

Vjeran Kursar, Nenad Moačanin, Kornelija Jurin Starčević, eds.

---

Evliya Çelebi in the Borderlands: New Insights  
and Novel Approaches to the *Seyahatname*  
(Western Balkans and Iran Sections)

For Publisher

*Damir Agičić*

© Copyright: Authors and Editors, Srednja Europa d.o.o., 2021.

Editors

*Vjeran Kursar*

*Nenad Močanin*

*Kornelija Jurin Starčević*

Reviewers

*Andelko Vlašić*

*Joshua White*

Graphic design and layout

*Tvrtko Molnar*

Banian ITC, IV. Ravnice 25, Zagreb

ISBN: 978-953-8281-33-4

A CIP catalogue record for this book  
is available from the National and University  
Library in Zagreb: 001095733.

This publication was made possible with financial support  
from the Ministry of Education and Science, Republic of Croatia.

Printed in Tiskara Zelina in March 2021.

Vjeran Kursar, Nenad Moačanin,  
Kornelija Jurin Starčević, eds.

**Evliya Çelebi in the Borderlands:  
New Insights and Novel Approaches  
to the *Seyahatname*  
(Western Balkans and Iran Sections)**



**srednja europa**

Zagreb 2021.



## Table of Contents

---

VJERAN KURSAR, NENAD MOAČANIN, KORNELIJA JURIN STARČEVIĆ	
Introduction .....	5
NURAN TEZCAN	
Evliya Çelebi's Balkan Travels and His Attitude Toward the Other .....	9
ROBERT DANKOFF	
A Puzzling Passage in Evliya Çelebi's Description of Croatia .....	19
NENAD MOAČANIN	
Ottoman Osijek as Seen by Evliya Çelebi .....	27
VJERAN KURSAR	
Evliya Çelebi and Drinking Culture in the Western Balkans in the Seventeenth Century .....	39
FARIBA ZARINEBAF	
Evliya Çelebi in Azerbaijan The Economic and Religious Landscape of a Borderland Region in the Seventeenth Century .....	63
JEAN-LOUIS BACQUÉ-GRAMMONT & MOHAMMADREZA ABBASI NADERPOOR	
Notes et documents sur l'histoire urbaine de Hamadan d'Evliyâ Çelebî à nos jours .....	79
HAKAN T. KARATEKE	
How Did the Volume Arrangement of Evliyâ Çelebi's Travel Account Evolve? .....	129
ALEKSANDAR FOTIĆ	
Receptions of Evliya Çelebi's <i>Seyahatname</i> in Serbian Historiography and Challenges of the Original Manuscript .....	149
KORNELIJA JURIN STARČEVIĆ	
The Autograph of Evliya Çelebi's <i>Seyahatnâme</i> as a "New" Source for Croatian History: Preliminary Survey of Some Selected Examples .....	165
SLOBODAN ILIĆ	
On Misreadings, Deliberate Leaving-Outs, Second-Hand Translations, and Lazy Editors: The Forthcoming Edition of Evliyâ Çelebi's Book of Travel Through Bosnia and Dalmatia, and Some Critical Remarks on Previous Editions of the Related Chapters .....	189
MARTA ANDRIĆ	
The Prototype and Tentative Variants of the Croatian Translation of the <i>Seyahatname</i> .....	211

## How did the Volume Arrangement of Evliyā Çelebi's Travel Account Evolve?

---

Evliyā Çelebi's travelogue, which amounts to some 13,000 A-4 pages in Latinized transliteration, is surely one of the most extraordinary travel accounts in human history. Despite an increased interest and the existence of a wide array of studies on the work, the fundamental question of *how* this remarkable man composed his work still remains an unsolved conundrum in scholarship. Pondering the circumstances in which Evliya wrote and arranged the account will, no doubt, be essential to our understanding of this text.<sup>1</sup>

The general assumption has been that Evliyā took notes while he traveled for over forty years, and wove them into his work when he sat down to write it in Cairo after 1673. I offered some particular suggestions about his working method elsewhere. I postulated that the traveler wrote sections of his travel account on the road—either during and between trips or a short time thereafter—as *complete sections* to be incorporated into the finished product. They were, therefore *not* (at least not all of them) taken as haphazard incomplete notes to be formed into a coherent narrative *later*.<sup>1</sup> In Cairo, then, the author arranged the order of the text and worked on transliterating the final fair-copy on the large sheets that would constitute the final product. Since a large part of the text is in chronological order, it is reasonable to assume that his notes and chapters were organized according to years or trips. They were perhaps loose leaves of paper stacked or bound together. With an assistant clerk's help, he undertook the arduous task of copying these large chunks of pre-written texts into what would eventually become the fair-copy. His assistant first transcribed the consonantal skeleton of the work on to the sheets. Evliyā later put the diacritics, made some corrections, and added a few marginalia, interlinear sentences and transitions between sections.<sup>2</sup>

---

\* I wish to extend my thanks to Robert Dankoff and Ilham Khuri-Makdisi for their very useful suggestions on an earlier version of this article.

1 See Karateke, "How Did Evliya Çelebi Write His Travel Account?" forthcoming in *Cemal Kafadar Festschrift*. That article and the present one are complementary and should be read in tandem.

2 See Dankoff, "Where is Evliya Çelebi in the Autograph Manuscript of the Seyahatname?" Published at academia.edu: robert dankoff. Further studies on the procedure of copying the travel text into volumes include Richard F. Kreutel, "Neues zur Evliyâ-Çelebi-Forschung," *Der Islam* 48 (1972), 269-279 and Pierre A. MacKay, "The Manuscripts of the Seyahatname of Evliya Çelebi. Part 1. The Archetype," *Der Islam* 52 (1975), 278-298.

