

TÜRKİYE'DE İLK DERLEME GEZİLERİNDE UYGULANAN YÖNTEMLER VE KARŞILAŞILAN GÜÇLÜKLER

*Gülhan ATNUR**

ÖZET

Halk bilimi XIX. yüzyılda önem kazanan alanlardan biridir. Malzemesi çoğunlukla halkın hafızasındaki masallar, hikâyeler, inanışlar, gelenekler vb.dir. Halk bilimciler gözlem, görüşme, anket gibi yöntemleri kullanarak bu malzemeye ulaşır ve inceleme imkânı bulurlar.

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin kuruluşuyla birlikte ülkemizde halk bilimi ürünlerinin derlenmesi ve arşivlenmesi bireysel veya kurumsal çerçevede hız kazanmıştır. Ziya Gökalp, M. F. Köprülü, Z. F. Fındıkoğlu... gibi âlimlerin halka yönelmek, halk bilimi ürünlerinin önemini her alandaki kişilere fark ettirmek için gösterdikleri çabalar olumlu sonuçlanmış, onların çeşitli yayınları –makale, çeviri vb.- ülkemizde folklorun bir bilim dalı olarak kabul edilmesine de vesile olmuştur.

Önce Dârülelhan (İstanbul Belediye Konservatuarı), daha sonra ise Halk Bilgisi Derneği'nin derleme çalışmaları Türkiye'de ilk derlemelerin en önemli örneklerini oluşturmuştur. 1924-1932 yılları hem Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nin maddi ve manevi birçok sıkıntıyla mücadele ettiği hem de halk biliminin bir bilim dalı olarak tanınıp kabul edilmeye başladığı dönemdir. Bu makalede de yukarıda adı geçen kuruluşlardan yetkililerin belirtilen dönemde Anadolu'da yaptıkları derlemeler, kullandıkları yöntemler ve yaşanan sıkıntılar ele alınmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Halk bilimi, derleme, gözlem, görüşme, anket.

* Yrd. Doç. Dr., Atatürk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, gulhanatnur@yahoo.com

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/3 Summer 2010*

**THE METHODS USED IN THE FIRST FIELDWORK
TRIPS IN TURKEY AND THE DIFFICULTIES
ENCOUNTERED¹**

ABSTRACT

Folklore is one of the fields that attracted considerable attention in the 19th century. Materials are often the tales, stories, beliefs and traditions in the minds of the people. Folklorists obtain these materials using observation, interview, and questionnaire and find the opportunity to examine these materials.

With the foundation of Turkish Republic, the fieldworking and archiving of the folklore products in Turkey took momentum both individually and institutionally. The efforts that some scholars such as Ziya Gökalp, M. F. Köprülü, Z. F. Fındıkoğlu made to go for the public, to make them aware of the significance of the works of folklore turned out to be useful and their studies such as article and translation made folklore a scientific field in Turkey.

The fieldwork studies that first Dârülelhan (Istanbul Municipality Conservatory) then the Halk Bilgisi Derneği (the Folklore Society) carried out the most important instances of the collections. The years of 1924-1932 are the period of Turkey's struggle against several difficulties and folklore was recognized as a scientific field. In this study, the collections that above mentioned the society's authorities made, the methods they used and the difficulties they encountered are examined.

Key words: Folklore, fieldwork, observation, interview, questionnaire.

¹ This study was presented at the National Turkology Days in 16-17 November and prepared for publication

INTRODUCTION

Fieldwork is the mere and the safest way in order to determine the works of folklore and register them. The more meticulously compiling, which is the first phase of folklore studies, is done, the sounder categorization and examination will become. Therefore, researchers have important responsibilities in folklore studies. Fieldwork is carried out by three ways: observation, interview, and questionnaire. Fieldwork requires careful implementation of these methods.

From the midst of the 19th century, in spite of the recognition of folklore as a discipline, compiling, classifying and examination in Europe were begun to be used and the importance of the field in Turkey was noticed in the early 20th century and the first studies were started in this period. Following the foundation of Turkish Republic, considerable studies about folkloric works were realized. The initial efforts that official and non-official institutions and some figures made were often for the fieldwork in Turkey. Yıldırım describing the folkloric field studies after 1920 as “synthesist period” states that:

“Folklore is seen as a source of raw material to constitute the cultural structure of modern Turkish state. The folkloric studies are supported by the government. The ultimate goal is to reshape our national culture through a new synthesis using the folkloric sources (1998, 66).

