Türkiyat Mecmuası
Journal of Turkology

Research Article | Araştırma Makalesi   ⊖ Open Access | Açık Erişim

An Attempt to Synthesize Arabic *Ilm* and Persian *Adab* in Turkish Literary Milieu: Ahmedi's *Badayi' Al-Sihr*

Türk Edebiyatı Sahasında Arapça "İlim" ve Farsça "Edeb"i Sentez Denemesi: Ahmedî'nin *Bedâyi'ü's-Sihr*'i

Ahmet Zahid Demirciler [1] ⓘD ✉

[1] Kırklareli University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Turkish Language and Literature, Kırklareli, Türkiye

Abstract

Ahmedi is the poet whose *ghazal*s were most imitated in the initial centuries of classical Turkish literature. This illustrates the significant role he played in establishing this poetic tradition. Moreover, Ahmedi is credited with authoring a Persian work titled *Badayi' al-Sihr fi Sanayi' al-Shi'r*, which is expected to offer a comprehensive theory of classical poetry. However, compared to his *ghazal*s, this work has received less attention. The objective of this article is to elucidate this apparent contradiction. To this end, the article initially considers the rationale behind the author's decision to compose the work. It has been established that Ahmedi intended his work to be a book of *badi'*, which should be assessed within the context of *adab* literature. Furthermore, Ahmedi provides further corroboration for this hypothesis by asserting that he was inspired by the Persian poet and prose writer Rashid al-Din Vatvat's *Hada'iq al-Sihr fi Daqa'iq al-Shi'r*. After examining the author's rationale, this article proceeds to a comparative analysis of *Badayi' al-Sihr* with its foundational work, *Hada'iq al-Sihr*. It was discovered that Ahmedi incorporated many novel figures that were absent in Vatvat's work and modified the definitions and scopes of numerous common figures. Furthermore, it was observed that he extensively employed al-Qazwini's *Talkhis al-Miftah*, a textbook of *balagha*, which belongs to the *madrasa ilm*s (disciplines) and does not align with the categorization of *adab* literature. This discrepancy between the components of Ahmedi's composition is identified as a principal factor contributing to the lack of interest in his work.

Öz

Ahmedî, klâsik Türk edebiyatının ilk yüzyıllarında gazellerine en çok nazire yazılan şairdir. Bu durum, söz konusu şiir geleneğinin kuruluşunda ne denli önemli bir rolü olduğunu gösterir. Ahmedî, *Bedâyi'ü's-Sihr fî Sanâyi'i'ş-Şi'r* adlı Farsça bir eser de kaleme almıştır. Edebî sanatları işlediği bu eserin klâsik şiirin teorisi mahiyetinde olması beklenir. Bununla beraber *Bedâyi'ü's-Sihr*, şairin gazellerinin gördüğü ilgiden mahrum kalmıştır. Bu makale, çelişkili görünen bu durumu araştırmaktadır. Bu doğrultuda önce yazarın eserini telif zemini tartışılmıştır. Ahmedî'nin, söz konusu eserini *edeb* literatürü kapsamında değerlendirilmesi gereken bir *bedî* kitabı olarak kaleme aldığı tespit edilmiştir. Eserini kaleme alırken Fars şair ve münşî Reşîdüddin Vatvât'ın *Hadâ'iku's-Sihr fî Dekâ'iki'ş-Şi'r* adlı eserini esas aldığını söylemesi de bu tespiti doğrular. Makalede *Bedâyi'ü's-Sihr*, telif zemini tartışıldıktan sonra kendisine esas teşkil eden *Hadâ'iku's-Sihr* ile karşılaştırılmıştır. Sonuç olarak Ahmedî'nin eserine Vatvât'ta olmayan birçok yeni sanat eklediği, ortak sanatların tanımlarını ve kapsamlarını değiştirdiği görülmüştür. Yaptığı değişikliklerin birçoğunda kaynak olarak Hatîb Kazvînî'nin *Telhîsü'l-Miftâh*'ından geniş ölçüde faydalandığı tespit edilmiştir. Hatîb Kazvînî'nin *Telhîsü'l-Miftâh*'ı *edeb* literatürü kapsamına girmesi mümkün olmayan medrese ilimlerinden *belagat*in temel ders kitabıdır. Böyle olunca Ahmedî'nin ortaya koymuş olduğu terkibin unsurlarında doku uyuşmazlığı meydana gelmiştir. Eserinin ilgiden mahrum kalmasının önemli bir sebebinin bu uyuşmazlık olduğu düşünülmektedir.

✉ Corresponding author | Sorumlu Yazar: Ahmet Zahid Demirciler a.z.demirciler@gmail.com

Introduction

The establishment of a written Turkish literary tradition in Turkey can be traced back to the 14th century, with the exception of a few examples from the 13th century. Tāceʾd-dīn İbrāhīm b. Ḫıżır Aḥmedī is widely regarded as the most prominent poet of this formative period.[1] In the 15th-century poetry collection of Ömer b. Mezid, 19 of the 65 groups of *naẓīra*s[2] include Ahmedi's poems as emulated poems, which serve as an important indication of the poet's influence during the 14th and 15th centuries.[3] Among the poets other than Ahmedi, those with the highest number of ground poems have only five such poems.

Ahmedi, who wrote in both Persian and Turkish, also composed a treatise in Persian entitled *Badāyiʿ al-Siḥr fī Ṣanāyiʿ al-Shiʿr* [Embellishments of Magic in the Arts of Poetry], which deals with the figures of speech.[4] In the pre-modern Turkish poetic tradition, the dominant themes and images have remained consistent for centuries. Attempts have been made to demonstrate the originality of art through its different representations, exploiting the possibilities of language. The identification and demonstration of the possibilities of language are achieved through the use of figures of speech. This work by Ahmedi must convey significant theoretical insights pertaining to the nascent stages of Turkish poetry. The fact that Ahmedi provides one example of his own Turkish poem in this work written in Persian demonstrates the interrelationship between Persian theory and Turkish poetry.[5] However, in contrast to his poems, there is no evidence that this work was appreciated during his own lifetime or in the subsequent period. Nevertheless, Rashid al-Din Vatvat's work on figures of speech, which Ahmedi adopted as a model for his own, enjoyed popularity in the Turkish literary milieu. The article's primary focus is the lack of appreciation for the pioneering poet Ahmedi's work, which he regarded as "embellishments of magic in the arts of poetry."

To address this issue, it is first necessary to trace the environment in which the work was created and the motives behind its composition. Subsequently, a comparative analysis will be conducted between Ahmedi's work and Vatvat's *Ḥadāʾiq al-Siḥr fī Daqāʾiq al-Shiʿr*, which, he claims, provided the foundational principles of his treatise. The objective of this research is to gain a deeper understanding of the theoretical foundation of Old Turkish literature.

1. Ahmedi, his Milieu, and the Foundation of his Creative Process

Ottoman biographer Mehmed Mecdi provides information indicating that the poet, who died in 815 AH (1413 AD) at the age of over 80, was born in the second quarter of the 14th century. Ahmedi, who originated

---

[1] For a bibliography of academic studies on Ahmedi, see Emrah Gülüm, "Ahmedî Hakkında Bibliyografya Denemesi," *Journal of International Social Research* 14, no. (77-1) (January 1, 2021): 175–206,https://doi.org/10.17719/jisr.11676; Mustafa Sefa Çakır, "Ahmedî ve Eserleri Üzerine Yapılan Çalışmalar," in *Ahmedî Sempozyumu*, ed. Alim Yıldız (Sivas: Sivas Cumhuriyet University, 2018), 263–70. For the proceedings of the symposium organized in the name of the poet, see Alim Yıldız, ed., *Ahmedî Sempozyumu* (Sivas: Sivas Cumhuriyet University, 2018).

[2] "The name 'naẓíra' or 'parallel' is given to a poem written in emulation of one by another writer. The *naẓíra* must be in the same meter and have the same rhyme and the same *redif* (if there be one) as the poem emulated; it should, moreover, be conceived in a similar spirit." Elias John Wilkinson Gibb, *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. I (London: Luzac, 1900), 99.

[3] Mustafa Canpolat, ed., *Mecmūʿatü'n-Neẓāʾir* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 1982).

