

# A Scholar's Journey from Timurid Khorasan to Mehmed I's Bursa: A New Version of the Introduction of Ḥaydar al-Harawī's *Sharḥ al-Kashshāf* and the Construction of al-Harawī's Biography from the Two Versions of the Introduction

M. Taha Boyalıklar\*

**Abstract:** Ḥaydar al-Harawī (d. 825/after 1427) was a significant scholar from Khorasan who migrated to the Ottoman lands. A distinguished student of al-Taftazānī, he earned high regard from Mehmed I and received patronage from him. al-Harawī dedicated his commentary on al-Zamakhsharī's *al-Kashshāf* to Mehmed I with exaggerated expressions of praise and provided significant details about his biography in the introduction of the work. After spending many years in Ottoman lands, al-Harawī established contact with Shahrukh, the son of Timur. He rewrote the introduction of *Sharḥ al-Kashshāf* and dedicated the work to Shahrukh. This new patronage relationship is evident in the second version of the introduction, where not only the dedication part but also the content was rearranged concerning the new patron's identity. Important biographical details not found in the first version are included in the second version, making it a crucial source for al-Harawī's biography. This article brings the second version of the introduction to light for the first time, constructing al-Harawī's biography by compiling information from both versions. While no specific dates are provided in either version, the duration of al-Harawī's stay in certain cities is mentioned. Gaps in the narrative were filled based on historical events, allowing for accurate dating of approximately forty years of al-Harawī's life, from Sarakhs through Shiraz, Tabriz, Shirvan, Bursa, Edirne, and back to Khorasan. This comprehensive overview sheds light on the relationship between scholars and rulers, the influence of political developments on scholarly life, and the intellectual world of a scholar dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge.

**Key words:** Ḥaydar al-Harawī, al-Taftāzānī, Mehmed I, Timur, Shahrukh, *Sharḥ al-Kashshāf*

\* Assoc. Prof., Istanbul 29 Mayıs University, Faculty of Islamic Sciences. Correspondence: mtboyalik@gmail.com

## Introduction: New version of the introduction of *Sharḥ al-Kashshāf*

A few years ago, a manuscript<sup>1</sup> of Ḥaydar al-Harawī's (d. after 825/1427) commentary on al-Zamakhsharī's (d. 538/1144) *al-Kashshāf* was identified and introduced.<sup>2</sup> al-Harawī's views on al-Zamakhsharī, *al-Kashshāf* and its commentaries, along his relationship with his teacher al-Taftāzānī (d. 792/1390), some of his travels, and his opinions on Meḥmed I (d. 824/1421) and the Ottoman sultans can be learned from the introduction of *Sharḥ al-Kashshāf* in this manuscript. In the article introducing this manuscript, the information contained in the introduction was outlined and briefly analyzed.

While examining the manuscript in question, it was noticed that the information regarding Ḥaydar al-Harawī's travels to Tabriz and Shirvan, as mentioned in a few sentences quoted by Kātib Chalabi (d. 1067/1657) from the introduction of *Sharḥ al-Kashshāf*, was not found in the manuscript available. To account for this discrepancy, the following explanation was provided:

Chalabi must have used a different copy containing the author's additional explanations. As a matter of fact, it is not uncommon for there to be different author's copies and for the later copy to contain additions and corrections, and for the introduction and especially the dedication to be reconsidered. It is less likely that our copy is incomplete and that Chalabi had a complete one. This possibility is weakened by the fact that the phrases are quite fluent in our copy and that there is no impression of any distortion.<sup>3</sup>

After the previous assessment, I found a second manuscript<sup>4</sup> of the same work and discovered that a significant part of the introduction of the work, particularly the dedication section, differed from the previous one. This revealed that there are two different versions of the introduction, as previously predicted. While Kātib Chalabi only makes mention of al-Harawī's travels to Tabriz and Shirvan, the second version furnishes a wealth of additional information, particularly concerning biography, chronological details, patronage, and dedications.

In the revised preface dedicated to Timur's son Shahrukh (d. 850/1447), al-Harawī provides significant biographical details absent in the initial version. Another study<sup>5</sup>

1 Konya Bölge Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Burdur İl Halk, 1215, fols. 1<sup>a</sup>-136<sup>b</sup>.

2 M. Taha Boyalık, "Ḥaydar el-Herevî'nin I. Mehmed'e İthaf Ettiği *el-Keşşâf Şerhi*'nin Tespiti ve Eserin Literatür, Biyografi ve Tarih Alanlarında Sunduğu Veriler", *Osmanlı Araştırmaları/The Journal of Ottoman Studies*, LIV (2019): 1-26.

3 Boyalık, "Herevî'nin *el-Keşşâf Şerhinin* Tespiti", 19.

4 Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Carullah, 200, fols. 1<sup>a</sup>-151<sup>b</sup>.

5 The discourse differences in the two versions and the analysis of the dedications within the framework of patronage relations will be analyzed in another article.

will undertake a comparative analysis of the alterations in content and tone between the two versions, considering the influence of patronage and delving into the discussions on dedication. However, this article aims to amalgamate the information from both versions to construct a comprehensive biography of Ḥaydar al-Harawī. Despite the absence of specific dates in either version of the introduction, a synthesis of the provided details, coupled with historical context, allows for the dating of al-Harawī's journeys from Sarakhs to Shiraz via Herat, then to Tabriz, followed by Shirvan, Bursa, Edirne, and ultimately to Shahrukh's side. This life trajectory serves as a valuable resource for gaining insight into the mindset of a scholar navigating a politically turbulent world, understanding his perspectives on cities, rulers, and events, and elucidating the dynamics between scholars and rulers more broadly.

## 1. General Comparison of the Two Versions

When comparing the two versions of the introduction of *Sharḥ al-Kashshāf*, it becomes evident that the first work was dedicated to Mehmet I, and later the second to Shahrukh. The previously identified manuscript contains the first version of the introduction (hereafter referred to as "V1" for "Version 1"), while the manuscript to be introduced in this article contains the second version (hereafter referred to as "V2" for "Version 2"). In general, the introduction can be divided into seven sections based on its content:

1. Hamdala-Salwala:<sup>6</sup> In this section, which praises God and sends salutations upon the Messenger of Allah, an interesting beginning (*barā'at al-istihlāl*) is provided by using the titles of works that are considered important in the literature of *al-Kashshāf* with their dictionary meanings. There is no difference here between V1 and V2.

2. Praise for *al-Kashshāf*:<sup>7</sup> This section mentions that *al-Kashshāf* is a unique work in the exegetical tradition and briefly explains the reasons for this.<sup>8</sup> Here, minor differences, additions, and omissions are observed between V1 and V2 that do not significantly change the content.<sup>9</sup>

6 V1: fol. 1<sup>b</sup>, line 1-9; V2: fol. 1<sup>b</sup>, line 1-10.

7 V1: fol. 1<sup>b</sup>, line 9-19; V2: fol. 1<sup>b</sup>, line 10-20.

8 For details see Boyalík, "Herevī'nin *el-Keşşâf* Şerhinin Tespiti", 9-10.

9 The differences in this and subsequent chapters in the two versions are exemplified in the appendix.

3. Criticism of *al-Kashshāf*:<sup>10</sup> This section mentions that *al-Kashshāf* also has aspects that need to be criticized, and these criticisms are listed.<sup>11</sup> Minor differences between V1 and V2 do not change the content.

4. Characteristics of previous commentaries on *al-Kashshāf*:<sup>12</sup> In this section, the commentaries of *al-Kashshāf* by al-Tibī (d. 743/1343), Qutb al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 766/1365), al-Jīluwī (Sirāj al-Dīn al-Kāzwīnī) (d. 745/1344-45), and al-Taftāzānī are evaluated and harsh criticisms are directed towards these commentators, except al-Taftāzānī.<sup>13</sup> There are no significant differences between V1 and V2.

5. Reasons for writing the book:

5.1. The birth of the idea of writing a new commentary:<sup>14</sup> After criticizing the previous commentaries, al-Harawī states that he alone can write a commentary worthy of *al-Kashshāf*. Beyond minor qualifications and simple spelling differences, there are no differences between V1 and V2.

5.2. Meeting with al-Taftāzānī and the years in Sarakhs:<sup>15</sup> In this short section, which deals with al-Harawī's years in Sarakhs as a student of al-Taftāzānī, the two versions are generally the same. After this section, the content of the two versions will differ significantly.

5.3. Travels and stops after Sarakhs:<sup>16</sup> While V1 briefly explains the journeys after Sarakhs, V2 goes into detail. In V2, more cities are mentioned, and the length of stay in these cities is indicated. There are also significant differences in the characterizations and evaluations of the regions, cities, and names mentioned in common, which appear related to patronage.

6. Dedication:<sup>17</sup> In V1, the work is dedicated to Mehmed I and expresses praise for the Ottoman sultans, especially Mehmed I. In V2, it is dedicated to Shahrukh and praises Timur (d. 807/1405) and Shahrukh.

10 V1: fol. 1<sup>b</sup>, line 20-21; fol. 2<sup>a</sup>, line 1-14; V2: fol. 1<sup>b</sup>, line 20-23; fol. 2<sup>a</sup>, line 1-15.

