



10.71138/turkav.1782857

## Ali Şir Nevaî'nin *Bedâyi'ü'l-Bidâye* Divanı'nın Oluşumu ve Klasik Türki Edebiyat Tarihindeki Önemi

Oysara Madalieva  
oysara19@gmail.com  
[0009-0008-0932-9570](tel:0009-0008-0932-9570)

Al-Biruni Doğu Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Kıdemli Araştırmacı,  
Özbekistan Bilimler Akademisi

### Öz

Türk edebiyatı tarihinde, 'Ali Şir Nevaî (1441–1501) gibi bir şairin ortaya çıkışı ve şiirlerinin derlenmesi, *Badâyi'ü'l-bidâya* adlı koleksiyonun oluşturulmasıyla sonuçlanan önemli bir olay olarak kabul edilir. Bu nedenle, Nevâî'nin kendisi tarafından sipariş edilen *Badâyi'ü'l-bidâya* gibi bir derleme eseri henüz yaratılmamıştı. Türk devanizmi bağlamında, önsöz ekleme geleneği *Badâyi'ü'l-bidâya* eseriyle başlamıştır. Bu divanda, “*Asbraqat min 'aksi shamsi-l-ka'si anvaru-l-hudâ*” mısrasını içeren derin bir gazelin yan yana getirilmesi ve “*Ketür saqî, ul may-ki, subh-i alast*” mısrasıyla başlayan bir *tarji'band* eklenmesi, farklı kompozisyon eserleri – şiirler – içeren divanın karmaşık yapısına katkıda bulunmuştur.

*Badâyi'ü'l-bidâya*, Nevâî'nin şiirlerinde ergenlik ve gençlik temalarını tasvir etmesiyle önem arz eder ve yazarın ilk kitabına gösterdiği titiz dikkatin bir sonucu olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. *Badâyi'ü'l-bidâya*'nın el yazmaları üzerinde çok sayıda bilimsel araştırma yapılmıştır. *Badâyi'ü'l-bidâya*'nın yeni tespit edilen el yazmaları ile daha önce bilinen el yazmalarının karşılaştırmalı analizi yoluyla, bu divanın yapısı hakkında güvenilir sonuçlara varılabilir. Bu çalışma, *Badâyi'ü'l-bidâya*'yı Türk edebiyatı tarihindeki önemli bir olay olarak diğer çağdaş divanlarla karşılaştırmaktadır.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** 'Ali Şir Nevâî, *Badâyi'ü'l-bidâya*, el yazma, divan, divan geleneği, dibaça, tür, gazel, *tarji'band*.

**The Formation of the Divān of *Badāyi' al-bidāya* by 'Ali Shīr Navā'ī and Its Importance in the History of Classical Turkic Literature**

**Abstract**

In the annals of Turkic literature, the emergence of a poet like 'Ali Shīr Navā'ī (1441–1501) and compiling his poems, resulting in the creation of the collection known as *Badāyi' al-bidāya*, stand as a momentous event. Therefore, a compositional work like *Badāyi' al-bidāya* ordered by Navā'ī himself, had not yet been created. In the context of Turkic *divānism*, the tradition of including a preface commenced with the work *Badāyi' al-bidāya*. Within this *divān*, the juxtaposition of a profound *ghazal* featuring the verse “*Ashraḡat min 'aksi shamsi-l-ka'si anwāru-l-hudā'*” and the inclusion of a *tarji'band* that commences with the verse “*Ketür sāḡı, ul may-ki, subb-i alast'*” contributed to the intricate structure of the *divān*, which comprises distinct compositional works – poems.

The *Badāyi' al-bidāya* holds importance with its portrayal of the adolescence and youth themes in Navā'ī's poetry and emerged as a result of the author's meticulous attention to his inaugural book. Numerous scholarly investigations have been conducted on the manuscripts of the *Badāyi' al-bidāya*. Only through a comparative analysis of the newly identified manuscripts of *Badāyi' al-bidāya* alongside the previously known ones can reliable conclusions be drawn regarding the structure of this *divān*. This study compares *Badāyi' al-bidāya* to other concurrent *divāns* as an important event in the Turkic literature's history.

**Key words:** 'Ali Shīr Navā'ī, *Badāyi' al-bidāya*, manuscript, *divān*, the traditions of *divāns*, *dibacha*, genre, *ghazal*, *tarji'band*.

### Introduction.

The earliest poetry of the poet Nizām al-din Mir ‘Ali Shīr Navā’ī (844–906/1441–1501) was compiled by his admirers into manuscript collections known as *Initial Divān*<sup>1</sup> and *Divān of the Aq Qoyunlu Admirers*<sup>2</sup>. According to scholarly assumptions, Navā’ī himself may have seen copies of these manuscript *divāns* or heard about them. Naturally, all these assumptions are based on the author’s own words.

H. Sulaymon (1910–1979), relying on the following passage from the preface of Navā’ī’s *Badāyi’ al-bidāya*: " اما خلائق آراسیدا مینک بیت ایکی مینک بیت آرتوغراق اوکسوکراک کیم اوزلاری جمع قیلیب ایردیلهر بغایت (but among the people, those who themselves collected one thousand to two thousand or slightly more or less couplets were very famous)"<sup>3</sup>, wrote that the poet is referring to *Initial Divān* in this instance<sup>4</sup>.

A. Erkinov explains that the author was aware of his early poetry being compiled into another *divān* in the land of Tabriz by enthusiasts of Turkic poetry, connecting it to the following verses:

<p>اگر بیر قوم کر یوز یوقسه مینکدور معین تورک اولوسی خود مینینکدور الیب مین تخت فرمانیمغه آسان چریک چیکمای خطا دین تا خراسان خراسان دیما کیم شیراز و تیریز که قیلیمیش دور نی کلکیم شکرریز<sup>5</sup></p>	<p>(If a people, be it a hundred, or if not, a thousand, is mine. The specific Turkic people are indeed mine. I have easily taken to my ruling throne, Without mustering an army, from <i>Khītā</i> to <i>Khorāsān</i>. Don't just say <i>Khorāsān</i>, for <i>Shirāz</i> and <i>Tabriz</i> For the reed pen of my writing</p>
---	--

<sup>1</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Ilk devon. 1466-yili ko'chirilgan qo'lyozmaning faksimile nashri*. Edited by H. Sulaymon. Toshkent: Fan, 1968.

<sup>2</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Oqquyunli muxlislar devoni. 1471-yili ko'chirilgan qo'lyozmaning faksimile nashri*. Edited by A. Erkinov. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, 2015.

<sup>3</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi' ul-bidoya*. Paris manuscript. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, no. 746, 885/1480-81: 12b.; Suleymanov, X. *Tekstologicheskiye issledovaniye liriki Alishera Navoi / V trex tomax / tom pervyy*. Tashkent–Moskva, 1955–1961: 25.

<sup>4</sup> Suleymanov, X. *Tekstologicheskiye issledovaniye liriki Alishera Navoi / V trex tomax / tom pervyy*. Tashkent–Moskva, 1955–1961: 47.

<sup>5</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Farhod va Shirin*. O‘zR FASHI, no. 5018, 889/1484: 233.

has produced sweetness)

"...these very lines can also be assessed as utilizing the possibilities of *fakbriya*<sup>6</sup> in the poetry of the Muslim East. However, recently I focused my attention on a manuscript that is known among art historians but has remained unknown among specialists in Uzbek classical literature. This manuscript is kept in the National Library of Egypt – Dar al-Kutub – in Cairo. In connection with the acquisition of this manuscript, which consists of Navā'ī's *divān*, the aforementioned lines of Navā'ī turned out to be not only *fakbriya* but also acquired a clear and substantiated meaning<sup>7</sup>.

So, if Navā'ī knew that his poetry had gained fame not only in Herat but also beyond, and had already been compiled into a *divān*, why did the need arise to arrange the *Badāyi' al-bidāya*? In our opinion, there were many reasons for this. Among them, the simplest answer is that the number of poems written by Navā'ī had further increased during the period since the compilation of the two *divāns* mentioned above. Therefore, Sultan Husayn (r. 1469–1506) ordered Navā'ī to compile a *divān*<sup>8</sup>. However, there are very subtle aspects to this issue which, in our view, lead back to the history of Turkic literature, and in particular, the history of Turkic *divān* writing.

### Method and Degree of Study.

Several scholarly works have been conducted on the *divān Badāyi' al-bidāya* and its manuscripts, as well as the preface written by the author for this *divān*<sup>9</sup>. This research investigates the significance of

<sup>6</sup> *Fakbriya/iftixoriya* (from Arabic, meaning self-praise; pride, fame; honor; sublimity) – is a poetic style in which the poet praises himself. In this, the poet takes pride in his poetic skill.

