'God hath Treasuries a'neath the Throne, the Keys whereof are the Tongues of the Poets.'

Hadis-i Sherif.
EDITOR'S PREFACE.

The sad circumstances which led to my becoming responsible for the editing of this and the succeeding volumes of the History of Ottoman Poetry are known to all those who are interested in Oriental scholarship, and are fully set forth in the Athenaeum for January 18, 1902, pp. 81—82, and the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for April, 1902, pp. 486—489. Nevertheless it seems to me desirable to begin my Preface to this the first posthumous volume of my late friend's great and admirable work with a brief notice of his life, a life wholly devoted and consecrated to learning and fruitful labour of research, but cut short, alas! in its very prime by premature and unexpected death.

Elias John Wilkinson Gibb was born at Glasgow on June 3, 1857, and received his education in that city, first at Park School under Dr. Collier, the author of the History of England, and afterwards at the University. It appears that from an early age linguistic studies especially attracted him; but I have not been able to ascertain exactly how and when his attention first became directed to the Orient, though I believe that here, as in many other cases, it was the fascination of the Arabian Nights which first cast over him the spell of the East. Be this as it may, by the time he had reached his twenty-first year his proficiency in Ottoman Turkish was remarkable enough to have attracted
the attention and aroused the admiration of the late Sir James Redhouse, to whose introduction I was indebted for a friendship which endured and increased with each succeeding year until the end. At first our communications were by letter only, our correspondence being often conducted in Turkish, and always dealing mainly with literary and philological matters; and it was not till the summer of 1883, after he had published (in 1879) a translation of the account of the capture of Constantinople given by Sa'du'd-Dîn in the Tāju 't-Tevārikh and his Ottoman Poems translated into English Verse in the Original Forms (London: Trübner, 1882), that I obtained the opportunity of making his personal acquaintance. In the Long Vacation of that year, however, having already taken my degree at Cambridge, paid my first visit to Constantinople and temporarily suspended my medical studies to pursue the more congenial paths of Oriental learning, I found myself free; and, receiving from Gibb an invitation to join him in London for a few weeks, eagerly fell in with a proposal to which I owed so much both then and afterwards. We took lodgings together in Brompton Square, and devoted nearly the whole of our time to the reading of Persian and Turkish poetry, the discussion of matters connected with the languages and literatures of the East, and the cultivation of the society of such educated and intelligent Asiatics as we were able to meet with. Notable amongst these was that eccentric but most talented Persian (who died some years ago in the capital of his native land) Mîrzâ Muḥammad Bāqir of Bawānāt (a district in Fârs near Abaraqûh), of whose character and attainments some account is given in the Introductory Chapter of my Year amongst the Persians.

From this period (July—August, 1883) dates my personal acquaintance and friendship with the author of this book,
that amiable and generous scholar, equal in modesty and learning, whose premature death it has been my sad duty to chronicle, and whose almost completed work it is my privilege to edit. The record of his life is a record of intellectual labour and scholarly achievements, not of external adventures and vicissitudes. It is the life of a scholar wholly devoted to a branch of learning but little cultivated or encouraged, in which he attained complete pre-eminence; and who summed up the final results of his life's work in a great and monumental book of which, alas! he did not live to see the complete production. It was a life also happy in all its circumstances; happy in its freedom from material anxieties and from those limitations which necessarily result from straitened means; still more happy in that loving sympathy from those nearest and dearest to him which is beyond all else in value and helpfulness. After his marriage, which took place in 1889, he resided, save for occasional visits to his parents in Scotland, almost entirely in London at his house in Chepstow Villas, where, surrounded by his rare and precious collection of books and manuscripts, he was ever accessible, not only to his friends, but to all those who were interested or learned in the history, literature, languages and thought of Western Asia. Notwithstanding the quiet and secluded life which he led, his house thus became one of the chief rallying-points in London of those engaged in studies kindred to his own; and the pleasure derived from these visits by his friends, whether European or Asiatic, was enhanced by the cordial welcome which he and his wife ever extended to their visitors.

The illness which caused his death declared itself about the middle of November, 1901, a few days after his return to London from Scotland; but it was only a day or two before his death, which took place early on the morning of
Thursday, December 5 of that year, that any apprehensions of serious danger arose. The calamity was equally sudden and unexpected, and the blow, therefore, the harder to bear. Yet almost the first thought of his parents and widow was for the continuance of the book which he had not been allowed to complete; and herein, as I think, their deep sympathy with his work and aims most strongly revealed itself. To the scholar his work is everything; and to such an one, suddenly called from this life, I can imagine no greater comfort, so far as the things of this world are concerned, than the assurance that, so far as possible, arrangements would be made by his survivors to secure from loss the result of his labours, and thus, as well as in other ways, to promote the studies to which his life was devoted. Of the steps towards that end taken in the present case I now propose to give a brief account.

Almost immediately after the funeral, which took place at Kensal Green Cemetery on Monday, December 9, 1901, I was asked by the widow and parents of my late friend to visit them at his house and consult with them as to the measures which should be taken to carry out what we could easily divine to be his wishes in respect to his literary work and materials. This History of Ottoman Poetry, of which he had lived to see the publication (in 1900) of the first volume only, naturally occupied the first place in our deliberations. Being invited to act as literary executor, I hesitated only for a moment; for though well aware how slender was my knowledge of the Ottoman language and literature compared to his, I could point to no one better qualified than myself who was willing to undertake a task which must needs be accomplished if much precious learning were to be saved from oblivion. Besides this I believed, and still believe, that, with the exception of my friend and colleague Khalil Khālid
Efendi, now Teacher of Turkish in the University of Cambridge (whose help and advice was as much at my disposal as it had been at Gibb's), I was, through long acquaintance and sympathy of views, better placed than any other student of Oriental languages for understanding the plan, scheme and aim of the author of this book. In this belief I was confirmed by a letter, dated September 24, 1900, which I had received from him after the publication of the first volume of this work, and in which, replying to a letter of mine, he wrote as follows: —

"Pray accept my sincere thanks for your kind letter, which it has given me great pleasure to receive. You are the one man in the country to whose opinion I attach real weight, and your approval is the best assurance of success that I can have, as well as the strongest encouragement to push on with the work.

"When you read the book you will see how greatly indebted I am to your own... works. This is especially the case in the introductory chapter and in that on the Hurufis. In the first of these I had either to follow your account of Sufi philosophy or do worse...; in the second, but for your studies, I should have been restricted to the meagre and unsatisfactory passages in the tezkires and whatever I might have tentatively deduced from the writings of Nesimi and his co-sectaries.

"I am glad that you have discovered what no one else has noticed — or at least remarked — my unexpressed aim to make the book useful to students not only of Turkish literature, but of Persian, and those others that are based on Persian."

This letter I cite in no spirit of self-laudation, for indeed I think that the writer over-estimated alike those of my writings to which he referred and his own indebtedness to
them; but I am sufficiently convinced of his entire sincerity of purpose, word, and deed to feel certain that he meant exactly what he said, and therefore that he would have wished me to continue and complete the work it was not given to him fully to accomplish. This being so, no consideration of the slenderness of my own attainments in a language and literature to which (though they were my first love) I have in later years devoted but little attention would have justified me in refusing to undertake so obvious a duty; a duty not merely towards those whom the death of my friend and fellow-worker had overwhelmed in a sorrow yet deeper than my own, but also towards that branch of learning to which my life, like his, was devoted.

The great value of this book, as based entirely on original work of a very arduous character, combined with that rare sympathy and insight without which no research can yield the fullest and finest fruit, had been apparent to me on reading the first volume; but the examination of the manuscript materials now placed in my hands enabled me to realize much more fully how immense was the labour involved in its preparation. This impression was deepened and intensified when I passed to my next duty, the examination of his manuscripts, books and note-books; for of the first almost every one bearing on Turkish literature contained translations, notes or abstracts written on loose sheets of paper lying between the leaves, while equal evidence of careful, thorough and systematic work was afforded by the two last.

Natural taste and aptitude combined with rare diligence and accuracy and ample opportunity were not, however, the only factors which enabled my friend to produce so profound a study of a subject so little cultivated in Europe: to these he added the yet greater gift of sympathy. I know several very eminent Oriental scholars who lack this; who
definitely dislike the Eastern character and despise the Eastern point of view; or who limit their admiration to some particular (usually ancient) period, without concerning themselves in the least about the later developments of the people, literature and language which form the subjects of their study. I confess that to me this attitude (which is still commoner amongst classical scholars, most of whom profess but little interest in the modern Greeks or Italians) is scarcely intelligible. Language is after all only the vehicle of a people’s thought, and its main interest is that it enables us to penetrate that thought in a way which no translation can do. To despise the later forms of a language because it has lost its inflections, simplified its grammar, or borrowed foreign words is intelligible, but I think unreasonable; for what should we think of an Asiatic student of English who confined his attention to a “classical period” ending at the Norman Invasion, and dismissed as unworthy of attention the works not merely of Byron, Shelley and Tennyson, but also those of Chaucer, Shakespeare and Milton? But to devote one’s self (save for practical ends) to the study of the language and literature of a people in whose national character one can find nothing admirable or fascinating is surely the strangest misapplication of energy. It may, of course, be answered that nations wholly change their characters, but this I do not believe; the modern Englishman still retains (for all his admixture with other races) very many characteristics of his Anglo-Saxon ancestor; the modern Persian (as Rawlinson has very truly observed in speaking of the truthfulness of Herodotus) still more closely resembles his fore-father of Achaemenian and Sásánian times; and even in the case of the modern Greek (whose language has undergone less alteration in historical times than either English or Persian) it appears very doubtful whether he so utterly
differs from his "classical" prototype as is commonly imagined. 1

If this be so, then, the study of even an ancient or mediaeval language or literature requires, that it may bear its fullest fruits, some actual acquaintance with its modern representative, and a certain familiarity and sympathy with the people to whom it appertains, should the language and people in question still be represented in the world. For this reason I should deem it a far easier task to enter into the spirit of Achaemenian Persia than of Assyria, Babylonia or Chaldaea, because Persia still exists as such, while the latter nations have long disappeared. In a word, I hold that the proper understanding of a literature involves some comprehension of and sympathy with the people to whom that literature belongs or belonged.

Now the presence of this sympathy and understanding appears to me to be the key-note of Gibb’s work. He both liked and understood the Turks; and, though thoroughly alive to the defects of their national character and literature, he believed equally thoroughly in their sterling virtues and future potentialities. How complete was his mastery of their language and literature is abundantly attested by the spontaneous evidence of Turkish men of letters — the only evidence which can be considered conclusive on such a point. To quote but a single instance, let me refer to the Obituary Notice which appeared in No. 98 of the Turkish paper named the Osmanli (December 15, 1901), wherein the writer, who signed himself "a Turkish resident in London" (هولندي العفين)

1 I have not space to cite, but, cannot refrain from referring to, the admirable remarks of the great Moorish historian Ibn Khaldun on this subject in that section of his Prolegomena which deals with the Arabic poetry of his own time (late fourteenth century), which many of his learned contemporaries affected to despise, and "listened to with profound contempt." See the Beyrout edition of 1879, p. 531, l. 24 — p. 532, l. 8 (= vol. iii, pp. 405—407 of de Slane’s French translation).
expressed himself in the following words:

"Neither in the Ottoman Empire nor amongst the Orientalists of Europe does anyone exist who has more profoundly studied the Ottoman language and literature than he."

Nowhere in Europe, as I believe, does knowledge (always provided that it is a knowledge which can be put to the proof by those to whom it is exhibited) command such high and universal respect as in Asia, especially when it is joined to a just, blameless, honourable and upright character. Hence Gibb was both loved and respected by his numerous Muslim friends, acquaintances and correspondents, especially by the Turks who constituted their majority. This was strikingly shown at the funeral service, a simple and beautiful ceremony conducted according to the practice of the Presbyterian Church. Muslims are not, as a rule, easily induced to enter a Christian place of worship; but no small proportion of the little congregation present on that sad occasion were followers of the Prophet of Islám, and, as I can testify, their grief was very deep and real. In the words employed by one of them, “hardly amongst the Christians could there be found a better friend to Islám than he.” So to their personal grief for the loss of a kind friend, a congenial companion, a wise counsellor, or a generous helper (for in one at least of these relations he stood to each one present) was superadded the bitter knowledge that Islám, and the nations and peoples which profess that creed, had lost one of the very few competent and sympathetic interpreters of its spirit and aspirations to the Christian West.

Let me come now to the matters of which more particu-
larly I have to speak in this Preface; and first of all to the manuscript of this work, the condition in which I found it, and the manner in which I have understood my editorial duties. This, the second volume, was practically ready for press, needing only the addition of a few notes, the verification of references, and, some trifling verbal alterations. It comprises the first seventy years of the "Classical Period" (A. D. 1450—1520), and, being now in the reader's hands, needs no further notice in this place. The third volume, comprising 466 pages of manuscript (about 330 of print) covers the remainder of the "Classical Period," from the accession of Sulaymán the Magnificent until the accession of Ahmed the Third (A. D. 1520—1703). It also appeared on perusal to be complete or almost complete, though the revision which I shall bestow on it as soon as this volume is off my hands may possibly reveal lacunae which passed unnoticed at the first reading. The fourth and last volume carries the history down from A. D. 1703 to the present time, and therefore includes the rise of the New or European School of Ottoman poets and writers. It is in many respect the most original and the most interesting portion of the whole work, for the author thoroughly understood and believed in this New School, which has hitherto received but little attention in Europe, even from those few students who interest themselves in Turkish. It is also the largest of the four volumes, since it comprises 658 pages of manuscript, equivalent to about 456 pages of print. Indeed I am not sure whether it was not intended, with the additions undoubtedly contemplated, to form two volumes; for here, unfortunately, there are unmistakable lacunae, the very important chapter dealing with Kemál Bey, one of the three founders of the New School, being in particular entirely wanting. How far these unwritten portions can be supplied
is doubtful, but certainly any attempt to supply them would be a mere makeshift, for the hand which alone was ready and able to write them lies motionless in death. A final volume (the fifth, as matters now stand) will contain the Turkish text of all the poems translated in the English portion of the work, and it is here that I anticipate the greatest difficulty and labour. I found, it is true, a sheaf of manuscript containing the texts of many Turkish poems copied out fairly for press; but on comparison with the translations contained in the English portion of the work it became apparent that while on the one hand it contained many texts which were not translated, it also omitted many which were. All these will have to be sought out and transcribed from the manuscripts contained in the author's library, a task which in some cases is likely to prove arduous enough.

