

FORERUNNER OF THE OTTOMAN ENLIGHTENMENT: İBRAHİM MÜTEFERRİKA  
AND HIS INTELLECTUAL LANDSCAPE

by

VEFA ERGİNBAŞ

Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Art

Sabancı University

June 2005

© VEFA ERGİNBAŞ 2005

All Rights Reserved

Burcu'ya

Entellektüel olarak birbirimizi şekilllendirmekten korkmadığımız için...

Sevda derinlerdedir, oysa Ferhad  
üstünü kazmada dağın

*Hilmi Yavuz*

*Doğu'nun Sevdaları I'den*

## ABSTRACT

İbrahim Müteferrika has been assumed to be one of the most known characters of the Ottoman history due to his inaugurating first Ottoman-Turkish script printing press. İbrahim Müteferrika himself becomes a minor player in this grand discussion of printing press and its timing. As opposed to established tendencies, his intellectual side is given central role in this study. He is analyzed as one of the “insiders” and he is not assessed as someone came into Ottoman lands as an “outsider” and brought big inventions and innovations from external world. He is evaluated as one of the Ottoman intellectuals shaped in Ottoman milieu, as someone inherited certain ideas from his Ottoman predecessors and bequeathed his ones to the intellectuals after him. The intellectuals influential on the thoughts of him like Kâtip Çelebi and Hasan Kâfi Akhisari are argued as part of the intellectual heritage he took over. İbrahim Müteferrika’s and *nasihatname* writers’ thoughts are tried to be connected with each other too.

His printing job is not at the centre of this study, but it is incorporated into the discussion of his intellectual configuration. Likewise, his life-story, his career and activities are also reviewed as part of his intellectual position. In this regard, for the first time in literature, there is a discussion in the study concerning the possible reasons for İbrahim Müteferrika’s publications. It is seen that the books İbrahim published, were not “radical” ones but they are in parallel with a classical Ottoman intellectuals preferences which are bounded by Islamic ideals and Ottoman political wisdom. The publications İbrahim choose were not randomly published. They were serving certain aims and timing of each was carefully selected. The question why he published the books he did is attempted to be answered. His main work, *Usulü’l hikem fî nizamü’l ümem* is a reform proposal and taken as the basic source in terms of his opinions and a “deep reading” of this text is allowed to realize itself. The originalities and unoriginalities of İbrahim Müteferrika have been investigated. His obsession with “order” and his innovative ideas on the military reorganization of the Ottoman Empire are discussed in detail. His utilitarian approach of sciences of history and geography are emphasized.

## ÖZET

İbrahim Müteferrika Osmanlı tarihinin en iyi bilindiği düşünülen konularından birini oluşturuyor. Ününü borçlu olduğu matbaacılık faaliyetini dahil etmezsek, İbrahim Müteferrika'nın entellektüel tarafı üzerinde fazlaca durulmadığını söylemek haksızlık sayılmasa gerektir. “Türkiye’ye matbaayı ilk getiren adam” kimliği onun diğer bütün kimliklerinin önüne geçmiş ve onları unutturmuştur. Bu çalışmada bu temayüllerin tersine, İbrahim Müteferrika'nın entellektüel coğrafyası çıkarılmaya çalışılıyor. Burada, İbrahim Müteferrika dışarıdan gelmiş ve bütün yenilikleri dışarıdan ithal yoluyla Osmanlı topraklarına sokmuş biri olarak değil de, içeriden biri olarak değerlendiriliyor. Osmanlı topraklarında yetişmiş, Osmanlı kültürünü temellük etmiş ve sonuçta klasik bir Osmanlı aydınından çok da farklı olmayan bir düşünsel miras bırakmış biri olarak. Kâtip Çelebi, Hasan Kâfi ve nasihatname yazarları bu bağlamda İbrahim Müteferrika'nın düşüncesine nüfuz eden Osmanlı entellektüelleri olarak anılıyor.

Onun matbaacılık tarafı bu etütün merkezinde yer almasa da entellektüel konfigürasyonunun bir parçası olarak değerlendiriliyor. Faaliyetleri ve bulunduğu görevler de öyle. İbrahim Müteferrika'nın neler bastığından çok niçin bastığı üzerinde de bir tartışma yürütülüyor. Ortaya atılan tez ise, Müteferrika'nın bastığı eserlerin çok da “radikal” diyebileceğimiz eserler olmadığı, aksine standart bir Osmanlı aydının, İslami bir söylemin ve devleti herşeyin merkezine koyan Osmanlı siyaset modelinin bir savunucusu olarak, tercih ve öncelikleriyle örtüştüğüdür. İbrahim'in başyapıtı olan *Usulü'l hikem fî nizamü'l ümem* İbrahim'in düşünce dünyası konusunda ana referans olarak görülüyor ve bu eserin derin bir okumasına girilmeye çalışılıyor. Bu bağlamda, Onun orjinal (önceden ifade edilmemiş ya da uygulanmamış) ve orjinal olmayan (önceden ifade edilmiş ya da uygulanmış) düşüncelerinin bir değerlendirmesi veriliyor. “Nizâm” fikri konusunda saplantıya varan bir yaklaşım benimsemesi, tarih ve coğrafya bilimleri konusundaki pratik yaklaşımı ve Osmanlı askeri yeniden düzenlemesi konusunda öne sürdüğü görüşler de çalışmada üzerinde durulan ana fikir damarları.

### Acknowledgements

I received considerable help from many people in my thesis. At the very beginning, I want to thank my advisor Y. Hakan Erdem who inspired me to study İbrahim Müteferrika and lavished care, attention and support during my M.A education. He was the person who supported any innovative idea of mine. I also want to thank manager of Boğaziçi University library Hatice Ün and Köksal Seyhan of department of literature of the same university who allowed me to study with priceless Müteferrika Press collection. I want to convey my thanks to Selçuk Akşin Somel and Hasan Bülent Kahraman who helped me to improve my thesis with their comments. Halil Berktaş deserves all kinds of thanks not only because he is a real “*hoca*” but also because of his support for me in the new environment of Sabancı University. Tülay Artan was the person who aroused in me an interest in terms of studying 17th and 18th centuries Ottoman history and who supported us in all our attempts. I have to thank here my dear friend Semi Ertan who was my only supporter and source of *morale* in my very heavy crisis moments. We were always in touch with Servet and he taught me cool-headedness in every aspect of life and he continued to be my best friend and supporter. And, I have to say my very special thanks to Hülya Canbakal because she believed in me and she was near me in my worst days. It is a pleasure for me to thank *Nuray Teyze* because she prepared in her sweat home everything for us to study in silence and peace. She was our source of hope and patience in depressive days. Finally, Burcu! You are the best part of my life. Thank you all.

INTRODUCTION .....	1
CHAPTER I.....	6
İBRAHİM MÜTEFERRİKA: HIS CAREER AND STRUGGLE.....	6
1.1: İbrahim Müteferrika- the man and his work as reflected in the literature .....	6
1.2: What did He print- Why did He print? .....	21
CHAPTER II.....	43
İBRAHİM MÜTEFERRİKA AS AN INTELLECTUAL .....	43
2.1: İbrahim Müteferrika: Intellectual, Political Theorist, Publicist.....	43
2.2: Reading <i>Usul'ül Hikem</i> : Ibn Khaldun, Thomas Hobbes, and İbrahim Müteferrika under same intellectual aura .....	46
2.3: “Old way of military fighting is over” or “The order is above all” .....	49
2.4: Archeology of the words .....	53
2.5: Originalities of an intellectual at the first quarter of the 18 <sup>th</sup> century.....	54
2.6: Geography and History at play: Uses of the “sciences” .....	59
2.7: Reconstructing military change from the perspective of İbrahim Müteferrika .....	64
2.8: A reassessment of Ottoman military change departure from <i>Usulü'l Hikem</i> .....	74
2.9: Some preliminary thoughts about a new text belong to İbrahim Müteferrika? .....	76
2.10: Some critical remarks on <i>Risale-i İslamiye</i> .....	83
CHAPTER III .....	89
SOURCES AND ORIGINS AND THE PROBLEM OF THE GENRE .....	89
3.1: Locating <i>Usul'ül Hikem</i> among nasihatnames .....	89
3.2: The possible connections between <i>Usulü'l Hikem</i> and <i>nasihatname</i> writers: A genuine or redundant intellectual? .....	91
3.3: The problem of genre of <i>Usulü'l Hikem</i> .....	92
3.4: <i>Nasihatname</i> writers on the military problem .....	93
3.5: Connections between <i>nasihatname</i> writers and İbrahim Müteferrika .....	102
REFERENCES .....	115
Primary Sources .....	115
Secondary Sources .....	118

## INTRODUCTION

As a polymath and a man of action who left his mark in the Ottoman history, İbrahim Müteferrika has been one of the extraordinary characters of the 18th century. Popularly known in literature due to his inaugurating printing press we can say that İbrahim has been given the due he deserved especially in terms of his place in the history of book/publication. However, he has not been given his due in the intellectual history of the Ottoman Empire again probably because of obsession with his role as printer and publicist. This fact was not confined to modern scholarship only, Ottomans themselves continued to call him as such and when he died his name was immortalized as "the printer the late İbrahim Efendi, son of Abdurrahman" (*basmacı merhum İbrahim Efendi ibn-i Abdurrahman*) in his probate inventory.<sup>1</sup> Needless to say, İbrahim Müteferrika's printing activity is the most important part of his life story which acquired for him rightful reputation not only among his Ottoman contemporaries but also in Europe as well. In this study, as opposed to established tendencies, I will concentrate on İbrahim Müteferrika's intellectual side which has been neglected for a very long time. His founding of a printing press is not at the centre of this study but it is in the margins.

Passing the Ottoman borders in his twenties, İbrahim Müteferrika brought a large baggage with himself. In his baggage, he was carrying various identities. He was a convert to Islam, a former Protestant, coming from Transylvania which is a region very vital for the future of Ottoman expansion in Europe, known as one of the castles of Protestant opposition against Catholics and famous for its printers; İbrahim came with a valuable luggage. However, he adopted ways and doings of Ottomans, their religion and authority.<sup>2</sup> He succeeded to be part of Ottoman bureaucracy and wrote one very

---

<sup>1</sup> Orlin Sabev, *Pärvoto osmansko päteshestvie v sveta na pechatnata kniga (1726–1746). Nov pogled (First Ottoman Trip in the world of printed books (1726–1746). A Reassessment)*, (Sofya: Avangard Prima, 2004), p. 395.

<sup>2</sup> Most of the studies on the 18th century Ottoman history are under the siege of established paradigms and anachronistic outlooks. One major paradigm concerning 18th century Ottoman history uses terminologies like "the impact of west", "western influence" and "westernization". According to this paradigm, 18th century seems to be the turning point in Ottoman history because, in this century, Ottomans began to "receive" things in technology, science and other fields of life from the West. (As an example see Fatma Müge Göçek, *East Encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the 18th century*, (NY: Oxford University Press, 1987).) This perspective assumes as if there is no interaction before and no exchange between Ottomans and Westerners. Ottoman's receptors were closed before and they believed their superiority and self-sufficiency so that they were not in interaction with the West. (See for example Stanford I. Shaw, *Between Old and New: The Ottoman Empire under Sultan Selim III*, (MA:



important treatise on military reform. Concentrating on İbrahim Müteferrika's intellectual formation, in this study, I will attempt to reveal the outline of İbrahim's thoughts, his agendas for reform and evaluation of history and society as expressed in his own studies. I will consider him here one of the Ottoman intellectuals shaped in Ottoman milieu. While doing this, I will attempt to locate him among Ottoman intellectuals before him for the purpose of understanding to what an extent he was an original intellectual and to what an extent he took over his thoughts from his predecessors. I would like to state, at this stage, that I use the word "original" in a very simple way in this study: if something had not been uttered or practiced before, it is "original" as far as I am concerned.

In this study, the main sources that I built my analysis on are the Müteferrika Press Collection and the works of İbrahim Müteferrika himself. Very few of the former and most of the latter are now present in transcribed modern Turkish forms. I also benefited from the works of *nasihatname* writers of 16th -18th centuries.

There are three chapters in this study apart from several sub-sections. First part of the first chapter dwells on the narrative of İbrahim's biography, the problems associated with his biography in literature and the assessment of the studies on him. In this part, my aim is displaying how problematic it is to reconstruct the life story of a 18th century Ottoman man in the light of secondary research which is very much distorted the reality because of ideological stances and subjective standings. There will appear here the problems associated with historical research when there are too many conflicting

---

Harvard University Press, 1971) and Bernard Lewis, "Some reflections on the decline of the Ottoman Empire", *Studia Islamica IX* (1958) pp. 125-127) For this point of view, every innovation introduced in the Ottoman Empire is introduced because of Western influence. Ottomans were passive receivers of change. They were not agents carrying social change but simple actors. If there is something new introduced in the Ottoman Empire it is introduced by "outsiders". Bounded with Eurocentric and Western-oriented view of social change as well as Kemalist interpretation of Ottoman- Turkish history, this outlook is full of problems: it does not give chance to "insiders" perspective and it creates strict dichotomies ( like East- West, open-closed, receiver-giver, progressive- backward etc) which simplifies situation and excludes alternative perspectives. In this study departing from the intellectual world of İbrahim Müteferrika I aim to question this paradigm and propose that change has its own agents and these agents are insiders themselves. Rifaat Abou Al Hajj also defends similar opinions. He espouses that Ottoman social change in the 18th century was a result of needs of Ottoman elites and produced their cultural context. Rifaat Abou Al Hajj, *Modern Devletin Doğası*, tr. Oktay Özel, Canay Şahin (Istanbul: İmge, 2000) pp. 109-125.

narratives on a certain topic. İbrahim's life story is one of these narratives every one interpreted according to his own premises. I will try to incorporate his life story with his intellectual formation in this chapter. The posts he held like the post of Mütferrika will be evaluated here as part of his intellectual make up. I will also deal with his printing job as a part of his biography. I will touch upon his famous treatise *Utilities of Printing (Vesiletü't Tıbaa)*, its referents, importance for İbrahim's intellectual history in the minor level and implications of Ottoman history in the major one. I will also discuss here major argumentations about the late introduction of the printing press in the Ottoman Empire with a special emphasis on the problems of this line of questioning. There will be another discussion here on the success of the Mütferrika Press and the impact of the Mütferrika Press on the Mühendishane Press and the possible connections, continuities and ruptures. The second part of the first chapter will introduce a new thing which was not done before in Mütferrika studies. I will try to find possible and logical answers to the question "What did he print and why did he print?". The first part of this question was already answered by several authors, but the second part will be dealt with for the first time. I will try to answer this question here with reference to İbrahim's prefaces he wrote in fronts of the books he published and with reference to his general intellectual formation. Here, it will be seen that what İbrahim published, were not radical books but they were in parallel with a classical Ottoman intellectuals preferences which are bounded by Islamic ideals and Ottoman political wisdom. What will be discussed mainly in this part is that the publications İbrahim choose were not randomly published. They were serving certain aims and timing of each was carefully selected.

Second chapter of the study is based on the deep reading of İbrahim's masterpiece *Usulü'l Hikem*. There is no doubt that this book contains everything İbrahim did and everything he was planning to do. It belongs to classical reform proposal genre and borrowed its structure from the advice to the Kings literature, *Usulü'l Hikem* will be evaluated as the basic source on İbrahim's intellectual formation. His proposal on military reform of the Ottoman Empire, his emphasis with the science of geography and his general stance of history and society will be assessed. While trying to do this, I will attempt to make a connection between İbrahim Mütferrika, Ibn Khaldun and Thomas Hobbes. What İbrahim brought as an innovative intellectual is concentrated on his observations about the military organization of the Ottoman Empire and of the contemporary Europe. Thus, main body of this study concentrates on the proposals of İbrahim on military organization. Here, I will put special stress on İbrahim's notion of

“order (nizâm) which occupies a great place in his discourse. Here I will excavate the statements he use in order to make an archaeology of the words he used and possible reasons of his frequent use of some words. The second part of this chapter concentrates on the originalities of İbrahim Müteferrika as an intellectual. His dichotomous perception of Moslems and Christians, his very early emphasis on the "rise of the West" phenomenon and his recognition of the rise of Russia, his Islamic revivalist opinions, his emphasis on science and knowledge will be evaluated. While making this, his utilitarian viewpoint of the sciences of history and geography will be inquired. Then, I will make an evaluation of Ottoman military change inspired by the main work of İbrahim Müteferrika. The next section will be about a text that I think belongs to İbrahim Müteferrika which was written as an interview between a Moslem and Christian officer before the 1718 peace treaty. The similarity between the thoughts of İbrahim Müteferrika and those of the writer of this treatise will persuade anyone who read both that the opinions expressed in these treatises are identical.

The section after, will dwell on *Risale-i İslamiye*, a text presumably belonging to İbrahim Müteferrika. I will raise here the question of its authenticity. The text was attributed to İbrahim Müteferrika solely on grounds that somebody wrote on its manuscript cover that this text belongs to the “convert İbrahim Efendi who practiced art of printing in the capital.” We do not have any other independent evidence; neither do we have a second manuscript of it nor any further reference conclusively proving that this text was indeed written by İbrahim Müteferrika. Even the name of the book- *Risale-i İslamiye*- was inserted later probably by the same scribe who reproduced it. İbrahim did not talk about such a text for instance in his *Usul’ül Hikem* and we do not encounter with a reference in this book that can display us İbrahim wrote such a book before. On the other hand, there is also no further reference to prove that this text does not belong to İbrahim either. Though I stick my reservations on the authenticity of this text, we can, giving the benefit of doubt, continue to assume, at least for the time being, that this text belongs to İbrahim. There will be also a discussion in this section about the content of this book.

The third chapter of this study aims to locate İbrahim Müteferrika among the *nasihatname* writers before him. I will try here to find the intellectuals inspired İbrahim. There will be a discussion about the thoughts of *nasihatname* writers on the military problem. I will try to display here possible connections between İbrahim and writers of book of counsels like Lütfi Paşa, Mustafa Âli, Koçi Bey, Aziz Efendi, anonymous

writers of *Kitab-ı Müstetab*, *Kitabu Mesalih* and *Hırzû'l Müluk*, Koçi Bey, Katip Çelebi, Defterdar Sarı Mehmed Paşa and Hezarfen Hüseyin Efendi. There will be a discussion on the problem of the genre of *Usûlü'l Hikem* here too. In this chapter, what I will attempt to outline is that İbrahim Müteferrika was not too much different than the writers before him. Conclusion section summarizes the main arguments discussed in the study.

## CHAPTER I

### **İBRAHİM MÜTEFERRİKA: HIS CAREER AND STRUGGLE**

#### **1.1: İbrahim Müteferrika- the man and his work as reflected in the literature**

There is a bulk of literature (mostly articles) written on İbrahim Müteferrika since the beginning of the 20th century.<sup>3</sup> However, these studies are not concerned with the intellectual formation of him. Most of these studies are written in an Encyclopedia format giving the milestones of İbrahim's life quoting each other or some other second-hand sources. Nevertheless, few studies made within the decade tried to fill this gap with reference to archival documents at least in the field of Müteferrika's biography.<sup>4</sup>

Most of the publications about Müteferrika relate his biography to his major work- establishment of a printing press- and so Müteferrika- the intellectual- gets lost in the grand narrative/discussion of relatively late development of printing in the Ottoman lands.<sup>5</sup> Most of these publications start with Müteferrika's life story as they learned

---

<sup>3</sup> Imre Karacson, "İbrahim Müteferrika", *TOEM*, 1/3, 1328, pp. 178-190; Ahmed Refik, "İbrahim Müteferrika" in *Alimler ve Sanatkarlar*, (Istanbul, 1924), pp. 329-358; Niyazi Berkes, "İbrahim Müteferrika", *EL*, v. III, pp. 996-998 – "İlk Türk Matbaası Kurucusunun Dini ve Fikri Kimliği", *TTK Belleten*, XXVI(104), 1962, pp. 715-737 – *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*, (Istanbul: YKY, 2004) 50-63 ; T. Halasi Kun, "İbrahim Müteferrika" *IA*, v.2, pp. 896-900; İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, v. IV(1) (Ankara : Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1994), pp. 158-162; William J. Watson, "İbrahim Müteferrika and Turkish Incunabula", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, v. 88, 1968, pp. 435-441; Halil Necatioğlu, *İbrahim Müteferrika ve Risale-i İslamiye*, (Ankara, 1982); Şahap Demirel, "İbrahim Müteferrika'nın Füyuzat-ı Mıknatisiye Adlı Kitabı", *DTCFD*, 1982, pp. 265-330; Salim Ayduz, "İbrahim Müteferrika", *Yaşamlarıyla ve Yapıtlarıyla Osmanlılar Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul : Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1999), pp. 631-633; Mustafa Asım Yediyıldız, "İbrahim Müteferrika", *Vakıflar Dergisi*, n.22, (Ankara, 1991), pp. 441-447; Rana Temir, "İlk Türk Matbaasının Kurucusu İbrahim Müteferrika Üzerine Yeni Bilgiler", *Türk Kültürü Yıl XXVIII* n. 321, January 1990, pp. 43-47; Adil Şen, *İbrahim Müteferrika ve Usulü'l Hikem fî Nizamü'l Ümem*, (Ankara: TDV Yay, 1995) ; J. Jozsef Horvath, "Osmanlıda ilk Matbaayı Kuran İbrahim Müteferrika", *Tarih ve Toplum*, n. 215, Kasım 2001, pp. 51-58

<sup>4</sup> Erhan Afyoncu, "İbrahim Müteferrika", *DİA*, pp. 324-327- "İlk Türk Matbaasının Kurucusu Hakkında Yeni Bilgiler", *TTK Belleten*, v. LXV n. 242-244, 2002, pp. 606-622; Orlin Sabev, *Părvoto osmansko păteshstvie v sveta na pechatnata kniga (1726–1746). Nov pogled (First Ottoman Trip in the world of printed books (1726–1746). A Reassessment)*, (Sofya: Avangard Prima, 2004)

<sup>5</sup> See following studies for the discussion of Müteferrika press: Giambatista Toderini, *İbrahim Müteferrika Matbaası ve Türk Matbaacılığı*, tr. Rikkat Kunt, (İstanbul, 1990); Franz Babinger-İbrahim Müteferrika, *Müteferrika ve Osmanlı Matbaası*, (Istanbul:Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2004) ; Selim Nüzhet Gerçek, *Türk Matbaacılığı- Müteferrika Matbaası*, ( İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi 1939) ; Server İskit, *Türkiyede Neşriyat Hareketleri Tarihine Bir Bakış*, (Istanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1939) and (Ankara:

from their predecessors and then evaluate why printing was developed so late and conclude according to their own premises and value judgments with really no real reference to any concrete information or statistics. In a discussion on such a big problematic İbrahim Müteferrika himself naturally becomes a minor player. Only few of these writings contain analytical judgments.<sup>6</sup> It is undeniable that his establishment of a printing house is one of the major components of his intellectual formation, however his works have not been given the central role in the studies we mentioned so far in footnotes<sup>7</sup> in spite of the fact that *Usûlü'l Hikem fî Nizamü'l Ümem* (UH now onwards) had a great impact on the Ottoman reform writers within the century after its first emergence.<sup>8</sup> In this study, I will dwell much on his intellectual formation which is -I think- neglected in most of the studies about İbrahim Müteferrika.

Although there is disagreement among writers on the birth date of him which is now accepted as between 1670-1674 in recent studies, nearly all the parties interested in İbrahim's life story shares the information that he was born in a Hungarian town

---

MEB yay 2000) ; Alador V. Simonffy, *İbrahim Müteferrika*, (Ankara, 1945) ; Edvard Carleson, *İbrahim Müteferrika Basımevi ve Bastığı İlk Eserler*, tr. Mustafa Akbulut, (Ankara: Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği, 1979) ; İsmet Binark, "Matbaanın Türkiye'ye Geç Girişinin Sebepleri" pp. 139-174, Süheyl Ünver, "İbrahim Müteferrika'nın Blimsel Yönü ve Yayınlarındaki Özellikler" pp. 1-7, Osman Ersoy, "İlk Türk Basımevinde Basılan Kitapların Fiyatları" pp. 69-83, Hidayet Nuhoglu, "Müteferrika Matbaasının Kurulması için Verilen fetva Üstüne" pp. 119-126 all in *Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği basım ve yayıncılığımızın 250. Yılı bilimsel toplantısı, 10-11 Aralık 1979, Ankara: bildiriler* (Ankara, Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği Yayınları, 1980); Jale Baysal, "II. Rakoczi Ferencin Çevirmeni Müteferrika İbrahim ve Osmanlı Türklerinin ilk Bastıkları Kitaplar" in *Türk-Macar Kültür Münasebetleri Işığı Altında II. Rakoczi Ferenc ve Macar Mültecileri Sempozyumu*, (İstanbul, 1976) pp. 217-225; Alpay Kabacalı, *Türk Kitap Tarihi*, (İstanbul: Cem yayınları, 1989), pp. 31-55 and *Başlangıcından Günümüze Türkiyede Matbaa Basın ve Yayın*, (İstanbul: Literatür yay. , 2000) ; Orhan Koloğlu, *Basımevi ve Basının Gecikme Sebepleri ve Sonuçları*, (İstanbul: Gazeteciler Cemiyeti yay, 1987) ; Mustafa Akbulut, "İbrahim Müteferrika ve ilk Türk Matbaası", *Türkler v. 14*, (Ankara : Yeni Türkiye Yayınları , 2002): pp. 919-926; Hidayet Nuhoglu, "Osmanlı matbaacılığı", *Türkler v. 14*, pp. 927-932, "Müteferrika Matbaası ve bazı mülahazalar, *Osmanlı v. 7*(Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999 ), pp. 221-229; Yusuf Kaplan, "Osmanlılarda Matbaa: Bir Medeniyet Krizi sorunu", *Osmanlı v. 7* , pp. 230-237. Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tarih-i Cevdet* (İstanbul: Üçdal neşriyat, 1994) v. 1, pp. 69-76; Joseph Freiherr von Hammer-Purgstall, *Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi* (7) (İstanbul: Üçdal Neşriyat, 1983) p. 356-357.

<sup>6</sup> Niyazi Berkes' studies are good examples for that. See his references above. There is also one study that I coincided very late. I saw that similar opinions to my ones are expressed in this mentioned study: Çoşkun Yılmaz, "Hezarfen Bir Şahsiyet: İbrahim Müteferrika ve Siyaset Felsefesi" in *İstanbul Armağanı* (4) *Lale Devri*, ed. Mustafa Armağan (İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür İşleri Daire Başkanlığı Yayınları, 2000) pp. 259-333.

<sup>7</sup> Except Berkes, Necatioğlu, Şen. Look at foot # 1 for the references.

<sup>8</sup> For example, *Koca Sekban Başı Risalesi* (Hülasat-ül Kelam fî Redd-il Avam) (İstanbul: Tercüman 1001 Eser no. 72, 1972) ed. Abdullah Uçman. For the original copy see "Hülasat-ül Kelam fî Redd-i'l Avam", *TOEM (Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni Mecmuası)*. (İstanbul, 1328/1910). For a discussion of İbrahim's impact on Koca Sekbanbaşı's treatise see Y. Hakan Erdem, "The Wise Old Man, propagandist and ideologist: Koca Sekbanbaşı on the Janissaries, 1807" in *Individual, Ideologies and Society: Tracing the Mosaic of the Mediterranean History* ed. Kirsi Virtanen, *Tampere Peace research Institute Research Report* No: 89, 2000 pp. 155-177

(Kolosvar- Cluj- Klausenburg). However, this information seems suspicious because it was taken from *Risale-i İslamiye* which is a book attributed to İbrahim without any proof. We do not have enough information to reconstruct his life story before his being a Muslim; we do not know even his original name.<sup>9</sup> Thus, all the information about his education and early years is no more than speculation. There is no reference as to his family either. However, when one looks at mentioned studies, he can recognize impact of Imre Karacson-a Hungarian priest writing in the early 20th century who played very important role in the writings about Müteferrika.<sup>10</sup> In this article, Karacson gives some information about Müteferrika basing his judgments on the letters of Cesar de Saussure<sup>11</sup> – a Hungarian nobleman who met Müteferrika in 1732 when he was in the company of Frenc Rakoczi-<sup>12</sup>. Berkes already showed that Karacson misused the letters and added details not existing in original letters in order to strengthen his narrative. According to Karacson, Müteferrika comes from a poor Calvinist family<sup>13</sup> and he was educated in a college in order to be a priest. Berkes, with reference to *Risale-i İslamiye*, strongly argues against this thesis and emphasizes that İbrahim should be a Unitarian because of the beliefs he inserted in his preface to *Risale-i İslamiye*. There, İbrahim stresses that he read the books prohibited by the imperial authorities. Berkes believed that these works belonged to Michael Servetus-the theoretical founder of Unitarian belief. Niyazi Berkes, basing his judgments on *Risale-i İslamiye*, claims that his former belief might have facilitated his conversion to Islam because both belief systems are “monotheist” as opposed to the religions defending trinity doctrine. The second assertion of Karacson about Müteferrika’s enslavement by Ottomans and his becoming a Muslim under force is also denied by Berkes who claims that İbrahim became a Muslim voluntarily and took refuge in Ottoman lands due to the Habsburg oppression in

---

<sup>9</sup> Jozsef Horvath indicates there are some references to his being a Sabaterian in Hungarian literature written on him. Horvath, *ibid.* p. 52. However, it seems there is no real ground to prove that. In some recent popular books he was represented as a freemason. Look at, Soner Yalçın, *Efendi*, (Istanbul: Doğan Kitap, 2004) p. 83; and [http://www.mason.org.tr/en\\_historycl.htm](http://www.mason.org.tr/en_historycl.htm) (Official website of Grand lodge of free and accepted masons of Turkey). There is not any concrete evidence to prove these ideas.

<sup>10</sup> Karacson, *ibid.* For example Uzunçarşılı, *ibid*; Refik, *ibid*; Baysal, *ibid*; Kun, *ibid*; Franz Babinger, *18. yüzyılda İstanbul’da Kitabiyyat*, (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2004).

<sup>11</sup> His name has been often miswritten as Czezernak which Horvath showed –nak suffix means “of” and his real name is just Cezar. Horvarth, *ibid*, p. 55

<sup>12</sup> Berkes, *EI*, 996.

<sup>13</sup> *ibid*, p. 178

Transylvania.<sup>14</sup> Ottomans were supporting independence of Transylvanian/Protestant people against Austrian/Catholic invasion in this place since very long time. He probably migrated with Tököly Imre who was in alliance with Ottomans around the year 1690<sup>15</sup>

We do not have sources discovered so far to reconstruct İbrahim's life after that time till his becoming a *Müteferrika* (court steward). There is a reference to a certain Müteferrika İbrahim Agha sent to negotiations with Prince Eugene in Vienna on 13th May 1715<sup>16</sup>, however it is now clear that he was not our İbrahim because latest archival researches displayed that the formal date of İbrahim's appointment as a *Müteferrika* is 18th April 1716<sup>17</sup>. Though *Müteferrikas* are called Aghas in theory, we do not know that he was called in any case as an *Agha*. The titles attributed to him were translator (*tercüman*), printer (*basmacı*), and (*müteferrika*) so this *Agha* should be another court steward with the same name. İbrahim was among the *sipahs* within the cavalry branch of *Kapukulu* army before this date with a daily stipend of 29 *akçes*.<sup>18</sup> There should be a second alternative that, probably, he was given the post of *Müteferrika* because of his

---

<sup>14</sup> For an early reference of the relationship between Ottomans and Protestants look at Carl Max Kortepeter, *Ottoman Imperialism during the Reformation* (New York : New York University Press, 1972); İlber Ortaylı, “ The Ottoman Empire at the end of 17th century” in his *Studies on Ottoman Transformation*, (Istanbul: ISIS Press, 1994), p. 9

<sup>15</sup> One İbrahim-a scribe of Tököly was given a property (*temlik*) in the year 1690 but there is no more evidence to prove that he was our İbrahim. Afyoncu, *ibid* (*Belleten*), p. 608.

<sup>16</sup> Hammer (v. 7), p. 183; Ivan Parvov, *Habsburgs and Ottomans between Vienna and Belgrade (1683-1739)*, (NY: Columbia University Press, 1995), p. 153

<sup>17</sup> Afyoncu, *ibid*, p. 610.

<sup>18</sup> Afyoncu, *ibid*, p. 610. *Sipahs* were the most prestigious branch of cavalries in the first years of Ottoman expansion and they were moving right of the sultan with their red flags in times of war. They were sent to tax-collection, in times of peace. They inhabited near Istanbul in first years of the Empire but than they expanded in to distant places in later years. They were promoted to this post (*çıkma*) at certain times from Topkapı, Edirne, Galata and İbrahim Paşa palaces. Experienced and well serving Janissaries could also be given this post. After some time, their sons were also included as well as the men of high officers and their slaves. Converts who proved to be able in the war and new converts were also awarded with this opportunity. These last ones were called “*garip yiğitler*”. İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilatından Kapukulu Ocakları II*, (Ankara: TTK, 1988), p. 190. For a detailed account of this branch of army look at same book pages 137-254

Pal Fodor who made a separate study on the term “*garip yiğitler*” conclusively says that this term was used for volunteers in general that did not belong to the traditionally closed society of timariots and to the Janissaries. Pal Fodor, “Making a living on the frontiers: Volunteers in the 16th century Ottoman army” in *In the quest of golden Apple: Imperial Ideology, Politics and Military Administration in the Ottoman Empire*, (Istanbul: , ISIS Press, 2000) p. 292. İbrahim might enter in the Ottoman army as a volunteer. Yet, beginning from the 16th century, foreigners were also included in times of need which increased their numbers dramatically. In 1713 when Müteferrika was among them only the number of *sipahs* was 10778- apart from the remaining approximate 12000 members of six divisions of *Kapukulu* cavalries (*altı bölük halkı*). Uzunçarşılı, *Kapukulu Ocakları*, p. 216



service as a translator or scribe between Hungarians and Ottomans. However, the question of the possibility to acquire such a post in this way remains still unanswered. On the other hand one should serve in Ottoman service for long time in order to be given such a post as *Müteferrika*.

It is necessary to understand the institution of *Müteferrikalık* in order to understand the portrait of İbrahim completely. They were servants of Sultan and viziers and also some other bureaucrats. The establishment of the institution goes back to very early days of the Empire. There is a reference to them in the law-book of Mehmed II. The sons of grand viziers, governors of governors and *nişancı*s were taken into the palace as *Müteferrika* in the first centuries. It seems that at the beginning *Müteferrikas* were sons of the elite (*zadegân*). After recruited people became viziers and bureaucrats, their sons were given *müteferrika* posts because these sons were not allowed to be in high offices. Palace gardeners (*bostancı*s) were also awarded with this title in the late Empire.<sup>19</sup> One register gives us a good representation of the members of *Müteferrikas* in 1617: 4 people from the sons of grand viziers (stipends: 35-100 *akçe*); 9 people from the wives, daughters and mothers of previous sheik-ul islam and some other high men (30-50 *akçes*); 2 sons of the teacher of Ahmed I- Mevlana Muslihiddin; 7 people from the sons of *mir-i mirans*, 5 people from the sons of governors (*umera*), 9 people from the sons of chief-treasurers ( 30-100 *akçes*) etc.<sup>20</sup> In time, people who were good at sciences and even holders of *timars* and *zeamets* were also given this post. Some of them were given daily stipends (*ulûfe*) and called *Müteferrikas* with stipends while those who had their fiefs (*dirliks*) were called *Müteferrikas* with *dirliks*. Their numbers were 433<sup>21</sup> at the beginning but rose to 631 in the year 1687.<sup>22</sup> Hezarfen Hüseyin Efendi who wrote the laws of Ottomans at the end of the 17th century asserts that *Müteferrikas* can be promoted to vizierships.<sup>23</sup> They were not dependent on anyone else and move with the sultan himself. It is impossible to sketch from this information İbrahim Müteferrika's

---

<sup>19</sup> Mehmet Zeki Pakalın, *Osmanlı tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü* v. 2 ( İstanbul: MEB, 1993), p. 637

<sup>20</sup> M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, "Müteferrika", *İA* v. 8, p. 855

<sup>21</sup> Pakalın, *ibid*, same page.

<sup>22</sup> Hezarfen Hüseyin Efendi, *Telhisül Beyan fî Kavanin-i Âli Osman*, prepared by Sevim İlgürel (Ankara: TTK, 1998) p. 86.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid*, same page.

way to this post. Probably, he was given this post because of his knowledge on the western languages. Otherwise, He should have had connections with palace officers that we could not determine yet. Since we know he was in the category of *Müteferrikas* with a daily stipend we can guess he did not have any grants given as *tumars* or *zeamets*. A separate study on *Müteferrikas* would be promising and enlighten historians in many respects.

