

*The most literary Ottoman pilgrimage narrative: Nabi's Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn**

Menderes Coşkun
University of Kırıkkale, Kırıkkale

Introduction

The most literary and celebrated pilgrimage narrative composed in Ottoman *inşa* (artistic prose) is the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* (The gift of/from the two sanctuaries) by the leading poet Nabi (1642–1712). It includes historical, sociological, geographical and autobiographical information. However, despite its importance and celebrity, it has not been studied properly so far. In this study, I concentrate on the main aspects of Nabi's pilgrimage journey and narrative, which have been overlooked in previous studies, seeking answers either factual or speculative to a number of basic questions, among which are the following: Where does Nabi's narrative stand in its genre? What motivated Nabi to compose such an elaborate text, which certainly required special effort and much time? What were his aim and priorities in his account? In what year did Nabi complete his text, was it 1090, 1093 or 1094? Where do a great number of the verse quotations come from? What route did he follow? What made him undertake an independent and long journey through Jerusalem and Egypt while the annual official caravan was more direct and presumably more secure? Which month or season of 1089/1678 did Nabi set out on the journey? How long did his journey last? The present study therefore sheds light on several aspects of Nabi's journey and narrative.

The *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* as a literary narration of the pilgrimage journey produced in a very elaborate and metaphorical language stands unique in

* *Turcicæ: Revue d'Etudes turques peuples, langues, cultures, Etats* 32 (2000), 363–388.
I am grateful to Dr. Christine Woodhead and Dr. Paul Starkey of University of Durham for their suggestions during the preparations of this study, which is extracted from my PhD thesis.

its genre. Surprisingly, no other leading Ottoman court poet produced a pilgrimage narration. One may wonder what made Nabi undertake an arduous pilgrimage journey via Egypt and produce such an elaborate narrative. Among Nabi's motivations were his personal attachment to the sanctuaries in the Hijaz; official support and, perhaps a commission for the work; the popularity of the subject in society, combined with the lack of an eloquent work on it; his literary aptitude and tendency to describe his real life experience, as mentioned earlier, and the influence of the fifteenth century Persian poet Jami (and perhaps Muhyi)'s verses on his perception of the sanctuaries.

In order to explore Nabi's personal affinity to the hajj and the Hijaz it is necessary to investigate his family background, which was the first influence upon his personality and ambitions. Nabi grew up in a notable religious family in Urfa. His two brothers and one sister also held the honorary title *hacı* in front of their names, which suggests that they had presumably performed the hajj. Even if the word *hacı* was a part of their original name this again testifies to their parents' affection towards the hajj.¹ Growing up in such a family, Nabi must have listened often to the accumulated accounts of pilgrimage journeys of his pilgrim ancestors or relatives. He relates that from his childhood whenever he heard the description of the sanctuaries he felt a strong feeling to go there. He used to shed tears, and sigh when he thought about the sacred places (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 59). During his journey we see him crying and sighing when seeing for the first time the sanctuaries in the Hijaz and upon leaving them. He says he was almost going to die due to the excitement of seeing the Ka'be. In fact, living and dying in the Hijaz seems to have been an objective for him according to both his *Divan*,² and his *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* (110). He also confesses that he had a life-long desire to see the Prophet's tomb in Medina, and was habitually sending his salutation to him from afar (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 100-101). In addition to his personal attachment to the sanctuaries in the Hijaz, there were other inducements to produce such a work. Nabi says that it was 'demanded eagerly by the elite and ordinary people' (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 4), perhaps suggesting both popular demand and the lack of a literary work.

As a member of such a family and an individual of such a disposition, and as a poet, who liked to portray his inner and outer experiences, Nabi

1. On the usage of the complimentary title *hacı* by Ottomans, see Faroqhi 1992.

2. Hezar hayf u hezaran dirig u sad efsus - Ki anda olmaya masruf 'ömr-i bi-namus (*Nabi Divanı* 168).

was personally ready to undertake a journey to the Hijaz and to set down an eloquent account of his journey, the experience of his lifetime. Accordingly, having achieved a position of good standing with his patrons, Müsahib Mustafa Paşa (d. 1687) and Mehmed iv (1648–1687) Nabi revived his long-standing desire to perform the hajj.

In his preliminary remarks, Nabi indicates that he had received governmental help for his journey. He relates that he first obtained leave for the hajj from his patron Müsahib Mustafa Paşa, and then submitted a *kaside* to Mehmed iv, describing the sacred places. Although I could not find such a *kaside* submitted to Mehmed iv in the edited *Divan* of Nabi, there are two *gazels* of ten and nine couplets describing the Ka'be and Medina respectively (*Nabi Divanı* 534–535). The sultan provided Nabi with a letter of recommendation addressed to 'Abdurrahman Paşa (d. 1691), governor of Egypt, ordering him to enable Nabi to make a comfortable journey (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 4; Salim 1315/1897: 629). In one of his *mesnevis* Nabi acknowledges Mehmed iv's assistance to him for the pilgrimage journey: 'O sultan of justice, you made me once a dweller in God's house'.³ Apart from the sultan's letter there may have been other assistance the government supplied to Nabi, since making a special and independent journey in a vast and mostly very dangerous terrain certainly required other arrangements for the maintenance of security and necessities like food. However, Nabi does not mention this, nor does he even record handing over the sultan's letter to 'Abdurrahman Paşa.

In Nabi's preliminary remarks there is no implication that he undertook the journey for any reason other than to see the sacred places and perform the hajj. He says that only while making preparations for the journey did he then decide to give a description of his pilgrimage experience. These remarks suggest that composing an account was something almost incidental which occurred to him at the start of his journey. If we however assume that his aim for the journey was primarily to perform the hajj and to describe the sanctuaries in the Hijaz one may wonder why he did not simply follow the usual route from Damascus to Mecca, which was much safer and more direct. Why did he prefer a long, arduous and risky journey via Egypt, lasting nearly one year, to reach Mecca, which by his own admission dampened the enthusiasm he had at the start of the journey? There is no explicit explanation of his choice of Egypt. In terms of the content of his description

3. Eyledin ey Hidiv-i adl-penah – Beni bir kez mukim-i beyt-i Ilah (*Nabi Divanı* 432).

the first answer seems to be that he wished to describe the mosques and tombs there. Since the presence of official support behind Nabi's journey is discernible, one might speculate that Nabi had been commissioned or motivated by his patrons Mehmed IV or Müsahib Mustafa Paşa to produce in return for their help a description of the significant mosques in the major Muslim cities, namely Damascus, Jerusalem, Cairo, Mecca and Medina. In Ottoman literature numerous prose works were written upon the order and sponsorship of the ruling class, to whom such works were generally dedicated. Therefore we have a justifiable reason to seek a more specific motivation behind the composition of the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*. Moreover, Nabi is reported to have submitted the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* to Mehmed IV, who in return granted him some rewards and a sable skin coat (Karahan 1987: 11).⁴

Yet when we are told that Nabi restricted his visit to the Aksa mosque to three days (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 46) this explanation becomes less convincing. Rather, visiting the Aksa mosque seems not to have been a significant part of Nabi's objective for the journey. Nevertheless, inclusion of the description of the mosque was crucial for his narrative. Nabi's mention of Mehmed IV's letter to 'Abdurrahman Paşa indicates that going to Cairo, or joining the Egyptian caravan was more important to him, and that this was decided at the beginning of the journey.

Nabi specifies and restricts his subject by saying that he intends to portray the sacred places, and the different and noteworthy things he would observe during the journey. In the course of his text, having depicted the coffee houses of Damascus, Nabi feels it necessary to remind the reader of his primary interest, the description of the mosques and shrines,⁵ and of the sanctuaries, as confirmed by the title of the work and by the large percentage of the space allocated to them in the text. Accordingly, when he reached the Hijaz and described the sanctuaries, he preferred, like other pilgrim authors, to end his text there, for his main objective was achieved.

Nabi is also careful to mention the tombs and burial places of the prophets, companions of the Prophet Muhammed, and saints he visited. In addition to the shrines noted in other pilgrimage narratives, such as those of

4. It is worth noting that a certain Kasım Efendi, who brought the keys of the Ka'be and the veil of threshold of the Ka'be to Istanbul in 1078/1667, was rewarded also with a sable skin coat, and asked by the Sultan [Mehmed IV] to describe the condition of the two sanctuaries (Atalar 1991: 125).
5. However the eloquent and elaborate sentences in the description may hint at that he described them by willingly.

Hibri, Kadri, and Hanifi, Nabi also visited relatively less-frequented tombs or burial places, including those of Mahmud-ı Hayrani and Sayyid Ni'mat Allah-i Nakhchiwani in Akşehir, Şeyh Şihab al-din-i Maqtul in Eregli, Camal al-din Qutb in Hıms, Fahr al-din İbrahim-i 'İraqi in Salihyya of Damascus, 'Uqba b. 'Amir, İmam Şafi'i and 'Umar ibn al-Farid in Qarafa, İbrahim Gülşeni in Cairo, and Muhammad Parsa in Medina.

