IMAGES OF SEXUALITY IN THE 16th CENTURY OTTOMAN SOCIETY: MEHMED GAZÂLÎ'S DAFİ'Ü'L GUMÛM

by

BURCU GÜRGAN

Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Sabancı University

Spring 2005

FIRAT'A …

TANAY'A…

SİNAN'A…

ABSTRACT:

This thesis presents an alternative analysis of a 16th century work of erotic prose, *Dâfi'ü'l-gumûm ve Râfi'ü'l-humûm*. It was penned by Mehmed Gazâlî, better known by his nickname Deli Birader. He was born in 1466 in Bursa and died in 1534/1535 in Mecca. He was a scholar and a poet. He became courtier of Piyâle Bey, and then was admitted to the close circle of Prince Korkud in Manisa palace. He stayed there in a brief period before accession of Selim I to the throne in 1513. He dedicated *Dâfi'ü'l-gumûm* to Piyâle. After death of his benefactor Korkud, he worked in medreses in various Anatolian cities. He abandoned his career as a scholar soon, and settled in Beşiktaş, Istanbul. The contemporary Ottoman biographers tell that because of the rumours concerning his involvement in "immoral affairs", and the execution of his patron İskender Çelebi, Gazâlî needed to take resignation in Mecca for the rest of his life.

The following study aims to (1) re-asses the current biographical information about Mehmed Gazâlî (2) re-instate the broader cultural context within which he produced his humour and (3) construe the representative-discursive world he built in his *Dafi'ü'l Gumûm*.

It proposes that the notion *meclis* and its various social-cultural associations provide a proper context to examine the convivial environment that inspires the literary imagery, and the human networks through which such a work is produced, transmitted and consumed. In the broadest sense of the term, there was, in early modern times, a widely practiced general "party" or "gathering" based on "witty conversation" (*sohbet*) as a core and containing many other elements including alcohol, food, music, dancers, plays and recitations. Such gatherings displayed an intersection of "patronage", "entertainment" and "literary-artistic production". They seem to be as important and popular among the court-dependent elites in Europe and Middle East as it was in the Ottoman Empire.

The convivial *mecalis* corresponding to Brother Madcap's subsequent life stages (in Korkud's court, among his friends and with his elite patrons in Istanbul, and in Mecca) is taken as a particular historical case. In this respect, the thesis may facilitate a preliminary research agenda to study the network of social and historical relations that develop within the circle of the Ottoman cultural production.

It is assumed that *Dafî'ü'l Gumûm* was constructed as a humour to enjoy primarily in the *meclis* context. Two basic questions are directed to the text: (1) How did *Gazâlî* create a humorous world? (2) Why could the reader find the text "funny"? The claim is that his thematic bag and literary strategies touch on and exploit certain tangible social dynamics and hierarchies (slavery, patronage, patriarchy, class differences e.g.). He avers human interactions that may prevail in real contexts (*meclis*, *medrese*, bathhouse etc.) and creates phobias and fears rooted in collective anxieties. To sum up, *Gazâlî*'s world of representations is not a discrete phenomenon detached from sociological reality, but it exaggerates that reality and makes a parody of it.

ÖZET:

Bu tez, 16. yüzyılda yazılmış olan "erotik" bir metnin, *Dafi'ü'l Gumûm Rafi'ü'l Humûm*'un alternatif bir analizini sunmaktadır. Metin, Deli Birader takma adıyla bilinen Mehmed Gazâlî tarafından kaleme alındı. Gazâlî 1466 yılında Bursa'da doğdu ve 1534/1535'de Mekke'de öldü. Bir medrese hocası ve şairdi. Manisa Sarayı'nda önce Piyâle Bey'in kortiyeri oldu, ve sonrasında ise şehzade Korkud'un yakın dairesine kabul edildi. *Dafi'ü'l Gumûm*'u Piyâle'ye ithaf etti. Selim I'in tahta geçtiği 1513 yılına kadar belirli bir süre burada kaldı. Velinimeti Korkud'un ölümünden sonra çeşitli Anadolu kentlerindeki medreselerde müderrislik yaptı. Bir süre sonra bu mesleği bırakıp İstanbul'da Beşiktaş'a yerleşti. Çağdaşı Osmanlı tezkirecilerinin anlattığına göre "ahlaksız işlere" karıştığına dair dedikodular ve patronu İskender Çelebi'nin idamı neticesinde hayatının geri kalan kısmını Mekke'de geçirmek durumunda kaldı.

Bu çalışma, (1) Gazâlî hakkındaki biyografik bilgileri yeniden değerlendirmeyi (2) onun mizahını ürettiği kültürel bağlamı yerine oturtmayı (3) *Dafi'ü'l Gumûm*'da inşa edilen simgesel-söylemsel dünyayı yorumlamayı amaçlamaktadır.

Çalışmada, "meclis" nosyonun değişik sosyal ve kültürel ilintileri ve yan anlamlarıyla *Dafi'ü'l Gumûm* gibi bir metnin üretildiği ve tüketildiği bağlamı ve bu süreçlerde etkin olan bir dizi ilişki ağını anlamımızı sağladığını tartışılmaktadır. En geniş anlamıyla, erken-modern dönemde Ortadoğu, Avrupa ve Osmanlı kültür dairelerinde "sohbet", "içki", "dans" ve "resital" gibi değişik pratikleri içeren ve "patronaj", "eğlence" ve "edebî-artistik üretim" in kesiştiği "parti" ya da "toplantı" ların özellikle hanedana bağımlı elitler arasında önemli ve popüler olduğu gözlemlenebilir.

Deli Birader'in hayatının birbirini takip eden aşamalarına denk gelen "meclisler" (Korkud'un hanesinde, arkadaşlarının arasında ve patronlarıyla İstanbul'da ve Mekke'de) spesifik bir tarihsel örnek olarak alınacaktır. Bu anlamda, tez, Osmanlı kültür üretimi dairesinde gelişen tarihsel ilişki ağlarını çalışmak için başlangıç niteliğinde bir ajanda önermektedir.

Dafi'ü'l Gumûm'un öncelikle "meclis" ortamında eğlenmek için yazılmış mizahî bir eser olduğu varsayılmaktadır. Metne iki temel soru yöneltilmektedir: (1) Gazâlî, mizahî bir dünyayı nasıl yaratmıştır? (2) Okuyucu bu eseri neden "komik" bulmuştur/bulabilir? Öne sürülen argüman, yazarın kullandığı tematik bagajın ve yazınsal stratejilerin somut sosyal dinamiklere ve hiyerarşilere (kölelik, patronaj, patriyarki, sınıfsal farklılıklar vb.) dokunduğudur. Yazar, gerçek bağlamlarda (meclis, medrese, hamam vb.)

filizlenebilecek ilişkileri vurgulamakta ve kökleri kollektif hassasiyetlerde olan korku ve fobiler yaratmaktadır. Kısaca, Gazâlî'nin temsilî ya da simgesel dünyası sosyolojik gerçeklikten kopuk değildir, bu gerçekliği "abartmak"ta ve onun bir "parodi"sini yapmaktadır.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

In these two years I've accrued lots of debts to many people. First of all, I must thank my advisors Dr. Tülay Artan and Dr. Y. Hakan Erdem. They showed me the various stages and theatres of the Ottoman political and cultural history, and encouraged me to study with primary sources which usually turn out to be the greatest phobia of the beginners in the field. The exciting seminars that they offered, and also our more informal conversations enabled me to recognize my professional and intellectual interests. They established in me a sense of "professional independence" and "intelligent criticism."

I am indebted to Prof. Metin Kunt who was patient to read my thesis meticulously, and allowed me to face my successes and failures in this very first large project in my career. Even though we did not work together for this thesis, I always remembered Dr. Halil Berktay's advice that achievement of academic career demands real psychological stamina.

Dr. Selim Kuru was kind to share his two unpublished articles with me; if he hadn't put all his effort and energy as to prepare a critical edition of *Dafi'ü'l Gumûm*, I wouldn't have had the chance of stepping into Gazâlî's vibrant world. Prof. Walter G. Andrews did not hesitate to answer my questions through an e-mail trafficking and he sent me a copy of his latest book from kilometres away.

My family provided a comfortable and warm "domestic island" for me; particularly my mother Nuray Sakarya is the figure who provoked questions pertaining to "gender" and "sexuality" in my mind, and she always finds excitement in my studies. My friend Özge Müge Bilgen acted as my critical eye to the outside world and "popular culture". I won a very special friend, Semi Ertan in Sabancı University.

Finally, Vefa and I made a "groundbreaking" and "affectionate" experience out of this thesis. I couldn't find the word to thank him for his limitless support and care.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION&DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM:

With the fruitful contribution of the rapprochement that has started to take place between history and social sciences, especially literary theory and anthropology, the last decade has seen the turn in historiography to investigation of cultural phenomena in all their complexities. This has opened up new fields of study. Richer histories of private life, life-style, popular culture, human body and representations are being constructed from the view point of the interpersonal and intergroup complexities of struggle and collusion, duplicity and complicity, control and resistance ,individuation and stereotyping, socialization and difference, with an awareness of culture and gender conflict, the construction of the self, the production and reproduction of power relations and the capacity of language and symbols to define reality.

One dimension that this new cultural history can reclaim is sexuality. In Western historiography, the canonical pieces of thinkers such as Michel Foucault[1] and John Boswell[2], interpretive methods devised and employed by historians of art, and of book/reading have inspired accumulation of works on premodern and modern sexualities, and on forms of "writing sexuality" in different periods in Europe.[3]

---

[1] Michel Foucault, *The history of sexuality*, translated from the French by Robert Hurley (New York : Vintage Books, 1990) ; for contribution of Foucault to historical method and thought see, Patricia O'Brien, "Michel Foucault's History of Sexuality", in *The New cultural history : essays*, et al. Aletta Biersack, ed. with an introduction by Lynn Hunt. (Berkeley: University of California Press, c1989) pp. 25-46.

[2] John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay people in western Europe from the beginning of the Christian era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago: 1981); John Boswell, "Revolutions, Universals, and Sexual Categories" , in *Same sex : debating the ethics, science, and culture of homosexuality*, ed. John Corvino (Lanham, Md. : Rowman & Littlefield, c1997) pp. 185-203.

[3] Especially see Paula Bennet and Vernon A. Rosario,eds. , *Solitary pleasures : the historical, literary, and artistic discourses of autoeroticism* (New York : Routledge, 1995); Louise Frandenburg and Carla Freccero, eds. , *Premodern sexualities* (London ; New York : Routledge, 1996) **;** John Corvino *Same sex : debating the ethics, science, and culture of homosexuality*, (Lanham, Md. : Rowman & Littlefield, c1997); John C. Fout, *Forbidden history : the state, society, and the regulation of sexuality in modern Europe : essays from the Journal of the history of sexuality* (Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1992).

Fortunately, there is a multiplicity of sources that inform us about the sexual life of Ottoman men and women (*letâyif* collections, *hicviyyes*, *fatwas*, memoirs, diaries, letters, jokes, anecdotes etc.), and that offer a rich repository of images. However, apart from the well-known studies on the Orientalist perceptions of Eastern/Islamic sexuality[4], historians' attempts to restore the concept of "gender" (as well as, "family" and "fertility") to Ottoman history[5], and anthropological studies about Muslim societies[6], we rarely encounter erudite works directly addressing the Ottoman sexual

[4] Especially consult Rana Kabbani *Europe's Myths of Orient, Devise and Rule* (London: Pandora Press, 1988).

[5] Leslie P. Peirce, *The imperial harem : women and sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (New York : Oxford University Press,1993) ; Madeline C. Zilfi, ed. , *Women in the Ottoman Empire : Middle Eastern women in the early Modern Era* (Leiden ; New York : Brill, 1997).

[6] Deniz Kandiyoti, ed. , *Gendering the Middle East : emerging perspectives*, New University Press, 1996, and her "The Paradoxes of Masculinity:Some thoughts on segregated societies",in *Dislocating Masculinity:comparative etnoghraphies*, eds. Andrea Cornwall and Nancy Lindisfarne (London&New York:Routledge, 1994). Elizabeth Warnock Fernea, ed. , *Women and the family in the Middle East: new voices of change* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1985); Leila Ahmed *Women and gender in Islam : historical roots of a modern debate* (New Haven:Yale University Press, 1992); Margaret L.Meriwether and Judith E.Tucker, eds. , *Social history of women and gender in the modern Middle East* (Boulder, Colo.:Westview Press, 1999) ; Nikki R. Keddie and Beth Baron, eds. , *Women in Middle Eastern history : shifting boundaries in sex and gender* (New Haven : Yale University Press, c1991); Nikki R. Keddie and Lois Beck, eds. , *Women in the Muslim world* (Cambridge, Mass. :Harvard University Press, 1978)

It is important to differentiate these "classical" anthropological works from a number of studies primarily concentrating on constructions and practices of sexuality in the Middle East:

One is Abdelwahab Bouhdiba's *Sexuality in Islam* (Alan Sheridan trans., Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul,1985) .The book of this Tunisian sociologist was first published in 1975 in France. Simply put, in his study Bouhdiba on the one hand claims allegiance to what he perceives to be the harmonious synthesis of the "sacred" and "profane" achieved by Islamic religious tradition ,on the other hand he is highly critical of what he sees as the failure of Muslim society to translate this ideal model into contemporary social institutions and practices. Accordingly, he emphasizes that, unlike Christianity, Islam accords a priveleged position to "sexuality". Islam does not depreciate or deny male libidinal energy, rather it attributes a sublime significance to the "sexual" ,and invests it with a "sacral" character that removes all trace of guilt and integrates it to the legitimate domain of the "religious". As sign of this, there is no celibacy in Islam, and marriage is a canonical obligation for all believers. Moreover, while admitting "sexual hierarchy" and "male supremacy" central to Islamic religion, he argues that, the fundamental "complementarity" of the sexes espoused by Islam negates this apparent "misogyny". However, this "harmonious synthesis" of the sexual and sacred has been rarely realized ,more frequently it has been degraded into a repressive sexuality that oppresses both men and women, by the exigencies of "historical decline" and "colonial domination". From the view point of Bouhdiba, to search out the dialectical relationship between the perception of sexuality in Islamic religion and the concrete reality of sexual relations in Arab-Muslim society is also to search out the lost meaning of "real faith" and "authentic love", and to restore them to their proper place in the Muslim social order. His method is a combination of symbolic and psychoanalytic approaches and insights which presents provocative construsions of concubinage, veiling, the *hammam*, circumcision and the mother cult. The book has subsequent chapters about the views of medieval jurists and scholars on such matters as marriage, ablution, homosexuality etc. Overall, Bouhdiba's attempt is a major contribution to the comparative study of sexuality and gender conceptions in the Judaic, Christian and Muslim traditions.

Among the first publications in the field history of sexual and particularly homosexual phenomena in the Middle Eastern society, one must mention also about other studies:

Sexuality and Eroticism among Males in Moslem Societies, a collection edited by Arno Schimitt and Jehodea Sofer (Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press, 1992) consists primarily of personal accounts of Western travellers' sexual encounters with Arabs and Iranians. In his subsequent *Bio-bibliography of*

experiences, Ottoman men's and women's perceptions of their own and others' sexuality, sexual "normality" codes, and how they are handled in moral, religious, pseudo-scientific and scientific terms.

Ironically enough there is a recent upsurge in publications dealing with sexual life in Ottoman society, written in different forms from novels to lavishly illustrated catalogues. They have sought to appeal variously to the market place, to serious scholarship, and to a range of other interests from the hotly political to the mildly prurient. The multiplication of popular-historical written and visual material exposes the diversity which marks the attitudes to the Ottoman past from contemporary contexts. It also shows that sexuality with baggage of imagery and discourses that it calls forth ("*harem*", "polygamy", pederasty" etc.) is one of the most problematic issues surrounding Ottoman society. As such, it is one of the scholarly topics of concern where political preoccupations, popular discourses and imagery, and historical idiosyncrasies most permeate.

Taken as a body, these popular-historical works generally fall into three categories, with somewhat blurred boundaries. The first comes within a novelistic genre, "popularizing" historical knowledge, and contains fruitful historical material shedding

---

Male-Male Sexuality and Eroticism in Muslim Societies (Berlin:Verlag Rosa Winkel,1995) Arno Schimitt provides rich bulk of references to Western and Islamic primary and secondary sources dealing with homosexuality and homoeroticism in Islamic civilizations.

Stephen O. Murray and Will Roscoe in *Islamic Homosexualities: culture,history, and literature* (with additional contributions by Eric Allyn, New York &London: New York University Press, 1997) expose to the reader a series of articles characterized by interdisciplinarity and diversity of approaches, judgments and evaluations. This certainly reveals the complexity and multiplicity of homosexual practices and patterns in medieval and modern Islamic cultures. It is important to note that, the editors of the book criticizes the "social constructionist" model pertaining to the constructs of "gender" and "sexuality", according to which sexual categories and identities are not abstract, universal and applicable across time and space; rather they are historically specific and culturally created. Secondly, they problematize the various social constructionist explanations looking for the sole reason for the development of modern homosexuality in the Western world in the development of modern medicine, the rise of capitalism, the emergence of major urban centres, features endemic to the Western world. Against these claims, they insist that, the patterns of homosexuality to be found in Islamic societies are not categorically distinct from all aspects of modern homosexual identity and lifestyle.

Franz Rosenthal and Everett Rowson's edition *Homoeroticism in Classical Arabic Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997) focuses itself on analysing homoerotic symbolism in classical Arabic and Persian lyric poetry, courtly letters, anecdotal collections, shadow plays, political satires, verancular songs and dreambooks.The study can be seen as a clear critique of the superficial and polemical misreadings of early Western writers ,of these diversed sources simply as evidence of the sexual culture of Muslim societies. It well shows that the homoerotic motifs in classical Arab literature ,often employed as metaphors, satires and parody, convey meanings that teach well beyond these early readings. It introduces me to the sexual imagery of Arab literature, and I have obtained many categories and tools of analysis from the several chapters of it.

light on daily social-cultural practices of the Ottomans.[7] The second is a eulogy of the Ottoman ancestors as "harbingers of sexual tolerance".[8] The Ottoman sultan who applied harsh measures to those groups that were dangerous to the very existence of the state and legitimate continuation of the dynasty, and assured the strict observance of Islamic rules organizing relations between men and women was extremely and exemplarily tolerant to production and dissemination of "pornographic" material. Thus, a kind of tolerance rarely found in contemporary society came from the Palace, from the Sultans themselves, filled with all the pleasures of carnality, who might have had their eyes half closed.

The third category is related to the formation of Marxist, feminist and "gay" identities with reference to sexual norms of previous centuries. Various Marxist and feminist perspectives emphasize the transformation of the early Ottoman political formation from a nomadic-tribal organism characterized by egalitarian, horizontal and undifferentiated relations to a world empire. It was a process accompanied by class differentiation, slavery, and the articulation of new sexual norms around them. The wives and daughters of the court-dependent elite were dispossessed of participation in formal decision-making processes and access to public space, and subject to patriarchal authority under their fathers, brothers and husbands. They became mere instruments for propagation of offspring and maintenance and solidification of ties with the imperial loci of power. The "emasculation" of male slaves by castration and the reduction of young men coming from poor societal sectors into objects of elite sexual desire is the other facet of the same process in which both men and women were "alienated" from

[7] This category is typified by Reşat Ekrem Koçu, Ahmet Refik Altınay and Ahmet Refik Sevengil. See especially, Ahmet Refik Altınay, *Lale Devri*, sadeleştiren Dursun Gürlek (İstanbul: Timaş, 1997) ; Ahmet Refik Sevengil, *İstanbul nasıl eğleniyordu? : 1453'ten 1927'ye kadar,* hazırlayan Sami Önal (İstanbul : İletişim, 1998); Reşat Ekrem Koçu, *Eski İstanbul'da meyhaneler ve meyhane köçekleri*, 2nd ed. (İstanbul : Doğan Kitapçılık, 2002) ,*Kabakçı Mustafa : bir serserinin romanlaştırılmış hayatı*, resimler Dağıstan Çetinkaya, 3rd ed. (İstanbul : Doğan Kitap, c2003), *Tarihten hikayeler kızlarağasının piçi*, 2nd ed. (İstanbul: Doğan Kitapları, 2000), *Binbirdirek Batakhanesi Cevahirli Hanımsultan* (İstanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık, 2003), *Yeniçeriler*, resimler Sabiha Bozcalı (İstanbul: Koçu Yayınları, 1964), *Erkek Kızlar* (Doğan Kitapçılık, 2001), and *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul : İstanbul Yayınevi, 1948-).

[8] Sema Nilgün Erdoğan, *Sexual life in Ottoman society* (İstanbul : Dönence, 1996); see introduction of *Book of prince : Dafiü'l gumûm, rafiü'l humûm* / Mehmed Gazalî (Deli Birader), illustrated by Münif Fehim, trans. Robert Landor (İstanbul : Dönence, 2001); see introduction of Murat Bardakçı, *Osmanlı'da seks: sarayda gece dersleri*, 6th ed. (İstanbul: Gür, 1992).

their natural biological, emotional and mental faculties, and any possibility of having a healthy relationship between the two sexes was eradicated.[9]

On the other hand, it is possible to see quite a number of references to some well-known Islamic and Ottoman texts -Mustafa Âli's *Mevaidü'n Nefais fi' Kavaidü'l Mecalis*, Keykavus's *Kabusname*, *Seyahatname* of Evliya Çelebi, anecdotes from mystical works of Feridüddin-i Attar- presented in many "gay" sites on the internet.[10] Here, by invoking the Islamic and Ottoman literary traditions displaying erotic themes, the "gay" identity is traced as far back in history as possible, opposing the scholarly-psychiatric camp which views modern conceptualizations of sexual identities as purely novel and socially relative, thus endemic to "modern industrial societies".

The first two categories have in common a willingness to demystify the figure of the sultan and to depict him as a down-to-earth figure stripped of his political-military might. They aim to "familiarize" him to the contemporary man, trading on our empathetic curiosity about how different the life of previous generations was from our modern one. The Sultan too indulged in excess of food, wine, narcotics; he too fell hopelessly in love and freely had sex. However, these most human deeds of the Sultan are often judged within "the decline paradigm" which associates opulent wealth and decadent luxury, moral depravity, cruelty and injustice with the close of the Golden Age.[11]

These attempts to establish a rapport with the past and to "bring the past to today", and instrumentalize historical knowledge in modern identity politics inevitably entail "anachronism". It goes hand in hand with "exoticization", and all the works alluded to above draw on the readymade Orientalist images of extravagant and pompous courtly life and sexual debauchery with concubines and male pages in the Harem.

---

[9] Especially see Doğu Perinçek, *Eşcinsellik ve Yabancılaşma* (İstanbul: Kaynak, 2000); "Özgür Kadın-Egemenlikçi Uygarlıkla Hesaplaşma", I am not in a position to determine the larger audiences that the book might have reached than the mostly learned "party guests".

[10] Especially see "Şark-İslâm Klasiklerinde Eşcinsel Kültür", www.ibnistan.net/sarkescinselk/sark ; Kaos GL&Sappho&Lambda initiative, "Perinçek'e Yanıt" , www.b.net/kosmos/eshtoplumsalkar SKL.htm

[11]See especially, Ahmet Refik Altınay, *Kadınlar Saltanatı* (İstanbul: TVYY, 2000) ,and his *Lale Devri*,sadeleştiren Dursun Gürlek (İstanbul: Timaş, 1997); Ahmet Refik Sevengil, *İstanbul nasıl eğleniyordu? : 1453'ten 1927'ye kadar*, hazırlayan Sami Önal (İstanbul : İletişim, 1998); Reşat Ekrem Koçu, *Kabakçı Mustafa : bir serserinin romanlaştırılmış hayatı*, 3rd ed. , resimler Dağıstan Çetinkaya (İstanbul : Doğan Kitap, 2003), *Binbirdirek Batakhanesi Cevahirli Hanımsultan* (İstanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık, 2003), and *Yeniçeriler* resimler Sabiha Bozcalı (İstanbul: Koçu Yayınları, 1964).

There are many Ottoman women's and men's diaries and memoirs bringing a wide range of male-female relations to notice as they were experienced in the broader context of polygamy, family life, child socialization and slavery, and in various theatres and stages of elite life. The ordinary reader may find pleasure in these texts as popular historical stories. However, these self-accounts forged through the highly personalized plays of "reconstructive memory" tell much about how the author observed and interacted with the historically and culturally structured concepts and practices of sexuality through her life; thus they come up with an "insider's view" for historical research.[12]

We owe a cross-cultural perception of sexuality to the traveling accounts left by Europeans and the Ottomans. These texts set a literary-political ground to understand how Western Orientalism and Ottoman Occidentalism establish themselves, and conceptualize their power relations/relations of submission and domination in terms of an erotic discourse and sexual images.[13]

The wide public circulation of popular-historical and ideological discourses related to sexual practices, moral codes and gender conceptions in Ottoman society is concurrent with the philological field which has witnessed the proliferation of studies regarding Ottoman literary representations of sexuality and gender, which appear in varied poetic and prosaic forms. A number of specialists in *Divân* literature consider the necessity of distancing themselves from the conventional idiosyncratic attitude, descending from the 19th century literary critics, of ignoring or "veiling" the homoerotic aspect of Ottoman court poetry and interpreting texts within a religious-mystical canon. By deconstructing

[12]Melek Hanım, *Haremden Mahrem Hatıralar* (İstanbul: Oğlak, 1999); Safiye Ünüvar, *Saray Hatıralarım* (İstanbul: Bedir Yayınevi, 2000); Leyla Sâz, *Anılar-19. Yüzyılda Saray* (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet, 2000); Emine Fuat Tugay *Three Centuries: family chronicles of Turkey and Egypt*, with a foreword by the Dowager Marchioness of Reading (London : Oxford University Press, 1963); Halide Edip Adıvar, *Memoirs of Halide Edib,*with a frontispiece in color by Alexandre Pankoff and many illustrations from photographs (New York : London, The Century co. , 1926); Evliya Çelebi b. Derviş Muhammed Zıllî Evliya Çelebi, *Seyahatnâmesi*: Topkapı Sarayı Bağdat 304 Yazmasının transkripsiyonu, dizini, ed. Orhan Şaik Gökyay (İstanbul : Yapı Kredi Yayınları Ltd. Şti., 1996); *Kendi Kalemiyle Temeşvarlı Osman Ağa: Bir Osmanlı Türk Sipahisinin Hayatı ve Esirlik Hatıraları*, ed. Harun Tolasa (Konya:1986).

[13] For "European observors" see, *Embassy to Constantinople : the travels of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, introduced by Dervla Murphy, ed. Christopher Pick (New York : New Amsterdam, c1988); Hans Ulrich Kraffts, *Türklerin elinde bir Alman taciri*, trans. Turgut Akpınar, 2nd ed. (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1997); Kelemen Mikes, *Letters from Turkey*, ed. and trans. Bernard Adams (London ; New York : Kegan Paul International &Columbia University Press, c2000) For "Ottoman observors" see Edhem Eldem, "18.yüzyıl ve Değişim",in *Cogito, Osmanlılar Özel Sayısı*, no. 19 (1999): pp.189-199. Also consult, İrvin Cemil Schick, *Batının cinsel kıyısı başkalıkçı söylemde cinsellik ve mekansallık*, trans. Savaş Kılıç and Gamze Sarı (İstanbul: TVYY, 2001).

the poetic idiom of "lover and beloved", they uncover the politico-sexual imagery that resides in it, and bring new insights to "parameters/multigenericity of Ottoman literary canon", "literary tastes", "patronage relations" and "readership".[14]

A series of articles by Jan Schmidt shed light on the rhetorical content of *"şevk-engiz"* as a particular genre of Ottoman pornographic poem, and ask to what extent different examples of it could be read as reflection of "local colour" or direct descendents from pre-Islamic Arabic and Persian literary models.[15] Kemal Sılay dedicates a whole chapter of his monograph on Nedim to the critical evaluation of traditional approaches upheld in philological education in Turkish universities, and he disentangles the sexual metaphors used in Nedim's poems in a dialogue with Arabic, Persian and Urdu literatures.[16] In his article *"The Sexual Intertext of Ottoman Literature: The Story of Me'âlî,Magistrate of Mihalic"* Walter Andrews deals with an amusing anecdote about the magistrate of Mihalic, widespread among the populace whether it is true or not, and related by Âşık Çelebi ; according to him a complete decoding of this story requires familiarity with the "intertext" woven by metaphors of the high culture lyrics, which are the mimesis of a set of relations (political, social and sexual) in the Ottoman power hierarchy.[17]

Most recently, Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı co-authored *The Age of Beloveds*, a compact monograph aspiring to explore in the early-modern or the late-Renaissance Europe and to the east, across the sea, in the urban centers of the Ottoman Empire and especially in Istanbul an "age of love and beloveds" running from the late 15th century through the first half of the 16th century. This culture of love and its semiotic universe was a historical congruence of the aesthetic-artistic and the political. The authors talk about the phenomena in a more general context, as if they were part of that European period and constellation of phenomena that is called the late-Renaissance;

---

[14] See especially Walter G. Andrews, *Poetry's voice, society's song : Ottoman lyric poetry* (Seattle : University of Washington Press, 1985) ,and "Literary Art of the Golden Age: The Age of Süleymân",in *Süleymân the Second and His Time*, eds. Halil İnalcık and Cemal Kafadar (Istanbul: ISIS Press, 1993), pp. 353-368; Walter Andrews, Najaat Black and Mehmet Kalpaklı, eds. , *Ottoman lyric poetry : an anthology* (Austin : University of Texas Press, 1997).

[15] Jan Schmidt, "Enderunlu Fâzıl:Poet or Social Historian?" and "Sünbülzâde Vehbi's Şevk-Engiz" in *The Joys of Philology: Studies in Ottoman Literature, History and Orientalism (1500 - 1923)*, Volume 1 (İstanbul: ISIS, 2001).

[16] Kemal Sılay, "Chapter five: The Lifting of Mystical Veils: Reflections of Homosexuality in the Divan –ı Nedim", in *Nedim and the poetics of the Ottoman court : medieval inheritance and the need for change* (Bloomington, Ind. : Indiana University, 1994), pp. 90-108.

[17] Walter G. Andrews, "The Sexual Intertext of Ottoman Literature:The Story of Me'âlî, Magistrate of Mihalic" ,*Edebiyât*, vol 2-3 (1988-1989): pp. 31-56.

it was also an age of beloveds, love and sexual activity to an extent that is astonishing to us today in what is thought of as lax, liberal, or even libertine era. The cross-cultural research is aided by re-reading the Ottoman biographical collections, chronicles and histories, books on manners and advice literature, *fatwas*, ghazels, "songs" (*şarkı*), "city-thrillers" (*şehr-engiz*), and works in prose in communication with the Western literary world (and its various mythological underpinnings), and sources of European social-cultural history.

The authors argue that from the perspective of "the lover and the beloved", the long 16th century was a historical moment when Europe and the Ottoman East appear to walk much the same path; when the Age of Beloveds wanes, they again diverged, each on the trajectory of its own particular modernity. On the basis of this claim, the study seems to be a continuation of the recent historiographical trends which try to surpass the East-West or Western Europe and Ottoman dichotomy, and to rescue Ottoman history from its "distinct", "sui generic" position within world history. The major weakness of the study is that it is beleaguered by the analytical priority of mapping cultural correspondences of the early-modern Europeans and the Ottomans. As a result, it neglects the Islamicate literary worlds reacted upon, copied, inherited by the Ottoman poet and prose writer.

The book's analysis of the "socioeconomics" of literary production in the Age of Beloveds is very important. The authors intend to marshal an explanation which contrasts with the personal explanations of the Ottoman accounts and the present-day histories that follow them. This personal explanation asserts that decline in the fortunes of the poets was attributable to weak sultans and other powerholders who failed to appreciate learning and talent. They assert that their study dwells on a unique historical period in which the wealthy government officials made private investments with the income from agricultural lands to which they held title. This brought large amounts of returns to wealthy individuals, and enabled them to expend large sums on a culture of love, literature and entertainment, and in turn supported the talents of many poets. As the 16th century progressed, the culmination of non-literary events and trends brought the end of the Age of Beloveds. The deterioration of the traditional prebendial system, the contraction of the dynasty and elimination of the satellite courts of princes and high officials, the appointment of powerful '*askeri* officials from the central administration to governorships in the provinces resulted in the reduction in personal relations to the land and its people on the part of the monarchy and its representatives. This diminished the

importance of personal relations at the meaning-producing center of the state. The powerful and wealthy started to make self-preservative decisions about where to invest money and interest. Moreover, during the 16th century it increasingly became risky for the high officials to support what might be seen as an affront to popular piety, and thereby make themselves vulnerable as scapegoats in the eyes of the morally outraged public. Thus, even though poetry retained some of its value as an enhancement to the status and reputation of the great, the age which was the synthesis of pleasure, profit and semiotic universe began to close. High officials and economic elites no longer invested as much in poetic life. Poets increasingly held jobs in a much more regularized scribal service and bureaucracy.[18]

There are two other important studies difficult to label as entirely scholarly or popular literature. İsmet Zeki Eyüboğlu for the first time brings together the *Divân* poems memorializing the names of the "boys with praised beauty" (*huban*) as *redif* so as to point out their ultimate sexual content.[19] On the other hand, from a scholarly point of view, his use of the category of "pervert" (*sapık*), and his basing the study upon the dichotomy of *Divân* and folk literature -the former is highly subjectified and abstracted from the palpable reality of the world as opposed to the latter, thus it is unsuccessful in terms of building up a real intellectual enterprise for future generations- turn his study into a controversial one. Similarly, regardless of his "anachronistic" perspective that idealizes sexual tolerance in Ottoman society, which may be a convention to distract public attention from political issues, *Murat Bardakçı*'s study is a singular one providing us with transcriptions of many texts written as *"şehrengiz",*" *bahnâme"*,"song-book" etc.; it can easily be taken as a compilation of primary sources to look through and speculate on.[20]

These efforts on the one hand expand the range of written sources available for the study of Ottoman social-cultural history, and on the other hand, through the restoration of literary production / consumption, and human relations that it tends to develop as an aspect of social-cultural reality they contribute to an enrichened and integrated picture of Ottoman cultural history.