Some writers claim that İbrahim became acclaimed after his writing of *Risale-i İslamiye* in 1710.<sup>24</sup> There is in fact no real evidence that can conclusively prove that this work belongs to İbrahim Müteferrika apart from an anonymous note written on the cover of the manuscript. Moreover, Müteferrika himself never talks about such a work of himself.<sup>25</sup> At the beginning of this piece, the writer states that he was born in *Kolosvar* and probably because of this reference this work was attributed to İbrahim. However, it might belong to another person. The title of this work is also added later on by some other person that we do not know because in nowhere writer says anything about the name of the work. On the other hand, in order to determine certainty of the name of the writer we have to scan whole Hungarian converts lived in this period in the Ottoman lands and should look at if there is any person who was able to write such a work-which requires a detailed investigation which is clearly outside the scope of this study. Since we do not know yet such a person we have to assume at least for now that this work belongs to İbrahim Müteferrika. Since we will deal with the content of this work and misunderstandings around it in the forthcoming chapter, suffice it to say here that there are also some reservations about the authenticity of *Risale-i İslamiye*.

After he became a *Müteferrika* he was sent to Belgrade in 1716 as a commissioner with the Hungarians in order to promote their struggle against Austrians for independence. He was appointed as a liaison officer to Prince Rakoczi Ferenc who came to Turkey in 1717 from France and he seems to have occupied this position till the death of Prince in 1735 although it became a honorary mission after Rakoczi's activities came to an end following the failure of his attempts to arouse the support of Hungarians

---

<sup>24</sup> Karacson, *ibid*, p. 18

<sup>25</sup> It may not be of course a real objection because most of the Ottoman intellectuals do not talk about themselves-one popular exception might be Mustafa Âli of 16th century who was on the contrary obsessed with talking about himself.

under Habsburg rule.<sup>26</sup> Such a long period of friendship between Rakoczi and İbrahim has not been also investigated in detail. We have only letters of Kelemen Mikes - a personal scribe to Ferenc- written to an imaginary aunt who talks bits and pieces about İbrahim Müteferrika between lines but never gives a detailed account of the relationship between them.<sup>27</sup> Mikes for instance says nothing about the printing job of İbrahim which is impossible for him not to know. Though it is claimed that Rakoczi supported İbrahim in his enterprise<sup>28</sup> we do not have any source to support this argument. However, it is true that İbrahim acquired close friendship of the prince that upon his demise the prince requested from the grand vizier to look for his “faithful interpreter” İbrahim and commends sultan’s favor for him. The prince prays for İbrahim in the following manner: “May almighty God reward him with His most precious gifts for his kindness to me”.<sup>29</sup> He was given 50 *akçes* extra for this service.<sup>30</sup> In the year 1731 a certain Müteferrika İbrahim was sent to mission to Thessalonica in order to guide prince Mirza Şafî of Iran.<sup>31</sup> Although some writers put their doubts on this mission giving reference to the existence of many other Müteferrika İbrahims in this period<sup>32</sup>, it should be our İbrahim because he was interested in history of Iran and even translated a traveler account of a Western traveler on Iran (*Tarih-i Seyyah*) and published it in his printing house in 1729. Therefore, İbrahim was a good choice to send to the Persian prince and probably he was not too busy since Patrona Halil rebellion shake the capital and the press was also in holiday at that date. In 1736 he was sent again to a diplomatic mission to Polish rulers in order to renew peace treaty between the two states.<sup>33</sup> He was one of the promoters of Turkish- French alliance against Austria and Russia during the

---

<sup>26</sup> Berkes gives his appointment date as 1720 while Afyoncu writes it as 1717. If we think that the treaty of Passarowitz were signed in 1718 and probably Müteferrika was in Belgrade in 1717 so the date Berkes gave seems more plausible.

<sup>27</sup> Kelemen Mikes, *Osmanlı’da bir Macar konuk: Prens Rakoczi ve Mikes’in Türkiye Mektupları*, tr. Edit Tasnadi (Istanbul: Aksoy Yayıncılık, 1999). For a good compilation of the official Ottoman documents on Rakoczi look Ahmet Refik, *Memalik-i Osmaniye’de Kiral Rakoçi ve Tevabii* (Istanbul, 1333).

<sup>28</sup> Horvarth, *ibid*, p. 57

<sup>29</sup> Kelemen Mikes, *Letters from Turkey*, tr. Bernard Adams (London and NY: Kegan Paul International, 2000) p. 176

<sup>30</sup> Afyoncu, *ibid*, p. 612.

<sup>31</sup> Ahmed Refik, *Onikinci Asr-ı Hicri’de İstanbul Hayatı*, (Istanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1988) p.119

<sup>32</sup> Afyoncu, *ibid*, p. 613.

<sup>33</sup> Afyoncu, *ibid*, p. 613.

years 1737-9; in 1738 he conducted negotiations on behalf of the Ottoman government and the anti-Austrian Hungarians for the surrender of the fortress of Orsova to the Ottoman forces. He also took an active part, together with Comte de Bonneval (Humbaracı Ahmed Paşa) in promoting Turkish-Swedish cooperation against Russia.<sup>34</sup> He was appointed as the scribe of Ottoman artillery (*Top Arabacılar*) in 1738 and continued his mission till 1743. He was sent to Dagestan in this year in order to give appointment paper (*tayin berati*) of Asmay Ahmed to Kaytak Khanate.<sup>35</sup> He was appointed to official historian-ship (*divan-ı hümayun tarihçiliği*) in the year 1744 and continued this work for one year till 1745.<sup>36</sup>

İbrahim was also called “*el-hajj*”. This title was used for the people who went to pilgrimage. There is no reference to his pilgrimage in the studies about him, but he must have gone sometime to Mecca and Medina probably before his appointment as a *müteferrika*.

Although there were many discussions about his date of death because of a poem written in his grave stone by the poet Nevres in order to date death of İbrahim in which it is seen as 1745, it became clear now it was late 1746 or early 1747.<sup>37</sup>

As to his household and house, he had a wife called Hadice ibnet-i Abdullah. Orlin Sabev argues that she might be also a convert because of her patronymic name.<sup>38</sup> However, names such Hadice must be popular among Ottomans and there is no further evidence to prove this idea. He had a little daughter whose name was Ayşe when he died. He must be a father at his sixties. According to his inventory, he had no sons when he died as opposed to common acceptance. Thus, İbrahim the junior mentioned in the studies about İbrahim Müteferrika was not his son but maybe one of his workers. There were three concubines in his household upon his death. He was living in the quarter *Mismari Şüca* next to the mosque of Sultan Selim I in Istanbul. According to his probate inventory, the printed books he could not sell were preserved in a “room build of stone”

---

<sup>34</sup> Berkes, *EI*. It is very interesting that one of the people-Edvard Carleson-(with von Hopken) appointed as the Swedish consulate in 1734 wrote something about Müteferrika press which is a fact makes us to think that he and İbrahim was friends. For this account, see Carleson reference in footnote 1. Carleson was also given 13 books as gift by Müteferrika published up until this time. p. 20

<sup>35</sup> From the history of Subhi quoted in Afyoncu, *ibid*, p. 614.

<sup>36</sup> Afyoncu, *ibid*, p. 615.

<sup>37</sup> Refik, 12. Asrı..., p. 168 and Afyoncu, *ibid*, p. 615, Sabev, *ibid*, p. 395.

<sup>38</sup> Orlin Sabev, *ibid*, p. 396

(*kârgir oda*) at a place called Tôphâne near by the mosque of Sultan Selim I. Upon his death, he left his house, printed books and three concubines as inheritance apart from some expensive fur coats and ordinary furniture. It seems that he had a moderate life, mainly concentrated on intellectual and diplomatic career. Orlin Sabev argues that his resigned lifestyle might be because of his Protestant past.<sup>39</sup> For a state official who had no fiefs or permanent income, moderate life with a fixed salary was not a choice but an outcome.

Niyazi Berkes argues that, his interest in printing should be inherited from his days in *Kolosvar* a place that was known for a famous printer of the time- Miklos Kiss- who opened a Unitarian printing house in the year 1689 and İbrahim probably had a personal relationship with him.<sup>40</sup> There are some references that he began to think about establishing a printing house as early as 1719 and prepared a cliché of the *Marmara* Sea map and presented it to Damad İbrahim Paşa in the same year.<sup>41</sup> However, for a new invention to be included in the Ottoman Empire- in which patronage relationships were basis of producing anything artistic and cultural- it is not sufficient to think on it, one have to find support of a patron. The relationship between Damad İbrahim Paşa and İbrahim Müteferrika has not been investigated in depth yet. Damad İbrahim was offered grand vizierate many times<sup>42</sup> before he took the post in the end in 9th of May 1718.<sup>43</sup> It is known that he was a pro-peace bureaucrat who had reservations about the war with Habsburgs between 1716 and 1718. His attitude was given to his obsession with joy and comfort, however when the war ended and İbrahim Paşa's preference of peace was proved to be right because of major Ottoman loses in Europe he was offered the grand vizierate. Damad İbrahim would become very famous in this period because of his construction of many palaces, kiosks, gardens, springs etc. More important than that he was also known with his love of books and he constructed libraries. He established a translation committee in order to translate some important

---

<sup>39</sup> *ibid*, p. 396

<sup>40</sup> Berkes, *Türkiyede Çağdaşlaşma*, p. 56

<sup>41</sup> Berkes, *ibid*, same page; Gerçek, *ibid*, p. 35

<sup>42</sup> Ahmed Refik, *Lale Devri*, (Ankara, 1973).

<sup>43</sup> İsmail Hami Danişmend, *İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi*, v.4. (İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1972) p. 12

works into Turkish.<sup>44</sup> Damad İbrahim is also a controversial character in Ottoman history condemned by many people and represented as someone indulged in entertainment and who could not achieve successful administration<sup>45</sup>. On the other hand, he is praised by many others because most of the innovations that would become cornerstones of Ottoman reform movement was also started to be taken in to practice in his time.<sup>46</sup> Most important failure of him should be his conspicuous consumption which is seen as a further blow on the subjects who were forced to pay more and more taxes. His days of happiness and glory came to an end with the rebellion of Patrona Halil which is now known that it stemmed from the class tension that became apparent in the times of İbrahim Paşa. On the one hand, tax-eating elites of the gate of felicity were consuming in extremes, on the other, tax paying subjects were becoming hostile to regime. We are now well informed about this rebellion thanks to recent works which emphasize the crisis in all levels of society including janissaries, shop keepers and peasants.<sup>47</sup>

What is vital for the purposes of us is that İbrahim Müteferrika established his printing house in the reign of Ahmed III and grand vizierate of Damad İbrahim Paşa. Surely, İbrahim was not the first person who published books in the Ottoman Empire. Armenians, Jews and Greeks had already published many books.<sup>48</sup> Jews were especially very active in this enterprise. They published 800 different books in Istanbul until 19<sup>th</sup> century<sup>49</sup> which is a number very much exceeded the ones published by Muslims till 20<sup>th</sup> century. There are also Arabic works published within the borders of Ottoman Empire. A certain book of Psalms of David (*Kitabü'l Mezamir*) was published in 1706 in Aleppo and after five years, ten more other Arabic books were published there.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Mehmet İpşirli, "Lale Devrinde Teşkil edilen Tercüme Heyetine Dair Bazı Gözlemler" in *Osmanlı İlmî ve Meslekî Cemiyetleri* ed. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu (İstanbul: 1987).

<sup>45</sup> Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tarih-i Cevdet*, v.1, p.64; Mustafa Nuri Paşa, *Netayicül Vukuat*, ed. Neşet Çağatay, (Ankara: TTK, 1992), p. 34

<sup>46</sup> See for example Ahmet Refik, 's *Lale Devri*

<sup>47</sup> For a detailed account of this rebellion see Münir Aktepe, *Patrona İsyanı*, (İstanbul: İÜ Edebiyat fak. Yay., 1958); Robert Olson, *Imperial Meanderings and Republican by ways, Essays on 18th century Ottoman and 20th century History of Turkey*, Istanbul: ISIS press , 1996) ; Rifat Abou Al-Hajj.

<sup>48</sup> See for the details Günay Alpay Kut, "Matba'a –in Turkey", *EI* (4), pp. 799-803

<sup>49</sup> Kemal Beydilli, "Matbaa", *DİA* (28) , p. 106

<sup>50</sup> Beydilli, p. 107

İbrahim's novelty should be his publishing of Ottoman Turkish books in Ottoman lands. Müteferrika himself gives information about the establishment of printing press in the prefaces of nearly half of the works he published. This shows us that he was very anxious about losing this opportunity and he was asserting this story to the beginning of each work. The history of the establishment of printing press was written many times by many authors in various time scales.<sup>51</sup> Half of these works are written in an introductory level in order to introduce the issue while the remaining half deals with the problem of the late introduction of press into Ottoman Turkey.

İbrahim Müteferrika was very careful about this new enterprise. It seems that he thought about every possible objection at the very beginning and took measures in order to silence them. He, first of all, presented the problem to Damad İbrahim within a well constructed essay called "*Vesiletü't Tıbaa*" in which he discussed the advantages and disadvantages of this new enterprise.<sup>52</sup> He reminds, in this essay, firstly, how Torah and Bible are deformed because of their believers' laziness and ignorance and then emphasizes Muslims carefulness about preserving their Koran and hadiths of Prophet. However, he complains about Chingizid invasion in which, he said, other books on various matters are destructed. He says that they are rare now in Muslim lands and he shows art of printing as a precaution to extermination of books. In this treatise, which reminds us a manifesto, İbrahim lists the advantages associated with the printings as such: (1) Thanks to this beautiful art (printing), dictionaries which serves as the reference of the language of Arabic will be augmented and corrected. The books of history, astronomy, philosophy and geography will be also multiplied thanks to this art. (2) Those books written in order to reinforce religion and state and order of Muslim community, since the beginning of the state of Islam, will be augmented and it will lead to invigoration of sciences. (3) Those books printed are without any mistakes and they are reliable. Moreover, in manuscripts ink might fade and the text might disappear, however, printed books are without this problem. (4) Since printed books are cheaper

---

<sup>51</sup> See footnote # 1.

<sup>52</sup> Ebu Nasr İsmail Bin Hammad el Cevheri, *Tercüme-i Sıhah-i Cevheri ( Vankulu Lügati)* 2 vols. Tr. Mehmed bin Mustafa el Vani (Konstantiniyye : Darü't Tıbaat'il Mamure, 1141 (1729)); For the transcriptions and translations of these very important materials look at, Ahmed Refik, *12. Asrı Hicride İstanbul Hayatı*; Turgut Kut Fatma Türe, *Yazmadan Basmaya: Müteferrika, Mühendishane, Üsküdar* (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat, 1996), pp. 30-35; "Appendix: Ottoman Imperial Documents: Relating to the History of Books and Printing" in *The Book in the Islamic World: The Written Word and Communication in the Middle East* ed. by George Atiyeh, tr. by Christopher M. Murphy (Albany: Suny Press, 1995) pp. 283-292.

and it takes less time to produce them, both rich and poor can acquire books and get proper education. (5) With printing, indexes and table of contents can be made both by summary and in detail so that it became easy for one to find something he looks for. (6) With the prices becoming low, everyone can acquire books especially in countryside so that it decreases ignorance. (7) With the increase of the books in other parts of the Empire, many libraries will be founded and people living there will be also benefited from it. (8) That Ottomans are superior to all other states, it will suit to their glory to put into practice printing. (9) Since Christian countries recognized the value of Arabic, Persian and Turkish books, they already printed books in these three languages and gained profit from this job. However, they are printed mainly with Western (*Mağrib*) script and full of mistakes because they do not have experts to do that. That Muslims are proved to be superior against infidels in every matter they should also surpass them in this one. (10) The practice of this beneficial art has been written and spoken many times and even some people has been given this task but because of various difficulties it could not be realized. He, at the end of his essay, adds that the printing will meet the needs of all Muslims, not only Ottomans’.

This treatise is a real manifesto that summarizes İbrahim’s aims and motives, but it is also informative in many respects: he, first of all, mentions necessity of dictionaries and he would realize his project when he publishes his first publication which is a dictionary. His second concern is about the mistakes in manuscripts and he would also realize this goal through publishing reliable and correct editions. He displayed his sincerity about this point through delaying publication of *Vankulu* dictionary due to several mistakes he recognized in manuscripts used for the publication. He seems also aware of the technical problems associated with hand written material and technical advantages of printed ones like indexes, tables etc. He has a more general mission that he tries to spread information through all empire not just in capital and he is aware of the advantages associated with cheap book production. In this respect, he reminds us Enlightenment intellectuals. However, he has more practical and political aim that he thinks that increasing books will lead to reinforcement of state and religion and will lead to awakening of Muslim community. He also sees the printing as a matter of rivalry with Christians: Muslims should be superior to Christians in every aspect of life and printing should be more developed than anywhere else. Two important points makes this piece very informative for us: He says that Arabic, Persian and Turkish books were printed in Europe. We know that the first two was achieved but we do not know that



Turkish books were also published. What did İbrahim talk about? Which books were published? Moreover, he is disturbed with the fact that Christians gain profit from this enterprise. Secondly, he says that an attempt to start printing was also spoken and some people are given this task. Who were these people? This point displays us that İbrahim's attempt is not new.

He achieved to get an imperial decree which gives the right to publish books useful to community apart from religious ones and a *fetva* from Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi and put them in front of the *Vankulu* dictionary- his first publication- and also took praises from the scholars of his age about the benefits of printing. Most of the people writing on this subject suppose publishing religious works are forbidden in *fetva* however there is no reference to that in the aforementioned *fetva* but it was written in the imperial order.<sup>53</sup> In his printing career he succeeded in publishing 17 works which we will discuss again what and whys of these works in next sections. Though he edited most of the works he published, he was not alone in this job, he was assisted by the former Thessalonica judge Mevlana Sahib (Pirizade) -a former sheykh-al Islam who translated Ibn Khaldun's famous work Muqaddimah from the beginning to the fifth chapter (last and the sixth one was translated a century later by Ahmed Cevdet Paşa) but remained in manuscripts.<sup>54</sup> , the former Galata judge Mevlana Esad, sheikh of *Kasımpaşa Mevlevihanesi* Mevlana Musa and previous Istanbul judge Mevlana Ishak. They were given the task of correction (*tashih*) by the imperial order we mentioned. The problem of correction was very vital because İbrahim Müteferrika was complaining about the mistakes in the hand-written books and presenting press as a precaution to that. This matter was also emphasized in the sultan's decree.

The major discussion however turns around the issue of relatively late development of printing and even one separate research was published on it.<sup>55</sup> Although there are some assumptions about the rejection of *ulema* class of printing books it became clear now that it was not because of any religious objection; on the contrary it was supported by scholars (*ulema*) who wrote praising articles in the preface of the first book published. Another assumption is concerned with scribes' opposition to printing

---

<sup>53</sup> Nuhoglu, "Müteferrika Matbaasının Kurulması için verilen fetva üstüne", p. 120

<sup>54</sup> C.E. Bosworth, "Pirizade", *EI*, New Edition (Leiden: Brill, 1995) (v.8), p. 309

<sup>55</sup> Koloğlu, *ibid.*

because of fear of losing their jobs. However, the extensiveness of the space left for them- the right to multiply religious works- makes this argument implausible.

We can summarize important reasons of late introduction of printing press in various items: (1) lack of commercialization of book industry. Though İbrahim Müteferrika was declaring that printing is a profit-making job in his *VT*, it had not become such a business and İbrahim was constantly demanding financial aid from the state in the petitions that he gave. Like many enterprises in the Ottoman lands it began with the financial help of the state so that it could not become commercialized. This fact also explains us why İbrahim Müteferrika needed permission for every small detail concerning the press because printing house was seen as the property of the state.<sup>56</sup>(2) High prices of books; even İbrahim himself had to work 677,5 days without any expenditures in order to buy a collection of his publications<sup>57</sup>- though he had 120 *akçes* of daily stipend which is the highest level among *Müteferrikas*- printed books' prices seem very much higher than manuscripts too. For example a certain Hasan Efendi among the 17<sup>th</sup> century *askeri* class left one *Lügat-i Türki-i Cevheri* which I guess it was *Vankulu* dictionary. Upon his demise this book was valued 300 *akçes* in his probate inventory.<sup>58</sup> If we calculate that 1 piaster was 120 *akçe* at this time, it makes just 2.5 piaster which is 14 times cheaper than printed *Vankulu* edition which was sold out at 35 piasters. (3) Not publishing of religious works which was in fact had a greater mass of buyers. For example, at the first half of the 19th century, when these kind of works started to be published a book of morals of Rıfat Paşa made 55 new editions<sup>59</sup> (This would be a very big opportunity for İbrahim Müteferrika in order to start a secular Enlightenment movement similar to European one however he did not even try it because his mind was not too much different than standard "Ottoman" man's mind besieged by Islamic ideals and Ottoman political wisdom which took the state as basis of everything. By the term secular I understand a modern concept which is specifically referring to European secularism which is based on the dominance of reason over religion). (4) The problem of literacy in the Ottoman society; only a small portion of the community had a chance to be educated. (5) The political culture was not based on

---

<sup>56</sup> Refik, *12. asrı...*, p. 94

<sup>57</sup> Osman Ersoy, *ibid*, p. 76

<sup>58</sup> Said Öztürk, *Askeri Kassama ait 17. asır İstanbul Tereke defterleri* ( İstanbul, OSAV, 1995) p. 182

<sup>59</sup> İskit, *ibid*, p. 37

public participation but practiced among the elites – whereas in France, for instance, political culture of the 18th century gave birth to Enlightenment and French Revolution with the assistance of printing press, pamphlets, and newspapers-. (6) Ottoman readers' preference of hand-written material to printed ones because former were perceived as pieces of art. (7) Political anxieties; printing was known for a very long time in the Ottoman lands and had been practiced by non-Muslim subjects of the empire, so use of it by Moslems after the use of non-Muslims might be seen as a dissemination of "foreign invention" into Muslim community-which is a view that I do not support, if the case was so, what did change so that they altered their standing against it in a short time? Second political concern was the state's experience with printing in the past which is (mis?)used by the members of different Christian sects in order to convert Ottoman non-Muslim subjects through publishing missionary materials- which was a real problem for the Ottoman state mind that was always seeking stability and preserving status quo and perceiving every possible change as a threat against its incorporation. (8) The problem of lack of experts and scarcity of paper because printing requires much larger quantities of paper. Probably there was not sufficient number of experts to employ and material necessities were not provided so that Müteferrika tried to establish a paper factory in Yalova in the last years of his life in order to inhibit flow of money to foreign paper industry.<sup>60</sup> This information is also important for us in order to understand İbrahim's economic mind. He was a provisionist who was aware very early the danger of cash flow to outside. (9) Simply, there was no need for printing. As Kemal Beydilli puts it ironically: "what would matter if the bus be late, if there is no passenger waiting for it?"<sup>61</sup>

Another discussion was about the success of printing press. In a very recent research conducted by Orlin Sabev who worked on İbrahim Müteferrika's probate inventory, it is apparent that one third of the books were not sold. Sabev evaluates this statistics and concludes that it was a successful enterprise.<sup>62</sup> Here Sabev rightfully argues that it is not fair to make a synchronic comparison between Europe and the Ottoman Empire. He suggests making a comparison diachronically between 15<sup>th</sup> century

---

<sup>60</sup> Ahmet Refik, *Alimler ve Sanatkarlar* (1924) p. 348; (1980) p. 287

<sup>61</sup> Kemal Beydilli, "Müteferrika ve Osmanlı Matbaası: 18. yüzyılda İstanbul'da Kitabiyat", *Toplumsal Tarih* 128, Ağustos 2004, p. 51

<sup>62</sup> Orlin Sabev, "First Ottoman-Turkish printing Press and formation of Muslim Print Culture ( 1726-1746)". Lecture text (sent me personally) given in American Research Institute in Turkey, Monday May 16 2005, p. 13-14

Europe when the printing established and 18<sup>th</sup> century Ottoman Empire. He concludes that the success of both were identical. It is of course very difficult to measure the success of this business which seems a relative issue. Compared with its contemporaries in Europe it was a major failure. However, some of the works he published were sold nearly in total while some others were not sold that much. It should be related to the choice of the works printed. However, Müteferrika's intellectual portrait gives us the right to say that he published works that were in correspondence with his general outlook of world that we will discuss in the forthcoming section. In 20 years nearly 10.000 books were sold, it is even in these days seems to be not too bad.

## **1.2: What did He print- Why did He print?**

As I argued at the beginning, Müteferrika press has been one of the favorite topics of Ottoman historians partly due to its leading role partly due to the comparative approach which uses analogies between Ottoman Empire and Europe. This approach presupposes the printing press as one of the irretrievable milestones of modernity and always asks the question why it came so late. It is a by-product of the modernist paradigm which presumes uni-linear development of society/nation toward enlightened/modern society. It excludes every other alternative path to reach it; in order to reach this highly desirable, exalted society every society had to walk through the same stages, and if it does not, it seems as a deviance and has to be explained. However, there is no real necessity to pass from the way that European countries passed in order to reach such a point. Suitably enough, an enlightenment movement can also be born in a society in which major form of book production is hand-written manuscripts if the situation is developed enough to give birth to such transformation socially/politically/economically despite the fact that it might be an elite one at the beginning. An alternative questioning might be asking why printing press came into Ottomans very early than any other Islamic state. From a negative (and sometimes pejorative) perspective, it is undeniable that Ottomans adopted press later than its contemporaries in Europe; on the other hand, from a more positive perspective, they adopted it much earlier than any other Muslim state.<sup>63</sup> This fact should also be questioned. There should be something more in Ottomans than other Muslim states. It

---

<sup>63</sup> See G. Oman, W. Floor, G.W. Shaw for the dates of introduction of press in various Muslim lands: "Matba'a", *EI* (4) pp. 794-799, 803-807

must be related with Ottomans adopting high culture earlier than other Muslim states probably because they encounter with West frequent than any other Islamic country.

Though the books that İbrahim published have been recorded many times I have to give a full list of these publications, and the probable reasons why he published them which are important in terms of incorporating his activities with his intellectual configuration.

The first book he published in 1729 (1141) was the two volume translation of the Arabic- Turkish dictionary *Sihah-i Cevheri (Lugat-ı Vankulu)*. The writer of the book is Ebu Nasr İsmail Bin Hammad El Cevheri <sup>64</sup>and translated into Turkish by Mehmed bin Mustafa el-Vani. İbrahim wrote life stories of both at the beginning of the dictionary. He also put the imperial decree of Sultan which permits publishing books and also put the juridical decision (*fetva*) of the mufti of the time Abdullah Efendi who was known by his reformist ideas.<sup>65</sup> There were also appreciations written by the important scholars of the time which support the establishment of the press and publishing of such a useful book. İbrahim also published his “*Vesiletüt Tıbaa*” (The Utilities of Printing) in the foreword of this dictionary which I discussed above.

İbrahim told the story of the establishment of press in his preface to this book. What is remarkable is that he would retell this story in nearly half of the books he published. He was probably anxious about losing the opportunity of printing. In his preface, he begins with praises to God, Muhammad and his friends as usual in classical format of Islamic literature. Then, he asserts that when the time reached to 1141 (1729) of hegira and the sultanate of Ahmed III reached to 26 years augmentation of books - which is a reason to revive sciences (*ihya-i ulum*)-, their proper publishing and purchase and sale were demanded from Damad İbrahim Paşa who, İbrahim claimed, was a connoisseur of sciences. He brought this demand- which will help intellectual maturation of students- to Abdullah Efendi and Abdullah Efendi approved this idea. To begin with the science of dictionary was seen suitable which is the base of the Arabic and the religious sciences and the title of the disciplines of *shariat (mebad-ı funun-u arabiyyet ve unvan-ı ulum-u şeriat olan fenn-i lüğat)*.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> He was given the nickname of *imam-ül lüğat* because of his concentration on Arabic language and he calls his work as *Sahih lüğat* which exposes that it is the most correct of all dictionaries.

<sup>65</sup> See Mehmet İpşirli, “Lale Devrinde Yenilikçi Bir Alim: Şeyhülislam Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi” in *İstanbul Armağanı (4) Lale Devri*, pp. 249-259 for some *fetvas* of Abdullah Efendi.

<sup>66</sup> *Vankulu Lügati* , 2a.

In this preface two important points attract us: The first one is that this book was chosen in order to fulfill certain needs of students. This point was also repeated in the imperial decree and the presentation that İbrahim presented to Sultan. Therefore, choosing a dictionary to publish was a practical matter. This would be proved in the future because this book would be bestseller of Mütferrika press<sup>67</sup> though it was published 500 copies and sold 35 piasters<sup>68</sup> which was really expensive for students to buy. Thus, most of the books sold were not bought probably by the students but any other wealthy people. (This book will be also re-published in 1756 as the first work of Mütferrika press when it will be reopened. This work will be also translated into Latin.<sup>69</sup>) The second point is that İbrahim -like other his contemporaries- sees Arabic language as the source of Islam and puts special importance on the proper learning of it.

Choice of the first book may give us many clues in terms of İbrahim's intellectual standing. First of all, why did he choose a dictionary to print but not any other thing? More or less it was a good choice because it will serve to benefit of all, not only students but all scribes and officials and bureaucrats and they will experience the use of press at the very beginning so they will support this initiative. Secondly, it will be sold and the profitable enterprise of press will be justified. More than anything else, it has a practical meaning. In the petition that İbrahim gave to sultan he was complaining about the laziness of scribes in terms of writing dictionaries which is very useful for the students and he published, first of all, a dictionary which is scarce.

The second book İbrahim published was *Tuhfetül Kibar Fi Esfaril Bihar* of Katip Çelebi (Hacı Kalfa, Hacı Halife). It is undeniable that Katip Çelebi was the most important person who was effective in the intellectual formation of İbrahim Mütferrika and probably the latter was taking the former as an example to follow. He would also publish two other books of Hacı Kalfa which is a fact supporting our opinion. Katip Çelebi was clearly a polymath who wrote in nearly all disciplines. He gives his life story

---

<sup>67</sup> Sabev, *ibid.* p. 397

<sup>68</sup> This price was determined by imperial decree. Refik, *12...*, p. 100. However Orlin Sabev records that the last dictionary remained in İbrahim's inventory was priced as 40 piaster. The number of copies was usually assessed as 1000 (Gerçek and others) but Sabev argues it is a misconception and it was 500 for each volume. p. 397

<sup>69</sup> Toderini, *ibid.* p. 29

in his *Mizan'ül Hak*<sup>70</sup> and *Sullemul Vusul*.<sup>71</sup> İbrahim seems to be a real follower of Katip Çelebi. He adopted notions of Çelebi about geography and history. In the preface İbrahim wrote to this book, he begins with nearly same sentences that he used in *Vankulu* and also gives the information about the establishment of press as we pointed out above. When the printing of the dictionary began İbrahim and the people assigned to correction recognized that the manuscript they took as their main source of *Vankulu* was full of mistakes so they stopped printing and started to correct the material. İbrahim informs us about that in this preface and adduces that the workers remain unemployed because of this correction job so they started to prepare *Tuhfetül Kibar* -which is small in quantity but big in quality and difficult to find because of scarcity- for publishing though preparation of the *Vankulu* finished before and emerged as the first. This book was chosen because it is a guide both in the land and sea for holy warriors. (*salikân-ı rah-ı cihadın berren ve bahren rehber-i hazıkı ve gaziyan-ı mücahidan-ı samimül ictihadın rehnümay-ı sadıkı*)<sup>72</sup> This point is very important in *Müteferrika*. He expresses the importance of publishing maps and books which will guide the warriors of Islam in many places. Thus, the second book he published serves this aim. It was published as 1000 copies and sold at 3 piaster. Choosing this book as a second one to print was also because of a practical reason, it was not bulky and was easy to prepare when the proofreaders were dealing with the voluminous *Vankulu*. This book of Katip Çelebi is a compendium of maritime wars of Ottomans beginning from the conquest of Constantinople to the time of Çelebi's writing of this book. It also gives information about the captain in chiefs of ( *Kapudan-ı Derya* ) Ottomans and also informs about the naval hierarchy and structure of them, their laws, types of ships and war materials, fiscal condition and expenses of nautical wars and also includes advices to pirates and privateers<sup>73</sup> which played very important role in Ottoman naval policy against other maritime powers. There were also 5 maps included in the book ( semi-sphere,

---

<sup>70</sup> Katip Çelebi, *Mizanü'l Hakk fî İhtiyari'l Ehakk*, ed. Orhan Şaik Gökyay (İstanbul: Devlet Kitapları, 1972) pp. 110-122. For further information see Orhan Şaik Gökyay, "Katip Çelebi" in *Katip Çelebi: Hayatı ve Eserleri hakkında İncelemeler* ( Ankara: TTK, 1957) pp. 1-90 ; " Katip Çelebi", IA ( 6) pp. 432-438 ; "Katib Celebi", *EI* New Edition (4) pp. 760-762 ; "Katip Çelebi", *DİA* ( 25) pp. 36-40

<sup>71</sup> *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler*, ed. Orhan Şaik Gökyay ( Ankara: Devlet Kitapları, 1968) p. 202-203

<sup>72</sup> Katip Çelebi, *Tuhfeti'l Kibar fî Esfari'l Bihar* (Konstantiniyye: Darü't tıba'atil Mamure, 1141 (1729)), 2b.

<sup>73</sup> Katip Çelebi, *Tuhfetül Kibar fî Esfaril Bihar* 2 vol., ed. Orhan Şaik Gökyay, (İstanbul: Tercüman 1001 eser no: 146-147, 1980).

Mediterranean and Black Sea, islands belong to Ottomans, Adriatic gulf and its islands, two naval compasses showing the names of winds). This book was republished in a short time.<sup>74</sup> [The book was translated into English in 1831<sup>75</sup>]

The third book Mütferrika press published was *Tarih-i Seyyah der Beyan-ı zuhur-u Ağvaniyan ve inhidam-ı bina-i devlet-i Şahan-ı Safaviyan*. Mütferrika himself expressed that the original of the book was belong to a writer from the Christian nation (*millet-i mesihiyeden*) and the original language of the work was in Latin. İbrahim translated it into Turkish.<sup>76</sup> It is known now that writer of this book was a Jesuit missionary – Judas Thaddaus Krusinsky (1675- 1756) - who was the translator and personal scribe of Isfahan episcopate in this time. He witnesses the fall of Safavid dynasty into the hands of Afghans.<sup>77</sup> İbrahim edits the book and corrects some chronological mistakes. Babinger argues that İbrahim was not good at Latin and it is impossible for him to translate such a work from this language into Turkish.<sup>78</sup> Thus he claims that this work was translated into Turkish by the same writer who wrote it in Latin. However, 36 titles in Latin found in the probate inventory<sup>79</sup> of İbrahim enforce us to put some reservations on Babinger's idea. Why did he possess them if he was not good at in this language in an age in which books were among the most expensive items?

Publishing of such a work as the third product of printing press is really intriguing. This attempt was the result of an attitude against Safavid dynasty which was a rival to the Ottomans before the emergence of this book. Though this work gives historical information about former Persian kings and valuable in historical detail, the choice of it was not coincidence. This book tells the defeat of Safavid kings against Afghan rulers. Publication of this book might be read as the direct representation of Ottoman Eastern policy. This book was published 1200 copies- highest in number among the books published by the Mütferrika press-. Though it was expressed by

---

<sup>74</sup> Toderini, *ibid*, p. 43; Babinger, *ibid*, p. 20

<sup>75</sup> Babinger, *ibid*, p. 20

<sup>76</sup> *Tarih-i Seyyah*, (Konstantiniyye: Darüt Tıbaatil Mamure, 1142), 8a.

<sup>77</sup> Babinger, *ibid*, p.20-21; Toderini, *ibid*, p. 43

<sup>78</sup> Babinger, *ibid*, p. 21.

<sup>79</sup> Sabev, *ibid*, p. 396.



Selim Nüzhet Gerçek that this book was published more in order to make use of the popularity of Afghan ambassador<sup>80</sup> who was a visitor at that time in Istanbul, it can be interpreted as the product of a long confrontation between the Ottomans and Safavids.

The fourth book that İbrahim published was about America. The title of the work is *Tarih-i Hind-i Garbi el müsemma bi Hadis-i Nev*. İbrahim says that this book-which was presented to Sultan Murat III- contains information about the new world which emerged in 903 after Hegira and also includes conquest and events happened 50 years after its emergence. This date coincides with the years 1497/98 of the Common Era. Did not İbrahim know that America was discovered in 1492 by Columbus? He should have known better about Columbus because he knows Katip Çelebi and the writer of *Hind-i Garbi* who knew about Columbus and they talked about him. Thus, why did he give the date wrong? There are three alternative explanations: Firstly, he did not know really which is possible. Secondly, the writer of *Hind-i Garbi* gave the information wrong and İbrahim reproduced it. Thirdly, İbrahim was talking about the discovery of Amerigo Vespucci. It was published in order to strengthen the power of the swords of holy warriors<sup>81</sup> because at the very beginning of this book writer of it expresses his hope that America would be conquered by the Ottomans. The writer of this work was assumed to be Mehmed bin Emir el- Hasan el-Mesudi.<sup>82</sup> There seems to be no real reference to him in most of the remaining manuscripts. Some were also misled by claiming that this work belongs to Katip Çelebi. However, Çelebi never talks of such a work belong to him in his life-story at the end of his *Mizanül Hak*. What is interesting is that Ottomans did not have a strong interest in this newly emerging world whose consequences in fact would lead to the Ottoman crisis of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. There were neither direct connections of any historical significance between the Ottoman Empire and the new world during the colonial era nor any indications of any official Ottoman interest beyond the British islands.<sup>83</sup> Although there were some bits and pieces of information about Americas before the emergence of this book first in 1580s within the works of Piri Reis' *Kitab-ı*

---

<sup>80</sup> Gerçek, *ibid*, p. 65.

