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1 In my book An Ottoman Mentality I characterized Evliyâ’s view of Europeans in comparison with other groups, such as Turks, Jews, Iranians, etc., as follows:

   Europeans are always referred to disparagingly: Fireng-i pür-reng, Fireng-i bed-reng, İfrenc-i pür-renç (tricky Franks). Yet, the overall negative judgment that these terms imply does not hinder his positive evaluation of aspects of their civilization. On the personal level, Evliyâ had no problem befriending individual Europeans. In Vienna he hobnobbed with a German physician who knew some Turkish and whom he used as an informant for phrases in German and Italian. He became so absorbed watching this physician’s treatment of a patient with dropsy that he delayed returning to the Ottomans’ quarters until the time when the gates of Vienna are closed, and when he did return in the late evening he regaled the envoy, Kara Mehmed Pasha, with the amazing operation he had just observed...

   Another Viennese associate was the son of Marshall De Souche, with whom he became very close friends (gayet yakın dost), and who allowed him to inspect the Habsburg munitions. He also befriended the Moscovite envoy during his travels in southern Russia, and expressed reluctance to leave him behind after returning to Azov in 1667; for which his Crimean host reproached him in the following terms: You have travelled so much in the land of the infidels that you have fallen in love with the infidels (Kâfiristanda geze geze kâfîrlere mahabbet etmişsin).¹

2 In Evliyâ’s terminology, Kafiristan and Frengistan are more or less coterminous. We may loosely translate Kafiristan as “Christendom” and Frengistan as “Europe.” But we should keep in mind that Kafiristan would not include the Christian populations of the Ottoman Empire, nor would Frengistan include what today we call Eastern Europe. So did Evliyâ “fall in love” with the kâfrs, meaning in particular the Europeans? More generally we may ask: What was Evliyâ’s attitude toward the Europeans, or the Franks as he calls them? To answer this, I will analyze his judgments on various levels: religious, political, social, technological and scientific, moral, and aesthetic.
Religious level

The designation of Europeans as kâfir encapsulates Evliyâ’s religious attitude, a prejudgment, no doubt typical of Ottoman attitudes, as people on the other side, who hold mistaken beliefs and who are worthy objects of warfare considered as gazâ or jihad. While this underlying sentiment is clearly present, it is not held in a doctrinaire fashion. So, for example, while he readily assimilates icons and statues in churches to “idols”, he also is at pains to record conversations with priests where he takes an ironic stance, even mocking his own prejudice, as in the Stephansdom in Vienna:

There are so many statues and icons in this church, images of the sons of Adam, and so many idols — I had not seen so many since the conquest of Uyvar when I toured the great cathedrals of Poland, Czechia, Sweden, Hungary, Dunkerque, and the port of Danzig. I was on good terms with several priests and, partly as polemic, partly in jest, I said:

‘How many gods you have — God forbid! — that whenever you pass by one of them, you remove your hats and bow down and worship.’

‘God forbid,’ they replied, ‘that we should consider them gods. The sole Creator of you and of us is God, the Holy Spirit. God forbid that we should bow down and worship these images, or that we should pray to them for sons and daughters, blessings and worldly fortune and long life. They are only images of our prophet Jesus and his disciples, of our saints who came afterward and our monarchs who were world conquerors and pious endowers of good works. Whenever we behold these images, we respectfully offer our benedictions. Most of all, we show reverence to the prophet Jesus, because he is the Spirit of God [Rûhullâh, a designation of Jesus, based on Koran 4:171 a spirit from Him]. In our religion, it is permitted to make images. When our priests harangue the people, just as your sheikhs do, they have difficulty conveying their message with fine words alone. So we convey the message through images of the prophets and saints and paradise, depictions of divine glory. And we show hell with demons, flaming fire and boiling water, depictions of divine wrath. When our priests give sermons, they point to these images saying, ‘Fear God!’ But we do not worship them in any way.’

Evliyâ expresses his admiration for the artistry in these images, as in the architecture of the cathedral, in hyperbolic terms. He goes so far as to suggest divine inspiration, when he speaks of

a jeweled gallery reserved for kings, the work of a German master who truly demonstrated his skill. The master architects of old expended their best efforts and the master builders executed their finest work on this gallery and on this highly wrought church. No ancient architect on the face of the earth produced such a masterpiece. Only the Eternal Master (üstâd-e ezel, i.e. God) could inspire such a marvelous work.

