

Péri, Benedek (2019). "The Persian Imitation Gazels (Nazires) of Kanuni Sultan Süleyman "Muhibbi" (1520–1566) as They are Preserved in a Hitherto Unnoticed Early Copy of his Divan". *Amasya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (ASOBİD)*. S. 5, s. 95-120.

THE PERSIAN IMITATION GAZELS (NAZİRES) OF KANUNİ SULTAN SÜLEYMAN "MUHİBBİ" (1520–1566) AS THEY ARE PRESERVED IN A HITHERTO UNNOTICED EARLY COPY OF HIS DIVAN KĀNŪNĪ SULTĀN SÜLEYMĀN "MUHİBBĪ" DĪVANININ BİLİNMEYEN BİR NÜSHASI VE İÇİNDE BULUNAN FARŞÇA NAZİRELER

Prof. Dr. Benedek PÉRI *
Eötvös Loránd University
peribenedek@gmail.com

Abstract

Kānūnī Sultān Süleymān "Muhibbī" (r. 1520–1566) was one of the most important poets in the 16th century in period that could be rightly termed the golden age of Ottoman poetry with authors like Ḥayālī, Zātī and Bākī. Most Ottoman poets in this period composed poetry in Turkish, only a few of them felt the necessity to write poems in Persian. Though the majority of the poems of Sultān Süleymān are in Turkish he also composed poetry in Persian. His small Persian divan was first published in 1995 by Coşkun Ak who based his edition on two manuscripts. One of them is preserved in the Topkapı Palace Library, the other in the library of Istanbul University. The present paper besides introducing a hitherto unnoticed manuscript from Israel copied during Süleymān's life that contains the Persian divan as well also aims at giving a detailed analysis of Muhibbī's Persian imitation poems.

* ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0002-3415-5532

Keywords: Kānūnī Sulṭān Süleymān, Muḥibbī, Dīvān-i Muḥibbī, gazel, Persian divan, imitation, nazīre

Öz

Kānūnī Sulṭān Süleymān “Muḥibbī” (1520–1566) esasen Osmanlı divan edebiyatının altın çağı olarak adlandırılan ve Ḥayālī, Zātī, Bākī gibi usta şairlerin yaşadığı 16. yüzyılın en önemli şairlerinden biridir. Söz konusu dönemde Osmanlı şairlerinin çoğu Türkçe şiirler yazıyordu. Bu şairlerin sadece birkaçı edebi dil olarak Farsçayı tercih etmiştir. Eserlerinin çoğu Türkçe olarak yazılmış olmasına rağmen Muḥibbī'nin Farsça şiirleri de mevcuttur. Bu şiirleri içeren Farsça divanının Coşkun Ak tarafından hazırlanmış Türkiye kütüphanelerinde muhafaza edilen iki nüshaya dayalı birinci baskısı 1995'te neşredilmiştir. Yazma nüshaların biri Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesinde diğeri ise İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi Nadir Eserler Bölümünde muhafaza edilmektedir. Aşağıdaki makale bilim dünyasında bilinmeyen, İsrail Millî Kütüphanesinde muhafaza edilen, Muḥibbī henüz hayatta iken istinsah edilmiş, şairin Farsça şiirlerini de ihtiva eden bir yazmanın tanıtımından sonra nüshada bulunan Farsça nazirelerinin detaylı bir analizini sunar.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kānūnī Sulṭān Süleymān, Muḥibbī, Dīvān-ı Muḥibbī, gazel, nazīre, Farsça.

Introduction

Kānūnī Sulṭān Süleymān was one of the most prolific poets in a period often termed the golden age of classical Ottoman literature. (Çelebioğlu, 2017: 585) By the time of Süleymān's reign the classical Ottoman literary tradition was firmly established and the literary canon was in the process of constant development and increase. Contemporary literary anthologies (*tezkires*) indicate that poetry had become a public affair and people from all walks of life actively and enthusiastically took part in a social game of composing poetry.

Ottoman is a derived literary system modelled on the classical Persian tradition and though by the reign of Süleymān it had found his own voice, the Ottoman system remained in constant discourse with its Persian past. As it had never broken from its roots the oeuvre of the classics of Persian poetry served as reference points for many Ottoman poets who as the following

couplet by Muhibbî indicates had a never ending imaginary competition with their intellectual predecessors.

*Cāmī vü Hüsrev eger bulsa Muhibbî yeni cān
Bana taḥsîn ederdi işidüp bu gazelüm (Ak, 2006, 569)*

"If Cāmī and Hüsrev found a new life, Muhibbî
Listening to my gazel they would applaud it."

This virtual race for acknowledgement and poetic excellence, however, was in most cases ran in Turkish in Süleymān's reign and only a small number of poets tried their hands at composing poetry in Persian. Süleymān the Lawgiver who used the pen name Muhibbî in both his Turkish and Persian pieces was one of them.

Muhibbî's Persian poems were first edited by Kasim Gelen as an MA thesis at İstanbul Üniversitesi in 1989 (Gelen, 1989). Gelen mentions four manuscripts of Muhibbî's Persian divan (Gelen, 1989: 25–30). One of them is preserved in the Topkapı Palace Library (Revan 785), one in the Nadir Eserler Collection of the library of Istanbul University (Türkçe Yazmalar 5477) and two copies are kept in the Millet Kütüphanesi (Ali Emîrî 323, Ali Emîrî 322). Only one of them is dated. The Topkapı manuscript was copied during Süleymān's reign by Meḫmed Şerîf in 973/1565–66 (Gelen, 1989: 25).

Since Gelen thought that Ali Emîrî 322 was a copy of Ali Emîrî 323 he based his edition on three manuscripts. His work contains ninety-five gazels, twenty-two tetrastichs (*rubā'īs* and *kit'as*) and forty-three independent beyts (*müfred*). The most comprehensive of all the manuscripts is Ali Emîrî 323 that contains fifty-one gazels not found in any other manuscripts. Based on the volume's appearance Gelen supposed that the copy had been prepared for the Palace (Gelen, 1989: 27).

The first edition that appeared in print was compiled by Coşkun Ak in 1995 (Ak, 1995). The small volume was republished in 2006 (Ak, 2006a). This latter volume contains the text of forty-five gazels, twenty-two tetrastichs (*rubā'īs* and *kit'as*) and forty independent couplets both in Arabic and Latin script together with their translations. In his short preface to his edition Prof. Ak

claims that except for the two manuscripts he used, the Topkapı and the Istanbul University manuscripts, no other manuscripts contain Muḥibbī's Persian poems. (Ak, 2006a, v.).

