

THE CITY AS A PERFORMATIVE STAGE:
A SOCIO-SPATIAL ANALYSIS OF *MEŞÁ'İRÜ'Ş-ŞU'ARÁ*

ÖZGE IŞIK

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2024

THE CITY AS A PERFORMATIVE STAGE:
A SOCIO-SPATIAL ANALYSIS OF *MEŞÂ'İRÜ'Ş-ŞU'ARÂ*

Thesis submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts in
History

by
Özge Işık

Boğaziçi University

2024

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Özge Işık, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis, and I have fully acknowledged and documented, in my view, all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature

Date

ABSTRACT

The City as a Performative Stage:

A Socio-Spatial Analysis of *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ*

The prospective study explores aspects of the Ottoman urban imagination of a city and its social network through a focus on the socialization practices of poets narrated in a group of texts called *tezkiretü'ş-şu'arâ* (biographical dictionary of poets). The purpose of this study is to investigate and map the diversity of experience, mobility, and performance of men of different paths who congregated in various spots in the early modern Ottoman capital, Istanbul. This will be accomplished through a critical analysis of how poets, as well as their encounters and use of space, were narrated and perceived in a specific text, *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ* (Stations of Poets), written by a sixteenth-century literati 'Âşık Çelebi. To explore the interaction between social practices and spatiality, this study examines various spots and residences in terms of their location and urban context, and attempts to specify what these reveal regarding the poets' daily lives and relationships with the city in a larger context. Furthermore, it poses questions regarding how the city as a stage for men's performances reveals the elites' biases and anxieties about status, gender dynamics and the urban environment. Accordingly, the thesis scrutinizes the ways men act in, and claims the city and how this relates to the novel modes of urbanity and expanding range of public spaces that made itself evident in sixteenth-century Ottoman Istanbul.

ÖZET

Performatif Bir Sahne Olarak Şehir:

Meşâ'irü 'ş-şu'arâ'nın Sosyo-Mekânsal Bir Analizi

Bu çalışma, *tezkiretü 'ş-şu'arâ* adlı bir grup metinde anlatılan şairlerin sosyalleşme pratiklerini odağına alarak Osmanlı kent tahayyülünü ve sosyal ağının çeşitli yönlerini keşfetmektedir. Bu çalışmanın amacı erken modern Osmanlı başkenti olan İstanbul'da çeşitli noktalarda bir araya gelen ve farklı sosyal çevrelere mensup erkeklerin deneyim, hareketlilik ve performans çeşitliliğini araştırmak ve haritalandırmaktır. Bu, şairlerin, onların karşılaşmalarının ve mekân kullanımının on altıncı yüzyıl yazarı 'Âşık Çelebi'ye ait *Meşâi'irü 'ş-şu'arâ* adlı metinde nasıl anlatıldığı ve algılandığının eleştirel bir analizi yoluyla gerçekleştirilecektir. Sosyal pratikler ve mekânsallık arasındaki etkileşimi incelemek için, bu çalışma çeşitli mekân ve muhitleri konumları ve kentsel bağlamları açısından inceler ve bunların şairlerin günlük yaşamları ve şehirle olan ilişkileri hakkında neyi ortaya çıkardığını belirlemeye çalışır. Ayrıca, şehrin erkeklerin performansları için bir sahne işlevi üstlenerek nasıl elitlerin statü, toplumsal cinsiyet dinamikleri ve kent hakkındaki önyargılarını ve endişelerini ortaya çıkardığına dair sorular sorar. Böylelikle, tez erkeklerin şehirdeki hareketlerinin ve şehri sahiplenme biçimlerinin on altıncı yüzyıl Osmanlı İstanbul'unda yeni yeni ortaya çıkan kentlilik imgeleri ve genişleyen kamusal alan yelpazesıyla nasıl ilişkili olduğunu inceler.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I was able to complete this dissertation thanks to the generosity and kindness of many individuals and institutions who supported me in different ways. First and foremost, I express my sincerest gratitude to my thesis advisor, Çiğdem Kafesciođlu, for her support throughout my undergraduate and graduate studies. As she became a source of inspiration, I learned much from her as a historian and mentor. She has always given me the freedom to formulate my own questions and structure my ideas yet intervene in the right places to remind me about what I was doing.

I would also like to thank Derin Terziođlu for her intellectual generosity and encouragement during my graduate years. She had contributed to several drafts of this text and listened to my endless talks on ‘Âşık Çelebi and his wanderings around Istanbul. I am also grateful to Selim S. Kuru and Ahmet Ersoy, who kindly and happily accepted to take place on my thesis committee. In addition, I would like to thank Selçuk Esenbel and Lâle Uluç, who made me interested in history academically, and N. İpek Hünler for her comments and feedback on the earlier stages of this study by asking me eye-opening questions.

Writing a thesis devoted to space and spatiality, it would not be fair not to mention Boğaziçi University and its academic environment as they become crucial spaces for the very existence of this thesis. The History and Literature departments played a significant role in shaping my intellectual output. The Aptullah Kuran Library became a second home where I not only studied for endless hours but also enjoyed taking part in intriguing discussions with professors and friends during coffee breaks at its door. The Cultural Heritage Museum Building, or *Müze* as we all

call it, was another spot where I learned how to teach or “make” history as a graduate assistant. I am indebted to another *Müze*, Türkiye İş Bankası Müzesi, since the folk there showed me that there are always other ways of being and telling stories. I also thank TÜBİTAK for providing me with a graduate scholarship to conduct my research.

I was very lucky to have a supporting family and friends at the different stages of my research. My grandparents never failed to support me through all those years until I found my way to graduate studies, even when they constantly worried that I might end up unemployed as a social scientist. Besides being the kindest person in my life, Alkan endured my constant struggle with ideas and works. My admiration for his honest being and commitment would continue forever. I am also indebted to my dear friends, Agâh, Ege, Rabia, and Yağmur, who prevented me from getting lost in this process, even though I have not been able to fully acknowledge their contributions yet. Despite our turbulent relationship, a secretive thanks goes to H for simply reminding me that there is still much to explore about oneself.



*New stories are born from old—it is the
new combinations that make them new.*

Haroun and the Sea of Stories

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Methodology and approaches	4
1.3 Remarks on the chapters of this study	13
CHAPTER 2: THE MAKING OF THE <i>MEŞÂ'İRÜ'Ş-ŞU'ARÂ</i>	15
2.1 The <i>tezkire</i> as a genre and its transmission to the Ottoman lands	15
2.2 'Âşık Çelebi in <i>Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ</i>	22
2.3 <i>Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ</i> and its significance in Ottoman literary tradition	27
CHAPTER 3: WHERE TO MEET YOUR FRIEND OR LOVER	35
3.1 The use and function of space in Ottoman literature	36
3.2 Spatial attributions in <i>Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ</i>	38
3.3 Early modern Ottoman sociability and its spatial configuration.....	43
CHAPTER 4: CLAIMING THE CITY	66
4.1 Determining the limits of physical mobility	66
4.2 Mapping <i>Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ</i> : Spatial presence and mobility of Ottoman poets	77
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	95
APPENDIX A: TYPES OF SITES AND STRUCTURES IN <i>MEŞÂ'İRÜ'Ş-ŞU'ARÂ</i>	100
APPENDIX B: LIST OF STRUCTURES IN <i>MEŞÂ'İRÜ'Ş-ŞU'ARÂ</i>	102
REFERENCES.....	146

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

*Kara Bâli-zâde'nün hânesinde şu'arâ vü zurefâ cem' olmuş idi. Her biri çerb-zebânlıklar ve şîrîn-beyânlıklar idüp yanıp yakılmakda şem' olmuş idi.*¹

1.1 Introduction

The prospective study explores aspects of the Ottoman urban imagination of a city and its social network through a focus on the socialization practices of poets narrated in a group of texts called *tezkiRETÜ'Ş-ŞU'ARÂ* (biographical dictionary of poets).² The purpose of this study is to investigate and map the diversity of experience, mobility, and performance of men of different paths who congregated in various spots in the early modern Ottoman capital, Istanbul. This will be accomplished through a critical analysis of how poets, as well as their encounters and use of space, were narrated and perceived in the texts mentioned. Although the primary focus is *Meşâi'irü'Ş-ŞU'ARÂ* (Stations of Poets), penned by a sixteenth-century Ottoman bureaucrat and literati es-Seyyid Pîr Mehemed bin Çelebi, known as 'Âşık Çelebi (936/1520-979/1572), other biographical dictionaries have written prior and contemporary to *Meşâi'irü'Ş-ŞU'ARÂ* will also be of interest for possible links and further liaison.³

¹ "In Kara Bâli-zâde's mansion, poets and intellectuals had gathered. Each of them was skilled in eloquent speech and sweet expressions, adding to the warmth of the gathering with their charming words." Âşık Çelebi, *Meşâi'irü'Ş-ŞU'ARÂ*, ed. Filiz Kılıç (Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2018), vol. I, 524.

² *TezkiRETÜ'Ş-ŞU'ARÂ* literally means reminiscence(s) of poets. In this study, I will use the terms biographical dictionary of poets, *tezkiRETÜ'Ş-ŞU'ARÂ* and *tezkiRE* interchangeably to avoid any misconception. For an early and brief study on Ottoman *tezkiRE* tradition, see James Stewart-Robinson, "The Ottoman Biographies of Poets," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 24, n.1/2 (1965), 57-74.

³ In this thesis, the critical edition of the text prepared by Filiz Kılıç was used for the references. Unless otherwise stated, all translations from Ottoman to English belong to the author of this thesis.

Being aware that the possibilities provided by *tezkires* in terms of spatial representation in the Ottoman realm are limited due to genre, this thesis argues that ‘Âşık Çelebi’s *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ* provides a form spatial continuity that often exceeds the fragmented structure inherent in the *tezkire* genre. Accordingly, having a closer look at ‘Âşık Çelebi’s work, one should be able to have the added benefit of getting a better sense of the perceptions, as well as representations of Istanbul’s literary production and interaction sites from a poet’s point of view. To put it another way, this study claims that the biographical dictionaries of poets not only present specific information on the lives and activities of the Ottoman literati but also suggest something of the general character of the spatial dimension of such activities and socialization practices of the poets at large.

Although discussing the spatial sensitivity of the early modern Ottoman authors, especially through fictional texts, goes beyond the limits of this humble study, it aims to draw attention to the originality of a single author, that is, ‘Âşık Çelebi, as it may open new projections on such texts’ availability as a genre, or a singular text for future studies examining spatial sensitivity across-genres. In doing so, this study argues that a broader inquiry into the urban imagery of such biographical dictionaries of poets would reveal how they juxtapose with the developing urban life of Istanbul. This exploration, therefore, is intended to contribute to a better understanding of how poets engaged with the city and interacted with their contemporaries.

‘Âşık Çelebi, intentionally or not so intentionally, depicts the lived spaces, commercial areas, spaces of encounter, and spaces of socialization side by side in his narrative. Analyzing such a spatial experience, this thesis claims that *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ* provides substantial data for understanding the socialization practices of

society, particularly those of men. Considering the spaces mentioned in the text and mobilities inherent to these, this study emphasizes the diversity of socialization spaces. More importantly, examining the entirety of the spaces in ‘Âşık Çelebi’s narrative, it suggests that these spaces not only shaped and restricted the mobility of the poets, but also provided a form of plurality. Thus, this thesis also highlights the experiences that differentiate through the politics of visibility and mobility.

In addition to a shared bond in their commitment to a specific mode of urbanity, this study elaborates on many variables defining one’s inclusion to or exclusion from certain places, including social status, networks, and professional associations. Hence, scrutinizing areas of presence, mobility, and socialization practices of the poets, it characterizes the spatial experiences of the poets of the age, on the one hand, maps the diversity and distribution of such venues to the city on the other. To explore the interaction between social practices and spatiality, it examines various spots and residences in terms of their location and urban context, and attempts to specify what these reveal regarding the poets’ daily lives and relationships with the city in a larger context. Furthermore, it poses questions regarding how the city as a stage for men’s performances reveals the elites’ biases and anxieties about status, gender dynamics and the urban environment.

The introduction continues by a section devoted to methodology and approaches asserting the main questions and themes of this study to demonstrate the relevance of such discussions to the sixteenth-century Istanbulite. Doing so, it also explains how this thesis reads *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, contextualizes the anecdotes in it, and makes use of space to create an analytical framework. Finally, the chapter concludes with remarks on each chapter and explicates their premises.

1.2 Methodology and approaches

Together with other biographical dictionaries of poets, *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ* has been endlessly mined as a repository of *facts* [emphasis added], either concerning the biographies of poets and their poetic samples or the very literary environment in which these texts were produced. Therefore, little has been written that deals with biographical dictionaries of poets as a source of representation and the manifestation of the urban experience, especially before the 2010s. Since I encountered mostly anecdotal notes from secondary sources describing the activities and experiences of poets in various districts of Istanbul, the need for a critical understanding of the use of space and narrativity in such texts became apparent to me while I was taking a course on Ottoman *tezkires* during my undergraduate studies.

Since this thesis aims to conduct a socio-spatial analysis of the locations in *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, it is necessary to state that the text reflects the socio-spatial and cultural understanding of its author. Hence, the examination conducted here seeks primarily to be historically grounded. Throughout the thesis, various deductions and interpretations I have made, although based on 'Âşık Çelebi and his text, reflect the understanding of his era at the same time. Therefore, it would not be wrong to argue that when examining the mobility of the mentioned poets, I am essentially discussing a broader Ottoman sociability.

However, I have to note that my understanding of the concept of socialization practices inherent to the text has evolved over time through various readings I have done. In other words, during my first examination of *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, I approached the narrative as a means of extracting fragments of experiences of various segments of the early modern Ottoman society. When examined through the lens of politics of visibility, however, I realized that the text might reveal

interesting stories where ‘Âşık Çelebi overlooks or remains silent on specific cases as well. Therefore, when I look after the factors that determined, shaped, and limited the poets’ visibility, I realized that the most dominant and visible group mentioned in the text appears to be the Muslim, particularly Sunni, males. *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ* includes a mere three women in its broad expanse, and the author mostly remains silent about the experiences of women and non-Muslim population of the empire.

In other words, the main incentive of this thesis assumes that biographical dictionaries of poets are ideally suited, yet, so far, neglected sources in terms of their spatiality. As a part of a broader inquiry into the urban imagery of the period, however, it would not be an exaggeration to claim that *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ* juxtaposes with the developing urban life of the sixteenth-century Istanbul. Being a narrative account, *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ* might provide invaluable insights into the urban experiences of the poets and their interaction with the city at large. It is undeniable that the production and use of space, and spatial practices occupy an important place in the scholarship, and numerous important studies have already addressed such issues. In that sense, this thesis argues that the studies proposing different approaches to the Ottoman public space and the spatial practices of the Ottomans might enable us to read the biographical dictionaries of poets from a nuanced point of view.

While some of these works examine space and the use of space in the Ottoman realm in a broader context from a historical perspective, some of them evaluate these on a discourse basis through critical reading of literary sources. Although differing in their aims and approaches, the first group of historians attributed to urban space an integral role in their analyses through focusing on institutional, social and architectural aspects of Ottoman Istanbul as an urban center. Since the second group of historians focusing on the the fictional sources are related

to the subject of the thesis, it would suffice to mention a selection of distinguished scholars who have delved into the social structures and dynamics of Ottoman Istanbul.⁴

These would include but are not necessarily limited to studies done by Alexander Shopov, Cemal Kafadar, Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, Derin Terzioğlu, Doğan Kuban, Ebru Boyar, Emine Fetvacı, Gülru Necipoğlu, Halil İnalçık, Madaline C. Zilfi, Marinos Sariyannis, Metin Kunt, Nina Ergin, Leyla Kayhan Elbirlik, Ömer Lütü Barkan, Shirine Hamadeh, Stefan Yerasimos, Suraiya Faroqhi, Tülay Artan, Zeynep Yürekli. Though not primarily focusing on Ottoman fiction and literary practices, the studies of such scholars paved the way for intriguing discussions on how to interpret and analyze the ways in which the Ottomans envisioned, understood, and interacted with the city.

As part of a broader inquiry into the urban imaginary of Ottoman Istanbulites, the second group of historians have surveyed different genres of writing, specifically fictional ones, on Istanbul and its role as a subject of literature on its own. Here, one should mention two preliminary studies by Agâh Sırrı Levend and Haluk İpekten. Levend's work titled *Türk Edebiyatında Şehr-engizler ve Şehr-engizlerde İstanbul* focuses on a distinctive mode of city description called *şehrengîz*,⁵ and surveys the development of this particular genre by providing examples from the sources and listing the available literature for future studies.

A much later study done by Mehmet Kalpaklı and Walter G. Andrews, for instance, chases the social context in which the same genre flourished, and provides a

⁴ By using the word fictional, I imply not only the manuscript or printed versions of text that have survived to the present day but also the canon in which they were produced, the possible genres and texts that are included or excluded in the formation of this canon, and the different realities and representations that such genres and texts provide.

⁵ Agâh Sırrı Levend, *Türk Edebiyatında Şehr-engizler ve Şehr-engizlerde İstanbul* (İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti İstanbul Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1958).

somewhat comparative framework.⁶ İpekten's study, *Divan Edebiyatında Edebî Muhitler*, on the other hand, claims that the development and canonization of the Ottoman literature in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries can also be read through the palaces where the artists and poets of the age gathered.⁷ The book traces the places where *divan* literature found an environment to develop, and mostly points to places where the associates with properties belonging to the palace networks. While the first part of the book marks the gathering spots of poets in the center of the state and provinces, the second chapter expands towards the public space associated with the urban culture. Here, İpekten examines the *meclis* (gathering) culture, shops and taverns.⁸ Although these studies provided valuable insights into the city's social history through fictional texts, it is important to note that their authors did not necessarily intended to tackle with the practical use of space, but rather reflected descriptively on what space is being referred to in the eyes of the Ottoman poets.

Today, there is an already extensive literature surveying different genres of writing about Istanbul in terms of spatial dynamics, especially written after the 2000s. Tülay Artan's study on the various forms and forums of social, political and cultural expressions, for instance, examines the Ottoman urban space through the concept of privacy.⁹ Her article reads the city and city descriptions, both visual and textual, together with the political environment that shaped such descriptions by using spaces such as coffeehouses, bathhouses, and gardens. A more recent article by Marinos Sariyannis titled "Sociability, Public Life and Decorum" continues where

6 Walter G. Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı, *The Age of Beloveds: Love and the Beloved in Early Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2005), 40-58.

7 Haluk İpekten, *Divan Edebiyatında Edebî Muhitler* (İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1996).

⁸ İpekten, *Divan Edebiyatında Edebî Muhitler*, 227-251.

⁹ Tülay Artan, "Forms and Forums of Expression: Istanbul and Beyond, 1600-1800," in *The Ottoman World*, ed. Christine Woodhead (New York: Routledge, 2012), 378-406.

Tülay Artan left off, providing a more detailed reading of Ottoman descriptions of social gatherings. Exploring the interplay between sociability, public life, and decorum in the early modern context, his article covers the norms and etiquette governing social interactions, the role of public spaces in fostering sociability, and how decorum shapes the behavior and perceptions. Here, Sariyannis uses different settings, including coffeehouses, taverns, bozahânes (selling a wam malt drink), barbershops, public bathhouses, and gardens to analyze the Ottoman consumption models through such spatialities.¹⁰

Although it does not intend to tackle the spatial dynamics of Ottoman poetry or Istanbul specifically, Sooyong Kim's thesis offers "a critical-historical framework for better understanding Zâtî's work and his position" in the literary atmosphere of the sixteenth-century Ottoman world.¹¹ In doing so, dealing with Zâtî's career in Istanbul and seeking different spots and audiences for whom his poetry was composed, Kim's study allows us to differentiate the physical space and spaces used as topos in *divan* literature.¹²

Here, one should also mention two scholars, bringing a different lens, that is, gender, into the discussion: Didem Havlioğlu and Selim S. Kuru. While Havlioğlu examines the relationship between the *meclis* culture and poetic discourse, she makes use of major concepts developed by feminist theory and gender studies, including "subject position," "marginality," and "performativity." Her study on Mihrî (d.1515)

¹⁰ Marinos Sariyannis, "Sociability, Public Life, and Decorum," in *A Companion to Early Modern Istanbul*, eds. Shirine Hamadeh and Çiğdem Kafescioğlu (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2021), 473-502.

¹¹ Sooyong Kim, *The Last of an Age: the Making and Unmaking of a Sixteenth-century Ottoman Poet* (London: Routledge, 2018), 4.

¹² Kim, *The Last of an Age*, especially 27-53.

tries to answer how a woman poet, Mihrî, could locate herself in an intellectual space, that is poetry, formulated and dominated by men.¹³

Using poetry as a source to reconsider the relationship between sociability and gender roles in Ottoman history likewise, Kuru's studies particularly focus on men and try to characterize their experience as urbanites. One of his recent works, "Istanbul: A City of Men," for example, brings various genres together and argues that such narrative and fictional sources commenting on city life allow historians to "map out the way that male inhabitants of Istanbul became visible in the cityscape through the signification of their vocational and ethno-religious associations."¹⁴ In this article, Kuru characterizes the spatial experiences of men and maps their spatial presence within the city. Highlighting the diversity of experiences of men through masculine performances, he challenges the ways in which Ottoman historians used to analyze the use of space in Istanbul by its male residents.

The following article in the same volume written by Lucienne Thys-Şenocak, on the other hand, traces the presence and agency of women in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Istanbul through a wide range of textual and non-textual sources, including court records, inheritance registers, letters, paintings, and architecture. Looking from a multitude perspective, Thys-Şenocak's article goes beyond the strict boundaries and binary oppositions and challenges the ways the Ottoman historians have conceptualized gender.

The "spatial turn" in the humanities and social sciences, sparked by Henri Lefebvre and many others, recognizes space as something produced and reproduced by humans. Mobility relates to what Lefebvre refers to as spatial practices or

¹³ Didem Havlioğlu, *Mihrî Hatun: Performance, Gender Bending, and Subversion in Ottoman Intellectual History* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2017).

¹⁴ Selim S. Kuru, "Istanbul: A City of Men," in *A Companion to Early Modern Istanbul*, 66.

movements that people make in their daily or not-so-daily lives. Representations of space, on the other hand, are linked to spatial practices because they guide people's movements. In that sense, the representational space, which refers not only to the space people live in but also to how they experience and use space symbolically,¹⁵ becomes especially important for studying social, political, and cultural interactions in various historical contexts.

That said, it is clear from his own writings that 'Âşık Çelebi was much of a man about town where he attended convivial gatherings as poetry, indeed, was an integral part of these social occasions. His account, therefore, could allow us, first, to characterize the spatial experiences of the poets of the age who traversed the far corners of an ever-expanding Istanbul and, second, to map the diversity of venues where they congregated. Since this requires a more systematic analysis of its own, this study makes use of an analysis of a number of key sites, districts, and neighborhoods to map the presence and movements of the poets through the anecdotes taken from the text.

Although criticized after the 1960s, statistical methods in the social sciences provide several advantages and serve as a point of reference for conceptualization and modeling.¹⁶ However, narrative texts such as *Meşâ'irü 'ş-su'arâ* include data that appears to be difficult to represent and analyze with the explanatory models that have been developed for mostly numerical data. With the new developments in digital humanities, the use of statistical and raw data allows historians to develop a new set of opportunities to identify and map the data in visualizing patterns of spatial

¹⁵ To read more on this issue, see Henry Lefebvre, *The Production of the Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), 14; 32-36.

¹⁶ On the discussions about quantitative methods, see John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods and New Directions in the Study of Modern History* (Harlow: Longman, 2010).

distribution and relations.¹⁷ For instance, with the help of GIS-generated maps, Firuzan Melike Sümertaş and Murat Tülek mapped architectural projects commissioned and endowed by Ottoman women from the sixteenth century onwards, and analyzed the distribution and patronage patterns of these in Istanbul.¹⁸

Meşâ'irü 'ş-şu'arâ as explored throughout this study, is a multi-layered text due to both the opportunities provided by the genre and 'Âşık Çelebi's own literary style. The thesis emerged as a result of multiple readings, with the initial focus on tracing spatial networks and a subsequent detailed reading to list all existing spaces within the text. The intention was initially to depict all these spaces on a digital map. However, I encountered a challenge since the author often used major reference points such as mosques, madrasas, and tombs instead of providing explicit descriptions, assuming the reader of his time would be familiar with the structures or buildings he mentions. While this challenges the modern reader's understanding, it suggests that 'Âşık Çelebi may have intended his text to be received within the context of his own time. This possibility imposes limitations on spatial analysis, particularly in pinpointing the locations of certain reference points that may not have survived to the present day. Additionally, when attempting to map existing or surviving spaces or references, it becomes challenging to create a map that specifically identifies each site, resulting instead in a map showing regional concentrations.

¹⁷ For further information on the digital “turn” and GIS, see Anne Kelly Knowles and Amy Hillier, *Placing History: How Maps, Spatial Data, and GIS are Changing Historical Scholarship* (Redlands: ESRI Press, 2008); for the impact of digital humanities on Ottoman studies, see Chris Gratien, Michael Polczynski, and Nir Shafir, “Digital Frontiers of Ottoman Studies,” *Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association* 1/1-2 (2014), 37-51.

¹⁸ The project is titled “Map of Women Patron’s Structures in Ottoman Istanbul.” [Osmanlı İstanbul’unda Kadın Bani Yapıları Haritası | SALT \(saltonline.org\)](https://saltonline.org) (Accessed 23 March 2023)

Furthermore, it is necessary to emphasize that the spatial descriptions found within the text vary temporally. In other words, as will be seen in Appendix B, the detailed descriptions in *Meşâ'irü's-su'arâ* mostly pertain to the biographies of certain poets who were contemporaries of 'Âşık Çelebi with whom he shared the same environment or those about whom he at least had direct access to information. In this sense, parts of *Meşâ'irü's-su'arâ* can also be read as an autobiographical text, as the author's firsthand experiences contribute to the elaboration and refinement of the biographies.

Accordingly, this thesis includes two appendices demonstrating different subjects and issues that are not necessarily linked in the text, yet can offer a complex web of relationships between the social, cultural, and physical aspects of the urban life of Istanbulite. Appendix A roughly lists the names and types of structures found in *Meşâ'irü's-su'arâ* arranged under five categories.¹⁹ Appendix B is a table that demonstrates the spatial and urban experiences of the inhabitants of the city arranged in tabular form.²⁰ It includes each site's name, its neighborhood or location, description, if available, and people who are associated with it. It also includes the page numbers where the relevant information is found in the critical edition of the text used for this study. Based on the anecdotes in circulation, the diversity and distribution of such venues in the city are manifested in the table. Thus, the number of sites and people who were associated with these sites highlight the very diversified nature of socialization and allow us to read *Meşâ'irü's-su'arâ* from a multiplicity of perspective in terms of spatiality.

¹⁹ See Appendix A titled "Types of sites and structures in *Meşâ'irü's-su'arâ*," 100-101.

²⁰ See Appendix B titled "List of structures *Meşâ'irü's-su'arâ*," 102-145.

1.3 Remarks on the chapters of this study

This study's organization reflects my desire to bring together topics and questions that are not often discussed together, but that occasionally can provide different layers of connections between the socio-economic, cultural, and spatial dimensions of urbanity. The second chapter, "The Making of the *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ*," provides a brief information on the *tezkiretü'ş-şu'arâ* genre, and tackles the Ottoman endeavors on the *tezkire* writing practices in particular. It claims that the Ottoman *tezkire*, examples of which began to be composed in the early sixteenth century, started to be produced in an era paralleled by a spatial and social transformation marked by expanding urbanism in the Ottoman cities. In what follows the chapter provides information on 'Âşık Çelebi and contextualizes his magnum opus, *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, among the other biographical dictionaries of poets that were produced in the Ottoman realm.

The third chapter, "Where to Meet Your Friend or Lover," tackles spatial references in *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ*. Following 'Âşık Çelebi's journey through the corners of Istanbul, this chapter lists various spots to prove how the text manifests that poetry was an integral part of social and literary gatherings held within the city, and is an appropriate source to analyze further the interaction between spatiality, social practices of poets, and urbanity. Furthermore, it examines individual sites discussed in the text and discusses their function in the poets' lives. In doing so, this chapter attempts to make observations on what 'Âşık Çelebi's understanding space was, how he perceived and described it, and tackles certain anecdotes and sections through close reading.

Scrutinizing areas of presence, mobility, and socialization of the poets within the city, the fourth chapter, titled "Claiming the City," poses questions

regarding the way these areas and, more generally, the city is used. Thus, this chapter rather focuses on the issues of mobility and its borders, the use of private and public space, and the dynamic nature of movement or possible points for transitions within a physical space. To achieve such an aim, it characterizes the spatial and urban experiences of the city's male inhabitants by mapping the diversity and distribution of such venues to the city. Since this requires a more systematic analysis of its own, this section provides an in-depth investigation into the developing relationships between men and their daily rituals corresponding to manifold locations through anecdotes narrated. Accordingly, it scrutinizes the ways men act in, and claims the city and how this relates to the novel modes of urbanity and expanding range of public spaces that made itself evident in sixteenth-century Ottoman Istanbul.

The fifth chapter is the conclusion. It briefly summarizes what has been done throughout this thesis. It highlights how *Meşâi'irü's-su'arâ*, in particular, and biographical dictionaries of poets in general, could reflect 'Âşık Çelebi's sensitivity to space and spatiality, thus, offer multiple perceptions of literary production sites and spatial experiences of the Ottoman literary elites that can be further examined in future studies.

CHAPTER 2 THE MAKING OF THE *MEŞÂ'İRÜ'Ş-ŞU'ARÂ*

... *tezkiretü'ş-şu'arâ olmayup aslda târîh-i şu'arâ olduğı cihetden ... Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ ad olundu.*²¹

This chapter addresses Ottoman efforts on *tezkire* writing methods in particular and offers a brief overview of the *tezkiretü'ş-şu'arâ* genre. It argues that the production of Ottoman *tezkire* coincided with a period of increasing urbanization in Ottoman cities, signifying a change in space and society. Furthermore, it includes information on 'Âşık Çelebi and places his masterpiece, *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, in perspective with other poets' biographies penned in the Ottoman literature. Then, the chapter discusses those features that distinguish *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ* within the corpus of *tezkire* literature, including the arrangement method of the work, its author's critical assessment of the sources he used, the popularity of the text, and finally, its author's sensitivity to space and spatiality.

2.1 The *tezkire* as a genre and its transmission to the Ottoman lands

The earliest Islamic literary endeavors might be linked to the predecessors of the *tezkiretü'ş-şu'arâ* genre in Islamicate literature(s). The word *tezkire*, of Arabic origin, deriving from the root *z-k-r* (to remember, to recall), means something that is instrumental in remembering. Relative to the proper reading and understanding of the Qur'an and hadith (the prophetic tradition), *tezkire* can be defined as one of the

²¹ “[This work], instead of being named as reminiscences of poets was named *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ* since it's essence is history of poets.” *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. I, 280.

outcomes of such philological efforts first driven by religious motivation, which later paved the way to a general interest in biographies. As such, the veracity and accuracy of the source of an information played a significant role in determining the value and authenticity of a hadith. Since this could be confirmed by means of biographical data on the transmitters of a certain hadith, biography established itself as a crucial component of such a process.²² These early biographical works were organized according to a classification system known as *tabaqat*, in which subjects are divided into groups representing various sects, professions, etc. Eventually, this resulted in the production of biographical compilations on the lives and works of *sūfīs*, poets, and different professions penned in Islamicate languages.

It was within the framework of this well-established and sustained biographical tradition that the compilations devoted solely to poets, known as *tezkiretü 'ş-şu'arâ*, or shortly *tezkire* arose and developed after the fourteenth century. Of course, biographical dictionaries of poets appeared in early Arabic literature prior to that, but few of these have survived. While *Tabaqât aş-şu'arâ* (Classes of Poets) of Muhammad b. Sallâm al-Cumahî (d.846) is the oldest known of the extant works of this nature, *Mu'cam aş-şu'arâ* (Order of Poets) written by al-Marzubânî (d.994) exemplifies a new stage in terms of the method of presentation. By arranging the poets examined in an alphabetical order, al-Marzubânî's text treats poets belonging to one group indulging in the same type of literary activity without prioritizing their origin, profession, or social standing.²³

Only at the beginning of the thirteenth century, the first extant works of the *tezkire* genre started to be compiled in Persian. Among these early texts, many of

²² For an earlier assessment of the *tezkire* genre in Islam, see James Stewart-Robinson, "The Tezkere Genre in Islam," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 23, n.1 (1964), 57-65.

²³ James Stewart-Robinson, "The Tezkere Genre in Islam," 61-62.

which were later taken as examples by the Ottoman literati, were *Bahâristân* (Land of Spring) by ‘Abdurrahmân b. Ahmad Câmî (d.1492),²⁴ and *Tezkeret aş-şu’arâ* (Reminiscences of Poets) of Devletşâh b. ‘Alâ ad-Devlet (d.1494-5).²⁵ Although composed in Chagatai Turkish, it is equally worth mentioning that the person to whom Devletşâh dedicated his work was none other than ‘Alî Şîr Nevâ’î (d.1501), the author of another influential biographical work. Nevâ’î’s *Mecâlis an-Nefâ’is* (Excellent Gatherings) became yet another significant source that served as a model for the Ottomans for centuries.²⁶

Later called the “golden age” of the Ottoman Empire, the late-fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were a period of remarkable dynamism that made itself evident in *diyâr-ı Rûm*, especially in the imperial capital.²⁷ Ottoman Istanbul was home to an expanding range of public spaces that occupied a growing role in the social and cultural dynamics of the city. A new group of solidarities and novel modes of expression culminated in the transformation of the cityscape; thus, a broader range of individuals started to be involved in the process of cultural production and

²⁴ The work can be seen as a collection of anecdotes arranged in the form of eight sections called *ravza* (gardens), of which the seventh includes the short biographies of twenty-eight poets. For further information on the influence of Câmî on Ottoman literature, Hamid Algar, “Jâmî and the Ottomans,” in *Jâmî in Regional Contexts: The Reception of ‘Abd al-Rahmân Jâmî’s Works in the Islamicate World*, eds. Thibaut d’Hubert and Alexandre Papis (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2018), 63-135.

²⁵ Devletşâh’s tezkire contains biographies of ancient and contemporary Persian poets arranged in *tabaqat* system, a pattern-based approach. For further information on the author and his work, see Devletşâh, *Tezkire-i Devletşâh*, trans. Necati Lugal (İstanbul: Tercüman, 1977).

²⁶ *Mecâlis an-Nefâ’is*, similar to *Bahâristân*, was divided into eight sections which followed a chronological order at most but also included sections arranged according to certain professions. For further information on the influence of Nevâ’î on Ottoman poetry, see Mehmet Çavuşoğlu, “Kanunî Devrinin Sonuna Kadar Anadolu’da Nevâ’î Tesiri,” *Atsız Armağanı*, eds. Erol Güngör, Mustafa Kafalı, Osman Fikri Sertkaya, and Saadettin Gömeç (İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları, 1976), 75-90.

²⁷ For the Ottoman golden age myth, see Cornell H. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Âli (1541-1600)* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1986), 226-27, 265-66; Cemal Kafadar, “Myth of the Golden Age: Ottoman Historical Consciousness in the Post-Süleymânic Era,” in *Süleymân the Second and His Time*, eds. Halil İnalçık and Cemal Kafadar (İstanbul: The ISIS Press, 1993), 37-48.

dissemination.²⁸ An intertwined set of physical and social features provided Istanbul with an emblematic character.

Akin in spirit to emerging modes of urban experience was the flourishing of the literature of *Rûm*, a social domain largely dependent of courtly circles. As high level Ottoman officials, including sultans, viziers, judges, and scribes, became preoccupied with accumulating capital for literary production in Turkish, the poets and scholars of the age found the protection and encouragement that they had been seeking for.²⁹ As such, a new type of belonging called *rûm* and *rûmî* started to be expanded within the empire as palace administrators and local governors in the provinces came across as wealthy patrons of arts and literature.³⁰ Adopted from earlier Arabo-Persian usage, the word *rûm* was first used to define both a cultural and a physical space, then it started to be used, especially after the fourteenth century, with respect to the Muslims of a certain geography referring to Asia Minor and the Balkans.³¹ When it came to the sixteenth century, for instance, ‘Âşık Çelebi defined the climate of *Rûm* as a source (*menbâ*) for Turkish poets. Within this new literary environment created under courtly patronage, *rûmî* poets adopted readily available forms and genres embedded in the classical and contemporary Islamicate models and reconfigured them into new contexts, demonstrating a regionalization that marked Ottoman culture at large.³²

²⁸ Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, “Viewing, Walking, Mapping Istanbul, ca. 1580,” *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, LVI (2014), 19.

²⁹ For a critical assessment of patronage system and its impact on art, see Halil İnalçık, *Şair ve Patron: Patrimonial Devlet ve Sanat Üzerinde Sosyolojik Bir İnceleme* (Ankara: Doğu Batı, 2013); İnalçık, “Klasik Edebiyatta Patronaj ve Fuzuli,” in *Has-bağçede ‘Ayş u Tarab* (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2018), 345-413.

³⁰ For the emergence and transitions of *rûmî* as a new term of identity, and their different interpretations, see Salih Özbaran, *Bir Osmanlı Kimliği: 14.-17. Yüzyıllarda Rûm/Rîmî Aidiyet ve İmgeleri* (İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi, 2004); Cemal Kafadar, “A Rome of One’s Own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum,” *Muqarnas* 24 (2007), 7-25.

³¹ Kafadar, “A Rome of One’s Own,” 18.

³² On Turkish literature from the late fifteenth to early seventeenth centuries, and the making of the *rûm* literary identity, see Selim Sırrı Kuru, “The Literature of Rum: The Making of a Literary

Parallel to these developments, the city of Istanbul experienced a rise in the production of literary works that engaged with urban spaces and architectural monuments. To put it another way, in this system of strictly urban literature, works produced by the Ottoman literati started to reveal the ways in which the city became intertwined with the emergence of new themes, narratives, and images in different genres. An example of such a flourishing was a distinctive mode of city description called *şehrengîz* (*shahrâshûb* or *shahrangîz* in Safavid literature), consisting of a catalogue of beauties, mostly beautiful young boys, of a particular city, especially major urban centers including Edirne, Bursa, and Istanbul. After Mesîhî (d.1512)'s work titled *Şehrengîz-i Edirne* (City-thriller for Edirne), the genre received particular attention, and Mesîhî's successors composed 78 *şehrengîz* within the course of 150 years.³³

Closely linked to the new modes of urbanity, the biographies of Ottoman poets appear to be at the very heart of the spatial, social and cultural transformation mentioned above. Using the expressive code of poetry itself, these compilers scrutinized, catalogued, and provided rhetorical forms to the pretextual and

Tradition (1450-1600),” in *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, vol. 2, eds. Suraiya N. Faroqhi and Kate Fleet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 548-592. On this new sense of self-identity and the canonization of the Ottoman art and architecture, see Gülru Necipoğlu, “A Kânun for the State, a Canon for the Arts: Conceptualizing the Classical Synthesis of Ottoman Arts and Architecture,” in *Soliman le Magnifique at son tems: actes du colloque de Paris, Galeries Nationales du Grand Palais, 7-10 Mars 1990*, ed. Gilles Veinstein (Paris: La Documentation Française, 1992), 195-216.

