Hymns, when addressed to God, are called Munajat; when addressed to the Prophet, they are styled Na't. There are usually some of each class among the collected works of a poet.

The Mesnevis alone have individual titles. In the case of romances these are as a rule formed of the names of the hero and heroine, as 'Khusrev and Shirin;' in the case of didactic poems they are often purely fanciful, as Nefhat-ul-Ezhar 'The Waft of the Flowers;' sometimes the title may be indicative of the subject of the work, as Saqi-Name 'The Book of the Cupbearer;' which is the name of many poems dealing with the pleasures of wine whether literal or allegoric.

Qasidas are often distinguished by a title taken from the subject of the exordium, or from the word that forms the redif, or, where there is no redif, from the last letter of the rhyming words. Thus a Qasida-i Behariya or 'Spring Qasida,' is one the exordium of which describes the spring season, a Gul Qasidasi or 'Rose Qasida' is one where the word gul or 'rose' forms the redif, and a Qasida-i Ra'iiye or 'R Qasida' is one in which the rhyme-words end in the letter R.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Libási} & \quad \text{husnina} \quad \text{göz dikkati} \quad \text{zalâm;} \\
\text{Niqáb-i} & \quad \text{zulfini} \quad \text{ref' eddi} \quad \text{didem.}
\end{align*}
\]

'On the vestment of her beauty did the world fix its gaze;
'My eye set aside the veil of her curls (i.e. I saw her face through them).'

To get at the solution here we see the 'eye' must 'set aside' or replace the 'curl.' Now the word for 'eye' in the verse is عين (aïn), but there is another word with the same meaning, namely عين (aïn), and this word is also the name of the letter ی (yi); again, according to a convention that holds in Enigmas the word 'curl' may be used (because of the form of a curl) to represent the letter ی. So we have somewhere to replace a ی by a ی: doing this in the word عیناس (libás) 'vestment,' we get عیناس (Abbás), which is the name we wish.
The term Diwan is applied to the volume which contains the collected works of a poet, excepting long mesnevis which usually form separate and independent books. In a Diwan all the pieces in the same verse-form are grouped together, the several groups forming as it were so many chapters or sections. Within certain limits the order or sequence of these groups or chapters is fixed; the qasidas always come before the ghazels, these before the ruba’is, and these before the independent distichs and hemistichs, which last generally close the volume. The position of the chronograms and other qit’as and of pieces in the stanzaic forms is not so rigidly determined, but these usually come between the qasidas and the ghazels. The position of any short mesnevis that may be included is likewise unsettled. The enigmas, when there are any, form a subdivision of the chapter of independent distichs.

The ghazels alone are arranged among themselves in a fixed order, the poems of the other classes following one another in their several chapters at hap-hazard and without method. The ghazels are arranged in alphabetical order; not however according to the first letter of the poem, but according to the last letter of the rhyming lines, which is of course the same throughout the poem. Thus all the ghazels in which the rhyming lines end in the first letter of the alphabet are brought together and made into the first subdivision of the chapter; similarly those in which the rhyming lines end in the second letter of the alphabet are collected and formed into the second subdivision, and so on through the whole alphabet.

When the ruba’is are so numerous as to form a volume by themselves (as occasionally happens), they are arranged in this same alphabetical order.
Although the practice is now falling somewhat into desuetude, it used to be the almost universal custom for every Turk when he became a writer of any sort, were it only a clerk in a Government office, to assume or to have given to him what is called a Makhlas, that is a pen-name or pseudonym, by which, unless he were a member of the Imperial family, he was ever afterwards commonly known. Thus such names as Fuzuli, Nefī, Haleti and Ghālib are all the Makhlases of the several poets, not their personal names by which no one ever thinks of or mentions them. The Makhlas is always a significant word; it is almost invariably Arabic, very rarely Persian, never Turkish. The practice of using a Makhlas came into force among the Ottomans about the time of the invasion of Timur early in the fifteenth century.

There are a few other class-names descriptive of the character or subject of a poem; but these are of comparatively rare occurrence and will be better dealt with in the course of the History.

Comparatively few poets wrote to any considerable extent in mesnevi-verse; the monorhyming forms (among which is included the sharqi) were for several reasons much more popular. For the sake of convenience we shall speak of those monorhyming forms collectively as Lyric Forms, of the work composed in them as Lyric Poetry, and of the poets who produced such work as Lyric Poets.
It is of course the Perso-Arabian prosodial system that prevails in Ottoman poetry. But this system is essentially unsuitable; for while the Perso-Arabian prosody is quantitative, there are, strictly speaking, no long vowels in the Turkish language.  

Ancient Turkish poetry, as exemplified in the Qudatqu Bilik, the Diwān-i Hikmet of Ahmed-i Yesevi and the Joseph and Zelikhā of ‘Alī, is constructed upon a very simple system which is in perfect harmony with the genius of the language. This system, which has all along prevailed in the popular songs and ballads, that is, in the true, spontaneous poetry of the Turkish people, is called Parmaq-Hisābī or ‘Finger Counting,’ and is not quantitative, like the Perso-Arabian, but is syllabic, the lines consisting of a given number of syllables, generally from seven to fifteen, with a caesura after

1 The presence of ِٰ or ِ in a Turkish word does not indicate, as it would in an Arabic or Persian word, a long vowel; these letters are introduced merely as guides to the pronunciation; and thus in early books written while the orthography was quite unfixed we find spellings like بار which may stand for either بار or بار، and which may stand for either بار (أثر) or بار. The letters ِٰ and ِ were subsequently introduced into these and other words in order to avoid confusion, not to indicate long vowels. So it is incorrect in transliterating to mark such vowels as long; thus ‘pretty’ ought to be transliterated güzel, not güzel or güzel, which is not only inaccurate, but is misleading, as the accent falls not on the first, but on the second syllable.

2 Or, in more high-flown language, Hisāb-ul-Benān.
every third or fourth, while the cadence is determined by the fall of the accent. But this method, though so well suited to the language out of which it has grown, has never been systematised, the metres of which it contains the germs have never been developed, indeed, even the existing cadenced arrangements of syllables remain unclassified and unnamed.

In the earliest West-Turkish literary verse, that written between the years 700 (1300-1) and 800 (1397-8), this system is generally, though not universally, employed. The poets of those days took considerable license; their metres, it is true, were always Persian, but while they made the feet as a rule syllabic, they would frequently, merely to suit their own convenience, treat them as quantitative. This blending of the Turkish and Persian systems is characteristic of that period; for it is noteworthy that there is scarcely a trace of the Turkish method of scansion in the poetry produced after the invasion of Timur at the beginning of the fifteenth century. That calamitous event forms a landmark in the development of West-Turkish poetry, that which is on the hither side being far less Turkish and more Persian than that which is on the farther.

The native Turkish metres fared even worse than the native Turkish system of scansion. But these metres were so like the Persian both in the number of their syllables and in their cadence that their supercession by, or rather their absorption into, the latter was inevitable as soon as the Turks began to look to Persia for guidance. Thus the metre of the Qudatqu Bilik is very like the Persian Mutaqärib of the Shah-Nâme; while the special eleven-syllable metre of the Tuyugh or East-Turkish quatrain is practically identical with the second form of the Remel described a little farther on. Things being so, it is but natural that while traces of the native system of scansion linger on for a century
in West-Turkish poetry, there should be no equally obvious vestiges of the ancient metres.

In the prosodical system elaborated by the Arabs and adopted by the Persians a vowel is long either naturally or by position. It is long naturally when accompanied by one of the letters of prolongation, it is long by position when followed by two consonants. When this prosody came to be systematically applied to the Turkish language, while there was no trouble as to the vowels that were long by position, the poets found themselves confronted with a difficulty in connection with the vowels that were accounted long naturally; for there are no long vowels in Turkish words, the presence in such of any of those letters which in Arabic or Persian mark prolongation being merely a guide to the pronunciation. They therefore determined that while the vowels in such Arabic and Persian words as were used in Turkish should continue to bear the same value as in their proper language, these vowels which in purely Turkish words are accompanied by what in Arabic or Persian would be reckoned a letter of prolongation, while remaining normally and properly short, might by a license be regarded as long when the exigencies of metre so required. This license, which is technically called Imále or 'Inclination,' was very largely used by the old poets; but unless employed for some special purpose, such as to give additional emphasis to a word, its presence is as a rule a defect from an artistic point of view, as it not only imparts a lumbering movement to the lines, but a feeling of discomfort is evoked on encountering words thus as it were racked on a Procrustean bed.

The Perso-Arabian prosodical system, in accordance with which is composed all Ottoman literary poetry of the Old School, is exceedingly elaborate and intricate. The whole subject is technical in the highest degree, and any attempt
to explain the principles upon which it is built and the laws by which it is regulated would be out of place in this History. Such a study would moreover be of no practical utility for our purpose here which will be better served by learning what actually are the metres most commonly used by the Ottoman poets.

In the Arabian prosody as modified by the Persians and accepted by the Turks there are some dozen or more distinct metres, each of which, besides its normal or standard form, comprises a number of variations. Each of these metres has a special name, and each of the variations has a compound name which is held to describe by more or less remote analogy the nature of its departure from the normal form.

