

KATİP ÇELEBİ AND HIS WORLD
AN INTELLECTUAL BETWEEN REASON AND SACRED LAW

by
BARIŞ ABDULLAH BAŞTÜRK

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

Sabancı University
Spring 2012

KATİP ÇELEBİ AND HIS WORLD
AN INTELLECTUAL BETWEEN REASON AND SACRED LAW

APPROVED BY:

Hakan Erdem
(Thesis Supervisor)

Akşin Somel

İzak Atiyas

DATE OF APPROVAL:

Bariř Abdullah Bařtrk 2012

© All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

This work attempts to analyze Katip Çelebi, one of the most prominent intellectuals of the 17th century. Based on *Mizan ül-Hak* and *Düstur ül-Amel*, that he wrote and *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire* and *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi* that he edited, this thesis, aims to explore Katip Çelebi's thoughts on social, political, legal and historical areas. The work considers Katip Çelebi within the perspective of Early Modern Era, in which religious law and reason often coexisted. This work is also aims to explore Katip Çelebi's thoughts on 17th century crisis, society and authority as well as his understanding of the ideal society. This thesis also aims to discuss the responses of Katip Çelebi to the popular debates of the 17th century and old debates of the Islamic-Ottoman cultural milieus. Basing on the works that Katip Çelebi edited, the work attempts to analyze how Katip Çelebi presented the texts to the Ottoman cultural milieu.

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, 17.Yüzyıl'ın ünlü entellektüel figürlerinden olan Katip Çelebi'nin zihniyetini bazı açılardan incelemeyi amaçlıyor. Bu tez, aynı zamanda, yazdığı Mizan ül-Hak ve Düstur ül-Amel eserlerine ve derlediği Tarih-i Kostantiniye ve Kayasire ve Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi eserlerine dayanarak, Katip Çelebi'nin toplumsal, siyasal, hukuki ve tarihsel alanlara ilişkin düşüncelerini değerlendirmeyi hedefliyor. Çalışma, Katip Çelebi'yi dine dayalı huku ve akli çoğunlukla bir arada düşünen Erken Modern zihniyetler çerçevesinde ele alıyor. Ayrıca, bu çalışma, Katip Çelebi'nin 17.Yüzyıl krizi, toplum, iktidar gibi alanlardaki düşüncelerini ve ideal toplum tasavvurunu inceliyor. Aynı şekilde, tez, 17. Yüzyılda popüler olan ya da Osmanlı İslam kültür dairelerinde mevcut bulunan tartışmalara Katip Çelebi'nin verdiği cevapları tartışmayı amaçlıyor. Ayrıca, çalışma, Katip Çelebi'nin tarihi içinde bulunduğu Osmanlı kültür dairesine nasıl aktardığını incelemeyi hedefliyor.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank to my supervisor Hakan Erdem, who encouraged me to study one of the most well-known intellectuals of the Ottoman Empire. I began to read Ottoman histories and accounts thanks to Hakan Erdem's course on Ottoman chronicles. I am grateful to him for his guidance and suggestions throughout the writing process.

I am also grateful to Akşin Somel and İzak Atiyas for their invaluable suggestions on the thesis. I should thank to Tülay Artan, Halil Berktaş, Hülya Canbakal and Metin Kunt. I learned much from them while I was taking courses in Sabancı University.

I should express my gratitude to Baki Tezcan, not only for his summer course that I participated but also for his studies which helped me to improve my understanding and reflection on Ottoman history.

Finally, I should thank to my parents for always supporting me in my adventure in Ottoman history and academic life. I could not stay in the adventure without their support. I should also thank to my friend Mustafa Altuğ Yayla, who with his advice and enthusiasm helped me to better orient myself in Ottoman history. I am grateful to Sara Wilson, who read over and over my work and contributed much while I am trying to write in a language that I am not native.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	iv
Özet.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
Notes on Transliteration.....	x
INTRODUCTION: WHY STUDY KATİP ÇELEBİ.....	1
CHAPTER I	
AN OTTOMAN INTELLECTUAL AT WORK: KATİP ÇELEBİ.....	6
I.1. Katip Çelebi's Life.....	6
I.2. Katip Çelebi's Work.....	9
I.2.1. Keşf-üz-Zünun.....	9
I.2.2. Fezleket'ül Akval ül-Ahyar.....	9
I.2.3. Takvim üt-Tevarih.....	10
I.2.4. Fezleke-i Tevarih.....	10
I.2.5. Cihannüma.....	10
I.2.6. Süllem ül-Vusül ila Tabakat ü'l-Füsul.....	10
I.2.7. Levami ün-Nur fi Zülmet-i Atlas Minur.....	11
I.2.8. Tarih-i Kostantiniye ve Kayasire (Revnak'üs-Saltanat).....	11
I.2.9. Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi.....	11
I.2.10. Bahriye.....	11
I.2.11. Düstur ül-Amel fi Islah ül-Halel.....	11
I.2.12. İrşad ül-Hayara ila Tarih ül-Yunan ve'r Rum ve'n Nasara.....	12
I.2.13. Tufet ül-Kibar fi Esfar ül-Behar.....	12
I.2.14. Mizan ül-Hak fi İhtiyar ül-Ehak.....	13
I.2.15. İlham ül-Mukaddes.....	13
I.2.16. Cami ül-Mutun min Cel ül-Fünun.....	13
I.2.17. Tuhfet ül-Ahyar fi'l-Hikem ve'l-Emsad ve'l-Aşar.....	14
I.2.18. Dürer-i Muntəsire ve Gurur-i Münteşire.....	14
I.3. Historiography of Katip Çelebi.....	14
CHAPTER II	
SOCIETY, POLITICS AND KATİP ÇELEBİ.....	30
II.1. The Sources.....	30
II.1.1. Düstur ül-Amel.....	31
II.1.2. Ottoman Mirror for Princes or Nasihatname Literature.....	31
II.2. Elements of Society according to Katip Çelebi.....	32

II.2.1. Social Classes in Düstur ül-Amel.....	32
II.2.2. Katip Çelebi and Social Order.....	34
II.3. Social Problems and Crisis according to Katip Çelebi.....	35
II.3.1. Katip Çelebi and the 17 th Century Crisis.....	36
II.3.2. Absolutists versus Constitutionalists.....	36
II.3.3. Katip Çelebi and Politics of his Age.....	38
II.3.4. Katip Çelebi and the Individual.....	38
II.4. Katip Çelebi's Remedies.....	39
II.5. Katip Çelebi's Ideal Society.....	41
II.5.1. Katip Çelebi and History.....	44
II.6. Summary of the Chapter.....	46
CHAPTER III	
ISLAMIC LAW, LOGIC AND KATİP ÇELEBİ.....	48
III.1. The Sources.....	48
III.1.1. Mizan ül-Hak.....	49
III.2. Theological-Legal Debates and Katip Çelebi.....	50
III.2.1. The Social Issues within Perspectives of Law, Logic and Reason.....	51
III.2.2. Why Consult Katip Çelebi?.....	51
III.2.3. Kadızadeli versus Sufi Debate.....	52
III.2.4. Singing, Dancing and Whirling.....	53
III.2.5. Tobacco.....	55
III.2.6. Coffee, Opium and Drugs.....	58
III.2.7. Parents of the Prophet.....	59
III.2.8. The Faith of the Pharaoh.....	60
III.2.9. Ibn Arabi and Katip Çelebi.....	61
III.2.10. The Cursing of Yazid.....	62
III.2.11. Innovation.....	62
III.2.12. The Visiting of Tombs.....	64
III.2.13. The Supererogatory Prayers.....	65
III.2.14. Shaking Hands and Bowing.....	65
III.2.15. Enjoining Right and Forbidding Wrong.....	66
III.2.16. The Religion of Abraham.....	66
III.2.17. Bribery.....	68
III.2.18. Katip Çelebi and the Controversies of the Age.....	68
III.2.19. The Recital of God's Bounty or the Conclusion.....	69
III.2.20. İlham ül-Mukaddes.....	74
III.2.21. Katip Çelebi and Enlightenment, Science and Reason.....	74
III.2.22. Religion, Islamic Law and Katip Çelebi.....	75
III.2.23. Katip Çelebi and Philosophy.....	76
III.2.24. Katip Çelebi and Practical Knowledge.....	76
III.3. Summary of the Chapter.....	77
CHAPTER IV	
A HISTORIAN AT WORK: KATİP ÇELEBİ BETWEEN THE EAST AND THE WEST	80
IV.1. A Discussion of the Sources.....	80
IV.2. Tarih-i Kostantiniye ve Kayasıre.....	80
IV.2.1. The Footnotes.....	81
IV.2.2. The Problem of Ethnicity.....	82
IV.2.3. History Writing and Katip Çelebi.....	83

IV.2.4. Turks According to the Chronicle Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire.....	84
IV.2.5. Geographic Regions in the Chronicle.....	86
IV.3. Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi.....	87
IV.3.1. Perception of Turks According to Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi Turks.....	88
IV.4. Summary of the Chapter.....	90
CONCLUSION.....	92
Bibliography.....	95

NOTES ON TRANSLITERATION

I preferred to use anglicized versions of words such as sharia, pasha and mufti. I preferred modern Turkish versions of words such as şeyhülislam, kadı and kanun.

INTRODUCTION: WHY STUDY KATİP ÇELEBİ

The 17th century Ottoman intellectual and polymath, Katip Çelebi was a brilliantly prolific figure. Katip Çelebi reflected and wrote intensively on issues of politics, religion, history and sciences. He was a dedicated intellectual and bibliophile who sought to increase the intellectual knowledge and understanding of his time.

Katip Çelebi's ideas are worth studying for several reasons. First, in his time he was considered an important scholar by the state elite, i.e. bureaucratic circles and *ulema* members. Even if his ideas were not necessarily implemented, the state elite sought and valued his opinion on various issues. In fact, according to Yurtoğlu Katip Çelebi was so highly regarded that *şeyhülislams* after his time paid much attention to his opinions in spite of the fact that he dared to call the *şeyhülislam* of his own age ignorant.¹

Second, although Katip Çelebi took sides on political and social issues, one cannot claim that he wrote as a politically engaged person who was writing for a specific agenda. Rather, he can be seen as an intellectual who wrote according to the principles in which he believed. It might be argued that he was an intellectual who did not embrace one particular political faction and expressed his views accordingly. Nonetheless, Katip Çelebi should be seen as a figure who took sides with a sound and rational argumentation of the ideas about why he chose a particular idea. In this sense, he can be seen as a leading intellectual of his age, and studying him can give historians insights and clues to understand the dynamics and politics of the age.

Third, Katip Çelebi aimed to bring “practical knowledge” to the world with the help of a wider web of intellectuals. His attempt at collecting and sharing information and knowledge about the world, history and science might be seen as part of a general attempt to learn and teach a certain portion of public the practical knowledge. This audience did not include wider sections of society,

¹ Bilal Yurtoğlu, *Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, 2009) p.161

but a collection of state elites and learned men. Katip Çelebi attempted to reform the state as well as to reach a broad understanding of the world. He hoped to reach his aim with dissemination and cooperation of knowledge. Thus, Katip Çelebi's ideas and projects did not exist independently of the intellectual context of the Early Modern Ottoman Empire or from some portions of the European intelligentsia.

These reasons make Katip Çelebi, his proposed solutions for the problems of the Ottoman Empire, and his understanding of society and politics worth studying. Studies of Katip Çelebi and his works will help the present-day historian to make sense of 17th century and Early Modern debates, ideals of society, perception of authority, justice and law. Studying Katip Çelebi can help us to understand the Early Modern Ottoman mentalities and contribute to our understanding of a more accurate image of 17th century Ottoman society and politics.

In this thesis, I intend to analyze Katip Çelebi's thoughts on different subjects such as history, politics, society, law, authority, science and reason. Considering the large and ambitious shape of the study, I have decided to focus primarily on several works of Katip Çelebi. These are *Düstur ül-Amel* and *Mizan ül-Hak*, together with his sponsorship and edition of some chronicles such as *Tarih-i Frengi* and *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*. I chose these works because, I believe that Katip Çelebi has been studied mostly vis-à-vis his works on natural sciences and geography. However, I aim to analyze Katip Çelebi's ideas on subjects such as society, politics, law and history.

I chose *Düstur ül-Amel*, which I believe might give the historian an idea about an intellectual outlook on Ottoman society as well as Ottoman ideals of society and politics. In other words, *Düstur ül-Amel* is an example of the reform or “mirror for princes” literature that flourished around the time that Katip Çelebi lived. By studying *Düstur ül-Amel*, I will elaborate on how Katip Çelebi responded to the crisis of the Empire, which reform projects he suggested and what kind of ideals of society he possessed.

I chose *Mizan ül-Hak*, because it was a flourishing source on Ottoman studies, in which an intellectual, Katip Çelebi, represented the ideas of the age together with his critic. Besides, the social framework that it presented, *Mizan ül-Hak*, also projected a rich source on Ottoman and Islamic legal thought. It is a source where debates of the age are discussed and, the opponents and

proponents of controversial questions about society, politics and law are elaborated upon by Katip Çelebi. In addition, it is a source heavily referenced by Ottoman historians. These features make *Mizan ü'l-Hak*, a necessary source to study.

In contrast to the sources mentioned above, the two chronicles, *Tarih-i Frengi* and *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*, were neither written nor translated by Katip Çelebi. However, Katip Çelebi's influence is present enough to give an idea about how an intellectual carried the knowledge of a different milieu into the Ottoman one. For this reason, I chose these chronicles, in order to better understand Katip Çelebi as a historian; more specifically, his representation of historical sources. As the scope of this study is limited, I will not to study a chronicle written directly by Katip Çelebi. Rather, I intend to reach his mental framework only with the chronicles that he edited.

I will try to demonstrate that Katip Çelebi's ideas are part of the intellectual legacies of the Early Modern Age. Similarly, the thesis will illustrate Katip Çelebi's relationship or response of the Islamic-Ottoman traditions and history. In this respect, Katip Çelebi used and favored the use of both *sharia* and reason in the search for the truth. The thesis involves several examples pointing Katip Çelebi's relationship vis-à-vis reason and intellectuals. In other words, the thesis will also demonstrate how being an intellectual shaped Katip Çelebi's ideas.

The thesis suggests that Katip Çelebi responded to the debates of his age with his use of reason, and sometimes by interpreting the *sharia* and customs of the society. In this sense, I will try to present Katip Çelebi as a member of the society and as an intellectual with political motivations. The thesis contains many examples of Katip Çelebi's position in the debates of his age. Those examples mostly point out Katip Çelebi's advocacy of moderation and embracement of the middle way. Similarly, Katip Çelebi's examples suggested his ideals of society and politics. In other words, reading of Katip Çelebi's thoughts on many subjects will help the historian to get an idea about both Katip Çelebi's and the era's ideals of society and politics.

