Gender and Sexuality in Muslim Cultures

Edited by

GUL OZYEGIN
The College of William and Mary, USA

ASHGATE

Published by
Ashgate Publishing Limited
Wey Court East
Union Road
Farnham
Surrey, GU9 7PT
England

Ashgate Publishing Company
110 Cherry Street
Suite 3-1
Burlington, VT 05401-3818
USA

www.ashgate.com

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

The Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data has been applied for.
Ozyegin, Gul, 1955–
Gender and sexuality in Muslim cultures / by Gul Ozyegin.
pages cm
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-4724-1452-6 (hardback: alk. paper)—ISBN 978-1-4724-1453-3 (ebook)—ISBN 978-1-4724-1454-0 (epub) 1. Sex role—Islamic countries. 2. Sex—Islamic countries. I. Title.

HQ1075.5.I74O99 2015
305.309767—dc23

2014046615

ISBN 9781472414526 (hbk)
ISBN 9781472414533 (ebk – PDF)
ISBN 9781472414540 (ebk – ePUB)

MIX
Paper from responsible sources
FSC® C013985

Printed in the United Kingdom by Henry Ling Limited,
at the Dorset Press, Dorchester, DT1 1HD

Contents

Chapter 6

The Janissaries and Their Bedfellows: Masculinity and Male Friendship in Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Istanbul

Serkan Delice

This chapter presents a preliminary discussion of how male same-sex intimacies were understood and represented by the Ottoman state in the eighteenth century. The concept of the state is not a coherent and static natural object that the historians must focus their gaze on in order to discern a certain practice. Drawing on Paul Veyne's insightful reconsideration of Michel Foucault as the "completely positivist historian" of practice, relation, and exceptionality, I see the state itself as a mundane "objectivization" or a correlation of a certain determined practice that gives rise to its own corresponding object. This does not mean that the state does not regulate and dominate the lives of its subjects through its coercive institutions and police violence. Instead, it means that the state should not be mystified, as in most cases it is the relational, heterogeneous and exceptional character of elaborate forms of social practice that gives rise to the "objectivization" that is called the state. My real concern, in other words, is with the multiple ways in which Ottoman men experienced their relationships and enacted their masculinities.

Rather than offering an all-encompassing historicization of the eighteenth century, therefore, I will focus on the transgressive practices of a group of lower-class, beardless young bath attendants/shampooers, some of whom were affiliated with the Janissary Corps. The presence of these beardless young shampooers (*sâb-ı emred dellaklar*) as prostitutes in the *hammams* of Istanbul was a persistent problem for the Ottoman state during the period under study. In a useful article on prostitution in Ottoman Istanbul, in which the emphasis is on female prostitution, Marinos Sariyannis has concluded that the networks and functions of male prostitution were similar to those of female prostitution. Both were seen, albeit with a certain uneasiness, as immoral, but also as unavoidable and commonplace fields of activity: "male prostitution clearly appears to be tolerated and accepted, inasmuch as it was

functioning under certain 'institutional' rules."[1] In this chapter, I will use the term "prostitution," whilst noting the absence, in both archival and narrative sources concerning men, of the following rather derogatory terms that were used frequently to characterize cases of female prostitution: *fuhş* (prostitution, immorality, indecency), *fuhşiyat* (obscenities, immoralities, and prostitution), *fâhişe* (prostitute), *fevâhiş* (pl. of *fâhişe*, but also gross errors, shameful things), *kahbe* (whore, harlot, prostitute, but also deceitful and perfidious), and *orospu* (prostitute, whore, harlot).[2] The absence of these terms does not necessarily mean that the state was more tolerant or oblivious of male prostitutes. As will be shown later, the names of the boys who were found having consensual or coerced sex with other men were recorded by the *subaşı* (police superintendent), who, in one case, used the word *hîz* (catamite) to identify them. Whether the word *hîz* was used to refer generically to all male prostitutes or exclusively to a sexually passive or receiving pubescent boy who was raped or found prostituting himself is not clear. Furthermore, the use of the word in the two sections of an eighteenth-century Ottoman treatise, *Risâle-i Garîbe*, provides evidence neither of professional sex work nor of sexual passivity. The anonymous author of this treatise put a curse on those *hîz* who were "playing with their damned crotches before their lovers" (*yârân karşusında kuryacağın karışduran hîzler*)[3] and on those *hîz* who were "hanging out in several places and offering friendly attentions to countless other men when they were in companionship with a lover" (*bir yârân ile ayakdaş olup gider iken kırk yerde ilişüp elli âdeme aşinâlık eden hîzler*).[4] The Redhouse translation of the word *hîz* as "catamite" should, therefore, be taken with a grain of salt. The historical transformation of the word "catamite," a corrupt form of "Ganymede" referring to a young male receptor in anal intercourse[5] or "a boy hired to be abused contrary to nature,"[6] is outside the scope of this chapter. The key point here is that the use, in the Ottoman context, of different vocabularies with a comparatively limited range of ambiguous words to refer to male prostitutes implies that male and female "prostitution" were two separate yet related domains.

1 Marinos Sariyannis, "Prostitution in Ottoman Istanbul, Late Sixteenth-Early Eighteenth Century," *Turcica* 40 (2008): 62.

2 *The Redhouse Turkish/Ottoman-English Dictionary*, 19th ed. (Istanbul: Sev Matbaacılık ve Yayıncılık, 2011).

3 *XVIII. Yüzyıl İstanbul Hayatına Dair Risâle-i Garîbe*, ed. Hayati Develi (Istanbul: Kitabevi, 2001), 27.

4 Ibid., 37.

5 Rictor Norton, "Lovely Lad and Shame-Faced Catamite," *The Homosexual Pastoral Tradition*, 20 June 2008. Accessed 21 June 2014. http://rictornorton.co.uk/pastor05.htm.

6 David L. Orvis, "Queer Subjectivities in Early Modern England" (D.Phil., The University of Arizona, 2008), 16.

This chapter aims to open up a space for queer others of the Ottoman past whose voices, I believe, have been lost in the midst of a series of broad diachronic divisions taken for granted by the long-range, constructionist histories of sexuality in the Ottoman and Arab-Islamic Middle East:[7] the divisions between pre-modern sexual acts and modern sexual identities; between masculine, bearded adult men and effeminate, beardless boys; between the dominant male penetrator and the subordinate "female" penetrated; and between spiritual love and sexual lust. Elsewhere I have shown how such divisions naturalize what, in most cases, were either regulatory normative ideals imposed by medical, legal, and religious texts or representational strategies by which social commentators and writers of conduct literature reinforced an image for themselves of a self-restrained, moral manliness or simply literary tropes that were used to entertain an elite group of literate urban men of learning.[8] Let it suffice to say that the entire demarcation of sexual acts from sexual identities is simply wrong. David Halperin's argument that nothing in Foucault's work "prohibits us from inquiring into the connections that premodern people may have made between specific sexual acts and the particular ethos, or sexual style, or sexual subjectivity, or those who performed them"[9] is exceptionally useful here. In this chapter, therefore, I will not get into the tired nominalist debate of whether the category of homosexuality can be applied to the pre-modern Middle East or not. I will approach male homosexuality as a dissident and productive practice, relation, and way of life in order to place it in a wider social, cultural, and economic context of masculinity, violence, and male friendship.

