

ABHANDLUNGEN FÜR DIE KUNDE
DES MORGENLANDES
Band 105

Silje Susanne Alvestad

The Uppsala Manuscript
of Muḥammed Hevā'ī Üsküfī Bosnevī's
Maḳbūl-i 'ārif (1631)
from a Turcological Perspective



Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft
Harrassowitz Verlag

ABHANDLUNGEN FÜR DIE KUNDE DES MORGENLANDES

Im Auftrag der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
herausgegeben von Florian C. Reiter

Band 105

Board of Advisers:

Christian Bauer (Berlin)
Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst (Berlin)
Lutz Edzard (Oslo/Erlangen)
Jürgen Hanneder (Marburg)
Herrmann Jungraithmayr (Marburg)
Karénina Kollmar-Paulenz (Bern)
Jens Peter Laut (Göttingen)
Joachim Friedrich Quack (Heidelberg)
Florian C. Reiter (Berlin)
Michael Streck (Leipzig)

2016

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Silje Susanne Alvestad

The Uppsala Manuscript
of Muḥammed Hevā'ī Üsküfī Bosnevī's
Makbūl-i 'ārif (1631)
from a Turcological Perspective:
Transliteration, Transcription,
and an English Translation

2016

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet
at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our
website <http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>

© Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft 2016

This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission
of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies
particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage
and processing in electronic systems.

Printed on permanent/durable paper.

Printing and binding: Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Printed in Germany

ISSN 0567-4980

ISBN 978-3-447-10635-1

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-447-19530-0

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	VII
SUMMARY	IX
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background, motivation, and objectives.....	1
Structure of the thesis	5
THEORY AND METHOD	7
Introductory remarks.....	7
Theoretical issues.....	7
Muḥammed Hevā'ī Ūskūfī Bosnevī: Who was he?	7
<i>Maḵbūl-i 'ārif</i> [Dear to the Wise]: Structure and contents.....	11
Manuscripts of <i>Maḵbūl-i 'ārif</i> in general, the Uppsala manuscript in particular	19
What's in a name? An excursus on <i>Potur Šahidija/Potur Šahidi</i> [Potur Šāhidī]	21
Methodological issues.....	25
Transliteration	25
Transcription	27
English translation.....	27
O. NOVA 546: TRANSLITERATION, TRANSCRIPTION, AND AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION.....	29
Introductory remarks.....	29
Part I, the foreword.....	29
Part II, the versified glossary	50
Part III, the afterword.....	114
THE TURKISH VARIETY IN <i>MAḴBŪL-Ī 'ĀRIF</i> :	
BALKAN TURKIC OR OTTOMAN?	116
Introductory remarks.....	116
The Turkish lexicon in the versified glossary as compared to the foreword and the afterword.....	116
Archaic and/or dialect features of the Turkish varieties represented in <i>Maḵbūl-i 'ārif</i>	119

CONCLUSION: SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK.....	121
Summary.....	121
Future outlook.....	122
References.....	125
Dictionaries.....	129
Online newspaper articles.....	130
Appendix 1: O. nova 546: The Uppsala manuscript of <i>Maḳbūl-i 'ārīf</i>	131
Appendix 2: Glossary of words from the afterword of <i>Maḳbūl-i 'ārīf</i>	161
Appendix 3: The Bosnian variety represented in the Uppsala manuscript: ikavian forms.....	162
Appendix 4: The Bosnian variety represented in the Uppsala manuscript: (i)jekavian forms.....	163
Appendix 5: Representation(s) of a selection of Bosnian phonemes in the versified glossary part of the Uppsala manuscript.....	164

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Having at long last come to the end of this writing journey I first and foremost wish to extend my gratitude to my supervisor, Bernt Brendemoen, Professor of Turcology at the University of Oslo, for all the time, energy, and resources he has devoted to me and my work with this thesis. I wish to thank him for sharing his knowledge with me. His comments, advice, and patience have been invaluable and without him my task would have been much more difficult to undertake.

