The Sultan's Syllabus Revisited: Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Madrasa Libraries and the Question of Canonization

A. Tunç Şen

Department of History, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA
ats2171@columbia.edu

Abstract

This study revisits the question of the early modern Ottoman madrasa curriculum, which, ever since the famous *Studia Islamica* article of Nenad Filipovic and the late Shahab Ahmed in 2004, has come to be recognized as the "sultan's syllabus," implying a strict imposition of a centrally-designed course of study. By utilizing a host of endowment lists, book registers, and autobiographical writings of high- to low-ranking Ottoman scholars from the sixteenth century that escaped Ahmed's and Filipovic's attention, I aim to redress an argument that was based on a misinterpretation of a single document but has been extensively cited and recycled since its first articulation almost two decades ago. All of these sources, some of which have never or only partially received scholarly attention, shed more accurate light, not only on the scope of learning, teaching, and canon formation in the early modern Ottoman world of scholarship but also on the mediating role the Ottoman court played by supplying copies of books wherever and whenever needed.

Keywords

Résumé

Cette étude revient sur la question du programme d'études des madrasas ottomanes du début de l'ère moderne qui, depuis le célèbre article de Nenad Filipovic et de feu

Shahab Ahmed dans *Studia Islamica* en 2004, a été reconnu comme le « programme du sultan », ce qui implique l'imposition stricte d'un programme d'études conçu de manière centralisée. En utilisant un grand nombre de listes de dotations, de registres de livres et d'écrits autobiographiques d'érudits ottomans du xvie siècle, de haut en bas de l'échelle, qui ont échappé à l'attention d'Ahmed et de Filipovic, je vise à redresser un argument qui était fondé sur une mauvaise interprétation d'un seul document, mais qui a été abondamment cité et recyclé depuis sa première articulation il y a presque vingt ans. Toutes ces sources, dont certaines n'ont jamais ou que partiellement reçu l'attention des chercheurs, jettent une lumière plus précise, non seulement sur la portée de l'apprentissage, de l'enseignement et de la formation des canons dans le monde ottoman de l'érudition au début de l'époque moderne, mais aussi sur le rôle de médiateur joué par la cour ottomane en fournissant des copies de livres partout et à tout moment.

Mots-clés

Bibliothèque – Empire ottoman – canon – curriculum – madrasa – ulémas – Ṣaḥn-ı Şemān – Süleymaniye

Which disciplines and books did students study in early modern Ottoman madrasas? Much scholarly ink has been spilled, overwhelmingly in Turkish, on the question of the curricula taught at early modern Ottoman colleges. The books commonly cited in encyclopedic works and biographical or first-person narratives of madrasa-affiliated individuals from the sixteenth through the early nineteenth centuries have been culled to identify the scholarly canon for a range of fields, from Arabic grammar and rhetoric to Islamic jurisprudence (*fiqh*) and Quran commentary (*tafsīr*).[1] Eventually, the gate of *ijtihad*

---

1   Later publications usually repeat the information covered in the following studies: İsmail H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devletinin İlmiye Teşkilâtı*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1965, 19-31, 39-43; Câhid Baltacı, *XV-XVI. Asırlar Osmanlı Medreseleri: Teşkilât: Tarih*, İstanbul: İrfan Matbaası, 1976, 35-43; Mustafa Bilge, *İlk Osmanlı Medreseleri*, İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1984, 40-63; Cevad İzgi, *Osmanlı Medreselerinde İlim*, v. 1,

was closed in 2004 with an article published by Nenad Filipovic and the late Shahab Ahmed, who introduced a curious document from the rich Ottoman archives to Anglophone academia. Unlike their predecessors in the Turkish academy who had only briefly noted the document in their work, Ahmed and Filipovic went much further and interpreted it as the "first known documentation in Islamic history of a move by the state to establish a canon of religious learning."[2]

This one-page document composed in the Hijri year 973 (1565 or 1566) was a short register of books, similar examples of which are also located in the Ottoman archives. The document registers thirty-nine titles in fifty-five volumes delivered to the professors of the imperial madrasas (*medāris-i khāqāniye*), which the authors took as the Süleymaniye madrasas.[3] In the original, a single sentence preceding the listed titles reads: *Medāris-i ḫāḳāniyeye lāzım olub fermān-ı pādişāhī ile müderris efendilere virilen kitāblarıñ beyānıdır.* Ahmed and Filipovic translate this as "*the list of the books required for the imperial medreses, given to the Müderris Efendis* [*teachers*] *in accordance with the decree of the Padishah.*" The unknown compiler of the document recorded the book titles in an abridged format, referring either to the famed author's name, such as *al-Bukhārī* (d. 256/870), or to the renowned part of the full title, like the *Kashshāf*. He made no attempt to systematically classify the books according to their respective scholarly disciplines. Still, one can draw from the list four major clusters representing four of the mainstream disciplines taught in the madrasas at the time. Among the thirty-nine titles listed in the register, twelve are Quran commentary, twelve relate to hadith, and a further twelve deal with Islamic jurisprudence, including both legal theory (*uṣūl al-fiqh*) and substantive law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*). The remaining three titles are Arabic dictionaries. Intriguingly, there is not a single work related to the other standard

---

İstanbul: İz, 1997, 62-116; Fahri Unan, "Bir Âlimin Hayat Hikâyesi ve Klâsik Osmanlı Eğitim Sistemi Üzerine," *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi* vol. 8 (1997): 365-391. The list of books in Bilge was made available to English-speaking audiences in the following study: Francis Robinson, "Ottomans-Safavids-Mughals: Shared Knowledge and Connective Systems," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 8, no. 2 (1997): 151-184, at 174-177. For a useful review of studies devoted to the canonized works in Ottoman scholastic tradition, see Şükran Fazlıoğlu, "Osmanlı Medrese Müfredatına Dair Çalışmalar: Nereden Nereye?" *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* VI/12 (2008): 593-609.

2   Shahab Ahmed and Nenad Filipovic, "The Sultan's Syllabus: A Curriculum for the Ottoman Imperial Medreses Prescribed in a Fermān of Qānūnī I Süleymān, Dated 973 (1565)," *Studia Islamica*, no. 98/99 (2004): 183-218, at 186-187. The document was cited in Baltacı, xiii, and Bilge, 63.

3   The new catalog number of the document is TSMA (Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Arşivi) E 546/40. Since the document contains no reference to the day and month, the solar year corresponding to 973 might also be 1566.

disciplines inculcated in madrasas, such as logic (*manṭiq*), disputation (*ādāb al-baḥth*), theology (*kalām*), dialectic (*jadal*), rhetoric (*ma'ānī*), or those branches of the mathematical sciences known to have been taught, albeit only by certain instructors, such as *handasa* (geometry) or *hay'a* (astronomical theory). For Ahmed and Filipovic, however, the absence of books in these areas should come neither as a surprise nor as a contradiction, given their contention that the highest-ranking imperial madrasas loosely cited in the register (*medāris-i khāqāniye*) were devoted only to specialized training in law, hadith, and Quran commentary.[4] Drawing solely on this document, then, the authors made the assertion, uncritically endorsed and widely recycled in Anglophone academia, that the Ottoman state laid down an imperial madrasa curriculum in order to create new generations of ulama who would embody its official Hanafi affiliation.

Attractive as this argument may be, several issues remain unresolved in the interpretation of this single-sheet document as if it were created to dictate a definitive list of books that the professors of the high-ranking imperial madrasas were required to teach. Aside from the inadequately addressed question of the absence of titles from other disciplines, why, for instance, did some of those same titles allegedly "dictated" by the imperial center not feature at all in the sixteenth-century imperial madrasa library catalogs and endowment deeds, which I will discuss in detail below, or in the surviving book collections of early modern madrasa scholars and students?[5] How did the register, which allegedly sought to impose a "unified" imperial curriculum in a modern sense, come to prescribe books and authors with discernibly diverging doctrinal orientations? Or if, as has been claimed, the sheikhulislam Ebū's-su'ūd Efendi (d. 982/1574), chief of the learned profession since 1545 and a close companion to the sultan, played a decisive role in reforming the education program and promulgating a definitive curriculum, what stopped him from adding some of his own essential texts to the list, such as his "hot off the press" Quran commentary for which the sultan was eagerly waiting many years and which soon became a favorite among scholars?[6]

---

4   Ahmed and Filipovic, 207.

5   The probate inventories of early modern madrasa students from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries reveal that only a small percentage of the titles listed in the 1565-1566 register feature in student collections. See İsmail Erünsal & Bilgin Aydın, "Tereke Kayıtlarına Göre Osmanlı Medrese Talebelerinin Okuduğu Kitaplar (XVII-XX. Yüzyıllar)," in *Osmanlı Medreseleri: Eğitim, Yönetim ve Finans*, eds. Fuat Aydın et al., İstanbul: Mahya, 2019, 93-120; Aydın Bilgin and Ekrem Tak, "XVII. Yüzyılda İstanbul Medreselerinde Okutulan Kitaplar (Tereke Kayıtları Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme)," *Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları/Journal of Language and Literature Studies* vol. 19, no. 19 (2019): 183-236.

6   For the impact of Ebū's-su'ūd's *tafsīr* compendium and Süleymān's personal interest in it, see Colin Imber, *Ebu's-su'ud: The Islamic Legal Tradition*, Stanford: Stanford University Press,

The point this article makes is a rather simple one: that the register Ahmed and Filipovic considered to be a "clear and detailed syllabus" had far less ambitious aims than imposing a curriculum. This single-page registry was, in fact, not unlike several other extant documents and registers from the period that mention or list books endowed by the sultans to the royal madrasas they founded or sent ad hoc from the palace to various places, including newly-constructed imperial madrasas, the chief physician's office, or even the observatory. None of these necessarily entailed a dynastic, or specifically sultanic, control over the teaching curriculum. Seen through the lens that these underused contemporary documents provide, it seems more plausible to argue that the register undergirding Ahmed and Filipovic's analysis was drafted with the mere aim of recording and filing the items sent from the royal library to the Süleymaniye madrasas, possibly to enhance the latter's book collection in the designated subject areas. This particular register, and similar other book lists drafted in different periods, no doubt reflect scholarly preferences and delineate "canonic" contours, but it would be misleading to take the further step and speak of a "syllabus" imposed top-down through these book inventories.

Here, I will reassess the question of the madrasa curriculum and its centrally planned character by utilizing a host of documents that escaped Ahmed's and Filipovic's attention, together with other relevant materials, including private correspondences and (auto-) biographical sketches of high- to low-profile scholars. All of these sources, some of which have never or only partially received scholarly attention, shed more accurate light, not only on the scope of learning, teaching, and canon formation in the early modern Ottoman world of scholarship but also on the mediating role the Ottoman court played by supplying copies of books wherever and whenever needed.

