

MANNERS AND IDENTITY IN LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ISTANBUL

SAYGIN SALGIRLI

FEBRUARY 2003

MANNERS AND IDENTITY IN LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ISTANBUL

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
OF  
SABANCI UNIVERSITY

BY  
SAYGIN SALGIRLI

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

IN  
HISTORY

FEBRUARY 2003

Approval of the Institute of Social Sciences

\_\_\_\_\_  
Professor Muhittin Oral  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Art.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Professor Ahmet Alkan  
Dean

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Assistant Professor Ahmet Ersoy  
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Associate Professor Tülay Artan

\_\_\_\_\_

Assistant Professor Hülya Canbakal

\_\_\_\_\_

© Saygın Salgırılı  
All Rights Reserved

## ABSTRACT

### MANNERS AND IDENTITY IN LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ISTANBUL

Saygın Salgırlı

M.A., History

Supervisor: Assistant Professor Ahmet Ersoy

February 2003

The following is a thesis on how manners contributed to the construction and maintenance of a male, urbanite identity in late seventeenth century Istanbul. The main theme being that, the arguments are based upon and derived from two main theories or perspectives. These are, first the history of manners literature and secondly theories of identity construction and politics of identity. Within the latter group, a special emphasis is given to manhood and masculinity studies. The three main primary sources used are *Meva 'Idü'n-Nefais Fi-Kava 'Idi'l-Mecalis* by Gelibolulu Mustafa 'Ali, a seventeenth century "book of curses" (or *beddua albümü*) by a certain Hacı Ahmed, written in Yanya (Ioannina); and a second, but this time anonymous, book of curses from the Istanbul of late seventeenth century (*Risale-i Garibe* as published by Hayati Develi in 1998). The main argument posed is that from the seventeenth century onwards, the elite strata of Ottoman society experienced increasing penetrations from the newly rich classes and this led to the emergence of the book of curses genre as an aggressive and reactionary literature. Correspondingly, "admission" to the elite culture, and survival within it, depended upon compliance to proper manners. However, due to the changing nature of this elite culture, the concern of the books of curses expanded to include people from all walks of life, and therefore, when *Risale-i Garibe* is concerned, almost all of Istanbul.

## ÖZ / ÖZET

### GEÇ ONYEDİNCİ YÜZYIL İSTANBUL'UNDA ADAPLAR VE KİMLİK

Saygın Salgırlı

Yüksek Lisans, Tarih

Tez Yöneticisi: Yard. Doç. Dr. Ahmet Ersoy

Şubat 2003

Ekteki tez, adapların geç onyedinci yüzyıl İstanbul'unda şehirli erkek kimliğinin oluşturulması ve korunması aşamalarındaki katkısı üzerine bir çalışmadır. Bu nedenle iki temel teori ya da görüş üzerine kurulmuştur. Bunları, öncelikle adap tarihi literatürü ve ardından kimlik oluşurumu ve siyaseti teorileri olarak sıralayabiliriz. İkinci grup içinde özellikle erkek kimliği çalışmaları üzerinde durulmuştur. Kullanılan temel birincil kaynaklar sırasıyla Gelibolulu Mustafa 'Ali'nin *Meva 'Idü'n-Nefais Fi-Kava 'Idi'l-Mecalis*'i, Hacı Ahmed tarafından Yanya'da yazılmış bir onyedinci yüzyıl beddua albümü ve geç onyedinci yüzyıl İstanbul'undan, bu sefer anonim, bir başka beddua albümüdür; ki bu 1998 yılında Hayati Develi tarafından *Risale-i Garibe* adıyla basılmıştır. Tezin temel argümanı, onyedinci yüzyıldan itibaren Osmanlı toplumunun elit kesimlerinin yeni zenginleşen zümrelerin gittikçe artan oranda katılımına maruz kaldığı ve beddua albümü literatürünün bu çerçevede saldırgan ve tepkisel bir tür olarak ortaya çıktığıdır. Bu bağlamda, elit kültürüne dahil olabilme ve bu kültür içinde tutunabilme adaplara ne kadar uyulduğuna bağlı hale gelmiştir. Ancak elit kültürünün değişen doğası itibariyle beddua albümleri hayatın her kesiminden insan gruplarını ve dolayısıyla, *Risale-i Garibe* söz konusu olduğunda, neredeyse tüm İstanbul'u kapsamaktadırlar.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

First, I would liked to thank my thesis supervisor Ahmet Ersoy for supporting me throughout my research, and helping me develop my thesis from an entirely different project into its current form.

I am also grateful to my jurors Hülya Canbakal and Tülay Artan who have been of great help, and whose advices contributed a lot to the shaping of this thesis.

Although he was not an active party in this thesis project, a special thanks goes to Halil Berktaş, who supported me throughout my studies at the Sabancı University M.A. program in history.

Finally, I would like to thank all my colleagues and friends who made my graduate life a pleasing experience.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1-2
1. A Problem of Definition: The Ottomans, The Elites and The Commoners .....	2-5
2. A Problem of Identification: Regions, Nations and Identities .....	5-8
3. Empire Building and Ideology .....	8-11
4. Identity Construction, Others and Ottomanization .....	11-15
5. Courtesy, Manners and Identity .....	15-18
6. Sources and Problems .....	18-22
CHAPTER 1: MANNERS FOR WHOM: AN ANALYSIS OF THE SOURCE ...	23-26
1. Geography and Chronology .....	26-31
2. The Author .....	31-39
3. The Audience .....	39-43
CHAPTER 2: A CHANGING <i>KIBAR</i> CULTURE? .....	44-46
1. A Possible Continuity: Risale-i Garibe, Makale-i Garibe and Meva ‘Idü’n – Nefais Fi Kava ‘Idi’l – Mecalıs .....	46-57
2. A Possible Change: Risale-i Garibe and Makale-i Garibe .....	57-66
CHAPTER 3: BEING A MAN IN LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ISTANBUL .....	67-85
CONCLUSION .....	86-88
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	89-92

MANNERS AND IDENTITY IN LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ISTANBUL

SAYGIN SALGIRLI

FEBRUARY 2003

MANNERS AND IDENTITY IN LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ISTANBUL

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
OF  
SABANCI UNIVERSITY

BY  
SAYGIN SALGIRLI

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

IN  
HISTORY

FEBRUARY 2003

Approval of the Institute of Social Sciences

\_\_\_\_\_  
Professor Muhittin Oral  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Art.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Professor Ahmet Alkan  
Dean

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Assistant Professor Ahmet Ersoy  
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Associate Professor Tülay Artan

\_\_\_\_\_

Assistant Professor Hülya Canbakal

\_\_\_\_\_

© Saygın Salgırılı  
All Rights Reserved

## ABSTRACT

### MANNERS AND IDENTITY IN LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ISTANBUL

Saygın Salgırlı

M.A., History

Supervisor: Assistant Professor Ahmet Ersoy

February 2003

The following is a thesis on how manners contributed to the construction and maintenance of a male, urbanite identity in late seventeenth century Istanbul. The main theme being that, the arguments are based upon and derived from two main theories or perspectives. These are, first the history of manners literature and secondly theories of identity construction and politics of identity. Within the latter group, a special emphasis is given to manhood and masculinity studies. The three main primary sources used are *Meva 'Idü'n-Nefais Fi-Kava 'Idi'l-Mecalis* by Gelibolulu Mustafa 'Ali, a seventeenth century "book of curses" (or *beddua albümü*) by a certain Hacı Ahmed, written in Yanya (Ioannina); and a second, but this time anonymous, book of curses from the Istanbul of late seventeenth century (*Risale-i Garibe* as published by Hayati Develi in 1998). The main argument posed is that from the seventeenth century onwards, the elite strata of Ottoman society experienced increasing penetrations from the newly rich classes and this led to the emergence of the book of curses genre as an aggressive and reactionary literature. Correspondingly, "admission" to the elite culture, and survival within it, depended upon compliance to proper manners. However, due to the changing nature of this elite culture, the concern of the books of curses expanded to include people from all walks of life, and therefore, when *Risale-i Garibe* is concerned, almost all of Istanbul.

## ÖZ / ÖZET

### GEÇ ONYEDİNCİ YÜZYIL İSTANBUL'UNDA ADAPLAR VE KİMLİK

Saygın Salgırlı

Yüksek Lisans, Tarih

Tez Yöneticisi: Yard. Doç. Dr. Ahmet Ersoy

Şubat 2003

Ekteki tez, adapların geç onyedinci yüzyıl İstanbul'unda şehirli erkek kimliğinin oluşturulması ve korunması aşamalarındaki katkısı üzerine bir çalışmadır. Bu nedenle iki temel teori ya da görüş üzerine kurulmuştur. Bunları, öncelikle adap tarihi literatürü ve ardından kimlik oluşurumu ve siyaseti teorileri olarak sıralayabiliriz. İkinci grup içinde özellikle erkek kimliği çalışmaları üzerinde durulmuştur. Kullanılan temel birincil kaynaklar sırasıyla Gelibolulu Mustafa 'Ali'nin *Meva 'Idü'n-Nefais Fi-Kava 'Idi'l-Mecalis*'i, Hacı Ahmed tarafından Yanya'da yazılmış bir onyedinci yüzyıl beddua albümü ve geç onyedinci yüzyıl İstanbul'undan, bu sefer anonim, bir başka beddua albümüdür; ki bu 1998 yılında Hayati Develi tarafından *Risale-i Garibe* adıyla basılmıştır. Tezin temel argümanı, onyedinci yüzyıldan itibaren Osmanlı toplumunun elit kesimlerinin yeni zenginleşen zümrelerin gittikçe artan oranda katılımına maruz kaldığı ve beddua albümü literatürünün bu çerçevede saldırgan ve tepkisel bir tür olarak ortaya çıktığıdır. Bu bağlamda, elit kültürüne dahil olabilme ve bu kültür içinde tutunabilme adaplara ne kadar uyulduğuna bağlı hale gelmiştir. Ancak elit kültürünün değişen doğası itibariyle beddua albümleri hayatın her kesiminden insan gruplarını ve dolayısıyla, *Risale-i Garibe* söz konusu olduğunda, neredeyse tüm İstanbul'u kapsamaktadırlar.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

First, I would liked to thank my thesis supervisor Ahmet Ersoy for supporting me throughout my research, and helping me develop my thesis from an entirely different project into its current form.

I am also grateful to my jurors Hülya Canbakal and Tülay Artan who have been of great help, and whose advices contributed a lot to the shaping of this thesis.

Although he was not an active party in this thesis project, a special thanks goes to Halil Berktaş, who supported me throughout my studies at the Sabancı University M.A. program in history.

Finally, I would like to thank all my colleagues and friends who made my graduate life a pleasing experience.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1-2
1. A Problem of Definition: The Ottomans, The Elites and The Commoners .....	2-5
2. A Problem of Identification: Regions, Nations and Identities .....	5-8
3. Empire Building and Ideology .....	8-11
4. Identity Construction, Others and Ottomanization .....	11-15
5. Courtesy, Manners and Identity .....	15-18
6. Sources and Problems .....	18-22
CHAPTER 1: MANNERS FOR WHOM: AN ANALYSIS OF THE SOURCE ...	23-26
1. Geography and Chronology .....	26-31
2. The Author .....	31-39
3. The Audience .....	39-43
CHAPTER 2: A CHANGING <i>KIBAR</i> CULTURE? .....	44-46
1. A Possible Continuity: Risale-i Garibe, Makale-i Garibe and Meva ‘Idü’n – Nefais Fi Kava ‘Idi’l – Mecalis .....	46-57
2. A Possible Change: Risale-i Garibe and Makale-i Garibe .....	57-66
CHAPTER 3: BEING A MAN IN LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ISTANBUL .....	67-85
CONCLUSION .....	86-88
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	89-92

## INTRODUCTION

The recent trend in identity studies and its applicability to history writing has been an extensively European phenomenon, and Ottoman studies have been left out of this domain. This has, of course, very practical reasons. First of all, most of these studies concentrated on Early Modern Europe, a period, which experienced a transformation into what we may broadly call the modern state. As a parallel development, Europeans also saw the emergence of something called the nation. Although, this was extensively different from our current understanding of the term, it still denoted a closed and ideally uniform entity. Therefore, it was more or less within this period that the people began to talk about their Englishness and Frenchness, and since it was the Europeans of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that talked about the characters of the English, it was perfectly legitimate for modern scholars to look back at that period and try to see the nature of these identities that were being constructed. However, and very rightfully, no scholar ever tried to question the “Habsburgness” of the people, and similarly no scholar ever tried to search for a uniform Ottoman identity. This was both because, due to their nature as empires, these entities challenged the very idea of uniformity and sameness, and because no Ottoman intellectual, at least in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, had the idea of a single Ottoman culture, which would go beyond his class and embody the whole “Ottoman nation.” However, the presence of these problems does not necessarily mean that identity studies cannot be applied to Ottoman history. There may not be a single Ottoman identity, and people in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries may not perceive the idea of an identity in the way that we do today, but this does not suggest that they did not have identities. As long as the problems are well put forth and the necessary limitations are made, Ottoman history may well take its part in identity studies.

In the following pages I will try to show how a male urbanite identity was constructed and maintained through manners, in late seventeenth century Istanbul. Therefore, focusing basically on manners, I will be limiting myself to only one aspect of

identity construction, and since I will look at primarily the late seventeenth century Istanbul and its male population, I will be concentrating on a particular period and a particular group of people. However, before moving forth, there are certain points that require clarification. These are both related to the general problems concerning the relation between Ottoman history and identity studies, and to the method and the perspective, which I will be using.

### **1. A Problem of Definition: The Ottomans, The Elites and The Commoners:**

For almost two decades, Blackwell Books have been publishing a series of studies on what might be called the peoples of Europe. These works such as *The Basks*, *The Goths*, *The Franks*, *The English* etc. can be regarded as the basic introductory books for those interested in the histories of these peoples, and they all open with the primary question of *who* the Goths, the Franks or the English were. In Ottoman history too there have been similar attempts, and what has come down to us as the Köprülü – Wittek debate is actually nothing more than an outstanding effort to solve the very same problem. Who were the Ottomans? What were their origins? Were their actions motivated by the Islamic *gaza* or by the Turco-Mongolian tribal tradition? To what extent were they influenced by Byzantine, Sasanid and Arabo-Islamic institutions? This almost seventy year old debate was then deeper excavated and further extended with the help of newcomers such as Halil İnalcık, Rudi Lindner and most recently Cemal Kafadar. However, compared to, say, the Franks, the Ottoman case presents a fundamentally distinct problem. While “Frank” refers to a people, “Ottoman” refers to a dynasty; and all the above remarkable studies sought a definition of that dynasty. With its administration, its methods of conquest and its concept of sovereignty, they tried to relate the Ottoman dynasty to the historical realities that surrounded it. Hence, it was primarily the elements which made up the “Ottomanness” of the dynasty that were brought to light, and this basically determined the identity of a small elite at the highest strata of the society. However, even in its restricted form as a dynasty, the definition of “Ottoman” embodied enough complexities and problems, which is in a way evident in the long

duration of this debate. Nevertheless, with its court rituals, ceremonies and manners, this dynastic identity – despite all its uncertainties – also structured itself as an ideal for the members of the ruling elite, and therefore it determined the first prerequisite of being Ottoman in its most politically correct form. That is, being part of the dynasty either as its member or as its servant, but in both cases, with a high feeling of belonging which brings along the full acceptance of its norms and customs. Although, such a formulation is an oversimplified and still a problematic one, to avoid further confusions and due to a necessity of standardization, this will be the definition, which I will stick to when I refer to the Ottomans.

In *Ottoman Empire and Islamic Tradition* Norman Itzkowitz writes about a group called “the true Ottomans.” Here, the term Ottoman does not have a solely dynastic meaning, but also a cultural one and defines an elite minority within the *askeri* class. To be a “true Ottoman”, one had to serve the state, serve the religion and “know the Ottoman way”. Knowing the Ottoman way required competency in “High Islamic Culture”, expertise in Turkish and compliance “in public to the conventional manners and customs”<sup>1</sup>. Similarly, Marcus underlines that in eighteenth century Aleppo, besides titles, ranks and dress codes, the separation between groups of high status and the rest of the society was determined by “elaborate rules of etiquette and ceremony which dictated proper behavior in different social situations<sup>2</sup>.” In both Itzkowitz and Marcus, proper behavior is taken as a requirement of high status both for someone in the central government and for a local notable. Therefore, besides a legally defined distinction between social groups, which was materialized through the dress code, we can also talk about a broader culturally defined division. Then, was this cultural “code” based on local traditions (of Aleppo as an example) or was there a common ground on which it had flourished? Suraiya Faroqhi claims that even though some pashas of the eighteenth century wanted to manage their provinces as independently as possible, in cultural

---

<sup>1</sup> Itzkowitz, Norman. *Ottoman Empire and Islamic Tradition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980, p. 60.

<sup>2</sup> Marcus, Abraham. *The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity: Aleppo in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century*. New York, 1988, p.64.

matters especially, they did not take their regions as a reference point. The provincial notables of both Anatolia and Syria looked towards Istanbul, and many of them, although they continued to speak Arabic, wrote works in the “Ottoman language” (e.g. Mustafa Naima)<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, the requirements of “true Ottomanness” – that is, “compliance in public to the conventional manners and customs” and “expertise in Turkish” – were not only valid for the small minority within the *askeri*. They were also accepted and found crucial by local notables, who, for various reasons, wanted to be as close as possible to the privileged class of Ottomans, if not to join them. These points suggest that from the seventeenth century onwards there emerged a new “elite”, which was no longer confined to Itzkowitz’s self-contained minority, and had become more complex to include various groups from the *askeri*-proper to tax farmers and merchants. However, using the term “elite”, especially when referring to this new and broad group, requires a good deal of clarification. A major problem rises from the relation between the terms *askeri* and elite, which is immediately followed by a problem of definition when the *reaya* is concerned. Being a legally determined “class”, the *askeri* would include, say, a *müderriş* from an Anatolian town, a janissary and the *bab-ü sade ağası*. Despite being members of a privileged class, and despite having ranks, would these people all pass as elites? They would certainly be distinguished members of the society, but where would our *müderriş* stand when compared to a wealthy merchant from Bursa, who, in legal terms would be a member of the tax paying *reaya*? How can we define the characteristics of an Ottoman elite class, which would be composed of people from “legally distinct” social groups, and where would we put the dividing line between this elite and the rest of the society, the commoners? These are very fundamental problems of Ottoman studies, which cannot be answered in clear-cut terms, and although manners and the Turkish language might have acted as one possible common ground for the legitimation of “membership” into the elite, they cannot function as the only social dividing line. For our purposes, economic power will be an important determinant, and besides those who have acquired social status and recognition through their ranks, I will use the term “elite” also to refer to those who had accumulated a certain amount of wealth and either bought offices/titles and became

---

<sup>3</sup> Faroqhi, Suraiya. Subjects of the Sultan: Culture and Daily Life in the Ottoman Empire. New York: I.B. Tauris, 2000, pp. 80,81.

notified, or just remained as wealthy members of the society, but still with the need and capacity to show off their economic status. Anyone, no matter how competent in Turkish and how conscious of proper manners he might have been, will be categorized as a commoner, as long as he does not have the economic means and/or the prestige to present himself within an elite *meclis*. On the other hand, since wealth and rank alone are not enough, and following the appropriate rules of conduct is also an important criterion, a second divide is also necessary. To stick to the language of our documents, this will be the one between the *kibars*, the polite or the gentlemen who followed the proper manners, and the newly rich or the *yeni zenginler/kibarlar*, who did not.

## **2. A Problem of Identification: Regions, Nations and Identities:**

Historiographies of all empires tend to suffer from a very peculiar problem that emerges from the mutual identification problem between an empire and its “nationalized” ex-subjects. As Cemal Kafadar underlines “national historiographies (indeed modern historiography in general, to the extent that it functions as the history of nations) have tended to assume more or less sealed cultural identities of peoples (Turks, Greeks, Spaniards, Arabs, etc.) who have come into contact within the framework of a larger bipolar division of equally sealed civilizational identities (East / West, Muslim / Christian, etc.)<sup>4</sup>.” Here, especially the emphasis on “a larger bipolar division” is extremely important, and that is why Kafadar considers the Spanish and the Ottoman cases to be similar. Due to such a dichotomous division of black and white, the former suffered from identification with its Muslim past, and the nation states that were formed within the boundaries of the latter (especially the Balkan states where both an East / West and a Muslim / Christian division was prevalent) had to find a way to deal with the Ottoman past. However, this historiographical dilemma has very little to do with a pure scholarly effort to explore the mutual interaction between an empire and the identities of the people that lived under its banner. It is more a problem caused by a retrospectively

---

<sup>4</sup> Kafadar, Cemal. Between Two Worlds, The Construction of the Ottoman State. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995, p. 20.

constructed and almost totally ideological perspective resulting from the identities built under the banner of the modern nation state. Therefore, within the historiography of the Ottoman Empire, there emerged a “genre” which inquired not the “Ottomanness<sup>5</sup>” of the subjects, but their Greekness, Serbness and Turkishness, which were believed to be preserved in spite of the Empire.

The problematic outlook that I have mentioned above is apparent especially in the works of the regionalist school. It is an indisputable fact that local diversities were fundamental characteristics of the Ottoman Empire; as they would be of any other empire. It is also an indisputable fact that from the seventeenth century onwards, local power groups started challenging the central government, either as local merchants or as local notable families, which in many cases overlapped. However, suggesting that with the weakening of the “totalitarian character of the state<sup>6</sup>”, local cultures finally turned to their natural development patterns (which was interrupted with Ottoman presence) is actually reasserting the existence of a national essence that helped the preservation of local identities. Then the question would be, what did exist in Aleppo, Cairo, Thessalonica, etc. prior to this *renaissance of consciousness*? Throughout the era of affective Ottoman presence, if local cultures were suppressed by the central authority, what was introduced instead of them? Even if the state did not bring along anything, would it be too awkward to suppose that the mere existence of suppression alone would open various sideways and off-tracks along the “natural development pattern” (if such a thing ever existed)? In other words, could the presence of the Ottoman state, in any given locale, have created a choice of identity, which would, when accepted by the commoners, enable us to talk about even a slight alteration in their habits and behaviors similar to that of the elite?

---

<sup>5</sup> Here, Ottomanness refers to a possible change in any local culture, which would result from Ottoman presence, and not to the transformation of the local populations into Ottomans as explained in the previous section.

<sup>6</sup> Todorov, Nikolai. *Social Structures in the Balkans During the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* in *Etudes Balkaniques* 4. Sofia, 1985, p.50. I believe that using a Cold War construct such as “totalitarian” to describe a pre-modern empire is in itself a problematic issue. This ideological composition, which eliminates all diversities and creates a single and almost theological “evil” is nothing more than the reincarnation of Oriental Despotism in a far less philosophical and far more politicized outfit.

Stoianovich mentions a peculiar “Greek” identity that was most explicitly apparent in the Balkans during the eighteenth century. This identity, as he stresses, was isolated from all ethnic connotations, and included Vlachs, Slavs, Albanians and Greeks either because they were all Orthodox (and Greek was a synonym for Orthodoxy), or because they were all merchants (and Greek was the language of commerce). For the latter possibility, Stoianovich quotes the following remarks: “a Greek was above all a peddler or merchant, and in this sense even a Jew could be a ‘Greek’<sup>7</sup>.” Such a definition provokes one to look for a similar common “language” (not literally) or a similar “religion” (again not literally) that would lead to the appearance of at least certain aspects of a common identity outside the realm of the elite and within that of the commoners. However, this should not suggest that there was a single and unifying tag, which could be attached to all members of the Ottoman society to equally define them as the fully overlapping elements of this complicated entity. Even when the elites are concerned, we would not expect one merchant from Aleppo and another from Bursa to resemble each other to the extent that we would have a single and over-arching definition of “an Ottoman elite.” On the other hand, still, any privilege that would result from being considered a *kibar*, would lead to the emergence of a common ground of minimum requirements between the two merchants – of manners for our concerns. When we talk about the influence of Ottoman presence on local cultures, the issue of reception – that is, how local populations received the Ottomans, or how they responded to them – becomes a crucial point of consideration. As we have seen, in the case of the elites, Ottomans and “the Ottoman way” could have been received as the legitimate pass into a privileged class. Beyond that, and especially for prominent merchant families, who would travel to distant lands, receive fellow merchants, or at least have connections with different trading posts, “a common language” or “a common religion” might in fact be a necessity. However, when we look at the commoners, it appears that their choice of joining a “common group” may not in fact bring along the equal privileges as that of the elite, and for a peasant in Kayseri, establishing a common ground with another peasant in Damascus would have, if any, very little advantages – even when we assume that he had

---

<sup>7</sup> Stoianovich, Traian. *The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant* in Journal of Economic History XX, 1960, p. 50.

such an idea in mind. On the other hand, this does not suggest that Ottoman presence had no influence on the commoners of different regions. Even a change in the taxation policy, or a restriction on entry into a particular artisan guild, or a re-structuring of the physical environment would have considerable influences, which might have been reflected on the manners and identities of the local populations and lead to a somehow common ground between different regions. However, such an influence is extremely difficult to detect, and for the purposes of this research, what we should keep in mind is that the “geographies” of the elite and the commoners were gravely different from each other. While “the greater Ottoman world” would have occupied little space in the mental map of a shoemaker or a peasant, for an elite it certainly existed with all its realities and requirements. Therefore, although regional diversities are always important determinants, when the commoners are concerned, they should be handled with even further care, and for a study on manners and identity where the characteristics of possibly different social groups seem to overlap, a geographical limitation is essential. This is also due to the nature of my sources, which I will deal with in detail in the following pages.

