

networks and Ottoman craft production (16th-17th centuries), in Takeshi Yukawa (ed.), *Urbanism in Islam. The proceedings of the international conference on urbanism in Islam...*, Tokyo 1989, i, 85-132; Findley, *Ottoman civil officialdom, a social history*, Princeton 1989; A. Marcus, *The Middle East on the eve of modernity, Aleppo in the eighteenth century*, New York 1989; Ahmet Akgündüz, *Osmanlı kanunnameleri ve hukuki tahlilleri*, 3 vols. to date, Istanbul 1990-; Sina Akşin (ed.), *Türkiye tarihi*, 4 vols., new ed., Istanbul 1990; D. Goffman, *Izmir and the Levantine world, 1550-1650*, Seattle-London 1990; Cemal Kafadar, *Les troubles monétaires de la fin du XVIIe siècle et la prise de conscience ottomane du déclin*, in *Annales ESC*, xlii (1991), 381-400; Çağlar Keyder and Faruk Tabak (eds.), *Landholding and commercial agriculture in the Middle East*, Albany 1991; Doris Behrens-Abouseif, *Institutions and foundations in Ottoman Cairo* (in press); S. Pamuk, *From akçe to lira: a monetary history of the Ottoman empire* (in preparation). (SURAIYA FAROQHI)

### III. LITERATURE

The literature to which the name of Ottoman is now generally given arises out of the literature of the Oghuz Turks, who settled in Asia Minor in the Saldjûk period and later in the time of the Ottomans in Rûm-ili, where they founded a powerful empire. This literature, which had an uninterrupted development from the time of the Saldjûks up to the beginning of the 20th century, was based on the literatures of still older dialects and remained in touch with these in all periods of its evolution. Especially since the 16th century, it became the most important and richest branch of all the Turkish literatures and exercised an influence on the literature of the other dialects. Here the general evolution of this literature will be sketched, noting its main genres and principal personalities. We shall deal not only with the classical literature which was confined to the upper classes, but also—in their general features—with the literature of the masses, that of the poet musicians (*sâz şâirleri*) and the literature of the various mystic groups.

Ottoman literature may be divided into three great periods, corresponding to the general development of the history of Turkey:

- Muslim literature from the 13th century to the end of the 16th century.
- After 1600 A.D.
- European-type and national literature, arising out of the development of the nationalist movement, to the end of the Ottoman dynasty.

These will be examined in chronological order, in order to avoid arbitrary distinctions.

(a) Until 1600 A.D.

#### 1. The beginnings

We find the first written examples of Ottoman Turkish literature already flourishing in the 13th century, and the works of that literature can be divided into three types:

- Classical mystical (Şūfī) literature;
- Religious mystical folk literature; and
- Classical (later called *Dīwān*) literature.

Given that the Mongol invasion of Anatolia gave an impetus to the spreading of mystical views there and to the literary activities based on them, we shall have to consider this period as the starting point. During the Mongol invasions, the migration from Persia and Turkestan to Anatolia was intensified: scholars, Şūfis and dervishes of various sects (e.g. Nađm al-Dīn Kubrā (d. 1226 [q.v.]), Kūṭb al-Dīn Haydar), and rich merchants settled down in Anatolia. Amongst them were major poets as well, such as Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Irākī (d. 1289 [q.v.]), author of the theosophical

poem *Lama‘āt*, Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī and Sheykh Nađm al-Dīn Dāya (d. 1256). These Şūfis settled in the cultural centres of Anatolia, such as Tokat, Kayseri and Sivas, and enjoyed the patronage and respect of the Rûm Saldjûk sultans, and attracted extensive popular followings. In this way, Şūfī concepts and ideas spread effectively amongst the folk masses over wide areas. In addition, when we consider that Ibn ‘Arabī (d. 1240), and his step-son and interpreter Şadr al-Dīn Kōnawī, both settled in Konya after having found peace and tolerance at the Saldjûk court, we can assume that already in the 13th century a cultural milieu for the future development of classical Şūfī literature had been prepared. Moreover, Rūmī both elaborated and popularised Ibn ‘Arabī’s mystical ideas within the spiritual and formal framework of classical Islamic literature. Thus he introduced the aesthetic conceptions and formal constructions of classical Islamic literature to Anatolia; he also played a most important role in the furthering of both classical (*Dīwān*) literature and the classical Şūfī literature of the Mewlewī order which arose after him [see MAWLAWIYYA].

The foundations of Şūfī literature were laid by Ḥadīdī Bektash Walī, one of the dervishes of Kūṭb al-Dīn Ḥaydar who also came from Kḥurāsān and settled in Suludja .Kara Höyük, in the vicinity of Kīrshchir, spreading his Bābā’ī-Bāḡīnī views. As with Mawlānā, he also laid the foundations of the so-called Bektashī literature, the literature of the Şūfī order named after him, that which was greatly developed later on in Janissary circles [see BEKTASHIYYA].

Alongside this Şūfī folk literature there developed a religious folk literature based on the tradition of singing of poetry with musical accompaniment (*sāz*) [see also NEFES]. This became widespread among the army and the city folk, the Turcoman tribes and the frontier *ghāzis*, and the folk minstrels, under the influence of the religious atmosphere, and it included heroic epic cycles and also short pious tales (e.g. the *Baḡlāl-nāme*, *Dānīshmend-nāme*, the Tale of the Gazelle, Tale of the Dove, etc.) This religious folk literature should accordingly be added to the Turkish literature of the 13th century.

The works belonging to the classical Şūfī literature of this period were composed with the metres and forms of classical Islamic literature. This meant that the first poets had to face the difficult task of applying the rules of the ‘arūd metre to the phonetic system of Turkish. As a result, we witness in these early poems a lot of unnatural and forced expressions. Amongst these works we should mention the following: two religious *mathnawīs*, the *Čarkh-nāme* and the *Ewsāf-i mesāḡid-i sherīfe* of Ḥadīdī Ahmed Fakīh [q.v. in Suppl.] from Konya, the Turkish *ghazels* of Mawlānā Rūmī (d. 1273 [q.v.]), the Turkish poems found in Sulṭān Weled’s (d. 1312 [q.v.]) *Rebāb-nāme* and *Ibtidā’-nāme*, Şeyyād Ḥamza’s *ghazels* and his *mathnawī* called *Dāstān-i Yūsuf*, and Şulī Fakīh’s *Yūsuf u Zuleykhā* which deals with the same story.

One may also include yet another version of this very popular biblical story, the *mathnawī Yūsuf we Zuleykhā*, translated by Kḥalīl-oghlu ‘Alī from a Kīpčak original composed by a certain Maḥmūd from the Crimea into Anatolian Turkish, using the syllable metre and quatrain form typical of traditional folk poetry.

The first example of classical Turkish literature in this century came from the pen of Khodja Dehhānī, poet at the court of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn III at Konya; he wrote *kaşides* and especially *ghazels* with non-religious themes, and was the first Turkish classical poet to sing

of the beauty of nature, and of carnal love, wine and the other pleasures of life.

## 2. The 14th and 15th centuries

With the collapse of the Saljuq central government in Konya around 1300, Turkish culture and art came to flourish in the capital cities of the beyliks, such as Kütahya, Aydın, Antalya, Kastamonu, Kayseri, Sivas and Konya. The material wealth of these cities and their lords, who did not know any language other than Turkish, attracted poets and writers who started to produce their literary works in their mother tongue. When the Ottomans started getting the upper hand over the Anatolian beyliks, cultural and artistic activities were channelled into the emerging Ottoman centres situated on important trade routes such as Bursa, Edirne, Amasya and Manisa (1410-53), and finally to Istanbul, so that the scholars, poets and writers who used to be active at the courts of the Anatolian beyliks now began to produce their works under the direct patronage of the Ottoman sultans and princes and of Ottoman dignitaries.

Among those poets who formerly served Germiyanoglu Ya'qub II (1387-1428) and who transferred themselves to the court of the Ottomans, were Ahmedî (1334-1413), *Sheykh-oghlu* (1350-?), Ahmed-i Dâ'î (d. after 1421), and *Sheykhî* (d. 1429); they were finally active at the courts of Bâyezîd I, his son Amîr Süleyman (d. 1412), Mehmed Çelebi (d. 1421) and Murâd II (d. 1451). These rulers were frequently poets themselves, e.g. Murâd II had the pen-name Murâdî, Mehmed II the Conqueror used that of 'Awnî, Prince Korkud (d. 1512) that of Harîmî and Bâyezîd II (d. 1512) that of 'Adî. From amongst these sultan-poets, Mehmed II, his son Djem (d. 1495) and Bâyezîd II wrote enough poetry to form independent *divâns*.

The Ottomans took special care to promote culture and the arts in order to preserve their cultural identity and not to be absorbed by the neighbouring Byzantine Christian culture. To achieve this goal, they also had to prove themselves victorious in the cultural rivalries that had been going on for some time among the Anatolian principalities. The following example will illustrate just how strong this rivalry was. When Mollâ Fenârî was seriously offended by the Ottoman sultan, he transferred to Konya, where the Karamanoglu ruler offered him a salary of 1000 *akçes* per day, as well as 100 *akçes* for each of his students, unheard of until that time. The flourishing economy of the Ottoman state (see section II, above) greatly contributed to the success of these literary and cultural activities, so that the living standards in provincial cities located on the trade routes across Anatolia to southeastern Europe such as Amasya, Trabzon, Bursa, Manisa, Antalya and Edirne increased significantly. That Mehmed Çelebi became governor of Amasya, Prince Korkud in Manisa, Prince Selim (II) in Trabzon, Djem Sültân in Kastamonu and Karamân, was not at all accidental! They brought with them their own scholars and poets, but they also encouraged and protected local literary figures. For instance, Nedjâtî Bey [*q.v.*] (d. 1509), one of the greatest poets of the 15th century, was first at the court of the crown prince 'Abd Allâh in Karamân, and after the prince died, he also served as the head of the *divân* of the crown prince Mahmûd in Manisa.

The most striking characteristic of the cultural and literary activities of the Ottomans during the 15th century was the admiration which the Ottomans felt towards the art and literature of the Timûrids at their courts in Samarkand and Harât, and especially towards Çaghatay literature; it would not be unfair to

say that classical Ottoman literature was under the spell of Mîr 'Alî Shîr Nawâ'î [*q.v.*] whose influence reached its apogee at the end of the 15th and beginning of the 16th century, including also in the Persian literature of the time. Indeed, Persian literature, music, miniature painting and architecture were greatly refined under the patronage of the Timûrid sultans Shâhrukh (d. 1447), Ulugh Beg (d. 1449) and Husayn Baykara (d. 1506) [*q.vv.*], and the attraction of this renaissance of Persian culture under Turkish political hegemony strongly influenced the Ottoman court, with echoes of that influence felt up to the 19th century.