The Ottoman Learned Class in the Service of the Empire

Ahmed's and Filipovic's tendency to read the register as evidence *par excellence* of Ottoman imperial control over the teaching curriculum was not without

---

1997, 18; Susan Gunasti, "Political Patronage and the Writing of Qur'ān Commentaries Among the Ottoman Turks," *Journal of Islamic Studies* 24, no. 3 (2013): 335-357. A manuscript copied in the first half of the nineteenth-century presents information about different donations made to the Süleymaniye library during the reigns of different sultans. The first of these records concerns Süleymān's endowment and lists seventy-one volumes on Quran commentary. Of these volumes, at least ten (over 14%) are Ebū's-suʿūd's *tafsīr* treatise. See Süleymaniye Library Süleymaniye Collection Ms 1075. The facsimile of the first folio, from where I have retrieved this information on books in *tafsīr*, is published in Mehdin Çiftçi, "Süleymaniye Dârülhadisi (XVI-XVII. Asırlar)," Ph.D. Dissertation, Marmara University, 2012.

reason. It has been common knowledge among students of Ottoman history that, from the late fifteenth century, the Ottoman enterprise achieved to create and maintain an unprecedented bureaucratic scholarly system through strict measures concerning ulama training, recruitment, and mobility. The early modern Ottomans are considered to have gradually deprived the ulama class of the relative independence they had enjoyed under the rule of earlier or contemporary Muslim dynasties and turned them into mere scholar-bureaucrats. This allowed the state both to meet the empire's legal and pedagogic needs and to establish a firm structure for regulating the ranks, functions, and promotion patterns of individuals within the scholarly hierarchy. The famous law-code ascribed to Meḥmed II (r. 848-850/1444-1446, 855-886/1451-1481) that arranged, among other things, the ranks and salaries of officials, their appointment and promotion patterns, and even their designated places in palace protocol also contained specific articles regarding the ulama. Accordingly, the madrasas, particularly those in the Turkish-speaking core regions, were classified according to their instructors' daily salary, which ranged in the first half of the sixteenth century between 20 and 50 aspers.[7]

Before the foundation of the Süleymaniye complex in the 1550s that introduced to the learned establishment four new high-ranking madrasas with an additional *Dāru'l-ḥadīth* (devoted to the teaching of prophetic tradition) and *Dāru'ṭ-ṭibb* (medical school), the Eight Colleges (i.e., the *Ṣaḥn-ı Şemān* or *Medāris-i Şemāniye*) in the Fatih mosque complex established in the late 1460s stood as the most prestigious and highest-paying institutes of education across the empire. A fresh graduate from the *Ṣaḥn* or a peer institute, who held the status of *mülāzım* (candidate for an appointment), was immediately eligible to start serving in one of the lowest level provincial posts in the hierarchy as an instructor, judge, or jurist. For those who opted for the teaching track, upward mobility in the hierarchy was determined, not unlike today, by a combination of one's scholarly credentials and patronage networks. If a professor teaching at a lower level changed his professional track and instead became a judge, his next appointment would be to a provincial judgeship with a salary of 45 aspers; chances were slim, however, that he could later attain a prestigious position in the judiciary. For those who remained on the teaching track, the route was open all the way to the *Ṣaḥn* level, which stood as a "threshold" before attaining the highest positions of the chief military judges (*ḳāḍī'āsker* of Anatolia and Rumelia) and the sheikhulislam.[8]

---

7   Abdülkadir Özcan (ed.), *Ḳānunnâme-i Âl-i Osman: Tahlil ve Karşılaştırmalı Metin*, İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2003, 11.

8   This summary is based, in addition to Uzunçarşılı and Baltacı cited above, on R. C. Repp, *The Müfti of Istanbul: A Study in the Development of the Ottoman Learned Hierarchy*, London:

The evident aim of this routinized and rationalized dynastic control was to maintain a steady supply of judges, jurists, and instructors who were trained primarily in law and in other scholastic disciplines closely tied to judicial training. This enabled the state to fulfill legal and pedagogic roles and duties in the empire's core regions excluding, to a greater extent, the Arabic-speaking lands after their integration into the empire in the early sixteenth century. This level of operational ambition required regular interventions in allocating and distributing ranks and positions as well as in monitoring, if not always manipulating, the contents and conduct of teaching. From as early as the first quarter of the sixteenth century, there is evidence of imperial edicts and confidential reports drafted by dynastic agents to regulate the modus operandi in the ulama hierarchy. One such document submitted likely around the year 1512 in the wake of Selīm I's (r. 918-926/1512-1520) accession to the throne reports on the "tenure" and "promotion" reviews of sixty-three individuals. According to the anonymous reviewer, who was likely the chief military judge of Rumelia at the time, some of the promising young scholars, including Kemāl Paşazāde (d. 940/1534) who later became a towering figure of Ottoman intellectual life, deserved to be promoted to one of the colleges at the Ṣaḥn, thanks to their assiduousness and dutifulness. Some others, however, were to be demoted or pushed into retirement for failing to meet the expectations, due either to their inattentiveness or age-related physical challenges.[9]

Concerning measures implemented by the Ottoman state to draw the contours of teaching, an imperial decree drafted sometime between the late fifteenth and first half of the sixteenth century presents further intriguing details. There are four surviving copies of this legal document that circulated under slightly different titles, such as *Ḳānūnnāme-i Ehl-i ʿIlm* (the law book concerning the learned people) or *Ḳavānīn-i Ṭalebe-i ʿUlūm* (the laws and regulations about students). However, none of the extant copies is dated, and there is no scholarly consensus about the precise time of its composition.[10]

Oxford University, 1986; Mehdin Çiftçi, *Süleymaniye Dârülhadisi: XVI-XVII. Asırlar*, İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2013; Yasemin Beyazıt, *Osmanlı İlmiyye Mesleğinde İstihdam (XVI. Yüzyıl)*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2014; Abdurrahman Atçıl, *Scholars and Sultans in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. I borrowed the emphasis on the Ṣaḥn's function as a "threshold" from Atçıl's *Scholars and Sultans*.

9   TSMA D. 9802, also cited in Ercan Alan and Abdurrahman Atçıl (eds.), *XVI. yüzyıl Osmanlı Ulema Defterleri*, Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi, 2018, 63-67.

10   The facsimile of the document was published along with its transcription in the following work: Ahmet Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnâmeleri ve Hukukî Tahlilleri*, v. 4, İstanbul: Fey Vakfı Yayınları, 1992, 661-666. For a useful summary of different scholarly views about the document's dating, see Yasemin Beyazıt, "XVI. Yüzyıl Osmanlı İlmiye Kanûnnâmeleri ve Medrese Eğitimi," *Belleten*, LXXVIII, no. 283 (2014): 956-975. For a critical survey of how this legal code came to be understood as the "study program" of the Ottoman

Intriguingly, the document would have supported Ahmed's and Filipovic's argument but escaped their attention, although previous Turkish scholars made use of it. Some of these studies argued that the document must have been produced in the later years of Meḥmed II's reign when bureaucratic centralization and codification of laws were in full force. Others asserted, without offering additional evidence or justification, that it was possibly drafted by the sheikhulislam Ebū's-suʿūd during the reign of Süleymān (r. 1520-1566) and before the establishment of the Süleymaniye complex.

Regardless of its date of composition, the document is the most illustrative piece of evidence demonstrating how the Ottoman state intervened in the course of teaching. The document recommends that instructors observe, as a general principle, the established custom (ʿādet-i ḳadīme) in the way and order in which they have taught the esteemed (text)books (kütüb-i muʿtebere). One particular article in the document specifically sets certain titles as essential reading for different study levels. Accordingly, the highest-ranking professors (i.e., instructors at the rank of 50-akçe paying madrasas) were expected to teach the following works alongside other texts they chose (sāir iḫtiyār itdikleri kitāblar) from among reputed books:

1.   of legal theory (uṣūl al-fiqh), super commentary on ʿAḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī's (d. 756/1355) Sharḥ Mukhtaṣar al-Muntahā, also known as Sharḥ-i ʿAḍud,[11]

2.   of substantive law (furūʿ al-fiqh), the Ḥidāya of al-Marghinānī (d. 593/1197),

3.   of Quran commentary, the Kashshāf of al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1144).

Those professors standing a level below the highest rank were expected to teach books up to the Talwīḥ of al-Taftāzānī (d. 792/1390) in legal theory. All "junior" professors (ṣiġār-ı müderrisīn) below that level were to teach the commentary on Qāḍī Bayḍāwī's (d. 685/1286) Ṭawāliʿ in theology,[12] the commentary on al-Urmawī's (d. 682/1283) Maṭāliʿ in logic,[13] the Muṭawwal of al-Taftāzānī in rhetoric, and al-Sayyid al-Jurjānī's (d. 816/1413) super commentary on Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī's (d. 672/1274) Tajrīd in theology. In addition to these cited titles,

---

madrasas, see Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, "Fâtih Külliyesi Medreseleri Ne Değildi? Tarih Yazıcılığı Bakımından Tenkit ve Değerlendirme Denemesi," in İstanbul Armağanı: Fetih ve Fatih, v. 1, ed. Mustafa Armağan, İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi, 1995, 105-136.

11   ʿAḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī's commentary on Ibn al-Ḥājib's Mukhtaṣar had several famous glosses, including the one by al-Jurjānī and another by al-Taftāzānī. It is difficult to ascertain which particular Sharḥ-i ʿAḍud is mentioned here.

12   The Ṭawāliʿ al-anwār was a heavily glossed kalām treatise. One of the most popular of these glosses was the commentary by Shams al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī (d. 749/1349).

13   Sirāj al-Dīn al-Urmawī's treatise in logic, Maṭāliʿ al-anwār, had several widely circulated commentaries, such as those by al-Jurjānī and Quṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 766/1365).

all professors, irrespective of rank, were expected to teach Islamic jurisprudence (*mütūn-ı fıḳh*) to the extent permitted by their skills and time.[14]

This legal code is striking for several reasons. On one hand, by referring to established customs in the instruction of reputed books, the document acknowledges intellectual trends and "scholarly canons," and thus provides agency to individual instructors to conduct their teaching based on texts esteemed in scholarly circles. Yet, at the same time, by designating and promoting specific titles as required readings, the document also endows these books, which were already part of the scholarly canon, with the status of "imperial canon" officially ratified by the state. Such attempts to develop a centrally-designed imperial canon in the inherently decentralized world of manuscripts were, as Guy Burak has hinted, among the key features of Ottoman innovativeness in instituting and institutionalizing a learned hierarchy.[15] The law code in question also reveals that this hierarchy was maintained on an understanding that associated different levels of madrasas and their instructors with the study of specific disciplines and a designated corpus of texts.

In light of other sources shedding light on the learned hierarchy's inner workings, we know that an aspirant to the path of knowledge usually began his journey around the age of six or seven by memorizing the Quran and studying the rudiments of Arabic grammar. The next few years of his schooling were often devoted to advancing his Arabic grammar and syntax. This could have taken place either within his immediate family or in a local school that did not need to be part of the formal madrasa hierarchy. As the student obtained his fundamentals in these propaedeutic arts, he was ready to "move" (*ḥareket*) along different ranks of madrasas. First, he would attach himself to an instructor teaching at one of the outer twenty or twenty-five *akçe* paying madrasas, which contemporary sources often identified as the *Ḥāshiya-i Tajrīd* schools. This was a reference to al-Jurjānī's super commentary on al-Ṭūsī's theological treatise that formed a key part of the curricula, along with instruction on several other digested works (*mukhtaṣar*), at this particular level of madrasa. The next stop would be an instructor teaching at a madrasa of thirty or thirty-five, also known as the *Miftāḥ* schools with respect to the convention of studying the corpus of *Miftāḥ al-ʿulūm*, a text in rhetoric by al-Sakkākī (d. 626/1229) and its commentaries. The madrasas of the "outer" (*ḥariç*) forty and fifty stood as

---

14   Akgündüz, *Osmanlı Kanunnâmeleri ve Hukukî Tahlilleri*, v. 4, 663.

15   Guy Burak, "Reliable Books: Islamic Law, Canonization, and Manuscripts in the Ottoman Empire (Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries)," in *Canonical Texts and Scholarly Practices: A Global Comparative Approach*, ed. Anthony Grafton, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2016, 14-33. Also see chapter four in his *The Second Formation of Islamic Law: The Hanafi School in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

the final stations before qualifying to proceed to the "inner" (*dāḫil*) system that represented, to a certain extent, today's "graduate" level of education. The madrasas of forty were sometimes referred to as *Talwīḥ* schools due to their custom of teaching the *Talwīḥ* of al-Taftāzānī in legal theory. The outer fifty madrasas were those institutions established by viziers and members of the royal family (other than sultans) in İstanbul, Edirne, and Bursa. Once the student completed his training in the outer madrasas, he entered the "inner" (*dāḫil*) structure. First in the inner fifty madrasas and then in the *Ṣaḥn* schools (and later also the Süleymaniye), the student invested primarily in the study of law, hadith, and Quran commentary before his eventual "graduation."[16] As was the case in medieval Islamic learning, there was no official "diploma" granted to students by their "institutions." Students were considered to have completed studying a particular book or a corpus of texts only when their master "licensed" them. Certificates of transmission (*ijāza* or *temessük*) embodied the student's authorization by his master, but a surprisingly small number of such documents have survived from the early modern Ottoman scholarly landscape.[17]

While this was, in principle, the general division between the madrasas, the boundaries between the disciplines and texts taught at different ranks were less rigid in actual practice than assumed. As Madeline Zilfi had aptly noted, the course of study in the lower grades already "included a smattering of the

---

16   In addition to the works cited in fn. 8, see Cornell H. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Ali (1541-1600)*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986, 18-33 for a concise summary of the structure.

