Poetry in the Text: The Use and Function of Poetry in Rāwandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr* and Yazıcızāde 'Alī's Translation of the Same Work in *Tevārīkh-i Âl-i Selçūk**

Efe Murat Balıkçıoğlu**

Metindeki Şiir: Rāvendī'nin Rāḥat al-ṣudūr *ve Yazıcızāde 'Alī'nin Aynı Eserin Çevirisini İçeren* Tevārīh-i Âl-i Selçūk'*undaki Şiirin Kullanım ve İşlevi*

Öz ▪ Rāvendī'nin on üçüncü yüzyıl Büyük Selçuklu İmparatorluğu tarihi olan *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr wa āyat al-surūr* adlı eseri, Büyük Selçukluların küçük yerel hanedanlıklara dönüştüğü dağılış dönemini mercek altına almaktadır. Bu eser, tarihi hadiselerin naklinden sonra metne iliştirilmiş çeşitli şiir parçalarıyla da meşhurdur. Rāvendī, metninde bazen beyitler bazen de daha uzun şiir parçalarına yer vererek bahsettiği tarihi hadiseleri özetlemeye ya da bu hadiselerden hikmetli sözler çıkarmaya çalışmaktadır. Bu kitaptan yaklaşık iki yüzyıl kadar sonra, II. Murad'ın ilk padişahlığı sırasında Memlûk İmparatorluğuna da elçi olarak gönderilmiş olan tarihçi Yazıcızāde 'Alī'yse *Tevārīh-i Âl-i Selçūk* adlı eseriyle bilinmektedir. Bu kitap Oğuz Türkleri, Selçuklular, İlhanlılar ve Anadolu Beylikleri dönemlerini tarayarak Yazıcızāde 'Alī'nin yazdığı Osmanlılar'ın şeceresini içeren beş ciltlik bir tarihtir. Bu eserin ikinci cildi Hamedān ve Kirmān Selçuklularına ayrılmış olup Rāvendī'nin *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*'unun kelime kelime çevirisidir. İlginç olan nokta, bu çevirisinde Yazıcızāde 'Alī'nin *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*'daki şiir alıntılarını atması ve bazı yerlerdeyse aynı şiirleri Osmanlı kültürel bağlamına göre yeniden kurgulamasıdır. Bu makale, sözü edilen şiir alıntılarının hangi olası işlevleri olduğunu araştıracak ve Yazıcızāde 'Alī'nin şiir alıntılarını ancak "kültüre has" bir bağlamda algıladığı tezini ileri sürecektir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Tarih ve Tarihyazımı, Anadolu'da Türkçeye İlk Çeviriler, Selçuk ve Osmanlı İmparatorlukları, Tarihi Metinlerde Şiirin Kullanım ve İşlevi

---

** Harvard Üniversitesi.

Muḥammad bin ʿAlī Rāwandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr wa āyat al-surūr* ("The Comfort of the Hearts and the Sign of Happiness") is a history of the Great Seljuq Empire giving a detailed account of its last decade, namely its dissolution into minor local dynasties (namely the Seljuqs of Hamadān, Kermān, Syria, and Anatolia (*Rūm*)) and later the subsequent Khwarazmian occupation which resulted in the killing of the last Great Seljuq Sultan Tughril III (1175/6-94) by the Khwarezm-Shāh, ʿAlā al-Dīn Tekish (1172-1200) in 1194. *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr* was written in Persian and completed around the year 1205. It was first dedicated to the Seljuq Sultan of Rūm, Suleimān Shāh II (1196-1204), who was the eldest son of Kilij Arslan II (1156-92). Because of the Sultan's sudden death however, Rāwandī had to rededicate his work to the new Sultan of Rūm, Kaykhusraw I (first reign: 1192-96; second reign: 1205-11). The text is full of interjections of poetry and after almost every episode of historical events, Rāwandī includes a couplet or sometimes even a whole block of poetry to summarize these events or give a word of wisdom through poetry. In some cases, one might argue that the poetic exposition of the events is loosely related to the actual text and this essay will explore what possible functions these poetic interjections actually serve within the actual historical material.

About the texts and authors

a) Rāwandī: The edition of Rāwandī's *Rāhat al-ṣudūr wa āyat al-surūr* (that Muḥammad Iqbāl published) is based on the manuscript at the Biblotèque Nationale in Paris and has the date of Ramadan 635, which is equivalent to April 1238 in the Gregorian calendar. There are several works of history dating from the times of the Great Seljuqs; and in that regard, as Muḥammad Iqbāl puts it in his introduction to the text, we can divide the Seljuq history into three different generic periods: the first period, that Iqbāl calls the "imperial age" is the period that starts from the foundation of the empire to the death of Malik Shāh I and this period can be surveyed through Bayhaqī's famous Eleventh Century book of history named *Tārīkh-e Âl-e Sebuktigin* ("The History of the Great Sebuktigin").[1] The second is the 'middle period' which could be well surveyed through the historical works of Ibn al-Athīr and ʿImād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī.[2] Lastly, Iqbāl categorizes the third portion of the Great Seljuq history as the period of 'decline and decay' and further comments about how Rāwandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr* is a great historical work which gives us insightful information about the reign of the last Great Seljuq Sultan Tughril III.[3]

---

1 Muḥammad Iqbāl, "Naşirin Önsözü", *Râhat-üs-Sudûr ve Âyet-üs-Sürûr*, trans. Ahmed Ateş, vol. I, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1957), x.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., xiii.

Rāwandī was born to a family with a long line of famous scholars in Rāwand, a town very close to the city of Kāshān, today in the Isfahān province of Iran. His uncle Tāj al-Dīn Aḥmad Rāwandī was a renowned scholar in a *madrasa* in Hamadān that Sultan Tughril III's *atabeg* Jamāl al-Dīn Ay-Ebe had founded.[4] Staying under his uncle's supervision for more than ten years, Rāwandī studied the basic Islamic sciences such as the *ḥadīth*, *tafsīr*, and Hanafite *fiqh* as well as the literary and artistic conventions of his age such as Arabic and Persian literature, calligraphy and book-binding.[5] The last Great Seljuq Sultan Tughril III, was famous for being a patron of the arts, and Rāwandī was brought to court along with other numerous calligraphers to work on a special manuscript of the Holy Qur'an that was being specially prepared for the Sultan himself. He garnered the Sultan's attention through his successful execution of calligraphy and, after the deposition of Sultan Tughril III from the throne by the Khwarezm-Shāh ʿAlā al-Dīn Tekish in 1194, Rāwandī found refuge in the Hamadān household of the local Alid ruler, Faḫr al-Dīn ʿArabshāh, who had previously been strangled by Tughril III himself, upon accusations that the former was plotting against the Sultan.[6] For six years, Rāwandī was the tutor of the late ʿArabshāh's three sons, Majd al-Dīn Humāyūn, Faḫr al-Dīn Khusraw-Shāh and ʿImād al-Dīn Merdān-Shāh, and later spent another two years as the tutor of a young student named al-Kāshānī.[7] It is said that he had the idea for a history book while working as the tutor of the latter and started writing his history of the Great Seljuqs in the year 599/1203 finishing it two years later. In order to get an honorarium from the legitimized successors of the Great Seljuqs, their heir in Anatolia, namely the Seljuqs of Rūm, Rāwandī visited Rukn al-Dīn Suleimān Shāh II after dedicating the book to him. Suleimān II, who had extorted the throne from his elder brother Kaykhusraw I, was now dead and Kaykhusraw I was the ruler of the Seljuqs of Anatolia again. For this reason, Rāwandī rededicated his book of history by making some substantial changes within the text, but still failed to exclude all the references that he had made to Suleimān II in poetic and biblical references. One example that Iqbāl cites in his introduction to the Turkish translation of the text is that Rāwandī forgot to omit the intertextual references to Prophet Solomon, the fourth king of the united monarchy of Israel, through which he wanted to praise Suleimān II of the Seljuqs of Rūm.[8]

