by the literary canon. That is to say, Sudi moves through his text following a certain exegetical agenda, according to which the commentator deems it necessary to expand his textual scope in certain parts of his commentary with the purpose of either addressing those questions that might arise in the minds of readers or sharing some supporting information that would help the same readers see Hafiz’s text within its literary, historical or cultural context. In Sudi’s case, expansion of the scope does not, however, mean that the commentator aims at molding his readers’ interpretive framework by bringing his own perspective on any aspect of the context/issue. Rather, Sudi’s exegetical expansions are intended only to present readers with the available and relevant information regarding the context/issue in question. Accordingly, when it comes to any aspect that falls outside the written text, the commentator keeps his view and leaves its interpretation to his readers and their background. This is so even in such cases as the present, where the issue/context referred to puts a controversial figure like Yazid next to Hafiz and thus needs clarification or justification by the
commentator, as it involves a potential “harm” to the fame and dignity of the poet under analysis, at least in the eyes of those aspiring readers of Hafiz who learn, in the very first lines of the commentary, that “the Tongue of the Unseen” was heavily criticized due to his seeking guidance from the notorious Yazid at the very beginning of his Divan.

In addition to revealing Sudi’s objectivity in textual exegesis and his well-organized exegetical agenda, the Yazid section also gives us some idea about the preparatory work Sudi did for his commentary on Hafiz. Based on his reference to Yazid’s poetry and his quotations from Ahli and Katibi, it is possible to say that Sudi engaged not only in close reading and study of Hafiz’s text per se, but also in researching and identifying the various references to Hafiz and his poetry in those literary and scholarly works he collected and went over. The extent and significance of Sudi’s literature review becomes clearly visible when we discover that the information Sudi provides is new, and introduced, for the first time, to the Ottoman readers of Hafiz, for neither Süruri nor Şem’i make any mention of the Yazid issue and the discussions around it. What is also worthy of note in this regard is that, thanks to his preparatory work, Sudi identifies that some significance is attached to the opening couplet of Hafiz and that he demonstrates this through reference to his sources, which is unlike the case of his two predecessors who draw no particular attention to the opening couplet and treat it in the same way as they treat the other couplets of Hafiz. It is possible; therefore, to observe that it is Sudi who, for the first time, highlights the opening poem and communicates its significance to the readers of Hafiz.

One final point regarding Sudi’s annotation on the Yazid issue can be related to his exegetical concern and preference for a plain and grammatical meaning of Hafiz’s text as it stands. That is to say, Sudi’s building of a textual bridge between Hafiz and Yazid can be viewed
as a subtle allusion to the idea that Hafiz’s line should be considered and interpreted along with Yazid’s lines, which apparently fall under the theme of wine drinking and feature some typical motifs of wine poetry. Quoting Yazid’s lines, Sudi, in a sense, presents the literal context to which each of the lexical items in Hafiz’s line originally belongs, which is a context where Yazid’s wine-related words signify meanings that are far from any mystical/allegorical connotations. Therefore, Sudi’s pointing to the original locus of Hafiz’s words can be seen as an attempt to show the Ottoman readers of Hafiz that these words can (or perhaps should) be taken literally, and not necessarily mystically, even if they carry meanings that might be religiously and/or mystically controversial when taken literally. In this regard, a better insight can be gained into the question of what Sudi seeks to achieve with his annotation on Yazid if one reads this annotation against the background of his predecessors’ interpretation of the same line. What is worthy of notice in both Süruri and Şem’i is that they offer a mystical reading of the line by construing the two “keywords” accordingly. Setting aside the literal sense and embarking on the metaphorical interpretation, both commentators rework the lexical meaning of the words sāqī (cupbearer) and ka’s (wine cup) in accordance with the Şem’iotics of mysticism. Accordingly, “what is meant by [the word] sāqī” is, according to Süruri, the “preacher or adviser,” and to Şem’i is the “true spiritual guide.” Likewise, the word ka’s refers, in Süruri’s opinion, to the “preach or advice,” and in Şem’i’s to the “cup of divine love.” Given that his predecessors render Hafiz’s words into mystically signified categories, Sudi’s motivation in highlighting Yazid’s line can be therefore considered as a quest for understanding Hafiz’s text without recourse to symbolic or mystical interpretation and so is linked to his critical stand against a solely mystical reading that is accompanied by an ignoring of the literal and textual aspects. Given the same heavily mystical renderings, Sudi’s motivation can be further interpreted as a critical move
towards a new portrayal of Hafiz, as an attempt to render the hitherto mystically envisioned poet into a poet detached from his mystical attributes and associated instead with his textually significant *Divan*. Sudi’s aligning Hafiz’s mystically defined poetry with the profane poetry of a carnal figure like Yazid thus echoes a critical step toward stripping Hafiz of the mystical aura surrounding him and his poetry, which is a step Sudi takes at the very beginning of his commentary and is necessary to open the door to a literal interpretation of Hafiz and a textual and grammatical study of his *Divan*.89

2.2 Following the prelude: Sudi’s analysis of the opening line

Sudi begins his analysis by parsing the opening line into the following eight grammatical units, which can be illustrated as follows:

\[\text{الأ} + \text{ يا} + \text{ أي} + \text{ ه} + \text{ ادر} + \text{ آ} + \text{ و و} + \text{ ناوهلها}\]

Following the order of the units in the line, Sudi explains each unit in terms of its grammatical category, function and meaning. In the hands of Sudi, the above line of poetry appears more as a grammatical sentence in Arabic divided into segments for analysis. Accordingly, in this very first expository section of his commentary, we see Sudi more as a grammarian of the Arabic language, who approaches the line as a grammatical cluster of words to bring it under grammatical scrutiny. Certainly, the distinct Arabic grammatical imprint on the way Sudi treats the opening line has much to do with the fact that the commentator focuses on an Arabic line produced in accordance with the rules of Arabic grammar. Coupled with the commentator’s grammatical orientation, and with the fact that this line is, as Sudi informs us, originated from the pen of Yazid, it can be further said that each of the eight units in the line is related, in the

mind of the commentator, to the categories and rules defined by the Arabic grammatical
tradition. Seen in this light, it is not surprising to see that Sudi embarks on a grammatical
analysis of this Arabic line by taking a lexical and morphosemantic approach common to the
tradition. A glance, then, at what Sudi writes in elucidating the eight lemmata (i.e., units) he lists
under the line will not only let us better see his focus as a grammatical commentator but will also
enable us to see some minor yet significant points that would go unnoticed otherwise.

Among the eight, four lemmata attract particular attention, mainly because these are the
ones in which Sudi’s elucidatory notes not only expand but also reveal those points that he
makes to highlight and criticize his predecessors’ accounts of the line. If we begin with the first
lemma (أ / alā), we see that Sudi first notes its grammatical category and function, and then
quotes a Qur’anic verse (Q10:62) to exemplify its usage. In indicating its grammatical function,
Sudi writes that the alā is the opening particle (harf-i istiftah), which goes contrary to what his
predecessors have agreed on, for to both Süruri and Şem’i the alā is the particle of attention
(harf-i tenbih). Here Sudi diverges from his predecessors not in determining the grammatical
category of the alā, for according to all three commentators the alā falls under the category of
particles, which is the third of the principal tripartite categorization of Arabic words as nouns,
verbs, and particles. Rather, he interprets the grammatical function of the particle differently
from his predecessors. Seen in this light, Sudi’s quoting a verse from the Qur’an seems to go
beyond exemplification and carries the intention of bringing evidence to what he provides as a
counter-explanation of the grammatical function of the particle in question. To shed more light
on why Sudi disagrees with his predecessors and interprets the alā as a particle that opens the
line, one should take a glance at Sudi’s remarks in his initial section on the textual origins of
Hafiz’s line, wherein the following two aspects become worthy of notice: his stress on the
significance of the first line as the opening line of Hafiz’s Divan and his illustration of how Hafiz changes the original order of Yazid’s lines in forming his own line. As mentioned in discussing this initial section, one of the aspects that come to the fore in Sudi’s bringing up Hafiz’s modeling of Yazid is that the commentator puts special accent on the first line by conceiving it as the opening line of the Divan. Correlating Sudi’s initial emphasis with his later note on the alā, it can be said that the commentator’s initial perception of the line is a precursor of his later grammatical interpretation of the particle. In this regard, Sudi’s illustration of how Hafiz foregrounds Yazid’s last line (the one starting with the alā) while backgrounding the penultimate one (the one beginning with the adir) is also revealing, in the sense that the commentator hints that, besides the rhyming issue, one other reason for Hafiz’s foregrounding and backgrounding Yazid’s lines is his rhetorical concern, namely, that his line should start off with an introductory particle (namely, the alā), not with an inflected verb form. Therefore, when combined with the consideration that his predecessors neither place any special emphasis on the line nor treat it as one that begins Hafiz’s poetic speech, it would be not surprising to see that Sudi departs from his predecessors in his assigning the grammatical function of the alā.

Besides denoting Sudi’s indirect criticism of his predecessors, the first lemma also presents us with a commentator who goes beyond his discussion of Hafiz’s text by referring his readers to a grammatical controversy on the morphological structure of the alā. Thus Sudi writes that “the author of the Kashshaf takes it [the alā] as a compound form but Ibn Malik says it is a simple form” and adds, without comment, that “the proofs offered by both parties can be found in the detailed works on Arabic grammar”.90 Beyond testifying to Sudi’s scholarly acquaintance

90 The author of the Kashshaf is the commentator and grammarian al-Zamakhshari (d. 1144), who is well-known mainly for the Kashshaf, his famous Qur’an commentary, and the Mufassal, his detailed work on Arabic grammar. Renowned for his concise Arabic grammar, the Alfiyya, Ibn Malik (d. 1274) is one of the famous Arabic grammarians of the medieval times. For the life and work of al-Zamakhshari, see Andrew J. Lane, A Traditional
with the Arabic grammatical tradition and to his objectivity in referring to the views of the scholars on the subject he discusses, this note also offers a glimpse into the question of who the intended readers of Sudi’s commentary were and thus helps us better grasp the commentator’s abstract description, in his introductory words, that his work is targeted at the beginning readers of Hafiz. The reason for thinking so is that embedded in Sudi’s note are some significant aspects that relate to the question of readership. To begin with, the commentator does not seem to be feeling that he digresses from what he focuses on by providing this note, as he seems to think that such a grammatical ‘digression’ would be already interesting to his readers, or at least to some of them. What is more, the commentator assumes, with this note, that the same readers have a certain level of background not only in Arabic grammatical tradition but also in Qur’anic exegetical tradition and are familiar with the major figures and texts associated with the two.91 Last but not least, in the same note the commentator takes it for granted that these readers can identify those “detailed works” he implicitly refers to and follow therein the relevant grammatical discussions. Considered together, these aspects suggest the following two conclusions: first, that the commentator ‘knows’ his audience well; that is to say, Sudi has somewhat a clear estimation of the interest and background of his readers, whom one can take to be the students attending his classes or pursuing an Islamic higher education. And second, that those beginning readers of Hafiz are already knowledgeable not only in Arabic grammatical tradition but also in the exegetical tradition on the Qur’an. These two conclusions lead us to the idea that Sudi’s commentary presents us, from the very start, with a ‘classroom commentary’

---

91 It is important to remind here that Sudi does not deem it necessary to mention the name of the author of the Kashshaf, nor does he make any annotation on the Kashshaf itself. Likewise, he does not give the title of Ibn Malik’s grammar.
destined primarily for those students who would read and study a Persian classic in a classroom, that is to say, a madrasa setting, where Qur’anic exegesis (tafsīr) and Arabic grammar (sarf and nahv) form the core components of the curriculum.92

Al-sāqī (الساقی) is the second lemma that attracts particular attention among the eight, in which Sudi writes, after explaining its grammatical category in relation to the preceding units, that “lexically, it means ‘the one who gives water’, but as a term it refers to ‘the one who serves a cup [of wine] at a wine gathering’”. When taken as the words of a commentator who insists on literality, this brief note can be interpreted as an instance of Sudi’s meticulousness in indicating the semantic aspects of Hafiz’s words. Looked at through comparative lenses, however, the same note goes beyond simply an indication of an attitude peculiar to a literalist and appears more as a reflection of Sudi’s critical attitude toward his predecessors. What leads one to think so is that in neither Süruri nor Şem‘i does one come across a note or remark on the lexical or terminological meaning of the word, except for an annotation they provide to highlight what the word mystically corresponds to, as illustrated above. The way Sudi introduces the word, however, is diametrically opposite to that of his predecessors, for Sudi foregrounds the literal meaning obscured by Süruri and Şem‘i while keeping quiet on the intended figurative meaning accentuated by them. Considered within the context of his predecessors’ approach, therefore, one can see behind Sudi’s grammatical note a critical stance against the tendency of his predecessors to refuse a literal interpretation in the rush to explain and justify Hafiz’s words through

92 It is worth noting in this connection that the two names Sudi mentions are those whose works are included in a typical Ottoman madrasa curriculum: while Al-Zamakhshari’s Kashshaf is the prime textbook of the madrasa students studying the Qur’an, Ibn Malik’s Alfiyya is one of the major textbooks used for Arabic grammar. For references to the wide circulation of these two textbooks in the Ottoman madrasas, see Betül Can, “Fatih Döneminden Tanzimat’a Kadar Osmanlı Medreselerinde Arapça Öğretimi” (Gazi University, Ph.D. Diss., 2009), 85–176. For a general list of the works taught in the Ottoman madrasas, see the following: İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Devleti’nin İlimiye Teşkilatı (Ankara: TTK, 1965), 19–31; Cahid Baltacı, XV–XVI. Asırlar Osmanlı Medreseleri (Istanbul: Irfan, 1976), 35–43; Mustafa Bilge, İlk Osmanlı Medreseleri (İstanbul: İstanbul University Press, 1984), 40–63; and Mefail Hızlı, “Osmanlı Medreselerinde Okutulan Dersler ve Eserler,” Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi 17:1 (2008): 25–46.
mysticism. Especially revealing, in this regard, is the second part of Sudi’s note, through which he refers to a worldly setting, a wine gathering, and portrays the sāqī as a figure associated with that setting. Considering Sudi’s treatment of the sāqī along with his initial reference to Yazid’s wine poetry, it can be said, in the final analysis, that Sudi’s critical and literalist attitude is again an outcome of his inaugural attempt at orienting his readers toward a literal perception of Hafiz’s text and introducing a way of reading that radically departs from the mystical perspective entrenched in the writings of Süruri and Şem‘i.

With lemmas six and eight, which are the last two worthy of notice, the critical tone underlying Sudi’s writing raises to a noticeable extent as the commentator points out and corrects the grammatical ‘mistakes’ of Süruri and Şem‘i, and particularly of the latter. Explaining the adir (أدر), the sixth lemma, Sudi agrees with his predecessors’ note that it is a verb in “the second-person imperative” (emr-i hazir) but uses the term emr-i muhatab (‘the addressee imperative’) to denote the second person. What Sudi is critical of is the way his predecessors interpret the verb in translating the line, where both Süruri and Şem‘i give the verb a causative meaning and translate it as a third-person imperative. Noticing the discrepancy between the way Süruri and Şem‘i treat the verb grammatically and the way they interpret it in the translation, Sudi thus sees it necessary to point out, in passing on to the next lemma, that the verb adir “means ‘pass it around’, not, as some suppose, ‘have it passed around’”. As a critical response, this passing note on the meaning of the verb marks the first instance where Sudi refers, though indirectly, to his predecessors’ commentaries. Driven by the commentator’s concern for grammatical precision,

93 The reason why Sudi chooses to use a different term in indicating the imperative mood of the verb can be explained by his being under the influence of Ibn al-Hajib (d. 1249)’s famous work on Arabic grammar, al-Kafiya, where Ibn al-Hajib uses the term “al-fa’il al-mukhatab” (the second-person agent, i.e., the addressee) in defining the imperative mood in Arabic (cf. Shuruh al-Kafiya, pt. 1, ed. Karahisarlı, 107). For further information about Sudi’s acquaintance with the writings of Ibn al-Hajib, and his commentaries on Ibn al-Hajib’s grammars, see the chapter on Sudi’s life and works. For a brief account of Ibn al-Hajib’s life and works, see “Arabic Grammar” in Religion, Learning and Science in the ‘Abbasid Period, eds. M.J.L. Young, J.D. Latham and R.B. Serjeant (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 134–135.
the note also testifies to Sudi’s thoroughness in reading and evaluating his predecessors’ texts. A similar observation holds true for Sudi’s explanation of the eighth and final lemma in the line, the nāvilhā (نويله), which Sudi breaks up into two grammatical constituents: nāvil (نويل), the verb in the imperative form, and hā (ھ), the suffix pronoun attached to the verb. In explaining the former, Sudi once again uses the term muhatab (الادرس أو) to indicate the second person of the imperative and thus departs from his predecessors. But his translation of the verb as “hand it!” follows the one found in Süruri and Şem’i verbatim. Finding Sudi of the same opinion with his predecessors, one expects the commentator to pass on to the latter constituent. Contrary to this expectation, however, we see Sudi pausing to provide an annotation on the morphological form of the verb, in which he writes that the original version of nāvil is nāvilnī, which is, as Sudi further explains, an extended form where the verb nāvil is followed by the first-person suffix pronoun (-ī) introduced by the letter nūn (-n), or in Sudi’s term, the ‘nūn of protection’ (nun-ı vikaye), a morpheme used to link the suffix pronoun to the imperative stem. “Due to meter restriction”, Sudi finally notes, the suffix pronoun (and the accompanying letter) present in the original form is omitted from the form given in the line. Reading such a morphological gloss, one cannot help but wonder whether there is any criticism behind the commentator’s uncovering of some grammatical particularities. In this regard, a quick look at what Şem’i writes in his commentary gives one the key to understand Sudi’s point in glossing on the morphology of the verb. Unlike Süruri, who does not make any specific comment on the meaning of the verb but implies, in his translation of the line, that it is the poet who would drink from the cup the cupbearer hands to him, Şem’i interprets the same verb to mean that it is the cupbearer, not the poet, who would drink from the cup he passes around, suggesting that the poet orders the cupbearer to drink from, what Şem’i calls, “the cup of love” (cam-ı mahabbet). As is clear from
his morphological gloss, Sudi, on the other hand, thinks that the poet calls on the cupbearer asking for a cup of wine. Therefore, given Şem’i’s interpretation, we come to see that Sudi’s reference to the original imperative is intended to bring grammatical evidence that provides support for his own proposition and calls his predecessor’s into question. Taking this lemma along with the ones considered so far, it is possible to conclude that the impetus behind Sudi’s elaboration of certain grammatical aspects is his critical attitude, which is directed sometimes toward both Süruri and Şem’i but often toward the latter.

2.3 Sudi’s annotated translation and his critical allusion to Süruri and Şem’i  Following the analysis section, Sudi proceeds to the translation of the line introducing a transitional phrase, *mahsul-i kelam* (the outcome/summary of the speech), which informs readers of the commentator’s coming translation while signaling that this translation should be considered as a summary of the grammatical discussion he presents in the preceding section.\(^{94}\) Sudi’s translation reads as follows: “O cupbearer! Pass the cup around the gathering of friends one after another, and then hand it to me!” Paying close attention to how Sudi renders Hafiz’s Arabic line into Ottoman Turkish, one notices that the commentator inserts into his translation three brief yet strategic annotations (underlined above) that relate to the points he previously made in explaining the following three lemmas: *al-sāqī, adir,* and *nāvilhā* respectively. Looking back to what Sudi writes about the lemma *al-sāqī*, one remembers his definition that the *sāqī* is “the one who passes the cup around at a wine gathering”. When we read Sudi’s translation in light of this definition, then, the first underlined phrase above appears not as a randomly inserted phrase, or an addition made out of context, but as a deliberate choice that is underpinned by the commentator’s previous interpretation and contextualization of the word *sāqī* as a term.

---

\(^{94}\) Literally translated, Sudi’s phrase reads as “the outcome of the speech”. But with an attempt to convey what the commentator means by this phrase, it should be interpreted as “the summary of the discussion”, in which the word “discussion” refers to Sudi’s grammatical discussion of the line and its constituents.
Likewise, Sudi’s annotation that all the friends at the gathering drink out of the same cup “one after another” is linked to his previous explanation of the verb *adir*. Finally, the rendering of the *nāvilhā* as “hand it to me!” rests on the commentator’s discussion of the original morphological form of the verb. Therefore the ways in which Sudi’s annotated translation connects to and embodies the various aspects of his grammatical discussion show that the commentator interprets the line in light of his previous grammatical glosses and integrates the insights he derives from grammatical analysis into his literal translation. Thus Sudi presents us with a translation that is faithful to the grammatical as well as literal aspects of the lexical constituents of Hafiz’s line.

