ESSAY TOPIC: ‘How did Evliya Çelebi view the place of the Ottoman Empire in the larger world?’

Abstract: This paper examines the social, cultural and political place of the Ottoman Empire in the wider world through a critical analysis of Book of Travels by the Ottoman traveller Evliya Çelebi, arguably the most influential travelogue in Ottoman history. Evliya seldom travelled beyond the political borders of the Empire, although he recorded missions in Safavid Iran, Crimea, Circassia, the Habsburg Empire as well as Central and Western Europe. His encounters with foreigners, however, are a recurring theme of his work. They are not restricted to his travels beyond the borders of the Ottoman Empire owing to its large geographical scope and multi-cultural character. Evliya’s multitudinous ethnographic accounts of people’s customs, culinary and clothing practices, language dialects and religious and artistic traditions create ‘discursive maps of the [Ottoman] self and the other’. A partial and selective reading of the Book of Travels would suggest that the Ottomans’ pre-determined set of clichés and stereotypes of foreigners reflect their rooted contempt of the other and their moral superiority in all domains. Nevertheless, a closer study of Evliya’s anecdotes in their specific contexts forces us to re-consider this claim. In fact, on numerous occasions Evliya did not necessarily satirise the other and even expressed admiration for their works of arts and urban life. Indeed, Evliya recognised the need for the Ottomans to take note of what the others had accomplished and follow their example. The present paper, therefore, attempts to demonstrate that the place of the Ottomans in the wider world was not as fixed as it would seem and that it was constantly re-defining itself with respect to the place of the other.
On 10 August, 1630, the Ottoman court musician and *muezzin*, Evliya Çelebi, had a dream that determined the course of his life. He found himself in the middle of a spiritual congregation of saints, prophets and martyrs headed by the Prophet Muhammad who gave him his blessings to become a ‘world traveller’ who will ‘compose a marvellous work’ and record all his experiences there.¹ Evliya Çelebi’s *Book of Travels* is a unique example of a seventeenth-century travelogue that set the precedence for the genre of travel accounts in the Ottoman Empire. Evliya departed Istanbul on the eve of his thirtieth birthday in 1640 and concluded his odyssey around the ‘seven climes of the world’ in Cairo fifty one years later.² At his time, the Ottoman realm extended from the coasts of the eastern Mediterranean up until the frontier lands with Safavid Iran and from the Hungarian borders with the Habsburgs down to Egypt. Evliya seldom travelled beyond the political borders of the Empire, although he recorded two missions in Safavid Iran in 1646-47 and 1655, and a stay with the Crimean khans, with the Circassians and with the Kalmyks north of the Azov Sea in 1667. He also ventured into Habsburg lands as part of an Ottoman embassy in Vienna under Kara Mehmed Pasha in 1665 and he claimed to have participated in a Tatar raid all around Central and Western Europe although his account of the latter is highly dubious.³

His encounters with foreigners, however, are a recurring theme of his work. They are not restricted to his travels beyond the borders of the Ottoman Empire owing to its large geographical scope and multi-cultural character. Evliya’s multitudinous ethnographic accounts of people’s customs, culinary and clothing practices, language dialects and religious and artistic traditions create ‘discursive maps of the [Ottoman] self and the other’.⁴ Evliya’s judgements and epithets, wondrous and fantastical anecdotes as well as art descriptions implicitly defined the cultural and moral boundaries of the Ottoman Empire. His account permits us to enquire into how the Ottomans viewed themselves and their place among the myriad of peoples surrounding and inhabiting their territories. Should the Ottoman cultural space be analysed in the Braudelian framework of permanence and slow evolution or

¹ Evliya Çelebi, *An Ottoman Traveller: Selections from the Book of Travels of Evliya Çelebi*, trans. and ed. Robert Dankoff and Sooyong Kim (London, 2011), pp. 4-6; Since this is the main source for this paper, any further references to this work will just include pagination.
² pp. 450-451.
was it one of dynamic interaction between centre, peripheries and beyond?\textsuperscript{5} A partial and selective reading of the Book of Travels would suggest that the Ottomans’ pre-determined set of clichés and stereotypes of foreigners reflect their rooted contempt of the other and their moral superiority in all domains. Nevertheless, a closer study of Evliya’s anecdotes in their specific contexts forces us to re-consider this claim. In fact, on numerous occasions Evliya did not necessarily satirise the other and even expressed admiration for their works of arts and urban life. Indeed, Evliya recognised the need for the Ottomans to take note of what the others had accomplished and follow their example. The present paper, therefore, will attempt to demonstrate that the place of the Ottomans in the wider world was not as fixed as it would seem and that it was constantly re-defining itself with respect to the place of the other.