Additionally though, Evliyâ probably also reworked the order of the volumes from its initial conception. In the ten-volume set we have at hand now, volume 1 is reserved to Istanbul, a large section of volume 10 is dedicated to Cairo, and his miscellaneous travels of more than forty years are apportioned among the remaining volumes largely in chronological order. It is safe to assume that Evliyâ Çelebî put some thought into conceptualizing and arranging the layout of his massive work. However, evidence in the text indicates that this arrangement may not have been planned from the start of his project. Inserting volume 1 on Istanbul in the beginning of the account and volume 10 on Cairo at the end of the work were probably late decisions. In the initial arrangement, the travel account most probably would have opened with the current volume 2, in which his actual travels start.

This article will examine the earlier conceptual stages of this magnum opus to glean a sense of how Evliyâ's idea of the book's structure may have evolved over time. The traveler occasionally provides cross references to indicate that a particular topic or location under discussion was also reported in detail elsewhere. Such an urge to refer the readers to another section of the travelogue probably emerges from the author's claim to perfection and his confidence about the completeness of his work. To collect data for this article, I examined all of his cross-references, although only a portion of them are elucidated below. As will be evident, some of his citations to other volumes are accurate; others, however, are either inaccurate or blank. I will offer explanations for these irregularities. Admittedly, most are conjecture and rest on incomplete evidence. Therefore, I have formulated my suggestions as questions below. Inevitably, some of my hypotheses will be easier to accept than the others. Depending on how one approaches the text and the questions directed to it, the validity of one or the other hypothesis may result in a need to develop alternative interpretations.

### **Was Istanbul not initially going to be compiled in volume 1?**

Most of Evliyâ's cross references point to volumes 1 and 2. Some of the references are correct; i.e., the referenced topic or place does appear in what is now volume 1 or 2. Others, however, appear in other volumes and are therefore incorrect. In particular, volume 5 contains abundant references to localities described in volumes 1 and 2 (15 references to volume 1; 6 references to volume 2). In almost every instance in volume 5 when Evliyâ cites volume 1, that referenced section turns out to be in volume 2; when he references volume 2, the correct citation is in fact volume 3. Volumes 4, 7, and 8 also make a few inaccurate references to those volumes. The pattern of inaccuracies suggests that the author made these references with a plan of volume 1 in his mind, but later decided to change the layout. He either forgot or did not have the opportunity to adjust them later.

Just as a reference, among the first eight volumes, which are believed to be autograph copies (series S), the length of volumes 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 vary between 185 to 196 folios. The other three volumes are volume 1 with 217 folios, volume 2 with 157 folios, and volume 4 with 223 folios. Volumes 1+2, volumes 3+4, and volumes 7+8 are bound together. The available manuscripts of volumes 9 and 10 are non-autograph copies.

### **HYPOTHESIS I**

It is possible that there was no volume 1 dedicated to Istanbul in Evliyā's initial plan. The account would have opened with his travels in chronological time, which begin in volume 2 in the current arrangement. When he decided that volume 1 would in fact be devoted to Istanbul, the change pushed the original arrangement of volumes 1 and 2 one volume ahead. This meant that references in subsequent volumes to volumes 2 and 3 are cited as being in volume 1 and 2 respectively.

The fact that the beginning of current volume 2 is conceptually designed as an introduction to the travelogue supports this argument. Volume 2 begins with Evliyā's first trip to Bursa and continues more or less chronologically from there. The current volume 2 opens with a proper preface (*dībāce-i Seyāhatnāme-i seyyāh-i 'ālem Evliyā-yı bī-riyā* 2:220b), which would have been also appropriate for the whole travelogue. Furthermore, his references to a table of contents (*fihris*) for volume 1 (i.e., volume 2 in the current arrangement) indicate that the inner arrangement of that volume was already completed ([2]).

Evliyā must have decided to dedicate volume 1 to Istanbul when he later sat down to arrange the early volumes. Was Istanbul originally going to appear in a later, separate volume?

### **HYPOTHESIS II**

References to the initial arrangement; i.e. the arrangement with volume 2 as the original volume 1, are dense in volume 5, but sparse in volumes 4, 7 and 8. Still, we cannot definitively know whether he outlined those volumes in their entirety before coming up with the new arrangement. He may have just written some sections in which he referenced volumes 1 and 2. Therefore, it would be logical to claim that Evliyā wrote (at least) the relevant sections in those volumes before his final arrangement of volume 1 as Istanbul.

One citation in volume 4 to volume 2 is correct [5], which suggests that this section was written after the new arrangement of volumes 1 and 2. Following this section about half a page was left blank on 4:303b. The next section starts with the description of his 1065/1655 journey from Azerbaijan to Iraq on the top of folio 4:304a.



## Textual evidence:

[1] 4:191b

*Bu şehr-i İzmidiñ bânisi ve ğalaṭ-ı meşhûru ve fâtihî ve eşkâl-i kal'ası cümle cild-i evvelimizde muḫaṣṣal taḫrîr olunmuşdur.*

[İzmit appears at 2:242b and several other places in volume 2]

[2] 5:16a

*Menzil-i kal'a-i Hınıs: Erzurûm eyâletinde ... bâlâda sene 1057 târihinde Defterdârzâde ve Ğâzî Seydî Ahmed Paşa ile 'âşî olan Şuşuk Begi ----niñ üstüne cenge gittiğimiz sene bu Hınıs kal'ası evşâfî cild-i evvelimizde muḫaṣṣal taḫrîr olunmuşdur. Cild-i evvelin fibrisine nazar oluna.*

[Description of Hınıs fortress is in volume 2; 2:291a]

[3] 7:148b-149a

*Lazka ibn Elheme Trabzan dağlarında qavâr edüp Gürcî kavmi ile hüsn-i ülfet ederek kavm-i 'azîm olup bunlara Lazka kavmi demeden ğalaṭ-ı meşhûr Laz dërler. Başka lisânları var. Cild-i evvelimizde lisânları ve işṭilâḫât [ve] 'ibârât-ları taḫrîr olunmuşdur.*

[Laz language is mentioned in volume 2; 2:250b]

