

**WAYS OF SEEING: NEV'İZĀDE ATĀ'Ī'S *ĀLEMNŪMĀ* AND CHANGES IN  
THE VISUAL PERCEPTION OF OTTOMAN SOCIETY IN THE EARLY  
SEVENTEENTH CENTURY**

by  
MUTLU KURNALI

Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences  
in partial fulfilment of  
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Sabancı University  
August 2020

**WAYS OF SEEING: NEV'İZĀDE ATĀ'Ī'S 'ĀLEMNŪMĀ AND CHANGES  
IN THE VISUAL PERCEPTION OF OTTOMAN SOCIETY IN THE EARLY  
SEVENTEENTH CENTURY**

Approved by:

Assoc. Prof. TÜLAY ARTAN.....  
(Thesis Supervisor)

Assist. Prof. YUSUF HAKAN ERDEM.....

Prof. HATİCE AYNUR.....

Date of Approval: August 14, 2020

MUTLU KURNALI 2020 ©

All Rights Reserved

## ABSTRACT

### WAYS OF SEEING: NEVİZADE ATAİ'S *ALEMNÜMA* AND CHANGES IN THE VISUAL PERCEPTION OF OTTOMAN SOCIETY IN THE EARLY SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

MUTLU KURNALI

HISTORY M.A. THESIS, AUGUST 2020

Thesis Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Tülay Artan

Keywords: Ottoman Literature, Nevizade Atai, Visual Perception, Ottoman Mentality

This thesis is an attempt to explain the projection of an author's seeing and perception of his surroundings on words based on a literary work in the context of the history of culture and mentality. The focus of the thesis is Nevizade Atai's *Alemnüma* masnavi, which is in saqiname genre, written at the beginning of the 17th century. The 17th century is a period in which the works produced in saqiname genre in the Ottoman literature showed a serious increase. The *Alemnüma*, written in this period, differs from earlier saqinames in terms of narrative style and the spaces, and it contains some similarities with saqinames written later in the same period. The fact that the visual depiction of the space and objects in the work constitutes the basic characteristic of the work provides important signs regarding the ways of the poet's perception his environment visually. The basic characteristics of these signs are the realistic representation of space and objects, the emergence of subject-object separation in space depictions, and the use of visual depiction more intensely than event narration. When these are traced, it is understood that Atai had a different way of seeing when compared to the earlier masnavis. This thesis explains the qualities and what of this new way of seeing and examines it in terms of the history of mentality and cultural history in Ottoman society in the early 17th century.

## ÖZET

GÖRME BİÇİMLERİ: NEVİZADE ATAI'NİN *ALEMNÜMA*'SI VE 17. YÜZYILIN BAŞLARINDA OSMANLI TOPLUMUNUN GÖRSEL ALGISINDA DEĞİŞİMLER

MUTLU KURNALI

TARİH YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ, AĞUSTOS 2020

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Tülay Artan

Anahtar Kelimeler: Osmanlı Edebiyatı, Nevizade Atai, Görsel Algı, Osmanlı Zihniyeti

Bu tez, bir edebiyat eserinden yola çıkarak yazarının etrafına yönelttiği bakışın kelimeler üzerinde bıraktığı izdüşümü kültür ve zihniyet tarihi bağlamında açıklama girişimidir. Tezin odağında Nevizade Atai'nin 17. yüzyılın başında yazdığı *Alemnüma* adlı sakiname türündeki mesnevisi yer almaktadır. 17. yüzyıl, Osmanlı edebiyatında sakiname türünde üretilen eserlerin ciddi bir artış gösterdiği bir dönemdir. Bu dönemde yazılmış olan bu eser, anlatı tarzı ve konu edindiği mekanlar açısından daha önce yazılmış olan sakinamelerden farklılıklar göstermekte ve aynı dönemde sonradan yazılmış olan sakinamelerle bazı ortaklıklar içermektedir. Eserde konu edinilen mekan ve nesnelere görsel tasvirinin ön planda olması şairin çevresini görsel olarak algılama biçimine dair önemli işaretler sunmaktadır. Mekanın ve nesnelere gerçekçi bir şekilde anlatılması, mekan tasvirlerinde özne-nesne ayrımının oluşmaya başlaması ve görsel tasvirin olay anlatısının önüne geçmesi bu işaretlerin temel niteliklerini oluşturmaktadır. Bunların izi sürüldüğünde Atai'nin daha önce yazılmış olan mesnevilere kıyasla farklı bir görme biçimine sahip olduğu anlaşılmaktadır. Tezde bu yeni görme biçiminin nitelikleri ve neliği açıklanmakta ve bu yeni görme biçimi 17. yüzyılın başlarındaki Osmanlı toplumunda kültür ve zihniyet tarihi açısından incelenmektedir.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Sāqīnāmes</i> .....	<b>3</b>
Nev‘īzāde Atā’ī and the ‘ <i>Ālemnümā</i> .....	<b>9</b>
The Karatani’s “Landscape” and Belting’s “Gaze” in the Text .....	<b>15</b>
Thesis Outline.....	<b>19</b>
<b>1. NEV‘İZĀDE ATĀ’Ī’S WORLD AND THE ‘ĀLEMNÜMĀ</b> .....	<b>20</b>
1.1. The Life of Nev‘īzāde Atā’ī .....	<b>20</b>
1.2. The Nev‘īzāde Atā’ī’s ‘ <i>Ālemnümā</i> .....	<b>26</b>
1.3. Realistic Depiction in the ‘ <i>Ālemnümā</i> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>2. SPILLS FROM SĀQĪ’S BROKEN CUP</b> .....	<b>48</b>
2.1. Sāqīnamas in the Seventeenth Century.....	<b>48</b>
2.2. Changing in Ilmiye and Urbanism in Early Seventeenth Century .....	<b>51</b>
2.3. Archaeology of the <i>Masnavī</i> : Between Imagination and Reality .....	<b>58</b>
<b>3. LANDSCAPE AND SUBJECTIVITY IN THE ‘ĀLEMNÜMĀ</b> .....	<b>66</b>
3.1. The Appearance of the Landscape.....	<b>66</b>
3.2. The Appearance of Subjectivity .....	<b>72</b>
3.3. Breaking of the Seeing and Mental Traces in ‘ <i>Ālemnümā</i> .....	<b>77</b>
<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>97</b>

## INTRODUCTION

The way people perceive themselves and their environment, in other words, their perception of the time and place they are in, is not always the same. The thought and belief systems into which people were born have an important role on the way people make sense of the world. Changes in governance types, social order, religious structures, geographical and climatic conditions affect thought systems and social norms deeply. In this respect, those who lived before were distinct from us physically and mentally by virtue of their own historical contexts; thinking that they had the same norms as us leads us to a form of anachronism. While researching the history of the past generations, the Annales School historians, who determined not to rely on their event or politics-oriented histories, produced highly qualified history studies especially in this respect. Understanding the ways of thinking, classifying and describing the worlds of people who lived at a certain time was on the agenda of many historians and academics<sup>1</sup>. From this point of view, for those historians who aim to reveal a total history study by focusing on various aspects of individuals' lives, while trying to understand how people who lived three centuries ago made sense of existence, the assumption that these people who lived before think like us is the easiest explanation and it is misleading (Darnton 1984, 12). We must be able to self-critique and develop different perspectives to escape a prejudiced understanding of the past.

Literary works are the primary sources to apply different points of view to different periods of the Ottoman Empire. Using literary works as a source base has largely been avoided in Ottoman historiography because Classical Ottoman literature was seen as a

---

<sup>1</sup>Philippe Ariès, *A History of Private Life*; Robert Darnton, *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History*; Carlo Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*; Suraiya Faruqi, *Crafts and Craftsmen of the Middle East: Fashioning the Individual in the Muslim Mediterranean*

repetitive genre detached from social reality.<sup>2</sup> According to Cemal Kafadar, the over-emphasis on archive documents in scholarship made statistical information easily accessible. Consequently, literary sources became secondary or tertiary options – undercutting their importance in conceptualizing Ottoman mentalities. According to Kafadar, in this way, research on Ottoman literature remained relegated to an aesthetic level. Although many qualified critical editions have been published, they have remained within the framework of technical expertise. There have been few efforts to contextualize literary works for their relevance to cultural and social history (Kafadar 1989, 122).

This situation started to change especially in cultural and social historical studies at the turn of this century. Ottomanists and literary theorists began to realize the potential for a multi-faceted comprehension of history offered through literary sources and many important works have been published.<sup>3</sup> However, it is still difficult to say that this interest is sufficient when compared to the critical editions made in the field of literature.

This thesis attempts to fill a small part of the above-mentioned gap by focusing on the '*Ālemnümā*<sup>4</sup> masnavi written by Nev'izāde Atā'ī (d. 1635). Atā'ī was a poet, scholar and member of a judiciary system who lived in the Ottoman Empire at the end of the 16th century and at the beginning of the 17th century. Using the '*Ālemnümā* as a case study, this project has two goals. The first one is to reveal Ātā'ī's ways of seeing. By this concept, I mean that although literary works do not use a visual language, they can describe the visual images seen and imagined by the author in writing. For this reason, we can find clues about the author's ways of seeing based on the traces in written works. The other goal is to find clues which make sense of the social mentality pointed out by these ways of seeing. Although we consider seeing as a natural fact, an action performed by our eyes spontaneously, seeing is actually affected by different elements outside of us. Therefore,

---

<sup>2</sup>Agah Sırrı Levent *Divan Edebiyatı Kelimeler ve Remizler Mazmunlar ve Mefhumlar*; Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı *Divan Edebiyatı Beyanındadır*.

<sup>3</sup>Cornell Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire, The Historian Mustafa Ali*; W.G. Andrews - M. Kalpaklı, *The Age of Beloveds: Love and the Beloved in Early Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society*; Cemal Kafadar, "Self and Others: The Diary of a Dervish in Seventeenth Century Istanbul and First-Person Narratives in Ottoman Literature"

<sup>4</sup>Atā'ī named his work as the '*Ālemnümā*: Nümāyān ider gūne gūne safā / N'ola nāmına dinse '*ālem-nümā*. In this period, the works in the form of sāqī-nāme did not have a specific name given by author but their categorical name. However, since Atā'ī names his work in this way, I will refer to the work as '*Ālemnümā*, not as a sāqī-nāme.



I think that if there is a change in the way of seeing, hearing or speaking, there must be reasons that affect it.

There are several reasons why I want to focus on Atā'ī's *Ālemnümā*. The main reason is that the *Ālemnümā* has indirect and layered narrations based on descriptions rather than an event or a pattern of events. It contains signifier-signified relationships both in couplets and as a whole. It is easier to see the connections between the signifier and signified, since metaphors, symbols and allegories are used less frequently in *Ālemnümā*. In this thesis, which aims to make sense of the ways of seeing through descriptions, these relations between signifier and signified provide very important clues. In addition, since it is one of the most important examples of a literary genre which grew in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, it allows for a historical review of the development of the genre. Finally, the work is an early example of Atā'ī's narrative style that can be seen in his other four *masnavi* (A narrative or reflective poem, often longish but of no fixed length, often romantic but with no prescribed subject matter. Its two-line verses normally rhyme AA, BB, CC, etc). Atā'ī states that the new things should be said in new forms and *Ālemnümā* is a great example of that.

### *Sāqīnāmes*

The *sāqīnāme* (Book of the Cupbearer) is one of the most common and important literary genres of classical Ottoman poetry. Its main theme is wine and types of wine – real or metaphorical, wine-related equipment, *majlis* (gathering) and *sāqī* (cupbearer, wine-pourer, lover). The word comes from the combination of the words *sāqī* (cupbearer) and *name* (letter or book).

Arabic and Persian poems about wine, called *khamriyyāt*, are considered to be the source of the *sāqīnāme* genre. However, it differs from the *khamriyyāt* in terms of meaning and quality (Losensky 2009). While *khamriyyāts* are mostly devoted to love, *sāqīnāmes* add philosophical, moral expressions. Although *khamriyyāt* poems have an important place in pre-Islamic Arabic literature, the emergence of *sāqīnāmes* as an independent genre took place much later in Persian (Karaismailoğlu 1994).

Losensky states that the defining formal and thematic features of the *sāqīnāme* first began to take shape in the works of Neẓāmī of Ganjavī (d. 1209). Entitled *Dar ʕefat-e ḥāl-e k̄viš-o yād-e godaštegān* (Describing the speaker’s state and in memory of the departed), the closing section of the introduction of *leylī o majnūn* is punctuated every seven to ten couplets by invocations of the *sāqī* and short descriptions of wine. Both the themes of this passage and its strophic-like form figured significantly in the later history of the genre. In *Iskandarnāme*, this introductory method is deployed throughout the work. Neẓāmī marks the transitions between major episodes by short passages of eight to ten couplets beginning with the formula *beyā sāqī* (“Come, sāqī”). Calling on the cupbearer for wine and inspiration, Neẓāmī reflected on some of the common themes of homiletic wisdom literature—the brevity of human life, the fickleness of fate, and the necessity of severing worldly attachments (Losensky 2009).

*Sāqīnāmes* describe the details of the wine, the *sāqī*, glass, jug, amusements in the *majlis*, meals and appetizers, households and reeds, the lord, the *majlis*’ characters, and many wine-related elements. While all these are being explained, the words are used in a way that complies with the real and the metaphorical or mystical (Arslan 2012, 14). Apart from these, *sāqīnames* discuss topics like harvesting grapes for wine, the benefits and detriments of wine, how and when the wine should be drunk, the types of wine, the types of glasses, the features of the tavern and the *majlis*, the characteristics of the sheikh/saloonkeeper, seasons, day, night, musical instruments, candles, etc. are covered with several couplets or in detail (Arslan 2012, 15).

The traces of the *majlis* tradition, a very common theme in the *sāqīnames*, are very old. The earliest examples of *majālis* were accompanied by wine, song, and poetry and found in ancient Mesopotamian, Canaanite, and Greek cultures. It is also a big part of the Sasanian culture which inherited the Hellenistic tradition as part of Alexander the Great’s legacy in Asia (Ali 2010, 43). According to Helen Pfeifer, “long before the rise of coffeehouses [...] exclusive social gatherings often called *majālis* constituted the main spaces for social and intellectual exchange across much of the Islamicate world” (Pfeifer 2015, 2). Deriving from the Arabic root j-l-s, meaning “to sit” and widely used in both Arabic and Ottoman Turkish, *majlis* literally means “sitting” or “place where one sits”. As such, from Andalusia to Persia, it was a shared term that could refer to various

gatherings of people (meetings, receptions, assemblies) and/or to the halls where such gatherings occurred (4).

Pfeifer states that the elements of *majlis* reflect not literal but metaphorical truths which, if decoded, offer a storehouse of deep-seated beliefs, attitudes, and mythologies. “Literary salons thus reveal a very dynamic process of Ottoman canon formation. A number of historians have seen the development of a more self-aware imperial culture in the literary, artistic and scholarly domains during the sixteenth century” (19).

Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı draws attention the *majālis*, called *the parties with sohbet*, are one of the forms of social interaction that are important for the whole society. in their work *The Age of Beloveds*. In this case, party refers to any of a broad range of social gatherings such as a dinner, a soiree, a garden party, holiday festivities, a wake, a circumcision feast, an outing in the country, an evening at coffeehouse, a night at the tavern, an intimate conversation between lovers and friends. This kind of conversations were major sources of pleasure and social bonding among people at all levels of society. In the circles of educated elites, conversation in gatherings implies wit, learning, mastery of a rhetorical style, and a general understanding of the poetic script for refined social interactions (Andrews and Kalpaklı 2006, 106).

These gatherings were usually held in private gardens under favorable weather conditions. Private garden parties were called *bezm* (party), *‘ayş*, *şoḥbet* (conversing), *meclis* (gathering), or *devr* (passing cup). These gatherings usually took place at night lit by the moon, *‘sem* (candle) or *çerağ* (lanterns). The assemblies continued until sunrise. *Mutribs* (musicians) played instruments and *Mugannis* (singer) sang songs. The musical instruments played were the *çeng* (harp), *ney* (reed-flute), *tabl* (drum) and *sāz* (long- or short-necked lute). Perfumes were used to intensify the atmosphere (*havā*). These intimate parties were intended for close friends (Çalış 2004, 117-118).

Food dishes and fruit were served with various drinks. One court poet lists various kinds of foods served at these parties, such as; chestnuts, walnuts, almonds, pistachios, hazelnuts, cherries, plums, figs, strawberries, melon, watermelon, apples, peaches, caviar, fish eggs, pickled fish, pastrami, lobster, mussels, sardines, cheese and varieties of kebab ( 118).

Wine was one of the major servings at private parties. It comprised different kinds of wine with a variety of names: *āb-ı engūr* (grape juice), *'arak* (similar to *rakı*), *bikr* (wine), *bāde* (wine), *mey* (wine), *mül* (wine), *rah* (wine), *bāde-i gülgün* (red wine), *āteş-i seyyale* (red wine), *dide-i horos* (red wine), *hun-i ketuber* (red wine), *sahbā* (red wine), *bāde-i sadsāle* (aged wine), *gül'arak* (rose wine), *şerab-ı cül* (rose wine), *kümeyt* (dark red wine), etc. The wine cup was also called with different names such as *ayağ*, *cām*, *cām-ı billūr*, *cām-ı cem*, *cām-ı lebriz*, *cām-ı mey*, *cām-ı musaffā*, *çanak*, *desti*, *fincan*, *gūze*, *mina*, *kadeh*, *kap*, *kāse*, *peymāne*, *piyāle*, *ritl*, *sāgar*, etc. Wine containers were called *sūrahi*, *abgīne*, *bat*, *sebu*, etc. Also, these gatherings took place in gardens called *gülşen* or *gülistān* (rosegarden), *bağ* or *ravza* (garden), *gülzar* (rose plot), *çemen* (lawn), *cennet* (paradise), *sahn* (yard) (118).

There are a large number of *sāqīnāme* works in different forms of poetry style in Ottoman literature, called as "İşretname, Safaname, Sahbāname, Aşkname" (Karahan 1980, 119). These can be works written in the form of independent books or chapters in subject-specific *masnavis*. It is possible to find poems under the name of *sāqīnāme* in the *divans* (a collection of a single poet's work). *Sāqīnāme* are usually written in *masnavi* form; however, depending on the content, the poets acted freely with regard to the verse form and rhythm. They wrote *sāqīnāmes* in the form of *tarjī band* (A stanzaic verse form that uses a single meter but varying rhyming elements), *tarkīb band* (A stanzaic verse form that uses a single meter but varying rhyming elements. It differs from a *tarjī band* only in that the single *matla's* (opening verse) that conclude the stanzas are different; they may or may not rhyme.), *mukhammes* (A poem in five-line stanzas, rhyming AAAAA, BBBBC, with variations) or *qasidah* (ode) (119).

In her 2018 PhD Thesis entitled *Klasik Türk Edebiyatı'nda Sâkînâmeler*, Özlem Çayıldak examines the *sāqīnāmes* in Ottoman literature from the 15th to the 20th centuries in terms of content and form. In this review, which the content of *sāqīnāmes* are not analyzed historically, she describes concepts in the *sāqīnāmes* in detail and explains the historical development of the genre in the introduction of her study. She notes that the most successful examples of the genre were written in the 17th century.

In Ottoman literature, we see the first example under the name of *sāqīnāme* in the *masnavi* of Khwārizmī called *Muḥabbetnāme*. In the *Muḥabbetnāme*, two verses call out to the *sāqī* at the end of the episode. In the fifteenth century, Ahmed-i Dāī's *sāqīnāme* in the

form of *tarjī band* is one of the important examples of the genre. In the sixteenth century, Fuzulī's (d. 1556) *Beng ü Bade masnavi* contains specific features of the *sāqīnāme* genre. In this century, Fakīrī's 106-couplets *masnavi* was written in the type of *sāqīnāme*. In addition, a part of Cinānī's (d. 1595) *masnavi Cilāu'l Kulūb* has a *sāqīnāme* character. In the sixteenth century, Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali (d. 1600) wrote 35 couplets in the form of a *tarkīb band*, and Fevri (d. 1571) wrote a *sāqīnāme* consisting of 55 couplets in the form of *tarjī band*. In this century, the work of Edirneli Revānī (d. 1523), called *İşretnāme*, was one of the first advanced examples of the genre in the classical Ottoman literature, and led the *sāqīnāmes* written later.

In his work entitled *Türk Edebiyatında Sâkînâmeler and İşretnâme*, Rıdvan Canım published the critical edition of *işretnâme*. Moreover, he asserts on the importance of the *sāqīnāmes* in terms of the folkloric materials in the *majālis* (Canım 1998). He also states that *işretnâme* is a text that is related to social life. However, he does not identify a relationship between *işretnâme* and *majālis* of the high society in his study. Canım states the necessity of establishing the relation of *işretnâme* with social life in order to emphasize the originality and importance of *masnavi*. In the study, the definition of the *sāqīnāmes* and the development of the genre is explained. The life and literary aspect of Revānī were evaluated. Descriptions of folkloric materials such as “candle”, “sāqī”, “wine” in the text are exemplified. In this sense, while the study shows a remarkable determination to show *sāqīnāmes*' importance in social life, it lacks a critical evaluation.

The best period of *sāqīnāme* genre in Ottoman literature is the seventeenth century. In this century, the *sāqīnāmes* written by the famous poets of the period and developed in terms of form and content draw attention. The independent *sāqīnāmes* of Nev'izāde Atā'ī consisting of 1590 couplets, Azmizāde Hāletī's (d.1631) 521 couplets, Riyāzī's (d.1644) 1062 couplets, Beyānī's 298 couplets, Tıflī's (d. 1660) 248 couplets were written in this century. In addition, Na'im's (d. 1694) *Gülzār-ı Na'im masnavi* has a *sāqīnāme* with 601 couplets. Other *sāqīnāmes* written in *masnavi* style in this century are as follows: Cem'ī Mehmed (d.1659) with 91 couplets, Şeyhülislām Yahyā (d.1643) with 77 couplets, Selanikli Es'ad (d.1633) with 114 couplets, Seyh Mehmed Allāme (d.1633-34) with 111 couplets, Kafzāde Fāizī (d.1621) with 168 couplets, Sabūhi (d.1647) with 113 couplets, Bahāyī (d.1654) with 88 couplets, Nāzikī (d.1688) with 64 couplets.

In the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Nergisī (d.1635) and Fehīm-i Kadīm (d. 1648) wrote a *sāqīnāme* in the form of ode, Fevzī (d.1679), Nef'ī (d.1635), Kelīm (d.1699), Yāri and Kāşif wrote in the form of *tarkīb band*, Hāletī-i Gülşenī, Cem-ī Mehmed (d. 1659), Feyz-i Kefevī (d. 1619), Bağdatlı Zihnī wrote in the form of *tarjī band*.

Adviye Tuğluk, in 1942 graduation thesis entitled *On Yedinci Asır Sâkînâmeleri* made critical edition of some short pieces of Atā'ī, Hāletī, Riyāzī, Bahāyī Mehmed Efendī, Ahmed Sabūhī Dede, Nef'ī's *sāqīnāmes*. The importance of the 17<sup>th</sup> century in terms of the *sāqīnāme* genre is emphasized in this work.

There is a decrease in the works of *sāqīnāme* genre in the eighteenth century compared to the previous century. In this century, the Subhizāde Feyzī' (d. 1740) *sāqīnāme* with 700 couplets and Rüşdī's 47 couplets were written in *masnavi* style. Belīg (d.1760), Sheikh Galib (d. 1799) and Kelāmī wrote *sāqīnāme* in the form of *tarkīb band*.

Writing poetry in the form of *sāqīnāme* continued in the nineteenth century. Those written in this century are generally short poems in the style of *tarkīb band* or *tarjī band*. The *sāqīnāmes* of Süleyman Celāleddin (d.1890) with 144 couplets, Benlizāde İzzet (d. 1809) with 296 couplets, Hüznī (b. 1891) with 63 couplets, Aşkī with 71 couplets, were written in this century. There are many poets who wrote *sāqīnāme* in the form of *tarkīb band* in this period. Aynī's *masnavi*-style *sāqīnāme* with 2008 couplets is the most successful example of the genre written in this century. The critical edition of this work was made by Mehmet Arslan and published in 2003.

Halil İnalçık's *Has-bağçede 'Ays u Tarab* explores the link between the ancient Iranian tradition and wine *majālis*. He expresses the importance of *sāqīnāme*: "In the literary genre of *sāqīnāme*, we see a considerable realism not found in other genres. For example, *hasbağçe*, *sāqī* and *hanendes* (singer, reader), *makams* (a system of melody types), entertainments are depicted realistically" (İnalçık 2011). As İnalçık suggests, due to the realism *sāqīnāmes* depict, it would be insufficient to deal with the *sāqīnāme* solely for the genre's literary value. Nevertheless, studies on *sāqīnāmes* are mostly related to literary value alone ( 276).

The most comprehensive of the study deals with the *sāqīnāme* as a literary genre in Classical Ottoman Literature, is Mehmet Arslan's 2012 book *Sâkînâmeler*. His study

focuses mainly on the *sāqīnāmes* of Aynī. Also, it includes transcriptions of eighty-seven *sāqīnāmes* written as independent or sections in a variety of works in different styles. Arslan makes brief evaluations about the common features, contents, and concepts of the *sāqīnāmes* in the introduction part of his work. He states that *sāqīnāmes* are important in terms of giving information about the lifestyle of the poets and reflecting social life by describing realistically manners in the *majālis*, musical instruments (*sāz, tambūr, ‘ūd, tef, çeng, kânûn*), drinking materials (pitchers, glasses, candles, appetizers) (Arslan 2012, 32). Although Arslan says that *sāqīnāmes* can reflect the morals, values, and tastes of a given period and peoples’ worldview, his review only handles *sāqīnāmes* as a literary genre.

Banu Durgunay’s 2013 Master's Thesis entitled *Seküler Hayatla Tasavvuf Arasındaki İlişkide Köprü Metinler: Sâkīnâmeler* compares three *sāqīnāmes* written in different centuries. Based on the link between reality and metaphor, she focuses on contemporary worldviews of their compilation. She compared Revânî's *‘İşretnâme* from the 16<sup>th</sup> century, Ātā’î's *‘Ālemnümā* from the 17<sup>th</sup> century and the *Sâkīnâme* of Aynī from the 19<sup>th</sup> century. She states that wine-related concepts can be simultaneously real and metaphorical, and it is wrong to categorize these texts as exclusively mystical or secular (Durgunay 2013, 14). Durgunay, accounting for İnalçık's views on ancient Iranian traditions, correlated with religion, mysticism in high-society, states that mystical references in *sāqīnāmes* bridges different worlds.