³³ The word *şehrengîz* is commonly translated as “city-thriller” or “city-disturber.” For a list of *şehrengîz* literature written on Istanbul and samples from those texts, see Agâh Sırrı Levend, *Türk Edebiyatında Şehr-engizler ve Şehr-engizlerde İstanbul* (İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti İstanbul Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1958); for relatively new and bibliographic studies, see Barış Karacasu, “Eski Türk Edebiyatında Şehr-engizler,” *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 10 (2007), 259-313; Fatih Tıgılı, “Klâsik Türk Edebiyatında Şehrengiz Çalışmaları Hakkında Bibliografya Denemesi,” *Turkish Studies*, vol. 2, no. 4 (2007), 763-770. For a brief overview of this genre in the Indo-Persian literature(s), see Sunil Sharma, “The City of Beauties in Indo-Persian Poetic Landscape,” *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, vol. 24, no. 2 (2004), 73-81.

contextual dimensions of poetry.³⁴ In other words, by relating what they had read and heard about the previous generations of poets, as well as what they had personally experienced in literary circles, the compilers of Ottoman biographical dictionaries managed to demonstrate specific personalities, and reflect the internal dynamics of the Ottoman literary community at the same time. In other words, in addition to providing pieces of information on history, poets of the age, patrons of art, and the city as a social and vivacious setting; these biographical dictionaries displayed their authors' literary tastes and worldviews. Being both producers and consumers of poetry, in particular, and of *belles lettres* in general, they constantly reproduced the literary circles and the conventions of classical poetry, thereby enabling the development of the corpus of texts that defined the Ottoman literary canon along the lines.³⁵

There are more than twenty extant biographical dictionaries of poets produced between the fifteenth and twentieth centuries in the Ottoman realm. Instead of discussing each Ottoman *tezkires*, this section will only mention those were written before 'Âşık Çelebi to provide a comparative framework.³⁶ The earliest of these, *Heşt Bihişt* (Eight Gardens of Paradise), was written by Sehî Bey (d.1548), who was probably a slave of Christian origin educated in the palace, in 1538.³⁷ In his

³⁴ Stefano Pello, "Persian Poets on Streets: The Lore of Indo-Persian Poetic Circles in Late Mughal India," in *Telling and Texts: Music, Literature and Performance in North India*, eds. Francesca Orsini and Katherine Butler Schofield (Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2015), 304-305.

³⁵ For a detailed discussion on three distinct Ottoman *tezkires* and their critical analysis, see Harun Tolasa, *Sehî, Lâtîfi ve Âşık Çelebi Tezkirelerine Göre 16. Yüzyılda Edebiyat Araştırma ve Eleştirisi* (Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 2002).

³⁶ For a total list of the non-mentioned texts, see Stewart-Robinson, "The Ottoman Biographies of Poets," 58-59.

³⁷ For information on Sehî Bey's life and his *tezkire*, see Günay Kut, "Heşt Bihişt'in Yeni Bir Nüshası ve Bir Düzeltme," *Journal of Turkish Studies* 7 (1984), 293-301; for a critical edition, see Sehî Bey, *Heşt Bihişt*, eds. Haluk İpekten & Günay Kut (Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2017). https://ekitap.ktb.gov.tr/Eklenti/56165.hest-bihistpdf.pdf?0&_tag1=03EE5380B678F1063BF0A9ED54D2FA0DD771F0E5&crefer=A4EC5A5970F58577E51975A05F6A35EE6B693C2775C6447ECA76FC62CA7CB89F

text, Sehî Bey mentions three Turco-Persianate *tezkire* compilers whom we are already very familiar with, Câmî, Devletşâh, and Nevâ'î, as major sources of inspiration for his own work. This was followed by Abdullatif Çelebi (d.1582), also known as Latîfî, coming from a well-known family of Kastamonu, one of the important centers of dervish lodges in the Black Sea region. He composed his work, *Tezkiretü 'ş-şu'arâ vü Tabsıratü 'n-nuzamâ* (Reminiscences of Poets and Demonstration of Versifiers), in 1546.³⁸ While *Heşt Bihişt* included the biographies of 241 poets, Latîfî's account covered 334. The third Ottoman *tezkire*, *Gülşen-i Şu'arâ* (Rose Garden of Poets), belonged to 'Ahdî (d.1593-94), a poet from a notable family of scholars in Baghdad.³⁹ 'Ahdî's work provided biographic entries of 381 poets, some of whom were introduced for the first time.⁴⁰

Ottoman biographical compilers used various methods to divide the information they had provided in their works. While some of the earlier literati tended to reflect a similarity to their Turco-Persianate precursors by paying attention to determiners such as origin, social standing, or profession, other compilers opted for changes in their approaches. Sehî Bey' and 'Ahdî's biographical dictionaries of poets were arranged according to the *tabaqat* system. The first exception to this was Latîfî's decision to disregard this sort of hierarchical ordering and to list poets in a strict alphabetical order, in which either the given name or penname of each poet determined the placement in the general alphabetical classification. By choosing an

³⁸ For information on Latîfî's life and a critical examination of his *tezkire*, see Walter G. Andrews, "The Tezkere-i Şu'arâ as a Source for the Critical Evaluation of Ottoman Poetry" (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1970); for a more recent study, see Walter G. Andrews and Ayşe Dalyan, "İki Farklı Latifi Tezkiresi ve Nüshaları," *Bellefen* 68 (2019), 49-68.

³⁹ For information on 'Ahdî's life and his *tezkire*, see James Stewart-Robinson, "Ahdî and his Biography of Poets," *Iran and Islam*, ed. C.E. Bosworth (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1971), 557-564; for a critical edition of the text, see Ahdî, *Gülşen-i- Şu'arâ*, ed. Süleyman Solmaz (Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2018).

<https://ekitap.ktb.gov.tr/Eklenti/56733.ahdi-gulsen-i-suarapdf.pdf?0>

⁴⁰ The text includes the biographies of 147 poets that are not available in other contemporary sources. See especially, Ahdî, *Gülşen-i- Şu'arâ*, 27.

alphabetical ordering, the Ottoman biographical compilers gravitated more and more toward the idea that poets should be recognized as a class unto themselves⁴¹ and should therefore be treated in one section regardless of their social affiliations. Yet, the classification of the Ottoman sultans and their sons within the Ottoman *tezkires* continued to follow a chronological order without adhering to the alphabetical category.

Although the length of individual notices in each *tezkire* ranges from a few words of introduction to pages of detailed information on the lives and works of poets, the Ottoman *tezkires* demonstrate similarities regarding the information they contain. As such, they provide data on the given names, *mahlas* (pennname), or *lakab* (nickname) of poets, their origins, ancestry, birth and death dates and places, the education they received, their professions and careers, their character and physical appearance, literary activities they engaged, samples of their poetry, and additional anecdotal material if available. However, it should be noted that it is unlikely to find all the mentioned information above in a single notice or that it is applied consistently throughout a *tezkire*. For instance, while the names and places of origin are almost always mentioned in notices, there is often very little to be found in entries regarding the birth dates, characters, or physical appearances of poets.

2.2 ‘Âşık Çelebi in *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ*

Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ is, indeed, among the primary sources for modern scholars looking into the Ottoman literary culture of the sixteenth century. It also serves as an intriguing type of ego-document providing valuable details on ‘Âşık Çelebi’s personal story within a broader Ottoman context. In fact, apart from a notice by the

⁴¹ Stewart-Robinson, “The Ottoman Biographies of Poets,” 62.

famous biographer Nev'îzâde 'Atâî (d.1635),⁴² the most important source of information on 'Âşık Çelebi's life is the *Meşâ'irü's-şu'arâ* itself.⁴³ Although the work contains the biographies of 427 poets, in prose and poetry, there is no explicit account dedicated to its author. His biography is rather infused with the narrative itself, whether through anecdotes or comments on his subject material.⁴⁴

The *mukaddime* (foreword) section of the text, together with the accounts that identify certain members of his family and close acquaintances, contains the main details of 'Âşık Çelebi's life story. His life is also portrayed through the accounts of biographies of his patrons, friends, and other people he held in high respect, as well as through passages where he draws comparisons between his own suffering and that of his subjects.⁴⁵ Therefore, the reader, contemporary of 'Âşık Çelebi and modern, has the opportunity to envision the author's life story through these sections and be informed about his family, education, career, friends, emotions, and reactions.⁴⁶ In that sense, *Meşâ'irü's-şu'arâ* not only gives an insight into the personality of 'Âşık Çelebi as a human being but also into the networks and socialization practices of an author and Ottoman gentleman.

⁴² In addition to being a biographer, Nev'îzâde 'Atâî was the son of the noted sixteenth-century poet Nev'î (d.1599). Moreover, he was among the former owners of an earlier copy of *Meşâ'irü's-şu'arâ* found in the Hüdâyî Efendi Collection of the Hacı Selim Ağa Manuscript Library in Istanbul. The manuscript bears several notes by him. See MS. Hüdâyî 1157. For further information on 'Atâî and his work, see Nev'îzâde 'Atâî, *Hadâikü'l-Hakâik fî Tekmiletü's-Şakâik: Nev'îzâde Atâyî'nin Şakâ'ik Zeyli*, ed. Suat Donuk, vol. I (İstanbul: Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2017), 109-235.

⁴³ Nev'îzâde 'Atâî, *Hadâikü'l-Hakâik*, vol. I, especially 591-597.

⁴⁴ Hatice Aynur, "Autobiographical Elements in Aşık Çelebi's Dictionary of Poets," In *Many Ways of Speaking About the Self: Middle Eastern Ego-Documents in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish (14th-20th Century)*, eds. Ralph Elger and Yavuz Köse (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, Verlag, 2010), 17.

⁴⁵ Aynur, "Autobiographical Elements," 18.

⁴⁶ In the notices dedicated to Emrî Çelebi and Hayâlî, the author even mentions that he contracted the plague in 1545. "Sene hamsîn ve tis'ami'ede hakîr mat'ûn olup haste vü zebûn yaturken mezbûr Emrî Çelebi Berkî nâm bir yâr-ı cânî ve bir kimesne ile hakîri iyâdete gelüp gördiler. Çün nabzuma el urdular, hayât ümmîdinden el çekdiler mezra-ı uhuvvet ü hullele bir mikdâr tohm-ı eşk-i rikkat ekdiler. Gitdükleri gibi vefat itdi diyü şâyi' olur. Emrî, Berkî'ye gitdi 'Âşık Çelebi dir. Hisâb iderler ittifâk târîh vâkı' olur. Hakîr istimâ' itdigümde gitmedi 'Âşık didüm." *Meşâ'irü's-şu'arâ*, vol. I, 367.

‘Âşık (lover; literally someone who has excessive love for something or someone), is, of course, the poet’s penname. As to his “true” name, which was given at birth, it is Mehemmed/Mehmed. He was born in 1520, in a small village called Vilcitrin, near Prizren. Feeling the need to highlight the authenticity of his lineage,⁴⁷ ‘Âşık Çelebi dates his paternal ancestors’ genealogy both to the prophet Mohammed and to the early stages of Ottoman rule in Asia Minor. Here, the author also cleverly uses his stammering to highlight this lineage and traces this condition to Hasan, the grandson of prophet Mohammad. Moreover, in his father’s biography, he describes how his great-grandfather Mehmed Nattâ’ was, in fact, related to a family of *seyyids* (a relative of the prophet Mohammed) from Baghdad who had settled at Bursa towards the end of the fourteenth century.⁴⁸ Similarly, ‘Âşık Çelebi ascribes his maternal side of the family to a famous and influential lineage. The fact that his mother was the daughter of Müeyyedzâde Abdurrahman Efendi (d.1516), also known as Hâtemî, one of the prominent poets and a learned man from the late 14th century, proves his parents’ affiliations to the learned classes of the age.⁴⁹

Following his father’s death in 1535, ‘Âşık Çelebi departed from Filibe and moved to Istanbul.⁵⁰ After having studied under various learned men of his day, including Sürûrî Çelebi (d.1562),⁵¹ Arabzâde Abdülbâkî Efendi (d.1563-64),⁵² Ebussuûd Efendi (d.1574),⁵³ he was taught by such recognized scholars of the time as Taşköprizâde (d.1560-61)⁵⁴ and Emîr Gîsû Efendi (d. ?),⁵⁵ and received a

⁴⁷ *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 699, 1121.

⁴⁸ *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 379-380; vol. II, 1119-1122.

⁴⁹ *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. III, 1503.

⁵⁰ *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 465.

⁵¹ *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 924-925.

⁵² *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 902-903.

⁵³ *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 166.

⁵⁴ Although ‘Âşık Çelebi does not provide enough information on the nature of his relationship with Taşköprizâde, Nev’îzâde ‘Atâî mentions him as ‘Âşık Çelebi’s *üstâd* (teacher). See Nev’îzâde Atâyî, *Hadâikü’l-Hakâik*, vol. II, 162.

⁵⁵ *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. III, 1299.

remarkable education thanks to his parents' affiliations to the learned classes of the period. Upon his arrival to Bursa in 1541, he became a *kâtib* (secretary) at the court of law.⁵⁶ Thereafter, he advanced to the position of clerk of the court at Istanbul thanks to the influence of his old tutor Emîr Gîsû Efendi.⁵⁷ After being registered as a *mülâzım* (candidate for government post) by Bostanzâde Mustafâ Efendi (d.1570), his career as a *kadı* (judge, chief administrator of a judicial district) officially began in 1550-1.⁵⁸

His statements in the *mukaddime* section demonstrate that he had to spend most of his life in various places as a *kadı* and had a lot of trouble in this profession.⁵⁹ During his turbulent career, 'Âşık Çelebi was appointed to nine districts as a *kadı*. These were Silivri, Piriştine, Serfice, Narda, Alaiye, Niğbolu, Çernovi, Kıratova, and Üsküp.⁶⁰ Complaining of his misfortunes, 'Âşık Çelebi also states that his periods of dismissal never lasted for more than four to five months.⁶¹ Moreover, the career problems that 'Âşık Çelebi encountered seem less severe, especially when compared to the biographies of his peers. One instance demonstrating the hostility he encountered becomes apparent during his stay in Narda. Even though his dismissal from this position was later compensated by a later appointment to Niğbolu, it is evident that this event upset him so deeply that he criticized the people associated with it in his *tezkire* at length.⁶²

⁵⁶ *Meşâi'irü's-su'arâ*, vol. I, 989.

⁵⁷ *Meşâi'irü's-su'arâ*, vol. III, 1299.

⁵⁸ *Meşâi'irü's-su'arâ*, vol. III, 1223-1224.

⁵⁹ Two examples from such statements follow as: “[B]aşa kazâdur geldi gördüm, zarûri kazâyâ rızâ virdüm” and “Kâzi olaldan gönül mihnet beyâbânındadır / Bilmezem kimdür diyen devlet kazâ yanındadır.” *Meşâi'irü's-su'arâ*, vol. I, 248-249.

⁶⁰ See especially, *Meşâi'irü's-su'arâ*, vol. I, 34-40.

⁶¹ 'Âşık Çelebi, foreword to *Meşâi'irü's-su'arâ or Tezkere of 'Âşık Çelebi*, ed. G. M. Meredith-Owens (London: Luzac, 1971), xv.

⁶² The author portrays the former *kadı* of Narda, Musa Efendi, and *vovvoda* of Narda, Ferruh Kethuda, as almost villains. *Meşâi'irü's-su'arâ*, vol. III, 1237-1247; 1250.

Throughout the narrative, ‘Âşık Çelebi’s emphasis on his personal relationships with high-ranking government officials and acquaintances reveals how implicit the impact of the Ottoman custom of patronage on education and postings was. As such, he intentionally made an effort to stay in touch with these people through various means. The chronograms that ‘Âşık Çelebi has written for various patrons and his comments on eminent figures of the age, including Nişânî-i Mehmed Paşa (d.1541),⁶³ Nişâncı Celâlzâde Mustafâ Çelebi (d.1567),⁶⁴ Dukâkinzâde Mehmed Paşa (d.1557), Şîrî Beg (d.?), Pirî Paşazâde Mîrî Beg (d.?), and Mesîh Paşazâde Memî Şâh Beg (d.?) proves such a point.⁶⁵

Furthermore, the text reflects his author’s desire to leave a personal mark on history and collective memory through self-fashioning. Looking at the number of stories and lengthy anecdotes, *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ* provides insights into the more intimate relationships that the author has developed over as well. Since ‘Âşık Çelebi is very attentive to providing detailed information on poets’ lives, he recites of many personal stories and gossip in his *tezkire* that concerned him or his friends on several occasions. Providing detailed and vivid accounts of his friends, his work offers unique and detailed information on the literary circles and stories surrounding the learned class of the age. In fact, it seems that of the 427 poets whom ‘Âşık Çelebi has written biographies of, he had known at least half of them personally, and the majority of this group constituted the Ottoman scholarly and literary circles during the reigns of Süleymân I (r.1520-1566) and Selîm II (r.1566-1574).

In addition to these, fragments obtained from poetic samples, letters exchanged between friends, and other anecdotes allow us to learn turning points in

⁶³ *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 868.

⁶⁴ *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 870.

⁶⁵ *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 869.

the biography of the author who does not share his own story from beginning to end.⁶⁶ Through these samples, for instance, we learn that ‘Âşık Çelebi decided to get married in 1550, but eventually got divorced. Another instance demonstrates how his friends responded when one of his beloveds, Kurd Bâlî, left him, and ‘Âşık Çelebi suffered a long time.⁶⁷

2.3 *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ* and its significance in Ottoman literary tradition

Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ consists of a *mukaddime* section where the author discusses the nature of speech, elements of prose, and verse, followed by the main part providing a list of Ottoman poets and their biographies. It also differs in length from other biographical dictionaries of poets compiled both in the sixteenth century and in different periods. In the sub-titles that determine the boundaries of the preface, ‘Âşık Çelebi conveys his knowledge of *belles lettres*, poetry, and poets as his predecessor in the Persian and Ottoman lands once did. In the *sebeb-i terkîm* (purpose of the compilation) section, the author presents his work to Selîm II, who also patronized the well-known poets of the era and the author’s friends, including Kâmî (d.1579), Fevrî (d.1571), and Bâkî (d.1600). He also intimates that he wishes for an appointment and states that he may be pleased with even a small service at the sultan’s gate.⁶⁸

In its structure, *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ* is undoubtedly on par with similar works that were composed before it. As in its contemporaries, the issue of legitimization (of poetry) is especially inherent in the introduction of the text. In addition, it is possible

⁶⁶ *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. III, 1216; 1333.

⁶⁷ *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. III, 1333.

⁶⁸ “Koyalum gayrı hep leffâflıkdur/Benüm hakkum nakîb eşrâflıkdur
Ebâ’an ced bana mîrâsdur ol/Ata yirin tutarsa n’ola ogul
Elüm al husrevâ ayakda kaldum / Refî‘ it kadrümi alçakda kaldum.” *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 272.

to argue that ‘Âşık Çelebi’s understanding of poetry is compatible with the literary or scholarly identities of the Ottomans as the framework of the introduction seems to be envisioned in the background of a general history of Islamicate tradition(s), similar to the Ottoman historiography.⁶⁹ Asserting that his work does not only give mere information on poets but reveals a history of poetry, ‘Âşık Çelebi wishes *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ* to be viewed from this perspective.

The main part of the text starts with the biography of Şeyh-i İlâhî (d.1491) and ends with that of Gulâmî (d.1544). In between, the author recounts poets who lived during the reign of Murâd I (r.1362-1389) to the date of compilation of the text. Considering the long production process of the work, it is worth mentioning that the number of poets included in the extant copies varies. While the earliest known and unfinished copy dates to 1563-4 and contains the biographies of 249 poets, the copy containing the greatest number of biographies dates to 1605 and includes 425 poets.⁷⁰ Considering the dates and information given in the text, it is possible that ‘Âşık Çelebi gave the text its final form between 1563 and 1568. Written almost thirty years later after the earliest known Ottoman *tezkire*, *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ* comes fourth in the line, and it is the sixth great *tezkire* composed in Ottoman Turkish in terms of the number of poets that it includes. What makes this text distinguished from others, however, is the order determining the placement of the poets.

In that sense, the section in which ‘Âşık Çelebi explains why he chose to compose his work in *ebced* order (based on chronogrammatic principles) is worth

⁶⁹ “Ve şî’rûn dahı aksâmı vardur ki kasâ’id ü gazeliyyât u murabba’ât u rubâ’iyyât u mukatt’âr u mesneviyyât. Şu’arânun ba’zı bu cümleye küşîş itmekle mütefennindür ve ba’zı ihtiyârıyla bir kısmın verziş idüp anda müte’ayyindür ol makûlenün zikrleri ifrâd olndı ve tezkiretü’ş-şu’arâ olmayup aslda târîh-i şu’arâ oldugı cihetden ba’zı ahvâllerinün zikrinde imtidâd olundı ve Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ ad olundı.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 280.

⁷⁰ The manuscripts mentioned above are respectively, Topkapı Palace Museum Library, MS. Yeniler 60, and Library of Çorumlu Hasan Paşa, MS. Çorum 1964.

examining in detail for many reasons. As discussed in the previous section of this chapter, most of the *tezkires* produced in the sixteenth century were arranged according to *tabaqat* system, and Latîfî was the first compiler who used a strict alphabetical order. Understood from *Meşâ'irü's-şu'arâ*'s introduction, both Latîfî and 'Âşık Çelebi decided to write a biographical dictionary after Sehî Bey had completed his in 1538. The idea was that Latîfî would adopt a method similar to Sehî Bey's, whereas 'Âşık Çelebi would pen his work in an alphabetical system. Both started to work on their *tezkires* in accordance, but later Latîfî decided to abandon the *tabaqat* system.⁷¹ Saddening with the news that Latîfî completed his biographical dictionary in 1546, 'Âşık Çelebi put aside his work for a considerable time, only to complete it in 1568.

This anecdote appears to be significant as it sheds light on the writing process of the text and the literary environment where the poets of the age interacted alike. 'Âşık Çelebi's decision in favor of the *ebced* system can only be seen as a deliberate and sensitive choice as he underlines that he “did not want to imitate Latîfî's classification.”⁷² Although he has not given more information than his predecessors, especially on the early poets, the way he constructed his text enabled him to claim that it was a quite unique work. In terms of the literary environment, it is also very significant that 'Âşık Çelebi exchanged ideas with Latîfî, a much older

⁷¹ “... yârân ile müsteşîr ve izhâr-ı mâfî'z-zamîr olındukda şu'arânun zarîfî ve erbâb-ı lutf-ı tab'un harîfî şî'r ü inşânun tab'-ı âzmûmî Monlâ Latîfî-i Kastamoni benüm dahî tevârih-i şu'arâda kitâb tertîbî murâdumdur diyüp kendü selâtin-i Âl-i 'Osmân zemânında olan şu'arâyî tertîb-i selâtin ile cem' idecek olup ya'nî Sehî Beg tertîbin savâb bilüp bu hakîr şu'arâyî mahlaslarınun evâ'ilinde olan hurûf tertîbî ile tertîbî takdîm ve te'hîr su'âlîne cevâba ve tarîk-i hakk u savâba enseb-i fikr kılup bu vifâk vefkî üzere ittîfâk ve tarafeynden teşmîr-i sâk-ı ictihâd ile ittîsâk itmişken Monlâ-yı mezbûr sonra pey-rev-i çerh-ı devrân olup ihtiyâr-ı na'l-i bâz-gûn idüp tertîb-i hurûfî ihtiyâr itdügin izhâr idicek nakz-ı îmânla naks-ı îmân hâtıra tîrden beter ve tîgden tîz ve ciger delmede mânend-i tîr belki nişter gelüp evrâk-ı müsevvede tâkçe-i nisyâna atıldı, tûle'l-'ahdi mensiyyun muktezâsı ile niçe zemân kesîfû'l-hatîb hâtîr-ı münşiden mensî oldu. Belki dil-ber lebi vâsfında olan eş'ârün müsevvedesi kâğıdları zarf-ı halvâ olup pulluk pulluk satıldı.” *Meşâ'irü's-şu'arâ*, vol. I, 245-246.

⁷² “Monlâ Latîfî tertîbine taklîd olmasun diyü ebced hevvez hurûfî tertîbî ihtiyâr olındı.” *Meşâ'irü's-şu'arâ*, vol. I, 268.

and experienced poet, even though they were working on the same subject matter. Since both of them decided to write their texts after the completion of Sehî Bey's *tezkire* in 1538, and Latifi completed his in 1546, the conversation between the two, if it took place, must have taken place when 'Âşık Çelebi was in his twenties. Moreover, this situation demonstrates how 'Âşık Çelebi, a novice poet, saw himself as competent to compile such a work as the successor of Sehî Bey.

In addition to its unique arrangement method and comprehensiveness, *Meşâ'irü 'ş-şu'arâ* stands out in this corpus of literature for numerous reasons. First, contrary to his contemporaries, 'Âşık Çelebi is highly attentive to providing detailed information on poets' lives, especially for those either whom he knew personally or who lived in his period. When the entire text is analyzed, it is seen that the poets who lived in the first half of the sixteenth century constitute the majority. In fact, he remains an outstanding figure in the Ottoman literary tradition because of his observations on the lives and characters of the poets of his epoch. Therefore, the content of the information he provides on the poets seems to be diversified based on the period. When it comes to ancient times (*zemân-ı evvel*) as 'Âşık Çelebi calls, it is seen that long evaluations were written only for the famous or well-known poets. However, most of these evaluations reflect the information in the biographies written before *Meşâ'irü 'ş-şu'arâ* without adding much.

'Âşık Çelebi's critical assessment of the sources that he used makes his work distinguishable among its contemporaries as well. Together with the earlier *tezkires* that 'Âşık Çelebi benefited from, the first-hand witnesses and letters sent by various authors and his friends enrich the text in a way that none of his contemporaries could match. To put it another way, the author not only provides unique and detailed accounts of the literary circles surrounding the learned class of

the Ottomans but also makes room for self-evaluation and self-representation. An important example of this situation exposes itself during the process of collecting poetic samples. ‘Âşık Çelebi recounts how he collected samples from the letters sent by his friends, thus, enabling them to determine the works they might have wished to be recorded in *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ*.

That the *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ* received ample attention from its target audience among the Ottoman literati soon after it was composed, and, indeed, well into the early twentieth century is clear from the large number of extant manuscript copies of the text.⁷³ There are today 33 extant manuscript versions. While thirteen of them are abroad, the rest of the copies are spread around the libraries in Turkey, including Istanbul, Ankara, and Çorum.⁷⁴ From these copies we can infer that at least 21 known versions of the text date to the late sixteenth century, four known versions date before the late seventeenth century, and eight before the early twentieth century. Although it is not possible to determine the exact reason(s), one could come up with a few points that might have an impact on the popularity of the text over different periods, including the personal endeavors and selectiveness of ‘Âşık Çelebi, the outstanding preface of the text, and its vivid form conveying the social life of the sixteenth century at best.

Another factor that can be seen as a sign of the text's popularity is the identity of these manuscripts' owners. Two manuscripts need to be mentioned are MS. Hüdâyî 1157 and MS. ‘Alî Emîrî 772. MS. Hüdâyî 1157 not only seems to be

⁷³ Yet, this does not mean that *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ* was the most copied *tezkire* among the Ottomans. The number of extant manuscripts of Latîfî’s text, for instance, is 97 in total. See Latîfî, *Tezkiretü’ş-Şu’arâ ve Tabsîratü’n-Nuzamâ*, ed. Rıdvan Canım (Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2018), 29-32.

<https://ekitap.ktb.gov.tr/Eklenti/60327,latifi-tezkiretus-suara-ve-tabsiratun-nuzamapdf.pdf?0>

⁷⁴ The list of the countries with the number of copies that they own follow as: Sweden (1), England (3), France (1) Egypt (2), Germany (1), Austria (2), Ireland (1) and Hungary (1). For a brief information on the manuscript versions of the text and a reconstruction of the genealogy of extant manuscripts, see *Meşâ’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 70-89.

one of the earliest copies of *Meşâ'irü's-şu'arâ*, but was probably an autograph copy representing an intermediate stage in author's writing. This copy was later owned by Nev'izâde 'Atâî during the periods when biographies were produced in larger numbers and were in high demand. In that sense, it is no surprise that Nev'izâde 'Atâî, being a famous biographer himself, was interested in the text. Moreover, the fact that both 'Âşık Çelebi and Nev'izâde 'Atâî wrote translations of Taşköprizâde Ahmed Efendi's *Şakâ'ikü'n-nu'mânîye* is a further proof that 'Atâî's interest in the biographies had culminated in the past. His notes and corrections on MS. Hüdâyî 1157 also demonstrate 'Atâî's knowledge on the biographies of the poets as well.

The latter copy found in the Millet Library, on the other hand, does not contain a colophon which might provide us with its copy date, place, or the name of the copyists either.⁷⁵ Yet, it is striking that among its owners was 'Alî Emîrî Efendi (d.1924),⁷⁶ who was a well-known bibliophile and the founder of the Millet Library. The fact that 'Alî Emîrî Efendi, who lived in a period when the popularity of *Meşâ'irü's-şu'arâ* and *tezkires* in general decreased relatively, had this copy can be explained by his personal interest in the genre. Thus, it would not be out of place to think that this ownership is compatible with the bibliophile personality of 'Alî Emîrî Efendi since he also composed a *tezkire* known as *Tezkire-i Şu'arâ-i Âmid* (Biographical Dictionaries of Poets of Amid).⁷⁷

⁷⁵ Yet, looking at its codex and paintings added later, it has believed that this copy might have been produced between the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. For an iconographic examination of the depictions included in this copy, see Aslıhan Erkmen Birkandan, "Metinlerden Tasvirlerle Yansıyan Yüzler: Musavver Bir *Meşâ'irü's-şu'arâ* Nüshasının Portreleri" (PhD diss., İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi, 2011).

⁷⁶ For further information on the life and works of 'Alî Emîrî, see *Ali Emîrî Efendi ve Dünyası: Millet Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi'nden Bir Seçme*, ed. Ekrem Işın (İstanbul: Pera Müzesi Yayınları, 2007).

⁷⁷ For detailed information on *Tezkire-i Şu'arâ-i Âmid*, see Ali Emîrî, *Mir'âtü'l-Fevâid Mukaddimesi ve Mir'âtü'l-Fevâ'id fi Terâcimi Meşâhîri Âmid*, eds. Günay Kut, Mesut Öğmen and Abdullah Demir, vols. 2. (Ankara: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı Yayınları, 2014).

Moreover, the only known illustrated biographical dictionary of poets produced in Ottoman art is none other than the copy found in the Millet Library. This brings us to the point where one should also mention the illustrated biographies in the Islamicate history. In parallel to the flourishing of the biographical texts in the Islamicate world after the sixteenth century, the illustration of these texts also gained momentum of its own. Yet, the number of illustrated manuscripts dedicated to biographies of poets, artists, or saints was relatively small. While *Tuhfe-i Sâmî* (Gift of Sâmî), written by Shah İsmail's son Sâm Mirzâ (d.1566-1567), appears as one of the earliest surviving illustrated *tezkire* from the Turco-Persianate world,⁷⁸ one of the first examples of illustrated *tezkires* in the Ottoman Empire was an abbreviated translation of *Şakâ'ikû'n-nu'mâniye* by Taşköprüzâde Ahmed Efendi, a biography of scholars and sheiks of the Ottomans.⁷⁹ Therefore, a critical question still needs an answer is why *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, the first illustrated biographical dictionary of poets, also remained the only illustrated one.

Turning back to *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ*'s unique features, a final issue that needs to be mentioned here is its author's sensitivity to space and spatiality. The difference of *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ* on this matter will immediately become apparent when the earlier and contemporary *tezkires* of the period is examined. Although this thesis rather focuses on the representation of space and its distribution among the city in 'Âşık Çelebi's narrative, it can be easily claimed that the text is a remarkable source in terms of reflecting its author's sensitivity to space and spatiality in general. In order to exemplify this, it may be helpful to compare articles dedicated to Zâtî in

⁷⁸ For further information on Sâm Mirzâ and a bibliography, see Adnan Karaismailoğlu, "Türk Edebiyatı Kaynaklarından "Tuhfe-i Sâmî" ve Altıncı Bölümün Tercümesi," *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları* 57 (1988), 178-186; Gülşen Seyhan Alışık, "Sâm Mirza," in *İslam Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul: TDV İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2009), 61.

⁷⁹ Erkmen Birkandan, "Metinlerden Tasvirlerle Yansıyan Yüzler," 54.

different *tezkires* written in the same period. When Zâtî's biographies in the *tezkires* of Sehî Bey, Latîfî, Ahdî, and 'Âşık Çelebi examined, we see that the shortest and most descriptive one among these belongs to Sehî Bey. Giving information about the type of works Zâtî wrote, Sehî Bey provides a few concise examples from his poetry. In terms of spatiality, the text only marks Zâtî's birthplace as Balıkesir, a coastal province in Northwestern Turkey.⁸⁰ When it comes to Latîfî and Ahdî, the similarity of the information given is striking. Both biographies repeats where the poet is from and what kind of works he produced.⁸¹ Yet, Latîfî's longer and more detailed comments on Zâtî's poetry and talent distinguish his account from Ahdî's relatively plain language. Unlike Sehî Bey and Ahdî, he also briefly comments on one of his skills, that is fortune telling.⁸²

Among these biographers, 'Âşık Çelebi stands out with both his personal evaluations on Zâtî's poetry and the importance he attaches to space. *Meşâ'irü 'ş-şu'arâ* provides us with the most comprehensive biographical entry on Zâtî, his career, and poetry. In addition to the poet's birthplace, origin, and samples from his poetry, 'Âşık Çelebi mentions Zâtî's character and education, the patrons and famous people he was associated with. Furthermore, the text informs the reader about Zâtî's personal life, including the location of his home and workplace. According to the text, Zâtî was living in a house in the neighborhood named Sarı Gürz Hamamı, while his workshop was in the mosque complex of Sultân Bâyezid. After a while, 'Âşık Çelebi adds, he moved to a relatively modest shop in the Koca İbrâhîm Paşa Hamamı due to economic reasons.⁸³

⁸⁰ Sehî Beg, *Heşt Bihişt*, 139-140.

⁸¹ Ahdî. *Gülşen-i şu'arâ*, 158-159.

⁸² Latîfî. *Tezkiretü 'ş-şu'arâ ve tabsiratü'n-nuzamâ*, 228-234.

⁸³ *Meşâ'irü 'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. II, 673.

CHAPTER 3

WHERE TO MEET YOUR FRIEND OR LOVER

*Seyr-i gülistânda ... Eyyûb
u Kâğıd-hâne çemenlerinde Galata ve
Hâsköy encümenlerinde, Zâtî dükkânında ve
Atmeydânı'nda bahâr sohbetlerinde ve
hazân cem'iyetlerinde gâh mahbûblar
mecma'ı olan hammâmlar seyrinde ve gâh
Dâvûd Paşa iskelesinde suya oynayan sîm-
endâmlar seyrinde gâh hânkâhlarda vefâ
semâ'ında ve gâh harâbâtlarda deblek
semâ'ında hem-dem idük.⁸⁴*

This chapter tackles spatial references and representation of space in *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*. Mainly focusing on Istanbul, it seeks both individual places of sociability and the city in general, and highlights a new form of sensibility that emerged in the mid-sixteenth century. It argues that *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ* is an appropriate source in terms of reflecting its author's sensitivity to space. The chapter also tackles different ways in which Âşık Çelebi evoked spatial attributes to associate, imagine, and define where the poets of the age gathered. It continues with an analysis of the spatial configuration of Istanbul as gleaned through *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*. Based on the number of references in *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, the chapter lists and examines spatial attributions in the narrative. It further analyzes related anecdotes to tackle the

⁸⁴ "In the stroll amidst the rose gardens ... in the foliage of in Eyüp and Kağıthâne, in Galata and Hasköy councils, at Zâtî's shop and in the Atmeydani, in springtime gatherings and in during autumn assemblies, sometimes amidst the beloveds' gatherings in bathhouses, and sometimes watching the silver-bodied beauties playing in the water at the Dâvud Pasha pier, sometimes in the whirling dance in the dervish lodges, and sometimes in the whirling dance within the ruins, we were together." *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. I, 469.

relationship between the representation of space and different modes of sociability in Istanbul.

3.1 The use and function of space in Ottoman literature

As discussed earlier, during the long reign of the Ottomans, hundreds of literary and non-literary works on Istanbul have been produced. Many themes, narratives, and images have been dedicated to the city after it became the new Ottoman capital. Yet, realistic depictions of Ottoman cities, with a distinct sense of space, started to be produced only after the middle of the sixteenth century. This growing awareness of depicting cities and city life in various forms was related to myriad changes in social life, which paved new modes of urbanism.

By the first half of the sixteenth century, Istanbul had become one of the most populous cities of early modern Europe. Due to increasing economic difficulties paved the way for a wave of social unrest, the Celali revolts in Anatolia resulted in a flow of migration in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, whereby large numbers of migrant workers and peasants moved towards urban areas, particularly Istanbul.⁸⁵ Moreover, urbanization was linked to the commercialization of the economy, which highlighted a new effort to build the capital city, including infrastructure projects and urban establishments for commerce.⁸⁶ These were paralleled by monumental buildings that embodied the imperial identities of the Ottoman polity. As stated in the Kafescioğlu's study on the various patterns in the courtly and urban production, "urban, suburban and inter-city complexes sponsored

⁸⁵ Oktay Özel, "The Reign of Violence: the Celalis, c. 1550-1700," in *The Ottoman World*, 184-202.

⁸⁶ Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, *Constantinople/Istanbul: Cultural Encounter, Imperial Vision, and the Construction of the Ottoman Capital* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University, 2009), 131-132.

by members of the ruling elite reflected changing dispositions and new agendas of Ottoman rule.”⁸⁷

Following the expansion of the city outside its city walls, Ottoman literati from different walks of life expanded the scope and content of their writing on the city. The educated Ottomans, including those from the higher echelons of the political hierarchy, such as sultans, viziers, high officials, and even soldiers, wrote reams of poems, often collected in *divans*. These poems written by the elite adorned public buildings, religious edifices, parks, and gardens. Although poetry written for architectural structures and natural beauties was not necessarily a development that emerged in the sixteenth century, the development of new genres, including *şehrengiz*, that deal with these alone and their quantitative increase within the literary canon in this regard coincided with the sixteenth century.