---

[18] Walter G. Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı, *The Age of Beloveds:Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society* (Durham & London: Duke Univ.Press, 2005).

[19] İsmet Zeki Eyüboğlu, *Divan şiirinde sapık sevgi* (İstanbul: Okat Yayınevi, 1968).

[20] Murat Bardakçı, *Osmanlı'da seks: sarayda gece dersleri*, 6th ed. (İstanbul: Gür, 1992).

This scholarly zeal and rich documentation that has been so far overlooked by the cultural historian motivates me to study *"Dafi'ül' Gumum ve Rafi'ül Humum"*,[21] written some time before 1513 by *Mehmet Gazâli*, who is known by his penname *Gazâlî*. His work was patronized by *Piyale Bey,* a courtier of Prince *Korkud. Dafiü'l Gumum* consists of seven chapters: After a brief introduction, and a chapter on the benefits and ills of marriage, and after a lengthy chapter where a metaphorical war between women-lovers and boy-lovers is depicted, each one of the four remaining chapters describes one object of desire for men, namely, women, boys, prostitutes and animals. Each chapter contains poems, anecdotes, and jokes that are organized around brief paragraphs about favourable and unfavourable sexual practices. The book has the pretence of a contemporary morality book, which classifies illicit sexual acts one should refrain from; however, it instead seems to be a parody of that genre. It also satirizes "the mirror for princes" literature as well as legalistic culture.

This study takes its departure from a basic question about the work:

Which cultural context makes possible the production of such a text formed around sexual allusions and metaphors in the court of an Ottoman prince, a potential heir to the throne without any serious disturbance in the normal course of its author's career?

The research objective is two-fold:

The first is to pose some basic and initial questions regarding the author of the text, broader matrix of patronage ties and literary milieu through which he pursued a career, the audience that the texts may have intended to address, and the intentions of the author in producing such a text on sexuality. I will propose that the notion *meclis* and its various social-cultural associations provide a proper context to examine the convivial environment that inspires the literary imagery, and the human networks through which such a literary work is produced, transmitted and consumed. In the broadest sense of the term, there was, in early modern times, a widely practiced general "party" or "gathering" based on "witty conversation" (*sohbet*) as a core and containing many other elements including alcohol, food, music, dancers, plays and recitations. This gathering seems to be as important and popular among the court-dependent elites in Europe and Middle East as it was in the Ottoman Empire.

[21] I am using the critical edition done by Selim Sırrı Kuru in *The Scholar and Author in the 16th century Ottoman Empire: Deli Birader and his Dafi'ü'l-gumum ve Rafi'ü'l humum"*, unpublished PhD thesis, Cambridge MA: Harvard University,2000. DG (Kuru) hereafter.

As the career of *Gazâlî* reflected by many contemporaries and by his own pieces overwhelmed with autobiographical references demonstrates, this was a practice not confined to courtly culture, but growing from within it and could be extended to the other sectors of society; there was a multiplicity of such gatherings hosted by princes, provincial governors, high dignitaries and wealthy women, and also similar literary-entertainment sessions were conducted among poets, artists and scholars in their private households and shops, gardens, public open-grounds, wine taverns and coffeehouses.

These *"mecalis"* were at the same time hierarchically connected; one could be a participant to many of them simultaneously, but one was allowed to the ruler's presence and introduced to the privileged courtly circle usually by the mediation of someone already established at court and holding his own minor *meclis* below the courtly one, and/or thanks to one's well-known intellectual, literary or artistic merits.

The courtly *meclis* often appears as a circle which is described as a court of legitimation where the sovereign appeared as a well-informed ruler, friend of letters and the arts, to any extent concerned about his reputation as patron; the role of poetry was considered as an instrument of government and propaganda by the ruler, always inclined to make use of the eulogies which were presented to him by versifiers of talent. At the same time, he made a public display of his generosity in numerous material ways.[22]

However, what is under closer inspection in my analysis is that the *meclis* either organized by the ruler or a protégé, was primarily an entertainment and recreation (*"teferrüc"*) session; in its course the participants gave themselves up to "sensual pleasure" provoked by special spatial arrangements (furniture, natural landscape, scents), music, singing and drinking, enjoyed literary and scholarly debates and discussions, and during these intimate meetings a sexually stimulating environment emerged.

Secondly, the study aims to interpret the world of representations and the discursive system created by the author, various constructions and formations of Ottoman masculinity and femininity, images and concepts surrounding "morality", boundaries between "normal" and "pathological" / "pervert" surfacing in the text. In this way, it may also be possible to catch a glimpse of how the Ottoman literature-producing and

[22] Encyclopedia of Islam, New Edition (Leiden: Brill) p.1030-1033

consuming elite perceived and made knowledge, and an image of the larger society cut across by "gender", "class", "ethnic", "religious" and "linguistic" lines.

I will emphasize the necessity to supplement the analysis of *Dafiü'l Gumum* with a number of sources, which were not necessarily produced in the same period with it, and among which manner books, medical treatises, advice books, *letâyif* collections and popular story cycles could be enumerated. This simultaneous reading of several texts authorized by the social-cultural environment of different ages may enable me to pinpoint an intertextuality which once promoted a shared -and changing- vocabulary and imagery of sexuality. It may also be helpful in clarifying analytical-historical categories and colloquial, most often slang language that the main text employs, and in delineating the layers of meaning it weaves together.

However, the thesis neither intends to carve out an overall analysis or classification of Ottoman texts with sexual associations, nor to provide a compendium of them. Calling to help the sexual and gendered sub-text that these sources elicit, I pursue a clearer and multi-dimensional understanding of the literary world structured in *Dafi'ü'l Gumum*. Such a method which emphasizes intertextuality could engender further research questions about the knowledge and images of sexuality fabricated in Ottoman society and the changes it underwent in successive periods.

Working with DG engenders many new questions:

1. Does the sexual imagery that the text forms out reflect the real sexual practices non-stigmatized and commonplace for the period that authorizes its production, so that we could consequently argue that the Ottomans, like their ancient and premodern counterparts uniformly entertain and regard eroticism as inherently pansexual, that is, all humans as polymorphously sexual, capable of erotic and sexual interaction with either gender, without being victim of any social discrimination?
2. Were these sorts of texts written so as to sexually stimulate the reader? Or, did they just bring into play sexuality for the sake of "humour"? Or, should we unearth the true hidden meaning of the text with reference to high mystical and moral ideals?
3. Were the "pornographic" genres used to assuage and control the sexual tendencies dangerous to the conventional moral-social order by creating a virtual fantasy in which all codes, norms and values are upside down, or by infiltrating public imagination with sexual phobias?
4. How could we explain the gradual change of more explicit genres into new forms, or their coming to an end? Is it because daily habits as well as moral conceptions from

1850s onwards were penetrated by the more prudish Western values which pushed this kind of literature to the underground, and curtailed all actual or potential sexual tendencies that were defined and depicted in such texts? How could the demise of slavery and the redefinition of prostitution within a legal framework have contributed to this process?

These questions are obviously difficult to answer within the confines of an individual research with either a philological or a historical emphasis. The reader may find at most hypothetically answers to them in this study. I suggest that they are suggestive as key problematics for further studies, and restrict the thesis's scope on the basis of two assumptions: *Dafi'ü'l Gumum* is on top of everything a sexual humour. Secondly, its author exploits themes and narrative models common to popular jokes and written traditions of satire, and draws a parody of social dynamics prevalent in the Ottoman society of his time. The representations of women and men, which he invents, conform to a "normality" constructed in "textual-discursive" level.

CHAPTER 1

MEHMET GAZÂLİ (DELİ BİRADER) - AS A SCHOLAR AND THE AUTHOR OF "DAFİ'Ü'L GUMUM RAFİ'Ü'L HUMUM":

1.1. Sources: The data to reconstruct the biography and career of *Gazâli* are gathered in *Tezkiretü'ş Şu'ara*[23], in *İn'amat Defteri* registers[24], encyclopaedic entries and articles written by modern scholars.[25]

---

[23]' Âşık Çelebi, *Meşâirü'ş-şu'arâ of Tezkere of Âşık Çelebi*, ed. Owens Meredith (Cambridge:E.J.W. Gibb Memorial,1971); Beyâni Mustafa bin Carullah *Tezkiretü'ş Şu'arâ*, ed. İbrahim Kutluk (Ankara:1997); Gelibolulu Mustafa Âli *Künhü'l Ahbar'ın tezkire kısmı*, ed. Mustafa İsen (Ankara: Kültür Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, 1994); Kınalızâde Hasan Çelebi *Tezkiretü'ş Şu'arâ*, ed. İbrahim Kutluk, vol. 2 (Ankara: 1989); Latifî *Latifî Tezkiresi*, ed. Mustafa İsen (Ankara : Kültür Bakanlığı,1990) ; Mehmed Mecdi Efendi *eş-Şekaiku'n-nu'maniyye ve zeyilleri : Hadaikü'ş-şakaik*, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan (İstanbul : Çağrı Yayınları, 1989); *Sehi Bey Heşt bihişt:Sehi Beg Tezkiresi*, ed. Günay Kut (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1978); *Sehî Bey Tezkiresi, Heşt Behişt*, ed. Mustafa İsen (İstanbul: Akçağ, 1998) ; "Güldeste-i Riyaz-ı İrfan'daki Şair Biyografileri", in ed. Kadir Atlansoy *Bursa Şairleri: Bursa Vefayetnamelerindeki Şairlerin Biyografileri* (Bursa: Asa, 1997), p. 236-238. I am using the 2 lengthy articles of Orhan Şaik Gökyay include a summary of the *"Gazali(Deli Birader)"* section of 'Âşık Çelebi's *tezkire* in *Türk Dili*, no. 222, (Mart 1970): pp. 448-460 (I) and no. 223 (Nisan 1970): pp. 18-29 (II).

[24] İsmail Erünsal "Kanuni Dönemine Ait Bir İnamat Defteri", in *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, no. 4 (1984): pp. 4-17

[25] Nihad Sâmi Banarlı, "Divân Şiirinde Mizah,Hezel ve Gazâlî (1466-1533)", in *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (Resimli)* (İstanbul: MEB, 1998): p.574-575; Burgalı Mehmet Tahir Efendi, "Gazâlî Muhammed Efendi-Deli Birader-Bursavi (942=1535),in *Osmanlı Müellifleri(1299-1915)* (İstanbul:Meral Yayınları,1972) p. 131; Mehmed Fuat Köprülü, "Harabat Erenleri:Deli Birader",*Yeni Mecmu'a*, no. 15 (1917): pp. 285-288; Mehmed Fuat Köprülü, *Edebiyat Araştırmaları-II* (İstanbul:Ötüken,1989) p. 643-646; Mehmed Fuat Köprülü, "Gazâlî", *İslam Ansiklopedisi*-MEB,vol.4, pp.728; Mehmed Fuat Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 2nd edition (İstanbul:Ötüken,1980) p. 387; Orhan Şaik Gökyay, "Deli Birader", *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*,vol 9 (1994) pp. 135-136; Murat A. Karavelioğlu, "Deli Birader",*Osmanlılar Ansiklopedisi*,vol 2 (İstanbul:YKY,1999) pp. 476-477; I.W. Gibb, *A History of Ottoman Poetry*,vol.III (London:Luzac&Co.,Great Russell Street,1904) p. 30-33. A more "popular" source is Reşad Ekrem Koçu, "Gazâli(Bursalı)", in *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*,vol. XI, pp. 6020-6022 and "Deli Birâder Hamamı", pp. 4355-4356.

"Tezakir" are biographical dictionaries of poets, and our knowledge of *Gazâli* primarily depends on these contemporary 16th century accounts; however the information they convey should be cross-checked with other sort of sources since they are often second or third-hand, rely upon gossip and reiterate each other verbatim with faults.[26] The way they recapture the poet's life story and evaluate his works are already embedded in the *tezkire* author's literary tastes, political view and moral reservations, and couched in terms of authoritative critical discourse of the age.

On the other hand, a focus should be established on this subjective authorial position which occupies the text, because it indicates how the poet under discussion was perceived in his age as a literary and politico-moral figure. It also subtly adumbrates the readership that the poet under discussion was likely to meet, the kind of reaction his written works aimed to evoke in the intended reader, and the way they were expected to be consumed. The mysteries, uncertainties, silences, disagreements and moral contentions created by both the contemporaries and modern scholarship around the course of the poet's career (including his interactions with the patrons) and character, and the narrative line in which they are related should be also taken into account in order to uncover the author-text-reader/reading triangle.

In these respects, the poet's own works may mean more than mere eulogies, satires and instruments of enjoyment; rather they are entwined with rich autobiographical elements. As such they constitute nearly the only source to illuminate the human relations that the poet became a part of, and the broader social-cultural milieu which produced a demand for his works. However they are frequently laid unexploited due to the presumption that poem as a genre falls beyond or outside the research techniques and priorities of history, and its form different from the archival hard data makes it an "elusive" unit of analysis. In the hope that they might give a hint of the enigmatic

[26] For a critical overlook and thematic analysis of "tezakir", see Günay Kut, "The Classical Period in Turkish Literature" ,in *The Ottoman Civilization-II*, eds. Günsel Renda and Halil İnalcık (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı) p. 561-563; Mehmed Fuat Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 2nd edition, (İstanbul:Ötüken,1980) p. 394-395; Halil İnalcık, *Şâir ve Patron* (İstanbul: Doğu-Batı ,2003); Haluk İpekten, *Divan Edebiyatının Kaynaklarından Türkçe Şu'ara Tezkireleri* (Erzurum: 1988); Harun Tolasa, *Sehi, Latifi, 'Âşık Çelebi Tezkirelerine Göre XVI. Yüzyılda Edebiyat Araştırma ve Eleştirisi* (İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi, 1983); Mustafa İsen, "Tezkirelerin Işığında Divan Edebiyatına Bakışlar:Divan Şairlerinin Mesleki Konumları", in *Divan Edebiyatı Üzerine Metinler*, ed. Mehmet Kalpaklı (İstanbul: YKY,1999) p. 310-314; Walter G. Andrews, *The Tezkere-i Şu'ara of Latifi as A source for the Critical Evaluation of Ottoman Poetry* ,unpublished PhD thesis (University of Michigan,1970); Walter G. Andrews "Literary Art of the Golden Age.The Age of Süleymân", in *Süleymân the Second and His Time*, eds. Cemal Kafadar and Halil İnalcık, (İstanbul: ISIS Press, 1993) p. 367

interrelation between the author, the text, the readership and the mode of reading, *Gazali's* two poetic works, namely his *Cerrname*[27] and *the Letters from Mecca*[28] will be incorporated into the general body of the study as important sources.

İn'amat Defterleri contain the registers of material blessings bestowed on the poets who deserved the sultan's attention for their literary talents ,and pieces of literature that they prepared for special occasions and festivities (e.g. circumcisions, birth of princes and princesses, death of members of the imperial family, military victories, seasonal changes). The poet who was able to demonstrate his merits in the sultanic *meclis* or by way of composing works regularly was often appointed to a scribal post. If he was a soldier he became the holder of a prebendial unit (e.g. *tımar, hâss, zeâmet)*, and to those from the *ulema* a judicial or a foundation management post (*mütevellilik / evkaf katipliği*) was given. The financial help (*in'am / câ'ize*) was distributed in the form of silver coins (*akça*) and rarely as golden coins (*sikke*). Its amount changed from 1000 to 3000 *akça* or 20 to 60 *sikke*. Various kinds of silk and cotton clothes (*hil'at / câme*) were presented on occasion as well. All these costs were met from the state coffers. The wages (*cihet/idrâr/râtibe*) for foundation management posts were paid from the surplus (*vakıf zevâyidi*) left over in the budget after making the necessary expenses to keep up endowment structure. This regulation was annulled in the year of 1491.[29] The "hard data" in these records shed light on how the Ottoman poet maintained himself financially. A *İn'amat* compilation from the age of *Süleyman* is available to us; it takes account of the payments made by the Palace to *Gazâlî* between 934-937/1527-1531.[30]

1.2. Mehmed Gazâlî's Biography: The real name of *Deli Birader* (Crazy Brother) is *Mehmed*[31], and his penname is *Gazâlî*. The two *tezkire* writers, Sehi and

[27] The complete work is published by Agâh Sırrı Levend, "Gazali(Deli Birader)'nin Cer-Namesi", *Türk Dili Araştırmaları*, (1970): pp. 123-124

[28]Günay Kut (Alpay), "Gazâlî'nin Mekke'den İstanbul'a Yolladığı Mektup ve Ona Yazılan Cevaplar",*TDAY Belleten*, nol. 2 (1973-1974) pp. 245-250

[29] Halil İnalcık, *Şâir ve Patron* (İstanbul:Doğu-Batı, 2003)

[30] İsmail Erünsal, "Türk Edebiyatı Tarihinin Arşiv Kaynakları-II:Kanuni Sultan Süleyman Dönemine Ait Bir İn'âmât Defteri", in *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, no. 4 (1984) pp. 4-17

[31]Beliğ(Atlansoy) p.263; Âli p.249; Kınalızade p.721;Mecdi p.471; Âşık Çelebi(Gökyay-I), p.450; Köprülü(1989)p.643; Köprülü(MEB İslam Ans.), p.728; Köprülü(1917), p.285;Bursalı Mehmet Tahir Efendi p.131. Sehi cites his name only as "Mevlânâ Gazâlî" (İsen,p.161)

Latîfî claim that he acquired this penname while holding the sheikh post in a dervish lodge called *Geyikli Baba* in *Bursa* after leaving the prince's court. They apparently address the direct linkage of the name *Gazâlî* (pertaining to gazelles) with the name of the lodge, *Geyikli Baba* (*Baba* with the Gazelles)[32]. Köprülü claims that he got the name "when he started to write enflaming ghazals with love of those with gazelle-eyes".[33] He, thus, makes a metaphoric attribution. Gibb points out this mistake, referring to *Deli Birader* (Crazy Brother) already speaks of himself under that name in an earlier work of him dedicated to Prince *Korkud*. According to the *tezâkir*, he was known among the "gentlemen" (*zurefâ*) by the name "Brother Madcap" (*Deli Birader*) because of a couplet he said in a gathering:

> Mecnun ki bela deştini geşt itdi seraser
> (That Mecnun passed all the way in the desert of misfortune)
> Gamhâneme geldi dedi hâlin ne birader"
> (He came to my house of agony, and asked how you are, oh brother)[34]

Gibb takes an approach different from the biography writers, and relates the title "Brother Madcap" with *Gazâli*'s merry jovial disposition and his excessive willingness to dissipate, and experience all sorts of lively pleasures.

He was born in the city of *Bursa.*[35] His father's name is said to be *Turmuş* / *Durmuş*.[36] Although Köprülü in his seminal article designates his date of birth as 1466, it is not possible to verify this piece of information from other sources so far.[37] Given the fact that he came under tutorship of *Muhyiddün 'Acemi*[38] as a student, he was probably

---

[32] Sehi(İsen), p.161 :"(...) O da Bursa'daki Keşiş dağında bulunan Geyikli Baba tekkesine şeyh oldu.Uzunca bir süre orada zevk,safa sürdü.Gazâlî mahlasını almasına da sebep budur." Latîfî(p.411):"(...) Burûsaya gelmiş ve Geyüklü Baba nâm zâviyeye şeyh olup bu münâsebetle Gazâlî tahallus itmişdür.Bu matla'ı ana şâhiddür:
Matla':Hayâl-i çeşm-i âhûlarla her bâr
Geyüklü Babaya döndük be hey yâr
Velehu:Gözi âhûların aşüfte hâli
Hevâ şûrîdesi miskîn Gazâlî (...) "

[33] Köprülü(1917), p.275: "(...) Ahu gözlîlerin 'aşkıyle ateşli gazeller terennüme başlayınca 'Gazâlî' ismini aldı."

[34] Beyâni(Kutluk) p.194 The translation is mine.

[35] Latîfî p.410; Kınalızade p. 721; 'Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay-II) p. 450; Köprülü (1917), p.285; Köprülü(1989), p.643; Mecdi p.471

[36] Köprülü(1989) p.643; Mecdi p.471

[37] Köprülü(1989) p.643;Köprülü(MEB Islam)p.728

[38] Köprülü(1989) p.643; Köprülü(MEB Islam)p.728; Mecdi p.471; Beliğ(Atlansoy), p.236

trained in Islamic sciences in one of the *Semaniye medrese*s in *Istanbul.*[39] A "duality" is said to colour his educational background: He was both a *medrese* graduate and a follower of the *Sufi* profession ("*meslek-i tasavvûfa sâlik olup…*").We do not know more about the nature of *Gazâlî*'s relation to mystical Islam, and his allegiance to a particular lodge or tariqa. It may be considered a common way for an Ottoman scholar living in the 16th century to have an attachment to this or that branch of mystical Islam. What bears the gravest importance for our study is that, *Sufis* is one group that becomes the target of *Gazâlî*'s defamation through the textual representations in *Dafi'ü'l Gumum*. Even though *Gazâlî* himself was a scholar and he had a hypothetical Sufi affiliation, although not well articulated in the sources, he mocks scholars as severely as he mocks *Sufis*. Selim Kuru argues that while he was composing the work, he wasn't actively working as a scholar; he was a courtier. As a courtier, he was at liberty to mock any other professional group.[40]

Following up his graduation, he seems to have obtained a regular post as *müderris* in *Bayezid Paşa Medresesi* in *Bursa.*[41] Then, he most likely sought a chance outside the traditional *medrese* path as courtier, and attended Prince *Korkud*'s court in *Manisa.* There, he was assigned the duty of "redacting" (*mukabele*) the works of the prince, and became one of his close companions.[42] He wrote *Dafi'ü'l Gumum Rafi'ü'l Humum* (The Repeller of Sorrow and Remover of Anxiety) there.[43] It was dedicated to *Piyale*, an officer and intimate associate of *Korkud*. The status that *Piyale* enjoyed in *Korkud*'s court and the role that he played in *Gazâlî*'s inclusion into the most inner princely circle will be dwelt on in more detail, insofar as it sheds light on the notion of *meclis* as a

[39] Muhyiddin 'Acemi: "After graduation,he worked in some medreses as müderris , and finally promoted to one Semaniye.He died while holding the kadı post in Edirne,in the reign of Sultan Bayezid II.He was buried there.His grave is in Kasım Paşa Mosque,next to Kazasker Mirim Çelebi.His works are cited in Mecdi. " Câhid Baltacı, *XV-XVI. asırlar Osmanlı medreseleri : teşkilât, tarih* (İstanbul : İrfan Matbaası, 1976) p.385

[40] DG (Kuru) , p.3 and footnote 7

[41]Gazâlî's name is not listed among the scholars who taught in this medrese. (Câhid Baltacı *XV-XVI. asırlar Osmanlı medreseleri : teşkilât, tarih***,** İstanbul : İrfan Matbaası, 1976,p. 95-96)

[42]Sehi(İsen), p. 161; Beliğ(Atlansoy) ,p. 236-237; Beyâni(Kutluk), p. 194; Gibb, p. 31; 'Âşık Çelebi(Gökyay-I), p .450-452; Âli, p. 249; Latîfî, p. 410; Kınalızade, p. 722; Mecdi, p. 422; Koçu, p. 6020-6021; Köprülü (1989), p. 643; Köprülü (MEB Islam), p. 728; Köprülü (1917), p. 245; Levend, p.574

[43]'Âşık Çelebi(Gökyay-I), p.452; Beliğ(Atlansoy), p.238; Gibb, p.31-32; Sehi(İsen), p.161; Levend, p.575; Köprülü(1989), p.645; Köprülü(MEB Islam), p.728; Latîfî p.410; Âli p.249; Koçu, p.6020-6021; Kuru, p.11-21.

general aspect of Ottoman social and cultural life. From *Beyâni*, we learn that he was together with the prince while taking refuge in the palace of *Kansu Gavri* in Egypt, between *Muharrem* 915/May 1509 and *Rebiulâhır* 916/July1510.[44]

According to a contemporary rumour, one day, at the wine table a "*va'az*" of *Gazâlî* worried *Korkud* a lot. He ordered the gatekeeper to execute him. However, our poet convinced the gatekeeper that the prince gave this imperative while being drunk and dizzy, if he woke up the next morning and heard that one of his close companions was dead, this would be the end of everyone. Thus, the gatekeeper decided to hide the poet that night; in the morning when the prince was told that his order had not been carried out, he became very happy and bestowed presents on the gatekeeper.[45]

The solemn reason lying behind *Gazâlî*'s leaving the princely court looks like one great mystery in his biography. Both contemporary and later accounts are in a disagreement, coming up with three different scenarios: Except for Sehi and Latîfî the biography writers' explanation is that the end of *Gazâlî*'s career in the princely court in *Manisa* was concomitant with *Korkud*'s execution by the new sultan Selim I in 1513. Whereas Sehi and Latîfî do not imagine his leaving *Manisa* independently from the fact that he was the author of DG. They argue, that, the prince found it unacceptable to patronize such a work, he at first ordered all the copies to be burned, and *Gazâlî* be executed, and then banished him from his court forever. After this decision, *Gazâlî* ran away from the court swiftly, took refuge in the city of *Bursa*, and was able to save his life.[46]

---

[44]Beyâni(Kutluk), p. 194. Sultan Korkud absconded to Egypt in the year 1509. In the declaration (*"ariza"*) handed in to Sultan Bayezid II, he justify his unexpected act under the pretext that,he had just seen a dream,in his dream Prophet Mohammed invited him to pilgrimage;so that he would go to pilgrimage by the way of Egypt, and thereafter he would turn back to his province (*"sancak"*). In fact,the three shehzade of Bayezid II ,namely Ahmet, Selim and Korkud were on the verge of a crown contest. Grand Vizier Ali Paşa was supporting Prince Ahmet as heir to the Ottoman throne, and trying his best to keep Korkud away from the political centre. Upon Ahmet's wish, Korkut was gathered from Manisa, and sent off to Antalya. Sultan Mahmud,bey of Kastamonu,replaced him (1512). When Şehzade Mahmud died in 913/1512, Korkud requested his transfer to Manisa; however he couldn't realize his plan of controlling Saruhan and Manisa region, he was appeased with the most ordinary advises. Korkud who was very much worried, started to make plans to escape to Egypt.
This sudden turn was a blow to the palace, the Cem incident still haunted the Ottoman political memory, and the sultan was frightened by the possibility of being involved in a "domestic" crisis extended to "international" arena. İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı in "II İnci Bayezid'in Oğullarından Sultan Korkut" (Belleten, XXX, No. 120, Ekim 1966, pp. 539-601) sketches out various stages and theatres of this factional war in a chronological order.

[45] Âli p.250

[46] Gibb, p.32

At first glance, it is possible to construe the first scenario as more "neutral", and the second as straightforwardly stemming from the moral reservations and literary tastes of its holders; at the same time it would be just an analytical easiness since generally all accounts pay a lip service to the "morally dubious" content of the work. Contradictorily his contemporaries don't denigrate *Gazâlî* because of penning such a text deleterious to the public morality. Instead, it is observable, that, they almost acclaim the work's creativeness and even its style which instigates sensual pleasure, and its author's outstanding qualifications which made him a popular and enjoyable figure of the *meclis* entertainments.

The third scenario is produced by Reşat Ekrem Koçu; according to him *Gazâlî* was banished by the prince because he fell in love with his "favourite" (*gözde*), *Piyâle*. This plot revolves around *Piyâle*'s sexual personae, and puts a new question mark for our developing analysis about *meclis* where "power politics", "patronage", "spirituality" and "sexuality" intersect.

After his career as courtier of the prince came to an end, *Gazâlî* took refuge in a dervish lodge called *Geyikli Baba* in the city of his origin, *Bursa*. *Güldeste-i Riyaz* cites the name as *Ahûlı Baba.*[47]

This information couldn't prove, but somehow strengthens the possibility of an affiliation of him to "heterodox" mystical orders: Âşık Paşazâde in his *Tevârih-i Âli Osman* establishes *Geyikli Baba* as the protagonist of an anecdote. The same story is repeated in other Ottoman histories and chronicles as Neşrî's *Cihannüma* and Kemalpaşazâde's *Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman*. It well depicts the sources and nature of the Ottoman tribe's early religions, and their relations with the Turcoman heterodox groups during their expansion: 'Âşıkpaşazade differentiates *Geyikli Baba* from other dervishes living in *Keşiş* Mountains, because he walks with deer. *Durgut Alp* loves this dervish and advises *Orhan* to visit him. *Orhan* asks the dervish to tell his sheikh, and *Geyikli Baba* declares that, he is the student of *Baba Ilyas* and belongs to tariqa of *Seyyid Ebulvefa*. Then, *Orhan* invites him to his palace, the *baba* does not respond to this call immediately, but he comes after some time with a poplar tree and, plants it in the palace garden. He tells *Orhan* that this tree is from them, and their prayers would be with the Ottomans as long as this tree continues to exist. *Âşık Paşazâde* adds that, this great tree is still in the garden of the palace, and every sultan takes care of it. *Orhan* wants to

[47] Beliğ(Atlansoy), p.237

bestow *İnegöl* district to this dervish but he does not accept his present, and claims that *dervishes* are not men of property but men of God; in the end he allows a small gift because of *Orhan*'s insistence. *Orhan* erects a *tekye* for the name of this dervish which is called *Geyikli Baba Tekyesi* in the author's time.[48]

This story epitomizes certain very old motifs evident in the early religion of the Ottomans, such as deer, mountain and tree. They symbolize the continuation of many ancient beliefs of Turks through the Ottoman period.[49] In general, the figure of *Geyikli Baba* is a symptom of the existence and influence of Turcoman *babas* as descendants of old shamans/bahşıs/kams in Anatolia from the times of *Orhan* and *Osman* onwards. Ahmet Yaşar Ocak underlines the significant *Kalenderî* element in the composite group of *Abdalan-ı Rum* inhabiting the Anatolian frontiers in the 14th century. The *Kalenderî*s (*Vefâî*, *Haydarî* and *Yesevî* dervishes) resorted to this relatively secure part of Anatolian geography in the aftermath of the bloody crushing of the *Babaî* Rebellion. The Ottoman leaders were sympathetic to this kind of popular religion, and they realized a sort of symbiosis with its pursuers during the early expansion of their political and cultural sphere of influence. These *Rum Abdalları*, *Kalenderî Şeyhleri* or *Horasan Erenleri* supplied a rich resource of single and uprooted warriors that did not have any relatives or families. In return for their services in the military campaigns, the Ottoman *bey*s granted them from the conquered lands to settle along with their entourage.

Geyiklü Baba was one of these sheikhs; it is known that he had migrated from *Hoy* (*Azerbaijan*). Ocak tells that, *Azerbaijan* does not essentially signify the place of his origin, but it is the territory where the first *Kalenderî* groups were instituted. His title beginning with *Geyik* is not necessarily related to his habit of walking around with deers, but he was given the name because of the deer fur that he was wearing. He participated in *Orhan Bey*'s *Bursa* campaign and, conquered the *Kızılkilise* zone himself. As related by the above mentioned anecdote, he settled somewhere between *İnegöl* and *Keşişdağı* (*Uludağ*); and *Orhan Bey* put up a lodge and a mosque for him,

[48]'Âşıkpaşazade Tevarih-i Al-i Osman, in ed. Çiftçioğlu Nihal Atsız *Osmanlı Tarihleri*, Türkiye yayınevi, İstanbul, 1949, p.102-122

[49]Ahmet Yaşar Ocak *Babaî İsyanı* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları,1980); Ahmet Yaşar Ocak *Alevî Bektaşî İnançlarının İslam Öncesi Kökenleri*, 2nd edit. (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2000); Jean Paul Roux *Türklerin ve Moğolların Eski Dini* (İstanbul: İşaret Yayınları, 1994); Irene Melikoff "İlk Osmanlıların Toplumsal Kökeni" in *Osmanlı Beyliği*, ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou (İstanbul: TVYY, 1997); Gibb, p.32 and footnote 1; "Müslüman Türklerinde Şamanizm Kalıntıları" and "İslam Türklerinde Şamanizm Kalıntıları", in Abdulkadir İnan *İncelemeler&Makaleler* (Ankara: TTK, 1968) p. 454-455, 469

the complex was named *Geyiklü Baba Tekyesi*. After his death, a tomb was also built here.