[4] For a study on the work, see Ali Temizel, "Aḥmadī Garmiyānī ve Āmūzash-i Ṣanāyiʿ-i Adabī Dar Sudda-i Hashtom-i Hicrī Dar Āsyā-yi Ṣaġīr," in *Acta Del VII Congreso de La Sociedad Española de Iranología (SEI), Celebrado En Madrid Los Días 16 y 17 de Octubre de 2017*, ed. Tea Vardosanidze and Gerardo Matallana Medina (Madrid: Sociedad Española de Iranología, 2020), 142–56.

[5] Ali Temizel, "Ahmedî'nin Farsça Eserleri Tenkitli Metin-İnceleme-Tercüme ve İndeks" (Doctoral thesis, Ankara University, 2002), 2:82–83.

from *Rūm*[6] (central Anatolia at the time), returned to Turkey after pursuing his education in Egypt. In consideration of the age of Ahmedi and the prevailing norms of the period, it can be surmised that he returned to Turkey during the third quarter of the 14th century.[7] He composed his *Mirqāt al-Adab, Mīzān al-Adab*, and *Mi'yār al-Adab* for the education of Aydınid İsa Beg's son Hamza.[8] The information provided by Taşköprizade and Katib Çelebi, along with the *qaṣīda*s written to Sultan Süleyman Şah of Germiyan in his *dīwān*, indicates that Ahmedi was at the court of Germiyan for a period of time.[9] Given that Fahreddin İsa Beg was the ruler of the Aydınids from 1360 to 1390 and that Süleyman Şah was the ruler of the Germiyanids from 1360 to 1381, it is evident that the poet was under the patronage of the Aydınid and Germiyanid principalities during the latter half of the fourteenth century. The poet's works, *Cemşīd ü Ḫurşīd* and *İskender-nāme*, which he presented to Emir Süleyman, and his description of the latter's life in Bursa, as presented in the poet's poems, demonstrate that the poet spent the early 15th century under the patronage of Emir Süleyman.[10] The fact that Ahmedi presented the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed I, who assumed control of the city following Emir Süleyman's departure, with his *qaṣīda*s as well as his works titled *Cemşīd ü Ḫurşīd* and *Tervīḥü'l-Ervāḥ*, which he had previously presented to Emir Süleyman, indicates that Ahmedi was attempting to secure a position with the new ruler.[11] The precise circumstances surrounding his relocation from Bursa to Amasya remain unclear. Despite the common designation of Ahmedi as "the poet of Germiyan" in the extant sources, an examination of the historical record reveals that he underwent multiple shifts in patronage during the era of political upheaval.[12]

1.1. Perso-Islamic Court Culture in Turkey and *Adab* Literature

The Aydınid, Germiyanid, and Ottoman courts that provided patronage to Ahmedi constituted the dominant regional powers in the cultural landscape of 14th- and 15th-century Turkey. As the westernmost representatives of Perso-Islamic court culture, the Aydınids and Germiyanids played a pivotal role in the formation of the Turkish written language and the transmission of court culture into the Turkish language.[13] The Aydınid rulers actively supported two distinct forms of literary production: *adab*[14] literature, intended for the political elite, and *madrasa* works, created to train professional scholars.[15] It can thus be proposed that they aspired to achieve the status of autonomous and legitimate Muslim rulers, as defined within the

---

[6] For a discussion on this issue, see Tunca Kortantamer, *Leben Und Weltbild Des Altosmanischen Dichters Aḥmedî Unter Besonderer Berücksichtigung Seines Diwans* (Klaus Schwarz Verlag, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1973), 90–100; Tunca Kortantamer, "Yeni Bilgilerin Işığında Ahmedî'nin Hayatı," in *Eski Türk Edebiyatı: Makaleler* (Ankara: Akçağ, 1993), 4–8; İsmail Ünver, "Ahmedī ve İskender-Nāmesi," in *İskender-Nāme: İnceleme-Tıpkıbasım*, by Ahmedî and İsmail Ünver (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 1982), 3–4; Alim Yıldız, "Ahmedî'nin Memleketine Dair," in *Ahmedî Sempozyumu*, ed. Alim Yıldız (Sivas: Sivas Cumhuriyet University, 2018), 15-18.

[7] Kortantamer, *Leben Und Weltbild Des Altosmanischen Dichters Aḥmedî Unter Besonderer Berücksichtigung Seines Diwans*, 90–106; Kortantamer, "Yeni Bilgilerin Işığında Ahmedî'nin Hayatı," 10.

[8] Nihad Çetin, "Ahmedî'nin 'Mirkatü'l-edeb'i Hakkında," *Türkiyat Mecmuası* XIV (1965): 220, https://doi.org/10.18345/tm.40533.

[9] Kortantamer, *Leben Und Weltbild Des Altosmanischen Dichters Aḥmedî Unter Besonderer Berücksichtigung Seines Diwans*, 105–24.

[10] Nihad Banarlı, "Ahmedi ve Dasitan-ı Tevarih-i Mülûk-i Âl-i Osman," *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 6 (1939): 54–55, https://doi.org/10.18345/tm.73231; Kortantamer, *Leben Und Weltbild Des Altosmanischen Dichters Aḥmedî Unter Besonderer Berücksichtigung Seines Diwans*, 132–74; Ünver, "Ahmedī ve İskender-Nāmesi," 13–16.

[11] Banarlı, "Ahmedi ve Dasitan-ı Tevarih-i Mülûk-i Âl-i Osman," 55; Kortantamer, *Leben Und Weltbild Des Altosmanischen Dichters Aḥmedî Unter Besonderer Berücksichtigung Seines Diwans*, 174–99; Ünver, "Ahmedī ve İskender-Nāmesi," 6.

[12] For a study on the poet's patronage relations, see Berat Açıl, "Anadolu'da Kültürel İktidarın Kökleri: Ahmedî Örneği," in *Ahmedî Sempozyumu*, ed. Alim Yıldız (Sivas: Sivas Cumhuriyet University, 2018), 145–51.

[13] A. C. S. Peacock and Sara Nur Yıldız, "Introduction Literature, Language and History in Late Medieval Anatolia," in *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Anatolia*, Istanbuler Texte Und Studien, Band 34 (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag in Kommission, 2016), 28.

[14] The term "edebiyat," which is currently used in modern Turkish to refer to "literature," has its etymological roots in the word "adab." For a more detailed examination, see Berat Açıl, "From Good Sense to Good Pleasure: The First Use and Meaning of the Word 'Literature,'" *İnsan ve Toplum* 5, no. 10 (December 15, 2015): 151–66.

[15] Sara Nur Yıldız, "Aydınid Court Literature in the Formation of an Islamic Identity in Fourteenth-Century Western Anatolia," in *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Anatolia*, ed. A. C. S. Peacock and Sara Nur Yıldız, Istanbuler Texte Und Studien, Band 34 (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag in Kommission, 2016), 198–99.

framework of Perso-Islamic ethical and religious discourse.[16] *Madrasa*s were formal educational institutions in the pre-modern Islamic world, while *adab* can be considered a form of non-formal education. In this way, an aesthetic education was implemented, whereby ethical values are inculcated through the transmission of canons of general cultural knowledge.[17] In this way, those who would go on to exercise authority and become leading figures were educated and constituted as a political and social elite.[18]

In her article centering on the relationship between *adab* and the production of texts from the court of rulers, Yıldız analyzes a range of literary works produced at the court of the Aydınids, encompassing texts spanning a wide range of fields, including religion, medicine, romance, and politics. At the end of the article, the author provides a comprehensive list of the works sponsored by the Aydınids. One of the works included on the list is *Mirqāt al-Adab* by Ahmedi.[19] Although Yıldız mentions only the name of one work, it is evident from the description of the work that it actually refers to three of Ahmedi's works: *Mirqāt al-Adab*, *Mīzān al-Adab,* and *Miʿyār al-Adab.*[20]

The aforementioned works are Persian verses that were composed with the aim of teaching the Arabic language. The first work is an Arabic-Persian dictionary. The second one addresses Arabic morphology (*ṣarf*), while the third focuses on Arabic syntax (*naḥw*). The last two works are similar in content to the textbooks utilized in the *madrasa* curriculum. The defining characteristic that distinguishes these works from *madrasa* textbooks is their use of the Persian language. It is pertinent to inquire whether these works, which diverge from *madrasa* books in terms of language, can be regarded as part of the *adab* literature. Peacock and Yıldız posit that the scope of *adab* literature, which encompasses anecdotal didactic wisdom literature and mirrors of princes, may be expanded to include philological, medical, astrological, and divinatory works. Thus, *adab* is considered to include all types of court-sponsored literature with a didactic purpose.[21]

1.2. The Concept of *Adab*

The scope and nature of *adab* are subjects of intense debate. Moreover, it has experienced significant evolution and acquired novel meanings as a result of its usage over centuries. The term *adab* has its origins in Arab society, where it initially signified adherence to tribal social norms. The means by which these norms were disseminated and adopted in society were proverbs, aphorisms, narratives of intertribal struggles, and poetry.[22] The concept of *adab* evolved in conjunction with the changes that occurred in Arab society, ultimately becoming integrated into the cultural fabric of non-Arab societies that adopted Islam. From the end of the Umayyad caliphate through the Abbasid period, the concept of *adab* was associated with urban courtesy, politeness, and refinement, in contrast to the values associated with nomadic life.[23] Despite the inherent contradictions between tribal and urban life, the concept of *adab* can be understood more abstractly as having manners and behaviors in accordance with the norms of the society or community in which one lives. The use of *adab* in relation to occupational designations also illustrates the extensive

---

[16] Peacock and Yıldız, "Introduction Literature, Language and History in Late Medieval Anatolia," 34.