---

4   Ibid.
5   Ibid.
6   Ibid., xv.
7   Ibid., xv-xvi.
8   Ibid., xvii.

b) Yazıcızāde ʿAlī: According to the Ottoman historian Neşrī, Yazıcızāde ʿAlī, who served twice as an envoy to the Mamluks during the first reign of Murād II, was one of the most important Ottoman historians of the Fifteenth Century. He probably wrote his famous book on the history of the Seljuqs, *Tevārīkh-i Âl-i Selçūḳ*, around the year 1436 upon the request of Murād II.[9] We do not have much information about his life other than Neşrī's report, but there are further discussions among scholars concerning the possibility that Yazıcızāde ʿAlī could be the brother of famous early Ottoman figures Yazıcızāde Meḥmed and Aḥmed-i Bījān who were both active during the time of Murād II.[10] The first historical work in the Ottoman Empire is said to have been written during the time of Orhan Gazi by Isḥāk Faḳīh. However, even though no copy of this work survives to date, we know that this work exists through an anecdote that ʿÂşıkpaşazāde tells in his history: as he was passing through Gebze, the hometown of Faḳīh, he became sick and stayed at Faḳīh's house and it was during his stay that he found the chance to read this work and later incorporate it into his own history.[11] Apart from Faḳīh's work, the oldest surviving history is Aḥmedī's appendix to his book of Alexander romance, *İskender-nāme*, and this short historical account of the Ottomans includes the events from Ertuğrul Gazi up to the period of the Ottoman Interregnum (the text itself is composed of 340 beyts and has the title of *Dastān-ı Tevārīkh-i Mülūk-ı Âl-i ʿOṣmān*.[12]

The text that will be dealt with here, namely Yazıcızāde ʿAlī's *Tevārīkh-i Âl-i Selçūḳ* ("The History of the Great Seljuqs"), has several names such as *Oğuz-nāme* or *Moğol-nāme* and the reason for these other names is that Yazıcızāde ʿAlī included a short introductory text as the first volume (to his five-volume history), named *Oğuz-nāme* in which he deals with the question of the origin of the Seljuqs (31). It is the first original attempt to trace the Ottomans back to the Seljuqs, even relating them to the Oghuz tribes by assigning them to a specific clan within the greater Oghuz tribe. Yazıcızāde ʿAlī's work was very popular, both during his own time and in later centuries, and there are many manuscripts available in many

9 quoted in Sevim Yılmaz Önder, "Önsöz", *Tevārīh-i Âl-i Selçūk*, vol. II, (İstanbul: Bilge Oğuz, 2009), 23. For Neşrī's report: *Neşri Tarihi*, ed. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Altay Köymen, vol. I, (Ankara: Kültür Turizm Bakanlığı, 1988), 239.

10 quoted in Dr. Abdullah Bakır, "Önsöz", *Tevārīh-i Âl-i Selçūk*, (İstanbul: Çamlıca Basın Yayın, 2009), xxvi.

11 Önder, "Önsöz", 28. For further discussion: Herbert W. Duda, "Zeitgenössische islamische Quellen und das Oğuznāme des Jazyğyoğlu ʿAlī zur Angeblichen Türkischen Besiedlung der Dobrudcha im 12. Jhd. n. Chr.", *Spisanie Na Bulgarskata Akademiya Na Naukit İ İzkustvata Kıniga* LXVI (Sofiya: Peçatnitsa Kınipegraf, 1943), 139.

12 Ibid.

different libraries worldwide such as in Istanbul, Ankara, Paris, Leiden, Saint Petersburg and Moscow.[13]

Yazıcızāde ʿAlī's five-volume work *Tevārīkh-i Âl-i Selçūḳ* gives a detailed account of the states of the Oghuz Turks, the Seljuqs, the Mongols (particularly the Ilkhanids), the Anatolian Beyliks and the Ottomans.[14] The first volume, as I have mentioned above, gives some information about Turko-Mongol and Oghuz clans, and reinterprets the legend of Oghuz Khan through Islam by talking about how the Turks became Muslim and how particular Turkish clans such as Uighur, Kıpchak, Karluk etc. were named after Oghuz Khan himself.[15] For references, Yazıcızāde ʿAlī counts Rashīd al-Dīn Hamadānī's enormous book of history from the Ilkhanate Empire, *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh* ("Compendium of Chronicles" or "Universal History"), the Book of Dede Korkut as well as an older text of *Oğuz-nāme* written in the Uighur script.[16] The second volume is devoted to the history of the Seljuqs of Hamadān (Iran) and Kermān (Iraq) and is a word-for-word translation of Rāwandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*.[17] The fourth and fifth volumes of Yazıcızāde ʿAlī's history is directly taken from Ibn Bībī's thirteenth-century history of the Seljuqs of Anatolia written in Persian, *al-Awāmir al-ʿalāʾiyya fiʾl-umūr al-ʿalāʾiyya*, and Rashīd al-Dīn's aforementioned *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh* respectively.[18] After talking about all these different periods, Yazıcızāde ʿAlī finishes his exhaustive historical account by surveying the period after the death of Ghazan Khan of the Ilkhanids and later describes the origins of the Ottoman dynasty.[19]

Poetry translations into vernacular Turkish during the Fourteenth Century Anatolia

The fifteenth century was an important period of literary development both in eastern (Chagatai) and western (Oghuz) Turkic languages. Especially in the east of Persia, we see that there were many great works written in the eastern Turkic Chagatai language. In that regard, ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī (1441-1501) is a towering figure coming from a well-established family with a long line of *bakhshī*s, court scribes specialized in the Uighur script. Later, he became a public administrator as well

---

13 Ibid., 68.

14 Ibid.

15 Ibid.

16 Ibid., 32.

17 Ibid.

18 Ibid.

19 quoted from Adnan Sadık Erzi in Önder, "Önsöz", 32.

as one of the key advisors to Sultan Ḥusayn-e Bāyqarā (1438-1506) and it was during this time that he accumulated a great amount of wealth and became one of the greatest patrons of the arts during his age. ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī was an accomplished poet who was included in Dawlatshāh's *Taẕkīrat al-shuʿarā* as one of the best poets of all ages, along with Jāmī. Interestingly enough, Dawlatshāh's anthology of poetry culminates with the poems of ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī, not with the works of the last great classical Persian poet, Jāmī. It is puzzling to see that ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī, who is primarily known for his poetry not in Persian, but in Chagatai, is regarded even greater than Jāmī according to the hierarchical ascension noted in *Taẕkīrat al-shuʿarā*. One explanation is that Jāmī is said to have lost his sense of reason in his old age, even though Navāʾī does not make an account of such a statement in his works.[20] So, it could be that Jāmī's mental health failed to a great extent at the time of his old age, but one thing that we can deduce from Dawlatshāh's inclusion of Navāʾī as the last poet would be that the latter was considered to be a great poet in his lifetime. Additionally, Navāʾī was also famous for his last book, *Muḥākamat al-lughatayn* ("Judgment of Two Languages"), which asserts the poetic superiority of the Chagatai language over Persian. There were other accomplished poets who were writing in Chagatai before the age of ʿAlī Shīr Navāʾī such as Luṭfī, Saqqāqī and Gadāʾī.