### **3. Empire Building and Ideology:**

If we are talking about first a legally defined *askeri/reaya* divide (despite all its problems and obscurities, which became even more prevalent after the seventeenth century), and then a more socio-economic elite/commoner distinction (for which I already gave my own definitions), we should also talk about different identities for the members of these social groups. If we vulgarly refer to this structure as a hierarchy of identities, then, at least for a certain period of time, at the top of this ladder, there was a group, which Itzkowitz calls “the true Ottomans.” If, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, “knowing their way” did really become an important factor in the creation of the new elite, then, we should now look at the process out which the idea of true Ottomanness might have emerged. This may enable us to draw a better picture of how this idea might have functioned in the construction and preservation of identities in the Ottoman Empire. Since the first glimpses of the Ottoman identity had flourished out of

the Köprülü-Wittek debate, it should make a good starting point for our search. Similar to the formulations of the regionalist school, but maybe with a more moderate tone, this controversy too was shaped within an ideological discourse. Without going into exhausting details about the discussion, I shall briefly underline that on the one side there was Paul Wittek, who was brought up within the scholarly tradition of the Weimar Republic. On the other, there was Fuad Köprülü, who had an *Annales* perspective in his mind, but which he had combined with the nationalist discourse of the young Turkish Republic. Wittek, with his Weberian approach to history, believed that ideas had a life of their own and that they had direct provocative effect on action<sup>8</sup>. Therefore, in his search for an idea or an ideology that might have influenced the activities of early Ottomans, Wittek came up with the *gaza* thesis. That is, the Islamic frontier warfare pursued against the “infidels”. Köprülü, on the other hand did not believe in either the force of a single motive, or in such “chivalresque imagery” as Cemal Kafadar calls it<sup>9</sup>. He tried to see the frontier society with all its complexities, at the heart of which laid a Turkish element; and that could not accept the influence of an Islamic ideology, which would go beyond the boundaries of the national essence. Therefore, in Köprülü’s approach, what motivated the early Ottomans was a Turkic tribal tradition, which embodied the characteristics of Seljuk and Ilkhanid practices. Here, what concerns us is neither the validity of the two approaches nor the shortcomings of the two scholars’ ideological perspectives. It is more the nature of their sources that I am interested in, and especially those of Paul Wittek.

The earliest document written by the Ottomans themselves is the Arabic Bursa Inscription (1337). This is also the earliest document on which Wittek bases his argument. In this inscription, Orhan is referred to as the “Sultan of the *gazis*” and “*gazi* son of a *gazi*”<sup>10</sup>. According to Lindner, these points should be considered more as a retrospective legitimation of Osman’s and Orhan’s pragmatic practices than a direct

---

<sup>8</sup> Lindner, Rudi Paul. *Ortaçağ Anadolu’sunda Göçebeler ve Osmanlılar*. (Trans.: Müfit Günay) İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi, 2000, p. 21.

<sup>9</sup> Kafadar, p. 41.

<sup>10</sup> Lindner, p. 20.

reference to the fundamental role of *gaza* in early Ottoman activities. That is to say, instead of the history of an earlier period, the inscription should be considered as the propaganda of a later period that was born out of a newly emerging orthodox and sedentary culture<sup>11</sup>. What Lindner emphasizes is the emergence of an Ottoman ideology that found it necessary to legitimize its past by transforming it into something that it was not. Again, here I am not interested in to what extent *gaza* played a role in early Ottoman history. My focus is on the rising need for a retrospective legitimation. Unlike it might be argued, this has very little to do with what the Ottoman past really was. In other words, no matter if the early Ottomans were good *gazis* or not, a later emphasis on a *gazi* past indicates that at the time the inscription was written, *gaza* was perceived as something to be underlined. This may, as Lindner argues, reflect a later introduction of the *gaza* ideology into Anatolia that made its retro-construction necessary for the Ottoman State. On the other hand, it may indicate the exact opposite – if not for the Bursa Inscription, most probably for later chroniclers such as Yahşi Fakih and Aşıkpaşazade who were part of the *gazi-dervish* milieu. That is, the disappearance of an early practice (the *gaza*) as the Ottoman State became a sedentary entity with its centralized institutions which made the detachment from its nomadic frontier principality past inevitable. Therefore, as Cemal Kafadar points out, what we see in Aşıkpaşazade and his likes is not the linear development of a state ideology, but on the contrary a second – and even a reactionary – voice raised against “the construction of an imperial political system and its ideology”<sup>12</sup>. In other words, beyond the ideological outlook of modern scholarship, there is an ideological controversy within the documents that modern historiography was based upon.

What could the above information have to do with the purposes of this section? First of all, it underlines that at some point in Ottoman history – and that would most probably correspond to the latter half of the fourteenth century – a former frontier principality (be it a Turco-Mongolian tribe or a band of *gazis*) began what Kafadar refers to as “an imperial project”. In its simplest form, this meant the restructuring of former

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, pp. 22-29.

<sup>12</sup> Kafadar, pp. 99-114.

institutions along the needs of a sedentary empire that claimed world dominance. As this renewal process went along, the institutional changes inevitably enforced the Ottomans to pursue a transformation in their ideological framework. As Kafadar underlines, it was out of the requirements of a sedentary centralized state that both the administrative traditions of classical Islam and *medrese*-educated intellectuals penetrated into the Ottoman system and re-interpreted *gaza* with an “orthodox coloring”<sup>13</sup>. In other words, although Ottoman religious perspective never completely detached itself from heterodoxy<sup>14</sup>, the gradual rise of orthodox Sunni Islam to dominance resulted from the practical realities of this state / empire building process. Therefore, regardless of what their origins might have been, by the end of Mehmed II’s reign<sup>15</sup>, the Ottomans had established for themselves a new and different identity. This suggests that, this whole epoch of institutional and ideological change also corresponds to the construction of an identity that would satisfy the necessities of the new empire. Of course, no identity construction can function properly without the presence of outsiders, and soon, the Ottomans would also find their appropriate “others.”

#### 4. Identity Construction, Others and Ottomanization:

Stuart Hall emphasizes the difference between a naturalist conception of identity as “a recognition of some common origin or shared characteristics with another person or group”, and a discursive approach that sees identification as a construction always in

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, p. 113.

<sup>14</sup> Further information can be found in Halil İnalçık’s article on the relationship between Mehmed II and Otman Baba (a prominent heterodox dervish of the period) in Smith, Grace Martin and Carl W. Ernst eds. Manifestations of Sainthood in Islam. Istanbul: Isis Press, 1993.

<sup>15</sup> According to Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, both the structure of the Ottoman State as a tribal principality and its ideology (represented by *Abdalan-i Rum*) found their ultimate transformation with Mehmed II and the conquest of Constantinople; and he adds – quoting from Halil İnalçık – that Mehmed II was the actual creator of the Ottoman Empire and its sultanic prototype. Therefore, it was not a coincidence that the “dream of Osman” (which told that world dominance was promised to Osman in a dream of quasi-religious motifs) stories were put to pen in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. (Ocak, Ahmed Yaşar. *XV-XVI. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı Resmi İdeolojisi ve Buna Muhalefet Problemi* in XL. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Kongreve Sunulan Bildiriler (Ankara: 5-6 Eylül 1990). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1994, pp. 1205,1206.)

process. Although, a constant continuity of construction does not necessarily suggest that identities can be lost or won at any time, it indicates a state of conditional existence. On the other hand, the conditions under which identities are sustained depend on difference and exclusion, rather than internal sameness. Therefore, they are constructed not outside, but through difference, through a relation to what they are not; and this process should be understood as the product of specific times and specific discursive formations. In other words, while identities are formed through a process of closure, the norms that determine the exclusion of the other and the different are subject to historical change<sup>16</sup>. However, although this relatively closed “unity” of identities may construct itself through a continuous redefinition of an “other”, its internal functioning depends on what Norbert Elias calls “a network of interdependencies.”<sup>17</sup> While the existence of a group identity or social identity depends on the existence of an “outsider” which will enable a self definition of the group, it also requires the existence of participant “insiders” to validate that definition. Therefore, such a network of interdependencies will eventually be necessary both internally and externally. Elaborated by Diana Fuss, identification, as “the detour through the other that defines a self, operates in a field of social relations, as the play of difference and similitude in self-other relations<sup>18</sup>.” Within the Ottoman context, the play of difference took place on two levels and it went parallel with the construction of the new imperial ideology. On one level as the new institutions and norms became solidified, a legal and institutional class division was formulated as the bipolar *askeri/reaya* divide. On another level, the “imperial project” made it inevitable that the early Ottoman past and the late fifteenth-sixteenth century realities had to be divided. That is to say, the Empire of the sixteenth century could not afford empathy towards the nomadic tribes of Anatolia on the basis of “a common origin or shared characteristic.” This was not only because of the fact that this “common origin” had been consciously

---

<sup>16</sup> Hall, Stuart. *Who Needs 'Identity'?* in du Gay, Paul, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman eds. *Identity: A Reader*. London: Sage Publications, 2000, pp. 16-18.

<sup>17</sup> Elias, Norbert. *Homo Clausus and the Civilizing Process* in Gay, Paul, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman eds. *Identity: A Reader*. London: Sage Publications, 2000, pp. 294, 295.

<sup>18</sup> Dunn, Robert G. *Identity Crises: A Social Critique of Postmodernity*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1998, p. 3.

transformed into an elevated Arabo-Persian heritage and a Seljuk lineage<sup>19</sup>. There were also practical realities that made these tribal groups unreliable on a long-term basis, since they would frequently take an independent and resistant attitude towards the central government<sup>20</sup>. Nevertheless, the *reaya*, the tribes and practically all conquered peoples within the core of the Empire were “the others” for the Ottomans of the “high classical age”. However, this never meant that the “Ottomanization” of the subject peoples (the others) was unlikely. On the contrary, this was the very practice on which the whole Ottoman system depended. A non-Muslim could join the privileged class of Ottomans by acquiring an *ümera* status through the *devşirme* system. In other words, he could actually become a part of the military-administrative system. According to Mustafa ‘Ali, a sixteenth century Ottoman intellectual and bureaucrat, the products of this slave system made up the most genuine Ottomans, and the system itself was the “fundamental process in the creation of the centralized state and the *askeri* class<sup>21</sup>.” For a Muslim member of the *reaya*, the process was more complicated and difficult, but nonetheless it was possible. One way of joining the *askeri* class was through a service in an *ümera* household. Although, following the late sixteenth century, the increasing restrictions on *reaya* advancement made service in the households of only high-ranking officials almost compulsory, the road was still open. On the other hand, for *reaya* volunteers (those voluntarily joining the campaigns) rising above the rank of simple *timar* holders was quite extraordinary<sup>22</sup>. However, there was also another way for a Muslim to rise within the system, and that was through *medrese* education. As a student he would subsequently finish *Haşiye-i tecrid*, *Miftah*, *Kırklı*, *Hariç*, *Dahil* and finally *Sahn-ı Seman medreses* and become a *danişmend*. At this point – and according to the *kanunname* of Mehmed II – if he wanted to join the *askeri* class, he would be granted twenty thousand *akçes*

---

<sup>19</sup> Fleischer, Cornell H. Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire, The Historian Mustafa Ali (1541-1600). New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1986, pp. 253, 254.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, p. 256, Note 7.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid, p. 256.

<sup>22</sup> Kunt, İ.Metin: The Sultan’s Servants: The Transformation of Ottoman Provincial Administration 1550-1650. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983, p. 35-45.

together with the first degree of *zeamet*<sup>23</sup>. Otherwise, he could choose to rise within the *ilmiye* class and join the “learned”. A member of an Anatolian nomadic tribe, a *yürük*, could follow the same steps. However, primarily he had to join the *reaya*, which required paying the agrarian tax and being recorded as a peasant in a *tahrir* register; and this constituted a point of no return for the tribesmen<sup>24</sup>. All of these cases indicate that the Ottoman state apparatus was based on a system of “Ottomanization”. Either through the *devşirme* and *medrese* systems or through service, a subject could be “educated” to become an Ottoman. Hence, an Ottomanized subject was above all a recruited or a volunteer young man who was educated in the requirements of Ottomanness. On the other hand, the process, which we see here here, corresponds only to a conscious, selective and a relatively encircled effort initiated by the ruling elite to satisfy governmental needs, and therefore instead of the emergence of a “common ground”, it suggests the incorporation of the subjects into the “grounds of the Ottomans.” In addition, this same process would be observed in its “ideal and proper” structure more in the classical age than in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and again, the governmental needs that we mention here correspond more to that classical age than the later periods. Just as the classical system had established a certain social divide according to its needs and capabilities, the new system of the post-classical age also created its own divides according to its own needs and capabilities, and as the economic structure began to evolve into something different, the former “class distinctions”, in a way, became less and less valid. How else can we explain the emergence of merchants, and especially tax farmers and *ayans* as the important members of the new Ottoman elite? Similar to Norbert Elias’ account on the European bourgeoisie, these people “aimed at increasing their own privileges at the expense of the old nobility, even though they were at the same time – and this gave their relationship its peculiarly ambivalent character – bound to the old nobility by a number of common social fronts<sup>25</sup>.” Therefore, the relative

---

<sup>23</sup> Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. Osmanlı Devleti’nin İlmiye Teşkilatı. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1988, pp. 12, 59.

<sup>24</sup> Lindner, p. 96.

<sup>25</sup> Elias, Norbert. The Civilizing Process. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1982, p. 501.

social mobility of the post-classical age did allow the appearance of a non-*askeri* elite (through a non-institutional process), whose positions were determined by their economic power (and titles, if they bought offices), but, whose recognition as *kibars* required obedience to appropriate manners (or the “Ottoman way”), which may be seen as the legacy of the classical period and the old “nobility.” On the other hand, for a commoner, who did not have the economic means, the only social mobility was still the institutional path, which was becoming less and less stable; and to underline again, his knowledge of proper manners mattered little as long as he was not able to join a *kibar meclisi*. However, the existence of class divisions, and the existence of different identities for different classes should not mean that the emergence of a common ground between distinct social groups was a total impossibility. At least in limited geographies, in periods of increasing social mobility and transparency and at least in minimum terms, this may be a valid case. Now we shall see whether manners might have acted as such a common ground in the Ottoman Empire.

### **5. Courtesy, Manners and Identity:**

Underlining that in earlier centuries the term custom was used to mean more or less what we mean by culture today, E. P. Thompson argues that custom should in fact be seen as a “*mentalité*, and as a whole vocabulary of discourse, of legitimation and of expectation”, and “as an arena in which opposing interests made conflicting claims.” Therefore, culture should also be considered as a similar arena of conflicts (between the literate and the oral, the superordinate and the subordinate, the village and the metropolis), and not simply as a system of consensus and sameness<sup>26</sup>. Expanding on Thompson’s view, I suggest that, as a category of custom and culture, manners constitute one of the most important domains over which such conflicts take place; and eventually lead to identity formations based on difference and sameness. Especially from the sixteenth century onwards, Europe experienced a separation of classes manifested

---

<sup>26</sup> Thompson, E. P. Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture. New York: The New Press, 1993, pp. 2, 6.

through behavior, gestures and speech. In 1528 Baldesar Castiglione published *The Book of the Courtier*, an early example of the courtesy book genre which would last up to the end of the eighteenth century. The courtesy books were written for a noble audience, and through instructions on manners, they established gestures as the most visible sign of difference between the nobility and the commons<sup>27</sup>. As Michael Curtin points out, the courtesy books emphasized the essential qualities for those whose concern was to stand out from the society<sup>28</sup>. On the other hand, as the nobility stood out from the society, the difference they played out was not only against the commoners, but also against the nobilities of other countries. This, in the end created separate identities for the French and the Spanish aristocracies, which was visually manifested in the way they walked, ate and gestured<sup>29</sup>. However, if identities are constructed with reference to the other, for the French aristocracy otherness was not only derived from their Spanish counterparts, but also from the subordinate population of France. In other words, exclusions and closures did not take place only across borders and between nobilities, but also within borders and between classes. Therefore, what separated the French and Spanish elites were also the peculiar qualities of the others that they found within their countries. Following the same argument, I suggest that a similar play of *différance* between the Ottoman elite and the commoners should have created identities for the two classes which were set apart – among many things – by the distinct characteristics of the manners that they internalized.

So far, everything seems to be pretty much clear, but what would happen when we have the sufficient social mobility and the transparency to shake this balance, and what would happen when social classes are less sealed and self-contained? The *Courtier* was written to teach courtly behavior to a noble audience, but its composition corresponded to a very peculiar period in European history. Within the first hundred years of its publication, and when the book was circulating throughout Europe in great popularity, it was read by the Fuggers and the Welsers, by doctors and lawyers, by administrators, and

---

<sup>27</sup> Muir, Edward. *Ritual in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 120, 126.

<sup>28</sup> Curtin, Michael. *A Question of Manners: Status and Gender in Etiquette and Courtesy* in *The Journal of Modern History*, Volume 57, Issue 3, September 1985, p. 418.

<sup>29</sup> Muir, pp. 123, 124.

by artists and musicians<sup>30</sup>. These were the new nobilities of a new court, which differed, and would differ even more, from Castiglione's Renaissance court. These people were joining the courts not because of their blood ties, but because of either their professions or their wealth, but still, they found it necessary to follow the courtly manners of a passing-by age. This is a situation quite close to what I have mentioned about the Ottoman Empire of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. However, there is also a further indication, which may be valid for both cases. These "new men" were coming from classes, which would be before considered as "low" or "common." With their own traditions and customs, they had little knowledge of courtly behavior or the Ottoman way, before these issues became the necessities of their new positions. At a time when social mobility was not possible and when inter-class relations were highly restricted, they would have neither the need nor probably the chance to learn the manners of the upper classes. However, as the "new men" began to move up, wouldn't they have carried along any characteristic of their previous classes at all? As they would be greatly influenced by their new social positions, wouldn't they have, in return, influenced them? Wouldn't these incidents all, enable the formation of a common ground of, at least, manners between different classes, which was based not on sameness and consensus, but on conflict, struggle and synthesis? We would naturally expect the play of difference between the commoners and the elite to have sustained the differences between the identities of these two classes. However, if we are to take Nietzsche's point that what we consider to be "good" and "moral" today, is actually what was once "noble" and "aristocratic"<sup>31</sup>, and when we consider the use of *kibar* in contemporary Turkish, we may in fact see the indications of such a gradual and slow, but nonetheless possible process.

---

<sup>30</sup> Burke, Peter. The Fortunes of the Courtier. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996, pp. 144-147.

<sup>31</sup> Kaufmann, Walter and Forrest E. Baird eds. Philosophic Classics: From Plato to Nietzsche. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1997, pp. 1120, 1121.

## 6. Sources and Problems:

In Ottoman history, what corresponds best to Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier* (both in terms of historical period and context) is probably Gelibolulu Mustafa 'Ali's *Meva 'Idü'n – Nefais Fi – Kava 'Idi'l – Mecalis* (Delectable Morsels in Society's Mores<sup>32</sup>). Born as a member of the *reaya* class (28 April, 1541), 'Ali had followed the *ilmiye* path, and had earned himself quite a reputation as a respected intellectual<sup>33</sup>. In the last years of his life (d. 1600), on Doğancı Mehmet Paşa's (Rumeli *beglerbegi* and *vizir* to Murad III) request he composed the *Kava 'idü'l-Mecalis* (1598). Following that and with Mevlana Sa 'deddin's advice that the current treatise could be expanded, he wrote *Meva 'idü'n-Nefais* (1599) as a supplement<sup>34</sup>. Together these two works make up one of the most useful sources on late sixteenth century Ottoman society with detailed information on various classes, occupations, ethnic and religious groups and of course on the appropriate manners of a proper Ottoman. On the other hand, unlike *The Book of The Courtier*, the treatise was not intended to be a guide for a prince or to educate the aristocracy. The initial demand that created the first volume came indirectly from Murad III to see whether the public gatherings (or more properly, the people's gatherings) of the old days still continued or not; and 'Ali decided to compose the second one when he saw the "strange and unmannered behavior of the people" on a cruise from Cairo to Cidde<sup>35</sup>. This suggests that 'Ali actually wrote a treatise on how proper demeanors should be based on what he observed as improper. The measures of a proper behavior, on the other hand, was filtered through the mind of an intellectual; a member of the *ilmiye* and an Ottoman. Correspondingly – and expectedly, a considerable section of the book is devoted to the gatherings and manners of the *kibars*.

---

<sup>32</sup> Translation is from Brookes, Douglas. *Proper Compartment in Ottoman Society*. Paper presented at Middle East Studies Association 31<sup>st</sup> Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California, November 22-24, 1997, p. 1.

<sup>33</sup> Fleischer, pp. 13-16.

<sup>34</sup> Gelibolulu Mustafa 'Ali. *Meva 'Idü'n-Nefais Fi-Kava 'Idi'l-Mecalis*. (Hazırlayan: Mehmet Şeker), Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1997, pp. 62, 63.

<sup>35</sup> Gelibolulu Mustafa 'Ali, pp. 262, 265.

Here, I have used a published version of *Meva 'Idü'n – Nefais Fi – Kava 'Idi'l – Mecalis* (Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1997). Prepared by Mehmet Şeker, this study opens with the life and works of Mustafa 'Ali, and this is followed by an analysis of *Meva 'Idü'n – Nefais Fi – Kava 'Idi'l – Mecalis*. This section is composed of three chapters: The first one is on why it was written and named as such, the available copies of the manuscript and its language. The second is on its possible sources and the final chapter is a critical edition of the text. Şeker's study ends with a full transcription of the document. Both the critical edition of the text and its transcription are based on a comparative study of its two known copies. The first of these was found by Raif Yelkenci, and its facsimile was published by Cavid Baysun and the Istanbul University Faculty of Literature and Early Modern History, in 1956. Following its publication, the original copy was returned to Raif Yelkenci, but after his death it was either sold or lost, and the whereabouts of this original manuscript is not known. Therefore, it is the facsimile of the document that Mehmet Şeker bases his study on. Cavid Baysun suggests that the manuscript was probably copied in the seventeenth century, and as it is indicated in the front page, it was once owned by Neyli-zade Mehmed Hamid Efendi, the *Kadı* of Istanbul (d. 1767). The second known manuscript is recorded under number 1214 in the Orhan Gazi section of the Bursa General Library. This appears to be a later (eighteenth century) copy<sup>36</sup>. The reason why Şeker uses both of the copies is the fact that none is totally complete and that scribal errors and obscurities (which seem to be prevalent in both documents) can only – though partially – be overcome with such a method of comparison.

When 'Ali wrote his work, he moved with the prejudices, expectations and norms of the class which he had become a member of, and the period in which he lived. However, in Ottoman literature there existed a certain genre, which (just like *Meva 'Idü'n – Nefais Fi – Kava 'Idi'l – Mecalis*) had manners as their main theme, but (unlike *Meva 'Idü'n – Nefais Fi – Kava 'Idi'l – Mecalis*) in terms of style and purpose they approached the issue in a different perspective. These were the “books of curses”, and as the name would imply they were written in order to curse the bad mannered. They opened with a passage that briefly described why the author composed such a work; and this basically

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid, pp. 64-67.

comprised the phrase – similar to ‘Ali – “on seeing the strange and unmannered behavior of the people”. Then they listed a set of curses (these will be given in the following chapter), which were followed by the descriptions of the people that deserved these curses. In terms of content – that is, the perception of a good (or bad) manner and the social arena where it was to be conducted – these books almost totally overlapped with *Meva ‘Idü’n – Nefais Fi – Kava ‘Idi’l – Mecalis*. However, a shift in style from Mustafa ‘Ali’s moderate, observation-based advices to observation-based curses of enmity has important indications. When authorship is concerned, and as I will try to show in the following chapter, it is extremely difficult to reach a clear-cut conclusion about the books of curses, but although we have no certain information about the social background of their authors, these books were evidently written by people, who were aware of proper *kibar* manners. In any case, this aggressive change in tone might, in fact point to a reaction towards what Elias calls “an increased upward thrust by the bourgeois strata<sup>37</sup>”, either by the members or the advocates of a more or less preserved and “true” *kibar* group. Although this possibility appears to be more in the favor elite authorship, I will deal with these problems in the following chapters, and for now, only the prevalence of such a tension should be kept in mind.

I have been able to look at two examples of the book of curses genre. A possibly earlier example is a late seventeenth century (1646-1673) manuscript written in Yanya (Ioannina) by a certain Hacı Ahmed<sup>38</sup>, and it can be found in the Baghdad 404 compilation of the Topkapı Palace Library, between the pages 96b and 98b. The second one, which will be my primary reference, is an anonymous eighteenth century (1719-20) example written in Istanbul. This version was transcribed and published with a facsimile by Hayati Develi in 1998. Following an introduction, Develi’s publication opens with the transcription of the text and ends with an analysis of eighteenth century Turkish based on the document, and the facsimile appears as an appendix. The original document is at

---

<sup>37</sup> The Civilizing Process, p. 500.

<sup>38</sup> Here, I would like to thank Cemal Kafadar for indirectly informing me about this document. Just to inform the reader I shall also add that Cemal Kafadar is currently working on two other seventeenth century versions and Şinasi Tekin has in his collection a nineteenth century book of curses.

the Nuruosmaniye Library in Istanbul, between the pages 48b and 76a of a 4925 numbered compilation. Since this compilation is recorded to be the donation of Osman II (1618-1622), the book of curses was probably a later addition. Looking at the front page of the manuscript, we also learn that it was once owned by a certain Derviş İsmail<sup>39</sup>. None of these manuscripts were titled by their authors, and to avoid any confusion, I will refer to the latter document as *Risale-i Garibe* (which is the title that Develi uses), and to Hacı Ahmed's manuscript as *Makale-i Garibe*.

Before moving any further, I shall underline an important problem of periodization. The dates, which I have given above, refer to the time when these manuscripts were copied and not to the time when they were originally written. When we compare the two documents, it appears that an approximation on the actual date of their composition is extremely difficult. The main problem rises from the nature of the book of curses genre, which seems to be based on a re-working of a previous example while keeping most of the content and the structure in their original forms. Therefore, even though the term *Kadızedeli* appears in *Risale-i Garibe*, this may not necessarily suggest that the manuscript was composed at the time of the *Kadızedeli* movement (1633-1685). It may well be based on a previous example of the genre from that period. However, a possible estimation can be made with reference to a certain religious figure. In Hacı Ahmed's text, there is – just as in *Risale-i Garibe* – a reference to Baba Nasuh<sup>40</sup>. If this person is really the *Halveti şeyh*, Nasuhi Efendi, whose *tekke* and *türbe* are in Uskûdar, and who died in 1718, we can suppose that Hacı Ahmed's text might actually be based on an earlier example of the genre that was written in Istanbul. However, since the *şeyh* died in 1718, the dates that we see in the manuscript, 1646 and 1673, create further problems. If Baba Nasuh is Nasuhi Efendi, due to a 72-year difference, the first date becomes totally irrelevant, and even if the second date corresponds to a time close to the composition of the text, an earlier example of the genre upon which the treatise was constructed cannot have been written much earlier than 1660s. Since *Risale-i Garibe* would not have been copied into a *mecmua* on the day that it was written, we may suppose that both the *Risale*

---

<sup>39</sup> XVIII. yy İstanbul'a Dair Risale-i Garibe (Hazırlayan: Hayati Develi). İstanbul: Kitabevi, 1998, p. 11.