The Timûrid court was taken as a model first in the political field. As is well known, at the cultural centres of Samarkand and Harât, the Uyghur alphabet was used side-by-side with the Arabic alphabet in literary texts as well as in the chancery. Wishing to compete with this Central Asian Turkish court, the Ottoman sultan Murâd II (d. 1451) kept at his court in Edirne secretaries capable of composing *firmâns* in the Uyghur alphabet. The crown princes themselves were taught the Uyghur alphabet. Even at later dates, some Ottoman *firmâns* were composed in Çaghatay and written down in both the Arabic and Uyghur alphabets. Thus Mehmed II announced his victory over the Ak Koyunlu Uzun Hasan in the form of a *feth-nâme*, in which he addressed the local rulers of Eastern Anatolia in Çaghatay written down in Uyghur letters with an interlinear text in Arabic letters. However, all the Ottoman *firmâns* addressed to the European powers in Ottoman Turkish were in the Arabic script.

The Timûrid court was also taken as a model in the literary and artistic fields, since Ottoman poets and intellectuals took a great interest in Çaghatay and Persian literature. Ahmed Pasha, who was Mehmed II's vizier and later on Bâyezîd II's *sandjak-bey* of Bursa, used to await with enthusiasm and excitement 'Alî Shîr Nawâ'î's latest *ghazels* carried with the caravans to Bursa. At one point, Nawâ'î sent 33 *ghazels* to Bâyezîd II, and Ahmed Pasha wrote *nâzîras* to them at the order of the sultan. To write *nâzîras* to Nawâ'î's poems remained fashionable among Ottoman poets up until the 19th century, and even the greatest and proudest Ottoman poets such as Nedîm [*q.v.*] and *Sheykh Ghâlib* followed that fashion. In the field of science many young men went to Central Asia to get a good education, and scholars and scientists from these lands were esteemed on Ottoman soil. One of these was the famous Uzbek *sheykh* Süleymân Efendi who dedicated his Çaghatay-Ottoman dictionary to 'Abd ül-Hamîd II. The influence of the courts in Samarkand and Harât found its echoes in the music festivals of the Manisa court of the crown prince Korkud, so that during the 17th century Ewliyâ Çelebi talks about music festivals called *Husayn Baykara faşîllari*.

An important characteristic of the 14th and 15th centuries was the intensive translation movement from Arabic and Persian texts. Even though the Anatolian beyliks and the early Ottomans considered themselves as Islamic political entities, they still had not completely broken away from their ancestral Central Asian traditions, nor had they fully assimilated the new civilisation of which they were now part. So in order to bring Islamic culture to a wider audience, a concerted effort was undertaken to translate works in every field of Islamic learning and practice into a simple and clear Turkish. These translations may be classified as follows:

1. Works of *'ilm-i hâl*, a kind of catechism of the

basic principles of worship and of behaviour within the family and the community. Alongside these, or perhaps later, there were made interlinear translations of the Qurʾān and translations of *tafsīr*, of the stories of prophets (*kīṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ*), legends of saints (*menākīb al-awliyāʾ*), etc.

2. Encyclopaedic manuals on medicine and drugs, on geography, astronomy and the interpretation of dreams, music treatises and dictionaries.

3. Translations in *mathnawī* form of love stories of typical Near Eastern content, as well as mystical Sūfī *mathnawīs*. The first texts to be translated in this category, were Nizāmī's (d. 1140) *Khusraw wa Shirīn*, ‘Aṭṭār's (d. 1193) *Mantīk al-tayr* and Firdawsī's (d. 1020) *Shāh-nāma*.

It must be emphasised that these so-called translations were not direct word-for-word ones, but rather adaptations made by the Turkish writers, who, besides putting in their own phrases, frequently added chapters and their own corrections or improvements, so that sometimes the translation would be three times as long as the original.

The strongest supporter of the translation effort was Murād II, who was a passionate lover of poetry and the fine arts and who attracted large numbers of artists and writers to his court.

Naturally, original creations exist side-by-side with these translations. Amongst them are to be noted the *Ḡharīb-nāme* of ‘Ashīk Paṣha (d. 1332 [q.v.]) which resembles Rūmī's *Mathnawī*, the allegorical *mathnawī Ḡang-nāme* of Aḥmed-i Dāʿī (d. after 1421) which expresses man's longing for immortality, the *Khar-nāme* by Sheykhī [q.v.] which is one of the best satirical works in the entire Turkish literature, the *Khawāṣṣ-nāme* by Tādī-zāde Djaʿfar Čelebi (d. 1516) which describes Istanbul, the *Mewlid* of Süleymān Čelebi [q.v.] which narrates the Prophet's birth, his *miʿrādī* and death, and finally, the *Muḥammedīyye* of Yazıdī-oghlu Mehmed (d. 1449 [q.v.]) which also deals with the Prophet's life and his miracles. Besides all this, we have to mention the greatest mystical folk poet, Yunūs Emre [q.v.] who has a place of his own within Turkish literature; soon after he died, many poets imitated his style, without however attaining the universalism of his appeal.

All these literary activities raise the issue of the history of the written language: was the Old Anatolian Turkish in existence before the migrations from Central Asia? Or did it arise in Anatolia after the migration? Some scholars have argued that the Oghuz tribes had established their own written language already in central Asia before their migration into Anatolia. However, this assumption does not seem to meet the basic precondition for the creation of a written language, namely that there should be a distinct political entity under whose auspices the written language can develop. Such a political structure existed in Konya after the 11th century, but was absent for the Turkomans in Transoxiana. Thus we have to assume that the Turkomans established their written language for the first time under the political patronage of the Rūm Saldjūks and the beys of the Anatolian principalities. There is strong material evidence for this, namely, the fact that in the very first Old Anatolian Turkish texts we witness a typically Qurʾānic orthography: defective writing of the vowels and excessive usage of *tanwīns* for Turkish endings and any final syllables of words. This would indicate that they did not bring with them an orthography already established in Central Asia, where the Karākhānid system was based on the full (*plene*) writing of the vowels.

### 3. Classical Ottoman literature during the 16th century

At the beginning of the 16th century, the Ottomans were established as a world-empire, and the literature of this century reflects well the new political situation. Starting from the most famous poets like Bākī (d. 1600) and Fuḍūlī (d. 1556) [q.vv.] down to lesser poets, one finds a strong feeling of confidence and self-assurance. Of course, this feeling finds diverse expressions. In Fuḍūlī it becomes a sense of pride that defies the world, especially in his famous complaint, *Shikāyet-nāme*, whereas in Bākī and in other poets it is evident in their majestic style and their placing themselves on an equal footing with the famous Persian poets. In Uṣūlī (d. 1538), Ḥayretī (d. 1534) and Kḥayālī (d. 1557 [q.v.]) it appears as an expression of disdain for the worthless material world, but in most works one can detect a celebration of victory and denial of humility. Considering that this atmosphere, one taken for granted in the historical writings, permeates love tales and even lyric poetry, one has to acknowledge that the psychology of triumph brought about by the successes of the Ottoman expansion deeply affected the literary works of this period. For instance, the love tale *Djem-Shāh ü ‘Aleṃ-Shāh* of Ramaḍān Bihīshṭī, a less than first-rate poet, which was dedicated to Süleymān the Magnificent (d. 1566), clearly expresses this ideal image of world domination in between the lines, for all that the poet presented his poem to his audience as a symbolic work expressing his own mystical ideas.

The literature of this age is mostly preoccupied with the material and living world, despite the great number of religiously-inspired works. The simple religious atmosphere of the previous centuries had vanished, and with it the simple language, which now gives way to a flowery idiom of word-plays and refined rhetorical devices. In prose, however, Turkish entered a mature period of clarity and accuracy of expression, despite the heavy borrowings from the Arabic and Persian vocabulary. The scribes of the secretarial class, increasing in size along with the empire's expansion, especially those attached to the *reʿīs ül-küttāb* and the *nishāndjī* [q.vv.], well-versed in poetry and chancery skills (*fünūn-i kitābet*), played a significant role in the emerging literary trends. A good number of the poets of this period came from this class of government officers, e.g. Muṣṭafā ‘Alī Efendi (d. 1599 [q.v.]) the famous historian, who wrote the *Künh ül-akḥbār* and first introduced critical method into Ottoman historiography. It is not surprising that these secretary-poets had to extol the pleasures of the material world, as this was part of their duties to please and entertain their superiors, up to the sultan himself. This would explain why suddenly the *kaṣīde* or ode became fashionable, and every poet of significance had to compose *kaṣīdes* for the sultan and the high dignitaries. Thus, in this period when the *kaṣīde* was so widespread, the poet was in essence forced to arrange both his inner and outer worlds according to the palace hierarchy: the sun, moon and stars of the nature became the sultan in the centre, with the Grand Vizier and other dignitaries around him; the sultan is the rose and his officials the other flowers; the beloved is the sultan, those around the beloved are the dignitaries of the palace and the lover, i.e. the poet, is the sultan's slave. The sultan was the centre of the universe and of the poet's personal world. This imagery was already present in its incipient form in the earlier centuries, but now acquired precision, continuing until this literature exhausted itself.

The most important representative of the classical literature flourishing in the palace circles was Bākī,

the court poet of Süleymān the Magnificent who was himself also a poet writing under the pen-name Muḥibbī. Bākī wrote *kaşides* for Süleymān and his successors, Murād II (d. 1595) and Meḥemmed III (d. 1603). His superb skill in composing meticulously designed, geometrical and artistic poems remained unsurpassed by contemporary or even later poets, a skill seen in the elegy which he composed while still in his forties for the dead sultan.

Bākī's *dīvān* is quite voluminous, revealing not only refined feelings but a brilliant intelligence and eloquence. Eschewing ugliness, he made nature and realistic love his themes, showing his skill by hiding the intended image under perfectly chosen words.