Geyiklü Cemaati, *Geyiklü Baba Dervişleri* or *Geyiklü Baba Sultan Cemaati* was the oldest known *Kalenderî* group among *Rum Abdalları* in the 14th century; they continued to persist under the same name in the 15th and 16th centuries. Evliyâ Çelebi in the 17th century, and Hammer in the 19th tell their visit to this lodge belonging to the *Kalenderîs* of *Geyiklü Baba*. The members of this heterodox community were dispersed in *Konya*, *Erzurum*, *Sivas*, *Malatya* and *Adana*. *Biga*, *Bursa* and *İnegöl* were the places that *Geyiklü Baba* himself lived, and they functioned as the headquarters of his lodge.[50]

The *Kalenderîs* were used to a way of life outside, and even at variance with *Sünni* norms and principles. A micro approach to their doctrines, organization and rituals lets us see that the followers remained "single" their whole life (*mücerredlik*), and "homosexual love" (*mahbubperestlik /cemalperestlik*) was common place among *Kalenderî* communities, and it took the form of "sodomy" (*livâtâ*) in time.[51]

Given the fact that the contemporary accounts do not give much information as to *Gazâlî*'s religious position or make any speculations on the issue, within the broader framework pertaining to "heterogeneity" and "heterodoxy" that typify the early Ottoman religion we may deduce two hypothesis: The overlapping of the name and location of the particular dervish lodge that *Gazâlî* stayed and the one established by *Orhan Bey* seems more than a coincidence. Furthermore, the negative view to the *ulema*, the pursuer of the Ottoman religious orthodoxy, and sexual overtones in the humour of *Gazâlî* might have been twisted and motivated by his "heterodox" beliefs and associations. Additionally, the oscillations in his career from "formal scholarly" to "morally dubious" cast suspicion on the reliability of the life story recounted in the *tezâkir*, it even makes us consider his biography, to substantial extent, fabricated. In the light of this hypothetical *Kalenderî* connection, it may be plausible to imagine that, he experienced a "dichotomous" cultural habitués. On one hand he went through the traditional scholarly path, and on the other got acquainted with the *Kalenderî* groups, and socialized into their sexual norms and ordinary ways. In *Cerr-name* he defines himself in a "dual" way, as "the chief of the unmarried" (*mir-i mücerredan*) and

[50] Ahmet Yaşar Ocak *Marjinal Sufilik:Kalenderiler* (Ankara: TTK, 1995) p. 161-171

[51] Ahmet Yaşar Ocak ibid. ; Ahmet T. Karamustafa doesn't cite the name of Geyikli Baba, but he notes the presence of *"kalenderhâne"*s in Lârende, Karaman, Birgi, Bursa, Edirne, Erzincan and Konya. *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the lslamic Later Middle Period 1200-1550* (University of Utah Press, 1994) p. 67

"scholar" (*ilm ehli*) [52]; by the former adjective he may have simply addressed his marital status or it may be interpreted as a sign of a connection to the *Kalenderî* ranks among which staying single was a general norm.

After spending a couple of years there, he returned to his teaching career. He taught at four schools in various Anatolian cities. Confusion is common ground for the name of the first city or town that *Gazâlî* taught at. Mecdi and 'Âşık Çelebi give the name of the city as *Seferihisar.*[53] In other *tezakir*, the name is *Sivrihisar*. Thanks to a popular anecdote, we may assume that the name *Sivri Hisar* was used in the time of *Gazâlî*. The most detailed version of the anecdote is related by Latîfî, as follows:

> He became a 'professor' (*müderris-i sâhib-tedrîs*) in the town called *Sivrihisar*. When he got there and sat, it hurt. After spending 'the regular term' (*müddet-i 'örfiyye*), he could live no longer there, in that same year he came back to the 'door of the state' (*der-i devlet*). The 'elite' (*a'yân u eşrâf*) asked him, 'Why did you return so quickly?' He answered, 'It was a pointed (i.e. *Sivri*) place, not comfortable to sit on, summon me to a town on a plain.'[54]

This word game gained him another post in *Akşehir*. Fuad Köprülü in his lengthy article on *Gazâlî* speaks of his appointment to this city in detail. He states, that, *Akşehir* was famous for its beautiful vineyards, gardens and bathhouses thus it was desirable for *Gazâlî* who had a great penchant for "entertainment". He composed a ghazel for the city's beauties, the authorities wishing to avoid *Gazâlî*'s mockings immediately sent him to *Akşehir.*[55] After sometime Gazâlî abandoned this place too, and came to *Kadıasker Kadri Efendi* and asked for his promotion to *Ağras*. However the latter replied that he was not eligible to the post.[56] According to another popular anecdote *Gazâlî* composed a *nazire* to the kadıasker, and was appointed to the post.[57] Kınalızade

---

[52]Agâh Sırrı Levend, "Gazali(Deli Birader)'nin Cer-Namesi", *Türk Dili Araştırmaları*, (1970) pp. 123-124

[53] 'Âşık Çelebi(Gökyay-I), p.453; Mecdi p.421

[54] Latîfî, p. 411 (The translation is mine.) Shortened versions of the same story are included by Âli, p.250; Kınalızade, p.723; Beliğ(Atlansoy), p.237; Gibb, p.32

[55] Köprülü(1917), p.286

[56] 'Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay-I) relates that he demanded *"müftülük"* of Ağras (p.454)

[57] Âli, p.251; Latîfî, p.411; Kınalızade, p.723; Beyâni(Kutluk), p.195
The nazire by Deli Birader:" Deminde yağmasa baran-ı ihsan
Letafet sebzezarı taze olmaz

Cihanda küçük ü büzürg katında
Keremden rast bir avaze olmaz

states that *Gazâlî* combined the teaching post in *Ağras* with a "foundation management position" (*tevliyyet*), making a total of 50 aspers a day. On the other hand, Latîfî's work reads as if *Gazâlî* was appointed to a teaching and foundation management position not in *Ağras* but in *Akşehir*.[58] Lastly, he worked in *Hüseyniyye Medresesi* in *Amasya*.[59] Câhid Baltacı in his work on the Ottoman *medrese*s in the 16th century cites *Gazâlî* as a professor of *Hüsamiye Medresesi* in *Amasya*. He mentions *Hüseyniyye* as a later post of his[60].

He was, then, retired with 1000 akçes monthly wage from waqf of *Fatih Sultan Mehmed* in *Istanbul*. He chose to settle in a coastal district of *Istanbul*, *Beşiktaş*. As far as 'Âşık Çelebi's account reveals, this part of the city was popular among old, retired, learned men as a residential site. Moreover, the informal gatherings these men frequently organized staged an intermingling of people from different social and occupational groups (scholars, small shopkeepers, sailors, heart-thieves and beloveds etc.). I will focus on this point in the next chapter.

He, immediately, launched a campaign to raise the necessary funds for building a seaside house, a garden, a mosque, a dervish lodge and a bathhouse. *Cerrnâme* (Eulogy of Demand/Book of the Beggar) that he composed to ask the grandvizir *İbrahim Pasha* for financial aid is one of his relatively famous literary works.[61] This poem will help us a lot to elucidate the broader patronage networks that he from time to time activated. The grandvizier rewarded him, and dispatched an officer called *Sufioğlu* to collect "aid from the learned men" (*ârifâne*). The vizier *Ayas Pasha*[62] did not give any money, but

---

Efendi lutf it ölçüp dökmegi ko
Meta'-ı himmete endaze olmaz "

Beliğ(Atlansoy) relates that he became müfti to Ağras thanks to Kadıasker Kadri Efendi (p.237) ; 'Âşık Çelebi(Gökyay-I), p.453-454; Köprülü(1989), p.463

[58]Selim Kuru attracts attention to Kınalızade almost quotes this section verbatim from an earlier account of Latîfî. Since the translation of Latîfî's work into modern Turkish is based on the printed version which skips a few lines of the section, the information it reveals is likely an error. DG (Kuru), p. 5

[59]Mecdi, p.471; Beliğ(Atlansoy), p.237; 'Âşık Çelebi(Gökyay-I), p.453-454; Köprülü(1989), p.463;Âli, p. 249

[60] Câhid Baltacı *XV-XVI. asırlar Osmanlı medreseleri : teşkilât, tarih* (İstanbul : İrfan Matbaası, 1976) p.138

[61]Agâh Sırrı Levend, "Gazali(Deli Birader)'nin Cer-Namesi", *Türk Dili Araştırmaları* (1970): pp. 123-124 A few stanzas from *Cerrname* are cited in Âli, p.251; Kınalızade, p.723; Beyâni(Kutluk), p.195. Köprülü mentions about Cerrname of Gazâlî in (1917), p.278 and (1986), p.644

[62] Latîfî contrasts Ayas Paşa with İskender Çelebi who was always a benevolent patron of artists and poets (p.412-416). See, a critical evaluation of the tezkire from the perpective of changing patronage

Kasım Pasha gave 8000 aspers. *Mustafa Pasha* intended to help the project, but he suddenly died. His wife paid 100 aspers in support of *Gazâlî*'s project[63]. During his years in *Istanbul*, he also enjoyed the patronage of *Defterdar İskender Çelebi*. With the collected amount, he erected a house and garden, and a mosque-dervish lodge-bathhouse complex.[64]

A *İn'âmât Defteri* published by *İsmail Erünsal* testifies that *Gazâlî* earned a large amount of money in return of his panegyrics from the Palace during the last years of his stay in the capital. In this document, for the period between 934-937/1527-1531, his name is recorded once as *Mevlânâ Birâder Efendi*, once as *Birâder Gazâlî*, twice as *Mevlânâ Birâder*, and twice as *Birâder*. He was awarded 4000 akçes for a chronogram on the 3rd *Cemaziyülevvel*, 934; 1000 akçes for a *kaside* at the dates of 13th of *Muharrem* 935, *Shevval* 936, *Zilhicce* 936 and *Muharrem* 937.[65]

There was a large pool in his bathhouse resembling a *Bursa* "spa" (*kapluca*). He also employed *Ateşîzâde* a dervish, and *Memi Şah* a "bare-faced boy" (*yalın yüzlü*). According to the contemporary writers, thanks to this spa-like pool and the charming and blossoming beauties of the two beloveds, the bathhouse became a major address of attraction for people of the city, and this situation resulted in a dramatic decrease in the customers of other bathhouse owners. In 'Âşık Çelebi's account we find a particular story about a *Pîrî Paşazâde Mehemmed* who was originally a professor in a *Sahn-ı Seman* and a manager in his father's waqf foundation. He owned a bathhouse located in *Kiremitlik*, likely to be a suburb of *Hasköy*. In order to turn his bathhouse into a popular place and to win over *Gazâlî* in this competition, he too built a pool patterned before *Bur*sa type of spa. In a short time, the place became full of "refined" (*zarif*) and "beloved" (*mahbub*), and the customers of *Gazâlî*'s once a famous and crowded bathhouse dried up. He composed a sharp-tongued poem mocking *Pîrî* who got jealous and imitated his pool.

---

networks and behaviours Walter G. Andrews, *The Tezkere-i Şu'ara of Latifi as A source for the Critical Evaluation of Ottoman Poetry*, unpublished PhD thesis (University of Michigan, 1970)

[63] 'Âşık Çelebi(Gökyay-II), p.20-21

[64] The date for construction of the complex is 931(1525) in Köprülü(1989)and (1986).

[65]İsmail Erünsal, "Türk Edebiyatı Tarihinin Arşiv Kaynakları-II:Kanuni Sultan Süleyman Dönemine Ait Bir İn'âmât Defteri", in *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, no. 4 (1984): p. 7, 8-11. For alternative analysis of the document consult, Halil İnalcık, *Şair ve Patron* (İstanbul:Doğu- Batı, 2003)

As a counter-attack, *Pîrî* disseminated the news about *Gazâlî*'s place, that, it was the rendezvous of all the dissolute characters of *Istanbul*, and *Gazâlî* himself was involved in immoral affairs. The bathhouseowners and some foundation officers claimed witness to these. They made a petition to the grandvizier *Ibrahim Pasha*. 'Âşık Çelebi says that the grandvizier had already been angered with *Gazâlî* because of some gossip ever reached him: One day, while enjoying the intimate company of *Memi* and *Ateşi* in the bathhouse, a couplet poured from the mouth of *Gazâlî*:

> Ne mahkûm orada belli ne hâkim
> (It is unknown there, who is the prisoner and who is the judge)
> Düğündür ki çalan kim oynayan kim"
> (It is a wedding, who does play, and who does dance)

Gazâlî's enemies persuaded *Ibrahim Pasha* that he should take these words in pejorative sense ,that, they aimed to disdain both the grandvizier and an unknown *Çeşte Bâlî*, who might have been a "favoured servant" of *Ibrahim*.The latest news exacerbated things. Nevertheless, in the end, the grandvizier ordered the demolition of *Gazâlî*'s bathhouse.

Gazâlî recited *Kaplucanâme* (Eulogy for the Bathhouse) to express his sadness because of the event.[66] He wrote a letter to 'Âşık Çelebi's father who was the qadı of *Kartova*, and told about his misfortune.[67] The contemporaries relate that as a remedy to this great agony, he migrated to Mecca along with the annually organized *Surre*.[68] Before leaving Istanbul, he subsequently arranged another fund-raising campaign, and with this money he founded a gardened house and a *mescid* in Mecca.

Gibb points out, that, the execution of his benefactor *İskender Çelebi* occuring soon after this event, *Gazâlî* found it prudent to retire from Istanbul. Koçu raises a similar reason for *Gazâlî*'s migration , that is ,his patron *İskender Çelebi*'s becoming a victim of *İbrahim Pasha*'s false accusation and being executed during the Iraq campaign worried him a lot, so he suddenly decided to rush from the city, turned his house into a lodge and dervish *Ateşî* would be in charge of its responsibility.[69]

---

[66] Köprülü mentions about it (1986) p.644 and (1989) p.728

[67] 'Âşık Çelebi(Gökyay), p.21

[68] The date of the migration is 938/1531-1532 in 'Âşık Çelebi(Gökyay-II), p.23; Köprülü(1989), p.644; Köprülü(1986), p.728; Kınalızade, p.724

[69] Koçu, p.6021

Sehi specifies the name of the town that *Gazâlî* migrated to as *Dekke*, which is obviously wrong.[70] In the *Mektub-ı Deli Birader*, *Gazâlî* himself tells that he bought a "garden" (*bustan*) for 200 gold pieces in *Birke-i Mâcid*, near Mecca, and there was a mill in this beautiful garden.[71] In the *tezkire* of 'Âşık Çelebi the year of his death is 1533-1534, whereas Mecdi gives the date 942/1535.[72] His grave was in the holy land of Mecca. No trace from his house and zaviye-mosque-bathhouse complex in *Beşiktaş* has survived today.

All the primary sources available to us, and the secondary sources modelled after them narrate the life story of *Gazâlî* more or less on the basis of this chronological line. It is subdivided into plots. Each narrative plot corresponds to a particular stage and turning point in *Gazâlî*'s biography, namely, his days in *Korkud*'s court, life among his friends in *Beşiktaş*, and among the elite of Mecca. Each stage is woven around a *meclis* scene, and leads to a duality, an uncertainty or open-ended question as regards the path of entry, participants, his assigned role, and nature of the entertainment. His was a career swinging back and forth between "scholar post", "dervish lodge" and courtly and lesser *mecalis*. His psychological portrait, mental map, lifestyle, and how all these factors moulded his writing is a major concern of the Ottoman biography writers and modern scholars flowing ink on the topic.

Fuat Köprülü depicts *Gazâlî*'s psychological make-up in detail. In his article *Gazâlî* stands for a more generalized image of "wrecked" and even "bohemian" way of life (*harabat*). His lifelong career could be summarized as changing lanes, and a steady search for a spiritual contentment. He couldn't stand being far away from crowds and noise of everyday life in cities of the time. This psychological mood fashioned his writing as well. Both his poem and prose devoid of eloquence, but they are open, understandable and calling to mind most humanly emotions. This literary style reflects his identity; he did not feel the need to mask his emotional and mental states. Köprülü states that it is rarely found in the poet/author of *Gazâlî*'s time, and even in the world of modern literature and arts. Besides, he posits *Gazâlî* into an unbridgeable contrast with the scholars, Sufis and religious elite whose lives were dominated by the principle of

[70] Sehi(İsen), p.161

[71] Günay Kut (Alpay), "Gazâlî'nin Mekke'den Yolladığı Mektuplar", *TDAY Belleten*, no. 2 (1973-1974): p.225

[72] Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay), p.24; Mecdi, p.473. Beyâni,Köprülü and Gibb are likely to have taught the exact date lying somewhere in between, and assumed that Gazâlî died in 941/1534. Beyâni(Kutluk), p.196; Gibb p. 33 ; Köprülü(1989), p.645; Köprülü(1986), p.728

"orderliness". Theirs was a world too "small", "closed", "dark" and "dusty" for a personality as *Gazâlî*. That's why they judged him as "extreme" (*deli*), and "wicked and dissolute" (*fasik ve facir*).

This analytical tendency may be taken as an implicit critic of the *Divân* poet, the standard victim of "superficiality" and "Arab and Persian literary hegemony over Turkish", he is a figure unfortunately deprived of any touch with "realities, experiences and language of the people" in the history of Turkish literature narrated from Köprülü's perspective. It may be also read as a more general critique of certain social groups and human interactions of the 16th century society. Therefore, *Gazâlî* is an "anti-hero" in his age and society, hence we could show tolerance to his professional and "moral deficiencies" argues Köprülü. On the other hand, it looks ambiguous how he takes a literary and moral position vis-à-vis *Gazâlî* when in another study he associates the names that produced works falling under the category of "facetiae (*hezeliyyat*)" with bizarre personalities.

In the *tezâkir,* several character traits are ascribed to *Gazâlî*, they could be grouped into two. The first bundle of adjectives is, for the most part, about his physical outlook, temper, manners, personality and lifestyle: He was "tall and fat" (*iri ve şişman*).[73] He was always "indecisive", changing jobs and places all the time; he never had a permanent venue (*mütelevvin*).[74] His manners were "bold, unreserved", "careless" and "coquettish (*şûh –tab'* / *şûh u laubâli*, *çapkın, meşreb âzâde*, *zârif u rind-i şâhid-bâz*).[75] He was "open-hearted" and "generous" (*saf-dil ü cûd*).[76] He was a "toper" (*rind*)[77] and a "low fellow" (*evbaş*)[78], who was indulgent to all kind of pleasure ("*keyif ehli*").[79]

Harun Tolasa in his comparative research on the biographical works of Sehi, Latîfî and 'Âşık Çelebi stresses that, similar package of adjectives and phrases repeated one after another by *tezkire* writers to portray different poets, it is questionable to what

[73] 'Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay-I), p. 450

[74] Mecdî, p. 471; Beliğ (Atlansoy), 237

[75] Latîfî, p. 410; Âli, p. 249; Beliğ (Atlansoy), p.238; Sehî (İsen), p. 161 ; Kınalızâde, p. 721

[76] Beliğ (Atlansoy), ibid.

[77] Kınalızâde, 721 ; Âli, 410; 'Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay-I), 450; Mecdî, p.471

[78] Mecdî, ibid. ; Kınalızâde, ibid.

[79] 'Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay-I) , p. 450

extent they are indicators of the *tezkire* author's critical eye, and whether the sort of personality they signal is identifiable in definite terms. It is plausible to evaluate them more laxly.[80]

The second set of characteristics highlights *Gazâlî*'s allure as a companion of *mecalis*. He was a man known as "witty" and "joyful" (*gönlü şen*)[81], and leaning to humour ("*yaradılışı latifeye yakın"*).[82] He was strong in rhetoric ("*nedîm-şîve"*, *"şîrîn-kelâm", "hüsn-i takriri ve rengin kelimâtı vardı…"*).[83] He was well-informed in history and had a fund of anecdotes (*"Tevârih u letâyifden bî-hadd ma'lûmâtı vardı."*).[84]

The handful of anecdotes summarized in Gazâlî's biography reflects another characteristic of him: During his career, saying *nazire* to authorities was a way to gain access to posts and positions, and to trigger patronage networks when needy. His appointment to *Ağras* took place upon sending stanzas to *Kadıasker Lütfi Efendi*, and he was transferred to *Akşehir* after writing a ghazel for the city's beauty. His help call to build his house and bathhouse-mosque-lodge complex was in the form of a poem. It was a strategy by means of his literary talents and sense of humour to benefit from the existing economic capital concentrated in the hands of the Sultan, the princes, and the notables. He was always quick at repartee against competitors too, which helped him in creating a living space for himself. He belittled *Pîrî Paşazâde* who tried to catch up with his success in the market of bathhouses with a poisonous *nazire*. Looking deep into the relations in the *Manisa* palace, we will notice that *Gazâlî* expressed his discontent with the uneven distribution of material blessings among the courtiers indirectly through saying *nazire*s. On top of everything, this ability of craftily acting in response, coupled with sense of humour, joy and wit increased his chances to become a courtier and friend in *mecalis*.

These are two complementary facets of his portrait: The bohemian lifestyle of the poet and the attributes of a favourite courtier. In line with Gibb's assertion, *Gazâlî* possessed all the accomplishments and qualities which were necessary for the success of the

---

[80] Harun Tolasa, "III.Kişilik Yapısı ve Özellikleri",in his *Sehî,Lâtîfî ve Âşık Çelebi Tezkirelerine Göre 16.Yüzyılda Edebiyat Araştırma ve Eleştirisi* (İstanbul:Akçağ) p.120-170 For the character traits of Gazâlî cited in the *tezâkir* consult, p.174, 233-234, 300, 318, 337, 340-342

[81] Sehî (İsen) , p. 161

[82] ibid.

[83] Latîfî, p. 412

[84] Sehî (İsen), p. 461

Eastern court-jester: A ready wit, an inexhaustible fund of facetious anecdotes, a facility in versification, and an unblushing effrontery.

1.3. The Literary Works of Gazâlî: DG is remaining his major opus, *Gazâlî* penned other works. They include *Miftâhü'l-Hidâye* (The Key for Hidâye), an Islamic treatise in verse and in *mesnevî* form which focuses upon the Islamic canon relating to prayers and ablutions.[85] *Hidâye* is a religious law book of *Hanefî* School, written by *Ebî Bekir Merginânî* (d.1197). At the time, the book was taught in the Ottoman *medrese*s of 50 aspers and higher rank.[86] Like DG, it was written in *Korkud*'s court and dedicated to *Piyâle Bey*. However, it is unclear which one was written before.

His oeuvre consists, for the most part, of epigrams and chronograms. During his life, he begged from his patrons, mocked his enemies, elegized the death of his friends and patrons and immortalized events through chronograms. The eulogies that he wrote for the execution of *İskender Çelebi* [87], and for the death of *Mustafa Pasha* [88], and two lengthy *kaside*s of his, the *Cerr-nâme* (Book of the Beggar) and the *Kaplucanâme* (Eulogy for the Bathhouse) are mentioned in the *tezâkir*. The most important use of Brother Madcap's chronograms is that accounts of his life in the biographical collections of the period frequently refer to them to date his life story. The *nazire*s that he composed to outdo his rivals, and to speak his talents in friendly entertainment are also in the collections. The biographiers consider his ghazels few in number, very poor, but appreciate his chronograms and mockeries.[89] It is noted that his verses were read both by "the cultured elite" and "the ordinary men" (*pesendîde-i kebîr ü sagîr*).[90]

He wrote *Mektûb-ı Deli Birader* (Letter of Brother Madcap) toward the end of his life, between 1532 and 1535, in Mecca. It was addressed to his friends some of whom

[85] Gibb, p.31; Kuru, p.8

[86] Câhid Baltacı , *XV-XVI. asırlar Osmanlı medreseleri : teşkilât, tarih* (İstanbul : İrfan Matbaası, 1976) p. 40-42 and footnote 126

[87] It is in the tezakir and in *Mecmua-i tevarih* of Ayvansarâyî. Its date is 941-942/1534-1536 in Mecdi, and 940/1534-1535 in 'Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay-II), p. 18-19 ; Âli, p.413-414; Ayvansarayi, p.334; Kınalızade, p.727. Âli cites two couplets from the eulogic poem (p.253).

[88] Kınalızade, p. 724; 'Âşık Çelebi(Gökyay-II), p.18-19; Beliğ(Atlansoy), p.238; Beyâni(Kutluk), p.196-197

[89] For parts from three ghazels of Gazâlî see, 'Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay-I), p. 25

[90] Âli , p. 253

were the famous poets of the age. Stylistically, the letter proceeds through questions about the places and people that *Gazâlî* befriended in Istanbul. He mocks some friends of his and mentions others with insults and tender words. The letter provoked the parallel letters of *Zati, Rumi* and *Kâtib Cafer Çelebi*. Kınalızâde implies the popularity of the work; after quoting four couplets at the beginning of *Gazâlî*'s letter he says that it is unnecessary to quote any further since the letter is very famous.[91]

[91] Kınalızâde, p. 725

CHAPTER 2

"MECLİS" - REINSTATING THE AUDIENCE FOR "DAFİ'Ü'L GUMUM RAFİ'Ü'L HUMUM":

2.1. Suggestions for the Semantic Field of Meclis: At the beginning of DG, *Gazâlî* explains the circumstances that inspire the composition of the work: *Piyâle Bey*, one of *Korkud*'s close and trusted slaves, enjoyed the stories exchanged by the learned men, and requested that a book be written. It would combine such stories that relieve and cheer up the heart in the days of sorrow, and in the times of anxiety. Brother Madcap undertook the task, and to this end he compiled orally related local stories and several works in Arabic and Persian. He dedicated the complete work to *Piyâle Bey.*[92]

As this suggests, DG was written for consumption first and foremost in a convivial gathering joined by courtiers and "learned men". Therefore, its content and style was moulded after, to a larger extent, the demands, expectations and tastes of the participants of that *meclis*. In addition, the stage of each grand episode in *Gazâlî*'s biography was a similar *meclis* environment. At this point, it is a prerequisite to think over the *mecalis* that *Gazâlî* actively became a part of, as to clarify the author-text-readership/reading triangle for DG. This endeavour to reinstate the context for production and consumption of his book may outline a number of propositions in

[92] DG(Kuru), p. 12-13 and p. 39-41

relation to *meclis* as a historical and cultural phenomenon and its several constituents, and it may enlarge its semantic field.

We are talking about a period from the late 15th century through the early 16th century which overlaps what is lately distinguished as "the Age of Beloveds". It was an age that the consistency of various non-literary micro-events, trends and trajectories created a moment at which the "aesthetic" and "artistic" were also "historical", "dynamic" and "political", and did not exist in as sphere divorced from the other concerns of life and livelihood (patronage, employment, entertainment e.g.). During this period, all power relations in society (lover-beloved, courtier-monarch, and patron-client) were imagined in the forms, the language and the metaphors of love, and they found expression in the cosmic-poetic and actual ground of the party.[93]

In this particular historical context, our focus is directed towards the elite households of Istanbul, the *Manisa* palace, during the period of 906/1500-1506 and 916/ 1511 and 918/1513[94], where the princes were still customarily assigned as provincial governors and a microcosm of the learned men in *Beşiktaş*. The *mecalis* supplied the milieu for the convergence of political legitimacy, patronage networks, and entertainment.[95] None the less, the more public and political-legitimatory accent on the *mecalis* does not overshadow its meaning and importance for the "entertainment culture", which comprises a wide range of perceptions, practices, and experiences - music and dancing, ghazel/mevlid recitations, scholarly brainstorm, story-telling, poetic production, traditional performance arts, wine and coffee houses, recreational grounds and gardens, uses and conspiracies of pleasure, emergence of manners and coded behavioural expectations as a new epistemological sphere, and eroticization of power relations.

At the top of the hierarchy, there was the Sultanic *meclis* where sprang up patronage ties from the very centre of patrimonial polity. It wouldn't be wrong if I argue that the

---

[93] Walter G. Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı, *The Age of Beloveds:Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society* (Durham & London: Duke Univ.Press, 2005) p.1-32, 304-355

[94] Korkud stayed at the Manisa palace twice; the first time he was appointed as provincial gorvernor around 1500/1501, and the second time he moved from Antalya to Manisa without his father's permission in the middle of a crown affair in 1511 (İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, "II İnci Bayezid'in Oğullarından Sultan Korkut", *Belleten*, XXX, No. 39, Ekim, 1966, p. 594-595.) If Gazâlî really went to Egypt with Korkud in the year of 1509 as Beyânî recounts (Kutluk, p. 194), then it is possible to say that he was admitted as the prince's courtier some time between 1500/1501 and 1509.

[95]Throughout this study, my conceptualization of meclis is very much influenced by the analysis of Dominic P. Brookshaw in "Palaces,Pavilions and Pleasure-Gardens:the context and setting of the medieval majlis", *Middle Eastern Literatures*, vol. l6, no.2 (July 2003) pp. 199-223

most obvious effect of the shift from the earlier "peripatetic entourage" or "court in move" of the Ottomans, to "residential court" was its impact on the size of the sovereign's household, occupied by salaried officers, the court guard, musicians, fools, cancers, singers etc. Wherever the court resided, the demands of housing, provisioning and entertaining created unparalleled opportunities for artists, poets and craftsmen. The court's urban setting often provided a highly competitive environment for distribution of offices and material blessings. In this way, it also connected the sultan to the larger political periphery, and universe of artistic-literary production.

The Ottoman sultans organized *mecalis* for the poets and the scholars (*şu'ara* ve *ulema meclisleri*) intermittently. For aspiring poets, admission to the privileged circle of the courtly *meclis* was a real chance, that it was the perfect forum within which they could demonstrate their skill, solicit patronage, be appointed to various positions, and earn occasional grants and regular income. The *meclis* was vital in the development of the age's literary-artistic media; new works disseminated, scholars commented on them, musicians were inspired by them, and listeners spread their celebrity. The princes were educated in playing the referee role in these gatherings, opening up scholarly and literary debates and playing the sides against each other or acting as the moderator (*musahabet*, *muâ'şeret*). Respectively, the accomplishment of this mission with success, and public demonstration and redistribution of wealth in such sessions boosted the legitimacy of the sultan as wise, generous and erudite ruler.

The court of the sultan was not always the unitary body in which a single household monopolizing the only route to favour and patronage. Beside the sovereign's household, there appeared a sequence of subsidiary courts and *mecalis* headed by the princes, powerful state men, and the elite at large. They often sought to emulate or even outshine the glamour of the sovereign's, and instigated a symbolic fight against each other. All these functioned too albeit one level down as rival points of access to patronage and favour, and as venues for representational display.[96]

At the bottom, the learned men formed their own intellectual-artistic locale and "subculture of love and entertainment" in coffeehouses, shops, wine taverns, and small households. Gaining support from the palace and flourishing in the elite world, they also developed self-help strategies in professional and economic meanings of the word.

[96]For the role of the Şu'ara and Ulema Mecâlis ,the princes, the state elite and the provincial governors in patronage of arts consult, Halil İnalcık, *Şair ve Patron* (İstanbul: Doğu-Batı, 2003) and Haluk İpekten, *Divan Edebiyatında Edebî Muhitler* (Ankara : Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1996)

2.2. "Meclis" and "Garden"- Feasibility of a Historical and Cultural Correspondence: The sultanic or non-courtly and more private, the meclis was extant through its historical-cultural association to the "garden".

In concrete terms, *meclis* was variously located in the palace proper, royal gardens, mansions, kiosks, recreational grounds (*mesire*), and urban and extra-mural gardens; thus it was the physical setting of such occasion.

