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PREFACE.

The History of Ottoman Literature has yet to be written. So far no serious work has been published, whether in Turkish or in any foreign language, that attempts to give a comprehensive view of the whole field. Such books as have appeared up till now deal, like the present, with one side only, namely, Poetry. The reason why Ottoman prose has been thus neglected lies probably in the fact that until within the last half-century nearly all Turkish writing that was wholly or mainly literary or artistic in intention took the form of verse. Prose was as a rule reserved for practical and utilitarian purposes. Moreover, those few prose works that were artistic in aim, such as the Humayun-Name and the later Khamsa-i Nergisi, were invariably elaborated upon the lines that at the time prevailed in poetry. Such works were of course not in metre; but this apart, their authors sought the same ends as did the poets, and sought to attain these by the same means. The merits and demerits of such writings therefore are practically the same as those of the contemporary poetry. The History of Ottoman Poetry is thus nearly equivalent to the History of Ottoman Literature. All the same, an account of the work done by the Ottomans in prose ought to be available; and to supply such an account is among the hopes of the present writer.

Within recent years there have appeared in Turkish a few monographs dealing with individual poets, also some
newspaper and magazine articles which survey briefly and without detail the whole field of literature. These, though often valuable and suggestive, are of necessity quite inadequate. The only serious attempt yet made at the systematic study of any branch of this literature is that made more than half a century ago by Baron von Hammer-Purgstall in his well-known ‘History of the Ottoman Poetic Art.’¹ But the monumental work so called hardly answers to its name; it is less a history of Ottoman poetry than a dictionary of Ottoman poets. There exist in Turkish a number of works called Tezkires, that is, ‘Memoirs of the Poets,’ which give the lives of poets who flourished at certain periods, together with specimens of their work. Von Hammer’s great book is not much more than a translation of these Tezkires, with the entries arranged in approximate chronological order. He makes but little attempt to trace the development of the poetry, to point out the various forces by which it has been affected, or to distinguish the relative positions of even the greatest poets, whether as regards the merit of their actual achievement, the nature of their indebtedness to their predecessors, or the measure of the influence they exerted over their contemporaries and successors.

The work therefore can scarcely be correctly described as a History. None the less, notwithstanding numerous errors, many of them almost inevitable in a first attempt, it is of the greatest value as a book of reference. If evidence of the critical faculty be somewhat to seek, we find on the other hand almost every detail that can be gleaned from the Tezkires and other Turkish authorities. Every poet, every versifier, of whom Von Hammer could find any mention, however slight, is entered in his pages. Thus although the last of

his four volumes was published as long ago as 1838, he has two thousand two hundred entries, each dealing with a different poet. His book is therefore likely to remain for many a year to come, what it has been since the day of its publication, the sheet-anchor of all whose pursuits lead them to the study of Ottoman literature.

In the present work no attempt is made to rival Von Hammer; my object is to supplement his labours, not to supersede them. In order to do the latter, not a History of Ottoman Poetry, but a more accurate and more complete Biographical Dictionary of the Ottoman Poets, would be required. The student who possesses this work will not be able to dispense with Von Hammer's; of the latter's two thousand two hundred poets, probably barely a tenth will appear in these pages. My object is rather to bring into prominence that aspect of the subject which has been left comparatively unnoticed by my talented and industrious precursor; I have endeavoured to trace the successive phases through which Ottoman poetry has passed, to discover the influences which have brought these about, and in this way to present as it were a panorama of the rise and progress of this poetry.

My chief purpose, however, in writing this book is not to supply Orientalists with a sketch of the development of Ottoman poetry, but to place within reach of English readers some account of a literature which has as yet been hardly touched upon by any writer in our language. Concerning the Arabic and Persian literatures a certain amount is now known; but regarding that of Turkey there is still blank ignorance, an ignorance which not unfrequently leads to the somewhat inconsequent conclusion that 'the Turks have no

1 In a very few instances the same poet has been entered more than once, owing to some confusion in the authorities.
literature.' As it is my hope and my endeavour to do something towards removing this ignorance, I have addressed myself in the first place to the average English reader who is wholly innocent of any Oriental learning. I have therefore explained many things, in the notes and elsewhere, which, had I been writing exclusively for scholars, I should have left unnoticed, as being perfectly familiar to everyone interested in any Muhammedan literature.

Of the many difficulties which beset the path of one who undertakes a work like the present, not the least is that of procuring the necessary materials. These for the most part still remain in manuscript; and to get together all the books it would be desirable to have, is a practically impossible task. And so, although after several years of search I have succeeded in forming a collection which, when supplemented by the volumes bearing on the subject preserved in the British Museum, has placed within my reach nearly all the more necessary of such books, there still remains a number which I have been unable to consult, and access to which would have allowed me to make my work somewhat more complete.

The scheme of this History is in Six Books, the first of which is Introductory, while each of the others deals with one of the Five Periods into which I have divided the story of Ottoman poetry. Of these Six Books, the First and Second are contained in the present Volume. 1

In order to assist the reader in realising, so far as this is possible without a knowledge of the language, what Ottoman

1 A list of the works consulted in the preparation of the History, together with indices to the notes, etc., will be printed in the final volume.

On the completion of the History I hope to issue a supplementary volume containing the texts of all the poems translated in the work. In the meantime the first line of the text of every translated passage will be found in an Appendix to the volume in which the translation occurs.
poetry is actually like, I have in most cases supplemented the account of a poet’s works by one or more translated extracts. The end I had in view would not have been attained by a prose translation, or even by a versified rendering of the usual sort from which every trace of the external form of the original has vanished. That end was to be attained only by a translation in which this form should be reproduced. Moreover, such reproduction is, in my opinion, one of the essentials of a satisfactory translation. As the late Mr. J. A. Symonds most truly says, ‘a good translation should resemble a plaster-cast, the English being plaque upon the original, so as to reproduce its exact form, although it cannot convey the effects of bronze or marble which belong to the material of the work of art.’ The principle thus laid down is practically the same as that enunciated and observed with signal success by Mr. John Payne in his admirable and scholarly translations of The Thousand and One Nights and the Quatrains of Omar-i Khayyam. Applied to the translation of Oriental poetry, it involves the preservation of the exterior form of the verse by following the movement of the rhyme, retaining, when possible, the identity in number of the syllables in each line, and suggesting the rhythm by the fall of the accent. These then are the practical rules by which I have been guided so far as the form of the translations is concerned. But while I have been thus respectful of the external structure, I have not allowed my care for this to prejudice the sense of the poem. I have throughout striven to be as literal as possible, omitting nothing of importance, and carefully guarding against the introduction of metaphors or similes for which the original gives no warrant. In this way I hope to have succeeded in presenting in these trans-

\[1\] 'Wine, Women, and Song,' p. 38.
lations a series of photographs of Ottoman poetry, and it is only as such that I offer them to the reader’s notice.

The critic who seeks to appraise the literary works of a foreign people will do well to bear in mind his own inevitable limitations. However learned he may be, and however scholarly the knowledge he may possess of the language in question, he must yet in some respects stand at a disadvantage beside the native school-child. A word or a phrase often suggests, over and above its dictionary-meaning, a world of associations instinctively perceived by every native, but which for the foreigner have no existence. And it is not unfrequently in the happy employment of such suggestive word or phrase that the chief merit of a literary passage lies. But while points such as this, or more subtle still, constitute something of the charm of literature in all languages, and should, if duly considered, tend everywhere to give the foreign critic pause, Ottoman poetry, owing to the extreme artificiality which characterised it till within the last few decades, contains a far less proportion than is usual of this intimate quality. For this poetry is so hedged in on every side by hard and fast rules, that there would almost seem to have been a deliberate conspiracy to block every avenue against spontaneity and individuality. The success of a poet was held to be determined in no small measure by the skill he displayed in dancing among many glasses without overturning any one of them. And here at any rate the foreign critic stands on an equal footing with the Ottoman. The rules of the game can be learned equally well by anyone, Turk or foreigner, who chooses to take the necessary trouble; and once they are mastered, it is easy enough to see whether they have been observed.

Still this is only one side of the matter; there is another and far more vital: did those poets, with all their verbal
jugglery and intellectual gymnastic, give true and adequate expression to the spirit of their world? The answer to this question is the verdict of their success or failure. And surely those for whom they wrote, those who lived in the same world and breathed the same moral and intellectual atmosphere, are the best qualified to give this answer. I have therefore, whenever these have been obtainable, given prominence to the opinions of the Ottoman critics on the Ottoman poets, more especially when poet and critic have been contemporary or nearly so. At the same time I have not refrained from expressing my own views, even when these are at variance with the opinions of the Turkish authorities. In such cases the reader must not take my conclusions as advanced with any pretension to finality; they are presented, as indeed are all the critical observations I have ventured to make, simply as the impressions of a foreign student who has tried to understand the works of the Ottoman poets and to enter into sympathy with them.

It remains for me gratefully to acknowledge the assistance I have received in my work. I here tender my sincere thanks to all who have in any way helped me, more especially to my friends Cherkesh-Sheykhi-zade Khalil Khalid Efendi and Professor Muhammed Barakat-ullah, the latter of whom has with the utmost kindness placed at my disposal the stores of his great erudition.

E. J. W. GIBB.

15, Chepstow Villas, London, W.
May, 1900.
ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF THE OTTOMAN NAMES AND WORDS.

As the present work is addressed in the first place to the general reader, no attempt has been made, when transliterating Oriental names and words, to distinguish between the several homophonous letters of the Ottoman alphabet. A definite system of transliteration has, however, been observed, and attention to the following remarks will ensure an approximately correct pronunciation.

The Ottoman vowel-system is highly elaborate, but here it will be sufficient to note:

- a is to be pronounced as a in ear, but rather shorter.
- e in 'met.' (At the end of a word must always be fully sounded.) This name, 'zadeh,' 'tezkireh,' are to be pronounced as if written 'meh,' 'zadeh,' 'tezkireh.'
- i in 'pin.' (In some cases it is pronounced as i in 'bird;' this has not been distinguished in the transliteration. When it occurs in a syllable preceded by one containing o or u, it is pronounced o: thus the name of the town Boli is pronounced Boli.
- o in 'so.'
- u in 'rule.' (In many cases it is pronounced like the French u in 'ru' or 'du.' This has not been distinguished. Occasionally it is sounded like the French en in 'deux,' or the German en. In the more important cases this last pronunciation has been represented by o in the transliteration.
- á, ã, ñ, occur only in Arabic or Persian words; in these languages they stand for the English sounds corresponding to the short vowel in

...
Turkish there are properly no long vowels, but the presence of ā, ī or ā causes the syllable in which it occurs to receive a stress or accent. ī has generally the sound of i in ‘machine.’

ay is to be pronounced as ay in ‘ay’ or ‘aye’ meaning ‘yes,’ i.e. as ‘I.’
ey is to be pronounced as ay in ‘they.’

The consonants are to be pronounced as in English, subject to the following notes:

ch as ch in ‘church.’
g is always hard as in ‘get,’ ‘give,’ never soft as in ‘gem,’ ‘gin.’ (When g is followed by ā, a slight y sound is introduced between them, just as when a Cockney says ‘gyarden’ instead of ‘garden;’ thus the name Nigār is pronounced as if written Nigyar. When g follows a vowel it has a tendency to melt away into a y; thus the title written Beg is pronounced Bey.)

gh is pronounced as gh in ‘ghastly’ or ‘ghost.’ (When gh follows a vowel it has a tendency to melt away into a sort of w, much as in our words ‘through’ and ‘throughout;’ thus oghli is pronounced like o-lu.)
h must always be fully pronounced whether it occurs at the beginning, in the middle or at the end of a word.
k (When k is followed by ā, a slight y sound is introduced between them, exactly as in the case of g and ā; thus the word Kātīb is pronounced Kyātīb.)

kh had originally the sound of ch in the Scotch ‘loch’ or the German ‘Nacht;’ but nowadays it is pronounced like a simple h: thus khan, khanim, Sheykhī, tārīkh, are pronounced as though written han, hanim, Sheyhi, tārīb.