17   The *ijāza*s from the Ottoman context exemplified in the current literature are often dated from much later centuries. See for instance Hüseyin Atay, *Osmanlılarda Yüksek Din Eğitimi: Medrese Programları, İcazetnâmeler, Islahat Hareketleri*, İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 1983; Yaşar Sarıkaya, *Ebu Said el-Hâdimî: Merkez ile Taşra Arasında Bir Osmanlı Alimi*, İstanbul: Kitap, 2008.

It is not clear why the surviving *ijāza* records from earlier periods are rare, even though sixteenth-century scholars do recount that they received or gave written *ijāza*s. Tashköprīzāde, for instance, refers to the *ijāza*s, both oral and written, that he obtained from his teachers. The reason might just be a matter of preservation, but there is also a modern methodological fallacy that Ottoman examples of *ijāza*s are often sought as individual official documents. In fact, the majority of *ijāza* records and certificates of transmission we know today were located between the folios of the manuscripts copied and/or owned by those scholars who received the *ijāza*s. When the manuscript universe of early modern Ottoman scholars and students is thoroughly explored, more *ijāza* examples appended to texts will likely be located. For examples of *ijāza*s and certificates of transmissions located in manuscript copies and miscellaneous volumes, see, for instance, Georges Vajda, *Les certificats de lecture et de transmission dans les manuscrits arabes de la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris*, Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1956.

'highest sciences' for instructional purposes."[18] The same was also true for the instruction of texts in fields other than law, hadith, and Quran commentary by the highest-ranking professors. Tashkoprizāde Aḥmed Efendi's (d. 968/1561) detailed autobiographical narrative at the end of his famous biographical dictionary, for instance, documents how, during his more advanced years as a student, he also studied theoretical astronomy, theology, and dialectic alongside hadith and Quran commentary.[19] The full details of the disciplines and texts he claims to have studied are presented in Appendix 1, but I should also add here that his list was likely incomplete, since it does not give a single specific reference to a work in legal theory or substantive law, even though he cites several books in these two disciplines when discussing his long teaching career following his graduation. Still, this autobiographical fragment neatly illustrates a madrasa student's course of study in the first half of the sixteenth century and helps us recognize the flexibility and hybridity involved in the actual teaching experience.

One might raise here the standard question posed against intellectual and micro historians about the representative quality of Ṭashkoprīzāde's particular case. Narrative sources and autobiographical accounts penned by some other members of the sixteenth-century ulama establishment also indicate that while the overall conventions related to the orderly allocation of specific subjects to different levels of madrasas were principally observed, there was room for scrambling the standard order of instruction or for incorporating texts and disciplines other than those canonized or supposedly prescribed.[20] In other words, what earlier scholarship on the social history of learning in medieval Syria and Egypt has identified about the precedence of instructors' individual interests and affiliations was still relevant in the seemingly hyper-institutionalized Ottoman scholarly establishment where personal predilections and the intellectual attachments of individual instructors

---

18   Madeleine Zilfi, "The *İlmiye* Registers and the Ottoman *Medrese* System Prior to the Tanzimat," in *Contributions à l'histoire économique et sociale de l'Empire ottoman*, eds. by Jean-Louis Bacqué-Grammont and Paul Dumont, Leuven: Éditions Peeters, 1983, 315, cited in Ahmed and Filipovic, "The Sultan's Syllabus," 191.

19   Taşköprülüzâde Ahmed Efendi, *Eş-şakâ'iku'n-Nu'mâniyye fî ulemâi'd-devleti'l-osmâniyye: Osmanlı âlimleri: (çeviri, eleştirmeli metin)*, İstanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2019, 854.

20   *'ulūmu 'ale't-tertīb görmek* (studying the disciplines in an orderly fashion) is an expression not infrequently found in scholar petitions or biographical entries. One such example is a petition (TSMA E. 968/87) written by a student of ʿAlī al-Ṭūsī (d. 887/1482), explaining how he studied the sciences in order at the hands of his master before he obtained the *mülāzemet* status.

and students maintained their weight.[21] For example, the lengthy versified autobiographical story of a certain Pīr Muḥammad (d. after 964/1557), a graduate of the Ṣaḥn schools and a long-time "adjunct" faculty who moved from one provincial madrasa to another, verifies, on one hand, the standard order and contents of study, starting with the condensed textbooks (*mukhtaṣarāt*) in grammar, logic, theology, and jurisprudence, and culminating in the study of Quran commentary and hadith at the Ṣaḥn. Pīr Muḥammed's testimony, on the other hand, reveals that even in the advanced years of his graduate program, he still studied theology and rhetoric, the disciplines Ahmed and Filipovic tended to rule out of their "imperial madrasa curriculum."[22] A similar picture could be drawn from Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī's (d. 1008/1600) reminiscences of his madrasa years in his chronicle, where he acknowledges his occupation with the study of theology toward the end of his education at the Ṣaḥn level.[23] In the same vein, one of Ebū's-suʿūd's former students at the Ṣaḥn later reported that aside from the canonical works in Quran commentary, legal theory, or hadith, he also learned rhetoric and lexicology from him.[24]

A more intriguing case here is the study of astronomical theory, which Ṭashkoprīzāde recounts that he did at the feet of Mīrim Çelebi (d. 931/1525), a leading astral expert and reputed madrasa instructor who later attained one of the highest positions in the scholarly hierarchy. Instruction in celestial sciences, however, was far from being the norm, for not every student and instructor had the means or the willingness to study it or a cognate mathematical and natural/occult science. For example, in an anonymous petition delivered to the imperial court around the early sixteenth century, the author – a senior professor overwhelmed by his heavy teaching load at the Ṣaḥn level – mentions in passing that besides the standard madrasa disciplines, he had also studied astronomical theory (*ʿilm-i hey'e*), geometry (*ʿilm-i hendese*) and the art of using astronomical tools for celestial observation (*ālāt-ı raṣadiye*). The particularly striking point about this note is how he describes this detail: in his view, these three sciences, which he curiously identifies as occult sciences (*ʿulūm-ı ġarībe*), did not grasp any scholarly attention in Ottoman lands (*bu diyārda kimesne*

---

21   See Jonathan Berkey, *The Transmission of Knowledge in Medieval Cairo: A Social History of Islamic Education*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992; Michael Chamberlain, *Knowledge and Social Practice in Medieval Damascus, 1190-1350*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

22   Zaifi, *Kitab-ı Sergüzeşt-i Za'ifi*, ed. Mehmet Ali Üzümcü, Unpublished MA Thesis, Kocaeli University, 2008, 60-65.

23   Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual*, 29.

24   Imber, *Ebu's-su'ud*, 11-12.

meşġūl olmuş değildir).[25] His sharp observations about the dearth of scholarly interest in the study of celestial and mathematical sciences are further corroborated by surviving sixteenth-century inventories of the library at the *Ṣaḥn* colleges that contain only a few references to texts in astral sciences, among more than one thousand titles in other disciplines.

Madrasa Library Inventories

Two lengthy catalogs of books at the *Ṣaḥn* library prepared in the sixteenth century enable us to examine the composition of the book collection in the highest institute of education in the Ottoman capital. That the overwhelming majority of books came through Sultan Meḥmed II's donations for the curricular and pastime use of instructors and students at his royal college also allows us to rethink the question of dynastic or sultanic intervention in the madrasa curriculum. The latter of these two catalogs was completed on 21 Rābīʿ al-Ākhir 968 (9 January 1561) by Muḥammad b. Ḥiḍr al-Ḥājj Ḥasan, who was an instructor at one of the eight *Ṣaḥn* colleges. In the preamble of his 87-folio document, al-Ḥājj Ḥasan provides a useful summary of the previous cataloging efforts exerted by his predecessors. Accordingly, after Meḥmed II established his grand mosque complex and donated numerous books to the people at the *Ṣaḥn* schools (*waqqafahā ʿalā ahālī madārisihi al-Thamān*), other dignitaries also jumped on the bandwagon and endowed several volumes from their private collections, all of which eventually expanded the collection.[26] Officials were commissioned at different times to inspect the items in the collection and to prepare or revise the library catalog. One of these officials was a librarian named al-Ḥājj Muḥammad, whose catalog, presumably the first one of the *Ṣaḥn* library, has not survived. Another individual charged with the task was Şah Çelebi ibn al-Fanārī (d. *ca.* 925/1519), a professor at the *Ṣaḥn* colleges who descended from the scholarly pedigree of the Fanārī family. It is the catalog that he produced sometime in the early sixteenth century that we now have as the earliest at hand.[27]

---

25   TSMA E. 968/70.

26   TSMA D. 9559, 2b-3a. The Arabic preamble of the document was translated into English by İsmail E. Erünsal. See his "Catalogues and Cataloguing in the Ottoman Libraries," *Libri* vol. 37, no. 4 (1987): 333-349. In another work, Erünsal studied the inventory in more depth: *Osmanlı Vakıf Kütüphaneleri Tarihi Gelişimi ve Organizasyonu*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2008, 91-157.

27   The document is located in the Ottoman archives under catalog number D. HMH.SFTH. D. 21941-B. The Turkish preamble of the document, some parts of which are completely

During his inspection of the *Ṣaḥn* library, Şah Çelebi located 1241 volumes in total. Of these, Sultan Meḥmed II endowed 796 and the rest arrived through smaller endowments by various individuals, including such high-caliber scholars of the late fifteenth-century as Muṣannifak (d. 875/1470), who donated eighty-one books, and Khaṭībzāde (d. 901/1496), who bequeathed eighty books. The total number of volumes at the library before Şah Çelebi's inspection must have been slightly higher, as he notes that he could not locate fifty-seven books mentioned in the previous catalog (although he did newly identify fifteen items).[28] Şah Çelebi's inventory follows a two-layered classifying scheme, organizing the collections amassed through individual donations into separate clusters starting with Meḥmed II's endowment. Furthermore, in each cluster, books are divided into distinct subject headings, reflecting the knowledge hierarchy widely adopted at the time, reminiscent of the way madrasa hierarchy was structured. These subjects start with Quran commentary and move forward, in descending order, to hadith, legal theory (*uṣūl*), substantive law (*furūʿ*), theology (*kelām*), philosophy (*ḥikmet*), Arabic grammar, and logic (*manṭiq*). Where individual donor collections did not contain samples from each discipline, those disciplines are, by nature, not noted. An additional, final cluster labeled miscellaneous (*müteferriḳa*) includes "non-curricular" books in the fields of medicine, celestial sciences, and occult arts.

Except for the few items lost or stolen, the volumes listed in the first catalog feature in the second one, along with additional books that entered the collection through new donations that brought the total in the second catalog to about 1770 volumes. Al-Ḥājj Ḥasan retained the previous cataloging scheme by creating clusters for separate endowments and by classifying books in each cluster based on their corresponding disciplines. A noteworthy difference between these two catalogs was the latter's preference to assemble all the smaller individual endowments cited separately in the previous catalog under a single, mega cluster named "the old acquisitions" (*al-ilḥāqāt al-qadīma*). Aside from Meḥmed II's donations and these "old acquisitions," which altogether amount to 1412 volumes, two new collections contained books endowed by Ḥalebīzāde (d. before 968/1561) and Mawlānā Shayhzāde (d. 951/1544) from the sixteenth-century ulama establishment.[29] They donated 333 and 44

---

illegible, can be found in İsmail E. Erünsal, "Fatih Camii Kütüphanesi'nde Ait En Eski Müstakil Katalog," *Erdem*, vol. 9, no. 26 (1996): 659-665.

28   D. ʜᴍʜ.sꜰᴛʜ. D. 21941-B, 53b-55b.

29   In his biographical entry on Ḥalebīzāde, Tashkoprīzāde relates that this scholar from the reign of Süleymān decided to become a judge after his initial appointment to a low-level provincial madrasa. Tashkoprīzāde makes a special note of Ḥalebīzāde's bibliophilia and says that out of his love for books and reading them (*muṭālaʿahā*) day and night, he

books, respectively. Like the first inventory, al-Ḥājj Ḥasan's catalog provides as much codicological information as possible about each volume, including the number of folios, the kind and color of paper, the type of script, the quality of binding, and whether the copy has illustrations, charts, or missing pages. This level of precision in describing the physical aspects of codices could enable us to match the items registered in the *Ṣaḥn* catalog with the actual manuscripts extant in libraries today, especially in the Fatih collection of the Süleymaniye Library.