The following are the most usual in Ottoman poetry: —

I. The normal form of the metre called Hezej; it is: —

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\end{array} \]

This is much used in lyric poetry, especially for ghazels and qasidas.

The following are all variations of the Hezej: —

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\end{array} \]

This measure is much used for mesnevis. Composed in it we have amongst others Sheykhī’s Khusrev u Shirin, Zātī’s Shem & Perwane, Mesihi’s Shehr-engız, Ahi’s Khusrev u Shirin, Hāmid’s Leyli u Mejinun, Kemāl-Pasha-zade’s Yusuf u Zelikha, Lāmi’s Vise u Rāmīn and Yahya Bey’s Yusuf u Zelikha.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\end{array} \]

The above is chiefly used for lyric forms.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\text{^} \\
\end{array} \]

This is another favourite for mesnevis; the two finest in the language, Fuzuli’s Leyli u Mejinun and Sheykh Ghalib’s

1 The authorities differ as to the exact theoretical number; but practically only eight are in use among the Turks.

2 In every case the scheme shown is that of a single hemistich.
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Husn u 'Ashq, are both written in it; so is Nābi's Khayrābād.

This is a lyric measure.

II. Two forms only of the Rejez metre are used; the standard:

and this variation:

Both are lyric.

III. Of the Remel metre four forms, all variations, are in use.

This, which is a very favourite lyric measure, finds a fairly close English parallel in the fifteen syllable trochaic measure rendered familiar by Tennyson's 'Locksley Hall.'

Locksley Hall that in the distance overlooks the sandy flats.

This form is used both for mesnevis and lyrics. It is the measure in which the great Persian poet Mevlānā Jelāl-ud-Dīn wrote his famous Mesnevi-i Ma'nevi, which book, as we shall see in another chapter, gave the keynote for the earliest Turkish poetry; and so this was the measure in which the first poets composed their mesnevis, the Rebāb-Nāme of Sultān Veled, the Gharīb-Nāme of 'Ashiq Pasha, the Mevlid of Suleyman Chcelebi and the Iskender-Nāme of Ahmedī being all in this variation of the Remel.

This is a lyric measure.

The following measure has four forms which may be used together indiscriminately:


This is chiefly used for mesnevis; in it are composed Yahya Bey's Genjine-i Raz, Khaqani's Hilye-i Sherif, 'Ata'i's Subbet-ul-Ebkär, Nábi's Khayriya, and Fázil Bey's Khubán-NAME, Zenán-NAME and Deftier-i 'Ashq.

IV. Practically only one form of the metre Seri' is used; it is a variation:

---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0

Yahya Bey's Gulshen-i Enwár and 'Ata'i's Nefhat-ul-Ezhár are written in this.

V. More popular is the following variation of the metre Khafif; this like the fourth variety of the Remel has four forms which are used together indiscriminately:

---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0

---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0

---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0

In this we have Hamdi's Yusuf u Zelikha, Fazlí's Gul u Bulbul, Yahya Bey's Shah u Gedá, 'Atáqi's Heft-Khán and 'Izzet Molla's Gulshen-i 'Ashq.

VI. Three variations of the metre called Muzári' are often met with:

---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0

and

---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0

and

---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0

These are all lyric measures.

VII. Of the Mujtes metre one variation is in pretty frequent use; it too is lyric:

---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0---0

VIII. One variation of the Mutaqárib metre is frequent:
This is chiefly used for mesnevis; in it are written Yahya Bey's Kitāb-i Usūl, the Sāqi-Nāmes of Háletī, of ʿAtāʾi and of the Sheykh of Islam Yahya Efendi, also the Zafer-Nāme of Sābit and the Mihnet-Keshān of ʿIzzet Molla.

In one or other of the measures represented by the foregoing eighteen schemes is written almost the whole of the literary poetry of Turkey, the only notable exception being the rubāʿīs or quatrains, which have a series of measures peculiar to themselves. There are twenty-four of these rubāʿī-measures, all modifications of a variation of the Ḥeżej metre; and the four lines of a single rubāʿī may be in any four of these.

It is manifestly impossible to exactly reproduce the Oriental measures in an English translation; the frequent successions of long syllables alone would forbid this. But a sufficiently close approximation may be obtained by preserving identity in the number of syllables and arranging the accents so that the cadence of the original is suggested; thus the English fifteen syllable trochaic measure already mentioned supplies a very fair representative of the most popular of the Remel forms.
The 'Ilm-i Belaghat, the Perso-Arabian Art of Rhetoric, was till the last quarter of the nineteenth century the only rhetorical system known to the Ottomans.

This Eastern Art of Rhetoric is divided into three great branches: (1) the 'Ilm-i Ma'ани or 'Science of Significations,' which deals with the arrangement of periods and the appropriate employment of phrases; (2) the 'Ilm-i Beyan or 'Art of Exposition,' which treats of the various ways in which a thought or idea may be expressed; (3) the 'Ilm-i Bedi' or 'Art of Verbal Embellishment' or, as we may render it, the 'Art of Euphuism,' which explains the nature and use of the rhetorical figures that form the decorative element in literary work.

With the first of these three branches, the 'Ilm-i Ma'ании, we are not here concerned. The second, the 'Ilm-i Beyan, which has four subdivisions, deals with a series of figures founded on resemblance or contiguity, such as the simile, metaphor, synecdoche and metonymy, which, though differently classed, are essentially the same as with ourselves, and therefore require no description. 1 It is the third branch,

1 The four subdivisions of the 'Ilm-i Beyan are:
(1) The Teshbih or 'Comparison' (including both our Simile and Metaphor).
(2) The Isti'âre or 'Trope,' that is the employment of a word in other than its proper sense, thus in this line of Sheykhi,

\[ \text{ناجییه، کندز، ایلامی پردنی،} \]

'She veiled the day with the night.'
the 'Ilm-i Bedi, the 'Art of Euphuism,' which renders it necessary for us to give some attention to Eastern rhetoric, for here we have a number of highly characteristic figures, many of which have no counterpart in our own manuals.

In the Art called Bedi or 'Euphuism' there is then a large number of Figures (technically called San'at), each of which is in most cases minutely subdivided. Most of these figures are common to poetry and prose; but some are peculiar to poetry, while others again are peculiar to prose. The last of these sections we shall leave out of sight as not being pertinent to our present subject, and confine our attention to the more important or more characteristic figures of the other two.

Some of these are either so familiar to us already, or bear names so self-explanatory, that they call for no description. Such are the Tazadd or 'Antithesis;' the Mubalagha or 'Hyperbole;' the Telmih or 'Allusion;' the Rujū or 'Epanorthosis;' the Iqtibās or 'Quotation' (from the Koran or the words 'day' and 'night,' which stand respectively for 'face' and 'hair' are isticēs or 'tropes.'

(3) The Mejāz-i Mursel or 'Synecdoche.'
(4) The Kinaye or 'Metonymy.'

In the last two cases the translations are merely approximate, as several classes of the Mejāz-i Mursel would be reckoned by Western rhetoricians as varieties of the Kinaye or 'Metonymy,' and vice versa. Each of these four subdivisions of the Beyān is further divided into numerous classes. The modern Ottoman rhetoricians restrict the Kinaye to 'Inuendo,' which in old times was one of its classes.

1 The Mubalagha or 'Hyperbole' is divided into three classes:
(1) Tebligh, when the exaggeration is possible both to reason and experience.
(2) Ighrāq, when the exaggeration is possible to reason but not to experience.
(3) Ghuluvv, when the exaggeration is possible neither to reason nor to experience.

2 i.e. allusions to incidents in history, romance, etc., with which the cultured reader is supposed to be familiar.
Hadis); and the Tazmin or 'Quotation' (from another poet). 1 But with most of the figures the case is otherwise; and the more popular of these we shall now briefly consider.

Among the greatest favourites in the group of figures that depend upon the sense of the words, and not upon their position in the verse or upon their form, are the following: —

Husn-i Ta'lii or 'Etiology:' this figure, the name of which literally translated means 'Eloquent Assignment of Cause,' consists in the assignment of some graceful but fictitious reason for some fact or occurrence, as in this couplet: —

1 Within the gar'd the Rose hath hid behind the verdant leaves,
2 Shame-faced, her glory humbled by the lustre of your cheek.

Here the poet attributes the rose's being red and its growing behind some leaves to the discomfited flower's blushes and its desire to conceal itself on having been outdone in beauty by the cheek of the lady he addresses. This figure, which, when prettily conceived and expressed, is extremely graceful, is of very frequent occurrence.

Iham (sometimes called Tevriye) or 'Amphibology:' this is a kind of pun, and consists in the employment of a word or phrase having more than one appropriate meaning whereby the reader is often left in doubt as to the real signification of the passage. As a rule the more unusual meaning is that really intended; and if this should give offence, the poet can always protest that he employed the word in its ordinary sense. The very numerous instances in which a poet plays upon the meaning of his own name are examples of the Iham.

Closely allied to the foregoing is the Iham-i Tenasub or

1 In the Tazmin the poet quotes the first line of a couplet by another poet, but substitutes a line of his own for the second.

