

THE END OF A TRADITION:
HOW THE CLASSICAL TURNED INTO BURLESQUE

A THESIS SUBMITTED
TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

BARIŞ KARACASU

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

APRIL 2007

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Ahmet İnam
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. David Grünberg
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. David Grünberg (METU, PHIL) _____
Prof. Dr. Hatice Aynur (Yıldız Uni., TDE) _____
Prof. Dr. Ahmet Çiğdem (Gazi Uni., SBKY) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Lastname: Barış Karacasu

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE END OF A TRADITION: HOW THE CLASSICAL TURNED INTO BURLESQUE

Karacasu, Barış

M.A., Department of Philosophy

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. David Grünberg

April 2007, 69 Pages

During the creation or invention of literary canon some texts are excluded with respect to the aims of the historians. This thesis analyses the process of exclusion in a historical context and tries to show how those texts are related to literary canon or so-called traditional-classical literature by means of intertextuality. It focuses on the burlesque pieces of literature of the 18th century and how they are composed with regard to the genres and forms they are transforming.

Keywords: Burlesque, 18th Century Literature, Intertextuality

ÖZ

BİR GELENEĞİN SONU: KLASİK OLANIN ALAYCI DÖNÜŞÜMÜ

Karacasu, Barış

M.A., Felsefe Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. David Grünberg

Nisan 2007, 69 pages

Edebi kanon oluşturulurken ya da icadedilirken kimi metinler edebiyat tarihçilerince kanon dışına itilir. Bu tez, sözkonusu metinlerin nasıl tarihsel bağlam içinde nasıl yok sayıldıklarını inceleyip gerçekte edebi kanonu oluşturan öteki metinlere ya da geleneksel edebiyata nasıl eklemlediklerini metinlerarasılık bağlamında göstermeye çalışacaktır. 18. yüzyılda ortaya çıkan alaycı dönüştürme metinlerine odaklanarak kimi tür ya da biçimleri tehzîl yoluyla nasıl dönüştürdüklerini açıklamaya çalışacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Alaycı Dönüştürüm, 18. Yüzyıl Edebiyatı, Metinlerarasılık

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

When I started my graduate study at the Department of Philosophy it was the year 1998. It lasted 10 years for me to write such a thesis. A talented or gifted student could have written a perfect thesis and it could have been a masterpiece under these circumstances. But, unfortunately, I am an ordinary student. And besides being ordinary I am also indolent and did not have lots of time to focus on this thesis. Writing this thesis is definitely a success for me after all happened in the last 10 years. And lot of people forced, helped, and encouraged me to continue my academic activities. I have to thank them all, but I am not able to mention them all here. The list is longer than anyone can imagine. Nevertheless I have to mention three persons here.

Though we have spoken each other for years about writing my thesis under supervision of David Grünberg, we could not have chance to work together. I had been willing to write my thesis with him, but also escaping from writing a thesis. After all he accepted to be my advisor. Though he was not interested in the subject of my thesis, he certainly helped me in completing this short thesis by putting up with my whims. If I was working with somebody else, I could not complete this thesis. I am proud to meet him and beyond everything else I am really indebted.

I also have to thank Hatice Aynur. Besides encouraging me to write a thesis at the age of 31, she also appreciated my attitude towards literature and history of literature

more than I deserve. Possibly she is one of the few persons who would understand what I wanted to do. I am honoured to thank her.

Lastly I want to thank Ahmet ıgdem. We know each other for years and despite my arrogance and insolence he kept being there. I am sure I went too far from time to time. It's my honour to have Ahmet ıgdem as a *Hoca*, as a neighbour, and as a friend.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
CHAPTER	
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1. LITERATURE, HISTORY, LITERARY CANON.....	5
1.1. NEED FOR LITERARY CANON.....	9
1.2. WRITING HISTORY OF OTTOMAN LITERATURE.....	11
2. BORDER LINE: EIGHTEENTH CENTURY CASE.....	18
2.1. ENDERÛNÎ FÂZIL BEY.....	19
2.2. SÛNBÛL-ZÂDE VEHBÎ.....	22
2.3. SÛRÛRÎ.....	24
3. THE DEAD END: CHANGE IN THE SUBJECT.....	28
3.1. INTERTEXTUALITY.....	28
3.2. GROTESQUE & CARNIVALESQUE.....	30
3.3. BURLESQUE.....	33
4. BURLESQUE, INTERTEXTUALITY AND OTTOMAN POETRY.....	37
4.1. FORMAL ELEMENT.....	38
4.2. VOCABULARY.....	40
4.3. CHARACTERISTICS OF ÇENGÎ-NÂME, ŞEVK-ENGÎZ AND HEZELS.....	40
4.4. BURLESQUE AND TRAVESTY IN OTTOMAN XVIIIITH CENTURY LITERATURE.....	45
CONCLUSION.....	48
REFERENCES.....	51
APPENDICES	
A. Çengî-nâme.....	55
B. Poem on Poetry.....	60
C. Sühan Kasîdesi.....	65
D. Hezliyyât-ı Sürûrî.....	68

INTRODUCTION

As writing histories of other fields writing history of literature also based on some presumptions or hypotheses. Since literature and literary criticism are used in constitution or invention of a nation, the main texts have to be determined, master pieces of the literature have to bring to light and after all literary history would be build upon these texts with the literary works which do not contradict somehow with the presumptions of the historiography. But this attitude towards the history of literature is problematic on the grounds that this type of history would certainly neglect, deny lots of literary works. In other words, this history of literature would not explain the existence of pieces of literature which do not satisfy the needs of historiography.

In case we try to construct the history of literature by neglecting “inacceptable” pieces of literature, we will not able to explain how a poet like Sünbül-zâde Vehbî could write all the poem known as “Sühan Kasidesi” [Poetry on Poem] “انشاد کرده است” the “قصیده کلامیه که در صدارت خلیل پاشا برای نصیح و استهزای شاعران هزیان کویان عصر با امر و اراده *mesnevi* like “Şevk-engîz” and the satire published by Turgut Kut in the special issue of *tarih ve toplum* on obscene literature [208]. Since we would not like to deal with those texts we would only cite them as interesting but also eccentric samples of literature with no value.

In this context we have to deal with these texts relying on the literary atmosphere of the period and within the frame of intertextuality. Intertextuality is used and discussed

in analysing Ottoman poetry. But there is not only one way of constituting intertextuality. While creating the literary canon of the Ottoman court poetry intertextuality was a fundamental mean. In fact, one of the founding elements Ottoman poetry *mazmûn* is also used to constitute this intertextuality. Besides many other ways of intertextuality this thesis would focus on the burlesque texts. The term burlesque is used with the meaning of “comic imitation of a serious literary form or artistic form that relies on an extravagant incongruity between subject and the treatment” relying on the conception of Kristeva’s intertextuality and in accordance with the Bakhtinian notion of carnivalesque. Within this context we can also deal with the conceptions of *nazîre*, *hezel* and *tehziîl*.

18th century has its own characteristics which make it differ with the others. Within the context of this thesis the obscene or grotesque pieces of literature constitutes this difference. In fact this is not surprising if we take into consideration the Middle Eastern literature. The theoretical frame presented firstly by Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar in his famous uncompleted work *19. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* simply called “courtly metaphor” and developed by Walter G. Andrews in his book entitled *Poetry’s Voice Society’s Song* as three layers of interpretation -god/believer, sultan/man, and beloved/lover - allows the reader to receipt the message as if there is a sexual relation between two lovers. But in the 18th century poets or writers started to mention this implicit relation clear and distinctly. In fact we can surely find some other examples of this kind work in previous centuries, but in the 18th century these obscene, grotesque and sexually explicit pieces of literature represents the general characteristics of the century.

Whatever the political, economical, social or military reasons are there had been several examples of this kind of works and had been a common practice of literature. What we have to do is to clarify the relation of these texts to mainstream literature based on the literary canon. And to be able to succeed this I would focus on and pick three poets of the period: Enderûnî Fâzıl Bey, Sünbül-zâde Vehbî and Sürûrî. These poets and other like them were blamed by Nihad Sami Banarlı to make vulgar the style of the poet Nedîm, one of the masters of the same century and also the so-called localisation movement [784]. But we have to keep in mind that the master of the style

had also used the language as “vulgar” as possible while saying the following line in *Nigâr-nâme* written to İzzet Ali Paşa: *Söz söz açar, söz göt açar ey gül-i ra'nâ*.

Within this thesis the literary value of Enderûnî Fâzıl Bey's *Çengî-nâme*, Sünbül-zâde Vehbî's *Şevk-engîz* and Sürûrî's *hezels* is tried to be discussed. Though these texts are obscene the poets are also choosing to de-construct and reconstruct the traditional poetry. The traditional Ottoman court poetry is implicitly referring to the subjects written by the above-mentioned and they just made it “clear and distinct”. They had problems with the tradition and somehow found this way to overcome the boundaries of tradition by using burlesque. They used the same formal elements, but changed the subject and the way they treat the subject. And at the end comic, humorous and at the same time literary works were produced. In order to make it clearer we can refer Rabelais masterpiece and quote a rondo told by Gargantua: Rondo is the lyric form of poetry in Latin, French and English literature. While we expect a lyric poem, Gargantua reads a poem on “shitting”. This rondo is certainly burlesque. The closest form in Ottoman literature to rondo is *gazel*. And we find a similar *gazel* in the compilation of Sürûrî, but this time the subject is “getting sick after being drunk”. The problem is while the work of Rabelais has some literary value, the historians of Ottoman literature do not pay attention to those works as Ağâh Sırrı Levend says: “üslûp ve edası çok âmiyane olduğu gibi, mevzuları da ahlâkî bakımdan okunmağa değmezdir; bunların çoğu ağza alınmayacak kadar müstehcen ve galiz kelimelerle doludur”. [Edebiyat Tarihi Dersleri, 345-346.]

At some point Ottoman literature reached the peak and it started to decline. Ottoman literature entered a period of formalism and sophistication, too. Kayahan Özgül offers to call this period “baroque” for the same reason [387]. He also adds that one of the characteristics of this period was change in the subject, but he relates this change to humour. Özgül founds his argument on the grounds that the poets wanted to change the tradition and in order not to be criticised they used humour. But I think this was not the fact. They certainly knew what they were doing. They were using all the literary elements which constituted the traditional Ottoman court poetry, except for the subject. They were purely literary and as Jan Schmidt stressed “if the metaphors, punning, wordplay, the comic obscenities... were eliminated or cast in the

form of dry prose, not much would remain of [these] work[s]" [191]. The period of decline was combined with the appearances of burlesque pieces of literature. And those texts were the medium for the traditional poetry to reach the end.

CHAPTER I

LITERATURE, HISTORY, LITERARY CANON

In an old manuscript from the 18th century an interesting Nasreddin Hoca story was related. The story is about the encounter of Saltuk Baba with Nasreddin Hoca and based on the conversation they had:

One day, Sari Saltuk visited Nasreddin Hoca in his house and asked him if he owned the property. The Hoca replied that he owned three things in this world: his two testicles and a penis. Surprised by the audacity of the answer, Saltuk Baba could not bring himself to believe that the Hoca meant what he said, so he interpreted the answer mystically. By the two testicles, the Hoca might have meant good deeds and divine knowledge, but Saltuk had trouble guessing the hidden meaning of the penis. The Hoca, divining what Saltuk Baba had in mind, said, “The one that you are trying to understand is purity of heart.” [Başgöz & Boratav, 8]¹

İlhan Başgöz interprets the story as a proof of the belief of general public that Nasreddin Hoca had mystical power [8]. Even if this interpretation can be well-founded we have to keep in mind that the interpretation is based from the standpoint of Nasreddin Hoca and the story also has another aspect to be thought about. If we change our standpoint and try to understand, interpret the story from the point of view of Saltuk Baba we will certainly see another picture. It would not matter whether Nasreddin Hoca can know or not what Saltuk Baba has in mind, the way how Saltuk

¹ The story can be found in Ottoman script in *Saltuk-name: the legend of Sari Saltuk / collected from oral tradition by Ebu'l Hayr Rumi*. Text is in facsimile with a critical and stylistic analysis and index by Fahir Iz. The book had been published by Orient Press in 1974. But I am not going to use the Turkish version of the story. The story was used by İlhan Başgöz in the book entitled *I, Hoca Nasreddin, Never Shall I Die: A Thematic Analysis Of Hoca Stories*. Since the book was in English he also translated the story into English.

Baba understands the answer would not change and he would have the same tendency how to understand the response. Whatever the literal meaning of the answer is, how grotesque or obscene the response is Saltuk Baba would be inclined to interpret the story in the way he wants to understand. The answer has to have another meaning and has to refer to another frame of interpretation. Otherwise the general interpretation, understanding of the world by Saltuk Baba would collapse and the unity of the world of meanings would be certainly deconstructed. In other words, if Nasreddin Hoca insists that those three things were exactly what he mentioned the story would not be included in the manuscript at all.

My purpose in picking up this example is to emphasize that there is a parallelism between the interpretation of a certain thing on a certain moment of the history and our attitude towards a special thing related to the history of literature on a certain moment of time and within a specific *Weltanschauung*. The way how Saltuk Baba eliminates the grotesque parts of story and understands the answer the way he wants to is very similar to the attitude of eliminating, discarding several texts while writing literary history. There can be several reasons of this approach towards historiography² or history of literature. First of all historians working in the field of literature are dealing with some texts with prejudice or at least they do not prefer to deal with them at all. This type of approach even includes “misconduct of duty”. In case a text does not fit the researcher’s understanding of literature or does not serve for the purposes of the historian it can be interpreted in a way that it does.³

² I use the term with meaning of the study of the writing of history, examining factors such as how the style of historical writing, methods of interpretation and tools of investigation changed in the course of time.

³ As an example of this kind of distortion I can cite a recent book written by a group of academicians working in the field of “History of Turkish Literature”. The writers include one of the dominant figures of the field Prof. Dr. Mustafa Isen who is also Undersecretary of Minister of Culture. The book is entitled *Eski Türk Edebiyatı El Kitabı* [Introductory Book for Old Turkish Literature] and in the chapter “Tarihî Gelişim [Historical Development]” we find a quotation from Haluk İpekten on the metre called *aruz* used by Ottoman poets. According to the quotations Ottoman poets created their own version of *aruz*: “XVI. yüzyılda artık büyük şairlerin elinde hatâsız ve ustaca kullanılan Türk aruzu yaratılmıştır.” [88]

Though what Turkish *aruz* means and what are the characteristics of this new metre matter for the purposes of the book we are not informed about those details. Instead we can easily check the source about the details. But what we will find is not going to be the same the authors quoted. On the contrary Haluk İpekten clearly disclose that Ottoman poets used the Persian version of the metre:

“... Türk şairleri denenmiş ve pek çok değişikliklere uğratılarak ve yumuşatılarak yeniden düzenlenmiş olan İran aruzunu dillerine ve şiir zevklerine daha yakın

The second reason is the outcome of the effect of dominant / official ideology over the writing the history. The early republican ideology tried to break off the relation with the “old” and the republican “revolutions” physically managed to realise this break by changing the alphabet. Changing the Arabic letters with Roman ones succeeded in a formal break. This was followed by so-called “language revolution”: changing the old vocabulary with the new vocabulary led to break from the *mana* of the old world. This operation had a practical outcome in writing the history itself and also the history of literature. Breaking up with the old made people to be able to write the history from the beginning; by destructing the continuity the official ideology had the chance of reconstructing the past.

But on the other hand this break led to some difficulties. Since the intellectual continuity was damaged the literary canon upon which the history of literature would have been based on had to be reinvented. The more the distance between the researcher / historian and the subject is, the more difficult to penetrate into the subject matter. But, at this point, I have to mention here that Victoria Holbrook alleges in the chapter “Inventing Difficulty: Modern Reception of Ottoman Poetry” of her book *The Unreadable Shores of Love: Turkish Modernity and Mystic Romance* that the was an invented difficulty as the title of the chapter announces:

It has often been passionately asserted that a rupture between the two was, and is, total. The remarkably successful alphabet revolution in 1928 (and attending semiotic revolutions of costume, calendar, professional title, and surname), followed by comprehensive revision of syntax and vocabulary in which large sectors of population enthusiastically took part [Hayd, 1954], did make all pre-1928 literary artifacts hard to read. The Arabic-based Ottoman script was exchanged for a new alphabet based o Roman, and Türkî became two languages, distinguished by script: “Ottoman” (Osmanlıca) and “Turkish” (Türkçe). [20]

bularak benimsemişlerdir... Arap ve İran aruz kaideleri ve kalıpları hakkında bilgi veren bazı kitap ve risaleler yazılmış olmakla birlikte, Arap ve İran edebiyatlarında olduğu gibi aruz ölçülerini inceleyen, tartışarak yeniden düzenlemeye çalışan ve Türk diline uygun bahir ya da kalıplar öneren yazarlar çıkmadığı için bu ölçünün uygulaması yalnızca onu kullanan şairlere kalmıştır... XVI. yüzyılın başında ise aruzun kullanılmasında hiçbir güçlük kalmamış ve önceki yüzyıllardaki aksaklıklar ortadan kalkmıştır. Özellikle bu yüzyılın Fuzûlî, Hayâlî, Bâkî gibi büyük şairlerinin elinde hatasız ve ustaca kullanılan, ayrıca söze aheng katan bir şiir ölçüsü haline gelmiştir.” [27-28]

Victoria Holbrook also calls this invented difficulty “euphemism”: “...Turkish revolutionaries found it necessary, for the survival of a Turkish state, to submit Ottoman poetry to orientalizing. ‘Difficulty’ is a euphemism for that surrender, by which statements about Ottoman poetry became allusions to the Ottoman state, and literary criticism became a field for the articulation of Turkish nationalism” [31]. Though Holbrook is right in putting the problem this way she is unfortunately not able to dissolve the problem which the young researcher is facing whatever the motives had been for using this difficulty. Dealing with Ottoman literature needs a special knowledge of that language. In fact this is not only a problem for the young researchers but also for the professors. Ahmet Talât Onay⁴ stresses this difficulty in the “Preface” of his comprehensive dictionary *Türk Edebiyatında Mazmunlar* as follows:

[Veled Çelebi İzbudak’ın] tavsiyesini yerine getirmek için divanları dikkatle okurken pek az şeyleri bildiğimi anladım. Eğer üstâda söz vermemiş olsa idim, okutmak hevesi icbâr etmeseydi bu işi yarı yolda bırakmak pek kolaydı. Bazen bir mısra veya beytin beni saatlerce düşündürdüğü, anlamak nasip olmazsa fütûr içinde bıraktığı vâki olmuştur. [LIX]

Though Ahmet Talât Onay had perfect knowledge of Ottoman language and also knew the set of references in details, he also had several difficulties in writing the “dictionary”. Relying on this fact we have to accept that this break had deep impact on the academic study of the field of Ottoman literature and history. In order to be able to bring up the symbolic value of this break we have to focus on the creation of literary canon and invention of history during the early period of republican era. But before going there I would like to quote Selim Kuru to summarise the characteristics of this canon -I mean the canon of the court literature- as precursor:

The present canon is well defined in encyclopedias, anthologies, and textbooks, and is taught in the Turkish Language and Literature departments of universities. The canon relies on an established set of categories and generalizations, and portrays Ottoman literature as a monolithic entity, devoid of historically determined characteristics.

⁴ I have to stress here that Onay was one of founding “Hoca”s of academic study on Ottoman literature. If you would look at Hatice Aynur’s article entitled “Eski Türk Edebiyatı Alanında Yapılan Tezler (Yüksek Lisans - Doktora) Üzerine 1922-2005” and published in the 9th issue of *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* you would see that he was the root of academic study in the field of Ottoman literature with Ali Nihad Tarlan.

And it deliberately neglects many important aspects of Ottoman literary culture. For example, according to this canon, Ottoman literature is necessarily written in Turkish. Studies of a particular author, accordingly, consider his or her Turkish works, and more often than not overlook the fact that authors tended to know at least one other language. In fact, most Ottoman authors wrote in Arabic and Persian as well as Turkish, and their sources could be written in any or all of these languages. [Kuru, forthcoming article]

1.1 Need for Literary Canon

According to Michel Foucault one of the fundamental and historical achievements literary criticism is founding of the framework which is called “literary canon” [Bové, 322]. Literary canon, shortly described, means determination of the literary classics of a nation, making those classics public and putting them into the curriculum of public education, publication of those literary works and releasing critics of those texts. But if we start to talk about the history of Turkish literature we can talk about a dilemma or some kind of schizophrenic split. Since the literary project of Kemalism had been based on the neglect of the heritage of Ottoman literature, some kind of reactionist understanding of Ottoman literature had been also constituted. This second attitude also invented its own literary canon and understanding of literature. But in order to do this the history of Turkish language, literature and the history of Turk itself had to be written.

