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In contrast with Persian literature, Ottoman literature has been sadly neglected by Western scholars, so much so that even the most fundamental works necessary for its study and appreciation are lacking to us here (1). This may, in part, be due to the fact that Ottoman literature was regarded, not only by Western scholars but by the Turks themselves, as an inferior imitation of Persian literature and so not deserving of equal study. Whether this notion is correct or not, it surely must suffer from the fact that there has never been a comparative study of the two literatures or the Ottoman materials that are prerequisite to such a study.

Most important amongst such materials must certainly be - apart from the literary productions themselves - the series of biographical works devoted to the poets, known as Tezkere-i șu‘arā, or merely tezkere. Although two of these have been fully translated into German by Oscar Bescher (2), and while von Hammer-Purgstall's Geschichte der Osmanischen Dichtkunst bis auf unsere Zeit is substantially a paraphrase of many of them, and while E.J.W. Gibb in his A History of Ottoman Poetry has used them, it can be said that they have never been studied as an independent body of literature apart from the information they contain.

(1) cf. the remarks of Gibb made over a century ago on this which are still applicable to a large extent (HOP, pp.v-xi).
(2) Latifli's Tezkere and Sehi Rey (Tübingen, 1950).
Von Hammer-Purgstall's method of work, in his histories of Persian and Arabic literature, *Geschichte der schönen Badekünste Persiens, mit einer Blüthenlese aus seydhundert persischen Dichtern* and *Literaturgeschichte der Araber*, as well as in *Osmenischen Dichtkunst*, was simply to translate uncritically native materials of this order and too frequently his work is marred by errors of translation and interpretation (1) that must necessarily result from the tremendous productive programme which he maintained throughout his life. Now, Gibb's work, while making more selective and judicious use of the same materials than von Hammer-Purgstall, was highly influenced by the literary works of the late 19th century Ottoman critics such as Namik Kemal, Şinasi, Ekrem, Naci and Ziya Paşa who were themselves largely influenced by the West, and he rarely attempts to appreciate this source material in its own terms or as an independent mode of literature with its own conventions and forms. It will be apparent that any continuous body of literary work dealing with the Ottoman poets over a period of fully three centuries must contain much valuable material for the history of the development of Ottoman literary taste, as well as the mere statistical information that can be obtained from it.

Never before have the *teşkere-i su'ara* been studied in entirety for this purpose; von Hammer-Purgstall translated and paraphrased uncritically only nine of these biographies which were, Sehî, Latîfî, 'Abdî,

`Asik Çelebi, Kinalisade, Riyazi, Riza, Safa'I and Selim (1) and Gibb made use of eight, namely, Sehi, Latifi, `Asik Çelebi, Kinalisade, Riyazi, Riza, Selim and Esrar Dede (2).

It will be the purpose of this thesis to examine in its entirety this body of work considered as an individual branch of Ottoman literature, to trace its historical development as a literary form and to estimate its value as literary criticism. It will consist of four sections including a brief survey of the history of the form in Islamic literature followed by a more detailed history of the genre in Ottoman literature in which information will be supplied on individual tsekeres and their works together with a description of their tsekeres, and this will lead up to an estimate of the value of this work regarded as literary criticism.

Reference has already been made to the French influence which began to make itself felt on both the literary productions and literary criticism in the Ottoman language from about the middle of the 19th century. This influence was to change profoundly the whole nature of Ottoman letters to the extent that the works of the preceding centuries may be truly regarded as belonging to a different literature. Even though such works of the tsekeres class were produced after the period when Ottoman literature per se ends and Turkish literature begins, and indeed right down to our own day, these reflect the spirit of the new age and are quite distinct from their Ottoman

(1) GOD, i,44.
(2) HOF, ii,xviii.
predecessors. For this reason they have been omitted as primary materials for the purpose of this study (1).

Most of the primary materials have never been printed and consequently a large number of MSS have had to be used in the preparation of this work. The limitations imposed by time, and indeed the very purpose of the research, did not allow a comparative study of the various MSS of individual works although many have been used in several recensions. Critical editions of these works are sorely needed and in a sense this present thesis was designed to serve as a background and to supply the principles which must precede the task of editing. A full list of the textbooks used is appended to this thesis.

Among the secondary source material used may be mentioned Mehmed Nadili's expanded version of Ahmed b. Mustafa Taşköprüsîde's Seçeri'ik un-nun medeniye, with the gaz̲a̲l to it by Nev'Isâde 'Ata'i and Mehmed Şeyhi's Vekayi' ul-futulâ, which are concerned with the biographies of the members of the ʻulamâ and nashâ yi classes. Once or twice also, biographical works specializing in one particular class of people, such as Süleyman Se'dedîn Mustafaşîde's Tuhfe-i hattatun and regional works like İsmâ'îl Belî's Gildeste-i riya'î ʻirfan ve vefâyat-i danişverân-i nâhidân have been consulted. The Ottoman historical works and particularly those of the va:k'a-niâvi type which append vefâyat either to each year or to each reign, such as the histories of Peşevi,

(1) Fatin might have been included, but truly belongs to the transition period and is so poorly regarded that its study would not have contributed to the thesis (Edusiya, Murumo-ı elâiyet-i ısimiyâ, pp.237-6; Kopru, IA, oz. 35, Fatin Efendi, p.528b.)
Rüştü, 'Āsım, Şuhûl, Cevdet Paşa and Lütfî, have been used for biographical data and historical facts. While not of this class, the famous histories of 'Ālî and Sa'deddîn Efendi have been especially useful. Also very helpful, have been bibliographical works like the Kesf i'tîzânîn of Muṣṭafâ b. 'Abdullâh Kâtîb Çelebi and its zayl by Bağdâlî İsmâ'llî Paşa. These last two works are of less importance on account of the brevity of the biographical information sometimes found in them. Although considerably late and somewhat unsatisfactory, modern works like Bursâlî Mehmêd Tâhir’s Ogmânî müellîfleri and Mehmêd Sûrâyî’s Sicill-i Ogmânî have, out of necessity, also been used as secondary sources.

The system of transcription adopted in this thesis is that proposed by the Literary Faculty of Istanbul University and employed in the Turkish version of the Encyclopaedia of Islam (1). All dates have been uniformly given according to the Hijri year.

I wish here to express my thanks to Mr. J.R. Walsh, lecturer in Turkish at Edinburgh University, for his kind supervision of and his invaluable and friendly advice in connection with this research; to Dr. W. Montgomery Watt, Reader in Arabic at the University of Edinburgh, for making possible the undertaking of this thesis and for his kind and valuable advice; to Mr. L.P. Elvell Sutton, lecturer in Persian at the University of

(1) Türk Îlmi transkripsiyon kilavuzu, İstanbul, 1946.
Edinburgh, for his generous assistance in several matters; to Mr. G.E. Mundy of the School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London; to Professor Fahir İn, professor of Turkish literature at the University of Istanbul; to Mr. A.D. Alderson of the Saint Michel College in Istanbul, all of whom have assisted me with advice or sympathy in many aspects of my work; to Dr. L.W. Sharp and the staff of Edinburgh University Library for their courteous and generous assistance in procuring and making available to me materials of every description; to Dr. Pearson and the staff of the library of the London School of Oriental and African Studies; to the staff of the Oriental Room of the British Museum; to the Director and staff of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris; to the librarians of the Faculty of Literature, the Türkiye Etütüsü, the Türkoloji Şubesi and the General Library of the University of Istanbul; as well as to Ahmed Bay and Nâli Bey of the Library of Hagib Faşa; to Şemsi Bey of Millet Kütüphanesi and the heads of the libraries of Süleymaniye, Murad Nolla, Fatih and Karaucanmîye in Istanbul and to the Director and the librarian of the Türk Tarih Kurumu in Ankara, for their help and advice as regards MSS and books.
Chapter 1.

THE TEZKERE-I Şu'ARĂ IN ISLAMIC LITERATURE

The antecedents of the Ottoman tezkere can be traced back to the earliest beginnings of Islamic literary activity and may be described specifically as one of the developments of the Muslim pre-occupation with biography necessitated by the techniques of the science of hadīth, and, generally, as one of the results of literary activity in matters pertaining to the correct reading and interpretation of the Kur'ān. The motivation behind such activities was primarily religious and was developed into an interest in literature per se only subsequently.

As a result of the Muslim expansion following the death of the Prophet, a very large number of peoples of non-Arabic origin were converted to Islam. Since these new Muslims of widely divergent, but mostly of Persian, background could not understand and interpret the Kur'ān, and, in addition, as the Arabic script at the time of the compilation of the Sacred Book was far from being perfect, it became necessary and a matter of some urgency to establish the general rules of Arabic grammar and lexicography (1). Such studies could be carried out only with the help of oral or written materials in use roughly at the time of the utterance of the Kur'ān. In the absence of any Arabic prose literature, the early philologists had recourse to the oral poetry for the purest examples of Arabic speech. While it is not at all certain whether the early collections of poetry attributed to pre-Islamic versifiers were indeed of pre-Islamic origin or whether they were a post-Islamic imitation (2), the collection and study of the ancient

verses of the Arabic was recognized as an essential prerequisite for the preservation of the Arabic idiom in which the Kor'ân had been written.

Initially, the collection of poetry was affected with the collaboration of râvîâ who flocked to the Mesopotamian urban areas to sell their poems. Two literary centres and two schools of thought emerged in 'Irât; that of Baghâr and, founded a little later, that of Kûfâ. In time the different approaches of these schools gave rise to a rivalry between the two. The Baghâr school insisted on reducing all sciences to fixed rules, whereas the Kûfâ school took account of usage and anomalies. Later, both were superseded by the school of Bagdâd which was eclectic in its approach. Numerous members of these literary centres participated in the recension of the poetry collected with the help of the râvîâ, in research on the poets and on the circumstances on which they said their verses.

The result of this intensive activity may be seen in three anthologies compiled by some members of these scholarly groups. The earliest appears to be the Mu'allâhât attributed to a râvîâ, Harâmûd ar-Sâviye (d. 138) (1). There is considerable divergence of opinion on the exact numbers of odes contained in the original anthology, but it appears to have been composed of from seven to ten hajîs of pre-Islamic origin (2). Unlike the proceeding, the compiler of the Mu'allâhât, Mu'âwîd al-'Abbâsî (d. 170), was a philologist of Kûfâ. The work contains 126 to 128 complete or fragmentary

(1) GAL.: 61, p. 64; ed. by Arnold, Septem Mu'allahaet, carmina antiquissima Arabum, Leipzig, 1870.
(2) GAL.: 34, p. 74; Mâchârâ, op. cit., pp. 144 ff.
poems of pre- and post-Islamic origin (1). Of a similar nature is the collection of 72 poems by another philologist, this time of Baghdad, al-Andalusi (d. 215). His Andalusi anthology, more so than the preceding two, the subordination of literary quality to the choice of samples of the greatest philological value (2). To these may be added the Humash of Abū Tammūn (d. 251) and his student Dbūturi (d. 264) both of whom were poets in their own rights. Abū Tammūn's anthology is composed of a collection of fragments of poetry by lesser known poets (3), while the chief characteristic of Dbūturi's is that the poems in it are arranged according to subject matter (4).

Similar anthologies, known as mumā'as or qama, were collected by the Ottomans. All these must be distinguished from the testes which are nearly always fuller in biographical detail.

The members of the schools mentioned above produced a number of works on philology to which brief reference must be made here because of the central part played by poetry in their compilations. Towards the beginning of the 4th century, the recession of poetic materials was completed (5) by, among many others, scholars like Abū Ubayda (d. 209) who was interested, in the main, in genealogy and the aḥbār and only secondarily in language and grammar (6), and like al-Andalusi who, on the contrary, was more

5. Blackmore, op. cit., p. 112.
interested in grammar and vocabulary. Of the men who worked on philology and its allied sciences, Jalal b. Ahmed (d. 175), as well as being credited with having worked out a complex metrical theory, was the author of the *Kitāb al-ʿayn*, a dictionary type of work based on ancient poetry in which the words are classified phonetically (1). His student, Siboveyn (d. 177), also of the Basra school, deals with Arabic grammar in his *al-Kitāb* (2).

To this short list of examples should be added a typical product of the old philologist. The *al-Kāmil fi l-ʿadāb* of al-Ḥiborred (d. 265) contains traditions of the Prophet, sayings of pious men, proverbs and many poems mostly of the older period, and, its characteristic feature is the full grammatical and lexicographical commentary which is given to every quotation (3).

In connection with research on ancient poetry, mention must also be made of the *quʿubiya* conflict in which most litteratours took part.

Intermingled with the problems of preserving the poetry of past ages for the purpose of developing the literary sciences to serve studies on the *Kurʾān*, was a desire to praise or discredit the Arabs who claimed superior nobility. In general, those of non-Arabic origin identified themselves with the *quʿubiya*, though Ibn Ṭūṭayba (d. 276), who was of Persian origin, was numbered among the Arabophiles. The polemical works of those who were involved in those conflicts were based on the older poetry which, the pro-Arabs contended, was evidence of Arab superiority over other races, and, out of which the *quʿubiya* faction selected those verses which best

---

(2) GAL: 61, p. 101.
(3) GAL: 61, p. 100, 61, p. 103; C. Brockhann, in *Re*, vol. iii, pp. 628b–629c.
demonstrated his megalib in an attempt to prove his inferiority; in both
cases poetry being used as a means to an end other than the appreciation
of poetry in itself. A writer who wrote in favour of the Arabs and who
is credited with having been the first to coin the word ma'ābiya (1) was
Gābih (d. 233). His Kitāb al-bayān wa-l-taqlīd is an anthology which con¬
tains very precious examples of Arabic verse collected to demonstrate the
Arab's talent in the art of versification (2).

Religious origins can also be found behind the birth of the
biographical genre which is very intimately related to history in Islamic
sciences. It is again with the pre-occupation with the Qur'ān and its
studies and particularly the ḥadīṣ that there emerges a need for genealogy.
Correct behaviour for the Muslim meant knowing something of the life of
the Prophet and his actions incorporated in the Traditions. The value and
authenticity of a hadīṣ depended very largely on the veracity of an imām
and this could be verified by means of biographical material on the trans¬
mitters of a hadīṣ. Very early, consequently, biography became an
essential part of the study of Traditions which the scholars and compilers
criticized mainly from a biographical point of view (3). The details con¬
cerning the life of most subjects of biographical notices are much the same
in all works. The important data appear to be; the date of death, genealogy,
education if the men were a scholar and literary achievements if he were a
littératour (4). The Islamic biographical works are based on a system of

(2) C. Pellat, Langue et Littérature arabes, Paris, 1938, p. 151; M.A.L. 61,
(3) C. Pellat, op. cit., p. 21; H.A.R. Gibb, art. "Ta'rikh", in EI (Supplement)
p. 257b.
classification in which the subjects whose lives are being treated are divided into groups, tribes, professions, sects etc. Hence the name Tabakāt given to most of these works which deal with 'classes' of men and women.

The same conceptions and traditions are to be found in biographical compilations which concern themselves exclusively with poets. Works of this nature appeared early in Arabic literature, but very few of these have survived to us. Information available in later works which refer to these now presumed lost, and a study of those still extant, would indicate that they were generally known under the titles of tabakāt usṣ-ṣu‘arā, abhār usṣ-ṣu‘arā or kitāb usṣ-ṣu‘arā (1).

Though most of them are no longer available, it is known that the earliest were in the form of abhār or 'histories' of various tribes and that, in the course of time, these developed into works which dealt with types of poets. There appear to have existed a number of works on poets who were also brigands (2), those who were assassinated and of others who were recorded merely because they were famous. Many of these works were used by Abū‘l-Farrock al-Iṣfahání for his Kitāb ul-qānī (3). All these were again compiled for the benefit of or by philologists, theologians and historians who were interested in poetry and poets solely as a means to an

(2) M. Chârèv, op. cit., p. 132.
end — the explanation of the language of the Quran and the collection of hadīs.

The standard Arabic works of reference like the Kitāb ul-fihrist, the Irgād īl-arib ilā ma'rīfet il-adīb and others, refer to numerous compilations devoted to the lives of the poets and their verses of which no examples have survived to us. While little is known about them, there appears to be no doubt that these were similar to the few which have been preserved. The oldest of the extant works of this nature is the Tabakat uṣ-ṣuʿārā of Muhammad b. Sallām al-Ḳumah (d.c. 231) (1).

It contains two large sections devoted to the poets of pre- and early Islamic times, and each one of these sections is divided into ten tabakāt. Between the two sections, there are two sub-divisions; one on the composers of elegies, and, the other, on the poets of the Arabian cities of Mединah, Mekkē, Tā'if, Bahreyn and the Jewish poets of Mединah. The biographical notices, rather bare in detail, are based, mostly, on oral information for which ḫanāqa are invariable given. Verses attributed to these poets are usually appended to the notices (2). This work makes an important contribution to our knowledge of early Islamic poetry and acquaints us with the studies of the philologists of the first centuries of Islam (3).

Also extant is the Kitāb uṣ-ṣiʿr veṣ-ṣuʿārā of Ibn Ḳutayba.

Primarily a philologist and a traditionist, his interests covered all the Islamic sciences. His work is composed mainly for the benefit of members

(1) Šāhī, Si, pp. 45 and 165.
of the Abbasid bureaucracy and is didactic in character. In keeping with
his firm belief that cultured personages should know the poetry of the
ancient poets, the work contains an anthology of poems and the author’s
opinion as regards the respective values and merits of the verses written
by the ancient and modern poets. A work of literary polemics, it belongs
to the qu’ubīya conflicts in which Ibn Ḥuṭayba wrote in defense of the
claim made by the Arabs (1). As such, it must be regarded as constituting
a piece of work, the basic purpose of which was not the appreciation of
poetry.

Although better known as the author of the first great Arabic
work on rhetoric, the Kitāb ul-bādī (2), Ibn ul-Ḥuṭayba (d. 296) was also
the compiler of a biographical work entitled Taḥkāt uq-qu’arā al-muhdāgin
in which are listed the histories (abbār) of the poets of this class who
flourished before the biographer and praised the Abbasid caliphs. Con-
taining anecdotal material pertaining to 126 poets, this work is particu-
larly valuable because it includes poems which are mostly little known. In
keeping with the practice of the times, the compiler bases his citations on
the reports of ṭawīl for whom he invariably supplies ḥanāda (3).

A somewhat specialized, though an equally important contribution
to our knowledge of literature and society during the first centuries of
Islām, is the Kitāb ul-ṣānī of Ebu’l-Ferōq Iṣṭahānī (d. 357). It deals,
primarily, with the history of Arabic verses set to music and with the bio-

(1) Ch. Pellet, Langue et Littérature arabe, Paris, 1952, pp. 132-3; OAL: 61, p. 120; Gaudroy-Jamais in his translation of the Mushaddine of the
work: (Ibn Ḥuṭayba, Introduction au Livre de la Poésie et des Poètes,
(2) I. Kratchkosvsky, Kitāb al-Badī‘ of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥuṭayba, edtd. from
the unique MS in the Escorial, with introduction, notes and indices,
ographies of the poets and musicians who composed them; and contains an immense quantity of verses as well as a large number of historical traditions and anecdotes. Being of an entertaining character, it could be considered as belonging to the edeb class of literary composition (1).

The Mu`cim us-su`arā of al-Mazūbānī (d. 380) offers an interesting and most significant development in approach and method of presentation of biographical material pertaining to the poets. While two lost works arranged according to traditional classification are attributed to him, al-Mazūbānī, in the Mu`cim adopts, as far as can be ascertained, for the first time, the method of classifying the poets in the hurūf al-su`arā alphabetical order. The significance of this departure from tradition rests upon the fact that whereas formerly the biographers thought of the poets as belonging to one class or another, Marzubani considered them as belonging to one group, without regard to origin, tribe, professional class, social standing or historical setting, indulging in the same type of literary activity. This suggests that Marzubani, for one, held the poetry itself to be the central and most important feature, and to be a common quality among men and women of all classes and positions (2).

The traditional method of classification of poets by territories is witnessed in two works of this genre in the following century. The first of these, the Ketīmet ud-dehr, was compiled by as-Sā`libī.
(d. 429) who collected the poems and described the lives of the poets of his own age with talent and, apparently, with impartial judgment. Arranged in four books each containing ten chapters, the work covers the poets of the 4th century who lived in Syria, 'Irāq, Persia, Gūrān, Ṭabaristān, Ṣarāsān and Transoxiana (1). A continuation to the above work was compiled by Sāhāraī (d. 467) under the title of Dīwān ill- ḡagr and containing the verses and biographies of the poets of the 5th century until the year 450 (2). In the next century, āyāta were collected to these two by al- Ḫāṣārī (d. 568) and 'Imād ud-Dīn al- Ḥasbānī (d. 597) bearing the titles of Zināt ud-dōhār and Ḥaridat ill- ḡagr respectively. Arranged on the same principle and covering the same areas, those concern themselves with the 6th century poets (3).

This Islamic biographical tradition was continued uninterruptedly to the end of the 6th century and was written exclusively in Arabic. A few years later, at the beginning of the next century, was the first (4) extant work of this type in the Persian language. The Lubāb

ul-albah of Muhammad al-'Azif was probably written in the year 616 and was dedicated to 'Ayn ul-Mulk al-Aqari, the qal' of the ruler of Sind, Faqir ud-Din Khabna (1). In the organization of its contents it follows the general Islamic pattern of classifying the poets according to the classes to which they belonged and the reigns in which they flourished (2). The links between Persian and Arabic literature of this nature are to be found in the Lubbah ul-albah in which 'Azif lists such Arabic works as the Tabakht of Ibn Sallān, Ibn Mutayba and Ibn ul-‘Atrac, the Xatīrat ihd-dhur of ag-‘Alībī and the Ḫayyd al-Magr of al-Bāyrazi (3).

The Ḫabarištān of 'Abdurrahmān b. Ahmad Cāmī, completed in 992, strictly speaking, does not fall into this category of literary production, but is worthy of some mention in this survey because the first Ottoman biographer of poets refers to it in his introduction when listing the Persian works which served him as models (4) and also because Cāmī includes notices on poets in it. A collection of anecdotes, this work is divided into eight ravius of which the seventh is devoted to the short biographies of twenty-eight poets (5).

(3) H. Blind, "On the earliest Persian Biography of poets, by Muhammad ‘Azif, and some other works of the class called Taskarat ul-Shurā", in JMAS, ix, 1899, pp. 111-176.
(4) Edīrriān Sohī, Tashkore-1 Sohī, Mathnawiā-1 Amīfī, 1925, p. 4.
Compiled in the same year as the Beharistan was the Teskereh up-sa'arā of Devletshāh b. 'Alā ad-Devlet and dedicated to the author of another biographical work, Mir 'Ali Shīr Nevā'ī, also mentioned by the first Ottoman teskereci (1). This teskere contains the biographical notices of ancient and modern Persian poets and is divided into three larger parts. The Baykal has the compiler's observations on the art of poetry. The seven Tabakāt which follow constitute the major part of the work and each is devoted to some twenty more or less contemporary poets and the princes under whose patronage they flourished. The last section, or Jütme, contains the biographies of seven poets who were the contemporaries of the author and ends with the praise and merits of Sultan Huseyn during whose reign the work was compiled (2). It contains fuller biographical notices than the first Persian compilation of this kind and for this reason is of considerable value to the students of the literary history of Persia (3).

A Çağātāy teskere begun in 896 plays an important part in this Islamic literary genre because of its influence on the system of classification of the work of the earliest Ottoman teskereci. Mir 'Ali Shīr Nevā'ī, one of the most prolific and elegant of Çağātāy litteraturan (4),

(1) Edirneki Sehi, op. cit., p. 4.
(3) ed. E. G. Browne, The Tabāhirat-i-Shīr-Sha'arā (Memoirs of Poets) of Devletshāh b. 'Alā' ad-Devlet Balkhtishāh al-Shāhi of Samsarcand, (Persian historical texts, i), London and Leyden, 1901, Preface, pp. 2–9; this work was translated into Turkish almost in entirety by Sileyman Pehm under the title of Sefinet up-sa'arā and printed by the Tab'hāne-i Amir in Istanbul in 1259.
was omir at the court of Sultan Hüseyn and the author of a Persian divan. His Mecâlie ün-nefâ is is divided into eight parts comprising:

a) deceased poets personally unknown to the biographer, b) poets deceased before 896 whom the author had met, c) living poets known to the author, d) men of letters who occasionally wrote poetry, e) noblemen of Jorâsan who indulged in the art of verification, f) non-Jorâsân poets, g) kings and princes of the house of Timûr, and, h) Sultan Hüseyn (1).

A variation of the same system of division and classification will be adopted by the Ottoman Sehî in his Nešt Bihîst (2).

A tezkere which may be considered as a continuation of the above mentioned works by 'Avfî, Devletpâh and Nevâ'i, is the Tuhfe-i Sâmi of Ebû'n-Naṣr Sâm Mîrzâ, the son of Şâh Ismâ'îl. It contains the notices of poets who flourished between the latter years of the 9th century and is divided into seven şâhife including the poets of the Safâvid dynasty, the 'ulemâ, persons of distinction who wrote poetry occasionally, poets best known by their pen-names, poets of the Turkish race and poets of the lower classes. This work was completed in or about the year 957, therefore twelve years after the completion of the first Ottoman work of this order (3). By then, Sehî had compiled the Ottoman version of the tezkere genre, though it remained comparatively little known to subsequent

---

(2) Edirne, Sâmi, op. cit., pp. 9, 12, 56, 75, 107 and 123.
(3) Storey, op. cit., pp. 797-800; ed. Tehran, 1314.
Ottoman thokoresis. The biographies of poets which will be collected thereafter by the successors of SehI will merely be the continuation of a literary tradition launched by the Arabs, systematized by the Persians, and, to a large extent, formalized in the Ottoman Empire by SehI and his continuators.
It was within the framework of this Islamic biographical tradition that the Ottoman Tezkere-i șuʿarā arose and developed, and it may be properly considered as a continuation and development of the former. In this chapter will be given a detailed account of the life of each tezkereci, followed by a characterization of his work and an assessment of its values relative to other works of this class.

While our chief source of biographical information on the tezkerecis is usually incidental statements within their own works, much valuable information is also to be found in their continuators and in the contemporary historical and biographical literature. Too, many of the tezkerecis, being poets in their own right, are mentioned in subsequent tezkerecs and some even include themselves among the poets in their own works. Such information generally concerns their descent, some details about their fathers, brothers and other members of the family, their education and under which masters this was gained, the various offices and appointments which they held etc. In short those external facts of an individual's life which are customary in all Islamic biographies. The formulas of praise which might be applied are almost wholly conventional, and are used so indiscriminately as to be practically devoid of biographical value. To a large extent, this limitation is imposed by the nature - resembling that of a dictionary - of Islamic biography which was originally considered as sufficient for its purpose as an ancillary to history to give that chronology of a person which would
allow the verification of an isnad or the establishment of the authenticity of a relation (1).

The earliest tezkere classifies the poets (tablakat), but in general the poets are presented in purely alphabetical order; 'Aşık Celebi, however, presents them in the abeced sequence. There is no consistency in quality, indeed in quantity of information; some, such as Sālim, enter into detail almost equal to that of the customary biographies of the 'ulum, while others, such as Niżā, often give no more than one or two simple facts. Some seen to have been conceived with the idea of an antholgy in which the choice verses of the individual are collected together into one work, and in this respect resembling the mecnu' a and the cünk. Others content themselves with a mere recital of names and dates. Some are written with the concision of a reference book, while others regard the form as a field for the display of their own literary abilities and produce works intended to be admired in themselves. All attest a continuing admiration for poetry and an interest in the poets who produced it throughout the course of Ottoman history, and thus, represent a source of unique value for the development of Ottoman literature and the growth of literary taste.

Literature of this type in the Islamic East, was almost invariably produced under patronage and dedicated to the great and wealthy in expectation of favour and reward. There are no examples, however, of such a work having been actually commissioned and the initiative in compiling those works seems to have arisen from the author himself. It is true that we sometimes find,

in the introduction, statements which would indicate that it was the request of friends that prompted the tezkereci to undertake the task, but such statements are so much part of the tradition of Islamic literature that it is probably safest to regard it as a purely conventional feature of an introduction. Such a system of patronage, of course, determined a certain locale for the works. There were many cultural centres in the Ottoman Empire. Any provincial court at the head of which there was a prince serving his apprenticeship in preparation for the responsible state duties which lay ahead of him, or at the residence of a local ruler, there were always a number of men of letters. By far the most important centres, however, were Istanbul, Edirne and Bursa.

Statements made by the tezkerecis themselves, in general, indicate that some of the chief reasons for writing this type of work were; the human urge to continue a class of literature, the fear that unless recorded in the form of biographies and anthologies, the facts relating to the poets' lives and the choicest of their verses would be lost to posterity, and lastly, a genuine admiration for poetry and those who composed it and a desire to collect it.

With exceptional representatives from the mystical orders and palace service, most of the tezkerecis were of the 'ulema class and can be taken as reflecting the mentality, interests and tastes of this class. After preliminary studies, an 'alim would enter, by examination, one of the various great madrasas of the empire. Here he would follow a curriculum, everywhere largely the same, including such divers branches of knowledge as Arabic, Persian, literature, philosophy, jurisprudence, medicine, mathematics and
astrology. Just as the limitations of the numbers which could be accepted into these institutions tended to make of the successful candidates an intellectual elite in the empire, so, too, did the similarity of their studies and occupations throughout the years of their studentship provide them with a common intellectual background and create in them a uniformity of thought.

Those of the meşâyiḥ class, on the other hand, with their other-worldliness and their intense preoccupation with spiritual values, are in striking contrast to the ʻulma. While some members of this class answered the call to a spiritual life after they had followed the training required for other professions, most of them entered one of the orders after receiving what must be regarded as merely an elementary education. They joined a tekke of a particular tariqat as mürıds and received training in literature, music and religious subjects under a şeyh while serving their apprenticeships. Once they had successfully passed the various stages designed to train both the body and the mind to a rigorous discipline and fulfilled the requirements, they became full members of the order and were henceforth known as şeyhs, devoting the rest of their lives to contemplation. (1)

In contrast to both the ʻulma and the meşâyiḥ classes, the enderun class was recruited by the devshire system and its members spent their adolescent years training in one of the services of the palace. It was only at this period that they began their studies in the arts, sciences and even in the very languages of Islam including Turkish, and many never acquired more than a superficial knowledge of any of these. Their training prepared them

(1) A. Gölpinarlı, Mevlânadan sonra Mevlevilik, 390-408, et passim.
for service as pages and ultimately for administrative posts upon leaving the palace. Owing to their foreign background and their training which was
designed to discipline them to loyalty and to develop them physically and on
account of the fact that they acquired their knowledge of the Ottoman language
late in life, they constitute a class quite different to the first two in out-
look and feeling (1).
In the tenth century, the Ottoman Empire reached the apogee of its military and political power, and under the patronage of the throne and the nobility, the same energy manifested itself in the cultural and intellectual life of the realm. It was in this century, too, that the first example of the genre known as the Tezkere-i şu'arâ makes its appearance in Ottoman literature, and it is by virtue of this single work that Sehî of Edirne can claim a unique place in the history of this literature.

The amount of information available on Sehî's life is very small. Subsequent tezkerecis seem to have little to say about him and he is hardly mentioned in other biographical works and histories. Letifî (p. 196) knows only two of his offices and makes brief mention of his tezkere. 'Aşık Çelebi (f. 155b) supplies a few more details about his origin and career and comments on his tezkere. Kimâlîzâde (f. 143a), repeats 'Aşık's statements and remarks on his poetry. Beyânî (p. 91), merely summarizes Kimâlîzâde's account. Riyâzî (f. 57b), in a short notice simply says that his work was famous.

'Ali (KA, M, Add. 10004, f. 51a) repeats the information supplied by the tezkerecis, but in (Es'ad Efendi, f. 498a), makes some valuable comments on his tezkere. Evliyâ Çelebi (Sevâhat-nâme, 1, 343), gives some details on his marriage. Fâîık Meşâli (Nest Bizîşt, p. 142), disputes Evliyâ Çelebi's statements on Sehî's marriage. Sehî (Nest Bizîşt, Muğaddîne), gives details on the circumstances which led to the writing of the tezkere.

It is most probable that Sehî was born in Edirne, although one can
never be sure that the regional *nichâb* indicate birth in, residence in or merely subsequent association with, a town or region. His descent, family and names are given nowhere, all reference to him being under his *nichâb* of Şehî. While his date of birth, too, is not specified, Latifî says that he attained the age of eighty; since he died in 955, he must have been born about the year 875.

Nothing is known about his education, but his employment as secretary and his manifest literary abilities as well as his familiarity with both Persian and Ottoman literature, allow us to infer that he had received a high degree of education. His friendship with Necati may have been instrumental in directing these literary interests towards poetry.

He undoubtedly spent several years of his life with Necati. When Sultan Mahmud, son of Bayezid II, was sent to the *sevok* of Magnisa in the *live* of Saruhan (1), Necati and Şehî went out with him, the former to become his *nigânî* and the latter his *kâtib*. According to the Tâş üt-tevârîh, the appointment of Sultan Mahmud took place in the year 910. The prince died in 913 and as both Necati and Şehî returned to Istanbul then, where Şehî became *dîvân kâtibi*, the latter had at least three years near Necati. The next appointment, after being secretary to the *dîvân*, was in his native town of Edirne. Sources indicate that he became *mütevelli* of the Dâr ül-ḥâdí in that town. However, 'Aşık Çelebi's notice indicates that he was attached to a *hâlîk* and served as *mütevelli* to Ergene which appears to be a little *kašaba* near Edirne (2), and to certain *amirî* in Edirne beforehand. It was during this period of his career that he wrote his tawars in 945 and presented it to Sultan Süleyman together with

(1) Tâş üt-tevârîh, 11, 272.
(2) M.T. Gökbilgin, XV-XVI asırlarda Edirne ve Feza livâesi, 216.
a poem in which he asked for promotion and a return to the palace. There is no record of his having succeeded in the plea. Sehî died in Edirne in the year 955 (1).

Only Leșîî gives information about his character. He appears to have been noble and a man of clear convictions. His faultless nature was disposed towards the life of a dervîş.

Evliyâ Çelebi says that Sehî married the daughter of Necâî and adds that rumours held him to have made this contract solely in order to get possession of the literary remains of his father-in-law (2). When the latter died Sehî built a marble tomb for him.

Sehî wrote his Teskeret uş-şu‘arâ or Heşt Bihîşt in 945 and dedicated it to Sulṭân Süleymân. He was inspired by Persian works of this nature of which he mentions three in his muğaddime. 'Abdurrehman b. Ahmed Çâmi's Bahâristân, which was completed in the year 892. It is in eight sections, the seventh of which is devoted to the biographies of poets (3). The Teskeret uş-şu‘arâ of Devletşeh b. 'Alâ‘î-devlet, also written in 892. And lastly, the Mecûlîs ün-nefâ‘îs of Mir 'Ali Şir Nevâ'i written in Çàğâtay Turkish in the

---

(1) Evliyâ Çelebi is probably incorrect in giving it as 951.
(2) Fâ’îk Boçâd, in his biography of Sehî at the end of the printed edition of the Heşt Bihîşt (p. 142), disputes this. He says that Necâî had only one daughter and she was married to Um-i Veled-zâle 'Abdul'azîz Çelebi. Since, he continues, 'Abdul'azîz died three years before Sehî (according to Necâî, 407, it was five years before Sehî), the latter could not have been in a position to marry. He ends by saying that Sehî was not the kind of man who would have done what Evliyâ Çelebi alleges.
(3) Bahâristân of Çamî, edited by Schlechte-Wssehrd, Vienna, 1846.
year 896. Sehî had read and studied these three works and had come to the conclusion that some similar work in Ottoman should be produced to preserve a record of the poets of Rûm. Conscious of his inadequacy to compile such a biography, the execution of this work was postponed for several years. It was not until the year 945, when he was already in his seventies, that, realizing that unless the lives and poetry of the Ottoman poets were recorded there was the danger of time erasing them from people's memories, he set about compiling the work.

As the name suggests, the work is divided into eight parts, each of which contains poets of a certain social class or who flourished at a certain time of Sehî's life. The way in which the biographical information on each poet was obtained also determines, to some extent, the section in which the poet is placed. The sections, the members of which are given in no particular order, are as follows:

1. The reigning pâdişâh, Sultan Süleyman.
2. Preceding sultâns and some of their sons.
3. State and provincial officials.
4. Poets who distinguished themselves in the field of learning.
5. Poets who were dead before Sehî's time and about whom information was obtained from second-hand sources.
6. Poets whom the author had met in his youth.
7. The biographer's contemporaries.
8. Poets who were young in Sehî's old age.
Each part is opened with an introduction giving details of the contents of the part and ends with a tatemme.

The work commences with the usual dibagai, and then begins a mukaddime with some general remarks on poetry and poets, a short description of the Persian works of this class and the necessity for one in Turkish, closing with a kaside in praise of Sultan Süleyman to whom the work, which is named Neşt Bihisht, is dedicated. The work ends with a hâtime in which God is thanked for His help during the writing of the biography. It is in this section also that the date of compilation is given as 945.

Compared with subsequent ones, the first (1) Ottoman teşkere is short and the biographical detail contained in it is scanty. The poets are listed under the mehla and sometimes the given name and region of origin may be supplied in the article together with some detail of education and teachers and offices and appointments held. In this there is no consistency and it is difficult to determine the nature of the information that Sehî thought proper to his purpose. It may be that the general paucity of detail may be due to Sehî’s own lack of information. Anecdote is not so prevalent as in later examples. Dates are hardly ever given and one can only judge the age of the poet from the reigns in which he is said to have lived.

(1) Although a certain Kenâ il-küpherî by Şeyhâlu is mentioned by Babinger (COM, p.68) as earlier than this work, the only known MS of this is in the private possession of Mehmed Fuad Köprülü and Babinger relies for his description of it in Köprülü’s own account in Türk edebiyatında ilk nütesavrefler (p.410). The description given in Osmanlı tarihçileri (ii,122) does not give the impression that the work is concerned with our subject.
Although poetic samples are supplied for nearly all poets, they are few in number and seldom exceed a half or two.

Sehî's style is comparatively simple, direct and seems rarely to strive for literary effect. While one notices a tendency towards éclaté which very frequently conceals a total lack of information about the subject of the article, yet his vocabulary rarely becomes unusual or obscure and his structure throughout maintains a simple and pleasant rhythm.

The teksterecis who followed and copied Sehî in this form of literature have very little to say about his tekstere. Only two of them give more than simply the title of their precursor's work. ʿĀqîk Galebi and Riyâşî say that it was still famous in their time. That it did not enjoy as high a reputation as its continuators is indicated by ʿĀlî.
Within less than a decade after the compilation of the Host Birhišt, the second teskere-i şu‘arā was written by Latifî of Kastamonu. The following sources have been used for details of his life and work:

Latifî (Muhaddine, pp. 135, 228, 257, 297 and Hâtime), gives details about his father, his own life and his works. Sehî (p. 136), in a short notice comments on his poetry. 'Aşık Çelebi (f. 106b), supplies by far the best biography and criticizes his parochialism. Kınâlisâde (f. 238a) and Bayâni (f. 172), merely repeat the details found in 'Aşık Çelebi's notice. Riyâslî (f. 103a), comments on his prose style. 'Ali (or 32, 318b) and (2162, f. 498a) makes some independent comments on the teskere. Kâtib Çelebi (Kosf 'üz-şünûn, 1, 387), makes no contribution and makes an error in his given name. N. Çetin (Ia, cüz 69, pp. 19-20, 'Latifî'), gives an up to date biography plus additional information from works which were not available to us, but to which reference will be made when required.

'Abdullatif (1), hereafter referred to by his mehâla Latifî, was born in the Anatolian town of Kastamonu which was the place of origin of many poets and members of the 'ulamâ class at this time (2). While there is no record of his father's name in the sources, Latifî mentions his grand-father as the poet Hâşib-zâde Handî who died towards the end of the reign of Sultan

(1) Kosf 'üz-şünûn, 1, 387, erroneously gives his name as Latifûllâh
(2) Kamûs ul-âlam, v, 3662.
Mehmed Fâtihi. While his date of birth is nowhere stated, he mentions, in his Risâle-i evvâl-i İstanbul (1), that he was thirty-five years of age in 931, when this work was completed, which must therefore place the date of his birth in 896. Judging by his own account of his early life, Latîfî began to show signs of exceptional ability soon after he had left the cradle. He tells us that when he was seven years old he had no option but to submit to natural compulsion and compose beautiful gazels. While it is evident that he received a good education before leaving his native town, neither he nor any of the sources give the names of the scholars under whom he studied. However, in his account of the life of the poet Filibeî 'İsâ Şoca Fânî, Latîfî says that he read the Lema'ât-i 'Irâkî (2) with him. Furthermore, his friend and advisor Hâcî-sâde Mehmed Za'îfî of Kastamonu may also have been a teacher to him. Be that as it may, his works and his career are evidence of a highly cultured man trained in the arts of the secretary qualified for high official appointments.

It is not known if he held any offices in Kastamonu, or whether he left his native town with the purpose of seeking employment elsewhere. 'Âsîk Çelebi says that he submitted a 'Baharıye' hâşide to Defterdâr İskender Çelebi (3). In return for this panegyric, which we are told was presented at Nevrûz, Latîfî was appointed kâthib in the district of Belgrade. From this it is certain that

(1) N. Çetin, IA, cüş 69, pp.19-20, 'Latîfî'; this work which is to be found in the Istanbul University Library (TX,3751) was not available at time of writing.
(2) Keşf üş-qûmûn, ii,1563; GAL, S. i,793.
(3) Peçevelî, Zerbî, i,40; Uzuncârpîli, Ormanî tarihî, ii,340.
he left Kastamonu before the year 941 (3), and the date of his Risāle would indicate that his acquaintance with Istanbul, either through visit or residence, must have been at least ten years earlier. His duties in various cities kept him in Rumeli for about ten years until 950 when he arrived in Istanbul, five years after Sebih had finished his teakere.

There is no record in any of the sources as to the date of his appointment as kātib to the vakf of Ebū Eyyūb-i Ansārī, nor is it known what offices he held between his arrival in Istanbul and his appointment to the above kitābet. ʿĀli, however, seems to suggest that he held secretaryships to certain ʿimārīs before this. It is said that it was following Latīfī's presentation of his teakere to Sulṭān Sūleyman Kāmûl in 953 that he was given the office of secretary to the ʿimāret of Eyyūb-i Ansārī. The fact that Latīfī was kātib to this vakf while the poet Arnavud Yahyā was its mütevelli, prompted ʿĀşık Čelebi to describe the vakf as the 'bower of poets' (mesʿar-i suʿārā), and that he should couple him with a poet so highly regarded as Yahyā may be taken as some indication of the esteem with which he was held. It is certain that the biographer, who was by then well over sixty years old, still held this office in the year 960 when ʿĀli made his acquaintance.

ʿĀli who records that Latīfī went to Egypt from Eyyūb, probably telescopes this progress, for the other sources say that he was appointed kātib to the ʿimāre-i sulṭānī of Rhodes (1) after his dismissal from the vakf of Ebū Eyyūb-i Ansārī. The length of his stay on the island is not specified, but it appears that he went directly to Egypt from there without returning to Istanbul. His exact activities in Egypt remain obscure, but ʿĀli informs us

(1) Hermes Balducci; Rodea'da türk minarisi, translated by Celalettin Rodoalu, p.10
that he held somewhat advantageous appointments there as katib (1).

The accounts of the rest of the life of Latifî are conflicting and little is known of his fate after he reached Egypt. ‘Aşik Çelebi, writing in 977, in his notice on Latifî says that the biographer was still in Egypt, spending much time worshipping God and busy either composing poetry or writing prose. On the other hand, Kınalîzade who completed his teşkere in the year 994, speaks of him as being in Istanbul and describes him as a decrepit old man bent with age like the bow of a violin. It should be noted, however, that Kınalîzade took several years to finish his work and it is possible that while he was actually writing his müsvedde, Latifî was still in Istanbul before going to Rhodes. Furthermore, Çetin points out that there exist copies of Kınalîzade’s work bearing certain alterations and that one of these indicates that the version alluding to Latifî’s still being in Istanbul is a later addition. If this observation be correct, it would appear that Latifî spent some time in the capital on his return from his first appointment to Egypt. Hüseyin Keevi, in his Râsnâme (2), includes a letter from Mesîh zade relating the circumstances of Latifî’s drowning, on 25th Ramazân 990, during a storm at sea while on his way to Yanbu on the Red Sea coast of Arabia. This letter from one of the few survivors of that sea disaster must be regarded as definite evidence for the date of his death (3). Kâfsâde Fâ’îzî and Miyâzî

(1) Re‘dehî Latîfî Miqa gitmiydi. Anda ba‘zi nüfîde kitâbetlerinde rî‘âyet olmub ..........
(2) Ke‘f înzâmin, 1,663; ‘0M, 1,276, where the title is given as Râsnâme fi
    Menâhîb ul-‘ulomâ ve‘l-meevâli ve‘l-fusulâ, and of which a MS is said to
    exist in Nezimoğlu library.
(3) M. Çetin, op. cit.
merely know that he died early in the reign of Sultan Murad III (982 - 1004).

While he is the author of twelve works including a divan, Latif is known chiefly as a tezkereci. His tezkere-i şu'arâ, completed in the year 953, is the second Ottoman work of this class. It comprises a lengthy mukaddime, three fasla and a hatime.

The mukaddime is devoted largely to the author's views on the poetic standards of his time, some general remarks on poets and poetry and the introduction to his tezkere. It begins with the traditional eulogies of God and the Prophet. The next subdivision of the exordium contains remarks on the excellence and virtues of poetry; the discourse is frequently interrupted by quotations from the Persian poets. In this section, too, Latif discusses the contention that poetry was first composed by Adam, a theme also to be found in Fehim, the thirteenth century collector and translator of several Persian tezkeres (1). After next praising at length the reigning pâdisâh, Sultan Suleymân, he continues his introduction with an explanation of the reasons which led him to compose this work. In this conventional apology Latif expresses his opinion of many contemporary poets and, voices dissatisfaction with the debased values of the critics of his generation, when the true poet found little appreciation while honours were showered on the mountebank poetasters. Over a century later similar criticism will be made by the tezkereci Gürti. Then follows an account of the immediate reason for the composition of the work: a friend, who although unnamed here we learn in a later section of the work was the

(1) Safine-i şu'arâ, p.6.
Mowed Lu’fi of Kastamonu, has read to him from Cemî’s Baharistân and has urged the author to collect his own evrâk-i peripan into a tezkere in order that the memory of the poets of Rûm should remain forever alive in this transitory world. Lu’fi feels some reluctance to comply with this request arguing that men of talent receive little reward or honour in this age and simply expose themselves to the malicious criticisms of the envious, but Za’ifi replies that the saints, too, were often despised and unrecognized in their own lifetime; he urges him to face up to his responsibilities and ignore his critics. Persuaded by this, Lu’fi undertakes to write such a work and immediately proceeds to an exposition of the classification of the poets (1). His most important thesis is that the true poet is the one who has an inborn inclination towards the composition of poetry. While anyone can learn to write poetry, only a few can breathe the spirit of originality into it. It is of some interest to remember that Lu’fi leaves the reader in no doubt as to which class of poets he himself belongs. He complains about those who put into verse the first idea that comes to their minds without due regard to sense and propriety. He criticizes, too, the "thieves" who steal from good poets and present another’s poems as their own by changing the ta’hallus. This high standard underlies Lu’fi’s whole attitude towards the work of the poets who feature in his tezkere. Referring to his work, Lu’fi says he has tried to do justice to the well-known poets and to those not so well-known, and turning to its contents, he enumerates the various aspects of the life and works of the poets which he mentions in it.

(1) Such introductory dialogues in explanation for the reasons of the composition of a work are a long standing convention of Islamic secular literature and one cannot attribute too much factual value to them.
laying particular emphasis on their characteristics as poets. The information on the biography and works of each poet has come, he declares, from the prose and poetic works which he searched out and studied for a long time and out of which he selected and recorded the famous lines and verses. So that the readers should not think that his own skill lay only in prose, he adds that he has, here and there, inserted a poem or a naẓīrāre of his own.