Aside from offering the exciting opportunity to reconstruct the sixteenth-century college library collection in İstanbul, these catalogs also allow us to reassess Ahmed's and Filipovic's overstated interpretation of the archival register as clear evidence of the imposition of a centrally-designed madrasa curriculum. If we are to interpret the archival document used in their analysis as an act of prescribing "the sultan's syllabus," how then shall we treat the *Ṣaḥn* library catalogs or similar endowment lists and book registers from the previous and contemporary eras that reveal the titles dispatched from the sultanic collection to royal madrasas? Were these documents also intended to dictate an "official" curriculum? If not, how do we distinguish among these different registers? On what basis would we conclude that one was compiled to prescribe the official curriculum, while the others merely recorded donations and deliveries? If, by contrast, we accept the imposition of a definitive curriculum, how then could we explain the considerable variation between the books cited in these lists?

Let us look more closely, for instance, at books in the field of Quran commentary, the supreme discipline in the knowledge hierarchy of madrasa scholasticism. The 1565-6 register lists twelve *tafsīr* works in seventeen volumes from twelve different authors. The *Ṣaḥn* library catalog prepared by al-Ḥājj Ḥasan in 1561 lists ninety-six volumes collected through Meḥmed II's donation, including different copies of the same titles. What we see, when we juxtapose the *tafsīr* works cited in the 1565-6 register with those ninety-six volumes available at the *Ṣaḥn* library as of 1561, is a partial overlap: the library contained copies of works by only six of the twelve authors. Al-Zamakhsharī and his *Kashshāf* unsurprisingly prevail in the library collection. Of the ninety-six volumes, thirty-three were from the *Kashshāf* corpus; eighteen contain al-Zamakhsharī's original text, either in full or part, and the remaining fifteen are commentaries and super commentaries, including the works by Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī (d. 711/1311) and Saʿd al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī that also

---

preferred a solitary life. Before his death, adds Tashkoprīzāde, he bequeathed all of his books to the *Ṣaḥn* instructors, which explains the presence of the 333 titles in the collection. See Taşköprülüzâde Ahmed Efendi, *Eş-şakâʾik*, 739.

appear in the 1565-6 register. The Ṣaḥn library also had eleven copies of the *Tafsīr* of Qāḍī Bayḍāwī, another book of Quran commentary widely acclaimed among scholars and students of the early modern Ottoman world. The other two *tafsīr* authors cited both in the 1565-6 register and the Ṣaḥn catalog are al-Qurṭubī (d. 671/1273) and al-Qāshānī (d. 730/1330). The remaining six *tafsīr* authors acknowledged in the 1565-6 register, however, are missing from the list of books endowed by the sultan to the community of scholars and students at the Ṣaḥn.[30]

More important than this halfway overlap, the Ṣaḥn catalog lists several other *tafsīr* works that were widely circulating among contemporary scholars but were unmentioned in the 1565-6 register. One obvious example is Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's (d. 606/1210) *Mafātiḥ al-ghayb*, also known as *al-Tafsīr al-kabīr*, whose prestige and popularity next to the *Kashshāf* of al-Zamakhsharī and the *Tafsīr* of Qāḍī Bayḍāwī is verified by other contemporary sources, such as the famous library inventory of the Ottoman palace produced in 1502-3 that notably put al-Rāzī's text at the top of its *tafsīr* canon.[31] Al-Jurjānī's commentary on the *Kashshāf*, which Tashkoprīzāde says he taught during his tenure at the Ṣaḥn from 1547 to 1551, is also noteworthy.[32] Besides the works of al-Rāzī and al-Jurjānī in the field of Quran commentary, the notable books abundantly available at the Ṣaḥn library by 1561 but missing in the 1565-6 register include the *Tafsīr* of Abū'l-Layth al-Samarqandī (d. 373/983), who, as a prominent early Hanafi jurist, was a respected name in Ottoman lands, the *Ma'ālim al-tanzīl* of al-Baghawī (d. 516/1122), the *Kashf al-Kashshāf* of al-Fārisī (d. 745/1344), the *Tabṣīrāt* of al-Kawāshī (d. 680/1281), and the *Kashf al-asrār* of Rashīd al-Dīn al-Maybūdī (d. after 520/1126).[33]

---

30 These six names include al-Jārabardī, al-Ṭībī, Mevlānā Ḥamza, al-Suyūṭī, al-Nasafī, and al-Iṣfahānī. See Ahmed and Filipovic, 197-199.

31 Mohsen Gouderzi, "Books on Exegesis (Tafsīr) and Qur'anic Readings (Qirā'āt): Inspiration, Intellect, and the Interpretation of Scripture in Post-Classical Islam," in *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4)*, eds. Gülru Necipoğlu, Cemal Kafadar, and Cornell H. Fleischer, Leiden: Brill, 2019, 267-308.

32 Taşköprülüzâde Ahmed Efendi, *Eş-şakâ'iku'n-Nu'mâniyye*, 860. In the epistle in which he offers a meticulous discussion of certain Quranic verses based on the *ḥāshiya*s of al-Zamakhsharī, Kınalızāde (d. 1572), the famous Ottoman scholar who held professorships at Ṣaḥn and Süleymaniye, lists al-Jurjānī's super commentary among those seven essential texts in the *Kashshāf* corpus that attained a high reputation in the Ottoman realm. The other six scholars he cites are al-Ṭībī, al-Fārisī, al-Jārabardī, al-Bahlawān, Quṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī, and al-Taftāzānī. See Walid A. Saleh, "The Gloss as Intellectual History: The *Ḥāshiyah*s on *al-Kashshāf*," *Oriens* 41 (2013): 217-259.

33 For the importance of Abū'l-Layth al-Samarqandī on Ottoman tafsīr tradition, see Gouderzi, "Books on Exegesis," 275-6 and Susan Gunasti, "Political Patronage and the Writing of Qur'ān Commentaries Among the Ottoman Turks." For the influence of al-Kawāshī and al-Baghawī, see Muhammed Abay, "Osmanlı Döneminde Yazılan Tefsir ile

If the number of copies at the *Ṣaḥn* library collection are taken as an index to measure contemporary recognition and usage of books by high-ranking madrasa professors, we can exemplify more cases in disciplines other than *tafsīr* that point to remarkable discrepancies between the *Ṣaḥn* library catalog of 1561 and the register of books dispatched from the palace in 1565-6. In the field of legal theory (*uṣūl al-fiqh*), for instance, the corpus of *al-Manār* by al-Nasafī (d. 710/1310) and the subsequent line of commentators was undoubtedly a favorite of Ottoman scholars and students. The corpus constituted twenty of the ninety-eight volumes in legal theory that Sultan Meḥmed II donated to the *Ṣaḥn*. Intriguingly, though, the 1565-6 register does not cite a single work associated with the *al-Manār* corpus.[34] In a similar vein, neither the Maliki jurist Ibn al-Ḥājib's widely circulating textbook *al-Mukhtaṣar* and its glosses, nor the *al-Mughnī* corpus by al-Khabbāzī (d. 691/1292),[35] of which the *Ṣaḥn* library had fourteen and thirteen copies, respectively, were listed in the register. When we move from legal theory to substantive law, the examples only multiply. While the *Ṣaḥn* library catalog contained copies of *Kitāb al-Muḥīṭ* by Burhān al-Dīn al-Bukhārī (d. 616/1219-1220), al-Sarakhsī's (d. 483/1090) *al-Mabsūṭ*, Ibn al-Sāʿātī's (d. 694/1295) *Majmaʿ al-Baḥrayn*, or the *Kitāb al-Wiqāya* of Burḥān al-Sharīʿa (d. 747/1346), none of these works appear in the register of 1565-6.[36]

One might raise an objection here based on the chronological gap between when Meḥmed II donated these books to the *Ṣaḥn* library and when the register in Filipovic's and Ahmed's analysis was compiled. In this light, the discrepancy of titles cited in different inventories might be attributed to the possibly changing "official" stances between the 1470s and the 1560s. However, this line of thinking requires further explanation of the different doctrinal positions these deviating titles represented, to the extent that they were once adopted but later abandoned in line with changing "imperial" priorities.

İlgili Eserler Bibliyografyası," *Divan İlmi Araştırmalar* vol. 2 (1999): 249-303, and also see the Süleymaniye Library Süleymaniye Collection Ms 1075 cited in fn. 6 above.

34   To give a better context to the significance of *al-Manār* in the early modern Ottoman scholastic tradition, I should add that Kātib Çelebi (d. 1067/1657) cites in his massive bio-bibliographical account more than eighty works pertaining to al-Manār in the form of commentaries, super commentaries, or abridgements. Cited in Mürteza Bedir, "Books on Islamic Legal Theory (*Uṣūl al-Fiqh*)," in *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4)*, 426.

35   For the popularity of Ibn al-Ḥājib's *Mukhtaṣar* among Ottoman scholars, see Bedir, 431-432.

36   For the wide circulation of these titles among Ottoman learned individuals, see Himmet Taşkömür, "Books on Islamic Jurisprudence, Schools of Law, and Biographies of İmams from the Hanafi School," in *Treasures of Knowledge: An Inventory of the Ottoman Palace Library (1502/3-1503/4)*, 389-422.

To put it more succinctly, which particular aspects of al-Rāzī's Quran commentary, Ibn al-Ḥājib's textbook in legal theory, or the *fiqh* compendium of al-Sarakhsī, for instance, began to appear unfavorable, if not entirely alarming, to authorities who allegedly decided to rule them out of the imperial "curriculum" in the 1560s? The question is indeed a rhetorical one, for we know, thanks to similar endowment lists and book inventories from the period, that not only those works of al-Rāzī, Ibn al-Ḥājib, or al-Sarakhsī, but also many other titles somehow did not make it to the so-called "sultan's syllabus" in 1565-6 yet kept participating in the scholarly canon within their corresponding fields.

Compared to the inventory of books Meḥmed II endowed to the Ṣaḥn in the 1470s, the list of titles appended to the endowment deed (*waqfiyya*) of the Süleymaniye complex, the construction of which lasted from 1550 until 1557, might provide a chronologically more pertinent case for comparison.[37] The *waqfiyya* does not explicitly designate a library in the complex, nor does it stipulate the tasks of a librarian or a team of librarians.[38] The list at the end, which appears without a title or a descriptive note, merely notes the names of around 115 different works contained in 174 volumes by referring either to the abridged title or the author's name. Similar to the books endowed by Meḥmed II, these volumes – presumably donated by Süleymān – span a broader range of disciplines than appear in the 1565-6 register, including theology, rhetoric, and biography writing. The works flagged above as examples of titles surprisingly missing in the 1565-6 register, such as al-Rāzī's Quran commentary or works on Islamic jurisprudence by Ibn al-Ḥājib, Sarakhsī, or Ibn al-Sāʿātī, all appear in the endowment list. Rāzī's *tafsīr*, for instance, appears in four copies and Ibn al-Ḥājib's in five, making each the most copious title of their corresponding disciplines in the *waqfiyya*. More intriguingly, the document also makes note of several books that do not fit easily into the exclusive Hanafi subscription of Ottoman legal theory and practice. Some of the principal works of the Shafiʿi school, such as al-Māwardī's (d. 450/1058) *al-Ḥāwī*, al-Ghazālī's (d. 505/1111) *Kitāb al-wajīz*, and al-Bulqīnī's (d. 868/1464) *al-Tajarrud wa'l-ihtimām*, together with a curious title that appears to be related to the Hanbali school (*al-Kāfī ʿalā madhhab al-Ḥanbalī*), are all listed in the document. Had these registers of books been intended to impose a teaching curriculum with an outright Hanafi orientation on the imperial madrasa professors, as Ahmed and Filipovic

---

37   The facsimile of the *waqfiyya* is published in *Süleymaniye Vakfiyesi*, ed. Kemal Edib Kürkçüoğlu, Ankara: Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü, 1962. The list of books is on pp. 210-218. Yasin Yılmaz has transcribed the list into modern Turkish, but this should be used cautiously due to a number of inaccurate title designations. See Yasin Yılmaz, *Kanûnî Vakfiyesi Süleymaniye Külliyesi*, Ankara: Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü, 2008, 279-284.

38   Erünsal, *Osmanlı Vakıf Kütüphaneleri Tarihi Gelişimi ve Organizasyonu*, 141.

claimed, would we encounter in the endowment list such titles defying the presumed Ottoman doctrinal loyalty?