This brings me directly to the second matter of which I particularly desire to treat in this Preface, namely my late friend's library. To its beauty and completeness, and the care evidently bestowed alike on the selection, binding and keep of the volumes composing it, I have already alluded. By a will made at the time of his marriage my late friend bequeathed to the British Museum the whole of his very valuable collection of manuscripts, and thither they would ere now have been transferred but for the deplorable practice of that institution (a practice which, notwithstanding the high attainments and unvarying courtesy and consideration of its officials, has offered and continues to offer so great a barrier to research of this kind) of refusing under any circumstances to lend their manuscripts outside the walls of the Museum. I hoped that in this case an exception might be made so far as to permit me, as literary executor of the generous donor of so precious a treasure, to remove from time to time
to Cambridge (with whatever precautions and under whatever guarantees might be deemed necessary) those volumes which I might need for the proper performance of my editorial duties till such time as the publication of the book should be completed. Being informed, however, that this was out of the question, and that my request could not for a moment be entertained, I had no resource but to beg the relatives of the donor to retain the manuscripts in their possession, so that I could borrow them as the necessity for so doing arose, until the publication of this work should be completed. It therefore seems to me desirable to publish here the summary list of these manuscripts (about 325 in number) which I drew up immediately after I had accepted the position of literary executor. The distinctive number prefixed to each manuscript is only of temporary importance as a means of identification, the sequence of these numbers merely representing the order in which the volumes were examined and are for the present arranged. Many manuscripts of which the proper title was not obvious, and which I have not yet had time to identify, are imperfectly described in the following list, while the classification is of the roughest, and lays no claim to even an approximate perfection.

ROUGH LIST OF THE GIBB MSS.

I. PERSIAN POETS (29 MSS.)

Firdawsi. (221) The well-known abridgement of the Shāhnāma compiled by Tūlak Beg, and entitled Ta'rikh-i-Shamshir Khanī, dated A. H. 1063.

Hāfiz. (11, 131, 16, 13) Four MSS. of the Diwān of Hāfiz; the first, dated A. H. 1040, of Indian workmanship and adorned with miniatures; the second dated A. H. 1063;
the third undated, with miniatures; the fourth, also undated, written in neat nastā'liq.


Jalālū’d-Dīn Rūmī. (186, 231). Two copies of the Mathnawi, the first a fine copy transcribed by ʿAlīmad Sakkākī of Shīrāz in A. H. 1004, from the collections of Castelbranco and de Sacy; the second, comprising 974 pages, wrongly labelled “Shāhnāma.”

Khāqānī. (268) The Kulliyyāt or Complete Works.

Luqmān. (243) The Selīm Khān-nāma, a history of Sultan Selim in Persian verse, modelled on the Shāhnāma, with miniatures.

Mazhar. (242) The Divān followed by excerpts from the Akhlāq-i-Nāṣirī and other ethical works.


Ṣūrp. (185, 222, 283) Three copies of the Divān, the first dated A. H. 1087.

Shawkat. (28, 94) Two copies of the Divān, the first dated A. H. 1240.


Anthologies. (238a and 238) Selections from Ḥāflīz, Amir Khusraw. Kātibī and other Persian poets; and an oblong note-book containing scraps of Persian verse.
II. TURKISH TEZKIERES, OR BIOGRAPHIES OF POETS (10 MSS.)

Ashiq Chelebi. (86) A Tezkire comprising ff. 338 which I believe to be 'Ashiq's.

Esrar, Seyyid —. (80) The Tezkire-i-Mevlevi, or biography of poets belonging to the Mevlevi Order of Dervishes.

Hasan Chelebi (Qinâli-zâde). (84) Dated A. H. 1013.

Latifi. (64) A fine copy dated A. H. 1006. (56) Another copy of (I think) the same Tezkire, dated A. H. 982.

Riza, Seyyid —. (65) Lives of poets who flourished between A. H. 1000 and 1050 (pp. 85).

Riyazi. (67, 79) Two copies of a Tezkire divided into 5 sections (entitled حكایت) which I think to be Riyazi's.


III. TURKISH POETS (160 MSS.)

Ahâ (with Lamiri, q. v.). (166) Husnu u Dil, or "Beauty and Heart."

'Abdul-Bâqi. (205) Divân: a fine copy.

Ahmed. (44, 35) Two MSS. of the Divân, followed in the first copy by that of Nâdirî.


Ahmed Pashâ, Şakir —. See below, under Şâkir Ahmed.

'Akifî. (288) Verses (naçmî).

'Ali Dede. (134) Bahâr'ul-Gharâ'ib.

'Ashqî (or 'Ishqî) Efendi. (157, 200) Two MSS. of the Divân, conjoined in the second copy with the Divâns of Nef'i, Vehbi, Vâysi, etc., q. v. (127) The Heft Feyker and Qâsr-i-Nâmân Khâvarnaq.

'Alamat. (42, 257) Two MSS. of the Divan, the latter followed by poems of Hâziq and Fâzîl Bey.

Baqi. (88, 208) Two MSS. of the Divan, the first with illuminations and miniatures, the second followed by odes of other poets.

Başri (Mişri). (246) Divan, a poor copy with paper covers.


Birgili. (143) Vaşîyyat-nâmê.

Dânishî. (281) Divân (fl. 136).

Dügâkin-zâde. See above under Ahmed.

Eshref. See Rûmi.

Esrâr-ede. (204) Kulliyât, including the Divân, Quatrains, and Mesnevis, amongst the latter being the Muhârek-nâmê, Futâvvet-nâmê, a story in verse, Hûlây-i-Shâtîf-i-Mevlânâ, Tirâsh-nâmê-i-Mevlânâ, speeches of Yûnûs Imrâ, and aphorisms of Plato. (316) Divân.

Fâşîh-i-Mevlevî (22) Divân.

Fâzîl Bey. (108) Khûbân-nâmê, Defter-i-’Ishq, etc. (55) Zanân-nâmê, written in good nastâ’îq, adorned with miniatures, and dated A. H. 1190. (264) Khûbân-nâmê, Zanân-nâmê, etc. See also under ’Alamat.

Fazlî. (53) Gul u Bulbul, dated A. H. 1025 (fl. 77).

Fehîm (Unji-zâde Muştafa Chelebi). (91, 296, 308) Three copies of the Divân, the first including poems by Shêhri, the last dated A. H. 1104.

Feyzi. (211) Divân, with that of Mazâqi.


Ghâlib. (142) Divân.

Ghâlib-dede. (100) Husn u ’Ishq.

Gulshevi, Sheykh Hasan Sezâ’î —. (63) Divân. (213) Maqâlât.

See also below, under Ibrâhîm Haqqî Sezâ’î.
Guvâni. (54) Pend-nâme.
Hâfiç (254) Divân.
Hamdi. (59, 314) Two copies of the Yûsuf u Zuleykhâ. (47)
Leylâ ve Mejinîn.
Hânîf. (50) A mesnevi poem on religious subjects, dated
A. H. 1260.
Hâshîm. (78) Divân, dated A. H. 1254.
Hâshîmi. (32) Risaletül-Lajîf ve Sandîqatul-Ma‘ârif fol-
lowed by poems of Nâdim, Ṭâyyâr, etc.
Hâtîm. (291) Divân.
Hâyretî (70) Divân.
Hâzîq. See previous page under ‘Alîf.
Hewâî. (199) Divân, followed by poems of Surârî.
Hûshmat. (105, 301, 310) Three copies of the Divân.
Jâdîdî. (29) Divân. (284) Poems by this and other authors.
(48) Mesnevi poem, apparently by this writer, beginning:

اسمبلة أكبر رضي الله عن وحيلى
كل ذكر ابدادم دلا خلدائي

Ibrâhîm Ḥâqî. (110) Divân, with that of Sezâî.
Ihya. (196) A collection of poems which appear to be by
an author with this pen-name.
Ishîq. (38) Divân.
Ismailî. (321) Divân, with that of Sâmi‘î.
Izzet ʿAlî Pâshâ. (309) Divân, incomplete at end.
Jem, Prince — (60) Divân.
Jevri. (74, 258) Two versified Turkish commentaries on
selected verses of Jalâlu’d-Dîn Rûmî’s Mathnâvî: pro-
ably by Jevri.
Kâni. (62, 276) Ornate compositions in prose and verse
(Munsha'ât), conjoined in the second manuscript with the Divân.

Kâshîf. (72) Divân.

Khâgâni. (58, 306) Two copies of the Hûlya (or description of the Prophet’s personal appearance and characteristics) of Khâgâni, dated A. H. 1108 and 1144 respectively.

Khašmi. (245) Divân.

Khâyâli. (163) Divân.

Lâmi'i. (259) Divân.

Lâmi'i. (51) Kulliyyât (fl. 249). (133) Husn u Dil, dated A. H. 933. (117) Sheerefû'l-Insân, dated A. H. 957. (184) The same with the 'Ibrit-numâ and Behîr u Shitâ of the same author. (262, 271) Two MSS. of the 'Ibrit-numâ, the first from the libraries of Castelbranco and de Sacy, the second comprising fl. 117. For another copy, see above under Âhi. (165) Commentary on the Preface of Sa'dî's Gulistân, dated A. H. 987.

Mazâqî. (299) Divân. See also above, under Fegzi.

Munif. (81, 218) Two copies of the Divân.

Nâbi. (112, 239) Two copies of the Kulliyyât, the second dated A. H. 1117 and containing also the Munsha'ât.

(172, 275) Two copies of the Munsha'ât, the first from Castelbranco’s library, the second containing fl. 241.

(103, 289) Two copies of the Divân, the second entitled Ferâ'id-i-jerâ'id-i-jevâhir u la'âli, ve 'Arâ'is-i-nefâ'is-i-jevâhir-i-mutela'li. (162) Tuhfetû'l-Harameyn. (303) Kheyriyye, dated A. H. 1223.

Nâdirî. See above, under Ahmed.

Nâ'îlî (Yeni-zâde Muṣṭafâ Efendi.) (76, 305) Two copies of the Divân.

Naẓîm (Muṣṭafâ). (198) Divân.

Nedîm. See above, under Hashîmi.

Nedîmi. See almost immediately below, under Nejâtî.
Nefzî (of Erzeroum). (77) Divân. See also above, under ʻAshqî. (197) Satires, entitled Sihâm-i-Qaṣâ.

Nejâtî. (104, 161) Two copies of the Divân, of which the first also contains the Divân of Nedîmî.

Neshet. (106) Divân.

Nesîmî. (61) Divân. (145) Muqaddamatu Tuhfeti‘i-Haqqîq, a Ḥurûfî work.

Nevres. (73) Divân.

Nevadî (Mir ʻAli Shir). (188, 227) Two copies of the Divân, the second dated A. H. 1081 and both well and carefully written.


Qâ‘îmî (Hasan Esfendî). (244) Divân, dated A. H. 1191.

(97) Qaṣîda.

Râghib. (107) Divân.

Raḥîmî. (210) Shâh u Gedâ.

Râshîd. (21, 173) Divân, the first dated A. H. 1157 and containing also the Divân of Tâlib; the second comprising ff. 109.

Refet. (27) Divân (ff. 91).

Reysheni, Dede —. (20) Divân, dated A. H. 1012.

Rîzâ (Nejjâr-zâde Shëkyh Muṣṭafâ). (40) Divân.


Rûmî, Eshref-i —. (270) Kelimât.

Sâbit (Thâbit). (57) Żafir-name, Divân, etc, (263) Divân.

See also immediately below.

Sâmi. (95, 253). Two copies of the Divân, the second containing also the Divân of Sâbit.

Sâmi‘î. See above, under ʻIṣmâṭî.


Selâm (? Selami). (45) Divân.

Servet (Tharwat). (195) Divân, with other poems.

Sezâî. (287) Divân. See also under Gulsheni and Ibrâhîm Haqqî.
Shākir Ahmed Pasha. (171) Dīwān, entitled ʿIṣḥāqīyya.
Shehri. (274, 297) Two copies of the Dīwān. See also above, under Fehim.
Shemsî. (26) Deh Murgh, defective at beginning, dated A. H. 1031.
Sherīf. (2) Turkish verse-translation of the Shāh-nāme (pp. 560), containing 32 miniatures, from Castelbranco’s Library. (89) Dīwān.
Dīwān. See also above, under Fehim.
Sheykhi. (247) Dīwān, dated A. H. 1276. For another copy, see above, under Râshid.
Tarṣî. (43) Dīwān, dated A. H. 1184.
Tayyâr. See above, under Ḥāshimi.
Tayyârī. (82) Dīwān.
Thâbit, Thâqib, etc. See Sâbit, Sâqib, etc.
Vehbi. (46, 101) Two copies of the Dīwān. (96) Latîfa (17) Sûs-nāme. See also above, under ʿAshqi.
Veysi. (115) Munshaʿat. (141) Tawḥîd-nāme. See also under ʿAshqi.
Zâti. (39, 251) Dīwān, the second a poor copy. (52) Shemâile Pervâne (ff. 131).
IV. Other Turkish Mesnevi Poems. (19).


Giy u Chevgân. (312).
Humâyûn-name (122, 236), the first containing 758 pp.; the second containing 403 pp. and dated A. H. 984.

Iskender-name (30), defective both at beginning and end.
Mesnevi poems, Two unidentified Turkish — (49, 298), the second dated A. H. 987.

Mevlûd-i-Nebî (83), Commentary on a "Birth-song" of the Prophet.

Prophet's Life and Exploits, Versified History of — (102), with miniatures.

Veysi's Vision of Alexander the Great (93).

V. Turkish Anthologies (15).

These, which I have not yet carefully examined, include Anthologies of a certain size and some pretension to selection and arrangement (31, 36, 37, 116, 240); smaller and less formal collections (Mejmû'a), comprising often select extracts of ornate prose (279, 293, 295); mere note-books (Beyaz), in which have been jotted down verses which happened to please the former owner (33, 250, 323); and last, but most important, several collections of those popular ballads known as Sharqiyyât (178, 282, 311, 322).

VI. Qur'ân and Commentary (6).

Three complete Qur'âns (123, 181, 234), of which the first is a pretty but modern MS. with illuminations; the second a minute and beautifully-written copy in a velvet case; and
the third a Maghribi MS. dated A. H. 1240. There is also a Kufri fragment (14) comprising six leaves; and (151) a portion of the Qur’an, richly illuminated, followed by the Dalā'ilu'l-Khayrāt, the Burda, or “Mantle Poem”, of al-Bāširi, lists of the “Companions,” and other such things interesting to pious Muslims. The only Commentary (233) is a Turkish translation of al-Bayḍawi (-Beyzawi) dated A. H. 1123 (ff. 300).

VII. PRAYER-BOOKS (3).

Of these there are three (136, 182, 183), the first written in a Maghribi hand and dated A. D. 1860 by Sheykh Abū ʿAbdillāḥ Muḥammad an-Nafzāwī (?); the second (illuminated) and third containing Turkish as well as Arabic pieces.

VIII. LAW AND FETVĀS (5).


IX. MYSTICISM (1).

Twelve tracts (Kasāʾil) of the great mystagogue Sheykh Muḥyiyyu’d-Dīn b. al-ʿArabi (256).
X. Arabic Poetry (3).

\(^\text{51}^\text{Ali b. Abi Ṭālib. (199) A beautiful copy of the so-called }\) Diwān of \(^\text{51}^\text{Ali, with Persian verse-translations. These are written in black, while the Arabic original is in gold. }\)


XI. Titled works not included in above classes arranged alphabetically. 1 (57)


(90) From library of Fiott Hughes. (t) Dated A.H. 1247.


(286) More epistolary models.

(192) (t) Many curious coloured illustrations. Dated A.H. 1209.

(7) Dated A.H. 1209. (t) By Ibrāhīm Āghá.

(15) Dated A.H. 1148.

(6, 175, 223) Egyptian "Mantle-Poem" by Sūrūḏ al-Dīn, dated A.H. 1148.