One of latest contributions to the topic is Şadi Aydın's small volume on Turkish poets who produced a full divan in Persian which provides the reader with a detailed description of the same four manuscripts already described by Gelen (Aydın, 2010: 95–97).¹

Quite recently a hitherto unnoticed manuscript of Muḥibbī's divan has been discovered outside Turkey, which besides containing the Sultan's Turkish poems includes some of his Persian pieces as well. The volume is preserved in the Yahuda Collection of the National Library of Israel (Yahuda Ar. Ms. 1065). The manuscript is undated, the name of the scribe and the place of copying are unknown. The volume sized 266x163 mm and consisting of 291 numbered folios with an average of 13 lines on a page must have been made for a well-to-do customer. The text was copied in elegantly written and clear *nastalīk* by a master calligrapher on *zereḫşān* paper and the volume contains two nicely executed *şames* (fols. 3v–4r), an exquisite double frontispiece (fols. 4v–5r), two *ʿunvāns* (fols. 1v, 280v) and many decorated headings embellished with phrases of blessings written in white against a blue background and minutely painted floral patterns.

According to Prof. Efraim Wust's description of the volume available on the library's homepage the manuscript was copied around 960/1553 (Wust: E.T. 03.04.2019).² Though the exact date of copying is not known phrases used as headings like *ḥallada Allāhu taʿālā ʿumrahu wa abbada salṭanatahu* ("May Allah make his life eternal and make his sultanate last forever"; Muḥibbī:

¹ The comprehensive bibliography of research done on Muḥibbī's oeuvre compiled by Cihan Dadaş adds a further item to the list (Dadaş, 2018: 276). According to Dadaş an edition including both the Persian and Turkish divans were published in Iran in 2014. This publication proved unavailable for me. Dadaş also mention a fifth manuscript containing Persian poems (Dadaş, 2018: 271) but I was unable to verify his information.

² I am deeply grateful to Dr. Raquel Ukeles and Prof. Efraim Wust for their help in confirming the approximate dating of the manuscript.

19b), *tawwala Allāhu ʿumrahu wa rifʿatahu* ("May Allah lengthen his life and his exalted state"; Muhibbî: 27a), *ḥafazahu Allāhu min jamīʿi al-āfāti* ("May Allah protect him from all evil"; Muhibbî: 28a) make it certain that the volume was copied during Muhibbî's life time. Prof. Wust points out that an elegy (*mersiye*) composed in *murabbaʿ* commemorating the death of Şehzāde Mehmed (d. 1543) on fols. 260rv can help to narrow down the time frame of the possible date of copying (Wust: E.T. 03.04.2019). Though Coşkun Ak mentions a *murabbaʿ* written on the death of Şehzade Mehmed (Ak, 2016b: 36), the poem doesn't seem to be included in any of the critical editions of Muhibbî's divan. It contains the famous chronogram "*Şehzādeler güzidesi Sultān Muḥammedüm* (The chosen one among the princes, my Sultān Muḥammed)" the gives the year 950/1543. (The text of the poem is included in the Appendix.)

Since research work on the manuscript has started and hopefully, a comprehensive edition will be published in the near future,³ the following short description serves only to give an idea of the manuscript's contents. The volume starts with a nicely decorated *ʿunvān* and a short chapter containing five gazels under the heading "*Calla calāluhu. Der münācāt-i kâzî al-ḥācāt ʿamma navāluhu* (Great be his glory. [Poems] praising the Judge of [our] needs. Magnificent be his bounty)". The first gazel is no. 1. in the edition of Kemal Yavuz and Orhan Yavuz (Yavuz and Yavuz, 2016: 129). The second *münācāt* is no. 2 in Ak's edition (Ak, 2006b: 41). The third poem is gazel no. 1752 (Yavuz and Yavuz, 2016: 931), the fourth is no. 1946 (Yavuz and Yavuz, 2016: 1022), the fifth one is no. 392 (Yavuz and Yavuz, 2016: 308–309) in the 2016 edition. The introductory chapter is followed by a double page containing two *şamses* surrounded by floral patterns painted in gold.

The *gazeliyyāt* chapter starts with a minutely decorated double frontispiece containing five couplets from poem no. 2 (*Āh kim vardur benüm başumda biñ dürlü hevā*) of the aforementioned edition (Yavuz and Yavuz, 2016: 130). This section ends on fol. 256r and contains almost 940 poems some of which doesn't seem

³ The editing work is going to be done by Dr. Christiane Czygan and Dr. Benedek Péri.

to have been published yet. Fols. 256r–266v contains poems composed in various genres mainly *muḥammese*s and *murabbaʿ*s. The next section (fols. 267r–271r) contains tetrastichs followed by *kitʿas* and *müfreds* arranged in alphabetical order (fols. 271r–279r). The last section in the volume titled *Ġazaliyyāt al-Fārsī* contains Muḥibbī's Persian poems (fols. 280v–291r) including 38 gazels – one item occurs twice – 8 tetrastichs and two independent couplets.

Persian gazels are arranged in the following order:

1. *Dīda az ātaş-i dil ğarķa-yi āb-ast marā* (fol. 280v)
2. *Gah girih-hā zanī az nāz ḥam-i abrū-rā* (fols. 280v–281r)
3. *Har dam bi-man-aş caurī u har laḥza cafāy-ast* (fol. 281r)
4. *ʿĀşik-i dil-ḥasta-rā parvā-yi nang u nām nīst* (fols. 281rv)
5. *Tā çand kaşam dar ğam-i tu bār-i malāmat* (fol. 281v)
6. *Tīr-i turā kudām dil az cān nişāna nīst* (fols. 281v–282r)
7. *Vah ki zulf az dīdan-i rüy-i tu mārā māniʿ ast* (fol. 282r)
8. *Ay az nazāra-yi tu ḥacal āftāb-i şubḥ* (fol. 282r)
9. *Bi-man hargiz kasī hamdam na-gardad* (fol. 282v)
10. *Damī ḥvāham tu-rā bā sāġarī bī-hamdami digar* (fol. 282v)
11. *Tā kunam ruḥsār-i ān mah-rā tamāşā-yi digar* (fol. 283r)
12. *Çün man ma-bād kasī asīr-i balā-yi ğam* (fols. 283rv)
13. *Dard-i dil dāram u dil-dār na-dāram çi kunam* (fol. 283v)
14. *Dīda-hā sūy-i ğazab çin abruvān andāḥtī* (fols. 283v–284r)
15. *Bāz āşufta-am az ḥayrat-i ʿanbar-müy-ī* (fol. 284r)
16. *Ān parī az nāz-i hargaz na-şinūd zār-i kasī* (fol. 284v)
17. *Dilā dil-ḥasta-am darmān-i man çī-st* (fol. 284v)
18. *Ḥāl gūyam bā fiġān man bā dil-i nā-şād-i ḥud* (fol. 285r)
19. *Dil-hā ki asīr-i zulf-i yār-and* (fol. 285r)
20. *Ay dil u ārām-i cān az tu cudāyī çun kunam* (fols. 285rv)
21. *Dar hicr-i tu dar-mānda-am ki gāh mā-rā yād kun* (fol. 285v)
22. *Ātaş-i dil zi dard-i miḥnat-i ū-st* (fol. 286r)
23. *Çün may ḥurī va rüy-i tu gardad cihān furüz* (fol. 286r)
24. *Şad āh bi-dil va zi muja ḥūn mī-guzarānam* (fol. 286v)
25. *Īn dam çu gul şikufta tamannā-yi may kunam* (fol. 286v)