When we compare Sudi’s translation with the ones given by his predecessors, we also see that the annotations Sudi makes in translating the line come to reflect his underlying critical attitude. That is to say, by choosing to give an annotated translation, Sudi implies that his predecessors’ translations do not fully reflect the grammatical peculiarities of the line. In order to have a better sense of how Sudi’s translation significantly departs from those of his predecessors, a comparative glance at the three translations would be appropriate. If we start with Süruri’s following translation, we see that his translation is a brief linear translation that closely follows the syntactic order of Hafiz’s line: “Arise, O cupbearer! Pass around the full cup and hand it.” Şem‘i’s translation is almost the same as Süruri’s: “Arise, O cupbearer! Pass around the cup and hand it.” Compared to these two brief word-for-word translations, Sudi’s annotated translation appears more as an interpretation that is particularly sensitive to the grammatical texture of the

---

95 In this regard, it is important to note that Sudi provides, immediately after his translation, an explanation for using the phrase “one after another” by writing that “the reason [for translating as I did] is that the only way one can make the cup go round is to hand it one after another”. Here the word Sudi uses to refer to the going round of the cup is the *idāre* (turning, turning around), which is a verbal noun derivationally related to the verb *adir*. Thus Sudi’s self-explanation testifies to the idea that the insertion of the phrase “one after another” has much to do with the commentator’s grammatical interpretation of the imperative *adir.*
line. From the same comparative perspective, one can also sense, besides grammatical concerns, Sudi’s didactic tone: unlike Süruri and Şem‘i, who do not see any need to provide a translation that would give their readers some context or background information to better understand the setting Hafiz is depicting in the line, Sudi seems to be concerned to present his readers with a translation that would help them contextualize the same setting. This is to tantamount to say that, through his annotated translation, Sudi, in a sense, communicates to his readers what a wine gathering is like and informs them of the characters (the cupbearer and the friends forming the circle) and rituals (the going round of the cup and drinking from the cup “one after another”) associated with it.

2.4 From critical allusion to critical confrontation: Sudi on Şem‘i’s reading of the line

Following the translation, Sudi does not pass on to the second line of the opening couplet, but rather goes back to Şem‘i’s account of the first line and revisits his explanation of the lemmas nāvil and alā, the last and first lemmas in the line, respectively. In this way Sudi opens up a section in passing from one line to another, which can be seen as a move intended to draw attention to what Sudi considers as examples of the critical fallacies in Şem‘is grammatical elucidation and interpretation of Hafiz’s poetry. In this short yet harshly critical section, Sudi makes two quotations from Şem‘i’s commentary: one regarding Şem‘i’s interpretation of the meaning of the imperative verb nāvil, the other regarding his grammatical remark on the syntactic function of the particle alā. In his first criticism, Sudi quotes and attacks Şem‘i’s argument that the imperative verb should be understood as referring to the poet’s urging the wine-server to drink from the cup passed round, which is, obviously, an argument that goes contrary to Sudi’s previous explanation of the verb as an imperative form that refers to the poet’s asking for a cup of wine from the wine-bearer. What is interesting in Sudi’s criticism is that he
quotes not only Şem‘i’s words but also the couplet which Şem‘i cites from Abd al-Rahman Jami (d. 1492) as a proof to support his own argument, a couplet in which a line in Persian alternates with a line in Arabic that ends with the same imperative verb, the nāvilhā. Quoting both Şem‘i’s argument and the textual evidence he offers, Sudi thus draws attention to the inconsistency between what Şem‘i argues and what his evidence means, for the Arabic imperative form in Jami’s couplet denotes the same meaning as the one in Hafiz’s line, namely that it is the poet, not the wine-bearer, who would have a sip of wine from the cup passed around. Refuting Şem‘i’s argument by his own evidence, Sudi in turn offers a chain of proofs to support his position, which obviously serves Sudi’s intention to distinguish himself from Şem‘i in terms of his skills in argumentation and in extracting evidence to document his arguments.96 In his second criticism, Sudi responds to Şem‘i’s comment that the opening particle alā syntactically relates to the second line, instead of to the first line in which it occurs. Here the critical tone becomes harsher as Sudi finds such comment unacceptable and writes that a commentator making such a claim is now “completely astray”. Treating Şem‘i’s comment as an apparent grammatical error, Sudi deems it unnecessary to go into an extended discussion or bring any evidence in rebuttal, as if implying that the falsity of Şem‘i’s grammatical comment would be readily clear to the readers. Thus, beyond simply repeating what he had said earlier in explaining the particle, Sudi readily concludes his critique of Şem‘i, writing that the particle “is by no means related to the second line”.

96 In arguing against Şem‘i, Sudi first makes a reference to the quatrain he quoted from Yazid at the very beginning of his commentary, where Yazid calls himself as “the intoxicated” (al-masmūm) and begs for wine. Then Sudi reminds his readers of the morphological analysis he made previously to show the way the first-person suffix pronoun (-nī), omitted for the sake of prosody, informs the meaning of the imperative form nāvilhā. Finally, he quotes an Arabic couplet where the poet invokes the cupbearer to seek solace in wine by uttering the verb nāvil-nī, the original form of the imperative nāvilhā in Hafiz’s line.
Taken jointly, the two criticisms speak to Sudi’s textual and philological concerns and thus can be seen as his attempt at revising his predecessor’s errors to present a grammatically correct reading of Hafiz’s text, an attempt through which Sudi hints at the idea that one needs to be conversant in the grammatical structure of the text prior to offering an interpretation, including the mystical one. Aside from grammatical concerns, the same criticisms can also be seen as indicating Sudi’s motivation to identify and uncover the shortcomings of his predecessor’s grammatical knowledge as well as the methodological problems inherent in his work. Given that this motivation reveals itself beginning with the very first pages of his commentary, it would not be wrong to say that one of the major purposes behind Sudi’s writing a commentary on Hafiz is to present a critical review of Şem’i’s 1574 commentary, which is now twenty one years old but still widely recognized and read especially by the late sixteenth-century mystical circles of Ottoman Istanbul.\footnote{For information on Şem’i’s commentary on Hafiz, see Şeyda Öztürk, “Şem’i’nin Mesnevi Şerhi” (Marmara University, PhD. Diss., 2007), 77. For references to the popularity of the commentary, see especially the pages 3–8 of Öztürk’s dissertation.} Seen in this light, one can read Sudi’s critique as a piece written by an adamant scholar who positions himself against the writings and scholarship of Şem’i, who is, though a predecessor of Sudi by the date of his commentary, a contemporary of Sudi, a colleague sharing the same scholarly environment, and an established commentator on many Persian classics including Hafiz’s Divan. In this connection, it is important to note that it is in this critique that Sudi chooses, for the first time, not to allude critically to Şem’i’s grammatically incorrect interpretation of Hafiz’s text, but rather to expose it by quoting and refuting his colleague’s words. Beyond indicating the extent of Sudi’s critical stance against Şem’i, the shift in the way of referencing shows us the way in which Sudi enters into a critical dialogue with a contemporary commentator and renders his contemporary’s text as the target text of his commentary. Therefore if one interprets Sudi’s critique in light of his scholarly
disagreements with Şem‘i, then, it follows that while one reason for Sudi’s effort to discredit Şem‘i’s commentary is his scholarly premise that a thorough knowledge of the grammar is the key to a better understanding and analysis of such a grammatically intricate source text as Hafiz’s Divan, another reason has much to do with his claim for a better commentary that would challenge the canonical status of his contemporary’s commentary.98

2.5 Stepping into Persian grammar: Sudi on Hafiz’s second line

As is the case with the preceding one, Sudi presents a lemmatic analysis of Hafiz’s second line, which reads as follows:

که عشق اسان تمود اول وئى افتاد مشکلها

For love seemed easy at first, but (then) difficulties arose

Following his regular manner of exposition and translation, Sudi breaks the line down into eight grammatical units, defines the grammatical category, function and/or meaning of each unit individually, and adheres to the literal meaning of Hafiz’s words in translating the line. What is different from the previous section, however, is that the literal translation is now followed by a relatively lengthier annotation, where Sudi interprets Hafiz’s conception of love as worldly and

98 The assumptions made above regarding Sudi’s bringing Şem‘i’s text to the center of his commentary may seem overstated, as they rely solely on the critical remarks the commentator makes in passing. However, when one considers his commentary on Hafiz in its entirety and along with his other commentaries, especially the ones on Gâliban and Bostan, it becomes visible that the extent of the critical language Sudi uses against Şem‘i looms large in his writing, which is intended to place Şem‘i’s scholarship under critical scrutiny. That Sudi adamantly pursued this intention is understood from Şem‘i’s own words in his conclusion to his 1600 commentary on Abd al-Rahman Jami’s Subhat al-Abrar (Rosary of the Pious), where he openly complains about those who are critical of his works, claiming that he is unjustly accused due to the mistakes made by ignorant scribes (cf. Öztürk, “Şem‘i’nin Mesnevi Şerhi”, 68). Considering the fact that Sudi takes the lead in criticizing Şem‘i’s scholarship, the implied addressee of Şem‘i’s complaint becomes clear. In the same conclusion, Şem‘i also advises his critics to check his autograph copies before making any judgment about his works. In this regard, what is interesting to note is that in his above-mentioned critique Sudi seems to be referring to the autography copy of Şem‘i’s commentary on Hafiz, which is MS Kadızade Mehmed 403 located in the Suleymaniye Library, Istanbul. That Sudi uses the autograph copy is understood from his second quotation from Şem‘i, which appears in the autograph copy of Şem‘i’s commentary but does not occur in the subsequent copy (MS 1142 in the Hamidiye Collection of the same library) thanks to a correction made by the scribe who copied from the autograph in 1575, a year after the date of Şem‘i’s commentary. It would not be wrong, therefore, to conclude that Sudi is a careful reader and a meticulous critic of Şem‘i’s works as much as he is a commentator on the works of Hafiz and Sa’di, which explains the reason why Sudi’s criticism is reserved largely for his contemporary beginning with the first pages of his commentary.
explains what the poet means by the difficulties of love. What is of particular interest about Sudi’s analysis of the second line is that he now introduces his readers to Persian grammar as he lists and explains the words and particles contained in this first Persian line of Hafiz’s *Divan* one by one. Accordingly, here we see Sudi taking on the role of a grammarian of Persian, and thus putting into practice his main intention to teach or, at least, to exemplify the rules of Persian grammar through a lemmatic analysis of Hafiz’s text, which, as would be remembered, is an intention that he alludes to in his introduction to the commentary. When one looks at the lemmas listed under the second line, the first lemma stands out in terms of indicating the way Sudi works through the grammar of Persian as a scholar and a teacher of Persian philology. As seen above, the first lemma is the Persian *ki* (آٽ), a subordinating conjunction that connects two clauses. As a form that appears in different grammatical categories, *ki* is one of the puzzling aspects of Persian grammar, and, as such, can confuse learners as much as commentators. Aware of the interpretive problems that can be occasioned by its shifting grammatical roles, Sudi thus considers it necessary to explain the various uses of the Persian *ki* before defining its grammatical function as it is found in Hafiz’s line. Accordingly, rather than giving a quick gloss over the poet’s use of the phrase, Sudi first makes a distinction between the two grammatical categories to which the Persian *ki* belongs, and then he explains the role it plays in each category. In addition, to illustrate the grammatical roles played by *ki*, Sudi quotes a couplet from Sa’di’s *Gulistan*, where *ki* is used with two different roles. Thus, from the way Sudi treats the first lemma, it is clear that the commentator intends to provide learners and students of Persian with the necessary grammatical information about the Persian *ki*, that is to say, with a grammatical reference that the same learners and students can use in interpreting the grammatical function of *ki* in Hafiz’s other couplets to follow. 99 Besides reflecting his grammatical and pedagogical concerns as an

99 That Sudi pursues such authorial intention is understood when one considers the fact that Sudi does not reiterate
instructor of Persian, the way the first lemma is elucidated is also significant in terms of showing how Sudi incorporates another Persian classical text that he taught and wrote a commentary on into his discussion of a particular grammatical phrase in Hafiz’s text. Of particular significance is that Sudi makes reference to Sa’di’s *Gulistan*, which is not only one of the widely read Persian classics among Ottoman readers, but also one of the standard texts employed, by almost every Ottoman instructor of Persian, for the study of Persian grammar in or out of classroom. What is also significant about the *Gulistan* is that it is the text on which Sudi completed a commentary in the same year that he wrote his commentary on Hafiz’s *Divan*. Seen in this light, Sudi reference to the *Gulistan* can be taken to assume that the commentator worked on his two major commentary projects simultaneously and in such a way that he used certain parts of the two texts he commented on as grammatical examples to explain each other. This is supported by the fact that Sudi makes references to the *Gulistan* throughout his commentary on Hafiz as he does so to Hafiz’ *Divan* in his commentary on the *Gulistan*. That is why it would not be misleading to conclude that the way Sudi explains the first lemma is illuminating not only of his motivation to

---

100 On the significance of Sa’di’s text for learning and teaching Persian in the Ottoman Empire, see Ahmet Kartal, “Osmanlı Medeniyetini Besleyen Kültür Merkezleri” (PhD diss., Gazi University, 1999), 88–90.

101 In his commentary on Hafiz’s *Divan*, Sudi refers to the *Gulistan* twenty seven times in total. And in his commentary on the *Gulistan* the number of Sudi’s references to Hafiz’s *Divan* is fourteen in total. The total numbers may seem low, but given that Sa’di’s *Gulistan* is the most frequently cited text in Sudi’s commentary on Hafiz and, vice versa, that Hafiz’s *Divan* is the most referred-to text in Sudi’s commentary on the *Gulistan*, the idea that his commentaries on the *Divan* and *Gulistan* were concurrent projects becomes stronger. Also, if one compares, for example, the number of Sudi’s references to the *Gulistan* in his commentary on the *Divan* with that of his references to the *Bustan* in the same commentary, the same idea becomes a telling one: throughout his commentary on Hafiz Sudi makes only two references to Sa’di’s *Bustan*, which is a text he wrote a commentary on in 1598, three years after the completion of his projects on the *Divan* and *Gulistan*. For further information on Sudi’s references to the *Gulistan*, see İbrahim Kaya, “Şerh-i Divan-i Hafiz (Sudi): Kelimeler, Remizler, Kavramlar” (PhD diss., İnönü University, 2008), 164–169. For Sudi’s references to Hafiz’s poems in his commentary on the *Gulistan*, see Ozan Yılmaz, “16. Yüzyıl Şarihlerinden Sudi-i Bosnevi ve Şerh-i Gülistan’i” (PhD diss., Marmara University, 2008), 366–727.
furnish the beginning students of Persian with grammatical rules and examples but also of the way he composed his commentaries and interrelated the texts he commented on.

2.6 Stepping aside: a comparative glance at Sudi’s reading of the opening couplet

Having looked at Sudi’s analyses and translations in some detail, it would be better to stop for a while to sketch out the extent and ways in which Sudi departs from Süruri and Şem’i in his approach to and interpretation of Hafiz’s opening couplet, for it is only through such comparative framework that one can come to see and better understand what Sudi brings to a hermeneutic tradition that is informed and shaped by the commentaries of Süruri and Şem’i. In addition, given that each commentator consistently adheres to a regular pattern of exegesis throughout his work, this initial sketching out of the points of convergence and divergence between Sudi and his predecessors will also give us some preliminary but promising insights regarding the overall exegetical attitudes and techniques of these commentators both in the remaining couplets of Hafiz’s opening poem and in the rest of the *Divan*.

To begin with Hafiz’s opening line, it would be misleading to say that Sudi is the first commentator who presents a lemmatic analysis of the grammatical texture of this Arabic line, for in both Süruri and Şem’i one can see a similar analysis. On a closer look, however, Sudi’s analysis departs from his predecessors’ brief and cursory accounts as a more systematic and sophisticated form of grammatical exposition, which is, obviously, rooted in Sudi’s scholarly background in Arabic grammatical tradition. The divergence between Sudi and his predecessors in terms of their interest in a detailed, grammatical reading of Hafiz’s text becomes increasingly obvious if one looks at the way the three commentators elucidate the second line, the line in Persian. The reason is that while Süruri and Şem’i hasten to translate the line and add a gloss on its mystical content without making any comment on its grammatical aspects, Sudi adheres to his
grammatical focus and explains the grammatical constituents of this Persian line following the same method as with the opening line. Seen in this light, this early divergence between the exegetical attitudes of Sudi and his predecessors indicates that Sudi, unlike his predecessors, pursues a systematic grammatical approach to Hafiz’s text. And considering especially that Şüruri and Şem’i are not interested in the grammatical aspects of Hafiz’s Persian line, the same divergence also indicates that while Sudi is oriented toward teaching Persian grammar through the lines of a Persian poet his predecessors do not pursue such intention.

The divergence between Sudi and his predecessors is not only along the lines of a grammatical approach to Hafiz’s text, but also along the lines of a literal interpretation of it. Obviously, one can sense the contrast between the mystical attitude of Şüruri and Şem’i and the literalist stance of Sudi in the way they interpret the opening line, which particularly contains two words (saqi and ke’s) that allow different levels of interpretation. Thus the interpretive divergence between Sudi and his predecessors reveals itself as Şüruri and Şem’i offer mystical significations for the words saqi and ke’s while Sudi takes them literally. The divergence implicit in these initial interpretive acts becomes wider, however, when one looks at the way the three commentators translate and gloss over the second line, which contains the word ‘ishq (love), a semantically critical word that signifies a theme central not only to Hafiz’s opening poem but also to the rest of the poems in his Divan. Looking at the translations by Şüruri and Şem’i, one notices that both commentators translate the word ‘ishq as “divine love” (‘ışık-ı ilahi). Contrary to this mystical rendition, Sudi translates the same word as “love of the beloved” (‘ışık-ı canan) and leaves the interpretation of the word “beloved” (canan) open to the reader. Here Sudi’s choice of vocabulary in translating the word ‘ishq partly uncovers his reluctance towards the mystical sense. But what marks Sudi’s complete departure from his predecessors’ mystical
perspectives is the gloss he provides for the nature of love in Hafiz’s couplet immediately following his translation. Reading Sudi’s gloss in comparison to the ones by Süruri and Şem’i, one can see that Sudi takes a couplet that is mystically read and interpreted as a literal statement about worldly love, rather than as an allegorical expression of mystical love. Taking the same comparative perspective, one can especially notice that while Süruri and Şem’i relate the difficulty of love, as expressed by Hafiz, to the difficulties experienced by a mystic who goes through the different stages on the mystical path to union with God, Sudi construes Hafiz’s opening words as the cry of a suffering lover who turns to various sedatives (such as the wine Hafiz is asking for) and even, as Sudi lists, narcotics to alleviate the affliction he suffers from his love for the indifferent beloved. Beyond marking the interpretive divergence between Sudi and his predecessors, what is also striking about Sudi’s construing of the theme of love is that he reverses the mystical narrative through which Hafiz’s opening couplet came to be interpreted by replacing the well-established set of mystical underpinnings with its opposite, that is to say, by replacing the interpretation of the couplet as an allegory of mystical love with an interpretation that renders the same couplet as the story of a troubadour’s love. Seen in this light, and considered against the background of the long-standing mystical/allegorical interpretive framework built on the opening poem since the time of Hafiz, the literalist stance of Sudi goes beyond offering a grammatical reading of Hafiz’s text, or a literal interpretive framework for its study, but rather highlights a pioneering attempt to deconstruct the mystifications that have long obscured the text.

