

Marijana MIŠEVIĆ*

Institute of History

Belgrade

HOW AND WHY WAS SLAVIC LEARNED AT THE OTTOMAN COURT? INSIGHTS FROM THE FIFTEENTH-CENTURY PROJECTS DEDICATED TO LEARNING LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD**

Abstract: This paper addresses the question of the status of Slavic/Serbian language in the Ottoman Empire during the late 15th century by focusing on three multilingual language-learning handbooks, which were produced at or around the Ottoman court and contain fragments in Serbian written in the Arabic script. Two of these handbooks (MSs Süleymaniye *Ayasofya* 4749 and *Ayasofya* 4750) have attracted scholarly attention since 1936. Using the historical language ideology as a hermeneutical tool, this paper first revisits the scholarly interpretations of these two manuscripts and then introduces a third, so far unnoticed codex (MS SB Berlin *Or.oct.33*). The analysis of the form and contents of this manuscript provides new insights into the original context in which all three manuscripts were produced, along with a series of similar handbooks which do not contain Slavic material.

Keywords: history of Slavic/Serbian language, Ottoman Empire, multilingualism, historical language ideology.

Анстракт: У раду се разматра питање статуса словенског/српског језика у Османском царству током касног 15. века, анализом три вишејезична приручника за учење језика, који су израђени на османском двору или око њега и који садрже фрагменте на српском написане на арапском писму. Два таква приручника (MSs Süleymaniye *Ayasofya* 4749 и *Ayasofya* 4750) привлаче пажњу истраживача од 1936. Коришћењем историјске језичке идеологије као херменеутичког алата, у раду се најпре преиспитују научна тумачења та два рукописа, а затим се уводи трећи, до сада незапажен кодекс (MS SB Berlin *Or.oct.33*). Анализа форме и садржаја тог рукописа пружа нове увиде у изворни

* marijana.misevic@iib.ac.rs

** This paper is a modified version of a section of my doctoral dissertation. M. Mišević, *Writing Slavic in the Arabic Script: Literacy and Multilingualism in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 2022) 54–93. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations and transliterations are mine. I have transliterated Ottoman Turkish according to the *İslām Ansiklopedisi* transliteration system. For Arabic and Persian, I used the DMG (*Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft*) transliteration system.

контекст у коме су сачињена сва три рукописа, уз низ сличних приручника који не садрже словенски материјал.

Кључне речи: историја словенског/српског језика, Османско царство, вишејезичност, историјска језичка идеологија.

In the late medieval period, the Balkan Peninsula was one of the densest linguistic and cultural contact zones in Europe. A part of the area where speakers of Slavic languages¹ constituted a majority (hereafter: South-Slavia), can, in modern terms, be described as a dialect continuum. In this region, (Old) Church Slavic dominated as a written language, with some of its functions overlapping with those of written Greek and Latin. A rare glimpse into how contemporaries viewed the history of the written word in this geo-linguistic space can be found in Constantine of Kostents's famous work *Skazanie iz'javljeno o pismenex* (after 1423), where he speaks about *slovenski* (Slavic) of the holy books as a shared property of multiple "tribes." This written idiom, according to Constantine, was deliberately created through translation from Greek, indirectly drawing from Syriac and Hebrew, and combining elements from seven (spoken) "languages" to achieve precision and refinement. Constantine calls these languages *ruski*, *bugarski*, *srspski*, *slovenski*, *bosanski*, *češki*, and *hrvatski*.²

Constantine wrote his treatise more than half a century after the onset of the Ottoman conquests in South-Eastern Europe (ca.1350). The Ottoman political expansion brought new administrative practices into the region and literacy based on the Arabic script (hereafter: Arabographic literacy). The functions of the languages previously written in South-Slavia underwent modifications, partly due to socio-political encounters between their users and those employing the interacting Arabic, Persian, and Turkish. Arguably, these encounters occurred within an ideologically laden context and persisted throughout the early modern period. In other words, the establishment of Ottoman rule in South-Slavia brought about a change in the late medieval

¹ "Slavic" is an abstraction I use to encompass languages/dialects belonging to the South Slavic branch of the broader language family, which have, at different times, been labeled as Slovene, Croatian, Bosnian, Serbian, Montenegrin, Macedonian, Bulgarian, BCS, Serbo-Croatian, and Croatian-Serbian. When specific glottonyms appear in primary sources or in the cited literature, I will mark them with *italics* to emphasize that this choice was not my own but rather that of historical actors or the scholars cited.

² Konstantin Filozof, *Povest o slovima. Žitije despota Stefana Lazarevića*, ed. G. Jovanović, Beograd 1989, 53. The factuality of Constantine's deliberations is not my concern here, just as is the case with other historical actors discussed.

literacy/language regime, whether explicitly (discursively) or implicitly (practically) constituted. The regime was gradually replaced with what can be tentatively described as the Ottoman literacy/language regime,³ itself subject to change based on shifting extra-linguistic circumstances. Some of the theoretical questions that can be raised against this background include: Did Ottoman Arabographers perceive South-Slavia as a unique geo-linguistic space? Were they interested in its history? Did they, prioritizing Islamic literary traditions, think of Slavic as a Christian language, as mainstream wisdom suggests? Did they consider it a “foreign” language or a language of their “own” polity/community? How did they articulate their attitudes, and how did these attitudes change? Did they engage with or produce texts written in the Slavic language, and if so, for what purpose? How did the status of Slavic differ from or resemble that of other “Ottoman” languages?

This paper addresses some of these questions by focusing on the late 15th century and discussing the circumstances in which three Ottoman multilingual language-learning handbooks, containing fragments in Slavic written in the Arabic script, were produced. The form and contents of two of these handbooks (MSs Süleymaniye *Ayasofya 4749* and *Ayasofya 4750*) have been interpreted on various occasions, albeit with different concerns. The contents of the third one (MS SB Berlin *Or.oct.33*), a product of like-minded efforts, remains virtually unknown to scholarship. All three codices were produced by anonymous intellectuals affiliated with the Ottoman court. They are vocalized and written in a neat, scholarly hand,⁴ and none contains users’ notes, suggesting that they served as clean copies, possibly templates for individual and/or instructed learning. The existence of *Or.oct.33* was recently established when an Ottoman Palace library inventory containing its description was published.⁵ The same

³ The concept of the *language regime* has been theorized based on the modern, directly observable sociolinguistic realities. Various language regimes have been discussed in relation to policies of modern states which tend to promote and regulate the use of one or more “official languages.” In modern times, therefore, language regimes figure as systematically imposed and ideologically supported responses to a need to accommodate language diversity and manage multilingual communication. This need, we may hypothesize, was also felt by the elite of the various historical polities characterized by multilingualism of this or that scope, though in terms which differed in meaning and connotations from those we use today (“an official language” being an example). See, for example, F. Coulmas, *Guardians of Language: Twenty Voices Through History*, Oxford 2016, esp. xi-xxii; J. Costa, “Introduction: Regimes of language and the social, hierarchized organization of ideologies”, *Language and Communication* 66 (2019) 1–5.

⁴ Vocalization of Arabic consonants upon text production can be taken as signaling the efforts made towards increasing the clarity of a text.

⁵ The inventory was prepared in 1502–03 by Ḥayreddīn Hızır b. Maḥmūd b. Ömer el-‘Aṭūfī. (d. 1541). It has been preserved in MS *Török F.59*. The critical edition accompanied by a series of

source contains descriptions of the *Ayasofya* codices.⁶ While there is no clear proof that the textbooks were compiled at the Ottoman imperial palace, it appears that they were used there. Available internal and external evidence supports a dating to the period of the rule of Mehmed II (1444–1446; 1451–1481).⁷ In addition to Slavic, the three codices, observed together, contain texts in Arabic, Persian, Greek, and Latin (Italianate).

The language of the Slavic fragments is called *Serbian* by composers (in case of *Or.oct.33*) or later users (in all three cases).⁸ This suggests several possibilities: that the composers/users viewed *Serbian* as a synonym for Slavic, covering/representing the parts of South-Slavia known to the Ottomans; that they did not have a concept of (South-)Slavic or the idea of the geographic scope in which its, more or less, mutually intelligible variants were spoken (like Constantine of Kostenets did); that the Slavic speakers involved in the handbooks' production called the language *Serbian*, either considering it an idiom different from other options (e.g. *Bosnian*, *Croatian*, *Bulgarian* etc.) or thinking of themselves as Serbs in an ethnic, social, or political sense, or all

essays analyzing its context and various aspects has been published in G. Necipoğlu, C. Kafadar & C. H. Fleischer, eds., *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3–1503/4)*, Leiden 2019. The entry in the inventory which describes *Or.oct.33* reads: Kitābu mulḥaqāti *Dānestan* mina'l-luġati'r-rūmiyyati wa's-sarfiyyati wa risālatu ḥikāyati Qirīsūs bi-ḥaṭṭin 'arabiyyin wa ġayrihi wa awrāqin fiḥā ḥuṭūṭun muḥtalifatun fī muġalladin wāḥidin [Book of appendices to the *Dānestan* from the Greek and Serbian languages and treatise of the story of Croesus in Arabic and other scripts, and folios with various writings, in a single volume], *Ibidem*, 297 (f. 145b).

⁶ The descriptions read: *Ayasofya 4750*—Risālatu kalimātin 'arabiyyatin mutarġamatin bi'l-fārisiyyati wa'r-rūmiyyati (ay al-yūnāniyyati) wa's-sarfiyyati [A Treatise on the Arabic words translated into Persian, and Greek, and Serbian]; *Ayasofya 4749*—Risālatu kalimātin 'arabiyyatin mutarġamatin bi'l-fārisiyyati wa'r-rūmiyyati wa's-sarfiyyati wa kitābu Īsāġūġi 'alā'l-luġati'l-'arabiyyati mutarġamun bi'l-yunāniyyati fī'l-mantiqi wa risālatu'l-amṭilati'l-muṭṭaridati'l-mutarġamati bi-luġatin 'arabiyyatin fī muġalladin wāḥidin. [The treatise with the Arabic words translated to Persian, and Greek, and Serbian; the *Eisagoge* in Arabic translated to Greek on the theme of logic; treatise on examples of regular verbs translated into Arabic, all in one volume], *Ibidem*, 296 (f. 145a).

⁷ The modern cataloguer of an extant copy of *Or.oct.33* notes that the author/writer was alive/flourished in 870/1465, and that the copy was made in 1100/1688. Despite all effort, I could not determine how he came to the date of 1465, nor how the manuscript reached Berlin and when. W. Ahlwardt, *Verzeichnis der Arabischen Handschriften: Sechster Band*, Berlin 1894, 197–198.