<sup>40</sup> Hacı Ahmed, 97b.

and the *Makale* were composed while Nasuhi Efendi was still alive. Therefore, regardless of which one might have preceded the other, we may also presume that the two books of curses were written roughly in the late seventeenth century. This is of course an estimation based on the assumption that Baba Nasuh and Nasuhi Efendi were the same people. If that is not the case, then we would have to expand our time frame to include the *Kadızedeli* movement, which would take us back as early as the 1630s.

The following is a study on how manners contributed to the construction and validation of an Istanbulite identity in the way that it was reflected in *Risale-i Garibe*. Beyond this main purpose, there will also be a related additional theme, which is the possible transformation that both the *kibar* world and the Istanbul of the late seventeenth century were experiencing. The first chapter will be a detailed analysis of the *Risale* where I will try to show who the author might have been, in which social and cultural environment he might have written, and who could have been his possible audiences. The second chapter, on the other hand will be devoted both to the transformation of the *kibar* society and an elimination of similarities between the three documents so as to see what the author might have actually experienced in late seventeenth century Istanbul. I will start this chapter first with a comparative analysis of the three documents and then leaving Mustafa 'Ali aside, I will look at the two books of curses. With this method, we will be able to see both the changes and the continuities in the *kibar* culture and reach the possibly actual observations of the author. Finally, the third chapter will be a study based on only the *Risale* and the proper manners of a man in late seventeenth century Istanbul.

## CHAPTER 1: MANNERS FOR WHOM: AN ANALYSIS OF THE SOURCE

*Risale-i Garibe* opens with a passage that describes why and for whom the anonymous author has composed his work. It is after seeing the enjoyment of the people, hearing their indecency, remembering their violence and witnessing the pain that the graceful suffered from all these that the author starts writing down his curses of enmity<sup>41</sup>. His targets are, therefore, those who lack the simplest notion of manners and those who have no consideration for others. Following this short introductory section, the author lists down a set of curses which cover both the most unpleasant situations a man could find himself in and the most unpleasant illnesses that he could suffer from:

...His feet should stumble and he should fall into the well and break his neck. In the hot weather he should suffer from constipation and in the cold weather he should suffer from diarrhea. In summer he should be malaria and in winter he should suffer from pain. In a blind alley a dog should tear his skirt and bite his leg. In a narrow street he should be kicked by a mule, a camel and an ox. In a rainy weather, while passing through a crowded bazaar, his horse should tumble and his *sarık* should fall down and therefore, he be disgraced. While walking on a muddy road, his arm should turn dark [from the mud] and therefore, he be disgraced. On his groin and his testicles, he should have boils as big as goose's eggs. While laying down under the mosque's fringe he should be attacked by snakes, centipedes, scorpions, fleas, louses and mosquitoes. When he is young he should have itchy beards and be a pig and when he is old he should be a catamite. Instead of being ashamed only once, without being aware, he should fart [or talk empty] a thousand times, fall in shame, be publicly disgraced and therefore have no face to be present in public again<sup>42</sup>.

---

<sup>41</sup> *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 19.

<sup>42</sup> “*uřana (?) vardıkta ayađı sürçüp ol kuyuya düşüp boynu altında kala, ısıcak günde kabız ve sovk günde ishale uğraya, yaz günleri sıtmaya, kış günü sancıya uğraya; çıkmaz sokaktan kelb-i ‘akurardın alup eteđin yırtup baldırın bir yanından bir yanına diş geçüre ve taraçık sokaktan katır çiftesine ve deve depmesine ve öküz süsmesine uğraya ve kalabalık çarşı içinde giderken yağmurlu havada atı[nı]n ayađı sürçüp başından sarıđı düşüp risvay, çamurlu yolda giderken kolı zifüre uğraya, esbabı rüsvay ola. Kasıđı yerinde ve hayaları yerinde kaz yumurtası gibi kan çıbanları çıkara ve cami ‘ saçađı altında yaturken yılan ve çıyan,*

Similarly, Hacı Ahmed's manuscript opens with the following curses: "when he goes to pour water<sup>43</sup> he should fall into that well, in winter days he should be in terrible vain, on his groin he should have boils, into his nightgown forty snakes should crawl, he should be kicked by a mule and while riding on horseback through the bazaar, his *sarık* should fall, and while in a big gathering he should fart and therefore fall in shame and be publicly disgraced<sup>44</sup>".

The similarity between the endings of the two set of curses – in terms of embarrassment – suggest that all of these curses were possibly given for one single purpose: The cursed one should be in such a shame that he should no longer be able to participate in social / public life. Therefore, the underlying intention points out to an interconnection between shame and de-socialization. The curse must come in such a way that the victim should first experience immense shame (and not death or physical harm<sup>45</sup>), and then this should be followed by an exclusion from public life as the ultimate punishment. When we look at the very beginning of *Risale-i Garibe*, we can see the reason behind such an emphasis on shame – at least for that particular document. Here, the author inversely quotes a *hadith*. According to Hayati Develi, the proper form of this saying should be: "*el-Hayau mine'l-iman (Shame from – or because of – Faith)*". However, the author uses it in the order that would mean "*Faith from – or because of – Shame (el-İmanu mine'l-Haya)*<sup>46</sup>". He may have intentionally altered the *hadith*, or he

---

'akreb birle kehleden, pireden gayri tahta biti, sivri sinek şerrine uğraya. Genç iken uyuz sakal[l]lanup tonuz ola, kocalıkta puşt ola, bir utanacak yerde boş bulunup bin dane kavara vaki ' olup hicaba düşe ya 'ni rüsvay 'alem olup ol meclise bir dahi varaçak yüzi sureti kalmaya." *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 19.

<sup>43</sup> *ab-efşana*: The meaning here could either be the exact literary equivalent – which would simply be pouring water – or the expression could have been used to mean urination. If the latter is the case, then the well would be a toilet hole, making the situation quite embarrassing.

<sup>44</sup> "*ab-efşana haneye vardukda ol kuyuya düşe, ve kış günlerinde 'azim zifozlara uğraya, ve kasık yirlerinde kan çibanları çıka ve came habında kırk dane yılan gire, ve katır depmesi dokuna ve çarşuda at ile giderken sarığı düşe, ve 'azim meclisde otururken beza'en (bazen?, beza:becoming obscene in speech) eyüce bir kavare çalup ve yüzi kare olup hicaba düşüp rüsvay 'alem ola.*" Hacı Ahmed. *Makale-i Nefsü'l-Emr* in B. 404, Topkapı Palace Library, 96b-98b, p. 96b.

<sup>45</sup> There are examples of physical damage and illnesses, but these do not constitute an end in themselves. In other words, the physical harm is not the actual aim of the curse, and it is too intended to cause shame.

<sup>46</sup> *Risale-i Garibe*, p.19

might have known it in the form that he had used. Nevertheless, in each case the author must have believed that shame would eventually lead to faith. Such an emphasis on shame is not peculiar to neither Ottoman nor Islamic literature. In *Nicomachean Ethics* Aristotle writes that shame, although it is not good in itself, is conditionally a good thing because it helps us avoid bad actions. Christian authorities of Early Modern Europe also continued the same line of argument and suggested that humankind had experienced shame in the Garden of Eden, Noah had been shamed by his nakedness and Jacob by his effeminate body. Therefore, for them shame was an important medium for controlling behavior. Similarly, Renaissance authors considered shame to be like a medicine which was not good in itself, but which produced good effects<sup>47</sup>. However, as I have mentioned before, shame is not the primary concern of the *Risale-i Garibe* author. Although he seems to believe in the potential of shame as a producer of good effects, he primarily deals with the outcome of shame as a punishment; which is exclusion from public life. The ones who are delighted by public life, but give the most damage to it and to those who know the appropriate manners, should be punished by not being able to be a part of it anymore. Here, the crucial point is the indispensability of public life as a determinant of social existence when it is conducted through proper demeanors. Therefore, if we consider manners as the core body of a compulsory performance upon which an urban / Istanbulite identity is constructed, then the exclusion from the main stage where this performance takes place (the public life) would mean the denial of the identities of the excluded ones. In the following pages of *Risale-i Garibe* we read the specific occasions and modes of behavior that would lead to such a denial, and we see the “others” of a mannered group who most probably considered themselves to be the proper performers. This framework inevitably raises a set of questions: Which historical and spatial circumstances are we talking about? Who is the author and who are the audiences? What is the social and cultural context of the text?

---

<sup>47</sup> Gundersheimer, Werner L. *Renaissance Concept of Shame and Pocaterra's Dialoghi Della Vergogna* in *Renaissance Quarterly*, Volume 47, Issue 1, Spring 1994, pp. 34, 37, 48-49.

## 1. Geography and Chronology:

In eighteenth century England, when courtesy literature was at its peak, the manners that it conventionalized not only separated the aristocracy from the commoners, but also set the difference between what was urbane and what was provincial. Through the courtesy books, the nobility of the countryside prepared themselves for the standards of London and its “fashion”<sup>48</sup>. As it was emphasized by E.P. Thompson, under the umbrella of the “un-consensual” culture, the conflicts did not take place only between the classes, but also between the village and the city, which in fact, by the eighteenth century had already set the standards for new class distinctions. Since this is neither a study on urban history nor on the emergence of modern capitalism, I will not go in detail to explain how and why the city came to dominate both the Early Modern and Modern eras of European history. However, I shall briefly underline that what set the difference between the country and the town was the existence of two distinct modes of production which led to two distinct modes of existence. That is, industry and commerce (from guilds to factories and merchants to multi-nationals) on the one hand and agriculture (from the plough to industrial farming) on the other. Here, what led to the rise of the European city – and the whole discussion of European city versus the Islamic city<sup>49</sup> – was the relative independence of European towns from central governments (or monarchs) that enabled class formations based on economic activity and independent of the bonds of ancient regimes.

When we look at Ottoman history, the issue becomes more complicated in terms of the distinction between the town and country. According to Suraiya Faroqhi in economic terms and when compared to Europe, such a divide was less rigid in the Ottoman Empire,

---

<sup>48</sup> Curtin, p. 402.

<sup>49</sup> For a detailed historiographical study on the issue see Haneda, Masashi and Toru Miura. Islamic Urban Studies: Historical Review and Perspectives. New York: Kegan Paul International, 1994.

and the existence of country merchants and city farmers was more prevalent than it was in Europe<sup>50</sup>. However, the actual difference between European and Ottoman cities was not based on city farmers and country merchants, but on the fact that with very few exceptions Ottoman cities did not possess charters which had led to the independent development of their European counterparts and the rise of strong merchants. On the other hand, at this point one has to be cautious in terms of which parts of the Empire are under consideration, especially if we are talking about the emergence of a new and more diverse elite from the seventeenth century onwards. Looking at provincial towns, and especially those in the Middle Eastern regions of the Empire, it becomes evident that especially from the seventeenth century onwards, both economically and politically merchants became a strong and prevalent group. In eighteenth century Aleppo, it was only the big import-export merchants that could penetrate into the city's elite<sup>51</sup>. Similarly, in Mosul, the Jalili household (originally a merchant family) was the most influential group<sup>52</sup>, and in seventeenth century Nablus it was the emergence of yet another strong merchant community that allowed the growth of the region<sup>53</sup>. In seventeenth century Cairo, the merchant Abu Taqiyya and his colleagues were strong enough to contribute to the physical transformation of the city, and they were politically eager enough to start building projects in the vicinity of al-Azbakiyya lake, which, as the summer residence of the merchant elite, rivaled Birka al-Fil where the *askeri* elite had been building their summer houses<sup>54</sup>. However, when we come to the core of the Empire (that is to say Anatolia and the Balkans), we see that the level of independence approaches to what Faroqhi refers to as "semi-dependent"; and when Istanbul is

---

<sup>50</sup> Subjects of the Sultan..., pp. 58, 59.

<sup>51</sup> Marcus, p. 51.

<sup>52</sup> Khoury, Dina Rizk. *Between Khassa and Amma: Elites and Commoners in Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century Mosul* in eadem., State and Provincial Society in the Ottoman Empire: Mosul, 1540-1834. Cambridge, 1997, p. 119, 122.

<sup>53</sup> Doumani, Beshara. Rediscovering Palestine: Merchants and Peasants in Jabal Nablus, 1700-1900. Berkeley, 1995, p. 25.

<sup>54</sup> Hanna, Nelly. Making Big Money in 1600: The Life and Times of Isma'il Abu Taqiyya, Egyptian Merchant. New York: Syracuse, 1998, pp. ??.

concerned, what we can talk about is the direct administration of the central government<sup>55</sup>. Still, even in Istanbul and as early as the fifteenth century, the dress-code division – as the visualized expression of a class distinction – between the merchant and the artisan (that is to say, one that is determined more or less in economic terms) had become more important than the one between a Muslim and a non-Muslim<sup>56</sup>. On the other hand, regardless of regional differences and the amount of independence, one characteristic of Ottoman cities separated them extensively from rural life. No matter if an Ottoman town experienced European-like class formations or felt the absolute authority of the “Oriental Despot”, what survived within its borders was a “literate culture”. In the Ottoman Empire, written culture was accessible only to a small portion of the rural population, and although they existed even in small towns, in the countryside mosques and schools were not built in large numbers until the nineteenth century<sup>57</sup>. The majority of Ottoman literature was written for an urban audience, and therefore, they reflected the culture, customs and manners of the city; and for the purpose of this paper of Istanbul, the Ottoman capital.

The *Risale-i Garibe* (1719-20) was copied down sixteen years after Ahmed III was enthroned, a year after Damat İbrahim Paşa became the grand *vizir*, again a year after the big Cibalikapı fire and on the year of the 1719 earthquake, which, two months later, was followed by another big fire. Of course, this was also a year after the Treaty of Passarowitz<sup>58</sup>. In other words, when a certain scribe added the *Risale* into a certain *mecmua* in the Nuruosmaniye Library, the Empire that he saw, and its capital, was going through a very peculiar period. While its military and political power no longer spread fear into the hearts of the infidels and its prosperity no longer evoked admiration,

---

<sup>55</sup> Faroqhi, Suraiya *Crisis and Change* in İnalcık, Halil and Donald Quataert eds. *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire Volume II: 1600-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 576,577.

<sup>56</sup> İnalcık, Halil. *The Ottoman Empire, The Classical Age 1300-1600*. London: Phoenix, 1997, pp. 141, 150.

<sup>57</sup> *Subjects of the Sultan...*, p. 59.

<sup>58</sup> Danişmend, İsmail Hami. *İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi, Cilt: 4*. Istanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1972, pp. 12, 13.

especially Istanbul was experiencing an era of cultural, numerical and “visual” growth. It is important that the *Risale* was copied into a compilation within this epoch, which would lead to the infamous Tulip Era, and its tragic end with the Patrona Halil Revolt. It is also an important indication about the perception of the books of curses to note that the *Makale* is in a *mecmua*, which also embodies the *Kanunname* of Sultan Suleyman and the *fetvas* of Ebussud. The books of curses may also be the reflections of the worries that the people had at the time that they were copied as well as that of their authors. This may be the outcome of a change that was taking place from the time that the authors composed their treatises onwards. When the *Risale* author composed his work, Istanbul was already structured in a visually segregated fashion with wealthy officials residing in the vicinity of the palace<sup>59</sup>, and the author had certainly seen “those who owned *yalis* from Sarıyar to Beşiktaş, but who, like thieves, watched the boats of their guests from a hole and said ‘if they have sheep with them, let us welcome them, if they do not let us not be seen’<sup>60</sup>”. He certainly should have noticed the ever-increasing migrations into the cities<sup>61</sup> (and to Istanbul, of course) so as to curse “those donkeys who come to this city of great might, and without knowing why they came, without studying its language and learning Turkish, wonder around for fifty-sixty years referring to leaf as finger<sup>62</sup>.” In fact, the population increase became exhausting enough for the *Divan* to take precautions first in 1724 to prevent further migrations from Edirne, and then in 1729 from Anatolia and Rumeli<sup>63</sup>. Similarly, in 1734 orders were given to send those Albanians wandering around in

---

<sup>59</sup> *Crisis and Change*, p. 581.

<sup>60</sup> “ve Sarıyar’dan Beşiktaş’a değin yalı sahibi olup yaz günleri gelen müsafirin kayığı içine delükten hırsız gibi bakup ‘Kayık içinde kuzu var ise gözüne girelim. Kuzu yoğ ise gözükmeyelim!’ deyen balıkçılık ile bağı pişmiş gidiler.” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 23.

<sup>61</sup> Bruce McGowan writes that either for security or to find occupation, in the eighteenth century, Ottoman cities experienced considerable amount of migration, and by the time of the Patrona rebellion there were approximately 12,000 Albanians living in Istanbul, who also the supporters of the revolt. McGowan, Bruce. *The Age of the Ayans, 1699-1812* in İnalçık, Halil and Donald Quataert eds. *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire Volume II: 1600-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 646, 647.

<sup>62</sup> “ve bu şehir-i ‘azime gelüp ne için geldiğin bilmeyüp elli altmış yıl ‘ömür süriüp lisanın tashih etmeyüp Türkçe öğrenmeyüp yaprağa barmak deyen eşekler.” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 22.

<sup>63</sup> Ahmed Refik, *XII. Asr-ı Hicri’de İstanbul Hayatı*. İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1988, pp. 80, 81, 105.

Üsküdar and Kartal back to their homes, and in 1763 it was again ordered that all the unemployed people residing in Istanbul should be sent to their homes<sup>64</sup>. Especially the Albanian population should have really annoyed our author, since in almost all cases he curses someone (or a group) for doing or not doing something, he curses the Albanians simply as “the Albanians (*Arnavudlar*)<sup>65</sup>.” On the other hand, the author was also aware of the fact that Istanbul was also a religiously and ethnically segregated city, and therefore he cursed “those singers who learned melody [*makamat*] from the gypsy of Eyyup Ensari, and those who hoped for a cure from the Jew of Balad<sup>66</sup>”. In addition, since he was living in Istanbul it would be inaccurate to suppose that he was unaware of the increasing tension between the Janissaries, the *ulema* and the *esnaf*, which eventually led to the Patrona Halil rebellion. What I am suggesting is that the emergence of a treatise such as *Risale-i Garibe* could only take place within an urban context where both social, cultural and economic diversities and contradictions would be most visible and where there would be a literate population to read, understand and appreciate such a work. Since the birthplace of the document is Istanbul, for the time being, every single manner that appears in *Risale-i Garibe* should be considered as applicable to only Istanbul. To what extent and how they were received outside the city can only be understood as similar or overlapping documents from other regions – and confined specifically to those regions – come to light. However, due to the unique role of Istanbul as the Empire’s capital and due to immense similarities between the *Risale* and the *Makale*, a geographically wider applicability – at least for the core of the Empire, which means Anatolia and the Balkans – of these manners is a relevant probability; but also one that goes beyond the scope of this paper. On the other hand, since the work we are looking at was possibly written in the late seventeenth century, the manners mentioned in the text should be considered as the product of this specific period. However, it should also be remembered that the *Risale* is an example of a certain genre. Therefore, there is

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid, pp. 131, 132, 199.

<sup>65</sup> *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 41.

<sup>66</sup> “*Eyyup Ensari çinganesinden makamat öğrenen hanendeler, Balad’ın cihudından deva umanlar.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 22.

always the high probability of literary influence, which should make us cautious while approaching certain issues as the products of purely the author's own experiences. At this point, the next question to answer would be who the author of the document was – or at least what his social and cultural background could have been?

## 2.The Author:

The first step towards understanding the social and cultural background of the author would be a literary and linguistic analysis. A similar study is already done by Hayati Develi, and I am personally not qualified enough to take it any further. From his analysis, we understand that *Risale-i Garibe* was written in the “spoken language”. As Develi points out, Ottoman Turkish was composed of three language groups: Spoken Language, Written Language and Reading Language. The difference between these three groups defined the level of the author's education. An author who is using the “written language” would follow the appropriate orthographic rules. However, while reading the text, he would use the “reading language” and pronounce the words according to the “spoken language.” On the contrary, a less educated man would use the “spoken language” and write down the words exactly in the form that they were pronounced. Again as Develi underlines, in the eighteenth century what is known as the “New Turkish” was being established, and one of the fundamental rules of Turkish grammar, the vowel harmony, was almost completely formed. In other words, while from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries the word *buldu* (he/she/it found) would be written and pronounced as *buldi*, in the eighteenth century (using the Written Language) it would still be written as *buldi*, but pronounced as *buldu*<sup>67</sup>. When we look at the *Risale-i Garibe*, we see that the same word is written as it was pronounced. This may suggest that the text was composed by an author, who only knew the basic skills of reading and writing and did not have any further education. On the other hand, we have to be really cautious before reaching such a conclusion. First of all, the text is not in its original form and it

---

<sup>67</sup> Risale-i Garibe, pp. 49-55.

was copied down by a certain scribe, and this linguistic characteristic may indeed reflect the identity of the scribe rather than the author. Secondly, the *Turki-i Basit* movement of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries did not always remain marginal, and although both Nazmi and Mahremi (the initiators of the movement) were highly criticized, their legacy did survive into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries<sup>68</sup>. It was the seventeenth century poet Nabi, while advocating simplicity in language, who wrote, “a collection of *gazels* is not an Arabic dictionary<sup>69</sup>.” Therefore, we may also suppose that the *Risale* author might easily be a highly educated man, who uses a plain language and a simple literary style, not because he is incapable, but because he prefers to do so.

A second method to be followed to clarify the identity of the author would be a content analysis. This can be done in two ways. The first would be an analysis based on the text itself and the second through a comparison with similar works written by known authors. However, the first method would soon render itself useless, since without relatively stronger reference points, the content of the text would have no contextual ground to stand on. This is neatly related to the fact that – as I have previously mentioned – the author and the people mentioned in the text do not have to be from the same social and cultural backgrounds; just as the content and the readers do not have to be. Therefore, the only way to detach the author from the text and give him an identity of his own would be through a comparative analysis.

In *Risale-i Garibe* the first group of people that the author considers to be worth a curse are the “*Sufis* of six months who are the people of the robe<sup>70</sup> but who claim to know the truth”. Then comes the second group: “The Kadizades who are dressed like strange

---

<sup>68</sup> Silay, Kemal. Nedim and the Poetics of the Ottoman Court: Medieval Inheritance and the Need for Change. Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies Series, 1994, pp. 14-20.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid, p.20.

<sup>70</sup> “*Evvela hakikat da ‘vasın eden ehl-i kisvet alti aylık sufiler’*”: One possible meaning of the term would be condemning new *Sufis* who have been in the order for only six months (therefore know very little), but who, by wearing the distinguishable costume of the *dervishes* give the wrong impression of being knowledgeable. A similar emphasis can also be seen in Mustafa ‘Ali who considers the “*ulema* who wear the trappings of learning but have none” to be among the lowest group of fundamentalists (Fleischer, p. 260). Another, and related meaning would come from the use of *kisvet* not as a costume, but as outlook. Therefore, *ehl-i kisvet* would mean people who care for their outward qualities more than the inner ones; and this would be the exact opposite of true *dervishes*.

birds and claim to be Phoenixes<sup>71</sup>.” These two lines create a rather ambiguous situation in terms of the author’s religious position. We know that he is a Muslim, but keeping himself equally distant from both orthodox and heterodox factions, he obscures to which side he is closer. Similarly, the Yanya manuscript also opens with a curse on “the *Sufis* who are in the guise of the people of the robe and who are laughing up their sleeves, but claim to know the truth<sup>72</sup>.” Then, a few lines later, comes the Kadızadeli. However, Hacı Ahmed does not use the word Kadızadeli (or Kadızade). Instead he refers to them as “those with tinged eyelids (*gözleri sürmeli*)” and “those that wear spun *misvak*<sup>73</sup>(*çıkırığa çevirilmiş misvakları sokman*)”. From Evliya Çelebi, we know that the Kadızadeli wore the spun *misvak* in their headgears and that they tinged their eyelids<sup>74</sup>. Similarly, in a later passage, the author of *Risale-i Garibe* too makes a reference to the use of *misvak*<sup>75</sup>. There are two interconnected points that one can deduce from these similarities. The first one concerns the “book of curses” genre itself – of course based on the two known documents. Both texts start with equal enmity towards the “extremes” of heterodoxy and orthodoxy. In terms of heterodoxy, the extreme is “not knowing, but pretending to know”, which is the exact opposite of a conventional *dervish* who is

---

<sup>71</sup> “ve simurga sinek demez ‘ankalık da ‘vasın eden ‘acep kuş kıyafetli Kadızadeler.” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 20.

<sup>72</sup> Hacı Ahmed, p. 96b. Here, unlike *Risale-i Garibe*, it is clear that the author is writing against those who pretend to be *Sufis*. However, Hacı Ahmed writes “*evvela hakikat da ‘vasın iden rishande ehli sahib-i kisvet mukallak sufilere*”. Interestingly, he uses *mukallak*, the Arabic *ism-i Mef’ul* of the Turkish word *kılık*, instead of *kılıklı*. The reproduction of Turkish words through Arabic grammar is known to be the practice of the learned. Therefore, if not he himself was one, Hacı Ahmed must have been somehow related to the learned circles. Alternatively, some of such transformed words may have become knowledgeable to a larger segment of the society.

<sup>73</sup> Hacı Ahmed, p. 96b.

<sup>74</sup> *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 80. Here, it should be noted that the use of *misvak* was not specifically confined to the Kadızadeli. Gelibolulu Mustafa ‘Ali, too writes about a hypocritically religious group of people that wear *misvak* in their headgears, and he goes so far as to describe them as “the friends of the devil”. However, this was written approximately thirty years prior to the appearance of Kadızade Mehmed as a dominant figure. Gelibolulu Mustafa ‘Ali. *Meva ‘Idü’n-Nefais Fi-Kava ‘Idi’l-Mecalis*. (Hazırlayan: Mehmet Şeker), Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1997, p. 377, 378.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid*, p. 21. If we consider the Kadızadeli movement to be prominent between 1633 and 1685 – that is, from the confrontation between Kadızade Mehmed and Sivasi Efendi in the Sultan Ahmed mosque to the death of Vani Efendi – by 1719-20, the influence of the movement should have been relatively minor. Therefore, we can suppose that by 1720 the name Kadızade might have become the synonym for orthodox fanaticism.

supposed to be the “light”. In terms of orthodoxy, this is the “religious fanaticism of the unreligious<sup>76</sup>”. Therefore, in both texts there is a reaction against religious hypocrisy; and since the two documents start with this same reaction, we may consider the issue to be somehow a characteristic of the genre, and also, as we shall see later on, of the period. However, since for the moment our concern is the identity of the author, I shall mention, as my second deduction, that he is not against “extremes” only in terms of religious corruption; but also in the way that they appear as the dividing line between the worldly and the spiritual. In three subsequent passages, he mentions that he is against the “Kalenderi-like people who say that the world is just to eat, drink, fart and shit”, “those who do not know why they came to this world and who spend their lives with talking” and “those who do not practice the five-time prayer and follow the orders of their masters”<sup>77</sup>. Although these may sound like the words of a confused mind, they actually suggest that the author is someone who is against false religiosity and someone that, in his own practices, follows a moderate way that is neither completely sinful nor fundamentally religious. Hence, the ones to be cursed in religion are the false *şeyhs* and *dervishes* and the ones who do not know the balance between faith and worldly life. This issue of balance will be one of the most frequent issues raised in *Risale-i Garibe*, however, for now I shall continue with the content analysis.