I also want to thank Svein Mønnesland, Professor Emeritus of Slavic languages at the University of Oslo, for drawing my attention to *Maḳbūl-i 'arīf* in the first place, for giving me his first copy of the 2011 edition of the work, for taking the time to meet with me whenever I have had any questions, and for encouraging me along the way. The copy of the Uppsala manuscript, titled O. nova 546, in Appendix 1 was given to him by the staff at Uppsala University Library and is given here with his and the library's permission. Furthermore, I am grateful to Lutz Edzard, Professor of Semitic Linguistics at the University of Oslo and the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, for his valuable comments, his encouragement, and our collaboration. I am also thankful to Bırsel Karakoç, Associate Professor in Turkic languages at the University of Uppsala, and Robert Dankoff, Professor of Turkish at the University of Chicago, for valuable comments on the word *hücece*. Thanks are also due to Mehmet Bilgin for his comments on the word *potur*. Furthermore, I am grateful to all the people at the Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages at the University of Oslo who made my work with my thesis easier and even more enjoyable.

I also wish to extend my gratitude to my evaluation committee, consisting of Bırsel Karakoç and Kjetil Rå Hauge, Associate Professor Emeritus of Central European and Balkan Studies at the University of Oslo. Their comments contributed to further improvements of my work.

Next, I am utmost grateful to Barbara Krauss and her colleagues at Harrassowitz Verlag for their willingness to publish my work in this series and for their help and support in the process of revision.

Finally, I want to thank my boyfriend, Per-Helge, for truly living up to his first name and being my rock. This work is dedicated to him.

Needless to say, any errors in this work are my own.

Oslo, February 2016

Silje Susanne Alvestad

SUMMARY

The object of study in this thesis is the Uppsala manuscript, O. nova 546, of Muḥammed Hevā'ī Ūskūfī Bosnevī's literary work *Maḵbūl-i 'ārif* from 1631. The manuscript, handwritten in Ottoman script, reached the University Library in Uppsala from Cairo in 1924. *Maḵbūl-i 'ārif* is frequently referred to as the first known Bosnian-Turkish dictionary, but this label is misleading. First, the work consists of three parts—a long and sophisticated foreword and an afterword in addition to the dictionary part. Besides, the part of the work that is the cause of the unfortunate label is not a 'dictionary' in the modern sense of the word. Among other things, it is versified, dialogue-oriented, and split into chapters according to a hierarchically structured set of different topics. The versified glossary is the only part where we find Bosnian words; approximately 650.

The motivation behind this thesis is twofold. First, *Maḵbūl-i 'ārif* has received little attention from a turcological perspective. Considering the fact that *Maḵbūl-i 'ārif* is a Turkish, or Ottoman Turkish literary work of art, it is striking to note that the vast majority of researchers concerned with the work examine it from a Bosnian cultural and/or linguistic perspective. Ūskūfī refers to 'the Bosnian language', so the widespread interest should perhaps be seen in light of a larger Bosnian nation-building project after the fall of Yugoslavia. However, it is time that *Maḵbūl-i 'ārif* receives its fair share of attention from a turcological point of view too.

The second motivation is as follows. In the wake of the renewed attention drawn to the Uppsala manuscript of *Maḵbūl-i 'ārif* by Svein Mønnesland in 2010, a new edition of *Maḵbūl-i 'ārif* was published in Tuzla, Bosnia, in 2011 (Kasumović & Mønnesland 2011). One would expect, then, that the transcription provided would be based on the Uppsala manuscript, but this expectation is not entirely borne out. Instead the transcription given is for the most part based on works by previous scholars who have had several manuscripts of *Maḵbūl-i 'ārif* at their disposal, but not the Uppsala manuscript. There are therefore several divergences between the transcription given in Kasumović & Mønnesland (2011) and the Uppsala manuscript.

Against the background of this twofold motivation, my contributions with this thesis are as follows. First, I provide a grapheme-by-grapheme transliteration of the entire Uppsala manuscript. Second, I give a transcription of the manuscript and, third, I provide an English translation of the entire *Maḵbūl-i 'ārif*. None of these enterprises have as yet been undertaken. The English translation may serve as a starting point to make *Maḵbūl-i 'ārif* available to a wider audience.

