Since the Ottoman Empire has its particular law, philosophy, language, architecture, music and so on, its poetry is, too, a wholeness of certain aesthetic feelings inspired by the accumulation of experiences or traditions in the same civilization. At one time all arts that were based on the national identity had become a mirror to society although they borrowed their forms from the Eastern-Islam (Jazak-Islam) civilizations. However, after creating the most splendid works of art and initiating great artistic movements, these arts retired to their distant places in our reminiscences of that civilization or archives of our minds. Now they are seeking to live their bronze times in history through playing the role of some antique furniture or precious papers. Time will judge either one should feel sorry for the old one or should feel happy with the new one. Yet I may say that the Western world called as bourgeoisie did not regard its past as a burden in the throughout process. Indeed the Western world carried together its whole past by accepting the arts inherited from the past traditions. Thus, its modern identity has been developed on the acceptance of the past. For the West world, civilizations gain strength from the criticism of the preceding civilization in the process of systematization. As for our dilemma, we pushed away thousands and ten thousands works of a literature which embraced sorrows and joys of society, the images of society and man. With cultural aphorisms we disregarded these works and put outside the agenda.

**BETWEEN UTTERANCE AND THE WORD**

In the Ottoman society the word was seen important; everywhere and in every occasion it was emphasized that the word should be of beauty and not be wasted without any thinking. It was the Ottomans whom made the saying “Man has one tongue, but two ears” and established the rule “Say once, listen twice!” According to them, the word was regarded neutral; in the higher stages, it was the word (revelation or speech (kudsi; styler)); in the lower stages, it was just utterance (worthless, empty words (hay labardi)). Poetry is to beautify, adorn and refine the word to the higher stages. Because of this definition, poetry was accepted as the noblest art of arts. For the Ottoman poet what would one do with the poetry other than adorning the word? Therefore, they favored poetry...
rather than prose (maw'ir); they employed the poetic language in every area from medicine to encyclopedias, from dictionaries to mysticism. Even when they wrote in prose, they were not able to escape from adorning it.

The underlying basis of the use of an elevated and adorned language among the Ottomans may be the result of the given value of the word in society. It was elevated to a higher or 'divine' level. The fervor for the adornment of the word was manifested as an uninhabitable spirit of art; thus, the aesthetics of the word was broadened depending on the degree of the imagination.

Otherwise, what would you think of when you see the abundance of arts in Eastern (Sark) rhetoric?

DO NOT PUT ME IN PIGEONHOLES!

It is the fabrication of the intellectuals in the modern period to label the Ottoman poetry and poets as divan poets, folk (bulk) poets, (derwish) lodge (suk) poets or bands. However, in the ancient times, they called themselves only "poets"; they would never separate themselves since the audiences to which they addressed were of different situations. Some were in the (derwish) lodges performing their arts, some were among the circles of learned people in the urban towns or cities, some were in the villages or rural places addressing to their audiences. At some time they would substitute for another's art. For example, it was possible to witness a divan poet (i.e. Seyh Galip) performing dhikr (zikr) (rememberance of God) in a (derwish) lodge, a folk poet (i.e. Agak Omer) writing a gazel or in arzu meter or a mystic poet (i.e. Pir Sultan Abdal) playing the hafflamada (stringed instrument which resembles a lute).

These poets are generally divided into two groups: those who write poems with a sophisticated education (they were graduate of malûdars and among the circles of refined, sophisticated groups in urban cities) and those who write poems with a poetic sense by birth (they were endowed with God's gift of inspiration). The poets of the first group took private or open courses (such as rhetoric [boluqlat], bim-i aruz, kar-i jaf), Persian, Persian poetry (etc.) on poetry and literature and thus learned the poetry. However, as they wrote or recited poetry based on their education, they were not able to create original lines; they were perfect imitators of the great masters or poets. That is why today we never know the majority of their names even though they were mentioned in Tizkires or the dictionaries of the ancient poets.