11 For details see Boyalık, "Herevî'nin *el-Keşşâf* Şerhinin Tespiti", 10-13.

12 V1: fol. 2<sup>a</sup>, line 14-21; fol. 2<sup>b</sup>, line 1-13; V2: fol. 2<sup>a</sup>, line 15-23; fol. 2<sup>b</sup>, line 1-17.

13 For details see Boyalık, "Herevî'nin *el-Keşşâf* Şerhinin Tespiti", 13-17.

14 V1: fol. 2<sup>b</sup>, line 13-21; V2: fol. 2<sup>b</sup>, line 17-23; fol. 3<sup>a</sup>, line 1-5.

15 V1: fol. 2<sup>b</sup>, line 21-22 (Continued on the margin of the folio); V2: fol. 3<sup>a</sup>, line 5-11.

16 V1: fol. 3<sup>a</sup>, line 1-11; V2: fol. 3<sup>a</sup>, line 11-22; fol. 3<sup>b</sup>, line 1-2.

17 V1: fol. 3<sup>a</sup>, line 11-24; fol. 3<sup>b</sup>, line 1-3; V2: fol. 3<sup>b</sup>, line 2-17.

7. The decision to write the work and the beginning:<sup>18</sup> After the dedication, the author returns to the reasons for writing the commentary on *al-Kashshāf* and begins the work by stating that it will be a competent commentary that fills the gaps in previous commentaries. In V<sub>1</sub>, it is stated that the work was written as a gift to Mehmed I, and in V<sub>2</sub>, it is stated that it was written as a gift to Shahrukh.

As can be seen, the two versions are largely identical up to chapter 5.2, apart from some minor differences. After this section, the two versions diverge. While some information is omitted in the second version, more details about the travels are given, and especially the thoughts about Anatolia and Bursa are expressed differently. The dedicatory parts also naturally differ.

## 2. Biography Construction and Dating

Detailed information about Ḥaydar al-Harawī's life is found only in two introduction versions. His two extant works other than *Sharḥ al-Kashshāf* are *al-Iḥsāḥ fī sharḥ al-Īzāh* and *Sharḥ al-Farāid al-Sirājiyya*. In the fifteen manuscripts<sup>19</sup> of these two works examined, no biographical information was found except for the dedication of *al-Iḥsāḥ* to Murad II.<sup>20</sup> The author of the hagiography (*manākitib*) Ḥāfiẓ Khalil (d. after 857/1453) and later Ottoman historians such as Āshikpashazāde (d. after 891/1491), Mehmed Nashrī (d. 926/1520 [?]), Khoja Sa'd al-dīn Efendi (d. 1008/1599) and Solakzāde (d. 1068/1658). 1068/1658) only briefly mentioned al-Harawī in the context of his relationship with Mehmed I, and especially his role in the trial of Sheikh Badr al-Dīn (d. 819/1416 [?]).<sup>21</sup> al-Sakhāwī (d. 902/1497), al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), Ṭashkubrīzāde (d. 968/1561), and Kātib Chalabi in *Kashf al-zunūn* give brief information about his being a student of al-Taftāzānī, his teaching activities and his works.<sup>22</sup> In

18 V<sub>1</sub>: fol. 3<sup>b</sup>, line 3-9; V<sub>2</sub>: fol. 3<sup>b</sup>, line 17-22; fol. 4<sup>a</sup>, line 1-2.

19 The library numbers of these manuscripts are given in the "References" section.

20 al-Harawī, *al-Iḥsāḥ fī Sharḥ al-Īzāh* (Rāgīb Paşa Kütiphanesi, Rāgīb Paşa, 1261), fol. 2<sup>a-b</sup>.

21 Ḥāfiẓ Halil, *Şeyh Bedreddin Menakubnamesi*, trans. Mehmet Kanar (İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 2015), 192-194; Āshikpashazāde, *Tārikh Āli 'Usmān: Āshikpashazāde Tārihi* (Istanbul: Matbaa-i Āmira, 1332), 92-93; Mehmed Neşrī, *Kitāb-ı Cihan-nümā: Neşrī Tarihi*, prep. Faik Reşit Unat, Mehmet A. Köymen (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1957), II, 547; Khoja Sa'd al-Dīn Efendi, *Tāc al-Tawārikh* (Istanbul: Ṭab'khāne-i Āmira, 1279), I, 299; Solakzāde Mehmed Hemdemī, *Solakzāde Tarihi*, prep. Vahid Çabuk (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1989), I, 184-185. For an overview of what is said about al-Harawī in these sources, see Boyalık, "Herevī'nin *el-Keşşâf* Şerhinin Tespiti", 3-4.

22 Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Sakhāwī, *al-Daw' al-lāmi' li ahl al-Qarni al-Tāsī'* (Beirut: Manshūrāt

his biography of al-Harawī in *Sullam al-wuṣūl*, Kātib Chalabi adds to the information in *Kashf al-zunūn* information that appears to be from the second version of the introduction.<sup>23</sup>

Regarding al-Harawī's biography, the two versions of the introduction contain much more than what is mentioned in the sources. This review will construct his biography by considering both versions of the introduction and filling the gaps in the narrative as much as possible based on historical data. The historical events mentioned in the two versions and the periods of residence in the cities allow us to date more than forty years of al-Harawī's life.

### 2.1. Becoming a disciple of al-Taftāzānī: The Years in Sarakhs

The biographical information in the introduction follows al-Harawī's statements indicating his extensive study of *al-Kashshāf*, the positive reception of his explanations, and the mounting pressure on him to produce a commentary. These statements suggest that al-Harawī was not in his youth then and had likely progressed beyond his early years as a student. While it remains uncertain in which city al-Harawī studied the sciences, particularly *al-Kashshāf*, he was probably in his hometown of Herat. He recounts that, while still being urged to write a commentary on *al-Kashshāf*, he did not consider himself fully qualified for the task and harbored a strong desire to join the esteemed scholar al-Taftāzānī, whom he greatly admired, and become his disciple. al-Harawī outlines the course of events that led him to Sarakhs as follows:<sup>24</sup>

... The more I withdrew and asked for forgiveness [for writing a commentary on *al-Kashshāf*], the more they insisted and encouraged me. In this way, I spent some time hesitating and asking God Almighty to bring me to the region of that great scholar (*al-muḥaq-*

Dār al-Maktabat al-Ḥayāt, n.d.), III, 169; IV, 199; X, 131; Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, *Bughyat al-wu'āt fi ṭabt aqāt al-lughawīyyīn wa al-nuḥāt*, ed. Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Lebanon/Şaida: Maktabat al-Aşriyya, n.d.) I, 549; 'Işām al-Dīn Aḥmad Ṭashkubrīzāde, *al-Shaqāiq al-Nu'māniyya fi 'ulamāi al-Dawla al-'Uthmāniyya* (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, 1395/1975), 37-38; Kātib Chalabi, *Kashf al-zunūn 'an asāmī al-qutub wa al-funūn*, eds. Kilisli Muallim Rifāt, M. Şerafeddin Yaltkaya (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1942/1362), II, 1247, 1479, 1894. For an overview of what is said about al-Harawī in these sources, see Boyalık, "Herevî'nin *el-Keşşâf* Şerhinin Tespiti", 4-7.

23 Kātib Chalabi, *Sullam al-wuṣūl ilā ṭabaqāt al-fuḥūl*, prep. Mahmūd al-Arnaūṭ, Şalīh Sa'dāwī (İstanbul: IRCICA, 2010), II, 70.

24 Statements that differ in two versions will be translated with the version information in square brackets at the beginning.

*qiq al-Niḥrīr*<sup>25</sup>) to benefit from him and collect his precious jewels. Finally, God Almighty granted me the opportunity to go to him in the city of Sarakhs in Khorasan, may God protect him from calamity and misfortune. I met an overflowing sea, a skillful sage, and a cloud that radiated mercy. I considered it an honor to talk and debate with him, and I devoted all my time to benefiting from him. Every day, I would turn to him for reflection and submit my ideas to his opinion. I was completely devoted to this. While I was engaged in intensive deliberations and immersed in my studies, time drew the sharp sword of enmity, and in Khorasan - the land where I first opened my eyes, where I ate its bread and drank its water - all kinds of mischief spread, confusion increased, what was in hand was lost, life became unbearable, and the inhabitants of the region could no longer breathe.

[V<sub>1</sub>] So al-Niḥrīr [al-Taftāzānī] set out towards Māwarā al-nahr. I, on the other hand, set out for Herat...<sup>26</sup>

[V<sub>2</sub>]: So al-Niḥrīr [al-Taftāzānī] set out for Samarkand. I, on the other hand, set out for Shiraz, may Allah preserve it.<sup>27</sup>

The discrepancy in the last part of this text is reconcilable. While V<sub>1</sub> mentions the region where al-Taftāzānī is headed, V<sub>2</sub> specifies the region and provides the city's name. While it could be argued that this change was not intentional, it's plausible that Samarkand, the seat of Timur's reign, was explicitly named in the version dedicated to Shahrukh. According to both versions, the journey after Sarakhs concludes in Shiraz. In V<sub>1</sub>, Herat is mentioned as a stop on the way, while in V<sub>2</sub> only the final destination is mentioned.