The Ottoman privy gardens are commonly referred to as *irem bağı* -a reference to the legendary gardens said to have been devised by *Shaddad bin Ad* in imitation of the gardens of Paradise. The most widespread interpretation is that variety of scriptural descriptions of Paradisal garden (*irem bağ*) was to have a great influence on the landscaping of Islamic gardens, most favourite stage of *mecalis*, in general. In Muslim eschatology, Paradise is thought of as an extraordinarily beautiful garden. In creation of the earthy gardens, the aim was to emulate Paradise in this world by conforming to its Qur'anic depictions. The images of Paradise share a number of elements in common: The eternal garden is embellished with lush and verdant vegetation watered by fountains and cool streams, non-perishable fruits of all kinds, confluence of rivers of uncorrupted water, milk and wine and four rivers of honey. There, the righteous are promised not just pure wives, *houris* which are maids of modest glances whom no man nor jinn has deflowered before, and round them shall go boys (*ghılman*) of theirs as though they were hidden pearls. The fellow of paradise and their wives reclining on green cushions and beautiful carpets in cool pavilions shall be served all round with a cup from a spring, white and delicious to those who drink, wherein is no insidious spirit, nor shall they drunken therewith.[97]

Divorced from its "ontological" quality and "metaphorical" sense, the recurrent motifs of the Koranic paradise were taken as a model in the refashioning of the garden culture, and in the staging of the *meclis* entertainment. The ultimate motive became foretasting the pleasures of the Paradise in this world. This willingness did not limit itself to the spatial arrangements and preparation of the dish, but the "sensual-sexual" aura of the after-life was tried to be actualized. The Paradise's "true immortal" image was

[97] Nurhan Atasoy *A Garden for the Sultan* (İstanbul: Koç, 2002) p. 211-217 ; Suzanne Pinckney Stetkevych "Intoxication and Immortality:Wine and Associated Imagery in al-Ma'arrî's Garden", in *Homoeroticism in Classical Arab Literature*, eds. Everett Rowson and J.W. Wright,Jr. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997) pp.219-139

manipulated by the "false" and "mortal" motives, and *ghılman/houri* serving the Eternal Liquor/the Water of Life was replaced with the real *saqi/dilber/huban* figure serving wine/coffee, singing, dancing and flirting in the intimate gatherings.[98]

It is noticed that, 'Âşık Çelebi sees *Sirkeci Bahşı*'s garden in *Beşiktaş*, a party place ornamented by sweet fruits, tall and healthy trees and hosting the learned friends and the beautiful boys as "lofty heavens" (*cennet-i 'ala*). He compares its fruits and trees to those in the Paradise, and concludes that the garden's beauty would make the guards of the Paradise jealous. As parallel to this, Lâtifî in his *Evsâf-ı İstanbul* (Essay in Description of Istanbul) describes the city's beauties and treasures, the monumental buildings (*Ayasofya*, II. Sultan Mehmed Mosque, *Semâniye*, the Palace, *Eyüp Sultan*), the kiosks of the rich, the "dervish lodges" (*hankah*), the famous "recreational grounds" (*teferrüçgah*), wine and coffee houses in *Galata, Kağıthane* and *Tophane*, and the bazaars. In his eyes, the city is "the Garden of Paradise" (*irem bağı*) in this world and the Palace is a "paradise within paradise". Apart from the glittering rich and natural landscape, what approximates the 16th century city and the palace to the Paradise is the youth (*dilberler/dilrübâlar/hubanlar*) as beautiful as *ghılman/houri* and *Yusuf*, another Koranic character.[99]

Another example is the tendency of *Mustafa Âli*, in his commentaries on the courteous behaviour, to produce an "eroticized" knowledge of the pages in the Palace, servants of the elite, and various beardless lads.[100]

The "garden" for the period under question was also analyzable as a visualising of a cosmic/poetic-political synthesis. This period in the Ottoman historical trajectory ("the

---

[98] Lâtifî, *Evsâf-ı İstanbul* , ed. Nermin Suner(Pekin) (İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1977) p.7-11 and 23-27 Consult, Walter G. Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı, *The Age of Beloveds:Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society* (Durham & London: Duke Univ.Press, 2005) p. 63-84

[99]Latîfî ibid., especially "Evsâf-ı Gılman Seyr-i Sarâ-yı Âmire" , "Sıfat-ı Bağçe-i Sârây-ı Âmire", "Bezeztânı Beyân Eder", "Evsâf-ı Esnâf-ı Hûbân Maksud-ı Dil ü Can ve Matlub-ı Cenan", "Sıfat-ı Tophâne", "Sıfat-ı Belde-i Galata" p. 23-27, 40-41, 51-53, 55-59; consult Afsaneh Najmabadi and Gayane Karen Merguerian "Zuleykha and Yusuf: Whose 'Best' Story? ", *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 29 (November, 1997) pp.485-509

[100] *The Ottoman gentleman of the sixteenth century : Mustafa Âli's Mev¯aidün-Nef¯ais f¯i kav¯aidil-mec¯alis : "Tables of delicacies concerning the rules of social gatherings"*,annotated English translation by Douglas S. Brookes (Cambridge, Mass. : Dept. of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 2003); *Gelibolulu Mustafa Âli ve Mevâ'ıdü'n-Nefâis fî-Kavâ'ıdil-Mecâlis*, ed. Mehmet Şeker (Ankara: TTK, 1997) p. 364-365 The books are hereafter cited as Âli (Brookes) and Âli (Şeker). Consult, Walter G. Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı, *The Age of Beloveds:Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society* (Durham & London: Duke Univ.Press, 2005) p. 63-84

Golden Age", "the Age of Beloveds", or "the Late-Renaissance") was a synthesis that combines power, an ethos supporting a particular exercising of power, and the means to effectively articulate that ethos. The power of rulership, relations of dominance and submission, relationship of authority and obedience are all eventually subsumed in the imagery of "love" and interpreted by it. All the themes of selfless love, of the powerful, fatally attractive beloved, of wine and intoxication, of art, literature and music, of mystical religion and the esoteric interpretation of the physical world- all of these themes are included and synthesized poetically in the allegory of an "elegant entertainment for a circle of close friends in a garden". The symbolism of the garden also becomes a vehicle for the exercising of an unparalled literary language. At this point, Ottoman Turkish takes into its lexicon the developed vocabularies and literary conventions of the Eastern and Western Turkic languages, of Persian and Arabic. This enables the poet to manipulate his language with a technical mastery that in an age of less refinement and duller tools might to us seem artificial and overdone. The understanding of this new poetic language and taking pleasure in it requires an encyclopaedic familiarity with the tropes of the tradition and the lore accompanying them. Those who do not posses the common fund of information to give meaning to this inescapable and uncompromising poetic intertextuality stay outside the walls of the garden. Inside the garden are gathered both the powerful and the seekers after power enacting dramas of dominance and submission in an agreed upon interpretive context. Just as the cosmic and garden imagery of the poetry are reflected in decorative art and architecture, so did "party behaviour" spill out of the gardens of the wealthy and highly-placed into the society at large. In other words, there is multiplicity of circles, where similar dramas played out, and the same interpretive context can be extended.[101]

2.3. Gazâlî between Mecâlis:

2.3.1. Korkud's Court and the Question of Politics of Intimacy: The 16th century biography authors identify *Piyâle*, the first patron of *Gazâlî* in *Manisa* court

[101]Walter G. Andrews, "Literary Art of the Golden Age: The Age of Süleymân",in eds. Halil İnalcık and Cemal Kafadar *Süleyman the Great and His Age* (Istanbul: ISIS, 1993) pp. 353-368 ; Walter G. Andrews, *Poetry's Voice Society's Song* (Seattle:University of Washington Press ,1985) p. 175-189; Walter G. Andrews and Irene Markoff "Poetry,the Arts and Group Ethos in the Ideology of the Ottoman Empire",*Edebiyât* , no. 1 (1987) pp. 28-70

and the addressee of DG, as *Korkud*'s "favourite and accepted" (*sevdiği ve makbulü*)[102], his "companion and wine-cup friend" (*musâhiblerinden nedîm u hem-kadehi*)[103], his "beloved and accepted" (*mahbûb ve makbûlü*)[104], and his "most special man" (*ehass-ı havâssı*).[105] *Gazâlî* at the beginning (*Mukaddime*) of the work, introduces *Piyâle* as one of *Korkud*'s closest and trusted slaves.[106] It is decisive to track down the historical-cultural connotations of *musahib* and *nedim* in uncovering the structured workings of patronage relations through the control of upward mobility in the hierarchy of *mecalis*-tables.

Musahib is in encyclopedic terms a close companion of the sultan or the shehzade. In the secondary literature, we find contradictory and incredulous information concerning *musahib*s. This confusion may be stemming from the fact that varied statuses held by the crowded entourage of the sultan and the palace personnel couldn't be easily differentiated.

İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı in his work on the institutional organization of the Ottoman palace says that the person in the *musahib* position was generally expected to posses a number of merits: He had to be "well-informed" (*malûmatlı*), "refined" (*zarif*), "quick at repartee" (*hazırcevap*), and "witty" (*nüktedan*). At occasion he functioned as the Sultan/prince's private tutor and imperial advisor as well. This first point is obviously in a contradiction with the claim of the author that, *musahib* might have been also a dwarf (*cüce*) or a mute (*dilsiz*). The sultan/prince chose his own *musahib* from among the ranks of *agha*s, black eunuchs, or provincial governors (*beğlerbeği*).[107] The poet whose works and talent most admired by the sultan in the periodically held *meclis* for the poets (*Şu'ara Meclisi*) might have been honoured to be the *musahib* of the sultan.[108] The sultan might have many such companions. Uzunçarşılı enumerates Murad III's

[102] Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay) ,p.450-451

[103] Mustafa Âli, p. 249

[104] Kınalızade, p. 722

[105] Latîfî, p. 410

[106] " *...Sultan Korkud bin Bayezid Hazretlerinün mukarreb u makbûl adamlarından mü'eddeb ü makbûl bendelerinden...*" DG (Kuru), p. 39

[107] Zeki Pakalın *Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri* (MEB:1993) p. 667. He verbatim cites the information in , İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devletinin saray teşkilâtı*, 3rd ed. (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi,1988) p.75

[108] Halil İnalcık, *Şair ve Patron* (İstanbul: Doğu-Batı, 2003)

companions *Şemsi Paşa* and *Beğlerbeği Mehmed Paşa*, Mehmed IV' s vizier and son-in-love *Musahib Mustafa Paşa*, famous composer *İsmail Dede Efendi*, and Mahmud II's story-tellers *Abdi Bey* and *Hayalî Said Efendi* among the men once occupied this position.[109] He assumes that the position was legally abolished in 1250/1834.[110] However, we know that down into the late period the sultans used to have *musahib*s as the previous sultans had.

Nedim is "drinking company" and, by extension friend, courtier/confidant of rulers, princes and wealthy persons. His duty is to entertain them, eat and drink in their company, play games with them, accompany them in hunting and partake in their pastimes and recreations.[111]

The *musahib* and *nüdema* images in the memoirs of the old palace staff and foreign observers reveal an aspect of the culturally constructed notion of "entertainment". Their phobias, deformed bodies and disabilities, contention among them to prevail in the eyes of the sultan and to get blessings, and ridiculous situations they put themselves into during recreations in suburban gardens, kiosks and mansions to amuse the sultan are the scenes that the reader comes across with. Those who had special talents in music, singing and recitation, and acrobacy are said to have been educated in the palace, and served in the recreation sessions of the sultan. The *musahib* and *nüdema* were often enforced by viziers and other courtiers the difficult and risky task to deliver bad and unlucky messages and news to the sultan.[112]

These groups come into sight as a treacherous "political" party to be inhibited and reformed in the traditional *"nasihatnâme"* genre crystallized in the 16th -17th centuries:

In *Nushatu's Salâtin* (1581) and *Mevaidü'n Nefâis* (1587), Mustafa Âli talks about the ideal *musahib* figure: *Musahib* is a companion whose speech is full of knowledge and wisdom. His companionship affords advice and admonishment. He is aware of the respective positions and different ranks of people. He would never have the audacity to

---

[109] İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devletinin saray teşkilâtı* , 3rd ed. (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1988) p.75

[110] ibid.

[111] *Encyclopedia of Islam* (Leiden:Brill) pp.849-851; Zeki Pakalın *Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri* (MEB:1993) p.667

[112] Hafız Hızır İlyas Ağa, *Letaif-i Enderun*, ed. Cahit Kayra (İstanbul:Güneş,1987); *III. Selim'in Sırkâtibi Ahmed Efendi Tarafından Tutulan Rûznâme*, ed. V. Sema Arıkan (Ankara:TTK,1993) ; Santuri Ali Ufki Bey *Topkapı Sarayı'nda Yaşam* (İstanbul:Kitabevi,2000); Ottaviano Bon *The Sultan's Seraglio:An Intimate Portrait of Life at the Ottoman Court*, ed. Gofrey Goodwin (Saqi Books,1996)

commit an impudent act which constitutes a shameful intrusion. He must come from the erudite classes or from the *ulema*, from the ranks of accomplished poets and eloquent persons, or from the intelligent dervishes who have renounced this world. He should have familiarity with the biographies and adventures of sultans and prophets, to exemplify a contemporary situation with reference to "the Golden" periods in history, and provide advice based upon them. He should possess knowledge in Islamic sciences, chiefly in *hadith* and *tafsir*. He should be over 40 years old. He should disclose any oppression and exploitation to the sultan, and offer his service as an honourable and disinterested member of the spy corps. He shouldn't surrender to the feelings of jealousy and hostility. He should be similar in disposition and manners to the sultan. Abbasid caliph *Harun al-Rashid* surpassed all other monarchs in his selection of intelligent and generous *musahib*s, possessing of high morals. *Kânûni*'s nedim Celâl *Bey* was also well-equipped by the token of these criterions. However, he was too strict, so expelled from the duty. A bad example was the case of *Musahib Mehmed Paşa*, a vizier to *Murad* III and governor of Rumelia. He was murdered by soldiers who staged a revolt and besieged the Imperial Council in the year 999/1589. Not seeing fit to content himself with these high positions, he was favoured with the title of *musahib* as well. He was an ignorant and unqualified person, of Armenian origin.[113]

Âli asserts that, *nedim* is a comedian who always displays a gay mood and by his movements and acts evokes laughter. He is skilled at adjusting his words to the delicate mood of the king; when he notices him somehow annoyed he would behave in such a way as to disperse his sorrows. At the same time he is a courtier, in his appearance and comportment. It is however necessary that he does not play the courtier at an improper time. He also does not relate stories that are against the king's taste, or his humour does not run counter to his temperament. If not, according to the noble hadith,"humour is the beginning of the evil", he may provoke damage to himself when he is expecting rewards and favours.[114]

Koçi Bey (1630) in his famous *Risâle* offered to *Murad IV* narrates the evil deeds of *nüdemâ*: He complains that, until 982/1574, end of Suleimanic age, the viziers were independent in their business. They held the authority to dispense and depose. Nobody

[113]Andreas Tietze, *Mustafa Âli's Counsel forSultans of 1581* (Vienna:1979) p.95; cited in Ahmet Uğur, *Osmanlı Siyasetnameleri* (İstanbul:MEB,2001) p.93; Âli (Brookes) p.25-27

[114] Andreas Tietze ibid.

got access to the flow of information and imperatives between the sultan and his viziers. Those in close proximity to the sultan acquired wealth and prestige in time. They caused many grand viziers, obstacles in their way, be toppled or executed. *Ferhat Paşa*, *Yemişçi Hasan Paşa*, *Derviş Mehmet Paşa* and *Nasuh Paşa* all suffered from calumny of such men. From then on, the viziers began to work to their benefit, and distribute *başmaklık*, *arpalık*, *has* and *zeâmet* units arbitrarily. Nepotism and bribery escalated. The gate of victories and conquests closed, and the treasury started to melt away.[115]

Lütfi Paşa's *Asafnâme* (1541) affirms the usual practice of holding close companions. However the sultan shouldn't come together with and enjoy his *nüdemâ* frequently. *Nüdemâ* and *musahib* have the right to take their share from financial blessing and occasional presents (*"...bahşişlerden ve hil'atlardan..."*); though they shouldn't interfere in public affairs.[116]

Kitâb-ı Müstetâb (1620 c.) sees the foundation and continuation of *Devlet-i Aliyye* dependent on keeping "the circle of justice" (*adâlet*) intact and enforcing "the traditional order" (*kanûn-ı kadîm*). To succeed in this, the posts and salaries should be distributed to those worthy of. One shouldn't rely on the words of *müsâhib* and *nüdemâ* in the service of the sultan, and servants not participating in the government to take action. The grandvizier is the closest and most intimate servant of the sultan. The imperial orders shouldn't be divulged to anyone except him. In previous periods, there was a universal fear of the grand vizier; things changed nowadays, people appeal to improper people, and carry out their orders and wishes.

The author tells an anecdote to draw morals: In the reign of *Selim I*, there popped up the *Kızılbaş* provocation both in Rumelia and on Persian borders. One day, the Sultan declared that he would go to a campaign against the *Kızılbaş* threat; he left any other technical detail unclear. *Pîrî Paşa* was confused for the direction of the campaign, but he was afraid of asking such a stupid question to the sultan as the grand vizier. He sent a *tezkire* to Selim's dwarf *nedim*, and wanted him to one way or other learn the destination while the sultan was in recreation and relaxed. When the sultan understood that the grand vizier tried to solve his problems through intermediacy of his *nedim*, he

[115] Cited in Zeki Pakalın *Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri* (MEB:1993) p.667

[116] Lütfi Paşa, *Asafnâme*, ed. Ahmet Uğur (Ankara:Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1982) p.17-18

got very angry. He stated that *nüdema* were only for amusement. The dwarf was beheaded, and the head was sent in a pack to *Pîrî Paşa.*[117]

Hırzü'l-Mülûk (1632 c.), another account from the 17th century, distinguished the ideal *musahib* figure of the previous periods: His clothing and comportment are appropriate. He is well-read in all matters. He is free from all ambitions, and religious. He should function as the eye and ear of the sultan. He should inspect who is trustworthy, just and devoted from the elite and commoners, and who is not; and he should learn about those from the men of pen busying themselves with science and edification, and who under the banner of *müderris* are engrossed in impious acts.[118]

If we read attentively, the designation of the *musahib* and *nedim* figures and advices offered to the sultan about them are grounded within the easily recognizable premises, themes, presumptions and hyperboles of the Ottoman mirror for the prince genre. The preoccupation with the convenient link between "justice" (*adalet*), "traditional order" (*Kanun-ı Kadim*) and "personal piety" (*ahlak*), sanctification and heroising Süleymanic age as true representation of the pure imperial traditions, warning against all kinds of transgressions over the authority of the Grand Vizier, defiance of the proper system of promotion on the basis of competence and merit, and corrosion of the state pillars are easily distinguished. The problem is how to manage the discrepancy between the polemics in *nasihatnâme*s and contemporary social reality, how to restore the particular audience that each text addressed, and to determine the motives and political/social problems specific to the time and place that occasioned the reproduction of each text.[119]

All these accounts were written at least one century later than the reign of *Bayezid II* and governorship of *Korkud* makes the analysis more convoluted. Notwithstanding their methodological shortcomings, the reflection of the *musahib* / *nedim* in the counsel-to-sultans literature as the scapegoat of "favouritism"- captivating the Ottoman political

---

[117] *"Kitâb-ı Müstetâb"*, in ed. Yaşar Yücel *Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilâtına Dair Kaynaklar* (Ankara:TTK ,1988) p.18-19

[118] *"Hırzü'l-Mülûk"*,in ibid. ,p.180-181

[119] For nasihantnâmeler and their various analysis, consult Bernard Lewis "Ottoman Observers of Decline", *Islamic Studies*, no. I (1962): pp. 71-87; Rhodes Murphey "Westernization in the Eighteenth Century Ottoman Empire:How far,How Fast", *BMGS*, no. 23 (1999): pp. 116-139; R. Abou-el Haj "The Expression of Ottoman Political Culture in the Literature of Advice to Princes (Nasihatnameler) 16th to 20th Centuries", in *Sociology in the Rubric of Social Science Prof. Ramkrishna Mukherjee Felicitation Volume*, eds. R.K. Bhattacharya and A.K. Ghosh (1995) pp. 282-292

mind especially after *Süleyman* in 1523 made *İbrahim Paşa*, a palace favourite, Grand Vizier in defiance of the old system- equips us with an angle to put in the context the human dynamics at work in the *Korkud*'s palace in *Manisa.*

The way that *Piyâle* climbed the ladder to be the *musahib* or *nedim* of the prince is unclear to us. He might have been a poet, musician or an artist native of *Manisa* or from surrounding provinces and in the end found a patron, or as *Gazâlî* he might have put aside his career as scholar and started to look for a new career opportunity in the imperial courts. He was likely to be, in *Köprülü*'s "romanticized" words, a young slave brought from his homeland in kilometers away; otherwise, if he had possessed any significant literary-artistic talent, it would have been cited in the *tezakir*. Instead, his hospitality and open-handedness toward the men of talent and knowledge are underlined by the biographers. It is ironic that, the contemporaries do not touch on *Piyâle*'s sexuality, or they avoid mentioning it. Thus, we are compelled to evaluate his status in a continuum from purely "ministerial" to "sexual".

Korkud's palace consisted of a series of thresholds, matched up with a hierarchy of "tables" (*sofra*) and a *mecalis*, each requiring higher degrees of status or the ruler's favour before they could be crossed. The clear barriers interposed between the outside world and the court's inner sanctum, and the control of entrance to the prince's private apartment enabled the ruler to establish an ad hominem hierarchy of personal favour. It might have stood quite separately from and sometimes in rivalry with the hierarchies of elite and other ranks that largely determined precedence within the palace's public domains. The close companion's promotion might have violated the axioms of the traditional line of career. That is the reason of all the vehement hostility that favourites attracted in the Ottoman *nasihatnâme* genre, and the modern usage of terminology referring to *Piyâle* as the "sexual" favourite.

Piyâle as the *musahib/nedim* of *Korkud* nevertheless seem to have provided a mechanism of mediation between these different thresholds in *Manisa* palace. He was also responsible for furnishing an intellectual milieu by attaching poets, authors, musicians and actors to the princely house, and incorporating them to the princely *meclis*. We learn about the attendance of other artists to the court from two anecdotes in Mustafa Âli's account. He speaks about the "singer/rector" (*gûyende*) *Düriye* with 30 aspers stipend (*Düriye* is a female name, which means that women also became courtiers, and attended the entertainment sessions.) and the "lute player" (*tanbur-nevâz*) *Kel Kâsım* with 25 aspers stipend working in the court. *Gazâlî*'s *ulûfe* was 25 aspers

too; he was not satisfied with it, and asked for an increase with a *nazire*.[120] His stipend was increased by 5 aspers. The other story is about a *"bayram"* when various clothes (*hil'at*) were distributed to the poets and court companions (*"...şu'arâ ve nüdemâya..."*). *Gazâlî* was given an old, cotton coat; he expressed his disappointment with another *nazire*.[121]

Another source of the learned men for *Korkud*'s palace was his brothers' households. The princes were engaged in exchange of the learned men: *Zeynelabidin*, the tutor of the famous Persian "*kemençe"* player *Hüseyin Avvâd* came to Anatolia, and was admitted to the *meclis* of Prince *Ahmed*. He was paid 50 aspers stipend, and provided shelter and daily food. This musician could be considered a professional courtier; he had been serving in the *mecalis* of the Akkoyunlu sultan Yakup and Hüseyin Baykara before. *Korkud* wrote a letter to *Ahmed*, and invited *Avvâd* to his own *meclis*. In return for his delightful musical performances, *Korkud* granted him a plate of silver and golden coins. Similarly, *Serirî* of *Manisa* was famous for his great talent in playing lute, and joking. After a brief career in *Korkud*'s *meclis*, he was transferred to the court of *Selim*.[122]

The first step to the private circle was passing from *Piyâle*'s *meclis* and table. This rule is exemplified by *Gazâlî*'s story. In *Manisa* palace, he first attended *meclis* of *Piyale*, after his code of conduct, and talent proved to be compatible with the expectations of the princely table and wine *meclis* there, he was accepted to the intimate circle of *Korkud.*[123] Therefore, it is possible to add the *mecalis* of the higher court-office holders and favourites which were often to be found in the immediate environs of the ruler to the ladder.

In line with the observations and complaints of the Ottoman observers of decline, *Piyâle* was highly involved in politics as the favourite in the court of the heir which frequently became the rallying point for "reactionary political interests". He was

---

[120] Âli p.250 : "Biri didi bu kapuda dirlicigün nedür didi
Düriyeden beş eksicek Kel Kâsımun berâberi
Döndi didi n'olaydı ırlamacak bile idün
Tanburacık çalayidün böyle gezince serseri"

[121] İbid.

[122] İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı "II İnci Bayezid'in Oğullarından Sultan Korkut", *Belleten*, XXX, No. 120, Ekim 1966, p. 594-595

[123] *"...Ba'dehû anun hüsn-i terbiyesiyle şehzâde meclisine dâhil olmuş..."* (Âli, p.249); *"...Merhum Gazâlî giderek şehzadenin kendi özel meclisine girer..."* (Âşık Çelebi/ Gökyay-I , p.450); *"...giderek meclis-i şehzâdeye dâhil ve şehinşah-ı merkûm ashâb-ı leta'if ve kemâlete ma'il olmagin mertebe-i takarrub ve vahdete vâsıl olmuş idi."* (Kınalızâde, p.722); *"...Sultan Korkud musahibi Piyâle ta'rifiyle şehzadeye nedîm olup..."* (Beliğ/Atlansoy), p.237

possibly the third leading figure after *Korkud*'s mother and tutor in advising his political decisions and maneuvers.[124] Moreover, he was an active party in the factional war between the princes, which eventually resulted in the execution of *Korkud.*

The friendship of *Korkud* and *Piyâle* is represented as a commendable one. Hammer reports the last days of *Korkud*, and *Piyâle*'s life after the execution of his patron in detail: As soon as *Korkud* learned the sons of other princes, *Mahmud*, *Şehinşah* and *Âlemşah*, were murdered by his brother *Selim*, he understood that it would be his turn. He made unsuccessful attempts to have the support of the Janissary against his brother, however news reached *Selim* quickly. Hammer tells that he moved with his 10.000 soldiers to *Manisa* from *Bursa* under the pretext of a hunt intention. *Korkud* by chance was able to run away from the back door of the palace with his "trusted and loyal friend" (*...mûtemed, sâdık dostu...*) *Piyâle*. They changed clothes, hid in caves, and escaped to the province of *Teke*. The ambitious *Kaasım Beğ*, the governor of *Teke* captured them. *Selim*'s man *Kara-çinoğlu* brought *Korkud* and *Piyâle* to Bursa. At the city gate, the executioner *Sinân* forcefully separated *Piyâle* from his benefactor. The Ottoman biography writers insert another part to the story that *Korkud* begged in front of his brother, and wanted to have only *Piyâle* and *Gazâlî* in return for the throne.[125] After the execution took place, *Selim* appointed *Piyâle* as *Korkud*'s *"türbedâr"*. He mourned for his patron for the rest of his life.[126]

My proposition is that carrying as much learned men as possible under the benefaction of *Korkud* was another line of attack in the combat between the candidates to the throne; as figuratively, feeding more learned men, renders the prince approximate to the ideal ruler who was considered to be generous and capable of to appreciate and valuate the literary-intellectual work. He was also the author of a Turkish *divan*, and many works on the topics of Islamic morality, legal theory, *hadith* and *tafsir*[127]. Besides, patronizing more men entailed a crowded faction of supporters, exercising whatever political power,

---

[124]Leslie Pierce "Shifting Boundries:Images of Ottoman Royal Women in the 16ht and 17th Centuries" ,*Critical Matrix*, no. 4 (1998) pp. 43-82; İsmail H. Uzunçarşılı "Sancağa Çıkartılan Osmanlı Şehzadeleri", *Belleten*, XXXIX, No. 156, Ekim 1975, pp. 659-696

[125] Kınalızâde, p. 722

[126] Joseph von Hammer Purgstall, *Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi-2* (İstanbul:Üçdal,1996) p.403-406. See, Celal-zade Mustafa *Selim-Name*, eds. Ahmet Uğur and Mustafa Çuhadar (Ankara:Kültür Bakanlığı,1000 Temel Eser ,1990) particularly parts 8,10,12,14 =p.70-94, 101-126; *Haydar Çelebi Ruznâmesi*, ed. Yavuz Senemoğlu (İstanbul:Tercüman) p. 37-41(the letters of *Korkud* and *Selim*)

[127] İsmail Hakkı "Sancağa Çıkartılan Osmanlı Şehzadeleri", *Belleten*, vol. 39 (1975) pp.559-696

on the prince's side. From another angle, it may be postulated that the entertaining and intellectually pleasurable *meclis* sessions distanced the princes from the day's political distress and pressure, and it was the only activity to spend their spare times .These two statements, or a concern with public image and individual leisure, are not mutually exclusive.

Bearing in mind the biased and exaggerated comments of the *nasihatnâme* authors, *Piyâle* gives the impression of having benefited financially a lot from his intimate access to *Korkud*. The archival research of *Feridun Emecen* shows that he had a considerable amount of wealth from his endowments in *Manisa*.[128]

2.3.2. İbrahim Paşa and İskender Çelebi-The Great Patrons of the Age: Composed by *Gazâlî* in his early days in *Istanbul*, *Cerr-name* (Book of the Beggar) aimed to attain the financial support of certain social groups, the short-term expectation was help for his immovables, but beyond the surface his was an attempt to come under protection of an elite household in days of his retirement. In the poem he called after *Süleyman*, "the state officers" (*erkân-ı devlet*), "the religious scholars" (*ulema*), "the polite" or "the elite" (*zarifler*) and "the pious" (*sofılar*).

As we have seen, *İskender Çelebi*, *İbrahim Paşa, Kasım Paşa* and *Mustafa Paşa*'s wife made donations to the edifice of *Gazâlî'*s gardened house and bathhouse-lodge-mosque complex.

In short time, thanks to his outstanding qualities he became a companion in the cultured conversations[129], and was admitted to the *meclis* of *İskender Çelebi* and *İbrahim Paşa*, whose home "was a material manifestation of the poetic garden wherein the talented and beautiful gathered in celebration of love, wine, music and cultured conversation. Through him and his generosity passed the power of the state."[130]

Noted above, he was conferred on considerable amount of money from the palace for his literary pieces, but there is no evidence that he was invited to the sultanic *meclis*.

---

[128] Feridun Emecen, *XVI. Asırda Manisa Kazası* (Ankara:TTK,1989) p.106,180

[129] *"…Vesâyit-i fezâyil birle nice selatin ü vüzerâ ve müluk u ümerâ ile sohbet etmiş ve mecâli-i 'izâma dahil olmış idi."* (Latîfî, p. 712)

[130] Walter G. Andrews, "Literary Art of the Golden Age.The Age of Süleymân", in *Süleymân the Second and His Time,*eds. Cemal Kafadar and Halil İnalcık (İstanbul: ISIS Press, 1993) p.365

2.3.3. Among the Learned Men in the 16th century Istanbul: *Gazâlî* settled in *Beşiktaş* upon his arrival to the capital. His preference for this district was not out of the blue; *Beşiktaş* of the age was populated by, and the melting pot of people from different social and professional backgrounds- sailors, shopkeepers, tavern owners, famous "beloveds", retired scholars, poets and state elite.

Mehmed II.'s policy of renovating and repopulating the city invigorated the social and economic life in *Galata* and on the northern shores of the Golden Horn, all along *Kasımpaşa*, *Beşiktaş* and *Fındıklı*; *"İstanbul Haslar Kazası Defteri"* dating from 904/1498-1499 shows that in *Beşiktaş*, *Akıntıburnu*, *Ayofoka (Ortaköy)* and *Maçoka (Maçka)* share-cropping, garden culture and vineyards were prime activities. *Beşiktaş* was also a centre of velvet weavers, millers, bakers, wax producers, slaughter houses, and other petite investors. The Muslim, Armenian, Greek and Jewish communities inhabited *Köyiçi*, the heart of commerce in *Beşiktaş*. In the reign of *Bayezid* II, the seashore residences were built for the Ottoman master captains in the area stretching from *Beşiktaş Bahçesi* to *Hayreddin* Seaport. From the last decade of the 15th century onwards, the Empire's naval forces were anchored on the shores of this village. *Süleyman* I established a summer palace behind *Beşiktaş Bahçesi*. When we come to the 17th and 18th centuries, the recreational grounds, suburban gardens and seashore kiosks of the sultans and the imperial women had shaped the topography and everyday life in *Beşiktaş* district. This part of the city had been a residence for the retired scholars, and those who gave up such a career and made a new fortune.[131]

The letters that *Gazâlî* wrote from Mecca, some time between 1532 and 1535, further illuminates the circles he belonged to in Istanbul than his years in his new place of resignation. With a move from the letter trafficking between *Gazâlî*, *Zati*, *Rumi* and *Kâtib Cafer Çelebi*, I add up of explicit references made in these series of epistolary verses to real or imagery personalities, and classify the men that *Gazâlî* was likely to have befriended on the basis of their social background:

1. *Haşimî, Mevlevî, Nakşibendî seyyits*/dervishes and followers, *Hüseynî*s and "Anatolian saints" (*Rum Erenleri*)[132]

[131] *Dünden Bugüne Beşiktaş*, ed. Nuri Akbayar (İstanbul:Tarih Vakfı & Büyükşehir Beşiktaş Belediyesi, 1998) consult "Osmanlı Dönemi", p.17-24

[132] Murtazâ-zâde mir-i mülket-i Necd (Haşimi) p. 229 and footnote 25, Gubâri (Nakşibendi) p. 232 and footnote 50; "Rum erenleri" p. 243, "Mevlevi vü Hüseynler" p. 243, Günay Kut (Alpay) "Gazâlî'nin Mekke'den İstanbul'a Yolladığı Mektup ve Ona Yazılan Cevaplar", *TDAY Belleten*,vol.2 (1973-1974)

2. The small shopkeepers and petite investors; "perfumer", "incense dealer", "confectioner", "barkeeper", "shoemaker", "geomancer", "goldsmith", "prickle/vinegar- maker" (*attar*, *buhurcu, şekerci ,meyhaneci ,ayakkabıcı, remilci ,kuyumcu, sirkeci/turşucu*) [133]
3. The *ulema* of upper ranks; ("*şeyhülislam*", *"kadı", "müfti"*)[134]
4. The men of various formal positions (*"hazine kâtibi"*, *"kethüda", "kapıkulu"*, *"mukaatacı"*, *"tersane emini"*, *"matbah emini"*, *"divan kâtibi"*, *"silahdâr kâtibi"*)[135]
5. Musicians (*kemençedâr*)[136]
6. People from Slavic, Greek, and Tatar communities[137]
7. The *"nüdema"* of the princes and the elite patrons[138]
8. Poets[139]

---

[133] Yâ'kûb (Buhurcu) p. 229, Keşfî(Buhurcu) p. 232/footnote 47, Rahîkî(Attar/Şerbetçi) p. 238/ footnote 86, Kandî (Şekerci) p. 232/footnote 46, Zati (Ayakkabıcı-Remilci) p. 245, Bahşı (Turşucu-Sirkeci) p. 233, Efo (Meyhaneci) p. 247, Yâdigâr (Kuyumcu) p. 229

[134] Şeyhülislam Hamitli Abdülkadir Çelebi Efendi ("Kadiri-i pür iktidar") p. 227 and footnote 16, Muhyiddin Mehmet el-Fenari ("Muhyi-i din ü şer' efendi") p. 227 and footnote 15; Şeyh Kemalpaşazade Ahmet Şemsettin Efendi ("Müfti-i kamilü'l- 'ayâr") p. 228 and footnote 17, Şeyh Sâdi Sadullah Çelebi ("Hâkim-i şehr Sa'di-i Es'ad") p. 228 and footnote 18; Urcunzâde Mevlâna Muhittin Mehmet ("İbn-i 'Urcûn Hatîb") p. 241 and footnote 97: Günay Kut (Alpay) "Gazâlî'nin Mekke'den İstanbul'a Yolladığı Mektup ve Ona Yazılan Cevaplar", *TDAY Belleten*,vol.2 (1973-1974). Derviş Çelebi was a "kadı". ('Âşık Çelebi/Gökyay- I) p. 455

[135]Çeşte Bali (İbrahim Paşa kethüdası) p.228 and footnote 21, Emânî(İbrahim Paşa hazine kâtibi) p. 229 and footnote 27, Bini-zâde (Hazine kâtibi) p. 229 and footnote 28, Kara Bali oğlı (mukaatacı) p. 230 and footnote 35, 'Ârifî (kapıkulu) p. 231 and footnote 41, Körce Velî (tershane emini) p. 233, Efşancı (Sultan Mehmet mütevellisi) p. 228 and footnote 22, Bursalı Muhasebeci Ahmed Çelebi (Divan kâtibi) p. 230 and footnote 38, Haydar (defterdar) p. 240 and footnote 96, Seydi Beg (nişancı) p. 236 and footnote 68, Rüstem (Rum ili kethüdası) p. 242, Koska (Muhtesib) p. 246, Nazlı Mahmûd Çelebi (defterdar) p. 235 and footnote 67: ibid. We learn from 'Âşık Çelebi that Gazâlî's friends Duhânî Bey was a "silâhdar kâtibi" and Revânî was "matbah kâtibi" in the reign of Selim I. (Âşık Çelebi/Gökyay-II) p. 26 and footnote 166.