[4] 8:201b

*Menzil-i qaşaba-i Babadağı*

*Şarı Şaltık Sultân ya 'nî Mehemed Buhâri ḫazretleri bu şehrde medfûn olup bu şehr onun âsitânesi evkâfî olduğı cümle bâlâda cild-i şânîmizde mestûrdur.*

[Babadağ is described in volume 3; 3:126b f]

[5] 4:303b

*Muḫaddemâ sene 1057 târihinde Erzurûmdan Nahşevâna ve kırk pâre şehri temâşâ edüp şehr-i Tebrîze ---- Hân 'aşrında gelüp ---- gün zevk u şevkler ettiğimizde şehr-i Tebrîzin evşâfî ğâyet tafşil üzre cild-i şânî-i Seyâḫatnâmemizde taḫrîr olunmuşdur, aña nazar oluna.*

[Tebriz is indeed described in volume 2; 2:298a f]

## Were volumes 1, 2 and part of volume 3 prepared consecutively in the new arrangement?

The answer to this question may seem obvious, but given the fact that he arranged some volumes before the others, it is worth looking at the evidence. We have seen above that the references in volumes 4, 5, 7 and 8 to volumes 1 and 2 are overwhelmingly inaccurate. The references in volume 2 to volume 1, and in volume 3 to volumes 1 and 2, on the other hand, are consistently correct.

### HYPOTHESIS III

Evliyā arranged, wrote, or edited parts of volume 2 immediately after he finished volume 1. Cross references in volume 2 point exclusively to volume 1 and are accurate. As, arguably, not much time has passed since the completion of volume 1 and that he has not worked on other volumes, we can assume that he still remembered many sections that he covered in volume 1 by heart. He might have of course looked in and re-read sections of the completed volume 1 as well. Such dense referencing does not occur anywhere else in the travel account and most of his references are clustered in the first half of volume 2, between folios 220 to 276 (with one exception of a reference on folio 369, [11]).

This observation would appear to conflict with the fact that he already had a table of contents (as mentioned in [hypothesis i](#)) and that the contents of current volume 2 were complete. He must have edited and added sections with references to the current volume 2 later on.

### HYPOTHESIS IV

In the same vein, Evliyā arranged volume 3 after volume 2. He has correct references to volumes 1 and 2 in this volume, however, the references in volume 3 are not exclusively to earlier volumes. Since part of this volume concerns his trip to Syria, he makes several references to his Hajj trip without providing a cross-reference (see [hypothesis xiv](#)).

### ANOMALY I

A reference in volume 2 to Pendik as having been described in volume 1 is not to be found in the latter or anywhere in the *Seyāhatnāme* ([17]). Evliyā must have been under the impression that he described the town, which is in the outskirts of Istanbul, in volume 1.

**ANOMALY II**

A series of three references at the very beginning of volume 3 create some confusion. The first one is to Gekbeziyye, which Evliyâ says was “described above” in volume 2 [12]. This information is correct. The stopover is described among the localities he visited during his 1056/1646 journey. If we take volume 3 to be written after volume 2, this is to be expected.

However, the next two sites on the same route, the landing at *içme suyu* and *dil hânı*, are referenced as having been described in volume 1 ([13],[14]). Although these two sites are adjacent to Gekbeziyye, Evliyâ reports on them in volume 2 describing an earlier journey he undertook in 1050/1640, one of his earliest trips. Therefore, this information is incorrect.

It is strange that in three successive references, one is correct and the other two are erroneous. The section in volume 3 in which these references appear (3:4b) shows no visual signs of later additions. For some reason, Evliyâ remembers his 1050/1640 trip to İzmîd and to the Princes' Islands (Kızıl Adalar) to have been included in the first volume.

Textual evidence:

[6] 2:220b

... *biy kırk senesinin mâh-ı Muharreminin guresinde piyâdece şehr-i İslâmbol içre serserî gezüp bâlâda cild-i evvelimizde İslâmbol evşâfin tahrîr êdigimiz üzre ... .. 'ışk [u] şevkimiz Arz-ı muqaddese ve Bağdâd-ı behîşt-âbâd [ve] Mekke ve Medîne ve Mısr u Şâm câniblerine 'azîmete bel bağlayup cild-i evvelimiz ibtidâsında tahrîr olunduğu üzre ...*

[This section appears at 1:6b]

Further evidence:

[7] Reference to the Tomb of Meḥmed II in volume 1 (2:237b): Appears at 1:39b f.

[8] Reference to Yeñiköy in volume 1 (2:245a): Appears at 1:137b

[9] Reference to Kavağ in volume 1 (2:245a): Appears at 1:138b f.

[10] Reference to Üsküdar in volume 1 (2:276a): Appears at 1:141a f.

[11] Reference to Üsküdar in volume 1 (2:369b): Appears at 1:141a f.

[12] 3:4b

*Menzil-i kaşaba-i Gekbeziyye: Bunlar bālāda Erzurūm seyāhatine giderken cild-i şānimizde vasf olunmuşdur.*

[Gekbeziyye is described at 2:276a-b]

[13] 3:4b

*Der sitāyiş-i iskele-i içme şuyu: İskele-i ‘azīm olup deryāyı karşı dile bu maħalden geçildiği ibtidā bir elli ta’rihinde seyāhat etmege çıkdığımız maħalde cild-i evvelimizde bu iskele ve müsbil içme şuyu daħi bu maħalde olmağ–ıla teferrücgāhı ve içme şuyunun havāşşı cümle taħrİR olunmuşdur.*

[İçme şuyu is described at 2:242a]

[14] 3:4b

*Menzil-i dil hānı: Sene 1050; daħi cild-i evvelde mufaşşal mevşūfdur.*

[The hān close to this promontory is mentioned at 2:242a]

[15] 3:105a

*Sitāyiş-i buhayre-i Çekmece: Muqaddemā cild-i evvelimizde İslāmboluñ mesiregāh evşāfında bu Çekmece evşāfı Tuna balıklarını çıkdığı ile mufaşşal taħrİR olunmuşdur.*

[Çekmece promanade is described at 1:146b]

[16] 3:106a

*Silivriden Karadeñiz kenārında Terkoz kal‘asına varınca mezkūr yedi kat germe kal‘ayı harāb edüp İslāmbol maldosuna istilā edenleri cild-i evvelimizde mufaşşal taħrİR olunmuşdur.*

[The episode is described at 1:10b,12a]

[17] 2:276a

*menzil-i karye-i Pendik: Leb-i deryāda bir ‘azīm kefere köyüdür. ... Ğayrı evşāfları cild-i evvelde mestūrdur.*

[Pendik is not included in volume 1 or anywhere else in detail in the travel account. The stopover at Pendik and its plain are mentioned during campaign marches, but the town is not described.]