Although it's challenging to infer precisely when al-Harawī arrived in Sarakhs and departed, the mention that "Sarakhs had become uninhabitable at that time and Khorasan was in turmoil" provides some clues about his time there. Additionally, details about al-Taftāzānī's life, particularly his journey from Sarakhs to Samarkand, offer more direct insights into this period.

Based on the city names and dates provided regarding the completion of his books or issuance of *ijāzahs*, al-Taftāzānī's whereabouts can be traced: Jurjāniyya, Khwarazm on 2 Ramadan 742 (February 9, 1342), Herat on 11 Safar 748 (May 23, 1347), Mazār-i jān in Jumāda al-Awwal 752 (July/August 1351), Ghujduwān in 756 (1355/56), Ghulistan-i Turkistan in Dhū al-Qa'dah 758 (October/November 1357), Herat on 9 Dhū

25 The expression "al-Niḥrīr," which means a profound scholar, became a nickname used in the works of the later period (*al-mutaakhkhirin*) especially for al-Taftāzānī.

26 V<sub>1</sub>: 2<sup>b</sup>. At the end of the page, sentences continue from the margin.

27 V<sub>2</sub>: 3<sup>a</sup>.

al-Qa'dah 759 (October 13, 1358), Khwarazm in Sha'bān 768 (April 1367), Khwarazm in Dhū al-Ḥijjah 770 (July/August 1369), Khwarazm in 775 (1373/74),<sup>28</sup> Khwarazm in Rabi' al-Awwal 777 (July/August 1375),<sup>29</sup> Khwarazm in 778 (1376/77), Khwarazm in Rabi' al-Awwal 781 (July 1379),<sup>30</sup> Sarakhs in 782 (1380/81), in Samarkand in Dhū al-Qa'dah 784 (January/February 1383), in Sarakhs in 785 (1383/84), in Samarkand in Rajab and Shawwāl 789 (July/August and October/November 1387), in Samarkand in 791 (1388/89),<sup>31</sup> and Samarkand in 792 (1390), when he passed away. His body was transferred to Sarakhs and buried there in the same year.<sup>32</sup>

According to this information, it is highly probable that al-Taftāzānī's Sarakhs-Samarkand journey, which concerns us, took place between 782-784 (1380/81-1383) or 785-789 (1383/84-1387). al-Taftāzānī was in Khwarazm in 770 (1369), 775 (1373/74), 777 (1375), 778 (1376/77), and 781 (1379). Although there is no information on whether he left Khwarazm during the eleven years between 770-781 (1369-1379), it is understood that he generally resided in the Khwarazm region during this period. Timur's fourth siege of Khwarazm ended the Khwarazm years for al-Taftāzānī. Following Timur's fourth siege of Khwarazm, which began in Shawwāl 780 (February 1379) and ended in victory in Rabi' al-Awwal 781 (July 1379),<sup>33</sup> Muḥammad, the ruler of Sarakhs, through his nephew Ghiyāth al-Dīn Pīr 'Alī, petitioned Timur to send al-Taftāzānī to Sarakhs, and Timur granted this request.

However, when Timur returned to Samarkand after spending the winter in the Chain Palace,<sup>34</sup> the scholars who came to congratulate him referred to al-Taftāzānī as "the leader of the world's scholars, the greatest scholar of mankind, the one whose

28 At this time in Khwarazm, he gave al-Ghujdwānī the ijazah of *al-Muṭawwal*. See, Ḍiyā al-Dīn al-Qālish, "Muqaddima al-taḥqīq", *Sharḥ Talkhiṣ al-Miftāh al-Muṭawwal* (Qaṭar: Wizāra al-Awqāf, 1442/2021), 31.

29 At this time in Khwarazm, he gave his student al-Zurnūki the ijazah of *al-Muṭawwal*. See al-Qālish, "Muqaddima al-taḥqīq", 31-33.

30 It is known that al-Taftāzānī was in Khwarazm during Timur's fourth conquest of Khwarazm. As will be noted, on the given date Timur captured the fortress of Khwarazm.

31 In this year, he debated al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī in the presence of Timur in Samarkand. See Abū al-Ḥasānāt Muḥammad Laknawī, *al-Fawā'id al-bahīyya fī tarājim al-Ḥanafīyya*, ed. Muḥammad Bedr al-Dīn (Cairo: Maṭba'a al-Sa'āda, 1324), 129-130.

32 Ṭashkubrizāde collectively gives the dates and places where the books were completed. See Ṭashkubrizāde Aḥmad, *Miftāh al-sa'āda wa miṣbāḥ al-siyāda fī mawḍi'āt al-'ulūm*, (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, 1405/1985), 191-192.

33 Şerefüddin Ali Yezdî, *Emîr Timur: Zafernâme* (İstanbul: Selenge, 2013), 122.

34 Yezdî, *Zafernâme*, 123-124.



writings illuminated the world and made the brightness of the sun null and void” and said that the real spoils of the Khwarazm victory had been taken by the ruler of Sarakhs. Timur regretted sending al-Taftāzānī to Sarakhs and immediately invited him to Samarkand. Although al-Taftāzānī initially declined this invitation, stating that he intended to go on pilgrimage, he could not refuse Timur's second and insistent invitation. Despite being on his way to perform the pilgrimage, he turned to Samarkand and joined Timur.<sup>35</sup> Given that Timur had not recognized him until then, this was al-Taftāzānī's first trip to Samarkand, the center of Timur's reign.

Since al-Taftāzānī was in Khwarazm in Rabī' al-Awwal 781 (July 1379), when Timur captured the fortress of Khwarazm and traveled to Sarakhs after this event, one would expect him to be in Sarakhs in the same year or at the latest in the following year. Indeed, we know that he was in Sarakhs in 782 (1380/81).<sup>36</sup> Probably in the same year, al-Taftāzānī declined Timur's first invitation and left for the pilgrimage, but upon Timur's second and insistent invitation, he had to go to Samarkand. He must have reached Samarkand before the end of 782. In fact, in late 782 (February 1381), Timur began preparations for the conquest of Khorasan-Iran and left Samarkand to conquer Herat.<sup>37</sup>

al-Harawī said Sarakhs' unlivable condition was the reason for al-Taftāzānī's departure. His teacher headed towards Samarkand. However, according to the information above, al-Taftāzānī had just arrived in Sarakhs when he had to leave, moreover, set out to go on a pilgrimage and later turned towards Samarkand. Thus, the Sarakhs-Samarkand journey al-Harawī mentions is not the one that took place in 782 (1380/81).

After Timur departed from Samarkand, there was no indication that al-Taftāzānī returned to Sarakhs. In any case, he was in Samarkand in Dhū al-Qa'dah 784 (January/February 1383).<sup>38</sup> By this time, Timur, who had conquered Khorasan and returned to Samarkand, would set out in 785 (1383) to conquer the regions of Sistan and Zabulistān.<sup>39</sup> It can be inferred that al-Taftāzānī must have left Samarkand around the

35 Ghiyāth al-Dīn Khāndmīr, *Tārīkh ḥabīb al-siyar fī akhbār afrād al-bashar*, ed. Muḥammad Debīr-i Siyāki (Tahran: Kitābfurūṣ-i Hayyam, 1362), III, 544-545; Musa Şamil Yüksel, *Timurlular da Din-Devlet İlişkisi* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2021), 85-86.

36 Ṭashkubrīzāde, *Miftāḥ al-sa'āda*, 192.

37 Yezdī, *Zafernāme*, 126-130.

38 Ṭashkubrīzāde, *Miftāḥ al-sa'āda*, 192.

39 Yezdī, *Zafernāme*, 140-146.

same time, as he was in Sarakhs within the same year.<sup>40</sup> al-Taftāzānī's next known presence in Samarkand is Rajab 789 (July/August 1387).<sup>41</sup> At the end of the same year, Timur would also transfer al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī (d. 816/1413) from Shiraz to Samarkand.<sup>42</sup>

Since al-Taftāzānī was in Samarkand in late 784, in Sarakhs in 785, and in Samarkand in 789, al-Harawī must have traveled to Sarakhs to study with al-Taftāzānī sometime between 785-789 (1383-1387). Accordingly, al-Taftāzānī left Sarakhs because it had become uninhabitable and traveled to Samarkand, the Timurid capital, while al-Harawī set out for Shiraz via Herat. It can be speculated that the disturbances al-Harawī mentions for Sarakhs were caused by the political vacuum in Khorasan during Timur's three-year conquest of Azerbaijan and Iran beginning in 786 (1386).<sup>43</sup>

## 2.2. Longing for Tranquility: The Years in Shiraz

Regarding al-Harawī's destination when he left Sarakhs, the first version of the introduction gives the name Herat, while the second gives the name Shiraz. As mentioned, this difference can be reconciled. In the first version, after stating that he headed for Herat, he states that he arrived in the lands of Fars after a long and arduous journey and entered Shiraz. Thus, Herat is a stop on his journey to Shiraz, and in the second version of the introduction, Shiraz is directly mentioned without mentioning Herat. According to the explanations following the section quoted above, al-Harawī's story after leaving Sarakhs is as follows in both versions:

... I threw myself into hardships and difficulties and fell into deserts and oases.