Through this aim, Mehmet Halit Bayrı, Hamit Zübeyr Koşay, Z. Fahri Fındıkoğlu, Mahmut Ragıp Gazimihal and others played a directing role upon the subsequent field studies.

The first fieldworks of the Republic were made by Dârülelhan (İstanbul Municipality Conservatory) and the Halk Bilgisi Derneği (Folklore Society). In this study, handling the purpose and contents of the fieldwork studies that these institutions carried out, the methodological problems and the difficulties that were encountered are investigated.

I. The Fieldwork Initiatives of Dârülelhan (İstanbul Municipality Conservatory)

Dârülelhan which was founded in order to teach courses such as Turkish musical styles, theory, solfege in İstanbul in 1 January 1917, took the name of İstanbul Music Conservatory in 22 January 1927 and finally became İstanbul Municipality Conservatory (Özcan 1993, 518-520; Tan 2006, 186-188).

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/3 Summer 2010*

The first person to suggest the idea to compile folkloric products by means of questionnaire is Yusuf Ziya (Demirci)² who worked at Dârülelhan. He prepared a questionnaire with 14 questions³ to compile folk songs through the permission taken from the chief of Dârülelhan, Musa Süreyya (Mahmud Ragıp 1928, 157; Sakaoğlu 1985, 86-90). Fındıkoğlu states that this questionnaire was not randomly prepared but in a historical awareness of connecting Anatolian Turkish identity with Asian Turkishness and the members of European music in the conservatory supported this idea to use folk music as the inspiration source (Fındıkoğlu 1952, 51). However, it is seen that most of the answers of the questionnaire that was prepared with a great ideal and sent to Anatolia by the Board of Education in 1924 could not be taken to the notes and some of them were blank. Though folk songs obtained were classified as “can be saved” and “badly written”, the first questionnaire study initiative failed (Mahmud Ragıp 1928, 158).

Nevertheless, this failure in fieldwork initiatives did not refrain Yusuf Ziya Bey, and when he was designated the manager of the Dârülelhan in 1926, he set up four fieldwork trips in which observations and interviews were used by some officials so as to record folk songs (Mahmud Ragıp 1928, 157-186; K. Mahmut Ragıp 1929, 12-13; Ülkütaşır 1972, 30-35; Sakaoğlu 1985, 90-91; Düzgün 1997, 116-117). The first of them was organized from Adana, Gaziantep, Urfa, Niğde, Kayseri and Sivas from the South and Middle Anatolia, and lasted 51 days to compile folk songs, folk dances and musical instruments in July 1926. The trip committee consisting of Yusuf Ziya, Rauf Yekta, Dürri and Ekrem Besim compiled 250 folk songs (K. Mahmut Ragıp 1929, 12-13; Ülkütaşır 1972, 32; Sakaoğlu 1985, 90).

The second initiative of Dârülelhan began in July 1927 and lasted 35 days, Yusuf Ziya, Ekrem Besim, Muhittin Sadık and Ferruh Bey joined the compilation around Konya, Ereğli, Karaman, Alaşehir, Manisa, Ödemiş, Aydın (Mahmud Ragıp 1928, 177-186; Ülkütaşır 1972, 32; Sakaoğlu 1985, 90-91).

² When these studies were conducted since the Surname Law had not been acted yet, the last names of the persons are given in parenthesis ().

³ The questions are presented to the reader in the Journal of Dârülelhan in the volume of 1 February 1340/1924 (Sakaoğlu 1988, 90; Özcan 1993, 519). These questions were published again by Z. Fahri Fındıkoğlu in the journal of İş ve Düşünce, vol. 128. 1952, in the article titled “Türk Folklorculuğunda Anket Usulünün İlk Tatbikatı” (1952, 50-51).

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/3 Summer 2010*

The third trip was made in İnebolu, Kastamonu, Çankırı, Ankara, Eskişehir, Kütahya and Bursa by the doers of the second trip (K. Mahmut Ragıp 1929, 12; Ülkütaşır 1972, 33; Sakaoglu 1985, 91).

The fourth trip, in 15 August-17 September 1929 was realized by Yusuf Ziya Bey, Mahmut Ragıp (Gazimihal) Bey, Remzi Bey, Ferruh Bey and Abdülkadir (İnan) Bey from the Türk Halk Bilgisi Derneği. During this study, information about folk dances and musical instruments were compiled in addition to almost 300 folk songs around the provinces of Trabzon, Rize, Gümüşhane, Bayburt, Erzurum and Erzincan (K. Mahmut Ragıp 1929, 13; Ülkütaşır 1972, 33-34; Sakaoglu 1985, 91).