ꕥ ꕥ ꕥ

The following presents a discussion of a series of documents that were located by the writer under the *Maliyeden Müdevver* classification of the Prime Ministry's Ottoman Archives in Istanbul. This classification includes registers mostly of the names, salaries, functions, and assignments of military units, provisioning

7 I am referring to the otherwise highly innovative and insightful books *Before Homosexuality in the Arab-Islamic World, 1500–1800* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2005) by Khaled El-Rouayheb, and *Producing Desire: Changing Sexual Discourse in the Ottoman Middle East, 1500–1900* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 2006) by Dror Ze'evi.

8 Serkan Delice, "Friendship, sociability and masculinity in the Ottoman Empire: An Essay confronting the ghosts of historicism," *New Perspectives on Turkey* 42 (2010): 103–25.

9 David Halperin, "Forgetting Foucault: Acts, Identities, and the History of Sexuality," *Representations* 63 (1998): 99–100.

and construction of military establishments, records of the taxes levied by the Ottoman government, and accounts of government expenditures.[10] The majority of Istanbul *hammams* were "revenue-generating components of charitable endowments" and they were "rented out to private persons who operated them independently as businesses for profit,"[11] which must be the reason why these apparently irrelevant documents are located under the *Maliyeden Müdevver* classification. Referring to Istanbul proper, the following, dated 29 August 1709, is the first of the four consecutive texts in the same classification, in which the same content, though with slight variations, is reiterated for different sections of the capital, namely, Eyüp, Galata, and Üsküdar:

> The said five managers of baths located in the city of Istanbul have each declared in front of the Sharia court "we have all expelled from our baths the beardless shampooers whose expulsion has been ordered by an imperial edict and we have unanimously agreed that from this day on we would not let any of these beardless shampooers work in our baths and we have all acted as surety for each other in this matter" and in order to keep the record of this on the twentieth day of the month of Jumada'l-Akhira of the year 1121 a court document was given to this effect, signed and sealed by Ebu İshak İsmail Efendi, the kadı of Istanbul, and as an imperial decree was issued to the effect that it be kept and recorded in the head office of accounting, it was accordingly recorded and kept on the 22 of J[umada'l-Akhira] of the year 1121.[12]

Each text provides a confirmation from the owners/managers of the baths based in a specific district that they all dismissed from their baths the young, beardless shampooers (*şâb-ı emred dellakları*) whose eviction had been ordered by an imperial edict,[13] and that they collectively agreed and stood surety for each other that from that day on they would not allow any of these young, beardless shampooers to work in their baths. Overall, the owners of 58 baths in Istanbul proper, 8 baths in Eyüp, 25 baths in Galata, and 8 baths in Üsküdar confirmed their commitment to the stipulations of the court document. This is a relatively

10 Alan W. Fisher, "Ottoman Sources for a Study of Kefe Vilayet: The *Maliyeden Müdevver* Fond in the Başbakanlık Arşivi in Istanbul," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 19 (1978): 192.

11 Nina Ergin, "The Albanian *Tellâk* Connection: Labour Migration to the Hammams of 18th-Century Istanbul, Based on the 1752 İstanbul *Hamâmları Defteri*," *Turcica* 43 (2011): 234.

12 BOA, the *Maliyeden Müdevver* classification 2483/1122.

13 I have not been able to locate the original imperial edict in the Prime Ministry's Ottoman Archives.

small number compared to the total of 408 baths in Istanbul given by Derviş İsmail in 1686, 23 years before the issuance of these documents.

What is striking at the end of the text for Eyüp is not only the use of the word *makule*, which means "kind" or "sort" but which may also be working, in this context, to refer to the young, beardless shampooers as a particularly "contemptible"[14] group, but also the specific order that these young, beardless shampooers should be "dealt with" as soon as possible: "This sort of (contemptible) beardless shampooers should not be employed in the baths and they should be dealt with if they can be located."[15]

The Galata document, on the other hand, uses the somewhat generic condemnatory category *fısk u fücûr*, which provides the reader with further evidence as to why the state commanded the eviction and chastisement of young, beardless shampooers. In his analysis of seventeenth-century Ottoman social vocabulary, Marinos Sariyannis places the compound term *fısk u fücûr* under the category of "'mob' and rebellion," arguing that these words did not only connote a type of marginalized behavior at odds with moral and social standards; they also implied openly antinomian behavior: "Among them were *ehl-i fısk*, 'people of immorality, sinners,' whose second word can be replaced by or combined with *fücûr*, 'lewdness, dissoluteness; wickedness, unbelief' to make *fısk u fücûr*, meaning 'indulgence of the fleshly lusts, debauchery.'"[16] The Galata document also states that the owners of the baths had expelled, and would not again employ young, beardless shampooers and attendants; they were aware of the imperial decree that all the servants of the baths should be solid, reliable, and trustworthy persons and there should be no impious, depraved, or dissolute man among them. All the bath servants now had people standing surety for them so that those working in the baths would be decent and devout people.[17]

The extent to which all these systematic and stringent beginning-of-the-eighteenth-century measures to stop young, beardless shampooers from working in the baths were actually successful is highly dubious. A confirmation response from the Grand Vizier to a previous imperial decree issued by Sultan Selim III in 1790 shows that the "problem" was persistent. The Ottoman authorities were tackling the problem together with a series of other mundane social issues:

14 *The Redhouse Dictionary Turkish/Ottoman/English, 19th ed.* (Istanbul: Sev Matbaacilik, March 2011), 727.

15 "*bulundukları takdirde haklarından gelinmek üzere*," BOA, the *Maliyeden Müdevver* classification 2483/1122.

16 Marinos Sariyannis, "'Mob,' 'Scamps' and Rebels in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul: Some Remarks on Ottoman Social Vocabulary," *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 11 (2005): 9.

17 BOA, the *Maliyeden Müdevver* classification 2483/1122.

> ... the taverns must be shut; the brothels must be investigated and reported and the people associated with them should be chastised; *and amongst the baths, those suspected of [accommodating] shameful acts should be investigated and the insides of those places should be rendered free from that sort of [contemptible] infamous beardless boys*; and the issue of the expulsion of female prostitutes should be taken care of with due care and attention, as is required ... And to command belongs unto him to whom all commanding belongs.[18]

This late-eighteenth-century document uses two specific words, namely *fazahat*, which means "shameful act" or "ignominy" and refers to what was allegedly (*mazanne-i*) happening in certain baths, and *müftazih*, which means "exposed," "disgraced for evil deeds," and "infamous" and refers to the *emred*, that is to say, the beardless boys working in those "shady" baths. There is no specific reference in this document to the age of beardless boys, whereas the early eighteenth-century documents investigated above used the word şab, meaning "young, youthful," with the Üsküdar document using the word *taze*, meaning "young without facial hair," to characterize beardless shampooers. Neither is there a particular indication of what these so-called infamous beardless boys were actually doing in the baths, whereas the above-mentioned documents identified them as shampooers, with the Galata document referring even more specifically to attendants (*natır*) alongside shampooers.

