FROM VIENNA TO THE KALMYK LANDS: THE CONSTRUCTION OF PLACE IN THE *SEYAHATNÂME*

VİYANA'DAN KALMUKİSTAN'A: SEYAHATNÂME'DE YERİN İNŞASI

Sooyong KIM*

Abstract

In the past few decades, scholars have pointed to the importance of a travel account's very spatial setting in the construction and representation of place, in marking out the cultural and political boundaries. Yet that aspect has been little explored when it comes to Ottoman travel writing, especially from the early modern era. This article examines the role of spatial setting in the construction of place in Evliyâ Çelebi's *Seyahatnâme*, of Vienna and the Kalmyk lands in particular, two places outside the Ottoman imperial realm. The accounts illustrate how greatly the specificity of each place in the Ottoman territorial imagination defines Evliya's depiction of those locales. For Evliyâ, it is argued, Vienna and the Kalmyks lands represent two wholly different and exclusive foreign places: the former is constructed as an urban space beneficial to Ottoman material interest, and the latter as a pastoral space without such benefit.

Key words: Vienna, Kalmyk lands, place, Evliyâ Çelebi, *Seyahatnâme*, travel

Özet

Son zamanlarda gezi yazınında yeri kavramsallaştırırken, kültürel ve politik sınırların belirlenmesinde, uzamsal konumun önemine sıkça değinildiğini görüyoruz. Ancak, Osmanlı gezi yazını – özellikle erken modern dönem – bu açıdan henüz pek irdelenmiş değil. Bu makale Evliyâ Çelebi'nin *Seyahatnâme*'sinde, özellikle Osmanlı İmparatorluğu sınırları dışında kalan iki yer olan Viyana ve Kalmukistan'a ilişkin bölümlerinde, uzamsal konumun yerin inşasındaki rolünü incelemektedir. *Seyahatnâme*'nin bu bölümleri bu yerlere ilişkin Osmanlı egemen yer imgeleminin detaylarının Evliyâ'nin betimlerini nasıl şekillendirdiğini gösterdiği için ayrı bir önem taşımaktadır. Bu makalede, Evliyâ'nın gözünde, Viyana ve Kalmukistan'ın birbirinden tamamen farklı ve ayrık iki yaban diyarı – Viyana, Osmanlının maddi cıkarlarına hizmet edecek gelişmiş medeni bir yeri; Kalmukistan'sa, pastoral ve bu vaadlerden yoksun bir yeri – temsil ettiği tezi savunulmaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Viyana, Kalmukistan, yer, Evliyâ Çelebi, *Seyahatnâme*, gezi

As Kay Anderson and Fay Gale have pointed out, a traveler's understanding of the world is an "inherently geographic concern," by which existing meanings are made sense of and new ones generated in the construction of place.[1] Thus a traveler's perceptions of a town or a region are shaped by both knowledge had prior to the visit and his actual experience of it. His account of it, factual or fictive, can then be read as a series of acts that fulfill, disappoint, or even challenge expectations. Of course, the view that travel writing is a mediated practice is not remarkably new.

* Koç University.

1 Kay Anderson and Fay Gale, introduction, *Inventing Places: Studies in Cultural Geography* (Melbourne, 1992), 4.

And as Irvin Cemil Schick has recently noted, from the 18th century onward, a travel account's very spatial setting constituted an important element in the construction and representation of place, in marking out the cultural and political boundaries.[2] Yet that element has been little explored when it comes to travel writing before then, and especially in the Ottoman context.

Evliyâ Çelebi's *Seyahatnâme* or *Book of Travels*, completed around 1683, provides us with an apt Ottoman example for examining the role of spatial setting in the construction of place. The *Seyahatnâme* is a text shaped by medieval geographical works in Arabic, chiefly focusing on towns and the manners and customs of the population, which in the course of the 17th century became increasingly available in Turkish translation.[3] It is also a text familiar with maps and atlases such as Mercator's more contemporary *Atlas Minor*, Ptolemy's classic *Geography*, and a *Mappa Mundi*, all three of which Evliyâ expressly mentions in his description of the mapmakers' guild in his hometown of Istanbul.[4] A number of histories and chronicles are also cited throughout the *Seyahatnâme*, Ottoman and beyond.[5] Besides, the text is infused with imperial and popular lore. This is not in the least surprising, since Evliyâ came of age, as Robert Dankoff has observed, "surrounded by courtiers and artisans who regaled him with accounts – whether first-hand or passed on – of Ottoman military *and* cultural activities from Baghdad to Budapest."[6] There are few specimens of travel writing of the time that are as mediated by prior knowledge, geographic in particular, as the *Seyahatnâme*.

Of special interest to us are Evliyâ's reports of his visits to Vienna and the Kalmyk lands, two places of which there are no previous first-hand written accounts by any Ottoman subject. The visits occurred within approximately a year of each other, between late spring of 1665 and the winter of 1666, and the reports respectively bookend the seventh of his massive ten-volume *Seyahatnâme*. Furthermore, the visits to those places comprise rare instances in which Evliyâ ventured outside the Ottoman imperial realm and into foreign territory, and as such his first-hand accounts function too as border-crossing narratives, where Vienna and the Kalmyk lands become places of otherness, if not strictly of the singular other typical of the colonial encounter. This article considers the extent to which the distinctive locality of each setting plays a part in that construction.

---

2 Irvin Cemil Schick, "Self and Other, Here and There. Travel Writing and the Construction of Identity and Place," in *Venturing beyond Borders – Reflections on Genre, Function, and Boundaries in Middle Eastern Travel Writing*," eds. Bekim Agai, Olcay Akyıldız, and Caspar Hillebrand (Würzburg, 2013), 20.

3 Giancarlo Casale, *The Ottoman Age of Exploration* (Oxford, 2010), 186.

4 Evliyâ Çelebi, *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi: Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Bağdat 308 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkipsiyonu – Dizini*, vol. 1, eds. Robert Dankoff, Seyit Ali Kahraman, and Yücel Dağlı (Istanbul, 2006), 163a. For an overview of early modern Ottoman cartography and geography, see M. Pınar Emiralioğlu, "Cartography and Geographical Consciousness in the Ottoman Empire (1453-1730)," in Ian Manners, *European Cartographers and the Ottoman World, 1500-1700: Maps from the Collection of O. J. Sopranos* (Chicago, 2007), 95-107.