INTRODUCTION

Background, motivation, and objectives¹

In 2010, a manuscript of what has become known as the first Bosnian dictionary was “rediscovered”² at the University Library in Uppsala, Sweden: Muḥammed Hevā’ī Ūskūfī Bosnevī’s *Maḵbūl-i ‘ārīf* [Dear to the Wise] from 1631 (O. nova 546). In the wake of this and in connection with the 380th anniversary of the first edition of the work and the 410th anniversary of the birth of its author, *Maḵbūl-i ‘ārīf* was reprinted and published as a little book by the municipality of Tuzla, Bosnia, in 2011 (Kasumović & Mønnesland 2011). The book includes one foreword by the Bosnian Minister of education and science, and one by the Mayor of Tuzla, as well as articles by some international and national scholars. It was ceremoniously launched in the presence of these and other notabilities, and speeches were held in which it was pointed out that *Maḵbūl-i ‘ārīf* was not only the first known Bosnian dictionary, but the first in any of the South Slavic languages, including Croatian and Serbian, and that the Bosnian language has its own unique history.³

“Ūskūfī is to Bosnian what Dante is to Italian”, argues the Bosnian historian Dr. Enver Imamović,⁴ and according to the Bosnian linguist Dr. Josip

1 An earlier version of certain sections of the first, second, and fourth chapter of this thesis has been published in Alvestad (2014a).

2 The manuscript, O. nova 546, was known to exist in Uppsala, but it was now brought to the renewed attention of the scientific community in Bosnia and Herzegovina thanks to Svein Mønnesland, Professor Emeritus of Slavic languages at the University of Oslo (cf., Kasumović 2011: 55). The claim that the Uppsala manuscript was a “dosad nepoznati prijepis” [a hitherto unknown manuscript], as put forward by, e.g., Izet Muratspahić in a review of Kasumović & Mønnesland (2011) in *Bosanska Pošta* [Bosnian Post] on April 5, 2012 (cf. http://www.bosanskaposta.no/vise.php?article_id=1038&category_id=2, accessed Oct. 19, 2014), is incorrect. To my knowledge, Kasumović & Mønnesland (2011) is the first scientific work to be concerned with the Uppsala manuscript. Previous works on *Maḵbūl-i ‘ārīf* have been based on manuscripts other than that in Uppsala.

3 See, e.g., the newspaper articles given in References.

4 “Što je za italijanski jezik Dante, to je za bosanski Uskufi” (cf. the interview in “Muhamed Hevai Uskufi: Bosansko-turski rječnik iz 1631. godine” [Muhamed Hevai Uskufi: A Bosnian-Turkish Dictionary from 1631], at <http://www.ljubusaci.com/index.php/knjizevni-kutak/536-muhamed-hevai-uskufi-bosansko-turski-rjecnik-iz->

Baotić, Üsküfî is one of the first two to have ever referred to the language as ‘Bosnian’.⁵ In the foreword to *Maḳbûl-i ‘ārîf*, Üsküfî on six occasions refers to ‘the Bosnian language’.⁶ One example is given below.⁷

- (1) *êdem Bosna dilince bir lügat cem* ‘
‘let me compile a dictionary **in the Bosnian language**’

Maḳbûl-i ‘ārîf has received a lot of attention in Bosnia and from a Bosnian linguistic perspective. The widespread interest could probably be explained in terms of strategies, or processes of nation-building in Bosnia after the fall of Yugoslavia. Language is widely held to be important in shaping national identities (see, e.g., Hroch 2005: 171-201). However, *Maḳbûl-i ‘ārîf* consists of three parts, namely a foreword, a dictionary part, and an afterword. Bosnian words occur only in the middle, dictionary part. Besides, the dictionary part of the work is not indexical like our modern dictionaries, but rather dialogue-based, split into chapters according to topic, and in verse. For this reason, and following Dankoff *et al.* (1996), I will refer to this part as a versified glossary.

Muḥammed Hevā’î Üsküfî refers to one of the languages represented in the versified glossary as Bosnian, but the language in the foreword and the afterword is Turkish, and the ‘thread’ that weaves the versified glossary part together is the Turkish language. This language he refers to as ‘Türkî’ in the foreword and ‘Tür[k]çe’ in the versified glossary. Together with (1), consider (2) from the afterword and (3) and (4) from the final and the fourth chapter, respectively, of the versified glossary. In (3) and (4), Bosnian words are

1631-godine, accessed October 19, 2014).