On the other hand, the poets of the second group recited or said (did not write) poems with their feelings, perception and imagination. They did not attend malûdars or take courses on poetry, but their names were remembered throughout the centuries. Since they had no connection with the written tradition, both their poetry and their names disappeared in time. That is why we do not know them, or even their names today.

The most distinguished poets of the Ottomans were the poets who merged these two categories of poets mentioned above. They had both an innate sense of poetry by birth and a background of poetical arts... They became Fuzuli, Baki, Necim or Galib and resonated the magnificent sounds of that civilization through the heavens.

Now do you believe that a good poet will be the one who merges or unites these two categories? I think so.

SUCH A ROSY CHEEK THAT...!

For us the two classes of poetry mentioned above were roses too. The former was growing in the royal garden with a great care. The gardener was watering it or pruning its thorns and when necessary, it was put in the vases. The latter was growing alone at wild on mountains, watering with rain, and had never a chance to be put in vases. Both smelled sweet, both had wonderful colors, but people usually favored that of the gardeners, and at least those who were familiar with the word at higher levels did so. It was a symbol for a higher civilization or the gigantic castle of that geography whereas the other one was standing for only simplicity or a sparsely vegetated plain. While the fragrance of the former was of a refined, sophisticated life, the fragrance of the latter was of a feudal life or order. Briefly, one represented our urban life or our being civitle (sivilitlik) and the other for our rural life or our being peasantly (kuyululuk). Finally, every peasant would migrate to the city. That is why a folk poet who studied literature for a short time tends towards writing divan poetry or arzu meter as if he was a divan poet. This attitude reveals us that the Ottomans preferred the rose in the royal garden rather than the wild rose in mountains. At least, having studied the Ottoman poetry for over 25 years, I have witnessed this attitude everywhere.

It is curious that the intellectuals of our generation also rejected the Ottomans, their civilization and poetry. They spent great efforts to show that the Ottoman poetry was at the ivory towers detached from the common people. Our sole excuse for this rejection was that the Ottoman language was outdated and not used; in fact we are to be blamed, not the poets for we have never tried to read them.

Do you think that there is another nation in the world that condemns enlightened minds of their ancestors, except us?

IS THIS A CAMPAIGN OF "NO TO OUR CLASSICS"?

Today the classics are confronted with several difficulties everywhere in the world. Shakespeare's Hamlet, for example, is one of the English classics, and it is not easy for Englishman to understand Hamlet in its original language. It is same for Goethe and Faust. Have you ever seen a Hindu or a Persian who rejects Beydaba's Kelâbâ and Dinme saying that "now we don't speak Sanskrit language any longer"? No. Therefore, for what must we reject Fuzuli, Baki, Nef'i, Nedim or Galib and see them as the ruins of the past? Why must we blame them for their language—the language of a great civilization? Anybody with an intellectual consciousness could add his vocabulary 300 or 500 new words belonging to that civilization and it would be enough to read and understand the works of those poets. Instead of doing this, we just rejected and forgot them with the excuse that their works were incomprehensible. This manner can only be explained by our laziness or ignorance. Besides, while we are spending great amount of money, time and effort to learn a foreign language, why are we reluctant to learn 300 or 500 words used by our ancestors? Is it because the poetry reminds us the past? But every poetry is connected to the past or it deals with the past. Today the Western poets spend great efforts to employ the images from Greek culture or Christianity in their poetry. How can we explain our manner of rejecting the Ottoman poetry? Any intellectual in the West carrying such a fear or uneasiness for the classics of his civilization might be seen mad or crazy. What about you?

THEY CALLED THEIR POEMS "DIVAN"

Contrary to the common belief, the urban poets of the Ottomans mentioned above was not a conceived aristocrat or a syrenantor who earned his living by writing poems to everybody. They humbly called themselves "poets"; they called the notebook on which they wrote their poems as "di- tan". Though they be of any class (sultan, bureaucrat, scholar, tradesman, soldier, unemployed, man in the street etc.), they had to attain a certain cultural background in order to follow general rules of the poetry. The poetry was in great harmony...
among the members of society. From a peddler to a skilled worker, from illiterate men to woman poets, everyone was reading, reciting and listening to poetry. They were spending money on poems, buying them for gifts to friends. It is certain that they had to acquire the necessary background for the poetry. In other words, whether they be poet or not, if they were interested in poetry, they had to gain an intellectual point of view through scrutinizing the rules of poetic arts in society. Now after considering their labor, it is a great shame for their grandchildren, us to label them as those who "detached from the common people!"

