An Ottoman Dragoman Who "Translated/Converted" Himself: Murad Bey and His *Tesviyetü't-Teveccüh ilal-Hakk*

*Ekin Öyken**

Kendini "Çeviren" Bir Osmanlı Mütercimi: Murad Bey ve Tesviyetü't-Teveccüh ilel-Hakk *Eseri*

Öz ◼ On altıncı yüzyıl Osmanlı tercümanı Murad bin Abdullah (1509 – yak. 1585), ilk bakışta, savaş esiri olarak Osmanlı topraklarına getirildikten sonra, köle olarak maruz kaldıkları muameleden kurtulmak için İslam'ı seçenlerden biri gibi görünebilir. Ancak, burada çeviri tarihi perspektifinden inceleyeceğim *Tesviyetü't-teveccüh ilel-Hakk* [Yüzünü Allah'a Çevirmek/Doğrultmak] adlı uzun risalesi, Murad Bey'in İslam'a karşı tutumunun daha samimi olabileceğine işaret etmektedir. *Tesviye*, yayımlanmamış ve dolayısıyla nispeten bilinmeyen, Osmanlı Türkçesi ve Latince olmak üzere iki dilli bir metindir. Adından da anlaşılacağı üzere, bir yandan ilmihal kitaplarını, diğer yandan ben-anlatısı olarak Augustinus'un *Confessiones*'iyle başlayan itikatname literatürünü hatırlatan teolojik nitelikte bir eserdir, ancak İslam'ı Hristiyanlıkla karşılaştırarak ele alıyor ve büyük ölçüde tasavvuftan etkilenmiş bir bakış açısını yansıtıyor olması itibarıyla da benzerlerinden ayrılır. Eserin, asıl adı

Balázs Somlyai olan yazarı Murad Bey, Macaristan ya da Erdel kökenli bir savaş esiridir ve gençliğinde Osmanlı başkentine getirilmiş, daha sonra orada İslam'ı seçmiş ve eserin sonundaki otobiyografik bölümün bize bildirdiği üzere sarayın baş Latince tercümanı olmuştur. Risale, İslam ve Hristiyanlığın farklı dönemlerdeki alımlanışına ilişkin genel bilgilerin yanı sıra, Osmanlı devletinde o zamanlar yeni şekillenmekte olan Sünni ortodoksi ve dönemin Avrupa'sındaki dinî bölünmeyle ilgili çağdaş ve benzersiz bir bakış açısı sunması bakımından tarihsel anlamda büyük öneme sahiptir. Dahası, Murad Bey Osmanlı bürokrasisindeki elitlerin yozlaşmasına karşı, mühtedi olması itibarıyla beklenmedik keskinlikte bir eleştiri ortaya koyar. Eser 1557'de tamamlanmış ve Avrupalılar tarafından geniş çapta okunmasını bekleyen yazarın kendisi tarafından on yıl sonra Latinceye çevrilmiştir, ancak eser sadece bilinen üç el yazmasıyla günümüze ulaştığı için yazarın bu beklentisi gerçekleşmemiş gibi görünmektedir (bunlardan birinde Türkçe orijinal metin ve Latince çevirisinin tamamı, birinde iki dilli metnin eksik bir müsveddesi, diğerinde ise sadece orijinal metin bulunmaktadır). Risalenin hazırlamakta olduğum açımlamalı İngilizce çevirisiyle ilgili çalışmama dayanan bu yazıda, *Tesviye*'yi çeviri tarihi açısından, özellikle Latince çeviriden ve kaynak metinden pasajları yakın okuma suretiyle inceleyerek ele alacağım.

Anahtar kelimeler: Çeviri Tarihi Yazımı, Öz-çeviri, Din ve Çeviri, Osmanlı Mütercimleri, Tercüman Murad Bey (Balázs Somlyai), Avrupa'da Hristiyanlar ve Müslümanlar Arasındaki İlişkiler

The lives and works of future dragomans who had been captured in war and brought to the Ottoman Empire (Mehmed İhlâsî, Ali Ufukî and İbrahim Müteferrika come to mind, among many others[1]) are of interest to anyone who studies the history of European-Ottoman relations. Among them Murad ibn Abdullah (henceforth Murad Bey), born in Transylvania[2] in 1509 as Balázs Somlyai, represents, in the light of current evidence and literature, a unique case. A voluminous bilingual treatise on religion titled *Tesviyetü't-teveccüh ilal-Hakk* [On Properly Submitting/Directing One's Face to God[3]] (henceforth *Tesviye*)

---

1 For Müteferrika, see Orlin Sabev, *İbrahim Müteferrika ya da İlk Osmanlı Matbaa Serüveni, 1726-1746. Yeniden Değerlendirme* (İstanbul: Yeditepe, 2006); for Mehmed İhlâsî, see Abdülhak Adnan Adıvar, *Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim*, 4th ed. (İstanbul: Remzi, 1982), pp. 126-128; Gottfried Hagen, *Ein osmanischer Geograph bei der Arbeit: Entstehung und Gedankenwelt von Kātib Čelebis Ğihānnümā* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 2003), pp. 66-68, 277-281.

2 Linguistic and cultural territories and not national ones are meant by this and similar designations.

3 For this working translation of the title, I especially consider Murad Bey's own testimony (see Table 11 below) in the Latin translation. The key to the meaning of the original title is the Islamic concept of *wajh* (face); on this concept, and its meaning within the context of

that was written in 1556-1557 and translated from Turkish into Latin a decade later by him,[4] has been transmitted by three manuscripts so far known, all in the author's hand, of which one has the source text alone and one, which I assume was a draft, is in a badly mutilated condition.[5] The work contains directly and indirectly autobiographical sections. The fact that such self-translations by dragomans which also qualify as ego-documents are rare, and the religious matters (Christian as well as Islamic) treated there, are contextually and historically related to the theological polemics that played an important role in the shaping of modern European as well as Ottoman culture gives *Tesviye* a significant position in the history of several fields. As a Latinist who has been studying lately the history of classical receptions in Turkey, I aim in this essay to present a preliminary description and contextualization of *Tesviye* from the general perspective of translation history.

"submitting one's face to God", see Angelika Neuwirth, "Face of God - Face of Man: The Significance of the Direction of Prayer in Islam", *Self, Soul and Body in Religious Experience*, ed. A. I. Baumgarten, J. Assmann, and G. G. Stroumsa (Leiden: Brill, 1998), p. 300. It has been translated as "Guide for turning [or orienting] oneself towards God [or truth]" and "The Guide for One's Turning towards God/Truth" by Krstić and others who followed her, see Tijana Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011), p. 98; "Of Translation and Empire. Sixteenth-century Ottoman Imperial Interpreters as Renaissance Go-betweens", *The Ottoman World*, ed. Christine Woodhead (London: Routledge, 2012), p. 136; "Murad ibn Abdullah", *Christian Muslim-Relations. A Bibliographical History. Volume 7. Central and Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa and South America (1500-1600)*, ed. David Thomas et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2015), p. 701.

4   Murad Bey revised the Latin title as "Coaequalitas faciei versus Deum" (Add. 19894, fol. 7ᵇ), which was earlier "Intentus vultus erga Deum" (A.F. 180, p. 2); see the following note for the sigla of the manuscripts.

5   Of the three exemplars the earliest one (1560), which has been recently discovered by Pamuk [see İsmail Emre Pamuk, "Bir 16. Yüzyıl Okuryazarının Zihin Dünyası: Tercüman Murad ve *Tesviyetü't-Teveccüh İle'l-Hak* Adlı Eseri" (MA thesis), İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2021, pp. 13-17] in the manuscript collection of the T.C. Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Kütüphanesi [Library of the Turkish Religious Affairs Directorate] (nr. 210, henceforth D.), contains the Turkish text alone, while the Austrian National Library copy (A.F. 180, henceforth A.), which has the incomplete draft (written after 1568), and the British Library copy (Add. 19894, folio numbers in all *Tesviye* citations refer to this copy unless otherwise stated), which is the most complete and presumably the latest one (dating from the reign of Murad III, 1574-95), contain both the Turkish source text and its Latin translation. My observations are based mainly on these bilingual exemplars.

Writing the History of an Exotic Translation

Each translation is unique,[6] but I believe that Murad Bey's *Tesviye* was and is, in many respects, exotic also. To my knowledge, it is one of the oldest and longest Latin translations of a treatise in Turkish, and one of the very few, if not the only self-translation of this kind. By a happy coincidence, the extant manuscripts include a draft (with corrections) of the translation, which provides a window, albeit a small one, to the mind of Murad Bey. *Tesviye* and its translation is the embodiment, that is, the testimony, of the cultural and religious conversion experience of a translation professional. Although there are historians who roughly describe it, not without some reason, as a "Muslim catechism",[7] the genre of *Tesviye* is not less idiosyncratic.[8] Therefore, I think that the originality of the case deserves a careful meta-theoretical consideration to be made here.

With the following questions in mind, which I certainly cannot hope to resolve here, I have neither ruled out nor overvalued anecdotal evidence when attempting to locate *Tesviye* translation in historical time and space.

- Can a group of translations and a single translation be studied with the same methodology or theoretical framework of historiography?
- Where does the historiography of a translation differ from its criticism?
- What can the close reading of a translated text reveal about its "translation project",[9] as the translation philosopher, Antoine Berman calls it?
- How does a study of translation history that focuses on the reading of the translated text differ from a text-linguistic reading, especially in the case of a self-translation?
- What is the nature of intra- and interdisciplinary perspectivism in translation historiography?

---

6 Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond*, 2nd ed. (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2012), p. 22.

7 See for instance Pál Ács, *Reformations in Hungary in the Age of the Ottoman Conquest* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019), p. 160.

8 The work has been convincingly categorized as an instance of vernacular theology by Pamuk, "Tercüman Murad", pp. 73-115.

9 I use the term "translation project" in the sense defined by the translation philosopher Berman, that is, a flexible series of purposeful decisions that shapes the translation but does not contradict its immediate and intuitive character, see Antoine Berman, *Pour une critique des traductions. John Donne* (Paris: Gallimard, 1995), pp. 76-79.

There are number of meta-theoretical accounts that strive to formulate the particularity of the field of translation history and its difference from general historiography.[10] From my current point of view, the answer seems to be rather straightforward: Translation history is the intersubjective description of translations from a reliable perspective on textual and cultural transfer, with the self-reflexive methodology that the interdisciplinarity of the matter requires, by researchers who are concerned with, experienced and knowledgeable about translation. This statement may seem vague or prescriptive on the contrary, like most definitions of this demarcating kind, but it has, I believe, the strength of reminding historians on one hand, that they need to make sense of how translation works, in order to write its history, and translation scholars on the other hand, of the importance of the historical methodology. To illustrate the first through my case study, it will suffice to say that the original title of the work, *Tesviyetü't-teveccüh ilal-Hakk*, is rather unusual for the cultural polysystem it belongs to, and makes more sense when read with its expansive Latin translation at 152^b (*conversio et rectificatio et coaequalitas vultus versus deum* [The turning, pointing and aligning of the face towards God]), which is better grasped when one knows about translation decisions such as lexicographical equivalence. In that, we are not bound up in synonymity or common semes in Latin *conversio*, *rectificatio* and *coaequalitas* (read *coaequatio*), which all gain their full meaning that reflects the author's own religious experience, when taken with the rest of the translated title.[11] This insight,

---

10 See, among others, Anthony Pym, *Method in Translation History* (Manchester: St-Jerome Publishing, 1998); Lieven D'hulst, "Translation History", *Handbook of Translation Studies. Volume 1* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2010); Christopher Rundle, "History Through a Translation Perspective", *Between Cultures and Texts. Itineraries in Translation History*, ed. Chalvin Antoine et al. (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011); "Translation as an Approach to History", *Translation Studies*, 5/2 (2012); Mirella Agorni, "Translation History: Just Another History?", *Recent Trends in Translation Studies. An Anglo-Italian Perspective*, ed. Sara Laviosa, Giovanni Iamartino, and Eileen Mulligan (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2021).

11 When blaming inadequate and unfaithful translations for the distortion of scriptures, Murad Bey makes a similar point by saying that "Although one can grasp various common meanings of a word in a foreign language, they cannot all by any means be kept when translating into another language. All but one meaning are to be excluded" ("*Ve bir dilden dile olan lafızda niçe maânî-i müştereke anlansa âhar dile döndürüldükte bir ma'nâdan gayriye istidlâline çâre yoktur. Kalanı ketm olunmak lâzım gelir*"; translated as "*item si in una quadam dictione varia communia sensua intelligerentur in interpretatione aligenarum linguarum nullatenus conherere possunt. praeter unum sensum cetera derelinqui videntur*", 11^b; see also p. 18 in the copy A).

in return, can only be obtained through adequate description of the translation by placing it in a historical framework, and this is where its linguistic dimension is most likely to merge again with its corresponding historical and socio-cultural dimensions, which require their respective methodologies. However, this obviously does not mean that translation projects of the past can be restored to their historical place with complete accuracy.

The same translation can give rise to different (but not necessarily competing) translation histories, in other words, can be located at different positions in history.[12] As one may expect, this plurality originates mainly from the study of the same translated text and translation process by different researchers using different theoretical frameworks. This, in turn, relies largely on the question of what should be taken as fact, which is part of the more general discussion on historiographical epistemology.[13] The generalization, which has been applied to the field of translation studies by Toury and others,[14] that the distinctive perspective and approach of each theory is a major determinant in the identification of facts appears to hold up here. Nevertheless, exploring translations and translation processes from different theoretical angles, does not imply the simplistic view that the best history and historiography should be determined through scientific elimination. That is because different approaches mean different research questions and different facts. These approaches, moreover, do not need to be microhistories, they can present or contribute to comprehensive historical narratives.

Indeed, a common tendency that can be observed today in translation historiography is building narratives and presenting theses on the conditions, realization, and influence of translations through examination of the research material within the framework of a particular theory and its specific concepts that previous knowledge, observation and experience have established. However, it is crucial to question what is to be included as material, and not to confuse this with research

---

12 For a philosophical account on this, see Philip Wilson, "The Philosophy of History and Translation", *The Routledge Handbook of Translation History*, ed. Christopher Rundle (London: Routledge, 2021).

13 See Paul Newall, "Historiographic Objectivity", *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography*, ed. Aviezer Tucker (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009).

14 Cf. D'hulst, "Translation History", p. 397; see Gideon Toury, "Translation – A Cultural-Semiotic Perspective", *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics, Tome 2, N - Z*, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1986), p. 1112; Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, pp. 17-25.

object,[15] which denotes the thing that a study aims to understand, not the means used for this aim. I am inclined towards a comprehensive definition of material that includes not only the source and translated texts in a strict sense and all other concrete documents that are relevant to the translations under scrutiny, but also the various "relational patterns" or "networks", including intertextual relations, that these sources bring to light.[16] I think that this latter does not need to be considered hopelessly subjective nor excluded from the material on account of its being abstract or intangible.[17] Whether these networks and the scientific speculation based on material[18] should be regarded as one and the same thing, seems to depend on the kind and degree of objectivity attributed to historiography.[19]

It appears to me that not a few researchers in the field of translation history have been steered between thoroughly presenting the extant material up to the standards of contemporary historiography and placing it in a well-accepted theoretical framework through which research questions can be answered satisfactorily.[20] This, I think, results in many cases, either in piling up of the data without adequate regard to correlations, or, on the contrary, in reduction in order to fit them in a chosen framework.[21] This aspect of the matter can be thought of as inevitable due to the enormous mass of data involved in this line of study. Besides, none of these outcomes is entirely unfruitful. The data, for instance, put forth by studies that show the first tendency provide an important source for studies that implement a particular theory. Also, it may be thought that theory-ladenness is

---

15 See Gideon Toury, "A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies", *Dispositio*, VII/19-20 (1982), p. 25.

16 This has been called "node of intertextuality" by Lawrence Venuti, "Translation, Intertextuality, Interpretation", *Romance Studies*, 27/3 (2013), p. 159.

17 See F. R. Ankersmit, *Narrative Logic. A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1983), p. 104 and passim; cf. C. Behan McCullagh, "Colligation," *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography*, ed. Aviezer Tucker (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), pp. 155-158.

18 For instance, "colligatory claims" (see McCullagh, "Colligation") or "narratios" (see Ankersmit, *Narrative Logic*).

19 On different kinds of objectivity see Heather Douglas, "The Irreducible Complexity of Objectivity", *Synthese*, 138/3 (2004).

20 This is the case even though no theory can be final in the field of humanities.

21 For a similar but more general observation, see Lieven D'hulst and Yves Gambier, "General Introduction", *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge. Sources, Concepts, Effects*, ed. Lieven D'hulst and Yves Gambier (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2018), pp. 1-2.

not a drawback in terms of methodology, as the material excluded by one perspective can be considered by another.[22] Nonetheless, such reasoning does not escape the following pitfall of the first approach: Considering the difficulty of staying out of the range of the inflation of theories in the fields of cultural and translation studies, data gathering still remains problematic, as it is unconsciously or uncritically carried out to a considerable extent under the influence of theoretical frameworks,[23] and this more often than not contributes to misleading discourses that attribute extensive validity to limited observations.[24]

For instance, because *Tesviye* of Murad Bey is a self-translation, and some theories that rely on a specific definition of translation do not regard this kind of interlingual transfer as translation proper, since they consider the target text as an organic part or continuation of the source text rather than its version or result,[25] it may be asserted that the present study along with the product, process, and agent that are studied concern literary history or history at large, more than translation history. However, even if we suppose it to be true for a moment, this assumption weakens once we begin to gather information on Murad Bey and his work, and learn that he was a professional dragoman and apparently an active advocate of Islam, and his only other original writing that reached us (in an

---

22 For a fictional but realistic case, see Wilson, "The Philosophy of History and Translation", p. 224.

23 A similar observation can be found in Venuti, "Translation, Intertextuality, Interpretation", pp. 163-164.

24 Although this bias may be seen from a philosophical viewpoint (especially Gadamer's hermeneutics) as a natural and necessary element for understanding facts, I am more concerned with concrete problems of methodology. Also, the wide perspective of the history of knowledge does not require to abandon scientific thinking for intuition. Finally, the relation between facts and the data through which they are studied is an important issue. The critical question is whether the same data can be used to define different facts. The answer to this depends, of course, on the definition of data. By contrast, according to Popper a point of view is required prior to all observations, see Newall, "Objectivity", p. 174. I think that one should not forget the obvious difference between point of view, research question, theory, and theoretical framework.