One should also mention Tâcîzâde Câfer Çelebi (d.1515)’s *Hevesnâme* (Book of Desires) and Latîfî’s *Evsaf-ı İstanbul* (Descriptions of Istanbul) since these are much more focused on spatial description as they structured around space and place. The first section of *Hevesnâme*, for instance, describes the natural beauties of Istanbul and its important structures along with various neighborhoods. This section, which depicts the different neighborhoods of urban life of that era, including Galata, Sarây-ı Hümâyun, Hagia Sophia, and Fatih Mosques, madrasas, bathhouses and palaces, hospitals, and soup kitchens, as well as the tomb of Mehmed II and the discovery of the tomb of Abu Ayyub al-Ansari, depicts the architectural structures, settlement, and social life of the neighborhoods of Kağıthane, Eyüp, and Yedikule. Through poetry, therefore, one can claim that poets of the sixteenth century found

⁸⁷ Kafescioğlu, “The visual arts,” in *Cambridge History of Turkey*, vol. 2, eds. Suraiya N. Faroqhi and Kate Fleet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 513.

new ways of attributing meaning to their activities and rituals, including social gatherings and dervish rites.

3.2 Spatial attributions in *Meşâi'irü's-su'arâ*

As shown above, the production and use of space and spatial practices in literary narratives have been the subject of significant scholarly writing. Yet, little that has been written deals with biographical dictionaries of poets as a source of representation and manifestation of the urban experience of poets. In that sense, this section investigates how Istanbul is imagined and experienced spatially in the narrative. Before discussing specific sites and their relationship with urbanity, it tries to demonstrate how 'Âşık Çelebi makes use of space to reveal the experiences of poets and their interaction with the city at large. This section examines the spatial references and certain phrases used in the narrative based on their impact on poets' life.

The first group of references relate to either the background of the poets or their social standing. Usually having an impact on poets' careers, these references constitute the sections where spatial references are provided more often albeit in the form of repetitive expressions. While the former indicates a location identifying the origin or a later settlement of a poet, the latter denotes spatial references indicating information on either education and training or service. The names of the vast majority of the cities and towns mentioned as places of birth and settlement in the sixteenth-century *tezkires* seems to be used reference points, usually without further commentary. From this common practice, it can be argued that the main purpose and impulse of the compilers was probably to set a specific place within a *rûmî*

framework, which could also help to determine the identity of a poet for the future reader, perhaps at a later period.

His account being no exception, ‘Âşık Çelebi’s attention to detail, however, makes his text stand out in this corpus of literature. Information regarding poets’ origins, birthplaces, or settlements is often found in the introductory section of each entry. In most cases, ‘Âşık Çelebi mentions a location that has been introduced directly or indirectly, either in a short or long description. These types of connotations are, in some cases, provided with phrases indicating the place of birth or settlement clearly where the author uses various expressions including *mevlid* (birth), *menşe vü mevlid* (origin of birth), *mevlid ü muhted* (birth and origin). In some cases, however, the author gives references that are more ambiguous and does not specify the difference between origin and settlement by using expressions such as *Bursevî* (from Bursa) or *mahrûse-i Edirnedendür* (from the city of Edirne). It is also equally common to come across references based on family origin, which may be understood as the birthplace of the poet. Within his long list of poets, it is striking that only eighty-five poets’ birth or settlement information remained unmentioned. Based on the secondary sources, however, one could see that almost all these poets are from *diyâr-ı Rûm*, and, in fact, mostly from the Rumeli provinces.

As with the rest of the *tezkires* of the period, Istanbul stands out as the place where most of the poets are registered. Istanbul is followed by Amasya, Bursa, and finally, Edirne in terms of numbers. While two of them, Bursa and Edirne, constituted the former capital cities of Ottoman rule, Amasya was a critical princely capital (*sancak*). In addition, all three were cities where cultural production was high and known for the abundance of poet assemblies accompanied by good patrons. Why, then, ‘Âşık Çelebi did not mention the provenances of eighty-five poets

mentioned above, especially those from Istanbul? It is possible to explain this in two ways. One is related to the fact that most of these poets were known of each other, meaning that ‘Âşık Çelebi might not have felt the need to specify some people who were clearly known to be from Istanbul. On the other hand, a much simpler explanation would be that the author might have simply overlooked the provenances of some of these poets.

Parallel to earlier descriptions discussed above, poets from Istanbul are introduced with phrases such as *İstanbuldır* (from Istanbul), *mahruse-i İstanbuldandır* (from the city of Istanbul), *mevlidi İstanbuldur* (originally from Istanbul). In addition to these, ‘Âşık Çelebi employs phrases to highlight being a part of the capital city and an Istanbulite, including *İstanbul ferzendidür* (a child of Istanbul), and *İstanbullu şehir oğlanıdır* (a city-boy from Istanbul). While some poets are described only as being from Istanbul, some entries provide abundant information on poets’ houses and even the neighborhoods they lived in. It is seen that the districts mentioned in the text are mainly located *intra muros*, including Haseki Sultân, Emîr Buhârî, Gürânî, ‘Âşık Paşa, and Akserây Bâzârı.

Apart from Istanbul and the former capitals of Ottoman rule, there are a few of cities and towns that have been described at length. Cities including Kastamonu, Piriştine, Prizren, Yenice, and Manastır are examples of such cases. It seems that these cities come to the fore due to their social setting, cultural diversity, or natural beauty. The following depiction, where ‘Âşık Çelebi mentions poet Nehârî (d.1520), represents how the author perceives the relationship between the geographical environment, spatiality, and poet’s experience.

It is narrated that if a boy is born in Prizren he would be claimed his penname before his own name; if he is born in Yenice, then, he starts to speak Persian

before even saying the word father; if he is born in Piriştine, he is born with a pen on his waist.⁸⁸

This comment is important in terms of showing how ‘Âşık Çelebi establishes a relationship between poetry and local identities and affiliations as he perceives these connections as inherent aspects of poetry as a profession.

As stated briefly at the beginning of this section, there are also spatial descriptions that extend well beyond the placement of birth and settlement. These refer to the places where the poet has been, seen, or traveled and are mainly related to education, training, or service. There are also additional references relate to trades or livelihood of poets. Mostly excluded from the introductory section, they do not show as much continuity and order as information regarding birth and settlement. Spaces related to education, training or service of poets constitute the second category that had a considerable impact on poets’ lives. It is, in fact, quite impressive how *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ* enables the reader to trace the mobility of a large group of poets from their early school years to their late careers. When looked at in terms of career development, one often encounters two occupational groups that are frequently referenced and represent a structured mobility: *kadi* (judge) and *müderriis* (professor).⁸⁹ For many individuals, ‘Âşık Çelebi conveys their *mülâzemet* (awaiting) and appointment processes in detail and provides abundant information by mentioning the cities they passed through each service.

In addition to new appointments, dismissal from a position or exile often points to a change of position, indicating another form of spatial displacement. ‘Âşık

⁸⁸ “Rivâyet olunur ki Prezrin’de oğlan togsa adından mukaddem mahlas korlar. Yenice’de togan oğlan etmege *papa* diyecek vakt Farsî söyler. Piriştine’de oğlan togsa dividi bilinde togar dirlir.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 904.

⁸⁹ To see examples from such cases, see articles on İshâk Çelebi (*Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 328-341), Dânişî (*Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 507-508), Vusûlî (*Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 564-569), Aşçı-zâde Hasan Çelebi (*Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 619-623), Muhyî (*Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 791-794), Nihâlî (*Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 906-921); Hâşimî (*Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 532-533), Hecrî (*Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 533-537), Hâletî (*Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 608-612), Tulû’î (*Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 652-653), Me’âlî (*Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 761-781).

Çelebi's own dismissal from being a *kadi* in Narda followed by his exile to Alanya in 1562 exemplifies such a situation. One of the most interesting examples of spatial change through exile occurs when the poets known as poets of Cem (*Cem 'şâ'irleri*) left the Ottoman lands to follow their beloved patron, Cem Sultân (d.1495) because he was exiled.⁹⁰ However, it would be a mistake to think that spatial displacements are limited only to those who belonged to the *ilmiyye* and *kalemiyye* branches. The career choices of poets from different walks of life also created temporal or permanent spatial mobilities. An example can be seen when Zâtî (d.1546), who ran a fortune-telling shop, moved his shop from the courtyard of Bâyezîd II's mosque to near the baths of Koca İbrâhîm Paşa, probably for economic reasons.

The second group of spatial references usually relate to poets' social standing, networks, and abilities. Referring to various types of mobilities, including career mobility, spatial mobility, either in the form temporal movement or everyday activities, these references provide information on poets' use of space and movement within spaces. Poets, for instance, often went on pilgrimages, paid several visits to friends or relatives, and sometimes sought voluntary trips. Constituting one of the most mobile groups, dervishes, abdals, and preachers (*vâ'iz*), often lived and traveled through various dervish lodges (*hânkâh*) and caravanserais within the borders of the *diyâr-ı rûm*. In fact, one of the most visible examples of such a temporal movement can be observed easily in dervish lodges. The lodge near Vefa meydanı, a square that took its name from the Sheikh Vefâ's (d.1480) mosque-lodge, for instance, was particularly known for its intellectual atmosphere, where novice poets gained poetic training and had heated discussions with their peers until they left for another lodge.

⁹⁰ These poets are Cem Sa'dîsi (d.1492-3?), Haydar Çelebi (after 1495), Şâhidî (1504-5?), La'lî (d.?), Kandî (d?), Sehâyî (d.?) respectively. For more information on Cem 'şâ'irleri see, Hatice Aynur, "Cem Şairleri," *İlmî Araştırmalar* 9 (2000), 33-43.

In addition to these, all sorts of gatherings and entertainment activities of poets held at various spots also can be included in the second group of references. In the early pages of his text, ‘Âşık Çelebi narrates how he paid several visits to shops of poets such as Zâtî, Rahîkî (d.1546-7), and Kandî (d.1555), booksellers, and even taverns, when he came to İstanbul in 1534-5,⁹¹ and how he was more than welcomed into the gatherings in the mansions and courtyards of prominent patrons of his time. He also writes frequently of the city’s gardens, fountains, bathhouses, and dervish lodges. In that sense, tracing the author’s own experience only provides us with a lot of information regarding the understanding and places of sociability of the poets of the period. When the text is examined in its entirety, however, it immediately becomes clear that these places are very diverse, spreading over the city in a way that transcends the dichotomy of public and private space.

A final note to be mentioned, though not categorized under any group of reference, is the death of the poet. The announcement of death is usually given with additional information such as time, either definite or estimated, the final post held, the probable cause of death, and the location of the grave. Yet, these, again, do not show as much continuity as information regarding birth or settlement.

3.3 Early modern Ottoman sociability and its spatial configuration

This section starts with the overall examination of early modern Ottoman sociability by focusing on spaces for various sorts of social gatherings cited in *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*. Accordingly, it lists various imperial and urban spaces, ordered according to the number of times they are cited within the narrative. Providing anecdotes from the text to further highlight the relationship between sociability and spatiality, this

⁹¹ “Sene ihdâ ve erba‘în ve tis‘ami’ede ki hakîr İstanbul’a geldüm.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 202.

section argues that the textual descriptions of life in Istanbul attest to the high level of sociability since Ottoman literature itself reflects a growing awareness of prominence juxtaposing with significant shifts in institutions. The aura that Istanbul acquired during this century also drew people from different walks of life who were ambitious or simply looking for a better life.⁹² Following these people from different backgrounds and professions, therefore, might lead us into intricate ways of experiencing early modern Istanbul.

As already stated at various points of the thesis, an emphasis on spatiality that spread almost throughout the narrative can be observed easily. Although temporality and permanence work in different ways for each, the spaces in *Meşâi'irü's-su'arâ* can be grouped under two general headings: imperial and urban. There are, for instance, dervish lodges and cells where Sufism shapes the environment more, as well as mosques and madrasas where much more orthodox Islamic thought dominates to a great extent. These are followed by areas where commercial activities are more decisive, such as marketplaces and shops. What distinguishes these places from others is that their inhabitants are very flexible and mobile, and constant mobility can be observed. Similarly, squares are also important areas in terms of the diversity and mobility of the crowd. In addition, we encounter places where the participation of the Muslims is not welcomed, at least by the state, such as churches and taverns. It is possible to observe how different the worlds of the poets, who often violate borders here, are from the ideal segregation in the eyes of the state.

⁹² Cemal Kafadar, "The City Opens Your Eyes Because It Wants to be Seen," in *A Companion to Early Modern Istanbul*, 35.

There are also spaces, such as bathhouses, that navigate between the public and private. We also encounter individuals in their residences, households, houses and sometimes their gardens. Since these are much more private and enclosed spaces, the guest lists are shaped accordingly, and socio-economic backgrounds become much more important. Finally, although they do not come across often, we see graveyards, tombs, and graves. Especially tombs belonging to popular people among the literati sometimes hosted ceremonies where poets come together. Nevertheless, these spaces often appear in the narrative as a reference point to locate another place. Spatial references of *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ* will be discussed in the following part of the chapter. However, one must underline the fact that this listing does not imply any form of hierarchy, nor does it attempt to classify types of mobility. On the contrary, as will be seen both in here and the next chapter, it only demonstrates the existing fluidity in terms of spatial practices.

3.3.1 Mosques, masjids, and madrasas

Although mosques, masjids, and madrasas are often mentioned in the narrative, it is seen that many of them are given only as referential points, either to mention religious and educational networks or to highlight the professions of the related poets. *Meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ* mentions nine mosques, three of which are imperial foundations built by Mehmed II, Bâyezîd II, and Süleymân I. In addition to these mosque complexes, there are also mosques built for religious scholars, such as Şeyh Vefâ, and smaller mosques commissioned by the bureaucrats and poets of the age.

Yet, it is striking that although being so enthusiastic about experiencing and wandering around the city, 'Âşık Çelebi tends to neglect the relationship between architectural decorum and social practices totally. Here, one could argue that there

might be a lack of correspondence between elite codes of decorum, with reference to Necipoğlu's study, and 'Âşık Çelebi's perception and experiences. Rather, he seems to be focused on how poets relate to such structures through different forms of engagement such as being the founder or taking on various roles or positions there. In most cases, 'Âşık Çelebi mentions imperial mosques or related structures within mosque complexes to provide information on the occupation of certain poets. The entries of Nakşî and Keşfi marking their positions as *muvaqqit* (the person who determines the time, especially prayer times) in Süleymaniye mosque complex⁹³ and *buhûrcı* (the person who manages the censers in places of worship)⁹⁴ in Bayezid mosque complex respectively demonstrate such a situation. In the cases of mosques built by poets Sâfî (d. after 1502), Nişânî (d.1567), and Fazlî (d.1574), however, the author brings up these structures by mentioning their founders together with the other structures he lists. In Fazlî's entry, for example, 'Âşık Çelebi mentions how he built a mosque and primary school near his house in Tophane to be secluded from the people.⁹⁵

As for the madrasas of the period, the author, again, chooses to concentrate on such structures as reference points where poets used to be educated or occupied certain posts. 'Âşık Çelebi mentions twenty-two madrasas in Istanbul in total. In most cases, he lists various madrasas of the period to highlight the career patterns of the poets he mentioned. Those in Istanbul, including Mehmed II's mosque complex with eight madrasas, the Semaniyye, and the Süleymaniye occupy the largest space among the madrasas mentioned since they were a major attraction for those aspired

⁹³ "Hâliyâ Câmî'-i Cedîd-i Süleymânî'de muvaqqitdür." *Meşâi'irü 'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. II, 892

⁹⁴ "Sultân Bâyezîd-i merhûm İstanbul'da câmî'-i şerîf bînâ itdükde evvel ol buhûrcı olmuştur." *Meşâi'irü 'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. II, 718.

⁹⁵ İstanbul'dan 'uzlet ve ehl-i dünyâdan hicret idüp Top-hâne civârında olan evleri kurbında câmî' ü mekteb binâ idüp..." *Meşâi'irü 'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. II, 1191.

to join the ranks of the ulema. These would be followed by the madrasas built by various patrons of architecture and relatives of the sultans of the age, including the madrasas of Kâsım Paşa, Murâd Paşa (d.1473), Dâvûd Paşa (d.1498), İbrâhîm Paşa (d.1536) and Sinân Paşa (d.1596). Here, one should emphasize the fact that even though mosques and especially madrasas are the most referenced places in the narrative, they were indicated as career markers rather than lived or experienced spaces. ‘Âşık Çelebi also mentions, in some cases, salaries of professors teaching those madrasas highlighting the hierarchy among such structures. The following anecdote belonging to Hâtemî proves such a point:

[Sultan Bayezid] ... with forty *akçe*, assigns [Hâtemî as müderris] to the Kalenderhâne madrasa in Istanbul, thereafter with forty-five *akçe*, [he] is assigned to the Sahn, then with fifty *akçe*, is appointed as a *kadi* to Edirne, followed by an appointment of *kâzî-’asker*.⁹⁶

Hence, as discussed earlier in this chapter, one could easily follow the career patterns of the learned class from one madrasa to another.

3.3.2 Shops and marketplaces

Shops of various sorts and marketplaces or commercial centers were also among the welcomed spaces for many poets in the sixteenth century. These were frequent destinations, especially for those who did not have a chance, or perhaps privilege, to attend literary gatherings and drinking parties hosted by the higher echelons of the bureaucracy. Among the five shops that ‘Âşık Çelebi directly mentions, the most famous one belonged to Zâtî (d.1546). Located, first, in the courtyard of the complex of Bâyezîd II, then moved to the bazaar of the İbrahim Paşa bathhouse (*hammâm*)

⁹⁶ “[Sultân Bâyezîd]... kırk akça ile İstanbul'da Kalender-hâne medresesin virür ba'dehu kırk beş akça ile Sahn'ı virüp andan elli akça idüp andan Edirne'ye kâzî ba'dehu kâzî-'asker ider.” *Meşâî'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. III, 1496.

around Sarı Gürz neighborhood in walled city,⁹⁷ Zâtî's fortune-telling shop (*remilci dükkânı*) was a celebrated meeting place for poets.⁹⁸ Apart from telling fortunes, 'Âşık Çelebi narrates, Zâtî used to write poems on commission and provide help to novice poets:

Poets would come to his feet under the pretext of fortune-telling, showing the verses they recite, each poet would bring whatever he owned and would disclose it, he would hide the concealed words like a hidden moon, placing them within the collar of his garment.⁹⁹

Another well-known shop was an herbal shop owned by Sübûtî (d.1543) and located in the Karaman bazaar, in the same district as Zâtî's. Similar to Zâtî's shop, Sübûtî's herbal shop was quite popular among the literati. In addition to pastes (*ma'cûn*) and candies in different colors and tastes, Sübûtî used to sell pleasure inducing substances (*mâddetü'l-ferâhlar*), including wine and opium.¹⁰⁰ Other shops that served as gathering places for poets were dispersed in terms of their location. Among them, there were Zeynî's (d.?) book shop in the Karaman bazaar,¹⁰¹ Enverî's (d.1547) ink shop in Bitbazarı (flea market),¹⁰² and Kandî's (d.1555) candy shop in the courtyard of the complex of Bâyezîd II.¹⁰³

Although not directly associated with particular shops belonging to poets, 'Âşık Çelebi describes market places and commercial centers of Istanbul. In addition

⁹⁷ “[M]erhûmun evi Sarı Gürz Hammâmı mahallesinde ve dükkânı Sultân Bâyezîd hareminde idi. Her gün piyâdece dükkâna mürâca‘at iderdi... Sehl zemân geçmei dükkâna mülâzemetden kaldı, za‘f u pîrî âfetin aldı. Evi kurbında Koca İbrâhîm Paşa Hammâmı çarşusunda dükkân tutdı, yine remli âlet-i hengâme idüp cem‘-i şu‘arâ itdi.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu‘arâ*, vol. II, 673.

⁹⁸ For a critical assessment on the networks that developed around Zâtî's fortune-telling shop, see Sooyong Kim, “Minding the Shop: Zâtî and the Making of Ottoman Poetry in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2005).

⁹⁹ “Reml bahânesiyle şu‘arâ ayagina varurlar, didükleri eş‘ârı gösterürler, her şâ‘ir mâ-melek ü maktûrın getürüp öninde der-mîyân iderdi, ol içinde yakası açılmaduk sözleri giribânına koyup hâlede mâh gibi pinhân iderdi.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu‘arâ*, vol. III, 1576.

¹⁰⁰ *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu‘arâ*, vol. III, 1488.

¹⁰¹ *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu‘arâ*, vol. I, 588.

¹⁰² *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu‘arâ*, vol. I, 387.

¹⁰³ *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu‘arâ*, vol. I, 582.

to the Karaman bazaar and Bitbazarı (flea market), the text mentions Atbâzârı (horse bazaar), Avretbâzârı (slave bazaar), Balıkbâzârı (fish bazaar), İplikbâzârı (yarn bazaar) as places of daily encounter and even meeting spots for the beloveds. The author, for instance, quotes a poem after a poet named Husrev wrote upon his beloved's absence in such a market:

When the beauty named Yûsuf did not come the Avretbâzârı once, he [Husrev] said:
*Would it be a wonder if the world becomes a prison for me
That beauty of the age [Yûsuf] did not come to the market today.*¹⁰⁴

‘Âşık Çelebi also mentions a *bedestân* (a market hall within a bazaar complex) through the story of a poet Âftâbî (d.?) and his lover named Çerâk, whom the author personally knew.¹⁰⁵

Another commercial area that ‘Âşık Çelebi frequently narrates is Taht al-kal’a, the commercial core of the port along the Golden Horn, near Rüstem Paşa mosque underneath the Süleymaniye. The anecdotes depicting the variety of participants in the market demonstrate how marketplaces were an integral part of a vibrant city life. It is also observed that these areas were also spaces to be experienced, and allowed its spectators for watching (*seyr*) the young beauties of the city. Various anecdotes record stories on how poets such as Kadrî Efendi (d.?)¹⁰⁶ and

¹⁰⁴ “Yûsuf nâm dilberi bir gün Avretbâzârı'na gelmedükde dimişdür. *Beyt: Zindân olursa tan mı benim başuma cihân / Bâzâra gelmedi bu gün ol Yûsuf-ı zemân.*” *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. III, 1531.

¹⁰⁵ “...Çerâk dirler bir cevanun şem'-i hüsnine pervâne imiş ve âteş-i 'ışk ile tutışmakta bi-ihfîyâr olup dîvâne imiş. Mezbur Çeraga ahir-i 'ömrinde biz de irişdük. İstanbul bezzâzistanında kitâb sahhâfi idi. Aftabî'nün kendüye olan gazellerin okuyup gezüp anun vassâfi idi.” *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. I, 348-350.

¹⁰⁶ “Tahte'l-kal'a seyrânına varsa yine yârânınun fevkın gözler imiş.” *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. III, 1312.

İshâk Çelebi (d.1537)¹⁰⁷ would go to Taht al-kal'a to encounter male beloveds while others frequented certain shops as a part of their daily routines.¹⁰⁸

The number of references to such places in similar texts of the period proves that the commercial sprawl and its focal points come to the fore as production and circulation points for poems. Here, one could reference to Latîfî's *Evsaf-ı İstanbul*. Consisting of a preface, six chapters and an epilogue, *Evsaf-ı İstanbul* describes the capital city with both its structures and social life. The fifth chapter of the manuscript needs particular attention as it describes bazaars and shops of Istanbul. Here, the author devotes a lengthy section on taht al-kal'a, highlighting that this area has become living space for Ottoman literates at a relatively later date. Latîfî provides further information on the variety of participants in the market and rapidly expanding city life by celebrating Taht al-kal'a "as a place of wonders and spectacles, where the elegants of the age gathered (*mecma'-ı zürefâyı devrân*) and a source for the wise poets."¹⁰⁹

3.3.3 Dervish lodges, zaviyes and cells

Until the sheiks of the Zeyni order began to establish themselves in the northcentral region of Constantinople between the 1450s and 1470s, there was little Sufi presence in the Ottoman capital, in a formal or institutional sense, especially during the very first decades of Muslim rule.¹¹⁰ Starting with the reign Bâyezîd II and particularly

¹⁰⁷ "Tahte'l-kal'aya ugrayup at üzerinde Şerbetçi Bekr nâm mahbûbun katâyıfın yir imiş." *Meşâi'irü 'ş-su'arâ*, vol. I, 331.

¹⁰⁸ The case of Visâlî exemplifies such a situation: "Her gün Tahte'l-kal'a'da tereddüd ider, görenler 'acebâ Tahte'l-kal'ayı iltizâm mı itdi dir." *Meşâi'irü 'ş-su'arâ*, vol. I, 563.

¹⁰⁹ "Ol mecma'-ı zürefâyı devran ve menbâ'-ı nüdemâ-yı ehl-i irfân... tahtü'l-kal'a-i taht-ı İstanbul her kûşesinde seyr-i 'acâib ve temâşâ-yı garâib eyler." Latîfî, *Risâle-i Evsâf-ı İstanbul*, ed. Nermin Suner Pekin (İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti, 1977), 51.

¹¹⁰ To read more on Sufi presence and lodges of different orders over centuries, see John J. Curry, "Sufi Spaces and Practices," in *A Companion to Early Modern Istanbul*, 503-527.

through the sixteenth century, the number of Sufi lodges (*hânkâh*) and their growing centrality as urban institutions increased within the capital city.¹¹¹

These lodges were, of course, among the places where members of Sufi convents gathered and had their meetings and rituals. Though not offering much on the specific names, *Meşâi'irü's-su'arâ* names a couple of lodges and mentions their locations. One of the first entries where 'Âşık Çelebi specifies a dervish lodge named Vefâ hânkâhı. The founder of the lodge was one of the most important representatives of the Zeyni order, Sheikh Vefâ who came to Istanbul after the 1460s and took up residence in a mosque and lodge complex that Mehmed II (r.1444-1446, 1451-1481) constructed for him. Surveying the history of the Vefâ mosque and the surrounding complex, Kafescioğlu argues that some authors from the sixteenth century, including Hafız Hüseyin al-Ayvansarayi refer to the square that faced to the mosque as the Vefâ meydânı. She also asserts that “a common urban and architectural theme of the period becomes salient in the Vefâ foundation: the use of a square to lend prominence and visibility to significant buildings.”¹¹² 'Âşık Çelebi's references to the meydan and its surroundings also confirm this information. He also mentions another convent founded by Mehmed II, known as Kalenderhane.¹¹³ Converted from a monastic Byzantine church, this convent was situated directly south of the Vefâ mosque and served as a home for the Sufis of the period.

The author states that Şem'î (d.1529-30) was among the inhabitants of this lodge and spent most of his time with wandering dervishes. As soon as the spring arrived however, 'Âşık Çelebi adds, Şem'î would leave the lodge and joyfully rush to

¹¹¹ Kafescioğlu, *Constantinopolis/Istanbul*, 221-224.

¹¹² Kafescioğlu, *Constantinopolis/Istanbul*, 101.

¹¹³ For a brief analysis of the Kalenderhane, see Kafescioğlu, *Constantinopolis/Istanbul*, 101-103.

taverns (*meyhâne*) to join the beauties.¹¹⁴ This opposition, between lodge and tavern, in fact, is crucial as it demonstrates that almost none of the places mentioned have a fixed clientele or that being a regular at one place does not prevent access to the others, even if these appear to be in contrast to each other in terms of their functions. The author also describes a cell (*hücre*) that used to belong to Galatalı Nakkâş Haydar (d.1573)¹¹⁵ in another dervish lodge, this time around Tophane. ‘Âşık Çelebi celebrates this cell as a meeting place for poets and the elites of the period and adds another place, this time in Eyüp, called *haydarhâne*, frequented by many dervishes, including heterodox Kalender dervishes of the period.¹¹⁶

3.3.4 Graveyards, graves and tombs

There were numerous connections between Istanbulites and the dead of the city. In the cultural imagination of Ottomans, the dead were frequently invoked; bureaucrats, Sufi sheiks, poets, and, of course, biographers welcomed the dead as members of their own universe, establishing connections with prior incarnations and utilizing them as role models or advisors for current issues.¹¹⁷ Even though they lack a physical dimension, dreams were also used to communicate with the dead since they were treated as both prophecies and reflections of the inner world.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ “Şeyh Vefâ mürebbilerinden, câmi‘ü hânkâhî kûsesinün ehl-i inzivalarından imiş... Ammâ bahar vakti gül devri olup yârân meyhâneye açılısalar bu dahı tarikle sufleri tolandurup kadeh devrinde gâh başın ortaya atıp gâh pervâne gibi dâ’ireden nâzır olur imiş.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 607-608.

¹¹⁵ Nigârî was his penname.

¹¹⁶ “Galata’da Top-hâne cânibinde olup hücresi mecma‘-ı şu‘arâ vü zurefâ idi. Hâlâ cânib-i Eyyüb’da bir ‘işret-âbâd peydâ idüp kezâlik niçe dervîş ü kalendere tekyegâh ve süfre vü çerâğı ma‘mûr bir Haydar-hâne vü hânkâhdur. Harîf-i zurefâ ve nedîm-i agayân u ümerâ ve mülâzım-ı ‘ulemâ vü fuzalâdur.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 893.

¹¹⁷ Nühket Varlık, “Death in Istanbul: Plagues, Fires and Other Catastrophes,” in *A Companion to Early Modern Istanbul*, 425.

¹¹⁸ ‘Âşık Çelebi’s text, for instance, includes twelve dream narratives mostly relating to the future lives and careers of their owners. For the interpretation of two dreams belonging to two poets, Sa’dî Çelebi and Figânî, and their meaning in the early modern Ottoman imagination, see Aslı Niyazioğlu, “Rüyaların Söyledikleri,” in *Âşık Çelebi ve Şairler Tezkiresi Üzerine Yazılar*, eds. Hatice Aynur and Aslı Niyazioğlu (İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2011), 71-84.

Istanbulites would go to the local shrines, which were the tombs of religious authorities and Sufi leaders, to ask for blessings and intercession. The shrine belonged to Abu Ayyub al-Ansari (d.699) was arguably the most important of those locations.¹¹⁹ A public cemetery was established nearby, and eventually a mosque was constructed on the site of his tomb.¹²⁰ Along with the tombs of religious figures, tombs of particular poets were also among the popular sites for meeting with friends and commemorating the dead. Throughout the narrative, ‘Âşık Çelebi lists thirteen graves, twelve of which belong to the poets. While four of them were located either in Eyüp or on the road of Eyüp, three of them were situated in Edirnekapı and outside of Edirnekapı borders. Among the ones belonging to Necâtî (d.1509), a famous poet of the age, near the Sheikh Vefâ square appears to have been a well-known spot for Istanbulites.¹²¹

The author's sensitivity is particularly noticeable when it comes to death, especially concerning the graves of famous individuals or those personally known to ‘Âşık Çelebi. This demonstrates the author's direct involvement in certain ceremonial activities related to the commemoration of a poet's death. Scene depicting the grave of Yûsuf-ı Sîne-çâk (d.1546-7) and his commemoration, a year after his death, is portrayed in great detail as follows:

In the year 954, along with the late Sîne-çâk’s student, Mevlânâ Şûrî, and the late Peyrevî, [known as], Günâhî, and other members of the Mevlevî order, gathered for reciting the mystical chants and rare melodies... They organized an Ashura event in Ca'fer-âbâd and engaged in conversation and spiritual communion ... Afterwards, the Mevlevis performed the sema ceremony according to custom, surpassing the threshold of the sanctuary ... The poets, in their eloquence, deemed it appropriate to inscribe verses on Sîne-çâk's tombstone, each expressing their thoughts. Recognizing the relevance of 'Ârif's verse to the situation, they unanimously agreed to

¹¹⁹ He was among the circle of prophet Mohamed and believed to have died during an early siege of Constantinople.

¹²⁰ Varlık, “Death in Istanbul,” 426.

¹²¹ “Merhûmî hâlâ kabri meşhûr olduğı yirde defn iderler. Sehî Beg mezârın mermer ile yapdurup bu rubâ'isin yazdurur.” *Meşâi'irü 'ş-şu 'arâ*, vol. II, 855.

admire and inscribe it. The stone engravers inscribed with a skill such that they engraved the coin in marble.¹²²

This particularly long account of Sîne-çâk's commemoration depicting his pupils, Mevlânâ Şûrî (d.1582-3) and Günâhî (d.1580-1), together with other Mevlevîs cooking and distributing food at the grave of their sheikh might need further analysis. The author also depicts the crowd shaving their heads and crying while reading poetry during this ceremony. Yet, whether the author is describing Mevlevîs partaking in Alevite practices or if 'Âşık Çelebi's detailed account has any relation to this is unclear.

3.3.5 Public bathhouses

Another important space for socializing was bathhouses (*hammâm*). Âşık Çelebi mentions a total of four baths, two in Eyüp, one in Beşiktaş and the other in Hasköy. The bathhouse in Beşiktaş, owned by a former madrasa teacher, Sufi and poet known as Gazâlî (d.1535), was quite popular among the poets of the age. One of the bathhouses in Eyüp seems to be commissioned by Nişâncı (chancellor) Celal-zâde Mustafâ Çelebi (d.1567), also known as Nişânî Beg or Koca Nişâncı. In addition to the bathhouse, Nişânî had constructed a garden, vineyard, and mosque in Eyüp.¹²³ Besides being the most famous chancellor during the reign of Süleymân I, Nişânî's house was built by one of the greatest architects of the Ottoman realm, Sinân, next to

¹²² "Sene erba'a ve hamsîn ve tis'ami'e Muharrem'inün 'âşûrâ günü [954] merhûm Sîne-çâk'un şâkirdi Mevlânâ Şûrî ve merhûm peyrevî ya'nî Günâhî vesâ'ir Mevlevî cem' olup nagz u mergûb ve nâdirü'l-üslûb zîkr ü âvâze eylediler ... Ba'dehû Mevlevîler âyîni üzre semâ' idüp sahn-ı hânkâhı aşitdılar ... Şu'arâ tab'-âzmâyılık idüp Sîne-çâk'un kabri sengine yazmaga münâsib ebyât dimege kûşîş itdiler, her biri diyüp işitdiler. Cümleden 'Ârifî'nün bu beyti hasb-i hâle münâsib görölüp ittifâk üzre anı begenüp yazdılar. Seng-terâşlar bir san'atla yazdılar ki sikkeyi mermerde kazdılar." *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. II, 686.

¹²³ "Ebî Eyyûb-i Ensârî civârında bâg u bâgçe ve câmi' ü hammâm âbâdan itmişlerdi. Kendü anda sakin olup sohbetin hasr-ı ehl-i 'ilm ü irfân itmişlerdi." *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. II, 874.

his Friday mosque along the shore of Eyüp. Eventually, these structures probably gave the quarter its name, Nişanca.

Public bathhouses welcomed people from every social group, not only for hygienic and religious reasons, but for seeking the pleasure of sociable bathing. In fact, Nina Macaraig on her study of the Çemberlitaş Hamamı defined the Ottoman bathhouse as the “locus for leisure”¹²⁴ since the Ottoman women and men frequented the large bathhouses with a group of friends of the same sex every once in a while, accompanying each other with rumors, gossip and even poetry. ‘Âşık Çelebi’s narrative also proves how bathhouses were used as places where poets held poetic discussions and even had battles. An anecdote involving two poets, Zeynî and Sübûtî, whose shops already mentioned above, demonstrates such an environment nicely. ‘Âşık Çelebi narrates that both of the poets were in love with a young boy named Fındık Memi. Unfortunately, one day, all three ran into one another at the Nişancı hammâmı where Zeynî and Sübûtî got into a *poetic battle* [emphasis added], perhaps, to impress the young beauty. Nevertheless, after reading a few couplets (*beyt*) against each other, Zeynî seems to have lost this battle, and the attention of the young boy as well.¹²⁵

In addition to these, bathhouses were one of the chief attractions since they provide the opportunity to its customers to observe attractive young men, from bath boys (*dellâk*) to regular customers, as Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı have already underlined.¹²⁶ Thus, homoerotic attraction and sensuality in the bathhouse

¹²⁴ Nina Macaraig, *Çemberlitaş Hamamı in Istanbul: The Biographical Memoir of a Turkish Bath* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2019), 121.

¹²⁵ “[Zeynî] Bu esnâda Fındık Memi ki ‘ışkı nukl-ı meclis-i ‘uşşâk idi, anı sevüp ‘âşık-ı yâr-ı pistede hân oldu. Sübûtî dahı ‘âşık idi, biri birine rakîb idiler. Bir gün üçü Nişancı hammâmında cem’ oldılar... Zeynî ter düşüp fi’l-hâl sakalın ve kaşın ve kirpüğün çâr-darb terâş eyledi, kendüyi Kalenderlere baş eyledi. Dil-ber, Zeynî’nün vu hâlinde ‘âr idüp sohbetinden red eyledi.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-su’arâ*, vol. I, 588-89.

¹²⁶ Andrews-Kalpaklı, *The Age of Beloveds*, 72.

emerged as a theme in the Ottoman literature. Depicting the beautiful beloveds in a bathhouse setting, authors began to compose works in a particular genre called *hamâmiye* or *hamamnâme*. ‘Âşık Çelebi mentions one of the most famous authors of this genre Gazâlî as he built a bathhouse in the district of Beşiktaş.¹²⁷ Even though he does not provide further detail on the location of the bathhouse, ‘Âşık Çelebi demonstrates Gazâlî’s establishment as an interesting case since it explicates “a sixteenth-century bathhouse’s identity as a place for carnal pleasure.”

The beloveds of Istanbul streamed to that bath from all directions, and the lovers came, burning hot in fires of separation [from their beloveds], and in that bath they enflamed the wild horses of their hasty desire in the waters of lust ... Birader filled casks with silver bullion; the bathhouse attendants, [overcome] by desire, put on bath towels [and joined in], and the bath boys stuffed their purses.¹²⁸

Similarly, a later sixteenth-century historian Mustafa ‘Ali described several venues in which beardless young boys were used to attract customers in bathhouses. In fact, in *Meva‘idu’n-nefâ’is fi kava‘idu’l-mecâlis* (Exquisite appointments in the etiquette of gatherings), the author echoed Gazâlî’s appraisal of the convenience of boys as beloveds.¹²⁹

3.3.6 Gardens

Gardens, both as ideal and real spaces, are an equally prominent feature of Ottoman space and literature. As Gülru Necipoğlu already mentioned, there is no Ottoman

¹²⁷ His original name was Mehmed while he became famous as Deli Birader and used Gazâlî as his penname. For detailed information on Deli Birader and his famous work *Dafi’ü’l-Gumûm ve Rafi’ü’l-Humûm*, see Selim Sırrı Kuru, “A Sixteenth-Century Scholar: Deli Birader and his *Dafi’ü’l-Gumûm ve Rafi’ü’l-Humûm*” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2000).