The second most important poet of this period is Fuḍūlī, who excelled because of the liveliness of his artistic skill and the sincerity of his emotions in his *kaşides* dedicated to the prophet Muḥammad and the sultan Süleymān. What distinguished him sharply from all other Ottoman poets is that he was not a poet from the capital but from Baghdād, which he greatly praises in his Turkish poems, all written in Aḍharī or Azerī Turkish. He was influenced by the Şūfī poet Nesīmī (d. 1418 [q.v.]) and especially by ‘Alī Shīr Nawā’ī; the latter's poems provided inspiration for a lot of his compositions. He may be considered the poet of suffering. All his poems express a suffering and love that directly emanate from his nature. For all that his skills are as superb as Bākī's, this is not immediately apparent, since it takes a careful reading to unveil the complex images (*maḍmūn*) and word relationships hidden behind a seemingly effortless pleasing verse (*sehl-i mīmteni*).

In the 16th century, the *mathnawī* was still a very popular genre. In fact, we see an increasing number of poets who wrote love tales as well as mystical and religious subjects in the *mathnawī* form. Among the poets who wrote *mathnawīs* in the fashion of the famous Persian poet Niẓāmī [q.v.], with his *Khamsa*, two well-known poets can be mentioned here. One of these was Taşhīdjālī Yahyā (d. 1582 [q.v.]). His *Khamsa* consists of the following five *mathnawīs*: *Genḍjīne-i rāz*, *Uşūl-nāme*, *Shāh u gedā*, *Yūsuf u Züleykhā* and *Gülşen-i enwār*.

The second poet, who not only wrote one but two *Khamsas*, was Lāmi‘ī Čelebi (d. 1532 [q.v.]), very well versed in Persian culture and literature, as well as Çağhatay literature, and very much influenced by the works of Djāmī (d. 998/1492 [q.v.]), Mīr ‘Alī Shīr Nawā’ī and other famous Persian poets. As a result of this, he translated their works into Anatolian, namely, Ottoman Turkish. Because of his great interest in Djāmī and because of his translations of the latter's works, he was given the title of Djāmī-i Rūm (“the Djāmī of Anatolia”). Lāmi‘ī was an outstanding figure in both Ottoman verse and prose. Being very productive, he introduced works of diverse forms into Turkish literature. Among them, his *mathnawīs* included: *Absāl u Salāmān*, *Wāmiḳ u ‘Adhrā*, *Wīs u Rāmīn*, *Ferhād u Shīrīn*, *Tuḥfe-yi Lāmi‘ī*, *Shehrensāz-i Bursā*, *Guy u Čewgān*, *Maktel-i Husayn*, *Shem* u *perwāne*, and *Heft peyker* (unfinished at his sudden death).

Along with the poets writing in the elaborate classical style we should mention Tatawālī Maḥremī (d. 1535) and Edirneli Nazmī (d. 1548 [q.v.]) who represent a group of poets who tried, with reasonable success, to apply the ‘arūd metres to a Turkish relatively purified of foreign borrowings. Whether writing love or mystical poetry, there was a conscious effort to address the larger audience of the folk masses; it may be that these poets took their inspiration from the popular story-tellers and their stories recited at various meeting places.

The absence of a religious and mystical atmosphere from classical poetry is the characteristic peculiarity of this period. (This is the only period during which the above peculiarity is valid for all poetry.) This is not to say that there is no mystical thought in these poems, only that this is pushed into the background. These poets used Şūfī terminology, but expressed their own personal emotions, so that there emerges, for the first time, a distinction between the mystical (Şūfī) and the mystical-style (*mutasawwif*) poet. Even in the love *mathnawī* *Leylā ve Meḍjnūn* of Fuḍūlī, which is permeated with a mystical atmosphere, a story of worldly but Platonic love is narrated with same intensity as the love adventures and sufferings of two living people in love. The same can be said of the *mathnawī* *Shāh u gedā* by the period's greatest *mathnawī* writer, Taşhīdjālī Yahyā.

This interest in the material world made the poets of this period less and less interested in the classical themes of Persian literature, and they started to turn to stories taken directly from real life, to their immediate vicinity and to contemporary human types, along with the traditional classical topics; this so-called *mahallīleşme* movement continued well into the 17th and 18th centuries, but, with the exception of Nedīm, eventually lost its impetus without ever achieving the creativity and universality which the poets were hoping for.

The main reason for this tendency to be interested in the real and material world is perhaps connected with entertainment literature. Translation activity here had started in the 15th century, but was now intensified. In particular, Djelāl-zāde Tāhīr Čelebi translated the tales of Firūz-Shāh and the extensive story collection in Persian *Djāmī‘ al-hikāyāt wa-lawāmi‘ al-riwāyāt* of Muḥammad ‘Awfī [q.v.] for the benefit of the sultans and grand viziers. However, these stories were not read only in palace circles; the people would listen to them in coffee houses and public gatherings. Story-tellers had been active narrating religious-heroic cycles, love stories and excerpts from the *Shāh-nāma* from the 13th century onwards. During the 16th century, their repertory came to include unusual events and characters taken from everyday life. The custom of employing such story-tellers in the palace had been going on since the reign of Bāyezīd I, but acquired new significance in the 16th century, when the court story-tellers started being educated persons, to the point that some of them became the sultan's personal courtiers. New themes emerged. For instance, Muştafā Djīnānī (d. 1585) wrote his collection of stories for Murād II, who loved the new stories. Most likely the same motivation was behind the collection *Ibrat-nūmā* of Lāmi‘ī, the very knowledgeable translator of the Persian poet Djāmī. (It is in the *Ibrat-nūmā* that we find the first serious mention of Naşr al-Dīn Khodja [q.v.] and his extremely popular anecdotes.)

Finally, we have to mention one event of lasting consequence. In the 16th century the Ottomans became in closer touch with the Western world. This was the result both of accident and necessity, and the relations with the West were not deliberate and conscious but passive. The following example will illustrate how these contacts were reflected in literature: a writer using the pen-name Esīrī (“prisoner”) narrates in his *Sergūdhesht* the story of his captivity during one of the Ottoman campaigns, his escape and adventures before reaching home again.

Another significant event in this regard was the introduction of the printing press into the empire since the reign of Bāyezīd II by the non-Muslim subjects, including Christians and the Jews who had been

welcomed into the Ottoman domains after their expulsion from Spain in 1492. Books on Judaism, on Christianity and on the works of European Renaissance-period authors were published, and their influence on Ottoman Muslim society, though not direct, cannot be dismissed altogether. Moreover, the old Turkish theatrical representations, *Orta oyunu* [q.v.], greatly expanded in the 17th century and were certainly influenced by the Sephardic Jewish theatrical traditions and the Italian folk-comedy, given that the Ottomans had close political and commercial relations with Genoa, Venice and other Italian principalities.

Throughout the 16th century, then, Ottoman literature and culture was still considerably influenced by the Turco-Persian literature flourishing in the courts of K̄hurasān and Samarqand, while themes from everyday life inevitably crept into them as well; furthermore, Ottoman society, was beginning to be influenced by the West, without being fully aware of it.

*Bibliography:* See the articles on the various literary figures mentioned in the article and the general surveys of earlier Turkish literature given in the more detailed *Bibl.* at the end of this section on Literature. (GÖNÜL ALPAY TEKİN)

#### 4. Historical and geographical prose literature and popular poetry during the 16th century

Prose in this century assumes a heavier and more artificial form; exaggerating Persian models, the simplest ideas are expressed by the most complicated images to the detriment of the subject. This lack of taste is found in the greatest stylists of the period: Lāmi‘ī, Kemāl Paṣṣa-zāde [q.v.], Djelāl-zāde Muṣṭafā Ālebi [q.v.], Feridūn Beg [q.v.], ‘Azmi, the translator of the *Humāyūn-nāme*, ‘Alī Ālebi, Kīnālī-zāde ‘Alī Ālebi [q.v.], K̄h‘ādja Sa‘d al-Dīn [see KHODJA EFENDI] and others. This artificial tendency had a much more marked influence on prose than on poetry. Works written in simple language were despised by the educated classes. We find, however, that in very long works, it was only the preface that was written in this turgid and clumsy style. Many literary, historical, religious or moralising works of the period were in fact written in more simple language. The same applies to official correspondence and other state documents. In religious works intended for the people, every endeavour was made to write as simply as possible. The prose which we possess by Bakī and Fuḍūlī shows an elegant and comparatively simple language.

We shall begin with the historical works, a field in which great progress was made in this century, mainly on account of the interest taken by the educated classes in the military successes of the empire. Beside the rhymed chronicle, in continuation of the Saldjūq tradition, we find from the time of Bāyezīd II and Selīm I historical works in prose. The official Ottoman history written in Persian by Idrīs Bidlīsī was translated into Turkish by his son. Other general histories were those of Ibn Kemāl, Djelāl-zāde Muṣṭafā Ālebi, entitled *Tabakāt al-mamālīk*, of Muhyī al-Dīn Djemālī, of Luṭfī Paṣṣa [q.v.], of K̄h‘ādja Sa‘d al-Dīn and of ‘Alī [q.v.]. There are also a number of special histories, dealing with particular periods or certain events (the *Feth-nāmes*) and biographical works (like the *Djawāhīr al-manākīb* relating to Ṣokollu Mehmed Paṣṣa). At the same time, the office of *Sheh-nāmedji* was maintained at the court. In the time of Süleymān, it was filled by Feth Allāh ‘Arif Ālebi, whose successors included Eflātūn Shirwānī, Seyyid Luḳmān and Ta‘līkī-zāde (d.

1013/1604). These were also Turkish poets, but tradition demanded that the official *Sheh-nāme* should be written in Persian in the *mūtekerīb* metre, until Meḥemmed III ordered it to be written in Turkish. From the time of Ta‘līkī-zāde, prose began to appear scattered through the text. From the historical point of view, these *Sheh-nāmes* are naturally of less importance than the non-official chronicles. While works like the *Tādji al-tawārīkh* of Sa‘d al-Dīn were regarded as models of style, the *Ta‘rīkh* of Luṭfī Paṣṣa, whose style more resembles that of the old chronicles, and especially his *Āsaf-nāme*, are very important for our knowledge of the social history of this period. The *Ta‘rīkh* of Selānikli Muṣṭafā Efendi shows how corrupt the administration was at the end of the century. We must regard ‘Alī as the greatest historian of the time, and his other works reveal him as a man of almost encyclopaedic learning. Not only his *Kūnh al-ak̄hbār*, but also his *Nasīhat al-salātīn*, *Ḳawā‘id al-mad̄jālīs* and *Menākīb-i hünerwerān* show that the author was a severe critic, well informed about the conditions of life of his time. The style of his historical works is relatively simple (on his life and works, see the introduction by Ibn ūl-Emīn Maḥmūd Kemāl to the edition of the *Menākīb-i hünerwerān*, Istanbul 1926). To this century also belongs the *Shakā‘ik-i Nu‘māniyye* written in Arabic by Taṣḥkōprü-zāde [q.v.] and translated into Turkish with additions by Medjdī [q.v.] of Edirne and K̄hākī of Belgrade; also, an extensive biographical literature among which the biographies of the Turkish Ṣūfī *shaykhs* are of considerable historical interest. A similar interest is contained in a few light works of badinage (*mizāhī*) like the *Nafs al-amr-nāme* of Lāmi‘ī and of Niksārī-zāde (see *Millī Tettebbu‘lar Med̄jimū‘asi*, no. 3).