[136] Şeh kuli-i (kemençedâr) p. 236: Günay Kut (Alpay) "Gazâlî'nin Mekke'den İstanbul'a Yolladığı Mektup ve Ona Yazılan Cevaplar", *TDAY Belleten*,vol.2 (1973-1974).

[137] In the letters he wrote from Mecca, Brother Madcap often uses some Greek and Slavic words,phrases and idioms: "horuz oynamak", "dovoyka", "pıravda", "takumi buğa", "kospodar" ibid., p.243 and footnotes 106-109. He also asked after some Greek,Slav and Tatar people. İbid., p. 229, 241, 247.

[138]Basirî was a companion of İskender Çelebi. ibid., p. 231 and footnote 44. Sirkeci Bahşı was probably among the companions of İskender Çelebi. ('Âşık Çelebi/Gökyay-I): p. 459. Revânî was a courtier of Selim in Trabzon; Karabâlizâde was a "mukallit" (actor) in the meclis of İskender Çelebi. and ('Âşık Çelebi/Gökyay-II): p. 26 and footnote 166, p. 30 and footnote 194

[139] Mahremî and Nazmî were a part of *Türkçe-i Basit* Movement; Basirî famous for his "hezelliyat"; Hayali Bey. Günay Kut (Alpay) "Gazâlî'nin Mekke'den İstanbul'a Yolladığı Mektup ve Ona Yazılan Cevaplar", *TDAY Belleten*,vol.2 (1973-1974): p. 232, footnotes 48 and 55; p. 231 and footnote 44; p. 231 and footnote 40

On holidays, *Gazâlî* and his cultured friends used to get together and held their own *meclis* in "garden" of Sirkeci *Bahşı*, a friend from old days.

I put a question mark on the name of *Bahşı* which is most likely a pseudonym. It may be a derivation of "*baksi*" which means *"shaman"/ "kam"*, another insinuation for *Gazâlî*'s connection to the heterodox (in particular, *Kalenderî*) circles. Or else, it may be rooted in the Ottoman word *"bahş etmek"*; it might have been given to him by his *meclis* companions, because of the "intoxicating" and "transcending" pleasures that his garden promising.

'Âşık Çelebi tells an amusing anecdote about this ex-scholar: He originally came from *Bursa*, too. During his younger days as a *medrese* student he was constantly drunk and disorderly. When the *Zelzele-i Sugra* (the Lesser Quake)[140] suddenly hit, and destroyed large parts of the city in 915/1509-1510, he was sipping wine, and got drunk out of his mind at the *medrese* of the Mosque of *Fatih Sultan Mehmed*. As the building shook, he climbed into the window niche and cowered there with terror. After this nightmarish experience, he decided to repent his evil ways, gave up striving after power and position, and moved to *Beşiktaş* which was then a village up to the Bosphorus. *'Âşık Çelebi* says that he was a *molla* with 100 aspers salary, when he suddenly left the scholarly career behind.

While he was a student and a heavy drinker, *Bahşi* had acquired a taste for pickles (*turşu*). He always deposited a couple of bowls of pickles in his room, where his drinking friends would gather and snack on pickles to fight their hangover. *Bahşi* gave up drinking, and started to indulge in coffee, but he invested in pickle business. One plot of his *Beşiktaş* garden was allocated to the fruits of sweet varieties, another to the sour, and yet another plot to the "vinegar factory" (*sirke kârhânesi*) from which his nickname "Vinegar Maker" (*Sirkeci*) came. There, he employed *'acemi oğlan*s (slave pages and janissaries in training), and produced copious amounts of highly prized vinegar. His

---

[140] ('Âşık Çelebi/Gökyay-I): p. 458. Walter G. Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı give the date of *Zelzele-i Sugra* as 14 September 1510. *The Age of Beloveds:Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society* (Durham & London: Duke Univ.Press, 2005): p. 107. I couldn't find any information about an earthquake that hit Istanbul on 14 September. Moreover, the date is not given in the facsmile of *Tezkere of Âşık Çelebi*, ed. Owens Meredith (Cambridge:E.J.W. Gibb Memorial,1971, p. 294a) This "Lesser Quake" was probably an aftershock of September 1509 quake, one of the largest and most decisive earthquakes of the last five centuries in the Eastern Mediterranean. Another possibility is that it was another large earthquake which hit Istanbul on July 10 1510, and destroyed 1500 houses in the city. Consult, N.N. Ambrassey and C.F. Finkel *The Seismicity of Turkey and Adjacent Areas: A Historical Review, 1500-1800* (İstanbul: Eren, 1995) p. 37-43

cucumber (*hıyar*) and beet prickles (*çüküdür turşusu*), the beverage prepared from vinegar and honey (*sirkenceb*) and *helva* were famous. He was known to be a very good cook. His customers were pregnant women longing for sweet and sour, tavern keepers, the heavy-drinkers and the opium and *berş* addicts. When *Barbaros Hayreddin* became his neighbour in *Beşiktaş*, the Ottoman fleet would order vinegar for their stocks in the ships.[141] He was not the only man who had developed a refined garden pleasure. For instance, a foundation manager called *Efşancı* owned a beautiful hyacinth garden. I reckoned that it was another favourite spot for parties.[142]

The garden entertainment had multiple facets among which there were "music" (*mûsikî*), "dancing" (*köçeklik/çengilik*) and "story-telling" (*kıssa-hânlık*), feasts, cultured conversation, and enjoying the company of "the heart thief" (*dilber*).[143] Music (*musiki*), "algebra" (*hisap*), "natural and medical sciences" (*cüziyyat*), Arabic and Koran interpretation were spelled out among the specialties of this coterie. They were potential topics to be discussed in their cultured conversation. They also liked playing games such as inventing secret alphabets, fortune-telling and challenging each other by composing *nazire*s. *Gazâlî*'s poetic fights with *Revâni* and *Duhâni Bey*s find way through 'Âşık Çelebi's account.[144]

Gazâlî in his letters addresses some names, such as *Alî Balî*[145] who was to a great possibility one of the most most admired beloveds of the age, and joining their sessions most of the time. 'Âşık Çelebi says the following stanza to give a more accurate picture of these intimate parties:

> "Ehl-i aşka çün gıdâ-yı can gerek
> Onlara olmaz et ve ekmek kayısı
> Besdürür şevk-ı zekan, kûy-ı dehen
> Ekmek ayvası ve et şeftalüsü"[146]

[141] 'Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay-I) p.458-460

[142] 'Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay/II) p. 28 and footnote *

[143] Consult, G. Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı , *The Age of Beloveds:Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society* (Durham & London: Duke Univ.Press, 2005) p.106-147

[144] 'Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay/II) p. 26-27

[145] Günay Kut (Alpay) "Gazâlî'nin Mekke'den İstanbul'a Yolladığı Mektup ve Ona Yazılan Cevaplar", *TDAY Belleten*,vol.2 (1973-1974) p. 229 and footnote 23

[146] 'Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay-I) ,p.459

Easily seen, in the last couplet he utilizes a tropology echoing the sensual/sexual aura of the party; *"ekmek ayvası"* and *"et şeftalüsü"* stand for the beloved's chin and lips, enough to satisfy the actual hunger of his lover.

Since the gatherings in *Sirkeci Bahşı*'s garden were intimate and even "erotic" and the conversations were "cultured", it was not a place proper for everyone. The wise, the poet-scholars and the beloveds were "included", and 'Âşık Çelebi defines those "excluded" from the garden revellers. All "the mean and despicable" (*alçak ve mayası bozuk kimseler*) were kept far from the skirts of the rose garden like "evil eye" (*kem göz*), and "the common and ignorant" (*ayak takımı ve bilgisizler*) were exiled from this meadow gathering like the envious gaze.[147]

The commercial exchanges also lingered in this friendly circle; *Hasan Bey*, a sailor wounded in Rhodes campaign, paid 2000 aspers and presented a piece of green cloth (*yeşil sofu*) to *Gazâlî* for a chronogram.[148]

The taverns scattered in *Sütlüce*, *Üsküdar*, *Galata* and *Beşiktaş*, and the small shops belonging to some of these men were among their favourite addresses. The shops owned by *Gazâlî*'s best friends functioned as literary *salon*s, where the young volunteers were educated and instructed in poetry. *Zati* had a small shop in the courtyard of *Bayezid* Mosque. He sold Koran, books, "fragrances" (*anber, misk*) etc. He was also engaged in fortune-telling and "marketing" his poems. The scholars, literature-lovers, dilettante and professional poets were meeting in the shop after prayers. It was a school for young beginners. The renowned poet of the 16th century, *Baki* had been a student of *Zati*, too.[149]

2.3.4. Gazâlî and the Elite of Mecca: Brother Madcap continued to give "banquets" (*ziyâfet, ziyâfet-i ikrâm*) and take pleasure in "cultured conversation" (*mu'aşeret ve musahabet*) in the garden of his house in Mecca. His guests were "the elite and refined Arabs" and "the poets" of the city (*...efâzıl ve meşayih-i 'Arab ve emsâl-i ahsâb-ı fazl-ı edibden ve ba'zı ekâbir...*). Death even found him while he was in

[147] ibid. ,p. 460

[148] 'Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay-I) ,p.29

[149] Günay Kut "The Classical Period in Turkish Literature", in *the Ottoman Civilization- II*, eds. Halil İnalcık and Günsel Renda (Ankara:Kültür Bakanlığı, 2000) p.531-532; Âgah Sırrı Levend, Edebiyat Tarihi (İstanbul: Kanat Yayınları, 1939) p. 140

the middle of a *meclis* (*meclis-i zendgân*) with his new friends.[150] The *tezâkîr* don't give any clues to understand the nature of these gatherings, and how different they were from the ones *Gazâlî* enjoyed in Istanbul.

[150] Kınalızâde,p. 725; Beliğ(Atlansoy), p. 237; Âli, p.252

CHAPTER III

"THE REPELLER OF SORROW AND REMOVER OF ANXIETY"- ON ITS STRUCTURE&GENRE:

3.1: Basic structure and organization of Dafi'ü'l Gumûm*:* After an Introduction (Mukaddime) DG is divided into seven chapters (bâbs). The individual chapters dwell on certain themes and subjects; they define different sexual practices, and include related anecdotes and vocabulary, and poems that carry the penname, Gazâlî. These poetic sub-sections both filter the author's subjective point of view, and remind the reader of the gist of each anecdote. A section named Apologia (Fi'l-i'tizâr) concludes the work.

A summary of chapters are given below, in order:

1. The main topic is "the virtues of marriage and benefits of "conjugality" (*fezâ'il-i munâkehât ve fevâyid-i mucâma'ât*). The chapter concerns the practical and social benefits of marriage, and emphasizes wedding act as a form of union that protects men against sinful liaisons (adultery and pederasty). The author weighs the pros and cons of marrying virgin girls or widow women. The chapter closes with a strong denial of marriage imposing limits over freedom of men. It is also a defence of living a bachelor's life.
2. An allegorical war between "pederasts" and "womanizers" takes place (*"gulâm-pâre yârânlar ve zen-pâre birâderlerün mâbeyninde olan munâzarât ve*

mufâhirât…"). The pederasts take offence at the comments of the womanizers and provoke a war. Satan intervenes and convinces them to have a verbal duel in order to prevent a disastrous war among his followers. As the plot unfolds, they take sides in a dispute over the favourable parts of body, and compare "ass" (or man) and "pussy" (or woman). The winning party is the pederasts at the end of the day, and a treaty is reached. The term of the agreement is that they will enjoy all the illegitimate boys born of adulterous relationships.

3. The main topic is "the pleasure in the company of beautiful lads with cypress stature and tulip cheeks" (*serv-kadd pûserlerün ve lâle-hadd dilberlerün letâfet-i musâhabeti…*). The author classifies the pederasts on the basis of their choice of beloveds (whether they prefer youngsters or adults). He provides a catalogue of postures applicable in male-to-male sex. Many stories are related; they are all screened in different contexts (university, wine party, small shops, bathhouses, dervish lodge, and private households).
4. The main topic is "the sweetness of sexual intercourse with women with silver bodies and girls with jasmine bosoms"(*sîm-ten zenlerün ve semen-ber duhterlerün halâvet-i mucâma'âtı…*). The author warns about women possessing different psychological temperament and physical characteristics. He mostly tells the stories of "dissatisfied" women habiting lovers, and masturbating with "dildo" (*zıbık*).
5. The main topic is "masturbation", "nocturnal emissions", and "bestiality" (*calk ü ihtilâm, vaty-ı hayvân*). The author includes stories about self-eroticism, nocturnal emissions and intercourse with a wide array of animals from elephants to lice. He furnishes us with a mock-vocabulary of masturbation techniques. His own position is clearly expressed that, bestiality is the worst of all sexual practices, and he advises his readers not to eat the meat of the animal involved.
6. The main topic is the acts of "queers", "hermaphrodites" and "transvestites" (*rencûrlar*, *muhannesler*, *mülevvesler*). The chapter begins with a pseudo-scientific/mock explanation for passive homosexuality. The main point loosely links to the second chapter, in which Satan allows the party of pederasts to abuse the children of adulterous relationships. Apparently, these children are the ones who end up as *rencür*s. It slightly touches upon the subject of hermaphrodism in a single anecdote.
7. The main topic is "pimps" (*gidiler, mu'arrâslar, püzevenkler, hâcî-analar*). The author describes the refined forms of the profession. While the *hâcî-analar* act as

intermediary between the married woman/virgin girls and their lovers, the *gidiler* supply prostitutes, and cheat young men looking for a girl to marry.

The introductory section opens with a formulaic acknowledgment of the tellers of graphic stories of olden times; and the author extols his patron *Piyâle Bey*, referencing him as an inspiration for the work. It continues with a list of sources in Arabic and Persian that were utilized in composition of the work:

1. Kitâb-ı felek al-ma'ânî
2. Kitâb ruşd al-bîb fî mu'âmelât al-habîb
3. Hezeliyyât-ı Aynî
4. Fuhşiyyât-ı 'Ubayd-i Zâkânî
5. Kitâb-ı alfîyya salfîyye

The Ottoman biographers cite the satires of *'Ubayd-i Zakani* and *Hakîm Ezrakî* as the "prototype" of *Gazâlî*'s work. *Zakani* came from Qazvin to the court of Shiraz, and the last forty years of his life coincided with the reigns of Shah Abu Ishaq, later year Mubarez al-Din Mohammed (1313-1357) and his son Shah Shoja' (1357-1384). Leaving aside his eulogies and ghazels written for the contemporary kings and their ministers, the *tezakir* may refer as *"fuhşiyyat"* to the sum of *Zakani*'s masnawi named *'Ushshaq-Nama* (The Book of Lovers), *'Rish-nama'* (The Book of the Beard) which is a fantastic dialogue between the author and the beard considered as the destroyer of youthful beauty, *'The Joyous Treatise'* that is a collection of satirical anecdotes, and *'The Treatise of One Hundred Maxims'* which is a book of counsels.[151] *Ezrakî* composed *Kitâb-ı alfîyya salfîyye* in the first half of the 12th century for his patron *Tuğrul* Shah. It is an illustrated book about the story of a woman who makes love to 1000 men, as a remedy for the impotence of *Tuğrul*'s nephew *Doğan (Togan)* Shah, the governor of Nishapur.[152]

Gazâlî says to have combined stories from this written tradition with the most ornate, tasteful, colourful and sensual oral stories and legends popular at the time as "fucking and jacking off " (*sikişde ve calkda*), and organized them into a structure using stylistic devices and rhetorical arts.

---

[151]'Obeyd-e Zakani *The Ethics of Aristocrats and Other Satirical Works*, trans. Hasan Javadi, Middle Eastern Studies (11) (Jahan Books Co. : 1985) p. 9

[152]Sehi (İsen), p.161; Âli, p.250; Gibb, p.31, footnote 2; Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay-I) p. 452 and footnote 10; Beliğ (Atlansoy), p.238

In his establishment of DG's edition, Kuru uses four manuscript copies. The autograph copy presented to *Piyâle Bey* in *Manisa*, and the copies consulted by the contemporary biographers of *Gazâlî* are missing. It is possible that the original copy might have been in the personal library of *Piyâle*. However, it might have been also found among the books of *Korkud* delivered to the *Topkapı Palace Library* where they were kept during the flight of the prince from the castle of *Manisa*[153]. The earliest manuscript used by Kuru is dated from 1629-1630, more than a century after the work was written. The other copies are from 1834-1835 and 1821-1822, suggesting that the book continued to be copied well into to the 19th century.

3.2. Discussions on the genre of DG: The 16th century biographers and the modern specialists of the Turkish literature classify DG as *"hezeliyyât"* (jests, pleasantries, satires, bawdy talks).[154] *Hezl* is to mock, satirize and ridicule someone.[155] *Tehzil* is to compose a new poem, copying a well-known poet's rhyme and rhythm. The *tehzil*s written by different poets were collected in the *"hezeliyyât mecmuası"*. The *tehzil* is expected to be subtle, keen and witty in its critic for the existing institutions, people and general condition of the things. As a literary art, *hezl* is placed between *nükte*/ *latîfe* and *hiciv* in a chain continuing with stronger and more acerbic satirical forms (*şetm, kadh* etc.).[156] Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı discuss *hezl* in the context of the long history of indecent and pornographic writing in the literary tradition inherited by the Ottomans. *Hezl* is one of those forms variously known as *mucun*

[153] İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı "II İnci Bayezid'in Oğullarından Sultan Korkut", *Belleten*, XXX, No. 120, Ekim 1966, p. 601

[154]Zeki *Pakalın Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü* (MEB:1993) p. 802; *İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Diyanet), vol. 17, p.304-306; Günay Kut "The Classical Period in Turkish Literature", in the Ottoman Civilization ,vol.2 (Ankara:Kültür Bakanlığı, 2000) p.566-567

[155]Günay Kut includes DG, *Sihâm-ı Kaza* (Arrows of fate) by *Nef'î*, *Tezkiretü'ş-Şu'arâ* by *Güftî Ali*, *Şehr-engîz* by *Fehîm-i Kadîm* and Mütâyebât (with the *Kastamonu* dialect) by Abdülhalîm Galib Paşa in this genre (Günay Kut, ibid. , pp.566-567). *İshak Çelebi* (ö.944/1537), *Nihâlî Câfer Çelebi*, *Nev'îzâde Atâî*, *Bahâî-i Küfrî*, *Hevâî*, *OsmanzâdeTâib*, *Tırsî İbrâhim*, *Kânî*, *Seyyid Osman Sürûrî*, *Süleyman Fâik*, *Bayburtlu Zihni* are the Ottoman poets who made a collection (*"mecmua"*) of their *hezel*s. *Edirneli Güftî* in his *Teşrîfâtü'ş-şuarâ* tells about 106 poets in sytle of mockery (*İslam Ansiklopedisi*/Diyanet, p. 306)

[156] Mine Mengi "Divan Şiirinde Yergi Amaçlı Söz Sanatları", *JTS*, XX (1996): p.126-132; Âgah Sırrı Levend "Divan Edebiyatında Gülmece ve Yergi", *TDAY Belleten* (1970), p. 37-45; *İslam Ansiklopedisi* (Diyânet) ibid.

(impudence, brazenness), *sahf* (deficiency in judgment), *habisat* (impure, wicked things), and tales, anecdotes and verses such as those recounted by Brother Madcap.[157]

Gazâlî fabricated a work on sexuality which achieves a balance of descriptions of sexual acts, explanations of special vocabulary, related poems and anecdotes, and informative statements. It is embedded into a plurality of literary styles and discourses:

1. The pseudo-scientific discourses; the author employs the ancient theory of bodily fluids (*"Ahlat-ı Erbaa"*) in explaining the benefits of sexuality. His thesis says that copulation corrupts humours, and diminishes morbid matters; it drives phlegmatic diseases away, and repels sanguine morbid states.[158] He also takes in some popular claims and common sense assumptions for sexuality: The explanation for queerness and transvestism in DG is that, when the sperms of a young pubescent boy enter the womb of a woman or the ass of a boy, a worm appears. It feeds on sperm. Whenever it is hungry, it starts moving, and to relieve one's self from this movement one must copulate.[159] On the other hand, *Gazâlî* attacks the justification of a group of pederasts who makes sex to blacks and Abyssinians. They say that "Abyssinian hot assholes" are good for back-pain.[160]
2. The poetic convention of the "lover-beloved-guard/obstacle" (*aşık -maşuk-rakib/ engel*); the spiritual, platonic and hopeless love pattern is a trope to narrate the mood of the man sought solace in homosexual encounter in DG.
3. The genre of instruction manual (*bahnâme*) and moral treatise; the author remains loyal to the formal appearance of an Islamic moral book. In Apologia, it is stated that the reader shouldn't think that the book's purpose is to induce sexual passion; the bawdy stories in the book provide the knowledge of blasphemy and disobedience. Those who have had a look at them can tell truth from sin, and repel the diabolical suggestions from their heart and prepare for the Day of Judgement at every moment. Pretending to be a manual like *the Perfumed Garden* of Nafzawi, the anecdotal body is interrupted by sporadic instructive remarks. He provides the reader with "mock"-lists: The most favoured positions of homosexual intercourse are, "doggy style" (*sikiş-i çâr-*

[157] Walter G. Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı *The Age of Beloveds:Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society* (Durham & London: Duke Univ.Press, 2005) p. 131

[158] DG(Kuru), p. 47-48

[159] ibid. ,p. 138

[160] ibid. ,p. 81

pâ), "the dome of pleasure" (*kubbetu'l- 'ıyş*), "the fountain head" (*şadırvânî*), "horseback riding" (*esb-suvârî*), "kick work" (*çifte- kârî*), "the blender" (*sikiş-i gırbâlî*), and "side-kick" (*sikiş-i yanbegi*). Elsewhere, different masturbatory techniques are mentioned; these are "femoral masturbation" (*calk-i fahzî*), "watery masturbation" (*calk-âbî*), "masturbation with mirror" (*calk-ı mirâtî*), and "Western-style masturbation" (*calk-ı Frengî*).

4. The standard proceedings of Islamic legal discussions are imitated; the scholarly pederasts are commenting upon details of sexual encounter with young boys in their fatwas.
5. The models from the Middle Eastern literatures; the allegorical war between man-chasers and woman-chasers in the second chapter is apparently a derivation of the *Rangstreit* literature that became significant during the early heyday of the Abbasids, and continued to be fashionable throughout the Muslim Middle Ages. The comparisons of the virtues of the rose and the narcissus, the debates between the sword and the pen, between the East and the West, between poetry and prose, between *dirham* and *dinar* between Arabs and non-Arabs, between Cairo and Damascus, and between girls and beardless boys concerning their respective merits are a few of the relevant topics pursued by the Muslim litterateurs. It is said to have furnished an outlet for a relativist view of life contrasting with the dominant absolutism of religious dogma and practice, together with the widespread preference of the age's moralists for pointing out dichotomy of good and bad inherent in almost everything.[161] *Zakânî*'s satirical anecdotes and Nefzawi's *the Perfumed Garden* furnish significant parallels with *Gazâlî*'s humour.
6. The themes predominant in popular idioms and jokes of the day (*Zatî* and *Nasreddin Hoca*) share in common the same themes.

The biographers take different positions toward the work the content of which seems transgrassive today. Mustafa Âli is so inclined to DG. He argues that it is a novel work, and it has already far surpassed his predecessors (*Zakânî* and *Besâtî*[162]) lagging behind in this genre.

[161] Franz Rosenthal "Male and Female: Described and Compared", in eds. Everett Rowson and J.W. Wright,Jr. *Homoeroticism in Classical Arab Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997) pp. 24-54

[162] A poet from Semerkand . 'Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay-II), p. 24 and footnote 151

He highly esteemed *Gazâlî*'s couplets and quatrains in the work, and quotes a lyric poem which is famous for its originality (*"bikr-i mazmun"*) among them:

> Gâh olur kim açılur gül gibi handandür b[ü]z[ü]k.
> (Sometimes it opens like a smiling rose, the anus)
> Gâh olur gonca-dehen dem-beste hayrândur b[ü]z[ü]k.
> (Sometimes it closes, becomes a rosebud lip in wonder, the anus)
> A[m] kasık gibi kısık yirde yapılmış hânedür
> (The vagina is a house built in a narrow place like the crotch)
> Ana nisbet kündür oynatmalı meydandur b[ü]z[ü]k.
> (In comparison, it is in a plaza where one plays boccie ball, the anus) "[163]

For Âli, "reading it incites a pleasure comparing with orgasm" (*Kırâ'atı inzâl zevkine ba'is bir lezzet-i pür-sürûr ferhat nümûndur.*)[164]. He says another favourite couplet of his in the book:

> "Ey Gazâlî borcum olsun bulıcak bir turfa a[m]
> (Oh, Gazâlî it is my promise/debt that, when I find a fresh vagina,)
> Ni'met-i vuslatdan evvel ana burnum bandıram
> (Before the blessing moment of union, I should poke my nose into it) "[165]

As a literary critique, 'Âşık Çelebi prefers DG over *Zakânî*, *Besâtî*[166], *Beyâzı*[167], *Sûzenî*[168] and *Ibn Yemîn*[169], in the valley of *hezl*.

Latîfî considers the expressions of *Gazâlî* "rejoicing and cheering up" (*...meserret-fezâ ve ferah-zedâ ta'birât ile...*), and describes the book as "joy-exciting and mingled with pleasure" (*...kitâb-ı neşât-engîz ve cerîde-i zevk-âmiz...*).[170]

The biographers' comments on DG are a key to what different "readings" that the text might have been subjected to; they put emphasis not on the "funny" side but on the "sexually stimulating", "pleasure- inflaming" potential. We also learn that, they are familiar to the lampoons of Persian poets, suggestive of the literary taste and reading

---

[163] Âli, p. 249

[164] ibid., p. 249

[165] ibid., p. 250

[166] Look at, footnote 147

[167] A poet from Persia, his *hicivs* are well-known. 'Âşık Çelebi (Gökyay-II) ,p. 24 and footnote 153

[168] A Persian poet, a predecessor of Zakânî, he is famous for his verses and *hicivs*. ('Âşık Çelebi ibid., p. 24 and footnote 155)

[169] A Turkish poet from Persia (1286-1368). ('Âşık Çelebi ibid., p. 24 and footnote 156)

[170] Latîfî , p. 410

habits of the age. For instance, Mustafa Âli in *Mevâ'idü'n Nefâis*, on the subject of the witty persons who possess a modicum of talent for poetry to satirize others of their class from head to toe, compares *Ubeyd Zâkânî* to the *Melâmî* dervishes, *Molla Siyâhî* of *Aydın* known for his book of facetiae (*hezeliyyat*).[171] We understand that, he was a continuous reader of Arabic, Persian and Turkish satires.

Sehi and Beliğ stand on the other pole; Sehi deems *Gazâlî*'s lampoons as so ugly that it is impossible for the heart not to be disgusted by them. He says that since putting such lampoons into his clean book is improper, he quotes nothing of that sort. Although he says to be repulsed by Brother Madcap's work, he admits that his work is successful in its use of stylistic devices in verses and in the rhetoric.[172]

Beliğ tells that *Gazâlî* himself started to buy the copies of his lampoon (*"hezel-âmiz"*), which was not acceptable and likeable from the standards of his day, buy 1 filöri. However, all the extant copies couldn't be destroyed.[173]

The Western view on such mock-sex treatises and manuals has been intrinsically "ambivalent". In the translations of Asian and Islamicate erotic sources made into European languages, it is appreciated that the aim of these ancient sexual manuals is primarily the inculcation of healthy sexual attitude and practice as well as the promotion of happy and contended marriages. The Easterners present love as in a sense a sacrament, and looks upon the sexual act not only as a means to "procreation", but also as a "healthy, even a healing pleasure". On its highest and purest level they regard coition virtually as an act of worship; orgasm symbolizes the ecstasy of the soul possessed by, or in union with God, even though it yet remained imprisoned within the confines of the flesh. They developed an affectionate consideration and highly refined art of love, each based upon a reverence for "religion, marriage, and family life". Sexual technique is encouraged as a natural means towards the happiness of the individual, the stability of the home, and not least, the achievement of that union symbolic of the unity of the Divine.

The Orientalist discourse says that, in contradiction, the Christian mind which for centuries associated sexuality with shame and filth no way reflecting the divine wisdom and wholesome teachings of Jesus. The educational system in the West grossly ignores

[171] Âli (Brookes), p. 151-153; Âli (Şeker) , p. 384-385

[172] Sehi(İsen), p. 161

[173] Beliğ (Atlansoy), p.238

that branch of knowledge tree aided by long series of volumes, written by learned physiologists, men of social standing and religious dignitaries in high office. Such attitude has entailed untold miseries upon individuals, families and generations. On the other hand, the translators are more cautious to the "coarseness of language and humour" characterizing the texts; they argue that the literary products of a "more outspoken age" may offend the taste of the present time.[174]

Antoine Galland in the memoirs of his stay in Istanbul between 1672 and 1673 relates that he saw a book in *Bedesten*, and he was informed that the name of this ugly and immoral book was *Deli Birader.*[175] Interestingly, Kuru argues that although *Galland* did not record his purchase of the book, he probably made an acquisition of a commercial copy for Bibliothéque Royale.[176]

Joseph Freiherr von- Hammer Purgstall in his history of Ottoman poetry (1837) makes a comparison of Brother Madcap to the Italian poet *Aretino* (1492-1556). *Aretino* barely escaped punishment for the sonnets that he published on sixteen sexual positions by taking refuge in Florence. This happened in 1524, approximately ten years after the composition of DG. Though Hammer-Purgstall condemns DG as offensive, he finds its formal aspects perfect.[177]

Elias John Wilkinson Gibb advocates the same attitude in his translation of the famous Turkish story cycle, *the History of Forty Vezirs*, dedicated to a *Sultan Mustafa*. He makes the excuse, that being products of an unspoken age, many of the tales are of a character that is contrary to the taste of the present and as offensive to the modern Ottoman as to the modern English reader, for transliterating three stories into Latin script (but not translating or publishing them in Arabic script). [178]

---

[174] Rana Kabbani *Europe's Myths of Orient, Devise and Rule* (London: Pandora Press, 1988); *The Perfumed Garden of the Shaykh Nefzawi*, trans. Sir Richard Burton, ed. with an Introduction and Additional Notes by Alan Hull Walton (London: Book Club Associates,1963) p.7-57

[175]Antoine Galland *İstanbul'a Ait Günlük Hâtıralar (1672-1673)*, trans. Nâhid Sırrı Örik, vol. 1 (Ankara:TTK, 1949) p. 46 and footnote 43

[176]DG (Kuru), p. 35

[177] Joseph Freiherr von- Hammer Purgstall *Geschichte der Osmanichen Dichtung bis auf unsere Zeit* (Pest: C.A. Hartleben, 1837) p. 189-199, cited in DG (Kuru) p. 25

[178] History of the Forty Vezirs or the Story of the Forty Morns and Eves, written in Turkish by Sheykhzada, trans. E.J.W. Gibb (London:Luzac, 1886) p. viii – xxii The book is available in Turkish, now: Kırk Vezir Hikayeleri, ed. Tahir Hafızoğlu (İstanbul: Selis Kitap, 2002)

3.3. Gazâlî & Humour: The multi-generic composition of DG mimicking the formal features of different genres challenges modern scholar trying to craft a consistent strategy for textual analysis.