ā had formerly a nasal sound, but is now generally pronounced as a simple n.

q is pronounced exactly like k: thus kasīda, Bāqi, ‘Ashiq, are pronounced as if written kasīda, Bākī, ‘Ashik.

s is always sharp as in ‘mouse,’ never flat as in ‘reason.’

sh is the English sh in ‘shall,’ ‘rash,’ and so on.

represents the Arabic letter ‘Āyn;’ in Turkish, when this occurs in the middle of a word, its presence is indicated by a slight hiatus or catch in the breath; when it occurs at the beginning of a word, it is entirely ignored in pronunciation: thus Reffī and ‘Ashiq are pronounced Reffī and Ashik.

indicates that a letter is omitted; when this occurs between two vowels,
it also has the value of a slight hiatus, as in the name Atā-i pronounced Atā-i.

When a letter is doubled in writing it is also doubled in pronouncing; thus the word mukhammes is pronounced mu-ham-mes, each m receiving its value, as in our compound, 'home-made.'

Accentuation is less strongly marked than in English; but as a general rule the last syllable of a word receives a certain stress, and this even if the word contain one of the Arabic or Persian long vowels a, i or u: thus ghazel is pronounced as ghāzel rather than as ghāzal; and the last syllable of qasida takes a slight accent, qa-si-da, notwithstanding the presence of the i in the middle syllable.

In the case of Oriental words that have become naturalised in English, the ordinary spelling has been retained when this adequately represents the pronunciation. Of such words are Islam, Koran, Houri, Sultan, Bey, Cadi, and Dervish, which according to the system would be written Islam, Qur'an, Hūrī, Sūltān, Bey, Qādi (for Qāzi), Dervish. On the other hand Vezir (for Vezir) has been used instead of the barbarous Vizier, Khālīfa instead of Caliph, Muslim instead of Moslem.

In the same way, with regard to geographical names: forms that have become established by usage, such as Aleppo, Cairo, Baghdād, Crimea, have been employed instead of their originals, Haleb, Qāhira, Baghdād, Qirīn; in the case of Greek and other European names modified by the Turks, the original form has been retained when this is the more familiar, thus, Adrianople, Smyrna, Bosnia, for Edirne, Izmır, Bosna; otherwise the Turkish modification has been used, thus, Qonya, Iznik, Izmid, for Iconium, Nicea, Nicomedia.
LIST OF THE OTTOMAN SULTANS.

'Osman I succeeded his father Er-Togrul, son of Suleyman Shah, as chief of his tribe in A.H. 687 (A.D. 1288); he became an independent sovereign on the dissolution of the Seljuq Empire in A.H. 699 (A.D. 1299).

The dates are those of the Sovereign's accession, according to the Muhammadan and Christian eras.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sovereign</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>A.H.</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>'Osman I</td>
<td>son of Er-Togrul</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>1299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Orkhan</td>
<td>son of 'Osman I</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>1326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Murad I</td>
<td>son of Orkhan</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>1359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bâyezid I</td>
<td>son of Murad I</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interregnum (The Princes Suleyman, Ta, Musa, and Mehemed, sons of Bâyezid I, fight for the throne.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sovereign</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>A.H.</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mehmeded I</td>
<td>son of Bâyezid I</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Murad II</td>
<td>son of Mehmeded I</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>1415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mehmeded II</td>
<td>son of Murad II</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bâyezid II</td>
<td>son of Mehmeded II</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>1451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Selim</td>
<td>son of Bâyezid II</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>1481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Suleyman I</td>
<td>son of Selim I</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>1512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Selim II</td>
<td>son of Suleyman I</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>1520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Murad III</td>
<td>son of Selim II</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mehmeded III</td>
<td>son of Murad III</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ahmed I</td>
<td>son of Mehmeded III</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>1595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mustafa I</td>
<td>son of Ahmed I</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>'Osman II</td>
<td>son of Ahmed I</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>1617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mustafa I</td>
<td>(restored)</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>1618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Murad IV</td>
<td>son of Ahmed I</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>1622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td>son of Ahmed I</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>1623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mehmeded IV</td>
<td>son of Ibrahim</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>1648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Suleyman II</td>
<td>son of Ibrahim</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father's Name</td>
<td>A. H.</td>
<td>A. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ahmed II</td>
<td>son of Ibrahim</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>1691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mustafa II</td>
<td>son of Mehemed IV</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ahmed III</td>
<td>son of Mehemed IV</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mahmud I</td>
<td>son of Mustafa II</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Osmun III</td>
<td>son of Mustafa II</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mustafa III</td>
<td>son of Ahmed III</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Abd-ul-Hamid I</td>
<td>son of Ahmed III</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>1773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Selim III</td>
<td>son of Mustafa III</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>1789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mustafa IV</td>
<td>son of Abd-ul-Hamid I</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mahmud II</td>
<td>son of Abd-ul-Hamid I</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Abd-ul-Mejid</td>
<td>son of Mahmud II</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Abd-ul-Aziz</td>
<td>son of Mahmud II</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Murad V</td>
<td>son of Abd-ul-Mejid</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Abd-ul-Hamid II</td>
<td>son of Abd-ul-Mejid</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>For:</th>
<th>Read:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>لا عرف</td>
<td>لا عرف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>it the cause</td>
<td>it is the cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>eck</td>
<td>seek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>carry</td>
<td>carry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mushterk</td>
<td>Mushterek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Subhet</td>
<td>Subhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>حكمت</td>
<td>حكمت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ا</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jelal-ud-Din</td>
<td>Jelal-ud-Din</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>آكلويم</td>
<td>آكلويم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>resent</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Riyari</td>
<td>Riyari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>لا بمر</td>
<td>لا بمر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>شبا</td>
<td>شي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Zahir</td>
<td>Zahir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>calander</td>
<td>calender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Khired-Name</td>
<td>Khired-Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>anything</td>
<td>anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>أنا</td>
<td>أنا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>سوأة</td>
<td>سوأة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>frustrate</td>
<td>frustrate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOOK I

INTRODUCTORY.
CHAPTER I.

THE ORIGIN, CHARACTER AND SCOPE OF OTTOMAN POETRY.

A long road lies before us. We are about to trace the rise and development of poetry among the Ottoman Turks, a people whose literary history began six hundred years ago and is still in progress. We shall first have to try to catch some glimpse of the earliest efforts of this poetry in the far off days of the founders of the Empire; then we shall have to watch it feeling its way, now in this direction, now in that, while the Ottoman power itself is being gradually evolved; next we shall see it spreading its wings in surer flight as prosperity and security bring increase of culture; then we shall trace its brilliant course through the seventeenth century, when of a truth it held the gorgeous East in fee; after which we shall pursue its devious track through the years that follow, look upon its struggles and its failures, till at length we see it in these latest days burst forth once again in strong fresh life, more vigorous, more buoyant, more hopeful than ever it had been in the days of the Suleymans or the Ahmeds.

But before setting out on our journey through the ages, it will be well to equip ourselves for the road by getting some idea as to what have been the aims and tendencies
of Ottoman poetry, what the conditions under which it has been developed, and what the forms of verse in which it has found expression. We shall therefore first of all try to learn something of the general characteristics of this poetry and of the circumstances which have influenced these; after which we shall look at its outward structure.

Ottoman poetry falls into two great divisions which we may call the Old or Asiatic School and the New or European School. The first of these rules unchallenged from the very outset down to the middle of the nineteenth century, when the second makes its appearance and in the course of a very few years wholly supersedes its worn-out rival. This second school differs so widely not merely in the outward form of its verse, but in its whole bent and purpose from all that goes before, that it will be better to leave it to be treated apart later on, and to confine ourselves for the present to the consideration of the Old or Asiatic School.

The Old School of Ottoman poetry covers a period of five and a half centuries; and although during this long time it naturally passed through many stages and underwent many modifications, its unity was never broken; what its form and purpose were in the fourteenth century, that in all essential points they were in the nineteenth.

The five and a half centuries occupied by this School may be conveniently divided into Four Periods. The First of these will cover the century and a half which extends between A. D. 1300, when the Empire was established, and A. D. 1450; during this Period, which might be called the Formative Age, the Western branch of the Turkish language¹ was being

¹ The Turkish language extends through Central and Western Asia from the frontier of China to the shores of the Mediterranean. Those dialects that are spoken between China and Persia are grouped together under the name of East-Turkish, those that prevail between Persia and the Mediterranean under that of West-Turkish.
fitted to become a literary medium. The Second Period, which will embrace the hundred and fifty years between 1450 and 1600, marks the time when, the initial difficulties with the language having been overcome, the poets were able to give their chief attention to the study and reproduction of the methods of the contemporary Persian school, that school at whose head stood the illustrious Jami. The Third Period will cover the seventeenth century; it is marked by the yet further Persianisation of Ottoman poetry, and by the supersession of Jami by Urfi, and later by Sa'ib, as literary model. The Fourth Period, which will embrace the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth, differs from the others in being an age of uncertainty. At first many of the poets follow the Persian Shevket; then there comes a reaction against Persianism¹ and an unsuccessful attempt to give a more Turkish character to poetry; this again is followed by a time in which all guiding principle seems to be lost and poetry to be drifting helplessly back to an effete and colourless Persianism. And it is upon this moribund and hopeless age that the sun of the new culture, the culture of the West, arises, bringing fresh life where lay the shadow of death, and bright with happy promise for the future.

Of course the dates mentioned in connection with those Four Periods must not be considered as hard and fast boundary-lines, a thing so subtle as a literary tendency does not admit of being mapped out with any such definiteness. But looked at broadly, these divisions will be found to correspond to as many distinct movements; and they will, moreover, prove of considerable assistance in a systematic study of the development of this poetry.

¹ By the term 'Persianism' I mean here and elsewhere, not a Persian idiom, but Persian culture as adopted by the Ottomans, and more especially, as applied by them to matters connected with literature.
That great race to which the Ottomans belong, that race which includes not only the Turks both Western and Eastern, but all the so-called Tartars and Turkmans as well as the Mongols, has never produced any religion, philosophy or literature which bears the stamp of its individual genius. This is because the true genius of that race lies in action, not in speculation. The Turks and their kinsfolk are before all things soldiers. The societies which they formed in early times, before the introduction of Islam into Central Asia, were almost exclusively for military purposes. When the expedition was at an end, the several clans, families or individuals who had banded together for a common purpose most often dispersed, very soon to become members of some new and equally impermanent combination. Had there been nothing else, the unceasing restlessness of this mode of life would have been enough to prevent these people from elaborating any profound theory of the universe or developing anything in the way of literature beyond a mere folk-poetry.

The distinguishing qualities of the Turkish race have ever been the essentially military virtues of courage and loyalty. Of their courage it is needless to speak; all the world knows how from the beginning down to the present hour courage has been the birthright of every true Turk. Their loyalty has been no less persistent, and has manifested itself in many directions. It forms the basis of what is perhaps the most striking characteristic of Ottoman literature. It is well exemplified in the relation of the race to Islam. The Turks are not naturally a people of strong religious feeling. While left to themselves, they had no definite religion; in ancient times, before foreign missionaries came among them, such religious notions as they had were confined to a vague nature-worship. By and by some among them became, under outside influence, Buddhists or Christians; afterwards the great majority of the
race accepted Islam, not because that religion was peculiarly in harmony with their native genius, but as a result of the circumstances in which they found themselves. Yet from that day to this the Turks have with unflinching courage and unflattering loyalty defended the religion to which they thus tendered their allegiance. They have not argued much about it, neither have they sought to force it upon other nations; but whenever it has been attacked they have been the foremost of its defenders. In like manner have the Turks carried the military spirit of their race into all the relationships they have formed: as faithful soldiers, when they receive an order, do not discuss but obey it, so this people, when they accept a system, do not criticise but stand by it. This unquestioning loyalty to principles once accepted lies at the root of the Turkish character. We shall see how it has acted upon their literature.