The təskere proper is in three parts: The first deals with the Nəṣəbīn, both those who originated from Rūm and those who came to Rūm from elsewhere and became famous in this land. The second part is devoted to five pədīgəhs and two şəhsədəs in chronological order. Into the third section are placed the poets who flourished from the time of Murād II to his own day. This faṣl is in strict alphabetical order. The idea of treating the poets in the aλıʃbə order is not Ləţİfı’s own. ʻAşık Çelebi says that it was he who first thought of using this system of classification and had mentioned it to Ləţİfı who promptly employed it for his own təskere before ʻAşık Çelebi himself could adopt it. Ləţİfı is silent on this and simply says that his poets are arranged according to the hurūr-i tehecəf system with due regard to the correct order of the letters of each name. The convenience which this system ensures more than compensates for the occasional injustice of giving precedence to an inferior poet over a greater one. In the third faṣl and immediately following his autobiography, Ləţİfı has a section entitled Taʃal-i aқşan-ı şir in which he discusses the two classes into which the learned (hükəmə) divide poets — those who are endowed with (vehbı) and those who acquire (kesbı) the ability to write poetry. In this section, too, the author mentions three of his own works as proof of his having originated a new prose style which employed proverbs in much the same way
as Necati used them in poetry. Latifi says that ten, perhaps even more than ten, tezkereas were written before his time, but that these were never copied, bought or sold. He no doubt includes Sefi's Hept Bhish among these unfamiliar biographies as his notice on the first tezkereci indicates that he was aware of its existence. Nowhere in his tezkere does Latifi even once refer to the Hept Bhish as a source for his own work. While it is possible that he was unable to obtain a copy of Sefi's work which seems to have been little known (1), certain similarities between the notices of some poets figuring in the two works are so striking as to leave little doubt of Latifi's dependence on his predecessor (2).

The hātime is used to register again Latifi's disappointment and dissatisfaction with the unfavourable times in which he lived and worked. It contains a solemn vow by the author not to write any more and he seems to have been true to his word, for he never continued his tezkere to bring it up to date neither is there record of his having written any other work subsequently, although he lived for almost forty years after the completion of the tezkere.

In several places in his introduction, Latifi expresses the fear that his frank judgments, his prose style and his work in general will not be appreciated and will induce unfair criticism from a crass, materialistic society devoid of literary taste. The mere study of some of the opinions expressed on him in other tezkerecis shows that his fears were not altogether groundless. The most serious charge brought against him was first made in no uncertain terms by his friend Aşık Çelebi, who citing several examples to prove his point,

(1) 'Ali Emiri's Introduction to Lütfi Paşa's Ḥaqal-nâme, pp.2-6. In European collections there are only three (GOW, p.67).
(2) L, pp. 96, 131, 289 and 325.
accuses him of clannishness (ta'asghub), of giving undue credit and publicity to his native town of Kastamonu and of incorrectly associating other well-known poets with this town. On account of this parochialism, states 'Arık Çelebi, Latifi's tezkere was called the Kastamonu-nâme by the zurafî-yi yarân. Kinaliżade, who drew upon 'Arık Çelebi for much of his information, reiterates this charge; this, however, does not prevent him from freely accepting these local poets in order to augment the number of entries in his own work. While 'Ahdî, who wrote several years before 'Arık Çelebi, makes the same accusation of clannishness, he is not so specific in his charges. It may be that 'Arık Çelebi is faithfully reporting the commonly held opinion in literary circles and that he does not mention it merely out of spite against Latifi for having appropriated the system of classification which he regards as his own. It is almost certain that Kinaliżade is merely echoing him and probably had no fixed opinion on the matter at all. In fact, a closer study of all the poets mentioned by Latifi as being from Kastamonu reveals that this accusation is exaggerated. Of the twenty-seven Kastamonu poets mentioned in Latifi, only four are omitted by his successors (1). While not all the remainder are specifically localized to this region (2), there is actually disagreement as to the place of origin in the case of only two poets (3). Even allowing for the servile dependence on predecessors and the ideals of inclusiveness characteristic of this genre, we can only judge that the Kastamonuluc which appear in Latifi

(1) Sena'i, Hamdi, Ferha and Mihani.
(2) 'Andelibi, Dâ'i, Hâdi, Harifi, Bâri, Şâmi, Şâvir, Şemâl, Şemâl and Şemâl.
(3) Şâm-yi Rûmi, Leylî.
were not thought utterly unworthy as poets by his continuators and critics. That there should be dispute in only two cases is actually surprising when one considers the haphazard and unsystematic ways in which such information had to be gathered by biographers.

Latif's prose style, too, was criticized by some tezkerecis. Riyâzlî says that it was weak in expression and Kınâlîzâde that, apart from not making good use of his material, his prose was only second-rate. ʿ Ağî ʿ Čelbî, on the other hand, praises him. According to him, there is no connection whatsoever between Sehî and Latifî, either in prose style or in the organization of the work, thereby finding the second tezkere superior to the first. He adds that with the exception of its parochialism, there is nothing in the work that is shameful. So considerable a professional literary man as ʿ Âlî, describes the tezkere as the best of its kind, in which every poet has been judged according to his desserts.

Latif himself claims to have written twelve works. Of these the tezkere-i ʿ u ʿ ʿ arâ has been printed (1), the rest are either in MS form or lost.

(1) Printed by Ahmed Gevdet at the İdân Maṭbaası in 1314. There is a summary of the work in German by Th. v. Chabert under the title of Latifî oder biographische Nachrichten von vorzuglichen türkischen Dichtern, nebst einer Bibliographie aus ihren werken, (Zurich, 1800). Based on the Istanbul printed edition and nine MSS, there is another German translation by C. Roscher entitled Latif's Tezkere, (Tubingen, 1950).
Divan. While Latif says that he collected 500 ıncala and 33 kapis ıns into a divan, there is no MS of it. A number of his poems are to be found in mecmû'ag and dispersed among the pages of his tezkereler.

Risâle-i evâr-i İstanbul. This work, of which there are several MSS in Istanbul (1), was completed in 931 and consists of a mukaddime, six fasla and a hâtima. In it are given the stories and descriptions of districts and buildings in Istanbul.

Fusul-i arba'a. A work in prose and verse describing the particularities of the four seasons. Following its serialization in the newspaper, 'Asîr, it was published by Tevfik Bey in Istanbul in 1287 under the title of Munâsâre-i Latif (2).

Rebi 'iyye-i esâr. Mentioned by 'Asîk Çelebi and 'Ali, this work is thought to be part of the Fusul-i arba'a on account of its subject and the fact that no MS of it exists (2).

Subʾat ul-ʿusâr. The Arabic text and Turkish translation of 100 hadîg. This work, of which there are several MSS, has a mukaddime and a hâtima in mevlevi form (3).

Naṣm ul-ʻevâbîr. It contains 207 sayings by 'Ali translated into Turkish (4).

Ahyâl-i İbrahim Paşa. Mentioned by 'Asîk Çelebi and reported to have been seen by 'Ali who gives it the title of

Vasif-i şaâf-nâme, this work appears to be lost.

(1) The title of this work is given as Vasif-i şehr-i İstanbul by 'Asîk Çelebi.
(2) 'CM, iii, 134.
(3) Rieu, 256a.
(4) Arkeoloji Müzesi (No. 341) ff. 40b-66b.
Baîs ül-fûsahe. One of the works named only by Leîtiff himself, but of which there appears to be no MS.

Esmâ' guwar ül-ju'ran. A poem of 29 bâyts enumerating the sûras of the Kur'ân (1).

Nasr ül-ale'âli. A versified translation of the Naşm ül-çeşâhir (2).

(1) University of Istanbul, (TY 902), ff. 115b-116a.
(2) 'OM, iii, 134.
Little information is to be found on the next tezkereci who wrote his work in Bagdad eighteen years after Lat iff's. Although he gives some details about his long journey to Istanbul in the introduction to his tezkere and a few scantly notes are scattered here and there in the body of the work (ff. 12a, 22a, 28a, 43a, 68b, 73b, 91b, 92a, 105b, 133a, 156a, 167a, and 169c) which throw some light on his acquaintances and his family, 'Ah d I does not give any adequate personal information which would assist us in sketching his biography. The other tezkerecis, too, say very little about his background, education, teachers and profession: 'Asl p Celebi (BN, Suppl. 1077, f.176b), Kitâlisâde (BN, Add. 24957, f.203b), Beyânî (f.131), Riyâî (f.88b), Kâfsâde (f.73b) and Şâdîîî (pp.281 and 295) (1) in general repeat what he says about himself and their remarks are more important as an indication of the esteem in which his work was held by subsequent writers in the same field. 'Ali (Es'ad Ef. 2162, f.500a) was the only one who had actually met him, but his contribution, too, is almost negligible. Katib Celebi, in the Kesf uz- szumun (1,388), bases his biographical notice on the makaddime of the tezkere in question.

Ahmed, whose nâmâs was 'Ahd I, was from the city of Bagdad. His use of the word va'坦 when referring to Bagdad seems to indicate that he was

(1) Mesc a vâl-havâl, (Tabriz, 1327).
a native of that city, and consequently, he is specified as ʿAhdi-yi Bağdādī in most of the sources. His father was a member of the ʾulema class called Şemsi-yi Bağdādī, who appears to have been the author of three ʾanvari. He is mentioned in Şadi as being ardent ʿArīf, while Riyādī (1) knows only that he was the father of ʿAhdi. Among the poets ʿAhdi has in his tezkere there are four members of his own family: Şemsi, his father, is treated in the same style as the other poets and we are told that he had written three ʾanvari which he dedicated to Sultan Suleyman and that his gazels were collected into a ʾdīvān. His elder brother was known as Riza; he associated with poets and wits and often left his country for the purpose of trading until his death in 963. Murādī (2), his younger brother, was still alive in 970. His cousin Hindi (3) also collected a ʾdīvān. We may gather from the statements of ʿAşık Çelebi and Kınılisüde that ʿAhdi was a respected member of the Bagdad community.

ʿAhdi's date of birth, the type of education which he received and his occupation are unknown. In his notice on a certain poet ʿArīf of Yenişehir, mentioned by no one else, ʿAhdi says that he learned and completed his knowledge of many sciences from him (4). As this occurred while he was in Rūm, we may assume that one of the purposes of his travels was to complete his education under some of the recognized scholars of his time. He also mentions his association with certain other poets, but the vagueness of his remarks does not allow us to infer that he was their pupil.

(1) Şemsi is mentioned in only one MS of Riyādī's tezkere (Mu'roosmaniye, 3724).
(2) GOD, ii, 526.
(3) GOD, ii, 423.
(4) Ḥādīpayindan çok maʿārif tahsil u tekmīl idūb ............
In the year 940, 'Ali was appointed defterdar of Bagdad. On his arrival about forty local poets presented him with their kəsîdes, tərhəs and kəzəlas. Among these poets he mentions 'Abdî, Mevlâna Țarzî (1) and Bûnî (2).

'Abdî set out on his journey to Rum in 960 accompanied by a friend, also a poet, whose name was İhsan (3). They went from place to place, travelling along the dangerous roads, journeying with, calling on and meeting old and young, mendicant and sultan. After having seen new places and increased their knowledge, they finally reached Istanbul. Nowhere in the account of the journey given in the mukaddime does 'Abdî mention the name of the towns he visited or of the people he met. However, in the notices on the poets, he indicates those he came in contact with and the places of his acquaintance with them. Apart from Istanbul, we know that he went to Bursa and Edirne. Temerrûd 'Ali Paşa (4), Pervîs Ef (5), Rıșâ'Î Ef (6), Emîrî (7), Țemîrî (8), Țâtemî (9), Țarîfî (10),

(1) Ah, f. 119a.
(2) Probably İhsan-ı Bagdaûû who died in 1014.
(3) And not Şerîfî as Rue (Cat. Turk. Man., 76b) reads. The name is contained in the mûammâ-

جیشُ کُردهُ خُیال قَرَلَهُ ای سَرُو رُوْا، سَرُو بَیْسُ یُوُرُوُنَ مُوَا مَهْلیّرُ هُمَان

The solution of which appears to be like (mîsâl) خو و in the midst of it a رُسُو has almost grown, i.e. the first two letters of سُرُو, giving the name خو.

(4) A pasa of Anadolu (Ah, f.12a).
(5) 'Atâ'I 253: Was kâzî of Bagdad from 955-957 when 'Abdî was still there. The two men could have met later when Pervîs was kâzî of Edirne from 965-968. He was kâzî of Istanbul from 968-971 and kâzî-ascîr of Anadolu in 971. He died in 987.
(6) 'Atâ'I 24: 'Abdulkerîn born in Dinîtîka in 924. 'Abdî probably met him when he was a mûellîfâ in Bursa in 967. He died in 985.
(7) Edîmeli Bûralâh who died in 963 and whom 'Abdî met both in Istanbul and Edirne.
(8) There is no record of 'Acsnâde Țemîrî in any other source. 'Abdî says that he met him when he came to Bagdad.
(9) Aş, f.251b: Mehmed b. Mahsûîd of Burgûs between Edirne and Istanbul. 'Abdî met him both in Edirne and Istanbul. He died in 1004.
(10) Known only to 'Abdî, he was from Yeniçehir in Rumeli.
Mecci (1) and Nev'i (2) are the individuals 'Ahdî says he met and associated with during his stay in Rûm.

'Ahdî stayed in Rûm for about ten years. In the year 971 he returned to Bagdad and there he began collecting all the information he had acquired on the poets of Rûm during his association with the people of Rûm, into a tezkere. The title of this work, the only one which 'Ahdî is known to have written, Gûlân-i Su'arâ is also the date of compilation - 971.

All that is known about 'Ahdî after his return to Bagdad, is given by Riyâzî. The subsequent biographer says that his father, Bûgîlî Muṣṭafâ b. Mehemed, was judge of Bagdad when 'Ahdî gave him a kâşide which led to friendly intercourse between them. Muṣṭafâ b. Mehemed was in Bagdad in the year 989 (3).

None of the early sources give the date of 'Ahdî's death. Riyâzî is the only tezkereci who indicates that he died towards the end of the reign of Sulṭân Murâd III which came in 1004. Mehemed Süreyyâ's statement that the biographer died in 1002 is probably correct, but his source could not be found (4).

On his return to Bagdad, 'Ahdî decided to collect all the information which he had been able to gather on the poets of Rûm, through hearsay, at first hand and by actually studying them, in the form of a tezkere. Unlike his predecessors, he does not give the conventional reasons for compiling his work. It

(1) 'Atâ'I 334; Mehemed of Edirne. Died in 999 while still a mülâzim.
(3) 'Atâ'I, 295, iii, 609.
(4) Sicill-i 0smâni. The fact that 'Ahdî met Riyâzî's father in 989 disproves Kâtib Çelebi's statement (1, 387) that he died in 980.
is possible, however, that his great admiration for Rûm and its inhabitants, and, the fact that at every opportunity he speaks of the kindness and hospitality which he was given there, may have prompted him to write the tezkere as a token of his appreciation. In addition, he says that, as well as dedicating the work to Şehzade Selim, he is making a present of it to the young and old of Bagdad. He may, therefore, have had a dual reason for compiling the Gûlûn-i Şu'arâ; to thank the people of Rûm and to inform the citizens of Bagdad.

The Gûlûn-i Şu'arâ is composed of a mukaddime, three or four faşls and a tarih.

The mukaddime opens with the usual eulogies of God, the Prophet and the reigning pâdişâh, Sultan Süleyman Khanû. Then follows a eulogy on Şehzade Selim, who became Sultan Selim II on his accession three years later, to whom the work is presented. The rest of the mukaddime is devoted to an account of the author's journey into Rûm, his stay in Istanbul and a short description of the tezkere. The section ends with another eulogy on Selim and a tarih giving the date of writing as 971.

While the contents of the Gûlûn-i Şu'arâ are arranged into four faşls in the MS which has been used, there are apparently some in which the contents are in three faşls (1). The faşls are as follows:

1. Sultan, şehzâdes and statesmen.
2. The ʿulemâ class.
3. The sancak-beys and defterdârs.
4. The poets.

(1) Keaf üç-zümûn, i, 387 and Türk şairleri, i, 261.
When there are only three fāsils, the third section given above is merged with the section on the poets.

In the tetime 'Ahdī uses the conventional method of calling attention to the fact that the work has been honoured by the inclusion in it of the name of the Şehsāde and the ʿulāmāʾ and that the poems given in it have rendered it distinguished. The tetime closes with apologies for errors and short-comings, and, with the request for a prayer for the author.

In the mukaddimah and throughout the tezkere, 'Ahdī gives the impression that all the biographical information which he supplies, has been acquired either directly from the poets concerned or, indirectly, from others who knew them. A thorough search for internal evidence that he used material borrowed from the two tezkeres which preceded his yields very little to prove the contrary, at any rate in the case of the poets of Rûm. Only in the notices on ʿIqṣī (1), Ḥandi (2),

(1) Ah, f.130b; Istanbul mukābelesinde vâkı' olan Üskûdar nâm kaşabadandır. Babası dergah-i malla yeniçeri-lerinden îmiş, kendî de ol böldünde iken nâğah gerdîs-i devr-i Fâleke 963 'de temininde bir ʿarîza peydâ olmuş, hismetde kusur ve sahmet-le renür olduğu seelden ʿulûfesin kemâlâr.


The only two poems given by Sehî are to be found in 'Ahdî.

(2) Ah, f.145b, Se, p.135, L, p.275. Ahdī gives five bârta for Ḥandi; two are the only bârta given by Sehî and the other three are a târîh given by Lâṭîfî.
Kudsi (1) and Helâki (2) are there any similarities to suggest that he had the Heşt Bîhîst and the tezkere of Laţîfî in front of him when he was preparing the mûsvedde of the Gûlşen-i Şu'arâ. He seems to have made greater use of the Heşt Bîhîst which he does not mention anywhere and the author of which is not even included in the faşî on poets, than the tezkere of Laţîfî whom he regards as the compiler of a tezkere-i Şu'arâ which had no success because of its parochialism.

'Ahî's style is simple, usually to the point and devoid of the artistry, often very tiresome and obscure, which will be witnessed in the subsequent works of this nature. His clauses, usually well-balanced, are easily isolated without harm to the narrative. While his Persian background allows him full use of attractive and picturesque language, the frequent repetition of words suggests a limited vocabulary.

In general, the judgments of the critics are favourable. They all express surprise at his achievement despite his persianism. AŞÎK Çelebi says that his tezkere is 'well studied' and he himself frank with the Rûmîs. KiNâLÎ-zâde, who is copied by Beyânî, finds his poetry 'rûmî' and masterly, which he thinks is not usual for Persians. 'ÂLÎ says that he attempted to write a tezkere

(1) Ah, f.146a: İstanbuludur. Şehîkan şehr-i mezbûrun emîni olan Bâyesîd Çelebi'nin oğludur. 6îl-i 'ilm şâmresinden, tabî'at-î patri câmbî-i şî're mâ'îl, ol fende hayîi kâblîdir.
Se, p.134: İstanbul emîni olan Bâyesîd Çelebi'nin oğludur. Tabî'at-î şî're Fiyesi var, hayî fâhî Yigitdir.
Both Ahî and Sehî give the one and only bevt.
(2) Ah, f.130: Karâmânîdir. 'Ilm-i şâhîre meggül ve yârân içre 'ilînîn mecbûl olmek hare iken ferâgât olmaytâ.....şî're mâ'îl olub.....
Se, p.136: Karâmânîdir. 'Ilm-i şâhîre meggül iken ferâgât idûb şî're heves itdî.
The only two bevts given by Sehî are also given by 'Ahî.
of the poets of Rûm forgetting that he was Persian. Riyâsi, who refrains from making any personal comments, says that because it was not acceptable to the hard to please, the tezkerê 'was laid in the corner of oblivion'.

The Gâlên-i Şu'arâ numbers among the shorter tezkereş and the biographical detail contained in it is meagre. On the other hand it is a useful Ottoman source for the poets who flourished in the Eastern fringes of the empire. Furthermore, the author's travels in Rûm allowed him to hear of and meet several poets who lived in Rûm, but who never found a place in the other tezkereş.
In comparison with those of Latiff, details of the life of 'Ashiq Çelebi are more abundant, and his ancestry can be traced as far back as his great-grandfather.

The chief source of information for the biography of this tezkereci is his own work. Its introduction and the individual notices on members of his own family and other poets contain a wealth of detail which, when supplemented by the information supplied by 'Ata-i (161), enable us to follow his career and to depict his character fairly accurately. Among the tezkerecis who mention him Latiff (p.237) who knew him personally, but who wrote his tezkere twenty years before the death of 'Ashiq, does little more than ascribe to him the translation of a Persian work. 'Abdî (f.124a) devotes his notice on him to a few remarks on his prose and poetry. Kinâlîzâde (f.163b) and Beyânî (f.108) after him, base their information on 'Ashiq's tezkere. Riyâfî (f.77a) confines himself to a few comments on his work. All the details given by Bursalî Belîg in his 'Güldeste' (p.148b) are taken from 'Ata-i and as such does not represent a primary source.

Some time before the year 806, Emîr Buğârî (1) left his native land of Buğârâ and began a journey into Rûm. On his way there he passed through Bagdad where he met and was offered hospitality by Seyyid Mehmed un-Natţâ in whose company he later travelled to Bursa. They both settled in the latter place and

(1) Meçdi 76. Seyh Semsüddîn Mehmed b. 'Ali Hüseyînî. Married the daughter of Bâyezîl 1 and died in 833.
Seyyid Mehmed married the daughter of İshek Paşa, Sultan Bayezid Yıldırım's vezir. He was then appointed Şeyh and mütevelli of the evkâf of the Ebü İshek zaviye which was especially built for him by order of the sultan. At the same time he was made naqib ül-eşrâf. During the interregnum which followed Timür's defeat of Bayezid Yıldırım near Ankara, Seyyid Mehmed was a prisoner of war and then, on his release, went to live in the Syrian town of Şafed where he earned a living as a leather worker (naṭṭa‘). He returned to Rûm and died there during the reign of Murâd II (825-855). His son, Mehmed Zeynül-‘Abidîn, performed the same duties as his father and died after 886. He in turn had a son called ‘Alî who was appointed kâşî of İnegöl in 918 and subsequently of Kırtoa, Üsküb and Şofya. He was the son-in-law of Mü‘eyyedzade ‘Abdurrahman Efendi (1) and died in 941 while kâşî of Filibe.

It was from this family that Pir Mehmed, better known as ‘Asîk Qelebi, came. He was born in 926 (2) in Prizrin (3) while his father, ‘Alî Qelebi who was kâşî of Üsküb at the time, was on an inspection tour of the above kâşâba. He was one of five children whom ‘Alî Qelebi had by the daughter of Mü‘eyyedzade ‘Abdurrahman Efendi. Of the other four we know only his elder brother Mehmed (4) who wrote poetry under the mehlas of Şâki and who died in 946.

‘Asîk Qelebi came from a family very closely connected with the ʻulema class. His father was a kâşî and his maternal grandfather a kâşî-‘asker.

---

(1) Meçdi 308. Born in Amasya in 868 ‘Abdurrahman b. ‘Alî Mü‘eyyedzade was kâşî-‘asker of Rûm in 911 and again from 919 to 920. Died in Istanbul in 922. His mehlas was ‘Hâşemî’.
(2) His date of birth is given in his father’s tarih. In some MSS, however, it is given as 927 making the date 927 and not 926.
(3) Kâmûs ul-‘a‘lam ii, 1496.
(4) Apparently given as Mehmûd in some MSS (Köprüli, IA cuz 9, p.695, ‘Asîk Qelebi).
It was in this atmosphere of learning that he grew up and was educated. In his
mukaddime he goes into great detail about his early misfortunes following the death,
first of his mother and then in 941 of his father, when he was fifteen. His good
family connections and the help of his father's colleagues, however, enabled him
to receive the best possible education and to train for the highest offices.
Being the grandson of as highly esteemed an official as the hāfi-‘asker Mū‘ayyedsāde
and the fact that in several places in his tawkīre he mentions his closeness to
Fenārī Muḥyīlūdīn Efendi (1) allowed him to meet and to train under some of the
famous teachers and scholars of his time. Among those he mentions as having played
a major role in his up-bringing and education are the müderris of Ḳāsim Paşa,
Sūrū‘i Čelebi (2), the müderris of Kalenderhāne Taşköprüsāde Efendi (3), ‘Arabsāde
‘Abdulbā‘l Efendi the müderris of Maḥmūd Paşa (4), a müderris at the Şāhan, Şāqīl
Emīr Efendi (5), Karasilī Ḥasan Čelebi (6) and Ebu‘ṣu‘ūd Efendi. He completed his
studies under Muḥyīlūdīn Fenārī who was one of his uncles, but did not qualify as
a mālasīm. He left the line of service for which he had been training and,
according to ‘Atā‘ī, travelled. Throughout his tawkīre there are incidental
interpolations which indicate that he associated with members of the ‘ulāma class
and was often in the company of poets both old and famous, and young and unknown.

(1) Medī 387. Muḥyīlūdīn Ğ. b. Mehmed b. ‘Alī b. Ḳusūf Bābī b. Şamsūdīn
al-Fenārī. From 949-952. Died in 954. His Mevlān was Muḥyīl.
After his arrival in Istanbul in 942 he became friendly with great poets like Zādī, Arnavud Yaḥyā and Ṣaydā. Among the younger poets whom he says he met during this period of his life were Maḥvī (1), Ṣun‘ī (2) and Ṣaydā (3).

We next hear of ʿĀṣīḥ in Bursa as secretary at a sērī' a court alongside the poet Sa‘yī (4). In 948 he was appointed mūṭevallī of the evkāf of Buṭr Sultān in the same town. It appears that he held this post for about five years. While there, in the year 950 (5), he was stricken with the plague. He was very ill and at one time he was thought to be dead, but he finally recovered (5). In 953 he was dismissed from his post as mūṭevallī following an adverse report on him by Rūṣenīzādē (6) the mīdērīs of the Murādiyeh who was sent on an inspection of the evkāf of Bursa. In the same year he returned to Istanbul. The reason for his dismissal is not known, but ʿĀṣīḥ expresses some disappointment at his removal from an office which allowed him to live in Bursa which he liked and on which he wrote a ʿSēhr-i engīz in 948.

(1) AǦ, f.118b; Istanbullu Bazār bağı oğlu Nūsaiyīn Čelebi.
(2) AǦ, f.210b; Bursali Ṣun‘ullūh b. Mevlīdī Čīsān.
(3) AǦ, f.244b; Istanbulin. Died in 938.
(4) Tirevī Namakzādē Ramāzān. Died about 960.
(5) Köprülü (IA, cūs 9, p.696). Gives the date as 953. In his notice on Ḥayālī AǦ gives the date as 952. However, one day when the poet Buṭr visited him, a companion of his, who was with him, thought AǦ was dead and said the following tārīḫ which gives the date 950. AǦ who overheard this opened his eyes and answered with another tārīḫ which also gives the date as 950.
(6) ʿAṯār 28, Ni‘mētullūh b. ʿAlī b. Rūṣenī. Mīdērīs of Murādiyeh in Bursa in 949. Died in Bagdad in 969. It is because of this report, ʿAṯār says, that AǦ devotes very little space to Rūṣenīzādē in his tezkere.
After his return to Istanbul from Bursa 'Asîk, with the help of Sağlı Emîr Efendi (1), his former teacher and at that time kâmil of Istanbul, was made secretary to a mahlkane where his friend Şûrî held a similar post. In 954 his last teacher Mûhîeddîn Fenârî died before 'Asîk, who must have decided that it was time he returned to his original profession, could apply to him for his mülâzamet. It appears that he was refused it by those in power because he lacked proof of his having studied under a master and of having completed the training that was necessary to become a mülâzin. It was Sağlı Emîr Efendi who again assisted him in proving that he had been dânişmand to Mûhîeddîn Fenârî and in 954 or early 955 he was registered as a mülâzin by Bustan Efendi the kâmil-asker of Rûm. 'Atâ'î attributes 'Asîk's laudatory notice on Bustan Efendi in 'Asîk's Arabic zavâl to the Sakkâ'îk-i Hu'mâniye to this favour.

It is not known how 'Asîk occupied himself or in what capacity he was employed during the two or three years that followed his registration. We hear of him again only in 957 when he is appointed kâmil of Silivri. We learn from one of the tarîhs of the poet Bursalî Kandî that he was married that year. In his notice on Rîzâ'î (2), he says that he returned to Istanbul while he was still in service in Silivri, when one of his relations died. It was during this visit that he lost one of his fingers in a riding accident.

With the help of some of his influential friends, 'Asîk was sent from Silivri to Priştine as kâmil at a date which is not given in any of the sources. There he associated with the poet Levî (3), and came across the dîvân of 'Abî Hâlîm (4).

(1) AÔ, f.302.
(2) AÔ, f.309b.
(3) Levî of Priştine.
(4) Mehmed Çulêmi who died in 951.
His next post was Serfiçe where, we understand, he was very happy. In his mükaddime Āşık gives a ganzel (1) in which he describes the beauty of this town. It was here too, in the year 964, that he collected all the poems which he had previously written, in the form of a divān at the end of which he included some of his shorter prose works. This done, he contemplated giving the finishing touches to the tezkere, the müavedde of which he had begun some fourteen years earlier, before becoming mütevelli (2). His sudden dismissal from the kāṣa of Serfiçe, however, further delayed the work which eventually made him famous. He was left without a post for several months and apparently with no means of earning a living. In a poem written on the occasion of his appointment to Narda, his next kāṣa (1), he complains bitterly about his plight and expresses dissatisfaction with the injustice of some of his superiors. In the same poem he forsees a long spell of bad luck. His predictions are proved correct by his dismissal from Narda and his posting to Manavgat on the Mediterranean coast of Anatolia. Āşık claims that his dismissal from Narda was due to another adverse report on him, this time by the voysoda of Narda, Ferruh Katbudā. Āşık, in several places in the tezkere, speaks with delight of his sojourns in Rumeli where he was born and which he loved; he even states his preference for the Eastern parts of this province. While a post anywhere in Rumeli would have made him happy he considers his appointment to Manavgat, in Anatolia and so far from Istanbul and Rumeli, as exile. He expresses his feelings in a tarih which he coined to mark his posting (2) in 970. His bitterness is further revealed by a long passage in the mükaddime

1. Arta in Greece.
2. The operative word in this tarih is "şâlîm" which adds up to 970.
in which he accuses certain minor officials of fabricating charges against him and of telling lies in high places in order to have him dismissed from his office in Rumeli and sent to Anatolia which he hated. He pleads for justice and a better post and resigns himself to his fate. He did not, however, stay very long in Manavgat. His influential friends and a taşısı of one of the padişah's poems, presented to Sultān Suleyman, secured for him the każı of Nikbuli. Soon after that he was made każı of Černovi in Eastern Rumeli. The dates of these postings are not given in the sources, but a tarih by the poet Şehişi indicates that the last took place in 971 (1). The capital of Černovi was Ruscuk (2) and ʿAşık was delighted that his appointment to this province had taken him to his favourite town. He compares Ruscuk on the Danube with Bagdad on the Euphrates and lavishes praises on Černovi and its capital. In the mukaddime he gives a poem which has the name 'Tuna' as its radix in which he says that he watched the Danube for seven years. This indication of the length of his stay in Ruscuk is probably exaggerated, since he went there in 971 and wrote his mukaddime in 976 after he had gone to another town. While some of his colleagues and immediate superiors might have been responsible for his previous dismissals on account of their jealousy or dislike of him, his character and disrespectful behaviour were probably also to blame for some of his misfortunes. The circumstances which led to his dismissal from Černovi is a good example of this.

Towards the end of the year 973, when the royal barge passed in front of Ruscuk on its way to Belgrade as part of the expedition against Sigitvar, ʿAşık refused

(1) AG, f.201b.
(2) Given as 'Rūs' by ʿAşık.
to send his own boat to welcome it. A certain 'Ali Re'is who was in charge of the barge was most indignant and upon his reporting the incident to the divân, 'Aşık was dismissed from his post. The following year Sultan Süleyman died and was succeeded by Selim II in 974. 'Aşık presented a lâmiye ğazel to the new pâdişâh who was on his way back to Istanbul from Belgrade. In return for this poem he was appointed to Kırıova with a stipend of 150 akçes. Having completed his turn of office, he was dismissed from there in 976.

In the same year, however, he completed the compilation of his tezkere-i şu'arâ and presented it to Selim II. At the same time he presented his şevâl to the Şekâ'îk-i Na'mâniye to the şadâr-i a'zam Sokollu Mehemmed Pasa. In the mukaddime of the tezkere 'Aşık asks for the post of nakîb ül-eğraf which his great-grandfather had received for himself and his descendants. Instead 'Aşık was appointed kâzî of Üsküb for life. ‘Ağâ’î says that when 'Aşık went to report to the Şeyhülislâm Ebüüssu‘ûd Efendi before going to his new post, he was asked whether he was going to the town of Üsküb whose beauties, İshaç Çelebi had once said, killed their lovers (1). In fact, adds ‘Ağâ’î, this angry was right, because after he went there, 'Aşık became enamoured of a beauty named Mehemmed Şah and died there of pleurisy at the age of 53, towards the end of Şâbân in the year 979 (2).

Both the tezkereci himself and subsequent writers have left enough details on his life for us to form a fairly good idea of ‘Aşık’s character. He appears to have been popular with those he lived and worked among and to have left

(1) Meccâ 468. İshaç Çelebi b. İbrâhîm Üskübî. Died in 943.

(2) The poet Bursalî Cenâni who died in 1004, gave the following târlîh for ‘Aşık’s death:

979

Evlîya Çelebi (Seyât-nâme, v, 560), says that this târlîh was written on ‘Aşık’s tombstone in the tezkere of Lükman Hekim in Üsküb.
behind a favourable impression, mainly, on account of his generosity and joviality. ʿAtaʾ I says that when he was kāfer of Üsküb in the year 1022, the inhabitants of the town still talked about his liberality, kindness and happiness. His mode of living and his behaviour suggest that he was light-hearted, frivolous and rather disrespectful to his immediate superiors who, on more than one occasion avenged themselves by having him dismissed from his posts. In many of the sources he is described as being free and easy and somewhat debauched. One biographer speaks of him as one who could not resist a pretty face or a slim figure. As well as poetry and prose, he is also said to have been addicted to wine and women.

ʿAṣk, brought up according to the highest traditions of Islamic culture, was well versed in both Persian and Arabic. The fact that he versified in both languages and even wrote a geyl to the ʿakāʾik-i Nuʿmāniye in Arabic is sufficient proof of his proficiency. Although he was the translator of several Arabic books on religious subjects, his main interest seems to have been literature and in particular, philology and poetry. The sources are almost unanimous in their praise of his prose and verse. In keeping with the conventions of his time, his prose style was rather ornate. His poetry, on the other hand, was comparatively simple. Descriptions of towns he lived in and their beauties seemed to have been his favourite subjects for verse. His amorous nature also made him write poetry on love and the joys of life.

It appears that it was solely his interest in literature, and especially, the history of literature, which made him decide to compile a biography of poets, since he does not state one of the traditional reasons for writing it. Like Sehī, he too, was inspired by the Persian tezkerecis. In
his introduction he mentions Devletşah's Tezkere uş-Su'arā, Cem'i's Beharistan, 'Alî Şir Nevâ'i's Mecalis un-Nefâ'is and, a work which was not known to Sehî, Hekim Şah Mehmed Kaavînî's Zeyl (1) to Nevâ'i's work. He had met and been friendly with Laţîf some time before the latter wrote his own work on the biographies of poets. It had been decided between them that Laţîf should arrange his material into sections each representing the reign of a sultan and that 'Aşik, who claims to have been the first to have the idea, into one section with the poets in it arranged in alphabetical order. Shortly after this, however, in 953, Laţîf, who, like 'Aşik, had already collected enough material, completed his tezkere in alphabetical order, leaving 'Aşik to devise another method of classification if he did not want to copy Laţîf. Greatly distressed by Laţîf's failure to keep his promise, 'Aşik put away his Müşvedde and did not actually complete his tezkere until twenty-three years later.

'Aşik's tezkere-i şu'arā, named the Meşā'ir uş-Su'arā, is one of the longest and best of its kind. It consists of a long Mukaddime and a section on the biographies of the poets.

The Mukaddime is devoted, mainly, to the history of literature, an account of the last twenty years of the author's life and a description of the work. He deals firstly with speech and how it distinguishes man from animal, then divides writing into prose and poetry and continues with a dissertation on the superiority of the latter to the former, mentioning and discussing, in passing, rhyme and meter. In a Teşbîb which follows he gives a superficial review of the

(1) Kese' üz-gümûn, ii, 1591; Turkish translation of the Mecalis un-Nefâ'is by Şah Mehmed b. Mübârek al-Kazvinî al-Hekîm.
evolution of poetry, and literature in general, among the Ottomans from the time of Murad I (764-792) to his own days, laying particular stress on the contributions of sultans Süleyman and Selim to the rapid development of poetry and prose through their patronage of the arts. Since it is divided into several parts, each representing a reign, this, in a sense, constitutes the section, in the Meş'ir uş-Şu'arā, which, in the other tezkereas, is set aside for the praise of the royal poets. This is followed by a subdivision of the muğaddime entitled Sebeb-i terkîn-i ḥurûf ve tansîn-i şufûf. In it the author introduces himself with the conventional taṣâre' and describes the hardships which he suffered by being left an orphan at an early age. In vain-glorious terms he then gives an account of his perseverance in and application to his studies, his achievements in the field of literature and the various ways in which he acquired an immense amount of knowledge, the possession of which, despite the discouraging and disparaging judgments of his critics, made him rank among the greatest men of letters in the realm. He then turns to the earlier tezkereas which, he says, he studied very closely naming those of Devletşah, Câmi, Nevâ'i and ھکیم ہکھ سہ ھکسیمی. Referring to the Ottoman tezkerees he mentions Sehî and Latîfî (1). He extols the former for being the originator of this type of literary work in the Ottoman language and his Heşât Biharîş for the success it has had. 'Asîî's remarks on Latîfî are confined to the dispute between them, already alluded to, concerning the classification of the poets in their tezkereas. There follows an account of the years he spent in various kaşâs when his müsvedde remained unattended to.

(1) He does not mention 'Abdî's Gülşen-i Şu'arâ although he was aware of its existence.
He says, however, that during this interval he kept adding to his material in the hope that one day, free of the misfortunes which his profession had led him to, he would be able to return to it. That he, in fact, never ceased to collect information for the tezkere is indicated by the interest which he showed in poets and especially their divına, mecmü‘es and cünké wherever he went. Despite the frequent changes of domicile, he kept in touch with friend and poets by letter. He declares that he finally finished his work on the Meşâ‘ir us-Su‘arā in 976, probably while he was kâzî of Kırçãova, and presented it to Sultân Selîm II to whom the muqaddime is dedicated. In the six muşĕpes which follow he displays further learning by referring to the works of Guvenî (1), Hoca Mënâ-yi İsfahânî (2) and Vaşşāf (3) which, he says, were well received and suggests that since he has written his own work for the greatest of muqaddı̈s, he should be given a corresponding reward. He then admits that in order not to imitate Latîfî, he is adopting the abjad alphabetical system for the classification of his poets.

Before beginning his notices on the poets, he ends the muqaddı̈me by giving the names of the various verse forms and states that, because his work is not a tezkere-i şu‘arā, but a history of poetry, he is calling it the Meşâ‘ir us-Su‘arā.

While 'Aşı̇k obtained some of the biographical detail on the poets which he includes in the second and by far the largest part of his tezkere, from the biographies which preceded his, an important part of it is the outcome of his independent research and personal study of the poets and their works. He was friendly with many of his contemporaries, the older among whom could supply him with second-hand material on earlier poets. He showed amazing perseverance and

(2) Ibid, ii, 1121.
spared no effort in his quest for a better knowledge of the poets who flourished in his own day. He followed them into public baths, interrupted their games of chess or accosted them in the streets or gardens. This method of investigation has given his tezkere a character different to that of his predecessors and there is much in the Meşâ'ir which cannot be found in other tezkeres. The author gives descriptions, at times lengthy, of places and people and often goes into detail on a certain poet's habits and characteristics, adding a human element to the book which distinguishes it from all other works of this type. His style is ornate and, in places, difficult to understand, but many passages are instructive and make very pleasant reading.

Apart from the Meşâ'ir uş-Su'arâ for which he is mainly remembered, 'Āsîk was the author of several other works.

Zeyl-i Şehâ'îk-i Mu'mâniyê: Asîk also appears to have written a separate translation of this work in Turkish (1) The zeyl was presented to Sokollu Mehmed Paşa and the translation to Taşköprüsâde.

Ravzât uş-Sühedâ: A Turkish translation of the Persian work by Hzseyin b. 'Allî al-Kâşîfî known as Vâ'îz (2). Its completion can be dated to before 953 by the fact that it is mentioned in Lâţîfî's tezkere finished on that date.

At-tîbr uş-mesbûk fi nasâ'îh il-mülik: Turkish translation of the work by İmân Abî Hâmid Mehmed al-Gasâli (3).


(1) 'Atâ'î, 163; Keşf uş-quire, i, 1057.
(2) Keşf uş-quire, i, 926; Storey, 212.
(3) Keşf uş-quire, i, 337; GAL, G.ı, 419.
(4) Keşf uş-quire, i, 916; GAL, G.ıı, 429.
Micraç iil-cvâle ve minhâc di-‘adâle (1): Translation of Ibn Taymiye’s As-siyânîs- 
up-sarâ’iyya II ışlah ur-râ’iyya presented to Selîm II.

Abâdî’s arba’în: ‘Âtâ’î is alone in attributing two works by this name to ‘Âşık, 
one a translation and the other an original compilation.

Siget VARâNE: An account in verse of Suleyman’s expedition to Sigetvar.

Mezmû‘a-î Şükû: Mentioned only by ‘Âtâ’î.

Sehrenîzî: On the town of Bursa (2) written in 948.

Dîvân: Collected while ‘Âşık was hâfi of Seferîse (3).

The judgements on ‘Âşık’s work by those who followed him vary.
‘Âhâdî very succinctly states that he was matchless in prose and poetry. Kınâlî- 
zade expresses wonder at the fact that while ‘Âşık’s verse was better than his prose 
which was devoid of charm and beauty, he is famous as a prose-writer and is 
umbered among the minaçis. But, he adds, his study of the poets is sound.

Beyânî merely summarises Kınâlisâde’s remarks. Riyâzî, while admitting that he 
seldom committed errors in historical facts, likens his prose to the verses of 
Nasreddîn Hoca and says that it did not have any success among the hard-to-please.

‘Alî’s opinion is that he was thorough and gave each poet his due and the only 
flaw in the tezkere is that he included in it many who were not poets in order to 
win his bread and butter and please some of his friends. Lastly, Bursalî Belîğ 
thinks he is unique in his study and that his anecdotes are delicate and pleasant.

(1) Kefîf üz-zîmûn, ii, 1011; GAL, G.ii, 105 and 446; ǦM, ii, 507, MSS of this 
work exist in the Aşir Ef. library in Istanbul and the library of Manastîr.
(2) Kefîf üz-zîmûn, ii, 1068.
(3) Ibid, i, 799.
The last tezkereci of the 10th century, Hasan Çelebi Kinalizade, was also from an established ʿulema family.

Biographical details can be found in Kinalizade's tezkere on his father and various other members of his family. His great-grandfather is mentioned in Meclî 198, and he and his father in ʿAṭāʾî 164 and 491. Of the tezkerecis, Beyâni refers only to his tezkere in his muḥaddīne giving no details of his life. Likewise, Rişā (p.30), Riyāzî (f.41b) and Ḫâfsâde (f.33b) add nothing to what is given in ʿAṭāʾî and what comments they make are confined to his work. Kāṭib Çelebi (Keşf ʿin-ṣûrûn i,387) makes a short statement on the tezkere, but gives his life, as found in ʿAṭāʾî, in full in the Fezleke (p.240). Peşevî (ii,458) gives a few lines on his father. ʿAlî (f.497b & tezvîl) gives biographical notes and criticizes his tezkere.

Kinalizade's great-grandfather, ʿAbdulkâdir, was from the kaşaba of Isparta in the vilâyet of Ḥamîd. He served as teacher to Sultan Mehmed II who dismissed him on the advice of his vezîr-i aʿzan Mehmed Paşa (1). He went back to his native town and died there. Because he used henna his descendants became known as the Kinalizâdes. His son, ʿEmrûllâh, was also from Isparta and, according to his grandson, was a contemporary of Necâti. He died in 967 while he was kâfi somewhere in Anatolia. His son, ʿAlî Çelebi, the tezkereci's father, was born in Isparta in 916. He began his education with ʿKâdrî Efendi (2) and, after the

(1) Included in all tezkeres as the poet ʿAdemî (or ʿAdli) who died in 878.
year 938, trained under Ma'âlûl Ebrî Efendi (1), Sinân Efendi (2), Merâhâbâ Efendi (3) and Kara Şâlih Efendi (4). In 944 he transferred to Çiviszâde Efendi who, on becoming Şeyhülislâm in 945, gave him his ihâzetnâme. In 948 Ebûsu'ûd Efendi, then kâisi 'asker of Rûm, appointed him to the medrese of Hüsamüddin in Edirne. Five years later he became müdderris of Ïamsa Bey in Bursa. In 955 he was transferred to the medrese of Velîüddîn oğlu Ahmed Paşa in the same town. Two years later he was müdderris of Rûstem Paşa in Kütahya. He returned to Istanbul in 957 to serve at the medrese of Şâseki and in 963 at the Semâniye. In 970 he was appointed kâisi of Damascus from where he went to Cairo in 974. In the same year he was back in Bursa as kâisi and two years later at Edirne. In 978 he became kâisi of Istanbul. He died in 979 in Edirne as kâisi 'asker of Anatolia.

In a very long notice devoted to 'Ali Çelebi in Kânalîzâde's tezkere, we are told that he was an extremely learned man with an extraordinary memory. He had studied all the sciences and on one occasion surprised his friends by reciting the Behâristân of Câmi from beginning to end. He always gave a good account of himself in debates and disputes, conducted in the Arabic language, against Arabs. He is also very famous for his mumâmmâs, a large number of which are to be found in his dîvân (5). He is, however, remembered chiefly for his Ahlâk-î 'Alâ'î (6) which he completed in Damascus in the year 972 and dedicated to the Bevlerbay of

(2) 'Aṭâ'I 165. Müdderris at Davud Paşa.
(4) Meedî 487. Müdderris at the Semâniye; died in 944.
(5) Kefâ 11, 803.
(6) A.A. Adîvâr (IA, ân 63, 710, Kânalîzâde 'Ali Çelebi') gives a detailed study of this work.
Syria, 'Ali Paşa. Also attributed to him are a large number of prose works on various subjects.

'Ali Çelebi's son Hasan Çelebi, the tezkereci, was born in 953 in the town of Bursa where his father was then müderris at the medrese of Şamsa Bay (1). He began his education with his father whose influence on his son, especially in prose style, will be discussed later. He was soon admitted to the meetings of the members of the 'ulema among whom he distinguished himself with his learning and aptitude in all the sciences. Then, between the years 967 and 970, he received lessons on the art of debating from the müderris of Yeni 'Ali Paşa, Nâzirzâde Efendi (2) and was trained in rhetoric a little later by Kâzıâzâde Efendi (3). He completed his training under Ebussu'ûd Efendi and in 973, received his icâzetnâme from 'Abdurrahman Efendi (4).

His first appointment took place in the year 975 when he became müderris of the medrese of Ahmed Paşa in Bursa with a stipend of thirty akçe. A year later, when his father became kâzi of Edirne, he went there as the müderris of Çuhaci Hâci with the same stipend. In 979, the year his father and ' Ağık Çelebi died, he was sent to the medrese of Eski İbrâhîm Paşa in Istanbul and his stipend increased to forty akçe. He was dismissed in Muḥarram of the year 981 and his post was given to Konyali 'Ümer Çelebi (5). After being ma'ṣūl

(1) Rz, (Aşar Ef. 243), f.15a, both his place and date of death are erroneously given as Gelibolu and 1003.
(2) 'Atâ'î, 240; Ramazân of Sofya who became kâzi of Istanbul. Died in 964.
(3) Ibid, 259; Şemsüddîn Ahmed. Born in 916. Şeyhülislâm from 985 until death in 988.
(4) Ibid, 226; Kâzı 'eeker of Rûm in 973.
(5) Ibid, 244; Died in 985.
for two years he became müderris of Kâzım Paşa and a year later dismissed and replaced by ʻAbdurrahman Efendi (1). In 984 he went to the medrese of Yeni ʻAli Paşa and from there, in Rebi ʻul-velvel of 988, was promoted to the Sulṭāniye in Bursa where he served for about two years until, in Şa‘bān of 990, he was sent to the Şehan where he replaced Şenbili Efendi (2) whom he had succeeded in Bursa. In Ramadān of 994 he was transferred to the medrese of Sulṭān Selim I in succession to ʻAbdurrahman Efendi (3). A year later, in the month of Rebi ʻul-velvel, he was appointed to one of the medreses at the Suleymaniye in place of Su‘ūd Efendi (4).