⁸ See fn. 5 and fn. 6. Titles added by later users/cataloguers are: *Ayasofya 4750*—1. Kitābu'l-Luġati min Lisāni'l-Muḥtalifa [The book of words from different languages] 2. Luġat-i Arabī ve Luġat-i Fārisī ve Luġat-i Rumī ve Luġat-i Sarfī [Arabic language, and Persian language, and Greek language, and Serbian language]; *Ayasofya 4749*—Luġat-i Fārisī 'Arabī Rumī ve Sarfī, Luġatu Alsinati Arba'a [Persian language, and Arabic, and Greek, and Serbian; the dictionary of four languages]; *Or.oct.33*—(in European hand) Bi-mulḥaqāt-i *Dānestan* mina'l-luġati'r-rūmiyyati [About appendices to *Danestan* from Greek language].

three simultaneously; and, that the Ottomans, in shaping their state's image as a world empire, thought they could appropriate the connotations of *Serbian* as a language of a former empire or simply as a language of *the world*, as they knew it and as they were learning about it.

To the best of my knowledge, there has been no attempt to question the exceptionality of these handbooks or contextualize them as indicators of Ottoman historical language awareness. As will be seen below, these manuscripts were part of a broader project aimed at equipping various languages used/spoken at the Ottoman court with the language-learning tools. What remains unclear is precisely how these handbooks were produced and used, by whom, and with what concrete ideas and goals in mind. In the following sections, I will first summarize the existing scholarly conclusions related to the *Ayasofya* codices, and then proceed to discuss all three handbooks.

Multilingualism at the Court of Mehmed II: the Status of Slavic/ Serbian According to Current Interpretations

Existing analyses of the *Ayasofya* codices have relied heavily on individual scholars' interpretations of the understudied socio-linguistic situation in the 15th century Ottoman Empire. In 1936, Caferoğlu informed about the existence of these codices and presented some speculative conclusions related to the theme of historical language ideology—the variety of ideas about languages and their functions which can be associated with historical actors.⁹ His conclusions have been uncritically cited in the literature and warrant revisiting. Caferoğlu primarily focused on the quadrilingualism (*Arabic-Persian-Greek-Serbian*) found in the only text in *Ayasofya* 4750, and the first part of *Ayasofya* 4749. Although he acknowledged that the descriptor “dictionary” (tr. *luġat*) was added later and did not align with the structure of the text (hereafter referred to as the manual, for the lack of a better word),¹⁰ he contextualized the “dictionary” by explaining the absence of *Turkish*, the mother tongue of the male members of the Ottoman dynasty, and the presence

⁹ A. Caferoğlu, “Note sur un manuscrit en langue serbe de la bibliothèque d’Ayasofya”, *Revue internationale des études balkaniques* 1/3 (1936) 185–90.

¹⁰ The manual is in the form of a series of dialogues which move from a setting to a setting. Market is the setting in which the series begins. Market and related activities feature prominently throughout the text. The next cluster involves the actions of coming and going centered around venues of learning and writing, using and buying the writing tools, all within an urban environment. Besides that, the vocabulary employed in the dialogues refers to feelings, weather, and religious piety, in no particular order.

of, first of all, *Serbian*.¹¹ Caferoğlu suggested that this work was composed for sultan Mehmed II and his sons. He supported this claim by suggesting that, during “that time,” educated individuals possessed equal proficiency in *Arabic* and *Persian*, as they did in *Turkish*, whereby *Turkish* was considered vulgar and unsuitable for didactic purposes in princely education. The goal of the manual, according to Caferoğlu, was to teach *Greek* and *Serbian* through the medium of *Arabic* and/or *Persian*. He further emphasized Mehmed II’s role as the model student of *Serbian*, noting that the sultan “who had an exceptional talent for the study of foreign languages, could not do without learning the language of people whose territory had just been annexed to his great Empire.”¹² Though this is quite an unfair critique of a short article, it is still useful to note that Caferoğlu did not discuss the kind of knowledge of *Serbian* which could have been acquired by means of these handbooks, and afterwards useful to the sultan.¹³ In summary, his conclusions were based on three lines of argumentation that were only partially supported by the intra-textual evidence. One argument revolved around Mehmed II’s extraordinary linguistic abilities and his image as a ruler interested in all subjects, while another centered on the timeless prestige of *Arabic* and *Persian* in the Islamic world. The third argument touched on the vague notion of *Serbian*’s importance in the Ottoman state.

Following Caferoğlu’s lead, Lehfeltdt, a philologist, studied the *Ayasofya* “dictionaries” on several occasions, primarily approaching them as rare contemporary sources for the history of the *Serbian* vernacular. He also conducted a detailed philological analysis of *Ayasofya 4750*.¹⁴ Based on the

¹¹ Caferoğlu mentions both codices but does not compare them. The codicological data he provides are related to no. 4749. He does not discuss the differences between the two manuscripts.

¹² A. Caferoğlu, “Note sur un manuscrit en langue serbe”, 187.

¹³ He notes, however, that Serbian started taking the character of a court and diplomatic language in the Ottoman state already during the reign of Bāyezīd I (1389–1402) to become a high-profile diplomatic language, together with Greek, during the reign of Mehmed II. To support this claim, he quotes a *fermān* (order) from 1456 sent from the Ottoman court to the Voyvoda of Moldavia. Finally, he refers to several accounts of the captives or foreign travelers to the Ottoman Empire, which testify to the spoken Slavic (and Greek) in the various strata of Ottoman polity. Besides being important as a diplomatic language, Caferoğlu adds, Serbian was also important as the language spoken by the Janissaries. *Ibidem*, 188.

¹⁴ W. Lehfeltdt, *Ein arabisch-persisch-griechisch-serbokroatisches Sprachlehrbuch in arabischer Schrift aus dem 15./16. Jahrhundert*, Bochum 1970; *idem.*, *Eine Sprachlehre von der HohenPforte: Ein arabisch-persisch-griechisch-serbisches Gesprächslehrbuch vom Hofe des Sultans aus dem 15. Jahrhundert als Quelle für die Geschichte der serbischen Sprache*, Cologne; Vienna 1989; see also, M. Marinković, “Srpski jezik u Osmanskom carstvu: primer četvorjezičnog udžbenika za učenje stranih jezika iz biblioteke sultana Mahmuda I”, *Slavistika* 14 (2010) 280–298.

grammatical features of the quadrilingual manual, he rightly observed that the *Arabic* text served as a template from which translations into three other languages were derived.¹⁵ Lehfeldt further suggested that the two slightly different quadrilingual compositions were intended for the “circle of high ranking Serbian and/or Greek ‘renegades’” who aimed to learn *Arabic*.¹⁶ The Persian component remained unaccounted for. Lehfeldt’s analysis of the orthography of the Slavic sections aptly demonstrates the extent of creativity and scrutiny invested in adapting the Arabic script for recording *Serbian*.¹⁷ He also noted that the *Serbian* translation occasionally deviates from the rules of Slavic syntax, indicating that the translation was driven by mechanistic calquing rather than a concern for the semantics of syntactic structures. Furthermore, Lehfeldt added that the *Serbian* (and *Greek* and *Persian*) text would be hard to understand without referring to the Arabic template, thus undermining the handbook’s efficacy for learning any language other than Arabic.¹⁸ Thus, if royal and other affiliates to the Ottoman court had used this manual only to learn *Serbian*, as Caferoğlu tentatively suggested, the *Serbian* they learned would have been slightly unusual.

The eclecticism and polyglottism of the Ottoman court have often been discussed in relation to Mehmed II’s rule and his towering personality. In 1971, Patrinelis suggested that the “oft-repeated assertions about his [Mehmed II’s] extraordinary[linguistic]competence” constituted a crucial component in the construction of “the romantic portrait of Mehmed II” by his “Italian panegyrists” who had paid significant attention to this aspect of the sultan’s persona, but provided contradictory accounts.¹⁹ Patrinelis also noted that these accounts had often been taken for granted, although this was not the case with Babinger, the chief biographer of Mehmed II (to this day), who was certain

¹⁵ Other formal features of the text support this conclusion—Arabic lines are vividly emphasized by the layout, the size of letters and the type of font.

¹⁶ W. Lehfeldt, *Eine Sprachlehre von der Hohen Pforte*, 3.

¹⁷ This can be concluded based on the fact that the composers “invented” a letter to designate a phoneme [c] which does not exist in either Arabic, Turkish, or Persian, and based on the ways in which the vowel system of spoken Slavic was reflected in systematically applied, novel orthographic solutions.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, 3 and *passim*.

¹⁹ Of these Patrinelis quotes Giacomo de Langusco (fl. 15c), Theodoros Spandonos/Spandugino (died after 1538), Martino Barletio (fl. 1504), Francesco Sansovino (1521–1583), and Pseudo-Sphrantzes. See, C. Patrinelis, “Mehmed II the Conqueror and His Presumed Knowledge of Greek and Latin”, *Viator* 2 (1971) 350. Patrinelis is not commenting on the generational differences between the authors who provided these “romantic” estimations of Mehmed II’s linguistic competences, but it seems from his writing that the idea was perpetuated through the influence of the older authors on the later ones.

of Arabic and Persian only.²⁰ Relying on writings of fifteenth-century Greek authors, some of whom were acquaintances of the sultan, Patrinelis concluded that “the young sultan did not know Greek and Latin.”²¹ Patrinelis labeled both *Greek* and *Latin* as “Western” languages, perpetuating an anachronistic East-West dichotomy that has influenced interpretations of Mehmed II’s reign to this day.²² Patrinelis did not mention Slavic.

A more nuanced evaluation of Mehmed II’s polyglottism, now with focus on *Greek* alone, comes from Raby who allowed for the possibility that the sultan had some competence in this language, which resulted from his general interest in Greek erudition.²³ For reasons that have only recently become clear (see below), Raby was not aware of the codices discussed here. Yet, his depiction of the ways of the Greek letters in Mehmed II’s court provides a solid background for situating them. First, Raby profiled two generations of men from the sultan’s immediate surroundings who were in some way involved with Greek letters after the conquest of Constantinople. The first generation was represented by people educated within the pre-Ottoman Byzantine system, and the second by people educated after 1453. The members of the first generation were those who decided to stay in Constantinople after the conquest and who were personally engaged in various services to the sultan. These individuals were representatives of traditional Byzantine erudition and served as the sultan’s companions who mediated communication between the court and the metropolitan Greek community by offering advice, interpreting, and providing secretarial and scribal services. Since the schooling of these people, whose names and biographies are relatively well-known, had mainly been completed by 1453, Raby hypothesized that various Greek manuscripts in Mehmed II’s library, many of which were related to Byzantine-style language instruction, could have served for the training of the new generation

²⁰ And guessed that Mehmed knew the language of his mother, a wife of Murād II of unknown slave origin, perhaps Greek, perhaps Slavic.