Though unable to originate any literature which should give expression to the true genius of their race, the Turkish peoples were very far from despising, or even undervaluing, culture. Consequently, when they were brought into close connection with the Persians, although they despised the latter as men, looking upon them as braggarts and cowards, they at once recognised their superiority in learning and culture. And so the Turks forthwith appropriated the entire Persian literary system down to its minutest detail, and that in the same unquestioning and whole-hearted fashion in which they had already accepted Islam. Here again they did not pause to consider whether this Persian culture were really in harmony with their own genius, they did not even attempt to modify it to suit that genius; on the contrary, they sought to adapt the latter to it, and to force themselves to think upon Persian lines and to look upon things through Persian eyes. Their loyalty to the system thus accepted explains the
secret of the long duration of the Old School of Ottoman poetry; and indeed this fidelity of five and a half centuries to a single tradition is the most truly Turkish characteristic which that poetry has to show.

From the very beginning then of their literature the Ottomans made it their practice to select and incorporate into their language such Persian and Persianised Arabic words and terms as were felt to be necessary to fill up the deficiencies in their native Tartar dialect. These new-comers, while each retained its original form unchanged, were all, so to speak naturalised, being subjected in every point to the rules of Turkish speech; they were woven into the Turanian groundwork of the language, and thus the Persian was Turkicised, not the Turkish Persianised. As time went on more and more of such additions were made; Persian ideas and canons of taste were adopted and incorporated; so that the language of the Second and later Periods comes to have the effect of an elaborate mosaic.

It is not too much to say that during the whole of the five and a half centuries covered by the Old School, though more especially during the Third Period, every Persian and every Arabic word was a possible Ottoman word. In thus borrowing material from the two classical languages a writer was quite unrestricted save by his own taste and the limit of his knowledge; all that was required was that in case of need he should give to the foreign words a Turkish grammatical form. Since the rise of the New School this license has been greatly curtailed. While the tendency has grown to drop such of these words as have failed to naturalise themselves, it has become the practice to confine this borrowing to really necessary terms — chiefly scientific or technical expressions — which are often introduced under forms or in combinations unknown in the original language, precisely
as we employ Greek or Latin terms for similar purposes.

But the principle has not changed; what was formerly done with Persian and Arabic is being repeated, though with far more discretion, in these days with French. Western words and Western idioms, necessary to give expression to new ideas born of a new civilisation, are driving the old Asian phraseology from its time-honoured throne and becoming part and parcel of the living language of to-day. So far as the mere language is concerned, the effect obtained by reading successively three poems, one of the Second Period, one of the Fourth, and one of the present day, might be compared to that produced by the shifting combinations seen in a kaleidoscope, a succession of brilliant devices, alike in general character, but differing in detail, with each individual member standing out distinct and clear.

This system of assimilation was of course not restricted merely to words and phrases; it extended to everything connected with letters. We shall find that the tone and spirit of Ottoman poetry have been profoundly affected by those foreign literatures which have been accepted as models; while it is still more indebted to them for its imagery, subjects and verse-forms. In the case of the Old School the literature thus accepted was, as we know, that of Persia, and before proceeding to examine Turkish poetry itself, let us see whether we can discover what were the circumstances which created Persia the literary instructor of the Ottoman people 1.

A mere tribe of rude and unlettered nomads was the little Turkish clan which in the thirteenth century of our era, flying

---

1 Some authorities would have it that Ottoman literature is modelled rather on Arabic than on Persian. But such is not the case, except perhaps in theological and legal writings; in belles lettres, and especially in poetry, Persian alone is followed. No Ottoman poet ever modelled his style on that of an Arab poet; whereas every Ottoman poet sought to reproduce something of the manner of one or other of the Persian masters.
before the terrible armies of Jengiz Khan, left its home in Central Asia and followed Suleymian Shah into Anatolia. On their arrival in that land these new-comers, who by and by were to form the nucleus of the Ottoman power, found established there another Turkish people, the Seljuqs, who had by this time attained a very considerable degree of culture, thanks entirely to Persian tutorage. For these Seljuqs had been originally, like the forefathers of the Ottomans, a barbarous Tartar clan. About the middle of the eleventh century they had overrun Persia, when, as has so often happened, the barbarian conquerors adopted the culture of their civilized subjects. Rapidly the Seljuq Turks pushed their conquests westward, ever carrying with them Persian culture, till towards the end of the eleventh century they founded the famous Seljuq Turkish Empire of Rum or Asia Minor, with Qonya, the ancient Iconium, as its capital. So when some hundred and fifty years later, Suleymian's son Er-Toghrul and his clansmen penetrated into Asia Minor they found that although Seljuq Turkish was the everyday speech of the people, Persian was the language of the court, while Persian literature and Persian culture reigned supreme.

Er-Toghrul at once acknowledged himself the vassal of the Seljuq Sultan, a step in which he was followed by his son Osman who is reckoned the first monarch of the Empire which takes from him its name of Osmanli or Ottoman. The feeble Seljuq court, perceiving the courage and hardihood of Osman and his sturdy followers, entrusted to them as a feudal domain a district in the north-west of the Empire, bordering on the Byzantine territory. Hardly were Osman and his clansmen settled in their new home before the Seljuq Empire fell to pieces, shattered by the irresistible onslaught of the Mongol hosts. The western portion of the Empire then split up into ten petty kingdoms, each under an
independent Turkish chieftain, by whose name it continued to be known so long as it enjoyed a separate existence. These little kingdoms, which together formed what has been called the West-Turkish Decarchy, were gradually merged in that of Orkhan and his successors, whereupon the inhabitants, Turks themselves like the Ottomans, readily amalgamated with these latter, whence it comes that by far the greater portion of the people known to the world as Ottoman Turks have, almost from the outset, been in reality Seljuqs who have adopted the Ottoman name.

It is to the Seljuqs with whom they were thus fused that the Ottomans, strictly so called, owe their literary education; this therefore was of necessity Persian as the Seljuqs knew no other. Moreover, as from the very beginning of the Empire the name of Ottoman was, as we have just seen, extended to all men of Turkish race as they passed under the sceptre of the 'Osmanli Sultan', a great deal of what we call Ottoman poetry is the work of men who were Ottomans in a political sense alone. But this makes little practical difference, as these writers were all alike, whether originally Ottomans or not, Turks who had been educated on exclusively Persian lines.

What the Ottoman did when he succeeded to the heritage of the Seljuq was to create Turkish literature. Up till then there had been no Turkish literature worthy of the name. When a Turk had wished to write he had, with a few rare

1 The name Ottoman is a corruption of the Turkish Osmâni, which properly means a follower of Osman, and would be exactly rendered by the term 'Osmanite'. It was originally applied to those Turks, whether his own clansmen or other, who were subject to Osman the first Sultan. But as the Empire of his successors increased, the name was extended to embrace all Turks included within it. Thus it frequently happened in those early times that men who were not 'Ottomans' one year, found themselves such the following. Nowadays the name is still further extended to include all the subjects of the Sultan whether Turkish or non-Turkish.
and, from a literary point of view, unimportant exceptions, made use of the Persian language. Henceforth, decreed the Ottoman, let the Turk who would address the world speak in his own tongue. But how to evoke a literary language from that chaos of rude tribal and local dialects? The first thing needful was surely some guide to show how thought should be expressed, some standard by which to determine the kind of phraseology to be used. As to this guide and standard there could be no hesitation, for there was no choice. The Turks knew but one literature, that of Persia on which they had been reared. And thus this brilliant literature became, not by selection, but by force of circumstances, the model after which the Turks should fashion that they were about to found.

This acceptance of Persian guidance was immensely facilitated by the fact that the native Turkish verse — as it found expression in the folk-songs and popular ballads — had already much in common with the Persian system. Metres and verse-forms, somewhat vague and rough-hewn: it is true, but very similar in lilt and shape to certain Persian varieties, were in existence among the Turks as products of genuine home-growth. Consequently when the question arose of elaborating a vehicle for literary poetry, it was not altogether met by a mere wholesale borrowing from outside, but to a certain extent by the working up of already existing materials to more perfect conformity with the accepted standard. In this way a good many points in the technique of Turkish verse, though now identical with their counterparts in the Persian system, are in their origin not, as superficially appears, loans from that system, but genuine native elements that have been artificially brought into complete conformity with it. This, however, is a matter of historical interest only, as every distinctively Turkish characteristic has been carefully
pruned away, and the conformity brought about is so perfect that for all that appears on the surface, these elements might, like the rest, have been taken over directly from the Persians.

As we have already seen, the Turks were not content with learning from the Persians how to express thought; they went to them to learn what to think and in what way to think. In practical matters, in the affairs of everyday life and in the business of government, they preferred their own ideas; but in the spheres of science, philosophy and literature they acknowledged only too freely their deficiency; and there they went to school with the Persian, intent not merely on acquiring his methods, but on entering into his spirit, thinking his thoughts and feeling his feelings. And in this school they continued so long as there was a master to teach them; for the step thus taken at the outset developed into a practice, it became the rule with the Turkish poets to look ever Persia-ward for guidance and to follow whatever fashion might prevail there. Thus it comes about that for centuries Ottoman poetry continued to reflect as in a glass the several phases through which that of Persia passed. So much for Turkish loyalty.

It behoves us therefore at this point to learn something of the character of this Persian poetry which has so profoundly affected that we are about to study. In so doing we shall of course pass over those sides of this poetry, such as the epic, which have had no influence in moulding Turkish verse, and confine ourselves to these that have inspired and directed the Ottoman poets. And the matters at which we are now about to look have the greater claim on our attention in that they were so thoroughly assimilated by the Turkish poets that although originally Persian, they are every whit as characteristic of the poetry of the Ottomans as of that from which they were borrowed.
Long before the time that the Ottoman determined to create a Turkish literature the Persian genius had recovered from the eclipse brought about by the Arab conquest, and the Persian poetic system was fully developed and securely established. The first period of Persian poetry, that robust and more virile period which had produced the great national epic, was past and gone, and for a century and a half poetry had been in the hands of mystics who deliberately turned away from the things of earth and sang in the language of love, borrowed from their predecessors, of the passionate yearning of the soul for God. And so by this time the Persian mystic-philosophic system was, like the Persian poetic system, completely elaborated and organised. The Turks thus found these two systems — the poetic and the mystic-philosophic — both fully evolved, and they accepted both in their entirety. They found moreover that the two systems were in close alliance; the poet was most often a mystic, and the mystic most often a poet. This too they accepted as part of the order of nature; and for ages afterwards the phraseology of the mystics continued to form no small portion of the Ottoman poet's stock in trade.

It would be interesting to enquire into the origin and development of these two systems, of which the one is as the body and the other as the soul of old Ottoman poetry. But the study would take us too far afield; so we must be content to follow the example of the Turks themselves and accept the two as ready made, restricting our attention to what they were when our story opens, and letting pass the question how they came to be such. The first, the poetic system, we shall consider in detail in another chapter; but of the second, the mystic-philosophic system, we may here say a few words that will be helpful to us when studying the writings of the Ottoman poets.
This mystic-philosophic system, which the Persians and Turks call 'Ilm-i Tasavvuf, a term usually rendered as 'Sufism,' has been well described as an idealistic pantheism. It has two sides; the one philosophic, the other mystic. These are closely interwoven, in reality they are but two aspects of a single whole; but like those iridescent shells which show one or another tint according to the light in which they are viewed, Sufism presents its one or other aspect according to the standpoint from which it is regarded. The poets, unless they are avowed teachers of the system, regard it almost wholly from the mystic side, and leave the philosophic comparatively unnoticed. We may therefore pass by the latter till we come to consider the various philosophies current among the Turks, and for the present confine our attention to the former, which is the real source of inspiration of well nigh all Persian and Ottoman poetry.