The thesis will also question Katip Çelebi's role in the edition of some chronicles. Within this process, I have tried to demonstrate that Katip Çelebi, although generally remaining loyal to the translation, sometimes did not hesitate to intervene the account of the translation. I will argue that these conscious and calculated interventions might give an idea about Katip Çelebi's history writing

and his intellectual legacy. I will also try to point out that Katip Çelebi's edition contained elements which will helped the reader to make a sense of the issues specific to Byzantine and Western European cultural milieus. In other words, Katip Çelebi's intervention and edition helped to present the works to the Ottoman intellectual and cultural realm.

In the first chapter, I will discuss the life of Katip Çelebi. In the same part, I will mention his childhood, education, scholarly vision. Then, I will present an account of Katip Çelebi's works. I will explore his scholarly works, projects and translations with providing their brief content. Next, I will try to discuss how scholars studied different works and aspects of Katip Çelebi by presenting different images of him. In other words, I will try to project how Katip Çelebi has been represented in the Ottoman historiography.

In the second chapter, I aim to analyze Katip Çelebi's *Düstur ül-Amel* treatise. More specifically, I will try to focus on *Düstur ül-Amel* as a work within the advice literature genre. In this respect, I aim to elaborate on Katip Çelebi's understanding of society insofar as he described in *Düstur ül-Amel*. Then, I will attempt to trace Katip Çelebi's social problems that he described in his work. I intend to analyze how Katip Çelebi conceptualized the crisis of the Empire that he perceived. In addition, I will examine his remedies and reform projects considering the problems that he detected. The following section will elaborate on his ideals of society and politics will be elaborated. In other words, what kind of an ideal society he projected, and when his ideal society was experienced in history.

In the third chapter, I intend to focus on Katip Çelebi's *Mizan ül-Hak*. I aim to discuss Katip Çelebi's outlook on various subjects related to social practices or theological questions of the Ottoman and Islamic history. I will try to demonstrate how Katip Çelebi summarized different opinions, criticized them and more interestingly, how he established a rational argumentation on the issues which were also questions regarding the Islamic legal theory. I will also point out how Katip Çelebi's suggestions and critiques were performed with rational interpretation of the sacred law. Thus, I will emphasis on his utilization of both reason and sacred law as two mutually inclusive sources.

In the fourth chapter, I intend to use two chronicles that Katip Çelebi edited, as primary

sources. In the chronicles of *Tarih-i Frengi* and *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*, I will attempt to demonstrate how Katip Çelebi established those works in an Ottoman cultural context. In addition, I will illustrate where, how and with which purposes Katip Çelebi intervened in the chronicle's account and how an Ottoman historian might interpret them. The question of how Katip Çelebi perceived the Turks or Ottomans and some other ethnicities is also another interesting point that I aim to discuss in this chapter.

Finally, this thesis is an attempt to analyze and discuss a broader picture of Katip Çelebi. This thesis neither attempts to present a detailed biography of him nor to study Katip Çelebi in relation to much broader concepts such as society, history, politics and law. Instead, in this thesis, I attempt to reach to a broader picture of Katip Çelebi, based on some of his writings on society, history, politics and law.

CHAPTER I

AN OTTOMAN INTELLECTUAL AT WORK: KATİP ÇELEBİ

I.1. Katip Çelebi's Life

In his work, *Mizan ül-Hak* and also in *Sullam ul-Vusul* there are sections where Katip Çelebi mentions himself or his life.² Most of the scholars who write about Katip Çelebi based their accounts mostly on these passages. Therefore, our knowledge of Katip Çelebi, is mostly based on Katip Çelebi's own account of himself.

According to that account, Katip Çelebi was born in February 1609.³ His original name was Mustafa. His father's name was Abdullah. He was also known as Hacı Halife among ulema members.⁴ His father was a *silahdar* and a scribe in the fiscal administration and a *devshirme*. After receiving a basic *mekteb* education, Katip Çelebi followed his father and joined the chancery as an apprentice. First, Katip Çelebi says, he joined his father on a campaign to suppress the rebellion of Abaza Mehmed Pasha. Afterwards, he joined his father on campaigns against the Safavids to recapture Bagdad and a second attempt to suppress Abaza's rebellion. He also mentioned going on campaigns in the Eastern provinces of the Empire. Gottfried Hagen argues that his scribal career ended because of the death of his father.⁵

According to Gottfried Hagen, Katip Çelebi's intellectual career began when he became acquainted with the famous preacher Kadızade Mehmed Efendi. Orhan Şaik Gökyay also suggests

² Gottfried Hagen, *Ein Osmanischer Geograph bei der Arbeit: Entstehung und Gedankenwelt von Katib Celebis Gihannüma*, (Berlin, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2003) p.7

³ Gottfried Hagen, ottomanhistorians.com, "Katip Çelebi", p.1

⁴ Mehmet Yılmaz, *Katip Çelebi Bibliyografyası*, (İstanbul, İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş. Yayınları, 2011) p.15

⁵ Gottfried Hagen, ottomanhistorians.com, "Katip Çelebi", p.1

that Kadızade Mehmed Efendi greatly influenced Katip Çelebi.⁶ Then, Katip Çelebi went to campaign with Husrev Pasha to Hemedan and Baghdad. When the army went to Aleppo for the winter, Katip Çelebi went to Mecca. He then moved to Diyarbakir and encountered some scholars in the city. In 1634-35, he participated in the Erivan Campaign. Katip Çelebi expresses, after some time, that he no longer wanted to go battle. Therefore, Katip Çelebi did not go on the Baghdad campaign and instead devoted himself to study and science. After the death of Kadızade Mehmed Efendi, Katip Çelebi attended the courses of some *medrese* teachers. Kürd Abdullah Efendi, Keçi Mehmed Efendi, Veli Efendi, İbrahim Lakani and Arec Mustafa Efendi were among his teachers. However, he never obtained a diploma.⁷

Katip Çelebi also mentions that he inherited a significant amount of money and bought many books with that money. Katip Çelebi had probably the largest private library in Istanbul.⁸ Katip Çelebi also expresses that he waited for a certain book from the *tereke* of a *şeyhülislam*.⁹ After 1642, Katip Çelebi began to teach. He taught subjects such as law, *tefsir*, *kelam*, mathematics and astronomy. These facts suggest that he always sought learning as well as his passion of collecting and reading books.

In 1645, Katip Çelebi observed the maps drawn for the Cretan expedition. After that, he resigned from his office and lived in isolation. He devoted himself to study and teaching. At some point, he became ill. Because of this, he began to read medicine books as well as books on *ilm-i huruf* and *esma*.¹⁰ Later, he obtained another state office. *Şeyhülislam* Abdurahim Efendi issued a *fetwa* for the benefits of Katip Çelebi's book *Mizan ül-Hak*.¹¹ Katip Çelebi died in 1657.

Gökyay argues that Katip Çelebi's contemporaries described him as a good tempered, taciturn and philosophic person who lived an unambitious life. Gökyay states that Katip Çelebi communicated with both ascetics and pleasure-lovers; however, he never drank or used addictive substances. Gökyay adds further that Katip Çelebi disliked satire and enjoyed growing plants.¹²

⁶ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, "Katip Çelebi Hayatı, Şahsiyeti, Eserleri" in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.5

⁷ Gottfried Hagen, ottomanhistorians.com, "Katip Çelebi", p.2

⁸ Gottfried Hagen, ottomanhistorians.com, "Katip Çelebi", p.2

⁹ Bilal Yurtoğlu, *Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, 2009) p.176

¹⁰ Joseph von Hammer Purgstall, *Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi 6 (vol.11)*, (İstanbul, Üçdal Neşriyat, 1996) p.46

¹¹ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, "Katip Çelebi Hayatı, Şahsiyeti, Eserleri" in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) pp.8-9

¹² Orhan Şaik Gökyay, "Katip Çelebi" in *The Encyclopedia of Islam vol. IV*, (Leiden, Brill, 1997) pp.760-762

In his book, *Mizan ül-Hak*, Katip Çelebi includes a section in which he describes his life. In that section, he also mentions a dream that he had dreamt in the past. In the dream, Katip Çelebi saw the Prophet Muhammad. In the section in which Katip Çelebi mentions the dream, he also interprets the dream. In addition, he derives some reasoning from the dream. Katip Çelebi expresses an account of the dream that he saw in which the Prophet appeared to him in a field, armed for a battle. Katip Çelebi narrates that when he came into the Prophet's presence, he, Katip Çelebi, asked the Prophet some questions of science and the Prophet answered him. However, Katip Çelebi does not explain what exactly he had asked to the Prophet. Then, Katip Çelebi asserts that he was half sitting and kissed the knees of the Prophet. Then, Katip Çelebi asked the Prophet to give him a name with which to occupy himself. The Prophet then suggested that Katip Çelebi should occupy himself with the name of the Prophet.¹³

After the narration of the dream, Katip Çelebi argues that the dream led and influenced him in many ways. In other words, Katip Çelebi interprets the dream and reaches conclusions by using symbols that appeared in the dream. In the interpretation of his dream, Katip Çelebi argues that the fact that the Prophet was dressed as if ready for battle points to his ambition to defeat the infidels with holy war and to take some islands. Katip Çelebi argues that this fact made him to engage more intensively with his plans to write about ancient campaigns. Katip Çelebi also argues that he was occupied with the legal sciences. For this reason, Katip Çelebi interprets the words of the Prophet as a confirmation that he should continue to work on those sciences. Moreover, Katip Çelebi interprets the Prophet's suggestion to use his name to mean that he should use the Prophet as an intermediary.¹⁴

In the end of the narrative, Katip Çelebi argues that there are two wings necessary for man to fly and asserts that without one, one cannot fly. He used the term flying as an analogy to reach the truth. In addition, he argues that one should embrace both natural and religious sciences to fly, in other words, to reach the truth. Therefore, Katip Çelebi says that he will engage in the study of religious sciences.¹⁵ Katip Çelebi interprets and acknowledges his dream as support for what he already wants to achieve. Therefore, Katip Çelebi explains, he continued his studies and writing of

¹³ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.145-146

¹⁴ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.146

¹⁵ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.146-147

several works after he saw his dream. Katip Çelebi saw the dream in which the Prophet appeared as a guiding mechanism in life.

Katip Çelebi depicts himself as a man devoted to study and uninterested in issues like career and important positions in the state administration. In this sense, Katip Çelebi's account of himself projects a view of the life of an intellectual.¹⁶ Therefore, it might be interpreted that Katip Çelebi wanted to be perceived as an intellectual who devoted himself to study. Considering the fact that *Mizan ül-Hak* was his last book, it might be suggested that Katip Çelebi wished to present an account of his life together with accounts of several important controversies of the age.

I.2. Katip Çelebi's Works

Katip Çelebi wrote many books and treatises on various subjects. Hagen divides the works of Katip Çelebi into four major parts. These four major parts, according to Hagen, are the “Encyclopedic Project”, Translations and Rewritings, Occasional Treatises, Didactic and Entertaining Compilations.¹⁷

I.2.1. *Keşf-üz-Zünun*

Katip Çelebi wrote this bibliographical dictionary in Arabic. It has a very detailed *Mukaddime* section. This dictionary is a collection of book titles that Katip Çelebi saw and recorded. Hagen interprets this project within the sphere of the Enlightenment project that Katip Çelebi undertook.

I.2.2. *Fezleket'ül Akval ül-Ahyar*

This book is a world history that Katip Çelebi wrote in Arabic. *Fezleket'ül Akval ül-Ahyar*, also known as *Tarih-i Kebir*, is the first work written by Katip Çelebi. It involves the whole history of the world starting from the creation of humans to the year 1641. The work consists of sections on creation, history of prophets, history of the caliphs, rulers after Islam and Ottoman history.

¹⁶ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.135-152

¹⁷ Gottfried Hagen, ottomanhistorians.com, “Katip Çelebi” pp. 3-11

According to Yılmaz, in this work, Katip Çelebi gives information about chronology, ethnology, biography and historical geography.

1.2.3. *Takvim üt-Tevarih*

This book is designed as a table of contents sections of a world history. In other words, with short sentences, Katip Çelebi aims to present a chronological section of world history. The book consists of summary of events from the creation to the year 1648.

1.2.4. *Fezleke-i Tevarih*

This work is a chronicle of Ottoman history which started with the year 1000 Hijra (1592) and is written in Ottoman Turkish. This work is a detailed translation of *Fezleket'ül Akval ül-Ahyar* of Katip Çelebi with the addition of a section on later events. According to Yılmaz, Katip Çelebi uses Hasanbeyzade Ahmet, Peçuyulu İbrahim, Mehmed Edirnevi, Topçular Katibi Abdülkadir Efendi, Cerrahzade Mehmed, Hüseyin Tuğı and Piripaşazade Hüseyin as sources. Yılmaz further states that Katip Çelebi mentions the events that he witnessed in this chronicle.

1.2.5. *Cihannüma*

This book is a geographic account in which Katip Çelebi tries to describe geographical aspects of different parts of the world. The book is written in Ottoman Turkish. It involves both elements of classical Islamic cosmology and recent information on Europe and New World.¹⁸ According to Hagen, Katip Çelebi uses Ebu'l Fida, Mehmed Aşık, Piri Reis, Hoca Sadeddin as sources.

1.2.6. *Süllem ül-Vusül ila Tabakat ü'l-Füsul*

This work is a dictionary of scholars written in Arabic. The work is arranged according to alphabetical order. Yılmaz claims that the work is divided to two parts. The first part is concerned with people who become famous with their own names. The second part is comprised of people

¹⁸ Gottfried Hagen, ottomanhistorians.com, “Katip Çelebi” p.6

who become famous with nicknames.¹⁹

1.2.7. *Levami ün-Nur fi Zülmet-i Atlas Minur*

This work of Katip Çelebi is the translation of Gerhard Mercator's *Atlas Minor* and is used as a reference source for *Cihannüma*. Katip Çelebi edited the translation of this work, which is called *Atlas Minor Gerardi Mercatoris Hondio plurimis aenis Atque Illustratus*, with the help of Mehmed İhlasi.

1.2.8. *Tarih-i Kostantiniye ve Kayasire (Revnak'üs-Saltanat)*

This is a translation of four Byzantine chronicles together with a section on Ottoman history. The work is a translation from Latin. The original name of the book was *Historia rerum in Oriente gestarum*, published in Frankfurt in 1587.

1.2.9. *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*

This work is a translation of Johann Carion's chronicle. Mehmed İhlasi who was a French convert and worked with Katip Çelebi, translated the chronicle. In addition, Katip Çelebi edited the book. The book involves sections starting from the creation of the world to the history of Greeks, Romans, history of the Ancient Near East, to Islam and Ottomans.

1.2.10. *Bahriye*

This work is written by Katip Çelebi based on Piri Reis' *Kitab-i Bahriye*. Hagen states that this excerpt was found recently by Fikret Sarıcaoğlu. According to Yılmaz, Katip Çelebi became interested in geography and the Mediterranean after the Cretan expedition and wrote an account of Mediterranean coasts, just like Piri Reis.

