

ISSN 2063-5346

# CONTROVERSIAL ASPECTS OF THE TURKIC MESNEVI *GUL U NAVRUZ*



Saidakbarova Saodat Parkhadjanovna<sup>1</sup>,  
Alimukhamedov Rikhsitilla Abdurashidovich<sup>2</sup>

---

Article History: Received: 10.05.2023

Revised: 29.05.2023

Accepted: 09.06.2023

---

## Abstract

This article explores and debates the imitation concept that has dominated Turkic poetry in general. Various hypotheses are given on the impulses that forced Turkish writers of the 15th and 17th centuries to recreate Persian poetry. The article summarizes the research Aspects of poetic imitation in 15th-17th century Turkish romances. The case of the *Gul u Navruz* by Hungarian scholar Ferenc Csirkes. *Gul u Navruz*, a collection of poems and stories celebrating the advent of spring and the renewal of nature, is one of the most famous Turkic manuscripts from this era. The manuscript has survived in several forms, each with its own set of variations and additions. The summary intends to analyze the highlighted facts in comparison with other scholars' suggestions. Several inescapable questions are addressed, but some crucial moments remain debatable. The dilemma about the first Chagatai author of the mesnavi is reviewed and compared with new facts. Ferenc Csirkes's belief based on Uzbek scholars' research is challenged by the long-lasting opposing idea that the mesnavi was recreated by Mevlano Lutfi rather than Haydar Khorazmiy. Despite its contentious nature, *Gul u Navruz* is a significant cultural relic in Persian and Turkic writings. It has been translated into numerous languages and is still studied and praised by academics worldwide. *Gul u Navruz*, in addition to its literary value, offers a window into the social and cultural context of Central Asia between the 15th and 17th centuries. Through its poems and stories, we can learn about the Turkic peoples' beliefs, customs, and traditions during this time era.

**Key words:** mesnevi, *Gul u Navruz*, Turkic poetry, Persian poetry, Chagatai, Ottoman, manuscript.

---

<sup>1</sup>PhD, Associate Professor, Tashkent state university of oriental studies

<sup>2</sup>D.S, Associate Professor, Tashkent state university of oriental studies

DOI:10.48047/ecb/2023.12.9.58

## Introduction

In the article *Aspects of poetic imitation in 15th-17th century Turkish romances. The case of the Gul u Navruz*, Ferenc Csirkés (Csirkés, 2007) attempted to explore the history of Ottoman and Chagatai literature and their interrelations with Persian ancestors through the mesnevi (narrative poem) *Gul u Navruz*. The author admitted that, even though there were significant number of masterpieces written by great novelists like Rumi and Navoi, he chose the one that had not gained much popularity in both Persian and Turkic literature. Turkic poetry went through several difficult phases in its development and struggled with misunderstandings for centuries. The debate over the originality of most Turkic manuscripts continues, with critics claiming that almost all novels that are not original are simply translations and supporters claiming that works were not only translations but also unique manuscripts based on the source.

The author intended to analyze historical, cultural, and traditional relationships to represent different periodical factors in Persian, Chagatai, and Ottoman literature. The fact that variations of the mesnavi were written in different periods allowed the author to compare and represent the cultural and literary lifestyles of those times. In Jalal-i Tabib's mesnavi *Gul u Navruz*, one could notice the mixture of romance and myth, which is not notable in the Turkic/Ottoman versions of the novel. On the other hand, in both Chagatai and Ottoman mesnavis there are religious signs that reveal the fact how poets tried to convert people to Islam through novels. Further in this article, indisputable facts will be analyzed to prove the idea mentioned above.

Issuable questions were addressed, but some crucial moments still remain debatable. Even though the author mentioned some research materials and discussion topics on the issue, the fact about the real author of the

Turkish/Chagatai version of the mesnavi *Gul u Navruz* had not been studied properly. Ferenc Csirkés believes that the mesnavi written in Turkish/Chagatai belongs to Haydar Khorazmiy. However, the majority of orientalist claim that it was Mevlana Lutfi who revived *Gul u Navruz*.

## Methodology

In identifying sources for this article review, multiple databases were used, including online platforms Scopus, Google Scholar, Academia, JSTOR, Islam Ansiklopedisi, and Ziyoz.uz were utilized to take an initial sample of what types of materials were available. Regarding these scientific platforms, broad search terms were used to establish a list of research articles that were primary sources. Research data allowed for a better list of more refined terms when utilizing other databases. Through the database selector in the library at Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies, I used the ERIC and SAGE databases.