<sup>7</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Oqqunyulı muxlislar devoni. 1471-yılı ko'chirilgan qo'lyozmaning faksimile nashri*. Edited by A. Erkinov. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, 2015: 27.

<sup>8</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi' ul-bidoya*. Edited by Sh. Sharipov. MAT. Yigirma Tomlik, Vol. 1. Toshkent: Fan, 1987: 10.

<sup>9</sup> Ali Şir Nevâî. *Bedâyi'ü'l-bidâye*. Edited by Vahit Türk and Jabbor Eshonkul. İstanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2023: 1072; Birnbaum, Eduard. "Ottoman Turkish and Chaghatay Literature: An Early 16th Century Manuscript of Nawa'î's Divan in Ottoman Orthography." *Central Asiatic Journal* 20 (1976): 157–190; Boltabayev, S. "Navoiy Devonining Shoir Hayotligida Ko'chirilgan Yangi Topilgan Nusxasi Haqida." In *Alisher Navoiy va Sharq Renessansi (Xalqaro Simpozium Materiallari)*, 438–466. Toshkent, 2022: 438–466; Eckmann, J. "Nevai'nin

İlk Divanları Üzerine.” *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı. Belleten* 13 (1970): 253–262; Juraboyev, O. “Kitabet Sanatının Bir Örneği Olarak Ali Şir Nevayî’nin ‘Bedayı’-‘Bidaye’ Divanının Taşkent Nüshası.” *Uluslararası Beşeri Bilimler ve Sanat Dergisi* 1 (2020): 14–27; Levend, A. “Türkiye Kitaphıklarındaki Nevai Yazmaları.” *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı. Belleten* (Ankara, 1958): 127–209; Madaliyeva, O. “Alisher Navoiy ‘Badoyi’ ul-bidoya’ Devoni va Uning Qo‘lyozmalari.” In *Professor Hamid Sulaymon Nomidagi Yosh Matshunoslarning Ilmiy-Amaliy Respublika Konferensiyasi Materiallari To‘plami*, 6–11. Toshkent: Yosh Avlod Matbaa, 2023; Madaliyeva, O. “Alisher Navoiy ‘Badoyi’ ul-bidoya’ Devonining Mashhad Qo‘lyozmasi.” In *Alisher Navoiy va XXI Nomli Xalqaro Ilmiy-Amaliy Konferensiyasi Materiallari*, 209–218. Toshkent–Boku: Zebo Print, 2023; Madaliyeva, O. “Alisher Navoiy ‘Badoyi’ ul-bidoya’ Devonining O‘rganilish Tarixi.” In *Alisher Navoiy va XXI Nomli Xalqaro Ilmiy-Amaliy Konferensiyasi Materiallari*, 400–408. Toshkent–Bursa: Zebo Print, 2023; Madaliyeva, O. *Alisher Navoiy devonlari qo‘lyozmalarining tarkibiy-qiyosiy tadqiqi*. Toshkent: Donishmand ziyosi, 2021: 679; Subtelny, M. “Mir ‘Ali Shir Nawa’i.” In *Encyclopedie de l’Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. 7, 90–93. Leiden–Paris: Brill, 1993; Abdug‘afurov, A. “Badoe’ ul-bidoya’ning Tuzilish Sanasi.” *O‘zbek Tili va Adabiyoti*, no. 4 (1989): 3–9; Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi’ ul-bidoya*. Edited by Sh. Sharipov. MAT. Yigirma Tomlik, Vol. 1. Toshkent: Fan, 1987; Volin, S. “Opisaniye rukopisey proizvedeniy Navoi v leningradskix sobraniyax.” In *Alisher Navoi*, edited by K. Borovkova, 203–235. Moskva–Leningrad: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR, 1946; Jo‘raboyev, O. “Navoiy asarlari qo‘lyozma va matnlarini o‘rganishning ba’zi masalalari.” In *Alisher Navoiy va XXI asr*, 32–38. Toshkent, 2016; Imomnazarov, M. *XXI asr. Alisher Navoiy lirik merosi matshunosligi muammolari*. Toshkent, 2021: 207; Imomnazarov, M. “Alisher Navoiy lirik merosi matshunosligining dolzarb masalalari.” In *Alisher Navoiy va XXI asr*, 6–10. Toshkent: Tamaddun, 2017; Imomnazarov, M. *Musulmon mintaqa madaniyati rivojida ‘majo‘z tariqi’ bosqiqchi. 2-kitob. Alisher Navoiy*. Toshkent: Mumtoz so‘z, 2022:510; Imomnazarov, M. “Uch devon muqoyasasi (Alisher Navoiy she‘riyati lirik janrlar xronologiyasiga doir).” In *Alisher Navoiy va XXI asr*, 12–17. Toshkent: Turon iqbol, 2018; Nagiyeva, J. *Bakinskiye rukopisi Alishera Navoi*. Baku: Elm, 1986; Ramazonov, N. “Alisher Navoiyda ‘tahrirni tahrir’.” *O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti*, 2006/1: 17–23; Ramazonov, N. “Yana ‘tahrirni tahrir’ masalasi xususida.” *O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti*, 2007/1: 78–89; Salohiy, D. “Tahlil va talqin mas’uliyati.” *O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti*, 2006/1: 74–78; Salohiy, D. *Badoe’ ul-bidoya malohati*. Toshkent: Fan, 2004; Semenov, A. *Opisaniye persidskix, arabskix i tureskix rukopisey*. Tashkent: Izdatelstvo sredneaziatskogo gosudartvennogo universiteta, 1935; Suleymanov, X. *Tekstologicheskoye issledovaniye liriki Alishera Navoi / V trex tomax / tom pervyy*. Tashkent–Moskva, 1955–1961, 415; Toutant, M. “Taqlid obrazi sharqshunoslik ko‘zgasida.” *Journal of Central Asian Renaissance*, Special Issue 1 (2021): 42–59; Turdialiyev, A., and Erkinov A. “Badoyi’ al-bidoya”ning Navoiy davrida ko‘chirilgan va yangi aniqlangan sanali oltinchi qo‘lyozmasi (Sultonali Mashhadiy, Hirot, 889/1484–1485-yil).” In *Alisher Navoiy va XXI asr*, 57–62. Toshkent: Turon iqbol, 2018.

the compilation of the *Badāyi' al-bidāya divān* in the history of 'Ali Shīr Navā'ī's poetry. It also examines the landscape of Turkic *divān* writing before the creation of *Badāyi' al-bidāya* and the question of whether this tradition, as a literary process, could compete with the parallel situation in Persian classical literature. In this sense, the *Badāyi' al-bidāya divān* is studied as the initial source of the outcome of this competition. Methodological approaches achieved in Navā'ī studies in recent years serve as the basis for posing the question in this way in the research.

One can become acquainted with a certain part of these new approaches in the research of academics A.B. Kudelin, A. Erkinov, and M. Toutant<sup>10</sup>. M. Toutant, while writing about the spread of 'Ali Shīr Navā'ī's manuscript works in Europe and the initial translations of excerpts from his works into European languages, emphasizes that they could not find their true value for several centuries and remained in the shadow of the *Bābur-nama*<sup>11</sup>. Regarding the English translation of the following information about 'Ali Shīr Navā'ī in the *Bābur-nama* the scholar writes: "*Alti masnavi kitāb nazm qalptur, beşi Kxamsa cavabida, yana bir Mantiq al-tayr vaznida Lisan al-tayr athāq*". The translation according to Leyden and Erskine is as follows: "He composed six mesnevis in verse, five in imitation of the *Khamsah* (of Nizāmi), and one in imitation of the *Mantiq ut-tayir* (the Speech of the Birds)"<sup>12</sup>.

M. Toutant makes the following scholarly conclusion regarding the error in translation: "Abd al-Rahim Mirza-khon literally preserved the term 'cawab' from the Chaghatay text in his Persian translation, as the word itself was Persian. In the above translation, this word is rendered as 'imitation'. In both French and English, the term 'imitation' is inadequate to express the diversity of the processes of interrelationship between different texts in Turkic-Persian poetry. The

<sup>10</sup> Kudelin, A. B. "Alisher Navoi – rodonachalnik uzbekskoy literatury (K 575-letiyu so dnya rojdeniya)." *Izvestiya RAN. Seriya literatury i yazyka* 75, no. 4 (2016): 5–11; Kudelin, A. B. "Alisher Navoiy – o'zbek adabiyoti asoschisi (Navoiy tavalludining 575-yilligiga)." *Journal of Central Asian Renaissance*, Special Issue 1 (2021): 33–41; Toutant, M. "Taqlid obrazi sharqshunoslik ko'zgasida." *Journal of Central Asian Renaissance*, Special Issue 1 (2021): 42–59; Erkinov, A. "V.V. Bartold nega Navoiyni tarjimon va taqlidchi deb hisobladi?" In *Alisher Navoiy va Sharq renessansi (xalqaro simpozium materiallari)*, 132–158. Toshkent, 2022.