[17] Stefan Leder and Hilary Kilpatrick, "Classical Arabic Prose Literature: A Researchers' Sketch Map," *Journal of Arabic Literature* 23, no. 1 (1992): 19.

[18] Yıldız, "Aydınid Court Literature in the Formation of an Islamic Identity in Fourteenth-Century Western Anatolia," 199.

[19] Yıldız, 233.

[20] In the description of the work, the following terms are used: "Persian verse dictionary of Arabic, Arabic grammar rules, and glossary of cultural terms".

[21] Peacock and Yıldız, "Introduction Literature, Language and History in Late Medieval Anatolia," 34.

[22] Bo Holmberg, "Adab and Arabic Literature," in *Literary History: Towards a Global Perspective*, by Anders Pettersson et al., vol. 1: Notions of Literature Across Cultures. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 201.

[23] Holmberg, "Adab and Arabic Literature," 202.

scope of "society or community."[24]

The acquisition of the behaviors that build society or community must also occur within the institutionality of that society or community. While proverbs, aphorisms, oral stories, and poetry were sufficient in a tribal community or a small city where oral culture prevailed, in larger cities and communities such as courts where written culture prevailed, written works also became the carriers of the *adab* norms. Therefore, the resulting *adab* literature must display a dynamic structure that adapts to the sociality of its production or consumption. The scope and content of *adab* literature are contingent upon the sociality to which it belongs, as well as its formal and stylistic characteristics. The absence of a specialized educational institution and a fixed, articulated program in *adab* education, in contrast to the *madrasa* sciences, may have resulted in a more entertaining presentation of knowledge. Moreover, the preponderance of the behavioral and practical dimensions of *adab* education, in comparison to the theoretical aspects of *madrasa* sciences, should also be a crucial factor in determining the style of related works.

The Perso-Islamic *adab* that Yıldız posits may encompass all forms of court-sponsored literature and may also be expressed as a variation of *adab* produced and consumed by the Perso-Islamic court community.[25]

1.3. Ahmedi's Persian Works and Their Reception

Following the discussion of *adab*, it would be beneficial to determine which category of Perso-Islamic *adab* or *madrasa* textbooks Ahmedi's Persian works on Arabic grammar for the Aydınid court fall into.[26] In his doctoral thesis on Ahmedi's Persian works, Temizel identified eight manuscript copies of *Mirqāt al-Adab* and one manuscript copy each of *Mīzān al-Adab* and *Mi'yār al-Adab*.[27] From the author's statements in the introduction, it can be inferred that the three works were composed concurrently and that the final two were continuations of the first work.[28] The number of manuscripts of all three works indicates that the last two were excluded and that only the first one was copied an additional seven times. The first text is a verse dictionary of Arabic and Persian. What factors might account for the exclusion of the last two? As previously discussed in the context of *adab* literature, these works are characterized by a combination of didactic, entertaining, practical, and behavioral attributes. It is permissible to provide a didactic treatment of Arabic morphology and syntax. However, these are theoretical disciplines rather than practical and behavioral ones. The two sciences, which concern themselves with the structure of Arabic through the use of logical definitions and classifications, are markedly distinct from the entertaining style of the *adab* literature. The versification of the texts does not appear to be sufficient to render them entertaining. Furthermore, while a structured curriculum is available for those wishing to learn Arabic grammar, going beyond this is unlikely to be widely perceived as a preferred approach. In light of the availability of introductory, intermediate, and advanced textbooks, as well as the copious commentary literature that supports them, this appears to be a highly reasonable choice. Consequently, these works were deemed incompatible with the extant literature on *adab* due to their structural characteristics and were similarly excluded from the *madrasa* literature due to the language in which they were written. Nevertheless, since a bilingual dictionary in verse does not necessitate a theoretical structure, it can be considered a valid addition to the corpus of *adab* literature.

---

[24] "Manuals for special activities, etiquette to be observed in certain situations, and manuals for various professions and offices were also called *adab*" Holmberg, 203.

[25] Yıldız, "Aydınid Court Literature in the Formation of an Islamic Identity in Fourteenth-Century Western Anatolia," 198.

[26] For details about Ahmedi's Persian works, see Ali Temizel, "Ahmedî'nin Farsça Eserleri," in *Ahmedî Sempozyumu*, ed. Alim Yıldız (Sivas: Sivas Cumhuriyet University, 2018), 109–32.

[27] Temizel, "Ahmedî'nin Farsça Eserleri Tenkitli Metin-İnceleme-Tercüme ve İndeks," 1: 39, 204, 256, 289.

[28] Temizel, "Ahmedî'nin Farsça Eserleri Tenkitli Metin-İnceleme-Tercüme ve İndeks," 2: 109.

To sum up, their incompatibility with the two dominant acculturation/educational systems in the Islamic world explains the lack of interest in *Mīzān al-Adab* and *Mi'yār al-Adab*.

1.3.1. *Badāyi' al-Siḥr fī Ṣanāyi' al-Shi'r*

An additional Persian work by Ahmedi is located at the beginning of the aforementioned miscellany. This work, entitled *Badāyi' al-Siḥr fī Ṣanāyi' al-Shi'r*, addresses the subject of figures of speech. It is unclear whether it was presented to the Aydınid ruler in the same manner as the other works. Based on the statements made in the introduction, it is reasonable to conclude that Ahmedi dedicated his work to a patron. While he does not explicitly indicate to whom he is dedicating his work, one of the couplets in which he praises his patron is as follows:

بگوی عیسی و دیگر مگوی کز نفست
رسد مردهٔ صدساله باز مژدهٔ جان

ba-gūy 'Īsā wa dīgar ma-gūy kaz nafasat
rasad murda-yi ṣad-sāla bāz muzhda-yi jān

say 'Īsā and say no more, from your breath
the promise of life returns to the hundred-year-old dead

As stated by Gölpınarlı, the couplet indicates that the work was dedicated to Aydınid İsa.[29] The question of whether the *Badāyi' al-Siḥr* was presented to İsa is inconsequential in light of its integral role in the broader corpus of works that he presented to the Aydınid ruler. Similar to the other three works, *Badāyi' al-Siḥr* is also pertinent to the field of language. Of the eight extant works by the author, four are in Persian, while the remaining works are in Turkish. The four Persian works of the author were copied into a single manuscript by the scribe and the illuminator Ahmed b. Hacı Mahmud el-Aksarayi.[30] It is reasonable to posit that the scribe was aware of the unity between the works, as evidenced by his decision to copy them all in a single manuscript. The *Badāyi' al-Siḥr* was designated as the inaugural composition of this miscellany.

Similarly, *Badāyi' al-Siḥr* has been largely overlooked, along with Ahmedi's two other Persian works. In addition to the aforementioned copy dated AD 1432 (AH 835) in the Library of the Mevlana Museum in Konya, there is another copy dated AD 1408 (AH 811) in the National Library and Archives of Iran in Tehran. The Tehran copy was inscribed in the author's lifetime (December 24, 1408) in Bursa and includes the author's corrections. The scarcity of extant manuscripts indicates that this work is not widely read.

In terms of both linguistic content and the language in which it was written, *Badāyi' al-Siḥr* is similar to the other three works. However, it differs from the aforementioned works in certain respects. In contrast to the other three works, which concentrate on the study of the Arabic language, *Badāyi'* presents a combination of examples drawn from Arabic and Persian literature. Additionally, the work includes an example of Turkish poetry. It may be assumed that the sources of the other three works were Arabic books of morphology, syntax, and lexicon. In *Badāyi'*, the author posits that the prototype was the Persian poet and prose writer Vatvat's *Ḥadā'iq al-Siḥr fī Daqā'iq al-Shi'r*.