Political level

On the political level, the Franks — more precisely, the Habsburg and the Venetians — are enemies of the Ottomans. Evliyâ depicts himself as fully engaged in combatting them, most prominently in the battle on the Raab (battle of St. Gotthard) and in the siege of Candia, as well as participating in diplomatic missions. In Dubrovnik / Ragusa he expresses his suspicions of Frankish wiliness (as opposed to Ottoman straightforwardness):
Despite the fact that they have renewed their treaty with the Ottomans every year since Orhan Gazi, still they are like the great plague under the wing of the Ottoman state, damnable swine who maintain the pretense of truth but whose satanic machinations infect all the infidels. To be specific: it is these Dubrovnik infidels who have led astray those of the great Bundukani Venedik — the Venetians, who are now our enemy — and secretly supply them with grain. They are the wealthiest of all the infidel kings, but make a show of poverty and humility in order to protect their state, and craftily maintain peaceful relations with all other rulers.  

Having got this off his chest, he goes on to praise the courtesy and kindness they showed the Ottoman envoys. And he relates a hilarious incident about Abaza Pasha’s antics that hardly reflects well on Ottoman diplomatic practice. As for Ottoman straightforwardness, or naïveté, in contrast to the crafty Europeans — this is a theme that Evliyâ sounds in contrast to Persian trickiness as well, so we can extrapolate that his arrière-pensée is to warn Ottoman diplomats to be as cagey as their enemies.

Social level

Law and order (zabt u rabt) is what Evliyâ misses at home and admires, say, in Vienna:

Everything in this city is praiseworthy, but especially noteworthy are all the physicians and surgeons, phlebotomists and oculists, painters and watchmakers, musket manufacturers and lathe turners; the cleanliness of the streets; the law and order maintained by the magistrates; the uniformity of scales and the honesty of merchants in the marketplace; the practice of justice and the fact that the subjects of the realm live in tranquility and are not subject to oppression.... The people live amicably among themselves and are hospitable to strangers. And all their provinces enjoy security — God bless them! Such security and practice of justice cannot be found in the lands of Islam.

By “lands of Islam” Evliyâ means the Ottoman Empire, since he has a very similar positive judgment about Safavid Iran:

With such officers they maintain law and order in Tebriz, exercising justice like that of Anushirvan [referring to the 6th-century Sassanian king, proverbial for his just rule], such that no one can lay a hand on even a mustard seed of anyone else.... But let me express my boundless admiration for the justice of his [the Safavid governor’s] administration, the safety and security of the city, his fostering care for his subjects, the law and order, the cleanliness of the marketplaces, the schedule of fixed prices of Sheikh Safi [referring to the eponymous founder of the Safavids, Safi al-Din Ardabili, d. 1334] and the prevailing orderliness.

These contrast with his judgment of prevailing conditions among the Ottomans:

In Anatolia, Celali rebels and outlaws and irregulars — such as İşpir Paşa and Seydi Ahmed Paşa and Tayyaroğlu Ahmed Paşa and Mirzâ Paşa and Kara Hasan Paşa — ravage the countryside and destroy the subjects of the realm. As long as they are ruining the provinces, no vizier is able to exercise authority, practice law and order and justice, and exact tax revenue.

So we can say that Evliyâ’s admiration of law and order in Europe, as in Iran, is a vehicle for his critique of the Ottoman Empire. The same holds true for other positive things he says about Europe, such as his remarks about currency. In chapter 3 of my book, An Ottoman Mentality, which deals with Evliyâ’s “Ottomaness,” I wrote:

In general, Evliyâ bemoans the poor condition of the Islamic regions (İslam diyarı) compared to Christendom (Kafiristan). Describing the Venetian gold ducats circulating in Split in 1660, he remarks:
“In the period of Sultan Ahmed [I, reg. 1603-17] I saw many of these in my father’s possession. But these days we never see them — even viziers don’t have them. We get by with pennies and coppers weighing ten a dram. God grant us blessings! What has happened to our zeal for Islam? We have to get our currency into good order!”