25 See Elizabeth Klosty Beaujour, *Alien Tongues: Bilingual Russian Writers of the "First" Emigration* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), p. 112 cited in Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, p. 100, n. 5; Rainier Grutman and Trish Van Bolderen, "Self-Translation", *A Companion to Translation Studies*, ed. Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter (West Sussex: Wiley, 2014), p. 324; Jan Walsh Hokenson and Marcella Munson, *History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2007), p. 199.

autograph manuscript), a trilingual (in Turkish, Latin, and Hungarian, probably his native tongue) religious hymn praising Islam and Sufism, was translated, and written by him in both Arabic and Latin letters.[26] These and other observations that I will present shortly, suggest that the Latin text of *Tesviye* qualifies as translation or "assumed translation" to say it with Toury according to the related norms of the time,[27] as it was clearly aimed at communicating some foreign knowledge, ideas and positions that linguistic, cultural and geopolitical borders had largely isolated. As this simple example illustrates, too restrictive a theoretical framework may result in disregarding or even discarding some valuable source of information.

These well-known methodological concerns that surfaced during the study design for this rare translation led me to question once more whether a non-theory-laden way to collect and describe data that strives for methodological objectivity rather than claiming for or against it too readily can be possible for the historiography of a particular translation. Obviously, this does not mean complete abandonment of theoretical frameworks, it aims, on the contrary, to provide more comprehensive and reliable data for them to use.

There have been many scholars who tackled issues of this nature in several fields,[28] and in translation historiography a similar questioning seems to have led Pym to coin the metaphor "translation archaeology".[29] Indeed, this is not a new concept or a heuristic term, but an instrumental metaphor,[30] and reflects

---

26 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Marsh 179. For a study of the hymn and a transcription of its Turkish text see Franz Babinger, "Der Pfortendolmetsch Murad und seine Schriften", *Literaturdenkmäler aus Ungarns Türkenzeit. Nach Handschriften in Oxford und Wien*, ed. Franz Babinger and Robert Gragger (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1927), pp. 42-53. While a transcription of the Hungarian text by Gragger can be found in the same volume ("Der magyarische Text von Murad's 'Glaubenshymnus' mit deutscher Übersetzung", pp. 55-69), the Latin text has not been published yet.

27 Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, pp. 26-31.

28 See C. Behan McCullagh, "Can Our Understanding of Old Texts be Objective?", *History and Theory*, 30/3 (1991)

29 Pym, *Method*, p. 5.

30 Because systematic gathering of data from a variety of sources, to which Pym referred as "archaeology" in 1998, was then as it is now a prerequisite in all historical studies. Besides, he did not include this term (apart from a single obviously metaphorical occurrence, in his recently published survey of the conceptual tools that have been used in translation history, see Anthony Pym, "Conceptual Tools in Translation History", *The Routledge Handbook of Translation History*, ed. Christopher Rundle (London & New York: Routledge, 2021). On the other hand, a metaphor can serve at the same time as a conceptual

in translation historiography the expansion of the research objects, which have evolved from being limited to source and translated texts to include social and individual aspects of translators along with the cultures they inhabit and the norms they hold. From this encompassing perspective, which has been gradually established since almost half a century, I attempt to playfully deflect and stretch Pym's metaphor by inquiring into the possibility and conditions of constituting "excavation inventories" for translations.[31] Apart from the descriptive study of translational norms, which is a different avenue of research despite the similarity of its initial considerations,[32] can we somehow define some objective or intersubjective categories for translation history, in a similar way that excavation inventories record the size, material, colour (according to the Munsell catalogue) and location of archaeological finds before identifying them? Can this be done in translation historiography without relapsing into either unconscious subjectivity or illusions of empiricism? This is certainly not a new problem,[33] and the contribution I, with my classicist background, can hope to offer now towards its solution is nothing more than a proposal to revise the place we assign to translated texts and their close reading.[34]

---

tool, but I believe that this is not the case with "translation archaeology" as it has apparently no more heuristic function than the "detective work" used in a similar sense by Pym, following Collingwood, one would say, if he had referred to him, see Robin George Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 243, 266-268, 281-282; Pym, *Method*, p. 5; "Conceptual Tools in Translation History", p. 86. On the place of metaphors in discourses on translation, see Lieven D'hulst, *Essais d'histoire de la traduction. Avatars de Janus* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2014), pp. 45-61; James St André, "Tropes (Metaphor, Metonymy)", *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge. Sources, Concepts, Effects*, ed. Lieven D'hulst and Yves Gambier (Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2019).

31 Holmes had pondered this, and proposed the descriptive model of "repertory of features" that is comparable to Linnaeus taxonomy in terms of the presence of agreed criteria, see James S. Holmes, "Describing Literary Translations. Models and Methods", *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, ed. James S. Holmes, José Lambert, and Raymond van den Broeck (Leuven: Acco, 1978), pp. 80-81.

32 See Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, p. 17.

33 For a general discussion, see Jack Wright, "Rescuing Objectivity: A Contextualist Proposal", *Philosophy of Social Sciences*, 48/4 (2018); for a philosophical perspective that follows Wittgenstein, see Wilson, "The Philosophy of History and Translation", pp. 224-226.

34 D'hulst and Gambier emphasize the methodological challenges encountered by scholars from other disciplines, see "General Introduction", pp. 1-2.

Such an approach, I think, will differ from Pym's translation archaeology, in that all other sources will be used to deepen a study that (re)focuses on the translated text. Although I am not fond of distinctions using mutually implicating terms, it may be useful to draw a line here between "target text" and "translated text", the first being an intertext or a function, while the other refers to the linguistic product[35] that results from the activity of translation. While Pym relegates the translated text to a secondary position both as a research object and material,[36] the approach that I conceive maintains the centrality of translated text throughout the study.[37] The reactionary position of translation studies that tends to condemn the quest for equivalence and the regress to the assumed mother disciplines, namely literary studies and linguistics,[38] appears to have contributed to the relative neglect of the detailed and multifaceted study of translated texts, as if the analysis of equivalence is the only possible reason for such a study. However, there can be much more for translation historians to study in translated texts. Giving the long tradition of thinking with metaphors in the history of translation knowledge,[39] I will venture to apply an overworked metaphor, the refraction of light through a prism, to this renewed focus on the translated text. In that, as the white light consists of a spectrum of colours, the translated text is never single-layered, and quite vast an array of historical facts can radiate from it.[40] I must confess that, had the textual material of the present study not been self-translation manuscripts that were never published, my emphasis to the importance of translated texts might

---

35 While the term *translatum* (or Germ. *Translat*), which was coined by Kade and later used by Reiß and Vermeer, serves to distinguish the process of translation from its end product, the distinction that I draw here aims at separating two different kinds of linguistic product of translation, see Otto Kade, *Zufall und Gesetzmäßigkeit in der Übersetzung* (Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1968), p. 33; Katharina Reiss and Hans J. Vermeer, *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action. Skopos Theory Explained* (London: Routledge, 2014), p. 4. Cf. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, pp. 17-25.

36 Pym, *Method*, pp. ix-x.

37 The translated text in this context is a direct reflection of the socio-cognitive process of translation and serves as a guide rather than a border.

38 See Susan Bassnett, "Culture and Translation", *A Companion to Translation Studies*, ed. Piotr Kuhiwczak and Karin Littau (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2007).

39 On thinking with metaphors in Translation Studies, see D'hulst, *Essais*, pp. 45-61.

40 This should not be seen as a token of adherence to Newtonian epistemology. Epistemological problems of the history of translation are too complex to be dealt with here; for a comprehensive survey, see D'hulst and Gambier, "General Introduction".

have been less pronounced.[41] This being said, unusual cases can be instrumental for taking a step back and seeing things differently.

The conceived approach will be target-oriented also. It goes without saying that from the target-oriented historiography here it should not be understood to limit our attention to what is written in the translated text. All aside, reading of a translated text for that purpose will naturally involve reading of the source text. Also, it is well established that any data on all peculiar and general factors involved in the translation process are valuable. This can be seen simply as a reiteration of the fundamental, yet controversial, formulation that "translations are facts of the culture that hosts them".[42] On the other hand, this target-orientedness applies to the nature of the research process as well, in that it reminds researchers that they may still want to dedicate a considerable part of their time and attention to the close reading of translated texts. In a similar way that translation does not consist of the translated text only, translation historiography, like all historical studies, does not consist of the materials only, but is a process as well. In short, I have been convinced of the significance of being once again, but with a renewed awareness after successive paradigm shifts and turns, an attentive reader of the translated text without being totally absorbed or trapped in it.

Exploring the Circumstances

Parallelism of this kind between the research objects and processes in translation historiography have been aptly summarized by D'hulst among recent reflexive approaches to translation studies.[43] He emphasizes the distinction and relationship

---

41 On the importance and methodological implications of using primary sources including manuscripts in translation historiography see Jeremy Munday, "Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns", *The Translator*, 20/1 (2014).

42 Cf. Theo Hermans, *Translation in Systems. Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained* (Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1999), pp. 40-41; Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, pp. 17-25. The fact that no culture where translation occurs is homogeneous, and all such cultures are therefore intercultures does not change the point, cf. Pym, *Method*, p. x.

43 Lieven D'hulst, "Why and How to Write Translation Histories?", *CROP* 6 (2001); "Translation History"; *Essais*, pp. 21-43. While his more recent approach to translation history largely relies on Burke's encompassing perspective of history of knowledge, this earlier position of D'hulst better fits my purpose here, cf. D'hulst and Gambier, "General Introduction"; Lieven D'hulst, "The History of Translation Studies as a Discipline", *The Routledge Handbook of Translation History*, ed. Christopher Rundle (London: Routledge, 2021); Peter Burke, *What is the History of Knowledge?* (Cambridge: Polity, 2016).

between history, historiography and meta-historiography in the context of translation studies.[44] I believe that his deployment of traditional query words in Latin which translate as who, what, where, when, why? etc. does not only serve as a way to delimit and describe the research field of translation history or as a technique "in view of generating and clustering ideas, hypotheses or arguments" as explained by D'hulst,[45] but also involves, in respect of the selection, an implicit quest for a kind of relational objectivity,[46] and this is exactly why I prefer to use them here to present the data on Murad Bey's *Tesviye*. The deliberate distance that the use of Latin question words or of a similar strategy brings about can perhaps allow researchers to work more flexibly with concepts such as time, place, events, agent and so on.[47] Of course, the production and dissemination of translations have

---

44 D'hulst, *Essais*, pp. 21-23. A simple example will illustrate this. The Punic Wars between Rome and Carthage is an historical event. Numerous histories of it have been written since the antiquity with various historiographical methods and perspectives. Meta-historiographical studies on these histories can clarify where and why they do or do not differ from one another. Hence, the latter two layers can inform not only about the historical event in question but also about its significance and reception in other contexts. For instance, the well-known story of the sowing of the ruins of Carthage with salt seems to be an invention of the nineteenth century European historiography, see R. T. Ridley, "To be Taken with a Pinch of Salt: The Destruction of Carthage", *Classical Philology*, 81/2 (1986).

45 D'hulst, "Translation History", p. 399, n. 4. His set of questions in Latin and their translations are as follows: *quis* (who), *quid* (what), *ubi* (where), *quibus auxiliis* (with what help), *cur* (why), *quomodo* (how), *quando* (when), *cui bono* (who or what benefits from)? These questions (there were seven of them initially) and their respective answers are known as "circumstances" (Lat. *circumstantiae*), which is a poetico-rhetorical tradition that goes back to Aristotle and was adopted by prominent figures such as Cicero, Quintilian, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and Matthew of Vendôme. All except "why?" were held to be self-evident or objective [For a diachronic survey, see Inoslav Bešker, "Tko se i kada dosjetio pravilima o pet W? [The Roots of the 5 Ws]", *MediAnali : medunarodni znanstveni časopis za pitanja medija, novinarstva, masovnog komuniciranja i odnosa s javnostima*, 3/5 (2009); for the original framework in Aristotle, see Michael C. Sloan, "Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics as the Original Locus for the Septem Circumstantiae," *Classical Philology*, 105/3 (2010); on the objectivity of circumstances, see Sloan, p. 240-241]. As absolute objectivity has generally been considered unattainable in social sciences and humanities, for our purpose we should better regard these circumstances as intersubjective categories.

46 On the concept of relational objectivity, see Efraim Shmueli, "How Is Objectivity in the Social Sciences Possible? A Re-evaluation of Karl Mannheim's Concept of 'Relationism'", *Zeitschrift für Allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie*, 10/1 (1979); Martin Endress, "Methodological Relationism", *The Problem of Relativism in the Sociology of (Scientific) Knowledge*, ed. Richard Schantz and Markus Seidel (Frankfurt: Ontos Verlag, 2011).

47 From a cross-cultural perspective, there is a virtually unlimited range of possible strategies for that.

never been mechanical actions devoid of social contexts; therefore, one cannot confidently claim to be able to provide definite answers to these questions. Yet I think that the Latin questions of D'hulst, instrumental for a reflexive approach, have invited researchers, at least during the still-unfolding foundational era of translation historiography,[48] to temporarily deliver themselves from the dissonance of theoretical connotations, which while often thought-provoking, can be frustrating when prolonged. The Latin word *quis*, for instance, which is distant, yet somewhat intelligible in Western culture, can be helpful in compensating for the overfocused theoretical frameworks on the "who" of translation –quite complex to define like the "why" of it–, and thus contribute to reaching a broader horizon of observation about the multifaceted identity and agency of the translator, which also apply to the scholar who studies translations and translators. This I believe is not much different from the terminological preference of some European theorists in social sciences and humanities who use an Ancient Greek, medieval or classical Latin word instead of a modern one with the aim of distancing themselves and their readers from the active connotations of common words (Bourdieu's use of the medieval Latin *habitus* instead of *habitude*, *habilité* or a similar French word,[49] or the Ancient Greek word *skopos* that was used instead of the German *Zweck* by Vermeer[50] are just a few of the many examples). It may be thought that early modern European scholars adopted a comparable strategy but in the opposite direction, by coining vernacular alternatives to medieval Latin terms and concepts.

In what follows, I will be summarizing the "circumstances" about *Tesviye* translation through the Latin questions that have been used by D'hulst.[51] Due to the limitations in the scope of my study, the focus will be on the layer of history, although a few brief comments that belong to the other layers will be made. It goes

---

48 D'hulst and Gambier, "General Introduction", p. 2.

49 See Pierre Bourdieu, *Questions de sociologie* (Paris: Les Édition de Minuit, 1984), p. 134; Rist Gilbert, "La notion médiévale d' 'habitus' dans la sociologie de Pierre Bourdieu", *Revue européenne des sciences sociales*, 22/67 (1984). Linguistically speaking, the false friend aspect of this and similar examples does not change my point, because we often observe that the same word is used with different terminological meanings in different theoretical frameworks. Bourdieu's resort to the Latin term *illusio* is of the same nature, as he made use of both the difference and overlap of meaning with its French cognate *illusion*, see Lionel Thelen, "illusio et libido", *Abécédaire de Pierre Bourdieu*, ed. Jean-Philippe Cazier (Mons: Sils Maria, 2006), p. 92.

50 See Hans J. Vermeer, "Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie", *Lebende Sprachen*, 23/3 (1978), p. 100.

51 D'hulst, "Translation History".

without saying that these circumstances are interrelated and often intertwined. At first, this may seem to complicate things because same data can be used for different circumstances, but this is also its strength as it allows multilayered thinking and productive questioning of received categories. For instance, time and place cannot be fully separated from each other in an historical framework because time is among other things a social phenomenon. Therefore, majority of the data that has to do with the place, pertains to time as well. Obviously, the same applies to "how" and "what", and other circumstances.

Also, the layers of these questions can get more numerous in practice than the threefold model of D'hulst posits. Murad Bey's *Tesviye* is a clear case of this, because for each main layer there are several interrelated answers. For instance, one can give many significant dates for the question *quando*, such as dates from translator's general biography or dates for the original idea and making of translation. If we continue with the same example, one of the many answers of the obviously speculative question, "Why there is a relatively large time lag (a decade) between the composition and translation of this work which was from the beginning intended for translation?" might be that because its author-translator was captured in war and brought to Istanbul at a young age and he could not continue his studies in Latin, and therefore it may have taken him years to gain adequate confidence in his Latin writing skills. This layer of the *quando* connects naturally with other circumstances such as *quis*, *cur* and *quomodo* once we ask, "Why *Tesviye* was not written in Latin in the first place?" In short, I agree with D'hulst that this basic set of questions serves more than to organize data, it can also enable new and fruitful research questions in a simple way.

Quis?

This circumstance bears on the identity of translating agents (translators, publishers, critics, etc.), and also of translation historians from a self-reflexive viewpoint. One of the main questions in this regard is whether and how the general biography of translators should be related to their translation activity or career. This reminds us of tenets of formalist criticism, which claim the independence of cultural products from the historical identity and hence the intentions of their creators. One may well wonder how far this applies to translation, which I believe depends on the critical framework that one adopts. At all events, the preference to take the translator's "who" into consideration does not require to ground all explanations in biographies. Researchers can aim to blow away the cobwebs and avoid easy but inadequate explanations.