¹²⁸ “İstanbul dil-berleri su-be-su ol hammâmun ayağına akdılar, niçe hecr ateşiyle yanmış ‘âşıklar varup ol hammâmda tevsen-i nefis-i tündkamlarını âb-ı şehvete yakdılar ... Birader Efendi simin güliçelerden futalar toldurup naturlar şevkden futa urup dellâklar kiseler pür eyledirler.” For the English translation of the citation, see Andrews-Kalpaklı, *Age of Beloveds*, 284; for the whole entry on Gazâlî, see, *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. III, 1635-1660.

¹²⁹ Kuru, “A Sixteenth-Century Scholar: Deli Birader,” 177-178.

garden surviving from the sixteenth-century, meaning that historians have limited sources based on textual and pictorial descriptions.¹³⁰ Based on the textual, especially narrative sources, public gardens and picnic spots were plentiful and among the popular gathering places. As the attendees varied, the venues where these gatherings are held also changed. In most cases, the garden space was intended to be disconnected from the spaces of the daily life. Accordingly, ‘Âşık Çelebi narrates various garden-like activities held in either public parks (*mesire*), gardens of public buildings, or private gardens of the elite, royal gardens, and even interior gardens.¹³¹

Among these public spaces Göksu on the Asian side of the Bosphorus, for instance, has been a popular destination for picnickers, lovers as well as poets. Another famous space, this time on the European side, was a park at Kağıthane. However, it would be a mistake to assume that all these places are located at the center of the city or on its immediate hinterland. Considering ‘Âşık Çelebi’s lengthy description of a park said to be near Şeyh Sinan Village¹³² on the outskirts of Istanbul proves such a point.¹³³

Apart from the aesthetic value that they carried, private gardens, probably, used to bring prestige to their owners. Perhaps to appeal to the eye, these gardens were often located in neighborhoods close to the sea. Among these were Üsküdar, Hasköy, Galata, Beşiktaş and Eyüp. Considering that the best-known patrons of the period were actually the high Ottoman bureaucrats, the long passages that ‘Âşık Çelebi devoted to these people and their gatherings in the narrative are equally

¹³⁰ Gülru Necipoğlu, “The Suburban Landscape of Sixteenth-Century Istanbul as a Mirror of Classical Ottoman Garden Culture,” in *Gardens in the Time of the Great Muslim Empires: Theory and Design*, ed. Attilio Petruccioli (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 32-71.

¹³¹ For interior gardens, see Walter G. Andrews, “Gardens-Real and Imagined-in the Social Ecology of Early Modern Ottoman Culture,” in *Garden Imagination: Historical Forms and Cultural Roles*, ed. Michel Conan (Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium Series in the History of Landscape Architecture, 2008), 106.

¹³² Probably near present Çatalca.

¹³³ “İstanbul etrâfında Şeyh Sinân kûyî câniblerinde seyrân idevüz.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 506-7.

noteworthy. As such, the author recalls various anecdotes describing how the grand vizier İbrâhîm Paşa (d.1536) and the chief treasurer (*defterdâr*) İskender Çelebi (d.1535) and Seydî ‘Âli Çelebi (d.1562) used to gather poets in their fancy mansions. These suggest that their courts possibly surpassed that of all others.

The gardens that belonged to Nîşancı Mustafâ Çelebi (d.1567) and his brother Celâlzâde Sâlih (d.1565) in Eyüp and Nişanca were also quite popular sites among the literati. ‘Âşık Çelebi, however, indicates that one of the most famous literary gatherings took place in a garden belonged to Kara Bâlî-zâde (d.1537) in Kabataş. Devoting a long passage to his *meclis*, ‘Âşık Çelebi highlights the good features of Kara Bâlî-zâde as a great patron of art and eulogizes his *meclis* known for its flexible codes of behavior.¹³⁴ Examining the accounts of the European travelers from the sixteenth century, Necipoğlu cites:

[The garden] had been particularly favored by Sultân Selîm II because of its convenient location close to the Topkapı Palace” and was described as a “royal pleasure garden” with a central cross-shaped alley wide enough for three horses to ride side by side ... surrounded by an enclosure wall bordered with two rows of trees to ensure privacy.¹³⁵

Necipoğlu also adds that the travelling accounts of Pietro Zen (d.1427), the Venetian vicebailo, and Jean Chesneau (d.?), the secretary of the French ambassador Gabriel d’Aramon, confirm that the shores of the Bosphorus were filled with suburban gardens dominated by large royal estates.¹³⁶ Yet, it is noteworthy that *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ* remains somehow silent about the famous royal gardens

¹³⁴ “Kara Bâlî-zâde-i merhum ki zarâfette şöhr-i şehri ve nezâfette ma’rûf-ı dehr, her fazl u ma’rifetden sâhib-i behr, mukalled-i a’yân u ekâbir ve câmi’-i me’âlî ve me’âsir evkâtı ekâbirle zevk u sohbet mahsûr ve odasında olsa zurefâ-yı vakt ve mehâbîb-i ‘asr ile ‘ıyş u ‘işrete maksûr idi ... Meclisi şöyle bî-tekellûf idi ki isteyen şem’ gibi turur isteyen yatuk gibi yatur isteyen sâgar gibi yürürdi ... Kara Bâlî-zâde’nün hânesinde şu’arâ vü zurefâ cem’ olmuş idi her biri çerb-zebânlıklar ve şîrîn-beyânlıklar idüp yanup yakılmakta şem’ olmuş idi.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 523-24.

¹³⁵ Necipoğlu, “The Suburban Landscape,” 32.

¹³⁶ Necipoğlu, “The Suburban Landscape,” 33.

associated with Süleymân or any other Ottoman ruler, including the Kule Bahçesi (tower garden) in Çengelköy, the Sultaniye (imperial) garden, located close to the Black Sea, near Beykoz or Fenerbahçe (lighthouse garden) occupying a promontory on the Asian shore of the Marmara Sea.¹³⁷ Another point to be mentioned here is the bostâns of Istanbul.¹³⁸ Even though the commercial produce gardens emerged in Istanbul hills and hundreds of bostâns were established during the sixteenth century, ‘Âşık Çelebi does not mention the bostâns or any agricultural space of Istanbul either.

3.3.7 Public squares

Another space that welcomed the huge crowds, especially during the festivities or weddings were the public squares. *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ* mentions two well-known squares, one is the main public square of the walled city, the Atmeydanı, and the other is the Okmeydanı, to the north of the Golden Horn. Yet, the references to the Okmeydanı seems to be rather limited in the sixteenth-century *tezkires*. This could be explained with a possibility that Okmeydanı became popular at a much later date. Zeynep Yelçe’s study on the imperial festivals, for instance, demonstrates that how circumcision festivals abandoned the Atmeydanı and transferred to the Okmeydanı.¹³⁹

The great square of the ancient Hippodrome, or Atmeydanı, on the other hand, seems to be main stage for festivities, particularly for the celebration of

¹³⁷ Necipoğlu, “The Suburban Landscape,” 37-38.

¹³⁸ For a brief survey of the bostâns of Istanbul and their formation, see Alexandar Shopov, “When Istanbul Was a City of Bostâns: Urban Agriculture and Agriculturists,” in *A Companion to Early Modern Istanbul*, 279- 307.

¹³⁹ N. Zeynep Yelçe, “Evaluating Three Imperial Festivals: 1524, 1530, 1539,” in *Celebration, Entertainment and Theater in the Ottoman World*, eds. Suraiya Faroqhi and Arzu Öztürkmen (Calcutta: Seagull Books, 2014), 71-109.

dynastic weddings and circumcision ceremonies, at least in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Various literary and visual records of such festivals held at the Atmeydanı proves that the hippodrome served as a place where court and city met “for a multivalent display of self-representation.”¹⁴⁰ Atmeydanı was also a space for everyday sociability as can be seen in the narratives of Taşlıcalı Yahyâ’s and Latifi. Both authors highlight visibility of various segments of the society and forms of sociability at the square. In addition to such textual sources, visual sources depicted the same area demonstrating the daily and nocturnal entertainments. One of the most famous of these accounts was a chronicle of an imperial circumscion festival in the summer of 1582 that had taken place in the Atmeydanı. *Sûrnâme-i Humâyûn* (The Book of Imperial Festivities) written by a minor scribe at the Ottoman court with the penname İntizâmî (d.?) needs particular attention since it includes total of 250 scenes, 224 of which are extant paintings have the square as their setting.¹⁴¹

Leaving imperial festivities aside, ‘Âşık Çelebi describes the Atmeydanı as a place where poets promenading in the square to meet their male beloveds, and narrates various stories including the poets Celâlî,¹⁴² Figânî, Nâtî, and Nûhî,¹⁴³ Kandî and Yahyâ Bey.¹⁴⁴ Among these poets, the stories about Yahyâ Beg (d.1582), a janissary poet also known as Taşlıcalı Yahyâ, needs particular attention as his personal writings also proves that he was keen on activities held at the Hippodrome. His work *Şâh u Gedâ* (The King and the Beggar) focuses on Istanbul during a Friday prayer at Hagia Sophia. As the narrative focuses on the aftermath of the prayer, the

¹⁴⁰ Kafescioğlu, “The Ottoman imperial capital: Istanbul between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries,” in *Bizansio, Constantinople, Istanbul*, ed. Tania Velmans, trans. Lucca Mezzetti (Milan: Editoriale Jaca Book, 2008), 251-319.

¹⁴¹ To read more on İntizâmî’s *Sûrnâme* and newly emerging modes of urban visuality, see Kafescioğlu, “Picturing the square, streets and denizens of early modern Istanbul: Practices of urban space and shifts in visuality,” *Muqarnas* 37 (2020)-139-177.

¹⁴² *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 469.

¹⁴³ *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. III, 1203

¹⁴⁴ *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. III, 1333.

narrator describes the Atmeydanı as a paradise garden and compares the space to a tent accommodating travelers of all sorts as guests.¹⁴⁵ In *Meşâi'irü's-şu'arâ*, 'Âşık Çelebi also describes a festivity where Yahyâ Bey, Kandî and himself while watching a spectacle there, met two young lovers, Çeşmeli and Şâh Ahmed.¹⁴⁶ Although his words on the Atmeydanı do not provide any detail on the objects of spectacle (*seyr* or *temâşâ*), the spectators were probably watching a performance where acrobats, jugglers, musicians as described in other contemporary sources.

Finally, the Atmeydanı was at the same time one of the primary sites where public displays of authority and dissent took place. Many executions were displayed at the Hippodrome publicly as a way to manifest and secure the power of the ruling body. The execution of the Melâmi master Oğlan Şeyh, for instance, was narrated in *Meşâi'irü's-şu'arâ* as 'Âşık Çelebi himself was present at the event with his friend Enverî.¹⁴⁷ Especially after the seventeenth century, the square became a zone of confrontation between the dissident, including the janissaries and civilians, and the authorities.

3.3.8 Taverns

The sixteenth-century tezkire literature is full of descriptions of the famous taverns (*mey-hâne*) of Istanbul, especially in the district of Galata, mostly due to its predominantly Christian character.¹⁴⁸ While Christians and Jews constituted the

¹⁴⁵ Levend, *Türk Edebiyatında Şehr-engizler*, 103-105.

¹⁴⁶ "Sene selâse ve erba'în ve tis'ami'e [943] bayramı idi ki Atmeydânı 'idgâhında Yahyâ Beg'le Kandî ve hakîr seyr iderken Çeşmeli ile Şâh Ahmedî bir yirde turur gördük. Bu iki 'âşık biz 'Âşıkâ ibrahîm itdiler ki varup ikisi ile birer def'a 'id merhabâsın idem, tekrâr birer merhabâ dahî idüp bu merhabâ 'âşıklarunuzundur diyem. Hakîr dahî ikdâm idüp ikisiyle bile ikişer merhabâ idüp bireri benümdür ve bireri Yahyâ Beg'le Kandî'nündür, anlarun emânetidür didüm. Her biri gülüp nâz u 'işve ve şive vü kirişmeye bozdılar, gelüp haber virdüm." *Meşâi'irü's-şu'arâ*, vol. III, 1333.

¹⁴⁷ "Oğlan Şeyh'ün Atmeydânı'nda boynun urduklarında Enverî ile fakir anda bile hâzır idüm." *Meşâi'irü's-şu'arâ*, vol. I, 390.

¹⁴⁸ For a suggestive description of Galata through contemporary passages and couplets, see Andrews-Kalpakh, *The Age of Beloveds*, 63-66; 69-70.

regular customers, there were also Muslims, especially poets, and soldiers, particularly janissaries. The famous Efe meyhânesi, for instance, was a gathering place of poets and revelers from the late fifteenth century through the sixteenth century. Various *tezkire* compilers also mention Yani meyhânesi,¹⁴⁹ the taverns of Galata and Tophane as well as seasonal open-air taverns that appeared on the banksides of the city.¹⁵⁰

Following his contemporaries ‘Âşık Çelebi provides a lively portrait of the Galata district as a place where entertainment events and drinking parties took place and the beauties of the city used to gather. Albeit the names of the specific places where the literati of the age would go for entertainment remain largely unknown. *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ* does not exactly reveal when and where these taverns generally operated either. Yet, the author provides a specific name, Efe meyhânesi, established in Taht al-kal’a, in the district of Eminönü. In fact, this tavern frequently comes across in the narrative.

3.3.9 Churches

One thing worth mentioning here is the issue of the hierarchy of buildings and religions. Most of the early modern Ottoman narratives written on the city, intentionally or not, focus on the structures built by the Muslims and their living environment, thus marking the city with the Muslim identity. Therefore, it is striking that most of the authors have a visible silence regarding the Christian and Jewish communities of the empire and the built environments that were inhabited by these communities.

¹⁴⁹ Most of these taverns seem to be named after their owners.

¹⁵⁰ İpekten, *Divan Edebiyatında Edebî Muhitler*, 224.

‘Âşık Çelebi’s text, being no exception, disregards the very existence of these as architectural monuments and public spaces. The word used for church (*kilisa*) occurs only once in the text, and the name of the church is not mentioned. Here, the author tells a story about Pîrî Paşa-zâde Mehemmed Çelebi (d.1532-3) and Aşçı-zâde Hasan Çelebi (d.1535) joining the Easter feast in a church in Galata by changing clothes to avoid being recognized.¹⁵¹ The incident above demonstrates that the church was used here only as a place or rather as a stage where the author tells his story.

A final issue to be mention is coffeehouses. Many scholars have already proved that by the second half of the sixteenth century, coffeehouses had also started to appear in various locations in Istanbul. In fact, coffeehouses around the Karaman bazaar became especially popular gathering spots for lovers, pleasure seekers, and, of course, poets.¹⁵² Although coffee was already a widely consumed beverage in the Ottoman realm, it was not until the sixteenth century that it was served and sold in places specically dedicated to it. Historian Mustafa ‘Âli (d.1600), for instance, asserted that the coffeehouses appeared in Istanbul around 1552, and described them as the gathering place for a wide variety of people looking for pleasant conversation including dervishes, janissaries, city-boys, and homeless strangers from all over the empire.¹⁵³

Instantly becoming fashionable among the urban populations of the empire, the coffeehouse provided a vibrant public space of interaction and cultural exchange among the male members of the city by the late sixteenth century. A quite famous

¹⁵¹ *Meşâi’irü’ş-su’arâ*, vol. II, 784.

¹⁵² Andrews-Kalpaklı, *The Age of Beloveds*, 70.

¹⁵³ Mustafa Âli, *Mevâ’idü’n-Nefâ’is fî Kavâ’idi’l-Mecâlis (Tables of Delicacies Concerning the Rules of Social Gatherings)*, trans. and ed. Douglas S. Brookes (Cambridge: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 2003), 129-130.

scene demonstrating an idealized representation of an Ottoman coffeehouse in the Chester Beatty Library proves such an environment.¹⁵⁴ The scene depicts people from different walks of life, the beardless young boys serving coffee, older men sitting in divan, a place reserved for the reputable people, musicians and dancers, and people playing popular games such as backgammon and mangala on the corner.

Although there is a quite substantial literature on sociability and socialization practices in early modernity, it is seen that most of these studies almost established around the performativity in the coffeehouses, often associated with either leisure practices or social unrest and uprisings.¹⁵⁵ However, when we turn to ‘Âşık Çelebi’s narrative, it is interesting that he remained silent about the coffeehouses of Istanbul. His only coffeehouse reference appears in the biography of ‘Atâ (d.1552), the chief physician at the court of Edirne. ‘Âşık Çelebi describes ‘Atâ’s fondness for coffee as follows:

[Although] in appearance, he is the chief physician at the Edirne palace, in reality, he is a regular of the coffeehouse and an occasional guest at his own home.¹⁵⁶

One possible explanation for the absence of coffeehouse references in Istanbul would be that these places had not yet reached popularity among the literati at the time ‘Âşık Çelebi penned his work or that they did not find a place for themselves in the corrections made by the author in the first draft of the text. Yet,

¹⁵⁴ Chester Beatty Library, T. 439, fol. 9.

¹⁵⁵ For a selection of works dedicated to the coffeehouses of the early modernity see, Cengiz Kırılı, “The Struggle over Space: Coffeehouses of Ottoman Istanbul,” (PhD diss., Binghamton University, 2000); Ali Çaksu, “Janissary coffee houses in the late eighteenth-century Istanbul,” in *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Dana Sajdi (London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2007), 117-132; Serkan Delice, “The janissaries and their bedfellows: masculinity and male friendship in eighteenth-century Ottoman Istanbul,” in *Gender and Sexuality in Muslim Cultures*, ed. Gül Özyeğin (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 634-649; Farhad Emami, “Coffeehouses, urban spaces, and the formation of the public sphere in Safavid Isfahan,” *Muqarnas* 33 (2016), 177-220.

¹⁵⁶ “Haliyâ zahiren Edirne serâyında tabîb-i sanîdür ammâ hakikatde kahve-hâne mücâviri olup kendü evinün ahyânen mihmânıdır.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 1094.

this still does not answer why coffeehouses do not appear as places of socialization in later *tezkires* written after *Meşâi'irü's-şu'arâ*, even in the seventeenth century. Likewise Peçevi (d.1650)'s depictions of the coffeehouses demonstrating how the religious authorities of the age proclaimed the coffeehouse as “a place of evil” and “it was better to go to the tavern than to go there” might also lead historians to reconsider the limitations of the coffeehouses in the early modern sociability.¹⁵⁷

References and anecdotes discussed in this chapter reflect the multitude and diversity of spaces appeared in *Meşâi'irü's-şu'arâ*. While some places, such as references to gardens and taverns, might appear as literary topoi, and possibly as actual places, others emerge as places where physical mobility is prominent. From this perspective, this section argued that it is possible to read ‘Âşık Çelebi’s setting as a historical work reflecting such a diversity in the sixteenth-century Istanbul. Taking into account the discussed anecdotes and the entirety of the text, the next chapter will attempt to make a nuanced interpretation of socialization spaces and types of mobility by tracing the transitions between such spaces.

¹⁵⁷ Peçevi, *Târih-i Peçevi* (İstanbul: Enderun, 1980), 363-365.

CHAPTER 4

CLAIMING THE CITY

*Bâgçesi ta 'tîl günleri 'ulemâya sohbetgâh ve
sâ 'ir ezmân zurefâ-yı erkâna ve rindân-ı ehl-
i 'irfâna ve şu'arâ-yı dânişmendâna
'işretgâh idi.*¹⁵⁸

Following the footsteps of 'Âşık Çelebi in his journey through various sites in the ever-expanding city of Istanbul, this chapter tries to examine the spatial experiences of poets by mapping their movements and places that they assembled in. The chapter opens with a discussion on the factors which used to determine one's acceptance to or rejection from certain places and gatherings. Then, the chapter tries to map the particular spots once located at the central crossroads of *intra* and *extra muros* Istanbul. Taking the role of broader range of organizations and individuals in this process into consideration, it tackles types of mobility and transitions within such spaces. The chapter underlines the diversity of socialization spaces, and emphasizes the mobility and fluidity of spatial practices through the use of space.

4.1 Determining the limits of physical mobility

As discussed in previous chapters, it can be observed that changes in the urban life and urban culture occurred in parallel with political and demographic changes in Ottoman Istanbul from the mid-sixteenth century onwards. Alongside these changes,

¹⁵⁸ "The garden [of Sirkeci Bahşı] was a venue for conversation for scholars on holidays and at other times a meeting place for revelry for the dignitaries, the revelers of the people of knowledge, and the poets of the wise." *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu 'arâ*, vol. III, 1643.

a period started to emerge where identities and statusmarks become more pronounced at the centers and edges of imperial authority, a process that helped to maintain the boundaries between moral and immoral, Muslim and *infidel* [emphasis added], self and other.¹⁵⁹ These identities, in various aspects, delineated the environments individuals had access to and those they were excluded from while controlling and limiting their actions in the first place. The primary objective of this section, therefore, is to analyze the factors that regulated entry into these places, thereby exploring multiple criteria influencing an individual's social standing, including religious affiliation, ethnic background, gender, and patronage. It also asserts that the descriptions of places in *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, whether imperial or public, can be seen as snapshots demonstrating a certain moment when topoi acquired a form of physicality. Thus, despite its fictional aspect, this chapter emphasizes that 'Âşık Çelebi's narrative tells us a lot about the positions of poets and the limits of their spatiality.

When discussing public spaces and their effects on social life, one of the criteria that must be considered is the physical boundaries of these spaces. In this regard, religions have had a significant influence for a long time in establishing and maintaining their own laws. However, determining the physical boundaries of communities shaped by religion or ethnicity in the Ottoman realm is not an easy task. Therefore, it would be useful to consider these two entities, almost as conceptual spaces beyond strict physical boundaries. One of the important sources to evaluate the population of non-Muslims and mark their locations in the Ottoman territories is the *tahrir* registers.¹⁶⁰ When the population of Jewish communities of the sixteenth-

¹⁵⁹ Marc David Baer, *Atmeydanı'nda Ölüm: 17. Yüzyıl İstanbul'unda Toplumsal Cinsiyet, Hoşgörü ve İhtida*, trans. Pınar Yanardağ (İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi, 2014), 13.

¹⁶⁰ Özel, "Avarız ve Cizye Defterleri," in *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Bilgi ve İstatistik*, eds. Halil İnalçık and Şevket Pamuk (Ankara: Başbakanlık Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü, 2001), 35-50.

and seventeenth century-Istanbul is examined based on these registers,¹⁶¹ four districts stand out: Balat, Galata, Hasköy, and Ortaköy.¹⁶² Thus, it would not be wrong to describe the demographic structure of these regions in the same century as an ethnic and religious mosaic. Describing the neighborhoods of Fener and Balat, the seventeenth-century intellectual Eremya Çelebi K m rciyan (d.1695),¹⁶³ for instance, mentions that in addition to Jews, many Christians and even Muslims from various nations lived together in these areas.¹⁶⁴ However, it would be overly optimistic to view these neighborhoods as spaces where everyone lived in harmony without any tension. These neighborhoods, which brought people from similar economic conditions, often hosted sexual, moral, and religious tensions which can be traced through court records.

Therefore, reading ‘ şık Çelebi's work within similar contextual divisions might help us understand to what extent the dynamics of *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-su 'arâ* reflects the social life of the period. When comparing the text to works such as Eremya Çelebi's *İstanbul Tarihi* (History of Istanbul) or *Yahudi Gelini* (Jewish Bride), a fictional narrative, it is obvious that Eremya's experience of Istanbul was quite distant from ‘ şık Çelebi's and other Muslim poets' narrated in the text. Here, it should be underlined that this distance does not only refer to a physical one. When the ethnicity of the poets is examined, it is observed that the overwhelming majority of poets addressed by the author are *r m * poets as the Muslim identity started to be a dimension of the designation of *r m * at this time. Although there are a few instances

¹⁶¹ Stefanos Yerasimos found out that the Jewish population in Istanbul tripled from the end of the fifteenth to seventeenth century, see Yerasimos, “La commun t  juive d’Istanbul a la fin du XVI si cle,” *Turcica* 27 (1995), 101-130.

¹⁶² Uriel Heyd, “The Jewish Communities of Istanbul in the Seventeenth Century,” *Oriens* 6, no. 2 (1953), 310-311.

¹⁶³ For a brief biography of Eremya Çelebi, see Eremya Çelebi K m rciyan, *İstanbul Tarihi*, trans. and ed. Hrand D. Andreasyan (İstanbul: Kutulmuş Basımevi, 1952), x-xxviii.

¹⁶⁴ Eremya Çelebi, *İstanbul Tarihi*, 20-21.

where the words *kürd* (Kurdish) and *'acem* (Persian) are used to refer to both ethnicity and sometimes language, their usage is limited and rather ambiguous within the text. Nonetheless, both *kürd* and *'acem* signify an identity shared with the *rûmî*, that is Muslim. The words *'Âşık Çelebi* used while describing a poet, Celilî (d.1569-1570), exemplifies such a situation:

His attire is in the Persian-style, [appearing] knowledgeable and intelligent, yet his gaze and gait are mad. His words are full of Turkish and his style is Kurdish.¹⁶⁵

Using words such as *'acemâne*, *türkâne*, and *kürdâne*, *'Âşık Çelebi* highlights the cultural and linguistic elements that are inherent to these cultures without giving a direct reference to geography.

Leaving the Muslim of different ethnic or linguistic belonging poets aside, among 427 poets, there is only one Armenian/Christian poet, Mesîhî (d.1512), who finds himself a place in *'Âşık Çelebi*'s compilation. He is one of the poets of the era of Bayezid II, his real name mentioned as Mesîh in the biographical dictionary of Sehî Bey and as 'Îsâ in other sources.¹⁶⁶ The poet probably chose Mesîhî as his pen-name in reference to the Christian prophet. *'Âşık Çelebi* shares an interesting anecdote describing a scene where Grand Vizier Hadım 'Ali Paşa (d.1511) wanted to have Mesîhî write something for him, he couldn't find the poet at his duty, and ordered the doorkeepers to search for that *şehir oglanı* (city-boy), and goes on to comment on how he would often be found either in the Taht al-kal'a or in a tavern.¹⁶⁷ Although *'Âşık Çelebi* devotes a significant space to Mesîhî in his narrative, it is significant that he remains as the only poet mentioned with a Christian background.

¹⁶⁵ "Libası 'Acemâne vü dânişmendâne vü huşmendâne ammâ bakışı vü yürüşi dîvânedür ... Kelimâtı işbâ-ı zamme ile Türkâne ve ser ü şekli Kürdânedür." *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-su'arâ*, vol. I, 479-480.

¹⁶⁶ Sehî Beg, *Heşt Bihişt*, 142.

¹⁶⁷ *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-su'arâ*, vol. II, 803-813.

In that sense, it can be argued that while *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ* reflects the ethnic and linguistic richness and diversified social statuses of the early modern Istanbul, it does not show an inclusive attitude when it comes to religion.

In analyzing spatial divisions and relationships established through spatial practices, gender relations are of critical importance. In this context, numerous studies have shown that the conceptual framework that shapes the dichotomy of public and private space and codes the former as spaces inherent to men and the latter to women does not have an equivalent in Islamicate geographies. Almost all of these studies indicate that the distinction between public and private is not sufficient to explain gender relations in Ottoman society, and brings concepts such as social status, ethnicity, religion and age into discussion.¹⁶⁸ The visibility of women who were not in a secluded status (*muhaddere*) in public spaces in Ottoman society is a further evidence that the use of space was not shaped solely by gender. Leslie Peirce argues that the *muhaddere* status serves a perception of order based on the isolation of women from life outside the home (*hâne*).¹⁶⁹ According to Peirce, the reason why women with high social status and wealth do not go out in public was economically determined, meaning that they had slaves who could do their work in public places for them. Similarly, examining the court records in the sixteenth-century Istanbul,

¹⁶⁸ For studies that evaluate space through concepts, including social status/class, ethnicity, religion, and age, see Leslie Peirce, "Beyond Harem Walls: Ottoman Royal Women and the Exercise of Power," in *Gendered Domains: Rethinking Public and Private in Women's History*, eds. O. Dorothy Helly and S. M. Reverby (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 40-55; Yvonne Seng, "Invisible Women: Residents of Early Sixteenth Century Istanbul," in *Women in the Medieval Islamic World*, ed. Gavin R. G. Hambly (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 241-268; Dina Rizk Khoury, "Terlikler Kapıda Mı, Kapalı Kapılar Ardında Mı: Ev İçinde ve Kamusal Mekânda Musullu Kadınlar," in *Modernleşmenin Eşiğinde Osmanlı Kadınları*, ed. Madeline C. Zilfi, trans. Necmiye Alpay (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000), 101-121.

¹⁶⁹ Leslie Peirce, *Ahlak Oyunları: 1540-1541 Osmanlı'da Ayntab Mahkemesi ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet*, trans. Ülkü Tansel (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2003), 466.

Yvonne Seng asserts that the presence of lower-class women in public spaces was a necessity for them to sustain their daily lives regardless of religion or ethnicity.¹⁷⁰

Dina Rizk Khoury also proves a similar situation for Mosul from the eighteenth to the nineteenth centuries. Khoury argues that women from the middle and lower classes were, in fact, largely free in using public spaces and secured their freedoms through law and social norms.¹⁷¹ Thus, there were many factors that determined the visibility of women in the city in the early modern Ottoman society,¹⁷² while most of the spaces labeled as public were predominantly under the control of Muslim men. According to Khoury, the identity of women from the middle and lower classes firstly depended on the neighborhood, then on a man who could be a husband, father, brother or child.

Turning back to *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, one can see that 'Âşık Çelebi provides a very limited information on the women of the city. The lack of women's presence in the narrative, innately, delineates a fragmented picture of the sixteenth-century Istanbulites while only offering glimpses of the daily lives of men of different social strata, whether poets or not. Not surprisingly, the text includes only three entries dedicated to women poets: Zeyneb Hatun (d.1474-1475),¹⁷³ Mihrî Hatun (d.1515),¹⁷⁴ and Ayşe (Hubbî) Hatun (d.1589-1590).¹⁷⁵ Upon the examination of the biographies of these three, it is noticeable that these women shared common features which enabled them to surpass the authorities mentioned above, at least to some extent. While Zeyneb Hatun, the first recorded Ottoman woman poet in the Ottoman

¹⁷⁰ Seng, "Invisible Women," 243.

¹⁷¹ Khoury, "Terlikler Kapıda mı," 118-119.

¹⁷² Lucien Thys-Şenocak, "The Gendered City," in *The City in the Islamic World*, ed. Salma K. Jayyusi (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2018), 877-893.

¹⁷³ *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. I, 591.

¹⁷⁴ *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. II, 832-836.

¹⁷⁵ *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. II, 1135-1139.

tezkires, and Mihrî Hatun were each daughter of a *kadi* in Amasya, Ayşe Hatun was the granddaughter of a prominent figure in the same city. From this perspective, it is understood that each of these poets had a social status that somewhat freed them from some constraints. Although we do not know much about their physical presence in public, ‘Âşık Çelebi’s portrayal of these women draws attention to their presence in social networks, meaning that these two meant different things.

However, it should be noted that the inclusion of these women poets, first, to literary gatherings, second, to the literary cannon cannot be explained by their social status alone. Thus, one can claim that certain literary networks had a say in individuals’ spatial mobility and physical presence, especially in literary gatherings. In comparison to Zeyneb Hatun, on whom there is less information in biographical entries, the web of relationships established by Mihrî and Ayşe Hatun with various patrons of art and individuals over time plays a significant role in their acceptance to such an environment. While Mihrî Hatun had Bayezid II and Bayezid’s son Ahmed (d.1513) as her patrons; Ayşe Hatun was the wife of Şems Çelebi (d.?), teacher of Selim II during his tenure as a *şehzâde* in Amasya. Thus, the very conditions that they lived in enabled these women to attend gatherings, thus, establish new networks and alliances that may return as a fame and monetary support to them.

Another factor determined women poets’ acceptance to the literary environment was their poetic training or talent. In each case, we see how these poets used poetic rhetoric and tradition to legitimate themselves as poets.¹⁷⁶ In his entry on Mihrî Hatun, for instance, ‘Âşık Çelebi describes how Mihrî competes with her fellow poets, Necâti (d.1509) and Makâmi (d.?) by redefining the meaning of *merdlik*

¹⁷⁶ To read further on the poetic performance and legitimacy of Mihrî, see Havlioğlu, *Mihrî Hatun*, especially 64-71; 115-137.

(manliness) through her *merdâne* (manly) poetic performance.¹⁷⁷ ‘Âşık Çelebi refers to the field of poetry as *merd-i meydan* (a warrior of the arena) as if it is a physical space. In doing so, he both marginalizes Mihrî’s position in this field and eulogizes her poetic skills by attributing masculine qualities to her.

Another issue that has been emphasized in biographical entries of Sehî Beg, Latîfî and ‘Âşık Çelebi, is the marital status of women poets. In fact, Latîfî and ‘Âşık Çelebi contrasted Zeyneb Hatun’s choice to marry with Mihrî Hatun’s choice to remain single, and stated that Zeyneb stopped writing poetry once she married. ‘Âşık Çelebi wrote:

Mihrî shied away from marriage and spent her life unmarried until she died. Zeyneb [on the other hand] married and lived under her husband’s command and she quit poetry and prevented contact with men.¹⁷⁸

This anecdote is particularly intriguing since it underlines that continued practice of poetry, at least in some cases, would necessitate contact with men, therefore, presence of women in places where poetry was performed. In fact, this might be one of the reasons why ‘Âşık Çelebi emphasizes Mihrî’s qualities being a modest, pious and virginal woman, and makes “connection between the phrase *bikr-i mânâ*, meaning ‘virginal meanings,’ and new concepts or imagery, and eventually to the virginity of Mihrî herself.”¹⁷⁹ This brings us back to the difference between physical presence in public and presence in social networks and literary settings. By emphasizing the chastity of Mihrî under the veil of virginity, ‘Âşık Çelebi, of course, inadvertently attests to the limited level of spatial mobility and physical presence of women in public. This, however, does not necessarily suggest that Mihrî was not an

¹⁷⁷ “Eğerçi zendür ammâ ol nâ-merd niçe merd-i meydâna cüfte-zendür.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 832.

¹⁷⁸ “Mihrî izdivâcdan ‘âr idüp ölince tecerrüd ile geçinmiş. Zeynep ere varup eri hükminde olup şî’rden ve ricâl ile musâhabetden çekinmiş.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 591.

¹⁷⁹ Havlioğlu, *Mihrî Hatun*, 49.

active participant in literary gatherings. On the contrary, both Mihrî's *divan* and 'Âşık Çelebi's anecdotes prove that she was a very productive attendant to the gatherings held at the court of Bayezid II.

One of the factors helped to determine poets' advancement and their acceptance to certain gatherings was their connections (*intisab*). A prominent historian, Cornell Fleischer defined *intisab* in the Ottoman context as follows:

İntisab signified a semiofficial patronage system whereby a member of the *askeri* class [tax-exempt elite] would help to secure entry into and advancement within the government system for his own proteges, who would in turn support their patron and his interests. *İntisab* was established on the basis of a variety of other sorts of relationships. Blood kinship constituted the most immediate basis for patronage, but friendship, marriage ties, sexual relationships, ethnic and geographical origins, household service, and student-teacher bonds also played an important part in the establishment of *intisab* networks.¹⁸⁰

Approaching *Meşâi'irü's-su'arâ* from this perspective, one can see that the text provides valuable insights on how 'Âşık Çelebi, as a poet himself, perceives *intisab* as a necessity for the survival of the poet. Since some of his entries written in a form resembling panegyric poems (*kaside*) addressed were to potential patrons, it can be argued that 'Âşık Çelebi used his text as a channel for establishing future networks. To define such a relationship, he uses various words including *terbiyet etmek* (to educate), *himmet etmek* (to contribute, to provide support), *ihsân etmek* (to gift), *nazarına manzûr olmak* (to meet one's approval). Although it is beyond the limits of this thesis, it is sufficient to say that the terminology of the author on *intisab* is quite extensive and intriguing in many ways as his text highlights a network of salons of varying degrees of social status, thus, a poetic practice across urban social classes.¹⁸¹

¹⁸⁰ Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual*, 19-20.

¹⁸¹ To read more on the patronage terminology in the Ottoman literature, see Tûba İşinsu İsen-Durmuş, *Tutsan Elini Ben Fakirin: Osmanlı Edebiyatında Hâmîlik Geleneği* (İstanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2009). In a similar study in 'Âşık Çelebi's tezkire, see Tûba İsen-Durmuş, asserts that there are about fifty different terms that correspond to the patronage relations. See especially, Tûba İsen-Durmuş

In this context, it is obvious that the recognition of the poet served as one of the significant factors enabling the poet's invitation to or acceptance by a certain gathering, which was fundamentally contingent upon being supported by a good patron. To put it another way, 'Âşık Çelebi connects the recognition by the literary circles and acceptance to the canon to a patron and web of rewards (*ihsân*), in kind or in cash. Patrons often showed interest and favor to the poet who sought various tasks or material gains in this regard, assisting and supporting them. This expression is also occasionally found in biographical dictionaries as a general term for protecting and supporting the poet.¹⁸²

When the entirety of the text is examined, two distinct spheres of patronage stand out: those shaped around the palace and those shaped outside the palace. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Ottoman literature, primarily centered around Edirne and Istanbul, and showed continuity and development in regions where palaces of the princes were located.¹⁸³ Therefore, during the formation process of the Ottoman literary canon, the significant influence of rulers not only in supporting art but also actively participating in art production cannot be overstated. It is known that sultans, princes, rulers, and bureaucrats at various levels of the state supported or engaged in various branches of art to varying degrees, depending on their interests. 'Âşık Çelebi, for instance, describes İbrâhîm Paşa as *penâh-ı ehl-i mâ'rifet* (refuge of the people of knowledge) and frequently highlights his generosity as a patron.¹⁸⁴

In addition, *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ* reflects various relationships established between poets and patrons of art, and even brings occasional criticisms to certain

"Edebî Hâmîlik İlişkileri: Kaynak Olarak Âşık Çelebi Tezkiresi," in *Âşık Çelebi ve Şairler Tezkiresi Üzerine Yazılar*, 134-136.

¹⁸² İsen-Durmuş "Edebî Hâmîlik İlişkileri," 136.

¹⁸³ İpekten, *Divan Edebiyatında Edebî Muhitler*, 162.