<sup>81</sup> *Tarih-i Hind-i Garbi veya Hadis-i Nev*, (Konstaniyye: Darüt Tıbaatil Mamure, 1142), 2b.

<sup>82</sup> Apart from the Goodrich edition which includes English translation there is also another one which includes some summary and facsimile of the manuscript one : *Tarih-i Hind-i Garbi veya Hadis-i Nev*, (Ankara: Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the Turkish Republic, 1987), p. 17

<sup>83</sup> Thomas D. Goodrich, *The Ottoman Turks and the New World: A study of Tarih-i Hind-i Garbi and Sixteenth century Ottoman-Americana*, (Otto Harrasowitz. Wiesbaden, 1990), p. 7

*Bahriye*, Seydi Ali Reis's *Al-Muhit*, the geography of Tunuslu Ahmet, mappa mundi of Ali Macar Reis, they were not all encompassing and sufficient. *Tarih-i Hind-i Garbi* was to be the only major source of Ottoman information about American colonial history and the great maritime powers after the 1580s.<sup>84</sup> The main aim of the writer was to make New World known to Ottomans. The major part of the book presents information about discoveries and conquests under Spanish aegis. The sources the author used were mainly the Italian ones. Instead of summarizing he selects bits and pieces of information from his sources. The passages selected for translation describe the history, the flora and fauna, the salient features and the people of newly discovered lands. In the introduction, the author remains in the circle of Islamic classical geographic perception of the Ptolemaic system though he criticizes Muslim geographers in some respects.<sup>85</sup> There are also many paintings of animals and flowers and humans included in the printed edition, most of them seems products of imagination which are far from any known reality about the Americas.

It must be correct that there were not too many books about Americas even at the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, İbrahim, otherwise, could choose more accurate work to publish on New World. *Tarih-i Hind-i Garbi* seems entertaining but full of exaggerations and mistakes and imaginations especially about human stock and fauna of Americas. Why did İbrahim choose this book is very much related with the aim of writing of the book: in order to inform Muslims about newly discovered places and display these places as new target for holy warriors.

Next book published was *Tarih-i Timur Gürgan*. The writer of it was great Arab historian İbn-i Arabşah and translated into Turkish by Nazmizade in 1110 (1698-99).<sup>86</sup> The original name of the book should be '*Aca'ibü'l- makdur fi neva'ibi ahbari Timur*'.<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> Goodrich, *ibid*, pp. 9-16

<sup>85</sup> Goodrich, *ibid*, pp. 17-18

<sup>86</sup> İbn Arabşah (1389-1450) was invited to Semerkand by Timur -who was collecting artists and scholars of time- after his near eastern conquest. He attained large portion of his education here from the most known and able scholars of this time. He became personal scribe of Çelebi Sultan Mehmed-one of the sons of Beyazıd I- and teacher of the princes in the year 1412 in Edirne. He also worked in *Divan-ı Hümayun* and established close connections with the scholars of Anatolia like Molla Fenari. He returned to his hometown-Damascus- after the death of Mehmed- his patron. He wrote most of his works there and he entered into the circle of the Mamluq Sultan Çakmak in Egypt. He was stigmatized by the scholars of his time in Cairo because of his harsh criticisms against them. He was put into prison and died after his short imprisonment. In the book he dedicated to Çakmak, he praises his current patron and disparages Timur. Abdülkadir Yuvalı, "İbn Arabşah", *DİA* v.19, p. 314

<sup>87</sup> Yuvalı, *ibid*, same page.

The original text was known in Europe for a very long time. It was published in its original form by Jakob Galius with a Latin preface in Leiden in 1636 and several other translations were followed in the 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>88</sup>

In the preface İbrahim wrote, he begins with the story of the establishment of printing press as usual and lists the books published so far. Though it is sorrowful to talk on Timur the haughty and evil -İbrahim says- it is necessary to learn his activities and 36 years of anarchy so that one should pray Ottoman state in which life is pleasant.<sup>89</sup>

Like *Tarih-i Seyyah*, *Tarih-i Timur* is the story of one of the enemies of Ottoman state in its foundation years. As we will discuss in the next chapter İbrahim sees history as an instructive tool for future events so he attributes history a practical meaning. Printing of these two books was direct product of his struggle of attaining proper information about enemies and taking lesson from the past so that same mistakes would not be repeated in the future. An analysis of the original book and differences in the Turkish translation might be instructive attempts in terms of understanding Ottoman attitude towards Timur who-Ottomans believe- insulted Beyazid I. Nazmizade- translator of the book- reconstructed the story and Timur was represented as one of the cruelest person ever in history in this book.<sup>90</sup>

The sixth book came out of Mütferrika press also carries same features with the preceding two. It was *Tarih-i Mısır-ı Kadim ve Mısır-ı Cedit* of Süheylî who was a scribe of the Cairo *divan* by this time and it was printed in 1142 (1729-1730). It was printed in two volumes and first concerns with the history of Egypt beginning from the creation to Noah float and from the Noah float to the emergence of Caucasian (*devlet-i Çerakise*) state. The second one was written as an appendix (*zeyl*) to first one and called as *Mısır-ı Cedit* which includes the stories of Selim I and Kansu Gavri. This book is the story of Ottoman take over in Egypt from Caucasian rulers and includes Selim's holy war (*gazavat*) against Kansu Gavri between the year of emergence of Gavri in 921 till 1038<sup>91</sup> It is very interesting to note that İbrahim calls Selim's war as a *gazavat* which is

---

<sup>88</sup> Babinger, *ibid*, p. 23

<sup>89</sup> Ahmed bin Muhammed b. Abdullah İbn Arabşah, *Tarih-i Timur Gürkan* li Nazmizade tr. Nazmizade Murtaza bin Ali (Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıbaa'til Mamure, 1142 (1730)).

<sup>90</sup> Toderini, p. 53-58

<sup>91</sup> Nazmizade Murtaza bin Ali, *Gülşen-i Hulefa* (Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıbaa'til Mamure, 1143), 4a.

a term not used for the wars of Muslims against Muslims. Why did İbrahim use this term? He might not accept Mamluqs as true believers or this term was a generic term used for every war of Ottomans without looking the opposite side. Both seem plausible alternatives.

The following book printed was the history of Caliphs and the city of Baghdad. Again belongs to Nazmizade Murteza who translated *Tarih-i Timur*, this book was called *Gülşen-i Hulefa* and as İbrahim mentioned in the preface it includes the history of Iran, Iraq, Anatolia, Damascus and Egypt beginning from the date 127 after Hegira till 1130. It is the history of Caliphs beginning with the Abbasid dynasty and their war on Baghdad. It also contains the viziers of Ottomans after the conquest of the city by Murad IV.<sup>92</sup> It can be also read as a local history but more importantly it was an Islamic history by an Ottoman man so deserves to be studied in terms of understanding Ottoman perception of other Islamic states and communities.

The eighth book İbrahim published deserves special attention because it was not listed by him in his publications at the end of the history of Naima he would publish later. It was a Turkish- French grammar book called *Grammaire Turque*.<sup>93</sup> It was a book prepared by a Jesuit priest Jean-Baptiste Holderman in order to teach French dragomans (*dil oğlanları*) Turkish. This project was supported by French ambassador in Istanbul- Marquis de Villeneuve. It was the first book ever printed which gives Latin equals of Arabic letters. İbrahim offered to publish it to Holderman whom he knows personally. He was also planning to publish a Turkish-French dictionary and Villeneuve would be supporting him economically. He could not realize his aim.<sup>94</sup>

What is important here for our purpose is the question why did he print such a work and why did not he include it in his list? Selim Nüzhet claims İbrahim did not include this book in his list because he was afraid of reactions of various sects of society because of his publication of a book in Latin alphabet. This opinion seems plausible however it is a question that should be answered that how it became possible for him to publish such a work without taking any permission. It is difficult to say that he did not ask anyone when doing such a thing, but he might be supported by rulers because

---

<sup>92</sup> *Gülşen-i Hulefa*, 1143, 4b.

<sup>93</sup> Jean Baptiste Holderman, *Grammaire Turque* (Constantinople, 1730).

<sup>94</sup> Gerald Duverdier, “İlk Türk Basımevinin Kuruluşunda iki kültür elçisi: Savary de Breves ile İbrahim Müteferrika”, tr. Türker Acaroğlu, *Belleten*, cilt LVI s. 215, Nisan 1992, p. 298

foreigners' learning of Turkish language would not just serve dragomans but also tradesmen. This was seen as a good attempt to teach them Turkish so they would increase their commercial activity. It would also serve to establish a cultural connection between the French and the Ottomans- political one was already established. It would also save press from economic difficulty because 200 copies of the book were bought by the ambassador himself so it was a profitable enterprise. It was again a practical matter for İbrahim to publish it. There might be another explanation why he did not include this grammar book in his list that he was simply not the publisher but only printer. İbrahim regards books he edited and published as belong to him and since he did not publish it he did not include it in his list.

İbrahim had close relationships with the ambassadors and other foreigners in Istanbul in his time, apart from his Ottoman friends and supporters like Damad İbrahim, Said Efendi, Pirizade; he had also some foreign friends like Villeneuve, Holderman, Carleson and many others. He was trying to incorporate European information with his classical knowledge and he had affinities with the Jesuits priests in his time.<sup>95</sup> This relationship should also be investigated which will be promising but clearly out of the scope of this study.

Next book İbrahim published was his own book *Usulü'l Hikem fi Nizami'l Ümem*<sup>96</sup>. We will deal with the content of this book in depth in the next chapter. It was written after the Patrona Halil Rebellion in 1730 and shares the basic properties of *nasihatname* / *siyasetname* / *ıslahat* literature. It was translated into French by Baron Reviczki in 1769 by the name *Traite de la Tactique* and published in Vienna. This book was really important in content and timing; it also gives us compendium of İbrahim's thought on politics, religion, society, history and military. It was a reform document in military organization but not more than that as many people insisted on. Other parts of the book carry main properties of similar *layihas* written within the last two centuries and it might be read not as a reform and westernization decree but an Islamic/ Ottoman Renaissance one. Some authors believe that this work did not reach its aim and Ottomans did not change anything for a long time.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> Duverdier, same page.

<sup>96</sup> İbrahim Müteferrika, *Usulü'l Hikem fi Nizami'l Ümem*, (Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıbaatıl Mamure, 1144 (1732) )

<sup>97</sup> "This book did not affect Ottoman government. Turks who are against all kind of change and loyal to barbaric laws do not want to be under discipline." Toderini, *ibid*, p. 68 and also see Babinger, *ibid*, p. 26

The tenth book published was again one of İbrahim's editions. It was called *Füyuzat-ı Mıknatisiye* and published in (1144) 1732.<sup>98</sup> It was compiled from Latin sources as İbrahim emphasized. The main part of the book was translation of an article emerged in 1721 in Leipzig. The book contains short history of the discovery of compass and more importantly new findings concerning its use in terms of determining latitude and longitude. His intent about publishing this book is again a practical one: recognizing these surprising and strange behaviors of compass affirms miracles of God. It is also a mean to expand commerce, a good guide for sailing science and a tool in the education of geography.<sup>99</sup> According to Demirel, this work was not best choice to translate in order to inform about new findings about magnetism and its relationship with compass and determination of longitude and latitude.<sup>100</sup> Probably, İbrahim did not have a better book in his hands and he obtained this one from a merchant as he declared in his translation. It was not easy to reach new texts in early modern period so when he encountered with this merchant he was excited from this opportunity to translate it into Turkish. Furthermore, we have to accept here that İbrahim was an amateur scientist and his knowledge on the sciences was limited. His edition also includes two paintings of the compass designed by the author of the original book.

İbrahim Müteferrika was surely a man of many parts. He was an amateur artist who is making maps, he was an innovator who introduced printing in the Ottoman Empire, he was an amateur scientist who wrote and edited a book on magnetism and he was a semi-professional geographer. In this respect he reminds me a Renaissance man. On the other hand, he was one of official historians of state in his late ages, a man working as an employee in his press, as a type-founder and a devout missionary of Islam, a diplomat and state official for his life time. In this respect, he is not too much different than a standard Ottoman bureaucrat and a Moslem. From a more modern perspective, he was a political theorist, a publicist who wants to disseminate knowledge to whole community, someone with a special consciousness of science and knowledge, in this

---

<sup>98</sup> İbrahim Müteferrika, *Füyuzat-ı Mıknatisiyye*, (Konstatiniyye: Darü't Tıbaati'l Mamure, 1144 (1732)). Fortunately we have transcribed text: Şahap Demirel, "İbrahim Müteferrika'nın Füyuzat-ı Mıknatisiye adlı Kitabı", *Atatürk'ün 100. Doğum Yılına Armağan*, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi DTCF, 1982), pp. 265-330.

<sup>99</sup> Original Ottoman-Turkish text reprinted in Demirel edition, p. 328

<sup>100</sup> *ibid*, p. 275

regard, he reminds me an Enlightenment man. What is correct is İbrahim was all. However, my argument is that his second identity dominates and transforms others.

The following book printed was *Cihannüma* of Katip Çelebi. İbrahim pays special attention to the science of geography. The books he published were mainly on history and geography. Katip Çelebi was the person İbrahim took as an example. *Cihannüma* was planned to be published in two volumes with several maps and figures. However, İbrahim could only able to publish the Asian part.<sup>101</sup>

In the preface, he reiterates information about the establishment of the press and than passes into the story of publication of *Cihannüma*: One day, he was visited by Mevlana Ahmed Efendi, chief mufti of the time and İbrahim gives a feast in honor of him and they get into conversation. Here they talk about that “the science of geography is one of the most useful of all sciences and it serves the aim of knowing the lands of enemies and it is also a very useful guide to the warriors of Islam. The infidels learned this science very well and proceed into unknown lands and conquered many others. Muslims, on the other hand, were faulty and lazy in terms of obtaining the knowledge of this science. However, Katip Çelebi tried very hard in order to invigorate this science and edited *Cihannüma*.” The mentioned mufti advises him to publish this highly useful work. Though the original text is scarce and remaining ones are full of mistakes, mufti gives İbrahim one copy that he owned. İbrahim compares it with the one he had and writes his thoughts on the part that he wrote at the end of the book with the name of *Tezyilü’t Tabii*. He also corrects mistakes through using Ebubekir Behram al Dimaşki’s appendix that he wrote to *Cihannüma*.<sup>102</sup>

Katip Çelebi wrote *Cihannüma* because of the scarcity of sources on geography in Arabic, Persian and Turkish despite the fact that there were numerous books in Western geography. He aimed to fulfill gaps in Islamic geography literature and gave information about current developments in this science. Apart from his own observations Çelebi used Atlas minor of G. Mercator and other eastern and western

---

<sup>101</sup> Mustafa B. Abdullah (Katip Çelebi), *Kitab-ı Cihannüma li Katip Çelebi*, Darü’t Tıbaati’l Mamure, Konstantiniyye, 1145 (1732). See following for further information. Hamit Sadi Selen, “Cihannüma” in *Katip Çelebi: Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara: TTK, 1957) pp. 121-137

<sup>102</sup> *Kitab-ı Cihannüma li Katip Çelebi*, 3a-3b. El- Dimaşki was one of the scholars of the late 17<sup>th</sup> century known as Coğrafyacı Ebubekir Efendi. He edited *Cihannüma* when he was making the translation of Atlas Major of Wilhelm-Joan Blaeu because he recognized Katip Çelebi’s mistakes. Fikret Sarıcaoğlu, “Cihannüma ve Ebubekir b. Behram el- Dimaşki- İbrahim Müteferrika” , *Prof. Bekir Kütükoğlu’na Armağan*, (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1991), p. 129

sources. He wrote the book at two different times with totally different methods. It is known as the most systematic geography book of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>103</sup>

When one reads *Cihannüma* what he encounters at the very beginning of his experience is the different genre of the book. *Cihannüma* is not a simple book on physical geography; it is a big collection of available knowledge about the world at large. In his *Zeyl* of *Cihannüma* Katip Çelebi stresses the importance of taking geography more general. For him, it is not enough to give physical shape of a country. Customs and traditions of the inhabitants of these countries should be also written under geography. He sees geography superior than history because of this aspect of this science.<sup>104</sup> Katip Çelebi includes current situation of many countries, their political organizations and structures, customs and traditions of the peoples and also physical structure (rivers, mountains, lakes, forest etc.) in *Cihannüma*. Therefore, his book deserves to be called one of the most useful and perfect books that Ottomans ever produced. What is remarkable for us is İbrahim was influenced very much from the perception of the science of geography of Katip Çelebi and the latter is the father of the ideas of the former in this science. İbrahim adopted Çelebi's viewpoint on geography, it means that he does not see it as a discipline just confined to physical geography, but İbrahim also includes cultural aspects of countries in his geography narratives. What Müteferrika draw about geography is realized by Katip Çelebi. *Cihannüma* gives nearly milimetric structure of every place he described. It is not fair to evaluate it as just a book of geography because it can be called as one of history too. For example one can recognize this fact when reading the history of Istanbul in *Cihannüma*.<sup>105</sup> Katip Çelebi informs the reader in global context without omitting anything local. This book can be also read as the local history of cities because it is full of detailed information about each.

In his appendix İbrahim wrote to *Cihannüma* he corrects linguistic mistakes of Katip Çelebi and completes the book with parallel to Katip Çelebi's first plan of *Cihannüma* that Çelebi could not realize because of many constraints like the lack of availability of sources about some parts of the world. İbrahim introduces new findings

---

<sup>103</sup> Orhan Şaik Gökyay, "Cihannüma", *DİA*, v.7, p. 541-542

<sup>104</sup> *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler*, p. 119

<sup>105</sup> *Cihannüma's Europe Part Transkripsiyonlu Metin* (Istanbul: 1971) (This text can be found in ISAM Library, Istanbul. Transcriber was not cited but it was transcribed from one of the original copies in Süleymaniye Halet Efendi Kütüphanesi nr. 640, 35a-169b) p. 3-4



concerning geography, geometry, physics and cosmography in that appendix and brings the story of the cities that Katip Çelebi left at the city of Van to Üsküdar in Anatolian part of Istanbul. He also enriched the book with figures and maps.<sup>106</sup>

*Cihannüma* was also one of the first books compiled by the Ottomans using western sources, so that, it represents change in geographic mentality from east to west. It was also one of the books widely known and used by European geographers for a very long time.

The twelfth book printed by İbrahim Müteferrika again belonged to Katip Çelebi- it was *Takvimü't Tevarih*. In his pre-word İbrahim emphasized, once more, the uses of printing press. Then, he thanks to God because of the completion of *Cihannüma*. Formerly mentioned mufti Ahmed Efendi who advised İbrahim to publish *Cihannüma* also supports him to publish second volume of the book which would include all countries and their conditions in the world. However, İbrahim stresses the difficulty of compiling this book properly. It is really difficult- he says- to draw maps of these countries geometrically and inform readers correctly and it needs hard working and large amount of money so that he postpones publishing second volume to future. However, the books of history do not need to be pictured and the science of history is useful and virtuous. Therefore, he intends to print books regarding history beginning with Adam till present day with giving special importance to the history of Ottomans. In this regard, since Naima's history is scarce and precious it was decided to be published by aforementioned mufti and İbrahim. Since the history of Naima ends at the date of 1070 after Hegira, the histories of Raşid and Çelebizade which were appendixes to Naima would be also published so that they would continue and be tied to each other. However, it is impossible to give all details in these books, so that, before publishing them it is decided to publish *Takvimü't Tevarih* of Katip Çelebi -that is a book organized as a calendar (*uslûb-u takvim üzere*) and gives all such important dates in history until the year 1058-in order to be an introduction to the books intended to publish. It was emphasized in this book that till the Hegira 6206 years passed in history according to the classification of Torah (*Tevrat-ı Yunani*). The book was brought to the date of 1144 by *Emir Buhari Şeyhi Mehmed Efendi* in the same manner and remaining

---

<sup>106</sup> Sarıcaoğlu, *ibid*, p. 140

two years- 1145-1146- was written by İbrahim Müteferrika.<sup>107</sup> İbrahim wrote the life story of Katip Çelebi after his introduction (*Menakıb-ı Katip Çelebi*) which is now certain to us that he took all the information he used there from Çelebi's *Mizan-ül Hakk*. There is nothing more than Katip Çelebi's own history of himself here. İbrahim gives Çelebi's life story, his appointments in chronological manner and lists his works at the end.<sup>108</sup>

*Takvimü't Tevarih* was translated into Italian in 1697 by the translator of Venetian ambassador in Ottoman palace, Giovanni Rinaldo Conte Carli.<sup>109</sup> This book provided Katip Çelebi a promotion in state service; he became second *halife* after the emergence of this book.<sup>110</sup>

The organization of his historical calendar is like that: first era includes events from the creation to Noah's flood, second one contains the ones beginning with flood till prophet Abraham, third period deals with the events between the time of Abraham and Moses, fourth one concerns with the events starting with the death of Moses to Nebuchadnezzar, the fifth period was about the events beginning with the former king and ends with the defeat of Dara by Alexander the great, the sixth one begins with the victory of Alexander and finishes by the birth of Jesus. The seventh and last one was dealing with the events between Jesus and Muhammad's hegira. After this event, he counts the years one by one through giving important dates and events, families and descendants of caliphs and Muslim princes, chronological table of Ottoman dynasty, grand viziers, and muftis, *Kadı-askers* of Anatolia and Rumelia and important men. The book ends with Katip Çelebi's advices on politics and morality.<sup>111</sup>

What İbrahim and mufti Ahmed Efendi intended would not wait too much in order to emerge. The history of the court historian Naima would come out next year as

---

<sup>107</sup> Mustafa bin Abdullah (Katip Çelebi), *Takvimü't Tevarih*, (Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıbaatıl Mamure, 1146 [1733]), 1b- 3a.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid*, 5a-6a

<sup>109</sup> Babinger, *ibid*, p. 28

<sup>110</sup> Orhan Şaik Gökyay, "Katip Çelebi", *İA*, v.6, p. 433

<sup>111</sup> Toderini, *ibid*, p. 90-92

the thirteenth book of Mütferrika press. Mostly known as *Kitab-ı Tarih-i Naima*, the original name of the book is *Ravzat el Hüseyin fi hulaset ahbar el- Hafikayn*.<sup>112</sup>

İbrahim begins his preface with asserting his Ibn Khaldunian opinions about the evolution of history and organization of societies: everyone needs other people in order to live and they need support and aid of other people in order to survive. However, powerful ones win over the weak others because of the differences in their cultures. Societies need governors in order to provide justice among people and give every one his own due. State, on the other hand survives by politics which is about laws. Laws on the other hand are two: ones given by God (*şer'i siyaset*) and the ones proclaimed by sultans (*siyaset-i müluk*) that are based on the reason. Christian nations do not have their laws of religion and they base their politics on the laws compiled according to their reason. Then İbrahim gives information about the emergence of Ottoman dynasty and praises them because of their struggle in the name of Islam. Ottomans are supreme over all states and Ottoman sultans are superior to every other emperor. He, then again, repeats the story of the establishment of printing press and asserts the necessity of the books of history of Ottoman dynasty in order to praise their glorious past. In this respect, the history of Naima is very good at composition and beautifully written as well as scarce and priceless and every one wants to own one copy of it so that it was intended to be published.<sup>113</sup>

Naima's history was published in two volumes with their own indexes and 500 copies for each. In the second volume İbrahim gives the list of the books he had published so far.<sup>114</sup>

*Tarih-i Naima* contains the history of Ottomans between the years 1000 (1591 C.E.) after Hegira and 1070 (1659 C.E.). Naima summarizes his perception of history before he began to write the history of Ottomans.<sup>115</sup> Here, Naima, too, uses the scheme of Ibn Khaldun in constructing his theory. All states have three periods: birth, rise and decline. They are composed of 4 basic classes which seem Naima took from Kınalızade. Most important class is the class of scholars (*ulema*) according to him and continuance

---

<sup>112</sup> Mustafa Naima, *Tarih-i Naima. Ravzatü'l Hüseyin fi Hülasati Ahbari'l Hafikayn*, 2. vol. , (Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıbaatil Mamure, 1147)

<sup>113</sup> *Tarih-i Naima*, 1b-2a

<sup>114</sup> *Tarih-i Naima*, v.2, 15a

<sup>115</sup> *Naima Tarihi*, 3 vol. haz. Zuhuri Danişman, (İstanbul: Zuhuri Danişman Yayınevi, 1967), pp. 29-61

of state depends on them. This class structure was adopted by nearly all of the Ottoman intellectuals before the 19<sup>th</sup> century and everyone perceives his own class more important than others. It seems İbrahim took his thoughts on history from Naima. According to him history is very useful in many respects; it increases the intelligence of scholars and warns reasonable people about the experiences in past and gives clues about future events.<sup>116</sup> The history of Naima was translated into English in 1832 and 1836 by the title of *Annals of the Turkish Empire from 1591 to 1659 of the Christian Era by Naima* by Charles Fraser.<sup>117</sup>

Giambatista Toderini who left a valuable source about the literature of Turks approximately 40 years after İbrahim Müteferrika's death, asks the question that why did not İbrahim begin publishing histories of state historians with *Tacü't Tevarih* of Sadeddin which was very beautiful in style and organization and he speculates that probably İbrahim did not find a good and correct version of the mentioned history.<sup>118</sup> However, the answer to the question why İbrahim began with publishing the history of Naima lies somewhere else. First of all, Naima was trying to write a history which we call today scientific as he mentioned in several items in his history. It should be read as a manifesto of his perception of history and beginning of the scientific approach: historian should be honest and should not write incorrect stories and if he does not know he should learn from the ones who know, he should not write gossips among people about the events, he also should give his message, he should be moderate in terms of evaluating the values of people, he should not praise someone who does not deserve and he should not abstain from praising others who deserve, he should write in a clear manner and with simple sentences in order to be understood, he should write in verse and prose those things deserve attention, he should give information about the future of state if he has an ability in astrology (*ilm-i nücum*).<sup>119</sup> Though it seems there are some deviations from scientific approach, at least he has a conception of using true sources in writing history and criticizing them where possible. What is critical is the proximity of perception of history between İbrahim and Naima. Both are students of Ibn Khaldun in constructing their historical evolution narrative so that it should be normal for İbrahim

---

<sup>116</sup> *Naima Tarihi*, v.1 , p. 30

<sup>117</sup> Babinger, *ibid*, p. 29

<sup>118</sup> Toderini, *ibid*, p. 94

<sup>119</sup> *ibid*, p. 31

to publish Naima but not any other history at the beginning. Though it might be because of some physical constraints as Toderini guessed it seems more defensible for us to say it was a conscious choice because Naima was writing what İbrahim wanted to write.

Next two books to be published were histories of Raşid and Küçükçelebizade Asım-again court historians- who completed the story beginning from the time where Naima left.<sup>120</sup> They were part of İbrahim's project of publishing complete histories of Ottomans in total as he wrote in his preface to Naima's history. He was demanding to see complete picture in its totality which we can call today total history. (*Osmanlı devletine ait vekayiın bir kül haline getirilmesi*)<sup>121</sup> He was also intending to publish histories of Sami and Şakir- court historians again- which he could not realize but put into reality by the owners of the Müteferrika press after it began its activities again in 1784. *Tarih-i Raşid* was published in three volumes. At the end of Raşid's history the travel account of 28 Çelebi Mehmed was given.

The 16<sup>th</sup> book came out of Müteferrika press was really a specific one. It should be also given special importance to this book which is a *gazavatname*. The title of the book is *Ahval-i Gazavat-ı der diyar-ı Bosna* of Ömer Efendi- a former Bosnian judge.<sup>122</sup> The book deals with the war with Austria -above the territory of Bosnia- of Ottomans between 1736 and 1739. The writer of the book collected his data from the narratives of people who saw the war. İbrahim says that he cross-checked information written, from honest people who participated into these wars.

It is understandable to find a *gazavatname* among the books İbrahim published because this war was one of the successful wars the Ottomans fought in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. If it is remembered that Ottomans were not much successful in their wars with European states in this century, collecting bits and pieces of success stories were very important for them. İbrahim praises Bosnian people for their courage, docility and obedience.<sup>123</sup> He acclaims them because of their fight against enemies. In this way he displays Ottoman subjects the virtues of fighting in the name of the state. Not only the people

---

<sup>120</sup> Mehmed Raşid, *Tarih-i Raşid*, 3 vols. , (Konstaniyye: Darü't Tıbaatil Mamure, 1153 [1741]) and Küçükçelebizade İsmail Asım, *Tarih-i Çelebizade*, (Konstaniyye: Darü't tıbaatil mamure, 1153 [1741])

<sup>121</sup> Danişman ed., p. 25

<sup>122</sup> Ömer Bosnavi, *Ahval-i Gazavat-ı der Diyar-ı Bosna*, (Konstaniyye: Darü't Tıbaatil Mamure, 1154 [1741]). We have also two transcribed editions: Ömer Bosnavi, *Bosna Tarihi* ( *Tarih-i Bosna der Diyar-ı Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa*), ed. Kamil Su, (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1979); Ömer Efendi, *Bosna Savaşları*, ed. Mehmet Açıkgözü, (İstanbul: Ötüken yayınevi, 1977).

<sup>123</sup> Açıkgözü ed., p. 100-102

fought but also other characters in the book are ideal: for example, the governor of the region does everything with consultation, soldiers fight with courage and belief. It also gives the importance of well organized army of enemies and describes a little bit their structure. It was not useless for İbrahim to publish a *gazavatname* which will increase moral of Ottomans because he emphasizes everywhere obligation of Muslims to fight in the name of God.

This book was also translated into German in 1789 and in English in 1830 by the title of *History of the war in Bosnia during the years 1737 to 1738 and 1739* again by Charles Fraser- translator of the history of Naima.<sup>124</sup>

The last book İbrahim published was one of the dictionaries he intended. *Lisanü'l Acem* of Hasan Şuuri came in the year 1741.<sup>125</sup> It was also called as *Ferhengi-i Şuuri*. It was a Turkish-Persian dictionary that Hasan Şuuri compiled in 20 years.<sup>126</sup>

İbrahim's publications were not confined to books. He also published 4 maps. Approximately ten years before the publication of Vankulu dictionary, İbrahim tried his printing materials on a map of Marmara Sea.<sup>127</sup> There is no copy of printed map but only its wooden block. There is no reference to the engraver of it but from the phrase below of the map it can be attributed to İbrahim Müteferrika himself: "My gracious master, if you permit larger ones (map) will be done. Year 1132 (1719-1720)". He probably presented it to Damad İbrahim Paşa in order to show one model of a printed item.

The second map he published was the map of Black Sea. The map of Marmara Sea was not well-drawn, however second map seems better; it shows the development in the press' ability to publish figures.<sup>128</sup> There is no reference to artist who engraved it either. In the introduction at the right of the map, it was written that this map was drawn agreeing with the laws of geometry and arithmetic. The reason for the publication of it was summarized as in order to help those who believe in one God and in order to facilitate works of the slaves of God who sail in this sea ( *mücerred zümre-i*

---

<sup>124</sup> Babinger, *ibid*, p. 30

<sup>125</sup> Hasan Şuuri, *Lisanü'l Acem*, 2 vols. (Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıbaatil Mamure, 1155 [1741])

<sup>126</sup> Toderini, *ibid*, p. 108

<sup>127</sup> A copy of this map can be found in *Yazmadan Basmaya: Müteferrika, Mühendishane, Üsküdar*; ed. Turgut Kut, Fatma Türe, (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat, 1996), p. 22-23

<sup>128</sup> This map can be also found in *Yazmadan...*, p. 24-25

*muvaahhidine imdad ve ianet ve bahr-ı merkumda geştü güzâr eden ibadullaha bais-i suhulet ve vesile-i selamet olur mülâhazasıyle*). This phrase reminds us thoughts of İbrahim Müteferrika. The map should be drawn by him or the text was written by him. It was printed in 1137 (1724-1725). Above the map, it was written that Damad İbrahim Paşa advised to publish it in order to guide Muslims in their sails in the Black Sea.

The third map published was a map of Iran printed in 1142 (1729-1730). It was drawn by İbrahim Müteferrika. It was printed in the same year with *Tarih-i Seyyah* so it should not be a coincidence but a conscious choice to publish this map of Iran in order to help people to imagine landscape of the country who read the book. İbrahim cites some information about the cities and climate of Iran within the text below the map. It was a developed version of the map of Guillaume Delisle printed in 1724 in Paris.<sup>129</sup> It contains mountains and rivers and important altitudes of Iran. It seems that it looks like a physical geography map.

The last map was a map of Egypt and published in the year 1142 (1730).<sup>130</sup> The artist of it was also guessed to be İbrahim Müteferrika. It was printed in the same year with İbrahim's publication of *Tarih-i Mısır-ı Cedit* probably because of the same reason we stated in *Tarih-i Seyyah* that in order to make readers imagine the geography of the country. It also contains figures of animals, ships and mountains.

What can we deduce from the maps that İbrahim published is that he was not as good as in his map-making as in his intellectual activities. The maps he printed can be seen extension of his interest in geography and practicality.

İbrahim was assisted by two artists in making the maps included in the books he published on geography like *Cihannüma*, *Tuhfetü'l Kibar* etc. They were Kırımlı Ahmet and Ermeni Galatalı Mıgırđıç. Judging from their works in *Cihannüma* we can say that they were more talented than İbrahim in map-making because their works really deserve attention in terms of their proportionality and accurateness. He had also some people who helped him in his enterprise:

Among the persons whom Müteferrika was indebted prior to his debt are mentioned the names of his dependents (*tevabi*) who were in all probability employees at his printing house. The printer owed monthly wages to Mehmed Çelebi, Mehmed son of Ali, Ahmed son of Osman, and Ahmed son of Mehmed. A salary (probably monthly) was paid to Hafız Abdülkerim Efendi too. Müteferrika was also indebted to a certain Jew (Yahudi), who was a type-founder (*hurufatçı*). The latter could be the famous Jewish printer Jona, who assisted

---

<sup>129</sup> A copy can be seen in Yazmadan..., p. 26-27

<sup>130</sup> Look at Yazmadan..., p. 28-29

Müteferrika in his printing activities. The fact that only monthly salaries were pointed out in the inventory implies that the printing house was likely active prior to the very death of its founder.<sup>131</sup>

İbrahim Müteferrika's printing job permits us to make a comparison with later Mühendishane-Üsküdar printing house in order to evaluate its successes and failures. We can say that İbrahim's attempt had been very instructive for the owners and managers of Mühendishane printing house. At the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century and at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Mühendishane continued patterns of Müteferrika press in terms of printing/editing. Dictionaries published here again including famous Vankulu.<sup>132</sup> They continued to be the bestsellers of press. It seems that İbrahim's experience in printing taught well for its successors. One major difference was publication of religious works and they had found readers. İbrahim's tradition was revived in terms of printing books on military science including famous Vauban editions like *Fenn-i Lağım* and *Fenn-i Harb* and French translation of Mahmud Raif Efendi –Tableau Des Nouveaux Réglements de L'Empire Ottoman-.<sup>133</sup> Another new attempt was printing books for educational purposes especially for the students of Mühendishane itself.<sup>134</sup> İbrahim's Katip Çelebi inheritance had been taken over that *Atlas-ı Kebir* was published as a supplement for *İcaletü'l Coğrafiyye* of Mahmud Raif Efendi.<sup>135</sup> What is striking is that İbrahim's courage and commercial success had not been achieved by Mühendishane press. For example, *Atlas-ı Kebir* was published 50 copies which is a number very much lesser than *Cihannüma* of Müteferrika press which was published 500 copies and almost half was sold. Textbooks were not published too much that for example 16 different titles of textbooks and treatises were published 1200 copies at total<sup>136</sup> which is equal to just one title -*Tarih-i Seyyah*- of Müteferrika press. Apart from dictionaries and some religious works most of the books published in Mühendishane press could not achieve commercial success of Müteferrika press. One major difference seems to be decreasing share of books of history in Mühendishane

---

<sup>131</sup> Orlin Sabev, *ibid*, p. 396-397.

<sup>132</sup> Kemal Beydilli, *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık Tarihinde Mühendishâne, Mühendishâne Matbaası ve Kütüphânesi (1776-1826)* (İstanbul: Eren, 1995) p. 181

<sup>133</sup> Beydilli, *ibid*, p. 151 and 181

<sup>134</sup> *ibid*, p. 228

<sup>135</sup> *ibid*, p. 169

<sup>136</sup> *ibid*, p. 229



press compared with Mütferrika. Half of İbrahim's publications were on history whereas there is only one in fifty publication of Mühendishane.<sup>137</sup> It displays the change in priorities: İbrahim published books on history for political purposes while Mühendishane converted it to religious books for the same aim.

---

<sup>137</sup> For the full list of Mühendishane publications and its evaluation see Beydilli, *ibid*, pp. 253-274.

## CHAPTER II

### ***İBRAHİM MÜTEFERRİKA AS AN INTELLECTUAL***

#### **2.1: İbrahim Müteferrika: Intellectual, Political Theorist, Publicist**

In the previous chapter, we delved into İbrahim's biography which is really crucial for someone who wants to understand his intellectual maturation. His life struggle, activities and tasks he held are essential components that complete his intellectual portrait. However, main fabric of his thoughts is reflected in his own works and especially in *Usul'ül Hikem* (UH).