²¹ Patrinelis cites Kritovoulos (fl. 15c), Theodosios Zygomalas (fl. 1578), and George of Trebizond (fl. 15c), *Ibidem*, 351–354.

²² Quoting Adolf Deissman and Emil Jacobs, he writes: “It is true that Mehmed’s personal library numbered several manuscripts or maps in many different languages including Greek and Latin. (...) The mere possession by Mehmed, however, of such works in Western languages as well cannot be used as evidence that he knew any Western tongue,” *Ibidem*, 354 (fn. 21). See also: G. A. Deissmann, *Forschungen und Funde im Serai: mit einem Verzeichnis der nichtislamischen Handschriften im Topkapu Serai zu Istanbul*, Berlin, Leipzig 1933, and E. Jacobs, “Mehmed II., der Eroberer, seine Beziehungen zur Renaissance und seine Büchersammlung”, *Oriens* 2 (1949) 6–29.

²³ J. Raby, “Mehmed the Conqueror’s Greek Scriptorium”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 37 (1983) 23.

of Ottoman chancellery staff. Many of these new students of *Greek*, Raby noted, were slave recruits raised in the Imperial Palace and not necessarily of Greek origin. As his reign progressed, these predominantly anonymous individuals, together with the (textual) outcomes of the Palace's self-reliance in training secretaries and scribes, began to shape the character of Mehmed II's secretariat.²⁴ Raby also noted, based on earlier studies, that the majority of Ottoman documents in *Greek* issued during the reigns of Mehmed II and Bāyezīd II were not characterized by linguistic accuracy, which could only be provided by native speakers: a Latin [i.e. an Italian] or a Turk, the two models Raby cares to mention, could not go further than learning "a vulgar Greek."²⁵ As a supplementary point, one may add that, in theory, a Slav could also produce a diplomatic letter in "a vulgar Greek," whether they were educated before or after coming to the Ottoman court.

Raby's writings imply that the new generation of Ottoman students of *Greek*, trained within the new system, learned the language from individuals educated within the Byzantine educational system, using language learning tools based on the Byzantine grammatical tradition. However, in light of the existence of a series of Ottoman-made manuals that were unknown to Raby, this conclusion requires revision. In other words, the influence of various forms of Byzantine knowledge preserved in the manuscripts available in the palace milieu on the linguistic training organized by the people from the Ottoman court remains an open question. Another perspective to consider, building on Raby's narrative, is that all non-ethnic Greeks trained in the Ottoman palace for employment in the Ottoman chancellery could only achieve mediocre competence in vernacular Greek. This suggests that the quality of the linguistic training for non-native speakers was at best, mediocre, and that, since Mehmed II was initially surrounded by qualified native speakers, the less skilled cadre likely became active during the latter part of his reign and during the rule of Bāyezīd II. Similar are conclusions made by Vryonis who was aware of *Ayasofya 4749*. In his discussion of Mehmed II's relationship to the Grecophone/Byzantine legacy of Constantinople and the role of his Greek secretaries in perpetuating "non-Muslim," Byzantine literacy after the conquest, Vryonis mentions *Ayasofya 4749* as supporting evidence that complements

²⁴ Ibidem, 26–27.

²⁵ Quoting previous scholarship, Raby writes: "...the majority of Greek documents issued under Mehmed II and Bayezid II are in a vulgar Greek, full of linguistic and diplomatic inaccuracies. Errors in grammar, syntax, and orthography have led both Laurent and Ahrweiler to suggest that the documents could not have been drafted by a native Greek speaker and must instead have been the work of a Latin or a Turk." Ibidem, 27, and 27 (fn. 63).

Raby's findings.²⁶ According to Vryonis, with the demise of Meḥmed II, the symbolic and instrumental importance of becoming familiar with Greek, the "non-Muslim" and the "western" language, diminishes.²⁷ Vryonis does not delve into the question of diplomatic, Ottoman Greek used by Bāyezīd II's chancellery.

In both Raby's and Vryonis's accounts, Meḥmed II, whether he knew *Greek* or not, appears as the key agent in the short-term perseverance of "non-Muslim"/Byzantine literacy in the elite Ottoman circles. Both authors lead us to conclude that the supposed efforts of the Ottoman educators affiliated with the court to train the self-made polyglot cadre did not lead to proficiency of Ottoman scribes involved in diplomatic correspondence. Despite this, however, there is no indication that the documents produced by these anonymous scribes in occasionally corrupted, vernacular Greek failed to transmit the messages they contained. What may be inferred from this, from a language ideology perspective, is that achieving proficiency in the originally Greek diplomatic language and style was not something of interest to the Ottomans involved in diplomatic chancellery business. Instead, they perhaps aimed for understandable vernacular written in a script familiar to the message receiver, which entirely served their purpose. This is not to suggest that correctness and style were unimportant aspects of diplomatic texts circulating the Mediterranean, Southern, and Eastern Europe of the 15th century, but to emphasize that these questions have not been explored in the literature I have encountered so far. Nevertheless, they can be very interesting, given that the 15th century can be characterized as a period of a substantial increase in cross-linguistic communication and heightened language anxieties, a time when the exchange of information became urgent, and the ideological importance of style of presentation may have been placed aside.

According to scholar Necipoğlu, it was also Meḥmed II who played a central role "in the transmission of classical texts through new translations."

²⁶ In the part dealing with "bureaucratization and literatization" (in the post-conquest Constantinople) Vryonis fashions the sultan as leading "a double-life" with this regards—Meḥmed II followed the "traditional Islamic patterns that the Ottomans had adopted earlier in their rise to empire," being at the same time "fascinated by the Greek literary remains and traditions." As the proof of this fascination, Vryonis quotes the fact that Meḥmed II's collection of "non-Muslim books," was dominated by the texts in Greek. Vryonis cites *Ayasofya 4749*, as presented by Caferoğlu and A. Papazoğlu, and suggests vaguely that "it must have been intended for the instruction of those inside the palace." S. Vryonis, "Byzantine Constantinople and Ottoman Istanbul: Evolution in a Millennial Iconography", in: *The Ottoman City and Its Parts*, New Rochelle/NY 1991, 13–52, esp. 36 and *passim*.

²⁷ "After the death of Mehmed II, the afterlife of this Byzantine literatization weakened greatly. His son Bāyezīd II shared little of his father's interests in this domain", *Ibidem*, 40.

She discusses a considerably large collection of grammars and dictionaries, including the three codices involving *Serbian*, from Mehmed II's palace library, in relation to the translation activities. In the same article, Necipoğlu specifically describes the users of these handbooks as "his pages and his multilingual chancellery scribes, who were trained to conduct the sultan's diplomatic correspondence in Greek, Latin, Serbian, Arabic, Persian, Ottoman, and Uighur Turkish."²⁸ Elsewhere, Necipoğlu details the phases in formation of the library during the reigns of two sultans (Mehmed II and Bāyezīd II), its spatial organization, and the ways in which it was understood and handled.²⁹ Her findings provide a probable explanation for why the multilingual language-learning manuals from Mehmed II's library escaped Raby's attention, even though they contained Greek texts. The cataloguers of the Palace library classified them as "books in Islamic languages," and did not place them among the category of "books in non-Islamic languages," where the manuscripts discussed by Raby had been sorted and physically kept apart.³⁰

The scholarly works cited above touch upon early Ottoman attitudes toward the languages of the lands they were conquering or neighboring, as well as toward polyglottism in general. Of particular non-Islamic languages, Greek dominates as an object of focus. While it is undeniable that Slavic was spoken in and around the Ottoman court, no concrete evidence has been presented to indicate Ottoman engagement with Slavic letters akin to the Greek case during this period or later. This is the case even though the three handbooks were not the sole examples of Slavic texts preserved at the Ottoman court of that time.³¹ There are also few known cases of Slavic speakers who were educated in their places of origin before coming to the Ottoman court. For instance, one can mention Mara Branković (b.ca. 1418-d. 1487), whose biography is comparatively well known.³² Mara, undoubtedly a Slav/Serbian

²⁸ G. Necipoğlu, "Visual Cosmopolitanism and Creative Translation: Artistic Conversations with Renaissance Italy in Mehmed II's Constantinople", *Muqarnas* 29 (2012) 11.

²⁹ G. Necipoğlu, "The Spatial Organization of Knowledge in the Ottoman Palace Library: An Encyclopedic Collection and Its Inventory", in: *Treasures of Knowledge*, 1–79.

³⁰ Ibidem, 12–13. The Ottoman terms for the later description (books in non-Islamic languages) were *kitābhā-i'imrānī* (ca. 1496) and *kütüb-igebrī* (ca. 1518). "Imrānī" is a relative adjective from "Imran" who was, according to the Quran: the father of Mary. "Gebri" is a relative adjective from Persian "geb(i)r" initially denoting one of the Zoroastrian Magi, and by extension the pagans.

³¹ Several Slavic texts and manuscripts were and still are preserved in the Palace Library. See G. A. Deissman, *Forschungen und Funde im Serai*, 97–101.

³² The latest monograph on Mara Branković which lists all the known sources about her is M. St. Popović, *Mara Branković-Eine Frau zwischen dem christlichen und dem islamischen Kulturkreis im 15. Jahrhundert*, Weisbaden 2010. The book was translated to Serbian, as M. St. Popović, *Mara Branković*, Beograd 2014.

presence at the Ottoman court, raises questions about her “first language,” given that her father was a Serbian despot and her mother of noble Greek origin. We know that most of the extant letters she dictated to her secretary were written in Slavic/Cyrillic. She also issued a few legally-binding documents in Slavic and in Greek.³³ The legal authority of these documents was founded on the authority of the documents in Turkish issued by the sultanic chancellery (of Mehmed II). Mara also cooperated with interpreters and was known for her diverse activities during the reign of Mehmed II. However, the literature does not suggest that her presence, or that of any other Slav, had any significant influence on the contemporary intellectual currents. In summary, a model Christian intellectual affiliated with the Ottoman court could be imagined based on historiography as a Greek, but not as a Slavic speaker.