---

1 "The small italic letters placed in brackets after the title indicate in what language or languages the book to which they refer is written. Thus (a) means that it is written in Arabic, (p) in Persian, (a, l) Arabic and Turkish, and so on."
The first copy comprises ff. 469 and is from de Sacy's library; the second is dated A.H. 1096; the third is dated A.H. 1015, and comprises 716 pages.

The first copy contains ff. 120 and is dated A.H. 1097. The second also contains the *Mizanu 'l-Haqq* and is defective at the beginning.

A versified treatise on Prosody, composed A.H. 1050, transcribed A.H. 1130.

A work on Turkí philology, composed A.H. 1214.

This translation was made by order of Emír ʾOsmán Sháh b. Iskender Páshá in A.H. 971.
XXVIII

(260) Dated A.H. 1216, and preceded by the Mir'atu 'l-Ishq. (t)

(278) Dated A.H. 1238. (t)

(319) In XXII chapters. (t)

(12) Genealogical Tables followed by 40 stories; dated A.H. 1123. (t)

(269) Dated A.H. 1179; ff. 136. (t)

(224) The fifth volume. (t)

(69) Ff. 233. (t)

(194) The "Crimson Peony" of Tâshkûprülûzâde; ff. 182.

(249) Pp. 79. (t)

(232) جَبَّارٍ غَزْيَ حَلَالَ اَنْهَد يَانُشَة (t)

This is no doubt a translation of al-Qazwînî's well-known work. The MS. is adorned with miniatures, but is defective at both beginning and end.

(168) From J. Lee's library. (t)

(230) Defective at both ends. (p)

(156) فَعَلَ حَرٍّ وَعَقِدَ عَالَ (t)

(318) A Turkish Toxophilos. (t)

(164) The translation of Aq Qâzi-oghlu. (t)

(135) Ff. 288. (t)

(265, 266) The second MS. is defective. (t)

(228) فَتَحَتِ الْأَلْبِيْبِ (p)

Fragment of an old thirteenth or fourteenth century historical MS. with more modern supply, containing the history of some of the Prophets and old Persian Kings. It may be
a portion of the Persian Tabari. The title here assigned to it is merely descriptive.

(261) كتاب العنوان في مکاتب السُنُون نُقل على بن عبر بن علي بن حسَن

(313) كتاب غيقومر أبادل

(138) Indian miniatures.

(209) From de Saey’s library. Dated A.H. 1209. (p. t.)

(159) Commentary on a work of Sháhid’s by ʿAbduʾr- R. (t)......

-Rahmán b. ʿAbduʾl-láh al-Quddúsí.

(18) Neat naskh; undated (p. t.)

(113) Dated A.H. 1161. (p. t.)

(294) Ff. 51. (sic! t)


See s. v. خلاصة العتبار, No. 260 on previous page. (t)

(170) Travels and adventures of Katib-i-Rúmí. (t)

See s. v. تکحفظ الكبار, supra.

(158) Dated A.H. 1018. (t)

(24) Dated A.H. 987. (t)

(3) Dated A.H. 1055. (t)

(152) نبر البلغي ظبيعت داستن (t)

Richly illuminated. Ff. 208.

(125) Ff. 119.

XII. MANUSCRIPTS NOT INCLUDED IN PRECEDING CLASSES. (17)

Art and Costume. (t) “The Court of Persia in 1858:” a series
of beautiful coloured drawings of costumes worn by different classes of Persians at that period. No text.

(120) "Persian Pictures."

(220) A portfolio containing about 25 Persian paintings.

(180) A woodland scene, with birds, beasts, trees, flowers, etc. cut out of paper or made up with real twigs, leaves and the like. This curious and beautiful production represents an art now, I believe, very rare, and known as "Fakhri Oymasi" (خصبی اویماسی).

(Astrology and Physiognomy. (193) A ragged and untitled tract on Astrology.

(207) A tract on Astrology followed by another on Physiognomy (علم القيامة). Fl. 88.

Calendars. (126) The Zij of Ulugh Bey, by Qâzî-zâde-i-Rûmî and ʿAlî Qûshî.

(241) The same with tables (jejadâvîl).

(317) An Almanac (taqvim).

(139) A volume full of wonderful designs cut out of paper and illuminated, bearing the (to me) unintelligible title:


(144) A beautiful piece of naskh writing executed by a Crimean Turk in A. H. 1129, in the time of Devlet-Girây, for Sultan Ahmed.

Dictionary. (304) A Turkish-Arabic-Persian rhymed vocabulary, beginning:

(315) "Tableau d'une partie d'échecs joué entre Khâtvani-zadé (? Khâtûnî-zádè) Taqî Efendi et Ahmed Mukhtâr Efendi." Many leaves at end blank.

Games (315) "Tableau d'une partie d'échecs joué entre Khâtvani-zadé (? Khâtûnî-zádè) Taqî Efendi et Ahmed Mukhtâr Efendi." Many leaves at end blank.

History. (9) Pechevi's history of the Ottoman Empire from the accession of Suleyman the Great until the death of

Stories. (189) Part of a story-book (perhaps a translation of Kalila and Dimna) beginning towards the end of ch. v.

The heading of ch. vi is:

باب ششم، در زاغان وبیمان،

Zoroastrianism. (324) A long roll containing Zend prayers and formulae written in the Persian character.

Besides these there is a Turkish ferman, framed and glazed, and one Japanese MS.

The above list is, as I have said, imperfect and merely provisional, being based on one hasty scrutiny of the manuscripts, but I think that it is complete, and it will at least serve to give some idea of the nature and value of the collection. It will be seen that the volumes dealing with Turkish poetry and Biography of Ottoman poets (classes II—V inclusive) number 195, and are by far the greater, as well as the more important, portion of the whole.

Of the printed books in my late friend's Oriental library I need say but little, since they are destined to be dispersed, and many fine volumes, as well as an immense number of Turkish pamphlets, have already been generously bestowed by Mrs Gibb on her husband's friends and fellow-workers, or sent where it was deemed that they would be of most use. None were offered for sale or found their way into the book-market. Of one class of these books only did I, assisted by Khalil Khalid Efendi, draw up a rough list; those, namely (excluding the small pamphlets mentioned above), which, being the product of Eastern presses, could not be dealt with except by one acquainted with the character and language in which they were written. They amounted to nearly 300 Turkish, 30 Persian and a few Arabic works, many of them of considerable rarity.

The particulars which I have already given as to the
measures adopted by Mr Gibb's relatives for the preservation of his work and the disposal of his library and literary remains afford abundant proof of that loving sympathy with his aims and ideals to which allusion has already been made. To a yet further proof, of which I hope to say more in the Preface to the next volume when the details connected with it have been elaborated, I may perhaps without indiscretion briefly refer in this place. It is the desire and purpose of my late friend's mother to promote the studies to which his life was devoted, and thus in the truest and best sense to perpetuate his memory, by establishing a Memorial Fund, under the control of trustees, yielding a yearly interest of some £200 a year, which will be employed, according to the judgement of the trustees, either in the publication of texts and translations of unpublished Turkish, Persian or Arabic books or scholarly works dealing with the literary history of these languages; or in grants or travelling scholarships designed to stimulate productive researches into the religious, philosophical and literary phenomena of the West Asian domains of Islam; or in providing in this country lectures on the Turkish language and literature and other cognate subjects. Should this most generous intention be realized, as there is every reason to hope it will, the stimulus which it will give to a branch of scholarship at present sadly neglected in this country ought, if the wisdom with which the Fund is administered even approaches the generosity of the donor, to be great and enduring.

It remains only to say a few words as to the principles which have guided me in my task of editing this book. My chief aim has been to carry out in every detail what I believe to have been the author's wishes and intentions. I have added very little (only here and there a note obviously required and distinguished by being placed in square brackets
and followed by the abbreviation "ED.") and changed still less. When I thought that I could make a sentence clearer or otherwise improve on it, I have not hesitated to do so; but I have faithfully adhered to the author's principles of translation and transliteration, and have endeavoured in all respects to fulfil his ideals. In the task of reading and correcting the proofs I have received the most valuable help from Mrs E. J. W. Gibb, the author's widow, who called my attention to many mis-spellings and other minor errors which I had overlooked. In spite of all our care I regret to find that there are still a few misprints left in these pages, but they are not, I hope, of a kind to cause the reader any trouble.

Although it was evidently the Author's intention (see foot-note on p. viii of vol. I) to reserve the Indices for the last volume, I experienced so much difficulty in finding the references which were constantly required that I resolved to add to this volume an Index of that portion of the work which is now before the public. Unfortunately, through circumstances into which I need not here enter, the arrangements which I had made for its preparation at the beginning of October broke down some six weeks later, and, being unwilling to keep back this volume any longer, I find myself compelled to abandon my resolution. Fresh arrangements are being made for the construction of full and adequate Indices, but their publication is, for the present, necessarily deferred.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO VOLUME II.

The present Volume covers the earlier part of the Second Period, carrying the story of Ottoman Poetry from A. D. 1450 down to A. D. 1520, the year of the death of Selim I, and thus leaving the later and more brilliant half of this Period to be considered in the next.

The opening chapter deals with the distinguishing characteristics of the School which flourished at this stage in the development of Ottoman Poetry, and has reference to the whole of the Period, the remarks made therein being indeed more particularly applicable to the work produced at the time of the culmination of this School in the reign of Selim's successor Süleyman I.

Many of the reviewers of the First Volume of this History have shown an inclination unduly to disparage Ottoman Poetry on the score of its being a servile imitation of the poetry of Persia. Regarded superficially, it appears to be such an imitation, its aims and methods being the same; but if we look more closely into the matter, we shall see that Ottoman Poetry would be more correctly described as a branch of Persian than as an imitation. In order to understand aright the relationship between the literatures of the non-Arab Muhammedan peoples, we should conceive these literatures as forming together a single unit, to which we might give the name of West-Asian literature. The question as to what language a writer in this West-Asian literature
should use, whether this should be Persian, Ottoman, Turki, Urdu, or Pushtu, was generally, though not always, determined by the speech of the locality in which he happened to find himself. I say 'generally', because it was usual for a poet of Persian or Central Asian origin who settled in Turkey to write verse in the Ottoman language, and vice versa; and 'not always', because much Persian poetry, including some of great merit, was produced outside the geographical limits of Persia, sometimes by men of other than Persian race.

That the nucleus of this West-Asian Muhammedan literature should be Persian was in the circumstances inevitable. Of the various races destined to contribute to its formation the Persians alone were heirs of an ancient civilization; and thus when they and their eastern neighbours were brought for the first time into close and lasting connection by acceptance of a common faith, they alone stood for culture; and the brilliance of their achievements in literature and art so dazzled the simple minds of those barbarians that even the conception of any culture upon other lines became for them impossible. And so in the fulness of time, when the descendants of those rude savages had reached the point when they themselves thought to write poetry, no ideas as to Persian or Turkish, as to originality or imitation, ever entered their minds. Poetry was to them a single entity, no more affected by questions of race or language than was theology or science. Therefore they might and did write these verses sometimes in Turkish, sometimes in Persian, accident generally

1 Several such instances are recorded in the Tezkırés.

[2 It is only necessary to mention Sa'di’s great contemporaries Amir Khusraw of Dihli (d. A. D. 1325) and Mir Hasan of Dihli (d. circ. A. D. 1327), and Fayzi (d. A. D. 1596), all Indians, and Badri-i-Châch (d. circ. A. D. 1350) of Tâshkend in Transoxiana. This list could easily be greatly extended from these two countries, and, to some extent, from Turkey also. Ed.]
deciding which, but in either case the spirit and the matter were the same, nothing differing except the words.

If then we must consider Persian poetry and Ottoman poetry as two separate phenomena, it were more correct to look upon the latter as a branch than as an imitation of the former; but the more philosophical view is that which regards them both, along with the other poetries that have been mentioned, as together forming a single manifestation of the activity of the human mind.

That Ottoman Poetry would have offered a more interesting field of study had it adequately reflected the Turkish genius need not be questioned; but this does not alter the fact that those who appreciate the poetry of Persia should find pleasure in that of the Turks also, seeing that the two are in reality one. And, moreover, that portion of what I have called West-Asian poetry which is written in the Ottoman language is, if we except some three or four of the greatest Persian masterpieces, on the whole quite equal in merit to that portion composed in the Persian tongue.

There is another matter, and one which has to do with my own share in the work, that has proved a stumbling-block to certain of my critics, namely, the presence of archaic words and phrases in my translations from the medieval Turkish poets. These reviewers seem to suppose that my first object in making those translations was to write pleasing English verses. I imagined that I had made it sufficiently clear that my object was not such, but was to present a rendering which should give as accurate an idea as possible of the characteristics and peculiarities of the original. As I stated in many places in the volume, this poetry is marked by affectation, pedantry, and artificiality; I therefore sought to transfer something of these qualities to the translations, and for this purpose had recourse to the obsolete phraseology
in question. Moreover I have been unable to devise any better way in which to suggest the greater or less degree of verbal obscurity and artifice that distinguishes one poet from another than the more or less free use of such terms in translation.

Until we reach the Modern School late in the nineteenth century, all Ottoman Poetry is masked by this 'preciosity;' it has always appeared strange, unnatural, remote to the non-literary Turk, and to render it into the current language of English poetry would be to give an altogether false idea both of the poetry itself and of the effect it produces and always has produced upon the minds of ordinary men.

As one of the ablest of my reviewers has pointed out with singular felicity, in order to realize how the Ottoman literary language stands with regard to the speech of everyday life, we have but to imagine what would have been the relationship of the language of English poetry to that which we ourselves speak, had all our poets from the days of Spenser persisted in writing in the artificial idiom of the 'Faerie Queene.' What actually happened among the Turks was the precise parallel to this; so everyone may judge for himself as to the adequacy of a translation into the ordinary language of to-day.

E. J. W. Gibb.

15, Chepstow Villas, London, W.

1 In the Pall Mall Gazette, 5 Dec. 1900 (1st. edition).
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THE SECOND PERIOD.

A. D. 1450 — A. D. 1600.
[The authorities for the earlier portion of the Second Period — that dealt with in the present Volume — are the same as those for the First Period. Since the issue of the First Volume I have succeeded in obtaining MSS. of the Tezkires of Schî Bey and Esrâr Dede. As stated in vol. 1, p. 139, the former of these is the oldest of all the Ottoman Tezkires. It was composed in 945 (1538—9), and is therefore eight years earlier than Latiff’s. Schî, who calls his work by the special title of Hesht Bihisht or ‘The Eight Paradises’, has not arranged the poets alphabetically like his successors, but has divided his book into eight chapters which he calls Tabaqât or ‘Stages’. The first of these is devoted to the praises of Suleymân I who occupied the throne at the time; the second deals with the other members of the Imperial house who wrote verses; the third with the poet vizirs and emirs; the fourth with the poets among the ‚ulema; the fifth with poets belonging to all other classes, concerning whom the author knew only by report, i.e. who were dead before his time; the sixth with poets whom he had known in his youth, of whom some were dead, some still alive, when he wrote; the seventh with poets who were his own contemporaries; and the eighth with the poets of the younger generation. Esrâr Dede, as stated in vol. 1, p. 422. n. 2, is the special biographer of the poets who belonged to the Mevlevî dervish-order. He wrote as late as 1211 (1796—7); but none of the poets mentioned in his Tezkire figure in the present Volume.]