### **Nev‘izāde Atā’î and the ‘Ālemnümā**

Nev‘izāde Atā’î, one of the most famous poets of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, is the son of the famous Ottoman poet Nev‘î Efendî. Atā’î’s real name is Atāullah. He was born in Istanbul in 991/1583. As his father was a scholar and poet, he engaged with science and literary *majālis* from a young age. After his father's death, he took lessons from Kafzāde Feyzullah Efendî and Abdülhalim Efendî. At the age of 22, he was first employed as a scholar and then to Lofça as a *qadi* (judge). His charge in Lofça is also the beginning of the judgeship experience that the poet will continue in the provinces by longing for Istanbul almost until the end of his life. After Lofça, Atā’î served as a *qadi* in Babaeski, Varna, Ruscuk, Silistra, Tekfurdağı, Hezergrad, Tirnova, Tirhala, Monastery, and Skopje.

Atā'ī returned to Istanbul after he was dismissed from Skopje and died in Istanbul in 1635/h.1044 (İpekten 1991).

Although Atā'ī, who has been in the intellectual and social circles since his childhood, died at an early age, he left many works in the form of poetry and prose. As one of the most important poets of the century, he has two hundred ninety-nine ghazels and thirty-one *qaşıda* in his *Dīvān* (Karaköse 1994). Atā'ī gets his real reputation in the field of literature from his *Hamse*. The Hamse tradition formed by bringing together five masnavis, and started with Neẓāmī of Ganjavī who strongly affected Ottoman literature. While determining the success of the poets who produce works in this field, we see many examples which they simulated or went beyond Neẓāmī's Hamse as a criterion to determine the qualities of their works. Atā'ī also wrote his *Hamse*, consisting of masnavis named *Ālemnümā (Sâkînâme)*, *Nefhatü'l-Ezhār*, *Sohbetü'l-Ebkār*, *Heft-hān* and *Hilyetü'l-Efkār* as a *nazīre* (paraphrase) according to this criterion. Atā'ī also has a *Hezliyat*, which contains poems in the form of *hezl*, which deals with serious and important ideas and issues in a humorous and informal manner in short *mecmu'a*.

Among the prose works of Atā'ī, the most important one is the book entitled *Hadāiku'l-hakāik fī tekmeleti'ş-Şekāik* which is a *zeyl* (addition) to Taşköprüzade's (d. 1561) *eş-Şekā'iku'n-nu'māniyye fī 'ulemā'i'd-Devleti'l-'Osmāniyye* – an anthology of *'ulemā* biographies. Apart from this, he has a book titled *El-Kavlü'l-Hasen Fî Cevābi'l-Kavli Limen*, a work about Islamic law and the *Münşeāt* which includes eight letters written to scholars such as İskender Paşa, Gānizāde Nādirī and Şeyhülislām Yahyā. He passed away before completing his work named as *Zeyl-i Siyer-i Veysī*, which is an addition to Veysī's prophetic biography.

There are critical editions of most of Atā'ī's works. Saadet Karaköse prepared the critical text of Atā'ī's *Dīvān* in her 1994 PhD thesis. In order to understand Atā'ī's social environment, the thesis includes a partial analysis under four main headings: Religion-Sufism, Society, Mankind and Nature. The *Dīvān* is not included some poems which are published in 2016 under the title of "Nevizade Atayī'nin Bilinmeyen Şiirleri" written by Mesut Bayram Düzenli. The work includes an ode that consists of fifty-two couplets and two *ghazals*.



The critical edition of the *‘Ālemnümā* was edited by Muhammet Kuzubaş. In his 2007 PhD Thesis entitled *Atā’īnin Ālemnümâ (Sâkînâme) Mesnevisinin Karşılaştırmalı Metni ve Konu Bakımından İncelenmesi*,<sup>5</sup> Kuzubaş makes a short analysis about the content and literary features of the *‘Ālemnümā*. Nevertheless, he only focuses on the literary aspects of the text. The critical edition of Hamse's second masnavi, *Nefhatü'l Ezhar*, was prepared by Muhammet Kuzubaş as a Master's Thesis in 2003. This masnavi has twenty chapters, each giving advice and moral lessons accompanied by a relevant *destān* (epic story).

The critical edition of Atā'ī's *Şohbet'ül Ebkār*, which is third masnavi of his Hamse, was prepared by Muhammet Yelten in 1998. Turgut Karacan, in his 1972 PhD Thesis, edited Atā'ī's fourth masnavi, *Heft Hān*. He also wrote an analysis classifying the depictions in the stories in the *masnavi*. The last *masnavi* of Hamse is *Hilyetü'l-efkār*. Some literary historians have regarded Atā'ī's *Dīvān* of as the fifth work of his Hamse (Kuzubaş 2007, 29). However, Âgâh Sırrı Levend proves that Hamse's fifth masnavi is *Hilyetü'l-efkār*. With the help of Tahir Olgun, Levend found and published a missing copy of one hundred ten couplets that formed the beginning of *Hilyetü'l-efkār*. However, the original/earliest copy of his masnavi has not yet been discovered (Kortantamer 1997, 57). The only book on *Hilyetü'l-efkār* was published in 1948 by Âgâh Sırrı Levend.

The only comprehensive review of Atā'ī's Hamse is Tunca Kortantamer's *Nevizade Atayi ve Hamsesi* which was published in 1997. In this study, providing significant insights into Atā'ī's life based on Atā'ī's Hamse, Kortantamer examines the masnavis that formed the Hamse and summarized each masnavi in detail by examining the coherence of each theme. According to Kortantamer, Atā'ī, who is a remarkable and successful figure in Turkish hamse writing, is distinctive in his refusal to imitate while using realism. Atā'ī's works are notable especially in deriving inspiration from social reality and the vitality in his narrative style (Kortantamer 1997, 16).

Kortantamer's extensive review consists of three parts. The first section of the first chapter compares reflections of the late 16<sup>th</sup> and early 17<sup>th</sup> centuries in Atā'ī's Hamse. In this section, an important place is given to *‘Ālemnümā*. Kortantamer states that the wine *majālis* refers to a social reality of the society's entertainment and the realism in *Hamse* is related to social life. In this section, he emphasizes that the Hamse's features reflected

---

<sup>5</sup> In this thesis, Kuzubaş's work is based on the text of *‘Ālemnümā*.

its context. The second section of the first chapter focuses on the reflections of Atā'ī's life based on his Hamse, and in the third section, includes general features and detailed summaries of masnavis. The second chapter deals with masnavis in Hamse as works of art. This part consists of two sections: In the first section, Kortantamer focuses on the masnavis' shape and style. In the second section, he examines Atā'ī's understanding of art, which has become evident in his Hamse. In the third chapter, Hamse's place in Turkish literature is examined.

Suat Donuk edited Atā'ī's *Hadâiku'l-hakâik fi tekmeleti'ş-Şekâik*, considered as the most important work of Atā'ī in many sources. He provided detailed information about the translation and additions written to *Şakâik-ı Nu'mâniyye* and general outlines of the *Şakâik-ı Nu'maniyye* tradition in the introduction chapter. In the next chapter, after mentioning the life and other works of Atā'ī, Donuk presents a detailed examination data related to the content and form of Atā'ī's work. Donuk draws attention to the importance of the work and includes important information about many poets and writers in the context of Turkish literature's history. He generates sections as "Poets and Writers with a Biography in the Work", "The Literary Criticism and Content in the Work" "The Comparison of Biographies of Poets with the Versions in *Şuara Tezkires*". The last part of the study includes the edition critique of *Hadâiku'l-hakâik fi tekmeleti'ş-Şekâik*. Thanks to Donuk's meticulous critical edition, it was possible to easily obtain more comprehensive information about Atā'ī's life and mind.

Aslı Niyazioğlu's 2017 book *Dreams and Lives in Ottoman Istanbul: A Seventeenth-Century Biographer's Perspective*, was written on Atā'ī's work named *Hadâiku'l-hakâik fi tekmeleti'ş-Şekâik*. It is a comprehensive and inspiring analysis. In her study, Niyazioğlu demonstrates the relations in the Ottoman cultural world at the end of the 16th century and the beginning of the 17th century, focusing on Atā'ī's selection of biographies of the sheikhs and *ulemâ*. She examines the importance of dreams in terms of worldly and spiritual power in the biographies of members of Halvetî and Bayrâmî mystical networks and their subordinates, Sünbülî, Gülşenî and Melâmi-Bayrâmî orders, who were dominant in Atā'ī's work. Niyazioğlu's attempt to understand how alive and dead were connected in narrations is also an inspiring standpoint for this thesis.

*Hezliyât*, which is generally ignored in studies on Atā'ī, was published by Suat Donuk as a critical edition in 2015. Poems in the *Hezliyât* have many couplets expressing sexual

molestation, mischievous jokes while mocking to unknown figures and *mahbups* (beloveds). Another point that draws attention in the context of language and style in the work is that there are no verses from Qur'ān, hadiths or poems of Arabic and Persian *kalām-i kibār* in Nev'izāde Atā'ī's *Hezliyat*. According to Donuk, it is understandable that Qur'ānic verses and hadiths are absent in the work since it contains statements that 'orthodox' religion did not tolerate. However, it is noteworthy that Arabic and Persian quotations are never made (Donuk 2015, 8). This situation suggests that Atā'ī's originality related with indigenusness seen in his *Hamse* is not an exception limited to that book.

Obscene narratives are also present in Atā'ī's *Hamse*. Tülay Artan's article titled "Mahremiyet: Mahrumiyetin Resmi" focuses on a dimension of this subject. In this article, Artan examines the five illustrated copies of the *Hamse-i Atā'ī* in terms of 18<sup>th</sup> century Ottoman social structure. She states that the main features of these illustrated stories is their realism and the reflecting of urbanism. Additionally, Artan highlights notable similarities between the persons of Istanbul and the new social classes emerging in London and Paris in the same period in terms of the behaviors determined by the public and private space hierarchies (Artan 1993, 96). Richard Sennett's concept of *public man* creates an important theoretical background throughout the study. The quantitative growth of cities in terms of population and material wealth has also greatly changed the social structures within the city. It may be possible to see these changes more concretely in Western societies than in Ottoman societies. However, the effects of changes in power relations and urbanization on the daily life of the Ottoman Empire can be traced in *Hamse* (101).

Aslı Yerlikaya in her 2014 Master's Thesis entitled *Nevizâde Atâyî'nin Üç Mesnevisinde Cinsel Söylemler ve İktidar İlişkileri*, examines the social structure and understanding of sexuality in society by analyzing sexual expressions in the *Âlemnümâ*, *Nefhâtü'l-ezhâr*, and *Sohbetü'l-ebkâr*. By adopting Michel Foucault's concepts like *sexual discourse* and *power* as a theoretical foundation, Yerlikaya determines the sexual discourses in these masnavis and tries to make sense of it within the framework of power relations arising from the male-dominated society at the time. Although it contains some remarkable points in terms of research questions and approaches, the study limits broader

interpretations of Ottoman cultural and social history, since it lacks an inclusive theoretical framework.

In Osman Ünlü's article, "Edgar Allan Poe'nun 'Tek Etki' Kuramı ve Klasik Türk Hikayesi: Nev-î-zâde Atâyî Örneği", published in 2016, Ünlü discusses the visibility of Poe's *unity of effect* theory in Atâ'î's masnavis. According to Ünlü, the unity of effect theory, which means every element of a story should create a single impact on the reader's mind, can be clearly seen in many stories in Atâ'î's Hamse. Although Atâ'î did not establish a story theory, long before Poe he used a technique similar to Poe's. In most of his stories, story editing, the development and tension lines of events, personality, location, and event depictions arranged an impressive and shocking end. Although Ünlü's article is an important study in terms of bringing modern approaches to classical literature, it is always necessary to consider the possibility of such studies being anachronistic.

In her article entitled "Nev'î-zâde Atâyî'nin Nefhatü'l-Ezhâr Mesnevisindeki Mevsimler Hikayesi", Şerife Yalçinkaya analyzes the *sebeb-i te'lîf* section of Atâ'î's masnavî as a story. Yalçinkaya states that in this first-person narrative, a reference was made to a mystical journey (Yalçinkaya 2018, 718). This spiritual journey is described in the story in separate planes of time and space. The timelines in the story are as follows: One day (five times), one year (four seasons), one life (childhood, adolescence, middle age, old age). There are two main places in which the story takes place: home and outside. The place is depicted in motion, changing. This feeling of mobility can be seen through the times of the day, seasons of the year, and periods of life. The multidimensional time and place changes were achieved with realistic transitions within the story (721).

The most important commonality that almost all of these studies on Atâ'î and his works shared is the novelty and realism in Atâ'î's narration. What makes the *Âlemnümâ* important for this thesis is that it depicts how the author perceives the space about which he writes, along with the narrative realism he utilizes. However, I have to state that the concept I refer to as realism has a different meaning from the art style that emerged in France in the 19th century and became visible in the novels of Flaubert, Zola or Balzac. There is a strong philosophical determinism on the background of this artistic attitude, which aims to explain the everyday life of society in all details and objectively. The basic concept that I use while dealing with Atâ'î's *Âlemnümâ* is real rather than realism in this sense. Here, I focus on the reality that began to emerge as the narrative of real things and

facts about social life, the city, and nature in Classical Ottoman literature, which mostly relies on symbols, metaphors and allegories as narrative form in earlier examples.

### **The Karatani's "Landscape" and Belting's "Gaze" in the Text**

The one of the main questions of this thesis is why Atā'ī used the different narrative style than earlier masnavis. The reasons of the contextual or stylistic changes that occur in literature or other art forms and how these changes can be interpreted socially and culturally has been on the agenda of many thinkers. Kojin Karatani, a Japanese philosopher and literary critic, is one of them. Karatani considers the origins of modern literature in terms of landscape. According to him, there is a relationship between the realistic reflection of objects and the discovery of the landscape (Karatani 1993, 22). Modern literature should not be understood as opposing antiquity or earlier periods. Since defining a literature as "modern" comes with all the limitations of the word, it causes the determination of the literature other than modern according to itself (35). Stating that literature does not have to follow this order historically, Karatani affirms that medieval or ancient literature (or Chinese Literature and Ottoman Literature) are the reconstructions of paradigms that already form "modern" literature. To overcome these boundaries, Karatani establishes an analogy between painting and literature. The place in traditional *sansui* painting exists not as a subject's relationship with the object, but as a transcendental and metaphysical model. When a *sansui* artist paints a pine tree, he almost depicts the concept of the pine tree. This is not a pine forest that appears from a certain point of view in a certain time and space (39). When the geometric perspective technique started to be used in traditional *sansui* painting, this conceptual point of view began to turn into a singular and subject-centered perspective. This situation has become apparent especially in landscape drawings. According to Karatani, cited from Simmel, the landscape is an object that is conceived by a person with a fixed perspective. The objectification of perspective, as a symbolic form (the term coined by Ernst Cassirer who is a linguistic philosopher) also forms the basis of the analogical approach between literature and painting (41). The gap between the subject and the object reveals itself in the landscape, and the view of the landscape appears in many parts of *Ālemnümā*.

German art historian Hans Belting, who similar to Karatani studies perspective as a form of perception, examines the history of seeing in the East and the West in *Florence and Baghdad* (2011). He states that the subject of perspective is not only an art-related issue. To understand the cultural importance of perspective we need to approach it as a painting because cultures use pictures to reflect their way of thinking (Belting 2011, 20). Belting says that with the introduction of perspective in the Modern Age, the gaze itself is included in the painting. “The center of the central perspective is always the viewer. The viewer's gaze stands at the top of the pyramid of vision” (21). Perspective, by creating painting for the gaze, adopts a subject-centered worldview.

Belting also talks about the cultural connections of perspective. Perspective is not universal but an invented cultural technique. It sacrifices the freedom of perception and fixes it to a single position. In this synthesis, perspective becomes the invention of the subject-dominated world (48). Considering Belting's and Karatani's thoughts on perspective, it is possible to make a cultural comparison about the landscape. I argue that landscape introduces the discussion of subjectivity and objectivity in both painting and literature. Landscape in both can be formed by changing the perception of nature. The origins of modern literature lie in the connection between the objectivity of the landscape and the inner self (Karatani 1993, 30).

It is possible to observe the issue of differentiation in the way of seeing, which Karatani tries to examine through the relationship between literature and painting, through Ottoman literature and painting. Ottoman painting consists largely of depictions that depend on the text of the manuscript in terms of content or subject. In addition, other forms of visual expression took place in Ottoman culture.

Ottoman painting mainly depends on the visual tradition of the Islamic world. It follows the principles of the basic narrative language of the book picture developed and diversified in this world (Bağcı and others 2006, 16). Although Belting repeats the claim that painting cannot find a place in the visual tradition of the Islamic world, the Islamic visual tradition has continued by producing its own forms in relation to other visual traditions. In addition, it is wrong to think that a tradition that has spread over a wide geography and has continued its development for centuries shows a single common feature in different times and places. At this point, it is necessary to consider the views of

Oleg Grabar, who has important studies in the Islamic art and architecture. Grabar states that Islam's reluctance towards images and efforts to create visual symbols in different ways during the formation period of Islam should be handled and evaluated within a framework that has mental and social connotations. The questions to be asked in this direction are no longer only about Islamic art, but they raise much more general questions such as the form of the formal and social nature of visual perception under different conditions (Grabar 1973, 105).

While following the principles of the basic narrative language of the book picture developed in the Islamic world, the Ottoman painting was in new searches under different conditions. These principles were adapted to Ottoman recognition. Over time, influenced by the vast geography of the empire and the its neighbors' representation way of the world through paintings, a unique language of painting was created within the distinctive pluralism of the Ottoman palace (Bağcı and others 2006, 16).

After the second half of the sixteenth century, the works of the Palace Nakkaşhane were completely separated from the painting of other Islamic cultures in terms of style and content. The ornamental elements of the past centuries were no longer dominant in these depictions. The fairy-tale world of the east, the gardens with detailed drawn flowers, the pavilions decorated with layers and walls, the thin and long graceful beauties were used less frequently in the depiction of the Ottomans (17). Ottoman painters preferred to depict nature with an unadorned approach. They would place an event in map-type landscapes. They used the non-bright colors without shading and it brought clarity to the painting. This helped to comprehend at first glance the items placed in the scene.

The Nakkaşhane administration also brought innovations to the Islamic book painting, in the selection of the subject of the works to be illustrated. The wars that the sultans and pashas participated in, the acceptance of the ambassadors, the skills of the sultans in hunting, army processions, wedding festivities, sultan portraits were the main subjects for painting. The first to be perceived in all these paintings is the presence of a formal, solemn atmosphere, the dynamic but strident power of the empire and the existence of an extraordinary order. This situation gives the Ottoman depiction a document quality (17).

As a matter of fact, in 2013 book *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court*, Emine Fetvacı focused on the illustrated history books produced in the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

In this work, she states that these illustrated books do not contain stereotyped commendations for the sultan, and that they comment on the current events of the period. These books also played an active role in forming the perceptions of Palace's current and future peoples. Fetvacı states that, these pictures give information about the hierarchical structures in the palace and play a role in the formation of the Ottoman identity (Fetvacı 2013, 18). This situation is important in terms of showing the relationship between Ottoman painting and reality in this period. In another work which is about a group of illustrated manuscripts produced during the period of Osman II (r. 1618-1622), Tülün Değirmenci focuses on the relationship between the pictures in the books and the reality. According to Değirmenci, the people in the depictions in these books are not just an image, they really lived and existed. These features of illustrated books have made them the eyewitnesses of the age they were in (Değirmenci 2012, 7).

When these paintings, which were produced after the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, are examined carefully, the first signs of the perspective technique can be seen, even if it is not possible to talk about the entry of perspective into painting as a conscious technic. There may be a parallel between these stylistic developments in the painting and the view of the subject that started to appear in *Ālemnümā* written at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Belting's approach to perspective as a cultural technic and Karatani's consideration of this cultural characteristic together with the formation of the interiority that enables the emergence of the self, provide important clues in the point of how this way of seeing in *Ālemnümā* corresponds to a change in Atā'ī's mentality. At this point, I refer to Kınalızāde Ali Efendi's work, *Ahlāk-ı Alāī*, which derived from previous moral books and updated according to his own time, is the basic premise of family, society and state order through a single understanding of existence. It is claimed to be effective in terms of providing a theoretical background to the establishing social hierarchies and the perception of existence of Ottoman society. The self of the subject in front of the object presented by the ways of seeing that appear in Atā'ī's work can be positioned against the cosmological imagination that is suggested in *Ahlāk-ı Alāī*. Therefore, the new way of seeing that emerged in *Ālemnümā* may also present the first signs of a change in the worlds of the mind. The direction of this change is from the vision of a holistic being without a distinction between subject and object, to a vision of a world in which one begins to perceive a distance between his own being and the world around him, and his own self begins to form within this distance.



## Thesis Outline

The thesis is divided into three chapters. The first part examines Atā'ī's life and realistic narrative style in the *'Ālemnümā*. Although this chapter mainly focuses on the *'Ālemnümā*, the piece in the beginning part of *Heft Hān* which is a small *sāqīnāme* and some selected parts from Atā'ī's other three masnavis will be included to analyze some examples of Atā'ī's ways of seeing. The biography and social environment of the author will also be included in the first chapter.

The second chapter focuses on the increasing number of *sāqīnāme* in the Ottoman literature in the context of the 17<sup>th</sup> century's socio-political milieu. Changes that developed on the structure of masnavis are examined parallel to the changes within the *'ilmiye* circles and growing urbanization during the 17<sup>th</sup> century. By doing this, I will discuss on which ground the *'Ālemnümā* sits in the Ottoman masnavi archaeology.

In the last chapter, I analyze the different ways of seeing that emerged within *'Ālemnümā* by focusing on the perspectives and the landscapes. Through the clues that are embedded among these newly emerging ways of seeing I will try to understand the mentality of the era and the transformations of the society as well as the individual.

## 1. NEV'İZĀDE ATĀ'Ī'S WORLD AND THE 'ĀLEMNŪMĀ

### 1.1 The Life of Nev'izāde Atā'ī

Şeyhi Mehmed's *Vekâyi'ü'l-fuzalâ*, which contains the largest material among the old biographical sources, mentions Atā'ī's name as 'Aṭā'ullāh bin Nev'ī Yahyā bin Pīr 'Alī bin Naşūḥ. Sources often refer to him as "Nev'izāde Atā'ī". He was the son of the famous poet and scholar of Nev'ī Yahyā Efendī (d. 1599), who was a *müderriis* (teacher/professor) at Sahn and a tutor of princes (İpekten 1991). The pseudonym Atā'ī used in his poems is the short form of this name, 'Aṭā'ullāh. The name that Atā'ī used for him is 'Aṭā'ullāh bin Yahyā el-ma'rūf bi-Nev'izāde (Ekinci 2018, 4).

Nev'izāde Atā'ī was born in 1583 in Istanbul Anadoluhisarı. Atā'ī's maternal grandfather was Nişancı Mehmed Beğ (d.1566), who was chief of scribes (*re'is'ül-küttāb*) and bookkeeper (*defterdār*) of Diyarbakır (Donuk 207, 92). Atā'ī's father's family was among the local notables of Malgara, a small town in Thrace. In *Hadâiku'l-hakâik fi Tekmileti'ş Şakaik*, Atā'ī suggests that his great grandfather as an ascetic who ran away from the Persian lands during the conquests of Timur in the early fifteenth century before settling in a cave near Rodoscuk (today Tekirdag in Thrace) (Donuk 2017, 93). His piety and asceticism impressed locals such that the *kadi* (judge) of Malgara offered his daughter's hand in marriage. Their matrimony resulted in three daughters, one of whom married the son of a merchant (*hace*) from Central Anatolia. She gave birth to Pīr 'Alī (d. 952/1545), Atā'ī's grandfather (Donuk 2017, 1040).

Pīr 'Alī spent most of his life as a *mū'ezzin* (prayer caller) and an *imām* (One who leads the prayers in a mosque) in his hometown Malgara, which probably earned him respect

and status in the small town. During his youth, he received mystical training from a Halveti sheikh (Niyazioğlu 2017, 29). After the death of the sheikh, Pīr ‘Alī returned to Malgara, got married. However, this life did not seem to satisfy him. In 1547, he left his hometown again to seek another Sufi master. This time, he chanced upon the founder of the Gulşeni subbranch of the Halveti order, Ibrahim-i Gülşenī (d. 1533-34), in Cairo. On his way to Cairo, Pīr ‘Alī met with the sheikh in Istanbul, who was visiting the capital for an investigation. However, as Atā’ī narrates, he did not join the order as Sheikh Gülşenī persuaded him to return home to his wife, blessing him with having a son who would become a prominent scholar (Niyazioğlu 2017, 30-31). According to Niyazioğlu, “this story of encountering a prominent sheikh and receiving his blessing for the kin must have been among the treasured tales of Atā’ī’s family” (Niyazioğlu 2017, 31).

Pīr ‘Alī’s son Nev’ī Efendī fulfilled the sheikh’s prophecy. Being an ambitious young man, he left his hometown for a career in the capital. He had a *medrese* (a Muslim school of theology) education, which allowed subjects of the Sultan to be admitted into the ruling circles to serve the Ottoman state. Since Nev’ī Efendī studied with an eminent professor at one of the highest ranking *medreses*, he graduated as a prospective member of the Ottoman elite. Like his classmates Bākī (d. 1599) and Sā’adeddin Efendī (d. 1599), he succeeded in rising to high ranking ‘ulamā positions as well. Niyazioğlu states that a major reason for his success was probably his literary and scholarly talents, which impressed his patrons and employers (31). In addition to many articles, he composed a *dīvān*, a *hadīth* collection in verse, a treatise on mystical love in verse, an encyclopedia of sciences, and a translation of Ibn ‘Arabī’s *Fususul-Hikem* which is a prominent mystical treatise from the thirteenth century, which was very popular among learned Ottoman circles of the period. As Nev’ī Efendī’s intellectual and literary interests corresponded with those of the court of Murad III (r. 1574-1595), he was appointed as a tutor for the princes in 1590 (31).