From two *alba amicorum* we learn that Murad Bey's birth name was Bálazs Somlyai and he was born in Nagybánya, modern-day Baia Mare in Romania:[52]

Table 1: Lat. text from Murad Bey's autograph entry in Arnoldus Manlius's *album amicorum* (H. fol. 26av) with Eng. trans.

Murad Beg tergzumani dergÿahi aalÿ.	Murad Bey, *tergzumani dergÿahi aalÿ*.
dominus muratus, interpres curiae excellentissimi caesaris turcorum, Sultani Selimi, olim in Hungaria Balasius Somlÿaÿ de rivulo dominarum Ungarice szathmar banÿa vocata civitate. in Constantinopoli mense maio anno virginei partus 1571, anno prophetae Muhamedi 978.	Murad Bey, dragoman of the court of Sultan Selim, the most sublime emperor of the Turks, was once Bálasz Somlyai in Hungary, born in the city of Rivulus Dominarum, which is called Szathmar Banya in Hungarian. [Written] in Constantinople, in the month of May of the year 1571 of the Birth from the Virgin, [that is] 978 from [the Hijra of] the prophet Muhammad.[53]

Erdély (Transylvania) region, where he was born and probably spent part of his childhood, was in the early sixteenth century at the junction of various religious

---

52 *Album amicorum* [album of friends] is the Latin name for the friendship books (Ger. *Stammbuch*) that originated in German universities during the sixteenth century. It typically consists of original or quoted poems, inscriptions, drawings, signatures by the hand of the friends or acquaintances of the *album* owner. As reminded by Ács, the first modern scholar to discover the birthplace and original name of Murad Bey was Béla Varjas. The evidence was found in 1979 by him in an *album amicorum* kept at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel, see. Pál Ács, "Tarjumans Mahmud and Murad. Austrian and Hungarian Renegades as Sultan's Interpreters", *Europa und die Türken in der Renaissance*, ed. Bodo Guthmüller and Wilhelm Kühlmann (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2000), p. 310. This information on the pre-conversion identity of Balázs Somlyai has been confirmed by another evidence of the same kind, by the autograph entry of Murad Bey in the *album amicorum* of Arnoldus Manlius (fol. 26av), which is held now at the Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg (*Stammbuch Heid.* Hs 487, hereafter H.), for a general discussion on this *album*, see Robin Dora Radway, "Three Alba Amicorum from the Habsburg Netherlands", *Early Modern Low Countries*, 6/1 (2022), pp. 106-113. Furthermore, the owner of this latter *album* wrote a two-page anecdote about an odd religious dispute they had with Murad Bey, see Pál Ács and Gábor Petneházi, "Késre menő vita 1571-ben Murád dragomán (Somlyai Balázs) és Arnoldus Manlius között", *MONOKgraphia: tanulmányok Monok István 60. születésnapjára*, ed. Judit Nyerges, Attila Verók, and Edina Zvara (Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó, 2016). As Radway ("Three Alba Amicorum", p. 110, n. 35) mentions, another entry signed by Murad Bey has been found in the *album amicorum* of Caspar von Abschatz (Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, *Cod. in scrin. 198a*, p. 767, hereafter Hmb.).

53 Translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

and political influences ranging from Protestantism and Unitarianism to Islam and Sufism. Therefore, the roots of Murad Bey's multiculturalism go probably deeper.

Although the Lutheran theologian, Stephan Gerlach wrote that the dragoman had studied in Vienna, and this has been transmitted as fact by historians,[54] there is to my knowledge no documentary evidence to support this. According to recent studies, the name Bálazs Somlyai does not appear in the lists of the Hungarians who studied at the University of Vienna in the early sixteenth century.[55] I think the assertion that he was a student there should be taken with a grain of salt despite some secondary details that can be used to connect Murad Bey to Vienna, such as his seemingly close relationship with his superior at the Ottoman court, dragoman Mahmud Bey, who was originally a Viennese named Sebald von Pibrach, and might have met him there when he was Bálazs Somlyai.[56] On the other hand, as great importance was attached to the Latin instruction in central Europe including Transylvania long before the era of Humanism, Bálazs may have learned his Latin in a Catholic high school there.[57]

———————————

54 See Stephan Gerlach, *Stephan Gerlachs des aeltern Tage-Buch*, ed. Tobias Wagner (Frankfurt am Mayn: Heinrich Friesen/Johann David Zunners, 1674), p. 33ª; Josef Matuz, "Die Pfortendolmetscher zur Herrschaftszeit Süleymans des Prächtigen", *Südost-Forschungen*, 34 (1975), p. 37; Tijana Krstić, "Illuminated by the Light of Islam and the Glory of the Ottoman Sultanate: Self-Narratives of Conversion to Islam in the Age of Confessionalization", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 51/1 (2009), p. 41; Krstić, "Murad", p. 698. Ács wrote that Murad Bey "attended the Latin school in Vienna" without specifying which school that might be, see Ács, *Reformations*, p. 190. Pamuk is more cautious by stating it as a strong possibility but not a certainty, see Pamuk, "Tercüman Murad", pp. 44-48.

55 In her research about the Hungarian students matriculated at the University of Vienna from 1326 to 1526, Tüskés Anna counts 19 students from Nagybánya, where our author-translator claimed to have been born (H. fol. 26ᵃᵛ), but the name Balázs Somlyai appears neither among them nor in any other list. The only Somlyai that is listed there is Nicolaus Somlyai from Temeşvar, see Tüskés Anna, *Magyarországi diákok a bécsi egyetemen 1365-1526. Students from Hungary at the University of Vienna 1365-1526* (Budapest: Az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Levéltára, 2008), pp. 12, 209. For the state of the art in this subject, see Borbála Kelényi, "Students from the Medieval Hungarian Kingdom at the University of Vienna. Additional Data to Their Studies: Faculties and Graduation", *University and Universality. The Place and the Role of the University of Pécs in Europe from the Middle Ages to Present Day. International University History Conference, 12-13th October 2017, Pécs*, ed. Fischer-Dárdai Ágnes, Lengvári István, and Schmelczer-Pohánka Éva (Pécs: University Library of Pécs and Centre for Learning, 2017).

56 On their careers and relationship, see Ács, "Tarjumans Mahmud and Murad".

57 For a summary on the Latin instruction in the schools of Transylvania during the period

As we learn from his own words at the epilogue of *Tesviye* (149ᵃ), he was captured at the battle of Mohács and brought to the Ottoman lands at the age of seventeen. He also wrote that he had been pursuing all his studies in Latin until it was thus interrupted, and unlike his peers, he did not accept to convert right away, and wanted to acquaint himself with the knowledge and sciences of the Ottoman domain. He clearly means with that not only theoretical knowledge but also language skills, namely the fluency he attained in Turkish, Persian, and Arabic. His Sufism-inflected Islam and translator identity considered, in this retrospective all these may have seemed like the fulfilment of his fate. In this very passage where he declares his intended readership as Christians who are ignorant of and hostile to Islam, Murad Bey uses the cross-culturally common physician-patient metaphor:

> Ammâ bunlardan muhtaçrak [149ᵃ] taife ki İslâm'a meyli olmayıp belki mebgûz-ı küllîleri olan küffâr taifesine bildirmektir.
>
> Garazlarımın aksâsı ki sağ olan kişi tabibe ne ihtiyacı var hastalar dururken? Bu hususta dahi kemâl-i dikkat ettiğim bir bu kim, bu fakir dahi Engürüs oğlanı olup Mohaç seferinde çıktığımda ol diyarın ilminde çalışmak üzere idim ki bunda İslâm diyarına gelindikte on yedi yaşımda olup İslâm arz olunduğun değmede kabul etmeğe cüret edemedim. Ol canibi bilip bu canibin ilminden aslâ bîhaber idim. Tâ okuyup tahsil-i ilm oldukta bildim, duydum Hak Teâlâ inayet eyledi. Ümittir ki hâtimemiz dahi îmân ile hatm ola. Yani küffâr taifesinin çoğu Müslüman olmaktan nefret ettikleri bilmediklerindendir.

His explanatory translation in this passage as in many others discloses some less pronounced details of the Turkish source text, such as the language of his studies before his captivity, or his need for learning more about Islam before embracing it:

---

in question, see William Hammer, "Latin Instruction in the Schools of Transylvania from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century", *Phoenix*, 8/3 (1954); Szegedi reminds that "the teaching languages in pre-Reformation Transylvania were vernacular in elementary parish schools, Latin in the Catholic higher schools, and Slavonic in the Orthodox schools", Edit Szegedi, "Educational Traditions in the Principality of Transylvania (1541–1691)", *Education beyond Europe. Models and Traditions before Modernities*, ed. Cristiano Casalini, Edward Choi, and Ayenachew A. Woldegiyorgis (Leiden: Brill, 2021), p. 286.

Table 2: Lat. text from 149ᵃ with Eng. trans.

tamen pluris indigentibus [149ᵃ] quorum cor ad istam fidem non est inclinata immo summo prosequuntur odio. plebi cristicolo [read *christicola*] etiam communicare summa intentione et desiderio conatus sum. namque enim quatenus aegroti adsint homines iam et incolumes qualem habeant medico indigentiam! item in ista re amplioris [read *amplius*] laborare me studuisse una praecipua causa ista est. scilicet, quoniam ego imbecillis cum fuerim de hungara natione, antequam in bello mohags per musulmanos captus sim, semper habebam diligentiam disciplinarum in lingua latina expressarum studio. cum equidem in regionem istam muszulmanicam adductus fuerim, eram natus septem decem annorum fidemque muszulmanicam quamvis propinatus fueram, tamen statim ita temerarie absque ulla circumspectione suscipiendi ausus non fui. quia disciplina fidei eorum peritus, de fide autem huius partis musulmana eram ignarus et imperitus. usque adeo ut hic etiam cum addipiscerer et aliquantulum disciplinarum hic quoque acquisivissem, cognovi et resensi deus enim altissimus e sua ingenti gratia concessit, speramus ut extrema mortis hora etiam per hanc fidem suam divinam permanere concedat. hoc est ut plerique omnes cristicolae hanc fidem divinam suscipere negantes immo recusantes abhorrentia eorum propter inertiam et insipientiam est.⁵⁸

And even more [beneficial] to indigents [149ᵃ] whose hearts are not inclined to this faith, and who on the contrary bear a deep grudge against it. I have endeavoured with great enthusiasm and desire to reach the Christian community as well. Indeed, what need of a physician for the healthy while there actually are sick people around! A principal reason why I put greater effort into this is the following: I, poor fellow, as I was from the Hungarian country before I was captured by the Muslims at the battle of Mohács, I was always diligent in the study of the branches of knowledge expressed in Latin. I was 17 years old when I was brought to this Muslim country, and although I had been offered to become Muslim, I could not dare to accept it right away, hastily and without any thorough consideration. Because I was versed in the science of their [=Christians] faith while I was ignorant and inexperienced about the Muslim faith in this region. Only when I got to know this place as well and obtained a little knowledge of the sciences here that I understood and believed, God the Lofty blessed me with his immense grace. Let's hope that he grants us to maintain this holy faith in him until the last moment of our lives. Most of the Christians refuse to accept, and even reject with abhorrence this holy faith because of their indolence and ignorance.⁵⁹

---

58 For the sake of practicality, I have generally corrected factual errors, supplied omissions, and preferred classical orthography in transcribing Latin texts, and departed from this practice only when the original writing is immediately significative of Murad Bey's *habitus* as a translator, as in the case of the incoherent variance of the letters *s*/*sz* or *ii*/*ÿ*, which apparently has to do with his Hungarian background.

59 Unless otherwise stated I have translated Murad Bey's texts from his Latin translations, with an eye on his Turkish text. In doing so, when I observed significant variance between the Turkish and Latin texts I preferred to adhere to the Latin text for the English translation.

In the continuation of the same section, we read Murad Bey's self-proclaimed lack of competence, maybe with a touch of false modesty, not only in writing a religious treatise but also in translating it into Latin:

> Hâliyâ [149b] aklım eriştiği kadar Hak Teâlâ müyesser eylediği üzere hazret-i Kur'ân'ın ve hazret-i Resulullah'ın medhini yazdım. Ammâ benim lisân-ı kâsırım nedir ki onların vasfının beyanında iktidarım ola? Alelhusus ki belli ulemâ kısmından olmayıp ancak alâ-kaderi't-tâkati onları sevip hizmetlerin etmiş kulları olduğum semeresidir. Ve hâliyâ gerçi kim bu dediğim Latin dilini kemâ-yenbagî olan fesâhat ile lâyık bilgim yoktur. Ümittir ki ehli olanlar ıslâh edeler. Bizim muradımız ancak manayı anlatmaktır. Anlanır da inşâ Allah.

Table 3: Lat. text from 149b with Eng. trans.

igitur [149b] inquantum imbecillitas mei mentis et iudicum habuit facundiam secundum numinis divini suffragium scripsi laudem sacratissimi libri dei alcuranici et etiam nominis celeberrimi nuntii dei prophetae collandam. quamvis ista mea lingua fragilis qualem habeat vim ut quiverim eorum laudem enarrandique vel saltem significandi conatum habere! praesertim cum de doctis et peritissimis virorum coertibus [*read* co(ho)rtibus] esse caream nisi fructus eorum amoris et secundum facultatem meam illis servitute vitam gestionis est. item quamvis in lingua latina non habuerim idoneum expertum et eius caream elegentiam attamen spero ut periti illius linguae bono animo accipientes emendare dignentur. nostra conatus et voluntas saltem ea est ut intelligatur et spero ut divina voluntate intelligitur [*read* intelligatur].	Therefore, [149b] according to the divine predestination, I wrote, as far as the humble faculty of my mind and judgement allowed, an imperfect praise of the holiest book of the God, the Quran, and of the [=person/authority] of the prophet, the most venerable messenger of the God. What is the strength of my feeble tongue that I could undertake the endeavour of telling or even referring to their praise! Especially because I fail to pertain to the band of wise and learned men, if I set aside the fruit of my adoration of them and my pursuit of life in their servitude to the best of my ability. Also, although I do not have the required command of Latin, and I lack its elegant use, I still hope that masters of this language would by their courtesy deem it worthy of emendation. Our intention and wish is that it be understood, and I hope it would be understood with the will of God.

As Leunclavius (Löwenklau) and Gerlach reported and Babinger pointed out, Murad Bey was said to be dismissed from his position at the Ottoman court because of his drinking.[60] There is also the anecdote recorded by the Flemish physician Arnoldus Manlius in his *album amicorum* where Murad Bey is portrayed as assaulting him not only because he was offended by his interlocutor's harsh words about Islam and the prophet Muhammad but also because he could not hold his drink.[61] According to some historians, the aphorism about the benefit of wine in old age quoted by Murad Bey in that very album further indicates the veracity of the hearsay.[62] While its reason, despite its verisimilitude, has yet to be confirmed by immediate documentary evidence, his removal from courtly duty can be more confidently considered to be factual, as there is evidence that he worked late in his life as a freelance interpreter and translator to provide for his family and himself.[63] For instance, one of his works from that time, the *Codex Hanivaldanus* named after Philipp Haniwald von Eckersdorf, an envoy of the Archduke Ernst to Constantinople, consists of passages from Ottoman chronicles (especially Neshrî's *Cihannüma*) that he compiled and translated into Latin. This translated compilation, which reached us only indirectly via paraphrases in the *Historia* of Leunclavius, remained for decades one of the most important sources on the Ottomans for European historians.[64] In his history Leunclavius referred more than once to the importance of Murad Bey's work:

---

60 Johannes Leunclavius, *Historiae Musulmanae Turcorum, de monumentis ipsorum exscriptae libri XVIII* (Francofurti: Apud heredes A. Wecheli, C. Marnium & J. Aubrium, 1591), col. 829, lines 43-45; Gerlach, *Tage-Buch*, p. 411; Babinger, " Pfortendolmetsch Murad", p. 39.

61 H. fol. 27^{r-v}.

62 H. fol. 26^{av}. See Nil Ö. Palabıyık, *Silent Teachers. Turkish Books and Oriental Learning in Early Modern Europe, 1544–1669* (New Work: Routledge, 2023), p. 64.

63 Based on income records of Murad Bey and his sons it has been convincingly claimed that his dismissal must have been not earlier than 1583, see Pamuk, "Tercüman Murad", pp. 67-71. Ács thinks that Murad Bey's disgrace can be related to the death of his colleague and mentor Mahmud Bey in 1575, see Ács, "Tarjumans Mahmud and Murad", p. 313.

64 On the popularity of this history in Europe, see Zsuzsa Barbarics-Hermanik, "Books as a Means of Transcultural Exchange between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans", *International Exchange in the Early Modern Book World* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), pp. 116-118. Regarding the sources of this compilation see Altay Tayfun Özcan, "Murat Bey, Codex Hanivaldanus ve Kaynakları Üzerine (Süleyman Paşa ile ilgili Kayıtları Özelinde)", *Timurlu Tarihine Adanmış bir Ömür: 75. Doğum Yılında Prof. Dr. İsmail Aka Armağanı*, ed. M. Ş. Yüksel (Ankara: Türk Kültürü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları, 2017).

Table 4: Lat. text from col. 31-32 of Leunclavius's *Historia* with Eng. trans.