On the other hand, when we look at the development of the western Turkic language Oghuz as an arising literary and political language, we see that the first attempt to make Turkish the official state language was in the late Thirteenth Century and was advanced by Karamanoğlu Meḥmed Beg of the Principality of Karaman, today in south-central Anatolia.[21] Likewise, later in the Fourteenth Century, we see a similar tendency toward some literary production in Turkish among the western Turks of Anatolia. Especially after the dissolution of the Seljuqs of Rūm, we find the first attempts at the use of Turkish as a state language: during the time of the Turkmen beyliks in Anatolia, there were some *waqf* documents from the Germiyanids written in 1411 as well as the famous *Teressül* by Aḥmed-i Dāʾī, the first *uṣūl-e inshāʾ* ("style manual") work in Turkish to date, along with some *kitāba*s ("inscriptions") surviving from Ankara (1439) and Bursa (written by the poet Jamālī in 1465).[22] Later during the time of the Ottoman Sultan Bayazıd I, we see that his son Emir Süleyman organized poetry

---

20 Cl. Huart and H. Massé, "Djāmī", *Encyclopedia of Islam*, vol. II, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), 422.

21 For the early influence of Turkish: Fuad Köprülü, "Yeni Farisîde Türk Unsurları", *Türkiyat Mecmuası* VII-VIII.1 (1942): 1-16.

22 Önder, "Önsöz", 19.

gatherings in which poets such as Aḥmedī, Şeyhī and Aḥmed-i Dāʿī recited poetry in Turkish.[23]

One might read the use of Turkish for administrative and literary purposes as a general tendency of the era, as it was not only the Turks in Anatolia or Central Asia and Khorāsān who started to produce works in their own Turkic languages, but we see a similar tendency among the Mamluks, who are now composed of a mix of Kipchak and Circassian Turks, as in the examples of ʿAynī's Turkish translation of Qudūrī's *tafsīr*, İbrāhīm Bali's *Ḥikmet-nāme* and the last Mamluk Sultan al-Ashraf Qānṣūh al-Ghawrī's *dīwān*. We might, at the same time, try to explain this broader interest in producing work in one's vernacular language with the universal phenomenon of vernacularization and similar attempts also arising in medieval Europe, which culminated in Dante's *Divinia Commedia* of the Fourteenth Century, the first long literary work written in the local Romance language.

In her analysis of Aḥmed-i Dāʿī's *Çengnāme*, Gönül Alpay Tekin argues that the first literary production in the Oghuz language of the Fourteenth Century was due to the relatively short, but affluent period of small Anatolian frontier principalities (*beylik*s) governed by Turkmen community leaders named *bey*s. Similarly, when we look at the oldest extant Islamic manuscripts from Anatolia, we see that the most of the works except around 10 lines in Turkish by Rumi as well as 74 Turkish couplets from his son Ṣulṭān Veled, all the works were either written in Persian or Arabic.[24] According to Ateş, the oldest surviving text is in Persian and it was el-Tiflīsī's dream interpretation manual *Kāmil al-taʿbīr*.[25] This thesis was later revised by Mikail Bayram, who argued that the oldest extant manuscript is *Kaşf al-ʿaqaba* which was written thirty years after the Battle of Manzikert in 1071.[26] Furthermore, Bayram argues that among all the surviving manuscripts from the Seljuq era, 145 and 68 of these manuscripts were in Persian and Arabic respectively, whereas only 15 of them were in Turkish.[27] The oldest of the latter

---

23 Gönül Alpay Tekin, "*Ahmed-i Daî*'den Önceki Anadolu'nun Kültür Hayatı ve *Ahmed-i Daî*", *Ahmed-i Daî and his* Çengnâme*: An Old Ottoman Mesnevi*, (Cambridge: Harvard University The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, 1973), 1.

24 Mecdut Mansuroğlu, "Anadolu'da Türk Dili ve Edebiyatının İlk Mahsülleri", *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 1.1 (1946-7), 10.

25 Ahmed Ateş, "Hicri VI-VIII. (XII-XIV.) Asırlarda Anadolu'da Farsça Eserler", *Türkiyat Mecmuası* VII-VIII (1945), 97.

26 Mikail Bayram, *Anadolu'da Te'lif Edilen İlk Eser "Keşfü'l-akabe"*, (Konya: Hayra Hizmet Vakfı, 1981), 7.

27 Ibid.

ones probably being a medical treatise *Tuḥfe-i Mübārizī* written by Khwarezmian Ḥākim Bereket.[28]

After the fragmentation of the Seljuq Sultanate of Rūm with the Battle of Köse Dağ in 1243 by the Mongols, these local *beylik*s not only attracted many Turkmen groups into their frontier communities in the name of *ghazā*, the holy war against the infidel (in this case against the Byzantine Empire) originally referring to the campaigns led by Prophet Muḥammad, but also accumulated considerable wealth in their regional centers by creating vibrant commercial network.[29] It was in the courts of these small Anatolian principalities that the very first western Turkic (Oghuz) translations of Persian and Arabic works were undertaken and it was again within this context, Turkish became canonized as an official state and literary language. The literary production in Turkish was not only limited to the works of literature, but a very early Turkish translation of the Quran dedicated to the head of the Isfendiyarids (formerly Candarids) Bayazıd indicates us that even religious works were translated into Turkish in the courts of these small Anatolian principalities.[30]

It would, of course, be too simplistic to argue that the main reason why Turkish had become so popular was because these *bey*s were oblivious to and not particularly educated in the Persian scribal and literary traditions, even though the intellectual enterprise during the time of the Seljuq Sultanate of Rūm relied mostly on the Persian (and Arabic) cultural and literary background.[31] Persian and Arabic were, however, still used especially in mosque inscriptions as well as the books compiled for *madrasa*s (such as those in İznik and Bursa).[32] However, we should also not forget that, in addition to the relatively stable and affluent courts of these small principalities, the influence of *taṣawwuf* was common among the Turkmen populations of Anatolia, and therefore, the very first literary and religions works, which were all Sufi poems in the western Turkic dialect, were actually written by prominent Anatolian *mutaṣawwif*s such as Şulṭān Veled, Aḥmed Faḳīh, Yunus Emre, Gülşehrī (the early translator of *Manṭiq al-ṭayr* of Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭar into Turkish in 1317), ʾĀşıḳ Paşa (the author of *Garībnāme*) in the late Thirteenth and early Fourteenth Centuries.[33]

---

28 Şehabeddin Tekindağ, "İzzet Koyunoğlu Kütüphanesinde Bulunan Türkçe Yazmalar I", *Türkiyat Mecmuası* XVI (1971), 134-5.

29 Tekin, "*Ahmed-i Daî*'den Önceki Anadolu'nun Kültür Hayatı ve *Ahmed-i Daî*", 2.

30 Ahmet Ateş, "Burdur-Antalya ve Havalisi Kütüphanelerinde Bulunan Türkçe, Arapça ve Farsça Bazı Mühim Eserler", *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 3-4 (1948), 174.