Atā’ī’s first teacher was his father. In *Hadāik*, he states that his father was his master: “The deceased Nev’ī Efendī who has knowledge and virtue and very precious supporter, father and master of the author of these lines, led to the emergence of this book” (Donuk 2017, 1042). In the same section, Atā’ī mentions that he, as a son of a high ranking ‘*ālim*, attended literary and social gatherings with his father from a very early age (Donuk 2017, 1042).

Nev'izāde also received an education from the foremost scholars of the period. One of the teachers of him in his childhood was Kafzāde Feyzullah Efendī (d. 1611), who was promoted to chief judge of Anatolia and Rumeli. Atā'ī was also trained by Karaca Ahmed Efendī (d. 1615), who worked as a judge in Manisa and Jerusalem. He was professor in *madrāsas* such as Sahn-ı Seman, Hânkâh, Eyyüp, Edirne Sultan Bayezid. Atā'ī also took lessons from 'Azmizāde Hāletī (d. 1631).

Students who received their education in the Ottoman *'ilmiye* (ulama class) for a certain period of time by studying at a madrasa were candidates of the profession with the title of *mülāzım* (assistant professor). Until the 15th century, the *'ilmiye* system proved useful. However, due to some confusion that emerged in the mid-16th century, there was a need for regulation in *mülāzemet* system. Süleyman I appointed Ebussuud Efendī to initiate these reforms. According to this regulation, the number of *mülāzım*s were to be given according to the ranks of each *molla* was determined, and set terms of duty were introduced for talented candidates every few years. With this method, the great kadis and *müderris* periodically gave *mülāzım* (İpşirli 2006). Ahizāde Efendī (d. 1604), after he was appointed to the chief judge of Rumeli in August 1601, announced the turn of duty and recorded talented *müderris* candidates in the *mülāzemet* registry. Meanwhile, Nev'izāde Atā'ī, who was continuing his *madrasa* education, became a *mülāzım* in the same year and gained the right to be appointed as a *müderris* (Donuk 2017, 94).

Atā'ī waited for such an appointment for a long time after he was registered in the *mülāzemet* registry. He must have written the following couplets in his *Hezliyat* with the trouble caused by this waiting:

*Tarık-ı ilme kadem basdı bir nice rācil*

*Erişdi pāyeye her birisi ayaklandı*

(Many illiterates entered the path of knowledge /When they got the rank, they stood up.)

*Saçak ümîdi ile ben mülāzemet iderek*

*Piyāde vara gele dāmenüm saçaklandı*

(While I intern for the hope of a roof over my head / Tails of my dress were fringed while walking.)

After writing a poem for the judge (*kadi*) of Istanbul, Şeyhülislām Yahyā Efendī (d. 1644), Nevʿizāde Atāʿī was appointed as the *müderris* of the Istanbul Canbaziye Madrasa in 1605. According to Niyazioğlu, his waiting problems did not end with this appointment – he went without a promotion for five years. After several failed appeals, he decided not to seek further advancement in the *ʿilmiye* (Niyazioğlu 2017, 40). In 1610, Atāʿī left his teaching career, which could possibly have led him to high ranking positions. Instead, he began a career as a middle-ranking *kadi*. By saying “He went to the countryside because he knew that the road did not go anywhere just like a dead end street”, Riyāzi Mehmed Efendī suggested the reason Atāʿī changed his profession was because promotion was impossible in teaching (Donuk 2017, 96).

Atāʿī’s life after the *ʿilmiye* passed as a judge in the provinces almost until his death. He was first appointed as a judge in Lofça on the Rumeli side in 1608. Then he served in Babadağ (in North western Romanian Dobrudja) (1610-1612), Varna (in Northwestern Bulgaria) (1613), Rusçuk, (Ruse in North western Bulgaria) (1614), Hezargrad (in North western Bulgaria) (1615), a second time in Lofça (1616), Silistre (in North western Bulgaria) (1618), Tekfurdağı (1621), a second time Hezargrad (1621), Tırnova (Tmovo in Bulgaria) (1624), Tırhala (today in Northern Greece) (1625-1627), Mezestre (in south Morea, Greece) (1627-1630), for a second time in Tırhala (1630) and in Üsküb (Skopje in Macedonia) (1631-1635).<sup>6</sup>

He continued his intellectual pursuits in the rich cultural life of provincial towns (Niyazioğlu 2017, 42). For example, Atāʿī involved himself with mystical circles and practices in Istanbul, where his father introduced him to prominent sheikhs and took him to shrines in the provinces. Brief statements of personal reminiscences cited in the *Hadāʿik* indicate that during his *kadi*-ships he established close relations with sheikhs from the Bayrāmī and the Halvetī orders. In the entry about the Bayrāmī sheikh Maḥmūd Babadağı, Atāʿī writes “when I was a *kadi* at that region [Babadağ, in Northwestern Romanian Dobrudja] in 1019 [1610], I received his blessing” (Niyazioğlu 2017, 42).

According to Kortantamer, it is easily seen that Atāʿī, who had extreme respect and interest in every occasion with elders of Sufi circles, had deep inclinations toward

---

<sup>6</sup>I found that there was a conflict in the information given by Kortantamer, Donuk and Niyazioğlu about the places Atāʿī’s served. The information of the places and dates are taken from *Hadāʿik*.

mysticism due to his grandfather's having been a sheikh of the Gülşenī and his father who had close relations with Sufis. Atā'ī was close to the sheikhs, respected them, established relations with them. But, he was not a Sufi. There are no signs that he was a *mürīd* (sufi student). It is, however, evident in all his works that he was a *muhib* (one who loves) (Kortantamer 1997, 105).

When we examine Atā'ī's works to find traces of his life, it is possible to say that he reflected a colorful and active life. Atā'ī appears in both his *Hamse* and *Hadāik* as an inquisitive and curious personality. His personality led him to different circles and caused him confusion until the end of his life. After leaving the *madrassa* and becoming a judge, he doubted whether his new vocation was suitable for him in the first years of his new career. He considered abandoning his job to fulfil his desire to write and go on the path of Sufism. But in the end, he remained a judge and produced other works. When he finishes his speech in *Nefhat'ül Ezhār*, he says:

*Bildüm anı herkese bi-irtiyāb*

*Kendi tarikinden olur feth-i bāb*

(I understood precisely that, everyone opens the doors in their way).

We know that Atā'ī took part in many gatherings and made friends during his duty as a judge in the provinces (Donuk 2017, 96). But his social relationships were not limited to locals. He also maintained relations with the ruling elite in Istanbul. He did not neglect to celebrate them by writing *kasīdes* to his close friends, especially in appointments to the central bureaucracy. The common feature of people whom Atā'ī wrote *kasīde* was that they belonged to the high-ranking *'ulamā* (Niyazioğlu 2017, 48). Compared with the *kasīdes* of the contemporary bureaucrat/poet Nef'ī, Atā'ī wrote *kasīdes* in almost all chief judges and chief muftis appointments, while there were a couple *kasīde* written by Nefi for high-ranking *'ulamā*. In particular, among the recipients of these *kasīdes*, the chief mufti Yahyā Efendī and the chief judge of Rumeli Ganizāde Nādirī, who helped Atā'ī to come to the positions he desired, draw attention (49).

Yahyā Efendī and Ganizāde Nādirī can be considered as part of a social network that includes the *'Azmīzāde Hāletī*, *Kafzāde Fā'izī*, *Veysī* and *Nergīsī*. The fact that these people come from high-ranking *'ulamā* families based in Istanbul may be one of the main factors that create this social bond. In addition, Atā'ī had teacher-student, patronage and

friendship relations with this group. Ganizāde Nādirī and Yahyā Efendī, whom he received patronage support, were students of Atā'ī's father, Nev'ī Efendī. Kafzāde Fā'izī, the son of 'Azmīzāde Hāletī – and Atā'ī's teacher – was a close friend of Atā'ī from an early age (Niyazioğlu 2017, 48-49).

The relations of this group with literature may be one of the factors that form this connection. In addition, it is known that all of these people wrote *sāqīnāme*, except Ganizāde Nādirī. Fā'izī, on the other hand, encouraged other people in the group to write *sāqīnāme*, as stated in the introduction of Atā'ī's *'Alemmümā*. This suggests that there was both incentive and competition in the field of poetry among writers in this group.

Although satisfied with the patronage support he received from the state, Atā'ī complains about not receiving the credit he felt he deserved. He wrote to Murad IV describing his own situation in a long *kasīde*. After praise, Atā'ī mentions that he wrote many rare works of ancient history, an addendum to *Şakāik*, and a more successful *Hamse* than Neẓāmī. While his predecessors found ready-made topics, he discusses his new writing style, along with the benefits and beauty of his works. Moreover, he devoted many of his works to Murad IV. He says that his father was favored by Murad III and he was a tutor of the prince, and that he is now waiting for a support from the Sultan (Donuk 2017, 107).

Atā'ī wrote a *kasīde* to praise Murad IV's occupation of Revan (modern-day Yerevan). In a choronogram, he talks about Ottoman forces defeating the Safavids. In the lines he talks about himself, he qualified himself as a poet, the son of the poet, more superior and knowledgeable than peers. But he is persecuted because of his misfortune and waits for the support of the ruler.

At the end of his life, it is apparent that Atā'ī's aspirations were still largely unfulfilled. He finally returned to Istanbul in early 1635 after relinquishing his position as a judge in Skopje. Atā'ī died a year later in Istanbul. His tomb is next to the tomb of his father Nev'ī, in the tomb of Sheikh Vefa (Kortantamer 1997, 125).

## 1.2. The Nev'izāde Atā'ī's 'Ālemnümā

The 'Ālemnümā, which is one of the successful examples of classical Ottoman literature, has sixty-seven extant copies (Kuzubaş 2007, 21). Fifty-nine of these copies are included in *Hamse* and eight are detached copies. When we compare Revānī's *İşretnāme* and Aynī's *Sākīnāme*, we estimate that the 'Ālemnümā was widely read in the century and subsequent centuries, since it is quite a lot in terms of copies. This suggests that Atā'ī's claims in the introduction of his 'Ālemnümā had broad appeal and that inferences made from Atā'ī's *masnavi* provide good grounds for cultural and social history analysis.

While Atā'ī explains the reason for writing the 'Ālemnümā, he opposes outdated subjects such as *Husrev and Shirin*, *Leyla and Majnūn*; In *Nefhatü'l-ezhār*, he criticizes the *Shāhnāme* and *İskendernāme*. "Since he does not want to write such things, he says that he had achieved great success by writing the 'Ālemnümā in order to talk about beautiful things, such as drinking and the lover." Atā'ī believed that "different and new things should be said, apart from seemingly cliché styles." In a spring day gathering where he meets with his friends, Atā'ī says that he was expected to write a work that would compete with the Persian *masnavi* tradition, especially at the insistence of Kafzāde Fā'izī (Kuzubaş, 138).

*Niçün itmeye bunda bir dāsītān*

*Zuhūrī pesendān-ı Rūmī-zebān*

(Why not write a story about it / Rūmī<sup>7</sup> language people who liked the Zuhūrī<sup>8</sup>)

*İdüp müstakīl ya 'nī bir meşnevī*

*Unutdurmaya şīve-i Hüsrevī*

---

<sup>7</sup>"The word Rum or diyar-ı Rum for defining a cultural as well as a physical space (the lands of Rome, limited over time to the eastern Roman lands, i.e., Byzantium) was adopted from earlier Arabo-Persian usage but now stretched by Turkish speakers to refer to the zone that they inhabited and in a large part also governed" (Kafadar 9, 2007). Cemal Kafadar deals with different aspects of this subject in the introduction of the book *Kendine Ait Bir Roma*, which also includes the Turkish version of his article on this subject. For more detailed discussion: see Salih Özbaran, *Bir Osmanlı Kimliği: 14.-17. Yüzyillarda Rum / Rumi Aidiyet ve İmgeler* (İstanbul, 2004).

<sup>8</sup>Zohuri Torşizi (d. 1616) is a Persian poet. His *sāqināma* one of the longest and most variegated representatives of quintessentially Safavid-Mughal genre (Losensky 2017). Zohūrī ranks sixth with 1224 *gazels* among the poets who have *gazels* in Persian literature after Mevlānā Celāleddīn-i Rūmī, Sâib-i Tebrīzī, Emīr Hüsrev-i Dihlevī, Molla Cāmī and Ehlī-i Şīrāzī (Şimşekler 2013).



(So write an independent masnavi / That will forget the Husrev-style saying)

*Huṣūṣā bu ma‘nā bulupdur ṣübūt*

*İder baḥṣ iden mülzim olup sükūt*

(Especially its meaning is fixed / The person talking about it ends the discussion and stops.)

*Ki medḥ ü tagazzülde Rümî-ḳalem*

*Olup gālib-i sāḥirān-ı ‘Acem*

(Rümî poets excelled in Persian poets in the field of *kaside* and *gazel*)

*Çü şemşîr-i ḥün-rîz-i ‘Osmāniyān*

*Zuhūr itdi ruchān-ı Türkî-zebān*

(Just as the Ottomans won great victories in the military field, the Turkish language gained superiority.)

*Velîkin ḳalup şîve-i meṣnevî*

*Sözi anda A‘cāmuñ oldı ḳavî*

(But they could not progress in the mesnevi style / Persian poets are still strong in this area)

*Dinilseydi bir nazm-ı gevher-nişār*

*Ki her beyti bir müfred-i rûzgār*

(If a poem could be written that spreads an ore / Each couplet of which is a unique wind.)

*Olup ḥamse aşḥābına nice tāb*

*Virilseydi ālāya tenhā cevāb*

(An answer that gives freshness should be written to all poets who wrote Hamse)

*Şarāb olsa mazmūn-ı cām-ı süḥān*

*Kesel geldi zîrā ki efsāneden*

(Let the metaphor of the goblet be wine / Tired of epic stories now)

*Mey-i āteşin ol güvārende āb*

*Süḥan gülşenine virür āb u tāb*

(That delicious red wine enhances the vitality of the garden of words.)

*Añılmazsa Şîrîn ü Leylî n' ola*

*Heman muṭrîb ü sâḳiye 'ışk ola*

(What happens if the stories of Şirin and Leyla are not remembered? / They are replaced by *sazende/hanende* (musician/singer) and *sâḳî*)

*O dem içlerinden bir ehl-i kemâl*

*Nişâr eyledi dürr-i dürc-i maḳâl*

(At that time, a person with perfection from among them / He scattered his words like pearls in his mouth.)

*O ser-çeşme-i hikmetüñ Fâ' izî*

*Kümeyt-i süḫan rāyizi Fâ' izî*

(That person is *Fâ' izî* who is the source of wise. / The breeder of the word horse<sup>9</sup> is *Fâ' izî*.)

*Baña itdi 'atf-ı 'inan-ı ḫiṭāb*

*Didi sen virürsün su' āle cevāb*

(He turned the direction of the word to me / Said you answer this question)

*Süḫan mülkinüñ merd-i pür-zūrusun*

*Bu meydānuñ el-ḫaḳ silahşorusun*

(You are the strongest in the land of words / You are really the warrior of this square)

*Hişāruñ idüp vaşfını pīşvā*

*Süḫan mülkine çek hümāyun-livā*

(Praising the qualities of the *Hişār* (fortress) / Pull the holy flag to the land of words)

*Hişār olmasa bezm-gāh-ı feraḫ*

*Harām ola isrāf-ı dürd-i ḳadeḫ*

(Without a refreshing gathering place like the fortress / Wasting of the residue in the glass would be *haram* (forbidden by religion))

*Faḳîr eyleyüp anlara i' tizār*

*Didüm bende yoḳ ol ḳadar iḳtidār*

---

<sup>9</sup> Kümeyt also means the red wine. Atāî used this word in two meanings at the same time with the *tevriye* (double-entendre) technic.

(I conveyed my apologies to them / I told them that I did not have that much power)

*Mekānum şaff-ı na' l iken dā' imā*

*Değer mi bu meclisde hiç söz baña*

(Even though my place is the shoe cupboard / It is not for me to speak in this gathering)

Atā'ī's *Ālemnümā* tried to reach originality in terms of space and style, while following the classical line in the tradition of *sāqīnāme* in terms of subject. The subject is wine, taverns and their items. The place is Istanbul, together with the Hisar and the Bosphorus. This situation is one of the most defining features that distinguish *Ālemnümā* from other *sāqīnāmes*. The poet did not prefer the places that are frequently found in Eastern literatures. Instead, he gave wide coverage to Istanbul and the Balkans, which were within the Ottoman borders of that period. This situation is in line with the purpose of writing the *sāqīnāme* that I mentioned above.

As for the writing date of the *masnavi*, Atā'ī specifies the date of writing in *Ālemnümā*, which he wrote while he was in Silistre:

*Tamāmına tārīḥ olursa revā*

*Şerābile pür-cām-ı 'Ālemnümā*

(If a date is suitable for its completion / The glass of *Ālemnümā* is filled with wine)

The second line in this couplet gives the date of 1026/1617 with the choronogram technic<sup>10</sup>. Kortantamer states that in most of the manuscripts he examined, the date is written in red ink next to or below this line (Kortantamer 1997, 164). However, despite the fact that the date of the *masnavi* was revealed precisely by the poet, the sections about Osman II in the *masnavi* confuse. It is odd that the section about Sultan Osman, who came to the throne in 1618 and was on the Polish Expedition in 1621, was in a work completed in 1617. Tunca Kortantamer thinks that this section was added to the *masnavi* later:

“The stylistic review also confirms this feature; Because, in all parts of the *Ālemnümā*, Atā'ī, who used the patterns and concepts related to the wine and drink as a means of expression. But he made little use of these tools of expression in this part. Atā'ī, who added this section to the work at least four years after writing the *masnavi*, must have come out of the mood of the

<sup>10</sup> A verse, line, or phrase composed in such a way that the numerical value of its letters, according to the traditional Arabic alphanumeric abjad system.

work when he was trying to write and finish the work” (Kortantamer 1997, 164).

At this point, it may be good to consider a doubt. As Kortantamer stated, it seems reasonable to add this section to this work later, since Atā’ī presented his work to Osman II. However, in order to be certain, it is necessary to reach the first copy of the work. When this is not possible, it may be possible that this piece was added to the work just before Atā’ī’s death. In such a case, it becomes a possibility that there may be a different purpose in adding this part to the work. In the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, when the negative developments on the western and eastern borders of the Ottoman Empire started to affect the domestic politics, different searches may have emerged to disperse this negative perception. Such a purpose may be the background of the description of the Polish expedition and the siege of Hotin, which the expected success was not achieved, in the *‘Ālemnūmā* as a definite victory with a detailed and vivid style. The fact that detailed descriptions of Anatolian and Rumeli Fortresses take place right after the complaint section in the *‘Ālemnūmā* can be evaluated in this respect. In addition, the physical and spatial similarity between the Hotin Castle and Anadolu and Rumeli fortresses may also be part of this possibility. However, another dimension of this possibility is that the whole work may have been written with the concern of producing a history. In this case, it was expected that this section, which was added to the book later, would not be incompatible in terms of style. Nevertheless, this possibility should be considered, even if it contains the possibility to refute this thesis and this situation should be questioned by going to the first possible copy of the work. Due to the limitations of this thesis, such an effort could not be made.

As in many *masnavis*, Atā’ī starts to his masnavi with the headings such as Tevhīd (Unity of God), Mūnācāt (Prayer to God), Na’t (Praise of the Prophet), Mi’rāc (Ascension of Prophet). The titles of the sections in the *masnavi* are respectively the following: The Praise of Osman II, The Campaign of Lehistan, The Reason of Writing, Complaint of Time, Hisar, Bosphorus and Rumeli Castle, Call to Sāqī, Qualities of Wine, Qualities of the Grapevine, Qualities of Earthenware Jar, Qualities of Saloon Keepers, Qualities of Tavern, Singers and Musical Instruments, Night of Drink, Candle, Morning Fun, Qualities of Arrack, Condemning of Doctor, Condemning of Tobacco and Tobacco Products, Condemning of Pleasureseekers/Coffehouses, Spring, July, Autumn, Winter,

The Mortality of Time, Qualities of Heart, Qualities of Love, Conclusion and Jactation, Praying to God, Epilogue. In addition, the poet added twelve *rubāīs* (A four-line poem in one or more of a group of traditionally prescribed meters, and usually rhyming AABA) between these sections.

These titles give the first signs that the real places and elements of the social life of the period in which the work was written will be included in the '*Ālemnümā*. Especially Hisar, Bosphorus, Rumeli Castle sections show this situation in terms of location. In addition, it is important in terms of the relevance of the work to social reality that tobacco consumption, coffehouses and different opinions in the society about them, which started to take place in the daily life of the period, are included in headings. While the *sāqīnāmes* written in the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries mostly tell stories through speeches with *sāqī*, there are depictions of physical phenomena such as tavern, elements of the tavern, seasons, and some daily life places like coffehouses in '*Ālemnümā* starting from the headings.

### 1.3 Realistic Depiction in the '*Ālemnümā*

In discourses about classical Ottoman poetry, there is a general opinion that this poem does not reflect daily reality and nature directly. The most important basis of this approach is that classical Ottoman poetry is produced with repetitious metaphors that have become clichés. This view suggests that the classical Ottoman poetry tradition came into existence with a singular style. As a generalization, this claim may seem valid, but in a detailed analysis, this poem is not actually a stationary structure, but a moving expression despite the stereotypes brought by the use of *mazmūn* (a poetic theme or proposition) (Şentürk 1999, 432).

The foundations of the idea that the classical Ottoman poetry tradition consisted of repetitive, i.e. stationary, metaphors is seen intensively in post-Tanzimat writers' evaluations of this poem. Cevdet Kudret states that this view started with Namık Kemal's article titled "Lisan-i Osmânînin Edebiyatı Hakkında Mülâhazatı Şamildir", published in

*Tasvîr-i Efkâr* in 1866. In this article and other published works, Namık Kemal suggests that classical Ottoman poetry does not reflect everyday reality and nature. Kemal's views on this subject can also be summarized with his words, "Divan poetry is an enemy of truth and hateful nature" (Kudret 199, 164).

E. J. Wilkinson Gibb, the author of six-volume *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, has similar thoughts. The fact that Gibb's Ottoman poets rarely deal with foreign objects embodies the idea that Classical Ottoman poetry does not directly represent daily life and nature. Gibb's summarizes the stillness of classical Ottoman poetry:

“It seems that this poem is also highly dependent on traditions. It is full of qualifications and metaphors. The face is likened to the moon, the height is likened to the cypress, the lip is compared to the ruby. And these take place from start to finish with a tedious repetition. Likewise, there are many evocative elements. You know that when the nightingale is mentioned, the rose will follow, and the moth will come when the candle is mentioned” (Gibb 1904, 62).

Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı, one of the literary historians of the Republican era, expressed a similar opinion in his 1945 book, *Divan Edebiyatı Beyanındadır* (The Declaration of Divan Literature). In the section titled “Nature and Divan Literature”, Gölpınarlı states that the nature described in the classical Ottoman poetry is not related to reality: “The Ottoman poet sees nature that admires us with their beauty with misty eyes. After seeing it, he closes his eyes and adapts what he sees as the language of metaphors in his head and writes so. And, of course, nature loses its naturalness when it is described as such” (Gölpınarlı 1945, 19).

The idea that classical Ottoman poetry is made up of repeating metaphors and does not reflect real nature and everyday reality was also emphasized by Ağâh Sırrı Levend. Levend's comments quoted below are that Ottoman poets could not really describe the nature because they understand the nature with repetitive patterns based on tradition: “For the Ottoman poet, nature is only an occasion to demonstrate skill and ability. He tries to see nature in the book frame and through the eyes of the masters who came before him, rather than seeing the nature with his true view and his own eyes” (Levend 2015, 646).

These views, which argue that everyday life and real nature are not represented in classical Ottoman poetry and that the same analogies are repeated consistently,

emphasized that the *‘Alemmümā* has a static structure. However, the point to be considered here is whether classical Ottoman poetry as a whole is included in these evaluations. For example, while Gölpınarlı tries to prove that the classical Ottoman poetry consists of repeated analogy patterns, he evaluates Fuḏūlī, Bākī, Nef‘ī and Nedīm in the same context. His approach would mean that classical Ottoman poetry continued without any transformation between Fuḏūlī (d.1556) and Galib (d.1798). However, when the poems of Ottoman poets are analyzed from a perspective reflecting nature in a realistic way and including everyday reality into the poem, we see a different picture.

Atilla Şentürk stated in his article "Observing the Ottoman Poets and Reality in Our Classical Literature" that Sabri Ülgener evaluates the history of economic mentality, literature and art in the same way. Ülgener used literature as the main source in his study titled *The World of Ethics and Morality and Mentality*. According to Ülgener, literary works should be seen as the expression of our socio-cultural personality in words and writing. Ülgener's work is very important in terms of being an example of the detailed study of the reality behind the symbols and patterns in classical poetry in different fields of social sciences. In the same article, the following determination that Şentürk made from a couplet of Gelibolulu Zaīfī (d. 1557) is remarkable in reflecting reality:

“The poet tries to recreate the object he scrutinized in detail, like a new painting created by a painter's brush strokes, but with words, not with colors. It gives him new perspectives according to his mastery in art, giving him depths that appeal to minds and not eyes” (Şentürk 1999, 433).

Nev‘izāde Atā’ī's works are also an important example in reflecting his own period in a realistic way. As Tunca Kortantamer has emphasized, lively and realistic depictions in Atā’ī can be seen in the *tevhīd* and *münācāt* sections, which are the most stationary part of the *sāqīnāme*. From the second couplet, Atā’ī begins to use concepts and images of the *majlis*. But by trying to visualize these concepts, he differs from previous *sāqīnāmes* in style (Kortantamer 1997, 162).

“The painter of the water-colored sky dome, which looks like an upside down glass with water bubbles on it, is God. His blue bottle in the sky is an insignia of his power.” In these couplets, the sky is compared to an upside down glass. However, to make the analogy, the physical elements of the sky and the glass were focused. There is no need to use any known *māzmūn* for this. God is compared to a painter who is trying to depict the sky with

its physical characteristics. The effort to describe the sky as it is, without using any allegories, involves the purpose of reflecting the reality as it is.

