The Soul Reasonable is distinguished by two special faculties: the 'Virtue Speculative' (Quvvet-i 'Alime), and the 'Virtue Practical' (Quvvet-i 'Amile); by the first the man is able to understand 'Speculative Philosophy,' by the second he can act according to the teaching of 'Practical Philosophy.'

The Soul Reasonable alone can draw universal conclusions or form abstract conceptions. Thus an animal may be able to form an idea of love in connection with its master, but it cannot conceive love in the abstract apart from an individual.

The definition given of the Soul Reasonable is: A simple, incorporeal substance, directly cognisant of intellectual conceptions, and working in the sensible body through the instrumentality of the faculties.

The proof that the Soul Reasonable is a substance, and not an accident, is that it is capable of receiving accidents, namely, mental or intellectual impressions; whereas it is an axiom that one accident cannot be the recipient of another accident. The proof that it is incorporeal is: all substance is either corporeal or incorporeal; if it is perceptible by the outer senses, it is the former; if it is not, it is the latter; the soul is imperceptible by the outer senses, therefore it is incorporeal. The proof that it is simple, and not composite, i.e. that it is indivisible and indecomposable is: it is capable of knowing certain things, such as unity, which are beyond question simple: for as knowledge is the merging of the impression of the thing known in the essence of the knower, it follows that what can know the simple must itself be

1 i.e. without the intervention of any instrument.
2 The favourite example of substance and accident is body and colour. The existence of body, which is substance, is in no wise dependent on that of its colour; but the existence of colour, which is accident, is dependent on that of the body which bears the colour, and is inconceivable without it.
The proof that it is directly cognisant of intellectual conceptions is that it is cognisant of its own existence, for the intervention of an instrument between a thing and its own essence is impossible. And so philosophers say the knowing and the known and the knower are really one. That the soul is brought into contact with the physical world through the instrumentality of the senses is obvious and demands no proof.

The immortality of the soul is deduced from the fact that it is a substance, not an accident; for it is only accident and form that come and go, substance is eternal.

As Humanity is the crown of the animal kingdom, so is the 'Perfect Man' (Insân-i Kâmil) the crown of Humanity. It is to this stage of the Perfect Man, who by contemplation and by virtue can enter into the pure thought of the First Intelligence, that all things consciously or unconsciously strive; for when the soul has reached this point it is ready to pass back into the bosom of that glorious Being whence it issued on its journey ages ago. This journey is called the 'Circle of Existence' (Deveran-i Vujûd). The spark of Divine Light or effluent Being descends through the Intelligences, the Souls, the Spheres and the Elements till it reaches Earth which is the lowest point on its downward course; and this is the 'Outward Track' (Tariq-i Mebde) or the 'Arc of Descent' (Qavs-i Nuzûl). The upward journey is then begun through the Mineral, the Vegetable, the Brute and Humanity till the stage of the Perfect Man is reached, when the Soul passes back into the embrace of the First Intelligence whence it set forth; and this is the 'Homeward Track' (Tariq-i Ma'âd) or the 'Arc of Ascent' (Qavs-i 'Urûj).

\[1\] As were it otherwise, were the knower (the soul) divisible and decomposable, that which has been merged in its essence (the concept of unity) must also be divisible and decomposable, which is inconceivable.
And when it is achieved the journey is accomplished. ¹

The scientific views at which we have just glanced were indeed accepted by the Sufis or Mystics; but these thinkers attached little importance to the physical world, such slight interest as it held for them lying almost wholly in the fact that it is a shadow of the supersensuous. It was the other side, the transcendental side, of Neo-Platonism that really possessed them; and to it they devoted practically their entire attention. ² As we saw in the preceding chapter, the

¹ The Sufis, who were generally philosophers as well as mystics, often allude to the Circle of Existence. The Homeward Journey is referred to in the following beautiful passage which occurs in the seventeenth story of the third book of the Mesnevi of Fadl-ud-Din.

² Many Orientalists consider Sufism to be an offshoot from the Vedânt.

\[\text{\textit{The Piûn, xxviii, 88.}}\quad \text{\textit{Koran, ii, 151.}}\]
system which bears their name presents two different aspects according to the prominence given to either of the two elements, mystic and philosophic, of which it is composed. We there gave our attention to the more mystic aspect, this being the immediate source of inspiration to the Ottoman poets; we shall here look for a little at the other side of Sufism, that in which the philosophic element predominates; for although the traces of this are less evident upon the surface, its influence in poetry has been very great.

The dealings of the Sufis are with matters beyond the reach of conscious thought, in realms where reason, which the scientist philosophers profess to follow, cannot act as guide; and so to understand their philosophy it is necessary that we should first learn their doctrine of the soul, as this is the basis on which the whole structure rests.

There is an ancient tradition according to which the universe consists of eighteen thousand worlds; and it may be that this tradition suggested the name of the ‘Five Worlds’ (Awalim-i Khamsa) of the Sufis. These Five Worlds are not five different localities, but five different planes of philosophy of India. My reasons for preferring to regard it as a development of Neo-Platonism are: Firstly, the practical identity of the two systems, except, of course, where coloured by the prevailing positive religion; Secondly, the circumstance that Sufism as a system is first heard of in Syria, the country of Iamblichus, where Neo-Platonist ideas were widely spread; (Râbî’a, the earliest of the lover-saints of Islam, died at Jerusalem in 135 (752-3); Abū-l Hashim, who died in 150 (767), and was the first to bear the name of Sūfī, was a Syrian Sheykh; it was about his time, and at Ramla in Syria, that the first Sufi convent was founded); Thirdly, the fact that the other side of Muhammadan philosophy is beyond question derived from the Neo-Platonist exponents of Aristotle.

The following probably apocryphal Hadis is sometimes brought forward in support of this notion:

\[\text{‘Verily, God hath eighteen thousand worlds; and, verily, your world is one of them.’}\]
existence which loses in true Being as it descends; they are consequently often spoken of as the ‘Five Planes’ (Hazrat-i Khamsa). The accounts we have of them are naturally somewhat confused, and differ more or less in the different authorities; but essentially they are as follows: Above and beyond the universe, yet compassing all things, and the Source of all things, is the ‘World of Godhead’ (Alem-i Lahiit); of this nothing can be predicated, and it is not reckoned among the Five. The First of these is called the ‘Plane of the Absolutely Invisible’ (Hazret-i Ghayb-i Mutlaq) or the ‘Plane of the Nebulosity’ (Hazret-i ‘Ama); and its world is the ‘World of the Fixed Prototypes’ (Alem-i A’yan-i Sabita), that is to say, the existences that people it are the Fixed Prototypes. The Second Plane is that of the ‘Relatively Invisible’ (Ghayb-i Muzaf), and its world is the ‘World of the Intelligences and the Souls;’ these are sometimes called the ‘Spirits of Might’ (Erwah-i Jeberatiye), and so this sphere of being is known also as the ‘World of Might’ (Alem-i Jeberut). The next Plane is called the ‘World of Similitudes’ (Alem-i Misal), or the ‘Angel World’ (Alem-i Melekut), or sometimes the ‘Intermediate World’ (Alem-i Berzakh), this last because it lies upon the border of the Fourth Plane. This is the ‘Visible World’ (Alem-i Shehadet).

1 It is impossible to translate the term A’yan-i Sabita exactly; Sabita (from Sabut) means ‘potentially existent’ as opposed to actually existent, as well as ‘fixed’ or ‘permanent;’ a’yan might be rendered by ‘realities.’ The A’yan Sabita are closely akin to the Ideas of Plato.

2 This sphere of existence is also called the ‘World of Meanings’ (Alem-i Ma’dni), that is, of the true meanings which underlie names and the outward show of things.

3 That is, of the Celestial or Spheral Intelligences and Souls.

4 The terms Jeburat and Jeberatiye convey the idea of ‘constraining,’ as though the beings of this World exercised some constraining power over those below them.

5 The term Melekut might also signify ‘kingship’ or ‘dominion’ or ‘possession.’
which is often called the ‘World of the Kingdom’ (‘Alem-i Mulk) i.e. the Physical World; it is the world in which we move, and is the antithesis of the ‘Absolutely Invisible.’¹

The Fifth Plane is the ‘World of Man’ (‘Alem-i Insán), which sums up and comprises all the others; for Man, as we shall see, is the Microcosm epitomising in himself the whole universe.

Through the Physical World is manifested the World of Similitudes (or the Angel World); through this, the World of the Intelligences and Souls; through this, the World of the Fixed Prototypes; through this, the World of the Divine Names or Attributes; and through this, the World of the Unity.

The Five Worlds are often regarded collectively as Three,² namely, ‘the Invisible, the Intermediate and the Visible;’ more often still as Two, ‘the Visible and the Invisible’ (‘Alem-i Shehâdet ve ‘Alem-i Ghayb) or ‘the Physical and the Spiritual’ (‘Alem-i Mulk ve ‘Alem-i Melekût).³

The World of Similitudes is so called because in it exist, ready to be materialised, the forms which are to be actualised on the Physical Plane. The number of these which are so actualised at any given time is in proportion to the whole ‘as a little ring in the midst of a vast desert.’

As the confines of this World of Similitudes touch those of the Visible World, passage between the two is possible; and this brings us to the Sûfî theory of the soul.

The human soul is a spirit, and therefore, by virtue of its own nature, in reality a citizen of the Spirit World. Its

¹ It is also called the ‘Sensible World’ (‘Alem-i Hissî), the ‘World of Form’ (‘Alem-i Sûret), the ‘World of Generation and Corruption’ (‘Alem-i Kevn u Fesây), and so on.

² They are then sometimes arranged thus, beginning from the lowest: Mulk, Jeberût, Melekût,—an order which suggests the Christian phrase, ‘the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory.’