Nabi, as a court poet and author writing for the elite and the sultan, pays particular attention to visiting the tombs, burial places or mosques of previous Muslim rulers. He gives several anecdotes related to Ahmed I (1603–1617), Murad IV (1623–1640), Nur al-din Zangi (1146–1174), the Mamluk sultans Qa'it Bay (1468–1496) and Tulun (d. 1479). For instance, Nabi visits 'a palace' in a pleasant valley between two mountains in Akşehir, where Murad IV (1623–1640) and Şeyhülislam Yahya (d. 1644) had rested on the campaign to Baghdad in 1638. During the stay, having composed a few verses, Murad IV inscribed them on a window of the palace, and Şeyhülislam Yahya composed on the same day a poem parallel to the sultan's poem. We learn from other sources that the name of the valley is Baş Tekke, 'which lies on the south side' of Akşehir, and that Murad IV wrote his verses 'over a window in a kiosque there' (Naci 1307/1889: 39; Gibb 1904: 275; Baysun 1997: 632–664). Unlike other pilgrim-authors such as Hibri, Kadri and Hanifi, Nabi as a man of letters records this literary activity and the poems involved in it.

Though neglecting to describe in great detail the cities in Anatolia, Nabi gives occasional information about topographic, architectural, social and educational aspects of important Arab cities including Aleppo, Damascus, Jerusalem and Cairo. His descriptions of these cities are unsatisfactory as to content but methodical in character, going from generalities to specific. Two descriptions which reflect directly the social life of seventeenth-century Damascus society need mentioning. One is the description of the coffee-house (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 24–27), the other of the public celebration of the conquest of the Polish fortress Çehrin (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 31–36). They are among the most elaborate passages of the narrative. According to Nabi, the portrayal of the coffee-house is something he did not previously intend to record but he could not keep himself from describing when he saw it. However, this explanation seems to be something of a rhetorical excuse because this very elaborate portrayal is not something he could have made unwillingly.

The journey

Nabi's pilgrimage journey of more than one year began in 1089/1678. Although Nabi does not give a specific date for his departure it is possible to estimate at least its season by using circumstantial though sometimes ambiguous details. To begin with, since his itinerary was much longer than that of the annual pilgrimage caravan and since he spent his time generously in certain cities he must have departed from Istanbul certainly several months earlier than the official caravan, which would have left Istanbul in the month of Receb 1089/August 1678. Secondly, his statement that he waited for suitable weather to cross to Hersek by boat indicates that he might have set out in late winter/early spring. Thirdly, on the occasion of celebration of the conquest of Çehrin⁶ in Damascus Nabi says that at the campaign time of the spring of that year [by which was meant 1678] Mustafa Paşa embarked on a campaign to the fortress of Çehrin. When reporting this news he uses the word '*meger*' which suggests that he had not known of the Paşa's departure, and which enables us to assume that Nabi set out on his journey before the decision in favour of the campaign, which occurred on 11 April 1678, with the army marching on 8 Rebi'ülevvel 1089/30 April 1678 (Uzunçarşılı 1951: 440). This circumstantial detail implies that Nabi started his journey before 11 April. Since Nabi is fond of hiding facts within similes it is worth noting that when he states metaphorically that he set out in the year 1089 he uses the word *delv* which means 'bucket'. Another meaning of this word is 'Aquarius', which is the eleventh sign of the Zodiac, corresponding to the period between 20 January and 19 February. If Nabi used the word metaphorically we may assume that he started his journey in this period. However since the first day of the lunar year 1089 corresponds to 23 February 1678, this rendering suggests a certain vagueness.

Like Evliya Çelebi, Nabi travelled in a small private caravan, which he probably led in person, since the caravan extended its route to Nabi's homeland, Urfa, and spent about fifty days there. We do not know precisely who constituted this small caravan since Nabi does not give the names of his comrades, and does not relate any anecdotes about them. However, other sources inform us that Nabi made his journey together with a friend Mehmed Rami, who after returning from the hajj became secretary to Müsahib Mustafa Paşa in place of Nabi, who by then had been appointed to the office of *kethüda* 'steward' to Müsahib Paşa (Robischon 1969: 128).

6. The Çehrin fortress was captured from Russia by the grand vezir Kara Mustafa Paşa on 3 Receb 1089/12 August 1678 (Uzunçarşılı 1951: 442).

Mehmed Rami later in his career ascended to the office of *kubbe veziri* and then to that of grand vezir in 1114/1703 (Babinger 1960: 999). When Nabi draws a picture of the caravan in the middle of a desert (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 47) he reveals that he and his friend(s) travelled [perhaps in palanquin(s)] on horses or camels, and that they were accompanied by some pedestrians, presumably slaves as in the case of Evliya Çelebi.

In general, Nabi's itinerary on his outward journey appears to have been determined by his visitations of mosques, tombs and burial places. If there is no tomb or a historically important place to visit Nabi seems not to care about recording the name of his halting places. It appears that he generally followed the usual route of the pilgrimage caravan from Istanbul to Damascus, passing through Kartal, Gebze, Hersek, Iznik, Eskişehir, Seyitgazi, Akşehir, Iğın, Ladik, Konya, Ereğli, Adana, Misis bridge, Payas, Antakya, Aleppo (with a long detour to Urfa and back to Aleppo via Antep), Hama, Hims and the Qutayfa strait. The fact that in Payas he or his friends suffered from shortness of breath due to extreme heat indicates he was there at least at the beginning of summer. During the fifty days' halt in Urfa, apart from visiting his brothers, sisters and old friends, Nabi visited the ancient places which were associated with the story of the Prophet Abraham. There seems no remark enabling us to anticipate exactly when Nabi arrived in Damascus and how long he stayed there. However, we know that before his departure from Damascus he attended the celebrations for the conquest of Çehrin, which occurred on 21 August 1678. After three days and nights of Çehrin celebrations, Nabi departed for Cairo. Within about ten days he reached Ramla where he stored his baggage, and paid a visit of just three days to Jerusalem and the Aksa mosque. He then returned to Ramla, and proceeded to Cairo through Ascalon, Ghazza, 'Arish, Suez, and Salihyya of Egypt.

Nabi reached Cairo in the autumn of 1089/1678. Like the seventeenth-century Moroccan traveller Abu Salim al-'Ayyashi (El Moudden 1990: 77), Nabi was overwhelmed by the density of the population of Cairo. He was also fascinated with the splendid architecture of the buildings, with the bazaars and the crowding of mosques built side by side by Kurdish and Circassian rulers. Nabi gives a general description of the city of Cairo, the Nile, the two reservoirs of the city, park lands, the Ahrām hills and the immediate neighbourhood of the city. In Cairo he must have received hospitality from 'Abdurrahman Paşa, who was or became a friend of his (Bilkan 1995: 68; Ergün 1936: 180, 182). While elaborating on some aspects of his journey, Nabi overlooks others, including where and how he spent the month of Ramazan and its festival. On 20 Şevval 1089/5 December 1678 Nabi

departed from Cairo in the Egyptian pilgrimage caravan bound for Mecca, passing through Adiliyya, Birkat al-hacc, the valley of Tih, Mount Sinai, Aqaba-i Misr, Badr Hunayn (on 1 Zilhicce 1089/14 January 1679) and Ra-bigh. Having travelled independently for most of the first part of his journey, presumably travelling by day and sleeping at night, Nabi was clearly struck by the customs of the pilgrimage caravan, which even during the winter months travelled at night.

In Mecca Nabi visited the sacred sites enthusiastically, and performed the hajj in January 1679.⁷ He gives a moving account of his experience as a pious emotional pilgrim. It appears that Nabi stayed in Mecca more than twenty days. On or immediately after 1 Muharrem 1090/12 February 1679, he set out for Medina, presumably in the Damascus caravan. A couplet in his Turkish *Divan* confirms that Nabi stayed in Mecca at least until the beginning of Muharrem 1090/February 1679: 'Nabi, we were at the Ka'be in [at the beginning of] 1090, it has been thirty years since we returned.'⁸

It is known that the caravan generally arrived at Medina around 10 Muharrem.⁹ While in Medina Nabi served at the tomb of the Prophet by lighting the candles, since his name was on the honorary list of attendants who were determined by the central government to serve the sanctuaries in Mecca and Medina. Nabi regards these services as a testimony to the legitimacy of Ottoman rule. He summarizes his return journey from Medina to Damascus and Istanbul in a few general words. If he travelled from Damascus to Istanbul in the official caravan he would have arrived in Istanbul in late Rebi'ülahir or Cemaziyelevvel 1090/June 1679. As soon as he returned to Istanbul Nabi must have begun to form his narrative.