Let us first examine the use of stereotypes in Evliya’s accounts that at first sight would seem undermining the other. Evliya expressed anger at foreigners on religious grounds, particularly. Religion constituted a crucial element in the building of nationhood and delineating religious boundaries signified carving for oneself a singular place in the world.\textsuperscript{6} In Persian lands, Evliya called the Safavids ‘caliph-cursers’ since because of their Shi’a beliefs, they refused to recognise the legitimacy of the Four Companions of the Prophet. At the audience with Kelp Ali Khan in Tabriz, some of the officials sat down as soon as they heard the names of the first four caliphs read out from the Ottoman ambassadorial letter.\textsuperscript{7} Evliya also disproved of the violence of ritual flagellation and blood-shedding that was displayed in the Ashura celebrations commemorating the martyrdom of Husayn ibn Ali (626–680).\textsuperscript{8} He also found the Safavid system of punishment too cruel with criminals being severely tortured, which contradicted the canons of Sharia law. In summary, he thought of the Safavids as heretical.\textsuperscript{9} Considering that relations between Safavids and Ottomans had been tense for over more than a century because of political conflicts over territory and power (‘each Ottoman was allowed to kill up to four
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Kızılbash’), it is no wonder that the negative image of Safavids circulating around the Ottoman Empire was reflected in Evliya’s writings.\textsuperscript{10}

Christians and Jews, for instance, were simply ‘a bunch of erring infidels’, which seems to be less strong than ‘heretics’\textsuperscript{11}. It is probably because of the commercial and merchant ties Western Europeans had with the Ottomans, which Evliya certainly witnessed in the marketplaces of Istanbul, that he showed more sympathy towards them. Muslims and other People of the Book could even be members of the same guilds, thus establishing mutual commercial relations, which could turn into friendships.\textsuperscript{12} That is why Evliya’s strongest criticism was directed towards those without adhering to a particular religion and not interacting with the Ottomans. Hence, the Rumelian Gypsies of Komotini with ‘no religion’ were considered be ‘renegades’. That is why, they were known to be tyrannical, quarrelling all the time, committing murders and ‘pretending to be Muslims when they are not even infidels’! Evliya’s negative portrayal of the Gypsies is further reflected in his choice to record vulgar expressions combined with sexual content as representative of their daily conversation.\textsuperscript{13} Evliya’s negative qualifications of the other could also simply reflect the Ottoman suspicion of foreigners. Indeed, Evliya’s accounts of his travels to Sudan and Ethiopia suggest that suspicion was a sign of racial discrimination. He termed the Sudanese eunuch surgeons of Cairo as ‘ruthless, [...] hideous black-skinned men of ill-omen, with dark faces and lustreless eyes’.\textsuperscript{14} At the same time, one of the kings of Fujistan, Qan Girgis, could not comprehend why Evliya and his retinue were ‘so white and raw’. In fact, he required them to take off their clothes to check they were humans.\textsuperscript{15} Discrimination then worked in both ways and was not simply an Ottoman trait.

Discriminating against foreigners allowed Evliya to highlight the Ottoman moral superiority over other nations, which justified their claim for the title of world conquerors. Turning the Ottoman Empire into a world empire was significant part of the official state ideology, which Evliya was inculcated on the premises of Topkapi
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Palace. Evliya carried this imperial image all throughout his travels. His accounts contained prophetic signs of the military victories of the Ottomans against the enemy, referred to as hinzir, a metaphorical term meaning ‘pork’, ‘pig’ or ‘boar’ which stood for violence and brutality in Ottoman Turkish.\textsuperscript{16} Evliya also added stories to re-assert Ottoman authority over subjects, especially in regions where Ottoman administration was fragile such as Kurdistan.\textsuperscript{17} Kurdistan was a semi-autonomous territory composed of hükümts, e.g. administrative units that were not part of the fiscal surveys of the central government and succession remained within Kurdish families.\textsuperscript{18} In a dialogue with the Khan of Bitlis, the Grand Vizier Melek Pasha reminded the khan of his obligation to obey the Ottoman state to avoid execution.\textsuperscript{19} Finally, the enthusiasm Evliya showed to participate in Ottoman military campaigns such as the conquest of Crete in 1669 or the imaginary Tatar raid of Western Europe, attests to the persistent Ottoman ghaza mentality. The expressions ghaza and ghazi soldiers appear in his account on various occasions.\textsuperscript{20} The Ottoman conviction of world supremacy was further reflected in Evliya’s practice to leave inscriptions. During the German campaign of 1664, he stumbled upon a ‘mammoth tree’ near the city of Krokondar where he inscribed a Christian prayer to Mary on its trunk. However, his true intention as he said himself was to ‘leave [his] mark in Germany’.\textsuperscript{21} Thus, Evliya endowed his inscriptions with particular meaning, that of a personal conquest that made him proud to be an Ottoman.\textsuperscript{22}

