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ABSTRACT

Tâcî-zâde Ca'fer Çelebi (856/1452 - 921/1515) was a prominent figure in the political life of Ottoman society in the late 15th and early 16th centuries, who both as a member of the Council of State and as a personality of distinction in the literary activities of the period was able to influence future developments in these spheres. However, apart from a few articles in works of an encyclopaedic nature, no study has hitherto been devoted to his life and his literary works, most of which have remained unpublished. What judgments have been expressed on his position in Ottoman poetical literature have, consequently, been based on only the most superficial acquaintance with his writings and have little validity.

The present thesis collects all the existing information on his life and his career, and presents for the first time a reliable biography, seeking as well, by a study of all his works, to establish his position in the literary environment of the age. In the second part there is given in transcription a critical edition of his Divân, for which all the existing manuscripts of the work have been used. The aim here has been to achieve a correct text which may be used with confidence by students of this period of Ottoman literature.
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INTRODUCTION

Tâcî-zâde Ca'fer Çelebi may be regarded as one of the representative men of Ottoman society in the late 15th and early 16th centuries. A scholar, a poet and a statesman, he achieved distinction in the nascent educational and administrative institutions, and by his poetry and prose works contributed to the cultural life of the new society and the formation of a language in which this might find expression. While regarded as a poet of secondary rank, his verse is still superior to that of most of his contemporaries; and were it not that he was rivalled by such great poets as Ahmed Paşa, Necâti and Mesîhi, it is likely that his reputation would have been greater than later critics allowed.

He lived in one of the most dynamic periods of Ottoman history, at that very time when the foundations were being laid for the distinctive Islamic Society created by the Ottomans; and for much of his life he was associated with the governmental apparatus that was guiding and shaping this. The efforts of Meḥmed II to adorn his new capital with monuments commensurate to the greatness of his Christian predecessors were matched by his care that these should be staffed and directed by the most eminent figures in learning and culture.
that the Islamic East had to provide. These foreigners were a stimulus and a challenge to the native scholars, who sought to emulate and exceed them within their own cultural milieu. That the poetry of Persia could be given an authentic Ottoman voice had been the contribution of the Ahmed Paşas and the Necatîs, and in elegant prose composition it was men such as Ca'fer Çelebi who demonstrated that Turkish could be no less beautiful and expressive than that of the Persian münşîs.

Those features of literature and learning which were later to become the lifeless stereotypes of Ottoman culture found their first expression in this period, and they present themselves to us with vigour and freshness. One can sense the élan and enthusiasm of a new creative impulse in much of the

(1) Her ãkanda bir 'âlim-i mütebaḫhîr-ü-müteferrid var ise, eger diyâr-ı Hindde ve eger vilayet-ı Sindde, hezâr ikrâm ve ıltifaṭîla yolunda begl-ı mül-ũ-menâl idûb, menâsîb-ı 'âliye ve merâtîb-î me'âliye birle istimâlet-ler virûb, bi-2-zârûre her birine vedâ'-ı vaṭan ve terk-ı mesken itdûrûrmiş. Latîfî, pp. 61-2.

literary productions associated with the reigns of Mehmed II and Bâyêzîd II, the latter being no less concerned than his father to foster the intellectual and artistic activities that would lend renown to the dynasty. (1) A man of many talents such as Ca'fer Çelebi found here an ideal situation in which to develop and mature; and the very frequency of his complaints in his poetry that he was not receiving due recognition for his qualities must be taken as an indication that such attributes commanded, and were expected to command, reward from the very centre of power.

After having achieved a position within the administrative institution, Ca'fer himself was able to extend such patronage to men of ability in both poetry and prose writing, and in this way fostered the cultural activities of the age as well as contributing to them. It is to cultivated personalities of this kind that we must look if we would wish to explain the flourishing literary life of Bâyêzîd's reign, a period that contributed as much to the spiritual development of Ottoman society as had his predecessor's to its military and

political achievements. The poet was accorded as of right a position in society; not as a teacher or a preacher, but as one who tempered and refined the spirit of what was still basically a military state, in which the attitude of the camp intruded even into urban life. Ca'fer's own tragic end illustrates how difficult it was to resolve the contradictory tendencies, when the renewed military energies of the state under Selîm allowed the balance which seemed to have been achieved by Bâyezîd II to swing once again in favour of the soldier.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amasya Tarihi</td>
<td>Hüseyin Hüsameddin, Amasya Tarihi, 4 vols. Istanbul 1327–1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Âşık Çelebi</td>
<td>Megā'irū 's-Šu'arā or Tezkire of Âşık Çelebi, ed. G. M. Meredith-Owens, London 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Âşıkpaşa-zade</td>
<td>Tevārīh-i Al-i 'Osmāndan Âşıkpaşa-zade Tarihi, ed. 'Alī Beg, Istanbul 1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleten</td>
<td>Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten, Ankara 1934–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyānī</td>
<td>Beyānī, Tezkiretū 's-Šu'arā, Millet Library no. 757, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTCF</td>
<td>Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Encyclopaedia of Islam, Leyden 1913-1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI²</td>
<td>Encyclopaedia of Islam, London 1960–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enveri</td>
<td>Enveri, Düstürnâme-i Enveri, ed. M. Halil, Istanbul 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferîdûn Beg¹</td>
<td>Ferîdûn Beg, Münse'âtû 's-Selâţîn, 2 vols. Istanbul 1264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feridun Beg</td>
<td>Feridun Beg, Münse'ätü 's-Selâ'în, 2 vols. Istanbul 1274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feth-name</td>
<td>Taci-zade Cafer Celibi, Nashüse-i Istanbul Feth-namesi, ed. Halis Efendi (as a supplement to TOEM, 20-21), Istanbul 1331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamenta</td>
<td>Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta, Vol. 2, Wiesbaden 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOD</td>
<td>Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte der Osmanischen Dichtkunst, 4 vols. Festh, 1836-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>İslam Ansiklopedisi, Istanbul 1950-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İlimye Teşkilâtı</td>
<td>İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, İlimye Teşkilâtı, Ankara 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İn'amât Defteri</td>
<td>Defter-i Musveddât-i İn'amât ve Taşâddukât ve Teşrifât ve İrsâliyat ve Gayrihi, Belediye Library, Muallim Cevdet Mss. 0.71, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İstanbul Tahrir Defteri</td>
<td>İstanbul Vakıfları Tahrir Defteri, 953(1546) Tarihi, ed. Ö. L. Barkan and E. H. Ayverdi, Istanbul 1970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kâtib Çelebi, Keşfû 'z-Zûnûn ... 2 vols. ed. Kilisli Rifat Bilge and Şerafeddin Yaltkaya, Istanbul 1941

Kaf-zâde Fâ'îîîı  Kaf-zâde Fâ'îîîı, Zûb-detü 'l-Þâr, Süleymaniye Library, Şehid Ali Paşa, no. 1377, Istanbul


Kûnhû 'l-Áîbâr Muş'tafâ 'Alî, Gelibolu, Kûnhû 'l-Áîbâr, University Library, TY 2290, Istanbul

Laţîfî Laţîfî, Tezkire-i Laţîfî, Istanbul 1314

Luţfî Paşa, Tevârîh Luţfî Paşa, Tevârîh-i Al-i 'Ogmân, ed. 'Alî Beg, Istanbul 1341

Me'âgîr Geðâl-zâde Muš'tafâ Çelebi, Me'âgîr-i Selîm Hân, British Museum Add. 7348, London

Mecdî Mehmed Mecdî Efendi, Hadâ'ikû 'z-Sâkâ'îk, Istanbul 1269

Mesihi Mine Özoðul, The Divan of the 15th century Ottoman poet Mesihi, Ph.D. Edinburgh University 1969
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Münecimbaşi</td>
<td>Müneccimbaşi Ahmed Dede, Müneccimbaşi Tarihi</td>
<td>2 vols. trans. İsmail Erünsal, Istanbul 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Münse'ât</td>
<td>Tacı-zâde Sadî Çelebi Münse'âtî</td>
<td>ed. Necati Lugal and Adnan Erzi, Istanbul 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necatî</td>
<td>Ali Nihad Tarlan, Necati Beg Divanî</td>
<td>Istanbul 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nişâncilar</td>
<td>Hüseyin Hüsameddin, Nişâncilar Durağî</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'OM</td>
<td>Bursalî Mehmed Tahir, 'Ogmânîli Mil'ellifleri</td>
<td>vol. I, Istanbul 1333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riyâzî</td>
<td>Riyâzî Mehmed b. Muştafa, Riyâzu 'ş-Şu'arâ,</td>
<td>Nuruosmaniye Library no. 3724 Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>Mehmed Süreyya, Sicill-ı 'Ogmâni, 4 vols.</td>
<td>Istanbul 1303-1315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'dî Çelebi Mecmu'ası</td>
<td>Taci-zade Sa'dî Çelebi, Sa'dî Çelebi Mecmu'ası</td>
<td>Beyazid Library Veliyüddin Efendi, no. 3253, Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sehi</td>
<td>Sehi, Tegkire-i Sehi</td>
<td>Istanbul 1325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selim-nâmes


Sülem


ŞN

Taşköprü-zâde Ahmed b. Muştafâ, *eg-Şakâ'ikü 'n-Nu'mânîye fi 'ulemâi 'd-Devleti 'l-'Ogmânîye in the margin of Vefeyâtü 'l-A'yân*, Mîr 1310

Şeyhi

Türk Dil Kurumu, *Şeyhi Divanı*, Istanbul 1942

TD

İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi, Istanbul 1949–

TDAYB

Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten, Ankara 1950–

TDED

Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi, Istanbul 1946–

TOEM

*Tarih-i 'Ogmânî Encûmenî Keçmû'ası*, Istanbul

TŞ


Tâcu 't-Tevârîh

Hoca Sa'deddîn b. Hasan Can, *Tâcu 't-Tevârîh*, vol. 2, Istanbul 1280

Tevârîh

Friedrich Giese, *Die Altosmanischen Anonymen Chroniken*, vol. I, Breslau, 1922
Tuhfe-i Ḥattātīn  Mūṣṭakīm-zāde Sūleyman Ṣa‘dūddīn Efendi,
Tuhfe-i Ḥattātīn, ed. ʿIbnū ʿl-ʾEmīn Maḥmūd
Kemāl, Istanbul 1923

Tūrsun Beg  Tūrsun Beg, Tamīr-i Ebu ʿl-Feth, ed. Meḥmed
ʿArif, Istanbul 1330

ZDMG  Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenlandischen
Gesellschaft, 1347-

Zātī  Ali Nihād Tarlān, Zātī  Divānī, 2 vols.
Istanbul 1963-70
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PART ONE
A. SURVEY OF THE SOURCES

1. Existing studies on Ca'fer Çelebi

The brief accounts of Ca'fer Çelebi's life given by von Hammer, Gibb and S. N. Ergun are all derived more or less from the notices given in the tezkires, and the only serious effort to expand this information is in the contribution by T. Gökbilgin to the İslam Ansiklopedisi. (1) Von Hammer relies principally on Kınalı-zade's Tezkire, offering no critical observations on the work of the poet; but Gibb uses, in addition, Sehî, Latîfî 'Aşîk Çelebi and 'Ali's Kühül 'l-Ahbâr, and even tries to explain away the adverse opinions of the latter. Gibb, moreover, has remarks to make on the quality of Ca'fer's poetry, but having to rely on an incomplete copy of his Divân - that now in the British Museum - these are not to be regarded as well-informed. He does no more than allude to Ca'fer's importance as a statesman, and ignores entirely his contribution to înşâ-literature.

In TŞ, S. N. Ergun repeats the notices given in the tezkires more extensively than the above, without, however, attempting to verify this information or to give a personal assessment of Ca'fer's work. Most of the dates given here can be shown to be incorrect. (2) T. Gökbilgin, relying mainly on

(2) For a discussion of dates, see pp. 20, 25, 37.
S. N. Ergun, repeats some of his errors; but in addition to the tezkires, he also examines the historical sources, and provides the most information on Ca’fer’s career as a statesman. He has no opinion to express on the literary personality of his subject, contenting himself with repeating the summary judgement offered by M. F. Köprülű in his Eski Şairlerimiz, Divan Edebiyatı Antologisi (İstanbul, 1949).

V. L. Menage’s brief article on Ca’fer Çelebi in EI² is correct in the facts given, but neither W. Björkman, in the Fundamenta, nor A. Bombaci, in the Storia Della Letteratura Turca, have anything new to contribute, and merely repeat what is to be found in the works mentioned above. N. S. Banarlı, in the Resimli Türk Edebiyatı does no more than summarize T. Gökbilgin’s article.

2. Sources for the biography of Ca’fer Çelebi.
   
   a. Ca’fer Çelebi’s Dîvân and Heves-nâme.

   The works of the poet himself will, of course, be the first and most reliable source for his own biography. In this way can be shown to some extent the relationship between his life and his poetry, admittedly very slight and tenuous. It is true that there are certain indications in Ca’fer’s kâşîdîes and the Heves-nâme which might be taken as contributions towards his biography, but in general these are slight and often obscure. Unless they could be substantiated from other sources, it was thought best to ignore them. In fact, the persona of the Ottoman poet was quite distinct from the actual personality of
of the man, and this distinction is deliberately maintained. Just as it would be pointless to seek for sincerity or emotional honesty in such poetry, so too must apparent allusion to events and individuals be treated with the utmost reserve. Only those verses which are usually collected in the kita'at section of dīvāns can be held to be informative, and these are for the most part no more than versified letters, as, for example, Ca'fer's Ḥasb-i hāl in the present Dīvān (p. 512).

b. Tezkires

There is a relatively large amount of information about Ca'fer Çelebi in the tezkires. Although this is not arranged systematically, it is still indispensable as an indication to what extent a poet's work was appreciated by his contemporaries, near-contemporaries and by succeeding generations. In particular, the anecdotes scattered throughout the tezkires are often our only means of throwing light upon the character and personality of a poet and upon his private life.

The earliest tezkire, Hest Bihişt, compiled by Sehî Beg in 945 (1533) is very succinct and usually gives only the briefest biographical details. Since Sehî Beg wrote his tezkire soon after Ca'fer's death, the information given by him can be considered a contemporary appreciation, though what value should be attached to the opinions of so undiscriminating a critic is questionable. Nor is his biographical information in any way proportionate to the importance of Ca'fer Çelebi both as a statesman and a writer.
The second tezkire which notices Cafer Çelebi is that of Latifi which was completed in 953 (1546). Although Latifi gives relatively little biographical information, his appreciative remarks on the Heves-name are of significance as evidence of the popularity of the Heves-name in Istanbul at this time.

'Asîk Çelebi's tezkire, Meşâ'irü's-Su'ârâ, completed in 976 (1568-69), provides much of our information about Cafer's personality, private life and his relations with his contemporaries. Apart from devoting a special entry to Cafer Çelebi, 'Asîk Çelebi also refers to him in a few other places, telling stories about him and his poet friends. These cast an interesting light on Cafer Çelebi's character.

Kimali-zade's tezkire, written almost twenty years later than 'Asîk Çelebi's Meşâ'irü's-Su'ârâ, does not add much to our knowledge of Cafer's life. Kimali-zade drew almost all of his information from 'Asîk Çelebi but he does give one interesting fact concerning the profession of Cafer's father Taci Beg, which cannot be found in any other tezkire. As this information is supported by a reference in the archives, it would appear to indicate that Kimali-zade's work could contain original material in places.

Riâyî's and Kaf-zade Fâ'iî's tezkires can be considered to be of no importance as regards this study, for the former merely repeats Kimali-zade Hasan Çelebi and the latter, apart from mentioning a few poems by Cafer, does not attempt to give any account of his life. Beyânî's tezkire, being a shortened version of the tezkire of Kimali-zade, has no particular value.
c. Biographical and bibliographical works.

Taşköprü-zade's biographical dictionary of the early Ottoman scholars and mystics, Şakâ'ık-i Nûmâniye, provides information about Ca'fer Çelebi and his career which has all the appearance of accuracy. The work was written in Arabic, but the expanded translation made by Edirneli Mecdi Efendi in 995 (1587) has been used much more by Turkish scholars than the original. In our study, because of some omission in Mecdi's translation, both the original Şakâ'ık-i Nûmâniye and the translation have been used.

Kâtib Çelebi's bibliographical work Keşfü 'z-Zünün does not give much information about the life of Ca'fer Çelebi, but mention is made of four of his works. Kâtib Çelebi's other work Süllemü 'l-Vügûl, designed to give information about the authors whose works are mentioned in the Keşfü 'z-Zünün, also adds something to our knowledge. In Ismail Paşa's supplement to the Keşfü 'z-Zünün we find mention only of Ca'fer's work Mahrûse-i İstanbul Fethînamesi.

Müstaşîm-zade's work on the biography of Ottoman calligraphers, Tuhfe-i Hattâtîn, is of particular interest for its appreciation of Ca'fer and his father Tâci Beg as calligraphers.

Hüseyin Hüsemeddin's unpublished work on Ottoman nigarânis, Nigarânlâr Durâgî(1) in spite of the new information with which

---

it provides us, has been used cautiously, for in some cases it was not possible to find enough supporting evidence to establish its accuracy. The same can be said for his published work on Amasya, Amasya Tarihi.

Both 'Osmânlî Mü'ellifleri and Sicilli 'Osmâni, confined as they are to the merest outlines of biographical or bibliographical detail, add nothing new to our knowledge.

d. Historical sources.


Since the most accurate account of the reign of Sultan Selîm is to be found in that body of works called collectively Selîm-nâmes, all these were examined for what information they might add to the other sources. Apart from Celâl-zâde's Me'âsir and Şükrü's Selîm-nâme, the other works of this class do not have much to offer. The reasons for Ca'fer's execution are given in a completely different way by Celâl-zâde and Şükrü, and a discussion of both accounts is given in the section on Ca'fer's life.

2. General histories.

In the historical works which cover the reigns of Bâyezîd II and Selîm I, there are to be found some references to Ca'fer Çelebi, throwing light in particular on his activity as a statesman during the events which took place before Bâyezîd's abdication and in the course of the Çaldîran campaign. For the present study, the works of 'Aşîk Paşa-zâde, Lütfî Paşa, İbn-i Kemâl, Hoca Sa'deddîn, 'Ali and Mûneccim-başî were consulted and the accuracy of their information evaluated.
In the Belediye Library in Istanbul there is to be found a defter called Defter-i Müşveddat-i İmâmat ve Taşaddukât ve Teşrifât ve Îrsâliyât ve Şayrihi which records the gifts given by Bâyezîd II to his subjects on various occasions.\(^{(1)}\) This defter is of great importance for the history of Turkish literature, as it gives precise information on most of the poets living during the reign of Bâyezîd II. The references made therein to Ca'fer Çelebi are used in this study.

Research in Başvekalet Arşivi produced some records written in the tapu defters by Ca'fer Çelebi while he was in the office of nizâncı. The same archive also contains a ferman of Mehmed II in which mention is made of Ca'fer Çelebi's father Tâcî Beg and his mother,\(^{(3)}\) and two vakfiyes prepared for Ca'fer's pious foundations.\(^{(4)}\) In Topkapi Palace Archive, in an envelope containing poems written for Bâyezîd II, there is an Arabic kâsiide by Ca'fer,\(^{(5)}\) probably written in his own hand, and also a vakfiye for which Ca'fer Çelebi is mentioned among the witnesses.\(^{(6)}\)

In the İstanbul Tahrîr Defteri, published by E. H. Ayverdi and Ö. L. Barkan, there is to be found some information concerning Ca'fer Çelebi's and his brother Sa'dî Çelebi's vakfiyes.

\(^{(1)}\) Mu'allim Cevdet Mss. no. 0,71.
\(^{(2)}\) Başvekalet Archive, no. 15, 19, 20, 77, 123, 370.
\(^{(3)}\) " " , Ali Emiri Section, no. 32.
\(^{(4)}\) " " , no. 19, 251, 1070.
\(^{(5)}\) E. 344/23.
\(^{(6)}\) Şüret-i Vakfiye-i Muştafa Paşa der Üsküb. No. E. 7024.
The Bayezid Library in Istanbul possesses a collection of writings by Sa‘di Celebi, the brother of Ca‘fer Celebi, under the title Sa‘di Celebi Mecmu‘asi.\(^{(1)}\) Besides a letter and chronograms written by Ca‘fer Celebi, the Mecmu‘a also contains letters sent to him by his brother. Certain parts of this Mecmu‘a were published by Necati Lugal and Adnan Erzi as Tacizade Sa‘di Celebi Mung‘esi (Istanbul 1956). In the present study reference has been made where possible to this published work; otherwise, material from unpublished parts of the Mecmu‘a has been cited.

\(^{(1)}\) Veliyuddin Efendi Mss. No. 3253.
The only source in which any mention is made of the genealogy of Ca'fer Çelebi is Hüseyin Hüsameddin's still unpublished *Nışancılar Durağı*. (1) As has often been the complaint of his major work, Amasya Tarihi, here, too, he neglects to show from where he derived his information, which consequently must be treated with reserve. The notice on Ca'fer Çelebi is to be found on pages 68 - 73, and begins:


No mention is to be found in the usual sources about any of the individuals mentioned in this genealogy, and it is only about his father, Tacı Beg, that we have information which may be regarded as historical.

According to Latîfî (2) and 'Aşık Çelebi (3) Tacı Beg came from a noble family. In the Amasya Tarihi (III, 226)

(1) The only copy of this work is in the private possession of his son, Kemâleddin Yaşar, now resident in Istanbul. See for description of this work; Turgut Akpınar, 'Amasya Tarihi Yazarı Hüseyin Hüsameddin ve Bilinniyelen Eserleri', Bibliyografya, I, 3(Ankara 1972), pp. 163-3.

(2) 'Ulûvw-i neseb ve kemâl-i haseble mevşûfdur. *Latîfî*, p.117.

Hüseyn Hüsameddin places Taci Beg among the retainers of Haci Beg-zade Yalil Beg b. Cazii Mehmed Beg in Amasya, and says that in 366 (1461-2) he entered the service of Shehzade Bayezid, who at that time was governor of the province. It would seem that he gained the confidence and the respect of the future sultan, and in the SN (I, 487) he is spoken of as his müdebbirü '1-umur. (1) In the Başvekalet Arşivi (Ali Emiri tasnifi no. 32) there is a ferman of Sultan Mehmed II, dated 883 (1478), in which it is mentioned that the wife of Taci purchased a village from Bâyezid's mother; Taci Beg is therein described as oğlum kapusında hizmet iden. In the same archive there is the tahrir defteri for Tokat which also dates from the time of Mehmed II, and on page 49 Taci Beg is mentioned among the military chiefs (ser-‘asker) of Amasya. (2)

(1) ‘Aşık Çelebi (60a) calls him the laâla of Shehzade Bâyezid, but ‘Ali (Kühü ‘1-‘Ahpâr, 204a-b) says that ‘Aşık Çelebi was confused by the title "beg" and that in fact he was only his müdebbirü '1-umur, which he explains meant ḥassâ emîni. Kâtib Çelebi (Sülemû ‘1-vüsûl, Şehid Ali Paşa 1837, p. 365) also calls him the müdebbirü '1-umur. In his introduction to Ca‘fer Çelebi’s Mahrûse-i İstanbul Feth-nâmesi (supplement to TOEM, 20-21) Fâlis Efendi also refers to Taci Beg as the laâla of Shehzade Bâyezid, although he may be merely following ‘Aşık Çelebi in this.

(2) Tokat Tahrîr Defteri No. 15. For the reproduction of this record see Appendix A.1. Kinali-zade also says that ‘Afer’s father was şâhîb-i seyf, which means that he was from the military class (70a).
Very little reliance can be placed on the other information about Tâcî Beg, given by Hüseyin Hüsameddin in his Amasya Tarihi. In 375(1470-1), we are told that Tâcî Beg, a poet of Amasya, became nişancı to Şehzade Bâyezîd (iii, 223); in 383 (1473), he is said to have fled to Baghdad to escape Mehmed II's punishment for having encouraged Şehzade Bâyezîd in dissolute practices (iii, 231). In 387(1482), however, he returned from Baghdad to Amasya and again became nişancı, presumably to Şehzade Ahmed for by this time Bâyezîd had become sultan (iii, 235). The other information given in this work is very doubtful, and seems hardly worth repeating.