Of the many who have sought to present the transcendental aspect of the Sufi system none has been more successful than the great Persian poet Jāmi. In a magnificent canto in the Introduction to his beautiful poem on the story of Joseph and Zelikhā he tells how and why the universe arose; and the account he gives, which may be taken as the Eastern poets' Confession of Faith, is in substance as follows.

God, whom Sūfis and poets generally speak of as 'The Truth,' is at once Absolute Being, the only Real Existence

---

1 The whole canto has been admirably translated by Mr. E. G. Browne in his excellent article on Sufism which appears in the volume entitled 'Religious Systems of the World' (Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., 1892). This translation is reprinted in the same scholar's 'Year amongst the Persians' (Black, 1893), a work which cannot be too highly recommended: the student will learn more concerning the real life and thought of modern Persia from this one book than from all the other records of travel that have yet been published.
that ever has been or ever can be, therefore necessarily comprising within Himself all apparent existences whatsoever; and Absolute Good, therefore necessarily Absolute Beauty, Beauty being one side or aspect of Good. Such is the Divine Nature; and having learned this, we may perceive how the phenomenal universe came into existence; for this, unlike the Absolute, is temporal, not eternal.

Ere yet time was, God dwelt alone in unrevealed loveliness and glory; alone in solitary radiance shone Absolute Beauty; no eye was there to gaze enraptured on Its unspeakable fairness, no heart to thrill in ecstasy at Its allperfect harmony. None was there to see It, none to love It:

'To Its own self It sang of loveliness,
'With Its own self It cast the die of love.

Now, as we all know, a marked characteristic of Beauty, whatever be the form it may assume, is an innate desire of self-manifestation. Thus a beautiful face is impatient of concealment and ever desires to be seen; similarly, when a beautiful thought or conception occurs to the mind, it is not content to be buried away out of sight, but seeks expression through language or through art, as the case may be. This is so because the desire of self-expression is an essential attribute of the Absolute Beauty whereof these phenomenal forms are so many partial manifestations. The phenomenal universe then results from this desire of self-manifestation on the part of Absolute Beauty. This is very clearly expressed in a famous Hadis or ‘Apostolic Tradition,’ continually on the lips of the poets, in which God, in answer to a question of David as to why He had created man, replies, ‘I was a Hidden Treasure, therefore

نواي دنیری با خویش میساخت * دم عاشقی با خویش میباخت 1
was I fain to be known, and so I created creation in order that I should be known.¹

But how was this manifestation thus demanded by the Divine Nature to be brought about? It is an axiom that things can be known only through their opposites or negations.² Thus it would be impossible for us to form the conception of light, were we ignorant of its opposite or negation, not-light, that is, darkness. Now the opposite or negation of Absolute Being, which is one and the same with Absolute Beauty and Absolute Good, is necessarily Not-Being, Not-Beauty, Not-Good. But such can have no real existence, for all real existence is of necessity comprised in Absolute Being, of which this is the negation. Not-Being is then only a

A Hadis is a traditional saying of the Prophet Mohammed handed down from one or more of his Companions. There is a great number of such, and the well-authenticated among them rank in authority second to the Koran. When, as in the above, the true speaker is God, and the Prophet is but the voice, the Tradition is called a Hadis-i Qudsi or ‘Divine Tradition;’ when on the other hand the Prophet is at once speaker and voice, it is a Hadis-i Sherif or ‘Blessed Tradition.’²

² This forms a text for Jaldal-ul-Din in the fifth story of the first book of the Mesnevi, where he says:

‘The Truth hath created pain and sorrow for this reason That through these opposites joyousness may become known. Thus hidden things become manifest through their opposites. Since The Truth hath no opposite He remaineth concealed. Thus by the opposite of light hast thou known light. Opposite showeth opposite in all things.’

A very good idea of the nature and scope of the Mesnevi can be obtained from Mr. E. H. Whinfield’s abridged translation, ‘Masnavi i Ma’navi. The Spiritual Couplets of Maulana Jalalu’d-Din i Rumi,’ Trubner & Co., 1887.
phantasm evoked for a season and for a special purpose. Again, in that it is the antithesis of the Divine Nature, Not-Being is also Not-Good, or, as we should say, is Evil. Here then we have the Eastern mystic’s explanation of the Mystery of Evil comprised in his explanation of the Mystery of Creation. As Absolute Being could be known only through Its negation Not-Being, so Absolute Good could be known only through Its negation Not-Good; and as Absolute Being and Absolute Good are one, so also are Not-Being and Not-Good. Evil has therefore no real existence; there is no Absolute Evil as there is Absolute Good; by its very nature Evil is temporary and limited, it is but an illusion which the conditions of manifestation have rendered necessary for a while.

The process of manifestation was accomplished thus. When Not-Being became opposed to Being there appeared on the former, as in a mirror, a reflection or shadow of the latter.1 This reflection, which partakes of the nature of both Being and Not-Being, is called Contingent Being, and is none else than the phenomenal universe in which during this life we find ourselves and of which we form part. The phenomenal universe has thus no real objective existence; it is but the reflection of Absolute Being cast on the mirror Not-Being. This has been well illustrated by the reflection cast by the

1 In Mahmūd-i Shbisteri’s Gulshen-i Rāz, or ‘Mystic Rose-bower,’ one of the text-books of Sufism, we read:

\[
\text{علم آبعینه عستی عستی مطلقة} \quad \text{کرو پیداست عكس تدبیش حف}
\]
\[
\text{علم منح کشته عستیا مقابل} \quad \text{درو ععسی شد اندر حل حاصل}
\]

1Not-Being is the mirror, Being is the Absolute
2Wherefrom is manifested the reflection of the effulgence of The Truth.
3When Not-Being became opposed to (was set opposite) Being
4A reflection was straightway produced thereon.

See Mr. Whinfield’s scholarly edition and translation of the Gulshen-i Rāz (Trübner, 1880).
sun on a pool. The reflection owes such existence as it has entirely to the sun: the moment the sun withdraws itself the reflection ceases to exist, and while the reflection is thus wholly dependent on the sun, the sun is absolutely independent of it, can indeed renew it an infinity of times without sustaining the slightest loss thereby. The pool is thus the mirror of the sun, as Not-Being is the mirror of Being, and the reflection cast on the water typifies the phenomenal universe. As the universe is thus the image of Absolute Being, that is of God, reflected in the mirror Not-Being, so, they continue, is man the eye in that image, and as when we look in a mirror, we perceive a small image of ourselves reflected in the pupil, so is the image of God reflected in this eye which is man. Thus is God revealed unto Himself and unto man, and thus moreover does man contain in himself the image of God.

Man, like the phenomenal universe in which he finds himself, and of which he presents an epitome, is double-natured, partaking at once of Being and Not-Being, of Good and Evil, of Reality and Unreality. But as that side of him which derives from Being, and which therefore alone has a real and eternal existence, is necessarily an emanation of Divinity, he is, so far, ultimately and essentially one with

---

1 See Mr. Browne's article on Sufism, p. 330.
2 In the Gulshan-i Râz we read:

```
علمی چیز علیه عکس و گیاهی چیز علیه عکس دویای شکست پنیان
Not-Being is the mirror, the universe is the reflection, and man

'*Thou art the eye in the reflection, and He (God) is the Light of the eye;*

'With the (human) eye, the eye (i.e. man) eyeth that Eye (i.e. God who seeth all things).'
```
God. This Divine particle in man, this spark of Pure Being, is ever seeking, consciously or unconsciously, to be reunited to its source; but so long as the phenomenal state lasts, the presence of the element of Not-Being holds it back. Man's business then is to eliminate, so far as may be, this element of Not-Being, and to attain to that union with God, that absorption into the Divine, which, though to be fully achieved only after the death of the body, is possible in a certain measure even in this present life.

But how is one to overcome the element of Not-Being? By conquering self; for self, which seems so real, is in truth the supreme illusion as it the cause of all our woe. For what are we to talk of self? We have no self; whatever we have of Real Being is God's, not ours; the rest is mere nothingness, the negation of Being, the negation of Good, to hug which can bring only sorrow.

And how is self to be conquered? By Love. By Love, and by Love alone, can the dark shadow of Not-Being be done away; by Love, and by Love alone, can the soul of man win back to its Divine source and find its ultimate goal in reunion with The Truth. And the first lessons of this Love, which is the keynote of Sufiism and of all the literature it has inspired, may be, nay, must be learned through a merely human passion. Than true love 'there is no subtler master under heaven.' In the poem already quoted, Jami tells of a would-be disciple who came craving instruction from a master of the mystic lore, when the master, having ascertained that this youth had never loved, bade him go back into the world, learn what to love means, and then return.

But this human love, good and helpful though it is, is not itself the end, it is but the means to the end; it is the 'Bridge' across which the pilgrim of The Truth must pass.
It is called the 'Typal' Love in contradistinction to the 'Real,' which is the Divine Love; and no watchword of the mystics is more often quoted by the poets than this pregnant phrase 'the Typal is the Bridge to the Real.'

But fair as the Bridge may be, the pilgrim must beware of lingering thereon, lest haply he should fail to reach his journey's end. Once across, his eyes are opened, his heart is made clairvoyant through Divine Love; wherever he turn his gaze he sees the Face of God; God shines down on him from every star in the sky, God looks up at him from every flower in the field, God smiles on him in every fair face, God speaks to him in every sweet sound: all around him there is God, nothing but God. If he turn his eyes inward and look into his own heart, there he can read letter by letter the very heart of God. For he has now become one with God, knowing and feeling that there is naught beside God; and he can cry out with Mansiir 'I am The Truth!' and exclaim with Bayezid of Bistam 'There is none other than God within my cloak!'

On such lines proceeds the mystic philosophy which the Turks learned from the Persians, and of which the echo, if not the living voice, rings for centuries in their poetry. In the language of the mystic poets God is 'the Beloved,' man

---

1 The Arabic runs: د. جسولا ننارة لالحقیقة For 'typal' we might equally read 'allegoric,' 'the Allegoric is the Bridge to the True.'

2 Huseyn Mansuri Hallaj, that is, Huseyn Mansur the Wool-Carer, is, so to speak, the patron saint of the Sufis, and his name is of frequent occurrence in the pages of the poets, who always mention him in terms of love and veneration. In A. H. 310 (A. D. 923) he was put to a cruel death by the doctors of Baghdad on a charge of blasphemy for having exclaimed while in a state of mystic ecstasy: "I am The Truth!" i.e. "I am God!"

When the poets mention Mansur it is usually in association with this famous phrase.

3 Bayezid of Bistam was a very famous saint of early times; he is said to have been born in A. H. 160 (A. D. 776-7) and to have lived to be nearly a hundred years of age.
'the lover.' Under the figure of the lover’s anguish at separation from his loved one they show forth the yearning of the soul of man for the Divine Soul whence it came; by the symbol of the cruel self-sufficiency of the beloved, frenzying the distracted lovers by half-revealed glimpses of a beauty no words may tell, they picture those momentary flashes which from time to time light up the soul, bringing it for an instant face to face with Reality, and vanishing ere their presence is realised. The poets see the presence of God immanent in all beautiful things, but manifested most clearly and most fully in fair humanity. Therefore is it good to love and to admire such, for through this is revealed most perfectly the Beauty of the Godhead. And even as it is God who is mirrored in the fair face, it is God, the poet feels, who looks through the lover’s eyes; God beholds and loves God, and the supreme miracle of Divine self-manifestation is accomplished.