The date of the completion of the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*

Modern researchers give two different dates for the completion of the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*, depending presumably on the chronogram for the narrative. While Levend (1944: 16) and Karahan (1987: 48)¹⁰ state that Nabi completed his narrative in 1094/1683, Gibb, Rieu and Ambros say that it was in 1093/1682 (Gibb 1904: 327; Ambros 1960: 839). The chronogram in my calculation

7. It is worth noting a small but common mistake about the year of Nabi's performance of the hajj. Nabi performed the hajj in 1089/1679 not in 1678 as usually stated.
8. Bin doksanı biz Ka'bede itdik Nabi – Avdet ideli oldi selasin sene (*Nabi Divanı* 1237).
9. Kadri [not identified in the hand-list of the library], *Menazilü't-tarik ila beyti'llahi'l-'atik*, Millet Ktp., Tarih., no: 892, f. 59b.
10. Karahan also cites both dates 1093 and 1094 in the same entry on Nabi in *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, and accepts the former date in another study on Nabi; see Karahan 1980: 200.

also makes 1093: 'Bu (8) *Tuhfe-i* (493) *haremeynim* (348) *kabul* (138) *ide* (20) *Mevla* (86)'. It is necessary here to amend a small but common mistake concerning the date of completion. Karahan and several researchers state that the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* was completed five years after Nabi returned from the hajj (Karahan 1987: 48; Pala 1989: 13; Levend 1944: 16). In fact, even if Nabi completed his text in 1094 it is wrong to say that he composed his text strictly 'five years after his return'. This would imply that he returned in 1089. However, as seen above, Nabi was still in the Hijaz in Muharrem 1090/February 1679.

The copies of the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* do not give a single date beneath the chronogram upon which all researchers can agree. The dates for the chronogram in the copies of the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* in the Süleymaniye library, the John Rylands Library of Manchester University, Cambridge University Library and the British Library bear varying dates including 1084,¹¹ 1085,¹² 1089,¹³ 1090,¹⁴ 1092¹⁵ and 1093,¹⁶ and 1095.¹⁷ These varying dates for the same chronogram must be due to different calculations of it. The placement of different dates indicates that the original copy did not bear a numerical date under the chronogram, and that the early copyists themselves calculated the chronogram, and reached different dates. Calculation of the earlier dates, 1084, 1085, 1089, are clearly wrong, as Nabi had not completed the hajj journey by these dates.

On the other hand, the date 1090, which is placed under the chronogram for the completion of the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* in Nabi's Turkish *Divan*, suggests that the date of completion was the year of his return to Istanbul (*Nabi Divanı* 218). As noted, the date 1090 is also accepted in a copy of the work in the Süleymaniye library, which is one of the earliest and most reliable manuscripts, copied in 1095, when Nabi was still alive. The same date 1090 is also cited in a copy found in the John Rylands Library of Manchester

11. Süleymaniye Ktp., Hacı Mahmud Efendi, no: 4939, 2862 and 4920.

12. Süleymaniye Ktp., Hacı Mahmud Efendi, no: 4886/1.

13. Süleymaniye Ktp., Hacı Reşid Bey, no: 43.

14. The John Rylands Library of Manchester University, Turkish mss., no: 134, 45 fols., (5b-50b), dated 1090 with no colophon; Süleymaniye Ktp., Lala İsmail Paşa, no: 400/1, 62 fols., dated 1090/1679 with a colophon.

15. Cambridge University Library, Or. 598 (7), 85 fols., dated 1092/1681 with no colophon; see Browne 1922: 47.

16. Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Ktp., no: R 840, 67 fols., dated 1093/1682 with no colophon; Köprülü Ktp., Hacı Ahmed Paşa (II), no: 260, 53 fols., dated 1093 with no colophon.

17. The date is placed in a copy (copied in 1142) in the private library of Emel Esin (Esin 1963: 217).

University.¹⁸ A later note at the beginning of the copy declares that it is the most reliable copy and must have been written by Nabi himself. The biographer Salim reports that the composition took place during the journey (Salim 1315/1897: 629). This may be derived from Nabi's assertion that at the beginning of the journey he decided to write down every detail of his journey (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 4). However, when mentioning an event that occurred in 1089 Nabi refers to 'that year' instead of 'this year'.¹⁹ This suggests that Nabi did not compose his narrative, or at least not the *final* version of it, in the year 1089. Combination of his journey jottings, if any, with mostly poetical material he had either in mind or in front of him may have taken some time after his return. The question is how long did it take or when exactly did he complete his composition? Since Nabi, as a secretary to a high official, had proficiency in producing high-flown prose very easily and quickly, it is quite possible that he could have finished his text in late 1090/1679 as recorded in the *Divan* and in the above-mentioned two reliable manuscripts.

Nabi's prose style and language in the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*

In terms of language and style, Nabi composed his various works in two very dissimilar styles: the first is relatively direct, plain and dry, and the second is elaborate, Persianised and metaphorical. Agah Sırrı Levend states best this apparent incompatibility, saying that when Nabi's prose works are compared to his verse works it is difficult to believe that they all were composed by the same person (Levend 1944: 17). It is therefore very misleading to judge Nabi's general literary style and language on the basis of any single work of his. The criticism of Nabi as an imitator of Persian poetry, which was made by Şeyh Galib on the basis of his heavily Persianised romance, the *Hayrabad*, and developed later by Gibb (1904: 246, 370) contradicts some fragmentary comments made by Ziya Paşa, Fuad Köprülü and Tanpınar, and some modern researchers who detected in Nabi's style and language in his other works the first lights of original and local motifs or colours (Mengi 1987: 29, 33, 38–39; Köprülü 1966: 294; Tanpınar 1956: xxxv). This does not mean what they said is wrong but emphasizes that the comments on a single or a few works of Nabi do not reflect Nabi's style as a whole, as the

18. The John Rylands Library of Manchester University, Turkish mss., no: 134; see also Crawford 1897.

19. meger ol sene-i 'amimetü'l-meymenenün hengam-ı cünbüş-i sipah-ı fasl-ı baharında (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 31).

above-mentioned researchers must have been aware. For example, the criticism of Nabi by Şeyh Galib on account of his Persianised style in the *Hayrabad* was accepted by Ziya Paşa (Mengi 1987: 31–32).

Indeed, Nabi employed a relatively plain language in many of his poems, particularly the *mesnevis* in the *Divan*, the *Surname* and the *Hayriyye*, which are closer to the modern Turkish language than many works produced in the nineteenth century. For instance, in one of his *mesnevis* in his Turkish *Divan* Nabi depicts a phase of his life story in a very clear and idiomatic language by using dialogues, as well as addressing himself directly: 'Go to the threshold of the sultan! Rub your face at that convent!';²⁰ 'I said, O sultan of the kingdom of prosperity, the mirror of my fate, the light of my eye.'²¹

In another *mesnevi* the poet sets up a story of four individuals, who came to Istanbul to receive '*ulufe* 'salary'. Like a playwright he first introduces the main characters of the story, and then proceeds to dramatize their actions and dialogues in a straightforward language which is very close to today's spoken Turkish, as in: 'Ahmed Aga! Do not be mean, like these, O reverend!'²² Nabi not only composed such poems but also explicitly criticises those who used a language full of unfamiliar words: 'O one who uses strange expressions in poetry, a *divan* of *gazel*(s) is not [should not be] a copy of a dictionary.'²³

However, contrary to his plain verse works and his opposition to the use of foreign and ambiguous words in 'poetry', Nabi employed very metaphorical language full of borrowings from Persian and Arabic in his 'prose' texts and his romance the *Hayrabad*. Levend suggests that Nabi's real art is exhibited in his prose texts, and that the *Zeyl-i siyer-i Veysi* and the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* are two of the most impressive examples of Ottoman prose literature (Levend 1944: 17). While evaluating his works in a *mesnevi* addressed to Mehmed IV Nabi devotes most space to the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*. He regards it as a masterpiece, stressing its superiority over other texts and its reputation:

'The purified work the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* is a source [treasury] of embroidery in the kingdom of prose.'²⁴

20. Varsan a astane-i şaha – Yüzünü sürsen e o dergaha (*Nabi Divanı* 405).

21. Didüm ey şah-ı mülk-i ma'murî – Bahtum ayinesi gözüm nurı (*Nabi Divanı* 410).

22. Ahmed Aga olma sakın dun-himem – Sen dahi bunlar gibi ey muhterem (*Nabi Divanı* 447).

23. Ey şî'r meyânında satan lafz-ı garibi – Divan-ı gazel nüsha-i kamus degüldür (Levend 1949: 94).

24. Eser-i pak-i *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* – Mülk-i inşaya oldu maye-i zeyn (*Nabi Divanı* 429).