After twenty years' service as a müderris in Istanbul, Bursa and Edirne, in Gümādā ul-ahire of 999, ʻInālisade was appointed kâzî of Aleppo in place of ʻAbdurrahman Efendi. In the month of Rebi two years later he was relieved of his first kâzî, and, in Gümādā ul-ahire of 1003, was appointed to Cairo replacing Dūkaşınzade ʻOsmān Efendi (5). He remained there for only one year and was dismissed in Muhārrem of 1004. In the month of Zil-ḥīce of the same year he was sent to the kâzî of Edirne where he replaced Es‘ad Efendi (6) who became the kâzî-e-saker of Rûm. In Rebi of the following year, he was dismissed and his post given to Mehmed Efendi (7). In Gümādā ul-ahire of 1006 he was appointed kâzî of Cairo for the second time and in Şevvāl of the next year became kâzî of his birthplace, Bursa. In Zil-ḥid de of 1008 he was given the arpalik of the kâzî of Aydın (8). In the month of Muhārrem of the following year he accepted the kâzî of Gelibolu.

(1) Ibid, 279; ʻİmādzade. Died in 992.
(4) Ibid, 315; Mehmed b. Emīr Ḥasan Nīkār. Died in 999 as kâzî of Āmid.
(7) Ibid, 418; Şeyhulislâm Bustanzade. Born in 942, died in 1006.
(8) Ali Cevâd, Cīmaṭfva Luṣṭū, 42.
In Cümâdâ ül-evlâ of 1009, he replaced ʿArabsâde Efendi (1) as kâzî of Eyûb. In Şafar 1011, he was transferred to the kâzî of Eski Zâgra in the Balkans (2). At about that time, however, he began to suffer from bronchial trouble and became an invalid. He applied for and was granted the kâzî of Rosetta in Egypt for life. He left Rumeli and settled down in Egypt where he died, after a very active life, in the month of Şevvâl of the year 1012, at the age of 59.

In his teşkere, Kânilîzâde supplies information on a number of the members of his family. Apart from his father ʿAlî Çelebi, to whom he devotes a long notice, he mentions his son, Mehmed (3), whom he describes as a most learned and well-behaved man and as having been the cause of the compilation of the teşkere. In a more detailed passage, he refers to his young brother, Mehmed Fehmi (4), born in Damascus in 972 while his father was kâzî there. He trained under his father and elder brother and received his icâzetname in 990. After serving in various medreses in Istanbul, he died of the plague in the year 1004.

Brief mention is also made of another younger brother by the name of Hüseyin Fevzî (5). He had two paternal uncles; Muslimî, who was müdderris and kâzî and who collected a divân died, according to Riyâzi and Kâtîb Çelebi, in 994 (6). His other uncle, ʿAbdurrahîm Kerâmî, died in 982, after serving in medreses and kâzâs (7). This uncle had a son, also mentioned by Kânilîzâde, called Mustafâ Vasfî who was born in Sîrûz and died when he was very young (8).

(1) ʿAtâʾî 442. ʿAbdurrahîf. Died 1009.
(2) ʿAlî Cevâd, Cevânî-va Luğâtî, 103.
(3) KZ, f. 246b.
(4) KZ, f. 223a; ʿAtâʾî, 400; Fesâlekâ, i, 74.
(5) KZ, f. 224a.
(6) KZ, f. 254b; Ry, f. 108a; Kešî-uz-ṣâmun, i, 814.
(7) KZ, f. 232b; Ry, f. 100a.
(8) KZ, f. 298b.
Unlike 'Āşık Çelebi, Kınalızade reveals nothing about himself in his work and the sources are silent about his personality. His background and the fact that he was a member of the 'ulema class, attest to his learning. There is no evidence in the sources that his nature, like 'Āşık Çelebi's, cost him his posts or that he was disliked by his superiors, neither is there anything to suggest that he was popular or otherwise among his colleagues. All that can be said about him with any degree of certainty, is that he was very proud of the family to which he belonged and seized every opportunity of giving it prominence in his tezkere.

Kınalızade wrote very little poetry and did not collect a divan. He made marginal comments on the Dürer u ğurur and, according to 'Aṭā'I, wrote a number of dissertations on various subjects. His largest and only famous work is the Tegkeret uş-Śu'arā.

This long tezkere comprises a lengthy müşaddime, three faşls and a very short hātine which is run into the last notice of the third faşl.

The müşaddime begins with the customary eulogy on God, followed by one on the Prophet. Then there is a long laudatory notice on Sultan Murad III in whose reign the work was compiled. He then goes on to say something of the wonders of poetry and poets and their place in society. He says that he has investigated the subject of verse in order to establish the reason for its being so esteemed by men and it is this study which has made him decide to immortalize all famous poets by collecting their biographies and verses into one place and organize it in the form of a tezkere. In his teşzār ĵf, entitled Güftar der beşan-i a'zār, he gives the usual reasons for feeling ill-equipped and unable to fulfill the task which he has set himself. Probably inspired by Latif'i's remarks in his tezkere, he complains about the lack of appreciation by his contemporaries of works such as
his tezkere-i şu’arā. The need for a tezkere, he declares, outweighs the fear of the criticism which is likely to be directed against his work once it is completed and while the circumstances are far from favourable, he has no option but to accomplish the work which he set out to do. After his 'pearl' was polished and ready for sale, however, no one was prepared to buy it. Continuing his complaint, he suggests that this lack of interest is due not to the deficiencies or defects of the tezkere, but to the fact that possible buyers have no idea what a tezkere is. They prefer to acquire works of no value whatsoever which they can understand without much effort, because they are ignorant. The Sebub-i te’lif-i kitāb which follows does not, as the title suggests, deal with his reasons for writing a tezkere. In rather obscure language he describes the new era, begun when the Şeyhüislām Sa’diaddin Yusaha Efendi (1) decides to buy his work, in terms of the re-birth of nature with the arrival of Spring and the return of life at dawn. There then follows a very elaborate biography of his patron on whom he showers the highest of praises and describes his person and learning in most laudatory language, ending with a short anthology of his poetry. The introduction closes with the Tetemne der vaṣf-i în kitāb ve iṣbār-i ʿacā tayār-i bi-hesāb, in which the tezkereci describes the divisions of the tezkere and the contents of each faṣl.

The tezkere is divided into three faṣls. The first deals with the lives of six sultāns, from Murād I to Selīm II inclusive. The second is devoted to four of the şehzades. The last section, which forms the bulk of the tezkere, contains over six hundred poets in the alifbā alphabetical order, including a long

(1) ‘Ata’, 429; Author of Tac üt-tevârî. Died in 1008.
notice on 'Ali Çelebi, the author's father, and brings the sequence of Ottoman poets right up to Kınalızade's own day. The fasl ends with a short hâtıme in which the date of completion of the work is given as 994, that is to say, while Kınalızade was a müderris at the Suleymaniye mosque.

While there is no mention of them in the mukaddime, Kınalızade's sources are referred to in various parts of the tezkere as having been the Mecâlis un-nefâ'is of Mevlâni, the tezkere of La'tifî, the Şâ'ik un-nu'mâniye of Taşköprüzâde, the Meşâ'ir al-qâ'arâ of 'Âşık Çelebi and the Heşet Bihîş of Mevlânâ İdrîs. In several instances he corrects La'tifî, to whose work on at least one occasion he refers as the Kastamununâme, and sometimes repeats, verbatim, the notices on certain poets found in La'tifî without acknowledging his source. While there are many poets given only by Kınalızade and no one else, his tezkere can be said to be based almost entirely on the Meşâ'ir al-qâ'arâ from which he drew extensively. Whole passages, sometimes, are copied directly from 'Âşık Çelebi's work and Kınalızade's factual contributions are almost negligible. Wherever and whenever he has chosen to alter 'Âşık's text, he has done so because it afforded him the opportunity of indulging in stylistic displays.

Kınalızade follows his predecessor in calling attention to the parochialism shown by La'tifî in his tezkere. A similar charge could be brought against Kınalızade himself. His tezkere, which has been called the Pedernâmeh (1), contains many of his own relations, some of whom were not considered for inclusion into other tezkeres. If the charge of parochialism brought against La'tifî, already discussed (2), is valid, then the same is also true of Kınalızade's clan-

(1) GOD, iii, 29: In a footnote von Hammer explains that it is the name given to it by a certain Mucib who made marginal comments in his own MS of Kınalızade.
(2) Refer to page in biography of La'tifî, pp. 39-41
Kînâlisâde's tezkere seems to have enjoyed a certain amount of success chiefly, it is suggested, on account of his heavy and flowery style, learnt from his father and favoured in his own day. Like his father, he wrote in a pompous and obscure style, not as beautiful as, and, more difficult to follow than Āšík's. Nearly every passage in his tezkere appears to have been composed solely for the purpose of displaying his vast Persian and Arabic vocabulary and his capacity for forming dreary sentences made up of several consecutive tarkâb, usually conveying nothing instructive and at times only, pleasing to the ear when read out aloud. One has the impression that facts and truth are sacrificed in favour of his particular stylistic experiments. It is the quality of the inşâ and not of the biographical information or critical evaluation of poetry contained in its three hundred folios, made the tezkere of Kînâlisâde one of the masterpieces of its age. Among the critics, 'Aţâ'I says little about it beyond recording that after the Aḩlâk-i 'alâ'I and the Humâyûn-nâme, no book in the Ottoman language was as much in demand as Kînâlisâde's Tezkere tâ-ṣarâh. Ālí who had read the work in entirety, on the other hand, has a different opinion of it. He declares that it is known for the elegance of its words and for the succession of iṣâretâ in it, and that it is a memû'a full of affectation and devoid of any sense. According to the historian, apart from misplacing maṭla's and beyts and committing errors in the origins of certain poets, he also exaggerated in his flattering remarks on some members of his own family. Beyânî, who no doubt felt obliged to justify his choice of Kînâlisâde's biography of poets as the basis of his own tezkere, describes Kînâlisâde's style as beautiful, his inşâ as graceful and the whole work as a ceride that conquers the heart and a memû'a which increases one's pleasure by
giving peace to the heart and supplying food for the soul. In saying this Beyani probably reflects the opinion of his age with which his contemporary ʿAlī disagrees. Riyāḍī very briefly attributes the value of tezkere to ʿÍnālīzāde's powerful prose style.
A shortened version of the tezkere of Kinalizade was written by the next tezkereci Beyani.

Only a few details of Beyani's life and work are available, despite the fact that he mentions himself among the poets included in his tezkere (55). Aşık Çelebi can give his biography only as far as the year he became a mülâsim (84b). Kinalizade (66a), who wrote fifteen years later, gives only a few more details to those he has drawn from Aşık Çelebi. Alî, in the Künh 'ul-ahbâr' 270a (BM, Add 10004) and 492a (Istanbul, 2162), mentions him in two separate sections of his history and supplies one detail not to be found anywhere else. Riyâzi (32b) who gives but a few lines, Karaçade (20a) supplying only the date of his death, Rıa (20) and Mehmed Tevîîk (1), a very late tezkereci (72), are the only tezkerecis who mention him and the contribution which they make is negligible. Ata'I (466) is by far the best source, but he too does not know enough about him to allow us to reconstruct his life satisfactorily. Tuhre-i ḥattâtin (p.506), gives a few details on his training as a hattât (2).

Mustafâ, whose mehlag was Beyani, was the son of a certain Gûrûlû about whose life nothing is known. He was born in the kapâbe of Rûscûl (3) in the livâ of Nikbulu at a date not specified by any of the sources. We are told by

(1) Kâfîle-i șu'ârâ, Istanbul, 1290.
(2) Tuhre-i ḥattâtin of Mustakîmzade, Istanbul.
(3) Given as Roduşûl by Alî. Mehmed Tevîîk gives his birthplace as Nikbulu.
'Aṭā‘ī that he was a compatriot and contemporary of the poet Emānī (1). He became the student and disciple of Ebūssu‘ūdzāde Mehmēd Čelebi (2) at a medrese. Since Mehmēd Efendi was a müdderris from 950 to 964, Beyānī’s studentship can be said to have taken place some time between those two dates. ‘Aṭā‘ī Čelebi, however, is alone in stating that he served Mehmēd Čelebi while the latter was kāzī of Aleppo, which, according to the sources, was in the year 970.

Beyānī received his icāzetname from Şeyhülislām Ebūssu‘ūd Efendi before the year 962 (3), who appointed him müdderris of Kestel in the sancak of Aydīn (4) with a stipend of twenty ekşes. The first part of this statement is made by Beyānī himself in his own biography and in the biography of the Şeyhülislām, but ‘Aṭā‘ī and the other sources disagree, stating that he received his icāzetname from Ebūssu‘ūdzāde Mehmēd Efendi. There is little doubt, however, that his appointment to Kestel was made in return for a copy he made, as a hattat, of the Şeyhülislām’s Tefsir, known as the İrşād ul-‘a‘kl is-selīm ilā nesāyā ul-kitāb il-karm (5). The medrese at Kestel appears to have been the only one at which he was müdderris before he became kāzī of Hāvrān, a suburb of Damascus (6). Following this appointment he went to Mecca for the hajj. During his return journey from there we understand that he decided to leave the legal profession and enter one of the dervis orders. He trained for the şūfī life under Şeyh Eknel (7) who was şeyh of the zāvīye near At Meydānī in Istanbul. While the name of the order which

---

(1) Aṣ,f.46b; KZ,f.5la; Kaf,f.8b; Ry,f.20a; B,f.23; GOD,i,359. Muṣṭafā of Ruskuk. Died in 1000.
(2) ‘Aṭā‘ī, 42.
(3) Ebūssu‘ūd’s death occurred in 962.
(4) Kāmūs ul-‘A‘lām, v, 3859; Coşrafva Luço, 666, 608.
(5) Kecf ‘a-sānūn, 1, 65, 441; GUL, G.i, 439, S.i, 651.
(6) Kāmūs ul-a‘lām, iii, 1996; Coşrafva Luço, 350.
he joined is not given in the early sources (1), the fact that he trained under Şeyh Ekmel indicates that he had joined the tarîka of the Ihlvetiye. He studied with Şeyh Ekmel for several years and then received his inâhe sometime before 985. ʿAli is the only source to state that Beyânî went to one of the Ihlvetî zavîyes in Gallipoli. Beyânî himself is silent about this period of his life. On the death of Şeyh Ekmel, in the month of Muḥarram in 985, Beyânî became şeyh of the zavîye in Istanbul in his place. There is no evidence in the sources that he left Istanbul or the zavîye during the remaining twenty-one years of his life. All sources agree that he died and was buried in the grounds of the zavîye in the year 1006.

The only statements on Beyânî the man, are made by ʿAşık Čelebi. He describes him as an upright, righteous and intellectually charming person of sound mind, well versed in the sciences and capable of propounding intelligent ideas. Most of the sources agree that apart from being the author of a prose work like a tezkere, he was also a good poet, able to versify in both Turkish and Arabic. Beyânî, who rather apologetically admits that he did not neglect the poets and poetry even after becoming a dervîş, is said, by ʿAli, to have been a poet capable of finding choice verses towards which one could be sincerely affectionate (iṣfâ). ʿAṭâʾî who found him proficient at both prose-writing and versifying, states that there were few people who could excel him in the composition of poetry in the Arabic language. That he was a good calligrapher is attested not only by statements to be found in the sources, but also by the fact that he was commissioned

(1) ʿCM,i,98.
by Ebussu‘ud Efendi to prepare a copy of his Tefsâr.

In spite of all that has been said about his poetic ability, Beyânî does not appear to have collected his poems in the form of a dîvân. He is known only for a Tezkeret us-su‘arâ which was not even an original work. It is a shortened version of Khânâlisâde’s which he brought up to date and to which he made slight additions and alterations.

The tezkeres consists of a mukaddime and a single faşl.

The mukaddime opens with the traditional eulogy on God, followed by a short survey of the origins of poetry. Cultured people, says Beyânî, define poetry as 'metrical and rhyming speech'. The earliest poets recorded facts without exaggeration and without adding their own inventions to them. The poet was distinguished from and respected by his fellow man because his speech, apart from being clear and graceful, was also metrical and rhymed. According to the tezkereci, the first man to falsify, exaggerate and add impurities to verse, thereby setting a bad example to those who followed and imitated him, was the pre-Islamic poet Mūhelhel. Poetry, continues Beyânî, cannot be written by everyone. Some compose verses with great effort and are not successful, to others it comes naturally and their poetry is good. Those who succeed in producing verses which are acceptable are esteemed and tezkeret us-su‘arâ are compiled for the purpose of preserving their memories in the same way as histories are written for the purpose of recording the lives and deeds of the pâdisâna, hâmam and ʿulamâ. Many tezkeres have been written in Persian and Turkish and of the latter group the tezkeres of Latîff, Āṣîk Čelesi and Khânâlisâde ʿHasan Čelesi are still famous and circulated among people (1).

Beyânî then makes a few laudatory comments on the tezkeres of Khânâlisâde of which,

(1) It is interesting to note that Beyânî makes no reference to the tezkeres of Sehî and ‘Ahî.
he says, he acquired a copy. He states that while his original intention had been to copy it in entirety, shortage of time obliged him to shorten it considerably. He therefore selected only those poets who had found fame and whose poems were famous, transforming, he says, a whole book into an article. He then emphasizes that this task was not undertaken in order to win admiration, but only for the pleasure of doing it. This rather discursive introduction continues with the statement that owing to the inferiority of the earlier poets, many of them who feature in the tezkere of Kınalızade have been omitted. However, he adds, during the reign of Sultan Meşmed II, there was a considerable improvement in the quality of the poetry written, after Mîr 'Ali Şir Nevâ'î had sent thirty-three of his own pasals to Ahmed Paşa (1). Beyânî closes his muqaddime by declaring that he thought it fit and proper to begin the work by mentioning the pâdisâhs and şehsâdes before the poets who have been arranged in alphabetical order.

The sections of the tezkere itself are not distinguishable. Following the muqaddime, there are the notices of six sultâns, including Sultan Murad III (982-1004), and three of their sons. These are not in any particular order, some of the şehsâdes being treated among the pâdisâhs and Murad III being left to the very end of the section. Notices of some four hundred poets constitute the rest of the tezkere which is classified in the alifba order and which ends without a hâtine. A comparative study of the tezkeres of Beyânî and Kınalızade, reveals that Beyânî has simplified some of the longer and more obscure passages found in Kınalızade by retaining only those parts which are of real biographical value.

(1) AÇ, f.35b; KZ, f.40a; GOD i, 198.
He has also appended some additional material to individual notices. There are seven supplementary poets given by Beyānī against over two hundred and forty he has omitted from Kīnālisāde's tezkere. Ahmed-i Dā'ī (1) and Mēlihī (2) are two of the notable omissions. There is a slight difference also in the number of poetic samples to be found in the two tezkeres.

Unlike Kīnālisāde, whose tezkere forms the basis of Beyānī's, the author has preferred a simple, straightforward style. One has the impression that whenever he has found it necessary to repeat Kīnālisāde's text, he has taken the opportunity of clarifying obscure passages or of leaving out the superfluous insertions that may have been in the original. In this respect Beyānī's tezkere, which was not commissioned by or dedicated to anyone, must be considered a companion to as well as a resume of Kīnālisāde's. The exact date of compilation of the work is not known, but must fall some time between the years 994 and 1004.

(1) Se, p. 56; L, p. 35; KZ, f. 263a; GOD, i, 72.
(2) Se, p. 62; L, p. 314; KZ, f. 263b; GOD, i, 303.
A biographical notice of the next tezkereci, Riyâzî, is given by 'Aṭā’î’s continuator, Şeyhî, in his Vehâvi‘ul-fuṣûlî (i, f.96b). His father, Birgili Muṣṭafâ, is mentioned by 'Aṭā’î (p.295). Of the tezkerecis, Şafîî (f.96) who has summarized the notice in Şeyhî, is the next best source. Riṣâ (p.36), has a very short note containing errors, and ‘Āşim (f.11) can only attribute a divân to him and supply the date of his death, in his neqâ‘a. Kâtib Çelebi (Kesfi‘ul-zînûn, i, 387), who commits errors in his ancestry, comments on his tezkere.

Riyâzî’s father, Muṣṭafî b. Mehmed, was born in the kasaba of Birgi in the vilâyet of Aydın (1). He trained under and received his icâṣatnâme from the royal mentor, ‘Aṭâ’ullâh Efendi (2). His first madrasa was that of Murād Paşa in Istanbul, and in 976, he was sent to Yeni İbrâhîm Paşa. Two years later he was transferred to Çeﬀer Ağa, and in 980, accompanied his father-in-law to Mecca. On his return to Istanbul in 983, he was appointed to the madrasa of Muṣṭafâ Paşa in Gelivize near İzmit (3), and in the same year became müdderris of Şorlu in Eastern Thrace. From there he went to the Şemâniye and, in 989, he was appointed kâdí of Bagdad. He was then transferred to Tripoli and relieved in 990. He died in Istanbul in 995.

Muṣṭafâ b. Mehmed’s son, Mehmed (4) Riyâzî, was born in the year 980,
either in Istanbul or in Mekka where his father was in residence late that year. He received his education from Şeyhülislâm Mu’ayyedzâde Abülkâdir Efendi (1). It would appear that he served at several medreses after he had obtained his iczazetname, but their names are not given by the sources. While he was māzul and drawing a stipend of forty ekços, in Şaban of the year 1010, he was appointed müderris at the medrese of Ahmed Paşa within the confines of Topkapu in Istanbul.

Four years later, in the month of Muḥarram, he was transferred to the medrese of Davud Paşa on the death of Rızaîzade Abülkâdir Efendi (2). In Şafar of 1016, he became müderris of Fâṭma Sultan. Exactly a year later, he was appointed to the medrese of Siyâvûş Paşa Sultanî in place of Kudâl Mehmed (3). In Cumâdâ ül-evlâ of 1017, he was at the medrese of Mihrînâhî in Edirnekapu. In Rabi‘ül-evvel of the following year, he was sent to one of the medreses of the Şâhen.

In Ramazân of 1019, he was offered the post of müderris at the Bâyesîdiye in Edirne, but he refused it. Two years later, he was in Üskûdar at the medrese of Vâlide Sultan.

From Üskûdar he went to Yenişehir (4) as kâtil, from where he was dismissed in Muḥarram of 1024. Five years later, in Rabi‘ul-vêrî, he was made kâtil of Aleppo, but he did not stay there for long. In Ramaşan of the same year, he was transferred to Damascus, and in Cumâdâ ül-evlâ of 1030 became kâtil of Jerusalem. He was dismissed in the month of Şevvâl and sent to Cairo.

---

(1) 'Atâ‘î, 327. Born in 920, Şeyhülislâm from 995-997. Died in 1002.
(2) Ibid, 500. Born in 980. Went to Davud Paşa in 1011 and died of the plague in 1014.
(3) Ibid, 642. 'Ibn Mişâncizâde Ahmed Efendi.
(4) Kânûnî, vi, 4005. There seem to be two towns bearing the same name. Mişânci’s place of appointment is not specified in the sources.
served there until his retirement in Cūnād al-shīr of 1035 and died on Friday 9th Ṣafar 1054.

Riyāḍī is said by the sources to have been very learned and a good poet. Ṣafā'ī describes him as the melik us-suʿarāʾ of the century and Ṣayḥī as a poet who could compose simple verses full of meaning. His prose style, too, was to the point and clear, his sentences being short and well balanced.

Apart from writing a tekârâ, Riyāḍī was the author of several works and a diwān.

Destsur ul-ʿawal mentioned by Ṣayḥī and Ṣafā'ī and ascribed to Riyāḍī without comment.

Sāhīnâme described by Katīb Čelebi as a Turkish work in verse (1).

Diwān attributed to Riyāḍī by all the early sources except Ṣāhā who knew only of his tekârâ. Katīb Čelebi says that it was a famous and popular diwān containing ninety-seven bayts.

Also ascribed to him, is a shortened version of Ibn Ḥallikān's Vefwât ul-ṣâvān fī enbâ'ī-ʾi ʿibnāʾ iz-zamān. Katīb Čelebi who gives a long list of translations and resumes of this work, does not mention Riyāḍī's. Ṣayḥī, and Ṣafā'ī after him, however, describe it as an important abridgement, written in an elegant style.

Bursalî Meḥmed Ṭâhir ascribes the following works to him which are not mentioned either in the sources or in Katīb Čelebi: Rīgāle fī āl-i bevān, a Sīvā, Kasf ul-ḥīcāb ʾawn vech is-sevāb and Ṣahā'ī ul-lâtīf fī ʿauvāʾ il-ʿulûm vel-meʿārīf (2).

Riyāḍī's tekârâ, known as the Riyāz us-suʿarāʾ, consists of a

(1) Kasf ʿa-zāmīn, ii, 973.
(2) ʿOlt, ii, 184.
mukaddime and two revīsas.

The mukaddime opens with the customary eulogy on God. This is followed by general remarks on poetry including the statement that it is the best form of expression because it deals with the aspects of love and desire, and those who compose it attain greatness. For this reason, continues the author, he decided to collect a mecmū'a containing the poets of Rum who were famous. He says that he began his work in the month of Recob 1016 and quotes the following tārīḥ:

> ālumbar adūrā = 1016,

by the poet Bursevī Haṣimi (1) who, he says, wished to point out, with this tārīḥ, that the tezkere did not confine itself to one particular period like the other tezkeres. Riyāsī then declares that his work has been named the Ḥiyās ʿus-ṣaurā because it is a garden of eloquence containing poets whose nature is like grass growing wild and whose verses, on account of their beauty and captivating essence, resemble roses. He then states that it comprises a tenbih and two revīsas.

The tenbih is divided into four ḥaṣīṣes (2) in which he outlines the characteristics of his tezkere as follows: Lengthy expressions have been avoided so that it should not be a source of restlessness and boredom to the readers and copyists. The previous tezkerecis, such as Ḥinālīzāde, have not shown any care in their distinction between the poet and the poetaster. Four hundred poets are included in this tezkere and the rest omitted. In contrast with the other tezkeres, this one contains only the best poems found in the available mecmū'as.

(1) Ry, f.126b.
(2) In the (Nuruosmaniye, 3724) copy, the last two are run into one.
of the poets. Lastly, all statements relating to the biographies and poetic ability of the poets, are based on fact and there has been no exaggeration or negligence in the evaluation of either their persons or their poetry. The Turkish language is not suitable for versifying and it is very difficult to compose poetry in it. Therefore one should not point the finger of reproach to the early poets for the flaws in their poetry. The modern poets have sacrificed sense in favour of elegant expression, but attention should be paid to both meaning and elegance.

Riyāzī then gives his own views on the qualities required in poets and classifies them into four classes: Those who are capable of originality, those who add beauty to a word by altering its meaning, those who express the original meaning of a word gracefully, and lastly, those who are careful to enhance the meaning of a word when they change it. The introduction ends with a eulogy on the reigning sultan, Ahmed I.

The tezkere itself consists of two ṭavān, the first of which contains seven pādīšāhs and the second some four hundred poets in alphabetical order. Riyāzī's sources were the tezkere of Kīnālisāde, the dīvāns and the mecū'as. The tezkereci indicates it when the poems which he gives come from a dīvān or a mecū'a which he had seen. The tezkere was completed in Recept 1018, exactly two years after it was begun. Kāfsāde Fā'īāl said the following tārīf on its completion:

كاملان زينيات اهل معرف

1018
The next work in this body of literature is, strictly speaking, a neşmû'â. Its organization and the attestations of the sources, however, justify its inclusion among the teskeres.

The chief source for the biography of Kafzâde and that of his father is 'Âtâ'î (660 and 539 respectively). Kafzâde's continuator, 'Âşîn (f.31) on account of the nature of his work, supplies only his name and date of death and ascribes a diyân to him, but can make no other contribution. Râyî's short notice (f.115a) covers his life only up to the year 1018. Rîzâ (p.77) gives no more than his name, his ancestry and his profession. Bursalî İsmâ'îl Belîg (Nuhbet ul-âsâr li-gayl-i Zâ'îdet ul-esâr, ff.66b and 101a) mentions only one detail not to be found in the other sources. Kâtib Celebi (Fezleke, i,341 and ii,29) summarizes 'Âtâ'î's notice, but gives a description of his neşmû'â (Kesf üz-şûrûn, ii,950).

Kafzâde's father, Feyzullâh, was the son of a certain Ahmed Efendi who died in 961 after retiring from the kâât of Damascus. According to 'Âtâ'î, his name was originally Muştâfâ, but changed it to Feyzullâh, so that it should resemble that of a certain Şân'ullâh Efendi, who was his contemporary. He wrote poetry under the mehlas of Feyzî. He was born in 953 and became a mülcün at the age of twenty after training under Ebûüssu'ûl Efendi. Between the years 973 and 998 he was müderris at the pedreses of İjâce İjâtûn, the İjârîc of Edirne kapû, Eâsun Paşa, Mihrîmâh Sultân, the Şehan, Selîm I and the Süleymaniye. In Zil-kicde of 998 he became kâât of Aleppo and then served in the kâât of Damascus
and Cairo until he became vâli of Edirne in Şafar 1007. After that he was kâzî of Galata and then of Istanbul. From 1013 until his death, in Cumnâda ilihan 1020, he was twice kâzî-asker of Anadolu and once of Rûm. He is said to have compiled a Fihrist to the Fetâvâ-ı Kâdîhan (1) and to have collected a divân (2).

His son ‘Abdulhây, known as Kâfsâde, was born in 998. After being educated and trained by his father, he received his icâzetname from Muṣṭafâ Efendi, mentor to Sultan Ahmed I (3), in 1013. In Zil-ki‘de of 1016 he refused the post of müderris at the medrese of Sinân Paşa in Beşiktas and was the first to be appointed to the medrese newly built by Etnekölâde Ahmed Paşa. Three years later, in the month of Cumnâda łuż-evlâ, he was sent to the Sultanîye of Govher Han. In Ramazân of 1022, he was appointed to one of the medreses of the Sultanîye from where, in Rebi‘ ul-evvel of 1024, he went to Valide Sultan, in the Istanbul suburb of Scutari. In Zil-ki‘de of the same year, he was transferred to the medrese of Sultan Selîm I. He was müderris at the Sûleymaniye from Zil-hicce of 1025 to the same month of the year 1027.

From his first appointment as kâzî of Salonica (4), he went to the kâzî of Damascus in Rebi‘ ul-âhir of 1029. While he was passing through Istanbul on his way to Damascus, his appointment was cancelled and Nevâlisâde Sa‘dî Efendi (5) was sent to Syria instead of him. On becoming nâzîl, he decided to stay where he was. He remained in Istanbul until Cumnâda łuż-âhire of the year 1030, when the arناس of the kâzî of Midilli (the island of Mitylene) was assigned to him. Three months later he lost it following the abolition of

(1) Kâfs iç-zümûn, 11,1227. 9OM,11,386. This work is ascribed to his son.
(2) Ibid, 1,805.
(4) According to ‘Atâ‘I, Kâfsâde said the following tarih on his appointment:
(5) ‘Atâ‘I, 748. Died in 1042 while he held the arناس of Ergene Köprüsû near the town of Edirne.
He was back in Istanbul and happened to be in the royal palace when the janissaries stormed it. 'Aṭā'-I and Kāṭīb Ğelebī after him, record that, during the confusion which preceded the murder of Sultan 'Osmān II, Kāfsāde was stricken with fright and fell ill. After a short while he died towards the end of the month of Receb, in the year 1031, when he was only thirty three years of age (1). He was buried in the grounds of a school named after his maternal grandfather, Ma'lūlsāde Efendi.

Kāfsāde, who used the tuḥalluṣ Fā'īzl, is known mainly as a poet. He wrote many poems which he collected into a dīwān which, according to Kāṭīb Ğelebī (2), enjoyed a certain amount of success. 'Aṭā'-I records that his poems were good enough to be imitated by some of the leading poets of the age and in this connection mentions Yalūyā Efendi who is said to have written a naẓīrē to one of his ğazalās. 'Aṭā'-I reproduces a bawt by Yalūyā Efendi in which he admits that he wishes to imitate Kāfsāde, although there is no name in this bawt to indicate that the poet referred to was not one other than Kāfsāde (3). The teszkereci Rīsā who gives one of his ğazalās, says that his poetry was famous.

He is also highly praised for the quality of his prose which, however, is not revealed in his nesmē-al. He is also said to have been a man of great learning and ability. We know the name of at least one man who benefitted from his teaching. Bursalî Iṣmā'īl Belīg mentions the münḵāl Nergiṣāl as having received his ģazātānīs from Kāfsāde Fa'īzl (4).

'Ata-i and the other sources, probably after him, ascribe a Leylā ve

(1) Rz, (Agīr Efendi, 243), f. 37a. His date of death is erroneously given as 1027.
(2) Keft uf-ṣūmūn, 1, 804.
Maanun and a Sâhinâne to him. These two works in verse, not mentioned by Katib Çelebi, were apparently never completed owing to the poet's premature death.

Kâfsâde's biggest and only extant work is the Zubdet ul-as'âr. This necmu'â, completed when the compiler was only twenty-five years old, has not been edited, but copies of it are preserved in several libraries in Istanbul. It is a collection of the poems of the poets who flourished from the time of Sultan Murâd II (625-655) to Kâfsâde's own day. It does not begin with the usual mukaddime and by way of a hâtine or tetemne, a few lines of prose written at the end of the work indicate that its compilation was completed in the month of Safar of the year 1023. The Zubdet ul-as'âr does not contain the biographical information that is to be found in the previous tezkere-i â'arâ, but is made up entirely of poems written by poets who were active during about two centuries. In this respect it could best be described as an anthology, but wherever and whenever possible, Kâfsâde has tried to give enough detail on the poet concerned for the reader to identify him. In some cases only, the nahla is supplied, in others, the name, occupation, place of origin and date of death of the poet are also given. When it was impossible for the compiler to give the exact date of death, he has endeavoured to fix the period approximately by indicating the reign during which the poet died or flourished. The absence of a mukaddime prevents us from knowing the reason that led Kâfsâde to collect these poems, but it would be correct to assume that his interest in poetry was the main urge. It is based almost entirely on divâne and other necmu'as. Ata i, with reference to the sources used by Kâfsâde, says that he read and studied all the available Turkish divâne and necmu'as, and in certain cases even those containing Persian and Arabic poems. The biographer describes the work as a
polished mecmūʻa, presumably to distinguish it from the commonplace books or qānsa. Kātib Čelebi who agrees with 'Atā’ī's description of it, adds that it is arranged in alphabetical order like a tezkere. Apart from containing some of the best poems of each poet, thereby, to some extent, giving an indication of the poetic taste of the age, this mecmūʻa is an important reference work for ascertaining whether or not the poet mentioned had collected a dīvān. In this respect Kāfsāde indicates very clearly when the poems he has selected come from a dīvān or another mecmūʻa. The work contains the poems of over five hundred men and women organized according to the alifbā alphabetical system, the sultāns and sehzādes being included among the poets under their mahlas.
The Tezkere-i şu'arā of Rızā was printed in Istanbul in 1316.

Although far from satisfactory, the fullest biography of Rızā is given by Şafâ‘ī in his Tezkere-i şu'arā (f.99) (1). Şeyhī, in his zeyl to 'Atā‘ī (1,f.524b), has a slightly shorter notice on him in the section on the poets of the reign of Sultan Meḥmed IV (1058-1099). The tezkereci Gürī knows no more than his name, place of origin and profession (f.46).

Bellīg, in Ruhbet ul-şārī līguyl-ī Zühdet ul-es'ār (f.30a), records his name in full and ascribes a dīwan to him. Bağdādī İsmā‘īl Paşa, in Zeyl-ī Kefa‘ úz-qūnūn (2), adds no detail that cannot be found in the earlier sources (1,274).

Seyyid Meḥmed Rızā Efendi originated from the town of Edirne (3). His father's name is known to have been Meḥmed also. Rızā became famous as Zehir-ı Mārzāde, although the origin of this venomous lākab is not given by the sources. The details of his training and education are unknown, but Şeyhī summarizes this period of his life by stating that he became a mülāzīm under a member of the 'ulamā‘ class. He is then said to have served as a müderris at medresse, the names and place of which are unspecified. While he was mażūl from a medresse at which he had been receiving a stipend of forty akçes, he entered the legal profession and held several appointments from the

(1) University of Istanbul, T.3215.
(3) Gürī is alone in specifying his town of origin as Ergene.
İkişen of Rumeli. While Şeyhi then states that he died as a member of the sultan’s retinue, Safi‘î says that he served as қәли of Uzun Köprü near Edirne (1). He died there, apparently a very old man, in the month of Ramażân 1062.

Rižâ’s Teşkere-i şu‘ârâ consists of a short dîbaçe followed by a brief mukaddime, a section on the royal poets, a larger section on the poets who lived between the years 1000 and 1050 and a hâtime.

Following a prayer to God in the heseç meter, Seyyid Rižâ declares that, driven by the desire to compile a teşkere-i şu‘ârâ, he set about recording the lives of the most poetical of the sultâns of the past and the men who had written poetry since the year 1000. Then there is a eulogy on the reigning pâdishâh, Sultan İbrâhîm (1050–1058) which begins with a few lines of prose and ends with a poem also in the heseç meter. Seyyid Rižâ then expresses the opinion that, to write a teşkere in his day would be considered not only a mistake, but also foolish. Because, Rižâ explains, apart from the difficulty of acquiring information on the poets, so many friends, who do not scrutinise facts closely, select a mehla and declare themselves to be poets without having enough intelligence to realize the deficiencies of their natures. So, Rižâ says, he has decided to cast aside and reject the poets who and not to include them in his teşkere. He ends his mukaddime by stating that these poetasters are certain to make him the target of their accusations, but, he concludes, he has no alternative.

(1) ‘Ali Cevîd, ِColloqya Lîjâ‘î, pp. 128, 290; Şamsaddîn Şinâ, Kâmûz il-‘alîmî, ii, 1085. Also known as Cezr-i Ergene on the river Ergene to the South of Edirne.
In the section on the sultāns whom he considers to have shown the greatest ability at composing verses, Rıza includes nine pādeşehs in chronological order, from Meḥmed Fāṭih to Murād IV, omitting Muṣṭafā I and ʿOmar II. As far as these royal biographies are concerned, Rıza's notable innovation in this genre is that he gives the date of each accession, the length of the reign and the number of years the sultān lived.

The rest of the tezkere contains the notices of about one hundred and seventy poets who lived in the first half of the 11th century in the a-kitāb system. Most of the notices are brief, but in most of them the date of death of the poet is usually supplied. Rıza's style is simple without being dull and his sentences are clearly indicated by the frequent use of Turkish copulas.

Rıza, to whom the sources ascribe a dīvān, ends his tezkere with a short ḥātine in which he announces the end of the work and asks the readers not to pay any attention to his shortcomings. A tārîh marks the end of the tezkere with the date 1050 (1).
A very short and incomplete tezkere is ascribed to Yümni, about whose life the sources supply very few details. The biographer Şeyhi in his şayla to 'Aṭā'î (i, f.548a), mentions him as one of the poets who flourished in the reign of Sultan Mehmed IV (1058-1099). 'Ali Emiri Efendi (1) reproduces verbatim the same notice in his copy of the tezkere of Yümni (f.26). Bursali İsmâ'îl Beliş in his Muğbet ul-üşâr liğeyl-i Zubdet ul-üşâr (f.118), adds only the name of his brother to an otherwise very short biography. Safâî who includes many of the poets mentioned by Yümni in his own tezkere, does not refer to him at all.

Mehmed Şâlih Efendi, better known under the maḥlas of Yümni, was from Istanbul. His maternal uncle was the kâzî‘asker ‘Abdulkâdir Efendi, also known as Kadir Efendi, who was kâzî‘asker of Anadolu from 1071 to 1072 and of Rumeli from 1074 to 1075. He died in Istanbul in 1082 (2). Mehmed Şâlih’s elder brother was Mehmed Rifîk Efendi (3), described by the tezkereci Şafâî as having flourished in Istanbul and died in the year 1111. While Şeyhi does not mention him among the members of the ‘ulumî class, it is known that he was educated and trained for the teaching profession and even served in kâzîs before he died. He received his icâzetnâme from Şeyhülislâm Behâ‘î

(1) İbnülendin İnal, Son aşır türk şairleri, i, 298.
(2) Şeyhi, i, 480.
(3) Tezkere et-şu‘ârâ (University of Istanbul T.3215), f.104b.
Mehmed Efendi (1). This would indicate that in 1059 or a little later, when Behâ'i Efendi was Şeyhülislân, Yâmi could not have been less than twenty years old. Nothing is known of the padresaq at which he served, but he is known to have died in 1073 (2), as kâzî of the kâzî of Kîlî, the exact location of which is not known (3). Since his uncle and elder brother survived him, it is reasonable to assume that he died rather young. Furthermore, the fact that Şeyhî says that his life was not long enough to allow him to complete the müsâvede of the tezkere on which he had been working, also suggests that he died at an early age. Mehmed Sâlih Efendi wrote a certain amount of poetry, but it is not known whether he collected a dâvûn. He is described by Şeyhî as having been famous for his learning.

Şeyhî, in his biography of the tezkereci, claims that he saw a copy of the tezkere of Yâmi in his own hand, giving the lives and poems of a number of contemporary poets. The biographer adds that the life of the tezkereci was not long enough to allow him to complete it and it remained unfinished. For about two centuries the müsâvede remained lost, but 'Ali Eriri Efendi says that he found it among a pile of scattered documents. He read it and reached the conclusion that while it was incomplete, it was well worth preserving. He arranged the material contained in it and copied it in his own hand. It is now available at the National Library in Istanbul (4).

(1) Şeyhî, f.1,172a. Şeyhülislân from 1059 to 1061. Died in 1064.
(2) 'Ali Eriri Efendi's (in Yâmi's tezkere) gives the date as 1077.
(4) Millet Kütüphanesi, 760.
The tezkere of Xünnî, as organized and copied by "Ali Emîrî Efendi on 30th Şevvâl 1323, consists of twenty-six pages in clear nîkâ'averaging about fifteen lines. It has no muqaddime apart from a short preface by "Ali Emîrî Efendi. Of the twenty-nine poets whose short biographies and poetic samples are included in it, fifteen are mentioned by the tezkereci Şafâ'I who compiled his tezkere in 1132. The biographies are succinct and to the point and the language is very simple. A brief biography of the tezkereci, drawn from Şeyhî, has been appended by the copyist to the section dealing with poets whose mahls begin with the letter ye. The date of compilation of this tezkere is not known, but it can be approximately placed to a few years before the year 1073 when Xünnî died.
A zeyl to Kâfzâde Fa‘îzi’s Zübdet ül-es‘âr was compiled by ʻĀsîm Efendî.

The fullest source for ʻĀsîm is Şeyhî’s Zeyl-i ʻAtâ’î (f.336).
Sa‘îdî in his tezkere (f.225a) is the only tezkereci to indicate his town of origin. ʻĀsîm himself refers to his brother and gives the name of two of his teachers (ff.14,15,31). Bursalî İsmâ‘îl Belîg gives only two lines (f.57b). Bağdâdî İsmâ‘îl Paşa in his zeyl to the Kefî uz-gûnûn (f.516) knows only his diwân.

ʻĀsîm’s father, Seyyid ʻAbdurrahman b. Seyyid Seyrekzâde Ahmed, served at several medreses between the years 1042 and 1053. He was then kâzî till 1058 when he became kâzî-asker of Anadolu. From 1063 to 1065 he was kâzî-asker of Rumeli. After serving in several kâzîs until 1080, he became kâzî-asker of Anadolu for the second time. He died in Sa‘îbân 1085 (1).

His son Seyrekzâde Seyyid Mehmed was born in Istanbul. After terminating his education (2), he trained in the Medrese-i Bayezîdie under Şeyh ul-îslâm Esiri Mehmed Efendi (3) who gave him his âcâmènâne. In Zil-khi‘de of 1076, he was appointed to the medrese of Bu‘ûriye. Four years later, in Rabi‘ ul-a‘hir, he became müderris of Ferhâd Paşa. In the month of Sa‘îbân of the year 1080, he was transferred to the medrese of Kürçû başî

(1) Şeyhî, i, f.329.
(2) ʻĀsîm, Zeyl-i Zübdâ, pp.15, 31 refers to a certain Sâmi Bey and a Şeyh Cufûrî as his hattâb, suggesting that he did some of his training under them.
(3) Şeyhî, i, f.376b. Şeyhî-îslâm from 1069 to 1072.
on the death of Kemal Efendisade Yahya Efendi. In Muharrem of 1083 he was made müderris of the medrese of Seyhulislam Huseyn Efendi. A year later, in the month of Receb, he was appointed to one of the medreses of the Şahen from where, in Ramazan of 1085, he went to the medrese of Siyavuş Paşa Sultanı. He died on the 15th day of the month of Sa'ban in the year 1086, exactly a year after his father. According to Seyhi, he was buried near Seyrekzade Yunes Efendi opposite the zaviye of Emir Buhari, outside Edirne kapu. We know from his notice on him in his tezkere, that 'Asim had a brother called Rafeet (1) who died at the age of fifteen and left behind a divan.

Nehmed 'Asim is described by Seyhi as being remembered for his knowledge of the sciences and for the excess of his liberality, and Safa'I, as being a learned poet of the century. Both Seyhi and Safa'I ascribe a divan to him. While the former says that the divan bore the mahlâs of 'Asim, Bağdâli İsmâ'il Paşa gives it under the mahlâs of 'Asim (2).

'Asim wrote a continuation to Kâfzade Fa'idî's Zubdet ül-es'âr. This work, a copy of which is in Istanbul (3), has no muhaddise. In a single fasl are given some one hundred and twenty poets who flourished during the half century which followed the completion of the Zubdet ül-es'âr in 1023. They are arranged in the alichâ alphabetical order. None of the sultans are mentioned, although one of the hâns of Crimea is referred to by his mahlâs. The poems are drawn from the divânes and nesû'as and their numbers vary from one bayt to one hundred. At the end of this tezkere which, like Kâfzade's, is

(2) Zeyl-i Kes' üs-zûnün, i, 516.
(3) Millet Kütüphanesi, 1326.
no more than a mecmû's. 'Aşirî says that he has collected the poems of the poets who lived after the time Kâfzâde's work was written, into one book and called it the Zeyl-i Zûbde.
The only work in verse in this body of literature was written by Güftî.

The biographical information on Güftî, supplied by the sources, is very scanty. Şeyhî, in the Vekâyi' ul-fuğalā (i, f.537b), ascribes a dīvān and a tezkere to him, but has little to say about his career. Şafâ'î (Es'ad Ef. 2549, f.293a) makes some additional remarks on his poetry. Bursali İsmâ'îl Belî̇g, in the Nuhbet ul-ṣuṣur (f.79b), knows only his name, date of death and that he completed a dīvān. A study of Güftî's tezkere is given by Faruk Kâdrî Demîrtâş (TDED, ii, 193 - 221) and Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's article in Millî Mescidê of the year 1928 which was not available at the time of writing, but which seems to be repeated in Demîrtâş. Bağdî̇li İsmâ'îl Paşa, in the Zeyl-i Keşf ug-zühün (i, 290), records only the name of his tezkere.

'Allî, known under the mahlaş, Güftî, was born in Edîrne. According to Şeyhî, he received the normal education of one of the ʿulûmî class, receiving his icâzetnâme and becoming ultimately, as Belî̇g tells us, one of the kuğat of Rumeli. He is then said to have performed the customary duties of a mülâsin. He had served as a müderris at a number of unnamed medreses, and it was while he was maʿzûl from one of these that he was promoted into the legal profession, becoming kâšî of kaẓā unspecified in the sources, Şeyhî saying merely that they were in Rumeli. All sources agree that he died in or about the year 1088.