1.2.11. *Düstur ül-Amel fi Islah ül-Halel*

¹⁹ Mehmet Yılmaz, *Katip Çelebi Bibliyografyası*, (İstanbul, İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş. Yayınları, 2011) p.24

This work is written in Ottoman Turkish by Katip Çelebi to suggest solutions to the financial crisis of the Empire. The work consists of a *mukaddime* section, three chapters and a *netice* section. In the *mukaddime* section, Katip Çelebi mentions the functions of a state and different parts of the society. In the first section, Katip Çelebi mentions the peasantry. In this section Katip Çelebi discusses four different groups of the society. He describes how the peasantry and the provinces had been devastated in the recent years. He idealizes the time of the Süleyman I and how old sultans of the Empire protected the peasantry. Katip Çelebi criticizes current sultans and administrations by comparing the conditions of the peasantry and the provinces with the Safavids and earlier Ottoman sultans. In the second chapter, Katip Çelebi mentions the military class. He discusses the increase of the number of soldiers and considers this fact harmless and suggests embracing the old custom (*kanun-i kadim*). In the third chapter, Katip Çelebi discusses the treasury. He suggests cutting some expenses which is difficult. Therefore, Katip Çelebi suggests that a man of sword (*cebbar biri*) should be appointed, so that he can implement the reforms that he, Katip Çelebi, suggests, such as cutting the expenses. In the *netice* section, Katip Çelebi rephrased his suggestions.

1.2.12. *İrşad ül-Hayara ila Tarih ül-Yunan ve'r Rum ve'n Nasara*

A treatise on Christian beliefs and customs written in Ottoman Turkish. According to Yılmaz, it is written by Katip Çelebi to inform the Ottoman audience about European countries. In the first section of the work, Katip Çelebi mentions the beliefs of Europeans. In the second section, he discussed the customs of European rulers. He mentions and discusses the different political philosophies such as democracy, aristocracy and republic. In addition, Katip Çelebi compared those regimes with the Ottoman system of government.²⁰

1.2.13. *Tuhfet ül-Kibar fi Esfar ül-Bihar*

This work is written in Ottoman Turkish. Katip Çelebi aims to give an account of the naval warfare of the Ottoman Empire. Katip Çelebi began to write this book because of his curiosity of maritime warfare that he developed after the Cretan expedition which begun at 1645 and lasted for decades. According to Yılmaz, this work is composed of one *mukaddime*, two chapters and a *hatimme*. In the *mukaddime* section, Katip Çelebi discussed the importance of the science of

²⁰ Mehmet Yılmaz, *Katip Çelebi Bibliyografyası*, (İstanbul, İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş. Yayınları, 2011) p.24

geography, especially within the perspective of naval warfare. Katip Çelebi also acknowledged that the western countries advances in geography and how this led to their conquests of the Americas and Indian ports. In the first section, Katip Çelebi mentions the Cretan expedition. In the second section, he discusses the chief captain (*kaptan-ı derya*), people of the docks, the “province of the navy”, the itinerary of the navy, naval wars, and the navy's features. In the *hatimme*, Katip Çelebi preaches the embracement of the old custom (*kanun- kadim*) and suggestions for the reforms on state and the navy.²¹

1.2.14. *Mizan ül-Hak fi İhtiyar ül-Ehak*

This work is written in Ottoman Turkish. Katip Çelebi tries to give his response to the debates and problems of his age. The debates of the age are discussed within the two main rival groups, *Kadızadelis* and Sufi groups. In this book, he discusses and gives his opinion on various social issues such as singing, dancing and smoking, as well as theological questions such as innovation, visiting of the tombs and the faith of the Pharaoh. By discussing and criticizing some thoughts of both *Kadızadelis* and sufis, Katip Çelebi suggests the political, social and theological embracement of moderation and the middle way throughout the book. In addition, Katip Çelebi gives importance to both reason and *sharia* in order to reach the truth. He also includes an autobiographical section at the end of the book in which he mentioned his life, studies and suggestions to scholars.

1.2.15. *İlham ül-Mukaddes*

A treatise about Islamic legal issues which are related with with astronomy and geometry. It is written as a criticism of Şeyhülislam Bahai Efendi. When Katip Çelebi asked for *fetwa* on some questions requiring the knowledge of geometry and astronomy from Bahai Efendi, the *şeyhülislam* could not issue a *fetwa* relating these issues. Therefore, Katip Çelebi criticizes him and gives responses to his own questions with this treatise.

1.2.16. *Cami ül-Mutun min Cel ül-Fünun*

²¹ Mehmet Yılmaz, *Katip Çelebi Bibliyografyası*, (İstanbul, İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş. Yayınları, 2011) p.22

This book is an anthology which is composed by Katip Çelebi on different topics. According to Yılmaz, Katip Çelebi edited main texts about the sciences that an intelligent and capable person should be familiar with. Yılmaz further asserts that Katip Çelebi argues that the person who understands these texts will be a great scholar.²²

1.2.17. *Tuhfet ül-Ahyar fi'l-Hikem ve'l-Emsal ve'l-Aşar*

An anthology composed by Katip Çelebi in Ottoman Turkish, Persian and Arabic. According to Yılmaz, the stories collected in this anthology are on family and state administration, on birds, other animals and plants, poetry and interesting stories. The stories collected are both didactic and entertaining.²³

1.2.18. *Dürer-i Muntəsire ve Gurer-i Münteşire*

This anthology is composed by Katip Çelebi on various topics which might be of interest to the people of his age. According to Yılmaz, Katip Çelebi's main source in this work is Gazzali as well as other Islamic scholars.²⁴

1.3. Historiography of Katip Çelebi

There is a widespread literature on Katip Çelebi in Ottoman historiography. Ottoman historians have been interested in and studied very different aspects of Katip Çelebi. There are three different scholars who have attempted to give a detailed bibliography of Katip Çelebi: Franz Babinger, Gottfried Hagen and Mehmet Yılmaz.²⁵ However, it might be argued that a comprehensive attempt to study the mental framework of Katip Çelebi has never been realized. Moreover, Katip Çelebi's views regarding history, politics, science and justice are generally not

²² Mehmet Yılmaz, *Katip Çelebi Bibliyografyası*, (İstanbul, İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş. Yayınları, 2011) p.33

²³ Mehmet Yılmaz, *Katip Çelebi Bibliyografyası*, (İstanbul, İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş. Yayınları, 2011) pp.30-31

²⁴ Mehmet Yılmaz, *Katip Çelebi Bibliyografyası*, (İstanbul, İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş. Yayınları, 2011) p.31

²⁵ Gottfried Hagen, ottomanhistorians.com, "Katip Çelebi"; Mehmet Yılmaz, *Katip Çelebi Bibliyografyası*, (İstanbul, İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş. Yayınları, 2011); Franz Babinger, *Osmanlı Tarih Yazarları ve Eserleri*, (Ankara, Kültür Bakanlığı, 2000)

focused on as a whole. Hagen argues that from the works of Katip Çelebi, a unified perspective of him might emerge.²⁶ However, there have not been many studies done to seek a general approach to Katip Çelebi's mental framework.

In the year 1957, on the 300th anniversary of Katip Çelebi's death, the Turkish Historical Institution published a book on Katip Çelebi, entitled *Katip Çelebi: Studies on His Life and Works*, edited by Orhan Şaik Gökyay.²⁷ In the book, Orhan Şaik Gökyay wrote a chapter on Katip Çelebi's life. In this chapter, he argues that Katip Çelebi considered society to be a main power which could not be denied. In addition, he argues that Katip Çelebi suggests that individuals should embrace moderation, the middle way and should not fall into bigotry.²⁸

Tayyib Gökbilgin wrote about Katip Çelebi's chronological dictionary, *Takvim üt-Tevarih*. Tayyib Gökbilgin asserts that Hungarian historian Szekfu Gyula had argued that Katip Çelebi was a scholar who came close to Western-style history writing. Gökbilgin further claims that Katip Çelebi based his history writing on providing brief and true information.²⁹ Gökbilgin acknowledges that Katip Çelebi designed *Takvim üt-Tevarih* as a summary or table of contents for his work *Fezleke*. Gökbilgin also added that *Takvim üt-Tevarih* has been seen as an important work in both Ottoman and Western spheres. He mentioned that this work is published by the Müteferrika printing press, as well as it was translated to some Western languages.

Hamdi Sadi Selen wrote a chapter on Katip Çelebi's geographical work, *Cihannüma*. Selen points out that Katip Çelebi's *Cihannüma* was one of the first works published by Müteferikka's printing press.³⁰ In addition, because of the fact that *Cihannüma* currently has many manuscripts in the libraries of Turkey and Western Europe, Selen claims that the work and its ideas disseminated in a widespread geography. Therefore it had influenced intellectual life both in Europe and Turkey.

Then, Selen mentions some problems that scholars have experienced while studying the

²⁶ Gottfried Hagen, ottomanhistorians.com, “Katip Çelebi”, p.3

²⁷ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991)

²⁸ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Katip Çelebi Hayatı, Şahsiyeti, Eserleri” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.88

²⁹ Tayyib Gökbilgin, “Katip Çelebi'nin Kronolojik Eseri: Takvimüttevarih” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.101

³⁰ Hamit Sadi Selen, “Cihannüma” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.121

Cihannüma. According to Selen, the question of to what extent the published edition of *Cihannüma* was written by Katip Çelebi should be further investigated. In addition, Selen also argues that the extent to which *Cihannüma* contributed to the areas of geography and historical geography of the time, should be further investigated. Selen points out that there are significant differences between different versions of *Cihannüma* in different libraries.³¹

Selen argues that, based on the information given in *Keşf üz-Zünun* and *Mizan ül-Hak*, there were two different texts of *Cihannüma*, both of which were written by Katip Çelebi.³² Selen acknowledges that Müteferrika added new information to Katip Çelebi's *Cihannüma* which he published in the 18th century. Selen points out that in *Cihannüma*, Katip Çelebi argues that Ptolemaic geography is no longer valid and therefore it was not practical for scholars to use it. Nevertheless, Selen also points out that Katip Çelebi does not present the “new geography” which had began to be widespread in Katip Çelebi's time in Europe. Neither Katip Çelebi's sources mention this new understanding of geography.³³

Selen acknowledges that in the second version of *Cihannüma*, the account is much richer because of the fact that Katip Çelebi uses European sources as well as Islamic ones.³⁴ Selen further argues that Katip Çelebi himself reminded the Sultan that such a work as *Cihannüma* was not present in the Islamic intellectual realm. Selen argues that the 16th century Ottoman Empire experienced a golden age in the intellectual sphere. However, according to Selen, this situation did not last long. Selen presents an account of Ottoman intellectual life which began to decline after 16th century. According to Selen's account, Ottoman Empire became “backward” in civilization and intellectual realms. In Selen's account, Katip Çelebi is presented as the first Ottoman scholar who, after the decline era, began to reestablish the link between Ottoman Empire and Western intellectual worlds.³⁵

³¹ Hamit Sadi Selen, “Cihannüma” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) pp.121-122

³² Hamit Sadi Selen, “Cihannüma” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.123

³³ Hamit Sadi Selen, “Cihannüma” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.126

³⁴ Hamit Sadi Selen, “Cihannüma” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.128

³⁵ Hamit Sadi Selen, “Cihannüma” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.130

Selen argued that *Cihannüma* contributed to geography in several manners. The fact that Katip Çelebi divides his account by the continents is, according to Selen, a contribution to geography. In addition, Katip Çelebi also contributes the geography by combining mathematical geography and political geography.³⁶

Süheyl Ünver wrote a section on the information about China that Katip Çelebi presented in *Cihannüma*. According to Ünver, Katip Çelebi uses a source which is called *Kanunname-i Çin ve Hatay*, which is a Chinese work translated to Persian. According to Ünver, Katip Çelebi argues that an Ottoman merchant who went to China wrote this account and he presented this work to Sultan Selim II. Katip Çelebi uses this account in *Cihannüma*'s account on China.³⁷

Bedi Şehsuvaroğlu wrote a chapter on Katip Çelebi's *İlham ül-Mukaddes Min el-Feyz ül-Akdes* treatise. In this chapter, Şehsuvaroğlu argues that Katip Çelebi was known for his studies of rational sciences. Then, Şehsuvaroğlu claims that, at some point, Katip Çelebi also became interested in religious sciences. According to Şehsuvaroğlu, Katip Çelebi explains the scope and change in his studies with a dream narrative that he wrote on *Mizan ül-Hak*, in which he argues that he saw the Prophet. Şehsuvaroğlu points out that, in the dream, the Prophet suggested to Katip Çelebi that he should be interested in religious sciences too. Then, based on that dream, Katip Çelebi explains that he began to study and focus more on religious sciences.³⁸

Şehsuvaroğlu claims that Katip Çelebi did not pursue a *medrese* education. Therefore, the *ulema* of the time, did not take Katip Çelebi into consideration as a serious Islamic scholar. Şehsuvaroğlu further argues that, because of this fact, Katip Çelebi wrote too many works.³⁹ According to Şehsuvaroğlu, the treatise *İlham ül-Akdes*, reduced much scholarly attention because of its brevity. However, Şehsuvaroğlu claims that it is a crucial treatise in order to understand the intellectual mentality of Katip Çelebi.⁴⁰

³⁶ Hamit Sadi Selen, "Cihannüma" in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.132

³⁷ Süheyl Ünver, "Katip Çelebi'nin Cihannümasında Çin ve Hatay Hakkında Verilen Malumat Kaynağı Üzerine" in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.138

³⁸ Bedi Şehsuvaroğlu, "İlham-al Mukaddes min-al Feyz al-Akdes Risalesi ve Katip Çelebi'nin İlmî Zihniyeti Hakkında Birkaç Söz" in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.141

³⁹ Bedi Şehsuvaroğlu, "İlham-al Mukaddes min-al Feyz al-Akdes Risalesi ve Katip Çelebi'nin İlmî Zihniyeti Hakkında Birkaç Söz" in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) pp.142-143

⁴⁰ Bedi Şehsuvaroğlu, "İlham-al Mukaddes min-al Feyz al-Akdes Risalesi ve Katip Çelebi'nin İlmî Zihniyeti

According to Şehsuvaroğlu, Adnan Adıvar claims that Katip Çelebi accuses Şeyhülislam Bahai Efendi of ignorance by implication. However, Şehsuvaroğlu differs from Adıvar because he claims that Katip Çelebi accused the *şeyhülislam* directly. Şehsuvaroğlu also adds that, according to Katip Çelebi, the *sharia* might not always be enough to issue the right judgement and one must also use reason.⁴¹

Şehsuvaroğlu praises Katip Çelebi for embracing and utilizing rational sciences. Nevertheless, he also adds that Katip Çelebi was unable to bring the new Western science of astronomy, which began with Copernicus, to the Ottoman Empire. Şehsuvaroğlu argues that the fact that Katip Çelebi died young might be a reason why he was unable to bring the new Western advances to the Ottoman Empire.⁴²