In addition, the number of articles was located through the reference lists in relevant articles. The search phrases used were chosen because they were appropriate and relevant to the goal of this literature review. Sources were analyzed according to a number of criteria. First, the source had to be in line with the purpose of the literature review based on the research questions of the article.

Second, the sources had to be primary or secondary sources of research. Any source that focused on third-party research was removed. Third, the sources had to be from an international journal source. In addition to these three primary criteria, I also looked for types of journals that would normally include research articles that were thematically aligned with my purpose. Thus, I gave greater weight to articles that focused on old Eastern literature and mesnavies. I also examined

journals that would be characteristic of their respective fields. Finally, I ensured that the journals used the most recent dates, going back no further than 2010, but in the case of materials, they covered a big phase of dates, as the article enlightens the poetry of the 15th–17th century.

### Discussion

In general, the author puts forward the common belief that Ottoman poetry developed on the basis of its Persian predecessor, which was considered the “pearl of the East”. If the West owes the Romans and Greeks for their great sonnets, then the East can be grateful to the Persian poets for their brilliant kasidas, gazelles, and poems. Therefore, by imitating the Persian style, Ottoman poetry became gorgeous and attractive. However, there were several attempts to eliminate the Persianization of Ottoman poetry, replacing it with Arabic, sometimes in western styles (John, 1882). Only after the 15th century did those precautions bear fruit, and the Persian language became extinct in the Turkic world. According to S.S.Kuru and M.U.Inan, ‘the mechanisms behind this seemingly abrupt mid-sixteenth century focus on already canonical literary texts in Persian are completely ignored in scholarly (Inan & Kuru, 2011). Yet, during the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, the lack of a proper system and literary language in poetry forced Turks to use the Persian manual. Francesca Orsini claimed that ‘in some cases, it was Orientalist scholars themselves who directly undertook literary translations from original languages with general readers in mind.’ If located in the colonies, ‘Oriental translators’ often used ‘native informants’ who knew the original languages and usually left them unacknowledged (Orsini, 2020). E.J.W. Gibb stated, ‘The Turks were not content with learning from the Persians how to express thought; they went to them to learn what to think and in what way to think’ (John, 1900). Poems and novels were

underappreciated and undervalued in world literature throughout the Ottoman and Chagatai empires' histories. The lack of research and articles revealed that Turkic poetry was considered mediocre. No work on the subject existed in the English language till 1879, until the little book *On the History, System, and Varieties of Turkish Poetry* (John, 1900). According to E.J.W. Gibb within the last half-century, nearly all Turkic writing that was as wholly or mainly literary or artistic in intention took the form of verse and it was the result of being neglected (John, 1900).

Following the Ottoman Empire's collapse, many scholars began accusing Ottoman poets of plagiarism and debating their originality. In light of the Ottoman past, the revolution made a reconstruction necessary. Republican scholars were pressed into service to produce basic teaching texts for the new nationalist educational institutions, introducing Ottoman poetry to students trained by the culture revolution to distrust it as an emblem of the failed empire (Holbrook, 1992). All of these facts prove that the idea of degrading Ottoman poetry had its real purpose, and Turkish Republican scholars did their best to represent old Turkic literature in a negative light not only in Türkiye but also outside of it. However, existence of thousands of Ottoman poets and writers proves that whatever the cause of Ottoman literature's disregard, it was not due to a lack of writers or the quality of the manuscripts. James Redhouse stated, ‘who, with no fault of their own, have been so much misunderstood and misrepresented of late by political hypocrisy, religious bigotry, and classical bias, have been at all times as successful in the poetical and literary lines as they have been great in war and politics.’ ‘Without much enthusiasm, European writers have taken note from time to time of the Ottoman Turks' successful cultivation of poetry and literature.’ (Redhouse & University of California Libraries, 1879).

Great novels such as ‘The Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk’ (Compendium of the Languages of the Turks) by the Turkic scholar Mahmud Kashgari (1072) and ‘Qutadğū Bilig’ (Wisdom of Royal Glory) by Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Hājib (11th century) reveal a perfect Turkic mentality and philosophical mindset.