1 The reason for this designation will appear from what is said in Vol. 1, p. 36.
CHAPTER I.

THE CHARACTER OF THE POETRY OF THE SECOND PERIOD.

The century and a half extending between the years 1450 and 1600 — what we have called the Second Period in the History of Ottoman Poetry — witnessed the rise and triumph of that wonderful movement known as the Renaissance which revolutionised the culture of Western Europe. But, as we saw in the last chapter, no ripple of this great upheaval, which changed the whole current of intellectual and moral life in the West, reached the shores of Islam. East and West, which hitherto had followed the same road, now parted company; the West struck off at a right angle, the East continued on the old path. And so while the European of the close of the sixteenth century was intellectually and morally a very different man from his fathers of the fourteenth, the Turk of 1600 was in those respects to all intents and purposes the same as had been his ancestors of the days of Osmán, and, for the matter of that, the same as are to be his children for two hundred years to come.

The poetry of the Second Period is therefore entirely medieval, neither more so nor less than that of the age preceding or that of the age following. Consequently the parallelism that has hitherto prevailed between Eastern and Western poetry now comes to an end; for the first few
years, before the genius of the Renaissance has entirely superseded the medieval spirit in the West, the resemblance indeed continues, but it quickly fades, and before the end of the fifteenth century disappears altogether.

But while the spirit that inspires Ottoman poetry remains unchanged and the ideals of the poets continue essentially the same, the new age is marked by many modifications. Thus the provincialism of the former time has passed away. The Second Period finds the several members of the Turkish family in Western Asia once more united under a single flag. Constantinople has been won, a worthy metropolis for the reborn nation; and the West-Turkish race is ready to set forth on its career of conquest. And it is to the Ottoman that the Turks owe this; it is the Ottoman who has gathered together the shattered fragments of the Seljük’s empire, and welded them into a nation which shall ride in triumph from Hungary to Arabia and from Persia to Morocco. And by virtue of the great deeds he has done, the Ottoman is paramount in the West-Turkish world; not indeed in the narrow exclusive sense of reserving for himself the high offices of the state — for these, except the highest, are open to all — but in the better sense of extending his name, with all the prestige surrounding it and all the privilege it confers, to every individual in the nation he has created. And so the Turk of Kütáltiya or of Qonya no longer calls himself a Germiyánli or a Qaramánli, but is fain to style himself an Ottoman. Similarly, when he writes a poem or a book, he no longer makes use of the dialect of Germiyán or Qaramán, but writes as far as he may in that of the ‘Osmánli, which is now the language of the court and capital of the great nation to which he is privileged to belong. Thus it comes about that the works of the Second and following Periods are, with but few exceptions, all written in one
dialect, that of the ʻOsmánlı. And this is the reason why we have said that the beginning of the Second Period is the true starting-point of Ottoman poetry properly so-called. 1

But it is not only in matters political and dialectic that there has been a change; a seeming transformation has occurred in the realms of poetry. When we reach the Second Period we enter into an ideal world. The voices of theologian and schoolman are silent, and in their stead we hear the lover's sigh and the nightingale's lament. The poets seem to move in an enchanted land full of blooming roses and singing birds and beauties fair beyond all telling. And we too, when we enter this fairyland, seem to pass beneath the influence of some magic spell. We wander on as in a dream, knowing not whether the lovely forms that arise on every hand are realities or shadows. A radiant iridescent haze envelops all things, rendering them vague and uncertain, while it transfigures them. For we are in the realm between heaven and earth, where the Mystic Love has met the Human and joined hands, and the two have become one. And so it were vain to ask whether what we see is the sweet face of some mortal fair one or a flash from the Eternal Beauty, a glimpse of God's own Self.

Things are so because the work of this Period is the Ottoman counterpart of that produced at the culmination of the so-called classic age of Persia. After having leavened every branch of Persian literature, the purely mystical school, that of such writers as ʻAttár, Jelāl-ud-Dīn, and Sultán Veled, had passed away and been succeeded by another, where the mystic and the material, the supersensuous and the sensuous, were inextricably interwoven, and where almost every sentence was susceptible of a double interpretation — a literal and an allegoric. This school, which cultivated chiefly

lyric and romantic poetry, and which was distinguished by its love of artifice, reached its meridian in the latter half of the fifteenth century at the brilliant court of the scholarly and accomplished Sultan Huseyn Bayqara of Herat. Here its spirit and substance were gathered up and summarised in their manifold works by the two greatest men of letters of the day, the poet Jāmi and the statesman Mīr ʿAlī Shīr-i Newāʾi. As these two illustrious writers were the guiding stars of the Ottoman poets during the whole of the Second Period, it will be well to look for a moment at their work.

Jāmi, who was born in 817 (1414—5) and died in 898 (1492—3), may be said to represent in himself this last of the classic schools of Persian literature. Without perhaps adding much that is original, he presents in masterly fashion, in a long series of works, both in prose and poetry, all the erudition and culture of his age. Thus in his Bahāristān or ‘Spring-land’ we have a graceful and charming example of the didactic literature initiated by Saʿdī in the Gulistān or ‘Rose-land’ on which this later work is avowedly modelled. Then his three Diwāns of lyric verses bear witness to the supremacy of the ghazel, a supremacy first advanced by Khusraw of Dehli and soon afterwards assured by the genius of Hāfiz. But the work to which Jāmi most owes his fame, through the virtue of which pre-eminently he won his commanding influence over Ottoman literature, is the magnificent series of seven mesnevis — romantic, mystic, didactic — collectively called the Heft Awrang or ‘Seven Thrones’, the Persian name of the constellation known among us by the more homely designation of the Plough.

For a time Jāmi’s mesnevis consisted of but five poems, written in emulation of the famous Khamsa of Nizāmī. ¹ Of

¹ See vol. i, pp. 144—5 and n. 3 on the former.
these the first is the Tuhfet-ul-Ahrár or 'Gift for the Free' which was written in 886 (1481—2) and is a 'Response' to Nizámi's Makhzen-ul-Esrár or 'Treasury of Secrets', like which it consists of a number of chapters each treating from a mystic standpoint some religious or ethical question, and each divided into two parts, in the first of which the lesson is inculcated while in the second it is driven home by some apposite story or fable. The next poem of the series, the Subhat-ul-Ebrár or 'Rosary of the Just', is very similar to the preceding both in purpose and in construction, but deals rather more with questions of practical conduct and less with purely abstract or speculative matters. The third poem is universally recognised as Jámí's masterpiece. It is the ancient romance of Joseph and Zuleykha which had been already sung by Firdawsí and others among the poets of old time, but was now presented radiant in all the splendours of the noontide of Persian rhetoric, and sublimated by the all-pervading presence of a sweet and lofty mysticism. Here, focussed in this book, as in no other single work, are the distinctive tendencies, aims, and methods of the poet's school; and so this Joseph and Zuleykha of Jámí came to be regarded throughout the Second Period of Ottoman poetry as being beyond all other works the standard alike of literary taste and style and of the altitude of the poet-mind. It was written in 888 (1483—4). The fourth poem is likewise a romance, the subject being the loves of Leylí and Mejnún. The story was familiar to all, being the theme of one of the best known and most popular of Nizámi's mesnevis; but Jámí took many liberties with it, so that the tale as told by him, besides being more manifestly an allegory, differs considerably from the simpler narrative of the earlier poet. It was composed in 889 (1484—5). The fifth poem, which

1 See vol. i, p. 100.
is the Iskender-Náme or ‘Book of Alexander’ — it is also called the Khired-Náme-i Iskender or ‘Alexander’s Book of Wisdom’, — resembles Nizámí’s work similarly entitled in little beyond the name. Here all the marvellous adventures of the great conqueror are ignored, and in their place we have lengthy philosophical discussions between him and the Grecian sages. These five poems formed the original Khamsa, to which were added subsequently two others, which thus changed the Quintet into the Septet of the Seven Thrones. The first of these additional mesnevis is an allegoric romance on the loves of Selámán and Ebsál; the second is a didactic work somewhat in the manner of the first two members of the Khamsa, and bears the title of Silsilet-uz-Zeheb or ‘The Chain of Gold’.

‘Alí Shír, who was the vezir and greatest friend of Sultan Huseyn Bayqará, and who died at Herat in 906 (1500—1), gained for himself a lasting renown in literature under his pen-name of Newá?i. Although he wrote much and well in the Persian language, his best and most important works are in the East-Turkish dialect known as Jaghatay. It has been claimed for Newá?i, and perhaps justly, that he is the first great poet who wrote in the Turkish language. At all events it is certain that notwithstanding the difference of their dialects, he was for long looked upon as a model by the Ottoman poets. Indeed, were it necessary to distinguish some single incident as definitively marking the establishment of the Second Period of Ottoman poetry, we should point to the publication of Ahmed Pasha’s ghazels modelled on the poems sent to Constantinople by this illustrious contemporary. Newá?i has four Diwáns of lyric poems in Jaghatay Turkish, besides several mesnevis, one of which has for subject the loves of Khusrév and Shirín, another the tale of Leylí and Mejnún, while a third deals with the adventures
of Alexander. Of his numerous prose works in the same language, that which most affected Ottoman literature is his Tezkire or ‘Lives of the Poets’; for this is the book which, along with a chapter in Jamī’s Bahārīstān, inspired Schī and Latīfī to write their memoirs of the poets of Rūm.

These two great poets, of whom the one wrote chiefly in Persian, the other chiefly in Jaghatay Turkish, well represent the brilliant throng of scholars who graced the Perso-Tartar court of Huseyn Bayqara, and by their presence shed upon it such lustre that the memory of it lingers for centuries in Ottoman verse as that of the fairest realisation of the poets’ golden age. The characteristics of the school thus centred at Herāt, this school which is the fruit and consummation of three centuries of Persian culture, have been already indicated more than once. Externally its most salient feature is its art, an art carried to the highest point of elaboration, but too often marred by an excessive use of rhetoric. The passion for rhetorical display is universal, and at times leads astray even the greatest masters, while it is constantly involving the lesser writers in disaster. The soul of the school is the Sūfī mysticism. But while mysticism underlies and inspires everything, it is rarely advanced boldly and without disguise as was the case in earlies times. It is almost always presented allegorically; and here we have the second distinctive characteristic of the school, — the tendency to reduce everything to allegory. This is the cause of our so seldom being able to be sure whether these poets and their Ottoman followers are really speaking of the material tangible things they mention or of quite other things whereof these are types. And such was their deliberate intention; they meant that each student should interpret their verses for himself, that each reader should find there just what he was fitted to find.
While this allegorising spirit permeates more or less subtly almost all the lyric poetry, it shows itself most clearly in the mesnevis. The tales of Joseph and Zelikhā, of Leylí and Mejnūn, of Khusrev and Shīrīn, and so on, had originally been told simply as stories, historical or fictitious. But now the story is no longer in itself the end, it is but a parable whereby to teach the great truths in which the poet lives and breathes. The lovelorn Zelikhā and the passion-frenzied Mejnūn have faded to shadows of their old selves and are become types of the human soul lost to care of earthly name and fame, beside itself with the all-consuming desire of reunion with the Beloved God.

More openly and unreservedly yet does this same spirit manifests itself in another class of mesnevi poems, the special invention of this school. In these the nominal subject is no longer a familiar story of the olden time. The essentially allegoric nature of the poem stands at once revealed in the title; a romance bearing such a name as ‘Rose and Nightingale’, or ‘Ball and Bandy’, or — clearer still — ‘Beauty and Heart’, or ‘Behold and Beholder’, must infallibly be an allegory. So while the Rose and the Nightingale, the Ball and the Bandy, or whatever be the conventionally associated objects that give the keynote, are here personified as a pair of human lovers and pass through a series of adventures suggested by the nature and usual conditions of the nominal objects, every character and incident is symbolic of some circumstance or experience of the soul of man in its mystic Love-quest.

The Ottoman poetry of this Period, being neither more nor less than a branch of this Persian school, will therefore display in a far more marked degree than that of the First the characteristics sketched in the opening chapter of this History. We there learned that prominent among the qualities we must look for in work produced under such conditions
are subjectivity, artificialness, and conventionality, combined with an ever-increasing deftness of craftsmanship and brilliance of artistry.

The extreme subjectivity which characterises so much of the Ottoman poetry of the Second Period is partly the cause and partly the result of that blending of the mystic and the literal of which we have already spoken. Men whose thoughts were persistently engrossed by their own feelings and aspirations would naturally read their personal emotions into everything around them; and so when they came to deal with poetry would see in the Rose and Nightingale and other commonplaces of the art so many symbols, of which the precise meaning would for them vary with their own ever-varying moods. Thus these poets of the Second Period seem never able to get away from themselves; they see their own emotions reflected in every object that meets their gaze, and very often they see nothing else.

Artificiality is the inevitable concomitant of an over-ardent pursuit of rhetoric; and as the pursuit of rhetoric was the chief technical end of this school, we must be prepared not only for the almost complete absence of spontaneity, but for the wellnigh universal cultivation of every variety of affectation. This all-absorbing passion for rhetoric was the most fatal pitfall on the path of these old poets; and many an otherwise sublime passage is degraded by the obstruction of some infantile conceit, and many a verse beautiful in all else, disfigured by the presence of some extravagant simile or grotesque metaphor. Yet all this, as I have said before, does not necessarily affect the sincerity of the writer; no man could be more deeply in earnest than Fuzûlî, yet no poet, even in those days, was more curious in the search after far-fetched fancies.

The conventionality of the Ottoman poetry of this Period
is of course referable in the first instance to the conventionality of the Persian work on which it was moulded. It was moreover an almost necessary consequence when every one was working from the same models. This is very clearly shown in the extraordinary similarity which exists between the verses of a vast number of the minor poets. It is quite exceptional to find such writers putting any of their own individuality, any of their own personal feelings or experiences, into their verses; questions of artistic skill or technical ability apart, the work of any one of those men might almost equally be that of any other. They said only what their models had said, and that only in the way the example of those models had authorised. Without precedent, without warrant, they did nothing. With the greater poets the case was of course otherwise; yet as a class the Turkish poets of old times were extraordinarily timid in the matter of introducing on their own responsibility anything new into their craft. They were not averse to changes as such, for they readily adopted the innovations which the poets of Persia brought in from time to time; but with comparatively few exceptions, they either mistrusted their own ability or lacked the necessary creative power, or else their native loyalty to tradition was so strong as to make anything in the way of unauthorised alteration appear sacrilege in their eyes.

The conventionality of the school displays itself further in a matter to which allusion was made in the opening chapter. This is the circumstance that the presence in a poem of words or phrases belonging to the terminology of the mystics is no longer sufficient evidence that the writer was what Veled or Nesimi would have called a 'Lover.' It is true that the minds of most educated and thinking men were more or less imbued with the Sufi philosophy; but this, if confessed at all, was generally presented as ancillary
to the Muhammedan faith, into which by some process of mental adjustment it was made to fit. And so from this time onwards many poets begin to make use of Sufistic terms, not indeed vainly or without sincerity, but with as keen an eye to their artistic value as to their moral or intellectual significance.