---

[29]Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, *Mevlânâ Müzesi Yazmalar Kataloğu*, vol. II (Ankara: MEB, 1971), para. 2524.

[30]Nihad Çetin, "Ahmedî'nin Bilinmeyen Birkaç Eseri," *Tarih Dergisi* 2, no. 3–4 (1952): 103–8.

2. Works by Ahmedi and Vatvat

The rationale behind Ahmedi's decision to base his literary theory on Persian can be attributed to the prevailing dominance of the Persian language and literature in Turkey during that period. In his *Badāyiʿ*, he makes reference to Vatvat (d. 1177) as follows:

<div dir="rtl">

این رساله را على العجاله جهتِ اتحاف حضرتِ او كه باغ قدس خُضرت ازو گیرد موسوم به بدایع السحر فی صنایع الشعر برقم قلم آورد و خلاصه مضمون حدایق السحر را با زواید شواهد و بدایع صنایع در این دُرج دَرج کرد

</div>

īn risāla rā ʿalā al-ʿujāla jihat-i ḥażrat-i ū ki bāgh-i quds-i khudrat az-ū gīrad mawsūm ba-*Badāyiʿ al-Siḥr fī Ṣanāyiʿ al-Shiʿr* ba-raqam qalam āward wa khulāṣa-yi mażmūn-i *Ḥadāʾiḳ al-Siḥr* rā bā zawāyid-i shawāhid wa badāyiʿ-i ṣanāyiʿ dar īn durj darj kard

"He quickly wrote this treatise, titled *Badāyiʿ al-Siḥr fī Ṣanāyiʿ al-Shiʿr* (Embellishments of Magic in the Arts of Poetry), to present to His Excellency, from whom the sacred garden draws its greenery. He inscribed it with the pen and incorporated the essence of *Ḥadāʾiq al-Siḥr* along with additional examples and literary arts in this volume."

Subsequent researchers have introduced the work by emphasizing "the essence of" and "additional examples" as articulated by the author. The work is often recorded as a compendium of *Ḥadāʾiq al-Siḥr*.[31] The expression "additional literary arts" has yet to be sufficiently explored in this context. What are these arts? What was the rationale behind the author's decision to include them? It would be beneficial to ascertain which other work(s) he drew upon as source(s). Into what form did he reshape the essence of *Ḥadāʾiq*? In the following sections of this article, the questions raised will be addressed. Consequently, the article will also elucidate the reasons behind the unpopularity of Ahmedi's work.

In the premodern Islamic scholarly tradition, the disciplines of literary devices are *maʿānī*, *bayān*, and *badīʿ*. The title, content, and certain statements within the text indicate that Ahmedi considered *badīʿ* to be the primary focus of his work. An examination of *Badāyiʿ*'s content reveals the absence of any discussions pertaining to *maʿānī*. There is no evidence that the concept of *maʿānī* was addressed in Persian literature until the eighteenth century. The initial examples from this century are based on Arabic texts.[32] Additionally, *Badāyiʿ* is not a book on *bayān*, as it does not address the subject of *kināya* (metonymy), which is a key element of this field of study. The concept of *majāz al-mursal* (hypallage) is only mentioned in the context of classifying *majāz* (allegory), and in this context, only *tashbīh* and *istiʿāra* are discussed. Ahmedi asserts that although *tashbīh* and *istiʿāra* are the subject of *bayān*, they are included in *badīʿ* books for poets who are not interested in *bayān*. Given that these two devices are among those that enhance the aesthetic quality of speech, poets are inclined to utilize them.[33] In his account of his encounter with *Tarjamān al-Balāgha*, the precursor to his own work, Vatvat states that he saw a text on *badīʿ*s in Persian poetry.[34] Despite the expansion of the scope by Vatvat, his work still encompasses the *Tarjamān al-Balāgha*'s topics. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that both Ahmedi's and Vatvat's works are focused on the *badīʿ*.

[31] See Çetin, "Ahmedî'nin Bilinmeyen Birkaç Eseri," 104; Çetin, "Ahmedî'nin 'Mirkatü'l-edeb'i Hakkında," 223; Gölpınarlı, *Mevlânâ Müzesi Yazmalar Kataloğu*, II:425; Kortantamer, *Leben Und Weltbild Des Altosmanischen Dichters Aḥmedî Unter Besonderer Berücksichtigung Seines Diwans*, 43.

[32] Alessia Dal Bianco, *The Subtle Meaning. An Outline of Persian ʿilm-i Maʿānī* (Venezia, 2024), 4, 7, https://iris.uniroma1.it/handle/11573/1702806.

[33] Temizel, "Ahmedî'nin Farsça Eserleri Tenkitli Metin-İnceleme-Tercüme ve İndeks," 2:32.

[34] Rashid al-Din Vatvat, *Ḥadāyiq al-Siḥr fī Daqāyiq al-Shiʿr*, ed. Abbas Eqbal (Tahran: Ketabkhane-ye Tahoori & Ketabkhane-ye Sanaye, 1984), 1.

2.1. The Concept of *Badīʿ* and the Concept of *Adab*

Badīʿ became a branch of literary scholarship with the publication of Ibn al-Muʿtazz's (d. 908) book of the same name.[35] Some sections of *badīʿ*, which address tropes and figures in an unstructured manner, were incorporated into the *maʿānī* and *bayān* disciplines, as classified by Sakkaki. The remaining sections were appended to the discipline of *bayān* as an annex, bearing the title *badīʿ*.[36] In accordance with the categorization proposed by Sakkaki and his successor Qazwini, Ahmedi recognizes *tashbīh* and *istiʿāra* as the subject of the framework of *bayān*. However, he provides an explanation for the inclusion of these two subjects in the book of *badīʿ* as previously outlined. Indeed, subsequent to Sakkaki and Qazwini, there was a rhetorical school that did not adhere to their established classification. Ibn Khaldun even differentiates between the two orientations in this regard, noting that those from the East tend to favor theory, while those from the West favor literature.[37]

In terms of chronology, Vatvat preceded Sakkaki. However, the Persian literature subsequent to that of Sakkaki does not exhibit a tripartite classification analogous to that observed in Arabic. In other words, Persian rhetoric reflects the method of Ibn al-Muʿtazz, not Sakkaki or Qazwini. The aforementioned explanations and statements by Ahmedi and Vatvat provide further substantiation of this assertion.[38] Persian literature did not adhere to the stylistic and classification conventions espoused by the school of Sakkaki and Qazwini. While the study of rhetoric in Arabic was a language-centered theory, in Persian, it was applied within the framework of poetic practice.[39] Raduyani's work, which served as a source of inspiration for Vatvat, is not a theoretical composition but rather a practical guide for novice poets.[40] In light of these characteristics and the absence of such works in the Arabic-language *madrasa* curriculum, it is imperative to consider Persian *badīʿ* works within the scope of *adab* literature.

2.2. A Comparative Analysis of the Two Works

A total of seventeen copies of Vatvat's *Ḥadāʾiq al-Siḥr*, the source of *Badāyiʿ al-Siḥr*, are extant in Turkish manuscript libraries. Additionally, Muslihuddin Mustafa Süruri's *Baḥrüʾl-Maʿārif* on literary theory also has more than sixty manuscripts in Turkish libraries.[41] The section of this work on the literary arts is almost a concise translation of *Ḥadāʾiq al-Siḥr*.[42] Given the extensive reception of *Ḥadāʾiq al-Siḥr* and *Baḥrüʾl-Maʿārif* in Turkey, it is curious that Ahmedi's work has not attracted greater attention. Despite the popularity of Ahmedi's poems during his lifetime, his work on the theoretical understanding of these poems has been largely overlooked. What were the specific differences between Ahmedi's approach and that of *Ḥadāʾiq al-Siḥr,* which he took as a prototype, that led to its being overlooked?

A comparative analysis of *Badāyiʿ al-Siḥr* and *Ḥadāʾiq al-Siḥr* will be conducted with respect to their general structure and layout, as well as their content. Their contents are categorized into four categories for

---

[35] Geert Jan van Gelder, "Traditional Literary Theory: The Arabic Background," in *A History of Persian Literature*, ed. Johannes Thomas Pieter de Bruijn, vol. 1, General Introduction to Persian Literature (London: I.B. Tauris, 2009), 128.