5 For a brief discussion of the works Evliyâ quotes or references, see Klaus Kreiser, "Evliya Çelebi." October 2005. https://ottomanhistorians.uchicago.edu/en/historian/evliya-celebi; and also Hatice Aynur, "Evliyâ Çelebi's Written Sources," in *Evliyâ Çelebi: Studies and Essays Commemorating the 400th Anniversary of His Birth*, eds. Nuran Tezcan, Semih Tezcan, and Robert Dankoff (Istanbul, 2012), 383-87.

6 Robert Dankoff, *An Ottoman Mentality: The World of Evliya Çelebi* (Leiden, 2006), 50.

Vienna: A Would-Be Ottoman City

In the summer of 1664, Evliyâ witnessed the defeat of the Ottomans by the Habsburgs in the Battle of St. Gotthard. In April of the following year, after the signing of the Treaty of Vasvár, an Ottoman embassy under Kara Mehmed Pasha was sent to the court of the Habsburg emperor, Leopold I, in Vienna to conclude a peace of twenty years' duration. Evliyâ joined the embassy, and according to him in an advisory capacity, due to the knowledge he had gained of the "frontier conditions" from his participation in the military campaigns that led to the Battle of St. Gotthard.[7] The embassy entered the city on June 8 in 1665, and would last for nine months, until March of 1666. But Evliyâ left Vienna far earlier, though exactly when is not certain, for he states in one instance that he toured the city for nearly three months and in another that he had departed on June 29, indicating that he spent only three weeks there.[8] In any case, his time in Vienna was relatively short and also limited, since the embassy was encamped outside the city and permission needed for trips inside, which Evliyâ apparently managed to obtain.

Predictably, given the circumstances of Evliya's visit to Vienna, his account of it is framed by two extended passages involving Kara Mehmed Pasha. The first is a description of the lavish procession that accompanied the ambassador's initial entry into the city, in which Evliyâ makes plain at the outset that, despite the recent Ottoman defeat, nothing was conceded in the matter of protocol. He relates that when Kara Mehmed Pasha was presented with a royal carriage to ride in, the ambassador refused the offer by saying: "I will not get in, and we are Ottomans. Our custom to mount Arab steeds, play jereed, and fight for the faith."[9]

The other is a report of Kara Mehmed Pasha's audience with the emperor ten days later. Here too, Ottoman priority in protocol is accentuated. Yet what punctuates Evliyâ's report of the audience is his portrayal of Leopold I, especially of his ugliness. Evliyâ starts by wondering whether God had indeed intended to create a human in Leopold I. He then describes Leopold I's physical features in the crudest manner possible, comparing the emperor's bulbous eyes to an owl's, his big ears to children's slippers, his large nose to a Morean eggplant, his swollen lips and huge white teeth to a camel's, to name some. Evliyâ concludes by observing, "By God's command, all the emperors of this house are just as ugly-faced."[10]

Evliyâ's portrayal of Leopold I as the quintessence of ugliness, while humorous, ought not be viewed as mere caricature. Rather, the depiction should be comprehended, as Suraiya Faroqhi has suggested, in the larger context of the long-standing Ottoman desire to conquer the Habsburg capital.[11] In this regard, the physical ugliness attributed to Leopold I can also be understood as a broader emblem of Habsburg rule over Vienna, signifying the ugliness of its political makeup, over a city that the Ottomans had originally attempted to capture more than a century ago in 1529.

---

7 Evliyâ Çelebi, *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7 (Istanbul, 2003), 30b. All translations are the author's unless noted otherwise.

8 Ibid., 72b, 73a. Evliyâ also mentions that on June 29 he set off for western Europe and returned to Vienna after two and a half years (75a). But this is obviously a fiction and serves as a narrative device to conclude his account of the city with a final description of the old and new fortifications.

9 Ibid., 54a.

10 Ibid., 66b. For a translation of the passage, see Nuran Tezcan, "Documentary Traces of Evliyâ Çelebi," in *Evliyâ Çelebi*, 44-45.

11 Suraiya Faroqhi, *Subjects of the Sultan: Culture and Daily Life in the Ottoman Empire* (London, 2000), 88.

It is perhaps not by coincidence that Evliyâ's cruel depiction of Leopold I is preceded by a report of an incident that serves as a forecast for a future conquest. The incident involves a gift horse for Leopold I that "the Ottoman sultan had personally ridden."[12] We are told that the horse, once taken to the Habsburg palace grounds, killed several and wounded many men there, before fleeing away and dying of its own accord near the city center. The actuality of the incident aside, what is significant for us is the vision conveyed of an enemy's helplessness in handling a lone belligerent steed, a fitting metonym for Ottoman military potency as far as Kara Mehmed Pasha would be concerned. Thus if the image of Habsburg rule, as embodied by Leopold I, is unsightly, it is heralded by a report that anticipates a change in appearance.

In forecasting the future, Evliyâ's report invokes the past as well. We are informed that the gift horse died after smelling the corpse of the horse of a certain Dayı Çerkes. This Çerkes we first learn about in relation to the 1529 siege of Vienna, which Evliyâ relates at the start of his account of the city. Evliyâ singles out Çerkes for his heroics, for having the courage to battle the enemy soldiers, unassisted and past the city walls, before succumbing to their bullets. Evliyâ further notes that at a place now called "Çerkes Square" in Vienna is Çerkes buried with his horse, whose "body remained skin and bones and not yet decayed" – hence its smell still palpable in the city and a reminder of an Ottoman presence.[13] Of course, it is at that very same square, Evliyâ reveals, that the gift horse too is buried, and conspicuously "in front of Çerkes's horse."[14] It seems, then, what is required for future success are warriors in Çerkes's spirit.

How much of what Evliyâ tells about the events surrounding the gift horse for Leopold I can be regarded as wishful thinking, reflecting the Ottoman desire to conquer Vienna, we cannot say. We do know, however, that there was an Ottoman belief that a Çerkes Square did exist in the city and close to the centrally located St. Stephen's Cathedral.[15] Yet more importantly, the link Evliyâ makes between a not-so innocent gift horse and a legendary soldier's horse highlights a key aspect of his account of Vienna: the influence of existing Ottoman narratives about the city. "It was colored," as Gisela Procházka-Eisl puts it, "by an oral tradition of legends and hagiographies that had become part of the Ottoman collective memory."[16] And like the tale of Çerkes, all of them have as their basis the 1529 siege of Vienna.