This lack of specificity may be the product of generic brevity. However, the fact that the expulsion of disreputable beardless boys was referred to almost in a routine fashion along with a series of other long-standing, if not chronic, Ottoman social problems, including alcohol consumption, taverns, brothels, and prostitution, especially in the Galata district, may also be taken to imply that the presence of these so-called dishonorable beardless boys in the baths, where shameful acts took place, was now a familiar issue. As such, it was perceived as one element in a wider social and cultural context of corruption and debauchery. It is also evident that in each of its declarations, the Ottoman state did identify these beardless youths working in the baths as a specific sort, placing them within the same overarching framework as a series of other subversive acts of depravity.

The point here is not to say that there was something extraordinary in the way in which the state identified and pursued these infamous beardless shampooers. It is not that there was a shift, break, or rupture in state discourses and policing of sexual morality. This was by no means a discursive explosion, which, from the eighteenth century onwards, led to the classification, medicalization, and legalization of sexuality in the West. Revisiting Veyne's reading of Foucault's conceptualization of the state as a correlation of a certain determined practice that gives rise to its own corresponding object, I argue that it was the dissident,

18 BOA, HAT 195/9720/1204. Emphasis mine.

disruptive, and persistent relationality of the practices of these infamous beardless shampooers that led to the specific ways in which the state represented them—dissident in the sense of generating unease, relational in the sense of forming "new alliances and the tying together of unforeseen lines of force." Both definitions stem from Foucault's exploration of identity as a "procedure to have relations, social and sexual"[19] and of homosexuality as a "mode of life" and a means of reopening "affective and relational virtualities, not so much through the intrinsic qualities of the homosexual but because the 'slantwise' position of the latter, as it were, the diagonal lines he can lay out in the social fabric allow these virtualities to come to light."[20]

The description of beardless shampooers in Ottoman state documents as "dissolute," "lewd," and "contemptible" "infamous" types as opposed to the "reliable," "trustworthy," "righteous," and "devout" points towards the emergence of a "sexual" subculture "manifested but not exclusively defined by sexual acts."[21] Such representation also indicates a tacit knowledge of, and intense hostility towards, "that sort of infamous beardless youth" appearing as a dissident type, coterie, and identity. But who were these beardless shampooers, where had they come from, with whom were they forming alliances, and under what conditions?

In his *Istanbul Encyclopaedia*, Reşat Ekrem Koçu points out that a large majority of the shampooers working in the baths of Istanbul had consisted of Albanian men until the 1730 Patrona Halil Revolt that replaced Sultan Ahmed III with Sultan Mahmud I and ended the Tulip Period. Post-war economic grievances were the chief reason behind the 1703 and 1730 rebellions in Istanbul, potentially a highly "inflammatory" city where a large number of Janissaries were concentrated: "One frequently expressed grievance was the government's inability to pay Janissary salaries on time. But other grievances had to do with post-war food shortages and the levying of extraordinary war taxes that amounted to 360,000 *akçe* in 1730."[22] Following the rebellion and the restoration of order, Patrona Halil and his comrades were executed; coffee

19 Michel Foucault, "Sex, Power, and the Politics of Identity: Interview conducted by B. Gallagher and A. Wilson in Toronto in June 1982," in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth. Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984*, ed. Paul Rabinow (London: Penguin Books, 2000), 166.

20 Michel Foucault, "Friendship as a Way of Life: Interview conducted by R. de Ceccaty, J. Danet and J. Le Bitoux in April 1981," in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth. Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984*, ed. Paul Rabinow (London: Penguin Books, 2000), 136–8.

21 Jeffrey Merrick, "Sodomitical Scandals and Subcultures in the 1720s," *Men and Masculinities* 1 (4) (1999): 365–84.

22 Fariba Zarinebaf, *Crime and Punishment in Istanbul 1700–1800* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2010), 61.

houses[23] and public baths where Albanians congregated were closed down. "All the Albanian, Laz and non-Muslim bandits and rebels who gathered in public baths, *hans* (guesthouses) and bachelors' rooms"[24] were banished from the city. Furthermore, the employment of Albanian men as shampooers and attendants was strictly forbidden by the state. From that time on, only Turkish boys from Anatolia and Muslim and Christian boys from Istanbul (*şehri uşak*) were to be employed in the baths. Reşat Ekrem Koçu published a list of the twelve shampooers working in the Kılıç Ali Paşa Bathhouse in Tophane, Istanbul, which he had found attached to an imperial decree by Mahmud I dated 1734. This document provides the reader with detailed information about the shampooers' physical characteristics, ethnic backgrounds, and occupational profiles:

Hüseyin bin İbrahim, 17. Artillery Company (*topçu bölüğü*),
dark beard, one-eyed, from Vlore, Albania
İsa bin İbrahim, 24. Artillery Company, brown moustache, from Vlore, Albania
İbrahim bin İsmail, has recently shaved (*henüz traş*), blonde, from Vlore, Albania
Hüseyin bin Ali, youth without facial hair (*taze oğlan*), from Vlore, Albania
Salih bin Mehmed, dark moustache, one-eyed, from Vlore, Albania
Hasan bin Murad, 17. Artillery Company, dark moustache, from Vlore, Albania
Süleyman bin Ali, 59. Artillery Company, thin
dark moustache, from Vlore, Albania
Osman bin İbrahim, 69. Artillery Company, dark beard, from Vlore, Albania
Yusuf bin Osman, youth without facial hair, from Vlore, Albania
Ali bin Osman, youth without facial hair, from Vlore, Albania
Seyyid bin Ali, old, from Tophane (Istanbul)
İbrahim bin Süleyman, dark, youth without facial hair, from Akşehir[25]

Thus, by the year 1734, twelve shampooers were working in this bath: ten from Albania, one from Istanbul, and one from Central Anatolia. Five shampooers also had positions in the imperial Artillery Corps.

An Ottoman bathhouse register from the year 1752, recently published and analyzed by Nina Ergin, shows that a large majority of male employees of Tahtakale Bath in *intra muros* Istanbul were from the Kastamonu province in the Black Sea region, although there was still a significant presence of those from

23 The 1730 Revolt was organized in a coffee house. "The leader of the rebellion, Patrona Halil, held a type of anti-court in the coffee house." Ariel Salzmann, "The Age of Tulips: Confluence and Conflict in Early Modern Consumer Culture (1550–1730)," in *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550–1922*, ed. Donald Quataert (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), 96.