31 Tekin, "*Ahmed-i Daî*'den Önceki Anadolu'nun Kültür Hayatı ve *Ahmed-i Daî*", 6.

32 Ibid.

33 Ibid., 8.

The most of the literary production of the Fourteenth Century was centered around principalities along the Aegean such as the Beyliks of Menteşe, Aydın and Germiyan. The literary activity in these frontier communities were twofold: these works in Turkish were either translations of famous Persian and Arabic literary or religious works (e.i. Aydınoğlu Meḥmed's translation of Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭar's *Taẕkīrat al-awliyāʾ*, Ḳul Mesʿūd's *Kalīla wa Dimna*, Faḥrī's translation of *Khusraw o Shīrīn*) or works written directly in Turkish mostly as imitations of previous Persian works (e.i. the imitations of the *maṣnavī Yūsuf o Zuleikha* by the poets Şeyyad Ḥamza and Süle Faḳīh).[34]

In addition to the main structure of literary production in Turkish during the period of Anatolian principalities, we also see that the concept of translation has different connotations and contextual uses. For instance, when we look at Aḥmed-i Dāʿī's *Çengnāme* composed in 1423, we see that even though the author intended this work to be a translation of Saʿdī's no longer extant *maṣnavī* with the same name, the work goes well beyond being a simple translation from Persian: as Saʿdī's aforementioned *maṣnavī* included 70 *beyt*s, Aḥmed-i Dāʿī's Turkish translation of this work includes 1446 such *beyt*s.[35] This shows us clearly that the status of translation in the early Fifteenth Century Anatolia had different connotations than we would expect it to have. That is to say, in such translations from this period, we should not expect that the author makes a faithful rendering of the original text into his own language, but instead, he composes a new one by changing most of the cultural references as well as making additions to a great extent.

Textual references and their use in *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*

There are many word-for-word interjections in *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr* from other Qurʾanic, historical, encyclopedic and literary texts. For instance, there are 264 pieces in Arabic that are directly taken from Abu Manṣūr al-Thaʿālibī's *Kitāb al-farāʾed waʾl-qalāʾed* without making any references to him.[36] All these short pieces are examples of *ḍarb-e maṣal* ("maxim" or "proverb" in English), which are all preserved in their Arabic originals within the text (without their Persian translations). They are included after almost every episode of events and, differently from poetic interjections, they act as plain words of wisdom to hint at the downfall of a

---

34 Ibid., 10-11.

35 Gönül Alpay Tekin, "*Çengnâme*'nin Kaynakları", *Ahmed-i Daî and his* Çengnâme*: An Old Ottoman Mesnevi*, (Cambridge: Harvard University The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, 1973), 72.

36 Julie Scott Meisami, "Rāvandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*: History or Hybrid?", *Edebiyāt: The Journal of Middle Eastern Literatures*, vol 5/2 (1994), 186.

character or a later glory to come. These maxims are included at least more than once in every paragraph and the message that they want to convey is often repeated in the poetry sections that come right after them. It is interesting enough to note that, in some sections, the *ḍarb-e maṣal*s deliver a very similar message to those that the poems usually do; and therefore, one might easily see the poems included in the text as the more elaborate expositions of the previosuly plainly expressed *ḍarb-e maṣal*s. For instance, in the section on Alp Arslan, in which Rāwandī talks about the execution of the previous vizier by the new one, namely the famous Niẓām al-Mūlk, the *ḍarb-e maṣal* states that the one who loves his own self should avoid sin, and the one who loves his son feels pity for the orphans (من احب نفسه اجتنب الا ثام و من احب لده رحم الایتام).[37] Likewise, the poetic interjection taken from *Shāh-nāma* has a similar message:

چنین بوذ تا بوذ گردان سپهر ۞ گهی پر ز کینست گه پر ز مهر

...

یکی را بر آرذ بچرخ بلند ۞ ز تیمار و دردش کنذ بی گزند

و او آنجاش گردان برذ سوی خاك ۞ همه جای ترسم و تیمار و باك

...

یکی را ز چاه آورذ سوی گاه ۞ نهذ برسرش پرز گوهر کلاه

سرنجام هر دو بخاك یندرند ۞ ز تارك بچنگ مغاك یندرند

As the *ḍarb-e maṣal* remarks that one should not commit harm to others if they do not want the very same things to happen to themselves, the part taken from *Shāh-nāma* says similarly that one may never anticipate what destiny will bring and whatever happens to one does not really matter, as everyone will end up being buried under the earth. Both of the texts, placed successively, hint at Niẓām al-Mūlk's tragic death at the hands of Ḥasan-e Ṣabbāḥ's assassins.

In terms of historical texts, we see that the first section of *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*, the section that deals with the origins of the Seljuqs (ذکری ابتدا کار سلجوقیان), was primarily taken from *Seljūq-nāma* of Ẓāhir al-Dīn Nīshāpūrī who was in the court of Sultan Arslan before the time of Sultan Tughril III.[38] Furthermore, the later sections, on the question of drinking according to *fiqh* as well as another one on the history of chess, were all taken from previous sources: the sections on the

---

37 Muḥammad bin ʿAlī bin Süleymān al-Rāwandī, *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr wa āyat al-surūr*, ed. Muḥammad Iqbāl, (Tahrān: Ensherāt-e Amīr-e Kebīr, 1364), 118.

38 Iqbāl, "Naṣirin Önsözü", xx.

permissibility of drinking, according to Ahmed Ateş, were taken from famous books on the Hanafite *fiqh* such as al-Shaybānī's *al-Jāmiʿ al-kabīr* and *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaġīr*, *Mukhtaṣar al-Ṭaḥāwī*, *Mukhtaṣar al-Karḫī*, as well as other commentaries by Masʿūd, Qudūrī and Farghānī; and similarly, the sections on the medicinal use of wine were directly taken from Ismāʿīl Jurjānī's medical encyclopedia written in Persian, *Ẕakhīre-ye Khwārazmshāhī* ("Treasures dedicated to the king of Khwarezm"), between the years 1111 and 1136.[39]

In addition to all these sections directly taken from other works of Qurʾanic, historical and encyclopedic texts, there are many poems inserted into the historical materials, most frequently in the forms of *beyt*s (couplets) and *qaṣīda*s (a form of lyric poetry with pre-Islamic Arab origins), but sometimes in the *musammaṭ* and (in the case of Neẓāmī) *maṣnavī* forms. In the *sabab-e taʾlīf* section of his *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*, Rāwandī talks about how he always had an idea of compiling a book of selections from the poetry of his age. The idea was given by a certain Shams al-Dīn bin Manūchihr Aḥmad Shaṣt-galla, who advised him not to read already outdated poets such as Sanāʾī, ʿUnṣūrī, Muʿezzī and Rūdakī (though Meisami argues that there are fragmentary verses from Sanāʾī's *Ḥadīqat al-ḥaqīqa*), but memorize the poems of his contemporaries such as ʿImadī, Anvarī and Abūʾl-Faraj Rūnī instead.[40]

In total, there are 2,799 *beyt*s, both in Persian and Arabic, that are used in the whole text and 511 of these *beyt*s belong to Rāwandī himself. According to Ateş, all of the *beyt*s by Rāwandī are panegyric in nature and written in praise of Kaykhusraw I (probably all these *beyt*s were initially written in praise of Suleimān II and later revised for his dedication of the whole book to the new Sultan Kaykhusraw I) (xx). Again in the *sabab-e taʾlīf* section of his *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*, Rāwandī mentions how he had embellished his work with the words of wisdom extracted from *Shāh-nāma* of Ferdowsī, a long epic poem written for Maḥmūd of Ghaznī between 977 and 1010 AD (Rāwandī 71). In addition to 676 *beyt*s taken from *Shāh-nāma*, there are also 348 from Mujir-e Baylaqānī, 249 from Neẓāmī Ganjavī (mostly from his epic romances *Khusraw o Shīrīn* and *Laylī o Majnūn*), 81 beyts from Jamāl al-Dīn Isfahānī, 77 from Athīr-e Ahsekatī, 72 from ʿImadī, 122 from numerous Arabic poets (most of them being from the works of Tughraʾī and Mutanabbī), 6 from the *fahlawiyyāt* (فهلويات) genre (folkloric poems written in local dialects as well as the Pahlavi language, the Middle Iranian language used at the time of the Sassanids) and the rest are from other numerous Persian poems.[41]

---

39 Ibid., xxi.

40 Rāwandī, *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr wa āyat al-surūr*, 70-71; Meisami, "Rāvandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*: History or Hybrid?", 187.