Bound up with this mystic side of Sufism is the famous allegory of the ‘Primal Compact.’ In a somewhat obscure passage of the Koran, God is represented as having, before the creation of the world, summoned into His presence the as yet unembodied souls of all who were to dwell on earth, and as having put to each one individually the question: E-lestu bi-rabbikum? ‘Am not I your Lord?’ to which each soul replied: Belâ! ‘Yea!’ 1 The poets are fond of imagining that it is the echo of this never quite forgotten oath of fealty, sworn before time was, which, ringing through the soul, impels it to that quest of The Truth where alone it is in harmony with its true being; and when they would tell of it in ecstatic trance, rapt and beside itself at some

---

1 The actual words of the Koran (vii, 171) are: And when thy Lord took from the children of Adam out of their loins their seed, and made them bear witness against themselves, ‘Am not I your Lord?’ They said, ‘Yea, we do bear witness.’
glimpse of the Divine Beauty, they picture it as 'drunken' with the 'Wine of E-lest' quaffed in eternity at the 'Primal Feast.'

The early Sufi poets had taken the current phraseology of the contemporary singers of love and wine, and by imparting a mystic signification to the terms thus adopted, they had constructed a species of symbolic language in which, for example, 'wine' represents the mystic love, 'the vintner' the teacher thereof, 'the tavern' the place where it is taught, just as the 'Beloved' stands for God, and the 'lover' for man. According to certain commentators this vocabulary was carried to an extreme point of elaboration, every object mentioned by the poet being typal of some philosophic or mystic conception; thus the 'cheek' of the Beloved represents the cosmos, the 'tresses' the mystery of the Godhead, and so on. Commentaries have been written on Hafiz in which the whole of that poet's works are interpreted in this 'spiritual' fashion; but it is extremely doubtful whether he or any other poet ever systematically wrote upon such lines. None the less the shadow of this symbolism never entirely passes away; it lingers as a vague reminiscence all through Turkish poetry.

According as mysticism or materialism is predominant in the poet's temperament, will the symbolic or the literal predominate in his work. As a rule both elements are present, subtly and inextricably blended, now the one and now the other advancing into the foreground and sinking into the rear. This poetry thus floats between the sensuous and the supersensuous; Love and Beauty are presented in their fairest and most seductive garb, but so deft is the presentation that the reader finds himself free to interpret as he pleases; and so, as has been said, the same poem which delights the libertine will raise the saint to ecstasy.
There are again many poets who are primarily artists in words; these take such things for what they are worth as decorative adjuncts, and work them into their verses to produce some desired aesthetic effect. For it must be borne in mind that while many among the Turkish poets were truly Sufis, and some even devoted their whole strength to the exposition and elucidation of their doctrine, others, and they are perhaps the majority, merely play with Sufi ideas and Sufi phrases. When the Turks took over the Persian poetic system they found these ideas and phrases ready to hand, and these became, along with many other things similarly acquired, so many 'studio properties' for the poet, to be introduced into his works as occasion might suggest.

At first sight it may appear strange that doctrines such as we have been considering should flourish side by side with the absolute monotheism of Islam. As a matter of fact, however, Islam is much less rigid than is generally supposed, and there are many passages in both the Koran and the Hadis which readily lend themselves to a mystic interpretation,¹ and with these the Sufis, who have almost invariably made profession of Islam, have strongly fortified their position. But to properly understand this point, as well as many another seeming puzzle that will come under our observation, it is necessary to know, something of the true nature of the Persian genius. As has been well said by a thoughtful writer² who has seen deep into the Asian mind, we must ever keep before us the fact that while the European seeks almost unconsciously to impart a homogeneity to his conceptions by rejecting whatever is incompatible with the beliefs he holds or embraces, the Eastern, for whom

¹ Mr. Browne quotes several in the article already mentioned.
² The Conte de Gobineau in 'Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale,' Paris 1865.
exactitude has no such charm, is more concerned to preserve from loss or oblivion every minutest idea which the mind of man has conceived. The exactitude so dear to the European is distressful to the Asiatic in that it tends to circumscribe the flight of his imagination. He does not seek to make diverse theories and conceptions square with one another, nor does he perceive what would be the utility of such an operation; these diverse theories and ideas are for him so many different windows opening upon different aspects of the infinite; but he will brook no limitations in his dealings with the limitless. From the earliest ages Western Asia has been a hotbed of all manner of religious theories, not one of which has ever been wholly forgotten. More or less modified or disguised, these appear and reappear again and again; and during the course of the centuries they have given birth to numberless religious and philosophic systems all of which live on in one form or another. So in the mind of the Eastern thinker, intent to learn and retain all he can concerning spiritual things, there generally exist side by side fragments of many such systems often contrary one to the other as well as incompatible with some among the tenets of his avowed religion.

Though natural to the Persian, such an intellectual state as this is really quite foreign to the Turk who, as we have seen, is properly a man of action, not a speculator or dreamer. None the less the condition of mind just described is that which is most frequently mirrored in Ottoman poetry, and this simply because the Turkish poets here as elsewhere deliberately set to work to assimilate their thought to that of the Persians.

The dervish orders, which are very numerous in Turkey and Persia, and which bear a certain resemblance to the monastic orders of medieval Europe, are all more or less
connected with Súfíism. Each order traces its origin to some eminent Súfi sage or saint, whose name it usually bears; but although the members have always called themselves Súfís, in many cases they have paid but scant attention to their patron’s teaching.

This last circumstance gave an additional impetus to a curious practice of the Persian and Turkish poets, namely, that of bitterly denouncing ‘the Súfi’ while themselves Súfís of the purest water. This seemingly paradoxical attitude of the poets arose in the first instance from the fact that the learning and piety of the early Súfís having gained for them a great reputation and attracted to them numerous disciples, there sprang up on every hand unscrupulous adventurers who gave themselves out as Súfís, and collected around them bands of dissolute and hypocritical fanatics. These the illiterate multitude taking at their own value, called by their unjustly usurped title of Súfi; and when the poets rail against ‘the Súfi,’ it is pretenders of this class, the ‘Súfís’ of the ignorant masses, that they have in view. ¹

Turning now to the external aspect of this poetry, we find that although at the outset Turkish verse was simple even to baldness, no sooner is the influence of Persia securely established than we are in the midst of a wilderness of ornament. Persian rhetoric is the counterpart of Persian art; and that, as everyone knows, is essentially decorative. Its merits, and they are great, lie exclusively in the beauty of its detail; the principle of the subordination of the parts

¹ In order to avoid confusion I shall in this work employ the term ‘Súfi’ exclusively in its true sense of ‘mystic,’ although it is more often used by the Turkish poets in its second and degraded sense, in which case it is commonly pronounced Sofu. The poets, when speaking of the true mystics, sometimes wished to avoid the now dubious title of Súfi; they then generally employed some such term as ‘Lovers’ (‘Ushsháq), ‘Followers of Súfíism’ (Ehl-i Tasavvuf), ‘Followers of the Esoteric’ (Ehl-i Bāthin), or ‘Sheykhs’ (Meshá’ikh).
to the whole is unknown. In like manner is Persian poetry enveloped in a mass of incongruous and unconnected ornament. Metaphors and similes, homonyms and anagrams, and a host of other rhetorical embellishments, for many of which we have no names in English, crowd on one another's heels, and seem to jostle each other in their eagerness to amaze the reader. Individually these figures may be, and very often are, both graceful and ingenious, but they are thrown together without so much as a thought being given to their effect as a whole. The result is certainly brilliant, sometimes dazzling, but the dignity which comes of restraint and orderly procession is not there.

In this again Persian poetry faithfully mirrors the Oriental genius. As we have just learned, the Eastern is far more alive to the details of a subject than he is to the subject taken as a whole. This mental attitude is maintained in the presence of all phenomena, psychical and material alike; the true Oriental is ever in the position of the man who cannot see the wood on account of the trees. We have seen one result of this in the medley of fragments of heterogeneous systems that makes up his philosophy, we have here another in the chaos of promiscuous ornament that forms the decorative element in his poetry. Be it said in passing that through this mental habit, whereby so many aspects of a subject are simultaneously perceived, there arises a certain vacillation of judgment which in practical affairs has led to many disasters; for it is through this, as the author already quoted has pointed out, that the Easterns, both as individuals and as nations, have, for all their courage and intelligence, been so often the victims of Europeans in many respects inferior to themselves, but possessed of a decision and resolution to which they are strangers.

1 Conte de Gobineau.
A poetry which wants, as does the Persian, in every kind of ambiguity of expression and far-fetched conceit must inevitably be extremely artificial; and artificiality is in fact one of the most prominent characteristics of this poetry. But this by no means necessarily implies lack of sincerity; for there have been in many literatures periods when it was natural to seek out subtleties of fancy and curiosities of language.  

The poetry of Persia is moreover intensely subjective, especially in those two branches, the lyric and the romantic, which have been most largely reproduced in Turkish. The poet rarely deals with external objects exclusively on their own merits. When he sings, as he constantly does, of wine and beauties, of roses and nightingales, it is not to tell of these as they are in themselves. What seems to strike him first and with greatest force is, not the effect which these produce upon his senses, but the suggestions they evoke in his mind. This is perhaps only what we should expect in the lyric poetry, but in the romantic we might have looked for a more objective treatment. To a limited extent we find such, more especially in early times; but the story — there are some dozen or so stories told and retold by poet after poet — is the least important part of a Persian romantic poem; it is but the excuse which the writer makes for the exposition of his doctrine, or may be merely for the display of his literary skill; and more often than not it is finally explained away altogether as an allegory.

Similarly, this poetry is highly conventional. It is replete with what are called stock epithets; the 'moon-face,' the 'cypress-form,' the 'ruby-lip,' occur with wearisome reiteration right through from the very beginning. In the same way,

1 For example, the poetry of the Troubadours, and that of the so-called 'metaphysical' poets in England.
what we may term stock associations abound; when the ‘nightingale’ is mentioned we may be sure the ‘rose’ is not far away, and if we read of the ‘moth’ in one line we may feel safe about meeting the ‘taper’ in the next. But for all this, Persian poetry shows, within certain limits, extraordinary fertility of imagination, and not unfrequently an almost supergracefulness both of thought and expression.

Such then is the nature of the poetry which Persia offered to the Turks, and which they, knowing of no other, accepted in its entirety, although it was in many respects out of harmony with the genius of their race. So the first Ottoman poets — and their successors through many a generation — strove with all their strength to write what is little else than Persian poetry in Turkish words. But such was not consciously their aim; of national feeling in poetry they dreamed not; poetry was to them one and indivisible, the language in which it was written merely an unimportant accident.

I have said that the spirit of Persian poetry is in many ways foreign to the Turkish genius; in some the two are directly opposed. The Turkish nature is simple, the Persian subtle. The objectivity of the Turkish popular songs is not less extreme than the subjectivity of Persian literary verse. Although from time to time it would strive to utter a feeble cry, for nearly four hundred years the Turkish spirit remained practically dumb in Turkish poetry, paralyzed in presence of the overmastering genius of Persia. But about the beginning of the eighteenth century the voice of the national spirit begins to be heard more clearly and persistently in the pages of the poets. A more objective note is struck, and the poet finds a manifest pleasure in singing of the things he actually sees and feels, not merely of those he has read about in some Persian book. A blithe and happy tone pervades his lines, and a frank honest delight in life and the joys of life.
The simple, pleasure-loving, happy-go-lucky Turkish spirit is at last allowed, not indeed to speak, but to whisper in Turkish poetry. But Turkish poetry was still far from being that which but for Persian teaching it might have been; there yet marred it many a fleck and many a flaw never wholly washed away till the reformers of our own day swept every vestige of Persian tradition into the limbo of forgotten things.

And so, helpful and beneficial as it in many ways undoubtedly was, guiding their timorous footsteps into the worlds of thought and art, Persian culture was yet upon the whole an ill-starred dower to the Turks. For with all the beauty and nobleness that invest it, Persian poetry seems to possess the Gorgon power of paralyzing the national spirit in the literature of every people that looks up to it. The poetry of Afghan, of Tartar, of Urdu-writing Indian is all, equally with that of the earlier Ottomans, just so much Persian poetry writ in other tongues; in every case the national spirit is silent, the spirit that speaks is that of Persia.