At first glance UH of İbrahim might seem impressive to a reader who is not an Ottomanist and he might even surprise when he encounters sophisticated opinions of him at the very beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Though İbrahim attempted to bring fresh voice to *nasihatname* genre in his booklet, it remained mostly within the circle of traditional advice to king literature. Although he proposed reorganization in the army, his suggestions were not as radical as assumed so far. He did not open, for instance, secular way of thinking as Niyazi Berkes argued. On the contrary, he wrote within the basic Islamic discourse of Ottomans. He was misinterpreted and misused too much by later ideologists in order to justify their subjective standing. Some adopted him as a successful convert who served the belief of God but some misrepresented him as the founder of laicism movement in Turkey. These relative outlooks mostly distorted the real picture of İbrahim Müteferrika who is neither the former nor the later. I regard him in this study as one of the standard Ottoman intellectuals who are tightly bounded to Islamic tradition on one hand and faithfully servant to Ottoman state, ideology and legitimacy on the other.

Opening lines of the book reminds personal and spiritual conflict of a Sufi sheik in his journey to God.<sup>138</sup> İbrahim degrades himself as usual in Islamic literature. He was living in silence and peace in his corner till thoughts attacked his mind when he was thinking the reasons of anarchy (*fitne esbabı*) occurred in the year 1143 of Hegira

---

<sup>138</sup> In this study we will use the transcribed text published in Adil Şen, *İbrahim Müteferrika ve Usulü'l Hikem fi Nizam-ül Ümem*, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı yayınları (Ankara, 1995). Further references to this transcribed text will be shown with the abbreviation of UH.

(Patrona Halil Rebellion). He worries about the laxity (*tekasül ve tehavün*) of the members of the Divan in terms of practicing laws of politics, on the other hand, he attributes the problems in the organization of the world (*nizam-ı alem*) and order of the people to customs of God and nature or necessity of the civilization of the human beings (*ber mucib-i adet-i ilahiye ve muktezay-ı tabiat-ı kevnîyye ve iktizay-ı temeddün-ü beşeriye*). He worries much more when he sees the signs of this weakness (*illet-i za'f*) in the Ottoman state and the current condition of the people is inclined to conflict (*muğayeret*).<sup>139</sup> He, then, turns his attention to the science of useful stories and books of history in order to analyze conditions of previous nations and sultans and countries, then, he recognizes that the changes and conflicts (*tebeddülat ve tegayyürat ve ihtilafat-u ihtilatat*) among the Islamic nations proved to be useful reasons for “the renovation of the rules of state and religion” (*teceddüd-ü ahkam-ı din ü devlet*) and “reinforcement of the power of sultanate” (*takviye-i bazuyu saltanat*) and “strengthening the structure of the laws of Islamic law” (*tahkim-i bünyan-ı kavaid-i şariat*) and “putting in order of the works of country and people” (*tanzim-i umur-u mülk-ü millet*) and “affluence of the situation of subjects” (*terfih-i ahval-i raiyyet*) and “invigoration of the way and doings of the prophet” (*ihya-i sünen-i seniyye*). After his recognition of the positive effects of this change he says that his sorrow relieved a little.<sup>140</sup>

This introduction is very instructive in terms of understanding İbrahim’s way of looking to world at large. First of all, he interprets change as natural. This perspective was not strange in this century neither in the east nor in the west. Ibn Khaldun was discovered in the preceding century by the Ottomans and now used frequently in this century. On the other hand, Thomas Hobbes was writing about natural law / law of nature in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. According to Khaldun, change is natural and irresistible and every state and society has its own limits and life duration. İbrahim recognized this fact and he tried to find a solution to this change which according to Khaldun will finish with vanishing of every state.

What is remarkable here is that İbrahim did not see change as something pejorative and deteriorating but positive as contrary to the *nasihatname* writers before him who were sure about the destructive sides of any possible change and deviation from the status quo. However, what he expected from this change is same with those of

---

<sup>139</sup> UH, p. 124

<sup>140</sup> UH, p. 125

the *nasihatname* writers; he did not expect a radical change but a return to the powerful days of the sultanate and sovereignty of Islamic law. One further point he emphasized was a real proof of his Islamic revivalist pioneering side: he was talking about the invigoration of the Sunnah of prophet. This phrase should be a concrete evidence of the availability of revivalist thinking among Ottomans very early.<sup>141</sup> For him, shariat is enough for the improvement of the state while Sunnah of the prophet is essential for empowering of the rules and regulations of the people.

İbrahim continues his introduction by stating his struggle in terms of understanding the reasons of anarchy in the past in various countries and nations. He, then asked himself the question why did Christians' armies start to defeat Muslims for a while though they were by nature weak and insulted (*cibillette za'fu hakaret*) compared with Muslims. In his answer to this question, he gives clues about the sources of his book: since he knows the Latin language he read history books in the mentioned language and the books covering the rules of the organization of their soldiers and war making as well as he talked with various man of science from various ethnicities and military officers who are informed about their organizations. In his investigation he says, he did not allege contemptibleness of the ground (*süfliyet-i zemin bahane olunmayub*) and collected bits and pieces of useful materials where necessary and he saved in his memory.<sup>142</sup>

What is significant for our purpose is İbrahim's opinion about knowledge acquisition. Preceding lines may justify İbrahim as one of the early enlightened Ottomans because knowledge is valuable for him without looking who produced it in whatever context. His claim that Christians are by nature weak and insulted is also critical in terms of displaying how a convert justify his later belief through speaking ill of his former one.

He concludes his introduction emphasizing that his book was appreciated by the scholars and he presented it to Sultan. He wishes from God his work will be evaluated by the members of the Divan and hopes that they should benefit from its uses and behave accordingly. He, then, pronounces that the book was divided into three main chapters. The first one is concerned with the uses and benefits of discipline in the army,

---

<sup>141</sup> My thoughts about the Islamic revivalist opinions of İbrahim Müteferrika are shaped in the course of Assist. Prof. Yusuf Hakan Erdem and influenced from him. Yusuf Hakan Erdem, from lecture notes in the course Hist 572: Sources and Methods for the 17th and 18th century Ottoman history, Spring 2004, Sabancı University, Istanbul.

<sup>142</sup> *UH*, p. 126

the second deals with the importance and utilities of the science of geography and the third gives information about the condition, organization and tactics of the Christian armies.

## **2.2: Reading *Usul'ül Hikem*: Ibn Khaldun, Thomas Hobbes, and İbrahim Müteferrika under same intellectual aura**

First part of UH contains İbrahim's view of natural condition of humans, evolution of history and politics. In his words: first part concerns with the necessity of rulers. It is interesting to note that he emphasized at the very beginning that discoverers and scientists proved that globe is shaped like a ball. Why did he stress that? There should have been still a discussion on this matter in this century in Ottoman lands. We know that İbrahim selected a mission to himself of introducing new information in geography. He wrote for example an appendix to *Cihannüma* of Katip Çelebi in which he introduced theories of Tycho Brahe, Kepler and Galileo as well as Aristotle and Descartes. This appendix was seen one of the very important texts in geography in the 18<sup>th</sup> century Ottoman Empire.<sup>143</sup>

God imposes people, İbrahim argues, to live in societies because they all need each other. However, people are different in their sects and way of living and some of them are superior to others because of power and enforcement or wealth and property. Those superiors have a tendency to make others subservient to their authority and to appropriate riches of these people. There should be rulers in order to make every one satisfied with his share. The founder of this law is called prophet. When the prophet fled into heaven, there should be a just and overpowering ruler (*hakim-i adil ve kahir*) who will carry out the rules of the religion and improve the state of the Muslims and protect orders of the prophet. [So that differences among the people will be glorified with crown of the state and the dress of sultanate will be silvered with the shariat (*fırak-ı millet efser-i devlet ile serfiraz ve hem libas-ı saltanat tıraz-ı zaz-ı şeriat ile mutarraz Ola*)]. Most of the nations are inclined to practice this rule naturally (*bit-tab'*) and they became subjects to a ruler and found states through this way.<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>143</sup> A. Adnan Adıvar, *Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim* (Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 2004) p. 171

<sup>144</sup> UH, pp. 128-130

Lines above prove that İbrahim is a true pupil of Ibn Khaldun and he was influenced very much from him in terms of perception of history and society.<sup>145</sup> Here are some excerpts from Khaldun's famous book *The Muqaddimah*:

We say that man is distinguished from the other living beings by certain qualities peculiar to him, namely: (1) the sciences and crafts which result from that ability to think which distinguishes man from other animals and exalt him as a thinking being over all creatures. (2) The need for restraining influence and strong authority, since man, alone of all the animals, can not exist without them... (4) Civilization. This means that human beings have to dwell in common and settle together in cities and hamlets for the comforts of companionship and for the satisfaction of human needs, as a result of the natural disposition of human beings toward co-operation in order to be able to make a living."<sup>146</sup> "Human social organization is necessary. The Philosophers expressed this fact by saying: 'Man is "political" by nature'. That is, he cannot do without social organization"<sup>147</sup> "When mankind has achieved social organization, as we have stated, and when civilization in the world has thus become a fact, people need someone to exercise a restraining influence and keep them apart, for aggressiveness and injustice are in the animal nature of man. The weapons made for the defence of human beings against the aggressiveness of dumb animals do not suffice against the aggressiveness of human beings toward each other because all of them possess these weapons. Thus something else is needed for the defense against the aggressiveness of human beings toward each other. It could not come from outside because all the other animals fall short of human perceptions and inspiration. The person who exercises a restraining influence, therefore, must be one of themselves. He must dominate them and have power and authority over them, so that no one of them will be able to attack another."<sup>148</sup>

Thomas Hobbes, in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, was also concerned with this problem nearly from the same perspective. Might have İbrahim read Hobbes? We do not know but it seems plausible. Hobbes was in the same mood when explaining natural condition of humans:

...Since we see that men have in fact formed societies, that no one lives outside society, and that all men seek to meet and talk each other, it may seem a piece of weird foolishness to set a stumbling block in front of the reader on the very threshold of civil doctrine, by insisting that man is not born fit for society...<sup>149</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup> For other followers of Ibn Khaldun in the Ottoman Empire see Z. Fahri Fındıkoğlu, "Türkiyede İbn Haldunizm" in 60. *Doğum Yılı Münasebetiyle Fuad Köprülü Armağanı*, (Istanbul: DTCF, 1953) pp. 153-163 and Bernard Lewis, "İbn Khaldun in Turkey" in his *Islam in history: Ideas, People and Events in the Middle East* (Chicago: Open Court, 2001) pp. 233-236. In this article Lewis discusses that European curiosity of Ibn Khaldun in the 19<sup>th</sup> century might be derived from their reading Ottoman intellectuals who used Khaldun beginning from 17<sup>th</sup> century onwards.

<sup>146</sup> Ibn Khaldun, *The Muqaddimah*, tr. Franz Rosenthal ed. N.J. Dawood (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987) p. 42-43. For the Turkish translation and excerpts see İbn-i Haldun, *Mukaddime 3 vols.*, tr. Zakir Kadiri Ugan (Istanbul: MEB yayınları, 1997) p. 97, 100, 103-104

<sup>147</sup> *The Muqaddimah*, p. 45

<sup>148</sup> *ibid*, p. 47

<sup>149</sup> Thomas Hobbes, *On the Citizen*, ed. Richard Tuck and Micheal Silverthorne, (NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 25

As the people are in conflict with each other in terms of sects and ways of living- İbrahim states- they are also in disagreement in terms of their way of ruling and organization. He introduces here three different forms of government: first was the way of Plato which is called monarchy (*Munarhiya*) in which people agree upon a person in order to obey and he is free in decision-making and everyone is required to obey his rules. Most of the governments in world are in this regime. The second way is the one of Aristotle who said state should be in the hands of the few elites. They choose one as their leader but they are not free from each other. This regime is called as aristocracy (*aristokrasiya*). Venice is an example to that. Third one belongs to Democratis who claimed government should be in the hands of the subjects. He then tells here Greek way of democracy (*dimukrasiya*). English and Dutch states have this regime.<sup>150</sup>

Though İbrahim is misinformed about the origin of the democracy and that he invented an imagined figure like Democratis, he was aware of the political reality in his nearby and he used the original names of these regimes. İbrahim was not the first person who used these terms because these regimes should have been known among Ottomans since very long time due to popularity of Aristotle and Plato in their literature. On the other hand, Thomas Hobbes was also talking about these regimes; İbrahim might have borrowed these terms from him.<sup>151</sup> More important than anything else, Katip Çelebi in his *İrşadü'l Hayara ila tarihü'l Yunan ve'n-nasara* gives information about these three regimes. Çelebi wrote this book after his recognition of the ignorance and misinformation among Muslims of political government styles of Europeans.<sup>152</sup> Probably, İbrahim adopted most of his information from Katip Çelebi who was the father of the most of thoughts of him. İbrahim's obsession with knowing the situations and conditions of Europeans -which we will discuss in forthcoming lines- should be also influenced from Katip Çelebi's *İrşad*.

İbrahim continues his narrative: the existence of the rulers is result of a culmination of desire of god and need of nature, humanity and civilization. These rulers

---

<sup>150</sup> UH, pp. 130-131. Niyazi Berkes claims that İbrahim implied that democracy is superior to all other regimes. Berkes, *Türkiyede Çağdaşlaşma*, p. 53. However, I did not see any such implication in this text. On the contrary, İbrahim describes three forms of goverment neutrally. Berkes' interpretation is a derivation of his grand narrative about the Turkish history which according to him unavoidably progressed towards modernization/secularism.

<sup>151</sup> Hobbes, *ibid*, p. 91-92.

<sup>152</sup> *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler*, ed. Orhan Şaik Gökyay ( İstanbul: MEB, 1968) p. 16

invaded the world and established countries. There is greed in the essence of humans and a natural inclination to attack others' territories and rulers are not exception to this rule. [So, everyone has to protect himself from assaults of others.] Rulers of countries recruit soldiers from their own people who are able to fight and they equip them with war tools and organize them according to the rules of fighting and killing. Those who are unwary of this fact have to withdraw from state making.<sup>153</sup>

It is interesting to see same lines in Hobbes:

In the state of nature, there is in all men a will to do harm, but not for the same reason or with equal culpability...But the most frequent cause why men want to hurt each other arises when many want the same thing at the same time, without being able to enjoy it in common or to divide it. The consequence is that it must go to the stronger. But who is the stronger? Fighting must decide...Therefore the first foundation of natural right is that each man protect his life and limbs as much as he can...He has also right to use any means and to do any action by which he can preserve himself...<sup>154</sup>

What can we deduce from the similarity between Hobbes and İbrahim? They were writing in the early modern period on similar problems. Their main concern was, understanding the nature of politics and legitimacy. They answer the same question nearly with the same reply in two different contexts. This fact denies the presumed differentiability between east and west through emphasizing same intellectual climate in the same period. They were intellectuals of world at large thinking in analogous lines and struggling to find a solution to political problematic. As an alternative explanation, the similarity between them might be because they use same sources (i.e. Ibn Khaldun).

It is not a secret, İbrahim asserts, to those people who know history that war has been a natural situation of humans. However, among the warriors, one class is superior to others who are holy warriors of Islam who do not only fight for today (*dünya*) but also for the day after (*ahiret*).<sup>155</sup>

We will see same attitude in İbrahim in the following lines many times: the superiority of Muslims over non-Muslims in terms of their belief, on the contrast, superiority of the later in terms of organization over the former.

### **2.3: “Old way of military fighting is over” or “The order is above all”**

---

<sup>153</sup> UH, p. 132

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid*, excerpts from pages 26, 27.

<sup>155</sup> UH, p. 133



İbrahim, then, attempts to depict war style and tactics of previous states and their pros and cons. He begins his account with emphasizing that former states' soldiers were not organized as the present ones. He says he took this information from the books containing information of military structure of these states. (*Ümem-i salifenin ilmuhaberini mutazammın olan devavin ve defatir mantukası*) Soldiers of these states were organized in three branches without looking their quantity: right, left and middle. They resembled a unique body of an eagle with two wings. Though cavalry and infantry were separated from each other, they were of one body. Experienced and competent officers were appointed to the right and left branches in order to rule both wings. After that, those who were able to tell and practice orders, had a capability to know soldiers, dexterous and agile were chosen as sergeants and given to the officers of two branches. Simple soldiers had to stay in their own branches and some officers should be also appointed as inspectors. All sub-branches among soldiers had their own flags and standards and there was a ranking among them which was definite and known to each other. The middle branch was the one of commander- mostly sultans- and their special soldiers and guardians. There were also elites experienced in war and state making in this branch and the commander applies to their consultation in need of emergency. The middle branch was also keeping eyes on right and left. There were also soldiers in this branch who were responsible from transmission of news and orders. This branch, in a way, resembles the brain of a body. These branches were ready to war and when the war began the eagle opens the wings and right and left wings became arranged like a single wall. However, present army of Christians is organized in geometric style as opposed to organization described in which rows are not disciplined and arranged like a line. There was no milimetric equity in the arrangement of previous soldiers. They were crowded in some places whereas rare in others. These undisciplined rows intermingled with each other when an enemy emerged. Sometimes, when a large ground remained between the armies, brave and fearless soldiers were fighting face to face with their weapons. Sometimes, fate helps one side and they became victorious, sometimes not. Sometimes, war lasts so long that nobody knows who wins. Sometimes, only brave and strong members were fighting and the result would be accepted. There were no cannons, rifles or gunpowder but only bows and arrows, sword and spear, rass and dagger as war tools. In conclusion, previous states were not organized and disciplined in terms of administration as they were also different in their sects and origins (*Düvel-i pişin ve pesinnin zaman-ı evvelden bu zamana gelince mebadı-yi bünyan ittifak ve ictimaları ve*

*tavr-u-tarz-ı cemahir-i ittihadları ve kanun ve kaide-i nizam-ı millet ve fetk-u retk-i umur-u devletleri ittihad üzere olmayub, mezahib-u ayin ve meşaribleri dahi tabayı-ı muhtelifleri iktizasına göre eğerçi muhalefet ve mubayenet üzere vaki olmuştur*<sup>156</sup>)

However, their recruitment and classification of soldiers and their patience in war were orderly. They were disciplined in their campaigns and use same weapons with their rivals.<sup>157</sup> Indians, Chinese, peoples of Turkistan and Iran, Israelites, Yemenites, Egyptians, Baghdadis, Anatolians, Arabs, Kurds and ancient European states were organized under this strategy.<sup>158</sup>

İbrahim states that, most of the Islamic states also adopted this model. Furthermore, he emphasizes, Muslims were superior to all others in swordsmanship. When the Ottoman Empire undertook the sword of Islam, it created fear in the hearts of enemies. However, there occurred some faults in their conflict with their rivals in recent times and it is the responsibility of everyone to contemplate on the reasons of these faults (*kusur*) and weaknesses. In order to achieve this objective, according to İbrahim, first and foremost prerequisite is to think carefully on the condition and behavior of the enemies of the state and religion. (*Adüvv-ü din-ü devlet olanların tavr-u tarz-ı ahvalleri cümleden evvel tecessüs olunmak*)<sup>159</sup>

This principle occupies significant place in İbrahim's understanding. He, in many places in *UH*, stresses the importance of being aware of the condition of the foes. This principle differentiates him from the writers before him because they were referring most of the time to internal conditions and requirements that should be done. However, for İbrahim, it is not enough to reform and regulate internal structure but

---

<sup>156</sup> *UH*, p. 137

<sup>157</sup> Paul Rycaut who attended 1665 campaign against Austria mentions this fact with an admiration. Paul Rycaut, *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1668). p. 205-206. "Though it is reported by those who are soldiers, and have experienced the Valour of the Turks in fight, that their victories are obtained by multitudes of Men, rather than by art, or Military discipline, however the conquests they have made on the parts of Christendom, is a demonstration of some supereminent order in their army, which recompences the defect of the knowledge in the true mystery of war and this regulation ( in my opinion) proceeds from nothing more than the strict prohibition of Wine upon pain of death...for hearby men become sober, diligent, watchful and obedient. In the Turkish camp no brawls, quarrels, nor clamours are heard, no abuses are committed on the people in the march of their army, all is bought and paid with money, as by travellers that are quests at ann Inn, there are no complaints by mothers of the rape of their virgin daughters, no violences and robberies offered on the inhabitants, all which good order tends to the success of their armies and enlargement of their empire..." . For an introductory information on Ottoman campaigns see V.J. Parry, "Harb", *EI* (3), 190-194.

<sup>158</sup> *UH*, pp. 133-138.

<sup>159</sup> *UH*, p. 139.

statesman should be also aware of external structure of rivals and the things they achieved. Successful war can only be attained through the true synthesis of both factors.

In order to understand the meaning of this fact -İbrahim avows- first of all, the condition of the soldiers, their summoning, war style and tactics of the previous Islamic states and thoughts of man of attention and man of war- who are experts in fighting- (*fünun-u hurub-u kıtalde mahir olan ashab-ı dikkat ve erbab-ı vukuf*) on the reasons of weaknesses and defeat should be known. Secondly, scholars and wise man of the Christian nation have been consulting each other since very long time on abolishing old style war in order to resist fast attacks; thus, it is necessary to inform reader about that and their adoption of a new organization (*tertib-i cedit*) and use of new tools of war. It is explicit now that old way of fighting face to face contains countless dangers. The problems with this old way are: firstly, soldiers are not ready to war neither in campaign nor in peace so that their summoning needs long time. In addition to that, they excuse themselves on the grounds of heat in summer and cold in winter in order not to participate in war and they were late every time. Onto campaign they oppress the subjects *en-route* and this is impossible to stop. Secondly, in the campaign, their camping and departure are not disciplined and they scatter around in narrow straits. This situation of them leads to many problems and enemies captures some of them in order to be informed (*dil almak*) about their way and take the measures and defeat them with the valuable information they got. Thirdly, since they are not organized, ordered and disciplined (*muntazam ve müretteb*) they can not stand against charges and they can not endure attacks. It is not important to have brave and strong soldiers in such an army, nobody succeeds organizing them and nobody can make them efficient. These brave soldiers fight on their own as a sign of their courage and do not accept order in departure and settlement and do not give credit to synchronic movements. On the other hand, the foe is strictly disciplined in geometric formations and they are silent. They know how to fight in order, all parties are arranged well. They are all connected to each other like chains of rings and avoid from rivalry among themselves. Thus, they take their courage from their unity. Despite strong attacks of disorganized enemies their strict rows can not be broken. Dispersed soldiers, in contrast, just tire themselves and fell into fear some time after and all their bravery leaves its place to regret. Though, they struggle very much they can attain nothing so that they are demoralized and it leads to their further dispersion. History is full of stories of sultans who were killed or forced to abdication by their soldiers after defeat in war. There are also stories of countries

devastated by such soldiers. Fourthly, soldiers of ancient style of war should not be trusted even though they are numerous, courageous and have their weapons because first and foremost requisite in an army is well order and organization. (*Belki şart-ı azam ve cümleden elzem ve ehem olan hüsn-i nizam tertib-i pür intizamdır*). Fifthly, soldiers in order know each other and the state of the foe, however, the disorganized opposite group of soldiers do not even know their own group so that when a problem occurs it leads to disorder and dissolution. Sixthly, victory or defeat of disordered soldier depends neither on power and struggle nor on initiative or measures. Neither Plato nor Aristotle serves them because strength and courage and abundance can only be useful if there is an order. To sum up, such a group of soldiers are depending on the wind of the fate in everything. Seventhly, lack of order in an army is the ultimate reason of many problems and harmful to treasury and a cause of the devastation of country. Therefore, it should be explicit now that -İbrahim adds- the old order of army is faulty in many ways and full of problems in many others.<sup>160</sup>

## 2.4: Archeology of the words

One is surprised when he sees the abundance of words meaning order and organization in *UH*. İbrahim seems to be obsessed with the idea of order and he mentions at least two hundred times words meaning order or its contrasts like anarchy/disorder and unrest. It is very essential to make linguistic analysis of this text in order to understand the referents and connotations of dominant terms in İbrahim's writing. These are just a few of these words having connotations of order, organization and discipline used many times over in the text: *hüsn-ü nizam* (well order), *tertib-i pür intizam* (well orderly arrangement), *zabt-u rabt* (control and discipline), *muntazam* (orderly, regular), *merbut* (strictly tied), *müretteb* (arranged), *ittifak* (alliance), *ittihad* (union), *manzum* (ordered), *tanzim* (to put in order) etc. In contrast to them, there are also their opposites used innumerable times that mean anarchy and conflict like: *tebeddül* (change), *tegayyürat* (becoming changed), *ihtilafat* (disagreement), *ihtilatat* (confusion), *fesad* (disturbance), *halel* (harm), *zilel*, *fitne* (disorder), *mübayenet* (lack of accord, opposition), *mütebayin* (different and opposed), *tefavüt* (impropriety), *tefrika* (discord), *muhtell* (infraction), *müşevveş* (disorderly) etc. The

---

<sup>160</sup> *UH*, pp. 139-144

contrasting words used copiously in order to create an aura of order versus anarchy. These words echo in the mind of the reader and produce a scene of war in which terms conflict with each other. When one considers the fact that İbrahim was writing in a period after Ottomans experienced one of the biggest anarchies they ever experienced- Patrona Halil rebellion, his abundant use of these words makes sense. It was a rebellion which was not contended with just taking the heads of viziers but also forced dethronement of the sultan. In such a political atmosphere it should be understandable that İbrahim is obsessed with the idea of order which he believes, cures every ill.

In his analysis about the organization of the armies –both in the past and the present- that I mentioned before the linguistic/semiotic inquiry of the words he used, İbrahim seems to be aware in the change of military organization. He truly diagnoses military revolution<sup>161</sup> for the first time-may be- in Ottoman intellectual literature. The problem is not change in structure but in military tactics. If there is something new in İbrahim, it is not his laicism as Niyazi Berkes argued, but his true recognition of military change. He absolutely knows that chivalric way of fighting as in feudal times was over. Neither heroism nor physical strength can save soldiers from defeat against centralized armies. In this way he also sends a message to *Timarli Sipahis* that old way of war is now something historic. Chivalry spirit should be abandoned.

As I will argue in following lines, *UH* is not just a treatise of reform and reorganization. It can be also read as a historical essay of events experienced in recent times in the Ottoman Empire. Though he did not give direct references and names; he was talking about Janissaries and criticizes their rejection of order through explaining disadvantages of the old way of combating. He complains about their oppression of the subjects of the empire in campaigns and excuses in order to escape from war.

## **2.5: Originalities of an intellectual at the first quarter of the 18<sup>th</sup> century**

It should not be an exaggeration to compare İbrahim with Hobbes because he uses “political language” as efficiently as Hobbes. For example, for him, the whole

---

<sup>161</sup> There is a big discussion among military historians about that if there is something called “Military Revolution”. Some claims that said revolution is nothing more than the evolution of feudal armies to a modernized organization. On the other hand some claims that 16th century is the real period in which revolutionary military tactics emerged and deserves to be called “military revolution”. For the discussion of this matter see Jeremy Black, *European Warfare 1660-1815* (London: UCL Press, 1994) pp. 1-38

globe is divided into four parts by the geographers as Asia, Africa, America and Europe in order to picture states which are constructed by rulers who make obedient their subjects. What is in the centre of everything is nothing than politics. Among these continents, İbrahim regards Europe both with disdain and admiration. Europe is most distinguished of all (*vech-i arzın güzidesi*). It was a place reserved for the Christian nation but they were not contended with it and spread into America so called New World. Christian nation had been few in numbers but became more and they harassed many places in the East as well as in the West and took these areas into their governance through traveling with their ships. They had been expelled from Asia when the Ottomans took the lead; however, they found way to India and China, then, discovered new islands so that they became powerful. On the other hand, the people of Islam did not pay attention (*gaflet ve müsamaha*) to the condition of Christians because of the animosity of religion and hate of the enemy. Learning the state of the rulers of Christian nation was neglected because of pure fanaticism (*taassub-u mahz*). However, it was very essential to be aware of the conditions, numbers and situation of them. This ignorance allowed them to be numerous when they were few, victorious when they were defeated, spread to whole globe when they were just confined to a small area. Thus, organization of their state, rule of countries, as well as regulation of the works of subjects, how they repaired their countries and their customs and laws of politics should be known ( *tedbir-i bilad, ve tanzim-i umur-u ibad, ve ta'mir-i memalik ve abadani-i mülk ve memleketlerinde düsturul ameleri olan kanun ve kaide-i riyasiyye ve siyasiyyeleri ve hıfz-u-hırasat-i mülklerinde olan adetleri*). In addition to that, the reasons why they became victorious against the army of Islam should be explained so that Muslims awake from their unawareness and ignorance. The new organization Christian armies adopted their tactics in war and tricks of soldiers should be deciphered so that their invasion of countries of Islam and conversion of the abode of Islam into the abode of war could not be tolerated because of the ignorance created as a result of fanaticism (*taassub*).<sup>162</sup>

One can find many important expressions of İbrahim's intellectual portrait here: he was very much against the spread of the Christian nation in an anti-imperialistic tone. On the other hand, he saw very early the "rise of the West" from a modern perspective. He attributed the rise of Europe to discoveries like some historians of today. He also

---

<sup>162</sup> UH, p. 145-147

recognized changing balance of the power between Ottomans and Europeans because of the latter's exploitation of the New World. It should be a leading thought in Ottoman literature as well as whole European thought: he probably recognized the phenomenon of the rise of the west perhaps earlier than the Europeans themselves. On the other hand, he was very angry about the Muslims because of their ignorance of the conditions of enemies. He attributes this fact to Muslims' fanaticism. This should be also a fresh approach in this century. A critical look from inside the Muslim community was realized by İbrahim Müteferrika. If one does not know the writer of these thoughts about Muslim community he probably would guess that this piece is belonging to a late 19<sup>th</sup> or early 20<sup>th</sup> century Islamic modernist-revivalist movement leader. Whereas, it was written in 1731/1732 by one Ottoman intellectual who was very anxious about the future of the Islamic community. His harsh criticism against Muslims seems again to be a practical matter because he saw that power of the Europe was increasing while the Ottomans' was decreasing so that his advice to know condition of enemies is for the aims of war. However, talking about fanaticism in very early 18<sup>th</sup> century should be read as a critique of the mentality of the Ottoman statesmen as well as intellectuals. Probably, because of that Niyazi Berkes evaluates him as a secular thinker. However, it is impossible to call İbrahim as such just because of the fact that he is against to fanaticism. What İbrahim understood from fanaticism is not one of the religious one as Berkes supposed but it is something about ignorance.

İbrahim trusts God and expresses in a resigned mood that victory and defeat is from the side of God. However, he emphasizes more than his resignation that everything created by God is assigned to certain causes (*esbabına teşebbüs*) and custom of God is based on them (*adetullah bunun üzerine cari*). Thus, it is explicit, İbrahim confirms, that well organized and disciplined armies would be victorious while the one lacks those and ignorant of new tactics and tricks of enemies would be defeated.<sup>163</sup> İbrahim might seem to be a fatalist at first glance; however, he does not build his actions on the wind of the fate alone. On the contrary, he seems to be very careful in terms of taking precautions at the very beginning and behaves according to the "rules of nature and customs of God". He is aware that pure belief would not bring victory unless the ultimate steps taken.

---

<sup>163</sup> UH, p. 148

After his assertion of the necessity of discipline in army, he considers, what will happen if two armies are equal to each other in terms of discipline, organization and numbers. In such condition, victory depends on the appropriateness of decision-making and measure-taking. On all other conditions, the side which is superior to other in discipline would be victorious. He gives, here the example of European internal warfare. They were equal to each other in war tools, discipline and organization so that their wars lasted so long that nobody knows who the victor is and who is the defeated.<sup>164</sup>

For İbrahim, disciplining soldiers would not only lead to victory in war, but also ensure the discipline among the people. There will be no anarchy in a society whose army is under control. He gives his example here again from European history: Roman Empire was constructed by Romulus and their state was built 570 years before the birth of Jesus. Their ruler was called Emperor which is a Latin word meaning one who orders. However, soldiers of the Roman state were undisciplined and their condition expanded into the subjects of the Empire. Thus, a very powerful empire was destructed and burnt by the disarray and conspiracy of the army (*fitne-i asker*). In time, the empire was also divided among the Frankish rulers and the names of Roman emperors remained only in books. Here, capitalizing on his knowledge on Austria he says that in the year of 1278 after the birth of Jesus Roman Empire's heritage was overtaken by the Austrian rulers (*Nemçe Çesarı*). Their dynasty lasted till today because they had their heirs. However, the current ruler does not have his son and the ruler and his wife are desperate about that. He gives his second example from the Byzantine empire- which is called the lesser Rome (*Rumiyyetil Suğra*). They were also glorified and powerful; however, their army was not disciplined and organized so that their rule came to an end. In sum, İbrahim concludes, those European states who adopted new way of army and tactics became victorious while others were erased from the history.<sup>165</sup>

We have to emphasize here the fact that İbrahim chooses most of his examples from European history. He knows very well their history and incorporates relevant examples into his narrative. He chooses especially close foes of Ottomans as examples in order to create a consciousness among them about the history of their enemies. He puts into practice his theory of arousing consciousness about the conditions of the close

---

<sup>164</sup> UH, p. 149

<sup>165</sup> UH, p. 149-152



rivals of Ottomans among Ottomans by this way. He does not only advise certain things to do but also practices himself.

The discipline of the army also serves increase of the well being of the subjects- İbrahim asserts. Order of the soldiers and their equipment is a science (or art) (*ilm-i rasih-ül bünyan*). Thanks to this science, true and false soldiers, those obedient and resistant, talented and fake, useful and harmful could be discerned from each other.<sup>166</sup> We have to think over this phrase a little bit in order to elucidate İbrahim's outlook at military organization. He sees it as a science which means something should be studied as a discipline. He, like his contemporaries in France- Enlightenment thinkers-, believes in scientism. As an amateur scientist himself, tries to analyze everything under a scientific discipline. His acquisition of information about the new military organization of Europe reflects this fact. He studied their books as well as learned from the experts.

On the other hand, he remains within the Islamic discourse in terms of his perception of nature and society. He repeats, for instance, that society is divided into four classes: man of sword, man of pen, man of agriculture and man of commerce. For him, most important class is the first one. Their job is to control other two classes with the consultation of the second class- scholars (*ulema*)- so that justice will be held.<sup>167</sup>

Moreover, an organized, disciplined and ready army would lead to increase in treasury and thwart waste because such soldiers would not need to take any other job and perform his own duties for day and night. He would be also ready to war every time so that state will not encounter with difficulty in terms of recruitment and record of soldiers in times of war and waste extra money.<sup>168</sup>

As we tried to explain above, *UH* is not just a reform treatise, surely more than that, it is a historical essay on events happened in Ottoman Empire till the time this book was written. İbrahim, here again, refers to the Janissaries and their performing two jobs. They seem as Janissaries but work in a different job, they take their money when salaries are paid but not participate in war. They destroy treasury doubly: first, because of taking regular salaries; second, because of violating the rules of artisans and craftsmen. He is not talking about something abstract but referring to real situation.

---

<sup>166</sup> *UH*, p. 152

<sup>167</sup> *UH*, p. 153

<sup>168</sup> *UH*, p. 154

İbrahim states that in order to prevent, change and anarchy in society, everyone should stay in his place. Those who are soldiers and those who are not should be separated from each other strictly. In this way, the country would be affluent and happy.<sup>169</sup> As I argued above, though İbrahim advises reform in military, his perception of Ottoman society is not so much different than Kınalızade or Mustafa Âli. Intermingling of classes leads nothing but anarchy: everyone should live in his own boundaries with his own rules of conduct. Otherwise, rule of anarchy dominates and peace of the subjects vanishes. Therefore, soldiers and the others should be differentiated in terms of their dresses as well as their behaviors. Those who do not belong to military class should not imitate ones who belong. Their quantity and quality should be clear and known so that in peace and in war there would be no disorder (*fitne ve fesad*).