As a matter of fact, Evliyâ begins his account of Vienna with a report of a prophecy connected to St. Peter about the future conquest of the city. According to the prophecy, while Süleyman's siege in 1529 would fail to capture the city, there would be another siege that would succeed in year 1100 of the Hijra (1688-89). Evliyâ claims that the prophecy predicting the Ottoman annexation of "this Golden Apple of Vienna" was even inscribed in St. Stephen's Cathedral and also recorded in Hungarian, German, and Greek chronicles.[17] It is after the report of the prophecy that Evliyâ recounts

---

12 *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 66b. A translation of the story is in Claudia Römer, "Legends about Vienna in the *Seyahatnâme* and Their Austrian Counterpart," in *Evliyâ Çelebi*, 294.

13 *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 55b. Çerkes is first mentioned just prior to the Vienna account in a story about the Neugebäude Castle, which the embassy visited before entering the city and where Süleyman pitched his imperial tent during the first siege. See ibid., 51b.

14 Ibid., 66b.

15 Römer, "Legends about Vienna in the *Seyahatnâme*," 293. See also Richard F. Kreutel, "Ein zeitgenössischer türkischer Plan zur zweiten Belagerung Wiens," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 51 (1950): 224-26

16 Gisela Procházka-Eisl, "Evliyâ Çelebi's Journey to Vienna," in *Evliyâ Çelebi*, 116.

17 *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 55b.

Süleyman's siege, in which he shares the exploits of Çerkes along with the deeds of Kasım Voyvoda, a semi-legendary commander who purportedly died in Vienna as well.

Moreover, the notion of Vienna as a "Golden Apple," a term the Ottomans employed for any would-be conquered Christian city of political importance, Evliyâ specifically identifies with Süleyman and the first siege.[18] Evliyâ informs us later that the reason why the city is called that is because Süleyman had decided not to bombard the bell tower of St. Stephen's Cathedral and instead sent the emperor back then, Ferdinand I, a golden ball with the following message: "Eventually it will be a Muslim sanctuary's place for the prayer call. So let [the ball] be my sign on this tower."[19] Evliyâ adds, however, that the ball has now been replaced with a golden thing shaped "like a forked cross," which he hopes will be taken down in the future by another sultan in the mold of Süleyman.

The references to Süleyman's 1529 siege and the lore associated with it are scattered throughout Evliyâ's account of Vienna. In his report of the city walls, we are learn of the breach made at the time of the siege, which remained unclosed. "Whenever it was repaired," Evliyâ tells us, "by God's command, this wall would collapse and continue to be in ruins."[20] In his mention of the market squares, he devotes much of his attention to "Çerkes Square," which we discover is the site not only of Çerkes's burial but also of his martyrdom. Of his death by gunfire, Evliyâ relates how Ferdinand I found the responsible soldier a coward and had him killed, and notes that the soldier's corpse was put and is still on display on a "wall opposite that Çerkes hero."[21] And at the end of his description of the city's clock towers, Evliyâ states that prior to the siege, the Viennese had carried them away to Prague to prevent their destruction and later brought them back. He adds, though, that according to another prophecy, "In the year '90 (i.e. 1090/1679) they will take them once more."[22]

This received tradition that Evliyâ provides overlay the cityscape of Vienna with a distinctively Ottoman gloss. While scholars in the main have focused on what is real or imagined, including whether the prophecies Evliyâ supplies were invented by himself, they have largely overlooked the resulting sense of place conveyed. Faroqhi has argued, for instance, that the references made to the 1529 siege and the lore told about it can be seen collectively as an act of symbolic appropriation of a foreign territory, similar in manner to early modern European pilgrimage reports covering visits to Jerusalem, which had "as a subtext an unwillingness to accept that the Holy Land was no longer in Christian hands."[23] There is certainly a strong element of that in Evliyâ's account of Vienna, an unwillingness to accept that the city is yet to be in Muslim hands, with constant reminders of an abiding Ottoman presence. But I would go one step further and suggest that the symbolic appropriation of the city also serves as a frame that allows Evliyâ to make observations of infidel wonders and marvels acceptable and desirable for his audience.

It is with that frame in mind that we must assess Evliyâ's observations of the mechanical devices and technical skills encountered in Vienna. What stands out in his description of the shops, for example, is his admiration for clockwork mechanisms newly witnessed – flour mills, meat skewers, water buckets, and even carriages that turn automatically – and expressed in a tone of universal

---

18 On the Ottoman notion of the "Golden Apple," see Pál Fodor, *In Quest of the Golden Apple: Imperial Ideology, Politics, and Military Administration in the Ottoman Empire* (Istanbul, 2000).

19 *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 61b.

20 Ibid., 56b.

21 Ibid., 58b.

22 Ibid.

23 Suraiya Faroqhi, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Around It* (London, 2004), 23.

appreciation and not as a specifically infidel or Christian achievement. Evliyâ, in fact, begins the description with a list of clocks found at the shops:

> And the shops are unequaled in the operation of wonderful objects and strange instruments. Alarm clocks, clocks marking prayer times, or the month and day, or the signs of the zodiac, clocks on a monthly or daily calendar, chiming wall clocks – all are functioning. And they make clocks in the form of various creatures, with moving eyes, hands, and feet, so the viewer thinks those animals are alive; whereas the master clock-makers made them move with wheel mechanisms.[24]

Evliya's interest in clocks also includes the clock towers dotted across the city, especially ones with animals that move at the strike of every hour, and a section solely dedicated to them concludes his extended report of the mechanical devices seen there. It is in this section, once he finishes describing a clock tower with two butting rams, that Evliyâ mentions the prophecy, quoted above, predicting the future removal of such clocks. In view of the positive tone adopted so far, the prophecy cited here has an additional function for Evliyâ: a means to allay any misgiving his audience might have that he is being too appreciative of infidel wonders. Notably, it is after mentioning the prophecy that he relates an amusing anecdote in which he confuses effigies of Muslim captives pounding medicaments to be alive, as if to indicate that he has not forgotten that he is in a contested place.[25]

For his description of St. Stephen's Cathedral, an overtly non-Muslim space, Evliyâ adopts an appreciative tone as well, despite the use of conventional rhetoric denouncing the unbelievers. This is quite evident at the start, where Evliyâ speaks of "stubborn and dirty" priests, but then praises the cathedral itself as a magnificent structure "that nothing like it has been or will be built in Turkey, Arabia and Persia, or in the seven climes of Christendom."[26] Thereafter, Evliyâ gives details about the library, stating how well it is looked after, with many servants who "dust off the books once a week," and in this instance admonishing his fellow Muslims to follow the unbelievers' example.[27] He also gives praise to the organ, by saying that "there is nothing like the organ of David found here in the churches of any infidel country."[28] After making this connection to David, known in the Islamic tradition for his affinity to music, Evliyâ explains the organ's impressive effect in terms familiar to his audience, employing Ottoman musical vocabulary.