Hilmi Ziya Ülken wrote a section about Katip Çelebi and thought. Ülken argues that Katip Çelebi's significance or contribution, is either exaggerated or belittled. For this reason, Ülken argues that it is important to leave exaggerations alone and specify the contribution of Katip Çelebi to the intellectual life of the Ottoman Empire.⁴³

Ülken argues that Katip Çelebi defended a cosmology which is non-Copernican. Ülken asserts that as a scholar who is interested with the West and Western scholarship, Katip Çelebi should have embraced the Copernican cosmology. Nevertheless, according to Ülken, Katip Çelebi was influenced by anti-Copernican Western scholars, and therefore did not embrace the Copernican cosmology. Ülken argues that Katip Çelebi did not go further than the Ptolemaic cosmology. According to Ülken, the fact that Katip Çelebi did not go further the Ptolemaic cosmology should be interpreted with caution. Ülken argues that Katip Çelebi should not be accused of this, because the Copernican cosmology was still a matter of discussion at the time, and the Copernican

Hakkında Birkaç Söz” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.145

⁴¹ Bedi Şehsuvaroğlu, “İlham-al Mukaddes min-al Feyz al-Akdes Risalesi ve Katip Çelebi'nin İlmi Zihniyeti Hakkında Birkaç Söz” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.147

⁴² Bedi Şehsuvaroğlu, “İlham-al Mukaddes min-al Feyz al-Akdes Risalesi ve Katip Çelebi'nin İlmi Zihniyeti Hakkında Birkaç Söz” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.147-148

⁴³ Hilmi Ziya Ülken, “Katip Çelebi ve Fikir Hayatımız” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.177

cosmology was not widespread enough. Ülken argues that the fact that Katip Çelebi doubted the Copernican cosmology is understandable.⁴⁴

Ülken claims that *Keşf üz-Zünun* cannot be considered a forerunner or original work, because, according to Ülken, this kind of bibliographical work had existed since Ibn Nedim's *Fihrist*. Therefore, in this article Ülken analyzes only *Düstur ül-Amel* and *Mizan ül-Hak* books.⁴⁵ Ülken argues that Katip Çelebi embraces the Ibn Khaldunian understanding of history. However, unlike Ibn Khaldun, he suggests that reforms might be efficient for states to postpone their declines. For this reason, Ülken suggests that Katip Çelebi did not embrace Ibn Khaldun's historical determinism.⁴⁶

Ülken claims that, in the *Mizan ül-Hak*, Katip Çelebi classifies sciences (*ilm*), but his classification is not an original one, and his classification comes from Ibn Sina and Aristotle. Ülken further argues that the book is also not original. However, it was a brave essay against common scholastic thought, because it provides a defense of a certain kind of secularism. Ülken praises Katip Çelebi for his struggle against superstition.⁴⁷

Ülken argues that the most significant chapter of the work is the one about innovation. Ülken claims that, in this chapter, Katip Çelebi describes important events in Ottoman history. In addition, according to Ülken, Katip Çelebi criticizes the Ottoman administration with for being unable to understand the practices and customs of the common people. Ülken argues that Celali rebellions might be examples of this unawareness.⁴⁸

Ülken claims that Katip Çelebi's thoughts might be understood within the secular understanding of state and society. Ülken asserts that allowing people to have their own ideas, and customs and not forcing them to give them up, is compatible with the secular vision of state and

⁴⁴ Hilmi Ziya Ülken, "Katip Çelebi ve Fikir Hayatımız" in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) pp.178-179

⁴⁵ Hilmi Ziya Ülken, "Katip Çelebi ve Fikir Hayatımız" in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.179

⁴⁶ Hilmi Ziya Ülken, "Katip Çelebi ve Fikir Hayatımız" in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.182

⁴⁷ Hilmi Ziya Ülken, "Katip Çelebi ve Fikir Hayatımız" in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.182

⁴⁸ Hilmi Ziya Ülken, "Katip Çelebi ve Fikir Hayatımız" in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.187

society. Ülken praises Katip Çelebi's ideas, which are based on a deep scientific background and a realistic vision of society which is even not applied today.⁴⁹

Ülken claims that Katip Çelebi read the scholars of his time, educated himself on the “knowledge of the world” and reached a level in which he might criticize the scholastic thought of his time. Ülken claims that Katip Çelebi understood the necessity of giving sermons to the people, and argued that sermons should be in Turkish. Ülken asserts that, as an institution, the *medrese* could not find an innovative vision which Katip Çelebi suggested.⁵⁰

Tayyib Gökbilgin wrote a chapter on 17th Century Ottoman reform needs, trends and Katip Çelebi. Gökbilgin argues that Katip Çelebi defends the rational sciences in his work *Mizan ül-Hak*.⁵¹ In addition, Gökbilgin emphasizes Katip Çelebi's complaints about superstition. Gökbilgin further argues that *Mizan ül-Hak* is a manifesto against bigotry (*taasub*). Gökbilgin presented Katip Çelebi, as a proponent of free thought, and as a tolerant and liberal intellectual.⁵² Gökbilgin claims that Katip Çelebi proposed some reform suggestions and also asserted that those suggestion were not taken into consideration.⁵³

In year 2009, the 400th anniversary of Katip Çelebi's birth, Turkey's Ministry of Culture and Tourism, published a volume on Katip Çelebi. The work is edited by Bekir Karlıağa and Mustafa Kaçar.⁵⁴

In the same book, Mücteba İlgürel, wrote a section called “The Katip Çelebi Century”. In this section, İlgürel asserts the main dynamics and *zeitgeist* of the 17th Century Ottoman Empire. She discusses the military scene of the Empire, the rebellions such as Celalis, together with the

⁴⁹ Hilmi Ziya Ülken, “Katip Çelebi ve Fikir Hayatımız” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.188

⁵⁰ Hilmi Ziya Ülken, “Katip Çelebi ve Fikir Hayatımız” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.191

⁵¹ Tayyib Gökbilgin, “XVII. Asırda Osmanlı Devleti ve Katip Çelebi” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.213

⁵² Tayyib Gökbilgin, “XVII. Asırda Osmanlı Devleti ve Katip Çelebi” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.214

⁵³ Tayyib Gökbilgin, “XVII. Asırda Osmanlı Devleti ve Katip Çelebi” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.216

⁵⁴ Bekir Karlıağa and Mustafa Kaçar, *Doğumunun 400. Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

political, social and economic scene of the Empire. Then, she analyzes the reform attempts of the Empire.

Said Öztürk wrote a chapter on Katip Çelebi's life. The title of his article is “Katip Çelebi's Life and Works”. He argues that Katip Çelebi might be considered the first occidentalist of the Ottoman Empire.⁵⁵ Said Öztürk argues that Katip Çelebi was mistaken to accuse Caliph Ömer with the burning of the library of Alexandria.⁵⁶

Orhan Şaik Gökyay wrote a chapter on Katip Çelebi's personality. Gökyay claims that Katip Çelebi was a man of good behavior, and self-control who was respected by everyone. Gökyay argues that only Mehmet Nazmi spoke about him negatively. According to Gökyay, Mehmet Nazmi argues that it was difficult to understand which view and opinion Katip Çelebi had. In addition, Nazmi accuses Katip Çelebi of narcissism and of being a person who does not know where to stop. He further accuses Katip Çelebi of criticizing his own *şeyh*: Şeyh Sivasi.⁵⁷

Gökyay claims that Katip Çelebi disliked and did not use humor. He further claims that Katip Çelebi was against superstition and disliked addictive substances. Gökyay asserts that Katip Çelebi was against false saints and messiahs, and criticized people who followed them. Gökyay suggests that Katip Çelebi was a bibliophile; that he did not sleep until the morning when studying and reading.⁵⁸ Gökyay claims that Katip Çelebi was a tolerant man but he had a “national pride”. Gökyay gives examples of Katip Çelebi intervening translations and arguing that the original author whose account praised Europe is actually incorrect.⁵⁹ Gökyay argues that the important speciality of Katip Çelebi, is his determined position to search for the reality, his courage to defend his arguments, and his neutral stance in hotly debated issues.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ Said Öztürk, “Katip Çelebi'nin Hayatı ve Eserleri”, Bekir Karlıağa and Mustafa Kaçar, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.24

⁵⁶ Said Öztürk, “Katip Çelebi'nin Hayatı ve Eserleri”, Bekir Karlıağa and Mustafa Kaçar, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.27

⁵⁷ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Katip Çelebi'nin Kişiliği”, Bekir Karlıağa and Mustafa Kaçar, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.34

⁵⁸ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Katip Çelebi'nin Kişiliği”, Bekir Karlıağa and Mustafa Kaçar, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp.34-35

⁵⁹ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Katip Çelebi'nin Kişiliği”, Bekir Karlıağa and Mustafa Kaçar, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.38

⁶⁰ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Katip Çelebi'nin Kişiliği”, Bekir Karlıağa and Mustafa Kaçar, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.41

Semiramis Çavuşoğlu and Mustafa Kaçar wrote a chapter on the *Kadızedeli* movement as a main social movement of the century. They argue that the movement was a religion based reform movement. They claim that the movement aimed to restore the practice of Islam in the time of the Prophet and the Four Caliphs. They argue that the debates around *Kadızedelis* involved the *bida* debate which is discussed by *Kadızedelis* and many legal scholars throughout the Islamic history. They differentiate between the scholars who distinguished the “good” and “bad” *bida* and those who did not distinguish and were against every form of *bida*.⁶¹

Bekir Karlıağa wrote a chapter on Katip Çelebi's cosmology. According to Karlıağa, Katip Çelebi criticized those who argued that the Earth was flat.⁶² Karlıağa argues that Katip Çelebi choose the *hadith* of “you know the works of the world better” and interpreted that one should be knowledgeable in the practical works of the world.⁶³ Karlıağa argues that the author of the Atlas praised Europe with its products, cities, history and Katip Çelebi responded that Europe should be praised because it was the home of Ottoman Empire. Karlıağa also adds that Katip Çelebi criticized the author because of his overemphasis on Europe, giving little space for other continents.⁶⁴

Karlıağa argues that Katip Çelebi is different from many Ottoman and Islamic scholars in his analysis of non-Ottoman realms. Therefore, in the early Republican era, he was mentioned many times by many intellectuals. Karlıağa accuses the Ottoman *ulema* of Katip Çelebi's age of having strict thoughts and mentalities and being closed to novelties. Karlıağa praises Katip Çelebi because he considers him unique in the Islamic and Ottoman worlds for being open to non-Islamic knowledge.⁶⁵ Karlıağa praises Katip Çelebi for effectively synthesizing present accounts and different accounts. Karlıağa claims that even if Katip Çelebi was mistaken, his method was successful and should be praised.⁶⁶

⁶¹ Semiramis Çavuşoğlu and Mustafa Kaçar, “Kadızedeliler Hareketi: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Şeriate Dayanan Bir Reform Teşebbüsü”, Bekir Karlıağa and Mustafa Kaçar, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.44

⁶² Bekir Karlıağa, “Cihana Tutulan Ayna ya da Katip Çelebi'nin Kainat Tasarımı” *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.71

⁶³ Bekir Karlıağa, “Cihana Tutulan Ayna ya da Katip Çelebi'nin Kainat Tasarımı” *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.72

⁶⁴ Bekir Karlıağa, “Cihana Tutulan Ayna ya da Katip Çelebi'nin Kainat Tasarımı” *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp.80-81

⁶⁵ Bekir Karlıağa, “Cihana Tutulan Ayna ya da Katip Çelebi'nin Kainat Tasarımı” *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp.82-83

⁶⁶ Bekir Karlıağa, “Cihana Tutulan Ayna ya da Katip Çelebi'nin Kainat Tasarımı” *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.85

Mustafa Kaçar and Atilla Bir wrote two articles about Katip Çelebi's geographical studies in *Cihannüma*. The first one is on the “Universe and Its Placement in *Cihannüma*”.⁶⁷ The second one is on Cartography in *Cihannüma*.⁶⁸ Thomas Goodrich wrote on Ottoman Cartography. Goodrich praises Katip Çelebi because he uses both Islamic and European knowledge and argues that the knowledge he provided was influential in the transformations that the Ottoman Empire experienced.⁶⁹ Robert Dankoff wrote on the sources of three Ottoman geographers. In this article, Dankoff studies and compares the accounts of Aşık Mehmet, Evliya Çelebi and Katip Çelebi on two cities, Tiflis and Bitlis.⁷⁰

Mahmut Ak wrote an article on the classification of cities in Ottoman geographical works. In the article, Ak analyzes and compares the examples of similar accounts in *Menazirü'l-Avalim* and *Cihannüma*. Ak mentions how Katip Çelebi changed his classification of *Cihannüma* after he came across *Atlas Minor*.⁷¹

John Curry wrote an article on Katip Çelebi's outlook on the American continent. Curry questions whether Katip Çelebi was aware of the discovery of the American continent. He argues that Katip Çelebi both accepted and refused ancient knowledge of the continents of Americas. For example Katip Çelebi argues that the historian Diodorus Siculus' account of a western continent might be America. On the other hand, Katip Çelebi refuses a similar story about Alexander the Great.⁷² Curry argued that Katip Çelebi might have tried to emphasize the significance of the discovery of Americas to the eyes of the Ottoman ruling class.⁷³

⁶⁷ Mustafa Kaçar and Atilla Bir, “Cihannüma'da Evren ve Yerinin Belirlenmesi”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp.89-111

⁶⁸ Mustafa Kaçar and Atilla Bir, “Cihannüma'da Haritacılık”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp.113-125

⁶⁹ Thomas Goodrich, “Osmanlı Haritacılığı 1450-1700”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp.136-137

⁷⁰ Robert Dankoff, “Üç Osmanlı Coğrafyacısı ve Kaynakları: Aşık Mehmet, Katip Çelebi ve Evliya Çelebi'ye Göre Tiflis ve Bitlis”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp.143-148

⁷¹ Mahmut Ak, “Osmanlı Coğrafya Eserlerinde Şehirlerin Tasnifi: Menazirü'l-Avalim ve Cihannüma Örneği” *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp.152-153

⁷² John Curry, “Bir Osmanlı Araştırmacısının Batı Yarım Kürenin Keşfi Üzerindeki Düşünceleri: Katip Çelebi'nin Cihannüma'da Amerika Kıtasına Bakışı”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.164

⁷³ John Curry, “Bir Osmanlı Araştırmacısının Batı Yarım Kürenin Keşfi Üzerindeki Düşünceleri: Katip Çelebi'nin Cihannüma'da Amerika Kıtasına Bakışı”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.170

İlhan Kutluer wrote a chapter on *Keşf-üz-Zünun*. He argues that *Keşf-üz-Zünun* is based on works such as Ibn Nedim's *Fihrist*, Kindi's *Aristotle Bibliography* and Farabi's *Ihsau'l-Ulum*.⁷⁴ Kutluer argues that Katip Çelebi destroys the balance between the religious and rational sciences by overemphasizing rational sciences.⁷⁵ Kutluer further claims that Katip Çelebi created this work to show the the accumulation of the Islamic civilization and to move it forward.⁷⁶ Kutluer mentions that Katip Çelebi points out the connection between the development of sciences and the cultural context of a civilization. In this respect, according to Kutluer, Katip Çelebi complained about the decline of the Ottoman Empire and its affects on philosophy and sciences.⁷⁷ On the other hand, Yakup Civelek wrote on the unknown *zeyls* of *Keşf-üz-Zünun*. He argues that even though the works mentioned in the *zeyls* are not present today, historians have the chance to know about their existence.⁷⁸

Zeynep Aycibin wrote a chapter on Katip Çelebi as a historian. According to Aycibin, Katip Çelebi created *Fezleke* based on previously written sources. Therefore, she reminds the reader of Bekir Kütükoğlu's remarks on *Fezleke*. According to Kütükoğlu, *Fezleke* is not an original work but a serious edition. In addition, Aycibin argues that in *Fezleke* there is also plagiarism and Katip Çelebi used Peçuyulu's account without mentioning his name.⁷⁹ Aycibin also argues that in *Fezleke*, there are some accounts which are based on Katip Çelebi's own observations. Those observations, according to Aycibin, are the most detailed accounts of the *Fezleke*. Aycibin argues that Katip Çelebi tried to stay neutral until he summarized different views of scholars, as a historian should do. Aycibin adds than only after that, did Katip Çelebi intervened and gave his opinion on a particular account.⁸⁰

Aycibin argues that in some works, Katip Çelebi criticized some individuals very harshly.