26. *Kār-i ū dāyim cafā u caur bāşad dād az ū* (fols. 286v–287r)
27. *Nī dil u nī ‘aql u nī cān u cihān dāram havas* (fol. 287r)
28. *Zi had guzaşt gam-am vah ki nīst gam-ḥvārī* (fol. 287rv)
29. *Bī-yā ay Sākī-yi gul-ruḥ bahār-i sabza-pūş āmad* (fol. 287v)
30. *Dilā yak sā‘atī bī-ḥvīştan şau* (fol. 288r)
31. *Ṭarāvāt-i saman-at dar ḳamar na-mī-yābam* (fol. 288rv)
32. *Giriftam hamçu Macnūn dah-rā bī-çāra-ī bāşad* (fol. 288v)
33. *Kār-i ū dāyim cafā u caur bāşad dād az ū* (fols. 288v–289r)
34. *Har kas zi yār agarçi vafā ārzū kunad* (fol. 289r)
35. *Mā mubtalā zi had bi-guzaşt ārzū-yi mā* (fols. 289rv)
36. *Dar sar-i zulf-i tu dil dar band-i zindānī ḥuş ast* (fol. 289v)
37. *Har kucā bīnad ma-rā ān çaşm ḥancar mī-kaşad* (fol. 289v–290r)
38. *Ān yār-i dil-navāz ki mastāna mī-rasad* (fol. 290r)

It’s difficult to decide the relationship of the Yahuda manuscript to the other three manuscripts Gelen used because at some points the text is identical with the text of the Topkapı and at other places resembles the University manuscript (Gelen, 1989: 32). The gazel starting with the line *Mā mubtalā zi had bi-guzaşt ārzū-yi mā* (“We are troubled our desire has exceeded all limits”) composed in the metre *recez-i müsemmen-i sālīm* (- - - | - - - | - - - | - - -) illustrates this point very well.⁴

According to Gelen’s edition only the Topkapı manuscript has *mubtalā* ‘afflicted’ as the second word in the first *mişrā‘*, in the other manuscripts it is replaced with *pā-futāda* ‘helpless’ which clearly violates the metre. The first hemistich of the second couplet is *Andar firāḳ-i hicr-i tu cānam bi-lab rasīd* “Your absence pushed my soul to the verge of departing” in the Yahuda manuscript. Only the University manuscript has the same wording. Instead of *hicr-i tu* ‘your absence’, the Topkapı manuscript has *hicr çu* ‘as absence’ and the Millet Kütüphanesi manuscript has *hicr* ‘absence’. The first *mişrā‘* of the third beyt is *Ḥū karda-īm ‘ays u şarāb u tarāna* “We got used to partying, to

⁴ Since I didn’t have access to the manuscripts the present analysis was done on the basis of Gelen’s critical edition.

wine and music". Instead of 'ays 'partying', the Topkapı manuscript has 'aşk 'love' and instead of *hū karda-īm* 'we have got used to', the University manuscript has *hū karda-am* 'I have got used to'. In order to discover the nature of the relationship between the manuscripts of the Persian divan further research is needed, which should include the comparative analysis of the Turkish texts as well.

Though a lot has been written on Muḥibbī's Turkish gazel poetry there is almost nothing on his Persian gazels. More than half of the poems contained in the Yahuda manuscript appear to be original (*muḥtara*) in the sense that the metre, rhyme, *redīf* combination they rely on wasn't used before by another poet. Some of these are very simple and flat pieces characterised by the lack of rhetorical figures and a narrow vocabulary. Compared to Muḥibbī's Turkish gazels they look as if they were composed by a beginner who was more of a versifier capable of arranging elements of the signifying universe of classical gazel poetry according to a given metre than a skilled poet able to fill his poem with poetic refinery.

Among the gazels in the Yahuda manuscript there are quite a few poems which seem to be poetic replies (*naẓīre, cevāb*). The following analysis concentrates on these poems and has a double aim. It tries to define the circle of Persian poets whose poems the Sultan chose as models and endeavours to showcase the various methods Muḥibbī used to compose his imitation poems.

The gazel starting with the hemistich *Īn dam u gul Őikufta tamannā-yi may kunam* "Now that the rose has blossomed I wish for wine" was composed using the metre *muẓārī^c-i aḥreb-i mekfūf-i maḥzūf* (- - . | - . - . | . - - . | - . - .), the rhyme *-ay* and the *redīf kunam* 'I am doing'. The same metre, rhyme and *redīf* combination was previously applied by Ḥāfiẓ (d. 1393; Ḥāfiẓ, 1382/2003: 232–233) and Nevāyī (d. 1501; Nevāyī, 1375/1996, 254–255). The poem of Nevāyī was meant as a poetic reply to the poem of Ḥāfiẓ. As intertextual allusions scattered in the text indicate Muḥibbī new both poems and though he borrowed several key motifs from the poem of Ḥāfiẓ the real model he closely followed and imitated was the gazel of Nevāyī.

All three poems start with an opening couplet (*maṭla'*) that has *may* 'wine' and *kay* 'when' as rhyming words but the notion of asceticism as the antithesis of wine drinking or music appears only in the poem of Hāfiz (couplet II) and Muhibbī (couplet I). Similarly, the name of three musical instruments within the same couplet occur only in the gazels of Hāfiz (*çang* 'harp', *barbat* 'lute', *nay* 'flute'; couplet II) and Muhibbī (*daf* 'drum', *çang* 'harp', *nay* 'flute'; couplet V).⁵

However there are lines in Nevāyī's gazel that were borrowed by Muhibbī almost word by word.