Apart from a tezkere, Güftî is said to have written several other
works. Şafâ'i is the only source which ascribes to him a versified work on the Twelve Imams which is probably 'OM's F'tme-i išne-‘azare (ii, 391), but, if extant, has not yet been discovered. His dîvân is mentioned by Şeyhî, and Demirtaş gives a number of verses from two MSS, one a mecmû'a and the other an incomplete dîvân (1). Bursali Mehmed Tahir mentions two more works by him: a şâmâme and a Şâh u Derviş, both of which, he states, are in the Sultan Selim library in Edirne (2). According to Demirtaş, Mehmed Fuad Köprülû, in the Millî Mecmû'a, mentions a short setyrical poem entitled the Zellenâme.

Güftî's most original and famous work, however, is his tezkere-i şu'arâ. It is the only work of this genre ever to be written in verse. It is composed throughout in a variation of the Ḥelî meter (3). It is divided into a mukaddime and a longer section on the lives of the poets.

Following two lines of praise to God, the mukaddime continues with an address to the author's pen. Güftî, like ฿atîfî a century before him, complains about the inability of the members of his own generation to understand and appreciate poetry. He mourns the fact that he is living in Rûm where due respect is not paid to him as a poet. If it were, he argues, then he would receive some reward or favour as a token of this respect. In keeping with the tradition faithfully observed by most of the earlier tezkerecis, he too gives his reasons for writing a tezkere. While, as it was in the case of some of the other tezkerecis, Güftî compiled his tezkere at someone else's request,

(1) Istanbul University library, TY.462 and TY.1861.
(2) 'OM, ii, 391.
(3) فاعلًا تَنَ فِتَاعِمَ نَفَعَانِ
the exposition of this request is most original and fanciful. He gives an account of a dream one night after he had placed his head on the 'pillow of meditation'. He dreams of a ride to heaven on the 'horse of thought and life'. There he meets the souls of the departed poets who ask him his views on the present situation in the world regarding poetry and the poets. It is in order to carry out this request that he sets about writing a tezkere describing the poets and their verses. This work, composed for and dedicated to the souls of the poets of a better age, he says, will be known as the Teşrifât us-pu'arâ. By selecting this title for his tezkere, Güftî is undoubtedly suggesting that he is acting as a master of ceremonies, extolling each poet he introduces. Güftî announces that, while in the past, the tezkerecis have used prose as their medium of expression, he will be original and take a fresh line by composing his work in verse.

The rest of the tezkere, containing about one hundred poets, is, in fact, an answer to the souls' questions. In various instances within the tezkere, he continues to complain of the lack of appreciation of and respect for the poet. He is frequently referring to the fame attained by and the favours shown to the poets of Persia. His standard of poetry is set by the Persians and the poets of Rum are good if they compare favourably with their Eastern counterparts. The tezkere is permeated with remarks which indicate that Güftî was far from satisfied with his career and finds those who came into contact with him mean and uninterested in his poetry. Like Laţîfî in his muqaddime, Güftî throughout his tezkere, leaves the impression that he is bitter at his failure to succeed, and while the Teşrifât us-pu'arâ is ostensibly a biography of the poets, it is one long protest against the
injustices and ignorance of his generation. But as revealed by his work, Güftî was not all pessimism and bitterness. The tezkere is not devoted only to the lives and work of the poets. Their peculiarities and physical characteristics afford Güftî the opportunity of poking fun at them. His humour is crude on the whole and some of the stories he tells would not bear repetition. This, we are told, is characteristic of his other works. While on the one hand his tezkere is mingled with wit and humour, on the other it contains some very derogatory and insulting remarks on the poets. He declares, however, that all he writes must not be taken seriously and is meant in fun. The exact date of the compilation of the Teşrifat us-qu‘arâ is not known, but it can be dated approximately to between the years 1069 and 1071 (1).

Güftî's poetry is generally rather plain. He uses tarkıbs almost in every beyt and his vocabulary is mainly Persian. The sources too, agree that he had a good command of the Persian language.

(1) TDED, ii, 202.
The first of three tezkeres completed in the first half of the 12th century was compiled by Şafāʾī.

The best source of information for this tezkereci is the Teşkere əş-şuʿarāʾ of Râmis (f.164). Şâlim in his tezkere (p.429), gives his biography to within a few years of his death. In Fatih's Hâtimet Âl-e'sâr (p.239), the date of death of Şafāʾī is erroneously given as 1196. This error has been repeated by Muʿallim Negî in Esâm (p.192) and by Şenseddin Sânî in the Rûmûs Âl-e-cââl (iv, 2956). The tezkere of Şafāʾī is also mentioned in Bağdâlî İsmâ'il Paşa's geyl to the Keşf Âz-şâûn (i, 275), where his date of death is also erroneously given as 1196. Most of the sources trace Şafāʾī's career in full, but none supply the dates of his various appointments. Neither do they mention the names of his ancestors and his teachers.

All the sources agree that Şafāʾī's name was Mustâfâ and that he was born in Istanbul. While it is known that he received training as a secretary and accountant, particulars of his teachers and education are not supplied. Having distinguished himself in the profession of kitâbat, we are told that he entered the service of şâdr-i aţâ'en Eknâs Mehmed Paşa (1) who made him his nektâbec. It is certain that Şafāʾī held this post during the years 1106 and 1109 which correspond to the period in which Eknâs Mehmed Paşa was şâdr-i aţâ'en. After the death of Eknâs Mehmed Paşa at the hands of the janissaries on the battle-field of Belgrade in 1109, Şafāʾī was appointed

(1) Râşid Tâhid, i, 317 and 415.
defter emini. Dismissed from this post, he was later re-appointed (1).

Following that, he was mukatta'aci and later was tezkereci of the biyik kal'c. He is also said to have held other similar posts which are not specified in the sources. He was then appointed maliye tezkerecisi for a time. On his dismissal from this post, he presented his completed tezkere to D面膜 İbrahim Paşa who, in return for it, made him defterdar of the siyk-i sani. He died while in that office in the year 1138 (2).

Safä'I is known to have written only a Tezkeret us-su'arâ. It comprises a mukaddime of moderate length, a single faqal and a short hâtime. A number of takarîz by Safä'I's contemporaries, including the tezkereci Sâlim, precede the mukaddime.

Following panegyrics to God and his Prophet Muhammed, the mukaddime contains a eulogy on the reigning padişah, Sultan Ahmed III. Then the author, introducing himself as Safä'I the kâtib-i divan, declares that he envied those who had immortalized their own names by recording the lives and works of the earlier poets. He continues by saying that he had the desire to write a continuation to the works of tezkerecis like Latîf, 'Aşîk, Rîzâ (3) and Hasan Çelebi whose tezkeres cover the poets who flourished up to the year 1050, by writing a tezkere containing the lives of the poets who came after that date.

(1) According to Râmis, the poet Üskûdarî Sîrî said the following bayt on that occasion:—

(2) This is the date given by 'Aşîm in his gazel to the history of Râsid (p.355) and Râmis agrees with it. Fuťin, Mu'allim Nâci, Bağdadîl Ismâ'îl Paşa and Süreyyê in Sicill-i 'Osmanî (ii, 228), however, give the unlikely date of 1196.

(3) In one MS (Nelet Ef. 112), the name is given as Riyâzi, but the fact that he mentions the date 1050 at which the tezkere of Rîzâ ends, makes it most likely that Rîzâ is the tezkereci referred to.
This had been his intention while he was in the service of ṣadr-i ʿāẓam Elnās Meḥmed Paşa, that is to say between the years 1106 and 1109. Because at that time he was employed as defter ʿemīnī and mektūb ān to the ṣadr-i ʿāẓam and was kept busy by affairs of state, the tezkere had remained in its müsavde form. Then there followed the death of Elnās Meḥmed Paşa, and the müsavde was cast into the corner of oblivion for a time. It was further neglected when he was dismissed from his post as maliye tezkerecī. Its completion finally became possible when he entered the service of ṣadr-i ʿāẓam Dānād İbrāhīm Paşa to whom the work was dedicated and presented.

Šafāʾī's tezkere contains the names of some five-hundred poets arranged in the alifbā order. It covers the years 1050 to 1132 and, as such, can be considered as a continuation to the tezkere of Rīzā. The notices are fairly full, usually giving the more important posts held by the poet or the significant events in his life. The origin, names and works of the poets are almost invariably mentioned. Dates of death, too, are frequently supplied, but in many cases these are given only approximately. The language is simple and very much to the point.

The tezkere ends with a hātime in verse. In this short poem God is thanked for His assistance and the reader requested to overlook the deficiencies of the work. It ends with the date of completion of the work given as the year 1132.

Rāmis describes Šafāʾī as very learned, but considers his tezkere to be devoid of the expressions of a māṣī and his language to be too simple. Continuing his comments, Rāmis says that, should the cliché evāʾil-i hālinda, which Šafāʾī has indeed used in nearly every notice, and the references to the works produced by the poets, be removed, it is obvious that there will be little
left in the prose style which could be described as elegant. Şalim who on several occasions corrects some of Şafā’î’s statements, says that when the tezkere was finished the poets of the age expressed their thanks to the author by writing tekārā to it.

İbnulemin Mahmud Kemal İnal (1) and Tahsin Banguoğlu (2) refer to a tezkere, executed in the year 1197, by a certain Kemiksızzüde Şafvet Efendi (3). The MS of this work, not mentioned by any of the primary sources, exists in the library of the University of Istanbul (4). Both İnal and Banguoğlu appear to consider it as an independent tezkere. A recent careful examination of it, however, revealed that this work is not more than a slightly shortened version of the tezkere of Şafā’î with a few insignificant additions. In a tezwîl at the end of the MS, Şafvet states that, because of the shortage of time, he has selected and copied only the best portions of the tezkere of Şafā’î and called the copy which resulted, the Nuhbet ul-āgâr fî fevâ’îd il-āsâr. Furthermore, he gives the date of execution of the copy as 1235 and not 1197 as stated by İnal and Banguoğlu. While the few additions to the work of Şafâ’î make this copy of his tezkere worthy of study, in view of the statements made by the copyist himself, it will best be considered as a shortened text of Şafâ’î’s tezkere and not as an independent contribution to the genre.

(1) Son asir türk saırları, 1,6.
(2) Thesis: Suara tezkireleri, presented to the University of Istanbul in 1930.
(3) Faţîn, Matînet ul-āsâr, p. 241.
(4) TY. 6189.
Only two years after Şafâ’î, Sâlim wrote and presented his tezkerê to the same şâdr-i afaq.

The best source for details of the life of Sâlim is his autobiography in his tezkerê (p.337). Râmix, in his own tezkerê (f.135), deals particularly with the last twelve years of his life. Mehemed Es‘ad, in the Bâgçe-i şafâ-endûs (f.151), Şafâ’î, in his tezkerê (f.152), Bursalî İsmâ‘îl Belyî, in the Nuhbet ul-Asr (f.32b) and Faţîn, in the Hâtinet ul-as‘âr (p.177), add nothing to what is contained in the notice given by Râmix. Mustâkîmsâde Süleyman Sa‘îd üd-dîn Efendi, in the Tuhfe-i haṭṭâtîn (p.454), however, supplies supplementary details on his two marriages and his studies in calligraphy.

Mehmed Sâlim was born in Istanbul in the month of Şumâdâ ul-‘âhîre 1099. His father was the şeyh ul-îslâm Mîrzâ Muṣṭafâ Efendi (1). His training began, when he was a little over seven years old, under Yeni Bâgçeli Efendi who later handed his pupil over to teachers he appointed himself. Sâlim was then coached by his father in literature, the commentaries of the Kur‘ân, the hadîq, arithmetic, logic, philosophy, etymology, syntax, lexicology, jurisprudence and astronomy. He received special training in the hadîs from Üskûdarî Mehemed b. Selên. In the year 1104, he became a mülâżîm under Ebû Sa‘îd-zade Fâyżullâh Efendi with the approval, we are told, of Başmakcazade es-Seyyid ‘Alî Efendi. In 1116, he was appointed müderris of the medresse of

(1) Râsid, Târîh, iv, 27,37 and 75; Āsim, Zeyl-i türîh-i Râsid, p.11.
Mü'eyyed Ahmed Efendi. In 1120, he was at the Şaham, and after fourteen months there, he went to the medrese of Ebül-fezāl Mahmūd Efendi with a stipend of sixty akçe. In 1122, he became mûderris of Sinān Paşa, and in Şevvāl of the same year was sent to the medrese of Şehsāde. In Muḥarram of 1125, he went to the Süleymaniye there, in Şābān of the same year he was appointed to the Dār ül-ḥadīs. Then he spent several months in Selanik and the neighbouring kaşaba of Siruz (1). In 1126, he was back in Istanbul and in Zil-Ḥijāza of the same year, was appointed kāzī of Galata (2). In Cumādā uš-šīrīr of 1127, he was dismissed from this post and went to live with his father in Trabzon in North-Eastern Anatolia. A few years later he held an unspecified post in Bolu in Northern Anatolia for two months. He afterwards returned to Istanbul and settled down in his villa by the sea named Emīr Gūnzāde. At about that time, he was given the arpalik of the kašā of Keşan in the vilâyet of Edirne (3).

In Rebi' uš-evvel of 1132, he received the nīve of Istanbul together with the arpalik of the kašā of Balya near the town of Balikesir in Western Anatolia (4). In 1134, having completed his tezkere, he presented it to gādir-i ʿāẓam Dānād ʿĪbrāhīm Paşa who, in return, had him appointed kāzī of Istanbul a year later. He was dismissed after seven months and given the arpalik (5) of Gümülcine near Edirne (6). In Cumādā uš-əvrām of 1142, he became kāzīsaker of Anadolu. Six years later, in the month of Ṣeḥb, he was appointed kāzīsaker of Rumelî (7).

(1) ʿAlī Cevād, Cərəfa Ləμəti, p.466.
(2) Rəşīd, Tərīh, iv, 23.
(3) Kəmu uš-əl-ləm, v, 3863; Cərəfa Ləμəti, p.666.
(4) Cərəfa Ləμəti, p.151.
(5) ʿAsim, Zəyî-i Rəşīd, p.34.
(6) Cərəfa Ləμəti, p.697.
(7) Şubhî, Tərīh, p.69.
He died in 1156 (1) while he was meşgûl from his last post. He was buried near his father by the aqueduct of Bozdoğan (2). Sâlim is known to have married twice. First he married the daughter of Râmi Paşa (3). Sâlim himself does not mention his second marriage, but Mustakînzâde says that he was the son-in-law of Şeyh ül-islâm Seyyid Feyzullah Şehîd (4).

In his autobiography, Sâlim refers to a number of works which he wrote before the year 1134. He mentions texts and commentaries on syntax and logic, marginal comments to Şâh Rüseyin, and commentaries and marginal comments to Hüseyin Efendi’s Bahâ-i âdâb (5). According to the sources, he translated the ‘Aqlâd-i înân Taḥâvi (6) into Turkish and a Persian dictionary. He wrote a work entitled Mâhiyet ul-‘Aşik on mysticism (7). A Neyl ur-reşâd fi enî ilcîhâd which is said to be in print, a Turkish translation of ‘Aynî’s ‘Ikîd ul-camân fi târîh-i ehl iz-zaman (8) of which eight copies are at the Nuruosmaniye library in Istanbul and a Selîmet ul-insân fi muḥâfat il-lisan existing in the ‘Aşîr Efendi collection of the Sâleymaniye library and said to be in his own hand, are ascribed to him by Bursâli Mehemet Tâhir (9). The tezkerecis Râmid and Şafâ‘î state that he had collected a dîvân.

This prolific writer is known mainly for a Tezkeret uş-su‘ârâ (10) which he presented to Dûmâd İbrâhîm Paşa. It consists of a long muqaddime,
two faqıls and a tetemme.

The muqaddime begins with eulogies of God and the Prophet followed by münaqat in a variation of the hàfif meter (1). These are followed by panegyrics on the sultan, gafr-i a'zam and the gafr ul-islam. The introduction to the tezkere begins with a survey of previous tezkeres written by Hasan Çelebi, 'Apık Çelebi, Laṭif, Kânsâde Fâ'îzî and Miyâzî. Sâlim states that, like the foregoing, he is contemplating writing a similar work on the poets who flourished between 1099, the year of his birth, and 1133. The tezkere was neglected for a while after it was finished, but was eventually accepted by Dânûd İbrâhîm Faşâ. Then the compiler refers to Șafâ'I who had presented his own tezkere to the same person two years previously. Like Laṭîf, Sâlim then predicts that the hard to please and the critics will charge him with falsification of the origins and mahlaqas of the poets he intends mentioning in his work. Sâlim argues that, if there are mistakes in the work, he should not be blamed for them because the poets alter their mahlaqas and change their domiciles so often, that it will be difficult for him to know what to record. The introduction ends with a tashid in which the author states that those who have written tezkeres before him observed certain rules in the organization of their works. He declares that he will do the same. There will be two faqıls, one for the sultans and one for the poets. The second faqıl will be arranged in alphabetical order in which attention will be paid to the second letter of each name. Two padişâhen feature in the first faqıl, Ahmed III and Mustafâ II.

(1) \( u^2 / u - u - - (u^2 -) \).
Their notices are almost entirely laudatory and contain little detail of any biographical value.

The second fagl contains over four-hundred poets arranged in the alifba order. In general the biographical detail supplied is very full, in many cases, the poet's career being followed step by step in chronological order. Dates of appointments and dismissals are almost invariably given. Wherever possible, the author has endeavoured to record whole gazals or complete poems, instead of a mere beyt or two as is often the case with some of his predecessors. He has also devoted a good deal of space to the other works produced by the men he includes in his tezkere.

The work ends with a teterme in which God is thanked for creating a sadr-i a'gham who made it possible for the compiler to finish his tezkere. A tarih gives the date of completion as 1134 (1).

Rāmīz describes Sālim as very learned in the Arabic sciences and unique in his style, as possessing a nature and mind suitable for poetry and prose, and his tezkere as being beyond description in its matchlessness.

(1)
Yet another zayl to Ḍafṣāzde Fā'īzī's Zübde ṣul-ṣaṣār was compiled by Beliğ.

Very little is known about Beliğ's education and career. The best of the early sources is Ṣafā'ī's Tezkere (45). Sālin, in his Tezkere (173), supplies a few more details on his career, but makes errors in his ancestry. In Rūmī's Tezkere (36), he is dismissed in a few lines. Meḥmed Es̄-ṣad, in the Rāṣe-i ṣafā-ṣandā (57), concentrates mostly on his work. Faṭīm, Ḥātimet ul-ṣaṣār (27), gives a very short notice of him. Meḥmed Tevīlköy, in Ḥāfile-i ẓu′far (64), draws all his information from earlier sources. A full biography of Beliğ by Meḥmed Es̄relf is appended to the printed edition of the Gūldeste (541). This biography is based on Suleyman Ḥalîğ's Vefāvât and Es̄relf zāde Şeyh Ahmed ziyyâ ʿud-dîn's Gūlğar-i ẓulahâ ve vefāvât-i ʿurafe which is said to be a zayl to the Gūldeste.

According to Meḥmed Es̄relf there is some doubt as to where and when Beliğ was born. One version is that he was born in the district of Naʾlband in Bursa, and another, that he was born in 1079 in the Bursa district of Emânetçī. Beliğ, whose proper name was Seyyid ʿismāʾīl Beliğ Efendî, was the son of Seyyid Şāhîn Es̄ir-zāde ʿĪbârîn (1) and the grandson of Meḥmed Şāhîn Efendî. While all sources agree that he received a good education, none gives any details concerning his teachers. Very little, too, is known about

(1) Sālin gives the name as Şāhîn Es̄ir Ağa zāde.
the offices which he held, and all that emerges from the few vague and sometimes contradictory details to be found in the sources, is that he held various posts in Bursa as nā'ib and kāṭib. He also seems to have been employed as nā'ib in the town of Tokat in Anatolia, before the year 1114 (1). He died in Bursa in the year 1142 (2) and was buried in the district of Yeni Yer (3).

While it was his Guldeme which made him famous, Belliğ's gevl to Kâfsâde Fâ'âl's Zâbde ul-aspâr also enjoyed a measure of popularity. It consists of a short muqaddime and a single fazl in which one sultan (Ahmed III) is mentioned among the other poets.

The muqaddime opens with the traditional panegyric to God. The compiler then continues with a few words on his tanzkere. He says that he, Es-sayyd İsmâîl Belliğ, is the author of the Guldeme-i riyâs-i ʿirfân which enjoyed considerable success in the period in which Dâmîd Ibrâhîm Paşa was şâd-ar-i aʿzam to Sultan Ahmed III. At this time, it occurred to him that he should write a gevl to Kâfsâde's Zâbde ul-aspâr, but the accomplishment of this task was delayed for a while by unfavourable circumstances. When it was finally completed, this heart-beguiling mecmûa was given the title of Mubâb ul-aspâr ligâyl-i Zâbde ul-aspâr. All the dîvâns of the poets who flourished between 1030, which was the date of completion of the Zâbde, (4) and 1139, were studied very closely from cover to cover. From these dîvâns were selected all

(1) Muḥet Ergun, Türk şairleri, ii, 309.
(2) Süleyman Haliṣ said the following târîh on the occasion of his death:—
(3) Türk şairleri, ii, 309. Yeni Yer is apparently also known as Çatalfirin as given by Süreyya (50, ii, 25) and Bursalî Meḥmed Tâhir (CM, ii, 102, n, 1)
(4) The Zâbde was actually finished in Šafar 1023.
the beautiful verses and recorded. These verses were arranged according to the method adopted by the compiler of the Zâbde. It is hoped, Belig concludes, that it will receive the approval of those who read it.

Like the tezkere of Kâfsâde Fâ'îâ and Mehemd 'Açîn, İsmâ'il Belig's Nuhbet ul-âgîr is organized into a single fasl. It contains over four-hundred poets, including one pâdigân, arranged in alifba order. Unlike the first two, however, there is much more biographical detail given for each poet. In this respect, despite the author's own description of the work in the Mukaddime, the Nuhbet ul-âgîr is a tezkere rather than a mecmü'â. The poetry inserted in it is almost invariably drawn from divâne and mecmü'âs and the number of bayts given varies according to the importance and the fame of the poet.

İsmâ'il Belig's most famous work is the Gûldeste-i rivâz-î 'irfan ve vefâvât-i dânişverân-i nâdirâden. Printed by the Hilâvedînî vilâyeti nâmé'sî in 1302, it was completed in 1139 and is a collection of the biographies of famous men who died in Bursa. Also ascribed to Belig are the following works: Gûl-î sad-berez containing one hundred hadîâ in verse, Sab'i-i sevâre containing seven naîts and mentioned only by the tezkereci Şafâ'I, the Sargüçeşt-nâmé a poem of one hundred and fifty bayts written in 1114 and of which an autograph exists in Millet kütûphaneesi in Istanbul (1), a Şehrengiz on the beauties of Bursa written in 1119, Genç-i şâyegân mentioned only by Bursali Mehemd Tahir who says that an autograph is in the library of Halis Efendi (2), and lastly, a Divân referred to by Şafâ'I and Mehemd Es'ad (3).

(1) Millet Kütûphaneesi, 665.
(2) 'Ôn, ii, 102.
(3) Bâce-î şafâ-endûz, f. 57.
The last tezkere of the 12th century was written by Rânis about whose life little is known. The short biography which follows is based almost entirely on a notice appended to the Millet Kütüphanesi manuscript of this tezkere, dated 1318, (1) by the unidentified copyist. A few lines are devoted to Rânis by Bursalî Mehmed Tâhir in Osmâni müllifleri (iii, 48).

His father was 'Azîz zâde Muṣṭafâ Na'îm Efendi who was born a little before 1100 and who was the son-in-law of a member of the kâzât of Rumeli, Balçîkî Ahmed Lütfî Efendi. Rânis's brother-in-law was Feyûlîh Feyû Effendi, nektûbec to Şeyhülislâm Ebû Sa'id zâde Muṣṭafâ Efendi. Muṣṭafâ Na'îm Efendi served in kâzâs in Rumeli and Anadolu and his home is said to have been in Istanbul in the district of Cebecibâşı 'Ali Ağa. He died in Şevvâl of the year 1149.

One of his sons was Rânis. His given name is not recorded by the biographer. Bursalî Mehmed Tâhir, however, states that it was Hüseyin, that his īsâkâb was 'Arab zâde and that he was from Balçîk in Bulgaria (2). This statement is contradicted by the copyist of the tezkere in question who says that he was born in Istanbul, in his father's house, in the district of Cebeci başı 'Ali Ağa. This house is said to have been situated near the mosque built by Şeyhülislâm İsmâ'îl Efendi in 1136. The tezkereci's date of

(1)  Ali Ediri Ef. 762.
(2)  Kânûsûl-sâlâm, ii, 1206; Goûreyya lüktî, p. 150.
birth is not known, but since his elder brother Mehmed Emīn was born in 1129 (1),
it must have been after that date. His maternal uncle was Belçikī Lütifī Efendi
zade Ahmed Efendi who was son-in-law to Seyhülislām Ībn-i zāde 'Abdullāh Efendi's
brother Hüseyin Efendi. Rāmis, described by Bursali Mehmed Tāhir as a man of
science and learning and interested in history, was educated by his father.
After his father's death, in Şevval 1149, he went to join his elder brother
Mehmed Emīn in Edirne. There he studied Arabic and Persian and other subjects.
Like several members of his family, he entered the legal profession. The
particulars of his career are not mentioned by his biographers. There is no
definite statement anywhere regarding the date of his death. His tezkere con-
tains a certain poet Rā'īf Bey who is said to have died in 1199 (2). If this
is not an addition by the copyist, it would indicate that Rāmis died some time
later. In 'Ogmānī Mü'ellifleri, the date is approximately fixed, probably on
the same basis, as the year 1200.

Bursali Mehmed Tāhir ascribes a number of works to him which are not
mentioned in the notice at the end of the tezkere: A book of legal documents
entitled Zāhir-i hūkām, seyle to the Hadīkat ul-vusūra and the Devhāt ul-
maṣāviḥ and a number of additions to the Kasf izgīnūn. All these works, says
the author of 'Ogmānī Mü'ellifleri, are mentioned in the mukaddime of Rāmis's
Zübālet ul-vāhi'āt written in the reign of Sultan 'Abdu'llāhī I (1187-1204) and
covering the events of six and a half years up to the year 1188.

Rāmis compiled a Tezkaret uṣqurā which continues the biographies
of the poets who flourished from 1134, the year Sālim completed his tezkere, to

(1) Ra, (Es'ad Ef. 3873), f.72a.
(2) Ra, (Ali Emīrī Ef. 762), f.94.
1199 which is the latest date mentioned in the tezkere by Râmis. The work, which has no mukaddime, is organized in one section containing some three hundred and seventy poets and poetesses arranged in alifbä order. The biographical notices in it are generally detailed and in certain cases, the exact dates of the events in the poet's life are also given. The style is simple and to the point and the author rarely indulges in flowery language and exaggerated praise. The tezkere, which according to Bursalî Mehemet Tahir was called the Ādâb-i șurarâ, is described by 'Ali Câ nib as an important document for the second half of the 12th century (1).

(1) Türkiye tasnîf, ii, (1926), "Ogmân zade Tâ'îb Efendi", p.105.
A tezkere devoted entirely to the poets belonging to the Mevlevi order of dervîses was compiled by Esrar Dede early in the 13th century.

The sources give only scanty information on Esrar Dede. While not mentioning his tezkere, Faṭīn's Ḥâtimet-ul-şârâr (p.9) contains the fullest biography. Mehmâd Tevîk, in Khîle-i şârâr (p.41), gives considerably less information and he, too, does not know of his tezkere. He is mentioned very briefly in Sâdî-i ʿOgmânî (i, 329) and ʿOgmânî mülâ'llifleri (ii, 80). Bağdâdî İsmâʾîl Paşa gives his father's name in the Zeyl-i Keşif ʿüz-zûnûn (i, 489).

Seyyid Mehmâd Esrar Dede was the son of a certain ʿAbdullah and was born in Istanbul. He joined the tarîkat-i Mevleviye and entered the Mevlevî-ğâne of Galata in Istanbul where he received his training. His teacher was Şeyhâjbâlib, the head of the Mevlevî-ğâne. He became his favourite and later wrote a tezkere at his request. There is no indication in the sources, that Esrar Dede ever left Galata to serve anywhere else. He is said to have spent his whole time on study and to have had a special interest in prose writing and poetry. He died in the year 1211 and was buried in the grounds of the Mevlevî-ğâne next to Faşîh Dede (2).

Besides a diwân (3), Esrar Dede compiled a tezkere exclusively on the poets who belonged to his own tarîkat. It comprises a mukaddime, one faṣîl and a short hâtîne.

(1) Esrar Dede, Tezkere, f.106b.
(2) Ibid, f.120b.
(3) Zeyl-i Keşif ʿüz-zûnûn, i, 489.
Following eulogies on God and the Prophet, the compiler describes the circumstances which led to the writing of the tezkere. His superior, Şayh Gâlib, had previously collected the verses of the Mevlevî poets into a mecû'a which he intended to expand into a tezkere, but pressure of work had prevented the realization of this plan. While Esrar Dede was benefitting from the teaching of the şayh and learning the art of prose writing and versification from him, he was asked to continue the collection of verses and to add to it the biographies of the poets contained in the mecû'a. The Tezkere-i Şu'ærê-yî Mevleviye is therefore the result of the efforts of two men. Esrar Dede complains about the previous tezkerecis who had endeavoured to write long and detailed tezkeres on all other poets without mentioning those who belonged to the tarîkat. Like his predecessors, Esrar Dede ends his mukaddima by saying that the verses and biographies of the Mevlevî poets, too, must be recorded and preserved for future generations.

The fasîl contains the biographies and poetry of over two hundred Mevlevî poets who lived between the 8th and 12th centuries. While most of the poets included flourished in the 11th and 12th centuries, a few go as far back as the middle of the 8th century, as for instance, Hîzîr Paşa Süleyman Şâh (1). The notices are long, but the biographical material is scanty, most of them being expanded by interpolations on derviş life and practice. Many of the sources used by Esrar Dede are mentioned by name in the tezkere. He drew material from the tezkeres of Latifî, Kînâlîzâde and Sâlim, from Riyûzî's Rivâî us-su'ârâ, Kâfzâde's Züb'det ul-âs'âr and Belîg's Rohbet ul-âsâr. One

(1) Esrar Dede, Tezkere, f.38b.
work which he used extensively was Şeyh Muṣṭafā Sarīb's Ṣafînâ-i nefsî. Also mentioned as sources are the Vekâ'î-ul-fukalâ of Şeyhî and Es'ed Efendi's Teşkere-i hâşendeğêh. There is a marked contrast between the language of the teşkere of Esrâr Dede and that of the other works of this nature. This is particularly true of the material which Esrâr Dede borrowed from earlier teşkereş. While the meaning remains the same, the vocabulary is invariably altered to give a more mystical flavour to the notices.

A hâtına in a variation of the hesâq (1) meter indicates that the work was completed in the year 1211 and that it took two months to write.

(1) ---u/-u--/u---
Prior to the year 1204, Mehməd Emın known as Silahdərzəde, a gedikli at court, wrote a short tezkere covering the lives of poets who flourished between the years 1166 and 1204. None of the sources, early or late, mention Siləhərzəde who is known only through a manuscript of his tezkere in the Millet Kütüphanesi in Istanbul (1). This work contains the names of some one hundred and twenty poets organized approximately in alfibə order. The biographical detail does not amount to much and is rarely more than a few lines on the poets' origin, profession and date of death. The poetic samples given in it are nearly always complete gazels or jil'as and rarely exceed two in number. On account of the brevity of its notices, this work could perhaps best be described as a mecmə with very little more than the usual information found in works of this nature.

Fifteen years later, Siləhərzəde's mecmə was used as the basis for a slightly larger work by Şefkat. Only a few details are available on his life. These are to be found in a very short notice by the author himself in his own tezkere (f.108), in the Sicill-i ʿOgmənî (iii, 151) where the tezkere is not mentioned at all, and in the ʿOgmənî müʾellifleri (ii, 265) in which some additional information on his works is to be found.

ʿAbdulfettāh Şefkat was born in the town of Bagdad. For a time he served the hanı of Crimea, probably as secretary. Later he was kātib to the

(1) Ali Emiri Ef. 795.
boys of Wallachia and Moldavia in Istanbul. He is also known to have held some office under 'Ali Bey who was a court official. In view of the fact that the latter died in 1233, it must be assumed that it was at about this date that Şefkat, because of extreme old age, went to live in retirement in his house at Kuru Çeşme on the Bosphorus. After an illness which lasted several years, he died in the year 1242 and was buried there in the local cemetery. Described by Süreyya as a poet and an erudite, Şefkat refers to himself as a member of the erişt-i meʾārif occupied with the propagation of the sciences.

Şefkat is said to have collected a dīvānçe and to have written a gazi to the Hacişık ul-vugārî. Bursaɪ Mehmed Ṭâhir also ascribes to him a rather long nesnövî poem on the Prophet and members of his family.

Şefkat's tezkere consists of a mukaddime, one fasıl and a very short hātimê.

Following the conventional eulogy of God, Şefkat continues his introduction by referring to the mecmûʿa collected and organized by Nâşid İbrâhîm Bey, the son of Râṭib Ahmed Pâşa. Nâşid was born in 1161 and trained in the Enderûn-i humâvûn. After serving as a mābâvîncî, in 1187, he was appointed kapucu başî. He died in 1210 as the kâhyâ of Emîr Sultan (1). According to Şefkat, this mecmûʿa was very successful and prompted another member of the palace, 'Ali Bey, to suggest to Şefkat that he should compile a tezkere. 'Ali Bey was the son of Yaḥyâ Paşazâde. He served as kapucu başî and died in 1233 (2). Şefkat puts forward the traditional reasons for con-

---

(1) So, iv, 532; Şefkat, Tezkere, f.190.
(2) So, iii, 556;
sidering himself unfit to accomplish such a task. Like all other tezkerecis, however, he finally agrees to write a tezkere organized in the same fashion as the previous works of this genre. The mukaddime ends with a few words in praise of 'Ali Bey. Before beginning the [as], the author states that only poets who lived since the time of Sultan Mahmud I (1143-1168) have been included in the work.

While there is no reference whatsoever to it in the mukaddime, as far as can be ascertained by a comparison of the two works, there seems to be little doubt that Şefkat had Silähdärzade's tezkere in front of him when he wrote his own work. Almost every notice in the tezkere of Şefkat is identical to that found in the tezkere of Silähdärzade. In some instances Şefkat has made some minor additions, mainly by supplying the date of death of the poets who were still alive when Silähdärzade wrote. Şefkat's tezkere, containing some one hundred and twenty poets, shows three omissions from and ten additions to the tezkere of Silähdärzade. There is very little difference too, in the poetic samples given by the two tezkeres.

The tezkere of Şefkat ends with a short hâtime in which the date of completion of the work is given as the year 1229.
A tezkere devoted exclusively to the poets who were employed at the enderun-i humayun was compiled by 'Akif.

The best source for this tezkereci is his autobiography to be found in the Mir‘at-i gi‘r (f. 110). Mehemed Es‘ad Efendi reproduces this autobiography in his bagco-i saleh-endü (f. 176). Ibtülminin Mehmud Kemal Inal, Son asir türk şairleri (i, 76), gives a summary of it and describes his tezkere. Bağdălî Isma‘il Paşa merely mentions his tezkere and gives his ancestry in the Zevl-i Keşf-i saleh (ii, 459).

'Akif’s father, Koca Bekir Paşa, was çavuş başı while Dâmed İbrăhin Paşa was grand vezir to Sultan Ahmed III. In 1136, he became a vezir and later, served as şeyh in Mecca, Gıdde on the Red Sea coast of the Arabian peninsula, in Ethiopia, Egypt, Bosnia and Morea. According to his son, he was also kamer-i dervâ for a time. He married Sâfiye Sultan, the daughter of Sultan Mustafa II. He died in 1171 and was buried in the grounds of a school which he had built in the district of Aksaray in Istanbul.

The tezkereci Mehemed 'Akif does not give the date of his birth in his autobiography. He merely says that at an early age, he was cared for by his grandfather Mehemed Bey. This would indicate that he was born before 1171. Mehemed Bey, who was still mir-i âlem-i hase while 'Akif was writing his tezkere in or a little before the year 1211, appears to have been his only teacher as well as his guardian. In 1193, 'Akif was admitted to the enderun-i humayun and a little later, received an appointment to the kiler-i hase. As far as
is known, he remained there at least until 1211, which is the date on which his tezkere was finished. It is not known when he died.

Mehmed 'Äkif, also referred to as 'Äkif-i Enderûnî, was the author of a tezkere containing the biographies and verses of his colleagues in the various departments of the enderûn-i hümâyûn. It comprises a mukaddime, four fasîls and a hâotime.

The mukaddime opens with eulogies to God and the reigning nâdîsîh, Sultan Selîm III. Then referring to his work, 'Äkif says that the poets included in it are organized into four groups. Each group represents one of four sections of the enderûn-i hümâyûn. The group headings are: Hâne-i hâgase, hâzîne-i hümâyûn, kîlar-i hâase and hâne-i seferli. After expressing the hope that those who read his tezkere, which he has named the Mir'ât-i sîr, will overlook his mistakes and shortcomings and will forgive him for daring to write such a work. Selim and Hasan Çelebi, 'Äkif continues, have included the verses of the sultân at the beginning of their tezkereler and he is emulating them by closing his introduction with a few poems from the dîvan of Sultan Selîm III. These poems are omitted in the manuscript of the Mir'ât-i sîr studied (1).

As stated by the author in the mukaddime, this tezkere has four fasîls containing the lives and verses of twenty-three poets who were 'Äkif's contemporaries and colleagues at the enderûn-i hümâyûn. The biographical information is short and centered mostly on the poet's career in the royal palace. While many of the poets are mentioned by other tezkereler, some were

(1) Ali Emîr Ef. 773.
known only to 'Ākif.

The tezkere ends with a ḥātime in which the tezkereci states that it was presented to Sultan Selim III by the good offices of Ahmed Efendi theṣir kātibi. 'Ākif closes his ḥātime declaring that the title of the tezkere, Mir'āt-i şir, is the tārīh which indicates that the work was completed in the year 1211.
A few years before the royal proclamation which ushered in the 
Tanzimat period of the Ottoman empire, the historian Es'ad Efendi compiled his 
"tezkere-i şu'arâ."

The fullest biography of Es'ad is given by another tezkereci Fatih in 
the Hâtimet ül-şar (p.13). Mehmed Tevfik summarizes the information given 
by Fatih in the incomplete "Kâfile-i şu'arâ" (p.41). The "vâli" Lütfi gives 
his "tercume-i hâl" and mentions some of his works in his "Tarih" (viii, 163). În 
Han-zade Na'îli Efendi appends a biography of Es'ad to his copy of the tezkereci's 
work ("Bâçe-i safâ-endûs, f.246). İmâm-emin Mehmed İnal mentions him in his 
tezkere, "Son sair türk şairleri" (ii, 321). Bağdâli İsmâ'îl Paşa mentions 
Es'ad's tezkere but does not give any further detail in the "Zavl-i Keşf üz-zûnûn" 
(i, 162). A notice of Es'ad is given in the "İslâm Ansiklopedisi" (Cüz 33, p.263) 
by M. Münir Aktepe.

Mehmed Es'ad Efendi, the son of Hâcî Ahmed Efendi, was born in 
Istanbul in the year 1201. In his childhood he was educated by his father and 
several other teachers who remain unnamed in the sources. When his father was 
appointed kâdh of Medina in 1213, Es'ad left Istanbul with him on a boat that was 
bound for the Hijaz. Somewhere near Suez, the boat sank and according to Fatih, 
Es'ad and his nephew, the kâtib 'Abdurrahman Efendi, floated on a piece of 
wreckage all night until they finally reached shore. With the help of the "vâli" 
of Egypt Es'ad returned to Istanbul and continued his training under Hâlet Efendi. 
In 1223, he became a müdderris, but owing to financial difficulties, he had to 
give up the teaching profession and went to serve as nâ'ib in various kazas in 
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Anadolu and Rumeli. On Şafar 1241 (1), he was appointed vâkʿaʾ-šârî in place of Şâhīzade ʿÂṭāʾullâh Efendi and remained in this position until his death. He appears to have returned to the teaching profession for a little while and after a few months at the Şefan, he was given the nâve of Üskûdar in 1242. During the war against Russia in 1243, Esʿad Efendi was appointed kâfî to the army, but returned to Istanbul during the same year to take up his appointment as kâfî of Üskûdar. Two years later, he received the nâve of Mekka, and in 1247, he was sent to Sofya and Şehîrciye (2) in connection with the census in Rumeli and Anadolu. Not long after that he was selected to supervise the preparation of the Tekvîma vekeârî of which the first copy appeared on 25th Cümâdâ ul-evlâ 1247. In the year 1249, he received the nâve of Istanbul as well as the arapalî of the island of Chios in the Aegean Sea, and then became kâfî of Istanbul. On the occasion of the accession of Mehmed Şâh to the throne of Persia in 1251, Esʿad Efendi was temporarily appointed ambassador from the Sublime Porte and sent to Persia to present the congratulations of Sultan Mahmûd II to the new şâh. At the same time, he received the nâve of Anadolu. Towards the end of 1253, he was dismissed from his post as nâzîr to the Tekvîmehâne because, on account of a long illness, he had not been able to submit his financial report to the mâliye nâzîr, Nâriş Paşa within the specified time. Later, however, he was appointed karâtîn nâzîrî and given the nâve of Rumeli. Then, for a period of two years, he served as a member of the Meclis-i alḵân-i ʿadliye, following the proclamation of the Tanẓîmat on 26th Şaʿbân 1255. In

(1) Fatîn and Mehmed Tevfik give the date of this appointment as 1239.
(2) Kânûs ul-ʾâlûm, iv, 2890.
Cumāda ul-ahiye of the year 1257, he became nakīb ul-eṣrāf and in 1259, was appointed kāfīʾasker of Rumeli. Three years later, he was made a member of the Meclis-i meʿārif-i ʿumūniye of which he became president not long after. He died in Safar 1264 and was buried near the library which he had built next to his residence in Yerebatan in Istanbul.

Mehmed Esʿad Efendi was very closely connected with the series of reforms which took place during the reigns of Māhmūd II and ʿAbdulmecīd. He served on various bodies concerned with financial and educational reforms. He played a prominent part in the final stages of the struggle between the sultan and the janissaries, and was the official who read the royal proclamation abolishing the corps in 1241 (1). He was a discriminating collector of books which he stored in his own library next to his residence. This valuable collection is now kept among the books of the mosque of Süleymaniye. As well as an active reformer, Esʿad Efendi was a versatile writer. Besides a tezkerə, he wrote several other works, some of which have been printed.

Tarih. A history in two volumes of the years 1237 to 1241 inclusive, of which manuscripts are available in several libraries in Istanbul. This history is a şevl to Şāfiʿ zādeʾs and was used by Cevdet Paşa as a source (2).

Taşrifât-i ʾ kadime (3). Printed in 1287, this work is about the various ceremonies observed in the court.

Üss-i ʾsafar. Perhaps Mehmed Esʿad’s best known work, it deals with the irregular cavalrymen used by the army during the reign of Māhmūd II and with the

(1) Cevdet, Tarih, xii, 168.
(2) Ibid, i, 13.
(3) 'OM, iii, 24, where the title is given as Taşrifât-i devlet-i ʾosmāniye.
abolition of the corps of janissaries. It was written in 1241 and printed first in 1243 and again in 1293 (1).

Zühve-i tēvārīh. It is based on Lārī's history, Mīr' āt ul-ṣadār va mīrḵāt ul-ṣāḥār (2). A copy of this work, in the author's own hand, is to be found in the Süleymaniye library (Es'ad Ef. 2410).

Sefer-nāme-i hāvr. An account of a journey in Eastern Thrace by Sulṭān Maḥmūd II in 1247 (3).

Şāhīd ul-mūverriḥīn. A work on the art of writing tārīḫs containing the biographies of the foremost tārīḫ writers of the age.

Arāt ul-hāvr. About a forty day journey, undertaken in the year 1253, by Sulṭān Maḥmūd II in the province of Tūm. A summary of this journey is given by Lūṭfī (Tārīḫ, v, 89).

Mīngā' āt. Two rocā̄qas containing various articles by Es'ad Efendi in the Süleymaniye library (Es'ad Ef. 3847 and 3851).

Dīvān. A copy in the author's own hand is also kept in the Süleymaniye library (Es'ad Ef. 3852). (4).

Tercümen-i Mustaʿrāf. A Turkish translation of the Mustaʿrāf (tabl kull fenn mustaʿrāf) of Meḥmed b. Aḥmed ul-Ṭaṭīb ul-Ībāṣī il-Miṣrī (5). It was printed by the Maṭbaʿa-i āmīre in 1263. To the tenth bāḥ of this work is appended a risāla entitled Naṣr ʿazīz.

El-vīrīd ul-mūfīd fi šerīt it-tevāvīd. Printed in Istanbul in 1264 and 1298.


(1) Zevl-i Keşf üg-gümün, i, 77.
(2) Zevl-i Keşf üg-gümün, i, 621.
(3) Aktepe, II, Ciz. 33, p.364, "Es'ad Efendi".
(4) Zevl-i Keşf üg-gümün, i, 489.
(5) GAL, C.11, 56.
A translation of Şayh Mehməd Cazıvrı’s As-sa‘ī ul-mehmūd II niṣā‘in ul-cimūd. Pendnəme. A poetic work in Turkish and said to exist in print (1).

Es‘ile ve esvihe. Printed in Istanbul in 1250, this work is a Turkish translation of an Arabic risāla written by Akşehirli Nīca ‘Ömer.

Mesh-i rīsā va mesh-i huf. A risāla. In the Suleymaniye library (Es‘ad Ef. 3625).

İhtilāf ut-tevratān. Suleymaniye library (Es‘ad Ef. 3642).

Maḥāsin-i meşādive. Suleymaniye library (Es‘ad Arif Bey 4268).

Es‘ad Efendi wrote a tezkere which he called the Bagçe-i şafā-şendūz. The mukaddime of this work is at the Suleymaniye. It is a very untidy and almost illegible draft copy in an unidentified hand. A very recent copy is to be found in the library of the University of Istanbul (2).

In a short mukaddime, the compiler states that the tezkere is a şayl to Sālim’s; tezkere, but unlike Sālim’s and Hasan Çelebi’s, it contains a number of Persian poets whom he met during his visit to Persia in 1251. The name of the tezkere is given as Bagçe-i şafā-şendūz which is also the tarih indicating that it was completed in the year 1251. The single tezkere contains the biographies of two hundred and six poets who flourished between 1135 and 1251. No poetic samples are given, although space left at the end of each notice indicates that the author intended to add them at a later date. The biographical detail is brief, but the information on the works written by the poets is often very detailed. The language is simple on the whole and usually to the point.

(1) Aktepe, IA. Güz 33, p.365, "Es‘ad Efendi".
(2) This manuscript was prepared in 1353/1935, by İne Han zade Sa‘ili Efendi who is a member of the Taşrif Komisiyom. He declares, in a preface, that he has found it very difficult to decipher Es‘ad’s hand and regrets that in certain places he has been obliged to leave blank the words which he was not able to read.
The last tezkereeci to be considered in this chapter is ‘Arif Hikmet, a highly successful member of the ‘ulūmī class who reached the zenith of the legal profession by becoming şeyhülislām.

The detail that is available on ‘Arif’s life is such that it is possible to reconstruct his biography in full and accurately. Among the contemporary tezkereecis Mehmed Es‘ad in the Būke-i ascā-śengūz (f.130) and Fatīm in the Hātimat ul-asp‘ar (p.70), concentrate largely on his career. The information is drawn mainly from the histories of Cevdet Paşa and Lütфи to which reference will be made wherever necessary. Supplementary details are supplied by İbnülemin Mahmud Konal İnal in the Son asîr türk şairlerê (iv, 620) who had access to an important work by ‘Arif not available or unknown to the earlier tezkereecis. This Meşhêrī ut-terācim contains valuable information on the tezkereci. In IA (cüz 8, 564), Fevziye Abdullah gives additional details drawn from Mehmed Ziver’s mukaddime to ‘Arif’s divān and other sources not available to us, but to which reference will be made as the occasion arises.