'It has become, like the radiant sun, the jewel in the crown of stylists of the world'²⁵

'Nowadays, who can produce such a work? Listen everybody!, Here are the men of skill!'²⁶

At the very beginning of the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*, Nabi asserts that he intended to produce a description that would give pleasure to those who had already performed the hajj, and would incite those who had not been there to go. He aimed to do this through his lively and high-flown prose style more than through a factual and detailed description in a dry language. This would have been expected of him since he was neither a *müderriş* nor another member of the '*ülema* 'learned men' such as a *müfti* 'authority on Islamic law'. As a secretary, his profession was determined by writing and composition not by education or scholarship. In the above verses Nabi himself evaluates his narration on the basis of its prose style not of its contents.

While disregarding a number of factual features of his journey, Nabi gives elaborate descriptions of some relatively insignificant details. However such descriptions sometimes contain factual information about the journey almost unintentionally. For example, while omitting the names of numerous stations he passed through he draws a vivid picture of the progress of his caravan in the desert through rhetorical language (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 47).

His description sometimes becomes very systematic. In the description of the coffee-houses in Damascus, he gives a brief general definition of a coffee-house, then describes one coffee house in particular. He first introduces the milieu in which he will dramatize poetically his observations there. Then the heroes, including waiters, musicians, story tellers, dervishes and even two vagrants called Bedi and Kasım, come into the scene. The descriptions of the physical appearances of some heroes are also not neglected. Another animated description is on the celebration for the conquest of fortress of Çehrin, through which Nabi portrays the tradesmen of Damascus, parading through the street. The presence of Nabi himself in many of such descriptions is either shadowy or not detectable at all. For instance, while determining the positions of all the people in the coffee-house, he does not specify where he himself was standing and what he was doing or drinking. However, it is possible to detect his personal approach towards the attendants of the coffee-house from his adjectives for them.

25. Oldı manend-i neyyir-i rahşan – Güher-i tac-ı münşiyân-ı cihan (*Nabi Divanı* 429).

26. Şimdi kimdür iden bir böyle eser – Es-sala işte reh-revan-ı hüner (*Nabi Divanı* 429).

The *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* contain numerous fragmentary simple verses in Turkish, which are appropriate to those who 'say' them in terms of language and content.²⁷ For instance when Nabi conveys the thoughts of his brothers and sisters about himself he uses an unpretentious language: 'I wonder if we will see that face again, or if that man far away from his home will stay where he is, and never come again!'²⁸

In the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*, Nabi employs very aptly the devices of high prose style, among which are 'internal rhyme', 'multiple rhyme', 'structural parallelism', 'alliteration', and 'loose phonic association' (Tietze 1973: 299-311). In fact, most of these devices are not consciously constructed by a stylist because to some extent they come naturally to a highly literate author because of the nature of the language. Since Nabi was employed as secretary to Müsahib Mustafa Paşa he must have had an easy command of Ottoman stylistic elements. Those who were involved in official writing by profession may well have used such devices of prose style in their spoken language (Tietze 1973: 311). Therefore, more or less the same things can be said for the prose styles of almost all accomplished Ottoman stylists such as Kınalızade Hasan Çelebi, Mustafa 'Ali and Nabi.

Nabi is fond of playing with words, placing them as if he was playing chess, which confuses his unwary reader. He uses some words which could be mistaken for words more familiar to the reader since both words are spelled the same in Arabic alphabet but are pronounced and meant differently. It seems that Nabi does this on purpose as if to test the reader's knowledge of vocabulary, and ultimately to demonstrate the richness of his vocabulary in using the devices of Ottoman prose notwithstanding his criticism of poets who uses elusive words in poetry (Levend 1944: 17). Through such things he keeps the reader's attention awake, and occasionally bestows on the reader the pleasure of identifying his deliberately obscure expression. If Nabi's aim was really to confuse his readers with word-play he seems to have achieved his aim. For example, the word *zin* 'saddle' in the phrase *mukim-i misafirhane-i zin olup*, which means 'rested in the guest house of saddle', can be wrongly read as *zeyn* 'embellishment'. In another remark, Nabi plays with the word *nili* 'blue', which can be read also as *Nil'i* which means either 'its Nile' or 'the Nile (in accusative case)'.²⁹ Since the subject of the remark is related to Egypt and the word Egypt is used a few times in the

27. It appears that Nabi did not include most of these verses in his *Divan* (see Bilkan's edition).

28. 'Aceb görür miyüz ol ruyı bir dahi - Yohsa kalur gider o garibü'd-diyar gelmez mi (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 14).

same sentence the reader is lead deliberately by Nabi to read the word in question as *Nil'i*. Again, if the reader reads the word wrongly he will think that the auxiliary verb *ol-* 'to become' is used wrongly instead of *et-* 'to make, to cause'. Even if one can read a phrase correctly he might not catch the correct or figurative meaning of it. For instance, the phrase *nesr-i ta'ir* may be misunderstood even by a competent researcher as 'the birds of prey' (Esin 1963: 176), although it means 'the constellation called the Eagle' (Steingass 1970: 1400).

Use of metaphors is the most common feature of Ottoman *inşa*. In terms of the originality of metaphors, Nabi's prose style deserves high praise. He does not restrict himself to common metaphors such as rose, sapling, ocean, sun, moon, but employs original and surprising metaphors which are related to items Nabi either saw or presumably sometimes used during his journey: the hooked stick and ball, chess, magnet, chameleon, a pair of compasses, camel, bell appended to the neck of a camel, Arabian horse, spur, bridle, saddle, cock, peacock, decoy-bird, dove, eagle, seed, plant, water-wheel, bride, and arteries. In the narrative he employs more widely and freely almost all the metaphorical devices a poet could use in his poems. Of them, Nabi frequently resorted to the *hüsn-i ta'lil*, interpretation of a real or natural event with a poetic or imaginary reason, etc. For instance, the author compares the chameleon of Nimrod to the two dragons of Dahhak and to the Arabic letter *ş*. He interprets poetically the formation of the chameleon in the form of *ş* as if it refutes Nimrod's false claims. He interprets the fact that the leaves and flowers of trees around the ponds of Damascus fall into the ponds as the favour of the trees to the ponds since the latter provided the garden of the trees with water (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 23). Having portrayed the course of the Nile, which goes first in a single line and then divides into two before reaching the Mediterranean sea, Nabi compares it to the *Zülfikar*, Caliph Ali's two pointed sword, and the Mediterranean sea to a round shield.

Nabi employed a very Persianised Ottoman Turkish in the narrative. Persian vocabulary and verse quotations are overwhelmingly dominant in it. What Şeyh Galib said of Nabi's *Hayrabad* in the prologue of his *Hüsn ü 'Aşk* is applicable to the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*: 'The poem of Persian-like verses, full of sequential compounds throughout'.²⁹ Instead of using proper/single-word Turkish verbs Nabi prefers Turkish auxiliary verbs *ol-*, *et-/it-*, *kıl-*, *eyle-*

29. yine bir sefineye hama'il-kerden kılınup canib-i Mısır'a i'ade olındukda, bu kez levha-i mihr-i münir yedi def'a gerden-i 'arus-ı nili-burku'-ı gerduna avizan olduğu müddetde sahil-i Mısır'a lenger-endaz-ı istikrar (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 50).

combined with long Persian phrases and compounds. He sometimes, though rarely, employs a Persian verb, e.g. *yad bad...*, *feramuş me-bad*. He expresses Turkish idioms in a Persianized Turkish. For instance, he utters the idiom 'a day was stolen from the life' as *ömrden bir gün duzdide kılındı* instead of *ömrden bir gün çalındı*. It is possible to translate numerous remarks into Persian just by making a few minor grammatical changes as is shown in the free translation of the last part of the narration in the so called *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyni'l-Farisi*.³¹

Nabi sometimes makes mistakes in using the auxiliary verbs *ol-* and *et-* as in: *cesed-i mutahher-i Muhammedil[ı] sav kafes-bend-i şübbak olan [iden] sultan; nazmın makam-ı evcde usul-i devri uzre terennüm-riz oldukça [itdikçe]*.³² There are a number of phrases and grammatical usages which sound strange according to modern Turkish usage: ...*hıtta-i Endülüs olmak [olması] mersum-ı ...ezeldir; sükkân-i şehre yetişmek [yetişmesi] hayli ma'nadur; istirahat oldılar [etdiler]; ne gördüm!; halde* with the meaning of *zaman*; *fazla* with the meaning of *başka*. He uses the construction of *belirtisiz isim tamlaması* (indefinite noun phrase) lavishly. Examples include *ol hak-i pak [ol hak-i pakın] züvvarından, nerkad-i mukaddes [mukaddesin] müşahedesinden, ol mahalde sıhhat [sıhhatin] vuku'ı müberhendir, bülend-şüküh [bülend-şükühun] dameninde* and *mıhrab-ı Meryem [Meryem'in] pişgahında*.