¹⁸⁴ *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. II, 750.

patrons. ‘Âşık Çelebi narrates through his biography of Zâtî that Ayas Paşa (d.1539), who succeeded İbrâhîm Paşa as the grand vizier, was not a friend of artists:

[After] İbrâhîm Paşa passed away Ayas Paşa became the grand vizier. And Mahmûd Çelebi became the honorable treasurer. [Upon that] the stipends and allowences [of Zâtî] were cut.¹⁸⁵

The author brings a similar criticism once more through the words of the poet Emirek (d.), quoting a *kıt’a* he wrote.¹⁸⁶ This situation indicates, first, how generous İbrâhîm Paşa was and how he showed favor to artists, second, demonstrates how ‘Âşık Çelebi determines İbrâhîm Paşa’s position by comparing him with other patrons who came before or after him or lived during the same period. The section where the author mentions Figânî exemplifies a similar case from another perspective. ‘Âşık Çelebi articulates that Figânî’s lack of recognition was due to not being educated (*terbiyet itmek*) by anyone.¹⁸⁷

As stated already, the patronage system in the Ottoman world largely functioned as a flow starting with the sultans down to lower ranks and the provinces, spreading and operating in a manner modeled after the palace. Princely capitals, centers of provincial government, palaces of pashas and beys, and various points in the city, including market places, had places within this patronage system and in turn contributed to the development of Ottoman art and poetry. For instance, while Ahmed Paşa served as the governor (*sancak beyi*) of Bursa, some poems of Necâtî Bey, whom was a novice poet at that time, reached his assembly through a caravan

¹⁸⁵ “İbrâhîm Paşa fevt olup Ayas Paşa vezîr-i a’zam oldu. Ve Mahmûd Çelebi defterdâr-ı ekrem oldu. Câize ve salyâne kat’ oldu.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 286.

¹⁸⁶ “İbrâhîm Paşa ve İskender Çelebi devri gidüp Ayas Paşa ve Mahmûd Çelebi zemânı olup şu’arânun câize vü salyânelerin kesdüklerinde bu kıt’ayı dimişdür ...” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 377.

¹⁸⁷ “Hemân aybı budur ki ne ‘ömrden ruhsât ve ne tâlî’de sa’âdet ve ne ashâb-ı devletden terbiyet buldı.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. I, 359.

from Kastamonu, and were read and appreciated in a *meclis* gathering.¹⁸⁸ Such a case indicates that the poems of poets who were just beginning to compose poetry were also read and evaluated in such assemblies. The idea that well-liked poems could be introduced to higher-ranking patrons, perhaps even to the sultans, might have led to these poetry assemblies becoming prominent patronage environments. However, the transmission of these poems by individuals who were not recognized as poets by profession, but rather belonged to lower echelons of society, outside the palace, illustrates the wide area in which poetry circulated during that period.

All these examples above demonstrate how spatial presence and mobility of poets were determined by multiple factors such as ethnic origin, religion, gender and patronage. Taking these into consideration, the remaining part of the chapter will tackle the spatial experience of poets by mapping the places where they were present and where they assembled.

4.2 Mapping *Meşâ'irü's-su'arâ*: Spatial presence and mobility of Ottoman poets

Following the footsteps of 'Âşık Çelebi and his fellows in their experience of the capital city, this section tries to map out the way that poets in Istanbul became visible in the cityscape. This section also locates the meeting places of poets to further analyze the physical distribution of such spaces. Examining each spatial entry related to Istanbul in *Meşâ'irü's-su'arâ*, Appendix A demonstrates the meeting places of poets grouped under five broad and partly overlapping categories: religious and educational institutions and structures, commercial establishments, pious foundations, public spaces, and residential areas, residential structures, and gardens

¹⁸⁸ Tûba Işınso İsen-Durmuş, "II. Selim Dönemi Sonuna Kadar Osmanlı Edebi Hâmîlik Geleneği" (PhD diss., Bilkent Üniversitesi, 2006), 71.

respectively.¹⁸⁹ Appendix B, on the other hand, tries to locate the aforementioned structures in a tabular form arranged alphabetically.¹⁹⁰ It specifies the structure types, locations or neighborhoods as they appear in the text, and provides information on people associated with these structures.

However, it should be noted that most of these places transcend the categories mentioned above, both due to the identity of their patron or owners, and the fluidity of the poets in terms of spatial mobility and movement. Many commercial establishments discussed in this section, for instance, were part of a waqf. Public bathhouses exemplify such a situation. Accordingly, bathhouses can be categorized under two groups, either a pious foundation, mostly when the patron is related to the higher echelons of the society, or a commercial establishment. Gardens illustrate a similar case as well. As one can see in Appendix B, there are numerous gardens belonging to high-ranking bureaucrats, likely yielding income to their owners, as well as many individual and small-scale gardens owned by poets. Therefore, it is also possible to categorize gardens in two different ways, that is as commercial establishments and social spaces.

Another point to be underlined is the difference between the spatial references and the multiple functions that they undertake. To put it another way, when the spatial references are examined, one can see that there are references that appear as both literary topoi and actual or physical spaces referred to by name. Structures such as bathhouses, taverns and gardens can be included in these two categories. An anecdote related to Zârî (d.1552) quoted below demonstrates an

¹⁸⁹ See Appendix A, 101-101.

¹⁹⁰ See Appendix B, 102-145.

example where the word tavern (*mey-hâne*) used as a topos rather than an actual space.

By saying [that] *the water and air of the tavern are different*,¹⁹¹ [Zârî] would spend months and years in scattered taverns in the heart of the sea and air of Is tanbul.¹⁹²

While spaces might act as literary topoi, thus, as abstract and recurring themes, actual spaces, in most cases, are described as tangible and physical locations within the city. Although they serve different purposes within their respective contexts, they sometimes intersect, especially in the case of *meclis* gatherings held at gardens owned by the higher echelons of the society.

Furthermore, as the text includes spaces exhibit different forms of mobility that can be traced within the narrative, there are also spaces that denote an established institutional framework, and thus, do not refer to any sort of movement. An example of the latter can be seen in madrasa references. The largest madrasas in Istanbul, the Semaniyye and the Süleymaniye, were significant attractions sites, especially for those aspiring to join the ulema. Therefore, it is no surprise that these two are the most frequently referenced madrasas in *Meşâ'irü 'ş-şu'arâ*. These are followed by small-scaled madrasas constructed by various patrons, whether imperial or not. 'Âşik Çelebi locates the madrasas founded by viziers such as Atik 'Ali Paşa, Dâvûd Paşa, İbrâhîm Paşa, Mahmûd Paşa, and Murâd Paşa. The majority of these structures seem to be scattered within the uninterrupted city walls, in various neighborhoods including Çemberlitaş, Cerrahpaşa, , Unkapanı, and Aksaray, with some references to Eyüp. There are also those madrasas whose locations cannot be determined: Mustafâ Paşa, Papasoğlı and Şeref Hâce. Although madrasas constitute

¹⁹¹ The quoted line showed in italics is in Persian. See footnote 189 for the original.

¹⁹² “*Hâne-i hammâr râ âb u hevâ-yi dîgerest* diyü İstanbul’un leb-i deryâda âb u hevâda küşâde meyhânelerinde aylar eyler ve yıllar yaylardı.” *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. I, 575-576.

the majority of spatial references in *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, it is not verly likely easy to map mobility or movement involding them. Determining individuals' status or signifying certain points in their careers as they were students or held professorships in these institutions, these structures are frequently mentioned to mark the career mobility of poets.

Spaces of encounter or socialization, on the other hand, allow one to detect possible patterns of the movement. Yet, this does not necessarily mean that there is no movement element in any institutional structure. Often referred as a structure in relation to education and career development, the Sahn-ı Semân or the Semaniye (Madrasa of the The Eight Courtyards) established by Mehmed II illustrates this. In the following anecdote it is evident that the madrasa room (*hücre*) of 'Âşık Çelebi during his education in the *Sahn-ı Semân* emerges both as a living space and a hub for socialization:

During my stay in the Sahn [madrasa], whenever himself (Hayâlî) would have gone from Istanbul to his garden in Súdlice, he would stop by [my] cell, whether on foot or on horseback, whether drunk or sober, take a breath [there], if I were found studying, he would wait until the end, [to] flirt and play, say "O my God" from the cell window, and even take me along to the garden.¹⁹³

The text includes imperial mosque complexes built by various sultans including Mehmed II, Bayezid II, and Süleyman I. Together with Ayasofya, 'Âşık Çelebi's narrative demonstrates that these mosque complexes were probably seen as iconic landmarks by the Istanbulties. Alongside such complexes, there are also smaller mosques dedicated to religious scholars, as well as mosques funded by the bureaucrats and poets of the era. Most of these small-scale mosques were located in

¹⁹³ "Sahn'da oldugum zemânda hod İstanbul'dan Súdlice'deki bâğçesine gitse gerek piyâde gerek süvâr gerek mest ve gerek hûşyâr hücreye ugrar, bir mikdâr teneffüs ider, eger ders okur bulınsam itmâma dek tevakkuf ider, bârî hücre penceresinden 'ışk u meşk idüp "yâ hû" dir beni bâğçeye bile alup giderdi." *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. III, 1549.

the walled city and its boroughs, yet scattered in terms of their locations. While Fazlî's mosque was located in Tophane,¹⁹⁴ Nişânî's was in Eyüp,¹⁹⁵ and Sâfi's was in Servili neighborhood, near the house of Rüstem Paşa in Ayasofya.¹⁹⁶

Unfortunately, 'Âşık Çelebi does not provide enough information on the exact location of structures such as hadith schools (*darü'l-hadîs*), dervish lodges (*hânkâh* and *zavîye*), or masjids. While describing such buildings, he rather focuses on the individuals who were either trained or being trained, or the residents of these buildings and their connections with such institutions. He lists the lodges (*zavîye*) of Cemâl Halîfe, Ebû Şîbe, Emîr Buhârî, Gazalî and İskender Paşa. Considering that most of these structures have not survived to the present day, it is important that the author to includes at least a general note on the locations of some of these places. While it was not possible to detect the location of the lodge of Cemâl Halîfe, 'Âşık Çelebi mentions that the lodge of Ebû Şîbe¹⁹⁷ was located in Eyüp, the one constructed by Gazalî in Beşiktaş,¹⁹⁸ and İskender Paşa's in Galata.¹⁹⁹ The lodge of Emîr Buhârî seems to be located near the Fatih mosque complex.

In addition to these lodges, the author mentions specific buildings called *hânkâh*, which seem to have served a function similar to *zavîyes*. Among these structures one is named after famous sheikh Vefâ, while the other is dedicated to sheikh Cemâl. Although there is no information to be found on this matter, it would

¹⁹⁴ "... Top-hâne civârında olan evleri kurbında câmi' ü mekteb binâ idüp ..." *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. III, 1191.

¹⁹⁵ "Ebî Eyyûb-i Ensârî civârında bâg u bâgçe ve câmi' ü hammâm âbâdan itmişlerdi." *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. II, 874.

¹⁹⁶ "İstanbul'da Ayasofya'dan beri Servili mahallesinde Rüstem Paşa evi civârında bir câmi'-i pür-nüzhet vardır." *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. III, 1297.

¹⁹⁷ "... Ebû Eyyûb-i Ensârî kapusmun dâhilinde olan zâviye ki Ebû Şîbe dimekle meşhurdur ..." *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. III, 1286.

¹⁹⁸ "...k endüye bir mesken ve yanında bâgçe vü gülşen ve zâviye-i bihişt-encümen ve bir mescid-i müzeyyen ve hammâm-ı İrem-ârâm içinde bir havz dil-i uşşâk gibi sâf u şeffâf u rûşen binâ eyledi." *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. III, 1646.

¹⁹⁹ "... Galata semtinde Atıcılar altında bünyâd itdüğü zâviyesin Safâyî'ye şart idüp ..." *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. III, 1290.

be worth researching whether the person associated with the Sheikh Cemal hânkâhı was related to the Cemâl Halife lodge or if these two structures are the same. Since almost all these places mentioned in the text were located *intra muros* and in the boroughs and were likely well-known locations to Istanbulites at the time the text was written, the author may not have felt the need to provide the reader with information about the locations of these places.

One further point to be highlighted is the function of these structures within the text. The mosque complexes and madrasas, as briefly discussed above, were usually used as referential points in the lives of poets as either career or status markers. The lodges, on the other hand, offer a picture of multitude of functions from friendly conversations to drinking parties. While an anecdote of Hâfız-ı Sirozî (d.?) mentions how the poet used to wander and spend his time either in the Cemâl Halife lodge or in assemblies held at other lodges,²⁰⁰ another anecdote depicts Safâyî (d.?) being responsible for the İskender Paşa lodge commissioned by İskender Paşa (d.1587) and how this lodge in Galata gradually became a hub where the elders, dignitaries and elite among the poets and people of wisdom used to engage in conversation, joy and revelry there.²⁰¹

In terms of religious structures, ‘Âşık Çelebi provides a very orthodox portrait full of minarets, dervish lodges and madrasas without mentioning any churches or synagogues. The dominance of these structures obscures the non-Muslim structures in central areas of the city. The placement of imperial mosques along the

²⁰⁰ “...gâh Cemâl Halife zâviyesinde ve gâh gayrı hânkâhlarda mecma'larda, sohbetgâhlarda âvâralık idüp 'ömr geçirirdi.” *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. II, 607.

²⁰¹ “[Safâyî] merhûm İskender Paşa'ya intisâb eylemiş, ol dahı Galata semtinde Atıcılar altında bünyâd itdüğü zâviyesin Safâyî'ye şart idüp zâviye-nîşîn olup cem'-i abdâl u ebrâr ve ashâb u erbâb eylemiş ... Ol zemânda İstanbul etrâfında mesîreler ü seyrângâhlar ve zâviyeler ü hânkâhlar yogmış. Ekâbir ü a'yân ve zurefâ-yı ehl-i dîvân şu'arâ ve ashâb-ı irfân seyr ü sohbet ve 'ıyş u işrete anda varurlar imiş.” *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. III, 1290.

former Byzantine ceremonial road, Mese, acts as a signifier marking the city's powerholders and their religious identity.²⁰² It is, therefore, no surprise that throughout the text, the word *kilisa*, appears only once, and even then, it is mentioned almost as a topos or a stage for the story to be narrated. 'Âşık Çelebi, describes a scene where Pîrî Paşa-zâde Mehmed Çelebi and Aşçı-zâde Hasan Çelebi disguised themselves to attend in a Christian holiday in Galata and were later recognized by Mahremî as follows:

In those days, Pîrî Paşa-zâde Mehmed Çelebi and Aşçı-zâde Hasan Çelebi disguised themselves during the Easter holiday of the infidels and came to Galata. When they entered the church, Mahremî [recognizing them] wrote a *kit'a* about this encounter ... after this incident, Paşa-zâde sent a word to the qadi, ordering [Mahremî's] dismissal.²⁰³

As Nühket Varlık has underlined, death was visible and audible in many senses in the lives of the Istanbulites. Cemeteries spread throughout the city served as a reminder of death's presence within the urban environment. The ruling class, has a particular role in the making of this type of visibility, as they erected tombs and mausoleums to ensure that their memory endured beyond death.²⁰⁴ It is documented that Mehmed II established the tomb complex of Abu Ayyub as his major imperial projects, alongside the Topkapı Palace, his own funerary mosque complex and commercial and water infrastructures. These projects influenced the urban layout, architecture, and ceremonial practices of the new capital. As Eyüp gained increasing ceremonial importance, especially after the late-fifteenth century, the routes connecting the shrine complex to the Golden Horn shore and the city center also

²⁰² Kuru, "Men of City," 67.

²⁰³ "Ol târihlerde Pîrî Paşa-zâde Mehemmed Çelebi ve Aşçı-zâde Hasan Çelebi kâfirlerin Kızıl Yumurta bayramı günü tebdîl-sûret idüp Galata'ya gelüp bir sûretle kilisaya girdüklerinde Mahremî de düşüp ... kıt'asın didükde Paşa-zâde kâzîya haber gönderüp 'azl itdürdi." *Meşâi'irü 'ş-şu'arâ*, vol. II, 784.

²⁰⁴ Varlık, "Death in Istanbul," 425.

became more significant. The primary thoroughfare along the shoreline between Eyüp and Ayvansaray was embellished with structures associated with the dynasty and the elite.

Although there were tombs and small-scale burial grounds belonging to the ruling elite and their relatives mentioned in the texts, one could easily assume that large cemeteries did not develop during this time. Yet, the need for establishing cemeteries outside the city walls increased in parallel to the growth in population and regulations implemented after the plague. Eventually, communal burial grounds encircled the city walls, extending from the shores of the Marmara Sea to the Golden Horn. One of the earliest communal cemeteries in Istanbul emerged during the reign of Bayezid II, organized primarily on the basis of confessional communities.

Mapping these cemeteries in Istanbul, Varlık asserts:

While Muslim graveyards began to form in the area outside of Edirnekapı, Yenikapı, and Topkapı gates along the city's land walls, those reserved for the Orthodox Christians were located in the area that extended from Topkapı to Silivrikapı gates; Jewish graveyards were located in the area between Eğrikapı gate and the Golden Horn.²⁰⁵

‘Âşık Çelebi's anecdotes on graves and cemeteries are in line with historical studies as well. Among the thirteen graves that Âşık Çelebi mentions, four of them are in Eyüp or on the gateway to Eyüp, three of them are located outside of Edirnekapı (*Edirnekapısı'ndan taşra*) and beyond the walled city while the locations of the rest remain unknown.

Especially after the mid-sixteenth century, the environs of large sultanic mosque complexes, such as Süleymaniye and Fatih, were hosting dervish lodges, shops of various sorts, bathhouses, and coffeehouses. Within certain mosque

²⁰⁵ Varlık, “Death in Istanbul,” 435.

complexes, there were rows of shops integrated into the architecture. In fact, the outer areas surrounding the complexes of the Süleymaniye and Bayezid II were lined with shops. Large market areas (*bâzâr*), shops (*dükkân*) located within or near these market areas, and bathhouses (*hammâm*) were fundamental as they constituted the largest areas where the mobility of poets within the city can be seen. Commercial districts such as Taht al-kal'a and Unkapanı, together with the *bedestân* area were mostly located in the northern part of the walled city, along the middle and eastern shores of the Golden Horn. These sites were populated by various khans and shops and sheltered many poets, whether novices or not, as gathering spots.

Although *Meşâi'irü's-şu'arâ* does not mention any khans or related structures, it focuses on commercial districts and specific shops owned by poets such as Zâtî, Rahîkî, Subûtî, Zeynî and Enverî and provides interesting anecdotes revealing the different functions of such structures. Sübûtî's herbal shop²⁰⁶ and Zeynî's bookshop were located in the Karaman bazaar, in the same district as Zâtî's latter shop.²⁰⁷ Kandî's candy shop was next to Zâtî's first fortune-telling shop in the courtyard of the complex of Bayezid II.²⁰⁸ Rahîkî's shop where he used to sell pleasant scents was located in Mahmud Paşa, uphill from Taht al-kal'a area,²⁰⁹ while Enverî's ink shop was located in the flea market (Bitpazarı), another densely populated area.²¹⁰

Meşâi'irü's-şu'arâ conveys and illustrates these areas as considerably populated, object-rich, and colorful. One reflection of this can be seen in the article

²⁰⁶ "Karaman bâzârında eşribe vü mürebbayât ve ma'âcîn ü müferrihât iderdi." *Meşâi'irü's-şu'arâ*, vol. III, 1488.

²⁰⁷ "Karaman bâzârında sahhâf dükkânı açup sâhib-i ser ü sâ mân oldu." *Meşâi'irü's-şu'arâ*, vol. I, 588.

²⁰⁸ "Sultân Bâyezîd avlısında kannâd dükkânı var idi." *Meşâi'irü's-şu'arâ*, vol. III, 1329.

²⁰⁹ "Mahmûd Paşa çarşusunda 'attâr dükkânı açup ..." *Meşâi'irü's-şu'arâ*, vol. III, 1351.

²¹⁰ "Bitbâzârı'nda Uzunçarşu agzında olan dükkânlarda süzenger idi ve mürekkebe satar idi. Miskîn egerçi zemânında şu'arânun be-nâmı idi." *Meşâi'irü's-şu'arâ*, vol. I, 387.

on Sübûtî. ‘Âşık Çelebi describes Sübûtî’s shop in Karaman bazaar through quite rich analogies:

He used to sell drinks, sweets, and various provisions in Karaman bazaar. In fact, those who wanted wine as sweet as the lover’s tongue and as red as blood, fragrant mixtures, pastes like amber ... refreshing substances, beneficial relexants, strong [tasted] candies would swarm in front of the shop like flies. [Sübûtî’s] shop was a home for poets and a nest for lovers who adorned the world.²¹¹

In addition to being a commercial area full of goods, stocks and people, these places emerge as important spaces for socialization and encounters in the narrative. Throughout the narrative, these shops are mostly depicted as meeting spots for friends and lovers, places where familiar faces met, or places one frequented simply to gaze at the beautiful and to watch the bustle of the city. The following anecdote depicting a *hurde-fürûş* (a second-hand store) in Taht al-kal’a exemplifies such a case.

In every two or three days, Nihâlî would arrive on horseback, sit in his shop gazing at the users of intoxicant and bewildered, and the ecstatic and elated passerbys from Galata and ardent lovers who have charming beauties as companions, spending his day from afternoon to evening.²¹²

Yet, there are also anecdotes demonstrating these shops as places where interesting encounters occurred and various hostilities are displayed. In the case of Kandî’s shop, ‘Âşık Çelebi narrates:

After Hayâlî pelted Kandî’s candy-pouring shop with stones and broke the wine-colored bottles ... we gathered [there] together and the crystal vessel of his pure heart became colorful. Once again we became divers in his

²¹¹ “Karaman bâzârı’nda eşribe vü mürebbayât ve ma’âcîn-ü müferrihâr iderdi. Fi’l-hakîka leb-i dil-ber gibi şîrîn ve mey-i ahmer gibi rengin şarâblar, miskî terkîbler, ‘anberî ma’cûnlar ... mâddetü’l-ferâhlar, râhatü’l-ervâhlar, kuvvetü’l-kulûblar isteyen meges gibi etrâf-ı dükkânın çizginürdi. Dükkânı şu ‘arâya mesken ve mehâbib-i cihân-ârâya nişîmen idi.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 625.

²¹² “İki üç günde bir atla varur anun dükkânında geçer oturur gelüp geçen bengi vü hayrânı ve Galata’dan geçen mest ü sekrâmı ve yanlarında dil-berler salındıran ‘âşık-pîşe yârânı seyr idüp ikindiden ahşama değîn günin bu güne geçürürdi.” *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 911.

praise, we plunged into the sea of poetry, recited odes and received gifts in return.²¹³

While the first anecdote depicts Nihâlî (d.1542) as someone who frequented the aforementioned shop in the corner of Taht al-kal'a, socializing with friends as part of his daily routine, the latter portrays lively scenes shifting from an act of hostility between Hayâlî (d.1557) and Kandî into a friendly and poetic meeting where 'Âşık Çelebi, Zâtî and other poets gathered and supported Kandî. The way 'Âşık Çelebi depicts such an environment, on the other hand, is noteworthy by itself. Phrases containing complementary metaphors such as "medhinde gavvâs olduk" and "deryâ-yı şî're dalduk" indicate the deep involvement of 'Âşık Çelebi and his friends in the world of literature. The author also vividly describes the depth of their experiences or emotions through the phrase "zücâc-ı sâf-ı hâtırî reng-pezîr oldu," suggesting that their memories became enriched or vibrant in some way during this meeting held at Kandî's shop.

The crowded areas of the city juxtaposing with the main commercial areas were also quite suitable for another structure, that is public bathhouses. Especially during the times when access to clean water and sanitation facilities were limited, bathhouses provided an essential venue for personal hygiene. As they became focal points in which neighborhoods and commercial districts developed, bathhouses helped to define the urban layout and structure of the city. Due to their spatial positionings, bathhouses also served as important social and cultural spots where people from different backgrounds gathered.

²¹³ "Hayâlî, Kandî'nün şekerîz dükkânın taşa tutup şarâbâtı şişelerin ... münkesir itdükde tekrâr cem' olup vardugumuzda zücâc-ı sâf-ı hâtırî reng-pezîr oldu. Ammâ yine medhinde gavvâs olduk, deryâ-yı şî're dalduk, kasîdeler diyüp câ'izeler aldük." *Meşâi'irü's-su'arâ*, vol. III, 1584.

As already been discussed in the previous chapter, the bathhouse belonging to Gazâlî in Beşiktaş seems to have been the most popular bathhouse of the era. When describing the crowd outside, ‘Âşık Çelebi narrates that “the refined and the common people who could not find a place inside climbed onto the roof [to] look inside through the window.”²¹⁴ Apart from the one in Beşiktaş, ‘Âşık Çelebi mentions four bathhouses. Although the location of the bathhouse named Kâşikârî²¹⁵ could not be determined, it is understood from the text that the two of the remaining bathhouses, Nişâncı²¹⁶ and Nişânî,²¹⁷ are located in Eyüp while the other was located in Hasköy, outside the city walls.

‘Âşık Çelebi’s anecdote on the latter one commissioned by the son of Pîrî Paşa reveals that there were, indeed, competition and sometimes even rivalry between the owners of such structures as commercial establishment.

To bring popularity to his bathhouse in Kiremidlik, Hasköy, Pîrî Paşa builds a circular pool. In a few days, the bathhouse becomes a gathering place for the lovers and the refined as well, and Birâder's bathhouse declines.²¹⁸

After the bathhouse in Hasköy became increasingly popular and Gazâlî's fell out of favor, Gazâlî wrote a couplet saying that Pîrî Paşa's son imitated his bathhouse with a pool in its middle. ‘Âşık Çelebi recounts that Pîrî Paşa, likely offended and angered by this poem, sought revenge as follows:

Upon that he felt offended and incited many of the trustees of the endowed bathhouses and the notable bathhouse keepers [to] come and complain [about Gazâlî] to İbrâhîm Paşa. The late Pasha ordered that one hundred

²¹⁴ “Zurefâ-yı havâs u 'avâm içerde yir bulımayup tama çıkup camdan baktılar.” *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu 'arâ*, vol. III, 1646.

²¹⁵ *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu 'arâ*, vol. II, 902.

²¹⁶ *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu 'arâ*, vol. I, 588

²¹⁷ *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu 'arâ*, vol. II, 874.

²¹⁸ “Pîrî Paşa'nun Hasköy'de Kiremidlik'de olan hammâmında revâca bâ'is olsun diyü bir havz-ı müdevver peydâ ider. Birkaç gün ol hammâm dahı mecma'-ı mehâbîb ü zurefâ olur, Birâder'ün hammâmı kesâd bulur.” *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu 'arâ*, vol. III, 1647.

soldiers from the Acemioğlanları ... to be sent and to demolish the pool in the bathhouse.²¹⁹

Another space where clients seeking leisurely diversion and conviviality were welcomed was the tavern. Although ‘Âşık Çelebi portrays vivid and realistic descriptions of the drinking parties held at taverns, the text only mentions two of them by their or rather their owners’ names, Yani and Efe. In most cases, the author does not give any clue on when and where other taverns were operated. Here, one could argue that ‘Âşık Çelebi uses taverns mostly as a topos without specifying any information on the actual space. The only exception here is the Efe meyhânesi, probably established in the Taht al-kal’a region.²²⁰ What ‘Âşık Çelebi narrates suggests that the poets who frequented the Efe meyhânesi witnessed interesting incidents there. Anecdotes describing literary gatherings and drinking parties held at the tavern are worth mentioning since they reflect taverns as places where poets would recite poetry and partake in old and new new ways of entertainment.

In one anecdote, for instance, ‘Âşık Çelebi comments on how Figânî (d.1531-32), Nûhî (d.1534), and Na‘tî (d.1455-56), who happened to be among the famous lovers of the city, were among the regulars of the Efe meyhânesi, and how they spent most of their time in taverns, drinking whatever they found, and sought lovers.²²¹

[Na‘tî] along with Figânî and Nûhî, were the downtrodden of the Efe tavern, like the dregs of the wine, and the glass drifters like bubbles, and the city's

²¹⁹ “Ol dahı incinüp evkâf hammâmlarınun mütevellilerinden ve hammâmcılarınun bellilerinden çok kimesneyi tahrîk idüp varup İbrâhîm Paşa'ya şikâyet eylerler. Paşa-yı merhûm emr eyledi ki yüz nefer 'Acemîoğlanları ... gönderüp varup hammâm içinde olan havzı yıkup hâke ber-â-ber eylerler.” *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-su 'arâ*, vol. III, 1647.

²²⁰ “Tahte'l-kal'a mecma'umuz ve Efe mey-hânesi tahsil-i âb-rû ve tertîb-i dimâg u tenkiye-i mizâc için seylân-ı seyl-âb-ı huzûr u hubûr menba'umuz idi.” *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-su 'arâ*, vol. II, 670.

²²¹ “Figânî ve Nûhî ile Efe mey-hânesinün dürd-i den gibi üftâdeleri ve habâb gibi kadeh âvâreleri ve şehrün meşhûr şâhid-bâz u gulâm-pâreleri idi. Gâh gülşen ü kâşânelerde gül gibi gülüp açılurlar gâh kûşe-i mey-hânelerde cur'aveş dökilüp saçılurlardı. Buldukların hemân kadehe koyarlar ve gice ile buldukları dil-beri soyarlar ve gâhî ehl-i 'ilmler ile hem-dest olup ilâhî sohbetler idüp...” *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-su 'arâ*, vol. II, 379.

famous boy-admirers. Sometimes they would laugh and blossom like roses in the gardens and mansions, and sometimes they would scatter and spill [like wine tavern corners. They would immediately pour whatever they found into the glass, and at night they would undress the beloved they found, and sometimes they would join to the scholars, engaging in divine conversation.

Another anecdote regarding the poet Âhî' (d.1588) depicts him as a regular of the Efe meyhânesi as well, and mentions how the tavern keepers would be surprised if he would not show up to their tavern one day.²²² All these anecdotes suggest that taverns, especially the Efe meyhânesi, were quite popular meeting points for the poets of the age. More importantly, however, it shows that despite the hundreds of decrees and edicts issued and religious debates aimed at restricting illicit behaviours, taverns continued to operate as crowded and vivacious settings.

Although *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu 'arâ* does not delve much into the specific locations of the taverns, there are contemporary sources providing details on taverns found not only in Galata with a predominant Christian population, but also *intra muros* and along the Marmara coast, and on both the western and eastern shores of the Bosphorus, ranging from Ortaköy and Kuruçeşme to Yeniköy, Kuzguncuk, Çengelköy and Üsküdar. Evliya Çelebi, for instance, provides a detailed list where the taverns of the age operated:

In the environs of Istanbul, there are many taverns, but the crowded ones are at Samatya Gate, Kumkapı, New Fish Market, Unkapanı, Cibali Gate, Ayakpınar, Fener Gate, Balat Gate, across them in Hasköy and Galata, which means tavern ... surely in every district there is an assigned tavern, but in Ortaköy, Kuruçeşme, Arnavutköy, Yeniköy, Tarabya, Büyükdere, and on the Anatolian side in Kuzguncuk, Çengelköy, Üsküdar, and Kadıköy, in all these cities mentioned, there are layer upon layer of taverns, each one crowded with people.²²³

²²² Merhûm bezm-i sohbetde ve dem-i 'işretde nûş-ı şarâbda ve meclis-i ahbâbda sâkit ü sâmit ve semti hamûşîye müsâmit imiş ... Mey-hâneçiler merhûmı dilsüz sanup bir mâni' düşüp bir gün meyhâneye varmasa bugün dilsüz dânişmend gelmedi ya dirler imiş." *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu 'arâ*, vol. I, 394.

²²³ "İslâmbol'un cânib-i erba'asında meyhâneler çokdur, ammâ vefret üzere olanlar Samadyakapusu'nda ve Kumkapu'da ve Yeni Balıkbaşârı'nda ve Unkapanı'nda ve Cibâlikapusu'nda ve Ayakpusu'nda ve Fenerkapusu'nda ve Balatkapusu'nda ve karşıda Hâsköy'de ve Galata demek meyhâne demektir ... her

Continuing with the spaces of encounter and socialization, *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ* gives information on various sites used by the public regardless of their social status, including public squares, fountains and meadows. The ancient Hippodrome and Okmeydanı were among famous sites, especially during ceremonial activities. In addition to these, the strategic placement of sultanic mosque complexes on the hills of Istanbul, paved the way for the development, or transformation of the ceremonial route of the Ottoman rulers, known as the Divan Yolu. These imperial mosques served as consecutive stops in elaborate royal processions that occurred on various occasions, including royal funerals, enthronement ceremonies, or departures from the capital for military campaigns.²²⁴ Thus, alongside the southern parts of the walled city, the Divan Yolu constituted one of the densely constructed parts of the city. Being the most heterogenous environments in public areana, these spaces allowed people from different social backgrounds to interact in a more fluid manner. Kuru, in his study of masculine performances of Istanbulites has asserted that the area covering the Divan Yolu, unlike the more residential southern or inner districts, was a central stage for display of masculine performances by all kinds of men regardless of their religion, ethnicity, or professions.²²⁵

Green spaces such as gardens, vineyards, promenades, meadows, and elite courtyards appear to be highly valued places for leisure and recreation, especially in 'Âşık Çelebi's narrative as well. The author eulogizes meadows and other outing spaces, without locating them specifically within the city. Although he mentions

rabtada meyhânes mukarrerdir, ammâ Ortaköy ve Kuruçeşme ve Arnavudköyü ve Yeniköy ve Tarabya ve Büyükdere ve Anadolu tarafından Kuzguncuk'da ve Çengelköyü'nde ve Üsküdar'da ve Kadıköy'de cümle bu zikr olunan şehirlerde tabaka tabaka beşer altışar kat meyhânelerdir." Evliyâ Çelebi, *Evlüyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 1, eds. Robert Dankoff, Seyit Ali Kahraman and Yücel Dağlı (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2013), 349-350.

²²⁴ Necipoğlu, "Dynastic Imprints on the Cityscape: The Collective Message of Funerary Imperial Mosque Complexes in Istanbul," *Colloque Internationale: Cimetières et traditions funéraires dans le monde islamique*, ed. Jean-Louis Bacqué-Grammont (Paris: C.N.R.S, 1996), 23-30.

²²⁵ Kuru, "Istanbul: A City of Men," 78-79.

several neighborhoods located around Beykoz and Davut Paşa, the ones in Eyüp and Kağıthane were probably more frequently visited destinations for the visitors as they were described as full of gardens and rose-beds. Another *tezkire* compiler, Latifi, for instance, portrays Eyüp as a charming promenade which he likened to heaven, and asserts that this pleasant and peaceful town was definitely frequented by a large number of folk.²²⁶ It is known from the contemporary sources that sultans and their courtiers used gardens as places for enjoyment and recreation since the late fifteenth century. However, this tradition appeared to shift significantly at the turn of the eighteenth century. As Shirine Hamadeh has demonstrated, in this period gardens became spaces for collective leisure that crossed social and religious boundaries, symbolizing a new form of urban social interaction.²²⁷

Another group of spatial references to be found in ‘Âşık Çelebi’s narrative is the residential structures. These usually refer to the lived spaces, and mostly to the residences of poets. In order to describe such structures ‘Âşık Çelebi uses terms including *ev* (house), *hâne* (household), *mesken* (dwelling), and *yurd* (home), and provides information on the residences of thirteen poets. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that all of the residences mentioned in the text are located within the old settlements, such as Eyüp, Vefa, Çemberlitaş, Kabataş and Üsküdar. The long and detailed descriptions of houses belonging to Kara Bâlî-zâde, ‘İşk-ı Sâlis (d.?) and Nişâncı Celâl-zâde are noteworthy. Each of these houses, most located on the seaside and accompanied by attractive gardens demonstrate that these were not only used as residential sites but also for pleasure. One way to understand this is to look at the

²²⁶ “... Kasaba-i Ebi-Eyyub ber şeref ol Hazretin şöhet-i şerefi birle gâyetde meşhur ve müşerref olup Cenâb-ı Cennet’in bir kûşesi olmuştur. Bir mertebede makâm-ı dilkeş ve teferrüçgâh-ı ferahbahş olmuştur ...” Latifi, *Risâle-i Evsâf-ı İstanbul*, 65.

²²⁷ Hamadeh, *The City’s Pleasures: Istanbul in the Eighteenth Century* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008), 110-125.

words and phrases ‘Âşık Çelebi uses when describing these places. Depicting the residences of ‘İşk-ı Sâlis and Kara Bâlî-zâde with the same expression, “*deryâya müşrif*” (overlooking the sea),²²⁸ the author shows how the locations of these structures and the literary gatherings held there were closely related, and fundamentally shaped by the theme of pleasure.

Another structure type the author names is *oda* (single room). Without providing any detail, ‘Âşık Çelebi mentions one of the single rooms commissioned by Hayâlî Bey in Balat, a historic neighborhood situated along the Golden Horn and was known for its diverse ethnic and religious population. Although ‘Âşık Çelebi doesn’t explicitly refer to them, these rooms and inns likely served as significant hubs within networks that facilitated newcomers’ integration into society and employment opportunities. Betül Başaran notes that there were, in fact, more than 250 registered rooms used by laborers, migrants, and janissaries on the docks of Kasım Paşa and Galata in 1763.²²⁹ Under the strict control and regulations of the state to maintain the public order and security, these areas functioned both as mechanisms for separating and bringing together different groups of people.

There are also neighborhood names that are generally used to indicate the residences of poets or certain areas where they stayed temporarily. While some neighborhoods probably derived their names from patrons of certain or large structures within those neighborhoods, such as Aşık Paşa, Dâvûd Paşa, and Haseki Sultan, others are named after structures that indicate their location within the city, such as Ahırkapısı, Aksaraykapısı, and Güngörmez.

²²⁸ See *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. II, 1090 and *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ*, vol. III, 1206-1208.

²²⁹ Betül Başaran, “Crime, Violence, and Urban Policing,” in *A Companion to Early Modern Istanbul*, 452.

This chapter attempted to examine the relationship between various sites discussed in the previous chapter and the spatial experiences of poets. By mapping the movement or mobility of poets mentioned in *Meşâi'irü'ş-şu'arâ*, and places that they assembled in, it analyzed the physical distribution of such venues in the city and made further comments on the factors determined the spatial presence and mobility of poets at the first place. It also highlighted the experiences that differentiate through the politics of visibility by scrutinizing the ways poets, in particular men, act in.



CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

*Sene ihdâ ve erba 'în ve tis 'ami 'ede
ki hakir İstanbul'a geldüm.*²³⁰

This thesis was born out of a fascination with 'Âşık Çelebi's extensive account on the biographies of 427 poets, their poetic practices, and the literary environment they lived in, and the curiosity that followed the question of whether there were interesting stories extending the spatial boundaries of the *tezkire* genre. I use the word spatial deliberately here in reference to the entirety of this study. *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu 'arâ*, which is highly delightful and challenging to read, vividly describes the world, culture and literary environment of its authors' age. As many who have previously studied 'Âşık Çelebi and *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu 'arâ* can attest, understanding his narrative fully is challenging due to the language, literary style and witty wordplays employed by the author. To truly grasp the world 'Âşık Çelebi presents to us, more studies with close reading are required.