<sup>11</sup> Toutant, M. "Taqlid obrazi sharqshunoslik ko'zgasida." 43-51.

<sup>12</sup> Toutant, M. "Taqlid obrazi sharqshunoslik ko'zgasida." 52.

term 'jawab' refers to one of the many such processes: a work created as a 'jawab' must indicate such a difference from the work being 'imitated' that the text to which a 'jawab' is given imitates a model that functions as a question or problem requiring a solution. Because Leyden and Erskine translated 'cawab' with the word 'imitation' and provided no explanations, Bābur's thoughts acquired a 'shallow' meaning. Nevertheless, the modern reader seeks to understand the significance of Navā'ī's approach to the preceding work. The reason is that the term 'imitation' has a derogatory connotation and implies more of a dry repetition rather than connecting with the debate and 'answering' process that the term 'jawab' expresses"<sup>13</sup>.

Thus, according to M.Toutant's scholarly assumptions, certain errors in the English translations of the *Bābur-nama* and through this language into other European languages, were among various factors that led to the incorrect interpretation of Navā'ī's works among European scholars.

A.B. Kudelin convincingly proves that Navā'ī's perception by Western researchers for several centuries as an "imitator of Persian speakers" was due to an incorrect interpretation of medieval Eastern literature and the processes within it<sup>14</sup>.

Criticizing E.E. Bertels' (1890–1957) views on the issue of *nazīra*, A.B. Kudelin writes: "The scholar considered it incorrect to call the authors of *nazīras* 'imitators,' assessing the situation as an approach contrary to historicity and a misunderstanding of the specific features of the literature of feudal society. This was because the selection of topics in this society was 'extremely limited' and was associated with 'narrowness of interests, confinement of life, and slowness of development.' For this reason, even authors who had the opportunity to innovate the subject of creation did not strive to go beyond the traditional range of topics. The narrowness of topics in the intense literary process led to the formation of 'excessive attention to the culture of the word' and views such as 'art for art's sake,' and 'in many cases, the goal of creating a work of art remained the skillful reworking of a well-known plot'... While E.E. Bertels, in his reflections, 'justified' the authors of the *nazīra* method in the Middle

<sup>13</sup> Toutant, M. "Taqlid obrazi sharqshunoslik ko'zgasida.": 52.

<sup>14</sup> Kudelin, A. B. "Alisher Navoiy – o'zbek adabiyoti asoschisi (Navoiy tavalludining 575-yilligiga).": 35-37.

Ages, noting that they wrote their works 'even in such difficult flight conditions,' this remains a product of the literary-theoretical ideas of the time when these words were spoken. Today, however, they need editing"<sup>15</sup>. Of course, E.E. Bertels' views were written based on the politics of the era in which the scholar lived. Indeed, as A. Erkinov points out, E.E. Bertels was one of the first scholars to prove that 'Ali Shīr Navā'ī was not an imitator of Persian-language literature"<sup>16</sup>.

A.B. Kudelin elucidates that "the types and forms of 'imitation' in medieval literature were united by a common goal based on a creative attitude towards the 'primary source,' competition, and rivalry with it. The concept of competition occupied one of the central places in the system of medieval world literature. It relied on the ahistoricism of traditional artistic thinking"<sup>17</sup>. The scholar explains the process of competition based on ahistoricism as follows: "Ahistoricism manifests itself in 'removing' the intermediate time distance during comparison: a periodic interval of five hundred, even a thousand years did not surprise scholars evaluating the results of 'creative competition.' In this, the fact that the compared authors lived in different eras, and even belonged to different literary and cultural environments, was not taken into account"<sup>18</sup>.

### Research Results.

It can be argued that 'Ali Shīr Navā'ī, in his creative work, particularly in the processes of compiling his collected poetry (*divāns*), aimed not only to equal the level of contemporary Persian poets but also to surpass the *divāns* of past masters. Some notes in the poet's works can support this hypothesis. Consider the following thoughts expressed in the preface to *Khaṣṣayin al-ma'ani*, which consists of four *divāns*, spoken through the voice of Sultan Husayn: "...among the multitude of mankind, composed of four jewels, no one has left behind four *divāns* as a memorial. In his own era, they call Amir Khusrau Dehlavi the treasure of spiritual meaning, for it is said that Sultan Malikshah Alp Arslan had four *divāns* arranged in his name and

<sup>15</sup> Kudelin, A. B. "Alisher Navoiy – o'zbek adabiyoti asoschisi (Navoiy tavalludining 575-yilligiga)": 36.

<sup>16</sup> Erkinov, A. "V.V. Bartold nega Navoiyni tarjimon va taqlidchi deb hisobladi?": 132-158.

<sup>17</sup> Kudelin, A. B. "Alisher Navoiy – o'zbek adabiyoti asoschisi (Navoiy tavalludining 575-yilligiga)": 36.

<sup>18</sup> Kudelin, A. B. "Alisher Navoiy – o'zbek adabiyoti asoschisi (Navoiy tavalludining 575-yilligiga)": 37.

adorned their conclusion with his name, and this deed reached the ears of both the good and the bad of that time, although this is mentioned, those *divāns* are lost, and although the names of those lost ones exist, their existence is unknown"<sup>19</sup>. Based on this information, it can be said that Navā'ī not only competed with the past Persian classics in *khamsa* writing but also, in a certain sense, vied with them in the matter of arranging and refining his *divāns*. It should be emphasized that these positive competitive efforts were aimed at the noble goal of raising the level of Turkic literature.

It is known that Navā'ī entered literature through his fondness for Persian poetry. In "Muhokamat al-Lughatayn" (The Comparison of the Two Languages), the poet himself wrote that he composed poetry mainly in Persian in his early youth<sup>20</sup>.

بو خاکسار غه صبا اوایلی دا کیم اغیز حقه سیدین بیرار کوهر ظاهر بولا  
باشلار اول کوهرلار هنوز نظم سلکی کا کیرمایدور ایردی کیم ضمیر دریاسیدین نظم  
سلکی کا تارتیلغان کوهرلار طبع غواصی سعیی بیله اغیز ساھلی غه کیلا باشلاماق  
کورکوزوب ایردی چون مذکور بولغان قاعده بیله کیم ادا تاپتی میل فارسی ساری  
بولدی اما چون شعور سنی غه قدم قویولدی چون حق سبحانه و تعالی طبع غه غرابت  
ساری میل نی ذاتی و دقت دشوار پسند لیق قه شعورنی جبلی قیلیب ایردی ترک  
الفاظی غه داغی ملاحظه نی لازم کورولدی.

Translation: In my early youth, when a few jewels began to appear from the coffer of my mouth, and those jewels had not yet entered the thread of verse, the jewels drawn from the sea of my conscience, through the efforts of the diving nature, began to show themselves coming to the shore of my mouth, but according to the aforementioned rule, the inclination was towards Persian. However, when the age of understanding was reached, since the True and Exalted made the inclination towards wondrous things and the innate understanding of subtle and difficult matters inherent in our nature, it was deemed necessary to reflect upon Turkic words as well<sup>21</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Xazoyinul ma'oni* – *G'aroyibus-sig'ar*. Critical edition, with introduction and appendices by H. Sulaymonov. 4 vols. Vol. 1. Toshkent: Fan, 1987: 11.

<sup>20</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Muhokamat ul-lug'atayn*. France, Bibliothèque nationale de France, no. Supl. Turc. 317. Copied by Ali Hijroniy (facsimile used from Q. Sodiqov edition): 11.

<sup>21</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Muhokamatu-l-lug'atayn*. Edited and annotated by Q. Sodiqov. Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2017: 71.

These notes suggest that the initial source of Navā'ī's inspiration was Persian poetry. This situation can be attributed to the influence of Persian-language poetry, which dominated the literary environment of the poet's time. Furthermore, as Navā'ī emphasizes in *Mubākamāt al-Lughatayn* the existence of already prepared expressions for writing poetry in Persian, while in Turkic it was mainly necessary to create anew and exert effort, encouraged emerging poets, even if they were originally Turkic, to write in Persian<sup>22</sup>. These thoughts suggest that Navā'ī, even in his youth, understood the vast amount of work to be done both theoretically and practically for the development of the Turkic language and literature, and that he first began to set an example himself in this path.

Navā'ī emphasizes that the role of a mentor is extremely important in a poet's entry into poetry. He seems to "justify" young creators preferring to write in Persian due to the lack of Turkic-writing mentors to whom they could present their works for editing<sup>23</sup>.

