

Maraş olayını, Guermani'nin sağ kalan çocuğunu Halep konsolosluğuna getiren Mustafa ve Ahmed Efendiler vasıtasıyla öğrenen İngiltere, hadiseden duyduğu rahatsızlığı dile getirmiş, son zamanlarda Osmanlı topraklarının muhtelif yerlerinde meydana gelen uygunsuzlukların önlenmesini istemişti⁷⁷. İngiltere sefareti, Maraş olayını, «mücerred taassub ve bâ-husûs Avrupalılar aleyhine vâkı' olan tevhiş ve husumet» olarak değerlendiriyor, hadisenin büyümesinde, nâibin tahrikleri ile mahallî idarenin aczinin söz konusu olduğuna dikkat çekiyordu⁷⁸.

İngiliz büyükelçiliği ile Bâbüâli arasında konu ile ilgili yazışmalar daha sonra da sürecekti.

İsyân bastırıldıktan sonra, hadisede yağmalanan mal ve eşyalar bulunmuş, ele geçmeyen sekiz yüz lira ise devlet hazinesinden İngiltere'ye ödenmişti⁷⁹. Guermani'nin yetim kalan çocuğuna da, hem yardımcı olmak düşüncesi, hem de Avrupa devletlerinin tepkilerini yumuşatmak maksadıyla, «kayd-ı hayat» şartıyla, aylık 500 frank maaş bağlanmıştı⁸⁰. Nitekim, Osmanlı Devleti'nin bu insancıl yaklaşımı tesirini göstermekte gecikmeyecek, özellikle İngiltere ve Avusturya hükümetlerinin memnûniyetlerini mucib olacaktı⁸¹.

Prof. Dr. Bekir Kütükoğlu'na ARMAĞAN,
İ.Ü. E.F. Tarih Araştırma Merkezi, İstanbul,
1991, s. 459-471.

Dergi / Kitap
Kütüphanede Mevcut

26 OCAK 1994

77 İrade-MM, nr. 356.

78 İrade-MM, nr. 287/2; ve 20 Mayıs 1856 tarihli İngiliz sefirinin tahriratı tercemesi: İrade-MM, nr. 287/6.

79 İrade-H, nr. 7106.

80 Guermani'nin yetim çocuğuna maaş bağlanması hakkındaki 4 Şevvâl 1272 (8 Haziran 1856) tarihli yazı: İrade-D, nr. 22915.

81 Bağlanan maaştan duyulan memnûniyet hakkında İngiliz sefirinden gelen mektubun tercemesi (18 Temmuz 1856): İrade-H, nr. 6806/1. Aynı konuda Avusturya sefirinden gelen yazı (9 Haziran 1856): İrade-H, nr. 6272/1; ve İrade-H, nr. 6272/3.

030617

OSMANLILARDA CUMA SELÂMLIĞI (Halk-Hükümdar Münâsebetleri Açısından Önemi)

Mehmet İPŞİRLİ

Halk-hükümdar münâsebetleri her toplumda önemle üzerinde durulan bir husus olmuştur. Bakış açıları, yaklaşımları farklı da olsa genellikle adalet, zalime haddini bildirip mazluma yardım etme, bu münâsebetlerin temel konusunu teşkil etmiştir. Osmanlılar'da halk-hükümdar münâsebetlerinin tesisinde başta İslâmî telâkkî olmak üzere eski Türk ananesinin ve dolaylı olarak da Sâsânî uygulamasının rolü olmuştur. Ancak bütün bu kaynaklardan istifade etmekle birlikte Osmanlı döneminde zamanla kendisine has bir tabikatin ortaya çıktığı ve geleneğin teessüs ettiği de bilinmektedir. Osmanlılar döneminde halk-hükümdar münâsebetlerindeki anlayışı yansıtan ifadeler atasözleri haline gelmiş ve bunlar yaygın olarak Osmanlı dönemine âit bir çok âbidevî binanın kitabesinde; ferman, adâletnâme ve kanunnâme metinlerinin muhtelif kısımlarında; devrin aydınlarının eserlerinde topluma ortak bir anlayış ve tavır kazandıran, reddedilmesi mümkün olmayan ifadeler tarzında yerini almıştır. Nitekim klasik dönem Osmanlı Saltanatının sembolü ve âbidevî yapısı olan Topkapı Sarayı'nda Bâb-ı Humayun'unun iki tarafında yer alan «Sultan Allah'ın yeryüzündeki gölgesidir, zulme uğrayan herkes ona sığınır» ifadesi bunu göstermektedir¹. Bu anlayışa ve prensiplere resmî kayıtlarda da rastlanmaktadır. Meselâ XVIII. yüzyıl başlarına âit Midilli cezâresi kanunnâmesi dibacesinde III. Ahmed için hakkın ve adaletin teminatı ve halife-i rûy-ı zemîn olması vasıflarının zikredilmesi dikkate değer bir örnek olduğu gibi²,