³ Poets and other writers continually allude to ‘the Two Worlds.’
true home is there; and thence, for a certain reason, it descends into the Physical Plane, where, to enable it to act upon its surroundings, it is clothed in a physical body. So long as it is thus swathed in corporeity the soul ever, consciously or unconsciously, seeks to regain its proper world; it is drawn as by a spiritual gravitation towards its real home. But the body keeps it back: the phantasmagoria presented by the bodily senses seems the one reality, and this forms a veil which in the great majority of cases shuts out from it the view of its original dwelling-place. So grossed is it by what is presented by the bodily faculties that it forgets the very existence of its own world; and failing to understand them, wrongly attributes certain inclinations that it has, in reality a heritage therefrom, to some material cause. It is only at rare intervals, when the body is asleep and all the avenues of the senses are closed, that such a soul can for a brief space, in a vision or a dream, look into its own world; but so dulled is it by oblivion and by the soil of earthly passions that it can receive only a faint impression of what is presented to it there, and thus when the sleeper awakens all is forgotten, or there remains but a vague indeterminable shadow.

1 The great majority of dreams have nothing to do with the Spirit World; they are but the result of forms which the senses have transmitted to the memory during the state of wakefulness. Such dreams, which are called by the Koranic term azghas-i ahdam i.e. 'tangled dreams,' are without significance. Those visions which are really received in the Spirit World are of two classes: the first and rarest are those which are so clear that they stand in no need of interpretation; the second and more usual are those perceptions which the percipient (the Soul Reasonable) transmits to the imagination to be clothed in some analogous form: it is dreams of this class that call for an interpreter. True dreams may be distinguished from 'tangled dreams' by the quickness with which the sleeper awakens and by the profound, clear and lasting impression which the dream produces. A dream, the details of which have to be laboriously brought together by the memory, belongs to the category of the 'tangled.'
The power of passing from the Physical World into the Spiritual is potential in every soul, but it is actualised only in a few. In a very few of these, namely in the cases of the prophets and great saints, it is, by the special grace of God, so developed that even while the body is awake, the veil woven by the senses is from time to time withdrawn and the soul is for a moment brought face to face with the Spirit World, and there, where is neither space nor time, it beholds the Reality of all things, and hears the voices of the Heavenly Host (Mele-i A'la). It is thus those gifted ones receive their revelations; and it is to impressions so obtained that we owe such information as we have concerning the Five Worlds and other spiritual phenomena. But we are explicitly told that such impressions cannot be adequately rendered in earthly language; they belong to a plane of existence the conditions of which lie outside human conception, and therefore to be conveyed at all, they have to be translated into some sort of allegory or metaphor which by analogy may suggest the inexpressible idea that lies beneath, but which must not be taken in its literal sense. This point is important as it underlies the whole Sufi terminology.

We now see the ground on which the Sufis base their transcendental doctrines; it is the experience of their own

---

1 This is the Oriental theory of Revelation; and as all the Prophets have been Orientals, we may take it that the Oriental is best qualified to speak upon the subject.

Divination is upon the same lines; the soul of the diviner passes momentarily from the Physical to the Spiritual World; but in his case this passage has to be induced by external means. The soul of the prophet or saint is so pure and so little under the influence of the senses that it effects the passage without external aid, while the diviner is compelled to have recourse to his incantations, or whatever else he may use as medium, in order to abstract his soul from the sensible world. But these media, which are really foreign to the perceptive faculty, mingle with his perceptions, and consequently the impressions he receives are sometimes true and sometimes false.
souls in the Spirit World. But such experience, which is technically termed 'unveilment' (keshf) in allusion to the withdrawal of the veil interposed by sensual perception, is not the aim of the true Sufi; it comes, so to speak, fortuitously. His real goal is absorption in the Deity. The highest happiness of any being consists in the most perfect realisation of itself; the human soul realises itself most perfectly in union with the Divine Soul, so therein lies its supreme felicity. This union is achieved through the state called 'Ecstasy' (Hal), and when in Ecstasy the soul is transported to the Spirit World and there beholds the mysteries.

That in their endeavours to express these ineffable mysteries in earthly speech different seers should make use of different, even divergent, language, is inevitable. Thus some seek to explain the descent of the soul to the physical world by the Divine desire of self-manifestation, and teach that it is really God who looks out upon His own works through the eye of man; \(^1\) others again, while admitting the ultimate identity of the soul with God, say that the soul has been sent down in order that it may perfect itself by experience of life on the physical plane, where the imperfections arising from the nature of matter offer opportunities for the development of noble qualities, opportunities necessarily lacking in a more perfect sphere; these teachers hold that according to the use the soul makes of such opportunities will be its position when it returns home. All agree in maintaining the pre-natal existence of the soul, and in declaring the physical world to be but the transient and distorted reflection of a far more glorious world, and in itself essentially unreal. They say that the love for whatever it may consider beautiful which is in every soul arises from the fact that in the Other World the soul gazed upon the Archetypal Beauty, and

\(^1\) See pp. 19-22. This is the view generally expressed by the poets.
that the beautiful earthly object awakens a reminiscence of this. But it is only the enlightened who are conscious of this fact, and therefore their delight in beauty is far above that of the ignorant crowd who attribute the pleasure they feel to some lower, most often material, source.

As we have seen from their idea of the Five Worlds which become less subtle and more complex as they recede from the One, the Sufi conception of the universe is essentially the Alexandrian doctrine of Emanations. It is therefore natural that they too should often speak of the first and second hypostases as the Universal Intelligence and the Universal Soul, although this may be somewhat outside their special terminology.

The first point on which they insist is the absolute ineffableness of God whom, as already mentioned, they generally speak of as 'The Truth.' He is beyond unity, beyond perfection, beyond even being; of Him nothing can be affirmed. In the words of an eminent Turkish Sufi, Sheykh 'Abdullah of Bosnia: 'The Truth, regarded from the side of the unconditionedness of His Essence and of the unformedness of His Ipseity and of His unparticularisedness, is, in His Essential Oneness and His Very Unity, above description and attribution and nomination and definition and predication. He may not be predicated of with any predication; He may not be described by any description; He may not

---

1 A Mohammedan friend once suggested to me that 'The Fact' would be a better translation of this term, Haqq, than 'The Truth,' as conveying more forcibly the idea that God is the one and only Reality in existence. But while admitting the force of my friend's contention, I have preferred to retain 'The Truth,' as being, to my mind at least, less concrete.

2 Sheykh 'Abdullah-i Bosnivi wrote an esteemed Turkish commentary on the celebrated Mulhud-Din bin-'Arebi's famous work entitled Fusus-ul-Hikem 'The Gems of Philosophy.' Ibn-'Arebi died in 638 (1240); Sheykh 'Abdullah in 1054 (1644-5). The passages translated are from the Introduction which the Sheykh has prefixed to his Commentary.
be named by any name; He may not be particularised by any definition. Nothing can be predicated of Him concerning either Unity or the necessity of His existence, or concerning any relationship of knowledge, whether of Himself or of others. He is above the multiplicity of the Attributes and the Names. While merged in Him, the Divine Names are He is He; not, They are He. So His Unity is one with Very Unity; it is not dependent on the opposition of multiplicity; its realisation in the soul and its impression in the mind of the thinker do not depend on the impression of its opposite. Nay, it is existent through its own self. And when we speak of 'Unity' it is in order to indicate its aloofness and its glory; not to express the usual meaning of the word 'unity.' So The Truth, regarded from the side of His Very Unity, and considered apart from His manifestation through phenomena, is not to be understood or comprehended or conceived, and is not knowable or describable.

The first particularisation (ta'ayyun) is in what is conventionally known as the Plane of Nebulosity; here the so-called 'Divine Names' (Esma-i Ilahiye) become distinguishable. These Names, examples of which are 'Merciful,' 'Eternal,' 'Omniscient,' 'Almighty,' are symbols which point to God through one or other of His Attributes. Hitherto these are merged in the Oneness, the 'Very Unity;' now they differentiate; and through their differentiation God becomes conscious of Himself. Here likewise come into individual potential being the Prototypes already mentioned, though their actualisation is in a lower plane.

1 It is above the axiom that things are known through their opposites.
2 The terms 'Names' (Esma) and 'Attributes' (Sifat) are used synonymously in this connection. The former was suggested by the two following passages from the Koran: vii. 179. 'To God belong the most fair names; call ye then on Him thereby;' and xx. 7. 'God, there is no God but He;' His are the most fair names.'
So the descent is continued with ever increasing differentiation and complexity through the several planes till we reach the physical. But this sequence is not a sequence in time; for time does not come into existence till we touch the phenomenal plane: it is a sequence in causation. Sequence in causation is illustrated by an essentially luminous body and the light it throws out; such light being subsequent to the luminous body in causation, as until the latter exists, the light cannot; but not being subsequent to it in time, as it is impossible for an essentially luminous body to have existed a single moment without giving off light.¹

The universe is summed up in Man who is its central point. Standing on the border-line between the spiritual and the physical, on the one side he joins hands with the angels, while on the other he is related to the brutes and the material world. Every other being in the universe reflects one or other of the Divine Attributes; Man reflects the whole. As Sheykh 'Abdulláh says: 'The universe is the aggregate of the individual objects through which are manifested the Divine Names; but as it was incapable of receiving the form of the Divine Totality, and as the manifesting of the manifestation of universality was not obtainable therethrough, God created Man, who is its soul, after the Divine image; so Man is the theatre of the Divine Names and the meeting-point of the Divine Attributes.' Man therefore gathers up in himself the individual reflections of the Divine Attributes elsewhere scattered singly through the universe, and at the same time he reflects the union of these, and in this way he is the image of God. So man is justly called the 'Microcosm' ('Alem-i Sughra) or 'Lesser World,' as being the sum and epitome of the 'Macrocosm' ('Alem-i Kubra) or

¹ See Mr. Browne's 'Year amongst the Persians,' p. 137.
'Greater World' outside. Moreover, as in the heart of Man are reflected all the Attributes of God, it is held that the way to the knowledge of God is through the knowledge of Man's own heart. This doctrine is insisted upon with the greatest earnestness, and not one of the many aphorisms of the Sufis is more constantly quoted than these famous words: 'Whoso knoweth himself knoweth his Lord.'