⁷⁴ İlhan Kutluer, “Keşfü'z-Zunun: Klasik Bilim Geleneğimizin Büyük Atlası”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.190

⁷⁵ İlhan Kutluer, “Keşfü'z-Zunun: Klasik Bilim Geleneğimizin Büyük Atlası”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.193

⁷⁶ İlhan Kutluer, “Keşfü'z-Zunun: Klasik Bilim Geleneğimizin Büyük Atlası”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.194

⁷⁷ İlhan Kutluer, “Keşfü'z-Zunun: Klasik Bilim Geleneğimizin Büyük Atlası”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.199

⁷⁸ Yakup Civelek, “Keşfü'z-Zunun'un Pek Tanınmayan Zeyilleri”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp. 212-213

⁷⁹ Zeynep Aycibin, “Katip Çelebi'nin Tarihçiliği”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.218

⁸⁰ Zeynep Aycibin, “Katip Çelebi'nin Tarihçiliği”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.220

She further adds that in *Fezleke*, Katip Çelebi most harshly criticized Kösem Sultan.⁸¹ Aycibin further argues that Katip Çelebi criticized debates based on bigotry. She argued that, in those cases, one should criticize and suppress both sides regardless of who is right.⁸² Aycibin claims that unlike other Ottoman historians, Katip Çelebi mentioned the events about European history in his *Fezleke*.⁸³

Hayrettin Yücesoy wrote a chapter on the universal history writing tradition in Islam and Katip Çelebi. Yücesoy questions where to put Katip Çelebi in Islamic universal history writing. Yücesoy argues that in the classical Islamic historiography, there are main trends on writing history. Historians wrote either by dividing the history according to prophets or by ruler. Yücesoy asserts that Katip Çelebi cannot be considered a follower of one of these trends. Instead, he uses both trends at the same time.⁸⁴

Mehmet Canatar wrote an article on *Fezleket'ül-Tevarih* of Katip Çelebi. In this article, Canatar demonstrates how Katip Çelebi used one of his sources, Cenabi.⁸⁵ Jean-Louis Bacque-Grammont wrote a section on the foundation of the Ottoman Empire in *Cihannüma*. Bacque-Grammont argues that the account of Osman in *Cihannüma* was the stately accepted account of the early 18th century.⁸⁶

Bilal Yurtoğlu wrote a chapter on Katip Çelebi's understanding of science. Yurtoğlu argues that, according to Katip Çelebi, there are two ways to reaching the knowledge. These are *en-Nazar* (rational thinking) and *et-Tasfiye* (spiritual purification).⁸⁷ Yavuz Unat and İnan Kalaycıoğulları wrote on astronomy in Ottoman Empire and Katip Çelebi's understanding of astronomy.⁸⁸ Dursun

⁸¹ Zeynep Aycibin, “Katip Çelebi'nin Tarihçiliği”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.222

⁸² Zeynep Aycibin, “Katip Çelebi'nin Tarihçiliği”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.223

⁸³ Zeynep Aycibin, “Katip Çelebi'nin Tarihçiliği”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.225

⁸⁴ Hayrettin Yücesoy, “İslam Tarihinde Evrensel Tarihçilik Geleneği ve Katip Çelebi: Kısa Bir Ön Mülahaza”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp.236-238

⁸⁵ Mehmet Canatar, “Katip Çelebi ve Fezleketü't-Tevarih Adlı Tarih Kitabı Hakkında Bazı Görüşler”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p. 242

⁸⁶ Jean-Louis Bacque-Grammont, “Katip Çelebi'nin Cihannümasında Osmanlı Devleti'nin Kuruluşu Hakkında Birkaç Not”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.252

⁸⁷ Bilal Yurtoğlu, “XVII. Yüzyılda Bir İsraki: Katip Çelebi'nin Bilim Anlayışı”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp.263-274

⁸⁸ Yavuz Onat & İnan Kalaycıoğulları, “XVII. Yüzyıl Başlarında Osmanlılarda Astronomi ve Katip Çelebi'nin

Ayan wrote a chapter on the geometry knowing *kadı* described by Katip Çelebi.⁸⁹

Salim Aydüz wrote on Katip Çelebi's thoughts on the *medrese* curriculum and his suggestions about *medreses*. Aydüz asserts that Katip Çelebi emphasizes both religious and rational sciences. Katip Çelebi argues that both should exist in a balanced way.⁹⁰

Mehmet İpşirli wrote a chapter on Katip Çelebi's attitude towards the West and Western knowledge. İpşirli argues that Katip Çelebi was a significant personality in the cognition of West by Ottomans. İpşirli believes that in this sense, it is difficult to compare him with another Ottoman intellectuals. He further argues that it was Katip Çelebi himself who provided the environment in which he studied and analyzed the West.⁹¹ İpşirli claims that Katip Çelebi's interest and knowledge of West was very limited when compared to the Western Orientalists' capacity. However, according to İpşirli, this is because of the institutionalization of Western Orientalism versus personal attempts to explore the West by Katip Çelebi.⁹²

Sabri Orman wrote about Katip Çelebi's socio-economic thought. According to Orman, Katip Çelebi tries to present a solution for the budget of the Empire in *Düstur ül-Amel* treatise. According to Orman, the main reason for the crisis was the degradation of the peasantry. Orman mentions that Katip Çelebi emphasized the previous sultans' willingness to protect the peasantry.⁹³ Katip Çelebi also argues that the spread of bribery negatively affects the crisis. Orman mentions that, according to Katip Çelebi, it is possible to make the state prosper again.⁹⁴ Orman argues that Katip Çelebi had tried to point out the social changes of the Empire. Thus, Katip Çelebi might be seen as a desperate reformer.⁹⁵

Astronomi Anlayışı”, *Doğumunun 400. Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp.277-296

⁸⁹ Dursun Ayan, “Katip Çelebi'nin Geometri Bilen Kadısı- Bilgi Sosyolojisi Üzerine Notlar”, *Doğumunun 400. Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp.299-307

⁹⁰ Salim Aydüz, “Katip Çelebi'nin Osmanlı Medreseleri Müfredatı ile İlgili Tespitleri ve Önerileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme”, *Doğumunun 400. Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.319

⁹¹ Mehmet İpşirli, “XVII. Yüzyılda Batı'ya Açılan Geniş Bir Pencere: Katip Çelebi”, *Doğumunun 400. Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.326

⁹² Mehmet İpşirli, “XVII. Yüzyılda Batı'ya Açılan Geniş Bir Pencere: Katip Çelebi”, *Doğumunun 400. Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.327

⁹³ Sabri Orman, “Katip Çelebi'de Sosyo-Ekonomik Düşünce”, *Doğumunun 400. Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.346

⁹⁴ Sabri Orman, “Katip Çelebi'de Sosyo-Ekonomik Düşünce”, *Doğumunun 400. Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.354

⁹⁵ Sabri Orman, “Katip Çelebi'de Sosyo-Ekonomik Düşünce”, *Doğumunun 400. Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.355

Said Öztürk wrote on Katip Çelebi's thoughts on wealth of the nations. Öztürk argues that Katip Çelebi differed from his predecessors because he used Western sources and embraced a critical position in scholarship.⁹⁶

Hüseyin Sarıoğlu wrote on humanity and ethics according to Katip Çelebi. Sarıoğlu argues that Katip Çelebi became familiar with the debates that Anatolian intellectuals discussed when he was on the campaigns in the Eastern parts of the Empire with his father. Sarıoğlu claims that Katip Çelebi perceived humans as a microcosm of the universe.⁹⁷ Sarıoğlu emphasizes Katip Çelebi's thoughts on the power of customs and how it is difficult convince common people to give up their customs once they embraced them.⁹⁸

Abdülkadir Özcan wrote a chapter on Katip Çelebi's education. Özcan mentions the scholars that Katip Çelebi took courses or studied with. Özcan claims that, according to Katip Çelebi, the *medreses* are not sufficient to build a sound education. Moreover, Özcan emphasizes Katip Çelebi's balanced vision of religious and rational sciences.⁹⁹

Adnan Adıvar discussed Katip Çelebi, within the perspectives of westernization and secularization. He tends to see Katip Çelebi as a forerunner of the westernization and secularization.¹⁰⁰ In addition, he considers Katip Çelebi's and other authors of the same age to be the observers of decline. In other words, the scholars who analyze Katip Çelebi within the perspectives of secularization and westernization take the words of Katip Çelebi and analyze them as elements of decline rather than a sign of a changing or adapting empire. Therefore, the studies on Katip Çelebi need to be redone with new perspectives that are developed in the Ottoman studies of recent decades.

In the *Mizan ül-Hak*, Katip Çelebi mentions that the *medreses* of Istanbul in 17th century are

⁹⁶ Said Öztürk, "Katip Çelebi'nin Milletlerin Zenginliği Üzerine Düşünceleri", *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp.359-369

⁹⁷ Hüseyin Sarıoğlu, "Katip Çelebi'de İnsan ve Ahlak", *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.372

⁹⁸ Hüseyin Sarıoğlu, "Katip Çelebi'de İnsan ve Ahlak", *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) p.377

⁹⁹ Abdülkadir Özcan, "Katip Çelebi'nin Eğitimi ve Ders Aldığı Hocalar", *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009) pp.382-385

¹⁰⁰ Adnan Adıvar, *Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim*, (İstanbul, Remzi Kitabevi, 2000) p.151

no longer offering courses on philosophy. Katip Çelebi lambasts this phenomenon and describes it as a lack of interest in philosophy. In addition, he expresses that the people who were educated in the eastern provinces of the empire have begun to teach philosophy to people in Istanbul, only because they possess relatively more knowledge of philosophy.¹⁰¹

The removal of philosophy courses in the curricula of *medreses* in Istanbul became a phenomenon in historiography and is considered an element or proof of the decline in Ottoman Empire by many scholars. For example, many scholars, such as Adivar, see the removal of philosophy courses in the *medreses* as a proof of the cultural decline of the Ottoman Empire in the seventeenth century.¹⁰² In other words, what Katip Çelebi says about the curricula of the *medreses* perceived as the main argument for the decline of Ottoman culture, i.e. its philosophy and education.

What existed outside the realm of Istanbul *medreses* needs to be elaborated. In addition, the reasons of actions such as the removal of a philosophy or science related activity should be analyzed with different perspectives. Today Ottoman studies is experiencing new perspectives on the interpretation of the Ottoman sciences and education. For instance, in a recent study, Tezcan demonstrates that the demolition of the observatory in Istanbul was performed with political motivations as opposed to the interpretation as a cultural “backwardness” or decline in the traditional Ottoman historiography.¹⁰³

The secularization perspective on Katip Çelebi also tends to designate Katip Çelebi as an exceptional figure who was beyond his time and therefore misunderstood by the society he lived in. Katip Çelebi has been perceived as a lonely figure who was not taken into consideration. Adivar argues that Katip Çelebi was not taken into consideration by the *ulema* of his time, because of the fact that he did not pursue a formal *medrese* education.¹⁰⁴ The recent scholarship criticizes the perception on Katip Çelebi in which he is seen as a lonely figure whose words were not heeded.¹⁰⁵ Although Katip Çelebi expressed that his writings in *Düstur ül-Amel* would not be taken into

¹⁰¹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.26

¹⁰² Adnan Adivar, *Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim*, (İstanbul, Remzi Kitabevi, 2000) p.127

¹⁰³ Baki Tezcan, “Some Thoughts on the Politics of Early Modern Ottoman Science” in *Beyond Dominant Paradigms in Ottoman and Middle Eastern/North African Studies: A Tribute to Rifa'at Abou-El-Haj*, ed. By Donald Quatert and Baki Tezcan, pp. 135-156. İstanbul, İSAM, 2010

¹⁰⁴ Adnan Adivar, *Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim*, (İstanbul, Remzi Kitabevi, 2000) p.140

¹⁰⁵ Bilal Yurtoğlu, *Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, 2009) p.161

consideration, he was asked for his opinion and, according to a scholar, Köprülü Mehmed later applied many reforms that Katip Çelebi had envisioned.¹⁰⁶ These facts help the scholars to reconsider the image of Katip Çelebi as a “lonely intellectual” who was not taken into consideration.

The recent historiography attempts to analyze different parts of Katip Çelebi's works with different aspects of Ottoman history. The historians who research the advice for kings literature in the Ottoman Empire mostly analyze *Düstur ül-Amel* treatise.¹⁰⁷ On the other hand, some scholars who try to understand the social and political aspects of the 17th century frequently use *Fezleke* as a main primary source.¹⁰⁸ Nevertheless, only a few historians analyze *Mizan ül-Hak* within a legal theological perspective.¹⁰⁹ Conversely, many scholars have worked on geographical accounts of Katip Çelebi using *Cihannüma* as a main source.¹¹⁰ Furthermore, *Keşf üz-Zünun*, is another work which is used by scholars who would like to understand Katip Çelebi's accumulation of knowledge and how he used knowledge as a source.¹¹¹

The other works of Katip Çelebi are used by historians as well. Nevertheless, I have attempted to demonstrate the main dynamics of the historians who use Katip Çelebi.