One day in Ḥuzwā and one day in al-'Aqīq

One day in al-'Udhayb and another in al-Khulayṣā

One day I found a way to Najd

Another to the paths of al-'Aqīq

And one day in the palace of Tayma<sup>44</sup>

40 Ṭashkubrīzāde, *Miftāḥ al-sa'āda*, 192.

41 Ṭashkubrīzāde, *Miftāḥ al-sa'āda*, 192.

42 Khāndmīr, *Ḥabīb al-siyar*, III, 547.

43 İsmail Aka, *Timur ve Devleti* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2014), 18-22; Hayrunnisa Alan, *Bozkırdan Cennet Bahçesine Timurular: 1360-1506* (İstanbul: Ötüken, 2007), 38-41.

44 The qaṣīda quoted here will be mentioned below.

Each settlement drew me to another, the highs to the lows. Finally, I reached the land of Fars (*Mamālik al-Fāris*) and entered Shiraz [V1: -may it be free from calamity-], and for many years (*sinīn*) I was engaged in teaching. A group of friends and a group of brothers concluded that I had attained a knowledge of the principles of this book [*al-Kashshāf*] that no one had ever attained, and that I had reached the heights that no one had ever reached in accessing its truths. They began to encourage and urge me [to write a commentary] and were very insistent. I kept apologizing and making excuses...<sup>45</sup>

With these statements, the common explanations in the two versions have ended. Hence, the two versions would diverge completely in terms of both scope and content. According to the last common explanations above, al-Harawī left Sarakhs and set out for Shiraz. According to the first version, he stopped in his hometown of Herat on this long journey. According to the information in both versions, the journey to Shiraz was arduous. The places mentioned in the *qaṣīda*<sup>46</sup> quoted by al-Harawī in the text are in the Hijāz region. However, quoting this *qaṣīda* does not mean that al-Harawī traveled to Hijāz before reaching Shiraz. This poem has become a metaphor for long and arduous journeys and is widely quoted in this context. Moreover, Hijāz is located far off the route from Sarakhs through Herat to Shiraz. As will be noted, al-Harawī would later express his intention to make the pilgrimage to Hijāz.

Considering that al-Harawī came to Shiraz to escape the turmoil in Sarakhs, he must have thought that this city had the scholarly environment he sought. During his journey to Shiraz, the Ilkhanate rule over Iran had ended, and the Timurid conquests had begun in the region. Shiraz, which was under the rule of the Muzaffarid dynasty, was turned into the center of the dynasty, especially during the reign of Shah Shujā' (760-786/1358-1384), and people of science and art were protected here.<sup>47</sup> Shah Shujā's adoption of Timur's rule by pursuing a balanced policy<sup>48</sup> protected Shiraz from great destruction during his reign. According to Ibn 'Arabshah, Shah Shujā' was a scholar, a man of virtue, and a writer of Arabic and Persian poetry and competent in commentary on Zamakhsharī's *al-Kashshāf*.<sup>49</sup>

45 V1: 2<sup>b</sup>-3<sup>a</sup>; V2: 3<sup>a</sup>.

46 In the quoted *qaṣīda* Abū Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥāzin (4th/6th century) praises Ṣāhib b. 'Abbād. For the poem and its story, see 'Abd al-Malik al-Sa'ālībī, *Yatīmat al-dahr fī maḥāsīn ahl al-'aṣr*, (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, 1403/1983), III, 228-229.

47 Mehlika Üstündağ, *İran'ın Bilinmeyen Hanedanlığı Muzafferiler* (Ankara: İraniyat, 2018), 60-64.

48 Yezdī, *Zafernâme*, 135-136.

49 Ibn 'Arabshah, *Ajāib al-maqaḍūr fī nawāibi Taymūr*, ed. Ahmad Faiz al-Himṣī (Beirut: Muassasa al-Risāla, 1407/1986), 79.

A ruler who valued scholars and took a scholarly interest in *al-Kashshāf*, al-Harawī's favorite work, would have been an ideal patron for al-Harawī. According to the above dating, Shah Shujā' (d. 786/1384) was either at the end of his life or had passed away when al-Harawī arrived in Shiraz. Before his death, he left the administration of Shiraz to his son Zayn al-'Ābidīn to ensure that it would be under Timur's protection.<sup>50</sup> When Zayn al-'Ābidīn failed to fulfill the requirements of this protection, he would incur Timur's wrath. However, due to the lessons learned from the destruction in Isfahan along the Shiraz route, the administration of Shiraz submitted to Timur, thereby preventing a great calamity in the city.<sup>51</sup> Timur, after capturing Shiraz and deposing Zayn al-'Ābidīn from the rulership, sent the great scholar al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī, who was among the city's inhabitants, to Samarkand in late 789 (early 1388).<sup>52</sup> Considering that al-Taftāzānī was also in Samarkand, two legendary scholars met in the capital of Timur's reign.

When al-Harawī reached Shiraz, he may have met and learned from al-Jurjānī, who had lived there for many years. Moreover, this is highly probable. Indeed, Kātib Chalabī added that this is possible, stating that "in a work by Kamālpashazāde (d. 940/1534), it is stated that he was one of al-Jurjānī's students."<sup>53</sup> Considering that al-Jurjānī had been in Anatolia and Egypt before Shiraz, that he stayed in Shiraz for about ten years after arriving there, that he went to Samarkand and stayed there for 18 years,<sup>54</sup> and that al-Harawī, as will be discussed, had moved to cities further west after Shiraz, it is most likely that if this teacher-student relationship was real, it took place between the date al-Harawī arrived in Shiraz and the date al-Jurjānī left. It is reported that al-Jurjānī read some chapters from *al-Kashshāf* with a commentary while he was a student.<sup>55</sup> He would also write a commentary on *al-Kashshāf* after studying al-Taftāzānī's commentary on *al-Kashshāf* in Samarkand, which was completed in

50 Yezdī, *Zafernâme*, 160.

51 Yezdī, *Zafernâme*, 160-164; Nizamüddin Şâmî: *Zafernâme*, trans. Necati Lugal (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu 1987), 161-166; Üstündağ, *Muzafferiler*, 65-68.

52 Yezdī, *Zafernâme*, 166; Khāndmīr, *Ḥabīb al-siyar*, III, 547; Ṭashkubrīzāde, *al-Shaqāiq*, 29-30; Kātib Chalabī, *Sullam al-wuṣūl*, V, 455.

53 Kātib Chalabī, *Sullam al-wuṣūl*, II, 70.

54 Sadreddin Gümüş, "Cürcānī, Seyyid Şerīf", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, 1993, XIII, 134-136.

55 Sakhāwī, *al-Daw' al-lāmi'*, V, 328-329.

789 (1387).<sup>56</sup> It is unlikely that al-Harawī, as a lover of *al-Kashshāf* and a distinguished student of al-Taftāzānī, would have come to Shiraz and not benefited from al-Jurjānī, one of the city's renowned scholars. If this teacher-student relationship is real, the accuracy of the above dating becomes even more likely.

In his own words, al-Harawī's adventure in Shiraz lasted "for years." It is clear from his statements above that he taught *al-Kashshāf* during these years of teaching and became famous for identifying the subtleties of this work. Although it is difficult to determine precisely how long he stayed in Shiraz, some data allow us to make a strong estimate. As will be discussed in detail, he most likely left Shiraz immediately after Timur's victory at the Battle of Ankara (804/1402) and headed for Tabriz under Timurid rule. Accordingly, he resided in Shiraz for a period between 15 and 19 years, engaging in educational activities.

### 2.3. New Adventures: The Years in Tabriz and Shirvan

al-Harawī mentions the years in Tabriz and Shirvan after Shiraz only in the second version of the introduction; he mentions Anatolia and Bursa in both versions but with different discourses, and the period under Shahrukh's patronage is naturally mentioned only in the second version.

According to the second version, after leaving Shiraz, al-Harawī traveled to Tabriz, where he stayed for "more than four years." He then traveled to Shirvan, where he stayed for "eight years." During his stay in Shirvan, he intended to go on Hajj, but circumstances diverted him to Anatolia (*Bilād al-Rūm*). He then traveled to Bursa, the seat of Sultan Mehmed I's reign, where he stayed for "approximately ten years." Eventually, his Bursa days ended "when his name was mentioned in the presence of Shahrukh."<sup>57</sup>

Considering this information, which is found only in the second version, in addition to a reasoned estimate of the date of al-Harawī's departure from Sarakhs and arrival in Shiraz, there is also the information that he stayed in Shiraz for years, stayed in Tabriz for more than four years, stayed in Shirvan for eight years, stayed

56 Mehmet Taha Boyalık, *el-Keşşâf Literatürü: Zemaşher'ın Tefsir Klasijinin Etki Tarihi* (İstanbul: İSAM, 2019), 133-131.