The presence of titles from non-Hanafi schools of law was not restricted to the Süleymaniye endowment. Another "batch" of books delivered in 1561 from the royal collection to one of the (unnamed) sultanic madrasas also cites these three specific texts subscribing to the Shafi'i school. In fact, considering the type, scope, and contents of the document, this *daftar* is closest to the 1565-6 register utilized by Filipovic and Ahmed. It is difficult to ascertain, though, which particular madrasa is at stake here, whether one of the Süleymaniye madrasas or another imperial college established around the time by the Sultan. Leaving aside for the moment the question of this madrasa's exact identity, the extant register compiled in late 1561 is crucial, for our purposes, to provide substantial details of another contemporary delivery from the palace library to an imperial madrasa.[39]

The register opens with the seal of Sultan Süleymān, which, then, is followed by the listing of 107 titles contained in 122 volumes. At the end of the list appears the following note: "on 22 Rabīʿ al-Ākhir in the Hijri year 969 [30 December 1561], under the cognizance of the Sultan, may his sultanate endure, the abovementioned books were deposited to the chief of the ward to deliver them to the glorious madrasa of the Sultan (*tāriḫ sene 969 şehr-i rebīʿüʾl-āḫir fī 22 mezkūr kitāblar ḫünkār ḥażretleriniñ medrese-i şerīflerine virilüb odabaşına teslīm olundı bi-maʿrifet-i ḫüdāvendigār dāmat salṭanatuhu*)." On the back page of the document there is another brief note, evidently written by a different pen, saying that the document is the register of books given to the glorious madrasa of the late Sultan (*merḥūm pādişāhuñ medrese-i şerīfine virilen kitāblar defteridir*). Among the 107 titles listed, three are entirely illegible due to the paper's tearing at the lower right end; of the remaining 104 items – listed in detail in Appendix II – a few have generic titles, making it difficult to identify with greater precision their author and corresponding discipline. Still, the register provides ample details about the presence of several intriguing titles from a wider variety of disciplines and genres that were absent in the more renowned register drawn up in 1565-6.

As examples of these intriguing titles, in addition to books by authors who subscribed to non-Hanafi schools, the 1561 register lists, for instance, the *Jāmiʿ*

---

39 TSMA E. 381/31. The former catalog number of the document was TSMA E 861/1, to which Gülru Necipoğlu also makes a brief reference in her "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), 66, fn. 83.

al-fuṣūlayn and the *Latā'if al-ishārāt*, two works in Islamic jurisprudence by Sheykh Bedreddīn (d. 823/1420), the fifteenth-century scholar-turned-revolutionary mystic who was executed by the Ottoman authorities after his failed rebellion.[40] Bedreddīn's authority as a reputed legal scholar never entirely faded away from Ottoman legal scholarship, and early modern Ottoman jurists kept using and writing commentaries on the *Jāmiʿ al-fuṣūlayn*. However, by the mid-sixteenth century, the controversy over Bedreddīn and his followers reached greater heights when measures of Ottoman "sunnitization" ramped up against the backdrop of conflict with the Safavid cause, which posed the greatest religious, ideological, and demographic threat to the Ottomans.[41] These measures and policies, conceptualized primarily at the hands of high-ranking madrasa-trained scholar-bureaucrats, came to identify, marginalize, and persecute a large number of individuals for their adherence to a religious doctrine and praxis vilified by the Ottoman center. The sheikhulislam fatwas functioned as the primary mechanism that provided the necessary legal justification to cast as "heretics" those non-conformists to the Ottoman cause and, hence, to define and redefine the confines of Ottoman Sunnism.[42] The name of Sheykh Bedreddīn often features in these fatwa compilations, not as an esteemed legal scholar but more as a detested figure. Ebū's-suʿūd, for

---

40   For the Bedreddīn episode, see Michel Balivet, *Islam Mystique et Révolution Armée Dans Les Balkans Ottomans: Vie Du Cheikh Bedreddîn, Le "Hallâj Des Turcs", 1358/59-1416*, İstanbul: Editions Isis, 1995; Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler (15.–17. Yüzyıllar)*, İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı, 1998, 159-235.

41   For a brief note on the Ottoman commentators of *Jāmiʿ al-fuṣūlayn*, see Ali Bardakoğlu, "Câmiu'l-Fusûleyn," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* vol. 7, 108-9. For the impact of the Ottoman-Safavid rivalry on Ottoman religious politics, see Hanna Sohrweide, "Der Sieg der Safaviden in Persien und seine Rückwirkungen auf die Schiiten Anatoliens im 16. Jahrhundert," *Der Islam* 41 (1965): 95-223; Adel Allouche, *The Origins and Development of the Ottoman-Safavid Conflict, 906-962/1500-1555*, Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 1983; Markus Dressler, "Inventing Orthodoxy: Competing Claims for Authority and Legitimacy in the Ottoman-Safavid Conflict," in *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power*, eds. Hakan Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski, Leiden: Brill, 2005, 151-173.

42   For an overview of the discussion on Ottoman "sunnitization," see Derin Terzioğlu, "How To Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization: A Historiographical Discussion," *Turcica* 44 (2012-2013): 301-338, and Vefa Erginbaş, "Problematizing Ottoman Sunnism: Appropriation of Islamic History and Ahl al-Baytism in Ottoman Literary and Historical Writing in the Sixteenth century," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 60 (2017): 614-646.

      For the use of sheikhulislam fatwas particularly in the Ottoman-Safavid religious competition, see Elke Eberhard, *Osmanische Polemik gegen die Safawiden im 16. Jahrhundert nach arabischen Handschriften*, Freiburg: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1970; Abdurrahman Atçıl, "The Safavid Threat and Juristic Authority in the Ottoman Empire During the 16th century," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 49/2 (2017): 295-314.

example, issued at least three fatwas about him and his sixteenth-century fol-
lowers, stating that whoever subscribed to the path of Bedreddīn should be
declared unbelievers (*kāfir*).[43] Given this official stance vis-à-vis Bedreddīn, it
is baffling, if not entirely impossible, to expect his scholarly works to be added
to the "centrally-planned and imposed" madrasa curriculum, had these regis-
ters of books actually served this purpose.

Aside from Bedreddīn's works in legal theory, the 1561 register includes sev-
eral classics in theology and rhetoric, such as al-Jurjānī's *Sharḥ al-mawāqif*
and al-Taftāzānī's *Sharḥ al-miftāḥ* that somehow did not make it to the 1565-6
list. The expansiveness of the 1561 list in terms of subject areas is further
indicated by a handful of books that are difficult to characterize merely as
"curricular" readings. Among these are al-Suhrawardī's (d. 632/1234) *ʿAwārif
al-maʿārif* in mysticism, Ibn Kathīr's (d. 774/1373) history *al-Bidāya waʾl-Nihāya*,
al-Zarnūjī's (d. 593/1196) work in educational methods and ethics (*Risāla Taʿlīm
al-mutaʿallim*), al-Nuwayrī's (d. 733/1333) sought-after encyclopedic compen-
dium *Nihāyat al-arab*, and a few volumes from al-Ṣafadī's (d. 764/1363) massive
biographical dictionary of notables, *al-Wāfī biʾl-Wafayāt*. While none of these
books is surprising to find among the preferred pastime readings of Ottoman
scholars and madrasa students, it would be farfetched to argue that they were
set by the Ottoman center as required readings in a prescribed "syllabus."

Coming back to the question of the identity of the school associated with
the 1561 register, the consistent use of the word madrasa in the singular form,
instead of *madāris*, in both notes makes it unlikely that what was at stake was
the Süleymaniye madrasas. Besides the Süleymaniye, there were other nota-
ble imperial madrasas established during the later years of Süleymān's reign.
One of these colleges was the Prince Meḥmed madrasa established within
the namesake's imperial complex constructed in the late 1540s by the chief
architect Sinān (d. 996/1588) upon the untimely death of Süleymān's favorite
son Meḥmed (d. 950/1543).[44] Immediately after its establishment, the Prince
Meḥmed madrasa was added to the learned hierarchy as a top-tier institute at
the level of *Ṣaḥn*.[45] It is unlikely, however, that the register of 1561 concerned
the Prince Meḥmed madrasa, for there was a separate inventory drawn up to

43   Ertuğrul Düzdağ, *Şeyhülislâm Ebussuud Efendi Fetvaları Işığında 16. Asır Türk Hayatı*,
       İstanbul: Enderun, 1972, 193. For another relevant fatwa from the same period, see
       Andreas Tietze, "Sheykh Bālī Efendi's Report on the Followers of Sheykh Bedreddīn,"
       Osmanlı Araştırmaları/The Journal of Ottoman Studies VII-VIII (1988): 115-122.

44   Gülru Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire*, Princeton:
       Princeton University Press, 2005, 191-207.

45   Atçıl, *Scholars and Sultans*, 147.

list the 130 volumes donated there from the palace repository.[46] When we look at this inventory, theology had the pride of place, with twenty-seven copies, ahead of substantive law (twenty copies), logic (fourteen copies), and legal theory and rhetoric (thirteen copies each). Curiously, the list makes a note of eight works in philosophy (*ḥikmet*).[47] The endowment deed, by its nature, does not stipulate which specific books should be taught, but obliged each instructor whose term at the madrasa was about to finish to pass all the books in the collection to the newly appointed instructors without a single missing item.

The other noteworthy imperial madrasa established in Istanbul in the 1550s was the Selīm I madrasa.[48] As an imperial madrasa endowed by the reigning sultan and bearing the name of a deceased Ottoman ruler, the Selīm I madrasa was ranked, like the Prince Meḥmed madrasa, among the highest level madrasas, offering its instructor 50 aspers per day and the opportunity to move up to the chief administrative offices in the scholarly establishment.[49] The register of 1561 might have pertained to the Selīm I madrasa, and this is how the modern archivists in the Ottoman State archives have tended to read and describe the document. But whether the document really is about the Selīm I madrasa or another highly ranked imperial madrasa is less important than the facts that registers were drawn up at the time to record items delivered from the royal collection to the madrasa libraries, and that these inventories made reference to numerous texts different than those counted in the 1565-6 register, which has heretofore been mislabeled as "the sultan's syllabus."[50]

The period also witnessed instances in which the royal collection supplied copies of books to people or institutions other than madrasa professors and

---

46   Müjgan Cunbur, "Kanunî Devrinde Kitap Sanatı, Kütüphaneleri ve Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi," *Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği Bülteni* 17/3 (1968): 134-142.

47   Cunbur, 140.

48   Mübahat Kütükoğlu notes, drawing on a contemporary archival record, that the Selīm I madrasa was still unfinished during the construction of the Süleymaniye complex, which lasted from 1550 to 1557. See her *XX. Asra Erişen İstanbul Medreseleri*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2000, 280.

49   Atçıl, 147.

50   There were indeed several other extant registers from earlier and later periods, listing the titles and number of copies sent to the royal madrasas from the palace. For the list of seventy-one items donated in 1435 to the recently established *Dāru'l-ḥadīth* in Edirne, see Bilge, *İlk Osmanlı Medreseleri*, 225-231. In the late 1480s, forty-two books, including a few medical texts, were delivered to the Bāyezīd II complex constructed in Edirne. See M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, *XV.-XVI. Asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı: Vakıflar, Mülkler, Mukataalar*, İstanbul: Üçler Basımevi, 1952, 42-46 (in the *Vakfiyeler* section at the end of the book). During the time of Selīm II (r. 1566-1574) and before the construction of the Selimiye complex in Edirne, a special register was drafted for the books in the imperial treasure reserved for the Selimiye madrasa. See Erünsal, *Osmanlı Vakıf Kütüphaneleri Tarihi Gelişimi ve Organizasyonu*, 148.

students. One such case, recorded by an extant archival register similar to the documents exemplified above, records the books given to the chief physician in the 1570s. The register notes "books given from the inner treasury to the chief royal physician [to be used in teaching]" (*iç ḫazīneden taʿlīm için ḥekīmbaşına virilen kitāblardır*) and lists sixty-five titles, overwhelmingly related to medicine, delivered to the chief royal physician who was at the same time the professor at the medical school (*Dāruʾṭ-ṭibb*) in the Süleymaniye complex.[51] Should we also read this register as the evidence of a centrally-designed medical curriculum imposed upon the chief physician? Or is it rather the case that the list was merely for registering the books sent from the palace to the chief physician who needed those copies in his studies and training sessions? Another illuminating example showing the willingness of the sixteenth-century Ottoman court to step in to meet the book demands of its "scientific" experts concerns the Istanbul observatory established in the late 1570s (only to be demolished a few years later).[52] In 1578, an imperial order was dispatched to the judge of Istanbul, asking him to find the endowed books in astral sciences belonging to the late Lütfullāḥ (d. before 957/1550), one of the previous court astrologers, and to send them to the observatory.[53] Should this royal involvement in the supply of books to court astrologers also be interpreted as an act of prescribing the "astral" curriculum?