---

102 It is worth noting in this connection that Süruri and Şem’i compare the relation between the saqi and the poet to the one between a spiritual master and his disciple or, in the words of Şem’i, between the şeyh and his mürid. In the same manner, both commentators construe the difficulty of love as one concerning the achievement of the ecstatic state of union with the divine, which is, as Şem’i puts it, the visal-i Hakk or, alternatively, the vusul-i ila’llah, as Süruri names it.
CONCLUSIONS

Contextualizing Ahmed Sudi and His Commentary

The life and works of Ahmed Sudi present us with a commentator who comes from a background in Arabic and Persian philology and is interested in expounding the widely read Persian classics in the Ottoman Empire according to the models of textual analysis rooted in Arabic grammatical tradition. Sudi’s commentary on Hafiz’s *Divan* is accordingly shaped by the commentator’s focus on the grammatical structure and meaning of the poet’s text. Besides his scholarly background and training, one other aspect that has an influence on the focus and direction of the commentary is Sudi’s concern for the needs of beginning readers of Persian as well as of Hafiz. Taken together, the commentator’s background and his readerly motivation are the two main factors that stand behind his focus on the lexical analysis and meaning of the poet’s *Divan*. Obviously, the method of lexical analysis of the grammatical constituents of a text is not unique to Sudi, for it is a method whose origins go back to the Arabic grammatical studies that concentrated on Qur’anic exegesis beginning with the early years of Islam.\(^{103}\) In Sudi’s case, however, one can identify the influence of the grammatical approach of a particular Arab grammarian, namely Ibn al-Hajib (d. 1249), the author of the two widely read and commented on Arabic grammars, *al-Kafiya* (the one on syntax) and *al-Shafiya* (the one on morphology). What primarily leads one to think so is that Sudi studied and wrote commentaries on the grammars of Ibn al-Hajib. Furthermore, as understood from his introductory words to his commentary on *al-“\(^{103}\) For the origins and development of Arab grammatical studies, see, among others, C. H. M. Versteegh, *Arabic Grammar and Qur’anic Exegesis in Early Islam*, Leiden: Brill, 1993 (especially chapters three and six). For a detailed account of the various aspects of Arab grammatical tradition, see “Grammatical Tradition” in *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, vol. 2, eds. Kees Versteegh et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 175–191.
Kafiya, Sudi also appropriated al-Hajib’s approach to, and views of, Arabic grammar. A convincing evidence for Sudi’s reliance on al-Hajib’s model of grammatical analysis comes from a comparative reading of the two grammarians’ analyses of poetry. If one compares, for instance, the manner in which al-Hajib treats the couplets of the Arab poet al-Mutanabbi (915–965) with the way Sudi analyzes Hafiz’s text, it becomes clear that al-Hajib’s focus on the lexical meaning as well as his concern with the grammatical particularities bear striking similarities with those of Sudi.

That Sudi follows al-Hajib’s grammatical approach and lemmatic analysis in expounding Hafiz’s text adds an important dimension to the contexts of Sudi’s commentary, one that involves the use and circulation of the commentary in the madrasa classroom. Especially considering that Ibn al-Hajib’s grammars were “pedagogical grammars written expressly for the madrasa,” it would not be inaccurate to say that most Ottoman madrasa students were familiar with al-Hajib’s grammatical work as well as the models of textual analysis developed by him.

Seen in this light, al-Hajib stands as a fitting source for a commentator like Sudi, whose commentary is aimed primarily at madrasa-based students who have a certain level of background in Arabic language and grammar but are new to Persian grammar and texts. Thus it is not surprising to see that Sudi follows a grammatical methodology known to madrasa scholars and students, frequently refers to the commonly read texts of Arabic grammatical tradition and readily uses Arabic grammatical terms in analyzing the grammatical structure and meaning of a Persian text such as Hafiz’s Divan. Regarding the use of the commentary within the madrasa

104 For Sudi’s introductory words, see MS Atif Efendi 2449, Süleymaniye Manuscript Library, fols. 1b–3b.
context, it should be also noted that, besides his training in Arabic philological tradition and his being influenced by the works of al-Hajib, one other significant aspect that led Sudi to writing a grammatical commentary on Hafiz is his close ties with madrasa scholarship. Considering, especially, that Sudi attended various madrasas and established close relations with a number of madrasa scholars both during his travels in the eastern lands of the empire and in the period beginning with his return to Istanbul, one can see that Sudi’s madrasa background inclined him towards writing a grammatical commentary that would suit the needs of the Ottoman madrasa circles. Seen in this context, Sudi’s commentary appears as a “pedagogical” commentary that is designed primarily to suit the needs of madrasa students who intend to study Persian grammar using Hafiz’s text and is thus appropriate for a madrasa curriculum.

Besides its underpinnings that are rooted in Arabic grammatical tradition, Sudi’s commentary presents us with two main contexts, one involving the Ottoman commentary tradition on Hafiz and his text, the other related to the study of Persian grammar and Persian classical texts in sixteenth-century Ottoman scholarship. The first context is an immediate context in the sense that it is the one in which the content, structure and purpose of Sudi’s commentary becomes not only more intelligible but also distinct from those of the preceding ones. In addition, it is through the same context that the critical nature of the commentary is better understood. The second context, the larger one, is the one which has been often neglected so far by scholars who have commented on the commentary. But the second context is a significant one for it enables us to better see that the commentary is written by an Ottoman instructor of Persian who was trained in the major centers of learning and was appointed afterwards to teach Persian grammar in the İbrahim Pasha Palace, one of the prestigious centers of Ottoman imperial education. Not only does the larger context let us perceive the commentary
as a book composed by an instructor of Persian, but it also provides us with a framework through which one can see those points in Sudi’s text where he engages in a critical dialogue with the works of sixteenth-century Ottoman scholars on Persian grammar and classics. Thus looking at Sudi’s commentary in this larger context broadens our understanding of the commentary since it allows us to see that, beyond being the work of an instructor of Persian, Sudi’s commentary is a work by a scholar of Persian language who was concerned about how Persian grammar and classics were studied, commented on and taught by sixteenth-century Ottoman scholars.

1. The Immediate Context:

Sudi and the Ottoman commentary tradition on Hafiz’s Divan

The context from which one can better approach Sudi’s commentary is the one that relates the commentary to the ones by Süruri and Şem‘i, for it is such a context that provides us with a better perspective to the motivation behind Sudi’s text as well as to his focus and concern as a commentator. The primary aspect of Sudi’s commentary that leads one to consider his text within the context of those of his predecessors is the critical tone that underlies Sudi’s writing, which appears early on in his introductory words to the commentary and gradually condenses into a harsh criticism as Sudi frequently engages in a critical dialogue with his predecessors’ commentaries throughout the rest of his text. If one takes into account that in almost all manuscript copies of the commentary the parts where Sudi refutes his predecessors’ interpretations are indicated in the margin, it can be said that historically Sudi’s text was seen not only as a text closely linked to the texts of his predecessors, but also as a text that was read and interpreted against the background of the mystical context provided by Süruri and Şem‘i. This is especially apparent if one considers that the marginalia of some manuscripts of the commentary include readers’ quotations from the commentaries of Sudi’s predecessors.
A particular insight that can be derived from interpreting Sudi’s text in the context of his predecessors involves the reason and intention behind Sudi’s writing a grammatical commentary that focuses on the literal and textual aspects of Hafiz’s Divan. In this regard, a comparative look at the introductions of the three commentaries provides insight into the context against which the grammatical nature of Sudi’s commentary should be interpreted. Looking at Süruri’s introduction, one can especially notice that it is heavily marked by the commentator’s intention to uncover and transmit the mystical aspects of Hafiz’s poetry to his readers. From the same introduction, it also becomes clear that in writing a mystical commentary on Hafiz the commentator pursues the goal of leading his readers to the path of mysticism that would provide them with spiritual guidance. Though Şem’i’s brief introduction to his commentary on Hafiz does not include any overt indication that the commentator is in the pursuit of a solely mystical interpretation, one can still see Şem’i’s mystical attitude toward textual exegesis if one pays attention to what he writes about his exegetical approach in his other commentaries. As he makes it clear in his concluding words to one of his commentaries, Şem’i takes all of the Persian classics he wrote commentaries on as allegorical texts and writes his commentaries to elucidate their mystical content. In the same concluding remarks, Şem’i also accentuates the idea that his primary goal as a commentator is “to multiply the mystical benefits” that readers would derive from reading his commentaries.107 Considered against the background of this mystical context, Sudi’s offering a grammatical approach in his introductory words to the commentary represents a radical departure from his predecessors. Seen in this light, Sudi’s departure from the mystical context also reflects a critical attitude informed by the commentator’s contention that there is a need for a non-mystical commentary that would elucidate and illustrate the linguistic, not the mystical, aspects and intricacies of the Divan and thus would give readers an insight into why

107 Öztürk, “Şem’i’nin Mesnevi Şerhi,” 68.
Hafiz is considered as one of the master poets of the Persian language as well as into why his *Divan* is accepted as one of the major texts of Persian.

Another benefit of looking at Sudi’s commentary in the context of his predecessors’ writings is that it provides us with a framework through which one can compare and contrast Sudi’s perception and representation of Hafiz and his *Divan* in relation to the mystical canon, which not only includes Süruri’s and Şem‘i’s perspectives but also a broad spectrum of perceptions and representations of the poet and his poetry in the sixteenth-century Ottoman Empire. Given such framework, one can notice that Sudi’s perception of Hafiz’s *Divan* as a literal text that should be interpreted literally stands in contrast with the mystical perceptions of Süruri and Şem‘i, which lead both commentators to laud Hafiz as one of the highly esteemed members belonging to the class of mystical adepts and interpret his text as one of the major handbooks of mysticism. Considered especially in relation to the sixteenth-century Ottoman perceptions of Hafiz as a mystic of high esteem and of his *Divan* as a source of divine guidance, it can be said that Sudi’s perception and representation of Hafiz as one of the outstanding poets of the Persian language marks a radical point of divergence from a long standing tradition.108 What lies behind Sudi’s divergence from the heavily mystical perceptions and representations of the poet can again be associated with his critical attitude, especially if one considers that in many parts of his commentary Sudi heavily attacks his predecessors’ extreme interpretations of Hafiz’s couplets and illustrates how insisting on a purely mystical approach to the *Divan* results in interpretive fallacies.109


109 For Sudi’s criticisms of his predecessors’ extreme interpretations, see, for instance, Şerh-i Divan-i Hafiz (Alexandria, Egypt: Bulak, 1834), vol. 1, 388–389 and vol. 2, 147.
In this connection, it is important to note that one can find a criticism similar to that of Sudi in a fetva (religious edict) issued by the sixteenth-century Ottoman şeyhülislam (the chief judge) Ebussuud Efendi (1490–1574), who held a number of madrasa positions as a scholar of Islamic sciences before finally serving as the şeyhülislam of the empire between 1545–1574. The fetva uncovers the critical attitude of an Ottoman judge toward those readings of the Divan that exceed the interpretive limits established by the şeriat (Islamic jurisprudence) and attempt to put mystical interpretations on every poem of Hafiz. As such, Ebussuud’s fetva helps us better contextualize Sudi’s critique of the purely mystical representations and extended interpretations of the Divan, for it allows us to consider Sudi’s critical approach in the context of sixteenth-century interpretive tensions between Ottoman mystical circles, which were inspired by the teachings of the major mystics like Hafiz, and the madrasa scholars, who adopted a literalist attitude toward texts and adhered to the interpretive principles set by the şeriat and shaped by Quranic exegesis and grammar. Seen in this light, that Sudi shares the same concerns with Ebussuud suggests that Sudi’s demystifying approach to Hafiz and his Divan can be viewed as a criticism voiced by a madrasa-based scholar who writes an intentionally non-mystical commentary as a response to extremist forms of mystical interpretation.

2. The Larger Context:

Sudi and the Ottoman scholarship on Persian language and classics

Unlike the case with the immediate context, one does not have much information to explore the broader context surrounding the commentary, except for what can be deduced from the general view of Sudi’s scholarly career and writings. Still, it can be argued that the commentary can be seen in relation to sixteenth-century Ottoman scholarship on Persian language and classics if one approaches it from two perspectives. Seen from the first perspective,

110 For the fetva, see Katip Çelebi, Kesfi’z-Zûnûn, vol. 2 (Istanbul: Matbâa-i ‘Ilm, 1892), 784.
the commentary is a text that identifies, focuses on, and corrects those parts of the preceding texts where Süruri and Şem’i misinterpret certain aspects of the grammar of Persian. Given that both Süruri and Şem’i are established commentators who were noted, in sixteenth-century Ottoman scholarly circles, for their scholarship on Persian classics, one can see that one of the motivations behind Sudi’s revealing the grammatical misinterpretations of his predecessors is to engage in a critical discussion with mainstream scholarship. Especially considering that Şem’i, a contemporary of Sudi, was particularly famous as an instructor of Persian, and also that he attracted patronage for his commentaries from the Ottoman palace, one can better see not only the nature and significance of Sudi’s unearthing of scholarly fallacies but also the reason why he directs most of his attention to the fallacies in Şem’i’s text.

Seen from the second perspective, the commentary appears as a text where Sudi goes beyond his critical dialogue with the scholarship of his predecessors to engage in a wider discussion with a range of scholarly works. Of these works, a corpus of sixteenth-century Ottoman commentaries on Sa’di’s Gülistan is the most revealing in terms of showing us how Sudi engages in a critical discussion with the Ottoman commentators of Sa’di on issues related to the study and interpretation of Persian grammar. In this regard, it is especially worthy of notice that Sudi turns his critical eye on the Ottoman commentators of Sa’di in discussing the grammatical aspects of Hafiz’s text, which can be interpreted as an indication that the commentator concerns himself with a broad range of scholarly perspectives on Persian language.

---

112 For the support Şem’i received from Palace circles, see İsmail Ünver, “Şem’i Şem’ullah”, Türk Dili 49:397 (January 1985): 38–43.
113 For Sudi’s references to Ottoman commentaries on the Gülistan, see, for instance, GI:6 (the sixth couplet of the first poem) in the transcribed text of the commentary.
and classics, and especially with the ones on the Gülistan, the focal text of Ottoman scholarship on Persian grammar.
PART II
I
TRANSCRIBED TEXTS

A Note on Transcriptions

The transcribed texts presented here follow the following transcription scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أ, ا</td>
<td>a, e, '</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ط</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>ğ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ق</td>
<td>ğ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غ</td>
<td>ğ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ع</td>
<td>v, o, ö, u, ū, ü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ی</td>
<td>y, i, ī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Bismillahi’r-raḥmāni’r-raḥīm

El-ḥamdū li’l-lāhi elleżi veффeъaъnī li-beъānī’ll-ulūmi ve’l-ma‘ārifi ve lisānī’ll-‘arabi el-mühezzēbi ve’l-acemi el-mü’eddēbi; ve’š-şalātu ve’š-selāmu ‘alā ṣefdaли ḡalkīhi Muḥammēdīn efṣāhī z’il-ḥasebī ve’š-sereфи ve’in-nesebī ve ‘alā ālīhī el-ebārī ve ašğābīhī el-ahyārī.


Mercūdur ki bu şerhe nāzır olanlar mer-aosu ve Südī-ī žaţīfi ḡayır du’ādan fer仫üş buyurmayarlar—bi-Muḥammed ve ālīhī el-ėmcādī. Ehl-ī inşāfdan me’mûldur ki bu şerhemizde sehv ü zezel ve Ŵatā ví ḡatel vāki’ olan maḥallerin ḵaлем-ī ʻafv ü şafḥla

114 The transcribed text of Sudi’s introduction is based on MS Hazine K.933, which is the oldest copy of the commentary that includes the introduction. Copied in 1007 A.H. (1599 A.D.), the manuscript is located in Topkapı Palace Library, Istanbul. The transcribed text of Sudi’s commentary on the first five poems is based on MS Feyzullah Efendi 1641 (located in Fatih Millet Library, Istanbul), which is the oldest extant copy of the commentary and is dated 1006 A.H. (1598 A.D.).
İşləh idüph 'uyübünü ibrāz ü izhärına sa'y ü küşış eylemeyeler zirā biz mu'terifiz ki böyle müşkil kitābī şerh eylemek bizim ḥaddimiz ve mıḳdārmızız degıldūr. Līkin ibrāma düşdük. Nite ki săbiken mezkūr oldı, bunuñ biriyle nazarından inşaf nazaran temennī iderūz.

Beyt
Ve 'aynü'r-rızā 'an külli 'aybin kefiiletün
Velākinne 'ayne's-suḥṭı tübdı'l-mesāviyah


Semā'-ı şūfiyān anuñ şūr-engīz gazelleri okunmayınca zamānında germ olmazdı ve meclis-i selāthin anuñ zevk-āmīz kelimətiün nukl-i meze-dārı nakl olmayınca zīb ü zīnet bulmazdı. Belki hāy u hūy-ı müştakān anuñ velvele-i şevkiyle olurdu ve sürūd-ı mey-perestān anuñ ġulğule-i eş'āriyla revnaq bulurdu. Şöyle ki temșilinde buyurmuşlardır:

Kıt'a
Gazel-serāyi-i Hāfız bedān resīd ki çerh
Nevā-yi Zohre o sāz-ı hoşes be-bord ez-yād
Be-dād dād-i ġazel der-zemān bedān vechī
Ki hīç şā'īr ez-ān gūne dād-i naẓm ne-dād
Çu şī'r-i 'ażb-i revāneş zi-bər konī gūyī
Hezār raḥmet-ı Ḥakk ber-revān-i Hāfız bād

Târîh
Be-sâl-i bâ’ o şâd o zâl-i ebced
Zi-rûz-i hicret-i meymûn-i Aḥmed
Be-sûy-i cennet-i a’lâ revân şod
Ferîd-i ‘ahd Şemsü’d-dîn Muḥammed
Be-ḥâk-i pâk-i zû cûn ber-gożestem
Nîgeh kerdem şafâ o nûr-i merkâd

Bu mışrâ‘ Yezîd bin Mu‘âviye’nüñ baḥr-ı hezecden bir kit‘asinuñ beyt-i şânîsidür. Bi-kemâlihi âsl-i kit‘a böluedür:

anna mûstûm muna unûdi
bûtiyâtî wîlâ raqi
advert wasa và naowla
âla ya ebi saqucî


Kit‘a

xwâje haçaz ra shibî diyem bixwab
kêfem aî ûr fûsl w dânîş bî miûal
az çê bêsti ûr xûd aîn shûr yûzût
ba wûoud aîn hûm fûsl w kêmûal
kêfem wîqûf nêstî zûn mesîlê
mûl kûfûr hêst brûmûm hûlal

Ve Kâtibî-i Nişâbûrî buyurur:

Kit‘a

ubûb dur hîrîm az xwâje haçaz
bûnumî kûsh xûd zûn uazî aîd
çê hûkumêt ûr xûr yûzût o
kê ôr ûnûkan nêstî aûwû sûrâid
êkêhê mal kûfûr brûsûmûl
halûsût w dûrû nâmû nêsûd
wûlî az shûr ubûyî ûn oûmûsû
kê lûhêz az dêhân sêk rûbûd
Elā: ḥarf-i istiftāḥdur. Nite ki āyet-i kerīmede vāḳiʿdür:

لا ان أولياء الله لا خوف عليهم ولا هم يحزنون

Keşşāf şāhibi terkībine ẓāhib oldı ve İbn Mālik “Basīṭdür” didi. Mufaṣṣalāt-ı naḥviyyede ikisiniñ de edillesi meştur ve mezkūrdur.

Yā: ḥarf-i nidā

Eyyu: münādā-yi müfred-i maʿrife


Es-sākī: taḳdīren merfū‘; şıfatıdur eyyulafızınuñ. Ḥaḳīḳatede münādā sāḳīdür. İki alėt-i ta’ rif cem’ olmamağçun eyyu lafziyla tavassuṭ eleyüp hāyla tenbīh eylediler. Luğatde “şuvarıcı” dimekdür ammā istilāḥda “bāde meclisinde kadeḥ süren”e dirler.

Edir: fi’i emr-i muḥâtabdur ifalus “döndür” dimekdür; “döndert” degüldür bażılar zannı gibi.

Ke’sen: “tolu”. “Kadeḥ’e dirler ammā kadeḥ ke’sden e’ammadur.


Hā žamīr-i müʾennes. Ke’se racı’dür.

Ma’lūm ola ki ḥamruñ cemi’ alaṭi ve esmā vü şıfatı te’nīs-i ma’nevi[de] müsta’meldür.


Feḥvā-yi kelâm: Ke’şi sür, nevbet baña gelsün, nüş ideyin.