### Was the section on Edirne in volume 3 a later addition?

The better question is whether Evliyâ added several sections to volume 3 later, including the journey that he undertook in the retinue of Melek Aḥmed Pasha after he was dispatched to Özi in Ramazan 1061/August 1651. Evliyâ describes many cities in the Balkans during the course of that journey. A little over a year later, the pasha is appointed to the governorship of Rumelia; this time, the journey takes them to Sofia. Finally, after the pasha was discharged from that office, the return trip in Şaban 1063/June 1653 to Istanbul is narrated in volume 3, including a description of Edirne. Volume 3 occupies the first 185 folio of Bağdat 305 manuscript. The section on Edirne starts on folio 148 and continues for about 20 folios. The rest of the volume is reserved for some episodes about Melek Aḥmed and Kaya Sultan. The next volume, which is included in the same manuscript, starts with Evliyâ's departure for Van in Cemaziyevvel 1065/March 1655.

Two references to the city of Edirne in volumes 6 and 8 are left blank. As I argue below, volume 6 was prepared immediately after Evliyâ arranged volumes 1-3 (hypothesis xiii). The author mentions that Edirne was described in detail in sections where he narrated his trip of 1063/1653 with Melek Aḥmed Pasha from Rumelia to Istanbul ([18]). If the important city of Edirne was included at this point in volume 3 already, the author would have certainly remembered that.

In the same vein, there are three references in volume 8 which were left blank ([20],[21],[22]) suggesting it was not clear from the beginning that the 1063/1653 trip would have been included in volume 3. As I propose below, parts of volume 8 were laid out quite early in the arrangement process, possibly before volumes 1-3, with other parts added later (hypothesis xi). Two of the aforementioned blank references are very close to one other: Muştafâ Pasha bridge on folio 147b-148a and Edirne, which starts on folio 148b. This evidence supports the hypothesis that the trip including Edirne was a later addition.

The final reference in volume 8 is to Silivri and is also left blank ([22]). Silivri appears in volume 3 some 40 folios before Edirne, but at the beginning of Evliyâ's Rumelia trip with Melek Aḥmed Pasha in 1061/1651. Additionally, a reference to the Danube river is left blank in volume 6 ([19]). The description of the Danube appears in volume 3, about 10 folios after Silivri.

### **HYPOTHESIS V**

The section that includes Edirne, possibly the two journeys of 1061/1651 and 1062/1652 accompanying Melek Aḥmed to his appointments, and the trip back to Istanbul after his discharge in 1063/1653, were appended to volume 3 subsequently.

Textual evidence:

[18] 6:51b

*Kal' a-i taht-ı s̄ānī edna'l-arz Edirne: Sene 1063 Rümēlinden Melek Aḥmed Paşa ile İslāmbola giderken cild-i ---- bu maḥmiyye-i Edirne muḥaṣṣal taḥrīr olunmuşdur.*

[Edirne is described at 3:148b f]

[19] 6:86b

*Cemī 'i abāl-i Budiniñ nūş étdikleri nebr-i Ṭuna-yı āb-ı ḥayātır. Ṭulū ' [ve] ğurūbu cild-i ----de meşṭūr olup Özü eyāletinde nebr-i Ṭuna kenārında Rusçuk kal' ası evşāfında nebr-i Ṭunaya ne kadar şū qarışır ol maḥalde merķūmdur.*

[The Danube river is described at 3:115a f]

[20] 8:380a

*Kaşaba-i cıs-r-i Muştafā Paşa: Muḥaddemā sene ---- ta'riḥinde nice kerre cild-i ---- muḥaṣṣal merķūmdur.*

[Muştafā Paşa bridge appears at 3:147b-148a]

[21] 8:380a

*Evsāf-i menzilgeh-i şehr-i 'azīm ve taht-ı s̄ānī-i belde-i kadīm-i maḥmiyye-i Edirne:*

*Bu sevād-ı mu 'azzam daḥi sene 1062 ta'riḥinde cemī 'i āsar-ı bināları ve bānisi ve ḥakimi ve cemī 'i 'amāristānlarıyla bālādaki cild-i ----de muḥaṣṣal meşṭūhdur. Ne mertebe maḥrūse-i kebīr olunduğu bilinmek için murād olunursa bālāda fibrislere nazār oluna.*

[Edirne appears at 3:148b f.]

[22] 8:383b

*Menzil-i kal' a-i Silivri: Bu daḥi bālāda cild-i ---- mevsūfdur.*

[Silivri appears at 3:105b]

## Was volume 4 close to completion before the other volumes?

A majority of references given in volume 4 are left blank and the referenced sections turn up in volumes 1-3 ([23],[24],[25]). This indicates that the idea of including those sections in what would become the first three volumes had not yet formed when the relevant sections were written in volume 4.

**HYPOTHESIS VI**

Volume 4 was compiled before the new arrangement of volumes 1-3. Otherwise, we would have expected Evliyâ to remember the sections he included in the volumes he arranged just prior. It is also possible that volume 4 was the first volume to be arranged almost in its entirety.