A similar pattern of praise, tempered with casual denouncement, is had in Evliyâ's description of the figurative paintings inside the cathedral, which from a normative Islamic stance should be a forbidden topic. Evliya commences thus:

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

---

[24] *An Ottoman Traveller: Selections from the Book of Travels of Evliya Çelebi*, eds. and trans. Robert Dankoff and Sooyong Kim (London, 2010), 232. Cf. *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 57b.

[25] *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 58b-59a. For a translation of the anecdote, as well as of the descriptions of the clock towers, see *An Ottoman Traveller*, 232-34.

[26] *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 59a.

[27] Ibid., 59b.

[28] Ibid., 60a-b. For a translation of the initial description of the cathedral, see *An Ottoman Traveller*, 235-40.

> jest, I said, "How many gods you have – God forbid! – that whenever you pass by one of them, you remove your hats and bow down and worship."[29]

Evliyâ then gives the priests' reply, in which they explain to him that the paintings have an edifying purpose, to communicate messages that are difficult to express with words alone. Their reply serves as a pretext for Evliyâ to give his highly appreciative description of the paintings of heaven and hell, providing cover against charges of idolatry. Of the depiction of heaven, he declares that when witnessed "one wishes to die and go to heaven, recalling the Koranic verse (89:30), *Join My servants and enter My Paradise.*"[30] The depiction of hell Evliyâ describes likewise, within an Islamic context.[31] Nevertheless, what is remarkable is that he chose to describe them at all.

There is an openness to Evliyâ's account of Vienna, particularly in the case of man-made wonders witnessed, such as the clockwork mechanisms and the surgical advances, the report of which immediately follow the description of the cathedral paintings.[32] At the same time, as Bekim Agai has lately observed, the appreciative tenor of the account is occasionally supervened by "affirmations of existing boundaries," religious for the most part.[33] Still, as seen with Evliyâ's description of the paintings, even religious boundaries are not always fixed. And what has often been understated by scholars is the political dimension to his account – that Vienna will be in Ottoman hands, sooner rather than later. In this regard, it should not be surprising that it is at the end of the description of the cathedral paintings that Evliyâ gives the explanation, mentioned earlier, why the city is called the "Golden Apple," after which he expresses his hope for its conquest.

Political boundaries too are transgressed, at least when man-made wonders are involved. In his report of Kara Mehmed Pasha's audience with Leopold I, which begins after the surgery reports, Evliyâ does not hesitate to speak of the grandeur of the Habsburg palace and its gardens.[34] On a personal level, Evliyâ seems to have had no trouble befriending individuals he met, a surgeon who knows some Turkish and the son of a field marshal who permits him to tour the armory.[35] He also mitigates a critical comment about public flirting between the sexes by conceding that there are many beautiful people in the city, high praise indeed.[36] To this we may add the overall impression of the inhabitants' industriousness we get from his account. Hence the cultural and gender divide as well is less marked for Evliyâ.

Evliyâ's generally positive assessment of Vienna, of its industry and material culture, presents the city as worthwhile place of future acquisition. And such an open appreciation for a non-Muslim place is made possible by its very specificity in the Ottoman territorial imagination – it is a city prophetically ordained to be Muslim with an Ottoman presence already. Thus there is little hint that existing divides cannot be overcome. But Evliyâ's desire that Vienna might one day be taken is not without ambivalence. In the course of his account, there is some fear that the buildings and works he

---

29 Ibid., 240. Cf. *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 60b.

30 *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 60b.

31 For a translation of the content of the paintings, see *An Ottoman Traveller*, 241.

32 For a translation of the surgical operations, see ibid., 242-47; and also John W. Livingston, "Evliyâ Çelebi on Surgical Operations in Vienna," *Al-Abhath* 23 (1970): 223-37.

33 Bekim Agai, "Religion as a Determining Factor of the Self and Other. How Islamic is the Muslim Worldview? Evliya Çelebi and His Successor Reconsidered," in *Venturing beyond Borders*, 113.

34 *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 67b-68a, 69a.

35 Ibid., 62b-63a, 69b.

36 Ibid., 71a. This view stands in stark contrast to an earlier description of Austrians as simply a dirty and uncouth people. See ibid., 49b; cf. *An Ottoman Traveller*, 230-31.

so admires would not survive another siege. It is a sentiment echoed by a dervish in his retinue, who tells him before their arrival to the city: "In the year '94 (1094/1683), may God not give this world and the fortress of Vienna, because they will destroy all these buildings."[37]

The Kalmyk Lands: An Unsettled and Unsettling Place

We do know exactly when Evliyâ departed Vienna or where he precisely traveled next.[38] But after a stint inspecting Ottoman fortresses in the Habsburg borderlands, he soon joined raiding expeditions into Polish and Russian territories under the aegis of Mehmed Giray IV and returned with him to Baghche-saray, the capital of the Crimean Khanate, in the winter of 1665. In the spring of the following year, Evliyâ accompanied Mehmed Giray IV to Dagestan, to the Kumyk principality of Enderi, where the khan had decided to take refuge upon his deposal by the new Ottoman sultan, his overlord. Evliyâ then received permission to visit the surrounding region, including areas under Muscovite control, and set out in May. He ventured up north by boat from the fortress of Terek on the Caspian Sea, onward to Kazan, and in the winter of 1666, while in the company of a Russian envoy heading to Azov, spent a week in the Kalmyk lands in the Lower Volga. The circumstances of Evliyâ's visit there, aided by official emissaries and somewhat accidental, did not differ greatly than those surrounding his tour of Vienna.