“Nāvil bunda sen iç ma’nāsına olmak evlādur” dimek ve Ḥaẓret-i Mevlānā Cāmī’nüñ bu beytini eyledüğü müdde’eya delil ţırd eylemek:

Beyt

صفاء جام مي جامی برد زنگ غم از خاطر

اذا ما تلق من هم فحاولها و ناوحلها

meddlülde ve delilde istıkāmatıden kemāl-i inhīrāfdur ve münāvele ile tenāvūli ‘adem-i tešhīsdür. Ve ‘ale’l-huṣūs ki şākînuñ içmesi maḳṣūd degüldür; belki şā’irün kendinüñdür ve “Ene el-mesmūm” ‘ibāreti baña şahiddür. Nite ki nāvil lafızına yâ-yı mütekellim taḳdīr eyledügimizden ma’lūm olmışdı ve şa’irün kavlı de buña delıldür:
Beyt

اترع قدمه المدام فالفجر يلوح
واسره و ناولني كالمسك يفوح
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که عشق اسان نمود اول ولی افتاد مشکلها

Ki: kâf-ı ‘Arabînûn kesri ve hâ-yi resmîyle ismle harf beyninde müsterekdür. İsm olıcaq zât-ı zevîl-’üküle delâlet ider. Gülîstânûn bu beyti gibi:

Beyt

از دست و زبان که برآید
کز عهده شکرش بدرآید

Harf olıcaq iki şey’üñ beynini rabṭ içün gelür: mübtedâyla haber ve şıfatla mevşûf ve’ illetle ma’lûl ve şayetle mûgayyâ ve bunlardan şayri. Bunda harf-i ta’lîldür ya’nî mezûr emr şiğalarına ‘illetdür.


Müskil: “çetiñ” dimekdür; “gûç” ma’nâsına.


Maḥşûlî beyt bu oldı ki “Ey sâkı bânda bâde vir zîrâ ‘îşk-ı cânân evvelde kolay gördündi ammâ âhirde müskiller vâkı’ oldı.”
Zîrâ bir kimseye gönlü virseñ ibtidâda saña envâ’-ı müläyemetler gösterür. ʿIşk u maḫabbet istiḥkâm bulunca şoñra istiğnâya başlar. ʿĀşıḳ-ı biçâre de istiğnâya taḥammül idemeýüp gâh bâdye ve gâh afyûna ve berše ve filuniyâya ve gâh esrâra ve kâhveye düşer tek dîvâne göñli bir miḳdâr ârâm u ƙarâr eylesün diyû.
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Bu beyti bir risâlede müstevfî taḥḳîḳ eylemişüz. Murâd idinen anda görsün. Ammâ bunda icmâlen ma’nâsını ẓik iderüz inşâ’ Allâh u Te’ālā.


Kî: şîfatla mevṣûfı rabṭ eylemişdür.


Zân: “ez-ān”dan muḫafffedîr. Ez “min ve ‘an” ma’nâsînadur, än ism-i işâretdîr ba’îde.


Cemî “ṭurer” gelür ğałnuñ ẓammî ve rânuñ fethîyle.

Zi-tāb: zā-yı müfrede “ez”den muḥaffefdür. Tābuñ niçe ma’nāsı vardur ammā bunda “burum ve büküm” ma’nāsına olmak evlādur.

Ca’d: şifat-ı müsebehedür; şa’ra ya’ni kîla şifat olur; “şar-rîn ca’dîn” dirler “müca’ad” ma’nāsına. Zencîr şeklinde olan şaclarda müsta’meldür. Gāh olur ki mevşufını ḥazf idüp kendüyi makâmina ikâmet iderler bundaki gibi.


Çe: bunda mübâlağa ifâde ider ider bu beyteki gibi:

Beyt

ﭽﭼ سالهای فراوان و عمرهای دراز
که خلق برسرما برزمن بخواهد رفته

Hûn: ḳandur.


Der: ḥarîf-i zarf


Maḥşûl-i beyt bu oldi ki “bir nāfe khôkusî sebebiyle veya bir nāfe umîdiyle, ancîlayîn nāfe ki şabâ ol nāfe[y]î ṭurre-i cânândan açîsardur, cânânênûn müşkîlî zûlfinûn burumînandan ve bükmûnden veya tûrenûn müşkîlî ca’dînûn burumînandan ve bükmûnden yüreklere mübâlağa kan düşdi.”

Kân düşmekte sebeb ziyâde intizârdur. Zîrâ şabâ zûlf-i müca’aduñ táblarını açmaga ziyâde eglenir ve ziyâde eglenmesi ziyâde iştîrâba bâ’iş olur ki yüreklere ḫûn düşmek zarûrîdür.

Hâsil-i kelâm: Ähû iki kısımdur: Birine “ähû-yi sepîd” dirler ve birine “ähû-yi müşkîn” dirler. Nite ki AŞAFI ikisini bile bir beytde cem’ eyletmiş:
Beyt

加紧奧和威利阿幾維肖肯駁

緊繃鴨鴨並記於奧維塞

Pes āhū-yı müşkīn Ḫīṭā ve Ḫoten ve Tübüt ve Činde olur ve ol memleketüñ âmemisi bunları süri süri beslerler ki hem etiyle sebeblenürler ve hem miskiyle fâyidelenürler.

Rūmuñ āhūları ya’nī āhū-yı sefīd yılda bir kerre boynuzların düşürüği gibi āhū-yı müşkīn yılda bir kerre nāfelerin düşürür. Ḥattā zamānı geldükde żāyiʿ olmaya diyü. Pes müşküñ husüline sebeb anı yazarlar ki ol āhūyı yā ḥayvān cinsi veyā insān ürküdüp ḥarāret kesb ider veyā biri biriyle oynamakdan ḥarāret kesb ider ve bu ḥarāret sebebiyle nāfesine bir kaç çate’e kan düşer.


Ammā aṣl meşhūr olan budur ki nāfe geyügüñ seresinde bi-iẕni’llāh meme gibi belüre daḥi içine kan ine ve yap yap büyüye, zamānı gelicek ẓopa, düşe. Keẓā fi ʿAḳīl-i Maḥān. Bu da ma’lūm ola ki āhūdan münfaṣıl oldukda ẓaḳī virmezimiş. Ba’dehu baʿżı mu’ álecātla terbiye iderler ki ma’hūd ẓaḳīyı virür. Baʿżılar didiler ki “Misk her otı otlamakdan ḥāṣil olmaz; belki lāle ve sünbül otlamakdan olur.” Nite ki ʿAṣafı dimiş:

Beyt

در دور لاله مستی آهو و
مشکین غزالة را بفصح نوشی أورد

Ve lehu:

Beyt

چشم آهویست مشکین روى کلکونرا زتبت
لآله زاری ساختی بهر غزال خوششن

Ve lehu:
Selmân:

Beyt

دراج و يوم او همه شاهین كند شکار
و هوى دشت او همه سنبل كند چرا

Pes tureyi nafeye ve sabâyi musk-fürüsa ki nafe-güşadur teşbîh eylemiş ve yüreklere kan düşmege sebeb tevakku' ve intizârdur.
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همی سجاده رنگین کن گرد پیر مغان کوید
به سالک بی خبر نبود ز راه و رسم منزلها

Be-mey: bâ “bile” ma’nâsına
Renginde yâ nisbet ve nun te’kîd içündür.


Muğân: muğûn cem’îdür. “Keşiş’e ve “oda çapn kâfir’e ve “muţlaqen kâfir’e dirler. Nite ki Şâhidî dimiş:

Beyt

مغ كاور شعله فروع و هزل لاغ

Pes pîr-i muğändan murâd bunluruñ ulusîdur.


Kı: ĕhr-f-i ta'lll

Resm: 'ădet
Menzilhâ: menzillerden murâd mey-ḫânelerdür.


Zîrâ her gün niçe 'ârif ü kâmiller konîrûp göcûrmedûr ve rîndler ta'rikînî hüb žabç eylemişdûr ve herkesüñ ta'bî'atîni ve mecbûribi a'llâ aňfâmâmâdûr ve herkese ne lâyıkûrdur güzel bîmîşdûr. Pes âna bi'ž-žarûret itibâbâláîmîrûn ki şofîra nedâmé tûmârîn çekmeye. Zîrâ emrinde ġikmet-i 'azîme vardur ve ol ġikmet anûn ve emshâlinîn ma' lûmidur ançak.

Mera'da mîm žamîr-i muťekellîm-i vaĥdedûr. Râ niçe ma'nâya gelûr. Înşâ’ Allâhu Te’alâ her birini maḩallinde beyân iderüz. Bunda mefûlîyyet ma'nâsını ifâde ider. 'Arabîde "iyyâye" gibi.


Cânân kıyâs budur ki cânuñ cem'i ola mûbâlaga ta'rîkiyle. Gûyâ ki cemî ūuşşâkuñ cânîdûr. Nite ki şâ’ir dir:

Mişrâ'

Heman bin Xusthe Nk Jâni Dâkllân Jân Ulâmsun

Çûn: bunda ta’lîl ma’nâsınıadur, “cünkî” dimekdür.


Ceres: “cañ”dur ya’nî develerûñ ve katîrlarûñ boynına aşdûkları.


“Feryâd-res” dîrler medede irişen kimseye. Belîyyelerde ve müsbette mûstam’meldür:

Beyt

هر كه فريند رسي روز مصبيت خواهد
كو در ایام سلامت بجوانمردی کوشد

Ammâ bunda “bâng u āvâz” ma’nâsına tâzmîn olunmuşdur ve bunu karînedûr ceresi insâna istl’âre eyledûğine.

Bu da ma’lûm ola ki evvel zamânda seferlerde göçmek vakîtinde ceres ötdûrûrûrûmûş herkes mütenebbih olsun diyû. Ammâ ’Oşmâniyân bori çalarlar.


Ki: feryâdı beyândur.

Ber-bendîd: ber ve “der” kelimeleri ki ef’âl evâyiîlînde vâkı’ olur, ekşer te’kid ifâde ider. Gâh olur ki her biri bir ma’nâ ifâde ider. İnşâ’ Allâhu Te’âlà maḩallinde beyân oluna.

115 Written as ileyh in MS 1641
116 Written as nefes in MS 1641
117 Written as yâ-yi müfrede in MS 1641


Şeb: gice
Târîk ve “târ”, “karanlık” ma’nâsînâdûr.
Ü: iżâfet-i beyâniyêdûr.
Bîm: ḫavf
Mevc: deňiz tâlgasî.
Ü: iżâfet-i lâmiyêdûr.
Yâ vaḥdêt veyă tenkîr içûndûr. “Herf-i maşdar” tûtanlar ma’nâyî bilmemîşlêr.
Çûnîn: mürekkebdûr çûn ile ğînden. Çûn bunda edât-i teşbihîdûr. İn ism-i işaretdür karîb içûn. Terkîb sebebiyle çûnûn vâvî ve Ģûnî hemzesi ḫâzî olmînîşdûr.
Hâyił: “hevl”dendûr, “ҝorku” ma’nâsînà.
Kucâ: kanda
Hâl-i mâ: hâl “emr ü şe’n” ma’nâsînûdûr. Mâ “biz” dimekdûr “nahnu” ma’nâsînà.
Sâḥîlîhâ: sahîlûn cem’idûr uşîb-i ’Acem üzrê; “deňiz kênârî”, “ṣâṭî’ül-bâhî” ma’nâsînà.
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همه كارم زخود كامي بیدنامي كشید آخر
نهان کي ماند ان رازى كرو سازند محفلها

Heme: ihâta-i efrâd içündür; “küll” ma’nâsına
Kâr: bunda “iş”, “fi’l” ma’nâsînadur.
Keşîd: bunda “înkîlāb ve taḥavvûl” ma’nâsına fi’l-i lâzîmdür. Mûte’addî degüldür ba’zîlarsân eyledüği gibi. “Çekîldî” dimekdür şarâb sirkeye ve süd yoğurdu çekildiği gibi. Nite ki Ḥażret-i Mollâ Câmî’nüñ bu beytinden zâhîrdür:

Beyt

جا كن درون ياك ضميري كه عاقبت
زين شيوه كار قطره بدردانكي كشيد

Beyt

چند أصفي بکوى پری پیکران روی
کار تو رفته رفته بديوانکي كشيد

Hilâlî:

Beyt

وه كه سودای تو أخر سريشيدايي كشيد
قصة عشق نهان ما برسوايي كشيد

Āhir: kelîme-i te’kîddür sâbîkâ beyân olınan gibi.
Key: Fârsîde “ḳaṣaን” dimekdür.

**Beyt**

**Ümmet**

**Beyt**

**Beyt**


Ān: ism-i işıaretîdîr.

Râz: “gizli iş”

Ya: vañdet veyâ tenkîr içûndûr.


Sâzênd: fi’l-i muşârî’-i cem’-î gâyib; “sâzîden”den “eylerler” dimekdîr. Bir ma’nasî dañî vardur. Înşâ’ Allâh Te’alâ yîrînde beyyân olîna.


Maḥṣûl-î beyt: “Cemî’ ef’al ü aḥvâlîm; kendi mûrûdûm ve maḵşûdûm mûkṭezâsîncî oldûgumdan, ya’înî kendi mûrûdûm ʿûsûliyîle mûkâyêd olup cânûn mûrûdiyîla taḵâyûd eylemedûgûmden, bed-nâmîla ya’înî rûsvâyîlîa mûncerr ve mûnkâlib ve mûteḥaﬃvîl oldî.”


Pes mişrâ’-î şanîyî bu taḵrîre ʾirsâl-ı meşel idûp buyûrur: “Kâçan maḥfî kalur bir râz ki andan mecma’lîr peyda idêler.”
Ya’nî, bir sırr ki mecāmi’ ü maḥāfilde söylene kaçan gizli खल. Elbette gizli kalmaz. Zîrâ

Beyt

بعد ازین راز هلالی نتوان ساخت نهان

که بهر خلوت ازو انجمین ساخته اند

Râzdan maḥāfîl ü mecāmi’ peydâ eylemekden maḳşûd, cā-be-cā ani söyleşmekdûr.

7

حضرورى كر همی خواهي ازو غایب مشو حافظ

منی ما تلق من تهوى دع الدنيا و واملها

Hūzûr: nakîz-i “ğiyybet”dûr ve “sefer” mûkabîlinde de müsta’meldûr. Ammâ bunda mûrâd

“istiräḥat”dûr.

Yâ: vaḥdet veyâ tenkîr içündür.

Hˇâhî: fi’l-i mużâri’i muḥāṭabdûr; “ḥˇâhîden”den müsta’kk. “Eger ḥuţûr dilerseñ”

dimekdûr.

Ez-˚: ü žamîri mîsra’-i şânînûn mazmûnîna ya’nî fehvarasîna maşrûfdur. İzmâr kâbû’z-z

ikr tarîkîyle zât-i Bûri’ye îrcâ’î efheş-i ḡaţayûdandur.

Gâyib: mûkâbil-i “ḥâzîr”dur. Ammâ bunda “gâﬁl” mûrâddur. Nite ki ba’zî nûsahda vâki’

dûr.


Metâ: esmâ’-i menkûşadan iki fi’l-i muzāri’i cezm ider. Müṣterekdûr şartla istîfham

beyninde. Bunda şart içûndür.

Mâ: ḡarf-i zîyîd; te’ki’d içûn.


cemîle düşmişidür. “Bulûçasân” dimekdûr. Taḫdîr-i kelâm

Metî arîdîn an Tlîqî dimekdûr tâ ki ma’nâ mústaḵîm ola. Nîte ki đa

bîyledûdî.


GII

1

ای فروغ ماه حسن آز روى رخشان شما
آب روى خوبي آز جاه زنخدان شما


Fûrûţ: ismdîr “ziyâ” ma’nâsına.

Mâh: ay; lafż-i müştersêkdür. Bunda “cirm-i ḵamer” murâddur.

Hûsûn: güzellik
Rûy: yüz
Raḥşān: şifat-ı müsebbehedür “raḥşīden”den; “yıldırğağın” ma’nasına
Şumā: siz; “entüm” ma’nasına. Žamīr-ı merfū’-ı münfaşıldırdur.
Āb-rūy: yüz şuyı; “ʿırż” ma’nasına.
Hūb: güzel
Yā: ḥarf-i maṣdar
Čāh: kuyı; bunda “çuḳur” murāddur.
Zenahdān ve “zenaḥ”, “eñek” ma’nasındur.
Maḥṣ āl: “Ey cānān, güzellik ayınıñ žiyāısı sizüñ yıldırğağın yüzüñüzdendir.”
Ya’ni felegüñ ayi güneşden när alduği gibi güzellik ayı sizen när u žiyā alur dimekdür.
Māhuñ hüsnе izāfeti isti’āreqe tarīkıleyedür.
“Ey cānān, güzellik yüzı şuyı sizüñ eñegüñüz ḳuyısındandur”; ya’ni çukurından. Ĥāslī: Cemī’en hüsnū letāfet sizün zenaḥdānuñuzda maḥṣürdurdur, her güzel hüsnı andan alur,
ay güneşden alduği gibi.
İki müştı tekerrür-i ḥaber ḳabilindendir.

2
Ki dehd dest eyn غرض يا رب كه همستان شوند
خاطر مجمع ما زلف پریشان شما

Key: bunda “kaçan” dimekdür.
Dehed: fi’l-ı mużārī’-i müfred-i ġāyib; “dehīden”den “virūr” dimekdür.
Dest: el
Ĝaraţ: bunda “murād” ma’nasınadur.
Yā Rābb: bunoñ gibi yirde ““acabā” ma’nasınadur.
“hücredaş” dimekdür. Destān, “dāstān”dan muḥaffef; “ḥikāyet” ma’nâsına. “Ḥikāyet-daş”
dimekdür. Bir ma’nâsi daḥi vardur. İnšâ’ Allāh maḥallinde beyān olına.
Şevend: fi’l-ı mużārī’-i cem-i ġāyib; “şevīden”den; “olalar” dimekdür.
Hāṭr: aşlında “göñüle gelen”dür. Şoñra “göñül’e ıtlâk eylediler žikr-i ḥal ve irāde-i maḥall
tarīkıyle.
Zülf: “kułak öñinden inen şaçlar”dur.
Perişan: “tağuk” dimekdür.

Maḥṣūl-i beyt: “Acabâ bu murâd kaçan el virür ki muşâhib ola bizüm hâṭîr-i mecmû’ umuz ve senûn perişan zûlfûn.”


3
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Ve lehu:

Ve lehu:

Pes “Cân ber-leb âmede cümle-i hâliyyedür” diyen hâlâ eyledi.

Bâz: bunda “gerü” dimekdür.
Maḵâm-ı istifhâmda vâki’ olmuş; “dönsün mi” ma’nâsina.
Fermân: “buyruk” dûr; “emr” ma’nâsina.

Dûr: “ıraḳ” dûr; “ba’îd” ma’nâsina.
Ḫâk: ṭopraḳ
Dâmen ve “dâmân”, “etek” dûr; “ţeyl” ma’nâsina. Însânda ve ġayrîde müsta’meldür.
Čû: ḥarf-i ta’lîl; “cûn” dan muḫaffef.
Ber-mâ: bizüm üstümüze; “aleynâ” ma’nâsina.
Be-gûzerî: bâ ḥarf-i te’kid; gûzerî fi’l-i müzârı’-i muḫâṭabdur; “gûzerîden” den; “geçersin” dimekdür.
Reh: “râh” dan muḫaffefdür; “yol” ya’ni “sebîl” ma’nâsina.
Ma’lûm ola ki Fârsîde ‘vâv’ dan ve ‘yâ’ dan ve elifden şoñra ki hâ-yi aşliyye vâki’ olsa bu ḥarfleri ḥafz eylemek käyizdür. Meşelâ “taş” a “küh” ve “kuh” ve “köy” e “diḥ” ve “dih” ve “ay” a “mâḥ”, “meh” dîrle ve ķis ʿalâ hâzâ.


Kurbân: lûqatde “sol şeydûr ki anûna Allâh’a yakûn olasın”. Ammâ bunda “Allâh icûn kesilên köyun ve âyarisî” murâddur.


Maḳṣûd, cânâna şefkat idûp andan merhamet âleme eylemesidûr.

Maḳṣûd, cânâna şefkat idûp andan merhamet âleme eylemesidûr.


Râ: edât-ı mefûldür.