- 5 The first, allegedly, was Konstantin the Philosopher at the end of the 14th or the beginning of the 15th century. See Sead Hasović’s article “Šta je pokazala promocija Bosansko-turskog rječnika u ANUBiH-u: Je li Uskufi i danas živ?” [What did the promotion of the Bosnian-Turkish dictionary at the Bosnian Academy of Sciences and Arts show: Is Uskufi still alive today?] in the Bosnian newspaper *Dnevni avaz* [Daily Voice] March 18, 2012.
- 6 Following the numbering in Kasumović & Mønnesland (2011) and Huković *et al.* (1990), ‘the Bosnian language’ is mentioned in line 45, 49, 53, 67, 73, and 88.
- 7 The transcription of the excerpts from *Maḳbûl-i ‘ārîf* in this and the subsequent chapter is my own and in accordance with the Uppsala manuscript, except (2) and (7), since the whole afterword is missing from this manuscript. In the English translation, I have consulted relevant dictionaries as well as looked to Kadrić’s Bosnian translation in Kasumović & Mønnesland (2011). I will return to all this in the third chapter of this thesis. (1) is line 45 of the foreword.

boldfaced, their Turkish counterparts are only italicized, and words and suffixes that bind the text together—which are all Turkish—are underlined.

- (2) *Îlāhî, bu kitābın şāhibisin*
*sevindür, rahmetüñle eyle dilşād*⁸
 ‘O God, please the owner of this book,
 make him happy with your grace’
- (3) *desno sağdur, dahi livo oldı sol*
*hem lahana turşu suyudur rasol*⁹
 ‘**desno** is right, and livo became left
and **rasol** is brine for cabbage’
 ‘desno is ‘right’, and livo became ‘left’
 and rasol is ‘brine for cabbage’
- (4) *Dahi tağa hem didiler gora,*
*çam ağacına didiler bora*¹⁰
 ‘and to mountain they said **gora**,
and to pine tree they said **bor**’
 ‘and to ‘mountain’ they said gora,
 and to ‘pine tree’ they said bor’¹¹

8 Kadrić (2011: 134).

9 In Kadrić’s transcription, we find ‘sağ’, ‘sol’, ‘lahana’, and ‘rasol’, cf. Kadrić (2011: 129). The transcription in (3) is in accordance with the Uppsala manuscript. In his transcription of the versified glossary part of *Maḳbūl-i ‘ārif*, Kadrić uses *ğ* for *g* in Turkish words and *g* for *ğ* in Bosnian words. I have retained *ğ* in (3) and (4) to ensure that the transcriptions of the foreword and the versified glossary are coherent. I will continue to do so in the third chapter of this thesis.

10 In Kadrić’s transcription, we find ‘dağa’, ‘gora’, ‘ağacı’, and ‘bor’, cf. Kadrić (2011: 89). The final *a* in ‘bora’ is an epenthetic vowel. For more on epenthetic vowels in the Bosnian words in the versified glossary of *Maḳbūl-i ‘ārif*, see, e.g., Smailović (1990).

11 The fact that Turkish is the metalanguage in the versified glossary suggests that the target audience of this part of *Maḳbūl-i ‘ārif* was not Bosniaks (see footnote 4 in the second chapter of this thesis) who wanted to learn Turkish (as suggested by, e.g., Blau (1868)), but rather non-Bosnian speaking people in Üsküfî’s circle whom he wanted to introduce to his mother tongue. As I will return to below, Bosnian was widely spoken at the court in Istanbul at the time, due to the *devşirme* system. I hypothesize that Üsküfî wrote *Maḳbūl-i ‘ārif* primarily with a non-Bosnian speaking audience in mind, such as fellow poets associated with the court in Istanbul, including the sultan himself. I will return to this idea on various occasions throughout the thesis.

Maḳbūl-i 'ārif is evidently a Turkish literary work, yet is by far most often examined from a Bosnian perspective (but see, e.g., Filan 2005, 2013). This discrepancy has also been noted by, e.g., Boeschoten (1995: 33). It is time the work receives its fair share of attention from a turcological point of view too. To accommodate this need is one of the aims of this thesis.