Yet in contrast to Vienna, Evliyâ does not seem to have had much prior knowledge of the Kalmyks. This is not remarkable, since Ottoman accounts, before Evliyâ's, are few and far between. The merchant Ali Akbar's account of his voyage from Iran to China, composed in Persian in 1516 and translated into Turkish near the end of the century, has a brief chapter devoted to the Kalmyks. The chapter, however, concerns the Kalmyks' obeisance to the Ming, and mention of them elsewhere focuses on their conflict with them.[39] The scholar Seyfi Çelebi's more contemporary historical geography of Asia, composed in 1582, includes a chapter as well dealing with the Kalmyks that nonetheless gives a bit more information about them. Seyfi speaks of their beauty and bravery, saying they are "like Tatars" when it comes to fighting spirit, but also makes note of how in multitude and size they resemble the "people of Gog" and of their habit of eating the flesh of any animal, "even a snake's."[40]

Furthermore, at the time Evliyâ traveled, the Kalmyks were no longer occupying their ancestral lands in western Mongolia and Dzungaria, as recorded in the existing accounts. At the beginning of the 17th century, the Kalmyks, a pastoral nomadic people, had migrated to the Lower Volga, expelling the local Nogays, and by the 1630s had firmly established rule over the region while becoming allies with Muscovy. In the decades thereafter, they posed a constant threat to their neighbors, creating a "general situation of instability" around them and conducting raiding expeditions especially against the Crimean Khanate.[41] And it is during his stay there, with Mehmed Giray IV, that Evliyâ first learns about the Kalmyk threat. In relating the plight of the Nogays, now

---

37 *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 53a.

38 Evliyâ claims to have toured western Europe afterward. But it is generally held that the claim is apocryphal.

39 See Ali Akbar Khita'i, *Khitây-nâma: sharh-i mushâhidât-i Sayyid 'Alî Akbar Khitâ'î mu'âsir-i Shâh Ismâ'îl Safavî dar sarzamîn-i Chîn*, ed. Iraj Afshar (Tehran, 1993), 147-49, 67-72; and also idem, *Ali Ekber'in Hıtayname Adlı Eserinin Çin Kaynakları ile Mukayese ve Tenkidi*, trans. Yih-Min Lin (Taipei, 1967), 159-61, 61-68.

40 Seyfi Çelebi, *L'ouvrage de Seyfi Çelebī: historien ottoman du XVI^e Siècle*, ed. Joseph Matuz (Paris, 1968), 73, 75.

41 Giorgio Rota, "Safavids and Kalmyks in the 17th Century: A Preliminary Assessment," in *Proceedings of the 5th Conference of the Societas Iranologica Europæa Held in Ravenna, 6-11 October 2003*, vol. 2, eds. Antonio Panaino and Riccardo Zipoli (Bologna, 2006), 191-92.

under the khan's protection and dwelling north of the Black Sea and in the Caucasus, Evliyâ reports that the Nogays continued to suffer terribly at the hands of the "cursed Kalmyks."[42]

The Nogays were the not the only people to have suffered. Evliyâ's account of his journey to Dagestan, via Circassia, is littered with reports of the fear and danger caused by the Kalmyks. Evliyâ notes, for example, that the Besleneys had chosen the site of their main settlement in the Laba River valley due to the "Kalmyk trouble."[43] He relates, in another instance, how the Abkhazians living around the Zelenchuk River, further east, paid an annual tribute in order to "ensure their safety from Kalmyk trouble and plunder."[44] The fear of the Kalmyks was also the reason why Evliyâ could not travel to Balkh and Bukhara as he would have liked. In refusing to give permission, the *shamkhal* or ruler of Enderi informs Evliyâ that roads are insecure, warning him: "The Kalmyks are many. You cannot go in peace."[45] And while approaching their lands, Evliyâ himself concedes, "We began to feel frightened."[46]

What is evident is that Evliyâ's knowledge of the Kalmyks was primarily gained during his travels and shaped little by existing accounts. The impression conveyed of them before his actual account is one marked by fear, along with the expectation that their lands, situated in the open steppes of the Lower Volga, would be empty of civilization. Prior to his departure from Terek, Evliyâ remarks in passing that "there are no prosperous and cultivated places" to be seen there, since it is under their rule.[47]

That impression of the Kalmyks as a dangerous and primitive people sets the tone of Evliyâ's initial description of them. He begins by calling them a "cursed, dirty, vermin" lot and asserts that their ominous appearance on earth was even foretold in the *Cifr-i Cami*, the "Encompassing Onomancy," an Arabic book of divination ascribed to Ali.[48] Evliyâ then states that the Russians too are afraid of the Kalmyks and sends them gifts every year. And Evliyâ mentions additionally that when his traveling group met with their chief *tayishi*, Daichin, at an unidentified encampment somewhere presumably between the Volga and Don Rivers, the Kalmyk leader "never showed any respect and courtesy to our ambassador."[49] Still, Evliyâ was able to curry favor, and Daichin's son, Monchak Shah, would host him during his short stay.[50]

The remainder of Evliyâ's account is mixed with information, both factual and fantastic. There are rather straightforward reports, for example, of the Kalmyks living in tents of camel felt, of their women's dress, including caftans made from fine Chinese cloth, and of the lack of coinage and the rarity of metal swords and stirrups due to the dearth of mines in the steppes.[51] Similarly, we are told that there is no enmity among them, that they are healthy and free of disease. Yet in the same breath, we are informed with genuine contempt that they attack constantly other peoples and eat

---

42 *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 106a.

43 Ibid., 156a.

44 Ibid., 158a. On Evliyâ's travels in the Caucasus, see Murat Yaşar, "Evliya Çelebi in the Circassian Lands: Vampires, Tree Worshippers, and Pseudo-Muslims," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientarium Hungaricae* 67 (2014): 75-96.

45 *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 165b.

46 Ibid., 171a.

47 Ibid., 174b.

48 Ibid., 175a.

49 Ibid., 175b. Evliyâ simply refers to Daichin as "Taysı Şah."

50 Evliyâ renders Monchak's name as Moyinçak. On the Kalmyk *tayishis*, particularly the political situation of Monchak, see Michael Khodarkovsky, *Where Two Worlds Met: The Russian State and the Kalmyk Nomads, 1600-1771* (Ithaca, 1992), 46, 96-99.