Âgeh: “âgâh”dan muḥâffefdûr ka’ide-i sâbika üzre; “âgâh” da “âgâhîden”den. Cemî’işi lâzimla müte’addî beyininde müşterekidür; “duymak” ve “duyurmak” ma’nâsîna.
Konid: fi’l-i cem’-i emr-i muḫāṭab; “eyleñ” dimekdür, “āgeh eyleñ” ma’nâsına; ya’nî “dildâra ṭuyuruñ”.


Cân-ı men u cân-ı şumâ: Fârsîde bu ‘vâv’, ‘Arabîde ‘vāv’ gibi muḫârenet ma’nâsına virûr. Nite ki şâ’îr dir:

Beût

ayî Rend jege Nouch To Wo Mestî Wo Xêmâr
ma Wo Neshîstî èshq Wo Mî Yest

Ba’zîlar didiler “’vâv’ sektûr, żarûret-i vezn-içün gelmişdür”.

Taḳdîr-i kelâm, “cân-ı men cân-ı şumâst” ya’nî “benüm cânûnum sizüñ cânûnuñuzdur”.

Ḫâsîli, ‘kendi cânûnuza ne lâyık ise benüm cânûnum anı eyleñ’.

Maḥṣûl-i beût: “Göñûl ėrâbicîk ideyorur, ya’nî ifşâ’-i râz ideyorur, dil-dâri ğâh eyleñ elbette ey düstlar zîrâ benûnum cânûnum hemân sizüñ cânûnuñuzdur” yâḫûd “benûnum cânûnum sizüñ cânûnuñuzladur; her ne ki benûnum cânûnuma olursa sizüñ cânûnuza ol olur”.


Zînhâr lafçî iki vechle te’kîde kêbildûr: ḩârâbicî mî-konende de ve ğâh konîde de te’ emmüldûr.

Kês beدور نركست طرفي نبشت إز عافيته
بِه كَه نِفروشند مستورى بمستان شما

Kes: kimse


Beyt

Nerks avu lif krk zrd ve zlmc le k vrdr
ar črgnhne dzlms drh m dnmrd

Rūm’da “zerrīn kadeḥ” didüklerine ‘Acem “nergis” didügine Kātibī’nüñ nergis red îfi kaşidesinde bu beyt şâhiddür:

Beyt

bste dstr s rtr cpq ntrng
dr sks Athe st trpgnt h rnt nuke

Ve bu rübaṭ-i Bushâk:

Rübâî

uler k chmn az rkh o gšt mnor
gwnkd k drd trqsi smp pr az rż
dr ndh bshqk n zr drd w n h sım
shh nnn tng drd w k tqs mdçfr

“Nân-ı teng” diyü “yufḳa ettmtg”ne dîrler.
Ve Hilâlî’nüñ bu beyti:

Beyt

ba hâm v çdh vzm chmn krd čw nuke
hrrks k dr n dnr bkv sım v zrtv dtst

Tâ: žâmîr-i muḥätâb
Yâ: vaḥdet veyâ tenkîr içündür.
‘Äfiyet: bunda “perhîz-kârlîk” ma’nâsînadur.
Bih: “yeg” dimekdür.

Be-mestān: bā harf-i ṣila; mestān elif ve ‘nūn’la cem’ eyledi ẕevi’l-ʿuḳūl mertebesin ilḥāḳ eylemekle. Zīrā murād “çeşm”dur ve “çeşm”i elif ve ‘nūn’la cem’ idegelmişlerdür:

**Beyt**

دل شیشه و چشمان تو هر کوشه برندش
مستند مبادا که بنا که شکنندش

**Maḥṣūl-i beyt:** “Kimse senüñ çeşmünü zamânında perhīz-kārlıkdan fāyide bağlamadı ya’ nī müstefid olmadı”; zīrā her kimse ki seni gördi mest-i ʿışḳuñ oldı. Ḥāṣılı, ‘tamām-ı ’ ālemi esrük ü divānê eyledûn’ dimekdür.


**Bahçe:** 7

بخت خواب آلود ما بیدار خواهد شد مکر
زان که زد بر دیده آبی روزی رخشن شما

**Bahţ:** tālî‘; mu’arrebdür; ‘Arabîsi “cedd”dür.

H’āb: “uyku” ve “düs” ma’nâsına; “ţ’ābîden”den

Ālūd: ismdür “alûden”den; “bulaşmak” ma’nâsına.

H’āb-ālūd: “uyku bulaşıği” dimekdür.

Bîdār: uyanıḳ

H’āhed şod: h’âhed “diler” ma’nâsına. Șod fi’l-i mâzî-i müfred-i ğâyib; bunda mašdar ma’nâsınadur. Zīrâ mâzî muţârî’e muţârîn olsu mašdar ma’nâsî murâd olur; “ţ’âhed şoden” ma’nâsına.

Meger: bunda “ki-ennehu” ma’nâsınadur.

Zân ki: ašlında “ez ân ki’dür: ân ism-i işâret; ki harf-i tā’îl.

Zed: fi’l-i mâzî-i müfred-i ğâyib; “urdı” dimekdür “zeden”den.

Ber-dîde: ber bunda bâ-yî şîla ma’nâsınadur; dîde bunda “göz” dimekdür.

Ābî: yā harf-i vaḥdet veyâ tenkîr. Bunda ābî rûya muţâf eyleyen ḥatâ eyledi.
Maḥṣūl-i beyt: “Ki-ennehu bizüm ḥʾāb-ālūd ve ḥʾāb-nāk ṭāliʿümüz uyanıṣardur zīrā senūn rūy-i raḥsānuñ baḥtumuñ gözine şu sepdi”.

Başa Hıdmete Tıraşından Evvel Nisbetinde
Boğum Yoğunun Sınırında

Bā-śabā: bā “maʾa” maʾnāsına; şabā sābıkā beyān olmışdur.
Hem-rāh: hem edāt-ı muƙārenet; hem-rāh “yoldaş” dimekdür.
Be-firist: fiʿl-i müfred-i emr-i muḫāṭab; “firistiden”den.
Maḥṣūl-i beyt: “Ey cānān, ruḫuñ gülşeninden şabāyla bir deste gül ırsāl eyle, ola ki ayaguñ başduğu bustanuñ tüрабbinden bir küçük țuyaydük”.
Ba’zılar bu beyti țayırının terzi̇k-i taḵdīrātıyla taḵfīr idüp beyān țeyleder ve ziyāde pesend țeyleder. Țaḳk bu kim țabʿında zerre mıḳdāri istişmâmeti olan kimesne bu maḳûle heţeyânātī jāj-i Bāḳil kabîlinden ‘add ider.

8

9

Osman بن و مراد ای ساقیان بزم جم
کرچه چام ما نشد پرمنی بدورن شما

**Beyt**

عشق بحر از دلشان سر برزرد
اَتِش شوق بجان شان در زد

**Bād:** emr-i ġāyib şīqāsidur. “Bovīden”den müştaḳḳ; “olsun” dimekdür. Mevāḳiʿ-i duʿāda isti’māli ekşerdür bundaki gibi.

**Bezm:** meclis

**Cem:** Ḥażret-i Süleymān Peyğam-ber’dür. Nite ki Ḥ“āce Ḥāfīz buyurur:

**Beyt**

خاتم جم را بشارت ده بحسن خاتمت
که اسم اعظم کردن از دو کوتاه دست اهرم

**Cām:** ayaḳlı ḳadeḥ

**Por-mey:** şarābla ṭolu

**Be-dovrān:** bā ḥarf-i žarf; dovrān ‘vāv’uñ sükürniyle Fārsīde “zamān” ma’nāsında müsta’ meldür. Bunda bezmē nisbet ḥūb vāki’ olmiş.

**Maḥṣūl-i beyt:** “ʿÖmrünüz uzun ve murāduñuz ḥāsil olsun ey pādisāh meclisinüñ sāḵileri egerçi bizüm ṫadeḥümüz sizüň zamānuñuzda pūr-mey olmadi”.

Murādı, pādisāh-ı Yezd’e taʿrīżdür. Zīrā Ḥ“āce anı medh eylemiş imiş ve medhine muḵābil şila ve cāyize virmemiş imiş. Nite ki bir kit’ada buyurur:

**Beyt**

شاه هرموزم ندیده بک زمان صد لطف کرد
شاه یزدم دید و مدهش کردوم و هیچم نداد

Pes murādī Ḥ“āce’nüñ budur ki ‘Ey şāh-ı Yezd ‘ömṛün ve devletüñ uzun olsun egerçi beni behr-mend idüp murādum virmedüñ’ dimekdür.
Mişkend Hafiz Dua ve Bəşnu ve Amīn bək

Ve ba'zısı:

Mişkend Hafiz Dua ve Bəşnu Amīn bək

Du'ayiđe ve āminide yəlar vaḥdet veyə tenkîr içündür.

Rûzî: "rizḳ" ve "nasīb" ma'nalərində müstə'meldür.


Maḩṣūl-i beyt: "Ḫafig du'a eyler ey cânân, sen işit ve āmîn di". Ol du'a budur: “Bizüm naṣībümüz olsun sizüñ şeker şaṭicı dudağuñuz".

11

Ayi sëba ba səskinan şeher yezd az ma bək
Küa sër ḥeq na sënasan kûv ʃokkan şma

Ba'zi nüşhada köv Mîdân düşmiş. İkisi de güya münasibidür.

Murâd "şehr-i Yezd'üñ sâkinleri"nden şâ-h- Yezd kendidür. Ta'zîmen cem' yelemişdür.

Ve şehr-i Yezd "Şirāz'dan üç günül yokdur" dirler ve Rûkn-âbâd şuvi ki menba'i Şirâz'dur Yezd'e akrar ve şuynü iki cânivi sögüle kawkak dikmişdür. Şöyle ki yolcilar güneşden hiç zahmet görmezmiş. Ve bu iki şehrûn mä-beyni ġâyetle ma'mûr imiş Torkatla Amâsiyye mä-beyni gibi. Ve'l-ʼuhdet' ʻale'ra vı̂.

Haţq mâ-şınşân: "kûfrân-i ni'мет" ma'nâsindâr.

Güy: ṭop

Çevgân: cîm ü kâfi-ı 'Acem-ile bir "uzun degnek"dür; uci egri, kêsîşler 'aşasî gibi ki anufîla at üzərində oyun oynalar. Ya'nî bir tôpî meydâna şalarlar ve ol çevgânla anı ortadan kâparlar. Her kim ki kâparsa devlet anûndur.

Maḩşūl-i beyt: "Ey şabâ, şehr-i Yezd'de sâkin olan pâdîşâha ve a'yân-i devlete söyle ki kûfrân-i ni'metûnûz olanların başı sizûn çevgânuñuz tôpî olsun".

Mişrâ'-î şânî ḥâşv-î melîh tařîkîyila vâkı' olmiş. Aşl-i maḵûl-ı kavl, gelecek beytdür. Ya'nî:
103

12

کرچه دوریم از بساط قرب و همت دور نیست
بنده شاه شماییم و نشا خوان شما

Bisāṭ: “düşenen eşyā”da müsta’meldür.
Kūrb: “yakınlığı”dur.
Himmet: Kesr-i ‘hā’yla ve fethiyle luğatdur “irādet” ma’nāsına.
Maḥsūl-i beyt: “Ey Yezd’üñ sakinleri, egerçi sizden vücūdumuz ve tenümüz ıraḳdur
ammā himmetümüz ıraḳ degüldür”; ya’nī gönlümüzden çıkmazsiz. “Pādīsāh-uñuzuñ kulı ve sizün du’acuñuzuz”.
Murādī pādīsāhı isti’tāfdur.

13

ئى شهنشاه بلند اختر خدارا همتي
تا بپوس همچون خاک ایوان شما

dimekdür, “begler begi” gibi.
Bolend: ’bā’nunun fethiyle ve ẓamılya luğatdur.
Aḥter: Fārsıde “yıldız”dur ammā “ṭāliʿ ü baḥt” ma’nāsında isti’māli çoḳdur:

Bevt

اخترم سیر بجاابی کند از شهر مهی
که نیوده اثر از انجم و افلاک انجا

Huđā-rā: Huđā Tañrī; rā edāt-ı taḥşis veyā edāt-ı kasem
Himmetide yâ vaḥdet veyā tenkīr
Tā: ḥarf-i ta’līl
Be-büsem: bā te’kīd içün; büsem bā-i ‘Arabīyle fi’l-i mużārī-i mütekellim-i vaḥde
şiğasıdur. Bunda “öpem” dimekdür.
Hem-çu gerdūn: hem ḥarf-i te’kīd; cu “cün”dan muḥaffef, edāt-ı teşbihdūr. Gerdūn
“felek” ve “kañlı” ki iki tekerlekli olur, Anaṭolı vilāyetinde “araba” yirine isti’māl
eyledükleri hep oldur. Bunda “felek” murāddur.

Maḥşüli beyt: “Ey bülend-tâli’ pâdişâh, Ḫüdâ hakki-çün veyâ Ḫüdâ için himmet eyle tâ gerdûn gibi ḥâk-i eyvânuñ öpeyin”; ya’nî gerdûna müşâbih veyâ gerdûn öpdügi gibi öpeyim.

GIII

1

Saqî: bennor bade brâfroz jam ma

Mêtrb bko kke kar cêhan shd bêkâm ma

Sâkî: münâdâ


Muṭrib: ism-i fâ’il; “aṭrab, yuṭrib”; if’al bâbîndan; “sevindirici” ma’nâsîna. Ammâ istîlâhîda “sâzende”ye ve “gûyende”ye dirler.

Be-gû: bunda emrdûr “irla” ma’nâsîna.

Ki: hârf-i ta’lîl veyâ râbiţa-i kavûmakül.


2

Ma dr piyâle öyksrê xar dûde ayım

ei bexibî z lût shêrêm mâmam ma
105

Piyâle: Lâmi‘î Çelebi “boş kadeh” dimiş ammâ luğatlerde “şagrak” dimişdür.

Maĥşûlı beyt: “Biz piyâlede ya’nî nûr-ı piyâlede yârûﬁ yûzî ‘aksini görmüşüz ey bizüm dâyîm içkümüzden yâḫûd bade içdûgümüzden bî-ḥaber kimesne”; bizi ma’zûr tut. İki mîrâ” ma’nâ cihetinden taqdimine ve te’hibre ma’hûmdür.

3

чендан بود کرشه و ناز سهى قدان
کاید بجلوه سرو صنوب خرام ما


Sehî-kadân: elif ve ‘nûn’la cem’ olmış vaﬂ-ı terkîbîdîr; “tûrî kâmêtî ma’hûbîlî” dîmekdûr.

Be-çilve: bâ ḥarf-i şiła; Lâmi‘î Çelebi çilve “şalınmaq” dimişdür ammâ luğatlerde “arz-ı cemâl” ma’nâsînadur.

Şanevber-ḫîrâm: vaﬂ-ı terkîbîdîr. Şanevber, çam ağacı; murâd bunda serv şeklinde olanîdûr, muţlakî degül. Ḥîrâm “ḫîrâmîden”den müstakîdîr; “şalınmaq” ma’nâsîna. Ya’nî “şanevber şalınışlı serv”.

Maĥşûlı beyt: “Mevzûn kâmêtî ma’hûbûlîrûn nâz ü şîvesi ol zamâna degdûr ki bizûm şanevber şalınışlı servûmûz ya’nî ma’hûbûbûmuz şâlîna veyâ ‘arz-ı cemâl eyleye”. Ya’nî bu gelince anlara i’tibâr kalmaz.

Pes bunda istîfâm-ı inkârîye ḥûkm eleyene inkâr iderûz.
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هړژک نمبري آنکه دلسه زنده شد بعشق
ثبتست بر جريدة عالم دوام ما
Ne-mİred: fi‘l-i nefy-ı istİkbâl; “ölmez, lâ-yemûl” ma‘nâsına.

Zinde: “diri, ḥayy” ma‘nâsînâdur.


Yâ: ḥarf-i vaḥdet ve hemze ḥarf-i tevessül

Bâz-ḥâst: kîyâmet


Âb-î hârâm: kînayetdûr “hâmîrdan.

Maĥşûlî beyt: “Ḳorḳaram ki kîyâmet ânînde faţîleti olmaya şeyhûn hêlâl diyû yidügî vaḳf etmeginüñ bizûm hârâm diyû içdûgûmüz şarâb üzerine”.

Ya’nî “anuñ zerţle ve riyâyla geçîndügie ve bizûm rindîkle geçîndûgûmüz berâber gele’.

Aþbâb: dûstlars; ve “habîb”üñ cem‘idür.

Gol-şen ve gol-zâr “güllük” ma’nâsînâdur.

ترسم كه صرفة نبرد روز باز خواست
نان خلال شيخ ز أب حرام ما

Aşı Bade Akır Baksen Aşhab بکذری
زنهار عرضه ده بر جانان پیام ما
Aḥbābdan murād cānānı ve sā’ir eḥībbāsīdur. Yāḥūd bunda müfred murāddur ya’nī cānān; ta’zīmen cem’ eylemişdür.


Ber-i cānān: iżāfetle “ʿind” ma’nāsınadur; ya’nī “cānān ḳatına”

Peyām ve “peyem” ve “peyġām” ve “peyġam” “ḥaber”dür.

Maḥṣūl-i beyt: “Ey bād, eger dūstlar meclisinden geçerseñ elbette cānān ḡużūrna bizüm ḡaberūmüzi ʿarż eyle”.

‘Arţ eyleyecegi, gelecek beytūn mażmūnidur.
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كو نام ما ز ياد بعدا چه میبرى
خود ای درpolation یاد نیاید نام ما

Yād kerden: “añmaḳ”dur.

‘Amd: ḳaṣd

‘Amden: ḳaṣden

Maḥṣūl-i beyt: “Ey bād, cānāna söyle: Bizüm adumuzı ḳaṣdla ḡāṭıruñdan ne giderūrsin?

Ol zamān ḡod gelür ki adumuz hergiz añılmaz”.

Ya’nī ‘ölürüz ve nām u nişānumuz defter-i kāʾinātdan maḥv olısardur’.
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مستی بچشم شاهد دلبند ما خوشست
زان رو سهرده اند بمستی زمام ما

Mestīde yā ḡarf-i maṣdardur.


Ṣāhid: “maḥbūb” ma’nāsinda müsta’mel’dür.


Hoş: iyi; bunda “yaraṣīk” ma’nāsınadur.

Be-mestide hā, ḥarf-i şila; yā, ḥarf-i maṣdar.


Maḥşūl-i beyt: “Bizüm gönlümüz kendüye müte’allik eleyen maḥbūnu čeşmine mestānelik yaraşıḳ ve yaḳışıḳdur. Ol vechendendür ki bizüm zimām-ı iḥtiyārumuzu mestānelige ḥavāle eylemişlerdür”.

Ya’nī: ‘Ol mestāne-čeşm olduḏığıçün biz mestliği iḥtiyār eyledük’.

Eşk: göz yaşı

Yā: ḥarf-i tenkīr; “vaḥdet-ičün” degül baʿzılar didügi gibi.

Hemī: te’kīd içün.

Feşān: emr-i muḥāṭab; “feşānīden” “ṣaçmaḳ, nis̱ār” ma’nasına.

Murğ: muṭlaḳ en “ṭayr” ma’nasınadur, iżāfetle taḥṣīṣ kesb ider. Meşelā tavuğa “murğ-ı ḥāneği” dirler.


Maḥşūl-i beyt: “Ey Ḥāfīz, gözünden eşk ya’nī göz yaşı dānesini ṣaç, ola ki vaṣl murğı bizüm duzağumuza meyl eyleye”.

Ya’nī: ‘ Ağla, ola ki cânân gözüŋ yaşıını görüp saña raḥm eyleye’:

Beyt

فضان سرشفک نیاز آصفی زنالله چه سود
بدانه رام کن آن طائر همايونا

Beyt-i Ḥāfīzda iltifāt vardur muḥāṭabdan mütekellime.
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حافظ ز دیده دانه اشکی همی فشنان
باشد که مرغ وصل کند قصد دام ما

10

دریای اخضر فلک و کشتی هلال
هستند غرق نعمت حاجی قوام ما
Ahdar: yaşıl  
Keşti: gemi  
Derya-yi ahdar müsebehün bih, felek müsebehbedür. 
Kîvâm: feth-i kâfla ve kesleluğa tûdûr. Nite ki İmâm-ı Zevzenî, Lebîd-î ‘Âmirî’nûn kâşidesi, ki Mu’allakâtûn birisidür, anuñ şerîhinde dimîsdür:

Cuwam şiî ve cuwamîe bilal sarâve fêltî ve fêtî ma'cûm ma'cûm, bizüm Ĥâcî Kîvâm’umuzuñ ni'metine ġarḳdurlar.