Isn’t it touching and sad?

THE SO-CALLED PROBLEMS OF CRITICISM AND THEORY

It is certain that all those poets and their beautiful poems will live for centuries with great nostalgic tastes. Some people insist that the Ottomans did not attempt to violate the lines of classical forms and develop any criticism or theory. I think that they are partially right in their claims. But if those who invented illogical theories to the Ottomans poets would say that the Ottoman poetry could not accept criticism or any ideas due to its pastiche (sazçilik) tradition, instead of blaming the Ottoman poetry for being detached from the common people, they would be more consistent and logical in their claims. Even they would not regret seeing the failure of their smear campaigns. When seen from the scientific objectivity of late 20th (and 21st) century Turkish Classical literature has always lacked and neglected criticism and theory. Had Fusuki, Bakl, Nedim, Nefi, Nabi or Ga- lik lived among us, we would have acknowledged them as the poets who did not praise modern literary criticisms and theories and blamed them for not being social. We can even say that "Ah, if only the Ottoman poets had developed literary criticisms and theories!" However, for the realization of this wish, both the poets and the other institutions of society had to live a different life in a different world. Since art is the wholeness that transforms the chronology of time into civilization, it deals with every parts of society including its body, mind, heart and understanding. Thus, the Ottoman Empire displays this wholeness in its government, organization, military, social life as well as its poetry, music, art and crafts and urban life. In short, every age unceasingly maintains the equilibrium between supply and demand, which is necessary for its continuation. Some Ottoman poets had written poems criticizing the poetry of their contemporaries; but these humorous poems were never praised by the literary circles of that age. Consequently, we only come across literary criticism during the time of Tanzimat.

When criticism remains just a fantasy how can we talk about the progress- we do not mean the development of new forms- in art?

CLASSICISM AND TURKISH CLASSICAL POETRY

Classical arts accept the perfection in meter and form and the artist who follows this principle has been favored with a great appraisal. Because the classical arts have evolved within the inspiration of 'Ideal examples', the artist is required to follow a "master"; thus, he is always dependent upon this "master" like a moth that is attracted to a light at night. It might be said that Classicism, first named in the 17th century of Europe and later systematized as a movement, existed as a thin stream in the Eastern (Türk) arts during the Middle Ages. The second and third generations of masters (mârisce, maâkâsh, peyres) who followed on the path of their pioneers, their guides (tâmisâ, kadâmâ, rebler) or the scho- ol of classicism took great pains to imitation (ben- zame) or similarity (benzame), not creativity. This attitude in art which would be prevalent in all branches of art in the 18th century of France led to the diminishing of the stars that were still born till the 15th century of the east. Now then, the efforts to create new works of art replaced with making new interpretations of the old works. Thus, in all branch-
trade. This was the sole reason for their success. Indeed, the jingle of "I sell butter and honey / My master died; now I sell (Yoğurt sataram, bal sataram / Üstam ildi ben sataram) is the implication of the common manner in crafts. This led to the confession that "now my master died but I sell".

Although they did not study arithmetic, geometry, astronomy or geometry in medrese, those generations of 'pirates' who gorgeously drew maps which were really accurate and made compasses which did not deviate even one degree in precise now vanished.

So what? There were really crafts everywhere and people obey their masters while both writing and the progress connected to writing were being disappeared in society.