For reasons already given it is impossible to describe in any adequate or satisfactory manner that verbal art the elaboration and perfecting of which was the real goal of this school. Perhaps some idea at once true and satisfying of its marvellous grace and subtle harmony, of its fantastic ingenuities and its stateliness of language, of the elusive beauty assumed by all things in that opalescent atmosphere, might be conveyed through a series of wonderful translations which, without sinking into either paraphrase or parody, would preserve both the spirit and the letter of the original. But to make such, if it be possible at all, is a feat far beyond the powers of the writer of this History; and so the translations from the great poets of this Period that appear in these pages must be looked upon as giving just so much notion of the splendour of their work as a collection of skeleton leaves would give of the glory of the summer woods.

This poetry is thus placed under a cruel disadvantage. Its art, the feature through which chiefly it sought to recommend itself, is of a nature which does not admit of any adequate reproduction. Not only is the evasive charm of diction and cadence wholly lost, not only are the cunning and suggestive allusions unintelligible save through the cumbersome and distracting medium of explanatory notes, but imagery which to an Eastern poet is both natural and beautiful often appears strained and unpleasing in an English

1 Vol. 1, pp. 31—2.
translation, while figures which in the original are only quaint or fantastic are at times grotesque or even revolting when presented in another language. And so, while most of what is beautiful in the original disappears from the translation, what is strange and bizarre stands out in undue and over-accentuated relief. Again, it is scarcely practicable to illustrate the development of this poetry through a series of translations, as the subject-matter remains always the same, the change being only in points of style or technique. To suggest this at all, the renderings would have to be made in English the quality of which passed in a gradually ascending scale from the most rugged to the most refined.

While the condition of Ottoman poetry throughout the century and a half that lies between the rise of Ahmed Pasha and the death of Baqī was broadly speaking such as has been described, even during this Second Period when the genius of Persia was thus lording it on every hand, the Turkish spirit was not left altogether without witness. When early in the sixteenth century the poet Mesihī flung aside his Persian books and wrote his playful verses on the young beauties he saw in Adrianople, the native spirit stirred and there arose a little wave of laughter which rippled on through the centuries. For this poet sang — first of Ottomans — in true Turkish fashion, not of metaphysics, but of actualities; not of things he had read about, but of things he had seen; neither did he seek to dazzle his readers by the brilliance of his rhetoric or the subtleties of his fancy, his object was to amuse himself and them, to make the smiles play round his lips and theirs. Such poetry as this must have been peculiarly distracting to the author's contemporaries and immediate successors; on the one hand its objectivity and humour must have appealed strongly to them as Turks, on the other they would be unable to find any authority for
such writing in the works of their Persian masters. But in many cases the temptation to follow a strain so much in harmony with their native impulses, perhaps at times a desire to outdo the originator in his own field, proved strong enough to overcome even the fetish of precedent; and many a grave and stately poet condescended to compose a ‘parallel’ to Mesíhí’s little comedy. In this way the Shehr-Engíz or ‘City Thriller’ — as from the title of Mesíhí’s original poem all such works were called — came to be a recognised variety of poem in the Second Period, — the one and only variety of poem for the prototype of which we should search the literature of Persia in vain.

Up till now the predominant poetical form has been the mesnevi. Except Nesímí no poet of distinction has written wholly or even chiefly in lyric verse. The ranks of the poets, moreover, have been somewhat slender. In both these matters there is now a revolution. A great burst of lyric poetry ushers in the Second Period, a mighty chorus rises on every side; the passion for writing poetry flashes through all classes of society, sultans and princes, vezirs and muftis, merchants and artisans, dervishes in their convents and ladies in their harems, one and all lift up their voices and sing ghazels or indite qasídas. It is as though some spell has been cast upon it, and the whole nation is seized by an irresistible impulse to burst forth into song. As we advance, the multitude of poems of every description becomes absolutely bewildering; we seem to find ourselves in a vast plain thickly sown as far as the eye can reach with gorgeous exotic flowers. The flood-gates have been opened; and from this time forth the stream of lyric poetry rolls on continuously, and though its course may from time to time be changed, its force and volume are never lessened.

Like most similar movements in literature, this lyric out-
burst is not in reality so sudden as at first sight appears. For the last fifty years a good deal of ghazel and qasida writing had been going on. This, it is true, had for the most part been confined to the less prominent and less gifted members of the Turkish literary world; but none the less the work of these men had sufficed to familiarise the people with the appearance and the character of the lyric forms. The adoption of these forms by some author of sufficient literary talent and reputation was alone required to establish them as the most popular of poetic modes of expression. And so no sooner were the qasida and ghazel taken up and cultivated by Ahmed Pasha than lyric poets began to rise up all around in every city of the Empire. So long as a mesnevi of several thousand couplets was demanded as a proof of poetic talent, busy men whose lives were spent in the service of the state or in providing for their own daily needs would be debarred by want of leisure, if by nothing else, from entering the lists. But when it was discovered that it was not necessary to be a mystic devotee and write a huge versified treatise on philosophy or theology in order to take rank as a graceful and accomplished poet, that innate bias towards poetry, which seems to be a heritage of all Eastern peoples, began to assert itself. And although we are still some centuries off Râghib Pasha who said:

'An thine object be to make thy mark, one noble line 's enow',

men were beginning to feel that, provided it rang true, a ghazel of eight verses was in its way as good a proof of the writer's poetic talent as a mesnevi containing as many thousand couplets. This feeling, though perhaps unacknowledged to themselves, no doubt induced many who would otherwise have remained silent to give expression to the poetic tendencies of their nature.

اُکَر مَفْصُول اَئِرَمْه مِصرِع دِر جَمَّعَه كَذَٰلِكَ.
But while the Second Period is thus pre-eminently a period of lyric poetry, it is also the flowering-time of the romantic mesnevi. In the previous age the mesnevi, as a poetic form, had indeed occupied the first place, but this was as the vehicle of mystic or religious poetry. Yet even in the First Period, in what was essentially the age of the religious mesnevi, Ahmedí and Sheykhí had shown the way of the romantic, and now many a poet whose genius was not to be confined within the limits of a ghazel or a qasida eagerly strove to follow in their footsteps.

Similar in form to the romantic mesnevis, though as a rule far inferior to them in poetic merit, are the rhyming chronicles which likewise now begin to make their appearance. These are simply versified paraphrases of the national annals, and they are to the full as tedious and long-winded as such productions are wont to be.

The poets of the First Period had been for the most part private individuals, unconnected with the court or with any department of the state. A few among them, especially towards the close of the Period, had dedicated their work to the reigning Sultan; but none of the greater writers, with the one exception of Ahmedí, had written deliberately for the court, or been brought into immediate and lasting relationship with a royal patron. A great change now occurs in the connection that springs up between the court and poetry. It becomes the rule for the Sultans, the Imperial Princes, and the great officials to take a lively interest in the poetic art, to encourage and reward its practitioners, even to write verses themselves. For a man of literary ability there is now no better introduction to the notice of the great than a skilfully composed qasida or ghazel; and so we find that from this time forward nearly all the greater poets are at least nominally either court functionaries or
government officials of one class or another. When a clever young poet was brought under the notice of a vezir or other grandee, it was almost a point of honour with the great man to find him some berth where he would be provided with a competence and yet have leisure to cultivate his talent.

But not unfrequently the poet was ambitious of social promotion, and indisposed to settle down permanently as an obscure petty official. In this case it was necessary for him to cultivate the society of the great, and what he required there was not birth — that goes for little or nothing in democratic Islam, — but charm of manner and ready wit. He had to be a delightful companion, an excellent conversationalist, possessed of considerable learning, and quick-witted to avail himself of any incident or chance that gave opening for a sally or repartee. As the Persian, Nizámi-i 'Arúzí, himself a court-poet, says, speaking of the qualities needful to success in such a career: 'The poet must be of tender temperament, profound in thought, sound in genius, clear of vision, quick of insight. He must be well versed in many divers sciences, and quick to extract what is best from his environment; for as poetry is of advantage in every science, so is every science of advantage in poetry. And the poet must be of pleasing conversation in social gatherings, and of cheerful countenance on festive occasions'. Many of the anecdotes handed down concerning the Ottoman poets of the second and following Periods will show how true to life is Nizámi's portrait.

During the century and a half which forms the Second Period the Ottoman Empire reached the zenith of its power. This was owing, among other reasons, to the fact that the

1 See Mr. E. G. Browne's translation of the Chahár Maqāla or 'Four Discourses', p. 49. Luzac & Co. 1899.
institutions of that Empire were then fully organised, and the laws regulating them rigorously observed. When Mehemmed II had crowned his predecessors' work by the capture of Constantinople and the incorporation of Qaramán and Qizil-Ahmedli, he addressed himself to another task and thoroughly organised every department, civil, military, and legal, of the state. Every detail concerning every branch of these is laid down in his Qánún-Náme or 'Book of Laws'; and the system of administration therein elaborated is in perfect harmony with the genius of the Turkish people, and admirably adapted to the requirements of the time. In the following century Suleymán I re-edited the Qánún-Náme, introducing certain changes and many modifications which the greatly increased extent of the Empire and other reasons had rendered necessary.

Till nearly the beginning of the seventeenth century the laws laid down by these two Sultans were strictly carried out, with the result that the ʿulemá were almost always men of real learning, and the vezirs and other functionaries, officers of approved worth. In consequence of this, Turkey, during this century and a half, was one of the greatest powers on the earth.
CHAPTER II.

THE CONQUEROR AND HIS COURT.

"Verily thou shalt conquer Constantinople: happy the Prince and happy the Army who shall effect this conquest."

These words, said to have been uttered by the Prophet himself, shine, blazoned in letters of gold, on the front of the great mosque of St. Sophia, the cathedral-mosque of the Imperial City. The youthful Sultan Mehemed — he was only twenty-two years of age when in 855 (1451) he succeeded his father Murád II — was scarce established on the throne ere he marched forth to win for himself and his people the benediction thus promised by the Apostle, and to earn that surname of 'The Conqueror' which he has ever since borne among his countrymen. In 857 (1453) Constantinople fell before the Turkish hosts; and even as she fell, she rose phoenix-like the heart and centre of a power mightier than the Byzantine, and entered upon a new stage in her checkered history, as the metropolis of the Ottoman Empire. By the capture of this famous city not only was the Turkish nation provided with a capital befitting the dignity and importance to which it had now attained, but the Empire itself was consolidated by the disappearance of the foreign state which

1 Fáth or Ebu'l-Feth.
had hitherto intervened between its Asiatic and European provinces.

With the conquest of Qaramán and of Qizil-Ahmedli, which followed the capture of Constantinople, the last outstanding Kingdoms of the Decarchy passed away; and by their elimination as independent states all the Turkish peoples of Asia Minor were finally re-united under a single government. It was thus reserved for Mehemmed the Conqueror to place the coping-stone on the work of his predecessors. He finished this great work, the work of making the West-Turkish nation, in the early years of his reign; what he did later, and what his successors for many a generation did, was but to add foreign provinces to the Ottoman Empire.

But those foreign wars of Mehemmed do not concern us here; what we have to consider is his attitude towards the development of culture among his people. Several of his ancestors had fostered learning and encouraged progress, but none had done so with the munificence and care displayed by this King whose surname of ‘the Sire of good Works’ is as widely known as his title of ‘the Conqueror’. In the spacious court before the great mosque which he built in Constantinople he erected eight medreses or colleges, which were reckoned as a single university and called the ‘Court of the Eight Colleges’, or more usually, ‘the Eight Colleges’, or simply ‘the Court’ or ‘the Eight’. Behind those colleges were raised residential buildings where nearly two hundred poor students received free board and lodging. This institution at once became, and for long continued to be, the heart of the intellectual life of Turkey.

1 Ebu-l-Khayrát or Ebu-l-Hasenát.
2 Sahn-i Medáris-i Semániye. For the value of the university degree, called from this institution Sahn Muderrisi ‘Court Principal’, or Semániye Muderrisi ‘Eight Principal’, see Appendix A.
3 See Appendix A.
Mehemmed, moreover, first definitely organised the hierarchy of the learned profession, the members of which are collectively known as the ʻulemá. This was probably his greatest service to the cause of letters; for this body, besides filling all the religious and legal offices in the Empire, controlled all matters connected with education and every form of learning. It formed what might be described as the learned world of Turkey; and most men whose tastes lay towards literature were enrolled in its ranks, the only notable exceptions being the members of the dervish-orders. Consequently, a large proportion of the poets whom we shall meet in this and the following Periods were in one way or another connected with this corps.

Mehemmed II organized likewise the civil and military administration. As constituted by him, the Divan, what we should now call the Cabinet, consisted of nine members, namely, four Vezirs, the chief of whom was called the Grand Vezir and was President of the Divan and Prime Minister of the Empire, two Qázi-ʻAskers, who controlled all matters connected with the ʻulemá, the one in Rumelia, the other

1 In view of the importance, of the part played by the ʻulemá in the history of Ottoman literature, I have given a sketch of the organisation of that body in Appendix A.

2 The word 'Diwan' ought in strictness to be transliterated 'Diwán', as it is spelt and pronounced exactly in the same way as the name given to the collected lyric works of a poet, but for the sake of distinction I shall use the popular form 'Divan' where the Ottoman cabinet is meant, and reserve the more correct 'Diwán' for the other and more technical sense of the word.

3 This title, which literally means 'Army-Judge', is strictly قاضي عسكر Qázi-ul-ʻAsker, but it is generally written and pronounced قاضي عسكر Qázi-ʻAsker; sometimes it is pronounced Qádi-ʻAsker (Cadiasker), or, vulgarly, Qaz-ʻAsker. At first there was only one, and he was supreme head of all the ʻulemá in the Empire; but towards the close of his reign, Mehemmed II created a second to look after the Asiatic affairs, while the first, who remained head of the profession, confined his attention to the European. See Appendix A.
in Anatolia; two Defterdârs or Treasurers; and one Nishânji \(^1\) or Chancellor. \(^2\)

This Sultan was very partial to the society of poets and literary men in general, and several of his vezirs were men of considerable distinction in letters. Notable among these were the Pashas Ahmed, Mahmûd, and Sinân. The first of this trio, Ahmed Pasha, is so prominent a figure in the history of Ottoman poetry that it will be necessary to speak of him at some length in another place. Mahmûd Pasha, a Croat by birth, who, after having been twice Grand Vezir, was executed in 877 (1472), the victim of official jealousy, wrote ghazels of some merit, under the pen-name of ^Adî. \(^3\) Sinân Pasha was not a poet, but he composed the first artistic work in Ottoman prose. This, the Tazarruf^ât-Nâme or 'Book of Humiliation', as it is called, consists of a series of religious and moral reflections written in a singularly clear and elevated style, though quite in the Persian manner. \(^4\)

The Sultan was, as I have said, munificent in his patronage of letters. When at his invitation the learned ^Ali Qûshji \(^5\)

---

1 The word Nishânji strictly means that person who inscribes the Taghра or Cypher of the Sultan over official documents; in practice the official so called discharged the duties of a chancellor.

2 This continued to be the constitution of the Divan till the time of Suleymán I, who added several new members to the original nine.