Alterum nobilis viri, Philippi Hani-ualdi Eckerstorfiani, qui serenissimo principi, Ernesto Archiduci Austriae, praecipuos inter aulicos operam navat, singulari erga nos, fraternaeque benev-olentiae debemus. Is Constantinopoli, qua in vrbe cum dignitate vixit annos aliquot, Muratem begum, natione Vn-garum, primarium superioribus annis Osmaneae Portae Dragomanum, mihi notum in itinere meo, linguarumque plurimum, Arabicae, Persicae, Turcicae, Latinae (sed barbarae, quod adulescens in servitutem abductus, apud barbaros consenuisset) Vngaricae Crouaticaeque peritum, largitionibus cottidianis im-pulit ut ex Turcorum historiis selec-ta quaeque transscriberet[65] et secum communicaret: in quo sane deprehendi reipsa quiddam ab eo praestitum, quod esset operae pretium, et illustrandae Turcorum historiae non exiguum posset adiumentum adferre.	For the other [book] we are in debt to the singular and brotherly benevolence towards us of the nobleman Philipp Haniwald von Eckersdorf, who served the illustrious Archduke Ernst of Aus-tria as one of his distinguished dignitar-ies. In Constantinople, where he lived with dignity for a few years, he urged with daily gifts the Hungarian-born Murad Bey, a former chief dragoman of the Ottoman Court whom I met dur-ing my journey, and who knows many languages including Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Latin (barbaric though be-cause he was abducted as a slave in his adolescence and grew old among bar-baric people), Hungarian, and Croatian, to translate and share with him selected passages from Turkish histories. I clearly saw in the work a significant contribu-tion by him because it was worthwhile and could be of no small help to illumi-nate the history of the Turks.

---

65 As the service Murad Bey gave to Haniwald was mainly compiling and translating Turk-ish passages (see Leunclavius, *Historia,* col. 583, lines 30-33), Leunclavius must have used the verb *transscribere* here in the sense of "to translate" and not "to copy" as Palabıyık thought (see *Silent Teachers*, p. 69). This meaning of the verb in the same context can be found elsewhere in his *Historia* (col. 42, lines 23-28): "*In Hanivaldana vero historia, quam Murates begus, primarius Portae Dragomanus, e Turcicis monumentis ceteroqui pleniorem, sed admodum barbare transsicripsit, omnino non legitur*" (Indeed [this story] appears nowhere in the history of Haniwald [=codex Hanivaldanus] that Murad Bey, a chief dragoman of the Porte, <u>translated</u> extensively but with a quite broken language from Turkish histories). This meaning of the verb *trans(s)cribere* in humanistic Latin seems to have been first used by Leonardo Bruni at the beginning of the fifteenth century, see Johann Ramminger, "Lan-guage Change in Humanist Latin: the case of traducere (to translate)", *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici*, 40–41 (2015-16), pp. 37-38.

Murad Bey may also have assisted his senior colleague Dragoman Mahmud in his *Tarih-i Ungurus* [Hungarian History] by reading or translating passages from chronicles in Hungarian and Latin. Indeed, marginalia written in Hungarian but in Arabic characters have been found in the famous fourteenth century illuminated Latin chronicle, *Chronicon Pictum*, which Mahmud Bey is known to have used. Because Hungarian was Murad Bey's native tongue and we are familiar with this rare practice from his *Tesviye* and trilingual hymn,[66] Ács thinks that our translator may have been the one who wrote those marginalia.[67]

Murad Bey had also translated/adapted into Turkish passages from a classical Latin work, namely Cicero's *De senectute*, under the title *Der medh-i pîrî* [In Praise of Old Age]. This work that was commissioned to him around 1559 by the Venetian *bailo* Marino de Cavalli is said to be destined as a gift for Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent.[68] We are told in the preface of the work[69] that the initial source text was Latin notes of Andrea Foscolo (former *bailo* and grandfather of de Cavalli) about a dialogue on old age that took place between Sultan Murad II and his son Mehmed (later Mehmed II).[70] While almost nothing is known about those notes, it has been shown by Rossi that there is apparent parallelism between the Turkish text and the *De senectut*e.[71]Although it has been recently claimed that the *Der medh-i pîrî* qualifies as an original work rather than a translation or adaptation,[72] I believe that we must be cautious with such assertions, considering the differences in historical translation norms.

---

66 On the rarity of this practice, see Branka Ivušić, "Developing Consistency in the Absence of Standards – A Manuscript as a Melting-Pot of Languages, Religions and Writing Systems", *Creating Standarts. Interactions with Arabic Script in 12 Manuscript Cultures*, ed. Dmitry Bondarev, Alessandro Gori, and Lameen Souag (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019), p. 152.

67 Ács, "Tarjumans Mahmud and Murad", pp. 312-313.

68 The first and still most thorough study on it is Ettore Rossi, "Parafrasi turca del 'De senectute' presentata a Solimano il Magnifico dal Bailo Marino de Cavalli", *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, 12 (1937), see also Mehmet Aydın, *Cicero. Marino de Cavalli. Der-Medh-i Piri: Yaşlılığa Övgü. İnceleme - Metin - Dizin ve Tıpkıbasım* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2007), pp. 17-27; Krstić, "Translation and Empire", pp. 138-139

69 İstanbul, Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi, MS. 3295, fols. 2b-3b.

70 Rossi, "Parafrasi", p. 681.

71 Rossi, "Parafrasi", pp. 685-688.

72 Krstić, "Murad", p. 699.

Quid?

The circumstance of *quid* pertains to the general aspects and nature of the translated text as well as of the translation process under scrutiny. These mean for *Tesviye* primarily the examination of its status as a self-translation. The work was most likely meant to be translated and promulgated from the outset although there is no clear reference to it in the manuscript D, the oldest, monolingual (Turkish) copy we have. This is supported by the general aspects of the translation project, and also by Murad Bey's own testimony:

> Hâliyâ bu risâleciği Türkî dili üzere yazalı hicret-i nebeviyenin dokuz yüz altmış üçünde [1555-56] başlayıp [148ᵇ] dokuz yüz altmış dördünde [1556-57] tamam oldu. Ammâ aksâ-yı muradım bu oluptur kim Hak Teâlâ kemâl-i ihsanından müyesser edeydi kim Latin dili üzere dahi tercüme edebileydim ki Nasârâ taifesinin çoğuna Frengistan'ın her türlü vilâyetine ve Engürüs'e ve Alaman'a ve Leh'e ve Çeh'e ve França'ya ve Portugal'a ve İspanya'ya şâyi' olup kabul ettikleri takdirce hele bâri İslam dininin kadri var imiş demekliğine kalplerine telyîn geleydi.

Table 5: Lat. text from 148ᵃ⁻ᵇ with Eng. trans.

quamvis istam codicem per linguam turcicam scripseram et composueram anno transmigrationis prophetae nostri noningesimo [*sic*] sexagesimo tertio, virginei quoque partus anno millesimo quingentesimo quinquagesimo sexto inceperam, [148ᵇ] futuro anno perfiniveram in spatio unius anni, verumtamen extremum desiderium meum hoc fuerat ut deus altissimus e sua immensa clementia concedere dignaretur ut in linguam etiam latinam traducere possim, quae quidem lingua latina commune nota est ferre [*sic*] omnium cristicolorum doctis, scilicet italiae, galliae, et cuiuslibet eorum nationibus, et item hungariae et germaniae et poloniae et bohemiae et franciae et portocaliae et hispaniae existentibus, ut etiam et ipsi publicaretur, utilitasque huius communicaretur omnibus etiam et cristicolis. quamvis non acceptarint etiam, verumtamen haec saltem recuperatur utilitas ut secundum pristinam ignorantiam eorum haec fides islam salutis, vilipensione eliberatu aliquantulum pretii seu modici etiam existimationis acquireret. istaque existimatione cor eorum mollificaretur.	Although I had composed and written this work in Turkish language, beginning in 963 of the migration of our prophet, which is 1556 from the delivery of the Virgin [148ᵇ], and completing it in the span of a year, my utmost desire was that God the Lofty would, out of his boundless clemency, deem worthy of letting me to translate it into Latin, the language that is indeed generally known by almost all educated Christians, of Italian and Gallic lands, also regardless of their nation, of Hungary, Germany, Poland, Bohemia, France, Portugal, and Spain, so that it could be published by them, and it could benefit all Christians. Even if they did not accept it, there would be yet at least the benefit that after their former ignorance, Islam, the faith of salvation, would acquire some appreciation or gain some esteem, and their hearts would soften with that esteem once the contempt is abandoned.

This passage is a good example where quiddity and causality intertwine, in that *Tesviye* appears as an assumed translation, and the reason for the translation project is given as the prejudices bred by ignorance about Islam, which our author-translator aimed to break down with his apologetic treatise arguing for the superiority of Islam over Christianity and all other religions. On the other hand, Murad Bey claimed that *Tesviye* would be a valuable work even if fate had not allowed him to translate it into Latin, in that it could help his fellow Muslims in deepening their faith:

> Ol ki Hak Teâlâ'dan başına saâdet yazılmıştır, kabul eder ve ol ki yazılmamıştır; Resulullah hakkına Ebû Talip için "*İnneke lâ-tehdî men ahbebte*"[73] hitab-ı izzet gelmiştir; ona ne çare? Velhasıl mücerret Türkî dili üzere kaldığı, gerçi kim ehl-i İslâm'a dahi bu müşkülât ki bunda yazılmıştır, bilinmek güzel. "Yezdâdû îmânen maa îmânihim."[74] Ammâ bunlardan muhtaçrak [149ᵃ] taife ki İslâm'a meyli olmayıp belki mebgûz-ı küllîleri olan küffâr taifesine bildirmektir.

Table 6: Lat. text from 148ᵇ with Eng. trans.

Verum est ut deus altissimus cuicumque felicitatem et beatitudinem aeternam praescripserit, ille acceptabit et acceptatum servabit. Attamen cuicumque praescripta non fuerit quemadmodum ad dominum prophetam responsum divinum fuerat, quando adeo petiverat ut Ebutalib nominato patri ali in istam fidem ineundi daretur licentia, dictumque est ut *inneke la tehdÿ men ahbebte*, hoc est tu nullum tui amatuum potes dirigere in viam rectam meam, hoc est ut cuicumque felicitas adeo altissimo praescripta non fuerit nullum reperetur remedium. in summa hic libellus saltem per turcicam linguam permansisset, difficiliaque quaestionum hic expositarum addipiscerentur, est valde optimum, *liiezdadu ÿmanen mea ÿmanihim*, secundum hanc sententiam divinam, id est ut adaugmentetur fides intima eorum, affortietur.	It is true that only the one for whom God the Lofty predestined eternal happiness and beatitude will accept [the faith] and serve it. However, for whom it is not predestined, just as the divine response came to our prophet when he so much wished that liberty of embracing this faith be given to Abu Talib, the father of Ali, and it was said *inneke la tehdÿ men ahbebte*, that is "You can guide none of your beloved ones to my just way," in other words, there will be relief to no one for whom happiness has not been predestined from above. After all, had this little book of mine remained in Turkish only and had hard-to-understand sayings been accessible within the discussions here exposed, it would still be very useful, in accordance with the divine saying *liiezdadu ÿmanen mea ÿmanihim*, which means "that their inner faith may be augmented, strengthened".

---

73 "Surely thou dost not guide whomsoever thou lovest […]" (Quran, al-Qasas 28:56, trans. Seyyed Hossein Nasr et al., *The Study Quran. A New Translation and Commentary* (New York: HarperOne, 2015), p. 958).

74 "[…] that they might increase in faith along with their faith […]" (Quran, al-Fath 48:4, trans. Nasr et al., *The Study Quran*, p. 1248).

Regarding the textual material of the three extant manuscripts, the Turkish texts in the monolingual (D) and the complete bilingual (B) copies are generally similar except for the frequent variance in word choices, shortness of the poetic appendix, and absence of the introduction (1^b-6^b) and epilogue (148^a-153^b) sections in D.[75] The manuscript A counts 140 pages[76] and ends abruptly. Its first 129 pages correspond to the folios 7^b-37^b of the manuscript B, which is complete and consists of 167 folios. Paratextual material and the poetic appendix excluded, this amounts roughly to one fourth of the text of *Tesviye* based on B. Because A and B are entirely bilingual, these apply to both the Turkish and Latin texts. Fortunately, the author-translator's explanatory style makes its presence felt in the very partial manuscript A as well, especially in p. 129, where we read in Latin:

Table 7: Lat. text from p. 129 of the MS A with Eng. trans.

verumtamen volui ut istos praedictos decem mores vitiosos et virtutes decem laudabiles, de eodem libro divi kutbuddini secundum textum suum hic in hac interpretatione adiungam ut communicetur utilitas eius omnibus etiam et latinis cum non reperiatur praeter linguam turcicam sunt enim duo capituli deo annuente adiunxi	However, I wanted to translate from the same book by the holy Kutbuddin the sections on the above-mentioned ten vicious character traits and ten laudable virtues, and to add them here in this translation so that his utility can be communicated to all. Hence there are two chapters that I added in Latin [translation], with God's blessing, as it can be found in no other languages than Turkish.

This explanation, bilingual like the rest of the text, not only reiterates Murad Bey's debt to Kutbuddin İznikî's *Mukaddime*,[77] one of the many Islamic works

---

75 Pamuk, "Tercüman Murad", p. 17.

76 This manuscript is paginated not as folios but pages, and due to larger margins, its word count per page is roughly half of the copy B's word count. The page size is 19.68 × 13.97 and 20.32 × 14.60 cm for the manuscripts A and B respectively, see Gustav Flügel, *Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hofbibliothek zu Wien*, vol. III (Wien: K.K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1867), pp. 130-131; Charles Rieu, *Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London: The British Museum, 1888), p. 8.

77 Kutbuddin İznikî (d. 1418) was an Ottoman Islamic scholar and mystic, and his *Mukaddime* is among, if not the first Islamic catechisms in Turkish, which teaches the main beliefs and the five pillars of Islam in accordance with the Hanafi school. See, Kerime Üstünova, "İlk Türkçe İlmihal. Mukaddime ve Yazarı Kutbüddin İzniki", *Akademik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 8/31 (2006-2007).

quoted by the author,[78] but also gives an idea of the way Murad Bey structured that part of his treatise. These two chapters that he translated from *Mukaddime*, of which we have only 11 pages (130-140), are absent from the manuscript B. As I will be demonstrating soon, the copy A was most likely written earlier than B, and therefore he must have decided to leave out those translated chapters. This exclusion also points out his decision to paraphrase rather than compile.

Murad Bey's identity as a translator, his clearly stated purpose of translating, and the relatively minor divergence of the Latin text from the Turkish one shows that *Tesviye* qualifies as a bilingual (self-)translation rather than a book with two languages. Some important details that can be found only in one or the other language, which occurs mostly in the Latin text, seem to matter more for the history than the description or criticism of translation. In contrast, a historian of religion who adopts the framework of intertextuality for instance, might see in *Tesviye* a "mosaic of texts".

Ubi?

The *ubi*, that is, the spatial circumstance of the translator is manifold. As for the translation at large, it involves Istanbul, which is most likely where Murad Bey composed and later translated *Tesviye*, as well as Transylvania, where according to his own testimony he was incarcerated for two-and-half years and had the original idea for this confessional treatise that he intended as a guide to genuine Islam (see Table 11 below). Like all others, this circumstance can be explored in various directions mostly depending on the discovery of new documentary evidence.

Quibus auxiliis?

The names of Sultan Suleiman and Rüstem Pasha stand out when we ask by whom *Tesviye* translation may have been facilitated. The latter in particular appears to be fully supportive of Murad Bey in many ways. He did not only ransom him out of a long and dreary captivity, but also presented him to the sultan, vouched for his linguistic skills, and enabled him to secure a position of dragoman at the court.

[153ᵃ] Ve bilcümle hak dinin aşkına her ne kim ezâdan olunduysa çekerdim. Ve her saatimi ve nefesimi ol muzâika hâlimde ibadet yerine bilip rızadan gayrıya

---

78 For a list, see Krstić, "Murad", pp. 702-703; Pamuk, "Tercüman Murad", p. 100.

ne sözümüz var idi? Ve bu resme tamam otuz ay zindan çektim. Âkıbet hele Hak Teâlâ *"Seyec'alullahu ba'de usrin yüsrâ"* va'd eyleyen padişah inayet eyledi.

Pes, ol vezir-i âzam ve düstûr-ı mükerrem Rüstem Paşa, kıla rahmet ona Hallâk-ı mâ-şâe bu ednâ duacısını kurtardığı gibi saadetli sahip-kıran Sultan Süleyman hazretlerine arz olunup Latin dilinde ve Engürüs dilinde olan hurûf üzere okumağa ve yazmağa ve mana anlamağa [153ᵇ] iktidarım olduğu i'lâm olunup Dergâh-ı Âlî tercümanları zümresine layık görülüp nasb olundum.

Table 8: Lat. text from 153ᵃ⁻ᵇ with Eng. trans.

verumtamen amore fidei divini libenter tuli et omnem [h]oram meam et omnem spiratum meum in tempore angustiarum mei status loco servitutis divini computabam, patientia enim cum sit servitus dei. quid aliud agendum nisi praedestinationi divino contentio [*sic*] et complacitus agebatur? per hunc ordinem triginta menses carceribus tenebris vitam degens passus sum. finaliter tandem deus altissimus *zeiegz alullahu beade oszrin yuszren* pollicitans, id est, statim deus convertebit omnem angustiam et difficultatem in facultatem et commoditatum [*sic*], adferet post tristitiam gaudium, gratiam suam infundens illustrissimus dominus augustae memoriae, dominus mihi clementissimus Ruztem pasa, cuius animam deus optimus maximus salvificet, quam primum hunc vilem servum deum pro eo obsecrantem e captivitate eliberavisset, ad praesentiam potentissimi et invictissimi caesaris augustae memoriae sultan Szuleymano praesentatus sum et certiorem fecerunt eundem principem me habuisse auctoritatem legendi et scribendi et intelligendi et interpretandi omnes scripturas per linguam latinam et hungaram scriptas. [153ᵇ] itaque ergo sum additus in numerum personarum interpretum suae celsitudinis et dignum [*sic*] visus constitutus sum.	However, I willingly endured with the love of faith, and in times of distress, I considered every hour I had and every breath I took as a holy service, because patience is indeed a worship to God. What should I do other than submit to the divine predestination with contentment and willingness? I suffered living like this in dark dungeons for thirty months. Finally, God the Lofty who promises "zeiegz alullahu beade uszrin yuszren", that is, "God will instantly turn every anguish and difficulty into ease and convenience, bring joy after sorrow," once Rüstem Pasha, of blessed memory, the grand vizier who pours his grace –may God, the Best and Greatest, rest his soul– liberated from captivity this poor servant of God who prays for him, I was presented to Sultan Suleiman, of blessed memory, all powerful and invincible emperor, and he [=Rüstem Pasha] informed this very sovereign that I have the competence of reading, writing, interpreting and translating of all documents in Latin and Hungarian.[79] [153ᵇ] Hence I was added to the number of the dragomans of His Majesty, and having been deemed worthy I was given a position.