A second objective is based on the following. The 2011 Tuzla edition of *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif* emerged in the wake of the renewed attention brought to the manuscript in Uppsala. One would expect, then, that the transcription provided in the book is based on the Uppsala manuscript, but it is not. Rather, the transcription and Bosnian translation of the foreword are from Korkut (1942), who did not have the Uppsala manuscript at his disposal. Moreover, the middle, versified glossary part in the 2011 book is “for the most part presented as it was done by Otto Blau (Leipzig, 1868), and Alija Nametak (Sarajevo 1931 and 1978, and Zagreb 1968)” and is taken directly from “a certain book that was published in Tuzla in 1990”¹² (Kasumović 2011: 52-54, my translation). As it turns out, Blau (1868)¹³ is based on at least three different manuscripts, some of which are no longer available, and Nametak’s 1968 and 1978 works are based on a total of nine different manuscripts, and the Uppsala manuscript is not one of them (Nametak 1968, 1978). Finally, the transcription of the afterword in the 2011 edition is from Blau (1868). The afterword is where the available manuscripts vary the most (Kasumović 2011: 55). As a result, there are divergences between the transcription given by Kadrić in Kasumović & Mønnesland (2011) and the Uppsala manuscript. In other words, the Uppsala manuscript has not yet been properly transliterated and transcribed. I will do that in this thesis. In addition, I will provide an English translation of *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif*, thereby taking a first step towards introducing the work to a wider audience and, hopefully, convincing the research community that Üsküfî and his *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif* both need and deserve further investigation.

In my thesis I will also raise the following research questions. First, how should the Turkish, or Turkic variety expressed in *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif* be characterized—as Balkan Turkic, Ottoman, or closer to a spoken variety of Turkish? Second, what can *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif* tell us about its author, Muḥammed Hevā’î Üsküfî—was he, for example, a *devşirme*, one of the many Christian boys who

¹² This is probably Huković *et al.* (1990).

¹³ Otto Blau is the first person known to have taken a scholarly interest in *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif* (see, e.g., Nametak 1968: 231). On the title page of his 1868 work, *Bosnisch-türkische Sprachdenkmäler*, Blau presents himself as “North-German consul to Bosnia, knight of several orders, member of scholarly societies, etc.”

were taken to Istanbul as a kind of blood tax to be of civil or military service to the Ottoman Empire (see, e.g., Malcolm 1996: 45-47)? To anticipate, I will with respect to question 1 argue that the language in the foreword and afterword of *Maḳbūl-i 'ārīf* is literary Ottoman, while the metalanguage in the middle part, the versified glossary, is much closer to the spoken language. This is in line with Filan (2013). As to question 2 I will argue that Muḥammed Hevā'ī Ūskūfī indeed was a *devşirme* and that this is the reason why he appears to have been so familiar with the sultan's court in Istanbul.

Structure of the thesis

The thesis is structured as follows. In the chapter titled Theory and method, I first provide a detailed presentation of Muḥammed Hevā'ī Ūskūfī, *Maḳbūl-i 'ārīf*, and the Uppsala manuscript. I provide an overview of the state of the art of accounts of, and the research on *Maḳbūl-i 'ārīf*, including, *inter alia*, Evliyā Çelebi's account of his travel to Sarajevo in 1656, Otto Blau (1868), Nametak (1968), Huković *et al.* (1990), Boeschoten (1995), and Kasumović & Mønnesland (2011). The final section of the chapter is devoted to methodology. I describe how I have proceeded when transliterating and transcribing the Uppsala manuscript and when translating *Maḳbūl-i 'ārīf* into English.

In the chapter titled The Uppsala manuscript of *Maḳbūl-i 'ārīf*: Transliteration, transcription, and an English translation, I provide a grapheme-by-grapheme transliteration and a transcription of the Uppsala manuscript. As I go along, I comment on how the transcription diverges from that given by Kadrić in Kasumović & Mønnesland (2011). Occasionally and to the extent that they have been available, I also present transcriptions given by other researchers, such as Okumuş (2009) and Filan (2013). I write 'occasionally' here for the following reasons. First, none of the researchers in question have had access to the Uppsala manuscript, so our transcriptions may diverge for this reason. Second, the researchers in question transcribe only parts of the manuscript(s) that they have had at their disposal.