Since I have already mentioned the author’s religious stance, the best way to continue would be following the same line of argument. When the author writes about the use of *misvak* in the headgear, he allegorically connects the ones who follow this practice with deer<sup>78</sup>. This symbolic relation between a deer’s horn and *misvak* alone may not make much sense. However, the author of *Risale-i Garibe* is not the only one who makes this allegory, and he is not the only one who supports a moderate religious

---

<sup>76</sup> By Hacı Ahmed this is given as “those with tinged eyelids who pretend to be *şeyhs* without ever praying (*bi-namaz*)”, and in *Risale-i Garibe* as “those who sin and lie, but greet each other with three *vavs* (reference is to the Muslim religious greeting: *ve aleykümselamu ve rahmetullahi ve berekatühü*) and know no word other than ‘my Muslim brother.’” Hacı Ahmed, 96b; *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 20.

<sup>77</sup> “*ve heman dünyada lezzet yeyüp içmek ve osurup sıçmaktır deyeyen Kalenderi-meşrebler, bu dünyaya ne için geldiğün bilmeyüp ‘ömürin laf güzaf ile geçüren cüvanlar, ve beş vakit namazın kılmayup efendisiniün buyuriğün yerine getürmeyenler.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 44.

<sup>78</sup> “*ve çikrikta çevrilmiş misvak riya için başına sokan geyikler.*” *Ibid*, p. 21.

position with a reaction against hypocritical / pretentious religiosity. As a seventeenth century poet, intellectual and *kadı*, Atayi (d. 1636) writes the following in the *Sakiname*:

He slanders for you have drunk the wine  
(Bize hefte cengi cefasın komaz – Çeviremedim)  
Wears in his head the best of the *misvak*  
Like a rhino he attacks anyone he sees  
Hypocrisy is his cloth, like a sign  
His heart is troubled; there is a mirror (*ayine-var*)  
If it was with wearing cloak  
Every worker would be the Bayezid of his time<sup>79</sup>

In the same manner as the author of *Risale-i Garibe*, Atayi thinks that *misvak* in the headgear resembles horns, but not of a deer, of a rhino. As it is evident in the poem, Atayi uses rhino to indicate the aggressive nature of religious fanatics. It is hard to estimate in which sense the deer was used in *Risale-i Garibe*. Although, it would be anachronistic to assume that the word was used in its contemporary Turkish meaning; that is to refer to a light even empty speech, this is still one possibility. On the other hand, the Turkish-English Redhouse dictionary gives “pander” as the equivalent of *geyik* (deer) in slang usage<sup>80</sup>. However, it is less likely that the meaning we are concerned here is the same; since the author frequently uses the more explicit form of pander: *püzevenk* (*pejavend* in Persian and originally meaning “a door knob”), which would be translated into English simply as pimp. The etymological origin of *geyik* is the old Turkish *keyik*, which was used to refer to every untamed, undomesticated and wild animal<sup>81</sup>. Although in Anatolian Turkish, the word is believed to be used to mean deer only, there is still a probability that the old usage might have been kept. If we suppose that this is the case, then there appears a wildness-aggression relationship between the allegories of Atayi and the author of *Risale*. There is an obvious visual link that can be formed between the *misvak* in a headgear and a horn. This link, in Atayi comes out as a rhino and in *Risale* as a deer. Although, the obvious connotation of rhino is less clear in the use of deer, it may

---

<sup>79</sup> Kortantamer, Tunca. *17. Yüzyıl Şairi Atay'nin Hamse'sinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Görüntüsü in Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi II*, 1984, p. 72.

<sup>80</sup> Redhouse: *Yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük*. İstanbul: Redhouse Yayınevi, 1987, p. 398.

<sup>81</sup> Eyuboğlu, İsmet Zeki. *Türk Dilinin Etimoloji Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Sosyal Yayınlar, 1998, p. 281.

still bear a similar negative meaning that would denote a relationship between the wild and the aggressive. Nevertheless, despite the differences between the visual reflections of their allegories, both authors intend to reach similar conceptual conclusions about hypocritical religiosity. This may suggest that the *Risale* author was at least familiar with certain characteristics of the Ottoman literary tradition, if he himself was not brought up within that tradition.

A similarity, parallel to the one above, also exists between *Risale-i Garibe* and Gelibolulu Mustafa ‘Ali’s *Meva ‘Idü’n – Nefais Fi – Kava ‘Idi’l – Mecalis*. Although a more detailed comparison between the two works will come in the following pages, I shall nevertheless mention a few points that I find to be important for the moment. In the *Risale*, the author curses “those who travel around Istanbul and say ‘today I have seen so many places’”. These people, according to him, “are satisfied with their eyes, like a cook’s dog<sup>82</sup>”. Similarly, ‘Ali writes about the people who, like a cook’s dog, are satisfied with their eyes. However, in ‘Ali’s usage, these are not the people who talk about the places that they have seen, but those who (in a feast) look at the servants with passionate eyes, and those who (with greed) are never satisfied with what they eat (or have)<sup>83</sup>. The idiom that the two authors use is no longer a part of modern Turkish. Nevertheless, the meaning that it carries should be closer to ‘Ali’s usage. For a cook’s dog – unlike an ordinary street dog – food is practically more available. On the other hand, since it also constantly sees more food (than it consumes), a cook’s dog is never satisfied with what it has and always has an eye on what is being served. In *Risale-i Garibe*, there is a minor alteration in the meaning of this phrase. Unlike ‘Ali, the author uses it to refer to people who boast about what they have seen and done. Although both “satisfaction with what you have” and “keeping it (what you have achieved) to yourself” imply the importance of modesty, in *Risale* this is more explicit, whereas ‘Ali, more than modesty, emphasizes moderation. Between Atayi and *Risale* we have seen the

---

<sup>82</sup> “ve bütün İstanbul’ı seğirdiüp gezüp ‘Bu gün fılan kadar seyr eyledim!’ deyen gözinden doyar aşçı köpeği tabi ‘atlu kulanparalar.” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 25.

<sup>83</sup> Gelibolulu Mustafa ‘Ali, p. 349.

expression of a similar concept through different verbal and symbolic means. Correspondingly, between ‘Ali and *Risale*, there is the expression of a – though related – different concept through the same phrase. Of course, this does not necessarily suggest that our author was of the elite / learned circles. However, therefore, as it was the case with Atayi, we can nonetheless talk about a possible connection between the *Risale* author and certain layers of the Ottoman *ilmiye*; a connection, which does not have to be particularly an organic one. A further clue to this possibility is also evident in the approaches of ‘Ali and the *Risale* author towards the acrobats. In *Risale-i Garibe*, this appears as a curse on “the acrobats who walk on the rope to earn their day but who fall and die indecently (*murdar*)<sup>84</sup>.” Similarly, ‘Ali refers to the acrobats as indecent and stupid people and to what they earn as religiously illegitimate (*haram*)<sup>85</sup>. We know that ‘Ali composed his work at the end of the sixteenth century, and that the *Risale* is from the late seventeenth century. However, throughout the period between the two documents, the reaction towards the acrobats seems to have remained prevalent. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, it is hard to talk about such an approach. Abdülaziz Bey mentions them simply as entertainers<sup>86</sup> and Balıkhane Nazırı Ali Rıza Bey writes about their talents<sup>87</sup>. It is hard to tell how and why in the earlier centuries such a negative reaction emerged. What we should keep in mind here, is the prevalence of an overlapping view about a very specific profession between a palace intellectual of the late sixteenth century and an anonymous book of curses author of the late seventeenth century. Both this and the previous points seem to be fairly strong suggestions of a possibility that our author cannot actually be too much detached from the elite / learned circles of his time.

An analysis on the extent of slang used in *Risale-i Garibe* may further clarify the social background of the author. If such a study is solely based on the *Risale*, the amount

---

<sup>84</sup> “*ve dünyalık için urgan üzerine çıkup düşüp de murdar ölen canbazlar.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 43.

<sup>85</sup> Gelibolulu Mustafa ‘Ali, p. 308.

<sup>86</sup> Abdülaziz Bey. *Osmanlı Adet, Merasim ve Tabirleri: İnsanlar, İnanışlar, Eğlence, Dil*. (Hazırlayanlar: Kazım Arısan, Duygu Arısan Günay), İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995, p. 394.

<sup>87</sup> Balıkhane Nazırı Ali Rıza Bey. *Eski Zamanlarda İstanbul Hayatı*. (Hazırlayan: Ali Şükrü Çoruk), İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2001, p. 183.

of slang used in the text would immediately strike the reader, and with all the prejudices derived from the modern notions of “polite language”, we would conclude that the author was from the “lower” ranks of the society, where the use of slang is even an appreciated custom. However, what we think of today as offensive and “bad” words were not actually so bad three-four hundred years ago. Our modern understanding of an offensive insult is more or less limited with sexually explicit language, but this may not have been the case even for a prominent Ottoman intellectual as Mustafa ‘Ali. While criticizing the *Melameti* Molla Siyahi, ‘Ali does not attack the poet for using an obscene language, but for having the arrogance (despite being a weak poet) to self-satirize himself in an extreme manner so as to avoid criticism from other people. ‘Ali then quotes this poem in its exact form as an example of words of nonsense (*yave-gu*), and not obscenity<sup>88</sup>. Therefore, first of all one should rule out the established correlation between slang and low social status, and looking at the work of a palace intellectual, one should also question how offensive such a language was. At the moment, we have no certain information on who the intended audience of the *Risale-i Garibe* might have been, but we know that ‘Ali was writing to be read by an elite circle. Therefore, since he was a man who was making a living out of writing, it would be absurd to assume that the language he used was to be received as offensive. This suggests that the use of slang may not be a very adequate decisive factor when speculating on the identity of the *Risale* author, and he may indeed be a highly educated person. Therefore, with the light of all these evidents, the author of *Risale-i Garibe* may be considered as a man, who has a high familiarity with the elite culture (either through organic or inorganic ties), and in religious terms, he chooses a middle way, but when hypocrisy is concerned reacts fiercely. On the other hand, with all the ambiguity of his social position, he is also a strong advocate of a preserved and proper *kibar* culture.

---

<sup>88</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, p. 385. The poem goes as follows:

*Kırımle iki hussemler halk itdikde*  
*Germ oldu benim nefsim ucunda bazaar*  
*Amyle götün bilmek için mikdarın*  
*Hak kıldı sikimle taşığım bir kantar*

### 3.The Audience:

I have already underlined that the *Risale-i Garibe*, like most of Ottoman literature, was written within an urban context and for an urban audience. First of all, the text we have is written in Ottoman Turkish, and therefore, it is primarily addressed to those who can read and understand that language. Secondly, we know that it was written in Istanbul, and for the residents of Istanbul since it contains certain details about the city, which for an outsider would be meaningless. Thirdly, it was written for the Muslims of the city for it also embodies expressions and concepts that only Muslims or those who are highly familiar with Islamic culture would understand. While *şeyh* and *dervish* would be familiar names for many people, expressions such as “*yayak abdallar* (walking dervishes)” and “*Baba Nasuh kuşu* (the disciple of Nasuhi Efendi, the *Halveti şeyh*)<sup>89</sup>” would not make much sense. Fourthly, and related to my analysis on the author’s identity, it was written for an audience who were equally acquainted with the customs, expressions and concepts of the elite culture. As I have mentioned before, the readers and the people included in a text do not have to be from the same social status. However, when a book of curses on manners is concerned, they should have some knowledge of the appropriate demeanors of the elite, so that they can make sense of a curse on an inappropriate one. When the author writes about the people “who go to the house of a polite / an elite (*kibar evi*) and sit without being invited to do so<sup>90</sup>”, the reader should know that this is in fact the example of a bad manner. Hence, the work would have been directed towards people, who were aware of the *kibar* culture, either because they were its old members or because they were newcomers with a certain level of consciousness, but in any case still carrying similar anxieties to that of the author. Here, I am talking about a certain group of people, who detached themselves from the “vulgar” or the bad-mannered with reference to certain modes of behavior, and not the amount of wealth they

---

<sup>89</sup> *Risale-i Garibe*, pp. 22, 25.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid*, p. 26.

had accumulated, or the ranks that they had achieved. This situation corresponds to the dividing line between the newly rich and the *kibar*, where both our author and his possible audiences appear to be the advocates of the latter. As we shall see in the following chapters, what seem to trouble them were not precisely “new entries” into the elite; but entries, which did not follow the rules of the elite and therefore carried the potential danger of transforming this culture into that of the “vulgars”, did trouble them. Therefore, the group we are talking about might have been composed of either the members of the “old nobility” or the “new men”, but they were united around one common principle: The preservation of the *kibar* culture through a complete compliance to its manners and customs.

As a final remark on the nature of the *Risale* audience – and based on more concrete grounds than the above “speculation” – we can say that the text was directed towards the male population of Istanbul. This is, first of all, due the fact that in a society where literacy among the female population is considerably low, any written text should be considered to have targeted the male audience. The second evidence comes from the content of the document. Except a few cases where women are directly cursed, which will be mentioned in the following two chapters, in *Risale-i Garibe* those who are mentioned are primarily men. If there is any reference to the bad manners of a woman, this is not directed towards her, but towards her husband<sup>91</sup>. This can be based on the realities of the pre-modern patriarchal society, where active participation in public life was primarily and dominantly confined to men. In the *Risale*, every manner that is mentioned is restricted to this male domain, be it the streets, the coffeehouses, the bazaar or a feast. I do not suggest that women were not present in these places, but their presence did not require activeness. Their properness was not determined by their own manners, but of their husbands’ and fathers’; and not by what they did, but what they were allowed and not allowed to do. That is to say, in *Risale-i Garibe*, Ottoman identity is determined according to the appropriateness of the manners of men, and, concerning the women; we can only see an indirect reflection of this identity. Hence, in our document Ottomanness appears as a male performance.

---

<sup>91</sup> *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 24. “Those pimps who, on Fridays, let their wives go out on the street”.

Ever since anthropological studies on masculinity appeared in academia, “performance” and “demonstration” became the dominant terms that defined the process through which male identity was constructed. The first scholar who explicitly underlined performative excellence as the fundamental element of manhood was Michael Hertzfeld. In *The Poetics of Manhood*, a study on the Cretan mountain village Glendi, Hertzfeld examined that “in Glendoit idiom, there was less focus on ‘being a good man’ than on ‘being *good at* being a man’ – a stance that stresses *performative excellence*, the ability to foreground manhood by means of deeds that strikingly ‘speak for themselves’”<sup>92</sup>. In Glendi, it did not matter whether a shepherd could steal a sheep or not<sup>93</sup>; he had to do it in such a way that the victim would immediately notice the perpetrator’s skill. Similarly, if someone danced, he had to do it according to the exact rules. As David Gilmore points out, this means not only “adequate performance within set patterns”, but also “publicity” and “being on view”<sup>94</sup>. As the only person from the Castilian village of Fuenmayor to pursue a graduate education, Lorenzo was someone who deeply suffered the consequences of not being on view. Unable to complete his dissertation for various reasons, he returned back to his village, where he was eventually seen as a *flojo*, a term that means lazy or flaccid, but also used to describe a dead battery. The reason behind this was the life style that he picked for himself, which – unlike a proper man – he chose to pursue within the house and not in the cafes and taverns<sup>95</sup>. Such was also the case of Alfredo, owner of a small grocery store in Fuenmayor. Just as Lorenzo, his manhood was under suspicion since he preferred to spend his time with his family and not with his fellow male villagers<sup>96</sup>. However, unlike Alfredo, Lorenzo’s

---

<sup>92</sup> Hertzfeld, Michael. *The Poetics of Manhood: Contest and Identity in a Cretan Mountain Village*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985, p. 16.

<sup>93</sup> In Hertzfeld’s study, stealing sheep appears as the first step for a Glendoit shepherd boy to move from adolescence to maturity. It is almost a ritual that every boy must perform.

<sup>94</sup> Gilmore, David D. *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990, p. 36.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid, pp. 32, 33.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid, p. 52. The issue of spending too much time at home appears to be a inter-cultural, or at least a Mediterranean wide issue, as similar instances can be observed in Lozios’s study on Cyprus and Bourdieu’s

classification as a *flojo* was not limited to the fact that he lived a non public life. As the term itself implies, he was a *flojo* also because he was unemployed and unable to serve and look after his family. Therefore, along with the public demonstration of manhood through various means, we can also talk about an element of “useful activeness” that constructs and validates the male identity. The relation between “being at home” and “being un-manly” is most evident in the Portuguese village of Pardais, where domesticity feminizes and “softens” a man both because it implies unemployment and a man’s incapacity to provide, and also because it indicates a man’s absence in the masculine space *par excellence*, the café – where masculinity is practiced through drinking, smoking, talking and competing, yet not chaotically, but within the boundaries of formality and etiquette<sup>97</sup>.

The application of an anthropological study to history is most definitely problematic, since what is under investigation now is a past, which we cannot observe, but only try to reconstruct with the help of what has remained of it as evidence. However, it is nonetheless a possible and useful approach as long as we can trace the existence of similar concerns in our sources. This is exactly what Anthony Fletcher did in his article *Manhood, The Male Body, Courtship and The Household in Early Modern England*. Although he approaches the issue from a different perspective – that of the institutional aspect (schooling and as such) of manhood construction – performance again appears as a fundamental principle; but this time as the indication of a man’s control over his household<sup>98</sup>. Fletcher also emphasizes that effeminacy was seen as the opposite of manhood, and that it was identified with boyhood and immaturity, to which a return was seen as a drawback that had to be avoided<sup>99</sup>. Returning back to *Risale-i Garibe*, we see that the issues of performance, public presence, usefulness (being able to “serve”),

---

on Algeria (Gilmore, p. 51). Miguel Vale de Almeida underlines that the same incident can also be observed in the highly genderised Portuguese language which denotes ‘house’ as feminine and ‘work’ as masculine (de Almeida, Miguel Vale de. *The Hegemonic Male: Masculinity in a Portuguese Town*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1996, p. 49)

<sup>97</sup> de Almeida, p.55, 89.

<sup>98</sup> Fletcher, Anthony. *Manhood, The Male Body, Courtship and The Household in Early Modern England* in *History* July 99, Vol. 84, Issue 275, p. 431.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 421, 427.

control over the household and the contrast between effeminacy and manhood are all prevalent points, which the author raises either directly or indirectly. These points will be dealt with in detail in the third chapter. However, beforehand I shall underline that in the *Risale*, “useless” appears quite frequently as an insult in a direct fashion, and in directly as the characteristic of those who do not have control over their households. This should give at least some clue on the relation between the anthropological literature on manhood and our document. The rest, as I said, will appear in the final chapter.

## CHAPTER 2: A CHANGING *KIBAR* CULTURE?

The historical and geographical scope of *Risale-i Garibe* covers the Istanbul of late seventeenth century, and it is the work of an author, who – with the broadest possible definition – is a strong advocate of a preserved and “true” *kibar* culture. Correspondingly, the targeted audience of this author is a group of people that more or less correspond to his position. On the other hand, I have also underlined that a considerable amount of the manners mentioned in the document showed remarkable similarities with those of the intellectual elite (as evident in ‘Ali, and as will be exemplified later on). This suggests that our author was either a member of that group or had some strong, but inorganic ties with them. However, in any case he carried an anxiety that the *kibar* culture was under the threat of the newly rich (and their increasing penetration into the elite), who cared little about its manners. Therefore, one aspect of the document is its characteristic as the reflection of a conservative stand on behalf of a particular *adet-i kadim*. Certain, and indeed important, aspects of this *adet-i kadim* were formulated by Mustafa ‘Ali in the late sixteenth century. In the late seventeenth century, what we see in both the *Risale* and the *Makale* is a rage against observable and increasing deteriorations of proper manners. On the other hand, despite being the advocates of a preserved *kibar* culture, the books of curses authors may indeed be the advocates of a culture that was considerably different than what ‘Ali believed to be *kibar* in the late sixteenth century. As I have mentioned in the introduction, if culture was an arena of conflict and not of consensus, a transformation in the *kibar* world would take place in a similar manner as the consequence of a clash between the newcomers and its old members. The more the number of the newcomers increase (especially those with stronger intentions to preserve their previous identities), the more ferocious the reactions of the old members become; and these old members do not necessarily have to be from the old nobility, or the *askeri*-elite. They may well be a generation or two older than the

new ones, but since the most conservative classes are usually also the most privileged ones, they would still try to prevent new entries and therefore increase both the conflicts and the rate of transformation within the *kibar* culture. Therefore, the books of curses might also be the manifestations of a meeting point between two previously distinct classes, which could have resulted from a mutual exchange of norms and patterns of behavior. More properly, this would be the reflection of a rising class, which on its way up, carries certain elements from its former position and adopts certain elements of its new spot; and therefore contribute to its transformation.

In this chapter I will look at what remained of ‘Ali’s idea of a proper *kibar* manner in the late seventeenth century, and what changed. Therefore, the first section will be a comparison between the two books of curses and *Meva ‘Idü’n – Nefais Fi – Kava ‘Idi’l – Mecalis*. The intention here will be showing the similarities between the three works, and therefore portraying the extent of preservation within the *kibar* culture, at least in terms of ideals. Then, leaving ‘Ali’s treatise aside, I will focus on the *Risale* and the *Makale*, to see what has changed within the course of a hundred years. On the other hand, an important point to be kept in mind is the fact that the books of curses are at the same time, the examples of a certain genre, and it is not possible to suggest that the contents of the texts were exclusively and solely derived from the experiences and observations of the authors. This suggests that the documents embody both the characteristics of the genre and general reactions specific to the post-classical age that may not be all confined to what the authors experienced. However, as we shall see in the third chapter, it is easier to detect the observations of the author in *Risale-i Garibe* than in the *Makale*, and therefore, that final chapter will be devoted generally to the *Risale*, and specifically to the manners of Istanbul.

Before getting into a detailed analysis, I shall first re-emphasize certain issues and possible problems that might rise from this study. First of all, the presumption that *Risale-i Garibe* – and the book of curses genre in general – was actually the reflection of a conservative reaction on behalf of the preservation of a *kibar* culture, is based on my analysis of only the two sources I was able to look at. Therefore, both the studies on other examples of the genre and the perspectives of other scholars might, in fact, bring to

light enough clues to disprove my deductions. Secondly, since there is a hundred year distance between the *Meva 'Idü'n – Nefais Fi – Kava 'Idi'l – Mecalis* and the *Risale-i Garibe*, and since to my knowledge, there are no sixteenth century examples of the genre, I can only suggest that it was from the end of the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries that such a reactionary genre emerged. Correspondingly, one would also expect this particular literature to first appear in Istanbul and then spread to other parts of the Empire. However, the *Makale* was written in Yanya, and if it is really an earlier example of the genre, this may suggest the possibility of a reverse process. Considering the dense settlement structure of this city<sup>100</sup> and the probably equally dense interaction between different classes that might result from this, such a possibility is not out of question. Keeping all the above problems in mind, we can now move into a detailed study of the three documents in hand.

### **1. A Possible Continuity: Risale-i Garibe, Makale-i Garibe and Meva 'Idü'n – Nefais Fi – Kava 'Idi'l – Mecalis:**

If the urban / male identity was something to be demonstrated publicly, this did not mean that one had to “prove” it only outside the household and within the various domains of the urban world. The thin line between the private and the public spaces was easily crossed and “interrupted” through different forms of gatherings, since these indicated the “invited invasions” of the private space and its transformation into a public one. Presence in another household, or the presence of other people within yours required the demonstration of proper behavior, since only after that point onwards were acceptance and rejection crucial matters of consideration. The dependence of this identity on social existence and the dependence of social existence on public presence meant that, through a continuation of mutual invitations, one’s identity had to be

---

<sup>100</sup> The city is located by the lake of Yanya and is composed of an old Byzantium fortress, which includes both the governor’s house and other – densely grouped – residences. The fortress, on the other hand, is surrounded by another residential area, which is also dense, and the total of the city is not bigger than contemporary Eminönü region of Istanbul.

approved; and this could only be achieved with the conduct of proper manners. Therefore, while comparing Mustafa ‘Ali and *Risale-i Garibe*, my starting point will be gatherings, invitations and manners of the table.

The beginning of every gathering, of every invitation involves a promise; a promise of being at a certain place at a certain time. According to ‘Ali, those who do not come to a meeting although they were invited (and in return promised to come), should be punished according to the decision of whoever organizes the gathering. The penalty, which he finds suitable, is the payment of a certain amount of gold<sup>101</sup>. The author of the *Risale* shows a similar reaction both towards “the dissolute men, who say ‘I will come to you at this time’, but do not and keep the man waiting” and “the dissolute men, who say ‘come to me at this time’, but when the time comes, not being present in their homes, make the [invited] man miserable<sup>102</sup>.” Of course, visiting someone (but not gatherings and feasts) is not always a pre-arranged incident, and may take place spontaneously. However, even if that is the case, there are certain rules to be followed, and in the world of the *kibars* “dropping by” is not always a welcomed practice. It is timely bound, and the party to be pleased is more the *kibar* host than the visitor. If you are careless enough to visit a *kibar* during meal times, then according to the author of *Risale*, as an insolent, you deserve a curse<sup>103</sup>. Since you are not to displease a *kibar* with your visits, ‘Ali suggests that the best thing to do is to observe at what times of the day he is happy and joyful. Possible dropping by times, which he advises are forenoon, noon and afternoon, among which forenoon is the most suitable one. Since after-lunch corresponds to a period of relaxation, laziness and heaviness, visits at such a time is most disturbing and troubling for the *kibar*<sup>104</sup>. The visits, gatherings and feasts of the *kibars* did not only involve the elites themselves, but also their servants. However, the amount and type of servants that you could bring along was also restricted. Anyone who joins a gathering with his young

---

<sup>101</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, p. 377.