How Slavs/Serbs at the Ottoman court perceived the changes brought forth by the Ottoman language regime is another question that has not been widely explored. The role of Slavic/*Serbian* and its speakers in the early Ottoman Empire is frequently explained by acknowledging that Slavic served as a diplomatic language of the Ottoman Porte, persisting at least until the mid-16th century. This assertion finds ample support in existing documentary evidence.³⁴ Nevertheless, the same evidence testifies that, in producing official documents in Slavic, the Ottoman chancellery relied mainly on the individuals who already knew Slavic as either their mother tongue or a second language. Although the literature does not explicitly focus on the “accuracy” and style of the Ottoman-Slavic diplomatic correspondence, the overall impression is that the competence required for its production was rather high, and stylistic features can be traced back to various local chancelleries and the pre-Ottoman period. In what follows, I suggest that the three handbooks for learning Slavic/*Serbian* cannot be automatically connected with the function of Slavic as a diplomatic language, as previously assumed.

³³ R. Ćuk, “Povelja carice Mare manastirima Hilandaru i Svetom Pavlu”, *Istorijski časopis* 24 (1977) 103–116, and, M. St. Popović, *Mara Branković*, 220.

³⁴ Slavic/*Serbian* as diplomatic language in the Ottoman Empire has been on the scholarly agenda for a while now. N. Isailović & A. Krstić, “Serbian Language and Cyrillic Script as a Means of Diplomatic Literacy in South Eastern Europe in 15th and 16th Centuries”, in: *Literacy Experiences concerning Medieval and Early Modern Transylvania*, Cluj-Napoca 2015, 185–196; L. Nakaš, “Portina slavenska kancelarija i njen utjecaj na pisare u prvom stoljeću osmanske uprave u Bosni”, *Forum Bosnae* 74–75 (2016) 269–297; T. Lutovac-Kaznovac, *Jezik pisama turskih sultana Dubrovniku* (Doctoral dissertation, Univerzitet u Kragujevcu, 2019); V. Polomac, *Srpski kao diplomatski jezik u XV i XVI veku: filološki pristup*, Kragujevac 2023.

Serbian among the Languages of the World

The publication of the inventory of books from the Palace Library revealed that the three handbooks involving *Serbian* were part of a larger project resulting in the production of a dozen of multilingual handbooks, with *Ayasofya 4750* being the only one analyzed in detail. Even a superficial examination of the titles of the inventoried codices makes it clear that Turkish served as a significant intermediary language for learning other languages.³⁵ This finding challenges arguments suggesting that Turkish was considered inferior to Arabic and/or Persian, or that “Meḥmed II” had an *unusual* interest in languages other than Turkish. On the contrary, it shows that during the reigns of Meḥmed II and Bāyezīd II, written Turkish evolved as both a symbolic resource and a means of written communication.³⁶

The Slavic portions of the three multilingual handbooks represent the only known sources of instructional material for *Serbian* as taught at the Ottoman court. Drawing an analogy with Greek language instruction can be informative. While we know (based on the texts produced in the Ottoman chancellery) that learning Greek in the Palace school occasionally resulted in mediocrity, with grammatical and other mistakes, we do not know what, if anything, was translated by the usage of Greek as a second/learned language beyond this correspondence. Unlike the Greek case, we lack precise knowledge of the methods and tools used for teaching and learning written Slavic *anywhere* during the late medieval period and after. The two *Ayasofya* codices have been presented in the literature as rare, if not the only, textual evidence that Slavic may have been taught and learned at the Ottoman court. Based on the structure of these codices, it is clear that *some* Slavic speakers could achieve *some* competence in Arabic (and perhaps Persian) by memorizing the provided dialogues, while non-Slavic speakers could use them to acquire *some* spoken Slavic. Understanding the intended use and the individuals behind this knowledge, I argue, requires us to set aside questions related to diplomacy and translation.

A self-referential part of the text found in two *Ayasofya* manuscripts states that beginners were the target audience for this manual:

³⁵ F. Csirkés, “Turkish/Turkic Books of Poetry, Turkish and Persian Lexicography: The Politics of Language under Bayezid II”, in: *Treasures of Knowledge*, 698.

³⁶ See C. Kafadar, “Between Amasya and Istanbul: Bayezid II, His Librarian, and the Textual Turn of the Late Fifteenth Century”, in: *Treasures of Knowledge*, 79–155.

The composer of this book of useful speech, which renders the tongues of beginners free from impediment, said: understand it, work on it, and remember it so you, with God's permission, become eloquent.³⁷

The paragraph provides a clue about the method of learning, which involved memorization (“by heart”). The origin and authorship of the Arabic template used in this manual remain unknown. The term “useful speech” likely refers to the informal nature of the language material, which was based on everyday speech-acts and organized in the form of questions and answers along a loose narrative line. Another excerpt provides a clue about the linguistic universe within which the template was originally composed, directly linking polyglottism involving Arabic and Persian to the concept of *adab*:³⁸

Come, let's speak Arabic, for the tutor (*mu'addib*) forbade us to speak Khwarezmian, and indeed we had forgotten Arabic and Persian, and we limited ourselves to Kurdish and Turkic. We will do that by the help of God the Almighty.³⁹

Based on this, we can suppose that the Arabic template probably originated in an environment wherein Arabic and Persian held the status of literary languages.⁴⁰ It was perhaps created as a tool for learning these languages by a community of speakers of Khwarezmian, an original, Middle Iranian language of Khwarezm, which had been ruled by ethnic Turks since the 11th century. These speakers were also exposed to Kurdish, and/or a Turkic language. The model tutor appeared to have had a negative attitude towards spoken Khwarezmian but a neutral attitude towards spoken Kurdish and Turkic. Khwarezmian fell into disuse by the end of the 14th century, having been superseded by (Eastern) Turkic. This fact very tentatively places the model

³⁷ *Ayasofya 4750*, f2a; W. Lehfeldt, *Eine Sprachlehre von der Hohen Pforte*, 76.

³⁸ *Adab* is a concept which has roots in pre-Islamic, Arabophone culture when it designated “a habit, a practical norm of conduct, with the double connotation of being praiseworthy and being inherited from one's ancestors.” With time and with spread of Islam and development of its intellectual tradition it evolved to mean “the civility, courtesy, refinement” attributable to, for example, urbanity, or to designate the “etiquette” which goes with a behavior/practice or a profession. It developed parallel with two other broad concepts and ideals of *ilm* (knowledge) and *dīn* (religion). See, F. Gabrieli, “Adab”, in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Second Edition, consulted online on 19 July 2021.

³⁹ *Ayasofya 4750*, f. 10b-f. 11a, W. Lehfeldt, *Eine Sprachlehre von der HohenPforte*, 93–94.

⁴⁰ As Lehfeldt also notes, on f.39b of *Ayasofya 4750* there appears a Persian verse as an integral part of the Arabic template text. In *4750* this verse is only translated to Greek, and not to Serbian. The same verse is on f. 32a of *4749* and it is translated to Greek in somewhat different way, and to Serbian. This perhaps indicates that *4749* was produced later than *4750*.

mu'addib's attitude to Khwarezm between the 1000s and 1300s.⁴¹ However, the negative attitude towards Khwarezmian does not align with the fifteenth-century Ottoman context.⁴² The phrase “we have forgotten Arabic and Persian,” in any interpretation, also seems out of place in the fifteenth-century Ottoman court.

Evidently, *Serbian* and Greek translations from Arabic were added by the Ottomans in the 15th century to an existing, older textbook that may have been bilingual (Arabic/Persian). This older manual was created in a different language regime.⁴³ This method of translating templates from Arabic (and somewhat later, Persian) to the languages of learners was not invented by Ottoman instructors of the 15th century; they continued a well-established practice of earlier Arabographers who produced language learning handbooks using this method. While we cannot provide a proof, it is conceivable that the template used in the *Ayasofya* manual was, at some point, translated into Khwarezmian, Kurdish or a Turkic language. The key question here is what made this particular template suitable for teaching Arabic (and Persian) to Slavic and Greek speakers, and vice versa.

One particularly popular template in the fifteenth-century Ottoman context was *Muqaddimatu'l-adab*, composed by one of the most famous Khwarezmians—al-Zamaḥṣarī (d.1144).⁴⁴ This work is often described in the

⁴¹ D. N. MacKenzie, “Chorasmia III. The Chorasmian Language,” in: *Encyclopædia Iranica*, consulted online on 18 March 2020. Modern Turcology also operates with the concept of Khwarezmian Turkic, which is classified among Turkic languages as East Middle Turkic, used in the 13th and 14th centuries in the Golden Horde, and a preliminary stage of Chagatay (15th to 16th centuries Timurid realm).

⁴² One can, however, place a remark that the author of the text had his own idea of what Khwarezmian was, but whatever the case, the author of Arabic template fashions himself as part of a community which was familiar with the language, a community which can hardly be imagined to have existed in the fifteenth-century Ottoman state.

⁴³ The differences between the Arabic texts in the two *Ayasofya* codices are minor and rare. Some stem from copyist(s) omissions or unnecessary additions, but sometimes there occur small differences in grammatical form which however do not impact the meaning. Overall impression is that both texts were copied from a third one but not without thinking. It is also obvious that a person was checking and correcting the Arabic of *Ayasofya* 4750 after it was copied. The differences between Persian parts are of similar kind, can be explained by mistakes or small interventions like changing pronouns from *you* to *yourself*, missing or adding the particles (*ke*, *be*), etc. As noted before, a detailed philological analysis of these and other handbooks produced at the same time is still a desideratum.