24 Zarinebaf, *Crime and Punishment in Istanbul 1700–1800*, 60–61.

25 Reşat Ekrem Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* (Istanbul: Tan Matbaasi, 1958), 4363.

the cities of Vlore and Pogradec in Albania. Ergin points out that the reason why the Ottoman administration felt so threatened by the Albanian bathhouse employees was that the latter "by dint of their profession came into contact with a large number of people," and thus were able to exchange political ideas and opinions with their customers, which turned bathhouses into potential hotbeds of revolt and dissention: "Even though access to bathhouses was a religious necessity for the canonical full-body ablution (*abdest*), the authorities considered this institution so dangerous to the social order that they deserved to be treated in the same manner as taverns and brothels."[26]

In the 1709 documents analyzed in this chapter, there is no mention of the ethnic backgrounds of the infamous beardless shampooers. This implies that in 1709, the Albanian origins of the beardless shampooers were taken for granted by the Ottoman administration and the main problem was not that they were of Albanian extraction, but that they were carrying out morally dubious acts. The use, in the 1709 Üsküdar reiteration, of the word "*tâze*" to refer to the beardless shampooers *without facial hair* is an indication in this direction. The detailed description, in the 1734 and 1752 registers, of physical distinctions with respect to the existence and quality of facial hair, such as "old," "elderly," "mature," "youth without facial hair," "youth with slight facial hair," "who has recently shaved," and "young boy,"[27] demonstrates two things: first, despite the aforementioned 1709 documents, in which the owners of the baths had confirmed that they would not employ beardless shampooers in their baths, some large bathhouses, including Tahtakale and Kılıç Ali Paşa, were still employing "youths without facial hair." One may argue that the categories of "young, beardless shampooers" in the 1709 documents and "infamous beardless boys" in the 1790 document were negatively loaded categories referring to a particularly dissident group, whereas the term "*tâze*," meaning "youth without facial hair," was a broader and more neutral term used by the state for classification purposes.

Second, different gendered life-cycle stages were identified and documented by the Ottoman state. This corroborates Leslie Peirce's point that the transition of boys into adult masculinity was considered a problematic process. It was important to be able to determine "when the physically maturing youth was no longer a potential disruptive stimulus to adult males in his vicinity and could therefore be safely admitted into their company."[28] Nina Ergin's brief

26 Nina Ergin, "The Albanian *Tellâk* Connection," 242.

27 Ibid., 245.

28 Leslie P. Peirce, "Seniority, Sexuality, and Social Order: The Vocabulary of Gender in Early Modern Ottoman Society," in *Women in the Ottoman Empire: Middle Eastern Women in the Early Modern Era*, ed. Madeline C. Zilfi (Leiden, New York: Brill, 1997), 178.

characterization of young, beardless shampooers as a "third gender"[29] relies on Irvin C. Schick's argument that young boys without facial hair were reflected in Ottoman divan poetry as a third gender alongside adult men and adult women.[30] It is my contention that the entire application of the category of "third gender" to the Ottoman context is problematic, as it assumes a binary gender system. It is worth revisiting the useful point made by Judith Butler that the alternative to the binary system of gender should not necessarily be a quantification or multiplication of genders: "a restrictive discourse on gender that insists on the binary of man and woman as the exclusive way to understand the gender field performs a regulatory operation of power that naturalizes the hegemonic instance and forecloses the thinkability of its disruption."[31] In the second section of this chapter, I will show how in the lives of the beardless shampooers, gender served as a disruptive apparatus that deconstructed and denaturalized notions of masculine and feminine.

ꕥ ꕥ ꕥ

This section presents an analysis of *Dellaknâme-i Dilküşâ* or "The Book of Shampooers that Opens the Soul," an Ottoman treatise dated 1686, which was written by Derviş İsmail, the Istanbul-based *kethüda-yı hamamcyân* or Chief of the Bath Keepers. The first reference to this narrative was made by the twentieth-century historian Reşat Ekrem Koçu, who, in his *Istanbul Encyclopaedia*, provided a short history of the circulation of this text.[32] The version I will be analyzing here is a copy of the manuscript, which was bought in an auction in Istanbul in 1985 by Murat Bardakçı, who transcribed the text into modern Turkish and published it in 1993.[33] Bardakçı confirms that both the manuscript he bought in 1985 and the transcription he provided in 1993 are complete and unabridged.[34] Several large sections of the manuscript reproduced in the authoritative *Istanbul Encyclopaedia* by Koçu and the transcription of the manuscript provided by Bardakçı completely correspond with each other.[35]

29 Nina Ergin, "The Albanian *Tellâk* Connection," 243.

30 Irvin Cemil Schick, "Representation of Gender and Sexuality in Ottoman and Turkish Erotic Literature," *The Turkish Studies Association Journal* 27: 1–2 (2004): 87.

31 Judith Butler, *Undoing Gender* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 43.

32 Reşat Ekrem Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, 4370.

33 Murat Bardakçı, *Osmanlı'da Seks* (İstanbul: Gür Yayınları, 1993), 86–102.

34 I have not been able to see the manuscript itself, which Bardakçı holds in his private collection.

35 The text is also mentioned by I.C. Schick, "Representation of Gender and Sexuality," Nina Ergin, "The Albanian *Tellâk* Connection," and Marinos Sariyannis, "Prostitution in Ottoman Istanbul." None of these authors have provided a detailed analysis, though.

The treatise describes the lives and relationships of the eleven late-seventeenth-century Istanbul-based shampooers who worked in the *hammams*, not only as shampooers, but also as prostitutes serving the needs of their male customers. Derviş İsmail recounts that by the year 1686, there were overall 408 baths and 2,321 shampooers in Istanbul (including Istanbul proper, Eyüp, Galata, and Üsküdar). Derviş İsmail decided to compose this "heart-warming" treatise because Yemenici Bâlî, one of the eleven shampooers/prostitutes and, subsequently, the servant and "bedfellow" (*döşek yoldaşı*) of Derviş İsmail himself, asked the latter to write a biographical memoir so that his name and fame would live on forever. The treatise provides detailed information about how each shampooer began working as a shampooer and sex worker in a bath, the *hammam* in which he worked, and the prices he and the owner of the bath charged for different sexual acts, consisting, mainly but not exclusively, of receptive and insertive anal sex between men.

Yemenici[36] Bâlî was "a gorgeous fifteen-year-old boy in the service of the Janissaries (*çivelek acemisi*) in the 59. Regiment of the Janissary Corps." The term *çivelek*, from the second half of the seventeenth century onwards, referred to a "Janissary candidate." As the traditional *devşirme* (collecting) method declined and the Muslim-born city folk and "rabbles" gained access to the Janissary Corps, the high number of applications exceeded the actual demand. Therefore, the young "applicants" were registered on a waiting list. They were not paid an *ulûfe* (a sum paid to a soldier), but they were allowed to stay and eat in the Janissary barracks. Young and inexperienced novices on the verge of puberty (*mürâhik*), they took shelter under the protection of a powerful fellow Janissary, stayed with him and served his needs until they grew up and were able to "twist the moustache." Reşat Ekrem uses the phrase *ayak takımı*, which means the rabble, great unwashed, or riffraff, to point to the lower-class background of these Janissary candidates. When they went out together, Koçu recounts, the senior "protector" Janissary, would put a tasselled veil over the face of his *çivelek* so that his beardless face was not exposed to the desiring gaze of other men. Not all the Janissary novices wore the veil, however: "those who put on the veil were beautiful beloveds; the fact that they walked with a veil on their faces was regarded as yet another spectacle of villainy in a period when the Janissaries were nothing but a source of brigandage and mischief in the city."[37]

In Koçu's aforementioned list of shampooers at the Kılıç Ali Paşa Bath in 1734, there was no shampooer associated with the Janissaries. In another

36 Yemenici refers to an artisan who produces light shoes worn by peasants and/or colored cotton handkerchiefs and head-kerchiefs.