*Nigārende-i k̄ubbe-i āb-gūn*

*Ḥabāb-āver-i sāgar-ı ser-nigūn*

(The painter of the water-colored sky dome / That looks like an upside down glass with water bubbles on it.)

*Bu ne şīşe-i nīlī-i āsümān*

*Anuñ nefhā-i kudretinden nişān*

(This blue sky bottle is a sign of his strong breath)

*O şahbāya peymānedür māh u mihr*

*Tehī humm-ı galtīdesidür sipihr*

(The sun and the moon are a glass to that wine / The sky is the rolling earthenware jar of that wine)

*Bu humı idüp pür-mey-i 'ışk-ı pāk*

*Buhārı sehāb oldı dürdisi hāk*

(When pure love wine fills this earthenware jar / The vapor of the wine became a cloud and the residue became earth)

The images we see when we turn our heads to the sky begin to take place in the poem. The sun and moon are likened to the glass, and the sky to the earthenware jar. Clouds have been compared to the steam emanating from an earthenware jar of wine, and the sediment at the bottom of the wine to the soil. These verses, created by comparing the concepts of wine with natural elements, have gained their independence in order to depict purely physical objects with their visual features instead of forming parts of any grand narrative. What is meant by reality here is not realism as a concept of modernity, but the coming of the real things into poetry with their values as an object.

The *tevhīd* section is followed by *münācāt*. When the poet is fasting, his mouth is sealed; however, it is filled like a wine earthenware jar. If he doesn't think the candle is a wine glass, he won't go to the mosque. When he goes to the mosque, he has no power to stand on his feet. His troubled heart sees the stair of the pulpit as the stair of the tavern.



*Mühürli dehen gerçi vaqt-i şıyām*

*Derūnum hum-ı mey gibi pür-ḥarām*

(When fasting, the mouth is sealed, but / My body is full of forbidden by religion like a wine earthenware jar.)

*Ayağ başmazın mescide lā-cerem*

*Meğer anda kandīli sāgar şanam*

(Surely I wouldn't come to the mosque / If I don't think the oil lamp is a wine glass)

*Varursam da ser-mest ü şūrīde-ḥāl*

*Ayag üstüne turmağa yok mecāl*

(Even if I go I'm drunk and miserable / I have no power to stand on the foot.)

*Görüp minberi bu dil-i pür-melāl*

*İder mey-gede nerdübānın ḥayāl*

(When I see the pulpit with this sad heart / I think it is the stairs of the tavern)

In these couplets, there is a comparison between the religious structure and the tavern, which is the main comparison in the *sāqīnāme* genre. However, as in the previous couplets, these two structures are depicted with their physical features. We understand that there is an oil lamp in the mosque and that it looks like a glass. Also, next to the pulpit, there is a staircase similar to the one at the entrance of the tavern.

After praising the sultan in the next section, the victory of the Ottoman navy against the Cossacks pirates mentioned, followed by the Polish Expedition. In the Black Sea, where the Ottoman Empire had great power, security problems started in the first years of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The main reason for this is that the Cossacks, who are affiliated with the Russians and the Poles, looted the Black Sea's coastline and captured people. Therefore, the Ottoman government tried to prevent the damage caused by the Cossacks from time to time by sending the navy to this sea (Uzunçarşılı 1995, 110). In Osman II's reign, with the provocation of Polish, the Cossacks started looting again. The sultan set out ceremoniously from Istanbul in April 1621 in order to teach a painful lesson to Polish. Nev'izāde Atā'ī describes the sultan's preparations for the expedition and the process of expedition in the couplets below. The poet tells that the sultan wore his belt on his waist and armor on his chest and that he goes on a campaign with his army on a spring morning.

I have mentioned that this section was probably added to the work afterwards. For this reason, the elements of wine and tavern, which are too much in other parts of the work, are very few in this section. But the visuality and vitality of the narration here is as strong as the other parts of the work. Even if this chapter was added here to create a perception about the Polish expedition, the narrative style in here emphasizes a feature in Atā'ī. He adopts a narrative style that will reach the reader's/listener's concrete visual perception, not the abstract imaginary world.

*Seher kim şehen-şāh-ı encüm-sipāh*

*Binüp rahşına giydi zerrīn külāh*

(In the morning, the sultan, who has more soldiers than stars, put on his golden cap and got on his horse.)

*Alup dūşüne Gāveyānī siper*

*Çuşandı miyāna Keyānī kemer*

(Like *Kāve* (a heroic blacksmith in the *Şāhnāma*), he took an iron shield over his chest like / A belt unique to the sultans was put on his waist)

*Hurūşunda Rûmī sipeh çavķ çavķ*

*Çep ü rāst pīş ü pes ü taht u fevķ*

(The voice of the Rum army echoes in its enthusiasm / Left and right, front and back, down and up)

*Dem-i şubḥ u eyyām-ı faşl-ı bahār*

*Zemīn sebz ü ḥurrem zamān tāb-dār*

(It's a spring morning / The ground is green and joyful, the time is bright and lighted)

“One morning, the sultan stands beside his horse in the brightness of the newly rising sun on the green grass. It is evident that the ornaments of his horse are remarkable. The sultan gets on the horse and then puts on his golden armor on his head. He takes an iron shield on his chest. He puts a fancy belt around his waist. The enthusiastic voices of the soldiers rise.” The purpose of this detailed narrative is to draw the reader into the scene that without any imagination. The task of the reader is just watching in front of this scene presented by Atā'ī.

He continues the same narrative style in the section which the Siege of Hotin is described. Atā'ī, at this point, presents the appearance of the army and the war and paints a picture with words through his innovative pen. According to the poet, drums and battle pipes are playing in front of an army of heroic soldiers. The image of soldiers advancing with flags in their hands is similar in successive waves.

*Baħr u berde āheng idüp her dilr*

*Döküldi nakāre çalındı nefr*

(Every soldier on land and sea had fun / War horns and drums were ringed)

*Hum-ı kûsınuñ gürleyüp sīnesi*

*Remān oldı a 'dā-yı pür-kīnesi*

(The earthenware jar-like body of the drum roared / Enemies frightened)

*Hum-ı kûs-ı pīl üzre itdi figān*

*Yaħud gürledi ra 'ddan āsümān*

(It shrieked on the drum-like body of the elephant / Or the sky thundered)

*Revān oldı Rûyin-tenān fevc fevc*

*Biri biri ardınca mānend-i mevc*

(Bronze armies set out in crowds that came one after another / Like waves that came one after another)

*Olup bayraq-ı sürh ü zerd āşikār*

*'Aevlendi gûyā ki bir mīşe-zār*

(When the red and yellow flags appear / As if an oak forest flared.)

*Yeşil bayrag ile ney-i nīzeler*

*Yeşil berg ile ney-şekerdür meger*

(They are like spear sticks with green flags / Sugar cane with green leaves)

Atā'ī, under the title *Şikayet-i Rūzigar ü Bī-vefā-i Çarh-ı Gaddār*, complains about the disloyalty of time and destiny by using the concepts of drink and drink gatherings. The poet likens the wounds in his heart to a glass filled with red wine. In a place where there is a glass full of red wine, his fate is to drink this wine:

*Bu meclisde oldı naşībüm ħumār*

*Hemān derd-i ser gördi cān-fikār*

(My share in this meeting is the headache that comes after the drink / The sufferer immediately saw the heartbroken person)

*Şurāhileri oldı mizāb-ı ħūn*

*Şarāb ile pür-cāmı gird-āb-ı ħūn*

(Jugs became a bloody waterway / The glass filled with the bloody vortex of wine)

*Leb-ā-leb kadeħle mey-i āteşīn*

*Olur dāğ-ı pür-ħūn-ı kalb-i ħazīn*

(The fire of the wine into a full glass becomes the blood mountain of the sad heart)

*Gıdā ħūn-ı dıldür ne ħurd u ne ħāb*

*Meze istemez çünki yağlı şarāb*

(Food is neither sleep nor food, food is blood flowing from the heart / Because there is no need for an appetizer with oily wine)

*Hevālandı bağrumdaki kanlu yaş*

*Ĥabāb itdi peydā o ħūnābe-pāş*

(Bloody tears on my chest boiled / Those bloody tears became water bubbles)

*Bu devr içre sāgarda şanma ħabāb*

*Olur bīm-i kahr ile her zehre āb*

(Do not think that the water bubble in the glass will be medicine for every poison in this period)

Even in these couplets, which talk about an abstract situation belonging to the inner world of the poet, the narrative is tried to be expressed with concrete visual elements as much as possible. Immediately after a drink meeting, we see the poet alone and tired at the tavern. The wine jugs are overturned on the ground, the wine flowing from the jugs looks like rivers with blood. There is a full glass in front of the poet. The water bubbles on the glass return him to his inner world.

Under the heading *Sıfat-ı Hisār ü Ta'rîf-i Nüzhet-gâh En-diyar*, which is one of the sections where the narrative based on visual reality is seen most concretely in 'Ālemnümā,

Atā'ī narrates the Bosphorus, Anadolu and Rumeli Fortress. According to him, many ships full of treasures passed through the Bosphorus. There are also many ports where ships take refuge to avoid the waves.

*Nice hūb limānı var bī-keder*

*Muḥīṭ-i sipihr ider kūşeler*

(It has many beautiful ports / Its every corner is surrounded by the traces of the sky)

*Olur mevcden fülke kehfü 'l-emān*

*Deniz daḥı ana şıgınrur hemān*

(These ports become a safe cave for boats on the waves / Even the sea takes cover in these ports immediately)

*Gelür bād ile ṭolı keşṭileri*

*Ne keşṭi ki gencīne-i Kayşerī*

(The ships arrived with the drag of the wind / They are full of Kayser<sup>11</sup> treasures)

*Ni 'amla gelen ṭolı keşṭileri*

*Bize andırur genc-i Bād-āveri*

(These ships full of blessings / Resemble the treasures of Badaver<sup>12</sup>)

There are many beautiful ports around the Bosphorus. When the sea is too wavy, boats come to these ports. But the real owners of these ports are ships full of treasures. These ships, which contain many different blessings, pass through the Bosphorus with their wind-filled sails and arrive at these ports. It is the first time I have seen such a narrative based on the real elements of the Bosphorus in the texts of Classical Ottoman literature I read. This is also one of the most important elements that show Atā'ī's originality.

The shadows of the surrounding mansions fall on the waters of the Bosphorus. In the spring, the leaves pouring from the trees to the whirlpools in the sea appear as if they were in the bowl:

---

<sup>11</sup> The title the Arabs used for the Roman and Byzantine emperors (*Kubbealtı Lugati*, “Kayser” (Access 27 August 2020))

<sup>12</sup> Treasures of Badaver (genc-i Bād-āver): The treasure of Hüsrev-i Perviz. Kayser, who started to fight with the Persian ruler Hüsrev-i Perviz, wanted to load his treasures on ships and smuggle them to the islands, but the windships were thrown into the land of Hüsrev and these valuable treasures were taken by the Persians (*Kubbealtı Lugati*, “Genc” (Access 27 August 2020)).

*Nice aşr-ı zıbā-yı ferru-zılāl*

*Su zre urur āk-ı gerdn-miāl*

(The shadows of the ornate mansions reflect on the water like large arches)

*Dkldke gird-āba berg-i bahār*

*Grinr mnebbit yeil kāse-vār*

(As the spring leaves fall into the stream, they look like they're in the green bowl)

People in the Bosphorus also enter Atā'ı's gaze. The silver-bodied beauties floating in the waters of the Bosphorus are similar to the rose inside the bottle.

*Girp ana ubān-ı sımın-beden*

*Grinr ruı gl gibi ıeden*

(Beautiful men with their silver-like bodies come into the water / Look like a rose from a bottle)

Of course, these silver-bodied beauties are not personal characters expected to be in a realistic narrative. However, it is the first time we see young and beautiful men swimming in the Bosphorus as a type in Ottoman poetry. This gives us an indication of the social structure of the period. The beautiful men of the city, which we always see in the promenade and gardens in a stereotyped way, are at sea. It is a real view of the Istanbul of the time that goes beyond a pattern.

Atā'ı's following couplets about social life in Istanbul and the Bosphorus are also very important:

*Gehı Mevlevıler ki seyrān ider*

*Gelp ol kenārı neyistān ider*

(Sometimes Mevlevis<sup>13</sup> wander the sea / When they come, the seaside turns into reeds)

*Deler lccenn barını ol nevā*

*Gelr raa gird-āblar cā-be-cā*

---

<sup>13</sup>Mevleviyye is a Sufı order. They are also known as the 'whirling dervishes'. Their famous practice of whirling with music of reed flute.

(Their voices pierce the sea / The whirlpools whirl with the effect of this sound)

*İder Gülşeniler nevā-yı garīb*

*Olur gülşen-i şoḥbete ‘andelīb*

(Gülşenis<sup>14</sup> make strange sounds / Their voices is nightingale in their conversation)

*Güzār eyleyüp ḥayl-i abdāl-ı Rūm<sup>15</sup>*

*Pür eyler çerāğını hakku’l-ḳudūm*

(Many Rum abdals pass / They fill the lamp of those who come from afar)

*Geçer gāhi ālāy ile ḥūblar*

*Olur zevraḳ anlarla dürc-i güher*

(The beauties pass in procession / Boats become like jewelry boxes)

As we understand from these couplets, *Mevlevis*, *Gülşenis* and *Rum Abdals*, who are some of the most important Sufi groups of Istanbul, go around with boats in the Bosphorus with their own musical rituals. Atā’ī showed the dervish groups that are generally imagined in the tekke with their reality in social life. It is important in terms of revealing the strong relationship of the narrative with reality in Atā’ī.

The spaces around the Bosphorus continue to be described in the poem with their physical and visual features. Hisar, located around the Bosphorus, is like the key to the sea. “Anadolu Hisarı and Rumeli Hisarı look at each other like two young lovers. Among them, the sea entered like a separation arrow. People also watch these two castles and love them equally.”

*N’ola bahruñ olsa kilīdi ḥiṣār*

*Girer birbirine dem-i kār-zār*

---

<sup>14</sup>*Gülşeniyye* is a Sufi order. They give importance to poetry and music in their rituals. For more details: see Mustafa Kara, “Gülşeniyye”, *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*

<sup>15</sup>During the turbulent time from the last period of the Anatolian Seljuks to the first century of the Ottoman Empire, the *Rum Abdals*, most of which were formed by the dervishes who migrated from the Middle Asia and Persian geography, ensured the spread of the Vefaism movement to a wide area. The most important representative in Anatolia is the Turkmen Sheikh Dede Garkın, who is understood to have founded a sect with his own name. Vefaism, represented by Baba İlyas and his members in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, is also considered one of the oldest Sufism movements in Anatolia (Haşim Şahin, *Dervişler ve Sufi Çevreler*, Kitap Yayınevi, 2018).

(What would happen if the castle was the key to the sea / they would come together in war time)

*İki al'a kim birbirine baar*

*Biribirine 'aşı olmuş meğer*

(Two castles look at each other / Fall in love with each other)

*Velī bar olup māni'-i ittişāl*

*Girer araya tīg-ı hicrān-mişāl*

(But the sea prevents them from reunion / Intervenes like a sword of separation)

*Beraber utup seyr ider ehl-i dil*

*Birin kimse tercihe ādir degil*

(Kind people watch the two together / They don't prefer one over the other)

In the following verses, Atā'ī talks about the clash of those who have fun around Anadolu Hisarı and those who have fun around Rumeli Hisarı and shows the real social scenes in these real spaces. The he continues to explain the surroundings of the Bosphorus and describes places of interest to the public such as Durmuş Dede Lodge, Akbaba's Mausoleum, Yuşa's tomb and Gökusu.

*Olup pīr-i merdān-ı 'uzlet-gede*

*arār eylemiş anda urmuş Dede*

(Turmuş Dede who was a dervish in the corner of seclusion decided then)

*Anatolinuñ al'ası üstüvār*

*Ki her bürce zātü'l-bürüca medār*

(Anatolia's castle is solid / Every tower turns to the sky)

*Bu sāhilde olmuş maarr Yūşa'a*

*Ki envār-ı feyzi şalar şa'şaa*

(Yuşa resides on this beach / His advance shines)

*Odur bürce-i hürşid-i şub-ı şafā*

*Ki anda maām eylemiş Akbaba*

(He is the sign of the sun of the morning of peace / Akbaba's place is there)



*Cihānun maṭāfi vü mes'āsıdır*

*Anuñ Gökşuyı ayn-ı zerķāsıdır*

(It is the kaaba and the evening of the earth / Gökşu is its eye of sky)

Describing the concrete geographical locations together with the abstract traces on the poet enables us to follow a visual trace through the poem about Istanbul of the period.

Towards the end of the episode, Atā'ī's father, Nev'ī, comes to his mind. Atā'ī remembers the visits to these places with his father. This situation allows a real event to get inside the real places of the Bosphorus. There is also a recall here. Instead of imaginations that are often used in Ottoman poetry, the recall of an event experienced by the poet and its inclusion in poetry show that the real ground of poetry was created directly with the people and events in life:

*Bu faşl içre vardık pederle aña*

*Çalem oldı vaşfında destān-serā*

(We came there with my father this season / His pen praised the qualities of these places)

*Şalup şūret-i nev-beste gül-zārına*

*Bu ebyātı naķş itdi divānına*

(Released the new compositions to Gülbahçe / He wrote these verses on his *divan*)

*N'ola olsa ser-meşķ-i nazm-ı sūhān*

*Ki yazdum göñül levhına anı ben*

(What if this is a sudden written version of his poetry / I wrote it to my heart)

*Anun feyzidür dilde olan güher*

*Hem üstāddur bana ol hem peder*

(The ore in my tongue is thanks to him / He is both a teacher and a father to me)

In Atā'ī, the narrative style based on visual concreteness is seen not only in the sections where Istanbul and the Bosphorus are described, but also in sections such as the natural parts of the *sāqīnāme*, such as the calling to the *sāqī*, wine and grapevine. Atā'ī describes the properties of a grapevine as the source of wine in the section under the title *Sıfat-ı Tāk*. Grapevines have the appearance of the leaves of the willow tree hanging over the

ground. The grapes are swinging downwards so that the vine is not missing. Just as the snake was cut to destroy the poison, when Spring comes, the branches of the grapevine are pruned to yield more grapes.

*Ne mey kim olup tākide ehl-i hāl*

*Ola şekli bād-i müvelleh-miṣal*

(Wine becomes good in grape vine / Its shape is like a willow tree hanging down)

*Şalar düşuna sebz-i seccādesin*

*Velī eksik itmez yine bādesin*

(It puts green prayer rug on its shoulder / But still keeps its wine)

*Kesilse n'ola ta ki faşl-ı bahār*

*Olur çünkü tiryāk için kat '-ı mār*

(In spring, its branches are cut / Because the snake is cut for the antidote)

Grapevines cannot stand like drunks and want to endure somewhere. Also it wants to hug what it finds, like ivies.

*Ayag üstüne tıramaz hem çü mest*

*Ḳomayınca çak düş-ı eşcāra dest*

(Because it is drunk, it cannot stand if it does not hold on to the shoulders of the trees.)

*'Aşāya düşer gerçi pīran gibi*

*Şarar bulduğun 'ışk-ı pīçān gibi*

(It uses canes like old people / It embraces everything like light)

The striking feature of this narrative about the grape vine is that the metaphors focus on the visual perception of the reader, not the imagination. Expressions such as grapes, like branches of a willow tree, leaves like a cover on the shoulder, grapevine with pruned branches exemplify this situation.

It is possible to see the same feature in the section titled *Sıfat-ı Meyhane* in which Atā'ī expresses his thoughts about and lists the features of taverns. The building of the tavern is layered like the sky and its air is heart-pleasing like the world. This is a hidden treasure that turns the poor into kings and beggars into rich people.

*Felek gibi kat kat bināsi anun*

*Cinān gibi dil-keş hevāsi anun*

(His building is layered like the sky / Its air is alluring like heavens)

*Faķiri ŧeh eyler gedāyi ganī*

*Ħum-ı ħüsrevānī ile maĥzenī*

(Its warehouse and the earthenware jar turns the poor into the sultan and the beggar into the rich.)

The taverns on the edge of the Golden Horn are especially unique. When the shade of the roof of the tavern is reflected in the water, it is similar to Kaydafa who drowned in water:

*Ħarābātun olur mı hem-tāsi hic*

*Ħuŧuŧa ki ola kenār-ı Ħalīc*

(The tavern is unique / Especially those on the Golden Horn coast)

*ŧalup baĥra ‘aks o tāk-ı ħarāb*

*Meġer Ķaydafā mülkidür gark-āb*

(When the shadow of its roof reflects to the sea / Similar to Kaydafa<sup>16</sup> drowning in the water)

As in the previous chapters of *‘Ālemnümā*, spatial descriptions are followed by descriptions of the people in these spaces. When looking at the whole of the *‘Ālemnümā*, various people who are defected and not approved by their works attract attention. The most prominent of them is the preacher (*vaiz*). According to Atā’ī, preachers say that wine is forbidden, but what they do is obvious. They do not know what the wine of love is, nor do they care about the heart. The preacher behaves with hypocrisy, wears his *miswak* (stick toothbrush) behind the ear and criticizes those who drink wine.

The headline of the section where Atā’ī criticizes the addicts of tobacco products, such as opium, is *Ta'n-ı Erbāb-ı Keyf*. In the continuation of the episode, he begins to explain the man of pleasure: the *Ehl-i keyf* spends his life asleep; so actually, he does not know what

---

<sup>16</sup> Kaydafa was first mentioned in *The History of al-Tabari*. Also, she is mentioned in Firdevsi's *Şehname* as a female ruler. According to *Şehname*, Kaydafa has bad intentions about Alexander. Hearing this, Alexander dug the sea in a way that would submerge Kaydafa's country. For more details: see Melike Gökcan Türkdoğan, “Ahmedi'nin *İskendernamesinde* Kadın Hükümdar Modeli ve Kraliçe Kaydafa”, *Turkish Studies*, Fall 2009.

pleasure is. They travel in strange realms; They cannot raise their head and look around. According to the poet, those who drink opium crawl in places such as lizards, coffee drinkers get poisons from it.

*Tuyar mı bu zevki uyur ehl-i keyf  
O keyfiyyet ile geçen 'ömre hayf*

(The lethargic ones sleep constantly. They don't get this pleasure. / A pity for a life of lethargy)

*Bu hacletle varmış 'acib 'āleme  
Başın kaldırıp bakamaz ādeme*

(With this embarrassment, he has reached a strange realm / He cannot look up at anyone)

*Meğer sūsmār oldı ma 'cūn-fürüş  
Ki andan alur zehri hep kahve-nuş*

(Opium drinker became like a lizard / Coffee drinker always takes his poison from it)

At the end of this section, Atā'ī compares the tavern and the coffeehouse. It is noteworthy that coffeehouses, which were one of the important parts of Ottoman urbanization since the mid-16th century (Yaşar 2018, 9), are depicted in a realistic style through Atā'ī's eyes. According to Atā'ī, a dilapidated coffeehouse cannot replace a dilapidated tavern. The home of the smoker is the cup and the home of the rind is glass that is the mirror of Alexander. While the tavern is full of blessing and joy, the coffeehouse is a place full of gossip, where legends are told, and people doze off.

*Harāb olsa da kaşrı meyhānenüñ  
Yerin tuta mı kahve-hāne anuñ*

(Even if the tavern is dilapidated / Coffeehouse cannot replace it)

*Anuñ pāy-ı taht ise fincānları  
Bunuñ cāmı mir'āt-ı İskenderī*

(If its cups are main element / The glass of the tavern is the mirror of Alexander)

*İder bunda pür-neşve nakş-ı 'amel  
Virür anda efsāne hāb-ı kesel*

(While the tavern is the place of joyful actions / Coffeehouse is where legends are told)

*Bu řāfi muħabbetle řidk u řafā*

*Mūsāvī vü gıybetle ol gam-fezā*

(While there is a joyful conversation in the tavern / There is gossip that increases unhappiness in the coffee house)

I was able to get very few verses here due to the tightness of my place here. But I think these can give an idea of the narrative style in *‘Ālemnümā*. These couplets contain a reality not seen in previously written *masnavis*. As I mentioned before, although this is different from realism, which was a literary movement that emerged in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it has been described as realistic due to its effort to reflect real places, events and situations. The tool that Atā’ī uses in order to achieve originality is to enrich the narrative with visual elements, to show what he sees as it is.

## 2. SPILLS FROM SĀQĪ'S BROKEN CUP

### 2.1. Sāqīnamas in the Seventeenth Century

In Ottoman literature, we see the first example under the name of *sāqīnāme* in the *masnavi* of Khwārizmī called *Muḥabbetnāme*. In the *Muḥabbetnāme*, two verses call out to the *sāqī* at the end of the episode. The first original example of the *Sāqīnāme* genre in Ottoman literature is the work of Edirnelī Revānī (d. 1524), which is named as *‘iṣretnāme*, although its name is not a *sāqīnāme*. This work, which is 694 couplets in total, is accepted as an excellent example in terms of form and content during the formation and development of the *sāqīnāme* (Canım 1998, 96). The work was later accepted as a model by many poets who wrote works in this field and content. The number of *sāqīnāmes* written in Ottoman literature with different names is about 75 (Arslan 2012, 26). Especially in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, there was a serious independent *sāqīnāme* writing. Twenty-four of these seventy-five *sāqīnāme* were written in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Thirty of them were written in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. *Sāqīnāmes* written in the 19<sup>th</sup> century were written much shorter than those written in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and generally outside of the *masnavi* style such as *tarjī band* (A stanzaic verse form that uses a single meter but varying rhyming elements), *tarkīb band* (A stanzaic verse form that uses a single meter but varying rhyming elements. It differs from a *tarjī band* only in that the single *maṭla* 's (opening verse) that conclude the stanzas are different; they may or may not rhyme.), *musaddas* (A poem in stanzas of six lines, usually rhyming AAAABB, CCCDD), *mukhammes* (A poem in five-line stanzas, rhyming AAAAA, BBBBC, with variations), *musallas* (A poem in three-line stanzas, rhyming AAA, BBA, CCA, with variations) and *mustazad* (A poem with extra phrases following the end of each line; these phrases too include meter and rhyme).