کبَرْنَلَی دَلْسَنَلَی، يَشَدِّي بِبَرْیَن آَرَیَنَل
رُنُج عَلَارَوْسَن، لَاوُسُوْب شَرْجُسَر کُل

8
‘Amphibological Congruity.’ Here while one of the significations of the amphibological word is obviously intended, the other, though clearly not meant, has some congruity with the subject in hand, as in this distich of ‘Ali Hayder Bey:

‘Proud of its rosebud, the branch of the rose
'Tosses, and floats rüzgâr (i.e. Fortune; the wind).’

Here the word rüzgâr is evidently used in its sense of ‘fickle Fortune’ or ‘the world’ in general, which the rose-branch, proud of its loveliness, is said to look on with disdain; yet the other meaning of rüzgâr, namely ‘wind,’ is congruous when speaking of a twig tossing in the breeze. Both forms of Amphibology are very often met with; it is of course hardly ever possible to suggest them in translation.

Tejahul-i ‘Arif, literally, ‘Feigned Ignorance:’ this figure consists in affecting ignorance of what one knows in order to heighten the effect of one’s statement, as in this opening couplet from one of Nefi’s qasidas:

‘Say, is this Adrianople-town or is it Eden-bower?
‘Say, is yon the Royal Pavilion or a Paradisal tower?’

The poet knows perfectly well that the place he is praising is Adrianople and not Paradise, but he affects doubt in order to heighten the effect of his eulogy.

Irsâl-i Mesel, literally, ‘Proverbial Commission:’ this consists in quoting and applying a proverb in a single distich; by its means the poet is able to enforce his statement by the citation of some well-known adage. The practice of quoting proverbs, which was always more or less popular, was carried to great lengths by the poets of the Third and Fourth Periods.

1. شاعر كش غنچی صهیلا سرافراز صاحب سوروزکار ایلاب نیاز
2. اردیبهشتی بویا کلوش مولامبدر
3. اندیه فتح پادشاهی جنن اسلامی‌در
The figures comprised in the following group depend on the position of the words or phrases in the verse.

Leiff u Neshr, literally, 'Fold and Spread:' this consists in naming two or more subjects and subsequently naming their respective attributes, as in this couplet of Nedim:

1
They've distilled the rose's fragrance, broidered daintily its leaf:
2
One is made thy perspiration, one is made the towel for thee.'''

We have this figure in English, thus in Shakspere's 'Venus and Adonis:' —

1
An over that is stopped, or river stayed,
2
'Burneth more hotly, swelleth with more rage.'

Sometimes the order of the attributes is reversed, in which case the figure is said to be 'Irregular.'

'Aks or 'Antistrophe:' this consists in the reciprocal conversion of the same words in different clauses, as in this couplet from Sheykh Ghalib's allegory 'Beauty and Love:' —

Etdi rukh-i husni nesteren-zár
Rukhsar-i 'ashq ve 'ashq-i rukhsar
1
'The face of Love and the love of (his) face
2
'Made Beauty's cheek a bower of eglantine.'

Here in the phrases rukhsare-i 'ashq (face of love) and 'ashq-i rukhsar (love of face) the words are mutually reversed.

Tard u 'Aks or 'Epanodos:' this consists in forming the second line of a distich from the reversed halves of the first line, as in this couplet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hengam-i jawani dir tahsil-i huner waqti,</td>
<td>Tahsil-i huner waqti hengam-i jawani dir.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
Beyi kela tenthir ommish na'he bishmesh awjigehi
2
Beyi ommish khasi beyi destemel ommish si dah

ایسدی رخ حسنی نسترنزار رخساره عشف و عشف رخساره
The season of youth is the time to acquire knowledge,
The time to acquire knowledge is the season of youth.'

In the foregoing example the conversion is complete and
the figure is called 'Perfect;' when it is less complete, the
figure is 'Imperfect.' We have the figure in English, as in
this couplet of Milton:—

'O more exceeding love, or law more just;
'Just law indeed, but more exceeding love.'

Reedd-ul-'Ajzi 'ale-s-Sadr or 'Epanadiplosion:' this consists
in repeating in the second hemistich of a couplet a word
or phrase that occurs in the first. It has several varieties
according to the position of the repeated word, its 'Perfect'
form being when the first word of the first line is made the
last word of the second.

I'ade or 'Epanastrophe:' in this figure the last word of
one couplet is made the first of the next. When a poem
is formed upon this plan it is said to be Mu'âd.

The figures in the next series depend on the form of words.

Tejnîs or 'Homonymy' or 'Paronomasia:' this, which is
a variety of pun, is one of the greatest favourites among
the rhetorical figures, and is subdivided into a large number
of classes. It consists in the employment of words having
the same or similar forms and sounds.

The Jinâs or 'Homonymy' is said to be 'Perfect' when

1 The best-known example in Turkish is the beautiful ghazel of Fuzuli
which begins: —

'ai وجید کاملک اسرار حکمت متعددی
متدري ذاتک اولان اشيا صفایا ممنی

'0 Thou whose perfect Being is the Source of the secrets of wisdom!
'Those things whose Source is Thine Essence are the vehicles for the man-
ifestation of Thine Attributes.'
the homonymous words have exactly the same form and sound, as in this couplet: —

Ider irāqa-i *dem* hasreti-na cheshmānim;
Terahhum it, nije *dem* dir esir-i hijrān im.

'Through yearning for thee my eyes pour forth blood;
'Have pity! how long a time am I the thrall of separation!' ¹

Here the Arabic word *dem*, 'blood,' and the Persian word *dem*, 'time,' have exactly the same form and sound.

The Jinās is said to be Mefrūq or 'Disjoined' when the two terms are not written alike, as in this example: —

Rukhsāri, ey dilber, *dyineye* beñzetdim;
Veh! veh! ne khata etdim! *ayi neye* beñzetdim?

'O fair one, I likened thy face to the mirror;
'Alack! alack! what a mistake I have made! to what have I likened the moon?' ²

Here the word *dyineye* 'to the mirror' is matched by the two words *ayi neye* 'the moon to what.' By 'the moon' the face of the beauty is meant.

The Jinās is Merfū or 'Repaired' when one of the terms is completed only by adding to it a portion of another word, as in this couplet by Safā Bey: —

Yoq-ken guneshi, esh *semāde*
Bir esh gurinurdi shemse *māde*

'Though the sun has no mate in the sky,
'There appeared a mate to the sun in the water.' ³

Here to match the single word *semāde* 'in the sky' the last syllable of *shemse* 'to the sun' has to be taken along with the word *māde* 'in the water.' The mate of the sun

¹ ابدرس لاقوُدِ دم حسنُتکله چشمَه،
ترخُم ایب نیزهِ دم در اسمه گنج‌ردَن

₂ رخساریکی ای دلبر آبیدنیه نکردیم
و، ون خات ایلند آبی نخیه بکرندیم

پیوکن کوئشک انشی سماه، یر انش کورینوردی شمسه ماده
in the water is of course the reflection. This variety of Homonymy has always been very popular, even from the earliest times. The following English example will make the principle quite clear:

Wandering far, they went astray,
When fell on the hills the sun's last ray.

The Jinas is said to be Láhiq or 'Contiguous' when the two words have the same letters except one letter in each of the two; this irregular letter may be initial, medial or final. In this example it is the initial letter that is irregular:

Sebâti yoq bu âlemin, âna kim î'timâd ider
Ferâh gelir, terâh gider, ferâh gelir, ferâh gider.

1 Inconstant ever is the world, and he who doth thereon repose
2 Now gladly comes, now sadly goes, now gladly comes, now gladly goes.'

The 'gladly' and 'sadly' of the translation, which represent the ferâh and terâh of the original, suggest the Jinas.

The Jinas is Nâqis or 'Defective' when one of the terms has an extra letter, initial, medial or final. 2

The Jinas is Muharref or 'Altered' when the letters of the terms are all alike, but the vowel points differ, as in the couplet:

Shehrin ichinde shuhreti artar jemâlinîn
Evâfî verâî 'arîzi vîrdî zebân olur.

1 The fame of her beauty increaseth in the city,
2 'The praise of her rose-cheek is the theme of (every) tongue.'

Here the letters in the words vîrd 'rose' and vîrd 'theme' are alike, it is only the vowel points (usually unmarked in Eastern writings) that differ.
The Jinás is said to be Khatti or 'Scriptory' when the form of the two words is the same, but the dots differ.  
Qalb or 'Anagram:' this is reckoned among the varieties of the Jinás. When the transposition of the letters is total, as in the English words 'live' and 'evil,' the Anagram is said to be 'Perfect.' This verse contains an example: —

Öñine ebr-i siyahi chekerek,
Edi pinhin kelt-i bedri fëlek.
1 'Drawing a dark cloud before it,
2 'The sky concealed the freckles (i.e. the spots) of the moon.'

When the transposition of the letters is only partial, the Anagram is said to be Ba'z or 'Partial.'

Qalb-iMustevi or 'Palindrome;' in this, which is an extended anagram, a complete line, sometimes a complete distich, is the same when read backward or forward.

In the Jinás-i Muzdevij or 'Coupled Homonymy' part of an antecedent word subsequently forms a whole word, as in this couplet of Sámi: —

Qachan kim nukte-senj olub achar od mâh-i zumm fem
Rumuz-i 'ilm-ul-ismân urmaz dakhî ādam dem.
1 'When that rosy Moon opens her mouth in subtle sayings
2 'Adam no longer brags about the mysteries of the Science of Names.'