51 *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 175b, 177a.

only millet and raw meat, and quite unbelievably that they are blessed with longevity, living until 300 years in age. And of those who eventually die, we learn that "their bodies are buried in the ground, burned in fire, thrown into water, or eaten."[52]

The Kalmyks' cannibalism claimed at the end Evliyâ describes in detail later in a section devoted to their strange practices. Their cannibalism, in fact, is the chief focus. We are once again informed of the Kalmyks' longevity and the four distinct ways a corpse can be disposed of, which is apparently determined by the casting of a four-sided and separately colored wooden lot, with green indicating that it should be eaten. To corroborate his claim, Evliyâ relates a personal anecdote:

> One day it happened that one of [Monchak] Shah's sons had died. They roasted his body, poured out the fat and blood, and were eating the flesh, accompanied by great merriment and festivity. When I passed by they invited me to the feast, saying:
>
> "Come, you too can partake of our emperor's son."
> "Can one eat human flesh?" I asked.
> "Indeed," they replied. "We eat his flesh so that his soul will enter one of us. Thus he does not die, but goes on together with us."
> "And who is your father?" I asked.
> "He who made you and me and the Shining Mountain."
>
> Such was their blasphemous reply, and some words that I dare not write down. They have no sense of being infidels or going astray, no notion of the Last Judgement, of the Scales, of Paradise and Hell and Purgatory, of the Four Books, the Prophet, obligation and Sunna. They are simply beasts in the shape of men, the Yellow Tribe.
>
> "Sirs," I cried, "can one really eat human flesh? Isn't it bitter?"
> "It is bitter," an old Kalmyk said. "Don't eat it. But if you want to know what it tastes like, just kiss a woman and see how sweet it is. If you eat human flesh you will derive eternal life from its sweetness and will live long, like us."
>
> In that meal, the body of one man was enough to feed forty or fifty Kalmyks. As for the fat, they smeared it over their faces and eyes and bodies; and they buried the bones.[53]

The question of whether Evliyâ actually witnessed cannibalism among the Kalmyks has been the subject of some scholarly attention. Dankoff has argued, for instance, that Evliya's story is "hard to credit," given that the Kalmyks were Buddhists, and thus the story ought to be regarded as one of his most fantastic, verging on fiction.[54] Evliyâ certainly provides no help in this respect, for he himself admits afterward that it is difficult to believe everything he hears from the Kalmyks, but adds ironically that he does so because "they never tell lies."[55] Leaving aside the issue of veracity, Eric Dursteler has recently suggested that we should view Evliyâ's claim of cannibalism as a means for "ascribing cultural boundaries," for representing a people as strikingly different, at worst barely

---

[52] Ibid., 176a.
[53] *An Ottoman Traveller*, 254-55. Cf. *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 176b.
[54] Dankoff, *An Ottoman Mentality*, 61-62.
[55] *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 176b.

human, in culinary terms.[56] Needless to say, cannibalism is a common trope of travel writing of the time and earlier, setting apart the civilized from those deemed the exact opposite. And Evliyâ's claim, even if wholly invented, has that effect, defining the limits of civilization.

Conspicuously, Evliyâ's tale immediately follows a description of the Kalmyks' physical characteristics, which is reminiscent of his portrayal of Leopold I. The emphasis too is on unsightliness, but here the cultural dimension is more pronounced. Evliyâ states that the Kalmyks have large heads like an Adana melon, flat faces like a plate, narrow eyes like a needle's slit, huge teeth like a camel's, and are short statured with big hands and feet, with torsos round as a basket and necks thick as a wolf's. And he adds that they are all "filthy and foul-smelling," since their diet mainly consists of raw meat and their clothing of animal hides.[57] Evliyâ's description of the Kalmyks, while not depicting them as outright savages, does present them as a people of a beastly nature, which his tale of cannibalism serves to enhance.

The boundaries Evliyâ ascribes, however, are not categorical. After declaring that the Kalmyks "never tell lies," he goes on to mention a few more of their good qualities, including that "they know nothing of adultery, sodomy, or masturbation," though with the caveat that "their women know nothing of marriage."[58] That the Kalmyks "know nothing of ..." is a frequent refrain from Evliyâ, as he makes observations about their practices, and the ignorance they display he at times attributes to the lack of proper faith, but not in the same condemning terms as he does for their cannibalism. Remarkably, despite the lack of proper faith, Evliyâ does not once denounce the Kalmyks for being infidels in the mold of Christians, nor does he accuse of them of having no religion at all. As a matter of fact, he informs us that they have an array of faiths: some believe in transmigration, some in Zoroastrianism, and others worship fire, earth, the sun, the moon, or oxen.[59]

That Evliyâ understood the Kalmyks to have had multiple faiths underscores just how unfamiliar he was with the Tibetan Buddhism or Lamaism that they adhered to since the late 16th century. If the Kalmyks knew nothing of many things, so too did Evliyâ regarding them. Perhaps it should be expected that, without any ready reference, when condemning the Kalmyks for their cannibalism, Evliyâ oddly resorts to calling them the "Yellow Tribe," *Banu'l-Asfar*, a tribe of unbelievers that plays a role in eschatological musings but one that is usually identified as a western people.[60]

At the same time, Evliyâ associates the "Shining Mountain" the Kalmyks tell him about – their place of pilgrimage and probably Lhasa in Tibet – with Mount Qaf of Islamic lore, which was believed to surround the inhabited world. Yet he relates further that they also call the mountain the "Wall of Gog and Magog."[61] Hence, with echoes of the physical comparison Seyfi makes, Evliyâ locates the Kalmyks as the most northern folk in closet proximity to Gog and Magog, a people who represent absolute destructiveness and barbarity and are linked with the end of human civilization as well.[62]

---

56 Eric R. Dursteler, "Infidel Foods: Food and Identity in Early Modern Ottoman Travel Literature," *The Journal of Ottoman Studies/Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 39 (2012): 150.

57 *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 176a.

58 Ibid., 176b.

59 Ibid., 176a.

60 On the *Banu'l-Asfar*, see Maribel Fierro, "Al-Asfar," *Studia Islamica* 77 (1993): 169-81.

61 *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 179a. Cf. 159a.