The poets who wrote detached poetry in the *masnavi* style in the 17<sup>th</sup> century are as follows: Atā'ī, Riyazī, 'Azmīzāde Hāletī, Beyānī, Tıfli, Qāfzāde Fā'izī, Selanikli Esad, Sabuhi, Şeyhi Mehmed Allame Efendī, Cemi, Şeyhülislam Bahayī, Şeyhülislam Yaḥyā, Naziki. In the same century Yarī, Fevzī, Kelīm, Nef'ī wrote *sāqīnāme* in the *tarkib band* style, Fā'izī Kefevi and Cemi in *tarji band* style, Fehīm-i Kadīm and Nergīsī in the *kasida* style (Arslan 2012, 27-35).

One of the important *sāqīnāmes* of this century is 'Azmīzāde Hāletī's (d. 1630) *Sāqīnāme*, which has 521 couplets. The work was written in the form of *masnavi*. However, it was not organized in a *masnavi* pattern. The *sebeb-i te'lif, naat* (A poem in praise of the Prophet), *miraciye* (A poem about ascension of Muhammad) and *methiye* (A poem about the sultan and government leaders) sections that are mostly found in the *masnavi* are not included in this work. The *tevhid* section is mostly in the style of *münacat*. The work consists of one *tevhid*, fifteen articles and a *hatime*. The titles of the chapters and articles in the work are as follows: *İftitāh-ı Sühan be-Tevhîd-i Bârî 'Azze Şānuhu* (Starting to Statement with the Unity of Saint and Precious God), *Makâle-i Yeküm der-Hitâbı Sâkî ve Şurû'-ı der-Hasb-i Hâl-i Hîs* (Article 1 - Calling To *Sāqî* and Conversation About Feelings), *Makâle-i Düyüm der-Hitâb-ı Sâkî ve Ta'arruz-ı be-Şıfat-ı Bâde ve Câm der-Zımn-ı An Hitâb* (Article 2 - Calling to *Sāqî* and Qualifications of Wine, Glass And Pitcher), *Makâle-i Siyüm der-İstimâlet-i Sâkî ve İzhâr-ı Hüsn-i Taleb der-Şûret-i Kasem* (Article 3 - Making Request from the *Sāqî*), *Makâle-i Çehârüm der-Sıfat-ı Mugannî ve Mutrib ve İstid'â-yı Sürûd ve Zahme-i Rûd* (Article 4 - Qualifications of Singer and Musician, A Song Request and Hitting Instrument's Strings), *Makâle-i Pencüm der-Sıfat-ı Pîr-i Mugân ve Taleb-kârî-i Telattuf be-Tarîk-i Hitâb* (Article 5 - Qualifications of Saloonkeeper), *Makâle-i Şeşüm der-Sıfat-ı Harâbât* (Article 6 - Qualifications of Tavern), *Makâlei Heftüm der-Hitâb-ı Sâkî-i Sâhid-i Meclis* (Article 7 - The Calling Out To Witness of Gathering), *Makâle-i Heştüm der-Âdâh-ı Meclis ü Nedîmân-ı Nûş* (Article 8 - Manners of Gathering and Members of Gathering), *Makâle-i Nühüm der-İtâb-ı Zâhid ve Tergîb-i Muvâ-fakat-ı Rindân* (Article 9 - Condemning Preacher (*Zahid*) and Being Invited to Approve Rinds), *Makâle-i dehüm der-Sıfat-ı Bahar-be-'Akd-i Bezm-i Bâde der-Bâğ u Râğ* (Article 10 - Qualifications of Spring and Garden), *Makâle-i Yâzdehüm der-Sıfat-ı Subh* (Article 11 - Qualifications of Morning), *Makâle-i Düyâzdehüm der-Sıfat-ı Mey ü Şevk-i Yârân bâ-Iyş-ı Şebistân* (Article 12 - Qualifications of Wine, Winter and Drinking

Gathering), *Makâle-i Sîzdehüm der-Şevk-i Rindân ber-Iyş-ı Şe- bâre* (Article 13 - Night Drinking Gatherings of Rinds), *Makâle-i Çehârdehüm der-Ta 'rif-i Hâl-i Sipîhr-i Cefâ-cû ve der-Hitâb-ı 'Îtâb-âmîz bâ* (Article 14 - Description of the Tormenting World), *Makâle-i Pânzdehüm der-Tenbîh-i Müşfikân ber-Fenâ-yı 'Âlem ü 'Âlemiyân ve Tahzîr-i Erbâb-ı Mechs-i Üns ez-Fevt-i Fursat* (Article 15 - The Mortality of the World and Warning of the Members of the Gathering About Not Missing Opportunities ), *Hatm-i Kelâm be-Münâcât-ı Bârî 'Azze Ismuhû ve 'Özr-i Takşîr-i Hîs* ( Epilogue- Prayer and Suppliance). The language of Hâletî's *sâqînâme* is quite heavy with the *sebk-i hindi* style (The poetry style that emerged in India in the sixteenth century and formed by poets influenced by Indian philosophy and poetry). It is commonly considered that the work is mystical in nature (Kaya 2000, 64).

The *Sâqînâme* of Riyâzi (d. 1644) is 1062 couplets and was written in the form of *masnavi*. The titles of the chapters and articles in the work are as follows: “*Tevhid, Naat, İgrâ-yı Tab*‘ (Reason of Writing), *İbtidâ-yı Saki-name* (Prologue of the *Sâqînâme*), *Sıfat-ı Tâk* (Attribute of Grapevine), *Sıfat-ı Câm* (Attribute of Glass), *Sıfat-ı Dürd-i Mey* (Attribute of Wine), *Hutâbiyyât, Sıfat-ı Sâkî ve Mutrib* (Attribute of the *Sâqî* and the Singer), *Sıfat-ı Sâz* (Attribute of the Instrument), *Sıfat-ı Bezm-i Bâde* (Attribute of Drinking Gathering), *Sıfat-ı Şeb-i İşret* (Attribute of Night of Drinking Gathering), *Sıfat-ı Bezm-i Subh* (Attribute of Morning of Gathering), *Sıfat-ı Humâr* (Attribute of A Sore Head), *Sıfat-ı Hamyâze* (Attribute of Oscitation), *Sıfat-ı Katre-i Mey* (Attribute of the Drop of Wine), *Sıfat-ı Dil* (Attribute of Heart), *Sıfat-ı Aşk* (Attribute of Love), *Sıfat-ı Harîf-i Bâde* (Attribute of the Friend of Wine), *Sıfat-ı Bâde* (Attribute of Wine), *Sıfat-ı Bahâr* (Attribute of Spring), *Sıfat-ı Rutûbet* (Attribute of Humidity), *Tetimme-i Sıfat-ı Bahâr* (Supplementation to Qualificaton of Spring), *Riyâ vü Tevbe Der- Bahâr* (Hypocrisy and Pledge for Spring), *Sıfat-ı Fenâ-yı Dehr* (Qualification of Mortality of World), *Bî-Vefâyî-i Ebnâ-yı Zamân* (Disloyalty of People) , *Sıfat-ı Sermâ* (Qualification of Winter), *Sıfat-ı Şebâb* (Qualification of Youth), *Sıfat-ı Giryeye-i Mestâne* (Qualification of Tears of Drunk), *Sıfat-ı Sâkî* (Qualification of the *Sâqî*), *Sıfat-ı Temmûz* (Qualification of July (Summer)), *Sıfat-ı Leb-i Deryâ* (Qualification of Seaside), *Sıfat-ı Yasak* (Qualification of Prohibition), *Hutab-ı Zâhid* (Preacher Call), *Güşâden-i Mey-hâne* (The Spaciousness of The Tavern), *Redd-i Nâsîh* (Rejeciton of Advice), *Sıfat-ı Meyhâne* (Qualification of Tavern), *Sıfat-ı Pîr-i Mugân* (Attribute of Saloonkeeper), *Sıfat-ı Mey* (Attribute of Wine), *Hâtîme-i Meyhâr* (Epilog of Wine Drinker), *Sıfat-ı Mihr-i Cân*



(Attribute of Autumn), *Hâtime-i Sakiname* (Epilog of *Sâqînâme*), *İ'tizâr ve Temeddüh* (Apology and Self-Praise), *Kasemiyyât* (Prayer)” (Arslan 2012, 213)

These two independent *sâqînâmes*, whose contents I have given above, constitute the most advanced examples in terms of masnavi structure among the *sâqînâmes* written in the seventeenth century. Written in the same period as Atâ'î's *sâqînâme*, these *sâqînâmes* contain a separate narrative in each title, as in *Âlemnümâ*, rather than creating a single large narrative based on the plot. In these three *sâqînâmes*, the description of wine, taverns, saloonkeepers and seasons, and time complaints are common. Although Halefî's and Riyâzi's *sâqînâmes* did not use visual elements as much in the narrative as in *Âlemnümâ*, the effort to describe objects and elements of nature with their characteristic features is observed in these two *sâqînâmes*. This situation makes me think that the signs about the new way of seeing in Atâ'î based on seeing objects and space in their own subjectivity were shared by other poets who wrote in the same period. It also allows for other questions.

What could be the reason why the works written in *sâqînâme* genre gained importance in terms of quantity and quality in the 17<sup>th</sup> century? Could the similarities in terms of content and expression in the *sâqînâmes* written at the beginning of this century be related to other features of the period? It can be correct to answer this question based on the general evaluation of the period. The 17<sup>th</sup> century represents a critical period not only for the Ottoman Empire, but also for world history more generally. It is a period of intense cultural, economic, political and social transformation. This process not only specifies the character of the next century, but also reveals features in which various religious, political and economic movements took shape. Some historical events in this period determined the future of the empire and paved the way for a new understanding to gain importance.

## 2.2 Changing in Ilmiye and Urbanism in Early Seventeenth Century

One of the reasons for a serious increase in *sâqînâme* writing in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, as I mentioned in the section about Atâ'î's life, may be a result of encouragement

and competition within social and intellectual groups. However, many new developments, changes and transformations that emerged in this period which may have influenced poetry production. The new developments emerging in the scientific order and the acceleration of urbanization are two points that stand out in this process. In addition, there may be an inconspicuous close contact relationship between the *Ḳādīzādelī* movement that emerged in this period and the increase of *sāqīnāme* writing.

The Ottoman Empire, whose borders apexed during Süleiman I's reign in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, entered the process of change and transformation since the end of this century (Tezcan 2010, 21). The most noticeable changes in the political structure and administrative relations have emerged in different dimensions and different places within the vast borders of the empire both culturally and socially. These changes effected not only the Ottoman Empire but contemporary European empires as well (Adivar 2012, 120). Rising city populations emerging in the same period and new public spaces emerged accordingly, urbanization and the scientific world can be evaluated in this regard (Cerasi 2008, 466).

The one of the important developments at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century is the *'ilmiye's* (ulama class) lost reputation, which is frequently mentioned in the works of the period. In particular, writers mention bribery for promotions and the scientific piers became increasingly blighted with nepotism (Atik 2000). Especially in chronicles, is stated that the appointment and promotion system was linked to bribery in this period with the influence established on the palace by circles such as *Ḳādīzādelīs*. There is a huge literature on this subject in Ottoman history studies.<sup>17</sup> However, due to the limits of this thesis, I refer to the Ali Fuat Bilkan's book *Fakihler ve Sofuların Kavgası: 17. Yüzyılda Kadızādeliler ve Sivāsiler*, which is one of the last works on this subject. Bilkan describes the changes in the ulama class, which he sees as the reasons for conflict between Sufis (*Sivāsīs*) and preachers (*Ḳādīzādelīs*), as dissolution (29).

According to İpşirli, Katip Çelebi is the person who best identified the decline and causes that emerged in *'ilmiye* in this period. Katip regards the removal of philosophy and reason lessons from *madrassa* (a Muslim school of theology) curriculum in his work titled *Mizanül-hak fi ihtiyari'l-ehak*, as one of the most important reasons for the decline of the

---

<sup>17</sup> Madeline C. Zilfi, Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, Dina Le Gall, Hüseyin Akkaya, Marinos Sariyannis, Mustafa Aşkar, Gürsoy Şahin, İbrahim Boz, Semiramis Çavuşoğlu, Simeon Evstatiev, Khaled El-Rouayheb, Derin Terzioğlu

*‘ilmiye*. According to him, there has always been a conflict between Christianity and philosophical sciences. However, the Islamic world has never rejected these sciences. On the contrary, the religion tried to reconcile religion, philosophy and reason. In the first period of Islam, foreign science and thought had been banned due to concerns of shaking the faith. Afterwards, when Islamic belief dominated a wide geography, all sciences were allowed. Greek science and philosophy were fully translated and annotated. Islamic philosophers who produced artifacts in these fields were trained. Thinkers who tried to reconcile reason and *Sharia* emerged. Narrow-minded people, on the other hand, did not understand the meaning of the ban in the time of the first caliphs and limited themselves to imitation. They denied philosophy and science. There were scholars who combined reason and *sharia* from the early Ottoman period in the 14<sup>th</sup> century to the time of Suleiman I. When Mehmed II founded the *madrasas* of Sahn-ı Seman, two of the required readings were *Haşiyeye-i Tecrid* and *Şerh-i Mevakıf*. These books were the main books of the field of Kalam, which tries to explain religious issues with reason and revelation. Subsequent rulers removed these lessons, saying “these are philosophy” and were replaced by *Hidaye* and *Ekmel* books which were on Islamic jurisprudence. As only these remained in the *madrasas*, the development of the ideas declined. After a while, these lessons became incomprehensible. Some scholars from the eastern provinces who have read in the old style have begun to take advantage of this gap that is the absence of teaching the reason and philosophy lessons (İpşirli 1981, 281-282).

It is possible that this change in *‘ilmiye*, which was mentioned by Katip Çelebi, caused an important gap in terms of the minds that tried to make sense of the world. This gap caused by the absence of rational science emerging in *‘ilmiye* may have led to the emergence of some independent intellectuals such as Katip Çelebi, Evliya Çelebi and Eremya Çelebi. The inability to make sense of the world caused by this gap must have been severe, especially considering the new developments that have emerged in new public spaces.

Another change that occurred in this period was the land system. From the 16<sup>th</sup> century, some peasants, who could not cope with taxes, stopped processing the fields. This situation is mentioned in many works of the period.<sup>18</sup> Some people left their village and

---

<sup>18</sup> Halil İnalçık, “Military and Fiscal Transformation in the Ottoman Empire, 1600-1700” *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 6 (1980), p. 283-337; Mustafa Akdağ, *Türkiye'nin İktisadi ve İctimai Tarihi*, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2018; Michael Ursinus, “The Transformation of the Ottoman Fiscal Regime, c. 1600-1850” in *The Ottoman World*, Christine

scattered to find a job at the gate of a pasha began to derive a very high number of existing business needs. For this reason, dangerous *çiftbozan* (the people who have left their farm for other occupations) communities formed around the Marmara against the social order. This included major cities such as Bursa, Istanbul and Edirne (Akdağ 2018, 460).

The turmoil in land system caused the migration from villages to large cities. During the Baghdad expedition, Murad IV witnessed the state of Anatolia. The region was devastated by the Celali revolts, caused some measures to prevent the problems caused by migrating agricultural peasants to big cities. The most important of these was a measure to send the peasants back to their village again. The *avarızhane* (household defined for tax purposes) counts of 1620 shows that this measure was carried out systematically. In this framework, during the Celali turmoil of 1634-35, a few months of inspection and irritation were carried out in Istanbul to identify and return those who escaped from Kayseri and settled in Istanbul (Öz 2005, 150). However, once the dissociation began, it was not possible to return, and city populations showed a serious increase.

Ottoman historians working on this period were trying to find the underlying causes of these changes. Some reasons of them are related with the seventeenth century crisis. Ottoman and non-Ottoman sources mention unusual climatic conditions during the period of the Celali rebellions (Griswold 1983, 39-40). Starting here, W. J. Griswold based the crisis on climate changes for the first time. E. Huntington also revealed in his researchs that climate events such as rain and drought stopped at the root of the incident (Kadioğlu and Yılmaz 2017, 272). Later, Sam White elaborated on the subject. Generally, historians studying the crisis that emerged in 1590-1610 sought the cause in the internal structure of the Ottoman Empire. But from a systematic point of view, it can be seen that there was a general crisis in the world at that time. Based on such an approach, Sam White thinks that the Ottoman troubles of 1590-1610 were a part of the world crisis stemming from climate change, and at the same time, environmental factors peculiar to the Near East expanded the scope of the crisis in the Ottoman Empire and extended its duration (White 2011, 7-8). Since the end of the sixteenth century, similar problems have been experienced especially in Anatolia and the Mediterranean region, as well as in Southeast Asia, West Africa, India and Japan. However, in White's words, Near East countries

---

Woodhead, ed., London: Routledge, (2011), 423-435; Mehmet Öz, *Osmanlı'da Çözülme ve Gelenekçi Yorumcuları*, Dergah Yayınları, 2005.

suffered the most. According to Sam White, the Near East suffered the disasters of the age earlier than other parts of the world and could not recover as much as the others (11). Moreover, White states that the crisis in the Near East initiated population movements and disrupted the rural-urban population balance. This caused the tax order to deteriorate. At the same time, the plague has killed more people in cities. Also, major crises in the Near East disrupted the delicate balance between settled agriculture and animal husbandry-based nomadism. Cultivated areas were subject to invasions. Thus, there has been a fundamental change in land use ecology (12).

Another noteworthy development that emerged during this period is that Sufism, which has been met with tolerance in Ottoman society for centuries, was subjected to serious opposition by the Kādīzādelī movement. The Kādīzādelī movement, which emerged in the reigns of Murad IV (r.1623-1640), İbrahim (r.1640-1648) and Mehmed IV (r.1648-1687), was named after Kadızade Mehmed Efendī, one of the preachers of the Murad IV's reign (Çavuşoğlu 1990, 100). The most powerful and active period of the Kādīzādelīs, who have an important place in the Ottoman religious life, is between 1620 and 1680. The Kādīzādelīs, who were influential in the Ottoman palace since 1650, are also referred to as *Fakihs* in some sources (Öztürk 1981, 208). *Fakihs*, who had a positive image in the early periods of the Ottoman Empire, gained a negative meaning because of they take religious subjects at their face value in the later period.

The Kādīzādelīs oppose the practices of Islamic belief that are connected to traditions and religious practices that came after the century when Prophet Muhammad lived, opposing all kinds of innovations in social life (Zilfi 2008, 134). The movement, which had great repercussions in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, opposed Sufi orders in particular: music, singing, dancing and similar chanting practices were frowned upon. Kādīzādelīs also opposed Sufis because of their tolerance towards wine (140). The reaction of the Kādīzādelīs to the Halvetīye and Mevlevīye, who were the two major sects known for these practices, was very great. Uzunçarşılı states that this hostility caused Halvetī and Mevlevī mystics to conceal or discontinue their rituals (Uzunçarşılı 1983, 3/241).

The Kādīzādelīs ideas are usually linked to Ibn Taymiyya (d. 1328), a scholar who lived in the 13<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> century who had been influential in the Islamic world for centuries (Öztürk 1981, 133). The idea of Ibn Taymiyya, which nourished some predecessor movements in the Ottoman geography, had an impact on Imam Birgivi and his students in the 16<sup>th</sup>

century. Also, the roots of *Wahhabism* which is an ultraconservative and fundamentalist Islamic doctrine and religious movement which emerged in the following period, are based on the thoughts of Ibn Taymiyya. (Encyclopaedia Britannica). Imam Birgivi, who lived a modest life in small town near Istanbul, was the source of the Kādīzādelīs' idea in Anatolia.

I think that there is a connection between these developments at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century and the increase in the composition of *sāqīnāme* that appeared in the same period. Kādīzādelī movement tends to perceive religion without any interpretation of the expressions in its main sources. But the Sufi interpretation of Islam tends to find meanings hidden behind or deep in the expressions in these main sources. For this reason, Sufi poetry uses metaphors and allegories extensively. There is a similar situation not only in Sufi literature but also in the main sources of Sufism literature. Because the meaning is not fixed, it is constantly being remade. There is a huge literature on this subject. Even the Ian Almond's book *Sufism and Deconstruction: A Comparative Study of Derrida and Ibn 'Arabi*, which may be considered very limited in the huge literature on this subject, makes it possible to see the complexity of this subject.

Although I do not know this extensive literature and expertise, my limited readings have led me to think that there is an indirect relationship between the increasing power of Kādīzādelīs against the Sufis and the increased production of *sāqīnāme* in the first half of the seventeenth century. This relationship has two different dimensions. The fact that *sāqīnāme* genre contains both metaphorical and real meanings can provide an escape from the pressure of the Kādīzādelī movement for Sufi groups. In modern studies on *sāqīnāme* literature, trying to indicate whether the studied book is worldly or mystical shows this equivocity.

But the main issue I want to focus on is the other dimension of this indirect relationship. The *sāqīnāme* genre has been introduced to new styles and places, such as realistic parables and landscapes, with the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. I think that a mental relationship can be established between the writing style that focuses on the apparent reality in the world and the rise of the religious movement that perceives religion superficially. In other words, although they are completely opposite poles, Kādīzādelīs and poets who wrote *sāqīnāme* like Atā'ī may be acting with the same mental codes.

As a form of representation, literature aims to make sense of the world with the facts and events in it. While doing this, many different methods have been developed between reflecting the reality as it is and representing it in a surreal way. The choice at this point is related to many different factors such as wars, victories, natural disasters, climatic changes, and economic problems. These factors affect people's view of the world directly or indirectly. Moreover, they have influenced not only art forms that try to represent the world, but also religions. Economic, political and social developments in the Ottoman Empire in the seventeenth century also affected religious institutions and approaches. Since its establishment, the esoteric interpretation of Islam with various schools of Sufism has had an important place in the Ottomans' interpretation of the world with religion. The emergence of the Kādīzādelīs in the seventeenth century and its widespread repercussions suggest that the esoteric interpretation of Islam began to evolve towards a more material point. But this is a transformation in itself. When symbols break with what they symbolize and begin to gain an existence on their own, a process of transformation begins. Esoteric interpretations are often based on symbols. The fact that Kādīzādelīs rejected these symbols and wanted to turn to the first known sources of religion may be due to their inability to establish the connection between symbols and things or to think that these connections were broken. In any case, this situation seems to have caused that Kādīzādelīs perceive the religion dependent on the material existence of the world.

As will be explained in detail below, Atā'ī's *Ālemnümā* contains unprecedented realism. The poetry now included direct imitations of space and poetry as it is without any metaphorical statement (*mazmun*) or symbols, and with all its reality. These two situations, which occur in different ways, are a sign of a conflict or displacement between representation and imitation. This can be an example if the social, political, military and economic crises in the 17<sup>th</sup> century were reflected in the cultural patterns and mentality. This can be also a sign of change in the way they perceived the world and events.

As a result, the important changes that occurred in the Ottoman *ilmiye* organization in the 17<sup>th</sup> century and the emerging of the Kādīzādelī movement, which fed from the same place with the origins of this change, can be directly affected the cultural, intellectual and religious atmosphere of the period. These effects, which led to sharp distinctions in the meaning of the world, can be directly reflected in the production of literature. At the same

time, new public spaces emerged with increasing urbanization may have caused this effect to be felt deeply.

### 2.3. Archaeology of the *Masnavi*: Between Imagination and Reality

Since the work of the *sāqīnāme* form studied in this thesis is part of the genre of *masnavi*, it is necessary to focus on the genre's development. Therefore, it is necessary to focus on paradigms that proceed parallel with the development of the genre. This part of the thesis will mostly refer to Victoria R. Holbrook's works. There are certain reasons for this. First of all, unlike the academicians who see Classical Ottoman literature as a philological field of study, which I mentioned in the introduction, Holbrook has produced many works aimed at understanding this literature as a whole. While doing this, Holbrook considers the perception of Ottoman poetry both in its own period and in the modern period and tries an intertextual reading on this literature with using semiotics tools. While Similarly, Walter Andrews, who also made original contributions to Ottoman literature studies, focused on gazel style, Holbrook directed her focus to the *masnavi* style. In 1994 book *The Unreadable Shores of Love: Turkish Modernity and Mystic Romance*, she tried to describe the Ottoman poetry within the frame of poetics of the Sheikh Galip's *Hüsn ü 'Aşk*, which has an important place in the *masnavi* style in Ottoman poetry. She focuses on the originality, realism, intertextuality and interpretation of the Ottoman *masnavi* poetry as an art under three main categories as writer, work and reader.

In the "Alegorinin Ölümü, Hüsn ü Aşk'ın Özgünlüğü" (Death of Allegory, Originality of *Hüsn ü 'Aşk*) article, Holbrook tries to determine the frame of the Ottoman *masnavi* poetics. She focuses on paradigms that remove *masnavi* from being a simple narrative tool and give it an overall integrity. Holbrook's aim is to make an interpretation based on the continuity of the *masnavi* tradition and to evaluate the themes, techniques, philosophical problems and interpretations that make up the tradition (Holbrook 1999, 405). First of all, she writes about the diversity of the *masnavi*'s subjects. There are many texts such as medical treatments, chronicles, circumcision depictions written in *masnavi* style. But this diversity is somewhat deceiving because the subjects that are covered were



also expressed in the form of prose. So these texts are not major works of the *masnavi* style (407). Therefore, the *masnavi* referred to by Holbrook is not just the name of a style. She states that: “When we look at the historical development of the *masnavi*, the originality of it comes from the fact that it is a seriously and sincerely described species that cannot be coped with. This is also characteristic of Bildungsroman's ancestor pre-modern romance” (408). Based on this point, Holbrook characterizes the main characteristic of his *masnavi* narratives as "the theme of maturation in the path of love". Therefore, the *masnavi* of Sheikh Galib was written as a "maturation story". However, *Hüsn ü 'Aşk* focuses on one story on the one hand and refers to "other possible stories" on the other. In this respect, it is a “*masnavi* archeology” (408).