The only reference in volume 4 to volume 1 is on the first folio of volume 4 (see [1]). This is an incorrect reference.

**HYPOTHESIS VII**

The section containing 4:191b was added to volume 4 after its first draft, but before the rearrangement of volumes 1-3.

A volume number in a reference to the tomb of Me'mûn Hâlıfe was left blank. The referenced section turns up in volume 9 ([26]).

**HYPOTHESIS VIII**

[26] supports hypothesis xiv that Evliyâ decided on the volume in which his Hajj journey would be included quite late in his arrangement chronology.

Textual evidence:

[23] 4:297a

*Ve cümle Şâmıy Dürzî ve Tîmânî dağlarında nohûdî mezheb âdemler var kim Kızılbaşlığı yetmiş mertebe öte geçdikleri Şâm ve Şâm-ı Trablus seyâhatlerimiz cild-i ----inde muşaşşal tahtîr olunmuşdur.*

[Tîmânîs are described at 3:40a f.]

[24] 4:305a

*Erdebîle giderken bu Kebrevân kal'ası evşâfî cild-i ---- de 'ale't-tahtîl tahtîr olmuşdur.*

[Kehrevân fortress is described at 2:305a f.]

*Şeyh Şafî hazretleri bu Erdebîlde medfûn olduđu ve cemî'î 'imâretleri ve arz-ı beledi ve tûl-ı nehârî cümle sene 1057 târîhinde Tebrîz hânıyla geldigimiz mahtalde 'ale't-tahtîl tahtîr olunmuşdur. Ol cild-i ---- nazâr oluna.*

[The tomb of Şeyh Şafî is described at 2:306b f.]

[26] 4:333a

*Bānī-i sādisi ... Me'mūn Ḥalīfedir kim ... şehr-i Ṭarsūsü {Freng elinden} dest-i kabr-ile fetḥ edüp ba'dehū ḳal'a'ī ta'mīr ü termīm ederken merḥūm olup Cāmi'ün-nūr nāmında bir cāmi'-i münevveri sāḫasında āsūde olup mermer şandūḳasında ta'rīhiyle cild-i ---- mestūrdur.*

[The tomb of Me'mūn is mentioned at 9Y:153b]

## Was volume 5 arranged after volume 4 and before volumes 1, 2, and 3?

Unlike volume 4, in which many references were left blank and referenced sections turn up in volumes 2 or 3, most of the references in volume 5 are to volumes 1 and 2. They are, however, incorrect.

### **HYPOTHESIS IX**

Evliyā must have at least composed the sections in volume 5, in which references appear, after he had an initial plan for volumes 1-3. That plan later changed, as I suggest above, when he dedicated volume 1 to Istanbul and rearranged the layout of the earlier volumes (hypothesis i). He did not have an opportunity to rectify the old references, and this caused the inaccuracy in volume 5.

### **HYPOTHESIS X**

Evliyā must have decided the penultimate layout of volumes 1-3 between the arrangement of volumes 4 and 5. References in volume 4 do not list any volume numbers, but the referenced sections turn up in volumes 2 and 3 (hypothesis vi). On the other hand, references in volume 5 *are* indeed to volumes 1 and 2, but they are incorrect (and appear respectively in volumes 2 and 3) because the initial layout changed.

Textual evidence:

[27] 5:26b

*Menzil-i ḳal'a-i Bolu: Ḳal'asının ḫarābiyle ve bānisiyle ve fātiḫiyle ve şehriniñ cümle āşār-ı binālarıyla cild-i evvelimizde terkīm olunmuşdur. Fibrise nazar oluna. Ammā Türkistānda bu daḫi bir şehr-i ḡanīmetdir.*

[Description of Bolu is in volume 2; 2:277b]



[28] 5:85a

*Netice-i kelâm, bu Keşişdağının mufaşşalan evşâfi Seyâhatnâmemizin cild-i evvelinde 'acâyib ü garâyibât ve 'alâyimât u âsârât-ı günâ-günlarıyla taḥrîr ü tavşîf olunmuşdur. Şimdi terkîme hâcet yokdur kim taḥvîl-i kitâbet olur.*

[Description of Keşişdağı is in volume 2; 2:229b]

[29] 5:31a

*Menzil-i kaçaba-i bender Kavarna: Bu daḥi cild-i şânide mektûbdur.*

[Description of Kavarna is in volume 3; 3:124b]

[30] 5:48b

*Bir kerre Tatar ile sene ---- ta'rîhinde bu on konaḫ çölü bir gecede aşup bu kal'aları nehb u ğâret etdiğimiziz cild-i şânide meşûrdur, nazâr oluna.*

[This incident is described in volume 3; 3:124a]

### **Were parts of volume 8 arranged after volume 4 and before volumes 1, 2, and 3?**

Volume 8 displays the most diverse type of references. Most likely its various parts were written at different times. Parts of volume 8 seem to have been put together when Evliyâ had a plan to open the *Seyâhatnâme* with his travels, and not with a volume on Istanbul. Therefore, two references to volume 2 appear in volume 3 in the new arrangement ([31],[32]). At least three further references are left blank, which also appear in volume 3 in the new arrangement ([20],[21],[22], cf. [hypothesis v](#)).

#### **HYPOTHESIS XI**

Sections that include [31] and [32] were written before the arrangement of volumes 1-3.

The volume numbers of four references are left blank. The referenced sections are included in volume 5 ([33],[34],[35],[36]).

#### **HYPOTHESIS XII**

Evliyâ must have written these sections before he decided that the volume, whose contents were already arranged, would be volume 5 ([33],[34],[35],[36]).