Seyyid Ahmed ‘Arif Hikmet’s father was the kâdi’aṣker İbrâhîm ğüşmet who died in 1222. ‘Arif’s ancestry is given in full by İnal from the Meşhêrī ut-terācim as b. İbrâhîm ğuşmet b. il-vezîr ışâ-şehîr Râ‘îf ğisâ‘îl Paşa b. il-vezîr ışâ-şehîr Malatvâvî İbrâhîm Paşa b. il-ışıc Muṣṭafâ al-Hûseynî al-İstanbulî. ‘Arif was born in Istanbul on Sunday night 25th Muḥarram 1201 (1) and began his training at the age of ten. His education and apprenticeship

(1) 80, iii, 275. The date is erroneously given as 1200.
appear to have lasted twenty years, but there is no mention, in any of the sources, of the names of his teachers. In 1229, he went to Mecca on pilgrimage and two years later received his first appointment to the nevleviyyet of Jerusalem. He held similar offices in Cairo from 1236 and in Medina from 1239, following which, in 1242, he was given the nāwen of Istanbul (1). According to Lütfi, 'Aref was offered the kāzā of the capital in 1244, but refused it on the grounds that he was in debt, sick and not the owner of a palace. Despite the şeyhülislām's efforts to force him into accepting the office by referring the matter to the sultan, 'Aref's decision was upheld (2). In 1245, he was sent to Rumeli in connection with the census which was being taken there. The following year, on his return to Istanbul, he became nakib ul-esraf. In Muḥarram 1249, he was appointed kāzīcasker of Anadolu. In Safar 1250 he resigned from the post of nakib ul-esraf. At that time, too, having sold the villa which he inherited from his father in Kusguncuk, he acquired a house in Eski Hanam in Üsküdar. In Ramādān of 1254, he became kāzīcasker of Rumeli. The following year he was appointed a member of the Meclis-i vāle-yi ehl-i cedlive. According to Lütfi, officials were sent to all parts of the empire to ascertain whether the reforms proclaimed by the sultan in the Gülhane square in Sa'bān 1255, were being carried out. One of these officials was 'Aref, who, as kāzīcasker of Rumeli and a member of the above named Meclis, was appointed inspector of Rumeli in 1256 (3). Referring to this inspection, İbnülemin Mahmud Keneal İnal quotes a passage from 'Aref's diary, found in the former's

(1) This appointment, mentioned by all early sources, is left out by Fevziye Abdullah.
(2) Lütfi, Tarih, ii, 152.
(3) Lütfi, Tarih, vi, 101.
private library, in which the tezkereci gives an account of a visit to Bergos (1) where he was attacked by over one hundred bugs which caused him to seek refuge in the local medrese. In 1260 'Arif was made a member of the Dér-i şüre-yi 'askeri, and in 1261, of a meclis formed to recommend reforms in the mekâtib-i şûbân (2). On the death of Mekki-zâde Muṣṭafâ ʻAsîm Efendi, on 22nd Zi‘l-hicce 1262, 'Arif became şeyhülislâm. According to the mukaddime of his dîwân, he held this highest post in the legal profession for seven years, six months and nineteen days and resigned on 21st Gümâdân 1-a‘hir 1270. It is understood from a passage in Ziyâ Paşa’s Verâset mektûblârî, quoted by İbnülemîn İnal, that 'Arif decided to resign from his post on account of some disagreement between himself and the şadîr-i â‘zam Reşîd Paşa. After this resignation, he instituted a library in Medina containing more than five thousand books. He had intended spending the rest of his life in study and meditation among these books, but he died in Istanbul on 16th Şâ‘bân 1275. He was buried next to his father at a place called Mûḥ Kuyusu in Üşküdar.

We learn from a letter, quoted by İbnülemîn İnal, which he wrote from Jerusalem to some one in Istanbul, that 'Arif had a daughter called Hasîbe and that she and her mother died in Jerusalem. That he had another daughter by the name of Fâţma who died in 1227, is revealed by a târîh which Fevziye Abdullah says is to be found in his dîwân. A son, called Mu‘în Bey, is mentioned by Şüreyya (3). While there is no reference to it in the sources, 'Arif is said to make it quite clear in his dîwân that he belonged to the târîket known as the Neşâgibendî.

---

(1) Göğsüye lüqetî, p.166; Kârûnüs 1-ul-a‘lâm, ii, 1281-2. There appear to be two places in Rumeli by this name.

(2) Lü‘îf, Târîh, viii, 19.

(3) 30, iii, 275.
It is understood from numerous quotations given by İbnülemín İnal from works like Rifat Efendi's *zav̠il* to the *Devshet ul-mesâvir*, Çevdet Paşa's *Marûzât*, Abdurrahman Şeraf Efendi's *Târîh mûsâhabeleri* and from an article in the *Cerdî-i hâvûdîs* of 17th Şâ'bân 1275, that ʿArif Hijmet was highly esteemed and well known for his learning, generosity and shyness. From another quotation by İbnülemín İnal, we learn that he was tall, thin, awe inspiring and that he had exceptionally thick eyebrows.

Contemporary evaluation and criticism of his work shows that he was not as successful as would be expected for a man of his position and reputation. While Çevdet Paşa praises the poetry which he wrote in the three languages and says that he was famous even outside the empire (1), Muʿallim Nâîf, in *Qâmûnî* şâârîlerî, finds his poetry mediocre (1) and Fevziye Abdullah implies, by referring to works which devote little room to his verses, that he was not worthy of a better place in the anthologies compiled during and after his lifetime. İbnülemín İnal expresses the opinion that far greater works than the ones he wrote would have been expected from a man of ʿArif's learning and ends by saying that, while he had both the knowledge and the time, he cannot understand why ʿArif did not produce work of a higher standard.

Apart from his tezkere, ʿArif's works are: *Divân* containing poems in Ottoman, Arabic and Persian. It was lithographed by the Matba’a-i Āmire in 1283 with a mukaddime by Mehmed Ziver. According to Fevziye Abdullah, most of the poems contained in it are ındârâ and târîhî. *Mecmû́a i̇t-tarâcîn*. An Arabic biography of the *ulumâ* and poets who flourished during various periods. In his biography of ʿArif, İbnülemín İnal says that

(1) Quoted by İbnülemín İnal.
he does not know where this work is, but in another part of his own tezkere he
indicates that it is in İsmâ'îl Paşa's possession (1). In yet another reference
to it in an article, İnal states that a copy is to be found in the Millet Kütü-
phaneesi (2). Bursaî Mehmed Tahir says that he studied the work, but does not
say where it is to be found (3).

Zeyl-i Keşf ızg-şünün. İnal states that a large part of this müsavedd is held
by İsmâ'îl Paşa who made use of it for the compilation of his own zevl. Some
sheets of the müsavedd, İnal continues, are in his own library. Fevziye
Abdullah states that the part of the work as far as the letter ctn is in the
hands of the commission engaged in editing the Keşf ızg-şünün.

Al-shikâ'ul-marî'îva fi'l-arâzîl ı-sâîrîye. This work is mentioned very briefly
only by Bursaî Mehmed Tahir and Bağdîlî İsmâ'îl Paşa (4).

Jülâset ul-mâkâlât fi mecalîs il-mükâlemât. A collection of agreements reached
at the conferences of the Mükâlemât-i siyâsiye to which the collector's father,
İsmet Bey, was a delegate. A very good copy of this work is to be found in
the Istanbul University library (no. 3791).

Tegkeret ızg-şarâ. This work, the last with which we shall be concerned in
this body of literature, is a short tezkere never actually finished by the com-
piler. A copy of it, made by 'Ali Bârî Efendi from the müsavedd owned by
İsmâ'îl Paşa, is kept at the Millet Kütüphaneesi (no. 789). It consists of one
section on poets who lived between the years 998 and 1252 and opens with a few
lines on Sultan Selîm III who composed verses under the mahlas of ilhamî.
Most of the two hundred and nine poets contained in it flourished in the

(1) Son asîr türk şairleri, i, 8.
(2) TTM, 18 (95). 1926, 'Meşhir-i mecbûle', p.39.
(3) 'CN, ii, 327.
(4) Ibid; Zeyl-i Keşf ızg-şünün, i, 37.
second half of the twelfth and the first half of the thirteenth centuries, but
a number of earlier poets are also included. The notices in this tezkere
which has neither mukaddime nor hâtime and of which the date of compilation is
not known, are very short and of little biographical value. The information,
originally in the müavedde, has been supplemented with tecvila by the copyist
who very clearly marks his own additions. For a man of 'Arif's calibre this
work falls short of the requirements of a good tezkere, but constitutes a link,
nonetheless, between the earlier tezkeres and Faṭīn's Hâtime ul-as'ār written
about twenty years later. 'Ali Emīrī Efendi, in a very short introduction
to the Millet Kütüphanesi copy of the work, expresses the opinion that 'Arif
conducted his research well and that the tezkere contains information not to
be found anywhere else. The copyist laments the fact that the work is incom-
plete and declares that copies of it are rare and the one he is preparing must
be preserved.
Sources of the Teskerecis

1. Continuity of the genre.

While, basically, the purpose of this traditional Islamic literary genre continued to be an attempt at the preservation of the facts regarding the lives of the poets and the illustration of the quality and character of their literary work, through time, its Ottoman examples or counterparts began to take on a characteristic form, to which, with some notable exceptions, all subsequent representatives remained faithful. The first Ottoman tezkereci, as is everywhere evident in his work, differs little from his Persian predecessors in the arrangement of his material and the exposition of the few facts which he could collect; and, for that matter, gives little evidence of independent thinking when compared with the Persian biographies of this nature which he used as an example for his own work. His notices are usually very short and rarely exceed a few lines which do no more than merely identify the poet. Those who copied him and continued the same tradition in Ottoman literature after him, however, while adopting more or less the same method of organization of material, began to make certain valuable biographical additions and to swell their notices by interpolating anecdotes and passages which throw some light on the social life of their times. It should be recorded, however, that this was the case only as regards the longer and fuller tezkereis, the shorter ones being closer imitations of the earliest Ottoman example. While the continuity of the genre appears to be uppermost in the minds of all the tezkerescis, they did not all subscribe to the same conception with regard to the character and purpose of the genre. For some, like Sehi,
Rıza and Çefkat, the tezkere was a reference work and all the material is recorded without polish and kept to a bare minimum. For Kınâlisâde the genre was, almost, a pretext for the production of a work in which could be displayed his own literary capabilities. For ʿ Ağik Čelebi, it afforded an opportunity of recording contemporary social tendencies and characteristics, transforming the tezkere into a work which had both biographical and historical value and which somewhat justified the author's description of it as 'a history of poetry' (1). And for Güftî, it was an opportunity of displaying poetic ability.

There is a strong desire to achieve the continuity of one genre or another throughout Ottoman literature. This desire acts as a stimulus for the composition of works dealing, to a large measure, with subjects of an historical and biographical nature. The historians and biographers show an awareness of the need for an unbroken chain of recorded facts. History, we are led to understand, is made everyday, it was recorded in the past and will have to be recorded in the future. Likewise great statesmen, saints and poets come and go perpetuating an age-long heritage in their own fields of endeavour, leaving behind them more facts which will add yet another chapter to existing knowledge and link it with more data concerning the future in the shape of biographical literature. This desire led to the production of historical works written by the vakâ' i'niwâs, of biographies of famous men who belonged to the ẓâlemâ and meşâyîh classes by authors like Taşkörâsâde, ʿ Aṭâ'I and Şeyhî, and lastly of the tezkere-i guvârâ. All three classes are regarded as history by the

(1) Ağa (634), Nakaddime, f. 34b.
native bibliographers, and grouped as such in the original catalogues to the large libraries.

In considering the sources to which the tezkerecicis turned for material, this attempt at continuing the work of an earlier tezkereci is manifest in the number of zeyls produced. Even if the tezkereci has omitted to specify that his own tezkere is a continuation, the fact that the poets who are selected for mention in his tezkere flourished or lived during the years immediately following the completion of the preceding tezkere is a clear indication that the tezkereci is attempting, consciously or otherwise, to continue from where his like-minded predecessor left off. Among the tezkerecs which are declared by their authors to be zeyls are: the Zeyl-i Züde of 'Aşim and the Nuhbet ul-âsâr ligezeyl-i Züdet ul-âşâr of Belîg Efendi, both of which are continuations to Ẓâfârde Pā'înî's Züdet ul-âşâr. Those which are not declared to be zeyls but which are undoubtedly continuations, are the works of Ẓafâ'î, Sâlim, Râmis and Esâ'ad Efendi.

There is considerable overlapping in all the tezkerecs of the tenth and the early eleventh centuries. Many of the poets who flourished at that period are featured in the works of several tezkerecicis. This enabled the biographers to make greater use of preceding tezkerecs as sources than will be witnessed in the later stages of the history of Ottoman biographies of poets, even by the tezkerecicis who fail to mention the fact in their introductions or individual notices. As an example of this may be cited the case of Leţîfî who makes use of Şehî's Nâş Bihîşt without
acknowledging it, a fact already alluded to in the biography of the former in the last chapter (1), or the numerous passages copied verbatim from Āṣīk Čelebi by Ǧīnālīzādē. There are many tezkerecis, however, who do make acknowledgements and indicate from which source they have borrowed material.

Relying for his material on notices by Latfī and Āṣīk Čelebi, Ǧīnālīzādē generally introduces this borrowed information with phrases such as: Latfī ḫavūlū üzre…, "According to Latfī…; Āṣīk Čelebi… diyā hikāyet eder, "Ḵāṣī Čelebi relates that…; or criticizes his source with: Latfī mezbūrī… diyū medī yelemişdir, lākin…, "Latfī praises the aforementioned as …, but…; or compares his two sources with: Latfī Kastamuni-nāmesinde… dimişdir, lākin Īṣī Čelebi… dimişdir, "In his Kastamuni-nāme Latfī says…, but Īṣī Čelebi says…" (2). Īṣī Čelebi, on the other hand, holds his source responsible for the veracity of the detail; Sehī Bey istilāhine…, "In Sehī Bey's words…" (3); or Nevā'ī'ın Mecālis un-Nefā'is 'inde megđıür olan şu'arādan…, "One of the poets mentioned in Nevā'ī'ın Mecālis un-Nefā'is..." (4). Sālim expresses his dislike of his predecessor, whom, however, he did not refrain from using, in quotations like: "The irritating Safā'ī who wrote a tezkere…" (5).

(1) See, O.h. 2 p. 39.
(2) KZ, ḵf. 104b (Dā'ī), 80b (Ḫustī), 95a (Ḫustī), 115b (Rā'ī) and 126a,b (Zeyneb Ṣatmī), cf. B, ḵf. 80 (Ṣāḥī) and ḵf. 120 (Ḵāṣkerī).
(3) Aṯ (6434) ᵐs. 63a (Celīfī).
(4) Ibid. (6434) ᵐs. 73a (Ḵāṣkerī). Ǧīnālīzādē reproduces the same details ( ᵐs. 61b) in slightly altered language.
(5) Sām, ḵf. 262 (Rā'īd) et passim.
Esrar Dede, on the other hand, is more straightforward and prefers:

"The teskere writer 'Aşık Çelebi writes on the biography of the above in this manner...." (1). 'Arif İlmet says simply: "It is written in the teskere of Riyâzî that he was a member of the kuşât." (2). And Mehrad Es'ad Efendi: "Given in the draft of Râmis that he was the brother of a man named Nûh Efendi." (3).

2. Mecmu'as and Divâns.

As far as the poetic citations, traditionally appended to each biographical notice in almost every teskere, are concerned, the primary sources of the teskerecitis were the numerous anthologies known as mecmu'as into which were collected the selected poems of various individuals. Another source were the divâns which, unlike the mecmu'as, were the collected works of one poet, and which, although more rare than the mecmu'as, were fuller in the biographical detail sometimes found in their muqaddimes. In most of the mecmu'as - Kâfzâde's being the only prominent exception - the only identification of the poet is by the heading of the selection or, more frequently, by the mahlaq in the poem itself. This occasionally caused confusion, and thus, for example, a şazel by

(1) KD, f. 53a. (Derviş Hayâtı).
(2) AH, f. 39b (Qafî'î).
(3) ME, ff. 3 (Esor) and 72 (Fîrî) respectively.
Ahmed Paşa in Naşimi's Meemü'='n-naṣā'ir is attributed to Ahmedî and this has misled van Hammer (GÖD, vol. i, p. 30) into including it in his section on the latter; being found here, it caused Portsch, in his Berlin catalogue (p. 364), to give a wrong attribution to a Divân-i Ahmedî which is in reality that of Ahmed Paşa (1). The Ottoman biographies of poets which have already been described as Meemü'as rather than tezkeres, made greater use of lesser known Meemü'as and of a larger number of Divâns than did the tezkeres and other works of a biographical nature. In the tezkere of Kâfzâde Fâ'îzî, for instance, the majority of the poetic citations are introduced with cliché phrases such as: Divâni görülüb bu iki beyti ihtiyâr olundu, "His Divan has been seen and these two couplets of his selected (2), or again; Meemü'a-i eş'arî görülüb... "His collected poems having been seen...." (3). Belîğ, following the example of the tezkere to which he wrote a zeyl, introduces poetic citations in a similar way (4). In a more elaborate manner, 'Ashîm uses phrases like; Bu boyt-i meşhûr Meemü'asindan intihâb olundu, "This famous couplet was selected from his Meemü'a (5) and declares, in his hâtime, that he has chosen poems from Divân (6). As already indicated, even among those biographers who compiled the more detailed tezkeres, there are some who mention the fact that they have made use of Meemü'as and Diyâns. Riyüzî characteristically introduces his poetic samples with: Bu eş'ar Divânindan intihâb olumub seât olundu, "These poems were chosen

(1) J.R. Walsh, Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts in the John Ryland's Library, Manchester (in preparation).
(2) Kaf, f. 6b (Ahmed Bey) et passim.
(3) Ibid, f. 78b (Kâbilî).
(4) Eg, f. 71b (Dervîş Paşîh).
(5) As, f. 5 (Bendî).
(6) Ibid, f. 54.
from his *divan* and recorded" (1). Es’ad Efendi, two centuries later, does
the same in somewhat different language with: ....cos'olunq be'zi mecâ"adan
neşè olundu, "....was extracted from certain collected *mecâ"as*" (2). And
Esâr Dede, on one occasion, says: *Eçiçe divânleri tertib olunmuşdür,
lakin eser meccami'de geše....; Although his *divan* was not collected,
written in most *mecâ"as* is...."(3); on another occasion he actually identi-
fies the *mecâ"as*: Nâbi‘ Ogmân Dede‘nin meccâ"asında....öçär-i-latifi
görülb..; "His fine poetry was seen in the *mecâ"a* of Nâbi‘ Ogmân Dede....."(4).

Sometimes, too, the longer *mecâ"yi* type poems of the poets were used and the
better verses selected for inclusion in the tezkores. In his notice on Vâli
of Ankara, Şâflu‘i records one or two byrta from the poet's long poem written
on the occasion of the anniversary of the Prophet's birthday - the *Novlid-i
Nobî*; *Naşn oylediği Novlid-i Nobî oyätından birkaş boyt....; A few couplets
from the *Novlid-i Nobî* which he composed are...." (5). Referring to Şemsi-
yi‘Acem, Deyâni says (p. 94): *Kitâb-i Dîlmûrâq* (6) *naşn iâh Sullân Selîn-i
Kadhâne vermişdir. Bu ol kitâbdandır, "He composed the Dîlmûrâq and presented
it to Sultân Selîn I. This is from that book....".

3. Other biographical works.

Among the biographical works available at one time or another
which must have been frequently consulted and extensively used for

(1) Ry, f. 13b (Ahmed Paşa), 33b (Celâlâ‘) and 44b (Hamdi). It should be
noted that among the compilers of tezkores other than the *mecâ"as" Niyyât î
appears to have seen more *divans* than anyone else.

(2) NE, f. 14b (Niyyât).

(3) BD, f. 57b (Zahîr Sâlih Dede).

(4) BD, f. 144b (Dorvîb Vehbi).

(5) Sz, f. 178a.

(6) Ky, 1, p. 762.
information, but which are seldom referred to by the tekerekis are to be numbered the more substantial biographies of the 'ulema and the meşâ'îl. The most important of these were Taşkâprüfâde's Şakâ'îk un-mu'maniye and the geysals to it by 'Aţâ', ʿUşâkîzsâde and Şeyhî (the Veşâ'i ul-fuṣalā) (1). Of all the tekerekis, Esrâr Dede and Kînâlisâde are the only two who mention them as sources. For the purpose of this study, many passages from the tekerekis were compared with some of these biographies, but no evidence of direct use of them was revealed.

In his notice on ʿHâbi ʿHasansâde Câmi, Kînâlisâde says:
Cünkî ahvâl-i fašl u kemâli kitâb-i Şakâ'îk de meṣâri, ...., "As his virtue and perfection are recorded in the Şakâ'îk (un-mu'maniye),....", or again, Taşâ'îl-i hâl-i ferhunde-mo'âli Şakâ'îk de meṣâri, ...., "Details of his suspicious state are written in the Şakâ'îk,...." when referring to Hizir Bey (2). On Reşki ʿAli Dede, Esrâr Dede says: Ve Şeyhî Zeyle bu beylerini Irâd itâsîg ki,...., "And Şeyhî quotes these verses of his in the Zeyl (Veşâ'i ul-fuṣalâ)" (3). The biographies mentioned above and another zeyl to them - 'Uşâkîzsâde's Zeyl-i Zeyl-i Şakâ'îk - dealing with the members of the 'ulema and meşâ'îl classes who lived up to the middle of the twelfth century, would be indispensable to serious and conscientious studies on the biographies of the poets. Yet, an astonishingly few tekerekis give evidence of having used them.

(1) Şeyhî concludes each reign of his work with a section on the poets who died in the period. These are usually very brief, but in every case verses are quoted.
(2) EK, ff. 69b and 96a respectively.
(3) ED, f. 61a.
There is a sufficient number of references in Esrur Dede's Tezkere-i mevleviye to show that he consulted and used the biographical works written especially to record the lives and preserve the poems of the poets who belonged to the Mevlevi order of dervishes. The work of this nature to which he appears to turn most often is the Sefine-i nefise(1) of Şeyh Mustafa Sâkib (2). The following example is one of many references to this work throughout Esrur Dede's tezkere: Manâkıb-i ʿurafa-yi mevleviyeyi ḥâvi Sefine-i nefise nâm kitâb.... "The book by the name of Sefine-i nefise which contains the histories of the Mevlevi mystics...." (3).

The same tezkereci also mentions Es'ad Efendi's Tezkere-i Hânendegân (4): Es'ad Efendi Tezkere-i Hânendegân'inda nevlidi nā-ma'lûm diyûb.... "In his Tezkere-i Hânendegân, Es'ad Efendi says that his place of birth is unknown...." (5). The works of Mustakîmzâde Süleyman Sa'd ud-Dîn Efendi were used by the later tezkerecis. His Tuhfe-i Hattâtin (6) is nowhere mentioned, but his Meccellet um-Nîşâb (7) is referred to by Mehmûd Es'ad Efendi. In his notice on Bârî-i he says: Meccellet um-Nîşâb-i Mustakîmzâde' de kalem-i istikâmêt-i rakamlâ....muhabberdir."It is written in Mustakîmzâde's Meccellet um-Nîşâb that...." (8); and in the notice of Hîfzi:

La'îzâde dânu'dâ Mehmûd oldûgû Meccellet um-Nîşâb'dadîr, "That he is Mehmûd, the son-in-law of La'îzâde is (written) in the Meccellet um-Nîşâb" (9).

(1) Kq(2), ii, p. 18; OM, i, p. 50 where the title of this work is given as Sefine-i Mevleviye.
(2) BD, f. 27a.
(3) BD, f. 24b (Sâkib Dede) et passim.
(4) SC, i, p. 255.
(5) BD, f. 148a (Yûsuf Dede).
(6) Kq(2), i, p. 246; OM, i, 166.
(7) Kq(2), ii, p. 432 where the full title of this work is given as Meccellet um-Nîşâb ft'l-asmâ'i va'l-kâmî va'l-âlkâb. OM, i, p. 166.
(8) ME, f. 42.
(9) Ibid, f. 124.
‘Arif Hikmet, too, mentions Mustakimzade in one of his notices without, however, naming the work which he is consulting. Of Şani, he says: Mustakimzade Ispanche Amadi (of Diyarbekir) ‘Abdulkerin Efendi‘dir. "According to Mustakimzade, he is ‘Abdulkerin Amadi Efendi" (1).

4. Historiae.

One of the characteristics of Ottoman historical works is that they contain considerable biographical information on statesmen and poets, mentioned either in connection with political or social events or in special sections at the conclusion of chapters devoted to the reigns of sultans. While it is true that almost all Ottoman histories follow this general principal in their organization, on the whole, remarkably few teskeres of the pre-Tanzimat era make specific allusions to historical works and declare that they have used them as sources for biographical data. One of the earliest references to an historical text is prompted by a comment on the part of the author of a tenth century history of the Ottomans.

In his notice on the poet Necati, Köçekizade says: Mevlana İdris Tevârîh-i Âl-i ‘Osmân‘da (2), şâ‘îr-i mo‘ezbûr u mericûman medâh u genûnda â‘râ idûbi...., "Mevlana İdris, in the Tevârîh-i Âl-i ‘Osmân, has exaggerated in his eulogy and praise of the above poet" (3). Three

(1) AH, f. 38b.
(2) KÇ, i, p. 2045; 'EM, iii, pp. 6-7 and 50M, p. 43. This is the last Bitihist of Mevlana İdris-i Bâbîli, a history in the Persian language of the first eight reigns of the Ottoman dynasty. It was completed in 319.
(3) KÇ, f. 278c.
centuries later, another teskereci, 'Arif Hilmi, recorded conflicting information supplied by three different sources of which one is a history of the Ottoman Empire. With reference to the poet Şehîl, he writes: Şâhib-i türîh Na'imâ (1) ve şâhib-i teskere Safâ'I ûavlînçe, Vâni, ve Musta'înza'de ûavlînçe, Âmedî 'Abdu'lkerîm Efendi'dir. "According to Na'imâ, the author of a history, and, Safâ'I, the author of a teskere, he (Şehîl) is from the town of Vâni. According to Musta'înza'de, (however), he is Âmedî 'Abdu'lkerîm Efendi." (2).

5. Other sources.

The teskerecis could not rely entirely on textual information in order to be able to piece together the biographies - bare enough though some of them were - of the numerous poets and poetasters they included in their teskeres. Either because not all those who had indulged in the art and pastime of stringing verses were famous enough to be included in previous biographical works - of the teskere kind or others - or in histories, or, because they had lived and flourished at too recent a period to feature in any work, the teskerecis had, perforce, to have recourse to details acquired verbally from those who had known them. That Şehî was faced by such a problem of research is made very clear in the section of his mülkaddime which he sets aside for an examination of his sources and source material. As the pioneer of the genre in Ottoman literature, Dervîş Şehî had very few sources which he could use for information. He says (p. 7): "But because some of this class (the poets)

(1) GON, p. 245.
(2) AH, f. 38b.
came before, this impoverished one did not find it possible to enjoy their noble company and graceful familiarity, and because they had journeyed from the transient abode of ignorance to the permanent abode of joy, the description and poetry of each was made manifest and the works (of each) were made evident by a general consensus of reporters, (such as), people of old age and experience. There are many examples to show that verbal (or hearsay) information constituted a major source for Seljük's continuators also, though in many cases the statements are so vague that one cannot rule out the possibility that a written source was used. Each tezkereci has his own way of introducing such second-hand material. 'Ahdî of Baghdad, who had many opportunities of hearing about certain poets during his journey within Fās, distinguishes between hearsay information and textual information with the comment: Evâf-i hemîdesîn gûn itdi̇miz qu'arâdandîr......; "He is one of the poets whose praiseworthy description I heard...." (1). Chronologically speaking the tezkereci who followed 'Ahdî, 'Iraqi Çelebi, when referring to one of the experiences of Firdö of Istanbul, leaves one in no doubt as to his source: Haç'îre böyle riv'âyet ve mâcérâ-yî ahvâlî bu vaçhîle hikâyet itmîlîrdîr ki......; "His experiences were transmitted to me in this manner....." (2). Beyânî uses a simpler form of cliche to introduce the same type of material, but it should be noted that in this and some of the following quotations there is a strong possibility that the sources referred to are textual sources: Rivâyet olûmar ki.....

(1) AH; f. 44b (Üşûf Efendi) et passim.
(2) AÇ; (1077), f. 179b et passim.
"It is related that..." (1). Or again, Kınılızade in the case of Cafer Celebi: Hilâyet olunur ki.... "It is narrated that ...." (2).

To show that information relating to Kemal Paşa'zade Ahmed Efendi was transmitted from one person to another, Riyâzi says: Nâkl olunur ki.... "(The information) is transmitted that...." (3). In order to indicate that his knowledge of the given name of a certain poet is based entirely on hearsay, Sâlim specifies: "I have heard that his honoured and illustrious name was Ahmed" (4). Barâr Dede has recourse to the same method of obtaining information as his reproduction, in his notice on Davrâg Lebih, of a hikâyev (story) intended to throw some light on his education and master, shows (5). That such hearsay information came, sometimes, directly from the poet in question is indicated by a remark made by Boyânî in connection with şamî: Kendiden nâkl olunur ki, "'Acem'den gelarkin haflzinda olan gazeliyyati mahûsebe itdim 10,000 den ziyade gazel buldum" diyü buyurmuşlar, "It is transmitted from himself, that he said, 'while coming from Persia I counted the gazels which were in my memory and found more than 10,000 of them! " (6)

(1) B; f. 252 (Vâliîîî) et passim.
(2) KZ; f. 70b et passim.
(3) Ry; f. 14a.
(4) Sm; p. 144 (tmsîîîî).
(5) ED; f. 130b.
(6) B, f. 137. It has already been pointed out that Boyânî's teskere is no more than a summary of Kınılızade's. In this particular case, Kınılızade's version of the incident is as follows: Kendilerinden hikâyev olunur ki 'vilâyet-i 'Acem'den diyûr-i Rûm'a âheyn itâde yolda mahûsun olan gazeliyyâti 'ad cyledim 10,000den ziyade hicâne-i hikâyveâda nâzûn ve nâtûlî u eyvâden nice le-'llî-yî ăbâder sâdûr-u derâmûnda meşûr u meknûn bulundu" diyû buyurmuşlar (KZ, f. 210b).
There is one example of a member of the family of a poet treated in the teskeres supplying the complete biography of the poet. The teskereci who utilized this source was Sālim who devotes ten pages to Ahmed Dede. Ahmed Dede had a son by the name of Çelebi Efendi from whom the biographer claims to have received this detailed information. Following a few words introducing his source, the teskereci begins the passage in these words: "This is what he (Çelebi Efendi) communicated (to me) when questioned on the life of his illustrious father..." (1).

One other source which the teskerecis used for the same purpose was the poet himself. Poets in their own right, the teskerecis were undoubtedly in correspondence with, or personally knew, the men and women in whose lives they were interested. And yet, only three of the biographers actually mention the fact that they communicated with the poets who were their contemporaries. In fact, only 'Ahdī of the city of Bagdad, who was not a permanent resident of either Istanbul, Edirne or Bursa, refers to his having personal knowledge of a poet he includes in his Gülşen-i su'arā, the document which contains much of the research he conducted during his extensive tour of Asia Minor. In the notice on Vālihī Ahmed Çelebi he says: Râkim Edirne'de ve İstanbul'da ɾidmetleriyle müşerref olmuşdur, "The writer (‘Ahdī) had the honour to associate with him (Vālihī) in Edirne and Istanbul (2). Bâkî's contemporary Kınâlisâde, in his long notice on the famous lyric poet, introduces an anecdote which he attributes to the poet with: Kendüleri hikâyet iñlerler kl...., "He himself relates that...."(3). Like many other teskerecis, it is to be

(1) Sm, p. 110.
(2) Ah, f. 174a et passim.
(3) KZ, f. 59a.
presumed, Râmiz had solicited cooperation from the men and women on the compilation of whose biographies he was engaged, or that he had at least advertised the fact. He includes samples of poems which were apparently given to him, by their authors, for the specific purpose of inserting them in the teskere. This is borne out by the introductory comments to the samples of verses of Mehmed Resā of Galata: 

*...bu teskere-i cerîdeye sebt icûn irsâl-i 'abd-i faqîre buyurduklari bu gazel-i bi-belleri....,*

"This matchless gazel which he (Resā) sent me for insertion into this teskere...." (1). Some sixty years earlier, Sâlim had acquired samples of İsmâ'îl ἞nâ in exactly the same manner (2).

The primary, secondary or direct sources used by the biographers may therefore be summarized as follows: 1. Other tezakir-i qu'arâ, Ottoman or otherwise, compiled by the predecessors of the teskeresis. These were either consulted to supplement details already known about the poets, or, copied to swell the notices written by such biographers as Kınlîzâde and his continuator Beyânî. At times, several similar sources of this nature were used at the one time for the same poet. 2. Memû'ns, divâns and longer poems such as mesnevîs, used primarily for the selection of poetic samples. 3. Other biographical works such as the Şêkâ'ik um-mu'mâniye and its rexîls for information on sultâns, members of the 'ulenâ class and the meşâ'îh, biographies of saints such as the Sefîne-i

(1) Ra, f. 115 et passim.
(2) Sm, p. 226 et passim.
nefer for further details on the lives of the members of the Nevlevi order of dervishes, biographies of a certain group of artists such as the Tuhfe-i hafzānīn for information on one or two poets who were known to be calligraphers, the Mecellet ım-nişāb, and, historical works for their short biographical notices at the conclusion of sections dealing with certain reigns. (1) 4. Hearsay or anecdotal details collected from those who knew the poets, members of their families, or directly from them through personal acquaintance with them.

(1) An attempt was made to reveal use of certain standard histories by the tāṣkerosis who had omitted or forgotten to acknowledge their source. Despite the comparison of many passages, however, this was unsuccessful.
Contents of the teskores

The length of individual notices ranges from a few words of introduction, sometimes limited to a lajab, the place of origin and a date (1), in the shorter mecmükä type of teskores in which the poetic samples are more copious, to from five to ten pages of detailed biographical data in the longer teskores (2) where, as a rule, less space is devoted to poetic citations. In the following pages of this chapter, it is proposed to examine the more important items which are included in these notices.

A. Material of a biographical nature.

1. Names and titles.

Each notice is headed by the maḥlaq or given name of the poet. While the maḥlaq is almost always used as the title of each notice — especially in those sections of the teskores set aside for the guʿarā — as a rule, the notices devoted to sultāns, members of the ruling dynasty and their statesmen which precede the longer faṣlā on the poets, are headed by the given names. This is the case particularly in the Gülşen-i guʿarā in which ʿAhdī has three separate faṣlā for the House of ʿOsmān, the ʿulema and the central and provincial administrators. The pseudonyms of poets who fall into the aforementioned categories, are inserted in appropriate places within the notices themselves in language which leaves

(1) Kaf, f. 23a (Cevrî) et passim. Cf. As, f. 19 (Şeyhî) et passim.
(2) L, p. 325 (Necâtî); AÇ (Or 6434), f. 111b (Meʿallî); KE, f. 178a (ʿAllî Celebi); G, f. 118 (Medînî); SF, f. 128a (Namî); AK, f. 81 (Pemî); Sm, p. 105 (Ahmed Dede) et passim; BD, 106b (Gâlib Dede).
leaves one in no doubt as to the intentions of the tezkereci (1). Most biographers make a point of supplying the given name of the poet in addition to the assumed pseudonym at the head of the notice (2). When the given name is not available or is unknown, one has only the place of origin of the poet to distinguish him from other poets who had selected the same *nom de plume* (3). Some can be identified only through their *lakab*, though these surnames are often supplied in addition to the given name, father's and place of origin (4). There were certain Ottoman

(1) Ah, ff. 22b and 23a. Mehmed Efendi Kara Çelebi's mahlas was "Bahri" and Mehmed Çelebi's "Meylî". Cf. Se, p. 26 (Hacı Hasan oğlu) et passim; L, p. 63 (Sultan Bâyesîd); KZ, f. 22a (Sultan Mehmed); B, f. 10 (Sultan Süleyman); Ry, f. 10b (Sultan Murad); Rz, p. 9 (Sultan Ahmed); Sf, (112) f. 14a (Adem Dede); Sm, p. 58 (Sultan Mu'tafarî); Şt, f. 150 and Sl, f. 53b (Gâlib Es'âd Efendi).

(2) Se, p. 52 (Şeyhî) et passim; L, p. 96 (Emrî) et passim; Ah, f. 150b (Müdâmî Bey); AÇ (S, 1077) f. 170a ("İlmî") et passim; KZ, f. 172a ("Arîfî") et passim; B, f. 79 (Bâgârî) et passim; Ry, f. 95b (Kâtibî); Kaf, f. 37a ("Jâlîîî"); Rz, p. 66 ("A'llî") et passim; T, f. 22 ("Kâmî") et passim; As, f. 48 (Vedîî); G, f. 55 ("Selîm") et passim; Sf, (2549), f. 217a ("Asîzî") et passim; Sm, p. 248 ("Müllü"î) et passim; Bg, f. 75b ("A'sîm") et passim; Ra, f. 116 ("Reşîd") et passim; Ak, f. 53 ("Reşîd") et passim; ED, f. 53a ("Darvîş" Cevrî) et passim; Şt, f. 52 and Sl, f. 15b ("Terîfî") et passim; ME, f. 238 ("Mîhâî") et passim; AH, f. 53a ("Fe'hîm") et passim.

(3) Such is the case, to cite but one example, of Ma'novî of Salonika mentioned by AÇ (6434), f. 125b; KZ, f. 261a; ED, f. 134b; and, of Ma'novî of Konya mentioned by AÇ, (6434), f. 125b; ED, f. 134b.

(4) Se, p. 99 ("Ferîdî") et passim; L, p. 180 ("Bâgârî") et passim; Ah, f. 58a ("Beyî") et passim; AÇ (6434), f. 111b ("Reşîlî") et passim; KZ, f. 66a (Beyâni) et passim; B, f. 59 ("Selîm") et passim; Ry, f. 44a ("Hülmî") et passim; Kaf, f. 62a ("Abîdî") et passim; Rz, p. 48 ("Selîmî") et passim; As, f. 39 (Mehmed); Sf, (2549), f. 208a ("Te'lib") et passim; Sm, p. 229 ("Hekîm") et passim; Bg, f. 41a ("Sîmî"î) et passim; Ra, f. 157 ("Şâhî") et passim; Ak, f. 11 ("Arîf") ; Şt, f. 79 and Sl, f. 29a ("Râmî") ; ME, f. 45 ("Hâkî") ; AH, f. 45 a ("Arîf").
poets who changed their pseudonyms in later life leaving verses under two pseudonyms. In such cases, the tezkerecisi used the last _maḥlaš_ as the title of the notice, mentioning the fact that the poet had had another _maḥlaš_ somewhere in the narrative. Figānī of Trabzon is a good example of this and serves to point out that, at times, this change of pseudonym led to a certain amount of confusion (1). When the poet was thought not to have used a _maḥlaš_—a very rare occurrence in Ottoman poetry—the fact is referred to in the notice (2). Although of an incidental character, another detail pertaining to nomenclature that can be found in the tezkere, is the reason for the choice of a particular _maḥlaš_ (3).

---

(1) KZ, f. 220a (Figānī). Evā‘il-i hālinde Huseynī taḥallus itmeske Laṭīfī ḫazāl-i mezbūri Huseynī num gā‘īrārā ispād itmisdir (f. 221a). Cf. L, p. 267 (Figānī) where the first _maḥlaš_ is not mentioned. Although Laṭīfī does list a Huseynī (p. 152), it is undoubtedly another poet. As far as could be ascertained through the printed edition of Laṭīfī, the _ḥazāl_ alluded to by Kınālizāde, is not given by Laṭīfī. Cf. also, B, f. 209 (Māmī); Sl, (112), f. 44a (Ta‘īb) et passim; Ak, f. 55 ('Tādīr); ED, f. 132b (Derviš Neyūl); Ṣṭ, f. 57 and Sl, f. 16a (Servet) et passim; ME, f. 51 (Emīn) et passim; AH, f. 7a (Fartov).

(2) B, f. 111 (‘Abdulvehhab). The tezkereci makes the following statement in the notice: Kendine _maḥlaš_ ihtiyār itmesayib eṣārī bi- _maḥlaš_ olan qu‘arādendir. However, there is little doubt that Seyhī is in error, for this is ‘Abdulvehhab of Bursa mentioned by Āq, (3.1077), f. 161a; KZ, f. 172b and Ry, f. 79a as “Abdi” and of whom L, p. 239 has this to say: “He used his given name as a pseudonym”.

(3) Cf. Se, p. 135 (Kandī); L, p. 274 (Kandī) et passim; Āq (6434), f. 74a (Māmī); Rz, p. 35 (Deštī); Sm, p. 374 (Ṣeref) et passim.
2. Origins.

While the place of origin of the poets is almost always (1) mentioned in the notices, the manner in which this detail is presented frequently gives rise to vagueness or ambiguity. The more popular and standard cliché phrases to record this important detail about a poet's life are: Şehr-i Istanbul'dandir, "He is from the city of Istanbul"; in KZ, f. 25a (Mürdenci); Erzurumu Mahmud Efendidir, "He is Mahmud Efendi of Erzurum", in Y, f. 4 (Abi); Nişndevi Hüseyindir, "He is Hüseyin of Nişde", in Re, f. 69 (Kâmid); or simply, Bursevi, "Of Bursa", in Kaf, f. 35b (Harî) (2). It is very difficult to determine exactly what is meant by these phrases. They could be references to the towns in which the poets were born, to the towns they went to reside subsequently, or to the towns in which they flourished and became known as poets. Nevertheless, there are one or two examples illustrating that in certain instances it was possible for the teskerecis to be a little more specific regarding the district, in a large city, in which the poet had his origin. The poet Dervîş is mentioned by no less than six teskerecis of whom 'Abdî (f. 81a), 'Aşîî: Çelebi, (6434), (f. 72b), Riyâzi (f. 55a) and Esrûr Deîî (f. 55b) give his town of origin as Istanbul without being more specific. However, Kinâlisâde - and Beyânî after him - has a much longer passage in which he adds further details which were apparently

(1) 'Aşîî, Silâhderzade and Şefkat may be cited as exceptions, for they very seldom mention such data.
(2) Cf. also, Se, p. 43 (Mevlânâ Mûrtî Şemsûddîn Ahmîd) et passim; L, p. 77 (Zenâîî); Ah, f. 55b (Beyânî) et passim; AÇ, (6434) f. 117b (Mecdi) et passim; KZ, f. 172a ('Arîî) et passim; G, f. 69 (Şubîî) et passim; Ak, f. 59 (Ferîî) et passim; ED, f. 103a ('Arîî) et passim; Mî, f. 36 (Enîî) et passim; Ah, f. 43b ('Otyûr Pâpa) et passim.
unknown to the earlier and omitted by the two later biographers mentioned above. In his notice on the same poet, (Texture) says that he was from the Ayık Paşa quarter of the city of Istanbul (1). Even this additional detail, however, does not throw any definite light as to his place of birth, since it is only by inference that we are led to assume that Derviş was born in Ayık Paşa. Equally vague are such simple statements as: İstanbul'dan şubur itmişdir, "He appeared in (emerged from) Istanbul", or more elaborate pronouncements as: "Being a refined man of talent from among the wits of Istanbul...." about a certain Mähî in Sâlim (pp. 214-5) (2). There are numerous examples, however, in which the poet's place of birth is clearly identified and even, though more rarely, distinguished from the locale in which he lived and flourished. Of Kemâl Paçâzâde, for instance, Latîfî (pp. 79-80) says; "His birth occurred in Tokat and (but) he flourished in Edirne" (3). A similar statement, but couched in more obscure language,

(1) KZ, f. 106b. Muhiyye-i Koştantiniye’nin ab u havası latîf ve sâha-i väsi’esi şerîf olan mağallat rayıs ul-berekettdinden meema’dı ehl-i şara mağalle-i dâhil Paşa’dendir. Cf. also, for other vague statements on place of origin in, Se, f. 91 (Şubûrî) et passim; L, f. 201 (Sâhidî) et passim; Kâ, f. 56a (Sâhidî) et passim; Râ, f. 38 (Zîhni) et passim; Y, f. 4 (Pendî) et passim; G, f. 143 (Râhi); 3f, (112) f. 122 (Hûgâ) et passim; Sm, f. 379 (Şerîf) et passim; E, f. 17a (Hâliq) et passim; A, f. 15a (Hâret) et passim.

(2) Cf. also, AÇ, (643b) f. 77a (Vâhi) et passim; KZ, f. 30b (Aftâbi) et passim; Hâ, f. 91a (Nâbi); Râ, f. 115 (Resâ); E, f. 17a (Dervîş Mehmed Berri) et passim; A, f. 60b (Nedîm).

(3) Writing before Latîfî, Sebî (p. 43) did not know his place of birth and says he was from Edirne without specifying whether he was born or just flourished there. Some seventy years later, Riyâxî (f. 140) mentions only Tokat and indicates that he was born there. In the interim, however, ‘Abî (f. 13b), ‘Aşık Çelebi (643h) (f. 37a), Kınılîzâde (f. 36b) and Beyânî (f. 18) mention no town in connection with him.
is made by Sâlim (pp. 110-20) about İbrâhîm Gûlçentî, "He set foot on earth and was born in the city of Edirne" (1).

---

(1) Cf. also, Sc, p. 81 (Revâni) et passim; L, p. 184 (Sûhâbi) et passim; Ah, f. 56b (Başîrî) et passim; AC (6434) f. 92b (Tabî) et passim; KZ, f. 50a (Aftâbi) et passim; B, f. 209 (Necâti) et passim; Rz, p. 55 (Şehrî); Ak, f. 25 (Naşîfî) et passim; ED, f. 6a (Ahmed Dede Mûseccim) et passim; ME, f. 4 (Ahsen) et passim; AH, f. 30a (Rifîî).
3. Dates of birth.

While most tezkerecis supply a date of death for many of the poets, they very rarely mention dates in connection with birth. As a rule, such data constitute an exception to the general practice of the biographers. By far the best example of this nature is given by Sālin in a most accurate statement on Ahmed Yahya (p. 100); "He is the noble son of Debbā'zāde Mehməd Efendi. On Friday the sixth night of (the month of) Sevval in the Hijri year 1086...he appeared and... became manifest". This is by no means an isolated demonstration of love for detail in Sālin, for whenever and wherever possible he is as meticulous in other parts of his long work(1).

(1) Sm, pp. 294, 563, 569 et passim. Cf. also, Aq, (1077), f. 266a (2-āti) where the source of information is given as the poet himself.
4. **Ancestry.**

With the exception of the mescü' type of tezkere wherein details are exceedingly scanty, the biographies nearly always supply the name and sometimes the künüve or lakab of the poet's father. The most usual entries of this type are brief and to the point: **İsmâ'îl Efendi** şâibinden..., "of the progeny of İsmâ'îl Efendi..." (1). On occasion, however, names are not available and the poet is described as the son of someone whose profession only was known. Such vague information is rarely encountered and is usually in the shorter notices of not so well-known poets or poetesses (2). The fullest detail on ancestry is again supplied by Sâlim. In his notice on Mîgî, he goes back to the poet's grandfather as he traces his ancestry to Mehemd Şâlih Efendi, but does not apparently know his father's name; "(He is) the grandson of the late Mehemd Şâlih Efendi the son of İshâpi, who died during the reign of Sultan Mehemd IV while he was the kâfi of Cairo" (3). Or again, in the notice on Feyzi, when he records that for more than twenty years his father, Ahmed Efendi, was müftî of Bolu, a position which had been held by İbrâhîm Efendi, his grandfather, and Yûsuf Efendi, his great-grandfather, before

---

(1) Ak, f. 25 (Naẓîr). Cf. also, Se, p. 125 (Fikri); L, p. 224 (Şûnî Bey) et passim; Ah, f. 51a (Shîrî) et passim; AÇ, (6434), f. 76b (Yecdi) et passim; KZ, f. 61a (Emînî) et passim; B, f. 52 (İmâne) et passim; Ry, f. 39a (Hâletî) et passim; Rz, p. 40 (Rifcatî) et passim; Y, f. 17 (Arîf); As, f. 50 (Latifî); G, f. 69 (Sadik); Ef, (112) f. 95a (Mehdi); BS, f. 51b (Rexvî) et passim; Ra, f. 167 (Tahir) et passim; ED, f. 43b (İshâpi Ahmed Dede); Sl, f. 32a and St, f. 86 (Refî); ME, f. 162 (Şâkir) et passim; Ah, f. 34b (Bûrûrî) et passim.

