



Turkish Folklore: An Introduction

William H. Jansen

The Journal of American Folklore, Vol. 74, No. 294, Folklore Research around the World: A North American Point of View. (Oct. - Dec., 1961), pp. 354-361.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0021-8715%28196110%2F12%2974%3A294%3C354%3ATFAI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-H>

The Journal of American Folklore is currently published by American Folklore Society.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/folk.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WILLIAM H. JANSEN

TURKISH FOLKLORE: AN INTRODUCTION

THIS essay is organized around general bibliographical data which, it is hoped, will yield simultaneously a picture of the types of folklore extant in Turkey and the direction of folkloric studies in that country.

To begin with, two general bibliographies are useful to the student who is most at ease with English. The first, and the more valuable, is by the late John Kingsley Birge, probably the greatest Turkologist of our time. Called *A Guide to Turkish Area Study* (Washington, D. C., 1949), his book presents a kind of running expository comment on both source materials and research based on these materials. In this indispensable work the folklorist will find particularly rewarding Chapters IV, VII, and XI. Though not a folklorist himself, Birge was one of the few scholars who realized that in Turkish culture there is no clear demarcation between folk and nonfolk. He perceived that an understanding of the Turkish character is only possible through a close study of Turkish folklore, and that modern Turkish culture is both a product of the conscious welding of Turkish folklore with Western "nonfolk" culture and a product of the purposeful rejection of the literate culture of prerepublican Turkey. The latter rejection is assured, for the literature of Ottoman Turkey published in Arabic characters is no longer available to the modern Turk who knows only the Romaic alphabet. The alphabet reform certainly has deprived the modern Turk of magnificent heirlooms, many of which of course have been transliterated; but this reform naturally has in no way affected the survival of the national folk heritage, dependent as it is upon oral transmission.¹

The second general bibliographical source is Grace Hadley Fuller's mimeographed and hard-to-obtain *Turkey: A Selected List of References* (Washington, D. C., 1943). This bibliography, prepared for the Library of Congress, supplements Birge's later work, as it mentions a number of relevant periodical and journalistic articles. For the student of folklore, the three most useful subject headings in this study are Religion, Women, and Arts and Letters. That these unlikely headings yield the most rewards for the folklorist affords in itself a too-revealing commentary upon Western study of, and attitudes toward, Turkish folk culture.

Still under the general heading, I must mention three Turkish societies as well as an institution difficult to classify; all of these have contributed largely to Turkish folklore study and publication. What I take to be the oldest of these organizations is the *Türkiyat Enstitüsü* (The Institute of Turkology), founded at Istanbul in 1924, which is now moribund if not defunct. Under the general editorship of the nation's great senior historian, Köprülüzade Mehmed Fuad, better known to the West as a fine statesman under his later name Fuat Köprülü, the Institute began to issue in 1935 the *Türk Halk Edebiyatı Ansiklopedisi* (*The Encyclopedia of Turkish Folk Literature*). Although the published beginnings of this encyclopedia (from AA only partially through B) reflect impressive and dedicated scholarship, for reasons unknown to me the project was evidently abandoned in the same year in which it began. Under the

same aegis and fine editorship, there also began to appear a series of monographs on the *sazşairleri*.² This series has continued under various sponsorships, including the University of Istanbul and commercial publishers, and is one of the most impressive in Turkish folklore scholarship, both because of the caliber of the research and because of the peculiar interest of the material presented.

The *sazşair* is a folk minstrel, both composer and singer, who performs and sometimes creates or adapts folk lyrics and balladlike songs of which he frequently claims to be the hero. The *saz* is a musical instrument resembling a long-necked mandolin; *şair* means singer-composer. Today only a rather sad remnant of the species may still be encountered, a remnant adulterated by the radio and popular music. While the "art" composers and poets of the Osmanlı and earlier Turkish eras (ca. 1071-1566) were imitating foreign, usually Persian, forms and often actually composing in foreign languages, the *sazşairs* were working in the vulgate Turkish and were preserving the simple but effective art forms that the Turks presumably brought with them to Asia Minor as part of their folk culture. Not only the names but rather full biographies of these folk poet-minstrels survive, even from the early centuries of the Turkish occupation of Anatolia.³ And their poems, probably orally composed and orally circulated—though of course frequently transcribed in later times—survive orally, still ascribed to their traditional and revered composers.⁴ An illustration of the effect of these minstrels upon modern Turkish culture is *Yunus Emre*, an oratorio by Turkey's greatest musicologist and current Director of the Ankara Conservatory of Music, Adnan Saygun. Written and first performed in 1946, the oratorio tells the story of Yunus Emre, an ancient *sazşair* (1280-1330), and uses the strangely moody, despondent folk lyrics (moving both in words and in music) still ascribed in the folk mind to that folk genius of long ago.