37 Reşat Ekrem Koçu, *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*, 3596.

list (dated 1734) providing the names of the ten shampooers working in the Çömlekçiler Bath in the Eyyub district of Istanbul, however, there is a certain "Ahmed bin Mehmed from the 27th Janissary Regiment with blond beard," as well as a "Mehmed bin İbrahim from the 46th Janissary Regiment with grizzled beard."[38] The fact that the Janissaries and Janissary-affiliated *civeleks* were allowed to work as shampooers, Koçu suggests, was an indication of the worsening corruption of the Janissary corps in the eighteenth century. The Janissaries were now indeed a "locus of disorder"[39] within the empire: a loose, unmanageable, dispersed, and highly seditious force that had decentralized and diffused through society and controlled almost all the professions and trades in cities. Most urban artisans "were said to be Janissary-affiliated in the eighteenth century while most Janissaries were said to be artisans."[40] The muster rolls of the army and Janissary entitlements were now "public instruments of exchange, traded on the open market to whoever had the wherewithal to invest."[41] "The blending of 'soldiers' into the commercial and artisanal life of the city"[42] was not the only problem. While some Janissaries exploited and benefited a great deal from commercial, entrepreneurial venues and institutional ties by resorting to coercive means, some other Janissaries had to move down the economic ladder.[43] In 1703, for example, the average daily wage of a Janissary was 10 *akçe* and this pay was "low compared with the salaries of other government employees and skilled workers."[44] What forced Yemenici Bâlî and other Janissary affiliates or apprentice Janissaries to first attach themselves to the Janissary corps and then to end up in a bathhouse as shampooers/prostitutes was not only intra-male power relations and sexual violence; it was also predominantly an economic necessity.

38 Ibid., 4364.

39 Virginia H. Aksan, "Military reform and its limits in a shrinking Ottoman world, 1800–1840," in *The Early Modern Ottomans, Remapping the Empire*, eds V. Aksan and D. Goffman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 123.

40 Donald Quataert, "Janissaries, Artisans and the Question of Ottoman Decline 1730–1826," in *Workers, Peasants, Economic Change in the Ottoman Empire 1730–1914* (Istanbul: The ISIS Press, 1993), 199.

41 Aksan, "Military reform and its limits in a shrinking Ottoman world, 1800–1840," 119.

42 Cemal Kafadar, "Janissaries and Other Riffraff of Ottoman Istanbul: Rebels Without a Cause?," in *Identity and Identity Formation in the Ottoman World: A Volume of Essays in Honour of Norman Itzkowitz*, eds Baki Tezcan and Karl K. Barbir (The Centre for Turkish Studies at the University of Wisconsin, 2007), 116.

43 Quataert, "Janissaries, Artisans and the Question of Ottoman Decline 1730–1826," 201.

44 Zarinebaf, *Crime and Punishment in Istanbul 1700–1800*, 39.

Yemenici Bâlî was caught whilst being raped by a şahbaz *yoldaş* in a *kulluk* (guardhouse or police station[45]). Şahbaz referred to a fine, handsome man and/or a rough, daredevil bully, whereas *yoldaş* meant a fellow Janissary. Here is Derviş İsmail's rather graphic account of what happened to Yemenici Bâlî:

> Beauty, coquetry, good manners, politeness and loyalty are his virtues. He [Yemenici Bâlî] is a budding rose blossoming on the branches of love, a young nightingale in the cage of the chest. If hair is called hyacinth, dimple rose, gaze executioner, stature Turkish boxwood, dagger steel, bottom crystal bowl, belly drop of light, calves silver pillar, feet silver bullion and locks of hair silk thread, it is only because of [the mesmerizing beauty of] Bâlî the shampooer. Sauntering like a peacock in the garden of the *hammam*, this chaste youth was the recruit of the 59th Regiment as well as the apprentice of a master shoe maker in Tophane … One evening, a villain called Darıcalı Gümüş Ali from the 59th Regiment, who ran a coffee house in the caulking wharf, hedged round Yemenici, pulled him into the police station and, together with Kıçlevendi Zehir Ahmet, a sailor, and Kurt Halil, one of Tophane's demons of hell, swarmed his bowl of honey like wasps and buggered him again and again all night long, took off his clothes and made him dance buck naked. When the police superintendent found out that a drinking party was taking place in the police station, he raided the place, saw Yemenici being buggered, took him away, disgraced him by adding his highly esteemed name to the list, and to crown it all, imprinted the word "catamite" on his calves … Bâlî thought enough was enough and he would be sorted out [now only] in a joy-giving bath. Thus he headed to the Kaptan-ı Derya Kılıç Ali Paşa Bath in Tophane, kissed the hand of a master shampooer, undressed himself and joined [in order to start working in] the bath. Making a name for himself before long, he charged 70 *akçe* for a single fuck … If he served as a bedfellow overnight, he charged 300 *akçe*. Depending on the strength of the sodomite, Bâlî could allow himself to be fucked as many times as possible, which would be included in the price but when the shampooer on guard shouted "it is morning time!" and if the sodomite wanted to fuck Bâlî one more time, he had to pay an extra 90 *akçe*. Bâlî did not allow himself to be fucked more than three times a day. He was a clean, robust [boy], a nightingale [lying] on the chest, a lamb tinged with henna … When I became the Chief of the Bath Keepers in September 1685, this Bâlî got in touch with me, cried his eyes out, and exclaimed that he now was absolutely sick of getting fucked. He asked for deliverance from the bath and wanted his name to be deleted from the police superintendent's list. He besought me to work as a servant in my place. What I was looking for, I had found [unexpectedly] in the bosom of love! After saving the poor boy from the claws of the police superintendent and the

45 The Janissaries were also responsible for the security of Istanbul.

> proprietor of the bath, I took him in, put him, outwardly, in charge of smoking pipes,[46] but [in reality] I [finally] attained my desire by having him as a bedfellow in my private room.

One of the most significant characteristics of this narrative is the way in which Derviş İsmail described, and clearly took pleasure in describing, the graphic details of how these youths, *not* all of them without facial hair, were raped and penetrated by older, physically stronger, well-endowed Janissaries, sailors, bandits, and brigands, i.e. all sorts of sexually predatory and socially disruptive men. The use of various vulgar literary figures of speech to describe the moments of both forced and consensual anal penetrative sexual intercourse, however, was obviously a narrative strategy by which the author aimed to entertain himself and his potential audience by simply "selling porn." The author, more important, purported to secure his *own* dominant masculinity, class-based privilege and morality, and omniscient narratorial voice by clearly identifying the penetrator and the penetrated, objectifying and detaching himself from such sleazy sexual encounters, and associating himself with the less obscene, more ambiguous, and affectionate "bedfellow" status. Male control, that is to say, had to hinge on a clear identification of sexual identity, even when there was no such stable and decisive sexual identification. It was the very slippery boundaries between masculinity and femininity that forced the Ottoman legal authorities into preventing the sort of gender transformation from masculine to feminine which would undermine the gendered hierarchy.[47] In order to give maleness "a sense of privilege and a sense of visible differentiation," the author tried to administer patriarchy based on a clear identification of sexual identity.[48]

One may also argue that both the *subaşı* (police superintendent) and the author gained from what R.W. Connell dubs "hegemonic masculinity": the *subaşı* added Yemenici Bâlî's name to his list/register of prostitutes and stamped the word *hîz* (catamite) on his calf, which, the author adds, was a humiliating, stigmatizing experience for Bâlî. The author, on the other hand, presented a hierarchizing, classificatory account of rape and sodomy in order to clearly distinguish the dominant and submissive parties. Hegemonic masculinity, Connell emphasizes, is not a fixed character type, but a "configuration of gender practice" in specific situations in a mobile structure of relationships. It is a configuration embodying "the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and

46 çubukdarlık.