Sources and influences

When the topic of a work is the description of a journey, what might be said about influences upon the work other than the personal experiences and observations of the traveller? In fact, the study of sources serves to identify if the text was based on the author's actual journey, or if the author derived all or some of his information from other relevant sources, and how authentic his account is. From the perspective of authenticity of the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*,

30. *Manzume-i Farisi-veş ebyat – Bi'l-cümle tetabu'ı izafat – İnşaya virür egerçi ziyet – Türki söz içinde ayn-ı sıklet* (Levend 1949: 94, quoting from the *Hüsn ü 'aşk*).
31. *Ey bimarân-ı pister-i hasret, bu ol darü'ş-şifa-yı 'illet-i ma'siyetdür ki gubar-ı sahn-ı mu'allasından terkib olınan ma'cun-ı müferrih visal-i cevahir takviyet-bahş-ı dil-hastegan-ı 'isyan olmasa teb ü tab-ı humma-yı hamimden ifakat na-müyesser idi. Beyt (Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn 97).*
The *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyni'l-Farisi* (Süleymaniye Ktp., Erzincan, no: 135, f. 201b) reads: *Ey bimarân-ı pister-i 'illet, in an darü'ş-şifa-yı 'illet-i ma'siyet-est ki eger ez gubar-ı sahn-ı mu'allayış terkib-yaftegi-i ma'cun-ı müverrih-i takviye-bahş-ı dil-hastegan-ı 'isyan nemişüd ez tab-ı teb-ı humma-yı hamim halas müyesser na-bud, Nazm.*
32. The auxiliary verb *et-* 'to cause, to make' accepts an object in the accusative case, the auxiliary verb *ol-* 'to become' takes a noun but not an object.

an ambiguous phrase at the very start of the section on the reason for composition needs recording here: 'The commander of the army of imagination arranges the caravans of words in the following way'.³³ This vague expression may be a rhetorical disclaimer, or alternatively it may suggest that Nabi constructed his account out of his imagination. There are, however, several specific assertions testifying to the authenticity of his pilgrimage journey. Besides Nabi's statements in his account and his verses in his *Divan*, certain biographers assure us that Nabi went on the hajj through Egypt and produced his narrative.³⁴

What matters therefore is to determine the sources of the material which constitutes Nabi's narration since his pilgrimage account is not only a narration of what he saw during his journey but also a skilful combination of things experienced and heard with those memorised or quoted from texts he may have had in front of him during the course of writing. In fact, this type of combination is a principal characteristic of many detailed medieval pilgrimage narratives, including those of Ibn Battuta (Dunn 1986: 313), Mandeville (Howard 1980: 54), Marco Polo and Evliya Çelebi, and appears to have been part of Nabi's method too. After giving an external description of a mosque, shrine or a sacred site Nabi adds a piece of relevant information or an anecdote either from memory or from the jottings of the journey or from written sources. He may have occasionally used local written sources. For instance, he gives tangible information about the manuscript copies of Ibn al-Arabi's *Fütühat-ı Mekkiyye* in the library of Mevlana's shrine in Konya, suggesting that he gained access to the library of the shrine. On the other hand, one of the more extended descriptions in the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* is that on the Aksa mosque, but surprisingly Nabi says that he stayed in Jerusalem for just three days, which seems a very short time to produce such a long description. He gives the measurement of the Aksa mosque in *zira'*, and determines its location and how much space it occupies in the city. The nature of the information, which is statistical, historical and descriptive, implies that he must have made use of a relevant source, either oral or written.

33. Ka'id-i ketibe-i hayal bu tarik üzere tertib-i kavafil-i makal ider ki (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 3).

34. Mısır u Irak u Rum'ını gördüm bu alemün – Hiç görmedüm esas-ı beka bir diyarda (*Nabi Divanı* 981); Seyl-i eşküm gibi hergiz nehr-i cari görmedüm – Vardum ey Yusuf- cemalüm Nil'e de Ceyhun'a da (*Nabi Divanı* 957).

However Nabi leaves his sources unspecified, using terms such as: 'as it is related by the narrators of the events of the past',³⁵ 'which is related by the historians of Egypt',³⁶ 'from the words of the tongues of learned men',³⁷ 'as it is written by the tongue of reed[pens] of narrators'.³⁸ His ambiguous descriptions of his references suggest that he depended generally on oral sources, but wished to confirm their truthfulness by implied reference to written sources. Indeed, Nabi's main concern was the skillful employment of his own prose style, not the detailed treatment of the subject.³⁹ Several pilgrim-writers including Evliya Çelebi, Mehmed Edib and Kadri who give more priority to subject than to prose style refer occasionally to specific written sources.

It is unnecessary to investigate the sources of information which seemingly come from Nabi's general knowledge. But it is worthwhile exploring the sources of his direct quotations, which clearly inspired him. In this respect, the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* is full of Turkish, Persian and Arabic verses, a significant number of which appear to be quoted from other poets. Numerous Persian verses cited in the narrative are available in Persian works called the *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn*, which describe the sacred places of Mecca and Medina, and the ceremonies of the hajj in more or less same or similar verses. There is a problem in identifying the real composer of the original work of the *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn(s)*. Since the work constitute the most crucial source for the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* it is worth concentrating on determining its poet. It is stated by several modern researchers that the *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn* was written by Muhyi of Lari (d. 933/1526–1527), and that it was misattributed for a long time to Jami (Rieu 1881: 655; Berthels 1960: 478).⁴⁰ Indeed, biographical entries on Jami in reference works do not include any work called the *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn* among his works. Instead, we are told that

35. *elsine-i nakala-i ahbar-ı ezmine-i sabıkada cari olduğu üzere (Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn 11).*

36. *zeban-güzar-ı tevarih-şinasan-ı vekayi'-i Mısıryyedür (Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn 51).*

37. *aklam-ı elsine-i ashab-ı vukufdan (Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn 46).*

38. *çekide-i zeban-ı yara'a-i rüvat olduğu üzere (Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn 17).*

39. See the section on Nabi's prose style.

40. While introducing Muhyi's *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn*, Rieu (1881: 654) gives some biographic information on the author: "Muhyi Lari, a native of the island of Lar in the Persian Gulf, lived, according to Riyaz ush-Shu'ara, fol. 411, from the time of Sultan Ya'kub (A.H. 883–896) to the reign of Shah Tahmasp, who succeeded A.H. 930. He wrote a commentary upon the *Ta'riyyah* of Ibn Fariz, and dedicated the present poem, on his return from Mecca, to Sultan Muzaffar B. Mahmud Shah (who reigned in Gujrat [Gujarat] from A.H. 917 to 932). That dedication is not found in the present copy." Muhyi died in 933/1526. See also Simsar 1937:

Jami, who went on the hajj in 877/1472, wrote a prose work on the rites of the hajj called the *Risale der-menasik* in Baghdad on his outward journey (Okumuş 1993: 98; Huart 1960: 421–422; Togan 1997: 17).

It seems that there is no descriptive study on Muhyi and his works, and the ascription of the *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn* to Muhyi must have been made by cataloguers due to the fact that the name Muhyi is placed at the beginning and in the introduction to copies of the work (Simsar 1937: 140). Muhammed Ahmed Simsar says that Muhyi quotes from Jami, depending probably on Rieu who says that Muhyi incorporated an extract from Jami's *Tuhfetü'l-ahrar* in full (Rieu 1881: 655). The latter work consists of twenty sections, the seventh of which concerns Jami's visit to the Ka'be (Hikmet 1320: 194). Muhyi clearly quotes many verses from Jami in the work.⁴¹

In the manuscript libraries of Istanbul there are several copies of the *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn* which were ascribed by cataloguers to Muhyi.⁴² However, a copy of the *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn* found in the Millet library defies the attribution of the work to Muhyi, and suggests that it was written by Jami, for the pseudonym Jami is placed instead of Muhyi in the same verses placed in the preliminary and concluding sections.⁴³ The name Muhyi does not appear in the work at all. Interestingly, it includes verse quotations from Jami, giving reference to him. Besides the placement of Jami, there are certain differences between this copy and others. In this copy, which was made in Mecca, the pictures are different. Numerous verses are cited in different places and sometimes in different contexts. The copy, which is complete with introductory and concluding verses, does not contain the panegyrics for Jami and some others which appear in other texts, and which must have been composed later by Muhyi. Therefore, the copy is shorter than 'Muhyi's version' in the Süleymaniye library and others in the British Museum and the Chester Beatty Library (Arberry 1962: 22–23). The copies in the Millet library and the Chester Beatty Library were copied in Mecca in 1007/1598 and 1003/1595 respectively.