Conclusion

This article aims to redress an argument that has been extensively cited and recycled since its first expression almost two decades ago. As must be clear from the discussion above, the register used by Ahmed and Filipovic as proof of Ottoman imperial plans to impose a particular curriculum upon imperial madrasa professors was far from unique and prescriptive. There were

---

51   TSMA D. 8228. Modern Turkish transcription of the register is available in Yılmaz, *Kanûnî Vakfiyesi Süleymaniye Külliyesi*, 331-333.

52   For the story of the Istanbul observatory, see Aydın Sayılı, *The Observatory in Islam and its Place in the General History of the Observatory*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1960.

53   The order is recorded in the *mühimme defteri* (the register of important affairs) numbered 34. See İsmet Miroğlu, "İstanbul Rasathanesine Ait Belgeler," *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* v.1, no. 3 (1972), 80. The name Lütfullāh mentioned in this record has often been misattributed in the scholarship to the more famous Molla Luṭfī (d. 1495), but it should be the chief court astrologer Lütfullāh who served in the first half of Süleymān's reign. For more details on Lütfullāh, see my "Astrology in the Service of the Empire: Knowledge, Prognostication, and Politics at the Ottoman Court, 1450s-1550s," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago 2016, 228-229.

similar contemporary book lists drawn up concerning the makeup of imperial madrasa collections that involve references to numerous other texts not cited in the more famous 1565-6 register. Thus, it is no more tenable to view it or any of these other registers as an imperial or sultanic "syllabus."

There is no doubt that the surviving catalogs of Ottoman madrasa libraries and registers of books donated or delivered from the collections of notables, including members of the royal family, are indispensable sources for reconstructing textual horizons in the early modern Ottoman world of scholarship. The lists exemplified in this article are, in fact, only the tip of the iceberg. The Ottoman archives and manuscript libraries house numerous other relevant materials from the fifteenth through the nineteenth centuries that researchers could mine to produce works similar to Konrad Hirschler's model study on a thirteenth-century catalog of a library established in an endowed complex in Damascus.[54] In addition to underwriting individual monographs on separate library catalogs or book lists, these registers of varying length, together with extant probate inventories of madrasa-affiliated individuals, could be collated to generate a useful online database exposing which books found higher esteem in separate disciplines among early modern Ottoman scholars and madrasa students.

It is even possible – and sorely needed indeed – to go beyond the preparation of dry lists and write a more colorful and comprehensive narrative of the history of scholarship in the early modern Ottoman world that touches less the institutional and intellectual, and more the social, cultural, and "personal" aspects of learning and teaching. By systematically browsing thousands of surviving copies of those titles cited in the madrasa library inventories and relevant book lists, we could compile a massive amount of textual and paratextual fragments that would shed more precise light on how books were read, copied, studied, discussed, and annotated over their centuries-long journey through different hands in the madrasa setting.[55] Such a human- and book-centered approach toward madrasas will enable us to narrate the alternative stories of madrasas and their people, which could remedy the modern notoriety of these institutions as the symbol of religious obscurantism and the bulwark of intellectual decline.

---

54   Konrad Hirschler, *Medieval Damascus: Plurality and Diversity in an Arabic Library. The Ashrafīya Library Catalogue*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016.

55   For a promising example that explores through a collective effort the numerous paratexts located in the copies of an early-eighteenth century Ottoman scholar, see *Osmanlı Kitap Kültürü: Cârullah Efendi Kütüphanesi ve Derkenar Notları*, ed. Berat Açıl, Ankara: Nobel: 2015.

Appendix 1 – The Order of Books Tashkoprīzāde (d. 1561) Claims to Have Studied during His Education

	Title	Author	Discipline	Studied at the hands of
1.	*Qurʾān*			his father Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā
2.	Basics of Arabic language (شيئًا من اللغة العربية)			his father Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā
3.	*al-Maqṣūd*	Unidentified	Morphology (ṣarf)	ʿAlā al-Dīn ʿAlī al-Aydīnī a.k.a. Mawlānā Yatīm
4.	*Mukhtaṣar ʿIzz al-Dīn al-Zanjānī*	ʿIzz al-Dīn al-Zanjānī (d. 660/1262)	Morphology (ṣarf)	ʿAlā al-Dīn ʿAlī al-Aydīnī a.k.a. Mawlānā Yatīm
5.	*Marāḥ al-Arwāḥ*	Aḥmad b. ʿAlī b. Masʿūd (fl. 13th century)	Morphology (ṣarf)	ʿAlā al-Dīn ʿAlī al-Aydīnī a.k.a. Mawlānā Yatīm
6.	*al-ʿAwāmil al-miʾa*	ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī (d. 471/1078-9)	Grammar (naḥw)	ʿAlā al-Dīn ʿAlī al-Aydīnī a.k.a. Mawlānā Yatīm
7.	*al-Misbāḥ fī al-naḥw*	al-Muṭarrizī (d. 610/1213)	Grammar (naḥw)	ʿAlā al-Dīn ʿAlī al-Aydīnī a.k.a. Mawlānā Yatīm
8.	*al-Kāfiya fī al-naḥw*	Ibn al-Ḥājib (d. 646/1249)	Grammar (naḥw)	ʿAlā al-Dīn ʿAlī al-Aydīnī a.k.a. Mawlānā Yatīm
9.	*al-Wāfiya fī sharḥ al-Kāfiya*	Ibn al-Ḥājib (d. 646/1249)	Grammar (naḥw)	ʿAlā al-Dīn ʿAlī al-Aydīnī a.k.a. Mawlānā Yatīm
10.	*Kitāb al-Hāruniyya*	Unidentified	Morphology (ṣarf)	his paternal uncle Qiwām al-Dīn Qāsim
11.	*Alfiyya*	Ibn Mālik (d. 672/1274)	Grammar (naḥw)	his paternal uncle Qiwām al-Dīn Qāsim [when Tashkoprīzāde was 13 (lunar) years old]
12.	*Ḍawʿ al-Miṣbāḥ*	Muḥammad al-Isfarāyinī (d. 684/1285)	Grammar (naḥw)	his paternal uncle Qiwām al-Dīn Qāsim
13.	*Mukhtaṣar Īsāghūjī*	Amīn al-dīn al-Abharī (d. 733/1333)	Logic (manṭiq)	his paternal uncle Qiwām al-Dīn Qāsim
14.	*Sharkh Mukhtaṣar Īsāghūjī*	Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan al-Kātī (d. 760/1359)	Logic (manṭiq)	his paternal uncle Qiwām al-Dīn Qāsim

(*cont.*)

Title	Author	Discipline	Studied at the hands of
15. *Sharḥ al-Shamsiyya*	Quṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 766/1365)	Logic (*manṭiq*)	his paternal uncle Qiwām al-Dīn Qāsim
16. *Sharḥ al-Shamsiyya*	Quṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 766/1365)	Logic (*manṭiq*)	his father Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā
17. *Ḥawāshī sharḥ al-Shamsiyya*	al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī (d. 816/1413)	Logic (*manṭiq*)	his father Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā
18. *Sharḥ al-ʿAqāʾid [al-Nasafiyya]*	Saʿd al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī (d. 792/1390)	Creed of Islam (*ʿaqāʾid*)	his father Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā
19. *Ḥawāshī sharḥ al-ʿAqāʾid*	al-Ḥayālī (d. *ca* 875/1470)	Creed of Islam (*ʿaqāʾid*)	his father Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā
20. *Sharḥ Hidāyat al-Ḥikma*	Mawlānāzāda Aḥmad (d. 900/1495)	Philosophy (*ḥikmat*)	his father Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā
21. *Ḥawāshī sharḥ Hidāyat al-Ḥikma*	Ḥocazāda Muṣliḥ al-Dīn (d. 893/1488)	Philosophy (*ḥikmat*)	his father Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā
22. *Sharḥ Ādāb al-Baḥth*	Masʿūd al-Rūmī (?)	The Art of Disputation (*ādāb al-baḥth*)	his father Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā
23. *Maṭāliʿ al-Anẓār*	Shams al-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī (d. 749/1349)	Theology (*kalām*)	his father Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā
24. *Ḥawāshī Sharḥ al-Ṭawāliʿ*	al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī (d. 816/1413)	Theology (*kalām*)	his father Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā
25. *Sharḥ al-Muṭawwal li'l-Talkhīṣ al-Miftāḥ*	Saʿd al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī (d. 792/1390)	Rhetoric (*maʿānī wa'l-bayān*)	his father Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā
26. *Ḥawāshī Sharḥ al-Muṭawwal*	al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī (d. 816/1413)	Rhetoric (*maʿānī wa'l-bayān*)	his father Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā
27. *Ḥāshiya Sharḥ al-Maṭāliʿ*	al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī (d. 816/413)	Theology (*kalām*)	his father Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafā

(*cont.*)

Title	Author	Discipline	Studied at the hands of
28. *Ḥawāshī Sharḥ al-Tajrīd*	al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī (d. 816/1413)	Theology (*kalām*)	his maternal uncle
29. *Sharḥ al-Miftāḥ*	al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī (d. 816/1413)	Rhetoric (*maʿānī waʾl-bayān*)	Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Fanārī
30. *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*	al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī (d. 816/1413)	Theology (*kalām*)	Muḥyī al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ḳocavī
31. *al-Kashshāf*	al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1144)	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)	Muḥyī al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ḳocavī
32. *Kitāb al-Fatḥiyya*	ʿAlī al-Qushjī (d. 888/1474)	Astronomical Theory (*hayʾa*)	Mīrim Çelebi
33. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*	Al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870)	Hadith	Shaykh Muḥammad al-Tūnusī
34. *Kitāb al-Shifāʿ*	Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ (d. 544/1149)	Hadith	Shaykh Muḥammad al-Tūnusī
35. Unnamed texts		Dialectic (*jadal*)	Shaykh Muḥammad al-Tūnusī
36. Unnamed texts		Juridical Disagreement (*khilāf*)	Shaykh Muḥammad al-Tūnusī
37. Unnamed texts		Rational Sciences (*al-ʿulūm al-ʿaqliyya*)	Shaykh Muḥammad al-Tūnusī
38. Unnamed texts		Arabic grammar (*al-ʿulūm al-ʿarabiyya*)	Shaykh Muḥammad al-Tūnusī

Appendix 11 – Books Listed in the Register Drawn up in 1561 (TSMA E. 381/31)

1. *Al-juzʾ al-khāmis wa'l-sādis min Tafsīr al-Qurʾān li'l-imām al-Rāzī* (2 volumes)	Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's (d. 606/1210) *Tafsīr al-kabīr*, also known as *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb*	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)	
2. *Al-mujallad al-awwal min Tafsīr Kabīr* (1 volume)	Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's (d. 606/1210) *Tafsīr al-kabīr*, also known as *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb*	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)	
3. *Al-mujallad al-thānī min Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī* (1 volume)	Muḥammad al-Qurṭubī's (d. 671/1273) *al-Jāmiʿ li-aḥkām al-Qurʾān*	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)	**also cited in "The Sultan's Syllabus" #9, p. 198**
4. *Kitāb Talwīḥ* (1 volume)	Saʿd al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī's (d. 792/1390) *al-Talwīḥ fī kashf ḥaqāʾiq al-Tanqīḥ*	Legal theory (*uṣūl al-fiqh*)	**also cited in "The Sultan's Syllabus" #36, p. 205**
5. *Kitāb Maṣābīḥ* (2 volumes)	al-Baghawī's (d. 516/1122) *Maṣābīḥ al-sunna*	Hadith	**also cited in "The Sultan's Syllabus" #17, p. 200**
6. *Al-mujallad al-thālith min Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (1 volume)	al-Bukhārī's (d. 256/870) *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*	Hadith	**also cited in "The Sultan's Syllabus" #13, p. 199**
7. *Al-mujallad al-thālith min Lughat al-Azharī* (1 volume)	al-Azharī's (d. 370/980) *Tahdhīb al-lugha*	Lexicon (*lugha*)	
8. *Kitāb Mashāriq al-Anwār* (1 volume)	al-Ṣaghānī's (d. 650/1252) *Mashāriq al-anwār al-nabawiyya min ṣiḥāḥ al-akhbār al-muṣṭafawiyya*	Hadith	