<sup>102</sup> “ve: ‘Adem sana filan vakt gelürüm’ deyüp gelmeyüp ademi intizara düşüren sefihler, ve ‘Fülan vakt bana gel!’ deyüp ol vakt hanunda durmayup gelen ademi zar giryan eden sefihler.” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 37.

<sup>103</sup> “ve ta ‘am zamani her vakit kibar ziyaretine varan edebsizler.” Ibid, p. 26.

<sup>104</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, p. 395.

and beautiful [male] servants is, according to the author of *Risale-i Garibe*, a dotard<sup>105</sup>. The answer to the question why, comes from Mustafa ‘Ali. Since the servants are not allowed to join the meal, they have to wait outside, together with the servants of the host. However, these young and beautiful boys, the *sade-ru* servants, are a part of an elite’s *harem*. If the visitor is of a lower rank than the host, his *sade-ru* servants will not be allowed to join those of the host, but will have to wait with the disgraced (*erazil*) ordinary servants. This is as dishonoring a behavior as bringing along your wife to a gathering, since those ordinary servants will be then taking advantage of the *sade-ru* servants<sup>106</sup>.

Once the arrival and all the procedures relevant to it is successfully completed, a *kibar* enters the actual stage where he will have to demonstrate how proper a man he is: That is, the table. And the challenge starts with the very problem of how to take a seat. It is a most unusual and unacceptable manner to sit without being invited to do so; and it is even worse if the seat that you take is at the head of the table, a place that is reserved for the most respectable and the highest-ranking member of the gathering. And if you are insolent enough not just to take that seat, but also to lean back to the cushion in an unmannered fashion, then for ‘Ali you deserve to be taken by the arm to the lowest seat at the table<sup>107</sup>, and for the author of *Risale* you deserve a double curse. First, for taking a seat before you are invited to do and then, when you are invited, rising up and sitting back so as to look polite; and second, for sitting above those who are older than you<sup>108</sup>.

Having overcome the “seating” ritual without being dragged by the arm and without being cursed, it is now time for the meal and the conversation, a long and painful experience since every move you make from this point onwards is an indication of your personality and character. Patience comes as the first task. If you are with your superiors, you should first wait for the eldest member of the gathering to take the first portion of the meal. If you are among friends and equals, then it is the owner of the

---

<sup>105</sup> “ve bir yere müsafirete varup taze hizmetkarın getüren ... matuh kibarlar.” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 36.

<sup>106</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, p. 394.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid, p. 395.

<sup>108</sup> “kibarlar evlerinde ta ‘am kurulup sahib-hane: ‘Buyrun!’ demeden seğırdüp çökenler ve: ‘Buyrun!’ denildikte aklınca zirafet ediip, geri oturup,... ve da ‘vet olunmadan meclise varan, varup da gendiinden ihtiyar kimselerin üzerine oturanlar.” *Risale-i Garibe*, pp. 26, 27.

house that you should wait for<sup>109</sup>. On the other hand, when you start eating, a behavior that you should definitely avoid is pulling a certain dish that is away from you, closer to yourself, especially if it is right in front of someone else; or if you are eating from the same pot. According to the *Risale* author, the people who do so, together with the ones who use five of their fingers while eating, are glutton cows (*'abdu'l-batn sığırları*)<sup>110</sup>, and Hacı Ahmed curses them as “people whose dirty hands should dry<sup>111</sup>.” Patience and avoidance of gluttony, at least its obvious expression, is then to be followed by an open submission to the Turkish proverb “the guest eats not what he wishes, but what he finds”. This means that besides from your close friends or those equal to you in terms of rank or age, you should not ask for a dish or a drink other than what are already being served. Doing so indicates your “stupidity<sup>112</sup>”, because if you are “a guest who changes the already served dish by saying ‘let this go and bring another food’<sup>113</sup>”, then ‘Ali would immediately dismiss you from the gathering; and if your insolence goes far enough to ask for opium and coffee, then the dismissal will be preceded first by the insult “eat and drink poison and pass out”, and then by two slaps in the face<sup>114</sup>.

The gathering, which you attend, might be – as well as being a regular meal – a “wine meeting” (*bade meclisi*). That is to say, it can be a gathering that involves the consumption of wine, whether with or without meal. In that case, the first thing that you should be careful about is to avoid getting drunk before your friends and before the conversation heats up. It should not be the habit of a *kibar* “to pass out like a fruit tree

---

<sup>109</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, p. 397.

<sup>110</sup> “ve yaranın öninden ta ‘amı gendü önine çekenler, ve ta ‘amundan beş parmağın bile yahni içine sokanlar.” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 27.

<sup>111</sup> “ve sofrada cümlesi bir yirde bir sahandan yirken gayrı ta ‘ama el uzunluğun iden dest-i na-pakı kuruyacaklara.” Hacı Ahmed, 97b.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid, 97a. Here, the cursed group appears almost in the same way as it does in *Risale*: “those fools, who – after the table is ready, the bread and the salt are served and the meal is brought – loose / send away the ready meal by saying ‘also bring this [another food]’.” (*sofra çekilüp nan ü ni ‘met dökilüp yimek ortaya geldükden sonar hele filan dahi gelsün diyü hazır ta ‘amı koyup ga’ibe giden (iden?) ahmaklara.*)

<sup>113</sup> “ve sofrada konmuş iken ‘Bu dursun, fülani yimek gelsün!’ deyüp hazır ta ‘amı kalduran müsafirler.” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 30.

<sup>114</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, p. 350.

struck by the hail, to speak improperly, to vomit and then to become unable to talk<sup>115</sup>.” In fact, *Risale-i Garibe* curses those people twice (again), since they are already the damned “who drink wine, but – not being able to handle it – vomit like dogs<sup>116</sup>.” However, if you are not able to drink properly, it is better not to attend such a gathering than to do so without drinking. Going to a wine meeting, and saying, “I am not going to drink wine, but only eat”, will return to you as a curse, since you will then become a “table/meal exploiter” (*sofra kurudan*)<sup>117</sup>. On the other hand, gatherings as such are crucial elements of the urban life, and not attending one is not such a desirable choice, especially if you are invited – remember that this would make attendance almost obligatory. Correspondingly, since you would neither want to be cursed nor called a *sofra kurudan*, the only logical option seems to be joining the meeting and drinking the wine so as to show everyone how proper a man you are. However, being not so resistant to wine will make things highly difficult for you. You must be very careful, drink very slowly and try not to lose control, because the punishment that you will get may not be confined to dismissal from further gatherings and being cursed. If, by chance, you look at the face of the *sade-ru* servant, you may think that – with the influence of alcohol – he is smiling back with his “rose-like red lips”. Then, the look in your eyes may lead the house owner (and the others) to conclude that you are mutually hoisting signals of lust. Although the boy is innocent and it is the wine that makes you think that he is responding to you, the punishment that follows is both your and the servant’s execution<sup>118</sup>. Looking at the face of the servant boy, on the other hand, is the indication of an ill manner not only in wine gatherings. It is an animal-like behavior, even though it may be coffee that you are drinking<sup>119</sup>. Therefore, no matter what your actual feelings may be, your ability

---

<sup>115</sup> Ibid, p. 348.

<sup>116</sup> “*ve hazm etmeyüp şarab içüp köpek gibi kusan mel ‘unlar.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 35.

<sup>117</sup> “*ve bade meclisinde varup: ‘Ben bade içmem, heman yirem!’ deyen sofrâ kurudanlar.*” Ibid, p. 27.

<sup>118</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, p. 348.

<sup>119</sup> “*ve kibar hanesinde taze hizmetkarlar kahve verirken oğlanın yüzine bakan hayvanlar.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 26.

to hide them and cover your lust, will distinguish you from the ignorant, ill mannered and animal-like people.

As a *kibar*, it is almost inevitable that in at least one of the meetings / gatherings that you attend, there will be people who are either older or of a higher status than you. In front of such people, you should avoid spitting, belching, picking your nose and blowing your nose loudly<sup>120</sup>. “The ill mannered and impotent (sexually)<sup>121</sup> people who [when the bowl and the ewer is brought to the table] – not being embarrassed by the presence of others – spit and blow their noses into the bowl”, and “the useless people who [in a gathering], put their fingers into their nostrils, pick their noses and flick away the dirt [the slime]<sup>122</sup>”, do not know the demeanors of the society, and they should not be brought to the house and their names should not be spelled<sup>123</sup>. However, “blowing your nose with a tune (*makam ile*) and like a trumpet (*firenk borusu gibi*)” is always a sign of wickedness as long as there are people present, no matter if they are friends or superiors<sup>124</sup>.

The reason why people come together, of course, is not just to eat and drink. Conversation, or proper conversation, constituted a crucial part of the gatherings. Here, patience, respect and attention are the three qualities that a proper urbanite should have. If you are impatient enough to “speak before someone else has finished his sentence” or to “interrupt another man’s story by saying ‘don’t forget your word, stick a candle’<sup>125</sup>”, then certainly you are not aware of the delights of a proper conversation and deserve the

---

<sup>120</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, pp. 352, 353.

<sup>121</sup> “*ve ba ‘de-ta ‘am el yunurken legene sümküren bestelere.*” Hacı Ahmed, 98a. The word which Hacı Ahmed uses is *beste*, and among many meanings that can be found in Redhouse – including bound, prisoner and under obligation – impotent seems to be the most appropriate here.

<sup>122</sup> “*ve liğen ibrik geldükte leğen içine sümküriüp ya tüküriüp ol mecliste olandan utanmayan bi-edebler,..., ve bie mecliste parmağı burnuna sokup karışdırup çıkan habaseti fiske ile atan mehmelatlar.*” Risale-i Garibe, pp. 26, 27.

<sup>123</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, p. 352.

<sup>124</sup> “*ve birkaç kimseler yanında makam ile sümküriüp firenk borusu gibi burnunu öttüren na-hemvarlar.*” Risale-i Garibe, p. 34.

<sup>125</sup> “*ve bir adem cevab söylerken ol dahi tamam olmadan söz söyleyenler,..., ve bir adem hikaye söylerken: ‘Sözünü unutma, mum yapıştır!’ deyüp sadede girenler.*” Ibid, p. 27.

blasphemies of the *kibars*<sup>126</sup>. In Hacı Ahmed's words, "anyone who starts a story before another man finishes his" is after all, nothing more than a "dog (?)"<sup>127</sup>. On the other hand, if you do not pay attention to an elder's words, and with all your disrespect (and without knowing what he is really talking about) interrupt his speech by asking "what did you say"<sup>128</sup>, then first you should be dismissed from the gathering, and if you insist on misbehavior, you should be dismissed (never to come back) after being beaten up<sup>129</sup>. Such an act makes you a "disgraced addict"<sup>130</sup>.

However, proper conversation is not only determined by formal – or behavioral – rules. There are also certain things that you should never mention. During a meal, talking about diseases and accidents related to the flow of bodily fluids is as indecent a behavior as blowing your nose like a trumpet<sup>131</sup>. This is – in its most explicit form – "talking about shit [literally] at the table"<sup>132</sup>. On the other hand, such issues that would cause disgust among the listeners were inappropriate to be mentioned not only during meals, but also when there were elders amongst you, and under such circumstances, spitting on the face would be the punishment for anyone who disgusted the listeners<sup>133</sup>. In addition, you should definitely not talk about topics that you do not know well enough to comment upon. If there are experts among you, this will only make your ignorance more apparent, and degrade you more<sup>134</sup>. That is to say, not to be insulted like an idiot,

---

<sup>126</sup> Mustafa 'Ali, p. 285

<sup>127</sup> "ve bir kimesne bir hikaye diyüvürürken arkurıdan ol tamam olmadın bir hikaye dahi başlayan köpeklere (?)." Hacı Ahmed, 98a.

<sup>128</sup> "ve müshabeti evvelinden dinlemeyüp tamam olçak: 'Ne dedün?' deyü soran hayvanlar." Risale-i Garibe, p. 35.

<sup>129</sup> Mustafa 'Ali, p. 284

<sup>130</sup> "ve bir müsahebet evvelinde dinlemeyüp dahi tamam olacak mahalde evvelin soran nekbeti tiryakilere." Hacı Ahmed, 97a.

<sup>131</sup> "ve sofrta üzerinde mariz ve hades müzakeresin idenler." This section appears right after the one on blowing the nose. Risale-i Garibe, p. 34.

<sup>132</sup> "ve sofrta üzerinde poh lakırdısın iden pohlı mucıçlara." Hacı Ahmed, 97b.

<sup>133</sup> Mustafa 'Ali, p. 352.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid, p. 294, 295.

you should be “as sound and sedate as iron” (*demür boku gibi ağır*)<sup>135</sup>. Therefore, during a conversation, the properness of a man is defined both by formal rules (such as showing respect through the avoidance of interruption) and the content of his speech (not mentioning certain issues).

What we have so far seen were the rules that determined the appropriate manners of an Ottoman during meetings and gatherings. Although, as I have mentioned before, the activities within such a domain cannot be defined as belonging to the private sphere, they took place within a relatively closed circle. Moreover, those qualities of properness were (more or less) confined to the special circumstances of those meetings. However, the life that took place outside such circles was equally important, and without it, the social sphere of a man would be incomplete. On the other hand, the rules of the outside world that appear in Mustafa ‘Ali, Hacı Ahmed and *Risale-i Garibe*, and correspond to each other, represent the general characteristics of a proper urbanite, and unlike those mentioned above, they are not case specific. Nevertheless, they still represent the similar expectations and beliefs of three different authors.

As I have mentioned every gathering starts with a promise, and not keeping that promise involves a punishment. However, “not keeping the promise” is not an ill manner only because it ends with the dissolution of one’s expectations. It has a deeper dimension, which leads to a deeper fault, a sin in fact. The immediate reaction, “You said you would come, but you did not”, ends with the ultimate expression of disappointment, “You lied.” In our documents, lying appears as an ill manner first as itself, and then as the basis of various other forms of misbehavior. The “liars, who do not keep their promises<sup>136</sup>” or “the Arab-like (or worker / peasant-like) (*fellah tabi’atlu*) scoundrels, who tell a lie as if it was the truth and swear, and swear in every answer<sup>137</sup>,”

---

<sup>135</sup> *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 37. Here the meaning might also be reverse. Since *demir boku* also means “iron dust”, it may read as “like iron dust, not being heavy and being degraded like an idiot.” The Turkish goes as follows: *Demür boku gibi ağır olmayup gendüyi zelil eden şulfalar*.

<sup>136</sup> “*ve ‘ahdine turmayan yalancılara.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97b.

<sup>137</sup> “*ve bir yalan gerçek gibi söyleyüp yemin idenler; ve her cevabda yemin eden fellah tabi ‘atlu negbeti gidiler.*” *Risale i Garibe*, p. 40.

are, according to ‘Ali, like a candle without light, and since they constantly keep their companions in dark, they are bound to cause them trouble. In addition, since they constantly say “*Vallahi, Billahi*” (by and by God), they sin twice: First, because they lie and second, because they take an oath upon a lie<sup>138</sup>. Besides those who consciously lie, there are also people “who tell whatever they here without ever knowing if they are true or not<sup>139</sup>”, and that is why one answer to the question, “who is the liar”, is, “the one who tells what he hears”<sup>140</sup>. Therefore – besides not to lie –, what appears as a characteristic of a proper man is to avoid “carrying words” (or to gossip in the broadest sense), since it can make you an unconscious liar. On the other hand, “carrying words” may appear not just as an unconscious act, but a highly conscious and harmful one once it turns into telltale and misinformation. “The deprived [from God’s mercy] people who tell tales about others and who deserve to die young<sup>141</sup>” and “those who should be hanged from their necks because they [untruthfully] blame people by saying ‘So and so made fun of you’<sup>142</sup>” are devils in the shape of man. Those “traitors<sup>143</sup> are like a plague, which can destroy a whole city since their job is to separate the lover from the loved, the father from the son and the brother from the sister<sup>144</sup>.

Lying is itself an unacceptable behavior, but it also opens the way for another ill manner: Hypocrisy. We have already seen that both authors were highly sensible about its religious dimension. However, as a cloak, hypocrisy also functions in other parts of the daily life, and “those damned people who eat and drink with their friends, but talk

---

<sup>138</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, p. 302.

<sup>139</sup> “*ve her biliüp bilmediği aslı yok işittiği sözleri söyleyenler.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 42.

<sup>140</sup> Mustafa, ‘Ali, p. 303.

<sup>141</sup> “*bir kimseden bir söz işidiüp kendüyi rahmetden mahrum etmek için gammazlık iden civanmerg olacak bi-nevalara.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97a.

<sup>142</sup> “*falan kimesne seni hakkında hezeliyyat söyledi diyüp münaflat ve zemlik iden boğazından asılacaklara.*” Ibid, 97b.

<sup>143</sup> “*ve birinin mabeyninde münaflat eden ha’inler.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 27.

<sup>144</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, pp. 303, 304.

from their back when they leave, are to be hanged from their necks<sup>145</sup>.” Just as making fun of someone, respecting him during his presence but loathing him as soon as he leaves is an equally unacceptable behavior, and fit only for the hypocrites. It has been understood that such grandees are worse than intriguing small people, and even worse “than those who drink the wine of poison in the gatherings of debauchery<sup>146</sup>.” If hypocrisy is a means of disguise, it is not only one that hides someone’s actual motives or ideas, but also one that – and with a more direct connection to lying – portrays him physically different than who he really is. Therefore, just as the unfaithful may look faithful and the bad may look good, with a hypocritical lie, the rich can easily look poor, and “those accursed dogs, who say ‘We are poor’, while they are rich<sup>147</sup>” appear as the proprietors of another, yet related, bad manner: Miserliness. Those people who do not prepare meals despite having the enough means, cooks, servants and the kitchen, and those who do not provide food (bread) for the needy, while it is possible are not received well by the society<sup>148</sup>. These are the “Pinti Hamids<sup>149</sup>, who – although they are well off – wear dresses with eighty patches; the well offs, who put patches on their shoes and socks (*mest*) only because of their stinginess; the greedy merchants, who put the cheese in a bottle and lick the bottle; those who do not buy melons and water-melons until the ports start smelling [with their skins, since they are plenty]; and the donkeys, who buy two kilos of rice from the port, but – since they do not pay five *akçes* to the porter – carry it themselves<sup>150</sup>.” Of course, the opposite extreme of miserliness, wastefulness, is also an

---

<sup>145</sup> “*yanarile yeyüp içüp yüzüne gülüp ardından fasl eden boğazından asılacak melunlar.*” Risale-i Garibe, p. 27.

<sup>146</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, pp. 335, 336.

<sup>147</sup> “*ve zengin olup: ‘Fakirem’ deyen köpek mela ‘inler.*” Risale-i Garibe, pp. 30, 31.

<sup>148</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, p. 331.

<sup>149</sup> An imaginary character – most probably dating back to eleventh century Iranian literature – used as a metaphor for miserliness, as the equivalent of “Varyemez” (Develi, p. 91). A “Scrooge McDuck”, so to say.

<sup>150</sup> “*ve vakti hoş olup seksen yamalı esbab geyen Pinti Hamidler; ve hasisliğinden mestini, pabucunu yamalayan bi-ma ‘niler; ve peyniri şişe içine koyup taşrasın yalayan bazirganlar; ve kavun karpuz iskeleler kokmadan alup yemeyenler,..., ve iskeleden iki kile birinc alup hammala beş akça vermeye kıyamayıp gendüsi yüklenüp getüren humarlar.*” Risale-i Garibe, p. 30.

unacceptable manner. If you – just because you desire, and although there is ready meal – ask for and prepare banquet-like meals, then you are an equally ill-mannered person<sup>151</sup>. After all, between the two extremes, there is an important connection, and “the stingy people who say ‘Let God provide’ to the poor when they ask for money” are the same that “tip the acrobats and the tumblers<sup>152</sup>.” Therefore, to be a proper man, the delicate balance between miserliness and wastefulness has to be kept, just as the one between faith and religious fanaticism.

I have given two sets of examples on how manners overlapped in three documents, written in different periods and by different authors. The first set was what we can basically call the “manners of the table”, and of “gatherings and conversation”. The second, on the other hand, showed what the expected general characteristics of properness were. One thing that the reader might have noticed so far, is the extent of similarities between the three documents, which – while moving back and forth between them – made the above piece almost seem as if coming out of a single source – though the changes in tone and language might have made it possible to distinguish between them. However, I shall mention that this is not the case for every manner that appears in the texts, and while the above selection reflects the level of parallelism on certain topics, it is not possible to find every issue raised by Mustafa ‘Ali in *Makale-i Garibe* and *Risale-i Garibe*, and vice versa. This may be due to the possible transformation that the *kibar* culture was going through. To see whether this may be the case or not, the next step to pursue would be leaving Mustafa ‘Ali and pursuing a similar comparative account of the manners as they correspondingly appear in the two books of curses alone. Since this section dealt with the traces of a possible continuity in the *kibar* culture, taking Mustafa ‘Ali as a starting point, I concentrated on the clues of that process in Hacı Ahmed and *Risale*. In the following pages, on the other hand, I will be looking at the similarities between the two books of curses – though from different geographies – to see the perception of good and bad manners in the late seventeenth century. These may, as

---

<sup>151</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, p. 331.

<sup>152</sup> “*ve taklabazlara ve hokabazlara bahşış verüip fukaraya, bir dünyalık diledükte: ‘İfteilahu’ deyen hasisler.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 31.

one might expect, resemble or extensively differ from those that I have already touched upon. However, before moving any further, there is one more point that I want to underline. As you would recall, I have, at the beginning of the first chapter, mentioned that the curses in *Risale-i Garibe* and *Makale-i Garibe* were punishments, which intended to exclude the cursed one from public life (through shame) rather than cause physical pain. Similarly, the punishments, which ‘Ali found suitable for the ill mannered, were (besides the extreme example of execution – which may, in fact, be seen as the ultimate form of exclusion) also based on either dismissal from gatherings or exclusions from further ones. Therefore, once again, the social or public sphere appears as the stage where urban masculinity is performed, and exclusion from it, accordingly, reflects the rejection of that identity when demonstrated inappropriately.

## **2. A Possible Change: *Risale-i Garibe* and *Makale-i Garibe*:**

So far, it seems that most of what ‘Ali perceived as bad manners were more or less preserved in the books of curses. However, in certain aspects – and besides those that I have mentioned above – they differed in quite a remarkable fashion. If you recall the section concerning “blowing the nose”, it was, for both the book of curses authors and Mustafa ‘Ali, an unacceptable behavior to pursue that practice during a meal (or in front of the elders) and in a noisy fashion. On the other hand, while the book of curses authors were also advising not to blow your nose into the bowl (which was brought to the table to clean your hands), such a caution was not prevalent in ‘Ali. This may suggest that certain manners were internalized to such an extent that ‘Ali did not find it necessary to mention them. Then, why did it become necessary in the late seventeenth century for the authors of the *Risale* and the *Makale*, to underline such a demeanor? Could this point to the increasing presence of such insolent and bad mannered people in the gatherings of the *kibars*? Similarly, in the two books of curses we also observe that the authors do not limit themselves with the manners of *kibar* gatherings and that they move into the outside world, into the “street.” Correspondingly, could this suggest that the *kibar* culture was evolving into a less secluded and more open body?

To visit a *kibar* without an invitation was something acceptable, as long as it was done at the appropriate time. However, when a gathering or a meeting is concerned, and you are not among the invited, then the case will become quite different, and “going to a place [a gathering] that you are not invited to<sup>153</sup>” is going to make you “impudent<sup>154</sup>.” Although, in the two books of curses, this appears like a general concern, and it is not directly indicated that the authors are actually writing about gatherings, since the following sections in the two texts are similarly on the manners of the table (during such meetings) it is possible to suggest that the place that you should not go without being invited is in fact a gathering. In *Risale-i Garibe*, this is the section on “sitting above the elders” and in Hacı Ahmed, there is an immediate curse on “those who put the pilaf inside their hand-kerchiefs<sup>155</sup>.” In ‘Ali, uninvited attendance seems to be an irrelevant issue, and he does not ever mention it. After all, since the punishment of misbehavior during a meal is dismissal or exclusion from further gatherings, it should be unthinkable to participate in one without ever being invited.

We have already seen various examples of what to do and not to do before the meal, but with the two books of curses, another “prohibition” appears; and again this is something that we cannot see in ‘Ali. The “dull people<sup>156</sup>” who, “like cows, drink too much water before the meal<sup>157</sup>” are cursed by both of the authors. The reason of such a reaction was probably the fact that excessive consumption of water prior to the meal would fill you up so much that you would not be able to eat; and eating being the primary reason why you attended the gathering, this would be a serious offense to the host. Once the meal starts, there are, of course, further offences – or improper manners / behaviors – that you should avoid. One of them is related to the general concern about hypocrisy.

---

<sup>153</sup> “ve da ‘vet olunmadan meclise varan.” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 27.

<sup>154</sup> “ve da ‘vet olunmayan yire varan utanmazlara.” Hacı Ahmed, 97a.

<sup>155</sup> “hob pilavı destmaline saran ‘arsızlara.” Hacı Ahmed, 97a.

<sup>156</sup> Öküz: This would also mean “ox” as well as “dull.” Ibid, 97b.

<sup>157</sup> “ve yimek evvelinde sığır gibi çok su içen öküzlere.” Hacı Ahmed, 97b; “ve ta ‘am evvelinde çok çok sığır gibi su içenler.” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 30.

This is “reciting the *Fatiha* while the meal is still on the table<sup>158</sup>.” *Fatiha*, being the first *sura* of *Kur’an*, is believed, by many, to be the essence of *Kur’an*, and it was not meant to be recited in every occasion. While the beginning or the end of a meal could have been perceived as a proper time of recitation, the middle of the meal was certainly not; and those who did not follow that practice could only be “hypocrites<sup>159</sup>,” trying to show-off how good Muslims they were. However, and despite its importance, reciting the *Fatiha* was not directly related to the manners of eating and drinking. “Putting the food that has remained in your spoon back in to the bowl<sup>160</sup>,” on the other hand, was, and it would make you “dirty<sup>161</sup>” and “degenerate<sup>162</sup>.” The reason is obvious when you consider that everyone was actually eating from the same bowl. In that occasion, putting what had remained in your spoon back into the bowl would be no different than spitting it back. Another bad table manner that appears in the books of curses, but does not in ‘Ali, is a curse on “those – whose hands should dry – who wipe their hands and mouths with the table napkins<sup>163</sup>.” Of course, a bad mannered person can always go further in his misbehaviors, and leaving the napkin aside and instead “wiping your mouth with the sleeve of your furry coat<sup>164</sup>” or “with the tip of your sash<sup>165</sup>” is just the thing to do if you want to be called a “dog<sup>166</sup>.” If this is not enough for you, and you also want to be called “filthy”<sup>167</sup>, then you may very well “hide fish and meat under your coat<sup>168</sup>”

---

<sup>158</sup> “*dahi ta ‘am ortada iken fatiha okuyan yegencik mürayilere.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97a; “*ve dahi ta ‘am ortada iken fatiha okıyanlar.*” Risale-i Garibe, p. 35.