In her article, Holbrook associates this archeology with two different processes of transformation. The first of these transformations depends on a poetic element called the *formal harmonious image*. This element, which means “comparing and emulating the objects in terms of their forms in the image”, provides original description possibilities with a limited dictionary. Referring to Alessandro Bausani's article, "The Development of Form in Persian Lyrics", Holbrook draws attention to the importance of this *formal harmonious image* for literary periodization. This image is formed by comparing the meanings imposed by concrete shapes, such as the analogy of the human face to the moon. The use of the image in this way was also described as “classical” by Bausani. Accordingly, Hāfız's poems are “classical”. However, in the “post-classical” period, “the simulation of the concrete forms of the classical image has been replaced by the comparison of the shapes attributed to the abstractions” (407). Thus, an evolution occurred in the imaginary plane. This evolution should be understood as "the development of both an image style and a narrative style that follows the image" (407). In other words, the evolution of the *formal harmonious image* caused the allegory to appear as a more complex narrative possibility. *Masnavis* are also specific narrative environments of this allegorical narration. Therefore, the evolution is also a fundamental feature of *masnavi*. Berat Açıll summarizes the features of the type of allegorical narration as follows: personification, internal conflict, way of searching, polysemy, intertextuality, temporal and spatial ambiguity, compliance-based relationship building, mostly explaining of the allegory at the end of the work, the consisting of a single story, the continuity of the allegory without interruption throughout the work (Açıll 2013, 22). In his work which focus on allegory in classical Turkish literature, Açıll specifies

twentyeight of the masnavi written in Arabic, Persian, Urdu and Turkish as allegorical. At this point, it is understood that Açı describes the allegory differently than Holbrook. Although his work provides a very comprehensive historical and theoretical review of allegory, I think that his interpretation that the allegorical work should contain a single story would ignore allegoric features of the masnavis that contain eclectic allegorical elements.

The second transformation process that determines the *masnavi*'s archaeology is experienced in the paradigm of love. For Holbrook, this transformation has two obvious reasons. Firstly, there is a narrative of a spiritual journey that develops independently from the theme of maturation in the path of love. In this narrative type, maturation is the chief goal and is based on *miracname* – or, stories about the Prophet Muhammed's ascension. The spiritual enlightenment of the Prophet, who progressed through the journey by having certain experiences, constitutes the legitimate basis of this maturation fiction. Holbrook emphasizes that at some point this narrative type intersects with the theme of maturation in the path of love and has become widespread through increasingly diverse voyager types (406).

The second process, which concerns the transformation in the love paradigm, is directly related to "love metaphysics". Using the concepts of *Leylā o Majnūn* and "pre-classical", "classical" and "post-classical", Holbrook states that this transformation related the changes in Islamic views from Fuzuli to Sheikh Galib. Holbrook attributes this change to one of the important debates in the history of Islamic philosophy. The debate centers on the concepts of *teşbih* (similitude) and *tenzih* (exonerate). Accordingly, in the 9<sup>th</sup> century *Mutezile* (The theological sect that gives priority to reason and personal agency in the interpretation of belief-related issues) advocated that the creator and the act of creation should be separated from analogy because it is not possible nor acceptable to understand God with human actions and qualities (Atay 2003). An opposing point of view to this approach argues that *teşbih* which posits that explanation through analogy is appropriate and necessary. Especially, thanks to this perspective, the metaphysics of existence gains a new dimension. This new metaphysical expansion, called "unity of existence" – deriving from Ibn 'Arabī's mystical philosophy – assumes that God and His creatures have established an "immanence" relationship. The fact that Ibn 'Arabī and his works were seen as legitimate religious sources in the Ottomans' state ideology helped spread

the idea of “immanence”. However, the previous metaphysical structure gave God a “transcendent” position (411). Holbrook compares Fuzūlī, whom she sees as the best representative of the classical paradigm, and Sheikh Galib, the post-classical representative, stating that this contrast also reflects the love paradigm.

“In the classical period, Fuzūlī favors the thought of *tenzih*. Truth is transcendental to things; It is not found in the lover, that is, in the goods of this world. Mecnûn leaves Leylâ. After classical, Galib accepted the unity of existence. Truth is not separate from the two sides of love. Both sides are the positions of the same existence” (411).

Holbrook links this paradigm shift to mysticism rather than the *masnavi* tradition. According to her, Galib was influenced by the works of Aḥmed Gazālī, Fahreddīn ‘Irākī and Rūmī. Despite Ibn ‘Arabī’s approach identifying reality with existence, Gazālī prioritizes love in his work titled *Sevânih fi’l- ‘Aşk*. The viewpoints of these two thinkers came together in the epistle of *Lema ‘ât* which is written by ‘Irākī who is student Şadrettin Kūnavī’s, and led to the metaphysics of love and existence, which was also revealed in the *Mesnevi-yi Manevī* of Rūmī (411). The new love paradigm that Galib overlaps with classical *masnavi* norms stems from this metaphysical love.

Holbrook, while making this assertion, also comments on the appearance of *masnavi* tradition. These comments are based on the various criticisms and references that Sheikh Galib voiced in *Hüsn ü ‘Aşk*. For example, in the last part of his *masnavi*, Sheikh Galib uses the following expression when explaining his work’s quick yet unsurprising completion:

*Gördük niçe şāhlar gedālar*

*Bir ānda yapar anı babalar*

(We have seen many poor and strong people / Wise people make them all at once)

According to Holbrook, this expression was used deliberately by Sheikh Galib. With these words, Galib implies the *Şāh u Gedā masnavi* written by classical poets such as Yaḥyā and Rahmi. Holbrook thinks that these and similar mesnevis are in fact parody works that play with great tradition, and that she shows that Sheikh Galib has the same opinion as above. These types of allegorical *masnavis* are marginal works whose heroes

are traditional motifs rather than human, so they are not texts that shape the paradigm of love and may have influenced Sheikh Galib (404).

At this point, I would like to move to another direction, which Holbrook mentioned in the same article, and which has meaning for Nev'izāde Atā'ī's work. For this reason, evaluating the section where Sheikh Galib remembers preceding *masnavi* poets and ties them to a certain family tree provides some clues about reality in *masnavis* (Atay 2003). Galib says the following in the *sebeb-i te'lif* section of *Hüsrev ü 'Aşk*:

*Bulmuş sühān-ı bülend-nāmi*

*Firdevsī vü Hüsrev ü Nizāmī*

(They discovered the famous rhetoric / Firdevsi and Hüsrev and Nizami)

*Ayīn-i Nevāyī'de Fuzūlī*

*Bulmuş sühāna reh-i vüsūlī*

(Fuzuli found the way to the word in the style of Nevayi)

*İstanbul'umuzda Nev'ī-zāde*

*Etmiş tek ü pû velī piyāde*

(Nevizade in our Istanbul / Ran to his way but pedestrian)

*Olsun mı Nizāmī'ye hem-āheng*

*Ḳur'ān'a uyar mı nağme-i çeng*

(Could it be the same value with Nizami? / Does Çeng's music fit the Quran?)

*Olmaz belī lutf-ı ṭab'ı inkār*

*Onun gibi dahı niçeler var*

(There is no denying the grace of the talent / there are more like him.)

Three poets are mentioned in Galib's *masnavi* family tree, namely Firdevsī, Hüsrev and Nizāmī. These are the three main poets of his *masnavi* canon. This situation is apparent even in an early work such as 'Alī Şīr Nevā'ī's *Muhakemetü'l-Lugateyn*. While Nevā'ī commemorates the leading poets of *masnavi* in his book, he says, *üstād-ı fen Firdevsī* and *nādir-i zamān Şeyḫ Nizāmī* and *cādū-yı Hind Mīr Hüsrev*. In the tradition of Ottoman literature, this canonical description continues its influence throughout history. Sheikh Galib placed to the second row of the pedigree two poets, Nevā'ī and Fuzūlī, whom he

saw related to each other. According to Holbrook's method of periodization, we can interpret this connection as the maturation line of the "classical" era. Nevā'ī made a conscious effort to carry the *masnavi* tradition to Turkish at a certain level of maturity, and Fuzūlī supported this effort with a new interpretation. The reason Atā'ī was added to Galib's *masnavi* family tree is that unlike the other two, he was an Istanbulī poet who was born and grew up in Istanbul and also, he has a *hamse*. However, as Holbrook points out, the value judgment of Sheikh Galib about this *masnavi* poet shows that there is a different and implicit family tree. It is pointed out as a series of works that Galib called "the sound of a harp" (*nağme-i çeng*) when compared to Nizāmī's works and written by "many people" (*dahı niçeler*) such as Nev'izāde. These other works cannot be expected to be indicative of an implicit paradigm originating from a single source. However, that a group of *masnavis* seen by Holbrook as "parodies of the classical paradigm" have been added to an implicit pedigree is an important step to expand interpretations of *masnavi* poetics (Atay 2003).

We can start following the "implicit" and "marginal" development line of *masnavi* archeology with the help of Holbrook. She talks about narratives in the form of *seyr-i sülūk* (contemplation) allegory in the last chapter that is titled "Subjectivity and Interpretation", which is an important source for understanding the *masnavi* tradition. Therein, she touches on the relationships between the real life of dervishes and the life of the allegorical *seyr-i sülūk* (Holbrook 1994, 244).

In this context, she benefits from the preface written by Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı in the critical edition of Fuzūlī's *Sıhhat ü Maraz*. As Holbrook reports, Gölpınarlı gives Atā'ī's father Nev'ī's *hasbıhāl* as an example of the "contemplation allegory" (245). This example is very important in terms of Atā'ī's originality and his position in *masnavi* archaeology. Atā'ī makes the following comment regarding his father's *hasbıhāl* in the "introduction" section of *Heft Hān*, which Atā'ī wrote in order to compete with Nizāmī's *Heft Peyker*:

*Pederüñ hasb-i hāline bakdum*

*Şīve-i bī-miṣāline bakdum*

(I looked at my father's *hasbıhāl* / I looked at his unique style)

*Āb-ı tāb-ı suhanla çün o kitāb*

*Oldı bu bahra bir dūr-i nā-yāb*

(Because that book, with the beauty of its word / It has become a unique pearl to the sea)

*Pey-rev oldum o pīr-i dānāya*

*Beñzemek hoşdur ādem ataya*

(I became a follower of that scholar / It is good to look like the father.)

Nev'izāde praises his father's *ḥasbīḥāl* with these words and states that his duty is to follow his ancestor. However, he seems determined to follow a different path rather than fulfilling his duty:

*İtmedüm meşk o vādiye bu ḥakīr*

*Eyledüm ḥasb-i ḥālūmi tahrīr*

(I did not play a pen in that valley / I wrote my own *ḥasbīḥāl*)

*Ḥasb-i ḥāl olsa dāstān deyicek*

*Kime yalan ise bana gerçek*

(They say fairy tales for *ḥasbīḥāl* / But whoever says lie is true for me)

*Rūmda oldı gerçi Şāh ü Gedā*

*Eser-i ḥāş-ı ḥāme-i Yahyā*

(Though in *Rūm*, *Şāh ü Gedā* was written / The original work of Yahya's pen)

*Oldı çün-kim sözi zebān-ı vukū´*

*Buldı elfāza āşināsı şuyū´*

(Because its word was taken from a real event / It found the words most familiar to it)

*‘Āşıkāne sözinde var ḥālet*

*‘Āşıka derd-i ser degül şan ‘at*

(There is an arbitrariness in the word of love / For a lover, mastery is not a priority)

*Ehl-i ‘ışka verür tesellīler*

*Dil-i sengīn-i yārı nerm eyler*

(It gives comfort to the people of love / It makes soft the stone-hearted beloved)

*Bu eser ol kitāba lāzım olur*

*Okıyan dil-rübā mülāyim olur*

(This work would be necessary for that book / The merciless beloved who read this book would be benign)

In this way, the poet expresses that he has not chosen the path of his father's *hasbîhâl*. Instead, he decided to write his own. In other words, unlike his father, he chose to describe the real events that happened in his own. Therefore, Atâ'î warns his readers not to confuse his own events with ordinary stories (*dâstân*). In other words, what comes out of his pen is real. Also he links his work with the Taşlıcalı Yaḥyâ 's *Şāh u Gedā* masnavî. He states that Yaḥyâ Bey used the *zebân-ı vukû* style in *Şāh u Gedā*. Apparently, there is a specific style behind Atâ'î's view of Yaḥyâ Bey as an example. It can be said that the term *zebân-ı vukû* – meaning the language in which a realized event is expressed – has something to do with the writing *hasbîhâl* (Atay 2003, 18). As a matter of fact, the *masnavî* of Yaḥyâ Bey has been described as a *hasbîhâl* by some of his contemporaries, and the reality of the story has been particularly emphasized (18). In the first episodes of *Şāh u Gedā*, Taşlıcalı Yaḥyâ describes the Hagia Sophia and then the most crowded place of the city, At Meydanı. This situation makes it understandable that Atâ'î established a relationship between the *masnavî* of Taşlıcalı Yaḥyâ and his own writings which includes realistic depictions of the city (19).

Atâ'î's *manavis* that can be evaluated in other studies stated by Holbrook have a unique paradigm value in the context of realism in the *masnavî* genre. It would be wrong to see this reality in the same line with the reality in the Taşlıcalı Yaḥyâ 's *masnavî*, which was written in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. In Chapter Three, I exemplify the reality mentioned in Taşlıcalı Yaḥyâ 's *masnavî* is still an illusion dimension that should be evaluated in more classical forms compared to Atâ'î's *Âlemnümâ*.

### 3. LANDSCAPE AND SUBJECTIVITY IN THE *‘ĀLEMNÜMĀ*

#### 3.1. The Appearance of the Landscape

In the introduction of John Berger's book *The Ways of Seeing*, he says that looking comes before speaking. The child learns to look and recognize before starting to speak. According to Berger, we describe this world in words, but words never change the fact that we are surrounded by the world (Berger 2011, 7). Seeing is primarily a mental phenomenon. We follow the traces of the way the mind perceives the world in the language. According to Ricoeur, language expresses not only a process of speaking and writing, but all forms of art and narration (Ricoeur 2011, 17). Therefore, it is necessary to consider language as a means of representation. Sculpture, painting, dance, music or literature are areas in which people define their reactions to them in different environments. Whether it is visual, tactile or auditory, each different culture or subject names and classifies the world it perceives in different ways in terms of this language. According to different cultures or artists, linguistic changes in art or style are ordered according to their relationship between world phenomena of this classification. This order may vary depending on the subject or culture, or according to the medium used.

It determines what kind of mediums the representation is produced and transmitted, what kinds of arrangements it contains, leading to values and relations with the world for a given culture and the subject. The system of values and relations expressed by art is also related to the forms and techniques of the verbal language in a certain period or cultural environment (Farago 2006, 14). While these forms take shape in culture, they also have a direct effect on the regulation of thinking and perception. For example, a culture in which lettering is used and a culture in which calligraphy is used differs in understanding



and perceiving the world (Erzen 2012, 61). The relationship between representation and reality often presents a situation that intertwines, feeds and shapes one another. Our ways of representing reality also determine the content of reality. At this point, the time and place when reality is perceived is the determining position in the relationship between subjectivity and objectivity experiences, their perception, and expression.

As discussed in the Introduction, Belting says the use of perspective was a turning point in the history of seeing and expressing what he sees through language. He states that the subject of perspective is not only an art-related issue, but to understand the cultural importance of the perspective we need to approach it as a painting problem. According to Belting, what cultures do with pictures and how they reflect the world with pictures shows us their way of thinking (Belting 2011, 20). Belting says that with the introduction of perspective with the Modern Age, *gaze* is included in the painting. “The center of the central perspective is always the viewer. The viewer's gaze stands at the top of the pyramid of vision” (21). Perspective, by creating painting from a gaze, adopts a subject and subject-centered worldview. Belting also talks about the cultural connections to perspective. Perspective is an invented cultural technique. It sacrifices the freedom of perception and fixes it to a single position with the single motionless eye it creates. In this synthesis, perspective becomes the invention of the subject-dominated world (48).

Belting examines this situation that emerged in the history of seeing in eastern and western cultures comparatively. According to him, although the theory of perspective came from *Perspectiva* by the Arab mathematician Ibn Heysem (d. 1040), Renaissance artists turned this theory into a theory of *gaze* and applied it to painting. While Arab tradition thinks that perception will be shaped only by the inner world, Western tradition has a tendency to depict perceived seeing objectively. For this reason, while the Islamic tradition adopts an inward view and abstract geometric arrangements, Western tradition has focused on an objective and figurative depiction (35).

Gülru Necipoğlu opposes this dichotomy established by Belting. First of all, a conceptualization made as the Islamic tradition of seeing is wrong because it is possible to see different vision regimes in different geographies where Islam has been dominant since the emergence of Islam. It is also misleading to treat these visual traditions in a historical continuum. For example “Europeanizing images, attested in the figural mural

paintings of Nasrid Granada, also began to appear in the Persianate arts of the book in the Islamic East during the fourteenth century. This trend would accelerate in subsequent centuries until figurative representations in the "Frankish manner" eventually displaced the post-Mongol taste for sinicizing imagery around 1600." (Necipoğlu 2015, 41)

Although Necipoğlu's criticism on Belting's definitive comparisons and generalizations is stimulating, I think it might be wrong to position the concept of *scrutinizing gaze* directly opposite the way of perspective seeing. *Scrutinizing gaze*, which can be explained with the concept of *contemplative perception*, which Necipoğlu uses with reference to Ibn Haldun, is not the same as the perception of a single point of view. *Contemplative perception* is a way of seeing that opens, spreads and deepens the gaze in the world of mind. It requires not only looking at what is being looked at, but reflecting upon what is viewed through its impressions. This contemplation is directly influenced by the cosmological perception of the existence. When a person, who perceives existence holistically as macrocosm and microcosm, directs her gaze over a palace, a garden, or a book painting, she will likely see them as prototypes of the whole. She will sense the meaning with reference to this whole. But the gaze is fragmented in the way of seeing the perspective suggests. The perspective that emerges in the gaze perceives the visible things not in their holism, but by making the parts independent from the whole.

Although Belting makes generalizing and prejudiced comments about the Islamic vision culture, such as painting has no place in Islam, it is important to evaluate the innovations that the perspective technique brings to the way of perceiving the world. Because the perspective technique requires us to think about representation and imitation first of all. Approaches of all religions, ideas, ideologies and cultures on this issue have been effective in formation of their world views.

It has gained visibility in various situations at different times and places with the effect of different factors that guide this effort to understand. Moreover, It is noteworthy that there is no historical linear progress or change. For example, There were many discussions in Ancient Greece. Mimesis in pictures was criticized by Plato. Plato denied writing and painting as inanimate tools, accusing authors for faking live speech through writing (Erzen 2012, 46). According to him, writing was equal to pictures, which presented existence's broken products as if they were alive. If people in the picture were

asked a question, they would keep quiet with dignity. The same was true for the written words: “You think they can speak and understand everything they say. But when asked what it means they cannot answer” (46).

In the Islamic culture, which had a abstainer attitude about figurative representation especially during the establishment period, visual expression forms emerged in different ways. It is seen that the cultures around them have an important effect on the emergence of these forms. When we look at the tradition of painting and representation in the Islamic cultures, we can see the Mongol’s conquest of Baghdad cause to emerge the miniature painting from China in texts throughout the Islamicate world (İpşiroğlu 2017, 47). I especially emphasize Chinese painting culture, because according to Erzen, they should not be confused with Western medieval miniatures (Erzen 2012, 68). The aesthetics of these paintings can only be understood and interpreted in tandem with reading. Reading texts usually consist of universal perspectives from a narrator's point of view. Sometimes, a picture depicts the various stages of the story because this picture utilizes a narrative space that cannot be confused with the architecture or the landscape (Belting 2011, 50) This is not only unique to Islamic art. We know this from ongoing pictorial narratives, which does not depend on the integrity of time and space like perspective. Such pictures reflected collective knowledge, not personal experience (55). According to Titus Burckhardt, in fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, many miniatures, which are included in Islamic culture, do not portray the outside world perceived by senses, with all its incompatibilities and discordances. Instead, it indirectly gives the constant essences of things. For example, a horse is not just a certain member of its kind, it is a perfect horse in itself, and this is the quality miniature art depicts (Burckhardt, 57).

Although Islamic miniatures have different dimensions in different geographies, it has similar qualities with Chinese painting in main patterns. According to Usami Keiji, to describe the place in *sansui* painting, which is also a different dimension of Chinese painting, the place and time in *sansui* painting must be examined (Karatani 1998, 32). The image of "place" in the *sansui* painting cannot be reduced to a position as in Western paintings. In perspective, the position is solely grasped by someone with a fixed perspective (33). Anything that enters the field of that point of view at any given moment is placed in the eyes of the network of coordinates, and the interrelationship between them is determined objectively. Our current sense of sight realizes this understanding based on

this perspective. On the other hand, the place in *sansui* painting exists not as an individual's relationship with the object but as a transcendental and metaphysical model (33).

Although Islamic miniatures and Chinese paintings process different objects in terms of the subjects they deal with, they have common features in viewing an object. According to Karatani, when a *sansui* painter paints a pine tree, he depicts the *concept* of a pine tree. This is not a pine forest that appears from a certain point of view in a certain time-space range. Undoubtedly, "landscape" is an object "comprehended by a person with a fixed perspective". The perspective in *sansui* painting is not geometric. Thus, there is no such thing as "landscape" in the *sansui* painting (34).

Karatani states that this situation in *sansui* painting started to change in the eighteenth century. When we trace this situation in Ottoman painting, we see a change in the second half of the sixteenth century. After the second half of the sixteenth century, the works of the Palace Nakkashane were completely separated from the painting of other Islamic cultures in terms of style and content (Bağcı and others 2016, 17). The ornamental elements of the past centuries were no longer dominant in these depictions. The fairy-tale world of the east, the gardens with detailed drawn flowers, the pavilions decorated with layers and walls, the thin and long graceful beauties were not included in the depiction of the Ottomans (17). Ottoman painters preferred to depict nature with an unadorned approach. They would place an event in map-type landscapes. They used the non-bright colors without shading and it brought clarity to the painting. This helped to comprehend at first glance the items placed in the scene.

The Nakkashane administration also brought innovations to the Islamic book painting, in the selection of the subject of the works to be illustrated. The wars that the sultans and pashas participated in, the acceptance of the ambassadors, the skills of the sultans in hunting, army processions, wedding festivities, sultan portraits were the main subjects for painting. The first to be perceived in all these paintings is the presence of a formal, solemn atmosphere, the dynamic but strident power of the empire and the existence of an extraordinary order (17). As I mentioned in the introduction section, studies on illustrated books from the end of the sixteenth and early seventeenth century show that miniatures have come out of common conceptual contents and started to include everyday realities.

About this change also seen in *sansui* painting, Karatani establishes the relationship of this situation with literature in terms of landscape. There is a relationship between an object's realistic projection and the discovery of the landscape (36). The style needs to change in order for the landscape to appear, and this requires an inversion. Karatani cites Paul Valery, who describes the history of Western painting as a process in which landscape painting penetrates deeply:

“Thus, the interest of painters in the landscape was gradually transformed. What started as complementary to the subject of the painting took on the form of a new realm of fantasy, a land of marvels ... and finally, impression triumphed: matter or light dominated. Within a few years, painting was inundated by images of a world without human beings. Viewers were content with the ocean, the forests, the fields ... devoid of human figures. Since our eyes were far less familiar with trees and field than with animals, painting came to offer greater scope for the arbitrary; even gross distortions were acceptable. We would be shocked at the sight of an arm or a leg depicted in the same way that a branch might be in these paintings. Our ability to distinguish between the possible and the impossible is far less astute in the case of vegetable and mineral forms. The landscape afforded great conveniences. Everyone began to paint” (26).

According to Karatani, there is a certain basis for looking at literature and painting in such an analogical perspective. For example, Erwin Panofsky considered perspective as a "symbolic form" based on the Neo-Kantian philosopher Ernst Cassirer (36). The symbolic form is essentially based on the idea of Immanuel Kant, who states that the object (phenomenon) is created through a subjective form and category. After philosophical questions were thought through language, Kant's philosophy was criticized for being subjective. In fact, however, Kant's expressions of forms and categories of intuition were linguistic (Erzen 2012, 37). Cassirer had long called this "symbolic form". Therefore, perspective is also an issue of language. If we turn the subject upside down, the perspective emerged in another way in literature.

Belting, who sees perspective not only as a painting technique but defines it as a cultural phenomenon, agrees with Karatani, who is looking for a trace of his ways of viewing in literature. For Belting, in *perspective* everyone had become the symbol of the right to perceive the world *through their own eyes* (Belting 2011, 29). In this sense, it can be said that the perspective is a symbolic form that expresses modern culture. The paradox is that

perspective pictures are three-dimensional spaces depicted on a flat surface that does not exist in nature. But this space cannot be separated from the seeing and cannot be put on the seeing because it is a function of that seeing, not the other way around. In perspective, space is created with the *gaze* – and only for gaze – because it is actually on a surface that is not a space. We see it as concrete and spatial, but it symbolizes our perspective view in two dimensions and uses the surface of the image as a symbol. The reason for the space in the picture is that the view needs a space. In perspective, the picture plane is the metaphor of the viewer's presence, and the viewer is designed as a function of the picture (23).

Karatani states that this situation, which that expresses itself in perspective, should be considered with the emergence of *interiority* and the individual (Karatani 1998, 45). A landscape's appearance was made possible by the separation of the subject from the object brought by perspective. In the next section, I examine this distinction in more detail and try to emphasize the relationship between interiority and landscape that appears in perspective.

### 3.2. The Appearance of Subjectivity

In this section, I discuss the relationship between the birth of the *individual* and the discovery of *interiority* in the context of subject-object separation. Since the classical period, the issue of the individual's perfection in various cultures, traditions, religions and ideologies has always been important. The individual as a concept is mentioned in advice literature of ancient Greek philosophers: about leading a meaningful life, the advice of East Asian religions on the moral goodness of a person, or in cases where Islamic Sufism defines personal maturation as the purpose of existence. However, it is noteworthy that all these individual assumptions take place as an element of a holistic cosmological view. The ideal is to achieve *integrity*. In this respect, it is not possible to talk about the individual as a pure existence or as a self. The conceptualization of the individual as a self-conscious being who reflects and expresses his selfhood is a recent phenomenon. The concept of 'individualism' has often argued to be the base of the modern ideology.