57 V2: 3<sup>a-b</sup>.

in Bursa for nearly ten years, and then went to Shahrukh. Accordingly, if the date of al-Harawī's arrival in Bursa is determined, the biography can be dated retroactively.

al-Harawī's reasons for heading to Bursa and Anatolia, which he mentions in the first version of the introduction,<sup>58</sup> indicate that central authority had been established in this region. In the second version, he states that when he arrived in Bursa, the city was "the seat of the reign of Mehmed I."<sup>59</sup> In 816 (1413), Mehmed I ended the struggles between the princes during the Interregnum period and firmly established his rule.<sup>60</sup> Therefore, al-Harawī must have arrived in Bursa after this date. Trusting a subtle detail provided by Āshikpashazāde, this date should be pushed further. When al-Harawī arrived in Bursa, he became close to Sultan Mehmed I and headed the delegation that tried Sheikh Badr al-Dīn.<sup>61</sup> Āshikpashazāde, in his account of Sheikh Badr al-Dīn's trial, refers to al-Harawī as "a sage (*danishmand*) person who had recently arrived from Khorasan (*Ajam*)."<sup>62</sup> Since Sheikh Badr al-Dīn was executed immediately after the trial, it follows that Āshikpashazāde is referring to al-Harawī's "recent" arrival in Bursa in 819/1416, the most likely year of the execution.<sup>63</sup> If we interpret the phrase "recently" here in the broadest sense of "a few years," we conclude that al-Harawī arrived in Bursa sometime between 817 and 819 (1414-1416). Even if one is skeptical of Āshikpashazāde's use of the phrase "recently arrived," this dating is quite plausible. After Sultan Mehmed I established stability in the Ottoman territories in 816 (1413), it would have taken a few years for Bursa to become attractive for patronage, for al-Harawī to decide to come from Shirvan to Bursa, and for this decision to materialize. As can be seen, when the biography is traced backward, all the data reinforces the correctness of this dating.

We know that al-Harawī came to Anatolia and Bursa from Shirvan and stayed in Shirvan for eight years. Thus, considering the date we have proposed for his arrival in Bursa, he must have stayed in Shirvan from between 809-811 (1406-1408) to between 817-819 (1414-1416). al-Harawī stated that he stayed in Tabriz for "more than four years" before Shirvan. This statement can logically be interpreted as the completion of the

58 V1: 3<sup>a</sup>.

59 V2: 3<sup>a</sup>.

60 Halil İnalçık, "Mehmed I", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, 2003, XXVIII, 391-394.

61 For details see, "Herevî'nin *el-Keşâf* Şerhinin Tespiti", 3-4.

62 Āshikpashazāde, *Tārīkh Āli 'Usmān*, 92.

63 Although different dates are given for the execution of Sheikh Badr al-Dīn, such as 818, 819, 820 and 823, both Mehmed I's and Sheikh Badr al-Dīn's biography indicate that this event took place in 819.

fourth year and the beginning of the fifth. Thus, if the fifth year had not begun, one would not say “more than four years”; if the fifth year had been completed, one would say “more than five years.” In this case, if we assume that he stayed in Tabriz for 4-5 years, he must have arrived in Tabriz between 804-806 (1401-1403) and left between 809-811 (1406-1408) and headed to Shirvan. This calculation allows us to approximate how long he lived in Shiraz before Tabriz. Before this, it is necessary to see whether the above calculations are supported by the facts. Looking at what happened in Tabriz, Shiraz, and Anatolia in the years in question, almost all the facts confirm the accuracy of the above calculation and even allow for more precise determinations.

According to the dating provided above, the years we need to focus on are between 804 and 819 (1401-1417). al-Harawī was supposed to have arrived in Tabriz from Shiraz early in this period. Tabriz was under Timurid rule during the years we have identified for al-Harawī's arrival, between 804 and 806 (1401-1403). The most significant event during this time was the Battle of Ankara between Timur and Bayezid I on 27 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 804 (28 July 1402). Timur's victory in this battle not only defeated the Ottomans but also indirectly defeated the Jalayirids and the Qara-Qoyunlus, who had sought refuge with the Ottomans before the battle.<sup>64</sup> Considering that these latter two were important factors in the power struggles in Azerbaijan, Timur solidified his sovereignty in the region with this victory. It is almost inconceivable that al-Harawī, who seems to have been an extremely pragmatic scholar in gaining patronage from his dedications, would have moved to Tabriz without seeing the results of the Battle of Ankara. In the region, the Qara-Qoyunlus and the Jalayirids were fighting against the Timurids in alliance with the Ottomans. Therefore, the identity of al-Harawī's future patron in Tabriz is directly related to the outcome of the Battle of Ankara. al-Harawī must have followed the outcome of the Battle of Ankara and, upon the decisive Timurid victory, moved towards Tabriz, which was certain to remain a Timurid city. In this way, he would both distance himself from Shiraz's power struggles and benefit from Tabriz's opportunities, a center of commerce and scholarship that was expected to be prosperous for at least a certain period. Considering that the Battle of Ankara took place in the last days of the year 804 (mid-1402), the year 804 (1401) can be eliminated, and the period 805-806 (1402-1403) can be brought forward for the date of departure from Shiraz to Tabriz.

64 Yaşar Yücel, *Timur'un Ortadoğu-Anadolu Seferleri ve Sonuçları (1393-1402)*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1989), 126-133.

Timur's unexpected death would end al-Harawī's dream of a city free from power struggles. In 806 (1404), Timur had placed Azerbaijan, along with many other regions, under the rule of Mirza 'Umar, son of Miran Shah.<sup>65</sup> After Timur's death on 17 Sha'bān 807 (February 18, 1405), power struggles among the princes (*mirzas*) began, and as part of these struggles, Mirza Abū Bakr, another son of Miran Shah, took control of the city in 808 (1405). With Timur's death, Qara Yusuf of Qara-Qoyunlu, Sultan Ahmad of the Jalayirids, and Shirvanshah Ibrāhīm I also hoped to dominate the region. Taking advantage of Mirza Abū Bakr's departure from Tabriz to capture Isfahan in late 808 (1406), Shirvanshah Ibrāhīm briefly captured Tabriz. Still, when Sultan Ahmad of the Jalayirids marched on Tabriz with an army, he agreed to surrender the city to him and returned to Shirvan. Sultan Ahmad entered Tabriz in early 809 (1406) and captured the city without a battle. However, Sultan Ahmad's mismanagement deteriorated the conditions in Tabriz. Mirza Abū Bakr of Timurid, at the invitation of the people, moved to capture the city in the same year, and after Sultan Ahmad fled, he took control of the city without a fight on 8 Rabi al-Awwal 809 (August 23, 1406). However, a major plague epidemic broke out in Tabriz, and the people fled the city. Abū Bakr did not enter the city either. In the meantime, Qara Yusuf moved towards Tabriz with his army, and the battle between Qara Yusuf and Mirza Abū Bakr's armies near Nakhchivan on 1 Jamaz al-Awwal 809 (October 14, 1406) was won by Qara Yusuf, who then took control of Tabriz. The following year, Qara Yusuf defeated Mirza Abū Bakr again and strengthened his regional dominance.<sup>66</sup>

In 809 (1406), the struggles for control of Tabriz between Jalayirid Ahmad, Mirza Abū Bakr of Timurid, and Qara Yusuf of Qara-Qoyunlu, as well as the great plague epidemic that caused the population to flee the city, must have forced al-Harawī to end his stay there. Even without other data, it can be easily argued that this year is the best candidate for his departure from Tabriz. If al-Harawī's statement that he stayed in Tabriz for "more than four years" is logically interpreted as four to five years, and if al-Harawī left Tabriz in 809 (1406), as we think he did, then he must have arrived from Shiraz in 805 (late 1402), just as we have predicted, following the battle of Ankara. Thus, the interval of 805-806 (1402-1403), which we had previously determined for his arrival in Tabriz, would also be 805 (1402). To have resided in Tabriz for 4-5 years after

65 Yezdī, *Zafernâme*, 426.

66 Faruk Sümer, *Kara Koyunlular (Başlangıçtan Cihan-Şah'a Kadar)*, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1992), 70-74; Bülent Yılmaz, "Celâyiriler: Kabile-Devlet" (PhD Dissertation, Erzurum 2002), 221-222; Sara xanım Aşurbəyli, *Şirvanşahlar Dövləti* (Bakü: Nəşriyyat-Poliqrafiya Evinin mətbəəsi, 2006) 213-215.



this year, Tabriz would have to have been abandoned in 809 (1406). It is as unlikely that al-Harawī came to Tabriz before seeing the outcome of the Battle of Ankara as he did not leave Tabriz in 809 (1406) when all kinds of disturbances and disasters were observed. Even the locals left the city due to the plague epidemic. This two-sided confirmation makes our conclusions about his arrival and departure from Tabriz extremely strong. With the date of arrival in Tabriz clarified, the time spent in Shiraz can also be estimated. As we have suggested, if al-Harawī traveled from Sarakhs to Shiraz between 785-789 (1383-1387), he would have stayed in Shiraz for 15-19 years.