In the Bedâ'i'i'ül-Vekâ'i a story is related from Ca'fer Çelebi about how his father, while in Amasya, had been given a purse of 3000 akçeş by Şehzade Bâyezîd to be distributed amongst the dervises of Çelebi ˘Yalîfe (Şeyh Mehmed Çelebi el-Cemâli el-Òaramanî) in order that they might pray for his intention. This may be taken as indicating a close relation between Tâcî Beg and Şehzade Bâyezîd, which would certainly have favoured the fortunes of Ca'fer after the latter ascended the throne.

(1) The document in Feridun Beg's Münseeature (I, 263-4) to which Hüseyin Hüsameddin refers does not mention Tâcî Beg among the individuals accused by the sultan. The document, moreover, is dated 12 Muharrem 334 — the Amasya Tarihi would have it written in 373 or 381.

(2) Hüseyin, Bedâ'i'i'ül-Vekâ'i', II, 310a, ed. A. S. Tveritinova, Moscow 1961.
The date of Tācī Beg's death would seem to be beyond dispute: in four chronograms given at the end of his son Sa'dī Çelebi's Münse'āt this is fixed at 906(1485). (1) In the Süllem Kātib Çelebi says that his death occurred in Muḥarrem of this year, and that he was then fifty-four years of age; (2) this would place his birth in 836(1432-3). (3)

In the two tezkires, Tācī Beg is included among the poets of his age. Lāṭifī describes him as the defterdār of Şehzāde Bāyezīd in Amasya and quotes a single matla' as a sample of his work: (4)

Göz yaşlu gümüllü zülf-i perişanlar içinde
Kaldum karańu gicede bārānlar içinde

Kınalı-zāde Ḥasan Çelebi merely repeats Lāṭifī, who was clearly

(1) Sa'dī Çelebi Münse'āti, ed. Necati Lugal and Adnan Erzi (Istanbul 1956), pp. 68-69. Despite this definite evidence, the editors still attribute a letter dated 906 to Tācī Beg! (Introduction vii) The letter is by Ca'fer Çelebi, who in this work is usually referred to as Efendi.

(2) Süllem, p. 365.

(3) The name of his wife (or maybe one of his wives) is recorded as Rabi'a Ḥatun. Cf. Ö. L. Barkan, 'Ayasofya Camii ve Eyyūb Tūrbesinin 1439-1491 yıllarına ait Muhasebe bilançosları,' İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, XXIII, 1-2, (Istanbul 1962), p. 359. In the same Muhasebe mention is made of his two sons Ca'fer and Sa'dī as recipients of incomes from the vakīfs of Ayasofya and Eyyūb Tūrbesi between the years 1439 and 1491 (p. 357).

(4) p. 103.
his only source, and offers the same verse (67b).

In the Tuhfe-i Hattatin (p. 147) he is listed among the calligraphers and is said to have studied the art along with Şeyh Hamdullâh, but the name of their master is not mentioned. (1)

Cafer is reported to have been born in Amasya in Şa‘ban 856 (Aug. 1452). (2) His early education in this city was received from Şeyh-i-zâde ‘Abdi, Mu‘id-zâde Muhyiddîn Meşmed,

(1) According to Ekrem Hakkî Ayverdi no examples of his calligraphy have survived (Fatih Devri Hattatlarî ve Hat Sanatî, Istanbul 1953, p. 49).

(2) This date is given by Hüseyin Hüsameddîn in Nigancılar, p. 63; however, Kâtib Çelebi in the Süllem (p. 69), says that he was 53 years of age when he died in 921, and this would put his birth in the year 368(1463-4).

In the Heves-nâme (85b), which was completed in 899(1493-4), reference is made to his love affair with a young woman which may have occurred shortly after his arrival in Istanbul about the year 891, in the course of which he refers to himself as being twenty-two years of age:

Egerçi her sözidür bir risâle
‘Acebdür var ise bîst ü dü säle

Although there can be no absolute confidence placed in such tenuous evidence, this might be taken as broadly confirming the date of birth which can be deduced from the Süllem.
Horasani-zade es-Seyyid 'Abdullah Çelebi, and because of the position and the interests of his father this would presumably be the best that could be found at that time.

We do not know at what age he left Amasya to continue his studies under scholars of greater reputation, but it would seem likely that it was Bursa rather than Istanbul that would offer him an advanced education at this time. The Şemâniye in Istanbul did not begin to receive scholars until after Recep 875 (Jan. 1471), and most of the teachers under whom he is reported to have studied remained in Bursa to teach in the medreses of that city. According to ŞN, these were Hacı Hasan-zade (d. 911/1505-6), el-İstalani (d. 901/1495-6), Hâtib-zade (d. 901/1495-6) and üvâce-zade (d. 893/1438). In the

(1) Nişancılar, p. 68.
(2) Sehi, p. 28; Künhü 'l-Aḥbār, 204b.
(3) ŞN, I, 487; Medî, 435. İ. H. Uzunçarşılı says that Hızır Beg, the first kâdi of Istanbul was also one of Ca'fer's masters, but this would be impossible in as much as Hızır Beg died in 863! (İlmiye Teşkilatı, p. 229)

In a chronogram by Ca'fer Çelebi to be found in his brother's Münse'ât (p. 82), another of his teachers at this time would appear to have been Kâdi-zade (d. 899/1493-4):

Kâdi-zâde muʿin-i şer-i ʿavâm
Ki merâ bud bihterin üstâd
Sevvûmîn rûz ez meh-i ramažân
Şud birûn z'in sarây-ı hûzn-âbâd
Her ki be-şnîd güft der tarîh
Vâtan-ı o behîst-i bâkî bâd
Heves-nâme he mentions several of the prominent scholars of the Şemâniye, amongst whom three of these names figure:

**Şifat-ı Şemâniye**

Bu câmi' çevresinde ol Şehinsâh
K'ani itsün garîk-i rahmet Allâh

Binâ itmiş sekiz 'âli medâris
Ki her birinde bir ulu müderris

Eğerçi her biridür bağr-ı 'irfân
Velîkin dördidür deryä-yi 'umman

Haţîb-oglı biri ol merd-i dâna
K'anufila idemez bâhs İbn-i Sînâ

Biri daği 'Arab meşhûr-ı 'alem
Sütüde kâvli fi'îli dîni mu'îkem

Yiter faşlina anuÎ bu 'alâme
Ki fetvâsî yürür Rûm ile Şâma

Biri deryä-yi dâniş Kaştalânî
K'odur hikmetde Eflâ tun-ı gâni

Biri Hâci Hasan-zâde Va$hâdî
Zamânûn mu'ktedâsî vu ferîdi

Faşîlet ma'denî vü 'ilm kâni
Şerî'at mesnedî Nu'mân-ı gâni

Musa'îîr şab'îna ma'kül-û-menêkül
Selâmet üzre zihn-î pâki mecbûl
We may assume from the fact that he singles them out for special mention that they may have formerly been his own teachers in Bursa.

He received his mülazemet from Hacı Hasan-zade. (1) He himself speaks of his accomplishments (Dīvān, p. 112):

86. Kılm胺 hayli ehāde tefāṣīre nazār
Olmişam asḥāb-i fīkhan dīn arāsinda benām

87. Çekmişem zaḥmet uṣūl ile furū‘a bī-ḥesāb
İtmişem fen-i kelām u ḫikmete ğok īrtimām

As well as these formal studies, he also achieved a reputation as a calligrapher, having been a pupil of the famous Şeyh Hamdullah. (2)

According to ‘Aşık Çelebi, Ça’fer Çelebi, having finished his studies, entered the career of teaching. (3) It seems probable that his first appointment was to the medrese in Simav, where he also acted as kādi. (4) Mecdī mentions a mosque which he built in this city; and in the vaḳf for his other

---

(1) ‘Aşık Çelebi, 60a; Kânil-zāde, 70a; Riyāzī, 45b;
Künhü 'l-Aḥbār, 204b.
(2) Tuhfe-i Ḥattātīn,p.148; ‘ON, I,p263.
(3) ‘Aşık Çelebi, 60a.
(4) Nīgāncīlar, p. 68.
(5) Mečdī, p. 337.
mosque in Istanbul, provision is made for the stipends of the imām and the mū'ezzin of the one in Simav. (1)

Hüseyin Hüsemeddin records an interesting incident which must have occurred during this appointment:

Shehzade Cem mes'elesinde mu'akademā muşārun ileyhe takdīm eylelediği bir 'ubūdiyet-nāmesi tutulub طرف- 

dârlîq ile ithām edildiginden 839'da 'azl ve hâps edildi.  

Yedikule zindanında bir-buçuk yıl kadar kaldı. Sonra  

takdīm eylelediği bir ḳaṣīdesi ve Amasyali ricālīn şefā'atı  

neticesinde 891'de 1 tlâk edildi. (2)

The ḳaṣīde mentioned here would probably be that found on  

page 512 of his dīvān, and this would give relevance to such  

beyts as:

6. Şikāyetüm katı çokdur zemāneden şahā  

Ki ben kemîne ḥuşûşında itdi çok takṣīr

(1) Portions of this vakf are to be found in Tayyib Gökbilgin,  

Edirne ve Paşa Livası, (İstanbul 1952), p. 487; İstānbull  

Tahrir Defteri, p. 298; and Taşp Defteri, Paşvekalet Arşivi, 

no. 251, pp. 531-2. The latter entry is reproduced in  

Appendix A.2.

(2) Nişâncılar, p. 68. In fact, we have a ta'rīh by Ca'fer  

on the death of Sultan Cem:

Zā'ir-i Beytü 'l-harem seyyāh-ı ßerr-û-bahr Cem  

K'ide luṭfîndan ḡûdâ erzânî cennetler aña  

Gün köyüb miḥnet evin gitdi sarây-ı râḥata  

İşidenler didiler ta'rīh rahmetler aña  

Münge'ât, p. 83; the last part of the first misrâ' is  

defective.
7. Şu cümân içân ki ‘udul eyledüm тарîkûmden
Döne döne feleg-i dün-nevâz ide ta’zîr

13. Olan yol oldu mezâ mä mezâ giden gitdi
Ki böyle yazmış imiş anî Kâtib-i ta’dîr

25. Yine тарîkûme varmağâ eyleyüb himmet
Uitarâbe gönülmü anuña eyleyem ta’mîr

28. Yemîn, idem ki daţi çıkmayam тарîkûmden
Eger yâçarsa bu yolda başuma şançer-û-tîr

There is no information available about what medrese in
Istanbul he taught in(1) until the year 899(1493-4), when,

(1) We have a letter written to him from Bursa by his brother,
Sa’dî Çelebi, dated Receb 897, in which he is invited to
visit him there, where he has so many good friends. In
another letter, also from Bursa, dated 898, he is requested
to maintain a correspondence with him. (Sa’dî Çelebi
Mecmû’âsî, 106b-108a) At this time Ca’fer was trying to
obtain a more remunerative position, and in the kit’a
dedicated to ‘Alî Paşa (Dîvân, p. 520 ), we may have an
example of the efforts he was making for this purpose:

3. Neyyir-i burc-i veфа ھазret-i Paşa ki anuN
Pertev-i râyi durur şem’i şebistân-i kerem

8. Şam bucağında revâ mî ben olam ac u şusuz
İrişe kamulara âb-î şeha nân-i kerem

10. Geçer ekger günümüz kîlet ile himmet idüN
Ki ‘inâyet ide biz kulîna sultan-î kerem

(cont’d)
through the influence of Çandarlı İbrāhīm Paşa, he was given the medrese of Maḥmūd Paşa with a stipend of 50 akça. It was in 899 that he completed the Heves-naire, but as the work is without a dedication we are unable to say to whom he may have presented it.

(cont'd from p.18):

11. Üstümüzden naẓar-ı şefkatını eksimeyüb
   Artura dirligümüzi şeh-i devran-ı kerem

12. Aslsuz olduğu-ğun yazısı timarumuzuñ
   Niçe sa'y itdük ise çıkmadı ey kân-ı kerem

13. Meh-i āmâlüm anuñ naşı hilâl itdi velî
   Var umidüm ki tamâm ide bu noksani kerem

(1) Only Hüseyn Hüsâmeddin in Nişâncılar (p. 63) mentions İbrahim Paşa in connection with this appointment, but it is not improbable that Cafer or his father Tâci Beg could have gained his friendship when he was in Amasya as the lâlâ of Şehzade Bâyezid. The chronogram for the appointment by his brother Sa'dî is given in the Münse'ât, p. 82.

The information about his teaching career in SN, I, p. 433, (Mecdî, p. 335) and in the tegkires - Kûnâlî-zâde, 7Ca, Riyâzî, 45b - is summary and lacking in detail. Gibb, HOP, II, p. 264, is certainly wrong in saying that the medrese of Maḥmūd Paşa was his first appointment.
While still in this post - and probably in Reb. I, 903 (Oct. 1497) - he was appointed to the imperial Divan as nişancı. According to 'Ali it had been decided that the person holding this office should be of the 'ulema class, and the members of the council were agreed that there was no one more deserving or capable than Ca'fer. On achieving this post he received the rank and style of paşa, and enjoyed most of the privileges of a vezir. He was very conscious of his own dignity, and it was because of a protest that he made to the Sultan that the nişanı was henceforth given precedence over the defterdâr in the Divan, and allowed a vezirial tent when on campaign.

The earliest activity that can be discovered of his period in this office relates to the campaign against Moton and Koron in Ramazan 905 - Muḥarrrem 906 (Apr. - Aug. 1500), in which he would appear to have participated. There is in his Divan a kaside (p. 103), in which the taking of Moton is described.

(1) Nişâncılar, p. 68. Three chronograms for this appointment are found in Sa'dî Çelebi's Münge'ât, p. 85; S. N. Ergun, TS, II, erroneously gives the date as 904, and is probably the source for the same error in T. Gökbulğân, IA, III, p. 3.
(2) Kühül '1-Ahbab, 204b.
(3) 'Asîk Çelebi, 60b.
(4) In the Sa'dî Çelebi Mecmu'ası, we have two letters sent from Bursa by Sa'dî to Ca'fer, who was in Edirne, probably prior to the commencement of the campaign. Both are dated 905, the first seeking favours for certain of his friends (70b-71a), and the other asking that the muhtesib of Bursa, who was in financial difficulties, be given his assistance (102a-102b).
in detail; and it was he who wrote the *feth-nâme* of the campaign (dated *Muḥarrem* 906/July 1500), which appears in the *Münge'ât* of Sa'dî Çelebi. This was sent to Bursa from Moton.

Although his name does appear now and again in various connections in the subsequent years, it is not until the end of the reign of *Bayezid II* that he figures in any major event. Thus in the *İn'ämât defteri* we find him recorded as having received a gift from the Sultan on 13 *Reb.* II 909 (5 Oct. 1503), in return for a *kaşîde* which he had written; and again on

(1) pp. 45-8.
(2) In the *Sa'dî Çelebi Mecmû'asî*, we have two letters written to him from Bursa in 906 by his brother Sa'dî, the first dated *Ramazan*, the other *Zi 'l-Ḥicce*. Both complain of Ca'fer's neglect in writing to him (62b-64a, 93b-14a resp.).
(3) The notices from this defter mentioned in the text are given in reproduction in Appendix A.
(4) *İn'ämât defteri*, p. 16, Appendix A.3. It is very likely that this is the *Benefse Kaşîdesi* (*Dîvân* p. 125), the 15th beyt of which speaks of the plague which struck Istanbul in 909 (1503):

15. **Yâk oldı dirıği bu yıl âsîb-i ṭeḇâda**
   Ṣoṭ 'ārîzî gûl ṭurra-i ṭârârî benefse

The plague of 909 is mentioned in *Münecimbaşi II*, p. 418.

The *kaşîde* is a nazîre to that which Ahmed Paşa had earlier addressed to Sultan Cem, and reference to this is made at the end, in the beyt:

56. Bu ʿi'r servâdin okusun ḳanı ki Ahmed
   Görsün ki nice olur imiş bârî benefse
23 Gem. II 909 (13 Dec. 1503) he was rewarded for a letter he composed to be sent to the Sultan of Egypt. (1) On 5 Sa'ban 909 (23 Jan. 1504) and on 7 Receb 910 (14 Dec. 1504), he is also recorded as having received gifts, but in what connection is not disclosed. (2) He is mentioned in four other places in this defter as a recipient of the Sultan's largesse: 12 Zi 'l-ka'de 913 (15 Mar. 1503), 3 Reb. I 914 (2 May 1503), 15 Sevval 914 (6 Feb. 1509) and 24 Sevval 916 (24 Jan. 1511), but the reasons for the rewards are not stated. (3)

In the Tapu defteri, no. 20, in the Başvekalet Arşivi, there is to be found an entry in his hand recording the conferment of the Hasan Fakih Çiftliği to Davud Paşa on 6 Reb. II 910 (16 Sep. 1504); and for Zi 'l-ka'de of the same year he records in this register the villages which Bayezid had conferred on his daughter Şah Sultan in 896 (1490-1). (4) Again for Sa'ban 912 (Dec. 1506), we find in the same defter the entry in Çafer's

(1) İn'ämät defteri, p. 25. Appendix, A.4.
(2) " " p. 32 and p. 87 resp. Appendix A.5 and A.6.
(3) " " pp. 262, 282, 313 and 419 resp. Appendix A.7, A.8, A.9 and A.10.
(4) Tapu defteri, no. 20, p. 45. Appendix A.11.
hand recording the conferment by the Sultan of the village of Keşenlülü near Edirne on Hani Hayatun, the daughter of Mustafa, the son of Mehmed II. (1)

Subsequent mention of him is made in the İn‘ämât defteri under various years:

23 Cem. I 913 (1 Oct. 1507) : for a ta‘ziye on the death of Şehzade Mahmûd (2)
14 Safer 914 (14 Jun. 1508) : for a kaşide (3)
17 Cem. II 915 (4 Oct. 1509) : on the occasion of the circumcision of his son (4)
8 Zi‘l-Ka‘de 915 (18 Feb. 1510) : for a letter he wrote to the Sultan of Egypt (5)
Receb 916 (Oct. 1510) : for a letter he wrote to the Sultan of Egypt (6)

In all the above entries he is described as holding the office of tevkî‘î (nişâncı).

A reference to this entry made in 925 (1519), mentions that it was made by Ca‘fer Çelebi in his own hand (Başvekalet Arşivi, no. 77, p. 123; Tapu defteri, no. 370, p. 14). Appendix A.14 and A.15 resp.

(2) İn‘ämât defteri, p. 236. Appendix, A.16.

(3) " " p. 279. " A.17.


In the struggle for the succession which was waged among the princes towards the end of the reign of Bâyezîd, Ca'fer supported the party of Şehzade Ahmed, even going so far as to write a kâşide in which he mentions him as vâris-i mülk and indicates that he expects him to be the future sultan:

27. Vâris-i mülk şeh Ahmed ki kul olmaga aña Yûzini göye tutub Tahtidan ister nergis

71. Rişte-i nazm-i dür-eşânnum ile deste idüb Gönderür bezm-i dil-âvîzüne Ca'fer nergis

72. Ki el öüüb bulicaq hîdem-i şâh ile şeref Kemterîn bendeden irdûre du'âlar nergis

75. Efser-i 'izz ü devlet kona Ḥakdan başuña Niçe kim zerden ursa başına efser nergis

Bâyezîd had intended to abdicate in favour of Şehzade Ahmed and had summoned him to Istanbul. While Ahmed was on his way to the capital, Bâyezîd II attempted to persuade the Janissaries to abandon Şehzade Selîm and to rally around Ahmed. When Ahmed arrived at Üskûdar and camped there awaiting word

(1) Divân p. 194; in Tevârîh (ed. Giese, I, p. 131) he is spoken of along with the Kazasker Mû'eyyed-zâde and Yûnûs Paşa as being "Sultan Ahmedîû". In SN, I, p. 483, no reference is made to his support for Şehzade Ahmed, and he is said to have been dismissed from the office of tevâkî'i for a reason too long to go into.

from his father, a rumour spread among the Janissaries that Bâyezîd II and Ahmed's supporters were planning to bring Ahmed to Istanbul and proclaim him sultan. (1) To prevent this the Janissaries, who were in favour of Şehzâde Selîm's cause, attacked and looted the houses of the eminent members of Ahmed's group, including that of Ca'fer Çelebi, and he is said to have barely escaped with his life. (2) The date of this event is variously given in the sources, but the most reliable is that found in the article by Ç. Uluçay on the accession of Selîm, 27 Cem. II 917 (21 Sep. 1511), (3) which is based on an eyewitness report.

Following this riot Bâyezîd II gave way to the demands of the Janissaries and dismissed the nişânca Ca'fer Çelebi, together with the grand vizier Hersekoğlu Ahmed Paşa, the beylerbeyi of Rumî Hasan Paşa and the kazasker Mü'eyyed-zâde Abdurrahman Çelebi and appointed Çandarlızâde 'Işâ Çelebi to the position

(1) Tevarîh (ed. Giese) I, p. 131; Selîm-nâmes, p. 59.
(2) Tacu 't-Tevarîh II, pp. 190-1; İdrîs Bidlisi, Selîm-nâme (British Museum Ad. 24969) 54b-55a; Vekâyi'-i Sultân Bâyezîd ve Selîm Han (Topkapı Sarayî, Emanet Hazinesi no. 1416) 29b.
(3) Çağatay Uluçay, 'Yavuz Sultan Selim Nasîl Padişah Oldu', TD, VII, no. 10 (1954), p. 120. TŞ, II, p. 882 (913/1512); T. Gökbilgin, İ.A. III, p. 8 (913/1512). Marino Sanuto, Diari XXXII, p. 222, supports the date given by Ç. Uluçay: 21 September 1511.
of nişancı. (1) According to ŞN, Bâyezîd II offered Ca'fer a
pension of 100 akçes a day, which was refused. (2)

On 8 Şafter 918 (25 Apr. 1512) Bâyezîd II abdicated in
favour of his son Selîm. Ca'fer wrote a Persian kaşîde to
commemorate Selîm's accession. (3)

(1) İdrîs Bidlisi, Selîm-name, 55a; Vekâyi'-i Sultan Bâyezîd
ve Selîm Han, 29b. In the Ottoman sources no date is given
for the dismissal of these officials. İdrîs Bidlisi and
Hoca Sa'deddîn, Tâcu 't-Tevârih II, p. 190, suggest that
they were dismissed on the day after the riot.

(2) ŞN, I, p. 438. In Künhü 'l-Ahbâr, 204b, the sum is given
as 200 akçes. After Selîm's accession to the throne, this
sum was augmented by the stipend from several ğâdalîks and
was subsequently accepted by Ca'fer (ŞN, I, p. 438).

(3) This kaşîde exists only in Ms. M. (see Divân, p. 556).
The first beyt is:

' Ağîk Çelebi, 6la-b, gives the following account of this
event:

'Aceb hikmetdâr ki Sultan Selîm merhûm serîr-i
salṭanata cülüs itdûkde ve Ca'fer Çelebi merhûm tehniye-i
cülüs için dest-büs itdûkde bu kaşîdeyi ithâf ider ki
maâla':

Bu maâla' egerî bî-naşîrdûr amma tâtatýyur idûgi zâhîrdûr.
Bu kaşîdeyi İşâk Çelebi Işâk Kâsim okudugunda Işâk Kâsim
tekrâr okuyub ber kef-i mâ yerinde ber yed-i mâ okur. İşâk
Çelebi mukuabelede ber kef-i mâ dir. Işâk Kâsim "yine kef
Having abdicated, Bayezid II set out for Dimetoka to spend the remaining days of his life in his birthplace; but he died suddenly in the vicinity of Corlu on the 10th of Reb. I 918 (26 May 1512). (1) Cafer wrote a mersiye on this occasion, in which he refers to the sorrow which afflicted Bayezid II on his abdication (2) (Divan, p. 219),


Çudret Allâhuñ, fûl vâki'eya muţâbîk ve bu ta'bîr vâki'eya muvâfîk olur.