1 As in the words تنسکیحیر and تنسکیحیر.
2 اوکنده ایس سپاپی جنگیده کلیف بدلی فلک.
3 As in the words ihmal and imhâl: امتبک mâder and madâr; fêlî and fêlî.
4 In this couplet of Nazmi each line is palindromic: —
5 'Her blandishments are ruby (i.e. intoxicating like ruby wine), the pain caused by her ruby (red lip) is anguish:
6 'It (her ruby lip) is houri-like, the cure for that soul (i.e. the lover's).'

The allusion in the second line is to the story in the Koran according to
There is another variety of this figure in the following distich of the same poet:

Shi'va-vesh akhir olur qameti ālimāda līm
Chiqaran waz-i teberra ile dushnōnda nām

1 At last will the form of him become a līm through woes who like the Shi'a
2 'Maketh his name by introducing denunciation in abuse.'

Mushákale: this figure consists in using a word twice consecutively, once in a natural, and once in a figurative sense.

Ishtiqāq or ‘Paronymy’: this consists in bringing together words derived from a common root, as in this couplet of Fu'ād Pasha:

Hukumet hikmet ile mushterek dir,
Vezir olan hakim olnaq gerek dir.

‘Authority and wisdom should go together;
‘He who is vezir, he should be wise.’

Here the words hukumet ‘authority,’ hikmet ‘wisdom,’ and hakim ‘wise,’ are all derived from the Arabic root HKM.

Shibh-i Ishtiqāq or ‘Quasi-Paronymy:’ in this the words, though apparently of common derivation, are in reality not so, as in the line:

Qalir-mi bāsira khāli khayāl-i khārīndan?

‘Will the eye bide void of the image of her mole?’

Here the Arabic words khāli ‘void’ and khayāl ‘image’

which God taught Adam the Names of all things, and then enquired them of the angels, who, being unable to tell them, were hidden hear them from Adam and then bow down in adoration before him. This they all did except Iblis who, being puffed up with pride, refused to obey the Divine command, whereupon he was driven from the presence of God, and became Satan.

1 i.e. become bent like the letter līm ل.
2 A Shi'a is an adherent of the heretical sect that prevails in Persia, one of the customs of which is to denounce the first three Khalifas.

3 Shībūdsh Ākhawānī Qāmī Ālām Adam, * Čečecun yûtu tēbā ānā Dela dāshmād * Ňam
4 Ḥukumet Ḥakamīt ābāl-e mash'tērkar * Wizir ola-n Ḥakamī awmēf-kārdar
5 Qalirīmi baš-e xā-nil e Khāmil xā-nilān
and the Persian word *khal* 'mole,' though they resemble one another, are all three quite distinct in origin.

The next group contains figures dependent on the letters composing the words.

Hazf: this consists in using only words formed entirely of undotted letters; a poem composed of such words is said to be Mahzuf. Menquf: this is the reverse of the preceding, and consists in using only words formed entirely of dotted letters. Raqtâ: this consists in arranging words so that the letters are dotted and undotted alternately. Khayfâ: this consists in using alternately words composed wholly of dotted and wholly of undotted letters. Muqatta6: this consists in using words none of the letters of which join. Muwassal: this consists in using words all of the letters in which join. The late Ziya Pasha has two Mahzufqasidas, both of which are printed in his great anthology called the Kharâbât or 'Tavern;' but I have not met any Turkish examples of the other varieties though they are mentioned in books on rhetoric and illustrated by trivial Persian verses.

A number of points connected with the manipulation and arrangement of rhyme are likewise reckoned among the rhetorical figures. Of these the most important are: —

Irsâd or 'Preparation:' this consists in hinting or suggesting to the reader or hearer of a poem in monorhyme — once he knows the rhyme-sound — what will be the rhyme-word before he reaches the end of the distich, as in this couplet from a ghazel of 5Asim Efendi the famous translator into Turkish of the great Arabic and Persian dictionaries named respectively the Qâmûs and the Barhân-i Qâtî:

\[
\text{Nije bir khidmet-i makhlûq iile mahzûl olâlim? —}
\text{Sûhî Haqî olâlim, nâ’îl-i mescûl olâlim.}
\]

\[\text{'Wherefore should we be cast off serving the creature? —}
\text{'Let us pray of God, let us attain our prayer!' 1}\]

جزیه بر خدای کوثری محروق ایله تخدّول اولملم - ستّئلل حّف اولملم نائل مسّئلل اولّملم
Here the reader having learned from the word makhzūl in the first line that the rhyme-sound is āl (the oltālim is a redīf), is prepared on encountering the word sā'il at the beginning of the second to meet its passive form meṣūl as the rhyme-word.

İltizām or ‘Supererogation,’ also called Luzūm-i má lā Yelzem or ‘Making Necessary the Unnecessary,’ and İnāt: this consists in using a given letter or sound in addition to what the rules of rhyme demand. One variety has been described in the note on page 75.

Zúl-Qāfīyetcyn or ‘Double-Rhyme:’ here each rhyming line of the poem has two distinct rhymes. When these are contiguous the Double-Rhyme is said to be Mutaqarrin or ‘Adjacent,’ as in this couplet of Nābī:

\[\begin{align*}
1 & \text{ Efzuni-i hayāt kem-āzarligda dir,} \\
2 & \text{ Ser-māye-i nejāt sebnk-bārliqda dir.}
\end{align*}\]

‘Increase of life is in scantness of trouble, 
‘The fund of salvation is in the lightness of (one’s) load.’

Here the rhyme-words kem-āzarligda and sebnk-bārliqda (the dir is a redīf) are immediately preceded by the rhyming words hayāt and nejāt.

When one or more words intervene between the two rhyming words the Double-Rhyme is said to be Mahjūb or ‘Screened,’ as in this couplet also by Nābī:

\[\begin{align*}
1 & \text{ ^Aleni esir-i dest-i meshiyet digil-mi dir?} \\
2 & \text{ Adem zebun-i penche-i qudret digil-mi dir?}
\end{align*}\]

‘Is not the world thrall in the hand of Will? 
‘Is not man powerless in the grasp of (the Divine) Might?’

Here several words intervene between the rhyme-words cālem — meshiyet and ádem — qudret.

1 افروینی حیات گم آزارلقيقة در سرماهی ناجات سبکبارلقيقة در

2 علم اسمیرست مشتیت دکلمبیدر آدم زوبون پذجیده قدرت دکلمبیدر
Zú-l-Qawání or ‘Polyrhymer:’ here each rhyming line of the poem has more than two rhymes as in this couplet again by Nábi: —

Pá-der-gil-i telish magálín-la khamél,  
Pichídáj firádsh khayáln-la nímél.

‘Discoursing of Thee are the reed-pens stuck fast in the clay of agitation:  
‘Imagining Thee, do the treatises writhe on the bed.’  

Here there are three pairs of rhymes, *telish* and *firádsh*, *magálín-la* and *khayálín-la*, *khamél* and *nímél*. The Polyrhyme also can be ‘Screened,’ as well as ‘Adjacent’ as in the foregoing example.

*Terší* literally ‘Bejewelling:’ this is a yet further elaboration of rhyme in which each word in the first hemistich has a corresponding word of the same rhyme and measure in the second, the only exceptions being parts of the verb substantive and particles, which are repeated. Poetry thus rhymed is said to be Murassá or ‘Bejewelled.’ These lines offer an example: —

Bákhzán qulnn behé-rí gulshiní!  
Mustádín ašá dárí dushméni!

‘Autumnless may the spring of thy garden remain!  
‘May He whose aid we pray bear off the peace of thy foe!’

The two lines that follow show how this trick would work out in English: —

Thine be cheery gladness, yea, and dear delight!  
Mine be weary sadness, aye, and drear despite!

There are further a few miscellaneous figures, the most noteworthy of which are the following.

Beraá’át-i Istihlal ‘Eloquent Presagement:’ this consists in foreshadowing at the opening of a long poem, such as a

Pá dródá rlásh másláké xámanár. *Pí-ráchídá* firásh khántáké náméirá;  
bi khónán fásínn báár pláshak *mésátán* fásínn fárár dáshmáké.  

*Pá* — an article meaning some.

*Dráš* — to fear.

*Fásínn* — a suffix meaning ‘by’.

*Máslák* — talent, skill.

*Xámán* — spring.

*Pláshak* — to fight.

*Dará* — to bear.

*Náméir* — a suffix meaning ‘off’.

*Fásí* — a suffix meaning ‘the’.

*Dásh* — to bear.

*Fárá* — to bear away.
romantic mesnevi, the subject of the poem and the manner of its treatment. This figure is very common in prose works also.

Telmiː: this consists in writing a poem partly in Turkish and partly in Arabic or Persian, the lines or half-lines being alternately in the one language and the other. Poetry composed in this macaronic fashion is said to be Mulemma or ‘Pied.’

When poetry can be scanned in more than one metre it is said to be Mutelevvin or ‘Polychromatic.’

Acrostic verse is called Muveshshah.