Absorption in the Deity, the merging of the individual soul of the saint in the Universal Soul of God, is the ultimate aim of Sufism. This blissful state, which in the present life is possible only from time to time, and which is not to be evoked at will, is attainable by the saints alone, and the whole Sufi life consists in training the soul to be capable of such attainment. This training is generally begun by the aspirant becoming the disciple of some Sufi sage in whose teaching he must place the most absolute confidence. Asceticism and retirement from society are generally recommended; the former, because it tends to dull the animal appetites (for in proportion as these are dulled the windows of the soul are opened); the latter, because by shutting out the great sources of distraction, it renders self-concentration easier for the soul. But the all-important factor in this work is Love, a Love which, as we have already seen, rises from the seen and temporal to the Unseen and Eternal. It is by this all-constraining Love that the soul is wrapt in the utter self-oblivion of ecstasy and borne aloft into the great heart of Being. This is the feature of Sufism which the poets seized upon, and which they elaborated into the religious

1 Some writers call man the macrocosm, and the outer world the microcosm, man being in reality the greater of the two.

2 This speech, which is attributed to Ali, the Prophet's son-in-law, will remind the reader of the equally famous aphorism of Thales: Know thyself!
philosophy of Love which has been sketched on a previous page.¹

There is a matter calling for some attention in connection with this love-philosophy, in which the Orientals, by closely following their Grecian teachers, took up a position which is directly opposed to modern ideas. They held that the most fitting object of the human love which is to lead to the Divine is a youth, not a woman. Love for a youth, they maintained, is the only form of love worthy of the noble soul; for it alone can bring the Lover to that divestment of selfism which is the aim, as it is the only form of love which can be absolutely free from selfish desire. This, which is 'Platonic Love' in the true sense of that phrase, seems to entail a corresponding depreciation of woman; at least, we find that in proportion as it is current in a community, a tone of misogyny prevails in literature.² The idea of 'masculine love,' as the Greeks called it, was by them handed on with the other details of their philosophy to the Mohammedans. It consequently forms part and parcel of the literary outfit borrowed from the Persians by the Turks, and the traces of it are visible all through Turkish literature till we come to the Modern School. That with the Turks, at any rate, this fashion was for the most part merely a literary convention is shown by its absence from the national

¹ See pp. 20-2. This insistence upon Love as the chief agent in bringing the soul into the knowledge of God, and the prominence given to ecstasy as the state in which the soul is for the time being united with God, are among the clearest indications that the roots of Sufism should be sought in Neo-Platonism rather than in the Vedânta philosophy. Love and ecstasy, as is well known, form essential elements of the Greek system, while they are entirely absent from the Indian, the rigorous logic of which allows no room for raptures or for passionate love of the Deity.

² The reader who desires to see how this form of love affected Greek literature is referred to an interesting volume entitled 'Antimachus of Colophon and the Position of Women in Greek Poetry,' by E. P. M. Benecke (Swan Sonnenschein & Co), where the subject is ably and fully discussed.
ballads, in which is heard the true voice of the people, by the struggle between it and love for woman even in the literary poetry, and by its final and decisive defeat.

Its prevalence, however, has created a considerable difficulty for the translator of the older poetry. The Turkish language, like the Persian, knows no distinctions of gender; and as the poets describe and address a beautiful maiden and a beautiful youth in identical terms, it is generally impossible, without some external clue, which is rarely forthcoming, to determine with certainty which of these was present in the writer's mind. Whether then shall we translate by 'he' or 'she'? From the unvarying sameness of their descriptions and the conventionality and constancy of the type, it is evident that the poets were for the most part concerned less with doing honour to any individual fair one than in offering their homage to abstract or ideal Beauty. We intuitively conceive of ideal Beauty under a feminine form: any other conception would be for us forced and unnatural. Consequently, by rendering their verses as though the earthly vision that inspired them were feminine, we shall perhaps come closer to and more faithfully represent the spirit of these poets, even if at times we be farther from the letter.

The Sufi teachers have reduced their system to a science which bristles with a complicated and generally obscure terminology. Into this it is unnecessary we should enter, as it has little direct bearing upon poetry. The poet who is imbued, as most poets are, with the Sufistic mysticism, pays but scant heed to these technicalities. Unless he be himself a teacher of the Way, he leaves such details to the Schools, and lets his heart be wholly filled by the sublime conceptions of all-embracing Unity and all-conquering Love which form the real basis whereon all the rest is built.

Underlying all action, all existence, in the universe, such
a poet sees the Divine energy, of which all action and all existence is merely a manifestation. Reason, he knows, cannot transcend phenomena; and so, driven to pierce through to what lies beyond, he is fain to cast reason aside and lay bare the heart to receive that inward light by which alone man can behold The Truth. For the eye of reason before the Divine Light is like the human eye before the sun, it is blinded by excess of brightness, it loses itself in that ‘dazzling darkness.’

When reason is thus burned up by the proximity of the Divine Light, the radiance of Illumination streams into the soul, and the poet sees how the whole phenomenal universe is an illusion, in itself non-existent. He sees how The Truth is the one source of all existence, diffused throughout the universe through emanation after emanation; how the Primal Intelligence, itself rayed out from the One, rays out in turn the Primal Soul; how the Divine Names cast their light upon the darkness of not-being, each separate atom of which mirror-like reflects one. He sees how the Awful Attributes of The Truth are reflected in the existence of hell and the devils, and how the Beautiful Attributes are reflected in that of Paradise and the angels. He further sees how Man reflects all the Attributes, Awful and Beautiful alike, and is thus the Microcosm, summing up the universe in himself. He thus sees how it is The Truth alone that is acting through all things, and moreover how this action is a never-ceasing, never-pausing process, every non-existent

---

1 Nār-i Siyah, literally ‘Black Light,’ i.e. ‘Dazzling Darkness,’ is one of those Sufi phrases often used by the poets, — though sometimes in senses far enough from the original.

2 The Divine Names or Attributes are often divided into those of ‘Awfulness’ (Jelāl) and those of ‘Beauty’ (Jemāl). The former are those pointing to the more terrible aspects of the Divine Nature, such as ‘the Avenger,’ ‘the Destroyer,’ etc.; the latter to the gentler, as ‘the Merciful,’ ‘the Forgiver,’ etc. Some say the Awful Attributes are the negative, such as ‘the Unsleeping,’ ‘the Undying;’ and the Beautiful the positive, such as ‘the Holy,’ ‘the Just.’
atom being each instant clothed with a fresh phenomenal eftlux radiated from the Source of existence and being again stripped of it, so that the whole contingent universe is momentarily being annihilated and re-created, though the successive acts of destruction and renewal follow one another in such swift succession that they are wholly imperceptible, and all appears as one uninterupted line, 1 even as an unbroken circle of fire is seen if a single spark be whirled quickly round. 2 But the poet may not rest content with the mere perception of these high mysteries; indeed that very Love which has revealed them to him impels him to seek reunion with The Truth. How could he who sees how every effluent spark of Being is straining to return to its Source do other than strive with his whole heart and soul to attain that blessed consummation?

Such is the philosophic Sufiism of the poets.

From those diverse elements, theological, philosophic and mystic, was formed the religious and intellectual life of old Turkey. With the poets mysticism usually predominated; but they made as free use of the opinions and phraseology of the religious and the philosophers as they did of those

---

1 This idea of the continual destruction and recreation of the universe, which is often referred to by the poets, appears to be borrowed from one of the doctrines of the Mutekellimun or Scholastics. These doctors seem to have taken up the atomistic theory of Democritus, which they manipulated to suit their own purposes. They contended that God created the atoms; that the universe results from the 'accidents' these receive; that the accidents are the immediate creation of God; that no accident can last longer than one atom of time; and consequently that the universe is maintained in existence by a continuous series of distinct creative acts. Their name for the atom is Jevher-i Ferd, 'isolated substance,' or 'monad.'

2 The Shule-i Jevwale, or 'Whirling Spark,' is often alluded to. A spark attached to a string and whirled quickly round appears to trace a complete circle of fire. While the spark is in reality every moment in a different spot, its motion is so rapid that the line of fire it presents appears continuous.
of the Sufis. Their verses therefore present ideas belonging to each of the three groups, and these are introduced side by side without any attempt at reconciliation. It follows that we must not take every statement and every allusion that we find in a poem as indicative of the real belief or opinion of the poet. A man who accepts the Ptolemaic system cannot possibly believe that the earth is supported by a bull that stands upon a fish; yet we sometimes find the same poet in the same poem referring to both conceptions. But such phenomena are common to all literatures. A poet takes ideas which are current among his people, whether such ideas be religious or scientific, mythological or fabulous, and introduces them in his verses, sometimes with the object of strengthening his statements by the citation of an authority popularly held Divine, sometimes with that of illustrating and illuminating his teaching by referring to some fable or some theory familiar to all, and sometimes with no other than the purely decorative purpose of adding vivacity or brilliance to his lines by allusions fraught with a wealth of associations.

There were, however, it should be said, certain writers who made some attempt to harmonise the opposing systems. Those men proceeded on the lines that the 'Arsh and Kursi of the theologians represent the Ninth and Eighth Spheres of the philosophers; that the Light of Muhammed is merely another name for the First Intelligence; and so forth. In so far as these terms came to be used synonymously such would-be peace-makers were practically right; but in their origin those and similar conceptions were unconnected, and the associations attached to them remained distinct throughout.