When al-Harawī wanted to leave Tabriz, one of the most suitable destinations was Shirvan under the rule of Shirvanshah Ibrāhīm (1382-1417), who managed to protect his region from war and destruction by maintaining a policy of balance between the Timurids, the Golden Horde, the Jalayirids, and the Qara-Qoyunlus.<sup>67</sup> It has already been mentioned that Ibrāhīm I briefly captured Tabriz in 808 (1405), took advantage of the region's vacuum, and returned to Shirvan in the same year. It is possible that al-Harawī recognized him and perhaps contacted him at this time. He could not have gone with him to Shirvan, and for then, he would not have spent four years in Tabriz. He must have gone to Shirvan because of the turmoil and plague the following year.

Since his Shirvan adventure lasted eight years, according to his account, al-Harawī stayed in Shirvan from 809 (1406) until 817 (1414). During these eight years, Shirvanshah Ibrāhīm ruled the city except for a brief interruption. In 815 (1412), Ibrāhīm lost the battle with Qara-Qoyunlu and was captured along with his sons and retinue; after a period of captivity in Tabriz, he returned to Shirvan in 816 (1413), recognizing Qara-Qoyunlu sovereignty through a treaty.<sup>68</sup> A year later, al-Harawī left Shirvan, intending to make the pilgrimage, but then changed his plans and headed to Anatolia to Bursa. al-Harawī reached his new patron in the same year or the following year, who had recently taken Bursa under his control.

#### 2.4. A Sage (*Danishmand*) from the 'Ajam Land: The Years in Bursa and Edirne

The facts support our dating of al-Harawī's arrival in Bursa (817-818/1414-1415) and his previous journeys. We are left with the years al-Harawī spent under the patronage of Mehmed I, his first patron in the Ottoman lands, and Murad II, his next patron,

67 Aşurbeyli, *Shirvanşahlar Dövləti*, 210-213.

68 Aşurbeyli, *Shirvanşahlar Dövləti*, 215-217.

and the years he spent under Shahrukh's patronage. About 6-7 years after al-Harawī arrived in Bursa, Mehmed I (d. 824/1421) passed away. As one of the scholars closest to the Sultan, it can be assumed that al-Harawī resided in Bursa and Edirne with his patron during this period and participated in some conquests with him. Indeed, he was in Saraz with the Sultan when the Sheikh Badr al-Dīn incident occurred.<sup>69</sup> After Mehmed I, al-Harawī's new patron was Sultan Murad II. al-Harawī dedicated his book titled *al-Ifṣāh* to the new Sultan,<sup>70</sup> perhaps to ensure the continuity of his patronage in the Ottoman country. Kātib Chalabi reports that al-Harawī was the muftī of Edirne during the reign of Murad II.<sup>71</sup> Although no other information is available, it is to be expected that he was given this position. The only objection might be the statement in the second version of the introduction that "I made Bursa my homeland for nearly ten years."<sup>72</sup> However, it is possible that al-Harawī used Bursa metaphorically to refer to the Ottoman lands. He likely stayed mainly in Bursa, but also in Edirne due to his relations with the two sultans and his duties as mufti. During these years in the Ottoman lands, al-Harawī taught many students, including renowned figures such as Ibn 'Arabshah (d. 854/1450),<sup>73</sup> Khiḍr Bay b. Qāḍī Jalāl (d. 863/1459),<sup>74</sup> Fakhr al-Dīn al-A'jamī (d. 865/1460-61 [?]),<sup>75</sup> Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Kāfiyājī (d. 879/1474),<sup>76</sup> and Mullā Khusraw (d. 885/1480).<sup>77</sup>

## 2.5. Back to the Homeland: The Years Under the Patronage of Shahrukh

In the second version of the introduction, al-Harawī states, "I made Bursa my homeland for approximately ten years until I had the honor of being mentioned in the presence of Shahrukh."<sup>78</sup> Accordingly, al-Harawī stayed in the Ottoman country for nearly ten years and then went to Shahrukh and presented his commentary on *al-*

69 Āshikpashazāde, *Tārīkh Āli 'Usmān*, 92.

70 al-Harawī, *al-Ifṣāh fi Sharḥ al-Īqāh* (Rāḡib Paṣa Kūtiiphanesi, Rāḡib Paṣa, 1261), fol. 2<sup>a-b</sup>.

71 Kātib Chalabi, *Sullam al-wuṣūl*, II, 70.

72 V2: 3<sup>b</sup>.

73 Sakhāwī, *al-Daw' al-lāmi'*, II, 127.

74 Sakhāwī, *al-Daw' al-lāmi'*, III, 178.

75 Ṭashkubrīzāde, *al-Shaqāiq*, 38; Kātib Chalabi, *Sullam al-wuṣūl*, III, 17.

76 al-Suyūṭī, *Bughyat al-wu'āt*, I, 549; Kātib Chalabi, *Sullam al-wuṣūl*, II, 70; III, 146; Sakhāwī, *al-Daw' al-lāmi'*, II, 127.

77 Ṭashkubrīzāde, *al-Shaqāiq*, 70; Kātib Chalabi, *Sullam al-wuṣūl*, II, 70.

78 V2: 3<sup>b</sup>.

*Kashshāf* to him with a new introduction and dedication. Although we do not know whether he reached Shahrukh, he certainly wrote the second version of the introduction with this in mind. The most plausible explanation for “approximately ten years” could be 8-9 years. Accordingly, since he arrived in Bursa in 817-818 (414-1415), al-Harawī must have gone to Shahrukh in 825-827 (1422-1424). These dates correspond to the early years of Murad II's reign. al-Harawī's search for a new patron may have been prompted by the fact that he did not receive the same high level of attention from Murad II that he received from Mehmed I, or by any resentment towards the Sultan. Indeed, the scholars of the period had high expectations from the sultans. For example, al-Harawī's student Mullā Khusraw left Istanbul in resentment after Mehmed the Conqueror allocated his right side to Mullā Ghūrānī (d. 893/1488) and seated him on his left side at a wedding party.<sup>79</sup> A similar seating crisis occurred when Timur seated al-Jurjānī on his right and al-Taftāzānī on his left.<sup>80</sup> Amid such or more serious resentment or dissatisfaction, al-Harawī may have wanted to take advantage of the new opportunity for patronage that arose when he was mentioned in Shahrukh's presence. Even without resentment, returning to his homeland at the end of his life may have appealed to him in many ways.

To estimate when and where al-Harawī's name was mentioned in Shahrukh's presence, we should first focus on the Azerbaijan region, where he resided for 13 years before coming to the Ottoman lands, and the dates of Shahrukh's arrival in this region. We see that Shahrukh set out from Herat on 15 Sha'bān 823 (August 25, 1420) to re-establish Timurid rule in the Azerbaijan region, eventually eliminating the Qara-Qoyunlus threat and establishing dominance in the region, including the capital city of Tabriz, wintering in Qarabakh on 9 Dhū al-Ḥijja 823 (December 15, 1420) and heading for Tabriz on 19 Rajab al-Awwal 824 (March 24, 1421). Until his return to Herat on 19 Shawwāl 824 (October 17, 1421), Shahrukh remained in Azerbaijan to strengthen his regional authority.<sup>81</sup> It must have been around this time that he heard of al-Harawī, a student of al-Taftāzānī, his father's favorite scholar. When Shahrukh wintered in Qarabakh after his first successes in Azerbaijan, the rulers and scholars of Shirvan and Tabriz were among those who came to congratulate him. Shirvanshah

79 Ṭashkubrizāde, *al-Shaqāiq*, 71-72; Kātib Chalabi, *Sullam al-wuṣūl*, III, 219.

80 Ṭashkubrizāde, *al-Shaqāiq*, 29.

81 İsmail Aka, *Mirza Şahruh: Timur'un Hükümdar Oğlu, Uluğ Bey'in Babası (1405/1447)*, (Istanbul: Kronik 2022), 210-227.

Khalilullah, the son of al-Harawī's patron in Shirvan, Shirvanshah Ibrāhīm, appeared before the Sultan on 14 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 823 (December 20, 1420), and the qaḍi of Tabriz and the city's notables on 30 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 823 (January 5, 1421).<sup>82</sup> It is likely that during or after these receptions, Shahrukh became aware of the traces of al-Taftāzānī's distinguished disciple in the region. The following observations show that the detail of al-Taftāzānī here is extremely important:

Most of the distinguished ulama of his period were either men of Khorasanian provenance or students of Temür's protégés [...] The prestige of three scholars Temür had brought to Samarqand, Sa'd al-Din 'Umar Taftazani, Sayyid 'Ali Jurjani, and Shams al-Din Muhammad Jazari, passed on to their offspring and students. [...] During Shahrukh's reign, the family of Taftazani was the more prominent in the capital, since Jurjani had left Samarqand for Shiraz at Temür's death, while Taftazani's son Shams al-Din Muhammad remained in Herat.<sup>83</sup> [...] Throughout his reign, then, Shahrukh gave positions to Khorasanian personnel and ulama connected to the scholars of Temür's court.<sup>84</sup>

al-Harawī is not only a native of Khorasan but also a distinguished student of al-Taftāzānī. Furthermore, his hometown is Herat, the capital of Shahrukh, where the al-Taftāzānī family predominates in the scholarly class. It is also highly probable that he was a student of al-Jurjānī, another favorite Timur scholar. Surely, the people of Tabriz and Shirvan who remembered the past days could not present a more remarkable profile of a scholar to the victorious Sultan Shahrukh.