3 Von Hammer, following Sehî and Latîfî, writes Adeni (for ^Adî), but Ashiq and Hasan have ^Adî.

4 Printed by Ebn-z-Ziyâ Tevfiq in A.H. 1305 (A.D. 1887—8).

5 ^Ali Qûshji, i.e. ^Ali the Fowler, was an illustrious philosopher of Samarqand. He assisted the King of that country, the celebrated Ulugh Beg, in the compilation of his well-known astronomical tables. On his patron's death he set out for Mekka; but when he reached Tebriz, he was induced by the White Sheep King, Úzán Hasan, to go on a mission to the Ottoman court. He was so gratified by his reception there that he promised Sultan Mehemmed to return after he had fulfilled his task. He did so, and it was to cover the expenses of the return journey that Mehemmed sent him the money mentioned in the text. He settled in Constantinople, where he was treated with every honour, and where he died in 879 (1474). He wrote several works on astronomy and other sciences. He owed his surname to the fact that his father was falconer to Ulugh Beg.
came from Persia to Constantinople he sent him 1,000 aspers for each stage of the journey, that he might travel in all comfort. He sent 1,000 florins every year to the great Persian poet Jámi. He pensioned thirty Turkish poets who did not care to accept any official position, giving to each 1,000 aspers a month. It afterwards became the custom for the Sultans to pension a certain number of poets; but it was Mehemmed II who did so first.

The artistic sympathies of this Sultan were by no means confined to literature. He was a great builder; and no sooner did he obtain possession of Constantinople than he began to beautify it with palaces and mosques. His most famous buildings are the great mosque with its eight colleges already mentioned, the mosque raised by the tomb of Eyyûb, the Companion of the Prophet, outside the city walls, whither to this day the Sultans go to be girt with the sword of Ûsmân — the analogous ceremony to our coronation —, and the great palace which he reared on that promontory which has ever since borne the name of Scaglio Point. This palace, which was begun by Mehemmed, was added to by many of his successors, and continued till the middle of the nineteenth century to be the principal residence of the Sultans. The space enclosed within its three miles of walls was for more than four hundred years the heart of the Ottoman Empire and has been the scene of many a strange and stirring incident.

1 At this time the asper was worth about two pence. See vol. 1, p. 262, n. 2.
2 The first Ottoman gold coins were struck by Mehemmed II in 883 (1478—9). The standard was the Venetian ducat; the value about 9 shillings sterling. Previously Venetian and other foreign coins had sufficed for Turkish currency. At first these coins seem to have been called simply alûm, i. e. 'gold-piece'; but the writers of the 9th and 10th centuries of the Hijre generally speak of them as filûrû, i. e. 'florin'. The Ottoman florin therefore was a gold coin of the approximate value of 9 shillings.
3 A description of the Scaglio, contributed by the writer of this History, will be found on pp. 267—292 of the volume on Turkey in the 'Story of the Nations' series.
Again, it is well known how Mehemmed, rising superior to the prejudices of his environment, prayed the Venetian Signiory to send to his court an artist skilled in portraiture, and how, when Gentile Bellini came to Constantinople in response to this request, he was received by the Sultan with gracious welcome, was admitted within the favoured circle of his familiar, and, when his work was done, was sent home to Venice covered with honours and laden with rich gifts. ¹

The Turkish writers, more especially Latifi, speak of the reign of Sultan Mehemmed as a kind of golden age. At no time and among no people, says this biographer, was learning so highly esteemed and was justice so universally practised. The Sultan himself took a personal interest in every student in his university; old men, survivors of the ʿulema of a former generation, told Latifi how Mehemmed used to keep a register in which were entered the attainments and the progress made by each individual, and how, whenever a vacancy occurred in the ranks of the judiciary or the college principals, he used to consult this register, and appoint that man whose record showed him best qualified for the post. And in those happy days judges and magistrates did not construe the Laws to suit their private interests, neither did they conceal the truth in the hope of favour or promotion; but even-handed justice was dealt to all, and when vezir or pasha happened to be party to a suit it was not the practice for the judges to say ‘My lord hath spoken the truth!’ Thus to Latifi did far-off fields look green; yet he himself lived when Turkey was in the noontide of her greatness, and when her throne was filled by one of the noblest and most gifted of her monarchs.

¹ For a detailed account of the relations between the Sultan and the painter, see ‘Gentile Bellini et Sultan Mohammed II’, par L. Thuasne, Paris, 1888.
Sultan Mehmed himself wrote verses; sufficient, according to 'Ashiq, to make a Diwán. From the scraps given as specimens of these by the biographers it is impossible to say more than that they appear to be neither better nor worse than the average lyric work of the time. It may be noted that this Sultan is the first Imperial poet to make use of a makhlas or pen-name; in his verses he calls himself 'Avni.

Mehmed II died on the 4th of the First Rebi' 886 (3rd May 1481), and was succeeded by his eldest son Bāyezīd II. But Bāyezīd was not allowed to enjoy the throne without a struggle. His younger brother, Prince Jem, a famous poet, whose romantic story will be sketched in another chapter, fought hard for a share in the inheritance, but in little more than a year was compelled to fly the country. Bāyezīd himself, Velí Sultán Bāyezīd or 'Sultan Bāyezīd the Saint', as he is often called, was a man of many amiable qualities, but without the energy that characterised his ancestors and immediate successors. He erected many buildings for religious and charitable purposes, prominent among which is the noble mosque that bears his name. He too, like his father, encouraged letters. He continued the yearly gift of 1,000 florins to Jāmī, and moreover sent an annual pension of 500 to the eminent Shirāzī philosopher and jurist Jelāl-ud-Dīn-i Dewānī.¹ He wrote verses, using for pen-name 'Adnī according to some, 'Adlī according to others;² but even less of his work than of his father's is quoted by the biographers.

¹ This Jelāl-ud-Dīn-i Dewānī, who died in 908 (1502—3), is the author of the well-known ethical work entitled Akhlāq-i Jelālī, an English version of which, by W. F. Thompson, was published in 1839.

² Schī and Latīfī say 'Adlī; but 'Ashiq, who is generally the most accurate, as he is the most thorough, of the early biographers, says 'Adnī. There is some confusion in the authorities as to which of the pen-names 'Adlī and 'Adnī was used by Mahmūd Pasha, and which by Bāyezīd II. I am inclined to believe that 'Ashiq is correct in his attribution of the former ('Adlī) to the Pasha, and of the second ('Adnī) to the Sultan.
On the 8th Safer 918 (25\textsuperscript{th} April 1512) Bäyezid II resigned in favour of his son Selim I; and he died on the 16\textsuperscript{th} of the First Rebi\textsuperscript{c} (26\textsuperscript{th} May) of the same year, while on his way to Demitoka, his native town, whither he was going to end his days.

The most prominent patron of literature at this time was, however, not the saintly Sultan, but the famous legist Mu'eyyed-záde "Abd-ur-Rahmán Chelebi. In accordance with a usage of those days by which the Imperial Princes were early trained to the responsibilities of rule, through being sent out while yet mere children as nominal governors of some province, Bäyezid had in his boyhood been appointed to the government of Amásiya, a position which he continued to hold till called to succeed his father on the throne. While there he had made the acquaintance of this Mu'eyyed-záde, who was nine years his junior. The two young men soon became firm friends, and the influence to which Mu'eyyed-záde attained with the Prince grew so great as to rouse the jealousy of certain ill-disposed persons, who in consequence denounced him to the Sultan. Mehemmed therefore sent a despatch to Amásiya in which he ordered Mu'eyyed-záde to be put to death; but Bäyezid, who had got a hint of what to expect before the despatch had time to arrive, sent his friend out of the country amply provided with funds and all necessaries for his journey. This took place in 881 (1476—7), when Mu'eyyed-záde was just twenty years of age. The fugitive went first to Aleppo, which was then included in the dominions of the Memlúk Sultans of Egypt, where he studied for a short time; but not finding there any teacher to his mind, he made his way to Shiráz in Persia, and there he remained seven years studying under that Jelál-ud-Dín-i Dewání to whom Bäyezid afterwards

\footnote{Bäyezid was born in 851 (1447—8), and Mu'eyyed-záde in 860 (1456).}
sent his yearly gift of 500 florins. On hearing of the accession of Bâyêzîd, Mu'eyyed-zâde returned to Turkey in 888 (1483), going first to his native town of Amâsiya, whence, after a stay of forty days, he proceeded to Constantinople. Here his learning filled all with admiration, and Sultan Bâyêzîd appointed him Muderris or Principal, of the Qalander-Khâne medrese or college in that city. In 891 (1486) he married a daughter of the famous legist Muslih-ud-Dîn-i Qastalânî, and on his wedding day he was named by the Sultan a Principal of the Eight Colleges. He held this position for eight years till in 899 (1494) he was promoted to be Cadi or Judge of Adrianople. In 907 (1501) he was Qâzî-Asker of Anatolia, and in 910 (1504—5) Qâzî-Asker of Rumelia, and therefore head of the 'ulemâ. He remained in this lofty position till 917 (1511), when he was deposed through a Janissary revolt, in the course of which his house was sacked. On this he went into retirement; but soon after the accession of Selîm I in 918 (1512), he was made Cadi of Qara Ferya, and then, in 919 (1513), restored to the Rumelian Qâzî-Askerate. He accompanied Selîm on the campaign which culminated in the overthrow of Shâh Isma'il of Persia on the battle-field of Chaldiran; but on the homeward journey his reason showed signs of giving way, and so he was then and there, in 920 (1514), deposed from his official position.

1 For the functions of a Muderris and for the term as a university degree and grade in the hierarchy of the 'ulemâ, see Appendix A.

2 Mevlânâ Muslih-ud-Dîn-i Qastalânî, or Mevlânâ Kestelli, as he was commonly called, was one of the most distinguished of the 'ulemâ of this time. He was one of the eight original Muderrises appointed by Sultan Mehemed to his 'Eight Colleges' (see Appendix A). It was during his tenure of the office that the Qâzî-Askerate was divided into two, he being the last Qâzî-Asker of the whole Empire and the first Qâzî-Asker of Rumelia. He died in 921 (1495—6).

3 For the promotion implied by this and the other steps in the learned profession, see Appendix A.
After this he lived quietly in Constantinople, in receipt of a daily pension of 200 aspers, till his death, which occurred on the Night of Assignments 1 922 (1516).

Although Mu‘eyyed-záde wrote some professional works and, like most Orientals of education, tried his hand at poetry (which he composed under the pen-name of Khátemi), it is not as an author, but as a patron of authors, that he acquired celebrity. He was, moreover, as far as is known, the first among the Ottomans to form a private library. He was a great lover of books, and got together, we are told, as many as 7,000 bound volumes, an enormous collection for those days, when of course printing was unknown in the East.

Of the Princes and statesman whose names I have mentioned only Prince Jem and Ahmed Pasha won any real distinction as poets, and they and their works will be considered in the following chapters. The Díwán of Sultan Mehemmed, if it ever existed, seems to have disappeared; at any rate it is for the present inaccessible. With regard to the works of Mahmúd Pasha and Sultan Báyezíd there is some uncertainty. In 1308 (1891) there was published in Constantinople a little volume which purports to be the Díwán of Sultan Báyezíd II. The 124 ghazels contained in this volume are clearly works of an early period, and they are written by a poet who calls himself ‘Adlí. This, as we have seen, was according to some authorities the pen-name of Báyezíd II; and it is doubtless this circumstance, coupled with the antiquated language of the poems, that led the editor, Mehemmed Fu‘ád Bey, to attribute them to that Sultan. None the less, I believe this attribution to be mistaken, and am inclined to think that the poems in this volume are in reality the work, not of Sultan Báyezíd, but of Mahmúd Pasha, who also is

1 See vol. 1, p. 295, n. 4.
said to have used the pen-name of 'Adli. My reason for this opinion is that while none of the verses quoted by the biographers as being the work of that Sultan occur in the volume, one which is cited as being by Mahmūd Pasha does. It is this couplet:

'Pause a moment, Sphere, nor overthrow the palace of my heart;
For therein yon fairy-beauty's fantasy is guest e'en yet.'

Whoever this 'Adli may be, his ghazels are pretty, though without much originality or distinction, and very similar to the contemporary work of Ahmed Pasha.

Moreover, there is in my collection a manuscript of the diwān of a poet who styles himself 'Adni, and whose manner, language, and orthography show him to have written about the second half of the fifteenth century. I am disposed to believe that in this volume we may have the real Dīwān of Sultan Bāyezid. I am led to this belief firstly by the fact that no other poet named 'Adni is mentioned by the biographers, except an obscure dervish writer whose name occurs only in Esrār Dede’s special work on the Mevlevīs, and who, as he died sometime about the end of the seventeenth century, may safely be left out of sight; and secondly by the internal evidence furnished by the style and language as to the approximate date of the poems in question. I am withheld from definitely attributing this Dīwān to Bāyezid by the circumstance that the one couplet quoted by almost all the biogra-

١

٢

Ashiq Chelebi quotes this couplet twice in his Tezkire, once in his notice of 'Adli (i.e. Mahmūd Pasha), and again in his notice of Prince Jem, and in both places he attributes it to Mahmūd. In the second line he has دلده where the printed volume has آله, but this does not affect the sense of the verse.

Nothing like the specimens of this man’s work which are given by Esrār occurs in the MS.
phers as being that Sultan's work does not occur in it. This, however, does not prove anything; for not only are manuscripts often incomplete, but this particular volume is imperfect, breaking off before the chapter of ghazels is quite finished. Whatever may have followed is therefore lost. Now if the distich quoted by the biographers happens to be a detached couplet, and does not form the opening verse of a ghazel, it may very well have occurred in the series of such couplets, which would naturally follow the chapter of ghazels, and so may have been on one of the missing leaves. And further, while this couplet is absent from the manuscript as it stands, we have among the ghazels a poem with the same rhyme and the same rather unusual redif \(^1\) or 'rereword'. \(^2\) It may be that here, as has frequently happened, the poet originally wrote as the opening verse of his ghazel one of these two couplets, and afterwards rejected this in favour of the other which he composed later, or at any rate finally preferred, and that thus both obtained currency; it is in this way that many of the different readings often found for a single line or couplet originated. \(^3\) The poetry of this

---

\(^1\) For the meaning of this technical term see vol. i, p. 75.

\(^2\) This is the couplet given by Latifi, 'Ashiq, and Hasan as Sultan Bâyezid's:

\[\text{ئي سوار اسب نار اونن رکاب جانب بسن}
\]

\[\text{حسن میدانی سنکدر آیغه ملیانه بسن}\]

'O rider of the courser of disdain, set (thy foot) in the stirrup of the soul;
The lists of beauty are thine, set thy foot manfully'.

and this is the couplet I refer to as being in my MS:

\[\text{مست عشق ایت جام عشقی سقیمی بارانه بسن}
\]

\[\text{زم میدانی غفلت آیغه ملیانه بسن}\]

'Make (us) drunk with love, O cupbearer, set the cup of love \{friendlily.\}

'foot like a toper\{ before the topers\'.

\(^3\) It might of course be suggested that the Diwan in this MS. is really that of Mahmûd Pasha, and that those writers are correct who give 'Adnî as that poet's pen-name; but such a suggestion seems to be negatived by the
Adné, whether he be Sultan Bayezid, Mahmúd Pasha, or some other person altogether, is, as we should expect, marked by that curious combination of simplicity, even to banality, of ideas with an obviously forced and ill-concealed artificiality in style which characterizes all Ottoman lyric poetry till we come to Nejáti, and which is almost pathetic in its childlike naiveté. But Adné’s work must be allowed somewhat more of originality, or at least of individuality, than Adli’s, in that now and then it is lit up by flashes of insight which show that here the poet was not wholly swallowed up in the artificer.