Among historical works, those which deal with literary history occupy an important place. The first Ottoman *tedhkerē* is the *Heshṭ bihisht* written in 945/1538 by Sehī [q.v.], in imitation of the *Mad̄jālīs al-nafā‘īs* of Nawā‘ī. He was followed by Laṭīfī [q.v.], ‘Ashīk Ālebi [q.v.], ‘Ahdī of Baghdād and Ḥasan Ālebi [q.v.]. ‘Alī also gives important notices of poets in his *Kūnh al-ak̄hbār*. The compilation of collections of *nazā‘īr* on poems of other poets, like the *Djāmi‘ al-nazā‘īr* written in 918/1512 by Hādjdji Kemāl, containing poems by 266 poets, and others, is a custom which is also found in the 16th century and has contributed greatly to our knowledge of Turkish poets.

It is in this century that we find geographical works and travels beginning to appear. In the 15th century we have only translations and excerpts from al-Ḳazwīnī and Ibn al-Wardī as well as a translation from the Greek of Ptolemy. In the 16th century, these two works are again translated, as well as those of Abu ‘l-Fidā‘ (by Sipāhī-zāde) and al-Iṣṭakhrī (by Sherīf Efendi) and ‘Alī Kūshdjī’s work on mathematical geography, and geographical descriptions of Egypt. A *Ālī seyāhat-nāmesi* written in Persian by the merchant ‘Alī Ekber K̄hātāyī was translated into Turkish for Murād III. The celebrated *Bahriyye* of Pīrī Re‘īs [q.v.] written in 935/1529, was a result of the maritime policy of the Turkish empire. It is based in part on older cartographers like Saḫā‘ī and on Italian maps. As a result of Süleymān’s campaigns by land, we have Matrāk̄djī Naṣūh’s [q.v.] work, full of admirable little sketches. Seyyidī ‘Alī Re‘īs wrote his *Muhīl* as a result of his unfortunate exploit in the Indian Ocean, although the book is based entirely on earlier Arab works. The *Mir‘āt al-mamālīk* by the same author is much more original. After it we have the *Seyāhat-nāme* in verse of the merchant Ahmed b. Ibrāhīm, describing his voyage to India. The *Menāzir al-‘awālīm* of

Mehmed ‘Ashik of Trebizond is very important; based on the old Arab geographies, it gives valuable new information about the Ottoman lands. Finally, we may mention a *Ta’rīkh-i Hind-i gharbī* on the discovery of the New World, translated in 990/1582 from a European language by Mehmed Yūsuf al-Herewī (on this literature see F. Taeschner, in *ZDMG*, lxxvii [1923]).

Alongside classical Turkish literature, we find the literature of the people increasing, the knowledge of which was spread by the *kışsa-kh‘ān*, the *meddah* and the *karagözçü* in the popular cafés and in the barracks of the Janissaries. Many classical poets also wrote *türküs* [q.v.] intended for the masses. These *türküs* are in the ‘arūd metre and in the form of *mürebbā‘*; later they were called *sharkī* [q.v.]. This form of poem goes back to the earliest forms of verse among the Turks. But the works of unlettered poets, like Enwerī, Thiyābī, Rāyī, Rahīkī and others, written in imitation of the classical poets, were more to the taste of the people. In popular gatherings such themes as *Abū Muslim*, the *Hamza-nāme*, *Baḥḥāl Ghāzī*, etc. were enthusiastically received. This encouraged Hāshimī of Istanbul to write the *methnewī* entitled *Barķī we-pūlād* taken from the *Hamza-nāme*, and inspired several authors and poets to write similar works. Sultān Süleymān had the story of *Firūz-shāh* translated into Turkish in 8 vols. by Šālīh Efendi, translator of the *Djāmi‘ al-hikāyāt* of ‘Awfī. There were *kışsa-kh‘āns* even in the palaces of the sultans. Alongside of old Islamic and Persian subjects, we find also collections of stories of everyday life like the *Bursalī Kh‘ādja ‘Abd al-Re‘ūf Efendi hikāyesi* by the poet Wahdī, also called *Ana Badī‘ hikāyesi*. The stories of everyday life by Muṣṭafā Djinānī of Bursa in an unaffected style give us a valuable insight into different aspects of the life of the people in these days. Another poet of this kind is Medhī [q.v.], whose real name was Derwīsh Hasan, who was the *meddah* of Murād III (see Rieu, *Cat. of Turk. mss.*, 42).

In the 16th century we are a little better informed regarding the activities of the *ozan* [q.v.], although they are now generally known as ‘ashik or *çöğürçü*. These wandering musicians were to be found wherever the people congregated and used to recite their poems in syllabic metres, love-songs, heroic tales, *merthiyes* and *türküs*. At the beginning of this century we have a portion of Bakhshī’s epic on the Egyptian campaign of Selīm I, and at the end of the century we have the names of Kul Mehmed (d. 1014/1605), Öksüz Dede, Khayālī and Köroghlu, and, in the garrisons of the Maghrib, Çirpanlī, Armutlu, Kul Çulka, Gadāmuşlu (see also Köprülüzāde M. Fu‘ād, *Türk sâz shâ‘irleri*, Istanbul 1930). The influence of the various classes of society on one another even had the result that syllabic metre was sometimes used among the cultured classes (but especially in the *hezl*) and the ‘arūd metre in popular poems, just as had been the case formerly for poems of a religious character. The mystic poets however, following the tradition of Yūnus Emre, wrote their *il-āhīs* in syllabic metre. We may note the names of Ummī Sinān (d. 958/1551), Ahmed Sārbān (d. 952/1545), Idrīs Mukhtefī (d. 1024/1615) and Seyyid Seyf Allāh Khalwetī (d. 1010/1601). But the greatest successors of Yūnus and Kayghusuz were found among the Bektāshīs and Kizilbashs, such as Kul Himmet and his pupil Pīr Sultān Abdal, a native of Stwās who was executed in 1008/1600 by order of Khidr Pasha (cf. Sa‘d al-Dīn Nūzhet, *Pīr Sultān Abdal*, Istanbul 1929). Other products of the popular literature of the period were *Hasan-oghlu türkūleri*, *Kara-oghlan türküsü* and *Geyik destāni*.

(b) After 1600 A. D.

#### 1. The 17th century

In spite of the political decline of the empire, we still find intellectual and literary life pursuing its normal course. The knowledge of the Ottoman literary language spread among the Muslim lower classes generally and also through districts with a non-Turkish population or speaking a non-Ottoman Turkish dialect like eastern Anatolia (Aḥarī dialect) and the Crimea. The Crimea [see *kīrīm*] began to produce a number of Ottoman poets, among them actually some of the Khāns. The influence of Turkish literature and culture is found as early as the 16th century in the use of Arabic characters by the Muslim Hungarians and Croats (cf. *Ungarische Bibliothek*, Budapest 1927, no. 14). There is also a Turkish-Serbian dictionary in verse, called *Potur shāhidīyye*, composed by Hawāyī (*Bull. of the Soc. of Sciences Skoplje*, iii, 189-202), a similar Turkish-Bosniak vocabulary by Uskūfī and several rhymed Turco-Greek glossaries.

Istanbul was always the centre to which men of letters and learning flocked from all parts of the empire and from beyond its frontiers. With the exception of Murād IV, no sultan took an interest in literature, and among statesmen there were relatively few patrons of literature like Ilyās Pasha, Muṣāhib Muṣṭafā Pasha, Rāmī Pasha and the *Sheykh al-Islāms* Yahyā and Behāyī. In spite of this and of the decline in the *medreses*, this century saw scholars of ability like Šarī ‘Abd Allāh [q.v.], Ismā‘īl Anḳarewī, Ishāq Kh‘ādjasī, Ahmed Efendi, and others. The various branches of religious learning and Arabic philology have, however, no great representatives in this century, and the conflict between the *medreses* and the *tekkes* known as the “question of the Kādī-zādes” shows what a narrow point of view still prevailed in the *medreses*. The persecutions of the Šūfī orders, which sometimes had a political object also, did not however prevent these orders from continuing to prosper throughout the empire.

The “classical” Turkish poetry of the 17th century was in no respect below the level of the Persian models. But in place of devoting themselves to imitations and translations, the Turkish poets were now working on original subjects. It is true, on the other hand, that the influence of contemporary Persian and Indo-Persian poets is still felt. Nef‘ī shows the inspiration of ‘Urfī, Nābī of Šā‘ib and Nā‘ilī-yī Qādīm that of Shawḳat.

Nef‘ī [q.v.] may be regarded as the greatest Turkish master of the *kaşide*, on account of the power of his imagination, the richness of his language and the harmony of his style. His *ghazels* and his *hidjw* on the other hand are less successful. The influence of Nef‘ī was always great on his successors, although his period saw several eminent *kaşideçīs*, like New‘ī-zāde ‘Atāyī, Kāf-zāde Fā‘idī, Riyādī, Šabrī and Ridāyī. The greatest representative of the *ghazel* is the *Sheykh al-Islām* Yahyā [q.v.] who may be regarded as the successor of Bāķī, especially on account of his great power to express feelings and emotions. His fame likewise survived into the following centuries. Other representatives of the school of Bāķī and Yahyā are the *Sheykh al-Islām* Behāyī and Wedjdī. In contrast to the latter, the poets Fehīm [q.v.], Nā‘ilī-yī Qādīm [q.v.], Shehrī and even the poet Nābī [q.v.] were under the influence of contemporary Persian poetry. Nābī, on whom can be noticed the influence of Šā‘ib, became renowned for his *methnewī khyriyyes* and his *ghazels*. His poems are characterised by the preponderance of intellectual conceptions, but this has not affected his popularity. In many of his poems he

describes and criticises the social life of his time. His young contemporary Thābit [q.v.] endeavours to show his originality by mingling proverbial expressions with his poetry. Among the masters of the *ghazel* in the 17th century we may also mention Nishāfī Mewlewī, Djewrī and Rāmī Mehmed Pasha.