(1) There is some conflict in the sources over the exact location of the place in which Bayezid II died: while İdris, Selim-nâme 60a, gives it as Sogütû Dere in the vicinity of Edirne, Kemâlpşa-zâde, Selim-nâme (Topkapı Palace Library, Hazine no. 1424) 49b, gives it as Hâskûy, also in the vicinity of Edirne. For a further discussion of this problem, see: Ş. Tekindag, 'Bayezidin Ölümü meselesi', TD 24 (1970), pp. 1-16.

(2) V/11. Bundan şan ile gitdi vû anda ümidûr Çudsîler ile ülfet idûb şadkâm ola

12. Şuñ kîlmadi yefã aña çarş-1 pûr-cefã 'Arif olana va'z-u-naşihat tamâm ola
and bewails his own sad situation. (1) This meraiye is noteworthy for the complete absence of the customary prayer for the new sultan.

It is not possible to determine precisely how long Ca'fer remained without an official position, for none of the sources give the exact date on which he was re-appointed nişancı. According to the ılımat defteri, 'İsâ Çelebi held the position of nişancı in 918, (2) and a document dated Cem. II 919 (Aug. 1513) still refers to him as holding this office. (3) The first reference to Ca'fer as nişancı is at the beginning of Şevvâl 919 (Dec. 1513). (4) Accordingly, it may be assumed that Ca'fer remained without an official position between 23 Cem. II 917 (21 Sep. 1511) and Şevvâl 919 (Dec. 1513). In a kaside addressed to Sultan Selîm, which was probably written in this period, Ca'fer complains about his own situation and asks the

(1) ılıl. Hâkkâ ki sâyesinde birer pâdisâh idûk Mûlîk-i cihânda bilmemîğüz ol hûmâ-yimîş

12. Meclisler içre derd ile şimden girî dirîg Ney gibi her nefes ıgûmûz vîy vîy imîş

IV/8 Yiriydi cân içinde ideydûk yirin velî Bu mıhnet ü belâlar ile bizde cân ğanî

(2) ılımat defteri, p. 502.


Sultan to give him an official post. (1)

(1) Divan p. 207.

79. Ne sir durur ki hûner sikkesi-yle 'âlemde 'Azîz iken direm-âsâ kâpuşda olam yâr

82. Elin şel eylemiş âlâm yazmadin bir beyt Ki saha la'îk ola ey Şeh-i felek-mîkdâr

83. Çarîbler durur emmâ cemî'-i ebyûtum N'ola çarîb-nevâz ola Şâh-i nîkû-kâr

84. Egerî kapladi dil gülçenini ser-tâ-ser Harîm-i sînede yâr-î gumûm nâ-hencâr

85. Bahâr-î ma'decetûfide ümîd-vâram kim Nezâr gongşa-î sâdî bitûre her bir yâr

86. Ne şam belâlar ile kildi ise kâmetûmi Hamîde geng gibi rûzgâr-î bed-kirdâr

87. Nevâzîş eyler iseîn nağme-i dil-âvizûm Getûre şevk ile râkşa cihânda her ne ki var

88. Çû kimyâ naçarunî ûâki zer kîlur benden Dirîş itme 'înâyet naçarlarîn zinhâr

90. Baña ne vakt-i ferâqat ne inzivâ demidür Tenâ'îm eylemedin devletûfide bir mîkdâr

91. Cefâlarrâna sipîhr itmedin henüz 'ıvâz Zemâne eylemedin itdûgine istîğfâr

(cont'd)
A few months after Ca'fer Çelebi's re-appointment as nizâncı Selîm set off on the Çaldıran campaign, on 23 Muharrem 920 (20 Mar. 1514). (1) 'Âşık Çelebi states that Ca'fer Çelebi, together with the historian İdrîs and Ḥalîmî Çelebi, the lâlâ of the Sultân, accompanied Selîm and held conversations with him. (2) While the army was at İzmit, Ca'fer composed a letter in Persian which was sent to Şâh İsmail on the 27th of Şafâr 920 (23 Apr. 1514), (3) and during the course of the campaign Ca'fer wrote a further two letters to the Şâh. The first of these letters, which were written in Turkish, was composed at Erzincan, in Cem. I 920 (Jun. 1514), (4) and the second at Yermük in the following month. (5)

(cont'd from p. 29):

92. Cihan faţa'ilümün virmedin dahi kadîn
Bişa'at-i hünerrûm bulmadın dahi bâzûr

93. Karîn-i hâlîm olursa vûfûr-i 'âtıfetûm
Koyam zemâne edevrûnde ben de çok âsîr

(1) J. R. Walsh, Çaldıran', EI²
(2) ʻHattâ sefer-i Erdebilde 'azîmet-i Şâh İsmâ'îlde ekser evkâât Monla İdrîs ve Ḥalîmî Çelebi ve Ca'fer Çelebi merhûm Faâşîh ile çâr 'ungur gibi hem-ʻinân, harf-zenân ve begl-gûyân giderlermiş. 'Âşık Çelebi, 60b.
(3) İdrîs Bidlisî, Selîm-nâme, 71a; Celâl-zâde, Me'âsîr, 127a-129a; Hüseyîn, Bedâ'îü 'l-vekâ'î, II, p. 429.
(4) Celâl-zâde, Me'âsîr, 132b-133b; Münşèât memûası (D.T.C.F. İsmail Saîb Yaz. I/4504), 36a.
On 2nd Recep 920 (23 August 1514) the Şah was routed at Çaldiran and fled, abandoning his treasury and even his wife, Taclu Hanım. (1) Selîm presented Taclu Hanım to Çafer Çelebi, his nîçancı. (2)

(1) Taclu Hanım's status is the subject of some discussion by the historians of this period. Hoca Sa'deddîn, Tacu 't-Tevârîh II, p. 373, and Mümecimbaşi II, p. 465, state that she was not the wife but merely a favourite concubine. For the discussion on this subject, see İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, 'Şah İsmailin Zevcesi Taclî Hanîmîn Mücevheratî', Belleten XXIII, 92 (Ankara 1959), pp. 611-9.

(2) Similarly Taclu Hanım's status in respect of Çafer Çelebi is also the subject of some discussion. According to Tevârîh-i Al-i 'Osmân, p. 237, Selîm presented Taclu Hanım to Çafer as his wife, having dismissed the Şah as a heretic and consequently any marriage contracted by him was uncannical and thus no impediment to a further marriage by Taclu Hanım. Çerkesler Kâtibi, 19b, and Celâl-zâde, Me'âgîr, 143b, mention that she was presented to Çafer, but failed to specify whether she was to become his wife or concubine. İbn-i Kemâl, however, states that Çafer was requested by the Sultân to accept Taclu Hanım as a wife (Selîm-nâmes, p. 112-3). The account given by Şa'ban Şifâ'i, Fazâ'il-i Al-i 'Osmân, 109a-b, is contradictory in that he states that the Sultân wished to send Taclu Hanım to Istanbul but Çafer married her without the consent of the Sultân, who when he heard of the marriage became extremely angry and maintained that she was already
On the return from the Çaldırı campaign, camp was set up at Çoban Köprü and the march was halted for one day while appointments and dismissals were made in several of the offices of state. Zeyrek-zâde left the post of kazasker of Anadolu and Cafer Çelebi was appointed in his place.\(^{(2)}\)

On 16th Şevval 920 (6 Dec. 1514), Selim reached Amasya, where he intended to spend the winter before continuing the campaign the following year.\(^{(3)}\) Duşakın-oğlu Ahmed Paşa was appointed to the grand vizierate replacing Hersekoğlu Ahmed Paşa, who had been dismissed while returning from Çaldırıan.

On 8th Muḥarram 921 (23 Feb. 1515), the Janissaries, with the encouragement of some of the ministers of state, rioted in order to force the Sultān to abandon the campaign and to return to

(\textit{cont'd from p. 31}): married and was therefore unable to enter into a further marriage. Cafer Çelebi countered this argument with several proofs of the invalidity of kızılbaş marriage services and was able to placate the Sultān's anger. The \textit{Cami'ü 't-Tevārīh}, 260a, suggests that Selim's anger was not placated and attributes Cafer's death to his marriage with Taclu Hanım.

\(^{(1)}\) İbn-i Kemâl, 9th Defter, in \textit{Selim-nâmes}, p. 124.

\(^{(2)}\) The date of this appointment is given in İbn-i Kemâl as "after 25th Receb" (Selim-nâmes, p. 125). In Ferîdûn Beg \(^{1}\) p. 413, \textit{Bedâyü 'l-Vekâ'i}, II, p. 444, and \textit{Me'âgir}, 143a, the date is 25th Şa'ban.

\(^{(3)}\) İbn-i Kemâl, 9th Defter, in \textit{Selim-nâmes}, p. 127.
Istanbul. They attacked and burned the houses of Piri Paşa, Halimi Çelebi and Ca'fer Çelebi. The Sultan discovered that Dukakin-oğlu Ahmed Paşa had been responsible for inciting the riot and had him killed ten days later.

(1) İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Tarihi, II, p. 257.

(2) Me'âgir, 150b. According to Hüseyin Hüsameddin, Amasya Tarihi, III, pp. 275-6, the riots were caused by the appointment of Piri Çelebi to a vizierate which had traditionally been given to a person who had joined the ranks of the Ottoman forces from the devşirme. Janissaries petitioned their ağa Iskender Ağa, who in turn requested Ca'fer Çelebi and Halimi Çelebi, the lâlâ of the Sultan, to try to influence the Sultan. Ca'fer Çelebi and Halimi Çelebi, however, were reluctant to petition the Sultan and asked the Janissaries to accept the Sultan's will without obligation. Having been incited to riot by Dukakin-oğlu and his kethüda, the Janissaries disregarded this advice, and, rising in revolt on 8th Muharrem (23 Feb. 1515), they set to looting the houses of Piri Paşa, Ca'fer Çelebi and Halimi Çelebi.

(3) Celâl-zâde, Me'âgir, 150b, is certainly mistaken in recounting that Ca'fer was executed together with Dükakin-oğlu. Ca'fer Çelebi was executed after his return to Istanbul. Feridun Beg, I, p. 412, adds that a further reason for Dükakin-oğlu's execution was the rumour that he had come to some agreement with Dülkadir-oğlu 'Alâü 'd-devle.
After spending the winter at Amasya and annexing the beylik of Dulkadir, the cities of Kemah and Diyarbakir and some citadels in the east, Sultan Selim returned to Istanbul on 29th Cem. I, 921 (11 May 1515). He soon set about discovering which of his ministers had incited the Janissaries at Amasya. (1) Summoning the Janissary ağa and some senior members of the corps to denounce the leaders of the revolt, he learned that the persons responsible were the second vizier İskender Ağa, the kağasker Cafer Çelebi and Balyemez Ümman Ağa, the sekbanbaşi. (2) İskender Ağa and Ümman Ağa were executed forthwith, and Cafer

(1) Tâcu 't-Tevârih, II, p. 293; Vekâyi-i Sultan Bayezid ve Selim Han, 44b.

(2) Tâcu 't-Tevârih, II, p. 293; Vekâyi-i Sultan Bayezid ve Selim Han, 44b. Şükru, Selim-nâme, 121a, relates the denouncing of the instigators of the uprising thus:

Bu fesâdi eyle erenler serveri
İtti birkaç bî-şired yeniçeri
Lîk bâ'ig bunda üç bî-bîhredûr
İğbu tâhrîk ile anlar şöhredûr
Biri İskender Paşa durur benâm
Ol biri sekmenbaş ey Nîk-nâm
Biri dağî kažî 'askerdûr ki Şâh
Şanur ani her cihetden nîk-ûvâh
Çelebi was summoned to the Sultan's presence. (1) According to Hoca Sa'deddin, Selim asked Cafer Çelebi to suggest what suitable punishment might be meted out to a person who encouraged the troops of Islam to revolt and, upon receiving the reply that such a person, if proved guilty, should be executed, he ordered Cafer's execution. (2) According to Şükrü, the question was framed differently and, on being asked to suggest a punishment for a person who intended to kill a müslim, Cafer replied similarly that if his guilt was proved, the penalty should be death. Şükrü frames the Sultan's reply in the following beyts: (3)

Men ki Şaham 'ilmüm irmişdür tamâm
Sen de inkâr idemezsîn uş kelâm

Sen fulan menzilde bir gün aşikâr
Dimedûm mi ki Ferîd-i rûzgâr

(1) Şükrü, Selîm-nâme, 122a. 'Ali (Künhû 'l-Abbâr, 205a), however, states that the Sultan sent a man to Cafer Çelebi to ask some questions.

(2) Tâcu 't-Tevârîh, II, 1. 298. According to Çerkesler Kâtibi, 29b, after Cafer's execution Selim regretted having killed Dükakin-oglu, considering him to be innocent:

Bir teessûf çekdi anda padişâh
Kim Dükakin-oglu gitdi bî-gûnah

Ferîdûn Begî I, p. 415, gives a detailed account of the trail and execution.

(3) Şükrü, Selîm-nâme, 122a.
It can be understood from the following beyts that Şükrü considered some rivalry to have existed between Piri Paşa and Ca'fer Çelebi, and that Piri had denounced Ca'fer as a rabble-rouser and advised the Sultan to execute him:\(^1\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Piri Paşa } & \text{ hod baña bir gün nihän} \\
\text{Didi ki ey } & \text{ jüsrev-i mülk-i cihän} \\
\text{Kaži 'asker fitnedür ref' eylegil} \\
\text{Yir yüzinden fitneyi def' eylegil}
\end{align*}
\]

'Ali indicates another reason for Ca'fer's execution. 'Ali was informed by Celâl-zâde that during the period in which Selim was struggling to obtain the throne he met the army of his father, Bâyezîd II, at Karuşdîran Ovasî and withdrew his troops without a fight, retiring towards Kefe. On the occasion of this military withdrawal, Selim became the victim of a satirical work which was unfortunately attributed to Ca'fer, and became the cause for his execution.\(^2\) There is support for this account in the \textit{İn'âmât Defteri}. It is recorded that in Cem. I 917 a poet by

\(^1\) Şükrü, \textit{Selîm-nâme}, 122a.
\(^2\) Künhü 'l-Âhîbâr, 205a.
the name of presented a ta'rih about the defeat of Selîm Beg to Bâyezîd and was remunerated. This ta'rih could be attributed to Ca'fer. Furthermore, Celâl-zâde gives an account in his Me'âsir (103a) which is connected with the above story. After Selîm's withdrawal Ca'fer was reported to have said

سلیم بک "the dog has gone into the desert", and his words became famous at that time. Celâl-zâde considers that this remark was instrumental in bringing about Ca'fer's execution.

The tezkires give the following line as a chronogram for Ca'fer's execution:

\[ \text{وراد کندی بو جاندن جنفر} \]

However, this chronogram produces the year 920, which is clearly wrong, as the historical sources are agreed upon the 8th Receb 921 (13 Aug. 1515) as the date of his execution.

1. In'amât Defteri, p. 454. Appendix A.21. This ta'rih may be a chronogram, or it may, in fact, refer to a work of history.

2. Kafzâde Fâ'ižî, 21a; Riyâzî, 45b. S. N. Ergun prefers to rely on the chronogram and considers the historical sources to be at fault (T9, II, p. 833). OM, I, p. 263, and HOP, II, p. 269, also give the date as 920. As Sultan Selîm returned to Istanbul after the Çaldîran campaign on 29 Cam. 921, it is certain that the historical sources are correct.

According to 'Aşık Çelebi and 'Alî, Ca'fer had tried in vain to persuade the Sultan of his innocence and, quoting historical precedents, he had recounted that Hûrûn Reşid had suffered pangs of guilt after the execution of his vizier Ca'fer Bermekî, whom he felt he had executed unjustly. (1)

After Ca'fer's execution his corpse was taken to Balat to the mosque (2) which had been named after him, and buried there by his brother Sa'dî Çelebi. (3)

In the tezkires it is recounted that Ca'fer had a premonition of his own death. Two or three days before Ca'fer's execution, Mevlânâ Necmi went to Ca'fer's house to pay a visit, during the course of which Ca'fer told him that he had just written a hâzel, of which he particularly liked this couplet: (4)

Ben şehid-i tığ-i 'ışık oldukda râh-ı yârda
Yumadîn defn eylehûz tenden şubêri gitmesûn (5)

(1) 'Aşık Çelebi, 60b-61a; Kûnhû 'l-İâbârâr, 205a.
(2) For his mosque in Balat, see Hadikâtû 'l-Cevâmi', I, p. 39. For its vakfiye, see İstanbul Tahrîr Defterî, p. 298.
(3) Şehî; p. 23; 'Aşık Çelebi, 6la; Kûnâlî-zađe, 71a. 'Aşık Çelebi, 156b, recounts that Sa'dî Çelebi was so struck by grief at the death of his brother that he could not stop himself from cursing the one responsible, and for a long time afterwards lived in continual fear that he had been overheard, and his words reported to the palace.
(4) 'Aşık Çelebi, 6la; Kûnâlî-zađe, 71a, Riyâzî, 46a.
' Ağık Çelebi sees in this couplet an allusion to Ca'fer's execution.

Sultan Selim showed remorse for Ca'fer's execution and castigated his courtiers for not having advised imprisonment rather than death. Following Ca'fer's death, a fire broke out among the houses and shops which belonged to the vakf of Atik 'Ali Paşa in Dikilitaş. Sultan Selim visited the scene in order to supervise the extinguishing of the fire, and is reported to have said "this fire is a spark from the fire of poor innocent Ca'fer's sigh". Another anecdote supports the idea that Selim showed regret, as he is reported to have said "there were only two great men in Rûm: one of them was Mü'eyyed-zâde, the other Tacî-zâde Ca'fer. What a pity that the first reached old age before I ascended the throne and the other I killed without realizing his true worth".

Following Ca'fer's death his wife Taclû Hanım was received into Selim's presence on 15th Receb and given an imperial bequest. According to the Câmiʻû 't-Tevârîh, she benefited from the revenue of lands at Tîrîhala, which were given to her for the remainder of her life. She died in 984 (1576-7).

---

(1) Künhû 'l-'Aḥbâr, 205b. 'Alî's statement that Selim had executed Dûkâkin-oğlu for not having prevented his ordering Ca'fer's execution is certainly mistaken, for Dûkâkin-oğlu had been killed in Amasya before this date.

(2) ' Ağık Çelebi, 61a; Kınalî-zâde, 70b; Riyâzî, 45b-46a.

(3) ' Ağık Çelebi, 61a; Kınalî-zâde, 70b; Riyâzî, 45b-46a.

(4) Ferîdûn Beg, 1, p. 418.

(5) Câmiʻû 't-Tevârîh (Sûl. Lib. Fatih, 4306), 260b.
It is reported in the tezkires that Ca'fer was survived by a son who wrote poetry under the mahlas of Ca'feri.\(^{(1)}\) Ca'feri spent a convivial life and died from an overdose of opium.\(^{(2)}\) We can find some of his poems in certain mecmû'as.\(^{(3)}\)

In a vakf document dating from the beginning of Zi 'l-Ka' de 918 (Jan. 1513) it is mentioned that Ca'fer Çelebi had other children, but no mention is made of their names.\(^{(4)}\)

Apart from his mosque in Istanbul, Ca'fer was responsible for building a mosque and a hamam in Simav, a kervansaray in Bergama\(^{(5)}\) and a primary school in Edirne.\(^{(6)}\)

Ca'fer Çelebi's brother Sa'di Çelebi was also famous as a münâş and poet. Sa'di Çelebi's background is more or less the same as that of his brother. He was born in Amasya,\(^{(7)}\) on

\(^{(1)}\) 'Aşık Çelebi, 62b-63a; Kinali-zade, 72a. According to Hüseyin Hüsameddin his name was İbrahim Bâli Çelebi. (Nigâncilar, p. 72).

\(^{(2)}\) 'Aşık Çelebi, 62b; Kinali-zade, 72a.

\(^{(3)}\) Egridirli Haci Kemal, Mecmu'atü 'n-Nezâ'ir, p. 869-70; Pervâne Bey Mecmu'ası, 625a, 364a; Mecmu'atü 'n-Nezâ'ir (Hasan Hüsnû Paşa, no. 1031), 301b; Mecmu'atü 'n-Nezâ'ir (Ün. Ktp. T.Y. 752), 30a.

\(^{(4)}\) Tapu Defteri, no. 251, p. 531-2 (Appendix A.2); İstanbul Tahrir Defteri, p. 298.

\(^{(5)}\) İstanbul Tahrir Defteri, p. 298.

\(^{(6)}\) Tapu Defteri, no. 1070, p. 150-1. (Appendix A.22)

\(^{(7)}\) 'Ali (Kühnu 'l-Aḫbâr), 204b.
what date we do not know. After studying under the famous scholars of his time, such as Mevlânâ Kasım, known as Kâdi-zâde, and Hacı Hasan-zâde, most likely in Bursa, he was appointed müdderris to the medrese of Gazi Murâd in Bursa. (1) According to certain records in his Mecmu'a, he was in Bursa between the years 897 (1491-2) and 906 (1500-1). (2) On pages 147b to 150a of this Mecmu'a there are some Arabic poems written in 905 (1499-1500) while he was still there.