---

79 For an example of documentary translation by Murad Bey dating from 1562, and a brief observation on his Turkish fluency and skill in the Ottoman chancery style, see Anton C. Schaendlinger, "Eine diplomatische Intervention Kaiser Ferdinands I. an der Hohen Pforte", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 80 (1990), pp. 212-217; Claudia Römer, "Contemporary European Translations of Ottoman Documents and Vice Versa (15th-17th Centuries)", *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 61/1-2 (2008),

He also mentioned without names the Christian theologians who visited and discussed with him on religious matters during his long captivity and unintentionally inspired him for *Tesviye*.[80] We can speculate in the light of this testimony that he saw in them his prospective readership, and this impression played a formative role not only in the composition of the work but also in its translation. Indeed, the scholarly aspects of the translated text such as phonetic transcription[81] and expanded translation suggest that he expected learned readers. To our surprise, our translator did not mention his senior colleague Mahmud Bey in this regard, who had probably introduced him to his vast network that includes learned figures. As a more experienced translator Mahmud Bey may also have supported him in matters directly related to their profession.

Cur?

In general terms, this circumstance concerns the motivations of the translation projects as well as of the scholars aiming for the historical study of those projects. Without any intention of implying that the significance of the study depends on the significance of the translation, and that this can be reliably measured, I believe that the relation between the historical and historiographical layers is particularly salient at this point. The motivations that different intra- or inter-disciplinary perspectives consider as significant may differ considerably. Moreover, new documentary discoveries can substantially change the aspect of this circumstance. Until then, in the light of our ego-document and all other sources we can speculate on the possible motivations of *Tesviye* as follows:

- Personal contribution to the weakening of the negative perception of Islam in Europe
- Securing his position as a dragoman
- Performing his duty as a dragoman for a hidden political agenda of the Ottoman state

The following passages may be Murad Bey's clearest statements of his motivations for *Tesviye* translation.

---

pp. 221-222, 224. Some of his other documentary translations can be found in the Austrian State Archives, for a list, see *Regesten der osmanischen Dokumente im österreichischen Staatsarchiv. Band 1 (1480-1574)*, ed. Ernst Dieter Petritsch (Wien: Das Staatsarchiv, 1991), p. 276.

80 See 12ᵃ, 153ᵃ.

81 See Examples 10 and 11 in Table 13, also Table 14 and its explanation.

Pes, ol tâife-i Nasârâ'nın bunun gibi olmaz sözlerini bu risalede yazıp beyan etmek min-vechin hatadan hâlî değil idi. Ammâ kim hata ve küfürlerini ilzâm ve ikhâm için bazısını yazıp getirdim ki hazret-i Muhammed'in dini olan İslâm dininin paklığını ve gökçekliğini ve cümle-i edyândan artık ve mümtâz olup Hak Teâlâ'nın tevhid-i hakkânîsini kemâ-yenbagî [147ᵇ] nice gökçek beyan eylemişlerdir ki İslâm dini her veçhile Hakk'ın dini olup her millet gele bu dine gireler. Ve ol atalarından dedelerinden göre geldikleri dinlerin terk edeler.

Table 9: Tr. and Lat. text from 147ᵃ⁻ᵇ with Eng. trans.

ergo in isto opusculo attulli nonnulla verba inania cristicolorum, quamvis non sit absque alia parte culpae. verumtamen errorem et infidelitatem eorum arguendi et culpandi causa quaedam verba alloquutus sum ut recognoscatur fides vera sacratissimi muhammedi quam purissima sit et quam elegantissima supra omnes fides praestantior et acceptabilior sit et quam peroptime et pulcherrime edocuit unificationem [*read* unitatem] dei altissimi secundum veram dignitatem meritumque [147ᵇ] commodum. recognituque hanc fidem iszlam nominatam omnibus modis fidem dei altissimi esse et ab ipso iam in hoc ultimo tempore aetatis mundi nisi istam fidem mandatam fuisse, ceteras veteras amittendas esse ut omnes nationes convertentur [*read* convertantur] in istam fidem, et summo honore acceptantes salutem aeternam lucrentur, amittentes a patribus et avibus et abavibus hactenus visam fidem.	Hence, I reported some worthless words of the Christians in this humble work [of mine], although it too is not entirely free from flaws. Yet in order to demonstrate and disclose their error and infidelity I put together some words so that it could be realized how pure and refined is the genuine faith of the most sacred Muhammad, and being more excellent and worthy of acceptance than all other faiths, how perfectly and pleasantly it teaches the unity of God the Lofty, as it needs and deserves to be. [147ᵇ] By recognizing that the faith called Islam is, in all respects, the faith of God the Lofty, and the sole faith that was mandated by Him in this final age of the world, and that previous faiths should be abandoned so that all nations can convert to this faith, and the ones that solemnly accept it can reach eternal salvation by leaving the faith so far followed by their fathers, grandfathers and grand-grandfathers.

Table 10: Tr. and Lat. text from 149^b with Eng. trans.

[...] murat İslâm'ın şerefini cümle rub'-ı meskûna şâyi' etmektir.	intentio mea haec est ut gloriam et splendorem fidei divini [*sic*] ad universa loca quattuor angulorum orbis terrarum divagari et amplificare queam.	My intention is that I can spread and amplify the glory and splendour of the holy faith everywhere at the four corners of the world.

The passage below does not only describe the conditions in which the translation project emerged, but also relate an interesting introspection of the translator, and these reveal a lot about his motivation:

> Ve hâliyâ asılda dahi bunun gibi kitap söylemek ne ağzıma düşerdi ammâ hikmetullahtır, hiç aslâ fikrimde ve niyetimde yok idi ki bu makûle liyakatim ermeyen ve istihkâkım olmayan işe girişem; lâkin olacak olur. Belki niçe ifadeler hâsıl olmak var idi. Hele kalem elime alıp yazdıkça yazdım. Alâ-kaderi'l-imkân böyle bu risaleciğim zuhura geldi. Ve *Tesviyetü't-teveccühi ile'l-hakkı* ad verile diye gönlüme ilham olundu. Ve ammâ ibtidâdan hiç bir nesne bu cürete [153^a] bâis olmadı. İllâ kâfiristanda tutsak olduğumda taife-i Nasârâ âlimlerinin benimle dinde olan mübâhaseleri oldu.

Table 11: Lat. text from 152^b-153^a with Eng. trans.

item ego non eram dignus componendi huiusmodi codicem. verumtamen de dispositione prudentiae divinae concessum et factum est, quamvis nec intendendi necque cogitandi habebam conatum ut huiusmodi opus operarem, quod nec dignus neque meritus fueram operandi et incipiendi. verumtamen omnia quae fieri praedestinata sint erunt. immo quam plurimae utilitates assequi contigerant. In summa calamum in manus accipiens quanto plura scripserim tanto pluris in mentem et calamum affluit, ut hic codex secundum possibilitatem ad istam formam visam productus est. *tesvietuttevegzgzuhi ilel hakki* nomen addere a divina parte concessum est. hoc est conversio et rectificatio et coaequalitas [*read* coaequatio] vultus versus deum. sic et tale nomen additum est.⁸² verumtamen origo intentionis meae ad istam audaciam et conatum [153^a] nullius causae fuerat, nisi cum in regione cristicolorum captivus fueram, adveniebant multi docti eorum ad disputandum in fide.	Besides, I was not adequate to compose a book of this kind. However, it is permitted and done with the ordinance of the divine providence, although I was not attempting to try or even plan to produce such a work because I was neither adequate nor worthy of producing and undertaking it. However, everything that is predestined to happen will happen. Yet countless benefits have been obtained. Eventually, whenever I took the pen in my hand, the more I wrote, the more came into my mind and into the pen, so that this book could reach within the bounds of possibility its present form. Giving it the title of *tesvietuttevegzgzuhi ilel hakki* was granted by the divinity. This means conversion, rectification, bringing into line of the face in the direction of God. This is how such a title was added. Nevertheless, there was no reason for my daring and attempt, [153^a] had many educated Christians not come to discuss about religion while I was captured in the region of the Christians.

---

82 On the title of the work, see also 15^b and A. p. 37.

It can be observed in the Latin part of the passage below, which was quoted more fully earlier (in Table 5) under the heading of "Quid", a detail that is absent from the Turkish text, namely the prospect of his book's failure in persuading to conversion.

Table 12: Tr. and Lat. text from 148[b] with Eng. trans.

[…] Latin dili üzere dahi tercüme edebileydim ki Nasârâ taifesinin çoğuna […] şâyi' olup kabul ettikleri takdirce hele bâri İslam dininin kadri var imiş demekliğine kalplerine telyîn geleydi.	[…] ut etiam et ipsis publicaretur, utilitasque huius communicaretur omnibus etiam et cristicolis. quamvis non acceptarint etiam, verumtamen haec saltem recuperatur utilitas ut secundum pristinam ignorantiam eorum haec fides islam salutis, vilipensione eliberatu aliquantulum pretii seu modici etiam existimationis acquireret. istaque existimatione cor eorum mollificaretur.	[...] so that it [=*Tesviye*] could be published by them [=educated Christians], and it could benefit all Christians. Even if they did not accept it, there would be yet at least the benefit that after their former ignorance, Islam, the faith of salvation, would acquire some appreciation or gain some esteem, and their hearts would soften with that esteem once the contempt is abandoned.

Quomodo?

As mentioned earlier, the original text in Turkish was copied at least twice and the Latin translation, which was completed nearly a decade later, was written on the same pages with the Turkish text. In the partial one (A) of these two bilingual copies, the Latin translation must have been written first, as suggested by the consistency of the line numbers (15 in all pages) of its text[83] and an incomplete (without diacritics unlike the rest) Turkish line that was first written at the end of the column but then cancelled and rewritten on the following page (to keep the two texts aligned),[84] while in the other copy (B), the Turkish text appears to have been written first, as indicated once again by the line numbers (15 throughout the text) and Murad Bey's struggle in some pages to squeeze the Latin text in the

---

83 Pamuk, "Tercüman Murad", p. 15.
84 MS A, pp. 78-9.

margin.[85] We have no information on the number of *Tesviye* copies. There was maybe a Latin-only copy as well. Leaving out possibilities of this kind, we can try to trace Murad Bey's steps in creating the extant copies as follows: First, the text in the monolingual copy D was written in draft Latin translation (as suggested by the multitude of strike-through words, additions, and substitutions) on the bottom half-pages in A. Afterwards, the Turkish text in D was copied with minor changes (mostly related to word choice) on the upper halves of the same pages in A, over the corresponding Latin translation. The Turkish part of the resulting bilingual text was later copied, with minor changes again, on vertical halves of the separate pages of B, and then the corresponding Latin translation in A was added on the other half-pages in B. Most of the changes indicated in A were directly implemented in B, and in a few cases new changes were added. Although this gives an initial idea about how he was working, more valuable insight emerges when one inspects the variance between the two copies, the corrections, and additions especially in the copy A.

Table 13: Significant Translation Revisions in the Manuscripts A and B of *Tesviye*[86]

Ex.		Latin texts	Description and probable direction of the revision	Notes
1	A2	in nomine dei pÿ **\erga omnes bonos et malos/** [omnibus bonis et malis] in hoc mundo misericordis **\erga bonos/** [bonis] saltem in futuro saeculo.	erasure and interlinear insertion A → B	The two revisions to the Basmala translation in A are implemented in B. It appears he realized that the adjective *misericors* does not govern a dative, and replaced the dative "omnibus bonis et malis" with the prepositional phrase "erga omnes bonos et malos".
	B7[b]	in nomine dei pÿ **erga omnes bonos et malos** in hoc mundo et misericordis **erga bonos** saltem in futuro saeculo.		
2	A23	illi autem quibus non est data facultas **\subtilitates miraculosas intellegere/** non **potest** capax fieri.	interlinear insertion A → B	It seems that he replaced the *posse* and infinitive construction "*intellegere potest*" in A with the independent potential subjunctive "*intelligantur*" in B to avoid pleonasm, and also preferred the hendiadys "*subtilitates et miracula*" over the adjectival phrase "*subtilitates miraculosas*" of the A.
	B12[b]	ignorantibus autem **subtilitates et miracula** eius non **intelligantur.**		

---

85 Especially 102[a-b], 103[a], 108[a] among others. Again for keeping the two texts aligned he left large blank spaces in some pages, see 111[b].

86 The following transcription symbols are used in this table: / \ insertion on the line; \ / interlinear insertion; \\ // marginal insertion; [ ] erasure; [/] correction: [pre-correction form/ post-correction form].

Ex.		Latin texts	Description and probable direction of the revision	Notes
3	A28	illi **verum\tamen/** qui sunt invigiles	interlinear insertion A → B	The word insertion revision is implemented in B.
	B14ᵃ	**verumtamen** illi qui invigiles		
4	A33	nunc chorus et circuitus prophetiae \ad/ hu[ic/nc] pertinet.	interlinear insertion; syntax-related correction on the line A → B	He must have realized that the verb *pertinere* does not govern a dative, and hence changed the dative *huic* to the prepositional phrase "*ad istum ipsum*" in B.
	B15ᵃ	nunc autem series et ordo circuitusque temporis prophetiae **ad istum** ipsum pertinet.		
5	A35-36	quoniam quicumque hic non reperiet, **neque cognoverit** nec ante videre ipsum potuerit, ille erit qui ibi in futuro saeculo etiam videndi neque conveniendi potestatem habebit.	marginal insertion B ↔ A	While the Turkish expression "[*ve*] *bilmeyen*" (B15ᵇ) was translated and written as "*neque cognoverit*" in A, it was first omitted and later inserted as "*et non cognoverit*" in B. If he did not realize this omission reading the Turkish text, he must have noticed in the Latin translation of A or another copy unknown to us. Because the extant part of A, which corresponds roughly to one fourth of B, contains many more corrections and insertions, this and similar cases hardly suggest the earlier production of B than A.
	B15ᵇ	cum equidem quicumque hic ipsum non reperierit \\ **et non cognoverit//** et non viderit ipse erit qui etiam in futuro saeculo non videbit nec conveniendi habebit facultatem.		
6	A36	Attamen \recognoscandum est ut/ deus altissimus e sua immensa clementia nobis utilissimum remedium praestavit.	interlinear insertion A → B	The Turkish expression "*Gerektir imdi bunu bilmeğe ki*" (B15ᵇ) that he forgot to translate is inserted as "*recognoscandum est ut*" in A, and this revision is implemented in B with a grammatical modification, namely by using subjunctive (*ut recognoscatur*) instead of gerundive.
	B15ᵇ	Operae pretium est ergo **ut** hoc **recognoscatur,** namque deus altissimus e sua immensa clementia nobis imbecillibus valde opportunum et utilissimum remedium condonare dignatus est.		
7	A46	altare etiam cristicolorum eadem fuerat sed postquam beata maria pro partu domini iesu in villam betlehem **proficiss[isset/eretur]** quae versus orientem sita fuerat.	verb morphology-related erasure and interlinear correction A → B	As the revisions in A clearly show, he first forgot that *proficiscor* is a deponent verb, and conjugated as if it was an active verb. Then he corrected it as *proficisseretur* (read *proficisceretur*) but he probably unwittingly shifted the tense from pluperfect to imperfect. In B we see the correct form *profecta fuisset.*[*] Because this is a fairly common error, and we can easily follow his process of self-correction, the direction of this revision must have been from A to B. [*] The use of the perfective forms of *esse* in periphrastic verbs is typical of the post-Classical Latin.
	B18ᵃ	item cristicolorum etiam altare sanctuarii eadem erat, verumtamen, cum postremo beata virgo maria pro partu domini iesu in villam quandam betlehem vocatam **profecta fuisset** quae quidem versus orientem sita fuerat.		
8	A51	ista vero semper fieri solent, \propter **transgressionem in peccatis populorum/** ut populus eius temporis somno peccatorum resuscitarentur.	interlinear insertion A → B	The Turkish expression "*ma'ṣıyyete gâyet ile tecâvüzlerinden ötürü*" (B19ᵃ) that he forgot to translate is inserted as "*propter transgressionem in peccatis populorum*" in A, and this is incorporated with minor change (*hominum* instead of *populorum*) into the body text of B.
	B19ᵃ	solet namque talia contingi **propter transgressionem hominum in peccatis,** ut populus eius temporis e somno peccatorum resuscitarentur.		