<sup>159</sup> *Mürayi=Müra’i (?)* Hacı Ahmed, 97a.

<sup>160</sup> “*ve kaşığında kalan ta ‘amı yine ta ‘am içine dökən na-cinslere.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97b; “*ve kaşıқта kalan ta ‘am bakiyyesini gine ta ‘am içine alup gine sofra içine dökən murdarlar.*” Risale-i Garibe, p. 30.

<sup>161</sup> “*murdarlar.*” Risale-i Garibe, p. 30.

<sup>162</sup> “*na-cinsler.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97b.

<sup>163</sup> “*ve ba ‘zı ziyafetlerde peşkir ile elin silen eli silen eli kuruyacaklara.*” Hacı Ahmed, 98a; “*ve kibar evlerinde azim ziyafetlerde latif peşkirlere elini silen ve ağzın yağını silen eli kuruyaçaklar.*” Risale-i Garibe, p. 26.

<sup>164</sup> “*kürklü ferace yeniyle ağzın silen köpeklere.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97b.

<sup>165</sup> “*ve ferracesiniün eteği ile kuşağın ucile ağzın gözün silen beynedler.*” Risale-i Garibe, p. 30.

<sup>166</sup> “*köpekler.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97b.

The final curse related to proper behavior at the table is cast upon “the insolent people, who invite the servants of the house owner to the table<sup>169</sup>.” ‘Ali, again does not find it necessary to mention such an ill-manner, however, since the curse involves the invitation of the servants to the table, the gathering can not be one that is organized by and for the commoners. It should be held by someone, who can afford to have servants, and the guests should be from the same (or close) social status. Then, if ‘Ali took the avoidance of this act almost as a given and known fact, and did not write about it in the late sixteenth century, why did it become necessary to emphasize it in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries? One possible answer would be that ‘Ali might have just overlooked it or forgot to mention, which then, could easily be the case for all of the bad manners I have mentioned above. On the other hand, we should also remember that ‘Ali composed his treatise upon a request and based on what he had observed as the misbehavior of the people. Therefore, what he did not write could possibly be what he did not see. In *Risale-i Garibe*, there is a section that curses “the newly-rich, who – when they have a few *akçes* – consider themselves to be grandees and say ‘No one but me has *akçes*<sup>170</sup>.’” Then, another possibility would be that the insolent people, who invited the servants to the table, were actually those newly-rich: People, who were unaware of the manners of the *kibars*, and “the workers who, although [they themselves are] coming from the ‘class’ of the Turks (*tai’fe-i Türk*), the converts (*ahriyan*) and the slaves (*kölemen*), don’t like anyone after having a little wealth<sup>171</sup>.”

---

<sup>167</sup> *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 30. The insult *mülevves* (filthy) appears in Hacı Ahmed (97b) as *mülevven*, which means colorful. This is probably a spelling error.

<sup>168</sup> “*ferracesiniün altına et veya balık saklayan mülevvenlere.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97b; “*ve eteğin altına et ve ciğer ve zifir şeyler saklayan mülevvesler.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 30.

<sup>169</sup> “*ve kabir sofrasında ta ‘am sahibiniün hizmetkarın sofraya çağırın edebsizlere.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97a, 97b; “*ve bir meclise varup hane sahibiniün hizmetkarlarına: ‘Siz de buyurun!’ deyü sofraya çağırınlar.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 35.

<sup>170</sup> “*ve eline bir kaç akça girmeğile gendüyi bir büyük adem tabakasına koyup: ‘Benden gayri kimsede akça yok!’ kıyas eden sonradan görmişler.*” *Risale-I Garibe*, p. 32.

<sup>171</sup> “*ve tai ‘fe-i Türk ve Ahriyan ve Kölemenlikten gelüp bir miktar şey’e [malik] kimse olmağıla kimse beğenmeyen ırgadlar.*” *Ibid*, p.32.

When we look at the preceding lines, this reaction becomes more evident, and also takes a new dimension. Here, we read a curse cast upon “those who are the followers (*tevabi’i*) of neither the *aghas* nor the *vezirs*, but still wearing the cloths of the *sarıcas* and the *sekbans*, ..., especially those who are noble urbanites / Istanbulites, but still do not seclude themselves from the world of the people<sup>172</sup>.” In the first part of the quotation, we can see the disapproval of an imitative penetration into the elite, or more properly the *kibar* class, which would challenge the former regulative divisions based on the dress code. Accordingly, in both the first and the second parts, what we see, beyond a critique of the new rich, is a willingness to return back to a certain ‘*adet-i kadim*’ which would clearly set the noble apart from the commoner. A similar concern also appears as a curse on “the *alim* [without knowing themselves and their ranks] who affiliate with the brigands, and the honorable nobles who speak with the cheaters and the disgraced<sup>173</sup>.” Of course, it is not possible to presume that texts such as the books of curses were weaved around a single argument, or that they advocated clear-cut points. Therefore, I do not suggest that these are definite facts. They are only possibilities, and since one might also ask the question, how come the books of curses authors were aware of these ill manners, but the newly rich were not, the case is an open one.

If we move out of the household and into the streets, we also get closer to the manners of the everyday life and of a world that is hard to define either as belonging to the elite or the commoners. However, this is at the same time a world, which ‘Ali neglects to describe, and therefore, we can only understand it through the eyes of our book of curses authors. On the other hand, what overlap in the two documents as “manners of the street” (and not general views or comments) are limited to a few incidents, but nevertheless these are sufficient enough to draw a general picture.

As I have previously mentioned, the targeted audience of *Risale-i Garibe* was the male population of Istanbul, and while the women in most of the cases appeared as passive subjects, activeness and *performative excellence* was only expected from men.

---

<sup>172</sup> “*bahusus zat-i şerif şehir oğlanı olup da halk aleminden hicab etmeyen*”, Ibid, p. 32.

<sup>173</sup> “*ve alim olup mertebesin bilmeyüp eşkiya ile ihtilat eden gendilerin bilmezler; ve kişizade olup ehl-i ‘ırz iken maryol negbeti ile konuşan olmayacak.*” Ibid, p. 32.

The two curses (that appear in both of the documents, others, appearing only in the *Risale* will be given in the next chapter), which are directly cast upon women and not through men, are for “those rotten [women], thinking that they are old (or as if they were old), walk in the streets with their faces open (not veiled)<sup>174</sup>” and “the imbeciles and the neglected [women] that tinge their eyes with coal<sup>175</sup>.” Besides these examples, women, together with children, appear not as the active conductors of a bad manner, but as passive victims. Therefore, “the panders, who got to the Mevlevihane with their wives and [little] sons<sup>176</sup>”, “those who go to the port [to buy linen] with their wives and *cariyes*<sup>177</sup>”, “those donkeys and dissolute people, who bring their [little] sons to the *mescid*; and the pimps, who take their daughters out during festival days<sup>178</sup>” are the cursed ones, and not the wives, sons and daughters.

An important place where the male-urbanite performance took place was the coffeehouse. In the coffeehouse, and while among friends it would be a highly insolent behavior to say to your servant, “son, go to the house and bring the big purse, I ran out of money<sup>179</sup>.” Hacı Ahmed refers to these people as “penniless and impudent people” and the author of *Risale-i Garibe* as “pimps”. The authors might have reacted and cursed these people because of two possible reasons. First of all, such a behavior (in the presence of people and especially friends) would most probably be considered as impolite and ostentatious. Secondly, and more related to Hacı Ahmed’s reaction, it might have

---

<sup>174</sup> “*kendüyin kocakarı zann idiüp de çarşuda yüzün açup gezen kokmuşlar.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97b; “*gendüsin koca karı zann ediüp sokaklarda yüzün ve gözün açan kokmuşlar.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 28.

<sup>175</sup> “*gözlerin kömürle çilingir yüzüğüne döndüren eblehlere.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97b; “*ve dahi tul ‘avrat olup gözün ve kaşın kömür ile silinmiş çikünler (?) büzüğüne döndüren mühmelatlar.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, pp. 28, 29.

<sup>176</sup> “*ve küçük oğlı olup eline ve karısı ardınca Mevlevihane syrine giden deyyuslara.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97b.

<sup>177</sup> “*ve avrat ve cariyesile iskeleye ketan almağa bile gidenler.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 24.

<sup>178</sup> “*ve küçük oğlancı olup da mescide bile getiren merkeblere.*” Hacı Ahmed, 98a; “*ve küçük ma ‘sumu çarşuya ve cami ‘e ve mescide ve ba ‘zı seyrana kucağına alup getiren sefhiler; ve bayram günü kızların seyre çıkaran boynuzlar.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 24.

<sup>179</sup> “*ve kahvehanede ve yaran mabeyninde hizmetkarına: ‘Bre oğlan var evden büyük kiseyi getir kitemizde harçlık kalmadı’ diyü izharlık iden edebsiz zügürt bi-‘arlara.*” Hacı Ahmed, 98a; “*ve bir mecliste yaran yanında hizmetkarına: ‘Var oğlan, cebümüzde harçlık kalmadı, andan büyük kese getir!’ deyen püzüvenkler.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 35.

been perceived, again, as the ostentatious display of richness, but this time of someone who, in fact is not rich. In terms of its hypocritical dimension, such a behavior is not very much different than “constantly carrying prayer beads, but never practicing the five time prayer<sup>180</sup>.” However, since the “penniless and impudent people” are rather comical and relatively less harmful than the religious hypocrites, they should be considered closer to “the presumptuous people, who wear eagle wings [on their turbans] as if they were valiant<sup>181</sup>.” Related to that, dressing up in the proper way was an important criterion, as it reflected the personality of a man. For the Ottomans too, “it was the cloth that made the man.” Therefore, if you wore your *sarık* (headgear) in a fashion to cover the back of your neck and leave your forehead open<sup>182</sup>, this had a certain indication and a specific name in *Risale-i Garibe*. It was, in its polite form, called “the ‘I don’t give a damn to the world’ *sarık*<sup>183</sup>”, and if you were irresponsible and insolent enough to wear it, then you would deserve to be called an “animal<sup>184</sup>” by Hacı Ahmed. Of course, if you wanted to be called an animal – precisely a donkey – instead of messing with your headgear, you could always insist on buying something that was not for sale<sup>185</sup>. On the other hand, not every bad manner returned to you as an insult and a curse, but yet without any gain at all. Accepting to be an improper Ottoman, and therefore an outsider, you could easily find your way around as an ill-mannered man, and “waiting for the *öli ta ‘amı* with your bowl in your hands” or similarly “waiting for [and looking forward to] the *iskat akçası*<sup>186</sup>”,

---

<sup>180</sup> “*ve namaz kılmayıp da da ‘ima elinde tesbih götüren münafiklara.*” Hacı Ahmed, 98b; “*namaz kılmayıp da ‘ima tesbih çeviren münafiklar.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 27.

<sup>181</sup> “*bahaduram diyü başına kartal kanadı sokunan dilsüzlere.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97a; “*ve her işte fodulluk edüp ‘Bahadram!’ deyü başına kartal kanadın sokanlar.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 35.

<sup>182</sup> “*ve bayram gününde sarığının ardın önine giyen hayvanlara.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97b; “*saruğımı ensesinden aşağıya döküp cihan sikime saruğın sarınanlar.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 37.

<sup>183</sup> “*cihan sikime saruğı.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 37.

<sup>184</sup> “*hayvanlar.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97b.

<sup>185</sup> “*ve bir kimesneniün bir tuhfesi nesnesi olup hala ki satılığı degül iken elbette bana sat diyen humarlara.*” Hacı Ahmed, 98a; “*ve bir kimseniün bir tuhfesi olup hala satılık geğil iken: ‘Elbette bana sat!’ deyen hayvanlar.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 35.

<sup>186</sup> “*ölü ta ‘amı için koltuğuna çanak sokup bekleyen nekbetilere.*” Hacı Ahmed, 97b; “*ve ölü ta ‘amina ve iskat akçasına göz karardup yelişen tarrarlar.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 29. *Öli ta ‘amı* was the meal cooked

would be the very practices fit for you. Although, you would then be called disgraced or a plunderer<sup>187</sup>, having accepted the rejection of the society, this would not matter much.

Before concluding with this chapter, there is one final point I want to underline. Although this does not have much to do with manners, it is still an important indication that portrays the literary connection between the two documents. I have already mentioned that the two book of curses open in a similar fashion, and that the first people to be cursed are religious hypocrites (both as Kadızadelis and as Sufis). Following that, the next parallel curse in Hacı Ahmed is cast upon “those who [although, they speak wrongfully<sup>188</sup>] think that they quote and speak scientifically, but in fact surround Turkish [language] with walls and put it in holes<sup>189</sup>”. The same appears in the *Risale* on page 21, but as “the Turkish learned men (*danişmendler*) who think that they quote and speak scientifically, but in fact do not even understand Turkish<sup>190</sup>.” After this, the *Risale* author goes on to curse “the teachers (*müderriş efendiler*) who do not attend their lessons even once in a month and leave the classrooms empty, and those who [without bettering their language] try to read the *Kur’an* from memory and put the masters in great pain<sup>191</sup>.” On the other hand, according to Hacı Ahmed, the next group of people who need to be cursed, after those who “torture” the Turkish language, are “the ones who deserve to die young (*civanmerg*) for they carry the shape of the *Ka ‘be* to every village and read the legend of Ibrahim (Abraham) at every door; and the [religiously] unclean *mevlevi*s who

---

after the death of someone and distributed for three days to anyone who attended the funeral. *İskat akçesi*, on the other hand, was the distribution of a portion of a deceased’s property (upon his last will) or money so that his sins would be forgiven.

<sup>187</sup> “*neketi*.” Ibid, 97b; “*tarrar*.” Ibid, p. 29.

<sup>188</sup> *Çetrefiller*: The etymological origin of the word is *çatra-patra*, and it is used to refer to the accented Turkish of the *Rumelian* population and the Circassians. In that sense, it is somehow similar to the origin of the word barbarian. Eyuboğlu, p. 142.

<sup>189</sup> “*ve ıstılahat ve ‘ibarat söylerin sanup Türk sözi divara kısıp deliklere koyan çetrefillere*.” Hacı Ahmed, 96b.

<sup>190</sup> “*ve ıstılahat ve ‘ibarat söyler sanup Türki sözü dahi idrak edemeyen Türk danişmendleri*.” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 21.

<sup>191</sup> “*ve ayda bir kerre derse gelmeyüp hücreleri boş koyan müderriş efendiler, ve lisanın tashih etmeden kurradan okumağa varup üstaza ‘azim cefa edenler*.” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 21.

do not know *sema* and *safa*, *namaz* and *abdest* and cleanness<sup>192</sup>.” At first, the logic behind the ordering of the “curse-deserving” groups in the two texts may appear quite different. It is obvious that while the *Risale* author continues with “educational” problems, Hacı Ahmed jumps back to the issues related to religious “corruption”. However, in *Risale-i Garibe* the allegorical connection between *misvak* and deer horns, which we have previously dealt with – relating it to religious fanaticism –, appears right before the section concerning the Turkish language, and the “educational” problems are immediately followed by curses on “the *dedes* who do not follow their *şeyhs*, the *dervishes* who are sinners (or outlaws-brigands, *şaki* with *kaf*), the non-praying (*bi-namaz*) *ışıks* (*ışıklar*: referring to heterodox *dervishes*), and the wandering *dervishes* (*yayak abdallar*) who smoke too much hashish<sup>193</sup>.” A joint equivalent of the latter two groups also appears in Hacı Ahmed as “hashish smoking *ışıks*, who do not know the way (*bi-mezheb*: might also correspond to ‘not belonging to a sect’)<sup>194</sup>”. Then, when the two documents are analyzed together, what we see, in fact, is the reflection of a general concern about the conditions of religious life to include both its educational and practical aspects. Here, the underlying emphasis is on superficiality and pretentiousness, which is evident both in the curses on those who try to speak scientifically despite their incompetence in Turkish, and the unfit behaviors of certain religious groups. Therefore, certain issues, which have previously appeared in the form of bad manners, were also prevalent in other forms of misbehavior. That is to say, between those who wore eagle wings despite not being valiant and those who – improperly – kept speaking with quotations, there is a connection based on ostentatious behavior, though one may indicate simple show-off and the other ignorance. Similarly, not attending the classes and not acting according to the conventional norms of a religious order may not in themselves be bad manners, but yet they are not much different than disregarding and breaking the conventional norms of a gathering. The aura that unites all these different forms of

---

<sup>192</sup> “ve köy be köy Ka ‘be suretin gezdürüp ve kapu kapu İbrahim destanın okıyan civanmerglere ve sema ‘ve safa bilmez namaz abdest taharet bilmez bi-namaz cünüb mevlevilere.” Hacı Ahmed, 96b.

<sup>193</sup> “ve şeyhine tabi ‘ olmayan dedeler, ve şaki olan dervişler, ve bi-namaz olan ışıklar, esrarı çok yayak abdallar.” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 22.

<sup>194</sup> “esrar yiyen bi-mezheb ışıklara.” Hacı Ahmed, 97a.

misbehavior is a reaction against “things not done in the way that they should have been.” In other words, although the ignorance of the *dervishes* may not be a bad manner, it still indicates a move out of the expected and conventional track.

I began this chapter with a three-partite analysis between Mustafa ‘Ali, Hacı Ahmed and *Risale-i Garibe*, to show a possible continuation of the *kibar* culture, and then, leaving ‘Ali aside, I continued with the two books of curses to portray what might have changed. This latter section provided us with two points concerning the manners of the table and of gatherings. First, there appeared a possibility that – if what ‘Ali wrote was what he saw – what appeared in the books of curses and not in ‘Ali could have actually been the manners, which were internalized to such an extent by the *kibars* that emphasizing them was not seen as a necessity. The second point, on the other hand, arose from the ill manner of inviting the servants of the host to table. Since this was not, again, written down by ‘Ali, I pointed out to a probability that the cursed group mentioned here might have been the newly-rich of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. On the other hand, we have also seen that although in the books of curses there was an emphasis on the manners of the street, this was something lacking in ‘Ali. These points may all suggest a possible transformation that was taking place within the *kibar* world; a possibility that this domain was both experiencing an increasing pressure from newer penetrations and transforming into a less enclosed entity. Since the purpose of this paper is finding out how an urban male identity was reflected through manners in *Risale-i Garibe*, it is now time to get more specific and look at *Risale-i Garibe* in more detail. Since the similarities between first the three and then the two documents are singled out, this will give us, more or less, the experiences and the observations of our author. That is: “Things to do and not to do for an urbanite in eighteenth century Istanbul”.

### CHAPTER 3: BEING A MAN IN LATE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ISTANBUL

To be an urbanite in eighteenth century Istanbul, first of all, one had to be able to live there, and to be able to do so; one needed an occupation, a job. However, not every job was fit for a proper man, and those that were fit had to be practiced in the right, appropriate way. Our author seems to have a special interest in palace related occupations of various ranks so as to curse:

...The [liar] doorkeepers of the palace, who live on the treasury (*beytü'l-malden yeyüp*), but complain about serving the sultan; the disgraced troop commanders (*alay beyleri?*), the bankrupt *müteferrikas*; the substitute judges (*na'ib*), who cheat; the brawling police superintendents (*muhtesib ağası*), the messengers of the *vezirs* (*kethüdaların [kara]kulakları*); the presumptuous Janissary captains; those who play music at the *meyhane*; the fallen (or addict, *düşkün*) *heybeci sipahis*; the cheating conscripts (*acem oğlanları*), the gypsy gunners; the fallen (or addict) armorers (*cebeci*); the incurable sergeants; the useless people who become janitors and thinking that they have become some big bird do not fit into the streets and cannot find a single man to greet; the unarmed *sekbans*; the rascal *miklacıs* (?); the malicious dismissed pashas and the thief *sarıcas*<sup>195</sup>.

At first it may seem that some of these people are cursed not because they have a particular job, but because they are conducting it in an improper way. In other words, the *müteferrikas* may be cursed for being bankrupt, the *na'ibs* and the conscripts for cheating, the Janissary captains for being presumptuous and the *cebecis* for being addicts. However, there is also another possibility; a possibility that the fact might actually very well be the opposite, and all of the occupations listed above could have become almost synonyms for the insults (or misbehaviors) that they are listed together. In other words, *na'ibs* were not cursed for cheating, but it was only a cheater that would

---

<sup>195</sup> “ve beytü'l-malden yeyüp de padişah hizmetinden elem çeken kapucuların yalancıları, ve negbeti alay beyleri, ve müflis müteferrikaları, ve na'iblerin telbisleri, ve muhtesib agasının yaykaracısı, kethuzaların kulakları, ve bölük başıların fodulları, ve meyhanadan çalgu çaldıran ve heybeci sipahilerin düşkünleri, 'acem oğlanının maryolu, ve topçının çinganesi, ve cebecinin düşküni, ve çavışların onmazı, ve oda başı olup gendüsini bir büyük kuş oldum kıyas edüp sokaklara sığmayup selam verecek adem bulamayan zeva 'idler, ve sekbanın silahsız, ve miklacının uğursuz, ve sarıcanın hırsız.” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 21.

become a *na'ib*, and similarly it might have been the very character of a *cebeci* to be an addict. Since the author considers the night-watchmen, court officers (*muhzır*), guards, hereditary Janissaries (*kul ođlari*) and the pimps to be within the same group of people who can not find any other job and who deserve to be hanged<sup>196</sup>, this appears to be a high possibility. Nevertheless, in other instances of “improper jobs for proper men”, the situation is less complicated. Such is the case for the “unbelievers, who, not finding any other job, become apprentices to the executioners<sup>197</sup>.” If you were able and if “your beard was long and your look (dress) was fine”, then “becoming a guard or a janitor at castle gates, and – like a beggar – opening your hand to every passerby<sup>198</sup>” was something that you should have never done. If you already had an occupation, it was best to stick with it and to avoid “moving from one profession to another.” For instance, “having a job, but belittling it and becoming a water-melon merchant on the sidewalk<sup>199</sup>” would simply make you a “useless” man. Of course, for a Muslim “becoming a tavern keeper<sup>200</sup>” or “being partners with the tavern keepers of Samatya<sup>201</sup>” were also unthinkable options, as long as he did not want to be called a “pimp<sup>202</sup>”. The restrictions on Muslim occupations were not, on the other hand, limited to these. Although, being a janitor or a guard was not seen as a proper job, “being a guard at the Patriarchate of Fener<sup>203</sup>” was a step further into misbehavior, because in the delicate network of relationships between Muslims and non-Muslims, it meant “crossing the line” since a

---

<sup>196</sup> “*ve diınyada bir san ‘at bulamayup ya ‘ases ya muhzır veya yasakçı veya kul ođlari veya ‘avrat püziıvengi veya ođlan püziıvengi olan asılacak gidiler.*” Ibid, p. 25.

<sup>197</sup> “*ve diınyada san ‘at bulamayup cellada řakird olan dinsizler.*” Ibid, p. 21.

<sup>198</sup> “*ve ak sakalı sinede, kılıđı kıyafeti yerinde kal’e kapularında yasakçı, kapucı ve bacdar olan sa’il gibi gelüp geıenin öniıne durup avuı açanlar.*” Ibid, p. 22.

<sup>199</sup> “*ve san ‘atı var iken hor group kaldırım üzerinde karpuz bazirganı olup na’ib efendi geldikte dolařan zeva’idler.*” Ibid, p. 39.

<sup>200</sup> “*ve Müsliman olup meyhanacılık edenler.*” Ibid, p. 35.

<sup>201</sup> “*Samatya’da meyhanacılar ile ortak olan püzevenkler.*” Ibid, p. 23.

<sup>202</sup> “*püzevenk.*” Ibid, p. 23.

<sup>203</sup> “*Fener Kapısı’nda batrikaya yasakçı olanlar.*” Ibid, p. 22.

Muslim would then be serving a non-Muslim. Such an act would definitely deserve a curse, and you would not be much different than:

The confused people, who dress up [fancy] during festive days and, imitating the infidels, go to the tavern and drink wine; the unbelievers who drink with the infidels during their festivals; the filthy people who talk with the infidels in the infidel language although they know Turkish; those [who should be taken by the devil] who say ‘My darling’ while trading with the infidels; those who go to the house of the infidels and greet in the infidel way; and those greet back when greeted by the infidels<sup>204</sup>.

Fitting well into the purpose of this chapter, what we see here is actually what the author saw around him as he strolled through the streets of Istanbul. For the author, those people who acted like the non-Muslims made up the “excommunicated” segment of the urban population. The exclusion, which we observe here, is something beyond being expelled from a feast. Further than “class” distinctions and proper conduct in gatherings (of the elite or among friends), this was something, which contradicted the whole Ottoman perception of their world and of “the order of things.” The line between the Muslims and the non-Muslims was not supposed to be crossed by the former towards the latter, and the reverse too was not welcome in all occasions; especially in the case of “the new Muslims [male or female] who beg in the grand mosques with the beggar’s cup in their hands, saying: ‘I have just become a Muslim’<sup>205</sup>”, or for “the Greeks who become Muslims because of the fear of *harac*, but speak Greek when they see another Greek<sup>206</sup>.” As a minor addition, I shall also emphasize that affiliation with the Turkish and convert (*ahiriyan*) population of Istanbul (as well as the non-Muslims) was equally enough to make you a “dissolute man<sup>207</sup>.”

---

<sup>204</sup> “*ve bayram günü geyiniüp kuşanup mihaneye varup şarab içen ve kefereye taklid eden müşevvişler, ve keferenün küfri günü kefere ile işret eden dinsizler, ve kefere gördükte Türkçe bilirken kefere lisanı ile söyleşen pelidler, ve kafir ile alış veriş iderken: ‘Canım!’ deyen canı çıkasılar, ve kafir evine varup keferece selam verenler, ve kafir gelüp selam verdükte selam alanlar.*” Ibid, p. 33.

<sup>205</sup> “*ve kar idiniüp (?) cami’-i şeriflerde: ‘Yeni Müslüman oldum!’ deyu eline [keşkül] alup cerr eden eger erkek eger dişi yeni Müslümanlar.*” Ibid, p. 42.