The *Türk Dil Kurumu* and the *Türk Tarih Kurumu* (the Turkish Linguistic and the Turkish Historical Societies), both founded in Ankara and in part supported by the Turkish hero Kemal Atatürk, have published extensively in folklore and have stored in their various archives of source material enormous mines for future research and publication. As an example of this resource material, I will cite one archive in the Linguistic Society's truly remarkable library. This archive contains, very systematically arranged, the material for a kind of linguistic atlas for the folk speech of each of Turkey's sixty-three provinces. For each word there are given instances of its occurrences in proverbs, riddles, and the like with these folk sayings quoted exactly as collected in the various provinces. Need I enumerate the possibilities here for the eager folklorist?⁵

The "institution difficult to classify" cited earlier is the *halkevi* (plural, *halkevleri*: folk houses). The *halkevleri* were community adult education and cultural centers founded by Atatürk and his Republican People's Party in 1932. They were government-sponsored and supported centers, located throughout the country in cities, towns, and even in small villages. Here the people could find copies of the nation's newspapers; participate in social activities such as folk dancing; learn to read and write, using the new alphabet; and perhaps be indoctrinated with political dogma. When the Democratic Party, under Celâl Bayar and Adnan Menderes, came to power in 1950 the approximately four hundred *halkevleri* were closed because of their close connections with the opposition party. And, so far as this speaker knows, they have mostly remained so. Whatever the political significance of the *halkevleri*, the folklorist must gratefully acknowledge that, strangely perhaps, a number of them sponsored

and published varying impressive volumes of folklore collected in the specific areas where they were severally located.⁶

The total number of monographs, volumes, and journals (at least eight journals are now defunct) published by these societies and by the *halkevleri* is unknown to this writer, but it must run into the hundreds. Neither am I aware of how many occasional folklore articles have appeared in quarterlies published by the various Turkish university faculties, but once again the figure seems to be a large one. I suppose a complete collection of Turkish folklore scholarship in print may not exist outside of Turkey, though representative collections are available in the Library of Congress and at Indiana University. Oddly, neither collection is catalogued.⁷

I shall turn now to more specific matters, hoping to give simultaneously an impression of what specific scholars are doing in Turkish folklore and an over-all view of emphases peculiar to folklore in Turkey. The greatest active Turkish folklorist of today is Pertev Naili Boratav. Now living in France, Boratav nevertheless concerns himself with the Turkish folktale, a very rich branch of Turkish folklore encompassing a bewildering number of generic names. Among these terms for oral narrative are: *hikâye* (a story, novel, narrative, rather like the romance, sometimes translated in English as "minstrel tale," and in form resembling the *cante fable*); *destan* or *dasitan* (the folk epic, whose hero is frequently both a bandit and a *sazşair*, sometimes indistinguishable from the *hikâye* except in length); *masal* (sometimes apparently a synonym for *destan*); *fıkra* (the anecdote); *nükte* (an anecdote involving a witticism); and many others, including those designated by Western folklorists as *Märchen* (*peri masalı* or *masal*) and saints' legends (*evliya destanı*). This plethora of generic Turkish nouns designating overlapping types of folk narrative may explain the reluctance of Turkish folklorists to use the Thompson indexes.⁸

An excellent idea of the extent of Turkish folk narrative may be gained from Boratav and Wolfram Eberhard, *Typen Türkischer Volksmärchen* (Weisbaden, 1953). The invaluable introductory essays in this volume deserve great praise, as does Boratav's introduction to his *Contes Turcs* (Paris, 1955), an excellent sampling of the gems in his own collection, representing the types and characteristic styles described in the introductory essay. Other good small modern translations are Margery Kent's *Fairy Tales from Turkey* (London, 1946), growing incidentally out of a *halkevi* project, and Naki Tezel's *Contes Populaires Turcs* (Istanbul, 1953), distributed *gratis* by the Turkish Information Offices.