The second period of Ottoman poetry had significant alterations. After overcoming the initial difficulties with the language, the poets focused on studying and reproducing the methods of the contemporary Persian school headed by the illustrious Jami (John, 1900). The author validates that the novel illuminates the range of poetic ingenuity in Chagatai and Ottoman romantic epics of the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries. However, the author’s choice of the novel to represent the imitation of Turkic poetry is debatable. Firstly, I would discuss the term ‘imitation,’ which may lead a reader to reckon the 15<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries’ Turkic poetry as a plagiarism or copied version of Persian poems. As we have mentioned above, the evolution of any poetic style is due to its predecessor. Therefore, this process was commonly known and accepted not only by Turkic/Ottoman poets but also by poets all over the world. Persian poetry, too, had been influenced by Arabic mesnavis or gazals (Lewis, 1970/1985). Ancient Ottoman literature was rich in great novels and writers, but the problem was with poetry, which required meters. Persian meters, unlike Arabic, Latin, and Greek ones, had three lengths of syllable (short, long, and overlong). Therefore, they were used not only in classical Persian poetry of the Ottoman period, but also in Urdu poetry under the Mughal emperors (Persian Metres, 2023).

Secondly, the dilemma arising around the Turkic version of *Gul u Navruz* makes it impossible to analyze Turkic poetry on its basis. The existence of plenty of controversial facts given by scholars

worldwide about several individuals who are claimed to be the authors of the novel still generates a heated debate among orientologists. By the 1970s, the famous Turkic writer Lutfi had been considered the author of the novel, but several Uzbek scientists, such as Iskhakov (1972) and Rustamov (1972), claimed *Gul u Navruz* belonged to Haydar Kharazmiy (Sodat, 2020). Professor Adnan in his research on *Abdinin Gul u Navruz mesevisi*, analyzed the third version of the novel which was written by Abdi, in 1577 (İnce, n.d.). In his work, the author stated that there were four versions of *Gul u Navruz*, and all of them were translated. According to Professor Adnan, Lutfi translated the mesnavi from Persian into Chagatai (14th century), Muhibbi (16<sup>th</sup> century), Abdi (16<sup>th</sup> century) and Sabir Mehmet Parsa (17<sup>th</sup> century), into Anatolian Turkic in different periods (İnce, n.d.). Two Turkic scholars have mentioned Kalkandelin Mu’idi (16<sup>th</sup> century), whose *Gul u Navruz* was unknown for some decades. Both authors claim that Mu’idi’s work was based on the Persian origin of the novel but not translated.

My intention is to analyze all versions of the novel written or translated by authors and to study scholars’ justifications referring to their points.

### Persian poetry

**Jalal-i Tabib.** Initially, the novel was written by Jalal-i Tabib, a Persian poet from Shiraz, in 1333. The author mentions in his description that the novel’s hero, Navruz, was born on Iranian New Year and named after it. During the research, I noticed both Iranian and Turkish researchers neglected the novel *Gul u Navruz*, as minor articles can be found about it. The reason may lie in religious belief because most Muslims do not celebrate and appreciate Navruz as a holiday.

The episode about Navruz’s dream, where he saw Gul for the first time, truly illustrates the imaginary and extraordinary

approach of Persian style in novels. Phrases like ‘world-illuminator,’ ‘the gate of a cypress,’ ‘became drunk without drinking wine,’ ‘rose-faced,’ ‘the fair maid,’ and ‘thornless rose in the garden’ are the best examples of literary metaphors that enrich any kind of poetry. Jalal-i Tabib's attention to detail in the novel is inspiring—even the names of the heroes were carefully chosen. *Gul* and *Navruz* these two associations are deeply connected with each other. The Iranian New Year (Navruz) comes in the spring, which cannot be imagined without flowers (*Gul*). Bulbul (the nightingale) and Susan (Lily) also harbingers of spring. The name of the Chinese Emperor's evil servant was Yalda (Winter Solstice), which explains to the reader its negative connotation. It was common to compare heroes with stars and moons in Persian and Turkish literature. Jalal-i Tabib's brilliant comparison of *Gul u Navruz* to the pearl that nurtures in April, on the other hand, is truly outstanding. This phenomenon of illustration the nature in the poems was common in Arabic poetry. According to Y.A. Hamoud and S.H. Ruzy “the Arab poets have a close interconnection with the natural world and, therefore, they tend to feature it prominently in their poetry” (Ahmed & Hashim, 2015). If one of the goals of the article was to better understand the nature of Persian poets or even society, the Persian version of *Gul u Navruz* might be a good place to start. The prince who gave up everything for the girl from his dream, and the emperor's death as a result of the girl's rejection exemplifies the power of love and the society's weak emotional state. On the other hand, parents' pilgrimage to Makka and their belief in Allah demonstrate obedience and faithfulness. However, this part of the article cannot truly present Jalal-i Tabib's religious beliefs, and the author skips some crucial facts that could lead to a completely different interpretation of the novel. For example, Jalal-i Tabib begins his novel *Gul and Navruz* by greeting and