It is perhaps unnecessary to add that the preceding sketch in no wise represents the culture of modern Turkey. There may still be some ignorant peasants who believe in Mount
Qaf and the Seven Seas; Sufism or some kindred form of mysticism must always remain, for such is the necessary attitude of certain temperaments, to be found everywhere, though more common in the East; but the medieval philosophy which undertakes to explain all things in heaven and earth has passed away. The astronomy and physiology taught in Turkish schools to-day are the same as those we teach in England; the cosmography of Ptolemy and the psychology of Aristotle are now relegated to the study of the antiquary or historian.
CHAPTER III.

VERSE-FORMS, PROSODY AND RHETORIC.

In this chapter we shall consider the mechanism of the poetic system which the Turks borrowed from the Persians, looking first at the verse-forms, then glancing briefly at the prosody and at some of the more usual of the rhetorical figures.

Here the Turks were borrowing what was itself a loan, as almost every detail connected with the structure of Persian verse had been adopted by the Persians from the Arabs. To this Persianised-Arab system the Ottomans added, about the close of the seventeenth century when the national spirit began to stir in literature, a new and very simple verse-form modelled on their own popular ballads; and the system, thus reinforced, remained in exclusive use down to the year 1879, when the great reformer Hamid Bey introduced into Turkish poetry certain Western verse-forms, with a result that has proved revolutionary.

Although no distinctive trace of it is left in full-fledged Ottoman poetry, it will be interesting and useful if we try in the first place to get some slight idea of what old Turkish poetry was like before Persian influence had swamped or wiped out every genuine native element. To help us here we have three books, all written in Central Asia, and all considerably earlier than the commencement of the fourteenth
century when Ottoman, or rather West-Turkish, poetry begins.

The oldest of these is the Qudatqu Bilik or ‘The Auspicious Knowledge.’ This, which claims to be the first book ever written in the Turkish tongue, was finished in Kashghar in A. H. 462 (A. D. 1069-70). It is in the Uyghur dialect of Turkish, and is the work of a certain Yusuf who was Khass Hajib or Privy Councillor to Boqra Khan, the King of those regions. In purpose this old book is ethical; it discusses, chiefly in the form of conversations between a fictitious King, his Vezir, and the Vezir’s son and brother, the moral and social questions which weighed most with the Turks of those far-off times. As to external form, it is written in what the Persians and Ottomans would call Mesnevi verse, that is, in rhyming couplets. The lines are uniformly eleven-syllabled, and the metre, according to Veled Chelebi — a modern Ottoman scholar of whom more anon, — is approximate to that of the Shah-Name of the Persian poet Firdausi. This last point is, however, difficult to determine, as the true Turkish metres — in one of which the Qudatqu Bilik is written — are syllabic, not quantitative like the Persian, and are sometimes susceptible of being read in more ways than one.

The second of the old books referred to is the Diwan-i Hikmet or ‘Philosophic Poems’ of Khoja Ahmed-i Yesevi. This is some fifty years later than the Qudatqu Bilik, and

1 The Qudatqu Bilik has been published along with a German translation and an interesting and valuable Introduction by Professor Vambery: Uigurische Sprachmonumente und das Kudatku Bilik, von Hermann Vambery, Innsbruck, 1870.

2 Veled Chelebi says it was written in A. H. 500 (A. D. 1166-7), but perhaps the true date is somewhat later. Khoja Ahmed-i Yesevi, i.e. Khoja Ahmed of Yesi (in Turkistan), was the most famous of the early Turkish Sheykhhs. According to a Persian work entitled Khażinet-ul-Asfiyâ or ‘The Treasury of the Pure,’ by one Ghulam Muhammed, Khoja Ahmed died in his native town of Yesi in A. H. 562 (A. D. 1166-7).
is in the Uzbek or Jaghatay dialect. Judging from a statement at the beginning of the first poem, the Diwán in our hands is the second volume of the author's works; the first seems to have disappeared. The book which we have consists of a collection of short poems wholly on mystic subjects. These poems vary somewhat in form, the norm being a succession of four-lined stanzas, the first three lines of each of which rhyme together, but take a new rhyme with each stanza, while the fourth lines are either identical throughout or, if varied, keep up the same rhyme. This rhyme-arrangement — a monorhyme with a thrice-repeated internal sub-rhyme — seems to have been very popular with the Turks. It is not confined to stanzaic verse; sometimes it appears in the couplet, the sub-rhyme being in this case repeated in the middle and at the end of the first line and in the middle of the second, while the monorhyme occurs once, at the end of every second line. It so happens that this arrangement of rhyme in connection with both stanza and couplet is known in Persian too; when it is in connection with the stanza, the form of verse is called Murebba, when with the couplet, it is said to be Musemmat. Yesevi's metres are all genuine Turkish; but although the principle on which they are founded — a principle in true harmony with the genius of the language — is quite other than that of the Persian, an effect very similar to that of the Persian metres is often produced through the number of syllables being in many cases the same, while the fall of the accent replaces in a measure the quantity of the feet.

The third of our triad of ancient books is a poem on the scriptural romance of Joseph and Zelikhá written, probably in Bokhara, by one 'Ali, and finished on the 30th. of Rejeb 630 (12th. May, 1233). This poem is composed in four-lined

1 Some call it Musejja.
stanzas of the form just described, that is, the first three lines in each rhyme with one another, while the fourth lines rhyme, or rather, are supposed to rhyme, together throughout. What actually happens in these fourth lines is that each ends in the same word, in what, as we shall learn, the Persians and Ottomans call a Redif, before which the true rhyme-word ought to come; in 'Ali's poem these penultimate words do as a rule (but not always) rhyme more or less perfectly. The metre, while certainly not quantitative, is not strictly syllabic, as the number of syllables to the line fluctuates between eleven and twelve; it is probable that accent played a considerable part here.¹

From what has been said it will be seen that except in the matter of its prosody, which is based on an entirely different principle, native Turkish poetry, as represented by the three old books at which we have glanced, had much in common with Persian. Its chief verse-forms were in use among those of the more cultured system; and the lilt of its verse, though reached by another road, was not very different. That this should be so is natural enough considering that not only had the Turks and Persians been in contact for ages, but that for some time they had been brought yet closer by belief in a common faith. The way was therefore paved for the adoption of the Persian system by the Turks; and it was almost without an effort that the native system glided into the foreign. So far as West-Turkish poetry is concerned, the only struggle was between the two principles of prosody, the syllabic and the quantitative; for the first hundred years they were used together indiscriminately, till about the beginning of the fifteenth century the former

¹ A description of 'Ali's poem, with a number of extracts, is given by Th. Houtsma in the 34th. Vol. (that for 1889) of the Journal of the German Oriental Society.
disappeared, leaving the Persian in undisputed possession.

One consequence of the acceptance by the Ottomans of the Perso-Arab poetic system is that almost all the technical terms used in Turkish in connection with the art or science, the names of the verse-forms, metres, feet, rhetorical figures and so on, are Arabic. In that language these are all significant words, describing, most often figuratively, that structure or peculiarity to which they are applied; but the Turks, in whose language few of them have any self-evident meaning, employ them as purely technical terms, generally without regard to their original signification.

Like all else connected with Persian and Ottoman poetry, the outward form is regulated by hard and fast rules which admit of no relaxation. Thus there are eighteen distinct verse-forms, each more or less appropriated to a certain class of subject; these the poet is bound to employ, making his choice according to his matter; he is in no wise at liberty to invent new combinations, and, indeed, no writer of the Old School ever attempted such a thing. Similarly, there is a limited number of metres; but as almost all of these are susceptible of several modifications, the total number of available varieties is pretty considerable. Each of these metres is divided into a definite number of feet, which, in their turn, are subdivided into a determined number of long and short or, as the Orientals call them, heavy and light syllables, following one another in a particular order which may not be altered. Some of these metres are generally used with one verse-form, some with another.

Let us look first at the Verse-forms which, as we have seen, are eighteen in number.

It is chiefly in the arrangement of the rhyme that these
verse-forms differ from one another, and so a few preliminary words on the nature of Ottoman rhyme will be appropriate here. As given by the Oriental rhetoricians, the rules in connection with this are very technical and extremely elaborate, but with only one exception they work out into practical identity with those that regulate rhyme in our own poetry.¹

When it extends beyond a single couplet Ottoman poetry is always rhymed, blank verse being unknown.

In addition to the rhyme we have very frequently what is called a Redif (which in Arabic means 'Pillion-rider'); that is, one or more words, always the same, added to the end of every line that has the same rhyme, throughout an entire poem; which word or words, though counting in the scansion, are not regarded as the rhyme, the true rhyme in every case being found immediately before. The lines:

'When it shines such a truth about thee,
I did not dare to doubt thee.'

afford an English example; the word 'thee' being here a Redif, while 'about' and 'doubt' form the true rhyme. But while in English we very seldom find a Redif consisting of more than one word, a Persian or Ottoman Redif may consist of every word in the line except the first, there being

¹ The exception referred to occurs in what is technically called Ma'esses-Rhyme. Here the rhyme-letter (technically named the Revi) is preceded by a short vowel (technically named the Tevji'h), which again is preceded by a consonant (technically named the Dakhil), which in its turn is preceded by a long vowel (technically named the Te'sis). Now while in such rhyme the Revi, the Tevji'h and the Te'sis must be the same, the Dakhil need not be the same; thus the words Jazib, Katib, Talib are all good rhymes in Persian and Turkish. Such rhymes would be paralleled in English by 'baker,' 'hater,' 'paler,' words which we should regard as merely assonant, not as really rhyming. When the Dakhil also is made the same, as in the words Jazib and Kazib, Katib and Ratib, Talib and Ghilib, the resultant rhyme is reckoned by the Easterns as a rhetorical embellishment, and classed as a variety of the figure called Ilizar or 'Supererogation.' With this exception the principle of Perso-Turkish rhyme is virtually the same as that of English.
of course always one word to form the rhyme. The Redif does not form part of the original Arab system; it was grafted on to this by the Persians when adapting it to their own poetry. It is, however, probable that the Redif was a feature of ancient Turkish poetry also, as it is of frequent occurrence in so early and so thoroughly Turkish a work as the Diwán-i Hikmet of Ahmed-i Yesevi, and runs right through ʿAlī's Joseph and Zelikha. It used to be constantly employed by the Ottoman poets, but it has somewhat lost ground of late years, as it tends to hamper freedom of expression, and moreover is not a characteristic of French poetry.