The following are some of the fragments ascribed by the biographers to Sultan Mehemmed II.

This is given by Sehi and Latifi: —

Fragment of a Ghazel. [70]

Skinker, hand the wine, for ah! the tulip-land one day will fade.
Autumn-season will o’ertake us, spring and garden gay will fade.

Vain for grace and beauty grow not, O thou lovely one; be true;
For with no one hides it long time. — beauty’s fair array will fade.

The next is quoted by Ashiq: —

Fragment of a Ghazel. [71]

Bounden in thy tresses’ chain, my Liege, thou’st made me thrall to be!
O my God! I pray Thee, never from this thraldom set me free!

Slight of loved one, taunt of rival, fire of absence, ache of heart: —
Ah! for many and many a sorrow, God, hast Thou created me!

Hand in hand with bitter purpose me to whelm and burn have joined
Fire of bosom, flame of sighing, tear-flood of my weeping e’e.

fact that while one of the verses quoted by the biographers as being by Mahmúd occurs in the printed Diwan of Adli, none among them is to be found in this MS.

1 Fire and water (the latter represented here by the tear-flood), though naturally opposed to one another, make common cause against the lover.
Both Ṣ̣hīq and Hasan quote the following; so does Latifi who, however, attributes it to Sultan Bayezîd: —

Fragment of a Ghazel. [72]

Hacked to fragments my liver is by thy cruelty's poniard keen;
Slashed my patience's wede by the shears of my longing for thee and my teen.

He would make it the shrine whereunto he bowed, like the niche in the [Ka ba-fane, 2
Were the print of thy foot within thy ward by an angel of Heaven seen. 3

How should ye pour forth tears before her sun-face, O my eyne,
When all of your blood is gone, dried up by the beams of her visage sheen? 4

The following fragment is attributed by Schî, Latifi, and Hasan to Mahmûd Pasha: —

Fragment of a Ghazel. [73]

O'er the loved one's cheek whene'er I see her amber-scented hair,
'Lo!' methinks, 'a musky serpent lying in a garden fair!' 6

1 As we have seen before (vol. i, p. 294, n. 3), the liver was in former times regarded as the seat of passion.
2 Referring to the mihhrâb or prayer-niche towards which the worshippers in a mosque turn, mentioned in vol. i, p. 224, n. 1. The top of the mihhrâb is arched, and so its shape bears some rough resemblance to that of a footprint.
3 The 'ward', i. e. the dwelling-place, of the beloved is a kind of holy land to the lover.
4 In this verse there is an allusion to the notion mentioned in vol. i, p. 217, n. 1, that tears were distilled blood which issued from the eyes in weeping. Of course, there could be no tears if there were no blood, as that was the material whence they were derived. Now the poet here says that his very blood has been dried up by the brilliancy of his beloved's face, and consequently it is vain to expect that tears should spring up in his eyes, as they otherwise naturally would when he looked upon an object radiant as the sun.
5 'Amber-scented' i. e. ambergris-scented, the beloved's hair being always conceived as full of sweet fragrance.
6 The rosy cheek being the garden, the curling lock the serpent.
O thou moon-face, 'tis for this that o'er thy cheek the tresses coil, —
Through his lying in the sunlight, strong the serpent waxeth e'er. 1

Bloom and scent be like the rose hath stolen from thy tulip-check,
Therefore to the stake they bind and bear her through bazaar and square. 2

This poem is taken from the printed edition of 'Adli's Diwán; 3 it is the ghazel in which occurs the couplet quoted in the note on page 32: —

Ghazel. [74]

Haste thee not, O Doom, for grief 's the life within my breast e'en yet; 4
Yea, her glance's wound 's the balm to set my pain at rest e'en yet. 5

Pause a moment, Sphere, 6 nor overthrow the palace of my heart;
For therein yon fairy-beauty's fantasy is 7 guest e'en yet.

There is none may fight thine eyen, all do fly thy glance's glaive;
Though the scar of parting from thee 's buckler to my chest e'en yet. 8

1 i. e. it is well known that serpents grow stronger the more they bask in the sunlight; and that is the reason why thy serpent-curls coil about thy sun-bright cheeks, — they are thus more powerful to make lovers' hearts their prey.

2 Here we have an instance of the figure husn-i ta'īl or aetiology (vol. 1, p. 113): roses, tied to slips of wood, are carried about the public places for sale; but here the poet feigns that this is done to them by way of punishment for their having stolen what they possess of beauty and sweetness from his beloved's red cheek, the allusion being of course to the old custom of parading a criminal, bound to a stake in a cart, through the chief streets and market-places of a city. This performance was called Teshhir, and was sometimes carried out immediately before the culprit's execution.

3 It is no. 25, on p. 36.

4 i. e. O death, thou needest not to hasten if thou thinkest to grieve me, for my life itself is grief.

5 i. e. the wound dealt by her glance can alone assuage the pain of my heart which she has hurt.

6 For the Sphere as here conceived, see vol. 1, p. 44, n. 3.

7 The word 'fantasy' (Khayāl) is often used, as here, to denote the image impressed on the mind by an object of sense. This meaning comes from the fact that such image is preserved by or in the faculty called the 'Fantasy', (see vol. 1, p. 50).

8 Fretting and pining on account of separation from the beloved has caused
Every hair upon my body is an arrow shot by thee:
Think then what the host of arrows in my body prest e'en yet.

As my tears well forth they wash the blood thine arrows make to flow;
Look upon them, how with gory hues they are revest e'en yet.¹

From my sighing's smoke a kebab-scent doth rise because of this,—
That the liver in my body o'er grief's fire is drest e'en yet.²

Since their parting from yon Idol³ are the pupils of thine eyes,
Weeping, 'Adi, clad in mourning, yea, in black bedrest e'en yet.⁴

The two following ghazels are from the manuscript Diwán
of the poet who calls himself 'Adni, and who, as we have
seen, may be Sultan Bayezid II.

a sore to appear on the poet's chest: this sore, which by reason of its shape
and its position on the breast may be compared to a shield, is very highly
prized, seeing that it over its existence to the beloved. Yet even though protected
by so rare a buckler, the poet dare not face the sword of her glance; how
then should others, who have no such shield?

¹ Here the poet attributes the gory colour of his tears, not to the usual
cause, namely, excess of weeping compelling recourse to the raw material of
tears (vol. I, p. 217, n. 1.), but to the fact that as they course down from
his eyes they wash the wounds which, as he has said in the preceding
couplet, the arrows (glances) of the beloved have opened in every part of
his body.

² The cooking of kebabs is a common sight in all Eastern cities. Kebabs
are gobbets of meat, spitted on iron skewers and roasted over wood embers,
the skewers being frequently turned round to ensure the equal roasting of
every side of the meat. During the process of cooking, the meat gives out
a pleasant smell. When ready, the kebabs are served upon flat tough cakes,
called pide, sometimes with a garnish of chopped onions and parsley.

With us the comparison of a lover's heart to a piece of roast meat would
be, if not downright burlesque, at the very least, bizarre in the extreme: but
with the Eastern poet, who sees the whole world shot through and through
with symbolism, the case is very different. To him the familiar sight of those
lumps of flesh roasting over the red-hot embers presents an appropriate and
pathetic image of the heart or liver (the seat of passion) of the unhappy
lover burning with the fire of unrequited affection or of separation from his
loved one. And so we find this metaphor among the most frequent of the
common-places of Oriental poetry.

³ i. e. the beloved.

⁴ An instance of etiology (husn-i ta‘lil), see vol. I, p. 113.
Whiles it is that fickle Fortune love and troth to us-ward shows,
While it turns, and gives for every former boon a myriad woes.

Ne'er before had I that anguish known which I for love have borne;
Ah, the moon-faced beauties teach the lover things he little knows.

While forspent for love of her I toil aweary down the way,
Each at other wink the charmers, as 'twere saying, 'There he goes!'

Think not that this thwart-wise rushing Sphere ¹ gives leisure to be glad;
For in truth it works oppression, though it seeming joys bestows.

She mine own physician ² at one glance perceived and knew mine ill;
Surely she must e'en be Loqmán, such the remedies she strows. ³

If so be thou hast forgotten, learn from 'Adnî of Love's way;
Since 'tis practised guides direct him whoso doth the roadway lose.

Wheresoever doth the dearling make her roguish glances play,
Yonder wayward eyen cast her heart-sick lovers mid dismay.

Full of mischief-tricks is she, she makes her lover's heads to whirl;
Fair a juggler she who spinneth cups upon her finger aye. ⁴

When with ways so arch she danceth, quivereth the lover's soul;
Yea, a host of fallen-hearts would fling their lives for her away.

¹ The (ninth) sphere, whose rapid motion occasions the sudden changes in the relative positions of the stars, which according to the astrologers, are so intimately connected with the fortunes of humanity, is often described as 'thwart-wise rushing', because, firstly, it moves in a contrary direction to all the other spheres, and secondly, by its revolutions it thwarts the hopes and designs of men. See vol. i, p. 44 and n. 3.

² i. e. the beloved.

³ For Loqmán the Sage see vol. i, p. 389, n. 1. He is generally represented as having been a great physician; see the connection in which he is mentioned in the verse by Ummî in vol. i, p. 414.

⁴ [One of the words used for a juggler in Turkish is huqqa-báź, which means, literally 'playing with cups'. The lovers' heads are here compared to the cups or jars spun by the juggler's fingers. ED.]
So thou'rt wise, be not thou cheated by the demon-world's cajole;
Driving him from crown and throne, it made e'en Solomon to stray. ¹

Be not heedless, Adni, for one day the adverse-wind will rise,
Oman's Sea ² will rage and make thy being's barque to reel straightway.

¹ Solomon is constantly mentioned by the Oriental poets. He is the type of the ideal monarch. He is held to have been a prophet; he was perfect in all sciences; he understood the language of beasts and birds. The winds were subject to his command, and used to hear his carpet, on which stood his throne and all his hosts, whithersoever he would. Jinnís, demons, and fairies were under his control, and constrained to do his bidding. The source of his mighty power was his Seal, on which was graven the Most Great Name (see vol. 1, p. 379, n. 2), and it was by virtue of it that he was lord of creation. According to a well-known legend, a demon called Sakhr once obtained possession of this Seal by appearing in the shape of Solomon to Emine, one of that monarch's concubines, to whom he used to entrust it when he washed. Having received the Seal from her, Sakhr seated himself upon the throne and did what seemed good unto him. But so impious was his conduct that on the fortieth day the grand Vezir Asaph and some doctors of the Law determined (possibly in the hope of admonishing him) to read the scriptures in his presence. No sooner did the Word of God fall upon the demon's ear than he resumed his native form, and fled in haste to the sea-shore, where the Seal dropped from him. By the providence of God, the Seal was swallowed by a fish. When Solomon had been deprived of his throne, the light of prophethood had departed from him, and none had recognised him. So for forty days he had wandered about the country, begging alms. On the fortieth he entered the service of a fisherman who covenanted to give him two fishes as his daily wage. The fish that had swallowed the Seal was taken by the fisherman and given to Solomon, who thus recovered his Seal and with it his Kingdom. Sakhr was caught and imprisoned in a copper vessel which was then sealed with the wondrous Seal and cast into the Sea of Tiberias, there to remain till the Resurrection Day.

² The Sea of Oman, i. e. the Persian Gulf, was the greatest expanse of water familiar to the old Persians; hence it came to be conventionally used in poetry as the type of a mighty ocean.
CHAPTER III.

Ahmed Pasha and the Inauguration of the Second Period.

A large share of the honour of having inaugurated the Second Period of Ottoman poetry, that period during which the Ottoman poets looked for guidance to the literary stars of Herát, is due to Sultan Mehemmed the Conqueror's tutor and vezir Ahmed Pasha, whose name has been mentioned in the preceding chapter; for it was he who first studied and reproduced the methods of Mír ʿAlí Shír-i Newáʿí.

When the writings of Jámi were introduced into Turkey is not recorded; but as a portion of them was well-known to Sultan Mehemmed II, who carried on a correspondence with the illustrious Persian, they must have reached the West before those of Mír ʿAlí Shír, which, we are expressly told, were not brought to Turkey till the reign of Báyezíd II. The Ottoman poets were therefore doubtless familiar with many of the works of Jámi before they saw those of ʿAlí Shír; and as Ahmed Pasha was the most prominent among the Ottoman poets of his time, he can hardly fail to have been acquainted with some at least among the writings of the former master. All the same, these do not appear to have directly affected his work, probably because Ahmed was essentially a lyric poet, while those of Jámi's poems which were best-known in the West seem to have
been the mesnevis. Until he saw some of Newârî's ghazels, towards the end of his life, Ahmed's models, as we shall learn shortly, were rather the earlier Persian lyric poets and notably Háfiz.

It thus comes about that the change of model by Ahmed and the Ottoman lyric and romantic writers in general results after all in little more than a perfecting of their former manner, the style of Huseyn Bayqara's poets being, as we have seen in the first chapter of this volume, merely the consummation of that of their predecessors. And so the Second Period does as it were imperceptibly evolve itself out of the First. No definite date can be assigned to the general acceptance or even to the appearance of the works of the Herât poets in Turkey; and so it is for the sake of convenience, rather than because that particular year saw any decisive change, that I have taken 1450 as the starting-point of the Second Period.

This Ahmed Pasha whose Diwan forms the visible link between the two Periods is described by Lati'î and Riyâzi as a Brusan, but whether they mean to indicate by that term that the poet was a native of Brusa, or merely that he was for many years one of its most distinguished citizens, is not clear. Schi and Beligh make him an Adrianopolitan; while Tash-Köprü-zâde, 5 Ashiq, and Hasan are silent as to his birthplace. His father Veli-ud-Dîn, who claimed descent from the Prophet through Hasan the son of 5 Ali, was one of the most prominent men of his time, having held the post of Qâzî-5 Asker, then the highest legal office in the Empire, under Murâd II; and so Ahmed was generally known among his contemporaries as Veli-ud-Dîn-oghli, that is, the Son of Veli-ud-Dîn. We first hear of the poet as Muderris or Principal of the medrese or college founded by
Murad II at Brusa, whence he was promoted to be Cadi or Judge of Adrianople. He was a man of many talents, a charming conversationalist and the possessor of a ready wit. Those gifts endeared him to Sultan Mehmed the Conqueror, whose intimate companion he became. The offices of Qazi-^Asker, of Khoja or titular tutor to the Sultan and, finally, of Vezir were successively conferred on him; and for a brief time he basked in the full sunshine of Imperial favour.

But ere long an event occurred which not only banished the poet for ever from his sovereign's presence, but came near to costing him his life. Although the same in substance, the accounts of this event differ in detail in the different authorities. Like so many of the learned in ancient and medieval times Ahmed had a profound admiration for the beauty of youth. Now there was, it would seem, among the Imperial pages a lad whose grace and beauty had deeply affected the impressionable poet. One day, according to Latifi's version of the story, this youth committed some fault which caused the Sultan to put him in irons. When Ahmed heard this, carried away by his feelings, he then and there improvised the following lines:

1 Y-brent be earth! yon Taper sweet and bland
2 A-weeping lieth, bound with iron band.
3 Would he but sell his Shiráz-comfit lip,
4 'T would fetch Cairo, Bokhârâ, Samarcand'.