The sources about the Turkish folklore history reach a consensus that Dârülelhan organized four field study trips. But M. Şakir Ülkütaşır describes the trip to Balıkesir and its surroundings that Mehmet Halit (Bayrı) from Halk Bilgisi Derneği, Hikmet Turhan and Yusuf Ziya Bey from the conservatory as Dâruehlan's fifth trip (Ülkütaşır 1972, 36).

The most significant source that explains the situation in the trips of Dârülelhan committee appears to belong to Mahmut Ragıp Gazimihal (1928). He expresses the events in the work of "Anadolu Türküleri ve Musiki İstikbalimiz" through Yusuf Ziya Bey's explanation. From this work, it is understood that the committee carried out these fieldworks interviewing the source persons and sometimes observing them. As for transferring to the notes and taking to the phonograph, the source persons known as the respected and appreciated dwellers of the region concerned and who had been determined by the officials were employed. Thus the assistance of these officials deserves appreciation. Governors, teachers and other officials, young people from Turk Ocakları provided source persons for the determination of folk songs and folk dances, and sometimes they took part in these initiatives (Mahmut Ragıp 1928, 179-186). During the trips, the names the folk songs, the location in which they were compiled, the names of the source persons and sometimes their ages were recorded (K. Mahmut Ragıp 1929, 39-47).

One of the most important elements of these trips is many observations about the climate, nature, houses, life activities, the characteristics, and their clothes of the people in the visited regions in addition to their folk dances and musical instruments. Especially in the fourth trip there is considerable information about the details above (K. Mahmut Ragıp 1929, 17-38).

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/3 Summer 2010*

Fieldwork studies in the early years of Turkish Republic brought certain difficulties since they were the first studies. The prominent difficulties in the trips of Dârülelhan were undoubtedly the allocation of fund and phonograph provision. The financial problem was solved by 2000 liras that Muhiddin Bey the mayor of Istanbul, gave, the phonograph bought by this money was retrieved by Cemal Reşit Bey from Paris (Mahmud Ragıp 1928, 158).

The difficulties that Dârülelhan committee encountered prior the trips replaced new difficulties during the trips. These are transportation, the accents of the source persons, immigration, the reservations about talking to recorder and taking to notes, and the region was affected by trade and other reasons.

Transportation is one of the most important problems that fieldwork committee encountered. While the researchers were going to the various places of Anatolia from Istanbul they used the transportation vehicles such as train, ship, automobile, they never doubted to ride on a horse to go to the mountainous villages (Mahmud Ragıp 1928, 182-183). Another problematic issue about transportation was the risk of the breaking of the discs due to wrong placement. For example, during the final trip of Dârülelhan since about 80 discs were broken, more compiling could not be carried out (K. Mahmut Ragıp 1929, 28).

The biggest problem encountered during the fieldwork trips results from the source persons. The first one is the reservations of the source persons about the folk songs' recording process to the recorder or to directly paper. Mahmut Ragıp Gazimihal that mentions the limitations of taking the songs to the notes points out the importance of phonograph in the fieldwork studies since repetitions used to bore the villagers, and the melodies used to change each time (Mahmud Ragıp 1928, 88-89). However, during the field work some difficulties were encountered since villagers became shy to sing when they first saw the phonograph (Mahmud Ragıp 1928, 175-176).

Due to the recording problems of unmetred folk songs, in the second trip unmetred folk songs were taken to recorder and the other folk songs were directly taken to the notes (Mahmud Ragıp 1928, 179). That youth did not attach importance to the folk songs and the fieldworks were made by the persons over 45 ages are other problematic issues encountered during the initial trips (Mahmud Ragıp 1928, 175-176).

Post-compilation phase consists of the classification, evaluation and publication of the material. Amongst the folk songs

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/3 Summer 2010*

subsequent to the first trip mentioned were published with their notes under the names of Anadolu Halk Şarkıları (1926-1927) (1th 2nd and 5th notebooks), as the second one Anadolu Halk Şarkıları (1927) (3th , 4th., 6th. and 7th notebooks), the third one as Halk Türküleri (1929-1931) (8th, 9th., 10th and 11th notebooks), the fourth one as the Şarkî Anadolu Türküleri ve Oyunları (1929) and Halk Türküleri (1930) (13th notebook) (Ülkütaşır 1972, 32-33; Sakaoğlu 1988, 8-9).