Nevāyī V.

*Āyīna-yi Sikandar-am az cām-i may bi-dast*⁶

Hvāhī ḥabar zi tāj-i Cam u taḥt-i Kay kunam

"I am the mirror of Iskandar and with a the goblet of wine that's in my hand,

If you wish, I give you information on the crown of Cam and the throne of Kay"

Muhibbī II.

*Īn cām-i dast-i mā-st çu cām-i cihān-numā-st*⁷

Hvāhī ḥabar zi Husrau u Kāvus u Kay kunam

"This is our goblet in our hands. As it can show the World

⁵ Coşkun Ak read and translated the couplet in the following way: *Çün cilve gerd şāh-i reyāhīn be bāğ u rāğ/Ān meh ki istimā'-i def ü çeng ü ney künem* "Bağ ve bahçede reyhanların şahı görününce/o ay yüzlü için ney tef ve saz sesleri işitilir" (Ak 2006a: 104). The text of the poem in the Yahuda manuscript suggest a better reading: *Çun cilva kard şāh-i rayāhīn bi-bāğ u rāğ/Ān gah istimā'-i daf u çang u nay kunam* "When the king of the herbs appears in full pomp in the garden and the meadow/That time I will be listening to [the music of] the drum, the harp and the flute".

⁶ Typographical devices are used to highlight the paralellisms in the couplets compared.

⁷ Ak reads the beginning of the first hemistich as *Īn cām dast-i māst* (Ak, 2016a: 34). Though the metre and metrical rules would allow an overlong syllable to be read after the word *cām* 'goblet', inserting an *izāfet* (*cām-i dast-i māst* 'the goblet of our hand') seems to give a better reading.

If you wish, I give you information on Hüsrau, Kāvūs and Kay”

As it is quite clear Muḥibbī not only produced a close copy the second hemistich of the couplet, he also borrowed a combination of some of the key elements present in the first *mişrāʿ* (*cām* ‘goblet’ and *dast* ‘hand’). Nevertheless, his intention might have been to produce a close and not an exact copy of Nevāyī’s couplet. The reason behind his decision to include the poetically neutral image of “a hand holding a goblet of wine” could have been that he wanted to avoid borrowing the semantically bonded word pair of *cām* ‘goblet’ and *Cem*, the king who according to Iranian lore invented wine and winemaking. However, the proper name *Cem* is a central element of Nevāyī’s *beyt* because through its semantic relations to the words *cām* and *Kay*, the name of a dynasty in Iranian mythology, it guarantees a strong poetic bonding between the first and the second hemistichs. With his choice to leave *Cem* out Muḥibbī manoeuvred himself into a poetically uneasy situation forcing him to take “emergency measures”. He added the phrase *cām-i cihān-numā* referring to the famous goblet of *Cem* to the first hemistich and he replaced *Cem*’s character in the second *mişrāʿ* with two other Iranian kings, Hüsrev and Kāvūs. The result is a rather awkward couplet that starts with a clumsy utterance, has a word repeated within one hemistich and lacks any poetic force binding the two *mişrāʿ*s together. Moreover, by erasing *Cem* from the couplet the *beyt* became rhetorically flat which is considered a major flaw in classical poetry.

The closing couplet (*maḳṭaʿ*) was created using almost the same method but the result is much better.

Nevāyī VI.

Hādī-st pīr-i dayr az ān ahl-i zuhd-rā

K-az rah futāda-and dalālat bi-vay kunam

“The elder of the convent is a guide for ascetics

Because they have swerved from the right path. I’ll show him the way.”

Muhibbî V.

Dar dayr raft çun ki Muhibbî kâdaḥ bi-dast

*Har kas **zi rah futâda dalâlat bi-vay kunam**⁸*

"Muhibbî went to the convent with a goblet in his hand

I'll give directions to everyone who has swerved from the [right] path."

Though Muhibbî borrowed almost a whole line here as well, he approached the first *mişrâ'* in a more open minded manner. The backbone of Nevâyî's couplet is the dichotomy of orthodox religious practices and the quest for a personal spiritual experience, a topos in classical poetry. From the perspective of true seekers of God, orthodoxy which is represented here by the phrase *ahl-i zuhd* 'people of asceticism' means a swerving from the path of leading to the Ultimate Truth. In the signifying universe (*mundus significans*) of the classical poetic tradition the sacred place where seekers congregate is the wine house, often termed *dayr* 'convent' where wine an entheogen used to open up the gates to the non-visible world is served. The sacred space of the tavern is managed by the *pîr* 'elder', who can guide seekers treading the path leading to God and the *sâkî* 'cupbearer' a young and beautiful person who distributes wine a substance that can help to recognize the right spiritual path for true seekers.

Muhibbî slightly changed the meaning, still he quite successfully paraphrased Nevâyî's couplet. He managed to include the dichotomy of orthodoxy versus real spirituality through adding a semantically suitable phrase to the first hemistich and thus he was able to preserve intact the semantic field of 'spiritual quest' that dominates the model beyt.

Textual evidence suggests that there is one more couplet in the poem that was inspired by a beyt in Nevâyî's poem.

Nevâyî VII.

⁸ Ak erroneously reads the last three words of the second hemistich as *delâlet-i bûy kunam*.

Hastī miyān-i DILBAR u Fānī fikand bu'd

Īn rah çu barq-i bū ki bi-yak gām tay kunam

“Existence has created a distance between the beloved and Fānī
Like a lightning of fragrance I may traverse this road in one
step”

Muḥibbī IV.

Az mā bi-YĀR çūn ki masāfa ba'īd şud

Yak dam çu barq-i ḥātif-i īn rāh tay kunam

“The distance from us to our beloved became remote
[But] like the lightning of the divine messenger of this road I
traverse it in a minute.”

The influence of the model couplet is less evident here than it was in the previous two cases because Muḥibbī managed to reword his model in a successful way by using a basic imitation technique. His method was to keep some of the key elements and replace others with synonyms which he could do quite easily because, compared to his previous models, Nevāyī's *maḳta'* is a both poetically and rhetorically simple couplet lacking an elaborate and complex relationship binding together the key elements of the beyt. The cohesion between the two hemistichs is guaranteed by the meaning they convey which creates a wider space of action for the imitator to move freely around and supplies him with more options to choose from.