[36] van Gelder, "Traditional Literary Theory: The Arabic Background," 135.

[37] van Gelder, 136–37.

[38] For detailed information on the development of Persian rhetorical literature and works, see Natalia Chalisova, "Persian Rhetoric: ʿElm-e Badīʿ and ʿElm-e Bayān," in *A History of Persian Literature*, ed. Johannes Thomas Pieter de Bruijn, vol. 1, General Introduction to Persian Literature (London: I.B. Tauris, 2009).

[39] Chalisova, "Persian Rhetoric: ʿElm-e Badīʿ and ʿElm-e Bayān," 171.

[40] Chalisova, 145.

[41] These results were accessed on 29.07.2024 through a search on "Manuscripts Database" (Presidency of Türkiye Manuscripts Institution, 2024), https://portal.yek.gov.tr.

[42] Yakub Şafak, "Sürûrî'nin Bahrü'l-Maârif'i ve Bu Eserdeki Teşbih ve Mecaz Unsurları," *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* (4), s (1997): 219.

comparison: Ahmedi's introductions to certain figures, additional figures not included in Vatvat's repertoire, the use of identical terms with differing content, and the style employed in the handling of subjects. Each of the five areas of comparison will therefore be addressed in turn below, with a dedicated heading for each.

2.2.1. General structure and layout

A comparison of the works of Vatvat and Ahmedi reveals that neither of them exhibits a hierarchical structure. The terminology utilized to convey a specific figurative expression is presented in the form of headings, with only some of the aforementioned terms having subheadings.

In his work, Vatvat begins with a brief introduction that elucidates the rationale behind its composition. He then proceeds to examine figures of speech, concluding the book without providing a formal conclusion. In contrast, Ahmedi provides an introduction to the concepts of *balāgha* and *faṣāḥa*, as well as a conclusion that explores figures of speech related to intertextuality. Consequently, Ahmedi's work has assumed a more theoretical structure.

Ahmedi demonstrated a general adherence to Vatvat's ordering of figures of speech, although he did introduce some modifications. Notably, he chose to start with *ḥusn al-maṭlaʿ*. By situating this figure, which is associated with the introductory phase of a text, at the outset of his treatise, Ahmedi presumably sought to ensure logical coherence in the sequencing of the subject matters.

Another noteworthy discrepancy in the two works' organization pertains to the order of *tashbīh* and *istiʿāra*. In his work, Vatvat initially addresses *istiʿāra* and subsequently introduces *tashbīh*, after discussing several other figures in between. No connection was established between the two figures. In contrast, Ahmedi, as seen in the *balāgha* books within the *Talkhīṣ* line, initially addressed the subject of *tashbīh* and subsequently turned to the topic of *istiʿāra*. Furthermore, he emphasized that both figures are among the subjects of *bayān*.

The *Badāyiʿ al-Siḥr* contains sixteen additional figures not found in the *Ḥadāʾiq al-Siḥr*. Fourteen of these figures are presented in consecutive order. It should be noted, however, that these figures are not appended to the work at its conclusion. Fourteen new terms were incorporated between *al-kalām al-jāmiʿ* and *muwashshah*, situated approximately midway through the work. Ahmedi introduces *taṣrīʿ*, which he states is related to *sajʿ*, immediately after it, and *istikhdām*, which he considers close to *īhām*, immediately after it.

To elucidate the subject further, the definitions provided in both works are followed by the examination of Arabic and Persian texts. The Arabic examples are drawn from the Qur'an, *ḥadīth* of the Prophet Muhammad, and Arabic poetry, whereas the Persian examples are predominantly from Persian poetry. With the exception of one instance, Ahmedi employed a Turkish poem of his own as an exemplar in the title of the *muwashshah*. This style is also evident in Arabic works on similar themes, with the earliest example being that of Ibn al-Mu'tazz.[43] Vatvat incorporated Persian poems alongside Arabic verses, *ḥadīth*s, and poetic exemplars. A similar approach was also employed in some Turkish rhetorical works, with examples provided in three languages.[44] Thus, it is concluded that Ahmedi's *Badāyiʿ al-Siḥr* is not a work that is centered solely on the Arabic language. It is therefore more accurate to view it as the rhetoric of Persian, the dominant literary language in 14th-century Turkey, as well as of Western Turkish, which was undergoing a process of transformation into a written literary language largely in the hands of Persianate literates in Turkey.

---

[43]van Gelder, "Traditional Literary Theory: The Arabic Background," 128.

[44]See Ahmet Zahid Demirciler, "Mustafa İzzet Def'ü'l-Mesâlib Fî Edebi'ş-Şâ'ir ve'l-Kâtib (Analyse-Text-Index)" (Master's thesis, Ankara University, 2014).

2.2.2. Introductions and conclusion

In *Badāyi' al-Siḥr*, there are four introductory sections dispersed throughout the text. The initial introduction functions as an introduction to the book as a whole, while the remaining introductions serve to introduce the specific devices of *tashbīh*, *isti'āra,* and *taḍādd*. These introductory sections adopt a theoretical approach.

The construction of Arabic rhetoric as a scientific field encompassing three disciplines was completed with Qazwini's *Talkhīṣ al-Miftāḥ*.[45] Vatvat composed his *Ḥadā'iq* long before this. Indeed, it constitutes one of the sources utilized by Fakhr al-din al-Razi in his *Nihāyat al-Ījāz*. This is regarded as the initial phase preceding the third section of Sakkaki's *Miftāḥ al-'Ulūm* in the process of the disciplinary organization of Arabic rhetoric.[46] Qazwini's *Talkhīṣ* is a critical summary of *Miftāḥ*.[47] Accordingly, Vatvat's mention of three disciplines of *balāgha* is not feasible in light of the chronological gap and the evolution of Arabic rhetoric. In consequence, Vatvat makes no mention of the theoretical classification of *ma'ānī*, *bayān,* and *badī'*. Furthermore, the concepts of *faṣāḥa* and *balāgha* are not addressed as terms in *Ḥadā'iq*.

In addition to the chronology, another factor prevents the theoretical classification of Vatvat's work. The author wrote his text for practical purposes related to literary texts. However, as Larcher notes, Arabic rhetoric has two aspects: one literary and one hermeneutical. Due to its hermeneutical aspect, it is intertwined with religious sciences. This is one of the factors that shape the structure of Arabic rhetoric.[48] In his treatise, Vatvat provides the following account of the motivation behind its composition: Khwarazmian ruler Atsiz showed him a copy of *Tarjamān al-Balāgha*, a text that elucidates the arts of Persian poetry. Vatvat found the textual illustrations in the book to be inadequate. He asserts that a new book is required to compile knowledge of the virtues of Arabic and Persian poetry and prose. Accordingly, he intends to author a comprehensive volume that encompasses the entire corpus of poetic knowledge, including prosody, rhyme, and the flaws and virtues of a poetic text.[49] The author's use of the terms "verse" and "prose," both in identifying a gap in existing literature and in explaining his intentions for the book, demonstrates that practical literary considerations were a primary factor in the emergence of the work.

Ahmedi provides an introduction to elucidate the terms *faṣāḥa* and *balāgha*, as well as to introduce and differentiate the disciplines of *ma'ānī*, *bayān*, and *badī'*. He then proceeds to discuss the literary devices individually. This introduction is structured in accordance with the plan utilized by Qazwini in his *Talkhīṣ al-Miftāḥ*. Subsequent to the information about *faṣāḥa* and *balāgha*, the text provides definitions of *ma'ānī*, *bayān,* and *badī'*. These definitions are also in alignment with those proposed by Qazwini.

Furthermore, Ahmedi composed an introduction to the devices of *tashbīh* and *isti'āra*. In the introduction to *tashbīh*, the author states that although *tashbīh* and *isti'āra* are the subject of *bayān*, they are included in *badī'* books. The author's interpretation has previously been mentioned in more detail.

The author summarizes the elements of *tashbīh*, which have been translated from *Talkhīṣ*, in the section's introduction. Subsequently, he diverges from the approach set forth in *Talkhīṣ* and instead aligns with

---

[45] William Smyth, "The Canonical Formulation of 'Ilm al-Balāghah and al-Sakkākī's Miftāḥ al-'Ulūm," *Der Islam* 72, no. 1 (1995): 8, https://doi.org/10.1515/islm.1995.72.1.7.

[46] Nasrullah Hacımüftüoğlu, Introduction to *Nihāyat Al-Ījāz Fī Dirāyat al-I'jāz*, by Fakhr al-Dīn Mohammad bin 'Umar bin Ḥusayn al-Rāzī, ed. Nasrullah Hacımüftüoğlu (Beirut: Dar Sader, 2004), 10–11.