⁴⁴ A suspected native speaker of Khwarezmian in retreat, al-Zamaḥṣarī was a towering figure in the field of *tafsīr* (Quranic exegesis) and Arabic linguistics. C. H. M. Versteegh, “al-Zamaḥṣarī,” in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*, consulted online on 20 March 2020. Slavist Nicolina Trunte expands on the above quoted paragraph to conclude that the production of the quadrilingual textbooks was somehow informed by al-Zamaḥṣarī's *Muqaddimatu'l-adab*

literature as Arabic/Persian “dictionary,” but this label can be misleading, not only due to the modern connotations of the term. *Muqaddima* was primarily composed by selecting Arabic texts for the study of Arabic by speakers of other languages.⁴⁵ The extant sources contain glosses in Persian, Khwarezmian, Eastern Turkic, and Mongol. The Ottomans had access to the translation of *Muqaddima* into Persian (*al-luġa ’l-fārisiyya*) and most likely translated it to Turkish (*al-luġa ’t-turkiyya*) and Latin/Italianate (*al-luġa ’l-afranġiyya*), but not into Slavic and Greek.⁴⁶ Embracing al-Zamaḥṣarī’s work, Ottomans were not necessarily embracing his ideas about various languages, for he was a renowned champion of Arabic and one of the last vocal opponents of linguistic *šū ’ūbiyya*—an intellectual tradition advocating for the (absolute) equality between Persian (and to a lesser extent other languages) and Arabic within the category of the “language of Islam.”⁴⁷ By the 15th century, the debate was long over, and Islam as adopted by ethnic Turks relied on both Arabic and Persian, with the latter coming in both highly stylized and in simpler registers.⁴⁸ Modern scholarship, however, has often attributed to early Ottomans anxieties about Turkish as a language not worthy of being considered a proper language of Islam or as a language of literature that lacked a long tradition. As previously

without providing any internal textual evidence. Useful from the perspective of the references it uses, the article is rather confusing in argumentation. The author, for example, claims that one Slavic informant originated from “south-Macedonia” contrary to the way Lehfeldt profiled him, and that he was affiliated with the Bogomil sect. N. Trunte, “Maḥmūd Zamaḥṣarī bei den Südslaven? Eine Spurensuche in der Sprachlehre von der Hohen Pforte”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 167/2 (2017) 363–380.

⁴⁵ Other languages which could have been included by al-Zamaḥṣarī himself were, according to Zeki Velidi Togan, Persian, Khwarezmian (Middle Iranian), and Eastern Turkic (spoken in Khwarezm). Kurdish (a Western Iranian language), mentioned in our quadrilingual manual, but not by Togan, perhaps, could also be part of this group, but no extant source of the combination exists. Z. V. Togan, “Zimaḥṣerī’nin Doġu Türkçesiyle Muḳaddimetü’l Edeb’i”, *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 14 (1965) 81–92.

⁴⁶ G. Necipoġlu, “The Spatial Organization of Knowledge”, 54. See also F. Csirkés, “Turkish/Turkic Books of Poetry”, and MS Török F. 59/f. 145a and *passim* for all lexicographical and grammatical works involving Arabic, Persian and Turkish and combinations with other languages.

⁴⁷ L. Richter-Bernburg, “Linguistic *Shū ’ūbiyya* and Early Neo-Persian Prose”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94/1 (1974) 55–64. R. P. Mottahedeh, “The *Shū ’ūbiyyah* Controversy and the Social History of Early Islamic Iran”, *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 7/2 (1976) 161–182, esp. 179.

⁴⁸ How various registers of written Arabic were approached and received by non-native Ottoman producers/users of Arabic texts is to my knowledge a blind spot in the literature. Useful remarks on different registers of Persian sufiesque literature, as received by the Ottomans can be found in C. Kafadar & A. Karamustafa, “Books on Sufism, Lives of Saints, Ethics and Sermons”, in: *Treasures of Knowledge*, 439–453, esp. 444–445.

suggested, the concerns of the producers of language-learning handbooks were of a different nature.

The linguistic information contained in the *Muqaddima* and its derivatives is primarily lexicographical, with minor excursions into morphology. As such, it was not particularly helpful for understanding syntax. Artificially created dialogues as language instruction tools were, to the best of my knowledge, very rare in Islamic traditions, at least before the late 15th century.⁴⁹ If this was indeed the case, the producers of the quadrilingual conversational manual had to invest significant effort in finding an Arabic template capable of introducing the syntax of Arabic to beginners, and when translated, the syntax of *Serbian* and Greek. Therefore, if the project of creating the three handbooks received special attention, it is reasonable to assume that it was guided by distinctive ideas about the languages involved, their relationships, and their place in the Ottoman plurilingual configurations.

Those involved in the translation of Arabic text to Greek and *Serbian* were, of course, already familiar with Arabic. The presence of Greek words in the *Serbian* text serves to remind us of the historical interconnectedness of the two languages prior to the Ottoman conquest and the prestige enjoyed by Greek in contrast to written (Old) Church Slavic and its late-medieval regional recensions.⁵⁰ The *Serbian* translation was evidently recorded as it was heard from or pronounced by informants.⁵¹ By the time the manuals were composed (not earlier than 1444 and not later than 1481), the practice of educating ethnic Slavs (slaves and/or voluntary converts) in an Ottoman manner which commonly included instruction in Arabic, was well-established. However, whether this practice was limited to young Slavic men recruited through the *kul/devshirme* system, the specific details of this practice, and what constituted the “Ottoman way of education” in this period of time, remain open questions.⁵² In any case, at least two different anonymous individuals

⁴⁹ Based on the literature related to the language learning in the Islamicate world in the 15th century and before, it is not easy to conclude how exceptional was the employment of conversational type of language learning manuals.

⁵⁰ When the translator to Serbian reaches out for Greek words (e.g. *qalamār* – pen case, ar. *dawāt*) the Arabographic solutions are the same in the Greek and Serbian text.

⁵¹ Even the name Muḥammad (Prophet) is recorded “by ear” rather than transliterated/copied. When read “in Serbian,” “Muḥammad” becomes Muhamed. See f. 1b, line 12 in 4749, and line 16 in 4750.

⁵² Normally by “Ottoman educational system” the introductions to Ottoman history mean the system of *medreses* (colleges of various ranks and programs whose students could be young men who already possessed the literacy skills acquired in *mektebs*, the elementary schools). Alternative options for education also existed, most notably in Sufi lodges (*tekkes*) or within the elite households organized by analogy to the most prominent of all, the sultanic Palace. Strangely or not, “what was the oldest Ottoman *medrese* founded in South-Slavia” is not a

who knew both Arabic and Slavic can be postulated as contributors to the manual, with one of them possibly also having the knowledge of Persian. This is based on the dialectical differences between the two translations that are clearly reflected in orthography. The consistency in dialectical features across both *Serbian* versions suggests that the informants involved were native speakers of Slavic.⁵³ The translation of Arabic lines into *Serbian* was clearly a collaborative endeavor. As already noted, the orthography was carefully crafted to accommodate Slavic phonology, resulting in a fairly consistent system. With the guidance of a teacher, this textbook could provide students with enough knowledge to engage in basic day-to-day conversations through short, simple utterances.

Publishing the critical edition of *Ayasofya 4750*, Lehfeldt neglected the parts of *Ayasofya 4749* that were added to the quadrilingual manual (on folios 1b-52b).⁵⁴ This material indicates that those involved in the project indeed intended to teach some basic Greek to those who knew Arabic and Persian. This instruction included writing in the Greek script. When looking at *Ayasofya* codices only, it might seem that Greek was better supported in terms of material for instruction compared to Serbian. However, an examination of the contents of the 300 plus folios of *Or.oct.33* reveals that these three codices, and probably, all others produced around the same time, complemented each other in providing a comprehensive language learning program.

question a student of Ottoman history can answer automatically. Even when South-Slavia gets replaced by say, Europe, or the Balkans, the feeling is the same. Speaking of South-Slavia, good candidates are *medreses* founded during the reign of Murād II, according to the most cited survey of Ottoman *medreses* in general. See C. Baltacı, *XV-XVI asırlar Osmanlı medreseleri: teşkilât, tarih*, İstanbul 1976, 141–142 and 259–260.

⁵³ One can only guess how much weight the compilers or the informers attributed to the dialectical differences and if so for what reason. What can be safely concluded is that two texts clearly reflect efforts to fix and improve the orthography and clarity in the first place. If one is to judge by *Serbian* parts only, it is very hard to say which of the texts was “better.” The lexical and syntactic solutions are identical and it is beyond doubt that one of the texts was produced with insight into and knowledge of the other.

⁵⁴ The rest of the *Ayasofya 4749* comprises the following: 53b–61b: Persian-Greek translations of various forms of verbs, starting with infinitives (ar. *al-Maṣādir*), through tenses and participles. Each verbal form is illustrated with the examples of the same ten Persian verbs translated to Greek (*dānestan*, “to know”, being the first); 62b: Arabic-Greek translation of the 19 terms related to logic; 63b–66a: Arabic-Greek translation of some 50 plus logical terms from *Eisagogue* including several examples of sentences; 67b: Translation to Greek of various verbal forms of the Arabic verb *naṣara* (as of 71a: a list of various verbs given in first person singular); 71b Arabic-Greek translation of declined pronouns; 72a: A note about “talking in the language of Greeks” (*kalāmu fī luḡati 'l-Yunāniyyīn*) illustrated by three examples of conjugated verbs; 73a: Pronouns, Greek-Persian; 73b–101a: Exercises in Greek pronunciation and writing containing series of syllables; 101a–Greek Alphabet, a table.

The orthographic solutions found in *Or.oct.33* are consistent with those in the *Ayasofya* codices. The compilers of this manuscript covered Greek and Slavic grammar, writing, and pronunciation in the same manner and to the same extent. The teaching method employed in this manual was also based on the methods developed within the tradition of teaching Arabic as a second language. Whether all three handbooks had *anything* to do with the Byzantine style instruction material I cannot say. A closer examination of the grammatically most extensive section within *Or.oct.33* titled *Kitābu'l-Mulḥaqāti Bi-Dānestan* (Appendices to *Dānestan*, hereafter: *Al-Mulḥaqāt*), sheds light on how Persian and Arabic served as mediators for instructing *Serbian* (and Greek).⁵⁵ The logic of the approach was above all linguistic and pragmatic and not based on any cultural or religious connotations associated with respective languages: Arabic provided the grammatical terminology for explaining *Serbian* and Greek grammatical forms, but it was Persian that could provide the cognate verbal forms.