47 Dror Ze'evi, *Producing Desire*, 24.

48 Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500–1800* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995), 83.

the subordination of women."[49] From this perspective, the author might be seen to have a relationship of "complicity" with normative cultural ideals and institutional power: he benefited from the patriarchal dividend "without the tensions or risks of being the frontline troops of patriarchy."[50]

Beneath this seemingly, and strategically, hierarchical and polarizing surface of the narrative, however, one discerns dissident gender practices and sexual relationships that did not fit within the normative gender and sexual boundaries. These practices, I submit, require a different framework of masculinity than the one suggested by Connell, namely, a different framework of a *non-dichotomous* gender relationality. Such a framework should valorize what Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick calls "the middle ranges of agency." Sedgwick critiques the reimposition, in gender and queer studies, of Foucault's analysis of the pseudodichotomy between repression and liberation as the reified binary of "the hegemonic *versus* the subversive." The problem with this binary is its "gradual evacuation of substance, as a kind of Gramscian-Foucauldian contagion turns 'hegemonic' into another name for the status quo (i.e. everything that *is*) and defines 'subversive' in, increasingly, a purely negative relation to that." Sedgwick argues that this unhelpful binary neglects the significance of "the middle ranges of agency that offer space for effectual creativity and change."[51]

Let's consider, for example, the description of Yemenici Bâlî: at the age of fifteen, and thus presumably with a face not totally without facial hair, Bâlî attached himself to a bath in order to avoid sexual harassment and stigmatization, the latter caused by the police adding Bâlî's name to the register and stamping the word "catamite" on his calf. The text makes it clear that Bâlî worked in the bath mostly as a sexually "penetrated" sex worker. He was "a budding rose blossoming on the branches of love," with "his hair like hyacinth," "his locks of hair like a silk thread," "his dimple like a rose," and "his bottom like a crystal bowl of honey." However, he also had a "stature like a Turkish boxwood," a "calf like a silver pillar," a "dagger like steel" (a metaphor for his penis), and a "gaze like that of an executioner." The description, in the narrative, of the sexually "penetrated" shampooers/sex workers always brings together what would be seen today as "masculine" and "feminine" qualities. It is evident that neither the author nor the shampooers and their clients assumed an incompatibility between these qualities, or between masculinity and sexual passivity. We see Keşmîr Mustafa, for instance, another sexually penetrated shampooer, walking "in a stately and roistering manner" (*levendane reftar ile*), greeting people with a "lively and coquettish attitude," but also in "a polite and gentlemanly fashion."

49 R.W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005), 77.

50 Ibid., 79.

51 E.K. Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2003), 13.

Sipahi Mustafa Bey, a "fairy-faced little boy" at the age of fifteen, is praised not only for his "good manners and decency," but also for his "coquettishness" and "generosity in giving his fruit of union" (i.e. allowing himself to be penetrated).

Drawing on the useful distinction made by Judith Butler between a norm, a rule, and a law, I see masculinity as a norm operating within these social practices and "always and *only tenuously* embodied by any particular social actor." The norm, Butler maintains, "governs the social intelligibility of action, but it is *not* the same as the action that it governs."[52] The ideality of gender as a norm is the "reinstituted effect" of the practices that it governs. That is to say, gender is a norm by which the gender binary is produced and naturalized. Yet at the same time, the relation between practices and the idealizations under which these practices work is contingent. One might argue that the beardless shampooers/sex workers were contesting the idealizations by taking advantage of this contingency and the distance between "gender and its naturalized instantiations" or between "a norm and its incorporations."[53] Butler's idea of keeping the term "gender" apart from masculine/feminine, man/woman, male/female is, therefore, so crucial in terms of being able to see how gender may also have been a means for the subjects of history to deconstruct and denaturalize the very notions of masculine and feminine.

Kalyoncu Süleyman (Suleiman the Sailor), a shampooer/sex worker based at the Piyalepaşa Bath, provides yet another example of the way in which gender was used as a disruptive apparatus. Süleyman was a very popular, sexually "active," mighty, and valiant young man serving (i.e. penetrating) nobles and upper class customers. What is particularly revealing in the description of Süleyman is the fact that he desired and penetrated older and, status-wise, superior adult male customers. There is no indication in the text that the latter were effeminate as opposed to the manly Süleyman. Neither is there any sort of evidence that they were considered aberrant or pathological because they allowed themselves to be penetrated. More important, the way in which Süleyman, despite being a masculine, sexually penetrating, bearded young man, was depicted as an object of the desiring gaze of other *penetrating* sodomites/pederasts (*şehrî kulampara*) does complicate binary understandings of gender, sexuality, and masculinity in early modern Ottoman society:

> One day Kalyoncu Süleyman was sitting in the Ali Paşa Coffee House in the Hasköy Pier in a free and easy, roistering manner, with his bare feet and open chest, firing the hearts of city pederasts [who were wondering] what was the length and size of this sailor boy's steel dagger … Hasan Ağa, the proprietor of the Piyalepaşa Bath and one of the brave and manly bath keepers of our city, happened to be in the same Coffee House, watching the boy's hunky bare feet and hanging bulge. "All right, what I need is such a brave, handsome, gallant, penetrating agile shampooer and clean, skilful and superior young man," said he; and showing friendship to the boy, having a chat with him, tempting and persuading him, he took him to his bath, undressed him, wrapped the bath waist cloth [used by the shampooers] around his waist, and Süleyman [started receiving] clients after a few days' training in the hands of a master.