It is still too early to reach a final conclusion without a thorough study. But it is very possible that Muhyi based his compilation on Jami's verse description and added his own verses. The cultured Ottoman author Eyüb

41. Muhyi, *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn* (Süleymaniye Ktp., Lala Ismail, no: 102, dated 942/1542), f. 2, 6, 7, 46.

42. Several copies of the *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn* in the Süleymaniye library are held in the following sections: Hacı Mahmud, no: 3494; Reşid Bey, no: 1176; Laleli, no: 1183/3; Lala Ismail, no: 102/2.

43. See a copy of the *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn* in the Millet library, Farsça, no: 478.

Sabri Paşa (d. 1890), author of a very detailed book on the historical and geographical description of the Hijaz, ascribes a number of quotations from the *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn* to Jami in his work *Mir'atü'l-haremeyn* (Sabri 1302/1884: 1147). It is worth noting that Sabri mistakenly ascribes a few verses from the *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn* to the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* (Sabri 1302/1884: 1159). Nabi himself must have attributed the verses in question to Jami although he does not refer to him in his narrative. This is because while we do not sense Muhyi's presence in Nabi's works at all, Jami's influence is evident both on Nabi's philosophy and his other works including the Persian *Divançe* and the *Tercüme-i hadis-i erba'in*. Indeed, Jami's *Tuhfetü'l-ahrar* appears to have been among the favourite works of the Ottoman literati, for this work was given as a gift to sons of Mehmed IV by the grand vezir of the time in 1086/1675 (Levend 1944: 42), and is also complimented by Nev'izade 'Atayi in his *Suhbetü'l-ebkar* (Levend 1973: 107).

Despite a great number of quotations from the *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn*, Nabi rarely quotes verses from other master poets unless he finds them particularly appropriate for his immediate subject. Among the poets we can identify are Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi, Fuzuli (d. 1556), Baki (1526–1600), and Naili (d. 1077/1666). There are a few poems the poets of which were identified by Nabi himself. These are by Murad IV (r. 1623–1640), Şeyhülislam Yahya (1644) and Ahmed I (r. 1603–1617). The *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* also contains several of Nabi's own verses, some of which are included in his Turkish *Divan* and Persian *Divançe*.⁴⁴ It seems that these panegyrics to persons such as the Prophet Muhammed, Ibn el-'Arabi and Mevlana were composed in the course of the journey (*Nabi Divanı* 138).

44. The opening couplets of the poems Nabi included in his *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* are the followings:

El-veda' ey hak-i rahun kuhl-i iman el-veda'

Seng-i kuyun gevher-i tac-ı Süleyman el-veda'

(*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 110; *Nabi Divanı* 738; Persian *Divançe* 34);

El-veda' ey merdüm-i çeşm-i basiret el-veda'

El-veda' ey sünbül-i bag-ı hakikat el-veda'

(*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 92; *Nabi Divanı* 738; Persian *Divançe* 35);

Sakın terk-i edebden ku-yı mahbub-ı Huda'dur bu

Nazargah-ı İlahi'dür makam-ı Mustafa'dur bu

(*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 96; *Nabi Divanı* 952; Persian *Divançe* 35);

Pişani-i şevkun kadem-i rah-ı necat it

Müjganunı çarub-ı gubar-ı 'Arafat it

(*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 69; *Nabi Divanı* 473; Persian *Divançe* 35).

In conclusion, Nabi's sources for the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* can be identified as his own experiences and observations; material collected from oral and written sources; his general culture as a learned man; and his specific knowledge of existing poetry. In some cases, especially in the description of the sacred cites in the Hijaz, his remarks appear to be a prose paraphrase of the Persian verses cited. Yet, in spite of a large number of quotations from other poets, particularly from Jami and/or Muhyi, Nabi seems not to have imitated them much as to content and style. While portraying *his own story* in his Persianised language and elaborate style, Nabi generally used the verses of other poets as marginal embellishments or as additions to his own pictures.

The place of the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* in the genre

Nabi's narrative stands unique in its genre in several respects. Unlike the majority of Ottoman pilgrimage texts, which aimed to provide the reader with practical data about the stations, Nabi's account does not give proper descriptions of the stations.⁴⁵ In terms of style and content his narrative also does not resemble the works by Evliya Çelebi and Şefik Söylemezoğlu who aimed to give detailed geographical and historical information in a factual manner. With respect to written format Nabi's *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* stands beside the narrations of Fevri and İbrahim Hanif, who composed their texts in prose with extensive verse sections. It is possible to see a parallel between Nabi's aim and that of Ahmed Fakih, who in his *Kitabu evsafı mesacidi's-şerife* intends to produce a literary description of the sacred places in the holy cities of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem, overlooking the journey itself (Mazıoğlu 1974).

Despite major differences as to the aim and style of their narrative, there can be found some similarities between Evliya Çelebi and Nabi in terms of the way they undertook the journey. They both made a relatively comfortable and exceptional journey, not joining the official pilgrimage caravan until it was necessary. It seems that they both enjoyed official assistance during their journeys. While Evliya was helped by Harmuş Paşa, governor of Jerusalem, and Hüseyin Paşa, governor of Damascus, Nabi must have been assisted by Abdurrahman Paşa, governor of Egypt, and others. Like Evliya Çelebi, who was accompanied by his close friend Sa'ili Çelebi and seven slaves, Nabi was accompanied by his friend Mehmed Rami, and

45. Little work has been published on the genre of Ottoman pilgrimage narratives generally. For a discussion of several texts see my unpublished PhD thesis called 'Ottoman pilgrimage narratives and Nabi's *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*' (University of Durham, 1999).

probably by some slaves. Both travellers visited the sacred sites in Jerusalem and intended to join the Egyptian caravan although Evliya had to join the Damascus caravan (Çelebi 1935: 518). Neither man's description could be regarded as a proper reflection of the pilgrimage experience of the vast majority of Ottoman pilgrims.

In order to establish the place of Nabi's narrative in its genre it is necessary to identify similarities between the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* and other pilgrimage texts composed previously and subsequently. The narrative contains a number of verses similar to those cited in earlier pilgrimage texts. For example, where the sixteenth-century poet Bahti's *Manzume fi'l-menasik-i hacc* reads:

'It is a temple; it is in reality the place where God is worshipped; it became a place of prostration; in fact, it is the place of prostration before God.'⁴⁶

Nabi's *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* reads:

'That is the place of prostration and the place of prostration before God. That is the temple and the place where God is worshipped.'⁴⁷

The latter couplet is found in the Persian pilgrimage narration the *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn*,⁴⁸ which proves that neither Nabi nor Bahti composed it. Rather, while Nabi quotes it Bahti paraphrases it in Ottoman Turkish.

The following example of similarity is a couplet, the first line of which is in Arabic and the second in Persian. This type of couplet is called *mülemma*, and is also cited in Muhyi's compilation. While Nabi quotes it in its original form, Bahti translates the Persian line into Turkish. The couplet was originally composed to greet someone on the festival day, hence the most proper place to cite it is the description of Mina, where pilgrims celebrate the festival of *adha* or *kurban bayramı* 'festival of sacrifice':

'May God grant you a happy morning! May this festival day be blessed for you!'⁴⁹

46. Ma'bededür ma'nide ma'bud-ı Hakk – Secdegeh oldı veli mescud-ı Hakk (Bahti, *Manzume fi-menasiki'l-hacc*, Süleymaniye Ktp., Aşir Efendi, no: 123, f. 2).

47. Secde-geh an başed ü mescud-ı Hakk – Ma'bede an başed ü ma'bud-ı Hakk (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 2).

48. Muhyi [Jami], *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn*, Millet Ktp., f. 7 (this copy seems to have numbered by a later hand).

49. The *Fütuhu'l-haremeyn* (f. 31b) and the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* (81) reads: Sabbaha-ke'llahü sabahe's-sa'id – Ber-tü mübarek bud in ruz-i 'id. Bahti (f. 20b) reads: Sabbaha-ke'llahü sabahe's-sa'id – Ola mübarek sana bu yevm-i 'id.

There are several similar expressions and metaphors found in Nabi's *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* and Kadri's *Menazilü't-tarik ila beyti'llahi'l-'atik*. However, these may be simply echoes of common expressions and are not sufficient evidence to show that Nabi made a particular use of Kadri's text. Kadri's text reads:

'One who sees the river in the middle of that meadow, as if it wears silver belt and green cloth of velvet/brocade'.⁵⁰

Nabi's narrative reads:

'the river of 'Asi which is the silver belt round the middle of the black clothes of Hama'.⁵¹

Kadri's reads:

'Look up and down of that ambergris-coloured line! They say that paradise is either above or below Damascus'.⁵²

Nabi's reads:

'Those who say that paradise was either below or above Damascus have said that beyond any doubt it is above'.⁵³

The above-cited similar verses between Nabi's narrative and previous texts may indicate the similarity of their sources although it might be in some cases a different version of the same sources.