According to historians of Ottoman lexicography, *Dānestan* is an alternative title for a Persian-Turkish dictionary/grammar book composed before the end of the 14th century—*Tuḥfatu'l-Hādīya* (Gift of the Rod) by Muḥammad b. Ḥaḡḡī Ilyās. The *Tuḥfa* originally included an introduction that explained how children who acquired some knowledge in Arabic often became interested in speaking Persian, leading the author to compose a book focused on morphology which was divided into two parts. The first part consists of a list of Persian infinitives (the first being *dānestan*, hence the alternative title) translated into Turkish, as well as examples of conjugated verbs, while the second presents a list of nouns organized in four thematic groups (the nouns related to sky and earth, human organs, occupations, and animals). The ways in which *Tuḥfa* was received, shows that subsequent users were not always

⁵⁵ *Al-Mulḥaqāt Bi-Dānestan*, Or.oct.33, 2b–113a. This part contains: 2b–14a: Introduction in Arabic; in Persian-Greek-Serbian [Al-Fārisiyyatu—Al-Rūmiyyatu—Al-Sarfiyyatu]: 14b–24b: The infinitives—223 Persian verbs glossed with Greek and Serbian equivalents; 24b–66b: Various verbal forms derived from the infinitive. Each form is illustrated by minimum 2 to 4 examples. All 223 verbs are given only for the third person singular of the future tense; 67a–100b: Nouns; 100b–107a: Noun-Pronoun; Pre/Postposition-Noun; 107a: Grammatical explanations of suffixal pronouns; 109a–113a: Numbers. The rest of the manuscript contains: 114b–119a: Numbers in Arabic, Greek (al-Rūmiyya), and Serbian (al-Sarfiyya); 120b–140b: “Decrees of the Sages”—Text in Greek. Transliteration in Arabic script of the Greek text. Translation of the Greek text to Arabic; 141b–234b: The story of the King Croesus; 235b–283b: Exercises in writing and pronunciation—Series of Serbian syllables written in Cyrillic script; 284a: Serbian Letters—A table with Cyrillic Alphabet; 285a–299a: Exercises in writing and pronunciation—Series of Latin syllables written in Latin script; 300b–343a: Exercises in writing and pronunciation—Series of Greek syllables written in Greek script; 343b: Greek Alphabet—A table with Greek Alphabet.

concerned with preserving Ḥaḡḡī Ilyās’s authorial work—besides ignoring its original title, they often omitted the introduction, and appended new (groups of) words.⁵⁶ The concept, however, was preserved, and by the time *Or.oct.33* was composed, apparently understood as applicable to any language. From all we know, *Muqaddima*, *Tuḥfa* and similar works were meant to be memorized by heart, by a beginner. What a beginner would do further with these words is less clear. Seen together with *Ayasofya* manuals, however, *Al-Mulḥaqāt* as a tool for learning *Serbian* can be viewed as a source of meanings to be incorporated into Slavic syntactic structures found there. If this was the case, the range of day-to-day situations which could be addressed in *Serbian* would significantly expand, the level of sentence structure remaining the same. Besides multiple verbal forms, an unusual addition to the common forms of “*Dānestan*” is a section on pronouns found in *Al-Mulḥaqāt*. From the perspective of Greek, the title can also be seen as communicating with the section on Greek verbs from *Ayasofya* 4749 since the ten infinitives used there are also the first ten infinitives in the long list of infinitives (Greek and *Serbian*) provided in *Or. oct.33*.⁵⁷ Significant is also a series of Arabic grammatical descriptions of verbal forms non-existent in Arabic. Whether this terminology was developed in earlier descriptions of Persian or devised for this particular occasion I cannot say at the moment.

Various recensions of *Muqaddima*, *Tuḥfa* and other similar works, can be studied in search of insights into expectations from and tried methods for teaching beginners (of whatever age) in a multilingual context. Observed together, they also tell us something about the grammatical (and ideological) levels at which Arabographic literacy was inclusive, flexible, and fluid. In the Ottoman multilingual context, it seems, the syntax remained, first and foremost, the “Arabic” science for Arabic language instruction.⁵⁸ The fluidity

⁵⁶ For introduction to the original *Tuḥfa* and other information about extant manuscripts, see Y. Öz, *Tarih boyunca Farsça-Türkçe sözlükler* (Doctoral dissertation, Ankara Üniversitesi, 1996) 142–146; For a text which is in many ways similar (but not identical) to *Al-Mulḥaqāt* in terms of selection of words (both verbs and nouns) and possibly of close date of copy, see Ş. Kalsın & M. Kaplan, “*Müellifi Meçhul Bir Lugat: Haza Kitab-iLugat-i Dānisten*”, *Turkish studies* 4/4 (2009) 555–598; For other recensions of *Tuḥfatu’l-Hādīya* see: UB Leiden-MS Cod.Or.1028; UB Leiden-MS Cod.Or.167; BNF-MS Supplement Turc 296 (ff. 1b–17b), and BNF-MS Supplement Turc 453.

⁵⁷ See fn.55.

⁵⁸ For about ten works written in Arabic which qualify as “grammatical descriptions of Turkic” (including Western Oğuz), see R. Ermers, *Arabic Grammars of Turkic: The Arabic Linguistic Model Applied to Foreign Languages and Translation of ‘Abū Ḥayyān Al-‘Andalusī’s Kitāb Al-‘Idrāk Li-Lisān Al-‘Atrāk*, Leiden, 1999, 16–43. Although the locations of the extant copies show that Ottomans did know about these “Arabic grammars of Turkic,” it seems that they were not widely used in the areas where Turkish was spoken by substantial parts of the population. It is

and inclusivity were obviously encouraged, based on this type of handbooks at least, at the level of basic structures and daily conversations. Yet, while copies and recensions of *Muqaddima* and *Tuhfa* covering Arabic, Persian, and Turkish, were made centuries after, *Al-Mulḥaqāt* involving *Serbian* was a product of the 15th century, which remained confined within the walls of the Palace.

If the Greek and *Serbian* received, in *Or.oct.33*, similar treatment in terms of grammar, the non-grammatical material and coherent texts provided for exercise/illustrations are exclusively in Greek (translated into/from Arabic). The stronger interest in Greek displayed in *Or.oct.33*. and *Ayasofya 4749* may be attributed to a stronger interest in originally Greek knowledge. Strong is thus the impression, based on these materials, that Slavic written culture did not enjoy a similar level of attention as Greek one did (but see below for how the relationship between the two was understood by an author of *Or.oct.33*). The Greek materials within these codices testify that the texts used were adaptations made primarily by having in mind the linguistic instruction, but also the *adab*. Whether their preparation was informed by past translation achievements or future ambitions aimed at translating Greek knowledge, cannot be concluded with certainty. Their contents are, however, illustrative of the educational environment in which the multilingual codices were probably used. Two parts of *Ayasofya 4749* are dedicated to Arabic-Greek translation of the terms related to logic. Within Arabographia, (Porphyry's) *Eisagogue* (ar. *Īsāghūḡī*) quoted as a source in the handbook, was the standard introduction to logic, though in the version authored by Aṭīr ad-Dīn al-Abharī (d. 1265), which was studied in the early phases of the Ottoman *medrese*-based education. The Ottoman palace slaves (the *kapıkulu*) were also taught logic, probably in the early phases of their education. A Turkish work on logic explicitly targeting this group was dedicated to sultan Bāyezīd II.⁵⁹ This work uses colloquial Turkish to explain and organize the Arabic logical terminology, and illustrates a possible way in which Turkish as a language actively spoken at the court was used in all kinds of instructional situations, whether recorded in a textbook or not. The *Story of (King) Croesus* from *Or.oct.33*. (in Greek translated to Arabic) was adapted, rather than taken over from an original Greek source. The text contains a line

also of importance to note that there are grammatical works designated as Turkish translations of Arabic grammatical works, but this part of Ottoman translation activities is known from catalogues of manuscripts only. If, at all, there were grammars of Turkish produced in Turkish in the early modern period, they did not circulate widely.

⁵⁹ K. El-Rouayheb, "Books on Logic (mantıq) and Dialectics (jadal)", in: *Treasures of Knowledge*, 891; 895. El-Rouayheb also quotes a critical edition of this work, titled *Zübdetül-beyân* (The Cream of Exposition), see H. Kızılcırdak, *Lâdikli Mehmet Çelebi'nin Türkçe "Zübdetü'l-Beyân" Adlı Mantık Eseri Üzerine Bir İnceleme*. MA Thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2010.

which clearly points to the overlapping temporalities and linguistic adaptations. It reads:

In Asia there was a king whose name is Croesus and who was a Lydian. He was the king of all the people who live around the (Halys) River which is known in this era, in Turkish language, as *Kızılca Irmak*.⁶⁰

All of the above considerations have been made based on the instrumental parts of the codices, namely those that were actually used for the instruction in the classroom-like environments. It is in *Or.oct.33*, however, that the voice of an anonymous author, or rather one of the producers, can be heard. The Introduction to *Al-Mulḥaqāt* written in Arabic explains what motivated the composition of the book.⁶¹ It starts with a *bismillāh*, a praise of God, somewhat extended expression of *ṣahāda*, and a praise of Prophet Muḥammad and his family. The God-praising parts of the introductions to various genres of Ottoman literary works tend to be adjusted to the theme—if the work is related to language study it is common for the writers to emphasize God as the agent who endowed humans with the faculty of speech. When Arabic is involved, these introductions note that Arabic, of all the languages, was chosen by God as a language of revelation, i.e. *the Book*—Quran.⁶² In this particular case, God is depicted as the agent who made the tongues of all created things (ar. *elsinatu'l-anām*) speak in his praise and glorification and the one who enlightened the hearts of Muslims (ar. *ahlu'l-Islām*) testifying to his sanctity and applying themselves to the (solitary) study and observance of the commands and prohibitions of their religion. God is also the one who endows a Muslim with the very wish to pursue the means for examination/study of the signs (ar. *āyāt*) of his Oneness (ar. *tawḥīd*).⁶³ Overall, the praise

⁶⁰ “Kāna (...) fi arḍi'l-Āsiyyā malikun ismuhu Kṛīsus wa cinsuhu Liḍiyyun. Hādā malika camī'a'l-umami allatī min nahri Āliūs alladī huwa mašhūrun fi hādīhi'l-'aṣri bi'l-lisāni't-Turkī Kızılça Irmak”, *Or.oct.33*, ff. 141b–142b.

⁶¹ *Or.oct.33*, ff2b–14a.

⁶² Introduction to *Muqaddimatu'l Adab* reads: “Al-ḥamdu li-llāh alladī faḍḍala 'alā camī'i'l-alsinati lisāna'l-'Ārab kamā faḍḍala'l-kitāba'l-manzūla bihi 'alā sāriri'l-kutubi...,” see National Library Ankara-MS B-46 (a copy from 1389 with interlinear glosses in Persian). Introductions to Persian/Turkish dictionaries only rarely make notes related to Arabic (as the language of revelation, or any other possibility). For a number of examples see, Öz, *Tarih boyunca*. In these cases, therefore, there is no particular emphasis on Arabic. Though one would need more examples, it is tempting to suggest that, in general, the “prestige” of Arabic was not looming so large over instances of linguistic meta-genres involving other languages.