[31] 8:201b

*Menzil-i kaşaba-i Babadağı*

*Şarı Şaltık Sultân ya 'nî Mehemmed Buḥārî hazretleri bu şehrde medfûn olup bu şehr onun âsitânesi evḳâfi olduğu cümle bâlâda cild-i sânimizde meştûrdur.*

[Babadağı is described at 3:126b]

[32] 8:203a

*Hâfıza nâm Süleymân Hânın bir muşâhibesi ḥayrâtı olduğu sene 1065 ta'rîhinde cild-i sânde muḫşşal medḫ olunmuş kaşaba-i ma'mûrdur.*

[Hâfıza/Hafsa is described at 3:169a]

[33] 8:201a

*İsmâ'îl şehrî de bâlâdaki cild-i ----de muḫşşal tavşif olunmuşdur.*

[The town of İsmâ'îl appears at 5:34b]

[34] 8:234a

*Menzil-i tekiye-i Memî Baba Sultân: Bu ḥânḳâh-ı pür-nür Egribucak kazâsı ḥâkînde ulu dergâb-ı ḥânḳâh olduğu mâ-takaddem sene ---- ta'rîhinde zabîre-bahâ taḫşîli-yçün geldiğimizde cild-i ----de evşâfi muḫşşalan taḫrîr olunmuşdur.*

[The town of İsmâ'îl appears at 5:180a]

[35] 8:234b

*Menzil-i kal'a-i kadîm Serfiçe: Vê Serefiçe daḫi derler. Mâ-takaddem bunun daḫi sitâyişi sene ---- ta'rîhinde cild-i ----mizde muḫşşalan meştûrdur.*

[Serfiçe appears at 5:181a]

[36] 8:372b

*Menzil-i şehr-i 'azîm ve belde-i kadîm-i maḫmiyye-i Manaştır: Bu şehr kâmil yedi kerre gelip meḳs etmek ile evşâfi çok taḫrîr olunmuşdur kim bâlâda cild-i ----mize nazar oluna.*

[Manaştır appears at 5:176a]

### **After preparing volumes 1, 2 and 3 consecutively, did Evliyâ next arrange volume 6?**

As mentioned above, the references given in volumes 4, 5, 7 and 8 to volumes 1 and 2 are overwhelmingly inaccurate (hypothesis i and ii). Based on that evidence, I suggest that the arrangement of those volumes may have by and large been complete when Evliyâ returned to try a new layout for the first three volumes. On the other hand, the references given in volume 6 to the new arrangement of the earlier volumes are correct.

#### **HYPOTHESIS XIII**

After Evliyâ arranged volumes 1, 2 and 3, he started working on volume 6. This is evidenced by the fact that his references in volume 6 to volume 1 in the new arrangement are correct ([37], [38]).

Textual evidence:

[37] 6:49b

*Menzil-i evvel kaçaba-i Topçular: Hemân İslâmboluñ bir mahallesidir kim cild-i evvelde evşâfi mestürdür.*

[Topçular appears at 1:117b]

[38] 6:51a-b

*Menzil-i mandıra-yı pâdişâhî: Iştiranca dağı içinde bir âsitâne-i Hâcî Bektaş Velî ocağıdır. ... Pâdişâhın nice biñ şığırları ve nice biñ 'aded koyunları bunda durup mandıra gülâmları âyende vü revende misâfirîne hıdmet êdikleri cümle cild-i evvelde muşşalan tabrîr olunmuşdur.*

[Mesîregâh-ı Iştiranca dağları and Mesîregâh-ı mandıra-i Selîm Hân appears at 1:146b]

### **What volume would his Hajj journey appear in?**

Undoubtedly, one of the most important journeys in Evliyâ's travel account is to Hajj. The journey to Mecca takes up the entirety of volume 9 in the current layout. He sets out from Üsküdar on 12 Muharrem 1082/21 May 1671, passes through several Anatolian towns, and reaches Syria. After several visits to significant towns and shrines, the traveler finally reaches Mecca in Zilhicce 1082/April 1672.

Evliyâ had undertaken another trip in the same direction a little over two decades earlier. The account of that trip is included in volume 3. The traveler departs from

Istanbul in Şaban 1058/September 1648. His route takes him to Konya, Antakya, Hama, Homs, Damascus, and all the way to the Dead Sea where his return trip begins. A cluster of references in these sections, between the folios 19b and 61b in volume 3, have cross references to places on the same route as the Hajj route. Instead of describing certain cities or shrines in volume 3, he simply refers to the volume in which he would describe his Hajj journey ([39],[40],[41],[42]). Every time he makes a reference, the volume number is left blank.

#### **HYPOTHESIS XIV**

He had not yet decided that the Hajj would appear in volume 9 when he was arranging volume 3. This is quite late in the arrangement process. That said, he must have already written and arranged the volume of his Mecca journey.

#### **HYPOTHESIS XV**

Otherwise, his references to volumes 1 and 2 are correct, which means that he arranged volume 3, after volumes 1 and 2 (See [hypothesis iv](#)).

Textual evidence:

[39] 3:19b

*[Adana] cemî`i evşâfiyla ... hacc-ı şerîfe `azîmet êtdigimiz senede cild-i ---- mu-  
faşşalan taḥrîr olunmuşdur.*

[Adana is described at 9Y:154a f.]

[40] 3:19b

*Evşâf-ı kal`a-i Mıŝıŝ-ı kadîm: ... Bu ŝehrîñ daḥi evşâfi ḥacca giderken cild-i ----  
meŝûr [u] mevşûfdur.*

[Mıŝıŝ is described at 9Y:156b]

[41] 3:49b

*Menzil-i ḥân-ı cîsr-i Ya`kûb: ... bu yollarda olan âsâr-ı `imâretler cümle  
Kuds-i şerîfe gîtdigimiz cild-i ---- mufaşşal taḥrîr olunmuşdur.*

[Appears at 9Y:237b-238a]

[42] 3:61b

*Evşâf-ı kal`a-i kadîm ve ŝehr-i `azîm-i Mâr-ı `ıŝ: Bunuñ daḥi cemî`i sitâyiŝ-i  
ŝehrengîzi cild-i ---- yetmiş gûne ḥüsnîyyâtiyle taḥrîr u temdîḥ olunmuşdur.*

[Mar`aş is described at 9Y:159a f.]

## Was Cairo initially not included in volume 10?

There is a reference in volume 1 to a type of chicken found in Egypt. According to Evliyâ, it was an animal very much worth seeing. He claims that he wrote about this curious bird while describing Cairo in volume 3 (1:191a; [43]). Yet the section he refers to is included in volume 10 in the current arrangement (10Y:229a). Since the orthographies of the words “third” (“üçüncü”) and “tenth” (“onuncu”) are very similar, it is not outside the realm of possibility that a copy error occurred. But as it stands, the word is clearly written as “volume 3” in the text. If the reference in volume 1 is not a mistake, it may indicate that his trip to Egypt was initially going to appear in the latter part of volume 3.

### **HYPOTHESIS XVI**

While Evliyâ was arranging volume 1 as Istanbul, he was not sure yet that a large part of volume 10 would be dedicated to Cairo. Therefore, the concept of Istanbul and Cairo as major cities mirroring one other had not yet been developed.

Textual evidence:

[43] 1:191a

*Ve Mısrda tavuğu fişki içinde yavru çıkarmağı Kārūn peydā eylemişdir. Bu dünyâda anı görmeyen bir şey görmemişdir. Üçüncü cild kitabımızda Mısr evşâfında mufaşşal taḥrîr olunmuşdur, aña nazâr oluna.*

[This chicken is described at 10Y:229a]

## What about volumes 9 and 10 in the current arrangement?

Curiously, there are no references to other volumes in volume 9 and only two, that are left blank, in volume 10. As is well known, the final two volumes are not part of the series of manuscripts of volumes 1-8, which are believed to be autograph copies (series S). The non-autograph volumes 9 and 10 that are commonly used to reconstruct the text are referred to as series P, Q, and Y.

Since these copies eventually go back to the autograph copy, it is safe to assume that the volumes would have been used after they reached their “final” stage, i.e., the editing process was over (for example, after Evliyâ's death). Robert Dankoff has concluded that volumes 9 and 10 must have reached the final fair-copy stage before they were copied.<sup>3</sup> He further hypothesizes that volumes 9 and 10 were damaged when they were brought to Istanbul in 1742, and that an effort was made to salvage the

3 Robert Dankoff, “Shall We Tear Down That Observatory?” In: *From Mahmud Kaşgari to Evliya Çelebi: Studies in Middle Turkic and Ottoman Literatures* (Istanbul: Isis, 2008), p. 339.

contents by copying the final two volumes anew. According to Dankoff, parts of the manuscripts were illegible such that the copyists leapt over these portions. They also failed to properly render Evliyā's orthography during this process.

It is not clear at this point why there are no cross references in volume 9 and only two blank ones in volume 10. Could it have been that the 1742 copyists also undertook some editing by omitting such references? It does not seem very likely, but the sparsity of references in the final two volumes warrants examination.

### Was volume 2 going to be dedicated to pilgrimage sites in the initial plan?

Evliyā briefly refers to Ebū Hüreyre in volume 1 as the patron saint of inner-boot makers (*mestciyān*) and mentions that he wrote about the commemorative *mevlūd* ceremony dedicated to this person and a miracle connected to his burial place elsewhere in the *Seyāhatnāme*. Specifically, he remarks that these points were detailed among the descriptions of pilgrimage sites in volume 2 ([44]). The only time these themes are discussed by the author is in volume 10 among the tombs and shrines in and around the city of Cairo (10Y:271b). The fact that a burial place in Cairo was initially imagined to be in volume 2 is confusing. In the current layout, volumes 1 and 10, if anything, are clearly dedicated to two important cities, Istanbul and Cairo.

The critical question is whether his reference to “descriptions of pilgrimage sites” (“*evşāf-ı ziyāretgāh*”) was intended only for the 63. sub-section in volume 10, which is titled “the tombs and shrines in and around the city of Cairo” (10Y:256b “*Mısrın karāfelerinde civār-ı rahmete vāsil olan selāṭin-i mazī ve ‘ulemā ve meşāyih [ve] kādī ve kibār-ı evliyānın irjī ‘i emrine rāzī olan şahābe-i kirāmın ve e’imme-i müctehidīn merākīd-ı pür-*envārlarını beyān eder*”). Or did Evliyā perhaps conceptualize all the pilgrimage sites to be in a separate (second) volume? In any event, the fact that he remembers a site in Cairo to be in volume 2 makes one consider the possibility that volume 10 was not dedicated to Cairo from the start (see [hypothesis xvi](#)).*

One potential piece of supporting evidence for the hypothesis that volume 2 was exclusively dedicated to shrines is again in volume 1. This time, Evliyā writes about a certain Şuraḥbīl Sultan, whose graveyard is in the vicinity of Kilis. The traveler indicates that he visited and described the dervish lodge and the tomb of this great sufi in volume 2 ([45]). In fact, his trip from Kilis to Aleppo and further on to journey to Hajj is included in volume 9. Şuraḥbīl Sulṭān's tomb is also described there, albeit only briefly, among the tombs and shrines of Kilis (9Y:167a).

**HYPOTHESIS XVII**

Since the two references that we have are from volume 1 ([44],[45]), we may cautiously assume that when Evliyâ was arranging this volume as Istanbul, he probably (still) planned to dedicate volume 2 to pilgrimage sites exclusively. Since both references are close to the end of volume 1, he must have changed his mind as he sat down to arrange volume 2, which eventually became the opening of his early travels.

**HYPOTHESIS XVIII**

If hypothesis xvii is correct, a quick rearrangement of the volume structure would only be possible by reshuffling sections. Evliyâ has a section called “descriptions of pilgrimage sites” (*evşâf-ı ziyâretgâh*) for many sites he visited. One would imagine he had these sections written on loose pieces of paper which he rearranged at will.

Textual evidence:

[44] 1:196a

*Ebû Hüreyre ... râvî-i hadîs ulu sultândır. Cild-i sânitimizde evşâf-ı ziyâretgâhda mevlûdu ve yerden âdem kemikleri zâhir olduđu muşafşal taħrîr olunmuşdur.*

[The section about Ebû Hüreyre appears at 10Y:271b]

[45] 1:210b

*Ĥazret-i Şevrülhabîb [Kilisde] yatır ... Ĥakîr âsitânesiniñ 'atebesi ve seng-i mezârî ta'riħleriyle mazbûtumuz olduđu cild-i sâñide meşîrdur.*

[This section appears at 9Y:167a]

### **Possible timeline of volume arrangement**

In the initial or penultimate conception, volume 1 is not dedicated to Istanbul. The concept of Istanbul and Cairo as major cities mirroring each other had not yet been developed.

Evliyâ first completes the arrangement of volume 4. He does not yet know which number this volume will be.

At this point he still thinks that the book will start with his travels, which happens with volume 2 in the current layout. There is no volume 1 dedicated to Istanbul planned.

He must have changed his mind after the arrangement of volume 4. He decides to make volume 1 Istanbul and evaluates other layout possibilities for further volumes.

He works on volume 5 and parts of volume 8.

He sits down to arrange volume 1 as Istanbul. Throughout his engagement with volume 1, he might have thought of dedicating volume 2 to pilgrimage sites.

As he finishes volume 1, he makes use of the penultimate layout for the first two volumes, only to push them one volume ahead: volumes 1 and 2 in the earlier layout, now become volumes 2 and 3. This means that volume 2 starts with his travels chronologically. Volumes 2 and 3 are arranged consecutively. Only the earlier part of volume 3 is certain at this point. He still does not know in which volume his Hajj and Cairo journeys will appear (see below).

He decides that the volumes he arranged first will become volumes 4 and 5.

Next, he arranges volume 6.

He must have added the second part, roughly from folio 104 onwards, to volume 3 around this time.

Next, he arranges volume 7.

It is not clear when he decided to dedicate volume 9 to his Hajj account and part of volume 10 to Cairo. According to our current knowledge, he had not yet done so until after he finished the first part of volume 3.

## Conclusion

I would like to reiterate that evidence for my hypotheses in this article is at times meager. Evliyā probably did not mechanically finish one task and move on to another in a very planned fashion. He made amendments, moved parts around, inserted previously written sections with or without editing them, wrote some sections for the first time in Cairo. The massive work that he created is the result of years of note-taking, writing, editing, copyediting, arranging, and finally rearranging. He certainly did not complete the final arrangement in one sitting. In their current form, the manuscripts of the first eight volumes, which we believe to be autograph copies, are not finalized either.

Since one is accustomed to view the work in 10 volumes, it is difficult to imagine what he might have been planning to do in the earlier stages of his conceptualization. Evidence points to earlier volume arrangements. As discussed above, dedicating volume 1 to Istanbul was a late decision by the author. We do not know what volume would have included Istanbul in the original layout. A radical idea is that Istanbul would be a separate book.

A rearrangement of the chapter and volume structure of such a massive work is only possible with easily moving parts. That is, if Evliyā had first written down chapters or longer sections on loose pieces of paper or fascicules. The fact that similar inaccurate references are oftentimes close to one other suggest that portions of text were inserted or moved to other places en bloc (for example, see [20],[21],[22]).



During the course of composing and organizing parts of the book, he decided to re-arrange its overarching structure. He was able to do this efficiently, but as a negative byproduct of this process, several references were left unchanged, hence inaccurate, from the initial stages of the book's layout concept.

Checking the volume citations is only one way to think about the book's arrangement process. There may be instances where Evliyâ's description of the same location in different trips (for example his trips to Syria) include conflicting or updated information, which in the end might give away further clues about his working practice. Certainly as we delve deeper into his narrative, it will be possible to develop new hypotheses and ideas about Evliya's working methods.

## Bibliography

- Dankoff, Robert. *A Guide to the Seyâhat-nâme of Evliya Çelebi*. Updated version: unpublished.
- Dankoff, Robert. "Shall We Tear Down That Observatory?" In: *From Mahmud Kaşgari to Evliya Çelebi: Studies in Middle Turkic and Ottoman Literatures* (Istanbul: Isis, 2008), pp. 329-351.
- Dankoff, Robert. "Where is Evliya Çelebi in the Autograph Manuscript of the Seyahatname?" Published at academia.edu: robert dankoff.
- Evliyâ Çelebî. *Seyâhatnâme*. Vols. 1 and 2: Bağdat 304, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Library, Istanbul; vols. 3 and 4: Bağdat 305, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Library, Istanbul; vol. 5: Bağdat 307, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Library, Istanbul; vol. 6: Revan 1457, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Library, Istanbul; vols. 7 and 8: Bağdat 308, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Library, Istanbul; vol. 9Y: Bağdat 306, Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Library, Istanbul; vol. 10Y: TY 5973, Istanbul University Library. [Since a final critical edition of the *Seyâhatnâme* has still yet to be produced, my references in the article are to the manuscripts. However, I would like to acknowledge the Yapı Kredi Edition (1996-2007), without which I could not have written this article. That edition was carried out by Yücel Dağlı, Robert Dankoff, Orhan Şaik Gökyay, and Seyit Ali Kahraman].
- Kreutel, Richard F. "Neues zur Evliyâ-Çelebi-Forschung." *Der Islam* 48 (1972), 269-279.
- Karateke, Hakan. "How Did Evliya Çelebi Write His Travel Account?" forthcoming in *Cemal Kafadar Festschrift*. Edited by İlham Khuri-Makdisi, Ali Yaycıoğlu, and Rachel Goshgarian.
- MacKay, Pierre A. "The Manuscripts of the Seyahatname of Evliya Çelebi. Part 1. The Archetype." *Der Islam* 52 (1975), 278-298.