(*cont.*)

9.	*Ṣadr al-Sharīʿa* (1 volume)	Ṣadr al-sharīʿa's (d. 747/1346) *Sharḥ al-Wiqāya*	Unidentified	
10.	*Al-juzʿ al-awwal min Fatḥ al-bārī li-sharḥ al-Bukhārī* (1 volume)	Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī's (d. 852/1449) *Fatḥ al-bārīʿ li-sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*	Hadith	**also cited in "The Sultan's Syllabus" #16, p. 200**
11.	*Kitāb Sharḥ al-ṣaghīr* (1 volume)	It should be one of the commentaries on al-Shaybānī's (d. 189/805) *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaghīr*. [Alternatively, but less likely, it might be one of the commentaries on al-Suyūṭī's (d. 911/1505) Hadith treatise, *al-Jāmī al-ṣaghīr*.]	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	
12.	*Mukhtaṣar Jāmiʿ al-Kabīr* (1 volume)	It should be one of the digests of al-Shaybānī's (d. 189/805) *al-Jāmiʿ al-kabīr*, the most famous of which was penned by al-Khilāṭī (d. 652/1254)	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	
13.	*Al-mujallad al-thānī min Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (2 volumes)	One of the many commentaries on al-Bukhārī's (d. 256/870) *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*	Hadith	
14.	*Al-mujallad al-rābiʿ min Maʿānī al-Qurʾān* (1 volume)	It should be one of the numerous *maʿānī al-Qurʾān* treatises.[a]	Arabic linguistics and Quran commentary	
15.	*Al-mujallad al-awwal min Tuḥfat al-Ḥarīṣ fī Sharḥ al-Talkhīṣ* (1 volume)	al-Fārisī's (d. 739/1339) *Tuḥfat al-Ḥarīṣ fī sharḥ al-Talkhīṣ*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	
16.	*Tafsīr al-Kawāshī* (1 volume)	al-Kawāshī's (d. 680/1281) *Talkhīṣ Tabṣirat al-Mutadhakkir wa Tadhkirat al-Mutabaṣṣir*	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)	

---

a   İsmail Aydın, "Meâni'l-Kur'ân," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, supplementary volume 2, 207-209.

(*cont.*)

17.	*Sharḥ-i Īżāḥ* (1 volume)	Jamāl al-Dīn al-Aqsarā'ī's (d. 791/1389) *Sharḥ al-Īḍāḥ al-Ma'ānī*	Rhetoric (*ma'ānī*)
18.	*Al-mujallad al-awwal min Sharḥ al-Mabsūṭ* (1 volume)	al-Sarakhsī's (d. 483/1090) *Kitāb sharḥ mukhtaṣar Mabṣūt li-Shaybānī*	Substantive Law (*furū' al-fiqh*)
19.	*Al-thālith min Sharḥ al-Minhāj* (1 volume)	This could be Muḥammad b. Ḥasan al-Badakhshī's (d. 923/1517) *Manāhij al-'uqūl fī Sharḥ Minhāj al-Uṣūl*	Legal theory (*uṣul al-fiqh*)
20.	*Kitāb al-wasīṭ li-imām al-Ghazālī* (1 volume)	al-Ghazālī's (d. 505/1111) *Kitāb al-Wasīṭ 'alā madhhab al-Shāfi'ī fī al-fiqh*	Substantive Law (*furū' al-fiqh*)
21.	*Kitāb Adab al-Qāḍī* (1 volume)	There are several treatises that went under this title[b]	Substantive Law (*furū' al-fiqh*)
22.	*Al-juz' al-awwal min Sunan* (1 volume)	There are several treatises that went under this title[c]	Hadith
23.	*Al-mujallad al-thānī min Tafsīr al-marḥūm* (1 volume)	Difficult to identify precisely whom the "marḥūm" is referring to	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)
24.	*Al-mujallad al-awwal min Aḥkām al-Qur'ān* (1 volume)	There are several treatises that went under this title[d]	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)
25.	*Khizānat al-fatāwā* (1 volume)	Abī Bakr al-Ḥanafī's (d. 665/1266) *Khizānat al-fatāwā fī al-fiqh*	Substantive Law (*furū' al-fiqh*)
26.	*Kitāb min al-Ḥāwī* (2 volumes)	al-Māwardī's (d. 450/1058) *al-Ḥāwī*	Substantive Law (*furū' al-fiqh*)
27.	*Sharḥ al-mawāqif* (2 volumes)	al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī's (d. 816/1413) *Kitāb sharḥ al-mawāqif*	Theology (*kalām*)

---

b   Salim Öğüt, "Edebü'l-Kādî," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 10, 408-410.

c   M. Yaşar Karademir, "Sünen," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 38, 141-142.

d   Bedreddin Çetiner, "Ahkâmü'l-Kur'ân," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 1, 551-552.

(*cont.*)

28.	*Kashf al-Asrār Sharḥ al-Manār* (1 volume)	al-Nasafī's (d. 710/1310) *Kashf al-Asrār Sharḥ al-Muṣannif ʿalā al-Manār*	Legal theory (*usūl al-fiqh*)	
29.	*Al-juzʾ al-awwal min al-Durar* (1 volume)	This might be Mollā Ḫüsrev's (d. 885/1480) *Durar al-ḥukkām* or one of its commentaries	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	
30.	*Kitāb Asrār al-Tanzīl* (1 volume)	Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1210) is reported to have composed *Asrār al-tanzīl wa-anwār al-taʾwīl*. The title might be referring to that book.	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)	
31.	*Majmaʿ al-Baḥrayn* (1 volume)	Ibn al-Sāʿātī's (d. 694/1295) *Majmaʿ al-Baḥrayn fī al-fiqh*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	
32.	*Al-mujallad al-awwal min Kitāb al-Muḥīṭ* (1 volume)	It might be one of these two *fiqh* works: Burhān al-Dīn al-Bukhārī's (d. 616/1219-1220) *Kitab al-muḥīṭ al-burhān* or al-Tūsānī's (d. 569/1174) *Kitāb al-muḥīṭ bi-masāʾil*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	
33.	*Al-rābiʿ ʿashar wa ʿUmdat al-Qārī fī Sharh Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (1 volume)	al-ʿAynī's (d. 855/1451) *ʿUmdat al-qāriʿ sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*	Hadith	**also cited in "The Sultan's Syllabus" #15, p. 200**
34.	*Kitāb Fuṣūl al-Badāyiʿ* (1 volume)	Muḥammad Mollā Fenārī's (d. 834/1431) *Kitāb Fuṣūl al-Badāʾiʿ fī Uṣūl al-Sharāʾiʿ*	Legal theory (*usūl al-fiqh*)	
35.	*Kitāb Uṣūl al-Fiqh* (1 volume)	There are several treatises that went under this title[e]	Legal theory (*usūl al-fiqh*)	
36.	*Al-mujallad al-awwal min Kashf al-Mashāriq* (1 volume)	This should be ʿAṭūfī's (d. 948/1541) *Kasfh al-mashāriq*	Hadith	

---

e Asım Cüneyd Köksal & İbrahim Kâfi Dönmez, "Usûl-i Fıkıh," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, vol. 42, 201-210.

(*cont.*)

37.	*Al-sādis min Rāfiʿ al-kabīr* (1 volume)	This should be ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Rāfiʿī al-Qazwīnī's (d. 623/1226) commentary on al-Ghazālī's *al-Wajīz*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	
38.	*Kitāb Kāshif al-anwār* (1 volume)	Unidentified	Unidentified	
39.	*Munyat al-muṣallī* (2 volumes)	Sadīd al-Dīn al-Kāshgarī's (d. 705/1305) *Munyat al-Muṣallī wa-Ġunyat al-Mubtadī*	Creed of Islam (*ʿaqāʾid*)	
40.	*Fatāwā-yi Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ* (1 volume)	Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ Shahruzūrī's (d. 643/1245) *Fatāwā wa masāʾil*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	
41.	*Ḥāshiya-i Muṭawwal* (1 volume)	This should be one of the numerous glosses written on al-Taftāzānī's (d. 792/1390) *Muṭawwal*	Rhetoric (*maʿānī*)	
42.	*Kitāb al-Hidāya fī Sharḥ al-Bidāya* (2 volumes)	al-Marghīnānī's (d. 593/1197) *al-Hidāyā fī sharḥ al-bidāya*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	**also cited in "The Sultan's Syllabus" #25, p. 202**
43.	*Kitāb al-Hidāya fī al-Fiqh* (2 volumes)	al-Marghīnānī's (d. 593/1197) *al-Hidāyā fī sharḥ al-bidāya*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	**also cited in "The Sultan's Syllabus" #25, p. 202**
44.	*Kitāb al-Arbaʿīn* (1 volume)	Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's (d. 606/1210) *Kitāb al-arbaʿīn fī ʿilm al-kalām*	Theology (*kalām*)	
45.	*Al-awwal waʾl-thānī waʾl-ʿishrūn min al-Wāfiʿ biʾl-Wafayāt* (2 volumes)	al-Ṣafadī's (d. 764/1363) *al-Wāfi biʾl-Wafayāt*	Biography (*tabaqāt*)	

(*cont.*)

46.	*Al-mujallid al-thānī wa'l-thālith wa'l-tāsiʿ min Kitāb al-Bidāyat wa'l-Nihāyat* (3 volumes)	Ibn Kathīr's (d. 774/1373) *al-Bidāya wa'l-Nihāya*	History (*tārīkh*)	
47.	*Kitāb Sharḥ al-Miftāḥ* (1 volume)	It should be al-Taftāzānī's (d. 792/1390) *Sharḥ miftāḥ al-ʿulūm*	Rhetoric (*maʿānī*)	
48.	*al-Mujallad al-awwal wa Kitāb al-Nihāyat wa'l-Kifāyat wa Sharḥ al-Hidāyat* (1 volume)	Abū ʿAbd Allāh Tāj al-Sharīʿa ʿUmar b. Ṣadr al-Sharīʿa al-Awwal al-Bukhārī's (d. 709/1309) *Kitāb al-Nihāya al-kifāya fī sharḥ al-Hidāya*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	
49.	*Kitab al-Bazdawī* (1 volume)	Muḥammad al-Pazdawī's (d. 482/1089) *Uṣūl al-Pazdawī*	Legal theory (*usūl al-fiqh*)	**also cited in "The Sultan's Syllabus" #39, p. 206**
50.	*al-Mujallad al-awwal wa'l-thānī min Tafsīr al-Qāḍī* (2 volumes)	Qāḍī Bayḍāwī's (d. 685/1286) *Anwār al-tanzīl wa asrār al-taʾwīl*	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)	**also cited in "The Sultan's Syllabus" #5, p. 197**
51.	*Kitāb al-ʿAwārif* (2 volumes)	It should be Shihāb al-Dīn ʿUmar al-Suhrawardī's (d. 632/1234) *Kitāb ʿawārif al-maʿārif fī al-taṣawwuf*	Sufism (*tasawwuf*)	
52.	*al-mujallad al-thānī min Kitāb al-ʿināyat fī Sharḥ al-Hidāya* (1 volume)	Akmal al-Dīn al-Bābartī's (d. 786/1384) *al-ʿInāyat fī sharḥ al-Hidāya*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	**also cited in "The Sultan's Syllabus" #28, p. 203**
53.	*Kitāb Jāmiʿ al-Uṣūl* (1 volume)	Ibn al-Athīr's (d. 606/1210) *Jāmiʿ al-uṣūl li-aḥādith al-rasūl*	Hadith	**also cited in "The Sultan's Syllabus" #22, p. 201**

(*cont.*)