⁶³ “Bi-smi-l'lahi rahmāni rahīm. Al-ḥamdu li'lāh alladī antaqa elsinata'l-anāmi bi-tasbīḥihi wa taḥmīdihī wa aṭbaqa af'idata ehli'l-islām bi-nūri taqḍīsīhi wa tafīdihī wa raffaqaḥum bi-ni'matihī li-raġbatin fi asbābi-(i)ṭtilā'i'alā āyāti tawḥīdihī li-yanḍurū fi iḥtilāfi'l-aṣāri wa yastadillū bihā 'alā aḥadiyyati'l-mu'attiri wa yaṣtaġilū fi taḥmīdihī,” *Or.oct.33*, f2 b.

part of the Introduction, sets the tone for the main part of the work which starts with an exposition in which the author emphasizes that the study of the various linguistic forms (ar. *ibārāt*, *alfāz*, *iṣṭilāḥāt*—expressions, words, terms) is what a human needs in order to attain knowledge of the things existent, the very existence of which testifies to the existence of God. Supporting his claims by a Quranic verse,⁶⁴ the author notes that all useful knowledge (ar. *favā'id*) cannot be attained by being acquainted with one language only, i.e. that there is no harm in discovering the meanings of words in different languages. Then he proceeds by informing that sultan Mehmed II was the one who ordered the collection and translation of “the words non-Arabic” and by explaining the way in which the task was handled. Here he claims that one of the steps was to supply books of various “groups” (ar. *firaḳ*) in their own languages.⁶⁵ As seen from above, the producers of the manuals could have had books in Greek and Slavic at their disposal, and this note can be viewed as more than a mere tribute to the established tradition in producing Arabographic language-learning tools.⁶⁶ Why informants, who were definitely helping, were not mentioned is an issue we can only speculate about.

The Introduction then continues with a “Prelude” (ar. *al-muqaddima*) divided into two parts (ar. *iṣārātayn*), in which the author expounds on the histories of Greek and *Serbian* languages by intertwining the histories of respective speech communities with the histories of their writing systems. He starts the first part by explaining the kind of knowledge on which his book was based. The knowledge pertained to “the letters of Romans” (ar. *beyānu ḥurūfi'r-Rūm*) and to “what is related to the pronunciation of its [Greek] expressions” (ar. *mā yata 'allaqu bi-talaffuḍi 'ibārātihā*). He continues by informing that it was a well known fact that most of the letters then (i.e. in the 15th century) used for writing the language of the *Rūm* (Romans/Byzantines) were the same as the letters used for writing the old language of *Yunān* (Ancient Greeks). He further relates that, at some point, the *Rūm* (Romans/Latins) left their ancient

⁶⁴ “And of his signs is the creation of heavens and the earth and the diversity of your languages and your colors. Indeed in that are the signs for those of knowledge,” Quran 30: 22.

⁶⁵ “Uḥḍira bi-himamihi kutubu'l-firaḳi'l-muḥtalifati fī lisānihā,” *Or.oct.33*, f5 b.

⁶⁶ The introductions to various forms of Arabographic dictionaries are often accompanied with notes about the sources of the corpus. When Arabic is a source language, these are by the rule respectable texts, the Quran being in the first place. Of many examples one can quote the Arabic/Persian dictionary dedicated to infinitives titled *Tāj al-Maṣādir* (the Primary Source) in which its author, Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Bayhaḳī (d. 1150) writes that he isolated the infinitives he defines in Persian, first and foremost from the text of the Quran (since there can be no rhetoric without it: *lā balāgāta illā wa minhu*), then from *hadīṭ* collections, collections of Arabic poetry etc., paying special attention to those that may present some difficulties in understanding. Hādī 'Ālim'zādah, ed., *Abū Ja'far Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Bayhaḳī: Tāj al-Maṣādir*, Tihrān 1987, 2 (130).

land (which was ruled by Franks/*Faranğ* then, in the 15th century) to settle in the lands of *Yunān*. This they did with their famous emperor Constantine. Coming to the land of *Yunān* they mixed with the local population to the point that one could not know which of them was *Rūmīyy* (Greek/Byzantine) and which was *Faranğīyy* (Frank/Latin). The *Rūm* (Romans/Latins) opted to speak the language of *Yunān* (Greeks) but kept adding to it the words which did not originally belong to this language. So, for the sake of recording the language of *the commoners of Rome* (ar. *luğatu 'awāmi 'r-Rūm*) a number of letters had to be added to the alphabet used for recording the language of *the elite of Rome* (ar. *ḥawāṣṣihim*), which was similar to the language of *the (Ancient) Greeks* (ar. *luğatu 'l-Yunāni 'l-Qadīmati*). The core of the alphabet used for this (elite) language consisted of twenty letters, according to the author, which are “simple” and the pronunciation of which corresponds to the pronunciation of the certain letters of Arabic (listed under their Arabic names). The rest of part one is dedicated to technicalities of pronunciation of Greek letters (especially the “compound” ones historically added based on the commoners’ idiom) as recorded by the use of the Arabic script. In the second part, the same themes are addressed in relation to “the letters of Serbs” (ar. *ḥurūfu 's-Sarf*). In relation to the history of *Serbian* we learn that this language was a relative (ar. *qarībatun*) of the old language of the *Yunān* (Greeks). To the extent that the language preserved its connection to its older Greek predecessor, *Serbian* could be represented by the letters used for this language. Over time, additions were made, and at the time of writing, the total number of *Serbian* letters amounted to twenty-seven. The rest of the section is dedicated to the pronunciation of the orthographic solutions for *Serbian*.

Thus, if we were to judge by the Introduction, the informed author, and by extension, sultan Mehmed II, seem to have thought, relying on the authority of the Quran, that every language of the world was a legitimate medium through which a *Muslim* could testify to the oneness of God, and manifest the knowledge of God, his creation and his commands. Nevertheless, the vocabulary employed throughout the manuals can hardly be described as being dominated by terms and ideas related to religion. The primary goal of the handbooks, I would argue, was to prepare *Muslim learners* for *everyday communication* in languages “non-Arabic.”⁶⁷ The attitudes expressed in the introduction can also be seen as an act of duty, an obligation towards tradition,

⁶⁷ Lehfeldt detects in *Ayasofya 4750* some 40 words related to religion and rituals translated to Serbian from Arabic. *Mesc(ğ)id* (place of worship) is, for example, translated as “crkva” (church). *Furqān* (ar.lit. which distinguishes truth from error, also a name for the Quran) is the only word that was left untranslated. W. Lehfeldt, “Zur serbokroatischen Übersetzung arabisch-islamischer Termini in einem Text des 15./16. Jahrhunderts”, *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 7/1–2

and as a justification of the attention paid to “non-Arabic” languages, by—first of all, speakers of Turkish. Thus, the whole compendium, rhetorically and practically, was oriented towards learning “non-Arabic” languages—after Arabic, the language of Islam *par excellence*, by Muslim individuals who already knew Turkish. The author, informed of the changes in the history of the two languages, allowed the possibility that *spoken* Greek and Slavic/Serbian (as written by the Ottomans) could be/become “languages of Muslims.” The silence of the author about Persian (and Turkish) indicates that he was not concerned with any sort of a comprehensive outline of hierarchical relations among languages he engaged with, whether these relations would have religious connotations or not. The implied hierarchies are not to be searched in the Introduction only, but also in the way in which the instrumental parts of the handbooks were structured. Here, the logic is historical and linguistic/grammatical. Including the extant, but unstudied manuals for learning *al-afranġiyya* (Latin/Italianate) into discussion would certainly help understand the supposed hierarchies better. Remembering Caferoġlu and Raby, however, one can go beyond the texts discussed here and ask which of these languages, if any, were indeed considered “foreign,” the “languages of the sultans’ subjects,” or the foreign languages of sultans’ subjects, and which were simply considered Ottoman and/or “imperial.” As represented in the three handbooks, the *spoken* Greek and Slavic/Serbian which had just entered a new (albeit short) chapter of their history, appear as solid candidates for the last category.

As for the profile of the target-learners, based on what we know, the pages and (young) women of various ethnic origins freshly entering the Palace as *kapuġulları* could have been both literate and illiterate. Literate could be those individuals who learned to read and/or write in their mother tongue prior to being recruited to the palace, as well as the persons illiterate in their mother tongues, but who, after being enslaved, learned to write while learning second language/s (Arabic, Persian, and/or Turkish) in some other household before being transferred to the Palace. Illiterate were the persons who did not learn to read and/or write in their mother tongue, nor in a second language before being recruited directly to the Palace. The variety of these models further complicates the ways in which the handbooks could have been used, but it can be safely said that they could equip any learner with knowledge sufficient for basic and simple everyday communication, no more and no less than that. Unfortunately, the textbooks provide no clues about the written texts the users were supposed

(1969–70) 28–43; Several words and phrases from the list of nouns in *Or.oct.33* can also be considered as belonging to religious discourse, most notably the names of the five daily prayers.

to produce after learning the languages in question nor about the links between model learners' linguistic and professional profiles.

Conclusion

A fresh reading of *Ayasofya* codices, together with *Or.oct.33*, informed by recent scholarly findings, reveals several important insights about the original context in which the three handbooks were produced. For one, the handbooks were part of an ambitious project aimed at providing tools for learning a series of languages used by Muslims of various ethnic origins gathered around Mehmed II's court. The group of languages represented in the three handbooks is just one combination among those found in the larger group of manuscripts that are yet to be investigated. Secondly, while the production of the *Serbian* sections involved native speakers of Slavic, the teaching method employed was rooted in the long tradition of teaching Arabic as a second language. Thirdly, the composers were well aware that the histories of language/s were not static; their functions adjusted according to shifting extra-linguistic circumstances. By devising systematic orthographic solutions for recording spoken *Serbian* in the Arabic script, they were perhaps conceiving a new chapter in its history as a written language of the Ottoman Empire.

Created within a relatively short period of time, the extant multilingual textbooks seem to have addressed a newly perceived, immediate need which could not be satisfied by the resources available in the second half of the 15th century. The clear boundedness of the usage of these manuscripts in time and space, specifically the fact that they did not seem to instigate any endeavors that would enhance the initially set base, suggest to me that the whole project was part of an intense discussion of how the multilingualism of the late 15th century should or could have been managed. The project was abandoned in its starting phase, and Slavic did not gain the status of a language the learning of which was accompanied by developing academic interest. The question of the status of Slavic/*Serbian* in the Ottoman Empire, however, remains open from the perspective of historical language ideology, and its investigation should not be limited to either these handbooks or references to the function of Slavic as an Ottoman diplomatic language. Finally, focusing on one language or differentiating between Islamicate and non-Islamicate, or Western and non-Western (Eastern) languages, provides a poor starting point for a thorough understanding of the ideas that informed not only this project, but the "Ottoman" literacy/language regime in general.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Unpublished Primary Sources

- Bibliothèque nationale de France MS *Supplement Turc* 296
Bibliothèque nationale de France MS *Supplement Turc* 453
National Library Ankara MS B-46
Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin MS *Or.oct.33*
Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi MS *Ayasofya* 4750
Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi MS *Ayasofya* 4749
Universiteits bibliotheek Leiden MS *Cod.Or.1028*
Universiteits bibliotheek Leiden MS *Cod.Or.167*

Published Primary Sources

- Konstantin Filozof, *Povest o slovima. Žitije despota Stefana Lazarevića*, ed. G. Jovanović, Beograd 1989.
Abū Ja‘far Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Bayhaqī, Tāj al-Masādir, ed. H. ‘Ālim’zādah, Tih-rān 1987.