The foregoing list of figures, though very far from complete, is sufficient for our purpose, and will moreover give some idea of the extremely elaborate character of the Oriental Art of Rhetoric. But now, so far as Turkey is concerned, this old Eastern art is a thing of the past. Its knell was sounded when in 1299 (1881-2) Ekrem Bey published his Ta’lim-i Edebiyat or ‘Lessons in Composition.’ In that admirable work where for the first time the canons of Western literary taste were systematically placed before the Turkish student, the entire rhetorical system is revolutionised. The old divisions of Maʿāni, Beyân and Bedî are abolished, and nine tenths of the figures we have been considering are swept away as incompatible with earnestness and sincerity in modern times. But as up till then the old system held undisputed sway, the attention we have bestowed on it is justified.
CHAPTER IV.

HISTORICAL OUTLINE.

It will be helpful, if before starting on our journey, we trace an outline map of the road we are to follow; we shall therefore, before beginning the story of Ottoman poetry, sketch roughly and briefly the line of its development.

The history of strictly Ottoman poetry does not begin till the middle of the fifteenth century.

During the preceding hundred and fifty years, which we have called the First Period, a good deal of Turkish literature was produced in Asia Minor; but only a very small proportion of this was the work of strictly Ottoman writers. Each of the several little states into which the Turkish population of Western Asia was divided still looked upon itself as a distinct and separate power, and viewed its neighbours with a jealous, if not a hostile, eye. It was the work of Ottoman statecraft during this century and a half to bind together these antagonistic members of a single family, and through their union to re-create a Turkish empire in Western Asia.

This embryonic period of the Ottoman Empire was likewise the embryonic period of Ottoman literature. During this period the Western branch of the Turkish language was
gradually shaping itself to become a literary medium; and during this period was determined by a combination of circumstances which, as we have seen, were beyond the control of the Turkish peoples the direction which their literature was to take, and the lines along which it was to develop. The age and the locality between them decreed that this direction was to be that of the Persian masters, that these lines were to be those of Persian poetry.

The primary result of this was the definite adoption as a fundamental principle by the strictly Ottoman poetry that followed of a practice which had held more or less from the very start, the practice of looking for guidance to contemporary Persian poetry and following whatever movement might develop therein.

The second result was the infection of Ottoman poetry in its every aspect with a Persianism so potent and so inveterate that its effects are operative even to the present day.

Mevláná Jelál-ud-Din of Rúm presided at the birth of West-Turkish poetry, and during the First Period his was the most powerful personal influence. The poets who wrote under the immediate influence of this great teacher were too deeply engrossed in their subject to spare much attention to the merely literary aspect of their work, even had the language not been in so rough-hewn a condition as to render anything but the plainest and baldest style practically impossible. So although towards the close of the period, after the invasion of Timur, when the influence of Nizámí had made itself felt, a certain interest began to be shown in the more purely artistic side of poetry, the leading characteristic, from a literary point of view, of the work of the First Period is its naïveté.

By the middle of the fifteenth century—that is, by the time when through the Ottoman’s having become paramount
in the land his dialect had been definitely accepted as the
court and literary language of the new West-Turkish Em-
pire, — the mystic atmosphere which in earlier years had
so closely enveloped Nearer Asia was in certain measure
passed away, and men were eager to make a start in some
fresh direction.

In Persia the purely mystic period had been left behind
for some time before the definite emergence of the Ottoman
dialect from amid the welter of local patois as the West-
Turkish literary medium, and literature in that country was
now in the hands of the lyric and romantic poets who
gathered round the court of Huseyn Bayqara. At the head of
the first of these groups stood 'Ali Shir-i Nowa'i, the heir
and successor of Hafiz, a writer distinguished alike in poetry
and prose, and equal master of Persian and his native
Jaghatay or Eastern Turkish. The second group was under
the leadership of the famous poet Jami. The influence of
these two illustrious men of letters remained supreme in
Persia for nearly a hundred years, not being seriously affected
till 'Urfi and Feyzi introduced a new style and taste towards
the close of the sixteenth century.

All was therefore ready for the advent of Ottoman poetry;
the formative forces at work during the First Period had
fitted the West-Turkish language to serve as a literary me-
dium, had determined which of its dialects was to become
this medium, and had trained it to follow easily and without
effort the lead of its accepted guide. This guide had now
entered a region where the literary and aesthetic cravings
of the age were recognised and answered; so there was
nothing wanting but the man of destiny, the man who by
discovering, if not pursuing, the road for which all were
groping, who by stammering, if not by singing, the words
for which all were seeking, was to inaugurate the literature
of the Osmanic Empire and become the van-courier of the host of Ottoman poets.

The voice of the age cried aloud for a leader, and in response arose Ahmed Pasha. So it is with Ahmed Pasha that the history of Ottoman poetry proper begins. As with Shinási Efendi in later times, so with Ahmed Pasha now, his real services were those of the pioneer, the intrinsic value of his work being comparatively slight. Vaguely conscious of an ideal which he could not clearly conceive, let alone express, Ahmed was stumbling along his way when, lo, out of the East came light, the light for which he and all his fellows were straining with eager gaze. When the ghazels sent by Newá'í to Constantinople came into the hands of Ahmed, his eyes were opened; he saw before him embodied in a form, fairer than which he could not picture, these very moods and fantasies which he and his companions had been vainly striving to express.

For a century and a half the movement thus begun flowed on without let or break; during this century and a half the poetry of Newá'í, either directly or through that of his Persian followers, was the main source of inspiration to the Ottoman lyric writers, as the works of Jámí and his imitators were to the Ottoman romancists. Now the style of Newá'í and Jámí, which was really but the culmination of a literary movement that had been in progress for three centuries in Persia, was remarkable for its lavish use of rhetorical embellishments of every description. This was the feature which most attracted the Ottoman poets and which they most strenuously endeavoured to reproduce in their own work.

And so during this Second Period the chief aim of the Turkish poets was to decorate their verse with every imaginable variety of subtle and fantastic conceit, even at the expense, if need be, of grace of diction and beauty of thought.
It was therefore with the opening of this Period that the Ottoman literary idiom definitively broke away from the spoken form of the language and began its development upon entirely distinct and purely artificial lines.

This movement culminated in the work of the poet Râqi, very shortly after whose death in A. H. 1008 (A. D. 1600) there occurred a modification in the method and purpose of poetry so marked as to inaugurate a Third Period. About the middle of the sixteenth century the style of Newâ'î and Jami had been superseded in Persian literature by that elaborated by Urfî and Feyzi. The novelty in this style lay, apart from the introduction of a number of fresh terms into the conventional vocabulary of poetry, in the deposition of rhetoric from the chief seat and the enthronement of loftiness of tone and stateliness of language in its stead.

This was reflected in Ottoman poetry, especially in the writings of Newâ'î whose work is the high-water mark of this particular school. It was, moreover, during this Period that the Persianisation of Ottoman poetry reached its extreme point. Many native Turkish words and phrases which had been preserved up to this time were now discarded and their places filled by Persian or Perso-Arabic equivalents; and while the poets had in the preceding Period frequently alluded to purely Ottoman customs or institutions, even though treating these in the Persian manner, it now became the fashion altogether to ignore such and deal exclusively with matters to be found in the pages of the Persian poets. To such a pitch was this Persianisation of poetry carried that there are many passages in the productions of this Period which might have been cut out bodily from some Persian poem.

The Third Period lasted till the end of the seventeenth century; but towards its close there appeared a poet, Nabi by name, who by skilfully grafting on to the current style the
peculiar didactic tone of the contemporary Persian poet Sā́ib, introduced a yet further modification into Ottoman poetry.

The Fourth Period, which covers the whole of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, is unlike the Second and Third Periods in that it is an age of eclecticism; there is no longer a single school including practically all the poets. The chief reason of this is that there was at that time no contemporary Persian poet of sufficient merit or eminence to command universal allegiance. The best that Persia could then show was the poet Shevket who is deserv- edly famous for his marvellous ingenuity and fertility in the invention of fresh and picturesque images and similes. For more than half a century this writer continued to be the guiding star for the majority of Ottoman poets. The work that these men produced was for the most part an amalgam of the style of Nābī with that of Shevket; its tone is didactic like that of the former, while it relies for decoration on a new and quaint imagery modelled upon that of the latter. These poets who looked to Shevket as their master were the last followers of the old tradition which taught the writers of Turkey to turn to contemporary Persia for guidance; and after their time Ottoman poetry ceases to reflect that of the eastern kingdom.

All along — though more especially during the sixteenth century — there had been sporadic outbursts of the national spirit in Ottoman poetry; the Persian forms had indeed always been respected, but from time to time the voice of the native genius had striven to speak through these. The most notable of such occasions was when the poet Sā́bit had at the end of the seventeenth century made the first determined effort to stem the overwhelming flood of Persianism and convert Turkish poetry into a somewhat truer interpreter of the Turkish mind. From his day, all through the first stage of
the Fourth Period, the movement to which he had given so great an impulse continued to gather strength, till in the latter half of the eighteenth century it became sufficiently powerful to be the dominant motive in Ottoman poetry for some fifty years. This change marks the second of the three stages of the Fourth Period. The movement which brought this about had its origin in revolt, revolt against the traditional Persianism; but with success revolt very speedily developed into license. There was nothing to guide or control the new spirit thus suddenly advanced to a foremost place. It knew not how to speak save in the terms of Persian poetry, so it spoke in these while it defied them; it knew not of what to speak save the themes of the Persianists, so it spoke of these while it made light of them. The typical poetry of this stage truly reflects the genius neither of Turkey nor of Persia; what it displays is a struggle between the two, a struggle which while it lasted entailed anarchy. Had there been any guide to direct the national spirit, it must have triumphed; for it was full of vigour while Persianism was decrepit; but the latter, though it had no living champion, had behind it five centuries of culture, and thus it was able by the sheer dead-weight of the past to stifle for the time its rival's efforts at emancipation.