Just like the “nation” literary criticism also appeared on a certain point of history. There is neither a group of persons representing a nation nor a sum of cultural elements referring to a certain tradition. These are both invented:

“‘Ulus’, kültürün birliğini, onu diğer kültürlerden ayırarak, sınırlarını çizerek tanımlar; bu elbette yapay bir birliktir, çünkü, zaten içerideki ‘biz’in kendisi her zaman farklılaşmıştır. Benedict Anderson’un kendi sözleriyle ‘ulus’, ‘hayal edilen toplumdur’ -diğer bir deyişle kendimizi evimizde hissedebildiğimiz yerdir ya da kültürdür” [Donald vd, 110-11].

Literary criticism, especially when thought in accordance with historiography, is also imagined just like the nation, and it appears as a frame which excludes all the differences emerging from differentiations of class, culture and gender. For the purposes of this thesis we should consider this within the context of modernity and literary canon. Starting from the 16th century in the Western Europe modernity

appeared as a process changing each society from the others and had several characteristics:

Modernity in this context usually signifies those structural attributes of western European society that began taking shape around the sixteenth century and that distinguished it from previous periods and other contemporaneous societies. These attributes include industrial expansion; constitutional restrictions on exercise of political power; the rise of civil bureaucracies; the growth of urban centers; the spread of literacy and mass education; secularism, the appearance of interior, psychological self; and functional differentiation. [Jusdanis, xii-xiii]

During this process national culture worked as a fundamental constituting element for the state which was the main political form of modernity. The state uses the national culture as a mean of constitution of the national identity. This process can be followed in Turkey with the foundation of *Halkevleri*, compilations of folk literature samples, purification of the language and constitution of State Theatre, State Conservatoire, etc.

This process can be also evaluated with regard to the constitution of the nation-state. Since the final aim of the nationalism was nation-state, literary criticism took part in this project from the very beginning: The state needs some kind of mortar composed of values common to whole nation which would keep the all together. Inventing a nation needs collective narratives, neglect of ethnical differences, creation of citizens accepting the ideology of the society [Jusdanis, 28].

Literature was imaginary mirror in which the nation reflected itself, where people experienced themselves as members of such a union. It was both a manifestation of the nation as well as a part of the nation-forming process. As a collection of narratives, the literary canon contains the tales by means of which members of a community understand their common links. Literature in a sense is the nation's diary, telling the story of its past, present and future. Literary culture has been indispensable to ethnic communities wishing to cement their integrity as nations... [Jusdanis, 47]

The literary canon does not only help in the creation of a whole nation's identity it also protects that identity. While inventing this identity literary canon also finds out the masterpieces of a nation's history.⁵

Since the literary criticism had different tendencies in Turkey we had several problems in creating literary canon. Whatever the tendency of the literary criticism was none of the notions of literary canon could present us a list of masterpieces [Koçak, 90]. This literary canon can be only invented by means of national aesthetic categories which are working in accordance with the ideology of national culture. Since those aesthetic categories are varying from the attitude towards the literary canon, constituting the list of masterpieces of the nation becomes problematic. But whatever the tendency is some pieces of literature are blamed to be excluded from the history of literature.

1.2. Writing History of Ottoman Literature

After recent studies of Jusdanis, Anderson, Chatterjee and several others modern linguistic studies and histories of literature are accepted as tools for the constitution of the nation-state and the nation itself.⁶ For the understanding of Turkish practice of this process we can refer Suavi Aydın's article called "30'ların tezlerine geri dönüş: Anadolu'da 'proto-Türkler'in yeniden keşfi" written on the nationalist thesis of 30s and its reflections on recent attitudes:

Bu çerçevede üç temel kaygı ve kabul göze çarpar. Bunlardan ilki, "çok kültürlülük" olgusu karşısında ulusun benzersizliğini/biricikliğini ve türdeşliğini kanıtlama çabasıdır. İkincisi söz konusu ulusun üzerinde yaşadığı topraklarda otoktonluğunu ya da tarihsel kıdemini kanıtlama girişimidir. Üçüncüsü ise ilksel (*primordial*) bir ulus anlayışına uygun olarak, ulus olgusunun modern bir siyasallık/toplumsallık biçimi olduğuna ilişkin kuramsal duruşların aksine, ulusun insanlık tarihinin üzerinde şekillendiği temel varolma biçimi olarak tarihin derinliklerinden modern çağa ulaşan bir temel nüve olduğu kabulüdür.

⁵ According to the Hatice Aynur's article "Eski Türk Edebiyatı Alanında Yapılan Tezler (Yüksek Lisans - Doktora) Üzerine 1922-2005" the very first PhD theses were also trying to bring the masterpieces of Turkish literature to light.

⁶ For aims, allegations, thesis, intentions and results of the Turkish example you can check the following articles published in the 4th volume of *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce* under the title *Milliyetçilik*: "Otuzlarda Türk Milliyetçiliğinde Irk, Dil ve Etnisite" by Soner Çağaptay and "Bir Aidiyet Fermanı "Türk Tarih Tezi"" by Büşra Ersanlı. But original sources are, of course, the papers presented during the early language and history congresses. [continuous applauses]

Tarih bu kabulün üzerinde, tarihin ana renginin onun ulusallığı olduğu veri alınarak kurulur. [Aydın, 9]

We should keep this explanation in mind to remember what are included in writing any kind of history. It also implies why some types of texts including the ones which are the subject of this thesis can be neglected. In order not to be lost within theoretical discussion we can limit ourselves with the arguments related to history of literature. We can transport the designation of Aydın for the history in general into the history of literature and reach at least one single consequence: Studies of literary history can be described as the effort for proving the homogeneity of literature against the diversity of literary works.

Linguistic studies and studies of literary history generally are shared by two different ideologies. Those persons working in the field of linguistic studies can be described as “nationalist” and the remaining persons working in the latter field are mostly “*maneviyatçı-mukadderatçı*”. The academy is also shared in accordance with his distinction. This different attitudes towards language and literature also means two different attitudes towards history of language and literature. As of history of literature they are postulating a certain tradition and a certain kind of literary canon. Presumptions in evaluating history of literature and inventing a tradition brings a certain set of fundamental literary texts, literary canon, which excludes some others. On the other hand, we can easily find several literary works which can be evaluated within the general development of Ottoman literature, but would contradict that invented tradition and literary history. For the sake of this literary history those texts or works are just details which can be eliminated.

Since the beginning of Turkish literature in Anatolia there had been always such texts which cannot be related to literary canon. Even their existence cannot be founded. Those works also include grotesque, burlesque, comic or even sexual material. Although those texts can be used for the sake of social history, linguistic studies, anthropology, sociology or some other fields of study, some of them are not worked of transcribed into Roman letters at all. While writing the history of Ottoman literature they were only mentioned, but not examined in details. Selim Kuru explains this attitude as follows:

Kadı sicilleri, fetvalar, tarih eserleri, hikâye derlemeleri, değişik konularda gazeller, kasideler, mesneviler, Osmanlılar'da cinsellik ve cinsiyet sistemlerine ışık tutacak biçimde okunabilir...

Osmanlı edebiyatında, hezel başlığı altında değerlendirilen ve hezelâmiz olarak tanımlanan eserler arasında letaif mecmuaları ve hicviyyeler en genel olarak üretilmiş eserlerdir, ancak bu tür eserler, cinselliği yazıyla buluşturdıklarından olacak, akademik veya gayri akademik tanımlamaya ve sınıflandırmaya yönelik ilgiden mahrum kalmaktadırlar. [36]

Interpretation of Kuru certainly refers to a reality of the field. This reality was also described by Murat Bardakçı in his famous compilation of Ottoman texts on sexuality *Osmanlı'da Seks: Sarayda Gece Dersleri*. The first edition of the compilation was released in 1992 and Bardakçı said followings on the texts appeared in the book:

Yüzlerce yıl önce söylenmiş, yazılmış, çizilmiş konulardı bunlar... Ve en önemlisi, hepsi “bizim” öykümüzdü. Ama günümüzde her nedense üzerlerinde pek durulmamış, incelenmemişlerdi... [7]

But we cannot assume that they were completely not interested by the academic society. They were not taken into consideration while writing the history of literature, but there are still few academicians like Kuru who are working on those items. In fact several journals including *tarih ve toplum* and *Kebikeç* released special issues on the topic. Several thesis were presented on some of the literary works, individual articles appeared in journals. However we cannot allege that those texts were subject to mainstream academic study.

Nevertheless the mainstream academic attitude towards those works of literature can be divided into two separate inclinations: The first approach denies their existences whatever the importance of those works. The more dangerous second attitude agrees on the existence, but aims to degrade or misinterpret them.

As an example for the denial such texts we can refer to two editions of *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. The encyclopaedia had been published in English and then translated into Turkish to be published by Ministry of Education. One of the entries was the Persian writer Tifâşî. He is known with his work with the title of *Rücu'ş-Şeyb ilâ Sibâh fî'l-Kuvveti alâ'l-Bâh* written in Persian. The book had been translated several times into Ottoman Turkish and includes stories and scientific texts on sexual intercourse.

Though there is a paragraph on the book in the English edition, the paragraph was omitted in the Turkish one.

In order to make the attitude towards this kind of works clear let me give two more examples from two separate works from different periods of republican era. Historian Agâh Sırrı Levend makes following comment on the genre *bezel* - opposite of lyric poems *gazel* in grotesque form - and the poet Sürûrî by saying those *bezels* were not worth reading:

Sürürinin bir de Hezliyyatı Sürurî isimli bir mecmuası vardır. Bu mecmuada birçok latifeler ve hicviyeler vardır. Fakat bunların çoğu, ağza alınmayacak kadar müstehcen ve galiz kelimelerle doludur. [364]

Second example is from a recent work by Tahir Üzgör. In 1991, Üzgör released the poems of Fehîm-i Kadîm. Because of his excellence in writing the poet Fehîm had been and is presented by literary historians as a “literary genius”. But on the other hand he also had the most obscene version of *şehr-engîz* genre. Tahir Üzgör while exalting Fehîm for his poetry ends the introductory part of the book by saying his *şehr-engîz* had no literary value for its obscenity:

Fehîm’in divânından başka, hafif bahrının Fe’îlâtün/mefâ’ilün/ fe’ilün kalıbıyla yazılmış 273 beyitlik mesnevî tarzında bir *şehr-engîzi*, Arap, Arnavud, Ermeni, Rum, Yahudi, Tatar, Acem, Kürt, Türk ve kendi ağzından olmak üzere on ağzı taklit etmek suretiyle bahr-ı tavîlden yazdığı uzunca bir manzumesi, bir tercüme-i letâif-i kibarî ve Durub-ı Emsâl-i Türkî gibi eserleri varsa da bunların üzerinde durulacak bir değere sahip olmadıklarını söyleyebiliriz. Zira, divânında pek nadir olarak ölçülü ve sınırlı bir şekilde karşımıza çıkan ve bir bakıma Nedîm’in habercisi olarak telakki edebileceğimiz müstehcenliğin bu şiirlerinde çok bayağı bir hüviyette karşımıza çıktığını görmekteyiz. [11]

Nevertheless the literary works produced during the Ottoman era in a wide geography for centuries include varying genres, styles and forms. Since the history of the Ottoman literature is written based on principle text, those text constituting the literary canon, and supposed secondary text allegedly related to those primary ones, the raining works are generally denied or at least not focussed on. When evaluated with regard to formal characteristics, vocabulary, and most importantly intertextual relation we would certainly find out that many other texts, literary works can be seen within this tradition, but from another aspect of view. Taking those literary works

into consideration and finding out their relation to others would also have deep impact on our idea of history of literature and the last outcome of this attitude would be another history of literature. Consequently we would also be able to explain the existence of the literary works which are alleged to be outside the literary canon and how they appear on a certain moment of time. Just mentioning a piece of literary work and isolating it as it is does not have any importance for the writing of history. What we need is to disclose those texts and try to bring into light their relation to others. But before dealing with this issue a big problem is still standing in front of us.

In order to be able to write a complete and comprehensive history of literature all the literary works have to be brought in light. This is why the departments of Turkish literature focussed on texts. This was a necessary measure to be taken for writing the history of Turkish language and literature. Unfortunately the number of the works to be studied and several other secondary reasons did not allow this list of literary masterpieces and works to be completed. One of our pioneer historians Faruk Timurtaş clearly puts this problem into words:

...bir edebiyat tarihi, ancak eserler, şahıslar, edebî neviler, devirler, muhtelif meseleler üzerinde inceleme, araştırma ve tahliller yapıldıktan, monografiler yazıldıktan, biyografik bibliyografik her türlü malûmat bir araya getirildikten sonra yazılabilir. [28]... Edebî mahsullerimizi tam olarak bilmediğimiz gibi, edebiyat tarihi kaynaklarını da esaslı şekilde incelemiş ve muhteviyatını tesbit etmiş durumda değiliz. Hususî ve umumî şuarâ tezkireleri, vefeyât kitapları, Şekayık ve zeyillerinin teşkil ettiği ulemâ tabakası, vezirler, hattatlar vesaireye dair yazılmış tezkireler, evliya menâkıbı, nazire mecmuaları, müntehabât mecmuaları, Keşfü'z-zünûn ve zeyilleri nev'inden kitabiyat eserleri, umumî tarihler, seyahatnâmeler, sefâretnâmeler, ve bunların dışında kalan diğer kaynaklar üzerindeki inceleme ve araştırmalar çok az ve kifayetsizdir. [28-29]... Şimdi her şeyden önce hangi asırda hangi eserlerin yazılmış olduğunu ve bunlardan bize nelerin intikal ettiğini tesbit etmekle işe başlamalıyız. Memleketimiz ve yabancı memleket kütüphaneleri esaslı surette taranmalı, hususî ellerdeki kitaplar da tesbit edilmelidir. Bir taraftan edebî mahsullerin tam olarak tesbiti ile uğraşırken, öbür taraftan bilinen ve yeni bulunan eserlerin yegâne nüshalarını faksimile etmek ve belli başlılarının tenkidli neşrini hazırlamak yoluna gitmeliyiz. Metin neşrine muvazi olarak bunlar üzerindeki şekil, uslûb ve muhteva bakımından tahlil, inceleme, araştırma ve her türlü mukayeseler yapmak ve edebiyat tarihi kaynaklarını en istifadeli bir hale getirmek gerekir. Bütün bunlar yapıldıktan sonra sıra umumî ve terkiibî edebiyat tarihi yazmaya gelir.

Ancak o zaman gerçek ve ilmî bir edebiyat tarihi yazabilmek mümkün olacaktır. [30]

Following expressions of Agah Sırrı Levend he admitted in the “Preface” of *Türk Edebiyatında Şebre-engizler ve Şebr-engizlerde İstanbul* written on 5 April 1957 also determines how determination and publication of different types of literary works were critical for the constitution of the idea of literary history:

Divan edebiyatının başlıca ürünleri divanlar, hamseler, münşeâtlar, tezkireler ve tarihlerdir. Bunların hepsi de belirli bir sanat anlayışıyle kaleme alınmış olmakla beraber, divanlarla hamseler, bu edebiyatın daha çok sanat cephesini aksettirir. Mektuplarla türlü yazmalardan toplanmış olan münşeâtlar birer belge hizmetini görür. Tezkirelerle tarihler ise tanınmış kişilerle belli başlı olayları aydınlatan birer kaynaktır.

Ancak, eski edebiyatı bir bütün olarak anlayabilmek için, bu ürünler dışında kalan sayısız eserleri de yakından tanımak gerekir. Bu çeşitli eserler arasında, hamselere girmeyen manzum ve mensur hikâyeler, dinî, tasavufî ve ahlâkî eserler, “nâme” başlığı taşıyan gazavat-nâmeler, sûr-nâmeler, sâki-nâmeler, kıyafet-nâmeler, siyaset-nâmeler, sefaret-nâmeler, seyahat-nâmeler, sergüzeşt-nâmeler ile, şehr-engizler, ta’rifatlar, münazaralar, mizahî, didaktik ve ansiklopedik eserler büyük bir yer tutar.

...

Bu çeşitli eserleri sosyolojinin ışığı altında dikkatle gözden geçirecek olursak, eski türk hayatını, divanlarla hamselerden daha çok, bu sayısız eserlerin aksettirdiğini görürüz. bu maksadı sağlamak için en kestirme yol doğrudan doğruya metinlere başvurmaktır. [5]

In this context -if I try to put it with the term of computer sciences- the database including all the literary material is filtered in accordance with the above-mentioned *Weltanschauung* and served the use of ordinary users. In other words those literary works or texts which are in contradiction with or can undermine the invented literary canon or literary history are denied categorically throughout centuries and are never evaluated as literary texts. Their names were mentioned at most in the histories of literature, and also evaluated as “they were not worth reading”.

... we should also note its [the literary canon’s] vagueness. Rather than relying on lists of masterpieces, this canon is genre-bound, and its emphasis on verse over prose parallels the convictions of many 19th century Ottoman authors. In effect, prose texts, even those that combine both verse and prose, are treated as unproblematic major-

source material, and rarely subjected to analytic study. Further, the addition of a scandalously sexual vocabulary to prose works causes these hezel-amiz, or facetious works, to be entirely neglected and marginalized as inconsequential to our understanding of Ottoman literature. [Kuru, forthcoming article]

But thinking on the value of these works may lead to new expansions on the history of Turkish literature. If we start to list those kinds of literary works we would certainly see that there were lots of examples of those grotesque, burlesque and even travesty works. And we should also keep in mind that the writers of those texts were also high-ranked persons / officials in the Ottoman Empire era. Under these circumstances instead of alleging that these works do not have any literary value, we should focus on the political, social, and especially literary dimensions of those pieces. Though there are academic works based on some samples of those pieces of literature there is no comprehensive and systematic study of them. By comprehensive and systematic study I mean interpretation of those pieces, but not releasing the text itself.⁷

⁷ The *şehr-engîz* genre has a special importance within this frame. Since the genre had been accepted for some time to be invented by Turks several studies were released on the issue. But none of them included any interpretation of the essence of the genre. In fact, to some extent, the truth was distorted. After accepting the truth about the subject matter of the genre, now some articles can be found trying to find the roots of the genre in other cultures. For details you can see my review article “*Türk Edebiyatında Şehr-engîzler*” on the genre published in *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* spring issue of 2007.

CHAPTER II

BORDER LINE: EIGHTEENTH CENTURY CASE

For most of the historians working in the field of Ottoman literature or history one of the centuries is longer than the other relying on the tendency of the historian, on the expertise of the academician. For instance, for Mehmed Çavuşođlu and his ancestors or successors 16th century is the longest one, but for the historians like İlber Ortaylı or Ahmed Hamdi Tanpınar it is the 19th century. But every single century whether Gregorian or Hijri is unique with the changes and developments they are dwelling for. And thus neither of them is longer than the other.

One of those equally long centuries is the 18th century. This century also has its own characteristics which make it differ with the others. Within the context of this thesis the obscene or grotesque pieces of literature constitutes this difference. In fact this is not surprising if we take into consideration the Middle Eastern literature. The theoretical frame presented firstly by Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar in his famous uncompleted work *19. Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi* simply called “courtly metaphor” and developed by Walter G. Andrews in his book entitled *Poetry's Voice Society's Song* as three layers of interpretation -god/believer, sultan/man, and beloved/lover - allows the reader to receipt the message as if there is a sexual relation between two lovers. But in the 18th century poets or writers started to mention this implicit relation clear and distinctly. In fact we can surely find some other examples of this kind work in previous centuries, but in the 18th century these obscene, grotesque and sexually explicit pieces of literature represents the general characteristics of the century. This special status of this century forces us to explain how a poet like Sünbül-zâde Vehbî

could write all the poem known as “Sühan Kasidesi” [Poetry on Poem] “انشاد کرده است” the “قصیده کلامیه که در صدارت خلیل پاشا برای نصیح و استهزای شاعران هزیان کویان عصر با امر و اراده *mesnevi* like “Şevk-engîz” and the satire published by Turgut Kut in the special issue of *tarih ve toplum* on obscene literature [208]. In case we would not like to deal with those texts we would only cite them as interesting but also eccentric samples of literature with no value.