It is highly probable that Shahrukh invited al-Harawī to join him after hearing of his fame or that al-Harawī, upon hearing his name mentioned in Shahrukh's presence, spontaneously moved towards his lands. It is unlikely that al-Harawī joined Shahrukh while he was still in Azerbaijan. In this case, he would have stayed in Ottoman territory for seven years, even if the earliest date of his arrival in Bursa is considered. This is only possible if "approximately ten years" is interpreted as seven years. Otherwise, al-Harawī would have joined Shahrukh within a few years of his return to Herat in 824 (1421).

There is no definitive information regarding the date of al-Harawī's death. The

82 Aka, *Mirza Şahruh*, 217-218.

83 Beatrice Forbes Manz, *Power Politics and Religion in Timurid Iran* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 215.

84 Manz, *Power Politics and Religion in Timurid Iran*, 219.

data presented in this study indicates that al-Harawī was alive at least until the year 825. While al-Suyūṭī states that he died after 820,<sup>85</sup> Kātib Chalabi states in *Kashf al-zunūn* that he died in 830 in one place<sup>86</sup> and between 820 and 830 in another,<sup>87</sup> and in *Sullam al-wuṣūl* that he died in Bursa in 825.<sup>88</sup> al-Baghdādī provided his birth date as 780 and his death date as 854.<sup>89</sup> These conflicting dates seem to be speculative. The date of death given by al-Baghdādī cannot be accurate because al-Taftāzānī passed away in 792, and the last time he was in Sarakhs was before 789. If the birth date were correct, it would imply that al-Harawī became a student of al-Taftāzānī before the age of 9, which contradicts his claim of being renowned for his understanding of the subtleties of *al-Kashshāf* before joining al-Taftāzānī. There is no basis for the death date provided by al-Baghdādī as well. Although the end of a manuscript of al-Harawī's *al-Ifṣāh fi Sharḥ al-Īdāh* states that it was written by Ḥaydar al-Harawī in 830,<sup>90</sup> the existence of a manuscript of the same work dated 827<sup>91</sup> suggests that we should be cautious about the date of 830. Kātib Chalabi's statement that he died in Bursa in 825 seems unsubstantiated. Indeed, when al-Harawī's statements are read together with the historical facts, it appears that he traveled to Shahrukh within a few years after 825 and presented his commentary on *al-Kashshāf* to him. It is unknown whether this journey was completed and whether he could present his commentary on *al-Kashshāf* to his new patron. Kātib Chalabi's date and place of his death can only be authentic if al-Harawī intended to travel to Shahrukh, wrote a new version of the introduction dedicated to him, and then died in Bursa before he had a chance to depart. In our opinion, however, the accounts of Kātib Chalabi, who gives three different dates for al-Harawī's death, are not sufficiently reassuring to credit such a remote scenario. It is likely that al-Harawī went to Shahrukh and ended his life story in his homeland.

85 al-Suyūṭī, *Bughyat al-wu'āt*, I, 549.

86 Kātib Chalabi, *Kashf al-zunūn*, II, 1247.

87 Kātib Chalabi, *Kashf al-zunūn*, II, 1894.

88 Kātib Chalabi, *Sullam al-wuṣūl*, II, 70.

89 Ismā'il b. Muḥammad al-Baghdādī, *Hadiyyat al-'arīfīn asmā al-mu'allifīn wa āthār al-muṣannifīn*, eds. Kilisli Rifat Bilge, İbnülemin Mahmud Kemal (Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı 1951), I, 342.

90 al-Harawī, *al-Ifṣāh fi Sharḥ al-Īdāh*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Nadir Eserler Koleksiyonu, 2721, fol. 215<sup>a</sup>. I would like to thank Dr. Musa Alak for informing me about this copy.

91 al-Harawī, *al-Ifṣāh fi Sharḥ al-Īdāh*, Rāgīb Paşa Kültüphanesi, Rāgīb Paşa, 1261, fol. 305<sup>a</sup>.

## Conclusion

Ḥaydar al-Harawī presented his commentary on *al-Kashshāf* first to Mehmed I, son of Bayezid I, and then to Shahrukh, son of Timur. In the second version, he not only changed the dedication part of the introduction but also restructured the sections on his biography and travels, considering the identity of the patron to whom the work was presented. The information presented in the two versions allows for the construction and dating of al-Harawī's biography. A careful reading of al-Harawī's account of the cities he visited and his experiences there allows for a highly accurate dating.

According to the data obtained in the article, when al-Harawī attracted attention for his explanations of *al-Kashshāf*, he postponed writing a commentary on *al-Kashshāf*. He went to Sarakhs sometime between 785 and 789 (1383-1387) to become a student of al-Taftāzānī, one of his greatest desires. During Timur's three-year conquest of Azerbaijan and Iran, conditions deteriorated in Sarakhs due to the political vacuum in Khorasan, so al-Taftāzānī traveled to Samarkand and al-Harawī traveled to Shiraz through his hometown, Herat. In Shiraz, al-Harawī taught for 15 to 19 years and became especially famous for his teaching of *al-Kashshāf*. After a long stay in Shiraz, al-Harawī probably became overwhelmed by the power struggles there and, in search of new patronage, awaited the outcome of the battle of Ankara between Mehmed I and Timur in 804 (1402), and then moved towards Tabriz, a center of science and commerce that was certain to remain a Timurid city after Timur's victory. al-Harawī arrived in Tabriz in 805 (late 1402). After experiencing difficulties in Tabriz during the period of turmoil following Timur's unexpected death, he spent four to five troubled years there. Subsequently, in 809 (1406), he went to Shirvan and received patronage from Shirvanshah Ibrāhīm I. After eight years in Shirvan, al-Harawī left the city in 817 (1414), intending to go on pilgrimage, but then headed to Anatolia, where Mehmed I had restored stability, reaching Bursa in the same year or the following year (818/1415). In Bursa, he became one of the closest scholars to Mehmed I and headed the committee that tried Sheikh Badr al-Dīn. al-Harawī continued to stay in Ottoman lands after the death of Mehmed I and received patronage from Sultan Murad II. al-Harawī trained important scholars in Bursa and Edirne for nearly a decade and, according to Katib Chalabi, served as the muftī of Edirne during the reign of Murad II. While Shahrukh was in Azerbaijan between 823 and 824 (1420-1421), he became aware that the distinguished disciple of al-Taftāzānī, his father's favorite scholar, had spent several years there, and al-Harawī heard that his name was mentioned in Shahrukh's presence. Taking this as an opportunity for new patronage, he rewrote the introduction to his commentary on *al-Kashshāf*, which he had previously dedicated

to Mehmed I, to dedicate it to Shahrukh. Whether he had the opportunity to present the work to his new patron is unknown from the available data. If he presented his work to Shahrukh as planned, he would have returned to his hometown of Herat, the Timurid capital, between 825 and 827 (1422-1424) and likely spent the rest of his life in the Khorasan.

The two versions of the introduction show that the analysis of manuscripts can contribute to a wide range of fields, from political history to urban historiography and from scholar-sultan relations to biography writing. Although this article is limited to the construction of a biography, it has been observed that if these two different versions, whose contents are determined by patronage relations, are subjected to discourse analysis, striking results can be obtained.

## References

- Aka, İsmail. *Mirza Şahruh: Timur'un Hükümdar Oğlu, Uluğ Bey'in Babası (1405/1447)*. İstanbul: Kronik, 2022.
- Alan, Hayrunnisa. *Bozkırdan Cennet Bahçesine Timurlular: 1360-1506*. İstanbul: Ötüken 2007.
- Åshikpashazāde. *Tārīkhī Āl-i 'Usmān*. İstanbul: Maṭba'a-i Āmira, 1332.
- Aşurbəyli, Sara xanım. *Şirvanşahlar Dövləti*. Bakü: Nəşriyyat-Poliqrafiya Evinin Mətbəəsi, 2006.
- al-Baghdādī, İsmā'il b. Muḥammad. *Hadīyyat al-'arīfīn asmā al-mu'allīfīn wa āthār al-muşannīfīn*. Edited by Kılıslı Rifat Bilge, İbnülemin Mahmud Kemal. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1951.
- Boyalık, M. Taha. "Haydar el-Herevī'nin I. Mehmed'e İthaf Ettiği *el-Keşşâf Şerh*'nin Tespiti ve Eserin Literatür, Biyografi ve Tarih Alanlarında Sunduğu Veriler". *Osmanlı Araştırmaları/The Journal of Ottoman Studies*, LIV (2019): 1-26.
- Boyalık, M. Taha. *el-Keşşâf Literatürü: Zemaşşerî'nin Tefsir Klasığının Etki Tarihi*. İstanbul: İSAM Yayınları, 2019.
- Farzalı, Şahin Fazıl. "XV. Yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Sirvanşahlar Devleti ile İlişkileri". Translated by Toğrul V. Kamiloğlu. *Yeni Türkiye*, (2002/44): 59-64.
- Gümüş, Sadreddin. "Cürcânî, Seyyid Şerîf". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*. XIII, (1993): 134-136.
- Hâfız Halil. *Şeyh Bedreddin Menakıbnamesi*. Translated by Mehmet Kanar. İstanbul: Tekin Yayınevi, 2015.
- al-Harawī, Burhān al-Dīn Ḥaydar b. Muḥammad. *al-İfşāh fī Sharḥ al-İdāh*. Râgıb Paşa Kütüphanesi, Râgıb Paşa, 1261; Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Laleli, 2855; Beyazıt Kütüphanesi, Veliyyüddin Efendi, V2820; İstanbul Üniversitesi Nadir Eserler Koleksiyonu, 2721.
- al-Harawī, Burhān al-Dīn Ḥaydar b. Muḥammad. *Sharḥ al-Farāid al-Sirājiyya*. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Kasidecizade, 260; Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Murad Molla, 1225; Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Kılıç Ali Paşa, 514; Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Giresun Yazmalar, 41; Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Yeni Cami, 301; Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Fatih, 2526; Beyazıt Kütüphanesi, Veliyyüddin Efendi, V1591; Beyazıt Kütüphanesi, V1602; Konya Yazma Eserler Kütüphanesi, Bölge Yazma Eserler, BY0000003125; Konya Yazma Eserler Kütüphanesi, Bölge Yazma Eserler, BY0000004754; Amasya Beyazıt Kütüphanesi, Beyazıt, 1268.