62 In medieval geographical works, the territory of Gog and Magog was determined to be in the northern climes, from the fifth to the seventh. See Emeri van Donzel and Andrea Schmidt, *Gog and Magog in Early Christian and Islamic Sources: Sallam's Quest for Alexander's Wall* (Leiden, 2010), 98-105.

In locating the Kalmyks most northerly, Evliyâ relies greatly on medieval accounts of northern peoples, mostly of Slavic and Turkic peoples, based on the Hellenistic understanding of climes that regarded them as prone to savagery and war – a facet of his account that has been often overlooked by scholars. Their "manifestations of barbarousness," as Aziz al-Azmeh has suggested, were typically measured through three indices: cleanliness, sexuality, and funerary rites.[63] And Evliyâ's account of the Kalmyks' strange practices, their foulness and the cannibalistic way they dispose of the dead, keep to those indices. As for their sexuality, we learn toward the end of his account, after an extended passage dedicated to their mountain, their "Ka'ba" in his words, that his host Monchak habitually copulates with unusual women from the "Land of Women," who cannot get pregnant, and offers Evliyâ one such woman, whom he turns down.[64] This reported incident, at once exotic and fantastic, points to the Kalmyks' potential to subvert norms of sexuality and reproduction, already hinted at by their own women's ignorance of marriage.

As an account that barbarize the Kalmyks by reporting on their transgressive and threatening nature, Evliyâ's is not very different from contemporary accounts coming out of Safavid Persia, whose territories were directly exposed to their raids. For example, in an account of the Kalmyks' embassy to the Safavid court in Isfahan in 1655, the chronicler Vahid Qazvini describes them as a wild, ruthless, and faithless people; and likewise, in an account of travels in and around Persia in the 1670s, Petrus Bedik, an Armenian Catholic missionary, deems the Kalmyks a barbarous lot who do not avoid eating any kind of animals, from dogs to lizards.[65] In all these accounts, including Evliyâ's, there is a stress on the traditional divide between sedentary and nomadic peoples, coupled with fear and fascination of the unfamiliar.

By contrast, however, Evliyâ's account is also concerned with the extent of the borders between civilization and barbarity, with the expanding space that the Kalmyks occupy. This is achieved largely by locating them as the most northern folk, with their Ka'ba situated at the northern edge of the world. Yet their journeys and the traces left behind in their wake are not simply confined to ill-definable open steppes that lead to it.[66] Evliyâ concludes his description of the "Shining Mountain" thus:

> The Portuguese by sea, and the Kalmuks by land, are world travellers. There is no part of the world on which these two peoples have not set foot. And because they have many emperors (*padishah*) these Kalmuks have even travelled beyond the World of Darkness as far as the New World – indeed, the people of the New World are reported to be in fear of them. The Kalmuks truly deserve the title: travellers of the two worlds [i.e., Old and New].[67]

Evliyâ's mention of the New World here is striking, because it is not done so to present it as a place of last refuge for lowly Christians, of little civilization, which is the case elsewhere in his *Seyahatnâme*.[68] Instead, the New World is referenced to reinforce the Kalmyks' expanding and

63 Aziz Al-Azmeh, "Barbarians in Arab Eyes," *Past and Present* 134 (1992): 7.

64 *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 179a.

65 Rota, "Safavids and Kalmyks in the 17th Century," 195.

66 Curiously, Evliyâ's only description of the landscape of the "Kipchak Steppe," the Ottoman term for the western and central Eurasian Steppe, occurs once he has departed Kalmyk lands, en route from Azov to the Crimea. See *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 8, 189b-90b.; cf. *An Ottoman Traveller*, 264-65.

67 Dankoff, *An Ottoman Mentality*, 62. Cf. *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, 179a.

68 Hakan T. Karateke, "Evliyâ Çelebi's Perception of the New World," in *Evliyâ Çelebi*, 183-84.

unsettled territorial occupation, as a result of their consummate nomadism, or of their world-traveling ways, and to highlight ultimately their unsettling effect on other peoples, even those of the New World. In short, there is also a geographic concern to Evliyâ's account of the Kalmyk lands, not as a site desired and to be acquired in the future but rather as a distant expanse antithetical to civilization and one that is best skirted.

Even so, in spite of all the shortcomings the Kalmyks may have had in the eyes of an urbane and cultured observer like Evliyâ, his attitude toward them is a "guarded tolerance," to quote Dankoff.[69] Evliyâ is more often bemused by their peculiar customs and manners than unremittingly hostile to them, and reminds us repeatedly that they know nothing of many things, and further that they never lie. In other words, the Kalmyks are not portrayed as an un-civilizable people, their cannibalism notwithstanding. It can be said that, in Evliyâ's view, they have the potential also to convert to norms. But his problem seems to have been that he had no established frames to suggest that. What Evliyâ did have was an older and still-current discourse that tended to barbarize any new politically threatening people, particularly nomads, who appeared on the eastern horizon and came from the north. Therefore the profound difference that the Kalmyks represented Evliyâ articulates as a direct intersection of culture and geography. And to boot, they are a people who traverse and occupy the northern climes of both the old and the new world.

Conclusion

It is clear that for Evliyâ civilization was inconceivable outside an urban environment and particularly in steppe lands devoid of permanent settlement. Given that, it is not surprising that his account of the Kalmyk lands that he visited patently differs from those of other places, generally the cities and towns he traveled to, since there were no buildings to describe. As Dankoff has astutely pointed out, Evliyâ's main measure in determining the value of a place is "the number and quality of buildings, including houses and shops, but especially public buildings or *'imaret*," which are concomitant with prosperity and civilization.[70] Ultimately, then, the Kalmyk lands form a place demarcated by the lack of those kinds of buildings and populated by a people whose customs and manners stand in conflict with Ottoman urban norms. But by the same token, there is little hint of the topos that such a people are completely incapable of achieving anything worthwhile.

If the impression we get of the Kalmyk lands is of a place lacking the basic structures of civilization, shaped in no small part by Evliyâ's stay in Vienna, the picture presented of this city is the complete reverse. A defining feature of his account of Vienna is the attention paid to and appreciation for the beauty of the well-maintained buildings. Moreover, the account is filled with admiration for the mechanical devices witnessed. What is plainly emphasized is the city's material prosperity and its inhabitants' industriousness. Thus, in the final analysis, Vienna and the Kalmyk lands exemplify for Evliyâ two wholly different foreign places in two exclusively distinctive localities. Vienna is an urban space that would be a valuable addition to the Ottoman imperial realm. The Kalmyk lands, on the other hand, constitute a pastoral space that would be unbeneficial to Ottoman material interest.