Now it is necessary to ascertain what was the place of Nabi's narrative in the context of the succeeding pilgrimage texts. It should be noted immediately that Nabi's pilgrimage narrative was used as a model by several authors of succeeding centuries in their pilgrimage texts. Of these, the first work to be mentioned is the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyni'l-Farisi*, which is a brief Persian paraphrase of Nabi's description of the sacred sites in the Hijaz. The only known copy of the work is available in a manuscript including other works by Nabi in the Süleymaniye library (Erzincan, no: 135). Folios 200b–207b of the manuscript are occupied by this work, which seems complete, containing introductory and concluding remarks. The existing copy of the

50. Dir gören ab-ı revanı ol çemende der meyan – San kuşanmış sim kemer giymiş yeşil kamha kaba (Kadri f. 21a).
51. nitak-ı simin-i miyan-ı sevad-ı Hama olan nehr-i 'Asi (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 20).
52. Zir u balasına bak ol hatt-ı 'anber-famun – Cennet üstinde ya altında dimişler Şam'un (Kadri f. 23a).
53. Ref' idüb şübheyi üstinde 'ıyandur didiler – Cennet altında ya üstinde diyenler Şam'un (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 32).

work was made in 1176/1762 by Muhammed Sadık. The writer sometimes translates, sometimes paraphrases, sometimes summarizes and sometimes adds different verses and remarks. The text could not therefore be deemed a proper translation of the relevant parts of Nabi's description. Several couplets are placed in different contexts. The order sometimes differs from Nabi's. The introduction and conclusion of the Persian work are totally different from Nabi's *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*. However towards the end of his introductory remarks the writer summarizes his journey, which can be reconciled with that of Nabi. According to the summary in the Persian account the author rested in his homeland, traversed a desert full of robbers and went along the dangerous coast of the deep sea. Consequently, with the help of God he succeeded in visiting the Ka'be and the tomb of the Prophet Muhammed (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyni'l-Farisi* f. 201a). After introductory remarks and couplets the author starts his main narration with a description of his observations and of the sacred sites in Mecca and in Medina.

It is highly probable that the identical verses and similar description led the cataloguer to ascribe the work to Nabi, and to name it the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyni'l-Farisi*. The adapter of the work intentionally eliminates Nabi's name and puts Rafi' instead several times as is shown in the following verse and prose examples, which also exemplify the relationship between the two texts. The *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyni'l-Farisi* reads:

Siyah-ruy vü güneh-kar Rafi'-i bi-dil
Küned ümid-i 'ata ya Muhammed-i 'Arabi (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyni'l-Farisi* f. 203b).

The *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* reads:

Siyah-ruy vü güneh-kar Nabi-i bed-kar
İder ümid-i 'ata ya Muhammed-i 'Arabi (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 96).

The *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyni'l-Farisi* reads:

Ba'z zeban-ı hod ra mahi-i cuybar-ı salavat ve ba'z tuti-i natıka-i hod ra garka-i şekeristan-ı tahıyyat sahte nahl-bend-i hadika-i eser Rafi' ez zerre'i kemter in sünbül-i nev-demide-i ihlas ra dest-aviz-i kuy-ı Hayru'l-beşer mi-kerd (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyni'l-Farisi* f. 203b).

The *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* reads:

Kimi zebanın mahi-i cuybar-ı salavat ve kimi tuti-i natıkasın garka-i şekeristan-ı tahıyyat itmegin nahl-bend-i hadika-i eser ya'ni Nabi-i kemter dahi bu sünbül-i nev-demide-i zemin-i ihlası dest-aviz-i ser-i kuy-ı hazret-i Hayru'l-beşer eylemişdür (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 95).

Unfortunately, the major eighteenth and the nineteenth-century biographical dictionaries including Safayi, Salim, Şefkat do not help us identifying a poet called Rafi' (Levend 1973: 305–352).

The eighteenth-century author Mehmed Edib's *Nehcetü'l-menazil*, which is reported as a popular pilgrimage narration, has a number of verses identical with those in Nabi's *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*. There is therefore the possibility of a common source which both Nabi and Mehmed Edib used in their descriptions. However, the fact that these verses were not quoted by other pilgrim authors such as Hibri and Kadri, who both produced their texts before Nabi in more or less the same manner as Mehmed Edib supports the assumption that Mehmed Edib made direct use of Nabi's text. Several verses are identical in the pilgrimage narratives by both Nabi and Mehmed Edib, who might have quoted from Nabi's narrative.⁵⁴

Besides these identical verses, Mehmed Edib quotes a poem by Nabi, which is implied by Nabi to have been composed in Medina (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 96). Only one couplet, which begins with *küşade*, is missing in Mehmed Edib's text. This couplet is also lost in the copy of *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* in British Museum.⁵⁵ The opening couplets of the poem are as follows: 'O beloved of God, O Arab Muhammed! The intercessor on Doomsday, O Arab

54. The following verses are included by both Nabi and Mehmed Edib (1232/1816–1817) in a similar context:

Gör Hama şehrin dolanmış guşe guşe ablar
Nehr-i 'Asi'ye muti' olmuş döner dulablar
(*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 20; *Nehcetü'l-menazil* 108);

Mazhar-ı merhamet-i hazret-i Mevla olduk
Ravza-i hazret-i Yahya'ya cebin-sa olduk
(*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 28; *Nehcetü'l-menazil* 57);

Zülf-i ham-der-hamunda buldı karar
Şam'dan çıkmak istermez dil-i zar
(*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 31; *Nehcetü'l-menazil* 65);

Ya hayra men düfnet fi'l-ka'i a'zamüh
Ve tabe men tibe-hürne el-ka'u ve'l-ekem
Ruhi'l-fida' el-kabra ente sakinüh
Fi-hi el-'ifafü ve fi-hi el-cudu ve'l-kerem
(*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 100; *Nehcetü'l-menazil* 117);

Firak-ı Ka'be'den sen sanma çeşm-i hun-feşan aglar
Ser-i ku-yı hakikatdür bu tenler içre can aglar
Degül giryan olan ancak beni Adem veda'ından
Feleklerde melek inler zemin u asman aglar
(*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 92; *Nehcetü'l-menazil* 225).

55. Nabi, *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*, British Museum, add 7853, f. 65a.

Muhammed!⁵⁶ On the other hand, it is obvious that Mehmed Edib, who gives more detailed and factual information from other sources, including the *Tarih-i Dınışk* (Edib 1232/1816–1817: 55), does not base his entire description on Nabi's.

An eighteenth-century anonymous pilgrimage narration testifies strongly to the celebrity of Nabi's narrative.⁵⁷ The anonymous author quotes verses from Nabi on several occasions such as on arriving at Medina, on leaving the mausoleum of the Prophet, on describing 'Arafat and on leaving the Ka'be. The first couplets of these poems are the following: 'O leader of the descendants of Adam, greetings to you! O reason for the creation of the world, greetings to you!⁵⁸ Make the forehead of your enthusiasm the foot of the road of salvation; Make your eyelash the sweeper of the dust of 'Arafat'.⁵⁹

The biographer Bursalı Mehmed Tahir states that Nabi wrote a poem to be hung in the mausoleum of the Prophet in Medina, and cites that poem in his biographical dictionary (Tahir 1333/1914: 449). The opening couplet of this famous poem, which is given in the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*, is the following: 'Take care not to behave improperly, this is the home of the beloved of God! This is the place God holds high in esteem, the position of the Chosen'.⁶⁰ However, Nabi does not mention hanging this poem at the tomb. The poem which he stated in his narrative to have been composed to be hung in the tomb of the Prophet is a different one (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 104). However, the *gazel* rhyming in *bu* 'this' seems to have been more popular. There is even a story regarding this poem, probably made up by an imaginative reader of Nabi's text (Karahan 1987: 10–11; Aktüccar 1984: 13–14). In addition, the nineteenth-century Persian author Muhammed Ma'sum in his pilgrimage narrative also called the *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*, cites a Turkish poem which must have been composed as a parallel to Nabi's *gazel* rhymed *bu*. The first couplet of the parallel is the following (Şirazi 1362/1943: 50–51): 'This is the position

56. Eya habib-i Huda ya Muhammed-i 'Arabi – Şefi'-i ruz-ı ceza ya Muhammed-i 'Arabi (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 95; *Nehcetü'l-menazil* 114).

57. Anonymous, *Janib-i Misrdan Makka Mukarrama* (Route book for pilgrims) about 1760, The John Rylands Library, Turkish mss., no: 88.