- al-Harawī, Burhān al-Dīn Haydar b. Muḥammad. *Sharḥ al-Kashshāf*. Konya Bölge Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Burdur İl Halk, 1215 (Version 1); Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Carullah, 200 (Version 2).
- Khāndmīr, Ghiyāth al-Dīn. *Tārīkh ḥabīb al-siyar fī akhbār afrād al-bashar*. Edited by Muḥammad Debīr-i Siyākī. Tahran: Kitābfuruş-i Hayyam, 1362.
- Khoja Sa'd al-Dīn Efendi. *Tāc al-Tawārīkh*. Istanbul: Ṭab'khāne-i Āmīra, 1279.
- Ibn 'Arabshah. *Ajāib al-maqdūr fī nawābī Taymūr*. Edited by Ahmad Faiz al-Himşī. Beirut: Muassasa al-Risāla, 1407/1986.
- İnalcık, Halil. "Mehmed I". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*. 2003, XXVIII, 391-394.
- al-Qālish, Diyā al-Dīn. "Muqaddima al-taḥqīq", *Sharḥ Talkhīş al-Miftāh: al-Muṭawwal*. Qaṭar: Wizāra al-Awqāf, 1442/2021.
- Kātib Chalabī. *Kashf al-zunūn 'an asāmī al-Qutub wa al-funūn*. Edited by Kilisli Muallim Rifat, M. Şerfeddin Yaltkaya. Istanbul: Milli Eğitimin Bakanlığı, 1362/1942.
- Kātib Chalabī. *Sullam al-wuşul ilā ṭabaqāt al-fuḥūl*. Prepared by Mahmūd al-Arnaūṭ, Şālīh Sa'dāwī. Istanbul: IRCICA, 2010.
- Laknawī, Abū al-Ḥasanāt Muḥammad. *al-Fawāid al-bahīyya fī tarājim al-Ḥanaṭīyya*. Edited by Muḥammad Bedr al-Dīn. Cairo: Maṭba'a al-Sa'āda, 1324.
- Manz, Beatrice Forbes. *Power Politics and Religion in Timurid Iran*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Neşrī, Mehmed. *Kitāb-ı Cihan-nümā: Neşrī Tarihi*. Prepared by Faik Reşit Unat, Mehmet A. Köymen. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1957.
- Sa'ālibī, Abd al-Malik. *Yatimat al-dahr fī maḥāsīn ahl al-'aşr*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-İlmiyya, 1403/1983.
- Sakhāwī, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad. *al-Daw' al-lāmī' li ahl al-Qarni al-Tāsī'*. Beirut: Manshūrāt Dār al-Maktabat al-Ḥayāt, n.d.
- Solakzāde, Mehmed Hemdemî. *Solakzāde Tarihi*. Prepared by Vahid Çabuk. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1989.
- Sümer, Faruk. *Kara Koyunlular (Başlangıçtan Cihan-Şah'a Kadar)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1992.
- al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn. *Bughyat al-wu'āt fī ṭabaqāt al-lughawīyyīn wa al-nuḥāt*. Edited by Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl İbrāhīm. Lebanon/Şaida: Maktabat al-Aşriyya, n.d.
- Şāmī, Nizamüddin. *Zafernāme*. Translated by Necati Lugal. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1987.
- Ṭashkubrīzāde, 'İşām al-Dīn Aḥmad. *Miftāh al-Sa'āda wa mişbāh al-siyāda fī mawḍū'at al-'ulūm*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-İlmiyya, 1405/1985.
- Ṭashkubrīzāde, 'İşām al-Dīn Aḥmad. *al-Shaqāiq al-Nu'māniyya fī 'ulamāi al-Dawla al-'Uthmāniyya*. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, 1395/1975.
- Üstündağ, Mehlika. *İran'ın Bilinmeyen Hanedanlığı Muzafferiler*. Ankara: İraniyat, 2018.
- Yezdī, Şerefüddin Ali. *Emîr Timur: Zafernāme*. Translated by D. Ahsen Batur. İstanbul: Selenge, 2013.
- Yılmaz, Bülent. "Celâyirliiler: Kabile-Devlet". *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü* (PhD Dissertation). Erzurum, 2002.
- Yücel, Yaşar. *Timur'un Ortadoğu-Anadolu Seferleri ve Sonuçları (1393-1402)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1989.
- Yüksel, Musa Şamil. *Timurlularda Din-Devlet İlişkisi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2021.



## Appendix

Nūsha 2		Nūsha 1	
fol. 1 <sup>b</sup> . line: 6-7.	حتى طلع من مطالع ضمائره (...) من مجامع صدره	fol. 1 <sup>b</sup> . line: 6.	حتى طلع من مطالع ضمائره (...) من مجامع صدره
fol. 1 <sup>b</sup> . line: 11.	-	fol. 1 <sup>b</sup> . line: 11.	لا تسمح بمثله الأدوار، ما دار الفلك الدوار
fol. 1 <sup>b</sup> . line: 14.	قوانين التفسير	fol. 1 <sup>b</sup> . line: 14.	قوانينه
fol. 1 <sup>b</sup> . line: 16.	وكل كتاب بعده في التفسير	fol. 1 <sup>b</sup> . line: 15.	وكل كتاب كتب بعده في التفسير
fol. 1 <sup>b</sup> . Line: 17-18	سقط في مزلق	fol. 1 <sup>b</sup> . line: 17.	أخذ في مزلق
fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 2.	ولئنه يكتفي بقدر الضرورة	fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 2-3.	ولئنه يكتفي منها بقدر الضرورة
fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 6.	ونعم ما قال الإمام الرازي رحمه الله في تفسيره في قوله تعالى "يُجِبُّهُمْ وَيُجِبُّونَهُ": خاض صاحب الكشاف...	fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 6-7.	ونعم ما قال الإمام الرازي في كتابه في تفسير «يُجِبُّهُمْ وَيُجِبُّونَهُ» الواقع في سورة آل عمران: خاض صاحب الكشاف...
fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 9.	طبقات الآفاق، أنه مع تجرّه	fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 9.	إطباق الآفاق، أنه مع مهارته
fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 12-13.	وكمال رأفته، كما أخبر به الصادق المصدوق صلى الله عليه وسلم، وعليهم مدار الإسلام	fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 12.	وكمال رأفته، وتخصيصه إيّاهم بلطفه وعصمته، وعليهم مدار الإسلام
fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 13.	بعبارة وكلمات فاحشة	fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 12-13	بأسامي وألقاب فاحشة
fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 13-14.	وتارة ينسبهم على سبيل التعريض إلى الكفر والإلحاد	fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 13.	وتارة يعرض بهم بالكفر والإلحاد
fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 16.	يقتبس منه فضلاء البلاد	fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 15.	ينتفع به فضلاء البلاد
fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 17.	من تبيين وجوه القرآت	fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 16.	من إيراد وجوه القرآت
fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 18-21.	وتدقيق نكاته وبذل مجهوده في تقرير مسأله وتحرير دلأله، فلأن فيه شئين: أحدهما ليس من الأفعال الاختيارية، وهو أن هذا الكتاب كتاب مبین، وحصن حصين، وسد رصين، لا يكمل علمه بمجرد العبور على العلوم الظاهرة والعتور على الفنون الزاهرة	fol. 2 <sup>a</sup> . line: 17-19.	وتعيين نكاته وبذل مجهوده في تدوين مسأله وتحرير دلأله، إلا أن فيه شئين: أحدهما ليس باختياره، وهو أن هذا الكتاب كتاب محكم، لا يكفي فيه مجرد العبور على العلوم الظاهرة والعتور على الفنون الوافرة