respecting Allah and the prophet and ends it by visiting Makka, pilgrimaging to the Kaaba, and organizing *Gul* and *Navruz*'s wedding in Madina (Sodat, 2020).

In fact, most of the mesnavis of Turkic and Iranian literature had similar scenarios. The sultan, who had no children, used to dream, disguise himself, and fall in love by seeing it in pictures and dreams; he also kept a list of places where no one was allowed to enter, except for people. The author was not sure about his conclusions that Jalal-i Tabib's *Gul u Navruz* had been based on mystical connotations, but he claimed that his Turkic elaborators understood the mesnavi in that way.

### Chagatai poetry

**Haydar Kharazmiy.** The author believes that Haydar Kharazmiy was the first person who recreated the mesnavi into the Chagatai language in 1411. According to him, the mesnavi could be considered as the first writing of Chagatai literature in Shiraz, Central Asia, where two versions of *Gul u Navruz* were written seventy years earlier. The author compared two versions and discovered that there were mythical accelerations in Haydar Kharazmiy's version. The fact that the hero of the mesnavi *Navruz* was charmed by himself after drinking wine was Haydar's own literal creation. Although the motif ‘self-charming’ had no connections to the main idea of the mesnavi, the author associated it with the narrative style and the *Gul u Navruz*'s Mystical Path of.

In addition, the author presented new hypotheses about two Lutfis, one of whom he believes also translated *Gul u Navruz* into Chagatai. The author paid attention to the copy of the mesnavi that is kept in the library of the Hungarian Academy. Although, the author of this mesnavi is unknown, there are many suggestions as to its origin. Csirkes mentions some Chagatai writers like Mir Alisher Navoi and Saqi were also counted as possible writers of the mesnavi *Gul u Navruz*. In fact, he

accepts that most copies of the mesnavi have the title Lutfi, and he gives his interpretation of the dilemma. According to him, the author of the dictionary 'Abushka' confused Haydar's and Lutfi's mesnavis and mistakenly titled Haydar's *Gul u Navruz* with the name of Lutfi. Occasionally, the author mentions about Mevlano Lutfi who has long been regarded as the author of *Gul u Navruz*.

By analyzing the mentioned mesnavi Csirkes gave a detailed description and stated that the beginning chapters of the mesnavi had been lost. In comparison with the Jalal-i Tabib's origin work the mesnavi had minor changings like Nevruz's rival Chinese emperor illustrated as Khazan (Autumn). It was noted that there are some similarities with Navoi's Layli and Majnun when Nevruz also wandered in the mountains after being defeated by Khazan.

Together with Ferenc Csirkes, a group of scholars claim *Gul u Navruz* belongs to Haydar Kharazmiy, and their belief is based on materials by Uzbek orientalists Iskhakov (1972) and Rüstemov (1972), who had a great contribution in the field of studying Alisher Navoi. According to Iskhakov, Lutfi lived and worked in Herat, and due to this fact, he could not be the author of the novel, which was devoted to the Persian sultan Iskandar (Fazilov, 2006). On the other hand, Haydar Kharazmiy lived and worked at the residence of Sultan Iskandar. Scholars believe that Lutfi's rival actions against Sultan Iskandar contradict the spirit of the novel, which is based on the idea of glorifying Sultan Iskandar. After analyzing *Gul u Navruz*, some critics claim its style is close to Haydar Kharazmiy's techniques.