Yet, the most intriguing aspect of *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu 'arâ* for me, from the very beginning of my endless readings on the text, has been the way 'Âşık Çelebi portrays Istanbul as an experienced space. 'Âşık Çelebi's account manifests how poetry was an integral part of social and literary gatherings of the sixteenth-century Istanbul. Describing such gatherings held at various spots where the notables and poets of the age could stroll, and drink together, he takes its reader, whether contemporary or modern, on a pleasant journey through the city, from *hânkâhs* to *mey-hânes*, from

²³⁰ "In the year of 1535, I came to Istanbul." *Meşâi 'irü 'ş-şu 'arâ*, vol. I, 202.

various sorts of *dükkâns* to *hammâms*, and from public *bağçes* and *mesires* to private gardens and *avlus* of the elites. Within walking distance of another, these spaces do not only offer multiple perceptions of Istanbul's literary production sites and the spatial experiences of the poets, but also demonstrate the diversity of such venues of an ever-expanding city.

By examining a number of key sites, districts, and neighborhoods to map the presence and movements of the poets through the anecdotes taken from *Meşâ'irü 'ş-şu'arâ*, this thesis explores the interaction between spatiality and poets' daily and social practices. Thus, approaching the narrative from a spatial perspective by placing Istanbul at its center, it offers an alternative approach to read and contextualize *tezkires*. By using space as the organizing principle and building on the numerous studies mentioned in the introduction and elsewhere, this thesis also questions the binary opposition of public and private and acknowledges a intermediary state shaped by the ways in which poets act in and claim the city.

Furthermore, the thesis tackles spaces that exhibit different forms of mobility that can be traced within the narrative. Although madrasas constitute the majority of spatial references in *Meşâ'irü 'ş-şu'arâ*, the examination of such references proves that 'Âşık Çelebi uses such structures to mark the status of poets or certain points in the career since they were either students or held professorships in these institutions. Thus, it asserts that while some of the structures such as madrasas were used to mark the career mobility of poets, others including the marketplace, bathhouses, or residences of poets were often marked the spaces of encounter and socialization.

The use of space as represented in *Meşâ'irü 'ş-şu'arâ* both confirms and occasionally complicates the historical evidence. Stories and anecdotes discussed in

various chapters of this thesis or those can be seen in the Appendix B portray how boundaries are negotiated and challenged by different actors. Women like Mihrî and Zeyneb Hatun make *meclis* gatherings and the very field of poetry their own space through their writing practices, while men, especially from the higher echelons of the society, attempt to exercise control by determining or even limiting access to certain places such as taverns or coffeehouses. Accordingly, this study asserts that a detailed examination of these moments of transgressions reveals the social norms and gendered codes embedded in the use and conceptualization of public spaces.

Yet, it also underlines that most of the spaces explored in the third and fourth chapters are, in fact, primarily male spaces defined by men's performances and accessibility. Places accessible to women are easily categorized as semi-public in secondary literature, whereas the places such as mosques, masjids, taverns or coffeehouses frequented only by men are still imagined as the public space. Likewise, the marketplace, where men are the main actors, is considered a public space, even though there are class and gendered boundaries that undermine its public character. Nevertheless, most of these spaces narrated in *Meşâi'irü's-su'arâ* were widely accessible to the Sunni Muslim male, the default actor of Ottoman historiography.

The area defined by the Golden Horn shores to the north and the Divan Yolu to the south developed as the main stage for the literary gatherings held at various spots. Commercial districts such as Taht-al kal'a, Unkapanı, and Bedestân, were mostly located in the northern part of the walled city, along the middle and eastern shores of the Golden Horn. These sites were populated by various khans and shops where the poets of the age would gather. The Divan Yolu, on the other hand, constituted one of the densely constructed parts of the city. Especially after the mid-

sixteenth century, the large sultanic mosque complexes, such as Süleymaniye and Fatih, were hosting, dervish lodges, shops of various sorts, bathhouses, and coffeehouses, even though ‘Âşık Çelebi did not mention the latter in his narrative evidently.

References to the taverns in ‘Âşık Çelebi’s account reveals that most of them were located in the Galata and Tophane districts. Considering its predominantly Christian character one could imagine why various Ottoman intellectuals considered Galata equivalent to the tavern as a topos. Even though *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ* does not offer much on their locations, other contemporary sources provide information on numerous taverns that were attested whether in the districts of Fatih including Samatya, Kumkapı, Cibali, or along the Marmara coast and *extra muros* on both the western and eastern coasts of Bosphorus sketching from Ortaköy, Kuruçeşme, Yeniköy, Kuzguncuk, Çengelköy, and Üsküdar.

Representing almost a collective sense of leisure, gardens used for literary gatherings reveal a much more scattered distribution within the city. Depending on both the status of these spaces and their attendees (public and private, non-elite and elite), there were several occasions to meet occasionally. The public and private gardens of Bosphorus and the Golden Horn, especially those of Beşiktaş, Emirgan, Göksu, and Kağıthane were quite popular sites. Yet, there were also a couple of meadows along the Asian shore of the Bosphorus.

This thesis aims to further enrich early modern Ottoman prose studies by focusing on spatial presence and performances of men in a heteronormative setting. To better grasp the experience(s) of men who found themselves a place in *Meşâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ* and other fictional sources, additional research is necessary in their diverse linguistic, ethnic and religious affiliations as well as masculine

performances developed around such markers. This study also asserts that a broader inquiry into the urban imaginary of biographical dictionaries of poets would reveal how such texts juxtapose with the developing urban life of Istanbul. Therefore, it intends to contribute to a better understanding of spatial sensitivity of the early modern authors, especially through fictional texts as it may open new trajectories on such texts' availability across-genres.



APPENDIX A

TYPES OF

SITES AND STRUCTURES IN *MEŞÂİ'RÜ'Ş-ŞU'ARÂ*

A. Religious and Educational Structures	
1	Câmî'i (mosque)
2	Dârü'l-hadîs (hadith school)
3	Hânkâh/Zâvîye (dervish lodge)
4	Haydar-hâne (lodge)
5	Hücre/Uzlet-hâne (dervish cell)
6	Medrese (madrasa)
7	Mekteb (primary school)
8	Mescid (maşjid)
9	Kilisa (church)
10	Türbe/Kabir/Mezar(tomb/grave)

B. Commercial Establishments	
1	Bâzâr (bazaar)
2	Hammâm (public bathhouse)
3	Dükkân (shop)
4	Tavern (mey-hâne)

C. Pious Foundations	
1	İmâret
2	Vakıf (waqf)

D. Public Spaces	
1	Avlı (courtyard)
2	Çeşme (fountain)
3	Çimenlik (meadow)
4	İskele (pier)
5	Meydân (square)

E. Residential Areas, Residential Structures and Enclosed Gardens	
1	Bâğ (vineyard)
2	Bâğçe (garden)
3	Ev/Hâne/Mesken (house)
4	Oda (temporary room)
5	Yurd (house)
6	Districts
7	Semt (quarter/district)
8	Mahalle (neighborhood)
9	Kule (tower)
10	Serây (palace)

APPENDIX B

LIST OF STRUCTURES IN *MEŞÂİ'RÜ'Ş-ŞU'ARÂ*

A. RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL STRUCTURES						
	NAME	TYPE	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	PEOPLE ASSOCIATED	PAGE NUMBER
1	Ayasofya	mosque	Hagia Sophia mosque		Basîrî (Ayasofya zevâ'idinden ve 'ulufesi ve pâdşâhlardan sâlyâne-i ma'rûfesi var idi) Revânî (İstanbul'da Ayasofya evkâfına tevliyet itmüştür)	421; 1389
2	Câmi'-i Süleymânî	mosque	Süleymaniye mosque complex		Nakşî (Hâliyâ Câmi'-i Cedîd-i Süleymânî'de muvakkittür)	892
3	Fazlî Câmi'i ve mektebi	mosque; mekteb	Top-hâne	Top-hâne civârında olan evleri kurbında	Fazlî (İstanbul'dan 'uzlet ve ehl-i dünyâdan hicret idüp Top-hâne civârında olan evleri kurbında câmi' ü mekteb binâ idüp ehl-i dünyâdan bir ferde tereddüdi ve efkâr-ı Hakdan gayrı hâtırına nesnenün âmed şudı yokdur)	1191
4	Nişânî Câmi'i	mosque	Eyüb	Ebî Eyyûb-i Ensârî civârında	Nişânî Beg (Ebî Eyyûb-i Ensârî civârında bâg u bâgçe ve câmi' ü hammâm âbâdan itmişlerdi. Kendü anda sakin olup sohbetin hasr-ı ehl-i 'ilm ü irfân itmişlerdi)	874
5	Sâfi' Câmi'i	mosque	Servili Mahallesi; walled city	Ayasofya'dan beri Servili mahallesinde Rüstem Paşa evi civârında	Sâfi (İstanbul'da Ayasofya'dan beri Servili mahallesinde Rüstem Paşa evi civârında bir câmi'-i pür-nüzhet vardır)	1267
6	Sultân Bâyezîd Câmi'i	mosque	Beyazıt		Keşfi (Sultân Bâyezîd-i merhûm İstanbul'da câmi'-i şerîf binâ itdükde evvel ol buhûrcı olmuştur) Seydî (Sahn müderrisi iken Sultân Bâyezîd-i merhûm İstanbul'da binâ itdüğü câmi'-i şerîfe vakf itdüğü kurâyı ana tahrîr itdürüp ol hizmet)	718; 1013

					mukâbelesinde İstanbul kâzîsı itmişdür)	
7	Sultân Mehemmed Câmi'î	mosque	Fatih mosque complex		<p>Yetim (gâh harâbatî gâh melâmeti ziyinde bî-ser ü pâ mest ü şeydâ Sultân Mehemmed câmi'î'nün nerdbânlarına yasdanmışdur)</p> <p>Sabrî (mahrûse-i İstanbul'da Sultân Mehemmed câmi'î'nde hâfız-ı kütüb olan sâhib-i şâş-ı kebîr ve râkib-i boz bâr-gîr Monlâ 'Arab'un oğludur)</p> <p>Türâbî (Cümleden biri bu latîfedür eger hakîka ve eger sakîfedür, ramazân gicelerinden bir gice ba'de't-terâvîh Sultân Mehemmed câmi'î'nde cemâ'at-i müslimîne va'z u nasîhat ider, harâret-i kalbine ihrâk-ı kelimât munzamm olup mizâcın teshîn idüp hayli izhâr-ı germiyyet ider, iştihâsı açılır. Ba'de'l-ferâg câ'miden çıkup evine gider olur. Câmi'î hareminde su yolu meremmâtından fazla kalmış bir tekne içinde bir mikdâr taze lökün ile yanında bir çanak bezîr yağı bulur, ramazân takrîbi ile herise [keşkek] olmak ihtimâlin virür. <i>En-nefsu harîsatun 'ale'l-herîseti</i> (nefis herise yemegine düşkündür) diyü kavî iştihâyla koyılır, muttasıl bezîr yağı koyup ıslâh ider. Her bâr ki lökün koyılır, iştihâsına temâm sükûn ve şereh-i nefisine rükûn gelmeyince lökün idügin bilmez, eklden ferâgat kılmaz. Bu makûle nevâdiri meşhûr, bundan dahı 'acîb letâ'if mecmû'alarında mestûrdur)</p>	657; 1282; 1478
8	Şeyh Vefâ Câmi'î	mosque	Vefa		<p>Monlâ Lütfi (Derse vardukda atın kendü eliyle medrese kapusu halkasına bağlar ve önüne otlucağ döker ba'de'd-</p>	730; 1443

					ders Şeyh Vefâ câmi'ine varur Buhârî nakl ider, anlar semâ' ider ol aglar imiş) Şem'î (Şeyh Vefâ mürebbîlerinden, câmi' ü hânkâhı kûşesinün ehl-i inzivâlarından imiş ... Egerçi câmi'-i Vefâ'da evrâda hâzır ve sûfiîer halka olup dilberler görüp vefâ semâ'n itdükçe bu dahı ol devrlerde dâ'ir olur imiş. Ammâ bahar vakti gül devri olup yârân mey-hâneye açılısalar bu dahı bu tarikle sûfileri tolandurup kadeh devrinde gâh başın ortaya atup gâh pervâne gibi dâ'ireden nâzır olur imiş)	
9	Zeyrek Câmi'i	mosque	Zeyrek	Edirnekapusu'nda n taşra	Şeyh İlâhî (Zeyrek câmi'i'nde ikâmet idüp kesretde vahdet kâ'idestin ri'âyet eyler) Husrev (Zeyrek câmi'inde müderris olup)	285; 1526
10	Papasoglu Dârü'l-hadîsi	hadith school	unknown		Işkî-i Sâhî (İstanbul'da Papasoglu Dârü'l-hadîsine müderris olup 'abâ giydi vü şemle sarındı)	1086
11	Cemâl Halîfe Zâviyesi	lodge	walled city		Hâfız-ı Sirozî (Tarîk'i 'ilmde iken ferâgat idüp gâh Cemâl Halîfe zâviyesinde ve gâh gayrı hânkâhlarda mecma'larda, sohbetgâhlarda âvâralık idüp 'ömr geçürirdi)	607
12	Ebû Şîbe Zâviyesi	lodge	Eyüp	Ebû Eyyûb-i Ensârî kapusunun dâhilinde	Sadrî (Ba'de'l-feth Sultân Mehmed fethe hazır olanları tarîkiyle ri'âyet itdükde Ebû Eyyûb-i Ensârî kapusunun dâhilinde olan zâviye ki Ebû Şîbe dimekle meşhûrdur ammâ Tefsîr-i Kebîr tahkîki üzre asl Ebû Eyyûb-ı Ensârî ol olmak üzre mezkûrdur, Sultân Mehmed bana ol kûseyi ma'mûr idivir ki bunda kûşegüzîn ve zâviye-nîşîn olayum didi. Sultân Mehmed murâd-bahş olup makâm-ı ma'hûdı mescid ü zâviye idüp ve merkâd-ı sâhib-i	1286-1287

					kabri ta'mîr ü tezyîn ile mânend-i cennet-i 'âliye ider, zâviyedârlığı evlâdına ta'yîn ider)	
13	Emîr Buhârî Zâviyesi	lodge	walled city		Gubârî (Nakş-bendiyye nakşı geldi. Dest-i sülûkına İstanbul'da Emir Buhârî zâviyesi şeyhinden cura' sunuldu)	1613
14	İskender Paşa Zâviyesi	lodge	Galata	Galata semtinde Atıcılar altında	Safâyî, İskender Paşa (merhûm İskender Paşa'ya intisâb eylemiş, ol dahı Galata semtinde Atıcılar altında bünyâd itdüğü zâviyesin Safâyî'ye şart idüp zâviye-nîşîn olup cem'-i abdâl u ebrâr ve ashâb u erbâb eylemiş ... Ol zemânda İstanbul etrâfında mesîreler ü seyrângâhlar ve zâviyeler ü hânkâhlar yogmuş. Ekâbir ü a'yân ve zurefâ-yı ehl-i divân şu'arâ ve ashâb-ı irfân seyr ü sohbe ve 'ıyş u işrete anda varurlar imiş, Safâyî bu vech ile merci' ü masîr ve bâğçesi teferrüçgâh-ı mesîr imiş)	1290
15	Haydar-hâne	lodge	İskenderpaşa;	walled city	Meşrebî (Biraz şöyle serseri oldu sonra Haydar-hâneye varup şemle-puş, zencirli tokalı Kalenderî oldu)	815
16	İşret-âbâd/Hânkâh	lodge	Eyüp	câhib-i Eyyûb'da	Nigârî (Hâlâ câhib-i Eyyûb'da bir 'işret-âbâd peydâ idüp kezâlik niçe derviş ü kalendere tekyegâh ve süfre vü çerâğı ma'mûr bir Haydar-hâne vü hânkâhdur)	893
17	Şeyh Cemâl Hânkâhı	dervish lodge	Südlince		Yetim ([Şeyh Cemâl-i merhûm] hânkâhında on beş yıl halvetler çeküp mücâhedelerle terbiyetler görmüşdür)	657
18	Şeyh Vefâ Hânkâhı	dervish lodge	Vefa		Şem'î (Bir deste şem' alup bu gece Şem'î'nün şebistânı vardır diyü Vefâ hânkâhı mücâvirlerin ve kendünün sâ'ir yâr u mu'âşirlerin da'vet eyler. Şem'lerün cem'îsin yakup yârân lutf eylen, siz zikre meşgûl olun ben bir mikdâr yatayın diyü zâhirâ kasd-ı istirâhat eyler. Bir	1443; 1582

					<p>mikdâr zikr itdükden sonra bî-dâr itmek dilerler, birkaç kere çağırıp hareket gelmeyecek <i>en nevmu ehul-mevti</i> (Uyku ölümün kardeşidir) diyü kendin ne 'aceb aldırılmış diler. Tekrâr uyarmak kasd eylerler, görürler ki çeşm-i vücûdın hâb-ı ecel almış, bî-dâr olması subh-ı ferdâ-yı kıyâmete kalmış)</p> <p>Zâtî (Ol [Kadrî Efendi] Ayasofya hücrelerinde, ben Şeyh Vefâ hânkâhında olurduk)</p>	
19	Nigârî'nin hücreci	cell	Galata	Galata'da Top-hâne cânibinde	Nigârî (Evvel Galata'da Top-hâne cânibinde olup hücreci mecma'-ı şu'arâ vü zurefâ idi)	893
20	Kadrî Efendi'nin hücreci	cell	Ayasofya Câmî'i		Zâtî (Ol [Kadrî Efendi] Ayasofya hücrelerinde, ben Şeyh Vefâ hânkâhında olurduk)	1582
21	Rızâyî'nin hücreci	cell	Ayasofya	Ayasofya haremide	Rızâyî (İstanbul'da Ayasofya haremide olan hücerâton birinde mukîm eyledi)	1363
22	(Atik) 'Alî Paşa Medresesi	madrassa	Çemberlitaş; walled city		<p>Hâfız-ı 'Acem (Bu gazeli diyüp yazup rikâb-ı şâhîye irsâl idüp şâh görüp pesend itmiş ve câ'izeler virüp İstanbul'da 'Alî Paşa medresesin sadaka idüp behremend itmişdür)</p> <p>Muhyî (Sultân Bâyezîd-i merhûm devrinde vezîr-i a'zam olan Hadîm 'Alî Paşa ogul idinüp Mü'eyyed-zâde güyegü idinmişdür. 'Alî Paşa medresesin yaptığı vakt evvel kırk akça ile ana virmişdür)</p> <p>Sâlih Çelebi ('Alî Paşa'ya müderris olup)</p>	604; 791 1270
23	Câmî-i 'Atik Medresesi	madrassa	unknown		Dânişî (Papasoglu ve Unkapanı ve Câmî-i 'Atik medresesine müderris olup)	507
24	Ebî Eyyûb-i Ensârî Medresesi	madrassa	Eyüp		Sâlih Çelebi (medrese-i Ebî Eyyûb-ı Ensârî sadaka buyurıldığı takdîrce ifâde-i	1272; 1515

				<p>'ilm-i tefsîr ü hadîs sebeb-i nef'-i uhrevî ve 'amel-i kavî idügin 'arz itdiler. Yüz akça ile anda müderris oldılar)</p> <p>‘Aşık Çelebi ([on Sâlih Çelebi] Bu esnâda Ebî Eyyûb medresesi virildükde ben haste bulunup şeref-i dest-bûslarına baht-ı menhûs mânî' oldukda merhûm Hatmî'ye i'âdeyi ihsân buyurmuşlar, fakîri 'iyâdete göndermişler)</p> <p>Hatmî, Celâl-zâde Sâlih Çelebi (Celâl-zâde Salîh Çelebi Efendi medrese-i Ebî Eyyûb'da müderris iken i'âdesinden mülâzım olmuşdur, hâlâ tarîk-i tedrîse 'âzim olmuşdur)</p>	
25	Dâvûd Paşa Medresesi	madrassa	Cerrahpaşa; walled city	<p>Abdü'l-'azîz Çelebi (Giderek Dâvûd Paşa müderrisi olur)</p> <p>Fahrî ([on his brother] 'Azîz Çelebi tarîk-i tedrîse sülûk idüp Dâvûd Paşa müderrisi iken fevt olmuşdur)</p> <p>Fevrî Efendi (Âhir Dâvûd Paşa medresesine el öpdürdiler, kabûl idince haylî akçadan ugundılar)</p>	1041; 1152; 1241
26	Hâcî Hasan-zâde Medresesi	madrassa	Zeyrek	<p>Nihânî (Üstâdum Sürûrî Çelebi, Nihânî Hâcî Hasan-zâde müderrisi iken ana dânişmend olmuş)</p>	924
27	[Hadım] İbrâhîm Paşa Medresesi	madrassa	Esekapı, Cerrahpaşa	<p>Vusûlî (İstanbul'da kırk akça ile İbrâhîm Paşa medresesinde müderris olup ifâde vü ifâzaya müdâvim oldılar)</p> <p>Müslim Çelebi (kırk akça ile İstanbul'da İbrâhîm Paşa müderrisi iken Rodos'a ba'dehu Amâsiyye'ye kâzî oldi)</p> <p>Nevâlî Çelebi (Kırk akça ile İbrâhîm Paşa medresesinden ma'zûldür)</p>	564; 806; 898

28	Kalender-hâne Medresesi	madrassa	walled city	Hâtemî (kırk akça ile İstanbul'da Kalender-hâne medresesin virür ba'dehu kırk beş akça ile Sahn'ı virüp andan elli akça idüp andan Edirne'ye kâzî ba'dehu kâzî- 'asker ider)	1496
29	[Cezerî] Kâsım Paşa Medresesi	madrassa	Eyüp	Necmî (Kâsım Paşa-yı merhûmun medresesin âlâ vecdi't-te'bîd yigirmi beş akça ile kabul idüp vazîfesi otuz ba'dehu kırk oldu 'Arab Çelebi ki ol medrese evvel müderris idi) Sürûrî Çelebi (Elli akça ile İstanbul karşusunda Kâsım Paşa medresesinde müderris iken terk-i 'örf-i izâfet ve menâsib-ı i'tibâriyyeden ferâgat ve İstanbul'da Emîr Buhârî şeyhi 'Abdü'l-latîf Çelebi'den tevbe vü inâbet eyledi ... Kâsım Paşa hayatda bulunup medresesin ana meşrût eyledi ve hall u 'akd-ı vakfin anun re'yine merbût eyledi; Heftede dört gün müderrisvâr medresede hâzır bulunurdu)	862; 964-966
30	Kâzî [Hüsâm] Medresesi	madrassa	unknown	Naîmî (Hâlâ İstanbul'da Kâzî medresesinde elli akça ile müderrisdür)	886
31	Kepenekçi [Sinân] Medresesi	madrassa	Zeyrek	Cevherî (Kepenekçi medresesi müderrisi iken libâs-ı 'örf ü 'izâfeti koyup tarîk-i 'uzlete 'âzim oldu)	498
32	Kirmasti Medresesi	madrassa	Vefa	Fevrî Efendi (birkaç gün Kirmasti medresesinde suhtevât depişmesinde ve Etrak karsanbasında incir ezmesin yimekten agzına bal çalınup agzı sulandı)	1241
33	Mahmûd Paşa Medresesi	madrassa	Hasköy	Ca'fer Çelebi (Mahmûd Paşa müderrisi iken menşûr-ı âmâli tevkî'-i iltifât-ı pâdşâhî ile muvakkı' olup Dîvân-ı Sultânî'ye nişancı ve tab'-ı nahl-ârâsı bezm-i câh u celâle reyhâncı oldu)	454; 720; 902; 906; 1579

					<p>Kemâl-i Zerd ([Mahmud Paşa] Fevt olduktan sonra Hâsköy nâm kasabada olan medresesine müderris olur)</p> <p>Nûrî (Mahmûd Paşa müderrisi iken biz dânişmendi idük)</p> <p>Nihâlî, Tâcî-zâde Ca'fer Çelebi (Merhûm Ca'fer Çelebi, Mahmûd Paşa müderrisi Tâcî-zâde Ca'fer Çelebi'den Sahn'a Mü'eyyed-zâde'ye varup Edirne kâzısı oldukda mülâzım olur)</p> <p>Zâtî (merhûm Pîr Mehmed Çelebi nâm bir kâbil ü fâzıl, elli akça ile Mahmûd Paşa medresesine müderris idi)</p>	
34	Mustafâ Paşa Medresesi	madrassa	unknown		Abdü'l-hay Çelebi (Elli akça ile İstanbul'da Mustafâ Paşa medresesinde müderris iken)	278
35	Murâd Paşa Medresesi	madrassa	Akserây		<p>Nihâlî (Ma'zûl olup İstanbul'da Murâd Paşa medresesine müderris olup ba'dehu Galata'ya kâzî iderler)</p> <p>Sâlih Çelebi (Paşa-yı merhûma ol târihlerde târihle ve şi'rle intisâb kâbil olmagın intisâb ve şeref-i iktisâb idüp anlarun himmetleriyle Mûrâd Paşa müderrisi olup)</p> <p>Gazâlî ([on Dervîş Çelebi] Murâd Paşa müderrisi iken kâzî olmuş kuzâtun server ü ser-defteri idi)</p>	907; 1270; 1640
36	Papasoglu Medresesi	madrassa	unknown		Dânişî (Papasoglu ve Unkapanı ve Câmî-i 'Atîk medresesine müderris olup)	507
37	Sinân Paşa Medresesi	madrassa	walled city		Azmî-i Sâni (Hâlâ elli akça ile Sinân Paşa medresesinde müderrisdür)	1070
38	Sahn-ı Semâniyye	madrassa	Fatih mosque complex		İshâk Çelebi (Sene seb'a ve selâsin ve tis'amî'ede Sahn'a müderris olmuşdur, Sahn-ı Semâniyye'nün baş açuk	332; 465; 543; 581; 624; 784; 792; 906; 981; 983;

				<p>mollâsı ve her fennün ... dânâsı idi)</p> <p>Ca'ferî (kendü Sahn'da İshâk Çelebi'nün dânişmeni ve 'asrının zurefâ ve şu'arâsı anun âşık-ı pür-şûr u şegâbı idi)</p> <p>Hem-demî ([İshâk Çelebi-i merhûmun]... Sahn'da... hıdmetkâr-ı hanvâdesidür)</p> <p>Zemînî (İdhâk Çelebi Sahn'da müderris olduğunun evâhirinde Zemînî'nün şiftesi ve baş açık firîftesi idi)</p> <p>Hasan Çelebi-i Diger (Hâliyâ Sahn'da mu'iddür)</p> <p>Mahremî (Sahn müderrislerinden Pîrî Paşa- zâde Mehemmed Çelebi)</p> <p>Muhyî (Andan Sultân'a, andan Sahn'a müderris, andan Edirne'ye ve İstanbul'a kâzî oldı)</p> <p>Nihâlî (Sahn'a Mü'eyyed- zâde'ye varup Edirne kâzîsı oldukda mülâzım olur)</p> <p>Sa'dî Çelebi (Merhûmun 'ulûfesi Sahn'da yüz olmuş iken Mısır seferinde fevt olmuşdur)</p> <p>Sa'dî Çelebi el-Müftî (Semâniyye'de müderris oldukdan sonra on bir yıl İstanbul'a kâzî ve beş yıl müftî olup kâr u kirdârından halk hoşnûd ve Hâlik râzî olmuşdur)</p> <p>Selmân-ı Aydınî (Efşâncı merhûm Sultân Mehemmed mütevellîsı iken ol Sahn'da dânişmend olup musâhebet iderler ve bâde-hârlık idüp 'ıyş u 'iştret iderler imiş)</p>	<p>998; 1013; 1086; 1152; 1153; 1270; 1399; 1496; 1533; 1548-1549; 1241; 1642</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>Seydî (Sahn müderrisi iken)</p> <p>‘İşkî-i sâni (Kâzî-'asker Sinân Çelebi'ye Sahn'da mu'îd ... oldu)</p> <p>Fahrî (Sahn'da müderris iken fevt olmuş ve cümle âmâl u emânisi fevt olmuşdur)</p> <p>Firâkî (Sahn'a geldükde şeyh-zâdelik hâ'il olup <i>kullu şey'in yerci'u ilâ aslihî</i> [Her şey aslında döner] yolundan avk itdi)</p> <p>Sâlih Çelebi (Iyâs Paşa devri oldukda fazl u kemâllerine küllî i'tikâd idüp Sahn'a getürdiler)</p> <p>Riyâzî-i Sâni (Sahn'da Celâl-zâde-i merhûm i'âdesinden mülâzım oldu)</p> <p>Hâtemî (kırk beş akça ile Sahn'ı virüp)</p> <p>Hızrî, Taşköpri-zâde (Sahn'da merhûm Taşköpri-zâde hıdmetine girdi)</p> <p>Hayâlî- Ma'rûf, ‘Aşık Çelebi (Sahn'da oldugum zemânda ... hücreye ugrar bir mikdâr teneffüs ider eger ders okır bulınsam itmâma dek tevakkuf ider bari hücre penceresinden 'ışk u meşk idüp yâ hû dir)</p> <p>Fevrî Efendi (Sahn'da Mal'ûl Emîr Efendi'ye ulular lisânından envâ'-ı ibrâmle el öpdürdiler)</p> <p>Gazâlî, Tâcî-zâde ([on Sirkeci Bahşı] Tâcî-zâde ki Sahn'da yüz akça ile monlâ idi, andan mülâzım olmak üzre iken ferâgat eylemişdür ... Kendüden işitdüm ki sebep-i ferâgati buymış ki sene hams ve 'aşere ve</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>tis'ami'ede vâkı olan büyük zelzele gicesinde Sahn medresesinde kanzil mest ü lâ-ya'kil idüm. Zelzele hininde mey-hurde ve kaykerde bulındum. Havf u haşyetümden ve kemâl-i dehşetümden hücre penceresinün içine girdüm. Ol kahr u gazab hâlinde ol halde bulınduguma te'essüf idüp nefsume insâf virdüm, âmâl-ı bî-me'âl-i tarîkden ferâgat itdüm)</p>	
39	Sultâniyye-i İstanbul Medresesi	madrassa	walled city	<p>Dânişî (Sultâniyye-i İstanbul medresesi i'âdesinden mülâzım oldu)</p> <p>Lem'î (İstanbul'da kırk akça ile Sultâniyye müderrisi iken intikâl itdi)</p> <p>Makâmî (Serây-ı Sultânî'de içoglanlarına hâce olup İbrâhîm Paşa-yı merhûmun ve İskender Çelebi'nün oğlanlarına tâlim-i Kuran ve gına vü elhan ile be-nâm olmışdur)</p> <p>Na'îmî-i Sâlis (Akıbet Semâniyye'ye vardukdan ... dem çeküp anı dahı yutdı ve nerrâd-ı felek şeş-der-i kazâda nakd-i 'ömrin alup anı utdı)</p> <p>Fevrî Efendi (Hâlâ Sultâniyye-i İstanbul'da müderrisdür. Gündüzler mermûk-ı nazar-ı kütüb olup sahâ'if ü defâtir ile mücâlisdür ve giceler şem'-i fûrûg-ı 'ilm ü 'irfâna pervâne gibi mûnisdür)</p> <p>Fevrî Efendi (Hâlâ Sultâniyye-i İstanbul'da müderrisdür)</p>	507; 742; 826; 889; 1225	
40	Süleymâniye Medresesi	madrassa	Süleymaniye mosque complex	<p>Şâh Çelebi Efendi (Kat-ı menâzil-i medâris idüp Süleymâniyye medresesine ta'yîn-i pâdşâhla müderris</p>	1425; 1374	

					oldukdan sonra Mısır'a kâzî oldılar) Rızâyî-i Sâlis, Hâcî Hasan-zâde Efendi (Hâcî Hasan-zâde Efendi'nün Sultân Süleymân medresesinde iken i'âdesinden mülâzım olmuşdur)	
41	Şeref Hâce Medresesi	madrassa	unknown		Kıyâsî (Sultân Süleymân-ı merhûm mezkûrun Şeref Hâce medresesi talebinde vâkı' olan kıt'ası nazar-ı şerîfleriyle manzûr oldukda medrese-i mezkûreyi ihsân buyurup sahâ'if-i âmâlî 'unvân-ı şeref buldı) Fevrî Efendi (birkaç gün Şeref Hâce buk'asında birkaç gün Kirmasti medresesinde suhtevât depişmesinde ve Etrak karsanbasında incir ezmesin yimekten agzına bal çalınup agzı sulandı)	1335; 1241
42	Tûtî-i Latîf Medresesi	madrassa	Yenibâgce		Tûtî-i Latîf (Zemân-ı kazâda eline girdüğü mâlî cem' idüp İstanbul'da Yenibâgce'de bir medrese binâ idüp haylî meblag vakf idüp kendüye şart itmişdür)	734
43	Unkapanı Medresesi	madrassa	Unkapanı	near Vefa square	Dânişî (see column 36, page 107)	507
44	Galata[da bir] kilisa	church	Galata		Mahremî (Ol târihlerde Pîrî Paşa-zâde Mehemmed Çelebi ve Aşçı-zâde Hasan Çelebi kâfirlerün Kızıl Yumurta bayramı günü tebdîl-sûret idüp Galata'ya gelüp bir sûretle kilisaya girdüklerinde Mahremî de düşüp ... kıt'asın didükde Paşa-zâde kâzîya haber gönderüp 'azl itdürdi)	784
45	Efşâncı mektebi ve mezârı	primary school; grave	unknown	bâgçesinün bir kûşesin mekteb idüp	Selmân-ı Aydınî ([Efşâncı] Âhir-i 'ömrinde bâgçesinün bir kûşesin mekteb idüp kabrin anda olmak vasiyyet itdi ... Kabrin ol mekteb hazîresinde kazdılar ve levh-i mezârına vasiyyeti ile bu beyti yazdılar)	1000

46	Mahmûd Çelebi mescidi	masjid	unknown		Ârifî (Ebi Eyyûb Ensârî'de defterdâr Mahmûd Çelebi mescidine dimişdür)	1037
47	Sürûrî Çelebi'nin mescidi	masjid	Kasımpaşa		Sürûrî Çelebi (Kâsım Paşa canibinde mescid abad eyledi)	966
48	Revânî Mescidi	masjid	Kırkçeşme	Kırkçeşme kurbında	Revânî (Kırkçeşme kurbında mescid ü mülâzımına süknâ olmagçün hücerât binâ itmişdür. Revânî mescidi dimekle ma'rûf mescidi etrâfını ol ihyâ itmişdür. Hattâ ol mescid binâ olurken Sultân Selîm merhûm yoldan geçüp giderken <i>bu mescid kimindür</i> diyü sormışlar Revânî kulunuzundur didüklerinde <i>hoş Ayasofya'sın hoş yılda bir mescid togurursın</i> diyü latife itmişdür)	1389
49	Ahmed Çelebi Kemâl Paşa-zâde'nin mezarı	grave	Edirnekapı		Ahmed Çelebi Kemâl Paşa-zâde (Edirnekapusu'ndan taşra Mahmûd Çelebi zâviyesinin hazîresinde medfündür)	305
50	Ca'fer Çelebi'nin mezarı	grave	unknown		Ca'fer Çelebi, Sa'dî Çelebi (Karındaşı Sa'dî Çelebi-i merhûm ... gelüp meyyitin alup cesedin İstanbul'da kendü mescidi harîmînde tedfîn itdiler)	457
51	Hasbî'nin mezarı (suffe)	grave	Eyüp	Edirnekapusu'nda n taşra Ebî Eyyûb yolında	Hasbî (Karındaşı Keşfî ile oğlu 'Atâ'yı Edirnekapusu'ndan taşra Ebî Eyyûb yolında bir suffede defn idüp kendüye dahı cây-ı kabr ihzar idüp bu ebyâtı yazdırmışdur)	618
52	Kandî'nin mezârı	grave	Nişanca; Eyüp	Nişancı Celâl-zâde Ebî Eyyûb semtinde ihyâ itdüğü câmi'-i şerîf harîminde	Kandî-i Müverrih (Sene isnâ ve sittîn ve tis'ami'e evâhirinde fevt olup Nişancı Celâl-zâde Ebî Eyyûb semtinde ihyâ itdüğü câmi'-i şerîf harîminde ki Nişancı Beg'ün cümle-i âsâr-ı hayrındandır ki şu'arâ vü zurefâya medfen eylemişdür anda medfundur. Ve ol kelblerün birkaçı hak-ı nâmı terk itmeyüp mezârında mücâvir olup ziyâret idenlere	1334

					Kandî'nün mezârın reh-nümündür)	
53	Keşfi'nin mezarı	grave	near Eyüp	Edirnekapusı'nda n taşra Ebî Eyyûb'a giderken yol kenârında	Keşfi (Edirnekapusı'ndan taşra Ebî Eyyûb'a giderken yol kenârında medfündür) 'Atâ ([Keşfi'nin] oğlu 'Atâ ki gencine-i girân-mâye iken fevt olmışdur yanında bile mahzündür)	719
54	Necâtî'nin kabri	grave	Vefa		Necâtî, Sehî Beg (Merhûmî hâlâ kabri meşhûr olduğu yerde defn iderler. Sehî Beg mezârın mermer ile yapdurup bu rubâ'isin yazdurur)	855
55	Nihâlî'nin mezarı	grave	Vefa		Nihâlî (Evi Şeyh Vefâ mahallesinde olduğu takrîb ile Şeyh Vefâ hazîresinde defn olındı)	911
56	Safâyî'nin mezarı	grave	İskender Paşa Zâviyesi, near Fatih mosque	ol zâviyenün [İskender Paşa] bir kûşesine	Safâyî (kabri ol zâviyenün bir kûşesine vü ebyâtı çâr-dîvârına yazılıp zîb ü zînet virmişdür)	1290
57	Yûsuf-ı Sîne-çâk'ın mezarı	grave	near Südlice	Südlice'de Ca'fer-âbâd reh-güzârında giderken yolun cânib-i yesârında	Yûsuf-ı Sîne-çâk (Südlice'de Ca'fer-âbâd reh-güzârında giderken yolun cânib-i yesârında defn olunmuşdur) Hüseyin Çelebi ([Sîne-çâk'ın] Kabrin dil-i saht-ı erbâb-ı zemân gibi seng-i terâşide ile üstüvâr ve külâh-ı Mevlevî üslûbında seng-i mezâr itdürmüşdür) Mevlânâ Şûrî, Günâhî, 'Ârifî (Sene erba'a ve hamsîn ve tis'ami'e Muharrem'inün 'âşûrâ günü merhûm Sîne-çâk'ün şâkirdi Mevlânâ Şûrî ve merhûm peyrevî ya'nî Günâhî vesâ'ir Mevlevî cem' olup nazg u mergûb ve nâdirü'l-üslûb zikr ü âvâze eylediler, eşrâf u eshiyâ-yı İstanbul'ı dervâze eylediler. Cem' olan ma'dûd mevcûdî sabr-ı 'âşık gibi dem-i nakd itdiler. Ca'fer-âbâd'da 'âşûr tertîb idüp sohbet ü iclâs 'akd itdiler. Zurafâ vü 'urefâyı cem' idüp Sîne-çâk rûhiçün	686