Whatever the political, economical, social or military reasons are there had been several examples of this kind of works and had been a common practice of literature. What we have to do is to clarify the relation of these texts to mainstream literature based on the literary canon. And to be able to succeed this I would focus on and pick three poets of the period: Enderûnî Fâzıl Beg, Sünbül-zâde Vehbî and Sürûrî. These poets and other like them were blamed by Nihad Sami Banarlı to make vulgar the style of the poet Nedîm, one of the masters of the same century and also the so-called localisation movement [784]. But we have to keep in mind that the master of the style had also used the language as “vulgar” as possible while saying the following line in *Nigâr-nâme* written to İzzet Ali Paşa: *Söz söz açar, söz göt açar ey gül-i ra'nâ.*

2.1. Enderûnî Fâzıl Bey and His Works

One of the important historians of Ottoman literature Gibb introduces above-mentioned three poets in a separate chapter under the title “The culmination of the Romanticist Movement”. He stresses that Enderûnî Fâzıl Bey had a special importance for the period and had been the start point of the new era:

Turkish Romanticism culminates in the work of Fazil Bey. Revolt against traditional authority, assertion of individuality, local colour, unbridled license alike in matter and in manner, whatever in short distinguishes this movement from the Classicism which precedes and the Modernism which follows, is here present in the fullest measure, inspiring and permeating the works of this author, and placing them at once among the most interesting and the least beautiful in all the range of Ottoman poetry. [220]

Enderûnî Fâzıl Bey had an interesting character within the history of literature. Though we do not know the details of his life Jan Schmidt summarises his life as follows:

Of Fazıl Beg's life not much is known. We are provided with some data by historians and the author himself. The most important facts are: Fazıl Beg came from an Arab family of Madina. His grandfather Tahir Beg, as governor of 'Akka (Acre) and Safad, was able to maintain a semi-independent state in the area, but his domain was subjected to Porte (central government) in 1090 / 1776-77 by Gazi Hasan Paşa. During the fight Tahir Beg was killed, and his son, the father of the poet, was killed a year later. Fazıl and his brother were transported to Istanbul, where they were taken into palace as slaves of the sultan. Fazıl Beg left the *saray* in 1198 / 1783-84, after a disastrous love affair, and became administrator of Rhodos (Rhodes) pious foundations (*evkaf*). Not long afterwards he ran into trouble, probably after the fall from grace of his protector *Reisülküttab* Ebu Bekr Ratip Efendi, and was temporarily banished to Rhodos (1214 / 1799-1800), where he suffered from blindness. He returned to the capital, Istanbul, and lived there for another ten years, mostly in ill health (perhaps caused by sexual disease), in Eyüp and Beşiktaş. [183]

Enderûnî Fâzıl Bey left behind 5 works of literature after such an interesting life.

Dîvân-ı Fâzıl Bey Enderûnî: The work is the compilation of the poems of Enderûnî Fâzıl Bey. Besides many manuscripts of the *Dîvân* there is also a printed version published in Cairo by Bulak Matbaası. Several passages from the work were published for several occasions. According to the information released by Saliha İçen the work is also studied by Yusuf Yanartaş as master's thesis under the title of "Enderunlu Fazıl Divanı ve İndeksi" in 1997.⁸

We can also find several manuscripts of the following four works. Few of those manuscripts also include miniatures.⁹ The catalog of printed Ottoman books by Seyfettin Özege called *Eski Harflerle Basılmış Türkçe Eserler Kataloğu* included three printed versions of these works.

Defter-i Aşk, Hûbân-nâme, Zenân-nâme, Çengî-nâme. İstanbul: Matbaa-i Âmire, 1253/1837
[including Sünbül-zâde Vehbî's *Şevk-engîz*]

⁸ I did not see the thesis. Unfortunately it is not registered in the catalog of the YÖK. But Hatice Aynur cites the thesis in her *Bibliography*.

⁹ Two thesis were prepared in connection with the manuscripts including miniatures:

Feza Çakmut. "Hûbânnâme-Zenânnâme'nin Minyatürleri" Basılmamış bitirme tezi. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi, Sanat Tarihi Bölümü, 1975.

Saliha İçen. "Huban-name ve Zenan-name'de Metin-Resim İlişkisi" Basılmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sanat Tarihi, 2001.

Those miniatures were also used for several purposes.

Hûbân-nâme, Zenân-nâme, Rakkâs-nâme. y.y.: y.y., 1255/1839

Defter-i Aşk, Hûbân-nâme, Zenân-nâme, Çengî-nâme. İstanbul: Ali Rıza Efendi Matbaası, 1286/1870 [including Sünbül-zâde Vehbî's *Şevk-engîz*]¹⁰

Defter-i Aşk: The work also includes details from the life of the poet and the poet relates his relation to four beloveds. The text was studied by Selim S. Kuru. Kuru presented a paper on the work and the poet: “Modernizing Sacred Love: Enderunlu Fazıl’s ‘Love’s Register’ and Poetics of Ottoman Modernity,” *Focal Points and Critical Perspectives in Turkish Literature* Middle Eastern Studies Association 2003 (9 November 2003). An article was also published by Kuru relying on the paper in the *A Festschrift for Şinasi Tekin* in 2005 and the article includes the text itself: “Biçimin Kıskacında Bir Mesnevi: Enderunlu Fazıl ve Defter-i Aşk Adlı Mesnevisi”.

Hûbân-nâme: Kemal Silay allegedly works on the text: *The Book of Handsome Ones: A Study on Fazıl-i Enderuni and Gay Literature in Ottoman Turkey*. On the other hand passages from the work had been published: *Enderunlu Fâzıl: Hubanname ve Zenanname*. Haz.: Ercümen Muhib. [Y.y.]: Yeni Şark Kitabevi, 1945. But the text has to be read with care.

Zenân-nâme: The text of the work was studied by Nebiye Öztürk as a master’s thesis in the field of folk literature. The thesis has the text of the work as addendum. The thesis of Saliha İçen also includes the text. The work had been translated into French in 1879 under the title of *Le livre des femmes (Zenan-nameh) de Fazıl-bey* by J.-A. Decourdemanche (Paris: E. Leroux, 1879).¹¹

Çengî-nâme: The shorter work of Fâzıl Bey is on the boy dancers of İstanbul. The text was released by me in *Ottoman Studies XVII* in 2006 [The edition-critique of the text can be found in the Addendum of this thesis]. Jan Schmidt also wrote the article “Fazıl Beg Enderuni: Social Historian or Poet?” [published in *Decision Making and Change in the Ottoman Empire*. Kirksville: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1993.] The work is also known as *Rakkâs-nâme*.

¹⁰ I saw and had the chance to work on the last two, but I did not see the first one.

¹¹ Selim Sırrı Kuru also presented another paper in 1994 under the title “Fazıl’ın kadınları: Enderunlu Fazıl’ın Zenanname adlı eseri” during the seminar XIII. *Sanat Tarihi Araştırmaları Haberleşme Semineri: Tarih Öncesinden Günümüze Anadolu Kadının Sosyal ve Kültürel Konumu* between 9 and 13 May 1994 in İstanbul. Unfortunately we did not have the chance to read the paper.

2.1.1. Çengî-nâme [Book of Dancers]

All the works or statements on *Çengî-nâme* -except for the article of Jan Schmidt- agreed on that the work had no literary value, if it had any kind of value it relies on the details it provided on daily life of the time. We have to admit at least that there is no detail in the poem on daily life just like there is no detail on the life of poet or at least those parts are limited. This was also mentioned by Jan Schmidt previously. *Çengî-nâme* is certainly a piece of literature. The failure can be summarised as follows: It seems as if historians of literature are focusing on the subject of poem and somehow discard the literary characteristic of the poem. The most dangerous side effect of this kind of attitude is creating prejudice against these texts. Though Jan Schmidt “value[s] the work, primarily for what it is and what it doubtlessly was meant to be by the author [as a] work of entertaining, comic literature” [191], his comments on the value of the work are important:

The dominant characteristic of Fazil Beg’s work is literary and poetic: if the metaphors, punning, wordplay, the comic obscenities, the striking and often original contrasts between the elements of the high Divan poetry and low, realistic details were eliminated or cast in the form of dry prose, not much would remain of his work, and its interest would be completely lost. [191]

2.2. Sünbül-zâde Vehbî

Another popular figure of the time is Sünbül-zâde Vehbî. Though he had a *Divan*, two verse dictionaries and an advice book he is mostly known with his poem on poetry called “Sühan Kasidesi”. The title of the poem was translated by Kemal Silay as “The Kaside On Poetry Written By Imperial Order And Decree During The Grand-Viziership Of Halil Paşa In Order To Ridicule And Admonish Those Poets Of This Age Who Speak Nonsense”. [The full text can be found in Addendum of this thesis] His literary inheritance can be summed up as follows:

Sunbul-zâde Vehbî wrote a good deal of poetry; his works include a bulky Dîwân, a humorous mesnevî entitled Shevq-engîz, or The Provoker of Mirth, a didactic poem called Lutfiyya, modelled on the Khayriyya of Nâbî, and two riming vocabularies dealing respectively with Persian and Arabic words. Besides these productions, which are all in Turkish, he left a small Dîwân of Persian poems. [Gibb, 246-247]

The information on his life which can be found in several sources are summarised by Björkman in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* as follows:

Wehbî was educated in Marash, then went to Istanbul, where his writing of *kasidas* and chronograms gained him influential patrons, securing him the rank of *müderriis*, then that of *kadhî*, in which he was to serve for seventeen years or more in number of locations in Balkans, in Rhodes and al-Manisa, and with the Imperial Army in the Edirne, Sofya, and Nish areas. He also served for seven years in the Ottoman scribal institution, rising to the rank of *keb' adje*. [876]

Though in his “Sühan Kasidesi” he was dealing with the “poets of this age who speak nonsense” he was also accused by Şehabeddin Süleyman for being one of those poets:

“Sühan Kasîdesi” enâfis-i âşârından telakkî edildiği hâlde bile yine içinde zevk-i selîmi, hiss-i şâ'iriyeti rencîde edecek birçok soğuk, birçok âdî sözlere tesâdüf olunuyor... Kendisi bu görünüşte ma'zûrdur. Çünkü mevhibe-yî tabi'ât olan hissiyât-ı şâ'irânenen hassasına pek az bir şey isâbet etmiştir.[248]

As of his Şevk-engîz which was written in the form of *münâzarâ*, meaning debate or contention, we can say that he made two persons to discuss on sexual tendencies. The persons, namely Suyolcu-zâde [*suyolcu* refers to female genital organ] and Kazıkçı Yegeni [*kazık* refers to male genital organ], are introduced at the beginning of the poem::

naql eder bir sülhan-ârâ-yı cihân
pîr-i şûzîde dil-i tâze beyân
der ki var idi iki ehl-i fücûr
şehr-i istanbul içinde meşhûr
birisi sürmeli zen-pâre idi
biri gök gözlü gulâm-pâre idi
ikisi biri birinden rüsvâ
iki şeytân idiler recme sezâ
her biri mâhir idi kârında
şan'at-ı müfsidin âşârında
kullanıp kârların gündeliğe
işemezdi ikisi bir deliğe
iki mışrâ' idi gûyâ gidiler
ma'tla'-ı şî'r hevâyî idiler
geçmedi yerlere ol iki gidi
şanki bir çiftte çatal kazık idi [112]

After discussion for almost 800 lines whether inclination to women or men is the true way of love, the story ends with the allegation that the only true love is the love for god.

2.3. Sürûrî: Life and Works

Sürûrî was cited or noted in most of the histories or dictionaries. Bağdatlı İsmail Paşa introduces Sürûrî in his *Hediyyetü'l 'Ariî'n, Esmâü'l Mü'ellifîn ve Âsârü'l Musannifîn* as follows:

سرورى عثمان الشاعر - عثمان بن السيد موسى الاطنهوى ثم الرومى
القاضى الحنفى الشاعر المؤرخ المتخلص بسرورى توفى سنة ١٢٢٩ تسع
و عشرين و مانتين و الف. له ديوان شعره تركى. هزليات سرورى مشهورة.

As this short description indicates Surûrî was known with his chronograms and *hezels*. A chronogram is a line or inscription in which letters stand for numerals and represent a particular date when calculated. And *hezels* is the grotesque counterpart of lyric poem *gazel*. Sürûrî is certainly most talented poet in writing both chronograms and *hezels*. In other words Sürûrî was not writing within the rules described by the tradition in accordance with the so-called literary canon. That's why he was not accepted a true poet. Ebuzziya Tefîk wrote in the book on Sürûrî following paragraphs alleging that he had no talent to write down poems:

Eğer şiir dediğimiz lisân-ı hayâl bizim kitâplarda ta'rîf olunduğu üzere "mevzûn ve mukaffa kelâm"dan 'ibâret ise Sürûrî'ye şâ'ir itlâkı doğru olabilir. Çünkü cidd ü hezlden 'ibâret olan manzûmâtı kâmûsün nısf cildini istî'âb edecek mertebededir.

Hâsılı Sürûrî servet-i şâ'iriyyetten mahrûm ve fakat kuvvet-i tahsîl sayesinde kudret-i inşadda rûsûh peydâ etmiş bir nâzımdan başka bir şey değildir.

Hattâ merhûmun müverrihliğe hevesle o yolda kendinden evvel gelenlerin kâffesine isbât-ı rüchân ve kendinden sonra gelenlere gıbtâ-resân olacak derecelerde ihrâz-ı muvaffakiyyet edişi dahî o kudretten mahrûmiyyetini idrâk etmeliği neticesidir denilebilir. (2-3)

In his history of literature Şehabeddin Süleyman agrees with Ebuzziya Tefîk in that Sürûrî had a special importance in course of Ottoman literature by writing chronograms and *hezels*, but not true poems:

Târîh yazmak ve söylemekteki mehâret-i husûsiyyesiyle hezl ve mizâh husûsundaki iktidârına binâen Sürûrî târîh-i edebiyât-ı osmâniyyede bir mevki'-i mümtâza mâlik olmaktadır.

Yoksa tabi'at-i şî'riyye, zevk-i selîm, hüsn-i san'at i'tibâriyle hiçbir mevki', hiçbir şahsiyet-i husûsiyyeye mazhar olamazdı.

Bursalı Mehmed Tâhîr follows them by citing Muallim Nâcî:

Sürûrî'nin *Hezeliyyât*'ı çekilir belâlardan değildir. Kendisi bu vechle ne kadar şâyân-ı muâheze görölse bir şey' dinlemez. Bunların ba'zıları bir mecbûriyet üzerine söylenilmiş olabilirse de gûya sırf eğlence olarak yazılmışları dahî vardır. Hâlbuki kendisinin 'aleyhinde hicviyyeler neşretmiş olan eşhâsa 'âlicenâbâne bir sûrette mukâbele etmek elbette büyüklüğe daha muvâfık düşerdi.

Mecbûriyetsiz hezeliyyât yazmak için hiçbir sebep bulunamaz. Erbâb-ı kalemin dâ'imâ ahlâk-ı umûmiyyeyi islâh ve a'lâya çalışmaları en mühim vazâ'if-i medeniyyededir. (238)

Sürûrî started writing poems in Adana with the pen-name Hüznî. His real name is Osman and the turning point of his life is being brought to Istanbul by future Şeyhül-İslâm Tevfik Efendi in 1193 / 1179-80. He also changed his pen-name from Hüznî to Sürûrî upon demand of Tevfik Efendi. He was also known as "Sürûrî-i Müverrih" [Sürûrî the chronogram writer] in order not to be confused with another poet using the same pen-name [İbrahim Necmi, 251]. After coming to Istanbul he became a *kadı* and worked in several towns. He also worked with Sünbül-zâde Vehbî while he was in Eski Zagra. They became life-long friends and Sürûrî was buried next to the Vehbî.

Sürûrî did not write chronograms for the events of his time, but also of the past. After all he compiled his chronograms in a book. Ahmed Cevdet Paşa describes the compilation of Sürûrî in the chapter on chronograms of his book *Belâgat-ı Osmâniyye* as follows:

Sürûrî Efendi gerek kendisinin ve gerek eslâf ve mu'âsırı olan şu'arânın târîhlerinden makbûl ve müstahsen olanları cem' ile bir mecmû'aya kaydedip vefâtında 'İzzet Mollâ dahî 'asrında söylenen târîhlerin müntahablarını buna 'ilâve etmiştir. ba'de vakı'a-nüvîs Es'ad Efendi dahî intihâb eylediği târîhleri ona katmıştır. Hakkâ ki eslâf-ı şu'arânın en güzîde târîhlerini câmi' bir eser-i bî-nazîrdir.

Sürûrî ol mecmû'ayı asıl tevârîh-i müntahabe-i türkiyye için tertîb eylemiş ise de ba'zı tevârîh-i fârisiyye ve 'arabiyyeyi dahî kaydeylemiştir.

The real proficiency of Sürûrî in writing chronograms can be seen in the following quotation from Süleyman Şehabeddin. Sürûrî wrote a chronogram before a marine battle on the victory of Ottoman navy. When he was asked what if Ottoman navy could not reach victory, he replied that the chronogram includes both possibilities. And though metre becomes problematic if you change the place of only one syllable the date remains, but the meaning changes into to the opposite:

Târîh söylerken pek az düşünür, pez az durur, sanki bil-irticâl söylermiş. “1204” târihinde Rusya seferine mâmûr olan Donanma-yı ‘Osmânî ile Kapudan Pâşâ’nın Bahr-ı Siyâh’a ‘azimetinde şu târihi söylemiştir.

Şekl-i gerdân gelir fikre yazarken târih
Sürdü yelken kürek a’dâ’yı Kapûdân Pâşâ

Bu târihin söylendiği mecliste bulunan zevât “Ya kazıyye bir ‘aks olursa ne diyeceksin?” dedikleri zamân “Ne diyeceğim! Benim târihim zâten muzafferiyet ve mağlıbiyete câmi’dır.” cevâbını vermiş, ezhâr-ı hayretle ne demek istediğini sordukleri zaman

Sürdü yelken kürek a’dâ’ Kapûdân Pâşâyı

sûretine tahvîl ile okumuştur. (255)

Since his *hezels* would be discussed on the fourth chapter of this thesis I am not going to give examples of those poems here in this chapter. But one single example may show his talent in combining both chronograms and *hezels* -I use the term here for both burlesque lyrics and also comic satires. He wrote several chronograms for Sünbül-zâde Vehbî and one of them is on the death of Vehbî’s wife. Sürûrî wrote in this chronogram how Vehbî killed his wife during sexual intercourse:

Kulağın dağlasın ol eşşeğin bu târih
Koca Vehbî-i har öldürdü yarakla dışısın [1205] (*Hezliyyât*, 78)

We have to be careful here in calling Sürûrî chronogram writer and also a humorist for his *hezels*. And Gibb also falls in to this error by calling him humorist:

Surûrî is famous not only as a chronogrammatist, but as a humorist. Had he never written a single chronogram, he would yet have made his mark in Ottoman literature by his comic poems.

But his poems called humorous by Gibb can be divided into three separate parts and Von Hammer was aware of this distinction and determined following three kinds of

poems in his well-known work *Geschichte der Osmanischen Dichtkunst bis auf Unsere Zeit* as follows:

Seine Gedichte sind in drei Theile getheilt: Mushikat, D.i. die zum Lachen, Heseliat, die Scherzhaften, und Hedschwiat, die satirischen; die ersten sind poffenreißerisch, die zweiten zottenhaft und die dritten reine Schmächungen. [489]

The subject of this thesis would be the second type of poems in the forth chapter.

And I prefer to use the word *scherschaft* as facetious or facetiae.

CHAPTER III

THE DEAD END: CHANGE IN THE SUBJECT

As a coincidence two separate and important figures for literary criticism appeared in 1960s in Western languages. Though Mikhail Bakhtin submitted his revolutionary dissertation on the French renaissance poet François Rabelais under the title *Rabelais and Folk Culture of the Middle Ages and Renaissance* right after the World War II, it was not published until 1965. The book was published under the title *Rabelais and His World*. Almost in the same year Julia Kristeva introduced a new concept to the language, vocabulary of literary criticism: intertextuality. The first masterpiece changed the evaluation of literary work and the second changed the interpretation of the way the literary work related to other texts.

3.1. Intertextuality

Before discussing the Bakhtinian notions of carnivalesque and grotesque and going in details what burlesque is, how it is created, and how the stylistic versions of the burlesque are implemented we have note the use of intertextuality by Julia Kristeva.

Kristeva used the term intertextuality to analyse and disclose the possible meanings in every single text and the layers of a text in connection with previous texts. The meaning is not created only by the writer and understood by the reader as it is, on the other hand the writer's intention is transferred to the readers by means of signs shared by the writer and reader by means of other texts. Although Kristeva introduced the term in to the vocabulary of literary criticism in 60s some 20 years

later she needed to make the definition of the notion in order to be understood clearly:

To these we must add a third “process” -the *passage from one sign system to another*. To be sure, this process comes about through a combination of displacement and condensation, but this does not account for its total operation. It also involves an altering of the thetic *position* -the destruction of the old position and the formation of a new one. The new signifying system may be produced with the same signifying material; in language, for example, the passage may be made from narrative to text. Or it may be borrowed from different signifying materials: the transposition from a carnival scene to the written text, for instance. In this connection we examined the formation of a specific signifying system -the novel- as the result of a redistribution of several different sign systems: carnival, courtly poetry, scholastic discourse. [59]

The term *inter-textuality* denotes this transposition of one (or several) sign system(s) into another, but since this term has often been understood in the banal sense of “study of sources,” we prefer the term *transposition* because it specifies that the passage from one signifying system to another demands a new articulation of the thetic - of enunciative and denotative positionality. If one grants that every signifying practice is a field of transpositions of various signifying systems (an inter-textuality), one then understands that its “place” of enunciation and its denoted “object” are never single, complete, and identical to themselves, but always plural, shattered, capable of being tabulated. In this way polysemy can also be seen as the result of a semiotic polyvalence -an adherence to different sign systems. [59-60]

We shall call *transposition* the signifying process’ ability to pass from one sign system to another, to exchange and permute them; and *representability* the specific articulation of the semiotic and the thetic for a sign system. Transposition plays an essential role here inasmuch as it implies the abandonment of a former sign system, the passage to a second via an instinctual intermediary common to the two system, and the articulation of the new system with its representability. [60]

As Kristeva clearly explains intertextuality does not only imply a relation between a present text and older texts, but also includes a change in the reference or sign system of the older texts in the new one. This characteristic of the intertextuality creates the originality of the new literary work and connects this literary piece to other texts. This effect also has the following aspect as Victoria Holbrook stresses:

Intertextuality is multi-level concept that will serve here to shift attention away from the beleaguered influence of nationalized “sources” onto varied contexts of imaginative and intellectual play...