Struck by the huge crowds gathered at Christmas time in Kaschau / Kosice (Slovakia) Evliyâ marvels at God’s ways, wondering why He fosters the infidels. On Chios in 1671 he says that he has described the flourishing condition of the churches only as an admonition to the Muslims; and he blames the ulema in particular for devouring the vakf endowments. More than once, with a note of bitterness, he contrasts the care of Christians for their churches and other institutions with the neglect and ruin under the Ottomans. He complains about the neglect of books in the Attarin mosque in Alexandria, which he visited in 1672, in contrast with the care of books in St. Stephen’s cathedral in Vienna, which he visited in 1665. In Bethlehem Evliyâ admires the jewels preserved by the Christians in the Prophet’s shrine, and again criticizes the Muslims for being so careless with their endowments. Of St. Catherine’s monastery at Mt. Sinai he remarks: “It has remained in the hands of the Christians. Were it in the possession of Islam, it would be in ruins”.

Technological and scientific level

Military matters

Evliyâ openly admires non-Ottoman fortifications, saying that the Europeans take the palm in construction, while the Persians are superior in defense; and he is at pains to absolve the Ottomans of blame for their perceived shortcomings in this area. Other than this, I do not recall any passage in which he considers the Ottomans inferior to the Europeans in any military capacity — artillery, siege warfare, etc. Such defeats as the Ottomans suffer — as at the battle on the Raab (battle of St. Gotthard) — he attributes to poor planning.

• Clockwork mechanisms – Evliyâ has a long disquisition on these marvels as he perceived them in Vienna. It begins with an overview of the marketplace: The watchmakers, goldsmiths, book-printers, barbers and tailors have shops that are decked out like Chinese picture galleries. And the shops are unequalled in the operation of wonderful objects and strange instruments. Alarm clocks, clocks marking prayer times, or the month and day, or the signs of the zodiac, clocks on a monthly or daily calendar, chiming wall clocks — all are functioning. And they make clocks in the form of various creatures, with moving eyes, hands, and feet, so the viewer thinks those animals are alive; whereas the master clockmakers made them move with wheel mechanisms. Whatever mills there are in the city, not a single one is turned by a horse or an ox or a man. The mills — and the kebab skewers, the buckets of water drawn from the wells, even the carriages traveling in the countryside — are all set in motion with devious and devilish clockwork mechanisms, not with a horse or an ox. They are marvelous contrivances.

And it culminates with the hilarious account of Evliyâ mistaking effigies of Turkish prisoners pounding medicaments for real people.

• Medicine — Evliyâ greatly admires the hospitals of Vienna, and in particular the advanced surgical techniques that he witnessed. About Dubrovnik he states: Their physicians are famous. They have not, however, found a cure for the French itch (i.e., syphilis). The only treatment they have found for it is diet and eating
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little. God save us, all the infidels of Frengistan suffer from the French itch, and that is why it is famous.

- Printing — Evliyā is aware of the scholarly standards that were due to printing, remarking about the Latin chronicles that they “are the most reliable and authoritative. In fact, when a chronicler writes a history, it is first examined by an ecclesiastical board to make sure that it contains no errors or exaggerations. Only after it has been approved by the board, and the Twelve Bans have given their imprimatur, can it be printed.” And he admires the printed books in the Stephansdom in Vienna, contrasting their quality and condition with those in Ottoman libraries. He writes:

The walls of the cupboards have niches plastered with raw ambergris and housing copies of the Gospel, the Torah, the Psalms, and the Koran. Important books by various authors in every language of the world are found here. There are hundreds of thousands of bound books, with special priests appointed for their care. It is a great library that has to be seen. There is no such collection of books anywhere in the world, except in Cairo at the mosques of Sultan Barquq and Sultan Faraj, and in Istanbul at the mosque of Mehmed the Conqueror, the Süleymaniye, the mosque of Bayezid the Saint, and the New Mosque (mosque of Valide Sultan). God only knows the number of books in those mosques. But the number is greater in this Stephan monastery in Vienna, since there are numerous illustrated books in the infidel script of every language, including anatomical texts and cosmographies with the titles Atlas, Minor, Geography, and Mappa Mundi. Our libraries, on the other hand, have none of these illustrated books, since “Pictures are unlawful.” That is why there are so many books in the Stephan Monastery. When this humble one had a tour of it, with the permission of the head priest, I was lost in astonishment, and the fragrance of musk and pure ambergris suffused my brain.