‘Azmi-zāde Hāletī [q.v.] excelled in all poetical genres and is best known for his *rubā’īs*. The *lughz* [q.v.] and the *mu‘ammā* became very popular, as did the *ta’rīkh* (chronogram). The *hidju* and *mizāh*, composed in different forms, caused poets of the first rank to write very coarse things. Some products of this genre, however, can be appreciated, like the *tedhkere* in the form of a *methnewī* by Güftī in which the author depicts contemporary poets; the *hidju* of Fehīm and of Djewrī, written in the form of *mulamma‘*, are curious because the text is scattered with passages in non-Turkish languages.

Some *methnewīs* of the first half of the century show a remarkable perfection. The subjects of the old *kham-sas* are gradually replaced by more topical subjects. The greatest representative of the style is New‘ī-zāde ‘Aṭāyī [q.v.] who acquired his great reputation with his *Khamasa*, the subjects of which are taken from the life of his time. This poet reveals the influence of his Turkish predecessors like Yaḥyā of Tashlīdja and Djinānī (see above). After him we may note the following authors of *methnewīs*: Kāf-zāde Fā‘idī, Ghānī-zāde Nādirī and Riyādī. It was mainly in this century that it became fashionable to write *Sākī-nāmes* in imitation of the Persian poet Zuhūrī, although this genre is already found earlier, as is shown by the *‘Ishret-nāme* of Rewānī (16th century). Among the *Sākī-nāmes* we may specially note those of ‘Aṭāyī, Riyādī and Hāletī; all are tinged with mysticism. The *methnewī* thus served for all sorts of subjects taken from daily life, stories, descriptions, speculative works, tales of actual events, etc.

The number of religious and mystical works, lives of Šūfī saints and didactic works connected with the different *ṭarīkas*, is very great in this century. Poetical forms were often used for them. Very well-known is the *Mi‘rādīyye* of Nādirī. Then there were panegyrics of the Prophet (*na‘ī*), translations in verse of the *Ḥādīth-i arba‘īn*, of *mawliids* etc. Among the Šūfī poets there were some who used the syllabic metre; we may note Niyāzī-i Mišrī, founder of the Mišriyye branch of the *Khalwetiyye* order, whose poems were long popular; the *Bektāshīs* also numbered several poets in their ranks. There are also a large number of historical works in verse, *Shāh-nāmes*, *Ghazā-nāmes*, etc., like the *Shāh-nāme* of Nādirī of the time of ‘Othmān II and others. The *Shehīnshāh-nāme* written by Mülhemī by order of Murād IV has only the preface in Turkish; the rest is Persian in keeping with the old tradition. It is in this century also that the custom begins of writing brief Ottoman histories in verse; we have that of Ṭālibī, written in 1017/1608, of Nīthārī (d. 1075/1664) written for Mehemmed IV, and the *Fihrist-i Shāhān*, dedicated to Mehemmed IV by Şolāzāde Hemdemī, and continued by a series of poets down to Dīyā (Ziyā) Pasha in the 19th century. This kind of work has neither much historical nor literary value.

Literary prose follows the same lines as in the preceding century. The great stylists (*münshī*), like Weysī, Nergisī [q.v.], Okdju-zāde [q.v.] and others, carried affection of language to a still more advanced degree. A fine specimen is given by the official documents addressed to the Persian court and written by *münshīs* like Hükmi; this same style was sometimes used even in private correspondence. The works

which were considered to have no literary value in their day are those which are now most appreciated, like those of Koçī Beg, Kātib Çelebi, Ewliyā Çelebi and Na‘imā. Histories, in this century also, take first place among prose works. There are several which have the character of semi-official chronicles like the *Shāh-nāme* written in prose by Taşköprüzāde [q.v.] for ‘Othmān II. Murād IV appointed Kābilī as *wak‘a-nūwīs* for the Eriwan campaign. In 1074/1664 the *nishāndji* ‘Abd al-Rahmān Pasha was appointed by Mehemmed IV to chronicle events, as was Mehemmed Khalifa [q.v.] of Fındıklı by Muştafā II. It is only later that Na‘imā was appointed *wak‘a-nūwīs*. The historical works of this century are translations of the general histories of Islam, original works on the same subject, general and special works and monographs on Ottoman history. From the historical point of view, the most important are the *Djāmi‘ al-duwal*, written in Arabic by Müneccidjim Bāshī [q.v.], the *Fedhke* of Kātib Çelebi, the *Ta’rīkh* of Peçewī and the best that of Na‘imā. The great encyclopaedist Kātib Çelebi [q.v.] also reveals himself in his *Mizān al-hakḳ* and *Dastūr al-‘amal* as a historian of penetrating insight. Peçewī [q.v.], who made use of Christian sources, is also very valuable for his sound judgment and impartiality. Na‘imā [q.v.] who possessed descriptive powers of the first order, gives vivid psychological analyses of historical characters. Koçī Beg [q.v.] examines in his celebrated *Risāle* the causes of the decline of the empire. Kara Çelebi-zāde is a *münshī* rather than a historian. We must also mention chroniclers like Wedjīhī, Ḥasan Bey-zāde and Şolāzāde, as well as the *dheyh* to the *Shakā‘ik-i nu‘māniyye* by New‘ī-zāde ‘Aṭāyī and the continuation by ‘Ushshākī-zāde.

The *tedhkere* is much below the level of the 16th century; the most notable is that of Riyādī written in 1018/1609. The *Riyād al-shu‘arā* of Kāf-zāde Fā‘idī composed in 1030/1621 also contains specimens of the work of the poets dealt with in it. There is also the *dheyh* to this work by Mehemmed ‘Āşim (d. 1086/1675), the concise *tedhkere* of Riḍā and that of Güftī already mentioned. The *Matālī‘ al-nazā‘ir* by Kḥiṣālī (d. 1062/1652) is a collection of *maṭla‘as*.

In the field of geography, the most important works are those of Kātib Çelebi and Abū Bakr Dimashkī. They use European as well as Muslim sources. The *Seyāhat-nāme* of Ewliyā Çelebi [q.v.] is important for the history of all aspects of social life. In spite of its defects it is a work without an equal in Turkish literature. In this century also the first *sefāret-nāmes* appear.

The great popularity of the *shehnāmedji*, *meddāh*, *karagözçji*, etc. continued in this century in all classes of society. At Bursa we have Derwīsh Kāmilī, Kurbānī ‘Alisi and others, at Erzerüm Kaşşāb Kurd, Kandıllı-oghlu, etc. In Istanbul there were eighty *meddāhs*, who were organised in a gild (*eşnaf*); the best known is Tiflī [q.v.] who was *medim* to Murād IV. Towards the end of this century, the *meddāh* Kırīmī (d. 1120/1708) flourished.

The musician-poets (*sāz shā‘irleri*) became very numerous in the 17th century. We find them among the Janissaries, the *sipāhīs* [q.v.], the *lewends* [q.v.], the *Djelālīs* [see DJALĀLĪ in Suppl.], and in the religious bodies like the *Kızılbaş* and the *Bektāshīs*. They were always to be found in military retinues. The writer of this article succeeded in collecting and identifying the works and names of about thirty musician-poets of this century. The most notable are Gewherī and ‘Ömer ‘Ashīk [q.v.]; the latter has almost become the patron saint of the *sāz shā‘irleri* (cf. Köprülü-zāde

M. Fu’ād, *Türk sazşairlerine ait metinler ve-tetkikler*, i-v, İstanbul 1929-30). The influence of this popular literature is felt even among the upper classes, as in the poems of the Khān of the Crimea, Mehmed Girāy, who wrote under the *makhlās* of Kāmil, and a *merthiye* of ‘Afife Sulṭān, one of the favourites of Meḥammed IV. Several “classical” poets also wrote *sharkīs* for the masses. The poem on the hero *Gençî ‘Othmān* by Kayıkdjī Muṣtafā has actually given rise to a folk-tale which still survives in Anatolia (Köprülü-zāde, *Kaykıcı kul Mustafa ve-genc osman hikayesi*, İstanbul 1930). It is probable that several other folk-tales originated in this century, like those called *‘Ashik Kerem*, *‘Ashik Ghārib*, and *Shāh Ismā‘il*. Lastly, we see from the statements of Ewliyā Çelebi that it was in this century that the *orta oyunu* [q.v.] began to be popular with the people.

### 2. The 18th century

Literature and culture in this century continued to follow the same lines as in the preceding centuries. There was a vast output in prose and poetry, while the intellectual links with Persia and Transoxania continued to exist. Persian poets, especially Shawḳat and Şā‘ib, exercised a great influence on Turkish poetry. But in spite of all this, the tendency to a more individual development gained in strength and was shown in the endeavours to simplify the language. It is mainly due to the great poets of the beginning of this century that classical Turkish poetry entered on a path entirely independent of contemporary Persian poetry.

The period of Dāmād Ibrāhīm Paṣha [see IBRĀHĪM PAṢHA, DĀMĀD] is a very important one. Many works were written and translated by his orders or those of Sultan Aḥmed III. Committees were appointed to translate important works rapidly. Among the poets of this period we may mention ‘Othmān-zāde Ahmed Tā‘ib [q.v.], who was called the king of poets, Seyyid Wehbī, Sāmī, Rāshid, Neylī, Selīm, Kāmī of Edirne, Durri, Thākib, ‘Arif, Sālīm, Çelebi-zāde ‘Aṣım, and ‘Izzet ‘Alī Paṣha. Nedīm [q.v.] in particular acquired a great reputation in the second half of the century and later. His *ghazels* and his *sharkīs* recall the period of Sa‘dābād [see LĀLE DEWRİ] and by his original subjects, rich imagination and harmonious language, he surpasses his predecessors and his contemporaries. In the *sharkī* he reached a level which neither Nāzım before him nor Fāḍil Enderūnī after him attained. It was also through the patronage of Dāmād Ibrāhīm Paṣha that Ibrāhīm Mütferriḳa [q.v.] was able to inaugurate Muslim Turkish printing [see MATBA‘A. 2]; but for several reasons printing remained confined to a very restricted sphere throughout this century and did not exercise any particular influence on intellectual or artistic life.