## **2.6: Geography and History at play: Uses of the “sciences”**

I touched upon above İbrahim’s scientific consciousness. However, it would be an exaggeration to identify his view of sciences with the one of the Enlightenment thinkers for instance. As we asserted above many times, he is a standard Ottoman intellectual in various respects. For him, knowledge is not valuable just for itself; he loads practical meanings to sciences. They should serve an aim. In whole book, İbrahim reserves specific place to three of these sciences: the science of military organization, history and geography. His perception of geography- for example- is again very practically political: those who rules the state should know the countries, citadels, borders they have as well as the situations of these borders, the conditions of close foes, their distances, easy roads to pass, conditions of their lands and seas, rivers and mountains and the condition of the people live there so that they can take appropriate decisions. The subject of the science of geography fits with those expectations. Holy war (*cihad*) is a must to all Muslims; however, the most important holy war is to know the conditions of the enemies in the land and the sea. The science of geography serves this aim. Those who govern the state should know the adventures and the events of the world, geography, in this regard, is a mirror showing the world and the situations of the

---

<sup>169</sup> UH, p. 154

people (*mirat-ı alemnüma ve ahval-i akvam-ı zemin-u zaman anda nümayan bir cam-i cihannüma*). Thanks to this science (*fenn*), what is probable and what is impossible can be discerned. For example, if one says that the Muscovite emperor attacked east India, those who knows the distance between these places, would know the impossibility of such news; however those who do not know geographic distance would fell into panic.<sup>170</sup>

İbrahim has also a critique against the Muslim community in terms of their ignorance of this science. Muslims are the best of all people - İbrahim defends-, and the Muslim nations are not confined to the Ottoman Empire. They are scattered around the globe and do not know each other so that they are not able to assist each other. Most of them live under the oppression of the unbelievers desperately.<sup>171</sup> These lines are very crucial and repeated many times in the *UH*. As I discussed above, these thoughts remind us 19<sup>th</sup> century Islamic revivalist thinkers like Cemaleddin Afghani and Muhammad Abduh. They were also complaining about the ignorance of Muslims of knowing each other and lack of assistance and the disagreement among themselves.<sup>172</sup> The essential difference is that İbrahim was cautioning Muslim community two centuries before the emergence of İslamic revivalism after the colonization of the West of Muslims. In this respect, İbrahim should be counted among the pioneers of Islamic revivalism process.

If the science of geography is promoted, it would lead to the unification of the ones who believe in one God as well as their encouraging each other, in this way, they would save themselves from the oppression of the unbelievers. The soldiers who travel both in land and sea and tradesmen of Muslim countries also learn the distances between the lands and seas, diagnose the distance between the countries of foes. They

---

<sup>170</sup> *UH*, p. 155-156

<sup>171</sup> *UH*, p. 156

<sup>172</sup> For the thoughts of Cemaleddin Afgani and Muhammed Abduh see their writings in their periodical that they published in Paris. *Cemaleddin Afgani and Muhammed Abduh, Urvetu'l Vuska* (Istanbul: Bir Yayıncılık, 1987). They also share one of the main thoughts of İbrahim about the harms of European imperialism in Muslim lands. In her influential book, firstly published in 1966, Elie Kedourie discusses that Afgani and Abduh are not Islamic reformers as claimed. She says that the thoughts they published and the ones they really have are completely different. She sees their religious beliefs something close to idolatry and heterodoxy. She argues that they used Orthodox Islamic views just for their political aims. See for the details, Elie Kedourie, *Afghani And 'Abduh: An essay on Religious Unbelief and Political Activism in Modern Islam*, (London: Frank Cass, 1966;1997). For a short story of Afghani And Abduh on Arab movement see Eliezer Tauber, *The Emergence of the Arab Movements* (London: Frank Cass, 1993) pp. 22-24

can avoid from whirlpools and traps; determine the intensity of the winds and learn how to find their ways when they are lost and also coasts and islands.<sup>173</sup>

His critique of Muslims and specifically Ottomans is not just about their disorganization of armies and ignorance of geography and sciences. He complains about the lack of the maps and the books of the seas in the hands of the Ottoman fleet so that they sail around the Mediterranean and the Black Sea aimlessly and need the Frankish maps. However, he says, the science of map-making is an ancient one whose theory (*ilmi*) is written in the books of Islam, however practice (*ameli*) is only possible with drawing. The Christian nation with the help of picture and description put it from abstract to concrete and benefited from it in a short time because, thanks to the map-making, they controlled many new places and discovered new world and found ways to East India and started to control whole globe. However, in order to practice this science, one have to know the science of drawing whose accurateness is bound to the science of printing and impossible to put into practice by relying on the skills of individual engravers and scribes. Columbus (*Kolon*) who discovered the new world with the help of these maps gave priceless opportunity to the Christians because they expanded into unknown places and controlled many others in the East and the West due to these discoveries. He wishes from God that this science may lead to the expansion (*tevessü*) of the Ottoman state.<sup>174</sup>

I already displayed, in the first chapter, that İbrahim was an amateur map-maker. He emphasizes above the importance of printing maps and he put into practice his projects by publishing 4 separate maps and many others included in *Cihannüma* and *Tuhfetül Kibar*. He was complaining about the lack of maps and books of navigations. However, Piri Reis's *Kitab-ı Bahriye*, Ali Macar Reis' Navigational Atlas should be known among Ottomans and these books could fulfill the gap İbrahim complaint. Why did not he publish at least one of them? He did not have probably original copies of these books or he might find these books outdated or simply he did not know them. This should be also valid for the maps. What did Ottoman fleet use as maps? They should have something in their hands, as opposed to İbrahim's claims. For example a Habsburg soldier, agent and intellectual Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli were constantly buying

---

<sup>173</sup> UH, p. 157

<sup>174</sup> UH, p. 158-159

Ottoman geographical materials and maps in his stay in Istanbul in the year 1693.<sup>175</sup> If there are no maps available where did Marsigli get them? However, İbrahim's project aims something else. He, first of all, wants to print correct and accurate maps, secondly, as a result of the first; he wants to spread them to everyone who needs. More important than first two, as a provisionist, he is disturbed from using the maps of Franks and wants to create local and original ones. I asserted above, İbrahim's true recognition of the importance and impact of the discoveries. He is very much against the expansion of the Christians. Though, anti-imperialistic in tone, his disdain against the spread of the West is again just for a practical aim. In his pray, he wants from God to expand Muslims into these places.

There is no doubt that, İbrahim's perception of geography is same with the one of Katip Çelebi. He was probably influenced from the thoughts on geography of Çelebi. Çelebi, in his preface of *Tuhfetül Kibar*, emphasizes the importance of this science for state officials. They should know descriptions of their own countries so that they can easily penetrate into the borders of enemies and preserve own borders. He stresses, like İbrahim stressed, that infidels expanded into New World due to the science of geography. He gives the example of Venice. They were no more than a dukedom (*dükalık*), but now started to harass the Ottoman country from sea.<sup>176</sup>

Apart from geography and military science, history is also one of these practical disciplines in İbrahim's narrative. According to him, history is a lesson-giving (*ibretnüma*) and insight-increasing (*basiret-feza*) science (*ilm*). It is also value-increasing (*refi'ul-kadr*) and highly esteemed (*celil-ül itibar*) discipline. Most importantly, those who govern the state should absolutely know it (*ilm-u marifeti vacib*) because it is a real guide (*rehber-i hakikatperver*) for them.<sup>177</sup> Probably, İbrahim adopted Katip Çelebi again in his understanding of history. In his *Fezleke*, Çelebi emphasizes the importance of the science of history. He sees it as something teaching

---

<sup>175</sup> John Stoye, *Marsigli's Europe 1680-1730: The Life and Times of Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli, Soldier and Virtuoso* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1994) p. 118. It is surprising to note the similarity of the careers of Marsigli (1658-1730) and İbrahim. Though Marsigli is more prolific as a writer than İbrahim and he is a general rather than a simple soldier, they are both soldiers, sent to diplomatic missions, agents of their states, bibliophiles, amateur geographers and map-makers. Both wrote a book on Ottoman military structure. İbrahim's *Usul* and Marsigli's *Stato militare dell Imperio Ottomanno, incremento e decremento del medesimo* (The Hague and Amsterdam, 1732) were interestingly published in the same year though Marsigli wrote his book approximately half a century earlier than İbrahim. Marsigli's book is in Italian.

<sup>176</sup> Katip Çelebi, *Tuhfetül Kibar*, (Orhan Şaik Gükyay edition), p. 5

<sup>177</sup> *UH*, p. 159

experiences of the past which will guide in future acts.<sup>178</sup> İbrahim was influenced from Naima too in terms of his conception of the history as a practical science. Naima touches upon the benefits of the history at the beginning of his history. He says that history is beneficial for everybody. It increases intelligence of the scholars and opens eyes of reasonable people; it teaches layman previous events while high men learn from it secrets. Those who know this science learn truths in the change of the ages so that they learn what happened to preceding nations and the reasons of their decay.<sup>179</sup> *Nasihatname* writers, who we will be dwelled on the next chapter, also attribute same meaning to history and some of them evaluate knowledge of history as one of the main requirements that a king should have. For example Mustafa Ali in his *Nasihat-üs Selatin*, says that Sultan should read history in his spare time.<sup>180</sup> The unknown writer of the *Kitab-ı Müstetab* states that examining the history books of the previous just rulers is the task of the Sultan.<sup>181</sup>

Geography, on the other hand, helps to discipline (*zabt-u rabt*) the science of history, for İbrahim. For example, one who heard the adventure of the history of a previous nation and tribe would open the book of geography and find the place of this tribe so he can be informed as if he was there. As a second example, if there is a fire in a city, those who do not know the distances between places could not find the road to exit. In the time of war, distances and destinations, deserts and mountains, straits and villages should be pictured and printed and everyone should take one copy of it so that they could know the easy and difficult ways, farness and closeness, and the conditions of their destinations-which can only be provided by the science of geography. However, İbrahim is aware, it is impossible for one engineer to picture such a big city like Istanbul without any mistakes so that maps are not excepted from such mistakes, even the Christians, though they work very hard on this job could not make absolutely correct maps. On the other hand, İbrahim increases doses of his critique; Muslims even did not attempt to map their own countries. They have some descriptive books but they are full of mistakes. Nonetheless, despite their mistakes, it is not true not to use them because they are better than none. These maps are also used in terms of resolution of the

---

<sup>178</sup> Excerpt from Arabic *Fezleke* on history. *Katip Çelebiden Seçmeler*, p. 187-188

<sup>179</sup> *Tarih-i Naima* (Zuhuri Danışman edition), p. 30

<sup>180</sup> *Mustafa Ali's Counsel for Sultans of 1581*, 2 volumes ed. tr. Andreas Tietze (Wien, 1979), v. 1 p. 39

<sup>181</sup> *Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilatına Dair Kaynaklar: Kitab-ı Müstetab, Kitabu Mesalihi'l Müslimin ve Menafi'il Müminin, Hırzû'l Müluk* ed. Yaşar Yücel (Ankara: TTK, 1988). *Kitab-ı Müstetab*, p. 17

conflicts on the borders between the states. However, it is impossible to picture every small place, in this condition; it is a custom to call someone who knows this place in order to avoid mistakes. The books on the description of countries are numerous in Ottoman hands and there are also many people who are talented in these jobs. First of all, this science-geography- should be constructed and then mistakes would be corrected by those talented people.<sup>182</sup>

## **2.7: Reconstructing military change from the perspective of İbrahim Müteferrika**

Needless to say, most inventive and promising part of the İbrahim's book concerns with the change in the Ottoman and European armies. Though it carries some analytical look at these armies, İbrahim was Ottoman-centric in his analyses. I talked above about his true recognition of the change of military organization and structure. For him, in the past, cannons and rifles were few in Christian armies and most of the fight was done with swords. In this art of swordsmanship (*şimşirbazlık*), people of Islam were clearly superior to Christians. The latter was always in fear. They scattered around the globe but had not found any solution to stop Ottomans for a long time. Then, they consulted with each other in order to solve this problem and came to a decision that after perfecting their cannons and rifles, they also had to put complete and sound order (*nizam-ı tamm ve tertib-i kaviyyül erkan*) to their soldiers so that soldiers can not escape from fighting because of fear and they can resist against the soldiers of Islam. İbrahim admires this process by the way of emphasizing that this condition of the ordering soldiers came to a point that it became a separate science and books were written on it. He says -in conclusion- the new organization of the European armies is the real factor that keeps Ottoman army from progress. He mentions his conversations with the officers of Christians many times and is sure that if soldiers of Islam had adopted this new order they would not had been defeated because brave and fearless soldiers are countless in army of the Islam whereas there is no one in the army of Christians. It is so clear that- İbrahim assures the reader- if two sides are called for duel there will be many braves from the side of Muslim who are eager to fight whereas no one would volunteer from the side of Christians and they use their rifles treacherously from distance and

---

<sup>182</sup> UH, p. 159-162

martyr those brave soldiers. The Christian nations do not have their rules of living cited in their holy books so that their order of state is based on their own reason. In addition to this, since they do not have any worry about the hereafter what they do is for this world and specific to situation they come across. However, holy war is a must for the Muslims whose benefits in the world is known and merit in the other world is acclaimed. Moreover, people of Islam are courageous and strong-hearted at birth as opposed to infidels who were by nature ill-created and fearfully born. One can compare them in terms of their garments. The soldiers of Islam are lightly costumed while infidels are heavily garmented because of their fear. This situation makes Muslims' acts quick while foes can not move easily and tire frequently in war.<sup>183</sup>

His opinions about the dichotomous nature of Muslims and Christians are Ottoman-centric as well as they are essentialist. Muslims are essentially courageous while infidels are fearful at birth. His anthropological perspective is constructed with these binary oppositions. Nonetheless, his early recognition of Europe's secularization process deserves attention. He is a real pioneer in terms of truly understanding European change. Reason starts in this century to take the role of religion and never leave its place to anything else forever in Europe. However, İbrahim sees it as something advantageous for Muslims against "infidels". What would become a big advantage in future for Europeans –i.e. basing state structure on reason but not religion- was a disadvantage for İbrahim who believed the great acquisition can not be acquired in this world but rather in the other.

The lines above are also crucial in terms of understanding his look at historical evolution; he attributes change in European military organization directly to Ottomans: Europeans adopted this new order because Ottomans forced them to do so. What changed in European warfare is not because of their internal evolution but external pressure.

İbrahim states that those who are experienced and knowledgeable in the matter of the warfare as practiced by Europeans and Ottomans said that Ottoman soldier's victory against disciplined armies lies in forthcoming adjustments: Ottomans should adopt two strategies in order to defeat organized and ordered army of the foe: first one is fast and quick attack with swords and the second one is cutting roads in which foe's war materials are carried, distancing them from forests and forcing them to walk in open

---

<sup>183</sup> *UH*, p. 162-166



areas. In the first strategy, soldiers of Islam should attack quickly as a unique body with ordered manner so that they can destruct first line of the enemy's army and the second and the third and the others can not find opportunity to help them. Christian soldiers will escape in such condition because they are naturally and in birth cowards. Moreover, the conditions of the war field and the direction of the wind should be investigated carefully and if the situation does not permit, war should be postponed. However, if it is impossible to order army of Islam, second strategy should be put into practice: face to face fight should be abandoned and wings of the foe should be destructed with hit and run tactic and should be forced to walk in open areas. The numbers of Muslim soldiers need not to be high but they have to be disciplined and their commander in chief should be aware of the conditions of the enemy. It is not sufficient to have disciplined and ordered army but there should be also soldiers who must destroy munitions of the enemies in peace and devastate their countries. More important than anything else – İbrahim claims- a state should know its own capacities and capabilities, if not it will be defeated by even weak forces. What is granted by God to Ottomans had not been given to any other country neither in sea nor in land, neither in munitions of war and treasure and cash, nor in ammunitions and equipment of soldiers. Thus, İbrahim assures, why the infidels started to defeat Ottomans is because of the latter's ignorance of knowing the conditions of their foes and the former's highly disciplined and unified soldiers.<sup>184</sup>

What is very vital above is İbrahim does not only put emphasis on the importance of knowing the conditions of the enemies, he also call attention to the essentiality of one's recognizing own limits. It will become frustrating to attack your foe if you do not know what you have and what you have not, what are your superiorities and what are your weaknesses. In this regard, İbrahim's suggestions are not heroic though sometimes essentialist. One has to refer to his reason in order to decide further actions.

İbrahim's diagnosis of the problems of the Muslim community makes his book one of the important essays and reform/counsel books of the age. Christians do not have their rules of conduct given in their holy books while in Koran everything happened and will happen is written. The problems in the Ottoman body are not originated from the holy law (*sharia*) but: (1) defectiveness in the practice of the shariat, (2) ignorance in practicing justice, (3) tolerance in disciplining, (4) assigning important tasks to

---

<sup>184</sup> UH, 167-170

undeserving people, (5) lack of consultation, (6) failing to put into practice what experienced and sagacious people advised, (7) looseness in organizing soldiers and ignorance in using new war tools, (8) soldiers' lack of fear from their officers and their inclination to take bribes and ignorance of their own task.<sup>185</sup>

The problems enumerated above are uttered by nearly all the *nasihatname* writers of the previous two centuries. Thus, what differentiates İbrahim from them is not his diagnoses because diagnose was already made. İbrahim emphasized more than anyone else the changing role of the military in state-making and drew the attention to external threat rather than internal causes. Since I will discuss the connection between *nasihatname* writers and İbrahim in the next chapter, suffice it here to say that he was not the first person who recognized ills of the Muslim community.

İbrahim, then, introduces the main structure of the new organization of the armies according to the information he got from experts of this strange science (*fenn-i garib*): first of all, divisions (*orta, bölük*) consist of one or two thousand soldiers, however it is better to have five hundred and there should be many officers in these divisions so that officers know their privates personally and employ them according to their talents. In time of need, they can be ordered in rows quickly. Secondly, costumes they wear in a certain division should be uniquely colored and cut so that strangers can not infiltrate into and if they do, they can be easily discerned and punished. If divisions are not organized in this manner, there would be many fugitives. Thirdly, there should be five hundred long muskets in a five hundred division and all of them should be equal in weight and height as well as in their powder capacity so that they can load and shot, lift and lower uniquely. They can be ordered easily in this way and those who counter should be punished. In addition to that, cavalry should have also five hundred muskets as well as one pistol for each soldier. In countries that have large population soldiers are recruited according to their height so that soldiers can be equal to each other in every respect. Fourthly, in a division consists five hundred soldiers, there should be at least forty officers in order to discipline remaining privates. Officers should be two kinds also, first one like the corporals should fight with their privates and the second group in middle, right and left should follow the foe and deal with order of the soldiers and their discharge and punish the ones who are faulty.

---

<sup>185</sup> UH, p. 171

After introducing their basic organization, İbrahim lists what should be done in terms of establishing these rules: the rules of war should be read at least once a month to soldiers so that every one should know own task and those who do not obey should be punished. The officers should be ordered strictly according to their hierarchy. Their wages should also be arranged according to their ranks so that they do not covet the stipends of soldiers because of greed. Yet, there is no problem with promotion money (*teşvik ulufesi*) which should be same for all. However, for the officers it should be again given according to their hierarchy. Officers should have right to grant officer-ship to privates who are useful in war and other officers should be promoted so that they would be acclaimed and honored. Fifthly, there should be two regiments in war: first regiment should counteract against the regiment of the foe. This first regiment should appear in the war arena in a row and disciplined according to the order and quantity of the enemy. They should walk together in rows like the rows of Muslims in pray. Nobody is allowed to quit rows or be late when proceeding because it causes destruction in the order of the lines. The second regiment should walk behind the first one in quiescence and assists them. They should fill the gaps occurred in the first row because of deaths. The order will break down if people try to hold deaths. In this situation, affection to one is treason to all. If two regiments are ordered and organized in this manner second one immediately fills the gaps in the first and order can not be violated. If the second regiment displays looseness, they are punished after war. This order of regiments is beneficial for the chief-officers more than anyone else because in time of war, it is very difficult to control people. This order will protect officers from accusations. Though they have sagacious thinking it is impossible to discern faulty. A head-officer should not be punished because of a single fault because it is impossible for a person to know and control everything.<sup>186</sup>

One who read the lines above is surprised when he sees what a modern way İbrahim suggests. Everything should be unique and standard, there should be promotion based on meritocracy, rules of conduct should be known, and strict system of punishment should be applied for all. There is no doubt that what can summarize something modern can be summarized in one phrase: UNIFORMITY. Uniformity of uniforms, nation, flag, language, soldiers. Everything should be standardized. İbrahim, in this sense, advises a modern organization in army. We asserted above that *UH* is not

---

<sup>186</sup> *UH*, p. 172-177

just a reform treatise but it is also a historical essay of events in recent times in the Ottoman Empire: what İbrahim tries to show here is how Ottoman army is destroyed. The problem is not on the level of privates (*neferat*) but officers (*zabitan*). Officers are appropriating salaries of their soldiers so; first of all, they should be satisfied so that they do not lead to disorganization in army because of their greed. Those who deserves should be promoted and given ranks.<sup>187</sup>

İbrahim's obsession with order is apparent above. Soldiers should rank like the community in prayer (*namaz*). Violating order is prohibited so strict that affection is not a virtue here but a weakness, to feel sorry for someone is treason to whole community. Apart from uniformity İbrahim acclaimed too much, reason should serve soldiers in war, nothing else.

It is noteworthy here that İbrahim's suggestions are designed especially for officers as we discussed above. It is not just to punish an officer because of his mistake. *UH* again serves here as an account describing the political climate of the age: it is not just to rotate neither soldiers nor rulers because of their mistakes which is inherent in human nature. His point not only describes frequent rotation of offices in this century but also puts a critical remark on it.

His example to this fact is from again the European history: France and Spain became enemies in the past, the French king appointed an experienced and dexterous soldier as chief-officer to his army. Though this commander applied everything needed he had been defeated during seven years. Thus, the people of France summoned and demanded from King to dismiss this commander. However, the king was a sagacious man who said that humans are not exempted from committing mistakes. The commander also learned seven tricks of the enemy in seven years and at the end, his army became victorious so the king's decision to keep the commander in office was proved to be right.<sup>188</sup>

---

<sup>187</sup> Paul Rycaut in his valuable account on the military organization of the Ottomans in the second half of the 17th century reserves a certain place to the issue of the "degeneration" of the Janissaries in which he asserted how Janissaries are excluded from promotion which led their further alination from the Empire: "The particular means whereby the Janissaries have been studioudly destroyed, are by many ways evident, for first, they are exposed upon every obscure service, and drawn forth to encounter every assault of the empire...who were formerly reserved for times of eminent exploits and glory...sixthly, hope of reward and fear of punishment which are the incitements to worthy actions and restrictions from the vilest crimes are rarely held up to Janaissaries in these times for their encouragement or terrour...". Rycaut, *ibid*, p. 197-198

<sup>188</sup> *UH*, p. 177-178

Frequent rotation of officers had been one of the major problems that *nasihatname* writers observed beginning with Lütü Paşa. They are all against to frequent changes in posts which they believed caused to devastation of the country and officers' suppression of subjects and their misappropriations of taxes in order to collect more money before losing their posts. They were especially concerned with the change in the office of the grand vizierate. They were also disturbed because posts had been given to people who do not deserve.<sup>189</sup> İbrahim seems in the same line of thinking with the writers before him. He criticizes rulers because of their impatience to commanders.

After İbrahim completed his suggestions, he tries to introduce exact names and the structure of the regiments of the Christian nations. He uses here exact European names which is a fact make us suspicious about thinking he borrowed these terms from a certain source that he read. There are three classes in their army-İbrahim informs:- first one is infantry (*piyade*), second one is cavalry (*süvari*) and the third one is both. The first one consists of single privates called “*soltad*”. They have only long rifles (*boy tüfengi*) and bayonets (*bayluneta*) which soldiers carry in their waists. In time of need, they put it to rifle and prod enemies. Their talent is turning left and right quickly after they shot and load their guns immediately. There are also grenadiers (*granadiyer*) whose number is limited. They were chosen among strong “*soltad*”s. They are two or three hundred in a two thousand regiment. They carry hand grenades and they are located in both sides of the regiments. The second class is called dragoons (*drağon*) who are cavalry in fact; however, they change into infantry in time of need. Their weapons are a rifle, a gun and a dagger (*paluş*). They have also axes in order to dig trenches and cut trees. Third class is cavalry (*kavalariya*). Their soldiers are called *raytar* and *korajı*. Their weapon is a carbine (*karabina*) which is shorter than the rifle of the infantry. They have also two pistols and daggers. These strong soldiers war with their rifles most of the time they use daggers only when their foes come too close. All the tasks in war are done by these three classes including digging trenches and sewers. They choose their soldiers from villages because they are accustomed to work while people living in cities are inclined to comfort.<sup>190</sup>

---

<sup>189</sup> Lütü Paşa, *Asafname* ed. Ahmet Uğur (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1982) p. 16; *Mustafa Ali's Counsel for Sultans of 1581*, 2 volumes ed. tr. Andreas Tietze (Wien, 1979). *V.1* p. 63; Koçi Bey, *Koçi Bey Risalesi* ed. Ali Kemali Aksüt (İstanbul: 1939) p. 72.

<sup>190</sup> *UH*, p. 179-180

This phrase also completes İbrahim's anthropological perspective which is based on binary oppositions: those who live in villages are naturally workers while city-dwellers are conformists. (*Zira bilad ehli her yerde ten-perver ve rahat-perest olub, karye halkı ise renç-berliği ve ırgadlığı hin-i sabavetten itiyad etmekle ta'b-u meşakkate ziyade tahammül ederler*)

Their regiments are not fixed and consist five hundred, a thousand, two thousand and more people. However, all regiments are divided into battalions, one hundred soldiers for each or eighty cavalries. Their rule is that one fourth of their regiments is composed of officers from all ranks so that they can control and discipline soldiers.<sup>191</sup> They appoint one commander to forty and fifty thousand soldiers and there are also thirty agile people whom he consulted from the experienced and intelligent man. The commander should take his decision by the consultation of this group. They have something called watchwords. They are very strict at determining that. In time of war, everyday a certain phrase is chosen as a password and everyone is informed about that and there are watchman placed in all places that the army settled. They ask the watchword when someone stranger comes, if he says the watchword correct they allow him to pass and if not they kill him so that strangers can not infiltrate in army. They sometimes change the watchword twice in a night if it is necessary.<sup>192</sup>

İbrahim introduced here-may be for the first time in Ottoman military writing-original names and methods of European military organization. He was constantly cautioning about the danger of enemies' taking information (*dil almak*) from the Muslim soldiers. He introduces here watchword as a real precaution to that danger.

Soldiers of Christian nations –İbrahim declares-either study the science of war or watch in the doors of their officers in time of peace and war. They also practice the laws of war and rituals of campaigns. They take attendance even before campaign and strictly obey the rules of password. They are also strict in terms of keeping their order and inspecting frequently their soldiers so that strangers can not penetrate into their armies. They especially preserve themselves from giving information to enemies while they are very good at taking from foes. Their arrangement in war is like this: assume 12000 soldiers are fighting against same amount. Half of them become first division and they

---

<sup>191</sup> İbrahim seems right that on the eve of the war of Austrian succession (1740-48) French army had an officer for every eleven enlisted man. Larry H. Addington, *The Patterns of War Through the Eighteenth Century*, Indiana University Press (Indiana and Bloomington, 1990), p. 119

<sup>192</sup> *UH*, p. 180-182

are also arranged in four, five, or six rows. Remaining half become bottom regiment and they are also arranged in same style with the front regiment. They proceed together and bottom regiment never fires their guns unless they came face to face with the enemy, however, music of their war band is heard. The first row in the first regiment fires together when they encounter with the foe and they kneel down and go back so that second row substitute first and they also fire together uniquely and third row replaces them. The other rows also follow up same steps. Since they are well organized, they do not have any problem with the practice of this system. If there is a gap in the front line, the bottom line assists the front one. Those who do not adjust and violate the rule are killed by his officer immediately. If they are defeated they do not break their order, if they defeat; they do not run after their enemy because their order can be violated because of dispersion.<sup>193</sup>

It is explicit that İbrahim was aware of the discussion about the reorganization of Ottoman army among Ottomans themselves. Some claims that – İbrahim adds- the way of fighting of the previous sultans was sufficient enough because if there is a need in the past, these sultans can extract it from shariat and practice according to it. Soldiers of Christian armies are mainly mercenaries and it is more beneficial for the Ottomans to pull them into their armies through offering them double of their wages and continue to give after the war ended so that their information can be used. On the other hand, some claims that Ottomans are superior to all other foes in terms of mobilizing soldiers and it will not last so long to conscript soldiers and educate them according to new order of Christians.<sup>194</sup>

İbrahim defends the second side clearly and he is a harsh critique of the first mentality. He wrote his book in order to consolidate the necessity of the second idea. His example is again from Europe: The Muscovites were ill created and shameful (*zelil ve rezil ve itibardan kalmış bir taife-i hakaret-ayin ve na-hoş sıfat*) and they were afraid of participating into any war only a century ago. However, a certain tsar came and organized their army along the European lines. He attracted experts of war in land and sea from many places including England and Netherlands. They started to control many places in Europe as well as expanded into east. They opened Caspian Sea into trade and

---

<sup>193</sup> UH, p. 183-185

<sup>194</sup> UH, p. 186-188

constructed a strong navy there. He called engineers and measured the limits of this sea and expanded into *Ajemestan and Dagestan*.<sup>195</sup>

The expansion of Russia occupies a strong place in İbrahim's anti-expansionist thinking. He was not only disturbed by the expansion of the West but also of the East. He looks with disdain to Muscovites whom he thought ill created but also appreciates them because of their quick adoption of new military organization. He was one of the very early intellectuals who are aware of this expansion and caution statesmen about it. He gives Russia as an example to them in order to show how a weak state can defeat their enemies via adopting this new order of armies and become a strong political power through expanding its own territories. The tsar he mentioned was Peter the Great who reorganized Russian army with new conscription system he introduced.<sup>196</sup>

It is very interesting to note that İbrahim demands from the philanthropists/owner of the donations to donate their properties and cash to military in order to reinforce regiments.<sup>197</sup> This suggestion should be a very new approach in terms of financing the soldiers. The classical *timariot* army based on land was already decomposed and the state had acute cash problem in supplying armies. In such a condition, as a solution, İbrahim yearn for donations to army which was probably never demanded in such manner before. If the viziers and household leaders knew order is the most outstanding necessity and a well-ordered army is important than anything else, they also manage their own retinues in this manner- İbrahim defends. Ottoman soldiers are themselves inclined to accept order naturally (*bizzat ve bittab*). If they are organized in this manner foes will bring the keys of their cities to Ottomans because they can not stand against Ottoman attacks.

---

<sup>195</sup> UH, p. 189-190. For an analysis of the change in the European tactics of war against Ottomans between 16th and 18th centuries see. V.J. Parry, "Manierre de Combattre" in *War, Technology and Society in the Middle East*, ed. V.J.Parry and M.E. Yapp (London: Oxford University Press, 1975). pp. 218-257. Writing a history of military change needs a special care because most of the time histories of wars are written with reference to eye-witnesses and accounts of one side of the war. However, a war is more complex than a subjective account might tell us. For example Parry's article on the Manners of combat between 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries in Europe against Ottomans is a successful one in terms of giving us thoughts of the Europeans about the military (de)organization of Ottomans, however, it is full of subjective material which reduces Ottoman military organization to a total disorder-ness. For a more complete analysis of European Warfare between 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries see Jeremy Black, *European Warfare 1660-1815* (London: UCL Press, 1994)

<sup>196</sup> For a useful analysis of the changing military structures of three important powers of Europe- Austrians, Russians and Ottomans- see Virginia Aksan, "Locating the Ottomans among the early modern empires", *Journal of Early Modern History*, 3:2, 1999, p. 103-134

<sup>197</sup> UH, p. 191



## 2.8: A reassessment of Ottoman military change departure from *Usulü'l Hikem*

The Ottoman military change has been one of the highly debated problematic subjects of the Ottoman history.<sup>198</sup> How can one assess Ottomans' position in an age change is constant and irretrievable? Why did Ottomans have a big problem in terms of adopting new military tactics and why did not they convert their army in to a brand new shape? Was it because of Ottoman's inability to adopt new developments and new military technologies [under the general reference of Ottoman's incapability to create a Scientific Revolution] or was it due to more general and global process that Europe experienced itself as the centre while leaving Ottomans at the periphery of this continuum? Or was it a matter of culture to adopt new tactics [based on the assumption that Ottomans were not backward in terms of using new war tools and technologies]? Rhoads Murphey in his encompassing study on Ottoman warfare between 1500 and 1700 asserts:

In general terms, Ottoman artillery practice in 17<sup>th</sup> century coincided with the European practice. As for the standards of production and general capabilities of the Ottoman weapons, it seems they were also broadly comparable with those commonly found in Europe at the time. Around the Thirty Years War European muskets using bullets weighing approximately one and a third ounces (12 dirhems or about 38.5 grams) had an effective range of 220-70 yards (approximately 201-47 meters). By comparison, the range of the muskets in use by the Ottomans about the time of the siege of Vienna was approximately a fifth greater, capable of delivering their loads, according to Western military observers, a distance of up to 300 meters.<sup>199</sup>

That Ottomans failed to adjust their army with new military organization is a common point shared by all the intellectuals writing on this matter. For example, V.J. Parry who wrote a concise essay on the changing manners of warfare in Europe by this time espouses:

---

<sup>198</sup> For a classical but still unchallenged account of Ottoman military see İ.H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilatından: Kapukulu Ocakları* (Ankara:TTK, 1988). For an analysis of Ottoman military transformation in 17<sup>th</sup> century see Halil İnalcık, "Military Transformation in the Ottoman Empire 1600-1700", *Archivum Ottomanicum* IV (1980), pp. 283-337 and "The sociopolitical effects of the diffusion of fire-arms in the Middle East" in *War, Technology and Society in the Middle East* ed. V.J.Parry and M.E. Yapp, (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), pp. 164-195. For a brief description of the Ottoman warfare after the conquest of Istanbul till 19<sup>th</sup> century see Virginia Aksan "Ottoman war and warfare 1453-1812" in *War in the Early Modern World*, (London: UCL Press, 1999), pp. 147-175. See also Pal Fodor, *In the quest of golden Apple: Imperial Ideology, Politics and Military Administration in the Ottoman Empire*, (Istanbul: , ISIS Press, 2000). For a short review of the books on Ottoman land military in the last decade see Virginia Aksan, *Journal of Early Modern History* (6,1), pp. 52-62

<sup>199</sup> Rhoads Murphey, *Ottoman Warfare 1500-1700*, (London: UCL Press, 1999), p.111

In Europe technological advance led to tactical revolution. Improved weapons, e.g. cannon easier to handle and move, hand-guns more rapid and accurate in their fire, made it possible to create new and co-ordinated systems of alignment and manoeuvre. The exploitation of these capacities became so refined and elaborate as to constitute an “art of warfare”. As long as the technological standards current in Europe remained at a “primitive” level, it was feasible for the Ottomans, through continued borrowing, to reach and maintain a parallel effectiveness in war... To preserve an equal status with the armies of Europe the Ottomans, henceforth, would have to take over not alone the artifacts, but also the “art of war”, not guns alone but generals-to assimilate in short the latest tactics as well as the latest weapons used in Christendom.<sup>200</sup>

Rhoads Murphey agrees with this opinion though he is very critical against the comparison of scientific usage in Ottoman military technology with Europe which he thought was comparable:

As in all matters military in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, however, what mattered most was not the technical specifications of or the theoretical capabilities of the standard issue weaponry, but the manner as well as conditions of their use in actual combat situations.<sup>201</sup>

Understanding Ottoman position in changing military structure and tactics of the age seems a problem difficult to understand with single component as a unit of analysis. The answer to question why Ottomans did not adopt new military tactics easily should be investigated in the military structure of the Ottoman Empire. Based on a fief-based army at least three centuries, it was difficult for Ottomans to adopt a war tactic based on infantry/artillery. Slow transformation of the Ottoman army was not because of Ottomans’ unawareness of the changing tactics but because of the structure of the Ottoman military system. Financing the army with land in an age cash economy is the only way of centralization was absolutely outdated. Supplying armies with cash was the main problem of all empires in this age and Ottomans were not exception to this fact. Using new muskets did not require high skills or long education process as opposed to using swords which requires strength, stamina and apprenticeship. Ottoman army mainly composed by the latter group was really difficult to convert. Explicitly enough, changing Ottoman military tactics and warfare structure meant to change whole Ottoman fiscal and political organization. That Ottomans could not change their way of fight did not derive from the fact that they did not know how to deal with it- at least we have examples like İbrahim who know and show it- but dealing with it is a more grand problem than a simple re-organization. Reform struggles in 18<sup>th</sup> century and failed one

---

<sup>200</sup> V.J. Parry, “Manierre de Combattre” in *War, Technology and Society in the Middle East*, p. 255

<sup>201</sup> Murphey, *ibid*, same page.

of Selim III are concrete examples of this fact. This fact finds itself realized in the words of Jeremy Black very well:

...while earlier European conquests could in most cases rely on superior technology, those of the period 1660-1815 reflected not only superior technology but also a superiority in military technique (broadly conceived to include drill, cartography, logistics and financial institutions as well as tactics) which was more difficult to transfer or replicate than technology, resting as it did on the foundations of centuries of European social and institutional change.<sup>202</sup>

Let's say it more clearly: what is needed by the Ottomans in order to adopt new military organization and tactics is nothing than creating a modern state- which surely İbrahim was aware though he could not utter it loudly.

## **2.9: Some preliminary thoughts about a new text belong to İbrahim Müteferrika?**

Mustafa Nuri Paşa in his *Netayic-ül Vukuat* mentions a reform proposal (*layiha*) which he said written by Damad İbrahim in order to persuade statesmen about signing a peace treaty with Austrians in the war between 1716 and 1718.<sup>203</sup> This proposal can be found in the *Vekayiname* of Vak'anüvis Sahaflar Şeyhizade Kadiasker Esad Mehmed Efendi, however, Esad Efendi claims that this piece is written by some reasonable men and presented to Sultan Ahmed III through Damad İbrahim.<sup>204</sup> What is important for our purpose here is that this treatise is probably belonging to İbrahim Müteferrika. Niyazi Berkes and Faik Reşit Unat who transcribed this treatise already said before that this treatise might have been inspired by İbrahim Müteferrika but they hesitated to utter that it was written by him. Departing from his opinions in *Usul-ül Hikem* I argue that this work belongs to İbrahim. If it is not belonging to him, he might have dictated it to another person to write. What enforces us to think that this piece is written by İbrahim is that thoughts mentioned in this text are same with the ones in *UH*. If this text was not written by him, this fact nullifies all our thoughts about the originality of İbrahim's book.