¹⁰⁶ Norman Itzkowitz, *Ottoman Empire and Islamic Tradition*, (Chicago; London, University of Chicago Press, 1972), p.99

¹⁰⁷ Bernard Lewis, “Ottoman Observers of Ottoman Decline” in *Islam in History*; Douglas Howard, “The Ottoman Advice for Kings Literature” in *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire* ed. Aksan & Goffman, Cambridge, 2007

¹⁰⁸ Gabriel Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy*, (London, University of California Press, 2003)

¹⁰⁹ Haim Gerber, *State, Society, and Law in Islam Ottoman Law in Comparative Perspective*, (Albany, State University of New York, 1994); Eunjeong Yi, *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth Century Istanbul: Fluidity and Leverage*, (Leiden; Boston, Brill, 2004)

¹¹⁰ Gottfried Hagen, *Ein Osmanischer Geograph bei der Arbeit: Entstehung und Gedankenwelt von Katib Celebis Gihannüma*, (Berlin, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2003)

¹¹¹ Bilal Yurtoğlu, *Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, 2009)

CHAPTER II

SOCIETY, POLITICS AND KATİP ÇELEBİ

In this part, I will discuss Katip Çelebi's outlook on society and politics of his age. In order to analyze Katip Çelebi's perspective on society and politics, I will trace examples of how Katip Çelebi perceived and discussed different social groups or different elements of the society. Here, I will analyze Katip Çelebi's outlook on society in four parts. Before that, I will mention some of the sources that are used. In addition, I will provide a brief perspective regarding the sources. I will briefly mention *Düstur ül-amel* and Ottoman tradition of *nasihatname* literature.

After the discussion of the sources, I will elaborate on the social and political outlook of Katip Çelebi. First, I will briefly mention Katip Çelebi's thoughts on the politics and society of his age. The elements of society and politics that will be elaborated will be based on and illustrated with the examples of Katip Çelebi's thoughts primarily as they appeared in *Düstur ül-amel*. The second element will be the problems and crisis that Katip Çelebi identified within his own society. The third element will be the “remedies” or the solutions that Katip Çelebi suggested in order to solve the crisis or the problems of the society in which he lived. The fourth one will be the ideal society or organization of politics that Katip Çelebi suggested or he had in his mind. I shall try to point out how and to what extent Katip Çelebi's spirituality and rationality is combined and can be found in these four categories.

II.1. The Sources

This chapter will focus on how Katip Çelebi perceived and responded to the society that he experienced. Moreover, it will elaborate on what kind of a concept of society he reflected and dreamed of. In order to answer this question, I will begin by pointing out different social groups that

he mentioned in some of his works. I will use Katip Çelebi's treatise *Düstur ül-amel* to point out and analyze his conception of society and politics.

II.1.1. *Düstur ül-Amel*

The treatise of *Düstur ül-amel* might be considered within the “mirror for princes” or the *nasihatname* literature. In this treatise, Katip Çelebi expresses some observations that he has made about the fiscal, social and political state of the Empire. In addition, he compares the present state of the Empire that he is witnessing with an idealized version of Süleyman's reign. Similarly, he compares Ottoman provinces with the Safavid provinces. In both comparisons, Katip Çelebi complains about the problems of the Empire. Furthermore, he expresses his ideal society together with the reform projects that he envisioned.

What might Katip Çelebi have intended with the *Düstur ül-amel* treatise? In order to pursue the answer of this question, the reasons behind the writing of this treatise should be explored. According to Bernard Lewis, after a meeting called by Mehmed IV to inquire about the deficit and fiscal conditions of the Empire, Katip Çelebi wrote the treatise of *Düstur ül-amel*.¹¹² On the other hand, Gottfried Hagen indicates that Tarhuncu Ahmed Pasha ordered a collation of the account books which also involved Katip Çelebi.¹¹³

There is no doubt that Katip Çelebi tried to create solutions to the crisis of the Empire. However, he was not the first person to attempt to write political and administrative advice in the Ottoman tradition. The *nasihatname* literature or the genre of Ottoman political writings and treatises were written mostly by Ottoman bureaucrats who knew the state and its administration very well.

II.1.2. *Ottoman Mirror for Princes or Nasihatname Literature*

The *nasihatname* literature existed long before the Ottomans in different cultures and states. The Islamic tradition of statecraft and *nasihat* is well known in the historiography. In the Ottoman Empire this literature began to develop primarily after the 16th century. Lütü Pasha, Mustafa Ali, Hasan Kafi and Kınalızade Ali were among the the first authors to write in this genre before Katip

¹¹² Bernard Lewis, “Ottoman Observers of Ottoman Decline” in *Islam in History*, p.217

¹¹³ Gottfried Hagen ottomanhistorians.com p.9

Çelebi. These authors were mostly bureaucrats or other members of the state elite. Each of them had an ideal version of an Ottoman or Islamic state which was just and strong. These authors suggested reform projects in order to help reestablish the power of the Ottoman state according to their perception of justice and the ideal state.

Cornell Fleischer divides the authors of the *nasihatname* literature into two categories. One category consists of those who attempted to give advice to the ruler and the other includes those who attempted to share thoughts or teach the sultan ethics and good behavior.¹¹⁴ Such authors elaborate concepts such as justice, social hierarchy, the ideal sultan, the ideal state, Islamic law, *kanuns*, customs, ethics and economy. Douglas Howard points out that the “advice of kings” genre flourished respectively with the development of Ottoman Turkish as a literary genre starting from the late 15th century. He also reminds the reader that in Ottomans, Safavids and Mughals, this genre increasingly flourished.¹¹⁵

Koçi Bey, the famous author of the era's reform literature, complains about the conditions of the peasantry. Koçi Bey demonstrates the connection of different spheres of the state and how those affected the prosperity of state and peasantry. He states that the increase of the soldiers (*kul taifesi*) led to the increase of the state's expenditures (*masraf*), the increase of the state's expenditures led to the increase of the taxation (*teklif*), and the increase of the taxation led to the degradation of the peasantry.¹¹⁶

II.2. Elements of Society According to Katip Çelebi

This section will elaborate on the different social groups discussed in Katip Çelebi's writings. This analysis will be based mostly on *Balance of Truth* and *Düstur ül-amel*. These social groups will be analyzed according to their positions with certain concepts which helped Katip Çelebi to define the differences and boundaries between social groups.

II.2.1. Social Classes in *Düstur ül-Amel*

In his treatise, *Düstur ül-amel*, Katip Çelebi elaborates on different social classes. He mostly

¹¹⁴ Cornell Fleischer, *Tarihçi Mustafa Ali: Bir Osmanlı Aydın ve Bürokrati*, (İstanbul, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996) p.102

¹¹⁵ Douglas Howard, “The Ottoman Advice for Kings Literature” in *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire* ed. Aksan & Goffman, Cambridge, 2007, p.139

¹¹⁶ Koçi Bey, *Koçibey Risalesi*, ed. Yılmaz Kurt, (Ankara, Akçağ, 1998) p.60

discusses soldiers and peasantry. He also mentions the learned men and traders as different social groups. Katip Çelebi compares the four bodily humors with different social groups. The bodily humors were believed to be the constituents of the body in Galenic medicine which was the dominant understanding of the body and medicine throughout the Medieval and part of the Early Modern ages. The four social groups that Katip Çelebi mentioned are the *ulema*, the soldiers, the traders and the peasantry.¹¹⁷

Katip Çelebi mentions that the sultans in the past cared about the peasantry. He asserts that the sultans tried to treat the peasantry justly and prevented oppressors from molesting the peasantry. Furthermore, the sultans also cared about the provinces, the villages and their prosperity. Katip Çelebi mentions that during the campaigns, he had visited the Safavid territories. There, he observed that the provinces and villages prospered, unlike the Ottoman villages on the other side of the border.¹¹⁸

In the same part of his treatise, Katip Çelebi criticizes the current administration and the incumbent sultan. In other words, he observes that the Ottoman provinces are experiencing a lack of prosperity which had not been the case in the previous century, in the time of Süleyman. Therefore, by praising the time of Süleyman and the previous sultans, Katip Çelebi tries to draw attention to the current fiscal problems or crisis. Similarly, Katip Çelebi asserts that the previous sultans made significant efforts to protect the peasantry from the oppressors.¹¹⁹ With this statement, Katip Çelebi also aims to demonstrate the unjust rule that the Empire is experiencing by comparing the present conditions with an idealized past. By doing this, Katip Çelebi might have aimed to persuade the sultan or the authorities that his reform projects were a solution to the current crisis. By contrasting the Safavid and Ottoman examples, Katip Çelebi draws attention to the fact that the villages and the peasantry might prosper under good administration and the problems have nothing to do with the climate or food shortages.

It might be observed from the comments of Katip Çelebi, that he believed people with high levels of education, knowledge or spiritual training should not be evaluated in the same way as the majority of the population. This is because Katip Çelebi believed that their level of intellectual depth would not lead to same consequences as the same actions might in the case of “common people”. According to Katip Çelebi, some practices might be permissible to the “few”, whereas the

¹¹⁷ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Düster ül-amel” in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968) p.156

¹¹⁸ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Düster ül-amel” in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968) p.157

¹¹⁹ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Düster ül-amel” in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968) p.157

same practices should definitely be forbidden to the majority of the population. He believed that few people are wise enough to seek the middle ground on the debates of the society, in which ordinary people might go easily to the extremes, due to lack of understanding or in an attempt to become famous.

II.2.2. Katip Çelebi and Social Order

Another interesting question is how Katip Çelebi perceived and reflected on society. In order to elaborate on this issue, one might question how Katip Çelebi perceived his own society, how he reflected and suggested solving the crisis of his own society, and what his ideal society looked like. In addition, one might ask how Katip Çelebi perceived different social classes and the relationships between them.

Many studies on Ottoman social order have been conducted. There have been several attempts to analyze and interpret, the *nasihatname* or “advice for kings” literature in recent Ottoman historiography. In this respect, concepts such as justice or just rule and *nizam-ı alem* are mostly elaborated. Barkey claims that the concept of *nizam-ı alem* was the basis of the Ottoman social order. Therefore, according to Barkey, those who disrupted it were not tolerated.¹²⁰

The social order that Katip Çelebi envisioned involved different and unequal social groups which coexisted. The *ulema*, soldiers, merchants and peasantry were the four basic classes that Katip Çelebi perceived in society. According to him, this ideal society consists of a balanced and just but unequal treatment of all these four groups under the supervision of the sultan or a man of sword who will establish the order in society (*halkı hakka boyun eğdirir bir celadet sahibi*).¹²¹ This man of the sword might be a grand vizier.

In the time of Katip Çelebi, many individuals began to act outside the established boundaries of their classes. In other words, people began to pursue different careers. This transformation meant that the traditional classes of the Empire as well as the *askeri- reaya* boundaries began to melt down. The Ottoman bureaucracy witnessed and complained about this change. Defterdar Sarı Mehmed Pasha referred to this phenomenon and suggested care should be taken not to mix the

¹²⁰ Karen Barkey, *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*, (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2008) p.162

¹²¹ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Düster ül-amel” in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968) p.160

askeri and the *reaya*.¹²²

Unlike the ideal society that Katip Çelebi described in his *Düstur ül-amel* treatise, he argues that the present society in which he lives is a deteriorated version of the ideal society that he had described in his treatise. In addition, according to Katip Çelebi, this ideal society was reached by Ottoman in the time of Süleyman the Magnificent. However, according to Katip Çelebi, Ottoman state has fallen in his time far from that ideal which existed a century ago. The Empire that Katip Çelebi narrates is struggling with the demolition of the provinces and peasantry, the long wars and the deterioration of the existing class structures.¹²³ Katip Çelebi perceives all of these facts as elements of decline.

The concept of justice that Katip Çelebi subscribed to, was the treatment of one individual according to his own social group in society. In this sense, it was not much different from the Medieval understanding of the justice or equity. Katip Çelebi emphasized this concept of justice in his accounts. For instance, he expresses the popular saying that “society is not destroyed by unbelief, but it can be destroyed by injustice”. This account might be interpreted as the fundamental role of the concept of justice in the political rhetoric of Katip Çelebi and Ottoman tradition of statecraft. Moreover, it is well known in the historiography how the concept of justice and just rule were essentials that the administration or the sultan should provide to the society.¹²⁴

II.3. Social Problems and Crisis According to Katip Çelebi

The increasing expenditures of the state as well as the bad conditions that the peasantry was experiencing, were concerns that Katip Çelebi describes in his treatise *Düstur ül-amel*. Here Katip Çelebi complains about the oppressors of the peasantry and the provinces as well as villages which were abandoned in bad conditions. He defends the argument that the taxes that were taken from the peasantry were too high.¹²⁵

Katip Çelebi acknowledges that the problem with the peasantry originated from the

¹²² Defterdar Sarı Mehmed Paşa, *Devlet Adamlarına Öğütler* ed. Hüseyin Ragıp Ural (Ankara, Türkiye Kültür Bakanlığı, 2000) pp.96-97

¹²³ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Düstur ül-amel” in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968) pp.157-158

¹²⁴ Hakan Karateke, “Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate” in *Legitimizing the Order*, ed. Karateke & Reinkwoski (Leiden; Boston, Brill, 2005) p.38

¹²⁵ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Düstur ül-amel” in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968) p.157

intermediaries. In other words, the intermediaries purchased the right to tax the peasantry from the state and therefore, continued to increase the taxes without regard for the harsh conditions that the peasantry experienced as a result. He also expresses that it led to the destruction of the provinces.¹²⁶

Katip Çelebi criticizes the practice of bribery for different reasons. He argues that it is considered a sin even in the infidel realm as well as it is against the Islamic law. Therefore Katip Çelebi claims that Muslims should abstain from practicing bribery. In addition, Katip Çelebi argues that bribery is both unfair and against the *sharia*. This might be seen as another argument in which Katip Çelebi uses both reason and religion to oppose the practice of bribery in Ottoman society.

The controversies in which *Kadızedeli* puritanical groups and sufis became involved, according to Katip Çelebi, are a chaotic clash of “fanatics”. Katip Çelebi accuses both groups of being fanatics. In addition, he accuses some members of those groups of going to the extremes in order to become famous. Katip Çelebi argues that the clashes between those groups have led to chaos and unrest in the Empire.

II.3.1. *Katip Çelebi and the 17th Century Crisis*

In some of his works, Katip Çelebi reflects on the crisis and problems that the Ottoman Empire was experiencing. This perception of the crisis is a common theme among the Ottoman bureaucrats and intellectuals of the post-Süleymanic age. The Ottoman authors of the political works observed that the traditional structure of society where different social classes existed side by side but had little porousness, began to change. The new structure became a structure where some members of the classes could reach different levels of prestige. This change is interpreted by those authors, who were mostly bureaucrats, as a decline and therefore something that should be avoided.

II.3.2. *Absolutists versus Constitutionalists*

The question of how Katip Çelebi reflected on the debate between “absolutists” and “constitutionalists” merits analysis. Baki Tezcan argues that late 16th and 17th centuries Ottoman society and politics might be analyzed with the perspective of the different groups such as absolutists and constitutionalists.¹²⁷ According to this perspective, constitutionalists tried to limit the

¹²⁶ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Düster ül-amel” in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968) p.157

¹²⁷ Baki Tezcan *The Second Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010) p.11

monarchy's power, while, absolutists tried to increase it.