					âb u as itdiler. Ba'dehû Mevlevîler âyîni üzre semâ' idüp sahn-ı hânkâhı aştdılar. Cigerinde olan evbâş serverler terâş olup imâm 'ışkına Hüseyinler ve şâh-ı Horasan şevkine Şirvâniler kesüp başlarında na'ller ve bedenlerinde burclar, sînelerinde elifler çizdiler, niçe nâ-terâşîdeler âhendillik idüp ol dâ'ireden pergâr gibi kıyı çizdiler. Şu'arâ tab'-âzmâyılık idüp Sine-çâk'un kabri sengine yazmaga münâsib ebyât dimege küşîş itdiler, her biri diyüp iştdiler. Cümleden 'Ârifî'nün bu beyti hasb-i hâle münâsib görölüp ittifâk üzre anı begenüp yazdılar. Seng-terâşlar bir san'atla yazdılar ki sikkeyi mermerde kazdılar)	
58	Zâtî'nin mezarı	grave	near Edirnekapı	Edirnekapısı'nda n taşra, Keşfi ve Basîrî'nin mezarlarının olduğu yerde	Zâtî (Edirnekapısı'ndan taşra Keşfi ve Basîrî ve tâ'ife-i şu'arânun niçe pîrî ve cem'-i kesîri yanlarında medfün eyledük)	1589
59	Sultân Mehemed Türbesi	tomb	Fatih mosque complex		Dellâk-zâde, Âhî (Sultân Mehemed-i merhûm türbesinde cüz'-hân imiş ... [Âhî] türbe önünde her gün ana mülâzemet ider imiş)	394
60	Uzlet-hâne	cell	Südlice	Südlice'de şeyhün mezârı ve Ca'fer-âbâd'un reh-güzârı kurbında	Yefîm (Şeyhten [Cemâl] sonra yine Südlice'de şeyhün mezârı ve Ca'fer-âbâd'un reh-güzârı kurbında bir uzlet-hâne binâ idüp anda olurdu)	657

B. COMMERCIAL ESTABLISHMENTS

	NAME	TYPE	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	PEOPLE ASSOCIATED	PAGE NUMBER
1	Atbâzârı	bazaar	walled city		Sihri-i Sâni (Sihri Çelebi dahı Atbâzârı kâtibi olup rahş-ı murâdı 'arsa-i kâmrânîde sebük-refîâr oldu)	957
2	Avretbâzârı	bazaar	walled city		Husrev (Yûsuf nâm dilberi bir gün Avretbâzârı'na gelmedükde dimişdür. <i>Beyt: Zindân olursa tan mı benim</i>)	1531

					<i>başuma cihân/Bâzâra gelmedi bu gün ol Yûsuf-ı zemân)</i>	
3	Balıkbâzârı	bazaar	Eminönü		Derûnî (Harkî iltiyâma kâbil olmayup penbe-dûzları ayagı barmagıyla gösterürdi, akça pulı Balıkbâzârı'nda görürdi)	514
4	Bitbâzârı	bazaar	walled city	Bitbâzârı'nda Uzunçarşu agzında olan dükkânlar	Enverî (Bitbâzârı'nda Uzunçarşu agzında olan dükkânlarda süzenger idi ve mürekkebe satar idi) Yakînî (her gün Bitbâzârı'na varup <i>dellâl elinden masâd görüp getir göreyüm</i> diyü eline alur bahâsın sorar <i>mâsât bize yaramaz diyü</i> yine eline virür imiş) Riyâzî-i Sâni (Bitbâzârı'nda dellâl elinde masât görse eline alup <i>mâ sat</i> dirdi yine dellâl eline virürdi) Fevrî Efendi (Bu hâlde Bitbâzârı'nda dört buçuk akçaya bir müzevvece satun alıp ... birkaç gün Kirmasti medresesinde suhtevât depişmesinde ve Etrak karsanbasında incir ezmesin yimekten agzına bal çalınup agzı sulandı)	385; 684; 1399; 1241
5	İplikbâzârı	bazaar	walled city		Merdümî (İplikbâzârı'nda Fâtımacığa <i>kim dirler kaht-ı rical denüle</i> diyü bu vaz'dan dil-figâr itdi)	803
6	Karamanbâzârı	bazaar	unknown		Dellâk-zâde, Âhî (Bir gün yine mey-hâneye gitmelü oldukda yârân Karamanbâzârı'na ugrayup nukl alurken) Zeynî (kaba sakal sarkıdup Karamanbâzârında sahhâf dükkânı açup sâhib-i ser ü sâmân oldı)	394; 588
7	Tahte'l-kal'a	bazaar	Tahtakale		İshâk Çelebi (Tahte'l-kal'aya ugrayup at üzerinde Şerbetçi Bekr nâm mahbûbun katâyıfın yir imiş)	331; 563; 809; 1208-1209; 1260; 1312; 1582

					<p>Visâlî (Her gün Tahte'l-kal'a'da tereddüd ider, görenler 'acebâ Tahte'l-kal'ayı iltizâm mı itdi dir)</p> <p>Mesîhî (Elbette kapucular yâ Tahte'l-kal'a'da yâ deyr-i mugânda yâ mahbûblarla kûşe-i gülistanda bulurdi)</p> <p>Figânî, 'Aşık Çelebi (Üç günden sonra Tahte'l-kal'aya indüm Figânî şimdi bunda idi İstanbul subaşı aldđ gitdi didiler. Neyiki diyü haber sordum. Evvel ta'zîr itdiler ba'dehu eşege bindirüp teşhîr itdiler didiler. Sebebi nedür diyince iskeleye götürüp asdılar didiler. İskeleye varup maslûb gördük, libâs-ı hayâtı kâmet-i vücûdından meslûb gördük)</p> <p>Fehmî (Bârî Tahte'l-kal'a'da her ikindi zemânında gelüp Fürsde mübâhasesi olan yârân anı hakem farz iderdi, müşkillerin ana 'arz iderlerdi)</p> <p>Kadrî Efendi (Mey-hâneye varsa surâhî gibi gerden-firâzlık idüp şem' gibi sadr-ı meclisi özler imiş ve Tahte'l-kal'a seyrânına varsa yine yârânınun fevkın gözler imiş. Gonce gibi kîsesi pür olsa el açıklığından gül gibi seher elinde avucında olanı döker saçar ve sehergeh gül-i pür-jâle gibi eli pür-direm olsa kuşlıga iletmez ber-bâd idüp hevâya münkalib eyler imiş)</p> <p>Zâtî, Kadrî Efendi (Tahte'l-kal'a mecma'umuz ... idi)</p>	
8	Gazâlî Hâmmâmı ve zâviyesi	bathroom; lodge	Beşiktaş		<p>Gazâlî (kendüye bir mesken ve yanında bâgçe vü gülşen ve zâviye-i bihişt-encümen ve bir mescîd-i müzeyyen ve hammaâm-ı İrem-ârâm içinde bir havz dil-i uşşâk gibi sâf u şeffâf u rûşen binâ</p>	1646-1647

					eyledi ... Cümleden evvel hammâmı temâm itdi ve dellâkların birer serv-i sîm-endâm itdi. Havzı olduğu cihetden Kapluca diyü nâm itdi. Âteşi-zâdeyi hammâma âlet-i hengâme idüp kendü hammâmcı yirinde geçüp ârâm itdi. İstanbul dil-berleri sû-be-sû ol hammâmın ayagına akdılar, niçe hecr âteşiyle yanmış 'âşıklar varup ol hammâmda tevsen-i nefs-i tündkâmlarını âb-ı şehvete yaktılar. Zurefâ-yı havâs u 'avâm içerüde yir bulımayup tama çıkup camdan bakdılar. Birâder Efendi sîmîn gülîçelerden fûtalar toldurup nâtûrlar şevkden fûta urup dellâklar kiseler pür eylediler ... İstanbul hammâmları mu'attal olup niçe hammâmcı hâceler fakrdan medyûn olup külhânî oldılar, niçesi habs olunup dokmak gibi boyunlarına ipler takdılar, dellâkları bî-kârlıktan ellerin ovdılar. Nâtûrlar kurnaya ve şâdervâna su salmakdan el yudılar. Hammâmlarda kiçe işleyen kiçeciler kiçelerin sudan çıkaramayup hammâmlar başlarına tar oldu. Niçeler müflislik belâsından ugurlık ihtiyâr idüp âhir yirleri dar oldu)	
9	Kâşikâri Hammâmı	bathhouse	unknown	Nûrî, Hayrû'd-dîn Paşa (Hayrû'd-dîn Paşa-yı merhûmun İstanbul'da Kâşikâri hammâmı yapıldukda bir beyt diyüp 'Alî Sultân'a hatt-ı celî ile yazdırup haşiye vü pervâz itdi. Etrâfın nakş-perdâz itdi. Getürdi hammâmın kapısına asdı)	902	
10	Nişancı Hammâmı	bathhouse	Nişanca;Eyüp	Zeynî, Fındık Memi, Sübûtî (Bir gün üçü [Zeynî, Fındık Memi, Sübûtî] Nişancı hammâmında cem' oldılar)	588	

11	Nişânî Hammâmı	bathhouse	Nişanca; Eyüp	Ebî Eyyûb-i Ensârî civârında	Nişânî Beg (Ebî Eyyûb-i Ensârî civârında bâg u bâgçe ve câmi' ü hammâm âbâdan itmişlerdi. Kendü anda sakin olup sohbetin hasr-ı ehl-i 'ilm ü irfân itmişlerdi)	874
12	Pîrî Paşa Hammâmı	bathhouse	Kiremidlik; Hasköy		Gazâlî, Mehemmed Çelebi (Pîrî Paşa'nun Hasköy'de Kiremidlik'de olan hammâmında revâca bâ'is olsun diyü bir havz-ı müdevver peydâ ider. Birkaç gün ol hammâm dahı mecma'-ı mehâbîb ü zurefâ olur, Birâder'ün hammâmı kesâd bulur, bu kıt'ayı dir ki matla'ı budur. Matla: <i>Pîrî Paşa oğlu taklîd-i Birâder eylemiş/Ol da hammâmında bir havz-ı müdevver eylemiş</i> ... Ol dahı incinüp evkâf hammâmılarınun mütevellilerinden ve hammâmcılarınun bellilerinden çok kimesneyi tahrîk idüp varup İbrâhîm Paşa'ya şikâyet eylerler. Ba'zı kimesne dahı nefsinde ol hammâm menba'-ı şer ü şûr ve mecma'-ı ehl-i fisk u fücûr oldı diyü şehâdet eylerler. Paşa-yı merhûm emr eyledi ki yüz nefer 'Acemîoğlanları ve Ehrimen-i Süleymân'dan artuk devinür ahıryanları gönderüp varup hammâm içinde olan havzı yıkup hâke ber-â-ber eylerler. Birâder-i derdmendün kasr-ı âmâlın kalb-i virânı gibi ziîr ü zeber iderler. Yârân fırsat bulup kıt'alar ve târîhler dirler, cümleden Hâverî havza sıçdun diyü târîh dir. Birâder'ün elinden ne gelür, rûz u şeb aglar ve ezgiyi bu terâneye bağlardı)	1647
13	hurde-furûş	shop	Tahte'l-kal'a		Nihâlî (Tahte'l-kal'a kûşesinde bir pîr-i hurde-furûş var idi, zemân-ı evvelde anunla mey-hânede bün-i humda dürd-i den gibi bile kaynamışlar ve	911

					cem'iyetlerde mahbûb meclislerinde 'âşık oyunun bile oynamışlar. İki üç günde bir atla varur anun dükkânında geçer oturur gelüp geçen bengi vü hayrânı ve Galata'dan geçen mest ü sekrânı ve yanlarında dilberler salındıran 'âşık-pîşe yârânı seyr idüp ikindiden ahşama degin günün bu gûne geçürürdi)	
14	Kandî'nin dükkânı	shop	Beyazıt	Sultân Bâyezîd câmi'i avlısında	<p>Kandî-i Müverrih, Hayâlî, Zâtî (Sultân Bâyezîd avlısında kannâd dükkânı var idi. Kasr-ı mînâ-yı felek gibi çîni vü sırça hokkalarla der ü divâr-ı dükkânı pür-encüm-i tâbdârdı ... Hayâlî işidüp bir gün mestâne dâmânın taş toldurup gelüp Kandî'yi taşa tutdı Kandî topa tutulmuş maymuna dönüp kaçdı ... Hokkaları ve şîşeleri 'ırz-ı mest ve kalb-i 'âşık gibi pâre pâre olup ferş-i dükkânı rîze-i mînuyla çerh-ı mînâya döndi. Kandî-i merhûm Hâtem-i zemân-ı mürüvvet, hâtem-i engüşt-i vezâret İbrâhîm Paşa'ya halin agladı. Gözi yaşından bedel dâmânın sîm ü zerle pür itdi ki tıfl-ı kûdek-sâle gibi bî-ihliyâr avundı ammâ dükkân u destgâhı tagıtdı yine ol haremde vakf odalarından bir oda tutup ölince anda bir nişîmen tutdı ... Zâtî çâr-tâk-ı hâlâ diyü târîh didi. Kandî dükkânı öninden geçerken eline sunıvirdi. Hakîr hâzır idüm, hemân aldugı bir oldı yine Zâtî'den kalem isteyüp Mısra: <i>Gidi pohun yüzine layık yidi diyü târîh diyüp Zâtî'nün eline virüp gidivirdi</i>)</p> <p>Zâtî (Hayâlî, Kandî'nün şekerrîz dükkânın taşa tutup şarâbâtı şîşelerin zücâc-ı kalbi gibi münkesir itdükde tekrâr cem' olup</p>	1329; 1332;1584

					vardugumuzda zücâc-ı sâf-ı hâtır reng-pezîr oldu. Ammâ yine medhinde gavvâs olduk, deryâ-yı şî're dalduk, kasîdeler diyüp câ'izeler alduk)	
15	Rahîkî'nin 'attâr dükkânı	shop	Mahmud Paşa çarşısı		Rahîkî, 'Aşık Çelebi, Tabl-bâz-zâde İbrâhîm Çelebi (Mahmûd Paşa çarşusunda 'attâr dükkânı açup el-kâsibu Habîbu'llâh [<i>Kazanan Allah'ın sevdiği</i> dir] silkine sülûk kıldı. Tîmâr-hâne'de dahî şerbetci olup harâbâtılığa kodı şarâbâtî oldu. Dükkânı hokkadehenler hayâliyle ve nâzûk-mizâclar 'ışkıyla pür olmuş kalb-i 'âşık gibi hokkalar ve şişeler ile toldı. Çün şânının kâbiliyyeti var idi kütüb-i tıb-ı mutâla'a idüp derûmı evdiye-i edviye ve kalbi ev'îye- agdiye olup sehl zemânda hikmetden dem urup mahkeme-i hükûmet-i hikmetde tahakküm iderdi ... Dükkânı Galata'ya seyre giden erbâb-ı 'irfânun derneği idi ve 'uşşâkına cilve vü 'arz-ı cemâl idecek şûhlarun cây-ı derneği idi. Erbâb-ı 'ıyşa esbâb-ı 'işreti dükkânında hâzır u müheyyâ iderdi. Balıkbâzârı'na giden Rahîkî tahallusuna sebep şarâbâtılığî dahî olsa olur harâbâtılığî dahî olsa olur. Bu hâlde geçünüp sene sül ve hamsîn ve tis'ami'ede haste oldu. Tabl-bâz-zâde İbrâhîm Çelebi-i merhûmla 'ıyâdetine varduk gördük ki niçe 'illetle zâtı mu'tell ve intifâ-yı harâret-i 'azîzi ile dimâgı muhtell olmuş. Ammâ bizümle hûşmendâne kelîmât eyledi. Helâlleşüp vedâ' itdük iki günden sonra işitdük ki vefât eyledi)	1351
16	Sübûtî'nin ma'cûn dükkânı	shop	Karamanbâzârı		Sübûtî (Karaman bâzârında eşribe vü mürebbayât ve ma'âcîn ü müferrihât iderdi. Fi'l-hakîkka leb-i dil-ber gibi	1488

					<p>şîrîn ve mey-i ahmer gibi rengîn şarâblar, miskî terkîbler, 'anberî ma'cûnlar cedvârî hablar, nâfi' müferrîhler ve mukavvî cüvârîşler, sükkerî perverdeler, feryâd-resler, fîrûz-nûşlar, mâddetü'l-ferâhlar, râhatü'l-ervâhlar, kuvvetü'l-kulûblar isteyen meges gibi etrâf-ı dükkânın çizginürdi. Dükkânı şu'arâya mesken ve mehâbîb-i cihân-ârâya nîşîmen idi ... Bir zemân dahî dükkân ü destgâhı ve bâr u büngâhı tağıtdı. Merhabâ Çelebi-i merhûm Şam'a kâzî olup gitdükte bile gitdi, diyâr-ı 'Arab'da Şam ve Haleb'de oldı. Yine dimagina bûy-ı vatan-ı aslî hevâsı toldı, dükkâna geçüp yine mecma'-ı şu'arâ vü zurefâ oldı. Gâh kakıtdılar dükkânı etrafında nîşîmenleri giderdi gâh bî-sohbet-i yârân dil-gîr olup yeni nîşîmenler peydâ idüp hâlâ bir niçe yıldur ki bey-i mükeyyifâtdan ferâgat idüp ancak edviye-fürûşdur şi're dahî tevbe idüp hâmûşdur)</p>	
17	Zâtî'nin dükkânı	shop	Beyazıt	Sultân Bâyezîd câmi'i yakınında	<p>Celâlî (Eyyûb u Kâğıd-hâne çemenlerinde Galata ve Hasköy encümenlerinde, Zâtî dükkânında ve Atmeydân'ında bahâr sohbetlerinde ve hazân cem'iyetlerinde gâh mahbûblar mecma'ı olan hammâmlar seyirinde ve gâh Dâvûd Paşa iskelesinde suya oynayan sîm-endâmlar seyirinde gâh hânkâhlarda vefâ semâ'ında ve gâh harâbâtlarda ... hem-dem idük)</p> <p>Zâtî, 'Âşık Çelebi (Sultân Bâyezîd hâreminde dükkânı olup evkâtı kitâbet-i kütüb ü devâvîne ve yazduğı kitâblara ser-levhâlar idüp rânâ cedveller çeküp tezhîb ü</p>	469; 1576-1578; 1587-1588

				tezyîne masrûf idi ... dükkân ana ser-mâye ve reml âlet-i hengâme idi. Reml bahânesiyle şu'arâ ayagina varurlar, didükleri eş'ârî gösterürler, her şâ'ir mâ-melek ü makdûrın getürüp öninde der-mîyân iderdî, ol içinde yakası açılmaduk sözleri giribânına koyup hâlede mâh gibi pinhân iderdî ... Hakîr bir ramazân günü Zâtî dükkânına vardum. Zâtî-i merhûm ramazân âdeme garîb fikrler itdürür imiş, bir gazel didüm didi ve bu üç beyti okıdı ... Her gün piyâdece dükkâna mürâca'at iderdî, elinde 'asâsı bile idi. Balçık olmayıcak 'asâsına tayanmaz idi, heman asayı götürürdi; balçık olıcak 'asâya i'timâd iderdî. Bir gün dükkânına giderken yolda rast geldüm gümân itdüm ki kadd-i hamîdesi kemân ola ki dü-tâ olmuş; zihî kemân ki zihi elindeki 'asâ olmuş)	
18	Zâtî'nin dükkânı	shop	walled city	Zâtî (Sehl zemân geçmedin dükkâna mülazemetden kaldı, za'f u pîrâ âfetin aldı. Evi kurbında Koca İbrâhîm Paşa Hammâmı çarşusunda dükkân tutdı, yine remli âlet-i hengâme idüp cem'-i şu'arâ itdi)	1588-1589
19	Efe Mey-hânesi	tavern	unknown	Âhî (Merhûm bezm-i sohbetde ve dem-i 'işretde nûş-ı şarâbda ve meclis-i ahbâbda sâkit ü sâmit ve semt-i hamûşîye müsâmit imiş. Hattâ ol vakt ki Beyt: <i>Zurefâ mecma'ı safâ kânı/Efe mey-hânesi yâhud Yani imiş.</i> Mey-hâneciler merhûmı dilsüz sanup bir mâni' düşüp bir gün mey-hâneye varmasa bugün dilsüz dânişmend gelmedi ya dirler imiş) Na'tî, Figânî, Nûhî (Figânî ve Nûhî ile Efe mey-hânesinün dörd-i den gibi üftâdeleri ve habâb gibi kadeh âvâreleri ve	394; 884; 906; 997; 1507; 1582

					<p>şehrün meşhur şâhid-bâz u gulam-pareleri idi. Gâh gülşen ü kâşânelerde gül gibi gülüp açılurlar gâh küşe-i mey-hânelerde cur'aveş dökilüp saçılurlardı. Buldukların hemaân kadehe koyarlar ve gice ile buldukları dil-beri soyarlar ve gâhî ehl-i 'ilmler ile hemdest olup İlâhî sohbetler idüp çerb-zebânılgla şemün canına odlar yakup şîrîn-güftârlıgla şekerlerün başına sular koyarlardı)</p> <p>Nihâlî (Efe mey-hânesinde ve sâ'ir cem'iyetgâhlarda bile sohbet iderler)</p> <p>Selmân-ı Aydınî, Şîrvân (Tarîk-i 'ilmde iken merhûm Şîrvân'la vesâ'ir yârânla ol kadar harâbâtılıgla mübâşeret ve Efe mey-hânesine müraca'ât belki mücâveret itmişdür ki piş-hun tahtası kalmamışdur ki dürd-i meyle anlarun hadiseleri yazılmaya ve mey-hâne kapusu yokdur ki anlarun beyti ya mısraı kazılmaya)</p> <p>Hâverî (Efe mey-hânesinde bir fuçı yogdı ki aylarla ayılmayup dibine küp düşüp kalmış olmaya ve bir mey-hâne pîş-hânı yogdı ki ol anda eski hasîr salmış olmaya)</p> <p>Zâtî, Kadrî Efendi (Efe mey-hânesi tahsîl-i âb-rû ve tertîb-i dimag u tenkiye-i mizâc için seylân-ı seyl-âb-ı huzûr u hubûr menba'umuz idi)</p>	
20	Yani Mey-hânesi	tavern	unknown		Ahî (see column 19, page 122)	394

C. PIOUS FOUNDATIONS						
	NAME	TYPE	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	PEOPLE ASSOCIATED	PAGE NUMBER
1	Mehemmed Paşa 'İmâreti	imaret	Üsküdar		Heçrî (Üsküdar'da 'imâret sâhibi Mehemmed Paşa'nun 'utekâsından ve Anadolu kâzîlarının rü'esâsından idi)	534
2	Mustafâ Paşa 'İmâreti	imaret	Gebze		Kadrî Efendi (Gegbûze'de 'imâreti olan merhûm Mustafâ Paşa ... merhûmı terbiyet idüp şâh-ı iklim-i erbâb-ı teslîm Sultân Selîm-i merhûma yanaşdırup)	1312
3	Sultân Mehmed 'İmâreti	imaret	Fatih mosque complex		Remzî (Sultân Mehmed 'imâretine mütevellî olmuş, sehl zemân geçmedin defterdâr olmuşdur)	1380
4	Ebî Eyyûb-ı Ensârî Vakfı	waqf	Eyüp		Latîfî, Yahyâ Beg (Ba'dehu rûzgâr anı vakf-ı Ebî Eyyûb-ı Ensârî'de sâhib-i kitâbet eyledi. Yahyâ Beg mütevellî ve Latîfî, kâtib-i cem' olup mütevellî şâ'ir ve kâtib şâ'ir oldı; vakf-ı Ebî Eyyûb meş'ar-ı şu'arâ oldı)	737
5	Sultân Mehmed Vakfı	waqf	Fatih mosque complex		Selmân-ı Aydınî (Eşâncı merhûm Sultân Mehmed mütevellîsi iken) Gazâlî, Eşâncı (Merhûm mutasarıf olduğu ayda bin akça Sultân Mehmed evkâfı zevâi'dinden ta'yîn olunmuş imiş. Ol vakt mütevellî-i vakf Eşâncı imiş ki ser-âmed-i zurefâ ve server-i 'urefâdur, Birâder'un ay başından birkaç gün önürdi zarûreti olup bu kıt'a ile vazîfesin ister)	998; 1656

D. PUBLIC SPACES						
	NAME	TYPE	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	PEOPLE ASSOCIATED	PAGE NUMBER
1	Çeşme	fountain	Yahûdîkapısı	Yahûdîkapısı'n da Arslancıbaşı tekyesi karşusunda	Ârifî (İstanbul'da iskelede bir çeşmeye [Yahûdî kapusunda taşrada olan çeşme mîriden bina olındukda] târîh ... dimişdür)	1037; 1332

					Kandî-i Müverrih (Yahûdikapısı'nda Arslancıbalı tekyesi karşusunda bînâ olunan çeşme)	
2	Müderriş çeşmesi	fountain	Beşiktaş		Müderriş (Niçe niçe yıllardur ki ol diyârda [Beşiktaş] gâh yapup gâh yıkup denizler toldurup topraklar kazdırup taşlar taşıdur. Gelüp ol mekâna mekîn ve ol engüşterîne nigîn olduğına ve ol mahalde çeşme binâ itdügine târîh dimişdür)	796-798
3	Begkozi	meadow	Beykoz		Andelîbî (Sultân Süleymân Begkozi nâm mevzide şikâr üzre iken Sebzi ile Andelîbî pâdşâhun ihsânı tama'ına birer kıt'a diyüp)	1129
4	Ca'fer-âbâd	meadow	Südlîce		Hayâlî-i Ma'rûf (Bir zemânda İstanbul'da Ca'fer-âbâd'da fasl-ı bahârda, bezm-i ashâbda, şeb-i meh-tâbda musâhabet olunurken İshâk Çelebi'nün eş'ârından sana kankısı eyü gelür diyü su'al eyledi)	1557
5	Eyyûb	meadow	Eyüp		Ca'ferî (Gel gör 'âşıklarınun âh u nâlesin ol gün Eyyûb'a varınca dinilen mersiyeler ile mü'ezzinlerün feryâd u 'alâlesin) Celâli (Eyyûb u Kâğıd-hâne çemenleri) Hâverî (Eyyûb'a ma'ân kâzî olup)	466; 469; 1507
6	Kâğıd-hâne	meadow	Kağıthane		Celâli (see column 17, page 121)	469
7	Şeyh Sinân Kuyı	meadow	Çatalca		Ferdî (Kavl itdük ki İstanbul etrafında Şeyh Sinân kuyı câniblerinde seyrân idevüz, aslda birbirümüzi kurbân idevüz)	1170
8	Tekye-bınarı	meadow	unknown		Ferdî, 'Âşık Çelebi (Bunun gibi zemânda ikimiz vâdilerde geşt ve seyr-i kûh u deşt iderken Tekye-bınarı dimekle ma'rûf câygâha varduk ki ol makâm bir hurrem sahn ve bir arsa-i	1171

					pehndür; her zemanda ser-sebz ü hurrem, gûyâ ki makâm-ı Hızr'dur ki sebzeler bitmişdür ol araya basduğı dem kadem.	
9	Dâvûd Paşa İskelesi	pier	unknown		Celâlî (see column 17, page 121)	469
10	Atmeydânı	public square	the Hippodrome		<p>Enverî, ‘Âşık Çelebi (Oğlan Şeyh'ün Atmeydânı'nda boynun urduklarında Enverî ile fakir anda bile hâzır idüm)</p> <p>Celâlî (bahâr sohbetlerinde ve hazân cem'iyetlerinde, Atmeydânı'nda bahâr sohbetlerinde ve hazân cem'iyetlerinde)</p> <p>Figânî, Na'tî, Nûhî (Atmeydânı seyrinde üçü aşkar göziyle seyrân iderler ve nokta-i şa'r gibi üçü bir ugardan şî'r üzre düşüp gâh müşâ'are idüp gâh münâzarada tab'ların imtihân iderlerdi)</p> <p>Kandî-i Müverrih, Yahyâ Beg, ‘Aşık Çelebi, Çeşmeli, Şâh Ahmed (Sene selâse ve erba'în ve tis'ami'e bayramı idi ki Atmeydânı 'idgâhında Yahyâ Beg'le Kandî ve hakîr seyr iderken Çeşmeli ile Şâh Ahmedî bir yirde turur gördük. Bu iki 'âşık biz ‘Âşıkâ ibrâm itdiler ki varup ikisi ile birer def'a 'id merhabâsın idem, tekrâr birer merhabâ dahı idüp bu merhabâ 'âşıklarunuzundur diyem. Hakîr dahı ikdâm idüp ikisiyle bile ikişer merhabâ idüp bireri benümdür ve bireri Yahyâ Beg'le Kandî'nündür, anların emânetidür didüm. Her biri gülüp nâz u 'işve ve şive vü kirişmeye bozdılar, gelüp haber virdüm)</p>	390; 469; 1203; 1333
11	Okmeydânı	public square	Okmeydanı		Ulûmî (anlar [yeniçeriler] Ok Meydânı'nda ok atardı, bu kemân ebrûlar vâsfında	1100

				hayâller bulmaga niçe şâ'irün yayın yasardı)	
12	Dîvân Yolu	road	walled city	Hasbî, Basîrî, Zâtî, Keşfî, Kandî (Şüyûh-ı şu'arâdan Basîrî ve Zâtî ve Keşfî ve Kandî cem' olup dîvân yolında [İbrâhîm] paşayı selâmlayup her biri medh ü cerîdeler virüp halâsa şefâ'at iderler)	615

E. RESIDENTIAL AREAS, RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES AND ENCLOSED GARDENS

	NAME	TYPE	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	PEOPLE ASSOCIATED	PAGE NUMBER
1	Dervîş Çelebi ve Sirkeci Bahşı'nın bâğçeleri	garden	Beşiktaş		Gazâlî (Yârân-ı kadîminden Hafîb Seydî oğlu Dervîş Çelebi dirler bir kâzî ve Sirkeci Bahşı demekle ma'rûf kimesne ki Beşiktaş semtinde bâğçeler idinüp tavattun itmişlerdi... Beşiktaş'ında bâğ u bâğçe ihdâs idüp anda ikâmet eylemişdür. Ol vaktten kendü anda kûşe-nîşin ve bâğçesi bihişt-berîndür... bâğçesinün bir cânibi memlû mîve-i turş u şîrîn ve bir cânibde sirke kâr-hânesi kurılıp niçe 'acemî oğlanları ol kâr-hânede hıdmete dâmen-çîn idi. Rivâyet iderler ki öyle maâyeli fuçuları ve küpleri var idi ki sâfî deniz suyun koysalar üç güne dek sirke olmakda hemîn idi. Ve bi'l-cümle bâğçesi kudret halvâları olan mîvelerle ve sûret-i zâhiden turş ve nasihât-ı vâ'izden telh sirkelerle gûyâ ki şîşe-i sirkencibîn idi. Derd-i humâra çâre soranlara turşu eyüdü dise haylice sirke hall itdün diyü yârân istihzâ iderlerdi; sirkesinden zevk idenler sâ'ir mey-hâneçilere Mısra: Göreyin mey-hâneçi sirken şarâb olsun senün diyü bed-du'âlar iderlerdi ve bir cânibden berş ü efyûn yübüsetiyle huşk-leb olanlar	1640-1644

					<p>latîf u ter âb-dâr u şîrînter mîvelerden gelu teri iftâr iderlerdi ve ba'zılar zâhid-i huşk zumına bâde-nûş olup tertîb-i dimâ' eyleseler sirke ve turşılarla def-i humâr iderlerdi. Turşıya müte'allik ne isteseler yanında makbûl idi. Aş yiren avretlere hıyar ve çükündür turşısı mebzûl idi. Sirkecilikle haylî kesb ü kârı vardı. İskender Çelebi'den sonra Hayrî'd-dîn Paşa konşılığında olduğün hod her tonanma oldukça gemiciler kumanyasıçün bir uyardan niçe yüz fuçı sirke satup forsa kâfirleri evi öninde bit sirke gibi kaynaşup karban kondurmış denlü kâr u bârı vardı. Kendü sohbet-perver olup her aşun hevici olup nohud gibi her kaba koysalar bile kaynardı. Bî-nazîr âş-pez idi, bulduğın yimege sarf idüp kendü eliyle bişürürdi, ferda gamın yimezdi. Egerçi kimsenün bişürdüğün begenmezdi ammâ yine bulduğın yirmezdi. Bişürdüğü halvâlar dil-ber lebi gibi halvâ-yı bî-dûd olurdu. Elinde bir çaşni vardı ki şeker katmasa kandâlûd olurdu. Bâğçesinün sîbleri âsîb-i teşnegîye şifâ, et şeftâlûleri lebi-i dil-ber gibi tâze vü ter, etmek ayvaları gûyâ zekân u nâf-ı dil-rübâ idi... Bâğçesi ta'tîl günleri 'ulemâya sohbetgâh ve sâ'ir ezmân zurefâ-yı erkâna ve rindân-ı ehl-i irfâna ve şu'arâ-yı dânişmendâna 'işretgâh idi. Erzâl u enzâl çeşm-i bed gibi dâmen -i gülşeninden dûr ve 'avâm-ı cühhâl 'ayn-ı hased gibi çemen-i encümeninden mehcûr idi. Ve kendünün hûb-çihreler ve hüsn ü cemâlden sâhib-behreler şevk ü şegâfî şöyle idi ki erbâb-ı sohbet içinde bir</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>mahbûb olsa rîş-i sefîdi ile yoluna cârû-keş olurdu ve reh-güzârına gird-i gerd-i bâğçeden gubâr irmemekçün dîde-i rûzgâr dîdesiyle âb-efşânlık idüp eşk-i hûnpâşî renginden yollar 'ayn-ı pây-endâz-ı münakkâş olurdu. Ol gün cûş u hurûşî deryâları güm güm ötdürürdi ve şevkle sürudi bâğçesinün bûlbüllerinün sıklığın dindirürdi. Şarâb içmedin ser-hûş ve esrâr yimedin bengi olurdu. Neşât u tarabdan gâh rakkâs ve gâh çengi olurdu. Gâh ak sakalıyla kahve-gerdân olurdu gâh hikâyât u nevâdir söyleyüp kıssa-hân olurdu. Kahveye gayet meyl iderdi, şerâbdan sad bâr yegdür dirdi... Sair ayvaları cennet ayvasından bihter belki çekirdegi bile cigerdeki niçe daye sebab-i küşayiş olup niçe teng-dilliliği def iderdi. Rıdvan enarın görse enarallahu burhanehu dir idi, incirin görse reşkinden bulsa cennet incirin yir idi.</p>	
2	Efşâncı'nın bâğçesi	garden	unknown	<p>Selmân-ı Aydınî (Merhûm [Efşâncı] zemânında zemîn kesmekle iştiyhârî zemînden âsmâna irmiş ve kesdüğü bâğ u bâğçelerden niçe in'âm şükûfelerin koparup selâtin ü ekâbirden câ'ize mîvelerin dirmiş. Kesdüğü hurûf zemânı kâtîblerün hurûf-ı hattîsine harf atar, bahâr kesse reyhâncılara otlar yoldurur, benefşeyi deste işidür diyü pullık pullık satardı. Niçe zemân hademe-i dîvândan ve küttâb-ı hazâ'in-i sultândan olup makbûl-ı vüzerâ vü erkân ve manzûr-ı a'yân olur... Ol hasretten Efşâncı bâğçesi demekle meşhûr bir bâğçe âbâd ider ve serv ü şimşâd kesretiyle reşk-i İrem-i zâtü'l-'imâd ider... Ol</p>	999

				<p>bagçede bu hâssa ve bu kerâmet 'aceb degüldür ki tâbiş-i mihr ve perveriş-i mâhdan gayrı ol bâğçeye sultân-ı serîr-i 'Osmânî sâye-i sultânî ancak İbrâhîm Paşayla gâh gâhî ba'z-ı sehergâhı pertev salup envâr u ezhâr u esmârî tâb ve ruhsârlarından reng ve mihr-i dîdârlarından tâb-ı lezzet ve güftârlarından çaşni ve cur'a-i câm-ı hoş-güvârlarından âb alurdu. Bu hâlle ehl-i irfânun zurâfası ve kavâbilün ezkiyâsıyla 'ömr sürerdi gâh aynek alup ve gâh şîşe-i meyden gözine götürüp çihre-i 'ıyş u neşât görürdi. Egerçi Kara Bâlî-zâde ekser-i ahvâlde buna müşârik ve ol dahı bu meydânda çâpük-süvâr-ı ma'ârikdür ammâ bu e'âlfî-karîn ü ahâlî-nişîn ve hem-dem-i 'ulemâ vü eşrâf idi... Âhir-i 'ömrinde bâğçesinün bir kûşesin mekteb idüp kabrin anda olmak vasiyyet itdi.</p>	
3	Hayâlî-i Ma'rûf'un bâğçesi	garden	Südlice	<p>Hayâlî-i Ma'rûf (Sahn'da olduğum zamanda ['Aşık Çelebi] hod İstanbul'dan Südlice'deki bâğçesine gitse gerek piyâde gerek süvâr gerek mest ve gerek hûşyâr hücreye ugrar bir mikdâr teneffüs ider eger ders okır bulinsam itmâma dek tevakkuf ider bârî hücre penceresinden 'ışk u meşk idüp yâ hû dir, beni bâğçeye bile alup giderdi. Süvâr ise atdan inüp beremeye dek piyâde-revlikle muvâfakat iderdi. Kezâlik İstanbul'da musâhabet ü müvâneset üzre idük. Yigirmi yıl hem-dem oldum, bir kavlınden remîde ve bir fi'linden rencîde olmadum)</p>	1549
4	İlmî-i Sâni'nin bâğçesi	garden	Galata	<p>İlmî-i Sâni (Galata'da harîc-sûrda... [b]âğçeleri ebrû-yı yâr-ı bahr-i hüsne haâle olduğı gibi deryâyâya müşrif</p>	1097-1098

				bir müşerref câygâhdı. Mecma'-ı şu'arâ vü zurefâ ve ârâmgâh-ı 'uşşâk-ı cângâhdı. Fi'l-cümle muhtasarât-ı 'ulûmdan âzmâyişi vardı)	
5	Muhyî'nin bâğçesi	garden	unknown	Muhyî (Bâğçesi heftede iki gün mecma'-ı fuzelâ ve erbâb-ı irfân idi. Meşâih-i 'ulemâ ve eşrâf u eali vü mevali astanına tereddüd iderlerdi. Ve pâdişâh u vüzera ahvalin ruz-be-ruz tefakkud iderlerdi)	792
6	Mustafâ Aga'nın bâğçesi	garden	unknown	Ferdî (Mustafâ Aga bâğçesiyle ma'rûf bâğçeye cân atdılar bir iki şeb u rûz anda 'ıyş-i dil-efrûz itdiler ve eyyu na'îmin lâ yukeddirihu'd-dehru [<i>Zaman hangi nimeti bulandırmamıştır ki!</i>] mücibince bir gice İstanbul'dan kapu açdurup sandal tonadup birkaç yayabaşları geldiler. <i>Kul isyân itdi, vüzerâ evin nehb ü gârete ve şehri yagma vü hasârete gitdiler</i> didiler. Aga mest ü lâ-ya'kil bulundu. Ortaya aldılar, gâh def gibi yüzine tabanca urdılar gâh ud gibi kulagın burdılar gâh elin ayagın ovdılar gâh başına sovuk sular koydılar. Sekrân u sergerân iken bir mikdâr ayıldı, bu haber-i vahşet-engîzi işitdükde yine bayıldı. Ba'de harâbi'l-Basra ne fâ'ide, bir sandala yükletdiler, nîm-mest ü pür-bîm-i cân İstanbul'a iletdiler)	1169
7	(Palak) Mustafâ Paşa bâğçesi	garden	unknown	Sadrî (Palak Mustafâ Paşa, Yûnus Paşa bâğçesin alup Ayâs Paşa'yı konakladuğı meclisde münâsebetle didüm diyü bu beyti okıyup temâm iftihâr iderdi... Merhûm Mustafâ Aga bâğçesinin köşkinde yazılan bu kıt'a dahı anundur. Kıt'a: <i>Bu kûşeyi ki gelüp bunda biz binâ itdük/Koyup gidenlere sabıkda biz du'â itdük</i>)	1288-1289