And so with the early years of the nineteenth century there came a recrudescence of Persianism; but as there was now no contemporary Persian master, not even a Shevket, whom the poets could follow, for the next thirty or forty years there was not properly speaking any school, each poet choosing as guide or model whichever writer of former times appealed most strongly to his individual taste. These years of uncertainty form the third and last stage of the Fourth Period; and with them the history of the Old School of Ottoman poetry comes to a close.
It is usual to disparage the Fourth Period, to speak of it as an age of decline; and so in many respects, especially from the Persianist point of view, it unquestionably is. On the other hand, as it includes the one sustained attempt to dominate literary poetry made by the native genius without any guidance from outside, it yields in interest to few epochs in the history of this poetry.

At no time had Ottoman poetry appeared in so hopeless a plight as during the last years of the Old School. Persia, stricken with intellectual paralysis, was no longer able to act as guide; the effort of the Turkish poets to supply from within what had thus failed from without had ended in disaster; and poetry seemed to have fallen into a Chinese stagnation of lifeless conventionalism with neither wish nor power save to mumble the dry bones of a long-dead culture. Such was the position when at the end of the sixth decade of the nineteenth century Shinási Efendi bade the vivifying spirit of the West breathe for the first time into the worn-out frame of Ottoman poetry. By the production in 1859 of a little volume of translations from the French poets into Turkish verse this author opened the eyes of his more thoughtful countrymen to the fact that there was a literature worthy of study outside the realms of Islam, and in this manner prepared the way for a revolution the results of which have been beyond compare more momentous and farther-reaching than those of any other movement by which Ottoman poetry has been affected.

The efforts of Shinási Efendi to remodel literature after a Western pattern were ably and successfully seconded by his brilliant disciple Námiq Kemál Bey. But the work of these two distinguished reformers was practically confined to prose. No serious attempt was made to apply their principles to poetry till the year 1296 (1879) when cAbd-ul-Haqq
Hamid Bey published his epoch-making Sahra or 'The Country.' ¹ This tiny booklet of but fifty-nine pages contains ten poems composed in Western verse-forms and treating their subject in a simple, natural, Western fashion,—the first original Turkish poems written in this style. ² The direction suggested by this book was at once recognised by the more talented among the younger poets as that in which salvation must be sought, with the result that there now began a steady flow of poetry written on the lines of the Sahra, and consequently absolutely unlike anything which had gone before. As a matter of course the new movement was at first violently opposed by the adherents of the old system. But the result of the struggle was never for a moment doubtful; moribund Persianism might fret and fume for a few years, but that it could offer any effectual resistance to the strong fresh spirit that was inspiring with new life the intellectual world was inconceivable. It is now just twenty years since the first note of the new poetry was sounded, and within this brief period the whole aspect of things has changed. Where there seemed to lie the apathy of death there is now busy hopeful life; torpor and stagnation have given place to progress; for short as has yet been its life, the New School has passed through more than one stage.

Although Turkish poetry owes this marvellous transformation to the influence of the West, the position of the New School towards Western poetry is very different from that of the Old School towards Persian. The aim of the

¹ Hamid Bey is at present (1899) Councillor to the Ottoman Embassy in London.

² Four years before this, in 1292 (1875), Hamid Bey had indeed published some incidental verses in the European style in a prose drama entitled Dukhter-i Hindú or 'The Indian Maid.' These verses are actually the first original Turkish poetry in the Western manner; but they seem to have been overlooked by the public, as it was not till after the issue of the Sahra that Europeanised poetry came into vogue.
old poets was to write what was practically Persian poetry, and that as far as possible in Persian words. The object of

the new poets has not been to write Western poetry, nor

yet to study their verses with foreign terms; they have not

turned to the West to learn what to think, but to learn

how to think. They have studied the attitude of the Western

poet's mind as displayed in his work, and they have them-

selves endeavoured to assume a similar mental attitude. Thus

they have found that the Western poet seeks to describe

the things which he sees about him and to express his own

feelings in regard to these, so they likewise have tried to
describe things that have come under their own eyes and

to tell the emotions that these have awakened in their

own breasts. As a consequence Turkish poetry has become

for the first time natural and personal.

But this is not all; by leading the Turk straight to nature,
to nature on which at the bidding of the Persian he turned his
back six hundred years ago, the West has unconsciously, but

none the less effectively, opened the way for a poetry which

is truly Turkish. A century before, when the genius of the

nation had grappled with and for a moment got the better of

its ancient taskmaster, it had failed to profit by its victory, for

it had not known what to make of it. But what was wanting
then is forthcoming now; a trusty guide has pointed out

the road; the Turkish poet has learned at last that his true
duty is to copy neither the Persian nor the Frank, but to

interpret the heart of the Turkish people; and that to per-
form this duty aright, he must study, not the diwáns or

the dramas of foreign writers, but the lights and shadows,

the joys and sorrows, that make up the daily life of the

humble and simple among his own fellow-countrymen.¹

¹ Early in the present year 1316 (1899) a little volume of verses entitled

TurkJe Şi'r!har or 'Turkish Poems,' was published by Mehemmed Emin Bey,
The change from the Old to the New School must have come sooner or later; the Europeanisation of every department of Turkish life which had been in progress for years rendered it inevitable. But this does not alter the fact that the man who directly brought about this great and beneficial change is and must ever remain the central figure in the history of Ottoman poetry. The work of Hâmid Bey forms the turning-point in this history; everything composed before he wrote bears in one form or another the mark of Persia, everything worthy of the name of poetry composed since he has written shows directly or indirectly the influence of Europe. No man of our generation has, as far as I know, so profoundly influenced the literary destinies of a nation as has this illustrious poet and reformer.¹

The extraordinary enthusiasm with which this change was welcomed and the signal success with which, despite manifold discouragements from official quarters, it has been crowned, show how willing is the Turkish people, for all its innate loyalty to tradition, to accept beneficial reform and how able to profit by it. In the wide and complex question of reforming the institutions of the country, it is probably in this one particular alone, namely the reform of literature, that the Turkish people has had an absolutely free hand. Here and here alone foreign intriguer and domestic revolutionary have been unable to carry out their baleful programme of thwarting every effort at amelioration. Had the Turks, when the opportunity was presented to them, shown themselves unwilling or unable to carry out this vital

in which the first attempt is made to present in literary form the real speech and feelings of the great body of the Turkish people. In these little poems, put into the mouths of common soldiers and Anatolian peasants, the true voice of the Turkish people speaks for the first time in literature.

¹ Hâmid Bey followed up his Sahra with a number of brilliant lyric and dramatic works which I hope to describe in detail in a later volume.
reform in the one sphere which they wholly controlled, where neither Russian emissary nor Armenian anarchist could enter to blight the tender promise ere it could gather strength, then would the judgment of their traducers have been justified, and they would have proved themselves to friend and foe alike a race whose vital energy was spent. But since, on the contrary, notwithstanding the alien source whence it was derived, they have welcomed with open arms this great, this revolutionary change in a province rendered sacred by the continuous tradition of near six hundred years; and have welcomed it, moreover, solely because they were satisfied of its superiority, without a thought of the impression their action might produce upon the outside world which is as ignorant of the progress of intellectual life in Turkey as it is of what may be developing in Mercury or Mars; and as they have applied it with such thoroughness that there is as great a difference between the language and spirit of a Turkish book of to-day and one of but fifty years ago as there is between the poetry of Tennyson and that of Chaucer, we are constrained to admit that the mental energy of this people is unimpaired, and that those who have so glibly doomed it as plunged in a lethargy from which there is no awakening, as stricken with a paralysis from which there is no recovery, have but shown once more how worthless is the judgment that is based upon ignorance and prejudice.
BOOK II

THE FIRST PERIOD.

A.D. 1300 — A.D. 1450.
[There are no contemporary records for the First Period. The earliest Tezkires or Dictionaries of the Poets date from the middle of the sixteenth century, that of Sehi Bey, the oldest of all, having been written only a very few years before Latifi’s, which was finished in 953 (1546-7). 1 Ashiq Chelebi’s Tezkire was completed in 970 (1568-9), 2 Qinali-zade Hasan Chelebi’s in 994 (1586), 3 while that of Kiyazi — the last to deal with the whole field of Ottoman poetry — was compiled as late as 1018 (1609-10). 4 Tash-köprüzade’s biographical work on eminent dervish sheykh- and members of the 'ulema, which bears the title of Shaqayiq-un-Namâniya or 'The Crimson Peony,' was written in 965 (1558), 5 and Ali Efendi’s general history called...