The innumerable collections and translations of collections of *Nas'r eddin Hoca* anecdotes need not be discussed here, though it is worth noting that in various cheap editions and popular adaptations they sell well in every Turkish bookstore and newsstand, as do other collections of anecdotes not so well known in the West.⁹ One group of anecdotes centers around the *Beğtaşî* dervish order (all such orders in Turkey were dissolved in the early days of the Republic) and glorifies a kind of worldly sophistication towards traditional religious practices and tabus.¹⁰ As an illustration of how such folklore dominates the national culture, I remember a truly hilarious comic strip—the Turks have a long history of excelling in caricature—featuring one *Canbaba* (roughly Father John), a bumbling but lovable man of old-fashioned religious customs who is completely baffled by modern ways and who I suspect is traceable to the *Beğtaşî* of anecdotal fame.

Perhaps most exciting to the few Western folklorists who know about them are the romances in *cante-fable* form, or the minstrel tales as Eberhard has termed them.

A number of these epiclike narratives exist, glorifying bandit outlaws, all of whom seem to have been also folk poets. It is usually claimed that the bandits wrote the romances in which they star or, at the very least, composed impromptu the songs contained within the narratives.¹¹ The heroes usually are depicted as of middle-class or humble origin, of colossal proportions, of passionate and loving nature, and frequently as having been wronged by society, the law, or the aristocracy. In some details, they and their narratives are reminiscent of British balladry's Robin Hood and, even more, of the Serbians' Marko Kraljević.

The best study of these minstrel tales or romances is Boratav's monumental *Köroğlu Destanı* (Istanbul, 1931), the German translation of which has been predicted repeatedly. *Köroğlu* (the Blind Boy or the Blind Man's Son) is both the name of the hero and of the romance in which he appears. This narrative, the longest of its kind (its English translation, though incomplete, runs into hundreds of pages),¹² is, I suppose, the one most loved by the Turks. It tells of a young man who, in avenging an injury to his stableman father, becomes the leader of a horde of bandits and the terror of sultans and rival bandit chiefs. After a number of Herculean feats, performed frequently with the aid of his wonder horse, the hero allows himself to be killed rather than to go on fighting after his horse has been treacherously hamstrung. Eberhard reports on modern occurrences of this and other romances in a first-rate monograph of 1955, *Minstrel Tales from Southeastern Turkey*.

There are numerous indications of the continuing popularity of these romances. Like the lyrics ascribed to the various *sazşairleri* of ancient times, many of them are available in lurid, cheap-paper editions, particularly at newsstands in rural and poor urban areas. A somewhat atypical romance, *Kerem ve Aslı*, is the basis of the greatest modern Turkish opera, composed by Adnan Saygun.¹³

From folk narrative to folk drama is not a long step for the Turkish scholar, who considers the folktale's performance as one facet of the folk theater. The best work on the entire subject of Turkish folk drama is Selim Nüzhet Gerçek's *Türk Temaşası* (Istanbul, 1942). This rather rare little volume, much deserving of translation, treats Turkish folk theater under three headings: the *meddah*, the *orta oyunu*, and the *karagöz*. To define these terms will indicate the nature of folk drama in Turkey. The *meddah* was (past tense, unfortunately, except for nostalgic revivals and perhaps remote provincial survivals) the coffee-house and mosque-yard entertainer who performed folktales without using properties other than the shawl and stool which were the traditional badges of his profession. Seated on a table, on an improvised platform, or under the arch of a mosque cloister, he would recite the old tales (frequently *Märchen* or *novelle*) from memory, relying only upon his facile voice and gesticulation to bring them to life.