HE IS MEMORIZING HIS ASSIGNMENT

The courses (ereth-i aşıım or arrangements of sciences) given in the Ottoman medrese were divided into three fields: mathematics ( Riyazi ), natural and religious sciences. Arithmetic, algebra, geometry and music were included in mathematics; medicine, physics, chemistry, botany, zoology, mineralogy, geology, agriculture and geography were included in natural sciences; the Qur'an, hadith (sayings of the Prophets), interpretation ( tafsir ), halo and law (fikih) were included in religious sciences. In each century, one of those sciences was dominant in medrese depending on the institutionalization, district, economic and social facilities, teachers and politics of that age. However, as we said above, education in medrese was obliged to be based on not to develop theories or progress in science but to recount the existing knowledge. The anonymous sayings of "My son reads / But reads the same thing again and again (Benin okum bunu okur! Din min dinin yine okur) and "Reiterating is useful even it be 180 times (E-i-äderä äken velet hâne yitsekem)" disclose the underlying premises of educational pedagogy.

The poet Ishak Efendi (1680-1734) paraphrases this attitude:

If you want to learn by heart, do memorize
Do reiterate, reiterate, reiterate
(Elçü fahim cyle dercin cyle czer
Nâwechat et, nâwechat et, nâwechat)
Do you think that this abundance of reiteration allows developing theories?

THUS SPOKE THE MASTER!

The virus of memorization, imitation, annotation and interpretation prevalent in sciences and crafts in the Ottomans after the 15th and 16th centuries damaged the brains with the format of "Thus spoke my master!". This virus affected even the brains in arts such as calligraphers, miniaturists, architects and poets. Besides poets were enthusiastic about similarity or imitation for a long time. It began with the imitation of dress and the translations of rhymed couplets (mawâr) written in Persian between the 13th and 14th centuries. However, during the 15th and 16th centuries Turkish masters such as Ahmed Pasha, Necati, Zahiri, Bâkî and Fato lü wrote classical poetry adorned with Turkish poetical traditions. Thus they formulated the frameworks of Turkish classical poetry.

Poetry, contrary to common beliefs, was seen important not because it was taught in medrese but because it was a center of attraction for intellectual tastes. In a world where there are no modern entertainment facilities and technologies poetry is regarded as a life style with an aesthetic dimension. Every student could read poems written in Persian although Persian language was not given in medrese. They could read the poems of great masters, such as Hafiz, Sâ'di and Mevlana, who wrote in Persian. Even they spent several nights sleepless in order to imitate those masters with the reiteration of "Thus spoke the master!".

Classical style considered that imitation was important. The medium of language in medrese was commonly Arabic; the religious sciences were taught in the Qur'anic language and textbooks were written in Arabic. Naturally, this led to the stu-
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HALK İÇİNDE MUTEBİR BİR NESNE YOK DEVLET GİBİ
OLMAYA DEVLET CİHANDA BİR NEFES SİHHƏT GİBİ

SALTANAT DEDİKLƏRİ ANCAK CİHAN KAVGASİDİR
OLMAYA BAHT U SAÄDET DÜNYAĐA VAHİDƏT GİBİ

DIVAN OF ZATİ
(COLLECTION OF SÜLEYMANİYE LIBRARY)

GARİBƏM GURBƏTE DƏŞTİM GƏÜNUL ĀVARE YARİM YOK
BENİM AH ETTİĞİM AYB EYLEMEN KİM İHTİYARIM YOK

ŞU KARŞIKI KARADAĞDAN GEÇƏM Mİ EBR-VES YA RAB
HEVA-YI ZÜLF-YAR İLE BENİM BUNDAN KARARIM YOK
DIVAN OF AHMET PASHA

(COLLECTION OF SÜLEYMANİYE LIBRARY)

HER KIMİN KIM HEM-DEMİ GÜL YÜZÜLÜ BİR CANAN OLUR
HANESİ CENNET BİĞİ DAIM BAHARİSTAN OLUR

HAR-İ MÜJGANIMDA FİL HAL AZALIR NESRİN-İ EŞK
BAĞ-İ ÇEŞMİLDEN ÇÜN OL GÜL YAPRAGI PINHAN OLUR

DIVAN OF FUZULİ

(COLLECTION OF SÜLEYMANİYE LIBRARY)