Apart from the religious and military sphere, Evliya distinguished between foreigners and Ottomans according to lifestyle. The Ottoman capital of Istanbul, which constituted the political, economic, commercial and administrative centre of the Empire, was a multi-cultural city with merchants and ambassadors from all over the world; therefore, the majority of the Ottoman stereotypes and clichés about
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\textsuperscript{22} Mehmet Tütüncü, ‘Evliya Çelebi’nin Izi sürülebilen Yazi ve Kitabe örnekleri’ in Coşkun Yılmaz (ed.), \textit{Evliya Çelebi Atlası} (Istanbul, 2012), pp. 1-4 [this is the pagination for the English translation that we have used which is downloadable at https://www.academia.edu/7926520/EVL%C4%B0YA_%C3%87ELEB%C4%B0_AS_A_WRITER_OF_INSCRIPTIONS_AND_GRAFFITTIOS].
foreigners’ way of life were formed within the confines of the city itself. Istanbul was the city where Evliya was born, educated and started his career as a personal entertainer and muezzin for Sultan Murad IV (1612-1640). His first-hand exposure to both urban lifestyle and courtly etiquette determined to a large extent his worldview and perception of the other, although not quite.²³ In the words of Dankoff, Istanbul was ‘the touchstone and measure of everything he saw’.²⁴ Evliya acquired many of the stereotypes in Galata, the European district of Istanbul, whose description appears in the first volume of his work dedicated to the city of Istanbul. He particularly focused on its taverns full of drunkards and its inhabitants’ sexual entertainment activities with both ‘darling boys and girls’, which Evliya found morally corrupt.²⁵

Thus, when he set for his first journey outside Istanbul in 1640, Evliya was equipped with a set of negative epithets designating various foreign nations: ‘inauspicious Ukrainians’, ‘straying Portuguese’, ‘shameless Transylvanians’, ‘fornicating Hungarians’, ‘tricky Franks’.²⁶ We might wonder, however, to what extent these stereotypical representations inflicted real resentment on the part of the Ottoman traveller. Evliya’s use of such epithets might simply reflect Ottoman conventions and might obscure Evliya’s true cultural sensitivity. At one point, Evliya questioned the veracity of these claims on foreigners altogether. For instance, he found the accusation of the Persians’ being adulterous unjustified on the grounds that ‘the men of the world are slanderers’ and he had not come across anything like that during his travels.²⁷ Evliya then believed only what he saw with his own eyes, which suggests that he ultimately formed his own conclusions about the other.

Many satirical comments made by Evliya about foreigners actually sound rather funny than criticising. For instance, the audience with Emperor Leopold in Vienna led to a conflict of ceremonial rules between Austrians and Ottomans. The Pasha required the Emperor to take off his crown and kiss the Pasha on the shoulders whereas the Emperor wanted the janissaries to kiss his hand and play traditional
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music. The tone with which Evliya recounted this story is rather comic and its entertainment value is enhanced by the caricature portrait of Leopold who had ‘camel teeth and lips’ and ‘a mouth so big that a whole loaf of bread could fit in it’. Similarly, he also laughed at the feathers placed on the hats of the Viennese men and the belts worn by the women. He also smiled at the bodies of the Kosovarian warriors whose ‘heads get as big as Adana pumpkins’. Indeed, we might wonder to what degree Evliya’s writings should be taken at face value and how his style of writing, which Lamers termed as ‘Indian’, affected the credibility of his stories.