---

<sup>202</sup> Jeremy Black, *European Warfare*, p. 16

<sup>203</sup> Mustafa Nuri Paşa, *Netayic-ül Vukuat*, p. 35

<sup>204</sup> Faik Reşit Unat, "Ahmet III. Devrine Ait Bir Islahat Takriri: Muhayyel Bir Mülakatın Zabıtları", *Tarih Vesikaları* (1:2) Haziran 1941-Mayıs 1942, p. 107. I will refer this text as IT (*Islahat Takriri*) hereafter.

This proposal was written in a very interesting format: as an interview. Such a style seems very innovative in this age if it was really written in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. In the interview, one Ottoman soldier and one Christian one (probably not real but imaginary) discuss the problem of Ottoman military and the question why the Ottomans started to be defeated by Austrians for a while. Ottoman soldier declares that he had spent his time for holy war since his childhood but he also confesses that he does not know the new tactics and tools that Christian armies started to use. In addition, he avows, Ottomans had been constantly defeating Austrians (*Nemçeliler*) beginning with the coming out of Ottoman Empire till the sultanate of Suleiman. However, after the campaign of *Bec*, he says, Austrians started to be superior over Ottomans. He asks his Christian counterpart the reason of this change.<sup>205</sup>

In his answer to this question the Christian person emphasizes that his livelihood is also military. He adds, he does not really know the situation of army of Islam and he could not rely on the information given by Austrians because they are rivals of Ottomans, therefore, he assures that he can not say anything about a topic that he does not know (*mechulüm olan umurda cerhü tadil kanuni hikmete muhaliftir*). On the other hand, he emphasizes that he know very well Christian countries because of his frequent travels and because he conversed too much with their state elites, thus he states, he can inform his Muslim counterpart about the military structures of Christian nations. However, first of all, he demands from his counterpart to eliminate his suspicions about Ottomans' inclination to peace with Austrians although they have a chance to defeat them because Franks and Hungarians were suppressing Austrians from both sides. The Muslim soldier says that, "I think you are talking about the peace of Karlowitz. All the points you mentioned were presented to grand vizier Hüseyin Paşa, however, he is inclined to peace because of these reasons: to provide security of people, to increase treasury and decrease anarchy, so Hüseyin Paşa concluded that peace is better than anything else. The Ottoman soldier asserts that he also agrees with the arguments of Hüseyin Paşa because the flock/subjects (*reaya*) are trusts of God and they might be destroyed because of the war and their properties would be destroyed which may cause disorder among people. He says that those who are prone to peace are always superior to ones opposite in every age because preferring the results known to unknown is the

---

<sup>205</sup> *IT*, p. 108

essence of goodness.<sup>206</sup> It is very interesting to note that Christian soldier approves thoughts of his interviewer through emphasizing how Ottomans are just and reasonable in their decisions. He also prays from God to continue the caliphate.<sup>207</sup>

The Christian soldier, then, asks another question: Other states do not rotate their administrators unless they are dead or commit a big fault, why do the Ottomans change their functionaries so frequent and is not it a reason for disorder to do like that? The Muslim one replies to this question as that offices are too few in the Ottoman Empire, however, those talented and deserving people are too many. In other states, rule is based on inheritance which passes from one generation to other which is a fact does not necessitate something like rotation. However, in the Ottoman Empire it is based on the decisions of the individuals. What is problematic is the incapability of discerning ones who do not deserve these positions from the ones who deserve. If discerning the goods from the bad can be achieved, the disadvantages associated with frequent change can be eliminated.<sup>208</sup>

The Muslim soldier complains about that they went too far from their main topic and repeats his first question of why Ottomans started to be defeated. The Christian one again asserts that the glories of Ottomans are written in the history books of Christians. According to him, first and foremost problem of Ottomans is faultiness in practicing holy law (shariat) and lack of conforming old laws/customs ( *evvela mūraati merasimi şeriatte kusurunuz, saniyen kavanini kadimeye ademi şuurunuz*). However, previous holy warriors were very good at the art of war as well as in practicing holy law and disciplining soldiers. Their officers were honest, devout, reasonable and courageous individuals, their main occupation was *ghaza* and profit was plundering the goods of enemies. They were not concerned with commerce or agriculture and they were modest in terms of disciplining their soldiers. The privates were obeying their officers while officers had affection against their soldiers. They were united. Austrians were desperate about fighting with these soldiers of Islam face to face and they started to construct cannons and rifles in order to endure attacks of Muslims. They started to organize their soldiers under strict discipline and work very hard in war and peace in order to use new tools. They wrote books and opened factories on it so that they started to be perfect in

---

<sup>206</sup> *IT*, p. 109

<sup>207</sup> *IT*, p. 110

<sup>208</sup> *IT*, p. 111

the art of war because of their hard-working. The Ottoman soldiers, on the other hand, did not adopt it because of their ignorance. If the Ottomans studied hard on perfection of their armies they would be certainly successful. Christians' superiority is in rifles not in swords and because of this fact they organized their armies in divisions in order to reinforce each other. Every one thousand soldier has its own officer and this officer divides them into ten. Every division has its own uniform different than others, their rifles are unique in terms of weight and height so that they can uniquely lift and shoot together. They are ordered in rows like a wall so that they can stand against enemy. No soldier or officer disobey this rule. All rows are organized in this manner and when the first row fire, they turn back and second replace them and the third replaces second etc. Austrians started to defeat their rivals after they invented this tactic. Though Ottoman soldiers are numerous and courageous they can not endure such an order so it should be understood that old order is out of context now. The army composed of the Turks and Kurds (*etrak ve erkad*) and other sources of disorder seek plundering in war and perform agriculture and commerce in peace so that they can not resist such an ordered army. Ottomans soldiers are defeated because they do not obey the rules of order; however, Christian soldiers do not violate their orders and do not go to plundering even if they defeat their enemies. They also follow the wind and try to lean against the direction of it.<sup>209</sup>

The Muslim soldier asserts against this answer that Ottomans are accustomed to offensive style so he asks if it is logical to wait in peace for a while in order to discipline soldiers and complete munitions. In the remaining part of this treatise, the Muslim soldier tries to take hints from his Christian friend about the possibility of peace and if it is beneficial to sign a treaty with Austrians and its possible consequences. The Christian soldier, here again, emphasizes the importance of an army ordered and organized. He says that, though it might be possible to organize soldiers, it seems difficult to find talented officers to educate them in short term. The Muslim soldier asks if it is logical to sign a treaty with Austrians if they gave *Timișvar* and Belgrade. His friend answers that if they admit such a big concession, it means that there is a trick here because why should they give these places although they have a chance to win the war? The Muslim soldier confirms that he understood that peace is better than war. However, if the peace can not be provided what should be done, asks the Muslim soldier. Commander-in chief

---

<sup>209</sup> *IT*, pp. 112-114

should discipline rows and appoint competent sword-users and he should also stand among them. These swordsmen should stand at the left and right of the soldiers who have firearms and try to help them in war when they need. Other soldiers should be also organized in rows. However, it is not possible to defeat Austrians with swords so cannons and rifles should be used against them. There should be also rass, bows and its equipments (*siper*). Those who disobey should be punished whereas those who display courage should be acclaimed because there are many courageous ones among the Muslim soldiers. Nonetheless, if they are not in an order, neither heroism nor courage can be useful in war. If the peace is provided, Christian soldier affirms, Muslims should study in order to organize their soldiers, put into practice shariat and obey their rulers and they should recruit soldiers talented and courageous. These soldiers' number might be few but -they are superior to those who only plunder- because it is possible to discipline and educate them. However, it is impossible in short term to find officers to educate them. Thus, Muslims should recruit disciplined and armed soldiers from Christians among the foes of Austrians and grant them with bonuses and salary so that they aid their army in war as well as help their discipline. Yet, victory depends on order and order needs time, so that, peace is unavoidable, the Christian officer states. There are- Christian soldier asserts- two ways of war: firstly, ordered and perfect army exterminates the enemy wherever it finds and siege their castles. Secondly, after completing munitions, as if there will be an attack, borders of foes should be harassed and raided by soldiers in order to thwart their preparations. This tactic is used when one state does not trust to own soldiers or due to physical constraints. Most of the commanders have a tendency to practice this second way. One should also know the easy roads to pass enemy countries very well.<sup>210</sup>

The Muslim soldier, then, asks his friend where will Austrians attack next year and what might be ways of thwarting them and the Christian one answers this question according to his opinions.<sup>211</sup> At the end, Ottoman soldier complains about his friend's attitude of always displaying that Austrian soldiers are better than Muslims. He claims that Ottomans expanded into Europe with only forty men and they had been never

---

<sup>210</sup> *IT*, pp. 114-117

<sup>211</sup> *IT*, p 117-118

fearful of fighting without looking if they win or lose. He concludes, however, victory depends on the will of God.<sup>212</sup>

His Christian friend apologizes about misunderstanding that he caused. He also admits that victory depends on God's will and he emphasizes that his aim is not praising Austrians but just show their tricks. He finishes his thoughts with giving information about how Austrians became a strong country in Europe. He stresses, at the end, the importance of Transylvania (*Erdel*) in terms of constant control of the threat of Austrians through quoting a phrase from Suleiman.<sup>213</sup>

It seems impossible for one not to recognize powerful similarity between *UH* and this piece. Although this text was written for a solid aim -in order to show the necessity and beneficence of peace-, opinions about the organization of the army and obsession with the notion of "order (*nizam*)" strongly reminds us that there should be something related to İbrahim in this piece. He probably wrote this text between the years 1716 and 1718 in order to persuade statesmen to sign a peace treaty which he perceived more advantageous for the Ottomans. Damad İbrahim was also pro-peace in this time and the Damad's support of İbrahim in his future projects should be related with this treatise-not *Risale-i İslamiye* as some people claimed- which I think opened a way of career for İbrahim and he found patronage and become a trusted officer of Damad İbrahim.

The style of the text is very interesting and it is really difficult to discern which thought belong to whom, but we can say that writer said most of the things he wanted to say from Christian soldier's perception. He says at the very beginning that he is experienced in war and spent most of his time in war. İbrahim was also a "*sipah*" before he became a Mütferrika which is a fact supports our idea. Christian soldier prays God for continuation of the sultanate of Ottomans and acclaim them in every opportunity which is a fact displays that writer wrote from the mouth of a Christian in order to be more persuasive. He -for example- sees the main problem of Ottomans as their ignorance of shariat and *qanun* from a Muslim perspective. İbrahim was also putting this matter at the top of his list when he counted the main problems of the Muslim community (*UH*, p. 171). The question of departure of the writer of this text is same with İbrahim: he also concerns with why Austrians started to defeat Ottomans for a

---

<sup>212</sup> *IT*, p. 119

<sup>213</sup> *IT*, p. 119-121



while. In his answer, he emphasizes the good order and organization of their armies. He also sees the Ottomans as the ultimate factor that led Europeans to inaugurate a new military organization -like İbrahim. The writer of the text gives information about the tactics and organization of Austrian army in the same way that İbrahim did. He also talks about the necessity of uniqueness of uniforms and arms as İbrahim emphasized. He has deep historical information about the European history as İbrahim has and strongly emphasizes the essentiality of knowing the conditions of their rivals.

On the other hand, this text was written nearly fifteen years before *UH* appeared. If it belongs to İbrahim we have to admit that he already mentioned these ideas before. However, he never talks such a study of himself in *UH*-though it might not be a good proof to show that he did not write it because many people writing in these ages do not talk about their former studies if there is no relevant context. If this study does not belong to İbrahim, it means that these opinions were uttered before him. Thus his originality vanishes. I want to remind here that what I understood from the term originality contains the things not uttered before by any one. There is also some more evidence to this thesis: For example Muslim soldier in the text does not complain about the frequent rotation of administrators and tries to justify it, however, İbrahim was totally against it. Moreover, there are verses used and we do not know anything about İbrahim's poet side-to put it more correctly, İbrahim did not use verses but prose in his writing as far as we know. What is more, he refers to age of Suleiman as a golden age which is a fact that we do not come across in İbrahim's book.

We should accept that these misunderstandings might be originated from the style of the text; it means that, it is difficult to determine which question is asked for what purpose and which thoughts are belong to the writer. As a final guess, nonetheless, the probability that this treatise belongs to İbrahim is much greater than the probability that it does not.

Niyazi Berkes argues that the Christian soldier in this treatise is a French officer -Rochefort- who came with the Huguenots-Catholics converted into Protestantism in France- to Ottoman Empire in 1716 as refugees after Louis XIV's decree that prohibited all Protestant sects.<sup>214</sup> Berkes claims that this Rochefort presented a treatise on establishing a detachment of foreign military engineers (*projet pour l'établissement*

---

<sup>214</sup> Niyazi Berkes, *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*, p. 46

*d'un troupe d'ingenieurs etrangers au service de la Porte*<sup>215</sup>) to Damad İbrahim who was not a grand vizier yet - for the hope of their acceptance as refugees. Berkes tries to imply that this piece was written under the supervision or deep impact of Rochefort. His argument seems plausible; İbrahim might speak with these Huguenots and he benefited from their ideas about the organization of the European armies. On the other hand, this interview might be an imaginary one and it might be meaningless to search for real figures. Berkes' guess might explain why the Christian officer is revengeful against Austrians/Catholics in this interview.

Berkes claims that thoughts mentioned in this text are not belong to the people of the age or "insiders" but given by a circle which is represented as "Christians".<sup>216</sup> I defend in this study that the reform idea was not something enforced from outside on the contrary produced inside under the suppression of internal problems and needs. *Nasihatname* writers were seeking answer to this question during 200 years before this text was written. However, they did not agree on how to do it. İbrahim did not only believe in the necessity of reform but he did also know how to achieve it as an "insider".

## **2.10: Some critical remarks on *Risale-i İslamiye***

Historical analysis is based mainly on primary sources. However, main problem with these sources is that it is very difficult to determine authenticity of such texts if there are no sound references to the writers of these pieces. There is a similar problem with *Risale-i İslamiye*. In the cover of this book it is written *Risale-i İslamiye* of convert İbrahim Efendi who practiced art of the printing in the reign of Ahmed III in capital (*Devr-i Ahmed Han-ı Salisde basma sanatını Asitane'de icra eden muhtedi İbrahim Efendi'nin Risale-i İslamiyesi*). There is just one copy of this book which is another big problem that makes it more difficult to cross-check the information about the book and the writer. There is also no reference to the name of the book within the text which makes us believe that the current name was put by the scribe who wrote it. Information about the early phase of the life of the İbrahim has been reconstructed with reference to this book whose authenticity is vague. For example the writer says that he was born in Kolosvar at the beginning of the book and those who wrote on İbrahim started to say

---

<sup>215</sup> A. Adnan Adivar, *Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim*, p. 181

<sup>216</sup> Berkes, *ibid*, p. 45

that İbrahim born in this city. After some time this information was established among intellectuals and they started to say that this book belongs to İbrahim because it was written that the writer is born in Kolosvar. Though we have many reservations about this book we have to admit at least now that it belongs to İbrahim because there is no further evidence to prove that it does not belong to him either.

There is also a major disagreement about the content of this book. Tibor-Halasi Kun argued that this book is a defense of Islam. Niyazi Berkes, on the other hand, who is the first person, emphasized the importance of this book in terms of reconstructing İbrahim's life story as well as his early intellectual formation, claims that this book is a text in which writer tried to display how sacred book (*Kitab-ı Mukaddes*) had been deformed in time.<sup>217</sup> Berkes also espouses that İbrahim converted to Islam voluntarily basing his arguments on the thoughts in *Risale-i İslamiye*. He deduced that İbrahim was a Unitarian and his former religion facilitated his conversion to Islam. Halil Necatioğlu, who transcribed and published this book, says that this book is about the prophecies (*tebşirat*) evident in sacred book about Mohammed.<sup>218</sup> However, none of these writers seems aware about the political subtext of *Risale-i İslamiye* which is my own point to discuss hereafter.

It is now clear that the book was written in 1710.<sup>219</sup> At the beginning of the book, the writer asserts that he was born in Kolosvar in the country of Hungary and studied Torah, Bible and Psalms of David (*Zebur*) since his childhood and he says that he was permitted to preach on them. He read secretly the old Torah forbidden (*mensuhtur diye okumasından nehy olunduğum atik ecza-i Tevratları*) and encountered a verse which is harbinger of Prophet Mohammed. He, then, presented it to his professors and asked them why they denied the prophecy of Mohammed.<sup>220</sup> Niyazi Berkes, departing from this information claims that İbrahim read the works of Micheal Servetus and especially his *Christianismi Restitutio* which dwells on the problems of

---

<sup>217</sup> Niyazi Berkes, "İlk Türk Matbaası Kurucusunun Dini ve Fikri Kimliği", p. 729

<sup>218</sup> Halil Necatioğlu, *Matbaacı İbrahim Müteferrika ve Risale-i İslamiye Adlı Eserinin Tenkidli Metni* ( we will refer to this text *RI* hereafter), p. 37-38

<sup>219</sup> Berkes, *ibid*, 731

<sup>220</sup> *RI*, pp. 56-58

Trinity doctrine.<sup>221</sup> Servetus was displaying Koran as a proof against Trinity-says Berkes- which affected İbrahim in terms of his conversion.<sup>222</sup>

The writer, asserts that he will translate from Greek ( probably he refers to Latin when he said *lisan-ı Yunani*) in to Turkish the proofs in the Sacred books which tells the coming out of Prophet Mohammed as well as the ones prophesizing victory of Ottomans in the east and the west, from left and right, as the protector of shariat of Mohammed who reached the state of Suleiman and the power of Alexander as well as owner of the country of red/golden apple and Muscovites ( *malik-i Kızıl Elmaviye ve Moskoviyye*).<sup>223</sup> The writer asserts that in the reign of Sultan Ahmed, among the Ottomans, the world became exempted from cruelty and the sultanate reached its highest level and Ottomans became victorious over various peoples. The signs of these victories in the Bible and history of Golden Apple will be also written.<sup>224</sup>

The main argument of the book is that sacred books are deformed by the people -mostly apostles after the death of Jesus. He argues that there were many verses which told the coming of Mohammed as a prophet in the Bible and Torah, however, the people who deformed these texts either took these verses out or put the name of Jesus in place of Ahmed. Despite the deformation there are even now many verses in Torah that are signs of Prophet Mohammed.<sup>225</sup> This book is an unofficial story of Christianity from Muslim eyes. He tells the history of the evolution of Christianity though not in a neutral manner. The writer also gives the history of prophets till the emergence of Mohammed and their good news about the prophet of Islam.

This book is not just a compilation of prophecies but also uses strong metaphors in order to reinforce its arguments. He talks about a dream of Prophet John (*Yahya*). In his dream, *Yahya* sees a woman. This woman gets on a monster. The monster has seven heads and twelve horns. All words of infidelity are written in its heads. The woman has a golden bowl and it was full of wine of prostitution and infidelity. In her forehead, it was written “the mother of infidels and adulterers”. Suddenly, when *Yahya* became desperate; one human from the direction of Mecca appears. He was dressed in white and

---

<sup>221</sup> Berkes, *ibid*, p. 729

<sup>222</sup> Berkes, *ibid*, p. 730

<sup>223</sup> *RI*, p. 58-59

<sup>224</sup> *RI*, p. 60

<sup>225</sup> *RI*, p. 62

had a baton. He was getting out fire from his mouth. He fought with this woman and defeated her and her monster. Then, an angel appears and interprets the dream: this woman is referring to people who pretend to be caliphs of prophets with tricks. The monster refers to the city he inhabited. Seven heads refer to seven mountains of this city. Twelve horns are the kings obeyed him. The man who came is the prophet. That he came from the direction of Mecca displays that his birth occurred there. That he defeated with his baton refers to his victory over twelve kings. That he gets out fire from his mouth is his call of goodness and prohibition of the opposite. That he fought with the adulterer is that their war is eternal. That he dressed white means that he is perfect in his obedience to God. However, the writer of *Risale-i İslamiye* expresses, those infidels interpret this dream as such: the woman is soldiers of Islam. The monster is the city of Istanbul. Seven heads are seven mountains of Istanbul. The man came from the direction of Mecca is Jesus who born in Jerusalem. That he defeated the woman means that Jesus will come and deny Koran and establish Bible. Then, writer gives his own interpretation: Since he is talented in the Bible and Torah and *Zebur* and language of Greek (Latin) and Hungarian and histories of Golden Apple, he says that, adulterer woman is the pope of the Red apple.<sup>226</sup> He is called as *Rim Papa*. The monster is the city of Rome (*Kızıl Elma*) he inhabited. The seven heads are the mountains of this city.<sup>227</sup> Twelve horn refers to the kings he approved and crowned and one of them is Austrian king (*Nemçe Çesarı*). Christians are divided as the sect of Nestorians, Jacobians, Lutherans, and Unitarians etc. ( *fırka-i Nesturiyan, Yakubiyen, Füluniyan, Lutraniyan, Ünitariyan, Şusniyan, Anababatşite*) and all these sects are agreed on that adulterer in this dream is the Pope.<sup>228</sup> The baton that the man in the dream has is the Ottomans and community of Muslims. That he wins over the woman is that Ottomans will be victorious over the *Rim Papa*.<sup>229</sup>

The writer of the book, in fact, does not concern very much with the prophecies written in the Bible about Mohammed. The political subtext in his narrative is more dominant. He does not only give these verses as the proofs of the coming of Mohammed and his victory over Christians. He explicitly emphasizes that these verses are evidences

---

<sup>226</sup> *RI*, pp. 69-73

<sup>227</sup> *RI*, p. 91

<sup>228</sup> *RI*, p. 94

<sup>229</sup> *RI*, p. 99

of the victory of Ottomans and specifically Sultan Ahmed III. What is more, he is not against all Christians but only Catholics and the Pope. In whole of the text, writer dwells on how the Popes destroyed Christian religion and beliefs and how they extracted financial gains from these inventions. He counts, for instance, Lutherans, Unitarians, Nestorians and many other “heretic” (according to Catholicism) sects as the enemies of the Pope and Catholicism. The political subtext appears very well in his interpretation of the dream. He sees the Ottomans not any one else but as the true savors. There are many metaphors fighting within the text apart from this dream, he constantly uses stories from various sources and tries to show how Catholics misinterpreted these stories, then, he gives his own interpretation. In his interpretations, Ottomans became victorious every time, Islam dominates over others in every instant. Metaphors serve as ideologies in his narrative.

In a very successful article, Pal Fodor discusses the evolution of Red Apple metaphor in Hungarian-Ottoman context. This red apple story is used in order to imply the end of the Ottoman Empire; on the other hand Ottomans were using similar metaphors in order to imply that Christian countries will be under Ottoman control after some time:

1. Among the Ottomans the *kızıl elma* originally referred to the city of Constantinople, and evidently took its origin from the symbolism of the statue of Justinian. 2. After the capture of the city the *kızıl elma* became a threefold symbol: firstly it referred to other cities (mainly royal residences); secondly, to that ultimate and mystical place where the Ottoman conquest would come to an end; and thirdly, to the world domination which resulted from the preceding two points. This complex symbolism had long been used by the Ottomans before the beginning of the supposed European influence. 3. The Ottomans had for a long time avoided defining the last *kızıl elma*, and only began to identify it with Rome in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. This reluctance can easily be explained by a natural defensive reflex; as long as the ultimate end was unknown, conquests could be continued endlessly, and there was a hope that the catastrophe of the Muslim world predicted in the prognosis would not ensure before the achievement of that ultimate end. Consequently, the legend of *kızıl elma* gave birth to two diametrically opposed interpretations; while the Ottomans thought that it foretold their continuous increase in power, the Christians, and among them the Hungarians, inferred from it the imminent end of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>230</sup>

The dream interpretation is similar to red apple story. Rome was referred as Red Apple- probably referring to Ottoman ultimate aim in Europe. The writer has a great disdain against Rome and *Rim Papa*, if İbrahim wrote it, his Protestant belief seems very

---

<sup>230</sup> Pal Fodor, “The view of the Turk in Hungary: The Apocalyptic Tradition and the Legend of The Red Apple In the Ottoman-Hungarian Context” in *In Quest of the Golden Apple*, p. 96

effective in his formation of this book. He writes it as an ex-Protestant but new Muslim, his narrative carries things from both sides.

Why did the writer need to write such piece? Was there a discussion about the subject he touched upon? What were his motives? What he aim to do? Molla Kabız was sent to death two century before because he claimed that Jesus is superior to Mohammed. Is there a similar discussion at that time so such a book was written in order to display how Mohammed was acclaimed in Christianity? It seems plausible. However, this book seems to me written because of some personal and political motivations. If İbrahim wrote it, he probably tried to show his sincerity as a new convert. Moreover, he probably aimed to present it to Sultan or high officials who he supposed to bring him some fame and financial advantages. He might have also aimed to justify his new belief with reference to faults in the Catholic Christianity, so that, aimed to show that he converted voluntarily not under suppression which was clearly inferior to voluntary act. What is more, he refers to Ahmed III as the person whose coming is prophesized in sacred texts.<sup>231</sup> Could it be about a discussion on the legitimacy of Ottoman dynasty so that he tries to prove that their coming was written even in the books of Christians? He might have aimed to increase the morale of high officers that he wrote the book for through displaying that they are the chosen people by God.

There are also other references that might reinforce ones argument that this book belongs to İbrahim. For example, he gives Rakoczi Ferenc as an example who was against Catholics whom we know İbrahim would be a translator later.<sup>232</sup> Moreover, he talks about the New World that Rim Papa sent his missionaries in order to spread their religions and benefited from material goods.<sup>233</sup> We know that İbrahim has a strong conscious about the Christians expansion to new world. He has also strong disdain against Austrian King (*Nemçe Çesarı*) who suppressed Hungarians and Protestants. On the other hand, İbrahim Müteferrika never mentions *Risale-i İslamiye* in his masterpiece *Usulü'l Hikem*. There is also no reference to consciousness of an expert of Christian divinity in his later work. The question of the authenticity of *Risale-i İslamiye* still seems a vague one.

---

<sup>231</sup> *RI*, p. 135

<sup>232</sup> *RI*, p. 136

<sup>233</sup> *RI*, p. 97

## CHAPTER III

### **SOURCES AND ORIGINS AND THE PROBLEM OF THE GENRE**

In the previous chapter we delved into deep reading of *Usulü'l Hikem*. In this chapter, I will try to determine place of İbrahim's book with reference to some selected literature written in the two centuries before his book appeared. While doing this, my point of departure is the book of counsels (*nasihatnames*) that I thought İbrahim read. My main point of comparison is the thoughts about the military reform of these writers because *Usulü'l Hikem*'s innovative approach concentrates on this problem. There will be also a discussion on the problem of the genre of the İbrahim's book.

#### **3.1: Locating *Usul'ül Hikem* among *nasihatnames***

*Siyasetnames/nasihatnames* or “mirror for princes” is coeval with the Islamic politics. Based on one of the basic orders of Islam “prohibiting the wrong and reinforcing the right” (*emr-i bin maruf nehyi anil münker*), there has been written many treatises that one simply call as *siyasetname*.<sup>234</sup> Most of the writers contributed to this genre said that it is their responsibility to warn the King/viziers about the abuses they observed in state apparatus.<sup>235</sup> Some of them are concerned with the personality and morality of the king, what he should do and what he should abstain from. Some of them, on the other hand, are concerned with the responsibilities and wrong-doings of viziers and high officers.

Borrowed most of their thoughts on the state and society from ancient Greek philosophers like Plato and Aristotle<sup>236</sup> as well as from ancient Indo-Iranian and Turkish

---

<sup>234</sup> For a good list of the *siyasetnames* see Ağâh Sırrı Levend, “Siyaset-nameler” , *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten* (1962), pp. 167-194. This useful work has some mistakes as the information given about the İbrahim Müteferrika. Levend, claims that İbrahim wrote his *Usul-ül Hikem* after the printing press was destroyed in 1143 rebellion. ( p. 192) However, we know that, press has been always open and rebels did not destroy press though it did not work for some time.

<sup>235</sup> For example Âli says: “All creatures that possess speech are bound to help their kings by counsel and advice, in their prayers they should specifically name them in all sincerity, and when they see growing trouble because of disasters and catastrophes they should rush to their word and deed, with their possessions and good intentions.” *Mustafa Âli's Counsel v.1* , p. 24

<sup>236</sup> Levend, p. 173-176



political tradition<sup>237</sup>, *siyaset-names* represent Kings as dearest beings of God and see people as charges of God to kings. The ruler should pay back his blessing with displaying justice against the ruled. The foundation of the sultanate is justice, according to the narrative of these treatises, and courage and generosity are the other necessities that reinforce the rule of Sultan. *Siyasetnames-nasihatnames* concerns mainly with the necessities/virtues that a ruler should have, his responsibilities that religion and ethics burden on him and the things that he should abstain from. They reserve a distinct place to the benefit of counseling and conditions of companions of the King. *Nasihatnames* argue the essentiality of giving the posts those who deserve and according to their ranks. They also contain advices about the finance and treasure, the conditions of the ruled and the situation of the holders of fiefs. King's attitude against scholars, the subjects and soldiers are also specified in these treatises: He should pay salaries in time, check oppression of the officers, work conditions of them and apply punishments necessitated by the holy law. Some of the *nasihatnames* may also include relationships with foreign countries. They pay special attention to the necessity of obeying laws and the principles of rule. An important part of these treatises dwells on the reasons of decay of a country.

There are also *siyasetnames/nasihatnames* written for the viziers. They contain these points- apart from the ones cited for the kings-: their responsibilities against the King, keeping secrets, not fearing from losing the post, inspecting the country and fortresses, knowing the conditions of Janissaries and Cavalry, inspecting the holders of fiefs, encouraging soldiers for the holy war, abstaining from bribery, preserving the treasure, avoiding from waste, inspecting officers and being careful about the payments of the salaries of soldiers, taking necessary precautions for the reform.<sup>238</sup> Ottoman *siyaset-names/nasihatnames* can be seen as true representatives of this genre because they include most of the items above.<sup>239</sup>

---

<sup>237</sup> Halil İnalcık, "Turkish and Iranian Political Theories and Traditions in Kutadgu Bilig" in *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1993) p. 1

<sup>238</sup> Levend, p. 170-171

<sup>239</sup> See Ahmet Uğur for an attempt to analyze Ottoman *nasihatnames* though the book is not well-organized and easily usable. Ahmet Uğur, *Osmanlı Siyasetnameleri* (Istanbul: MEB, 2001).

### 3.2: The possible connections between *Usulü'l Hikem* and *nasihatname* writers: A genuine or redundant intellectual?

During the two centuries before İbrahim Müteferrika wrote his masterpiece, *Usulü'l Hikem*, Ottoman intellectuals wrote many treatises that we gather under the general title of *nasihatname/siyasetname* genre. They concerned with the problems that they saw in the Ottoman state and society. They created a genre that influenced not only their contemporaries but also modern scholarship. Frequently referred to as “decline paradigm”, this specific genre has been already deciphered by various scholars.<sup>240</sup> Most of the writers writing on the problem of *nasihatnames* rightfully observed the drawbacks that are associated with taking these pieces at face value. It is now decoded that *nasihatname* writers’ perception of the change in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries’ Ottoman state as “decay” or “decline” is a consequence of their subjective idea of history. They were interpreting every possible change under the conceptions of “change” (*tebeddülât*) and “bad invention” (*bid’at*) which are used in negative connotations. For them, the universe and the state and society have established rules whose alteration is nothing than decadence. This is especially true for the intellectuals of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. In the 17<sup>th</sup> one, this view would be changed and some of them like Katip Çelebi and Naima, would adopt the notion that change is natural and inevitable. For most of the thinkers of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century personal characteristics of the ruler

---

<sup>240</sup> Cemal Kafadar, “The Question of Ottoman Decline” *Harvard Middle Eastern and Islamic Review* 1-2 (1997-98) pp. 30-75. Mehmet Öz, *Osmanlı’da “Çözüm” ve Gelenekçi Yorumcuları* (İstanbul: Dergâh, 1997); R.A. Abou-el Hajj, *ibid*, pp. 56-62 and “The expression of Ottoman Political culture in the literature of advice to princes (*nasihatnameler*) sixteenth to twentieth centuries” in *Sociology in the Rubric of Social Science, Professor Ramkrishna Mukherjee Felicitation Volume* R.K. Bhattacharya and A.K. Ghosh eds. (1995) pp. 282-292; Virginia Aksan, “Ottoman Political Writing 1768-1808”, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 25, No: 1 (Feb., 1993) pp. 53-69; Douglas Howard, “Ottoman Historiography and the “Literature of “Decline” of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries”, *Journal of Asian Studies* (1988) pp. 52-75; Cornell Fleisher, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Âli (1541-1600)* (NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986); Pal Fodor, “State and Society, Crisis and Reform, in the Fifteenth-Seventeenth Century Ottoman Mirror for Princes” in *In the Guest of Golden Apple* pp. 23-45; Roger Owen, “The Middle East in the 18th century- An “Islamic” Society in Decline? A critique of Gibb and Bowen’s Islamic Society and the West”, *Review of Middle Eastern Studies* 1 (1975) pp. 101-112; Bernard Lewis, “Ottoman Observers of Ottoman Decline”, *Islamic Studies* I (1962) pp. 71-87. Among the studies above, Roger Owen’s critique of Gibb and Bowen’s classical book, *Islam and the West*, deserves attention. Owen criticizes Gibb and Bowen because of their civilizational approach which defends that there is a unique Islamic civilization. In this civilization which is naturally in decline the rise of the Ottoman Empire is an anomaly especially for the period of the rise of the Ottomans between 1300 and 1600. However, Ottoman decline, for Gibb and Bowen is a natural part of the decline of the Islamic societies. Owen criticizes this outlook with reference to problems of civilizational approach. Douglas Howard takes *nasihatname* writers as materials of literature and bases his arguments on taken for granted thoughts in these treatises. Bernard Lewis is one of the few persons who takes these treatises at face value saying like the 16th and 17th century Ottoman observers that Ottoman Empire is in decline- which is a very problematic view discussed by the writers above.

class (sultan, viziers, and commanders) are at the core of their analysis. They evaluate “decline” as something began at the top and disseminated through lower levels/classes. The most basic problem in the Ottoman state apparatus, according to these writers, is lack of care of “circle of justice” which is a notion summarizing Ottoman/Islamic perception of the operation of politics. Equal with the preceding point, ignorance of ancient/established law (*kanun-u kadim*) is another significant point that they argued. Cornell Fleisher calls this attitude as “*kanun conciousness*”<sup>241</sup> which is a term refers to the obsession of the intellectuals of these ages with the ancient law. One basic tenet of their argument is that, at some time in the past (generally in the sultanate of Suleiman the Magnificent but sometimes in Selim I’s), there has been experienced an ideal period. Every deviation from the practices of these periods is now conceived as determinants of disorder. Most important violation of “*kanun-u kadim*” is observed in fief system, for these intellectuals. Most of these intellectuals see bribery as the ultimate reason of violation of the practices of past. They see bribery as a twofold problem: first of all, it causes problems in appointments that means posts are given to those people who do not deserve. Secondly, those who attained posts by bribery start to oppress subjects. This causes the ruin of country because subjects leave their lands due to oppression. For them, society is composed of four main classes and every one should stay in his own one. Penetrations should be strictly controlled. In terms of finance, the balance of the treasure is very vital and those factors lead to decrease in treasure should be eliminated. There are also big problems concerning behaviors of rulers, which is they believed is the ultimate cause of disorder in social life. “Immoral” acts like bribery, favoritism and untrustworthiness started to be vast among people and rulers. What should be done, for them, is re-appropriating the ways of old sultans. Sultan should appoint a just and wise vizier and give him autonomy in state matters. Posts should be given to those who deserve. Fiefs should be taken from the ones who appropriated it in illegal ways and redistributed to those who is worthy of.

### **3.3: The problem of genre of *Usulü’l Hikem***

*Usül-ül Hikem* carries main arguments of classical mirror for prince genre. Nonetheless, it seems difficult to call it as a *siyaset-name* or *nasihatname* easily.

---

<sup>241</sup> Cornell Fleisher, *The Historian Mustafa Âli*, pp. 191-200

Religiosity is dominant in İbrahim Müteferrika's writing as in most of the books in this genre. However, though İbrahim says that God is the ultimate determinant in the final analysis, he reserves a big place to "reason" and "precautions". For him, it is not enough to pray God but it is also essential to take basic steps. He also demands to obey holy law, like many people wrote in this genre. He chooses most of his examples from European history not from ancient Iranian and Islamic history as most of the *nasihatname* literature.<sup>242</sup> He shares the main points about organization of the society like most of the intellectuals writing in this genre who divide society into four classes: the military class, the class of the pen, the class of the agriculture, and the class of the artisans and craftsman. The ones who do not belong to one of these classes should be forced to be part of one of them.<sup>243</sup> İbrahim also agrees on this point. Though most important class differs from one writer to another –probably according to the class they belong- the military class is the most important one for İbrahim. In terms of military, most of the classical writers, dwells on the problems in campaigns<sup>244</sup>, İbrahim, on the other hand deals with the organization of the army.