52 Judith Butler, *Undoing Gender*, 41–2. Emphases mine.
53 Ibid., 48.

Hamlacı İbrahim, a sexually penetrated shampooer/sex worker, on the other hand, was a beardless (*taze*), "graceful and faithful companion serving gratuitously as a bedfellow without charging a price." İbrahim had moved from a town in the Black Sea region to Istanbul to visit his uncle, a *hamlacı*, a rower/boatman in a big boat serving the Imperial Guards protecting the sultan's palace and its premises. İbrahim himself was accepted as a *hamlacı* recruited to the Imperial Guard Corps and as an apprentice to a barber. When it was discovered that he had had (consensual) anal sex with a certain *Kürt Haso Ağa*, İbrahim was rejected by his uncle and expelled from both the barracks of the Imperial Guards' boatmen and the barber where he had worked as an apprentice. As a result, he had to start working in the Yeşildirekli Bath in Azapkapısı. What makes İbrahim such a striking figure in the narrative is the description of how he allowed himself to be penetrated by his clients in the private room of the bathhouse. The author presents İbrahim's easy manner, agility, and patience in being penetrated itself as a *sign of masculinity*, a result of İbrahim's "youthful perseverance" (*gayret-i nev-civânî*). Finally, at the end of the narrative, Derviş İsmail, the author of the treatise and the Chief of the Bath Keepers, lets the reader know that he also accepted İbrahim into his home, and thus saved him from the apparently difficult working conditions at the bathhouse. Derviş İsmail adds that he fixed Hamlacı İbrahim up with Yemenici Bâlî as a bedfellow, and the versatile way the two had sex, taking turns to be on top in anal sex was "such a spectacle to be seen."

The point in giving these examples is not simply to say that versatile sexual desire and practices, too, existed in early modern Ottoman society. Neither is it to claim that the categories of, and hierarchical boundaries between, masculinity and femininity, and the "penetrator" and the "penetrated," were totally irrelevant. After all, one does not know the extent to which the author's idiosyncratic desires and fantasies contributed to his final portrayal of the versatile sex scene between the two young men who had been working in the bathhouse as sexually penetrated prostitutes. The wider context of immigration, poverty, lower-class status, sexual violence, and exploitation, combined with the stigmatization by the author of certain ethnic groups, such as the Greeks and Copts, also raises questions about the extent of consent and agency on the part of the shampooers. The fact that Bâlî asked Derviş İsmail to have his

name deleted from the register kept by the *subaşı* reveals the existence of a network of coerced sex, labor trafficking, and violence. Derviş İsmail's account of how he had saved Bâlî "from the claws of the police superintendent and the proprietor of the bath" implies that this network was operated by the *subaşı* and the proprietors of the baths in question.

On the other hand, however, the relationships that these young shampooers established with each other, with their clients, and with other young men outside of the baths often went beyond this coercive network of sex work based on age, class, ethnicity, gender, and sex role stratifications. Peremeci Benli Kara Davud, a boatman and a sexually "active" shampooer/sex worker freelancing between several *hammams*, for instance, was a very poor youth with a slight moustache (çar'ebru) who wandered around barefoot and in rags. The reason for this, the author adds, was that he was a "destitute, poverty-stricken lover wasting all of his money on a coquettish gentleman" who was working in Saraçhane (the saddlery), where he was known as "the shampooer's saddler" (*dellâk saraci*). One of the reasons why the Ottoman state asked the owners to expel beardless shampooers from their baths in 1709, some two decades after the composition of the treatise by Derviş İsmail, then, might be the uncontrollable formation of such networks of both coerced sex work and consensual associations and intimacies between men from inside and outside the baths.

More importantly, though, there is no indication in this narrative, or in the aforementioned state archival documents, that these beardless and bearded shampooers/sex workers, or their both "penetrating" and "penetrated" adult male clients, were seen by the community as gender failures or as "lesser" men who failed to be fully masculine. The association of "passiveness" with effeminacy and "activeness" with hypermasculinity within a gender spectrum is itself a product of the modernist heterosexualization of love.[54] As such, it is a regulatory operation that reconsolidates the power of heteronormativity. In other words, a linear and progressive understanding of gender relationality as an asymmetrical relationship of difference and complementarity, or as an overlapping between masculinity/domination and femininity/submission, is inadequate. For one thing, neither Derviş İsmail's treatise nor the above-mentioned state documents placed these Janissary-affiliated beardless shampooers within a developmental narrative of "intermediate status,"[55] "transitional states," or "transformation," in which the hierarchical difference between those eligible for transformation

54 Afsaneh Najmabadi, *Women with Mustaches and Men without Beards: Gender and Sexual Anxieties of Iranian Modernity* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2005), 59.

55 El-Rouayheb, *Before Homosexuality in the Arab-Islamic World*, 26.

(males) and those who are not eligible (females)[56] would have mattered. On the contrary, one sees, especially in the "upgrading" of some of the shampooers to the curious "bedfellow" status, not a sign of eligibility for transformation into mature, "penetrative" adulthood at the expense of females, but a sign of the formation of an established, independent, and self-contained subculture: a male homosexual mode of life with its own internal yet permeable structures of inequality organized along the lines of gender, age, class, race, and ethnicity. Homosexuality was not an inward means to "discover in oneself the truth of one's sex," but an outward means to "arrive at a multiplicity of relations," to reach a productive relational system through dissident practices and affective intensities.[57]

In his seminal work on homosexuality and male friendship in Elizabethan England, Alan Bray identifies two separate yet potentially related images of male same-sex relationships: the image of the abominable and feared sodomite associated with treason and heresy and the image of the universally admired masculine friend, or the "bedfellow." Bray explains what it meant in early modern England to be someone's bedfellow:

> This was a society where most people slept with someone else and where the rooms of a house led casually one into the other and servants mingled with their masters. Such a lack of privacy usually made who shared a bed with whom into a public fact. It was also a potentially meaningful one, for beds are not only places where people sleep: they are also places where people talk. To be someone's "bedfellow" suggested that one had influence and could be the making of a fortune.[58]

According to *The Book of Shampooers that Opens the Soul* by Derviş İsmail, ending up as someone's bedfellow (*döşek yoldaşı*) pointed towards a similar protective network of patrons, clients, and suitors in Ottoman society. This was a network through which the three of the eleven shampooers described in the book, Yemenici Bâlî, Sipahi Mustafa Bey, and Hamlacı İbrahim, were "saved" by their patrons from the stigma associated with their names being on the register kept by the *subaşı*. The bedfellow status, however, was a less accessible and less affordable status. It did not exclude sex, but it definitely involved something more than sex. The proof is that the shampooers described by Derviş İsmail charged the highest rates when it came to spending the entire night with a client as the latter's bedfellow. When Hamlacı İbrahim delivered this "service"

56 Peirce, "Seniority, Sexuality, and Social Order: The Vocabulary of Gender in Early Modern Ottoman Society," 195.

57 Foucault, "Friendship as a Way of Life," 135–7.

58 Alan Bray, "Homosexuality and the Signs of Male Friendship in Elizabethan England," *History Workshop Journal* 29 (1990): 4.

without charging a fee, he was praised by the author for his generous act of "faithful companionship."