The *orta oyunu* (literally, "performance in the middle") was a kind of folk theater in the round. It is nonexistent today, even though there are still active performers in the nonfolk theater who served their apprenticeship therein. Each *orta oyunu* consisted of two men, one of whom acted all the female parts in the traditional pieces of their repertoire. These traveling companies would open their theater by laying a rug down in a public square, at a picnic ground, or elsewhere alfresco. Upon one corner of the rug the performers placed a three-sided dressing room for one, about the size of a phone booth; and then they staged their plays, using costumes and rough props. Their simple, slapstick productions featured dialect, conventionalized characters (the Arab, the Armenian, the Albanian, the Greek, the Westerner, the

soldier, the bully, the sissy, the drug addict, and so on), and ad-libbing. The audience stood on all four sides of the rug stage and willingly suspended their ability to see into the dressing room and through the nonexistent scenery.

The *karagöz* is the shadow theater, the one type of Turkish folk drama well studied internationally, as witness Georg Jacob's *Türkische Schattentheatre* (1900) and Hellmut Ritter's *Türkische Schattenspiele* (1924). In Turkey this form of folk drama has been treated not only in Gerçek's work but also in Sabri Esat Siyavuşgil's *Karagöz* (Istanbul, 1941), translated into French (Istanbul, 1951) and into English (Ankara, 1955)—a handsomely illustrated study which vigorously attacks the psychological and sensual emphases made by the earlier German scholars of the shadow theater.

In the early spring of 1953 it was my good fortune both as a member of the audience and as a privileged backstage visitor, to see the *Karagöz* of *Küçük Ali* (Little Ali), perhaps the last great *hayali* or *karagözcü* (shadow-theatre operator) of Turkey. The stage was a translucent screen, perhaps four feet square, with projecting wings that hid the operator. The screen was set upon a table, draped so that the operator's legs were invisible to the audience seated in front. Behind the screen were placed lights, like footlights (once candles). The operator, standing behind the lights, placed several two-dimensional translucent puppets, made of brightly colored camelskin, against the screen and manipulated them by slender three-foot-long rods. The audience seated on the other side of the screen saw these figures as brightly-tinted shadows moving animately and jerkily back and forth on a white screen. There were also colored shadow props, such as a well, a ship, a tree, and a palace, that were camelskin images leaned against the back of the screen. All of the characters were manipulated by the one operator, who also spoke all of the marvelously differentiated voices. He was aided by an apprentice who kept the proper puppets in readiness to go on stage and helped to set up and take down the theater. In performances of this kind, there may also be one or more musicians who supply incidental music on traditional Turkish instruments.¹⁴

The shadow plays, of which several dozen exist, have characteristics and characters similar to those of the *orta oyunu* with one very important exception: in the shadow theater the two main characters are always Karagöz and Hacıvat. Karagöz, whose name means Black Eye and who is portrayed by a puppet with piercingly black eyes, is a bearded country innocent who is put upon in every way by the sly, citified, pseudo-sophisticated, and unctuous Hacıvat, whose name is a corruption of *Hacı* (Pilgrim) Ayvat. The two get into broad burlesque, sometimes ribald situations, from which Karagöz despite his naiveté somehow always emerges victorious, to the discomfiture of the clever trickster Hacıvat. Interestingly the plays all utilize conventionalized opening and closing formulae which are beautifully symbolic invocations of the proprietor disclaiming fatalistically any responsibility for the actions of the puppets.

Except for mention of the *sazşair's* poems and the lyrics imbedded in the romances, I have scarcely referred to Turkish folk music—a vast subject by itself. There have been tremendous government-sponsored field expeditions for the collecting of folk music. In the National Conservatory of Music at Ankara are stored thousands of field recordings of the *türkü* (a balladlike song), the *mani* (lyric), the *ninni* (lullaby), dance tunes, such as the *zeybek*, and the ritual song of the dervishes and of other religious groups. Among others, Adnan Saygun and Halil Yönetken have organized and led such collecting expeditions.¹⁵ Other expeditions were sponsored, less scientifi-

cally, by local *halkevleri*. Of all this vast collected material, almost nothing has been published, though some commercial recordings of genuine folk music are available.