Ex.		Latin texts	Description and probable direction of the revision	Notes
9	A57	progenies ismaeli quaquidem tot et tanta multitudine augmentati fuerant [**sectam/ordinem**]que abrahami in fide divina observabant.	erasure and interlinear correction	He amended in A the word "*sectam*" to "*ordinem*", and the latter is incorporated into body text in B.
	B21ᵃ	progenies ismaeli qui augmentati et mutitudine summa plurificati fuerant, ipsi saltem **ordinem** divi abraham custodientes in fide divina observabant.	A → B	
10	A61	kad nerā tekallube \vegzhike/ fiszszemai felenuellienneke kibleten terzāha fevelli vegzheke satrel meszgzidil harami	interlinear insertion	In A he first forgot to write the phonetic transcription "vegzhike", later added it as an interlinear insertion. In B that transcription is incorporated into the body text.
	B21ᵇ-22ᵃ	kad neraa tekallube **vegzhike** fiszszemai fevenuellienneke kibleten terzaaha fevelli vegzheke satrel meszgzidil harami	A → B	
11	A94	\\cor nostrum illuminatione vel luce amoris tui adimplere digneris ut oculis nostris amor mundana lumne videri possit. hunc pro.rosissimum et vilissimum tu e nobis eiicere digneris. o domine deus director ad concordiam voluntatis tuae.//	marginal insertions	This most significant revision strongly indicates that A was written earlier than B. Because, he inserted an entire paragraph and three translated couplets in the margins of A, all of which are incorporated in the body text of B. Consistently with his general practice he also added in B the phonetic transcription of the Turkish originals of those couplets. It is unlikely that he wrote B earlier, then copying A he forgot or omitted such a long passage but realized it and added in the margins of A. The fact that the phonetic transcriptions are omitted in A but present in B further reduces the likelihood of this possibility.
		\\versus, o domine deus adoratus propter sanctitatem et honorum divinitatis tuae numera me inter pauperos in fide tua tibi placentes, nec me prae duritia paucitatis esurientem effice meque vero me praeter te ullo indigentem effice! domum tuam mei cordis illumina mihi oculosque meos contra te peccantes et peccare tuentes caecos effice.//	A → B	
		Imple et illumina cor nostrum vera luce amoris tui ut amor mundanus eiciatur nec locum habeat in corde nostro, immo vilissimus videatur. itaque hunc vilissimum e corde nostro eycere digneris. o director et heres directionis in concordiam tuae voluntatis.		
	B29ᵇ	versus turcicus, *eizzetung hakki igzun ÿ meabud fukaraden beni eÿle mahdud. ne benÿ killetile agz eÿle. ne szenung gaÿrunge muhtagz eÿle. kÿabei kalbumi nur eÿle benum. aÿni eiszÿanumi kÿeor eÿle benum.* hoc est ut, o domine deus adoratus propter honorem tui sanctitatis et divinitatis numera me inter pauperes in fide tua tibi placentes. nec me prae duritia paucitatis esurientem effice. neque vero me praeter te indigentem effice. domum tuam mei cordis illumina mihi. oculosque meos peccatorum contra te tuentes caecos effice.		
12	A112	iste autem metae et gradus et termina et tecta vel loca dignitatis **quae inter deum at hominum interiecta sunt. dixerunt doctores ut**// mille velamina velariaque [dixerunt/elevabuntur].	marginal insertion	The Turkish expression "*Hak Teâlâ ile kul mâbeyninde* […] *vâki' olmuştur,* […] *demişler*" (B33ᵇ) that he forgot to translate is inserted as "*quae inter deum at hominum interiecta sunt. dixerunt doctores ut*" in the margin of A, and this is incorporated with some minor changes into the body text of B.
	B33ᵇ	namque enim obnoxia et gradua tectoria **quae inter deum et eius famulos contigerunt doctores** divini numeraverunt et **dixerunt** mille gradus esse.	A → B	

All these strongly suggest that the copy A was written earlier than B, and it was, or later became a draft copy. This finding is important in several respects. First, it provides a ground on which plausible arguments on the internal processes of Murad Bey's translation work can be formulated. Furthermore, it enables us to productively relate circumstances, especially the *quando*, *quomodo*, and *cui bono* of the translation, which generally correspond to its time, methods, and beneficiaries. As will be seen below in Table 17 and its explanation, the meaning of a knowledgeable reader's (Jacob Palaeologus) comment depends among other things on the chronological ordering of these two manuscripts. This in return hypothetically allows to narrow down the likely time frame for the creation of the copy A.

We can continue with the two distinct but complementary dimensions of the *quomodo* of *Tesviye*. These are Murad Bey's translation criticism and his own translation strategy. As for the latter, the translation procedures that Murad Bey used in *Tesviye* are various, and it would not be wise to define his strategy within dualistic frameworks such as literal versus free translation, or within any other rigid categorical framework. This is not only due to differences in historical translation norms. *Tesviye* is a self-translation, therefore the tension between form and meaning, author and translator requires a different if not more adaptable descriptive/critical approach. I think that the safest general characterization of Murad Bey's translation strategy in *Tesviye* would be cultural translation,[87] in that although he was fully aware of the differences between European and Ottoman, Christian and Islamic cultures, and between the inner layers of these, he did not concede the untranslatability of cultures. When translating he usually paid due attention to the peculiarities of these cultures, and instances where he assumed equivalence between concepts do not invalidate this. Besides, as a Muslim who followed the Sufi way, he had recognized the limitations of communication even within the same language.[88] In short, several translation strategies seem to be adopted by our author-translator, and decisions on that may be related to his aims, his Latin and written translation skills, as well as his multifaceted cultural and professional identity, as an author and dragoman, as a Muslim who internalized Ottoman culture

---

87 On the various senses of the term, see, Ovidio Carbonell, "The Exotic Space of Cutural Translation", *Translation, Power, Subversion*, ed. Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996), pp. 79-98.

88 In 149ᵇ he wrote the following about God and the prophet Muhammad: "quamvis ista mea lingua fragilis qualem habeat vim ut quiverim eorum laudem enarrandique vel saltem significandi conatum habere!" [What is the strength of my feeble tongue that I could undertake the endeavour of telling or even referring to their praise!], for the context, see Table 3 above.

and an ex-Christian with middle-European educational background. The following examples may give a hint on the different aspects of his translation approach.

In the appended hymn in the form of *qasida* (157ᵇ), he translated the expression "*sad hezâr âh*" (hundred thousand sighs [of sorrow]) as, "*o ingens querela, gementia magna et mille ah*" (o the enormous grievance, the great lament and thousand sighs). The interjection "*ah*" is comparable in Latin and Turkish, yet the literal translation "*mille ah*" (thousand ah) would not mean much by itself in the target text, because in both languages this interjection can express a range of emotions. This appears to have led Murad Bey to over-translation, that is, to use more words to express an idea in target text than were used in source text.

As the following example illustrates, at times he took foreignization strategy to the point of risking intelligibility: In two instances (9ᵃ and 55ᵃ) he translated the Turkish idiom "*kılı kırk yarmak*" [to divide a hair into forty parts] overly literal as "*unum pilum ad quadraginta partes dividere*". The idiom denotes the act of examining something meticulously down to the smallest detail, but a reader unfamiliar with Turkish culture could scarcely understand this. In another case, where he applied the procedures of borrowing and cultural equivalence in conjunction, Murad Bey was more temperate in foreignization. In the section on Islamic observance, and within the context of a particular kind of almsgiving called "fitre" (25ᵇ), he translated the festival of Ramadan as "*pascha bayram ieiunii*" [the Easter like festival called *bayram* related to fasting], and thus informed the reader that Ramadan and the festival (*bayram*) of Ramadan can be compared to Lent (*ieiunium*) and Easter (*pascha*) respectively. By contrast, translating the same section in the copy A (p. 78), which must be produced earlier as is shown above, he had established a direct equivalence between "*bayram*" and "*pascha*" by writing "in pasc[h]ate post ieiunium festo die" [on the day of Easter following the fasting].

We find a similar attention to intelligibility in the translation of the Quranic metaphor of the Seal of the prophets.[89] This metaphor emphasizes that Muhammad is the last prophet. As a seal in a letter confirms the completion of the message and the identity of the sender, so Muhammad as "the seal of the prophets" represents the completion of the revelation that has been going on since the time of the first prophet Adam, and the permanent confirmation of the true words of God.[90]

---

89 " […] he is the Messenger of God and the Seal of the prophets." (al-Azhab 33:40, trans. Nasr et al., *The Study Quran*, p. 1032).

90 See 46ᵇ for Murad Bey's account on this.

In his first use of the metaphor (8ᵇ), Murad Bey rendered the simple partitive phrase of "*hâtemü'n- nebiyyîn*" [the seal of the prophets] as "*ultimus propheta postremus et sigillum omnium prophetarum*" [the latest and final prophet and the seal of all prophets], and thus tried to expand his literal translation.

From the last of these examples, which can easily be multiplied, we can turn to that other dimension under the *quomodo* of *Tesviye*, namely Murad Bey's translation criticism. He approaches this matter from two main angles, both related to the distortion of the Scriptures in translation. One is the bias of translators who are hostile to Islam, and the other is the incompetency of translators.[91] Murad Bey was aware that this latter might apply to himself as well, and I think that bilingual translation was his principal way of compensating for it. To my knowledge and surprise, it has not been asked why Murad Bey preferred to produce a bilingual text instead of the Latin translation alone. The main reason might be his belief that all translations of the holy books of God should be read along with their original text for easier identification of errors by the learned.[92] *Tesviye* abounds with quotations from the Quran. He thus might have wanted to avoid accusations of blasphemy that may be levelled in case of inadequate translations. I think his consistent use of the phonetic transcription when he translates from or into languages written in Arabic letters, and of the diacritics when he writes with those letters is related to this translation strategy of testability. Moreover, he practised this in non-religious or more precisely non-Quranic texts as well, regardless of if he was quoting from *Disticha Catonis* in an *album amicorum* (Hmb. p. 767), or couplets from Ottoman poetry (see for instance 98ᵇ) or a Turkish proverb such as the following in *Tesviye*:

---

91 Murad Bey stated this in the section (12ᵃ⁻ᵇ; cf. A. pp. 19-22) where he summarized his discussion on translations of the Scriptures with a religious scholar during his captivity in Transylvania. As an example, he mentioned without name a translation of the Psalms from Latin into Hungarian. Having convinced his collocutor about the inadequacy of a decision in that translation, he claimed that mistranslation, even if not intended, is among the main causes of the degeneration of faiths prior to Islam. For a short summary of Bible translations into Hungarian in the sixteenth century, see Ács Pál and Louthan Howard, "Bibles and Books: Bohemia and Hungary", *A Companion to the Reformation in Central Europe*, ed. Howard Louthan and Graeme Murdock (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2015), pp. 405-406; Edina Zvara, "Scholarly Translators and Committed Disputants: The First Century of the Hungarian Bible", *Hungarian Studies*, 31/2 (2017), pp. 271-282.

92 See fols. 10ᵇ-12ᵇ and A. pp. 15-22.

Table 14: Tr. and Lat. text from 95[b] with Eng. trans.

Ata bakma dona bakma câna bak, Şol gönül içindeki sultâna bak.	*ata bakma dona bakma gzane bak, sul gjungul ÿchindegy szultane bak,* ut ne aspicias externum suum equum et induitum, immo regem inspicias aeternalem in corde eius.	Do not look at the horse, nor at the clothes of someone, look at the eternal king [residing] in his heart.

A shorter variant of this Turkish proverb was later recorded by the nineteenth-century Hungarian Turkologist and mediator Ármin Vámbéry as "Ata bakma, icsindeki dsana bak".[93] Apart from documenting an earlier variant of the proverb, Murad Bey's quotation with phonetic transcription and Latin translation confirms that the correct reading of the first word was "ata" (at the horse) and not the almost equally plausible "ete" (at the flesh). This and similar cases in his translated texts considered, one can suggest that as a translator Murad Bey was keenly aware of his prospective readership.

In the following passage Murad Bey criticizes Theodor Bibliander's (c. 1505–1564) famous Latin translation and commentary of Quran, and especially a problematic translation and interpretation of a verse from the sura al-Baqarah:[94]

> Ve tâife-i Nasârâ kâfirlerinden biri [94[b]] Kelâm-ı Kadîmi kendi zu'm-ı fâsidesi üzere tercüme ettiği nüshasında "Nisâüküm harsun leküm fe'tû harseküm ennâ şi'tüm" ve ol mevki dübür hod hars denilmeğe yaramaz. Fe'tûhünne dese, hele dedikleri vechi olaydı ammâ fe'tû harseküm diye hars tekrar ifrâd bi'z-zikr vâki' olmuştur. Pes, ol dediği mânâya hars nice alınsın?
>
> Pes, nazar eylen ki ol kütüb-i selefeyi dahi ne yüzden muktezâlarına göre önün ardın çalmayıp tahrif ede, uş kıldıkları butlâna bu dahi şahittir.

---

93 See Vámbéry Ármin, "Török Példabeszédek", *Nyelvtudományi közlemények*, 1 (1862), p. 274.

94 See n. 95 below; Theodorus Bibliander, *Machumetis Saracenorum principis eiusque successorum vitae ac doctrina ipseque Alcoran: [1] Confutationes* (Basel: Johannes Oporin, 1543), p. 105

Table 15: Lat. text from 94ᵃ⁻ᵇ with Eng. trans.

Infidelis quidam cristicola [94ᵇ] qui secundum suum malum arbitrium divum alcuranum secundum textum extraneum false interpretatus est. in eodem autem codice respexi et vidi ut ubi dictum est ut *niszausum harszun lekum feetu harszukum enna sÿÿtum*,⁹⁵ hoc est ut uxores vestrae sunt vobis terra segetalis vel pratum seminale, ergo accedite ad segetalem et seminalem pratam vestram ex qua parte vel undecunque volueritis. Hic in isto loco autem ita est interpretatus ut tanquam ad illam malam sodomiam licentia data sit. Absit, deus auferat ut ita sit, namque enim locus posternus videlicet culus, seminalem vel segetalem dici non conheret; sin autem dixisset ut accedite ad uxores vestras undecunque volueritis, eo pacto aliquantulum haec dicta conhererent, sed cum iam *feetu harszekum* seminalem vel segetalem locum dupliciter recordatus est, quo pacto ergo intelligatur ad locum posternum? Ergo aspicite et videte quomodo libros etiam predecessos quali forma secundum desiderium et arbitrium suum initium rei vel finem non considerantes transferrentes et mutantes, ecce omnia opera eorum inania esse actus eorum in isto loco alcurani etiam testis est et manifestat.	An infidel Christian who, [94ᵇ] acting on his bad intention, incorrectly translated the Holy Quran by following the external text alone.⁹⁶ I relooked at that book and saw the passage where it was said "*niszausum harszun lekum feetu harszukum enna sÿÿtum*," that is, "Your wives are your tilth (or your plantable field), so approach your tillable and plantable field from any direction (or from wherever) you wish." He, however, translated there in such a way that one can suppose that such a great sin as sodomy was allowed. God forbid! Because, indeed, it makes no sense to say that the back part, that is, the buttocks is plantable or tillable; had He not said "approach your wives from wherever you wish" then these words [=interpretation] could make a little bit of sense, but since he has written once more "*feetu harszekum*"⁹⁷ [that is] plantable or tillable place, how then can it be possible to understand the back part? Look and see, then, how they translate and distort even the previous [holy] books according to their own pleasure and opinion, without looking at the beginning or the end; their doing in this section of the Quran also testifies and manifests that all their works are vain.

---

95 "Your women are a tilth to you, so go unto your tilth as you will, […]" (Quran, al-Baqarah 2:223, trans. Nasr et al., *The Study Quran*, p. 98).

96 The expression "external text" (*textus extraneus*) suggests that the general distinction he makes in religious matters between internal and external things covers translation as well.

97 "go unto your tilth".

Bibliander's commentary was for the most part a compilation of various earlier works that are mostly biased towards Islam.[98] Indeed, the original writer of that note criticized by Murad Bey was the Italian Dominican friar Riccoldo da Monte di Croce (c. 1243–1320).[99]

Quando?

As for the temporal circumstance, at the epilogue of *Tesviye* (148[b]) we read that Murad Bey began writing his book in 1556 and completed it in a year. We also learn from him (152[b]) that he put his hand to the Latin translation a decade later in 1567 and finished it in 1569:

> Hicret-i nebeviyyenin dokuz yüz yetmiş dördünde Latin dili üzere dahi tercüme etmesine başlayıp dokuz yüz yetmiş beşinde mübarek Şaban ayında tamam oldu.

---

98 On the encyclopaedic nature of Bibliander's work and his debt to Riccoldo, see Gregory J. Miller, "Theodor Bibliander's Machumetis saracenorum principis eiusque successorum vitae, doctrina ac ipse alcoran (1543) as the Sixteenth-century 'Encyclopedia' of Islam", *Islam and Christian–Muslim Relations,* 24/2 (2013), p. 250.

99 Vincenzo Lavenia, "Between Heresy and 'Crimes against Nature': Sexuality, Islamophobia and the Inquisition in Early Modern Europe", *Mediterranean Crossings. Sexual Transgressions in Islam and Christianity (10th-18th Centuries)*, ed. Umberto Grassi (Roma: Viella, 2020), p. 82. Bibliander had quoted the following passage (193[v], 38-43) of Riccoldo: "Item in capitulo de *Vacca,* concedit sodomiam tam cum masculo quam cum femina. Dicit enim Saracenis quod 'non polluant se cum infidelibus nisi credant'. Et de mulieribus dicit: 'Mulieres uestre aratura uestra, arate eas ut uultis'. Et tamen in eodem capitulo prius dicit quod 'illi sodomite tempore Loth operati sunt abominabile uicium et pristinis nationibus insuetum' [In the sura of the Cow, [Muhammad] allowed sodomy with man as well as with woman. However, he tells the Saracens "not to taint themselves with infidels unless they acquire faith". And he says about women: "Your wives are your field; plough them as you wish". Nevertheless, he had said earlier in the same sura that the people of Sodom committed at the time of Lot an abominable sin that even people that came before them were unaccustomed to], Jean-Marie Mérigoux, "L'ouvrage d'un frère prêcheur florentin en Orient à la fin du XIIIe siècle. Le 'Contra legem Sarracenorum' de Riccoldo da Monte di Croce", *Memorie domenicane*, 17 (1986), p. 84.

Table 16: Lat. text from 152[b] with Eng. trans.

Tandem postea anno transmigrationis prophetae nostri noningento [sic] et septuagesimo quarto anno quoque virginis partus millesimo quingentesimo sexagesimo septimo incepi ut transferam etiam in linguam latinam perfinivique anno prophetae noningento [sic] et septuagesimo quinto in mense seaban annoque virginis partus millesimo quingentesimo sexagesimo nono [sic] mense februarii.	At last, in the year 974 after the migration of our prophet, which is 1567 from the delivery of the Virgin, I began translating it into Latin and completed in the month of Şaban of the year 975 after the migration of our prophet, which is February 1569[100] from the delivery of the Virgin.