1 A biographical dictionary of the poets is called Tezkiret-ush-Shu'ara or ‘Dictionary of the Poets.’ In these works the names of the poets are entered in alphabetical order, and as a rule each entry contains, besides the biographical notice of the poet, a short criticism on his style, etc., and a few examples of his work. There are several of these Tezkires in Turkish.

2 Sehi’s book has not been printed, nor, as far as I know, is there any MS. in England. It would appear, however, to contain little or nothing that has not been embodied in the later Tezkires.

3 Latifi’s Tezkire was printed at the office of the Iqdam newspaper in 1314 (1808). There is a MS. in the British Museum (Add. 17,339), another in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society, and another in my collection. From the letter " this last offers a different (and apparently later) recension of the text from that of either of the other two MSS. or of the printed edition.

4 'Ashiq’s Tezkire has not yet been printed: there is a MS. in my collection. The word Chelebi that follows his name is merely a title signifying ‘Master.’

5 Qinali-zade Hasan’s Tezkire is likewise still unprinted: there are three MSS. in the British Museum (Add. 24,057: Or. 35: Add. 10,022), one in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society, and one in my collection. Most European writers, following Von Hammer, speak of this biographer by his family name Qinali-zade: the Turks generally call him Hasan Chelebi: I prefer to follow them.

6 Kiyazi’s work also is unprinted: there is a MS. in my collection.

7 ‘The Crimson Peony’ was originally written in Arabic. There are several Turkish translations. The best-known is that of Mejdi, which was made in 995 (1587): it is this version, which was printed in 1269 (1852-3), that I have followed in the present work.
Kunh-ul-Akhbär or 'The Essence of Histories' in 1007 (1598-9). Beligh's Guldeste-i Riyáz-i 'Irфан or 'Posy from the Bowers of Culture,' which contains the lives of men of distinction connected with the city of Brusa, is more modern still, having been finished in 1135 (1722). All these books start from the foundation of the Empire and carry the series of biographies down to the time of compilation. They form the chief sources of our information concerning the lives of the poets of the First Period, and in view of the remoteness of even the earliest among them from the times when these poets lived, it is not unlikely that their stories concerning them are in great measure traditional. For the rest, in most cases the more important works of these early poets are in our hands, and so we are fairly equipped to deal with the literary history of this far-off period, even if the figures among whom we move be somewhat vague and shadowy.

1 Part of 'Ali's History has been printed; the greater part of the unprinted portion, that which deals with events between the capture of Constantinople and the death of Suleyman I, is contained in two MSS. preserved in the British Museum (Add. 10,004: Or. 32).

2 Beligh's work was printed at Brusa in 1302 (1884-5).
CHAPTER I.

THE EARLY MYSTICS.

Mevlana Jelal-ud-Din. Sultan Veled. Yunus Imre. \(^\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\)\textsuperscript{Ashiq Pasha.}

The year 1300 of the Christian era, that wherein the Seljûq Kingdom ceased to exist, may be regarded as the birth-year of the Ottoman Empire. Nearly a century had elapsed since Suleymân Shâh had sought refuge in the west, and during that time his son and grandson had done good service to their Seljûq patrons as wardens of the Bithynian marches against the officers of the Caesars. But neither Er-Toghrul nor \(^\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\)Osmân had ever sought independence for himself; they had been content to remain loyal vassals of the suzerain power, which, on its part, had never failed to treat them with honour and generosity; and it was only when the Seljûq Empire was no more and \(^\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\)Osmân found himself without a lord, that he arose and fought for his own hand.

Out of the chaos which resulted from the Mongol invasion and the Seljûq downfall there emerged in Asia Minor the ten little Turkish kingdoms already mentioned as constituting the West-Turkish Decarchy. The names of those little states and of the ancient provinces to which they roughly corresponded are: 1. \(^\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\)Osmân (Phrygia Epictetus with a portion of Bithynia wrested from the Greeks); 2. Qarasi (Mysia);
3. Kermiyan¹ (Phrygia); 4. Hamíd (Pisidia and Isauria); 5. Tekke (Lycia and Pamphylia); 6. Saru-Khan; 7. Aydin (together Lydia); 8. Menteshe (Caria); 9. Qizil-Ahmedli² (Paphlagonia); 10. Qaraman (Lycaonia).³

Thus at the outset the Ottoman is but one, and that the least in extent, of a number of petty Turkish kingdoms sprung up from the ruins of the Seljúq or old West-Turkish Empire. But its rulers and people being the most enterprising and adventurous, it gradually gathered in the others, until we find about a century and a half after the Seljúq collapse that there is again but a single Turkish state in Asia Minor, though the supreme power is now in the hands of the Ottoman Sultan. This reconsolidation of the Turkish power would have occurred earlier had not Timur's invasion at the beginning of the fifteenth century thrown everything into confusion and retarded matters for fifty years.

Now in the regions forming these little kingdoms several Turkish dialects were spoken. These dialects were all variations of the Western branch of the Turkish tongue and did not materially differ from one another, though each had certain words and grammatical forms peculiar to itself. They were one and all perfectly intelligible to every Western Turk; there was therefore no reason why a poet in the days of the Decarchy should write in any other than that of his own province. And so we find that poets and other men of letters, born outside the Ottoman borders, whether they remained subject to their native prince or passed into the Ottoman service, made exclusive use of the Turkish of their own district.

¹ Several authorities write this name Germiyan.
² Sometimes called Isfendyári.
³ To the east was a welter of Turkman hordes, from out of which there emerged later on several local Turkish kingdoms, three of which maintained their independence in face of the Ottomans for over a century.
This state of things lasted for about a century and a half; and it was only when all the nine kingdoms had been finally gathered in, and Constantinople won by the Ottoman Sultan for the capital of the renovated West-Turkish Empire, that the Ottoman dialect, modified no doubt to a certain extent by those of the neighbouring provinces, became the sole recognised literary medium for the whole West-Turkish world. Up till that time each poet made use of his own native dialect; there was no single idiom accepted by all. Consequently comparatively few of the works produced during this century and a half which we have called the First Period are written in the true Ottoman dialect.

Nevertheless it would be wrong to pass over these in silence as certain modern Ottoman writers do; because even though they are written in old provincial dialects, they form the foundation upon which the more strictly Ottoman literature that followed has been reared. It may perhaps be said that such works cannot accurately be classed under the head of Ottoman poetry, that West-Turkish poetry would be a more correct designation; and from a philological point of view this would be true. All the same, these works are practically Ottoman; the majority of them were written in the Ottoman dominions for Ottoman patrons in dialects which differ less from the Ottoman than those of the English counties do from one another. Moreover, as they form the basis of the subsequent Ottoman poetry, without some knowledge of them we should be unable to trace satisfactorily the gradual development of sentiment and style in that poetry. We shall therefore take all the more prominent of these early writers just as though they had been Ottomans in the most restricted sense, and examine their works as fully as the materials at our disposal will allow.
During the woeful years immediately preceding the birth of the Ottoman power, when Western Asia was one vast battle-field where hostile races and rival dynasties struggled for existence or fought for pre-eminence, the Persian sun was standing high in the heaven of poetry, and the Eastern world was bright with the glory of that radiance the reflection of which lingers to this day. Some century and a half before, mysticism had triumphed over the more realistic spirit of earlier times, and now claimed as its own the whole field of contemporary Persian poetry. And in most quarters side by side with mysticism, even at this early period, reigned artificiality. The grandiose but obscure and affected qasidas of Anvari ¹ and Zahir-ud-Din-i Fárábí ² were looked upon as the crowning glory of lyric poetry, for the ghazel had not yet attained that predominant position which, thanks chiefly to the genius of Háfiz, it was afterwards to hold. Nizámí ³ had brilliantly inaugurated the mystic-romantic poetry

¹ Anvari, who died in 587 (1191-2), is considered by many to have carried the Persian qasida to its highest point of perfection.

² Zahir-ud-Din-i Fáraybí died in 598 (1201-2). His qasidas were held in high esteem by his contemporaries, some of whom placed them before those of Anvari. He is frequently mentioned by the early Turkish writers, always in terms of respect and admiration.

³ Nizámí of Genje was born in 535 (1140-1) and died in 598 (1201-2) or 599 (1202-3). His Khamsa or ‘Quintet’ contains these five mesnevis: Makhzen-ul-Esrár or ‘The Treasury of Secrets,’ ‘Khusrev and Shirín,’ ‘Leyli and Mejnán,’ Heft-Peyker or ‘The Seven Effigies,’ and the Iskender-Náma or ‘Book of Alexander.’ ‘The Treasury of Secrets’ is a didactic-mystic work in which the author discusses a number of questions bearing on conduct, each of which he elucidates by the addition of some appropriate anecdote. Works of this description became very popular both in Persia and Turkey. The ‘Khusrev and Shirín’ and the ‘Leyli and Mejnán’ are romances on famous love-stories. ‘The Seven Effigies’ is a romance on the adventures of King Behrám-i Gúr and his lady-loves. ‘The Book of Alexander’ consists of two parts, of which the first is sometimes called the Sheref-Náma or ‘Book of Glory’ or the Iqbál-Náma or ‘Book of Fortune,’ and the second the Khured-Náma or ‘Book of Wisdom;’ it deals with the romantic history of Alexander the Great. As these books were afterwards reproduced in Turkish, we shall examine their subjects more closely farther on.
of the East; and in his famous Khamsa, the work, or rather series of works, destined to arouse to emulation so many both in his own and other lands, were displayed — nowhere more clearly — the two chief tendencies of the age. For the Khamsa was written at the very time when the qasida was being stifled under every species of decoration, and it reflects in many and many a far-fetched metaphor and recondite allusion that passion for the artificial and ostentatious which had now established its tyranny over Persian poetry. Again, Nizami was the first romantic poet after the universal triumph of mysticism, and thus his stories are no longer, as in former times, romances pure and simple, but are all more or less allegoric in intention and mystic in spirit.