Navā'ī's scholarly views on the literary environment of his time, particularly on the issue of bilingualism (*zul-lisānaynlik*), are important for studying the history of Turkic and Persian literature up to the 15th century. Below are the meanings of these ideas:

"In some climates and lands of the world, after the Sart (Persian-speaking) rulers became strong, Persian-speaking poets appeared in this connection. In the *qasida*, there were Khāqānī, Anvarī, Kamāl Ismā'īl, Zahir, and Salmān; in the *masnavi*, there were the master of science Firdawsī, the unique of the age Sheikh Nizamī, and the Indian craftsman Mīr Khusrau; in the *ghazal*, there emerged the innovator of his time Shaikh Muslih al-Din and the unique one of the century, Khwāja Hāfiz Shirāzī. ... Among the Sart rulers, highly esteemed kings like Sultan Turghul and Shāh Shujā, and high-ranking star-like armies, composed colorful couplets and sweet *ghazals*; their works became famous in their time and were written on the pages of their lives. After the Turkic khagans gained reign of the country from the Arab and Sart sultans from the time of Hulagu Khan until the end of the reign Sultān Sāhibqirān Temur Koragān and his son Sultān Shāhrukh, Turkic-writing poets appeared, including well-versed kings from that noble lineage".

<sup>22</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Mubokamatu-l-lug'atayn*. Edited and annotated by Q. Sodiqov: 70.

<sup>23</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Mubokamatu-l-lug'atayn*. Edited and annotated by Q. Sodiqov: 70.

Navā'ī, who assessed the source of Persian poetry's flourishing as the Persian rulers and the development of Turkic poetry as the result of the policies pursued by Turkic sultans, compares the works of representatives of these two national literatures, "Among the poets are Sakkākī, Haydar Khārazmī, Atāi, Muqīmī, Yaqīnī, Amirī, and Gadāi. However, no one appeared who could stand against the aforementioned Persian poets except for Mawlānā Lutfī, who has a few beginnings that can be read by the people of taste"<sup>24</sup>.

Therefore, even though Navā'ī was well-disposed towards the *divāns* compiled by admirers of his poetry, he could not accept them as absolute. Indeed, as Navā'ī himself pointed out, there were few among the Turkic speakers who could provide a worthy response to the Persian poets. The poet emphasizes that the development of Turkic literature and the traditions of *divān* writing occurred directly as a result of Sultan Husayn's policies: "...In every science, beneficial works were created, and in every field, fruitful writings emerged; interesting books and wonderful types of poetry such as *divāns*, *ghazals*, qasidas, and masnavis appeared and spread everywhere. He himself (referring to Sultān Husayn – O.M.), although capable of speaking in both Persian and Turkic, inclined towards creating a *divān* in Turkic due to the pull of his innate talent and the widespread use of this language..."<sup>25</sup>. Based on this information, it can be emphasized that the inertia of Persian literature was strong in the literary environment of 15<sup>th</sup> century Khorāsān, and this constancy gradually gave way to Turkic only through the significance of court poetry.

According to the information, "The first among the poets in Turkic literature to collect his poems into a *divān* was Burhān al-Dīn Sivasī (14th century). Later, Hāfiz Khorazmī (second half of the 14th century – 30s-40s of the 15th century) arranged a *divān* in Turkic poetry. In literary studies, despite consisting only of *ghazals*, Sayfi Sarāyī's (1321–1398) poetic collection is also considered a *divān*. There is information that Atāi (15th century) also compiled a *divān*, but it has not reached us. Sakkākī (15th century) also compiled a *divān*"<sup>26</sup>. However, the aforementioned poetic collections were certain stages in the beginning of Turkic *divān* writing and fell short in meeting some

<sup>24</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Mubokamatu-l-lug'atayn*. Edited and annotated by Q. Sodiqov: 81.

<sup>25</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Mubokamatu-l-lug'atayn*. Edited and annotated by Q. Sodiqov: 83.

<sup>26</sup> Sodiqov, Q. *Matnshunoslik va manbashunoslik asoslari*. Toshkent, 2017: 60.

requirements. In particular, the absence of poems ending in all the letters of the Arabic alphabet, the lack of poems belonging to all genres of classical poetry, and other shortcomings.

It can be said that Mawlānā Lutfī (1366–1465) was the poet who relatively raised the traditions of Turkic *divān* writing to the level of Persian-language *divāns*. As a result of comparative studies of copies of Lutfī's *divāns*, specialists have concluded that the author revised his *divān* five times<sup>27</sup>. This indicates Lutfī's responsible approach to his work and his constant editing of his creative output.

In our opinion, according to Navā'ī, his *divān* (or *divāns*) should not merely consist of his poems arranged alphabetically but should also have a philosophically meaningful beginning, structure, and conclusion. Indeed, it is not difficult for the reader of Navā'ī's works to understand that underlying them is not only the author's aim to quantitatively equalize the scope of Turkic literary genres with Persian but also the idea of not lagging behind in terms of content. It can be said that 'Alī Shīr Navā'ī compiled his first *divān*, *Badāyi' al-bidāya* precisely based on these goals.

In this sense, *Badāyi' al-bidāya* is significant in that it carries the adolescent and youthful lyrics of Navā'ī's poetry, and it arose as a result of the great attention the author paid to his first *divān*. The author approached the preface – the foreword – being written for this *divān* as a serious undertaking. According to the literary scholar A. Abdughafurov (1931–2005), in writing prefaces to his *divāns*, Navā'ī created a unique form of the art of *fakhrīya* (self-praise), which should be understood as an artistic method skillfully employed by the great poet. This method allowed him to:

a) praise the human virtues of the ruler, demonstrate his patronage of the people of poetry, his benevolence, kindness, and generosity; and b) convincingly show his closeness to the Sultan, the high value, prestige, and respect he enjoyed as a creator in his presence, and the ruler's esteem and protection of poetry<sup>28</sup>.

In particular, the preface to *Badāyi' al-bidāya* states:

"But it did not occur to my mind to collect these scattered verses, nor did it cross my heart to arrange these dispersed poems. Although those who were my closest companions and dearest friends

<sup>27</sup> Sodiqov, Q. *Matnshunoslik va manbashunoslik asoslari*: 60-61.

<sup>28</sup> Abdughafurov, A. "Xazoyin ul-Maoniy' Jumboqlari (Uchinchi Maqola)." *O'zbek Tili va Adabiyoti*, no. 6 (1998): 3-10.

repeatedly requested and urged me to undertake this task..."<sup>29</sup>. As understood from the text, Sultan Husayn himself directly proposes and requests Navā'ī to collect his poems and arrange a *divān*. Indeed, in this text, it is possible to understand Navā'ī's intention to praise Sultan Husayn as a virtuous king who is familiar with literature and to show that he is not indifferent to his (Navā'ī's) creative work. If we take into account Navā'ī's views on the development of the Turkic language and literature written in *Muhākamat al-Lughatayn* it can also be suggested that this text from the preface aims to express that Turkic literature as a whole is under the protection of the country's ruler and that its development is at the center of attention of the first person of the state. This is because the poems whose compilation into a *divān* is being proposed, even requested, although belonging specifically to one poet – Navā'ī – were, in general, examples of Turkic literature.

Indeed, in the history of Eastern historiography and literary-artistic creation, cases are frequently encountered where an author, while writing a work, indicates that he is creating it at the suggestion and request of one of the famous people of that time. This situation can be seen both before and after 'Ali Shīr Navā'ī. For example, in the foreword to Abu Rayhān Birunī's (973–1048) work *Hindustān (India)* there are such notes:

"My teacher Abu Sahl al-Mun'im ibn 'Ali ibn Nuh al-Tiflisi (may God have mercy on him!), after re-reading the books on religions and nations and learning about their condition, urged and requested me to write about what I had accurately learned from the Hindus, so that it would be an aid to anyone wishing to refute the teachings of the Hindus and a document and resource for those who associate with them"<sup>30</sup>.

In the commentary provided by the preparers for publication of the work *Hindustān* it is stated that "Abu Sahl al-Mun'im ibn 'Ali ibn Nuh al-Tiflisi (i.e., from Tbilisi) is known only from this work of Biruni (i.e., from *Hindustān* – O. M.), a contemporary older than him, judging by the fact that the scholar respectfully calls him 'teacher.' Among Birunī's works, there are others written at someone's request.

<sup>29</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi' ul-bidoya*. Edited by Sh. Sharipov: 10.

<sup>30</sup> Abu Rayhon Beruniy. *Hindiston. Tanlangan Asarlar. II Tom*. Toshkent: O'zbekiston, 2022: 44.

It is not necessary to consider these requests one hundred percent accurate; in our opinion, this can be regarded as a stylistic method of writing works in that era"<sup>31</sup>.