Now, my dear, the import of this long disquisition is the following: These infidels, in their own infidel manner, consider these books the word of God. They have seventy or eighty servants who sweep the library and dust off the books once a week. In our Alexandria, on the other hand, there is a great mosque known as the Perfumers’ mosque supported by many pious foundations including hundreds of shops, hans, baths and storerooms; but the mosque itself lies in ruin, and its library that houses thousands of important volumes — including priceless Korans calligraphed by Yaqut Musta’sümî, Abdullah Kırmî, Şemsullah Gamravi and Sheikh Cuşî — is rotting because of the rain. Worshippers who come to this mosque once a week for Friday prayers can hear the moths and worms and mice gnawing at the Korans. No one from the Community of Muhammad stands up and says, “These Korans are being destroyed, let’s do something about it.” That won’t happen, because they do not love the word of God as much as the infidels do. I only wish that God make that mosque as prosperous as this church, and that its servants and governors regard that abandoned mosque with the eye of compassion.

Moral

Evliyā takes a dim view of Europeans’ morals. But he is careful not to condemn them outright. Here are some examples, drawn from my study of what he regarded as shameful behavior (âyıp) and what he excused on the grounds that those involved do not regard it as shameful (âyıp değil):

... As to the attitude of European men toward the opposite sex, he was astounded that the Hapsburg emperor should stand aside to let a woman pass, or doff his hat if a woman addressed him. This high regard toward women he considered a marvel (garîb ü acîb). In this land, he writes, and throughout Christendom women are in charge; and he attributes this to the people’s reverence for the Virgin Mary.
... Evliyâ never ceased to be amazed at Europeans’ attitude toward women. In Ligradçik, also Dubrovnik and Gingösh and in Muscovy, girls sit in the marketplace and sell their wares with no stigma attached. In Peshphel [Schwechat near Vienna] men and women do not flee from each other, he notes, and women may go outdoors without their husbands’ permission, and even sit and chat and drink “with us Ottomans,” and none of this is considered shameful. Here again he gives as the reason that throughout Christendom women are in charge, and they have behaved in this disreputable fashion ever since the time of the Virgin Mary.

... In yet another mission, Evliyâ is charged with ransoming an Ottoman officer being held captive by the Ban of Herzegovina. Before crossing the border, Evliyâ addresses the men in his retinue:

“See here, ghazis! The territory we are about to enter, under a truce, is the land of the infidels, where wine, women and boys are permitted. If I find any of you with a woman or a boy, or befuddled with wine or rakı, I will cook your goose and beat you black and blue. Is that understood?”

“God please you,” they replied, “none of us would do a thing like that.”

“Well, we have all been suckled on raw milk. A father cannot really vouch for his son, or a son for his father. It’s the way of the world. We have come this far with so much money and goods. Let us just ransom that ghazi, according to our sultan’s command, and then take our leave. If you do something shameful, the infidel may take it as a pretext not to release the captain; if he is a gentleman he will drive us out, and if he is not he will kill us.

Here Evliyâ appeals to the norm in the Ottoman realm where wine, women and boys are shameful (ayb), as opposed to Europe where they are permitted (mubah). As Ottoman representatives his men have to behave like proper Ottomans and not be tempted by European vices just because they have crossed the border. The reason he gives, however, is not to safeguard their morality, but to safeguard the mission!

... Evliyâ marvels at the strange customs in Ergirkasri (Gjirokastër, Albania), such as mourning for long-dead relatives; but he excuses them by saying that every country has its own rites and traditions. He goes on:

They have another bad habit. In weddings, on festival days of St George, Nevruz, St. Demetrius, and St. Nicholas, and on the two feasts of Bairam, they put on their finery and drink alcoholic beverages. Lovers go hand in hand with their pretty boys and embrace them and dance about in the manner of the Christians. This is a wicked practice, being a rite of the infidels; but it is their custom, so we cannot censure it.