Moreover, just about the time that Ottoman poetry was definitively taking shape, the creative genius of Persia was stricken with a sterility from which it has never since recovered. What Persian poetry was in the fifteenth century, that to all intents and purposes it is to-day. During the intervening period it has indeed passed through several phases, but these have been marked merely by modifications in manner and diction; there has been no radical change from within, no infusion of fresh life from without. What the poets said in the days of Jâmí they have gone on saying, varying from time to time the expressions and the metaphors, but never altering the substance or adding to the themes.

And thus for centuries Turkish poetry was, thanks to Persian precept and example, employed, not in interpreting
the Turkish genius, not in conquering new realms of thought, but in achieving within one narrow circle ever more brilliant and more subtle masterpieces of rhetoric. It is true that from the rugged Tartar dialect with which they started, the Persianising poets evolved a marvellous literary language so brilliant and so harmonious that the study of it is an aesthetic delight. But this beautiful language is so artificial, so far removed from everyday speech, that it has at all times been incomprehensible to ordinary men.

Thus Ottoman literary poetry has always been a closed book to the mass of the people. Without a special education no man could hope to understand it. The poets therefore wrote either for themselves or for the court; of the people they took no heed. To be a poet when Persian culture was at its height must obviously have demanded a more than ordinary education; and so we find that during that long period when poetry was valued in proportion as the learning was recondite and the rhetoric pretentious that adorned it, by far the greater number of its practitioners were members of the 'Ulema. ¹

To point out the defects of such a poetry as this, — its artificiality, its obscurity, its exclusiveness, — is easy; to indicate its merits is less so. And this is because this poetry is before all things an art; and, to be appreciated, the merits of art-work of every kind must be felt rather than described. The old poets are in the first place stylists, and any attempt to explain beauties and subtleties of style to those ignorant

¹ The word 'Ulemá means literally 'learned men.' It is the collective title of the body of doctors of the canon law of Islam, who form the legal counsellors of the state. In old times its members were par excellence the learned class, and naturally many among them played a great part in the history of Ottoman poetry. The organisation of the corps, which was at first simple, gradually became very complicated; but as some idea of it is necessary to a satisfactory understanding of the lives of many of the poets of the Second and later Periods, a sketch of it will be given in another volume.
of the poets' language were manifestly hopeless. With these poets manner comes before matter; what they say interests them comparatively little, the great point is how to say it. A score of themes sufficed them for centuries; these they present again and again, arrayed in ever increasing beauty of language and begemmed with ever subtler ingenuities of fancy, till their work comes to display a harmony of sound, a brilliancy of wit, and a deftness of manipulation capable of affording a keen aesthetic pleasure to those who by taste and education are fitted to receive it.

This was the goal of the Persianising poets, and they reached it.
CHAPTER II.

Tradition, Philosophy and Mysticism.

Among the Turks, as among the other peoples of Islam, intellectual life sprang from two distinct sources, of which the one was Semitic, the other Hellenic. From the first came religion, from the second came philosophy. Both religion and philosophy professed to interpret the universe; and the interpretations which they gave were not always in harmony. The vast majority of the vulgar and unlearned held exclusively by religion and utterly ignored philosophy, of which indeed they knew nothing. So did many among the more educated, who, though not wholly ignorant of philosophy, looked upon it with abhorrence as contrary to the revealed Word. Among the learned, while a few were philosophers and nothing else, though out of prudence they professed conformity to the popular faith, the majority, whatever might be their outward profession, held a creed which was in reality a compromise between the two, with a strong bias in favour of philosophy. This creed, if creed it can be called, was in great part the work of the Sufis or mystics who sought, among other things, to clothe philosophy in the language of religion; it was also to some extent the work of the Mutekellimun or Scholastics who endeavoured by a rational explanation of dogma to support
religion in the struggle with philosophy. But these last do not concern us here, as almost all the Ottoman poets were either Sufis or men who wrote in the language of the Sufis. As these poets, whether really Sufis or not, were perfectly acquainted with and made frequent allusion to, not merely the opinions and conceptions of their own sect, but those of the orthodox and the philosophers, it will be necessary for us to learn something concerning the tenets of all three parties.

The views of the religious are in all essentials those contained in the Jewish scriptures, and are consequently quite familiar to us; the only point that calls for special attention is their elaborate cosmogony which was borrowed almost wholly from Rabbinical traditions.

When God determined to manifest Himself through the creation of the world the first thing that He summoned into being was a glorious Radiance derived from His own Light. This is now generally called the ‘Light of Muhammed’ (Núr-i Muhammed)¹ because in after ages it was incarnated in the person of the last and greatest of the Prophets. When this Light burst into existence God looked on it and loved it and uttered this sentence, now one of the watch-words of Islam, ‘But for thee, verily I had not created the heavens!’²

¹ Sometimes the ‘Light of Ahmed’ (Núr-i Ahmed), Ahmed being another form of the name Muhammad.

² لَوْ لَمْ يُكَشَفَ مَا خَلَقْتَ إِلَاءَ الْأَخْلَاقَ. The heavens are not yet in existence, but God speaks as though their creation were an accomplished fact. This seeming discrepancy is thus explained. What we call ‘time’ exists not for God; in His eyes what we call ‘present’, ‘past’ and ‘future’ are one eternal Now. He therefore sees things, in what to us is the future, as already existent, and speaks of them as accomplished facts. Instances of this abound in the Koran, especially in passages describing the Last Day and Final Judgment. The Koran, it must be remembered, professes to be the direct word of God; He is the speaker from beginning to end; the Prophet is nothing more than His ambassador charged with the delivery of His message to mankind.
And it was through this Light, and for its sake, that all things were made. For when God looked in love upon this Light, it "perspired," abashed before the Divine gaze; and from the subtlest essence that arose from its perspiration He created the First Soul, and then in a descending scale the souls of all the various orders of beings.

After a while God looked again upon the Light, and from its perspiration He created the corporeal world. The first thing that arose was the 'Arsh, the 'Throne of God,' according to the usual interpretation; in any case, the first and most glorious of corporeal existences. Beneath the 'Arsh, and of its light, God created another wondrous thing, which is called the Kursi, and may be conceived as the 'Footstool' below the Throne.  

God likewise created under the 'Arsh, and of its light, a great 'Tablet' in colour as a green beryl, and a great 'Pen' in colour as an emerald, and filled with ink which was of white light. God cried to the Pen, "Write, O Pen!" whereupon it moved over the Tablet and wrote thereon everything that should happen till the Last Day, and the Tablet was covered with the writing.  

And thereon was then inscribed the Divine original of the Glorious Koran.

Beneath the Kursi, but somewhat to the right hand, God created a region like white pearl, in which is the 'Lote-tree none may pass.'  

Both the words 'Arsh and Kursi occur in the Koran where both seem to be used in the sense of 'Throne.'

This myth arose from a fanciful explanation of two passages in the Koran, in the first of which (xxviii. 15) God swears 'By the Pen and what they write!' and in the second of which (xxxv. 22) occur the words 'Verily it is a glorious Lection on a Tablet Preserved!'

This tree is alluded to in the Koran (liii. 13, 14.): 'And he saw him another time by the Lote-tree none may pass near which is the Garden of the Abode,' — the reference being to the Prophet's vision of Gabriel on the occasion of his Ascension.
Gabriel, beyond which he may not go. And in this place is the root of the Tūba-tree.

In a straight line below the 'Arsh and Kursi, and of the light of the former, God created the Eight Paradises. These are arranged one within the other, in as many ascending stages, the innermost and highest of all being the 'Garden of Eden' (Jennet-ul-'Adn) which overlooks all the others like a citadel on a lofty eminence in the midst of a walled city.¹ The distance between the ramparts that surround each Paradise is six thousand six hundred and sixty-six degrees, and each degree is a five-hundred years' journey.² The Paradises are generally represented as lovely gardens studded with beautiful palaces, the dwelling-places of the blessed.³ They are watered by many rivers, notably by the Keyser, the Tesnim and the Selsebil, most of which have their source in the Garden of Eden whence they descend into the lower stages. The wonderful tree called the Tūba or 'Beatitude,' the roots of

¹ The names of the Eight Paradises, and the materials of which they are formed, are as follows, beginning with the lowest: (1) 'The Mansion of Glory' (Dār-ul-Jelal), of white pearl; (2) 'The Mansion of Peace' (Dār-ul-Selām), of red ruby; (3) 'The Garden of the Abode' (Jennet-ul-Mewa), of green chrysolite; (4) 'The Garden of Eternity' (Jennet-ul-Khulūd) of yellow coral; (5) 'The Garden of Delight' (Jennet-un-Na'īm), of white silver; (6) 'The Garden of Paradise' (Jennet-ul-Firdaws), of red gold; (7) 'The Garden of Abidance' (Jennet-ul-Qarār), of pure musk; (8) 'The Garden of Eden' (Jennet-ul-'Adn), of lustrous pearl. Some writers, however, arrange the several stages differently.

² We are expressly told that these and similar expressions are not to be taken as actual measurements of distance; they are brought forward simply in order to convey the idea of vastness.

³ It is perhaps scarcely necessary to refute once again the old calumny that Islam denies a soul to woman. No Muhammedan ever propounded or ever could propound any theory which could be so construed; and in face of the fact that the Koran explicitly and repeatedly speaks of men and women as equally heirs of eternity (ix, 69, 73; xiii, 22–23; xxxiii, 35; xxxvi, 56: xliii, 70: xlviii, 5, 6; lxii, 12; lxvi, 10). it is difficult to imagine any other source for the libel than the deliberate malice of certain Christian writers.
which are in the region of the Lote-tree above the highest Paradise, sends its branches down into all the Eight Gardens, a shoot entering the abode of every inhabitant, just as the sun which is aloft in the skies sends its beams into every house on earth. The Garden of Eden is the scene of the Beatific Vision, the Divine Epiphanies, the sight of which will form the highest felicity of the blessed. The native inhabitants of Paradise are the houris, maidens of celestial beauty and possessed of every virtue, who will be the heavenly brides and companions of the blessed, and the 'eternal youths' who will be the attendants on the just. The guardianship of Paradise is entrusted to an angel called Rizwan.

Beneath the Eight Paradises are six seas, below which come the Seven Heavens. These latter are spread one above the other like seven tents or canopies, their edges resting on the seven outer of the eight ranges of Mount Qif which, as we shall see, surround the earth. In the first or lowest Heaven is the so-called 'Frequented House' (Beyt-i Ma'mur). This, which is a great dome of red ruby, was originally in the highest Paradise, the Garden of Eden, from which, on Adam's expulsion and subsequent repentance, it was brought to earth as a solace to him. It was placed where the Ka'ba of Mekka now stands, and Adam was bidden compass it, as the pilgrims still compass the Ka'ba; and the angels who dwell in the Seven Heavens were commanded to descend and perform the rite along with him. It remained on earth till Noah's time, but before the flood it was caught up to the spot in the lowest Heaven immediately above where it used to stand, and there it is daily visited by seventy thousand angels, and there it will rest till the Last Day when it will

1 Pronounced 'hoorees.'
2 This term occurs in the Koran (Ii. 4.) where God swears by the Frequented House; but no description of it is given.
be taken back to its original place in Paradise. Abraham, at God’s command, built the Ka’ba where the Frequented House formerly stood, so that were this to fall from Heaven, it would light upon the Ka’ba. The famous Black Stone, which is in the Ka’ba, and which all the pilgrims kiss, is a relic of the Frequented House; originally it was a red ruby, but at the flood God changed it into a black stone.

Immediately below the lowest Heaven is a sea of water; this lies above the air, and not a drop of it can fall through the air. Through this sea swim the sun, moon and stars, all under angelic guidance. Below this stellar sea, in the midst of the sea of air, half-way between heaven and earth, is another sea of water, whence rain is sent down to earth. An angel descends with every drop of rain, and lays it in its appointed place; these angels do not crowd one another, for they are incorporeal beings made of light.