It may be one alternative to take on a "Foucauldian-genealogical" perspective. *Michel Foucault* clarifies his effort in *History of Sexuality*, which is to treat sexuality as the correlation of a domain of knowledge (*savoir*), a type of normativity, and a mode of relation to the self; it means trying to decipher how, in Western societies, a complex experience is constituted from and around certain forms of behaviour. It is a historically singular experience that conjoins a field of knowledge (*connoissance*) (with its own concepts, theories, diverse disciplines), a collection of rules (which differentiate the permissible from the forbidden, natural from monstrous, normal from pathological, what is decent from what is not etc.), and a mode of relation between the individual and himself (which enables him to recognize himself as a sexual subject amid others).[179]

The main sources of his survey are dream books, dietetic and medical treatises, philosophical prose and rhetoric on love and spirituality, treatises about morality and ethics, and the antique drama, for the periods roughly covering the antiquity to the close of the 18th century. Following the footsteps of this canonical work and its theoretical underpinnings, instruction manuals, dream interpretations, professional medical treatises, manner books, fatwa collections, literature in general and *hezeliyyât* in particular may be considered to be a branch of the genealogy of sexual knowledge in the East across centuries. Secondly, from another perspective, the text may be envisaged in terms related to "gender", "masculinity" and "femininity", and modern approaches to "sexual identity".

Both strategies have serious pitfalls. We should forget for a minute the more general and "threatening" question of, how to measure the interface between literary representation of sexuality and real sexual acts and practices. The grand problem is whether the models and arguments derived from the Western societies had any resonance in the Ottoman context, and if they are perceptive of historically articulated social hierarchies knotted with sexual relations in the Ottoman society. In relation to this, the most important backdrop of relying on gender-based and modern "identity" theories is that, they are not promising for an understanding of how gender differences interact with other structural differences (age, class, ethnicity etc.), and how sexual

[179] Consult "Preface to The History of Sexuality Volume 2" , in ed. Paul Rabinow, *The Essential Works /Ethics*, vol.1 (Allen Lane The Penguin Press, 1997) p.199-205

identity construction become include a sense of not just "masculinity" or "femininity" but of social class, ethnicity, age and culture. However, this is not to place to discuss these methodological problems.

My principal concern in this study is "not to be blind" to the funny content of the text, and the complex interplay of humour with sexuality. I build up my reading of the text on three premises. The first is that sexuality is an instrument of "humour" in DG; while the book contains many elements from didactic prose to invective poetry, the main object remains to mock certain groups of people in an entertaining manner. The second is that *Gazâlî*'s anecdotes range from amusing stories about sexual relations and situations which are "possible" or "believable" in everyday life to descriptions of bizarre and grotesque sexual behaviours. Thus, his "humour" is not always a reflection of actual sexual dynamics and practices prevalent in his society; it manipulates them in many ways, and re-imagines them through literary and narrative hyperboles. It means that sexuality usually hands down to us in exaggerated form and as fantasy. A scrutiny of functioning of "humorous fantasy" still demands an understanding of how the lampoons touch upon the collectively shared meanings, codes and norms of sexuality. The third is that the book under question was primarily designed for the learned circles in the stage of *meclis* entertainment. On the other hand, it is perfectly reasonable for a contemporary or modern reader to respond to any literary description of sexuality and to be interested in it in diverse ways and with different motivations, to derive instruction and enlightenment from it in one way or the other, whether the work is fiction, poetry, a scientific study. Such description may be sexually stimulating, or it may be not, depending on the temperament, environment, preferences and the sense of humour of the reader. Thus, it is not possible to reduce the contact of the reader with such a text into a singular and unified experience (sexual stimulation, amusement, instruction etc.)

3.3.1. Man & Woman Compared- Man as the Female Object of Desire? : The humorous anecdotes of *Gazâlî* construct "male" and "female" as opposites: man as rational and capable of self-control, and woman as emotional and lacking self-control, particularly of sexual drives. He traces the origins of female bodily desire within the framework of Islamic cosmology, in the story of Adam and Eve who had first union in marriage and sex. The story had two sub-sections carrying complementary messages: In the first part, Almighty God, after creation, divided "the

lust for sex" into ten pieces, and placed only one of these in Adam, and he established the rest to Eve. When Adam the prophet felt this power, he wanted to unite with her, and Eve surrendering herself, consented with all her heart. She enjoyed the taste of copulation and union so much so that she told Adam that with the permission of God and in grand devotion to Him, they shouldn't be kept from such an entertainment. Here, it is recognized that, in line with the Islamic teaching, both men and women as having sexual drives and rights to sexual fulfilment. The intensity of the female lust and energy is God-given and natural-born stemming from the uneven distribution made by God.

In the second part, God ordained Gabriel the angel to discipline Eve with "the whip of modesty" (*hayâ kamçısı*). After modesty dominated Eve, whenever Adam wanted sex, she got shy and moved away. Since this manner originated in Eve, all women inherited modesty from her. If there is no modesty (*hayâ*) in a woman, this means that she has no "fear of God" (*fîtrat*) and "honesty" (*istikâmet-i cibiliyyet*); her disparaged character contaminates the children and her kin. The message is that, "modesty" is as innate as the strength of sexual desire; the women is implanted the very capacity of modest behaviour to control and limit their lust even within the legitimate sphere of marriage.[180]

The institution of marriage sets the boundary of the licit sex for the author; all other sexual behaviour is illicit. The ideal woman to marry should be a "modest" and "chaste" "virgin" (*ebkâr*). She is expected to free her husband from the burden of domestic works (cooking, doing the laundry, fixing clothes), and to keep him away from people's reproach, and establish his reputation as a trustworthy and pious man. Apart from the social and practical benefits of marriage to man, the sexual satisfaction that spouses may obtain from conjugal bond is "overemphasized". The carnal virtue of marriage is that it saves man from the refusal of favour from the beloved, the troubles of masturbation, bestiality, sodomy and adultery; the regular sexual life causes comfort, relieves exhilaration, ends the emotional dislocation, and repairs health.[181]

The maximization of this satisfaction is dependent on the woman's age, bodily slimness, facial beauty and refined behavioural conduct. The virgins that do not have any pre-marital sexual experience can't match "widows" (*seyyîbe hâtunlar*) -especially if they have "beautiful hair" (*saçı ibrişüm telli*), "white skin" (*ak tenlü)*, "tender flesh"

[180] For the whole story, DG (Kuru) ,p. 49-51 and p. 163-164. Hereafter, two series of page numbers will be given, the first is referring to the Turkish transliteration and the second is referring to the English translation of the text.

[181] ibid. ,p. 43-48 and p. 158-162

(*yumşak bodunlu*), "tall as cypress posture" (*serv kadd*) , "tulip-like cheeks" (*lâle hadd*), "peanut-size lips" (*puste leb*), "silver double chin" (*sîb gabgab*) - in serving, valuing their man, and obeying his wishes in an "unlimited" way with patience.[182]

The womanhood of those with ugly disposition and the old is condemned through depiction of their nauseating vagina that is liquid like oatmeal, colder than ice, and deep as caves.[183] The freshness and beauty of the virgins lasts from the age of ten to twenty.[184] Any women is at first called "bride" (*gelin*), when she gives birth for the first time she is called "auntie bride" (*gelin bûlâ*), after the second delivery the bride part is dropped and she is called "auntie" (*bûlâ*). By the third delivery she becomes a "respected female" (*hâtun gişi*), then by the fourth and fifth, she is called a "crone" (*karı*). The crone's beauty has all gone, and the defiled part of her body has remained.[185] In the text, the femininity congeals in the female body, and the woman is identified with the "vagina" that "vomits blood", and the pleasure it gives in time loosens with childbirth. Nonetheless, though there are no girls, brides and crones that do not have an inclination for men, in the old cunts this trait is dominant; they desire men the most.[186] In the book, the female sexual penchant manifests itself as an obsession with the size of penis:

> There was once a man with the nickname of double-cock. A woman asked him if he really had two cocks. He answered, 'Yes, I have two cocks. One of them is very big and I fuck poor women with it, the other is small and I offer it to rich people as a humble gift.' The woman said, 'Don't misunderstand me, when you see this expensive cloth, do not think that it is mine, I borrow it from friends![187]

Gazâlî measures the widow's loyalty to her new husband by the length and width of his male member. If a woman whose husband has divorced or passed away gets married to a man with a thick based, mace-like headed and strong waisted prick, the thought of

---

[182] *"...ebkâr...keyfiyyet-i hâli ve hidmet-i ricâli seyyibât gibi ber karâr olarak sebât göstermezler...seyyibe hâtunlarda sabr u tahammul u edeb ve erlerun kıymetin bilmek ve hâtırın ri'âyet kılmak hadden ziyâde ve endâzeden bîrûndur."* İbid. , p. 53 and p. 165-166

[183] ibid. , p. 54 and p. 166

[184] ibid. , p. 111 and p. 222

[185] ibid. , p. 112 and p.223. In the English translation of the text, "female lad" and "cunt" are used instead of "respected female" and "crone".

[186] ibid. , p. 116 and p.230

[187] ibid., p. 118 and p. 230 Otherwise stated, I remain loyal to the English translation of the anecdotes and jokes done by Selim Kuru. The omissions, adduces and changes that I cause are put into bracket.

her ex-husband leaves her, and she puts all his effort to the service of the new one. If her new man's cock is less than the former one, she remembers him everyday, keeps on grieving and despairing. She complains about her new life all the time.[188] Young men sometimes marry an old cunt with purely economical concerns, and after her death they become the director of all estates, slaves, gardens and fields. Thanks to his sexual power, though once he was a beggar, he ends up a noble person. Here, the book plainly refers to the "gigolos". As the final word, it advises man to force himself not to marry and copulate with ugly women and crones.[189]

Kuru assumes the first chapter, revising the ideas and images as to "marriage" and "women", as standing apart from the rest of the book, the focal point of which is sexual vices. I do not agree that the first part is an exception, and dissimilar to the general content. I opt for a "processional" reading of the text; the first chapter defines the parameters of the normal order of things, in a sense "how things should happen normally". *Gazâlî* stimulates the reader's sense of humour at the times that the order is blown by a radical reversal, as chapters subsequently expose diverse sexual fantasies. He creates most often phobic fantasies of the outbursting sexual temptations of wives and mothers, the inability of sons and fathers to contend them, too naïve or disinterested husbands, and the resulting disavowal of the legitimate hegemony of men over women.

I propose that these themes predominating *Gazâlî*'s anecdotes have been exploited across centuries, in novels, idioms, caricatures etc. Hidden in these amusing motifs is the social anxiety, and somewhat "universal" male anxiety, that female sexuality if dissatisfied and uncontrolled could result in social chaos (*fitna*), and if women are visible and unsupervised, there will appear the danger of losing control and the moral fiber of family and community will be at risk. This sensitivity is the pretext for seclusion, gender segregation, and everyday policing of woman's life. The domain of licit sexuality is placed in service to the patriarchal order, and the code of honour is linked to pre-marital virginity. The patriarchal family serves as paramount social institution and the proper locus of sex, thus ensuring legitimate filiation. Its honour requires supervision of women by male family members (husband, brother, son etc.); the husbands, brothers and sons are built up as the protectors of their mothers, sisters and wives, and legitimate their presence in the public places. The failure in this task

[188] ibid. , p. 52 and p. 165

[189] ibid., p. 114-115 and p. 226-227

may render them more than "amusing" in the public eye. At the same time, the females of the kin always have the malicious potential of deceiving and duping the males.

This subtantialistic approach to female sexuality blatantly reveals itself in early Islamic manuals, advice and chapbooks. *Kutadgu Bilig* (462/1069-70), a poetical advice book about the rules and morals of Islam, defines women as basically flesh which should be preserved well, otherwise they stink. It advises to keep them indoors all the time. Even though it is counted along with food and drink among the three pleasures of life, sexual intercourse with women is stated as the most dangerous pleasure since women and children "cut off men's strength".[190]

Kabusname written by Keykâvus (1082) and translated to Ottoman in the 15th century by Mercümek Ahmed advices men not to take wives of great beauty, because the beautiful women want to flirt with every men. One should marry a virgin girl; unlike the widow who may have love and desire of another man in her heart, the virgin only sees her husband and attaches herself to him with warm affection. The husband should avoid the jealousy of his wife, or else she would become a prostitute. If he takes a young virgin, he shouldn't make sex to her every night; because when she gets used to it, in the days of campaign and illness she looks for pleasure elsewhere.[191]

Another advice book in verse is Güvâhî's *Pendnâme* (933/1526), the sections of which are based on proverbs. It identifies three kinds of women: The modest woman secluding herself from other men's sight, the seductress woman cheating on her husband, and the stupid woman who can't tell good from bad.[192]

As parallel to the cosmological explanation of *Gazâlî*, *Muhammediyye* from 1400s tells that God punished Eve by having her bleed monthly and, burdening her with childbirth. He defines both of them as "oppression" and "diseases" (*cevr*, *emrâz*). He

---

[190] Yusuf Khâss Hâjib *Wisdom of Glory (Kutadgu Bilig) A Turco-Islamic Mirror for Princes*, trans. Robert Dankoff (Chicago, 1987) p. 157, 187; also see Selim Kuru, "Women, Gender and Representations of Sexualities and Gender in Poetry and Prose: Pre-modern, Including Courtly Poetry&Prose:Turkish" , fortcoming (*EWIC*-Brill) p. 3 I am indebted to Dr. Selim Kuru for sharing with me this unpublished article. It gave me the initial idea of looking at the advice literature.

[191] Keykâvus *Kabusname*, ed. Serpil Çalışlar Ekinci (İstanbul:Pencere Yayınları, 2003) p. 130-132

[192] Güvahi *Pend-nâme : (Öğütler ve atasözleri)*, ed. Mehmet Hengirmen (Ankara : Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1983) p. 179; also see Selim Kuru, Women, Gender and Representations of Sexualities and Gender in Poetry and Prose: Pre-modern, Including Courtly Poetry&Prose:Turkish" , fortcoming (*EWIC*-Brill) p. 4

grants women who die during labouring with martyrdom, but the childbirth and menstruation would mark their bodies forever.[193]

Mustafa Âli, writing a long treatise on manners in the same century with *Gazâlî*, exposes the common, official mythology among the elite concerning women. He depicts them as so weak in reasoning that they persistently succumb to their animal natures; the disinterest of men in guarding their women and the achievement by each of them of their hearts' desires according to the demands of lust tears the curtain of "chastity", rends the veil of "modesty", causing them to consort with those forbidden to them. He strengthens his point by an essentially "Orientalist", ethno-sexual legend according to which in China there is a plant by an unknown name. It grows and flourishes at a certain time each year. Whenever its scent reaches the nostrils of women, every one of them is swept away with the desire to copulate. Since the people of that country are very much informed on this matter, everyone keeps his wife under lock and key for a month, and whenever possible they take his rights and indulges in copulation day and night. If they did not keep them under guard, the women desire the intimacy of whatever man they encounter, and would ruin the good name of the honourable man.[194]

It is possible to sort out three narrative patterns in DG, rooted in these arch-themes. In an order based on the female protagonist's "age", they relate how "virgin girls", "married woman" and "old crones" reflect their desires in socially intimidating ways, and overturn the hegemonic sexual order.

The first pattern is about the unmarried girls that undermine the rule of pre-marital chastity. Some of them experience pre-marital sexuality and loose their virginity; just before getting married such girls, understanding that they will be shamed, consult the help of trusted friends and physicians or intermediaries (*"yenge", "hacı ana", "mu'azzim"*) for a trick. With numerous intrigues, they display themselves as untouched virgins in the nuptial night:

> Once a girl [who had lost her virginity was married off]. When they were alone at the first night, the girl, understanding what was going to happen, immediately thought of a trick and, behaving as she was not herself, acted like a possessed person. While the groom worried himself sick, she foamed at the mouth and fell down. The guests to the wedding rushed into the room. Some said that she was possessed, and some said this is the effect of the evil eye and they brought in a sorceress [*"mu'azzim"*]. Seeing her, the sorceress at once detected no signs of demons possessing her. She wanted to see her alone, and then

[193] Yazıcıoğlu Mehmed *Muhammediye*, ed. Amil Çelebioğlu (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1996) p. 67, 74; also see Kuru ibid., p. 4

[194] Mustafa Âli(Brookes) , p.130; Mustafa Âli (Şeker) , p. 364-365

> asked the girl what the situation was all about. She revealed her secret... Saying, 'Please, find a solution for my problem', she took out her earrings and bracelets and put them in front of the sorceress. The sorceress said, 'Don't worry, I know a solution, it is very easy', and she called the mother- and father-in-law. She [told them], 'A demon is in love with her, and it has settled in her heart. If you want to, I can get it out, but if I get it out through her mouth her mouth will be crooked; if I get it out through her nose, she will loose her sense of smell; if I get it out through her ear, her hearing ability will be damaged; if I get it out through her eyes, she will become blind; if I get it out through her anus, she won't be able to retain shit, and finally if I get it out through her cunt [*"ferc"*], she will lose her virginity. Ask the groom and let me know which one he prefers.' They told the groom [the words of the sorceress]. He thought a little bit, and concluded that loosing one's virginity was the least problematic, and the damage to other organs [were] more problematic. Involuntarily, he consented to her loos of virginity. The sorceress instantly said a few prayers and puffed around the girl and the girl stood up all of a sudden…[195]

The second pattern depicts the "phallocratic obsession" and limitless libidinal energy making the married women insatiable. They usually pursue two strategies to sexual satisfaction. They allow a lover to enter the legitimate sphere of marriage as the interloper:

> There was another man who told his mistress, 'Either let me fuck you near your husband, or don't come to see me anymore.' The woman… thinking of a trick…said, 'Come to the path to the fields, and tie a thread around your cock and wait on the side of the path. [Tell those whoever asks about it, that 'This is the Demand Tree (*"hâcet ağacı"*).']" The man went to the path leading to the fields, tied a thread around his cock, and waited there. The woman came to the spot with her husband and saw the man standing on the path. The husband moved towards the man and asked, 'What is this?' … the man answered, 'This is [the] Demand Tree. Women who can't have children take this in.' As it happens, this woman couldn't have children, and her husband was helplessly seeking a cure. The woman, noticing her husband's interest, rushed to his side and said, 'My dear, let's hold the Demand Tree, and we too will have a girl or a boy.' Her husband… checked it out and saw that it was a fancy thing with an indent [*"kertik"*] around and a string, and asked, 'What is this rope around it for?' The man answered, 'Whoever takes it in until the rope has a son who ends up being a merchant [*"tâcir oğul"*] and whoever takes it in until the indented part has a cruel son [*"zâlim oğul"*]. Finally, whoever takes it in all the way has a son who ends up being a ruler [*"beğ"*].' The husband told his wife, 'I now understand that this man needs to fuck you, but then we will be shamed before everyone's eyes… Listen, at least you take it until the rope so that the boy will be a merchant; don't take it until the indented part or else he will be a cruel sinner, and do not be greedy to take it all the way in, wishing that our son will become a ruler, because you know that rulers have many enemies, and as a result may perish without warning'. While the husband said this, he tightly grabbed the end of the rope, and the man, getting the hots, fucked the woman hard in front of her husband. He fucked her so hard that the end of the rope slipped from the hand of the husband and his whole long pole penetrated the woman all the way, stretching the woman like a bow, out of pleasure. She had eaten cherry, and a cherry pit suddenly shot out and almost took the husband's eye out. The husband cried, 'You fucking whore, haven't I told you not to take that pole all the way in so that the boy won't be a ruler. Look, he already started shooting and almost took my eyes out.'[196]

As an alternative, the women opt for "bestiality" or "artificial sex":

---

[195] DG (Kuru), p. 106-107 and p. , 216-217

[196] DG (Kuru) , p. 123 and p. 237-138

> Once there was [the] lady of a house who [went] to the barn all the time. …She was putting stopper on the cock of the donkey, which let it penetrate only half-way… One day one of the maids, saying, 'I will go and see what our lady is up to' went to the barn and saw her lady in this situation. ….later came back and did what her lady had done to the donkey. When donkey walked over her, it penetrated all the way up to its base, tearing her intestines apart. The poor maid [had not noticed] the stopper. …[197]

> A woman once sent her slave girl [*"halayık"*] to a spinning-wheel maker [*"çıkrıkçı"*] to order a dildo [*"zıbık"*]. The wheel maker sent her back saying, 'Ask your lady if she wants me to carve the dildo like an Arab, Persian, Turkish or Tartar cock.' Hearing this question, the noble lady told her slave, 'Go and ask the man what he means by these cocks.' When the slave-girl asked, the wheel-maker answered, 'The Arab cock is thin and long, the Persian cock is very short and thick, the Turkish cock is thick at the head and thin at the base, and the Tartar cock is small at the head and thick at the base.' The slave-girl told this to her lady, the lady thought for a while and said, 'Go to the wheel-maker, give him my greetings, tell him to make the length of the dildo the Arab way, the thickness the Persian way, the base the Turkish way, and the head the Persian way.' [198]

The third pattern narrates the sexuality of old women. In the later ages, the crones' sexual desire outpours as a willingness to marry with a younger man:

Once, a [crone] asked her son to marry her to a young man. One night, the son gave her ten walnuts and said, 'If you crack these until morning with your only tooth, I will marry you to a young man'. The woman taking one of the walnuts into her mouth, gnawed on it until morning. Her son woke up and asked, "Mama, how far have you gotten?" The woman replied, 'Look I cracked all of them open, if I break this one as well there will be only nine left.' [199]

In a number of anecdotes, the old protagonist satisfies herself with strangers. Her sons find themselves in a shaming situation, and fooled by the unmanageable sexual desire of their mother:

> Once, [a] traveller became a guest at the house of a [brave crone who] had three sons and a pubescent daughter. She prepared a bed for the guest next to a vinegar barrel, and everyone went to bed. In the middle of the night, the guest heard a babbling sound, and thinking that the vinegar was leaking, he wanted to stuff one of his fingers to the hole and look for the plug with his other hand. His finger fit into a warm hole, and immediately someone started screaming. It turned out that the daughter had come out to pee, when she felt the finger in her cunt she…started to scream. The [crone] hearing her daughter's screams, lit the furnace… the girl's brothers the guest and [the girl] naked. They beat the guest badly… tied him up on the main pole of the house… In the morning, they mounted their horses and went to fetch the police. The [crone] finding the man alone, started railing at him… suddenly she noticed the cock of the guest. At once she lost her mind for it… grabbed the cock, stroked it, and said, 'Fuck me once and I will let you go.' The guest accepted her offer…The [crone], scared that if she untied him he would escape without supplying her demand, brought a hay sack and put it in front of the guest, she climbed in the hay sack, tying each end of a rope to each of her feet, and she hung it around the neck of the guest… As she pushed from below, the sack came apart, and the [crone] stayed

[197] ibid. , p. 120-121 and p. 234

[198] ibid., p. 121-122 and p.235

[199] ibid. , p. 116 and p. 228

> hanging around the neck of the guest… her sons arrived and found their mother in such a position. They were ashamed, and understanding that that the guest had done nothing wrong, they let him go…[200]

Gazâlî also constructs hyperbolic stories in which the lustful crone sympathizes with the man applying "sexual violence" to her:

> Once, a man wanted to pull a [crone] aside, and rape her. The cunt started screaming, 'Isn't there a guard in this country?' The man, who had pulled the head of his cock out, said, 'I quit, I don't want such a struggle for a fuck.' The cunt took the head of the cock back in and said, 'You have already put this in, go on, we will discuss this later!'[201]

The traditional Turkish and Middle Eastern popular story cycles are explicitly "scratching" and "triggering" the same social fantasy about women out-of-control. In a large number of the *Nasreddin Hoca* idioms the protagonists are the *Hoca* and his wife. In the standard script, the *Hoca* couldn't reciprocate the sexual energy of his wife. The following idiom by the *Hoca* is parallel to the second one by *Gazâlî*:

> One night, the Hoca's wife said, 'Hoca! Let's enjoy tonight, and win God's reward for the Holy War.' They made love once. She aroused the Hoca, and they do it again, again and again. The Hoca got exhausted. After a couple of time, his wife said, 'Husband! Do it once more!' The Hoca farted, and pretended not to hear. She insisted, and the Hoca farted again. In the end, she asked, 'What the hell are you doing?' The Hoca answered, 'What can I do? I ran out of arrows, so I am fighting using the canon now.' [202]

> A man's wife once told him, 'It is said that whoever has sexual intercourse with his wife on Friday night does as good as deed as killing one infidel. Tonight it is Friday night, fuck me once tonight and accomplish the good deed of the Holy War.' Seeing that her wife wanted a fuck, the man assumed the position and fucked his wife well. After a couple of times, he got tired. When his wife said, 'Why do not kill you another infidel?' he turned his back and farted in his wife's cunt. The woman asked, 'What the hell did you do that for?' The man answered, 'I ran out of arrows, so I am fighting using the canon now.'[203]

As noted before, *Gazâlî* drew on satirical models from *Zakânî* for DG; but he gives no direct reference to any of his works. A volume including the English translations of several satirical treatises that *Zakânî* wrote in Persian and Arabic helps us at this point. Among these, especially his comic anecdotes compiled under the title of *Risalay-ye Delgosha* (The Joyous Treatise) exploit the same thematic baggage. It is recognizable

[200] ibid., p.113-114 and p. 225-226

[201] ibid., p. 116-117 and p. 229

[202] Pertev Naili Boratav, ed. , Nasreddin Hoca Fıkraları (Ankara: Edebiyatçılar Derneği,1996) p.135-136. The translations of all idioms are mine.

[203] DG (Kuru), p. 120 and p. 234

that there is an important similarity between a particular one of his anecdotes and a story related by *Gazâlî* in terms of the central plot (unsatisfied wife makes a complain to the judge), the depiction of the characters (the exhausted husband and sexually energetic wife) and the key element of humour (the woman explicitly accuses her husband, and fools his incapability by referring to his legally and socially recognized responsibilities). However, the final part where the node dissolves is omitted; the involvement of the judge in a sexual liaison with the husband's legitimate wife might have been seen "too explicit", or "offensive" by *Gazâlî*. The first of the anecdotes given below belongs to *Zakânî* and the other is from DG:

> A young wife went to the judge and complained, 'I am a young woman and my husband does not serve me right.' The husband said, 'I serve her as much as I can.' She said, 'I am not contended with less than five times.' He said, 'More than three times is not in my power.' The judge said, 'What a strange plight I am in! They don't bring a case to me unless I have to contribute something myself. But, let it be. I will undertake the two other times myself.' [204]

> A woman once sued her husband in front of a judge, and complained that he did not serve her well. The judge asked the husband; 'Why don't you do it?' The husband said, 'Mr. Judge, you don't know how I suffer. Every night I fuck her five times, and twice a day I fuck her at noon heat, coming back home from my shop and before going back to the shop I do it once more.' The woman said, 'Come on, oh my sire, this crazy man is counting his bit of a cock as a fuck!'[205]

Gazâlî mazed comic elements from *Nasreddin*'s and *Zakânî*'s works and incorporated them into DG. What is more significant to us is the intertextuality of *Zakânî* and *Nasreddin*. Given here, the first idiom is *Zakânî'*s, the second is *Nasreddin*'s:

> A woman was present at the meeting of a certain preacher. When she came home, she told her husband; 'The preacher said that they will build a house in heaven for whoever has intercourse with his lawful wife tonight.' That night when they went to bed, the wife said, 'Get up if you desire a house in heaven.' The man made love to his wife one. After some time passed, she said, 'You have built one house for yourself. Now, build another one for me.' So he built another one. After a while she said, 'what shall we do if we have company?' So the man built a guest house as well. The next day, the man caught his wife unaware and had anal intercourse with her, saying, 'Anyone who has built three houses in heaven should build one in hell.'[206]

> Once, the Hoca's wife attended a madjlis of a preacher. She came back home and told the Hoca that, 'Master! The preacher today said that if someone has intercourse with his/her

[204] "Risalay-ye Delgosha (The Joyous Treatise)", in 'Obeyd-e Zakani *The Ethics of Aristocrats and Other Satirical Works*, trans. Hasan Javadi, Middle Eastern Studies (11) (Jahan Books Co.: 1985) p. 73 and 11. anecdote

[205] DG (Kuru), p. 120 and p. 233

[206] "Risalay-ye Delgosha (The Joyous Treatise)", in 'Obeyd-e Zakani , *The Ethics of Aristocrats and Other Satirical Works*, trans. Hasan Javadi , Middle Eastern Studies (11) (Jahan Books Co.: 1985) p. 91 and 63. anecdote

> lawful spouse, God will build up a kiosk in heaven for them.' The night fell, they went to bed. The Hoca's wife said, 'Hoca! Do you want to build up a house in heaven?' He mounted once. The wife again said, 'Hoca! You have already built a house for yourself. Be quick, do it for me too.' The Hoca said, 'Let's see'[207]

The popular jokes, satires, idioms, jesters are to travel through different cultural geographies; the people re-telling and re-structuring them get oblivious of their origins, and they happen to be "anonymous" and "localized" in time, so that versions of well-known stories can be compiled by philologists and folklorists under the name of real or imaginary national figures (*Nasreddin Hoca*, *Bektaşi*), and among the regional jokes (*Karadeniz Fıkraları* e.g.). This intertextuality that I try to pinpoint -though might have been stemming from copying from each other, listening from friends, or hearing in the street- always functions properly and the reader/listener in different societies laugh at and get amusement from the same narratives; because they catch layers of culturally specific, or more "humanly and universal" anxieties, fantasies, images, and more complex system of naming and fixing social meanings and attitudes. They trade on the cultural "taboos".

Falling outside these story-patterns, another crushing blow to the male hegemony is the awareness that sexual activities among women may take place. There is a single reference to women having sex with other women in the context of sale/barter. *Gazâlî* tells us about the dildo-women in the great cities. They wear caftans and mount horses like cavalrymen. For pleasure they ride in covered wagons (*"koçu/koçi"*).Wealthy noble women invite them into their wagons and offer them chemises and other articles of clothing. Then they strap dildos about their hips, oil them with almond oil, ands set about the business in the usual manner, working away dildoing the woman.[208]

The "collective" and "ritualistic" undermining of the husband's public position and the important social values of virginity and family honour is the other satirical hyperbole. The woman appears to be compliant to this "social lynch":

> Once, while a man was walking, he saw a group of people standing under a tree. He wandered what all the excitement was about, and so he walked towards the group and saw that there was a beautiful young girl on all fours, and that all the people of the village were huddled around her and in turn each of them was mounting her and saying, *"tonbediz"*… The man's turn came, and they invited him to mount the girl as well. The man asked, 'First tell me, why are you doing this and then I will do it.' The people told him that this was the tradition of the village, that whenever a girl was pubescent, she should get married and

[207]Pertev Naili Boratav, ed. , Nasreddin Hoca Fıkraları (Ankara: Edebiyatçılar Derneği, 1996) p. 189

[208] DG (Kuru) , p. 121 and p. 235

> before the marriage the people of the village should come together and put the girl in the middle, then mount her one by one so that their 'right of eye' would be paid, and then they said, 'May she have a full progeny!' in this way wishing her luck. Learning this from the villagers, the man… immediately adjusted his skirts, penetrated the girl all the way, and said, '*kunbediz'*, adding, 'Where I come from the tradition is such!' Villagers, witnessing this, attacked the man and beat him and railed at him… the bride… immediately stood up and shouted out, 'Oh imam, oh pilgrims, oh officers, do something, what is the sin of this young man? Why are you beating him, why are you railing at him? His *kunbediz* is a thousand times better than all your '*tonbedizes'*…'[209]

Likewise, the 16th century poet *Zâtî* published jokes that assault the wife of contemporary poet *Keşfî* with sexually explicit insults:

> **Lâtîfe**: Once, *Keşfî* said, 'My wife is my state'. When I heard it, I uttered this couplet:
> The boy called *Keşfî* mentions of his wife
> (Keşfî didükleri oğlan anıcak 'avretini)
> 'She is my state' he says, oh I fuck his state
> (Devletümdür dir imiş vây s...eyin devletini) "[210]

> "**Lâtîfe**: I heard; once *Keşfî* said: I have taken a woman, she is so rich and propertied that she is able to build *kâr-bân-sarâys* and bathhouses. I immediately said this *rubâ'î*. *Rubâ'î*:
> If *Keşfî*'s wife erects two bathhouses
> (Keşfî hâtûnı yapa idi iki hammâmı eğer)
> I will give all mine to see them
> (Ben anı görmesine nem var ise virür idim)
> If one is single and the other is paired
> (Birisi çifte biri yalınız ola idi anun)
> I will arrive and enter the paired
> (Hele ben varup anun çiftesine girür idüm)[211]

> **Lâtîfe**: Mevlânâ Keşfî was holding a handkerchief in his hand, he said to me: Mevlânâ *Zâtî* watches this handkerchief; it has been ornamented by the woman that I took. When I heard this, I uttered this couplet:
> She is at the work of ornamenting handkerchief, *Keşfî*'s
> (Dest-mâle nakş işinde Keşfînün)
> His wife is doing prostitutions
> (Rospılıklar ider imiş 'avreti)[212]

According to the honour code the male head of the family is responsible for protecting his *harem* from the eye and tongue of strangers, ironically *Nasreddin Hoca* "otherizes" his own wife and daughter, and scorns them:

> One day, they told the Hoca: 'Your wife is fucking off.' He said, 'Of course, I fuck her! I don't have business with a wife that is not fucked up.' They said, 'Oh, Hoca! You don't

[209] ibid. , p. 109 and p. 219-220

[210] Mehmet Çavuşoğlu, ed. , "Lâtîfehâ-yı Zâtî", *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*, no. 18 (1970): p.5 (The translation of all jokes are mine.)