1 Es-sultânu zillu'llâhi fi'l-arz ye'vâ ileyhi külli mazlûmin.

2 «Pâdişâh-ı sâhib-kıran ve ra'iyet-perver ve sultân-ı selâtin-i adl-küster, hakan-ı a'zam ve kahraman-ı ekrem, hâmi-i bilâdu'llâhi ani'l-cevri ve't-tuğyân ve mâhi-i âsâri'z-zulmi ve'l-udvân, bâsıtu'l-emni ve'l-emân, nâşirü'l-adli ve'l-ih-

Thus far we have largely encountered learned criticism and what could be provisionally termed governmental repression as characterizing the relationship between the Egyptian elite and the culture, especially religion, of the people. This relationship, however, was certainly more complex. For in a dynamic cultural system which consists of subcultures, reality would hardly reflect ideology on a one-to-one basis. In other words, despite the general hostility that the learned and the rulers might develop toward the culture of the commoners, they had to take it into consideration and accommodate it. Sometimes they even succumbed, perhaps unconsciously, or else eagerly, to elements of popular culture. Two cases may help us fathom the cultural process in medieval Cairo in the light of the latter reservations. The first is a case of a meeting point of the cultures of the elite and the people. The second is of a contribution made by popular culture to the larger cultural edifice.

The case of cultural intersection which I intend to discuss is that of the state festival. In opposition to the popular festival of Nawrūz, the state festival was initiated by the regime and was first and foremost intended to serve its needs. Yet a state festival needed a large audience if it was also to convey some (mostly political) message. In terms of location, it therefore had to be staged not within the Citadel, the enclosure of the Mamluk regime, but in the streets of Cairo, in front of thousands of spectators. There the festival would be turned into an encounter between rulers and their subjects, and in a more extended sense, between the culture of the elite and the culture of the people. This encounter helped to create new cultural processes.

What were the state festivals in Mamluk Cairo like? One such annual festival evolved around the "Procession of the Palanquin" (*dawarān al-maḥmil*, or *maḥmal*), a camel carrying a richly decorated, normally empty litter, as part of the Egyptian Pilgrimage caravan to Mecca. It first occurred in the 1260s as a demonstration of Egypt's interest in the Holy Places,³¹ and persisted as an annual festival into our own century.³²

The *maḥmil* procession started on a Monday or a Thursday in or immediately after the middle of the month of Rajab, the seventh month of the Islamic year. The night before the "Day of the *maḥmil*" the camel carrying the decorated litter was stationed near al-Hākīm Mosque.³³ A festive fire (*naft ḥāfil*) was then lit in the quarter of Rumayla, below the Citadel.³⁴ The next morning the procession would commence. This is how it appeared to the traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṭa in 1326:

The four Grand Qādis, the Intendant of the Treasury, and the Muḥtasib . . . are mounted, and along with them ride the principal jurists, the syndics of the heads of corporations,^[35] and the officers of state. They all proceed together to the gate of the citadel, the residence of al-Malik al-Nāṣir, whereupon the *maḥmil* comes out to meet them, borne on a camel, and preceded by the amīr who has been designated for the journey to the Hijāz in that year. With him are his troops and a number of water-carriers mounted on their camels. All classes of the population, both men and women, assemble for this ceremony, then they go in procession with the *maḥmil* round the two cities of al-Qāhira and Miṣr [al-Fuṣṭāṭ].

accompanied by all those whom we have mentioned, and with the camel-drivers singing to their camels in the lead . . . thereupon resolves are inflamed, desires are excited, and impulses are stirred up, and God Most High casts into the heart of whom He will of His servants the determination to set out upon the Pilgrimage, so they start to equip themselves and to make preparations for it.³⁶

At the end of the procession, the camel carrying the *maḥmil* was stationed once again near al-Hākīm Mosque, there to remain until the procession of Shawwāl three months later. The latter featured the march (*musāyara*) of the emir in charge of the Pilgrimage caravan,³⁷ after which the caravan embarked on its long journey to Mecca to arrive in time for the Ḥajj.³⁸ Al-Maqrīzī, a fifteenth-century eyewitness, related that, on the day of departure, the Raydāniyya quarter, north of the Succour Gate (Bāb an-Naṣr), was crowded with merchants, entertainers, and many commoners; it was extremely difficult to move between Raydāniyya and the gate known as Bāb al-Futūḥ.³⁹

The splendour would have been particularly marked when the Mamluk sultan or members of his family set out themselves for the Pilgrimage. Such was the case in 1457, when the sultan's son, assuming the title of "emir of caravan" (*amīr ḥajj al-maḥmil*), went in a splendid parade watched by his father.⁴⁰ In 1514, shortly before the demise of the Mamluk regime, the Pilgrimage caravan included Qānṣawh al-Ghawrī's son, the sultan's wife (*khōnd*), and a senior official in the chancery (*kātib as-sirr*), each with his or her own canopy (*wiṭāq*). Especially impressive was the *khōnd*'s canopy, which was valued at 20,000 *dinars* and was led by torch bearers. The chronicler Ibn Iyās noted that the participation of the "First Lady" in the procession that particular year was without precedent. There also rode four regiments of cavalry (*ṭulb*) – that of the prince being a combatant regiment (*ṭulb ḥarbī*) – led by a band of drummers and pipers. The "prince's" party also included two teams of camels richly decorated with costly textiles, twenty of the camels carrying objects of Chinese manufacture and other precious vessels, all expensive items "that baffle the eyes". A large crowd gathered in the quarter of Rumayla, whereas the sultan observed the procession from the Citadel. Incidentally, there were occasions when the sultan viewed the *maḥmil* procession, when it reached the quarter of Būlāq, from a golden boat on the Nile.⁴¹ Our source concludes his elaborate report of the procession in 1514 by noting that the people prophetically viewed the event as signifying the end of the sultan's good fortune.⁴²

A special pageant during the *maḥmil* celebrations, about which we first learn in the fifteenth century, was the show of Mamluk lancers (*rammāha*), dressed in red, riding horses covered with iron masks as in a march to the battlefield, and exercising with lances. This show also featured a "combat" at the foot of the Citadel.⁴³ It was performed in the presence of Egyptian rulers: at least so we are told with regard to the last stage of the Mamluk period. Furthermore, the *rammāha* became a gimmick for impressing foreign visitors, as in 1509, when they marched in front of the Mamluk elite on the occasion of a visit by the Safavid ambassador from Iran.⁴⁴ It is noteworthy that in 1444 the lancers' show had to be cancelled

predecessors, Sehī gives concise information about his poets, with full details of names and education, but rarely giving dates of birth or death; he then ends with selections from his subject's poetry. This procedure was adopted as a model by future biographers. His work clearly fulfilled a need as pioneer of the genre, for shortly afterwards came the similar works of Laṭīfī, 'Ashīk Čelebi and several others.

There exist 18 mss. of the *Tedhkire* scattered through the library collections of Turkey and Europe (see Kut, *op. cit.*, 16-37). Ms. Ayasofya 3544 is the basis for Kut's edition; it was probably presented to Sultan Süleymān and was subsequently owned by Prince Mehmed. An earlier print was issued by Mehmed Shūkrī, Istanbul 1325/1907, with the title *Āthār-i eslāfdan tedhkire-yi Sehī* (but his printed version contains only 218 poets, see Kut, 12-14), to which is appended a study on Sehī by Fā'ik Reshād; this print was based on ms. Millet, Ali Emiri, Tarih 768, copied by 'Alī Emirī himself. Finally, the *Tedhkire* was translated into German by Necati Lugal and O. Reşer as *Sehi Bey's Tezkere. Türkische Dichterbiographien aus dem 16. Jahrh.*, Tübingen 1942. Kut's critical edition is based on six mss.; see her *Heşt bihişt* and also her *Heşt Bihişt'in yeni bir nüshası ve bir düzeltme*, in *Jnal. of Turkish Studies*, vii (1984), 243-301. In recent years, Dr. Müjgān Cumbur and a group of scholars have been working on a serial edition of all Ottoman biographical works, starting with Sehī's.

Bibliography: Given in the article. For the older bibl., see F. Babinger's *EP* art. (G.A. TEKİN)

SELĀMLİK (τ.), the Ottoman Turkish term for the outer, more public rooms of a traditionally-arranged house, used e.g. for the reception of guests and non-family members; it thus contrasted with the inner rooms which constituted the *haram* or harem for the womenfolk. The term *selamlık dā'iresi* is also found. A further use of the word *selamlık* is in the expression *selamlık ālayı* to denote the sultan's ceremonial procession from the palace to the mosque for Friday worship, a practice kept up by the Ottomans up to and including Mehmed V Reshād [*q.v.*] in the second decade of the 20th century.

Bibliography: Pakalın, iii, 153-5. (Ed.)

SELĀNĪK, the Ottoman Turkish name for classical and early Byzantine Thessalonike, modern Greek Thessaloniki, conventional form Salonica; the largest city of Macedonia, on the gulf of the same name, to the east of the Vardar river mouth. The city has always possessed a large and secure port, and was located on the Via Egnatia connecting Durazzo (Durrēs) with Byzantium. In the 5th/11th century, it is first named Salonikion, from which all variant names derive: Şalūnik or Şalūnik in Arabic, Solun in Bulgarian, Selānik in Turkish and Salonica in English. In the 6th/10th century, the town was an important centre of Mediterranean trade, with ties to the Islamic world; but apart from al-Idrīsī, the mediaeval Arab geographers do not mention it. An attack on the city by a naval force based upon Tripoli in Syria (289/902) supposedly netted the attackers a total of 22,000 captives. In 581/1185 Salonica was taken by the Normans; the textile artisans, for whom the town was famous, were transferred to the royal workshops in Sicily. In the early 7th/13th century, Salonica was ruled as an independent kingdom by the Marquis of Montferrat; but after the reconquest of Constantinople by the Byzantines, the Palaeologi recovered Salonica as well. Serbian conquests in the area resulted in the isolation of the Byzantine exclave of Thessaloniki by the middle of the 8th/14th century, which was then linked to Constantinople only by sea.

Ottoman activity in the area began under Murād I, with nomads from the western Anatolian principality of Şarukhān [*q.v.*] settling in the area. Ottoman forces once conquered the city, but returned it to the Emperor Manuel. Sultan Yıldırım Bāyezīd reconquered it in 796/1394, but after his defeat and capture in the battle of Ankara (804/1402), his son Süleymān returned it to the Byzantines (805-6/1403). Many details of this sequence remain unclear. However, after the siege of Constantinople by Murād II in 826/1423, the governor of Thessaloniki, Andronikos Palaeologos, sold the city, which then supposedly held about 40,000 inhabitants, to the Venetians. While the sultan recognised this transfer in the capitulations granted to the Venetians in 830-1/1428, in 833/1430 he conquered the city nonetheless. In the meantime, many inhabitants had abandoned the city because of the prevailing insecurity. Johannes Anagnostes, a Byzantine chronicler, has left a detailed account of these events. He claims that 7,000 persons, including himself, were taken prisoner. Yet in some cases, the sultan himself paid the ransoms of the captives and promised that those who had fled the city would have their properties restored in case they returned. Two or three years later, Turkish settlers were brought into Selānik from Yeñidje-i Vardar, and the church of the Acheiropoietos and the monastery of the Prodomos were turned into mosques.

A tax register (*tahrir*) was also prepared at this time, but has not survived. We do, however, possess a tax register dating from 883/1478 and a fragment from the reign of Bāyezīd II (r. 886-918/1481-1512) (Başbakanlık Arşivi Osmanlı Arşivi, Istanbul Tapu Tahrir 7, and Bibliothèque Nationale Cyrillos and Methodios. Sofia, Oriental section, SN 16/35, publ. in Bistra Cvetkova (ed.), *Fontes turcici historiae bulgaricae*, xvi. Sofia, 1972). There exist two further *mufaşşal* registers covering Selānik; one from about 967-8/1560 and another from 1022/1613 (Tapu Tahrir 403 and 723). The earliest *tahrir* enumerates 862 Muslim and 1,275 Christian householders. From their regular distribution among the pre-existing town quarters, it can be assumed that the Muslim inhabitants had been settled in the city by order of the sultan (*sürgün*). By the beginning of the 10th/16th century, Selānik had about doubled in size, as apart from 1,715 Muslim households, there were now 1,688 Christians and 754 Jews. A high point was reached in 925/1519, when an abbreviated register (*idjimal*) recorded 1,374 Muslim, 1,387 Christian and 3,143 Jewish households. By about 967-8/1560, a significant drop in population had occurred (773 Muslim, 1,047 Christian and 2,645 Jewish households). This decline was even more pronounced by 1022/1613, when the relevant figures were 1,090, 561, and 2,033, showing a relative increase of the Muslim and a decline of the Christian element. Thus Selānik seems to have held about 10,000 inhabitants in 883/1487 and to have oscillated between 18,000 and 30,000 thereafter. Ewliyā Čelebi claims 33,000 houses for 11th/17th-century Selānik, which would give a population of over 150,000. But European travellers indicate that during its years of prosperity in the second half of the 12th/18th century, Selānik possessed a population of about 60,000 to 70,000, 28,000 to 30,000 of whom were Turks.

Among the revenue sources of Selānik and other towns of the area which the 9th/15th-century Ottoman state attempted to exploit, were the salt pans, supplemented by a fishing weir in the vicinity of Selānik itself. Accounts begin in 873/1468-9, but show that the enterprise was in constant difficulties. Several