The Perso-Arab poetic system has two distinct rhyme-schemes, the one an invention of the Persians, the other the original Arabian plan. We shall begin with the first, as it is already familiar to us in our own literature, and as only one verse-form derives from it.

The distinctive feature of the Persian scheme is that throughout an entire poem the two hemistichs of each couplet rhyme with one another and without reference to the rhyme of any other couplet whatever, care only being taken that the same rhyme-sound does not immediately follow or precede, in other words, that two couplets having the same rhyme are not placed in juxtaposition. This system is simple in the extreme, and corresponds exactly to that observed in Pope's heroic couplets and countless other English poems.

I. Mesnevî, or 'Double-Rhyme;' is the name given to a poem written in these rhyming couplets. Each of these couplets must be complete in itself; there must be nothing of what the French call 'enjambement,' that is, there must be no overflow of words into the couplet following. On account of the unlimited freedom in choice of rhyme which it affords,
this verse-form is generally adopted for long poems, the Arabian or monorhyme system being preferred for shorter pieces. All the metrical romances, for instance, many of which extend to several thousand couplets, are Mesnevis. Thelrhyming chronicles and lengthy mystic, didactic and ethical poems are likewise composed in this form. It is the rule that a long Mesnevi, forming a complete book in itself, should open with a canto to the praise of God; this should be followed by one in honour of the Prophet, whose Mi'raj or 'Ascension' is very often celebrated in another. The next canto is generally a panegyric on the great man (usually the reigning Sultan) to whom the work is dedicated. This again is most often followed by a division bearing some such heading as 'The Reason of the Writing of the Book,' in which the poet narrates the circumstances that induced him to begin his work, generally the solicitations of some friend. After all this, which forms as it were the prologue, comes the story itself, or whatever else may be the subject of the work, divided as a rule into a number of books or sections, which are subdivided into a series of cantos. Each of these cantos is headed by a rubric, very often in the Persian language, setting forth the matter treated. The work is properly brought to a close by an epilogue, in which the date of composition is frequently mentioned. It was not unusual in early times for a poet to write a series of five such Mesnevis; in this case the series was called a Khamsa or 'Quintet.' When the subject of the Mesnevi is a romance the poet often introduces during the course of the story a number of the little odes known as ghazels, placing these in the mouths of his characters in critical moments or when their feelings are highly strung. Long Mesnevis, running into thousands of couplets, are characteristic of the First and Second Periods, the subjects being generally mystic or religious in the former
of these, mystic-romantic in the latter. By the beginning of the Third Period these lengthy poems began to pass out of fashion, and comparatively few Mesnevis of any great length were written after its close. The form did not lose in popularity, but was employed for shorter poems, sometimes religious, sometimes didactic, but most frequently narrative or descriptive. Indeed, the Mesnevi has at all times been the favourite verse-form for narrative poetry of every kind. Finally, its simplicity recommends it to the modern writers, with whom it is in much favour for short occasional poems.

As we have seen, the Qudatqu Bilik, the oldest Turkish book known, is written throughout in rhyming couplets; hence it is probable that Mesnevi verse formed part of the original Turkish material and is therefore, so far as Ottoman poetry is concerned, rather a survival from the native system than a loan from outside.

Turning now to the Arabian system; we find that the distinctive characteristic here is the monorhyme; that is, that a single rhyme runs throughout the entire poem, no matter how long this be. In poems written on this principle the first lines of the several couplets generally remain unrhymed, while all the second lines rhyme together; in some cases, however, the first line of the opening couplet — i.e. the first line of the poem — rhymes with its own second line and consequently with that of each succeeding couplet. There are seventeen verse-forms constructed upon this plan, which was much more popular than the Persian, almost all the shorter pieces, and these form by far the larger portion of Ottoman poetry, having been written in accordance with it up to the rise of the Modern School. Let us now look at these seventeen verse-forms.
The unit upon which the Arabian scheme is built is the Misra’ (or Misra’), which we may translate as ‘Hemistich.’ This is a single line of verse written in one of the established metres, which, if placed beside another line in the same metre, would form a distich or couplet.

II. When a Misra’ does not form one of the members of a couplet, but is a unit complete in itself, having no connection with any other versified writing, it is called a Misra’-i Azade or ‘Independent Hemistich.’

III. The Beyt, usually translated as ‘Couplet’ or ‘Distich,’ consists of two misra’s in the same metre, which misra’s may or may not rhyme together.

The Beyt, whether rhymed or unrhymed, may be either one out of several couplets which together form a poem, or it may, like the Independent Hemistich, be a separate unit.

When the two hemistichs rhyme, the Beyt is said to be Musarra’ or ‘Rhymed.’ This term is further applied — as descriptive of the rhyme-scheme — to any poem consisting of a succession of such couplets; so that in a piece of verse rhymed in Musarra’ fashion all the hemistichs will rhyme together.

When a Rhymed Beyt forms the opening couplet of a poem in monorhyme (especially of a ghazel or qasida) it is called a Matla’, a word which literally means the ‘Orient’ or ‘Rising-point’ of a heavenly body. Such is the correct use of the term Matla’; but the word is often loosely applied to an Independent Beyt when the two lines rhyme together.

An Independent Beyt the two lines of which do not rhyme together is called a Ferd, or, more usually, a Mufred, both of which words mean ‘Unit.’
often loosely employed, being frequently used to designate any Independent Beyt whether unrhymed or rhymed.

IV. The Ghazel: This, which is the most typically Oriental of all the verse-forms alike in the careful elaboration of its detail and in its characteristic want of homogeneity, is, or at least was till within recent years, the first favorite of the Ottoman poets. It is a short poem of not fewer than four and not more than fifteen couplets. Such at any rate is the theoretical limit, but Ghazels containing a much larger number of couplets may occasionally be met with; this, however, is exceptional, from five to ten being the average number. The first couplet of a Ghazel is, as we have seen, called the Matla\(^{c}\), and is invariably musarra\(^{c}\), the two hemistichs always rhyming together. All the succeeding couplets are non-musarra\(^{c}\); that is, all their second lines rhyme together and with the Matla\(^{c}\), while their first lines do not rhyme at all. If we employ the alphabetical notation usually adopted when dealing with rhyme-sequences, we get the following for a Ghazel of six couplets: A. A: B. A: C. A: D. A: E. A: F. A. The last couplet of a Ghazel has the special name of Maqta\(^{c}\) or 'Point of Section;' and in this the poet introduces his name, thus as it were affixing his signature to the little work. This custom of introducing the name towards the end of a poem is not peculiar to the Ghazel, but is common to all the verse-forms of more than two couplets deriving from the Arabian rhyme-system. Occasionally, but not often, a poet takes one of the lines, it may be the first or it may be the second, of the Matla\(^{c}\), and repeats it as the rhyming-line of the Maqta\(^{c}\), that is, as the last line of the Ghazel. This operation, which is called Redd-i Matla\(^{c}\) or 'Return of the Matla\(^{c}\)', has sometimes a very pleasing effect, when the line repeated is pretty or striking and falls naturally and aptly
into its place in either couplet. The second couplet of a Ghazel, that immediately following the Matla', is technically called the Husn-i Matla' or ‘Beauty of the Matla’; and it was a practice among the old poets to endeavour to make it more beautiful or more ingenious than the Matla' itself. Just as the couplet immediately below the Matla’ is called the Husn-i Matla’, that immediately above the Maqta’ is called the Husn-i Maqta’; and just as the poet was supposed to give the former a peculiar excellence, he was held to make the latter likewise a verse of more than usual merit. Thus the poet would choose the best of the five couplets that would remain after appropriating the Matla’, Husn-i Matla’ and Maqta’ of a Ghazel of eight distichs, and would place it immediately above the Maqta’, thus making it into the Husn-i Maqta’. Of course the judgment of the poet would not always be that of others, so the critics call what they take to be the best couplet of a Ghazel, whatever its position in the poem, the Shah-Beyt (or Sheh-Beyt), that is, ‘Couplet-Royal,’ or sometimes, the Beyt-ul-Ghazel (or Beyt-i Ghazel), that is ‘Couplet of the Ghazel.’ In point of style the poem should be faultless; all imperfect rhymes, uncouth words and questionable expressions must be carefully avoided, and the same rhyme-word ought not to be repeated. It is the most elegant and highly finished of all the old poetic forms, and it is in it that the Ottoman poets have the best opportunity for displaying their exquisite skill as stylists. Hence perhaps the extraordinary popularity of the form; the number of Ghazels in the language is probably greater than that of all the other poems put together. Love in all its manifold phases — the charms of the beloved, the rapture caused by her presence, the anguish born of her absence or her harshness, — this forms the true and proper subject of the Ghazel. What the sonnet was to the Italians
the Ghazel was to the Persians and Turks, the literary form dedicated to the praise of Love. But notwithstanding this we shall find that it was usual with the poets to refer in their Ghazels to many other things, sometimes widely enough removed from the master passion. But while the Ghazel may thus be made to treat of anything, from the mission of the Prophet to the introduction of coffee, there is a certain narrow circle of subjects which seem to have been regarded as the special and appropriate themes of this form of poetry. Prominent among these are the pleasures of wine, the delights of springtide, and the vicissitudes of fortune, with of course the wocs and joys of love in the foremost place of all. It may be that a single Ghazel will touch on one and all of these things, devoting a couplet or two to each; for it is a marked feature of the form that the several couplets stand in no direct relationship to one another, so that they might be arranged in any order without affecting the general sense of the poem. All the same, although there may be no definable connection between the individual couplets, these ought never to be out of harmony with one another, and a single tone of mind should run through a whole poem. One writer has likened the Ghazel to a brilliant coruscating with glorious colours and displaying many facets, but yet a single whole. Such indeed is what ought to be, but in practice we find that in a vast number of Ghazels, especially when the work of mediocre writers, there is no more unity of thought or feeling between the several couplets than there is between the paragraphs in the columns of a newspaper. It follows of necessity that each couplet must be complete in itself, must contain a complete idea completely expressed. The two lines often present a kind of parallelism, similar