Among the great poets of this century we must also make special mention of Koçja Rāghib Paṣha [q.v.], the greatest representative of the school of Nābī, and Sheykh Ghālib [q.v.], the last great poet of the classical period. In the *kaṣide* it was the influence of Nef‘ī that dominated, while in the *ghazel* there was a rivalry between the disciples of Nedīm and Sāmī on the one hand and admirers of Nābī on the other. But towards the end of the century, a decline in both schools became apparent; poets like Fāḍil Enderūnī [q.v.] and Sūnbül-zāde Wehbī [q.v.] are only mere imitators. The poets of this century practised all forms of poetry and special attention was devoted to genres characteristic of an epoch of decadence, like the *hidju*, the *hezl*, the *mu‘ammā* (enigma) and the *ta‘rīkh* (chronogram), while immorality and a general decline in good taste increased. On the other hand, true

religious inspiration still continued, as may be seen from the *munāddjāt* and the *na‘t* of Nāzım [q.v.], the *Mi‘rādjiyyes* of poets like Nāyī ‘Othmān Dede, Naḥifī [q.v.] and ‘Arif Süleymān Bey and the verse translation of the *Methnewī* of Mewlānā by Naḥifī. The *methnewīs* of this period are numerous but of little literary value, the old subjects of the *khamṣa* are entirely dropped, with the exception of the *Husn-u ‘ishk* of Sheykh Ghālib, the last masterpiece of this class. Finally, the rhymed historical works of this period and the Şūfī poems by initiates of the various orders are of little importance.

Literary prose tends to become gradually simpler, although we still find imitations of the style of Nergisī and Oğcı-zāde. A well-known stylist like ‘Othmān-zāde Tā‘ib openly declared against exaggerated artificiality in prose. Historical works occupy the first place. Among authors serving as *wak‘a-nūwis* [q.v.] we may mention Rāshid, Çelebi-zāde ‘Aṣım and Wāṣif, but none of them can be compared to their predecessors like Na‘imā, although hundreds of people were writing biographical and historical works. The political and military decline of the empire caused a large number of *lāyiha* (“memoirs”) to be written investigating the causes. The most remarkable of these memoirs is that of Koçja Segbān Baṣhī. From the point of view of geography, we may note a number of important *sefāret-nāmes*, of which the *Fransa sefāret-nāmesi* of Yirmi-Sekiz Çelebi Meḥmed Efendi [see MEHMET YIRMISEKİZ] is a typical example; these works were occasionally, although rarely, written in verse. The *sür-nāmes* written to celebrate the splendid festivals held by the sulṭāns are important sources for sociological research. Those best known are the *Sür-nāmes* of Seyyid Wehbī and of Ḥaṣḥmet. The collections of biographies of poets are even more numerous than in the preceding century. We may mention the *tedhkeres* of Şafāyī and Sālīm and that of Belīgh [q.v.]; the *tedhkere* of Esrār Dede [q.v. in Suppl.] is specially devoted to Mewlewī poets; to this century belong also the *Wakā‘i‘ al-fudālā‘* of Sheykhī, which is the final continuation (*dheyl*) of the *Shakā‘ik*. Lastly, the *Tuhfe-yi khattātin* of Mustakīm-zāde [q.v.]—whom we may regard as the greatest encyclopaedist of this century—is the most important source for the Muslim and Turkish calligraphers (*khattān*). In the field of geography we have only translations and excerpts from European works.

The *meddāh*, *karagözçü* and *orta oyundju* continued to enjoy the same popularity among all classes of society. The works of the musician-poets were also known everywhere; we may mention Kīmetī, Nūrī, Lewnī, Kaḳa Sakal Meḥmed and Faṣihī, but the popularity of Gewherī and ‘Ashik ‘Ömer continued; some of these poets were of Armenian origin, like Meḍjnūn and Warṭan who lived at the beginning of the century. This influence of Turkish musician-poets on the poems of the Armenian *ashūgh* perhaps begins as early as the 16th century (see KÖPRÜLÜ-ZĀDE, in *Edebiyyāt Fakültesi Meḍjmū‘asi* [1922], i, 1-32). The best example of the way in which the literary taste of the people had penetrated among the upper classes is the fact that the great poet Nedīm also wrote a *türkü* in the popular metre. This tendency became more marked as the century advanced.

### 3. The 19th century

At the beginning of this century, Ottoman literature had sunk to a very low level which continued till the period of the *Tanzimāt*. Wāṣif Enderūnī [q.v.] and ‘Izzet Molla [q.v.] alone show some originality. Wāṣif appeals to the popular taste and shows the influence of Nedīm as well as that of Fāḍil



Enderūnī. ‘Izzet Molla, while strongly influenced by Nedīm and Sheykh Ghālib, is, however, a much greater poet than Wāṣif, especially as regards the purity of his language and his poetical technique; in addition to *kaṣīdes* and *ghazels*, he wrote quite good *methnewīs*; he is the last “master” of classical poetry before the *Tanzīmāt*. It is true that even after the *Tanzīmāt*, many poets wrote *kaṣīdes* and *ghazels* in the ancient style, and among them the great advocates of literary innovations like Nāmīk Kemāl and Diyā Paṣha; to this period also belong Ghālib Bey of Leskofča, ‘Awnī Bey and ‘Arif Hikmet Bey [q.v.], all imitators of Nā’īlī and Fehīm-i Kādīm. They had, however, no influence on the course of literary development. It was only natural that the old literary tradition could not disappear at one stroke; Shināsī and his school had to maintain a long and hard struggle against the old school.

The prose of the period before the *Tanzīmāt* is not of much value, although the production was not less than in preceding centuries. In history, the *Ta’rīkh* of Müterdjīm ‘Aṣım [q.v.] is remarkable for its style and critical ability; the author uses even simpler language in his translation of the *Burhān-i kātibī* and of the *Kāmūs*. The *waḳ‘a-nūwīs* Es‘ad Efendi [q.v.], translator of the *Mustatraf* of al-Ibshīhī and author of the well-known *Üss-i zafer* on the extermination of the Janissaries, is far below ‘Aṣım, with his insipid language and confused style. The same writer edited the *Takwīm-i wekâ’ir*, and Sultan Maḥmūd II reproached him with the obscurity of his language in an account of a journey of the sultan which he had drawn up in this capacity. On the other hand, in his translation of the *Mustatraf*, he recommends the use of Turkish instead of Arabic and Persian words and the simplification of literary style, which shows to what an extent the movement to simplify the language had made progress. Lastly, we must not forget the celebrated poet and stylist Meḥmed ‘Akif Paṣha [q.v.] who, in spite of several poems written in the popular metre and some works in simple prose, ought not to be regarded as the first to spread literary innovations. ‘Akif Paṣha, indeed, remained entirely unaffected by European culture and was one of the last representatives of the old literature.

Among the representatives of the popular literature we have information about the *meddāhs* Pič Emīn, Kız Aḥmed, Hādīdjī Mü‘edhdhin, Kōr Hāfīz and others, as well as of some writers of shadow-plays (*khayālđji*) like Sherbetđji Emīn, Hāfīz of Kāṣım Paṣha, Muṣāhib Sa‘īd Efendi; it is only towards the end of the century that Kātīb Ṣālīh in breaking with the ancient tradition began to imitate the modern theatre.

The best known musician-poets of this century are Derdlī, Dhīhnī of Bayburt and Emrāḥ of Erzerum, who acquired a great and well-merited popularity in Anatolia as well as in Istanbul among all classes (see Kōprülü-zāde, *Erzurumlu Emrah*, Istanbul 1929). Down to the end of the reign of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, these *‘āshīks* used to assemble in a café in Taḡuḳ Pazārī. They had an organisation of their own with a chief (*re’īs*) at their head, recognised by the government. This organisation was broken up later on, but in the early 20th century there were still found musician-poets in Anatolia.

This classical Turkish literature and especially the poetry had lost almost all its vigour and originality by the time the *Tanzīmāt* began. Classical poetry had lost the ability to create anything new within its narrow limitations, and the poets could only produce imitations (*naẓīre*) of the great masters of the past, or in their efforts to show a little originality, fall into ar-

tificiality and platitude. As a result of continually repeating the same conceptions by the same limited means of expression, all the vitality of Turkish poetry was destroyed. Even great artists like Nedīm and Sheykh Ghālib had not been able to escape the rigid rules of the old models. On the other hand, the attempts to draw upon the language and literature of the people and to appeal more to popular taste and language, efforts such as we observe in Fādīl Enderūnī and Wāṣif, only resulted in vulgarity and banality. In spite of the political and economic connection with Europe which had existed for centuries, the social structure of the Ottoman people had never emerged from the frame of traditional Islamic civilisation, which had kept it imprisoned in a mediaeval system of ideas. It is true that the continual military defeats and the gradual economic decline had impressed upon thinking people the material and technical superiority of Europe and that, as early as the 18th century, they had begun to take advantage of European skills to reorganise the army and the fleet. But it was much more difficult to admit the superiority of Europe in the field of culture. The *medreses*, which were in a very backward state compared with earlier centuries, still clung tenaciously to the mentality and tastes of the Middle Ages. Modern science was beginning to be introduced only in institutions founded for the army, like the Engineering School (*mühendis-khāne*) and the Medical School (*tıbb-khāne*). These innovations owed a great deal to a few individuals, who had studied western languages and modern sciences, like Khodja Ishāk Efendi, Gelenberī and Shānī-zāde. It was the need felt by Selīm III, and especially by Maḥmūd II, to reorganise the army and navy and to establish a central administration to prevent the empire being parcelled out between feudal chiefs, that led them to consent, in spite of the opposition of the *medreses*, to the reform of the teaching of mathematics and natural sciences.

From the end of the 18th century, there were in Turkey men who knew French and recognised the cultural superiority of Europe. In bringing teachers from France and sending students to Europe, the movement of Europeanisation was encouraged in Turkey. It was natural then that, as a result of all these needs, European influence began to show itself little by little in every branch of life, including the fields of thought and art.

(c) “European-type” Turkish literature.

The period of the *Tanzīmāt* and the new literature

The great industrial and capitalist development in Europe as well as the political expansion and rivalry of the imperialist Great Powers could not long ignore so vast and rich a field of exploitation as Turkey. At the same time, the mediaeval institutions of the empire had lost their power of resistance, and the revolutionary movements in France had propagated the principle of nationality among the non-Muslim elements. All these circumstances made the urgent need felt of introducing reforms in the social and administrative institutions of the empire. These reforms were to meet with considerable resistance, not only among the lower classes but also among those members of the educated classes who had been educated in the *medreses*. It was due to Muṣṭafā Reshīd Paṣha [q.v.] and his little group of followers that the reforms were gradually introduced into the country. In Turkish history these reforms are known as *Tanzīmāt* [q.v.].