Although the concepts of individual and individuality that we are most accustomed to are recent and have no such elaborated equivalents in the Antiquity or the Middle Ages, it does not mean that it would be anachronistic to apply the terms to pre-18<sup>th</sup> century contexts. According to Stephen Greenblatt, 16<sup>th</sup> century Europe made it possible for an individual fashion his identity through self-consciousness. It was a consciousness that previously existed among the elites of the classical world but was later inhibited by Christianity's understanding of as inherently incompetent and flawed beings (Greenblat 1980, 1-11). Moving from the Geertzian preposition that the humans themselves are cultural artifacts, Greenblatt claimed that the concept and act of self-fashioning defies sharp boundaries between literature and social life. Indeed, literature is a central component and conveyor of a given culture because each literary work has clues that can provide information about its author's worldview. Thus, self-fashioning is embedded in contemporary literature (Greenblat 1980).

Karatani, while establishing a connection between the discovery of interiority and the discovery of the landscape, states that traces of landscape and interiority can be observed as an inversion in literary works (Karatani 1998, 44). With this inversion, things that have existed for a long time gain new meanings. The birth of the landscape should also be evaluated in this manner. Viktor Shklovski, who is one of the theorists of Russian formalism, addresses the situation mentioned by Karatani in the context of realism in literature. According to Shklovski, the essence of realism is breaking habit. In other words, realism forces us to see what we cannot actually see because of our habits. So there is no specific method in realism. This is a continuous process in which habit is broken. Realism must not only describe given landscape, but constantly create it. Although there has been a reality up to that point, there is a view that nobody has seen. So a realistic person is always an interior person (45).

This is a good point to return to perspective. According to Norman Bryson, a cursory glance has left its place from the 15<sup>th</sup> century to looking steadily, in other words, to peeping (Bryson 1983, 94). This situation, as Heidegger put it, caused the world to be perceived as a picture. The seeing directed to the world was depicted for the first time with a perspective picture, and the perspective transformed the seeing to the world. Perspective as a cultural technique had a tremendous impact. The perspective, which aims to put natural perception on the picture, not only changed art but transformed culture from

top to bottom (Belting 2011, 23). The most important feature of works of art is that they are both affected by the culture they come from and affect that culture. Even in Western culture, where visibility has always been at the forefront, perspective made a difference in pictures (23).

In his article entitled “Specular Grammar: The Visual Rhetoric of Modernity”, Barry Sandywell states that the modern western self was built on the Cartesian thought system. Equally, he describes how modernity developed from a God-centric universe to a worldview dominated by man (Sandywell 1998, 49). The birth of the modern middle class and the European theory of knowledge proclaims the autonomy of cognitive consciousness. As a pioneer thinker of this transformation, René Descartes produced powerful discourses on autonomy and the self. The Cartesian self, which is neutral, isolated, rational, self-sufficient, indifferent to differences and the other, in the direction of Sandywell’s view, is the origin of the (reflective) language of modernity that wants to see the world as a mirror reflection. With its reflective and objectifying fixed gaze, the Cartesian self organizes and produces the modern world with its dominant view of everything that looks from an advantageous point of view. For Sandywell, “cognition” in the language of modernity is a type of “inner thought” that appears under the guidance of the lonely thinker (Sandywell, 1998).

Sandywell, as messenger of social relations and cultural developments, addressed the religious and cultural wars and reformation periods of the Renaissance. Sandywell shows the changes in social organization of the public space-time system as the main reason underlying the visual language of modernity and the modern self as:

- The collapse of God-centrist worldviews and the disruption of the patriarchal social order;
- The resurrection and spread of universal Roman law that secularized canon laws;
- Autonomy and commodification of the image;
- The emergence of the first forms of capitalist social-economic practices;
- Time-series discussions on the formation of public spaces, early modern forms of space-time compression, centralization of political authority;
- The development of modern scientific processes and the formation of the individual society and the middle class.



Sandywell expressed the importance of rapid urbanization, commodification, monetary relations and the global market. The end of the late middle ages did not only nurture new spatial, cultural, and purposeful rearrangements, but also spread abstract concepts and urban cultures of personal freedom, individuality, mobility that refuses to be attached to any domain of sovereignty. With these changes, the “Descartean anxiety” was positioned beyond the boundaries of philosophy, thereby undermining traditional personality and common identity modeld. In these conditions, the problem of modern subjectivity as a series of values of mental understanding emerged as a historical phenomenon in the intersection of social, political and cultural change (Sandywell, 1998, 32).

According to Charles Taylor, we can say that Renaissance visual art directly affected the emergence of modern identity, not only increasing the importance of human constitutive power. The Renaissance’s passion for imitation led to a more realistic and complete description: this is, a detached art of sculpting that is no longer the same essence in its architectural context (Taylor 2013, 304). We can follow Gombrich’s view that our reality provisions are related to a tradition and context. However, what is important here is an intention to leave things to themselves and to prioritize the reality of nature over the various forms of iconographic tradition (305).

Rescuing nature from iconographic tradition also revealed a number of conclusions about the place of the subject. The artist who decided to imitate nature saw himself opposite to the object. There was a new distance between the subject and the object, and these two are clearly positioned relative to one another. On the contrary, the reality in previous iconic traditions did not have such a determined state; reality could not be precisely positioned inside or outs. In this new art, space and location in the space gained importance. The artist looked at what he described from a particular perspective. While acquiring a perspective, the depicted reality was displayed from a particular perspective (Belting 2011, 57).

As Panofsky points out, the surface depiction lost its materiality in late medieval times. Subsequently, instead of being a matte and invariable surface, surface became a window through which we see reality from a fixed perspective. Panofsky quotes from Alberti:

“Painters should know that they move on a plain surface with their lines, and that in filling the areas thus defined with colours, the only thing they

seek to accomplish is that the forms of the things seen appear on this plane surface as if it were made of transparent glass.”

And even more explicitly, he says: “I describe a rectangle of whatever size I please, which I imagine to be an open window through which I view whatever is to be depicted there.” (Panofsky 1972, 120)

The release of the object brings with it the independence of the subject. This independence takes place in a larger form of self-consciousness. The subject breaks its ties from the object and leaves it. This separation means being against what is portrayed and not being surrounded by it. This new distance, as Panofsky describes it, also personifies the subject while embodying the object (136). This paved the way for a more fundamental breakdown, in which the subject was strictly independent himself by objectifying the world. The divergence that confronts me with the world may also help to prepare a deeper break that I do not see the world as the center where my life goals are set. The stance of dissociation also helps to understand the perception of the deep understanding of being intertwined with the cosmos, the absence of a clear boundary between the individual and the world created by the pre-modern cosmic conceptions of the cosmic order. At the same time, new self-consciousness about the depiction of reality and the formation of new fields based on this depiction strengthens awareness of the role of human formationism and develops its importance.

It is not possible to claim that this new perspective emerging especially in Europe in the early modern period and the new forms of existence resulting from it were found everywhere in the same period. As Karatani points out, such norms are related to the combination of many different components, creating the appropriate environment that affected others. I cannot say that the issues of discovery of the landscape and interiority that I mentioned above took place in Ottoman society as a social norm in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. However, we can see traces of the origins of Ottoman modernization, which was generally started with the 19<sup>th</sup> century and whose visibility in literature in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century in terms of landscape and interiority. In the next section, I examine Atā’ī’s *‘Ālemnümā* from this perspective.

### 3.3. Breaking of the Seeing and Mental Traces in ‘*Ālemnümā*

Nuran Tezcan in her article entitled “Sebeb-i Teliflere Göre Mesnevi Edebiyatının Dönüşümü” (The Transformation of *Masnavi* Literature According to *Sebeb-i Telif* Sections) states that in pre-story introductions in *masnavis*, the poet expresses his thoughts on his work in an ideal framework (Tezcan 2010, 50). The poet's thoughts are often in the form of a preliminary interpretation of his work. In other words, this section contains a warning or a basic determination regarding the content of the *masnavi* (50). In fact, the aim is to link reactions to the story, positive or negative evaluations to a certain discursive framework, thereby legitimating the work. A preliminary comment with this feature draws attention in Atā’ī’s *Ālemnümā*. We begin to confront this interpretation with the first verses of the *Ālemnümā*. Atā’ī, as in many *masnavi*, first calls on creative power, its existence and oneness in *tevhid* section. However, this appeal senses that from the very first couplet formally, Atā’ī’s *masnavi* presents different signs.

*Nigārende-i kùbbe-i āb-gūn*

*Habāb-āver-i sāgar-ı ser-nigūn*

(The painter of the water-colored sky dome / That looks like an upside-down glass with water bubbles on it.)

*Cilā-baḥş-ı āyine-i cān u dil*

*Leṭāfet-dih-i tıynet-i āb ü gil*

(Who shines the mirror of the heart / Gives elegance to water and soil)

*Bu ne şīşe-i nīlī-i āsümān*

*Anuñ nefhā-i kudretinden nişān*

(This blue sky bottle is a sign of his strong breath)

The apparent purpose of these couplets is to bless creation, and therefore to praise God's creative power. While Atā’ī does this, he emphasizes the visibility of narrative instead of presenting the narrative conceptually. “God, the painter of the blue sky dome, gives the air bubble to an inverted glass. It brightens the body and heart mirror and gives beauty to the nature of water and soil. This blue sky is a sign of God’s powerful breath.” During the narrative, which continues in a similar way in the later couplets, picture frames come

to our eyes. In order to better see this situation in Atā'ī, it would be useful to look at the *tevhid* section of Revānī's *İşretnāme* written in the sixteenth century:

*Ana dil teşne olmuş ins ile cān*

*Anun bir kaçresidür āb-ı hayvān*

(Everybody wants to reach to Him / The water of life is a little part of Him)

*Anı nūş iden olmaz hīç fānī*

*Kim andandur hayāt-ı cāvidānī*

(Whoever drinks that water is not mortal / Immortal life is from Him)

*Velāyet kesb ider zıkr ile zākir*

*Hidāyet nurı andan oldu zāhir*

(Zakirs<sup>19</sup> become holy man by dihr / The light of the right path came from Him)

*Anun māhiyyetinden 'aql olur çāk*

*Anun keyfiyyetinden fehm itmez idrāk*

(The mind that thinks about Him essence disintegrates / The mind cannot understand His features)

As can be seen, visual elements were not used in Revānī's narrative. He prefers a more abstract narrative. It is possible to see this situation in most of the *masnavi* type narratives written in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. But the Atā'ī preferred to make visual depictions even in the most abstract subjects. We do not know whether Atā'ī consciously chose this form of narration, but it is not difficult to guess from the statements in the twelfth couplet that the images in his mind are alive and picturesque while creating the narrative.

*Gelür gözine bāde-i 'ışk-ı pāk*

*Değil serserī girye-i çeşm-i tāk*

(Pure love wine comes to your eyes / It is not the stray tears flowing from the eyes of the wine)

---

<sup>19</sup> The one who does *zıkr* to reach the unity of God as a principle of Islamic mysticism.

Atā'ī then continues his narrative with a *na't* and *münacāt*. In the first four couplets at the beginning of the *na't* section, although the word started with the frequently used praise words of classical Ottoman literature such as *şekerriz* (very sweet), *nazm-ı pāk* (pure statement), *terzebān* (witty), we encounter the couplets that included intense visual signs in the further part of the same section.

*İhāta idüp anı nur-ı cemāl*

*Görüp resmini alamazdı zālāl*

(Since the light of the beauty of his face surrounded him / The shadow could not see him and take his picture)

*Cemāli olup muşhāf-ı bi-mişāl*

*Aña faşl u āyāt idi hatt u hāl*

(The beauty of his face became a unique Quran / Shapes and expressions became verses and chapters for him)

*O zuhrundaki mihr-i behcet-nümā*

*Meger oldı resm-i hizāne aña*

(When the sun came out to show his beauty / It became a treasure picture for him)

“Since the beauty of God surrounds him, the shadow cannot take his picture. The beauty of his face is a unique book (Qur’ān), the shape and expressions are chapters and verses in that book. When the sun, showing her beauty, appears, it becomes a treasure-worthy picture.” These depictions in the section where praise is given to the Prophet contain information about the beauty and scheme of his face. As mentioned in the previous section, Islam has been reluctant to portray human figures. Because of this, drawing of the image of the Prophet was very limited. But the *hilyas* that emerged in the 17<sup>th</sup> century have been a means of substituting the picture with writing (Uzun 1998). Based on the transfer of those who saw the Prophet to those who could not see, these narratives were made into table to be hung on the walls with ornate writings and thus the gap of the picture was filled with writing. The *hilyas* gave an exhibition function to the writing. It is possible to establish a relationship between the emergence of the *hilya*, which did not take place as a separate art form until the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and the differences in the way of perceiving the world, which started to appear in imaginations and minds. In order to understand the way these differences appear in the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, we can proceed a little

further in Atā'ī's *masnavi* and to the *sebeb-i te'lif* (reason of writing) section in particular, the vanishing point where we find concrete signs of the world he perceives.

The *sebeb-i te'lif* sections are the sections in which he explains why the poet wrote his work. These sections, which have a special importance especially in *masnavi*, attribute the process of starting the writing of the work to some stereotypical reasons such as dream inspiration or friend advice, but an effort of originality that cannot be ignored is felt in the background. When it comes to Ottoman poetry, this struggle for originality takes place between Persian and Turkish poets. Although there are many poets who wanted to prevail in this war before Atā'ī, according to Nuran Tezcan, the *sebeb-i te'lif* put forward by Atā'ī is almost a single manifesto against Persian poets in this war for originality (Tezcan 2010, 55). This originality was not just a singular awareness but directly related to Atā'ī's way of seeing and points out what he sees, it is useful to take a look at the introduction part of *sebeb-i te'lif* section.

Starting this episode with the verse *Meğer bir dem irmişdi vakt-i ferāğ / Ne seyr-i çemen ne temāşā-i bāğ* (It was time to relax / The looking of lawn or contemplation of garden), Atā'ī points out that he will depict landscapes from a cruise. With this sign, which is seen in the first part of this chapter, nature tries to find a place in poetry as an element outside of everyday life that is contemplated independently. But this independent place must be justified. This legitimacy was provided by Atā'ī himself, at least in the later parts of the *sebeb-i te'lif*:

*Niçün itmeye bunda bir dāsītān*

*Zuhūrī pesendān-ı Rūmī-zebān*

(Why not write a story about it / Rūmī language people who liked the Zuhūrī)

*İdüp müstakıl ya'nī bir meşnevī*

*Unutdurmaya şīve-i Hüsrevī*

(So write an independent masnavi / That will forget the Husrev-style saying)

*Huşuşā bu ma'nā bulupdur şübūt*

*İder bahş iden mülzim olup sükūt*

(Especially its meaning is fixed / The person talking about it ends the discussion and stops.)

*Ki medh ü tagazzülde Rûmî-ķalem*

*Olup gālib-i sāhirān-ı ‘Acem*

(Rûmî poets excelled in Persian poets in the field of *kaside* and *gazel*)

*Çü şemşîr-i hûn-rîz-i ‘Osmāniyān*

*Zuhûr itdi ruchān-ı Türkî-zebān*

(Just as the Ottomans won great victories in the military field, the Turkish language gained superiority.)

*Velîkin ķalup şîve-i meşnevî*

*Sözi anda A‘cāmun oldı ķavî*

(But they could not progress in the mesnevi style / Persian poets are still strong in this area)

*Dinilseydi bir nazm-ı gevher-nişār*

*Ki her beyti bir müfred-i rûzgār*

(If a poem could be written that spreads an ore / Each couplet of which is a unique wind.)

*Olup hamse aşhābına nice tāb*

*Virilseydi ālāya tenhā cevāb*

(An answer that gives freshness should be written to all poets who wrote Hamse)

*Şarāb olsa mazmûn-ı cām-ı sühān*

*Kesel geldi zîrā ki efsāneden*

(Let the metaphor of the goblet be wine / Tired of epic stories now)

*Mey-i āteşîn ol güvārende āb*

*Sühān gülşenine virür āb u tāb*

(That delicious red wine enhances the vitality of the garden of words.)

*Añılmazsa Şîrîn ü Leylî n’ola*

*Heman muṭrîb ü sākîye ‘ışķ ola*

(What happens if the stories of Şirin and Leyla are not remembered? / They are replaced by *sazende/hanende* (musician/singer) and *sāqî*)

While Atā'ī turns in on himself, he joins a poetry gathering in Hisar on a beautiful spring day. Here the elites of Istanbul chat about literature. Ottoman poets who liked Zuhûrî ask a question why they should not write a *masnavi* that would be more successful than Husrev's style. As we understand from these couplets, Ottoman poets surpassed the Persians in poetry, namely *ghazal* and *kaside*, but remained behind in the *masnavi*. However, the Ottoman Empire showed its military power in the war, so the superiority of the Turkish language was indisputable. The claim of showing the power of Turkish, which has been going on since the *Beylik* period, the strong state, strong literature and art understanding were directly reflected in these last couplets of Atā'ī. Thinking that the desired level had not yet been reached in the *masnavi*, Atā'ī believed that he would do it himself. The superior state had to be superior in literature. The way to achieve the upper hand in literature is to write a *masnavi* belonging to the Ottomans in form and content. The telling of the stories of Şîrîn and Leylî was a sign of laziness. These stories were legends and had become commonplace. Therefore, new and local subjects and styles in the works that reveal the strength and superiority of Ottoman poets, give people happiness, had to be created. This locality claim was directly related to space in Atā'ī. The place, which is seen as a condition for ensuring the originality of the narrative, brought time to the contemporary plane. Atā'ī established this claim of originality, which presents the signs of a change in the understanding of time and space, based on the advice given to him by his friend Kâfzâde Fâ'izî.

*O dem içlerinden bir ehl-i kemâl*

*Nişâr eyledi dürr-i dürc-i maḳâl*

(At that time, a person with perfection from among them / He scattered his words like pearls in his mouth.)

*O ser-çeşme-i hikmetüñ Fâ'izî*

*Kümeyt-i sühan rāyizi Fâ'izî*

(That person is Fâ'izî who is the source of wise. / The breeder of the word horse is Fâ'izî.)

*Baña itdi 'atf-ı 'inān-ı ḥiṭāb*

*Didi sen virürsün su' āle cevāb*

(He turned the direction of the word to me / Said you answer this question)

*Sühan mülkinüñ merd-i pür-zürusun*



*Bu meydānuñ el-ḥaḳ silāḥşorusun*

(You are the strongest in the land of words / You are really the warrior of this square)

*Ḥiṣāruñ idüp vaşfinı pīşvā*

*Sūḥan mülkine çek hümāyun-livā*

(Praising the qualities of the *Ḥiṣār* (fortress) / Pull the holy flag to the land of words)

*Ki devr eyledikçe gûş-ı kelām*

*Müdām olmak ister bu dilkeş maḳām*

(As time pays attention / wants to be a regular of this beautiful place)

Tezcan states that these ideas expressed by Atā'ī on behalf of those in the gathering are also important in terms of showing the point that the literary ideal he belongs to had reached. This ideal required superiority over Persian literature (Tezcan 2010, 58). However, superiority gained a new dimension here. What needed to be done was not to "dress the *Rumiyane* clothes" of the Persian masters, but to create a unique and original work. While the original work target directed the poet to his own space and time, literature led to the establishment of a connection with life, that is, reality. As a matter of fact, even though Atā'ī provides his own legitimacy, he was positioned as Hisar in Istanbul. In addition, in these elites at the gatherings, he made a connection with his friend, poet Kāfzāde Fā'izī, by putting forward a realistic text.

Atā'ī claims that the imagination and originality in his work are much more beautiful than Neẓāmī's works. He raised his reputation like Nevā'ī with this new style work he created. He also celebrated the spirit of Revānī, who wrote the *'işretnāme*. If Cāmī was aware of his work and read, he would have evening entertainment – Hāfiz of Şīrazī would be resurrected by the effect of Atā'ī's work.

The originality and difference that Atā'ī promised to make in his *masnavi* as content appear in terms of form. This is especially visible in depictions of Hisar, where traces of realism are seen in poetry – as almost all literary historians write and think about Atā'ī's *'Alemmümā*. According to Hatice Aynur, it should be noted that the Istanbul narrative in Atā'ī's *Hamse* is important in two ways. The first is to lead the narration of the Bosphorus and its surroundings, which we will see in the Ottoman literary texts from the 18<sup>th</sup> century onwards, and the other is that *Hamse's* illustrated copies in the 18<sup>th</sup> century contributed to

the visual drawing of Istanbul as the capital in this century (Aynur 2015, 140). Hisar enters poetry as never before:

*Nice hūb limānı var bī-keder*

*Muḥīt-i sipihr ider kūşeler*

(It has many beautiful ports / Its every corner is surrounded by the traces of the sky)

*Olur mevcden fülke kehfü 'l-emān*

*Deniz daḥı aña şıgınrur hemān*

(These ports become a safe cave for boats on the waves / Even the sea takes cover in these ports immediately)

*Gelür bād ile ṭolı keşṭileri*

*Ne keşṭi ki gencīne-i Kayşerī*

(The ships arrived with the drag of the wind / They are full of Kayser treasures)

*Ni 'amla gelen ṭolı keşṭileri*

*Bize andırur genc-i Bād-āveri*

(These ships full of blessings / Resemble the treasures of Badaver)

*Sütünü idüp āsumāna güzār*

*Dibi püşt-i mähīyi eyler fiḡār*

(The mast of ship bores the sky. / Its bottom hurts the fish in the sea)

*Kıçı şeh-nişīn-i sipihr-i berīn*

*İçi birbiri içre zīr-i zemīn*

(The stern becomes a bay window to the sky / Its floors are intertwined)

*Olup bādbānī gibi pür hevā*

*Gelür seyre sür 'at-künān dāimā*

(When its sails fill with wind / It speeds up immediately)

Before depicting both sides of the Bosphorus, Atā'ī directed his gaze to the middle of the Bosphorus. Boats were in a safe area where even the sea takes refuge from it. Not only boats are visible in the sea, but large sailing ships, full of blessings, passed through the Bosphorus with dignity. Atā'ī offers a portrayal of a ship that we can easily bring to our

eyes with the size of its masts, the bulge resembling the bay window of a house at the back, the floors that intertwine each other. The calm of the small boats or the viciousness of the big ships do not affect the sea waves. The sea fluctuated with dignity and the same calm. The wind fills the sails of the ships, allowing them to continue their way on the sea as if they floated. This liveliness in the narrative is the product of a careful observation. The narrative leads us to look somewhere, not to imagine something. We see traces of an eye that we have not witnessed until the depiction of Atā'ī's work. It is possible that the gaze takes place between the object seen and the subject that looks at it. This is related to the subject's location in a separate place from the classical thinking conceptions. But this new way of seeing and expressing, which I linked with the emergence of the landscape, is a phenomenon related to literature, not painting. The landscape is formed in the mind and then becomes concrete with the tools of the art form chosen as the medium of expression. Since it is literature here, the landscape was expressed in words.

This issue, which emerged between the word and the image, has been in direct interest of art and literature theorists or historians working on communication and subjectivity since Aristotle described Horace's tragedies as "poetry like painting". There is a huge literature about this subject. This issue was on the agenda of many art historians, from Walter Benjamin and Erwin Panofsky to Ernst Gombrich, who viewed the tense relationship between word and image in terms of political and technical developments in the twentieth century. In addition, this issue created the environment for Ferdinand Saussure and Charles Peirce to create a semiotic method by centering the trio of symbols, images and signs, and then a separate study area for Roland Barthes, Umberto Eco and W.J.T. Mitchell. By way of these thinkers, my readings on this subject prompted me to look for many mental and cultural elements in the background of the relationship between words and images.

As Mitchell expresses, the relationship between words and image is like two countries that speak different languages but have long been influenced by mutual immigration, cultural interaction and other relationships. They do not have a fixed boundary as they usually live in a connected relationship (Mitchell 1980, 64). So, where do the written images that emerge from *Ālemnümā* in the Ottoman world in the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century in which Atā'ī wrote his work correspond in terms of their way of seeing? Or, in a culture that does not have a tradition of institutional painting and convey the expression

with the forms in which writing is used as a tool, how did the relationship between word and image go through the process of transformation and what consequences did this have?

The perspective issue we discussed in the previous section is an important tool to answer these questions. Because of spatial depictions, Atā'ī used unprecedented manner to depict the Bosphorus, indicating that he placed himself in a subjective position within the space in the form of mental perception.

*Girüp ana ħubān-ı sīmīn-beden*

*Görinür ruĥı gül gibi şīşeden*

(Beautiful men with their silver-like bodies come into the water / Look like a rose from a bottle)

*Nice kaşr-ı zībā-yı ferruĥ-ızılāl*

*Su üzre tırur tāk-ı gerdün-mişāl*

(The shadows of the ornate mansions reflect on the water like large arches)

*Döküldükçe gird-āba berg-i bahār*

*Görinür münebbit yeşil kāse-vār*

(As the spring leaves fall into the stream, they look like they're in the green bowl)

The beauties floating in the waters of the Bosphorus, the shadows of the surrounding pavilions falling on its waters, or the leaves pouring into the vortices from the trees at the seaside in spring show that this narrative was created by acting from a certain and fixed perspective. As we mentioned in the previous section, the figures shown in a miniature or traditional eastern painting are usually removed from all their singularities and personalities and are depicted as concepts and essences. This situation is seen in a similar way in poetry. The criticism of Ottoman poetry not having any traces of social reality is directly related to this situation. What is wrong is that this view is expressed in generalised dimension and that an enduring poetry tradition is treated collectively. In the *Ālemnümā*, these depictions, expressed in their singularity, rather than being concepts, point to a change in the way of seeing, and therefore in the world of mind. *Masnavis*, written before Atā'ī, often feature city descriptions. In fact, the *masnavi* itself is compared to building a city (Tezcan 2010, 50). But even with a brief glance, it is understood that Atā'ī differed significantly from the earlier descriptions of the Bosphorus

and Hisar, and that they are oriented to express objectivity conceptually rather than depicting the narrative's subjectivity or a subjective landscape.