The earth, which is flat, is surrounded, as by an eight-fold ring, by the eight mountain-chains of Qâf; these alternate with the Seven Seas, the innermost Qâf being within the innermost of the Seas, which bears the name of the ‘Encircling Ocean’ (Bahr-i Muhit). The breadth of each Qâf and of each Sea is a five-hundred years’ journey; and round the outermost Qâf, which is outside of all, is wound a great snake. Only a small part of the earth’s surface is inhabited, the proportion of this to the uninhabited being as the space enclosed by a tent to the desert in which the tent is pitched. It is in these unpeopled lands and in the unknown regions of the Qâfs and the Seven Seas, where dwell the jinn, that the tellers of fairy tales lay many of the scenes of their romances.

The earth we inhabit is the uppermost of seven, which are arranged one below the other like so many stages. At first this series of earths was unstable and tossed about like a ship on the surrounding seas; so God ordered a great
angel to grasp it and steady it on his shoulders. Under this angel God set a mighty rock, and under the rock a huge Bull, and under the Bull a great Fish, and under the Fish an ocean, and under the ocean the seven stages of Hell, and under those a tempestuous wind, and under that a darkness, and under that a veil: and beyond this the knowledge of man goeth not.

The cosmogony which has just been outlined, though known to all, was accepted in its entirety only by the illiterate and the more narrow-minded of the ultra-orthodox; the views of the learned were for the most part far more in accordance with the teachings of philosophy. The philosophy of the Turks is of course derived directly from the Persian and Arabic writers, but it is ultimately Greek, being little more than a modification of the Neo-Platonism of the fifth and sixth centuries which combined Aristotelianism with the mysticism of Iamblichus. In Turkey the philosophers, while accepting the Alexandrian doctrine of Emanations, gave their chief attention to the Aristotelian aspect of the system; the Sufis, on the other hand, while acquiescing in the Aristotelian explanations of natural phenomena, devoted themselves almost exclusively to the theosophical side.

We shall deal firstly with the more strictly philosophical matters, which were accepted by both parties, and afterwards we shall consider the peculiar tenets of the Sufis.

Philosophy is divided into two great branches, namely, 'Theoretic or Speculative Philosophy' (Hikmet-i Nazariye), which treats of matters beyond human control, and 'Practical

1 In the names Behemitz and Levitiya, sometimes given respectively to this Bull and Fish, we seem to recognise the Behemoth and Leviathan of the Book of Job.
Philosophy' (Hikmet-i 'Amaliye), which treats of matters within human control. Each of these has three subdivisions. Those of Theoretic Philosophy are: (1) 'Metaphysic' or 'Theology' ('Ilm-i Ilahi), which treats of beings essentially incorporeal, as the 'First Cause' (Mebde-i Evvel), 1 the Intelligences and the Souls. (2) 'Mathematic' ('Ilm-i Riyazi), 2 which treats of things conceivable by the mind as existing apart from matter, but which can have no objective existence save in matter, such as quantities and magnitudes and geometrical figures. This subdivision has four departments, namely, Astronomy, Geometry, Arithmetic and Music. (3) 'Physic' ('Ilm-i Tabii), which deals with things not to be conceived as existing apart from matter, as the Four Elements and all composed of them. 3 The three subdivisions of Practical Philosophy are: (1) 'Ethic' ('Ilm-i Akhlaq), which treats of the duty of man considered as an individual. (2) 'Oeconomic' ('Ilm-i Tedbir-ul-Menzil), which treats of the duty of man considered as a member of a family or household. (3) 'Politic' ('Ilm-i Tedbir-ul-Medine), which treats of the duty of man considered as a member of a community or state. 4

All these subdivisions of philosophy are worked out in detail; but to examine them all, even in the most cursory manner, would be quite outside the scope of this work. We shall therefore look only at those points which will assist

---

1 The 'First Cause' of philosophy is God in the language of religion.
2 Literally, 'Disciplinary Science.' This name comes from the fact that the old philosophers used to teach this subdivision to their disciples in order to discipline their youthful minds before starting on the more conjectural subjects of Metaphysic and Physic. For every point in this subdivision is demonstrable by proof, and 'the mind of youth craveth absolute demonstration.'
3 Metaphysic is also called 'the Higher Science' ('Ilm-i 'Ala); Mathematic, 'the Intermediate Science' ('Ilm-i Evaat); Physic, 'the Lower Science' ('Ilm-i Esfel).
4 It will be observed that there is no place for 'Logic' ('Ilm-i Mantiq) in this scheme: the reason is that Logic was regarded not as in itself a science, but as the instrument by the aid of which the sciences were to be investigated.
us in our study of the poets, passing by the others, which include the whole of the Practical branch and all the departments of Mathematic except Astronomy. 1

All conceivable existence is either (1) 'Necessary' (Wajib-ul-Vujūd), or (2) 'Possible' or 'Contingent' (Mumkin-ul-Vujūd), or (3) 'Impossible' (Mumteni'-ul-Vujūd); but as the third of these, an example of which would be a co-equal of the First Cause, cannot be, existence is actually limited to the Necessary and the Possible. The existence which is independent of another existence is Necessary; the existence which is dependent on another existence is Possible or Contingent (both terms are applied to the same existence). The only existence which is independent of another existence is that of the First Cause, so the First Cause is the only Necessarily Existent; the existence of every thing else is merely Contingent. The existence of the Contingent is the proof of the existence of the Necessary, since what is depended on must exist ere the thing that depends on it can exist.

Contingents, collectively considered, are called 'the Universe' ('Alam); so the First Cause plus the Universe represents the sum of existent things.

Every Contingent is either dependent on the existence of another Contingent, or it is not. If it is not, it is called 'Substance' (Jevher); if it is, it is called 'Accident' ('Araz). 2

1 The classical Turkish work on Practical Philosophy is the Akhlāq-i Ala'i. The author Qinalizade Ah, who died in 979 (1571-2), was the father of Qinalizade Hasan, the compiler of a very important work on the lives of the Ottoman poets, to which we shall constantly refer in the progress of our History. The title Akhlāq-i Ala'i, which may be rendered by 'The Exalted Ethics,' contains an allusion to the name of the vezir Ah Pasha to whom the book is dedicated. It was printed at Balaq in 1248 (1832-3).

2 The 'Ten Categories' (Maqūlāt-i 'Ashere) are the highest classes to which Contingents may be referred. They are: 'Substance' (Jevher), 'Quantity' (Kem), 'Quality' (Keyf), 'Place' (Eyn), 'Time' (Meta), 'Relation' (Izafet), 'Possession' (Mulk), 'Situation' (Waz), 'Activity' (Fad), 'Passivity' (Infal).
The genesis of the Universe is on this wise: Without suffering any alteration or diminution thereby, the First Cause rays out from Its own fulness an image of Itself, the first of a series of emanations or projections in which the proportion of Real (i.e. Necessary) Being diminishes as they recede from the Centre. This first emanation is pure thought, and is called the ‘First’ or ‘Universal Intelligence’ (‘Aql-i Evvel, ‘Aql-i Kull). ¹ It has three sides or aspects: (1) the ‘Divine’ (Haqq), through virtue of which it knows the First Cause; (2) the ‘Psychic’ (Nefs), through virtue of which it knows itself; (3) the ‘Dependent’ (Muhtaj), through virtue of which it knows its dependence on its Lord. ² From each of these three aspects of the First Intelligence there proceeds a different emanation, the law being that from one source but one thing can proceed, i.e. a thing cannot communicate to its own production anything other than itself. From the Divine aspect flows the ‘Second Intelligence;’ from the Psychic aspect, the ‘First’ or ‘Universal Soul’ (Nefs-i Evvel, Nefs-i Kull); ³ from the Dependent Aspect, the ‘Sphere of Spheres’ or ‘Universal Body;’ this last, as we shall see immediately, is the outermost of the nine concentric spheres or heavens that enclose the elemental world. From the three aspects of the Second Intelligence proceed in like manner the Third Intelligence, the Second Soul and the Sphere of the Fixed Stars. This process is continued till we reach the Tenth Intelligence, the Ninth Soul and the Sphere of the Moon, all produced from the Ninth Intelligence; so that there are

¹ This is the Nous of Plotinus and his successors, the Logos of Philo.
² These three aspects are sometimes described as (1) Vujud or ‘All-comprising Existence,’ i.e. that existence which comprehends both the Necessary and the Contingent; (2) Vujub or ‘Necessary Existence;’ (3) Imkán or ‘Contingent Existence.’
³ Often called, especially by Sûfis and poets, the ‘Cosmic Soul’ or ‘World-Soul’ (Jân-i ‘Alm, Jân-i Jihan). It is the Psyche of the Neo-Platonists.
in all Ten Intelligences, Nine Souls and Nine Spheres. The Tenth Intelligence bears the special name of the ‘Active Intelligence’ (Aql-i Fa’al), as it is sufficiently removed from the centre of pure spirit to be materialized to the point when it can act directly on the elemental world.

Interwoven with this doctrine of emanations is, as we have just seen, the Ptolemaic system of cosmography. 1 Around the central, stationary earth revolves a series of nine hollow concentric shells called Spheres or Heavens, arranged one within the other ‘like the coats of an onion.’ To each of the seven innermost of these is fastened one of the Seven Planets, which are thus carried round by the spheres in their revolution. These seven planetary spheres are in order, starting from the innermost: (1) that of the Moon, (2) that of Mercury, (3) that of Venus, (4) that of the Sun, (5) that of Mars, (6) that of Jupiter, (7) that of Saturn. Outside these is the Eighth Sphere, that of the Fixed Stars, outside which, and outermost of all, comes the Ninth Sphere, which is called the ‘Sphere of Spheres’ (Felek-ul-Eflak) as it encloses all the others, or the ‘Most Great Sphere’ (Cherkh-i A’zam) as it is the mightiest of all, or the ‘Fleckless Sphere’ (Cherkh-i Atles) 2 as, carrying no star, it is without spot or mark. 3

1 It is very necessary for us to have some acquaintance with this system, as it alone was recognized by the Turkish poets down to the rise of the New School, and allusions to it are innumerable. The Turks were not acquainted with the other astronomic systems; both the Tychoan and the Copernican are described by Katib Chelebi in the Jihan-Numa or ‘Belvedere,’ which he left unfinished at his death in 1068 (1657-8); but the poets, in their verses at any rate, preferred to adhere to the time-honoured system of their fathers.

2 The word ‘atles,’ which properly means ‘unfigured’ i.e. ‘unembroidered,’ is used as the name for ‘satin,’ whence comes an infinity of equivoces.

3 This, which is the Primum Mobile of the Middle Ages, is also called the ‘Limiter of Directions’ (Muhaddid-ul-Jihat), as beyond it the ‘six directions’ i.e. before, behind, right, left, above and below, have no existence; and the ‘Universal Body’ (Jism-i Kull), as it is the body which contains all other bodies.
The universe thus presents the appearance of a vast ball, the outside of which is formed by the convex surface of the Ninth Sphere. What, if anything, lies beyond this Sphere, whether there be ‘vacuum’ (khalā) or ‘plenum’ (melā) there, though often asked, is known to none.

Each of these Nine Spheres or Heavens has an Intelligence and a Soul as well as a body. ¹ The Intelligence of the Sphere of Spheres is the Second Intelligence, and its Soul is the Universal Soul; the Intelligence of the Sphere of the Fixed Stars is the Third Intelligence, and its Soul is the Second Soul, and so on, the Intelligence of the Sphere of the Moon being the Tenth, and its Soul the Ninth.

The Nine Spheres revolve, at different velocities, round the earth. The eight inner have two motions, one from west to east, which is proper to them, and which is ‘voluntary’ (irādī) or ‘natural’ (tabī'^i), and one from east to west, which is forced on them by the Ninth Sphere, and which is called ‘compulsory’ (qasri). ² The Ninth Sphere has a swift motion from east to west, effecting its revolution once in twenty-four hours, and carrying with it all the inner spheres. ³

¹ In theological language the Intelligences and Souls would be called Archangels.