SAÇMA EY GöZ EŞKDEN GÖNLÜMDEKİ ODLARA SU
KİM BU DENİLİ OLUŞAN ODLARA KILMAZ ÇARE SU

AB-GUNDUR GÜNBED-I DEVAR RENGİ BILMEZEM
YA MUHİT OLMUŞ GOZÜMDEN GÜNBED-I DEVVARA SU
DIVAN OF NECATI

(COLLECTION OF SÜLEYMANİYE LIBRARY)

DEMEZ NICHE SÜRÜNÜRSÜN KAPIMDA SEN DE GARIB
KİMSESİ OLMASIN BENCİLEYİN VATANDA GARIB
EGERÇİ AĞIR TAŞ KI KOPTUĞU YERDE
SİTȘEDİR KI AKIKI EDER YEMEN'DE GARİB

DIVAN OF SELİMİ

(SELİM I)

MERDUM-I DİDEMNE BİLMEM NE FÜZUN ETTİ FELEK
GİRYEMİ KILDİ FÜZUN, EŞKİMI HUN ETTİ FELEK
ŞİRLER PENÇE-I KAHİRMA OLMURKEN LERZAN
BENİ BİR GÖZLERİ AYHUYA ZEBUN ETTİ FELEK
TO CATCH THE COLOR OF THE SOUND

Classical poetry is just a magnificent miniature that is composed of sounds. Every educated man knows that life in poetry is brilliant, luminous, and colorful and in harmony just as is in miniatures. Just look at a horse, a bird or a flower and a tree in a miniature! They look very brilliant, attractive and perfect. They are different in actual life from their images on papers. For example, a beautiful horse on miniature may look ugly in actual life, but we watch its image on papers with envy.

Classical poetry, which is the miniature of sounds, represents the lover with great proportions. She is tall, slender, and graceful woman. In miniatures, we see her as a beauty of Turkistan. Everywhere she is of the same beauty. Sometimes we cannot differentiate whether the image is female or not. Nevertheless, we immediately recognize that beauty from her headgear not from her face or eyes. Poets inspired by the reflection of that beauty in dinar poetry had spoken of her. Centuries passed over, but this woman was still young and beautiful. In this sense, that beauty always captivates the imagination of dinar poets in all ages. This manner demonstrates the most important preliminary of dinar poetry since the question "how can I imitate my master best?" defines poet's style. Thus, the greatness of dinar poetry lays on maintaining its characteristics throughout centuries.

In other words, there is no theory and criticism, but isn't the greatness in obedience and imitation or similarity important?

AT THE PEAK OF A FOUNTAIN JET

Art likes sovereignty and wealth. When economic, social and cultural standards in society are...
higher, art by nature turns towards adornment and magnificence that are the signs of classical styles. The aesthetic understanding which has arrived at the summit long before searches for continuity while maintaining its place there. This continuity at the peak cannot only be maintained by the master himself. His successor should also strive for the perfection to maintain its place. The peak of water which sprouts upward from the fountain jet (fıstık) seems to be not moving, in fact, the water at the peak always changes. The water at the peak does not stay there but changes. The master is the one who defines and limits what peak is. It is by his successor’s job to maintain that level by supplying enough water to the fountain. In this situation, nobody is interested in the color or taste of the water. Its level is important. To say it in concrete terms, an artist has no luxury of criticizing his master or developing theories against him. Furthermore, the art under the patronage of sovereignty does not need such novelties since theory and criticism mean social or political messages addressed to society. Any artist whose poetics defined by beauty or aesthetic concerns or any poet who advocates the principle of ‘art for art’s sake’ does not try to develop critical theories or theories. A poet who has never seen poetry or lived in his life does not develop theorists of poetry or he does not criticize his master because the master never mentioned poetry in his works. Our ancestors had lived in wealth and abundance so their art was gorgeous and adorned. In their world art was the expression of the word with adornments. The question “Why didn’t they develop theories?” or “Why weren’t there criticisms in their world?” is similar to the question “Why didn’t Faith use electronic weapons when he conquered Istanbul?” Both are nonsense. What is wrong is to hold such a cruel approach to our ancestors, Furthermore, the same manner in arts can be seen among the artists in Europe during the Middle Ages.