[47] For more detailed information, see Seeger Adrianus Bonebakker, "Al-Ḳazwīnī (Khaṭīb Dimashḳ), Djalāl al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Umar," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976); August Ferdinand Mehren, *Die Rhetorik der Araber* (Copenhagen-Vienna: Verlag von Otto Schwartz - Aus Der Kaiserl. königl. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1853), 7.

[48] Pierre Larcher, "Arabic Linguistic Tradition II. Pragmatics," in *The Oxford Handbook of Arabic Linguistics*, ed. Jonathan Owens, 1st ed. (Oxford University Press, 2013), 188, https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199764136.001.0001.

[49] Vatvat, *Ḥadāyiq al-Siḥr fī Daqāyiq al-Shi'r*, 1.

Vatvat's classification. *Talkhīṣ* categorizes the types of *tashbīh* in a manner that is entirely distinct from that of Vatvat. This classification is also absent in Ahmedi.

Vatvat addresses *istiʿāra* (metaphor) and provides a definition along with illustrative examples. However, no classification is presented. Moreover, although Vatvat does not mention *majāz al-mursal* (hypallage), the definition of *istiʿāra* includes this figure and is consistent with the definition of *majāz* in *Talkhīṣ*. In contrast, Ahmedi commences his chapter on *istiʿāra* (metaphor) by addressing *dalāla* (denotation) and *majāz* (allegory), on the grounds that *istiʿāra* constitutes a specific type of *majāz*. In *Talkhīṣ*, *istiʿāra* is the subject of the chapter on *dalāla* and *majāz*. Ahmedi abbreviated and translated this chapter into Persian and included it in his book under the title *istiʿāra*.

Ahmedi's concluding "introduction" is on the *taḍādd* (antithesis). Vatvat's approach is to define this figure of speech and provide illustrative examples. In contrast, Ahmedi proposes that an introduction is indispensable for a comprehensive understanding of this art form. He posits that *taḍādd* is, in fact, a specific type of *taqābul* (opposition). Subsequently, he proceeds to define *taqābul* and its various types in a logical manner. Ahmedi's explanations of *taḍādd* here are not included in *Talkhīṣ*. However, these details are discussed in the commentaries.[50]

The endings of Ahmedi and Vatvat's works are wholly disparate. The poetic terms that Vatvat briefly defines in the text are not found in *Badāyiʿ al-Siḥr*. A comparison of the endings of *Badāyiʿ al-Siḥr* and *Talkhīṣ* reveals that they are similar. The types of *sariqa* (literary plagiarism) and the literary figures of *iqtibās* (Qur'anic quotation), *ʿaqd* (versification), *ḥall* (prosification), *taḍmīn* (poetic quotation), and *talmīḥ* (literary citation), which constitute the final section (*khātima*) of *al-Badāyiʿ al-Siḥr*, are topics that Qazwini adds to the concluding section of *badīʿ*.

In the four "introductions" and the concluding section, it is evident that Ahmedi drew upon *Talkhīṣ* as a foundational text. He employed *Talkhīṣ* as a source, occasionally abbreviating it and at other times providing elaborations and explanations in accordance with his requirements. As in the *taḍādd* section, it is evident that he also draws upon the literature surrounding *Talkhīṣ*.

2.2.3. Additional figures of speech

Ahmedi incorporated sixteen distinct literary devices from *Ḥadāʾiq al-Siḥr* into his treatise. Of the figures in *Ḥadāʾiq*, only *tarjama* (translation) is absent from *Badāyiʿ*. This heading, which addresses the Persian translation of Arabic poems, was deemed unnecessary by Ahmedi.

The sixteen arts that are not included in Vatvat's work but are included by Ahmedi are as follows: *taṣrīʿ*, *istikhdām*, *tafrīʿ*, *qawl al-mūjab*, *īghāl*, *tadhyīl*, *takmīl*, *tawshīʿ*, *madhhab al-kalāmī*, *irṣād*, *al-laff wa al-nashr*, *tashābuh al-aṭrāf*, *mushākala*, *ʿaks*, *rujūʿ*, and *tawfīf*. The text presents the figures in sequential order, except for two instances. Due to its previously discussed influence, this article provides an analysis of how these sixteen rhetorical arts are treated in the *Talkhīṣ*. Therefore, all of the aforementioned figures of speech, except for *taṣrīʿ* and *tawfīf*, are discussed in *Talkhīṣ*. *ʿAks*, which somewhat overlaps with *Talkhīṣ*, suggests that another source was consulted. Ahmedi offers some additional insights beyond those found in *Talkhīṣ* on *tadhyīl*, *madhhab al-kalāmī*, and *irṣād*. With regard to *tashābuh al-aṭrāf*, it is evident that Ahmedi does not incorporate certain details from *Talkhīṣ*. However, he does augment the number of Arabic examples. With regard to figures other than those already discussed, the two works exhibit substantial overlap in terms of both definitions and Arabic examples. Ahmedi's contributions are limited to providing examples of poetry from Persian literature.

---

[50]Taftazani et al., *Shurūḥ Al-Talkhīṣ* (Cairo: ʿĪsā al-Bāb al-Ḥalabī, 1937), 286–302.

2.2.4. The same figures are presented with divergent content

As has been previously stated, although Ahmedi asserts that he utilized *Ḥadāʾiq al-Siḥr* as a foundational text, he subsequently incorporated sixteen additional figures. However, the majority of the figures discussed in the book are also present in both treatises. Nevertheless, it appears that Ahmedi has modified them. At times, he expanded the scope; at other times, he contracted it; at times, he eliminated subcategories; at other times, he introduced them. He eliminated numerous examples while incorporating a multitude of new ones. The present study will not address changes in the examples.[51] An examination of the alterations in the treatment of devices reveals the impact of Qazwini's *Talkhīṣ al-Miftāḥ* in numerous instances. In some cases, the influence of Arabic literature is discernible, although the precise source remains uncertain. The influence of Persian literature is discernible in only one of the author's arrangements. In other cases, the source is entirely uncertain.

One figure whose content was influenced by *Talkhīṣ* is *taqsīm*. *al-Laff wa al-nashr* and *taqsīm* are similar figures. Vatvat's work does not include *al-laff wa al-nashr*. However, his definition of *taqsīm* encompasses the art of *al-laff wa al-nashr*. In contrast, Ahmedi employs a comparative approach to *al-laff wa al-nashr* and *taqsīm*, as exemplified in the *Talkhīṣ*. Moreover, Vatvat presents a singular definition of *taqsīm*. Ahmedi, once more subject to the influence of *Talkhīṣ*, offers two further definitions of the term *taqsīm*. Another definition that illustrates the impact of *Talkhīṣ* on Ahmedi is the *mubālagha* (hyperbole). According to this, if the limits of reason and custom are tested, "the approximative verb" should be introduced. The influence of *Talkhīṣ* is also evident in the definition of *tajāhul al-ʿārif* (feigning ignorance). Vatvat provides a concise definition of *tajāhul al-ʿārif* and offers illustrative examples, whereas Ahmedi employs *Talkhīṣ* to elucidate the rationale behind the construction of *tajāhul al-ʿārif*. In the case of *ḥusn al-taʿlīl* (conceit), while both works address the figure, Ahmedi, in contrast to Vatvat, defines and classifies it in accordance with *Talkhīṣ*. In discussing the subject of *taḍmīn*, Ahmedi states that quotations from the Qur'an and *ḥadīth*s of Prophet Muhammad are referred to as *iqtibās*. The influence of *Talkhīṣ* is also discernible in *tashbīh al-ʿaks*, a specific form of *tashbīh*. In accordance with the *Talkhīṣ* and its followers, such usages are not regarded as *tashbīh* but rather as *tashābuh*. This distinction is a point that Ahmedi emphasizes. Ultimately, Ahmedi eliminates *tabʿīd*, which Vatvat enumerates as a subcategory of *duʿā*. This category is not present in *Talkhīṣ* or among his followers.

As previously stated, Arabic sources other than *Talkhīṣ* also exerted an influence on *Badāyiʿ al-Siḥr*. One such influence is evident in the term *lughaz*. Ahmedi referred to a specific type of figure that exists in Arabic literature but not in Persian literature. A comparable situation pertains to the subcategories of *taḍādd* (antithesis): *muqābala* and *tadbīj*. These subcategories are absent in the Vatvat. The fact that the examples provided are exclusively in Arabic indicates that the source text must also be Arabic.