41 Meisami, "Rāvandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*: History or Hybrid?", 186.

Textual references and their use in *Tevārīkh-i Âl-i Selçūk*

The second volume of Yazıcızāde 'Alī's text is a direct translation of Rāwandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*. However, there are few parts that Yazıcızāde 'Alī does not include in his translation, such as the first two chapters of his work: in the first chapter of his work, Rāwandī delivers a lengthy praise of Prophet Muḥammad and then the other important figures of his time including some of the recent Seljuq Sultans; and later in the second chapter (*sabab-e ta'līf*), he talks about the motivations behind writing this work. Yazıcızāde 'Alī's translation directly starts with the migration of the Seljuqs and he particularly avoids translating the later sections of the work in which Rāwandī talks about the games of chess and backgammon, the profession of calligraphy as well as the sections on Medieval numerology (*abjad* numerals) and Aristotle's advise to Alexander the Great. The majority of the historical passages are preserved and it is only the poetic interjections (mostly in Persian) and the *ḍarb-e maṣal*s in Arabic that are deliberately omitted from the translation. The succession of events are copied from Rāwandī's work word-for-word and it is only in two particular sections that the author does not follow the order, yet includes both of these events in the later sections of his translation. Lastly, as Yazıcızāde 'Alī omits all the poems used within the text, we see that in some cases, he prefers to write of his own by, for instance, praising his own Sultan, Murād II, instead of the historical figures mentioned in the text such as Kaykhusraw I.

The Section on Tughril Beg

In order to understand the real function of poetic interjections in historical works, I will select a few significant passages from *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr* which are also present in their Turkish translations in Yazıcızāde 'Alī's *Tevārīkh-i Âl-i Selçūk*. One interesting aspect of Yazıcızāde 'Alī's translation is that, even though he does not make any changes in the storyline or in the main text itself, he omits all of the poems as well as the *ḍarb-e maṣal*s included within the text. For the purpose of this essay, I will only deal here with the use and function of the poetic interjections in Rāwandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*, and talk about the comparison of the uses of poetic interjections in a later section devoted to the general use of poetry in historical texts.

The first section that will be dealt with in this analysis is that on the period of Tughril and Chaghri Begs, right before the great Battle of Dāndanaqān against the Ghaznavids in 1040, which historically legitimized the Seljuq supremacy in Khorāsān. The full name of the section is:

السلطان المعظم ركن الدنيا و الدين ابوطالب طغرلبك محمد بن ميكائيل بن سلجوق

At the very beginning of this section, Rāwandī talks about the viziers and chamberlains of Tughril Beg and then moves on to a famous anecdote that tells the story of Tughril Beg's encounter with three saintly figures, namely Bābā Ṭāher, the famous eleventh century poet who wrote mystical verses in the Hamadānī dialect, Bābā Ja'fer and Sheikh Ḥamshā. As Tughril Beg was passing from a mount named *Khiḍr* (probably a reference to the saintly figure الخضر mentioned in the eighteenth sura *al-Kahf*), he saw three dervishes sitting there. When the Sultan approached them, one of these dervishes, Bābā Ṭāher who was said to be little bit crazy, asked him, by addressing him as 'the Turk', what he was going to do with them.[42] After Tughril Beg answers Bābā Ṭāher modestly by saying that he would do whatever he would command him to do, Bābā Ṭāher replies him by saying that he should do whatever God commands him to do and recites the first part of the ninetieth verse of *al-Naḥl*, "Allah commands justice, the doing of good" (ان الله يامر بالعدل و) (الاحسان). Upon hearing this, Tughril Beg starts crying and after he gives the answer of "yes" to the question of Bābā Ṭāher whether Tughril Beg takes his word or not, Bābā Ṭāher takes out the broken mouth piece of a pitcher (*ibrīq*) that he was wearing as a ring, presents it to Tughril Beg and places it on his finger saying that Bābā Ṭāher himself has put all the realms inside this ring and for this, Tughril Beg should be with justice.[43] After this incident, whenever he fought an important war, Tughril Beg always wore this special ring charmed by Bābā Ṭāher.[44]

After this episode, a piece from Neẓāmī's *Khusraw o Shīrīn* is interjected in order to heighten the effectiveness of the description of Tughril Beg's encounter with the famous mystic Bābā Ṭāher.

در آن بخشش که رحمت علم کردند ❁ دو صاحب را نام کردند

یکی ختم نبوت گشت ذانش ❁ یکی ختم ممالک در خیانش

According to the first two *beyt*s of the poem, it is said that there are two Muḥammads in the world after everyone is to receive their portion from compassion of God (*raḥma*): thus, one Muḥammad receives the ring (*khatm*, "ring" or "seal") of the prophethood (*nubuwwa*) and the other receives the ring of all the countries or the earthly realm (*mamālik*) in return.[45] Of course, Neẓāmī uses these *beyt*s in some other context and maybe even to praise one of his patrons with the name

---

42 Rāwandī, *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr wa āyat al-surūr*, 98.

43 Ibid, 99.

44 Ibid.

45 Ibid.

Muḥammad from the line of the Shirvānshāhs. Similarly, Rāwandī here uses this passage from *Khusraw o Shīrīn* to praise Tughril Beg who has Muḥammad as one of his names, and more importantly, Rāwandī wants to relate the story of Tughril Beg receiving the charmed ring from Bābā Ṭāher to these *beyt*s from Neẓāmī by addressing him as the real ruler of the world (as in the third *beyt* of the poem, he makes it clear that one Muḥammad (Prophet Muḥammad) is from the line of the Arabs whereas the second is of the lands of Persians (*ʿajem*, which normally means "someone who does not know Arabic", "non-Arab", a term coming from the age of the Abbasids):[46]

یکی برج عرب را تا ابد ماه ۞ یکی ملک عجم را جاودان شاه

The dichotomy between two Muḥammads, one being the guide of the heavens and the other being that of the earth, dominates the rest of the poem; therefore, in the next *beyt*, we see that Neẓāmī says that one Muḥammad saved religion from oppression and the other brought justice to the earth. In the next *beyt*, Neẓāmī executes a very clever word game in which he says that by having incorporating the two letters of *mīm* in the word Muḥammad, both of these Muḥammads manage to unite both words (*ʿālam*), one being the spiritual and the other being the physical.[47]

یکی دین را ز ظلم آزاد کرده ۞ یکی دنیا بعدل اباذ کرده

زهی نامی که کرد از چشمه نوش ۞ دو عالم را دو میمش حلقه در گوش

ز رشک نام او عالم دو نیم است ۞ که عالم را یکي او را دو میم است

In the last *beyt* of the poem, Neẓāmī makes mention of the hegemony of the Turks in the political realm by saying that by abrogating pillage (*naskh-e tārāj*, which could be read in two ways as *naskh* both means to abrogate and in the context of *khaṭṭ-ı naskh*, a type of calligraphic writing which at the same time, returns us to the 'pen' imagery in the rest of the *beyt*), this certain Turkish Muḥammad (with two *mīm*s) used one *mīm* for writing (*qalam*, "pen") and the other *mīm* for the *tāj* ("crown", at the same time rhyming with the word *tārāj*):

بترکان قلم از نسخ تاران ۞ یکی میمش قلم بخشذ یکی تاج

---

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid.