Every passage between systems -language, culture, literary form- involves a reorganisation of subjectivity and signification. It requires the destruction of one set of paradigmatic subject-object relations and creation of another, and understanding the world changes in the transaction. [32]

There are certainly several ways of constituting intertextual relations or transposition. The main means of this relation are citation, reference, concealed quotation, plagiarism, allusion, pastiche, parody, burlesque, and travesty. If we try to define above-mentioned styles we can make following assertions. Reference or citation is the most common mean of intertextuality. A piece of a text is taken into another text by citing the original text or by referring the author of the original text. But on the other hand concealed quotation or plagiarism is quoting a text without mentioning the original source and even in some case alleging that the “quoted” part was originally written by the quoting writer. Another mean of creating intertextuality is allusion. Allusion is neither citation nor plagiarism. In this case the writer tries to create the same discourse as in the text referred. This also includes reference to an older text without mentioning it. The remaining three, namely parody, burlesque and pastiche, are closely related and the distinction can be put as follows: Parody is creating a new piece of literature relying on an epic narrative or a tragedy by applying the stylistic elements of the original source into an ordinary story. This means that only a specific piece of literature, a certain story, a poem or a writer, artists, poet can be parodied. On the other hand burlesque or travesty is changing subject or content of a story by means of grotesque or daily language to ridicule the style or the genre, and at the end making fun of the original literary work or style or genre. And lastly pastiche is attacks the style of the original source as in a piece burlesque literature. But this time the writer does not ridicule the style and create a new text, imitate the original. [Aktulum, 133]

3.2. Grotesque and Carnavalesque

In his famous masterpiece Bakhtin focuses on the Rabelais’ work. As Stuart Elden points out “there are a number of ways we could read Rabelais – as anticlerical atheist, a defender of royal privilege, a precursor of rationalism; or as a religious disciple of Erasmus, a humanist, a defender of a particular view of religion against the domination of Rome” [97]. But what makes Rabelais’ work special or important for

him? Besides many other answers to this question we can quote the answer of Henri Lefebvre for the aims of this thesis. For Lefebvre one of the most important characteristics of the work is its being burlesque:

Between these two great forms of literature, the work of Rabelais represents a transition. Still an epic, it is an burlesque odyssey. Already a novel, it is the novel of the first modern individual: Panurge. [31-32]

And this burlesque effect was constituted by the use of grotesque and carnivalesque.

The literary theorist and philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin tries to construct a contrast between the great carnivals of medieval Europe by means of the grotesque language representing those carnivals and the political, economic, social, literary, ideological power of the church and also the state representing the values of the church. The authority of the church and its rules are lifted during the carnivals and Rabelais' work is representing the formation of this development within the frame of literature.

Bakhtin's innovation was to stress the primacy of language in the formation of men's thoughts. Well before Lacan, he argued that man thinks, can think, only in and through language. The power establishment is therefore able to impose its "official culture" on men by creating a language that reflects and embodies the principles of this culture. As long as men have only this language in which to think, they cannot even conceive of society in a different form. Man is trapped inside the language of his thoughts and cannot observe the ideology of which it is a product and a reflection other than in terms of the forms and values that this ideology has included in its language. Much less, of course, can this "monolingual" man conceive of another ideology than that of the establishment, since he has available to his thinking only the ideological forms that the establishment has embodied in its culture and language.

Herein lay the interest of popular culture for Rabelais, according to Bakhtin. Since popular culture was indeed completely distinct from official culture, it was totally free from the conceptual forms of the latter. By using the images and language of the marketplace, Rabelais was able to throw off the intellectual shackles worn by those who had only the language of official culture at their disposal. He and his readers became able to think in a language other than that created by official culture, and so to see this official culture from the outside, objectively, as it really was. [Berrong, 12]

Rabelais' work represents the changes in the values of the Medieval Europe during carnival and Bakhtin is our guide to follow these changes. Under these complicated conditions the essence of the literature is also subject to change. While the old genres

are substituted by new ones the grotesque and carnivalesque language has a revolutionary impact on the process by making people laugh. The ossified structure of the Medieval narratives are changed by means of laughter:

The Renaissance conception of laughter can be roughly described as follows: Laughter has a deep philosophical meaning, it is one of the essential forms of the truth concerning the world as a whole, concerning history and man; it is a peculiar point of view relative to the world; the world is seen anew, no less (and perhaps more) profoundly than when seen from the serious standpoint. Therefore, laughter is just as admissible in great literature, posing universal problems, as seriousness. Certain essential aspects of the world are accessible only to laughter” [Bakhtin, 66]

Bakhtin’s notion of carnivalesque and the laughter are closely connected with the conception of grotesque. According to Bakhtin, in creating the carnivalesque language and also the laughter effect the grotesque has an important role. The term is used mainly to refer to human attitudes like sexual intercourse, eating, shitting. This grotesque language of the carnival allows the transition from the rigid narratives of the Medieval Europe to the Rabelais’ masterpiece. The comic or humorous effect of the work, bad language used are the greatest example of carnivalesque literature for Bakhtin.

The essence of the grotesque is precisely to present a contradictory and double-faced fullness of life. Negation and destruction (death of the old) are included as an essential phase, inseparable from affirmation, from the birth of something new and better. The very material bodily lower stratum of the grotesque image (food, wine, the genital force, the organs of the body) bears a deeply positive character. This principle is victorious, for the final result is always abundance, increase. [62]

Although, for Bakhtin, there had been always a chorus of people laughing through the course of life, there had not been always a Rabelais for every single period of time. Despite having been the chief of the chorus for the medieval ages Rabelais can be regarded one of the important characters of the history literature who put light onto the grotesque and carnivalesque language of the public. [Bakhtin, 509] But there are certainly other figures who were also special characters for the history of literature on special break or turn points by creating the burlesque through the language of grotesque and carnivalesque in deconstructing the relations of power and authority.

3.3. Burlesque

In literary criticism, the term burlesque is used as a term in genre criticism. A piece of literary work can be described as a burlesque work in case humour is derived from a piece of high literature by constituting a contrast between genre, style, and subject. In most dictionaries of literature of studies on burlesque, the term is defined almost in the same way: “In literature, comic imitation of a serious literary or artistic form that relies on an extravagant incongruity between a subject and its treatment. Burlesque is closely related to parody, although burlesque is generally broader and coarser.” As the definition itself discloses burlesque is closely related to parody. The distinction between to stylistic manners can be put into words in a historical frame as follows:

The modern reduction of parody to a type of burlesque is descriptions of it in the eighteenth century and after has already been seen to have limited the meaning of the more ancient definitions and uses of parody. Not only is the term burlesque of more recent origin than of the Greek words for parody, but it is usually described as being derived from the Italian *burla*, meaning a joke of trick, rather than from equivalents for the words from which the term parody is derived, and is for this reason, and the meanings given to it by its early users, less able to describe the way in which the parody (or ‘*para-ode*’) imitates and than comically transforms other works in ambiguous and often complex meta-fictional ways. [On the other hand] some burlesque does not even require a specific literary model, and the word has been used to describe a variety of types of comic and even non-comic entertainments. [Rose, 54]

While mentioning “some burlesque does not even require a specific literary model” Rose is probably trying to stress that only a literary genre can be burlesqued, but not a specific literary text. In other words a certain piece of literature can be parodied and in this sense burlesque had a broader meaning than parody. So, a burlesque text does not need a source text to be referred. While creating a parody the writer directly or indirectly has to refer to a previous text, but a burlesque text only refers to a tradition.

...every parody refers at every point to historical knowledge that that is in a sense “outside itself” -that is , previous literary works- and thus to more or less probable genres... In parody ... we discover a curiously doubled external reference... in reading parody, we make use of external reference to other authors in order to understand how the parody attacks those same authors: the thing referred to, externally, to assist in comprehension, is the same thing referred to, externally, as the object of ridicule. [Booth, 123]

What constitutes a burlesque piece literature is not this net of references, but on the other hand creating a burlesque text lies on the elements of genre or characteristics of genre. In fact only a serious kind of genre is burlesqued by means of daily, grotesque language and the subject of the artistic work becomes coarser and mostly has references to sexuality. Creating the new literary work by means of this literary attitude also means that the subject of this new piece of literature targets a certain literature and a certain type / genre of literature, but not a specific text of a special artist. The very first difference between parody and burlesque lies here. The literary procedures can be defined by referring to genres and forms. We can pick an example from the field of Ottoman court literature and focus on the difference between *hez̤el* and *tehz̤îl*. *Hez̤el* is formally just like the lyric form *gaz̤el*. The detail on *hez̤el* would be discussed in the next chapter of the thesis. Though, on the other hand, *tehz̤îl* is also derived from *hez̤el* linguistically, *tehz̤îl* has a very different meaning than *hez̤el*. When we talk about the *tehz̤îl* of a poem we mean that the poem is parodied. In other words *hez̤el* can be translated as burlesque while *tehz̤îl* means parody. We refer to a *tehz̤îl* by Cem Dilçin. The *tehz̤îl* is the parody of one of the most well-known stories of Eastern literatures: Leylâ and Mecnûn. The title of Cem Dilçin's *tehz̤îl* is as follows: "mecnûn-nâme (tehz̤îl-i leylâ vü mecnûn)". In fact the introductory part of the poem also supports this allegation:

mecnûn-nâme
(tehz̤îl-i leylâ vü mecnûn)

ey neş'et-i 'aşkı şî're te'sir kılan
vezn ile binâ-yı nazmı ta'mîr kılan
evzân u kavâfîyi girih-gîr kılan
zîhn-i şu'arâ beynine zencîr kılan

kılsam taleb-i hicv ile îhâm u mecâz
tehz̤îl bahânesiyle 'arz itsem râz
elfâz-ı kadîmeyle günü itsem sâz
emsâl-i zamâneyle düni kılsam bâz

luğf ile şeb-i fikrümü çün rûz eyle
tehz̤îlümü telmîh ile dil-dûz eyle
nazmumu fuzûlî kimi efrûz eyle
hezlümü sürûrî kimi cân-sûz eyle [230]

When we read the whole story of Cem Dilçin we can easily notice that the work is certainly the parody of the love story Leyla and Mecnun. Dilçin transfers the story into

modern times and rewrites the story in a humorous manner with the language of daily life. But the language in the parody is not grotesque.

The second element what constitutes the difference between parody and burlesque lies in the language used. While in both styles the language of daily life is used, the language in burlesque texts is also grotesque or coarse. We can refer here again to Bakhtin. Though writers of burlesque texts are aiming to some extent to create a humorous effect they also have some kind of problem with tradition and somehow they have some kind of struggle against the tradition. The authority of the traditional literature is destroyed and sometimes deconstructed in the burlesque texts by means of a coarse language or if we put it with the words of Bakhtin with the grotesque and carnivalesque language. By doing this besides creating a humorous effect another and more importantly an important effect is created. This new effect brings the possibility of breaking the construction of the traditional. After a general burlesque attitude towards the literature the traditional cannot be evaluated or regarded same as in the past.

In this context, if we stress once again, burlesque is a much freer style than the parody on the grounds that a burlesque work is not limited to a special piece of literature or story. Burlesque texts do not focus on a certain artist or poet, but on the contrary on a genre or a style to create a special effect of literature on a different level of artistic attempt. Within the context of Ottoman court literature this shift in the level of the literature also brings a shift in the code of references constituted by the tradition. In fact what makes the effect is the language used in the burlesque texts. The language in burlesque pieces is certainly grotesque and being grotesque makes the artistic work shaking and forces the reader to think again on the presuppositions of the traditional literature. How burlesque texts are created and why this period of time is rich of burlesque texts would be discussed in the next chapter. But we can quote a short *hez̧el* by Sürûrî to make the point a little bit clearer. A certain poem of poet was not targeted in this poem and the language is simple, daily and also grotesque. What is interesting is the rhyme of the poem. The rhyme of this *hez̧el* is one of the most common words of Ottoman court poetry: “bûlbûl”, that is nightingale representing the lover in Ottoman poetry.

yapsın o bizim evde yuva boqluca blbl
blbl deresin adırır a boqluca blbl

baqlu sepedinden kafesim var tutabilsem
bo argası odum aa yâ boqluca blbl

taqld-i kibâr ile sıtanblda besler
kârzcilik eden fuarâ boqluca blbl

br bo sinegi name ile ıdı helâdan
kim uyduramaz aa adâ boqluca blbl

seyrine zemâne ocuu gt verir elbet
gsterse ulâm-pâre aa boqluca blbl

bâşurlu bzk ır ır edince oşururken
gyâ kim olur name-serâ boqluca blbl

şıdı şıvadı hâşılı outdu yuvâsın
tebdl-i maâm etse revâ boqluca blbl

bir alını altında hevâyî şııyorken
etmiş başı stnde nevâ boqluca blbl

CHAPTER IV

INTERTEXTUALITY, BURLESQUE AND OTTOMAN POETRY

In order to constitute a burlesque literary work the composer, creator of the burlesque one has to keep some characteristics of the imitated work and change, deform some other characteristics. In our case what was changed is the matter, subject of the poem. But what remains without any change is also a matter of discussion.

The intertextual relations are constituted in several ways within the tradition of Ottoman literature. Though burlesque a medium of this kind constitution Mine Mengi did not referred to this type of relation in her article on intertextual relation in Ottoman poetry:

Her metin kendi döneminin başka metinleriyle ya da daha önce yazılmış öteki metinlerle yer yer, biçim, içerik, tür ve anlatım özellikleri bakımından alıntı, yakınlık, benzerlik ilişkisi içinde bulunur. Bununla; edebi metinlerin sürekli bir ilişki içinde başka metinlerin etkileri ve katkılarıyla ortaya çıktığını söylemek istiyoruz. Daha açıkçası pek çok metin açık ya da kapalı bir biçimde başka metinlerle iç içedir; başka metinlere göndermede bulunur. Çünkü her edebi metin doğal olarak belirli bir kültürün içinde ortaya çıkar. Bu durum her metnin aslında kültür ortaklığı yönünden bir alıntılar mozaigi olarak okunması gerektiğini; başka metinleri de içine alabileceğini ifade etmektedir. [593]

Verdiğimiz *tazmin* ve *tabmis* örneklerinden başka; *terbi*, *taştir* de yine *tanzir* geleneğiyle bağlantılı olan ve bizi metinlerarası ilişkilerin varlığı düşüncesine götürecektir kavramlardır. Ayrıca *tevarüt*, *iktibas*, vb de bu bağlamda düşünülmelidir. [597]

Divan şiirinde söz sanatları olarak bilinen *telmih*, *benzer teşbih*, *kalıplaşmış istiare* ve *mecaz* da yine yukarıda değindiğimiz aynı kültür içindeki ortak

kullanımlar olarak anılan metin ortaklıkları ile bağlantılıdır. Çünkü, telmihte bilinen belli bir olay, durum ya da şahıslara gönderme; kalıp mecaz, mürsel mecaz ve istiarede ise belli durum, şahıs ve varlıklara yapılan gönderme, teşbih ve istiarede ise benzer varlık, durum ve olayları anımsatma, dolaylı ya da örtülü anlatım yoluyla yine ortak kültürün değişik metinleri arasındaki ilişkiyi sağlamaktadır. [598]

But burlesque as it is defined in the previous chapter of this thesis is one of the fundamental mediums of intertextuality, especially during periods of literary crisis. I am going to take the poems of Enderûnî Fâzıl Bey, Sünbül-zâde Vehbî and Sürûrî in accordance with the burlesque as defined “witty parody or travesty of piece of literature using the same formal elements” [Pala, 306].

4.1. Formal Element

Metre

The metre of court literature during the Ottoman era was *aruz*. The metre is mainly based on the order of short and long syllables. And different patterns of *aruz* were used in the poems of Enderûnî Fâzıl Bey, Sünbül-zâde Vehbî and Sürûrî.

The metre used in *Çengî-nâme* was *Fâ'ilâtün/Fe'ilâtün - Fe'ilâtün - Fe'iliün/ Fa'lün* pattern of *bahr-i remel*. We can declare that the metre was used by Enderûnî Fâzıl Bey all most perfectly except for few mistakes.

The same pattern of *aruz* was used by Sünbül-zâde Vehbî in *Şevk-engîz*. Though we can find more hitches in the poem of Vehbî it is certain that he was also master of the metre.

The important point here is both poets used the most popular metre of the *mesnevî* form while writing their poems in this form.

On the other hand we cannot mention a single pattern of *aruz* for Sürûrî on the grounds that he had been writing *hezel* which is *gazel*-like form and shorter than the above-mentioned poems. So also used several pattern of *aruz* in his poems. But we can refer to “Appendix D” how refined he was using the metre by quoting few couplets from two different poems.

Form

Enderûnî Fâzıl Bey wrote his *Çengî-nâme* with quatrains and using this form is not common. But even then the poem can to some extent be evaluated a revised version of *mesnevî*. In fact the genre *Çengî-nâme* belongs to, which I am going to discuss below, is mostly written in *mesnevî* form.

Şevk-engîz of Vehbî was also written in *mesnevî* form. The form was frequently used for long poems, especially for love stories. All the couplets are rhymed each other in this form and in fact the meaning of the word is double referring to the rhymed couplets. *Çengî-nâme* is 472 lines and *Şevk-engîz* is almost 800 lines. So the best literary form to write both poems was *mesnevî* and both poets used this form.

Despite above-mentioned two long poems Sürûrî's *bezels* are shorter poems. They were written in the form of *gazel*, which is most frequently used form in Ottoman literature. Shortly described, *gazels* are lyric poems of the tradition. Literal meaning of the word is "poem written to a beautiful woman".

Rhyme

Since the poem was composed of quatrains the rhyme order was also related to the form. The first three lines of the quatrain have the same rhyme, but the last line has always the same rhyme in every quatrain as in the following quatrains:

evvelâ cümleñiñ aķ babası
köhne kâr-dân ħaranıñ da'vâsı
şöhret-i kâzibedir ħavgâsı
beli yıldız gibi 'aşıkları var

The parts of the poem are distinguished also with the use of rhyme. In the very first quatrain of every part the first, second and last lines are rhymed as follows:

ħamda lâyıķ o cihân dâveri var
kâ'inâtıñ heman ol serveri var
eyleyen hüsnü rızâ 'aşkı ħaza
nice ħikmetle tecellileri var

Sünbül-zâde Vehbî wrote his poem in the form of *mesnevî* and the rhyme was also used as it had to be used in a piece of *mesnevî*. In *mesnevî* form every couplet is supposed to be rhymed within itself. We can see it on an example by quoting the last two couplets of the poem:

belki derler ne güzel nazm-ı laţîf
yazmıř ol pîr-i cihân tab'-ı zarîf

lafz u ma'nâsı 'aceb zevk-âmîz
nâmı olsa yakışır şevk-engîz

As we see in these two couplets the rhyme in the former is “îf” an is “îz” in the latter.

For the *hezels* of Sürûrî the rhyme is also simple. Since *hezêl* is written formally just like the Ottoman lyric form *gazel*, the rhyme is used in the same way. The first couplet has the same rhyme in itself and the same rhyme is used in the second line of every couplet:

kîr-i ħardan şanırim boyda uzundur yarağım
at sikinden de ħalınlıkda füzûndur yarağım
kışa ħalın mı yaĥûd ince uzun mu dersen
işte al baĥ hem uzun hem de yoğundur yarağım
cündiler binse eger oturamaz üstünde
şâh ħalkar yavuz atdan da ħarûndur yarağım

All these uses are common and accepted by the tradition.

4.2. Vocabulary

The vocabulary used in these poems is the most complicated part of the discussion. Though the language is much simpler than the language used in the Ottoman court poetry we can still register lots of words, compounds or phrases used in most poems of the Ottoman court literature. What is special to these poems is not only use of fewer Persian or Arabic expressions but also the way how they are excluded. These poems and poets evaluated worse followers of the so-called localisation movement. The main characteristic of the movement is uncomplicated lines and uses of daily language in the sense of Bakhtinian *carnivalesque*.

4.3. Characteristics of *Çengî-nâme*, *Şevk-engîz* and *Hezels*

Three poems under discussion are examples of three different genres. *Çengî-nâme* of Enderûnî Fâzıl Bey is a sample of *şehr-engîz* genre. On the other hand *Şevk-engîz* of Sünbül-zâde Vehbî is an example of *münâzarâ*. Lastly *hezêl* is the grotesque counterpart of the Ottoman lyric poem *gazel*.