The definition of *musammaṭ* represents a difference between the two works, one that does not stem from the Arabic tradition. Ahmedi begins his examination of the figure by emphasizing its prominence among the Persians. The discrepancy between his definition and Vatvat's is likely due to shifts in usage. Vatvat provides a definition and exemplification of the general use of the term *musammaṭ* as well as its specific use in Persian literature. Ahmedi, in contrast, offers only the second definition, but with a more expansive scope, noting that *musammaṭ* was renowned among the Persians.

Identifying the source of Ahmedi's arrangements apart from those listed above represents a more significant challenge. While Ahmedi's classification of the types of *tashbīh* is identical to Vatvat's, there are discrepancies in the definitions of certain types. While Vatvat's definitions of *tashbīh-i taswiyat, tashbīh-*

---

i tafḍīl, and *tashbīh-i iḍmār* elucidate more specific uses, Ahmedi has generalized the definitions and expanded the scope of these figures. The distinction between their definitions of *tashbīh-i iḍmār* is enough to alter the nuance of the art. Additionally, Ahmedi tends to generalize definitions with the exception of those pertaining to *tashbīh* types and *musammaṭ*. For instance, while Vatvat maintains that the term *muwāzana* is exclusive to poetry, Ahmedi does not adhere to this limitation. A definition that appears in *Badāyi'* but is absent from *Talkhīṣ* and *Ḥadāʾiq* pertains to *īhām*. Ahmedi includes in the figure the preference to interpret the interlocutor's words in a manner that diverges from his original intent. An ambiguous arrangement of Ahmedi is also the abolition of *mafrūq*, a subcategory of *tajnīs-i murakkab*, which is present in both *Talkhīṣ* and *Ḥadāʾiq* but is absent from *Badāyi'*.

2.2.5. Expression style

Ahmedi's treatment of the Persian *badīʿ* is not limited to incorporating literary devices into his book that are absent from Vatvat's repertoire and modifying the definitions and scopes of certain devices that are shared. In numerous instances where the definitions and content of devices are identical, the style of expression is modified. Ahmedi did not simply replicate the sentences of Vatvat verbatim; rather, he paraphrased them in his style. On occasion, he provided a concise one- or two-word explanation, and on other occasions, he omitted explanations that he deemed superfluous. At times, he retained the Arabic examples as they were; at other times, he augmented them; and at other times, he altered them. It is beyond the scope of this article to address each of these differences individually. However, an attempt will be made to provide an overview of the general characteristics of the differences in Ahmedi's expression style below.

Compared to Vatvat, Ahmedi's style is drier. He utilized terminology more frequently in his definitions and demonstrated a greater adherence to the principles of logic. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that Vatvat exhibits a greater richness of head terms. To be more precise, Vatvat also provided various alternatives for many of the terms he defined. This phenomenon is less prevalent in Ahmedi's work. This trend may be regarded as an illustration of Ahmedi's proclivity towards standardization in his more scientific style. Instead, Ahmedi seems to place significance on the etymology of the head terms. This preference is also consistent with the scientific discourse of the Muslim tradition.

To illustrate the difference in the authors' styles, consider the following example. In his description of the figure of *tarṣīʿ*, Vatvat begins with the phrase *dar abwāb-i balāghat īn ṣanʿat cunān* 'in the chapters of *balāgha* this figure…' Ahmedi, on the other hand, begins with *dar ʿurf-i ʿulamā-yi badīʿ* 'in the terminology of *badīʿ* scholars.' Vatvat's statement encompasses the broadest sense of *balāgha*, indicating that this figure is one of the many issues within the field of *balāgha*. In contrast, Ahmedi implies that this figure is among the subjects of the discipline of *badīʿ*. The word *ʿurf*, translated here as "terminology," is a term related to the categorization of speech in terms of denotation and connotation. Another example of Ahmedi's willingness to utilize terminology can be observed in the section on *sajʿ*. While Vatvat favors the phrase "There are three *sajʿ*," Ahmedi adds the word *nawʿ* 'type' and prefers "There are three types of *sajʿ*." *Nawʿ*, translated as "type," is also an Arabic term of logic. Vatvat states that *salāsat-i lafẓ* and *laṭāfat-i maʿnā* are observed in the *ḥusn al-takhalluṣ*. Ahmedi paraphrases as *salāsat-i kalimāt wa salāmat-i tarkīb wa gharāʾib-i maʿnā*. This statement suggests a more logical classification. He classifies Vatvat's *lafẓ* 'utterance' in terms of the lexeme (*kalima*) and phrase (*tarkīb*). While Vatvat characterizes the meaning as 'subtle' (*laṭāfat*), Ahmedi employs the word *gharīb*, a term defined by rhetoricians.

Regarding the logical definition, a comparison can be made between the two authors' definitions of *tashbīh-i mashrūṭ*. Vatvat defines it as *cunān buwadh ki cīzī rā ba-cīzī mānanda kunand ba-sharṭ wa gūyand agar cunīn būdhī cunīn būdhī* 'It was such that one thing would be likened to another with a condition, and they would say, "If it were like this, it would be like that.". In this statement, the logical definition is

completed with the word *ba-shart* 'condition.' The following statement can be considered a description. It seems reasonable to posit that Ahmedi considered the definition sufficient and thus omitted the subsequent description.

It is noteworthy that Ahmedi makes greater use of Arabic words than Vatvat. To illustrate, while Vatvat employs the Persian word *magar* 'except,' Ahmedi opts for the Arabic word *illā*, which conveys a similar meaning. It is notable that Arabic phrases such as *bi-ʿaynihī*, which are not common in Vatvat's style, are particularly evident in Ahmedi. Moreover, an insight into Ahmedi's style is that its Persian is more comprehensible for the Turkish native speaker author of this article than for Vatvat.

Conclusion

Ahmedi was a scholar, poet, and writer of 14th-century Turkey who completed his higher education in Egypt. During this period, literates whose written and literary language was Persian were engaged in the construction of the Western Turkish written language under the sponsorship of the Western Anatolian principalities. The aforementioned two sentences, which provide information about Ahmedi, demonstrate that he had a cultural background and intellectual accumulation situated at the nexus of the *elsine-i şelāşe* 'three languages' (i.e., Arabic, Persian, and Turkish). It is therefore unsurprising that his accumulation is reflected in the works he produced. His work *Badāyiʿ al-Siḥr fī Ṣanāyiʿ al-Shiʿr*, which is the subject of this article, is a book of literary theory that was composed using the accumulated knowledge of Arabic and Persian literature and is expected to address poets and writers who write or will write in Turkish.

It seems reasonable to posit that *Badāyiʿ al-Siḥr* was composed in response to the *adab* literature sponsored by the Aydınids in western Anatolia, which was created to legitimize their rule according to Perso-Islamic discourse. This context may have influenced the Persian language used in the work and the selection of Rashid al-Din Vatvat's writings, a prominent bureaucrat in Khwārazm, as a source. It seems reasonable to conclude that the primary factor determining the language of the work was the dominance of Persian as the language of the state, literature, and writing in 14th-century Anatolia.

Ḥadāʾiq al-Siḥr, a work of the Persian *badīʿ* genre, is a component of the *adab* literature due to its entertaining tone, courtly support, and practical nature. Ahmedi produced another work in the *badīʿ* genre based on this source. In addition to this work, he also made extensive use of Qazwini's *Talkhīṣ* as a source. This work by Qazwini represents a foundational text on *balāgha* sciences, which are comprised of three distinct disciplines. As one of the Arabic sciences, *balāgha* occupies a significant position within the *madrasa* curriculum. In contrast to the *Ḥadāʾiq al-Siḥr*, it is theoretically classified and comprises a style that is interwoven with logical terminology. While not as pronounced as the aforementioned influences, it is worthy of mention that other sources also exerted a considerable impact on *Badāyiʿ*, as evidenced by the content of the work.