He also mentions (152[b]-153[a]) that the idea of writing such a work and translating it into Latin grew out of his communication with Christian theologians during his thirty months of political captivity in Transylvania, which lasted from 1551 to 1553.

Another temporal layer of the circumstance *quando* would be in our case the related stages of life and career of the translator, who was born in 1509, taken captive by the Turks as a young man during the Battle of Mohács (149[a]), converted to Islam some time later, and sent to Transylvania as a member of a delegation in 1551 and confined once again but this time by the Christians (namely by the mercenary commander Gianbattista Castaldo),[101] and as a mature man and a Muslim, ransomed by Rüstem Pasha, and having been introduced by him to Sultan Suleiman, began to serve as a court dragoman (Dergâh-ı âlî tercümanı) in 1553. Shortly after this he began to write *Tesviye*, as a personal account of as much as a guide to conversion to Islam.

As for the manuscripts, the earliest exemplar so far known is the manuscript D in Turkish, and dates from 1560. The intact bilingual copy (B) must have been written during the reign of Murad III, as the author praise him in the introduction as the reigning sultan, that is after 1574.[102] Although as mentioned before, a large portion that corresponds roughly to three quarters of the entire work is missing from the other bilingual copy (A), and there are indications that this exemplar was written earlier.

---

100 The correct conversion for this last date should have been 1568, as it was first noted by Kropf Lajos, "Terdsüman Murád", *Századok*, 31 (1897), p. 388.

101 Ács thinks that they were prisoned together with Mahmud Bey, see "Tarjumans Mahmud and Murad", p. 312.

102 First pointed out by Lajos, "Terdsüman Murád", p. 389.

From the researchers' temporal standpoint, be they translation scholar, historian, or philologist, studying the history of *Tesviye* translation may be especially worthwhile today thanks to the prominence given to interdisciplinarity, the constantly improving means of digital communication, and the achievements of digital humanities.

Cui bono?

This circumstance concerns beneficiaries of the translation projects, which include the readers mainly but also the translators, other translation agents, or various actors of the source and target cultures, in both synchronic and diachronic dimensions, as well as scholars of translation studies and other fields.

An important question that emerges here is how widely disseminated was *Tesviye* in the given historical context.[103] Kâtib Çelebi mentions the work in passing in his *Kashf al-Zunun*.[104] Historians think that some European envoys or refugees such as Adam Neuser and Jacob Palaeologus might have read it in Istanbul.[105] Also, it seems that the manuscript(s) of *Tesviye* may have passed through the hands of some seemingly marginal Christian circles in Istanbul, who were maybe looking for a better version of the Christianity in Islam, and hence considering conversion. The passage in a letter dating from 1573 where Palaeologus, one of those Christians, recorded his views on *Tesviye* serves as a unique "reader's report" and deserves to be quoted in full:[106]

---

103 See Barbarics-Hermanik, "Books as a Means", pp. 113-118.

104 See Katib Çelebi, *Lexicon bibliographicum et encylopaedicum. Tomus II (Literas Bá - Jim complectens)*, ed. and trans. Gustav Flügel (Leipzig: The Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland, 1837), p. 290, entry 2984.

105 See Martin Mulsow, "Fluchträume und Konversionsräume zwischen Heidelberg und Istanbul", *Kriminelle - Freidenker - Alchemisten*, ed. Martin Mulsow (Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 2014), pp. 49-53; "Antitrinitarians and Conversion to Islam. Adam Neuser reads Murad b. Abdullah in Ottoman Istanbul", *Conversion and Islam in the Early Modern Mediterranean. The Lure of the Other*, ed. Claire Norton (London: Routledge, 2017), p. 184; Martin Rothkegel, "Jacobus Palaeologus in Constantinople, 1554-5 and 1573", *Osmanlı İstanbulu IV (IV. Uluslararası Osmanlı İstanbulu Sempozyumu bildirileri, 20-22 Mayıs 2016)*, ed. Feridun M. Emecen, Ali Akyıldız, and Emrah Safa Gürkan (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi, 2016), p. 1001; Pamuk, "Tercüman Murad", pp. 115-116.

106 The letter has been published several times with minor revisions, my translation follows the 1594 edition, which is the most accessible, Jacobus Palaeologus, *Epistola Iacobi Palaeologi, de rebus Constantinopoli et Chii cum eo actis, lectu digna* (Ursel: Henricus, 1594).

Table 17: Lat. text from the *epistula* (pp. 19-20) of Jacob Palaeologus with Eng. trans.

[…] datus est mihi legendus liber Turcicus, cum apposita ad singulos versus Latina interpretatione, ab interprete vno Regio sene, et non indocto viro, sacerdote olim, prius Christianorum, deinde Turcorum: In eo tota religio Turcica explicabatur. Hoc audito Nicolaus ille cum suis sociis venit ad me, rogans, ne iudicium meum in librum, dicerem, nec contradicere vellem; ne periclitarer. Respondi: "Si tacenda est veritas, satius erat Romae reticere." Dicebat autem, omnes milites ex Christianis factos Turcos, cum rogarentur quid crederent, vt vitarent improbitatem Sacerdotum, cogi dicere, Id quod Rex credit. Ita enim vitare omnes molestias. Venit igitur ille, et dixit, "Legistine librum?" "Perlegi," inquam ego; et ille: "Tam cito?" "Quid ni," inquam, "cum vitam traduxerim legendo, commentando?" Et ille: "Quid sentis? Eris Turcus?" "Multum," inquam ego, "longinquus sum ab hac sententia: nam liber vester principia et fines habet de Mehemeto, et citat Alcoranum. Media omnia continent tractatum de virtutibus. De virtitubis autem ciuilibus vellem legisses scriptores Graecos et Latinos eos, qui fuerunt ante natum Christum et Mehemetum: De Mehemeto autem, nisi Alcoranus abs te bene vertatur, postquam dicis, fuisse a Christianis male versum, et ego bene versum legero, quid dicere possim? Est tamen, in quo disputem tecum de annis, quod non videatur annus 981 transmigrationis Mehemeti, respondere Anno natiuitatis Christi 1573, posse: nisi velis facere, vt primus annus transmigrationis Mehemeti fuerit annus natiuitatis Christi 631, quod tu negas, et dicis annum primum transmigrationis incidisse in annum 592. Nam, si annus Turcicus est Lunaris et dierum 354, quomodo potest respondere annuatim annis Christianorum, qui sunt solares et dierum 365, hor[arum] 6?" Ita disputationem de annis exorsus, coegi illum melius cogitare, et dixit: "Audiui te doctum esse, et perspicacis ingenii, et multae lectionis."

[…] I was given for reading a Turkish book with a line-by-line Latin translation at the side by an old translator of the [Ottoman] court, not an uneducated man, used to be a priest, first of the Christians, then of the Turks [=Muslims]. The whole Turkish [=Islamic] religion is explained in it. Having heard this, Nicolaus [=Neuser] came to me with his companions, to request that I do not give my opinion on the book, nor I attempt to refute it, and I do not put myself in danger. I responded: "If one must keep silent about the truth, it would be better to keep silent in Rome." He said in return that all soldiers who were converted from Christian to Turk [=Muslim], when asked what faith they belong to, they were obliged to say that they believe the same as the sovereign does, to avoid the outrage of the priests. Indeed, they thus avoided all troubles. He [=Neuser?] came then, and said, "Have you read the book?", I answered that I read it all; and he asked, "So fast?" I said, "Why not, especially since I have spent my life reading and commenting?" And he asked, "What do you think? Will you be a Turk [=Muslim]?" I replied: "I feel very distant from this notion.[107] Because the beginning and end of your (pl.) book [=the book you gave] are about Muhammad and quote the Quran. All the middle sections comprise a treatise about virtues. I wish; however, you had read those Greek and Latin writers, who were born before Christ and Muhammad. As for Muhammad, what can I say if you do not produce a proper translation of the Quran, since you say that it was poorly translated by a Christian? I too would read the one that is properly translated. There is yet something that I could discuss with you about years, as it is not realized that the year 981 from the Hijra of Muhammad can correspond to the year 1573 from the year of Christ's birth, if one does not want to assume the first year from the Hijra of Muhammad was the year 631 from the birth of Christ, which you will reject and say that the first year of the Hijra corresponded to the year 592. Because, if the Turkish [=Islamic] year is a lunar year and consists for 354 days, how can it correspond one-to-one to Christian years, which are solar and consist of 365 days and 6 hours?" Thus, I began a discussion on years, and urged him to think more accurately, and he said: "I had heard indeed that you were well educated, had a keen intelligence, and did a lot of reading."

---

107 The Latin text of this sentence ("*multum, inquam ego, longinquus sum ab hac sententia*" in both the 1591 and 1594 editions of the *Epistula*) contains no expression that corresponds

There are many interesting things in this passage and its author can be rightfully mentioned within the circumstance of *quis* as one of the critics of *Tesviye* translation, or as one of the agents, though secondary, who contributed to it, hence within the circumstance of *quibus auxiliis*. While historians of Christian-Muslim relations have generally looked for vestiges of the anti-Trinitarian circles, I was attracted more to the pale but recognizable reflection of *Tesviye* in it. The remarks of Palaeologus about the book's middle sections on civil virtues, apart from indicating that the copy he read was most likely a one (maybe the copy A) that contained the two chapters directly translated from *Mukaddime*, also suggest that if Murad Bey was informed about this dialogue on his book, which seems very likely, he may have valued the comments of Palaeologus, who claimed that Greek and Roman authors would serve as a much better source for learning those virtues. In short, this may be the reason why he decided to exclude the translated chapters of *Mukaddime* from the copy B, dating from post-1574.[108]

The end section of the passage (p. 20), which deals with a misconception about calendar conversion, may be equally important in relation to *Tesviye*.[109] In his translated writings that are extant, we find only a few instances where Murad

to "a great work" that Mulsow ("Antitrinitarians", p. 185) inserted into his English translation and others repeated uncritically, see Pamuk, "Tercüman Murad", p. 116, n. 376. Mulsow obviously did not realize that the adverb *multum*, while separated with a comma, modifies the adjective *longinquus*. This seemingly minor error gives a misleading idea of the attitude of Palaeologus. Writing on the same letter Mulsow made another careless error by translating "*ab interprete vno Regio sene*" as "by one of six royal translators"; he obviously mistook the adjective *senex* as *senus*, "Antitrinitarians", p. 184.

108 Mulsow, who wrote on this letter, made an apparent mistake by stating that there is a single extant copy (means the B) of *Tesviye*, and this must be the very copy read by Palaeologus in 1573. This is not possible because there is a eulogy of Murad III in the epilogue (149b) of the copy B, which allows us to securely date it to between 1574 and 1595, which corresponds to the reign of this sultan, see Mulsow, "Antitrinitarians", pp. 184, 189, n. 13; Pamuk, "Tercüman Murad", p. 67.

109 Cf. Mulsow, "Fluchträume", pp. 53-54. Mulsow seems to have struggled with the Latin of this passage, as he clearly deviated from the source text by writing that: "Aber wie sah es denn auf der Seite von Palaeologus aus? Warum nennt er das Jahr 631? Die Hidschra –der Auszug Mohammeds von Mekka nach Medina –geschah ja 622 und nicht 631. War sich auch Palaeologus über die chronologische Rechnung nicht wirklich im Klaren?" [But what then was the situation on Palaeologus' side? Why did he mention the year 631? The Hijra –the migration of Muhammad from Mecca to Medina– took place in 622, not 631. Was Palaeologus also not really clear about the chronological calculation?].

Bey converted between the Hijri and Gregorian calendars. The conversions at the end of the copy B of *Tesviye* are correct except a single error, which seems like a *lapsus mentis* rather than a logical mistake.[110] I will venture to state that Murad Bey may have owed these virtually accurate conversions to Palaeologus again, if Palaeologus was there speaking about the date conversion errors he had seen in that *Tesviye* copy and not in a draft of Neuser's Latin translation under way of the Quran.[111] Along the same line of speculation, it can be suggested that there was maybe an epilogue with incorrectly converted dates at the end of the now-lost sections of the copy A. I will conclude this line of thought by pointing out that Murad Bey correctly converted the Hijri year of 978 as 1571 (or vice versa) in his autograph entry in the *album* of Manlius.[112] Therefore, we can also hypothetically assume that Palaeologus read a *Tesviye* copy (maybe the copy A) that was written between 1568 (the year Murad Bey completed the translation) and 1571. This another good example for the connections between circumstances, as a reader response enables new insights into the dating of a manuscript of the translation under study.

Taken with his other extant self-translation, namely his trilingual religious hymn praising Islam, *Tesviye* gives the impression that Murad Bey was sincerely aiming to convince his once fellow Christians to convert to Islam for their own salvation. While we are not aware of mass conversions of Murad Bey's former countrymen,[113] *Tesviye* seems to have served, along with his religious hymn, as a guide and persuasion means for some Unitarians mainly in Istanbul,[114] and this would hardly be possible had they not been translated into Latin.

Concluding Remarks

All these circumstances regarding *Tesviye* translation can be further explored in different layers to the extent that the research material allows. What is essential from our point of view is that *Tesviye* was meant to be translated right from the outset. I think that Murad Bey's self-avowed lack of Latin skills may be a little too

---

110 See 148ᵃ, 152ᵇ, also Table 5 and 16 above for the transcription and English translation; see n. 100 above for that error.

111 On Neuser's anticipated Quran translation that was expected to replace Theodor Biblian-der's much criticized translation and commentary, see Mulsow, "Antitrinitarians", p. 186.

112 See H. fol. 26ᵃᵛ, also Table 1 above for the transcription and English translation.

113 Ivušić, "Developing Consistency", p. 152.

114 See Ács, "Tarjumans Mahmud and Murad", pp. 315-316.

easily accepted by his commentators.[115] It is true that his Latin is far from classical, and closer to Hungarian Latinity.[116] His word choice is not always felicitous and gets repetitive at times. There are some spelling and grammar errors, and skilled readers can notice the lack of confidence in some of his constructions. On the other hand, his Latin rendition reads quite fluently for the most part, and he was able to come up with both adequate and creative solutions in some places where the source text is heavily imbued with the characteristics of Islam and Ottoman culture, and hence hardly penetrable for his target readers. In fact, Murad Bey's difficulties with Latin, present an opportunity for the historian, because in many places where I think he may have sweated over translation, he shifts from literal to expanded translation, and this often lets us better follow the flow of his thought in several layers including translation decisions.

As I tried to point out, this ego-document's importance is not limited to the first-hand account it contains about the life and career of a sixteenth century dragoman; it is also valuable for the information it provides on a myriad of subjects ranging from the linguistic features of the Ottoman Turkish of that era, to the multidimensional reception of Islam and Christianity within the historical, political, and cultural contexts of the Ottoman-Habsburg relations, from Anatolian Sufism to Turkish literary culture of the sixteenth century to name just a few. Due to the nature of this unique self-translation, detailed and multilayered study of the translated text is essential for the reliable understanding and description not only of its translation project but also of its value as an information source in general. This study which focused primarily on the Latin text and the translation process of *Tesviye*, can also be instrumental in exploring the well-known double question of how the general historiography can be useful for the shaping of translation historiography as a separate field, and how in return, histories of translation can contribute to general historiography.

---

115 His Latin has often been called "barbaric", see Leunclavius, *Historia*, col. 32, lines 9-11, col. 42, lines 27-28; Rieu, *Catalogue*, p. 9.

116 For instance, *inpraesentiarum* (149[b]) is in Hungarian Latin a common variant of the classical *in praesenti*(*a*), see Antonius Bartal, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis regni Hungariae* (Lipsiae: In aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1901), p. 337, sv. "inpresentiarum". Murad Bey's Latin contains many of these regional variants.

An Ottoman Dragoman Who "Translated/Converted" Himself: Murad Bey and His Tesviyetü't-Teveccüh ilal-Hakk

Abstract ■ The sixteenth-century Ottoman dragoman Murad ibn Abdullah (1509 - ca. 1585) may appear, at first glance, to be one of those who, having been brought to the Ottoman Empire as war prisoners, converted to Islam in order to escape the treatment they endure as slaves. However, his lengthy treatise *Tesviyetü't-teveccüh ilal-Hakk* [On Properly Submitting/Directing One's Face to God], which I will be studying here from the perspective of translation history, suggests that Murad Bey's attitude towards Islam may have been genuine. *Tesviye* is an unpublished and hence relatively unknown bilingual text in Ottoman Turkish and Latin. As the title suggests, it is a work of a theological nature, which is somewhat reminiscent of catechism manuals on the one hand, and on the other, of the confessional literature that began with Augustine's *Confessions*, as an ego-document. The difference is that it treats Islam by comparing it to Christianity and reflects a perspective largely influenced by Sufism. Its author Murad Bey, born as Balázs Somlyai, was a prisoner of war of Hungarian or Transylvanian origin, who was brought to the Ottoman capital as a youth and later converted there to Islam and finally became the chief Latin translator of the court, as the autobiographical section at the end of the work informs us. The treatise is historically very important, in that apart from general information on the reception of Islam and Christianity in different periods, it offers a unique contemporary perspective on the Sunni orthodoxy of the Ottoman state, which was then newly being established, as well as to the religious divide in Europe of that time. Moreover, as a convert, Murad Bey voices unexpectedly sharp criticism of the corruption of the Ottoman bureaucratic elites. The work was completed in 1557 and translated into Latin a decade later by the author himself, who was expecting it to be widely read by Europeans, but this expectation seems to have remained unfulfilled as the work has survived in only three known manuscripts, all autographs (of which one has the complete Turkish original and its Latin translation, one an incomplete draft of the bilingual text, and one has only the Turkish original). In this study, which draws on my ongoing work for the annotated English translation of the treatise, I will be exploring *Tesviye* from the perspective of translation history mainly through close readings of passages from the Latin translation and the source text.