Evlia’s style is characterised by the use of hyperbolic, humorous and sometimes obscure expressions, as well as by a mix of colloquial and literary language. As a result, it is not surprising to find in the Book of Travels references to wondrous and magical situations, which in the past had been considered as an argument to discredit the credibility of Evliya’s work. Evliya’s descriptions of the wonders and marvels, however, should not be regarded as a pure way of the author’s displaying his rich imagination on paper. Distinction between reality and fiction was not as clear-cut in the seventeenth century as it is now and the concept of the supernatural was unknown to the Ottomans; therefore, when Evliya described something out of the ordinary, he still believed it had its place and meaning in this world. In this respect, the concepts of acâ’ib (wonder) and garâ’ib (marvel) are key to understanding Evliya’s relation to and view of the other. To do that, we need to examine how these fit in the composition of the work as a whole, as well as in the context of its separate sections.
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Overall, the greater is the distance from the centre of the Ottoman Empire, i.e. Istanbul, the greater grows the proportion of wondrous stories to the extent that in the New World ‘tout est différent: leur taille [des hommes] et leur allure, leurs mouvements et leurs attitudes, leurs mots, leur aspect, la couleur de leur visage, leur manière de regarder, leurs langues particulières [...]’. Clearly, the quote suggests that there are many avenues to study the fantastical elements in Evliya’s work but it is particularly worth examining the diverse culinary practices. Evliya witnessed a curious episode in Circassian lands where one of the tribe leaders offered him honey containing ‘strange hairs’. Later, he found out that the hairs came from the area around the genitals of the tribe leader’s father, whose dead body had been colonised by bees. Evliya did not show any disgust, however, and he simply noted the treat as strange. He was more critical of the steppe people of the Kalmyks whom he termed as ‘beasts in the shape of men’ because of their cannibalistic practices. Indeed, indicating cannibalistic practices was a way of defining ‘other people by locating them in a system of values which is an inversion of one’s own.’

More generally, the accounts of food practices allow Evliya to create ‘culinary geographies’ and by doing so ‘to articulate culinary identities and inscribe cultural boundaries’. Indeed, dining rituals according to Norbert Elias defined a sense of civilité which stood as a model for civilised behaviour. Nearly none of accounts of Topkapi Palace ever omitted to include a section on food and dining, which suggests that correct table manners constituted an important factor of Ottoman identity. Indeed, after a banquet of local dishes in Split, the Ottomans remembered to ‘wash [their] hands according to Ottoman ceremonial and drink a goblet of musket-flavoured sherbets’. Then, if we are to apply the Ottoman sense of civilité to the practices of Evliya’s foreign hosts, we might be tempted to conclude that they

---

36 pp. 253-254.
37 pp. 254-255.
38 Urs Bitterly, Cultures in Conflict: Encounters between European and Non-European Cultures: 1492-1800 (Stanford, 1993), pp. 8-9.
41 For Ottoman cuisine in the Palace see for instance, Ottaviano Bon, A Description of the Grand Signor’s Serraglio, or Turkish Emperouers Court, trans. R. Withers (London, 1650), pp. 115-127.
42 p. 164.
were less civilised than the Ottomans. However, the way in which Evliya delivered to its readers the accounts of these culinary practices, gives the impression that he found them more incomprehensible and unusual than contradictory to the dining etiquette of the Ottoman court. In this respect, Evliya showed a degree of acceptation of the differences among peoples.

Evliya himself was willing to gain an understanding of the culture of the other. That is why he discussed with one of the priests in Vienna the purpose for the Christian veneration of images, which he eventually seemed to grasp. Evliya thus displayed an engaged and inquisitive rather than a dismissive attitude towards the other. Moreover, his recording of foreign languages, if not always accurate, has represented an important source for historical philologists and attests to Evliya’s honest interest in linguistics and communication. He recognised for instance the beauty of the Kurdish dialect of Amadyia and added a poem in this dialect. Therefore, we can go even further and investigate whether cultural acceptance could not result in appreciation. Indeed, the more fantastical situations Evliya described such as Bulgarian witchcraft practices, a battle between oburs, i.e. Circassian and Abkhazian vampires, and the magical performances of the Kurdish Khan’s court magician Molla Mehmed were referred to as a ‘a scroll of delights’.

What Evliya expressed particular admiration for was foreign religious buildings and although his aesthetical sensibility was defined by Ottoman artistic categories, he still managed to create a ‘spatial dialogue’ between different architectures. An excellent example is the description of the Parthenon in Athens, turned into a Friday mosque at that time, but still retaining its ancient Greek elements which Evliya was particularly impressed with. He was fascinated with its ‘enamelled dome’ which was ‘truly a wonder’ and the ‘four emerald-like porphyry columns’ in which ‘one observes multi-coloured shapes and wondrous flowers’. He also felt sensually invaded by the metope reliefs between the tops of the columns, which
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according to him portrayed odd creatures that the ‘human mind’ could hardly comprehend. They were all ‘white magic beyond human capacity’.\textsuperscript{47} He concluded his account of Athens by attesting that he ‘has nowhere seen such marvels as in the city of Athens’.\textsuperscript{48} It becomes apparent here that Evliya’s perception of the ‘wondrous’ did not necessarily equate the fictional or imaginary, but it pointed to the singular, unique and pompous.