² The motion of the inner spheres relative to that of the ninth is illustrated by the example of an ant creeping round the upper stone of a quern or hand-mill which is being turned in the opposite direction. As the ant, although it is borne round by the stone, still makes a little progress in the direction which itself desires, so the eight inner spheres, though carried round by the ninth, still progress slowly along their ‘natural’ course.

³ From this theory of the revolutions of the spheres arose a fancy which plays a very prominent part in poetry. Astrology was universally accepted, and men believed that the planets, directly or indirectly, exercised a far-reaching influence on mundane affairs. The nature of this influence depended very largely on the position of the planets relative to one another. Now this relative position was changing every moment owing to the rotation of the spheres, the eight inner revolving slowly, as we have seen, in their natural course, while the ninth whirled them all round in the opposite direction once in every twenty-four hours. This idea led the poets to represent the Ninth
The Nine Spheres are all transparent and therefore invisible; they and the stars they carry consist of ether, a substance which has no movement other than spatial, and no motion other than circular, but which diminishes in purity as it approaches the centre of the universe. They fit closely into one another, so that there is no empty space between the inner or concave surface of one and the outer or convex surface of that immediately within it.

Within the hollow of the Sphere of the Moon lies the elemental world. The basis of this is no longer ether, but 'Matter' (Heyula), and immanent in Matter is 'Form' (Suret), without which its actualized existence is impossible. Form is in two degrees: 'Corporeal Form' (Suret-i Jismiye), and 'Specific Form' (Suret-i Nev'iye). Matter, in combination with the first of these, produces 'Body in the Abstract' (Jism-i Mutlaq); and this, in combination with the second, produces the 'Individual Body.' Matter may in this connection be compared to the human breath, and Corporeal Form to sound, then the human voice, which is the result of the combination of human breath and sound, will correspond to Body in the Abstract, which is the result of the combination

Sphere, the rapid motion of which occasions these sudden changes in the positions of the planets, as a kind of evil power; and they are never tired of railing against its malignity and the delight it takes in frustrating human hopes and plans through the influences of those ever-shifting aspects of the planets brought about by the ceaseless rush of its revolution.

1 In order to account for the various movements of the planets the seven inner spheres were supposed to contain one or more 'subordinate spheres' (elâkî-i juzu'îye), such as the 'deferent' (hamil), the 'epicycle' (tedvîr), and so on; but it is not necessary for the student of poetry to be acquainted with these details.

2 Movement is of three kinds: 'Quantitative Movement,' i.e. increase and decrease (hareket-i kemîye); 'Qualitative Movement,' i.e. alteration (hareket-i keyfiye); and 'Spatial Movement,' i.e. locomotion (hareket-i cynîye).

3 'Body' (jism) is defined as that which possesses length, breadth and depth, and is therefore divisible.
of Matter and Corporeal Form; in the same way, Specific Form will represent the power of the several letters, for this, in combination with sound, produces individual words, just as Specific Form, in combination with Body in the Abstract, produces individual bodies.

Matter is susceptible of every Form; it has been likened in this respect to wax, and Form to the impressions the wax can receive. The Form is continually changing; the Matter is always the same. Matter is the substratum of which every sublunary body consists. Form is what gives to every body its individuality. But while Matter is thus looked on as passive rather than active, it must yet be regarded as having some power of its own, as it is from it that arises the necessity which limits and holds back both man and nature in their efforts towards self-realisation, and as it is due to its resistance that the soul can ascend only by degrees from the lower to the higher stages. Matter is therefore generally considered as essentially evil.

The first manifestation of Specific Form is in the 'Four Elements:' 'Fire,' 'Air,' 'Water' and 'Earth.' The arrangement of the elemental world is, like that of the ethereal, a series of concentric, spherical layers. As Fire is the lightest and subtlest of the Four, its region is the highest, lying within and touching the concave surface of the Sphere of the Moon. In its pure state Fire is colourless and transparent, consequently the Sphere of Fire is invisible. Next comes the Sphere of Air,¹ that element being somewhat denser than Fire. Within this is the Sphere of Water, denser still; and within the Sphere of Water is the Sphere of Earth, densest of all things in existence. The Earth thus forms the

¹ The Sphere of Air is subdivided into three 'strata' (tabaqāt). The Sphere of Fire and the highest stratum of the Sphere of Air, though by their own nature stationary, are carried round by the Sphere of the Moon in its revolution.
core of the universe, and the centre of the earth is the Centre of the Universe. The Sphere of Earth was originally entirely surrounded by the Sphere of Water; but owing to some reason — the explanations vary — the Water withdrew from the higher portions of the uneven surface of Earth and settled in the hollows, thus leaving certain parts of the surface of the Earth in contact with the concave surface of the Sphere of Air.

The Four Elements are distinguished from one another by their 'Natures' (Tabayi) or 'Qualities' (Keyfiyat). These are in each case twofold: Fire is dry and hot, Air is hot and moist, Water is moist and cold, Earth is cold and dry. The elements are continually passing into one another through the medium of that quality they possess in common; thus fire can pass into air through the medium of heat, air into water through the medium of moisture, and so on. In all those changes it is only the form that alters; the matter of which the elements (and therefore all sublunary bodies) are made never changes, however manifold and diverse be the forms manifested through it. This process of transmutation of the simple elements, which is called 'Generation and Corruption' (Keven u Fesād), is brought about by the in-

1 The geographers divide the surface of the terrestrial globe into two parts: land and water. The land part they subdivide into halves by the equator. That to the south is reckoned uninhabitable through the greatness of the heat. That to the north alone is peopled and cultivated. This is called the 'Habitable Quarter' (Rub'ī Meskān), and is divided into seven zones by as many imaginary lines drawn parallel to the equator, the space between the seventh and the north pole being reckoned uninhabitable through the greatness of the cold. The seven zones are famous as the 'Seven Climates;' and the countries and cities situated in each are carefully noted; but it is enough for us to know that the First Climate is that next to the equator, and the Seventh that farthest from it.

2 In this phrase 'Corruption' means Matter's putting off a particular form, 'Generation' its assumption of another form. The one cannot occur without the other, and both are in ceaseless operation in the elemental world, the world of change.
fluences of the Seven Planets, and results in the production of the three classes of compound bodies, namely, Minerals, Vegetables and Animals. The Seven Planets are therefore often called the ‘Seven Sires’ (Abá-i Seb’á); the Four Elements, the ‘Four Mothers’ (Ummehát-i Erba’a); and the three classes of compound bodies, the ‘Threefold Offspring’ (Mewálid-i Seláse). The class of Animals reaches its goal in ‘Man’ (Insán).

This brings us to Psychology. There are three degrees of soul: the ‘Soul Vegetable’ (Nefs-i Nebátiye), the ‘Soul Sensible’ — lit. ‘Soul Animal’ — (Nefs-i Haywáníye), and the ‘Soul Reasonable’ (Nefs-i Nátiqa). The first, which corresponds to what we should call the vital principle, is shared in common by plants, brutes and man; its functions are growth, nourishment and reproduction. The second, which represents the principle of sensation or perception, is confined to brutes and man; its functions are sensation and voluntary movement. The third, the principle of reason, belongs to man alone; and its function is reason. The individual human soul, in which all these combine, is thus threefold, but it is only the Reasonable element that survives death. Yet it is the same soul which having begun its terrestrial life in the mineral, pushes up, as swiftly as the opposition of matter will allow, through the plant and the brute to man, developing, as it ascends, its latent powers, till at last it is able to

1 This was the opinion of the physicists; the metaphysicians held the Tenth or Active Intelligence to be the agent. See p. 43. Both views are recognised by the poets and Sufis.

2 The theories here dealt with prevailed throughout Christendom as well as throughout Islam during the Middle Ages. They are expounded in English in the volume entitled ‘Batman upon Bartholome, his Booke “De Proprietatibus Rerum,’” London, 1582. This work, which is said to have been originally written in Latin about the middle of the thirteenth century by an English Franciscan friar named Bartholomew, is practically an encyclopaedia of medieval science.
discard as now useless crutches those faculties by means of which it has progressed so far upon its journey.

The Soul Vegetable possesses four faculties called 'Powers' or 'Virtues.' These are: (1) the 'Virtue Nutritive' (Quvvet-i Ghadiya), by which the organism supplies the waste of the body; (2) the 'Virtue Augmentative' (Quvvet-i Namiye), by which up to a certain period of life the organism grows, i.e. increases in length, breadth and depth; (3) the 'Virtue Generative' (Quvvet-i Muvellide), by which the organism, through detaching a portion of itself, produces another similar individual; and (4) the 'Virtue Informative' (Quvvet-i Musavvira), by which the aforesaid detached portion, if it fall into a suitable place, is moulded into its proper form and fashioned into a similar individual. These four 'Virtues' or faculties are served by four others: (1) the 'Virtue Attractive' (Quvvet-i Jazibe), by which the organism draws to itself the material proper for its nourishment; (2) the 'Virtue Retentive' (Quvvet-i Masike), by which it retains the food in the proper place until digested; (3) the 'Virtue Digestive' (Quvvet-i Hazime), by which it converts the food into matter proper for the reparation of the waste of the body; and (4) the 'Virtue Expulsive' (Quvvet-i Dafi'a), by which it casts forth what is superfluous.¹

The Soul Sensible has two faculties: the 'Virtue Motive' (Quvvet-i Muharrike), and the 'Virtue Apprehensive' (Quvvet-i Mudrike). The Virtue Motive is of two kinds: the 'Virtue Concupiscible' (Quvvet-i Shehviye), by which the animal seeks to obtain what it takes to be good; and the 'Virtue Irascible' (Quvvet-i Ghazabiya), by which it seeks to shun what it

¹ Several of these medieval terms have been retained in the terminology of modern science, though the application, of course, is changed; thus the names Quvvet-i Jazibe, Quvvet-i Masike, Quvvet-i Dafi'a, are nowadays applied to the forces of Attraction, Cohesion and Repulsion, respectively.
takes to be evil. This Virtue Motive acts through the impulsion of the Virtue Apprehensive, which is served by the ‘Five Outer’ and the ‘Five Inner Wits’ or ‘Senses.’ The former are, of course, ‘Touch,’ ‘Smell,’ ‘Taste,’ ‘Hearing’ and ‘Sight;’ the latter are the ‘Common Wit’ or ‘Sense’ (Hiss-i Mushterik), the ‘Fantasy’ (Khayál), the ‘Virtue Estimative’ (Quvvet-i Wāhime), the ‘Virtue Memorative’ (Quvvet-i Hāfīza) and the ‘Virtue Ordinative’ (Quvvet-i Mutasarrifa). The Common Sense is the recipient of all the perceptions conveyed from without by the five outer senses; it has been compared to a pond into which five streams flow. Its seat is in the front part of the foremost of the three brain-cells.¹ The Fantasy is the store-house of the perceptions received by the Common Sense; thus so long as an object is before us its image is reflected in the Common Sense, but as soon as it passes from before us its image passes from the Common Sense and is relegated to the Fantasy. The seat of the Fantasy is in the back part of the foremost brain-cell. The Virtue Estimative is that faculty which takes cognisance of moral qualities as manifested in individuals but not themselves perceptible by the outer senses, such as the affection of a friend, the hatred of an enemy; its seat is in the back part of the mid brain-cell. The Virtue Memorative is the store-house of impressions received through the Virtue Estimative; its seat is in the hind brain-cell. The Virtue Ordinative, whose seat is in the centre, in the front part of the mid brain-cell, takes impressions from both sides, and combines and separates these as it pleases. It is equivalent to what we call the imagination, and ‘the fanciful inventions of the poets, such as silver cypresses and ruby mountains, are its work.’

¹ The old physiologists divided the brain into three compartments which they called ‘cells’ or ‘dens.’