[211] ibid. , p. 4-5

[212] ibid. , p. 4

> understand. The strangers are fucking up your wife.' The Hoca answered, 'So what? I am a stranger, too. I am neither her father nor her brother.' [213]
>
> The Hoca's wife gave birth to a girl, and said, 'What if I had had a son with an egg between his two buttocks! ' The Hoca said, 'Oh, woman! Pray to God, and wish long life for your daughter. If she lives long enough, you will see numerous eggs between her buttocks.'[214]

While the experiences of the lads making sex for money are depicted in detail, I find only two instances on the female prostitution in DG. The first story is faintly related to the issue:

> There were two brothers who once visited the city. They liked the city so much that they decided to settle down. After a while, they got tired of being bachelors and started looking for women to marry. A respectable old man, sensing their trouble, approached them. Seeing that a respectable old man was approaching, they stood up and showed their respect. They asked him to favour them by finding them each a woman to marry. The old man said to one of them, 'There is a woman who befits you, but she can not be at home during the day, since she tutors slave girls in rich people's houses. Take a look at her, if you like her and be content to meet her only at nights, I will arrange her for you.' The man took a look at the woman and liked her. He contemplated that it wouldn't be a problem if she were to be out all day, since she would be with him all night long. Then the old man went to the younger brother and, holding his hand, said, 'I take you as a son, and I will find you a woman to marry. But be warned that, she reads books and tell tales to the daughters of the rich man at night. She will, however, be with you during the day. If you wish, I can arrange it for you.' The younger brother complied and got married. After a while, the two brothers got together again. They started talking about their wives, only to find out that they had married the same woman. At once they set out to find the old man, and, finding him, they dragged him on the ground, beating him up. They said, 'This is not enough for someone who marries one wife to other men.' [215]

The following is "Story of the Woman with Two Husbands" from the English edition of the *Sheikh Nefzawi*'s *the Perfumed Garden* completed by *Richard Burton*. Except from the alteration of the old and respectable man figure into an old female expert and the relation of brotherhood between two husbands into a close friendship, the narrative line and the nodal trick of the stories have no difference:

> It is related that a man, after having lived for some time in a country to which he had gone, became desirous of getting married. He addressed himself to an old man who had experience in such matters, asking her whether she could find him a wife, and who replied, 'I can find you a girl gifted with great beauty, and perfect in shape and comeliness. She will surely suit for you, besides, having these qualities, she is virtuous and pure. Only mark, her business occupies her all the day, but during the night she will be yours completely. It is for this reason that a husband might not agree to this.'
> The man replied, 'This girl need not be afraid. I, too, am not at liberty during the day, and I want her for the night.'

---

[213] Pertev Naili Boratav, ed. , *Nasreddin Hoca Fıkraları* (Ankara: Edebiyatçılar Derneği ,1996) p. 127

[214] ibid. , p. 170

[215] DG (Kuru), p.144-145 and p. 265-266

> He then asked her in marriage. The old woman brought her to him, and he liked her. From that time they lived together, observing the conditions under which they had come together.
> This man had an intimate friend whom he introduced to the old woman who had arranged his marriage according to the conditions mentioned, and which friend had requested the man to ask her to do the same service. They went to the old woman and solicited her assistance in the matter. 'This is a very easy matter,' she said. 'I know a girl of great beauty, who will dissipate your heaviest troubles. Only the business she is carrying on keeps her at work all night, but she will be with your friend all day long.' 'This shall be no hindrance,' replied the friend. She then brought the young girl to him. He was well pleased with her, and married her on the conditions agreed upon.
> But before long the two friends found out that the two wives whom the old harridan had procured for them were only one woman.
> Appreciate, after this, the deceitfulness of women, and what they are capable of.[216]

Nafzawi's book is not seen in *Gazâlî*'s list of sources; the story might have travelled from Asian through Middle Eastern oral and written traditions, and become incorporated to the cross-cultural intertextuality of jokes.

The second anecdote is told in DG's last chapter about bestiality, masturbation and nocturnal emissions. The main female character is a professional working within "institutionalized limits":

> Once there was a beautiful young girl ["*mahbûbe*"] in a city. She was agreeable and eloquent, but she chose to become a prostitute ["*kahbelik*"] and she paid a regular tax, so that nobody would interfere with her business. … [217]

The other arch-theme in DG relating to "women" is marked by the female phobias in place of male. Preferring the virgins over the ugly, deformed and loosened women, the book finds the slave-dealers very lucky since they always have the chance of tasting and defiling the virgin bodies. The stories touch upon and exploit the vulnerability and openness of slave body to every use, in slave bazaars and the master's household, and the female phobia of the domestic slave's sexual attractiveness. A closer look at the self-accounts of the Ottoman elite women reveals that, both in the palace *harem* and the *harems* of elite households, the sexuality of female slaves was considered "seductive","tempting" and "dangerous", thus it had to be controlled and supressed.We learn from the accounts that the slaves were exempt from veiling (*"tesettür"*) regulations that the free Muslim women were expected to observe. Their body could be seen and examined by the customers during purchase. The master was legally entitled to the sexual enjoyment of his female slaves; the master's free access to his slaves'

[216] *The Perfumed Garden of the Shaykh Nefzawi*, ibid. , p. 216-217

[217] DG (Kuru), p. 133 and p. 251

sexuality did not pose any "moral" disapproval either. It is intimately told in memoirs that, this situation resulted in "typical female fears" in a society where the polygamy and concubinage were legal and not immoral. The female head of the household employed certain strategies so as to be able to create a space of manoeuvre and secure her position as the wife. She might have guaranteed her status by giving birth to a son who would be able to live long enough, having the concubine impregnated by the male head undergone abortion, punishing concubines physically and vulnerating them emotionally, marrying off the concubine who would seduce your husband, and as in the case of *Melek Hanım* even murdering the concubine under suspicion.[218] Brother Madcap warns his readers that it is necessary for men to make love to his slaves in such a way that his wife won't get furious; if she hears or feels about the treachery under her roof, she changes to be "unfaithful".

This story makes the reader doubtful whether it may possibly happen. The element of humour implies the female fears, and the sublimated image of women enslaved by her emotions (jealousy and revenge):

> Once, a man went to the mosque for Friday prayer, and completing his prayer, saw a very ugly man sitting next to him. While everyone else prayed and repented, this man, turning his palms up, prayed, 'Pussy to cock, pussy to cock.' After he left the mosque, he found this man, held his hand and asked, 'While praying, why you say pussy to cock?' The man answered, 'A couple of weeks ago I was sitting in my room. Suddenly my door was opened by a tender beautiful woman... She… asked, 'Do you want me?'... I stood up and fucked her well... The next Friday she came back again... and said, 'Here I am, do not hesitate to come and fuck me.' So, I did. Then I held her hand, took her in my arms and asked, 'My lady, my life who are you? Are you an angel or a [djin], or a maiden from heaven above? What is the reason for your benevolence?'... When I insisted, she told her story in detail: 'My husband has a weakness for wine. He drinks until midnight and looses control. When he returns, he hurts me by taking to bed the ugliest of slaves, with large sulky lips, cheeks like a watermelon, mushroom ears, like a demon follower of Solomon, and with a monstrous face. The following day, he leaves for the bathhouse to perform ablutions in front of my eyes. I have complained several times to no avail, and have failed to find a solution. Finally, I decided to take revenge on him. I decided to go out every Friday, find a very ugly man and fuck him, and thereby to hurt his feelings as he did mine. The last two Fridays I walked around town to find the ugliest man and found out that there [is] no one uglier than you, so here I am.' ... she left and for a couple of more Fridays she favoured me. But today she did not come. It is likely that pimp quit fucking his slave-girl. I am repeating,'Pussy to cock', so that he will start fucking that slave-girl again and the lady, getting hurt, will visit me again.' … [219]

[218]Melek Hanım, *Haremden Mahrem Hatıralar* (İstanbul:Oğlak,1999); Safiye Ünüvar, *Saray Hatıralarım* (İstanbul:Bedir Yayınevi, 2000); Leyla Sâz, *Anılar-19. Yüzyılda Saray* (İstanbul: Cumhuriyet, 2000); Emine Fuat Tugay, *Three Centuries:family chronicles of Turkey and Egypt*, with a foreword by the Dowager Marchioness of Reading (London : Oxford University Press, 1963); Halide Edip Adıvar, *Memoirs of Halide Edib,*with a frontispiece in color by Alexandre Pankoff and many illustrations from photographs (New York : London, The Century co., 1926)

[219] DG (Kuru), p. 126-127 and p. 241-243

Gazâlî tells that the women among themselves construct a sub-language to name and stigmatize the husbands which have "bad" habits: They call the man cheating on his wife with the slave-girls "betrayer" (*hâ'in*), and the one habiting a mistress outside the house a "house-*zagal*" (*hâne-zagal*).[220]

3.3.2. Politics of Penetration- Social Hierarchies & Subordinated Masculinities: *Gazâlî*'s literary universe puts forward a sexuality which is defined according to the domination by or reception of the penis in the sexual act. Sex, that is penetration, takes place between dominant, adult free men and subordinate social inferiors: prostitutes, slaves and socially unprotected and unattached youngsters. What is at stake is not mutuality between partners but the adult's achievement of pleasure through domination. The sexual intercourses articulate in conformity to social hierarchies, and the lower classes and ethno-religious communities joining the imperial heterogeneity are enforced sexual submissiveness. As a result, a number of subordinated masculinities are rendered under the hegemony of one gigantic, high status/upper class, sexually active, Turco-Muslim male identity.

Within this sexual-ideological frame, DG sets out a vocabulary of varied sexual behaviours and the respective subject-object positions. :

The *zen-pâre* is plainly a women-chaser. The book discusses "love" only in the chapter about boys. It defines "love" separately from "sexual passion". The *mahbûb-perest* contemplates the beauty of boys, and has a platonic love of them. Where love and sexual passion intersect, the lover who attains his desire is called "contemptible lover" (*hasisü'l-akin*), and leader of sinners (*re'isü'l-fasikin*). Those who are content to merely kiss and hug are "loyal lovers" (*'âşık-ı sâdık*).[221] The *gulam-pâre* or *gulat* (pederast) is actively engaged in sex with boys. Ibn Sina in his *Risala fi al-'ashq* makes a similar typification of lovers: According to him, the platonic love for boys is acceptable while the sexual love is abominable.[222]

For *Gazâlî*, the origin of "sodomy" (*livâtâ*) is traceable to a "parodical" version of the Koranic story about the tribe of Lût: The people of Lot have grown cucumbers in their

[220] ibid. , p. 127 and p. 243

[221] ibid. , p. 73-74 and p. 184-185

[222] Ibn Sina, *Aşkın Mahiyeti Hakkında Risale*, ed.and trans. Ahmet Ate (İstanbul:İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1953) p. 8-13

gardens. Young boys came and stole the cucumbers. Whenever they caught a boy stealing cucumbers, they used to plunge the cucumber into the boy's ass. One day Satan saw that and appeared as a man, telling them to plunge their cocks to the boys and have pleasure in them. From that day on, they followed the Satan's advice and plunged their cock instead of cucumbers. And thereon whenever they found a boy they followed this way, and if he did not obey their desires, they used force.[223]

The book's depiction of the pederasts and the adulterers does not allow us to categorize their sexual tendencies or "preferences" respectively as "homosexual" and "heterosexual". In the sub-language of women, the married man who pursues prepubescent boys is a "black-face" (*yüzi kara*). The following story indicates the possibility that men may make sex both to women and boys, in other words they may have double inclination:

> One group of women came together, and started comparing their husbands. One said, 'My man is a betrayer [*"hâ'in"*]. Another said, 'Mine is a house-*zaghal*.'And another said, 'Mine is a black-face.' One of them did not say anything, so the others asked, 'What about yours?! She said, 'Mine is a betrayer, a house-zaghal, and a blackface.'[224]

Moreover, in the imagery universe of DG relationships with women emasculate men, while those with boys enhance masculinity. In the aforementioned debate between pederasts and fornicators with the Devil as a mediator, the description of the femininized, mannerist and etiquette-bound fornicators contrasts sharply with that of the warrior-like, manly and fierce pederasts.[225]

Gazâlî ascribes the sexual desire of the "passive male" (*rencür*) to a sickness. The sperm of young boys who have just entered adolescence inspires an excessive sexual appetite in the women or men who have intercourse with them. If a woman or a man has sexual intercourse with a young boy, the young boy's sperm turns into a worm in the woman's womb or the man's anus. This worm craves sperm, creating an itch in these organs. The craving expresses itself in the increased sexual appetite of the afflicted individual. An individual so afflicted is considered a *rencür,* or a sick person. The sexual desire of the active male is radically disjuncted from that of the passive male.

[223] DG (Kuru), p. 103 and p. 213

[224] ibid. , p. 127 and p. 243

[225] ibid. , p. 57-59 and 169-171

While the *gulampâre* is aroused and activated by the manly ardour of penetrating, the *rencür* has the womanish "phallocratic obsession":

> Once, a queer [*"rencür"*] was impaled, a man was passing by, he stopped and asked, 'How lucky you are that, thanks to the pleasure you draw from the pole, you surely do not feel any pain.'[226]

> One day, a queer [*"rencür"*] was caught stealing. He was taken to the Sultan. The Sultan first wanted to punish him with impalement, then, in a burn of compassion he decided to let him go. The queer said, 'The sultan's should keep his word, instead of letting people say that you broke your promise, it is better for me to get impaled.'[227]

The "hermaphrodism" (*muhanneslik*) is the least exploited and ridiculed condition in *Gazâlî*'s humour. An anecdote where a man whose wife is pregnant prays for his child would be born either as a boy or a girl implies that hermaphrodism is seen as a "genetic deficiency"; different from the sexual passivism of men, the hermaphrodite is not associated with pseudo-scientific play of fate, or metaphysical forces and mischievous sprite. The tendency to take hermaphrodism as a medical category shows itself in a 16th century fatwa by *Ebussuûd*:

> **Question:** If a person has both a vagina and a penis and urinates from both of them, and if more urine comes from a one, should that particular one be relied on?
>
> **Answer:** No, it is not relied upon. It is very difficult. [228]

In the 15th century, *Şerefeddin Sabuncuoğlu* describes the forms of "hermaphrodism" (*hunsa*) seen in men and women, and then prescribes the surgical operation that cures the hermaphrodites. [229]

DG classifies men and boys as sexual object of desire according to their ages. The age factor determines two major categories in this classification. One is "physical", young boys and girls are depicted as physically more suitable for maximum sexual pleasure, due to their "freshness" and "tightness". Women who have delivered many children are classified as the worst possible sexual partners in this respect. While "childbirth

[226] ibid , p. 142 and p. 263

[227] ibid. , p. 142 and p. 263

[228] *Şeyhülislâm Ebussuûd Efendi Fetvaları- Işığında 16. Asır Türk Hayatı*, ed. M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ, 2nd edit. (İstanbul:Enderun Kitabevi,1983) p. 198

[229] Şerefeddin Sabuncuoğlu *Cerrâhiyyetü'l- Haniyye-I*, ed. İlter Uzel (Ankara:TTK, 1992) p. 299-300

experience" is sign of ageing for women, for boys it is "body hair". DG differentiates the pederasts valuing the beardless, "prepubescent lads" (*nâ-baliğ*, *sâde -rû*), "haired" and "aged" men (*tıraşı gelmiş kurrezler*, *rîş-dâr*) and "very old" men (*sepîd-rîş pirler*).[230] The "prebubescency", a transitional phase placed between childhood and adulthood, is the critical stage here. It was argued in the medieval Islamic society that, the prepubescent boys, "being not yet man, and having not yet escaped from the maternal authority and socialized into the male world", could be penetrated without losing their potential manliness.[231] Nonetheless, in DG while a man penetrating a boy emasculates him, it does eliminate any threat to the masculine identity of the penetrator. Throughout the text, *Gazâlî* establishes women as active partners while boys are presented as "pacified" men. As soon as they taste sexual pleasure, as with Eve, women's abundant passion makes them insatiable partners capable of wearing men out. As I highlighted before, women's passion is jeopardizing, and thus women rather than boys present a challenge to the male ego and normative social order. Boys are "undemanding" partners, and their passivity is expressed in too naïve, easily tricked and trapped male figures in the text.

As for cultural aspects, Brother Madcap considers young boys to be the best targets of seduction for they naturally inhabit the all-male public circles, such as wine taverns, universities, dervish lodges, armies etc. The leader of pederasts in their battle against the adulterers explains that beautiful boys are always with them, and unlike women they do not have any guardians (*"...kimsenün taht-ı tasarrufı değül bir âdemdür..."*) – "master" (*beğ*), "night-watchman" (*ases*) or judge (*kadı*).[232] In a similar voice, Mustafa Âli tells the reader that lately, there are more "dishonourable" (*nâ-merd*) men who prefer beardless, smooth-cheeked, handsome, and sweet-tempered servant boys than there are man who prefer pretty and charming women. This is because marriageable women from the ranks of beauties are maintained in secret, out of fear of the police. On the other

[230] DG (Kuru) , p. 77-80 and p. 188-192

[231] Everett K. Rowson " The Categorization of Gender and Sexual Irregularity in Medieval Arabic Vice Lists", in ed. Julia Epstein and Kristina Straub, *Body Guards: the Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity*, (NY:Routledge, 1991) p. 66-67; Bruce Dunne "Power and Sexuality in the Middle East", *Middle East Report*, issue 206 (Spring 1998) p. 8-11+ 37

[232] DG (Kuru), p. 66-67 and p. 177-178

hand, young men can be a companion whether at home or on journeys in the way that the moon-faced members of the female sex can be neither a friend nor a companion.[233]

The absence or non-participation of women in the public sphere, and the dangers that any closeness to women poses on men could be a major reason for the choice of boys as ideal sex partners. However, the easier accessibility of young boys and their sexual pacification stems from their disadvantageous position in society. As such they represent another sexually vulnerable social group than slaves. The relation of adult male and young boy is neither sexual partnership nor a close friendship sometimes "tainted" with sodomy, but its representations denote a bargaining between a seller and a customer. It shouldn't have been an "institutionalized" prostitution, but a causal, amateur sex-for-money exchange. That young, male population migrating to urban centres for a new niche, and those working in jobs with poor money return and did not have any patrons, protectors and linkage to a household, in other words those who were in the economic periphery of the cities, might have taken advantage from their young bodies. These were the people that Mustafa Âli lumps into the composite social category of "the city boy" (*şehir oğlanı*), living in cities, uneducated, and met in every "wicked" turn.[234]

Gazâlî names the *çin-çin* lover who has plenty of silver and gold; he brings the money with him, holds it in his hand by the thousands, makes it ring out with a ching-a-ling, and in this way hunts the beloved and achieves his desire.[235] Some pederasts prefer the older, bearded boys over younger lads because they have more "physical stamina", and serve the customer well.[236] One of the arguments given for preferring younger boys is that they do not bargain. They demand negotiable prices from customers.[237] The affection between the young boy and the adult male is articulated around the Platonic, spiritual modus operandi in DG. In the "solid" context of prostitution, it may be decoded in the way that the "lover" (*el-'âşık*) signifies the adult male/customer, the

[233] Mustafa Âli (Brookes), p. 28; Mustafa Âli (Şeker), p.283-284

[234] Mustafa Âli (Şeker), p. 287, 293, 303, 316-317, 335, 350, 352, 363, 373, 380, 383

[235] DG (Kuru), p. 75 and p. 186

[236] ibid. , p. 78-79 and p. 189-190

[237] ibid. , p. 97-98 and p. 206-207

"beloved" (*el-mâşuk*) stands for the young boy; the "obstacle/rival" (*el rakîb, el-engel*) may symbolize other customers, or the pimp or watcher-dog selling the boy.[238]

The chapter on the young beloveds contains anecdotes whose protagonists are the boys engaged in bargain and sex with their lovers-customers. There is only a single story in which the boy and the adult lover/customer reach a real agreement:

> Once there was a beautiful boy who was the treasure of his time. He was famous for his [violent nature] and [sexual purity]. One day [one of his lovers mentioned a beloved in his presence, saying that this boy would perfom for fifty silver coins]. Hearing this, the boy said, 'Fifty silver coins is [no little bit]; such a cloth does not [fetch so] much. You can hug anyone for such money. [A minaret would bend over for you if you put fifty silver coins in front of it']. The lovers [got the point] and giving him fifty silver coins each, [they] enjoyed the pleasures he offered. [239]

In the other stories, the customer aiming to increase his material and sexual utility violates the agreement during the act, fully penetrates the young boy. In the following anecdotes breaking of the terms of the agreement starts to carry the overtones of "sexual violence":

> A man and a boy agreed on ten aspers for frotage, and one asper to put it in. [The boy asked the man to do whichever he wanted.] The boy, both thinking that it is better and it pays more, accepted frottage. The man smeared lots of spit on the boy's ass and while he was rubbing against him, pushing it a bit hard, he put it until the base. The boy turned back and asked, 'What are you doing?' The man answered, 'I am a poor man, I don't have enough money for ten aspers, a one asper job is enough for me.' " [240]
>
> "One day, a man hunted a boy, and agreed with him to put his cock half way in. The boy accepted his offer. The man put it into the pit all the way. When the boy protested, 'You said half way in, what is this? 'The man replied, 'I meant half way from the base of my cock.' [241]

Gazâlî produces "quasi-legal" discussions around the problems as to the same-sex negotiations from mouth of "the scholarly pederasts" (*'ulemâ-i mugallimîn*) and "the most eloquent of face-downers" (*fuzelâ-i mukallibîn*):

> **…**If a lowly man finds a young boy and [offers him a price for his union] and then takes him to a deserted place [, moistens his prick with spit, does the usual job], but if he ejaculates before penetration, and that silver lad becomes full of passion, should the boy get all his money, or should he get only part of it?
>
> On this problem, the people of Lot debates, and each group of them followed a different path. Some of them claimed, 'Since that beautiful boy… did what was expected of him …

[238] ibid. , p. 74-75 and p.185-186

[239] ibid. , p. 97-98 and p. 206-207

[240] ibid. , p. 102 and p. 211-212

[241] ibid. , p. 102 and p. 212

> the man should pay whatever he owed in full, and if he doesn't, he should be sent to prison… Some carefully evaluated the problem and following the path of justice and have claimed, 'If the boy moves out of pain, going forward and backward, and if he prevents the man from putting it in with such tricks, then he should get half of the established amount, and half stays with the man. But if the boy stands still, and the man ejaculates too soon for another reason, then it is his responsibility to pay the boy the full amount.' [242]

Later, in this hypothetical debate, the author cites the legal opinion of a Persian-speaking dignitary from the Lot community (*"mufti-yi müşkilât-ı ümmet-i Lût"*).[243]

Zakânî's *The Treatise of One Hundred Maxims* is put up with the same literary strategy. At the beginning, the author tells his motivation to compose a book of counsels. He reads discourses of Plato written for the sake of his pupil Aristotle, and many treatises such as the Book of the Counsels of the great kings. Then, he undertakes writing a book in a similar fashion, but his would be a work of sincerity and taste, devoid of the shadow of hypocrisy and signs of affection.[244] It is observed that he abstracts the morally and politically sanctioned content of "the mirror for the princes" genre, and injects "knowledge of coquetry" or "an evil knowledge" into it. The first counsels are reminiscent of the standard ethical rules just like saving time, respecting the high-spirited dervishes, protecting one's health and making sacrifices to good friends.[245] The others seem to be beneficial to learn the rules of sodomy and adultery:

> 41. Whenever you find pretty boys drunk and asleep, seize the opportunity before they wake up.[246]
>
> 45. Buy Turkish slave boys at any price when they have no beard, and sell them at any price when their beards begin to grow.[247]
>
> 60. Enjoy sleeping with handsome boys because it is a joy that you will not find in heaven.[248]
>
> 62. Before finishing with them do not pay young boys and prostitutes so that they will not deny it in the end and so there won't be a fuss.[249]

---

[242] ibid. , p. 102-103 and p. 212-213

[243] ibid. , p. 103 I am giving reference only to the transliteration of the text, where you can find the müfti's opinion written in Persian.

[244] *The Treatise of One Hundred Maxims*, in *Obeyd Zakânî The Ethics of Aristocrats and Other Satirical Works*, trans. Hasan Javadi, Middle Eastern Studies (11) (Jahan Books Co.: 1985) p. 63

[245] ibid., p. 63

[246] ibid. , p. 65

[247] ibid., p. 65

[248] ibid. , p. 66

> 67.Be cautious when you take a young boy into your room and when he leaves be on your guard that he does not steal something from you. [250]

Not physically involved in sexual intercourse, these young boys in public places such as hippodromes and bathhouses are used as visual stimulators for masturbation. In the crowd, they could be abused directly; DG reads that some abject people position himself behind beautiful boys in the crowd which has gathered to watch wrestlers, story-tellers, and cup-players. He then opens their skirt, push aside his underwear and stick his groin firmly against the boy. The boy can not move, can not turn around to stop him and out of necessity remains frozen in amazement.[251]

One step beyond the public abuse is outright raping boys. The wine *meclis* is the stage of sexual violence directed toward the beloveds in the subsequent anecdotes. The convivial *meclis* context assorted from the imperial palaces, to elite household gatherings, to garden parties of learned man, and to the tavernhopping revellers of unattached young men and poets was the culturally sanctioned and scripted venue for rehearsing attractions to young beloveds and heart-thieves, in the period that the book was written. As a witness to them, Brother Madcap situates the scenes of rape into the eroticized environment of parties. The beloved intoxicated by wine is sodomized in sleep, and pressed by the fear of being stigmatized in the people's eye:

> Once a witty pederast…met a beautiful and charming boy [*"bir ra'nâ dilber ve bir zîbâ pûser"*] during a party. When it got late and everybody fell asleep, he found a way and took the silver base at hand and pleasured himself with it. He slept for a while and intended to dip in again. The boy hurt so much that he felt it this time and stood up. Picking up his dagger, he said to himself, 'Let's check the cocks of all these sleeping. Whoever's cock smells of my shit, I will cut his cock and balls in revenge.' The man saw this and feigned being drunk. Laying on his face, he smeared spit on his own ass. The boy's hand touched his ass. He thought that what happened to him had happened to this man as well. The man mumbled, 'Don't you have any pity, why are you fucking me?' The boy asked, 'Did they fuck you too?' The man answered, 'Yes, you too?' The boy answered, 'Yes, they fucked me too. But what a fuck, as if they pulled out the veins of my heart. Come on, let's find the guys who fucked you and me.' The man said, 'Come on, now go sleep, when tomorrow comes, then we will make each one of them swear that they did not do it, and we will find the ones who did fuck us, and then we will punish them.' In the morning he went to the boy and held his hand. He said, 'My friend, we are already done, whatever lost is lost. I can't make a fool out of myself. If you want to tell them, go ahead and tell.' The boy asked, 'Do you give in?' The man said, 'Yes, I give in.' [252]

---

[249] ibid., p. 66

[250] ibid. , p. 66

[251] DG (Kuru) , p. 132 and p. 250

[252] ibid. , p. 82-83 and p. 193-194

The same "class-biased" perspective is prevalent in the previously mentioned accounts of Mustafa Âli and Latîfî.[253] While depicting the beauty of various social groups, they skip sultans, princes, statesmen, and military-civilian officials, and begin with the pages in the Palace and the elite households, then on down the entire scale of low-status occupations- shopkeeping, entertainment industry, and even high-way thieves and robbery. As in the case of *Gazâlî*, they reflect their sexual fantasies and aggressiveness on the lower-classes. Supporting my proposition, there is only anecdote in DG's chapter on "same-sex relations", the protagonist of which is a "sultan". In the story, a mad man satirizes the sultan who insists that he never benefits from his slave sexually.[254]

The sexual objectification of young males appears also as a common and natural outgrowth of the patronage system. As it is also reflected by the career of *Gazâlî* , men were enmeshed in webs of personal relations in which the poorer, younger and talented served the powerful, wealthier and older in return for valuable gifts, regular job, introduction to people at higher levels of power, and fame. At the top, courtiers were attempting to gain admittance to the private circles of the sultan, prince and other highly placed dignitaries. As laddering to the bottom household head and servants, professors and students, dervishes and followers, apprentices/shopkeepers and masters were in a patronage dynamic, based on the assumption that the power holder would take advantage of whatever services, including sexual, his underlings provide. The lesser, younger, inexperienced and uneducated side expected to augment his meagre economic and cultural resources, and to win a membership to a household, lodge, school or trade by undertaking the briefest service of his master. DG fantasizes the potential human interactions that might have been born out of this real social dynamic.