ĤḤ ĤḤāā āāṣṣ îl ı laââ āâmm mm: Bu şâhîb-i sa'âdetün veliyy-i ni'met olûğuña mübâlağa ta'rikîyle i'tirâfdur.
1

صفی بیا که آینه صافیست جام را
تابنکری صفاء میرا لعل فام را

giydüklerinden buña nisbet idüp “şûfi” didiler. Ḥarf-i nied ḥâzf olmîşdur.

Biyâ: fi‘l-i emr-i muḫâṭabdur; “āyīden”den.

Ḵâ‘ide-i külliyyedür ki bir kelimenüñ evvelinde hemze olsa, “āmeden” ve “āğâzîden” ve
“āsâyîden” gibi, edât-ı ḥâl veyâ istiḳbâl veyâ ḥarf-i nefy ü nehy evveline dâhî olsa

Fâm: “reng” ma‘nâsına

La‘l-fâm: la‘l renkli

Ma‘lûm ola ki şu’arânüñ ‘ādetindendir zerrâk ve mürâ‘î şûflere ya’nî şûfîler şekełinde
olan sâlûslara ta‘rîz iderler. Ammâ ehl-i meşreb şûfîlerle daḥî eylemezler. Zîrâ anlar
kendü ḥâlleriyle mukâyved olup kimsenüñ tanz u ta’nîyla takâyûd eylemezler.

Pes maḥşûl-i beyt: “Ey şûfi, gel ki câmuñ āyînesi şûfîdur”. Maḳṣûd, şafvet-i bâdedür,
câm degül. “Tâ la‘l rengli meyûn şafásını göresin” ya’nî seyr eyleyesin ki ne ḥâlet virür.

2
عنقا شكار كس نشور دام باز چین
کاینجا همیشه بادر است دام را

‘Ankā: Şîḥâḥ-i Cevherîde “bir ulu küşdür mevcûdü’il-ism, mecûlül’-cism”.

Ḫâšîl-i kelâm: ‘Ankânunüñ zuhûrinda ihtilâf eylediler. Kîmi didi ki “Ḥaẓret-i Mûsâ
zamânında Allâhu Te‘âlá bir çif kûs yaratdı Kudüs-i mûbarek eṭrâfînda. Ḥaẓret-i Mûsâ–’
aleyhi’s-selâm–müteveffîa olnîca Mekke taqîlarina gitdîlîn.” Ve kîmi didi ki “Ress
kâvminînûn zamânında gêldî ki anlarun peyğâm-beri Ḥanzele bin Şafvân idi”. Ba‘zîlîr
didîlî ki “Müddet-ı ömri Ḥaẓret-i Ḫâlid bin Sinân Ḳîsâ zamânına dek sürdi ki ol bir
peygamber idi, Ḥaẓret-i Ḳîsâ ile Ḥaẓret-i Muḥammed mâ-beyninde gêldî”. Şalavâtu’llâhi
aleyhim ecma'în. Câhiż dir ki "Cemî-i ümem-i sâlife 'ankâyî darb-î meşel eyler bir şeyde ki işidilür ammâ görinmez. 'Kibrît-i âhmer' de bölüldür". Ve didiler "'Ankâ anuñçün didiler ki boyûndîna aş tâvî varîdi" ve ba'zîlar didiler ki "boynuz uzun oludüçün" ve didiler ki "Fârsîce 'simûrg' didiler kemâl-i 'azamatînden güyâ ki otuz murûdûr". Ḥâsil-î kelâm, 'ankânuñ aḥvâl ü tefâşîlini bilme isteyen Makâmat-ı Harînîñüñ ellînci makâmenünîñ, ki âhîr-î makâmâturdy, Muṭarrizî şerîhine nazar eylestün.

Şikâr: "av"dur. Meşhûr-î kîrâ'-at, şikâri kese izâfetedûr ve ba'zîlar 'ankâşikârî vaşf-î terkîbi oğûdû ve terkîbi tâkîme ve te'hîre ḥaml eylediler.

Kîncâ: ki, ḥarîf-i ti'îñ
Hemîse: "dâyîmâ" ma'nâsîna

Maḥşûl-î beyt: "'Ankâ kimseye şikâr olmaz" yâhûd "Kimse 'ankâşikâr olmaz, duzağûn devşîr". Ya'nî cânân ki 'ankâ-mişâldûr, 'azamatî 'âlî-cenâbdûr; fennle ve şan'atle ve hîle ile kimseye ittîfât eylemez. "Zira bunda dâyîmâ duzağ elinde yilden ğayrî nesne yokdûr"; belki yıl de yokdûr zîrâ yile ğâyîl olur nesne yokdur.

Ya'nî: 'Cânân vîşûlinde terk-î tedârîk eyle ki sa'y-î bî-fâyîdedûr'.
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در عييش نقد کوش كه چوئن آبخور نمایند
امد بهشت روضة دارالسلام را

'Ays: luğatde "dirlik"dür; "hayât" ma'nâsîna. Âmmâ bunda "ževk ü 'işret" ma'nâsînadur.
Nakd: bunda "hâzîr" ma'nâsînadur.
Kûs: emr-i muḥâţâbdur; "kûşîden"den; "dürüşmek" ve "çalışmak" ma'nâsîna.
Ki: ḥarîf-i ta'îlî
Āb-hîr: "şuvar" ya'nî şu içecek yer
Bi-hişî: bâ-yi meksûrê ĥarîf-i te'kîddûr. Hişît 'hânuñ kesriyle fîl-i mûzî; "şalîvirdî" ya'nî "terk eyledî"; maşdarî "hişten" ve "hiîûden" gelûr.
Ravzê: luğatde "çemen"dür ammâ bunda "bâğçe" murâddur.
Dârûs-se'lâm: dâr "ev"dür; "beyt" ma'nâsîna; se'lâm "cennet"üñ adîdur. "Cennet evi" dimekdûr. Ravzûnuñ dârû's-se'lâmâ iţâfeti beyâniyyedûr.
Maḥṣūl-i beyt: “Ḩalā, ḥāzîr el virdüği zevk ü şafâya sa’y eyle, müstäkbele nâzîr olma. Zîrâ Ḥaţret-i Ādem’üñ ki cennetde naşîbi kalmadî terk idülp dünyâ evine geldî”.
Ya’nî: ‘Zamân-i istîkbâle mültefît oldûğiçin cennetden iḥrâc oldî’:

Beyt

غم نا أمده خوردُن بنيقدم رنجه ميدارد
همان بهتر كه با فردا گذارم كار فردا را

4

در بزم دور بک دو قِفْح در کش و برو
یعنی طمع مدار وصال دوام را

Bezm-i devr kinâyetdür “bâde meclisi”nden.
Der-keş: der teʾkîd içündür; keş emr-i muḫâtabdur “kesîden”den; “çek” ya’nî “iç”
Be-rev: “git” dimekdür; ya’nî “ziyâdeye ẓamaʿ eyleme”
Maḳṣûd, naṣîḥatdür: من قنع شبع و من طمع ذل ﻓِى dimekdür.
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أي دل شباب رفت و نُجَيْدُ كلي زعمُ
پیرانه سر بكن هنرى تنک و نام را

Şebâb: “yigitlik”dür.
Pîrâne-ser: “pîrlik vakṭ”i; zarfiyyet ifâde ider.
Neng: “âr ü ẓayaret” ma’nâsînadur.
Hünerî: hüner “menkabet”dür; yâ, ḥarf-i vâḥdet.
Nâm-râ: nâm bunda “nâmûs”dür; râ ḥarf-i tâhşîşdür.
Maḥṣūl-i beyt: “Ey göûl, yigitlik zamâni gîldî. 伢ل וֹى ʿömrden bir gûl dîrmêdûn.” Ya’nî ʿömrden bir fîyide ve nefîce görmedûn; ḡâšîli civânîlıkda vâṣîl-ı cânân olmâduñ. “Pes imdi pîrlik vaktinde bir hüner eyle, ʿâşikânê bir neng ü nâm tâhşîl eylemek-içün.”
Ya'ni: ‘Civânlıkda vuşlata bir sebeb taḥşîl idemedûn, bâri sa’y eyle pîrîkde bir ḥâlet eyleyesin’.
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Râz drûn pûrde z Rûndan mîst pûrs
Kîn hal nîst zâhîd ûâli mîqâm râ


Kîn: kâf ḥarf-i ta’îlî ve în ism-i şiärêtdûr ƙárîbe; ya’nî râz-i derûna.

Maḥşûlî beyt: “Perde içindeki râzî ya’nî gizli sîrrî mest ‘aşîklardan şor. Zîrâ bu ḡâl ‘alî-маkâm zâhîlderûn ƙalî degûldûr”.
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Ma ra br Ástân tu bûs ƙuç xêmûst
Âi xwaja ba’z bîên bîrêm ƙlâm râ

Mâ-râdakî rä taḥşîs ifâde ider “bizüm” ma’nâsîna.

Bës: “çôk” ma’nâsînadur; “bisyâr” gibi.

Bâz: böyle yirde te’kîd ifâde ider ançak. Pes, bunda bâz lafzîna “girû” ma’nâsînî vîrenler ilerûsîni ve girûsîni ve ardûni ve öñûni fîkr eylemezler imiş.

Ba’zi nûshîlarda ƙid met yirîne “ni’met” vâki’ olmiş. Ƙâk budur ki âsitân ve ḩâce ve terahhum ve ƙulâm lafzîlarîna ƙidmet ensebdûr.

Maḥşûlî beyt: “Bizüm senûn ƙâsitùnûnda çôk ƙâkk-ı ƙidmetûmûz vardur. Ey ḩâce, ƙulâmûna terahhumla nazar eyle”.

Ḫˇāce bunda “efendi” dimekdür ki cănândan ‘ibāret ola ve îhtimâldür ki Ḫˇāce ᴷıvâmü’-d-din Ḥasan ola veyā _KIND-ı Ekber ola. Sâbîkâ zikr olunan gibi, vezîrlere “ḫˇāce” dirler.
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حافظ مريد جام ميست اي صبا برو
وز بندگي برسان شيخ جام را

Bendegî: bir kelimenüñ ki āḫirinde hā-i resmî ola, aña yā-yı maṣdar veyā elif ü ‘nūn’-ı cem’ lâhîk olsa hā-yı resmîyijî kāf-ı ‘Acemîye tebdîl idüp bendegî ve “bendegân” dirler.

Şeyḫ-i Cāmdan bunda maḳṣūd Şeyḫ Aḥmed-i Nâmıḳî Ḥażretleri’dür ki Ḥażret-i Mevlânâ Câmî ile bir şehrdendir ki “Câm” dirler. Nite ki Ḥażret-i Mevlânâ Câmî buyurur:

₇ᵢ’s

مولدم جام ورشحة قلمم
جرعة جام شيخ الإسلاميس
زين سبب در جريدة اشعار
بدو معنى تخلص جاميس


Bu telmîhî bilmeyenler, bu maḫâmda çok ‘indiyyat söylemişlerdûr.

GV

1

ساقيا بر خيز و در ده جام را
خاک بر سر كن غم ایام را

Sâkiyâ: āḫirinde elif harf-i nidâdur ki Fârsîde ve Türkiye müsta’meldür.
Ber-ḫīz: ber bunda teʾkīd ifāde ider; Ḫīz emr-i muḫāṭabdur “ḫīzīden” maṣdarından; “kalk” yaʾnī “örü ṭur”; “ḫāsten” de maṣdar bu maʾnāya.

Der-dih: der ḥarf-i teʾkīd; dih emr-i muḫāṭabdur “dihīden”den; “vir” dimekdür; “dāden” de maṣdar bu maʾnāya.

Cām-rā: rā edāt-ı mefʿūldür.

Maḥṣül-i beyt: “Ey sāḳī, kalk daḥi cāmī vir. Ey sāḳī, ġam eyyāmını buṣına topraḥ yeyle”.

Yaʾnī: ‘İçüp mest olalum ve ġam eyyāmını nesyen mensiyen ferāmuş idelüm’ ki-ennehı ki ḥāk altına medfündur.

Sāğar: ṭadeḥ
Nih: emr-i muḫāṭabdur “nihīden”den; “ko” dimekdür.
Tā: ḥarf-i taʾlīl
Zi-ber: mīm-i mütekellim muḳadderdür; yaʾnī “zi-berem”; “üstümden” dimekdür.
Keşem: fiʿl-i mużāriʿ-i mütekellim-i vaḥde; “çekem”
Delḳ: ḥırḳa
Ezrak: gök
Fām: reng; yaʾnī “gök reng”
Rā: edāt-ı mefʿūıl


Bu beyt taʾrīz dür Şeyḥ Ḥasan-ı Ezrak-puş'a ve tevābi’ine ki anlar bi-esrihim gök cāmeler giyerler, nite ki maḥallinde beyān olsa gerek inşā’ Allāhu Teʾālā. Ve her yirde ki “ezrak-cāme” veyā “ezrak-libās” zikr ider anlara taʾrīz murāddur:

Beyt:

غلام همت آن رند عافیت سوزم
نه آن گروه که ازرق لباس و دلسیهند
كرچه بدنامیست نزد عاقلان
ما نمی خواهیم ننک و نام را


Bad-ı ġurūr iżāfeti beyāniyyedür.
Nā-fercām ve “bed-fercām”, “ākıbeti yaramaz ve イスラヘ קביל olmayan nesne”
Rā: taḫṣīş için.


Ya’nī: Bāde-nüşlukdan ġayrıya, muḳtażayāt-ı nefse tābi olmak tażiy-i ‘ömrdür.

Dūd āha ve āh sīneye ve sīne sūzāna muţaf olmişdur. Tetābu’-ı iżāfât bu dilde muṭlaḳen cāyizdūr.

Mahşūl-ı beyt: “Benüm yanaغان sīneműn āhı dütünü bu ḥāmطوņmısıları yakdı”; ya’nī bu ezrak-püşlari.
Zirâ Ḥ‘ăcenüñ bunlarla çok ’arbedesi geçmişdür. Nite ki maḥallinde beyān olur inşā’ Allāh’ Te’ālà.

Efsürdegān-ı ḫām ta’bīri de ziyāde nā-ḳābiliyyetlerinden ʿibāretdür. Zirâ iki şifat bile her şeyde mezmūmdur ‘ale'l-ḥuşūş ki insānda.

Mahremüñ rāza ḥiṣab etmek için mef’ûle iżāfet ve dilün şeydāya mevşūfuñ şifatına. ʿĀmm-rāda rā kese maṣrūfdur; “kes-rā ne-mī bīnem” takdirindedür.

Maḥṣūl-i beyt: “Diwanı gönlüme maḥrem-i rāz ya’nī sırına maḥrem kimse[y]i görmiyorum ḫavāṣṣ u ʿavāmmdan”.


Maḥṣūl-i beyt: “Bir dil-ārāmla benüm ḫāṭırum ḫoşdur ya’nī iyidür ki gönlümden bir uğurdan iletti ḫaṣr ü ḫaṭrî”.

Murād bundan, cânâni yaḥūd pīrådı bur ra ʿṣeyḥ Maḥmūd olmak var.
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ننکرد دیکر بسرو اندر چمن
هر که دید آن سرو سیم اندام را

ننگرید: fi‘l-i nefy-i müstaka’bel; “naẓar eylemez”; “nigeriden”den.

Diger: bunda “daḥî” ma’nâsinadur.

Be-serv: bā ḥarf-i şila

Diger bunda “girü” diyene düger gerek.

Sîm-endâm: sîm “gümiş”, endâm “şehl ü sîmâ” ma’nâsına; sîm-endâm ve “sîm-sîmâ” bir ma’nâyadur.

Mâḥṣûl-i beyt: “Daḥî serve çemende naẓar eylemez her kim ki ol gümiş sîmâlı servi gördü”.

Ya’nî: ‘İnsan güzelini gören bir daḥî çüb-i nātarasıdeye naẓar eylemez’ dimekdür.

9

صار کن حافظ بسختی روز و شب
تا بیابی منتهای کام را

Be-sahî: bā câyizdûr ki “ma’a” ma’nâsına ola yâḥûd ḥarf-i şila.

Tâ: ḥarf-i ta’lîf

Be-yâbî: “yâbîden”den; bâ ḥarf-i te’kid; yâbî fl‘i-mużâri‘i-muḫâṭab.

Münteḥa: nihâyet ü ģâyet

Kâm-râ: râ taḥṣîş içündür.

Mâḥṣûl-i beyt: “Ey Ḥâfîz, gice vü gündüz şiddetle şabr eyle” yâḥûd “şiddete şabr eyle tâ ki nihâyet-i murâduñi bulasın” zîrâ

الصبر مفتاح الفرج دور.
Süruri’s Introduction and His Commentary on Hafiz’s Opening Poem


Beyt

खोश्तर अन बाङ्द के सर दिल्हान
गँगे हां अंड दर हिँदेगां

Ve bu zümrenūn içinde lisānu’l-ġayb ve tercemānu’l-esrār laḵab virilen Şemse’d-dīn Muḥammed el-Ḥafīz eš-Şīrāzī–kaddese Allāhu sīrrah el-żīz–cemī es’ārinda, remz ü elğāz ve şüret-i mecāzda esrār-ı ṭarīḵatı iḥtiyār idüp ammā ahvāl-i sūlūkden ġāfīl ve esrār-ı ṭarīḵatden zāhid olanlar kuşur-ı fehāmetden inkār-ı kūlī kıļup ve ba’zı müteḥayyir kalup

Şi’r

و كم من عائشة صلى صحيحا
و أفته من الفهم السقيم

Kiṭ’a

جاجلان منكرند علمرا
كہ زجھل و عمی ندانندش
گرچہ ایمان محض آن باشد

118 The transcribed text of Süruri’s commentary is based on MS Ayasofya 4056, which is located in Süleymaniye Manuscript Library, Istanbul.
119 In the manuscript, the word nezzelā is written as enzelnā.
چون ندانتند کفر خوانندش

ve ehl-i dilden zürefā ve erbāb-ı kulübdan ‘urefā gahī bu fakîre ma’īl olup ba’zi esrari sâ’
il olup bu hakîr daﬁ bi bildügi kadar tahkîk-i merâm ve takrîr-i kelâm idüp ba’dehu takrîr
tahrîre tebdîl kîlînmaḳ ve Türkî dil ile ta’bîr olunmaḳ tâleb olunup ba’zi evkât aña mashrûf
kîlînup ‘alâ vechi’l-icmâl ma’nâ-yi mecazî beyân ve ma’nâ-yi hakîkî ‘iyân olundî tâ ki
kâșrî nâkıṣlar tâmm u kâmil ve ‘âmî vû gâﬁl olanlar ehl-i dil olalar.

Lâkin mütekâbir ve mu’anîd olanlar beyyinât-ı Ḥaṣrî ret-i Ḥudâ’dan ve mu’cizât-ı
zâhirât-ı enbiyâdan müte’eṣṣir olmazlar ve hakka taṣdîḳ ve īḳân kîlmazlar. Ḥ’âce Ḥâfiz
anlaruñ gibi bî-fehm olanlaruñ ḫiṭâbında, laṭîfe ve luṭf vechiyle cevâbında bu maṭla‘ı dé
miş:

Beyt

سخن شناس نئي دلبرا خطا اینجاست
چو بشنوى سخن اهل دل مگو كه خطاست

Lâ-cerem bî-ıdrâk mu’ânîdler ve ḥod-bîn ḥâsidler cehl-i cibillî perdesinde ve ‘inâd-
ehlî dâ’iresinde ḵalurlar. Ne’üzû bîllâh el-Ḥâfiz min zalîke. ʿIhfaznâ yâ Ḥâfiz ʿan el-
mehâlîk. Fe-Allâhu aḥyar Ḥâfiz’en ve Huve erĥame’r-râḥîmîn.
Elâ ħarf-i tenbîhdür ve yâ ħarf-i nîdâdur ve eyyu iسم-i mûbhemdûr, mu’arref bi’l-lâm olan isme ħarf-i nîdâ dâhîl olmak içûn vesîledûr ve aña hâ’i tenbîh dâhîl olmışdur te’kîd içûn ve lafż-i es-sâkî şîfatdur eyy‘ lafţîna ve edir emr-i ħâzîrdrd “edâre”, “yûdîr’u’dan ve ke’s şol ƙadehe dirler ki içinde şarâb ola ve næwil emr-i ħâzîrdrd “nâvele”den ve ke’s mü’ ennesûr anuñçün aña mü’ ennes şamîri irlc’a olunur. Ma’na-yi miṣrâ’ budur ki “Āgâh ol ey sâkî, devr étûrd ƙolu ƙadehi ve şun ânî.” Ve sâkîden murâd vâ’îz ü nâšîh ve rağbet ü zevk viricidür ve ke’s’den murâd şol va’z ü naşîhat ü kelime-i ħikmetdûr ki âdeme şevḳ ü rağbet virûr.