Sometime between 906 (1500-1) and 909 (1503-4), Sa'dî Çelebi must have come to Istanbul, since in a record in the İn'âmât Defteri it is mentioned that Sa'dî Çelebi, müdderris in the medrese of 'Ali Paşa, in Cem. I 909 (Oct. 1503) presented a kâşide to the Sultan. (3) According to the SN, he was later appointed to the Semâniye, (4) at that time the highest institution of learning. Again in the İn'âmât Defteri, it is recorded that one of the müderris of the Semâniye, Mevlâna Sa'dî, the brother of the Nişâncı, presented another kâşide in Zi 'l-Hicce 915 (Mar. 1510). (5)

(1) SN, I, p. 490; Mecdi, p. 337.
(2) Sa'dî Çelebi Mecmu'asî: for Sa'dî Çelebi's letters sent from Bursa to his brother Ca'fer, see: 106b-107b; 107b-103a; 70b-71a; 102a-102b; 62b-64a; 93b-94a.
(3) p. 17. (Appendix A.23) For a letter written while in Istanbul, in 909, to Ca'fer see: Sa'dî Çelebi Mecmu'asî, 105b-106a.
(4) SN, I, p. 490; Mecdi, p. 337.
(5) p. 375. (Appendix A.24)
Sa'di Celebi probably spent the remainder of his life teaching in Istanbul. As already mentioned, when Ca'fer Celebi was executed in 921 (1515) Sa'di removed his brother's body and buried it. 'Aşik Celebi says that shortly after Ca'fer Celebi's death someone was required to write a letter in Arabic to the Sultan of Egypt, İsansu Gavri, and Sa'di Celebi was summoned to the palace for this purpose. Selim I was very pleased with the letter he composed and rewarded Sa'di Celebi with a promotion of 30 akçes and a gift of 30,000 akçes.\(^{(1)}\)

In \(\text{SN}\), it is recorded that before he died Sa'di Celebi made the Pilgrimage and, on his return, was retired with a pension of 80 akçes. The date of his death is 922 (1516). His tomb is in the garden of the primary school built by him in Balat.\(^{(2)}\) 'Aşik Celebi, however, says that Sa'di died during the Egyptian campaign.\(^{(3)}\)

Apart from his teaching, Sa'di Celebi also wrote a number of commentaries in Arabic on text-books used in the medreses,\(^{(4)}\) and according to Hüseyin Hüsameddin, he is also the author of a work entitled Hayru 'l-Ahlam, in which is described the charms of the city of Amasya.\(^{(5)}\) His Arabic dīvān in his Mecmû'a is

\(^{(1)}\) 'Aşik Celebi, 156a-b.
\(^{(2)}\) \(\text{SN}\), I, p. 490; Mecdî, p. 337. For the vakfiye of his school, see: İstanbul Tahrir Defteri, p. 293, and Tapu Defteri, no. 251, p. 532. (Appendix A.2)
\(^{(3)}\) 'Aşik Celebi, 157a.
\(^{(4)}\) For his works, see: \(\text{SN}\), I, p. 491; Mecdî, p. 333; OM, I, p. 263.
\(^{(5)}\) Amasya Tarihi, I, p. 13.
incomplete, (1) and some of his Turkish beyts are to be found in the tezkires. (2) His Arabic poetry is praised by the tezkire-writers who claim that his abilities in this language are superior to his brother's, while Kinali-zade Hasan Celebi maintains that his ingâ, too, is preferable. (3)

(1) Sa'dî Çelebi Mecmu'asî, 24a-26a; 29a-34a; 56a-57a; 103a; 110a; 147b-150a.
(2) 'Âgîk Çelebi, 157a; Kafzâde Fa'imî, 35a; Meclî 337.
(3) 'Âgîk Çelebi, 156a; Kinali-zâde, 135a.
(4) 135a.
Apart from his Divan, which is discussed in detail below, Ca'fer Çelebi is credited with the following five works:

1. Heves-nâme(1)

This is considered both by modern scholars and by near-contemporaries to be Ca'fer's best work. Almost all the tezkires dwell on its importance,(2) Latifi considering it to be as original as it was innovative:(3)

"Ve Heves-nâme nâm bir destân-1 dil-sitâni vardur. Kendi karihasından şâdir olmış hâsâa icâdi ve hevâ-yi cevânide hasb-1 hâlinden ihtîrâ' ve âırdîdur. Bir kitâb-1 belâgat-nisâb ve bir nazm-1 sihr-intisâbdur ki min maâla' ilâ '1-maâta' elfaz-1 'acibe ve ma'âni-1 ya garibe ile ebyat-1 pür-nûkât ve şanâyi'-i bedâyi' ve 'ibârât ve isti'ârâtîr. Ta'rif-i âhre muhtâc değil." 

While one may have reservations about such extravagant praise of its literary value, its originality in this genre cannot be denied. M. F. Köprülü and R. Anhegger have stressed the fact that Ca'fer was consciously creating a work different from the

(1) In this study the Ms. Bibliothèque Nationale A. F. 300 was used.
(2) Sehî, p. 28; Latîfî, p. 117-3; 'Âşık Çelebi, 61b-62a; Kanali-zâde, 71b.
(3) Latîfî, p. 117-3.
mesnevis of other poets, in subject and in treatment. (1) Up to the time of Ca'fer almost all mesnevi writers, with the exception of Ḫalili, had looked to Persian or Arabic literature for their themes, or had simply translated an existing work into Turkish. Although the Firkat-name of Ḫalili, written in the reign of Mehmed II, shares certain features with Ca'fer's Heves-name, in that it relates an adventure of love personally experienced by the poet, in character it is wholly different, in that the object of Ḫalili's passion is not a woman and that the intent of the work is predominantly mystical. (2)

The Heves-name, which is in the usual mesnevi form, in a hezec metre, (3) falls into three distinct parts, the first two of which are by way of introduction to the theme. The first of these, following the almost obligatory tevhid, na't and münacat, consists of verses in description of the buildings in certain districts of Istanbul. In the second part Ca'fer

(2) For Ḫalili, see F. A. Tansel, Ḫalili, İA, V, p. 162; for a summary of the Firkat-name, see HOP, III, pp. 330-2.
(3) 'Aşık Çelebi, 61b, gives the metre as remel, and Katib Çelebi, KZ, II, p. 732, repeats this error. It is likely that 'Aşık Çelebi read some of the gazels in the work, which are indeed in remel, and attributed this metre to the whole work.
explains his reasons for writing the work, stressing its originality; after which he goes on to discuss the various concepts of love and gives his opinions about certain prominent poets. The third and substantial part of the poem is a narrative description of a love affair which the poet personally experienced.

It would appear that it is chiefly the first two parts of the work, in which can be found information on the daily life of Istanbul and its institutions and a discussion on the merits of his own work and those of other poets, that have earned for this poem a place in the history of Divan literature. In particular, his critique of Ahmed Paşa and Şeyhî have found mention in the tezkires of Latîfî and 'Aşik Çelebi, and in almost all previous researches on Ca'fer. (1) The first section seems to have no other relevance to the subject other than to locate the poet in Istanbul and provide a setting for the story which is to follow:

Buhun gibi mu'azzam bir şehr içinde
Ki hemtâsi bulunmaz dehri içinde
İkâmet eylemiđüm ben kemîne
'Düşüb kesi̇b-i fezâ'il 'âlemine

The analysis of the poem is as follows: after the tevhid and na’t, which are in general unremarkable, we find in the münâcät a naive admission that thoughts of women intrude into his mind even when at prayer:

Hayâllumde şarâb u şem’ u şâhid
Derûnumda hevâ-yi sâk u sâ’id

Kaçan tekbîr idûb  tabIndex namâza
Gömlü baslar nigârına niyâza

Ne aşı kÎlmadan mıhrâba ben rû
Çii gohÎlumde muhîm tâk-1 ebrû

N’olur ben tütdügumdan kibleye yüz
Ağar cân üsîtan-1 yâra gün göz

After the münâcät there follows the customary prayer for the sultân, Bâyezîd II, followed in turn by the description of certain buildings in Istanbul, which is one of the parts of the work which has hitherto received the attention of scholars.(1)

In fact, however, the information contained herein contributes very little to our knowledge of Istanbul in the late 15th and early 16th centuries, the descriptions of the buildings being fanciful rather than factual. Thus he mentions the tower of Galata (5b-6a), the Saray-ı Hümâyûn (6b-7b), the royal ğamam (7b-3a), Ayaşofya ((9a-9b), the mosque of Sultan Mehmed (9b-11b), the Semâniye (1)(12a-b), the 'imaret, or public kitchen (12b-13a) and the Dârû 'ş-Şifâ (13a-b). After the Dârû 'ş-Şifâ there is a comparatively long account of the establishment of the mosque and tomb of Ebû Eyyûb Anşarî, in which is given the familiar account of how Akgemseddîn, the mentor of the Sultan, located the site about half a fersahl outside the city. Curiously, he omits this detail in his Feth-nâme.

The second part, which can be considered to be the real beginning of the Heves-nâme, starts with a hasb-i hâl (16a-17a), in which Cafer gives some facts about his own life. He tells us that he spent his time, when not pursuing his studies, in the enjoyable company of friends:

Geçüb eyyâm-ı taşşîl olsa ta'tîl
İderdüm 'işret esbâbîn taşşîl

(1) He mentions the following scholars as teaching there at that time:  Ħaṭîb-oğlu, 'Arab,  Kháṣṭalâni and  Hâcı  Hasan-zâde.

(2) A similar description of many of these buildings is to be found in  Ħadîdî's Tevarîh-i Âl-i  'Ogmân (British Museum, Or. 12396), ff. 133b-135a.
Dirüb bir nice ehl-i dil ḥarīfi
Hümernend ü sebük-rūh u ṣarīfi
İderdüm anlarušla 'ayş-u-nüşı
Çıkarub göklere oğş-u-ţurüşı
Club birden ikiden sâde-rülar
Tolub sâgar boşalurdu sebûlar

In the course of these meetings he would engage his friends in literary discourses in which it was his custom to contribute extempore ġazels as well as şaşîdes in praise of the Sultan:

Gehî müşkil mesâ'il fiqr iderdük
Gehî dürülü muţahîk giqr iderdük
Gehî naşm-ı Derî vû gâh Tâžî
Gehî şâfranc u nerd ü lehv ü bâzî

Düşerdi şohbet egnâsînda ekşer
Bedîhî eydür idûm ter ġazeller
Dir idûm düştûgince gâh gâhî
Şaşâ'id medî iderdüm pâdiştâhî

At one of these parties, someone praised Ca'fer's poetical talent and exhorted him to write a meşnevi which would treat of love in an original manner:

Bu egnâda bâna bir yâr-ı cânî
Didi ey bahr-ı 'umman-ı ma'ânî
Budur þannum eyâ her fende mâhir
Ki sensin meşneviye daţi kâdir
Other companions joined in this proposal, but Ca'fer protested his reluctance to embark on such a task:

Bilûrsiz merdûm-i şâhib-fazîlet
İder 'år itmege eş'âra rağbet
Ki fažîlehline şâ'irlik yaraşmaz
Yed-i Mûsâya sâhirlik yaraşmaz
Kûlurken hàmemûz hall-i dekâ'îk
Olurken rûşen anûfîla haqâ'îk
Revâ midur ki yaza tûrrehâtî
Ki olmaya haqîkatde şebâtî
İderken rûz-u-şeb kesb-i faţâ'il
Koyub ani dürûşmek şî're müşkil

This is the conventional attitude towards poetry among the 'ulema, which nevertheless, did not prevent them from practicing it and seeking a reputation thereby. The production of a megnevî, however, was a time-consuming task, requiring a sustained effort that few were willing to make; and, moreover, the occasion for the reading or recitation of such extensive
works was private, and in this respect different from the meclis-i yāran which was the usual venue of the ḡazel or the kāṣīde, and the place in which a reputation as a poet could be most readily gained.

Following the Ḥaṣb-i Rāʾ comes the much-quoted passage in which Caʿfer criticizes Şeyḫī and Ahmed Paşa, who were still considered the two pre-eminent Ottoman poets:

Şular kim Türkī dīlde şöhreti var
Biri Şeyḫī biri Ahmeddur ey yār 19b

In fact, Şeyḫī is to be regarded as the most prominent of the early poets to emerge from Anatolia, and one of the founders of the school of classical Divān poetry, while it was Ahmed Paşa who established this poetry on a firm footing. Caʿfer's failure to mention Necātī, the most lyrical of the poets of the period of Mehmed II, may be due to the fact that he was not of the 'ulema class and did not hold an important post in the capital.

Caʿfer has little praise for either of these distinguished predecessors: Şeyḫī he accuses of paying scant attention to the rules of eloquence (feṣāḥat) and for employing archaic words:

Eger Şeyḫīdur inşāf ile bi 'llah
Suğanverlikden olmuş geṛçi āgeh

(2) M. F. Köprüllü, Ahmed Paşa, İA, I
Ahmed Paşa he holds to be incompetent in rhetoric (belâğat) and criticizes him for his inability to link ideas:

Furthermore, he considers both to have failed to contribute any original imagery or ideas to their poems and dismisses their works as mere translation and imitation: (1)

Furthermore, he considers both to have failed to contribute any original imagery or ideas to their poems and dismisses their works as mere translation and imitation:

(1) Latîfî concurs with Ca'fer's view that Ahmed Paşa had translated Persian poems and that Şeyhî was guilty of using archaic words. Tezkire-i Latîfî, pp. 71, 215.
Ararsaň her birinüi defterini
Tetebbu' eyler iseň sözlerini
Bulmazsan birinde ma'ni-yi ḥāş
Bulursan ḥayruñ əhengine rakkers
Ḩayāl-i ḥaşa gün kādir deguller
Ḩakikatde bular şa'ir deguller

Although this section in which Ca'fer Çelebi criticizes Şeyhi and Ahmed Paşa is the best-known section of the Heves-nâme, its fame rests not on its correct appraisal of these two poets but rather on the fact that it pleads for a more original treatment of subject matter and a less slavish subservience to Arabic and Persian models. (1) Ca'fer elucidates his ideas on originality in a section entitled Pend daden-i dil, in which he examines the options open to him in his choice of subject and style for the meşnevî he agreed to compose. Despite the fact that there is given here a more lucid account of Ca'fer's literary ideas, subsequent authors have tended to neglect it:

Didi dil şol əhikayetler kim anı
Lisân-ı āğarûñ bir nütkedânî

(1) M. F. Köprülü claims that Ca'fer Çelebi was responsible for influencing his protege Vahdî to adopt local characters and themes as subjects for literature (Edebiyat Araştırmaları, Ankara 1966, p. 379).
Edə itmiş ola tatlı dil ile
Emek çekmiş ola ay u yıl ile
İdüb dürlü güherler nazmina derc
Ömürler eylemiş ola aña ğarc
Olub muhtarı bir uslub-ı zibä
Aña virmiş ola hoş tarz-ı garrā
İdinüb muktedə sen dağı anı
Elüne alasin bir dâsitəni
Ne şüretilerle olt itdi-yse tahır
Kılasin tercüme Türkiye bir bir
Bu ehl-i fažl olana sehldür sehл
Benüm katumda belki sehldür sehл
Gerek sen idesin bir kişsa perdız
K'isitmiş olmaya bir kişsa-perdız
Senüň ihdâguň ola țavrm-u-țarzn
Saña mahşüş ola uslub-1 nağzn
Senüň ola ne kim var zişt eger țüb
Birisi olmaya gayriye mensüb
Bünür var ise olur bunda zâhir
Bunı iden kişidür nazma kâdir

Having explained at some length his ideas on literature, Ca'fer Çelebi returns to the discourse with his friends and states that being unable to resist their persuasion, he finally accepted their suggestions and embarked upon the task of writing the mevnevi:
Ca'fer approached his task by looking for a theme which had hitherto not been exploited:

Heves kıldüm diyem bir hoş hikâyet
Ki kimse kılmamış ola rivâyet

and began by reading histories and legends:

Tetebu' itdüm âhârî serâser
Tevârîği vü esmârî serâser

Unable to find inspiration from these works, he decided to narrate a personal experience of love to which he gave the title Heves-nâme:

Heves birle urub bünüyadin anuñ

According to 'Alī, this love affair was based on an actual event. Ca'fer, it would seem had seduced the wife of a member of the 'ulemâ, and by making various promises and employing a go-between, he managed to achieve his desire and subsequently
related the whole affair in the Heves-nâme. (1)

Almost as if to emphasise the originality of his work, he deviates from common practice and dedicates it neither to the sultân nor to one of the vezîrs, but rather to all pretty girls:

Ne şâh u ne vezîr adına yazdum
Perî ruhsârlar yâdına yazdum

Cafer's departure from accepted practice might suggest that his work was not intended for general circulation but was to be confined to the eyes of his close friends. This suggestion is further supported by the fact that the megnevi was not revised until a considerable amount of time had elapsed after its completion. There were apparently some other unspecified

Obstacles which barred its revision:

However, he later succumbed to the suggestions of his friends and produced a revised copy of his work in a brief period of time:

In the last beyt of the Heves-name, Ca'fer indicates that he finished the work in 899:
The work was done in his spare time and reached completion in less than two months.

Ki kăfidür bir ednă iltifatuñ
Gerekmez üstine dün gün gebătuñ
Buña maşruf olan vaktüm serăpär
Eger cem' olsa olmazdı iki ay

Ca'fer Çelebi discloses his ideas on love in a passage entitled ser-i suhan, which serves as an introduction to the narrative and an apology for the events which it relates.

Mecäzi 'ışki da gürme igen û'vär
Ki vardur anda dağî ğayli ağär
Kesar ma'şük gayrindan seni ol
Komaz cân gülşenine kimseye yol
Perämüs itdürür zühd-û-riyayî
Kazur dilden nüküş-î mä-sivâyî
Anî dänä olan ûtumaz fažihat
Ki olmîşdur pûl-î räh-î haçihat
Cûn oldî räh-î Haçka ḳantara ol
Aña teşnî'-û-ta'n itmek degül yol

(1) Contrary to the usual practice, the hemze is not to be included in the calculation. 399 is given in all the sources as the date of the completion of the work.
While in the above passage he defends the idea that *mecâzi* love is a means to *ilahi* love, throughout the *Heves-nâme* he seems content to pursue the means with scant attention to the end, and the passion he describes is explicitly carnal. He feels that those who suffer because of love are fools; no man of good sense would choose such a course:

Dir idüm ol durur ‘âlemde ‘âkil  
Ki hergiz virmeye dilberlere dil

Muradînî görüb ide ferâqat  
Gönhül bağlayub olmaya melâmet  

‘Aşık Çelebi tells us that Sultan Selîm accused Ca'fer of not being able to understand the true meaning of love, and criticized him for not treating the subject with due respect:


The third part of the *Heves-nâme*, in which the narrative proper is related, begins with *Ağâz-î dâsitân*. In this and the following sections we have the description of *Kâgidhânê* in the spring, when Ca'fer and some friends went there for a

---

(1) ‘Aşık Çelebi, Tezkire, 61b.
holiday. It was here that the love affair began. In the remaining part of the work he relates his first sight of his beloved, his falling in love, his finding a go-between, the suffering he endures, his several meetings with his beloved, his parting and the exchange of letters between the lovers. This section is in meşnevî form but is interspersed with gazels which have the effect of breaking the monotony of the hezec beyts. Some of these gazels are put into the mouth of his beloved. These gazels are also to be found in his Divan, and the question arises as to whether they were transferred from the Divan to the Heves-nâme, or vice versa. It is more probable that the gazels were written for the Heves-nâme, as they fit the context: had they originally been written for the Divan, their appropriateness for the Heves-nâme would be extremely fortuitous. His claim in the Heves-nâme that he had already composed a Divan should not be taken at face value. His claim was probably made to impress his beloved, who says to the go-between:

Didi yine buluş sen ol ḥerife
Anufla iderek læğ-u-laţîfe

Bize andan anufl Divânîn iste
Girân-mâye güherler kânîn iste

Eger ḥâzîr degülse bunda Divân
Biraz yâdînda olanlardan iy cân

Aha yazdur getür bir kaç gazeller
Kilalum nûkl-î bezm-i rûî-perver
Didüm Dīvān n'olur kim cān sızündür
Ne kim emr idesüz fermān sızündür

 Velī böyle gereklū olacāğın
Anuñ bu deflū rāğbet bulacāğın

Ne bileydük bile almaduğ anı
Jayālūmdē ḡazellerden olanı

The affair was not to continue, however, because of the
impossibility of contact being maintained between the lovers,
the woman being fearful of risking her reputation in such an
illicit liaison. And thus the poem ends in bathos, Ca'fer
seemingly being satisfied to accept the unsatisfactory outcome
without demur.
2. **Mahrüse-i İstanbul Feth-nâmesi**

This description of the conquest of Istanbul in 1453 is mentioned only by Ismail Paşa in his *Hediyetü 'l-‘Arifîn*. The text, which was published as a supplement to *TOEM* (parts 20 and 21, Istanbul 1331) is said to be taken from a manuscript owned by Hâlis Efendi. The introduction on Ca’fer Çelebi’s life was also written by Hâlis Efendi.

The work is written in a very elegant style, with ayets, hadîg and beyts in Arabic, Persian and Turkish scattered throughout the text, and may be considered one of the finest examples of sixteenth century Ottoman prose writing. Unfortunately, the complexity of the language and the richness of its style has prevented some scholars from appreciating its value as an historical source. S. N. Ergun, in his *Türk Şairleri*, II

---


(2) V. L. Menage, in his thesis on the early Ottoman histories, points out that "although Hâlis Efendi’s Library now forms part of Istanbul University Library, the manuscript there cannot be his, for it ends differently from the printed text." *A Survey of the early Ottoman Histories*, with studies on their textual problems and their sources, (Ph.D., University of London 1961), p. 132. The final lines of the University manuscript are given in A. S. Levend’s work on *gazavât-nâmes*, *Gazavat-nâmeler ve Mihaloğlu Ali Beyin Gazavat-nâmesi*, (Ankara 1956), p. 17.
p. 336, regards this book as a literary work rather than a history. V. L. Menage describes it as "little more than a literary exercise". (1)

A brief examination of the text and a comparison of the information given with that of other historians indicates that Ca'fer's work is in some aspects a reliable source for the conquest of Istanbul. In fact some of the events recorded by him seem to be more accurate than the records of Tursun Beg, (2) Negri, (3) 'Asikpaşa-zade, (4) Rühi, (5) or Enveri. (6) Tursun Beg's work is a first-hand source for Mehmmed II's reign and his narrative of the siege of Istanbul is regarded as "the most detailed Turkish account by a contemporary Ottoman." (7) A close examination of both texts reveals the points on which Tursun Beg and Ca'fer agree and disagree. The preparation for

(2) Tursun Beg, Tarih-i Bbu 'l-Feth, ed. Mehmed 'Arif, (Istanbul 1330).
(4) 'Asikpaşa-zade Tarihi, ed. 'Ali Beg, (Istanbul 1332).
(7) H. İnalçık, 'Mehmed the Conqueror (1432-1481) and his time', Speculum 35 (1960), p. 409.
the siege is given in both sources in equal length. (1) The council of war which was held before the siege and in particular Mehmed II's speech to the council is very detailed in Ca'fer's work. (2) Ca'fer's detailed report of the speech might have led one to believe that it was derived substantially from imagination had it not been corroborated by any other historian: Kritovolus' account of this same speech however, is remarkably similar. (3) As Professor Halil İnalci has pointed out, the two versions of the speech given by Kritovolus and Ca'fer, although varying from each other in some places, are in agreement on the essential points. (4)

The chain placed across the entrance to the Golden Horn and its history is very well described in Ca'fer's work, (5) while Tursun Beg gives it only cursory mention. (6) The number of vessels which were hauled overland across Galata into the Golden Horn is given in the Feth-name as between forty and fifty, whereas Tursun Beg refers to them as "boats and some ships". (7)

(1) Tursun Beg, pp. 42-4; Feth-name, pp. 9-10.
(2) Feth-name, pp. 6-8.
(6) Tursun Beg, p. 46.
(7) Feth-name, p. 15; Tursun Beg, p. 46. However, Negri, II, p. 691, and Bihist, (Br. Mus. Or. Add. 7369), 154a, are much more certain when they say "there were seventy vessels".
During the siege the Byzantines received help from outside. Ca'fer is more specific about this and states that "four huge vessels full of provisions, soldiers and ammunition came to the help of the Byzantines", (1) while according to Türkün Beg, only two vessels came to their help. The consensus of the historians of the siege would suggest that Türkün Beg is wrong on this point. (2)

After this incident Mehmed II held a meeting to encourage his officers and soldiers. In both Ca'fer's and Türkün Beg's works (3) this meeting is confused with the meeting held just before the conquest of the city. (4)

After the last attack, Istanbul fell into the hands of the Ottoman army. The date given for this is 357 Cem I, 20 şehanbe in Ca'fer's work, and 357 Cem II, 27 şehanbe in Türkün Beg's book. (5) Support for both dates can be found in other Ottoman histories, but it is certain that the conquest of Istanbul occurred on the date which is given by Ca'fer. (6)

The plundering and looting which occurred during the first three days of the conquest is vividly described by Ca'fer

(1) Feth-name, p. 15. Ca'fer's version of this event is supported by Enverî, p. 95.
(2) H. İnalçıklı, Fatih Devri, p. 127.
(3) Feth-name, pp. 15-17; Türkün Beg, p. 43.
(4) H. İnalçıklı, Fatih Devri, p. 130.
(5) Feth-name, p. 17; Türkün Beg, p. 49.
(6) Feridun Dirimtekin, İstanbulun Fethi (İstanbul 1976), pp. 136-213.
Çelebi, (1) but the withdrawal of Giustiniani and his men which preceded the conquest and the death of the Byzantine Emperor during the capture of the city are omitted in Ca'fer's work. "Tursun Beg's account regarding these events is very detailed. (2)

Ca'fer's closing lines are devoted to the conversion of Ayasofya into a mosque by Mehmed II. This part is presented in all Ottoman histories of that time in almost the same way.