1 According to Sehî, Ahmed's master in poetry was one Melîhî, a minor poet of some little note in those days.
2 We have already seen (vol. i, p. 215, n. 3) a beauty described as a 'taper': it is a constantly recurring common-place.
3 Referring to some kind of sweetmeat called after the city of Shiráz.
4 These lines are to be found among the rubâ'îs or quatrains in Ahmed Pasha's Diwán.
When this was reported to the Sultan he felt convinced that Ahmed had abused the privileges granted him, and ordered him to be incarcerated forthwith in the state prison of the Seven Towers. While shut up there Ahmed composed and sent to the Sultan a poem which afterwards became famous under the name of the Kerem Qasídasi or 'Grace Qasída', and in which occur the following couplets quoted by the biographers:

Oh! a droplet from thy grace's ocean is the main of grace:
From thy cloud-hand is the garth of bounty fed with rain of grace.
Should the slave do wrong, what evil if the King of Kings forgive?
Were my two hands steeped in blood, blood's stain away is ta'en of grace.
What the manner grace is that the which forslain of sin may be!
What the manner sin is that which may not be forslain of grace:
Water drowneth not, it fostereth those things which itself hath reared:
Wherefore then should ruin overwhelm me from the main of grace?

When the Sultan had read this poem he said that such was the eloquence of Ahmed that no king could do him any injury; and so he ordered his release, but banished him from the capital with an insignificant office to Brusa.

Tash-Köpri-záde gives no details as to the event which led to Ahmed's disgrace; he merely refers to it as 'a private

The Castle of the Seven Towers (Vedi Qiile) is an ancient Byzantine citadel which terminates the landward walls of Constantinople at the end near the Sea of Marmora. It was formerly used as a state prison; and in old times it was the custom to shut up within it the ambassador of any government which was at war with the Empire.

Possibly this line is an echo of Sa'di's couplet:

The stream engulfeth not the log: what is the reason thereof?
— It would be ashamed to engulf its own nursling.

1 The Castle of the Seven Towers (Vedi Qiile) is an ancient Byzantine citadel which terminates the landward walls of Constantinople at the end near the Sea of Marmora. It was formerly used as a state prison; and in old times it was the custom to shut up within it the ambassador of any government which was at war with the Empire.

2 Possibly this line is an echo of Sa'di's couplet:

3 It would be ashamed to engulf its own nursling.
matter. He is, however, at considerable pains to emphasize the highly honourable character of the poet, and he goes out of his way to prove that the charges of immorality which some had brought against him were impossible.

According to 'Ashiq's account, with which Sehi's is in practical agreement only less full, certain persons who were jealous of Ahmed's position, having discovered his admiration of the page, represented the matter as a scandal to the Sultan. Mehemmed, in order to test the truth of this accusation, commanded either that the page's hair should be cut short or that it should be concealed under his bonnet, and that he should be sent with a glass of sherbet to Ahmed when the latter was in the bath, feeling sure that when the poet saw his favourite in this state he would say something which would betray his true feelings. This was done, and as soon as the poet saw the fair boy without his long locks, he improvised this couplet:

'Yon Idol hath his tresses shorn, but quits not yet his paynim ways;  
'His zone he severed hath, but yet no Musulman is he become'.

The historian Saolph-d-Din in his account of Ahmed Pasha follows Tash-Kopri-zade exactly. He does not specify the event which brought about the poet's banishment, and he reproduces the story by which the author of the Crimson Peony seeks to establish Ahmed's innocence.

2 We have had the term 'Idol' before as a name for a beauty (vol. 1, p. 218, n. 1).

3 A beauty is very often called a 'Paynim' or 'Infidel' (Kafir), the type of cruelty: but, so applied, the term generally means simply that the person thus described is roguish and full of mischief.

4 The zunnar, i.e. 'zone' or 'girdle', is a rope or thread said to be worn round the waist by Christians and pagans in the East. It is often mentioned by the poets as an emblem of infidelity. Perhaps the rope-girdle worn by certain monks started the idea. The locks of the 'paynim' beloved, being long, are often compared to this. [The 'Kosti' or 'Kushti' actually worn by the Zoroastrians (who to the Persians were the 'heathens' or 'gabrs' par excellence) no doubt first led the Muslims to connect the zunnar with paganism. ED.]

5 Zanfn Kifdiravsh Lwm Shm Dehrezn Shoxavz Ginb  
Zarravsh Shomsh Wolz Daxbi Muslaamsh Awomsh
This persuaded the Sultan of the poet’s guilt, and at first he thought to slay him; he contented himself, however, with shutting him up in the ‘Chamberlains’ Room’; and there the poem was written which effected Ahmed’s liberation.

Hasan reproduces ʻAshiq’s version of the incident, but adds that he found a note in the handwriting of his late father Qināli-zāde ʻAlī, the talented author of the Akhlāq-i ʻAlā’ī, which evidently relates to the same affair. It is to the effect that certain of the jealous, having discovered that Ahmed Pasha was attached to one of the Imperial pages, reported the matter to the Sultan, who, in order to verify their report, made the lad gather up his hair and hide it under his cap, so that Ahmed, taken by surprise at the sight, might discover his feelings. This the poet duly did by improvising these lines:

1Hang thy heart-bewitching ringlet, hale it forth the bonnet-gaol;
For it stretched the hand of ravage, and hath wroughten many a wrong.

In Riyāzī’s account of the affair we have a good example of the way in which a story grows. This biographer takes both Latīfī’s and ʻAshiq’s versions, adds something (almost certainly apocryphal) of his own, and presents the whole as a single tale. He tells us that the Sultan’s suspicions were first aroused by the following occurrence. One day when the Sultan, attended by Ahmed and the page, was out hunting, a piece of mud flew up from the hoofs of one of the horses and touched the boy’s cheek, whereupon the poet half-involuntarily muttered these words from the Koran

1 The Chamberlains’ Room’ (Qapujilar Odasi) was the name of an apartment in the famous palace built on Seraglio Point by Mehemed II, and added to by many of his successors.
2 According to Sehi, the Sultan presented the boy to Ahmed on his release.
3 See vol. 1, p. 41, n. 1.
'would that I were dust!' The Sultan, who feigned not to have heard, asked what Ahmed had said, when the lad, who was as witty as the poet, at once answered with the complete quotation, 'The unbeliever sayeth — Would that I were dust!' Riyází then gives the incidents of the fettering of the page and of the hiding of his hair, both of which, he says, were arranged by the Sultan in order to verify his suspicions, which suspicions, being fully confirmed by the Pasha's conduct on each occasion, led to his disgrace and banishment.

From those different accounts all that can safely be inferred is that Ahmed had an admiration for one of the Imperial pages, that this was discovered by his rivals at the court and by them presented to the Sultan in the worst possible light, that the Sultan was persuaded of the truth of the charge and in consequence immediately banished the poet from his presence.

When Ahmed Pasha was released from prison he was at once dispatched to Brusa where he was given the petty office of administrator (mutevelli) of the endowments of certain foundations of Sultan Orkhan with a salary of thirty aspers a day. This was virtual exile; appointment to some more or less nominal provincial office has always been, and still is, a favourite proceeding with the Ottoman government when the removal of a functionary from the capital becomes desirable. By and by there was added to, or substituted for,

1 The passage occurs in the Koran, LXXVIII, 41, where it is said, referring to the Last Day: A day when man seeth what his two hands have sent forward; and the unbeliever sayeth 'Would that I were dust!'

2 The same story is told in Mr. E. G. Browne's 'Year amongst the Persians' (pp. 114—5), where Sa'dí and the young Prince of Shíráz take the places of Ahmed Pasha and the page. I have heard it also in connection with the famous doctor Teftázáí (see vol. I, pp. 202—3) and his equally famous pupil Seyyid Sheri-fi Jurjáí. It is unlikely that all three cases are historical.
Ahmed's administratorship of the Orkhan endowments the duty of administering those of Sultan Emir, the famous saint and doctor of Bâyezid the Thunderbolt's time; \(^1\) and while holding this office the poet composed a terzi-bend \(^2\) in honour of the holy man, whose spiritual aid he therein implored. Shortly afterwards he received the governorship of the sanjaq or department \(^3\) of Sultân-öni, which promotion is piously attributed by \(^{1}\)Ashiq and Hasan to the ghostly influence of the departed saint.

Sultan Mehemmed was succeeded in 886 (1481) by his son Bâyezid II who ere long appointed Ahmed Pasha governor of the sanjaq of Brusa; and this office the poet continued to hold until his death in 902 (1496—7). Although, as his verses show, the old courtier never ceased to regret his banishment from the Sultan's presence, he seems wisely to have made the best of his position. \(^{1}\)Ashiq tells us that he spent most of his time in the congenial society of wits and poets, and that every season he used to repair to the pasture-lands upon the slopes of the Bithynian Olympus which overlooks the city of Brusa, and there in 'a suitable place', probably a summer-residence, give himself up to 'mirth and merriment'. But the governor of Brusa did other things besides enjoy himself; he built in the city, over against the Murâdiya mosque, a medrese or college of which in after years both Qinalî-zâde \(^{2}\)Ali the philosopher and his son Qinalî-zâde Hasan the biographer were in turn Muderris or Principal. The turbe or mausoleum in which the poet is buried adjoins this mosque, and over its door is inscribed an Arabic chro-

---

\(^1\) See vol. 1, p. 232, n. 2.

\(^2\) See vol. 1, p. 90.

\(^3\) In old times the Ottoman Empire was divided into provinces called eyalet, which were subdivided into departments called sanjaq, each of which was governed by an officer styled the Sanjaq Begi, i.e. the Bey of the Sanjaq or the Sanjaq Bey.
nogram, the work of Efátún-záde Mehemmed one of the officials of the court of justice.

It must have been while he was governor of Brusa that Ahmed became acquainted with the poetry of Mir `Alí Shir-i Newá'i. We are told by both `Ashiq and Hasan that thirty-three of that poet's ghazels — presumably the first to reach the West — were sent to Sultan Báyezid, who forwarded them to Ahmed Pasha with instructions that he should write a 'parallel'¹ to each. This the poet did; and in the accomplishment of his task he cleverly availed himself of the opportunity to bring his desire for the restoration of court-favour under the Sultan's notice, the last couplet of one of his thirty-three parallels running thus: —

¹Dare the lovers with thy verses', if thou would'st to Ahmed say;
Thus for him to sing 'twere needful that thy ward his bower should be.²

For the nazira or 'parallel' see vol. 1, pp. 99—100.

¹Ashiq, who quotes this verse, says it is the maqta² (see vol. 1, p. 80.) of the parallel to Newá'i's ghazel beginning:

أول پیری پیکر که حیران بولمین انس وجان انکا
جملة عالم منکا حیران وپیامی حیران انکا

This, which is no doubt the same poem as that in the British Museum MS. Add. 7910 beginning: —

کرم که حیرانی ایمیل مین بیله مین حیران انکا

is the only one of the thirty-three ghazels to which any clue is given.

The complete Diwán (or series of Diwáns) of Newá'i was, according to all the biographers, first brought to Turkey by a Persian poet called Basírì who came from Heráit with letters of recommendation from both Jámi and Newá'i to Sultan Báyezid. `Ashiq and Hasan say that Basírì arrived when Mu'eyyed-záde was Qázi-'Asker. As we have already seen (p. 30) Mu'eyyed-záde did not receive that office till 907 (1501), five years after Ahmed Pasha's death: so it is probable that the latter's acquaintance with the Jaghatay poet's work was limited to the thirty-three ghazels spoken of by the biographers.
Ahmed was, as we have seen, credited with a remarkable talent for improvisation, and the following anecdote is related by Latifi as an example of his skill in this direction. One day when Sultan Mehemmed and some of his grandees were practising a species of bibliomancy very common in the East, which consists in opening the Diwán of Hâfiz at hap-hazard and drawing an augury from whatever passage happens to meet the eye,¹ they chanced upon this couplet: —

¹ 'Yon folk who dust elixir make by casting there the eye. — ²
² "Oh would to God that with a sidelong glance they us should spy!" ³

The Sultan expressed his profound admiration for this verse, whereupon Ahmed with his courtier's wit at once transformed it thus: —

¹ 'Yon folk who dust elixir make by casting there the eye
² 'The jewel-dust aneath thy feet for tutty ⁴ fain apply!' ⁵

Another little piece of information connected with the period of Ahmed's court-favour is recorded by Ashiq who received it from Názir Chelebi of Adrianople, the nephew

¹ See vol. 1, p. 166, n. 3.
² Certain holy persons were believed to have the power of converting dust (the most worthless of things) into elixir, i. e. the philosopher's stone (the most precious of things) by merely looking thereupon. In the verse of the poet those persons might represent the king by whose favourable regard a beggar may be made a prince, or perhaps the beloved who by a kindly look can transmute the poor heart into pure gold.

³ أذنِّهُ خالِرًا بنَظِر كَيْمِيَا كَنْنَدُ آرَآ ولْحَكَ كَ كُوَشَةٍ جُشُمِي بِما كَنْنَدَ
⁴ Tutty (tütiyâ) is properly zine or native carbonate of zinc, but the name is applied to any substance used as a collyrium to strengthen the eyesight. Precious stones, reduced to powder, were sometimes added to such collyriums. Thus tutty, in the sense of collyrium, is often mentioned along with jewels by the poets.
⁵ The present line, besides containing a reminiscence of this practice, suggests that the dust upon which the Sultan treads becomes thereby as precious as diamonds or rubies. Ahmed's manipulation of Hâfiz's couplet is an instance of what is called Tazmín (see vol. 1, p. 113).
and sole heir of the poet. It is to the effect that Sultan Mehemmed presented Ahmed with a slave-girl named Tútí Qadin ('Lady Parrot') who belonged to the Imperial household and to whom he gave as dower the village of Etmekji near Adrianople. By this girl Ahmed had a daughter — his only child — who died in her seventh year; and after her loss, it is said, the poet wholly abjured the society of women.

That Ahmed Pasha was a man of much learning and many accomplishments is asserted by all the biographers and is proved both by his works and by the story of his life. With regard to his character there is not the same unanimity; but Tash-köpri-záde not only goes out of his way, as we have seen, to defend him from certain charges that were freely made against him, but dwells with pleasure upon his magnanimity and generosity.

Ahmed Pasha’s literary work is most probably wholly lyric; he left no mesnevi,¹ but in his qasidas and ghazels he unquestionably attained a higher level of elegance and refinement than had hitherto been reached in West-Turkish poetry. It is owing to this and to the fact that in his Diwán he focussed the literary tendencies of his age and expressed those in the pure Ottoman dialect that he holds by universal consent his prominent position in the history of this poetry. Ahmed is not only the most graceful writer who has yet appeared, he is the first Ottoman Turk to compose verses of real literary merit. There can be little doubt that the so-far unexampled skill in diction which he displayed had some share in bringing about the recognition of the Ottoman dialect as the proper vehicle for literature. His poetry thus

¹ According to Sehi, he wrote a mesnevi on the story of Leylā and Mejnūn, over which he took great pains, but copies of which were not to be found. None of the other biographers make the slightest allusion to such a work; so it is probable either that Sehi is altogether in error, or that the poem was never completed and issued to the outside world.