“We cannot censure it” is literally “we cannot say it is ayb” — in other words, ayb değil! No passage in the Seyahatnâme is more revealing of Evliyâ’s attitude toward such customs.

Aesthetic

The term freng-pesend designates fine artistry in a vaguely understood European style. It may designate architectural decoration, statuary, painting, pools and fountains and jets, roads, mills, etc. or a cenotaph cover.

It is unclear whether freng-pesend has a specific meaning different from hayâl-pesend and ahsend-pesend. At one point Evliyâ claims that he made a multicolored drawing of a newly-conquered castle on four-fold Istanbul paper in European style, which was greatly admired.
Freng-pesend has to be studied together with other terms in Evliyâ’s vocabulary of aesthetic judgments before we may conclude whether he “fell in love” with European artistic practices. My impression is that he appreciated them — even to the point of attributing divine inspiration in at least one case, as we saw above — but that he was no less appreciative of other, and in particular of Ottoman, styles.

In conclusion, we may say that while Evliyâ had a genuine appreciation of many aspects of European civilization, and even had some European friends, he did not “fall in love” with them. Rather he treated the Europeans — as he did the Iranians — as a sounding board by which he could pass judgments on those he was in love with, namely the Ottomans.

NOTES

References to Volumes 1-8 of the Seyahatnâme are to the autograph ms. as follows:
- Bağdat 304 Volumes 1 and 2
- Bağdat 305 Volumes 3 and 4
- Bağdat 307 Volume 5
- Revan 1457 Volume 6
- Bağdat 308 Volumes 7 and 8

References to Volumes 9-10 are to:
- Bağdat 306 Volume 9
- İÜTY 5973, Volume 10. These references can be traced in the YKY edition, ed. Yücel Dağlı et al.


3. Ibid.

4. VI 151a; translation in An Ottoman Traveller, 205-06.

5. VI 152b-153a; translation in An Ottoman Traveller, 211-12.

6. See An Ottoman Mentality, 58, 101 (IV 303a: the Ottomans are plain and simple folk who know nothing of tricks and ruses [Âl-i Osmân oğuz tayfa ve mankaladır ... hile ve hud'a nedir bilmez]).

7. Cf. VII 68b where Evliyâ insists that the Ottoman envoys to the Habsburgs must be open-handed and pious men who inspire respect; otherwise the Europeans, who are very wily and deceitful, will make them dance like monkeys: elçi paşalara cümleden elzem-i levâzımından olan bu diyârda sahî ve sâhib-i kerem ve halâk ve havsalalı olup urz-i pâdîşâhî ve gayret-i dîn-i mûbînî gözârî âdem gerekdir. El-yâzan billâh eger elçi bir hasis ve le’îm ü deni ve lecûc ve fâsk u sefîh âdem olarsa âslâ rağbet ü izzet etmeyûp âslâ sâzîne amel ü ı’tibâr etmeyûp maymûn gibi oynarlar, zîrâ bu diyânîn küfürî eyle nakkâş ve fassâl ve zemmâm ü nemmâm ü dîn-i mübînî gözârî eyleden ve zemnâm ü nemnâm ü dahhâldirler kim bir âdemin reви-i cümûs [ü] harekât [ü] senânîndan ne mâhiyyet ve keyfiyyetde olduğun bilûp ana göre amel ederler.

8. VII 64a: Ve bu şehrin cümle şeyi memdûh [ü] meşhûrî, ammâ hezâr ahsend pesend cümle hukemâ ve çerâhî fassûl u kehhâl u nakkâş ve sâ’atçî ve tûfengçî ve çünkîcî ve sokakların pâlîcîne ve håkimlerinin zabt u rabîlralarına ve bey’ [ü] şirâlarda mızân u terâzîda helâf etmeyûp kizb
söylemediklerine ve adl-ı adâletlerine ve re‘âyâ ve berâyâlarının âsâde-hâl üzere olup zulm etmediklerine … ve cümle halkının herkes ile hüsân-i üflet edip garıb-dost olup dîl-nâvâzıklarına ve villayetleri cümle her şeyden emin ve emân olduğu nas bärekallâh âşk olsun kim İslam diyärında böyle emin ve adl-ı adâlet yokdur.