**Mevlano Lutfi.** Being one of the great masters of his time, Lutfi was interested in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish literature and history. In his works, he used both Persian and Turkic languages. He was a profound writer and left a remarkable mark in Chagatai literature (XIV-XV). His

manuscripts were precise, clear, and easy to understand. He tried to avoid using foreign words and phrases, replacing them with old Turkic ones. Turkic proverbs and idioms fulfilled Lutfi's poems and novels, which made him the hero of Chagatai literature (EFENDİOĞLU, 2018). Lutfi's artistic legacy includes the classic poems 'Divan' and 'Mashkhirul-Khakaik' ('People's Truth'), as well as various poetry novels (Fazilov, 2006). There are many pieces of evidence to prove that *Gul u Navruz* was written by Mevlano Lutfi, and a significant number of orientalists did plenty of research to discover the truth. Uzbek scholar E.I. Fazilov, by analyzing the dilemma between Lutfi and Haydar Kharazmiy, revealed several historical, phonetic, and paradigmatic facts supporting Lutfi's authorship (Fazilov, 2006):

1. The copy of the novel held by the Hungarian Academy of Science is one of the most closely related to the novel's origins and contains direct evidence that Mevlano Lutfi wrote it.
2. The novel was translated at the request of Sultan Iskandar, who ruled Persia and Isfahan from 1409 to 1416. Mevlano Lutfi was an honorable writer who spoke Persian and Chagatai fluently; thus, he was the right person to recreate the masterpiece *Gul u Navruz*.
3. Opponents claim that the mesnavi *Gul u Navruz* was written in a style that was unlike Mevlano Lutfi's other works. The Preface of the Mesnavi was devoted to Sultan Iskandar and his great rule, whereas Lutfi hardly ever lauded or complimented monarchs in his writings. However, glorifying sultans and governors was writers' traditional style, so Lutfi might be forced to follow the tradition.
4. Mirza Muhammad Mehdikhan, the eminent orientalist and historian

who wrote the *Dictionary of the Single*, referred to Lutfi in several excerpts from *Gul u Navruz*.

Fazilov even questioned the existence of the author, Haydar Kharazmiy, alleging there were two distinct individuals. Master of words Haydar lived in the same period as Lutfi and Kharazmiy, the author of masterpieces such as ‘Mahzan,’ ‘Mahzan-al-Asrar,’ and ‘Muhabbatname,’ who had lived a hundred years before Lutfi (Eraslan, 2003). S.Efendioglu stated ‘Lutfi’s *Gül ü Navruz*, which contains some archaic features that have now been lost in classical Chagatai Turkish, traces from Oghuz and Kipchak dialects (EFENDİOĞLU, 2018). The author mentioned that Lutfi’s *Gül ü Navruz* was a translation written in mesnavi style. On the other hand, Adnan Ince protected Lutfi’s *Gul u Navruz*, stating that it was not just a word-for-word translation. According to him, the mesnevi was elaborated by Lutfi, new words and couplets were added, and the work was given an air of royalty. (İnce, n.d.)

In addition to the above-mentioned facts about Lutfi’s *Gul u Navruz*, we can say that his mesnavi consists of 2400 verses and was written according to Eastern tradition, which glorifies Allah, and Prophet Muhammad. The first lines of the mesnavi make it clear that Lutfi wrote it during a difficult period in his life. The verses below show his emotional weakness and tiredness.

Ushul kunlarki vaqtim erdi noxash,  
 Buzulg‘on bu ko‘ngilda ming tuman  
 g‘ash,  
 Parishonliq bila aqlim mushavvash,  
 Tiriklik nomuloyim, umre noxash  
 (Zohidov, 1959)  
 (These days I am feeling down  
 A broken soul is worried a lot  
 I am confusing in puzzlement

Life is not gentle, aliveness is unpleasant<sup>1</sup>)

Several verses that were written before the main part of the mesnavi prove the fact that Lutfi translated the *Gul u Navruz* according to the sultan’s order and did not have any intentions of saying that the mesnavi was his own creation.

Magar axtar muborak urdi folim,  
 Ki shahanshah o‘ngina soldi holim,  
 Tarahhum qildi o‘z eski qulina.  
 Nazar qildi navosiz bulbulina.  
 Buyurdikim, bu gul faslinda darhol  
 Gulu Navro‘zning afsonasin sol.

Aiyt ul Qissani turki tilina (Zohidov, 1959)

(My life was blessed with good fortune.  
 When sultan was calling me,  
 He was mercy of his poor slave  
 And drew attention to his soundless  
 nightingale.  
 Ordered in the flower season  
 To recreate the myth of *Gul u Navruz*  
 By translating it into Turkic)

### Ottoman poetry

**Kalkandelen Muidi.** F. Csirkes claims that except for a few verses recorded in Latif's collection of poet biographies, there is no note about Muidi of Kalkandelen.

**Nigdeli Muhibbi.** The first existing Ottoman version of the mesnavi was written by Nigdeli Muhibbi in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. According to F. Csirkes, the mesnavi was devoted to Suleyman the Lawgiver and it differed from other variations of *Gul u Navruz*. However, this fact has not been proven by other scholars. Muhibbi lived and worked at the same time as Sultan Suleyman; this made us believe that the mesnavi was dedicated to him (Delice, 1997). Furthermore, Murat Umut Inan claimed in his article

<sup>1</sup> Translated by the author, S.P. Saidakbarova

“Rethinking the Ottoman imitation of Persian poetry” that Suleyman wrote his poems under the pen name Muhibbi (the One who Loves) (Inan, 2017). The author compared the Persian and Chagatai versions with Muhibbi’s work and identified that, unlike its predecessors, the main concept of Ottoman *Gul u Navruz* was to entertain people. One of the reasons why Muhibbi composed his *Gul u Nevruz* was his objection to being accused of imitating, and his anxiety was seen even in his poems:

*Olub efsānesi köhne gider Ferhād u  
Mecnūnuñ*

*Muhibbī kırsaş ı nevdür okunsun cümle  
mahfil hā*

(The legends of Farhad and Majnun have become old-fashioned and are bygone.

Muhibbi’s story is new; let it be told in all gatherings!) (Inan, 2017)

*Ger lisān-ı gaybdan gelse Muhibbiye gazel  
Rūh-ı Hāfızdan bir istimḍ āddur dirler  
baña*

(If a gazel were to come to Muhibbi from the voice of the Unseen

They would say of me, this is asking assistance from the spirit of Hafiz) (Inan, 2017)

According to the author, Muhibbi avoided the mystical approach that was in previous mesnavis and fulfilled it with more details and characters. There are also several notes on the similarities between Ottoman and Persian literature, as well as characteristics of Chagatai and Ottoman *Gul u Navruz*.

**Abdi.** A new version of *Gul u Navruz* appeared in Turkish literature in the 16th century. Ottoman novelist Abdi wrote it and gave it to sultan Murad III in 1577 (İnce, n.d.). There are only four novels written by Abdi and the mesnevi ‘*Gul u Navruz*’ or ‘*Nuzhet-name*’ (the second name of the mesnevi, translated as Purity). Professor Adnan Ince, in his research

‘*Abdinin Gul u Navruz Mesnevisi,*’ gave a detailed explanation of Abdi’s variant of the mesnavi. Abdi started his *Gul u Navruz* with 33 verses that glorify Allah, express the dignity of a human being, and offer philosophical thoughts about creation.

### Results

Ferenc Csirkes, in his article, analyzes the common belief that Turkic poetry is a pale imitation of Persian poetry. The author discussed the discourse of imitation that approaches Turkic poetry in particular, Chagatai, and Ottoman literature in general. The mesnavi was analyzed from three different perspectives and its Persian, Chagatai, and Turkish variations compared. To begin, the author stated that the mesnavi *Gul u Navruz* originated with a Persian writer, Jala-i Tabib, a famous physician and poet of the Muzaffariler Dynasty, which ruled Iran in the 14th century. According to Ferenc Csirkes, other known Turkish (Chagatai and Ottoman) versions of the mesnavis were based on the Persian origin and translated by Haydar Kharazmiy (1411) and Muiddi (1520?). There were differences and similarities between three novels written in different periods. Even though each version of *Gul u Navruz* had very close, sometimes similar approaches, each had its own unique purpose.

According to the author, despite the romantic concept of the novel, it can also be interpreted as a divine myth. In supporting the author’s view, I can add that almost all Persian and Ottoman poets were Sufis who left a significant mark on Islam through their writings. Therefore, a sacred trace exists in every Turkic manuscript or novel. The explanation traces its roots back to the period when the Persian poetic and mystic systems evolved. As a result, Ottoman poets adopted both, which were regarded as the soul and body of Turkish poetry.

*Gul u Navruz* was little known in both the Persian and Ottoman Empires. The absence of notable data or minor

statements about authors (except Lutfi) or their novels indicates that they were underestimated. However, *Gul u Navruz* is a rare example that reveals how Ottoman Turks adopted a Persian manuscript by slightly adjusting the plot. The mesnavi is also a love story in which the subjects are handled in the same way as in many Mesnavis after it. (EFENDİOĞLU, 2018) In addition to the ancient Indo-Iranian epic, story tradition, and mythology, the work, which bears traces of old Arabian storytelling, was transformed into a classic love story by embellishing it with Islamic motifs. This Persian mesnavi, written in the form of Aruz mefâîlün, consists of 1181 couplets in total. (İnce, 1998: 104).

### Conclusion

The study demonstrates how Turkic *Gul u Navruz* relates to and differs from its Persian origin, prompting us to make certain suggestions and reconsider Chagatai and Ottoman poetry. The 15th and 17th century Turkic manuscripts contain contentious religious and spiritual ideas that question traditional Islamic beliefs. Some of these manuscripts advocate Sufi mysticism, which prioritizes personal experience and direct understanding of God over religious doctrine. Many Turkic manuscripts from this era also contain ideas that challenge the Ottoman Empire's and its religious establishment's authority. Some of these manuscripts advocate for a unified Turkic state, free of Ottoman rule and free to pursue its own cultural and political objectives.

In the article Aspects of poetic imitation in 15th–17th century Turkish romances, In the case of *Gul u Navruz*, Ferenc Csirkes explains his understanding of Turkic poetry and compares it to the ideas of other scholars. The author debates over the originality of most Turkic manuscripts and proves his own side by analyzing the mesnavi *Gul u Navruz* from three different poetic periods. The author gave detailed

analysis of the Persian, Chagatai, and Ottoman versions of the mesnavi. He believes Jalal-i Tabib's *Gul u Navruz* is a unique example of its period, which was written in the imaginative love story genre with a mystical blend. Turkic versions of the mesnavi were based on mystical connotations, as Chagatai and Ottoman elaborators understood the original mesnavi accordingly.

Some versions of *Gul u Navruz* contain contentious ideas about love and sexuality, such as poems celebrating same-sex love and challenging conventional gender roles. Other versions are more spiritual in nature, emphasizing the importance of direct understanding of God and personal experience.

Evidently, extrapolating findings from the study of a single poem to other, if not all, Ottoman poems styled after Persian masters would be factually inaccurate. Even so, it would not be incorrect to suggest that Turkic mesnavis are best approached through intertextual reading, which provides a window into the rhetorical transformations involved in a Turkic poet's relationship with Persian poetry (Inan, 2017)

In the 1900s, politically biased scholars criticized Ottoman literature and tried to underestimate the power of the Ottoman empire and this fact mostly generated the idea of “imitation” in Turkic poetry of the 14th century. During our research we found indisputable evidence that most writers indirectly mentioned the origin of the source and gave information about its creation. The mainly claimed author of the mesnavi, *Gul u Navruz* Lutfi, informed readers that he translated the mesnavi from its previous verses. Despite the fact that the mesnavi were not original, each author tried to add unique features.

Overall, the Turkic manuscripts of the 15th and 17th centuries reflect a rich and complex body of literature that questions conventional Islamic beliefs and promotes new perspectives on religion, politics,

culture, and society. Scholars continue to study and debate these manuscripts today, providing insights into the Turkic peoples' diverse and dynamic past.

### Literature

- Ahmed, H. Y., & Hashim, R. S. (2015). Greening of Resistance in Arabic Poetry: An Ecocritical Interpretation of Selected Arabic Poems. 3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 21(01), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.17576/31-2015-2101-02>
- Csirkés, F. (2007). Aspects of poetic imitation in 15th–17th-century Turkish romances. The case of the Gul u Navrûz. Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, 60(2), 195–221. <https://doi.org/10.1556/aorient.60.2007.2.3>
- Delice, P. D. H. İ. (1997). NİĞDELİ MUHİBBİ VE GÜL Ü NEVRUZ MESNEVİSİ. [www.academia.edu](https://www.academia.edu/5033377/N%C4%B0%C4%9EDEL%C4%B0_MUH%C4%B0BB%C4%B0_VE_G%C3%9CL_%C3%9C_NEVRUZ_MESNEV%C4%B0S%C4%B0). [https://www.academia.edu/5033377/N%C4%B0%C4%9EDEL%C4%B0\\_MUH%C4%B0BB%C4%B0\\_VE\\_G%C3%9CL\\_%C3%9C\\_NEVRUZ\\_MESNEV%C4%B0S%C4%B0](https://www.academia.edu/5033377/N%C4%B0%C4%9EDEL%C4%B0_MUH%C4%B0BB%C4%B0_VE_G%C3%9CL_%C3%9C_NEVRUZ_MESNEV%C4%B0S%C4%B0)
- EFENDİOĞLU, S. (2018). LUTFİ'NİN GÜL Ü NEVRÛZ'U VE YAZMA NÜSHALARI Lutfi's Gul u Nevrûz and its Copies Süleyman EFENDİOĞLU □. Atatürk Üniversitesi. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/499008>
- Eraslan, K. (2003). LUTFİ. TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi. <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/lutfi> (Eraslan, 2003)
- Fazilov, E. (2006). Budapeshtskaya rukopis "Gul i Navruz" Lutfi. A.N. Kononova.
- Holbrook, V. R. (1992). Originality and Ottoman Poetics: In the Wilderness of the New. Journal of the American Oriental Society, 112(3), 440. <https://doi.org/10.2307/603080>  
[https://www.academia.edu/26151948/Reintroducing\\_Hafez\\_to\\_Readers\\_in\\_Rum\\_2011\\_with\\_Murat\\_Umut\\_%C4%B0nan](https://www.academia.edu/26151948/Reintroducing_Hafez_to_Readers_in_Rum_2011_with_Murat_Umut_%C4%B0nan)
- Inan, M. U. (2017). Rethinking the Ottoman Imitation of Persian Poetry. Iranian Studies, 50(5), 671–689. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00210862.2017.1310616>
- Inan, M. U., & Kuru, S. (2011). Reintroducing Hafez to Readers in Rum (2011) with Murat Umut Inan. [www.academia.edu](http://www.academia.edu).
- İnce, A. (n.d.). ABDÎ'NİN GÜL Ü NEVRÛZ MESNEVİSİ. Retrieved April 3, 2023, from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/156921>
- John, E. (1882). Ottoman Poems. Loren and Sons Printers Wellington Street.
- John, E. (1900). A History of Ottoman Poetry (Vol. II). Luzak&CO.Gibb.,
- Lewis, B. (1985). The Cambridge History of Islam: Volume undefined: The Central Islamic Lands from Pre-Islamic Times to the First World War. In P. M. Holt, A. K. S. Lambton, & B. Lewis (Eds.), Cambridge University Press. Cambridge University Press. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-history-of-islam/07D5BEBF551407754BF887D494B65D44> (Original work published 1970)
- Malcolm Edward Yapp, & Stanford Jay Shaw. (2018). Ottoman Empire | Facts, History, & Map. In Encyclopædia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/place/Ottoman-Empire>

15. Orsini, F. (2020). From Eastern Love to Eastern Song: Re-translating Asian Poetry. *Comparative Critical Studies*, 17(2), 183–203. <https://doi.org/10.3366/ccs.2020.0358>
16. Persian metres. (2023, April 2). Wikipedia. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persian\\_metres](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persian_metres)
17. Redhouse, J. W. (James W., & University of California Libraries. (1879). On the history, system, and varieties of Turkish poetry. Illustrated by selections in the original, and in English paraphrase, with a notice of the Islamic doctrine of the immortality of woman's soul in the future state. In Internet Archive. London, Trübner and co. <https://archive.org/details/onhistorysystemv00redhrich>
18. Shaffer, D. (2005). Teaching Idioms with Conceptual Metaphors and Visual Representations. *The Internet TEFL Journal*, 57, 57. [https://www.academia.edu/12163653/Teaching\\_Idioms\\_with\\_Conceptual\\_Metaphors\\_and\\_Visual\\_Representations](https://www.academia.edu/12163653/Teaching_Idioms_with_Conceptual_Metaphors_and_Visual_Representations)
19. Sodat, M. (2020). Gul va Navruz dostonlari misolida forsiy va turkiy adabiyotlar aloqasi haqida bir tadqiq. *Young Scientists*.
20. Suat Ünlü. (2014). Çağatay Türkçesi Sözlüğü. EĞİTİM YAYINEVİ.
21. Zohidov, V. (1959). O'zbek Adabiyoti (Vol. 1). O'zSSR Davlat Badiiy Adabiyot Nashriyoti.