Regarding this stylistic method, A. Abdughafurov interprets its use in the works of creators after Navā'ī, particularly in the preface to the *divān* of Muhammad Rizā Āgahi (1809–1894), as follows: "Āgahi recounts that Feruz Shah (1845–1910) encouraged him to create, and as a result, with 'strength in his heart and courage in his nature,' he wrote many poems, which also recalls the content and spirit of Navā'ī's prefaces. The following excerpt from Āgahi's preface is also to the extent of a manifestation of the 'reaching command' to Navā'ī:

'...addressing him with kindness, he said: – Collect all your scattered poems from all drafts and anthologies and other places, arrange them in the form of a *divān*, and write a preface to it, and then string the mentioned poems like jewels onto the thread of numbering in that very *divān* at their proper time!'"<sup>32</sup>. In this regard, while agreeing with A. Abdughafurov's thoughts, it is necessary to emphasize one more aspect. In our opinion, this situation can be another example of the process of competition with past contemporaries in Eastern literature, even after several centuries.

Professor H. Sulaymon, in his doctoral dissertation, dwelled in detail on the four known copies of *Badāyi' al-bidāya* at that time (Paris, London, Baku, Tashkent)<sup>33</sup>. Between 2018 and 2022, four more copies of *Badāyi' al-bidāya* copied during the author's lifetime were identified<sup>34</sup>. Thus, the existence of eight dated manuscripts of *Badāyi' al-bidāya* transcribed while Navā'ī was alive has come to light.

These are the following copies:

1. **Paris manuscript.** National Library of France, No. 746. 885 AH/1480-81 CE.

<sup>31</sup> Abu Rayhon Beruniy. *Hindiston: 412*.

<sup>32</sup> Abdug'afurov, A. "Xazoyin ul-Maoniy' Jumboqlari (Uchinchi Maqola).": 3-10.

<sup>33</sup> Suleymanov, X. *Tekstologicheskiye issledovaniye liriki Alishera Navoi: 63-70*.

<sup>34</sup> Boltabayev, S. "Navoiy Devonining Shoir Hayotligida Ko'chirilgan Yangi Topilgan Nuxsasi Haqida.": 438-466; Madalievva, O. "Alisher Navoiy 'Badoyi' ul-bidoya' Devonining Mashhad Qo'lyozmasi.": 209-218; Erkinov, A. "Badoyi' al-bidoya"ning Navoiy davrida ko'chirilgan va yangi aniqlangan sanali beshinchi qo'lyozmasi (888-yil, safar oyi/1483-yil, mart-aprel)." In *Alisher Navoiy va XXI asr*, 51–57. Toshkent: Turon iqbol, 2018; Turdialiyev, A., and Erkinov A. "Badoyi' al-bidoya"ning Navoiy davrida ko'chirilgan va yangi aniqlangan sanali oltinchi qo'lyozmasi (Sultonali Mashhadiy, Hirot, 889/1484–1485-yil).": 52-57.

2. **London manuscript.** British Museum, No. 401. 887 AH/1482-83 CE.
3. **Tehran manuscript.** Library of the Islamic Consultative Assembly, No. 14197. Safar 888 AH/March-April 1483 CE.
4. **Baku copy.** Institute of Manuscripts of the Republic of Azerbaijan, No. 3010. 889 AH/1484 CE.
5. **Istanbul manuscript.** Suleymaniye Library, Ayasofya No. 3981. 889-890 AH/1484-1485 CE, Herat. Copyist: Sultanali Mashhadi.
6. **Tashkent manuscript.** State Museum of Literature of the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan, No. 216. 891 AH/1486 CE, Herat. Copyist: Ali ibn Nur.
7. **Mashhad manuscript.** Astan Quds Razavi Library, No. 4783. Jumadi I 896 AH/March–April 1491 CE. Copyist: Darvish Muhammad Taqi.
8. **Tehran II manuscript.** National Library of Iran, No. 1082924. 906 AH/1500-1501 CE.

As A. Erkinov notes, "six of the manuscripts were copied between 1480 and 1486"<sup>35</sup>. Apparently, Navāʾī's second *divān Nawādir al-nihāya* had not yet been compiled by 1486. The copying of the Mashhad and Tehran II manuscripts in 1491 and 1500–1501, respectively, suggests that in the literary environment of Herat, even though the poet's later poetry had already been compiled into *divāns*<sup>36</sup>, the attention to his early lyrics had not waned. Indeed, the main content of many *Selected divān* manuscripts created by Navāʾī's admirers also consists of the poems of *Badāyi' al-bidāya*<sup>37</sup>.

The aforementioned manuscripts of *Badāyi' al-bidāya* differ from each other in terms of composition and the content of the poems.

---

<sup>35</sup> Erkinov, A. "Badoyi' al-bidoya"ning Navoiy davrida ko'chirilgan va yangi aniqlangan sanali beshinchi qo'lyozmasi (888-yil, safar oyi/1483-yil, mart-aprel)": 51-57.

<sup>36</sup> Here, the reference is to the collection of *divāns Khazayin al-ma'ani* consisting of *Gharā'ib al-shig'har*, *Nawādir al-shabāb*, *Badāyi' al-wasat* and *Favāyid al-kibar*, which were arranged by Alisher Navoi himself after *Badāyi' al-bidāya* based on his Turkic poems, as well as *Nawādir al-nihāya* also compiled by the poet himself.

<sup>37</sup> For more details, see: Madaliyeva, O. *Alisher Navoiy devonlari qo'lyozmalarining tarkibiy-qiyosiy tadqiqi*: 120-128.

However, they all have the same beginning and the same ending. The copies begin with Navā'ī's *ghazal*:

يار عكسين ميڭا كور ديب جام دين جقتى صدا

The rays of the sun shone forth  
From the cup of the lights of guidance.  
Seeing your reflection in the wine,  
The cup of religion cried out.

and conclude with the following *fard* (single line of poetry):

سيل يوليدا فنا دشتيدا مژگانيم اماس

كوز الاچوقلاري نينك دود بيكان اوقلاري دور.

Annihilation in the path of the flood,  
My eyelashes are protection in the plain;  
They are smoke-eating arrows from the eye's quiver.

H. Sulaymonov writes the following about the genres in the composition of *Badāyi' al-bidāya*: "As reflected in the table regarding the four manuscripts<sup>38</sup>, the genre composition of the remaining copies, except for the Paris manuscript, corresponds to each other, and these 11 genres also match the genre names recorded by the author himself. Only in the Paris copy, for an unknown reason, are 6 poetic genres missing (*mukhammas*, *musaddas*, *qit'a*, *mustazād*, *mu'ammā*, *tarji'band*). In our opinion, the addition of new poems to the London, Baku, and Tashkent copies was carried out by the poet adding his newly written poems after the compilation of *Badāyi' al-bidāya*<sup>39</sup>.

During our scholarly discussions with Professor M.Imomnazarov, the academician posited that Navā'ī might have deferred the compilation of the corpus until the composition of the *ghazal* commencing with the incipit "*Asbraqat min 'aksi shamsi-l-ka'si anvāru-l-budā'*" and the *tarji'band* initiating with the hemistich "*Ketür sāqī, ul may-ki, subh-i alast*". Considering that the extant manuscripts of the *Initial Dīwān* and the *Dīwān of the Aq Qoyunlu Admirers* do not commence with "*Asbraqat ...*" and, indeed, this particular lyric is absent from these collections, these hypotheses appear to possess a degree of verisimilitude. Furthermore, predicated on the absence of the *tarji'band* "*Ketür sāqī ...*" in the earliest authenticated codex of *Badāyi' al-bidāya* to date – the Parisian manuscript – it can be inferred that subsequent to the genesis of this poetic oeuvre, Navā'ī instituted alterations to the structure of his inaugural compendium,

<sup>38</sup> Here, the scholar refers to Table 1 on page 68 of his doctoral dissertation.

<sup>39</sup> Suleymanov, X. *Tekstologicheskoye issledovaniye liriki Alishera Navoi*: 69.

progressively refining its artistic merit. Indeed, as Professor M.Imomnazarov elucidated (in colloquium), the *ghazal* "*Asbraqat ...*" with its profound philosophical substance furnished a distinctive commencement for *Badāyi' al-bidāya* whilst the *tarji'band* "*Ketiir sāqī ...*" could constitute an original denouement to the overarching architectonics of this anthology.

The ensuing tabular representation delineates the generic taxonomy of the eight dated manuscripts of the *Badāyi' al-bidāya divān*.