But mightier than either lyric or romancist was he under whose shadow both were fain to sing. The mystic poet, the master who elected verse as the channel for his transcendental teaching, was lord-paramount wherever Persian culture held; and nowhere was his power more absolute or his influence more profound than in this very Asia Minor. For here in Qonya, the Seljûq capital, had been established for over fifty years the head-quarters of a group of saintly mystics who by the power of their writings and the spell of their personality have exercised an incalculable influence upon the subsequent literature and philosophy of the Muslim East. Hither, while yet a youth, had the greatest of them all, the Mevlana Jelal-ud-Din, ¹ been brought by his father Beha-ud-Din Veled; here had he lived and taught; here had he seen those visions and worked those signs which Eflaki ²

¹ Mevlânâ (in Arabic, 'Our Lord') is a title prefixed to the names of great dervish sheyks and eminent members of the ulama.
² Eflaki, who was a disciple of Jelâl's grandson Chelebi Emir Arif, wrote at the request of his teacher a biographical work on the early Mevlevi fathers, which he called Menâqib-ul-'Arifi'n or 'The Acts of the Adepts.' A number of translated extracts from this work, which was completed in 754 (1353),
has collected for us with such loving care; and above all here had he written his marvellous Mesnevi. This great poem, one of the greatest and most noble in all Persian literature, which in clear, simple language, but without apparent order or method, discourses on the doctrines and aspects of the mystic philosophy, has for ages formed the text-book of the Sufi thinker from the shores of the Mediterranean to the Wall of China. Scarcely less important has been the influence of the impassioned Divan where in inspired strains the poet-saint sings of the mystic Love, and immortalises his dear master Shems-ud-Din of Tabriz. Here too in Qonya had the Mevlana founded that famous dervish-order, called after him the Mevlevi, which in later years became so powerful, and which centuries afterwards gave to Turkey one of her greatest poets.

Unlike the contemporary lyric and romantic poets, Jelal and the other mystic teachers, both in Qonya and elsewhere, wrote in a simple and straightforward style, eschewing the tricks and artifices wherewith the court poets bedecked their works. These men were too much in earnest to play with words; moreover, they were less artists in language, or even

---

1 The full title of this famous book is Mesnevi-i Ma'nevi or 'The Spiritual Couplets;' but it is usually styled simply The Mesnevi, as being the Mesnevi among all mesnevis.

2 A selection of ghazels from Jelal's Diwan along with translations and valuable critical notes has been published by Mr. R. A. Nicholson under the title of 'Selected Poems from the Divani Shamsi Tabriz' (Cambridge University Press, 1898.)

3 The so-called 'dancing dervishes' are members of this order. The mystic dance which certain among them perform every week was instituted by Jelal himself who describes it in more than one poem in his Divan, where he represents it as symbolic of the universal life with its movements multiplex yet one.

4 Sheykh Ghalib.
poets singing because they must, than masters who chose to teach in verse rather than in prose, the former being more in harmony with the spirit of the time and better suited to the matter they had to say.

The influence then of Jelal-ud-Din and the mystics held the first place in the age and in the country wherein Turkish poetry was destined to start upon its course, while that of the lyric and romantic writers occupied the second. The effects of this are immediately evident; the earliest Turkish poetry consists of long mystic or theological mesnevis written in a plain and simple fashion with little attempt at embellishment or literary grace of any kind. Later on, when the immediate personal influence of the master and his band has somewhat faded, a change occurs; lyric and romantic poetry, and with them artificiality, begin to be cultivated with the greater assiduity, while mysticism as a formal subject of poetry falls into the second place, though remaining as the foundation and background of the whole.

It is just after the close of the fourteenth century that this change becomes clearly evident. The disastrous invasion of Timur, which occurred at the very beginning of the fifteenth century, cuts the First Period into two divisions, the poetry produced during the first of these being not only the more single-minded in purpose and the more artless and naive in expression, but also far the more Turkish in its manner and diction. Whether it be, as seems more probable, the natural result of a century of culture, or whether it be in any degree owing, as the historian ‘Alî would infer, to the influence of the Persian scholars who came into Asia Minor in Timur’s train, the West-Turkish poetry written about the time of the Tartar onslaught becomes somewhat suddenly much more Persian and much more artificial. The simple homely language of the earlier poets with their old-fashioned
‘finger-counting,’ suggestive of the ancient folk-songs and ballads, gives place to high-sounding foreign words and to the laboured rules of Persian prosody. Ingenious allegories begin to supersede the earnest if somewhat tedious homilies of the early followers of Jelal, and tricks of language and curiosities of imagery gradually replace the old straightforward speech.
Although he lived full half a century in a Turkish city, and for that same reason is known throughout the East by the surname of Rûmi — a term which practically means the (Western-) Turk — Mevlâna Jelâl-ud-Dîn, for all his splendid literary ability, did virtually nothing towards the great work of founding Turkish literature. His Mesnevi-i Ma'ânevi contains between 25,000 and 30,000 couplets, but there is never a Turkish line among them; there are in his vast Diwan 1,000,000 distichs, yet there is not one single ghazel written wholly in the Turkish tongue. Some time ago a scholarly member of the Mevlevî order, Veled Chelebi by name, made a careful examination of the master’s works for the express purpose of discovering to what extent he had made use of the Turkish language; and the only reward of this labour of love was one complete ghazel of the description known as Mulemma¹ written in mingled Turkish and Persian, together with three Persian ghazels each of which

¹ Rûm is an Oriental form of Rome. The names ‘Greece’ and ‘Greek’ are unknown; Yûnân represents Ionia. So powerfully did the Roman conquest of Greece and Asia Minor affect the Asiatic mind that to the Orientals not only all the subsequent, but all the former movers in these lands have ever since been ‘Romans.’ Thus Alexander the Great is known throughout the East as Iskender-i Rûm, ‘Alexander the Roman,’ while all the later dwellers in these regions, Byzantines, Seljûqs and Ottomans, have likewise been indiscriminately called Rûmis, that is ‘Romans,’ and their emperor, Christian or Muslim, is the Qaysar-i Rûm or ‘Cesar of Rome.’ And so the Ottoman Empire is, and has always been, styled the ‘Roman Empire,’ or simply ‘Rome,’ by Persians, Tartars, Afghans and Indians; an Ottoman Turk is called by these a ‘Roman,’ and the Ottoman language, the ‘Roman language.’ The name Rûm is thus virtually a geographical term and represents the territories ruled in succession by Roman, Byzantine, Seljûq and Ottoman; and it is in this sense that it is used in Persian and literary Turkish. The name Mevlâna Jelâl-ud-Dîn-i Rûm therefore means etymologically ‘Our Lord Jelâl-ud-Dîn the Roman (or, of Rome),’ but practically, ‘Our Lord Jelâl-ud-Dîn the Seljûq Turk (or, of Seljûq Turkey).’
contains a few Turkish distichs, and one or two other ghazels with a single Turkish couplet apiece.¹

Jelal-ud-Din was born in Balkh in Central Asia in 604 (1207-8), and died in Qonya in 672 (1273-4), so those few lines are our earliest specimens of West-Turkish verse.

Veled Chelebi quotes as examples the two following fragments. The passages which in the original are in Persian are italicised in the translation.

Fragment of a Ghazel. [1]

Or good or ill the brother be, indeed he
Upon a long and toilsome road will lead thee.²

The shepherd clutch thou fast, the wolves are many;
O my black lamb, O my black lambkin, heed me!³

And be thou Turk, or be thou Greek, or Persian,

The tongue of those the tongueless learn, I rete thee!⁴

Fragment of a Ghazel. [2]

Thou know' st how out of all folk I love thee and thee only;
If to my breast thou come not, for grief shall I die lonely.

I fain one day were seated alone beside thee, dearest,
Then would I learn me Turkish⁵ and quaff the wine full pronely.

¹ See an article entitled Edebiyat-i İslâmîya or 'Muslim Literature' by Mehemed Veled Chelebi in the special number of the journals Terjuman-i Haqiqat and Servet-i Fünûn published in aid of the destitute Muhammedans of Crete in 1313 (1897).

² The office of him who is to be thy brother on the mystic journey is arduous and vital, so it behoves thee to choose him with the utmost care.

³ Quzum 'my lamb' is a common form of familiar address among all classes in Turkey; but 'my black lamb,' if used at all now, must be provincial.

⁴ 'The tongueless,' i.e. those who are wrapt in silent contemplation of the Divinity, who have reached that stage where speech is not only inadequate but is misleading.

⁵ i.e. 'I would learn thy language so as to entertain thee.' So at least Veled Chelebi explains the words: —