11. An Ottoman Mentality, 113-14. “We have to get our currency into good order!”: V 150a Sîkke tas [h]îh olup zabant u rabat gerek idi. The other references are as follows: Kaschau: VI 14b28; Chios: IX 60b27; VI 15b17; Bethlehem: IX 226b26; Mt. Sinai: IX 380b27.

12. IV 288a: Hakâk ki kal’a beklemek Acem’e kalmışdır, ka’a bînî etmek Fireng-i bed-rengê kalmışdır.

13. See An Ottoman Mentality, 95.


15. V 57b: Sâ’atçüler ve kuyumcular ve kitâb bazmacular ve berberler ve derrzîlerin çârşîâlîn eyle müyyezîendir ki âyağ nask-‘ı nüshåhîn-ı çîndir ve hari snâm-ı aciîn ve alât-ı garîb iseçmede bî-nazîr esvâklûr. Ve münîbîbîhî ve miktâr ve ây ve qânilî ve erbîçhî ve mâyîyeyî ve rûznâmî eli asma çalâm sâ’atçîl işânîn. Ve cemî’i enças-ı mahlûkâtîn tasvîrâtçîlâyra gûn-gûn sâ’at inşâm ederler kim gözlîleri ve elleri ve ayaklari hareket edip gören âdem ol hayvânları haytadà zann edip eyle hareket eder. Ami ise üstâd-ı kâmîler çarşîlar ile hareket etdirüp sâ’ât etmişdir. Ve cümle sehr içre ne kadarâ деğîrmênler var ise ne at ve ne sâ’ir ve ne âdem çevîr deîrîmênleri ve kebâb çîlîlerin ve kuyulardan kovalar ile sulaç çekmêki ve sahrât perver olmaları ve kuyu-ların âzîsî ve sujârsiz cümle hîyel ve şeytanat ve musumân sâ’at çarşîlâyra hareket eder deîrîmênler ve kebâb çarşîleri ve kuyulûr dolablarî ibret-eser abaralardir (translation in An Ottoman Traveller, 232).

16. VI 58b-59a; translation in An Ottoman Traveller, 234.

17. VI 61a-63b; partial translation in An Ottoman Traveller, 242-47.

18. VI 156a: Ve havâmâlîn meşhûrdür, ammê Fireng uyuzuna aslâ dâ-i devâm olmam kemel olup te’âm yedirûp perhûdan gâyri mu’âlêce bulamayup cümle Firengistân kefereleri Fireng uyuzuna mûbèlelâdar. Allähümme âfînîn. Anıcıçin Fireng uyuzu meşhûrdî.

19. VI 151a; translation in An Ottoman Traveller, 205.

20. VI 59b; translation in An Ottoman Traveller, 236-37.


22. VII 71a25: Bu diyâyda ve gayri kâfîrîsta nîz avretin olup Meryem Ana âskına avrete ta’zîm ü tekrim edeler.

23. V 162b18: cemî’i dükkânîlarda kızar oturup her biri bîrî mîh-cîbîn ve peri-pekher ve melek-manzarlar metlîlärn âşkîrî fûrûh ederler, anlarda metâ’ satmak abîb deîjîldir; VII 152b19 baz-ı hûndî metlîlärn satan avretler ve bäkîr mahbûbê kîzar metlîlärn âşkîrî satarlar, bu kâfîrîstânda abîb deîjîldir; VII 40b5: pînçî-i âfîtîcî kızarlar ve kûlîne avretler dükkânîlarda oturup metlîlärn âşkîrî fûrûh ederler, asîl abîb deîjîldir; VII 174a23: dükkânîlarda avretler oturup her ne metlîlär var ise fûrûh ederler, abîb deîjîldir.


29. VII 93b Esztergomb: ve bu kapidan içeri hınto arabalar gîrûp çikarlar, zirâ vâsi’i yollari cümle Firengi-pesend kaldaran döşelirdir; VIII 228b Salonika: musanna’ Fireng-pesend çahrâl.


33. Such as sade güzeli, studied in An Ottoman Mentality, 53-54.

ABSTRACTS
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