Much has been done with folk speech, with proverbs, and with dialect vocabulary, although the full extent of such work is not quickly evident since a great deal of it has been published in regional and sometimes obscure Turkish periodicals. Sami Ergun, among others, has published collections of the *bilmece* or *mesele* (riddle or puzzle).¹⁶ Abdülkadir İnan has written several folkloric researches of merit, including the very significant *Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm* (Ankara, 1954), a title which might be rendered as *Shamanism Past and Present*. This is another work which merits translation into an accessible language.

In brief, what I have said boils down to this: there is a vast amount of folklore in Turkey, and it is of great potential interest and significance to the international science of folklore; a very respectable amount of research has been done on Turkish folklore, much of it by Turks and much of that still inaccessible to international scholars; a wealth of opportunities for folklore research exists in Turkey, and for a few projects the fieldwork has already been done.

What I have left unsaid is, I fear, of staggering extent. Turkey is a country of fascinating minority groups. According to popular belief, if one stands for an hour on Istanbul's Galatasaray Bridge, he will hear all of the languages of the world—and, I would add, some no longer spoken any place else. There are hundreds of other folk cultures in Turkey beside that ordinarily thought as of Turkish. The folkloric potentialities of a community separated from its homeland for five centuries;¹⁷ of an almost unstudied culture such as that of the Kurds; of the as yet completely unstudied Laz people of Trabzon; and of many intriguing enclaves are fascinating beyond measure.

In even briefer terms, I am saying that Turkey may well be the El Dorado of folklore.

NOTES

(The editor thanks Mrs. Daisy Crystal of Turkey, a graduate student at Indiana University in 1960-61, for assistance on this article, the author being in Indonesia.)

1. The alphabet reform, one of the many innovations made to westernize Turkey and to help it advance in all fields, was made in 1928. It is actually the complete substitution of one alphabet for another. The collected works of such well-known authors as Kadı Burhaneddin, Yunus Emre, and Hayali Bey have been transliterated. In addition to these and other great collections of Turkish literature, limited selections of religious and philosophical works, early travel accounts, and Moslem poems used at memorial services also have been transliterated. The average modern Turk has difficulty appreciating such works, however, not only because of the new alphabet but also due to the language employed. Both the untransliterated and transliterated literatures are incomprehensible to him because of the heavy Persian and Arabic borrowings, both in vocabulary and grammar. Many of these borrowings, as a matter of fact, never were part of the average person's speech. During the Ottoman era, for example, only the intelligentsia (comprised mainly of government officials and people connected with the court) were trained to write in this language.

2. The monograph series includes under the general title *Türk Sazşairlerine Ait Metinler ve Tetkikler* (*Texts and Analyses of Turkish Minstrels*) individual studies of minstrels, e. g., by Mehmet Fuat Köprülü, *XVII asır Sazşairlerinden Gevherî* (*Gevherî, One of the Seventeenth Century Minstrels*) (1929); *XIX asır Sazşairlerinden Erzurumlu Emrah* (*Erzurumlu Emrah, One of the Nineteenth Century Minstrels*) (1929); S. Nüzhet, *XVII asır Sazşairlerinden Pir Sultan Abdal* (*Pir Sultan Abdal, One of the Seventeenth Century Minstrels*) (1929); Köprülü, *XVI asır Sonuna Kadar Türk Sazşairleri* (*Turkish Minstrels Until the End of the Sixteenth Century*) (1930); Köprülü, *Kayıkçı Kul Mustafa ve Genç Osman Hikâyesi* (*Kayıkçı Kul Mustafa [a minstrel of the seventeenth century] and the Young Osman Story*) (1930); and P. Naili, *Köroğlu Destanı* (*The Köroğlu Epic*) (1931).