“Ki ‘ışkı ilâhî âsân göründi evvel velî düşdi müşkiller.”

Pes: Sâlik-i tarîkât ve tâlib-i hakîkat olana şevḳ ü zevk virmek gerek tâ kehillenmeyûp vuşûl-i ila’llâh ḥâṣîl olınca sa’y-î belyg ide.

2b

زجعد ظلف مشکینش چه تاب افتاد درد لها

Ca’d: "kıvırcık" dimekdür.
Tāb: bir nice ma’nāya gelür. Bunda “ḥarāret” ve “ziyā” ma’nāsı münāsibdür.
Ma’nā-yi mişrā’ budur ki “Anuñ müşkīn zülfinin kıvırıçıından ne ḥarāret ve nür düşdi
göñüllere.”
Ve ca’ddan murād, ṭabakāt-ı ḥicāb ve merātib-i istitārdur.

3a

بمي سجاده رنکين كن كرته پير مغان کوید

Geret lafızında tā hıṭāb içündür.
Muğ ve muğān "āteş-perest" dimekdür.
Ma’nā-yi mişrā’ budur ki “Şarāb ile seccāde[y]i rengin eyle ya’nī boya eger saña pîr-i
muğān dirse.”
Şarābdan murād ’ışḵdur, pîr-i muğāndan murād şeyh ve müṛşiddür ki ḥarāret ve şevḵ
şahibi ola.
Ya’nī: Seccādede ‘ibādettüñ ’ışḵ ile olsun, zāhid-i ḫuşk olma eger saña müṛşid dirse.

3b

که سالك پي خبر نبود ز راه و رسم منزلها

Maḵūl-i ḳavl budur; yā maḵūl-i ḳavl “Be-mey seccāde rengin kon” mażmūnudur, bu aña
ta’îldür.
Ya’nī: “Sālik bī-ḥhaber gerekmey yā sălik bī-ḥhaber olmaz menzillerüñ resminden ve
rāhindan.”
Ya’nī: Vuşūl-i ila’llāh menzillerinüñ resm ü ‘ādeti ve râh-ı vuşlatı ‘ışḵ ile olmak gerekdür
ki akreb-i ṭuruk-ı ila’llāh tařīk-i ’uşşāḵdur.
Baña cānān menzilinde ne emn ne 'ayş Çünkü her dem"
Cānāndan murād Ḥaḏret-i Ḥaḳḳdur ve menzilden murād sülūk mertebeleridür ki çokluq 'aḳabelere şeyṭān izlāl ider, ilḥāda düşürmek vardur.

Pes: Ben ki sălikem merātib-sülükda ve menāzil-i vuṣūlda çok ḥaṭārlar vardur. Öyleyse vuṣūl-i ila'llāh hāṣil olmadın baña ne emn ve ne devām-ı ʿuns-i Ḥaḳḳ vardur ki dāyim:

جرس فرياد ميدارد كه برينديد محملها

“Çañ feryād dutar ya’nī feryād idüp dir: Bağlañ maḥmilleri” ki bu menzil ḥaṭārlu yirdür, bunda ḳarār itmeñ.
Ceresden murād ṭarīḳ-i Ḥaḳḳuñ ḥaṭārlu yerlerin beyān idenlerdür. Nitekim Ḥažret-i Mevlānā buyurur:

Beyt

Ni  ḳονRX ad RNェy תונקצעב תונקצעב קספג ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח ירח יraciallu ḳılmayınca ve temkīn taḥṣīl itmeyince telvī’den ḫalāṣ olup emīn olmaz ve devām-ı ʿuns hāṣil kılmaz.

شب تاريک و بيم موج و كردابي چنين هايل

“Ḵarañu gice ve mevc korkusı ve girdāb; buncilayın korkunç”
Şeb-i tārīḳden murād zulmet-i ḥubb-i dünyā ve zulmet-i nefs ü hevādur ve bīm-i mevcden murād ʿaḳabāt-ı bahr-i sülük ve temevvüc-i deryā-yi ʿiṣyān ve teheyyüc-i iġvā-yi şeyṭāndur ve girdābdan murād ilhāda düşmek yā “ṭarīḳatde kemāl bulдум” diyü bir yirde ḳalmaḳdur.
5b

"Kanda bilürler bizüm hâlümüzi deñ kenârinuñ yüki yeynileri"
Bunlardan murâd vuşul-i ila'llâh hâşil kîlînlar ve cezbe-i ilâhiye irişüp vâsil olanlardur. Ba'zîlär murâd "melâ'ikedür" dimisîlär.

6a

"Dükeli isüm kendü murâdumca olmakdan bed-nâmliga çekdi âhir"
**Murâd budur ki** şeyh ve mûrşidsüz sülük itdûgüm üçûn bed-nâm oldum.

6b

"Kâcan gizlî kalur ol bir râz ki andan dûzerler mahfîlîlärî?"
Ya'nî: Kâcan meclîslär ve mecma'lar olsala, hâdişe söylesür olsalar, ol râzî söylesür olsalar, ol râz kâcan ma'hiba ve mestûr olûr?
**Pes:** Tarîkât ehlî gerekkür ki şeyqh irişâdiyłla sâlik ola tâ ki bed-nâm beyne'l-enâm olûmaya ki "ed-delîl sümme es-sebîl" dimişlär daňñî "er-refîk sümme eţ-tarîk" buyurmişlûrdur.

7a

"Hûzûrî lafzında hârf-i yâ vahezt içûndür ve hâhi lafzînda hârf-i yâ hîlâb içûndür.
Ez-û lafzi mişrâ'-î sâñi mažmûnîna išâretdûr ve ma'ňa-yî mişrâ' budur ki "Bir hûzûr isterseñ ondan gâfil olma Hâfîz"
Metâ ẓarf-ı zamândur ve fiʿl-i mużārî cezm ider ve mā zâyidedür ve telka “telkā” idi, cezm içân âhîrinden elif sâkiṭ olmîşdur ve lafz-ı men ismdür, ekşeriyâ ehl-i ’akl olanlarda ıtlâq olînur ve tehvâ dördinci bâbdan mużârî’dür, bu bâb’dan “hevâ” “mahabbet” ma’ nâsînadur, ve da’ emr-i hâzîrdur; “vada’a”, “yada’u”dan ve ehmîl emr-i hâzîrdur ûf’âl bâbînîn ve dünyā mü’neneşdîr, anuîçün aña mü’neneş żamîrî ircâ’ olînur.

Ma’nâ-yi mişrâ’ budur ki “Ol zamânda irişürsin sevdügüñ kimse ye ki dünyâ[yı] terk eyle daţi ihmâl eyle.”

Ya’nî: Anî şalîvir, berk dutma ve aña kalbûni müte’allîk kilma ki ta’alluk-ı dünyâ ‘abdi Mevî’dan ba’îd ider ki “dünyâkê mā yeb’adükê ‘an Mevlâkê” ve Ḥâzret-i Mevlânâ buyurur:

Beyt

بند بكسل باش ازار ای پسر
چند باشی بند سیم و بند زر

Ve Şeyh Sa’dî dimîş:

Beyt

تعلق حجابست وبي حاصلى
چو پبوندها بكسلی واصلى
Şem‘i’s Introduction and His Commentary on Hafiz’s Opening Poem

Hamdı bî-pâyân şâni‘râ ki âftâb-ı mûnîr-i bedîn bûlendi ez-kemâl-i şun‘eş yeş zerre est ve deryâ-yi muhîî-ı felek-i bedân pehnâyî yek ḳatîre. Ve şenâ-yi bî-gîrân ḥâfizîrâ ki be-luṭf-i ḥôd âsmân u zemînrâ nigeh dâred ve rûz u şebrâ be-kemâl-ı ḥîş pedîd âred. Zihî sübînî ki maşnû‘ât-ı vey bedîn keşret ez kälemen yeş nokṭa ḡatâ ne-reft:

Beyt

درین صحیفه نخواندم خط خطا زانرو
که هر چه می نگرم نقش کارخانه اوست


Ba’dehu ʿîn bende-i kemîne a‘nî Şem‘î-pây-mâl-ı ʿumûm ve şikeste-i hûmûm ki ez-devr-i zamân āşûfte-ḥâl ve perişân-bâl bûdem ki ṭarîk-i kânâ‘at ihtîyâr kerde der ǧûseî nişeste bûdem ki nâ-gâh yeκî buzurgterîn-i cîhân ve kerîmterîn-i zamân ki ʿârif-i devrân, vaḥîd-i ʿâlemîyân, ferîd-i zamâniyân bûd ammâ be-mertebê ki derîn cîhân-ı fânî-vgûcûd, nâm-i nîkeş be-seşjâ vû cûd, meşhûrter ez-Hâtem bûd:

Beyt

نام حاتم نبی مراد او که برد
که نیاپد ورا جواب برد

Ān şâhîb-devlet be-ṣerîh nivîsten-î īn Divânrâ iṣâret kerd. ʿîn bende-i ḡallîl‘-bîzâ‘a her çend ki be-ṣad zebân-î ʿacz be-kusûr-ı ḥîş i’tirâf kerdem, mâybûl-i ān ḡazret neyoftâd. ʿAkkîbetül-emr pes ez ilhâh-i bisyâr ve ʿibrâm-ı bî-ṣûmâr be-emr-i şerîf-i ān

120 The transcribed text of Şem‘i’s commentary is based on MS Kadızade Mehmed 403, which is located in Süleymaniye Manuscript Library, Istanbul.
بزرگترین‌ی بزرگ‌ان به‌شره کردن‌ی این شرعت کردم. وی امید می‌دایرم که هر کسی که از شرعت مصنف پذیرد و شریعت و باص نصرت بی‌درد سر شرط بفراموش نکند.

بیت

نامش احمد لقب فرید و نست
هر که دارد عداوتیش دوست

تیعممیون بی‌نام‌ی شریف‌ی عین‌ر به‌ی که از مانتید:

مشراً

الهی آخرش محمود کردن

G. I

الا یا ایها الساقی ادر کاسا و ناولها

"اگاه او ی ساکی، که‌سی دیور وتر و انی شن""نیلی: باندا "سین ی" ماناسا اولمک ایلادور. زیرا "ویر" ماناسی ایل تکرار اولر. نیت
کیم کامین‌ی بعیتینه "یچ" ماناسینادور:

بیت

صفای جام می‌جامی بردن زنک غم از خاطر
اذا ما تلقی مانه فحاوله و ناولها

۱ا

Elā: ی الحال لویه، مشراً‌ی شانتیه ماشریدی.
Yā: ی حال لویه.
Eyy: مینادادی.
Hā: زایییدی.
Sākü: ی لفظیشي شفتییدی.
Edir: ایل باینده امری حاژیردی.
Nāvil: emr-i hâzîrdur müfâ’ale bâbîndan.
Ke’s: dirler ki “içinde bakiyye ola.”
Ke’sden murâd câm-ı maḥabbetdür. Sâki’den murâd mûrşîd-i kâmîldür.

1b

كه عشق اسان نمود اول ولي افتاد مشکلها

“Ki ‘ışḳ-ı ilâhî viṣāl-i Ḥaḳḳ ile ‘ālem-i ervâhda evvel âsân görindi ammâ ba’de’l-viṣāl
’ışkuñ müşkilleri düştî”; ya’nî ‘ālem-i nâsûta gelmek ile zâhir oldî. Bu vech daṭî câyîzdür:
“İbṭidâ-i sülükda ‘ışḳ âsân görindi”:

Beyt

عشق آسان مي نمود اول ياميد وصال
نا أميدياهى هجروانش چنين دشوار کرد

Mûrîde lâzîmdur ki her dem şeyhînden müstefîz olup viṣâl-i cânâna isti’dâd hâşîl ide.

2a

بیوی نافة کاخر صبا زان طره بکساید

“Bir nîfe umîdi ile ki şâbâ ol творeden açar”: ya’nî aça diyî.
Taṟreden murâd hîcâb-î cemâl-i kibriyâdur. Sabâ’dan murâd feyţ-i ilâhîdîr. Nâfeden
murâd çeẕbe-i Ḫudâdur:

جذبة من جذبات الرحمن توازي عمل التقلين

2b

یجید زلف مشکینش چه خون افتاد دردلها

“Anuñ müşkîn zülfînîn kıvicicîndan havâşsuñ dillerine ne kan düştî”
Ya’nî: Bir çeẕbe hâşîl idince ne kanlar yutmişlar ve ne riyâţetler ve mücâhedeler
eyelemişlerdîr.
Zülfîden murâd zulmet-î kevndîr ki viṣâle hıcâbdur. Nîte kim Câmî dimîsdîr:

Beyt
Ve găhî "esrâr-i ilâhiyye" ma’nâsına gelür. Ca’ddan murâd zülmet-i kevnûn mütezâ’îf olmasıdır.

**Pes:** Sâlik bu cümlelenûn mahabbetinden geçmek gerekdür ki tâ Ḥaḳḳ ile aşinâlik eylemek mümkün ve kâbil ola.

Nâfe bunda "râyiha" ve büy "ümîd" ma’nâsînadur.

3a

**Böyle Sjâdhe Rnîkîn Kî Kûrt Pîr Mûgân Koûd**

"Pîr-i muğân eger saña mey ile seccâdeñi rengîn ve âlûde eyle diye anuñ emrine ımtîşâl idüp rengîn eyle.”

Pîr-i muğân’dan murâd mûrşid-i kâmîldür ki mîsrâ’-i şânîde olan sâlik lafzî aña karînedür.

Meyden murâd ‘ışk-ı Ḥûdâdur.

3b

**Kê Sâlk Bî Xibär Nûbûd Z Râh W Rûm Mensûlêhê**

"Zîrâ sâlik sülûk menzillerinûn ‘âdetinden ve râhîndan bî-ḥâber degûldür.”


4a

**Mûra Dr Mensûl Janan Çe Aman W Eîîsh Çûn Hêr Dm**

"Baña cânân menzilinde ne emn ü ne ‘ayş, ya’nî olmaz, çünkî her dem”

Zîrâ eger ǧafflet idûp emn ü ‘ayş üzere ola, ḥâṣîl ildûgui tabakâlardan düşmek lâzîm gelir.

Cânândan murâd Ḥaḳḳ Te’älâ ḥazretidûr, menzilden murâd seyr-i ma’nevîde olan tabakâtîdûr.
4b
جرس فرياد ميدارد كه بربديد محملها


5a
شب تاريک و بيم موج و كردابي چنين هانل

“Ḳaralu gice ve mevc āvfi ve buncelayın korkunc bir girdâb”
Şeb-i tânkden murâd maḥabbet-i dünyâdur, mevcden murâd teḳâžî-i nefsdür, girdâbdan murâd sû’-i ğâtimedür.

5b
كچا دانند حال ما سبک باران ساحلها

“Bizüm ğâlmûzi ḳanda bilürler deryâ kenârınuñ sebük-bârları.”
Sebük-bârdan murâd evliyâ’-î Allâhdur ki ʾışḳ-ı ilâhî ile mest olup bu ḥâlleri ferâmûş itmişlerdîr. Ba’zî kimseler “Murâd melâ’ikedür” dimişler.

6a
همه كارم زخود كامى بيدنامى كشيد آخر

“Dükeli ʾamelüm beni ḥod-kâmlîğumdan bed-nâmîğa çekdi”
Ya’nî: Nefse tâbi’ olduğumdan ötürü bed-nâm oldum.

6b
نهان كى ماند أن رازى كرو سازند محفلها
"Kaçan mestür kalur bir râz ki andan meclisler düzeler"; ya'nî o râzi bir niçe mahfilde söleyeyeler.

7a

حضرى گر همی خواهی ازو غایب مشو حافظ

"Eger bir ḥuẓūr ister iseñ Allâh'dan ġâyib olma ey Ḥâfiẓ"; ya'nî dâyim anuñ emri üzere ol.

Hâfiẓ münândâdur.

Ey ḥarf-i nidâdur, lafzen ḥaẃf olinmişdur.

7b

متى ما تلق من تهوی دع الدنيا و اهملها

"Ol zamânda ki sen mülâkı olmağı murâd idinesin şol kimseye ki anî seversin dünyâyi terk ve ihmâl eyle."

Metâ mâ-telkâda bu maḥallde irâdet ma'nâsi muḳadderdür zîrâ muḳadder i'tibâr olinmasa bu veçhe su'al vârid olur ki "Çün dünyânuñ 'adem-i terki mülâḳâta mânî' olmaya, pes niye terk itmek gerek?" Nite kim "İžâ küm tum ilâ eş-ṣalât"da muḳadderdür. Ve muṣrâ'-i şanî ma'nâda mısrâ'-i evvel üzere muḳaddemdâr.

Metâ ẓarf-i zamâni ve mâ zâyiyyedâ zîrâ metâ mânîz dañî 'amel ider.

Telkâ aşlında "telkâ" idi, metâ gelmek ile 'yâ' ḥaẃf olındi.

Men ism-i mevsülüber, şîlası tehvâdur.

Tehvâ dördinci bâbdan fi'l-i mużâri'-i muḫâṭâbdur, "maḥabbet" ma'nâsîna olan "hevâ"dan müstäkkâdur.

Ez-ûda olan žamîr-i ġâyib men lafzîna râci'dür iżmâr ḣâble'z-zikr tarîği ile.
II

TRANSLATIONS

Notes on Translations

1. My transliteration and translation of Hafiz’s opening couplet are given in square brackets.

2. All of my additions inserted into Sudi’s text are indicated in brackets.

3. In the translation, some technical words used by Sudi are italicized. Translations of these words are given in brackets. At times, these words are explained in the footnotes.

4. In the translation, the lemmas listed by Sudi are also italicized.
Sudi’s Introduction and His Commentary on Hafiz’s Opening Couplet

In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate

Praise be to God who granted me success in explaining sciences and knowledge, the immaculate language of Arabs, and the learned language of Persians. Blessings and peace be upon His most virtuous created being Muhammad, who is the most eloquent and noble in lineage, and upon his holy family and righteous followers.

Then let it be known that the writer of these pages and the narrator of what is written, this humble and sinful servant, namely, Sudi, the poor, says as follows:

One day, at the most auspicious of times and at the happiest of hours, the governor of (the city of) Madina, Ömer Efendi, who was the most intimate of companions and the most special of friends, may God bless his soul and may double his reward in Paradise, came, unceremoniously as usual, into my humble house, kissed my hand three times and said: “this is what I ask of you: you should write a commentary on Hafiz’s Divan (poetry collection) in such a way that it would be useful to seekers and beneficial for the beginners. In short, it would not suggest any extended meaning or mystical interpretation but just explain the grammar (of the text) following the methods of the Arabic grammarians and restrict itself to the basic meaning of the verses.”

Decorated with different kinds of knowledge and branches of science, Ömer Efendi was the compendium of merits and honors, the possessor of benevolence and beneficence, the abode of generosity and munificence, and the source of benefaction and bounteousness. If Hatam saw his nobility and generosity he would be mourning because of his zealous jealousy. Ömer

Hatam is the name of a legendary Arab character that lived in pre-Islamic times and was famous for his generosity.
Efendi is such that the world has not seen his equal since the nine revolving spheres started to rotate.

Upon his saying so, I took his request to be a command and his behest a godsend. Because the deceased and forgiven (Ömer Efendi) was so generous and benevolent to this praying man that neither is so a father to his son nor a brother to a brother. As such, only the one who knows me and him, the deceased, can so testify.