That is to say, what Neẓami conveys here is that the Turks, by establishing strong empires and therefore, bringing justice and order to the Islamic world, prevented more pillaging (disorder) and combined the two realms in their own empires: they used one *mīm* from the name Muḥammad for the arts and science (symbolized with *qalam*) and the other for creating substantial empires (symbolized with *tāj*) in the physical realm. One point here is that probably Neẓāmī does not praise his Shirvānshāh patrons here as, ethnically, the Shirvānshāhs were Persianized Arabs. However, these lines from *Khusraw o Shīrīn* perfectly suit Rāwandī's intention of praising Tughril Beg.

Later, Rāwandī moves on to the episode of the Seljuq-Ghaznavid battle and mentions how, with a huge army, Sultan Masʿūd I of Ghaznī sets out to Khorāsān to eradicate the Seljuqs from the region. When Tughril Beg hears the message that Masʿūd is approaching with a great army, being only 25 *farsakh* (one *farsakh* being 12,000 cubits or 5,919 meters) away from the city of Tūs, Tughril Beg gets anxious that he will not make it to where his brother Chaghri Beg is, so that they could unite their armies against Masʿūd I.[48] Assuming that everything is under control, Masʿūd I falls asleep on his elephant and, in the morning, he realizes that the news that Tughril Beg had made it to where his brother was had not reached him, because everyone, including the mahout himself, had been afraid to wake Masʿūd I up.[49] Here, Rāwandī includes a line which, according to Iqbāl, belongs to the vizier of Sultan Tughril III, and is written on the theme of wakefulness. As the line goes, if you wake up in the morning, I am afraid, it means that it would be too little too late (صراع: ترسم چو تو بیدار شوی روز بود). Masʿūd I returned, with his army, back to Khorāsān and, in the desert between Sarakhs and Merv, there was a great battle, before which the Seljuq army had dried up all the water sources in the desert hiding some for themselves in wells.[50] Having received a serious defeat by Tughril and Chaghri Begs, Maʿsūd I fled with his elephant from the battle field.

After giving an account of the great war between the Seljuqs and Ghaznavids, Rāwandī, interestingly enough, includes a section from Ferdowsī's *Shāh-nāma* concerning humility and the vanity of the world: Ferdowsī, in these lines, advises people not to be vengeful and reminds them that no one may ever be the sole possessor of the world as everyone is but a passer-by:

مسای ایچ با ازو باکینه دست ۞ ز منزل مکن جایگاه نشست

سرای سپنجست پرآی و رو ۞ یکی شذ کهن دیگر آرند نو

---

48 Ibid., 100.

49 Ibid.

50 Ibid.

In that sense, Rāwandī contrasts the gist of the words of wisdom from *Shāh-nāma* with the rash and immodest behaviour of Mas'ūd I, yet the irony is that he uses a book that was prepared for a Ghaznavid ruler, namely Mas'ūd I's father, Maḥmūd of Ghaznī, to address him. When compared to the *ḍarb-e maṣal*s used in the text, these lines from *Shāh-nāma* again seem very repetious, since they do not add anything more than a repetition of the points that have already been exposed by the three *ḍarb-e maṣal*s placed after each sentence in this particular episode. When we look at the number of sentences used to describe the clash between Tughril Beg and Mas'ūd I, we see that the sum of the couplets, plus the *ḍarb-e maṣal*s used in the text, is nearly twice as many as the sentences used the text to describe the anecdote. In that regard, this shows us that, as a rhetorical devise, Rāwandī prefers to use *ḍarb-e maṣal*s and poetic interjections to a great extent.

The last two *beyt*s of the section included from *Shāh-nāma* speak of something deep about the perception of life in medieval Islam:

یکی اندر ایذ دگر بگذرذ ۞ زمانی بمنزل چمذ با چرذ

جهانرا چنین است ساز و نهاذ ۞ ازین دست بستذ بدیگر بداذ

So, as these two *beyt*s state: one comes, one goes away, neither one hangs around in this station or grazes; the world was founded and put together like this, it takes its hand away and gives it to another. Rāwandī probably used these lines to show that Mas'ūd I's anger and greed is ungrounded and in vain. However, can we at the same time read these *beyt*s as being addressed to Tughril Beg or to any Seljuq Sultan who reads this story to learn from the past? Probably. Even though we know that it is the obligation of a medieval historical narrative to glorify the historical achievements of a particular dynasty that they are writing for, we should not, at the same time, forget that the poetic interjections act as intermission where one thinks about the story that has been read and further contemplates its implications for one's own life. That is to say, although Mas'ud I of Ghaznī is heavily criticized in these sections with words of wisdom by Ferdowsī, it is always good to think that people who read these stories, be it someone from the Seljuq family or someone else not belonging to the past, at the same time, goes through a reflective process of thinking about their own actions.

The section that comes after Mas'ūd I's running away from the battle field has a moral point behind it. When escaping from the Seljuq army, a few Seljuq soldiers catch up with Mas'ūd I, but, as he is getting on his horse, he smashes the head of one of the soldiers with his mace and no one is able to come closer to him. After relating this scene, Rāwandī includes the two *ḍarb-e maṣal*s, namely "virtue has

nothing to do with one's origin (*aṣl*) or genealogy (*nasb*), but has a basis in reason (*ʿaql*) and good manners (*adab*) (الفضل بالعقل و الادب لا بالاصل و النسب)" and "an intelligent person's hostility (*ʿadāva al-ʿāqel*) is preferable to the friendship of an ignorant one (*ṣadāqa al-jāhel*) (عداوة العاقل خير من صداقة الجاهل)", and repeats the same message over with a couplet again from *Shāh-nāma*:[51]

چو شنمن که دانا بوذ به ز دوست ۞ ابا دشمن و دوست دانش نکوست

The main point about this part is that though Masʿūd I seems strong and brave in fighting, he let himself fell into this position because he was not able to act intelligently before.

After winning the battle against the Ghaznavids, the Seljq power in Khorāsān was legitimized. Two brothers, Tughril and Chaghri Begs, and their uncles, as well as the sons of their uncles, along with other members of the greater tribe, gathered together to talk about the future of their newly legitimized state. Tughril Beg gave his brother an arrow to snap and Chaghri Beg snapped it very easily indeed. After repeating the same thing with two and three arrows consecutively, Chaghri Beg in the end was not able to break a bundle of four arrows.[52] Upon this, Tughril Beg remarked that as long as we are together, no one can prevail over us; however if we find ourselves against each other, then our enemies will be in the ascendant and we will lose our sovereignty:[53]

مثل ما همچنین است تا جذاگانه باشم هرکمترى قصد شکستن ما کنذ و بجمعیت کس برما ظفر نیابذ و یگر در میان خلافى بدیذ آید جهان نگشایذ و خصم چیره شوذ و ملك از دست ما بروذ

After this incident, Rāwandī again includes two couplets from *Shāh-nāma* and we see that before the couplets, he does not use any *ḍarb-e maṣal*s to bring further didacticism to the speech that Tughril Beg gives to the other members of the family. The *beyt*s by Ferdowsī echo the moral of the story:

اگر دو براذر نهذ پشت پشت ۞ تن کوهرا سنگ ماند بمشت

دلى کو ز درد سراذد شخود ۞ علاج پژشکان نداردش سوذ

---

51 Ibid., 101-2.

52 Ibid., 102.

53 Ibid.

That is to say, if two brothers help one another, they will turn a huge mountain into a stone, to a heart that suffers from a brother's affliction, the cure of the doctors does bring any remedy.