<sup>206</sup> “*ve harac korkusundan Müsliman olup da gine Urum gördüğünde Urumca söyleyen Urumlar.*” Ibid, p., 41.

<sup>207</sup> “*ve hak-i İstanbul Türk ve Ahiriyan ile sohbet eden sefihler.*” Ibid, p. 32.

There were, of course, many occupations, which were very much suitable for the Muslims, and some in fact were only for the Muslims, but again, proper conduct was the main criteria. Among these, the most important ones were naturally those directly related to Islamic institutions, from the mosque to education and to law. If you did not know the proper melody and the tune (*makamat*), you were not expected to and should not have been a preacher<sup>208</sup>. Similarly, to be an *imam*, you had to know the *Kur'an* by heart and be able to recite it with proper pronunciation and rhythm<sup>209</sup>. If you were a *devrhan* (reciting the *Kur'an* on an irregular but predetermined routine), then as promised, you had to be present at the mosque on Friday<sup>210</sup>. As the administrator of a pious foundation, you were expected to take good care of it, so that it would not become useless<sup>211</sup>. Not to torture the ears of the believers and not to be cursed to die, you could only be a *muezzin* – especially in the big mosques built by the Sultans – if you were tactful and educated well<sup>212</sup>. Becoming a scribe naturally required a higher level of education so as to be good at arithmetic<sup>213</sup>, and as a judge, you were to follow the canonical law of Islam exactly and deliver justice<sup>214</sup>. On the other hand, having even the minimum training required for any of these jobs was in itself a privilege, yet you could still find your way into a mosque or a *mescid*, but this time as a caretaker or a personnel. Then, you would have to do the cleaning properly and in time; and you definitely should not consume the olive oil that belonged to the mosque or the *mescid*<sup>215</sup>.

---

<sup>208</sup> “*makamat bilmeyüp dürlü dürlü nagma edeyin deyin hatib efendiler.*” Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>209</sup> “*ve hafız olmayup ve tevcid ile hazret-i Kur'an'ı kira'et edemeyüp imamet eden efendiler.*” Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>210</sup> “*Cum 'a günü devr-hon olup da mahfilde bulunmayanlar.*” Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>211</sup> “*sahib-hayrın hayratını ibtal eden mütevelliler.*” Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>212</sup> “*nadan olup selatin cami 'lerde mü'ezzin olan nefesi tutulasılar.*” Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>213</sup> “*hisab-ı rakamda cahil olan katibler.*” Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>214</sup> “*ve şer 'i şerif muktezasınca 'amel etmeyen na'ibler, ..., ve 'adalet etmeyen hakimler.*” Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>215</sup> “*ve cami ' ve mescid huddamları olup da siliüp sipürüp vakti ile hizmetin ida etmeyenler, ve cami ' ve mescid-i şerifin zeyt yağın ekl iden kayyumlar.*” Ibid., p. 20.

Religion and religious institutions certainly played a crucial role in eighteenth century Istanbul. However, there was also a popular side of religion, and there, a room was always preserved for exploitation. Therefore, our author does not neglect to curse “the pimps who say: ‘My husband, my wife is sick’, and [thinking that they are doctors] go to every infidel, Jew, *kızılbaş* and *Firenk*, and have their arms held (*kolunu sıkdıran*)”, those who would claim “we took our kids to Kara Ahmed Cevahir Hacı, and when they read [prayers], the kids were cured” and those who would say “I feel sick, so I had better go to pour lead<sup>216</sup>.” Talking about the popular aspect of religion, of course gypsies also take their place in the *Risale*, and a curse goes to “the bewildered people, who, in the winter night, go to the [religiously] dirty faced gypsy of Şahzadebaşı for soothsaying<sup>217</sup>.” On the other hand, the practical aspects of daily life and the occupations, which were related to the provisioning of the requirements of that life, occupied an equally – and maybe even more – fundamental role, since their improper fulfillments had far more immediate consequences. Therefore, it was very natural and expectable to curse the merchants at Cibalikapı, who sold wet coal mixed with dirt and stone, and those who sold wood with tricky weights at Davud Paşa İskelesi<sup>218</sup>. It seems that the ethics of the tradesmen were violated in many ways, and improper behavior and dirt seem to be spread everywhere. In Hasır İskelesi, there were *hacıs*, who sold “polished”, but rotten bacon, and who butchered mules and camels<sup>219</sup>. There were infidel-like bakers, who did not cut their nails; and *börekçis*, who, with no consideration at all, baked their *böreks* with flies in them. There were also water sellers, who would blow their noses with their hands, and without washing them; they would hold the mouth of the water bag. It was

---

<sup>216</sup> “ve ‘Ehlim, ‘ayalim hastadur’ deyüp, tabibdür deyü ne kadar kafir ve cühud ve kızılbaş ve Firenk var ise göndürüp kolunu sıkdıran püzevenkler, ve ‘Benümkiler ma ‘sumcaları Kara Ahmed Cevahir Hacı’ye getürdiler, okudular, eyü oldı’ deyen müşrikler, ve ‘Üzerimde ağırlık vardır, kurşun dökdüreyin’ deyen çölmek şerrine ugrayanlar.” Ibid, p. 28. Pouring lead is the practice of melting lead and pouring it into a bowl of cold water held over the head of the sick person. It is certainly a superstitious and not an Islamic practice, at least in the orthodox sense.

<sup>217</sup> “Şahzadebaşında kış akşamı çehresinde cünüb çingane karısına fal açtıran şaşkunlar.” Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>218</sup> “Cibali Kapusunda kömürü isladıp taş toprak katanlar”, “Davud Paşa İskelesi’nde eksik çeki taşıle odun satan gidiler.” Ibid, pp. 22, 23.

<sup>219</sup> “ve Hasır İskelesi’nde kokmuş basdurmaya cila veren ve katır ve deve yağı eden hacılar.” Ibid, p. 23.

very usual to see that the milkmen were actually mixing enough water into the milk to “deserve to be drowned in it.” Where the silk manufacturers sold only Jewish products, it was normal to see that the weavers were using rotten fabric and the shoemakers pinching the heels of the shoes that they sold<sup>220</sup>.

As I have mentioned, dirt had spread everywhere, even to the very place that you would go get rid of it. The baths were kept cold and unclean; the attendants brought rough bath gloves and wet towels; and there were stokers pitiless enough not to let the naked poor into the stoke hole of the bath in cold winter days<sup>221</sup>. Besides these, there were also misbehaviors, which did not cause such direct harm, but indicated the impropriety of their proprietors. Such was the case of the “*kibar* of Ağaç Pazarı, who, despite being nothing more than an *oturakçı* (seller of ready-made goods), crossed his legs and set as if he was the master of the bazaar (*dedesten*).” Similarly, it was not seen proper for the boatmen of Eminönü to swear to each other and then to greet as if nothing had happened, or for the porters to fight for whose turn it was; and for grocers of Yeni Kapı to fight over sharing the rent and to end up at the door of the *kadı*<sup>222</sup>.

Although all of these are examples of improper practices of certain jobs, there were also particular occupations and misbehaviors related to them, which were pronounced together with specific ethnic or regional names; and therefore their practitioners, due to their origins might have been already excluded as outsiders. To start with, at Unkapanı, it was the *sarıklı* Turks from Mandaşar, Karaman and Sigla, who waited and hoped for the price of the wheat to increase; and the Beyşehirli would sell rotten yogurt at Odun Kapısı and beg you to buy fig and grape at Yemiş İskelesi. At the Customs, the porters

---

<sup>220</sup> “*ve tirnakların kesmeyen etmekçi kafirleri, ve sinek gözetmeyüp sinekli börek yapan börekçiler*”, “*ve sümkürüp elin yumadan kırbanun ağzına yapışan sakkalar*”, “*ve bir süde üç vakiyye su katan suya gark olaçak südciler*”, “*ve safi cühud işi alup satan gazzazlar, ve çürük iplik ile bez dokıyan culhalar, ve bapuc ökçesine fiske uran haffaflar.*” Ibid., p. 40.

<sup>221</sup> “*ve hammamı sovak ve esbabını na-pak tutan hammamcılar, ve serd kise getüren dellaklar, ve yaş peştemal veren natırlar, ve kış günü çıblak fakiri külhana komayan külhancılar.*” Ibid, p. 40. As a tradition, the homeless children were allowed into the stoke holes to spend the winter.

<sup>222</sup> “*Ağaç Pazarı’nda oturakçı olup bir dizin bir dizi üzerine koyup bezazistan hocası kıyafetinde iskemle üstünde outran zarıflar, ..., Emin önü’nde birbirinin ağzına söğüp hal-i hatır sorar şeklinde gine tiziye nezir havasında olan kayıkçılar*”, “*‘Nevbet benümdür’ deyü çekişen arka hamalları, ..., Yeni Kapu’da kirasın pay iderken çekişüp kadı kapusuna giden manavlar.*” Ibid, p. 23.

[carrying their loads on poles] from Kastamonu would rush through the crowd shouting “open the way, boys and girls!”<sup>223</sup>” On the other hand, the grocers from Kastamonu would be more harmful than their porters, since they would be using tricky scales. However, the butchers from Egin were the worst, since they were “Armenian converts who add 50 *dirhems* of mustard to every 400 *dirhems* of beef that they sell”<sup>224</sup>.” This misbehavior must have been perceived as extremely offensive, since being called “Armenian convert” (*Ermeniden bozma*) was itself an extreme offense, for they were, according to our author “messing with every job and everything, while cleaning the sewers was enough for them; and trying to become poets although they had turned into ‘shit’ while cleaning the sewers”<sup>225</sup>.” In *Risale-i Garibe*, there are similar and almost equally offensive insults on various other ethnic, religious and regional groups. However, since these are not related to manners and misbehavior, and since these people are immediately cast out – no matter if they are bad mannered or not – for not being Muslims (or Muslims in the conventional way), I will not go into any further detail.

An occupation, a job was certainly necessary to be able to live in Istanbul, and to live properly it was also necessary to have the proper job and to conduct it in the proper way. However, urban life, especially one in a city like Istanbul, had other requirements than that. It had its own manners, its places to go and not to go, and its things to do and not to do. It also had its own language, and for that matter, while you would always be condemned for your greed, it was only in Istanbul that you would be one of the “ravens of Eyüp that tore each other apart during the *kurban* (sheep of sacrifice) loot at Hazret-i Eyüp”<sup>226</sup>.” Although it was usually a controversial issue, people in Istanbul (and of course in other parts of the Empire) did smoke pipes. On the religious side of the story,

---

<sup>223</sup> “*Un Kapanı’nda ‘Buğday bahaya çıksa’ deyen Madanşarlı, Karamanlı, Siglalı sarıklı Türkler, ..., Odun Kapısı’nda kokmuş yoğurtları ve Yemiş İskelesinde ademi geçmeğe komayup eteğinden yakalayup ‘İncir yüzüm al’ deyen Beyşehirli ayinehanlar, ..., ve Gümrük’te: ‘Ah uşaklar, dadılar! Savul yoldan!’ deyen Kastamonılı sırık hammalları.*” Ibid, p. 23.

<sup>224</sup> “*ve topı yeni kantar tutup kullanan Kistomoni bakalları, ..., ve bir vakiyye sığır etine yüz elli dirhem hardal koyan Ermeniden bozma Eginli kassablar.*” Ibid, p. 40.

<sup>225</sup> “*ve pokçuluk yeterken her şey’e ve her san ‘ata karışan Ermeniler, ve sulu bokçuluk ile boh olmuş iken şa ‘irliğe yeltenen Ermeniler.*” Ibid, p. 41.

<sup>226</sup> “*Hazret-I Eyyub’de kurban yağmasında birbirin paralayan Eyyub kuzgunları.*” Ibid, p. 22.

you should not be one of “those who [deserving to eat poison], during the Ramadan, end their fasting by smoking” and you should not exaggerate smoking by becoming one of the “cows that smoke and chat until the morning and then sleep until the evening<sup>227</sup>.” Of course, there is also a practical side of smoking, one that is determined by social norms and manners rather than religion. First of all, after the meal you should not immediately rush to your pipe, and washing your hands should be the first thing to do<sup>228</sup>. Before smoking, you should not use your fingers to stuff tobacco into your pipe. If you do so and then wipe your fingers with your coat, this will be a very indecent behavior. If there is coal in the brazier, you should use it and avoid lighting your pipe with the candle; and again, while smoking you should throw your ashes into the brazier and not into the candleholder<sup>229</sup>. However, as I have mentioned, Istanbul had its own peculiar language and its own manners. This was also valid for smoking, and as the reflection of an architecturally determined manner, you would be cursed if you took the boat from Ahr Kapısı and lighted your pipe before passing Sinan Paşa Köşkü<sup>230</sup>.

Just as any other cosmopolitan city, Istanbul had different neighborhoods and quarters for different ethnic and religious groups. Although, within the main city, and despite the segregation, there was more or less a mixed population structure, Galata, the opposite side of the Golden Horn was primarily and dominantly a non-Muslim quarter. Both because of that, and because of its privileged status, Galata remained a quarter of entertainment, and although they were regularly closed in Istanbul, the taverns and brothels of Galata were exempt from such regulations. Therefore, for a Muslim man spending too much time there, was not a very appreciable thing to do. Yet, there were still “pimps who loved a girl [prostitute] in Cihangir, and everyday passed to Tophane

---

<sup>227</sup> “*ve Ramazan-ı Şerifi’te iftari duhan ile eden zehir zakkum yudaçaklar, gecesi sabaha dek duhan içüp laf güzaf edüp ahşama değin uyuyan öküzler.*” Ibid, p. 33.

<sup>228</sup> “*ve ta ‘am yeyüp sofra kalkduğı gibi ellerin yumayup duhan çubuğın eline alan pesnedler.*” Ibid, p. 34.

<sup>229</sup> “*ve duhan lülesini barmağıle basup esbabına silen besnedler, ocak var iken mum sofrasına, şemi ‘-dan içine lüle silken elleri tutulasılar, ve ocakta ve mangalda ateş var iken mumda lüle yakup mumun üzerine tütün döken humarlar.*” Ibid, p. 26.

<sup>230</sup> “*Ahor Kapısı’nda kayığına binüp Sinan Paşa Köşkü’ni geçmeden duhan içenler.*” Ibid, p. 23.

and climbed that hill”; and “sluggish people who went to the brothel in Galata<sup>231</sup>.” While Galata was the locale of brothels and *meyhanes*, Tophane was the very place where the *Firenks* would go for gambling<sup>232</sup>, and therefore, it too had to be avoided.

Restrictions as such, on the other hand should never prevent a Muslim man to enjoy the delights of “this great city of might.” Balance, was a very crucial issue in the life of a proper Muslim, and it was not only restricted to religious life. Entertainment also had to be pursued within its boundaries, and while celebrating the “infidel festivals” and frequenting to non-Muslim quarters of the city were ill manners, not participating in the festivals designed primarily (if not exclusively) for the Muslims was almost equally unappreciable. After all, for Istanbul this was a period of seasonal entertainments and urban festivals, and not all of these were confined to restricted circles. Therefore, for our author it would not be too unjust to curse “the people who do not know the value of their lives and on summer and spring days do not go for excursions, and during the cherry season do not go to Hisar and the watersides<sup>233</sup>.” However, these were “really” seasonal entertainments, and knowing the exact time for a specific event in a specific locale was also an important issue. You could, for example, go to Ok Meydanı in the winter and wait to see a certain happening, but then you would not only end up seeing nothing, but would also be called a “mad/bewildered pimp (*mecnun püzüvenk*)<sup>234</sup>.” If you were living in Istanbul, you were definitely expected to know its own seasonal clock; and this was not only limited to entertainment and festivals. You were also supposed to be aware of the exact seasons for certain fruits and vegetables, unless, of course you wanted to be cursed as a “little donkey (*eşeçik*)” after going to the Bayram Paşa vegetable garden in Kadı Köyi to buy arm beets (a winter vegetable) in the grape season (summer)<sup>235</sup>. Here,

---

<sup>231</sup> “*ve Cihangir’de dilber sevüp her gün Tophane’ye geçüp ol yokuşa tırmaşan ayağı geyinli püzüvenkler.*” Ibid, p. 23.

<sup>232</sup> “*ve Tophanelerde kumar oynayan Firenkler.*” Ibid, p. 33.

<sup>233</sup> “*ve bahar yaz günleri seyrana kiras faslında Hisar’a varup yalı faslı etmeyüp canın kadrin bilmezler.*” Ibid, p. 44.

<sup>234</sup> “*ve kış günleri Ok Meydanı’na seyre giden mecnun püzüvenkler.*” Ibid, p. 24.

the author's concern is not (only) the necessity of a certain amount of knowledge about gardening and seasons. It is indeed, more a concern on the indispensability of a knowledge on the customs and the norms of the city that you were living in. If you wanted to be identified with Istanbul, first you had to be able to identify it yourself.

Getting back to the issue of "knowing the value of life", for our author, this did not only mean entertainment and pleasure. There was also a literary side of the story. Miserliness was in itself a bad manner, but moving it further to the level of "those who do not burn wood and coal in the winter and sit in the cold<sup>236</sup>", would then start harming you, and not the people around you. Correspondingly, greed has always been a good companion of a miserly man, and such was the case also in eighteenth century Istanbul. Its consequences, on the other hand would put a man's life in deeper jeopardy than miserliness alone. Especially if you were one of the "donkey-like worldly-minded people who do not know their [own] values [of their lives], and marry and settle in the places from Üsküdar to the Kavak; but being shop-owners in Istanbul, in summer, in winter, in the stormy weather and day and night, they travel [to the city] on a small boat, saying: 'Oh! Help'<sup>237</sup>." This is again an emphasis on the importance of a life set according to the principle of balance, which suggests the virtue of living in accordance to the idea that the eternal life is not the worldly one, but the one that will follow it. On the other hand, there were also other indications of a man's carelessness about his life, which fell outside the worldly-spiritual balance. Such was the case of the "people who are tired of their lives and go to the shaky-handed old barber for a shave", and "those who are tired of the [their] world and despite being twenty-thirty years old, marry a forty-fifty year old woman<sup>238</sup>."

---

<sup>235</sup> "üzüm zamanı Kadı Köyi'nde 'avratile Bayram Paşa bostanına bancar almağa varan eşçikler." Ibid, p. 24.

<sup>236</sup> "ve felek el verüp kışın kötek ve kömür yakmayup buylup oturanlar." Ibid. p., 44.

<sup>237</sup> "ve Üsküdardan öte Kavağa varınca olan yerlerde evlenüp de yaz ve kış ve fırtanalı havada İstanbulda ehli-i dükkân olup sabah ve ahşam kayık ile belki 'Bire meded!' ile gelüp giden gendü kıymetin bilmeyen dünyaperest gidiler." Ibid., p. 23.

<sup>238</sup> "ve eli ditrer ihtiyar berbere tiraş olan canından bezmişler", "ve yiğirmi otuz yaşında olup kırk elli yaşında 'avrat alan dünyasından bezmişler." Ibid., p. 31.

As I have previously mentioned, being a text directed towards the literate male population of Istanbul, in *Risale-i Garibe*, there were only few instances where women were directly cursed. It is now time to look at those incidents as a transition to how the proper deeds of manhood were reflected in the text. If the newly-rich men were cursed for not knowing the appropriate manners, the case was not so dramatically different for the women either. Just as the former slave and convert men, who would immediately forget their pasts when they accumulated some wealth, there were also “slave women [although they were slaves and dependents in origin] who married rich men, and who would have [their own] bowls brought to the public bath<sup>239</sup>”. Equally, our author also curses “those [women] who did not know Turkish, and [although once they were cook’s servants/slaves (*aşçı halayıđı*)] settled, married and called themselves ‘*küçük kadın*’<sup>240</sup>.” The ill manners of the ex-slave wives seem to be highly disturbing for our author, for the final curse on women (leaving aside the prostitutes) again comes upon “the ex-slave *kadıncıks* who called the *cariyes* [of their husbands, of the household] slut and prostitute<sup>241</sup>.” Now, if we consider these curses as supplements to those cast upon the newly-rich men, then we can say that the author is extremely sensitive about what we may broadly call “class mobility.” However, we should not think that he curses all the ex-slave wives and all the newly-rich men without exception. There is an important underlying emphasis on knowing the norms of every “class” (therefore acting according to them), and not forgetting your background. Hence, the curses are cast upon those who did not follow these principles; and looking at the frequency of such curses throughout the document, we can presume that the actual existence of similar people in the eighteenth century Istanbul was also equally predominant. Correspondingly, what we are observing here is not only a transforming *kibar* culture (due to increasing penetrations), but also a changing society.

---

<sup>239</sup> “*halayıklıktan ve beslemelikten geliüp zengin ere varup hammama leğen getiriden kırıaklar.*” Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>240</sup> “*ve aşçı halayıđı iken adı paydar olup, kocaya varup adını ‘küçük kadın’ koyan Türkçe bilmezler.*” Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>241</sup> “*ve cariyesine kahpe ve fahişe deyen halayıktan bozma kadıncıklar.*” Ibid., p. 43.

When we come the curses on prostitutes, surprisingly we see only two incidents, and there too it is not obvious whether these women were real prostitutes or only referred to as such for an insult. Nevertheless, in either case they still indicate the author's perception of indecent behavior. We have already seen the two examples of improper behavior for women in the previous chapter. However, none of these women were referred to as prostitutes, or anything close to that. On the other hand, for the "the fallen women who waited by the corner of the Janissary barracks and watched the passersby, and when a man approached covered their faces with their skirts, while revealing their asses<sup>242</sup>", getting away without being cursed as a prostitute was not a possibility. The same also applied to the "half veiled fallen women<sup>243</sup>." Veiling in the proper way (with two pieces of veil, one covering the face from the eyes to the neck and the other from the eyebrows to the hair line so as to leave only the eyes open) indicated decency, and therefore, its improper application could never be the deeds of an honorable woman.

The above two examples are the only ones in which the prostitutes are cursed, or women of indecent manners are insulted as prostitutes, in a direct fashion. However, prostitutes do keep up appearing throughout the document, but this time only as the passive participants in a line of curses directed towards men who were in one or another kind of relation with them. In *Risale-i Garibe*, we cannot see any clue to indicate that conducting sexual intercourse with prostitutes was in itself a forbidden or an ill mannered practice. On the other hand, just like every aspect of urban life, for it too there were certain regulative norms. To begin with, getting into a relationship with a prostitute after getting married was definitely an improper demeanor<sup>244</sup>. Accordingly, if you did the same thing when you were an elder man, meaning that if you "could not give up [seeing] the bitches despite having a white beard reaching your bosom", then you would

---

<sup>242</sup> "ve odalar kapusunda köşe başında geleni geçeni seyr edüp üzerine adem geldükte esbabınun eteği ile başın örtüp götün açan forklar." Ibid., p. 44.

<sup>243</sup> "ve yarım yaşmaklu forklar." Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>244</sup> "ve evlenüp yine fahişe mukayyed olanlar." Ibid., p. 24.

indeed be an “unbeliever<sup>245</sup>.” Of course, your relation with a prostitute also had to be kept within a certain distance, and you would not want to take much further unless you really wanted to be one of the “animals that kept on seeing a whore and then took her in marriage<sup>246</sup>.” Besides these restrictions, concerning a man’s acquaintance with a prostitute, there was also the issue of eligibility. Although, there was no “under eighteen” law in Istanbul at the time, Istanbulites had their own barriers and this takes us specifically into problems of manhood and male identity.

In the first chapter we have seen that although manhood was something to be proven through performance in public space / presence, it was also something to be achieved through the successful completion of certain stages. These stages may either be instruction-based levels such as schooling and education (as in the case of Early Modern England), or they may take the form of semi-practical, but highly symbolic rituals. An example for the latter case, and closest to the scope of this paper, would be the circumcision; whereas for a Melanesian of the New Hebrides, this would be what the Western culture has transformed into the sport of Bungee Jumping. However, the stages in the creation of an “Ottoman” man, had its own peculiarities and [pre]requisites other than instruction and ceremonies. In *Meva ‘Idü’n – Nefais Fi – Kava ‘Idi’l – Mecalis*, while criticizing a man for penetrating into the private sphere of another (his *halvethane*), ‘Ali condemns the former to be a *fail* (active) and a *meful* (passive) at the same time, and refers to him as “an impudent passive” and “a man of two delights<sup>247</sup>.” For an Ottoman man it was not an unusual situation to experience passive and active homosexuality one after another. However, the crucial point here is the unacceptability of being passive once that stage was completed. That is to say, once an Ottoman becomes a “man” he should not go back to a former stage, be it immaturity or effeminacy. Although, passing through the stage of passive homosexuality may not have been a requirement valid for all, it was nonetheless a common phenomenon as evident in the widely used phrase

---

<sup>245</sup> “*ve ak sakalı sinede olup orosbulardan vaz gelmeyen dinsizler.*” Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>246</sup> “*ve bir fahişe ile mu ‘amele edüp edüp sonar nikahile alan hayvanlar.*” Ibid., p. 31.

<sup>247</sup> Mustafa ‘Ali, pp. 353, 354.

“fresh boy”, and in the homosexual connotation of “boy (*ođlan*)” in modern Turkish. On the other hand, progressing through this level and coming one step closer to becoming a man did not have any *performative* requirements. Rather than demonstration, it was more based on formal qualities; more properly “a formal quality”, and this was having a beard. The very principle of being a *sade-ru* was not having any facial hair, and ‘Ali refers to beard as “the hair that troubles the heart<sup>248</sup>.” Beyond being a symbol that signaled the end of a boy’s beauty, beard was also a symbol of maturity. In *Risale-i Garibe*, the latter, together with the completion of the passive stage of homosexuality, determined the boundaries of a man’s public activities and accordingly his relations with the prostitutes. In other words, only after a boy had become a man – non-effeminate, non-feminine, not passive but active and masculine – that performance would be considered as a crucial determinant of his identity. Here, I shall underline that the examples of such *performative* requirements, which we have so far seen were not definitely specific to “the construction of manhood.” The reason why they appeared only in reference to men, was primarily the strict patriarchal structure of Ottoman society, which did not allow another possibility. However, from this point onwards, what we are going to look at will be the ill manners directly related to the male identity, and whose proprietors’ manhood is at serious stake.