---

[253]Lâtifî *Evsâf-ı İstanbul* , ed. Nermin Suner(Pekin) (İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1977); *The Ottoman gentleman of the sixteenth century : Mustafa Âli's Mev¯aidün-Nef¯ais f¯i kav¯aidil-mec¯alis : "Tables of delicacies concerning the rules of social gatherings"*, trans. Douglas S. Brookes (Cambridge, Mass. Dept. of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 2003); *Gelibolulu Mustafa Âli ve Mevâ'ıdü'n-Nefâis fî-Kavâ'ıdil-Mecâlis*, ed. Mehmet Şeker (Ankara: TTK, 1997) Consult, G. Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı *The Age of Beloveds:Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society* (Durham & London: Duke Univ.Press, 2005) p. 251-169

[254] DG (Kuru), p. 95-96 and p. 205

In a frequently repeated script, the protagonist deceives a younger trade member willing to master a special talent/knowledge with trickery, and sodomizes him in the end:

> Once, such a man found a beautiful perfume clerk [*"attâr oğlan"*], and led him to his own shop. He took [some Yemenite alum (*"şeb-yemenî"*)], some minerals [*"'itab-ı kânî"*], and Iranian chemical salt [*"milh-i İrânî"*], and gave to the boy a golden coin [*"eşrefî"*]. He went and shopped with the money. The boy was amazed and wanted to be an alchemist and begged the man, saying, 'Please instruct me in this knowledge of yours.' The man said, 'Allright, let's go and conduct an experiment.' He invited the boy to his little shop. The boy sat down, and the man brought two eggs. He said, 'The quicksilver of philosophy and the gold and silver of this art is this. This is a liquidy form, but the masters of this art take this as the string of eloquence, they make pure silver out of the egg's white and gold out of its yolk.' He put the eggs on the furnace and said, 'Let's talk until these are cooked. Then we will take care of business.' He sharpened his teeth for the paste of union [*"vusle"*] with the boy. The boy, thinking of his gain accepted the man's desire, and surrendered himself. After the man ate the bond of union of the boy altogether, the boy wanted the man to teach him the secrets of alchemy. The man took a golden coin out of his pocket and gave it to the boy. He said, 'Here is how you became the master of the alchemists. You made one golden coin in the time it took for two eggs to cook. Go and spend it, don't be stingy.' …[255]

DG tells that some from among the Sufi order and the followers of love have a predilection for sodomy. But their "turbans and coats" (*tâc ü hırka*) prevent them from approaching young bodies openly, so they follow the path of teaching. From then on, they exclude the "ordinary" and "ignorant" boys (*cehele ve 'avâm*) from their diet, and entertain with the learned beloveds in the path of love (*"ehl-i dil"*).[256] The organization of education which required the students and professors to spend their day and night working and staying together in a single-sex society might have provided a context for sodomy and sexual attractions among students. The element of humour apparently lies in the abuse of formal position of authority, and the trust that the student's parents put in teachers:

> One day, a man brought his kid to a teacher, saying, 'Oh my dear sir, rail at, rip open, train and beat him, his flesh and skin are yours, and his bones mine, as far as he learns science.' He left and one day showed up to visit his son. He saw that the teacher was sucking his boy's lips and had his legs over his shoulders, dealing with him as was his custom. The father said, 'Hey, what are you doing?' The teacher answered, 'What do you think I am doing! You said his skin is mine, and his bones yours. Here, I am eating his flesh and donning his skin. Otherwise, don't ever think that I would kiss or fuck a boy! "[257]

[255] ibid., p. 85-86 and p. 196-197

[256] ibid. , p. 87 and p. 198

[257] ibid. , p. 88 and p. 198-199

> to sleep outside. You see, because of the narrow space we are sleeping one upon the other.'[258] "One day, a man had wine and talked with teachers [*"dânişmendler"*] at a school. When it became late he stood up and left, but being unable to open the door of the school he returned. He found the teacher upon a student and said, 'The door is locked, let me stay here tonight, I will leave in the morning.' The teacher said, 'There are too many fleas, you need

A story parallel to the last one is related by *Zakânî*:

> *Muwlana Qotb al-Din* was making love to someone in his room in the school. Suddenly someone put his hand on the door of the room and opened it. *Muwlana*, said, 'What do you want? ' He said, 'I want somewhere to sit down and say my prayers.' *Muwlana* replied, 'Are you blind? Don't you see that this place is so small that one has to go on top of the other?' [259]

Gazâlî's comedy operates the politics of penetration at the level of ethno-religious hierarchies in society. It conveys a politico-erotic message that the foreign elements' sexual subjugation brings about the effacement of their distinct ethnic and religious identities in the larger hegemonic Turco-Muslim identity, or vice-versa:

> Once an infidel boy saw the truth and left blasphemy to become a Moslem. People gathered to circumcize him. In the evening they dispersed and left. Some wretched men desired him and stayed with him that night. They warmly told him sweet lies, and saying that it is the custom for new converts, fucked him. The following morning his father visited his son to see how he was doing. He asked his son, 'What did you find in Turks? Tell me, so that I may also convert and become a Turk… ' The boy said, 'Daddy, Turks are good people, but they have one flaw, they cut one's cock during the day, and they tear his ass apart at night. This is the Turk's custom.'[260]

> One day this ass thief drank a bit too much of the red liquid and got drunk. He found a Tartar beauty, tucking up his skirt, grabbed his cock, smearing it with a lot of spit, he plunged it in up to the base. The boy woke up due to the pain he felt. After the fuck is over, they went to the judge. The boy said, 'He sent a diver into my ass. Where can I hide if I get pregnant?' The judge answered, 'With that much of a load you won't get pregnant. But if you get pregnant, and can't afford a child, just leave it at the door of a mosque. You will see that a good person will find him and adopt him as his own son and take care of him until he dies.'[261]

After isolating the social and cultural realities that the anecdotes on sodomy are touching upon, I would like to turn to Brother Madcap's usual method of irritating the phobias in individual and societal subconsciousness and disavowing the real normative authorities. This time, *Gazâlî* engineers a phobia for the "religious" people. In the

---

[258] ibid. , p.88-89 and p. 199

[259] "Risalay-ye Delgosha (The Joyous Treatise)", in 'Obeyd-e Zakani *The Ethics of Aristocrats and Other Satirical Works*, trans. Hasan Javadi , Middle Eastern Studies (11) (Jahan Books Co.: 1985) p. 96

[260] DG (Kuru) , p. 91 and p. 201

[261] ibid. , p. 94 and p. 203-204

typical script, the protagonist keeps his son behind doors in secret, because he is afraid of the possibility that he would be discovered by the ill-intentioned pederasts. In the end, he is plotted against, his son is sodomized, and his "respectability" is weakened. It is told that, the pederasts are proud of penetrating such clean and honoured boys (*"mazbut oğlanı say etmek"*), and disseminating their success to others:

> There was once a Hadji who had a beautiful boy. Out of fear of pederasts he did not allow the boy outside the house. Whenever the boy heard the call for prayer, he asked his father, 'Daddy what is that?' and the father always answered as, 'They are fucking a boy, and he is screaming because of the pain in his ass.' The news about the kept boy reached the pederasts and was the gossip of town. One day, a Persian pederast heard about the boy and immediately planned a way to hunt him. He went to the father and said, 'I am leaving the city, but I have this trunk full of cloth, which I can't take with me. I tried to secure it with some friends but they refused me saying that they do not have anywhere to put it. Humanity has left the world: Noon helps anyone anymore. I wonder if you, out of kindness, would accept my plea.' 'Bring it in, we will put it in my son's room', said the Hadji, 'where it will be safe, nobody will hear of it or see it there.' Scheming, the wretched Persian man said, 'Let me send it with a boy to your place' and left.
> He prepared a large trunk and put some food and wine in it, then he also got into it. His servant locked the trunk and brought it to the Hadji's home and Hadji put it in a corner in his son's room and left. At night when the boy was left alone, the man opened the lock of the trunk and got out. Seeing the man, the boy attempted to call out for his father and mother, but the man said, 'Don't be scared, 'and convinced the boy that he was not after his life. Then he said next to the boy and served him food and wine. As soon as the boy gulped down the wine, he got giddy and cheerful and forgot his fear. He turned agreeable. The man immediately put his arm around the boy's shoulder, kissed him a couple of times and then undid his pants, spit on his ass and slowly fucked him. … Later the servant of the Persian came and picked up the trunk from the Hadji's home. One day the boy heard the call for prayer again and asked his father the same question, the Hadji answered, 'They are fucking another boy, and he is screaming because of the pain in his ass. The boy said, 'I got fucked as well, why not my ass hurt?' …[262]

The book derides the paragons of the true religion and spirituality- the *ulemâ* of various ranks and positions as well. In this idiom he depicts the judge as passive (*rencür*). When he is subordinated and penetrated, his "public dominance" ceases to be effective, too. He is castrated from his formal authority by being emasculated:

> [There was once] a judge who was queer. He was also famous for taking bribes. One day, two men came to him with a problem. One of the men knew the way of the judge and had a large cock. Standing in front of the judge, he pretended to scratch his cock and showed it to the judge. The other man, who was suing him, shouted and complained, but the man with the big cock was aloof. Still, the judge sided with the defendant, and he repelled the other man, and found a way to lure the man with the big cock to his home. He served him food and then, tacking up his skirt, he bended in front of him. The man fucked him hard. When the judge took in all of his colossal penis he said, 'It is said that the bribe is sweet to eat, now I see how true is the saying.'[263]

[262] ibid. , p. 98-99 and p. 207-208

[263] ibid. , p. 140 and p. 261

The textual defamation of these groups is evident in the following script. It is about a judge who abuses a slave, and adopts bestiality. He is both bodily "contaminated", and loses his hegemonic status in the people's eyes:

> Once a judge's wife went to the bathhouse, leaving her slave girl at home. The judge, seizing the opportunity, mounted the girl. After walking a few blocks, sensing the judge's act, the wife returned home and found the judge on top of the slave. Railing at the judge and beating the slave a bit, she picked the girl up and went to the bathhouse. Meanwhile, the judge's balls were very hard. He had a female donkey and he decided to fuck it. He went to the barn and took hold of the tail of the donkey. The donkey, getting annoyed, started kicking. The judge saw that this way wouldn't work, so he untied his long belt and tied it around his waist and the donkey's neck. Then he hanged himself under the rump of the donkey, spat on the head of his cock and started fucking the animal. The donkey tried to get loose in vain, and, breaking its rope, ran out of the barn and into the market place. The people, seeing their judge in this position, started beating him…[264]

There may be always an "individualistic" explanation for these textual attacks against the religious people and the *ulemâ*, and the constant defamation of the social groups may be reasoned by the assumed heterodox beliefs of *Gazâlî*. From a more general perspective, analyzing the parallel maxims of *Zakânî* below, it is possible to propose that the religious people and the public preachers of the orthodox religion are always put into the centre of social satires, because they represent "hypocrisy". The textual demonstration of their real face is meant to mock any "hypocritical", "moralist", "authoritative" and "discriminating" attitude. :

> 30. Do not marry the daughters of judges, theologians, sheikhs or dignitaries, and if such a union does take place against your own will, have anal intercourse with your bride lest her evil origin show itself and your children become hypocrites, beggars or headaches for their parents.[265]
>
> 31. Don't marry the daughter of a preacher, lest she give birth to an ass.[266]
>
> 91. Try to lie with the sons of sheiks by whatever means because this is considered a virtue comparable to a great pilgrimage.[267]

---

[264] ibid. ,p. 135 and p. 253-254. Gazâlî himself says in this chapter that Nasreddin Hoca has lots of studies relating to "donkeys", since they are very well known, there is no need to repeat them in the book. I couldn't find any Nasreddin Hoca idioms that are parallel to the anecdotes told in DG. Consult, Mustafa Duman "Mehmet Gazali'nin Dafi'ul Gumum ve Rafi'ül Humum Adlı Eserinde Nasreddin Hoca" ,*Tarih ve Toplum*, no. 116 (1993): p. 54-56

[265] "The Treatise of One Hundred Maxims", in *Obeyd Zakânî The Ethics of Aristocrats and Other Satirical Works*, trans. Hasan Javadi , Middle Eastern Studies (11) (Jahan Books Co.: 1985) p. 64

[266] ibid. , p. 64

[267] ibid. , p. 67

CONCLUSION:

For philologists and literary historians, *Gazâlî* is one of those poets standing at the margin of the literary canon. The Ottoman literary canon fails to recognize them, and the contemporary prevalent and institutionalized approaches totally deny the erotic voices as worthy of study or marginalize them as pervert. However, literary representations of sexuality (anthological jokes, sexually explicit poetry, and autobiographical anecdotes evaluated under one generic group: *hezel*, or facetiae) were common, and even reached its peak in the 16th century Ottoman Empire. Rescuing these sexually explicit texts from being slighted, and re-introducing them from the margins could change the previously established monolithic and monotonous picture of the Ottoman Turkish literature, and allow the scholars to investigate the perimeters of the canon. It could also be helpful in discovering the correlations between the internal transformations in the literature and those parallel changes in culture and "patronage politics".

This study has a more restricted scope. It aims to facilitate a preliminary research agenda to study the network of social and historical relations that develop within the circle of the Ottoman cultural production. In the first and second chapters, by a close reading of the biographical collections and inclusion of his autobiographical notes into analysis, I re-assessed *Gazâlî*'s biography and re-staged the context for his literary works around the "*meclis*" phenomenon. I claimed that he was a scholar, a potential heterodox, a typical courtier and a party companion. As a figure that was in close contact with several walks of life, most probably his habitus determined the body of literature he created. Consequently, I argued that DG was sexual humour primarily to dash off in the party environment, which was the usual venue for male sexual sociability.

Alas, there are important gaps in my analysis:

Firstly, in the first and second chapters I take the convivial *mecalis* corresponding to Brother Madcap's subsequent life stages as a particular historical case; thus many different definitions that *meclis* could find in the same period, the transformations in its character and role, and complex reasonings that may be made out between these changes and broader political and economic transformations are disregarded. Apparently, positing any *meclis* within a general historical framework requires an

intense reading of large bulk of political treatises, legal decrees, histories and chronicles, *tezâkîr* and literature, as well as visual sources across longer time periods.[268]

The last chapter about DG takes a micro approach, pulling the text itself to the centre, to find answer for two basic questions: How did *Gazâlî* create a humorous world? , and why could the reader find it "funny"? My claim is that his thematic bag and literary strategies are touching on and exploit certain tangible social dynamics and hierarchies (slavery, patronage, patriarchy, class differences e.g.). He avers human interactions that may prevail in real contexts (*meclis*, *medrese*, bathhouse etc.) and creates phobias and fears rooted in collective anxieties. To sum up, *Gazâlî*'s world of representations are not discrete phenomena detached from sociological reality, but it exaggerates and makes a parody of it. That is why people find it funny and amusing.

I used selective anecdotes and jokes from Turkish popular cycles (*Zâtî* and *Nasreddin Hoca*), Islamicate, and Asian manuals (*the Joyous Treaty*, *the Treatise of One Hundred Maxims*, and *the Perfumed Garden*) so as to show the use of similar satirical means at different times and in different cultural geographies. Among these accounts, *Zâkânî*'s *the Joyous Treaty* and *the Treatise of One Hundred Maxims* are important, because they constitute a part of the body of written culture from which *Gazâlî* gleaned jokes and stories for DG.

However, to map out the complete intertextuality multilingualism should be established as the parameter in research, and the other Arabic and Persian sources enlisted by *Gazâlî* should be studied. This may bring new findings about the Ottoman readership and literary tastes. A future research should also be an "anthropological" one putting its finger on the orally transmitted jokes which were reproduced for centuries, and are still in circulation today. The history of modern joke production is traceable to this complex trafficking between "written", "oral" and "drawn" themes, elements and strategies continuing for centuries.

What is more interesting, "sexuality" is one of the major points of attractions in all kinds of humorous work during all this long time, since it unearths, exaggerates, advocates or criticizes the real workings of human societies. Such an attempt, first of all, may provide a more thorough interpretation of the book and of the marriage of

[268] Another difficulty that I faced in the process of collecting material for the thesis is that in compare to the European courts and "parties", the politico-cultural aspect of the Ottoman courts and *"mecâlis"* has been less studied. Especially see, Peter Burke, *The fortunes of the Courtier : the European reception of Castiglione's Cortegiano*. (University Park : Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996); A.G. Dickens, ed. , *The Courts of Europe : politics, patronage, and royalty, 1400-1800.* (New York : Greenwich House : Distributed by Crown Publishers, 1984).

humour and mockery with sexuality. Hopefully, it may document attitudes toward sexuality that reveal much about Ottoman culture.

Another serious gap in my analysis concerns "readership". I am not in a position to determine the larger audiences that DG might have reached than the cultured "party guests". Future studies on number and location of different copies of the book, scribes' names, variations in use of language, and probate inventories may indicate those individuals and groups that had access to DG and its "popularity" through centuries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

PRIMARY SOURCES:

Adıvar, Halide Edip. *Memoirs of Halide Edib,* with a frontispiece in color by Alexandre Pankoff and many illustrations from photographs. New York: London, The Century co., 1926.

Arıkan, Sema V. *III. Selim'in Sırkâtibi Ahmed Efendi Tarafından Tutulan Rûznâme*. Ankara: TTK, 1993.

Âşıkpaşazade. *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman*. In *Osmanlı Tarihleri*, ed. Çitçioğlu Nihal Atsız, Türkiye yayınevi, İstanbul, 1949,

Atlansoy, Kadir. *Bursa Şairleri: Bursa Vefayetnamelerindeki Şairlerin Biyografileri*. Bursa: Asa, 1997.

Beyâni, Mustafa bin Carullah. *Tezkiretü'ş Şu'arâ*, ed. İbrahim Kutluk. Ankara: TTK, 1997.

Bon, Ottaviano. *The Sultan's Seraglio: An Intimate Portrait of Life at the Ottoman Court*, ed. Gofrey Goodwin. Saqi Books, 1996.

Boratav, Pertev Naili, ed. *Nasreddin Hoca Fıkraları*. Ankara: Edebiyatçılar Derneği, 1996.

Brookes, Douglas S., trans. *Ottoman gentleman of the sixteenth century: Mustafa Âli's Mev¯aidün-Nef¯ais f¯i kav¯aidil-mec¯alis: "Tables of delicacies concerning the rules of social gatherings"*. Cambridge, Mass.: Dept. of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 2003.

Celal-zade Mustafa. *Selim-Name*, ed. Ahmet Uğur and Mustafa Çuhadar. Ankara:Kültür Bakanlığı,1000 Temel Eser [154],1990.

Çavuşoğlu Mehmet, ed. *"Lâtîfehâ-yı Zâtî"*, *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*, vol. 18 (1970): pp. 1-16 + 41-51

Düzdağ, M. Ertuğrul, ed. *Şeyhülislâm Ebussuûd Efendi Fetvaları- Işığında 16. Asır Türk Hayatı*, 2nd edit. İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1983.

Evliya Çelebi b. Derviş Muhammed Zıllî. *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*: Topkapı Sarayı Bağdat 304 Yazmasının transkripsiyonu, dizini, ed. Orhan Şaik Gökyay. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları Ltd. Şti., 1996.

Galland, Antoine. *İstanbul'a Ait Günlük Hâtıralar (1672-1673)*, vol. 1, trans. Nâhid Sırrı Örik. Ankara: TTK, 1949.

Gazâlî, Mehmed (Deli Birader). *Book of prince: Dafiü'l gumûm, rafiü'l humûm*, illustrated by Münif Fehim, trans. by Robert Landor. İstanbul : Dönence, 2001.

Gelibolulu Mustafa Âli. *Künhü'l Ahbar'ın tezkire kısmı*, ed. Mustafa İsen. Ankara: Kültür Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, 1994.

Gökyay, Orhan Şaik eds. "Gazali (Deli Birader): 'Âşık Çelebi", *Türk Dili*, no. 222 (Mart 1970) pp. 448-460.

_ "Gazali (Deli Birader): 'Âşık Çelebi", *Türk Dili*, no. 223, (Nisan 1970) pp. 18-29.

Güvahi. *Pend-nâme: (Öğütler ve atasözleri)*, ed. Mehmet Hengirmen. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1983.

Hafız Hızır İlyas Ağa. *Letaif-i Enderun*, ed. Cahit Kayra. İstanbul: Güneş, 1987.

Kınalızâde, Hasan Çelebi. *Tezkiretü'ş Şu'arâ*, vol. 2, ed. İbrahim Kutluk. Ankara: TTK, 1989.

Kraffts,Hans Ulrich. *Türklerin elinde bir Alman taciri*, 2nd edit. , trans. Turgut Akpınar**.** İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1997.

Kuru, Selim Sırrı. "*Scholar and Author in the 16th century Ottoman Empire: Deli Birader and his Dafi'ü'l-gumum ve Rafi'ü'l humum"*, unpublished PhD thesis. Cambridge MA: Harvard University, 2000.

Latifî. *Latifî Tezkiresi*, ed. Mustafa İsen. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı,1990.

_ *Evsâf-ı İstanbul,* ed. Nermin Suner (Pekin). İstanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1977.

Lütfi Paşa. *Asafnâme*, ed. Ahmet Uğur. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1982.

Mehmed Mecdi Efendi. *Eş-Şekaiku'n-nu'maniyye ve zeyilleri: Hadaikü'ş-şakaik*, ed. Abdülkadir Özcan. İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989.

Keykâvus. *Kabusname*, ed. Serpil Çalışlar Ekinci. İstanbul: Pencere Yayınları, 2003.

Melek Hanım. *Haremden Mahrem Hatıralar*. İstanbul: Oğlak, 1999.

Meredith, Owens eds. *Meşâirü'ş-şu'arâ of Tezkere of Âşık Çelebi*. Cambridge:E.J.W. Gibb Memorial,1971.

Mikes, Kelemen. *Letters from Turkey*, trans. and ed. Bernard Adams. London; New York: Kegan Paul International&Columbia University Press, c2000.

Purgstall, Joseph von Hammer. *Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi-2*. İstanbul: Üçdal, 1996.

_ *Geschichte der Osmanichen Dichtung bis auf unsere Zeit*. Pest: C.A. Hartleben, 1837.

Pick, Christopher, ed. *Embassy to Constantinople: the travels of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, introduced by Dervla Murphy. New York: New Amsterdam, c1988

Sâz, Leyla. *Anılar-19. Yüzyılda Saray*. İstanbul: Cumhuriyet, 2000.

Sehi Bey. *Heşt bihişt:Sehi Beg Tezkiresi*, ed. Günay Kut. Cambridge MA:Harvard University Press,1978.

Shaykh Nefzawi. *The Perfumed Garden of the Shaykh Nefzawi*, trans. Sir Richard Burton, ed. with an Introduction and Additional Notes by Alan Hull Walton. London: Book Club Associates,1963.

Sheykhzada. *History of the Forty Vezirs* or *the Story of the Forty Morns and Eves*, trans. E.J.W. Gibb. London: Luzac, 1886.

_ Kırk Vezir Hikayeleri, ed. Tahir Hafızoğlu. İstanbul: Selis Kitap, 2002.

Safiye Ünüvar *Saray Hatıralarım*. İstanbul: Bedir Yayınevi, 2000.

Santuri Ali Ufki Bey. *Topkapı Sarayı'nda Yaşam*. İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2000.

Senemoğlu, Yavuz. *Haydar Çelebi Ruznâmesi*. İstanbul: Tercüman?

Şeker, Mehmet, ed. *Gelibolulu Mustafa Âli ve Mevâ'ıdü'n-Nefâis fi-Kavâ'ıdil-Mecâlis*. Ankara: TTK, 1997.

Şerefeddin Sabuncuoğlu. *Cerrâhiyyetü'l- Haniyye*, vol. 1, ed. İlter Uzel. Ankara: TTK, 1992.

Tietze, Andrea, ed. Mustafa Âli's Counsel for Sultans of 1581. Vienna: 1979.

Tolasa, Harun, ed. *Kendi Kalemiyle Temeşvarlı Osman Ağa: Bir Osmanlı Türk Sipahisinin Hayatı ve Esirlik Hatıraları*. Konya: 1986.

Tugay, Emine Fuat. *Three Centuries: family chronicles of Turkey and Egypt*, with a foreword by the Dowager Marchioness of Reading. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Yazıcıoğlu Mehmed. *Muhammediye*, ed. Amil Çelebioğlu. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1996.

Yusuf Khâss Hâjib. Wisdom of Glory (Kutadgu Bilig): A Turco-Islamic Mirror for Princes, trans. Robert Dankoff. Chicago, 1987.

Yücel, Yaşar. *Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilâtına Dair Kaynaklar*. Ankara: TTK ,1988.

Zakani, 'Obeyd-e. *The Ethics of Aristocrats and Other Satirical Works*, trans. Hasan Javadi, Middle Eastern Studies, no. 11. Jahan Books Co.: 1985.

SECONDARY SOURCES:

Abou-el Haj, Rıfat. "The Expression of Ottoman Political Culture in the Literature of Advice to Princes (Nasihatnameler) 16th to 20th Centuries". In *Sociology in the Rubric of Social Science Prof. Ramkrishna Mukherjee Felicitation Volume*, eds. R.K. Bhattacharya and A.K. Ghosh, pp. 282-292 (1995).

Ahmed, Leila. *Women and gender in Islam: historical roots of a modern debate*. New Haven: Yale University Press, c1992.

Akbayar, Nuri. eds. *Dünden Bugüne Beşiktaş*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı&Büyükşehir Beşiktaş Belediyesi, 1998.

Altınay, Ahmet Refik. *Lale Devri*, sadeleştiren Dursun Gürlek. İstanbul: Timaş, 1997.

_*Eski İstanbul*, yayına hazırlayan Sami Önal. İstanbul : İletişim, 1998.

Ambrassey, N.N. and Finkel, .C.F. *The Seismicity of Turkey and Adjacent Areas: A Historical Review, 1500-1800*. İstanbul: Eren, 1995.

Andrews, Walter G. *Poetry's voice, society's song: Ottoman lyric poetry*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, c1985.

_"Literary Art of the Golden Age: The Age of Süleymân". In *Süleymân the Second and His Time*, ed. Halil İnalcık and Cemal Kafadar (Istanbul: ISIS Press, 1993): pp. 353-368.

_ *The Tezkere-i Şu'ara of Latifi as A source for the Critical Evaluation of Ottoman Poetry*, *unpublished* PhD thesis. University of Michigan, 1970.

_ "The Sexual Intertext of Ottoman Literature: The Story of Me'âlî, Magistrate of Mihalic", *Edebiyât*, vol 2-3 (1988-1989): pp. 31-56

Andrews, Walter. , Black, Najaat. , Kalpaklı, Mehmet. *Ottoman lyric poetry: an anthology*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997.

Andrews, Walter G. and Kalpaklı, Mehmet. *The Age of Beloveds: Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society*. Durham & London: Duke Univ.Press, 2005.

Andrews, Walter G. and Markoff, Irene. "Poetry, the Arts and Group Ethos in the Ideology of the Ottoman Empire", *Edebiyât*, vol.1 (1987): pp. 28-70.

Atasoy, Nurhan. A *Garden for the Sultan*. İstanbul: Koç, 2002.

Banarlı, Nihad Sâmi. *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi (Resimli)*. (İstanbul: MEB, 1998).

Bardakçı, Murat. *Osmanlı'da seks: sarayda gece dersleri*, 6th edit. İstanbul: Gür, 1992.

Biersack, Aletta. eds. *The New cultural history*, with an introduction by Lynn Hunt. Berkeley: University of California Press, c1989.

Burke, Peter. *The fortunes of the Courtier : the European reception of Castiglione's Cortegiano*. University Park : Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.

Perinçek, Doğu. *Eşcinsellik ve Yabancılaşma*. İstanbul: Kaynak, 2000.

Bennet, Paula. And Rosario, Vernon. eds. *Solitary pleasures: the historical, literary, and artistic discourses of autoeroticism*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Bouhdiba, Abdelwahab. *Sexuality in Islam*, trans. Alan Sheridan. Boston: Routledge&Kegan Paul, 1985.

Boswell, John. *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay people in Western Europe from the beginning of the Christian era to the Fourteenth Century*. Chicago, 1981.

_ "Revolutions, Universals, and Sexual Categories". In *Same sex: debating the ethics, science, and culture of homosexuality*, ed. John Corvino, pp. 185-203. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, c1997.

Brookshaw, Dominic P. "Palaces, Pavilions and Pleasure-Gardens: the context and setting of the medieval majlis", *Middle Eastern Literatures*, vol.6/no.2 (July 2003): pp. 199-223.

Corvino, John. *Same sex: debating the ethics, science, and culture of homosexuality***.** Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, c1997.

Dickens, A.G., ed. *The Courts of Europe : politics, patronage, and royalty, 1400-1800.* New York : Greenwich House : Distributed by Crown Publishers, 1984.

Duman, Mustafa Mehmet. "Gazali'nin Dafi'ul Gumum ve Rafi'ül Humum Adlı Eserinde Nasreddin Hoca", *Tarih ve Toplum*, vol. 116 (1993): pp. 54-56.

Dunne, Bruce. "Power and Sexuality in the Middle East", *Middle East Report*, issue 206 (Spring 1998): pp. 8-11+ 37

Eldem, Ethem "18. Yüzyıl ve Değişim", *Cogito Osmanlılar Özel Sayısı*, vol. 19 (Yaz, 1999): pp. 189-199

Emecen, Feridun. *XVI. Asırda Manisa Kazası*. Ankara: TTK, 1989.

Epstein, Julia. and Straub, Kristina. eds. *Body Gurads: the Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity*. NY:Routledge, 1991.

Erdoğan, Sema Nilgün. *Sexual life in Ottoman society*. İstanbul : Dönence, 1996.

Erünsal, İsmail. "Kanuni Dönemine Ait Bir İnamat Defteri", *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, no. 4 (1984): pp. 4-17.

Eyüboğlu, İsmet Zeki. *Divan şiirinde sapık sevgi*. İstanbul: Okat Yayınevi, 1968.

Fernea, Elizabeth Warnock. eds. *Women and the family in the Middle East: new voices of change*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1985.

Foucault, Michel. *The history of sexuality*, trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.

Fout, John C. *Forbidden history: the state, society, and the regulation of sexuality in modern Europe: essays from the Journal of the history of sexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Frandenburg, Louise. and Freccero, Carla. eds. *Premodern sexualities*. London ; New York : Routledge, 1996.

Gibb, J.W.I. *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol.III. London: Luzac&Co., Great Russell Street, 1904.

İnalcık, Halil. *Şâir ve Patron*. İstanbul:Doğu-Batı,2003.

İnan, Abdulkadir. *İncelemeler&Makaleler*. Ankara: TTK, 1968.

İpekten, Halûk. *Divan Edebiyatının Kaynaklarından Türkçe Şu'ara Tezkireleri*. Erzurum: 1988.

Kabbani, Rana. *Europe's Myths of Orient, Devise and Rule*. London: Pandora Press, 1988.

Kalpaklı, Mehmet. eds. *Divan Edebiyatı Üzerine Metinler*. İstanbul: YKY, 1999.

Kandiyoti, Deniz. eds. *Gendering the Middle East: emerging perspectives*. New University Press, 1996.

_ "The Paradoxes of Masculinity: Some thoughts on segregated societies". In *Dislocating Masculinity: comparative etnoghraphies*, eds. Andrea Cornwall and Nancy Lindisfarne. London&New York: Routledge, 1994.

Karamustafa, Ahmet. *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the lslamic Later Middle Period 1200-1550*. University of Utah Press, 1994.

Keddie, Nikki R. and Baron, Beth. eds. *Women in Middle Eastern history: shifting boundaries in sex and gender*. New Haven : Yale University Press, c1991.

Keddie, Nikki R. and Beck, Lois. eds. *Women in the Muslim world*. Cambridge, Mass. :Harvard University Press, 1978, New York : Syracuse.

Koçu, Reşat Ekrem. *Eski İstanbul'da meyhaneler ve meyhane köçekleri*, 2nd edit. İstanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık, 2002.

_ *Kabakçı Mustafa: bir serserinin romanlaştırılmış hayatı*, 3rd edit., illustrated by Dağıstan Çetinkaya. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, c2003.

_*Tarihten hikayeler kızlarağasının piçi*, 2nd edit. İstanbul: Doğan Kitapları, 2000.

_*Binbirdirek Batakhanesi Cevahirli Hanımsultan*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitapçılık, 2003.

_*Yeniçeriler*, resimler Sabiha Bozcalı. İstanbul: Koçu Yayınları, 1964.

_*Erkek Kızlar.* Doğan Kitapçılık,2001.

Köprülü, Mehmed Fuat. "Harabat Erenleri: Deli Birader",*Yeni Mecmu'a*, no. 5 (1917): pp. 285-288.

_ *Edebiyat Araştırmaları-II*. İstanbul: Ötüken, 1989.

_ *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, 2nd edit. İstanbul: Ötüken: pp. 387.

Kuru, Selim S. "Women, Gender and Representations of Sexualities and Gender in Poetry and Prose: Pre-modern, Including Courtly Poetry&Prose: Turkish". Forthcoming.

Kut (Alpay), Günay. "Gazâlî'nin Mekke'den İstanbul'a Yolladığı Mektup ve Ona Yazılan Cevaplar", *TDAY Belleten*, no. 2 (1973-1974): pp. 245-250.

_ "The Classical Period in Turkish Literature". In *The Ottoman Civilization-II*., ed. Günsel Renda and Halil İnalcık, pp. 526-268 Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.

Levend, Âgah Sırrı Edebiyat *Tarihi*. İstanbul: Kanat Yayınları, 1939.

_"Gazali (Deli Birader)'nin Cer-Namesi", *Türk Dili Araştırmaları* (1970): pp.123-124.

_ "Divan Edebiyatında Gülmece ve Yergi*"*, *TDAY Belleten* (1970): pp.37-45.

Lewis, Bernard. "Ottoman Observers of Decline", *Islamic Studies*, vol. I (1962): pp. 71-87.

Mengi, Mine. "Divan Şiirinde Yergi Amaçlı Söz Sanatları". *JTS*, vol. XX (1996): pp.126-132.

Meriwether, Margaret L. and Tucker, Judith E. *Social history of women and gender in the modern Middle East*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1999

Murphey, Rhodes. "Westernizaiton in the Eighteenth Century Ottoman Empire: How far, How Fast", *BMGS*, no. 23 (1999): pp. 116-139.

Murray, Stephen O. and Roscoe, Will. *Islamic Homosexualities: culture, history, and literature*, with additional contributions by Eric Allyn. New York&London: New York University Press, 1997.

Najmabadi, Afsaneh. and Merguerian, Gayane Karen. "Zuleykha and Yusuf: Whose 'Best' Story? ". *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 29 (Nov. 1997): pp.485-509.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. *Babaî İsyanı*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1980.

_ *Alevî Bektaşî İnançlarının İslam Öncesi Kökenleri*, 2nd edit. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2000.

_ *Marjinal Sufilik: Kalenderiler*. Ankara: TTK, 1995.

Peirce, Lesli P. *The imperial harem: women and sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

_"Shifting Boundries: Images of Ottoman Royal Women in the 16ht and 17th Centuries". *Critical Matrix*, no. 4, 1998, pp. 43-82.

Rabinow, Paul. eds. *The Essential Works /Ethics*, vol.1. Allen Lane The Penguin Press, 1997.

Roux, Jean Paul. *Türklerin ve Moğolların Eski Dini*. İstanbul: İşaret Yayınları, 1994.

Rowson, Everett and Wright,Jr. J.W. eds. *Homoeroticism in Classical Arab Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Schimitt, Arno and Sofer, Jehodea. eds. *Sexuality and Eroticism among Males in Moslem Societies*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press, 1992.

Schimitt, Arno. *Bio-bibliography of Male-Male Sexuality and Eroticism in Muslim Societies*. Berlin: Verlag Rosa Winkel, 1995.

Schmidt, Jan. *The Joys of Philology: Studies in Ottoman Literature, History and Orientalism (1500 - 1923)*, Volume 1. İstanbul: ISIS, 2001.

Sevengil, Ahmet Refik. *İstanbul nasıl eğleniyordu? : 1453'ten 1927'ye kadar*, hazırlayan Sami Önal. İstanbul: İletişim, 1998.

Schick, İrvin Cemil. Batının *cinsel kıyısı başkalıkçı söylemde cinsellik ve mekansallık*, trans. Savaş Kılıç, Gamze Sarı. İstanbul: TVYY, 2001.

Sılay, Kemal. *Nedim and the poetics of the Ottoman court: medieval inheritance and the need for change*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University, 1994.

Tolasa, Harun. *Sehi, Latifi, 'Âşık Çelebi Tezkirelerine Göre XVI. Yüzyılda Edebiyat Araştırma ve Eleştirisi*. İzmir Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi, 1983.

Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. *Osmanlı Devletinin saray teşkilâtı*, 3rd edit. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1988.

_"II İnci Bayezid'in Oğullarından Sultan Korkut", *Belleten*, XXX, No. 120, Ekim 1966: pp. 539-601.

_"Sancağa Çıkartılan Osmanlı Şehzadeleri", *Belleten*, XXXIX, No. 156, Ekim 1975: pp. 659-696.

Zachariadou, Elizabeth. *Osmanlı Beyliği*. (İstanbul: TVYY, 1997).

Zilfi, Madeline C. eds. *Women in the Ottoman Empire: Middle Eastern women in the early Modern Era*. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997.

ENCYLOPEDIAS:

İslam Ansiklopedisi*, D.İ.A.*

İslam Ansiklopedisi*, M.E.B.*

Encyclopedia of Islam*, New Edition. Leiden:Brill.*

Koçu, Reşat Ekrem. İstanbul Ansiklopedisi. *İstanbul: İstanbul Yayınevi, 1948.*

Osmanlılar Ansiklopedisi. *İstanbul:YKY,1999.*

Pakalın, Zeki. Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri. *İstanbul: MEB, 1993*

INTERNET RESOURCES:

www.ibnistan.net/sarkescinsellik/sark (last accessed on 02/10/2005)

www.b.net/kosmos/eshtoplumsalkar (last accessed on 02/10/2005)