Poetry in the text: The use and function of poetry in historical texts

Before talking about the general use and function of poetry in historical texts in light of Rāwandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr* as well as its translation in the second volume of Yazıcızāde ʿAlī's history, I want to note that Yazıcızāde ʿAlī's omission of poems from the main text can give us some hints about the perception of poetry in the Fifteenth Century historical works written in Anatolia. From the historical point of view, if we say that the number of surviving manuscripts indicates the popularity of a particular work, then we might conclude that the main motivation of Yazıcızāde ʿAlī's omission of poetry from his translation of Rāwandī's work might suggest that Yazıcızāde ʿAlī could have wanted to compile a more concise history of the Seljuqs of Anatolia by taking out the more elaborate and prosaic parts from his translation. If Yazıcızāde ʿAlī is one of the first major popular historians who wrote about the origins and predecessors of the Ottomans, we might again conclude that he found poetic interjections embedded in the main text as unnecessary digressions from the main historical storyline, since his primary interest in compiling this five-volume work is not to survey Seljuq history in its most precise context, but to create an outline of historical genealogy for the Ottomans. However, we should not forget that the poems that Rāwandī selected for his history are both linguistically and culturally relevant to the greater *Persianate* social context of the Seljuqs of the early Thirteenth Century and, as Yazıcızāde ʿAlī was one of the first great Ottoman historians to write in the newly vernacularized form of the Anatolian Turkish language (which is at the same time, the new widely used literary language), then he might have found these *beyt*s written in Persian, Arabic and other various local Iranian dialects culturally irrelevant and out of context. This is also because most of these interjections are heavily embedded in the Persian and Arabic poetic traditions and it is nearly impossible to retain these lines without preserving the original syntax and vocabulary.

In that sense, it is understandable why Yazıcızāde ʿAlī omitted the poems from the text, since *firstly* they were not in Anatolian Turkish, and therefore, acted as a huge hindrance to the general readership of the text as the audience of this five-volume work would probably want the text to be within the Ottoman cultural and historical context (of course, here one should look more into the questions of readership and literacy in the context of the Ottoman fifteenth century: if it was only the Persian-educated high intellectuals who were reading Yazıcızāde ʿAlī,

then we can ask again why he would have omitted these sections). *Secondly*, we should at the same time consider the fact that Yazıcızāde ʿAlī also omits the Arabic *ḍarb-e maṣal*s taken from al-Thaʿālibī. As none of these proverbs selected from al-Thaʿālibī's work include any specific references to a particular culture context (whether Persian or Arabic), as in the case of, for instance, the *bey*ts selected from Ferdowsī's *Shāh-nāma* or Neẓāmī's *Khusraw o Shīrīn* (yet I do not think that the pieces that Rāwandī uses within his text are strictly "culture-specific", especially in the sections analyzed above), there could well be another reason in Yazıcızāde ʿAlī's removal of these interjections. In that sense, since the other parts differing from poems, namely the *ḍarb-e maṣal*s, do not bring any culturally specific dimension to the text, Yazıcızāde ʿAlī might have intended to carve out a precise text devoid of any unnecessary digressions.

Regarding the initial use and function of poetry in historical works, one might first argue that any additional material to the central historical text could be used as a rhetorical device to show that the author himself is highly knowledgeable about the cultural heritage of the dynasty for which he is writing the history. This argument is similar to that made by the Persian scholar Ismāʿīl Afshār as well as the editor of the critical edition of Rāwandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*, Muḥammad Iqbāl, as it is stated in Julie Scott Meisami's article concerning Rāwandī's prose style. In this article, Meisami points out the unusual hybrid quality of Rāwandī's text by assessing Afshār and Iqbāl's argument that Rāwandī's work is not original or instructive as he had plagiarized from other historical works from beginning to end without making any specific acknowledgement of the authors that he had used.[54] The accusation of plagiarism might be too anachronistic to use in this case, for it was a common convention during that period to use other materials when writing a book of history (given the fact that most of the five-volume history of Yazıcızāde ʿAlī was composed of sections that he had translated (sometimes in their entirety) from other works of history). Furthermore, as Afshār puts it, "Rāwandī's goal -who had a good hand and was skilled in gilding - in writing this book in the newly Islamicized Asia Minor, in which region Persian literature had not yet put down roots, and at a time when no Iranian notables or scholars were to be found in Konya, was to obtain a stipend from the Seljuq Kaykhusraw."[55] This argument could be accurate, as it was very common for historians and even poets to produce works in order to receive a honorarium or a promotion in administrative rank in medieval Islam; however, as Meisami puts it, Rāwandī wrote this work in Hamadān without having the intention of dedicating this book to any specific

---

54 quoted in Meisami, "Rāvandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*: History or Hybrid?", 185.

55 Ibid.

ruler. It was only after going to Anatolia to present this volume to Suleimān Shāh II that Rāwandī found out that the former was already dead.

Different from Afshār and Iqbāl, Meisami looks for other ways to explain the hybrid, or as she calls it the "bipartite" nature of Rāwandī's prose. Of course, the argument that any interjection in the main historical text has a function in which the author finds a way of acknowledging his versatility in Arabic and Persian literature, as well as Islamic theology, is still a valid one. In order for a text to be legitimized as a great historical work (whether they are pre-Islamic Sasanid "mirrors for princes" with full of ancient Persian proverbs – *ḍarb-e maṣal*s as in Rāwandī's case – or earlier Islamic histories as in the example of al-Ṭabarī's comprehensive text *Tārīkh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk* ("The History of the Prophets and Kings")) during the medieval period, it needs to make references not only to the particular verses of the Holy Qur'an or to the *ḥadīth*, but also to the most significant poetic works of Persian literature. In contrast, Meisami argues that the hybridity of Rāwandī's text has more complex structural and thematic ends than it is generally thought to be.[56] For instance, when Meisami talks about one of the earlier sections of Rāwandī's book, namely ذکر ابتدای کار سلجوقیان, in which he talks about the origins of the Seljuqs after taking the text directly from Nīshāpūrī's *Seljūq-nāma*, she points out that the references that Rāwandī makes within the text, deviate from the schematically continuous and unadorned narrative; that is to say, by recasting *Seljūq-nāma* through omission, amplification and rearrangement, Rāwandī restructures Nīshāpūrī's authoritative narrative of the formative years of the Seljuqs into a new, well-structured text with many thematically connected references to poetry, Islamic proverbs and Qur'anic verses.[57] In that sense, by breaking the straight-forward and generic narrative style of older historical texts, Rāwandī's scattered quotations serve not only to demonstrate morals, but also to provide introductions, transitions and conclusions in the best tradition of *ḥusn-e maṭla'*, *ḥusn-e takhalluṣ* and *ḥusn-e maqṭa'* and are structurally woven into coherent passages linked thematically with their contexts.[58]

One could argue that the inclusion of poetry in historical texts has many uses and functions. One apparent function would be to relate the greater historical narrative to a particular cultural context and in the case of Rāwandī's book, we see that he intends to situate his history of the Seljuqs within the greater Islamic and Persianate cultures. In that sense, we see that Rāwandī not only makes an extensive use of Persian classical poetry from the works of Ferdowsī and Neẓāmī, but also

---

56 Ibid.

57 Ibid., 193; 202.

58 Ibid., 202-3.

includes the Islamic lore of *ḍarb-e maṣal*s as well as verses from the Holy Qur'an. There are several arguments devised by Iranian scholars Afshār and Iqbāl who both believe that these textual references and interjections from the greater Islamic and Persianate cultural context do not have any particular meaning, but are used only to impress the Seljuq Sultan to whom the book is dedicated. In contrast, Meisami argues that these interjected passages are structurally and thematically connected to Rāwandī's greater historical account and have a rhetorical function in the greater narrative scheme. Considering Yazıcızāde ʿAlī's omission of these poetic interjections from his translation of Rāwandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr* in the second volume of *Tevārīkh-i Âl-i Selçūḳ*, I want to argue that the perception of poetic interjections is culturally specific. One possible reason why Yazıcızāde ʿAlī might have omitted these poems in Persian could be explained within the context of the Ottoman Fifteenth Century, in which there was a particular interest in producing literature in the vernacular Turkish rather than the official literary languages of the age, Persian and Arabic.