In the Ottoman context, the image of the *hîz* or "catamite" shampooer/prostitute was not "tolerated," though it was never vilified to the extent of being associated with treason and heresy. Yet neither was the figure of the bedfellow an accepted or idealized one, either. In some ways, being someone's bedfellow was even a more insecure and precarious position. This is evidenced by the author's significant note that he housed Yemenici Bâlî outwardly as a çubukdar, a servant in charge of smoking pipes, while in reality he had him as a bedfellow in his private room (*halvette*). The spatial arrangement of urban homes before the nineteenth century, Donald Quataert explains, was conducive to separate gendered spaces: "in many urban homes, there was a *selamlık* section, the predominantly male space, at the front while the *haremlik*, the female space, was located elsewhere … Urban homes often held the *selamlık* room, which the oldest male had the prerogative to use, in the centre with independent rooms off of it but without corridors linking these to each other."[59] The fact that in many urban, upper-class homes, males and females socialized in separate spaces must have facilitated relationships between the "men of importance" (*ricâl*) and their bedfellows. Still, these relationships necessitated considerable secrecy, discretion, negotiation, and commitment. It is, therefore, not a coincidence that when he referred to the bedfellows, Derviş İsmail extolled their faithfulness and fidelity. The bedfellows and their patrons, in other words, used the "middle ranges of agency," enacting "a form of relationality that deals in negotiations (including win-win negotiations), the exchange of affect, and other small differentials."[60] Their exceptional practices and dissident relationships created a "disturbing" homosexual mode of life. They also anticipated the truth of what Foucault said in 1981: "*Ce vers quoi vont les développements du problème de l'homosexualité, c'est le problème de l'amitié*,"[61] or "the development toward which the problem of homosexuality tends is the one of friendship."[62]

59 Donald Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700–1922* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 152–5.

60 E.K. Sedgwick, "Melanie Klein and the Difference Affect Makes," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 106 (3) (2007): 631–2.

61 Michel Foucault, "De l'amitié comme mode de vie," *Gai Pied* 25 (1981): 38.

62 Michel Foucault, "Friendship as a Way of Life," 136. I would like to thank Sibel Yardımcı for pointing me towards Veyne's work on Foucault. I also wish to thank Professor Edhem Eldem for his help in deciphering the documents from the Prime Ministry Ottoman Archives. That said, all mistakes and misunderstandings are mine alone. Special thanks go to Gul Ozyegin for her incredible patience, understanding, and encouragement.

References

Aksan, Virginia H. "Military reform and its limits in a shrinking Ottoman world, 1800-1840." In *The Early Modern Ottomans, Remapping the Empire*, edited by V. Aksan and D. Goffman, 117–34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Bardakçı, Murat. *Osmanlı'da Seks*. Istanbul: Gür Yayınları, 1993.

Bray, Alan. "Homosexuality and the Signs of Male Friendship in Elizabethan England." *History Workshop Journal* 29 (1990): 1–19.

Butler, Judith. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Connell, R.W. *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005.

Delice, Serkan. "Friendship, sociability and masculinity in the Ottoman Empire: An Essay confronting the ghosts of historicism." *New Perspectives on Turkey* 42 (2010): 103–25.

El-Rouayheb, Khaled. *Before Homosexuality in the Arab-Islamic World, 1500–1800*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Ergin, Nina. "The Albanian Tellâk Connection: Labour Migration to the Hammams of 18th-Century Istanbul, Based on the 1752 Istanbul Hamâmları Defteri" *Turcica* 43 (2011): 231–56.

Fisher, Alan W. "Ottoman Sources for a Study of Kefe Vilayet: The Maliyeden Müdevver Fond in the Başbakanlık Arşivi in Istanbul." *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 19 (1978): 191–205.

Fletcher, Anthony. *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500–1800*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995.

Foucault, Michel. "De l'amitié comme mode de vie." Gai Pied 25 (1981): 38–9.

Foucault, Michel. "Friendships as a Way of Life: interview conducted by R. de Ceccaty, J. Danet and J. Le Bitoux in April 1981." In *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth. Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 135–40. London: Penguin Books, 2000.

Foucault, Michel. "Sex, Power, and The Politics of Identity: interview conducted by B. Gallagher and A. Wilson in Toronto in June 1982." In *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth. Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 163–73. London: Penguin Books, 2000.

Halperin, David. "Forgetting Foucault: Acts, Identities, and the History of Sexuality." In *Representations* 63 (1998): 93–120.

Kafadar, Cemal. "Janissaries and Other Riffraff of Ottoman Istanbul: Rebels Without a Cause?" In *Identity and Identity Formation in the Ottoman World: A Volume of Essays in Honour of Norman Itzkowitz*, edited by Baki Tezcan and Karl K. Barbir, 113–34. Madison, Wisconsin: The Centre for Turkish Studies at the University of Wisconsin, 2007.

Koçu, Reşat Ekrem. *İstanbul Ansiklopedisi*. Istanbul: Tan Matbaasi, 1958.

Merrick, Jeffrey. "Sodomitical Scandals and Subcultures in the 1720s." *Men and Masculinities* 1 (1999): 365–84.

Najmabadi, Afsaneh. *Women with Mustaches and Men without Beards: Gender and Sexual Anxieties of Iranian Modernity*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2005.

Norton, Rictor. "Lovely Lad and Shame-Faced Catamite." In *The Homosexual Pastoral Tradition*. Last modified June 20, 2008. Accessed June 21, 2014. http://rictornorton.co.uk/pastor05.htm.

Orvis, David L. "Queer Subjectivities in Early Modern England." D.Phil., The University of Arizona, 2008.

Peirce, Leslie P. "Seniority, Sexuality, and Social Order: The Vocabulary of Gender in the Early Modern Ottoman Society." In *Women in the Ottoman Empire: Middle Eastern Women in the Early Modern Era*, edited by Madeline C. Zilfi, 169–96. Leiden, New York: Brill, 1997.

Quataert, Donald. "Janissaries, Artisans and the Question of Ottoman Decline 1730–1826." In *Workers, Peasants, Economic Change in the Ottoman Empire 1730–1914*, 197–203. Istanbul: The ISIS Press, 1993.

Quataert, Donald. *The Ottoman Empire, 1700–1922*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Salzmann, Ariel. "The Age of Tulips Confluence and Conflict in Early Modern Consumer Culture (1550–1730)." In *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550–1922*, edited Donald Quataert, 83–106. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000.

Sariyannis, Marinos. "Prostitution in Ottoman Istanbul, Late Sixteenth-Early Eighteenth Century." *Turcica* 40 (2008): 37–65.

Sariyannis, Marinos. "'Mob', 'Scamps' and Rebels in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul: Some Remarks on Ottoman Social Vocabulary." *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 11 (2005): 1–15.

Sedgwick, E.K. "Melanie Klein and the Difference Affect Makes." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 106 No. 3 (2007): 625–42.

Sedgwick, E.K. *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2003.

Schick, Irvin Cemil. "Representation of Gender and Sexuality in Ottoman and Turkish Erotic Literature." *The Turkish Studies Association Journal* 27, No. 1–2 (2004): 81–103.

The Redhouse Turkish/Ottoman-English Dictionary 19th edition. Istanbul: Sev Matbaacılık ve Yayıncılık, 2011.

Zarinebaf, Fariba. *Crime and Punishment in Istanbul 1700–1800*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2010.

Ze`evi, Dror. *Producing Desire: Changing Sexual Discourse in the Ottoman Middle East, 1500–1900*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2006.

XVII. Yüzyıl İstanbul Hayatına Dair Risâle-i Garîbe, edited by Hayati Develi. Istanbul: Kitabevi, 2001.

PART 2
Producing Muslim Femininities, Sexualities, and Gender Relations