1 Belighi, a janissary poet of the time of Murâd III, has a Ghazel on this subject.
to what is found so largely in Hebrew poetry, the second repeating, interpreting, or responding to the first. The couplets of a Ghazel have frequently been compared to pearls on a thread: the thread, they say, will make them one necklace, but the value of the necklace must lie in the beauty of each pearl, not in the thread. While this discursiveness characterises Ghazels as a class, it is far from being universal; sometimes a writer treats a given subject, or at least works a single vein of thought, throughout an entire poem; but even then, the couplets, being each an independent entity, lead up to nothing, and might be set down in any order without detriment to the whole. Ghazels devoted to a single subject occur more frequently in the Fourth Period than in earlier times; and nowadays unity of tone and sentiment, as well as avoidance of irrelevant digressions, is aimed at by the writers of these little poems. For although the Ghazel no longer maintains its old pre-eminence, it is far from having fallen into desuetude, and almost every poet of the New School has given us some examples of his skill in dealing with this old-time favourite. Fuzuli, Baqi and Nedim are the most famous of the Ottoman Ghazel-writers; of these, the first two belong to the Second, the third to the Fourth Period.

V. The Qasida — which word in Arabic means 'Purpose-Poem' — is in form similar to the ghazel, but is much longer. Theoretically it contains not less than thirty and not more than ninety-nine couplets. It is the original Arabian form, that in which the famous Mutallaqat and other ancient Arabic poems are written. In Persian and Turkish literature it is the special form affected by the court poetry, its proper subject being the eulogy of some great personage, a Sultan or Vezir or Sheykh of Islam. The Ottoman Qasida consists
of two parts: the Nesib, which we may translate as the 'Exordium,' and the Maqsad or Maqsiid, literally the 'Purpose,' which we may render as the 'Panegyric.' The first of these is often extremely beautiful; its subject, which is definite, admitting of none of the discursiveness of the ghazel, may depend upon the occasion on which the poem is written and presented to the patron to whom it is dedicated. Thus if it be during Ramazán, the Muslim Lent, or at the Bayram Festival, the theme of the Exordium will likely be a poetical account of the fast or of the feast; or if it be on the occasion of the completion of a new palace or the laying out of a garden, it will be a brilliant description of the same; or again it may be simply a highly coloured picture of the season of the year, spring, summer, autumn or winter, in which the poem chances to be composed. But anything may be taken as subject; sometimes it is the great man's horse, or his sword, or his signet; sometimes it is a flower, as the rose, the hyacinth or the tulip; occasionally, as in the case of a celebrated Qasida of Nefși, the Exordium is purely moral or philosophic. The Panegyric, which follows the Exordium, has seldom any essential connection with it, and great dexterity is often shown by the poet in the way he dovetails the one into the other; a remote resemblance, a momentary association of ideas, will serve him as a hinge, and while he seems yet to be singing the delights of spring, we find he has begun the glorification of his patron. The Panegyric itself proceeds with all the pomp and splendour of language which the poet can command; and, when the work of a master, the succession of long lines, with their stately measure and gorgeous imagery, has something of

1 The couplet in which the transition is made bears the technical name of Guriz i.e. 'Flight,' or Guriz-gah i.e. 'Place of the Flight;' some writers, however, apply the term Guriz-gah to the whole Nesib or 'Exordium.'
the magnificence of an imperial pageant. But too often the Panegyric is little more than a string of turgid and bombastic epithets, the resonance and grandiloquence of which fail to conceal the banality and insincerity beneath. The name of the patron is usually introduced near the beginning of the Panegyric, while towards the end, in a couplet, which is technically styled the Taj or 'Crown,' the writer mentions his own name, and begins a prayer for the prosperity of the great man, which closes the poem. Many writers introduce a ghazel into their Qasidas, sometimes near the beginning, sometimes near the end; this ghazel is often ostensibly addressed to some unnamed beauty and has no intimate connection with the Qasida itself beyond having the same rhyme, being in the same metre, and occasionally deriving its imagery from the same dominant subject. It is allowable in a Qasida to repeat the same rhyme-word with the same meaning, provided that at least seven couplets intervene, but it is always better to dispense when possible with this license. In poems of this class there are usually two or three matla's or rhyming couplets besides the opening distich; these are introduced here and there in the course of the poem to break the long sequence of non-musarra verses, and sometimes by way of beginning as it were a new paragraph. 1 In the Diwans, or volumes containing the collected works of a poet, there is usually a rubric prefixed to each Qasida setting forth its subject and mentioning the name of the great man in whose honour it is composed; these rubrics are usually in Persian. The best couplet of a Qasida is technically called the Beyt-ul-Qasid or 'Couplet of the Qasida.' The Qasida, which found its most brilliant exponent

---

1 A Qasida containing such couplets is technically called Zat-ul-Matili or 'Possessor of Matla's;' and the couplets themselves are respectively styled the First Matla, Second Matla, Third Matla, and so on.
in Nef'i of Erzerum, a gifted poet of the Third Period, has in great measure passed out of fashion since the rise of the Modern School. Not only is that flattery of the great which is its ultimate aim at variance with the better taste now prevailing, but the poets of to-day rightly regard it as a waste of time and ingenuity to get together some fifty or sixty rhyming words and work these up to form the rhymes of as many couplets, as the result must almost always be a mere tour de force, often woefully strained and sadly deficient in every element of true poetry. Thus Báqi, who is one of the finest poets of the Second Period, has what he calls his Hyacinth Qasida to the honour and glory of his learned teacher Qaramání-zâde Mehemmed Efendi, in which he makes the word Sunbul, that is ‘Hyacinth,’ end forty-nine lines, being preceded by as many words all rhyming together, only one of which is repeated in the whole course of the poem. The extreme difficulty of an achievement such as this, to end nearly fifty couplets with a word like ‘hyacinth,’ prefixing to the same in each case a different rhyme-word, and yet not only to preserve sense and avoid the evidence of labour, but also to impart to the work the charm of poetry, must be apparent to all. In most languages the feat would be simply impossible; but the wealth of rhymes in Turkish, together with the great freedom in arranging the sequence of words allowed to, or at least taken by, the old poets, render it somewhat less hopeless in their case than it would be with us. Some writers, as it would appear from mere bravado, go out of their way to choose a difficult word for the redif of a Qasida; thus the poet Sunbul-zâde Vehbi has a work of this class in which he makes the term Sukhan ‘Word’ end a hundred and twenty-eight lines, preceded of course by nearly as many different words all of which rhyme together. Efforts such as this are of necessity
foredoomed to be literary failures; but even when less ambitious, there are comparatively few writers whose Qasidas are at once so correct and so poetical that we can justly describe them as completely successful; and the leaders of the Modern School have done well in discouraging any further waste of time and talent in so unprofitable a field.

VI. The Qit'a, literally 'Section,' is identical in form with the ghazel except that the first couplet is non-musarra instead of being rhymed. Thus if the first couplet of a ghazel be removed, the remainder will be a Qit'a so far as the form is concerned. The poem, however, while it may treat of almost any subject, must confine itself to that subject; the theme may not be changed, as in the ghazel, with every couplet. A Qit'a may be of any length from two couplets upwards. In the longer Qit'as it is usual for the poet to introduce his name somewhere towards the close, but not in the last couplet. This form is much used for the Tarikhs or 'Chronograms,' of which more hereafter; but in these, if the poet mentions his name, he generally does so in the last distich.

The Nazm: This is simply a Qit'a with a rhymed in place of an unrhymed distich for the opening couplet, and is therefore exactly the same as the ghazel in form. It differs from the latter solely in the nature of its subjects, and in the manner in which these are treated. The word Nazm means 'Verse' in general, and this is its usual application; but as a technical term it is the name of the verse-form just described.

VII. The Mustezad, literally 'Complemented,' is formed by adding to each misra or hemistich in a piece of verse a short line called the Ziyade or 'Complement,' which may
be either read or omitted, the poem making equally good sense in either case. When the piece of verse so treated is a ghazel, it is usual to make each Ziyáde rhyme with the misra to which it is affixed. Sometimes, however, the matla and the second misra's of the succeeding Ziyáde-couplets have an independent rhyme of their own, leaving only the first misra's of the Ziyáde-couplets to rhyme with the first misra's of the couplets of the ghazel. There is only one metre in which it is allowable to write a Mustezád. When really well done, the Mustezád has a pleasing effect, but the management of the Ziyáde calls for a good deal of skill on the part of the poet. The success of the poem depends upon the happiness with which these short complementary lines are worked in; for while they must not materially affect the sense of the poem, they should heighten the effect of the whole by a series of graceful and significant touches. When they fail of this, they are apt to degenerate into mere padding.