**Table 1.**

**Quantitative Indicators of Poetic Genres in the Eight Dated Manuscripts of the *Badāyi' al-bidāya Divān***

№	Genre Nomenclature	Paris manuscript	London manuscript	Tehran manuscript	Baku manuscript	Istanbul manuscript	Tashkent manuscript	Mashhad manuscript	Tehran II manuscript
	<i>Ghazal</i>	731	571	606	603	480	657	630	424
	<i>Mustaza'ad</i>	–	3	3	3	–	3	3	1
	<i>Musaddas</i>	–	2	2	2	–	2	2	1
	<i>Mukbammās</i>	–	4	4	5	–	5	5	2
	<i>Tarji'band</i>	–	3	3	3	–	3	3	1
	<i>Qit'a</i>	–	41	50	41	23	41	49	13
	<i>Ruba'i</i>	37	78	78	62	68	83	82	31
	<i>Chistan/lu ghaz (riddle)</i>	1	10	10	10	10	10	10	9
	<i>Mu'ammā (enigma)</i>	35 <sup>40</sup>	52	52	52	52	52	52	–
	<i>Tayyūq</i>	4	10	10	10	3	10	10	10
	<i>Fard (single verse)</i>	23	42	51	48	16	50	53	19
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>831</b>	<b>816</b>	<b>869</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>652</b>	<b>916</b>	<b>899</b>	<b>511</b>

H. Sulaymon elucidates: "When discussing the poet's lyrics in *Makarim al-akhloq*, *Bābur-nama*, the *Abushqa* glossary compiled for the author's works, and in various *anthologies* spanning different years, his *divāns* *Gharā'ib al-ṣiḡhar*, *Nawādir al-shabāb*, *Badāyi' al-wasat* and *Favāyid al-kibar* or their collective designation *Khazayin al-ma'ani* (Treasures of Meanings), are customarily referenced. Additionally, his corpus of Persian poetry, *Divāni Fāni*, is also mentioned. However, regarding the

<sup>40</sup> As evident, the Parisian manuscript contains 35 instances of the *mu'ammā* genre. For an inexplicable reason, H.Sulaymon listed the *mu'ammā* among the poetic genres absent from this manuscript [49: 69].

initial *divāns*, *Badāyi' al-bidāya* and *Nawādir al-nihāya*, no information exists in the scholarly literature beyond the author's own annotations. Despite the empirical existence of the manuscripts of these collections, they have remained uninvestigated and unknown"<sup>41</sup>.

Indeed, subsequent historical sources, as well as modern catalogues and indices, also present the poet's Turkic *divāns* under the rubric *Divāni Navā'i*. In our analysis, the lack of citation or scrutiny of the *divāns Badāyi' al-bidāya* and *Nawādir al-nihāya* in various manuscript works of literary and historical provenance can be elucidated by Navā'i's own assertion that "the number of newly composed verses in the two arranged *divāns* is substantial, and each couplet is not merely a precious jewel in terms of diction and meaning but a radiant luminary; ... the treasury of lexicon and expression is filled with the gems of those meanings, hence its name *Khazayin al-ma'ani*"<sup>42</sup>, implying that *Khazayin al-ma'ani* encompassed virtually all the poetry composed by the poet prior to the compilation of this omnibus *divān*.

Furthermore, in "Muhokamat al-Lughatayn" (The Comparison of the Two Languages) (905 AH/1499 CE), penned towards the terminus of his life, the author himself, when alluding to his Turkic *divāns*, mentions *Gharā'ib al-ṣiḡbar*, *Nawādir al-shabāb*, *Badāyi' al-wasat* and *Favāyid al-kibar*, but omits reference to the two *divāns* he compiled earlier – *Badāyi' al-bidāya* and *Nawādir al-nihāya*. In this regard, the tradition of confining the citation of Turkic *divāns* to the mention of *Khazayin al-ma'ani* might have been initiated by the author himself. The descriptive cataloging of the poet's Turkic *divāns* under the encompassing nomenclature *Divāni Navā'i* in contemporary bibliographic resources and catalogues raisonnés can be ascribed to the cataloguers' predilection for a unified designation pending a scrupulous textual analysis of their constituent elements, thereby precluding definitive attribution prior to thorough codicological investigation<sup>43</sup>.

Moreover, a further pertinent datum that may serve to explicate the aforementioned dual phenomena concerns the explicit and

<sup>41</sup> Suleymanov, X. *Tekstologicheskiye issledovaniye liriki Alishera Navoi*: 79.

<sup>42</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Xazoyinul ma'oniy – G'aroyibus-sig'ar*. Critical edition, with introduction and appendices by H. Sulaymonov: 9, 14.

<sup>43</sup> For a more comprehensive treatment, vide: Sirojiddinov, Sh., and A. Erkinov. "Kirish." In *Alisher Navoiy – Qomusiy lug'at*, vol. 1, 8–30. Toshkent: Sharq; Madalievva, O. *Alisher Navoiy devonlari qo'lyozmalarining tarkibiy-qiyosiy tadqiqi*: 679.

incipitcolophons of Navā'ī's *divān* manuscripts, wherein they are frequently denoted by more generalized appellations. This bibliographical convention may have exerted a substantive impact on the historiography of the poet's lyric production. In any event, specific textual features inherent in these paratextual elements have engendered our current line of inquiry.

Characteristically, within these scribal annotations, the amanuenses often omit the precise titular designation of the transcribed volume, employing formulaic valedictions such as "تمت" (The codex is completed through the beneficence of the Bestowing Sovereign) or "شد بتوفيق خدای لا ینام ان" (The transcription of this codex was finalized on ... day by the grace of the vigilant God).

Occasionally, the title of the copied artifact undergoes generic abstraction, as evidenced by "تمت هذه النسخة الشريفة الكتابة امير علشير" (This venerable exemplar, transcribed by Amir 'Ali Shīr, cognomen Navā'ī, is completed) or "تمت التمام بو نسخه شريف مسمى بامير" (This esteemed recension, identified with Amir Navā'ī, is fully completed).

Infrequently, at the terminal juncture of the poet's manuscript *divāns*, do we encounter explicit statements providing precise identification, such as "دفتر اول نوابی کیم غرایب الصغر بیله موسوم ایردی ..." (The first fascicle of Navā'ī, which bore the title *Gharā'ib al-ṣiḡbar*) or "نوابی نینک اوچلانچی دیوانی کیم بدایع الوسط بیله موسوم ایردی" (The third *divān* of Navā'ī, which was designated as *Badāyi' al-wasat*). Ergo, the scribal practice of not explicitly recording the specific title when transcribing a *divān* by Navā'ī appears to have been prevalent. This bibliographical obscurity may account for the relative absence of explicit citation of the *Badāyi' al-bidāya* and *Navādir al-nihāya divāns* within primary source materials.

Within scholarly discourse, divergent hypotheses persist concerning the precise chronology of the compilation of *Badāyi' al-bidāya*. H. Sulaymon theorized that the *Badāyi' al-bidāya divān* was constituted within the period spanning 1469 to 1485. Regarding the four extant codices of *Badāyi' al-bidāya* known during his academic career, the scholar posited: "It is demonstrably valid that these four manuscripts represent the *Badāyi' al-bidāya divān*. Firstly, the generic

constitution of all four witnesses exhibits precise replication; secondly, the generic parallelism within their internal organization aligns with the author's declarations in the prolegomenon to this *divān*; thirdly, all four of these instantiations contain the prolegomenon specifically appertaining to the inaugural *divān* – *Badāyi' al-bidāya* [1]"<sup>44</sup>.

A. Turdialiev and A. Erkinov propose the thesis that the Parisian codex of *Badāyi' al-bidāya* may constitute its archetype or Urtext. These scholars adduce the evidence that this manuscript represents the oldest attested copy to date, coupled with its diminished quantum of genres in comparison to subsequent versions, as corroborating data for their conjecture<sup>45</sup>. We concur with the aforementioned observations articulated by these investigators. Furthermore, the absence within the Parisian codex of the *tarji'band* "*Ketir sāqī ...*" widely recognized as a seminal composition within Navā'ī's youthful lyric repertoire, further substantiates the argument that this manuscript embodies the *proto-divān* of *Badāyi' al-bidāya*. While ascribing the textual history of a codex to a singular poetic instance might appear somewhat reductionist, it is conceivable that an individual lyric can encapsulate the essential characteristics of a poet's entire oeuvre. Numerous analogous examples can be identified within the literary heritage of medieval classical poets.

It is evident from extant research that the Tehran II codex exhibits lacunae in comparison to other manuscript witnesses<sup>46</sup>. The paleographical analysis of the newly identified Mashhad manuscript suggests its potential derivation from the Tashkent codex. In toto, the discovery of eight dated manuscripts of *Badāyi' al-bidāya* constitutes a significant event in the historiography of Navā'ī studies. These codices are invaluable primary sources for investigating the diachronic evolution of Navā'ī's lyric poetry.