The question of whether Katip Çelebi was affiliated with some political factions or to what extent should be studied. Here, one might ask following questions. Was Katip Çelebi a politically engaged intellectual? In other words, did he seek to promote a certain political agenda or a political faction? Certainly, it is quite difficult to argue that he did not have an ideal vision of society and politics. Therefore, the level of his political engagement or non-engagement should be elaborated.

Hagen points out that he was against the random issuing of *kanuns* by Ottoman sultans.¹²⁸ He also asserts in many circumstances it was difficult to change the established habits or customs of society. Therefore, one might suggest that Katip Çelebi was against the absolutist agenda of the sultans who might try to alter the existing norms of the state administration and society. Orhan Şaik Gökyay argues that the fact that Katip Çelebi pointed out the impossibility of altering the society's customs is actually a proof of the fact that Katip Çelebi was trying to show the power of society.¹²⁹

In his *Düstur ül-amel*, Katip Çelebi calls for a strong man of sword who will restore the social order. Therefore, one might assume that in this sense, Katip Çelebi's suggestion for the restoration of social order and reforms are similar to an absolutist agenda. Nevertheless, Katip Çelebi also adds that this man of sword must be loyal to nothing but *sharia* and not even to the sultan. In this sense, it is hard to argue that his suggestion is part of an absolutist political agenda.

However, Baki Tezcan argues that *sharia* might be used to limit the authority of the sultan and aid the development of a constitutionalist agenda.¹³⁰ In this sense, Katip Çelebi's emphasis on *sharia* in the state administration as a code of rule to be followed by the ruling person, might be seen as a constitutionalist attempt to create a space of politics outside of sultans' will and be guided with *sharia* and reason.

Moreover, Piterberg argues that Katip Çelebi had read different versions of the regicide of Osman II and then wrote his own version of the event.¹³¹ Katip Çelebi's version criticizes the

¹²⁸ Gottfried Hagen, "Legitimacy and World Order", in *Legitimizing the Order* ed. Reinkowski & Karateke (Leiden; Boston, Brill, 2005) pp.70-71

¹²⁹ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, "Katip Çelebi Hayatı, Şahsiyeti, Eserleri" in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) p.88

¹³⁰ Baki Tezcan *The Second Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010) pp.76-77

¹³¹ Gabriel Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy*, (London, University of California Press, 2003) p.114

absolutist attempts of Osman II. In this sense, one might argue that Katip Çelebi reflecting as an intellectual and analyzing different versions of events and, after a reasoning of the events embracing one version of the event as a more accurate one. On the other hand, Tezcan argues that Katip Çelebi might have witnessed the event.

II.3.3. *Katip Çelebi and Politics of his Age*

I will argue that, although Katip Çelebi had a political and social vision and sometimes supported some political factions or social groups, he did not engage in a political agenda per se. In other words, he mostly elaborated and reflected on social, political and theological questions by using his reason or by embracing Islamic law or at least his own interpretation of the Islamic law. Therefore, it might be argued that it is inappropriate to claim that he followed a particular political agenda as a whole.

Marc Baer argues that Katip Çelebi saw a direct relationship between the “decline” of the state power and the increase of women's influence in the politics. Katip Çelebi claimed that sultan Ibrahim was the last heir to the throne in the Ottoman dynasty and therefore influenced badly by the women who were near him. In this respect, Katip Çelebi portrayed Sultan Ibrahim as a person who lacked agency and could therefore be influenced by women.¹³² As it is elaborated earlier Katip Çelebi favored the preservation of the traditional social hierarchy of society and social classes. Thus, he was against the influence and active participation of women in politics and affairs of state.

As an intellectual of the time, Katip Çelebi was sensitive to the political debates and rhetoric of his age. He was well aware that certain issues which were debated within religious rhetoric, had political background. For instance, he accused both sufi groups and *Kadızedelis* of “going to the extremes” for political appeal. He was well aware that “going to the extremes” would bring political appeal to some people. In addition, he was also aware that subjects debated within theological and legal discourses had social and political implications. Katip Çelebi did not hesitate to engage in this political rhetoric. However, he always formed his opinion after considering the work of scholars, Islamic law and customs, science or his own reasoning.

II.3.4. *Katip Çelebi and the Individual*

¹³² Marc Baer, “Manliness, Male Virtue and History Writing at the 17th Century Ottoman Court”, *Gender and History* vol.20 no.1 2008, p.135

According to Katip Çelebi, because different social classes are not equal, different persons are also unequal. In other words, it might be argued that Katip Çelebi thought that there are people who seek the knowledge of the world and use their reason to reach the truth. On the other hand, he also observed that there are people who are unable to seek the knowledge of the world and are therefore mostly ignorant. He claims that these ignorant people will always conduct certain practices that might not always be suitable for society. Thus, Katip Çelebi argues that those he perceives as the “common people” are not able to reach a deeper understanding of the world or the spiritual realm. Therefore they should follow a different set of rules and be judged accordingly.

Cemal Kafadar argues that Katip Çelebi's perception of the individual involved both a tendency to live life with individuality and freedom as well as constantly trying to surpass others. Moreover, according to Kafadar, Katip Çelebi's perception of individuality was limited within the boundaries of the social hierarchy or classes.¹³³

II.4. Katip Çelebi's Remedies

In the beginning of his treatise *Düstur ül-amel*, Katip Çelebi states that he has written this treatise in order to provide some suggestions to improve the function of the Empire. He argues that the state affairs has many problems and his treatise will be a “remedy” to the problems and the crisis of the Ottoman state.

Ibn Khaldunian's conception of history greatly influenced Katip Çelebi. As in the Ibn Khaldunian understanding of history, Katip Çelebi compares history or evolution of a state to the lifetime of a human being. According to Katip Çelebi, as in the lifetime of a human being, states rise, develop and fall. Nevertheless, according to Katip Çelebi, some reforms might postpone the fall of the Empire. Therefore, as opposed to Ibn Khaldun, Katip Çelebi believes that a declining empire might be revived with the right reforms.

Katip Çelebi gives a list of what should be done in order to resolve social and fiscal problems. He also gives a list of things that the rulers should avoid doing. For example, the prohibition of the common practices of the people will not be efficient, according to him. He believes that in their home, people should be free about their business. Similarly, he argues that

¹³³ Cemal Kafadar *Kim Var İmiş Biz Burada Yoğ İken* (İstanbul, Metis, 2009) p.16

people cannot be forced to change their customs and practices, In addition, he suggests that at their home people are free to do whatever they do.

Katip Çelebi argues that the problems that the Empire is experiencing might be solved with the implementation of certain reforms. Katip Çelebi argues that a strong man of sword should restore the order of society. According to Katip Çelebi, this man of sword should be loyal to Islamic law and God. In addition, he should be ready to serve society without avoiding harsh measures. With this comment, it might be argued that Katip Çelebi was aware of the fact that his reform projects would not please every part of society and the good order could only be restored by force.

Katip Çelebi further argues that some of the taxes on the peasantry should be abolished and the oppressors of the peasantry should be punished. He asserts that the increasing number of the soldiers should not be decreased. Nevertheless, one should decrease the salaries of the soldiers in order to fix the budget. According to Katip Çelebi, the budget should be fixed and the treasury should not to be empty. It should always have enough money to continue at least one more year.

Katip Çelebi argues that it was no longer possible to have a small number of soldiers as in the era of Süleyman I. Although Katip Çelebi presents the age of Süleyman the Magnificent as a golden age, he thought that the number of soldiers in Süleyman's age would not be enough for the circumstances of his time. Katip Çelebi argues that there is no harm in increasing the number of soldiers. These observations point to the transformations of the Empire in fiscal and military areas of the state.

Katip Çelebi projects that this man of sword should serve God. He adds that all persons such as sultan, soldiers and peasantry are considered subjects of God. He argues that the man of sword should unite people against oppression. Moreover, he should establish the ideals of justice. Here, one might argue that Katip Çelebi presents a powerful man who will restore justice and who will not be loyal to any of the political factions that lead the politics of the empire.

This man of sword that Katip Çelebi suggests for the implementation of reform projects must obey only God and divine principles.¹³⁴ This proposition may be read as a technocratic reform-oriented world view which legitimized itself with a commitment to divine principles and divine authority. In addition, this might also be read as a combination of both rational reform suggestions

¹³⁴ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, "Düster ül-amel" in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968) p.160

and a strong attachment to divine principles. It might be more accurate to embrace the latter interpretation, because of the fact that Katip Çelebi's rationality did not exclude his spiritual and religious understanding of the world.

In order to end the clashes between the puritanical and sufi groups, rather than suggesting sudden change, Katip Çelebi suggests the promotion of moderation. He suggests that the learned men should seek and preach the middle ground. However, he believes that the “common people” will not give up from their customs.

According to Katip Çelebi, only a man of sword might implement major reforms. This man of sword would implement those reforms because he would not be influenced by people who might be negatively inclined toward the reforms. Therefore, Katip Çelebi suggests that the man of sword should act with force. This understanding of a strong powerful leader might remind the modern reader of the Hobbesian understanding of state administration.

One might argue that in Katip Çelebi's mind, these two parts, a rational reform agenda and divine principles, are not necessarily mutually exclusive. In other words, a strong man of sword might coalesce the reform practices which would be supported with the strict implementation of divine law. Therefore, it might be claimed that, rather than using divine commitment as a legitimizing tool, Katip Çelebi projects divine commitment and his reform project as an integrated whole.

II.5. Katip Çelebi's Ideal Society

Katip Çelebi further develops the Ibn Khaldunian concept of the rise and decline of states. In other words, Katip Çelebi, just like Ibn Khaldun, argues that states, like humans, rise, stagnate and fall. Nevertheless, he diverges from Ibn Khaldun, with the notion that, with the help of certain reforms, the stagnation of the state power might be postponed. Thus, the Empire might be as powerful as before, at least for a time. In Katip Çelebi's conception of a state's evolution, there is room for reform and redevelopment. In this respect, his suggestions of reform aim to improve the fiscal and political conditions of the Empire thus making the provinces prosperous and just once again.

Katip Çelebi uses the body analogy in order to provide more concrete example of state and

society. According to him, social classes or groups are comparable to bodily humors which are present in the society. According to Katip Çelebi, there are different parts of society, which perform different tasks. In this sense, his understanding of society might be seen within the Medieval understanding of compartmentalized society. These four bodily humors are, according to Katip Çelebi, the equivalents of social classes present in the society. In other words, four bodily humors each represent a social class which had different functions in society. The bodily humors are metaphors of the social classes of society which had different functions.

The four bodily humors are substances that the body emits according to the Galenic understanding of medicine, which was the dominant theory of medicine during most of the Medieval and Early Modern period. These four bodily humors are black bile, yellow bile, phlegm and blood. According to Katip Çelebi's interpretation those are respectively equivalents of the peasantry, merchants, soldiers and the clergy or the *ulema*.¹³⁵

In other words, different social groups are symbolized with bodily humors. In his *Düstur ül-amel* treatise, Katip Çelebi explores mostly peasantry, soldiers and treasury and omits the merchants. In the last section of his treatise, he suggests certain reform projects concerning soldiers, budget and the peasantry and the takeover of a man of sword to implement reforms by force.

In his treatise, *Düstur ül-amel*, Katip Çelebi mentions the concept of the “circle of justice” (*daire-i adalet*). The circle of justice concept had existed in the political traditions of Middle Eastern societies throughout centuries. According to the tradition, men are subject to the sultan. Furthermore, a country exists only with men. Then, men exist only with sword. The sword exists only with money. The money in turn, exists only with people. Finally, the people exist only with justice.

This tradition of the circle of justice is mentioned by Katip Çelebi in the beginning of his treatise. Katip Çelebi believes that in order to make the state structure work again, it is necessary that some reforms be implemented. In addition, he argues that the fiscal reforms of the budget and state would improve the conditions of the peasantry and the provinces. Katip Çelebi uses the example of circle of justice to illustrate why it is necessary to improve the conditions of the peasantry.

¹³⁵ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Düstur ül-amel” in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968) p.156

Katip Çelebi argues that blood, which was seen as a life power, represents the *ulema*. With this analogy, Katip Çelebi tries to establish the guiding role of the *ulema* in society. Katip Çelebi praises both the power of learning, reason and knowledge as well as the power of *sharia* and those who study the divine word.¹³⁶ In other words, *ulema* as the blood should spread the divine word (*ilm-i sherif*) to the common people as blood spreads life to the body. According to Katip Çelebi, the sultan should protect his peasantry from the oppressors and should punish them and restore peace in the villages.

Afterwards, Katip Çelebi asserts that soldiers are like the phlegm of the body. Katip Çelebi reminds the reader that, just like the increase of phlegm in the body, the increase of the soldiers in the society might lead to some problems. Likewise, Katip Çelebi compared yellow bile with the merchant class.

Then, Katip Çelebi compares black bile with the peasantry. Just as, in the body the spleen excreted black bile to digest food, within the state, resources are extracted from the peasantry. In other words, Katip Çelebi states that, the food or taxes as cash are taken from the peasantry for the survival of the state, just like the black bile should be excreted from the spleen so that the food might be digested. He then furthers this analogy of body and state. The decline of state is like the decline of body with the disorder and imbalance of its constituents.

Afterwards, Katip Çelebi argues that these four classes, just like the bodily humors, should remain in balance. If the balance between the bodily humors shifts, the state will deteriorate like a sick man. For this reason, the boundaries between different social classes should be protected so as to maintain the balance of society. As the body might be sick with the imbalance of bodily humors, society might also become imbalanced, thus causing stagnation and then decline.¹³⁷

In the next part, Katip Çelebi argues that the sultan is in the substance of *ruh-i insani*. *Ruh-i insani* is a concept which might be translated as “the human spirit”. The concept is used in the *ishraqi* (illuminationist) sources. By suggesting that the sultan is from the substance of the “human spirit,” Katip Çelebi claims that it is the sultan who orchestrates the state mechanism. In this sense, Katip Çelebi puts the sultan in a position greater than the four different classes.

¹³⁶ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Düster ül-amel” in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968) p.156

¹³⁷ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Düster ül-amel” in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968) pp.156-157

In addition, the sultan was the is who makes the classes work and more importantly, prevents them from mixing with one another. In this kind of understanding of society, it is crucial that the boundaries between the social groups be preserved. If some members of a social group behave like members of another group, it will threaten or even destroy the social order. On the other hand, Katip Çelebi is in favor of the limitation of the sultanic power. He asserts that he is against the random issuing of *kanuns* by the sultans. Moreover, he is against Osman II's absolutist ambitions. In other words, he is at the same time a proponent of the idealized just rule of the Süleyman I, (a ruler known for his high patrimonialism) and also in favor of the limitation of the sultanic power.

While these attitudes of Katip Çelebi might seem inconsistent, it should be remembered that Katip Çelebi was criticizing the current administration while idealizing the rule of Süleyman the Magnificent. Therefore it might be claimed that he was against a Süleyman-like patrimonial monarch. Hence his stance on the sultanic rule and the limits of the administration presented the 17th century imperial dynamics. These were evolving into a constitutional-like state in which the chief eunuch, the *ulema*, royal women and the army were more powerful sources of authority than in the previous century.