VIII. The Rubá'í (in the plural Rubá'íyát) or 'Quatrain' is, as its name indicates, a short poem of four lines, the first, second and fourth of which rhyme together, the third remaining blank. This arrangement of the rhymes has a very singular and pleasing effect, as the rhyme of the first two lines, which seemed to be lost on the appearance of the third, returns like an echo in the fourth and closes the little poem in a manner at once grateful to the ear and satisfying to the aesthetic sense. Occasionally the third line also is rhymed, but then the result is less happy as the effect just mentioned is absent. There is a series of twenty-four metres,

1 This is a variation of the fundamental metre called Hezej; the misra to which the Ziyáde is added must scan: \(- - - | - - - | - - - | - - - - - -\), and the Ziyáde: \(- - - | - - - - - -\).

2 When the third line rhymes with the others the poem is called a Rubá'í-i Musarra' or 'Rhymed Quatrain.'
all derived from the Hezej, peculiar to the Rubāʿi; in one of these it must be written, and they may not be used for any other form of poetry. The Rubāʿi may deal with any subject, but it should do so in a forceful or epigrammatic fashion. It is as a rule little more than a pregnant hint; the poet seems, as it were, suddenly to see some point in a new and unexpected light, this he suggests in four nervous lines, making no comment, drawing no conclusion, the reader being left to follow up for himself the train of thought when he has recovered from the slight shock of surprise which the perusal of a good Rubāʿi should at first produce. Each Rubāʿi is a unit complete in itself, and has no connection with any other. In his masterly adaptation of a selection of the Rubāʿis of the Persian poet Omar-i Khayyām, the late Edward Fitzgerald has so manipulated and arranged the Quatrains chosen as to make them read as though there were a certain orderly connection between them, as though they followed one another in a naturally developing sequence, in fact, as though they were stanzas in one long poem—an idea never conceived, or at any rate never acted upon, either by Khayyām or by any other Eastern poet. Rubāʿis when collected are always arranged, exactly as ghazels are, according to a certain alphabetical system which we shall learn by and by; the sense of the several poems (for, as we have seen, each Rubāʿi is a separate little poem) has nothing whatever to do with the arrangement. Azmi-zāde Hāleti, who flourished early in the Third Period, is said to have been the most successful Rubāʿi-writer among the Ottomans. The Rubāʿi is sometimes, but not often, called Du-Beyt or ‘Double-Couplet,’ and occasionally Terane, a word which means, among other things, ‘Melody’ or ‘Harmony.’ This

1 By far the best of the English translations of Omar-i Khayyām is that by Mr. John Payne. (Villon Society, 1898.)
form is so short that the poet rarely mentions his name in it.

There is a native Turkish form which in the arrangement of the rhyme is identical with the Rubá'í, but which is composed in quite different metres. In East-Turkish literature this form is cultivated and called the Tuyugh or Tuyuq. It has never found its way into Ottoman literary poetry, but it lives in the Ottoman folk-verse known as Mani.

The verse-forms deriving from the monorhyme-scheme that still remain to be described are all stanzaic. It does not follow that these forms, though based on the monorhyme, are of Arabian origin; some at least are most likely Persian, while one (XI) is practically identical with a very early, and probably original, Turkish form. The first two are really but variations of a single model.

IX. The Terjíf-Bend (literally ‘Return-Tie’) is a poem consisting of a succession of stanzas (called Terjíf-Kháne or ‘House of the Return’) in the same metre, but each with a different rhyme. The stanzas are monorhyming and may be rhymed either exactly in the ghazel style, or in the manner called musarra' when the rhyme is repeated at the end of every hemistich; but whichever system is adopted in the first stanza must be adhered to throughout the poem. The number of couplets is the same in each stanza, and is never less than five and rarely more than ten. To each stanza is added, as it were, a refrain, an unvarying rhymed couplet, which has the same metre as the rest of the poem, and may or may not rhyme with the opening stanza. This rhyming couplet is called the Wásita or ‘Link,’ or else the Bend or ‘Tie.’ Some writers, however, apply the term Bend to the Terjíf-Kháne and Wásita taken together.
X. The Terkib-Bend (literally, ‘Composite Tie’) is exactly the same as the preceding except that the Wāsita closing the several stanzas (in this case called Terkib-Khāne) varies on each occasion.

The Terjī'-Bend and Terkib-Bend are much used for elegies; they are also employed for mystic, philosophic, and contemplative poetry in general. Towards the close of the last stanza, but not in the Wāsita, the poet mentions his name. The Terjī'-Bend is reckoned the more difficult form of the two, in as much as the several stanzas have to be so worked up that the recurring Wāsita falls naturally and appropriately into its place at the end of each. In the Terkib-Bend, where the Wāsita varies with every stanza, the poet has of course a much freer hand.

We now reach a second group of stanzaic verse-forms, each member of which has a special name descriptive of the number of lines in the stanza. We shall begin with the shortest and simplest.

XI. The Murebbā or ‘Foursome’ is a poem consisting of a succession of four-line stanzas called Bend or ‘Tie.’ The fourth line of the first stanza may or may not rhyme with the other three which must all rhyme together. But whatever be the rhyme of the fourth line of the first stanza, that rhyme must be repeated in the fourth line of every succeeding stanza, while the first three lines of each of these must take a new rhyme. Sometimes the fourth line of the first stanza is repeated as the fourth line of each one following, and is thus made into a sort of refrain; in this case the poem is known as a Murebbā-i Mutekerrir or ‘Repeating Foursome.’ Sometimes these fourth lines, while rhyming together, vary with each stanza, then the poem
is called a Murebba'\textsuperscript{-i} Muzdevij or 'Pairing Foursome.'

As has been already said, the rhyme-arrangement of the Murebba'\textsuperscript{c} is practically identical with one of the most popular and most characteristic of the original Turkish rhyme-schemes, that on which most of Ahmed-i Yesevi's poems and the whole of 'Ali's Joseph and Zelikha are written.

The Terbi\textsuperscript{c}: Sometimes a writer builds a Murebba'\textsuperscript{c} on a poem, usually a ghazel, of some other author. He does this by prefixing two lines of his own to each couplet of the poem he has taken as the basis of his work. These two lines, which are called the Zamîme or 'Addition,' must be in the same metre as the poem worked on. In the first of the four-line stanzas thus formed both lines of the Zamîme must rhyme with the matla'\textsuperscript{c} of the ghazel taken as basis, which of course forms the last two lines of the verse; but in each of the succeeding stanzas the lines of the Zamîme must rhyme with the first or non-rhyming line of the mufred to which they are prefixed. The result is of course a perfect Murebba'\textsuperscript{-i} Muzdevij. The difficulty in the Terbi\textsuperscript{c} (and in the similar Takhmis and Tesdis) is to make the Zamîme blend naturally and gracefully with the lines to which it is prefixed; it should so harmonise with these both in feeling and in language that the whole poem appear to be the work of one and the same writer. When this is not achieved, the stanzas have a patchy look, and the result is failure.

XII. The Mukhammes or 'Fivesome': This is exactly the same as the Murebba'\textsuperscript{c} except that here each stanza consists of five instead of four lines. It also may be either Mutekerrir or Muzdevij, according as the last line of the first stanza is repeated or varied in those that follow. Sometimes, however, the lines are divided by the rhyme into groups of three and two instead of four and one. In this case the
first three lines of each stanza take a different rhyme, while the last two keep the same rhyme throughout. Here again the poem may be either Mutekerrir or Muzdevij. In the Mukhammes, though it is usual, it is not essential that the fifth line, or the fourth and fifth lines, of the opening stanza rhyme with the four, or three, that precede.

The Takhmis: This is to the Mukhammes what the Terbi is to the Murebba, namely, a Mukhammes built upon an earlier poem. It is formed in precisely the same way as the Terbi except that three instead of two new lines are prefixed to each couplet of the poem chosen for basis, which here again is generally a ghazel. There is another and somewhat simpler variety of the Takhmis in which the poet constructs his Mukhammes, not upon a whole ghazel, but upon a single hemistich or upon a single couplet. In this case, if his basis be a line, he prefixes to it four, and if it be a couplet, three rhyming hemistichs of his own, which for the first stanza usually rhyme with the basis, but in each of those succeeding take a new rhyme. Such a Takhmis must necessarily be Mutekerrir. There is no necessary limit to the number of stanzas in a Takhmis of this class, whereas in a poem built on a ghazel the number of stanzas must of course be that of the couplets in the basis. The effect produced by a good Takhmis is far more pleasing than that to be obtained from an equally well constructed Terbi, and as a consequence the former stands in much higher favour. Thus while Terbi's are comparatively rare, examples of the Takhmis abound in Ottoman literature, especially during the later Periods.

XIII. The Museddes or 'Sixsome': In this form, which is similar to the two preceding, each stanza consists of six lines or, in other words, of three couplets. The four lines of the first and second couplets of each stanza rhyme together,
but in each stanza they take a new rhyme. The third couplet of the first stanza may or may not rhyme with the two that precede, and it may or may not be repeated as the third couplet of each following stanza, and the Museddes is Mutekerrir or Muzdevij, accordingly. As with the Murebba\(^c\) and the Mukhammes, here also when the poem is Muzdevij the final rhyme must be retained throughout. This is one point in which poems of this second stanzaic group differ from the Terkib-Bend where the several Wasitas have each a separate and independent rhyme. Occasionally, though rarely, the two lines of the third couplets do not rhyme together; when this is the case each line rhymes with its correspondent in the other stanzas, that is, the fifth lines of all the stanzas rhyme together, and so do the sixth lines, though they do not rhyme with each other.

The Tesdís: This is similar to the Terbf\(^c\) and the Takhmis, and is a Museddes built upon some previous work, usually a couplet, as in the second form of the second variety of the Takhmis. The same rules as to rhyme and metre hold for the Tesdís as for the Terbf\(^c\) and Takhmis.