(2) Cf. Se, p. 60 (Kâtîb Şewki); L, p. 178 (Zeynab); Ah, f. 130b (İskî); AÇ, (6434) f. 85b (Zeynab Hüdûn); KZ, f. 23b (Latifî); B, f. 56 (Şûrev); Rz, p. 15 (Shîrî); EG, f. 55a (Arîf); ME, f. 30 (Emînî).

(3) Se, p. 605.
him (1). Sometimes, however, this process of identification is reversed by mentioning the fact that the subject of the notice is the father of a distinguished son. Such is the case, for example, of Tālū who was the father of Cafer Qalebi (2).

(1) Ibid, p. 565. Cf. also, NE, f. 64r (Bohoet); AH, f. 58b (Müctim Cın).
(2) L, p. 108, mentioned also by KZ, f. 67a and B, f. 38.
While many of the poets who feature in the tezkerecs under consideration were members of the timarlot army, the Janissary Corps or Household Cavalry of the Ottoman Empire, many more were members of the 'ulema or the meşā'îb classes or served in the administrative offices of the state. It is a well known fact that the meşā'îb, the civil servants and, in particular, the 'ulema, underwent long and rigorous training in the tezkere, the palace schools and the medreses before they could attain their positions of responsibility in their respective vocations and professions. And yet, the tezkere writers, in general, have remarkably few details to offer concerning the education of these men. Many tezkerecs omit, either deliberately or because of lack of information, any reference to the type, extent of or school in which the training received by the subjects of the biographical notices. Others remain content with a few general details most of which are in any case obvious when they mention the class or professional group to which the poets belonged.

The earlier Ottoman tezkerecs, like Şehî and Latîfi, and some of the shorter later ones, do no more than mention the name of the particular section of society of which the poets were members. A cliché like, "Retiring on a pension from his studies, he entered the Naşibendi order (of dervîses)" (1), is a typical example of the vague and inadequate information to be found in some tezkerecs. Later on Kânâlîzâde adds a

(1) L, p. 194 (Şehî) et passim; Cf. also, Se, p. 65 (Nişâmi) et passim; Ah, f. 50a (Ümidî) et passim; Ry, f. 124b (Vişâlî); Rz, p. 49 (Sinâni) et passim; Y, f. 22 (Meşâ'îbî); G, p. 38 (Zâkîrî); Sf, (112) f. 27b (Ahmed).
little more detail by supplying a name in connection with professional studies followed by the poet: Talahül-ı 2'üm u faulilote milâemin oldukden sonra Nevlânı Kara Dâlî'den milênin club... "After being assiduous in acquiring knowledge and virtue, he was granted eligibility for office by Nevlânı Kara Dâlî" (1). In the 12th century, Şâfi'I uses a variation of the same aliche: Talâ'ül-ı pâlînde keseb-ı kareli-i me'rîzet id dib tarû-ı
ilme 2'üm ve milênin club... "Early in life he acquired an education and then engaged in scientific pursuits. Having become a candidate for office..." (2).

Of the palace trained poet, Nevlânı, the same textorcedî says:

Nevlân-ı taflûyetinde serây-ı 'âmire-ı padişâhîye qârî club nice zevâm
pidnet id dib talâhül-ı migâ'î 'ürân ittâmûden sonra 2'üm olub..... "In
his childhood he entered the imperial palace as an apprentice and after
serving (there) for a time and acquiring a taste for refinement, he left
(it) and (served in the provinces)...." (3).

A notice by Şâfi'I also, will suffice to demonstrate that he
treated members of the devril orders in a similar way, ....nezârî-i
Hayvâtîye'den 'ürân Sinânûde Hasan Efendi (4) nâm cefs-ı veğûnden inâbet
id dib ve talâhül-ı edeb-i tarâmîdetden sonra nevî-1 hûfet olmasîa
Istanbul'da Sûfiller rehallesiinde vâfi sâviyede mevâmed-nişân-ı meşâlih.
olmuşdur, "On being licensed for the succession by a saintly şeyh of the Halveti order, named Şemsî Sinânzade Hasan Efendi, and having acquired the customs of the order and then received the degree of a brother, he became the şeyh of the convent located in the Sufi quarter of Istanbul" (1).

(1) Sf, (112) f. 99a (Mustafızin). Cf. also, Sf, p. 621 who has the same information.
6. Teachers and mentors.

The lack of adequate and precise information on the education of the poets is partially compensated by the recording, fairly consistently, of names of the principal teachers. This is certainly the case in the longer and more detailed teskere which, while not always giving the name of the medrese professor who supervised the poet's training if he were a member of the 'ulema class, usually mention at least one of his tutors. It should be noted, however, that the earlier works by Şehî and Latîfî in general and the mecmû'as in particular omit such information altogether. On very rare occasions one is able to gather supplementary data on the tutor himself. One isolated notice which contains such data is on Bâhir 'Abdullâh Efendi in which Mehmed Es'ad, the biographer, not only identifies the tutor by name, but also supplies his date of death; 1164 hûşûndâ 'ażim-i ravân-i rîvân olan Mâhîrûde Muştafa Şâkir Efendi'ın (1) terbiyesiyle gîrî-i maʾrîfetden âltarâb.....

idûb..... "Under the training of Mâhîrûde Muştafa Şâkir Efendi who died in or about 1164 he acquired knowledge" (2). Sâlim's unusually long list of data concerning Es'ad Göca's education is a conspicuous exception to the general trend followed by the teskerecis; nothing as elaborate or detailed is repeated in the other teskere. He not only supplies a seemingly complete list of subjects which the poet studies, i.e. grammar, the sciences, geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, the arts and Persian, but also gives the names of the tutors under whom he studied them, even when he had more than one for each subject (3).

(1) 30, III, p. 124 where he is described as a müdderris who died in 1160.
(2) ME, f. 49. Cf. Ra, f. 11a (Bâhir).
(3) Sm, p. 70.
7. Class, profession or career.

In general all the tezkerecis, including the compilers of the memû'a type of tezkere, appear to mention, consistently whenever available, the class or profession in which the poets held appointments or of which they were known to be members. Such details are, perforce, given briefly, and, are explicit or implicit in statements made in the notices. As a rule, standard clichés are repeated over and over again by some tezkerecis while others vary them according to the amount of detail known. It would seem that the fame of the subject of the biographical note, either as a professional man or as a poet, determines the length of the statement or the amount of detail that is given in this connection. The more usual insertions, when little information is obtainable, are simply single words; Tabib, "Physician", Kâfi, "Judge", Nişanci, "Inscriber of the Imperial Cypher", Sipahi, "Cavalryman", or Yeniceri, "Janissary" which are to be found in a memû'a like Kâfzade Fâ'î's in keeping with the extremely bare biographical detail supplied(1). Somewhat longer, but equally vague, are statements like; Ehl-i 'ilm kis-mindan, "One of the men of science", Kuşt tâ'ifesinden, "A member of the class of judges", Talebe tâ'ifesinden, "A member of the student body", Semâniya müderrislerinden, "One of the professors at the Semâniye", Sipahi zümrésinden, "From the cavalry class", Böyük halkîndandır, "He is one of the Household cavalrymen", Zümre-i Bektaşiyândandır, "He is a member of the Bektaşî order (of dervîses)", Zu'mûdân idi, "He was a

(1) Kaf, ff. 90b (Mîrek), 110a (Vâqfî), 6b (Ahmed Bey), 36b (Hayî), and 47a (Nû̀yî) respectively.
zi'ümät land-owner"; Yenigeriyändendir, "He is a Janissary", Anadolu
kavgatından, "One of the judges of Anatolia"; Kâzırgân tâ’ifesindendir,
"He is a member of the merchant class"; Nevâli zümresinden, "A member
of the class of superior judges"; Ulemâdan ve müderrisâyın-ı kirâmdan,
"A member of the 'ulema class and one of the noble professors"; Tarîk-i
Nevlevîden, "Of the Nevlevi order", Sû'arâdan, "One of the poets",
Deftordürder, "He is an official keeper of a register" (1). The fore¬
going illustrates the variety of classes and professional groups to
which the poets belonged. Such insertions as; "One of the esteemed
judges" (2) which does no more than inform the reader that the poet was
a judge, or; "He was one of the secretaries of the Imperial Divân" (3)
which differentiates between secretarial posts, are also common. The
biographers, at times, presumably because they did not have more precise
information, name the poet's practical skill without specifying his actual
post; Fenn-i tibbâ mehâreti olmagla ol cihetden vâzîfedâr idî, "Because
he was proficient in the science of medicine, he was employed in that
capacity" (4). It is sometimes possible to draw some conclusions from

(1) Sc, p. 57 (Hâsûmi); L, p. 103 (Behârî) et passim; Ah, f. 78b (Hüluşî)
et passim; AÇ (1077) f. 148b (Saâ'di Çelebi TâbiÎeâde) et passim; KZ,
f. 235b (Kevecîî) et passim; B, f. 91 (Seyyûdiî) et passim; Ry, f. 31b
(Belîgî); Rz, p. 50 (Sipâhî) et passim; Y, f. 4 (Ahî) et passim; C, f.32
(Hâmîî) et passim; SF, (112) f.67b (Hâmîî) et passim; Et, f. 20a (Râzî)
et passim; Rz, f. 139 (Sürâîî); St, f. 16 (Es'ad Gûlibî); ME, f. 132
(Hâlîî); Ah, f. 22b (Zikrî Baba). The professions and the vocations
of the poets who are featured in the tezkeres of Akîf-i Enderûnî
and Esrâî Dede are obvious since the former treated only members of
the Enderûnî Hâsûyûn and the latter of the Nevlevî order.
(2) Rz, p. 55 (Şinâûsl). This is one of Rizâ's favourite expressions and
he uses it frequently in appropriate places.
(3) Ibid, p. 50 (Siyûhiî).
(4) B, f. 26 (Emirîk).
certain remarks made by the tezkereci in this regard: A statement like; مَعَلَمٍ ُالدكَانِسَرْنَا بِئِْذَاللهَبَظَةِ ءَبِي وَفَُكِمْ عَجَ١ٌدِ. "After being licensed, he became judge of certain towns" (1), leads one to conclude that without having served as a professor in the madreses, he immediately entered the legal profession. However, "He was numbered among the ʿulemaʾ of his age and was one of the erudite madresse teachers" (2), is an insertion which leaves one in no doubt that the poet pursued his studies until he qualified to teach.

As for the careers of the poets as members of a profession or of a service, one seldom finds a complete list of posts held, or dates of appointment to and dismissal from these posts. While reference to one appointment or post is usual, it is most unusual for a tezkereci to give a detailed account of a man's career over a number of years. Yet, the exception to this is again Sālim who traces ʿĪṣāk Efendi's career, step by step, between the years 1115 and 1130, supplying, in addition, the date of each appointment, the name of the post and the salary that he was paid (3).

(1) KZ, f. 253a (Nedîh) et passim.
(2) Rz, p. 30 (Fehmi) et passim.
(3) Sm, pp. 67-8 et passim. However, Cf. Ah, f. 155b (Lisānī) and KZ, ff. 100a-b (Yüce Çelebi Efendi) et passim.
8. Appearance of the poets.

There is very little to be found in the way of detail pertaining to the physical characteristics of the men and women mentioned in the tekkers. A number of vague expressions which might conceivably be true and honest descriptions of the poets, are used so indiscriminately and are so often repeated that they are undoubtedly devoid of any significance. Three references to the comeliness of the poets, however, deserve some mention here. They are most emphatic and totally unlike the expressions referred to above both in meaning and language. Latif, who is copied by Kinalizade (1), and Beyani (2) after him, describes San of Istanbul as a very good looking man whose beauty, like Joseph's was matchless, and suggests that, after Joseph, the 'embroiderer of creation' (God) did not fashion anything as beautiful (3). A shorter statement of a similar nature is made by Abdi with reference to Koyseri: Gemal-i bâ-kemâliyle güzellik tahtgâninin pâdisâhi ve hüsn-i mihr-esfûniyle âsmân-i hûnerin mähidir, "On account of his perfect beauty, he is the prince of the throne-room of beauty and the moon of the heavens of art" (4). And lastly, Riza who is not given to too much exaggeration and verbosity in his notices, considers the extreme beauty of Halit as 'defying all description' (5).

(1) KZ, f. 67b
(2) B, f. 38a.
(3) L, p. 112.
(4) Ah, f. 151b.
9. Characters of the poets.

Discounting the numerous passages which are sometimes quite out of proportion to the average size of the notices and which are written in very ornate but meaningless terms describing the characters or natures of the poets, it may be said that the terekere have very little to offer in the way of character analysis. Such expressions as چگلاق "pleasant disposition" and چگلاق یاريف "charming nature" are used with so little discrimination that one cannot rely on them for correct or honest information. These would appear, rather, to apply to most literary men and to be standard terms which belong to the class and not to any particular poet. There are, however, some rare and refreshing passages which throw some light on the nature of a few of the poets. In his description of one of his subjects' addiction to wine, ملیفی does not seem to exaggerate too much: "He was a wine-worshipping toper who was inebriated night and day. Unless he took the rose-coloured cup into his hand, his narcissus-like eye would not open and until he was slightly drunk, he did not know himself" (1). There were few poetesses in Ottoman literature who were sufficiently conspicuous in literary circles to warrant mention in terekere, despite the fact, it would seem, that the only basis for inclusion in a biographical work of this type was merely that the poet should have uttered one or two lines of verse. At any rate, women must have presented certain problems to the terekere; clichés that were apt in the case of men were obviously out of the question when the terekere had to describe a woman. What ملیفی does in the

(1) L, p. 315 (Melvi).
following passage is to record that Mihri enjoyed the company of men without blemishing her honour. In this way the biographer can refer to her 'unusual' habits without doing her an injustice: Eşerçe semânında şu-şarâ ve şurefâ ile şuçvet ve mîhr-i mubahbet üzerine olursa, lâkin kîse-i mahfüzminin mûhrine dest-i icâbet ermemiş ve aera-perde-i 'cimet ve 'ıffetine mî-hâremen haram koymamışdır. "Although, in her day, she associated with poets and wits, no hand was extended towards her virginity and no stranger violated the privacy of her honour" (1). The same tazkereci has this comment to make on Anî's particular addiction: Lâkin meglûb-u berq u efûn olmasâla vâqîl-i mertebe cûmûn olmuş idi. Ef'âli redâ'et ve aklûvî kabûhâtadan hâli deqîl idi. "However, being addicted to opium, he had become insane. There was always viciousness in his actions and offence in his language" (2).

(1) KZ, f. 266a Cf. also, L, p. 320 (Mîhrî).
(2) KZ, f. 95a.
10. Additional biographical material.

Apparently, the marital status of the poets did not interest the biographers. Of all the teskerecis, Şafə'İ alone records the marriage of a poet: Beşiktaş kurbunda meddûn kûtb ul-ʿârifeyn Şeyh Yakû Ėfendi evlândıdan Ümmetullah kadını nikâh ile alub...., "He took in marriage Ümmetullah, one of the children of Şeyh Yakû Ėfendi who is buried in the neighbourhood of Beşiktaş" (1).

With reference to a poet's talents as a builder, the same biographer describes his artistic activities in this field in these words: Nesbûrun ṭab'-i mi'mârisi olmâyla haşka ki beyt-i ma'ârif olub âhir-i ğêrûnde Namlî iskoleşi kurbunda leb-i deryâda bir ḳâşr-i dîlayâ bünyâd idûb nûşû-gûnmûn ile kendi naḳşa idûb....; "As a man with a natural bend towards architecture, the aforementioned was truly an edifice of knowledge. Towards the end of his life, he built a heart-adorning palace on the sea-shore in the vicinity of the Rumeli pier and decorated it himself with various designs" (2).

It is presumably the unusual circumstances in which it occurred which prompted Latîfî to devote more than the usual space to the recording of the death of Şâni of Istanbul: "Ultimately, when a lover saw that heart-deceiver with a rival, the arrow of cruelty touched his heart and the sheath-knife penetrated his bone making him feel acute misery. (As a result) he found it in himself to kill that enchanting one"(3).

(1) Sî, (2549) f. 274a (Fennîî).  
(2) Ibid, f. 269b (Fennîî).  
(3) L, p. 112.
11. The literary products of the poets.

The tezkeres are concerned with and interested in the poets, primarily, as composers of verse. However, the biographical notices contain a certain amount of detail on their products within other literary genres as well as their poetic works. As a rule, such details are more abundant in the longer tezkeres and are given in the notices of the more famous litterateurs, though, as it will be demonstrated below, a number of less known works or works which are now lost, also receive some mention.

This data is sometimes very simply recorded, as for instance, regarding the poetic work of Cafer Çelebi: Merhumun muğzannefatindan manşûm 'Heves-nâme' si meşhûr..., "One of his literary works, his versified Heves-nâme, is famous...." (1). Prose works are treated in the same manner (2). Works dealing with the history of the Ottomans receive separate mention, as in the case of 'Abdî: 'Mişânci 'Abdî Paşa Târîhi' diyi' te'lifi vardir, "He has a composition called Mişânci 'Abdî Paşa Târîhi" (3).

Of particular interest to this study are the tezkeres which are now no longer extant, but which are attributed to one or two of the poets mentioned in the tezkeres. To the poet Pertev, 'Arif Mîkmet attributes a tezkere in the following terms: Ahyâl-i gâkirdânîndan 'ibâret bir tezkere tertib itmiş ise de ne mi'âla'aya mebnû ise maâv ve ketûm idîldi'î menkûldur,

(1) KZ, f. 71a. Also listed in KÇ, if, p. 2047. Cf. also, Se, p. 49 (Hamîdî) et passim; L, p. 106 (Tâbi'i) et passim; Ah, f. 182b (Yahyâ) et passim; AÇ, (6434) f. 122b (Nezîhî) et passim; Ry, f. 16b (Azerî); Rz, p. 76 ('Arif) et passim; Sf, (2540) f. 216b ('Abdî); Sm, p. 114 (Ahmed Efendi) et passim; Ed, f. 107b (Sâlik Dede) et passim.
(2) Ed, f. 25a (Sâlik Dede).
(3) Sf, (2540) f. 250a ('Abdî); GOW, p. 227f. Cf. also, Se, p. 101 (Haddî); L, p. 81 (Kemîl Paşaazade Ahmed Çelebi); AÇ, (6434) f. 135b (Nezîhî) et passim; Ah, f. 44a ('Arîf).
"Although he compiled a teckere comprising the biographies of his pupils, it is reported that, whatever study it was based on, it is not extant" (1). When the poet had produced no independent or original piece of literature, his activities and production in the field of letters might be recorded summarily in this manner: Հայաղի ի ո գի կ ե ս ի լ ի ա վ թ ե դ ի ր, "He has commented on Հայաղի" (2). The same technique is applied to other short commentaries (գերբ), essays (էսայ), imitative pieces of poetry (նաշիրը) and translations (3). There are many examples of single works mentioned in the notices (4). At times, one is supplied with a longer and apparently complete list of the poet's writings, original or otherwise. By far the best example of this is to be found in Քրիմի ի սա տե դե ի ո գի կ ե ս ի լ ի ա վ թ ե դ ի ր օ ր (5).

(1) Հե, է, 7, կոկո ա, կոկո է, 68, նոր է, 211 (Միր Դանիջ). Հե, հե, (254) է, 226 (տեսուց). Հե, է, 66 (Բամատ) և փասամ.
(2) Հե, է, 66 (Բամատ). Հե, հե, սն, է, 227 (Հաշի) և փասամ.
(3) Հե, է, 45 (Հանի Ախմեդ Շահին); Լ, է, 192 (Տիւրի Ախմա) և փասամ; Հե, է, 236 (Մամի Եթենդ); ԱԺ, (6434) է, 151 (Բեսատ) և փասամ; Հե, է, 252 (Վարսե Մայի) և փասամ; Բե, է, 122 (Նիվես) և փասամ; Հե, է, 217 (Ազիջե) և փասամ; Սե, է, 68 (Իշայի; Եթենդ) և փասամ.
(4) Հե, է, 57 (Շարյա) և փասամ; Լ, է, 209 (Շեմի Օրվիչ) և փասամ; Հե, է, 182 (Թայմա) և փասամ; ԱԺ, (6434) է, 105 (Մայի) և փասամ; Հե, է, 220 (Մայի) և փասամ; Բե, է, 166 (Մայի) և փասամ; Հե, է, 76 (Արիֆ) և փասամ; Սե, (112) է, 57 (Բելի) և փասամ; Սե, է, 145 (Մայի) և փասամ; Բե, է, 57 (Ազիջ) և փասամ; Հե, է, 44 (Մայի) և փասամ.
prose works and poetic works (1). The same eagerness to record the titles of works composed by the poets, is evident in many other parts of his tekse. He does not, however, limit himself merely to listing these works. In the notice on Lutfullah, he not only gives the title of the author's work, but also informs the reader that the Bahá'ul-šáh 'Abd (2) is in two parts; one dealing with the Persian (language) and the other with the art of poetry. He adds that it is still famous and that because the work is about poetry, Maliki has been included in the tekse, despite the fact that his verses never brought him any fame (3).

(1) KZ, p. 257a. Bi-had rič̣îl ve muğanfesâti ve ʾilâH-i taqavvrî ve femni-מיْت ُيْنَ وَالفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ لَهُمُ السٍّيْنِ وَالْفَيْنِ Lutfullah, he not only gives the title of the author's work, but also informs the reader that the Bahá'ul-šáh 'Abd (2) is in two parts; one dealing with the Persian (language) and the other with the art of poetry. He adds that it is still famous and that because the work is about poetry, Maliki has been included in the tekse, despite the fact that his verses never brought him any fame (3).

(3) KZ, p. 253 where the title is given as Bahá'ul-šáh 'Abd ُيْنَ وَالفَيْنِ Lutfullah, he not only gives the title of the author's work, but also informs the reader that the Bahá'ul-šáh 'Abd (2) is in two parts; one dealing with the Persian (language) and the other with the art of poetry. He adds that it is still famous and that because the work is about poetry, Maliki has been included in the tekse, despite the fact that his verses never brought him any fame (3).
The deaths of the poets.

The last item of a strictly biographical nature which remains to be considered is information relating to the deaths of the poets. While tezkerecis rarely supply us with dates of birth, on the whole, they almost invariably give some information on deaths. This kind of detail is very important in view of the fact that very often it is the only means we have of distinguishing between poets who were known by and recorded under the same nablak. The tezkerecis mention these details either towards the end of the notices or before they discuss the poets' talents, though always prior to the poetic citations. Rifâ who gives information of this sort after the poetic samples, is the only exception to this rule. It would seem that not all the tezkerecis considered data of this nature as valuable. Güftî, for example, does not supply any dates of death while Riyâzi almost always does, and the first three tezkerecis, Sehî, Latîfî and 'Ah理智, seldom do.

Apart from the usual Ottoman clichés used to inform the reader of the death of a person, the tezkerecis sometimes state the place at which the death occurred: "...241 de Vârda'r'da fext oldu, "He died in Vârda in 241" (2) is a good example of the typical statement that would be made. Occasionally the place of burial is also stated as, for instance, is the case with Adem Dede though his date of death is not known to his

(1) Rz, p. 49 (Sinâni) et passim.
(2) Ry, f. 46a (Hayratî) et passim; Cf. also, AÇ, (643â) f. 87a (Hasan) et passim; KZ, f. 85b (Hilmi) et passim; Rz, p. 51 (Sâî-I) et passim; 3f, (112) f. 110a (Medînî) et passim; Sm, p. 142 (Emirî) et passim; Ey, f. 23a (Nâgib) et passim; Rz, f. 92 (DervÎ); BD, f. 128b (DervÎ Kâtîbî) et passim; AH, f. 5a (Efûân Bey) et passim.
biographer, Ḥāhire-i ʿAlī'ā værdišda mâyjam olmaqça meneh-i feyż-i
kamāl ʿAlī'ā Nowleviîânesinde defne olunmuşdur, "When he died, on his ar-
rival in Cairo, he was buried in the Nowlevi convent of Egypt" (1). When
the exact year of death is not known, the tezkereci gives the reign dur-
ing which death took place: "He died in the reign of Sultan Solîm" (2),
or give an approximate time within a certain year: "He died at the end
of the year 1103" (3). On very rare occasions we are given the exact
day: "He died on the twentieth day of Şafer 1109" (4). A number of
tezkereciers also supply the cause of death: "He was murdered in Istanbul
in 1046" (5). If the biographer's sources have not yielded any precise
information on the year in which the poet died, he mentions the last
reign in which he was known to have been alive: Ḥābîl-i devlet-i Murā
dîyode hayâtda idd, "He was alive in the early part of Murâd's reign"(6).
Also encountered in tezkereciers, as in most Islamic historical and biograph-
ical works, are chronograms: intiṣāl oyledi Bâktî bu sana dünyadan,
"Bâktî passed from this transient world – 1008" (7).

(1) Ṣf., (2549) f. 14a, Cf. also, Ry, f. 116 (Ebusu'ud); Ra, p. 16 (Ehât);
Sm, p. 109 (Almed Dede); Ed, f. 158a (Nâhi Dede).
(2) Ṣf, p. 100 (Bâhlî) et passim; Cf. also, KZ, f. 73b (Celîîî) et passim;
R, f. 215 (Mîhilî); Ry, f. 85a (ʿAtâ) et passim; Kaf, f. 35b (Zadîî) et passim;
Ra, f. 126 (Wâhlî) et passim; Ed, f. 86b (Dervîş Zâimirî);
Sl, f. 71a and St, f. 290 (Mûmînî); Ah, f. 74a (Zâlik).
(3) Ṣf, f. 18b (Ehât) et passim; Cf. also, Ry, f. 78b (Abdallâh Esfendî)
et passim; Sm, p. 121 (ṭhrâhîn Gâlânî); Ra, f. 6b (Ehât Balî) et passim;
Ed, f. 16b (Dervîş Bâlîyî) et passim; Ah, f. 4a (Ehât).
(4) Ṣm, p. 184 (Zâhipî) et passim; Cf. also, Ra, f. 232 (Kânîn).
(5) Ṣa, p. 55 (Nefîşî) et passim; Cf. also, Ah, f. 130a (Fâkîni); KZ, f. 129a
(Pasam Şebebî); Kaf, f. 30a (Yâhiî) et passim; Sm, p. 247 (Zânînî) et passim;
Ra, f. 232 (Kânînî); Ak, f. 102 (Mâhî); St, f. 61 (Nâhirî); Me, f. 238
(Mûmînî); Ah, f. 5a (Zâhipî) et passim.
(6) Kaf, f. 19a (Nefîşî); Cf. also, KZ, f. 73b (Celîîî) et passim; Sl,
f. 58a and St, f. 169 (Lebîb).
(7) Ṣa, p. 10 (Dâhi) et passim; Cf. also, Ṣm, p. 101 (Yâbiyû) et passim.
13. Anecdotal material.

Latif, 'Abdi, 'Ali Celobi, Kınılinde, Riyahi and Sâlim, at times, swell their notices by including anecdotal material in them. These usually come under sub-headings like Latife (Jest) or Mu'ayyede (Pleasantry). In his notice for Ahmed-i Rumi of Gallipoli, for instance, Latif has this Latife: "When one of the cultured lords said to Ahmed Paşa, that governor of the province of verse and prose, 'You too have the pseudonym of Ahmed and use your (given) name as your nom de plume in poetry. In that case can you not be confused with Ahmed of Gallipoli and does not this mislead the people? They may attribute your excellent and noble poetry (words) to him'. He (Ahmed Paşa) answered saying, 'As long as they do not attribute his empty words to me, it does not matter if they attribute my excellent words to him" (1). Just as this interpolation is undoubtedly an attempt at recording a famous poet's - in this case Ahmed Paşa's - opinion of Ahmed-i Rumi as a poet, so the following is intended to give the biographer's personal opinion of Sägari's verse: "In Winter, the city of Edirne - the centre for men of God - is (transformed into) a sea of water and a lake on account of the excessive snow and rain. One of the poets, annoyed by the excess of water and lakes in the aforesaid city, expressed his disgust in this couplet (in the Hезеq meter):-

O God, grant thy favour and save us from this worthless city.
What beauty can anyone see through its impenetrable damp and mud (2).

(1) L, p. 85.
(2) Ibid, p. 102. Alâhi lütf idub kurtar bizi bu şehri bêtilden, Kîfiî amî ne soyr îkâm geçilmez ab ile gelden.
This is but one of the several ways in which the second mura' might be read.
When the poets of Edirne heard this couplet, they were annoyed and vexed, each one replying with another couplet. However, the most apposite of all was Sajarî's. Laṭīfī does not give this (famous) bayt (1) which would have supplied us with additional material very useful in assessing literary poetic taste during the 10th century.

(1) L., pp. 181-2. For other interpolations within the biographical notices see, Ah, f. 66b (Riyādī); Aṣ, (1077) f. 175a (ʿAmrī) et passim; KZ, f. 43a (Ahmedī) et passim; Ry, f. 113b (Nāmī); Sm, pp. 123-6 (Ulfetī) et passim.
B. Incidental material.

In addition to material of a purely biographical nature, the teshceres contain observations of an incidental character designed, it would seem, either to demonstrate versatility and erudition on the part of the teshcereci or, to supply some relief from the more mechanical process of recording facts about the poets. These observations almost always concern poetry or the poets, but occasionally they reveal that the author was prompted to make them by considerations which are not directly related to the subject of the notice. The following example is intended to serve as an illustration of the spontaneity with which the teshcereci recorded his remarks. Esrür Dede, when tracing the biography of a certain Dervış Şâhib of Bursa, has occasion to mention the term "tecmül-i hânmet". It apparently occurs to him that the term is usually misused in other works and therefore supplies its definition as understood by the Mevlevi dervîses: "Let it be known that the term "tecmül-i hânmet" which is mentioned in this book and in certain sections of written documents pertaining to the Mevlevî order, is employed negligently. However, in the Mevlevî order, tecmül-i hânmet is intended to mean 'the completion of forty days of constant retreat' " (1). It is again in one of Esrür Dede's notices that we are given some incidental information on certain rewards to the writers of poetry that was acceptable to the sultan. Half way through the notice on Dervîş Dede, he introduces the following lines under the sub-heading of Valâf: "Because the za'amets and timârs allotted to

(1) ED, f. 86a. ḫâfîn ola ki gerek bu kitâbin gerek sa'îr tahrîrât-i cenâfe-i mevlevîyênin ba'în mânhallerinde gür olan "tecmül-i hânmet" iîçî mahlîmanetê gür almûr ve illâ tarîh-i mevlevîyênê "tecmül-i hânmet" ta'rifinden murad tecmül-i cenâfe-i mâhnîmedir.
the poet in that century (1), constituted gifts made by the pâdişâh as rewards in return for poetry..." (2).

"İşik Çelebi, who informs us that his tekâre is more than just another biography of poets (3), shows some interest in the financial dealings of the poets. After stating the fact that Zâtî lived by his pen alone, he goes on to say this about the arrangements concluded between himself and those who commissioned poems from him: "...some gave cash, others gifts of whatever their crafts may have been...and his book, Ahmed ve Halûd (4), was written for that (latter) kind of remuneration" (5).

(1) Kaf, f. 39b (Dervîş). Kafzade is the only biographer who supplies a date of death for this poet. It is on the basis of this date — given as 930 — that we can assume that the century alluded to by Esâr Dede is the 10th century.

(2) ED, f. 74b. Öl 'azîrâda şâ'îrlere virilen me'âmîet ve tîmûr gilla ve cevâyîz-i es'âr olarak ısfâm-i pâdişâhi olmişla....

(3) AÇ, (6474), Mâmûddine, f. 54b.

(4) KÖ, i, p. 25.

(5) AÇ, (1077), f. 270b. "...kimi nakûd ve kimi şahâatî ne ise ol şahâatîn bir tûbîye virîdî.... "Ahmed ve Halûd" nâm kitâbi dahi by nakûde okçe ile dininmişdir.
C. Nature of the poetic citations.

The foregoing sections of the present chapter have dealt with the biographical facts relating to the poets as they are to be found in the individual notices. The following remarks on the poetic citations contained in the təskhərs will conclude the examination of the nature and contents of this literary genre under discussion.

Although some of them are inserted in the notice itself, as a rule, all samples of verse are given at the end of the notices after all the available details of a biographical or anecdotal character have been recorded and, in some rare cases, discussed. The quantity of the verses given varies from təskhər to təskhər, generally, however, from one couplet in any təskhər to several folios in the mec̨̄ma type. Because of the very nature and purpose of the Zübde il-əḡ̨r Karada Hā'ī and the Zeyl-i Züde of Mehmed ʿAmin, one expects a greater number of poems in them. The chief distinction between the two types of biographies of poets is that whereas in the təskhər proper a greater emphasis is laid on biographical details, in the mec̨̄ma type, which is hardly more than an anthology, the main concern of the biographer or collector is to include as many of the finer verses of the poets as possible, always at the expense of the biographical data.

The extent of the representation of each poet's verses in the Züde and its Zeyl varies from poet to poet. In the main, it can be said that the more famous figures in the history of Ottoman poetry not only have a much wider selection of their verses recorded, but also have a much wider representation. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that many more of these poets had collected diyâms and were already better represented in
the necmu'as and ḍars which served as sources for Kaf'ade and his con-
tinuator. Consequently they had a much wider selection of source ma-
terial to draw upon. Three broad standards of classification appear to
have been adopted by the compilers of these anthologies on the basis of
the fame and productivity of the poets. This is reflected, in the works,
in the form of three categories which remain undeclarred by the collectors
themselves. Generally speaking, these categories may be defined as,
(a) the very well represented, (b) the well represented, and, (c) the repre-
sented. As far as the Zibde is concerned, into the first of these cat-
egories are placed outstanding poets like the mutannug-ru'a Ḥalṣūd
Bākī, Fuzūli of Bagdad, Necäti of Edirne, Zātī of Balikesir, Yaḥyā Nef'i
and the āsylislām Yaḥyā who is better represented than any of the pre-
ceding poets (1). Two of the better known names included in the second
category are; Ḥayālī of Vādār Yenişehir and Nīḥi-yi BagdādI (2). The
third category comprises those poets who were not as prolific, or, who
might be described as poetasters. As for Ḍā'im's continuation to the
Zibde, which is a much shorter work, the categories are not so easily
distinguishable. However, Ḍā'im, like the compiler of the more famous
Zibde, has succeeded in finding a wider and larger selection of verses
written by the better known poets. Very well represented are Ḍūmer Nef'i
of Erzurum and the author's predecessor Fāṭimā Dā'īha, and, represented
to a certain extent, is Nef'i-Zāde Ḍā'imI (3).

The compilers of the tezkerec proper, since they are interested

(1) Kaf, ff. 12a, 75a, 96a, 104b, and 115b respectively.
(2) Ibid, ff. 37b and 47b respectively.
(3) As, ff. 40, 51 and 29 respectively.
not only in preserving the verses of the poets but, to a greater degree, in making known the details concerning their lives, have a different approach to the question of poetic citations, at any rate as far as the quantity is concerned. They appear to be more discriminating in their choice of poems and this tends to make them record only the best, according to their own standards, tastes and judgments, of any poet's verses. That is why many of the tekheres, in particular the shorter ones, are full of single couplets as a representation of the total output of the poet. The more substantial tekheres like, Latifi, 'Abdi, 'Ashik Celebi, Kinalizade, Beyani, Riyazi, Safi and Sali, on the other hand, are able to record a cöcel (1) in entirety, some ten couplets from a kaIde (2) or mesevi (3).

There are a number of miqra's given individually within the narrative that constitutes the biographical notice. These are never meant to represent or illustrate a poet's power at versification, but to record written evidence of some statement or of some event in the poet's life (4).

(1) Se, p. 86 (Mihali); L, p. 151 (Heyali) et passim; Ah, f. 42b (Ahmed) et passim; AÇ, (1077) f. 178b (Firazi) et passim; KZ, f. 114b (Zati) et passim; B, f. 119 ('Uzzet) et passim; Ry, f. 79a ('Abdi) et passim; Rz, p. 43 (Selis) et passim; Y, f. 7 (Dami) et passim; C, f. 60 (Sahid); S2, (2549) f. 307b (Lutfi) et passim; Sm, p. 361 (Selim) et passim; Ra, f. 115 (Ress); Er, f. 85a (Sadi; Dele) et passim; Sl, f. 2b (Eprof) et passim.

(2) Se, p. 75 (Saybolu); Ah, f. 42a (Emir Celebi) et passim; AÇ, (6434) f. 111a (Lami) et passim; KZ, f. 116a (Rafi) et passim; Ry, f. 13b (Ahmed Papa) et passim; Rz, p. 16 (Bahi) et passim; Sm, p. 259 (Refev Bey) et passim; Ed, f. 142a (Derfiyi; Rifi). 

(3) Se, p. 75 (Saybol) et passim; L, 98 (Ah) et passim; AÇ, (634) f. 66a (Selili); KZ, f. 88a (Hamdi) et passim; Bl, f. 96 (Sahid) et passim; Ry, f. 20b (Barfi) et passim; Rz, p. 76 (Arif) et passim; Sm, p. 279 (Kemi) et passim.

(4) L, p. 31 et passim; AÇ, (634) f. 30b et passim; KZ, f. 66a (Hamdi) et passim; B, f. 3; Rz, p. 18 (Bali) et passim; Sm, p. 255 (Rami Papa) et passim.
While tārīhs are more usually used as a device to confirm a date, as for instance, that of the death of Zāti (1), they are also often selected to demonstrate the poet's ability to coin such chronogrammes for special occasions (2).

Mu'asāmāt are most difficult to coin and require much ingenuity on the part of the poet. It is not surprising, therefore, that there are few examples of these enigmas included among the poetic citations (3).

A favourite piece of verse which often features in poetic examples is the matla'. Being the opening beyt in a ḫazīl or gaḍīde, it gave the biographers the opportunity of recording the choice lines of a certain poem without having to cite the whole poem (4).

Some poets may not have written much poetry, but their names found their way into the teskheres solely on the basis of a few lines which were not necessarily part of a larger poem. Such poets are represented by kitāb examples of which are abundant in the biographies (5).

(1) AÇ, (1077) f. 271b.
(2) Se p. 114 (Kātīb Ḥasan) et passim; L, p. 276 (Kandī) et passim; Ah, f. 71b (Nasām Bey) et passim; KZ, f. 130a (Ṣūcūdī) et passim; Ry, f. 20a (ʿAlī); Rz, p. 55 (Ḥayrī) et passim; Y, f. 11 (Ṣānī) et passim; Sm, p. 414 (Ṣubāḥī) et passim.
(3) KZ, f. 220 (Fīgānī).
(4) Se, p. 47 (Fahrah) et passim; L, p. 239 (ʿAbdī) et passim; Ah, f. 48b (ʿAqābī) et passim; AÇ, (6434) f. 129b (Nāṯārī) et passim; KZ, f. 107b (Dervīsh) et passim; B, f. 162 (Kātībī) et passim; Ry, f. 19b (Aftābī) et passim; Sm, p. 256 (Seʿīd) et passim; ED, f. 11a (Dervīsh Ahmed) et passim.
(5) Se, p. 57 (Gāzālī) et passim; L, p. 204 (Lānī) et passim; Ah, f. 70b (Ḫūnālī) et passim; AÇ, (6434) f. 86b (Yilmī) et passim; KZ, f. 82a (Ḥasan Qulubī) et passim; B, f. 222 (Nāḥī) et passim; Rz, p. 29 (Ḥasībī) et passim; Sm, p. 562 (Feyżī) et passim.
Very rarely cited are ilmekes (1) and mahemeses (2). There are one or two isolated ruba'is included in two of the tezkores (3). Worthy of some mention also are the nazires sometimes composed by the tezkores or one of the poets in imitation of a poem included in the poetic samples (4). Occasionally the biographer's own poems, other than the nazires already mentioned, are also given space especially in the introductions to the tezkores (5).

(1) Sm, p. 115 (Ahmed Efendi) et passim.
(2) Ibid, p. 99 (Emin).
(3) L, p. 111 (Tomanaşı) et passim; Sm, p. 377 (Serif) et passim.
(4) L, p. 166 (Süleyman Efendi) et passim; Ah, f. 58a (Süleyman Efendi) et passim; Rz, p. 75 (Derviş Paşa); Sm, p. 164 (Derviş 'Atīr) et passim.
(5) Ss, pp. 5-7 et passim; L, p. 15 et passim; Ah, f. 6b et passim; A2, (Ch37h) f. 30a et passim; K2, f. 4a et passim; B, f. 2 et passim; Ry, f. 4a et passim; Sa, p. 4; Ss, (112) f. 13a et passim; Sm, p. 329 (Pusfayt) et passim.
As regards their contents, therefore, the Biographies of
Ottoman Poets yield such biographical information as, the pseudonyms,
given names, surnames, descent, the names of the towns of origin and
sometimes specifically, the places of birth, but almost never the date
of birth of the poets; brief particulars concerning their education and
the names of the teachers under whom this was gained; the class or
professional group to which they belonged and some details on their
careers; a few scanty notes on their personal appearances, natures and
characters; the precise and approximate year of their deaths and oc-
casionally the place of their burial; and, some additional and inci-
dental biographical information. In addition to material of a purely
biographical nature, some of the toskeres contain details on their
literary productions, including titles of works. Anecdotai material,
incidental data which do not always have a direct bearing on the poets
or their lives, and, poetic citations of various kinds complete this
summary of the contents of the toskeres.
Chapter 4

THE VALUE OF THE OTTOMAN TEZKÊRES AS LITERARY CRITICISM

Since early in the present century, modern literary criticism has been assisted by branches of the social sciences such as psychology, sociology and anthropology. In keeping with contemporary tendencies, this 'modern' or 'scientific' approach in methods of criticism has been defined as "the organized use of non-literary techniques and bodies of knowledge to obtain insights into literature" (1).

These recent methods would undoubtedly have been pertinent and most useful had this study been concerned with a critical examination of a poetic genre such as classical Ottoman poetry or a class of prose literature such as the biographies of Ottoman poets. Such a task, however, would demand many years of study, a most intimate familiarity with the motives, styles and techniques of Divân literature, and, above all, empathy. This last chapter, however, will contain the results of an examination carried out, primarily, to establish whether or not the compilers of the tezakir us-su ara under discussion used any critical judgments on poetry, secondarily, to cite examples to illustrate and support these results.

This evaluation can be made only if two important factors are borne in mind. The first can be stated in the words of an eminent orientalist who said:

"Oriental standards of taste are so deeply at variance with those which prevail in Europe that we are too ready to condemn outright what displeases us instead of trying, not to reconcile the points of view, but to lay our own aside and approach the other in a spirit of sympathetic curiosity" (2).

The previous statement was made specifically with regard to our judgment of Oriental literary genres and particularly with reference to Islamic poetry of one kind or another. But it is also valid for our appreciation of the critical standards adopted by those who had to evaluate Islamic poetry in the past. The literary criticism which it is the object of this study to reveal, is that of the tezkerecis whose literary background was totally different from our own.

The other factor of major importance is the fact that the literary standards and methods of criticism used by the tezkerecis were those of a bygone age long before modern or scientific literary criticism had come into being. That this is appreciated by a number of modern and Western literary historians is evident in the following statement:

"Scholarship has no propaganda and does not take sides. Its newest and best phase is the avoidance of anachronistic thinking on its own part. Its business is to seek truth, and its temper is undogmatic" (1).

This view is, however, by no means generally accepted. Two other literary historians, who call it 'historicism' and reject it, interpret it in this way:

"We must...enter into the mind and attitudes of past periods and accept their standards, deliberately excluding the intrusions of our own preconceptions" (2).

The same writers, continuing their criticism, further state:

"As such studies cannot but convince us that different periods have entertained different critical conceptions and conventions, it has been concluded that each age is a self-contained unity expressed through its own type of poetry, incomensurate with any other" (3).

(1) H. Craig, Literary Study and the Scholarly Profession, Seattle, 1944, p. 70. Similar views have been expounded by E. E. Stoll in Poets and Playwrights, Minneapolis, 1950, p. 217 and From Shakespeare to Joyce, New York, 1944, p. 1x.
(3) Ibid, pp. 29-30.
The implications of the above statement, when expressed in terms of a tradition such as the Islamic or Ottoman literary tradition, appear to be most apt. While it is true that the Ottomans "entertained different critical conceptions and conventions", it is even more to the point to say that during the age when it was in vogue, Ottoman poetry was, from the standpoint of other literary traditions, "a self-contained unity expressed through its own type of poetry, incommensurate with any other".

In this chapter, no attempt will be made to evaluate the critical standards of the tezkerecis by Western or by modern standards of literary criticism. In this respect, it will be necessary to disagree with the views of some modern Western scholars who say:

"The total meaning of a work of art cannot be defined merely in terms of its meaning for the author and his contemporaries" (1).

On the contrary, the critical judgments of the tezkerecis will, as far as it is possible, be related to the times and the milieu in which and for which they wrote. In this "historical reconstructionism", as it may apply to literature and its appreciation, the guiding principle will be the observation of the celebrated French critic, Sainte-Beuve:

"La première condition pour bien apprécier les anciens critiques et leurs productions de circonstance, c'est donc de se remettre en situation et de se replacer en idée dans l'esprit d'un temps" (2).

Unlike Arabic and to a greater extent Persian poetry, Ottoman poetry has received little attention from scholars or even lovers of verse.

(1) R. Wellek and A. Warren, op. cit., p. 51.
in general in the West. It has often been assumed, because of ill-founded ideas about the Ottomans, that the Turks who spanned three continents for several centuries were uncultured soldiers whose sole motivation in life was conquest and plunder. This assumption was made by those who knew little or nothing about the nature of the Ottoman Empire and the characters of the men who built it. Few (1) scholars had taken the trouble to investigate and appreciate Ottoman poetry and Ottoman literature in general until the appearance, between 1901 and 1909, of E. J. W. Gibb's A History of Ottoman poetry. This work proved, in no uncertain manner, that the Ottomans were not only highly cultured but that they also had a well developed taste for verse in which most of the members of the educated elite, and many who were not so privileged, indulged. This poetry, while not being an inferior imitation of, was to a large extent, influenced by, Arabic and especially Persian poetic techniques and genres. Its main characteristics were technique dictated by prosody, imagery, artistry and an ingenious use of an apparently limitless vocabulary. Its topics were so restricted and its patterns and metres were so strict that one poet could differ from another, usually, only in the way he expressed his thoughts without offending the principles of prosody and in the way he made use of words.

The same 'narrowness' is to be observed in the variety of critical judgments which are applied to this poetry by the tezkerecis. Just as the

(1) J. von Hammer-Purgstall with his Geschichte der Osmanischen Dichtkunst (Poeth, 1876-8) and J. W. Redhouse with his article, "On the History, System and Varieties of Turkish Poetry" in Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature (London, 1879) stand out among the limited number of Western scholars who showed an active interest in this literature.
teskerees were typical products of the Islamic literary tradition, so were their compilers deeply affected by the same tradition which narrowed their outlook on literature and coloured their critical judgments. Their standards of taste were made subservient to rigid poetic genres which did not vary very much in the three or four centuries during which the teskerees were written. The critical judgment of these critics were directed primarily to points of divergence from the generally accepted principles governing Ottoman poetry. What, by Western standards of literary taste and criticism, would appear as incorrect, offensive or in bad taste, was perfectly permissible, acceptable and in good taste by the standards of the teskerees. Thus, it should be emphasized at the outset, that, what will here be considered as criticism according to the Ottoman tradition will not bear much comparison with literary criticism as it is known in the West.

Here, too, a purely descriptive method has been followed, and, as in the preceding sections, the exposition and argument will be developed by wide citation from the representative authors with a view to showing harmony or conflict of attitudes and opinions. To have ventured further would have been to presume a greater organization of studies on Ottoman society and literature than so far exists.
A. Comments of a critical nature within the narratives.

1. Comparisons with famous poets.

Many of the Islamic poets and prose-writers showed some preference for and, in a certain way, specialized in a particular style of poetry or prose in which they were regarded as masters and described as such by succeeding generations of poets, writers and critics. Their fame, recognized ability to compose in one genre or another and their originality in this genre, enabled the literary historians and critics to set them up as standards for the purpose of comparison. That this was an apparently popular and somewhat accurate method of assessing a later poet's success and renown in one style or another, is evident by the many references of this nature to be found in the Ottoman tezkerecis. Most of these comparisons are made in favour of lesser poets and are probably rather adulatory, for in many cases one tezkereci's opinion in this respect is not shared by either his predecessors or successors. Furthermore, such judgments are very seldom supported by evidence. Consequently, they tend to be of a personal or subjective character. This fact, however, ought not to undermine the value of such observations by the tezkerecis (1). This failure to support with any kind of evidence statements made by the tezkerecis respecting the artists they criticize, characterizes the type of literary criticism which one encounters in the folios of the works under review. At any rate, the mere fact that one poet's ability - as judged by the tezkereci - to compose well in a particular poetic style, permits his critic to liken

(1) S.E. Hyman, op. cit., p.24, note 2. Of Ivor Winters, he says: ".... Winters himself seldom does any of these fine things, in most cases merely announcing the evaluation itself, as a flat obit dictum, with no evidence for it given and in terms so semantically meaningless as to preclude discussion. This failure in practice should not, however, detract from the relevance of his statement of intentions".
him to a master of this style and guides us towards an assessment
of not only what the critic thought of him as a poet but also towards an
appreciation of the way in which the poet referred to differed from others
as an exponent of the same style.

"In the art of poetry he was a second Hassan and
in the ḵaṣīde form (of poem) he was like Zahir
and Ḥāḵānī".

The above statement is an evaluation of the poetry of Mahmūd
Emīrī of Bursa by Latīfī (1). It would indicate, firstly, that at least
according to the critic, Emīrī was worthy of comparison with the Prophet
Muḥammad's contemporary, Ḥassān b. Ṣāḥib (2) and, secondly, that he was
good at the composition of ḵaṣīdes which resembled those of Zahir of
Paryāb (3) and Ḥāḵānī of Šīrāz. It could also be assumed that his ḵaṣīdes
were difficult and obscure in character, since it was mainly on this character-
istic that Ḥāḵānī's fame rested (4). This statement, consequently, leads
us to understand that in Latīfī's opinion Emīrī was an above-average poet
who specialized in a particular kind of ḵaṣīde.

That ʿAḥdī had an equally good opinion of ʿAbdolkorām Risāyī of
Bursa is evident from the following observation:

...ūslūb-u inšāda Vaqṭāf-i doverān... ẓīr-e
Emīr ve haf türmāne māhān-ī ẓalmān-ī sāḥīfīrān.

(1) L, p. 96. Cf. Se, p. 48; Aṣ, (6434) F. 44b; KZ, p. 54b. Cf. also,
Se, p. 42 (Ḵūṭbī) et passim; L, p. 160 (Ẓāfī); Rz, p. 11 (Aṭī).
(2) GML, G. i, p. 37; C. Pellat, Langue et Littérature arabes, Paris,
1952, pp. 76-77.
(3) E.G. Browne, Literary History of Persia, Cambridge, 1928, vol. i,
p. 589.
(4) Ibid, vol. ii, pp. 391-399; AJ. Arberry, Classical Persian Literature,
"...from the stylistic point of view, in prose composition he is the Vaşşaf of the age...he is skilled in poetry and in each (of its genres), he is an enchanting Salmān" (1).

It would seem that 'Abdi's admiration for Risāyl's prose style is evoked by its intricacies and verbosity resembling, we may assume, the characteristics of the style of Vaşşaf (2) who was generally admired for that reason. Salmān is considered to excel as a ḳašṭāde-writer and panegyrist and to have had considerable "technical skill in handling difficult rhymes" (3). 'Abdi's remarks, therefore, would suggest that the Ottoman poet in question resembled Salmān on this account.

In a less exaggerated statement, 'Āşık Çelebi had this to say concerning Məhmed Sun'ī of Gallipoli:

Gerce hem-i aşırlardan Ḫayālı ve Fiğānî'den ektik şahırdi itemşılır.

"He was indeed no less conspicuous (a poet) than his contemporaries Ḫayālı and Fiğānî" (4).

This would imply that in 'Āşık Çelebi's view Sun'ī's poetry compared favourably with his famous contemporaries and that he displayed a certain measure of originality since this characteristic marks the nature of the verse of both Ḫayālı (5) and Fiğānî (6).

Obviously a gross exaggeration, but nevertheless an interesting

(1) Ah, f. 26b. Cf. Aş, (1077) f. 226a; KZ, f. 119a; B, f. 71; Ry, f. 58b; See also, Ah, f. 65a (Rahmi) et passim and KZ, f. 51b (escaping) et passim.
(4) Aş, (1077) f. 299b. Cf. Sc, p. 138; L, p. 224; KZ, f. 163 b; Ry, f. 75a. Cf. also, Aş, (1077) f. 243b (şeyhli) et passim; BD, f. 20b (Derviş Tābi) et passim.
example from our point of view, are the following comments by Kınālisāde about the Īşrev u Şirīn composed by Āhī of Məkhələ:

"Hısrev u Şirīn dimidir. Fī'l-vā'īt kitāb-i melbūr bir nazi-im metin ve kitāb-i ragindir ki ölyet-ı Şirīn ve kelimät-ı renginini Nişāmī gərsə təşəskin idan Hısrev həzdır əferin idir idi.

"He has composed a (version of) Īşrev u Şirīn. In fact, the aforementioned book is so powerful and is (composed) of such powerful verse, that if Nişāmī were to see its agreeable line and charming words, he would admire it, and, Īşrev (himself) would express great satisfaction with it" (1).

Probably the finest version of the story of Īşrev u Şirīn was composed by Nişāmī of Gəncə (2), one of the foremost Persian poets. The same tale had been put into verse by no less a poet than Firdawsi (3) before Nişāmī and afterwards by Fuzūlī (4) and many other Ottoman poets. For the biographer to say in so uncertain terms that Nişāmī would have admired a version prepared by a comparatively unknown poet like Āhī, must be the last word in over-statements.

---

(1) KZ, f. 56a; Cf. 3e, p. 100; L, p. 97; AÇ (Ça) f. 51a and B, f. 29 who makes the same comment almost verbatim. Cf. also KZ, f. 165b (‘Ulvi) et passim; Sm, p. 190 (sabit) et passim.
2. Comments reflecting popularity or literary standing.

Certain distinct comments by the biographers within a myriad of vague and sometimes meaningless praises, may be considered as serious attempts at reflecting an opinion of the poet's contemporaries or at assisting in an evaluation of the poet's popularity or otherwise among succeeding generations.

Remarks like:

"His diwan is current on the tongues of the people" (1).

by Sehî with reference to Cafer Çelebi, and:

"Among the public, his diwan is famous and his verses are remembered" (2).

by the same tezkereci with reference to Ahmedî, would indicate that both these poets enjoyed considerable popularity - Cafer Çelebi among his contemporaries and Ahmedî some one century after he flourished. Sehî's contemporaries who covered the same periods do not appear to disagree with him on his assessment of Cafer Çelebi's popularity; as regards Ahmedî, however, Latîfî, while remaining silent on the question of his popularity in later generations, has this to say about his ıskender-nâme (3):

"But there is not so much elegance in his metrical compositions and charm in his expressions. It is related that when the aforementioned had composed the above book and presented it to the notables and nobles of that age (late 14th or early 15th century); "was not admired much" (4).

It would appear, from the foregoing, that the ıskender-nâme did not have much success at the princely court of Emîr Süleymân of Germîyan for whom it was

(1) Se, p. 28. Cf. L, p. 117; AÇ, (6434) f. 60a; KZ, f. 70a; B, f. 40; Ry, f. 34b.
(2) Se, p. 35. Cf. L, p. 82; AÇ, (6434) f. 39b; KZ, f. 44a. Cf. also, B, f. 85 (Sûrûrî) et passim.
(3) KÇ, i, p. 82.
(4) L, p. 82. Cf. AÇ, (6434) f. 39b; KZ, f. 44a who reiterates Latîfî's comments, but attributes one famous poem to Ahmedî.
written (1).

Latif was not at all happy about the way in which he had been treated by the patrons of the arts and he directed considerable criticism towards those who were in a position to reward poets and writers who displayed talent (2). The disappointments and frustrations which he suffered in life may have influenced some of the remarks he made when making appraisals of poets. Of ‘Iṣṣi, "one of the panegyrists of Sultan Mehmed (II)", he says:

"He does not have much creative talent and resourcefulness; and his verse has no charm whatsoever. And yet, in spite of this, he still held a high position at that time and had been appointed, by the pâdîşâh, to a post with a daily pay of one hundred akçe" (3).

‘Iṣṣi may well have been an untalented poet who wrote charmless poetry, and yet one cannot tell to what extent the biographer’s jealousy influenced this statement on the poet’s more fortunate social position (4). The evidence of overt and outspoken jealousy revealed by this passage, casts some doubt as to Latif’s ability to make unbiased judgments and leads one to conclude that E.J.W. Gibb who praises Latif’s fairness (5) had missed or forgotten about this and similar passages in the tezkereci’s work.

---


(2) See Chapter 2 under Latif.


(4) Further on (p. 244) Latif complains about the injustices of the patrons by saying, "It has become known that, from of old, fortune and success were not acquired by excellence or skill; and those who attained power and glory did not do so because they were deserving or qualified".

The younger brother of the biographer Șinâlisâde is the subject of a statement by R̲i̲s̲ă in which he indicates that his poetry is admired by a certain class of people. The statement is so formulated that the possibility of some popularity among others cannot be ruled out. Of Fehmî Mehmed Çelebi, R̲i̲s̲ă says:

"His matchless poems are acceptable to the people of learning and refinement" (1).

An even more restrictive comment was made by Sālim a century or so later with reference to Șasân Sezāyî, a member of the Gülşenî dervîş order:

"He has an extant dîvân and among the şeyha of the Gülşenî (order) he has renown and station" (2).

Many of the references to Sālim in the preceding sections have demonstrated that, in comparison with the other tezkerecis, he comes closer to our own conception of biography. The above quotation might conceivably be a reference to Sezāyî's 'renown' in matters other than poetry. However, since supposedly the biographer is interested in the poet primarily as a person who indulged in versification, it is fair to assume that by 'renown' he is referring to his fame as a poet among the members of the order to which he belonged. This assumption may be confirmed by another statement by the same biographer with reference to Mehmed Tālib of Bursa:

"He had an extant dîvân and among the poets he was considerably distinguished and renowned." (3).

(1) AZ, p. 80 et passim. Cf. KZ, f. 225a; B, f. 15a; Ry, f. 95b who erroneously calls him "Şayālisâde Şahrev Efendi". According to Rāfsâde (f. 77b), Fehmî had a dîvân.

(2) Sm, p. 250. Cf. Eg, f. 37a.

(3) Sm, p. 437 et passim. Cf. Eg, f. 48b. Cf. also, AÇ, (6434) f. 106b (Lâmiî Çelebi) et passim; Ah, f. 22a-b (Mehmed Çelebi) et passim; KZ, f. 104a (Şayâli) et passim.
While, in this example, Sālin once again records a fact regarding the literary standing of a poet via à via a certain class of individuals, his statement is a clearer indication of Ṭālib’s worth as a poet. The dervīş orders produced some outstanding poets (1) and, no doubt, many of their members were qualified to judge poetry, but the mere fact that the poet, Sesaylı, considered before Ṭālib was a member of the particular order the members of which admired him, tends to reduce the validity of Sālin’s statement. In the case of the second poet, however, the standards used in his evaluation are different and to a certain extent more reliable in guiding us towards a more accurate appreciation of his talents as a poet. According to his biographer, Ṭālib’s evaluators were poets and therefore, it would be correct to assume, better judges than mystics whose primary vocation was not versification.

So far in this discussion, citations have been made to illustrate to what extent the comments of the teskerecis would be useful in assessing the literary standing of certain poets as judged by Ottoman society as a whole. There are, however, a few comments which would indicate that there were poets who appealed only to a specific class or, in some cases, to all classes in general:

"But the fancies of his imagination being subtle in the extreme his particular style was specially for the nobles and the learned; the vulgar classes were not intellectually equipped to derive much pleasure from his eloquent poetry" (2)

(2) L, pp. 300–310. C, S, p. 109; K2, f. 256a; B, f. 192; Ry, f. 110b. See also, R. Rosati, "L’ode alla primavera del turco Ṭalib tradotta in latino da W. Jonas e ricantata in italiano da G. Marchetti (1934)" in OR, 1934, pp. 82–90.
In the above statement by Latifī, Mecāfī is considered to be the poet of the upper classes or the elite only. Aṭīf Geshī, however, seems to disagree with his predecessor. While conceding that Mecāfī had a style which was peculiar to himself, the later tekkere, in a shorter comment, indicates that the poet in question appealed to all classes:

"Ma-nasī āhā ve kendi mašū-ū qigār ve kibārdīr.

"The sense (of his expressions) is distinct and he is pleasing to the populace at large" (1).

Such seemingly exaggerated and repetitious praise as showered on cīnā Mecāfī of Edirne:

"The temperament of mankind and the mental dispositions of plebeians and nobles found pleasure and enjoyment in the mellifluousness of his verse and in the delicacy of his honey-strewn sayings. Because everyone of his poems related the circumstances of the lover and each one of his bayta was fit to become a proverb, to hold the public and to be soothing to the soul, he became world-famous and was pleasing and acceptable to both the elite and the common people" (2).

may be disregarded by some on the basis that Latifī who wrote these lines showed partiality towards those poets who had some connection with his native town of Kastamonu (3). As it is reasonably certain that Mecāfī flourished in that town (4), Latifī may well have been over-generous with his praise.

Be that as it may, in this biographer's opinion Mecāfī's type of poetry had a universal appeal. Even one of Latifī's severest critics (5) appears, to a limited extent, to agree with him with the following comment:

(1) Aṣṣ, (6344) f. 123a.
(2) L, p. 526; Ef, 99, p. 79; Aṣṣ, (6344) f. 130a; Kz, f. 277b; B, f. 209; Ry, f. 115a; Of also, 99, p. 56 (Ahmed-i Dā'ī); Sh, (112) f. 135b (Mahbūl).
(3) See Ch. 2, pp. 39-41.
(4) L, p. 523; Kz, f. 277b; B, f. 209; 100, vol. 1, p. 162; HDP, vol. 11, pp. 95-137.
(5) Kz, f. 230a-b.
One or two of his gazels ending in a 'done done' redif became famous among the noble and the vulgar.

One or two of the tezkerecis relied on the opinions of others in order to record an assessment of the poetic worth of a poet and based their statements on consensus. In his notice on Sâlik of Edirne, 'Abdi says the following:

"The consensus of the wits of Rum is that his company and singing were superior to his poems."

It is also possible to obtain some slight idea of royal tastes from the remark made below by 'Aşık Çelebi with reference to Sa'îf of Pazardih:

"When the late Sultan Bayezid ascended the throne, he saw and liked one of the gazels of Sa'îf and having made inquiries as to his health and ascertained his whereabouts, he summoned him."

One way to ensure that one's statements will carry weight, is to attribute it to an authority. Riyâzi, in the following comment on 'Abdullah Häleti, quotes no less an authority than Hayali (4) whose opinion of a poet would not easily be questioned:

(1) Ibid, f. 277b.
(2) Ah, f. 101b. Cf. Aq, (634) f. 140a; Kz, f. 149a. Cf. also, L, p. 77 (Ahmed Pasâ). Ah, f. 63b (Hâleti) et passim; Aq, (634) f. 60a (Câfer Çelebi): Ra, f. 209 (Hâleti); Jt, f. 204 and 31, f. 75a (Vehbi).
(3) Aq, (1077) f. 150a. Cf. Se, p. 85; L, p. 191; Kz, f. 157b; B, f. 87; Ry, f. 66b. Cf. also, So, p. 53 (Hâyali).
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"Hayal said that had Hayat applied himself a little to the art of poetry he would surely have checked many a skillful master on the 'table' of eloquence with the stratagems of the mind and the imagination" (1).

The statements of two tezkerecis of the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent with regard to a little known prose work by the early 15th century poet Ahmed-i Dâ'i help to throw some light on the development of a literary taste among the Ottomans. They indicate also, a change in the requirements for good stylistic prose-writting for particular purposes. The first of these statements is made by Şehî who says:

"He collected a terreśli concerning the science of letter-writing. (In it) he apparently explained the (type of) correspondence required among the people, the judges' letters of appointment and the imperial warrants conferring some dignity or privilege and mentioned titles for each individual according to his rank and befitting his office. Members of the clerical class would keep that terreśli by them and benefit from it whenever their business demanded it. And in their training of novices who entered the scribal profession for the first time, it was from that (volume) that they instructed them the method of writing. It was coveted by everybody and it is sought by the governmental clerks" (2).

while Latîfî, in a shorter passage, comments:

"...he also has a composition on (the art of) writing which is called the 'Ulûdî ul-covâhir(3) and in comparison with those of his contemporaries, it is superior. But being outdated in our

(1) Ry, f. 36b. Cf. L, p. 126; Ah, f. 65b; Ac, (63a4) f. 65a; KZ, f. 79; B, f. 4b.
(2) So, p. 56. Cf. KZ, f. 42a.
(3) K6, ii, p. 1156.
day, that art is no longer in vogue and that book, because of that (particular) style of writing, is outdated and is not now current. For the writers of the present time are extremely graceful (in their writing) and are very elegant in the variety (of writing called) of inpâ "(1).

It cannot be argued that Sehi thought highly of this work and praised it because a composition of this kind was in vogue while he was collecting his Hâct Bihâct. There is only a short period of eight years separating him from his successor Latifî. Sehi's language is not very precise in this passage and it is difficult to determine exactly which age he is referring to when he says that the work in question was in actual use. The fact that Latifî mentions a change in the style of letter-writing less than a decade after Sehi finished his task here, seems to indicate that Sehi's statement was valid only from Ahmed-î Deyî's age. It is curious, on the other hand, that Kınâlî-zâde who wrote almost half a century later should mention it and add that "it is famous" (2).

Latifî, in the following statement, expresses surprise at the fact that the poet Cemîlî, who flourished during the reign of Mehmed II, did not become famous with his good poetry:

"His beautiful style conformed to the desired form which is acceptable and agreeable in our day. The astonishing fact is that he had not been able to attain fame (ever) with so much polished verse and 'burning' poetry. Because he was not deemed worthy of it, while deserving renown and fame, his dîvân did not become famous" (3).

Here again, Latifî is giving evidence of independent judgment which does not

(1) L, p. 37.
(2) KZ, p. 42a. For further information on this poet and his works, see, İ. H. Ertaşlan, Ahmed-î Deyî - Hayâtî ve eserleri, Istanbul 1952.
(3) L, p. 121. Sc, p. 113; KZ, p. 74a; Ry, f. 36a; Kaf, f. 21b.
agree with the evaluation of others. It could be that the above passage is another reflection of the biographer's thoughts on what constituted good poetry which was not appreciated by the patrons and the public. This observation is partially confirmed by the following remark made by Şinâlisâde who in disagreement with Laţîfî, but who, it should be remembered, wrote almost fifty years later:

Laţîfî belgînda hayâtî îtrâ âdib bu mukûle eş'âr ile ıştipîr bulmazâhama ta'âccub ve inkar ilimâ- dir. Lakin, yazılığu eş'ârin âdînîn şandân melâ- hat ve şafa yokdur.

"Laţîfî exaggerated considerably on his (Cemâli's) account and expressed astonishment at his not having found fame with this kind of poems. However, there is not much beauty and polish in the expression of the verses which he (Cemâli) wrote" (1).

Another example which suggests a change in taste attributed to the ingratitude and faithlessness of the public, is to be found in a remark made by Şinâlisâde with reference to an early 16th century poet, Şâvîr of Kastamonu:

Nâzirî eş'âr ve 'îlmi-odvârda şemînînda pir-îstîbûr ile, lakin bu şemînde yezî-yî bilbân ve şadîkat-î iyun gibi ne ma u nişânînîn eşer şânîr u k'yan deîgîldir.

"He was apparently very famous in his age for his versification and music, but now, like the faithfulness of beauties and the devotion of brothers, there is no trace left of his renown and fame" (2).

The above observation to the effect that Şâvîr's fame as a poet was of rather short duration, is, to a certain extent, supported by Laţîfî who seems to suggest that half a century or so earlier the poet in question was still some-

(1) KZ, f. 74a.
(2) Ibid, f. 147b. cf. L, p. 199; AÇ, (1077) f. 254a; Ry, f. 69b (Şâvîr).
what of a celebrity. It should be borne in mind, however, that the tekkereli from Kastamonu was writing about one of his compatriots:

"He has excellent compositions and illustrious compilations on the arts of poetry and music. The late Necet and Telli strongly approved of the fancies of his un tarnished mind and of the power of his wit" (1).

The above comment also indicates his literary standing according to two authorities who were his contemporaries.

(1) L, p. 199.
3. Originality.

As already stated in the introductory words to this chapter, originality was not one of the more striking characteristics of Ottoman poetry. If at all displayed, it was to be found more in the mechanical process of writing this verse than in the ideas which it was used as a medium to propound. The few references to individuality or originality within the comments of the tâskereçis are very vague and seldom explained. The following citations are some of the few proofs that certain biographers were aware of such characteristics in the works of the poets they pass in review.

"He has no natural propensity for invention and artistry; he has many insertions (from the poems of others) and borrowings from the poetry of the ancient poets" (1).

In the above quotation Latifî would indicate that the poet in question was not capable, in many instances, of expressing himself in his own individual way and that he had to have recourse to the works of others for inspiration of this nature. Since the tâskereçî does not elaborate on this practice any further, we can only assume that these few comments were sufficient to demonstrate his disapproval of it (2).

A somewhat different view is expressed about Umidi of Istanbul by a later tâskereçî who is sympathetic towards him without exaggerating in his praise of him:

(1) L, p. 130 (Hârîîî). Cf. AC, (643h) f. 86a; K2, f. 89a; B, f. 47; Kâf, f. 33b. Cf. also, Se, p. 45 (Hâfîs-î ʿAcam) et passim.

(2) For further remarks on this question, see pp. 30-31 of Latifî's introduction to his tâskere.
"He has many amorous poems according to the witty people, but he does not have much fame as (a writer of) distinct meanings circulated among the poets. It is to be hoped that, as time passes, he will escape from the tongues of the enemies and will become a fully celebrated poet" (1).

That 'Ahdi's hopes were partially fulfilled is confirmed by Riyüzi who wrote about Ümid about half a century later:

"Fakat ki şahrı-bi belâghda payrev-i Bâni olmağla eşârî derece-1 kabule vizal bulmاعدur."

"While (because) he was truly a follower of Bâni on the highway of eloquence, his poetry found some measure of acceptance" (2).

In the next citation, Khinâlisade appears to be distinguishing between individuality and originality:

"Vâdi-yi bezel ve mu'tayebde eşârî pib ve şayyedê uşûl-u meghûb üzere väki' olmuþdur. Tarzında vehid ü ferid dinlilâs beði' u be'id deşildir."

"Those verses of his which were written in a jesting and jocular manner, were pleasant and extremely desirable in form. Though it can be said that he was unique and singular in his style, he was not original or unusual" (3).

Khinâlisade's continuator, and in many respects his copyist, Beyûni does not make this distinction while seeming to ascribe some originality to the same poet:

(1) Ah, f. 50b (Ümid). Cf. AÇ, (64/34) p. 42a; KZ, f. 53b; B, f. 26; Ry, f. 22a; Kaf, f. 10a, Cf. also, AÇ, (64/34) p. 47b (Emrî) et passim.
(2) Ry, f. 22a.
(3) KZ, f. 74a (Gemâli). Cf. Se, p. 115 (?); Ah, f. 63b; B, f. 42; Kaf, f. 21b (?). There seems to be some confusion between this Gemâli and other poets who wrote under the same pseudonym. See, GOD, vol. iii, p. 42.
"In jesting and pleasantries, he invented a (new) outlandish form and he has his individual form in poetry" (1).

Another example of a somewhat different character is to be found in Risā with reference to Şehri of Malatya:

"In truth, he is the inventor of (a new) style and (displays) beauty of imagination in fresh (new) expressions; his agreeable verse is jovial and fluent, and, the bride of his rare meanings is a sociable companion and a comrade to the learned" (2).

---

(1) B, f. 42 (Camâlis). Se, p. 107 (Câtû); Cf, L, p. 117 (Cafer Çelebi).
4. Imitating others and translations.

For one or two tezkerecis the imitation of other poets, the selection of verses from the poetic works of others for insertion in one's own poems and straight translation were not considered good practices. While the tezkerecis do not say so in as many words, some of their statements would indicate that they took exception to such ways of gaining 'inspiration', or that, even if they have no particular objection to them, others did.

Laṭīfī appears to know very little about Ḥarīrī of Bursa and consequently his notice on him is very short. Hariri was undoubtedly not a famous poet as all the other tezkerecis say little more than Laṭīfī does. It is the Kastamonu biographer alone, however, who states that the poet had used the verses of others:

"And he has many insertions (in his own poems from the poems of others) and borrowings from the poetry of the ancient poets" (1)

The same comments may be made on the following short observation of Āḡīr Celubi regarding Ābdurrahim Raḥīmī:

Celīli'ye mağallidir: "He imitates Celīli" (2).

In the next citation Laṭīfī, who often shows unusual independence in his judgments, honestly reproduces an opinion critical of no less a poet than Ahmed Pasha. In the same passage he gives us some insight into the standing of translation among some members of Ottoman society by recording their views on the matter:

(1) L, p. 130. Cf. AC, (6434) f. 86a; KZ, f. 80a; B, f. 47; Ry, f. 41b; Kaf, f. 53b.
(2) AC, (1077) f. 222a. Cf. Ah, f. 93a; KZ, f. 117b; B, f. 70; Kaf, f. 41b.
"Although the practice of translating is (considered) reasonable and acceptable by some learned men, it is (considered) reprehensible and suspect by some wits. The consensus of the eloquent ones is that if the late (Ahmed Pasha) had not been accused of translating, he would have been faultless and a master among the poets of Rûm and his poetical pre-eminence over them all would have been assured" (1).

Of another famous poet of the early period, Şeyhî, ‘Aşık Çelebi has this to say with reference to translation:


"Among the poets of Rûm, Şeyhî is truly one of the most learned and one of the lords of language. Though he has (composed) gazels also, they do not have the power that his mesevîs have, and there is no relation (comparison) between his gazels and mesevîs. Although most of the aforementioned book (Husrev u Şirîn) (2) is translation, it is, nonetheless, well-done and perfect" (3).

(1) L, p. 77. Cf. Se, p. 20; AÇ, (6434) f. 35b; KZ, f. 40a; B, f. 20; Ry, f. 12a; Kaf, f. 5b.
(2) KÇ, i, p. 704.
(3) AÇ, (1077) f. 245a. Cf. Se, p. 52; L, p. 215; KR, f. 153b who reproduces ‘Aşık Çelebi's comment verbatim; B, f. 97; Ry, f. 72a; Kaf, f. 56a.
5. **Comments about simplicity.**

Artistry and an over-exertion in the adornment and embellishment of verses leading to artificiality were usually commendable in Ottoman literary circles. This is the conclusion one arrives at on the basis of the following statement, and others throughout the textbooks, by Latif with reference to Şahid I of Edirne:

"He does not possess much ability for the art of versification and his poems have many unadorned and trite meanings. Though there are some acceptable couplets in his divan, they are of the evil type; unsuitable and incorrect." (1).

Ashik Qelobi, on the other hand, seems to approve of some measure of simplicity, but indicates, at the same time, the (possible) consequences of this. This is implied in the following comment on the gazels of Ishak Qelobi:

"The form of the gazels of the late (Ishak Qelobi) was free and easy and jovial. Most of them were devoid of artistry and extravagance, and were composed in a pleasant and graceful manner. On this account they were used among the jugglers and habitues of uproarious assemblies." (2).

Some two centuries later, Sâlim had approximately the same comment to make about Ahmed Qelobi Hanî:

---


(2) AÇ, (6454) f. 42a. Cf. Se, p. 45; L, p. 89; KZ, f. 47a whose comment is very much like Ashik Qelobi's; B, f. 21; Ry, f. 17a; Râf, f. 7b. Cf. also, AÇ, (1077) f. 165b ('Askert).
"His poetry being free and easy, it was devoid of extravagance and his meaningful speech lacked exaggerated adornment." (1).

(1) Sm. p. 252. Cf. Sf. (112) f. 63b; Ra. (762) f. 79. Cf. also, Nc, (643a) f. 124a (Mustafa Celebi); E2, f. 99a (Halili).
6. Impropriety.

The use of obscene language, and defamatory remarks directed against living individuals is by no means unknown in Ottoman literature. Nef'i, the celebrated panegyrist of the 17th century, for instance, is said to have lost his life as a direct consequence of his insulting attacks on some of the public figures he mentioned in his kasıdes (1). Since the tezkerecin make hardly any reference to improprieties of this nature committed, either deliberately or accidentally, by the poets, it is to be assumed, probably, that they were not particularly concerned by or with them. Two biographers however, criticize the same poet for precisely this reason.

The only comment which Sehi offers on Nevşehir Çazâlî's poetry is critical of the obscene words which he used in his latıfes. Having said that the poet was by nature prone to versifying pleasantries, he continues:

"He does not respect (honour) (his) words in the verses (sentences) of the witty sayings which he versified; most of the words which fitted the metre (of his poems) were shamefully obscene" (2).

It is not known what Sehi's conception of obscenity was since he does not give any examples of the passages to which he takes objection. The reason for this is that the tezkerecin considers the reproduction, in a tezkere, of such words as offensive (3).

Sehi's immediate successor also mentions this practice on the part of Çazâlî, but his critical comments in this regard are relatively milder. Latıf does not appear to have considered this practice objectionable and even

(1) Rz, p. 95 (Nef'i); CDD, iii, p. 234ff.; NOP, iii, p. 252ff.
(3) Se, p. 87.
adds that ḍasūlī was rather popular among certain sections of the society which he frequented; this included the imperial palaces, the princely courts and the local population of Mekka (1). Concern for impropriety in poetry seems to disappear after Latif, for none of the other taʾṣārebīs who mention ḍasūlī refers to this (2).

(2) Cf. Aβ, (1077) f. 279a; K2, f. 207b; B, f. 134; Ry, f. 39a.
7. **Evaluation of literary forms.**

Certain poets excelled in one *renre* or another and so became famous as exponents of a particular style. A few statements in the tarsokes reveal that very often the tarsokes preferred, for instance, the *jasele* of a certain poet to his *kneides* while the prose writings of another were considered superior to his poems. In the following passage, Latiff praises Necati's *jasele* style and indicates that in his opinion he had introduced a style (in the *jasele* form) which surpassed that of all the poets who had preceded him:

"In the *jasele* style, he has effaced the poetic style of former poets (who flourished) up to his own age like superseded books, and he has broken the barriers for esteem concluded by the ancient poetry like an invalidated transaction. By transforming his imaginative speech to legitimate enchantment (poetry), he made it reach the limits of astonishment (for the readers and hearers of this poetry). The skill of (behind) his eloquent subtleties in the Turkish language is complete. It is unlawful for others to collect books and divrana while there is his (Necati's) beautiful poetry and evidently charming verse" (1).

*Ägil Çelebi would appear to consider Necati to have been superior to his predecessors in all *renre*:

Vo bi'1-âdîle qu'arâ-yi Rûm'da üstäd-i evveldir

...vo Rûm'da siz're evvel ol tâwil urub rêş-kî

Bâg-i Isrâm bir kâşr-i hurrem eyledi ki ana inkar

lesek-1 Rûm'un neşrîdirdir.

"He is the first master among all the poets of Rûm....it was he who first laid the foundation of poetry in Rûm; he made of it such a luxuriant palace that it was the envy (even) of the garden of Isrâm and that this was not so could be contested (only) by those of (with) little understanding" (2).

(1) L, p. 336. Cf. Sa, p. 79; AÇ, (4374) f. 150a; KT, f. 270a; Ry, f. 115c;

Kfs, f. 93a.

(2) AÇ, (4374) f. 130a. Cf. also, Ah, f. 23b (Sâlih Efendi).
Discussing the same poet four decades after Laṭifi, Kınālis̄āde agrees that it was in the ḣaz̄el style which he excelled, though he considers him, in addition, to have been 'unique' in this style:

"That he was superior to the eloquent poets of the world in the ḣaz̄el style and in coining proverbs (parables) is as clear and evident as the brightness of the sun at its points of setting and rising. That he was unique in the world in the ḣaz̄el style... is, etc." (1)

In the next citation, ʿĀfiq Čelebi records the opinion of others on the literary output of Cafer Čelebi:

"The consensus of opinion is that the prose of the late (Cafer Čelebi) is to be preferred to his verse and that in poetry his ḡašīd̄es are preferable to his ḣaz̄el" (2).

A century and a half later, Sālim had this to say with reference to Muṣṭaf̄ī Tā'īb's excellence in the ṭaṣ̄wīf:

"In particular, it was in the ṭaṣ̄wīf form that he had perfect skill and in that form that he (showed) he had much ability" (3).

(1) KZ, f. 278a.
(2) Aṣ, (425) f. 60a. Cf. Se, p. 26; L, p. 117; KZ, f. 71a and B, f. 41 who respect ʿĀfiq Čelebi; Ry, f. 51b; Kaf, f. 21a. Cf. also, Ah, f. 101b (Ṣālikī); Aṣ, (1077) f. 188b (Fatī); B, f. 50 (Namā). (3) Sm, p. 106. Cf. 30, vol. 1, p. 45.
6. Persian and Persians in Ottoman poetry.

Because of the strong influence exerted on Divan poetry by Persian verse styles and by the Persian language, prosody and vocabulary, the Ottoman poets knew or were familiar with the Persian language. Some even wrote poems entirely in Persian. For this reason many comments are to be found in the teskereci which have some bearing on the position of Persian and the Persians in the literary circles.

In the opinion of Latifi, Necati's Persian verses were very good:

"His speech in the Persian language, too, was correct and in poetry, his expression and elegance were as sound as those of the Persian poets" (1).

For Arkik Celebi, the fact that Schadi, who flourished during the reign of Mehmed II, had the ability to write Persian poetry which was good enough to be acceptable to even the most learned and sophisticated members of Ottoman society, was unusual enough to be worth special mention:

Egerce Rumi imiz emz lijet-i farisiyeyi cagliyla
dilmegin mar'min maqbul-u erbat-i kemal itmeidir.

"While he was an Ottoman Turk, because he had a fundamental knowledge of the Persian language, (he wrote) his verses (in such a way as to make them) acceptable to those possessed of every excellence" (2).

Abduljan Efendi of Bolu, little known as a poet and mentioned only by Schadi as such, is also said to have written poems in Persian, though, in this case, the teskereci does not say how good they were and merely describes them:

(1) L, p. 327. cf. Se, p. 75; A?, (6134) f. 130a; KZ, f. 277b; B, f. 209;
B?, f. 113a; K?, f. 95a.
(2) A?, (1077) f. 243a. cf. Se, p. 67; KZ, f. 152b; B, f. 96.
"His gazels in the Persian language were imaginative and his graceful poetry in the Turkish tongue abounded in metaphors" (1).

Sometimes good poems in the Turkish language were ascribed to Persian poets. Such is the case of Bİdәrİ. The first tescereci to mention him was ‘Ahdİ whose statement is straightforward:

"He specialized in the composition of 'burning' poetry in the Persian language and possessed a Turkish (mode of) expression in his 'untarnished' speech (in verse) " (2).

‘Xәlf Ӡәләби, on the other hand, is of the opinion that the Persians were not capable of writing good poetry in Turkish:

"Although many Persians lack (the ability of) expression in Turkish, this one (Bİdәrİ) is capable of (composing) exquisite verse and flowing sentences (in Turkish) " (3).

And Riyәх indicates that despite the fact that Bİdәrİ was Persian, he was still able to write Turkish poetry:

'Acem әкән нааә-ә түркәдә мәбир иә әсәәс-әдәялә тә́бәрә әдәй иди. Нәтәдән бу мәфлә әйдән әзәздәр."
Although a Persian, he was proficient in (the composition of) Turkish verse and was able to express (himself) well (in Turkish) as is evident from this matla of his" (1).

(1) Ry, p. 55a.

There are a few statements in the texts which would indicate that the textores exercised some critical judgment in their appraisal of the works of the poets they pass in review. These remarks are seldom substantiated and are, more often than not, subjective and arbitrary. See, for instance, does not give any reason for arriving at the following conclusion regarding the poetry of Vâsî of Aşkâ: 

"His poems are not in accord with (equal to) his knowledge, they are not desired much (and), his vocabulary is dull and tedious" (1).

The same can be said of the following remark by See's continuator, Latîf: 

"He does not possess much ability in this art (of poetry) and he does not have much power in (the art of) expression" (2).

With reference to the Anatolian poet, Hasan ‘Andelîbî who was, according to Latîf (p. 250) alone, from Kastamouni, ‘Aşkâ Gelebi has indulged in the favourite pastime of playing on words: 

Exerce kendî zü‘muncu bâlbâl-gâl-pâyâyî såmmâ andan bir iyl såz iğdîlmek şagır-î zâlgâyî."

"Although in his own unfounded opinion he could sing like a nightingale, to hear a beautiful expression from him, was like (as rare as) a young one of the fabulous bird (‘ayfâ)” (3).

Latîf who may or may not be correct in saying that ‘Andelîbî was from the town of Kastamouni, appears to put forward some excuses for his failure to excel in poetry. It should be remembered, however, that in the opinion of some of the later textores, Latîf favoured the Kastamouni poets:

(1) Se, p. 50 et passim. Cf. L, p. 359; KZ, p. 296a; Ry, p. 154b; Kaf, p. 110a.
(3) AÇ, (1077) p. 176a. Cf. KZ, 202b. Cf. also, AÇ, (Ghâzi) p. 100a (Kagî).
"But he did not indulge in this art (of versification) so much and his poetic nature is not very powerful" (1).

The next citation of this character contains a criticism of an earlier tezkereci as well as the poetry of a poet:

Eğerce Laṭīfī medhinde îtfā itmişdir annâ didiği eylehden hildâliye mu'arrâ u mubarrâdîr.

"Laṭīfī exaggerated in his praise, but he (the poet) is completely devoid of the qualities which he (Laṭīfī) attributes to him" (2).

The above statement was prompted by the following remark of Laṭīfī:

"He is an enchanting poet who is an inventor in his style and he is capable of individuality in imaginativeness" (3).

This is how Beyûnî appraised the poetry of Muṣṭâfâ Lâyihi:

Fârüzânâliîf meghârdur annâ şîri vasât ul-ţâlîfîr.

"His Persianism is famous, but his poetry is mediocre" (4).

Kînâlîzîde, Beyûnî's predecessor, had even a worse opinion of the same poet:

Rûth-i meşâ u şîri şâfî...dir.

"His versification and poetry are of a low rank" (5).

In the case of Zātî of Balikesir, however, nearly all tezkerecîs give reasons as to why he was not very successful especially in the latter part of his life. Laṭīfī, for instance, attributes his loss of popularity to artificality and the abstruse nature of his verse, though he appears to claim that if Zātî's readers had been intelligent enough, they would have understood him:

(1) L, p. 230.
(2) KZ, f. 149b (zâhlî). Cf. Kaf, f. 54b; cf. also, KZ, f. 74a (Gemîlî) et passim.
(3) L, p. 201 (zâhlî-yi şarît).
(4) B, f. 172. Cf. B, p. 294; Ah, f. 152a; Aq, (6354) f. 111a; KZ, f. 258a.
(5) KZ, f. 238b.
"What kind of verse can there be which he has not attempted? What original ideas in meaning can there be to which his very intelligent and untinted nature could not be equal? But the poetry which he wrote after he had completed half his life (1), on account of his... manner and..., style, and excessive artificiality, became somewhat obscure. The affectionately inclined do not derive pleasure (from it) and cannot understand it readily, and because the delicacy of his fancies requires careful consideration and reflection, the intelligence of those who are not able to comprehend poetic art is not equal to it. For this reason, they imagine most of his delicate meanings to be nonsensical" (2)

Laṭīfī continues his critical examination of the work of Ẓātī and states the following with reference to a particular work:

"Among his mevlevi, the Risāle-i Ṣoni Pervāne (3) is a most artistically written book and its verses are endowed with magic. From its beginning to its end, each boyd (in it) is cultivated, full of imagination, artistic and matchless. But because (in the story) the 'dialogues' and the exposition of purpose are expressed in verse that is fanciful and ornate, his expressions are not (considered) by the erudite to be so clear and manifest; in (his) attention to linking the elements (which) constitute the story, too, he is not considered to be charming and worthy of admiration" (4).

While agreeing, in general, with Laṭīfī, ʿAṣik Qalebi puts forward some reasons for this 'deterioration' in Ẓātī's poetry in the latter part of his life, by examining the physical, economic and social conditions under which the poet had to work:

(1) ʿAṣik Qalebi (1077), (f. 266a) and Kürülizade (f. 110b) give his year of birth as 876. Since Aṣ (1077, f. 267b) says that this change occurred after the year 340, Ẓātī must have been sixty-four at this time.
(2) L, p. 160; also, L, p. 86 (ʿAṣad-ʾi Dāʾl); Sm, p. 408 (Ṣādik Efendi).
(3) KQ, ii, p. 1064.
(4) L, p. 159.
The poem which he wrote after the year 940 are completely devoid of elegance and smoothness. If the nobles needed kaşides and nağares, it was to his earlier kaşides and nafes that they referred. 

...But the late (şati) had a valid excuse. First of all, in some way or another, he suffered from blindness. ... Secondly, he was poor; it was necessary for him to plan his own sources of income, and to procure and compound his means of subsistence. Most of his time was spent on this and much of his time was wasted on this. Another excuse he had was this; he had no office or rank, and did not possess another science or talent; his only competence was poetry and ability to versify. For this reason, he was considered vile by the people and he himself was (rendered) helpless and sad by these afflictions" (1).
There are also isolated examples of other kinds of criticism which are worthy of mention here. Falling into this category is the following appraisal, by Latif, of the poetry of Sabit of Edirne:

"There is no question about his poetic power and his poetic nature. However, there are many places in his poetry which are colourless and simple. For this reason his verse did not have much fame, and it was not celebrated and mentioned on the tongues of the people" (1).

A similarly qualified statement is made by Aşık Çelebi with reference to Muhtar Valî of Monastir:

"Although, at times, imaginative expressions and 'pure' meanings emanated from him, at times, (he uttered), in his poetry, unpleasant and meaningless expressions which came to his mind" (2).

The same tezkereci, also, singles out one beyt as worthy of special mention, though the poet, Koçük of Germiyan, was generally considered to be a poor poet:

"Surprisingly, he has no gazel, not even a beyt and indeed even a misar in the gönks and anthologies which will fit the thread on a mişar, strike the eye (or) be read among friends. But.... this beyt of his is somewhat pleasant" (3)

(1) L, p. 200 et passim. Cf. Se, p. 72; KZ, f. 160a; B, f. 102. Cf. also, Se, p. 20 (Ahmed Paşa); L, p. 86 (Ahmed Bey).
(2) AÇ, (6424) f. 77b. Cf. KZ, f. 297b; B, f. 275. Cf. also, Ah, f. 62a (Haydar); Sn, p. 428 (Safîî) et passim.
Characteristically, Kinālisāde paraphrases the above statement without, however, making specific reference to the boy which Ṭuğlul Jadīd liked:

"But there is not a word in his poetry which could strike the eyes of those who possess 'sight' and which could be read at the gatherings of poets and vītes" (1).

Like Laṭīfī who has some scathing remarks to make about poetasters in his introduction (pp. 24-25), Boyūnī says the following with regard to Ṭuğlul Jadīd Čelebi whom he considers to be an impostor:

"While there was no art at all in what he wrote, he passed for the Firdevsī of the world; because most of the state notables were ingenuous and wanting in knowledge, they thought him to be really erudite and perfect, and he received a variety of gifts from each one of them" (2).

(1) KZ, s. 23āa (Keşfī).
(2) B, s. 109; Č, Akb, s. 131b (Ṭuğlul); Ḍ, (1077) s. 157a; KZ, s. 170b. Cf. also, L, s. 244 (İṣkî) et passim; KZ, s. 14 (Sülûk-hayrat).
10. Disagreement with and criticism of tezkerecil and others.

The tezkerecs contain a few passages which fall into this broad category. The first example of this nature reveals a disagreement between ʿinālīzāde and an unnamed group of people as regards the quality of the words which Emwllūh Emī of Edirne used in his verses:

"Some jealous people.... stretch the tongue of enmity to a great length and say that his (Emī) words are incorrect (vile), but that this is not true is as clear and evident as the sun" (1).

In the following citation, however, the critical remarks are directed against a tezkereci who is clearly identified:

"In his biography of poets, Laṭīfī has praised and cited this matla' of his (Ṭalībī) despite the fact that there is absolutely no beauty in his poetry" (2).

It is ʿinālīzāde also, who charges Laṭīfī with favouring his teacher in his appraisal of poetry. The poet in question is ʿītān yūsūf Fānī of Filibe:

Laṭīfīn'in ʿītān yūsūf Fānī olmālā 'soeb nedd u ʿītrā ūlaqīfī. Ṣadr Ṭaṭābī ʿīrindā ṭālā'īn hān ʿītrā ūlaqīfīn.

"Because he (Fānī) was Laṭīfī' s mentor, he (Laṭīfī) praised (him) and exaggerated (about him) in an astonishing manner. There is, (However), absolutely no art in the poetry which he (Fānī) uttered" (3).

---

(1) K2, f. 52a; O2, Se, p. 132; L2, p. 94; Ah, f. 45a; Aq, (643H) f. 46b; D, f. 24; Ry, f. 20b; K2, f. 2b.
(2) K2, f. 167a (Ṭalībī) ot pasamīn. O2, L2, p. 238. O2, also, K2, f. 76a (Ṣamīlī).
(3) K2, f. 217a; Ṣaf. L2, p. 297; D, f. 214b who makes no independent judgment; Ry, f. 90a. O2, also, K2, f. 140b (Ṣamīlī).
Just as Ḥinālisāde frequently criticizes his indirect precursor, so Sālim often takes Ṣafā'I to task for bad judgment. On the whole, however, Sālim is sharper and more insulting in his censure. In the first example, Sālim cenures Ṣafā'I for having committed an error in ascribing a poem, demonstrating a simple and unbecoming disagreement over Sayyid Mohmed Sa'dī:

"The above boyt is ascribed, in the textore of Ṣafā'I, to the late Ba'dānasāde Qalash - one of the close relatives of the aforementioned (Sa'dī) - whose biography is given under the pseudonym of Rāgī (1) in the section on the letter Ḥaf. This (attribution) is of the nature of a mistake and an error. I knew the above boyt as having been said by this one (Sa'dī)." (2)

In the next citation, however, Sālim is uncompromising and downright insulting. It concerns the historian Rāgīd Mohmed and Sālim's chief objection is Ṣafā'I's source of information:

"The irritating (one) by the name of Ṣafā'I who collected a textore in my time, because he did not have the ability to distinguish the individual possessed of every excellence (from others), in the place where he recorded the biography of such a virtuous individual (Rāgī), he reproduced the criticism which a man by the name of Farnā - who is a mischief-maker in the spacious wilderness of discourse and who is the foe of men of learning - directed against some of his (Rāgī's) kābulā. To reproduce, without reason, idle words of this kind in a volume (textore) of this kind which should be a compendium (mūsāfi'a) of discipline and learning, is attributable, merely, to his (Ṣafā'I's) own stupidity and to the lack of discernment on the part of his worthless nature." (3)

(1) 29, (2349) f. 255a; 3a, p. 56; Bg, f. 77a; So, Iv, p. 66; 60B, Iv, p. 503.
(2) 3a, p. 502; Cr, Ex, f. 30a; So, III, p. 25. In both 1338 of the textore of Ṣafā'I consulted (Ṣulaymāniye Kütûbhanesi, Halef Efendi Māhlakî, No. 112 and Sulaymāniye Kütûbhanesi, Eşad Efendi, No. 2549) there was no reference to Sayyid Mohmed Sa'dī. Cf. also, 3a, p. 297 (Bagīd)!
(3) 3a, p. 262; Cr, la (762) f. 100; Bg, f. 21a; So, II, p. 55; 600, Iv, p. 297; 160, Iv, p. 66; Cr, III, p. 78; 600, p. 268. The statement in n. 2 with reference to Ṣafā'I is valid here too for Rāgīd Mohmed.
11. Poetsess in the textbooks.

Few poetsesses were, presumably, well enough known and details concerning their lives sufficiently well documented, to be recorded in the textbooks under study. Three of them may be cited in connection with the subject discussed in this chapter.