It is a matter of record that a critical edition of *Badāyi' al-bidāya* was published in 1987<sup>47</sup>. The foreword explicitly states that "the Tashkent manuscript of the *Badāyi' al-bidāya divān* (inv. № 216) served as the base text," and that "its textual variants were collated with

<sup>44</sup> Suleymanov, X. *Tekstologicheskoye issledovaniye liriki Alishera Navoi*: 66.

<sup>45</sup> Turdialiyev, A., and Erkinov A. "Badoyi' al-bidoya"ning Navoiy davrida ko'chirilgan va yangi aniqlangan sanali oltinchi qo'lyozmasi (Sultonali Mashhadiy, Hirot, 889/1484–1485-yil)": 61.

<sup>46</sup> Boltabayev, S. "Navoiy Devonining Shoir Hayotligida Ko'chirilgan Yangi Topilgan Nusxasi Haqida.": 438-466.

<sup>47</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi' ul-bidoya*. Edited by Sh. Sharipov: 689.

photographic reproductions of earlier manuscripts of *Badāyi' al-bidāya*, including the codex transcribed in 1480 held in the National Library of Paris (inv. № 746) and the manuscript transcribed in 1482 bearing inventory number 401 in the British Museum"<sup>48</sup>.

In our considered opinion, a revised and augmented edition of this publication, incorporating a comparative analysis with the newly identified manuscript witnesses of *Badāyi' al-bidāya* would be a scholarly desideratum.

### **Conclusion.**

The following points may be presented as the conclusions of this article:

The manuscript artifacts provisionally designated *First divān* and *Dīvān of the Aq Qoyunlu Admirers* compiled by 'Alī-Shīr Navā'ī's patrons, hold considerable significance as they were organized during a period antecedent to the author's own formal *divān* compilation. Such recognition was the prerogative of a select few poets in the annals of Eastern literature. However, viewed from an alternative perspective, their structural organization represents an early stage in the evolution of Turkic *divān* writing and, by Navā'ī's criteria, could not serve as a nazira to the *divāns* of classical Persian poets. More precisely, the organizational principles predicated on the admirers' approach could not effectively compete with the curated anthologies comprising exemplars of Persian-language poetry. *Badāyi' al-bidāya* can be construed as a direct response to these prevailing circumstances. In this context, *Badāyi' al-bidāya* can be regarded not only as Navā'ī's inaugural *divān* but also as his initial engagement with Persian-language poetic collections.

*Badāyi' al-bidāya* underwent a process of progressive refinement and stylistic enhancement by the author. The textual divergences in composition between the early manuscript instantiations of this *divān*, transcribed during Navā'ī's lifetime, and later codices provide empirical evidence for this assertion. Indeed, certain poetic compositions imbued with profound philosophical content may have been specifically crafted to achieve the desired artistic integrity of this *divān*. This is because the aforementioned verses, while possessing autonomy as discrete lyric units within specific genres, functioned as

---

<sup>48</sup> Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi' ul-bidoya*. Edited by Sh. Sharipov: 5.

integral components of the overarching compositional architecture of *Badāyi' al-bidāya*. This structural coherence within his inaugural self-compiled *divān* held particular significance for the author as a pivotal point in its overall design.

Navā'ī's composition of a dedicated prolegomenon for this *divān* provided a theoretical foundation for the possibility of creating a comprehensive *divān* based on Turkic-language poetry. Furthermore, the numerous inscriptions articulated within this preface can be considered exemplars of a distinctive *fakhrīya* style within the tradition of our classical literature. One of the intended aims of this literary device was to underscore the author's elevated status within the courtly milieu and the fact that his poetic creations garnered the attention of Sultan Husayn. Another objective was to demonstrate and, moreover, to instruct future successors to the throne that, with appropriate political patronage, the potential of the Turkic language and literature could rival the acclaim achieved in other linguistic spheres.

*Badāyi' al-bidāya* in terms of both its content and structural organization, can be deemed the primordial Turkic *divān* capable of competing with the anthologies comprising exemplars of classical Persian literature. In our assessment, the relative inconspicuousness of the title *Badāyi' al-bidāya* in primary sources can be attributed to the incorporation of its constituent poems within the broader context of Navā'ī's lyric output as represented in the *Khaṣṣā'in al-ma'ānī divāns*. However, the repeated transcription of *Badāyi' al-bidāya* even after the organization of the poet's later *divāns*, underscores the enduring significance of this anthology within the historical trajectory of Turkic *divān* writing.

## REFERENCES

Abdugʻafurov, A. “Badoe’ ul-bidoya’ning Tuzilish Sanasi.” *Oʻzbek Tili va Adabiyoti*, no. 4 (1989): 3–9.

Abdugʻafurov, A. “Xazoyin ul-Maoniy’ Jumboqlari (Uchinchi Maqola).” *Oʻzbek Tili va Adabiyoti*, no. 6 (1998): 3–10.

Abu Rayhon Beruniy. *Hindiston. Tanlangan Asarlar. II Tom*. Toshkent: Oʻzbekiston, 2022.

Ali Şîr Nevâyî. *Bedâyiü'l-bidâye*. Edited by Vahit Türk and Jabbor Eshonkul. İstanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2023.

Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi’ ul-bidoya*. Baku manuscript. Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences Institute of Manuscripts, no. 3010, 889/1484.

Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi’ ul-bidoya*. Edited by Sh. Sharipov. MAT. Yigirma Tomlik, Vol. 1. Toshkent: Fan, 1987.

Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi’ ul-bidoya*. Istanbul manuscript. Turkey, Sulaymaniya, Ayasofya no. 3981. Herat, 889/1484-1485. Scribe: Sultonali Mashhadiy.

Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi’ ul-bidoya*. London manuscript. British Museum, no. 401, 887/1482-83.

Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi’ ul-bidoya*. Mashhad manuscript. Kitobxona-yi Oston-i Qudsi Razaviy, no. 4783, Jumadi I 896/1491, March–April. Scribe: Darvish Muhammad Tāqi.

Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi’ ul-bidoya*. Paris manuscript. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, no. 746, 885/1480-81.

Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi’ ul-bidoya*. Tashkent manuscript. Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, State Museum of Literature, no. 216. Herat, 891/1486. Scribe: Ali ibn Nur.

Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi’ ul-bidoya*. Tehran manuscript. Islamic Consultative Assembly Library, no. 14197, 888, Safar 1483, March–April.

Alisher Navoiy. *Badoyi’ ul-bidoya*. Tehran-2 manuscript. National Library of Iran, no. 1082924, 906/1500-1501.

Alisher Navoiy. *Farbod va Shirin*. OʻzR FASHI, no. 5018, 889/1484.

Alisher Navoiy. *Ilk devon. 1466-yili koʻchirilgan qoʻlyozmaning faksimile nashri*. Edited by H. Sulaymon. Toshkent: Fan, 1968.

Alisher Navoiy. *Kulliyot*. Topkapi Library, Revan Fund, no. 808. Herat, 901/1496–1497. Scribe: Darvish Muhammad Tāqi.

Alisher Navoiy. *Mubokamat ul-lugʻatayn*. France, Bibliothèque nationale de France, no. Supl. Turc. 317. Copied by Ali Hijroniy (facsimile used from Q. Sodiqov edition).

Alisher Navoiy. *Mubokamatu-l-lugʻatayn*. Edited and annotated by Q. Sodiqov. Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2017.

Alisher Navoiy. *Oqquyunli muxlislar devoni. 1471-yili koʻchirilgan qoʻlyozmaning faksimile nashri*. Edited by A. Erkinov. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, 2015.

Alisher Navoiy. *Xazoyinul maʼoniy – Gʻaroyibus-sigʻar*. Critical edition, with introduction and appendices by H. Sulaymonov. 4 vols. Vol. 1. Toshkent: Fan, 1987.

Birnbaum, Eduard. “Ottoman Turkish and Chaghatay Literature: An Early 16th Century Manuscript of Nawaʼi’s Divan in Ottoman Orthography.” *Central Asiatic Journal* 20 (1976): 157–190.

Boltabayev, S. “Navoiy Devonining Shoir Hayotligida Koʻchirilgan Yangi Topilgan Nusxasi Haqida.” In *Alisher Navoiy va Sharq Renessansi (Xalqaro Simpozium Materiallari)*, 438–466. Toshkent, 2022.

Eckmann, J. “Nevai’nin İlk Divanları Üzerine.” *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı. Belleten* 13 (1970): 253–262.

Erkinov, A. “Badoyi’ al-bidoya”ning Navoiy davrida koʻchirilgan va yangi aniqlangan sanali beshinchi qoʻlyozmasi (888-yil, safar oyi/1483-yil, mart-aprel).” In *Alisher Navoiy va XXI asr*, 51–57. Toshkent: Turon iqbol, 2018.