Keywords: Translation Historiography, Self-translation, Religion and Translation, Dragoman Murad Bey (Balázs Somlyai), *Tesviyetü't-teveccüh ilal-Hakk*, Christian and Muslim Relations in Europe.

Bibliography

Ács, Pál: *Reformations in Hungary in the Age of the Ottoman Conquest*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2019.

...... : "Tarjumans Mahmud and Murad. Austrian and Hungarian Renegades as Sultan's Interpreters", *Europa und die Türken in der Renaissance*, ed. Bodo Guthmüller and Wilhelm Kühlmann, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag 2000, pp. 307-316.

Ács, Pál, and Gábor Petneházi: "Késre menő vita 1571-ben Murád dragomán (Somlyai Balázs) és Arnoldus Manlius között", *MONOKgraphia: tanulmányok Monok István 60. születésnapjára*, ed. Judit Nyerges, Attila Verók and Edina Zvara, Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó 2016, pp. 39-45.

Adıvar, Abdülhak Adnan: *Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim*, 4th ed., İstanbul: Remzi 1982.

Agorni, Mirella: "Translation History: Just Another History?", *Recent Trends in Translation Studies. An Anglo-Italian Perspective*, ed. Sara Laviosa, Giovanni Iamartino and Eileen Mulligan, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing 2021, pp. 2-19.

André, James St: "Tropes (Metaphor, Metonymy)", *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge. Sources, Concepts, Effects*, ed. Lieven D'hulst and Yves Gambier, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins 2019, pp. 39-44.

Ankersmit, F. R.: *Narrative Logic. A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff 1983.

Anna, Tüskés: *Magyarországi diákok a bécsi egyetemen 1365–1526. Students from Hungary at the University of Vienna 1365–1526,* Budapest: Az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Levéltára 2008.

Ármin, Vámbéry: "Török Példabeszédek", *Nyelvtudományi közlemények*, 1 (1862), pp. 269-306.

Aydın, Mehmet: *Cicero. Marino de Cavalli. Der-Medh-i Piri: Yaşlılığa Övgü. İnceleme - Metin - Dizin ve Tıpkıbasım*, Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu 2007.

Babinger, Franz: "Der Pfortendolmetsch Murad und seine Schriften", *Literaturdenkmäler aus Ungarns Türkenzeit. Nach Handschriften in Oxford und Wien*, ed. Franz Babinger and Robert Gragger, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 1927, pp. 33-54.

Barbarics-Hermanik, Zsuzsa: "Books as a Means of Transcultural Exchange between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans", *International Exchange in the Early Modern Book World*, Leiden: Brill 2016, pp. 103-123.

Bartal, Antonius: *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis regni Hungariae*, Lipsiae: In aedibus B. G. Teubneri 1901.

Bassnett, Susan: "Culture and Translation", *A Companion to Translation Studies*, ed. Piotr Kuhiwczak and Karin Littau, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters 2007, pp. 13-23.

Beaujour, Elizabeth Klosty: *Alien Tongues: Bilingual Russian Writers of the "First" Emigration*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1989.

Berman, Antoine: *Pour une critique des traductions. John Donne*, Paris: Gallimard 1995.

Bešker, Inoslav: "Tko se i kada dosjetio pravilima o pet W? [The Roots of the 5 Ws]", *MediAnali : međunarodni znanstveni časopis za pitanja medija, novinarstva, masovnog komuniciranja i odnosa s javnostima*, 3/5 (2009), pp. 49-64.

Bibliander, Theodorus: *Machumetis Saracenorum principis eiusque successorum vitae ac doctrina ipseque Alcoran: [1] Confutationes*, Basel: Johannes Oporin 1543.

Bourdieu, Pierre: *Questions de sociologie*, Paris: Les Édition de Minuit 1984.

Burke, Peter: *What is the History of Knowledge?*, Cambridge: Polity 2016.

Carbonell, Ovidio: "The Exotic Space of Cutural Translation", *Translation, Power, Subversion*, ed. Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters 1996.

Çelebi, Katib: *Lexicon bibliographicum et encylopaedicum. Tomus II (Literas Bá - Jim complectens)*, edited and translated by Gustav Flügel, Leipzig: The Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland 1837.

Collingwood, Robin George: *The Idea of History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1946.

D'hulst, Lieven: *Essais d'histoire de la traduction. Avatars de Janus*, Paris: Classiques Garnier 2014.

...... : "The History of Translation Studies as a Discipline", *The Routledge Handbook of Translation History*, ed. Christopher Rundle, London: Routledge 2021, pp. 3-22.

...... : "Translation History", *Handbook of Translation Studies. Volume 1*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins 2010, pp. 397-405.

...... : "Why and How to Write Translation Histories?", *CROP* 6 (2001), pp. 21-32.

D'hulst, Lieven, and Yves Gambier: "General Introduction", *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge. Sources, Concepts, Effects*, ed. Lieven D'hulst and Yves Gambier, Amsterdam: John Benjamins 2018, pp. 1-14.

Douglas, Heather: "The Irreducible Complexity of Objectivity", *Synthese*, 138/3 (2004), pp. 453-473.

Endress, Martin: "Methodological Relationism", *The Problem of Relativism in the Sociology of (Scientific) Knowledge*, ed. Richard Schantz and Markus Seidel, Frankfurt: Ontos Verlag 2011, pp. 157-181.

Flügel, Gustav: *Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hofbibliothek zu Wien*, vol. III, Wien: K.K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei 1867.

Gerlach, Stephan: *Stephan Gerlachs des aeltern Tage-Buch,* ed. by Tobias Wagner, Frankfurt am Mayn: Heinrich Friesen/Johann David Zunners 1674.

Gilbert, Rist: "La notion médiévale d' 'habitus' dans la sociologie de Pierre Bourdieu", *Revue européenne des sciences sociales*, 22/67 (1984), pp. 201-212.

Gragger, Robert: "Der magyarische Text von Murad's 'Glaubenshymnus' mit deutscher Übersetzung", *Literaturdenkmäler aus Ungarns Türkenzeit. Nach Handschriften in Oxford und Wien*, ed. Franz Babinger and Robert Gragger, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 1927.

Grutman, Rainier, and Trish Van Bolderen: "Self-Translation", *A Companion to Translation Studies*, ed. Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter, West Sussex: Wiley 2014, pp. 323-332.

Hagen, Gottfried: *Ein osmanischer Geograph bei der Arbeit: Entstehung und Gedankenwelt von Kātib Čelebis Ğihānnümā*, Berlin: Klaus Schwarz 2003.

Hammer, William: "Latin Instruction in the Schools of Transylvania from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century", *Phoenix*, 8/3 (1954), pp. 92-108.

Hermans, Theo: *Translation in Systems. Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing 1999.

Hokenson, Jan Walsh, and Marcella Munson: *History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing 2007.

Holmes, James S.: "Describing Literary Translations. Models and Methods", *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, ed. James S. Holmes, José Lambert and Raymond van den Broeck. Leuven: Acco 1978.

Ivušić, Branka: "Developing Consistency in the Absence of Standards – A Manuscript as a Melting-Pot of Languages, Religions and Writing Systems", *Creating Standarts. Interactions with Arabic Script in 12 Manuscript Cultures*, ed. Dmitry Bondarev, Alessandro Gori and Lameen Souag, Berlin: De Gruyter 2019, pp. 147-175.

Kade, Otto: *Zufall und Gesetzmäßigkeit in der Übersetzung*, Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie 1968.

Kelényi, Borbála: "Students from the Medieval Hungarian Kingdom at the University of Vienna. Additional Data to Their Studies: Faculties and Graduation", *University and Universality. The Place and the Role of the University of Pécs in Europe from the Middle Ages to Present Day. International University History Conference, 12-13th October 2017, Pécs*, ed. Fischer-Dárdai Ágnes, Lengvári István and Schmelczer-Pohánka Éva, Pécs: University Library of Pécs and Centre for Learning 2017, pp. 193-213.

Krstić, Tijana: "Illuminated by the Light of Islam and the Glory of the Ottoman Sultanate: Self-Narratives of Conversion to Islam in the Age of Confessionalization", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 51/1 (2009), pp. 35-63.

...... : "Murad ibn Abdullah", *Christian Muslim-Relations. A Bibliographical History. Volume 7. Central and Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa and South America (1500-1600)*, ed. David Thomas, John Chesworth, John Azumah, Stanisław Grodź, Andrew Newman and Douglas Pratt, Leiden: Brill 2015, pp. 698-704.

...... : "Of Translation and Empire. Sixteenth-century Ottoman Imperial Interpreters as Renaissance Go-betweens", *The Ottoman World*, ed. Christine Woodhead, London: Routledge 2012, pp. 130-142.

...... : *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*, Stanford: Stanford University Press 2011.

Lajos, Kropf: "Terdsüman Murád", *Századok*, 31 (1897), pp. 387-390.

Lavenia, Vincenzo: "Between Heresy and 'Crimes against Nature': Sexuality, Islamophobia and the Inquisition in Early Modern Europe", *Mediterranean Crossings. Sexual Transgressions in Islam and Christianity (10th-18th Centuries)*, ed. Umberto Grassi, Roma: Viella 2020, pp. 65-88.

Leunclavius, Johannes: *Historiae Musulmanae Turcorum, de monumentis ipsorum exscriptae libri XVIII*, Francofurti: Apud heredes A. Wecheli, C. Marnium & J. Aubrium 1591.

Matuz, Josef: "Die Pfortendolmetscher zur Herrschaftszeit Süleymans des Prächtigen", *Südost-Forschungen*, 34 (1975), pp. 26-60.

McCullagh, C. Behan: "Can Our Understanding of Old Texts be Objective?", *History and Theory*, 30/3 (1991), pp. 302-323.

...... : "Colligation", *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography*, ed. Aviezer Tucker, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell 2009, pp. 152-161.

Mérigoux, Jean-Marie: "L'ouvrage d'un frère prêcheur florentin en Orient à la fin du XIIIe siècle. Le 'Contra legem Sarracenorum' de Riccoldo da Monte di Croce", *Memorie domenicane*, 17 (1986), pp. 1-144.

Miller, Gregory J.: "Theodor Bibliander's Machumetis saracenorum principis eiusque successorum vitae, doctrina ac ipse alcoran (1543) as the Sixteenth-century 'Encyclopedia' of Islam", *Islam and Christian–Muslim Relations*, 24/2 (2013), pp. 241-254.

Mulsow, Martin: "Antitrinitarians and Conversion to Islam. Adam Neuser reads Murad b. Abdullah in Ottoman Istanbul", *Conversion and Islam in the Early Modern Mediterranean. The Lure of the Other*, ed. Claire Norton, London: Routledge 2017, pp. 181-193.

...... : "Fluchträume und Konversionsräume zwischen Heidelberg und Istanbul", *Kriminelle - Freidenker - Alchemisten*, ed. Martin Mulsow, Wien: Böhlau Verlag 2014, pp. 33-60.

Munday, Jeremy: "Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns", *The Translator*, 20/1 (2014), pp. 64-80.

Nasr, Seyyed Hossein, Caner K. Dagli, Maria Massi Dakake, Joseph E. B. Lumbard, and Mohammed Rustom: *The Study Quran. A New Translation and Commentary*, New York: HarperOne 2015.

Neuwirth, Angelika: "Face of God - Face of Man: The Significance of the Direction of Prayer in Islam", *Self, Soul and Body in Religious Experience*, ed. A. I. Baumgarten, J. Assmann and G. G. Stroumsa, Leiden: Brill 1998, pp. 298-312.

Newall, Paul: "Historiographic Objectivity", *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography*, ed. Aviezer Tucker, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell 2009, pp. 172-180.

Özcan, Altay Tayfun: "Murat Bey, Codex Hanivaldanus ve Kaynakları Üzerine (Süleyman Paşa ile ilgili Kayıtları Özelinde)", *Timurlu Tarihine Adanmış bir Ömür: 75. Doğum Yılında Prof. Dr. İsmail Aka Armağanı*, ed. M. Ş. Yüksel, Ankara: Türk Kültürü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları 2017, pp. 203-220.

Pál, Ács, and Louthan Howard: "Bibles and Books: Bohemia and Hungary", *A Companion to the Reformation in Central Europe*, ed. Howard Louthan and Graeme Murdock, Leiden & Boston: Brill 2015, pp. 390-411.

Palabıyık, Nil Ö.: *Silent Teachers. Turkish Books and Oriental Learning in Early Modern Europe, 1544–1669*, New Work: Routledge 2023.

Palaeologus, Jacobus: *Epistola Iacobi Palaeologi, de rebus Constantinopoli et Chii cum eo actis, lectu digna*, Ursel: Henricus 1594.

Pamuk, İsmail Emre. *Bir 16. Yüzyıl Okuryazarının Zihin Dünyası: Tercüman Murad ve Tesviyetü't-Teveccüh İle'l-Hak *Adlı Eseri*, MA thesis, İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2021.

Pym, Anthony: "Conceptual Tools in Translation History", *The Routledge Handbook of Translation History*, ed. Christopher Rundle, London & New York: Routledge 2021, pp. 86-101.

...... : *Method in Translation History*, Manchester: St-Jerome Publishing 1998.

Radway, Robin Dora: "Three Alba Amicorum from the Habsburg Netherlands", *Early Modern Low Countrie*, 6/1 (2022), pp. 103-126.

Ramminger, Johann: "Language Change in Humanist Latin: the case of traducere (to translate)", *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici*, 40–41 (2015-16), pp. 35-62.

Regesten der osmanischen Dokumente im österreichischen Staatsarchiv. Band 1 (1480-1574), ed. Ernst Dieter Petritsch, Wien: Das Staatsarchiv 1991.

Reiss, Katharina, and Hans J. Vermeer: *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action. Skopos Theory Explained*, London: Routledge 2014.

Ridley, R. T.: "To be Taken with a Pinch of Salt: The Destruction of Carthage", *Classical Philology*, 81/2 (1986), pp. 140-146.

Rieu, Charles: *Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts in the British Museum*, London: The British Museum 1888.

Römer, Claudia: "Contemporary European Translations of Ottoman Documents and Vice Versa (15th-17th Centuries)", *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 61/1-2 (2008), pp. 215-226.

Rossi, Ettore: "Parafrasi turca del 'De senectute' presentata a Solimano il Magnifico dal Bailo Marino de Cavalli", *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, 12 (1937), pp. 680-756.

Rothkegel, Martin: "Jacobus Palaeologus in Constantinople, 1554-5 and 1573", *Osmanlı İstanbulu IV (IV. Uluslararası Osmanlı İstanbulu Sempozyumu bildirileri, 20-22 Mayıs 2016)*, ed. Feridun M. Emecen, Ali Akyıldız and Emrah Safa Gürkan, İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi 2016, pp. 977-104.

Rundle, Christopher: "History Through a Translation Perspective", *Between Cultures and Texts. Itineraries in Translation History*, ed. Chalvin Antoine, Lange Anne, Monticelli Daniele and Hermans Theo, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang 2011, pp. 33-43.

...... : "Translation as an Approach to History", *Translation Studies*, 5/2 (2012), pp. 232-240.

Sabev, Orlin: *İbrahim Müteferrika ya da İlk Osmanlı Matbaa Serüveni, 1726-1746. Yeniden Değerlendirme*, İstanbul: Yeditepe 2006.

Schaendlinger, Anton C.: "Eine diplomatische Intervention Kaiser Ferdinands I. an der Hohen Pforte", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 80 (1990), pp. 207-228.

Shmueli, Efraim: "How Is Objectivity in the Social Sciences Possible? A Re-evaluation of Karl Mannheim's Concept of 'Relationism'", *Zeitschrift für Allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie*, 10/1 (1979), pp. 107-118.

Sloan, Michael C.: "Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics as the Original Locus for the Septem Circumstantiae", *Classical Philology*, 105/3 (2010), pp. 236-251.

Szegedi, Edit: "Educational Traditions in the Principality of Transylvania (1541–1691)", *Education beyond Europe. Models and Traditions before Modernities*, ed. Cristiano Casalini, Edward Choi and Ayenachew A. Woldegiyorgis, Leiden: Brill 2021, pp. 282-298.

Thelen, Lionel: "illusio et libido", *Abécédaire de Pierre Bourdieu*, ed. Jean-Philippe Cazier, Mons: Sils Maria 2006, pp. 91-94.

Toury, Gideon: *Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond*, 2nd ed., Amsterdam: John Benjamins 2012.

...... : "A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies", *Dispositio*, VII/19-20 (1982), pp. 23-39.

...... : "Translation – A Cultural-Semiotic Perspective", *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics, Tome 2, N - Z*, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter 1986, pp. 1111-1124.

Üstünova, Kerime: "İlk Türkçe İlmihal. Mukaddime ve Yazarı Kutbüddin İzniki", *Akademik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 8/31 (2006-2007), pp. 175-187.

Venuti, Lawrence: "Translation, Intertextuality, Interpretation", *Romance Studies*, 27/3 (2013), pp. 157-173.

Vermeer, Hans J.: "Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie", *Lebende Sprachen*, 23/3 (1978), pp. 99-102.

Wilson, Philip: "The Philosophy of History and Translation", *The Routledge Handbook of Translation History*, ed. Christopher Rundle, London: Routledge 2021, pp. 217-232.

Wright, Jack: "Rescuing Objectivity: A Contextualist Proposal", *Philosophy of Social Sciences*, 48/4 (2018), pp. 385-406.

Zvara, Edina: "Scholarly Translators and Committed Disputants: The First Century of the Hungarian Bible", *Hungarian Studies*, 31/2 (2017), pp. 271-282.