Secondary Works

- Ahlwardt, W., *Verzeichnis der Arabischen Handschriften: Sechster Band*, Berlin 1894.
Baltacı, C., *XV-XVI asırlar Osmanlı medreseleri: teşkilât, tarih*, İstanbul 1976.
Caferoğlu, A., *Note sur un manuscrit en langue serbe de la bibliothèque d’Ayasofya*, *Revue internationale des études balkaniques* 1/3(1936) 185–90.
Costa, J., *Introduction: Regimes of language and the social, hierarchized organization of ideologies*, *Language and Communication* 66 (2019) 1–5.
Coulmas, F., *Guardians of Language: Twenty Voices Through History*, Oxford 2016.
Csirkés, F., “Turkish/Turkic Books of Poetry, Turkish and Persian Lexicography: The Politics of Language under Bayezid II”, in: *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3–1503/4)*, G. Necipoğlu, C. Kafadar & C. H. Fleischer, eds., Leiden 2019, 673–733.
Deissmann, G. A., *Forschungen und Funde im Serai: mit einem Verzeichnis der nichtislamischen Handschriften im Topkapu Serai zu Istanbul*, Berlin, Leipzig, 1933.
El-Rouayheb, K., “Books on Logic (mantıq) and Dialectics (jadal)”, in: *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3–1503/4)*, G. Necipoğlu, C. Kafadar & C. H. Fleischer, eds., Leiden 2019, 891–906.

- Ermers, R., *Arabic Grammars of Turkic: The Arabic Linguistic Model Applied to Foreign Languages and Translation of 'Abū Ḥayyān Al-'Andalusī's Kitāb Al-'Idrāk Li-Lisān Al-'Atrāk*, Leiden 1999.
- Gabrieli, F., "Adab", in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Second Edition, consulted online on 19 July 2021.
- Isailović, N. & A. Krstić, "Serbian Language and Cyrillic Script as a Means of Diplomatic Literacy in South Eastern Europe in 15th and 16th Centuries", in: *Literacy Experiences concerning Medieval and Early Modern Transylvania*, Cluj-Napoca 2015, 185–196.
- Jacobs, E., "Mehemmed II., der Eroberer, seine Beziehungen zur Renaissance und seine Büchersammlung", *Oriens* 2 (1949) 6–29.
- Kafadar, C. and A. Karamustafa, "Books on Sufism, Lives of Saints, Ethics and Sermons", in: *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3–1503/4)*, G. Necipoğlu, C. Kafadar & C. H. Fleischer, eds., Leiden 2019, 439–453.
- Kafadar, C., "Between Amasya and Istanbul: Bayezid II, His Librarian, and the Textual Turn of the Late Fifteenth Century", in: *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3–1503/4)*, G. Necipoğlu, C. Kafadar & C. H. Fleischer, eds., Leiden 2019, 79–155.
- Kalsın, Ş. and M. Kaplan, "Müellifi Meçhul Bir Lugat: Haza Kitab-i Lugat-i Dānisten", *Turkish studies* 4/4 (Summer 2009) 555–598.
- Kızılcırdak, H., *Lādikli Mehmet Çelebi'nin Türkçe "Zübdetü'l-Beyān" Adlı Mantık Eseri Üzerine Bir İnceleme* (MA Thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2010)
- Lehfeld W., *Eine Sprachlehre von der Hohen Pforte: Ein arabisch-persisch-griechisch-serbisches Gesprächslehrbuch vom Hofe des Sultans aus dem 15. Jahrhundert als Quelle für die Geschichte der serbischen Sprache*, Cologne; Vienna 1989.
- Lehfeldt, W., *Ein arabisch-persisch-griechisch-serbokroatisches Sprachlehrbuch in arabischer Schrift aus dem 15./16. Jahrhundert*, Bochum 1970.
- Lehfeldt, W., "Zur serbokroatischen Übersetzung arabisch-islamischer Termini in einem Text des 15./16. Jahrhunderts", *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 7/1–2 (1969–70) 28–43.
- MacKenzie, D. N., "Chorasnia III. The Chorasmian Language," in: *Encyclopædia Iranica*, consulted online on 18 March 2020.
- Mišević, M., *Writing Slavic in the Arabic Script: Literacy and Multilingualism in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Doctorical dissertation, Harvard University, 2022)
- Mottahedeh, R. P., "The Shu'ubiyah Controversy and the Social History of Early Islamic Iran", *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 7/2 (Apr., 1976) 161–182.
- Nakaš, L., "Portina slavenska kancelarija i njen utjecaj na pisare u prvom stoljeću osmanske uprave u Bosni", *Forum Bosnae* 74–75 (2016) 269–297.
- Necipoğlu, G., C. Kafadar & C. H. Fleischer, eds., *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3–1503/4)*, Leiden 2019.

- Necipoğlu, G., “The Spatial Organization of Knowledge in the Ottoman Palace Library: An Encyclopedic Collection and Its Inventory”, in: *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3–1503/4)*, G. Necipoğlu, C. Kafadar & C. H. Fleischer, eds., Leiden 2019, 1–79.
- Necipoğlu, G., “Visual Cosmopolitanism and Creative Translation: Artistic Conversations with Renaissance Italy in Mehmed II’s Constantinople”, *Muqarnas* 29 (2012) 1–81.
- Öz, Y., *Tarih boyunca Farsça-Türkçe sözlükler* (Doctorical disertation, Ankara Üniversitesi, 1996)
- Patrinelis, C., “Mehmed II the Conqueror and His Presumed Knowledge of Greek and Latin”, *Viator* 2 (1971) 349–354.
- Raby, J., “Mehmed the Conqueror’s Greek Scriptorium”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 37 (1983) 15–34.
- Richter-Bernburg, L., “Linguistic Shu’ūbiya and Early Neo-Persian Prose”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94/1 (1974) 55–64.
- Togan, Z. V., “Zimahşerî’nin Doğu Türkçesiyle Muḳaddimetü’l Edeb’i”, *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 14 (1965) 81–92.
- Trunte, N., “Maḥmūd Zamaḥşarī bei den Südslaven? Eine Spurensuche in der Sprachlehre von der Hohen Pforte”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 167/2 (2017) 363–380.
- Versteegh, C. H. M., “al-Zamaḥsharī,” in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Second Edition, consulted online on 20 March 2020.
- Vryonis, S., “Byzantine Constantinople and Ottoman Istanbul: Evolution in a Millennial Iconography”, in: *The Ottoman City and Its Parts*, New Rochelle/NY, 13–52.
- Лутовац-Казновац, Т., *Језик писама турских султана Дубровнику* (Докторска дисертација, Универзитет у Крагујевцу, 2019) [Lutovac-Kaznovac, T., *Jezik pisama turskih sultana Dubrovniku* (Doctorical disertation, Univerzitet u Kragujevcu, 2019)]
- Маринковић, М., “Српски језик у османском царству: пример четворојезичног уџбеника за учење страних језика из библиотеке султана Махмуда I”, *Славистика* 14 (2010) 280–298. [Marinković, M., “Srpski jezik u osmanskom carstvu: primer četvorjezičnog udžbenika za učenje stranih jezika iz biblioteke sultana Mahmuda I”, *Slavistika* 14 (2010) 280–298.]
- Поломац, В., *Српски као дипломатски језик у и веку: филолошки приступ*, Крагујевац, 2023. [Polomac, V., *Srpski kao diplomatski jezik u XV I XVI veku: filološki pristup*, Крагујевац, 2023]
- Поповић, М. Ст., *Мара Бранковић*, Београд 2014. [Popović, M. St., *Mara Branković*, Београд 2014]
- Ћук, Р., “Повеља царице Маре манастирима Хиландару и Светом Павлу”, *Историјски часопис* 24 (1977) 103–116. [Ćuk, R., “Povelja carice Mare manastirima Hilandar u Svetom Pavlu”, *Istorijski časopis* 24 (1977) 103–116]

Маријана Мишевић

**КАКО И ЗАШТО СЕ СЛОВЕНСКИ УЧИО НА ОСМАНСКОМ
ДВОРУ? УВИДИ ИЗ ПРОЈЕКТА ИЗ 15. ВЕКА ПОСВЕЋЕНИХ
УЧЕЊУ ЈЕЗИКА СВЕТА**

Резиме

Проучавање оригиналног контекста у којима су настала три рукописа у фокусу овог рада (MSs Süleymaniye *Ayasofya* 4749 и *Ayasofya* 4750; MS SB Berlin *Or. oct.* 33) корисно је за разматрање језичке идеологије као феномена који није искључиво савремен, већ и историјски. Јаснији закључци о идејама које су, у овом случају, османски интелектуалци и елита имали о словенском/*српском* и другим језицима, тек треба да се изводе. Овај рад међутим сугерише да чињеницу да је на османском двору у другој половини 15. века постојала идеја о учењу, пре свега, *говорног српског* не треба искључиво доводити у везу са словенским/*српским* као дипломатским језиком који је Порта користила из прагматичних потреба, већ са идејом састављача да је *српски* језик света, односно царства чије су територије наслеђене (пре него поробљене), баш као што је био случај са грчким. Та идеја је била кратког века, ако је судити по сачуваним изворима, а пројекат подучавања *српског* на османском двору је остао у почетној фази. Разлоге за краткорочност ове идеје тек треба проучити са становишта историјске језичке идеологије, и то имајући у виду да је словенски функционисао као дипломатски језик релативно дуго након што су уџбеници састављени, али не дуже од краја 16. века, као и чињеницу да је демографска база говорног словенског језика на Балканском полуострву под османском управом увек била јака.

Оригиналан научни рад

Примљен: 30.3.2023.

Коначно прихваћен за објављивање: 19.9.2023.