There is another poem among the Persian gazels of the Yahuda manuscript that shows the clear and direct influence of Nevāyī's Persian poetry on Muḥibbī's Persian gazels. The gazel composed in the metre *ḥafif-i müseddes-i maḥbūn-i maḥzūf* (. . - - or - . - - | . . - | . . - or - -) using the rhyme *-at*, the redif *-i ūst* 'is his/hers' and starting with the line *Ātaş-i dil zi dard-i miḥnat-i ū-st* “The fire in [my] heart is [comes] from the pain caused by his/her cruelty” is very similar to the previously analysed poem as it was inspired two gazels written by Ḥāfiẓ (Ḥāfiẓ, 1382/2003: 99) and Nevāyī (Nevāyī, 1375/1996: 101) respectively. According to a heading in

his divan Nevâyî's poem was meant as a poetic reply to the gazel of Hâfiz. Intertextual allusions, borrowed expressions and lines show that almost every line of Muhibbî's gazel was heavily influenced by either Hâfiz or Nevâyî.

Muhibbî I.

Âtaş-i dil zi dard-i miḥnat-i ū-st

Aşk-i çaşmam zi hicr-i firḫat-i ū-st

"The fire in [my] heart is [comes] from the pain caused by his/her cruelty

The tear[s] in my eye[s] [come] from his/her absence."

Nevâyî I.

Dar dilam âtaş-i maḥabbat-i ū-st

Âb-i çaşmam zi dūd-i firḫat-i ū-st

"There is fire in my heart that [comes] from the love I feel for him/her

The tear[s] in my eye[s] [come] from the smoke of his/her absence."

Muhibbî's technique of replacing key elements of the model couplet with synonyms is evident here and the problem with the result is the same as it was with the previously mentioned beyts. The poetic force binding the two *mişrâ*'s together in Nevâyî's couplet is provided by the semantic field of 'smoke' (*dūd*) represented by the words *âtaş* 'fire', *dūd* 'smoke' and *âb* 'water'. Smoke is a consequence of fire and the irritation it causes, makes human's eyes water. Nevâyî's *beyt* is a rhetorically complex couplet because, besides the *tenāsüb* 'congruency' created by the semantic relationship binding these words together, it also contains a *tezād* 'opposition' comprised of the two opposing notions of fire and water. Though Muhibbî manages to recreate the basic meaning of his model, by discarding the core element of the couplet *dūd* 'smoke' and replacing another key word *âb* 'water'

with the word *aşık* 'tear' he completely deprives his couplet of the rhetorical refinery present in Nevāyī's couplet.

Throughout the poem, except for the fourth couplet, Muḥibbī uses the same technique to imitate the model couplet chosen from either the poem of Ḥāfiz or Nevāyī and the result in each case is a close copy or a line that comes very close to plagiarism.

Muḥibbī II.

*Ġam ma-dār gauhar-i dāda kun nişār*⁹

Çün ki dil maḥzan-i maḥabbat-i ū-st

"Don't be full of sorrow. Scatter the gems of [your] eye[s]
Because the heart is the treasury of his/her love."

Ḥāfiz XI.

Faqr-i zāhir ma-bīn ki Ḥāfiz-rā

Sīna gancīna-yi maḥabbat-i ū-st

"Don't look at [his] apparent poverty, because Ḥāfiz's
Bosom is a treasury of his/her love"

Though the influence of Ḥāfiz is evident and moreover the second *mişrā'* appears to be a close copy of Ḥāfiz's second hemistich Muḥibbī's couplet can be considered the example of a rather successful imitation. The way he worded the first hemistich, especially the inclusion of the word *gauhar* 'gem' secures the cohesion of the two *mişrā'*s through the semantic bonding between the words *gauhar* and *maḥzan* 'treasury'. In his model this cohesion is achieved in another way, through the appearance of two opposing notions *faqr* 'poverty' and *gancīna* 'treasury'.

Muḥibbī III.

*Dar sar-i kūy-i ū zalīl mī-bīnam*¹⁰

⁹ The version in Ak's edition (Ak, 2006a: 8) reads: *Ġam meḥōr dürr-i dāde sāz nisār/Çünkü dil maḥzen-i maḥabbet-i üst.*

¹⁰ The first line in Ak's edition reads *Dar sar-i kūy-i ū zalīlam man.*

În mazallat ham maşiyat-i ū-st

"I look despicable in his/her street

[But] this abject state is because of his/her will."

Nevāyī V.

Gar zalīl-am bi-‘aşk u may ay şayḥ

În mazallat ham maşiyat-i ū-st

"Love and wine made me despicable

[But] this abject state is because of His will."

The third couplet of Muḥibbī is less successful first of all because it borrowed the second hemistich word by word from Nevāyī and secondly because Muḥibbī couldn't preserve the spiritual content of his model. The appearance of the Shaykh a representative of religious orthodoxy in the context of classical poetry on the one hand and wine a substance used by seekers of God on the their spiritual quest on the other, are references to the well-known poetic topos mentioned before. They suggest here that the final goal Nevāyī wishes to reach through being in love and drinking wine is to get a personal spiritual experience of God. Though the next couplet elevates Muḥibbī's feelings to a celestial dimension the spiritual sentiments present in Nevāyī's *beyt* are missing from Muḥibbī's couplet.

Muḥibbī V.

Banda-yi pīr-i dayr-am in daulat

Hama bīnī zi yumn-i himmat-i ū-st¹¹

"I am the slave of the elder of the convent. This blessed state

[And] everything you see comes from the bliss of his grace"

Ḥāfiẓ IX.

Milkat-i ‘aşıḳī u ganc-i ṭarab

Har çi dāram zi yumn-i himmat-i ūst

¹¹ The line starts with the words *ki tu bīnī* 'what you see' in Ak's edition.

“The kingdom of love and the treasure of joy
All I have come from the bliss of his/her grace”

Muhibbî VI.

Gar malâmat şudî Muhibbî çî bāk

Ġaraż andar cihân salâmat-i ū-st

“You got scolded but it doesn’t matter Muhibbî
[Your] aim in the world is his/her well-being”

Ĥâfîz X.

Man u dil gar fidâ şudîm çî bāk

Ġaraż andar miyân salâmat-i ū-st

“Me and [my] heart got sacrificed but it doesn’t matter
[My] aim here is his/her well-being”

Both of these Muhibbî couplets are rather well-done imitations perhaps because the models are void of complex systems of rhetorical figures.

As far as Muhibbî’s poem as a whole is concerned attention should be called to his technique of composing a *naẓîre*. In order to write his imitation poem he selected models from both the gazel of Ĥâfîz and the poem of Nevâyî. He considered the signifying universe of the two poems as one and from this set of poetic elements he selected key concepts, words, phrases which he included in his poem. All this means that his gazel wasn’t meant as a poetic reply either to the gazel of Ĥâfîz or to the poem of Nevâyî but it was composed as a reply to both or rather to the small paraphrase network consisting of both of them.

There are a relatively large number of allusions to the model poem in the gazel starting with the line *Bi-yâ ay Sākî-yi gul-ruĥ bahâr-i sabza-pûş âmad* “Come, rosy cheeked Cupbearer, the green-clad spring has come”. The gazel was composed in the metre *hezec-i müşemmen-i sâlim* (. - - - | . - - - | . - - - | . - - -) and relies on the rhyme *-ûş* and the redîf *âmad* ‘came’. Intertextual

allusions in the text suggest that the gazel was inspired by a poem of Nesīmī (d. 1417; Nesīmī, 1370/1991, 73–74).

The *maṭlaʿ* of a poetic reply is often used to inform the reader whose poem the author is going to try to imitate. For this purpose opening couplets can contain key elements, phrases, motifs, ideas the author of the *naẓīre* deemed characteristic of the model and chose to serve as a sort of "title" warning the reader supposedly well-versed in the classical poetic tradition how to interpret the poem. Intertextual allusions in a first beyt are often meant to show a poetic context facilitating the interpretation of the poem. These allusions occupy a prominent place in Muḥibbī's *maṭlaʿ*. The rhyming phrase at the end of Muḥibbī's first hemistich occupying exactly the same place where it is found in Nesīmī's poem and the second *mişrāʿ* contain two key phrases, one borrowed from the second hemistich of the second beyt (*ġanīmat dān* "take it as a gift") and one from the second hemistich of the fifth couplet in Nesīmī's poem (*bulbul bi-ḥurūş āmad* "the nightingale started wailing").

Nesīmī Ia.

Bahār āmad bahār āmad bahār-i sabza-pūş āmad

"The spring has come, the spring has come, the green-clad spring has come"

Nesīmī IIb.

Ġanīmat dān ki az ġayb-am saḡar-gāh īn bi-ġūş āmad

"Take it as a gift that at dawn this [revelation] came to my ears from the unseen [world]"

Nesīmī Vb.

Gul āvard ātaş-i Mūsā u bulbul bi-ḥurūş āmad

"The rose produced the fire of Moses and the nightingale started wailing"

Muḥibbī I.

Bi-yā sākī-yi gul-ruḥ bahār-i sabza-pūş āmad

*Ki in dam-rā ġanīmat dān ki bulbul bi-ḥurūş āmad*¹²

“Come, rosy-cheeked cupbearer, the green clad spring has come
The nightingale has started wailing, take this moment as a gift.”

The second *mişrā*‘ of the second *beyt* in Muḥibbī’s poem with the motifs of the rose and the wailing nightingale was modelled on Nesīmī’s hemistich Vb quoted above.

Muḥibbī IIb.

Naẓar kun dar gulistān z-ān ki bulbul dar ḥurūş āmad

“Look around in the rose garden; the nightingale has started wailing.”

Muḥibbī’s third *beyt* appears to be a close replica of Nesīmī’s fourth couplet. Both first *mişrā*‘s speak of the tavern as a place where an aching heart can find consolation and hope. As far as the second hemistichs are concerned Muḥibbī appears to have simply rearranged the words in Nesīmī’s line and added the word *çün* ‘because’ to meet the requirements of the meter.

Nesīmī IV.

Dilā daryūza-yi himmat zi bāb-i may-furūşān kun

Ki BŪY-i NAFḤA-yi Ĩsā zi pīr-i may-furūş āmad

“O [my] heart, petition the gate of tavern keepers for favour

¹² Comparing the hemistich in the Yahuda manuscript with Gelen’s critical apparatus it seems that the text is very similar here to the version contained in the University manuscript (Gelen, 1989: 41). The version of the Topkapı manuscript published by Ak (Ak, 2006a: 22) is a close copy of Nesīmī’s *mişrā*‘ as it reads *Ki in dam-rā ġanīmat dān saḥar-gah in bi-gūş āmad* „This [revelation] came into [my] ears at dawn; take it as a gift”. The phrase *bulbul bi-ḥurūş āmad* „the nightingale has started” occurs twice in the the Yahuda manuscript both in the first and in the second *beyt*. Since the repetition of such a phrase in two consecutive *beyts* would count as a serious flaw, its appearance in the first *beyt* can be a copyist’s error.

Because the fragrance of the breath of Jesus comes from the tavern keeper."

Muhibbî

Dar-i may-ḥāna-rā himmat ṭalab kun ay dil-i pur-ḡam

Ki NAFĤ-i BŪY çün 'İsā zi pîr-i may-furûş âmad

"Seek favour from the door of the wine house, O sorrow-stricken heart

Because a puff of fragrance that Jesus has, comes from the tavern keeper."

A similarity between the key elements of the two couplets suggests that the inspiration for Muhibbî's fourth couplet came from the tenth beyt of Nesîmî's gazel. The poet addresses the Sâkî in both of the first *mişrâ*'s asking for wine as a medicine and gives an explanation for his request in the second. Though the poetic context of the two beyts and the message they convey is different, Nesîmî asks the cupbearer to give wine to a Sûfî who needs to be cured of his spiritual unripeness and Muhibbî wishes to heal his own heart, the two couplets, especially the second hemistichs share common elements like the figure of the Sâkî, the imperative of the verb *dādan* 'to give' (*dah* 'give!'), the phrase '*ilâc-i illet* and the noun *şarâb* 'wine'.

Nesîmî X.

Bi-şūfî may dah ay Sâkî ki dar dâr al-şifâ-yi mâ

'Ilâc-i illet-i ḥāmî-ra ŞARÂB-i puḥta cûş âmad

"O Sâkî, give wine to the Sûfî because in our hospital

As a remedy for the illness of [spiritual] unripeness ripe wine is fermented."

Muhibbî IV.

Ma-râ dah Sâkî sâgar darûnam dard parvardast

'Ilâc-i illet-i dil-râ ŞARÂB-i cām nûş âmad

"Sâkî, give us a goblet [of wine], I am nourishing pain in my soul

As a remedy for the illness of the heart the wine of [our] cup is consumed.”

A number of Muḥibbī's *naẓīres* are considerably different from the above mentioned gazels as they contain much less intertextual allusions and thus their relationship to their models is of another nature. While composing these gazels their author doesn't aim at creating a replica of his model or models. He simply uses them as sources of inspiration and thus the distance between a model and the poetic reply it inspired is greater than in the previous cases. These poems usually retain or in some cases slightly change the formal framework of the model poem and contain only a few textual elements that can be considered intertextual allusions.

The poem composed in the metre *hezec-i müseddes-i maḥzūf* (. - - - | . - - - | . - - -), using the rhyme *-ān*, the *redif -i man çī-st* 'what is my...' and starting the with the line *Dilā dil-ḥasta-am darmān-i man çīst* "[My] heart I am sick-hearted, what is my remedy?" seems to have been inspired by a gazel of Kāsim-i Anvār (d. 1433; Kāsim-i Anvār, 1337/1958: 83). Except for including four of the rhyming words Kāsim also used (*darmān* 'remedy', *cān* 'soul', *sar-gardān* 'stupified', *afġān* 'lamentation') and the short utterance, *bi-ḥūn āġuṣta-am* "I am smeared with blood" appearing in the first *miṣrā'* of Kāsim's and in the first hemistich of the fourth couplet in Muḥibbī's poem there aren't further allusions to Kāsim's gazel.

The case of the gazel composed in the meter *mujtaṣ-i müsemmen-i maḥbūn-i maḥzūf* (. - - - | . . . - - | . - . - | . . - or - - -), relying on the rhyme *-ar*, the *redif na-mī-yābam* "I don't find" and starting with the *miṣrā'* *Ṭarāvāt-i saman-at dar ḳamar na-mī-yābam* ("I don't find the freshness of your jasmine in the new moon") is very similar. Except for the rare combination of metre, rhyme and *redif* and a few rhyming words, only a vague allusion in the text suggests that the poem was inspired by a gazel of Amīr Ḥusrau Dihlavī (d. 1325; Amīr Ḥusrau Dihlavī, 1361/1982: 439-440). The word *balā* 'trouble' occurs in both poems in the hemistich that includes the rhyming word *batar* 'worse'.

The gazel starting with the hemistich *Vah ki zulf az dīdan-i rüy-i tu mā-rā mānī' ast* "Alas, [your] curling locks prevent [me] from

seeing your face" uses the metre *remel-i müsemmen-i maḥzūf* (- . - - | - . - - | - . - - | - . - -), the rhyme *-i'* and the *redif* *-ast* 'is'. The poem is part of a small paraphrase network consisting of two poems one composed by Amīr Ḥusrau Dihlavī (Amīr Ḥusrau Dihlavī, 1361/1982: 69) and another by Kamāl-i Ḥucandī (d. 1400; Kamāl-i Ḥucandī, 1372/1993: 67). The previously mentioned gazel proves that Muḥibbī knew Amīr Ḥusrau's gazels and occasionally he found inspiration in his poetry. Nevertheless, unlike in a case mentioned earlier where he selected his model lines from the whole of the network in this case his gazel contains allusions only to Kamāl's gazel.

As it has been mentioned earlier, the first beyt in a nazīre can serve as a "title". In this case the first couplet of Muḥibbī includes a combination of key elements that can be considered intertextual allusions to Kamāl's poem. The first hemistich in both poems has a form of the verb *dīdan* 'to see' and the phrase 'your face' expressed with a noun phrase *rūy-i tu* and *rūy-at*. The second *miṣrā'* of Muḥibbī's poem contains a further reference to Kamāl's first hemistich, a combination of the rhyming word *kāni'* 'satisfied' and the concept of a 'vision' expressed by the noun *ḥayāl*.

Kamāl I.

DĪDA dar 'umrī zi rūyat ḥayālī kāni' ast

"Having seen only a vision of your face for all my life is enough for me"

Muḥibbī I.

Vah ki zulf az DĪDAN-i rūy-i tu mā-rā māni' ast

Z-ān dilam dar şām-i hicrān bā ḥayāl-at kāni' ast

"Alas, [your] curling locks prevent us from seeing your face

During the night[s] of [your] absence my heart is satisfied with your vision."

The second couplets of the two poems are also related. Both first *miṣrā'*s start, though in a different context, with the utterance

“the soul left/went...” (*cān ki raft...*; *cān-i man şud...*) and both second hemistichs contain a proverbial saying “everything returns to its roots”.

Kamāl II.

Cān ki raft az pīş-i mā ḥvāhad bi-an lab bāz gaşt

Çün bi-aşl-i ḥvīş har çizī ki bīnī rāci‘ ast

“[My] soul left me it’s going to return to those lips

Because everything you see returns to its roots [finally].”

Muḥibbī II.

Cān-i man şud sūy-i cānān u ma-rā şahā guzaşt

Z-ān ki aşyā cumla dar ‘ālam bi-aşl-aş rāci‘ ast

“My soul went towards [my] beloved and left me, O [my] Şāh

Because everything in the world returns to its roots finally.”

116

Muḥibbī’s gazel starting with the mişrā‘ *Tā çand kaşam dar ğam-i tu bār-i malāmat* “How long shall I bear the burden of scorn because of the pain you caused?” is part of a small paraphrase network consisting of poems composed by Ḥāfiż (Ḥāfiż, 1382/2003: 113), Nevāyī (Nevāyī, 1375/1996: 107–108) and Kātibī (d. 1435; Kātibī, 1382/2003: 64). These gazels were composed in the metre *hezec-i müşemmen-i aḥreb-i mekfūf-i maḥzūf* (- - . | . - - . | . - - . | . - -) and they rely on the rhyme *-āmat*. Intertextual allusions in Nevāyī’s and Kātibī’s poem show that both of them were meant as poetic replies inspired by the gazel of Ḥāfiż. Muḥibbī’s poem is, however, very loosely related to the other three poems and except for the poetic framework, several rhyming words (*malāmat* ‘scorn’, *kiyāmat* ‘resurrection’, *nadāmat* ‘friendship’, *ikāmat* “stay”) and two phrases found both in Nevāyī’s and Ḥāfiż’s poem (*rūz-i kiyāmat* “the day of resurrection”, *cāy-i ikāmat* “place of stay”) doesn’t share common poetic elements with the three other poems.

The Yahuda manuscript contains only these poems that can be termed imitations. As a conclusion it can be said that Muḥibbī’s

poetic replies as they are preserved in the Yahuda manuscript were inspired mostly by poets whom Muhibbî mentioned in his Turkish gazels as his ideals in poetry. The exceptions are Kâsim-i Anvâr and Nesimî who are never referred to as role models in any of the last couplets of Muhibbî's gazels and thus their poems are not expected to be part of the list containing Persian gazels that inspired the Sultan to compose poetic relies. It should be added here that though several of Muhibbî's gazel mention Nevâyî (Ak, 2006b: 149, 244, 287), the fact that his Persian oeuvre was regarded part of the classical Persian literary canon and his Persian gazels were chosen as models by an Ottoman poet is more than interesting

As *maḳṭa*'s of Muhibbî's Turkish gazels often evoke the figure of Salmân Sāvācî (d. 1376) and Cāmî (d. 1492) one would expect to find their works on the list of model poems. The Yahuda manuscript contain a poem that might show the influence of gazels composed by Cāmî and Salmân. The gazel starting with the couplets *Tā kunam ruḥsār-i ān mah-rā tamāşā-yi digar* "Until I can get a glimpse of that Moon's cheeks again", however, contain only a few poetic elements that can be considered as very vague allusions to Cāmî's poem and thus it was not included in the analyses. As far as the influence of Salmân is concerned, though the Yahuda manuscript doesn't contain any poems modelled on Salmân's gazels, the manuscript Ak used for his edition preserved one such poetic reply (Ak, 2006a: 15). Numerous intertextual allusions indicate that the gazel starting with the line *Man nasim-i şubḥ-rā cān mī-daham bar būy-i dūst* "I'd give my life to the morning breeze in exchange for [my] friend's fragrance" was inspired by Salmân's poem beginning with the *mişrā*' *Muşg rīzān mī-cahad bād-i bahār az kūy-i dūst* "The spring wind blowing from the friends alley sprinkles musk" (Salmân, 1371/1992: 386-387).

The comparative analyses of Muhibbî's *naẓīres* highlighted the Sultan's various approaches and techniques he used when composing an imitation poem. These techniques represent all shades of imitations between the two extremes: producing a close replica of the chosen model by replacing its key elements with synonymous expressions and composing an emulation that is only

loosely related to the poem that inspired the poet to write a poetic reply to it.

Appendix

Elegy on the death of Şehzāde Meḥmed (fols. 260rv)

*Ey ka‘be-i bakāya giden mīr-i erşedüm
Ey saltanat sipehrine mehtāb-i as‘adum
Ey tahtgāh-ı hūlda emīr-i muḥallidüm
Şehzādeler güzīdesi Sulţān-ı Muḥammedüm*

*Begler görüñ ki nitdi baña ṭālī‘-i siyāh
Ebr-i sefid içinde nihān oldı mihr ü māh
Cān gülşeninde ğonca iken ḥāka düşdi āh
Şehzādeler güzīdesi Sulţān-ı Muḥammedüm*

*Cān u gönül vişālile şād-kām idi
Ṭursa otursa serv gibi hoş-ḥirām idi
Gelse maḳāla bülbül-i şīrīn-keḷām idi
Şehzādeler güzīdesi Sulţān-ı Muḥammedüm*

*Nāgāh çekdi perdeye rüy-ı vişālını
Sem‘a erişmez eyledi şīrīn maḳālını
Eglence kovdı dünyede cānā ḥiyālını
Şehzādeler güzīdesi Sulţān-ı Muḥammedüm*

*Gülberg-i büstān-i zemīn ü zemān iken
Gün gibi nūr-i dīde-i cān u cihān iken
Terk itdi tāc u tahtı henüz nevcivān iken
Şehzādeler güzīdesi Sulţān Muḥammedüm
Niçe yanup yaḳılmayalar māder ü peder
Olmışdı ḥüsn ü ḥulḳla cān gibi mu‘teber
Didi Muḥibbi riḥleti tārīḥin āh ider
Şehzādeler güzīdesi Sulţān Muḥammedüm*

Bibliography

- Ak, Coşkun (haz.) (1995). *Muhibbî. Farsça Dîvân (Metin-Çeviri)*. Bursa: Uludağ Üniversitesi.
- Ak, Coşkun (haz.) (2006a). *Muhibbî. Farsça Divan*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Ak, Coşkun (2006b). *Muhibbi Divanı*. Trabzon: Trabzon Valiliği.
- Ambros, Edith Gülçin (1989), "Nazîre", the will-o'-the-wisp of Ottoman "Dîvân" poetry. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* S. 79, s. 57-83.
- Amîr Hüsrau Dihlavî (1361/1982). *Dîvân-i Kâmil*. Bi-ihitimâm-i Sa'îd Nafîsî. Tehrân: Intişârât-i Câvidân.
- Aydın, Şadi (2010). *Türk Edebiyatında Farsça Divânlar ve Divânçeler*. Ankara: İskenderiye Kitaplığı.
- Çelebioğlu, Âmil (2017). Turkish Literature of the Period of Sultan Süleyman the Magnificent I. *Divan Edebiyatı Araştırmaları Dergisi* S. 18, s. 563-623.
- Dadaş, Cihan (2018). Muhibbî Bibliografyası. *Akademik Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, C.2 S. 3, s. 266-287.
- Gelen, Kasim (1989). *Kânûnî Sultan Süleyman'ın Farsça Dîvanı*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisan Tezi. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi.
- Hâfîz (1382/2003). *Dîvân*. Bi-ihitimâm-i Muḥammad Ḳazvîni va Ḳâsim Ğanî. Tehrân: Intişârât-i Ṭahûrî.
- Kamâl-i Hucandî (1372/1993). *Dîvân*. Bi-taşḫîḥ va muḳâbila-yi Aḫmad Karamî. Tehrân: Silsila-yi Naşriyat-i Mâ.
- Ḳâsim-i Anvâr (1337/1958). *Kulliyât*. Bâ taşḫîḥ u muḳâbila u muḳaddima-yi Sa'îd Nafîsî. Tehrân: Intişârât-i Kitâb-ḥâna-yi Sanâyi.
- Kâtibî, Nişâburî Turşizî (1382/2003). *Dîvân. Ğazaliyyât*. Taşḫîḥ-i Taḳî Vaḫîdiyân Kâmyâr, Sa'îd Hû Muḥammadî Muḫibbî. *Dîvân*. Israel National Library: Yahuda Ar. 1065.
- Nesîmî, Seyyid 'Imâd al-Dîn (1370/1991). *Dîvân*. Pişguftâr az Hüsân Âhî. Tehrân: Intişârât-i Furûġî.

Nevāyī, Amīr ‘Alī-şīr (1375/1996). *Dīvān*. Bi-sa‘ī u ihtimām-i Rukn al-Dīn Humāyūnfarruḡ. Tehrān: Instiṣārāt-i Asāṭīr.

Wust, Efraim (Erişim Tarihi 03.04.2019): “Dīvān Muḡibbī”, http://beta.nli.org.il/en/manuscripts/NNL_ALEPH003445080/NLI