54.	*al-Mujallad al-thānī wa'l-rābiʿ min al-Kashshāf* (2 volumes)	al-Zamakhsharī's (d. 538/1144) *al-Kashshāf ʿan ḥaqāʾiq al-tanzīl wa ʿuyūn al-aqāwil*	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*) **also cited in "The Sultan's Syllabus" #1, p. 196**
55.	*al-mujallad al-awwal min Kitāb Jāmiʿ al-Kabīr* (1 volume)	al-Shaybānī's (d. 189/805) *al-Jāmiʿ al-kabīr*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)
56.	*Kitāb Madārik al-Tanzīl wa Ḥaqāʾiq al-Taʾwīl* (1 volume)	al-Nasafī's (d. 710/1310) *Madārik al-Tanzīl wa Ḥaqāʾiq al-Taʾwīl*	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)
57.	*Kitāb al-Tanwīr fī Sharḥ talkhīṣ al-Jāmiʿ al-Kabīr li'l-Masʿūd* (1 volume)	Masʿūd b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Ghujduwānī's (d. 771/1370) *Kitāb al-Tanwīr fī Sharḥ talkhīṣ al-Jāmiʿ al-Kabīr*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)
58.	*al-Juzʾ al-awwal min Jawāhir … al-Muḥīṭ fī Sharḥ* [illegible]	Unidentified	Unidentified
59.	*al-Mujallad al-akhir fī al-Muḥīṭ al-Burhānī* (1 volume)	Burhān al-Dīn al-Bukhārī's (d. 616/1219-1220) *Kitāb al-Muḥīṭ al-burhānī fī al-fiqh*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)
60.	*Kitāb al-aḥkām …* [illegible]	Unidentified	Unidentified
61.	Completely illegible	Unidentified	Unidentified
62.	Completely illegible	Unidentified	Unidentified
63.	*al-thānī wa'l-thālith min Sharḥ Ṣaḥīh al-Muslim* (2 volumes)	One of the several commentaries on al-Muslim's (d. 261/875) *al-Jāmiʿ al-Ṣaḥīḥ*	Hadith
64.	*Kitāb al-Nihāyat fī Ṭarīq al-Hidāyat* (1 volume)	Unidentified	Unidentified
65.	*Kitāb Sharḥ al-maqāṣid* (1 volume)	Saʿd al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī's (d. 792/1390) *Kitāb sharḥ al-Maqāṣid fī ʿilm al-kalām*	Theology (*kalām*)

(*cont.*)

66.	*al-Awwal min al-Lubāb* (1 volume)	It might be ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Khāzin's (d. 741/1341) *Lubāb al-taʾwīl*	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)
67.	*Kitāb Sharḥ Abyāt al-Īḍāḥ fī'l-Maʿānī* (1 volume)	Unidentified	Rhetoric (*maʿānī*)
68.	*Sharḥ Majmaʿ al-Baḥrayn* (1 volume)	Ibn al-Malak Firishte ʿIzz al-Dīn b. Amīn al-Dīn's (d. 821/1418) *Sharḥ majmaʿ al-baḥrayn*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)
69.	*Majmaʿ al-Fatāwā fī al-Fiqh* (1 volume)	It might be Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr al-Ḥanafī's (d. 665/1266) *Kitāb majmaʿ al-fatāwā*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)
70.	*Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* (1 volume)	Ibn Kathīr's (d. 774/1373) *Tafsīr al-Qurʾān al-ʿaẓīm*	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)
71.	*Nihāyat al-arab* (1 volume)	Al-Nuwayrī's (d. 733/1333) *Nihāyat al-arab fī funūn al-adab*	Encyclopaedia
72.	*Kitāb Ḥawāshī al-Hidāya* (1 volume)	It should be a collection of the glosses on al-Marghīnānī's (d. 593/1197) *al-Hidāyā fī sharḥ al-bidāya*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)
73.	*Matn al-Maqāṣid fī'l-Maʿānī* (1 volume)	Unidentified	Rhetoric (*maʿānī*)
74.	*Kitāb Jāmiʿ al-Fuṣulayn* (1 volume)	Shaykh Badr al-Dīn's (d. 823/1420) *Jāmiʿ al-fuṣūlayn*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)
75.	*Kitāb Ramz al-ḥaqāʾiq fī sharḥ Kanz al-Daqāʾiq* (1 volume)	Shams al-Dīn al-Kardarī's (d. ?) *Kitāb Ramz al-ḥaqāʾiq fī sharḥ Kanz al-Daqāʾiq*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)
76.	*al-thānī min Mishkat al-Maṣābīḥ* (1 volume)	Walī al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Khaṭīb al-Tibrīzī's (d. 833/1430) *Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ*	Hadith

(*cont.*)

77.	*Kitāb Tajrīd Asmāʾ al-Ṣaḥāba* (1 volume)	Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī al-Shāfiʿī's (d. 748/1348) *al-Iṣāba fī Tajrīd asmāʿ al-ṣaḥābah*	Biography (*ṭabaqāt*)	
78.	*Ḥāshiya Tafsīr al-Qāḍī* (1 volume)	One of the several commentaries on Qāḍī Bayḍāwī's (d. 685/1286) *tafsīr*	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)	
79.	*Mujallad al-ākhir min Kitāb al-Nihāyat fī gharīb al-ḥadīth fī'l-fiqh* (1 volume)	Abū al-Saʿādat Majd al-Dīn Mubārak b. Muḥammad Ibn al-Athīr's (d. 606/1210) *Nihāyat fī gharīb al-ḥadīth wa'l-athar*	Hadith	
80.	*Kitāb Manhal al-Yanābiʿ fī Sharḥ al-Maṣābīḥ* (1 volume)	Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Sakhūmī's (d. after 761/1360) *Manhal al-yanābiʿ fī sharḥ al-Maṣābīḥ*	Hadith	**also cited in "The Sultan's Syllabus" #20, p. 201**
81.	*Mukhtalif al-Riwāya* (1 volume)	Abū al-Layth al-Samarqandī's (d. 373/983) *Kitāb al-mukhtalaf bayn al-aṣḥāb fī'l-fiqh*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	
82.	*Al-juzʾ al-rābiʿ min Mukhtaṣar al-Nihāya* (1 volume)	It might be one of the digests of al-Athīr's (d. 606/1210) *al-Nihāya*	Hadith	
83.	*Sharḥ al-āthār li'l-Ṭaḥāwī* (1 volume)	It should be one of the commentaries on al-Ṭaḥāwī's (d. 321/933) *Maʿānī al-āthār*	Hadith	
84.	*Kitāb Sharʿīa* (1 volume)	Unidentified	Unidentified	
85.	*Kitāb Tajarrud wa'l-ihtimām* (1 volume)	Ṣāliḥ b. ʿOmar al-Bulqīnī's (d. 869/1464) *al-Tajarrud wa'l-ihtimām bi-jamʿ fatāwā al-wālid shaykulislām*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	
86.	*Sharḥ al-Mukhtaṣar* (1 volume)	Unidentified	Unidentified	
87.	*Sharḥ al-Miftāḥ li'l-Sayyid al-Dīn* (1 volume)	al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī's (d. 816/1413) gloss on *Miftāḥ al-ʿulūm*	Rhetoric (*maʿānī*)	
88.	*Bidāyat al-Hidāya li'l-Ghazālī* (1 volume)	al-Ghazālī's (d. 505/1111) *Kitāb bidāyat al-hidāyat*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)	

(*cont.*)

89.	*Khams rasā'il wa thānīha Risāla-i Ta'līm al-Muta'allim* (1 volume)	a-Zarnūjī's (d. 593/1196) *Ta'līm al-Muta'allim*	Educational ethics
90.	*al-Mujallad al-thālith min Kitāb al-Shifā fī'l-Ḥadīth* (1 volume)	al-Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ b. Mūsā al-Yaḥṣubī's (d. 544/1149) *al-Shifā' fī-ta'rīf ḥuqūq al-Muṣṭafā*	Hadith
91.	al-mujallad al-awwal min *Tuḥfat al-Abrār fī Sharḥ al-Mashāriq* (1 volume)	Akmal al-Dīn al-Bābartī's (d. 786/1384) *Tuḥfat al-abrār fī sharḥ Mashāriq al-anwār*	Hadith
92.	*Sharḥ al-Mashāriq li-Ibn al-Malak* (1 volume)	Ibn al-Malak Firishte 'Izz al-Dīn b. Amīn al-Dīn's (d. 821/1418) *Mabāriq al-azhār sharḥ Mashāriq al-anwār*	Hadith
93.	*al-Thalith min Ma'ālim al-Tanzīl* (1 volume)	al-Baghawī's (d. 516/1122) *Ma'ālim al-Tanzīl*	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)
94.	*al-mujallad al-awwal min al-Shifā bi-ta'rīf Ḥuqūq al-Muṣṭafā* (1 volume)	al-Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ b. Mūsā al-Yaḥṣubī's (d. 544/1149) *al-Shifā' fī-ta'rīf ḥuqūq al-Muṣṭafā*	Hadith
95.	*al-mujallad al-thānī min Kitāb al-Kāfī fī'l-fiqh* (1 volume)	It should be al-Nasafī's (d. 710/1310) *Kitāb al-kāfī fī sharḥ al-Wāfī fī'l-fiqh*	Substantive Law (*furū' al-fiqh*)
96.	*al-mujallad al-awwal min Kitāb al-Abkār al-Afkār fī Uṣūl al-Dīn* (1 volume)	Sayf al-Dīn al-Āmidī's (d. 631/1233) *Kitāb abkār al-afkār fī 'ilm al-kalām*	Theology (*kalām*)
97.	*Kitāb Matn al-Miftāḥ* (1 volume)	It should be al-Sakkakī's (d. 626/1229) *al-Miftāḥ al-'ulūm*	Rhetoric
98.	*Kitāb Laṭā'if al-ishārāt* (1 volume)	Shaykh Badr al-Dīn's (d. 823/1420) *Laṭā'if al-ishārāt*	Substantive Law (*furū' al-fiqh*)
99.	*Kitāb Fatāwā li'l-Shaykh al-Imām* (1 volume)	Unidentified	Substantive Law (*furū' al-fiqh*)

(cont.)

100.	*Kitāb al-Ikhtiyārāt fī Sharḥ al-Niqāya* (1 volume)	Wājid Pasha's (d. *ca* 806/1404) *Kitāb al-ikhtiyārāt fī sharḥ al-niqāyat*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)
101.	*Kitāb Talkhīṣ al-miftāḥ* (1 volume)	Khaṭīb al-Qazwīnī's (d. 790/1388) *Talkhīṣ al-miftāḥ*	Rhetoric
102.	*Kitāb Asʾila al-Quran* (1 volume)	Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's (d. 606/1210) *Unmūdhaj jalīl fī asʾila wa-ajwiba min gharāʾib āy al-tanzīl*	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)
103.	*Al-Risāla al-Sulṭāniyya fī Ḥawāshī Tafsīr al-Qāḍī al-Bayḍāwī* (1 volume)	Muḥammad b. Muṣṭafā b. al-Ḥājj Ḥasan's (Ḥasanzāde) (d. 911/1505) *al-Risāla al-sulṭāniyya fī ḥawāshī tafsīr al-Qāḍī al-Bayḍāwī li-sūrat al-Anʿām*	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)
104.	*Minhāj al-ʿĀbidīn wa'l-Taṣawwuf* (1 volume)	al-Ghazālī's (d. 505/1111) *Kitāb minhāj al-ʿābidīn fī al-taṣawwuf*	Sufism (*taṣawwuf*)
105.	*Kitāb miftāḥ al-miftāḥ fī sharḥ al-miftāḥ* (1 volume)	al-Quṭb al-Shīrāzī's (d. 711/1311) *Miftāḥ al-miftāḥ*	Rhetoric
106.	*Kitāb Farāʾid al-Durar* (1 volume)	Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Sharʿabī's (d. 837/1434) *Farāʾid al-durar*	Quran commentary (*tafsīr*)
107.	*Kitāb Khulāṣat al-Mukhtaṣar* (1 volume)	al-Ghazālī's (d. 505/1111) *Khulāṣatu'l-mukhtaṣar wa-nuqāwatu'l-muʿtaṣar*	Substantive Law (*furūʿ al-fiqh*)
Cem'an cild 122 [Total number of volumes: 122]			**Only one-third of the titles (13 out of 39) cited in the so-called "The Sultan's Syllabus" are listed in the register.**