In the same chapter I also provide a transcription of the afterword of *Maḳbūl-i 'ārīf* even though this part is missing from the Uppsala manuscript. I include it for the sake of completeness. With some exceptions the transcription I give of the afterword is identical to that given in Kasumović & Mønnesland (2011), which, in its turn, is based on Blau's (1868) transcription, and partly Korkut's (1942) and partly Ustavdić and Sümbüllü's translation into Bosnian (cf. Kasumović & Mønnesland 2011: 133, fn. 1). Finally, in the same chapter, I also give an English translation of the entire *Maḳbūl-i*

‘ārīf. Maḵbūl-i ‘ārīf has not been translated into English previously, so this is one of the most important contributions of my thesis. When translating I have prioritized meaning over rhyme and rhythm. In the translation of the foreword and the afterword I have consulted a selection of relevant dictionaries and also looked to Kadrić’s Bosnian translation in Kasumović & Mønnesland (2011). When translating the middle, versified glossary part, on the other hand, I had no work to consult, other than relevant dictionaries. No Bosnian translation of this part is given in Kasumović & Mønnesland (2011).

The chapter titled *The Turkish variety in Maḵbūl-i ‘ārīf: Balkan Turkic or Ottoman?* is devoted to a discussion of the variety of Turkish represented in *Maḵbūl-i ‘ārīf*. The discussion in the chapter grew out of a quite widely held assumption, or widely made claim, that the language in *Maḵbūl-i ‘ārīf* is Balkan Turkic, or a dialect thereof, that is, a Turkic variety used by ethnic minorities on the Balkans of Turkic ethnic origin. To anticipate, I argue that this claim has yet to be substantiated. There is nothing to suggest that the variety is anything other than Ottoman Turkish. Based on the nature of the lexicon in the various parts of *Maḵbūl-i ‘ārīf* I rather agree with Filan (2013) when she argues to the effect that the language in the foreword is literary Ottoman, while that in the versified glossary is closer to the spoken language. As far as the latter is concerned, Üsküfî himself refers to the language as *Türkî* in the foreword (line 74 and 79) and *Tür[k]çe* in the versified glossary (chapter 8, line 2b). Against this background I hypothesize that Muḥammed Hevā’î Üsküfî Bosnevî was a *devşirme* boy. At the end of the chapter I present a selection of archaic and/or dialect features that can be observed in the Turkish variety represented in the various parts of the Uppsala manuscript.

In the final chapter, titled *Conclusion: Summary and outlook*, I sum up what I have done in this thesis and give some suggestions for further research. As I will show throughout the thesis, many questions still remain both when it comes to *Maḵbūl-i ‘ārīf* and its author, Muḥammed Hevā’î Üsküfî.

THEORY AND METHOD

Introductory remarks

This chapter is devoted to theoretical issues and methodology. My aim with the theory part is to place *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif* in context. Thus, in the section titled Theoretical issues I first present what is known about its author, Muḥammed Hevā'ī Üsküfî, and next I give a detailed introduction to the work itself. Then I provide an account of the extant manuscripts of *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif* in general, and the Uppsala manuscript in particular. In the section titled What's in a name? I make an excursus on the name by which *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif* has become even more widely known, at least in the Bosnian tradition—namely, *Potur Şahidija*, or *Potur Şahidi* [Potur Şāhidī]. Throughout the theoretical part of this chapter I will discuss a wide array of works, including Evliyā Çelebi's account of his stay in Sarajevo in 1656 in his *Seyāhatnāme*, in which he provides some excerpts from *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif*, Otto Blau (1868), Nametak (1968), Huković *et al.* (1990), Boeschoten (1995), and Kasumović & Mønnesland (2011).

In the sub-sections devoted to methodological issues, I describe how I have proceeded when, first, transliterating and transcribing the Uppsala manuscript and, second, translating *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif* into English.

Theoretical issues

Muḥammed Hevā'ī Üsküfî Bosnevî: Who was he?

In the Bosnian literary history, Muḥammed Hevā'ī Üsküfî Bosnevî is known for his many poems in addition to his *magnum opus*, *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif*. Besides, he is known as 'Muhamed Hevai Uskufi' (see, e.g., Kasumović & Mønnesland 2011), or 'Muhamed Hevaija Uskufija' (see, e.g., Nametak 1968: 231) rather than Muḥammed Hevā'ī Üsküfî Bosnevî. In modern Turkish scholarly works, the name is sometimes spelled 'Mehmet Hevayi Üsküfî' (see, e.g., Taşcıoğlu 2006: 430). I have chosen the spelling Muḥammed Hevā'ī Üsküfî Bosnevî in short because I am taking a turcological perspective on him and his work. *Üsküfî Bosnevî* is the correct represen-