Similar to the Murebba\(^c\), the Mukhammes and the Museddes are:

XIV. The Musebba\(^c\) or 'Sevensome,'
XV. The Musemmen or 'Eightsome,'
XVI. The Mutessa\(^c\) or 'Ninesome,' and
XVII. The Mu'ashsher or 'Tensome,'
in which the stanzas consist of seven, eight, nine and ten lines respectively, and all of which are of very rare occurrence.

The subjects of poems of this second stanzaic group are generally those treated in the ghazel, but such poems are
not so discursive as that favourite form, they keep as a rule more strictly to the matter in hand. The poet mentions his name in the last stanza.

With this group closes the series of Ottoman verse-forms derived from the Arabian rhyme-system, and there now remains to be described only that one form which is of purely Turkish origin.

In Turkish popular poetry, that which is the peculiar possession of the uneducated classes, and is the outcome of the native genius uninfluenced by Persian or French models, the feet are, in accordance with the true Turkish system, syllabic, not metric, and the rhyme is frequently very imperfect, sometimes merely assonant.

The generic name for the Turkish popular ballad is Turki, that is 'Turkish (-song),' — itself an eloquent witness to the national character thereof. These Turkis, which are sung all over the country, especially in the humbler circles of society, are of various forms which differ slightly from one another. One of the most popular of these is a succession of four-line stanzas, the first three lines of each of which rhyme with one another, while all the fourth lines, which may be the same throughout or may vary with each stanza, rhyme together. Some of the oldest known Turkish poems, such as Āli’s Joseph and Zelikha and many of the pieces in Ahmed-i Yesevi’s Diwān-i Hikmet,¹ are, as we have seen, written in this form, which strengthens our belief that in the Turki we have a survival of the ancient pre-Persian poetry of the Turkish peoples. It is this variety of the Turki

¹ In many of Yesevi’s poems the first stanza is irregularly rhymed, the second line often rhyming with the fourth instead of with the first and third, which two occasionally do not even rhyme together. All these variations reappear in the Ottoman Turki.
which about the end of the Third Period, when the native genius began to assert itself, was dressed up as a new literary form and christened

XVIII. The Sharqí, that is, 'Eastern.' In the Sharqí the syllabic feet of the turki are replaced by metric feet of the orthodox description, the faulty rhymes are done away with, while the ungrammatical or provincial expressions are banished. In short, the poem becomes a perfectly correct composition written in accordance with the prevailing Persian rules of literary art. But the memory of its humble origin is preserved in the simple nature of the feeling that characterises it and of the language in which that feeling is expressed. The ingenious conceits and rhetorical exuberances that are held to increase the merit of a ghazel or a qasída would be reckoned out of place in a Sharqí; similarly, the Persian idioms and constructions which are sought after in the other verse-forms are avoided here, and their place is taken by a more homely phraseology. The tone of the Sharqí is nearly always gay, and the meaning clear and straightforward. The subject is almost invariably love, simple human love, very often it is an invitation to the beloved to come out for a stroll to the Sweet Waters of Europe or some other favourite promenade. Another reason of the greater simplicity of the Sharqís is that they were meant to be sung. The ghazels were no doubt occasionally sung, but they were primarily intended to be read. But the Sharqí is the literary development of the turki which is essentially a song; it is therefore a song written in conformity with the canons of poetic art, and as such it is intended to be heard, not to be read and re-read like the other forms, and consequently it must be simple. Another feature of its parent, the turki, retained by the Sharqí is its comparative freedom in certain minor points.
regarding form, thus the recurring line which closes the several stanzas, and which is called the Naqarat or 'Chorus,' is very often used also as the second line of the first stanza, which thus becomes irregular. Again, the Naqarat may vary with each stanza, as in the murebbâ'i muzdevij. In the terminology of music the name Miyan or 'Middle' is given to that portion of the music of the song to which the third stanza of a Sharqi is sung; this music is taken to be the most touching and impressive passage of the whole composition, and the poet is supposed to make his third stanza which bears the special name of Miyan-Khâne or 'Middle-House,' likewise the most tender and affecting of the poem. The poets Nedîm and Wasif are perhaps the most famous of the Sharqi-writers.

Monorhyming poetry has occasionally a secondary rhyme; when this is the case, each couplet has, besides the final rhyme common to the whole poem, a special rhyme of its own which is usually repeated three times, namely, in the middle and at the end of the first hemistich and in the middle of the second, an arrangement which has the effect of cutting up the distich into four divisions. When poetry is rhymed in this manner it is said to be Musemmat. Musemmat rhyme, which is simply the Murebbâ'i arrangement adapted to the couplet, seems to have been peculiarly pleasing to the Turkish ear, and most likely formed part of the original native system. As already said, we find it in the ancient pre-Ottoman poetry produced in Central Asia; and it forms the most striking characteristic of the first rude efforts in lyric verse made by the Western Turks.

The eighteen varieties which have been described consti-
tute the series of verse-forms used in Ottoman poetry down to the time when the Modern School revolutionised the entire literary system; but there still remain for consideration a few names which indicate not the form of a poem, but the nature of its contents. Leaving aside such terms as Medhiye or 'Eulogy,' Hijv or 'Satire,' Mersiye or 'Elegy' and Hezeliyât or 'Facetiae,' which denote varieties common to all literatures and call for no explanation, we shall confine ourselves to those which are more peculiarly Oriental.

Foremost among such is the Târîkh or 'Chronogram.' This is a word or set of words the numerical values of the letters \(^1\) forming which give on addition the year of the Hijre, or Muhammedan era, wherein occurred the event to which such word or set of words refers. Of course a Chronogram need not be in verse, but it generally is. In this case it is usually comprised in the last line of a short poem in the qitâ form which narrates the event the date of which the Chronogram embodies. When every letter in this final hemistich is included in the addition, and when this gives the exact sum required, the Chronogram is called a Târîkh-i Tâmîn or 'Perfect Chronogram.' When only the dotted letters are to be reckoned, the Târîkh is said to be Jevherdâr or Jevherin, that is, 'Gemmed;' when only the undotted letters, it is said to be Muhmel, that is, 'Unmarked.' Sometimes the sum of the letters in the last line is either more or less than is required; recourse has then to be had to a device technically called Ta'mîye or 'Enigmatizing,' which consists in suggesting to the reader by a cleverly contrived hint the sum which must be deducted from or added to the total yielded by the chronogrammatic line. \(^2\) Offering,

---

\(^1\) Every letter in the Ottoman alphabet has a numerical value.

\(^2\) An example may help to make this clearer. Belgrade was won back from the Austrians by Mehmed Pasha in the year of the Hijre 1152 (A. D.
as it does, a wide field for the exercise of ingenuity, the Chronogram was naturally a great favourite with the Turkish poets. It has been cultivated more or less at all times, but it reached its highest point of popularity about the beginning of the nineteenth century when flourished the greatest of all the Ottoman chronogrammatists, Surūrī, who possessed an extraordinary talent for improvising Chronograms—an almost impossible feat, one would have thought.

The composition of what are called Naziras has likewise been at all times a very favourite exercise with the Turkish poets. The name Nazira or ‘Parallel’ is given to a poem written in emulation of one by another writer. The Nazira must be in the same metre and have the same rhyme and the same redif (if there be one) as the poem emulated; it should moreover be conceived in a similar spirit. The fascination of Nazira-writing lay in the endeavour to outdo one’s fellow-craftsman on his own chosen ground. Thus a poet might select as redif for a ghazel or qasida some word or phrase which had never been so used before, and which was particularly hard to fit in neatly and correctly. This he would work in at the end of his verses with all the skill at his command; and when the poem was published, it would be recognised by his brother-artists as a challenge to which their literary zeal and their threatened reputation alike

1739). Rāghib Pasha commemorated this victory in the following chronogram:

 RCMP  * "Driving out the paynim host, I have told the chronogram thereof:
 'Mehemmed Pasha hath taken the fortress of Belgrade.'"

Here the sum of the letters in the second (the chronogrammatic) line is 2003, which is 851 in excess of what is required. Now the sum of the letters in the words 'the paynim host' is 851: this, we are told, has been 'driven out,' so we understand that we must 'drive out' or subtract the sum 851 from 2003, on doing which we get 1152, the year of the victory.
would constrain them to respond. But 'Parallels' were not written only to the verses of contemporaries or immediate predecessors; the poets often composed them to the works of men long dead whose style they admired and whose verses they were fain to rival. The term Nazíra is used only in connection with poems written on the monorhyme system. When one poet sought to 'parallel' a long mesnevi of another, his work was called a Jewáb or 'Response' to that of the latter. Thus the Subhet-ul-Ebkár or 'Communion of Virgins' by the Ottoman poet 'Atá'i is said to be a Jewáb or 'Response' to the Subhet-ul-Ebrár or 'Rosary of the Just' by the Persian Jámí. This same term, Jewáb, is applied to a Khamsa or 'Quintet,' that is, a series of five mesnevis, when this is written to 'parallel' an earlier series.

There are two classes of verse composition, the Lughaz or 'Riddle' and the Mu'ammá or 'Enigma,' which, though they can hardly lay claim to being poetry, were largely cultivated by many poets and often form a special chapter in the Dívâns or collections of a poet's works. The first of these, the Lughaz or 'Riddle,' is simply a versified conundrum in which from a more or less fantastic description the name of the object which is the answer may be guessed. But the Mu'ammá or 'Enigma' or 'Logogriph' is an extraordinarily subtle and ingenious variety of conceit such as the Eastern mind revels in. The answer, which is almost always supplied — so hard is the puzzle, — is usually a proper name, and is arrived at by the manipulation, in accordance with certain conventions, of some of the words and letters contained in the two lines of which the 'Enigma' generally consists.  

1 This 'Enigma' on the name 'Abhás by the poet Hashmet will serve as an example of the class: —