The Parthenon of Athens is no exception in Evliya’s account as the depiction of Stephan’s Dom in Vienna proceeded in similar laudatory terms. In the latter case, Evliya even recognised that ‘nothing like it has been or will be built in Turkey, Arabia and Persia, or even in the seven climes of Christendom’ which is fascinating to hear from the mouth of an Ottoman about a Christian Catholic building! He was also impressed with its wide collection of books, which according to his words were much better maintained than book collections in the Ottoman world.\textsuperscript{49} Thus, we come to the stage when Evliya’s account displays a degree of criticism of the Ottomans themselves. Evliya painted a rather idealistic picture of the Flanders, Germany, Poland, Czechia and Sweden in spite of his flawed geography of Western and Central Europe where he travelled in his imagination.\textsuperscript{50} All of them were praised for their prosperous and fertile territories in terms of agriculture and trade with Amsterdam considered as the ‘most prosperous city’ of them all.\textsuperscript{51} Evliya was also impressed by the cleanliness, hygienic measures, order, safety and security of the cities of Dubrovnik, Vienna and even Safavid Tabriz.\textsuperscript{52} He wished the latter to be conquered by the Ottomans although it would lead to the city’s ruin.\textsuperscript{53} Evliya then implicitly called for an improvement in the Ottoman urban landscape however praising his accounts of Ottoman cities are. He also directly criticised certain aspects of Ottoman attitude. In Bosnian lands, he passed through a village of infidels that complained about the kadi’s financial oppression.\textsuperscript{54} He also blamed the Ottoman defeat at the battle of St Gothaard in 1664 on the inconsistency of the Ottoman army.
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part of which went pillaging whereas the Habsburgs maintained an impeccable organisation and discipline. By no means, however, did the praise of certain aspects of European customs and practices make Evliya doubt his attachment to his homeland. He used the appraisal of the other to ‘pass judgement on those who he was in love with: the Ottomans’ and bring his nation to perfection in all respects: political, military, cultural, artistic and many others.\footnote{55}{p. 225.}

We contend that Evliya’s Book of Travels is more than just a ‘geographical encyclopedia structured as travel account and personal memoir’.\footnote{56}{Robert Dankoff, ‘Did Evliyâ Çelebi “fall in love” with the Europeans?’, \textit{Cahiers balkaniques} 43 (2013), pp. 5-6 [pagination of the on-line version downloadable at http://ceb.revues.org/3932].} It is true that Evliya recorded the languages, cultural practices, customs and architecture of a myriad of nations both within and outside the political borders of the Ottoman Empire, which makes his work mostly documentary and descriptive. It is still possible, however, to look at those records in a critical manner and draw important conclusions on the perceptions of the Ottomans on the self and the other, which defined their place in the wider world.\footnote{57}{Robert Dankoff, ‘The Seyahatnâme of Evliyâ Çelebi as a Literary Monument’, \textit{Journal of Turkish Literature} 2 (2005), pp. 71-83.} Evliya’s work may display the negative Ottoman stereotypes of foreigners in terms of race, appearance and religion. However, the work also shows Evliya’s willingness to go beyond those stereotypes and paint a picture of the other according to his own experiences. To a considerable extent, he accepted cultural differences and even showed admiration for the other in terms of art and architecture. He also made the effort to take note of other’s achievements in order to suggest improvements for his own beloved homeland. Thus, his audience - most probably composed of the courtly and literary circles of Istanbul - might have found his work not only entertaining, but also edificatory. His anecdotes imbued with enthusiasm for interaction with foreign cultures proves his open-mindedness to discover the other and to learn from them. Therefore, it is hard to accept Kim’s claim that Evliya’s travels were ‘not transformative of the self’.\footnote{58}{Irini Apostolou, ‘La représentation de soi et de l’autre dans le Seyahatnâme, ou Livre des voyages d’Evliyâ Çelebi’, \textit{Enquêtes et documents} 37 (2009), pp. 128-129.} It is challenging to ascertain however whether Evliya stood for the typical Ottoman mind as the knowledge and experience he acquired through his travels allowed him to define the place of the Ottoman Empire in the wider world in a more nuanced way.\footnote{59}{Kim, ‘The Seyahatnâme’, p. 364.}
than his co-citizens would have done from Istanbul. Nevertheless, the ubiquity of cultural juxtapositions and superimpositions he presented indisputably reveals the dynamicity of the Ottoman space of the seventeenth century.
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