Evaluating history with today’s conditions is a great methodological mistake. The past should be valued by its conditions. You cannot open a computer program if you use a different format in your computer. If your computer does not support the format of that program, you never run it. Like this, if you want to read the Ottoman poetry in your ‘computer’, you must open it in the format of classical arts. Then you will realize that they did not need to develop theories or criticisms in the perfection of that program. These ages produced a philosophy of art that is appropriate to their life-style. Our ancestors had found the perfection in their value system.

In short, there is no theory or criticism. Right? However, in fact they did not need to do. How many poets did develop theory and criticism in Europe during the Middle Ages?

WHAT SHOULD HAVE DONE DURING TANZİMAT?

After the revolution of alphabet, Atatürk had anticipated that some of the old works should have been translated into new alphabet in order to preserve the continuity of Turkish civilization. If only the intellectuals of Tanzimat and their successors, the intellectuals of the Republic had adopted the same attitude and recorded the theory of literature that they criticized? Then, they would have maintained this continuity. Even though they did so, the picture of our literature would be the same, but at least our poets would be inspired by classical poetry. Nobody would write gazel today, but the fragrance of it could be still sensed in our literature. Furthermore, nobody would feel uneasy to study on the Ottoman literature.

It is no doubt that civilizations do not return to the past, but they can preserve the continuity. Look at those old photographs of the past! Some are black and white, some are torn, some are barely perceptible; but what a great pleasure we take while looking at them! Have you ever thought that if the squares of our history had come to us like a film roll what would have we gained?

THOUGHT OF THE DAY

THE WORD SHOULD BE LITERARY IF IT IS TO BE ETERNAL

The word first should be literary if it is to be eternal or immortal. Nobody will oppose the assertion that the Ottoman poets wrote the most notable examples of poetry in terms of their being literary. Is it possible to deny Baki or Neimoth therefore we do not understand their language now? I believe that today’s elite poets are reading Fuzuli’s couples with an undisclosed envy. I am certain that they have the same feelings when reading or listening to the poetry of Karacaoğlan, Geyvheri, Yunus Emre and Pit Sultan.

It is said “There is nothing new under the sun, everything was said before.” However, all words need to be re-interpreted. We are waiting for the new masters of the word who will re-interpret the past with great self-confidence and patience.

Let us intend to know the Ottoman poetry instead of defining it with the definitions of “fıstık, fıstıkla...” Let us look at this poetry closely instead of pushing it away with ignorance or laziness. Let us first try to meet with this poetry even if we do not like it at first glance.

Do not afraid, when you meet with that poetry, you will certainly go back to the history and perhaps come across one of your ancestors. Thus, you will conclude that this “Poetry really talks about us and this poet is my ancestor too…”

Alphabet. “Yazılar (i.e. one out of ten) is miller’s share to the whole flock. It was said that millers were paid the amount of money equal to the value of a sheep. An old man was to wear mills, these are made of wooden or iron, or even of some glass. Since there were countless when, sometimes hardy or sometimes eaten grain, these mills “do not grind everything where they come (Ağlama sé bir yelde oğlama)”. They arranged such kinds of grist in a proper way. When the arrow of such arranged his goods, he marked his sale and consigned them when he put his hands to which seed was behind and which seed was front of his goods (Kemikler arası toplanti). Thus is case of any confusion, he could sit on his rights.

Last comment: the word “yazılar” in the couple (359) means “Ağlama (three-fifths).” The prefix “fi” in “fiș” which functions as a prefix in the word “fiş-fiş” also means three-fifths.

Now, in this couple there are totally 15 words and except the three words, all the others belong to the terminology of mill industry. Try to imagine that you are a poet. Now assume that you are writing a few lines of poems about mirth. You should use the jargon of mirth such as much as possible. Or forget the poets, but just try to write two or more sentences using a jargon of any profession or craft.