II. The Fieldwork Initiatives of the Türk Halk Bilgisi Derneği

In the early years of the Republic, apart from Dârülelhan, another institution was Türk Halk Bilgisi Derneği. The society which was founded the name Anadolu Halk Bilgisi Derneği in 1927 in Ankara, took the name of the Türk Halk Bilgisi Derneği in 1928.

The first activity of Türk Halk Bilgisi Derneği is the publication of the Halk Bilgisi Toplayıcılarına Rehber in 1928. This guide book that the pioneer of the subsequent studies encompasses information about the content and the elements of folklore.

Bayrı who explains the foundation and activities of the Türk Halk Bilgisi Derneği in his study states that he planned to make fieldwork trips in Eastern Anatolia subsequent to the foundation of the society but owing to lack of money to send three or four persons it was quitted (Bayrı 1952b, 499). That is why, it was decided that only Abdülkadir Bey's participation was thought to be appropriate the way transportation expenses would be met by the institution and the other expenses would met by the conservatory (Bayrı 1952b, 499).

The first trip of the institution organized together with the fourth trip of Dârülelhan. In this trip, the materials that Abdülkadir Bey compiled were made a book and published under the name of "Birinci İlmî Seyahate Dair Rapor" (Abdülkadir 1930). The society, in its journal named Halk Bilgisi Haberleri, states that Abdülkadir Bey correctly compiled and classified the materials (HBH 1930a, 48).

The second trip of the Halk Bilgisi Derneği was conducted by Abdülkadir, Ali Rıza (Yalgın (Yalman)) and Şakir Sabri (Yener) to the region of Gaziantep, Kilis and Nizip on July-August 1931, and the compiles about this trip were subsequently written by Bayrı and published at Halk Bilgisi Haberleri (Bayrı 1939, 2; Bayrı 1952a, 490). Before this trip, in the news in this journal the council would collect everything about folklore and took photos about the house types and local clothing are seen (HBH 1930b, 167-168).

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/3 Summer 2010*

The third trip was conducted by Müşfika Hanım (İnan) to Maraş and the collected materials were published in the same journal (Bayrı 1939, 2; Bayrı 1952a, 490). The fourth trip was organized by M. Halit (Bayrı), Yusuf Ziya and Hikmet Turhan (Dağlıoğlu) to the province of Balıkesir and Dursunbey and Sındırgı towns in 1932, and the materials were published by Bayrı under the title of “Halk Âdetleri ve İnanmaları” (Bayrı 1939).

Since many types in folklore (birth, marriage, funerals, beliefs, folk medicine, shepherd’s job, crafts etc.) were collected, the interviews and observations were mostly preferred. In the work titled “Birinci İlmi Seyahate Dair Rapor” published at the end of the first trip, the people’s names, locations and sometimes their jobs were indicated under the materials, and their names were written in other works and articles are instances of this fact (Abdülkadir 1930).

The Halk Bilgisi Derneği, in addition to the fieldwork, also conducted some questionnaires about, month, fishing, sea foods, mice and rat’s day, names and rain prayer. The questionnaires were sent to the members and agencies of the society in Anatolia, Türk Ocakları, Turkish teachers in secondary and high schools, and some of the replies were sent to the council and others were published in Halk Bilgisi Haberleri (Bayrı 1952a, 489-490).

In the introduction of the work, M. Halit mentions the troubles that Abdülkadir Bey encountered and states that the most prominent ones were indifference and shyness towards the folkloric activities. M. Halit complaining about these indifference and prejudice observed among both ordinary people and intellectual ones prevent from collecting the materials highlights two reasons (cited in Abdülkadir 1930, 3). The first one is the attitudes of the ones who make fun of folk’s products and customs and insult them. The second reason is the anxiety that others may think that these people have not removed the old fashioned customs and styles yet. M. Halit stating both ideas would disappear in the course of time comments on the individuals’ views that ignore folklore as follows:

“In our land, among the persons who do not tolerate folkloric activities there are some people who do not belong to us and not unique but exist in other nations... According to them, to deal with folkloric studies is appropriate for the prosperous nations. That nations, like us, who are poor and join the civilization atmosphere, deal with *luxurious* sciences is waste of time and effort.” (cited in Abdülkadir 1930, 5).

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/3 Summer 2010*

M. Halit also points out another problem that the members of the association could not go beyond the folk literature topics while they were compiling. Apart from this, during the first trip there were some jealous people who did not want local people's lives to be determined and published (cited in Abdülkadir 1930, 7).

Though some financial and affective difficulties were experienced during and after the trips, these trips contributed to the collections of deputies in Anatolia, and the fellows of the association (Bayrı 1952b, 500).