Ahmedi sought to synthesize the two works, which exhibited contrasting styles and structures. Nevertheless, this endeavor was largely overlooked by Turkish readers and writers. Those engaged in the study of *balāgha*, which was grounded in a theoretical foundation, directed their attention to the Arabic *Talkhīṣ* and its adherents. Those engaged in the practical study of *badīʿ* for practical purposes consulted *Ḥadāʾiq* until the 16th century and then *Baḥrüʾl-Maʿārif*, a translation of the former. Similarly, the 15th-century scholar Molla Lutfi's treatise on Turkish rhetoric was overlooked, just like Ahmedi's work. This Turkish *balāgha* book, following the format of *Talkhīṣ*, did not garner the same level of attention among Turkish readers as did its Arabic counterparts. It appears that prior to the nineteenth century, there was no inclination to pursue the study of *balāgha* in a language other than Arabic. While it cannot be definitively stated that *balāgha* books, of which there are numerous manuscripts in Turkish libraries, did not exert an influence on Turkish

poetry, it can be posited that Turkish poets' principal sources of reference when it comes to poetry were *badī'* books.

Author Details	Ahmet Zahid Demirciler (Asst. Prof. Dr.)

¹ Kırklareli University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Turkish Language and Literature, Kırklareli, Türkiye

🆔 0000-0002-0729-6567   ✉ a.z.demirciler@gmail.com

References

Açıl, Berat. "Anadolu'da Kültürel İktidarın Kökleri: Ahmedî Örneği." Sivas: Sivas Cumhuriyet University, 2018.

Açıl, Berat. "From Good Sense to Good Pleasure: The First Use and Meaning of the Word 'Literature.'" *İnsan ve Toplum* 5, no. 10 (December 15, 2015): 151–66.

Banarlı, Nihad. "Ahmedi ve Dasitan-ı Tevarih-i Mülûk-i Âl-i Osman." *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 6 (1939): 49–176. https://doi.org/10.18345/tm.73231.

Bonebakker, Seeger Adrianus. "Al-Ḳazwīnī (Khaṭīb Dimashḳ), Djalāl al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿUmar." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, IV:863–64. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Canpolat, Mustafa, ed. *Mecmūʿatü'n-Neẓāʾir*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 1982.

Çakır, Mustafa Sefa. "Ahmedî ve Eserleri Üzerine Yapılan Çalışmalar." In *Ahmedî Sempozyumu*, edited by Alim Yıldız, 263–70. Sivas: Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, 2018.

Çetin, Nihad. "Ahmedî'nin Bilinmeyen Birkaç Eseri." *Tarih Dergisi* 2, no. 3–4 (1952): 103–8.

———. "Ahmedî'nin 'Mirkatü'l-edeb'i Hakkında." *Türkiyat Mecmuası* XIV (1965): 217–30. https://doi.org/10.18345/tm.40533.

Chalisova, Natalia. "Persian Rhetoric: ʿElm-e Badīʿ and ʿElm-e Bayān." In *A History of Persian Literature*, edited by Johannes Thomas Pieter de Bruijn, Vol. 1, General Introduction to Persian Literature. London: I.B. Tauris, 2009.

Dal Bianco, Alessia. *The Subtle Meaning. An Outline of Persian ʿilm-i Maʿānī*. Venezia, 2024. https://iris.uniroma1.it/handle/11573/1702806.

Demirciler, Ahmet Zahid. "Mustafa İzzet Def'ü'l-Mesâlib Fî Edebi'ş-Şâ'ir ve'l-Kâtib (Analyse-Text-Index)." Master's thesis, Ankara University, 2014.

Gelder, Geert Jan van. "Traditional Literary Theory: The Arabic Background." In *A History of Persian Literature*, edited by Johannes Thomas Pieter de Bruijn, 1, General Introduction to Persian Literature: 123–38. London: I.B. Tauris, 2009.

Gibb, Elias John Wilkinson. *A History of Ottoman Poetry*. Vol. I. Londra: Luzac, 1900.

Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. *Mevlânâ Müzesi Yazmalar Kataloğu*. Vol. II. Ankara: MEB, 1971.

Gülüm, Emrah. "Ahmedî Hakkında Bibliyografya Denemesi." *Journal of International Social Research* 14, no. 77-1 (January 1, 2021): 175–206. https://doi.org/10.17719/jisr.11676.

Hacımüftüoğlu, Nasrullah. Introduction to *Nihāyat Al-Īǧāz Fī Dirāyat al-Iʿǧāz*, by Fakhr al-Dīn Mohammad bin ʿUmar bin Ḥusayn al-Rāzī, edited by Nasrullah Hacımüftüoğlu. Beirut: Dar Sader, 2004.

Holmberg, Bo. "Adab and Arabic Literature." In *Literary History: Towards a Global Perspective*, by Anders Pettersson, Gunilla Lindberg-Wada, Margareta Petersson, and Stefan Helgesson, 180–205. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.

Kortantamer, Tunca. *Leben Und Weltbild Des Altosmanischen Dichters Aḥmedî Unter Besonderer Berücksichtigung Seines Diwans*. Klaus Schwarz Verlag, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1973.

———. "Yeni Bilgilerin Işığında Ahmedî'nin Hayatı." In *Eski Türk Edebiyatı: Makaleler*, 1–30. Ankara: Akçağ, 1993.

Larcher, Pierre. "Arabic Linguistic Tradition II. Pragmatics." In *The Oxford Handbook of Arabic Linguistics*, edited by Jonathan Owens, 1st ed., 185212. Oxford University Press, 2013. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199764136.001.0001.

Leder, Stefan, and Hilary Kilpatrick. "Classical Arabic Prose Literature: A Researchers' Sketch Map." *Journal of Arabic Literature* 23, no. 1 (1992): 2–26.

"Manuscripts Database." Presidency of Türkiye Manuscripts Institution, 2024. https://portal.yek.gov.tr.

Mehren, August Ferdinand. *Die Rhetorik der Araber*. Copenhagen-Vienna: Verlag von Otto Schwartz - Aus Der Kaiserl. königl. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1853.

Peacock, A. C. S., and Sara Nur Yıldız. "Introduction: Literature, Language, and History in Late Medieval Anatolia." In *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Anatolia*. Istanbuler Texte Und Studien, Band 34. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag in Kommission, 2016.

Şafak, Yakub. "Sürûrî'nin Bahrü'l-Maârif'i ve Bu Eserdeki Teşbih ve Mecaz Unsurları." *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* (4), s (1997): 217–35.

Smyth, William. "The Canonical Formulation of 'Ilm al-Balāghah and al-Sakkākī's Miftāḥ al-'Ulūm." *Der Islam* 72, no. 1 (1995). https://doi.org/10.1515/islm.1995.72.1.7.

Taftazani, Maghribi, Subki, Qazwini, and Dasuqi. *Shurūḥ Al-Talkhīṣ*. 4 vols. Cairo: Īsā al-Bāb al-Ḥalabī, 1937.

Temizel, Ali. "Ahmedî'nin Farsça Eserleri Tenkitli Metin-İnceleme-Tercüme ve İndeks." Doctoral thesis, Ankara University, 2002.

———. "Ahmedî'nin Farsça Eserleri." In *Ahmedî Sempozyumu*, edited by Alim Yıldız, 109–32. Sivas: Sivas Cumhuriyet University, 2018.

———. "Aḥmadī Garmiyānī ve Āmūzash-i Şanāyiʿ-i Adabī Dar Sudda-i Hashtom-i Hicrī Dar Āsyā-yi Şaġīr." In *Acta Del VII Congreso de La Sociedad Española de Iranología (SEI), Celebrado En Madrid Los Días 16 y 17 de Octubre de 2017*, edited by Tea Vardosanidze and Gerardo Matallana Medina, 142–56. Madrid: Sociedad Española de Iranología, 2020.

Ünver, İsmail. "Ahmedī ve İskender-Nāmesi." In *İskender-Nāme: İnceleme-Tıpkıbasım*, by Ahmedî and İsmail Ünver, 1–52. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 1982.

Vatvat, Rashid al-Din. *Ḥadāyiq al-Siḥr fī Daqāyiq al-Shiʿr*. Edited by Abbas Eqbal. Tehran: Ketabkhane-ye Tahoori & Ketabkhane-ye Sanaye, 1984.

Yıldız, Alim, ed. Ahmedî Sempozyumu. Sivas: Sivas Cumhuriyet University, 2018.

Yıldız, Alim. "Ahmedî'nin Memleketine Dair." In *Ahmedî Sempozyumu*, edited by Alim Yıldız, 15–18. Sivas: Sivas Cumhuriyet University, 2018.

Yıldız, Sara Nur. "Aydınid Court Literature in the Formation of an Islamic Identity in Fourteenth-Century Western Anatolia." In *Islamic Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Anatolia*, edited by A. C. S. Peacock and Sara Nur Yıldız, 197–241. Istanbuler Texte Und Studien, Band 34. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag in Kommission, 2016.