3. The Ottoman Empire was founded in 1299. The Seljuk era, however, was earlier; it began in 1071 and lasted until 1244. For further information on foreign-language influences upon Turkish literature, see Ağâh Sırrı Levend's *Türk Dilinde Gelişme ve Sadeleşme Safhaları* (Ankara, 1949).
4. Some biographies of the minstrels are discussed by İlhan Başgöz in his "Turkish Folk Stories about the Lives of Minstrels," *Journal of American Folklore*, LXV (1952), 331-339.
5. The archives of the Türk Tarih Kurumu contain interviews with soldiers who were involved in the post-World-War-I fight for Turkish freedom; folk-minstrel songs about that and earlier wars; and the research of many students who have tried to prove some of Atatürk's theories about the long-range ancient history of the Turks. Articles of interest to folklorists appear in the Türk Dil Kurumu's monthly publication *Türk Dili*, e.g., Behçet Kemal Çağlar's "Folklorun Aynasında Türk İnsanı I: Türküler, Törelere, Oyalar" ("The Turkish Person in the Mirror of Folklore, I: Folk Songs, Customs, Embroidery"), XCVIII, No. 76. For full-length folkloric publications of the Türk Dil Kurumu, see, e.g., Muhtarrem Ergin's *Dede Korkut Kitabı (The Dede Story Book)* (Ankara, 1960); the five-volume collection of dialect words from all parts of Turkey, *İllerimiz Ağzlarından Toplamalar (Collections of Dialects)* (Istanbul, 1939-52); and *Türkiyede Halk Ağzından Söz Derleme Dergisi (Magazine of Collected Folk Sayings)*, ed. Şakir Ülkütaşır and Ömer A. Aksoy (Ankara, 1952), a collection of dialect words referring to local customs, published as a supplement to the five volumes of dialect words listed above. For folkloric publications of the Türk Tarih Kurumu, see, e.g., A. Caferoğlu's *Folklorumuzda Millî Hayat ve Dil Bakışları (National Life and Language Treasures in our Folklore)* (Ankara, 1940); and Abdülkadir İnan's *Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm: Materyaller ve Araştırmalar (Shamanism in History and Today: Materials and Investigations)* (Ankara, 1954).
6. See, e.g., the Gaziantep Halkevi's *Gaziantep Dilinin Tetkiki (Analysis of the Gaziantep Language)*, by Ömer Asım Aksoy (Gaziantep, 1933); and the Muğla Halkevi's *Türk Adları (Turkish Names)*, by M. Cavit and O. Saffet (Muğla, 1934). For folklore journals published by the now defunct local folk houses, see, e.g., the Ankara Halkevi's *Ülkü* and *Altı Ok* (24 issues between 1933-36); and the Eminönü Halkevi's *Halk Bilgisi Haberleri (Communications on Folklore)*. The latter was the only real Turkish folklore journal in existence when the folk houses were closed by the government in 1945. Preceded by *Halk Bilgisi Mecmuası (The Magazine for Folklore)*, which was published in 1927 by the short-lived folklore organization, Halk Bilgisi Derneği, *Halk Bilgisi Haberleri* was published by this organization from 1928-30, and then from 1931-45 by the Eminönü Halkevi in Istanbul.
7. Journals in Turkey that publish folklore articles today include: *The Anthropological Review*, published by the Institute of Anthropology and Ethnology at the University of Ankara; the *Publications* of the Turkological Institute of the University of Istanbul; *Arkeologia, Tarih ve Etnoğrafya*, published by the Ministry of Education, Ankara; the *Publications* of the literary and theological faculty of the University of Istanbul; *Türk Yurdu*; *Yeni Mecmua*; *Millî Tettebbular*; *Küçük Mecmua*; *Dergâh*; and *Millî Mecmua*. A new folklore journal, edited by Efâtun Cem Güney and others, is *Türk Folklor Araştırmaları*. Volume I (Istanbul, 1949-51) contains 24 numbers, and was published by the Türk Halkbilgisi Derneği (The Turkish Folklore Society).
8. Their reluctance is discussed at greater length in my review of Wolfram Eberhard and Pertev Naili Boratav, *Typen Türkischer Volksmärchen*, *Journal of American Folklore*, LXVIII (1955), 231-235.
9. Collections and studies of Nas'r eddin Hoca anecdotes include Henry D. Barnham's *Tales of Nasr-ed-din Khoja* (London, 1923, also titled *The Khoja: Tales of Nasr-ed-din*, New York, 1924); Beha'i's *Letaifi-Nasreddin Hoca (Pleasantries of Nasreddin Hoca)* (Istanbul, 1926); F. Köprülü's *Nasreddin Hoca* (Istanbul, 1918); I. Kunos's *Nasreddin Hodsa Tréjái (Jests of Hoca Nasreddin)* (Budapest, 1899); and A. Wesselski's *Der Hodscha Nasreddin* (2 vols., Weimar, 1911).
10. For anecdotes about the Bektaşî order, see *Bektaşî Hikâyeleri* (Istanbul, 1918). The word *Bektaşî* designates not only a member of the Bektaşî order of dervishes, but also sometimes connotes a freethinker or a dissolute person. More important for the folklorist, however, is its common usage as the name of a generic type of character who appears in Turkish anecdotes. Just as Americans can begin a story with "Once there was a Scotchman" and thereby create a stereotype in the listeners' minds, so the Turks can say "There was a Bektaşî" and produce the same effect. The stereotype thus invoked is that of a supposedly typical member of the Bektaşî dervish order, which derives its name from Hacı Bektaş Veli, a "saint" of the Islamic faith. The Bektaşî order dates back to the sixteenth century but probably was founded much earlier than Bektaş. Members of the Bektaşî order developed numerous ceremonial and ritualistic customs, based on their attachment to the Caliph Ali and other saintly persons, but they rejected established ritual. They wove into the order's Islamic background certain Gnostic and Christian elements, including the mystical significance attributed by Gnosticism to numbers, and the Christian concept of a trinity (*Encyclopedia of Islam*, ed. M. Th. Houtsma, et al. [London, 1913], I, 691).