The mill, whether it is a water mill or a windmill, has a notable role in society as the main important heritage memory of the Middle Ages. On the elevated level, the poet, composing his lines, just seems to sit about us about the process in which the word was (is) disclosed. However, he actually discloses the secret that the word is admitted with an abundance of meanings running through the oppositions or backgrounds familiar to everyone in society. Today the reader’s imagination cannot easily capture the images of mills where the mirth was made or the audience of that age where the miller was known without any aesthetic feelings even if he was illiterate and was not our intellectural. In other words, the poem addresses not only to the poet but also to a person who is riding on his mule and wandering with joy.
This is the abandonment of the word and the true meaning of the word (ziya), not an atterrier or empty words (lay laab) since in Divan poetry each couplet has infinite meaning concerning its literal meaning just as we meet another word when we move one word in a sentence or phrase. Like this, it is possible to write a fresh (lay laab) poem opening the meanings of a couplet in Divan poetry after doing it.
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It was a privilege given to sultans in the 16th century. The aim was to balance the number of words in a certain amount in order to lead them to the productivity in scientific-oppositional traditions. However, during the age of collapse, this system corrupted as well as other institutions of the Ottoman Empire; they took bribes and neglected the competence of work. Some saw court as a job or place where they paid the certain amount of bribes. At the times of Selim III and Mahmut II, reforms were implemented to correct this system, but the result was unsatisfactory. Ultimately, the public system became a great obstacle to trade and industry. Finally Abdülmecid II abolished this system in 1911. For a detailed analysis of this system see:falls, M. Zehi, Osmanlı Zorunlu Deposu ve Depo- lari Seçme, III. Is., C. I. (Istanbul, 1984), pp. 656-659.
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For a detailed analysis of the system see: I. O. Gersch, Osmanlı Ruhunun Dili, C. 10, (Istanbul, 1997).
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This work signifies an account for the education in dawlul which was solely based on memorisation. It means, “Education is useful even if it be 180 times.”
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This work, together with Muhitte in cans (ya) and written by Istanbul’s Suleyman Selim were printed in Istanbul: in 1291 A. H., 1874 A. D. (1935, 1879).
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See Ilgi, Ah. p. 77.
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writings exercises of poetry, practice for poetic forms; writing poetry cou-
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When we examine Selim or the dictionary of the ancient poems, we can see many names of poets who lived in the same age and were gradu-
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The plaitic lover of Daniel poetry is the reflection of that beauty in mi-
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One of the characteristics of the classical style of the academy of art-

\[ IS THIS DIVAN LITERATURE? \]

very year, in the first lesson of the term, I converse with the new students of the Litera-

\[ OECD’S VIEW ON TURKISH LITERATURE OF THE OTTOMAN PERIOD IN TERMS OF COMMONS OF FOLK AND DIVAN LITERATURES \]

Pro. Dr. Cemal Kurnaz
Kagti Universities, Fac. of Letters - Ankara - Turkey

In the Ottoman period existed a huge public population and, along with the Sultan, the court circles administrating the public. So, the literature of created by this huge population was the original national literature, the literature formed in the court circles was simply artificial and far from being national. Because the Folks literature used colloquial Turkish of masses, and it was, therefore, simple and unadorned. The use of traditional syllabic metre of Anatolian Folks poetry and national ver-

fication forms was a characteristic feature of Folk poetry. The language of Divan literature was, on the contrary, an incomprehensible one formed with Arabic and Persian-originated words and a quantitative metre called "aruz" besides Arabic and Persian versification forms. Furthermore, Divan poets lived in the palace and they preferred to keep away from the public, but Folk poets lived in the public. Divan literature was a "palace literature", created and appreciated by a few people in the court-circles. It never spread out of the palace and reached the masses. The reason why it is called the "upper-class literature" is that it was the literature of those belonging to a small group and looking down on ordinary people for-

miring the Ottoman society...

It should be kept in mind that these are the ideas of not only our university students coming from high school but also of many literate people. But in recent years these ideas, which are of no scientific validity, have started to be reviewed.