The very first samples of *şehr-engîz* genre had been started to be written in the 16th century. There are almost 70 samples of this kind of poems and several academic

studies were released on the samples and genre itself.¹² The term *şehr-engîz* is simply translated into English as “city-thriller” and the subject of the genre is the beautiful boys of a city. The important part of the samples is there are quite few direct references to sexuality or sexual intercourse. Though there are few examples of the genre explicitly referring to sexuality we can put them aside on the grounds that those samples are called *bezel* just like the *şehr-engîz* of Fehîm-i Kadîm.

The formal constitution of genre is summarised by Stewart-Robinson as follows by referring to Gibb:

...they all have three divisions: *Prolog*, *Catalog* and *Epilog*. The *Prolog*... is in several parts. The first, in observance of traditional Islamic practice, is an address to God... The *sebeb-i te'lîf* (reason for the composition) usually comes next in the *prolog*... The *Catalog* portion [is] in honor of the youths of the city... Every *shehregiz* ends with an *Epilog*, the shortest part of the three-part poem. It is used, as a rule, to sum up the essential purpose of the poem... [205-6-7]

If we check the parts of the *Çengî-nâme* we will find following parts:

Münâcât: 7 quatrains
Sebeb-i Nazm: 28 quatrains
Mâhiyyet-i Çengîyân: 73 quatrains
Hâtîme: 10 quatrains

As these parts implies the poem is formally just like a *şehr-engîz*. *Münâcât* and *Sebeb-i Nazm* are the parts of *Prolog*, *Mâhiyyet-i Çengîyân* is the *Catalog*, and *Hâtîme* refers to *Epilog*. But what makes the difference: First of all the poem is composed of quatrains which is certainly a characteristic of pieces of folk literature. Besides the language used the way the poem is composed also forces us to make reference what Bakhtin calls *carnavalesque*. But also the subject matter of the poem is the dancing boys and it leaves no space for different interpretations than that the poems is certainly on sexuality, which we cannot find in other samples of the genre. The poem also has explicit references to sexuality.

Şevk-engîz of Vehbî is a sample of *münâzarâ* genre. The literary meaning of the name of the genre is either debate or contention. There are several samples of the genre in Ottoman literature. The genre is based on a discussion between two persons or a

¹² As I mentioned in the first chapter of this thesis, for details you can see my review article “‘‘Türk Edebiyatında Şehr-engîzler’’” on the genre to be published in *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* in 2007.

group of persons on a certain subject. Both sides put their arguments in connection with the subject. The samples of genre are mostly allegoric poems. The style was described as follows by Mustaf İsen:

Belli bir konuda bazı kurallar dahilinde birden fazla kişinin ya da grubun katılımıyla yapılan, destekçileri ve karşıtları bulunan karşılıklı tartışma, fikir alışverişi. Tartışmacılar kendi düşüncelerini tezler halinde ileri sürer ve bu görüşlerini getirdikleri örnekler ve delillerle ispatlama yoluna giderler. Eski Türk edebiyatında da, alegorik mahiyette, bazıları karışık olmak kaydıyla manzum-mensur pek çok münazara örneği vardır. [253]

In our case two persons discuss on sexual tendencies.

naql eder bir sülhan-ârâ-yı cihân
pîr-i şûzîde dil-i tâze beyân
der ki var idi iki ehl-i fücûr
şehr-i İstanbul içinde meşhûr
birisi sürmeli zen-pâre idi
biri gök gözlü gulâm-pâre idi
ikisi biri birinden rüsvâ
iki şeytân idiler recme sezâ
her biri mâhir idi kârında
şan'at-ı müfsidin âşârında
kullanıp kârların gündeliğe
işemezdi ikisi bir deliğe
iki mışrâ' idi gûyâ gidiler
ma'la'-ı şî'r hevâyî idiler
geçmedi yerlere ol iki gidi
şanki bir çifte çatal kazık idi [112]

And the parts' titles are summarised as follows by Jan Schmidt:

- | | |
|---------|---|
| 1-8 | Introduction: the two protagonists, rather interlocutors, debauchers from Istanbul, are introduced |
| 9-106 | A characterization of the behaviour of the first interlocutor: a lover of woman (<i>zenpâre</i>) with the telling name of Suyolcızâde, «the son of a man responsible for the maintenance of water conduits», water conduit alluding here to the female sexual organ |
| 107-200 | A characterization of the behaviour of the second interlocutor: a pederast (<i>gulâmpâre</i>) with the no less telling name of Kazıkçı yegeni: «the nephew of swindlers»; <i>kazık</i> , meaning literally « pole»; which alludes to the male sex |

	organ – it also is a wrestling term, meaning «putting one hand deeply into the opponent’s shorts»
201-209	Introduction to the following discussion
210-335	A monologue by Suyolcızâde, singing the praises of women and sex with women
336-449	A monologue by Kazıkçı yegeni, singing the praises of boys and sex with boys
450-532	Criticism of Kazıkçı yegeni by Suyolcızâde, censuring boys and sex with boys
533-623	Criticism of Suyolcızâde by Kazıkçı yegeni, censuring women and sex with women
624-777	The colloquy halts; the two protagonists turn to an old sage (<i>pîr</i>) and ask him his opinion on their behaviour; the old man answers that only spiritual love provides deliverance; the two debauchers repent; colophon by the poet containing his pen-name, a <i>captatio benevolentiae</i> and explanation of the poem’s title. [17]

Though the poem was written in the form of a *münâzarâ*, the subject is completely different than any other samples of the genre. The formal elements remain, but the subject of the matter changes. And the poem includes really explicit uses of sexual references and Schmidt cites following lines to found his argument that the poem is pornographic work:

Suyolcızâde fucked Vehbî’s wife
 Kazıkçı yegeni did a good turn to his son’s ass
 He wrote it down for them, composed his *Şevk-engîz*
 He is the old pander of the world, he loves his prick so much
 vehbînüñ ‘avratını sikdi şuyolcızâde
 oğlı püştini şıraya çekdi kazıkçı yegeni
 hıtt edüb anlara nazm eyledi şevk-engîz
 kıoca deyyüş-i cihândür sever öyle sikini

Since *hez̤el* is written in the Ottoman lyric form *gaz̤el*, we have to define the form at the beginning:

... the *gaz̤el* has love contexts. This appears to be true within a very broad interpretation of the term “love”. That is, under the rubric “love” would come romantic love -man/woman and man/man- love of the Divine, love of a ruler or patron or friend, love as the contemplation of beauty, love as desire in general, love as intoxication and selflessness, etc. Moreover, each aspect and type of love will bring with it one or more standard, interrelated sub-contexts; e.g., the garden, wine-gathering, the dervish, etc. To say that the *gaz̤el* is “about” love is still rather misleading. Love is in the *gaz̤el* a strategy; it

is a microcosm in which a far vaster world is reflected. Love relationships hope, deceit, despair -in the entire range of human emotions which may occur for any of the myriad reasons which life in this world offers, but which the *gazel* writer chooses to express through the terminology and contexts of love. [Andrews 140-141]

Within this frame we can focus on the *hezeli* as a counterpart of the *gazel*. Though *hezeli* is mostly described in dictionaries as satire written in a grotesque manner against persons, we do not find even a single poem written to a certain person in the *Hezliyyât* part of Sürûrî's compilation.¹³ In order to understand the way Sürûrî writes his *hezels* we can refer to Rabelais. At some point Gargantua reads a *rondeau* which is the lyric poem of Latin, French and also English literature:

RONDEAU

Yesterday, shitting, I did know
The profit to my arse I owe
Such was the smell that from it slunk
That I was with it all bestunk
Oh, had but then someone consented
To bring meher for whom I waited,
 Whilst shitting!
I would have closed her waterpipe
In my rough way and bunged it up,
While she had with her fingers guarded
My jolly arsehole all bemedded
 With shitting [Rabelais 37]¹⁴

¹³ Though there are several *hezels* in the "Gazeliyyât" part of the compilation I would rather focus on the "Hezliyyât" part.

¹⁴ For the Turkish translation of the first book of *The Histories of Gargantua and Pantagruel* see: Rabelais. *Gargantua*. çev. Sabahattin Eyüboğlu, Azra Erhat, Vedat Günyol. İstanbul : Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2002.

The Turkish translation is formally more like a *ghazel*. Since the form is like a *ghazel* and the subject is "shitting" it turns that the poem is some kind of *hezeli*.

RONDO

Anladım geçen gün sıçarken
Kıçıma ne borçluymuşum ben
Bu kez bir başka türlüydü koku
Tüm üstüm başım pis pis koktu
Ah bir alıp getirseydi
O beklediğim sevgiliyi
 Sıçarken
Çiş deliğini kapardım iyice
O benim hoyrat usulümce
Parmaklarıyla da sevgilim
Bok deliğimi tıkarıdı benim
 Sıçarken [82]

While Gargantua reads a rondeau on “shitting”, Sürûrî writes a *hez̤el* on “getting sick” by using the lyric form of poetry. Within this frame of interpretation I can allege that any kind of *hez̤el* should not be regarded as satire of a person, but instead it is the satire of the poem or literary style or literary form within the conception of burlesque.

‘araķ içmiş idim lakin mey-âlâud eyledim ķuşdum
ne ĥalt etdim ke kendim böyle bî-ĥod eyledim ķuşdum
yüzüne karşı içdim şihneniĥ şahbâ-yı kûn-â-kûn
ki tâvûs kuyruĥu renginde maĥdûd eyledim ķuşdum
baķın balıķ etinde şuĥdur talyancınıĥ oĥlu
içip mey ‘aşķına ekel-i palâmûd eyledim ķuşdum
zenaĥdânıĥ taşvîriĥle meze rindâne ey sâķî
münâsib sîb idi ben nuķlum emrûd eyledim ķuşdum
olup dil-sûĥte ‘aşķıĥla düşdüm âlem-i ‘âba
ki yan monlâ gibi nâmûsu nâ-bûd eyledim ķuşdum
yedim semt-i ĥalebde bir pilâv ismi sût’âl etdim
‘arab ķuşķuş deyince bezl-i meĥûd eyledim ķuşdum
hevâyî-veş muķayyi’ ĥab alıp külĥâncı oĥlundan
yudunca kilyemi âĥımla pür-dûd eyledim ķuşdum

4.4. Burlesque and Travesty in Ottoman XVIIIth Century Literature

Kemal Silay stresses the widespread uses of curses, slang and vulgarity in the 18th century while he was interpreting the case Sünbül-zâde Vehbi and his “Sühan Kasidesi [Poem on Poetry]” in his book entitled *Nedim and the Poetics of the Ottoman Court*.

Yet it is also evident that while he is criticizing the poets who contaminated their *divâns* with “base” values in a “base” language, he himself is doing in his satire what he actually opposes. For example, calling the “bad” poets of his time “sons of bitches” and non-sense-talking impostors exhibits one of the typical characteristics of the discourse of the eighteenth century in which numerous poets uses curses, slang and vulgarity. Although such elements can be found earlier, the use of these kinds of expressions was never before as widespread as in eighteenth century poetry. [114]

The fact determined by Kemal Silay has a real importance for summarising the change in the Ottoman court literature. Though there were other samples of this kind uses in the Ottoman poetry, the attitude of using such expressions became somehow general characteristics or at least one of the mainstream tendencies in poetry. In fact, what should be analysed is this development and the motives of this shift. As

Auerbach puts it when dealing with Rabelais work Gargantua “there is developed an entirely different, entirely new, and, at the period, extremely current theme -the theme of the discovery of a new world, with all the astonishment, the widening horizons and change in the world picture, which follow upon such a discovery” [270]. There must be certainly reasons of this literary turn. In order to be able to explain this change, this turn in the Ottoman literature we can visit for a while another literature. Another literary experience can be helpful for our understanding. İhsan Yarşâtur, expert on Persian literature, lists all the accounts of explanations of the decline in traditional Persian literature. And he asks how the classical tradition ended with formalism and sophistication. He ends his interpretation with a simple explanation:

This survey apparently leaves us with no explanation for the decline of the classical tradition at the end of the Safavid period. It seems to me, however, that in all the accounts presented so far, a simple explanation has been left out. We have been offered every possible reason for the weakening state of an octogenarian without mentioning his age. Persian poetry does no more than follow a general pattern of development common to all arts. It begins with the simplicity and directness that characterize the earlier stages of an art and leads to the complexity and exaggerated formalism that plague all arts toward their end, when creative energy is expended.

At the dawn of an art form, as in the springtime of a nascent culture, the pulsations of an active and searching spirit give birth to new forms and new ideas. If it is allowed to follow its own course and is not stifled or diverted by other currents, in time it gains the elegance and the maturity characteristic of middle age. Elegance leads to refinement, and this already contains the seeds of decay. Gradually sophistication and formalism replace the expression of heartfelt sentiments. Art becomes over-intellectualized; clever, but no longer inspired. In the end it is halted in “perpetual turning up of new facets of a crystallized and undevelopable thought-stock...”

No art form, and indeed no culture, has continued in strength forever. Sooner or later an inward erosion sets in, and the art or style loses its creative capacity and its inner vitality. [Yarshater 286-287 (234)]¹⁵

At some point Ottoman literature faced the same problem. After reaching the peak it started to decline. Ottoman literature entered a period of formalism and sophistication, too. Kayahan Özgül offers to call this period “baroque” for the same

¹⁵ For the Turkish translation of the article see: Yarshater, Ehsan. “Sebki Hindî ya da Tarz-ı Safavî: İlerleme mi gerileme mi?” *Sözde ve anlamda farklılaşma: Sebki-i Hindî*. [haz. Hatice Aynur, Müjgân Çakır ve Hanife Koncu.] çev. Barış Karacasu. İstanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları, 2006: 192-235.

reason [387]. He also adds that one of the characteristics of this period was change in the subject, but he relates this change to humour. Özgül founds his argument on the grounds that the poets wanted to change the tradition and in order not to be criticised they used humour. But I think this was not the fact. They certainly knew what they were doing. They were using all the literary elements which constituted the traditional Ottoman court poetry, except for the subject. They were purely literary and as Jan Schmidt stressed “if the metaphors, punning, wordplay, the comic obscenities... were eliminated or cast in the form of dry prose, not much would remain of [these] work[s]” [191]. The period of decline was combined with the appearances of burlesque pieces of literature. And those texts were the medium for the traditional poetry to reach the end.

CONCLUSION

In a series of articles which had been published first in Ottoman Turkish in the journal *Felsefe ve İctimaiyyât* and afterwards compiled in a book under the title *Divan Edebiyatı: Kelimeler ve Remizler, Maḥmunlar ve Meḥbunlar* Agâh Sırrı Levend lists the sources of the Ottoman court literature. Besides other sources he also counts the *beḫel-âmiḫ*, satirical or humorous works under the title “Diđer Hususiyetler / Other Elements” without paying special attention:

- I - Tasavvuf, Din ve Felsefe: Tasavvuf - mjhhtelif tarikatler - hurufilik - beктаşilik - ŧer’î akideler, kelâm - hikmet-i kadime - Allah ve kainat.
- II - İman ve İtikat: Kur’an - hadis- enbiya kıssaları - mucizeler.
- III - Tarih ve Esâtir: Tarihî şahsiyetler - efsânevî kahramanlar - efsaneler - rivayetler.
- IV - Bâtıl ve Hakikî Bilgiler: Kimya - simya - nücüm - zâyırçe - reml - sihr ve tılsım - kıyafet - musikî - diđer ilimler.
- V - Hayat: Hayat ve edebiyat - ramazan - bayram - hamam - düğünler - merasimler - zamaneden ŧikâyetler.
- VI - Bezm ü Rezm: Bezm - iŧret âletleri - rezm - cenk âletleri - atlar.
- VII - Hâdiseler: Tarihî hâdiseler - tarihler - hâdiselerden ilhamlar.
- VIII - Âdet ve Ahlâk: Sihhat - ilm ve san’at - madde ve tabiat - inanmalar - bazı âdetler.
- IX - Âdet ve Ahlâk: Darbimeseller - tâbirler.
- X - San’at ve Güzellik Telâkkisi: San’at ve tasannu’ - edebî san’atlar - güzel nedir?

XI - Diğer Hususiyetler: Hecv ü müzah - medh ü fahr - tazallüm - rind ü zâhid - muamma ve lûgaz.

XII - Mefhumlar: Tabiat - kadın ve aşk - Türk ve Anadolu - vatan ve millet - İstanbul. [9-10]

As Ağâh Sırrı Levend points out those burlesque and humorous pieces of literature had little importance for the historians of literature. But, on the other hand, we can easily follow the traces of these pieces of literature through out the history of Ottoman literature. Thinking on the value of these works may lead to new expansions on the history of Turkish literature. If we start to list those kinds of literary works we would certainly see that there were lots of examples of those grotesque, burlesque and even travesty works. And we should also keep in mind that the writers of those texts were also high-ranked persons / officials in the Ottoman Empire era. Under these circumstances instead of alleging that these works do not have any literary value, we should focus on the political, social, and especially literary dimensions of those pieces. Though there are academic works based on some samples of those pieces of literature there is no comprehensive and systematic study of them. By comprehensive and systematic study I mean interpretation of those pieces, but not releasing the text itself. And after all 18th century is special for the richness of burlesque literature. Even in “true” / “genuine” literary works have references to those works. For instance, Keçeci-zâde İzzet makes the following reference to Fâzıl and Vehbî in his famous *Mihnet-keşân*:

budur berg-i sebz-i diyâr-ı keşan
n'ola olsa mağbûl-i miñnet-keşan
degildir kızıkçı hikâyâtı bu
degildir şu yolcu rivâyâtı bu
degildir zenân-nâmesi fâzılıñ
degil kârı zen-pâre-i câhiliñ [458]

But, unfortunately, such burlesque pieces of literature were not recognised as a part of literary history. In order to constitute a burlesque literary work the composer, creator of the burlesque one has to keep some characteristics of the imitated work and change, deform some other characteristics. In our case what was changed is the matter, subject of the poem. But what remains without any change is also a matter of discussion. In fact, besides having close relation to the literary canon of the Ottoman

literature they were also closely connected to the tradition by means of formal elements like metre, form, and rhyme; vocabulary and literary characteristics.

In this context, I would like to stress once again, a burlesque work is not limited to a special piece of literature or story. Burlesque texts do not focus on a certain artist or poet, but on the contrary on a genre or a style to create a special effect of literature on a different level of artistic attempt. Within the context of Ottoman court literature this shift in the level of the literature also brings a shift in the code of references constituted by the tradition. The poems of Enderûnî Fâzıl Bey, Sünbül-zâde Vehbî and Sürûrî are proper examples for founding this argument and they represent the change in the tradition. And certainly they appeared at the dusk of the classical!

REFERENCES

- Abdülhalim Gâlib Paşa. *Mutayyebat-ı Türkiyye*. y.y.: y.y., 13??.
- Ahmed Cevdet Paşa. *Belâgat-i Osmaniye*. tıpkıbasım. İstanbul: Mimar Sinan Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1987.
- Aktulum, Kubilây. *Metinlerarası İlişkiler*. Ankara: Öteki Yayınevi, 1999.
- Andrews, Walter G. *An Introduction to Ottoman Poetry*. Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1976.
- Auerbach, Erich. "The world in Pantegruel's Mouth" in *Mimesis*. tr. Willord R. Trask. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991: 262-284.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and his World*. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1984.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais ve Dünyası*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları, 2005.
- Banarlı, Nihad, Sami. *Resimli Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1998.
- Bardakçı, Murat. *Osmanlı'da Seks: Sarayda Gece Dersleri*. 6. baskı. İstanbul: Gür Yayınları, Aralık 1993.
- Başgöz, İlhan and Pertev Naili Boratav. *I, Hoca Nasreddin, Never Shall I Die: A Thematic Analysis Of Hoca Stories*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Turkish Studies, 1998.
- Berrong, Richard M. *Rabelais and Bakhtin*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1986.

- Booth, Wayne C. *A Rhetoric of Irony*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Bursalı Mehmed Tahir. *Osmanlı Müellifleri*. Haz. A. Fikri Yavuz-İsmail Özen. İst: 1972.
- Dane, Joseph A. *Parody: Critical Concepts Versus Literary Practices, Aristophanes to Sterne*. Norman and Londen: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Dentith, Simon. *Parody*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Dilçin. Cem. “Mecnûn-nâme (Tehzîl-i Leylâ vü Mecnûn)” *Journal of Turkish Studies*.
- Donald, J., E. Grosz, K. Robins, D. Mazzoleni, G. Ching, L. Low, Glenn Bowman. *Yitik Ülke Masalları: Kimlik ve Yer Sorunsalı*. Çev. Türkan Yöney. İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınları, 1996.
- Elden, Stuart. “Through the Eyes of the Fantastic: Lefebvre, Rabelais and Intellectual History” *Historical Materialism* (volume 10:4): 89–111.
- Enderunlu Fâzıl. *Defter-i Aşk, Hûbân-nâme, Zenân-nâme, Çengî-nâme*. İstanbul: Matbaa-i Âmire, 1253/1837
- Enderunlu Fâzıl. *Defter-i Aşk, Hûbân-nâme, Zenân-nâme, Çengî-nâme*. İstanbul: Ali Rıza Efendi Matbaası, 1286/1870
- Enderunlu Fâzıl. *Hubanname ve Zenanname*. Haz.: Ercümen Muhib. [Y.y.]: Yeni Şark Kitabevi, 1945.
- Enderunlu Fâzıl. *Hûbân-nâme, Zenân-nâme, Rakkâs-nâme*. y.y.: y.y., 1255/1839
- Enderunlu Fâzıl. *Zenân-nâme: Kadınlar Kitabı: Book of Women*. Ankara: AltÜst Yayınları, 2006.
- Gibb, E.J.W.. *History of Ottoman Literature: The Poets and Poetry of Turkey*. vol. IV. New York-Londra: 1901.
- Halman, Talât Sait. “Shahrangiz” *The Encyclopedia of Islam*, New Edition. cilt IX. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997: 212-213.
- Hammer-Prugstall, Joseph von. *Geschichte der Osmanischen Dichtkunst bis auf Unsere Zeit*. Pesth: Conrad Adolph Hartleben’s Verlag, 1838.
- Holbrook, Victoria Rowe. *The Unreadable Shores of Love: Turkish Modernity and Mystic Romance*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1994.
- Iz, Fahir. *Saltuk-name: the legend of Sarı Saltuk / collected from oral tradition by Ebu’l Hayr Rumi. Text in facsimile with a critical and stylistic analysis and index by Fahir Iz*. Cambridge, Mass.: Orient Press, 1974.

- İsen, Dr. Mustafa, Dr. Muhsin Macit, Dr. Osman Horata, Dr. Filiz Kılıç ve Dr. İ. Hakkı Aksoyak. *Eski Türk Edebiyatı El Kitabı*. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2002 ve 2003.
- İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1970.
- İz, Fahir. *Saltuk-nâme*. Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1981.
- Jusdanis, Gregory, *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture: Inventing National Literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991.
- Kaçalin, Mustafa. “Abdülhalim Galip Paşa’nın Mutâyebât-ıTürkiyye’si” *Journal of Turkish Studies (Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları)*. 24/I (2000): 137-185..
- Koçu, Reşad Ekrem. “Çenginâme” *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*. İstanbul: Tan Yayınları, 1958: 3845-47.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.
- Kuru, Selim Sırrı. “Sex in the Text: Deli Birader’s Dâfi‘ü’l-gumûm ve Râfi‘ü’l-humûm and the Ottoman Literary Canon” *The Journal of Middle Eastern Literatures*. (forthcoming).
- Lefebvre, Henri. *Rabelais*. Paris: Anthropos, 2001.
- Levend, Ağâh Sırrı. *Divan Edebiyatı: Kelimeler ve Remizler, Mazmunlar ve Mefhumlar*. İstanbul: İnkılap Kitapevi, 1943.
- Levend, Ağah Sırrı. *Türk Edebiyatında Şehr-engizler ve Şehr-engizlerde İstanbul*. İstanbul, 1958
- Levend, Ağah Sırrı. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1973.
- Mengi, Mine. “Divan Şiirinde Metinlerarası İlişkiler” *Şinasi Tekin’in Anısına: Uygurlardan Osmanlıya*. der. Günay Kut ile Fatma Büyükkarcı Yılmaz. İstanbul: Simurg Yayınları, 2005: 593-606.
- Muhib, Ercümend. *Enderunlu Fazıl, Hubannâme ve Zenânnâme*. Yeni Şark Kitabevi, 1945.
- Nedim. “Niğâr-nâme.” *Lale Devri Şairi İzzet Ali Paşa: Hayatı, Eserleri, Edebî Kişiliği; Divan: Tenkitli Metin; Nigar-name: Tenkitli Metin*. A. İrfan Aypay. (haz.) İstanbul: y.y., 1998: 309-314.

- Onay, Talat. *Eski Türk Edebiyatında Mazmunlar ve İzahı*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 2000.
- Özege, Seyfettin. *Eski Harflerle Basılmış Türkçe Eserler Kataloğu*. İstanbul: Fatih yayınevi, 1971-1979.
- Özgül, Kayahan. *Divan Yolu'ndan Pera'ya Selamette*. Ankara: Hece Yayınları, 2006.
- Öztürk, Nebiye. “Zenânnâme – Enderunlu Fâzıl” Basılmamış yüksek lisans tezi. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2002.
- Özyıldırım, Ali Emre. “Keçeci-zâde İzzet Molla'nın Mihnet-keşan'ı ve Tahlil” Basılmamış doktora tezi. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, 2002.
- Pala, İskender. “Hezel” *İslam Ansiklopedisi*. cilt 17: 305-306.
- Rabelais, François. *The Histories of Gargantua and Pantagruel*. trans. John M. Cohen. Pennsylvania: The Franklin Library, 1982.
- Rose, Margaret. *Parody: Ancient, Modern and Post-Modern*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Schmidt, Jan. “Fazil Beg Enderuni: Social Historian or Poet?” *Decision Making and Change in the Ottoman Empire*. Kirksville: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1993: 183-192.
- Schmidt, Jan. “Sünbülzâde Vehbî's Şevk-engîz: an Ottoman Pornographic Poem.” *Turcica* 25 (1993): 9-37.
- Silay, Kemal. *Nedim and the Poetics of the Ottoman Court: Medieval Inheritance and the Need for Change*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Turkish Studies Series, 1994.
- Stewart-Robinson, James. “A Neglected Ottoman Poem: The Sehrengiz” *Studies in Near Eastern Culture and History: Abdel-Massih Memorial Volume*. Michigan: The University of Michigan, 1990.
- Sünbül-zâde Vehbî. “Sühan Kasidesi.” *Divan*. Kahire: Bulak, t.y.
- Sürûrî. *Hezliyyât* [basma]. İstanbul: y.y., t.y.
- Timurtaş, Faruk. “Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi Ana Kitabı Nasıl Yazılabilir?” *Türk Kültürü* cilt 1 (Mayıs 1963): 28-30.
- Turgut Kut. “Bilinmeyen Bir Hicviyesi'yle Sünbülzâde Vehbî” *tarih ve toplum* 208 [“Mahrem Tarih” özel sayısı, Nisan 2001]: 73-76.
- Yarshater, Ehsan. “The Indian or Safavid Style: Progress or Decline?” *Persian Literature*. ed. Ehsan Yarshater. Columbia Lectures on Iranian Studies 3. Bibliotheca Persica Press, October 1988: 249-288.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

çengi-nâme-i fâzil beg

[rakâş-nâme-i fâzil beg]

fâ'ilâtün/fe'ilâtün – fe'ilâtün – fe'ilün/fâ'lün

hamda lâyıķ o cihân dâveri var
kâ'inâtıñ heman ol serveri var
eyleyen hüsnü rızâ 'aşkı kıza
nice hikmetle tecellileri var

al eteklik kuşadup eflâki
kıldı çâr-pâre bu cism-i pâki
başladı rakşa beşer idrâki
şun'ı haķķıñ ne 'aceb işleri var

eyledi cezbe-i hüsnü i'tâ
dimesdi hiç ne yehûd ü tersâ
'âlemi kapladı lutf-ı mevlâ
her biriniñ reviş-i digeri var

virdi her âdeme bir başka mezâķ
ihtilâf üzre mizâc-ı 'uşşâķ
kimi nefrette kimisi müştâķ
'aşkla her biriniñ mazharı var

dil-i 'uşşâķa idüp 'aşkı belâ
ruķ-ı hûbâna virüp hüsn ü bahâ'
buğa bilmem ki ne yapısın 'uķalâ
allahıñ 'aķl alıcı kulları var

birisi nâz ile olmuş rakķâş
öbürü 'aşkına olmuş gavvâş
cism-i vâhîdde bu şad kûne havâş
ķudret-i haķķa işâretleri var

bizi haķ kırtara bu mehlekeden
pâk ide sînemizi bu lemeden
ğarażım işte budur fezlekeden
söze âğâz idersem yeri var

sebeb-i nazm-ı çengi-nâme
[dâstân-ı ehl-i meclis ez haķķ-ı çengiyân
ve niyâz-ı fâzil]

ehl-i 'aşkıñ yine gavğâları var
bezm-i 'aşkıñ yine çok mahşeri var
şâ'ire zillet-i iķdâm olacaķ

'aşka dâ'ir yine da'vâları var
geldi bir meclise bir gün bir zât
anda tolmuş idi eşraf-ı kuzât
bir iki ehl-i sühan ehl-i nikât
fâzil ile her biriniñ ziveri var

kimi kıza kimi monlâ-yı 'azîz
kimi dâna kimisi bî-temyîz
olmuş ecnâs ile hâşıl lebrîz
ehl-i 'irfânı da var hem ħarı var

her biri bir kıla olmuş çengi
dir ki dünyâda bulunmaz dengi
ķurulup ehl-i belâniñ çengi
meclis içre öte git gel biri var

kimisi 'arşa çıkardı âhu
kimi vallâhî didi billâhî
kiminiñ yanmış idi cân-gâhî
dilberiniñ kaşı için ħançeri var

kimisi dir ki güzel yârimdir
nişf-ı 'âlem daħi aġyârimdir
kimi dir hüsnü anıñ yarımdır
kimdir ol hüsnü bütün dilberi var

kimi dir isteriseñ tâze beden
pûte-i 'aşka gümüşdür ma'den
alagör panbuġu yorğancıdan
kâfiriniñ penbe gibi elleri var

kimi dir mişun elinden eyvâh
uğrasın ħışmına ħâħâmıñ âh
iki kıol başını kessin allâh
kâfiriniñ pençe-i yağma-geri var

kimi dir yâsemene kıonma şaķın
gül-i zibâya da el şunma şaķın
kimi dir ermeniden dönme şaķın
anlarıñ yerle berâber seri var

kimi dir bir yana kıo bu lâfi

mi'de taşhîline dârcin kâfi
 çeşm-i âfet ten-i pâki şâfi
 ol bütün câzibe-i âhiri var

kimisi eyledi keşf-i râzi
 didi tavşana yetişmez tâzi
 dilberin âh o latîf âvâzi
 dil-i 'uşşâkı yakar ahgeri var

kimi dir gamze-i âhûya şîlâ
 ben dili eylemişim rûma fedâ
 öyle yana k'ola cismiñde hebâ'
 şanma sînemde anıñ dîgeri var

dilbere alzun top ile müdâm
 öyle fıstık ile gelmez ahşâm
 kırş u ten-sûlû ile olmaz sana râm
 nakd-i cân ile aña müşterî var

iki rub'iyye ile güç yetmez
 yeni dünyâda benefşe bitmez
 mâhitâb olmasa kârbân gitmez
 her diyârın dañi şehbenderi var

çıkamaz tilki kavağa evvel
 iremez hîle ile yıldıza el
 ol fidân üzre kıanarya ne güzel
 her hañbiñ dañi bir minberi var

er olan bir ola mı kaçıcık ile
 alınır mı keçi kıvırcık ile
 âfitâbi sıvama balçık ile
 ki anıñ bârika-ı enveri var

virdiler velveleye dünyâyı
 ekşidüp turşu gibi helvâyı
 gâzab-âlûde idüp gâvğâyı
 fitneye her biriniñ şeşteri var

bu fakîri görücek ol cumhûr
 didiler işte bu helâl umûr
 mürşidi ehl-i cünûn ehl-i şu'ûr
 zehri var hâmede hem sükkeri var

didiler işte budur 'umde-i deşt
 şîr-i âhû-figen-i bâdiye-geşt
 işte ol mâ-şadağ didi güzeşt
 bû'l'aceb fikret ü dânişveri var

birisi kıldı kelâma âğâz
 didi ey şâ'ir-i ma'nâ-perdâz
 işte hengâm-ı kerem vaqt-ı niyâz
 cümleñiñ böyle niyâz-âveri var

dilberin gamze-i 'ayyâşı için
 ruñ-ı zîbâsı için kaşı için
 fâzilâ sevdiğiniñ başı için
 ehl-i 'aşkıñ sana bir mañzârı var

bize çengileri kıl rûşen ü pâk
 kimi bed-rû kimi şâhib-ten-i pâk
 mî-dehed kim kimisi dâmen-i pâk
 her biriniñ nice hâletleri var

mañv idüp şübhemizi şâf eyle
 lik zulm eyleme inşâf eyle
 bizi şâyeste-i elţâf eyle
 sende mülk-i sülhanıñ kışveri var

biliriz hâlîne kâdirsin sen
 ki musavvir dañi şâ'irsin sen

mañv ü işbâtda mâhirsin sen
 sende her mâ'rifetiñ mañzârı var

ittifâk üzre rızâ-yı cumhûr
 zülf-i yâre tokunursa ma'zûr
 tek bize fâş ola râz-ı mestûr
 biliriz sende anıñ ezberi var

ben de endişeme itdikde su'âl
 didi kim hağ bu ki hayr-ı i'mâl
 şübhe erbâbına hall-i eşkâl
 müşkili fetih ideniñ kevşeri var

ol zemân tâbi-i cumhûr oldum
 halı idersen dañi ma'zûr oldum
 hall-i eşkâl ile me'mûr oldum
 hayra hezliñ dañi bir rehberi var

getiriñ kilik-i siyehkârı didim
 yazayım hep size esrârı didim
 şekli-defterde bu eş'ârı didim
 kalemiñ böyle ne bid'atları var

der beyân-ı mâhiyyet-i çengiyân
[ibtidâ'-ı şaff-ı çengiyân]

fâzilîñ işte yine cevheri var
 yine bir cânâ yakın sözleri var
 cümle inşâf ile eyler tañrîr
 çengiyânıñ ne kadar dilberi var

evvelâ cümleñiñ ağ babası
 köhne kâr-dân kıaranıñ da'vâsı
 şöhet-i kâzibedir gâvgâsı
 belî yıldız gibi 'aşkıları var

hüsnü yok halı belî müstesnâ
 tatlı sözlü dañi bir şîrin edâ
 kâfirin bañtı güşâde ammâ
 ya'ni gâyetle kavî ahteri var

ne dimekdir bu ki pîr olmuş iken
 gül-i ruhsârı dañi şolmuş iken
 bütün â'zâ'sına kıl tolmuş iken
 yine 'aşkıyla yanar çâkeri var

todori elli sekiz yaşında
 hem frenk zañmeti var başında
 müy zannitme hemân kıaşında
 delî ormanı kadar kıalları var

bir kırança venedik elçisidir
 şanasın kıuds-i şerîf hâcısındır
 ten-i murdârı şarâb fıçısıdır
 kâfirin hâşılı kıoğmuş teri var

müy ile rûyi olur bir kıl elek
 aña cımbısla çeker hayli emek
 şan debbâğ-hâneye girmiş o köpek
 anı oğlançık iden berberi var

evi kâr-hâne-i erbâb-ı neşât
 cem' olur ehl-i zinâ ehl-i livât
 şâk şak-ı kîr ile âvâz-ı zürât
 hânesinde şanasın dülgeri var

buyuruñ hâneye da'vetci didi
 size yetmez ise ol kañbe gidi
 işte evlâdı da var altı yedi
 zen ü hemşiresi var mâderi var

zen ü hemşiresi hâzır helvâ

da'vet eyler aña â'lâ ednâ
 kûnu gûyâ ki cehennemdir aña
 hep gulampârelerin maşşeri var
 büyük âfet o güzel yorgâki
 sîme beşzer o vücûd-ı pâki
 o edâ o revîş-i çâlâki
 şanma dünyâda ağan beşzeri var
 tavr u endâmına 'âlem meftûn
 deli eylerdi bizi vaqt-i düğün
 olmasa anda o endâze burun
 'âşıkı burnuna girse yeri var
 gonceđir çıđdı dikenden ol zât
 peder û mâderi ya'ni hırvât
 nesl-i şûmunda bulunur şoltât
 bâğ-bân var bir iki rençberi var
 gerçi anton dađi nâzikter idi
 eli ağzına uyar dilber idi
 taht-ı nâz üzre bir iskender idi
 iki biğ 'âşık ile kışmeri var
 yüzüne şimdi sinekler üşmüş
 la'l-i şîrne karınca düşmüş
 o güzellik didiğın bir kuş imiş
 meger âğın dađi bâl û peri var
 yâsemem şimdi dikenlenmişdir
 nergis çeşmi kefenlenmişdir
 belî her şivede fenlenmişdir
 aña hâlâ dađi çok müşteri var
 sikke maşşülû olan rub'îye
 ne 'ayâr ile ider fahrîye
 vaşlı değmez başa bir nişfiye
 ne ten-i pâki ne hoş manzarı var
 hüsni nâkış teni nâ-mevzûndur
 kalbezenler aña hep meftûndur
 bozular herkese bir alfundur
 zerdur ammâ iki biğ zer-geri var
 beni yağmaladı kâfir panayot
 komadı hâne-i dilde başa yurt
 o dađi tilki gibi bir deli kırt
 nâ-sezâ çok revîş-i bedteri var
 tilki ammâ ki biraz nâ-dândır
 postu elden giderir hayvândır
 belî insâna yakın bir cândır
 anda bir câzibe-i esmeri var
 çengiler şâhı mışırılı güzeli
 o tenâsüb o kâdd-i bî-bedeli
 raqşa girdikçe ider halkı deli
 katı çok 'âşık-ı hasret-geri var
 hoşcadır çehresi hem refâtı
 aña çözdürme aman şalvârı
 katı çirkin o ten-i murdârı
 ol yehûdiye yanaşma kırı var
 puşt-ı mışırî birisi de şevki
 böyle sa'ir ile her dem zevki
 انت يا سيدى تحتى و فوقى
 bu tekellümde feşâhetleri var
 o dađi cins-i yehûddan dönme
 ten-i nâ-pâkine hiç el şunma

cîfeye çünkü hemâşıq konna
 hâcı manşûr gibi çok ebteri var
 pek leâfetli degil hüsni laţif
 o yehûdiyi ne hâcet ta'rîf
 ne cemâlî ne de refâtı zarîf
 belî âvâz-ı cünûn-âveri var
 sözüümüz yok o civânıq sesine
 başı keldir el uzatma fesine
 nesine mâ'il olurlar nesine
 meger anıq dađi birkaç hârı var
 o gümüş tenli olan altun top
 götü 'uşşâka olur hâzır lop
 kal'asında bulunur dâ'im top
 ehl-i 'aşk içre du'âcıları var
 hele 'indimde benim ra'nâdır
 ermeni olmasa müsteşnâdır
 cümlesinden dir idim a'lâdır
 katı hoş kıt'a-ı nâzikteri var
 nedir ol kıt'a-ı pâk-ı mevzûn
 ermenide bu hîlâf-ı kânûn
 nedir ol penbe gibi kubbe-i kûn
 arqasında şanasın minderi var
 'aşkile itme hilâl kaşa nigâh
 bir tutulmuş aya beşzer ol mâh
 cismi ismine muhâlif eyvâh
 dađi andan nice a'lâteri var
 belî dârçın gülü bir ser ü schi
 o karanfil gibi hâl-i şiyehi
 saçı sünbül dađi nergis nigehi
 koqladım perçemini 'anberi var
 ne çiçekdir biliriz tâze fidân
 çok filiz 'aşladılar aña cihân
 kuru ağaca bulaşdırmam kan
 işte başında kavaq yelleri var
 teşşûluğ râyihâsı câna karîb
 bütün eczâ-yı ten-i pâki garîb
 nedir ol turre-i 'anber-terkîb
 gâliyâ kurşu gibi beğleri var
 zer-nişân ismi güzel oğlandır
 bir iki 'âşıkı var hayvândır
 'aşka bilmem ki neden şâyândır
 belî isminde faqaţ bir zeri var
 o da zîbâ gibi bir ismi güzel
 ermenilikde ve lâkin eşkal
 beddir a'zâsı vücûdu mücmel
 ne edâ var ne dađi zîveri var
 belî yıldız gibi yođdur bir mâh
 âh kuyruklu eger olmasa âh
 bir felek meşreb ü bî-gâne nigâh
 katı çok câzibe-i enveri var
 bir kamer çehre degildir mehtâb
 çehresi hâle gibi hâne harâb
 anı tâ göge çıkarsa alhbâb
 şanma rûyunda o mâhiq ferî var
 ola meftûnu kanarya cânıq
 o da bir bülbüldür hûbânıq
 kaldırmış kuşunu insânıq