11. This claim is made within the romances themselves, just as it also is made in the *sazşairler's* ballads. It can safely be considered as a convention of romance style. The clichés in these minstrel tales receive further discussion in my article, "A Culture's Stereotypes and their Expression in Folk Clichés," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, XIII (1957), 184-200.

12. This partial English translation comprises most of Alexander Chodzko's *Specimens of the Popular Poetry of Persia as Found in the Adventures and Improvisations of Kurroglu . . . and in the Songs of the People Inhabiting the Shores of the Caspian Sea* (London, 1842), pp. 17-344.

13. *Kerem ve Asli* is atypical in that it glorifies a romance between a Turk and an Armenian. It is somewhat atypical in that I know of at least one other romance, "Ali Pasha," that does the same thing. See Eberhard, *Minstrel Tales from Southeastern Turkey* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1955), pp. 27-29.

14. The typical performance starts with a musical solo on a primitive pipelike instrument. Then, after another musician plays on a tambourine, Hacıvat, one of the two major characters, comes on stage and sings one of the many songs available for this purpose, all of which conform to a fairly definite pattern. His song concluded, the play itself begins (Selim Nüzhet Gerçek, *Türk Teması*, Istanbul, 1942, p. 77). The shadow play I saw, however, was an unusually gala performance which employed four musicians; but the same *hayali* occasionally staged productions which utilized only one musician or none. During my stay in Turkey (1951-53) there were other shadow-theater operators besides Küçük Ali—even some in the National Theatre. But these latter were hardly authentic folk artists.

15. Yönetkin is a composer, conductor, and professor at the National Conservatory. Each collecting expedition, led by a professor plus several students, lasts throughout the long summer holidays.

16. Other publications of Turkish riddles include Hamamizade İhsan's *Bilmeceler*, in *Türk Halk Bilgisine Ait Maddeler* (Materials on Turkish Folklore), No. 3 (Istanbul, 1930), which contains 800 items; and Bahaeddin Ögel's 94 "Riddles from Erzurum," *Journal of American Folklore*, LXIII (1950), 413-424.

17. The conquest of Istanbul (1453) effectively closed off a number of communities from their homelands: among others, the Genoese, the Florentines, the Maltese, and the Sephardics—all of whom still speak their medieval languages. Midway between Istanbul and the Black Sea, moreover, is an enclave of Poles who have maintained their language for at least three centuries without any contact with the homeland. Incidentally, the Sephardics no longer have a homeland which speaks their language!

University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky