Kütüp

ianesi

612 NIR SHAFIR

and morality manuals of others. 65 He even simultaneously initiated a parallel and Arassa project of nasīhat for the empire's Christians by appointing his client, Awetik', to the position of Armenian patriarch for the express purpose of instilling "nasīhat" to combat the 'heretical beliefs' that Catholic missionaries were spreading among the Armenian and Syriac populations.<sup>66</sup> His disciplinary project was the culmination of a century of discourse around morality that emphasized the need for all of the empire's subjects to be responsible moral actors who reflected on their individual actions. Ensuring the moral certitude of the empire, both among Muslims and non-Muslims, was seen to be the only way to restore its grandeur and legitimize the sultan as the personal champion of the sharia. And yet, it is important to remember that this overambitious project failed and may have been one reason for the extreme animus he faced at the hands of the people. Perhaps his true sin was in going so far as to sideline even the sultan and make the office of sevhülislam the primary upholder of the empire's morality. Or perhaps it was his vision of nasīhat that the empire's subjects were simply unwilling to accept.

## NĀBĪ'S NAŞĪḤAT

If Feyzullah Efendi attempted to inculcate his naṣīḥat through a campaign of mass education, then the poet Nābī (1642–1712) whispered his naṣīḥat into his listeners' ears as they lay alone reading his books. It provides a radical political vision, but one tied to a private moral transformation. His popular verse book of naṣīḥat, which often went simply by the name of naṣīḥatnāme but was formally titled Ḥayriyye, was one of the most popular works of Ottoman Turkish literature ever written and its overwhelming approval ensured Nābī's immense stature in the following centuries. <sup>67</sup> Rare is the manuscript library that does not carry multiple copies of the Ḥayriyye today, with copy dates

65 Terzioğlu, "Ilm-i Hal," 99.

for its 1660 couplets ranging from shortly after it was written to the end of the nineteenth century.<sup>68</sup>

Nābī wrote the *Ḥayriyye* around 1701, the year before Feyżullah embarked on his campaign of *naṣīḥat* qua mass education. At the time Nābī was fifty-seven and his son, to whom he dedicated the manual, was seven. Elike Feyżullah. Nābī was a provincial boy who made good in the capital, coming from the Arabic and Turkish-speaking town of Ruha (today's Urfa) to become a successful poet and *kātib* (secretary) in Istanbul and Edirne, where he had attached himself to the households of various grandees. The death of his chief patron, Muṣāḥib Mustafa Pasha, in 1686 propelled him to find employment as a secretary in the imperial chancellery of Mehmed IV, but his success was short-lived since he lost the job following the deposition of the sultan in 1688. Like Feyżullah, whom he personally knew, he was unable to gain a foothold in the new political milieu and was forced to leave Istanbul and work as a tax collector in Aleppo.

While we might view this move as a simple loss of position, and it might well have been, Nābī cast it as an act of self-made exile that allowed him to push a radical critique of society and state. He describes his transition to Aleppo by saying, "No longer preoccupied with estate | I've fallen into the corner of solitude."73 This "corner of solitude (künc-i 'uzlet)," though, had a second meaning of a "treasure (genc) of solitude," a sentiment he repeats to his son later on: "Don't leave the house, for that is paradise | in the corner of the house is the treasure of solitude."74 It was a common enough act in his time. 'Uzlet, or withdrawal, was frequently used by intellectuals to present a deep critique of a society. Nābī would have known of Niyāz-i Miṣrī, who for much of the 1680s purposefully stayed in self-imposed exile on Limni Island as he publicly circulated a private diary that decried the legitimacy of the dynasty and issued prophetic and messianic claims, and of 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī, who retreated into his house in Damascus only a few years before Nābī in purposeful rejection of the corrupt society and government of his time. 75 All of these men, including Nābī, emerged from their exile with

<sup>69</sup> He was born in 1642, so arithmetic suggests the actual date of composition was 1699, or 1697 if one counts in *hiiri* years, though the Kaplan has provided the date of 1701.

<sup>52</sup> BOA, AE.SMMD.IV 23.2592; IE.ML. 31.2991. By 1695, he seems to have actually been promoted to the *defterdār* of Şām province: IE.EV. 31.3565.

<sup>73</sup> Nābī, *Ḥayriyye*, 180.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 225.

<sup>66</sup> Many thanks to Cesare Santus for sharing his forthcoming article, "The Şeyhülislam Feyzullah Efendi and the Armenian Patriarch Awetik: A Case of Entangled Confessionalization?," in Tijana Krstić and Derin Terzioğlu, eds., Entangled Confessionalizations? Dialogic Perspectives on Community and Confession-Building Initiatives in the Ottoman Empire, 15th-18th Centuries (Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, forthcoming in 2020). The text of the order is in Ensar Köse, "Bir Hayalin Peşinde Yüz Yıl," Tarih Dergisi 63, 1 (2016): 41–88; the original order is in BOA, D.PSK, 2/48, but it seems that a line is missing from when the order was copied by the scribe, making it somewhat difficult to understand.

Meserret Diriöz, Eserlerine Göre Näbî (İstanbul: Fey Vakfi, 1994), 136. I have used the semicritical edition prepared by Mahmut Kaplan, given that the most commonly available version of Iskender Pala is transcribed from the nineteenth-century printed version and thus it is about twenty couplets short. Nābī, Hayriyye-i Nâbî (Inceleme-Metin), Mahmut Kaplan, ed. (Ankara: Ataturk Kultur Merkezi, 2008); Nābī and Iskender Pala, Hayriyye. This work became canonical to the point that it elicited famous responses such as the Luffyye of Sünbülzāde Vehbī.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</sup> The mass popularity of the *Ḥayriyye* differentiates it from similar but earlier works like Mustafa Ali's cantankerous poem, scribbled on the edge of a manuscript. Andreas Tietze, "The Poet as Critique of Society, a 16-Century Ottoman Poem," *Turcica* 9 (1977): 120–26, 145–60.

This convoluted history of patronage is reconstructed in Diriöz, Eserlerine Göre Näbî, 58-84.
See the letters and kaşīdes that Nābī sent tö Feyzullah, in Bibliotheque Nationale de France,
Suppl. Turc MS 378, ff. 184ab, 257b-58a.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>75</sup> See the aforementioned morality manual of Ibn Ma'n, al-Tamyīz, 270-79. After being pardoned from his exile, Niyāz-i Miṣrī chose to stay on Lemnos Island for another fourteen years.