8	Mü'eyyed-zâde bânçesi	garden	Galata	Hâtemî (Rivâyet eylerdi ki Mü'eyyed-zâde bir gün Galata'da bânçesinde efâzıl-I 'Acem'den Monlâ İdrisi ve Kâzî-zâde'yi ve Şâh Mehemed'i ve Şâh Kâsım'ı ziyâfet itdi)	1498
9	Nişânî'nin bânç ve bânçesi	garden; vineyard	near Eyüp	Nişânî Beg (Ebî Eyyûb-i Ensârî civârında bânç u bânçce ve câmi' ü hammâm âbâdan itmişlerdi. Kendü anda sakin olup sohbetin hasr-ı ehl-i 'ilm ü irfân itmişlerdi)	874
10	Sâlih Çelebi'nin ev ve bânçesi	house; garden	Nişanca; Eyüp	Sâlih Çelebi, Nişancı (Ebî Eyyûb Ensârî civârında karındaşları Nişancı ihdâs itdüğü câmi'i kurbında ev ve bânçce itdiler)	1270
11	Mustafâ Aga'nın evi	house	near Fatih mosque complex	Ferdî ([Aga'nun] Sultân Mehemed-i merhûm 'imâretinün ahûrî kurbında taracık zükâk başında evi var imiş)	1167
12	Necâtî'nin evi	house	near Vefa square	Necâtî (Şeyh Vefâ meydânının altında kabri olan zâviye kurbında bir ev idinüp ekser-i evkâtın Mü'eyyed-zâde mülâzemetine hasr idüp bakiyye-i 'ömrin vakf-ı ülfet-i yârân-ı safâ ve sarf-ı sohbet-i ashâb-ı vefâ eyler)	874
13	Nihâlî'nin evi	house	Vefa mahallesi	Nihâlî (Evi Şeyh Vefâ mahallesinde olduğu takrîb ile Şeyh Vefâ hazîresinde defn olındı)	911
14	Zâtî'nin evi	house	Sarı Gürz Hamamı mahallesi	Zâtî (merhûmun evi Sarı Gürz Hammâmı mahallesinde... idi)	1588
15	Hayâtî'nin hânesi	house	Çemberlitaş	Hayâtî [ve karındaşı 'Alî Çelebi] (Sultân Selîm hammâmı kurbında bir latîf ü nâzûk hâne peydâ itdiler, hânelerin mecma'-ı şu'arâ vü zurefâ itdiler) Nişancı Celâl-zâde ([Hayâtî] hanesin Nişancı Celâl-zâde aldı)	637; 638
16	Kara Bâlî-zâde'nün hânesi	house	Kabataş	Figânî, 'Aşık Çelebi (Şâhid-perest idi ki guya anadan	1206-1208

				<p>togduđı gibi Őeker yirine leb-i dil-ber ile agzı aılımıŐı idi; meclisde dil-ber olmasa agzı dadıyla yimek yimezdi ve 'ayn-ı 'ıyŐ u iŐret gibi gzi iŐretle aılımıŐı ki 'ıyŐ u iŐret itmeduđı gni 'mrden dimezdi. Odası dil-berlerle kalb-i 'aŐık yâ deyr-i Ferhâr gibi pr nakŐ u nigârdı ve gyendeler  sâzendeler cem' olup saf saf otursalar gyâ ki musikârdı. Her Őeb sımât-ı kehkeŐana nukl-ı encm saılmadı ve câm-ı ufk rahık-i mrevvâk-ı Őafakla tolmadı anun bezm-i Őebânesi kurulurdu ve Zühre-i sâzende sazına nevâzende olmadı anun eng  egânesi nevbeti urulurdu ve her seher pİR-i felek sâgar-ı hurŐid ile def-i humâr itmedin ve dİde-i hufte-i 'âlem sekrân u sergerânlık def'i in eŐmesâr-ı hurŐiddin reŐaŐe-i eŐi"at ile yzin yumadı ol bezm-i sabhİ iderdi. Andan mukâta'acı iken dİvâna ve mtekâ'id iken ekâbir  a'yâna giderdi. Meclisi Őyle bi-tekellf idi ki isteyen Őem' gibi turur isteyen yatuk gibi yatur isteyen sâgar gibi yrrdi... Merhm-ı merkm Kara Bâlİ-zâde'nn hanesinde Őu'arâ v zurefâ cem' olmuŐı idi her biri erb-zebânlıklar ve ŐİrİN-beyânlıklar idp yanup yakılmakda Őem' olmuŐı idi... Figâni'yi deryâya mŐrif bir tahta-bendde dırabzına tayanmıŐ, deryâya nâzır grdm ammâ gâyet mell u mahzn... Bu halde Kara Bâlİ-zâde ıka geldi... Kara Bâlİ-zâde <i>nedr Figâni</i> <i>sebeb-i hayretn mey-i humardan gayrı zahmetn var mı...</i> Figâni'nn yzi gzi aılmayup âyİnesi gitdk eng-i gamla tondi.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

					Âhir envâ'-ı ilhâhdan sonra Figânî cevâb virdi ve didi ki <i>bir düş gördüm anı beliyet ü neketle yordum, sebab-i melalüm ve mucib-i infiâlüm oldur. Düşü sordular... Kara Bâlî-zâde gülüp didi ki bu vâkı'a hayrdur ne ihtimâl gayrdur... Bugün senünçün İskender Çelebi Efendi'ye varayın sana yâ Gümrük yâ Pencik kitâbetin alivireyin, ahşama komayayın berâtun yanumdan çıkarayın)</i>	
17	Kâtibi'nin hânesi	house	unknown		Kâtibî (Hânesi her zarîfe câ ve her yetîme mültecâ ve kâşânesi zurefâ-yı şu'arâ vü 'ulemâya menzil ü me'vâ idi... Sene seb'a ve erba'in ve tis'ami'ede reşk-i Nigâr-hâne-i Çîn bir kasr-ı cennet-temkîn binâ itdi. Zurefâ vü şu'arâdan şunlar ki ol hâne-i nüzhet-âbâdun âmed ü şud ile mu'tâd itdiler. Her birisi bu gûne târîh didiler [Kâmî, Müslim Çelebi, 'Abdî-i Zarîf Sabûhî, Hâtifi Çelebi, Yefîm); hânesi her zarîfe câ ve her yetîme mültecâ ve kâşânesi zurefâ-yı şu'arâ vü 'ulemâya menzil ü me'vâ idi)	693; 694
18	Nakkâş Bayram'ın hânesi	house	Vefa	Şeyh Vefâ meydânının altında kabri olan zâviye kurbında	Nakkâş Bayram (mahalle-i Vefâ'da sâkin olup 'ıyş u 'işret ile rûzgâr geçirüp ölince gicesi kadr ve gündüzi bayramdan yeg idi)	853
19	Seydî 'Alî Çelebi hânesi	house	unknown		Sabûhî (menzil ü mevası merhum Kâtibî Seydî 'Alî Çelebi hânesi ve her ne makâmı seyr eylese 'âkıbet karargâhı anun kâşânesi idi)	1284
20	İşkî-i Sâlis'in meskeni	house	Üsküdar	Cânib-i Üsküdar'da deryâyâ müşrif	İşkî-i Sâlis (Cânib-i Üsküdar'da deryâyâ müşrif müşerref bir ferruh u ferahbahş kenârda mesken ve şükûfezâr-ı cennet-âsada nişîmen tutdı. Zurefâ-yı erkânun sohbetgâhı ve sâ'ir yârânun melce' ü penâhı oldı. Gâh ekâbir bezmiyle reşk-i felek gâh mahbûblar cem'iyle mecma'-ı cem'-i	1090

					melek oldu. Gâh şu'arâ müşâ'aresiyle güm güm ötdi gâh 'ulemâ âvâzı kâ'inatı tutdı. Gâh 'ayyâşlar na'râsı vü surâhiler kulkulleri bağçesinün bülbüllerinün sıklığın dindürdi gâh mutrîbler nâgmesi vü sazlar elhâmı Zühreyi felek bamından bakdurdı gah sûfiler hûy u hâyı âftâba derâ'a vü taylasanın bırakturup semâ' itdürdi. Gâh şatranc-bâzlar ve nerrâdlar hengâmesi Müşterînün ma-melekin tas-ı felekde nerrad-ı reşke ütdürdi. Anda olan 'ıyş u işretler ve zevk u sohbetler gayretinden Zühre sermayeyi çaldurdu ve kamer külçesin kadeh-i haleye koydu. Hurşîd cam-ı Cemşîd-i döst-kâmîlerin çeküp şu'â-ı cur'aların bezme saçdı. Keyvân ehl-i bezme nühuseti irmesün diyü tokuzuncı feleke kaçdı. Ba'dehu yine ol meskeni tebdil itdi. Kevkeb-i tab'ı Üsküdar burcından Yenihisar evcine tahvil itdi)	
21	Hayâlî Beg'in odaları	room	Balat		Yahyâ (Sâza yasak olup Hayâlî Beg'ün Balat'da yapıdığı odalarında bir kahbe tutulup bî-günâh kendüye isnâd olındukda dimişdür)	680
22	Nişâncı Celâl-zâde'nin yurdu ve bâğçesi	house; garden	Eyüp	Ebî Eyyûb-ı Ensârî civârında	Nişâncı Celâl-zâde (Ebî Eyyûb-ı Ensârî civârında yurd bünyâd idüp bâğ-ı bihiştâsâ ve bağçe-i İrem-ârâ şükûfezâr-ı pür-reyâhîn ve hadâ'ık u besâtîn, nâdirü'l-üslûb hâneler ve tarz-ı mergûb kâşâneler âbâd itdiler)	637
23	Çatalca				Bahârî (Sinni hudûd-ı sittinde kendü Çatalca'da seb'in ile kâzî iken)	435
24	Galata				Celâlî (see column 17, page 121) Sultân Süleymân, Bâkî (Sene tis'a ve sittin ve tis'ami'ede	469; 414; 693; 784-786; 828; 1203; 1279;

				<p>zi'l-hiccesinün evâhirinde.... Sultân Süleymân-ı merhûm hamr getüren gemileri İstanbul ile Galata ortasında yakmak emr itdüklerinde Bâkî Çelebi bu gazeli diyüp)</p> <p>Kâtibî (Galata'dan kopmuş, tershâne kâtibi olmuş)</p> <p>Mahremî (Galata'da yigirmi yıl mikdârı niyâbet ve anunla kifâf-ı ma'îşet eyledi; İstanbul'a gelmege gemiye girüp yelken çözüp isa seren diyü engine saldı. Şâhin gibi kanat büküp gelürken karakuş gibi bir kâfir gemisi Mahremî gemisin pencesine aldı, [Mahremî] esîr oldu; [Mahremî'nün] zindeleri Galata'ya elüp esîrlikden halâs oldılar)</p> <p>Melîhî (nişîmeni harâbât ve mesîresi Galata'da deyr ü sumnât idi. Yahûdî hakîm- zâdelere mantık u hikmet ta'lîm iderdi)</p> <p>Sâlikî (bir zeman Galata 'azablarından oldu)</p> <p>Figânî, Na'tî, Nûhî (Ekser-i zemânda Na'tî ve Nûhî ve Figânî üçü zevâyâ-yı müselles gibi gâh odalarda müselles içerlerdi ve gâh mey-hâne sadrında geçüp murabba' oturmagçün Galata'ya geçerlerdi)</p> <p>Subhî (Galata'ya kâzî oldu)</p> <p>Kıyâsî (Bir zemân dahı Galata'da ve hâslarda niyâbet eyledi ve anunla kanâ'at eyledi)</p> <p>Şânî (Ekser-i Galata semtlerinde sâkin olurdu. Mısra: <i>Dervîş râ ser-â-ser kûy-ı fenâ besest</i> [Dervîşe en iyi yer fena köşesidir])</p>	<p>1335; 1408; 1380; 1382; 1507</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

				<p>mûcibince hânkâh kûşelerinde abdâl u ebrârla mukârin olurdu)</p> <p>Remzî (Galata'ya kâzî olup)</p> <p>Remzî Çelebi el-Kâzî (Galata ve sâ'ir mu'azzamât-ı kasabâta kâzî oldukdan sonra)</p> <p>Hâverî (Ol denli şeh-levendlik itmişdi ki Galata ile Eyyûb'a ma'ân kâzî olup Galata'ya vardukda şekerçi dükkânında bozun (?) şişeleri sensin ol diyü ana dört gözle bakarlardı. Tersâ-beçeler ezilmesün diyü mey-hâne çartaklarına çıkarlardı)</p>	
25	Hasköy			Celâlî (see column 17, page 121)	469
26	Edirnekapi			<p>Fevrî Efendi ([on Musa] Bir zemân kuzgunlarla Edirnekapi'sinde cenâze üzre savaşur oldu, Eyyûb cimrîleriyle kurbân eti üzre it gibi talaşur oldu. Bunlardan cimâr mantığın öğrenmekle sûhte kuzgunı şekline girüp her gece hatm du'asında ve her gün bir öli ıskâtında fukarâ ihtilâtında ve bi'l-cümle Burusalı Yavrulı Kuzgun ve Monlâ Gurâbî ki kuzgunluk hevâsında yüksek uçarlardı, bu onlara kuşum dimege kâdir oldu)</p>	1240-1241
27	İstanbul		travel; accommodation	<p>Ahmed Çelebi Pârepâre-zâde (Ma'zûl olsa yol harcına bir kitâbın satar ve İstanbul'a gelse mülâzemet harçlığıçün kitâbet iderdi)</p> <p>Elkâs Mîrzâ (İstanbul'a geldükde)</p> <p>Âhî (günlerde bir gün İstanbul'a irdi)</p> <p>Penâhî (Sultân Selîm-i merhûmun cülûsından sonra İstanbul'a gelüp)</p>	315; 374; 392; 428; 465; 469; 623; 666; 737; 756; 840; 872; 880; 900; 1005; 1017; 1043; 1064; 1067; 1075; 1224; 1335; 1377;

		<p>Ca'ferî (Sene ihdâ ve erba'în ve tis'ami'ede ki hakîr İstanbul'a geldüm)</p> <p>Celâlî (İstanbul'a geldükde)</p> <p>Hasan Çelebi ('arabaya binüp İstanbul'a giderken ve gâh tâlî'i gâh felek ile ceng iderken Mudanya civârında 'arabası şikest olur)</p> <p>Yetîm (bölük halkı zümresinden olmak ümmîdine Konya'dan İstanbul'a döndi)</p> <p>Latîfî (Hudûd-ı sene hamsinde İstanbul'a hicret ve anda ikâmete 'azîmet itdi)</p> <p>Lâyihî (İstanbul'da turamayup vatanı Siroz'a dek taban urdı)</p> <p>Mesîhî-i Ermenî (Ticâret vâyesi ve elinde olan endek mâyesiyle Rûm'a gelüp İstanbul ve Edirne'de niçe yıl turdı)</p> <p>Nişânî Beg (İstanbul'a geldüklerinde bu şi'r-redîf gazeli didiler)</p> <p>Nizâmî (Sultân Mehemed-i merhûm mezkûr İstanbul'a da'vet eylemiş, yolda gelürken ecel irüp âhirete rihlet eylemiş)</p> <p>Nûhî (İstanbul'a gelüp ol vakt hazînedârbaşı Dâvûd Paşa idi, ana hıdmete sülûk itdi)</p> <p>Selîkî (İstanbul'a gelürken kirâcılar ile incişüp Dobrıca nâm kasabada Deliorman içinde mâl u menâli ve ehl ü 'iyâli ile mefkûd olup ölusi vü dirisi bilinmeyüp 'aceb hâl oldı)</p>	<p>1526; 1532-1533; 1541; 1561; 1573; 1613</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Seyfî (Nûh adlı bir oğlu İstanbul'da şuglda iken bu manzûm mektûbı yazup göndermişdür)</p> <p>'Abdî (Kazâya tâlib oldu, hele birkaç gün akçalanayım diyü İstanbul'a nâ'ib oldu) Özrî (Rodos seferinde İstanbul'a vardukta bermucîb-i âyîn-i kavîm-i kâdim pâdşâha sunar bir takvîm)</p> <p>Azmî (Çünkü şeh-zâdenün [Sultân Mehemmed] kemâli zevâle irdi, kulları İstanbul'a geldi)</p> <p>Ferrûhî, 'Âşık Çelebi (Hudûd-ı isneyn ve erba'în ve tis'ami'ede haccdan gelüp siyâh sarınup İstanbul'a gelmişdi. Hakîr ol vakt görüp musâhabet itmişdüm)</p> <p>Fevrî Efendi (İstanbul'a geldüklerinde şuyûh-ı muhaddisîn ve sâ'ir kibâr-ı 'ulemâ-yı yakînden mücâz ve şî'r-i 'Arabîde dahı mümtâz geldi)</p> <p>Kıyâsî (Şugl için İstanbul'a gelüp tarîk-i 'ilme mülâzemet u efâzıl hîdmetlerinde ... fazilet eyledi)</p> <p>Refîkî (Monlâ [Kemâl Paşazâde] müftî oldukdan sonra dahı ekser-i zemânda İstanbul'a gelüp monlâyı sıla ider imiş)</p> <p>Husrev (İstanbul u Galata ve Hâslar ve Üsküdar'a kâzî [olup])</p> <p>Hızrî (Dedesı ki İstanbul kâzısı evvel ol olmuşdur ... İstanbul'a gelüp Taşköprizâde İstanbul kâzısı bulunup yine almak câ'iz oldu)</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Hayâlî-i Ma'rûf (sâ'idlerine kullâb ve miyânına zencîr, gûşına halka vü gerdenine tavk idüp İstanbul'a bile gelür gider; İstanbul'dan Vardârî Günâhî'nin mektûbı geldi)</p> <p>Zâtî (şir'e heves idüp İstanbul'a gelüp remli kifâf-ı ma'âşa husûl-ı mültemes idüp Edirne ve İstanbul'da 'ömr geçürmişdür)</p> <p>Gubârî (Evvel hâlinde İstanbul'da tahsilde olup)</p>	
28	İstanbul	<p>death</p> <p>Basîrî (Merhûm sinni hudûd-ı seb'inde iken sene ihdâ ve erba'inde mahrûse-i İstanbul'da rihlet eylemişdür)</p> <p>Vasfî-i Sirozî (Bir def'a haste olup İstanbul'da vefâtı haberi şâyî' olup mansıbın âhere virürler sonra sag çıkup sıhhati haberi gelür, mevti gayr-ı vâkı' olur)</p> <p>Sehâyî ('Irâkeyn seferinde Ferîdî ile bir yılda İstanbul'da fevt olmuşlardır)</p> <p>Zînetî (sâli selâsine varmadın günü tutıldı Sahn'da dânişmend iken eyyâm-ı cevânîde hasret ü mihnetle fevt oldı)</p> <p>'Ârifî (Sene tis'a ve hamsinde İstanbul'da dâr-ı âhirete sefer itdi)</p> <p>'Arşî (İstanbul kâzîsı Mi'mâr-zâde dânişmend iken mat'ûnen İstanbul'da şehid oldı)</p> <p>Kâdirî (ba'zı maslahat için İstanbul'a geldükde Üsküdar'da vedâ'-ı 'âlem-i bî-sebât itmişdür)</p>	<p>423; 561; 587; 1009; 1034; 1067; 1309; 1394; 1633</p>

					Revnâk (Samsunlu-zâde İstanbul kâzısı iken mütakâ'id olmuştu)	
					Garîbî (Sehl müddetden gelüp sene erba'a ve hamsîn ve tis'ami'ede İstanbul'da eceli yitdi)	
29	Silivri		extra muros		Ahmed Çelebi Pârepâre-zâde (Haylî zemân Silivri'de kâzî olmuşdur)	315
30	Tatavla		Galata	Galata'nun üsti yanında Tatavla nâm karye	Mahremî (Galata'nun üsti yanında Tatavla nâm karyedür maskat-ı re'si ammâ İstanbul ve Galata'da hâsıl olmuşdur neşv ü nemâsı)	784
31	Üsküdar				Sihri-i Sâni (Rüstem Paşa ba'de'l-'azl yine vezîr olup Üsküdar'dan gelüp dîvân-ı 'âlîde yine sadr-ı vezârete geçdükte didi)	959
32	Yenibâğçe				Revânî (Sultân Selîm-i merhûm Yenibâğçe'de konmuş idi ve cümle kapu halkı ve yeniçeri cem' olup merhûm otag öninde iskemleye de oturup)	1388
33	Ahurkapısı Mahallesi	neighborhood	Ahırkapı		Nakşî (İstanbul'dan Ahurkapısı mahallesinden idi)	891
34	Akserâybâzârı Mahallesi	neighborhood	walled city		Vâlî (Mahrûse-i İstanbul'dan Akserâybâzârı mahallesindendir)	549
35	Âşık Paşa Mahallesi	neighborhood	unknown		Dervîş Çelebi (Mahrûse-i İstanbul'dan 'Âşık Paşa mahallesinden bir yaya-başımın oğludur)	521
36	Dâvûd Paşa Mahallesi	neighborhood	extra muros		Câmî (Dâvûd Paşa mahallesinden kulogullarından) Sebzî (İstanbul'dan Dâvûd Paşa mahallesinden hafız ü cüz'-hân yârândandır)	453; 943
37	Emîr Buhârî Mahallesi	neighborhood	unknown; probably near Fatih		Tâbî-i Sâni (İstanbul'da Emîr Buhârî mahallesindendir) Sâni (Emîr Buhârî mahallesinde olurdu)	1475; 1483

38	Güngörmez Mahallesi	neighborhood	unknown		İstanbul'da Güngörmez mahallesi seyrinden bedel mülk-i zulemâta girdiler	205
39	Gürânî Mahallesi	neighborhood	unknown		Kâbilî (İstanbul'da Gürânî mahallesinden)	1307
40	Haseki Sultân Mahallesi	neighborhood	walled city		Hüdâyî (İstanbul'dan Haseki Sultân mahallesindedür)	537
41	Yidi Kulle	wall	walled city	burûc-ı seb'aya mümâsil olan Yidikulle'yi ta'mîr idüp ol hısn-ı hasîni ki sûrı mıntıka-i zâtü'l-burûca ta'n eyler	Sultân Mehemed, Mahmûd Paşa (mazhâr-ı gazab olup Yidi Kulle'de niçe gün habs iderler, âhir katl idüp telef-i nefis iderler) 'Azîzî (Yidikulle'nün merd-i hisârıdır, gûyâ Yidikulle mevc ile kenâre çıkmış bir sadefdür, içinde ol dürr-i şehvâridür)	190; 1057; 1074
42	Güngörmez Serâyı	palace	unknown	Rûy-ı zemîni serâdan süreyyâya dek teshîr-i şemşir-i cihân-gîrî itdüğine delâlet itmek için Güngörmez serâyın mahzen-i defâ'in eyledi	Sultân Mehemed	190
43	Ketâyûn Serâyı	palace dungeon	unknown	Üsküdar karşısında	Hasbî (Üsküdar karşısında olan Ketâyûn serâyı dimekle ma'rûf kal'ada mahbûs-ı ebed ider. On yıl anda mahbûs-ı ebed kaldı)	616

REFERENCES

- Ahdî. (2018). *Gülşen-i- şu'arâ*. S. Solmaz (Ed.). Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı.
<https://ekitap.ktb.gov.tr/Eklenti/56733,ahdi-gulsen-i-suarapdf.pdf?0>
- Algar, H. Jâmî and the Ottomans. (2018). In T. d'Hubert&A. Papas, (Eds.), *Jâmî in regional Contexts: The reception of 'Abd al-Rahmân Jâmî's works in the Islamicate work* (63-135). Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Ali Emîrî. *Mir'âtü'l-fevâid mukaddimesi ve mir'âtü'l-fevâ'id fi terâcimi meşâhîri âmid* (2014). G. Kut, M. Ögmen, A. Demir (Eds.). vols. 2. Ankara: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı Yayınları.
- Andrews, W. G. (1970). *The tezkere-i şu'arâ as a source for the critical evaluation of Ottoman poetry* (PhD diss.). University of Michigan.
- Andrews, W. G. & Kalpaklı M. (2005). *The age of beloveds: love and the beloved in early-modern Ottoman and European culture and society*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Andrews, W.G. (2008). Gardens-real and imagined-in the social ecology of early modern Ottoman culture. In Michel Conan (Ed.), *Garden imagination: historical forms and cultural roles* (91-115). Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium Series in the History of Landscape Architecture.
- Âşık Çelebi. (2018). *Meşâi'irü's-şu'arâ*. F. Kılıç (Ed.). Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Andrews, W. G. & Dalyan, A. (2019). İki farklı Latifi tezkiresi ve nüshaları. *Bellekten* 68, 49-68.
- Artan, T. (2012). Forms and forums of expression: Istanbul and beyond, 1600-1800. C. Woodhead (Ed.), In *The Ottoman world* (378-496). New York: Routledge.
- Aynur, H. (2000). Cem şairleri. *İlmî araştırmalar* 9, 33-43.
- Aynur, H. (2010). Autobiographical elements in Aşık Çelebi's dictionary of poets. In R. Elger & Y. Köse (Eds.). *Many ways of speaking about the self: Middle Eastern ego-documents in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish (14th-20th century)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, Verlag.
- Aynur, H. (2015). Şehri sözle resmetmek. In Ç. Yılmaz (Ed.), *Büyük İstanbul tarihi*, vol. VII (128-145). İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş. Yayınları.

- Aynur, H. & Niyaziođlu, A. (Eds.). (2011). *Áşık Çelebi ve şairler tezkiresi üzerine yazılar*. İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Baer, M. D. (2014). *Atmeydanı'nda ölüm: 17. yüzyıl İstanbul'unda toplumsal cinsiyet, hoşgörü ve ihtida*. P. Yanardağ (Trans.). İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi.
- Birkandan, A. E. (2011). *Metinlerden tasvirlerle yansıyan yüzler: musavver bir meşâ'irü'ş-şu'arâ nüshasının portreleri* (PhD diss.). İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi.
- Chester Beatty Library, T. 439, fol. 9.
- Çaksu, A. (2007). Janissary coffeehouses in the late eighteenth-century Istanbul. In Dana Sajdi, (Ed.), *Ottoman tulips, Ottoman coffee: leisure and lifestyle in the eighteenth century* (117-132). London; New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Çavuşođlu, M. (1976). Kanunî devrinin sonuna kadar Anadolu'da Nevâyi tesiri. E. Güngör & M. Kafalı & O. F. Sertkaya & S. Gömeç (Eds.), *Atsız armađanı* (75-90). İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları.
- Delice, S. (2015). The janissaries and their bedfellows: masculinity and male friendship in eighteenth-century Ottoman Istanbul. In G. Özyeđin, (Ed.), *Gender and sexuality in Muslim cultures* (634-649). Farnham: Ashgate.
- Devletşâh. (1977). *Tezkire-i Devletşâh*. N. Lugal (Trans.). İstanbul: Tercüman.
- Emami, F. (2016). Coffeehouses, urban spaces, and the formation of the public sphere in Safavid Isfahan. *Muqarnas* 33, 177-220.
- Eremya Çelebi. (1952). *İstanbul tarihi*. H. D. Andreasyan (Trans. and Ed.). İstanbul: Kutulmuş Basımevi.
- Evliyâ Çelebi (2013). *Evliyâ Çelebi seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 1. Robert Dankoff & Seyit Ali Kahraman & Yücel Dađlı (Eds.). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Faroqhi, S. N. & Öztürkmen, A. (Eds.). (2014). *Celebration, entertainment and theater in the Ottoman world*. Calcutta: Seagull Books.
- Faroqhi, S. N. & Fleet, Kate. (Eds.). (2013). *The cambridge history of Turkey*, vol. II, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fleischer, C. H. (1986). *Bureaucrat and intellectual in the Ottoman empire: the historian Mustafa Âli (1541-1600)*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Gratien, C. & Polczynski, M. & Shafir, N. (2014). Digital frontiers of Ottoman studies. *Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish studies association* 1 (1-2), 37-51.
- Hamadeh, S. and Kafesciođlu, Ç. (Eds.). (2021). *A companion to early modern Istanbul*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.

- Hamadeh, S. (2018). *The city's pleasures: Istanbul in the eighteenth century*. University of Washington Press.
- Havliođlu, D. (2017). *Mihri Hatun: performance, gender bending, and subversion in Ottoman intellectual history*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Heyd, U. (1953). The Jewish communities of Istanbul in the seventeenth century. *Oriens* 6 (2), 299-314.
- Işın, E. (Ed.). (2007). *Ali Emîri efendi ve dünyası: Millet yazma eser kütüphanesi'nden bir seçme*. İstanbul: Pera Müzesi Yayınları.
- İnalcık, H. (2013). *Şair ve patron: patrimonial devlet ve sanat üzerinde sosyolojik bir inceleme*. Ankara: Dođu Batı Yayınları.
- İnalcık, H. (2018). *Has-bağçede 'ayş u tarab*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- İpekten, H. (1996). *Divan edebiyatında edebî muhitler*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- İsen-Durmuş, T. (2009). *Tutsan elini ben fakirin: Osmanlı edebiyatında hâmilik geleneđi*. İstanbul: Dođan Kitap.
- İsen-Durmuş, T. (2006). *II. Selim dönemi sonuna kadar Osmanlı edebi hâmilik geleneđi* (PhD diss.). Bilkent Üniversitesi.
- Kafadar, C. (1993). Myth of the golden age: Ottoman historical consciousness in the post-Süleymânîc era. In H. İnalcık & C. Kafadar (Eds.), *Süleymân the second and his time* (37-48). İstanbul: The ISIS Press.
- Kafadar, C. (2007). A rome of one's own: Reflections on cultural geography and identity in the lands of rum. *Muqarnas* 24, 7-25.
- Kafesciođlu, Ç. (2009). *Constantinopolis/Istanbul: cultural encounter, imperial vision, and the construction of the Ottoman capital*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.
- Kafesciođlu, Ç. (2014). Viewing, walking, mapping Istanbul, ca. 1580. *Mitteilungen des kunsthistorischen institutes in Florenz* LVI, 17-35.
- Kafesciođlu, Ç. (2020). Picturing the square, streets and denizens of early modern İstanbul: Practices of urban space and shifts in visuality. *Muqarnas* 37, 139-177.
- Kafesciođlu, Ç. (2008). The Ottoman imperial capital: İstanbul between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries. In Tania Velmans (Ed.), Lucca Mezzetti (Trans.), *Bizansio, Constantinople, İstanbul* (251-319). Milan: Editoriale Jaca Book.
- Karacasu, B. (2007). Eski Türk edebiyatında şehir-engîzler. *Türkiye araştırmaları literatür dergisi* 10, 259-313.

- Karaismailođlu, A. (1988). Türk edebiyatı kaynaklarından “Tuhfe-i Sâmî” ve altıncı bölümün tercümesi. *Türk dünyası arařtırmaları* 57, 178-186.
- Khoury, D. R. (2000). Terlikler kapıda mı, kapalı kapılar ardında mı: Ev içinde ve kamusal mekânda Musullu kadınlar. In M. C. Zilfi, (Ed.), N. Alpay (Trans.), *Modernleşmenin dđiğinde Osmanlı kadınları* (103-124). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Kırlı, C. (2000). *The Struggle over Space: Cofffeehouses of Ottoman Istanbul* (PhD diss.) Binghamton University.
- Kim, S. (2018). *The last of an age: the making and unmaking of a sixteenth-century Ottoman poet*. London: Routledge.
- Knowles, K. A. & Hillier, A. (2008). *Placing history: how maps, spatial data, and GIS are changing historical scholarship*. Redlands: ESRI Press.
- Kuru, S. S. (2000). *A sixteenth-century scholar: deli birader and his dafi’ü’l-gumûm ve rafi’ü’l humûm* (PhD diss.). Harvard University.
- Kut, G. (1984). *Heřt Bihiřt’in yeni bir nüshası ve bir düzeltme*. *Journal of Turkish studies* 7, 293-301.
- Latîfî. *Tezkiretü’ş-şu’arâ ve tabsiratü’n-nuzamâ* (2018). R. Canım (Ed.). Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları.
<https://ekitap.ktb.gov.tr/Eklenti/60327,latifi-tezkiretus-suara-ve-tabsiratun-nuzamapdf.pdf?0>
- Latîfî. (1977). *Risâle-i evsâf-ı İstanbul*. N. S. Pekin (Ed.). İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of the space*. D. Nicholson-Smith (Trans.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Levend, A. S. (1958). *Türk edebiyatında řehr-engizler ve řehr-engizlerde İstanbul*. İstanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti İstanbul Enstitüsü Yayınları.
- Macaraig, N. (2019). *Çemberlitař hamamı in Istanbul: The biographical memoir of a Turkish bath*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Meřâi’irü’ş-şu’arâ or tezkere of ‘Âřık Çelebi*. (1971). G. M. Meredith-Owens (Ed.). London: Luzac.
- Mustafa Âli. (2003). *Mevâ’idü’n-nefâ’is fî kavâ’idi’l-mecâlis (tables of delicacies concerning the rules of social gatherings)* Douglas S. Brookes (Trans. and Ed.). Cambridge: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations. Harvard University.
- Necipođlu, G. (1992). A Kânun for the state, a canon for the arts: conceptualizing the classical synthesis of Ottoman arts and architecture. In Gilles Veinstein, (Ed.), *Soliman le Magnifique at son tems: actes du colloque de Paris*,

galeries nationales du Grand Palais, 7-10 Mars 1990 (195-216). Paris: La Documentation Française.

- Necipoglu, G. (1996). Dynastic imprints on the cityscape: The collective message of funerary imperial mosque complexes in Istanbul. In Jean-Louis Bacqué-Grammont, (Ed.), *Colloque Internationale: Cimetières et traditions funéraires dans le monde islamique* (23-36). Paris: C.N.R.S.
- Necipoglu, G. (1997). The suburban landscape of sixteenth-century Istanbul as a mirror of classical ottoman garden culture. In Attilio Petruccioli, (Ed.), *Gardens in the time of the great Muslim empires: theory and design* (32-71). Leiden: Brill.
- Nevîzâde Atâyî. (2017). *Hadâikü'l-hakâik fî tekmileti'ş-şakâik: Nev'izâde Atâyî'nin şakâ'ik zeyli*. S. Donuk (Ed.). Vol. I. İstanbul: Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı.
- Özbaran, S. (2004). *Bir Osmanlı kimliği: 14.-17. yüzyıllarda rûm/rûmi aidiyet ve imgeleri*. İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi.
- Özel, O. (2001). Avarız ve cizye defterleri. In H. İnalçık & Ş. Pamuk, (Eds.) *Osmanlı Devleti'nde bilgi ve istatistik* (35-50). Ankara: Başbakanlık Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü.
- Peçevi. (1980). *Târih-i Peçevi*. F. Ç. Derin & V. Çabuk (Eds.). İstanbul: Enderun.
- Peirce, L. (2000). Beyond harem walls: Ottoman royal women and the exercise of power. In O. D. Helly & S. M. Reverby (Eds.), *Gendered domains: Rethinking public and private in women's history* (40-55). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Peirce, L. (2003). *Ahlak oyunları: 1540-1541 Osmanlı'da Ayntab mahkemesi ve toplumsal cinsiyet*. Ülkü Tansel (Trans.). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Pello, S. (2015). Persian poets on streets: the lore of Indo-Persian poetic circles in late Mughal India. In Francesca Orsini and Katherine Butler Schofield, (Eds.), *Telling and texts: music, literature and performance in North India* (303-325). Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.
- Sehî Beg (2017). *Heşt bihişt*. H. İpekten & G. Kut (Eds.). Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı.
ekitap.ktb.gov.tr/Eklenti/56165,hest-bihistpdf.pdf?0&_tag1=03EE5380B678F1063BF0A9ED54D2FA0DD771F0E5&crefer=C0F9CA80211A045569AE05C2E542CC93388006144656F913B11D6E8BDFABDD8F
- Seng, Y. (1999) Invisible women: Residents of early sixteenth century Istanbul. In Gavin R. G. Hambly, (Ed.), *Women in the medieval Islamic world* (241-268). New York: St. Martin's Press.

- Sharma, S. (2004). The city of beauties in Indo-Persian poetic landscape. *Comparative studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 24 (2), 73-81.
- Stewart-Robinson, J. (1971). Ahdî and his biography of poets. In C. E. Bosworth, (Ed.), *Iran and Islam (557-564)*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Stewart-Robinson, J. (1965). The Ottoman biographies of poets. *Journal of Near Eastern studies* 24 (1/2), 57-74.
- Stewart-Robinson, J. (1964). The tezkere genre in Islam. *Journal of Near Eastern studies* 23 (1), 57-65.
- Tıǧlı, F. (2007). Klâsik Türk edebiyatında şehrengiz çalışmaları hakkında bibliografya denemesi. *Turkish studies* 2 (4), 763-770.
- Tolasa, Harun (2002). *Sehî, Lâtîfi ve Âşık Çelebi tezkirelerine göre 16. yüzyılda edebiyat araştırma ve eleştirisi*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Tosh, J. (2010). *The pursuit of history: aims, methods and new directions in the study of modern history*. Harlow: Longman.
- Yerasimos, S. (1995). La communauté juive d'Istanbul a la fin du XVI siècle. *Turcica* 27, 101-130.