**Südî, Aḥmed**

(mod. Tkish. Ahmet, and sometimes referred to, incorrectly it seems, as Mehmet), also known as Südî-yi (or Aḥmed-i) Bosnawî, Ottoman scholar noted as a commentator on the dīwān of Ḥâfiẓ [q.v.] the Gulistān and Bustān of Saʿdi [q.v.], and other Persian works. He was born in Bosnia at Sudici (whence his nisba), a village near the town of Foça which, being better known, some sources give as his birthplace. His birthdate is unknown, as are the names of his parents and other details of his family beyond the fact that he remained unmarried, a remark in his commentary on the dīwān of Ḥâfiẓ stating that, like Jesus, he never took a wife (Nazîf M. Hoca, Südî. Hayati, eserleri ve iki risâlesi’nin metni, İstanbul 1980, 15). The date given for his death varies from 1000/1592-3 to after 1006/8 May 1598 (op. cit., 16), but it is known that he was buried at the Yūsuf Paşhamosque in Aksaray, although the whereabouts of his tombstone is not known, it having been removed during the course of roadworks. Assumed to have adhered to the Ḥanafî law school, a charge that he suppressed from the Ḥāfiẓ corpus some poems of Shī‘î sympathy seems to have been disproved by lack of such poems in the earliest mss. [see Ḥāfiẓ].

Südî’s early schooling is assumed to have been in Fo’a, while his commentary on the Gulistān includes a reference to study in Sarajevo, and he is thought to have continued his education in Istanbul, to which city (like others from Bosnia) he came during the ascendency of the Bosnian-born Şoḵullu Meḥmed Paşha [q.v.]. He visited Erzurum, and studied with Muṣṭiḥ al-Dīnal-Lārî [see al- lārî] at Āmid in Diyarbekir before going to Damascus (where he read Saʿdi’s Gulistān with the poet Ḥalīm-i Shīrwanî), Baghdād, Nadjaf and Kūfā, and undertook
the Ḥadjdj. He comments on the places he visited, complaining, e.g. about an ignorance of Persian and good Arabic among the people of Baghpād, and describing the mosques and tombs of Kūfa as in ruins. He did not visit Persia itself, but everywhere sought to widen his knowledge of Persian, not only through contact with scholars but, according to his own statements, discussing difficult passages from Ḥāfīz and Sa’dī with such people as Persian merchants who were men of both trade and learning.

Returning to Istanbul, he undertook further study before becoming a teacher to the ghilmān-i ḥāṣṣa in the household of Ibrāhīm Pāsha (d. 942/1636) (on Ibrāhīm Pāsha and the ghulām system, see ghulām. iv, at 1087a) one of whom, Mostarli Derwīsh Pāsha (d. 1012/1603 [see derwīshpāsha]) was to mention Südī in the preface to his Murād-nāme.

Sūdī’s recension of the Dīwān of Ḥāfīz (3 vols., Būlāk 1250/1834) is said to have been produced at the suggestion of Muḥammad b. Badr al-DīnMuḥ‘ī ‘l-Dīn al-Munshī of Akhisar [see aḵ ḥīṣārī (b)]. Considered authoritative and outshining earlier works by Šhem‘ī and Sūrūrī (see Ritter, in lAart. Ḥāfīz), it was used for editions by Persian scholars as well as for studies by Western orientalists. His risāles on the second bayt of the first ghazal in the dīwān of Ḥāfīz and on one bayt of Sa’dī’s Gulistān are included in the study by Nazif Hoca (see above). The former is shown by Rypka (History of Iranian literature, Dordrecht 1968, 103) as an exception to the usual approach of the old commentators, who stressed only the intellectual content of Persian poetry rather than its formal aspect, which they regarded as self-evident (see also Browne, LHP, iii, 299, 302).
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