If a man had to be active in public space to demonstrate his manhood, first he had to be eligible to get into that space. Therefore, he was a “swine”, who “despite being a fresh boy could not handle being fucked, and tending towards women, waited in deserted streets for whores<sup>249</sup>.” Similarly, “the fresh boys who, before getting bearded, disregarded all dangers, drank wine and got acquainted with active pederasts”, definitely did not “care about their asses<sup>250</sup>.” These are, of course, incidents concerning the wrong doings of boys, who were not yet within the borders of manhood. However, as we have

---

<sup>248</sup> Ibid., p. 283.

<sup>249</sup> “*ve taze ođlan olup sikilmegi bařa ıkarmayup ‘avrata ma’il olup orospu iin تنها sokakları bekleyen hunzırlar.*” *Risale-i Garibe*, p. 31.

<sup>250</sup> “*ve taze ođlan olup sakallanmadan gzın budaktan sakınmayup řarab iiup gulampare ile ihtılat eden gtten gemiřler.*” Ibid., p. 31.

seen, once you became a man, you were expected not to return to the “habits” of a previous stage. That was the very reason why the “old fags who, despite having beards, let the tuft of their hair hang from the edge of their *sarıks*<sup>251</sup>”, were cursed by our author. Getting back to this pre-manhood stage of passive homosexuality was something inappropriate, and in its avoidance, absolute care had to be taken. Hence, there was also an element of fear from accidental drawbacks in the stages of masculinity. Such an idea embodied the curse cast upon “the crazy asses who could not save their [own] asses and then claimed to be boy lovers<sup>252</sup>”, but it was even more evident with those cast upon the “donkeys that laid face down in the bath and allowed the huge *tellak* climb up their backs” and the “old fags who [in the bath] put the bath towel on their knees and showed their asses to many a men and to the *tellak*<sup>253</sup>.”

We have seen the examples of specific cases, which would put the male identity into serious jeopardy and take it closer to a stage of effeminacy. However, such a drawback was not the only disapproval of manhood, and activeness was not confined only to the sexual life; it indeed, as I have mentioned, included all aspects of life. Although, public presence was necessary for a man, the manifestation of his manhood – similar to Early Modern England – started with his successful control over his household. Therefore, the *Risale* author does not neglect to curse the “woman minded fools, who, fearing that they would die, cannot control their sons and servants through punishment<sup>254</sup>.” The curse also comes upon the “panders who do not lock their doors, allow five hundred women come in every day, and make the house more crowded than the [female] slave market”, and “those who allow the voices of their wives and *cariyes*

---

<sup>251</sup> “*ve sakalı olup da sarığından perçemin göstüren bayat buştlar.*” Ibid., p. 31.

<sup>252</sup> “*ve götüni kurtarmayup sonar oğlan sever geçinür ah vah eden deli götler.*” Ibid., p. 31.

<sup>253</sup> “*ve hammamda yüzü koyun yatup dizman dellaki arkasına çıkaran eşekler, ve hammamda beştemalı dizine koyup bir alay ademe ve dellaka götüni gösteren köhne buştlar.*” Ibid., p. 31.

<sup>254</sup> “*ve oğlanını ve hizmetkarını terbiye ile zabt etmeyen ve: ‘Ölür!’ deyü korkan avrat akıllu divaneler.*” Ibid. p., 28. Here, I shall underline that the insult “woman minded” is the only occurrence, which is related to an “un-manly” behavior, where “female” is openly given as “the other” of male. I will refer back to this in the following pages when we deal with other examples of “un-manly” behavior.

be heard from the street and by the neighbors<sup>255</sup>.” If they were not able to demonstrate adequate control over their households, even the highest-ranking officials could not escape from the curses of our author. Hence, the “*devletlüs* who do not ask their servants where they have been, while they [servants] were looking for whores in the streets without the knowledge of their *ağas*<sup>256</sup>”, also take their share. Of course, we could not expect from our author to neglect the “dotard *kibars* who own *harems*, but do not attain guards and allow the servants approach the room [the *harem*]<sup>257</sup>.”

For a man in late seventeenth century Istanbul, control over the household was not alone a sufficient deed. He also had to take care of the house, and its members. In other words, he had to be ample in looking after them, be useful and not a *flojo*. That is why “those who leave their servants and *cariyes* hungry and naked<sup>258</sup>” are cursed in *Risale-i Garibe*. On the one hand, this indicates the importance of “thoughtfulness” and on the other, the necessity of being “able”. For the latter case, dependency appears as an opposite state, and in its extremity, it takes the form of being dependent on a woman: The very “other” of the male identity, besides effeminacy. Seeing people who established themselves upon the wealth of their wives appears to be somehow common in eighteenth century Istanbul, since in the *Risale* we read a curse cast upon “those who become masters of the market (*bezazestan hocagisi*) by borrowing [through usury] money from their wives<sup>259</sup>.” If a man took such a step, then the next one to follow could have easily been a more dangerous one: Being not only dependent on the wife in financial terms, but also leaving the control of the household to her. Therefore, the men who “give the control of their *cariyes* to their wives and allow them [*cariyes*] work all

---

<sup>255</sup> “*ve kapusun kilitlemeyüp günde beş yüz ‘avrat gelüp evini ‘avrat bazarından kalabalık eden köftehorlar*”, “*ve ‘avratının cariyesiniün sesini komşuluğa ve sokağa işiddüren.*” Ibid., pp. 28, 29.

<sup>256</sup> “*ve hizmetkarları sokak sokak yeliüp orospu arar, ağasının haberi olmayup: ‘Nerede idiün’ demeyen devletlüler.*” Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>257</sup> “*harem sahibi olup tolup oğlanı ta ‘yin etmeyüp duraz hizmetkarı tolaba yaklaştıran ma ‘tuh kibarlar.*” Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>258</sup> “*kulün ve cariyesin ac ve çıblak gezdirenler.*” Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>259</sup> “*ve karısından murabaha ile akça alup bezazestan hocagisi olan gidiler.*” Ibid., p. 39.

day and all night<sup>260</sup>” are also cursed. Of course, this example does not directly indicate impotency. However, if a man becomes one of the “swindlers who leave their *cariyes* pregnant, but because of their fear from their wives, sell them<sup>261</sup>”, this situation takes us into a different domain where the woman becomes the controller of the household and not the man. The equivalent of this situation in the language of *Risale-i Garibe* is “the pimps who become the slaves of women and have the *cerb* (?) of their wives upon their faces<sup>262</sup>.” In a more ridiculed fashion, our author also curses the “*bögüzades* (sons of *pehlivans*, *pehlivan*-like men?), who marry two-three women, put them in one house and [not being able to control them] allow one to tear off their beards, the other rip their collars, and the other smash their heads with tongs<sup>263</sup>.” For a man, incidents as these would mean the loss of manhood, and therefore, at the first place he would most probably not “have the face” to participate in public life, or such a participation – no matter how proper it was conducted – would not be taken into consideration by the others. This indicates that, *de facto* he would be dismissed from the very arena where he was supposed to exhibit his identity through *performative* excellence. Then, if we are to reconstruct the consecutive stages in the making of manhood for an eighteenth century Istanbulite, the picture would look like: Boyhood (passiveness and effeminacy, progress of maturation) – Manhood (activeness and masculinity, point of no return): Construction of manhood (usefulness, potency and control over the household) – Demonstration of manhood (*performative* excellence in public presence). Hence, if any of the links in this chain were broken, a man’s identity was likely to meet the unwanted consequence of denial.

To rework what this final chapter has showed us, it would be best to approach the issue in the way that Marc Bloch most probably would. That is, starting with what is best known to us, and then, if possible, moving to the least known. Even if everything

---

<sup>260</sup> “*ve cariyesini karısı hükmüne verüp bütün gün bitün geçe işleden.*” Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>261</sup> “*ve cariyesin hamile edüp ‘avrat korkusundan satan canbazlar.*” Ibid. p., 28.

<sup>262</sup> “*ve ‘avrat zebunu olup yüzine karşı ‘avratınun cerbin yeyen kodoşlar.*” Ibid. p., 29.

<sup>263</sup> “*ve iki üç ‘avratı nikahile alup bir evin içine koyup biri sakalın yolup, biri yakasun yırtup ve birisine maşa ile başını yarduran bögüzadeler.*” Ibid., p. 28.

about the nature of “the identity” reflected in *Risale-i Garibe* was left in obscurity, one thing appears to be pretty much clear: The text was directed towards a male audience, and it gave some important clues on how manhood was then perceived. We also know that the document is most probably from the late seventeenth century, and that it was written in Istanbul and for Istanbulites. Therefore, at the least, we have in our hands – though incomplete – a picture of the male Istanbulite identity of the late seventeenth century, and we know how a man was supposed to act on this grand stage. Although, we may not be able to call this identity, *kibar* or commoner in exact terms, we have seen incidents, which portrayed the proper manners for the members of each of these groups. The “sample group” of our author included examples on how a *kibar*, a *müteferrika*, a *devletlü*, a shoemaker and a porter were *not* supposed to behave. Hence, from these facts, we can also deduce what the proper demeanors for these people were, and see the requirements of an appropriate life in the Ottoman capital of the late seventeenth century. On the other hand, we also know that the books of curses were reactionary treatises written against a transformation that was taking place both within and outside the *kibar* world. Therefore, the picture we are looking at both reflects this new and changing scene, and what its ideal form was in the mind of our authors.

To continue with the known facts, one important issue, which frequently appeared in *Risale-i Garibe* and to a certain extent in Hacı Ahmed’s manuscript, was a repetitive emphasis (or a curse) on those who did not know Turkish, or could not speak it in the proper way. In Fleischer, we read that while for Mustafa ‘Ali Turkish ethnicity had nothing to do with the Ottoman state; he did identify the Turkish language with Ottomanness<sup>264</sup>. In the books of curses, although there is an emphasis on the Turkish language, there appears to be no connection between it and Ottomanness. Indeed, the authors never mention the word “Ottoman.” However, the corresponding appearance of this common point does indicate an important issue. Although the *Risale* author may not have identified himself with the Ottomans, regardless of from which social group he might be coming, what he defined as appropriate and proper in the late seventeenth century Istanbul did embody at least one element of what, in the sixteenth century, ‘Ali

---

<sup>264</sup> Fleischer, p. 256.

saw as the characteristics of Ottomanness, and not of the elite or the *kibars*. Therefore, if nothing ever moved down from the *askeri*-proper to the *reaya*-proper, the importance of the Turkish language certainly did, and this may too be incorporated into the expected characteristics of our late seventeenth century Istanbulite man.

## CONCLUSION

In his preface to *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character 1650-1850*, Paul Langford mentions that his study is a departure from the main tradition in the history of manners literature for its evidence is based on (mostly outside) observations rather than didactic literature. This, as he stresses, reveals more how people actually behaved and not how they were advised to<sup>265</sup>. His strategy underlines a possible danger that is also true for my research. Although, both Mustafa 'Ali and the books of curses authors mention that they decided to compose their treatises upon seeing the ill manners of the people, we do not know the extent of actual observation that can be found in their works. To overcome this problem, one thing I did was to pursue first a three-partite comparative analysis, and then a similar one between the two books of curses and finally a study based only on the *Risale*. The intention was both to see changes and continuities in the perception of proper *kibar* manners, and to eliminate repetitive similarities so as to reach what the *Risale* author might have observed in late seventeenth century Istanbul. However, this still does not eliminate all the problems, since we cannot be certain about the actual readers of both Mustafa 'Ali and the books of curses. What I have done here was no more than an approximation, and although the *Risale* author might have composed at least a particular portion of his work according to his observations, we do not know what segments or portion of the Ottoman society did really believe that what he wrote were examples of bad manners.

In *The Fortunes of the Courtier*, Peter Burke tries to see how Castiglione's *Courtier* was actually received by the Europeans. For this, he tracts down who had owned the book, when they aquired it and what sections of the book were underlined and found crucial by different audiences. This is one possible way to detect how a particular literature was perceived by a particular society. However, for the three sources I have,

---

<sup>265</sup> Langford, Paul. *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character, 1650-1850*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

such a study seems to be extremely difficult, if not totally impossible. First of all, I have no information whether there are other copies of the *Risale* and the *Makale* or not, and there are only two known copies of Mustafa ‘Ali, one of which survives only as a facsimile. Secondly, we know that the *Risale* was once owned by a certain Derviş İsmail, and *Meva ‘Idü’n – Nefais Fi – Kava ‘Idi’l – Mecalis* by Neyli-zade Mehmed Hamid Efendi (d. 1767), the *kadı* of Istanbul. This gives little clue about who had actually read these works, and looking at only these two examples, we cannot conclude that they were read by a particularly religious audience. However, although readership seems difficult to detect, it is still possible to examine how people actually behaved, and how that corresponded to the books of curses or Mustafa ‘Ali. One method, which I had in mind but due to lack of time could not put into practice, would be looking at various *fetvas* issued at different periods. This may provide a more solid link between literature and social reality. If, in the late seventeenth century, we are talking about a transformation in both the *kibar* culture and the Ottoman society in general, this this can best be viewed in the actual reactions of the people, who experienced that transformation and what they personally found to be offensive.

Identities are constructed through multiple layered and extremely complex procedures. Leaving aside the highly problematic case of “Ottomanness”, there cannot even be a concrete definition of “Turkishness.” Not only because of the immensely complicated process through which it is built, but also because of the diversity of perspectives through which it can be analyzed. In this paper, I looked at the role of manners only as one crucial aspect of identity construction. Although, it requires a long discussion and further research to conclude whether this gave us a solid identity or not, it certainly did provide us with the expected characteristics of an eighteenth century Istanbulite man, at least according to the expectations of a single author. On the other hand, due to all the problems I tried to list, my efforts were no more than approximations, and I believe that despite all its difficulties Ottoman studies do deserve to catch up with the current trend in identity studies. It is, of course, highly problematic to comment on the nature of an Ottoman identity and the uniformity of that identity. However, we have seen that indeed, at least on certain levels, there could have been

something (or someone) called Ottoman beyond the rigid definition, which the name conveys: A common ground upon which the members of previously distinct social groups at least shared the idea that “blowing your nose like a trumpet” was not really a good manner.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### *Primary Sources:*

Gelibolulu Mustafa 'Ali. Meva 'Idü'n-Nefais Fi-Kava 'Idi'l-Mecalis. (Hazırlayan: Mehmet Şeker), Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1997.

Hacı Ahmed. Makale-i Garibe in B. 404, Topkapı Palace Library, 96b-98b.

XVIII. yy İstanbul'a Dair Risale-i Garibe (Hazırlayan: Hayati Develi). İstanbul: Kitabevi, 1998.

### *Secondary Sources:*

Abdülaziz Bey. Osmanlı Adet, Merasim ve Tabirleri: İnsanlar, İnanışlar, Eğlence, Dil. (Hazırlayanlar: Kazım Arısan, Duygu Arısan Günay), İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995.

Ahmed Refik, XII. Asr-ı Hicri'de İstanbul Hayatı. İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1988.

Almeida, Miguel Vale de. The Hegemonic Male: Masculinity in a Portuguese Town. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1996.

Balıkhane Nazırı Ali Rıza Bey. Eski Zamanlarda İstanbul Hayatı. (Hazırlayan: Ali Şükrü Çoruk), İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2001.

Bierman, Irene A. The Ottomanization of Crete in Bierman, Irene A., Rifa'at A. Abou-El-Haj, Donald Perziosi, eds. The Ottoman City and Its Parts, Urban Structure and Social Order. New York: New Rochelle, 1991.

Brookes, Douglas. Proper Compartment in Ottoman Society. Paper presented at Middle East Studies Association 31<sup>st</sup> Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California, November 22-24, 1997.

Burke, Peter. The Fortunes of the Courtier. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.

Curtin, Michael. A Question of Manners: Status and Gender in Etiquette and Courtesy in The Journal of Modern History, Volume 57, Issue 3, September 1985.

- Danişmend, İsmail Hami. İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi, Cilt: 4. İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1972.
- Doumani, Beshara. Rediscovering Palestine: Merchants and Peasants in Jabal Nablus, 1700-1900. Berkeley, 1995.
- Dunn, Robert G. Identity Crises: A Social Critique of Postmodernity. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1998.
- Elias, Norbert. *Homo Clausus and the Civilizing Process* in Gay, Paul, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman eds. Identity: A Reader. London: Sage Publications, 2000.
- Elias, Norbert. The Civilizing Process. Oxford: Blackwell Publications, 1982.
- Eyuboğlu, İsmet Zeki. Türk Dilinin Etimoloji Sözlüğü. İstanbul: Sosyal Yayınlar, 1998.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya. Subjects of the Sultan: Culture and Daily Life in the Ottoman Empire. New York: I.B. Tauris, 2000.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya *Crisis and Change* in İnalcık, Halil and Donald Quataert eds. An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire Volume II: 1600-1914. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Fleischer, Cornell H. Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire, The Historian Mustafa Ali (1541-1600). New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Fletcher, Anthony. *Manhood, The Male Body, Courtship and The Household in Early Modern England* in History July 99, Vol. 84, Issue 275.
- Gilmore, David D. Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Gundersheimer, Werner L. *Renaissance Concept of Shame and Pocaterra's Dialoghi Della Vergogna* in Renaissance Quarterly, Volume 47, Issue 1, Spring 1994.
- Hall, Stuart. *Who Needs 'Identity'?* in du Gay, Paul, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman eds. Identity: A Reader. London: Sage Publications, 2000.
- Haneda, Masashi and Toru Miura. Islamic Urban Studies: Historical Review and Perspectives. New York: Kegan Paul International, 1994.
- Hanna, Nelly. Making Big Money in 1600: The Life and Times of Isma'il Abu Taqiyya, Egyptian Merchant New York: Syracuse, 1998.

- Hertzfeld, Michael. The Poetics of Manhood: Contest and Identity in a Cretan Mountain Village. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Inalcık, Halil. The Ottoman Empire, The Classical Age 1300-1600. London: Phoenix, 1997.
- Itzkowitz, Norman. Ottoman Empire and Islamic Tradition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Kafadar, Cemal. Between Two Worlds, The Construction of the Ottoman State. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995.
- Kaufmann, Walter and Forrest E. Baird eds. Philosophic Classics: From Plato to Nietzsche. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1997.
- Khoury, Dina Rizk. *Between Khassa and Amma: Elites and Commoners in Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century Mosul* in eadem., State and Provincial Society in the Ottoman Empire: Mosul, 1540-1834. Cambridge, 1997.
- Kortantamer, Tunca. *17. Yüzyıl Şairi Atay'nin Hamse'sinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Görüntüsü* in Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi II, 1984.
- Kunt, İ.Metin: The Sultan's Servants: The Transformation of Ottoman Provincial Administration 1550-1650. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Langford, Paul. Englishness Identified: Manners and Character, 1650-1850. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Lindner, Rudi Paul. Ortaçağ Anadolu'sunda Göçebeler ve Osmanlılar. (Trans.: Müfit Günay) İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi, 2000.
- Marcus, Abraham. The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity: Aleppo in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century. New York, 1988.
- McGowan, Bruce. *The Age of the Ayans, 1699-1812* in Inalcık, Halil and Donald Quataert eds. An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire Volume II: 1600-1914. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Muir, Edward. Ritual in Early Modern Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Ocak, Ahmed Yaşar. *XV-XVI. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı Resmi İdeolojisi ve Buna Muhalefet Problemi* in XI. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler (Ankara: 5-6 Eylül 1990). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1994.

- Perziosi, Donald. *Introduction: Power, Structure and Architectural Function* in Bierman, Irene A., Rifa'at A. Abou-El-Haj, Donald Perziosi, eds. The Ottoman City and Its Parts, Urban Structure and Social Order. New York: New Rochelle, 1991.
- Redhouse: Yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük. Istanbul: Redhouse Yayınevi, 1987.
- Silay, Kemal. Nedim and the Poetics of the Ottoman Court: Medieval Inheritance and the Need for Change. Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies Series, 1994.
- Smith, Grace Martin and Carl W. Ernst eds. Manifestations of Sainthood in Islam. Istanbul: Isis Press, 1993.
- Stoianovich, Traian. *The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant* in Journal of Economic History XX, 1960.
- Thompson, E. P. Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture. New York: The New Press, 1993.
- Todorov, Nikolai. *Social Structures in the Balkans During the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* in Etudes Balkaniques 4. Sofia, 1985.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. Osmanlı Devleti'nin İlmiye Teşkilatı. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1988.





## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### *Primary Sources:*

Gelibolulu Mustafa 'Ali. Meva 'Idü'n-Nefais Fi-Kava 'Idi'l-Mecalis. (Hazırlayan: Mehmet Şeker), Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1997.

Hacı Ahmed. Makale-i Garibe in B. 404, Topkapı Palace Library, 96b-98b.

XVIII. yy İstanbul'a Dair Risale-i Garibe (Hazırlayan: Hayati Develi). İstanbul: Kitabevi, 1998.

### *Secondary Sources:*

Abdülaziz Bey. Osmanlı Adet, Merasim ve Tabirleri: İnsanlar, İnanışlar, Eğlence, Dil. (Hazırlayanlar: Kazım Arısan, Duygu Arısan Günay), İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995.

Ahmed Refik, XII. Asr-ı Hicri'de İstanbul Hayatı. İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1988.

Almeida, Miguel Vale de. The Hegemonic Male: Masculinity in a Portuguese Town. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1996.

Balıkhane Nazırı Ali Rıza Bey. Eski Zamanlarda İstanbul Hayatı. (Hazırlayan: Ali Şükrü Çoruk), İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2001.

Bierman, Irene A. The Ottomanization of Crete in Bierman, Irene A., Rifa'at A. Abou-El-Haj, Donald Perziosi, eds. The Ottoman City and Its Parts, Urban Structure and Social Order. New York: New Rochelle, 1991.

Brookes, Douglas. Proper Compartment in Ottoman Society. Paper presented at Middle East Studies Association 31<sup>st</sup> Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California, November 22-24, 1997.

Burke, Peter. The Fortunes of the Courtier. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.

Curtin, Michael. A Question of Manners: Status and Gender in Etiquette and Courtesy in The Journal of Modern History, Volume 57, Issue 3, September 1985.

- Danişmend, İsmail Hami. İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi, Cilt: 4. İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1972.
- Doumani, Beshara. Rediscovering Palestine: Merchants and Peasants in Jabal Nablus, 1700-1900. Berkeley, 1995.
- Dunn, Robert G. Identity Crises: A Social Critique of Postmodernity. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1998.
- Elias, Norbert. *Homo Clausus and the Civilizing Process* in Gay, Paul, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman eds. Identity: A Reader. London: Sage Publications, 2000.
- Elias, Norbert. The Civilizing Process. Oxford: Blackwell Publications, 1982.
- Eyuboğlu, İsmet Zeki. Türk Dilinin Etimoloji Sözlüğü. İstanbul: Sosyal Yayınlar, 1998.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya. Subjects of the Sultan: Culture and Daily Life in the Ottoman Empire. New York: I.B. Tauris, 2000.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya *Crisis and Change* in İnalcık, Halil and Donald Quataert eds. An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire Volume II: 1600-1914. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Fleischer, Cornell H. Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire, The Historian Mustafa Ali (1541-1600). New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Fletcher, Anthony. *Manhood, The Male Body, Courtship and The Household in Early Modern England* in History July 99, Vol. 84, Issue 275.
- Gilmore, David D. Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Gundersheimer, Werner L. *Renaissance Concept of Shame and Pocaterra's Dialoghi Della Vergogna* in Renaissance Quarterly, Volume 47, Issue 1, Spring 1994.
- Hall, Stuart. *Who Needs 'Identity'?* in du Gay, Paul, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman eds. Identity: A Reader. London: Sage Publications, 2000.
- Haneda, Masashi and Toru Miura. Islamic Urban Studies: Historical Review and Perspectives. New York: Kegan Paul International, 1994.
- Hanna, Nelly. Making Big Money in 1600: The Life and Times of Isma'il Abu Taqiyya, Egyptian Merchant New York: Syracuse, 1998.

- Hertzfeld, Michael. The Poetics of Manhood: Contest and Identity in a Cretan Mountain Village. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Inalcık, Halil. The Ottoman Empire, The Classical Age 1300-1600. London: Phoenix, 1997.
- Itzkowitz, Norman. Ottoman Empire and Islamic Tradition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Kafadar, Cemal. Between Two Worlds, The Construction of the Ottoman State. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995.
- Kaufmann, Walter and Forrest E. Baird eds. Philosophic Classics: From Plato to Nietzsche. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1997.
- Khoury, Dina Rizk. *Between Khassa and Amma: Elites and Commoners in Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century Mosul* in eadem., State and Provincial Society in the Ottoman Empire: Mosul, 1540-1834. Cambridge, 1997.
- Kortantamer, Tunca. *17. Yüzyıl Şairi Atay'nin Hamse'sinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Görüntüsü* in Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi II, 1984.
- Kunt, İ.Metin: The Sultan's Servants: The Transformation of Ottoman Provincial Administration 1550-1650. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Langford, Paul. Englishness Identified: Manners and Character, 1650-1850. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Lindner, Rudi Paul. Ortaçağ Anadolu'sunda Göçebeler ve Osmanlılar. (Trans.: Müfit Günay) İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi, 2000.
- Marcus, Abraham. The Middle East on the Eve of Modernity: Aleppo in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century. New York, 1988.
- McGowan, Bruce. *The Age of the Ayans, 1699-1812* in Inalcık, Halil and Donald Quataert eds. An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire Volume II: 1600-1914. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Muir, Edward. Ritual in Early Modern Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Ocak, Ahmed Yaşar. *XV-XVI. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı Resmi İdeolojisi ve Buna Muhalefet Problemi* in XI. Türk Tarih Kongresi, Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler (Ankara: 5-6 Eylül 1990). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1994.

- Perziosi, Donald. *Introduction: Power, Structure and Architectural Function* in Bierman, Irene A., Rifa'at A. Abou-El-Haj, Donald Perziosi, eds. The Ottoman City and Its Parts, Urban Structure and Social Order. New York: New Rochelle, 1991.
- Redhouse: Yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük. Istanbul: Redhouse Yayınevi, 1987.
- Silay, Kemal. Nedim and the Poetics of the Ottoman Court: Medieval Inheritance and the Need for Change. Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies Series, 1994.
- Smith, Grace Martin and Carl W. Ernst eds. Manifestations of Sainthood in Islam. Istanbul: Isis Press, 1993.
- Stoianovich, Traian. *The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant* in Journal of Economic History XX, 1960.
- Thompson, E. P. Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture. New York: The New Press, 1993.
- Todorov, Nikolai. *Social Structures in the Balkans During the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* in Etudes Balkaniques 4. Sofia, 1985.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. Osmanlı Devleti'nin İlmiye Teşkilatı. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1988.