The *Tanzīmāt* were not confined to the fields of administration, justice and finance; with the object of

securing the progress of education among the Muslim Turks, primary and secondary schools were opened and plans made to found a university. An *Endjūmen-i dānīsh* was formed to prepare schoolbooks (1269/1853) and students were sent to Europe. The *Endjūmen-i dānīsh* was soon replaced by the *Djem‘iyet-i ‘ilmiyye-yi ‘othmāniyye* (1277/1860), which began to publish its own organ, *Medjmu‘a-yi fūnūn*. In the following year, the Girls' School was opened and in 1279/1862 University courses were begun. In 1282/1865 was formed a *Terdjeme djem‘iyeti*, in 1284/1867 the Civil School of Medicine (*Tibbiyye-i mülkiyye mektebi*) began its lectures, and in the following year, the Lycée of Galata Saray was opened, the curriculum of which was adapted from western secondary schools and French was used for teaching alongside of Turkish. The University (*Dār ül-Fūnūn*) was opened in 1286/1869, but the intrigues of the conservative elements forced it to be closed two years later. In 1287/1870 the School of Law (*Hukūk mektebi*) was opened and in 1294/1877 a School of Political Sciences (*Mekteb-i mülkiyye*). At the same time, museums and libraries were founded as well as technical schools such as the engineering, agricultural and commercial schools. Thus there was gradually created an educated class outside the *medreses*. All this activity was accompanied by a gradual development of the daily press. In 1247/1831 the official publication *Takwīm-i wekā‘ī‘* began to appear, which was followed by the *Djeride-yi hawādith* in 1256/1840, the *Terdjümān-i ahwāl* in 1276/1859 and the *Taşwīr-i eskār* in 1278/1861 [see DJARĪDA. iii. Turkey]. These two last mark an important stage in the history of modern developments for it was through them that Shināsī, founder of the new literary school, and his disciple Nāmīk Kemāl addressed the public. Down to the period when the absolutism of ‘Abd ül-Ḥamīd II prevented any kind of publication, the Turkish press developed very rapidly. Many scientific and literary works were translated from European languages, especially from French, and the Turkish language began to be simplified, at the same time enriching itself with a large number of scientific expressions.

The three great figures of the new literature are Shināsī [q.v.] who had been educated in France, his great disciple Nāmīk Kemāl [see KEMĀL, MEHMED NĀMĪK] and Ziyā (Diyā) Paṣha [q.v.], both of whom had lived in France as exiles. Through these circumstances the new school was imbued with the French literature of the 18th and 19th centuries, and the principles proclaimed during the political revolutions in France. The innovators wished to sweep away the old feudal literature and proclaim the ideas of "fatherland" (*waṭan*), "liberty" (*hurriyyet*), "democracy" (*khalkdijīlik*) and "constitutionalism" (*meshrūtiyyet*); and they aimed at creating a "bourgeois" literature. It was in this way that journalism, political and literary criticism, the theatre, the translation of western literary works, the novel and the philosophical and sociological study began. Shināsī was neither a brilliant stylist nor a great poet, but his programme was well defined; he wished to free himself from the trammels of the old unintelligible language, and although he was not able to realise all this programme, his theories exercised a great influence on those around him. Ziyā Paṣha, by his translations of Rousseau and Molière and by his literary and political criticism, gave great support to this movement. He was well versed in the classical literature, yet he went so far as to allege that this literature had no relation to the Turkish character; he upheld the thesis that one ought to follow nature, i.e. borrow

from the popular language and literature. In reality, Ziyā Paṣha had neither the strength nor the courage to put these theories into force.

It was undoubtedly Nāmīk Kemāl who assured the definite success of the new school. He was a great artist, a keen fighter, a prolific author and a great patriot. For him, art was a means of provoking a revival in the land and he contributed vigorously to the cultural and political revolution in Turkey by his political articles, his dramas, his novels, his patriotic poetry, his historical works, his critical essays and even by his private letters. He exercised a profound influence. The presentation of *Waṭan* was a great political event in the country. He attacked the old literature even more bitterly than Ziyā Paṣha and thought that it was impossible to write Turkish poetry in the *‘arūd* metre. However, not even Kemāl could cast off the old traditions entirely, nor could his friends. It is for this reason that Sa‘d Allāh Paṣha was able to write in 1297/1880 in an anonymous article in the journal *Wakt*, that pupils should only be given literal translations of western works because the "new" writers had not been able to produce in reality anything really new.

‘Abd al-Ḥaḥḥ Ḥāmid [q.v.], a pupil of Nāmīk Kemāl, brought about a great revolution in the field of poetry, which hitherto had not been able to free itself from ancient forms. This extremely prolific poet introduced into Turkish the lyric and the drama in which his models were Dante, Racine, Corneille and Shakespeare. Even Nāmīk Kemāl acknowledged that the new Turkish poetry begins with Ḥāmid. Other important figures were Redjā‘-zāde Ekrem [see EKREM] and Sāmī Paṣha-zāde Sezā‘ī [q.v.], but in proportion as the pressure of despotism increased, the second generation of the period of the *Tanzīmāt* began to pursue purely artistic ends.

Many other thinkers or writers contributed to the cultural evolution of the country. We may mention the famous historian Ahmed Djewdet Paṣha [q.v.], Ahmed Wefīk Paṣha [q.v.], Süleymān Paṣha, and the great writer and encyclopaedist Ahmed Midḥat Efendi [q.v.], as well as the lexicographer Shāms al-Dīn Sāmī Bey [q.v.]. Djewdet Paṣha, well versed in Islamic learning and author of a Turkish grammar in collaboration with Fu‘ād Paṣha, wrote beautiful prose in Turkish. Ahmed Wefīk, animated by western ideas, wished to revive national culture, and proclaimed the fact that the Turks of Anatolia were a branch of the great Turkish nation. He compiled the first dictionary of Anatolian Turkish, collected proverbs and translated the *Shadjara-yi Turk* of Abu ‘l-Ḥāzī. By his adaptations of the comedies of Molière, he played a great part in the development of the Turkish theatre. Süleymān Paṣha, who reorganised the military schools, was a great patriot. He claimed that the language and literature should be called "Turkish" and not 'Othmānlī; and in his *Ta‘rīkh-i ‘Ālem* he devoted a special chapter to the early Turks, taking his material from J. de Guignes and other sources.

Lastly, Ahmed Midḥat wrote and translated hundreds of volumes of a popular nature, beginning with books of the alphabet; he thus trained the people to read and contributed to raising the level of education, which was his only aim, for his books have no scientific or literary value. Sāmī Bey showed himself a worthy successor of Wefīk Paṣha in his *Kāmūs al-a‘lām* and *Kāmūs-i türki*.

At the end of the 19th century appeared Mu‘allim Nādīj [q.v.], who obtained great fame under the protection of Ahmed Midḥat. Nādīj was well versed in

Islamic culture and wrote *ghazels* in the classical style alongside good poems in the new style. The followers of the old school expected from him almost a resurrection of classicism, although Nādjī was not at all a champion of such a reaction, as is shown by his beautiful simple prose (as in ‘*Ömeriñ çodjuklughu*). His quarrels with Ekrem Bey originated rather in personal reasons. At the same time Nābī-zāde Nāzım, who died very young, came to the front; his novel *Zehrā* makes him a figure of first importance in literary history.

The most important event at the end of the 19th century is the literary movement begun by a group of youthful men of letters who had associated themselves, at the instigation of Redjā’ī-zāde Ekrem, with the periodical *Therwet-i Fünūn* [q.v.]; this movement marks the second and last stage of the Europeanisation of Turkish literature. It is dominated by the figures of Tewfīk Fikret and Khālīd Ziyā (Ziyā) [q.v.] and is very much under the influence of the literary movements in France at the end of the 19th century. Started in a period of absolute despotism and having only a short life of five or six years, this movement produced works of a neurotic and pessimistic sentimentality. Its motto was “art for art’s sake”. If we except Djenāb Shihāb al-Dīn, who acquired after the revolution the reputation of a great prose writer, Süleymān Nażif, who may be considered a pupil of Nāmīk Kemāl with an originality of his own, Fā’ik ‘Alī, an imitator of ‘Abd al-Ḥaḡḡ Hāmīd, and Ismā‘īl Şafā, an independent figure, who found his subjects in everyday life, all the poets who wrote in the *Therwet-i Fünūn* were imitators of Tewfīk Fikret. Khālīd Ziyā, who had a very choice style, was the true founder of the literary novel in Turkish. He takes his subjects generally from the upper middle classes, but some of his short stories describe the life of the people. The latter genre was more successfully treated by the novelists Ahmed Hikmet and Hüseyin Džahid, in more simple language. Mehmed Ra’uf [q.v.] was a novelist who made excellent psychological analyses, but his language was imperfect. In the field of science, philosophy and criticism, the collaborators on the *Therwet-i Fünūn* did no more than translate. But the severe censorship and the short life of the group did not enable them to show greater vitality.

While the school of Tewfīk Fikret and Khālīd Ziyā reflected only the life of the upper classes, Hüseyin Raḡmī [q.v.] depicted in his novels various aspects of the life of the people; and at the same time the notable publicist Ahmed Rāsım [q.v.] was dealing in several of his works with the same subject. Among the poets of this period, we may further mention Riḡā (Rizā) Tewfīk [q.v.] who wrote the finest lyrics in the style of the ‘*ashīk* poets and Bektāshīs, but in syllabic metre, the poetess Nigār Khānīm and lastly Mehmed Emin Bey [q.v.], who suddenly became celebrated during the Turco-Greek war by his *Türkçe şhi’rler*. Mehmed Emin employed a very simple language in the syllabic metre and wished to reach the people directly (*khalka doghru*), although the existing popular literature with its mentality, tastes and traditional forms were entirely unknown to him. As a man of letters he was entirely of the school of Fikret; he was not, however, an individualist like his contemporaries but imbued with the populist spirit (*khalkdjilik*). This was the first occasion on which a Turkish poet had descended to the level of the people. Perhaps it is right to charge him with a lack of lyrical feeling, but this does not prevent us from regarding him as an interesting figure in literary history. At the same time, the movement to simplify the language continued and even gave rise to

an exaggerated purism. By the translation of the works of European scholars, the early history and culture of the Turks became known, while the journalistic activities of the young Turks abroad began to envisage Turkish nationalism from the political point of view. These were the main elements in the cultural and literary life of Turkey before the Young Turk Revolution of 1908.

This event, having brought about the abolition of the censorship, caused an extended literary activity. The patriotic pieces of Kemāl and Hāmīd re-appeared on the stage and a large number of works of a sociological, philosophical and historical nature were translated into Turkish. At the same time, great improvements were made in education and the relations with Europe raised the general cultural level to a height never before reached.

The most important literary movement after the Revolution was that of the *Fedjir-i ātī* [q.v.], although it was a literary circle which lasted only a short time; its members began by following the school of Fikret and Khālīd Ziyā, but the majority of them ended up as members of the national literary movement. Ahmed Hāshım alone continued to develop in the way he had first chosen. He never abandoned the ‘*arūd* metre, nor the conception of “art for art’s sake” in its strictest form. Besides, he had ideas of his own on the relation between music and poetry (see H. Duda, *Ahmed Hāshım*, in *WI*, ii [1928], 200-44). The poet Yaḡyā Kemāl (Beyatlı) [q.v.], who had a great influence after 1912, had literary views entirely different from those of Ahmed Hāshım, for he sought music rather in the exterior elements of his poems, while he retained the motto “art for art’s sake”. Another poet, who remained outside the national literature, was Mehmed ‘Akif (Ersoy), the advocate of Pan-Islamism [q.v.] and unrivalled master of the ‘*arūd* metre; in simple language he described the life of the people in its most realistic aspects. ‘Akif, whose lyrics sometimes rose to great heights, remained quite uninfluenced by western poetry; he was a democratic poet, born of the people. In the work of these three poets, very different from one another, we see Turkish poetry striving to free itself from the too limited sphere of Tewfīk Fikret and his school; but under the stimulus of the great development of the nationalist movement, which manifested itself in the whole domain of art, poetry also ended by entering on new paths.

(d) The national literature

After the Revolution of 1908, it was the ideal of Ottomanism (*‘othmānlilik*) that animated the governing classes. But the political events which rapidly followed, soon proved that this ideal was a chimera, by the attitude of the Muslim elements no less than by that of the Christians. The Turkish element, which was dominant in the empire, thus needed a new ideal; this was the national ideal, which had already revealed itself in the period of the *Tanzīmāt* and which had existed through the Ḥamīdian period in a cultural form. After the revolution also, this movement began by assuming a cultural aspect. On 28 December 1908, the society *Türk Derneği* was founded, the object of which was to study the past and present of the Turkish peoples, to simplify the Turkish language and to make it a language of science. This society had not much power, but in November 1911 the periodical *Türk Yurdu* began to appear and on 12 March 1912, the *Türk Ođjaghi* was founded. This movement was not confined to a few Turkish patriots; associated with it were a number of Turkish intellectuals from other countries who had fled from Russian expansionism, like Aghaoghlu Ahmed, Hüseyin-zāde ‘Alī and Ak Coraoghlu

Yūsuf. The movement was violently opposed by the followers of a badly-understood occidentalism (*gharb-đılık*) on the one side, and by the partisans of Pan-Islamism (*ittihād-i İslām*) on the other. At the same time, the periodical *Gendī Kalemler*, published at Salonika, again started, under a pretentious name, a campaign to purify the Turkish language, and Ziyā (Diyā) Gök Alp [see GÖKALP, ZİYĀ] a member of the Committee of Union and Progress [see İTTİHĀD WE TERAKKĪ DJEM‘İYYETİ] began his activities. With the transfer of the central office to Istanbul, Ziyā Gök Alp joined the *Türk Yurdu*. Later, after the disastrous conclusion of the Balkan War, the younger generation also rallied to the national movement. The time was very opportune for the success of the national ideal; it only required a man capable of directing the national idea and laying down a programme and giving it a philosophical basis. It was Ziyā Gök Alp who did this. He exercised a great influence on the youth by his university courses, by his lectures and by his articles and poems; all his life, from the time of the Balkan War to the Armistice, when he was exiled to Malta, and later during his sojourn in Diyār Bakr and Anḳara, he displayed an uninterrupted activity: the résumé of his teaching is contained in his book *Türkçülüğün esasları* (Ankara 1339/1923, Istanbul 1940, Eng. tr., *Principles of Turkism*, 1968). His death, soon after, was a cause of general mourning throughout the land.

As in all branches of life, the national movement made its influence felt in literature: the syllabic metre attained the dominant position in poetry; the language was simplified; the motto ‘art for art’s sake’ was replaced by ‘art for life’; writers began to borrow from popular literature and its traditional forms; literature began to reflect the life and characteristics of all branches of society. Philological and historical studies were made on the works of the musician-poets, on the popular literature, the music of the people. In brief, the science of Turkology was founded, in large measure through the efforts of Mehmed Fu‘ād Köprülü (1890-1966 [q.v.]). All this contributed greatly to give a definite direction to the new literary movement.

Among the poets of this movement we may give first place to Fārūk Nāfidh, who in his last poems depicts the scenery of Anatolia, then Orkhān Seyfī [q.v.], Enīs Behīdī, Yūsuf Ziyā, Khālīd Fakhrī and Nedjīb Fādīl. All these show the influence of Ziyā Gök Alp and Yahyā Kemāl rather than of Mehmed Emīn. In prose, progress was still more marked and the writers in it have still greater force. The greatest figure of the period is Khālīde Edīb Khānīm (Adıvar [q.v.]). After the stories of love and passion which are characteristic of her first period she wrote books in the style of *Ateşden gömlek* in which she describes the struggle of Anatolia for independence. ‘Ömer Seyfed-din [q.v.], who died young, has left a number of very good little stories, some of which, like *Bombā*, are masterpieces of national literature. Refik Khālīd (Karay [q.v.]), who is perhaps the best writer of simple Turkish, describes in his *Memleket hikâyeleri* realistic scenes of Anatolian life, hitherto unknown to literature; his realism is however expressed in a merciless sarcasm, quite devoid of sympathy and feeling. Ya‘küb Kadri (Karaosmanoğlu [q.v. in Suppl.]) even in his novels, is more a stylist and a mystic poet than a story-teller. Other well-known figures in the new prose are Fālih Rikī (Atay [q.v. in Suppl.]), who describes in *Ateş we-güneh* episodes of the war in Palestine, and Rūshen Eshref. Among the novelists Reshād Nūrī (Güntekin [q.v.]) achieved fame by his novel *Çali kushu*.

The Western-type theatre enjoyed a great spurt in popularity as a result of the Young Turk Revolution and increased political liberalisation after the restoration of the constitution. Many of the plays of this period were patriotic ephemera only; but significant for the future evolution of the drama in Turkey was the first appearance in 1919 of a Turkish Muslim woman actress on the stage [see further, MASRAH. 3. In Turkey].

*Bibliography:* For general works on Ottoman literature and its various genres, see J. von Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst bis auf unsere Zeit*, 4 vols., Pesth 1836-8; E.J.W. Gibb, *A history of Ottoman poetry*, 6 vols., London 1900-9; P. Horn, *Die türkische Literatur*, in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, i/7 (1906), 269-81; A.F. Krımski, *Istoriya Turtsii i e’e literaturı*, 2 vols., Moscow 1916; Th. Menzel, *Die türkische Literatur*, in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, i/7, 2nd printing, 1926, 283-331; M.F. Köprülü, *Türk edebiyatı ta’rihi*, Istanbul 1926-8; F. Babinger, *Die Geschichtschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke*, Leipzig 1927; Hasan Ali Yücel, *Türk edebiyatına toplu bir bakış*, Istanbul 1932, German tr. O. Reşer, *Ein Gesamtüberblick über die türkische Literatur*, Istanbul 1941; A. Bombaci, *Storia della letteratura turca*, Milan n.d. [1956], French tr. Paris 1968 (good bibl.); Fahir İz, *Eski türk edebiyatında nesir*, Istanbul 1966; idem, *Eski türk edebiyatında nazım*, Istanbul 1966-7. See also *PTF*, ii, chs. *Die klassisch-osmanische Literatur* (W. Björkman), 427-65, *La littérature moderne de Turquie* (Kenan Akyüz), 465-634 (copious bibls.); W.G. Andrews, *Poetry’s voice, society’s song. Ottoman lyric poetry*, Seattle, etc. 1985; V.R. Holbrook, *Originality and Ottoman poetics: in the wilderness of the new*, in *JAOS*, cxii (1992), 440-54. See also HİKĀYA. 3; GHAZAL. iii; KAŞIDA. 3; MASRAH. 3, and İA art. *Türkler. Türk edebiyatı*.

(M.F. KÖPRÜLÜ\*)

#### IV. RELIGIOUS LIFE

Religious life all through the life of the Ottoman empire, and indeed until Atatürk’s secularist reforms of the mid- and late 1920s, had a two-fold aspect. First, there was the official religious institution of the ‘ulamā’ and fuḳahā’, in varying extents connected with the ruling dynasty and headed by the *Sheykh ül-İslām* in Istanbul, whose functions included amongst others that of *mufti* or issuer of legal opinions or *fatwās*. The training of these ‘ulamā’ rested on an extensive structure of orthodox Sunni *madrasas* scattered throughout the empire (whose curricula still warrant further investigation), and the finished products filled various official posts, often by a kind of *cursus honorum*, as *müderris*, *kādīs*, *nāzırs* of pious endowments or *ewkāf*, *khatıbs*, etc. They were expected to use their intellectual training and polemical powers, in the earlier centuries of the empire’s existence, against the threats from syncretism, within the Ottoman lands of Anatolia and Rumelia, with the previously-dominant Greek, Armenian and Balkan Christianity, and in the 9th/15th to 11th/17th centuries against Shī‘ism amongst Türkmen elements of eastern Anatolia and the Ottomans’ Şafawid enemies in Persia. In subsequent times, the religious classes, including the numerous class of theological students, *softas*, were often a politically and socially reactionary element, at critical periods involved in riots and revolts in the capital Istanbul, as in 1808, 1876 and 1909.

Hence for this official religious institution, see FATWĀ. ii; KĀDĪ. Ottoman empire; KĀDĪ ‘ASKER; KÜLLİYYE; MADRASA; MÜLĀZAMET; MÜLĀZİM; SOFTA; ‘ULAMĀ’.

Second, there has always been a strong current of Şūfī mysticism in Turkish religious life and in popular