Erkinov, A. “V.V. Bartold nega Navoiyni tarjimon va taqlidchi deb hisobladi?” In *Alisher Navoiy va Sharq renessansi (xalqaro simpozium materiallari)*, 132–158. Toshkent, 2022.

Erkinov, A. *Mustaqilligimizning 31 yilligiga munosib tuhfa: Alisher Navoiy “Badoe’ ul-bidoya”sining sakkizinchi nusxasi aniqlandi*. Uza.uz.

Hakimov, M. *Navoiy asarlari qoʻlyozmalarining tavsifi*. Toshkent: Fan, 1983, 199.

Hayitmetov, A. *Navoiy lirikasi*. Toshkent: Fan, 1961.

Imomnazarov, M. “Alisher Navoiy lirik merosi matnshunosligining dolzarb masalalari.” In *Alisher Navoiy va XXI asr*, 6–10. Toshkent: Tamaddun, 2017.

Imomnazarov, M. “Uch devon muqoyasasi (Alisher Navoiy she’riyati lirik janrlar xronologiyasiga doir).” In *Alisher Navoiy va XXI asr*, 12–17. Toshkent: Turon iqbol, 2018.

Imomnazarov, M. *Musulmon mintaqa madaniyati rivojida ‘majoz tariqi’ bosqiqchi. 2-kitob. Alisher Navoiy*. Toshkent: Mumtoz so‘z, 2022.

Imomnazarov, M. *XXI asr. Alisher Navoiy lirik merosi matnshunosligi muammolari*. Toshkent, 2021.

Imomnazarov, M. *XXI asr: Alisher Navoiy lirik merosi matnshunosligi muammolari*. Toshkent: Donishmand ziyosi, 2021.

Jo‘rabojev, O. “Navoiy asarlari qo‘lyozma va matnlarini o‘rganishning ba’zi masalalari.” In *Alisher Navoiy va XXI asr*, 32–38. Toshkent, 2016.

Juraboyev, O. “Kitabet Sanatının Bir Örneği Olarak Ali Şir Nevai’nin ‘Bedayü’l-Bidaye’ Divanının Taşkent Nüshası.” *Uluslararası Beşeri Bilimler ve Sanat Dergisi* 1 (2020): 14–27.

Kudelin, A. B. “Alisher Navoi – rodonachalnik uzbekskoy literatury (K 575-letiyu so dnya rojdeniya).” *Izvestiya RAN. Seriya literatury i yazyka* 75, no. 4 (2016): 5–11.

Kudelin, A. B. “Alisher Navoiy – o‘zbek adabiyoti asoschisi (Navoiy tavalludining 575-yilligiga).” *Journal of Central Asian Renaissance*, Special Issue 1 (2021): 33–41.

Levend, A. “Türkiye Kitaplıklarındaki Nevai Yazmaları.” *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı. Belleten* (Ankara, 1958): 127–209.

Madaliyeva, O. “Alisher Navoiy ‘Badoyi’ ul-bidoya’ Devoni va Uning Qo‘lyozmalari.” In *Professor Hamid Sulaymon Nomidagi Yosh Matnshunoslarning Ilmiy-Amaliy Respublika Konferensiyasi Materiallari To‘plami*, 6–11. Toshkent: Yosh Avlod Matbaa, 2023.

Madaliyeva, O. “Alisher Navoiy ‘Badoyi’ ul-bidoya’ Devonining Mashhad Qo‘lyozmasi.” In *Alisher Navoiy va XXI Nomli Xalqaro Ilmiy-Amaliy Konferensiyasi Materiallari*, 209–218. Toshkent–Boku: Zebo Print, 2023.

Madaliyeva, O. “Alisher Navoiy ‘Badoyi’ ul-bidoya’ Devonining O‘rganilish Tarixi.” In *Alisher Navoiy va XXI Nomli Xalqaro Ilmiy-Amaliy Konferensiyasi Materiallari*, 400–408. Toshkent–Bursa: Zebo Print, 2023.

Madaliyeva, O. *Alisher Navoiy devonlari qo‘lyozmalarining tarkibiy-qiyosiy tadqiqi*. Toshkent: Donishmand ziyosi, 2021.

Nagiyeva, J. *Bakinskiye rukopisi Alishera Navoi*. Baku: Elm, 1986.

Ramazonov, N. “Alisher Navoiyda ‘tahrirni tahrir’.” *O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti*, 2006/1: 17–23.

Ramazonov, N. “Yana ‘tahrirni tahrir’ masalasi xususida.” *O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti*, 2007/1: 78–89.

Salohiy, D. “Tahlil va talqin mas’uliyati.” *O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti*, 2006/1: 74–78.

Salohiy, D. *Badoe’ ul-bidoya malohati*. Toshkent: Fan, 2004.

Semenov, A. *Opisaniye persidskix, arabskix i tureskix rukopisey*. Tashkent: Izdatelstvo sredneaziatskogo gosudartvennogo universiteta, 1935.

Sirojiddinov, Sh., and A. Erkinov. “Kirish.” In *Alisher Navoiy – Qomusiy lug‘at*, vol. 1, 8–30. Toshkent: Sharq.

Sodiqov, Q. *Matnsbunoslik va manbashunoslik asoslari*. Toshkent, 2017.


Subtelny, M. “Mir ‘Ali Shir Nawa’i.” In *Encyclopedie de l’Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. 7, 90–93. Leiden–Paris: Brill, 1993.

Suleymanov, X. *Tekstologicheskoye issledovaniye liriki Alishera Navoi / V trex tomax / tom pervyy*. Tashkent–Moskva, 1955–1961, 415.

Toutant, M. “Taqlid obrazi sharqshunoslik ko‘zgisida.” *Journal of Central Asian Renaissance*, Special Issue 1 (2021): 42–59.

Turdialiyev, A., and Erkinov A. “Badoyi’ al-bidoya”ning Navoiy davrida ko‘chirilgan va yangi aniqlangan sanali oltinchi qo‘lyozmasi (Sultonali Mashhadiy, Hirot, 889/1484–1485-yil).” In *Alisher Navoiy va XXI asr*, 57–62. Toshkent: Turon iqbol, 2018.

Volin, S. “Opisaniye rukopisey proizvedeniy Navoi v leningradskix sobraniyax.” In *Alisher Navoi*, edited by K. Borovkova, 203–235. Moskva–Leningrad: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR, 1946.

 KAMU YÖNETİMİ ENSTİTÜSÜ SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ	
<b>Makale Bilgileri:</b>	
<b>Değerlendirme:</b>	<i>İki Dış Hakem / Çift Taraflı Körleme</i>
<b>Etik Beyan:</b>	<i>Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur.</i>
<b>Benzerlik Taraması:</b>	<i>Yapıldı / Turnitin / intihal.net vb.</i>
<b>Etik Bildirim:</b>	<i>bilgi@turkan.org.tr</i>
<b>Etik Kurul Kararı:</b>	<i>Etik Kurul Kararından muafır.</i>
<b>Katılımcı Rızası:</b>	<i>Katılımcı yoktur.</i>
<b>Mali Destek:</b>	<i>Çalışma için herhangi bir kurum ve projeden mali destek alınmamıştır.</i>
<b>Çıkar Çatışması:</b>	<i>Çalışmada kişiler ve kurumlar arası çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır.</i>
<b>Telif Hakları &amp; Lisans:</b>	<i>Çalışmada kullanılan görsellerle ilgili telif hakkı sahiplerinden gerekli izinler alınmıştır. Yazarlar dergide yayınlanan çalışmalarının telif hakkına sahiptirler ve çalışmaları CC BY-NC 4.0 lisansı altında yayımlanmaktadır.</i>
<b>Article Information:</b>	
<b>Peer-Review:</b>	<i>Double anonymized - Two External</i>
<b>Ethical Statement:</b>	<i>It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited.</i>
<b>Plagiarism Checks:</b>	<i>Yes / Turnitin / intihal.net etc.</i>
<b>Complaints:</b>	<i>bilgi@turkan.org.tr</i>
<b>Ethics Committee Approval:</b>	<i>It is exempt from the Ethics Committee Approval</i>
<b>Informed Consent:</b>	<i>No participants.</i>
<b>Financial Support:</b>	<i>The study received no financial support from any institution or project.</i>
<b>Conflict of Interest:</b>	<i>No conflict of interest.</i>
<b>Copyrights &amp; Licence:</b>	<i>The required permissions have been obtained from the copyright holders for the images and photos used in the study. Authors publishing with the journal retain the copyright to their work licensed under the CC BY-NC 4.0.</i>