In her article titled “Osmanlı Edebi Metinlerinde İstanbul” (*Istanbul in Ottoman Literary Texts*), Hatice Aynur draws attention to the narratives of Istanbul in the Tācizāde Cafer Çelebi’s *Hevesname masnavi*. In this *masnavi*, Cafer Çelebi depicted some basic buildings such as a hamam (bathhouse), Yedikule (Seven towers) and the Semaniye *madrassa* (eight courtyards) as well as characteristic places that symbolize the city's distinctly Ottoman and Islamic identity. These include the Hagia Sophia, the Fatih Mosque, and the tombs of Eyüp Ensari and Fatih. These descriptions summarize the semi-legendary political history of Istanbul (Aynur 2015, 137). The spaces described in these depictions are said to lead to different parts of a grand narrative. A similar situation is found in Taşlıcalı Yahyā Bey’s *Şāh u Gedā*. In sections of the *şehrengiz* (Poems written about the beauties and beauties of a city), where the beauties mentioned in the *masnavi* are described, depictions are narratives that do not contain visuals but rather try to strengthen a love story. In these sections that describe places such as *Yedikule* and Hagia Sophia, the aim is to express the places where love appears (139). However, as in Atā’ī’s depictions, there are no visual depictions that do not have a direct connection with the narrative, nor stand apart from the narrative. They freeze the space from a certain perspective and make it possible to bring a picture to our eyes.

We also encounter the expression of places via visual description narration in Tatavlı Mahremī’s *Şehname*. In this work, Mahremī depicts Amasya, Alexandria, Edirne, and Istanbul. The descriptions are vivid and detailed compared to contemporary city depictions. In these narratives, where the main purpose is to praise the cities, the qualities of the space are mentioned and the reader is intended to admire the space depicted (Aynur 2015, 207). The main point that leaves Atā’ī’s space narrative is that the landscape is not included Mahremī’s narrative. The places and events are depicted in a miniature layout. Therefore, even though the liveliness of the expression brings a bit of pictorial images into our minds, they lack distance between the space and the narrator subject and the constitutive space. However, as can be seen in the verses below, depictions in the *‘Ālemnümā* are the portrayals of seeing and this kind of seeing can only be possible within distance. The perspective that emerges as a way of seeing in this way teaches the viewer to understand the world as a painting or to transform it into his own painting.

*Akındı kenārında aşr-ı refi‘*

*O Őeh-beyt-i mevzūn bu bar-ı serī*

(The big pavilion at the edge of sea flow /It is the most beautiful pavilion at the end of the sea)

*İdūp āb-ı fısqıyye ara Őitāb*

*Olur bar önünde añun avz-ı āb*

(It quickly sprays water into the sky / A pool of water is formed in front of the sea)

*afeslerle varınca ‘ālī-maām*

*Olur ‘aksi deryāya dūŐdükce dām*

(When the sultan comes with his caged boat, his reflection in the sea looks like a roof to the sea)

*afes ire rahŐān olup mehveŐān*

*Olur peyker-i encüm ü āsümān*

(Moon-like beauty shine in the cage / They looks like the face of the stars and sky)

*urur ke-i gird-āb ile ār u ās*

*oyup āb-ı kegīre ‘aks-i afes*

(The twigs of the brush keep turning with the effect of the current / It looks like the cage of the strainer on the water)

The pavilion located at the edge of the sea does not serve anything other than adding visuality to the narrative. Or the small water pool in front of the sea is just there. Atā’ī only asks us to see it, he just tries to show it and does not try to make it part of any other narrative. Or the twigs collected by the foam of the vortex of the water are only there as an image. When we turn our gaze towards the middle of the Bosphorus a little further from the edge of the sea, a lively view awaits us this time.

*MeŐāyılı gelür huy ile hāy ile*

*Geer her biri zıkr-i deryā ile*

(Sheikhs come with hilarious sounds / Each one passes by chanting the sea)

*Dili ‘arif-āsā olur pür-ürūŐ*

*Gelür ol hevā ile deryāya cūş*

(From their intense enthusiasm, the sea comes to enthusiasm with the wind)

*Gehī Mevlevīler ki seyrān ider*

*Gelüp ol kenāri neyistān ider*

(Sometimes Mevlevis wander the sea / When they come, the seaside turns into reeds)

*Deler lüccenüñ bağrını ol nevā*

*Gelür raqşa gird-āblar cā-be-cā*

(Their voices pierce the sea / The whirlpools whirl with the effect of this sound)

*İder Gülşenīler nevā-yı garīb*

*Olur gülşen-i şoħbete ‘andelīb*

(Gülşenis make strange sounds / Their voices are nightingale in their conversation)

*Güzār eyleyüp hayl-i abdāl-ı Rūm*

*Pür eyler çerāğını haqqı’l-ı kudūm*

(Many Rum abdals pass / They fill the lamp of those who come from afar)

*Geçer gāhi ālāy ile hūblar*

*Olur zevrağ anlarla dürc-i güher*

(The beauties pass in procession / Boats become like jewelry boxes)

Atā’ī expresses a glimpse of the cultural landscape of his period while talking about the Sufi groups such as the *Mevlevis*, *Gülşenis* and *Rum Abdals*, who were crossing the Bosphorus with boats. The cultural environment in which Atā’ī grew should also have an impact on these three groups. Giving detailed information about his family in *Hadaik*, Atā’ī talks about his grandfather Pīr ‘Alī’s encounters with İbrahim Gülşenī, who associates Halvetism and Mevlevism. He writes that his father, Nev’ī Efendī, was also in close contact with the Sufi circles, and that he entered these circles with his father when he was a child, learning about them from his father.

As it is known that the *‘Ālemnümā* which includes the above verses is known to have been written in 1617, it must have been written in Silistire, because Atā’ī was appointed as a judge there at the beginning of 1617, where he remained until June 1620. Therefore, these Sufi groups passing through the Bosphorus signal remembering a potentially

bygone environment. Merleau-Ponty says that the landscape presented to us is accepted as the center of the world by our body and perception. Thus, geography is not determined by politics, but by the individual. However, this view does not necessarily have to be the view of our life. "Although I stay here, I may be elsewhere." (Merleau-Ponty 2016, 350). This situation points to the interiority that Karatani mentioned in the previous section and is similar to the mood of a person isolated from his environment.

When we look at the *‘Ālemnümā* from the phenomenological window opened by Merleau-Ponty, we encounter the following couplet.

*İki al‘a kim birbirine baar*

*Biribirine ‘āık olmuş meer*

(Two castles look at each other / Fall in love with each other)

The first thing we encounter is the gaze of two castles that fall in love with each other. It is not difficult to understand at first glance that these two castles facing each other are likened to love. In a literature where there is always love in its center and everything is connected with love, this is a dominant analogy. But in these verses, there is another gaze apart from the two castles facing each other. This is a seeing that links the two castles with the bridge of love. With this view, in order to look at the Rumelian and Anatolian Fortresses on both sides of the Bosphorus, we need to open towards the middle of the two. Without this distance, we can see neither these castles looking at each other nor the two castles in the perspective. For these perspectives to emerge, distance is required. This distance is homogeneous for the distance required for the appearance of the landscape. This distance means not only the distance between the two objects, but a third view as well: the subject's distance. *Ātā‘ī* no longer needs to go to the middle of the sea to depict this scene. The distance to the landscape allows it to be reproduced again and again in a mental state of remembrance.

As Richard Sennett has stated, reading the history of societies according to proximity and distance relationships with the place they live in allows us to reveal the relationships we were not aware of (Sennett 2002, 203). While *Ātā‘ī* reflects an obvious feature of the mentality of his age by trying to understand objects by analogy, the distance between these objects can create an environment both to see his period and to trace a confusion that even *Ātā‘ī* was not aware of.



In order to understand the Ottoman mentality world until the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, it is necessary to take into account the basic resources that fed this mentality. Since mentality structures are constantly changing, one should focus on a shorter period in the context of the subject. I think that it would be appropriate to try to understand Ottoman society at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, at least through ınālīzāde ‘Alī Efendī’s *Ahlāk-ı Alāī* in the context of Istanbul and its surroundings. This voluminous book of morals, written in 1564 and known for its important place in scientific circles, presents important signs of the perception forms of its period.

*Ahlāk-ı Alāī*, which ınālīzāde ‘Alī Efendī’s derived from previous moral books and updated according to his own time, is the basic premise of family, society and state order through a single understanding of existence. This idea of integrity originated by the order of existence established an integral relationship between different levels of existence and the branches of science. The work provides formulas on how the world should be perceived as a result of this idea of integrity, by examining how nature and moral problems should be handled under the same philosophical framework. The "world", a subject of cosmological research, went beyond its material features and became a "whole" that enables conceptual abstraction. Cosmology treats existence, the earth and the sky as part of this whole. Beings, from trees to mountains, from the sky and animals to the four elements, make sense with reference to this "whole". In other words, the universe becomes an “intelligible” entity only when it is comprehended as a whole. According to the idea of "big circle of being" that ınālīzāde calls *dairetu'l-vücūd*, everything that exists is related to each other (Kalın 2010, 26).

The examples I gave above from the *‘Alemlümā* offer signs of getting out of these codes suggested by the *Ahlāk-ı Alāī* in terms of Atā’ī’s understanding of the world. However, Atā’ī, as someone who is not completely out of his age, perceives the world in terms of similarities as seen in the world or in his other works. This is why castles are compared to human beings.

In order for Atā’ī’s descriptions to relate to the seeing and their landscape quality, the way of seeing must change. What I tried to show in this thesis is that the first signs of this change of seeing appeared in Atā’ī’s work, and the *‘Alemlümā* in particular. This is

directly related to a change in mentality. However, this statement should not allow generalizations –this change should be read in historical continuity based on a poet who wrote his works at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Mentality worlds, shaped by cultural and social history, are formed by the effect of many different paradigms. Reading these movements through a linear progression can lead to new misunderstandings. Here, a single person living in a limited time period is mentioned. Whether this may have historical continuity is possible by bringing together similar studies.

## CONCLUSION

The question of this thesis arose while I was working on a fictional film project about Evliya Çelebi. I had to postpone that project, but some questions I asked during that period had a significant impact on the formation of this thesis. The question was; How did someone who lived in the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century see? At first, I was surprised and belittled this question that came to my mind. We think that the actions and things that are the most fundamental part of our lives are always the same as they are today. But when we go back even a hundred years, we find with amazement that they were happening very differently from today.

The thesis was based on a simple question I asked about the historicity of the act of seeing, but the elements that form its main framework and material were shaped with my studies in the field of Turkish Language and Literature. Like many people who learned about classical Turkish literature in high school, my first impression of this literature was that it contained difficult and boring lyrical and epic topics. The classes I took during my undergraduate education showed the opposite of this situation.

First of all, an artwork reflects the characteristics of the time and space it comes out of. This is the case for all art forms. The dimensions and contents of this situation vary, but if we want to understand the lives of people who lived in the past, artworks must be one of the materials we should look at. This is also true for understanding Ottoman society and culture. The signs hidden inside the works of art enable us to see the cultures and societies that we are trying to understand in a holistic way. In this way, we can visualize people who lived at some point in history not as fossilized elements, but as real, living people.

The question of how someone who lived within the Ottoman borders of the seventeenth century sees and how he perceives his surroundings and his surroundings with this act of seeing began to strain my mind again when I was reading Nev'izāde Atā'ī's *Divan*. When I examined the *ghazals* on the *Divan*, I realized that Atā'ī used many new words. This is the beginning of my interest to him. This interest led me to his *Hamse*.

Atā'ī's *Hamse*, of which I can only focus on his first *masnavi*, '*Ālemnümā*, in this thesis, is a very important example of a literary work reflecting the characteristics of his time and society. By examining Atā'ī's work in terms of style and content, I focused on his ways of seeing. But the topics in the book deserve much more study. Studies on Atā'ī, who grew up in the center of Ottoman urban life and had various experiences in different social communities, will enable us to ask different questions and get answers about that period.

When we attempt to analyze works of art in terms of social and cultural history, we must first solve the method problem. First of all, a work of art is a representation. Hence it contains a circumlocution. It is a difficult task to analyze the work without understanding what this representation corresponds to. My main difficulty in this thesis process was related to the method. What kind of a way was I supposed to follow in order to extract marks about the way of seeing from a written text? At this point, I was interested in phenomenology and hermeneutics for a long time. Although these two methods provide an important opportunity to understand the written statements visually, it is necessary to be careful during the examination. Because when you wander around the field of interpretation, the possibilities can appear as truth to your mind. I must clearly state that although I try to be very careful, there may be such a danger in this thesis as well.

In this thesis, I tried to find the traces of Atā'ī's way of seeing, and I claim that these traces show him difference that is briefly as follows: Atā'ī perceives what he sees in their own objectivity. I have to underline the traces. Because I do not claim that Atā'ī saw the environment in a completely different way than other people of his age. But I think the difference in Atā'ī may be worth research.

The one of the other main questions of this thesis is *why*. Why Atā'ī showed different perceptions through seeing in the time and place he was in. Hans Belting and Kojin Karatani have made a significant contribution to the questions I seek to answer in this

thesis, with the answers they sought to questions about seeing. Hans Belting states that there is an important distinction in the way of seeing in eastern and western societies that is formed through perspective. The emergence of perspective, which is generally discussed through painting, has been effective in the formation of modern society and even modern institutions. Hans Belting examines the issue of perspective from the perspective of art and cultural history. But I have to point out that before Hans Belting, my curiosity and questions about the way of seeing and the relationship of perspective came from Ervin Panofsky and Pavel Florenski.

Kojin Karatani had a great influence in my choice of Atā'ī's literary text as the subject of a question about the way of seeing. Karatani established a relationship between the formation of modern Japanese literature and the *sansui* painting and placed the emergence of perspective at the center of this relationship. A similar relationship can be established between the Ottoman painting and literature in terms of changes that have occurred in these art forms. I see this parallel in this thesis as I focus only on the first half of the seventeenth century. Because there may be a relationship between new subjects and real people entering the Ottoman painting in a new style and the new expression style seen in Atā'ī. But other studies are needed to understand its historical continuity or discontinuity.

Why questions can be easily extended in a dialectic. The effect of the transformation of a painting technique that emerged with the Renaissance into a cultural phenomenon on the way of seeing may provide some clues about the reasons for the way of seeing in Atā'ī, but this is not enough. The historical conditions of Atā'ī's period offer us other answers at this point.

The seventeenth century, which was a period of crisis and transformation not only in the Ottoman Empire but throughout the world, had significant effects on Ottoman culture and society. The emergence of urbanization is one of them. Atā'ī's birth and growth in Istanbul must have enabled him to interact directly with this urbanization phenomenon. Urbanization means innovation and speed in a way. As the city grows and develops, many new things happen. These new things cause both curiosity and confusion. It is possible to see them in Atā'ī.

The main feature of the difference in Atā'ī's way of seeing is that it offers signs of seeing the object independently from other references. I think there may be a relationship

between this situation, which can be summarized as the perception of the apparent reality as it is, and the reasons of the fight between the Sufi groups of the period and the *Ḳādīzādelīs* movement that emerged in this period. This religious movement rejected symbolic and metaphorical interpretations of understanding religion. Instead, they claimed that that religious principles should be perceived with their meanings on the conditions where basic texts emerged. This understanding actually perceives religion on a material level. Although it is seen as a contradiction in the context of Atā'ī, which is known to be in close relations with Sufi groups, which especially *Ḳādīzādelīs* oppose, in fact, the change in his way of seeing has caused the world to be perceived on a material level. Therefore, I think the root causes of these two situations may be common.

Another factor that reveals the differences in Atā'ī's way of seeing is the landscape. This determination, which I made based on Kojin Karatani, has two dimensions. First of all, the difference in the way of seeing enabled the landscape to appear in his gaze. The second is that this gaze, which requires the separation of object and subject, presents the first signs of the birth of the individual and the interiority.

In order to understand what these new elements and differences that emerged in Atā'ī differ mentally from, Ḳınālīzāde 'Alī Efendī's work, *Ahlak-ı Alaī* can be a point of reference. This book, which contains the basic elements of earlier moral books, summarizes the cosmological elements that formed the Ottoman mental world. The essence of this cosmology is the perception of existence as a whole. Everything that exists is part of the main existence, God. A separation from the unity makes them incomplete. There is no distinction between object and subject in this understanding. Atā'ī's differentiation is here. Atā'ī's narrative style contains signs that the world is perceived on the basis of object and subject distinction. These signs make me think that there are signs of subjectivity and individuality in Atā'ī.

The proposals I put forward in this thesis, which I try to understand how Atā'ī sees through his *Ālemnümā*, also contain important questions. In order to understand more precisely the validity of these proposals and, more importantly, whether they point to a social and cultural reality, different sources on this subject should be approached with similar questions.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Açıl, Berat. 2013. *Klasik Türk Edebiyatının Alegori*. İstanbul: Küre Publishing.
- Ali, Samer M. 2010. *Arabic Literary Salons in the Islamic Middle Ages*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Akdağ, Mustafa. 2018. *Türkiye'nin İctimai ve İktisadi Tarihi*. İstanbul: YKY.
- Andrews, Walter G. and Mehmet Kalpaklı. 2006. *The Age of Beloveds: Love and Beloved in Early Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society*. Duke University Press.
- Arslan, Mehmet. 2012. *Sakinameler*. İstanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Artan, Tülay. 1993. "Mahremiyet: Mahrumiyetin Resmi". *Defter 20 (Bahar-Yaz)*: 91-115.
- Atay, Hakan. 2003. *Hevesname'de Aşk Oyunu: Tacizade Cafer Çelebi'nin Özgünlük İdeali*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Bilkent University.
- Atik, Kayhan. 2000. "17. Yüzyıl Aydınlarına Göre İlmiye Teşkilatındaki Çözölmeye İlişkin Tespit ve Teklifler" *bilig-14/Yaz*: 31-53.
- Aynur, Hatice. 2015. "Şehri Sözle Resmetmek: Osmanlı Edebi Metinlerinde İstanbul (XV- XVII. Yüzyıllar)". *Büyük İstanbul Tarihi (7)*: 128-145.
- 2015. "Tatavlı Mahremi'nin Şehnamesinde Şehirler". *M. Ali Tanyeri'nin Anısına Makaleler*. İstanbul: Ülke Yayınları: 201-214
- Bağcı, Serpil, Filiz Çağman, Günsel Renda, Zeren Tanındı. 2006. *Osmanlı Resim Sanatı*. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Başpınar, Fatih. 2018. "17. yy. Şairi Beyânî'nin Tasavvufi Sâkînâme'si" *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*.
- Belting, Hans. 2011. *Florence and Baghdad: Renaissance Art and Arab Science*. Tr. Deborah Lucas Schneider. Belknap Press.
- Berger, John. 2008. *Ways of Seeing*. Penguin.
- Bilkan, Ali Fuat. 2019. *Fakihler ve Sofuların Kavgası*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Bryson, Norman. 1983. *Vision and Painting: The Logic of the Gaze*. Yale University Press.
- Burckhardt, Titus. 2009. *Art of Islam: Language and Meaning*. World Wisdom.

- Canım, Rıdvan. 1998. *Türk Edebiyatında Sakinameler ve İşretname*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Cerasi, Maurice. 2008. "Istanbul 1620-1750: Change and Tradition", *The City in Islamic World I*, ed. H. Altenmüller vd., Brill: 465-489.
- Çalış, Bahar Deniz. 2004. *Ideal and Real Spaces of Ottoman Imagination: Continuity and Change in Ottoman Rituals of Poetry*. Middle East Technical University. Unpublished PhD Thesis.
- Darnton, Robert. 1999. *The Great Cat Massacre: And Other Episodes in French Cultural History*. Basic Books.
- Değirmenci, Tülün. 2012. *İktidar Oyunları ve Resimli Kitaplar*. İstanbul, Kitap Yayınevi.
- Donuk, Suat. 2017. *Nevzade Atayi - Hadâ'iku'l-Hakâ'ik fî Tekmile-ti'-Ş-Şakâ'ik*. Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı.
- Ekinci, Ramazan. 2018. *Şeyhi Mehmed Efendi - Vekayi'ul Fuzala*. Vol. 3. Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı.
- Erzen, Jale. 2012. *Çoğul Estetik*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Farago, France. 2006. *Sanat*. Tr Özcan Doğan. Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- Fetvacı, Emine. 2013. *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court*. Indiana University Press.
- Gibb, E. J. Wilkinson. 1904. *A History of Ottoman Poetry*. Vol. 1. London.
- Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. 1945. *Divan Edebiyatı Beyanındadır*. İstanbul: Marmara Kitabevi.
- Grabar, Oleg. 2010. *İslam Sanatının Oluşumu*. Tr. Nuran Yavuz. İstanbul: Kanat Kitap.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. 1980. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Griswold, William J. 1983. *The Great Anatolian Rebellion 1000–1020 / 1591–1611*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag.
- Holbrook, Victoria R. 1994. *The Unreadable Shores of Love: Turkish Modernity and Mystic Romance*. University of Texas.
- 1999. "Alegorinin Ölümü, Hüsn ü Aşk'ın Özgünlüğü" *Osmanlı Divan Şiiri Üzerine Metinler*. Ed. Mehmet Kalpaklı. İstanbul: YKY: 403-413.
- İpekten, Haluk. 1991. *Nev'izâde Atâî*, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (4). İstanbul: 40-42.
- İpşirli, Mehmet. 1988. "Osmanlı İlmiye Mesleği Hakkında Gözlemler ( XVI - XVII. Asırlar)" *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* (VII-VIII): 273-285.



- İpşiroğlu, Mazhar and Nazan İpşiroğlu. 2017. *Oluşum Süreci İçinde Sanatın Tarihi*. İstanbul: Hayalperest Yayınevi.
- Kadioğlu, Yahya, Yusuf Yılmaz. 2017. "Küçük Buzul Çağı, Kuraklık ve Diğer Coğrafi Olayların Celali İsyanları Üzerindeki Etkileri." *Studies of the Ottoman Domain* (8): 267-288.
- Kafadar, Cemal. 1989. "Self and Others: The Diary of a Dervish in Seventeenth Century Istanbul and First-Person Narratives in Ottoman Literature." *Studia Islamica* (69): 121-50.
- 2007. "A Rome of One's Own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum" *Muqarnas* (24): 7-25.
- Kalın, İbrahim. 2010. "Dünya Görüşü, Varlık Tasavvuru ve Düzen Fikri: Medeniyet Kavramına Giriş" *Dîvân Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi* (29): 1-61
- Karaköse, Saadet. 1994. *Nevi-zade Atayi Divanı (Kısmi Tahlil Metin)*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. İnönü University.
- Karatani, Kojin. 1998. *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*. Duke University Press.
- Kaya, Bayram Ali. 2000. Azmizade Haleti'nin Sakinamesi. *Journal of Turkish Studies, In Memoriam Agâh Sırrı Levend* (24/II): 59-106
- Kortantamer, Tunca. 1997. *Nevizade Atayi ve Hamsesi*. İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Kudret, Cevdet. 1999. "Divan Şiirine Uzaktan Merhaba". *Osmanlı Divan Şiiri Üzerine Metinler*. Ed. Mehmet Kalpaklı. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları: 164-170.
- Kuzubaş, Muhammet. 2007. *Atâi'nin Âlemnümâ (Sâkînâme) Mesnevisinin Karşılaştırmalı Metni ve Konu Bakımından İncelenmesi*. Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, unpublished PhD Thesis.
- Levend, Agah Sırrı. 2015. *Divan Edebiyatı*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.
- Losensky, Paul. 2016. "SĀQĪ-NĀME," *Encyclopædia Iranica*. online edition. Available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/saqi-nama-book> (accessed on 20 July 2020).
- 2017. "ZOHURI TORŞIZI," *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition. Available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/zohuri-torshizi> (accessed on 22 August 2020).
- Marleu-Ponty, Maurice. 2016. *Alginın Fenomenolojisi*. Tr. Emine Sarıkartal and Eylem Hacımuratoğlu. İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları.
- Mitchell, W.J.T. 1980. *The Language of Images*. University of Chicago Press.
- Necipoğlu, Gülru. 2015. "The Scrutinizing Gaze in The Aesthetic of Islamic Visual Cultures: Sight, Insight and Desire". *Muqarnas* (32): 23-61.

- Niyaziođlu, Aslı. 2017. *Dreams and Lives in Ottoman Istanbul: A Seventeenth Century Biographer's Perspective*. Routledge.
- Öz, Mehmet. 2005. *Osmanlı'da "Çözülme" ve Gelenekçi Yorumlar*. İstanbul: Dergah Yay.
- Panofsky, Ervin. 1982. *Renaissance And Renascences In Western Art*. Routledge.
- Pfeifer, Helen. 2015. "Encounter after the Conquest: Scholarly Gatherings in 16<sup>th</sup> Century Ottoman Damascus". *International Journal of Middle East Studies* (47): 219 - 239.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 2011. *Zaman Olayörgüsü Üçlü Mimesis*. Tr. Mehmet Rifat and Sema Rifat. İstanbul: YKY.
- Sandywell, Barry. 1998. "Specular Grammar: The Visual Rhetoric of Modernity, Interpreting Visual Culture: Explorations" *Hermeneutics of Vision*. Routledge: 31-57.
- Sennett, Richard. 2011. *Ten ve Taş*. tr Tuncay Birkan. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Şentürk, A. Atilla. 1999. "Osmanlı Şairlerinin Gözlemciliđi ve Klasik Edebiyatımızda Realiteye Dair" *Osmanlı Divan Şiiri Üzerine Metinler*. Ed. Mehmet Kalpaklı. İstanbul: YKY: 431-438.
- Şimşekler, Nuri. 2013. *Zuhûrî-i Türşizi*. Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (44): 505-506.
- Taylor, Richard. 2001. *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Harvard University Press.
- Tezcan, Baki. 2010. *The Second Ottoman Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tezcan, Nuran. 2010. "Sebeb-i Teliflere Göre Mesnevi Edebiyatının Tarihsel Dönüşümü" *Dođu Batı Osmanlılar Özel Sayısı II*: 49-75.
- Uzun, Mustafa İsmet. 1998. *Hilye*. Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (18): 47-51
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. 1984. *Osmanlı Tarihi* (3). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
- White, Sam. 2011. *The Climate of Rebellion in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yalçinkaya, Şerife. 2018. "Nev'izade Atai'nin Nefhatü'l-Ezhar Mesnevisindeki Mevsimler Hikayesi" *Turkish Studies* (13/12): 713-725.
- Yaşar, Ahmet. 2018. *Osmanlı Kahvehaneleri*. İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi.

Zilfi, Madeline C. 2008. *Dindarlık Siyaseti, Osmanlı Uleması, Klasik Sonrası Dönem*.  
Tr. Mehmet Faruk Özçınar. Ankara: Birleşik Yayınları.