Despite some of the similarities with classical *siyaset-name* genre, it seems more correct to determine the genre of *Usulü'l Hikem* as reform proposal (*ıslahat layihası*) because it is not a total *nasihatname* which touches upon nearly all fields of state apparatus, it concerns with the problems in one part of the state. It is not a book of morals like some of the *siyasetnames* which are composed of ethical/moral advices to rulers.

### **3.4: *Nasihatname* writers on the military problem**

In this section of the study, I will examine the thoughts of some of the *nasihatname* writers on the military change and problems of the Ottoman Empire for the purpose of investigating possible connections between these writers and İbrahim Müteferrika. This inquiry will aid us in terms of answering the question that to what extent İbrahim's opinions was genuine. Did he take over some of his thoughts from preceding intellectuals or were they brand new ideas?

---

<sup>242</sup> Uğur, *ibid*, p.5

<sup>243</sup> Uğur, *ibid*, p. 118

<sup>244</sup> Uğur, *ibid*, p. 113

The former grand vizier of Suleiman the magnificent, Lütü Paşa, presented a treatise called *Asafname* after he retired in 1541 on the matters of state in order to counsel rulers about the misuses and abuses in state apparatus.<sup>245</sup> In this very short but highly influential booklet, main concern of the vizier was the tasks of the grand viziers and how to increase treasury. For the military, he talks a little bit on the campaign and then complains about the large quantity of the Janissaries (*kul taifesi*). They should be few but strong (*asker az gerek uz gerek*) and their records should be taken strictly. 15000 soldiers with stipends are too much to pay for.<sup>246</sup>

One of the most prolific and outstanding intellectual of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, Mustafa Âli, wrote a similar piece called *Nushat-üs Selatin* in 1581.<sup>247</sup> This treatise is one of the most to the point of the *nasihatname* genre, a real masterpiece. In this book, Âli touches upon nearly all fields of life; he talks about the problems not only in politics but also in social life. Though we know that Ali's harsh criticisms are because of personal reasons, that he could not get what he want politically, this book is also a chronicle of events that Ali recorded in his life-time. He gives his examples from near past. He gives exact names of the main actors and displays their mistakes by the way of quoting the names of those who made. He also dwells much on the vizier and says that everything in his time –good or bad- are results of the actions of viziers. “In our time the viziers are both those that build up the country and those that oppress people”.<sup>248</sup> He strictly advises to give the posts to those qualify: “justice means putting things where they belong” Âli asserts.<sup>249</sup> He has also a part on the king: on what he should do and what he should abstain.<sup>250</sup> In terms of military organization, he is obsessed with the personal character

---

<sup>245</sup> For the full text of this treatise see Lütü Paşa, *Asafname* ed. Ahmet Uğur (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1982); Ahmet Uğur, “Asafname-i Vezir Lütü Paşa”, *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi İslam İlemleri Enstitüsü Dergisi* IV (1980) pp. 243-258; Mübahat S. Kütükoğlu, “Lütü Paşa Asafnamesi: Yeni Bir Metin Tesisi Denemesi” in *Prof. Bekir Kütükoğlu'na Armağan*, pp. 49-101. For the life story of Lütü paşa see Ahmet Uğur, “Lütü Paşa ve Asafnamesi”, *Türk Kültürü Araştırmaları* Yıl XVI/ 1-2 (1977-1978).

<sup>246</sup> *Asafname-i Vezir Lütü Paşa*, p. 250.

<sup>247</sup> *Mustafa Ali's Counsel for Sultans of 1581*, 2 volumes ed. tr. Andreas Tietze (Wien, 1979). Âli has also some other advices to Sultans in his *Mevaidün Nefais*. Mehmet Şeker, *Gelibolulu Mustafa Âli ve Mevaidü'n Nefais fi Kavaidü'l Mecalis* (Ankara: TTK, 1997)

<sup>248</sup> *Counsel v.1*, p. 25 and p. 37

<sup>249</sup> *ibid*, p. 2

<sup>250</sup> *ibid*, pp. 41-66

of field marshal (*serdar*). He should be equipped with insight and intelligence, with wisdom and perspicacity, to be patient at the moment of anger, forbearing and persevering at the time of trouble and exhaustion.<sup>251</sup> He should not quit main highway, and if he wants to, he should invite the leaders and notables, the men of many years and the expert young ones and discuss the matter with them.<sup>252</sup> He should completely abstain from taking bribes and hold himself and the men close to him under strict discipline.<sup>253</sup> The premise of field marshals and kings, the need of all well-guided champions of the Faith is the employment of efficient spies and their continual reports on evil actions on the side of the enemy. The art of sacred warfare is a workshop full of hardship, most clearly its master is the man of right decisions, and its tools are the instruments of bow and arrow and the utensils of cannon and rifle.<sup>254</sup> Moreover, Âli emphasizes, continual campaigns over many years, movements that involve costs and financial losses as well as physical exhaustion and hardships are most harmful to the victory-oriented soldiers and a calamity that leads their destitution.<sup>255</sup>

The unidentified writer of *Kitab-ı Müstetab* wrote his treatise at the first quarter of the 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>256</sup> He wrote in order to display how to reorganize state affairs. He says that, in present time, the situation lead to anxiety in the subjects of the Empire and created anarchy in the order of the universe (*nizam-ı aleme ihtilal ve reaya ve berayaya infial*). One of the main problems he observed is about the military organization: the foreigners started to be part of janissary army (*kul taifesine ecnebi karışub*) and the number of Janissaries became abundant though it is not necessary. Their stipends increased too much that expenditures exceeded income. Before, posts had been given to those people who displayed usefulness in campaigns but now it started to be allocated by bribery.<sup>257</sup> The soldiers of the past were few but very good (*az idi fakat uz idi*). They

---

<sup>251</sup> *Counsel* v.2, p. 9

<sup>252</sup> *ibid*, p. 10

<sup>253</sup> *ibid*, p. 11

<sup>254</sup> *ibid*, p. 19

<sup>255</sup> *ibid*, p. 42

<sup>256</sup> *Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilatına Dair Kaynaklar: Kitab-ı Müstetab, Kitabu Mesalihi'l Müslimin ve Menafi'il Müminin, Hırzû'l Müluk* ed. Yaşar Yücel (Ankara: TTK, 1988). I will refer to the names of the books hereafter. The page numbers are the page numbers of transliterations unless cited.

<sup>257</sup> *Kitab-ı Müstetab*, p. 2

did not have foreigners (*ecnebi ve saplama*).<sup>258</sup> He also complains about the large number of people recorded as Janissaries who take salaries but did not participate in war. Novices were few before, but became too many now. Their stipends increased in time. Most of them have their names in records but do not appear in war.<sup>259</sup> *Timarlı sipahis* were more than two hundred thousand people before and when they participated in campaign they became victorious, however, now, *zeamets* and *timars* became “*arpalık*” of viziers and they do not participate in war. He is very pessimistic about the Janissary army: It is impossible to conquer and fight with Janissaries; if it is possible previous Sultans could achieve it (*Kapukulu ile ceng ve fütuh olmak dahi muhaldir*).<sup>260</sup> What he advised is to appoint a good vizier. Moreover, everything should be suitable with the ancient law (*kanun-u kadim*) as well as all posts should be given those who deserve. Bribery should be also prohibited.

In 1631, approximately at the same time with the writer of *Kitab-ı Müstetab*, Koçi Bey wrote his famous treatise known as *Koçi Bey Risalesi*.<sup>261</sup> As a commander and companion of Murad IV, he presented his book to the Sultan. He probably read *Kitab-ı Müstetab*. His book is well-organized and he also wrote one treatise to Sultan İbrahim about the state apparatus. He says that he wrote his book in order to show the reasons of anarchy in the order and reasons for turmoil among people ( *baisi ihtilali alem ve sebebi tegayyürü ahvali beni adem* ).<sup>262</sup> Koçi Bey commemorates previous timariots in terms of their great service in the war. Before, nobody was given *timars* unless they display usefulness in the war. However, now, *timars* are given to foreign people and they do not participate in war. Beggars are given these lands and they distributed them to their own people. Real timariots were lost and no victory appeared since very long time. Discipline was eradicated, soldiers with stipends outnumbered cavalry. *Timars* should be given to those people who qualify because it is impossible to serve state and religion

---

<sup>258</sup> *ibid*, pp. 5-9

<sup>259</sup> *ibid*, pp. 9-15

<sup>260</sup> *ibid*, pp. 15-17

<sup>261</sup> *Koçi Bey Risalesi* ed. Ali Kemali Aksüt (Istanbul: 1939) ; *Koçi Bey Risalesi* ed. Zuhuri Danişman (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1985). I will use Aksüt edition and will be referred as *Koçi Bey Risalesi* hereafter. For a well-constructed analysis of Koçi Bey see, Rifaat Abou el Hajj, *Modern Devletin Doğuşu*, pp. 56-107.

<sup>262</sup> *Koçi Bey Risalesi*, p. 18

with these undisciplined soldiers (*derme çatma*)<sup>263</sup> Janissary army was also invaded by foreigners. More than ten thousand young and able soldiers who can fight acquired retire pensions (*oturak*). Posts were given to inexperienced young people with bribery. Janissary army was full of artisans and craftsman who has nothing to do with war. It is impossible to fight with them. They spent whole treasury and created disorder.<sup>264</sup> These soldiers (*kul taifesi*) can not be controlled with tolerance; they can only be disciplined with harshness and punishment (*kahrile zabt olunur, hilmile olmaz*). Previous sultans were controlling the Janissaries with timariots, however now, timariots totally disappeared. Large number of these soldiers is not profitable, they should be few but strong, disciplined and tied (*az ve öz muti ve münkad gerek*).<sup>265</sup> New bad inventions (*bid'at*) should be abolished and old customs (*kanun-u kadim*) should be protected in order to put in order Janissaries.<sup>266</sup>

Few years after Koçi Bey wrote his book, Aziz Efendi, probably a scribe in high council, wrote his *Kanunname-i Sultani* in 1632-1633.<sup>267</sup> In the section that he separated for salaried soldiers, Aziz Efendi, complains about the bad inventions (*bid'at*) in the rules of Janissaries like exchange (*becayış*) and that foreign elements started to penetrate in the army. Their numbers exceeded one hundred thousand persons, it is impossible to finance them even if they are obedient and disciplined. It is urgent than anything else to reorganize Janissaries. What should be done is getting out of *timars* from baskets and reallocating them to those who deserve. Then, all *aghas* and officers should bring together their soldiers and find records of the last forty-fifty years. After that, everyone should be questioned in terms of their hometowns, nations and origins – in order to learn if they attained their offices by conscription (*devşirme*) or inheritance (*kuloğlu*). If it is understood that they acquired these offices according to ancient law (*kanun*) they should be given imperial permissions (*berats*) and recorded in *defters*. Those given retire pensions (*oturak*) should be also investigated and foreigners should

---

<sup>263</sup> *ibid*, pp. 24-32. Similar thoughts about the degeneration of the timar system was also expressed in the *Veliyuddin Telhis*. See Rhoads Murphey, “Veliyuddin Telhis: Notes on the Sources and Interrelations Between Koçi Bey and Contemporary Writers of Advice to Kings” *Belleten* 43 (1979- ) pp. 547-571; “DÖRDÜNCÜ Sultan Murad’a Sunulan Yedi Telhis” in *VIII. Türk Tarih Kongresine Sunulan Bildiriler* (Ankara: TTK, 2002) pp. 1095-1099

<sup>264</sup> *ibid*, pp. 44-46

<sup>265</sup> *ibid*, p. 51

<sup>266</sup> *ibid*, p. 71

<sup>267</sup> *Kanun-name-i Sultani li Aziz Efendi* ed. tr. Rhoads Murphey ( MA: Harvard University, 1985)



be excluded and young ones should be recorded as soldiers again. Rural guardianships (*korucu*) should be also abolished which is not existing in the old law. After this careful investigation, it will be seen that true Janissaries will not exceed 15000 people. These real soldiers should be prohibited to go out of Istanbul; they should sit in their battalions/rooms (*oda*). Same things should be also applied to six cavalry regiments (*altı bölük halkı*).<sup>268</sup>

Another unknown writer like the one of *Kitab-ı Müstetab* presented a treatise to (probably) Kemankeş Kara Mustafa Paşa with the name of *Kitabu Mesalih* in 1643-44. In this text, the writer also presented many advices to grand vizier in order to correct misconducts in the state. More radical and less bounded to past than already mentioned *nasihatname* writers, the writer of *Kitabu Mesalih* gives a radical advice in terms of military organization. Novices (*acemi oğlanları*) should be given to *bölük halkı* not to the Turk so that they learn Janissary-ship and *sipahi*-ship. It is true that they had been given to Turk before; however, it is not the order of Prophet so that we obey it.<sup>269</sup> Moreover, he recommends that *Bölük halkı* should wear different berets so that one can easily differentiate them from others, in such condition, nobody can involve in a fight and cause a problem. Janissaries should also wear different berets so that they fear from causing disorder.<sup>270</sup> Apart from his counsels about the uniformity of dresses, he says that, servants of Janissaries and timariots should bear arms in war in order to avoid enemies' disbanding them.<sup>271</sup> *Kitabu Mesalih* includes some social observations too, which is outside the scope of this study, but deserves to be studied in a separate study.

In the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> century great Ottoman intellectual and polymath Katip Çelebi contributed this genre with a book called *Düsturu'l Amel li-Islahil Halel*.<sup>272</sup> Written in 1653, this book is very much like *Asafname*. Both are small in volume and include straight advices. In the second chapter of this treatise that Katip Çelebi

---

<sup>268</sup> *Kanunname-I Sultani li Aziz Efendi*, pp. 29-33

<sup>269</sup> *Kitabu Mesalih*, p. 93

<sup>270</sup> *ibid*, pp. 96-99

<sup>271</sup> *ibid*, p. 109

<sup>272</sup> Katip Çelebi, *Bozuklukların Düzeltmesinde Tutulacak Yollar (Düsturu'l Amel li-islahi'l halel)*, ed. Ali Can (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1982). We refer it as *Düstur* hereafter. Katip Çelebi also have some advices to rulers in his *Mizanü'l Hakk* ( pp. 123-128). See also M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, "XVII. Asırda, Osmanlı Devletinde Islahat İhtiyaç ve Temayülleri ve Katip Çelebi" in *Katip Çelebi: Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler*, pp. 198-218.

discussed the condition of the soldiers he refers to an organism which consists of four main components and says that society is also composed of four main elements. One of them is phlegm which Çelebi made an analogy with soldiers. Phlegm is necessary for body but its redundancy is harmful. Soldiers in society- like phlegm in body- are useful if they are few and strong, but if they are overabundant, it is obviously destructive. He then emphasizes that there are too many soldiers now. He is pessimistic about decreasing their number so he advises that cavalry should not be less than 20000 people and Janissaries should not be less than 30000 people, large number of others should be tolerated because it is not too bad to have many soldiers. What should be done is decreasing salaries with reference to old law and suitable precautions.<sup>273</sup>

At the end of the century, Hezarfen Hüseyin Efendi, in his all encompassing book *Telhis-ül Beyan fî Kavanin-i Ali Osman*, touched upon military problem.<sup>274</sup> He also advises to be aware of enemies in borders and to use spies. Commanders should have strict rules and they should apply them to their soldiers. He gives reference to *Asafname* many times and he complains about the large numbers of Janissaries. However, he is also pessimist about decreasing their numbers and he thinks that -like Katip Çelebi- harmless large quantity of them should be tolerated.

Occupied the post of the chief treasurer of the Sultan Ahmed III several times and lost his life because of his post, Defterdar Sarı Mehmed, wrote another well organized book of counsel called *Nasa'ih ü'l vüzera ve'l ümera* at the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>275</sup> One section of his book is reserved for the problems he observed in military and especially in campaigns. In this chapter he called “Explanation regarding the state of the ever-victorious frontier and the qualities of commanders”; he begins his narration by emphasizing the significance of knowing the condition of the enemies: “Many states have been ruined through ignorance of the enemy’s condition and through not seeking and obtaining information [about it]”. Wardens should be assigned to fortresses on the frontier of Islam among the courageous and zealous viziers and

---

<sup>273</sup> *Düstur*, pp. 26-28

<sup>274</sup> Hezarfen Hüseyin Efendi, *Telhisül Beyan fî Kavanin-i Âli Osman*, haz. Sevim İlgürel (Ankara: TTK, 1998); Robert Anhegger, “Hezarfen Hüseyin Efendi’nin Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilatına Dair Mülâhazaları”, *Türkiyat Mecmuası X* (1951-53) pp. 372-387

<sup>275</sup> *Ottoman Statecraft: The Book of Counsel for Vezirs and Governors, Nasa'ih ü'l vüzera ve'l ümera of Sarı Mehmed Pasha, the Defterdar* ed. tr. by Walter Livingston Wright Junior (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1935). I will refer this text as *Nasaih* hereafter.

*mirmirans* in order to achieve this aim. “They should strive to send secret spies from each frontier to the enemy country and be well informed always of the enemy’s condition.” It is essential to take care of protecting previously built fortresses and repairing and making them firm. This job should be committed to a man who abstains from profiteering and avarice so that treasure will be kept secure from waste.<sup>276</sup> All the fortresses should be ready to war with arms and instruments as if they are under a siege. “Provisions and other necessities should be procured and stored up in such quantities that no harm will arise if it be for a long time besieged.” Bullets and powder should not be wasted for public celebrations. In order to preserve supplies, frequent investigations should be held in fortresses. Local troops there should be also inspected regularly. Commissioners sent for these investigations should be devout and upright so that they do not mislead government because of their personal profits.<sup>277</sup>

Moreover, Defterdar asserts, it is a very great mistake to give for the pay of the soldiery in the fortresses as *ocaqlıq* (“In certain cases the *ocaqlıq* consisted of the right to receive fixed yearly quantities of goods or produce from a town or village... The responsibility for collecting the income was placed upon the beneficiary, thus saving expense and labor for the treasury”<sup>278</sup>) because those who collect taxes from the subjects seek their profits and extract more and more from them. What is more, they do not pay the salaries of soldiers. These soldiers, then, starts to complain, saying that “our pay does not come to us” and “our estate has no income” and remove themselves from their responsibilities. “In the end, it is certain that the harm accrues and pertains wholly to the Treasury”.<sup>279</sup>

The ultimate aim of the sultan and commander-in-chief –says Defterdar- should be the animating of the religion and the execution of the *sunnah* of the prophet. “Let them not be unjust or oppressive to any one, but just and equitable, and let them seek to win affection and praises. While not oppressing or tyrannizing over the military corps, let them safeguard proper discipline”<sup>280</sup>

---

<sup>276</sup> *Nasaih*, p. 121

<sup>277</sup> *Nasaih*, p. 122-123

<sup>278</sup> See the footnote # 6 in *Nasaih* page 123 for the term “*ocaqlıq*”.

<sup>279</sup> *Nasaih*, p. 123-124

<sup>280</sup> *ibid*, p. 126

Many soldiers who are proved to be useless –adds Defterdar- commit all sorts of shameful acts saying “we are on campaign” and cause the dispersion and wretchedness of the peasants on their road. They should be watched carefully in order to remove their oppressions. Most of the units of soldiers are neglect their prayers and can not carry out properly the rules of Islam.<sup>281</sup>

“Whatever the direction in which a campaign may be required, persons should be sought who are experienced in affairs and have lived many years on the beautifully ordered frontier.” After consultation with them, decisions should be held regarding the state of enemy and what preparation is necessary.<sup>282</sup>

If it is necessary to send a commander-in-chief he should be chosen among the man who served many years of state and religion, who is talented about the stratagems of warfare and management of soldiers, who knows how to make surprise attacks, a man of valor, a courageous vizier, a wise counselor. He should be patient and long-suffering in hard-ships and troubles. He should know how to treat each rank with due consideration so that his soldiers obey him saying that “he discerns ability and value”. Moreover, while peace is possible he should not venture upon war and battle. He should not refrain from consulting experienced persons in war, but abstain from consulting explicitly with the rest of the crowd, he should consult with them through not giving actual situation but using symbols and comparisons because sometimes an unwise person may bring a wise answer.<sup>283</sup>

In the matter of spies watchfulness is essential. They should not make their information known to each other. The commander should get it himself. Spies who come with a joy-giving news and spies bring news excites anxiety should be equally rewarded so that they do not conceal their information because of fear.<sup>284</sup>

In difficult mountain passes and marshes, necessary precautions should be taken in order that no one may experience any hardships. The commander-in-chief should make no difficulty over producing the pay and provender of the soldiers.<sup>285</sup>

---

<sup>281</sup> *ibid*, p. 126-127

<sup>282</sup> *ibid*, p. 127

<sup>283</sup> *ibid*, pp. 127-129

<sup>284</sup> *ibid*, p. 129

<sup>285</sup> *ibid*, p. 130

He, in conclusion, emphasizes that each enemy has its own manner of war; commander should also explore these different tactics and make preparation whatever style of warfare is peculiar to that army.<sup>286</sup> The commander should honor prudent soldiers essential to him and counsel every matter with them and do not allow words that might injure morale of the soldiers or weaken the advance or bring discouragement.<sup>287</sup>

### 3.5: Connections between *nasihatname* writers and İbrahim Müteferrika

İbrahim asserts, at the very beginning of his book, that he read “*devavin ve defatir matukası*” in order to be informed about the conditions of previous sultans. These notebooks that İbrahim said he read were probably *nasihatnames* of previous two centuries. The books that İbrahim possessed and now found in his probate inventory supports our idea: Among the many books he had there were *Mizanü'l Hakk* of Katip Çelebi, and *Ahlak-ı Alai* of Kınalızade Ali.<sup>288</sup> Most important difference between *UH* and previous treatises is that most of them share a great place to personal characteristics of the rulers, İbrahim, on the other hand, dwells much on the structural problems. His main actors in historical scene are not agents but structures. If there is a problem in army what should be done is not changing the commander in chief but military stratagems. İbrahim, like most of these writers, began his account with his complaints about the disorder in the order of the world. İbrahim, surely, took over some of the thoughts of these writers. There is no doubt that, İbrahim inherited the idea that soldiers should be “few but strong” from the previous intellectuals we displayed above like Lütü Paşa, the writer of *Kitab-ı Müstetab* and Koçi Bey. He seems to be taking his attention about knowing the conditions of enemies and using spies absolutely from Âli , Hezarfen Hüseyin Efendi and Defterdar. They are at least as obsessed with this matter as İbrahim. The writer of *Kitabu Mesalih* explicitly emphasized the importance of soldier’s wearing

---

<sup>286</sup> *ibid*, p. 130

<sup>287</sup> *ibid*, p. 131

<sup>288</sup> Orlin Sabev, *ibid*, cited in Erhan Afyoncu, “İbrahim Müteferrika’nın Yeni Yayınlanan Terekesi ve Ölüm Tarihi Üzerine” *Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi* 15 (Bahar 2004) p. 355.

unique clothes and berets and its benefits in terms of thwarting disorder among the army and preventing soldiers' involvement in fights.

It is very interesting to note that; İbrahim says nothing about the navy and organization of it. Ottomans were fighting mainly in land this century and İbrahim found it valuable to talk about military organization in land. Moreover, he says nothing about the fortresses too; however, Defterdar allocates nearly half of the part on military on this problem. İbrahim Müteferrika also says nothing about the fiefs and problems associated with it.

I have to restate İbrahim's diagnoses about the problems in the Ottomans state here for the purpose of comparing his ones with the ones of *nasihatname* writers. For him, main problems in the Ottoman state derived from: (1) defectiveness in the practice of the shariat, (2) ignorance in practicing justice, (3) tolerance in disciplining, (4) assigning important tasks to undeserving people, (5) lack of consultation, (6) failing to put into practice what experienced and sagacious people advised, (7) looseness in organizing soldiers and ignorance in using new war tools, (8) soldiers' lack of fear from their officers and their inclination to take bribes and ignorance of their own task. It is very clear that, all these points had been emphasized by previous *nasihatname* writers.

İbrahim's originality seems in his introduction of military organization of European armies. Where did he get this information? Niyazi Berkes strongly argues that the book that İbrahim said he read in Latin about the military science should be *Commentarii Bellici* of Raimondo Montecuccoli- an Austrian commander in chief who is said to be the savior of Christianity because of his victory against Ottomans in St. Gothard in 1664.<sup>289</sup>

Among the various intellectuals who had an impact on İbrahim, one is more dominant than others. At the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Hasan Kâfi Akhisari wrote a treatise by the name of *Usul-ül Hikem fi Nizam-ı Alem*.<sup>290</sup> Great similarity of the names of the books of Kâfi and İbrahim should not be a coincidence. We have evidence to prove that İbrahim took Kâfi's book as an example. Formations and physical structures

---

<sup>289</sup> Berkes, *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma*, p.54 and footnote # 25. See also Jeremy Black, *European Warfare*, p. 104-105 for Montecuccoli. There is a reference to the book of Montecuccoli in one of the *Tarih-i Cevdet* editions of Cevdet Paşa. It is written here that this book was translated into Turkish but it was not published. Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tarih-i Cevdet* (1) ( İstanbul: Üçdal neşriyat, 1994)

<sup>290</sup> For the transcription of this text see Mehmet İpşirli, "Hasan Kâfi El- Akhisari ve Devlet Düzenine ait Eseri Usulü'l Hikem fi Nizami'l Alem" , *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi*, 10-11 (1979) pp. 239-278. I will call it as *Kâfi* hereafter.

of both books are similar. At the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Hasan Kâfi, again, is the first person who advised Ottomans to take new war equipments of the Europeans.

Hasan Kâfi wrote for the same audience and the words that he used are exactly same with the ones of İbrahim.<sup>291</sup> He begins his book with same introduction with İbrahim: at the 1004<sup>th</sup> year of the Hegira he observes anarchy in the order of the world, then, he is inspired to write this book.<sup>292</sup> As most of the nasihatname writers he sees the ultimate reasons of the change and corruption as the ignorance of justice not giving the posts to those who deserve. Second reason is not counseling with the scholars and not giving them their due. Third reason is their ignorance of supplying soldiers and not using war tools of enemies, as well as soldiers' lack of fear from their officers. Ultimate reason of these three reasons is bribery, listening women in state matters and practicing what they said.<sup>293</sup> The part that Kâfi discussed how he put the name of his book is also same with the one of the İbrahim.<sup>294</sup> He also accepts the notion that society is composed of four main classes and each of them should be forced not to penetrate into the sections of others like İbrahim.<sup>295</sup> The most innovative part of Kâfi's book is about the necessity of using war equipments and dresses of the enemies. He emphasizes here that using these tools is a must (*farz-ı mühim*). He also stresses the importance of taking attendance of soldiers.<sup>296</sup> He says that he observed in Croatian border that enemies started to be victorious when they use new weapons. Muslims could counter-attack them when they adopted these tools. However, now, enemies exaggerated using these tools and Muslims ignored adopting new rifles and cannons. This is the ultimate reason for defeat for him.<sup>297</sup> The sultans and viziers, first of all, should order soldiers to be on

---

<sup>291</sup> Compare the following two quotations:

“...gayet de vazih u asan olan tabir ve takrir ü tahrir eyledim ki ayan-ı ashab-ı divan ve erbab-ı eyvan-ı sultana suhulet ile istifade mümkün ü müyesser olduktan sonra mazmunuyla amel olunub, biiznillahi teala alemde asar-ı semeratı ve envar-ı hayru berekatı zuhur eyleye”. Kâfi, p. 248

“Ola ki ayan-ı ashab-ı divan ve erbab-ı eyvan sultana meal ve mefadından istifade müyesser ve mazmuniyle amel mukadder olup, inayet-i Hak ile alemde asar ve semeratı-ı bahir ve enva-ı hayr u berekatı zuhur eyleye”. UH, p. 127

<sup>292</sup> Kâfi, p. 249 and UH, p. 123-127

<sup>293</sup> Kâfi, p. 249-250

<sup>294</sup> Kâfi, p. 250 and UH, p. 127

<sup>295</sup> Kâfi, p. 251-252 and UH, p. 152

<sup>296</sup> Kâfi, p. 267

<sup>297</sup> Kâfi, p. 268

their religions, they should prohibit causing disorder and should abolish bad inventions (*bid'at*) like coffee-houses. Soldiers, on the other hand, should fight for the sake of religion. Moreover, they should obey their officers. They should be united and abstain from animosity among themselves.<sup>298</sup> Though Hasan Kâfi's recommendations remains mostly within the circle of classical *nasihatname* genre, he differs from others in terms of his stress on the using new weapons of enemies. İbrahim seems to be influenced by Kâfi especially in terms of the format of his book. Similarity (or identity) between the names of the books should not be a coincidence. A linguistic analysis of the names of these treatises is also instructive. As a representative of the 16<sup>th</sup> century mirror for princes genre, who are obsessed with the idea of the order of the world (*nizam-ı alem*), Kâfi puts the name of his book *Usul-ül Hikem fi nizam-ül Alem* (Philosophical principles concerning the order of the world). İbrahim, on the other hand, who is aware of the change in perception of politics, puts the name of his book *Usul-ül Hikem fi Nizam-ül Ümem* (Philosophical principles concerning the order of the nations).

I asserted above that, İbrahim adopted Ibn Khaldun in his understanding of the social composition. Cornell Fleisher argues that before Ibn Khaldun discovered in 17<sup>th</sup> century, Âli already had a theory of rise and fall of the dynasties. He emphasizes the close similarities between Âli and Khaldun despite the fact that Muqaddimah was not among the sources of Âli. His argument is that Ottoman intellectuals, at least one of them already perceived the history similar to North African historian and when they discovered him they utilized his theory which is fitting to their own one. As Fleisher articulated:

...the Muqaddimah, while influential, hardly revolutionized Ottoman historical writing. Rather, it was accorded a warm reception by thinkers who found its ideas at once relevant and familiar, because conceptions of sovereignty and of the growth and decay of dynastic states very similar to those of Ibn Khaldun had already been articulated in Ottoman historical literature<sup>299</sup>

*Nasihatname* writers were collectively complaining about the “decay/decline” of the Ottoman Empire. In such conjuncture, Khaldun's theory of decline of the dynasties

---

<sup>298</sup> Kâfi, pp. 272-274

<sup>299</sup> Cornell Fleisher, “ Royal Authority, Dynastic Cyclism and ibn Khaldunism in Sixteenth Century Ottoman Letters” in *Ibn Khaldun and Islamic Ideology* ed. Bruce B. Lawrence ( Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1984) p. 47



served their aim properly. Thus, they adopted and applied his theory to their already constructed decline scheme.

What is important for our purpose is that İbrahim does not speak about the theory of rise and fall of the states of Khaldun, so he differs from previous writers like Katip Çelebi who adopted Khaldun's theory of dynasties. İbrahim seems to be influenced by Khaldun's social theory. He, like his predecessor, uses Khaldunian scheme of social composition -not the theory of dynasties- which defends that people need each other and people are social beings in nature.

## CONCLUSION

18<sup>th</sup> century Ottoman historiography pays too much attention to “Western impact” and most of the writings try to evaluate this century with reference to Westernization paradigm. According to this paradigm, Ottomans were perceived as passive receivers of Western science, technology and achievements. What is more, this paradigm depicts Ottomans as “closed” minds who are sure about their superiority and self-confidence for centuries and reflects them as a group who is not in interaction with other societies and states apart from the purposes of war. What is brought is brought from outside, if there is an innovation it is taken from neighborhood; it is not created inside. In this study, arguing against to this paradigm, I aimed to display the importance, motivation, struggle and “impact” of insiders in social and political analysis departing from 18<sup>th</sup> century “Ottoman” intellectual İbrahim Müteferrika. As one of the innovative characters of this century, he became an Ottoman in Ottoman political and Islamic context. Though he was an “outsider” at the beginning he adopted ways and doings of “insiders” and became one of the champions of insider perspective. He read enlightened men of Ottoman intellectual life and aware of the literature before him. He is also acquainted with the West. However, if İbrahim achieved something, it is the creation of Ottoman social, cultural and political atmosphere; it was not imported from West. İbrahim’s origins might be in the West but it is explicit that his output is created in the East.

In this study, which concentrates on one of the important figures of Ottoman intellectual history, I tried to fill a gap. Needless to say, İbrahim Müteferrika has been investigated by various writers since the first years of Republic. However, most of these writings are concentrated on İbrahim’s establishment of printing press- which is no doubt one main component of his intellectual body. His works have not been given central role in these analyses. I tried to build my study on these works contrary to previous tendencies.

Born in sometime between 1670 and 1674 and began his career in the Ottoman terrain as a soldier, there is not too much information about the life of İbrahim until his becoming a Müteferrika in 1716. All the information about his activities before this date cited by people writing on him is reconstructed from bits and pieces of information in a book called *Risale-i İslamiye* whose authorship is attributed to İbrahim. I already asserted my doubts about the authenticity of this book because there is no further

evidence than a statement written by a certain scribe on the cover of this book that it belongs to İbrahim the convert who practiced the art of printing in the reign of Ahmed III. Departing from this information, most people studying İbrahim claim that İbrahim born in a town in Hungary by the name of Kolosvar and studied divinity there in order to be a priest. Then, according to these narratives, he questioned dogmas of Catholic religion and converted into Islam after recognizing good news of Prophet Mohammed in the sacred books. Some other people, on the other hand claimed that İbrahim did not convert voluntarily but force to do such. Basing his argument on the thoughts in *Risale-i Islamiye*, Niyazi Berkes argues that İbrahim converted voluntarily and his former belief –Unitarianism- assisted him in his decision. Forced or voluntary İbrahim took refugee in the Ottoman Empire probably because of political reasons that Protestants are under suppression of the Catholics in his own country-Transylvania.

His talents should have been recognized by the state officials that he is given the post of *Müteferrika*. He was employed in various diplomatic missions. He was translator of Rakoczi Ferenc for his life time.

He established his printing house and published four different maps until inaugurating to publish books in 1727. He published 16-17 different titles in his press. He presented a concise essay about the utilities of printing to state officials and took permission to found press. He was assisted with a *fetva* of the sheik-el-Islam too. In his essay which reminds a manifesto İbrahim complains about lack of dictionaries -which are very useful for students- and correct editions of books. In addition, he puts the benefits of printed books like tables and indexes. Printed books are also cheaper which will fasten dissemination of knowledge. He wishes for dissemination of knowledge to whole country; not only capital city but also countryside. He sees printing as a matter of rivalry between Ottomans and Christians and asserts that Muslims should be superior to them in every matter and printing is not an exception. As a provisionist, he is disturbed by Europeans gaining profit from printed books in Muslim lands.

He seems very anxious about losing the opportunity of printing that he was constantly putting information in front of the publications about how he established printing house. He published first of all a dictionary, for example, which will serve not only general public but also professionals (scholars, scribes, professors etc.). Publishing a dictionary –it would serve high officials first of all- would silence people who are against printing through displaying how it is useful for all. Surely enough, İbrahim was not the first person who published books in the Ottoman Empire. Jews, Armenians and

Greeks had their own printing houses. İbrahim's novelty should be his publishing Turkish books.

Main discussion about the printing press is about the reasons of relatively late development of printing in the Ottoman Empire. I tried to outline above shortcomings of this outlook: first of all such a question that why Ottomans adopted printing later than Europe assumes European way of progress unique. In this unilinear development, every other country should pass the ways that Europe did in order to reach high civilization. Ottomans' adopting printing later than Europe is a deviation that should be explained according to this paradigm. However, it is not a must to pass from the same path that Europe did in order to create an Enlightenment movement. Although it might be an elite one at the beginning, it is also possible to create a cultural Renaissance in a society in which major form of book production is hand-written material. An alternative question in terms of Ottoman adoption of printing might be why Ottomans adopted it earlier than any other Muslim country.

The books he published can be seen extension of his intellectual interests in geography, history, language and military science. My argument in this study was that İbrahim's publications are not randomly selected. He chose the books that are fit in his general view: They represent the viewpoint of Ottoman state and published for the practical aims and needs of Muslim community. Apart from the books of geography, in publishing the books of history, he has an insight of total history. He wants to see picture in complete and printed histories of Ottomans and neighborhood states in chronological order. Timing of the books was not coincidence too and every one of them served special aims (like the books about Iran and Egypt). We do not know if printing served the aims of Ottomans, but it served very well Europeans because nearly all of the books published in Mütferrika press was translated into European languages. If Ottomans did not benefit from printing, Europeans benefited for sure.

In terms of understanding İbrahim Mütferrika it is very significant to emphasize that he prospered in a suitable environment. He had close friendship with the "enlightened" man of the reign of Ahmed III and Mahmud I. He was assisted by grand vizier Damad İbrahim and Said Efendi in his enterprise. He had close relationship with open-minded sheik-el-Islam Abdullah Efendi. He established friendships with the foreign ambassadors in Istanbul and exchanged ideas. He had an interest also in religious man of non-Muslim communities. He worked together with Comte de Bonneval and exchanged ideas about the military organization of the Ottoman Empire.

He was assisted in his printing job by one of the advanced intellectuals of the time: Pirizade who translated into Turkish Ibn Khaldun's *Muqaddimah*. He had conversations with the foreign officers of European states. He says he did not look at the contemptibility of the ground and acquired knowledge where available to him. In this circle, İbrahim became intellectual through taking pieces from each of these people.

İbrahim Müteferrika's opinions were clearly expressed in his masterpiece *Usulü'l Hikem*. Written as a reform proposal after his disturbance with the disorder in capital after Patrona Halil rebellion, this book was one of the early diagnoses of Ottoman ills. He says he wrote this book after his recognition of weaknesses in Ottoman body. However, as opposed to many of the previous intellectuals, he loads a positive meaning to change. This weakness would help the renovation of the rules of state and religion, reinforcement of the power of sultanate, strengthening the structure of the laws of Islamic law, putting in order of the works of country and people, improvement of the situation of subjects and invigoration of the way and doings of the prophet.

İbrahim's theory of social composition is influenced by Ibn Khaldun though he did not adopt Khaldun's theory of rise and fall of dynasties unlike the *nasihatname* writers before him who utilized from Khaldun's theory of dynasties in order to legitimize their "decline" scheme. I defended in this study that İbrahim might be also influenced by Thomas Hobbes because all three intellectuals see society as an organism which can not stand without individuals' alliance with each other. They also see rulers necessary for a society to survive in order to make every one satisfied with his due. Hobbes and İbrahim were writing in the same age with nearly same perspective. Their aim was similar too: they were trying to find a solution to political legitimacy problem and adopted same theory which see authority as natural. One intellectual from the East, the other from the West come together under same intellectual umbrella. This similarity between Hobbes and İbrahim can be read as a fact that denies absolute differentiability between East and West through emphasizing similar intellectual climate.

İbrahim concerns with the question why Ottomans started to be defeated in war. In the quest of an answer to this question, he sees the change in the military tactics as the ultimate reason. He is the first Ottoman intellectual who recognized the impact of military revolution on the power politics of world. In his comparison of old way of fight with new military organization, he emphasizes the importance of order. For him, "order" is above all. What is lacking in the Ottoman army is order. He also sees the problem in army in the level of officers and recommends, first of all, organization in

them. He stresses in his narrative the importance of “uniformity”. Everything should be uniform in order to be successful in war: dresses, salaries, standards, rifles, weight and height of soldiers etc. What he offered as a solution is nothing than a “modern” organization. İbrahim seems right in his analysis that what Ottomans must do in order to organize their army is reorganizing state apparatus in modern lines which is an argument I discussed in this study. The order in the army is also important for public at large because it would lead to the order in society and increase in welfare of subjects. Without giving name, he complains about Janissaries causing disorder, practicing two different jobs, not participating in war, consuming treasury etc. he complains from large number of soldiers and their inefficiency in war and abuses in campaigns.

In his anthropological perception, he sees Muslims superior at birth. They are superior to Christians in courage and swordsmanship naturally. Christians are ill-created and weak in nature while Muslims are blessed by God. His general outlook is Ottoman-centric that he attributes change in the West to the Ottoman impact. Though his perception seems heroic he puts special emphasis on knowing the conditions of enemies. Nearly half of *UH* dwells on how it is significant to be aware of capacities, tactics and organization of foes. Apart from, knowing the situation of enemies, it is also a must to know your own limits: one should be aware of his strengths and weaknesses. He is knowledgeable in European history –as the major foe of Ottomans- and gives most of his examples from their history.

Most innovative side of İbrahim’s intellectual configuration is his criticism against Muslim community and his revivalist opinions. Muslims are living in ignorance and separated from each other. They are sunk into fanaticism because of their ignorance. They do not even know their own conditions. Christians, on the other hand, spread into world and occupied many places. They found “new world” and launched into new riches. Muscovites were few and weak short time ago, but they expanded into Caspian see, now. İbrahim was very much against expansionist policies of Christians. However, it is for a political aim, he demands Muslims to expand in these places. One of the main points is İbrahim’s true recognition of “rise of the west” phenomenon from a modern perspective. He, like most of the contemporary historians, bases rise of the West to discoveries. He, probably earlier than most of the Europeans themselves, interpreted how West became dominant in world politics. He also recognized the place of reason on European change. He says that Christians do not have their rules written in their sacred texts unlike Muslims. Therefore, they have to base their organization on

reason rather than religion. However, İbrahim sees it negative. Muslims are superior because religion is superior to reason. His emphasis on the harms of fanaticism is not something about religion, but ignorance. On the contrary, he wishes for the invigoration of Sunnah of Prophet and strict application of rules of shariat. He also wants from Muslims to aid each other and come together. In terms of his emphasis on invigoration of the way of Mohammed and criticism of Western imperialism he reminds Islamic revivalism of 19<sup>th</sup> century represented by intellectuals like Cemaleddin Afgani and Muhammed Abduh. İbrahim deserves to be called founding founder of Islamic revivalism.

There is no doubt that İbrahim has a consciousness of science. For example, he sees military organization as something which should be studied under scientific discipline. Apart from, military science, he has an interest in the sciences of geography and history. However, his scientism is not comparable to Enlightenment thinkers. Sciences should have uses for him. Geography is most suitable discipline for this aim according to İbrahim's definition. Rulers should know this science in order to be informed about the physical geography of their enemies, their roads, distances between borders and cities, conditions of seas. Not only rulers but also sail men should know it in order to find their way in sea. His perception of geography is not confined with physical geography. For him, it should also include customs, habits, and living conditions of peoples of these places. History, as another useful discipline, serves similar aims like geography. Rulers absolutely should know the adventures of previous sultans in order not to repeat same mistakes.

Apart from Ibn Khaldun, most influential person on the thoughts of İbrahim Müteferrika is Katip Çelebi. İbrahim adopted Katip Çelebi's opinions on geography and history. He displayed his admire of Çelebi through publishing three important works of him: two on geography and one on history. Most of the thoughts İbrahim cited in UH on geography, history, their meanings and uses are directly taken from various books of Katip Çelebi. As just an example, İbrahim talks about political regimes of European countries. He introduces here regimes of democracy, monarchy and aristocracy which probably İbrahim copied from Çelebi's *Irşad*. Another influential person on İbrahim is Hasan Kâfi Akhisari. İbrahim borrowed the name of his book from Kâfi just changing one letter. He probably influenced from the formation of Kâfi's book too. One can find identical sentences between the books of İbrahim and Kâfi. Historian Naima also seems

one of the people influential on İbrahim's thought. However, none of these intellectuals are as influential as Katip Çelebi on İbrahim.

I proposed in this study that a text written in the reign of Ahmed I probably between 1716 and 1718 was also belonged to İbrahim Müteferrika because thoughts expressed in this text written as an interview between a Christian and Muslim soldier are identical with the thoughts expressed in *UH*. My argument was that if İbrahim was recognized by state officials it must not be because of *Risale-i İslamiye* but because of this text which defends peace with Austrians.

I also discussed *Risale-i İslamiye*— without concentrating on the author but with dwelling on the content of the book- and emphasized that this text is not only one which tells the good news of Prophet Mohammed in sacred books of non-Muslims but also there is a political subtext running underground that it espouses how Ottoman success are written in sacred books and how Ahmed I is a legitimate ruler. Full of metaphors carefully selected in order to display how Catholics are cruel, their belief is degenerated, the Pope is illegitimate and ill-created, *Risale-i İslamiye* is an unofficial history of Christianity from a Muslim's perspective.

İbrahim's observations about the problems of Ottoman Empire and their probable reasons are influenced from the *nasihatnames* (counsel for sultans) written before him. For him, main problems in the Ottoman politics derived from: (1) defectiveness in the practice of the shariat, (2) ignorance in practicing justice, (3) tolerance in disciplining, (4) assigning important tasks to undeserving people, (5) lack of consultation, (6) failing to put into practice what experienced and sagacious people advised, (7) looseness in organizing soldiers and ignorance in using new war tools, (8) soldiers' lack of fear from their officers and their inclination to take bribes and ignorance of their own tasks. These points were already expressed by the intellectuals of 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century. However, İbrahim differs from them in terms of his solution to these problems. He advises change in the structure not in agents/individuals. Devout statesmen and intellectuals like Lütü Paşa, Mustafa Ali, Koçi Bey, Defterdar Mehmed Paşa, Hezarfen Hüseyin Efendi and many others I touched upon in my study were concentrating on the qualities of individuals like viziers and commanders and even sultan himself. According to their treatment method, if the posts are allocated to the people who are talented and deserved and bribery and favoritism is blockaded, problems would have been solved. İbrahim, on the other hand, counsels for the change in the structure of state especially in military organization. Unlike Ali or Defterdar, he never



talks about concrete examples. He chooses his examples from West as well as East in order to strengthen his thesis. He does not have “kanun conciousness” per se like *nasihatname* writers in the meaning that he does not refer past as an ideal period. However, he shares same thoughts with *nasihatname* writers in his perception of social composition. He divides society into four different classes and is also against penetration between them though most important class is the man of army according to him which is a preference changing for each writer probably depending on his own class. He is also against frequent rotation of officers and bureaucrats like his precedents.

There is no doubt that İbrahim took over some of his thoughts from the writers before him: İbrahim, for example, inherited the idea that soldiers should be “few but strong” from the previous intellectuals like Lütî Paşa, the writer of *Kitab-ı Müstetab* and Koçi Bey. He seems to be taking his attention about knowing the conditions of enemies and using spies absolutely from Âli , Hezarfen Hüseyin Efendi and Defterdar. The writer of *Kitabu Mesalih* explicitly emphasized the importance of soldier’s wearing unique clothes and berets and its benefits in terms of thwarting disorder among the army and preventing soldiers’ involvement in fights. Hasan Kâfi is the first person, nearly one and half century ago, emphasized the importance of using new inventions in military technology of the Christians and observed disorder in army.

Despite the similarities between *nasihatname* writer’s treatises and İbrahim’s *Usûl’ül Hikem*, it is difficult to call İbrahim’s book a *nasihatname* or *siyasetname*. It is more correct to identify it as reform proposal (*ıslahat layihası*) because it is not a complete book of counsel for Sultans like *Nüşatü’s Selatin* of Mustafa Âli which contains strict advices and moral directions to King in every matter. It concentrates on a specific problem and includes specific advices.

As a “geographer-cartographer, diplomat-administrator, author-editor, translator, printer-typefounder, religious scholar, courtier, soldier, pamphleteer, reformer”<sup>300</sup> amateur scientist, political theorist, publicist, missionary; İbrahim Müteferrika reminds me a Renaissance men. However, it is for sure that he was a late-comer for the European Renaissance. On the other hand, if there is something that can be called Ottoman Enlightenment, İbrahim was the greatest harbinger of it not just with only his thoughts but also with his activities.

---

<sup>300</sup> Watson, *ibid*, p. 436

## REFERENCES

### Primary Sources

- \*Afgani, Cemaleddin and Abduh, Muharnmed. *Urvetu'l Vuska*. Istanbul: Bir Yayıncılık, 1987.
- \*Ahmed Cevdet Paşa, *Tarih-i Cevdet*. Istanbul: Uçdal neşriyat, 1994.
- \*Anhegger, Robert. "Hezarfen Hüseyin Efendi'nin Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilatına Dair Mülahazaları", *Türkiyat Mecmuası* X ( 1951-53) pp. 372-387
- \*Bosnavi, Ömer. *Ahval-i Gazavat-ı der Diyar-ı Bosna*. Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıbaatil Mamure, 1154 [1741].
- \*Bosnavi, Ömer. *Bosna Tarihi* (Tarih-i Bosna der Diyar-ı Hekimoglu Ali Paşa), ed. Karnil Su. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları, 1979.
- \*Bosnavi, Ömer. *Bosna Savaşları*, ed. Mehmet Açıkgözlü. Istanbul: Ötüken yayınevi, 1977.
- \*Defterdar Sarı Mehmed Paşa. *Ottoman Statecraft: The Book of Counsel for Vezirs and Governors, Nasa'ih al vüzera ve'l umera of Sarı Mehmed Pasha, the Defterdar* ed. Tr. By Walter Livingston Wright Junior. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1935.
- \*Demirel, Şahap. "İbrahim Müteferrika'nın Füyüzat-ı Mıknatisiye Adlı Kitabı", *Atatürk'ün Yüzüncü Doğum Yılına Armağan*. Ankara DTCF (1982): pp. 265-330 (Transcribed and original text)
- \*Ebu Nasr İsmail Bin Hammad El- Cevheri, Tercüme-i *Sihah-i Cevheri* ( Vankulu Lügati), 2. vol. tr. Mehmed b. Mustafa el- Vani. Konstantiniyye : Darü't Tıba'atil Mamure, 1141 [1729].
- \*Goodrich, Thomas D. *The Ottoman Turks and the New World: A study of Tarih-i Hind- i Garbi and Sixteenth century Ottoman-Americana*. Otto Harrasowitz. Wiesbaden, 1990.
- \*Hezarfen Hüseyin Efendi, *Telhisül Beyan fî Kavanin-i Ali Osman*, ed. Sevim İlğürel. Ankara: TTK, 1998.
- \*Hobbes, Thomas. *On the Citizen*, ed. Richard Tuck and Micheal Silverthorne. NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- \*Holderman, Jean- Babptiste. *Grammdire Turque*. Constantinople: 1730.
- \*İbn Arabşah, Ahmed B. Muhammed B. Abdullah. *Tarih-i Timur Gürkan li Nazmizade*. Tr. Nazmizade Murtaza b. Ali. Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıba'atil Ma'mure, 1142 [1730].

- \*Ibn Khaldun. *The Muqaddimah*, tr., Franz Rosenthal ed. N.J. Dawood. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987.
- \*Ibn Khaldun. *Mukaddime 3 vols*, tr. Zakir Kadiri Ugan. Istanbul: MEB yayımları, 1997.
- \*İpşirli, Mehmet. "Hasan Kafi El- Akhisari ve Devlet Düzenine ait Eseri Usulü'l Hikem fi Nizami'l Alem" , *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi*, 10-11 (1979) pp. 239-278.
- \*Karacson, Imre. "İbrahim Müteferrika", *TOEM* 1/3 (1328): pp. 178-190.
- \*Kâtip Çelebi (Mustafa bin Abdullah). *Tuhfeti'l Kibar fi Esfari'l Bihar*. Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıba'atil Ma'mure, 1141 [1729].
- \*Kâtip Çelebi. *Kitab-ı Cihannüma li Katip Çelebi*. Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıbaati'l Mamure, 1145 [1732].
- \*Kâtip Çelebi. *Takvimii't Tevarih*. Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıba'atil Ma'mure, 1146 [1733].
- \*Kâtip Çelebi. *Mizani'l Hakk fi ihtiyari'l Ehakk*, ed. Orhan Şaik Gokyay. Istanbul: Devlet Kitapları, 1972.
- \*Kâtip Çelebi. *Tuhfe 'til Kibar fi Esfaril Bihar 2 vol.*, ed. Orhan Şaik Gokyay. Istanbul: Tercüman 1001 eser no: 146-147, 1980.
- \*Kâtip Çelebi. *Bozuklukların Diizeltmesinde Tutulacak Yollar(Diisturu'lAmel li Islahi'l halel)*, ed. Ali Can. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1982.
- \*Kâtip Çelebi. *Cihanniima's Europe Part. Transkripsiyonlu Metin*. Istanbul: 1971. [ISAM Library]
- \*Koca Sekban Başı. *Koca Sekban Başı Risalesi* ( Hülasat-til Kelam fi Redd-il Avam). Ed. Abdullah Uçman. Istanbul: Tercüman 1001 Eser no.72, 1972.
- \*Koca Sekban Başı. "Hülasatu'l Kelam fi Reddi'l Avam", *TOEM (Tarih-i Osmani Encümeni Mecmuası)*. Istanbul, 1328/1910).
- \*Koçi Bey. *Koçi Bey Risalesi* ed. Ali Kemal Aksüt. Istanbul: 1939. ed. Zuhuri Danışman. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1985.
- \*Küçük Çelebizade, İsmail Asım. *Tarih-i Çelebizade*. Konstantiniyye: Darü't tıbaa'til mamure, 1153 [1741].
- \*Kütükoğlu, Mübahat S. " Lütfi Paşa Asafnamesi: Yeni Bir Metin Tesisi Denemesi" in *Prof. Bekir Kütükoğlu'na Armağan*, Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1991. pp. 49-101.

- \*Krusinsky, Judasz Tadeusz. *Tarih-i Seyyah der Beyan-ı Zuhur-ı Agvaniyan ve Sebeb-i inhidam-ı Bina 'i Devlet-i Şahan-ı Safeviyan* tr. İbrahim Müteferrika. Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıba'atil Ma'mure, 1142 [1729].
- \*Lütfi Paşa, *Asafname* ed. Ahmet Uğur. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1982.
- \*Mikes, Kelemen. *Osmanlı'da bir Macar konuk: Prens Rakoczi ve Mikes'm Tiirkiye Mektuplan*, tr. Edit Tasnadi. Istanbul: Aksoy Yaymcıllık, 1999.
- \*Mikes, Kelemen. *Letters from Turkey*, tr. Bernard' Adams. London and NY: Kegan Paul International, 2000.
- \*Morphey, Rhoads. (ed)- *Kanun-name-i Sultani li Aziz Efendi*. MA: Harvard University, 1985.
- \*Morphey, Rhoads. "Veliyuddin Telhis: Notes on the Sources and Interrelations between Koçi Bey and Contemporary Writers of Advice to Kings" *Belleten* 43 (1979- ) pp.547-571
- \*Mustafa Âli. *Mustafa Ali's Counsel for Sultans of 1581*, 2 volumes ed. tr. Andreas Tietze. Wien, 1979.
- \*Mustafa Nuri Paşa. *Netayic'ül Vukuat*. ed. Neşet Çagatay. Ankara: TTK, 1992.
- \*Müteferrika, İbrahim. *Usulü'l Hikem fi Nizami'l Ümem*. Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıba'atil Ma'mure, 1144 [1732].
- \*Müteferrika İbrahim. *Füyuzat-ı Mıknatisiyye*. Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıba'ati'l Ma'mure, 1144 [1732].
- \*Naima, Mustafa. *Tarih-i Naima. Ravzatü'l Hiiseyn fi Hülasati Ahbari'l Hafıkayn* 2. vol. Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıbaatil Mamure, 1147 [1734].
- \*Naima, Mustafa. *Naima Tarihi*, 3 vol. haz. Zuhuri Danışman. Istanbul: Zuhuri Danışman Yayınevi, 1967.
- \*Nazmizade Murtaza b. Ali. *Gülşen-i Hulefa*. Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıba'atil Ma'mure, 1143 [1730].
- \*Necatioglu, Halil. *İbrahim Müteferrika ve Risale- i İslamiye*. Ankara, 1982. (includes transcription)
- \*Raşid, Mehmed. *Tarih-i Raşid*, 3.vol. Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıbaatil Mamure, 1153 [1741].
- \*Refik, Ahmet. *Memalik-i Osmaniye'de Kral Rakoçi ve Tevabii*. Istanbul, 1333.
- \*Refik, Ahmet. *Onikinci Asr-ı Hicri ' de İstanbul Hayatı*. Istanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1988.

- \*Rycaut, Paul. *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*. London, 1668.
- \*Şeker, Mehmet . *Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali ve Mevaidü'n Nefais fî Kavaidü'l Mecalis*. Ankara: TTK, 1997.
- \**Tarihü'l Hindi Garbi El- Müsemma Bi Hadisi Nev*. Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıbaatil Mamure ,1142 [1730].
- \**Tarih-i Hind-i Garbi veya Hadis-i Nev*. Ankara: Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the Turkish Republic, 1987.
- \*Şen, Adil. *İbrahim Müteferrika ve Usulü 'l Hikem fî Nizamü'l Ümem*. Ankara: TDV, 1995 (includes transcription)
- \*Şu'uri, Hasan. *Lisanü'l Acem*, 2.vol. Konstantiniyye: Darü't Tıbaatil Mamure, 1155 [1741].
- \*Uğur, Ahmet. "Asafname.-i Vezir Lütü Paşa", *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi İslam İlimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi* IV (1980) pp. 243-258.
- \*Unat, Faik Reşit. "Ahmet III. Devrine Ait Bir Islahat Takriri: Muhayyel Bir Mülakatın Zabıtları", *Tarih Vesikaları* (1:2) Haziran 1941-Mayıs 1942: pp. 107-121.
- \*Yücel, Yaşar. *Osmanlı Devlet Teşkilatına Dair Kaynaklar: Kitab-ı Müstetab, Kitabı Mesalihi'l Müslimin ve Menafi'il Miiminin, Hırzı'l Müluk*. Ankara: TTK, 1988.

## Secondary Sources

- \*Abou-el Hajj, Rifat. *Modern Devletin Dogası*, tr. Oktay Özel, Canay Şahin. Istanbul: İmge, 2000.
- \*Abou-el Hajj, Rifat. "The expression of Ottoman Political culture in the literature of advice to princes (nasihatnameler) sixteenth to twentieth centuries" in *Sociology in the Rubric of Social Science, Professor Ramkrishna Mukherjee Felicitation Volume* R.K. Bhattacharya and A.K. Ghosh eds. (1995) pp. 282-292.
- \*Addington, Larry H. *The Patterns of War through the Eighteenth Century*. Indiana and Bloomington: Indiana University press, 1990.
- \*Adıvar, A. Adnan, *Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim*. Istanbul: Rernzi Kitabevi, 2004.
- \*Afyoncu, Erhan. "İbrahim Müteferrika", *DİA*, v. 21: pp. 324-327
- \*Afyoncu, Erhan. "İlk Türk Matbaasının Kurucusu Hakkında Yeni Bilgiler", *TTK Belleten* LXV n. 242-244 (2002): pp. 606-622
- \*Afyoncu, Erhan. "İbrahim Müteferrika'nın Yeni Yayınlanan Terekesi ve Ölüm Tarihi Üzerine" *Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi* 15 (Bahar 2004).

- \*Akbulut, Mustafa. "İbrahim Müteferrika ve ilk Türk Matbaası" in *Türkler* v.14. pp. 916-926.
- \*Aksan, Virginia. "Locating the Ottomans among the early modern empires" *Journal of Early Modern History*, 3:2, 1999, p. 103-134.
- \*Aksan, Virginia. "Ottoman war and warfare 1453-1812" in *War in the Early Modern World*. London: UCL Press, 1999: pp. 147-175.
- \*Aksan, Virginia. "Ottoman Military Matters" *Journal of Early Modern History* (6, 1): pp. 52-62.
- \*Aksan, Virginia. "Ottoman Political Writing 1768-1808", *International Journal of Middle East Studies*. vol. 25, No: 1 (Feb., 1993) pp. 53-69.
- \*Aktepe, Münir. *Patrona İsyarı*, İstanbul: İÜ Edebiyat fak. Yay.,1958.
- \*Atiyeh, George (ed). *The Book in the Islamic World: The Written Word and Communication in the Middle East*. Albany: Suny Press, 1995.
- \*Aydüz, Salim. "İbrahim Müteferrika", *Yaşamlarıyla ve Yapıtlarıyla Osmanlılar Ansiklopedisi*. (2 volumes.) V. 1 İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık, 1999: pp. 631-633
- \*Babinger, Franz and İbrahim Müteferrika. *Müteferrika ve Osmanlı Matbaası*. İstanbul:Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2004.
- \*Babinger, Franz. 18. yüzyılda *İstanbul'da Kitabiyat*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2004.
- \*Baysal, Jale. "II.Rakoczi Ferencin Çevirmeni Müteferrika İbrahim ve Osmanlı Türklerinin ilk Bastıkları Kitaplar" in *Türk-Macar Kültür Minasebetleri Işığ, Altında II. Rakoczi Ferenc ve Macar Mültecileri Sempozyumu*. İstanbul, 1976: pp. 217-225
- \*Berkes, Niyazi. *Türkiye 'de Çağdaşlaşma*. İstanbul: YKY, 2004.
- \*Berkes, Niyazi. "İbrahim Müteferrika", *El New Edition* 3: pp. 996-998
- \*Berkes, Niyazi. "İlk Türk Matbaası Kurucusunun Dini ve Fikri Kimliği", *TTK Belleten* XXVI n.104 (1962): pp. 715-737
- \*Beydilli, Kemal. *Türk Bilim ve Matbaacılık Tarihinde Mühendishane, Mühendishane Matbaası ve Kütüphanesi* (1776-1826). İstanbul: Eren, 1995.
- \*Beydilli, Kemal. "Matbaa", *DİA* (28) pp. 106-110.
- \*Beydilli, Kemal. "Müteferrika ve Osmanlı Matbaası: 18. yüzyılda İstanbul'da Kitabiyat" *Toplumsal Tarih* 128 (Ağustos 2004): pp. 44-52
- \*Black, Jeremy. *European Warfare 1660-1815*. London: UCL Press, 1994.

- \*Bosworth, E. "Pirizade", *ElNew Edition* (v.8): p. 309.
- \*Carleson, Edvard. *İbrahim Müteferrika Basımevi ve Bastığı ilk Eserler*. tr. Mustafa Akbulut. Ankara: Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği 1979.
- \*Danişmend, İsmail Hami. *İzahlı Osmanlı Tarihi Kronolojisi*. (4 vols.) İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1972.
- \*Duverdier, Gerald. "İlk Türk Basımevinin Kuruluşunda iki kültür elçisi: Savary de Breves ile İbrahim Müteferrika", tr. Türker Acaroglu. *Belleten*, LVI n. 215 (Nisan 1992), p. 298
- \*Erdem, Y. Hakan. "The Wise Old Man, propagandist and ideologist: Koca Sekbanbaşı on the Janissaries, 1807" in *Individual, Ideologies and Society: Tracing the Mosaic of the Mediterranean History*. ed. Kirsi Virtanen, *Tampere Peace research Institute* , *Research Report* No: 89,2000.
- \*Fındıkoğlu, Z. Fahri. "Türkiye’de ibn Haldunizm" in 60. *Dogum Yılı Münasebetiyle Fuad Köprülü Armağanı*. İstanbul: DTCF, 1953. pp. 153-163
- \*Fleisher, Comell. *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Ali (154/-1600)*. NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- \*Fleisher, Cornell. "Royal Authority, Dynastic Cyclism and Ibn Khaldunism in Sixteenth Century Ottoman Letters" in *Ibn Khaldun and Islamic Ideology* ed. Bruce B. Lawrence. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1984.
- \*Fodor, Pál. *In the quest of golden Apple: Imperial Ideology, Politics and Military Administration in the Ottoman Empire*. İstanbul: ISIS Press, 2000.
- \*Gerçek, Selim Nüzhet. *Türk Matbaacılığı,- Müteferrika Matbaası*. İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi 1939.
- \*Göçek, Fatma Müge. *East Encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century*. NY: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- \*Gökbilgin, M. Tayyib. "XVII. Asırda, Osmanlı Devletinde Islahat ihtiyaç ve Temayülleri ve Katip Çelebi" in *Katip Çelebi: Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında incelemeler*, pp. 198-218.
- \*Gökbilgin, M. Tayyib. "Müteferrika", *İA* v. 8, p. 855
- \*Gökyay, Orhan Şaik. "Katip Çelebi" in *Katip Çelebi: Hayatı ve Eserleri hakkında incelemeler*: Ankara: TTK, 1957: pp. 1-90.
- \*Gökyay, Orhan Şaik. "Katip Çelebi", *IA* 6, pp. 432-438.
- \*Gökyay, Orhan Şaik. "Katib Çelebi" *El New Edition* 4, pp. 760- 762.

- \*Gökyay, Orhan Şaik. "Katip Çelebi", *DİA* 25 pp. 36-40.
- \*Gökyay, Orhan Şaik. "Cihannüma", *DİA* 7, p. 541-542.
- \*Gökyay, Orhan Şaik. (ed.) - *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler*. Ankara: Devlet Kitapları, 1968.
- \*Hammer-Purgstall , Joseph Freiherr Von. *Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi* İstanbul: Uçdal Neşriyat, 1983.
- \*Horvath, J. Jozsef. "Osmanlı'da ilk Matbaayı Kuran İbrahim Müteferrika", *Tarih ve Toplum*, n. 215 (Kasım 2001): pp. 51-58
- \*Howard, Douglas. "Ottoman Historiography and the "Literature of "Decline" of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", *Journal of Asian Studies* (1988) pp. 52-75
- \*İnalcık, Halil. "Military Transformation in the Ottoman Empire 1600-1700", *Archivum Ottomanicum* IV (1980), pp. 283-337.
- \*İnalcık, Halil. "The sociopolitical effects of the diffusion of fire-arms in the Middle East" in *War, Technology and Society in the Middle East* .ed V .J .Parry and M.E. Yapp. London: Oxford University Press, 1975, pp. 64-195.
- \*İnalcık, Halil. "Turkish and Iranian Political Theories and Traditions in Kutadgu Bilig" in *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire*. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1993.
- \*İpşirli, Mehmet. "Lale Devrinde Yenilikçi Bir Alim: -Şeyhülislam Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi" in *İstanbul Armağanı* (4) *Lale Devri*, ed. Mustafa Armağan. İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür İşleri Daire Başkanlığı Yayınları, 2000: pp. 249-259.
- \*İpşirli, Mehmet. "Lale Devrinde Teşkil edilen Tercüme Heyetine Dair Bazı Gözlemler" in *Osmanlı ilmi ve Mesleki Cemiyetleri* ed. Ekmeleddin İhsanoglu. İstanbul, 1987.
- \*İskit, Server. *Türkiye 'de Neşriyat Hareketleri Tarihine Bir Bakış*. İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi, 1939 and Ankara: MEB, 2000.
- \*Kabacalı, Alpay. *Türk Kitap Tarihi*. İstanbul: Cem yayınları 1989.
- \*Kabacalı, Alpay. *Başlangıcından Günümüze Türkiye'de Matbaa Basım ve Yayımları*. İstanbul: Literatür yay., 2000.
- \*Kafadar, Cemal. "The Question of Ottoman Decline" *Harvard Middle Eastern and Islamic Review* 1-2 (1997-98) pp. 30-75



- \*Kaplan, Yusuf. "Osmanlılarda Matbaa: Bir Medeniyet Krizi sorunu", *Osmanlı* v. 7. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 1999: pp. 230-237
- \*Kedourie, Elie. *Afghani and 'Abduh: An essay on Religious Unbelief and Political Activism in Modern Islam*. London: Frank Cass, 1966; 1997.
- \*Koloğlu, Orhan. *Basımevi ve Basımın Gecikme Sebepleri ve Sonuçları*. İstanbul: Gazeteciler Cemiyeti yay, 1987
- \*Kortepeter, Carl Max. *Ottoman Imperialism during the Reformation*. NY: New York University Press, 1972.
- \*Kun, T. Halasi. "İbrahim Müteferrika" *IA* v .2: pp. 896-900.
- \*Kut, Günay Alpay. "Matba'a -in Turkey", *El* (4), pp. 799-803.
- \*Kut, Turgut and Fatma Türe (eds). *Yazmadan Basmaya: Müteferrika, Mühendishane, Üsküdar* İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat, 1996.
- \*Levend, Agah Sırrı. "Siyaset-nameler", *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten* ( 1962 ), pp. 167-194.
- \*Lewis, Bernard. *Islam in history: Ideas, People, and Events in the Middle East*. Chicago: Open Court, 2001.
- \*Lewis, Bernard. "Ottoman Observers of Ottoman Decline", *Islamic Studies* I (1962) pp. 71-87
- \*Lewis, Bernard. "Some reflections on the decline of the Ottoman Empire", *Studia Islamica* IX (1958): pp. 111-127.
- \*Murfhey, Rhoads. *Ottoman Warfare 1500-1700*. London: UCL Press, 1999.
- \*Murfhey, Rhoads. "Dördüncü Sultan Murad'a Sunulan Yedi Telhis" in *VIII. Türk Tarih Kongresine Sunulan Bildiriler*. Ankara: TTK, 2002. pp. 1095-1099.
- \*Nuhoğlu, Hidayet. "Osmanlı matbaacılığı" in *Türkler* v .14. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları ,2002: pp. 927-932.
- \*Nuhoğlu, Hidayet. "Müteferrika Matbaası ve bazı mülahazalar, *Osmanlı ansiklopedisi*, v. 7: pp. 221-229
- \*Olson, Robert. *Imperial Meanderings and Republican by ways, Essays on 18th century Ottoman and 20th century History of Turkey*. İstanbul: ISIS press, 1996.
- \*Olson, Robert. "The *esnaf* and the Patrona Balil Rebellion of 1730: A realignment in Ottoman politics?" *JESHO* 17, (1974)pp. 329-344.
- \*Oman, G. and W. Floor, G.W. Shaw for "Matba'a", *E14*: pp. 794-799,803-807.
- \*Ortaylı, İlber. *Studies on Ottoman Transformation*. İstanbul: ISIS Press, 1994.

- \*Pakalın, Mehmet Zeki. *Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü*. 3 volumes. Istanbul: MEB, 1993.
- \*Owen, Roger. "The Middle East in the 18th century- An "Islamic" Society in Decline? A critique of Gibb and Bowen's Islamic Society and the West", *Review of Middle Eastern Studies* 1 (1975) pp. 101-112.
- \*Öz, Mehmet. *Osmanlı 'da Çözülme " ve Gelenekçi Yorumcuları*. Istanbul: Dergah, 1997.
- \*Öztürk, Said. Askeri Kassama ait 17. Asır İstanbul Tereke Defterleri. Istanbul: Osav, 1995.
- \*Parry, V.J. "Harb", *E13*, 190-194
- \*Parry, V.J. "Manierre de Combattre" in *War, Technology and Society in the Middle East*, ed. V.J.Parry and M.E. Yapp. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- \*Parvov, Ivan. *Habsburgs and Ottomans between Vienna and Belgrade (1683-1739)*. NY: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- \*Refik, Ahmet. *Alimler ve Sanatkarlar*. Istanbul, 1924. and Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1980. pr. Vahit Çabuk.
- \*Refik, Ahmet. *Lale Devri*. Ankara, 1973.
- \*Shaw, Stanford J. *Between Old and New: The Ottoman Empire under Sultan Selim III*. MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- \*Sabev, Orlin. *Piirvoto osmansko piiteshestvie v sveta na pechatnata kniga (1726-1746). Novpogled (First Ottoman Trip in the world of printed books (1726-1746). A Reassessment)*. Sofya: Avangard Prima, 2004.
- \*Sarıcaoğlu, Fikret. "Cihannüma ve Ebubekir b. Behram el- Dımaşki- İbrahim Müteferrika" in *Prof Bekir Kütükoğlu'na Armağan*. Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1991.
- \*Selen, Harnit Sadi. "Cihannüma" in *Katip Çelebi: Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında incelemeler*. Ankara: TTK, 1957: pp. 121-137.
- \*Simonffy, Alador V. *İbrahim Müteferrika*. Ankara, 1945
- \*Stoye, John. *Marsigli's Europe 1680-1730: The Life and Times of Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli, Soldier and Virtuoso*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1994.
- \*Tauber, Eliezer. *The Emergence of the Arab Movements*. London: Frank Cass, 1993.

- \*Temir, Rana. "İlk Türk Matbaasının Kurucusu İbrahim Müteferrika Üzerine Yeni Bilgiler", *Türk Kültürü* XXVIII n. 321 (January 1990): pp. 43-47
- \*Toderini, Giambatista. *İbrahim Müteferrika Matbaası ve Türk Matbaacılığı*, tr. Rikkat Kunt. Istanbul, 1990
- \*Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği, *Basım ve yayımcılığımızın 250. yılı, bilimsel toplantısı, 10- 11 Aralık 1979, Ankara: bildiriler*. Ankara, Türk Kütüphaneciler Derneği Yayınları, 1980.
- \*Uğur, Ahmet. *Osmanlı Siyasetnameleri*. Istanbul: MEB, 2001.
- \*Uğur, Ahmet. "Lütfi Paşa ve Asafnamesi", *Türk Kültürü Araştırmaları* Yıl XVII 1-2 (1977-1978)
- \*Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. *Osmanlı Tarihi*, 4 volumes. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1994).
- \*Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. *Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilatından Kapukulu Ocakları II*. Ankara: TTK, 1988.
- \*Watson, William J. "İbrahim Müteferrika and Turkish Incunabula", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 88 {1968): pp. 435-441
- \*Yalçın, Soner. *Efendi*. Istanbul: Dogan Kitap, 2004.
- \*Yediyıldız, Mustafa Asım. "İbrahim Müteferrika", *Vakıflar Dergisi*, n.22 {1991): pp. 441-447.
- \*Yılmaz, Çoşkun. "Hezarfen Bir Şahsiyet: İbrahim Müteferrika ve Siyaset Felsefesi" in *İstanbul Armağanı (4) Lale Devri*, ed. Mustafa Armağan (Istanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür İşleri Daire Başkanlığı Yayınları, 2000) pp. 259-333.
- \*Yuvalı, Abdülkadir. "İbn Arabşah", *DİA* 19, p. 314.

#### **Internet Source**

<http://www.mason.org.tr/en-historycl.htm> {Official website of Grand lodge of free and accepted masons of Turkey) Last accessed 24.06.2005.