Laşşên, and half a century later, Beşânî make it a point of mentioning that the verses of Mîhrî Yâţûn and Zaynâb Yâţûn were, in certain cases, 'manly'. Of Mîhrî Yâţûn, the first textbook mentioned above says:

"Although the manner (of her expression) in poetry and her poetic style were womanly, from the point of view of sorrowing and pining she was affectionate, and she was virile in exposing ardour and supplication" (1).

Somewhat similarly, Beşânî states with reference to Zaynâb Yâţûn:

"Her verse is eloquent, it is manly and not the embroidery of a woman" (2).

To illustrate Zaynâb's continued fame almost two centuries later, the following example from Sâlim concerning Fatûma âtnâ Kadîn will suffice:

"Although the ānasel.... (3) of the earlier poets Zaynâb is given in the textbooks of Êsan Tâbebi (K2, f. 126b) and the story of her life is known and famous among contemporaries, when considered impartially and without injustice, the container of her spirit-exciting ardour is not overflowing with pleasure like the goblet of the happy nature of this one (âtnâ Kadîn) and her manner in expression

(1) L1, p. 500; G1, Sa, p. 122; As, (G35a) f. 127b; K2, f. 266a; D, f. 200; Kaf, f. 90b.
(2) B, f. 70b; G1, Sa, p. 122; L1, p. 17b; As, (G35a) f. 53b; K2, f. 126a; G1, also, K2, f. 60a (Mubbê). 
(3) A comparison of the two ānasel given by Sâlim (p. 154) with the poem given by Sâlim Tâbebi (f. 126b) shows that Sâlim was able to record only the last two ānasel of the ānasel referred to.
is not heart-ravishing like the beautiful flow (of expression) of this one. The legality of this claim is plain and evident from this beautifulasonol of the aforementioned (Au Kadin)...." (1).

It is also Sālim who makes this revealing statement with reference to Naim Dīrī of Sīnāb:

"Only, being a gallant, contrary to the habitual practice of the hierarchy of poets, he did not incline towards (the use of) pompous expression like other poets, but in order that his words should not be difficult for the comprehension of women whenever they (the words) were recalled in their midst, he expressed (himself) in everyday and well-known words, and plain language" (2).

(1) Sm, pp. 155-4. Cf. Sf, (112) f. 26a; COD, iv, p. 39; 80, i, p. 442; HCP, iv, p. 120.
(2) Sm, p. 244. Cf. Sf, (112) f. 26a; COD, iv, p. 234; HCP, iv, p. 120.
D. Comments introducing poetic citations.

It has already been said that the second major purpose in compiling the biographies of poets was to preserve examples of their verses (1). These occur, almost invariably, at the end or, as is the case in one of the tekceses (2), towards the end of the notices (3). The poetic citations, when given, seldom lack some form of introduction which ranges from the simplest announcement like, "this is his" (4) to very much longer prefices which often contain statements of a descriptive nature revealing the biographers' reaction to or judgment of them. It is to a short examination of some representative forms of introductions to the citations that the end of this chapter will be devoted.

1. Verses and poems which appeal to or are liked by the biographers.

In addition to the introductory statements which clearly indicate that the tekceesi approves of or likes a particular verse, one may also find some rare examples of poetic citations which are declared to be liked. No reason is given for this preference and the statement appears to be based on purely subjective judgment. As far as could be ascertained, introductions of this type are to be found only in the tekceses of Ṭḥāfir Čelobi, more impersonal statements being preferred by the other tekceses. One characteristic feature of all such examples which could be found is that Ṭḥāfir Čelobi is not categorical, merely stating that so and so 'appears' to him to be so and so.

Of Hayrūstānī Čevrī, for instance, he says:

(1) See Ch. 5, pp. 103-109.
(2) Mehmed Riisā has consistently recorded the poets' dates and places of death following the poetic citations.
(3) All the tekceses who give examples of poems do so at the very end of the notices, and seldom within it.
(4) L, p. 129 (Yurīqī) et passim. There are numerous other examples of this character throughout all the tekceses and anthologies.
Du murebbi' fakīrī ḥayli hālet-bahū ve cūnūl galūr.

"This murebbi of his appears to me to castacize highly and to be very ardent" (1).

Of a similar nature are the following two citations with regard to Edirnesi Sarî Nâsun Hifāż and Hacan Ǧinâhil of Verdar respectively:

Du nâšla' fakīrī hūg galūr, "This nâšla of his is very pleasing to (this) poor one" (2).

and

Fakīrī bu kîṭ'asī geyet a'lā galūr. "This kîṭ'a of his seems very good to me" (3).

---

(1)AQ, 6434) f. 69a. cf. Ah, f. 63a; KZ, f. 76a; Rv, f. 58a. cf. also, 
AQ, (1077) f. 100b (Pašš Râšib) et passim.
(2)AQ, 6434) f. 28b; cf. Se, p. 105; KZ, f. 94a; Rv, f. 43b. cf. also, 
AQ, (1077) f. 280b (Qulâmî).
(3)AQ, 6434) f. 106b. cf. Ah, f. 106b; KZ, f. 275a; Rv, f. 168; Rv, f. 101a.
2. Laudatory comments in the introductions.

It is assumed that the verses cited by the texkoresis represent the best of the total poetic works of each poet. Although the compilers, sometimes, left it to the interested reader of the texkoresis to judge for himself on the basis of these verses, frequently, the texkoresis himself reveals his own judgment, usually in favour of the poet, by introducing them in short sentences couched in terms that are very flattering to the poet. The following examples are cited because they are representative and also because they reveal the wide range of flattering expressions which the texkoresis had at their disposal for this very purpose. The first eight citations are comparatively simple:

"These boyto are from among his perfect ğanala" (1).

"This allegorical ğanala is one of the poems of his invention" (2).

Maltə neferine pınəşib bu kitə'vi bıvot e'ın dimişdir.

"He uttered this kitə'vi in connection with the expedition to Maltə, very beautifully" (3).

Bu obi'ət bəd deşildir. "These boyto of his are not bad" (4).

Kəndəi bənəsi vaqı'ının bu boytə-nəvəhən şəyətdə şəh dimişdir.

(1) Se, p. 57 (Ibranə). Cf. L, p. 43; K, ll, p. 1505. Cf. also, Se, p. 56 (Ahmad-i Də'lı) et passim.

(2) L, p. 260 (Kəfərə) et passim. Cf. Se, p. 59; COD, i, p. 124; Cf. also, L, p. 79 (Kəndəi Pəşənədə Ahmad Qəlobi).

(3) Açı, (6374) f. 70b (Də'lı) et passim. Cf. K, f. 104b; 30, ll, p. 322. Cf. also, Açı, (1077) f. 274b (Qubairə).

(4) Açı, (6374) f. 77b (Vaḫzə). Cf. K, f. 297b; D, f. 235. Cf. also, Açı, (6374) f. 73a (Darvış Qəlobi) et passim.
"He said this desirable bayt, describing his abode, very beautifully" (1).

Du ğarî-i sâlikâne-i şâyêt bâr söyledi.

"He uttered this mystical bayt very pleasantly" (2).

Du birkaç bayt-i ra'îni ol şâ'îro-i devarûnîn ğarî-i hâdî-i bâr söyledi.

"These few graceful bayts are some of the beautiful sayings of that poetess of the age" (3).

Bu â'în-e nawzîr-i bârî-i belaştît oldaşmîn.

"These verses indicate that he was the jewel of the 'market' of eloquence" (4).

An example of a more pompous character, the following may be quoted:


"Day and night, during his lifetime, he studied the poetry of the preceding poets and became the mother-pearl of art in the sea of knowledge; his utterances were accepted universally. This ğarî bears eloquent testimony to and illustrates the fact that the falcon of his endeavours was ambitious in flight" (5).

(1) KZ, f. 52a (Farsî). Cf. Se, p. 132; L, p. 26; Ab, f. 45a; Aq, (Ghâzî) f. 46a; B, f. 2b; Ry, f. 20b; Kaf, f. 6b. Cf. also, KZ, f. 54a (Nûrî) at passing; Aq, (1077) f. 27a (Ghâzî) at passing; 3/1, f. 20b and 3/1, f. 46 (Khalîlî Pağâ). (2) ED, f. 122a (Dervîş Fatîrî) at passing. Cf. GOD, IV, p. 165; 30, IV, p. 12. Cf. also. ED, f. 132a (Nââîî Dodo). (3) 32, (112) f. 26b (Aîl Râdîn). Cf. Sm, p. 152; 30, IV, p. 59; 30, 1, p. 44c; 30, IV, p. 150. (4) Ry, f. 33a (Gurhûrî). Cf. Aq, (Ghâzî) f. 60b; KZ, f. 70a; B, f. 4b; Kaf, f. 25a. Cf. also. Ry, f. 41b (Farnîrî). (5) Ab, f. 12a (Gurhûrî Pağâ). Cf. L, p. 123; Aq, (Ghâzî) f. 60a; KZ, f. 75a; B, f. 45b; Ry, f. 70a; Kaf, f. 22b. Cf. also. Aq, (Ghâzî) f. 70b (Yûsûfî); Ry, f. 30a (Gurhûrî); B, p. 64 (Zâmîrî); 32, (112) f. 17b (Shoroî).
"These heart-conquering beats are the offspring of his delicate nature" (1). 

Bu hırka hoyt-ı lațif ol vüsûd-u şerîflîn eş-ârîndandîn. 

"These few elegant beats belong to the poems of that noble individual" (2). 

"These heart-adorning words are from among the ravaging beats — esteemed by the wits of the world — of that discriminating one of the convivial meeting of pleasure" (3).
3. Famous poems of all descriptions.

Most of the tezkoreeic site poems which they describe as 'famous'. They never elaborate on this to explain why they were famous or when and where they attained this fame. The shortest and most simple, and most frequently encountered statement of this kind is:

Bu boyt-i meghur amindir. "This famous boyt
in here" (1).

The roots are coloured by the individual tezkoreeic's own stylistic taste, characteristics and verbosity:

"This kit'a is one of his poems which attained fame" (2).

"This famous boyt which is composed of similar and ambiguous letters and which is (made up) of symmetrical words and unified sounds, is ascribed to him" (3).

Bu gazoli didiklerinde bu boytî hayli göhrat

"When he uttered this gazol this boyt (from it/ of his) became very famous" (4).

Bu mefa-i pür-iştihâri meghur-u rûsûr ve mafqal-u mâlî'î lâbî'î olmaydur.

"This very celebrated ma'la' of his became famous in the age (world) and was acceptable to the men of discernment" (5).

(1) Ry, f. 96b (Kudal) et passim; Cf. So, p. 154; L, p. 273 et passim; Ab, f. 146a et passim; AQ (1077) f. 216a et passim; Kz, f. 227b; Cf. also, Kaf, f. 55b (Hariri).
(2) So, p. 90 (Egyniz). Cf. L, p. 100; AQ (6934) f. 147b; Kz, f. 148b; B, f. 70; Ry, f. 62a; Kaf, f. 49b.
(3) L, p. 994 (Nâsil) et passim. Cf. Ry, f. 122b; Kaf, f. 100b; Cm, ii, p. 222.
(4) AQ, (6934) f. 68a (Gala (Calil Culebi). Cf. Ab, f. 17a; Kz, f. 72b; B, f. 41; Ry, f. 77b; Cf. also, AQ (6934) f. 90a (Kudal Culebi).
(5) Kz, f. 80a (Amâli). Cf. So, p. 84; L, p. 25; AQ, (6934) f. 45a; B, f. 22; Ry, f. 19b. Cf. also, L, p. 150 (Gayali Boy) et passim.
Du jarel – birinci beyt-i məphür – muftid...-

"This is the first, several beys of which are famous in his...

 Ağır-larından bu beyt-i ma‘mür alcının-nüsha
büşüyet imtāber ve muhfurdu.

"This delightful beyt from among his works is extremely esteemed and famous on the tongues of the people" (2).

Du beyt-i məphür nəsir-larından intihāb olundu.

"This famous beyt was selected from his collected works" (3).

There are numerous examples in most of the textbooks indicating that the compilers were selective (4), as is the case in the immediately preceding citation, when recording the poem. It is to be assumed that the verses selected in this manner were the best that the poets had composed.

(1) Aḥ, 2. 135a (Qubārī). Cf. L, p. 232; Aḥ, (1077) 2. 275b; Eṣ, 2. 205a; B, 2. 122; Rv, 2. 194b.
(2) Cn, p. 251 (Qundī) et passim. Cf. Aḥ, 2. 9; 609, Iv, p. 571; 80, 11, p. 246, Cn, also, Aḥ, 2. 19b (Golāb Bey); B, 2. 107 (Qubārī).
(3) Aḥ, 2. 5 (Qundī Golābī). This poet appears to be known only to Āpīn.
(4) See, especially, the məphür beyt, Kaf, 2. 17a (Mihīfī) et passim; Aḥ, 2. 50 (‘Abdī) et passim.
4. Miscellaneous comments in the poetic citations.

Many poems or fragments of poetry are introduced by means of most flattering remarks, such as "matchless", "unique" etc. It is not possible to assess, from the way in which these are used, the value of such remarks. They are used too frequently and one is struck by the contradiction in terms which these involve. There appear to be so many "unique" poems that one must tentatively assume that the terms did not mean what is generally understood by it:

Du biskis națla-i bri-nisîl ol gâhîn-i pir-hô

"This unequalled mațla belongs to that sweet-sung poem. It has been recorded as a confirmation of this fact" (1).

'Gâl' îmâl-îci bi 'Yânîh vo 'Azrâ' da mayl rémbidir yin ațî boytir, naș-șipteştirke

"His Gâl îmâl to which he appended to the Yânîh and Râz (2) is composed of one hundred and two boytis. In 'praise-scattering', these boytis are unrivalled" (3).

Du îmâl-i bi-badal amindir. "This matchless îmâl is his" (4).

Oleh-i așnîndan ap'ârî bi-sâzîr vo gîstûri alâbîmûnîr.

"Of all his works, his poems are unrivalled and his speech is agreeable" (5).

(1) Ab, f. 150b (Nândî) et passim. Qf, Aq, (Gd34) f. 117b; Rz, f. 243a; B, f. 190; Ry, f. 105a; Kâf, f. 25a. Of. also, Ab, f. 154a (Lâqînî).
(2) Kû, 11a, p. 19991.
(3) Aq, (Gd34) f. 111b (Lâqînî) et passim. Of, 5a, p. 50; lâ, p. 290; Rz, f. 257a; B, f. 170; Rz, f. 101b; Kâf, f. 25a.
(4) 271, f. 18 and 35, f. 2b (Eşmail). Of, 5a, p. 20; Ab, f. 5a, 50, s, p. 500. Of, also, B, f. 174 (Lâqînî) ; Ra, (762) f. 115 (Râzî).
(5) 20, (120) f. 142a (Nândî). Of, 5a, p. 674; 30, f. 4v, p. 569. Of, also, Ra, p. 90 (Nândî) et passim; Ra, (7873) f. 5a (Nândî).
To be found also in the testes are vague descriptions of poems and fragments. These are achieved by means of simple adjectives or more elaborate adjectival constructions:

"Those poems in which 'the same or a cognate word is used, in the same or a different sense, twice in a dictum', are his" (1).

"This poem which points to the meanness of the time and the insensitiveness of the period, is his" (2).

In birînq boyt-i 'âqilâne vo rîndêne anlarîn mây-i neshâname-ânîdir.

"Those few amorous and 'licentious' boyts are from among his 'intoxicated' poems" (5).

In shabê-i nvevînîh anîndir. "These boyts filled with subtilities are his" (4).

Cînîle-i âsârî-î fasâne-digarîndan bu birînq boyt-i hevî-î hevî-rimûmân.

"Those few magical boyts from among his eloquent works have been recorded (below)" (5).

(1) Sc, p. 94 (Baba Jâsam). Of., L, p. 151 (Jâsâm-i Râmî) where this description is repeated. Of., also, Ag, (O4i4) f. 105b (Novâbâ làîfî); Sc, p. 203 (Kemî).
(2) L, p. 247 ('âlvîf). Of., Ag (1077) f. 171a; Kf, f. 103b; 'OH, Ma, p. 304 90, 111, p. 490; bag, 111, p. 24; n. 2.
(3) Ab, f. 27b (Lâsîl Efendî) et passim. Of., L, p. 290; Ag, (O4i4) f. 101a; Kf, f. 251b; B, f. 16b; Ry, f. 97b; Kf, f. 112a. Of., also, Ag (1077) f. 235b (âsâmî); Ry, f. 13b (Malîd Pâşa); Ab, f. 76b (Malîd Cân).
(4) B, f. 173 (Lisânî) et passim. Of., L, p. 258b; Ry, f. 102a; Kf, f. 60a. Of., also, L, p. 219 (Gântîl Qoâbî) et passim; Ab, f. 156b (Hevîdî) et passim; Kf, f. 266b (Malîsâmî) et passim; Ru, p. 57 (Malîsâmî); Sc, p. 414 (Palîbê) et passim.
(5) Sc, (112) f. 135b (Vebbî) et passim. Of., Sc, p. 720; 80; Iv, p. 617; bag, iv, p. 107. Of., also, L, p. 249 ('âly Qoâbî); Ab, f. 36a (Palîbê Efendî); Ag, (1077) f. 171a ('âlvîf); B, f. 196 (Intî Ezdi); Ru, p. 99 (Malîzî); Sc, p. 408 (Palîbê Efendî).
...certain classes in the poetic tradition we must understand, carols in the first two stanzas, poems in the last two stanzas, and so on. The poet's skill in the use of meter and rhyme is impressive. Haam's Colebi is another poet who put (1) in this category.

"He had more than forty karids and hymns that I have seen; all are skillfully executed and meaningful. His songs contain special meanings, exquisite artistry and perfection of expression. Haam Colebi reproduced these songs of which these two baya (are given below) (2).

The last category of introductions to be considered can be divided into those in which the teshirces explicitly state their preference for certain poems out of the total output of the poet (1), and those in which this is implied (3):

A.

"The glory of his divân and the pride of all his baya and poems are these few bayas" (3).

Geyt gizide op'ari burdur, "The choicest of his poems are the following" (4).

Ve divân'ı op'arinda olan matâ'î in bu matla' a'tâydir.

"Of the matla'î which are in his divân this matla' c is the best" (5).

Geyt iftîhar itâbî baya budur, "This is the bay of which he was extremely proud" (6).

(1) KZ, 22. 253b-5.
(2) E2, f. 126a (Darbiyû Câmihi) et passim. G? Ab, f. 148b; AQ, (145) f. 104b; KZ, f. 237a; B, f. 130; Ry, f. 101a; Kaf, f. 256. C? also, L, p. 242a (Ali Colebi); B, f. 175 (Hemî Colebi); E2, f. 130a (Hemî Dede).
(3) L, p. 22 (Ahmed Haskân) et passim. G? Se, p. 256 (Ahmed Dey); KZ, f. 194b where Hâmet û is quoted in full; 30, 1, p. 156; C?Dâ, 11, p. 206. C? also, AQ (1077) f. 174a (Sehî) et passim; Ry, f. 296 (Hemîtâ'î) et passim.
(4) AQ (1077) f. 237a (Hemîtâ'î). G? Se, p. 173; L, p. 273; Ab, f. 148b; KZ f. 256a; B, f. 190.
Baytí mánádín

"This baytí is the pride of all his poems and the masterpiece of his utterance" (1).

Baytí kaptıcında bu baytí mánádín

"This baytí in his Savy kaptı is beautiful" (2).

Bu općar divânından intâhâ olmuș sahîh olmuș.

"These poems were selected from his diwan and written down (here)" (6).

Zeveändigä şirî'îl intâhâ bulub lâkin bu vanändigä općârindan âzîr bulub mâzîk bu baytí'î bine-bine ve sâhih-ârîl divânî.

"Though in his own day he was famous for his poetry, no trace remains of his poems at this time. Only this baytí is feast-adorning and pleasure-increasing" (7).

(1) KZ, f. 133b ((Pqîah)). Se, p. 136; L, p. 204; Ah, f. 130a; Âq, (1077) f. 132a; B, f. 131; Ry, f. 22b; Kâf, f. 65b. Cf. also: Se, p. 135 (Kâmî); Ah, f. 143b (Kanî); Kâf, (112) f. 86a (Hayrettin) et passim.
(2) Âq, (Ghâfî) f. 45b (Ey większe Çeçobi). Cf. Se, p. 40; L, p. 80; Kâf, f. 46a; B, f. 23; Ry, f. 17a; Kâf, f. 7b.
(3) This is the Hilâmû Dîlî. See, Kâf, i, p. 666.
(4) Se, p. 100 (Milî). Cf. L, p. 97; Âq, (Ghâfî) f. 31a; Kâf, f. 56a; B, f. 38; Ry, f. 37b; Kâf, f. 11b. Cf. also: Se, p. 83 (Kâmî).
(5) L, p. 237 (Te'mîr). Cf. Ah, f. 214a; Kâf, f. 215a; B, f. 140; Ry, f. 90a; Kâf, f. 76a. Cf. also: Se, p. 135 (Kâmî); Kâf, p. 98 (Te'mîr); Kâf, (112) f. 146b (Hayrettin) et passim.
(6) Ry, f. 46a (Hayrettin) et passim. Cf. Se, p. 126; L, p. 147; Ah, f. 67a; Âq, (Ghâfî) f. 39b; Kâf, f. 37b; B, f. 31; Kâf, f. 56a. Cf. also: Ry, f. 12b (Salîmî, Harabî II) et passim; Kâf, f. 106 (Nihiştî) et passim; Âq, f. 3 (Kâmî Çeçobi) et passim; Se, p. 140 (Âqîh) et passim; Kâf, f. 58a (Çerî); Kâf, f. 135a (Nâvîf Dede) et passim.
Bearing in mind, first of all, that the critical standards of the tezkeres were set by a literary tradition which was, in many respects, completely alien to our own, and, secondarily, that we are dealing, here, with a body of literature which was collected a long time ago, the tezkeres contain the following material which may be regarded as critical: Comparisons of poets with well-established past figures; comments which indicate popularity and standing in literary or other circles; material which contains comments on originality, simplicity, impropriety, imitation, translation and Persianism; evaluations of poetic forms and styles; some adverse critical judgments; and a variety of comments which throw some light on the reactions of the tezkeres to particular poems that are cited in the works under consideration.

(1) Ra, (762) f. 115 (Reca). Cf. Sm, p. 294. Cf. also, B, f. 135 (UlvI) et passim; Sm, p. 134 (EdIb) et passim.
CONCLUSION

One of the main reasons for the importance of Ottoman literature is that it reached its height and maximum stage of development at a time when the other major branches of the Islamic literary tradition - the Arabic and Persian - had declined considerably and ceased to produce works of any significant importance. It was in the 16th and 17th centuries that this literature, and especially divan poetry, produced its best and truly representative exponents. While highly gifted men of letters like Mir 'Ali Šir Nevā'ī (in the Çağātāy language) and Mevlānā Celāleddin Rūmī (in Persian and Turkish), specifically for the earlier period, must be accorded a place of honour in the annals of this literature, it is especially Bâkî, Fuzûlî, Nefîdî and a few other poets who come to mind first when Ottoman literature in all its phases is contemplated.

Within the same literary tradition, the Ottoman branch through its temporal sub-divisions - with the important exception of the Tanzimat - displays numerous features which bind it closely to its Arabic and Persian ancestry (1) and make it a true product and representative of Islamic literature. Nevertheless, because it possesses certain characteristics which give it a marked individuality and distinctiveness, it has an individual place within the tradition. Moreover, the Turkish language which is the medium of this literature, as a literary language, possesses a highly inflected idiom and is capable of achieving clarity and precision of thought and expression which more than offset its disadvantages of lacking a developed literary tradition and of servilely accommodating itself to Persian and Arabic. In

(1) Cf. Ch. 1, where this relationship is discussed in detail with reference to the tezkores and other biographical genres.
addition, as the characteristic expression of Ottoman society, Ottoman literature reflects the synthetic nature of this society and represents the prototype of Islamic society in modern European thought.

The appearance, during the last century or so, of several works by European hands on various topics related to Turkish literature in general has gone a long way towards convincing many in the West that there did indeed exist a vast and impressive corpus of literary materials which had been created by the Turks, and, especially, by the Ottomans. One of the most valuable services rendered by these Western writers was to confront those who had, until then, denied to the Turks due recognition of their creative ability and literary genius with some representative samples of this rich literature. As a result, even very early in the present century, no less an authority than Edward G. Browne could claim solely on the basis of their achievements in poetry that the Ottoman Turks had never been "indifferent to literature" (1). Simultaneously, the Turks themselves added their own important contributions to this branch of world literary history by facilitating the use of the available material and by their original publications on the subject.

Mehmet Fuat Köprülü, one of the foremost native authorities on the literary history of the Turks, made an invaluable contribution to this particular branch of scientific endeavour by placing at the disposal of all scholars both his vast knowledge of this field and the results of painstaking research on Turkish literature through his publication of two creditable volumes on the subject. However, while both these works display every aspect

(1) HOP, v, p. v.
of scholarly investigation leading to accurate interpretation and lucid exposition, one concerns itself with the earlier literature of the Turks and the other, with the later. The first (1) is devoted to the pre- and Islamic literature without, however, reaching the Ottoman or Divan period in Turkish literary activity. The second (2) treats the post-Ottoman or European development of a 'national' Turkish literature. Other works by the same author follow more or less the same pattern; not one dealing seriously with the classical period (3). The same emphasis is laid on modern Turkish literature, to the detriment of the classical, by the other writers in Turkey (4). There are some general histories of Turkish literature, but these are not very reliable and, in any case, are devoid of any critical appraisal of the materials which they review (5).

The example set by these writers and scholars has been followed by their European counterparts, though the latter have shown even less interest in Turkish literature. The dearth of scholarly material published in the West on this subject bears conclusive testimony to the negligence with which this literature has been treated by non-Turkish scholars. A

(1) Türk edebiyatı tarihi, Istanbul, 1926.
(2) Büyük edebiyat, Türkiye'de milli edebiyat coreyününin son devirleri, Istanbul, 1924.
(3) Millî edebiyat coreyününin ilk mubessirleri ve divan-1 türki-yi bası, Istanbul, 1926 and Türk dili ve edebiyatı hakkında araştırmalar, Istanbul, 1954. One exception may be his anthology of divan poets: Eski şairlerimiz, Divan edebiyatı antolojisi, published in Istanbul in instalments with effect from the year 1931. To this list should be added, S. N. Ergin's incomplete, Türk şairleri, Istanbul, n.d.
(4) Three of these are worthy of mention: A.H. Özsü, Son asîr türk edebiyatı tarihi, Istanbul, 1940; İ.H. Sovük, Tanzimat veberi türk edebiyati tarihi, (2 vols.), Istanbul, 1944; and, A.H. Tampınar, Ondokuzuncu asîr Türk edebiyati tarihi, Istanbul, 1949.
typical example of this servile conformity to the emphasis given to very 
early and very late Turkish culture by the Turks is offered by the only gen-
eral work on the history of Turkish literature to be published in a European 
language. Alessio Bombaci's recent book on the subject bears a sub-title (1) 
which suggests that the work concerns itself with all periods and aspects of 
literary activity undertaken by various branches of Turkish peoples since 
the "Ancient empire of Mongolia to modern Turkey". This is true, but only in a 
narrow sense. However, the work in question is primarily a survey which 
contains only the barest information on the subject, although this inform-
oration, on the whole, appears to be based on some of the latest research on 
the topic conducted both inside and outside Turkey. The author is aware of 
the limited goal which he sets himself and announces, in his Preface (2), that 
the work is intended to "give a panoramic view" of Turkish literature to its 
Italian readers. That the same author was influenced by Köprülü is evident from 
the remark he makes in his introduction (3). The important contribution 
made by Bombaci to the history of world literature notwithstanding, his work 
suffers, somewhat, from the very defect which has been common to all similar 
published studies. This work, too, practically ignores the classical period. 
In this respect, as in many others that are apparent throughout the volume, 
Bombaci follows too closely the approach adopted by Köprülü.

One exception that must be made from the present general discussion 
is the collection of articles on the literature of the period which has 
appeared - and which is continuing to be a regular feature - in almost all the

(1) Storia delle letteratura turca, dall'antico impero di Mongolia all'odierna 
Turchia, Milano, 1956.
(2) Ibid, p. 8.
fascicules of the i'lated Encyclopedia. These significant contributions by Köprülü and several others in the field have so far dealt with individual littératours, various literary movements and with characteristic literary genres and forms. Though the significance and value of this kind of contribution which helps mitigate the scholarly 'injustices' committed against every aspect of divân literature as a tangible expression of a culture should not be underestimated, nevertheless, by its very nature, falls short of what is required to form a true and complete picture of the composition, essential character and noteworthy achievements of this literary period.

As a result of the present state of Ottoman studies and as a direct consequence of the trends, attitudes and the general approach that have prevailed with respect to Turkish literature, divân poetry which constitutes the most characteristic and, quantitatively, the most extensive branch of the literature of the Ottomans as a whole has necessarily also been neglected.

The first European to indicate an awareness of this poetry and to publish a large work devoted exclusively to its exponents was Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall. In his four volume history (1), the prolific Austrian gave a chronologically listed array of a large number of Ottoman poets whose biographies he based almost entirely on the few teskeres which were available to him and several other biographical works. The biographical notes are merely German renderings of some of the contents of the above-mentioned sources which he used uncritically and often inaccurately (2).

(1) Cf. Ch. 4, p. 194, n. 1.
(2) Cf. remarks in Introduction, p. 2.
Half a century or so later, Sir James W. Redhouse delivered a long lecture to the members of the Royal Society of Literature in London on the "History, System and Varieties of Turkish Poetry" (1). Apart from some irrelevant material, the paper contained scanty information on Ottoman verse a few samples of which he gave in the original script and in translation. Contained therein, also, were the names of a few poets with the barest details pertaining to their lives and very short definitions of poetic forms. However, it would appear that the whole purpose of the lecture was to bring Ottoman poetry to the notice of literary circles in Britain in an attempt to answer and refute the all too frequently repeated charge that the Ottomans were a 'barbarous people' (2).

Following the pioneering work of von Hammer-Purgstall and the lecture by Redhouse, Elias J.W. Gibb produced his six volume A History of Ottoman Poetry (3). He was the first scholar in the West to appreciate the purely literary value and richness of divân poetry throughout its long existence, from before the establishment of the Ottoman state to the decline of Ottoman culture as a predominantly Islamic culture in the 19th century, when it begins to relinquish - though reluctantly - its Ottoman (Islamic) characteristics in favour of French romanticism, and, Western literary concepts and tastes in general. Gibb approached Ottoman poetry both sympathetically and critically,

(1) It was delivered on February 12th, 1879 and then published in the Transactions of the Society in the same year. The reference here, is to a copy of the reprint presented to E.J.W. Gibb by the author on September 18th, 1879. Though Gibb makes several references to Redhouse, he only once vaguely refers to a 'pamphlet' which may be the one in question (HOP, iv, p. 314, n. 4).
(3) Posthumously edited by E.G. Browne and published in London between 1900 and 1909.
and there can be no doubt about his profound knowledge of this topic. His attempt, however, to subject divān poetry to a critical study in accordance with well established critical standards of Western origin, was unsuccessful for two main reasons. He may be described as the only European student of Ottoman poetry and cultural history as a whole, to have considered the literary creations of the Turks as being more than oriental curiosities and worthy of attention and study only as such. Throughout his monumental work, so far not superseded by any comparable work in either Europe or Turkey, Gibb displays a refreshing and genuine sympathy for the Ottomans and a sincere interest in their literature, and, especially, their verses. While his sentiments and empathy have assuredly enabled him to acquire a deep understanding of and feeling for this literature, these have also induced him to be subjective in his evaluations. In addition to this defect, he was particularly under the influence of Ziya Paşa in his judgments of divān poetry and was sometimes led astray by the idiosyncratic opinions of the 19th century Ottoman critic and writer. His numerous references to the author of the Harābāṭ (1) in a variety of points of discussion, judgment and appraisal, are adequate testimony to his reliance on him. This, in itself, would not necessarily have undermined Gibb's opinions on the divān poets or diminished the value of his work. However, Ziya Paşa himself was already imbued with Western thought and influenced by European standards and methods of criticism as a result of his extended residence in the West. These had necessarily coloured his opinions and, to a certain extent, affected his judgment.

(1) Harābāṭ (3 vols.), Istanbul, 1291-2. Of particular interest in this connection is the author's long and instructive introduction to this work.
The necessity, on the other hand, for adopting a different approach in the study of divān poetry by basing any critical evaluation of it on standards and methods other than those generally accepted in the West or that later development called 'modern criticism', has already been stressed (1). With a view to providing a suitable - and sorely needed - basis for a systematic study of Ottoman poetry along the lines suggested above, it seemed appropriate and timely to subject a specific body of literary material to scrutiny. The tezâkir-i șu'arâ were selected for this purpose and were examined precisely because they had been compiled by literary men who were native, intimately associated with the Islamic literary tradition, and contemporary with the exponents of Ottoman poetry. These tezkirres were the productions of people who cared about literature and who availed themselves of this only genre allowed to them by tradition to write about it, and, within these limits, frequently succeeded in achieving some measure of objectivity. The biographies of poets are further relevant to any critical history of Ottoman literature by virtue of the fact that they act as guides and indexes to the literary generations. Had theses not been available to us, it would have been necessary to create them through systematic study. This task would probably have been impossible considering the methods of Oriental book production and the state of available records. This would have resulted in the loss to us of many significant poets.

As far as could be ascertained, twenty-seven of these 'Biographies of poets' are still extant and all to be found in various collections in Turkey. When the period covered by these was carefully considered, it became apparent that not all could be effectively used without violating the

(1) Cf. Introductory remarks to Ch. 4.
principles which were set out above and which were considered essential for
the accurate and true interpretation and evaluation of this poetry without
committing anachronism. Bearing in mind that Ottoman literature had come
within the sphere of influence of Western literary concepts and, consequently,
had undergone serious modification during the Fanqisat period, discrimination
had to be exercised in order to avoid repeating mistakes made by earlier
students of this literature by selecting only those biographies which were
truly the products of the tradition which dominated divan literature. Five(1)
of these biographies were found to be unsuitable because of the fact that
they were either late compilations which had been influenced by the Fanqisat
movement or because, by their very nature, they would not have proved useful
for this particular study.

The remaining twenty-two were not all equally relevant to the pur-
pose for which their examination was undertaken. While the longer ones, which
are fuller in biographical details and which give more pertinent information,
were referred to in connection with almost every aspect of the study, the
shorter were used, for instance, to illustrate the contrast between one set
and another. Similarly, throughout the exposition of the nature and contents
of these materials, the tezkereas had to be differentiated from the mecmu'as.

(1) The Tezkere-i hātimet ül-eş'ār of Fuṭūn Efendi lithographed in Istanbul
in 1272; the Esār-i qū'ārā-yī Āmid of 'Ali Emīrī (a unique manuscript
of this work, probably by the hand of the author himself, is in the
Ali Emīrī collection - No. 781/1 - of the Mīllet Kütüphanesi in Istanbul;
a portion of the work, as far as the letter ẓāl and constituting a
first volume, was published in Istanbul in 1328 under the title of
Tezkere-i qū'ārā-yī Āmid), and, lastly, the Son asır Türk sahrleri of
the late İhmālimin Mahmud Kâmil inal published in Istanbul in twelve
volumes between 1931 and 1942. These three fall into the first category
mentioned above. Fehim Sileyman Efendi's Sefatnet as-su'ārā published in
Istanbul in 1299, and Mehməd Tovfîk's incomplete (it covers the poets
whose pseudonyms begin with the letter ḫā and does not go beyond that let-
ter) Kāfle-i su'ārā published in Istanbul in 1300, fall into the second
category. Of, also, the pertinent remarks in the Introduction, pp. 3-4.
The exigencies of methodology required that the origins of this literary genre should be traced. This involved an examination of the earliest history of Islamic literature where the antecedents of the texkerecis were shown to be the anthologies compiled by the Arabs during the early centuries of Islam as an essential part of the equipment used in the religious studies with a specific bearing on the shādiq and the interpretation of the Kur'ān. It was established, also, that a later development of this same tradition had been borrowed by the Persians who had subsequently been imitated by the Ottomans. The purpose of this historical investigation was to place the argument that the Ottoman texkerecis were but the continuation of a well known and cultivated literary tradition of foreign origin beyond any possible dispute.

Once the Ottoman texkerecis had been placed in proper perspective within the tradition which they perpetuated, the next step was to give a detailed account of their history. This task was carried out with a twofold objective in mind; the identification of the twenty-two texkerecis and the isolation of each texkereci within the corpus of the literary material to which it belonged. The examination and presentation of the background of each texkereci entailed the use of the texkerecis themselves - some of which (1) contain considerable material on the lives of their compilers -, the biographical, bibliographical, historical and literary works produced by the Ottomans throughout the period covered by the texkerecis, with a view to obtaining as much biographical information as possible relating to each texkereci. This examination revealed that not all the texkerecis were equally well known to their contemporaries; as was to be expected, more material was available

(1) The compilations of Laṭīfī, 'Abdī, Ḥaṣib Ḥalabī, Ǧīlālīsāde and Ǧālīm are most rewarding in this respect.
on the compilers of the longer and better known compilations. Consequently, our knowledge of several (1) of the biographers is most scanty and is likely to remain so until more pertinent sources are discovered in the future. In addition, as much information was available on the other literary productions of these authors was also given. This was finally followed by a detailed description of each tezkere listing principal contents, nature of the material contained, number of poets reviewed, period covered, major sources and the date, if available, of compilation. An attempt was also made to point out the individuality of each tezkere and its relation to the others. By means of references to the introductions which are given to many of the tezkere, it was demonstrated that the declared reason for the compilations was to record the details pertaining to the lives of the poets and to preserve the best of their verses for posterity. This showed how true the Ottoman tezkere were to form and faithful to the Islamic tradition which they were following, though in many respects they possessed characteristics which were strictly their own.

As part of the development of the same process in methodology, the tezkere were then considered as a whole with specific reference to their sources of information and to the nature of their contents. In the former category, extensive citations were made from all the tezkere to show that certain well defined sources had been used by all the tezkerecis in varying degrees and that throughout the period in which these works had been compiled there had been a conscious effort on the part of their compilers to achieve and ensure continuity of the genre by following the work of a predecessor from where he

(1) Namely, Rıa, Kimi, ʻAkif, ʻeşvat and Silahdarsade.
had left off. It should be noted that in many instances this was not the declared aim of the tezkerecs and that although he did not specifically say that he was engaged in the compilation of a geyl to the work of so and so, that he was doing just that is evident from the date which he selected for his starting point and the many references which he made to his predecessor in connection with a poet they both mentioned because he flourished during a period which both tezkerecs covered. As a result of this process, the modern scholar has been bequeathed an unbroken series of highly valuable documents relating to the history, development and exponents of divân poetry from its inception to its virtual eclipse by the Tanzîhât movement (1). Where overlapping has occurred, the scholar is afforded the additional advantage of having access to more than one opinion on the same poet.

As regards the contents of the tezkerecs, on the other hand, the material was grouped into a number of sub-divisions each representing an aspect of the poet's life. In this respect, as in some others, the meşalecs yielded very little or no information other than the given name, the origin and the date of death of the poet. Among the tezkerecs, too, not all were equally useful in this connection; while, for instance, ample material of a biographical nature is to be found in 'Aşık Qelobi, Kınâlisâde and Şâlim, this type of information is most scanty in such tezkerecs as those of Şehî, Rîzâ, Yûmî, Şafkat and Silâhderzâde. Very broadly speaking, the biographical details which can be found in these works may be classified under the following general headings: Names, origins, education, teachers, social groups, appearances, characters and dates of death of the poets; some incidental or anecdotal

(1) The statement is valid, also, with respect to the later period covered by the five tezkerecs excluded from this study.
data related to their lives, lists of the works - original or otherwise - composed by them and, lastly, various samples of all types of poems ascribed to them. In this manner, the characteristics which are common to all the tenekeos were singled out while the exceptions were isolated. This helped, at the same time, to distinguish between the tenekeos of one period and another as well as show the marked differences between the tenekeos themselves considered as a whole.

This essentially descriptive method was followed, too, with regard to the evaluation of these biographies of poets as a source of material of a critical nature. Each piece of critical material was, as far as it was possible, fitted into a group of similar critical materials represented within the biographical notices. Each group was dealt with under a separate sub-heading which opened with a general description of the particular type of criticism referred to followed by as many examples as could be identified from within all the tenekeos to illustrate it. Throughout this concluding part of the study devoted to a consideration of this aspect of the contents of the biographies, an attempt was made to demonstrate how far the individual tenekeos were influenced in their judgments by their personal backgrounds, the literary trends of the period during which they wrote, their sympathies and antipathies, and other similar considerations which might have induced their characteristic opinions of the men and women they reviewed and evaluations of the verses which these had composed. At no stage of this examination, however, were our own Western generally or modern in particular - standards of literary criticism utilized as criteria; on the contrary, every effort was made to be as detached and impartial as possible in illustrating points which appeared to reveal the critical standards of the tenekeos.
themselves. Yet, certain critical statements had to be made to point out the limitations of the critical aspects of the textes. On the whole, the investigation of this material disclosed that the criticism of the textes, in keeping with the general characteristics of the branch of literature with which they were concerned, centered on such topics as; the literary standing, popularity and otherwise of the poets and their status in relation to famous living or dead masters of poetry; originality, simplicity, impropriety, imitation, translation and Persianism, and a large variety of other elements which throw some light on the reactions of individual critics to specific poems with respect to ideas, sentiments, technique and choice of metre.

Having briefly exposed the motives for undertaking this study and disclosed the results obtained during it, a few words must be added with regard to future research which would involve these textes. While expressing anew a more than reasonable confidence in the value, practical usefulness and indispensability of the Ottoman teşbih-i mu‘anı, the extent of the investigation which must be sustained and the nature of the difficulties which still have to be overcome by research workers in this field must not be underestimated or minimized.

The majority of these textes are still in manuscript form and, in addition, the obvious divergences which are evident even through the most cursory examination of the numerous recensions of some of them, call for the scholarly preparation and publication of critical editions of these works at not too distant a future. Since several of these appear to exist in the form of unique manuscripts in well known libraries in Istanbul, such an undertaking, at least in the case of these, would not be too difficult. As for the four textes which are already in print; these are undoubtedly publications based solely on one or two of the many manuscripts which are available for each work.
and therefore fall short of the standards required for reliable and accurate texts. As, furthermore, these printed texts are no longer available, new critical editions of all the tezkerees are more than ever desirable and urgently needed.

Any future research into or use of the tezkerees should be done in conjunction with other Ottoman works of a similar nature. Experience has shown that the tezkerees, while most valuable in themselves, can be greatly supplemented by information contained within the folios of works dealing with the biographies of statesmen, şeyh and the 'ulema. Not only for biographical details, but also for material of a critical nature with reference to the literary works of the poets.

Lastly, any appraisal of the value of the tezkerees as literary criticism of one kind or another and of the evaluation of the critical standards of the tezkereees, will, to a great extent, depend on the success and thoroughness with which the critical vocabulary employed by these tezkerees who exercise some critical judgments is isolated and defined to eliminate vagueness, ambiguity and confusion.

Until the above tasks are achieved, it must be accepted that any research on divan poetry in particular and Ottoman literature in general will be tentative at least during the present generation. The contribution which the tezkerees can make to a better understanding of Ottoman poetry cannot be underestimated. This will go a long way towards giving this literature its due place in world literature. In any case, it must be admitted that a literature with an unbroken tradition of five centuries cannot be dismissed as an inferior imitation of foreign fashions, and it is the task of the modern scholar in this
field to expose the wholly individual position of Ottoman literature and no longer confine his efforts to establishing the borrowed themes and the pilfered images. Comparative literature must have as its ultimate aim the assertion of the uniqueness of the production of each people who are themselves unique in the cultural complex to which they may belong, and in this respect we are forced, a priori, to concede to Ottoman literature a character as singular and as important as is allowed to Ottoman culture and society.
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AÇ</td>
<td>Taoğlu Çelebi, Mesûr'ir uş-gu'árû.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ah</td>
<td>Abdi, Gâlân-i qu'ará.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AII</td>
<td>Arif Ullakot, Teşkaret uş-gu'ará.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ak</td>
<td>'Arif, Mûrât-i şîr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As</td>
<td>Aşin, Zeyl-i Zâdet ul-şâ'îr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Beşârî, Teşkaret uş-gu'ará.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>Blochet, E., Catalogue des Manuscrits Turcs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bg</td>
<td>Belîz, Zâdet ul-şâ'îr lîsîyl-i Zâdet ul-şâ'îr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>Esârû Dede, Teşkaret-i qu'ará-yî mevlîyi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>The Encyclopaedia of Islam (First and New Editions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cüftî, Teşkaret uş-gu'ará.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL</td>
<td>Brodcolmann, C., Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COWD</td>
<td>Hamor-Purgstall, von J., Geschichte der Osmanischen Dichtkunst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COW</td>
<td>Babinger, F., Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und Ihre Werke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>İslam Ansiklopedisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Journal Asiatique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNAS</td>
<td>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KA</td>
<td>'Ali, Kûnh il-aşhâr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaf</td>
<td>Kâfasâde, Zâdet ul-şâ'îr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KÇ</td>
<td>Katib Çelebi, Koşf uş-ğumûn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KÇZ</td>
<td>Bağdâdî ınci'î Paşa, Koşf uş-ğumûn Zeyli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZ</td>
<td>Kûnâlisâde, Teşkaret uş-gu'ará.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Laṭîffî, Teşkaret uş-gu'ará.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Mehmed Es'ad, Bâyse-i şafâ-ı endûr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Oriente Moderno.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORM</td>
<td>Tahir, 'Ogmâni mi'illiflerı.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Ricci, C., Catalogue of Turkish Manuscripts in the British Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ra</td>
<td>Rumi, Adab-i qurâfâ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSO</td>
<td>Rivista degli Studi Orientali.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ry</td>
<td>Riyâ'î, Riyâ'î up-çu'arâ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rz</td>
<td>Rizâ, Togkorot up-çu'arâ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>Şehî, Neçet Dâhiyet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Safû'î, Togkorot up-çu'arâ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Silâhpârâ'ode, Togkorot up-çu'arâ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S'n</td>
<td>Sâlin, Togkorot up-çu'arâ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>Şüreyya, Sicill-i 'Ogmâni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ş't</td>
<td>Şefkat, Togkorot up-çu'arâ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDED</td>
<td>Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dersisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Türkiyat Mecmuası.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TÖEM</td>
<td>Tarih-i 'Ogmâni encümeni mecmû'asisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTEM</td>
<td>Türk tarih encümeni mecmuasi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Ximî, Togkorot up-çu'arâ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYK</td>
<td>İstanbul Kitaplıkları Tarih-Geografía Yazmaları Kataloqları, soru I, Pasifik 7c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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dated 3/D. 1255.
İstanbul Ünivesitesi Kütüphanesi, No. T. 6100.
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Sâlim (Mârzâde Mehmed Enâm), Tegkeret ug-şu'arā.


Şehî (Bey), Heqt Bihâlât.


Sâlâhânzâde (Mehmed Enâm), Tegkeret ug-şu'arā.

Miîlet Kütüphanesi (Ali Emîr Efendi), No. 775, (YK, p. 613).
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British Museum, Add. 10004, (R., p. 27b).
Description: Foll. 150; (8.25 x 5.75), (6.2 x 3.5) ins; 23 lines; Nesh; apparently 18th cent.
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FAŢÎN (Dâvud), Nâmênet ül-egâr, (Istanbul, 1271).

FEHÎM (Suleyman), Sevîncü-1 mu'arâ', (Istanbul, 1259).
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عنقرزاز (تاريخ ماضي)، صالحة، من المباني القديمة.

محرر مولى ميثاف، نو. 1430.

الوصف: ظلات 390; (12.4 x 6.8); ( - ) mm; 31 line; تالك;

المستند: 1115.
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--------, "The sources of Dawlatshâh", in JRAS, (1899), pp. 57-70.
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SĀMĪ (3.), Kānūs al-‘lām, 8 vols., (Istanbul, 1308-16).

STOLL (E.E.), Poets and Playwrights, (Minneapolis, 1950).

———, From Shakespeare to Joyce, (New York, 1944).
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