One of the most important outcomes of the scientific trips that the Türk Halk Bilgisi Derneği is that the materials collected were published as books and articles (Bayrı 1952c, 524).

RESULT

At the very first years of the republic, the initial result occurred by means of Dârülelhan and the Türk Halk Bilgisi Derneği is the researchers' in both groups certain difficulties experienced before and after the trips. Though during the trips, money, source person, transportation problems, indifferent and intolerant attitudes towards folk science this type of science is considered luxurious or primitive were experienced, the eager and courage persons conducted the initial collections and they felt pride of being the pioneers of fieldwork.

Through certain studies, before the first trips were organized, considerable information about the types of fieldwork was obtained. Thus, interviewing, observation and questionnaire method were together or individually used, and the materials were published as books or articles.

The first fieldwork studies in Turkey have established a research environment to the next generations enhancing interest and support to the folkloric studies.

REFERENCES CITED

- “Abdülkadir beyin raporu”, (1930a). **Halk Bilgisi Haberleri (HBH)**, S:3, s. 48.
- Abdülkadir (1930). **Birinci İlmi Seyahate Dair Rapor**, İstanbul: İktisat Matbaası.
- BAYRI M. Halit (1930). **Halk Âdetleri ve İnanmaları**, İstanbul: Eminönü Halkevi Dil, Tarih ve Edebiyat Şubesi Neşriyatı.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/3 Summer 2010*

- BAYRI M. Halit (1952a). "Halk Bilgisi Derneğine Aid Hatıralar V, Konferanslar, Törenler, Anketler, Derleme Seyahatleri", **Türk Folklor Araştırmaları**, S:31, s. 489-490.
- BAYRI M. Halit (1952b). "Halk Bilgisi Derneğine Aid Hatıralar VI, Derleme Seyahatlerinin Dikkati Çeken Tarafları, Derneğin Bilinmiyen Dostları", **Türk Folklor Araştırmaları**, S:32, s. 499-500.
- BAYRI M. Halit (1952c). "Halk Bilgisi Derneğine Aid Hatıralar VII, Derneğin Neşrettiği Kitaplar", **Türk Folklor Araştırmaları**, S:33, s. 523-524.
- DÜZGÜN Dilaver (1997). "Halk Bilgisi Derneğinin Türk Folklor Tarihindeki Yeri", **V. Milletlerarası Türk Halk Kültürü Kongresi, Genel Konular**, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, s. 116-117.
- FINDIKOĞLU Z. Fahri (1952). "Türk Folklorculuğunda Anket Usulünün İlk Tatbikatı", **İş ve Düşünce**, S:128, s. 50-52.
- GAZİMİHAL Mahmut Ragıp (2006). **Anadolu Türküleri ve Musiki İstikbalimiz**, Haz.: Metin Özarslan, İstanbul: Doğu Kütüphanesi Yayınları.
- "İkinci İlmî Seyahat" (1930b). **Halk Bilgisi Haberleri (HBH)**, S:10, s. 167-168.
- K. Mahmut Ragıp (1929). **Şarkî Anadolu Türküleri ve Oyunları**, İstanbul: İstanbul Konservatuvarı Neşriyatı.
- Mahmut Ragıp (1928). **Anadolu Türküleri ve Musiki İstikbalimiz**, Maarif Matbaası.
- ÖZCAN Nuri (1993). "Dârülelhan", **Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi**, C:8, İstanbul: Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, s. 518-520.
- SAKAOĞLU Saim (1985). "Derleme İle İlgili İlk Anketler, İlk Geziler ve Derleme Bibliyografyası", **Türk Folkloru Araştırmaları**, Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, s. 81-107.
- SAKAOĞLU Saim (1988). **Sahada Derleme Metodları**, Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.
- TAN Nail (2006). **Atatürk Dönemi Kültür Kurumlarından Örnekler 1920-1938**, Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı Yayınları.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/3 Summer 2010*

Türk Halk Bilgisi Derneği (1928). **Halk Bilgisi Toplayıcılarına Rehber**, Ankara: Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Matbaası.

ÜLKÜTAŞIR M. Şakir (1972). **Cumhuriyetle Birlikte Türkiye’de Folklor ve Etnografya Çalışmaları**, Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi.

YILDIRIM Dursun (1998). **Türk Bitiği -Araştırma/İnceleme Yazıları**, Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.

Turkish Studies

*International Periodical For the Languages, Literature
and History of Turkish or Turkic
Volume 5/3 Summer 2010*