The other Ottoman historians such as 'Aşıkpaşa-zade, Rühi and Enveri give comparatively short versions of the conquest, and for the most part usually repeat each other with only slight differences: they do, however, usually favour Ca'fer's version of the conquest. (3)

It is not clear from the text which sources have been used by Ca'fer to compile his Fetn-nâme. The only reference to any source is in the following passage: "Muhaddisn-1

(1) According to Ca'fer, so much booty was taken after the conquest that even in his day it was customary to challenge a profligate spender with the following question: "İstanbul yağmasında bile miydûn?" (Were you present at the sack of Istanbul?) A similar version of this is given by Negri, II, p. 707, and İbn-i Kemâl, Tevarîh-i Alî 'Ogmaân, VII Defter, ed. S. Turan (Ankara 1957), p. 75.

(2) "Tursun Beg, pp. 50-3.

(3) For a comparison of Ottoman sources and their accuracy, see H. Ínalçık, Fatih Devri, pp. 109-132; Selahaddin Tansel, Osmanlı Kaynaklarına göre Fatih Sultan Mehmedin Siyasi ve Askerî Faaliyeti (Ankara 1953), pp. 62-111, and for European sources, see Feridun Dirimbekin, İstanbulun Fethi (İstanbul 1976).
It is certain that he did not rely exclusively on any source which is now extant, for he departs from Rühi, Enveri, Tursun Beg, Neşri and 'Aşikpaşa-çade either by adding new information or giving a conflicting account. It is probable that some of Ca'fer's written sources for his history have disappeared, and that Ca'fer did no more than collect the information they give and recast it in his own elegant style. In order to exhibit his talent in ingā and possibly to strengthen his position as a münfiz he ornamented the historical facts with extended epithets, āyets, hadīs and beyts, and paid great attention to sec, to such an extent that his work seems, at first glance, to be a literary essay on the conquest of Istanbul.

Although Ca'fer does not mention when he wrote this work, it is probable that he completed it sometime after 399 (1493-4), the date on which he finished his Heves-nāme, from which he has taken the description of Ayasofya and quoted certain of

(1) Feth-nāme, p. 5.

(2) H. İnalcık suggests in his article on Ottoman historiography that there might be other histories available to the sixteenth century historian which are no longer available to us. 'The Rise of Ottoman Historiography' in Historians of the Middle East (London 1962), p. 165.
his beyts from that chapter.

The complete text of the Feth-nâme is given by Nişâncı Celâl-zâde Muştafa Çelebi in his book called Me’âgir-i Selîm Han. The only reference to the Feth-nâme by another historian is that given by Hüseyin, an historian of the seventeenth century. A simplified version of the Feth-nâme in Latin transcription has been published by Şeref Kayaboğlu: Tuğrayî Ca’fer Çelebi, Mahrûse-i İstanbul Fethnamesi (İstanbul 1953).

(1) Celâl-zâde explains why he has given the complete text of the Feth-nâme thus: Merhûm Sultan Mehmed Han Gâzi - enâre 'llahu bûrhânehtü - mukaddemâ medîne-i maḥmiye-i Konstantiniyeyi feth itdüklerinde [Ca’fer Çelebi] ol hikâyeti beyân, teşhir-i cemîl ile gârrâ-ya‘ azîmû 'ş-şanlarımı ‘âyân için tafsîl-i bedî’ eylemişlerdîr. Teyemmûnên bu kitâb-î müstaṭabda tâşır ve tahîr olundî ki sâmi‘îne sürür ve beheçet hâsîl olur. (103a)

(2) "Merhûm nişâncı Tâcî-zâde Ca’fer Çelebi dağı İstanbulun yevm-i galisde feth olduğân tahîr ve tahârîh eylemiş". Bedâ'i‘ü 'l-Vekâ'i‘, II, p. 204b.
Almost all the sources agree about Ca'fer's abilities as a münşî, most of them ascribing to him a münse'ât. However, it is not clear from the sources whether the münse'ât is a separate work, or whether they are using this term loosely to indicate various letters attributed to him and included in other collections. In 1914, in the introduction to Mahrûse-i Istanbul Feth-nâmesi, Halis Efendi claimed to possess a copy of Ca'fer Çelebi's Münse'ât in his personal library. S. N. Ergün searched for this book, but was unable to find it in Istanbul University Library, where Halis Efendi's books were placed after his death. However, amongst the collection of münse'ât works in the University Library there is one attributed to Ca'fer Çelebi, İngâ-i Tâcî-zâde. This is clearly a misnomer, for only the first three letters and one other belong to Tâcî-zâde Ca'fer Çelebi, the remainder being by various hands. It is very probable that the title page was written by

(1) ŞN, I, p. 489; ' Ağâç Çelebi, 61b; Kınall-zâde, 71a; Riyâzi, 45b; Celâl-zâde, Me'âgir, 103a; KZ, II, p. 1361; Süllem, p. 69.
(2) " ve Münse'âtı (zamânın vuку'ât-ı mühimmesî üzerine yazılmış şeylerdir) kütüphâne-i 'acızmendemde mevcuddur" TOBM, supplement to no. 20-21, (İstanbul 1331), p. 4.
(3) TŞ, II, p. 386.
(4) Türkçe Yazmalar, 5723.
someone who had read no further than the first three letters in this collection. It may be that this is the work to which Ya'lis Efendi referred.

Another münçe'ät has been wrongly ascribed to Ca'fer Çelebi by Abdulbaki Gölpınarlı in his catalogue of the books in the Mevlana Museum in Konya. The title given to it is misleading (hâzâ inşâ be-ḥaṭṭ-ı Tacî merhûm), for some of the letters belong to the reign of Sultan Süleyman Kanûnî, long after the death of Ca'fer and his father.

It cannot be ascertained with any degree of certainty whether such a work exists. From other collections of münçe'ät and the historical sources six letters can be safely attributed to Ca'fer Çelebi: three written to Şâh İsmail, the ruler of


(2) Some of the letters which are exemplary could well have been composed by Tacî Beg, but others deal with events which took place after his death. This work has also been attributed to Ca'fer by Ş. Tekindağ, in his article on the Çaldıran campaign: 'Yeni Kaynak ve Vesikaların Işığî Altında Yavuz Sultan Selim'in İran Seferi', TD, XVII, 22 (1968), p. 60.
Persia, in the course of the Çaldiran campaign;\(^{(1)}\) on the

\(^{(1)}\) The first letter was written in Persian at İznikmid (Nicomedia) on 27th Safer 920; Feridün Beg\(^{2}\) I, p. 379; \(\text{i} \text{n} \text{g} \text{a}'-\text{i} \text{\c{c}a}-\text{i} \text{z} \text{\c{c}a} \text{d} \) (ün. Ktp. T.Y. 5723), 3b-6b; İdris Bidlisî, Selîm-\c{n}âme, 71a-72b; Luťfî Paşâ, Tevâri\c{g}î, pp. 203-13; Tacu 't-Tevâri\c{g}î, II, p. 246-8; Celâl-zâde, Me'\c{g}â'ir, 127a-129a; 'Alî, Künhû 'l-A\b{b}âr, 177b-178a; Münçe'\c{g}Î Mecmû'âsî (DTCF, Ismail Saib Yazmaları, I/4504), 34a; Hüseyin, Bedâ'i'ü'1-Vekâ'i' II, 429a-431a. For the Turkish translation of this letter see: Mecmû'a-1 Münçe'ât (Es'ad Efendi, 3379), 23b-25b; Mecmû'a-1 Münçe'ât (Ayasofya 4316) 411a-b.

The second letter was written in Turkish at Erzincan at the end of Cem. I. 920; Feridün Beg\(^{2}\) I, p. 333; \(\text{i} \text{n} \text{g} \text{a}'-\text{i} \text{\c{c}a}-\text{i} \text{z} \text{\c{c}a} \text{d} \) (ün. Ktp. T.Y. 5723) 6b-8a; İdris Bidlisî, Selîm-\c{n}âme, 76b-77b; Luťfî Paşâ, Tevâri\c{g}î pp. 213-6; Tacu 't-Tevâri\c{g}î, II, pp. 252-4; Celâl-zâde, Me'\c{g}â'ir, 132b-133b; 'Alî, Künhû 'l-A\b{b}âr, 173b-179a; Münçe'ât mecmû'âsî (DTCF, Ismail Saib Yazmaları, I/4504), 36a.

The third letter was written in Turkish also, at Çermük at the end of Cem. II, 920; Feridün Beg\(^{2}\) I, p. 385; \(\text{i} \text{n} \text{g} \text{a}'-\text{i} \text{\c{c}a}-\text{i} \text{z} \text{\c{c}a} \text{d} \) (ün. Ktp. T.Y. 5723), 9b-11a; Luťfî Paşâ, Tevâri\c{g}î, pp. 214-218; Tacu 't-Tevâri\c{g}î, II, pp. 256-7; Celâl-zâde, Me'\c{g}â'ir, 134b-135b; 'Alî, Künhû 'l-A\b{b}âr, 179a-180a; Münçe'ât Mecmû'âsî (DTCF, Ismail Saib Yazmaları I/4504), 36b.
occasion of the capture of Moton and Koron, (1) and one to 'Ubayd Allah, the hakan of Samarkand, after the battle of Cãldãran. (2)

Further references to letters written by Ca'fer Çelebi can be found in the İn'âmât Defteri of Bâyezîd II's reign. It is stated there that Ca'fer Çelebi was given a monetary reward for his services, which included the writing of letters to the Sultan of Egypt. (3) None of these have been located.

Although very few of his letters are extant, Ca'fer Çelebi's renown as a münşi would suggest that he was fairly prolific in

(1) Both letters are in Turkish. The first was sent to the people of Bursa at the end of Safar 906: Tâcî-zade Sa'dî Çelebi, Münşe'âti ed. Necatî Ingal and Adnan Erzi (Istanbul 1956), p. 45-8.

The second of these was written to Şehzade Ahmed at the end of Muḥarrem 906: Ferîdûn Beg 1, p. 333; İngâ'-î Tâcî-zade (Ün. Ktp. T.Y. 5723), 50b-54a. This letter can be attributed to Ca'fer Çelebi only from internal evidence, the wording, apart from the introduction, being the same as that sent to Bursa. Neither Ferîdûn Beg nor the İngâ'-î Tâcî-zade ascribe it to Ca'fer Çelebi.

(2) The letter is written in Persian and is not dated: Ferîdûn Beg 1, pp. 374-7; İngâ'-î Tâcî-zade (Ün. Ktp. T.Y. 5723), 33a-46a; Münşe'ât Necmû'asî (DTOF, Ismail Saib Yâzmaları I/4504), 43a.

(3) İn'âmât Defteri, pp. 25, 366, 402. For the reproduction of these records, see Appendix, A.4; A.19 and A.20 resp.
this field. His style has been praised by all the biographers, with the sole exception of 'Ali. Taşköprü-zade says: "his letters were many and he was esteemed amongst the literati". (1) 'Aşık Çelebi remarks: "he was the ruler of the realms of eloquence and expression and his Persian composition is superior to that in Turkish". Mü'eyyed-zade apparently did not approve of Cafer Çelebi's Persian, calling it "Ankara Persian". (2) According to Riyâî, he was appointed to the post of nisancı because he was the Ḥac-e-i Cihân of his time in the field of ingâ'. (3) and Kâbit Çelebi states that he was peerless in the art of composition. (4) Although 'Ali severely criticizes Cafer's poetry and dismisses his letter-writing (ingâ') as a mere attempt at composition, he seems to contradict himself when in his account of the campaign of Çaldiran he quotes Cafer Çelebi's letters in full, adding that they were unequalled, their style being held in great respect and considered exemplary. One can only conclude that unless he changed his opinion drastically, 'Ali was completely unaware that Cafer was the author of the letters which he quotes. (5) Nevertheless, Cafer Çelebi was recognized as an innovator in the field of ingâ'. Mecdi remarks that after Cafer had

---

(1) ŞN, I, p. 439.
(2) 'Aşık Çelebi, 61b; Xinaği-zade merely repeats the same, 71a.
(3) Riyâî, 45b.
(4) Süllem, p. 69.
(5) Künnû' 1-Abbâr, 177b, 178b, 179b.
become nişâncı, he introduced innovations in the style, the form and the organization of letters and decrees. (1) There is no doubt that it was during Ca'fer Çelebi's term of office that the art of letter-writing ceased to use the simple Turkish style of his predecessors and acquired the ornamentation and embellishment which were to be employed by all his successors. (2)

Quite apart from their literary merit, Ca'fer's six extant letters have great value as historical documents. His account of the conquest of Moton remains the most detailed and most vivid narrative describing the capture of this city.

(2) İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Tarihi (Ankara 1949), II, p. 629.

According to T. Gökbilgin, there were five writers who introduced new style into letter-writing: Tâcî-zâde Ca'fer Çelebi, Hoca Nişâncı, Râmazan-zâde, Oğlu-zâde and Hamza Paşa (İA, nişâncı, IX, p. 301).
4. **Enīsū ʿl-ʿArifīn**

Kātib Çelebi is alone among the sources to mention this work, which is a translation of Ṣūkrūllāh's treatise on ethics, with the same title. In an elegantly written introduction, Caʿfer Çelebi states that Hadīm ʿAlī Paşa had asked him to translate this work from Persian into Turkish.

1. The manuscript used is British Museum Or. 3016.
3. Hadīm ʿAlī Paşa was one of the most influential statesmen of the period. Many poets such as Mesiḥī, Caʿfer Çelebi, and the historian Īdrīs Bīdīsī enjoyed his special patronage. For ʿAlī Paşa, see R. Mantran's article in *EI*, I, p. 396.
4. Ol faṣl-1 ferverdinde ... bu bende-i bī-mīkār ve bu kemāne-i ḥāksāra ḥitāb-1 vacibū 't-taʿẓīm vārīd oldī ki ... Kitāb-1 Enīsū ʿl-ʿArifīn, ki dūrō-1 dūrēr-ī ḥīkmet ve burc-1 ġurer-ī pend ṭ naṣīḥatdūr, zebān-ī farisīdēn tūrīkīye türkümė eyleyem, bir ḥāṣrēdēn ki şāhib-1 dīvān-1 vezārēt ve şāhib-1 dīvān-1 ṣādārēt ... (Tercümė-1 Enīsū ʿl-ʿArifīn, Br. Mus. Or. 3016, 3b).

Although ʿAlī Paşa is not mentioned by name in the above dedication, this is given thus in the kāṣīdē addressed to him:

Neyyīr-ī burc-1 vezārēt maṭlaʿ-1 luṭf-u-kerem
Afītāb-1 ʾizz-ū-devlet āṣūmān-ī kibriyā

Muṣṭafā-sīrīt ʿʾmer-ḥeybet ʿAlī Paşa kīn ol
Šākī ile Bū Bekrādūr ḥilm ile ʿOgmān-ḥayā

4b/2-3
The introduction is followed by a kāşīde written in honour of 'Ali Paşa. (1)

The work consists of fifteen chapters, each of which deals with one aspect of ethics. (2) In stark contrast to the ornate style of the introduction, the translation is in a very simple Turkish style which one would hardly attribute to Ca'fer Çelebi, the famous münşī. (3) The beyts of the original work are translated into Turkish beyts, generally in the same metre.

(1) This kāşīde, which is not included in the Mss. of the Dīvān, will be found on p.133 of the present edition.

(2) For the contents of the Enişü 'l-‘Arifin, see S. N. Ergun TŞ, II, p. 337.

(3) As an illustration of this simple style, I quote a short passage from the book:

The date of translation is not given. Since 'Ali Paşa occupied the post of grand vizier twice during the reign of Bâyezîd II, 1501-1503, and 1506-1511, the work might have been translated in either of these periods. We have not found any evidence that would indicate a specific date. (1)

(1) Although S. N. Ergun, TŞ, II, p. 837, says that "the translation might have been completed after 1506", he does not give any evidence to support his claim.
This work is no longer extant and its title is variously given by Taşköprü-zade as the Kūs-nāmeh, and by 'Aşık Çelebi as the Kūs-nāmeh. (1) According to the latter, it is satirical in nature. (2)

Some have supposed that 'Aşık Çelebi was the first to make mention of this work, but we find an earlier mention of it in the Şekā'ik. (3)

That Ca'fer was quite capable of writing obscene satire is supported not only by the existence of some lampoons in his Divān, but also by the fact that the sources all refer

(1) SN, I, p. 439; 'Aşık Çelebi, 62a. If we are to accept the spelling of Kūs-nāmeh with a kāf (as نسامه) we can then read it as the Kav-nāmeh, which would seem a more appropriate title for a satirical work.

(2) "Ve hezelden Kūs-nāmeh adlu bir nāmesi vardur". 62a

(3) I, p. 489.

S. N. Ergun (TŞ, II, p. 387), T. Gökbilgin (IA, III, p. 10) and Gibb (HOP II, p. 275) have claimed that the first mention of this work was in 'Aşık Çelebi's tezkire. That they fail to mention the earlier attestation in the Şekā'ik is probably due to the fact that Necdī, in his translation, left out all mention of the Kūs-nāmeh.
to his double personality, both refined scholar and sensualist. (1)

(1) This aspect of Ca'fer's character is well substantiated by the authorities: 'Aşık Çelebi refers in his Tezkire to Ca'fer's informal manner, his fondness for women and his predilection for satire (149a, 216b); 'Ali relates that Ca'fer once seduced a woman of honour (Kün bü 'l-Ābār, 204b); Celâl-zâde Muştafa Çelebi remarks that Ca'fer had two sides to his character: "Lakin mазaclarında nev'an ẓarafet ve denâ'et olmak isnâd ederlerdi" (Mê'âṣir 103a), and also makes reference to his notorious fondness for women: "anlaruḫ beyne 'l-enâm zên-dostluk ile īstihâr-ları var idi" (Mê'âṣir, 143b).
D. LITERARY PERSONALITY OF CA'FER ÇELEBI

1. The Literary Environment

No valid judgement of any poet can be made without reference to his predecessors and his contemporaries, the one forming the base from which his own work departs, and the other the area of appreciation in which it received recognition. T. S. Eliot expresses this principle thus:

No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead. (1)

To this should be added the influence his work exerted on succeeding generations; the survival of a reputation, in fact, being the surest guide to the value placed on a poet by his own society.

In the absence of an acceptable aesthetic theory for Divan literature, the modern scholar is compelled to rely on criteria such as these in his effort to appraise the significance of the literary artists of the past; his own personal judgements and preferences, while always of importance, must inevitably in some measure distort the qualities which made the author under consideration popular in his own society and his own age.

(1) Selected Essays (London 1951), p. 15
However, to confine oneself entirely to the historical setting of a work of art, as the latter would imply, would inhibit the reader from expressing any critical opinion, and thereby reduce his observations to the level of documentations.

The very nature of Divan poetry is an obstacle even to establishing clearly this inter-relationship among poets of the same or different generations. Immediately one is confronted with the question whether or not we can interpret some similarities as evidence of one writer's dependence on another. Or we can ask the same question in a different way: are similarities or parallels in literary works enough evidence to establish the existence of an influence? But to presume an influence merely on the basis of such similarities in a literature, one of the most common practices of which was the writing of nazīres, could be misleading.

One of the main difficulties arises from the fact that Divan literature, like its Persian model, is a literature of convention. The Divan poets were thus compelled to produce work similar in subject-matter and form, and to employ a vocabulary constructed around motifs and images already employed by others. Moreover, the similarities in the education which they received and the societies in which they lived with the common heritage of Islamic culture produced in them a shared attitude to life. To take but a random example, those similes and metaphors about the stars and planets which merely state certain prevailing generalizations concerning cosmology found their way into the poetry of almost all the Divan poets. To
what extent would a judgement deducted from similarities in this respect be valid? If we take into consideration the fact that for centuries Çağmini's Hūlabḥas on cosmology and its commentaries were used in the medreses as text-books, (1) we would be inclined to assume a common source for these expressions rather than the existence of an influence.

The determination of the influence which one poet exerted on others is an important problem confronting the literary critic in his appraisal of Divan literature. But the most important of all is the definition of the literary tradition which took shape in previous centuries and to find out to what extent any given poet contributed to this literary heritage. It is in this area that the creative power of the Divan poet is revealed. Therefore we can speak of influence only when we find traces of characteristic unconventional motifs or unusual imagery appearing in the works of the poet's successors. If such traces cannot be found, to suggest an accumulative influence or the existence of a common source would be more preferable than to look for a specific derivation. (2)

When we speak of influence we must however make it clear that a completely different concept, that of imitation exists.

(1) İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, İlimye Teşkilâtı, pp. 20-21.
As Latifi mentions, imitation was very common in Divan literature:

... Zemāhede şā'ir ve müteşā'ir nā-ma'lūm olub 'arşā-ı nazm mükallid ve ehl-i taḵlīd ile ūlmiş ... Ve ekserinü̇n evrāk ve eş'ārını tefahhus ider olsanā kelimät-ı me'hzəe-sinü̇n me'ḥəzi ma'lūm olub her beyti bir divāndan almış ve her ma'ňayı bir şāhib-ı'ırfândan ğalmışdıırum.(1)

Imitation is the taking-over of the entire emagination of others, expressing it with only superficial modifications. In influence, however, what is important is the forming of new relationships between the already existing themes and the borrowed images and motifs. Latifi regards even this as an allowable kind of plagiarism:

(ûmûle-i düzdûn) bir kısım daňı ustāduñ nazminda
bir ma'ňayi görür ani bir nükte-ı bârike âlet-ı mülahaça
düşûrür. Tab'-ı pâk ve luţf-ı idrâk ile ol ma'nâdan
bir ma'nâ daňı hayâl ider ve ol şan'atden bir şan'ate
daňı intîkâl ider. Bu kısım şâ'ir-i mûbdî' gibi
ağzâm-ı mezûreden evlâ ve nazım-ı muţteri' gibi cümle-
den a'lädûr.(2)

In attempting to establish an influence, we must, first
of all, have external evidence. Therefore, we need to know

(1) Latifi, pp. 24-5.
(2) Latifi, p. 31.
the nature and extent of our author's contact with his predecessors and contemporaries.\(^{(1)}\) Once we have established a kind of relationship between our author and other poets, we need to find out whether the former actually read any of the works of the latter. Although in answering these questions the literary sources might give us great help, the work of the author in question can be regarded as the most reliable source. In particular, the practice of writing \textit{nazîre}s in Divan literature can be taken as an important indication, since it is necessary for a poet to read his model before writing his \textit{nazîre}.

Moreover, in many cases, the Divan poets in their work, either mention the name of their \textit{ustâd} whom they have imitated at the beginning of their career or in their formative period, or they challenge the outstanding poets in order to make a name for themselves. In both cases one can find some information to establish a relationship between certain poets.

While external evidence might lead us to assume a possible influence, the mere existence of such external evidence is, in itself, not sufficient to permit us to speak with certainty about such a connection. To attempt to reach a conclusion merely by depending on external evidence would most likely

lead to unconvincing conclusions. It was because of this attitude that the influence of Nevā'ī on Ahmed Paşa was exaggerated by the Ottoman critics, who felt he could be dismissed as a mere imitator. (1)

After using external evidence to establish the nature of the relationship between two poets, the second stage will consist of textual and comparative study, using stylistic, linguistic and aesthetic judgements.

The early development of the Divan poets was achieved by writing works in imitation of some admired predecessor or contemporary, and in this way he was able to master the craft of composition. (2) When we study the Dīvān of Ca'fer, we come across a large number of naẓīres, most of which are modelled on Ahmed Paşa's poems and some on poems by Şeyhî and Necātî. 'Aşık Çelebi mentions Ca'fer's relationship with his teacher Hacı Hasan-zade, who was a poet himself and used the pen-name Vahidî, and gives an example of exchange of poetry between them. However, due to unavailability of the latter's Dīvān


(2) Not only in Turkish literature, but also in Persian and Arabic, conscious imitation was regarded as one of the important methods by which an author could discover his own nature and his own identity. See Gustave E. Von Grunebaum, 'The Concept of Plagiarism in Arabic Theory', Journal of Near Eastern Studies III, (1944), pp. 234-53.
we are not in a position to define the extent of their relationship.

Ahmed Paşa is probably the first poet who influenced Ca’fer Çelebi. External evidence for their relationship can be obtained not only from the numerous nazīres Ca’fer wrote to him but also from some references in Ca’fer’s Divān and the Neves-nāme. It is most likely that Ca’fer at the beginning of his career as a poet, while he was still in the process of establishing his own style, wrote in imitation of Ahmed Paşa. The examples given below, if not actually unacknowledged tazmīn, are certainly mere imitations:

2. Mu’tribünn gül-gün yüzinde perde-i evtār-ı şeng
   Çekdi mīṣṭar şafha-i ḫursīd ü mehtāb īstīne
   Ahmed Paşa, K. 17

19. Yusrevā medşeh-ū-genāhī yazmaga zülfeyn-ī yār
    Çekdi mīṣṭar şafha-i ḫursīd ü mehtāb īstīne
    Ca’fer, K. 6

    ***

2. Beni sügüt gibi bağdan ayaga hангere sancar
   Hey ol serv-i hevā-bahşə hevādır olmasun kimse
   Ahmed Paşa, G. 269

2. Şu gibi ʾşılık-ı dīdar olanı pāyāmāl eyler
   Hey ol serv-i hevā-bahşə hevādır olmasun kimse
   Ca’fer, G. 205

In the following example Ca’fer Çelebi repeats Ahmed Paşa’s second mīsrā’ verbatim and expresses the idea of the original
first 

misra' with different words:

2. Cümle makşüduň mâyesser hem murâduñ cümle râm
   Devletüñ pâyende vi 'ümrüñ dirâz olsun begüm
   Ahmed Paşa, G. 194

2. Kadd-ı ra'nâ rûy-ı zîbâ devletin virmiş üdâ
   Devletüñ pâyende vi 'ümrüñ dirâz olsun begüm
   Ca'fer, G. 143

Ca'fer Çelebi sometimes takes an entire misra' from Ahmed Paşa, changing only one word:

37. Bir genâ dürrin çıkardı bahr-ı tab'um mevci kim
   Cân virür ğavvâs olan ol dürr-i nâ-yâb üstine
   Ahmed Paşa, K. 17

20. Dil kalub vaşında 'âciz bir şazel naşm eyledi
   Cân virür şarrâf olan ol dürr-i nâ-yâb üstine
   Ca'fer, K. 6

In the above example, Ca'fer changed only one word in Ahmed Paşa's second misra', and by so doing established a new connection between his own first misra' and the second. In the next example, he first takes the second misra' of a beyt by Ahmed Paşa, changing only one word, and then later in the same kaşide he incorporates the entire beyt in different words:

36. İşgûn toprağanı yüz sürdüğüm ma'zûr tut
   Çûn kadîmî resmdür tezhîb olur bâb üstine
   Ahmed Paşa, K. 17
15. Asitânuñdur felek olسا 'aceb mi zer-nîgar
Kim kadîmî resmâdûr têzîb olur bâb üstine
Ca'fer, K. 6

38. Kible-i erbâb-1 hâcetdûr kapyûn yüz sürdûgüm
Veçhi budur kim olur têzîb mihrâb üstine
Ca'fer, K. 6

Sometimes the same images and ideas are expressed in a
slightly different way:

9. Berät-1 hüsni beyâzinda kaşî halklarîn
Nişân-1 pâdişeh-î kâmkâra beîzetdûm
Ahmed Paşa, G. 201

11. Görüb bu mäh-likanû hîlal ebrûsin
Rikâb-1 pâdişeh-î kâmkâra beîzetdûm
Ca'fer, G. 141

* * *

6. Ka'be-î kûyûn tavâfîna ne sa'y eyler rakîb
Mekkeye varmak revâ midur müselmân olmayan
Ahmed Paşa, G. 227

5. Şohbetünde n'eyler ey hürî-likâ bî-dîn rakîb
Cennete girmez bilûrsin şod müselmân olmayan
Ca'fer, G. 154

* * *

4. Senûn bu şir peneçende cîhân-gârler zebûn iken
Rakîb-1 rübehe varûb ne içûn naşûr olasîn sen
Ahmed Paşa, G. 246
3. Niçe bın şir-merd ahû gözûne şayd olur iken
Rakıb-i kelbe düşmez kim varub nahçir olanın sen
Ca'fer, G. 153

In the following beyts it is clear that Ca'fer Çelebi owed a great deal to Ahmed Faşa's imagination:

4. Çin-i zülfinden nigâr el urdi nageh yüzine
Didi gâlib Rûmdan leşker çiğar Şâm Üstine
Ahmed Faşa, G. 227

4. Tanı mi ḥaddûfîn teveccüh itse diller zâlfüne
Şimdi mi leşker gelûbdûr Rûmdan Şâm Üstine
Ca'fer, G. 193

** *

7. Rûmi evrâk-ı gül-i ğandân þutar hoş büy ıle
Gül yüzûn vaﬂinda Ahmed nice kim defter yazar
Ahmed Faşa, G. 66

4. Þonca cûzdânîndaki rengîn vaракlîdan bahâr
Gül yüzûn vaﬂinda her yıl tâze bir defter yazar
Ca'fer, G. 50

** *

9. Umaram þâliş ola zer gibi bu kalb-i siyah
Kîmyâdur bilürem şeçbeti dervişlerûn
Ahmed Faşa, K. 9

7. Himmet itse çara þopragî kîzîl altun ider
Kîmyâ oldı meger himmeti dervişlerûn
Ca'fer, K. 3
In the following beyts there is an example of the way in which Ca'fer Çelebi reduces two beyts by Ahmed Paşa into one:

1. Oldı turunc-ı ğabgabuň ey sım-ber legiz
   Olmaz behişt míveleri bu kadar legiz

2. Vasluň na'ını lezzetini kande söyleyem
   Ki olur ğamuň dile nite kim gül-šeker legiz
   Ahmed Paşa, G. 32

2. Seng-ı cefası lezzetini kande vaşf idem
   Olmaz bihişt míveleri ol kadar legiz
   Ca'fer, G. 21

The year 399, the date when Ca'fer Çelebi wrote the Heves-nâme, can be regarded as a turning point in his poetry. As explained in a previous section, he criticised Ahmed Paşa in his introduction to the Heves-nâme, and reproached him with translating ideas from Persian literature. In the Heves-nâme Ca'fer condemns imitation and defends originality, and claims that he wrote this work with the intention of producing something of originality. Probably at this period of his life Ca'fer believed that his literary personality had matured and he had reached a certain level of competency, and therefore wished to challenge Ahmed Paşa, who was regarded at that time as the greatest poet. Thus, later, in a kaside written to celebrate the capture of Moton, he describes himself as having taken the place of Ahmed Paşa:

93. Ğam değül dürdiyse devrân defterini Ahmedüň
    Buldi gün ni'ıme 'l-bedel Ca'fer gibi Kă'im-maḳām
    K. 14
Ahmed Paşa wrote a *kasıde* for Sultan Cem with a redif in "benefse". In a *nazire* to this *kasıde*, written probably in 909 (1503) and dedicated to Sultan Bayezid II, Ca'fer challenges Ahmed Paşa:

56. Bu şi'r sevâdîn okusan kanı ki Ahmed
Görsün ki nice olur imiş bərî benefse

The influence of Ahmed Paşa upon Ca'fer Çelebi is clearly demonstrated in his *gazels*. Although Ca'fer Çelebi had a wide cultural background and a strong literary style, in comparison with Ahmed Paşa he was poorer in imagination. Therefore he was continually looking for a source of inspiration, and this he found mostly in the works of Ahmed Paşa. However, he usually expressed these ideas in a different manner in his own poetic vocabulary and strong style:

1. Ne ƙamerdür bu ki olmiş zülf müsk-eşan aña
Nice reyḩändür ƙatî kim kalmışın hayrân aña
Ahmed Paşa, G. 4

1. Sebz ƙatî kim säye şalım şül-i müsk-eşan aña
Hzırdur k'olmiş müyesser '3mr-i bî-payân aña
Ca'fer, G. 5

In the next example, it can be seen that Ca'fer Çelebi has expressed an idea taken from Ahmed Paşa and Necâtî in clearer and more colloquial language:
5. Zülfüncü Şerhini Ahmed nice kütah ide kim
Vaşf-ı sevdada dirüz oldı zebanı kalemüh
Ahmed Paşa, G. 159

6. Vaşf-ı hâlüm yazalı zülfüh ucindan şanem
Başı derd ile kara kana boyandı kalemüh
Necâtî, G. 322

7. Başın aşaga idüb sevkümi yazmakdan aña
Ca'ferâ indi gözine kara sular kalemüh
Ca'fer, G. 93

Apart from his nazîres to Ahmed Paşa, Ca'fer made a
tażmîn to one of his hâzels, but without mentioning his name. (1)

Another poet mentioned in Ca'fer's Dîvân is Şeyhî. Ca'fer
boasts that learned men likened him to Şeyhî on account of his
poetic style and the feeling he expressed in his poetry:

7. Sûz ile sözde şû gösterdi kârâmet Ca'fer
Anuñ erbâb-ı kemâl adînî Şeyhî didiler
G. 29

Also in one of his kaşîdes Ca'fer makes a tażmîn to a
maṣrâ' by Şeyhî:

36. Niçe kim Şeyhî dilinden sîyêne efvâhda
Yil gibi bir şubh 'azm-i kuy-ı yar itsem gerek
K. 19

(1) Dîvân, p. 402; Ahmed Paşa, G. 226
The influence of Şeyhi, who was regarded as one of the founders of Divan literature, extended for a long time over succeeding poets, even Ahmed Paşa writing nazîres to his keşides and gazels. Necâti, too, regarded Şeyhi as his Üstâd and praised him on various occasions. (1) This must be the reason why Cafer wrote in the Heves-name that Şeyhi was regarded as one of the two poets most renowned in Turkish literature. However, his attitude towards Şeyhi in the Heves-name is negative. He criticizes him for his lack of eloquence, for using strange words and for translating from other literatures. Cafer Çelebi's open stand against Şeyhi can be interpreted as evidence of his belief in his own literary competence and his desire to oppose the wholesale borrowing from Persian literature which was initiated by Şeyhi. Anhegger says that in the fifteenth century a conscious opposition arose to the domination of Persian literature over Turkish literature, and that Cafer Çelebi was involved in this movement, which gave more importance to original works rather than translations. (2)

Although in Cafer Çelebi's Divan we find some nazîres written to Şeyhi we do not find in them sufficient similarities to enable us to speak of an influence. Despite the fact that there are a number of migârîs in which the same motifs and imagery are employed, these are few. In the following example

it is seen that Ca'fer Çelebi expresses an idea taken from Şeyhi with the same imagery and practically the same vocabulary:

1. Dil müselsel zülfünün səvdası-la dīvānedür
   Cən mənəvver hüsününn şəm’ində bir pervənedür
   Şeyhi, G. 192

1. Zülfinünü səncərine dəl bir məhüm dīvānedür
   Kim şərəg-1 hüsənə şəm’-i felek pervənedür
   Ca'fer, G. 46

Most of the other resemblances can be explained, as mentioned above, by the common cultural heritage and source, rather than by an influence from Şeyhi:

6. Zulf ü ğalin dəlberünn gördükçə ey dəl kıl həzər
   Kim qılan her demə mürəği şəyə dəm-u-dənedür
   Şeyhi, G. 192

4. Ruhlarının əhəlidür beni giriftər eyleyen
   Raviça-i cənnətde lə-büd dəm-1 Adem dənedür
   Ca'fer, G. 46

The resemblance in the next example consists of a very common relation in Divan literature between rakib-it-düşman:

4. Seni sevenün ağladuğuna sevinərsin
   Sağın ki işidüb işüňe düşən güər ey dəst
   Şeyhi, G. 12

3. Ağladuğuma dərd ilə düşənələr olur şəd
   Rəhm it bəna kim həlümə itler güər ey dəst
   Ca'fer, G. 12
Although Ca'fer sometimes uses the same motifs, by forming different connections, he gives an entirely different meaning to the beyt:

4. Dilmezem yaküt-ı ahmer mi lebûn ya küt-ı rûh
   Bir şor ey sarrûf-ı devrûn kim ne ûevher devridûr
   Şeyhî, G. 29

7. İrdi hengâm-ı sitâ yaküt-ı seyyâl al ele
   Ca'ferâ sarrûf isenî bil kim ne ûevher devridûr
   Ca'fer, G. 40

Neither in his Divân nor in the Hewes-name does Ca'fer mention the name of Necâtî, nor do we find in the sources any indication of a relationship between them. Although this could be explained by the fact that Necâtî spent a large part of his life outside Istanbul and did not hold any important position in the capital, we cannot conclude from this that Ca'fer did not see Necâtî's poetry. On the other hand, the fact that, besides his anxiety to use phrases and expressions like Necâtî, Ca'fer wrote nâzîres to him and sometimes employed Necâtî's imagery and motifs, leads us to believe that a relationship existed between them. In the following examples, in particular in the second misrâ's, there are striking similarities:

3. Nergislerûû ki ko uyusun gûl yüzûhde kim
   Olur bahâr günleri ûây-ı seher legiz
   Necâtî, G. 54

5. Ca'fer subh-ı vaşa ile şeykden olûr
   Vakt-ı seherde uyku olûr dostlar legiz
   Ca'fer, G. 21
2. Dökmedin devr yire cur'a gibi kanumuzu
Sakiyya müş idelüm al berü şol kanlıkından
Necatî, G. 396

1. Bet be'niz kalmadı ben hastada hayranlıkdan
Sakiyya dem idelüm şun berü şol kanlıkdan
Ca'fer, G. 164

3. Bir destmâl ile siler âhir kefen bizi
Dimez ki bu gedâ imiş ol pâdişâ imiş
Necatî, p. 110

10. Ol Şeh kanî ki 'âleme in'âmi 'âm idi
Dimezdi bu tûvânger imiş ol gedâ-yimis
Ca'fer, K. 31

3. Hüsn meydânında top olalî zulf-i mûşg-bâr
Kalmadı bir şehrîyâruh elde çevgânı durüst
Necatî, G. 36

4. Cynamakdan top idûb başın şikeste dillerûn
Kalmamışdur kilca yârûm zûlfi çevgânı durüst
Ca'fer, G. 13

10. Iuîf idûb şorar iseñ ûasta Necatî hâlin
Gâh olur bilmez olur kendûzini gâh bilür
Necatî, G. 64

5. Fikr alur Ca'ferî şol deîlî hayâlûhle ki gâh
Yitürür bilmez olur kendûzini gâh bilür
Ca'fer, G. 33
In the following beyts, although there are some similarities, because of the use of an imagery very common in Divan literature, we cannot say with certainty that an influence exists:

2. Şöyle ki ardınca dur da’im Züleyha-veş şabâ
Sezmezem gül Yusufunu hala damâni dürüst
   Necâtî, G. 36

2. Çünkü şabâ pîrâhenâh buyn iletdi gülşene
Kalmdâ bir gönçanu hergiz giribanî dürüst
   Ca’fer, G. 13

* * *

1. Gül musâhaﬁn şabâ yili açdî varak varak
‘İsk ûyetini bûlbül okudu sebak sebak
   Necâtî, G. 281

1. Neemü’î cemâlûnî açdî varak varak
‘İskûn mu’âliminden okur cân sebak sebak
   Ca’fer, G. 91

* * *

1. Yirûn var eya kadî elîf cânlar içinde
   Hayf ola ki ‘ömrûn geçe dükkânlar içinde
   Necâtî, G. 553

1. Bir serv ki çok migli gûlistânlar içinde
   Yir itdi elîf gibi girûb cânlar içinde
   Ca’fer, G. 170

In determining the extent of a poet’s fame the most important sources are the views of contemporary and near-contemporary tezkire writers. The views of later tezkire writers might give some idea of whether his fame had lasted
through centuries.

The first of these to mention Ca'fer Çelebi is Sehi Beg, who wrote his work in 945 (1533), not long after Ca'fer's death. Therefore his opinion of Ca'fer is important as being the closest available contemporary evaluation. He speaks of Ca'fer as follows:

şi'r-ü-insâya mütetebbi' ehl-i fażl ve Şahib-i ma'rifet kişi idi ... Eş'âri vâfir ve kendisi nefis şâ'ir, Dîvânı elsin-e-i násda mütedâvil ve megnevî tarzında Heves-nâme adlu bî-bedel bir kitâbı var, ḳâylî çok ma'ânî cem' itmişdîr. Nazmî latîf ve kendisi zarih bir kimse idi. (1)

It may be seen from this that Ca'fer's contemporaries appreciated his Heves-nâme, and that his Dîvân was widely read.

Laţîfî, who completed his Tezkire in 953 (1546), apart from repeating Sehi, speaks at length on the originality of the Heves-nâme. (2) Laţîfî's testimony indicates that even more than half a century after the writing of this work, it was still considered as an original composition.

'Âşık Çelebi wrote his Tezkire in 976 (1568-9), more than half a century after Ca'fer's death. From the information he gives, it is clear that Ca'fer had retained his reputation as both poet and münși.

If Kinalî-zâde Hasan Çelebi is not merely repeating the

(1) Tezkire-i Sehi, p. 23.
(2) For his views on the Heves-nâme, see section on Ca'fer's works.
views of previous tezkire-writers, it could be said that the Heves-nâme was still appreciated a century later:

... Muşannefâtından manşına Heves-nâmesi meşhur, ve kemâl-i belâgat ve nihâyet-i fesâhat ile maâbûl-i cümhûrdur. (1)

Since the information given by later tezkire-writers such as Beyânî, Rıyâzi and Fâ‘îzî were taken from previous tezkires, and in particular from those of 'Âşık Çelebi and Hasân Çelebi, their views concerning Ca‘fer Çelebi do not reflect the opinions of their own time, and for this reason can be discounted.

In addition to the Tezkires, nazîre mecmû‘as and şi‘r mecmû‘as also give information on the extent of a poet’s reputation and the literary taste of the period. By means of these mecmû‘as we can determine what particular poems by which poets were most appreciated and discover which poets wrote nazîres to one another. Moreover, the presence of poems by a particular poet in mecmû‘as compiled at various different periods, can be taken as evidence that, at a specific time, the work of that poet was still being read.

A large proportion of the gazels by Ca‘fer Çelebi are found in mecmû‘as compiled in the 16th and early 17th centuries. (2)

(1) Kınalî-zâde, 7lb.
(2) For the distribution of his gazels in the mecmû‘as, see Appendix B.
Eğridirli Hacı Kemal, who compiled his Cami‘ü ‘n-nezā’ir in 918 (1512), included ten ̣âzels by Ca‘fer Çelebi. The Cami‘ü ‘n-nezā’ir of Edirneli Nazmi, written between 930 and 940 (1524-34), contains 73 of Ca‘fer’s ̣âzels. Pervane Beg, in the mecmû‘a which bears his name, compiled in 963 (1557-3), took 30 ̣âzels by Ca‘fer Çelebi. The other mecmû‘as which contain ̣âzels by Ca‘fer are undated and were probably written towards the end of the 16th and at the beginning of the 17th century.

In addition, in a mecmû‘a containing kasîdes by famous poets of the 15th and 16th centuries, we find 10 kasîdes by Ca‘fer, and also kasîdes addressed to him by Nesîhi and Zâtî. (1) From the evidence of nazîres and şî’r mecmû‘as, we can see that, almost a century after his death, Ca‘fer had retained his reputation and his works continued to attract attention.

In nazîre mecmû‘as it is mentioned that certain poets, such as Başirî, Mihâli, Nesîhi, Revûnî, İshak Çelebi, Kemalpaşa-zâde, Zâtî and ‘Amrî, wrote nazîres to Ca‘fer Çelebi. One of these, Nesîhi, aside from his nazîres also wrote kasîdes in praise of Ca‘fer and requested of him appointment as a divevân kâtib. (2) It is difficult to say whether Nesîhi, who had his own particular style and manner of expression, came under the influence of Ca‘fer. In the following examples there is some similarity between the imagery of Ca‘fer and that of

---

(1) Kaşâ'id-i Türkîye, Sûleymaniye Lib. Es‘ad Efendi, no. 3413.
(2) ‘Aşık Çelebi, 123a. For his kasîdes addressed to Ca‘fer Çelebi, see, Nesîhi, kasîdes no. 6-10.
Mesihî:

4. Ruğlarının hâlidür beni giriftür eyleyen
Ravza-i cennetde lâ-bûd dâm-ı Adem dânedür
Cafer, G. 46

5. Bu Mesihî hübler gayd itmege şir-rûnâdeki
Halka-i cîm ile her bir nokta dâm-u-dânedür

Mesihî, G. 84

** **

1. Ýykûndûgi iştün leblerüne ey nigâr la’l
Her lahzâ surh-rûdûr olub şerm-sâr la’l
Cafer, G. 117

1. Ýykûndi şer مش leblerüne ey nigâr la’l
Soûra yûzi kîzardî olub şerm-sâr la’l

Mesihî, G. 143

** **

2. Ýsîünde yir bulallı goçe irmişdûr başum
Nâh-ı nev kim gûrinûr arf-ı külâhumdûr benûm
Cafer, G. 132

5. Bu Mesihî gün değûlûr âsûmânda gûrûnen
Gâdlikdan goçe atdûğum külâhumdûr benûm

Mesihî, G. 160

** **

1. Çarğa yir yir od uran her gice âhumdûr benûm
Tîre iden ‘Aleme düd-ı siyâhumdûr benûm
Cafer, G. 132

2. Ahûm ile yüzeyûz oldûkça çarûnûn her gice
Yûzini kara kîlan düd-ı siyâhumdûr benûm

Mesihî, G. 160
Zātī, in relating his life to 'Aşık Çelebi, says that he enjoyed a comfortable life under the protection of Ca'fer Çelebi, but that after Ca'fer's dismissal and especially after his execution, he was left without a patron and suffered greatly. (1) In order to obtain favours from Ca'fer, Zātī wrote a number of kasîdes in his praise. (2) In his Dîvân, there are gazels written as nazîres to those of Ca'fer, in which Zātī sometimes makes use of Ca'fer's imagery or employs his motifs, and sometimes takes an idea as a whole:

1. 'Igikları ko hüsnüne kilsun nazâr ey döst
Ayîneye billâhi nazârda ne zar ey döst

Zātī, G. 37

Ca'fer, G. 12

6. Gice gündüz bir iki gün gelür yüzüne maşlûcuñ
Bu dehr-i dûna alınmañ iki yüzü münâfişkîdur

Zātī, G. 463

(1) 'Aşık Çelebi, 230a-231a.

(2) Kaşâ'îd-i Türkiye, Süleymaniye Lib. Es'ad Efendi, no. 3418, ff. 160a-161a; 245b-246a; 276a-277b.
3. Gönlinde peri-ruhlaruf ey dost hayalünn
Bir tutkiye beşzer ki demürden қafesi var

Ca'fer, G. 22

3. Şol kimse ki şirîn söz ile gönlümne girdi
Bir tutkiye beşzer ki demürden қafesi var

* * *

1. Gözüm yaşına bakmazsın baña senden 'inâyet yok
Bunu bildüm ki ey meh-rû sitârende sa'âdet yok

Ca'fer, G. 37

1. Güzeller çıkdilar seyre bile ol mâh ژal'at yok
'Acceb gün görmedûk şahsân sitârende sa'âdet yok

Zâtî, G. 641

* * *

4. Hüsünl ilinde fitne olduğuna şahum muttasâil
Şâhid ol yitmez mi kim ebrûlarûn peyvededür

Ca'fer, G. 32

3. Ben buradan bilmüşem 'ağıklarî öldürdüğümüz
Kaşlaruvhun ƙara yâsi muttasâil peyvededür

Zâtî, G. 439

* * *

4. 'Tomâr-î şi'rûmi n'ola elden çomazsa yûr
Zevki şahîn olana gelur ney-şeker legiz

Ca'fer, G. 21

4. Vaşf-î leb-i nigâr ile 'tümâr-î şi'rûme
Meyl itseler 'aceb mi olur ney-şeker lehzîz

Zâtî, G. 135
In at least one instance we can see a direct influence of Ca'fer even on Fu'zulî, which may be evidence that his fame as a poet had spread as far as Baghdad. The poem is no. 232 in the present edition; among the beyts comparable with those of Fu'zulî's gazel, the following are most striking:

3. Gözi nâz uyuhsînden hiç uyanmâga meded yok mı
   Cihânî tutdi feryâdum kara bahtum uyanmaz mı
   Ca'fer, G. 232

4. Şeb-i hîcîrân yanar cânnum töker kan çeşm-i gîryânîm
   Uyadur halkî efînanum kara bahtum uyanmaz mı
   * * *
   Fu'zulî, G. 264

5. Nigâruñ hüsni devrinde yaşum kan akduğun Ca'fer
   Ta'accüb itme ırmaklar bahâr olsa bulanmaz mı
   Ca'fer, G. 232

5. Gûl-i ruhsâruña karşu gözümde kanlu ahar şu
   Şabîbûn faşl-i gûldûr bu ahar sular bulanmaz mı
   Fu'zulî, G. 264

As will have been observed, all the examples given above are from poems identical in metre and rhyme with the ones offered for comparison, this being the only methodical way of contrasting the practices of the various poets concerned. But it should be remarked that such correspondences are only the immediately demonstrable evidence of an influence; and far greater than this is the entire conceptual ambience in which
the poet operated, his view of literature, his understanding of its purpose. These can be expected to pervade every aspect of his work, and are to be apprehended in the general rather than the particular.
2. His style

The conquest of Istanbul was not only the opening of a new era in Turkish history, but it was also a turning point in Divan literature. During Mehmed II's reign those shattered fragments of the Selçuk empire, the Anatolian beyliks, were finally incorporated and the political unity of the Ottoman empire was achieved.

Mehmed II wished to make Istanbul the cultural as well as the political centre of empire; and by offering attractive opportunities, in a short time he drew there many famous scholars and poets, including a considerable number of Persians. As a result of this, there was a great development in literature. Due to the influence of such men, the language of literature began to deviate from the vernacular and gave way to the synthetic poetical language. Ahmed Paşa is regarded by tezkire writers as among the first to apply successfully this newly-created language to poetry.\(^1\)

One of the main characteristics of 15th century Turkish poetical language is that it maintained a balance between Turkish and the new Arabic-Persian elements. In the divans of 15th century poets one can see beyts formed with purely Turkish words as well as others constructed with izafets and terkıbs in Persian fashion. In this transition period Ahmed

\(^1\) M. F. Köprülü, Ahmed Paşa, İA
Paşa, Necâti and Mesîhi tried to harmonize the foreign and native ones, and were to a great degree successful. In prose writing, also, ordinary Turkish was replaced by an idiom of greater eloquence. Cafer Çelebi is regarded as the initiator of this ornamental style which was to persist for centuries in official communications and in most historical writings.\(^1\)

In Cafer's works the characteristic features of the Turkish of this transition period can be observed clearly. In prose writing the style he used in the Mahrûse is in sharp contrast to that which he employed in Enîsü 'l-'Arifîn.\(^2\) In his poetry, too, we find lines consisting of Turkish words side by side with beyts which are almost entirely composed with Persian ızafets employing Persian and Arabic words. The following beyts, for example, are formed almost exclusively with Turkish words:

4. Beni ḳomaz ki yatub yâr iṣiqinde ọleml
Yatacaḳ yir göreyin bulmaya düşmen ọlichek

G. 115

4. Çünkî gönlûn yok gönlî uğirlamâdandan eyleme
Çamzelerle uğrin uğrin merḥabâyi kimseye

G. 194


\(^2\) See sections on Mahrûse and Enîsü 'l-'Arifîn.
5. Cafer nice ola diri 'alemde kim sen dilberi  
Görse sevincinden ölür görmezse hicrân öldürür  
G. 60

4. Çekmişem her ne kadar varsa şam u derd ü belä  
Bežizeme hiç birine sevgülü yar ayrulğığ
G. 227

In the following examples, on the other hand, one can hardly find a Turkish word:

Rahg-î devlet zîr-i rân u eblâk-î eyyâm râm  
K. 14

37. Gerd-i râhuû tüketâyi diâe-i ehl-i nazâr  
Sümûm-i esbûn sürme-dân-î sürme-i çeşm-i kibâr  
K. 12

2. Mümkir-i ‘išk olsa tañ mâ zâhid-i efürûde-dîl  
Tab‘î nâ-mevzûn hayâl-i şekl-i mevzûn eylemez  
G. 66

Cafer in his poetry, alongside Turkish forms, frequently uses Persian constructions such as vaşf-î terkiû and izâfets, employs ki for relative sentences and introduces some foreign prepositions and other Arabic elements. As we still lack a descriptive framework of 15th century poetical language, it is difficult to indicate an idiosyncratic use of any of these forms by Cafer Çelebi.
Ca'fer seems to have paid a great deal of attention to his style. In one şayzel, he regards his lisān-ı faṣiḥ as one of the blessings given by God:

7. Aänub bu ni‘meti Ca’fer ʿűddāya şükre eyle
Ki luṭf-ı ṭab’ ile virdi saña lisān-ı faṣiḥ
G. 17

Ca'fer's technique of versification is quite sophisticated. He usually introduces into his lines common expressions, proverbs, āyets and ḥadīṣ, and even Arabic sentences. The idea is generally expressed in the first miṣrā' of the beyt, with the second usually employed either to explain or to support this idea. The following beyts show him at his most characteristic:

1) In the use of proverbs:

30. Lebidur ẓün içen kanūn ẓolaşma zulfine ey dil
Megeldür ẓünkī ʿĪsānuñ şorilmaz cūrmi Mūsādan
K. 22

3. Dil dilerdi şala cânı zekana düşdi özi
ʻAḳibet kendü düşer kim ki ẓaza ẓayra çehi
G. 220

2. Görдум ağiýarı kenâr-ı yâra cem‘ olmıs didüm
Buldu şüret ma‘ni-yi lâ ḥayre illâ fi ‘l-vaṣat
G. 80
2) In the use of popular expressions:

21. Ki bir kül öksüz olub düşübdür halk ocağına
Cihanda bulmayub başın sokacağ bir ocağ ateş
K. 24

17. Çümle itmek ister ihsanını döklüb encüm direm
Şubha dek budur işi her gice görmez çeşmi büyüb
K. 23

2. Komadum kim dest-büsü yara ire sağıruñ
Kanına girdüm tutarsa tan değil ol kan beni
G. 233

5. Boynıba şalınduğunca zulfine yüz virdi döst
Bir zamandur şimdi Ca'fer yüz bulur küstähgär
G. 49

3) In the use of axiomatic statements:

7. Yandum ateş-gün libâsından ben anuñ derdi yok
Gerçi od ani yakar kim ol ola ana mümâss
G. 73

2. Süzum artar bu ne hikmet göricek 'arıştını
Xb hod kanda ise ateşi teskin ider
G. 51

2. Müsnüfe mağrûr olub 'üssâği ihletme igen
Kim zaman-1 gül bulur az müddet içre inkinâz
G. 79
4) In the use of fanciful explanation (ḥüsni ta‘līl):

3. Lāle yār adına ḳonmis dāgidur bāguñ ki bād
   Bendin açarken ḳanatmişdūr bul胺sīg ḳan aşna
   G. 38

4. Şūhūb şeklinde āteşler degüldür şaqılan dehre
   İzi tozına ol māhuñ melekler zer nişār eyler
   G. 38

5) In the use of poetic parallelism (leff-ū-neğr):

4. Girye kimaz şeb-i vuşlatda ruţuñ karsusına
   Ҭ‖fl-ı eşkini gözüm tāb-ı kamen den şaţınub
   G. 10

2. Ağzuñ dişt̄iñ nûmûnesidür gonça jâlude̱n
   Yâkũt hɔkkâ iqtre ki dûrr-i ‘Aden tūtar
   G. 42

6) In the use of similes:

2. Çeşmünde şayāli lebûnut bir nefes ârān
   Itmez şonası suya ûşiûbdür şeker ey dost
   G. 12

5. İsgin kim bekleyüb yatur güzeller dilberûn
   Şan melâ’ik Qa’ferâ ‘ars âsîtânın yagdanur
   G. 35

6. Lebi-yle dişleri naqımı bu serv-i lāle-ruţuñ
   Dehān-ı şonçada güyû ki ‘ikd-ı şebne̱mdür
   G. 47
7) In the statement and reply constructions:

3. İre mi vaşla düşen firkate didüm didi kim
   Genc-Ü-ni met bula her kim ki çeke miğnet-Ü-renc
   G. 15

8) In the conjunctive use of "ki":

1. Ḥatuḫ kitab-ı ruğuğadan çıkardı nakl-i şaîh
   Ki şamzen itdügidür baña cümle şulm-ı şarîh
   G. 17

7. Tîg-i ḫûn-rûzûd beni her dem şu dehîl pâreler
   K'acîyub kan ağlar ey dilber benüm-şûn yâreler
   G. 31

9) In the use of the imperative:

3. Hak ol hevâ yolında dilerseñi ger āb-ı rû
   Komâ tarîk-ı ışkî budur mezheb-ı eşâhî
   G. 17

1. Her ne dil k'anuñ dimâğında şaçuñ sevdâsî var
   Aña raĥm it kim başında 'âlemûn gavgâsî var
   G. 37

10) In playing with words:

1. Bir serv ki yok migli gûlistânlar içinde
   Yir iṭid elîf gibi gîrûb cânlar içinde
   G. 170
5. Kāmetūne benzedūgi-ğün elif ey nūr-i ‘ayn
Tende cānī cān içinde șaklaram anı dūrūst

G. 13

44. Hey ne cevherdûr sözûn gevherleri kim anlara
Kaîyemtî dûrr-i şemînûm olmaya şûmn-i şemen

K. 11

56. Ta gelûb Nevrûz-1 sultânî ide fetû-ı bahâr
Kesr olub kalb-i şitâda leşker-i sérnâ yine

K. 10

5. Halkasîndan zûlfûnumî kim nūr-i şûsnûm berk urur
Kalb-i ‘akrebden ŏłu’ itmiş şanasın mâhdur

G. 43

In Ca'fer's poetry a complete thought is generally expressed within one beyt; however, there are some beyts in which both misrâ have a separate meaning. On the other hand, and particularly in the kaşîdes, he may extend an idea over two beyts:

70. Sâl-i güçeştede gîceler mâhitâbdan
Gül reng-û-bû uğurlayub olmiş idi nîhân

71. Bulû bu yıl bahâr anı güleșende bend idûb
Zindân-i şonçaya kodi ḥabs itdi bir zaman

K. 5

It is evident from his poetry that Ca'fer had no difficulty in giving expression to his thought. What he did find difficult
was the creation of new ideas and images, and it is probably due to this that he tends from time to time to repeat himself:

12. ‘Ahd-i ‘adlünde ḥarāma ḳılmamag-iğün naẓar
Gözlerin yumar şarāb üstine geldükçe ḥabāb

K. 23

17.c. Şöyle itmişken cihānī ‘ask-i Şāh-ī kāmyāb
Kim gözin yumar şarāb üstine geldükçe ḥabāb

*K. 32

* * *

44. Elinde šās gedālar gibi şurur yolda
Diler ki Ḫusrev-i āfākī ide cer lāle

K. 27

40. Getürüb kāsesin a‘mā gibi yol üzre ūramış
K’uğraduğça Şeh-i āfākī ide cer nergis

* * *

50. Sennūf gibi đahi bir šūb-rū püser gelmez
Gül-i ter olsa eger māder ü peder lāle

K. 27

56. Bir ela gözlū güler yüzlū püser sencileyun
Gelmeye ger peder ola gūl ü māder nergis

K. 23

Wholly characteristic of the poetical production of its period, the Divān of Ca'fer Ǧelebi is of interest as a specimen of the literature which the Ottomans were slowly creating for themselves out of the precedents offered by Persia. In it we
can see the language used with a strict grammatical rigour, with the introduction of vernacular elements giving it that particular Turkish tone which, apart from all else, instantly marks this poetry off from that of its foreign model. One can observe the strict attention paid to the formal requirements of metre and rhyme which were to shackle Ottoman poetry throughout all its subsequent developments; and with these came a fund of imported imagery which in some measure defined and limited the content of poetic expression. It is through such poets as Cafer Çelebi that we can reach a proper appreciation of such masters as Necati and Ahmed Paşa, for by their very efforts at imitation they provide the background from which the individuality of the latter can emerge.
3. **Metre, rhyme, assonance and alliteration.**

Ottoman Divan poetry, in faithful adherence to its Persian models, was conceived above all as expression in rhymed and metrical language, limiting itself, also, to a restricted range of forms, themes and attitudes. The relation between form and theme, as for example in the \( \text{gazel} \), the \( \text{kasıde} \), and the \( \text{megnevi} \), was strictly observed, each being held appropriate for a particular type of utterance or narration, the choice of metre being the only feature left to the discretion of the poet.\(^1\)

Certain licenses were available to introduce variety into the monotonous rhythmical structure of a poem: the caesura (sometimes including an internal rhyme); the \( \text{sekt-i melîh} \) (the spondaic reduction of two short syllables to one long); \( \text{zihaf} \) and \( \text{imâle} \) (a lengthening or shortening of the vowels in certain words). With the exception of the first, these licenses were used sparingly, the \( \text{sekt-i melîh} \) almost only in the \( \text{H}5 \) metre, and \( \text{zihaf} \) and \( \text{imâle} \) most usually in Turkish words.

The metres most commonly used by Ottoman Divan poets have been tabulated by Faiza Shafie in her study of the \( \text{gazeliyât} \) of Nâbî,\(^2\) where it is shown that the \( \text{bahr-ı remel} \)

\(^1\) Gibb (HOP, I, pp. 107-110) gives a list of \( \text{"arûz} \) patterns and mentions for what kind of poems each was commonly used.

(R1 and R2), the bahr-i muₐrāʾī' (M1), and the bahr-i hezec (H1, H2, H3) account for most of the verses of authors whose Divāns were analyzed. In this respect, the Dīvān of Caʿfer Ǧelebi may be regarded as typical, the distribution of the metres being as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gazels</th>
<th>Kasımdes etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muc. 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ǧaf.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recez</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even by the time of Caʿfer Ǧelebi, the Ottoman poet was still experiencing difficulty in adopting these metres to the Turkish language, which, of course, has no original long vowels; and as a consequence of this the foreign vocabulary of Persian and Arabic was used extensively to give structure to the verse. As an example of the confusion that could result when Turkish words predominate, the following beyt, in R1, by Caʿfer Ǧelebi, in which only two foreign words occur, may be cited:

6. Ağlayayın şol kadar kim görmez olsun gözlerüm
Görmez olayınlı gulub oynaduğun akyär ile

6. 184
Again in this beyt (Rec. 1) most of the Turkish words are distorted from their natural pronunciation:

5. Ca'fer nice ola diri 'Alemde kim sen dilberi
   Görse sevincinden ölür görmezse hicrân öldürür
   G. 60

However, in certain instances it would seem that this treatment of Turkish vowels has a deliberate purpose, as in the beyt (Muc. 1) where the mahlas is given prominence by having its accusative ending lengthened:

5. Günahi yok dimegil Ca'feri gel öldür kim
   Degül durur seni çok sevmek az günäh baña
   G. 3

In the following (Rl), the lengthening of "ne" lends a colloquial emphasis to kara günler gelürse gelsün:

2. Ne kara günler gelürse gelsün ey mah başuma
   Gitsün ol gün gelmesün kim ben olan senden cüdâ
   G. 8

As compared with his contemporaries, Ca'fer can be regarded as most competent in his handling of the *arûz* metres, very rarely an unintentional false quantity being found in his versification.

The other inseparable quality of verse, rhyme (*kâfiye*), shows no particularities in Ca'fer's *Divân* which would differentiate
it from the common practice of the age. Like most of his contemporaries he favours redifs\(^{(1)}\) of pronounced length in both the \(\text{kasîdes}\) and the \(\text{gazels}\), by which a certain unity is given to the various beyts of the poem. To apply these redifs effortlessly in a variety of meanings throughout one poem seems to have been regarded as a mark of the poet's talent, and thus we find even long \(\text{kasîdes}\) committed to imageries constructed upon such words as \(\text{benefse, lâle, kerem etc.}\) The demands of the \(\text{kasîde}\) (terci’s, \(\text{kit’as}\) etc), however, often forced the poet into single rhymes, and thus out of 28 poems of this class, only 13 bear redifs. However, in the \(\text{gazels}\), we find that 222 out of a total of 255 end in redifs of varying lengths.

Although it was regarded as a fault to repeat the same rhyme in the short poems, on no less than 47 occasions do we find this in Ca'fer's \(\text{gazels}\). Greater latitude is allowed in the \(\text{kasîde}\), and of this, too, he avails himself freely. Thus, in the \(\text{lâle kasîdesi}\), which is rhymed in \(\text{-er lâle}\), the following words are found repeated: \(\text{meger, güner, hâcer (twice), seher, her, eser, ger, eger, ferr, -ver (three times), ser, ter (four times)}\).

\(^{(1)}\) By the term redîf as used here should be understood all syllables subsequent to the rhyme vowel: thus \(-\text{anı dürüst}\) is regarded as rhyming in \(\text{a}\) with \(-\text{ni dürüst}\) as an invariable annex throughout the poem. The classical theory of Persian prosody cannot be conveniently applied to Ottoman poetry.
In those metres which admit of a caesural pause (eg. Ḥl) we occasionally find beyts with an internal rhyme:

5. творура serv-i бала devour oturua verd-i ra‘nǎdur
гюзел olдури κи τυрдυγи oturдυга yaraсиκдυr
G. 34

7. твормис зульфие Ca‘fer перiгьan олma ey dilber
Ама ṭогrи yоли göster varubdur günkī rǎh egri
G. 242

Газел no. 165 (HL) maintains this internal rhyme throughout, and presents the appearance of a musammat.

Moreover, throughout his Divān, we come across the ġināsîl kāfiye and iltizām kāfiye which were regarded as rhetorical embellishments. In the following examples ġinās-i tām involves:

1. Заљфи gibi benden ki yüzин döst çevrrdi
Гам ġamzesi gibi cigerün giše çevrrdi
G. 203

1. Кадд-i dil-cüy ile k’ol serv-i revâν olsa gerek
Şu gibi cȃnlar ayağına revân olsa gerek
G. 95

1. Заљfini ruhları üstinde çu pûr-çîn eyler
Ol bütün ġîn ü ϣaṭa Rûm ilini ġîn eyler
G. 51

In the next examples revî, tevcîh (kâyıd), dahil and te’sîs are the same. Therefore an iltizām kāfiye involves:
l. Mağürü didevən țaçan ol məhitəb olur  
Burc-i şereflədə zərrelerim afitəb olur  
G. 27

1. Anda ki Ḫaḳ güzelərə kəmət virüb durur  
Kəmət yirine sənə kıyəmət virüb durur  
G. 39

1. Tutuşturum ʻışk ile bir nə-tüvənam  
Eger cân kurtarursam pehlüvənam  
G. 137

Although "graphic rhyme" (between words differing in pronunciation which appeared identical in the Arabic script) was allowable in Divan poetry, Ca'fer Çelebi only rarely avails himself of this license. (1)

The sound of the beyt when spoken or sung was frequently present in the mind of the poet in his composition, and to this end he employed vocabulary in its assonantal values as well as for meaning. Examples of such deliberate choice of words abound in the Divan of Ca'fer Çelebi, certain of whose beyts exhibit an almost musical construction:

1. Şunda bunda açılarmış ofəmasun gül bitmesən  
Güş-1 yara öykünürmiş kimseler iğıtmesən  
G. 163

(1) See for some examples: G. 11/1; G. 29/3,7; G. 61/4; G. 75/2; Q. 4/25 and Q. 14/22.
1. Yā Rab olsun kevger ü hūrî müyesser zāhide
Kim bize teslim idüb baılmaz şarâb u şâhide
G. 174

1. Beni öldürdî cevr ile seversin diyû bir bed- hüküm
Seversem kafir olmadum müsemlânlar ne işdürü bu
G. 163

7. Cevâhir toldurub her dem felek fîrûze-gûn câma
Diler kim ıçik-i râhina idê yârûn nîşâr andan
G. 161

5. İnleyû inleyû bostân-ı sarâyûn dûn-û-gûn
Döne döne şûlaram esâk ile dolâb gibi
G. 215

2. Dilûn ey döst bûlîlûdûr leşâfetâ dûzûn güldûr
Tap aglattûn bîzi güldûr ki gitdük üzde şehrûnden
G. 165

1. Gül ki resem eyledi zer levşa yine sînesine
Dûşdi ‘aksi ruhumu û san yüzûn ayînesine
G. 72

4. Gerçek imiş bu ısuq yirlerde olurmış peri
Yârdan gayrî diyâr-ı dilde gör deyyär yok
G. 92

These random examples demonstrate no systematic principle
of vowel-consonant relation, for indeed such an analysis of the
poetic line never entered into the consciousness of the poet.
But it is undeniable that the effect of the line on the ear
was in each a deliberate artistic consideration, and that in each the banality of the meaning is redeemed by its musical impact.

That certain of Ca'fer's pieces were actually intended to be sung - or at least composed in the form of a song - is beyond doubt. The musammats differ not at all from the şarkî, except that it is addressed to a rather more cultured audience; and the murabbas which are to be found in Ca'fer's Divân could have each provided the güfte for a musical rendition. In tone, too, they are frivolous and light-hearted, and in one instance (no. 123) there is a rather shocking indelicacy to be found, which nevertheless might have been found amusing by the circles in which it would be sung.

The choice of words is often determined by their familiar use in the vernacular language. In a beyt such as:

2. Ne kaça günler gelürse gelsün ey meh başuma
   Gitsün ol gün gelmesün kim ben olam senden çıdâ

the use of gel- and git- can be immediately identified even today as belonging to popular speech. Many more such examples could be shown, allowing the general impression that such hearkening to the common language of every day was inseparable from the art of the Ottoman poet.
D. THE DİVÂN OF CA'FER ÇELEBI

1. The manuscripts, the şecere of the manuscripts and their contents

Only eight copies of Ca'fer Çelebi's Dîvân have been located, of which six were used for the critical edition presented in this thesis. Seven of these eight manuscripts have been either catalogued or referred to by other scholars, only HE remaining hitherto unknown. The location of the copies of the Dîvân is as follows:

1) JRL: John Rylands Library, Manchester, Turkish Ms. no. 62. An elegantly written manuscript of 534 ff., containing the dîvâns of fourteen poets of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The Dîvân of Ca'fer Çelebi is between folios 326b and 430a.

534 ff., 20.5 cms x 10.5 cms (18.3 cms x 915 cms; inner area: 13.5 cms x 5.5 cms); 17 lines; thin glazed cream paper; double margins in gold; ornamental headings; small nesəˈalık of high calligraphic standard; leather binding with lisân; without date or name of scribe; 17th century.

There is an illuminated fihrîst on lb-2a of the poets represented in the work. On several pages throughout the work

(1) The description of the Dîvân is taken from an unpublished Catalogue of Turkish Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library, compiled by J. R. Walsh.
there is the seal of one owner Fethi-zaide Bende Mejmed, who, in a note on the first fly-leaf, calls himself Mejmed Aqa and gives the price of the work as 30 esedi kurush. The names of two other owners are on the same page: Dervis Hulvi el-Jalveti, known as Helvacı-basıl-zaide, and 'Abdulhayy Mustafa.

Contents: na't in form of terci-i bend (326b-330a); 22 kasıdes (330a-374a); 2 terci-i bends (331a-334a and 371b-374a); one müseddes (349a-351a); 7 kit'as (374a-377a and 430a); 242 gazels (377b-430a) including in the sequence 7 murabba's (393a-b, 402a-b, 402b-403a, 405a, 405b, 407b and 414b).

2) K: Dârû 'l-Kütübi 'l-Mişri, no. 3796

'Ali Efendi Hilmi Dagistanlı, Fihristü 'l-Kütübi t-Türkiyeti fi 'l-Kütüphâneti 'l-Hidviyeti 'l-Mişriye, Msr 1306, p. 153. This is also a collection of Divans of fifteenth and sixteenth century poets. Cafer's Divan is to be found between the folios 265b and 349b.

Contents: na't in form of terci-i bend (265b-268a); 25 kasıdes (268a-311a); 2 terci-i bends (269b-271b and 308b-310b), and a müseddes (236a-238a); 7 kit'as (310b-313a); 207 gazels (313a-349b) including in the sequence 7 murabba's (329b, 332b, 333a, 335a, 335b, 336a and 342b).

Contents: nāʿt in form of terci‘-i bend (1b-5a); 27 kašīdes (5b-59a and 63a-70b); 2 terci‘-i bends (43a-45a and 66a-69b); 10 kit‘as (59a-63a); 223 ġazels (72b-125b) including in the sequence 4 murabba’s (97a, 101b, 102a, and 114a).

4) HE: Halet Efendi (Süleymaniye Library) no. 148

129 ff., 21cms x 12.5 cms; 15 lines; thick glazed cream paper; margin in gold; vocalised nesīḥ; leather binding; without date or name of scribe – probably 17th century.

On folio 1a there are to be found the title of the work, Dīvān-ı Ca‘fer; the name of two owners, Muṣṭafā Dede Melevi and Esrār Mehm (d. 1796); an erased record which ascribes the Dīvān to Ca‘fer Dede Melevi and the dates of 1196 and 1197. On folio 2a there is the endowment seal of the Meleviğāne of Galata. On folio 45a there is a note which says "Ca‘fer Dede kuddise șirruhu șaḥretlerinin mağbûl-ı mardan olan ġazelleridür".

The work is divided into two sections: the first section begins with the title Muntəḥab-ı Dīvān-ı Ca‘fer (the word Çelebi has been erased), 1b; the second section bears the title of Dīvān-ı sānī fī kašā’id li-Ca‘fer Dede, 71a.

Contents: nāʿt in form of terci‘-i bend (1b-5a); 26 kašīdes (5b-9a and 77b-122b); one terci‘-i bend (9b-12b); 7 kit‘as (122b-126a); 221 ġazels (13a-63a) including in the sequence 7 murabba’s (23a, 29b, 32b, 51b, 52a, 52b and 53a); Arabic poems (71b-74a and 126b-127a); Persian poems (74a-77b and 127a-123b).
5) **AS**: Ayasofya Library, no. 3888

126 ff., 24.5cms x 15.5cms; inner area 15cms x 9cms; 15 lines; thick glazed paper; ta'lik of high calligraphic standard; leather binding; without date or name of scribe; 17th century. On the first page there is the seal of endowment of 'Osmān III.

Contents: na‘t in form of tercio‘-i bend (1b-5b); 26 kasîdes (12b-60b); one tercio‘-i bend (61a-64a); 10 kit‘as (64b-68b); 217 gazels (71b-126a) including in the sequence 6 murabba‘s (56b, 58a, 91b, 110a, 110b and 111b); Arabic poems (5b-9a); Persian poems (9a-12 and 69a-70b).


Contents: na‘t in form of tercio‘-i bend (1b-4b); Turkish kasîdes (15a-34b); 10 kit‘as (34b-39b); Arabic poems (5a-3b); Persian poems (3b-14b).

7) **NO**: Nuruosmaniye Library no. 3811. İKTYDK, I, p. 91.

Contents: na‘t in form of tercio‘-i bend (1b-5b); 26 kasîdes (12b-60b); one tercio‘-i bend (60b-64a); 10 kit‘as (64b-70b); 104 gazels (71a-96a) including in the sequence 2 murabba‘s (36a and 37b); Arabic poems (5b-9a); Persian poems (9a-12a and 69a-70b).

8) **BM**: British Museum Or. 7136. The Unpublished Supplement to Turkish Mss., p. 37

Contents: 146 gazels (3b-33a) including in the sequence 3 murabba‘s (19a, 20b and 24b); Arabic poems (1b-2a); Persian poems (2a-3a).
None of these manuscripts can be regarded as deriving directly from the autograph, and two dominant lines of transmission can be observed, represented by JR-K-EN and HE-AS-NO-M-EM, and JR and K are in fact identical and no doubt the product of the same copyist. According to the table of contents on f. 1a, K originally contained the Divâns of the same poets, but unfortunately half of the manuscripts has not survived and at present we have only the Divâns of Necâtî, Ahmed Paşa, Mesîhi and Ca'fer Çelebi. The end of Ca'fer 's Divân, too, is missing, lacking 32 of the yâ gazels. With few exceptions, the sequence of gazels is the same as in JR, but the 4 kasîdes which are omitted in the latter are included. As can be seen from critical apparatus, only in a few places do the texts of JR and K differ from each other. It is certain that both manuscripts were copied by the same scribe from the same original.

Although EN differs in sequence of gazels from JR and K, in essence, it would appear to represent the same tradition, derived from an intermediate manuscript between it and the common example. In many cases it is evident that EN attempts to clarify the text by substituting words which must have been more familiar to the copyist.

HE, both in content and variants departs from the JR-K-EN group, its text corresponding very closely with that of NO, and especially with that of AS, without repeating their mistakes in spelling. It is very likely that HE, AS and NO are copied from the same exemplar. The places in which AS and NO display
peculiar variants against HE can be explained either by the carelessness of the scribe of AS and NO, or by the fact that HE's scribe used two examples simultaneously. In the process of copying, the simultaneous use of two manuscripts as exemplars is considered to be very unlikely, and one must therefore conclude that the differences between AS-NO and HE are due to carelessness on the part of the copyist.

The close relationship between AS and NO is shown particularly in their sharing of certain obvious and trivial errors and lacunae, there being a total correspondence in respect of the latter. The fact that NO lacks some of the gazels in AS can be explained by studying the order of these poems in both manuscripts, from which it can be seen that the copyist of NO contented himself with transcribing only the gazels in the normal divan order, and omitted the miscellaneous ones which AS placed at the end of the gazel section. Consequently, NO has been eliminated from the critical apparatus.

The fact that AS-NO-HE have peculiar errors in common against all the manuscripts in the first group and that, in addition, AS-NO and HE show peculiar errors of their own would indicate that these three manuscripts derive from a common exemplar differing from the one from which the manuscripts in the first group derive.

BM, which includes only 142 gazels and a few Persian and Arabic poems, is more carelessly written and very defective. It shows some similarities with the AS-NO-HE group in variations and in its sequence of gazels. In the present study, BM is not used for the critical edition, although it was consulted at times.

M contains only kasîdes and, in so far as content and variations are concerned, seems to be much closer to the second group than the first. M is used in the present edition.

The evidence suggests the following stemmata (secere):

The main features of the two groups, apart from those mentioned above, are as follows: the dîvâns in the first group are conventionally organised, and do not include Arabic or Persian poems; the dîvâns in the second group depart from the usual ordering of materials and, with the exception of BM, (which includes only gazels and a few Arabic and Persian poems), all of them include a number of Arabic and Persian poems.
The text here edited is substantially based on JR, the readings of which were altered only when the sense seemed to demand it. For the four kasıdes which do not appear in JR, K was used, controlled by the other manuscripts.

The edition of Ca'fer Celebi's Dīvān presented here consists of: 23 Turkish kasıdes, 255 Turkish gazels, including 7 murabba's in sequence, 3 Turkish terci'-i bends, 10 Turkish kit'as, 4 Arabic kasıdes, 1 Arabic müstezät, 1 Arabic gazel, 2 Persian kasıdes, 1 Persian tahmīs, 2 Persian gazels and 1 Persian murabba'.

In his Turkish kasıdes, Ca'fer Celebi clearly exhibits the influence of Ahmed Paşa, who is rightly regarded as the chief exponent and indeed the prime innovator of this form in Ottoman literature. With the exception of two pieces addressed to his beloved, all the rest of the kasıdes are dedicated to the usual recipients of such panegyrics, and notably Sultan Bâyezîd. Four were written for Sultan Selîm, three for the vizier 'Ali Paşa, one for Şehzade Ahmed and two for a certain süfî. Prominent in his kasıdes to Sultan Bâyezîd, is the extent to which he dwells on the piety and religiousity of the Sultan, who alone enjoys the lakab Velî among all the other members of the dynasty.

Formally, the kasıdes contain the conventional nesîb, gûrizgâh, medîh, fâbriye, taleb and du'a - only the two addressed to the süfî, the two addressed to 'Ali Paşa and one written for his beloved, departing from this pattern. The kasıde
to 'Ali Paşa which is found in the Enişü 'l-'Arifin seems to be incomplete in that it commences with the medhiye, omitting introductory sections.

In connecting the theme of the kasıde to the praises of the person to whom it is addressed, Ca'fer shows a pleasing ingenuity, the gurizgah often linking naturally the nesib and the medhiye. For example, in that dedicated to Sulṭān Selîm (no. 29), he anticipates the medhiye by introducing the rhyme-word selîm in its proper sense in the beyt preceding the gurizgah, and repeats it as a proper noun in the succeeding:

9. Goncanun metninde muşmerken dekâ'ık mücmeli Gül am tafsil ile şerî itdi zî ta'bi selîm

10. Gullerûn kâlma mu’attar muçmerin gülşende bâd Meclis-i Şehzâdeye beñzer buğûr eyler nesîm

11. Mâh-ı burc-i saltañat þurşîd-i evo-i ma’delet Yusrev-i Gemsîd-ferr Şâh-ı cihan Sulṭân Selîm

The 26th kasıde is especially noteworthy both for its theme and for its gurizgah. For the nesîb, Ca'fer chose a more serious subject than usual, employing religious motifs. Explaining the theory of devr, he argues to the conclusion that this world and all it contains is but transitory and one should therefore prepare oneself for the next world:

78. Kamusi gitdi ögûmden hayâlûme gelmez Ne lâle-zâr u ne şahrâ ne bâg u ne bostân
79. Ne keseb-i mal ü menal ü ne ḥarṣ-i manṣib-u-câh
    Ne fikr-i bağ u ne tertîb-i ḥâne-vû-eyvân

80. Nezâr ʂük kî geldî ferâğat-î küllî
    Gözüme ʂöpçe görinmez bu kâr-u-bâr-î cihân

Although he himself is willing to give up all earthly pleasures, still he cannot renounce poetry, for this is his vehicle for praising the Sultân. Thus, the ʂûrizgâh:

81. 时常-i nazma da hergiz sülük itmez idûm
    Sebeb degülisme medî-û-du’â-î Şâh-î cihân

Although it was not the usual practice to introduce ʂâzels into the kasîdes, Ca’fer Çelebi almost always inserts one. These ʂâzels are usually addressed to a beloved and have no connection with the theme of the kasîde.

Ca’fer Çelebi’s ʂâzels, as far as form is concerned, do not show any particular difference from the conventional. In length they vary from 5 to 12 beyts. He generally mentions his name, as a mahlaş, in the last beyt, although in some instances this can be found in the penultimate. (See G. 3, 141, 153, 161)

The subject matter of the ʂâzels is generally profane love, only one treating of mystical ideas (G. 214). Like most ʂâzels, there is no unity of theme, but Ca’fer sometimes, through the use of a redîf, maintains a single idea throughout.

Those features which were remarked on above as distinguishing Ca’fer’s style, are most strikingly displayed in his ʂâzels, where he can be witty, colloquial and pithy to an extent
not allowed by the more formal kasıdes. From within the constricting limitations imposed on the writer by the conventions of this poetry, it can be seen that Cafer does emerge as a distinct literary personality and is not the mere stereotype that so many of his peers were to become.

In his four Arabic kasıdes - one of which is a nazire to Mütenebbi - Cafer displays his competence in this language, but as to their literary quality one would hesitate to pass judgement. The impression given is of Ottoman verse in translation, and to any Arab they would seem unfamiliar and probably be regarded as foreign to their literary experience. His contemporaries, in fact, did not regard his abilities in Arabic composition to be equal to those of his brother, and it is to be remarked that during his period as nişancı, on one occasion when a letter had to be sent to the Sultan of Egypt, Mü'eyyedzade was commissioned to do the drafting. (1)

In his Persian kasıdes, however, he shows a greater assurance - no doubt due to the close connection of that language to his customary Ottoman - and indeed the nazire to Selman Säveci addressed to Sultan Selim on his accession is of a particular elegance and loveliness. In general, it may be said that such ventures by Ottoman poets outside their own idiom are rarely of a quality to command admiration, and resemble the

gradus ad parnassum exercises of classical studies in Europe. This may be best observed in the taḥmīs which he wrote to a ḡazel by Ḥāfīz, where the contrast between the imitator and the master is all too apparent. Of Ca'fer's use of this language, Mu'eyyed-zāde is said to have remarked that it was "Ankara Persian". (1)

(1) 'Āşık Çelebi, 61b
2. **The system of editing**

The system of transcription used for this edition is that proposed in the Türk İlimi Transkripsiyon Kilavuzu (Istanbul 1946), which is the basis for that used in the İA, and has been followed by such scholars in this field as Ali Nihad Tarlan, Faruk K. Timurtas, etc. The pronunciation of words is given in the archaic form, even when the spelling does not demand it. Thus, eksülk and not eksik, yir and not yer, etc. When there is no choice to be made in this respect, the pronunciation (but not the transcription) of the Redhouse Yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük (Istanbul 1963) has been followed.

The vowel of the i̇zāfet is expressed either as a back or front high unrounded vowel (ı, i), and in general the choice is determined by the nature of the suffix which the word would take in its Turkish accidence. The i̇zāfet after long İ is shown with a palatal glide: thus, ma‘nī-yi sahīh, and not ma‘nī-i sahīh.

The conjunction vāv is made to follow vowel harmony in respect to back or front articulation, influenced by the terminal vowel of the preceeding word: thus, zemīn-ū-zamān, āh-u-havā.

The Turkish ile is not regarded as being a developed suffix at this period, and thus even in the combined form it retains its front vowels: thus da‘vāsī-yle, ḥūblārī-yle. However, when it is to be read without its first syllable, it
is treated as a suffix, and made to follow harmony: thus, belālarla, hūblarlā.

Information about the sources and the presentation of each poem therein is given in the upper right-hand corner of the page. With respect to the gazels, the number in parenthesis after the folio location indicates the position this poem occupies in the sequence of the other poems in this rhyme-letter. Thus, an entry such as: JR, 420b (6), BN, 116b (10), etc, indicates that this gazel is the sixth in this rhyme-letter in the JR manuscript, whereas it is the tenth in the BN manuscript. In the Hb and AS manuscripts, the sequence is sometimes random, and in these cases the folio number is underscored and no indication of sequence is given. When a gazel is to be found also in the Heves-nāme, the reference is to the Bibliothèque Nationale manuscript of that work.

In the upper left-hand corner of the page, the metre, rhyme and redīf are shown according to the system already described. Thus, the symbol: Ml: -ān daḥi: --- is to show that the poem is in this form of the muẓāri' metre, and that its rhyme maṣrā's are of the length of fā'ilūn. When the sequence of beyts varies in the gazels, this is shown below the metre symbol with reference to the organization presented in the text. Thus, K: 1-2-4-5-3-6-7 should be taken to indicate that the numbered beyts in the text below are in this order in the Cairo manuscript.
To the extent possible, an effort was made to present the kasıdes in a chronological order. In the BN manuscript these were provided with headings by the copyist and collected according to the individual to whom the poem was addressed. Because it seemed preferable to arrange these kasıdes chronologically, these headings have been omitted here, for in any case the person to whom the poem was presented will be clear from the medhiye section.
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Appendix A.14
Appendix A.16
Appendix A.20
Appendix A.22
Appendix A.23

Appendix A.24
APPENDIX B

Distribution of Ça'fer Çelebi's Gazels in Mecmû'as
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAZEL NO</th>
<th>Gazi'Ün-nezâir</th>
<th>Kârimî Beyridirî Kemal</th>
<th>Beyazit K. 5782</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I22b</td>
<td>I22a</td>
<td>I22b</td>
<td>65a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I19b</td>
<td>I19a</td>
<td>102a</td>
<td>95a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81a</td>
<td>81b</td>
<td>177b</td>
<td>177b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152b</td>
<td>152a</td>
<td>209b</td>
<td>209b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135b</td>
<td>135a</td>
<td>107a</td>
<td>107a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397b</td>
<td>397a</td>
<td>28b</td>
<td>28b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262b</td>
<td>262a</td>
<td>55a</td>
<td>55a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42b</td>
<td>42a</td>
<td>78a</td>
<td>78a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45b</td>
<td>45a</td>
<td>84b</td>
<td>84b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18b</td>
<td>18b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192a</td>
<td>192b</td>
<td>212a</td>
<td>212b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102a</td>
<td>102b</td>
<td>142a</td>
<td>142a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50a</td>
<td>50b</td>
<td>61b</td>
<td>61b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192a</td>
<td>192b</td>
<td>52b</td>
<td>52b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262b</td>
<td>262a</td>
<td>78b</td>
<td>78b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192a</td>
<td>192b</td>
<td>18b</td>
<td>18b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102a</td>
<td>102b</td>
<td>212a</td>
<td>212b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50a</td>
<td>50b</td>
<td>192a</td>
<td>192b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262b</td>
<td>262a</td>
<td>192a</td>
<td>192b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102a</td>
<td>102b</td>
<td>212a</td>
<td>212b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50a</td>
<td>50b</td>
<td>262b</td>
<td>262a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78a</td>
<td>78b</td>
<td>192a</td>
<td>192b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b</td>
<td>18b</td>
<td>50a</td>
<td>50b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212a</td>
<td>212b</td>
<td>262a</td>
<td>262b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192a</td>
<td>192b</td>
<td>78a</td>
<td>78b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102a</td>
<td>102b</td>
<td>262b</td>
<td>262a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50a</td>
<td>50b</td>
<td>212a</td>
<td>212b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I96a</td>
<td>I96b</td>
<td>197b</td>
<td>197b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Üniversite K.</td>
<td>Manz. Eş. 674</td>
<td>Üniversite K.</td>
<td>Üniversite K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Y. 1547</td>
<td>T.Y. 1547</td>
<td>T.Y. 1547</td>
<td>T.Y. 1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatîh b. 1931</td>
<td>Sül.K. H.Mümt</td>
<td>Fatîh b. 1931</td>
<td>Fatîh b. 1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I38a</td>
<td>I40b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I19b</td>
<td>I89b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I13b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>88a</td>
<td>I26a</td>
<td>31a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>82b</td>
<td>219a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I26</td>
<td>I16b</td>
<td>I72b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I66b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>II2b</td>
<td>213a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>92a</td>
<td>130a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>96b</td>
<td>142a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>180a</td>
<td>97b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>159b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>161b</td>
<td>232b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>29I</td>
<td>159b</td>
<td>238a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>258b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>173a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I03</td>
<td>228b</td>
<td>334b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I04</td>
<td>216b</td>
<td>352a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I11</td>
<td>208a</td>
<td>329b</td>
<td>I45a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I13</td>
<td>220b</td>
<td>355a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I14</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I16</td>
<td>239a</td>
<td>370a</td>
<td>82b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I21</td>
<td>232a</td>
<td>80a</td>
<td>I49b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I22</td>
<td></td>
<td>370b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I25</td>
<td>236a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I50</td>
<td>I49</td>
<td>I48</td>
<td>I47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAZEL NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Câmi'ü'n-nezâir Farâîlî Komal Beyazit K. 5782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Câmi'ü'n-nezâir Ebrûneli Nazmi H. Oş. K. 4915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervâne Bey M. Top. Saray K. Bağdad b. 406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Câmi'ü'n-nezâir Üniversite K. T.Y. 2955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mec. Nezâ'ir Ali Emiri K. Mecz. Es. 674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mec. Nezâ'ir Üniversite K. T.Y. 1547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mec. Şuara-yi K. Üniversite K. T.Y. 752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mec. Nezâ'ir Sül.K. Ü. Hüsnü Pasja b. 1031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I75</td>
<td>I74</td>
<td>I73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gümüş'un-铍氣</td>
<td>Wıdırîli Kemal Beyazıt K. 5782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gümüş'un-铍氣</td>
<td>Miranlı Naşir N. Os. K. 4915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervâne Bey M. Top. Saray K. Bağdad b. 406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gümüş'un-铍氣</td>
<td>Üniversite K. T.Y. 2955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mec. Nezâ'ir Ali Emiri K. Manz. Es. 674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mec. Nezâ'ir Üniversite K. T.Y. 1547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mec. Sura-ya K. Üniversite K. T.Y. 752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mec. Nezâ'ir Süleyman Hünü Paşa b. 1031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2256b</td>
<td>257b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509b</td>
<td>559a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520a</td>
<td>525b</td>
<td>555b</td>
<td>556b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480a</td>
<td>484b</td>
<td>494b</td>
<td>495b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Câmi'ü'n-nezâir Eryüdârî Kommal Beyazit K. 5782
- Câmi'ü'n-nezâir Edirnêli Nazmî H.Ös.K. 4915
- Pervâne Bey M. Top. Sarayî K. Bağdad b. 406
- Câmi'ü'n-nezâir Universite K. T.Y. 2955
- Mec. Nezâ'îr Universite K. T.Y. 1547
- Mec. Şurâ-î K. Universite K. T.Y. 752
- Mec. Nezâ'îr Sûl.K. H. Hüsnû Paya b. 1031
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAZEL NO</th>
<th>Câmi'ü'n-nezâir</th>
<th>Edirne'de kemal Becazit K. 5782</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>241b</td>
<td>Câmi'ü'n-nezâir</td>
<td>Edirne'de Nazmi H. Os. K. 4915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244a</td>
<td>Pervâne Bey M. Top. Saray K. Bagdad b. 406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524a</td>
<td>Câmi'ü'n-nezâir</td>
<td>Üniversite K. T.Y. 2955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495a</td>
<td>Mec. Nezâ'ir</td>
<td>Üniversite K. T.Y. 1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531b</td>
<td>Mec. Nezâ'ir</td>
<td>Top. Saray K. Nevân b. 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535b</td>
<td>Mec. Şuara-yı K. Üniversite K. T.Y. 752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535a</td>
<td>Mec. Nezâ'ir</td>
<td>Sü. K. H. Hüsnü Paşa b. 1031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>428a</td>
<td>571b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>406a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>417a</td>
<td>625b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>447b</td>
<td>586b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>406a</td>
<td>576a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>446b</td>
<td>584a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| GAZEL NO | GAZEL  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Çami'ü'n-hezâir Edirneli Kemal Beyazıt K. 5782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Çami'ü'n-hezâir Edirneli Nazmi H. Os. K. 4915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Pervâne Bey M. Top. Sarayı K. Bağdad b. 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Çami'ü'n-hezâir Üniversite 'K. T.Y. 2955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404b</td>
<td>Mec. Mezâ'îr Ali Emiri K. Manz. Bs. 674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427b</td>
<td>Mec. Mezâ'îr Üniversite K. T.Y. 1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579a</td>
<td>Mec. Mezâ'îr Top. Sarayı K. Revân b. 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621b</td>
<td>Mec. Şuara-yi K. Üniversite K. T.Y. 752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527a</td>
<td>Mec. Mezâ'îr Sült. K. H. Hüsnü Paşa b. 1031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>