bize mum tıtduracađ peykeri var
 kafes-i ‘aşka atup bî-pervâ
 anı dola bele erbâb-ı hevâ
 haylı ötdürdü anı şublı u mesâ
 nice biğ kışsa-ı cân-perveri var
 kız mehemmed o da bir âşüfte
 ya’ni hânlarda gezer âlüfte
 mâlnı çünkü virirmiş müfte
 qahbeniğ hâşlı yüz biğ eri var
 kafes içre tıramaz bir tûfî
 olmuş âvareleriğ meşrûfî
 dâ’im almağda du’â-yı lûfî
 didiler ‘illet-i müşkilteri var
 yeğî dünyâ o da bir küllhenidir
 şekl-i çingâne de bir ermenidir
 teni eşhâb-ı qubûruğ tenidir
 üstül^Wân üzre hemân bir deri var
 gerçi olmuş yeğî dünyâ ismi
 anı zannitme ki medh-i resmi
 çünkü dünyâya müşâbih cismi
 cîfedir cîfeye beğzer yeri var
 şayda gelmez o remîde âhû
 vahşidir tab’ı o çeşm-i câdü
 gerden üstünde o müşkîn gîsû
 sünbül-i çin ü hatın qatmeri var
 panayotuğ küçüğü masħaradır
 turre si hem gözü qası qaradır
 ruħ-ı zibâsı güzel ferferedir
 kâfiriğ tatlı ‘aceb dilleri var
 yorgi lâkin quru bir oğlandır
 şanki hummâ ile bî-dermândır
 mürdedir şekl-i teni bî-cândır
 sîne de şanki mezâr mermeri var
 fıstığî cismi belî fıstıqdır
 tab’ı fındıqçı gözü açıqdır
 çeşm-i bâdâmı belî qancıqdır
 qoz qarar gamze-i çâpükteri var
 kıt’a-ı pâki cihânda mefķûd
 qanğı dilberde o qâmet mevcûd
 ‘aybı ancağ bu ki ez qavm-i yehûd
 kâfiriğ ta’b-ı habâşet-geri var
 şâhib-i cezbe degil yorgâki
 şarılığdan o ten-i nâ-pâki
 şöyle zanneyleyesiğ tönbâki
 bir şararmış ruħ-ı nilûferi var
 hoş fidânım o çubukçu güzeli
 geçme ol dilberi ol ince belî
 yâsemem qâmetini söylemeli
 o kirâs lebler ile zîveri var
 turşu hep ‘âleme olmuş ser-gâh
 kîre ileyhünâ olsa nâ-gâh
 fıçıya dönmüş o ‘ifrît-nigâh
 gözü kanlı şanasın penç eri var
 turşunuğ fıçısı olmuş medħal
 ekşidir çehresi dâ’im eşkal
 sofra-ı vuşlatı helvâ-yı ‘asel
 fıçıya pek de şoqulma arı var

pandeli ‘aşkı ile ben de deli
 kıt’ada cezbede yoğdur bedeli
 var imiş çengileriğ bir güzeli
 melek hüsniğ meger iskenderi var
 neyleyim ol daği bir şüfi edâ
 qatre-i bâdeyi içmez hattâ
 ‘âşık-ı zâra söylemez aşlâ
 müte’assıb revîş-i bedteri var
 hayf ol hüsni ile ol dildâre
 yazık ol cezbeye ol refâtâre
 âh ol kıt’a-ı elmas-pâre
 nâ-tirâşide ‘aceb cevheri var
 şüfidir çünkü mezâki teşkil
 rakşı bilmem niçin itdi tahşil
 tâ kenîsâda oğusun incil
 her maħalliğ revîş-i digeri var
 çenginiğ perdesi işkeste gerek
 ‘uğdesi ‘ahdi gibi siste gerek
 kâle-i vuşlatı âleste gerek
 daği ceymbinde anığ sengeri var
 daği her medħe sezâ istavri
 dil-rübâlıkda müselle m tavri
 var imiş ehl-i belâya cevri
 şekl-i perçemde ‘aceb ejderi var
 küçük anğon didiğî mürdârı
 budur ol ermeniğî aħbârı
 nâ-becâ çehresi hem refâtârı
 belî zanqoç olacağ peykeri var
 o benefşe ne ‘aceb zor oldu
 burc-ı ‘âşıkları moşmor oldu
 çeşm-i nergis gam ile kör oldu
 gönceniğ qıbta ile qanderi var
 qoç olup şimdi kıvırcık oğlan
 qara manda gibi olmuş elân
 quzu dirmiş aqa ba’z-ı hayvân
 aqa qoyun bir iki serseri var
 iki boynuzlusu var ceylânığ
 tab’ı vahşî degil ol hayvânığ
 gamz ider çeşm-i gâzâlî anığ
 hâlqa bir nâfe-i nâzikteri var
 oğuna beğzer ol eski fidân
 meyve-i vaşlı çürükdür elân
 diyemem aqa fidân bir orman
 çınar olmuş nice ‘âşıkları var
 âfitâbiyla ‘aceb kim savaşır
 yüzüne bakmağa gözler qamaşır
 zâtına bir derece nâz yaraşır
 felek-i dilde anığ hâveri var
 qarğa hey’etlü qanarya şâkir
 ne qanarya bu ki baykuş kâfir
 ağı uçurma berây-ı hâtır
 belî yüzünde iki şehperi var
 ruħşat-ı vaşla rızâ virdi gâzab
 nedir ol zât-ı hâlîme bu laqab
 qâmet ü tab’ı mülâyimdir heb
 egilir herkese bir ‘ar’arı var
 nâle-i ‘aşka sezâ velvedir

ehl-i aşka o da bir gâ'iledir
rakşı bâzîçe degil zelzeledir
'aceb ardında anıñ lengeri var
nâzikâne ne bu etvâr-ı pesend
nedir ol kâmet o hoş serv-i bülend
hüsününe 'âlem olursa dil-bend
cân alır cezbe-i cân-perveri var
o beyâz tenli civânım pamuk
yumuşak penbe gibi bir ma'sûk
ağa atdırdı nice ehl-i füsûk
kavs-ı hallâc gibi kâşları var
küçük âfet belî bir âfet-i cân
nice âfet bu ki dilsûz-ı cihân
ismine cismi mu'tâbîk cânân
çengiler içre hemân ol peri var
bir zemân işte bu cânânım idi
mesned-i işvede şul'tânım idi
mâlik-i taht-ı dil ü cânım idi
nice bir bencileyin leşkeri var
nedir ol çeşm-i siyâh kaşı siyâh
nedir ol bârika-ı çehre-i mâh
ermenî olmasa eyvâh eyvâh
hücneti işte bu kim kâşparı var
ermenî olmasa ammâ o fakîr
benî tâ haşra dek eylerdi esîr
belki hep halkı iderdi teşhîr
öyle bir cezbe-i zûr-âveri var

[hâtime-i manzûme-i fâzîl]

sülhanımda nefis-i haydarî var
tab'imıñ hâme gibi kanberi var
zülfiğârım yine bu hâmemdir
hışn-ı ma'nâdan anıñ hayberi var
işte bu nâmeyi itmâm itdi
mâ-huve-l-vâkı'a i'lâm itdi

haqq ile cümleyi ilzâm itdi
cânib-i hâkdan anıñ yâveri var
kâzî oldu bu nizâ'a hâme
şulhe yârânı yattırdı nâme
harf-i zâ'id komadı i'lâme
buğa kulbaşlarıñ mañzârı var
cümle yârân ne güzeldir didiler
hırz-ı cân olsa mañaldır didiler
bize destûr-ı 'ameldir didiler
sihre beñzer nice ma'nâları var
irdi pâyâna kalem âhengi
ber-ıaraf eyledi yârân cengi
oldu manzûmesi bir kavli-i çengi
işte kırk üç şayılır dilberi var
rakşa girdi kalem-i nükte-şinâs
ağa yogurtculuk itdi kırtâs
seyrine çıkdı anıñ penç havâs
yine meclîsde tarla-ı teri var
oldu me'zûn kalemîñ surnâsı
başladı rakşa sülhan ma'nâsı
bu kâğaz-hâne düğün şahrâsı
bir 'aceb 'arşa-ı pehnâ-veri var
şarılır hâmeye hep ma'nîler
şanki kaytân oyunu taklîd ider
tutar rişte-i nazmı o çeker
her birinin revîş-i hoşteri var
hezl ile kill-i siyâh-ı rüsvâ
'âlemi kırdı geçirdi hâlâ
'arab oyununa çıkmış gûyâ
taze mazmûn gibi bir kışmeri var
işte hep çengileri oldu mastûr
ba'd-ez-in eylemesin kimse gürûr
dest-i 'uşşâka bu hüccet memhûr
fâzîliñ işte kavî defteri var

Appendix B

The Kaside On Poetry

Sünbül-zâde Vehbî

The Kaside On Poetry Written By Imperial Order And Decree During The Grand-Viziership Of Halil Paşa In Order To Ridicule And Admonish Those Poets Of This Age Who Speak Nonsense

1. True poetry ought be the poetry of the Great Holy Verses; the greatest of poems ought be that written on the Page of Miracles.
2. He is a poet into whose heart, like the heart of Hassan the inspiration of Gabriel, Trusted Spirit, whispers the poetic.
3. He is called lord of the dominion of eloquence, whose pen inscribes the signature of poetry on the royal patent of his imagery.
4. Let his coruscating thought, like Abraham, Interlocutor of God, show the White Hand (Yed-i Beyza) of poetry from within the garment-fold of meaning.
5. His life-enhancing breath, like that of Jesus, ought revive poetry with spirit-bestowing speech.
6. The stream of his verse should flood forth so that Hızr and İskender might trade the flow of his poetry for the Water of Eternal Life.
7. Through the essence of his pearlscattering speech, may the atoms of the raw matter of poetry find loveliness of form in this world.
8. Let his nature be a shining mirror, so that from it the parrot of poetry may learn to recite the Mantikü't-Tayr.
9. Would they call his verses a string of pearls, whose heart was not an ocean of talent, whose nature was not the grain of sand that is the seed of pearls.
10. Unless it has been refined in the crucible of the goldsmith of thought, the silver of meaning cannot accept the stamp of poetry.
11. None would look on its face if the radiance of colorful imagery were not rouge on the heart-stealer of poetry's cheek.
12. If his breast is not pure like a polished mirror, would poetry's reflections appear in beautiful form therein?
13. He who, with knotted heart, is not intimate with the Divine unraveling, will never discover the fine points of poetry.
14. If a trace of love's flame remains in the censer of the heart, then the ambergris of poetry will spread its fragrance all about.
15. Unless it is pure, like ruddy wine in the bottle, then a colorful verse can never become the crystal bead of poetry.
16. Drinkers like Câmî and Nâbî know this well: intoxication with poetry's wine is a unique kind of joy.

17. By capturing the land of meaning with the army of thought, the Dârâ of poetry displays his glory and might.
18. With the quickness of his wit, he makes his tongue-sword into a shining scimitar of poetry on the battlefield of verse.
19. Those not born to it can never consort with virgins of wit, if poetic excellence does not give power to natural disposition.
20. The peerless pearl of poetry lies in the ocean's nacre heart of wisdom; it is not to be found in every breast.
21. Imagination's eye should wander over untrodden paths as the foot of poetry ought to pass along the untravelled road.
22. Nor with one or two words like airy nonsense can vain prattlers become the speech-adorners of poetry.
23. How can those be called by the name of "poet" who, in the dark of night, have never seen the dream of poetry once in their lives.
24. For the poet who does not have a valid claim to poetry, this title is given on false authority.
25. Let him who would versify a gazel study its science first, if he hopes for poetry saying "I wish I had a poem."
26. Only when science and poetry are conjoined in sense can the ignorant versifier be one with the learned poet.
27. First he should be skilled in signification's art that he might know the delicate, hidden point of poetry's meaning.
28. Metaphor and metonymy, the real and the figurative flow endlessly through the riverbed of poetry.
29. Without knowing the most lovely form of a simile's aspect, to what shall the heart adorning face of poetry be compared?
30. The Hüma of poetry needs the two great pinions of Arabic and Persian, that it might fly high.
31. Let it fly, like the Phoenix, with the Eagle of the heavens. Let its orbit extend to the sublime zenith of poetry.
32. It is true, the lot of poets is not a happy one; the Pleiades of poetry ascended with inauspicious Saturn.
33. But we should not presume to complain of poetry that eloquence caused the oppression of the sphere.
34. If only fate would take mercy, desist in its torment; is there anyone left worthy of honor, wise in the subtleties of poetry?
35. A regiment of ill-spoken poets with unfortunate pen-names have brought about the ignominy of poetry with disgraceful verses.
36. The rhythmical measures of poems are determined on scales. These days the rhymes of poetry are weighed out in shops.
37. So many poetic rhyme-seekers have satisfied themselves merely with love and passion in the way of Aşık Ömer.
38. Today the rare, resplendent pearl of poetry's essence, God help us, has been turned into the songs of Gevherî
39. The beyt they build resembles Harabî's dwelling of talent. So many builders of poetry have ruined verse at its very foundation.
40. Most of their incoherent babbling is fervid nonsense; one wonders if the poets have caught a fever of poetry.
41. They have become afflicted with the ailment of metrical constipation. Let the physician of poetry come and give them laxatives.
42. Each winnows a remel meter from a hecez, and makes the wind of his talking into a storm of poetry.
43. By the four waves their speaking's icy wind has aroused, the heavenly bark of poetry is tossed and founders.
44. They attempt to write satire before they even know the alphabet, as though they would be warriors on the battlefield of poetry.
45. They know nothing of rhymed prose, rhymed verse, and metrical speech; nor do they know muhammes, murabba, or müsenna.

46. Some of them write mana and some of them, in the valley of the Turkmen, compose yelellâs like the Karaoglan kayabaşısı
47. Speaking of the tavern's wine, the young, attractive boy, like drunken Bekrî they have become ornaments in the wine-temple of poetry.
48. Again they drift to the fervor of moth and candle, and the night-adorning taper of poetry is ignited by zeal.
49. And in springtime, with odes of spring, of rose and nightingale, in the end, the worn-out spring is clad from head to toe in poetry.
50. If hair is mentioned, so many of the meaning-crazed and poetry-bewildered lengthen the chain of speech about madness.
51. As for the requirement that one tell the tale of Kays, what can I say? Has mad Mecnûn become wedded to the Leylâ of poetry?
52. Even though the helva of poetry be fresh and sweet, after a while talk of Ferhâd and Şîrîn grows bitter.
53. What beauty is there in alluding so much to Yûsuf that it might tear the Züleyhâ of poetry's curtain of modesty.
54. Without spending any of their lives studying grammar at the medrese, some loutish students pass as professors of poetry.
55. Drinking soup from the master of the soup-kitchen's bowl, they suppose themselves capable of explicating the highest pinnacles of poetry.
56. Now and again they play on their broken pens as on a trumpet, but even if they had the wind, they'd still play crudely on poetry's pipe.
57. Like a child at his letters, one cannot produce a chronogram correctly; though he make a thousand calculations, it yet escapes poetic sense.
58. By his own reckoning he makes up a spontaneous riddle, and the poor wretch thinks he has produced a poetic enigma.
59. Should they try to inscribe their writing as a scar on poetry's adamant heart, they are using ignorance to carve a die in marble.
60. Fine points of meaning in the art of enigma are a special thing. He will never see that rare delicacy, who is blind to poetry.
61. The market price of chronograms has dropped to sixty paras, and poetic goods have gotten cheap in the bazaar.
62. So many unfit, beggarly, panhandler-natured folk turn begging into capital when they try to compose poetry.
63. No difference remains between a poet and a beggar on the street, and writing poetry has become a product of imploring and pleading.
64. They rushed through the doors of the great saying "I have a gazel" and the exalted threshold of poetry has become a beggar's gate.
65. Whenever someone dies, they carve a chronogram on the gravestone; they make the corpses of poetry into cõnks and tomârs for the resurrection.
66. In short, they have polluted the world with chronograms; they have written corrupt, nasty, nonsensical poems.
67. Battâliyye has become the place for such papers. In every house, there is a sack or two of poetry.
68. When a new religious festival rolls around, they trot out an old kasîde, and find a pretext, old or new, for getting gifts for poetry.
69. They've turned verse into paper calendars for the fast and hand out gifts of poetry to everyone on Ramadan.
70. In this manner they sit at the helvâ table, as though they brought the sweet date of poetry as a fast-breaking morsel.
71. We are ashamed to say, "We too are poets," so much has the elegant face of poetry been disgraced.
72. They discovered the ancients' works as a treasure, and plundered poetry like a bunch of thieves.
73. Saying it is only translation, rewording, inadvertent co-creation; so do many robbers of poetry's masters try to cover up their sins.

74. The punishment for stealing verse is to have the tongue cut off; this is the canonical decision of poetry in the law of eloquence.
75. He is such an ass, up to his knees in the mire of stupefaction; in such a state he could never journey the wilderness of poetry.
76. The candy-eating parrot of poetry would not take in its mouth a chewed-over expression, though it were made of refined sugar.
77. The tall, slender body of poetry cannot be dressed in used conceits, and display its attractive airs in second-hand clothes.
78. Some of them, like an Iranian ahond, saying *bes ki*, compose poetry in the Persian language.
79. Novices who don't even recognize their errors, in setting the pillars of signification, pass for *Sâ'ibs* and *Rüknîs* of poetry.
80. Saying *bûd* for "was," *mîsheved* for "becomes," *bâshad* for "let be," *âmedshod* for "come and go," he thinks his absurd poems to be Persian.
81. He supposes the broken and bandaged verse he bound together to be lovely poetic lyrics sung in *Îsfahân*.
82. They turned their *kerre-nây* pens into the *şeh-nây* of poetry, and started to blast the notes of *âşirân-ı acem*.
83. Each of them passes for a knight in the jousting lists of eloquence; no matter, the swift-footed steed of poetry is lame and lazy.
84. Those who have not gone to Iran and drunk the tea of poetry cannot make their words a freshet of imagery with mere chatter.
85. If those innocent of poetry saw such prattlings, they would shrug it off to absolve themselves of blame.
86. What a shame that one who doesn't yet know Turkish well should bring forth poetry in the Persian and Arabic manner.
87. Let them just put on the Persian Cap in the manner of Iran and become the *Koca Mirzâ* of poetry in the city of *Tebrîz*.
88. *Gûy-ı Çevgân* of poetry is a different game! What would it mean to perform a display of poetry like a team from Persia?
89. The gold-woven goods of Iran are of another kind; gilded poetry like this does not appear in Ottoman lands.
90. These poets, merely seeking adventure, lust after the daughters of Persian metaphors; now, the sons of poetry are born bastards!
91. Should they know a couple words of Chaghatay, they pass for *Nevâyî* and think themselves heirs to the khans of poetry on the Kipchak Steppe.
92. Some of them, who make verse into a child's plaything, are the mid-wives of words, some the fathers of poetry.
93. Someday this sort will yet again make appearance; vagrant gossips wandering the lanes and plains of poetry.
94. *Sâbit*, the learned master of poetry, once cast stones of reproach saying: "There is a poet under every cobblestone of the street."
95. If only he could see what has emerged from the cracks; now a pack of poetryhounds wander the pavements.
96. Let these alphabet reciters go to the *hodja* and be read over. Let them go to school and learn the letters of poetry.
97. Let those new to poetry write poems in imitation of me, for every word of mine is the great text of poetry.
98. My talent mirrors the inspiration of God's bounty; to me has been revealed the hidden secrets of poetry.
99. My breast is filled with the royal pearls of conceits; my tumultuous and seething heart is the source of poetry's ocean.
100. *Bâkî*, after hearing of my fame in the lands of the after-life, realized that no residue of poetry would be left to him.
101. Perhaps *Nefî* would have understood poetry's profit and loss, if he had come and presented his poetic goods to me.

102. In order to prove myself I went to Şirâz and engaged in a battle of poetry with the boastful Urfi.
103. By mutual agreement, when we took it to court, Kutb-ı Şirâzî, the learned, was made judge of poetry.
104. There, Hâfız and Sa'dî became my competent witnesses, and it was judged in my favor, that I satisfied the claim to poetic skill.
105. What wonder that I am famed as the divine Vehbî; the gifts of poetry to me are the gift of divinely granted talent.
106. My inborn nature is that of an eloquent nightingale. What remedy is there that I am ever engaged in grief?
107. Alas, I am become speechless and mute from the reproaches of enviers; let the enemies of poetry who silenced me be struck dumb.
108. Enough is enough, whether for advice or chat or spat, all this clamor of the "hey" and "ho" of poetry.
109. With a heart-adorning, joy-bringing verse, let us now embellish the tumult of poetry in the lover's manner.
110. Now let us render a verdict and bring this lawsuit to an end; let this gazel be sure proof of acquittal in the matter of poetry.
111. When she lowers her eyes coquettishly, even if there's no singer of verse, still that eloquent eye makes allusion to poetry.
112. Her mouth is like a charming vial of ruby, and when she speaks, precious pearls of poetry are scattered everywhere.
113. As I recall the graceful gait of her tall body, however extravagantly I praise her with poetry, it is not too much.
114. They say she promised my rivals a kiss from her lips; I asked her about it but she revealed not a word.
115. Tonight I set upon her in earnest that she should submit to my words, but all the way 'til morning she never gave in to words.
116. She is an artful oppressor and intelligent heretic, but never does she pay heed to words from the feckless lover.
117. Oh Vehbî, I am dumb-struck in describing her ruby lip; I know that her tiny mouth is no place for words.
118. Oh Grand Vizier, pardon me that I have been so bold, and have written a poem of delicate jesting.
119. God forbid! Would I dare, without your license, to compose poetry in a self-laudatory mode?
120. It was only my aim to educate the poetasters, that they might know what the high degree of poetry is.
121. Like the Karamanlu, the journeyer in the wilderness of poetry is certainly in need of guidance to the Kaaba of verse.
122. Otherwise, it is not my aim to throw up in their faces those wretched ones' faults, those buffoon-faces of poetry.
123. Give gifts, Sir, without attending to good or bad; the leaven of fame is the generous giving of gifts for poetry.
124. So the Bermekî, one of them would not attend to good or bad, even should a band of eloquence-eroders come out of the desert.
125. As he let them take a purse to revivify their hearts, the community of the pure Arabs of poetry would say "long life to you!"
126. In your high position, may you be successful and in good health, and may those who adorn panegyrics of poetry be masters of eloquence.