Similarly, when we look at the common trends among the translations from this period, we see that as in the example of Aḥmed-i Dāʿī's *Çengnāme*, the translations are not limited to the original language itself, but consist of extensive additions and revisions in the "culture-specific" content of the works being translated. Reminding that Aḥmed-i Dāʿī's *Çengnāme* had 1376 more *beyt*s than the original would probably be sufficient to point out the different approaches and perceptions in translation during the Fifteenth Century Anatolia.

I want to conclude that the poetic interjections used in Rāwandī's text are thematically connected to the historical episodes that they come after; however, the *beyt*s that are chosen are sometimes too long and digressing to include or repetitive given the fact that, in most cases, these *beyt*s do not add anything new structurally and content-wise to the already quoted *ḍarb-e maṣal*s from al-Thaʿālibī's *Kitāb al-farāʾed waʾl-qalāʾed*. The main function of poetic interjections in historical texts is to summarize the historical episode that comes before them and make the moral of the story to be easily remembered through their rhymed schemes. For instance, when describing the deeds of Sultan Masʿūd I of Ghaznī in the Tughril Beg episode, Rāwandī aims to delineate Sultan Masʿūd I's hubris in a very didactic way with his references to Ferdowsī and Neẓāmī. Even though Rāwandī's poetic interjections are thematically related to the general moral of the story, they do not add anything new to the points already made in the *ḍarb-e maṣal*s. That is to say, especially in Rāwandī's case, the poetic interjections do not add anything new to the general moral quality of these historical episodes, but resituates them within the greater Islamic and Persianate context. This point is probably the main factor why Yazıcızāde ʿAlī omits these interjections from his translation of the very same work.

Poetry in the Text: The Use and Function of Poetry in Rāwandī's Rāḥat al-ṣudūr *and Yazıcızāde 'Alī's Translation of the Same Work in* Tevārīkh-i Âl-i Selçūḳ

Abstract ■ Rāwandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr wa āyat al-surūr* ("The Comfort of the Hearts and the Sign of Happiness") is an early Thirteenth Century history of the Great Seljuq Empire giving a detailed account of its dissolution into minor local dynasties. This particular work is full of interjections of poetry and after almost every episode of historical events, Rāwandī includes a couplet or sometimes even a whole block of poetry to summarize these events or give a word of wisdom through poetry. Two centuries later, the Ottoman historian Yazıcızāde 'Alī, who served twice as an envoy to the Mamluks during the first reign of Murād II (1421-1444), is today mainly famous for his five-volume work *Tevārīkh-i Âl-i Selçūḳ* ("The History of the Great Seljuqs") which gives a detailed genealogical account of the Ottomans, tracing the histories of the Oghuz Turks, the Seljuqs, the Ilkhanids, as well as later Anatolian principalities. The second volume of this work is devoted to the history of the Seljuqs of Hamadān and Kermān, and is a word-for-word translation of Rāwandī's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*. Interestingly, Yazıcızāde 'Alī omits most of Rāwandī's poetic interjections from his translation of *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*; and in some cases, he rewrites them according to the Ottoman cultural context. This essay will explore what possible functions these poetic interjections actually serve within the context of these two historical works and later argue that Yazıcızāde 'Alī's perception of poetic interjections is that the use of poetry in historical texts is "culturally specific."

Keywords: History and Historiography, Vernacular Translations in Anatolia, the Seljuq and Ottoman Empires, the Use and Function of Poetry in Historical Texts.

Bibliography

Alpay Tekin, Gönül: "*Ahmed-i Daî*'den Önceki Anadolu'nun Kültür Hayatı ve *Ahmed-i Daî*." "*Çengnâme*'nin Kaynakları." *Ahmed-i Daî and his* Çengnâme: *An Old Ottoman Mesnevi*. Cambridge: Harvard University The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, 1973.

Ateş, Ahmed: "Hicri VI-VIII. (XII-XIV.) Asırlarda Anadolu'da Farsça Eserler." *Türkiyat Mecmuası* VII-VIII (1945): 94-135.

.........: "Burdur-Antalya ve Havalisi Kütüphanelerinde Bulunan Türkçe, Arapça ve Farsça Bazı Mühim Eserler." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 3-4 (1948): 171-9.

Bakır, Dr. Abdullah: "Önsöz", *Tevārīh-i Âl-i Selçūḳ*. Yazıcı-zāde 'Alī. İstanbul: Çamlıca Basın Yayın, 2009.

Bayram, Mikail: *Anadolu'da Te'lif Edilen İlk Eser "Keşfü'l-akabe."* Konya: Hayra Hizmet Vakfı, 1981.

Duda, Herbert W.: "Zeitgenössische islamische Quellen und das Oğuznâme des Jazyğyoğlu 'Alī zur Angeblichen Türkischen Besiedlung der Dobrudcha im 12. Jhd. n. Chr." *Spisanie Na Bulgarskata Akadamiya Na Naukit İ İzkustvata Kıniga*. LXVI. Sofiya: Peçatnitsa Kınipegraf, 1943.

Iqbāl, Muḥammad: "Naşirin Önsözü." *Râhat-üs-Sudûr ve Âyet-üs-Sürûr*. trans. Ahmed Ateş. vol. I. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1957.

Huart, Cl. and H. Massé: "Djāmī." *Encyclopedia of Islam*. vol. II. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991.

Köprülü, Fuad: "Yeni Farisîde Türk Unsurları." *Türkiyat Mecmuası* VII-VIII.1 (1942): 1-16.

Mansuroğlu, Mecdut: "Anadolu'da Türk Dili ve Edebiyatının İlk Mahsülleri." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 1.1 (1946-7): 9-25.

Meisami, Julie Scott: "Rāvandî's *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*: History or Hybrid?" *Edebiyāt*: *The Journal of Middle Eastern Literatures*. vol 5/2 (1994): 183-215.

Neşrī: *Neşri Tarihi*. ed. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Altay Köymen. vol. I. Ankara: Kültür Turizm Bakanlığı, 1988.

Önder, Sevim Yılmaz: "Önsöz." *Tevārīh-i Âl-i Selçūk*. Yazıcı-zāde 'Alī. vol. II. İstanbul: Bilge Oğuz, 2009.

al-Rāwandī, Muḥammad bin 'Alī bin Süleymān: *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr wa āyat al-surūr*. ed. Muḥammad Iqbāl. Tahrān: Ensherāt-e Amīr-e Kebīr, 1364.

Tekindağ, Şehabeddin: "İzzet Koyunoğlu Kütüphanesinde Bulunan Türkçe Yazmalar I." *Türkiyat Mecmuası* XVI (1971): 134-9.

Yazıcı-zāde 'Alī: *Tevārīh-i Âl-i Selçūk*. ed. Sevim Yılmaz Önder. vol. II. İstanbul: Bilge Oğuz, 2009.