58. Anonymous (the folios of the text are not numbered): Es-salam ey server-i evlad-ı Adem es-salam – Es-salam ey badi-i icad-ı 'alem es-salam (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 100).

59. Anonymous (not numbered): Pişani-i şevkun kadem-i rah-ı necat it – Müjganunu çarub-ı gubar-ı 'Arafat it (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 69).

60. Sakın terk-i edebden kuy-ı mahbub-ı Huda'dur bu – Nazargah-ı İlahi'dür makam-ı Mustafa'dur bu (*Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* 96).

of 'Ali, the lion, the reverend, the pleasant; This is the visiting place of the souls of all saints'.⁶¹

Conclusion

Nabi's principal aim in his narrative appears to be to give an eloquent description of the mosques, shrines and other sacred sites he saw in the course of his journey. He manages to insert his shrewd and comparative observations into his static and factual description. Besides portraying such religious sites, Nabi occasionally incorporates incidental information of sociological, historical, geographical, and autobiographical characteristics. Descriptions of his meeting with his brothers, sisters and fellow countrymen in Urfa, of a Damascene coffee-house, of an official and public celebration of a conquest in Damascus, and of the progression of Egyptian pilgrimage caravan constitute the most vivid and interesting depictions of the narrative.

Nabi embellished and enlivened his descriptions through verse quotations from major Persian and Ottoman poets, including Mevlana Celaleddin-i Rumi, Jami, Fuzuli, Baki and Şeyhülislam Yahya. Particularly Persian verses by Jami and/or by other poets including particularly Muhyi, occupies a significant place in Nabi's narrative. However, his excessive quotation of Jami's verses does not prove that Nabi modelled or based his account upon the former's work, for the latter portrays his own personal experience in his own original metaphorical style. Whilst quoting such verses, Nabi put his own original poems in his narrative for he as a master poet aimed to produce a masterpiece which would be regarded and used as an ornament by men of letters, and indeed he achieved his aim.

Nabi had no precedent or successor in composing an account of the pilgrimage experience among the most well-known Ottoman court poets. His verses in his narrative have been loved and quoted widely by succeeding Ottoman authors, including particularly Mehmed Edib and Anonymous. Not only his verses but also his whole account must have been popular among Ottoman readers, particularly among those of literary interest. While other Ottoman pilgrimage narratives survive in only a very small number of copies, his work exists in a considerable number of manuscript copies, which are found in almost all relevant libraries in Turkey and across Europe, and was printed in 1848.

61. Makam-ı Haydar-ı hazret 'Aliyy-i Murteza'dur bu - Ziyaretgah-ı ervah-ı 'umum-ı evliyadur bu (Şirazi 1362/1943: 50).

References

- Aktüccar, H. (1984) *Nabi, hayatı, sanatı ve eserleri*, İstanbul: Gökşin.
- Ambros, E. G. (1960) *Nabi*, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 7, Leiden: Brill, 839.
- Arberry, A. J. (1962) *The Chester Beatty Library: a catalogue of the Persian manuscripts and miniatures* 3, Dublin.
- Atalar, M. (1991) *Osmanlı devletinde surre-i humayun ve surre alayları*, Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yay.
- Babinger, F. (1960) Mehmed Pasha Rami, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 6, Leiden: Brill, 999.
- Berthels, E. (1960) Muhyi'l-Din Lari, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 7, Leiden: Brill, 478.
- Bilkan, A. F. (ed.) (1997) *Nabi – Nabi Divanı*, İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.
- Bilkan, A. F. (1995) *Nabi'nin sanat çevresi ve sanatçı dostları*, *Yedi İklim* 65, 62–69.
- Browne, E. G. (1922) *Supplementary hand-list of the Muhammadan manuscripts: presented to the libraries of the University and colleges of Cambridge*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Çelebi, E. (1935) *Evlîya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi: Anadolu, Suriye, Hicaz (1671–1672)* 9, İstanbul: Devlet Matbaası.
- Crawford, G. M. (1897) *Handlist of oriental manuscripts*, Aberdeen: Aberdeen University.
- Dunn, R. E. (1986) *The adventures of Ibn Battuta*, Los Angeles – California: Berkeley.
- Edib, M. (1232/1816–1817) *Nehceti'l-menazil*, İstanbul.
- El Moudden, A. (1990) The ambivalence of *rihla*: community integration and self-definition in Moroccan travel accounts, 1300–1800, in Dale F. Eickelman – James Piscatori (eds.) *Muslim Travellers: pilgrimage, migration, and the religious imagination*, London: Routledge, 69–83.
- Ergün, S. N. (1936) *Türk şairleri* 1, İstanbul.
- Esin, E. (1963) *Mecca the blessed Madinah the radiant*, Nowara: Paul Elek Productions Limited.
- Faroqhi, S. (1992) Anatolian townsmen as pilgrims to Mecca: some evidence from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in Gilles Veinstein (ed.) *Süleyman le Magnifique et son temps*, Paris, 309–326.
- Gibb, E. J. W. (1904–1905) *A History of Ottoman Poetry* 3–4, London: Luzac & Co.
- Hikmet, A. A. (1320) *Jami: mutazammîn-i tahkikat der harih-i ahval u asar-ı manzum u mensur-i hatenü'ş-şu'ara*, Tahran.
- Holbrooke, V. R. (1994) *The Unreadable shores of love*, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Howard, D. R. (1980) *Writers and pilgrims: medieval pilgrimage narratives and their posterity*, London: University of California.
- Huart, Cl. – [Masse, H.] (1960) *Djami*, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 2, Leiden: Brill, 421–422.

- Baysun, C. (1997) Murad IV, in *İslam Ansiklopedisi* 8, Leiden: Brill, 632-664.
- Jackson, P. (1998) Marco Polo and his Travels, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 61, 82-101.
- Karahan, A. (1980) *Eski Türk edebiyatı incelemeleri*, İstanbul: İUEF.
- Karahan, A. (1987) *Nabi*, Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı.
- Köprülü, F. (1966) *Edebiyat araştırmaları*, Ankara: TTK.
- Levend, A. S. (1944) *Nabi'nin Surnamesi*, İstanbul: İnkılap.
- Levend, A. S. (1949) *Türk dilinde gelişme ve sadeleşme safhaları*, Ankara: TDK.
- Levend, A. S. (1973) *Türk edebiyatı tarihi*, Ankara: TTK.
- Mazıoğlu, H. (ed.) (1974) *Ahmed Fakih – Kitabı evsafı mesacidi's-şerife*, Ankara: TDK.
- Mengi, M. (1987) *Divan şiirinde hikemi tarzın büyük temsilcisi Nabi*, Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi.
- Nabi Divanı* see Bilkan (1997)
- Nabi (1265/1848) *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn*, İstanbul.
- Naci (1307/1889) *Osmanlı şa'irleri*, İstanbul.
- Okumuş, Ö. (1993) Cami, Abdurrahman, in *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi* 7, İstanbul, 94-99.
- Pala, İ. (1989) *Şair Nabi: Hayriyye*, İstanbul: Bedir Yayınevi.
- Rieu, Ch. (1881) *Catalogue of Persian manuscripts in the British Museum* 2, London.
- Robischon, D. (ed.) (1969) *Osmanzade Ta'ib Ahmed – Hadiqat ül-vüzerâ*, Freiburg.
- Sabri, E. (1302/1884) *Mir'atü'l-haremeyn: mir'at-ı Mekke* 4, İstanbul: Bahriyye Matbaası.
- Salim, M. E. (1315/1897) *Tezkire-i Salim*, İstanbul: İkdâm Matbaası.
- Simsar, M. A. (1937) *Oriental Manuscripts of the John Frederick Lewis Collection in the Free Library of Philadelphia*, Philadelphia.
- Şirazi, Na'ibü's-Sadr-ı (1362/1943) *Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn: sefername-i Na'ibu's-Sadr-i Sira-zî der-ziyaret-i Mekke ve seychat-i İran u Hind* 1, İran.
- Steingass, F. (1970) *A comprehensive Persian-English dictionary*, Beirut.
- Tahir, Bursalı M. (1333/1914) *Osmanlı müellifleri* 2, İstanbul: Matba'a-i Amire.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (1956) *XIX. asır Türk edebiyatı tarihi* 1, İstanbul: İbrahim Horoz.
- Tietze, A. (1973) Mustafa Ali of Gallipoli's prose style, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 5, 299-311.
- Togan, Z. V. (1997) Cami, in *İslam Ansiklopedisi* 3, İstanbul: Maarif, 17.
- Tuhfetü'l-haremeyn* see Nabi (1265/1848)
- Uzunçarşılı, I. H. (1951) *Osmanlı Tarihi* 3, Ankara: TTK.