[Silay, Kemal. *Nedim and the Poetics of the Ottoman Court: Medieval Inheritance and the Need for Change*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Turkish Studies Series, 1994: 215-223]

Appendix C

قصیده کلامیه

که در صدارت خلیل پاشا

برای نصیح و استهزای شاعران هزیان کویان عصر با امر و اراده انشاد کرده است

[kâşide-i kelâmiyye ki der şadâret-i hâlil paşa berâ-yı nuşh u istihzâ-yı şâ'irân-ı hezeyân-gûyân-ı
'aşr bâ emr ü irâde inşâd kerde est]

sûhan oldur ki ola âyet-i kübrâ-yı sûhan
şâ'ir oldur ki anıñ qalbine hassân gibi
husrev-i mülk-i sûhan aña denir kim qalemi çeke
eylese şa'sa'a-ı fikreti manend-i kelim
dem-i 'isâ gibi enfâs-ı hayât-efzâsı
hızru iskenderi sır-âb ide cûy-ı nazmı
cevher-i nuçk-ı güher-bârı ile 'âlemde
tab'-ı âyine-i işrâk ola tâ kim andan
nazmına silk-i cevâhir mi denir olmayanıñ
püte-i zergeh-i endişede kâl olmayacak
kimse bakmaz yüzüne tâb-ı hayâl-i rengin
sine mir'ât-ı mücellâ gibi şâf olmazısa
micmer-i dilde olursa eşer-i âteş-i 'aşk
hummm-ı endişede şahbâ gibi şâf olmayacak
anı câmi gibi nâbi gibi rindân anlar
ceyş-i fikrile alup memleket-i ma'nâyı
rezm-gâh-ı sûhana tığ-ı zebânın eyler
meşrem-i bîkr-i mezâmîn olamaz nâ-chlân
şadef-i sine-i deryâ-yı ma'arifde olur
şapa vâdileri seyrân iderek çeşm-i hayâl
yoğsa mânend-i hevâyî bir iki güfte ile
nice şâ'ir diyü ta'bir olunur anlara kim
şâ'iriyet aña isnâd-ı mecâziye çıkar
tâlib-i nazm-ı gâzel 'ilme çalışsun evvel
'ilm ü şî'r ikisi ma'nâda mürâdifler iken
evvelâ 'ilm-i ma'nânide mahâret lâzım
isti'ârât u kinâyât u haqîkatla mecâz
ahsen-i şüret-i vech-i şebhi bilmeyicek
fârisi ve 'arabiden iki şeh-bâl ister
ide mânend-i hüma nesr-i felekle pervâz
şu'arânıñ da belî tâlî-i mes'ûd olmaz
sebeb-i cevri felek hüsni maqâl oldı diyü
bir de cevri itnese farzâ felek inşâf itse
bir alay şâ'ir-i nâ-muntazam-ı bed-mağlaş
vezn-i eş'ârî terâzûlara vaz' itmişler
içtifâ eylediler meslek-i 'aşk 'ömere
gevheri güftesine döndü bugünlerde meded

yazıla şafha-ı i'câzda a'lâ-yı sûhan
nefha-ı rûh-ı emîn eyleye ilqâ-yı sûhan
ceyb-i ma'nâda nümüne yed-i beyzâ-yı sûhan
ede bir nuçk-ı revân-balş ile ihya-yı sûhan
eylese âb-ı hayâta bedel icrâ-yı sûhan
hüsni şüret bula efrâd-ı heyûlâ-yı sûhan
mantıktıñayr oğuya tûtî vü bebgâ-yı sûhan
dili deryâ-yı hüner tab'-ı güher-zâ-yı sûhan
sım-i ma'nâ olamaz kâbil-i tamğa-yı sûhan
olmasa gâze-i ruhsâr-ı dil-ârâ-yı sûhan
hüsni şüret mi bulur anda mezâyâ-yı sûhan
neşr eder râyihâsın 'anber-i sârâ-yı sûhan
nâzım-ı rengin olamaz zîver-i mînâ-yı sûhan
başkadır neş'e-i keyfiyyet-i şahbâ-yı sûhan
gösterir şevket ü dârâtını dârâ-yı sûhan
tîzî tab' ile şemşir-i mücellâ-yı sûhan
taqvıyyet vermeyecek tab'a mezâyâ-yı sûhan
yoğsa her dilde bulunmaz dür-i yektâ-yı sûhan
reh-i nâ-refteyi geşt itmelidir pâ-yı sûhan
herze-gûyân olamaz nâtıka-pîrâ-yı sûhan
şeb-i 'ömrümde henüz görmeye rü'yâ-yı sûhan
bilmeye ol ki haqîkatle mu'eddâ-yı sûhan
leyte şî'rî diyü eylese temennâ-yı sûhan
bir midir şâ'ir-i nâ-dân ile dâna-yı sûhan
bilmege nükte-i ser-beste-i ma'nâ-yı sûhan
dâ'imâ olmadadır câri-i mecrâ-yı sûhan
neye teşbih olunur vech-i dil-ârâ-yı sûhan
tâ ki pervâz-ı bülend eylese anka-yı sûhan
ola cevân-gehi tâ evc-i mu'allâ-yı sûhan
nağs-ı ekberle tulû'ı şüreyyâ-yı sûhan
yoğdur ancak yüzümüz itmege şevvâ-yı sûhan
var mı ikrâma sezâ nükte-şinâsâ-yı sûhan
nazm-ı rüsvâyî ile eyledi rüsvâ-yı sûhan
tartılır şimdi dükkânlarda mucaffâ-yı sûhan
'aşk u şevk ile nice kâfiye-cûyâ-yı sûhan
gevher-i nâdire-i lü'lü'-i lâla-yı sûhan

şahid-i 'adlim olup hâfîz u sa'dî anda
 nola vehbî-i ilâhî diyü meşhûr olsam
 çâre ne böyle kafes-bend-i gam oldum kaldım
 ta'n-ı hussâd ile dem-beste vü lâl oldum âh ebkem
 yetişür nuşh ise de lâf ise gavgâ ise de
 şimbi bir nazm-ı dil-ârâ-yı neşât-âver ile
 gayri fayşal virelim fâriğ olup da'vâdan
 süzilüp nâz ile olmazsa da gûyâ-yı sülhan
 deheni hoşka-i yâkût-ı letâfet gûyâ
 şive-i kâmet-i bâlâsını yâd itdikçe
 bûse va'd eylemiş agyâra lebinden dilber
 söze yatsun ditü pek üstine düşdüm bu gicesubha dek
 o cefâ-pîşe ve bâbî-i sülhan-fehm ammâ
 vehbiyâ lâl olurum vaşf-ı leb-i la'linde
 âşafa 'afv ki ma'zûr olup itdim böyle
 ruşsatı olmasa cir'et mi iderdim hâşâ
 müteşâ'irleri ancak garazım terbiyedir
 karamanlu gibi elbette delile muhtâc
 yolhsa bi-çâreleriñ yüzlerine 'aybın urup
 nîk ü bed bakma efendim yine in'âm eyle
 bermekiler dalîi bakmaz idi nîk ü bedine
 şuresin kapdırup ihyâ-yı kulûb itmedikçe
 şadr-ı rif'atde hemân devlet ile sağ olasin
 hüküm olundu başa ehliyyet-i da'vâ-yı sülhan
 hibedir mevhibedir başa 'ağâyâ-yı sülhan
 tatalım tab'im imiş bülbül-i gûyâ-yı sülhan
 olsun beni hâmüş iden a'dâ-yı sülhan
 bu kadar gülğüle-i hûy-ı sülhan-hâ-yı sülhan
 'âşıkâne olalım velvele-ârâ-yı sülhan
 olsun işte bu gâzel hüccet-i îbrâ-yı sülhan
 yine ol çeşm-i sülhan-gû ider îmâ-yı sülhan
 nuşka gelse saçılır lü'lü'-i lâlâ-yı sülhan
 yakışur her ne kadar eylesem îtrâ-yı sülhan
 aradım ağzını hîçitmedi ifşâ-yı sülhan
 olmadı bir dürlü pezîrâ-yı sülhan
 eylemez 'âşık-ı bi-çâreden işğâ-yı sülhan
 dehen-i tengi dğildir bilirim cây-ı sülhan
 vâdî-i hezl-i zarîfânede imlâ-yı sülhan
 tavr-ı fahrîyye ile itmege inşâ-yı sülhan
 aqlasunlar ne imiş rütbe-i vâlâ-yı sülhan
 ka'be-i nazma giden bâdiye-peymâ-yı sülhan
 maşşadım itme degil maşşarâ-sîmâ-yı sülhan
 mâye-i şöhret olur bezl-i 'ağâyâ-yı sülhan
 gelse çölden bir alay lağlağa-fersâ-yı sülhan
 bi-hayâtik dir idi ma'ser-i 'arbâ-yı sülhan
 olsun erbâb-ı sülhan maşşadet-ârâ-yı sülhan

[Sünbül-zâde Vehbî. "kaşide-i kelâmiyye ki der şadâret-i halil paşa berâ-yı nuşh u istihzâ-yı şâ'irân-ı hezeyân-gûyân-ı 'aşr bâ emr ü irâde inşâd kerde est" *Dîvan*. Kahire: Bulak, t.y.: 113-118.]

[The poem can be also found: Silay, Kemal. *Nedim and the Poetics of the Ottoman Court: Medieval Inheritance and the Need for Change*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Turkish Studies Series, 1994: 136-143.]

Appendix D

hezliyyât sürûrî

şakalım vaşfına kıldım taşagımdan âgâz
taşagım olmasa hâlâ şakalım olmaz idi
şakalım böyle uzun taşagım kanbûr
fitne enbânı taşagım kaba ahmak şakalım
şakalım farṭ-ı nevâzişte taşagım ohşar
karnı şiş haste taşagım aña yorgan şakalım
şakalım meyli füzündür taşagımdan turfe
şakalımla taşagım va'd-i mülâkât etmiş
taşagım şakalım kılsa nola âmizîş
şakalım etdi tenezzül taşagım bendesine
şakalım şadre çekip vardı taşagım aşığı
şakalım yüzde taşagım sikimiş altında
şakalım tâ ki takındı taşagımla edebin
şakalımdan utanıp şakladı kendin taşagım
şakalım kendüyü koyverdi taşagım çekdi
taşagımla şakalım torbalı göynekdendir
kırşehirli şakalım karğılı türktür taşagım
şakalım döğmege şaklar taşagım ser deste
taşagım üzre şalındıkça yukardan şakalım
taşagım kuş gibi sekmiş şakalım çalısına
şakalım ak taşagım debbeder ammâ ki yine
şakalım yayılır etrâfa taşagım çekilir
taşagımla şakalım var şuya batmaz bedenim
beykoza gitdi taşagım şarıyâra şakalım
şakalım çünkü hakikatde taşagım gibidir
farṭ olunmaz taşagımla şakalım kılca veli
taşagımla şakalımdır iki şahş-ı mû-sâb
yapağacı taşagım oldu kıtıkçı şakalım
şakalım döndü ketâna taşagımdır fûrça
şakalım kıllı barâkdır taşagımdır kirpi
şakalım gerçi mübârek taşagım oldu habîş
baş şakalım arasında nice yatar taşagım
koç yigittir taşagım çok kocamışdır şakalım
nâm verdi şakalımla taşagım dünyâya
şakalımla taşagımdır taşagımla şakalım

şanma kim puşt azalıp şimdi çoğaldı muğlim
etdi muğlimle yarış 'azm-i sikiş-hânede puşt
piş-i muğlimde meger puşt uzanır yatar imiş
daldırıp kîrini muğlim gice puştıñ götüne
puşt kim muğlimi gördükde şalardı kıyruk
tılkayıp kûnun oşurtmaz idi muğlim puştı

taşagımdır şakalım bahşin eden tül ü dırâz
şakalım şanki olunmuş taşagımdan efrâz
taşagım olsa 'aceb mi şakalımdan haylâz
zıdd iken oldu şakalım taşagımla hem-râz
taşagımla hezlle doğrar şakalım üzre piyâz
şakalım üstüne titrer taşagım eyle nâz
şanki maḥmûd şakalım taşagım aña ayâz
taşagımla sâkalım eyle o va'di incâz
taşagım sifle-i dündür şakalım sifle-nevâz
taşagım da şakalım pâyin öpüp kıldı niyâz
taşagımdan şakalım eyledi rütbe ihrâz
vechi var olsa şakalım taşagımdan mümtâz
taşagım oldu şakalımla maḥâsin-perdâz
taşagım taşra çıkardı şakalım verse cevâz
şakalım ben gibi loşdur taşagım tîr-endâz
şakalım da taşagım da degil ehl-i erbâz
taşagım da katı nobrân şakalım da nâ-sâz
taşagım yâvuz efendi şakalımdan da yobâz
şanırım kim taşagım karğa şakalım şeh-bâz
şakalım kessem eder belki taşagım pervâz
şakalım kâğıd uçurmakta taşagım kuş-bâz
esdigin görse şakalımla taşagım poyrâz
şakalımdır başa yelken taşagımdır tonbâz
taşagımdan şakalım hakķında yapsam elgâz
taşagım şakalım gibi desem şanma mecâz
taşagım yumru bölündü şakalım oldu dırâz
şakalımla taşagım ya'ni degildir kızzâz
ne 'aceb olsa şakalımla taşagım enbâz
ben taşagımla şakalım tararım günde biraz
taşagım şaydına etmekte şakalım tek ü tâz
şakalımla taşagımdır şanasın miş u gurâz
taşagım kara doğuzdur ki şakalım aña sâz
gerçi bakşar şakalım yaşı taşagımdan az
şakalım belde köroğlu taşagımdır ayvâz
beni tanzîr-i bahâyi de kılan herze-turâz

çoğalıp puşt aña nisbetle azaldı muğlim
'âkıbet puşt öñe geçdi gerü kıldı muğlim
puştı göt vermegi öğretdi domaldı muğlim
puştıñ üstünde biraz uyķuya daldı muğlim
tutdu puştıñ götüne kîrini şaldı muğlim
puşt kıpatdı kûnun ağzına buğaldı muğlim

puşta muğlim olayım deyü içli dışlı
rîş-i muğlim ağarıp bitdi şakalı puştu
muğlim-i müflis edip puştu hevâyî gibi mest

kîr-i hârdan şanırim boyda uzundur yarağım
kışa kalın mı yâhûd ince uzun mu derseğ
cündiler beinse eger oturamaz üstünde
âteşi urdu yalıq yüzlülerin rûyuna kim
göte nefsim şal amân der şalarım boğ çıkarır
kıza kırsam kızarıp oğlana kırsam şararır
ey hevâyî siki arık şıpanıq pek kâkâr

râst gelse paralar kûnu kûduzdur yarağım
götü çıkmak kişiniğ yegdir adı çıkmakdan
siki başdıqca tuman atdırırım oğlana
düzerim eli sekiz ibneyi bir zolotaya
bak seniğ tâ-be-taşak ise şakalıq a baba
götü evlâdımığ olsa giyicikli ne ‘aceb
şıçırınca göte küt küt ururum anıqla
ki büyür ki küçülür bendeniz amı siksem
darılınca biri birine kıatar amı götü
götü var ise hevâyî öñüne dursun anıq

dırlamak da nola bî-pâk olsa ağzımdan götüm
carta ile yeñilersem zartamı fark edemez
şahkaha-fermâ olurdu her kavârem meclise
türkle şehri tekelimde seçilmezdi hele
kîr ile ağzı çelikli bir muşâhibdir nola
tükrüğün kendim verip kesb-i ruğûbet etsem
şâ'im iken sik yemezdim böyle mâh-ı rûzede
şimdi oğlân mu'teberdir şâ'ir-i hoş-lehceden

ben demem kim serdeki destâr olaydım kâşki
çaşşuruğ astârına perde olur pîrâheni
cismi zibâsın ser-â-pâ kaplayaydım oğlanıq
tâze bekler hîdmet-i ibrîk-ı istincâ ile
dil-berih memşâde olsun seyrediyim dünbesin
kûn-ı etfâle keneflerde olup silgi bezi
bir büyük dâvul kadar kûnuğ şadâ-yı zartasın
yoğ naşibim çünki götünden tâzenih altındaki
kânî-i lûtî kadar derdim hevâyî muğlimim

kirimih akmış gözü yaşı çıkıp baş üstüne
kîrime karşı degildir zartâ-i kûn-ı gulâm
şabkaveş gider şu kâfir kîrime kûnuğ dedim
belki beñzerdi benim başı kıllıklı kîrime
kanlıdır kîrimle ağzından ururdum kızığa

yapsın ço bizim evde yuva boğluca bülbül
bağlık sepedinden kafesim var şutabilsen
taqlid-i kibâr ile şıtanbûlda besler
br boğ sinegi nağme ile çıkdı helâdan
seyrine zemâne çocuğu göt verir elbet
başurlu büyük çır çır edince oşururken
şıçdı şıvadı hâşılı koğutdu yuvâsın
bir çalınığ altında hevâyî şıçıyorken

[muğhîkât-ı sürûr-i hezzâl. Milli Kütüphane, A 2513: 14b-17b]

[The *beşels* can be also found: Ayan, Elif. *Sürûrî ve Hezîyyât'ı: İnceleme-Tenkîlî Metin-Sözlük*. yayımlanmamış master tezi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sosyâl Bilimler Enstitüsü. Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Eski Türk Edebiyatı Bilim Dalı, 2002: 119-129]

kızını puşta verip anasın aldı muğlim
puştu eskitdi felek şimdi kıocaldı muğlim
verdiği aqceyi puştan yine çaldı muğlim

at sikinden de kalınlıkda füzündür yarağım
işte al baş hem uzun hem de yoğundur yarağım
şâh kâkâr yavuz atdan da hârudur yarağım
kûre-i kûnu tutuşdurmuş odundur yarağım
şan balat içre kerizci şalamandır yarağım
renkden renge girer bûkelemündür yarağım
ben nahîf oldum ise şanma zebündür yarağım

kılları fırçaya dönmüş ne doğuzdur yarağım
vây anıq başına kim böyle yavuzdur yarağım
keşti-i şehvete kıçda çaşalozdur yarağım
göte pek çok sürülür çünki uzundur yarağım
ben fakîr oğluğuzuğ tâ-be-omuzdur yarağım
sârî olmaqla taşığımdan uyuzdur yarağım
patladında dögerim amı topuzdur yarağım
kâkşa gûyâ palamûd ince çirozdur yarağım
kârı câdü ise andan cadalozdur yarağım
râst gelse paralar götü kûduzdur yarağım

fark olumazdı biraz çâk olsa ağzımdan götüm
her ne deñlü ehl-i idrâk olsa ağzımdan götüm
nâkıl-ı ahvâl-i idhâk olsa ağzımdan götüm
ışılâh-âmûz-ı etrâk olsa ağzımdan götüm
hem-nefes olduğda çâlâk olsa ağzımdan götüm
muğlimih altında nem-nâk olsa ağzımdan götüm
kâbil-i ta'lim-i imsâk olsa ağzımdan götüm
ey hevâyî kâşki pâk olsa ağzımdan götüm

oğlanıq çaşşuruna astâr olaydım kâşki
don olup melbûs-ı kûn-ı yâr olaydım kâşki
hem livâta kürkü hem şalvar olaydım kâşki
kâm-rana etdiği hîdmetkâr olaydım kâşki
eñse cânibde olan divâr olaydım kâşki
pâk-dâmen olmadan murdâr olaydım kâşki
uykudayken kûş edip bî-dâr olaydım kâşki
zevğ eden şağş-ı ebânetkâr olaydım kâşki
ben de 'allâme gibi bî-âr olaydım kâşki

göte kayparsa yeridir yaş odun kıodum baş üstüne
top şadâsıdır sefer vardır açık baş üstüne
oğlanım açtı götün olsun dedi baş üstüne
bir büyük kıubbe yapılsa dikili taş üstüne
ey hevâyî furça bulsam ferc-ı hûn-pâş üstüne

bülbül deresin ağıdır a boğluca bülbül
boğ kıarğası kıodum aya yâ boğluca bülbül
kârizcilik eden fuqarâ boğluca bülbül
kim uyduramaz aya şadâ boğluca bülbül
gösterse gulâm-pâre aya boğluca bülbül
gûyâ kim olur nağme-serâ boğluca bülbül
tebdil-i mağâm etse revâ boğluca bülbül
etmiş başı üstünde nevâ boğluca bülbül