It is hoped the readers of this commentary may not forget to bless the deceased as well as this base Sudi as they bless Muhammad and his noble family. It is expected from the people of justice that they correct with the pen of forgiveness and indulgence those places in this commentary where errors and mistakes occur, and not make an effort to show and reveal its shortcomings. Because I confess it is not within my capacity and limits to write a commentary on such an intricate book. However, as mentioned previously, I was importuned to do so. Nonetheless, I ask the readers of this commentary to cast a fair eye on it.

Couplet

The eye of contentment is dull to all faults
The eye of discontentment, however, reveals the shortcomings

Let it be known that the noble name of Khajah Hafiz is Shams al-Din Muhammad. Among the learned men, he is famous as “the Tongue of the Hidden” and “the Teller of Secrets.” His lustrous poems are the envy of the spring of life, and the daughters of his thought are the cause of jealousy for maidens and boys of Paradise. By solid words he sweetened the palate of the common people, and by clear meanings he added salt to the mouths of the elites. Thus the doors of acquaintance of the men of the Seen have been open to him and the splendor of the light in the eyes of the men of the Unseen has grown. For every learned man he composed poetry

122 The word khajah means lord, master. It is an honorific title of a man of great dignitary.
suitable to their occasions. He invented pleasant and rare meanings for everyone and encapsulated abounding meanings in few words. His world-conquering *ghazals* (lyric poems) reached the borders of the countries in Turkistan and India in the least period of time, and his heart-pleasing words arrived the regions and districts of the two Iraqs and Azerbaijan in the shortest space of time. Without having his excitement-stirring poems recited, the ritual music and dancing of the dervishes would not become fervent, and without the tasty sweetmeats of his taste-arousing words having uttered, the gatherings of the rulers would not be embellished and adorned. Still more, the outcry of his incitement would make the hues and cries of the passionate possible, and the chant of the wine-worshippers would acquire splendor with the gurgle of his poems. This has been allegorized as follows:

Verse

The *ghazal*-singing of Hafiz reached to such an extent that
The firmament forgot the melodies of Venus and her pleasing lyre
In time he did absolute justice to lyric poetry
In a way no poet composed poetry in that way
As you memorize his pleasant-flowing poetry, say:
May a thousand mercies of God be on the soul of Hafiz

However his diligent study of the *Qur’an*, his regular appointment as teacher of the Sultan, his annotation of the *Kashshaf* and the *Miftah*, his perusal of the *Matali’an* and the *Misbah*, his studies on literary techniques, and his admiring interest in the works of the Arab poets prevented him from bringing his dispersed *ghazals* together and withheld him from assembling his heart-pleasing couplets on a string of necklace. Qivam al-Din Hasan used to bring up in conversation the rough draft of these couplets over and over again in the study room of the madrasah (college) which he built for Hafiz and say, in the course of conversation, that he should string these unique gems of value on a necklace and arrange these illustrious pearls in a
line, so that it would become a necklace for the graceful necks of the people of the time and an amulet for the jeweled girdles of the men of the time.

Hafiz entrusted the raising of this edifice of poetry to the unwarranted times and offered excuses amounting to the excuses of the people of the period until, in the year 791 A.H., he committed the life entrusted to him to the guardians of God’s decree and determination and carried the garment of existence out of the narrow vestibule of death. His immaculate soul joined the dwellers of the sublime world, and he became a pure companion of the black-eyed maidens of Paradise after separation from his body.

Chronogram

In the Abjad year of ba, sad, and zal
From the day of the auspicious Hijra of Ahmad
He set out toward the highest Heaven
The unique man of the era, Shams al-Din Muhammad
When I passed by his pure grave
I beheld the purity and splendor of the tomb

After Hafiz passed away, some of his companions, with commitment to companionship and obligation to respect friendship, arranged and organized his dispersed ghazals into a divan. May God set his soul at rest and perpetuate his prosperity in the rooms of Heaven. Amen, Lord of the worlds! God is the one who grants success in the road of righteousness. And He is merciful to his subjects, and sufficient for us is God, and He is the best Disposer of affairs.

---

123 The Abjad is a decimal numeral system in which the 28 letters of the Arabic alphabet are assigned numerical values. According to this system, the letters bā [ب], sād [س] and zāl [ذ] have the numerical values, respectively, of 2, 90 and 700. Therefore, the sum of the numerical values of the three letters (792 A.H.) gives Hafiz’s date of death, which is 1389/1390 C.E.

124 Hijra is the migration of the Prophet Muhammad and his followers to the city of Madina in 622 (Common Era). Alternate spellings of this Arabic word in English are Hijrah and Hegira.
This line (originally) belongs to the second couplet of a quatrain composed in the hazaj meter by Yazid bin Mu‘aviya. The original complete text of the quatrain is as follows:

I am poisoned,  
and I have no antidote or incantation  
Pass around a cup and hand it (to me),  
O cupbearer!

Transposing the (last) two lines (of Yazid’s quatrain) to make them correspond with the rhyme of his ghazal, Khajah Hafiz incorporated these lines into his poem and put them at the beginning of his Divan. It is for this reason that some poets criticized the Khajah (Hafiz). For instance, Ahli of Shiraz writes as follows:

One night in a dream I saw Khajah Hafiz  
I asked him “O unparalleled in virtue and in knowledge:  
why did you bind yourself to this verse of Yazid,  
notwithstanding all your virtue and perfection?”  
He said, “You don’t understand the issue here:  
an unbeliever’s property is lawful to a believer.”

And Katibi of Nishabur writes as such:

I am confounded at Khajah Hafiz,  
to such an extent that reason is paralyzed.  
What wisdom did he see in Yazid’s verse  
that he recited it at the beginning of the Divan?  
Though the property of an unbeliever is lawful to a believer, and regarding which there is no dispute,  
it is, nevertheless, a great shame  
for a lion to steal a bite from a dog’s mouth.

125 Hazaj is the name of one of the common prosodic patterns.
Alā is the opening particle, which occurs as such in the following Qur'anic verse: “Surely, there is neither fear nor grief for the friends of God”. The author of the Kashshaf (The Discoverer) argues that it (alā) is in compound form while Ibn Malik contends that it is in simple form. The arguments of both (scholars) are mentioned in the detailed grammatical works.

Yā is the vocative particle.

Ayy is the addressee, which is definite and singular.

Hā is a particle of admonition. Since the izafet is required after the word ayya, hā is used a substitute for the noun in the genitive case.

Al-sāqī is, by principle, in the nominative form. It is an adjective to the word ayya. Actually, the sāqī (cupbearer) is the addressee. In order not to let the two definite articles (i.e., the particles yā and al- respectively) come together, he (Hafiz) put the word ayya in between and used hā as a particle of admonition. Lexically, it (the word sāqī) means “the one who gives water”, but as a term it refers to “the one who serves a cup at a wine gathering”.

Adir is a second-person imperative verb and is of the if'al pattern. It means “pass it around”, but not, as some would assume, “have it passed around”.

Ka’s means “wine cup”. Some say it means kadeh (goblet), but the word kadeh has a more generic meaning than the word ka’s.

Va nāvilhā: nāvil is a second-person imperative verb and is of the müfa‘ale pattern. It means “hand it”. Its original form is va nāvilniḥā, which includes the nūn of protection (-n-) and the first-person pronoun suffix yā (-ī). Yā is omitted due to the prosodic requirement. Hā is a
feminine pronoun, and it refers to the word ka’s. Let it be known that (in Arabic) all of wine-related nouns, adjectives and other vocabulary items are treated as feminine.

The summary of the line is as follows: O cupbearer! Pass the wine cup around the gathering of friends one after another, and then hand it to me!

What causes the circulation of the wine cup is its being passed from one hand to another.

(Rhetorically,) the line is a type of synecdoche. (Thus) the meaning of the line is: Pass the wine cup around, and when it is my turn, I will drink it.

One argues that “it is more probable that here the verb nāvil means ‘Let you drink it up!’ ”, and he brings Jami’s following couplet forward as evidence for his argument:

Couplet

O Jami! The purity of the wine cup wipes off the dust of grief from the heart! Whenever you have something that distresses you, seek the wine cup and drink it!

By arguing so, he goes completely astray in drawing a correct relation between the evidence he provides and what the evidence stands for. Also, he is incapable of distinguishing between offering (someone a cup of wine) and receiving (a cup of wine from someone). And particularly, what is meant (in Hafiz’s line) is not that the cupbearer drinks from the cup. Rather, it is the poet himself who drinks it. This is attested to by Yazid’s (own) words —“I am poisoned”. Likewise, I made this (point) clear in my (previous) explanation that (in its original form) the verb nāvil is followed by the first-person pronoun suffix yā (-ī). One other evidence for this comes from the following words of a poet:

Fill the wine cup as the dawn appears! Drink it, and hand it to me! It exhales fragrance like musk.

To argue that “the particle alā is connected with the second line” is a complete divergence from the correct path (of interpretation), for alā is used to begin a sentence and occurs at the beginning
of a statement. As such, it only indicates accentuation. And since alā is used for calling upon the addressee, it is (grammatically) related to the two imperative verbs (in the first line). (In short,) it has absolutely no connection with the second line.

\[Ki \ ‘ishq āsān nūmūd uvrī uftād mushkilhā\]

[For love seemed easy at first, but (then) difficulties arose]

\(Ki\) consists of the Arabic (letter) \(kāf\) (ك), vowelled with \(kasra\), and the word-final \(hā\) (ُ).\(^{129}\) It is either a noun or a particle. If used as a noun, it refers to human beings, such as in this couplet from the \(Gulistan\) (Rose Garden):

Whose hand and tongue can fulfill the obligation of giving thanks to Him?

If used as a particle, it serves to connect two things, such as the inchoative and the predicate, an adjective and its substantive, the cause and the effect, an intention and the intended action and so on. Here it (\(ki\)) serves as a particle of cause; in other words, it explains the reason behind the imperative utterance (in the first line).

\(‘Ishq\) is pronounced with a \(kasra\) on the (letter) \(‘ayn\) (ع). It has various definitions, but the most common definition is “the excess of love”.

\(Āsān\) means “easy”.

\(Nūmūd\) is a verb in the past tense. It can be transitive or intransitive. Here, it is intransitive.

\(Uvrī\) is a particle of limitation, like the Arabic \(lākin\) (but/however).

\(Uftād\) is a verb in the past tense. It is like the Arabic (verb) \(vaqā‘a\) (وقَعَ / ‘fell upon’). It is used with two meanings, one referring to the act of “falling down”, the other referring to “the

\(^{129}\) \textit{Kasra} is a diacritical mark (ʼ) used in Arabic script to indicate that a letter is pronounced with short /i/. 
happening of something”. The verb is also used as such in Turkish. For example, they say “it happened thus and so.”

*Mushkil* means “hard” in the sense of “difficult” (to bear).

*Hā* is a plural suffix used with non-humans. It is ungrammatical to use this suffix with animates.

The summary of the couplet is as follows: O Cupbearer! Give me wine, for love of the beloved seemed easy at first, but then difficulties arose.

The reason (for Hafiz’s saying so) is as follows: when one falls in love with a beloved, at first s/he treats the lover with all sorts of kindness. But when the lover’s love becomes stronger and stronger, the beloved begins to act as if s/he were indifferent to him. Unable to endure his beloved’s indifference, the desperate lover tries to console himself sometimes with wine, sometimes with opium, laudanum or opium-based electuary, sometimes with hashish or coffee in order to find some relief and tranquility.
Süruri’s Introduction and His Commentary on Hafiz’s Opening Couplet

Praise be to God who protected the Qur’an from being changed by the adversities of the world. As He said, “Surely, we have sent down the Qur’an, and we are, indeed, its guardians.”\textsuperscript{130} Blessings be upon the one (the Prophet Muhammad) who maintained it (the Qur’an) through instruction and recited it as it is found in the preserved tablet (of God’s decrees). Blessings be also upon his companions and family members, of whom the Qur’an speaks with compassion and who are protected by the signs of the Qur’an.

Disgruntled with the world, this broken-hearted Süruri expresses his words in this manner: the righteous predecessors with mystical experience—may God be pleased with all of them—have explained the conditions of the path to mystical perfection and the secrets of the spiritual doctrine through the media of allegorical expressions, metaphors and allusions. Thus Mavlama (Jalal al-Din Rumi)—may God bless his secret—writes as follows:

\textbf{Couplet}

It is better that the secret of the beloveds should be told in the talk of others.

Shams al-Din Muhammad al-Hafiz al-Shirazi—may God bless his secret—belongs to the class of mystics, where he is given the honorific titles of “the Tongue of the Hidden” and “the Expounder of Secrets”. In all of his poems and in each of his allegorical, enigmatic and figurative expressions, Hafiz intends to convey the secrets of the mystical path. But those who are unaware of and detached from the conditions and mysteries of the mystical

\textsuperscript{130} The Qur’an, Chapter 15, Verse 9.
path either completely deny this due to their shortcomings in comprehension or remain confounded.

Couplet

How many have condemned a correct statement!  
The problem lies in their weakness of understanding

Quatrain

The ignorant repudiate knowledge,  
they do not know it due to ignorance and illiteracy.  
Indeed, their only creed is that  
if they do not know it, they blaspheme it.

Now and then, the ingenious men of spiritual understanding and the possessors of divine spirituality were visiting this poor Süruri to ask some questions about mystical secrets (in Hafiz’s poetry). Accordingly, this poor Süruri was investigating the (individual) inquiries to the best of his knowledge and was answering each of them verbally. Afterwards, I was asked to write down all these answers in the Turkish language. Hereupon, I spent some time putting them into writing. (Accordingly,) I briefly elucidated the metaphorical (i.e., mystical) meaning (in the poems of Hafiz) and thus made the actual meaning (of his poems) evident, so that those who are deficient and incomplete (in mystical knowledge) would become (mystically) complete and perfect and that the ignorant and the uninformed would become men of (mystical) sensibility.

But those who are arrogant and obstinate follow neither the manifest verses of God nor the obvious miracles of the prophets. (Doing so,) they do not submit themselves to the (eternal) truth, nor do they surely know it. In his following couplet, Khajah Hafiz speaks to such people who lack understanding by responding to them ironically:
Couplet 131

O Friend! You are not well-versed in speech, the fault is yours. When you listen to the words of men of wisdom, do not say that they have made a mistake.

But, undoubtedly, those who are obstinate and without understanding are not able to go beyond the veil of ignorance, and those who are self-centered and envious remain within the circle of obstinacy. May God save us from such people! Oh God, the Keeper and Preserver! Protect us from dangers! God is the most caring Preserver, and He is the most compassionate.

GI

1a

[Alā yā ayyahā al-sāqī adir ka’sān va nāvilhā]
[O cupbearer! Pass around a cup and hand it (to me)]

Alā is the particle of admonition, and yā is the vocative particle, and ayyahā is an indefinite noun that is used to attach the vocative particle to the noun in definite form, and hā, which is attached to ayyahā, is the particle of admonition and indicates accentuation, and the word al-sāqī is an adjective to the word ayyahā, and adir is the second-person imperative and is a derivative of (the conjugated verb forms) adār (أدار) and yudīr (يدير), and ka’sān is a cup that is filled with wine, and nāvilhā is the second-person imperative and is a derivative of (the conjugated verb form) nāvalhā (ناوله), and since ka’sān is feminine, it is referred to by the feminine pronoun (hā).

131 In Sūruri’s introduction, the lines of the couplet are transposed. In the ‘standard’ version of the couplet, the second line above is the first line (cf. Divan-i Hafiz, ed. Abu al-Qasim Incavi-i Shirazi, Tehran: Nashr-i Shahab, 2004, 28).
The meaning of the line is as follows: Arise, O cupbearer! Pass around the full cup and hand it. What is meant by (the word) sāqī is a preacher or a person who offers advice. Also intended (by the word sāqī) is that which attracts and gives pleasure. (Accordingly,) what is meant by (the word) ka’s is the sermon, advice or word of wisdom that inspires someone and attracts him.

1b

[For love seemed easy at first, but (then) difficulties arose]

(The meaning of the line is:) For divine love appeared easy at first, but difficulties fell upon. Accordingly, (what one should infer from Hafiz’s saying so is that) it is necessary to give encouragement to those who follow the mystical path and seek the mystical truth, so that they would not be discouraged (on their way to mystical perfection) and would continue to pursue their endeavor until the state of union with God is achieved.
Şem’i’s Introduction and His Commentary on Hafiz’s Opening Couplet

Everlasting praise be to the Creator! The splendid and magnanimous sun is a mere particle of His perfect creation, and so are the oceans surrounding the world. Immeasurable glory be to the Protector! He preserves and maintains the heavens and the earth through His grace. He brings the day and the night into view through His perfect creation. Endless glory be to God! His pen (of creation) made no single error despite the multiplicity of created beings:

Couplet

I did not see any mistake on this page (of Creation),
for wherever I look, I see (nothing but) the work of His atelier

Thousands of prayers and blessings be upon His most generous companion (the Prophet Muhammad), who is honored by the statement of “I have a time with God” and is (thus) the confidant of God, and also upon his children. Prayers and blessings be on his most esteemed companions, each of whom is the guiding star of the path of salvation and the candle of religious ceremonies. May God be pleased with all of them!

This humble servant, namely Şem’i, the one trampled upon by sorrows and afflicted with grief, had embraced sadness and been in a ruined state with the passing of time. (Accordingly,) I had chosen a moderate life and secluded myself from the world. It was during this period of seclusion that, quite unexpectedly, one of the eminent statesmen of the time visited me and implied that I should write a commentary on this Divan (poetry collection). A person without equal in knowledge, he was the unique of the age, to such an extent that in this world of vanities he was renowned with generosity and munificence, and even more celebrated than (the legendary) Hatam:
Couplet

Hatam’s name is forgotten when his is mentioned, 
thus no introduction is needed for him.

Though this servant of limited capacity confessed his own incapacity hundreds of times, 
it was not accepted by His Highness. After so many days of importuning from His Highness, 
who was the most eminent of the notables, I finally began writing a commentary on the *Divan* at 
his behest. I hope that this commentary would be helpful for everyone and that readers would not 
forget to pray to God for the commentator and for the one who motivated him:

Couplet

His name is Ahmad, and his epithet is Faridun. 
Whoever is hostile to him is a wicked man.

As a token of felicity, finally, I mention His honorable name here:

Verse

May God make its end fortunate!

GI

1a

آلا يا أيها الساقى أدر كأسا و ناولها

[Alā yā ayyūhā al-sāqī adir kaʿs‘ān va nāvilhā]

[O cupbearer! Pass around a cup and hand it (to me)]

(The meaning of the line is:) Arise, O cupbearer! Pass around the cup and hand it.
It is more probable that here the verb *nāvil* means “Let you drink it up!”, for such meaning is also reinforced by the meaning of the verb *adir*. Likewise, the verb *nāvil* has the same meaning in Jami’s following couplet:

Couplet

O Jami! The purity of the wine cup wipes off the dust of grief from the heart! Whenever you have something that distresses you, seek the wine cup and drink it!

*Alā* is the particle of admonition, and it is connected with the second line.

*Yā* is the vocative particle.

*Ayū* is the addressee.

*Hā* is a redundant particle.

*Sāqī* is an adjective to the word *ayū*.

*Adir* is the second-person imperative and is a derivative of the *if’al* pattern.

*Nāvil* is the second-person imperative and is a derivative of the *müfā’ale* pattern.

*Ka’s* is the name of that at the bottom of which there are dregs (of wine).

What is meant by (the word) *ka’s* is the cup of (mystical) affection. (Accordingly,) what is meant by (the word) *sāqī* is the (mystically) perfect guide.

1b

كَهْ عَشَقْ آسَانْ نمّودِ أواو وِلِيَ ْعَفْتَاد مشّكلِهَا

[Ki ‘ishq āsān numūd avval wālī uftād mushkilhā]

[For love seemed easy at first, but (then) difficulties arose]

(The meaning of the line is:) For divine love appeared easy at first when the state of union with God was achieved in the world of spirituality, but after the union the difficulties of love fell
upon. That is to say, the difficulties (of love) arose by coming to this world of mortality. The line can be interpreted in that way too: love appeared easy at the beginning of the mystical path:

Couplet

With the hope of union, love appeared easy at first,
But the despair of separation made it so difficult.

(Therefore,) it is necessary for the one follows the mystical path to receive the benefit of his master’s knowledge every single moment and prepare himself for union with the Beloved.
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