---

69 Dankoff, *An Ottoman Mentality*, 82.
70 Ibid., 49.

Works Cited

Agai, Bekim. "Religion as a Determining Factor of the Self and Other. How Islamic is the Muslim Worldview? Evliya Çelebi and His Successor Reconsidered." In *Venturing beyond Borders - Reflections on Genre, Function, and Boundaries in Middle Eastern Travel Writing*." Edited by idem, Olcay Akyıldız, and Caspar Hillebrand. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2013, 101-29.

Anderson, Kay and Fay Gale, eds. *Inventing Places: Studies in Cultural Geography* (Melbourne, 1992).

Aynur, Hatice. "Evliyâ Çelebi's Written Sources." In *Evliyâ Çelebi: Studies and Essays Commemorating the 400th Anniversary of His Birth*. Edited by Nuran Tezcan, Semih Tezcan, and Robert Dankoff. Istanbul: Republic of Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2012, 383-87.

Al-Azmeh, Aziz. "Barbarians in Arab Eyes," *Past and Present* 134 (1992): 3-18.

Casale, Giancarlo. *The Ottoman Age of Exploration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Dankoff, Robert. *An Ottoman Mentality: The World of Evliya Çelebi*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Dursteler, Eric R. "Infidel Foods: Food and Identity in Early Modern Ottoman Travel Literature." *The Journal of Ottoman Studies/Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 39 (2012): 143-60.

Evliyâ Çelebi. *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi: Topkapı Sarayı Kütüphanesi Bağdat 308 Numaralı Yazmanın Transkipsiyonu - Dizini*. Vols. 1, 7-8. Edited by Robert Dankoff, Seyit Ali Kahraman, and Yücel Dağlı. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2006, 2003.

——. *An Ottoman Traveller: Selections from the Book of Travels of Evliya Çelebi*, Edited and translated by Robert Dankoff and Sooyong Kim. London: Eland, 2010.

Emiralioğlu, M. Pınar. "Cartography and Geographical Consciousness in the Ottoman Empire (1453-1730)." In Ian Manners, *European Cartographers and the Ottoman World, 1500-1700: Maps from the Collection of O. J. Sopranos*. Chicago: The Orient Institute, 2007, 95-107.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. *The Ottoman Empire and the World Around It*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2004.

——. *Subjects of the Sultan: Culture and Daily Life in the Ottoman Empire*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2000.

Fierro, Maribel. "Al-Asfar." *Studia Islamica* 77 (1993): 169-81

Fodor, Pál. *In Quest of the Golden Apple: Imperial Ideology, Politics, and Military Administration in the Ottoman Empire*. Istanbul: Isis, 2000.

Karateke, Hakan T. "Evliyâ Çelebi's Perception of the New World." In *Evliyâ Çelebi: Studies and Essays Commemorating the 400th Anniversary of His Birth*. Edited by Nuran Tezcan, Semih Tezcan, and Robert Dankoff. Istanbul: Republic of Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2012, 183-89.

Khita'i, Ali Akbar. *Khitây-nâma: sharh-i mushâhidât-i Sayyid 'Alî Akbar Khitâ'î mu'âsir-i Shâh Ismâ'îl Safavî dar sarzamîn-i Chîn*. Edited by Iraj Afshar. Tehran: Markaz-i Asnâd-i Farhangî-i Âsiyâ, 1993.

——. *Ali Ekber'in Hıtayname Adlı Eserinin Çin Kaynakları ile Mukayese ve Tenkidi*. Translated by Yih-Min Lin. Taipei: [publisher not identified], 1967.

Khodarkovsky, Michael. *Where Two Worlds Met: The Russian State and the Kalmyk Nomads, 1600-1771* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Kreiser, Klaus. "Evliya Çelebi." October 2005. https://ottomanhistorians.uchicago.edu/en/historian/evliya-celebi

Kreutel, Richard F. "Ein zeitgenössischer türkischer Plan zur zweiten Belagerung Wiens." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 51 (1950): 212-28.

Livingston, John W. "Evliyâ Çelebi on Surgical Operations in Vienna," *Al-Abhath* 23 (1970): 223-37.

Procházka-Eisl, Gisela. "Evliyâ Çelebi's Journey to Vienna." In *Evliyâ Çelebi: Studies and Essays Commemorating the 400th Anniversary of His Birth*. Edited by Nuran Tezcan, Semih Tezcan, and Robert Dankoff. Istanbul: Republic of Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2012, 114-18.

Römer, Claudia. "Legends about Vienna in the *Seyahatnâme* and Their Austrian Counterpart." In ibid., 290-95.

Rota, Giorgio. "Safavids and Kalmyks in the 17th Century: A Preliminary Assessment." In *Proceedings of the 5th Conference of the Societas Iranologica Europæa Held in Ravenna, 6-11 October 2003*. Vol. 2. Edited by Antonio Panaino and Riccardo Zipoli (Bologna: Università di Bologna, 2006, 189-204.

Seyfi Çelebi. *L'ouvrage de Seyfī Çelebī: historien ottoman du XVI^e Siècle*. Edited and translated by Joseph Matuz. Paris: Librairie Adrien Maisonneuve, 1968.

Schick, Irvin Cemil, "Self and Other, Here and There. Travel Writing and the Construction of Identity and Place." In *Venturing beyond Borders - Reflections on Genre, Function, and Boundaries in Middle Eastern Travel Writing*." Edited by Bekim Agai, Olcay Akyıldız, and Caspar Hillebrand. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2013, 13-27.

Tezcan, Nuran. "Documentary Traces of Evliyâ Çelebi." In *Evliyâ Çelebi*. Edited by idem, Semih Tezcan, and Robert Dankoff. Istanbul: Republic of Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2012, 43-55.

Van Donzel, Emeri and Andrea Schmidt, *Gog and Magog in Early Christian and Islamic Sources: Sallam's Quest for Alexander's Wall*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Yaşar, Murat. "Evliya Çelebi in the Circassian Lands: Vampires, Tree Worshippers, and Pseudo-Muslims." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientarium Hungaricae* 67 (2014): 75-96.