Katip Çelebi further elaborates that when the bodily humors' balance changes, the state might begin to stagnate and decline just like a man becoming old. He compares the age and moisture of the body with the stagnation and decline of a state. Katip Çelebi also argues that after reaching a certain level of stagnation, there are still things that might be done for the state. Nevertheless, those things would be like an old man who get old cannot become young again. The things that might be done after reaching old age are limited. In other words, after reaching the level of stagnation, actions taken to improve the conditions of the state would like an old man dyeing his white hair.

II.5.1. Katip Çelebi and History

Katip Çelebi wrote history books or chronicles, such as *Fezleke* and *Fezleke ül-tevarih*. He also sponsored the translation of the chronicles from Latin. *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi* (the translation of Frankish or European history) and *Tarih-i Kostantiniye ve Kayasiriyye* (history of Constantinople) are translations from Latin.¹³⁸ These are books about European and Roman history.

¹³⁸ *Katip Çelebi, Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009) ; *Katip Çelebi, Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Palet Yayınları, 2010)

These works point to Katip Çelebi's desire to derive practical knowledge of the world for use in the administration of the state. Therefore, like geography, history was a tool for him to reach the truth, attain the practical knowledge and even to reform the state.

Katip Çelebi asserts that Ottoman Empire experienced a golden age in the era of Süleyman I. He argues that the Süleymanic era was a time of rightful implementation of *kanun* and *sharia*. Therefore, the Ottoman Empire was in its heyday in every sense. Katip Çelebi embraces Ibn Khaldunian theory of states and claims that the Ottoman Empire has begun to stagnate or decline in his own time. However, Katip Çelebi's theory constitutes a digression from the Ibn Khaldunian theory of states. Katip Çelebi argues that states might postpone their decline by implementing solid fiscal and administrative reforms. Katip Çelebi presents the Süleymanic age to create an image of an ideal society and state to contrast with the state and society that he was witnessing in his day.¹³⁹

Katip Çelebi perceives several indications of decline. These include different social groups fighting with each other and creating an atmosphere of chaos in the empire, long wars in which the empire was not successful, and the dissolving and oppressed peasantry and provinces destroyed by war. According to him, these were results of a break from the just rule of *sharia*. Therefore, according to Katip Çelebi, history was a time of bright golden ages and dramatic downfalls. Moreover, divine intervention and presence of divine justice are, according to Katip Çelebi, present in history as well as learned and ignorant men. In other words, what happened in history might be the results of wise actions of learned men or obvious failures of ignorant men. However, none of these were free from divine intervention. Therefore, according to Katip Çelebi's conception of history, both divine intervention and the actions of human beings were elements in the making of history.

Katip Çelebi had a cyclical vision of history. According to him, each age has its ignorant and its wise men. Likewise, each age has its own sovereigns who fight for political authority.¹⁴⁰ Katip Çelebi makes a distinction between political and religious authority. He acknowledges that some sheiks seek spiritual perfection and show reluctance to follow or subordinate to one another. Katip Çelebi expresses an understanding of two distinct and coexisting realms: the political and the religious. However, it would be difficult to argue that Katip Çelebi had in mind a “secular” zone free from divine intervention and which was guided only by earthly principles. Rather, Katip

¹³⁹ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Düster ül-amel” in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968) p.157

¹⁴⁰ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.119

Çelebi's political realm is a zone guided by divine principles and subjected to divine intervention while being guided with by reason and science.

Katip Çelebi argues that the religion and laws of different prophets go back to their time. In other words, Katip Çelebi acknowledges the historical perspective of the prophets. However, he believes that all the prophets are in harmony with one another and in unity with God. He illustrates that at the roots there is no divergence between them. However, at the branches there is divergence.¹⁴¹

Katip Çelebi's chronicle begins in the year 1000 (hijri calendar). This fact, according to Tezcan, represents a different look at the history. Tezcan asserts that Katip Çelebi's new perspective on writing history points to the transformation of the Ottoman state administration. This transformation, Tezcan suggests, is from a patrimonial Empire where historians wrote history dividing to rules of the sultans, to a history writing based on year to year entries starting from the year 1000.¹⁴²

Katip Çelebi argues that in every age there are orthodox people, whom Katip Çelebi considers to be ignorant, who criticize and attacked sufis or philosophy. Katip Çelebi condemns this behavior. Thus Katip Çelebi has a vision of history in which wise and ignorant peoples coexist. He gives an important place to religion in his life. He does not necessarily consider believers to be an elite and prestigious group. On the contrary, he favors mostly wise, intelligent and learned men.

II.6. Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter, I tried to demonstrate how Katip Çelebi perceived and wrote about society and politics of his time. Moreover, I attempted to analyze how he identified the crisis of the age. I tried to elaborate on what kind of remedies Katip Çelebi suggested in order to solve the Empire's crisis. In this respect, Katip Çelebi recommended several reform projects which involved the fixing of the Empire's finances and budget. In doing so, he aimed to enrich the villages and peasantry and improve the state mechanisms and finances, not by cutting the number of janissaries, but rather their salaries.

¹⁴¹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.110

¹⁴² Baki Tezcan "Politics of Early Modern Historiography" in *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire* ed. Aksan & Goffman (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2007) p.188-189

Katip Çelebi's ideal society was what he understood from and reflected in the age of Süleyman I. The age of Süleyman was idealized by many of the authors and scholars of the 17th century as the Golden Age of the just and mighty Ottoman rule. Katip Çelebi's ideal society resembled a mixture of Islamic sacred law based state and society, a rule of a powerful and lawful monarch such as Süleyman, and a society based on the concept of Medieval equity which was supported by the Galenic view of society.¹⁴³

It might be argued that Katip Çelebi's reform suggestions involved practical solutions of social, political and financial problems as well as a commitment to the divine principles and divine justice. I tried to demonstrate that in Katip Çelebi's mind, a reform project must depend on the restoration of just rule, fixing the budget, punishment of the oppressors and decreasing the salaries. Those kind of rational solutions were, in Katip Çelebi's mind, complimentary with divine commitment of the rulers and the divine rule of law. For this reason, he suggested a man of sword who was loyal only to the *sharia*.

Katip Çelebi expressed that a strong man of sword who believed in the divine law and justice might enact these reforms. Nevertheless, this man of sword should not fear the sultan or any political factions.¹⁴⁴ Instead, the divine commitment of this man of sword, Katip Çelebi considered this figure not to be a legitimizing tool, but as an integral part of his reform project that he presented as a solution to the incumbent sultan. Katip Çelebi's perception of ideal society should be reached with both rational reform projects and a strong commitment to divine law and spirituality.

¹⁴³ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, "Düster ül-amel" in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968) pp.160-161

¹⁴⁴ Orhan Şaik Gökyay, "Düster ül-amel" in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968) p.160

CHAPTER III

ISLAMIC LAW, LOGIC AND KATİP ÇELEBİ

Katip Çelebi, as an important intellectual of his time, paid attention to the debates of the era and responded to them. He elaborated the controversial issues of the age, sometimes taking sides and sometimes abstaining from doing so. Nevertheless, he always explained his opinion on a certain issue and why he took a certain opinion or abstained from taking one side of the controversy. In addition, Katip Çelebi usually recommended moderation and seeking the “middle ground” in most of the debates of his age. Rather than doing what he described as going to the extremes or fanaticism, he preached that the people should find the middle ground. Therefore, the learned people should preach for the common people to embrace the middle ground. Furthermore, Katip Çelebi always supported his arguments with rational and logical explanations, with Islamic law or other scholars' opinion who elaborated on the similar issues.

In this chapter, I intend to analyze the social issues which had theological or legal implications regarding their relationship with Islamic law and its teaching. Katip Çelebi's outlook on social issues was deeply rooted in the perspectives of Islamic law, tradition, logic and reason. The ways in which these perspectives are analyzed and interpreted and in terms of the prevalent social issues of the era will be elaborated upon in this chapter. This will provide us with a broader picture of Katip Çelebi's mentality and with the help to attain a more holistic picture of Ottoman cultural and intellectual life.

III.1. The Sources

Many issues regarding Islamic theology and social practices were debated in Katip Çelebi's era. Controversies mostly occurred among the adherents of the puritanical group of *Kadızedelis* and

sufi groups. In this chapter, I will elaborate on the seminal text of Katip Çelebi, the *Mizan ül-hak*.

In his work *Mizan ül-hak*, Katip Çelebi discussed issues debated mostly by these groups. Gottfried Hagen cites Gökyay who counts thirty different copies of *Mizan ül-hak* and argues that it became very popular when it was written right after Mehmed Pasha's purge of the *Kadızedelis*.¹⁴⁵ The book consists of different chapters devoted to different controversies of the time. Those issues are mostly debated between the adherents of the *Kadızedeli* group and the sufi circles.

III.1.1. *Mizan ül-Hak*

Next, I will explore what Katip Çelebi intended to demonstrate with the *Mizan ül-hak*. In order to understand this question, one should ask why this treatise is written. *Mizan ül-hak* is translated as “Balance of Truth”. A possible interpretation of this article is that it attempts to find a middle and rational way in different controversies of the age. Likewise, Katip Çelebi may have thought that many members of his society were “going to the extremes” on several issues and therefore, there was a necessity to find the middle and truthful ways in the controversies. The book should be conceived of in terms of the general treatise literature in the Islamic world. Within this literature, authors argue about different social issues or practices and their relevance and relationship with the Islamic law or tradition.

Nevertheless, in *Düstur ül-amel*, Katip Çelebi mentions more than one issue. He expresses his views on many of the social issues and practices which also have theological implications. In other words, the issues are analyzed according to Islamic law. Moreover, as many of other treatises, *Mizan ül-hak* can be read as a treatise with political implications. In this book, Katip Çelebi discusses some social practices and theological controversies which divided opinion in certain factions of society. Therefore, because it includes Katip Çelebi's ideas on many issues and preaches a middle way in many debates, the book is also a political one.

Katip Çelebi tries to bring new perspectives to those controversies by preaching a middle way. However, this new perspective, even if it might be understood as an attempt to find a middle way, does not entirely suffice to understand the mental framework in Katip Çelebi's book.

It should also be added that Katip Çelebi builds his arguments on the basis of previous

¹⁴⁵ Gottfried Hagen, ottomanhistorians.com “Katip Çelebi” p.10

authors' discussions, by accepting certain positions and critically engaging with others. In some circumstances, he bases his opinion on historical events. In cases, he bases his arguments on the Islamic law and his reasoning on the Islamic law. In other cases, he uses the sciences and his interpretation of science. Whatever he based his opinions on upon, Katip Çelebi applies a certain method of reasoning was generating his arguments.

The controversial issues concerned the daily life and also take Islamic law into consideration. Katip Çelebi gives his opinion relating the issue and criticizes many people of the age whom he considers fanatics. Katip Çelebi criticizes them for not using their reason and acting with the bias of their political agenda or criticized them for sliding into extreme positions just to gain popularity.¹⁴⁶

III.2. Theological-Legal Debates and Katip Çelebi

In the Ottoman Empire, the *şeyhülislam* was officially recognized as the highest ranking official regarding the interpretation of Islamic law. Hallaq argues that nowhere were political and bureaucratic structure of government manifested more than the Ottoman Empire. Hallaq further illustrates his argument with *şeyhülislam*'s power, i.e. his supremacy in *ifta*, his responsibility for appointing and dismissing *kadıs* and their power to depose the sultan.¹⁴⁷ Although, the *şeyhülislam* became an authority to decide on different legal matters as the highest authority, other Islamic scholars still retained the freedom to interpret the Islamic law according to their own understanding of law and theology. For instance, Haim Gerber suggests that even in the time of Ebussuud, which is perceived as the peak of the *şeyhülislam*'s power, he was nothing than an ordinary *mufti*.¹⁴⁸ On the other hand Madeline Zilfi also expresses that, since the early years of Islam, legal scholars served as authoritative experts either in official positions or informally in service of the community.¹⁴⁹ In other words, different scholars might argue and express opinion in different matters as long as their opinions were in harmony with the Islamic law, the *Sunna* and the founding texts of the Islamic legal doctrine.¹⁵⁰ In short, interpretation was allowed as long as it was compatible with the general traits of the Islamic law.

¹⁴⁶ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.133

¹⁴⁷ Wael Hallaq, *Sharia' Theory, Practice, Transformations* (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2009) p.157

¹⁴⁸ Haim Gerber, *State, Society, and Law in Islam Ottoman Law in Comparative Perspective*, (Albany, State University of New York, 1994) p.81

¹⁴⁹ Madeline Zilfi, "The Ottoman Ulema", in *The Cambridge History of Turkey* vol.3, Faroqhi ed.,2006, p.210

¹⁵⁰ The example of the defense of prohibition of music in circumstances where "body" prevails the "soul" pointed out that Katip Çelebi had certain limits like not to preach the "sin" to the people while he was preaching toleration and "middle ground". See *Balance of Truth* p.39

Apart from *muftis*, sultans had right to issue *kanun*. *Kanun*, or the sultanic law, was based on local customs but should also be compatible with the *sharia*. Halil İnalçık demonstrates how different *sanjaks* of the Empire were compatible with the *kanun-i Osmani*, a legal system peculiar to the Ottomans.¹⁵¹ *Kadis* were responsible for applying both the *kanun* and the *sharia*. İnalçık states that the principal role of the *kadis* is the execution of the sentences. Moreover İnalçık states that even the sultan had to respect toward the *kadis*' role.¹⁵²

III.2.1. The Social Issues within Perspectives of Law, Logic and Reason

Different social and theological problems or controversies are discussed in *Mizan ül-hak*. Among these are the life of prophet Khidr, singing, dancing and whirling, the invoking of blessings on prophets and companions, tobacco, coffee, laudanum, opium and other drugs, the parents of the Prophet, the faith of Pharaoh, the controversy concerning Şeyh Muhyi'l-Din Ibn Arabi, the Cursing of Yazid, innovation, pilgrimages to tombs, the supererogatory prayers, shaking hands, bowing, enjoining right and forbidding wrong, the religion of Abraham, bribery, the controversy between Ebussuud Efendi and Birgili Mehmed Efendi and the controversy between Sivasi and Kadızade.

As might be understood from the list, these are the issues that Katip Çelebi mentions in his *Mizan ül-hak*. In this respect, Katip Çelebi is mentioning this issues in the book. These issues were the important controversies of the age which were debated and sometimes led to violent clashes between different groups. Therefore, Katip Çelebi seems to have felt the need to answer or discuss these issues and preach the people to find the middle ground instead of going to extremes and clashing with each other. Nevertheless, the question of why these issues were the main controversies of the age needs to be clarified.

III.2.2. Why Consult Katip Çelebi?

Katip Çelebi was not a *medrese* graduate and therefore did not pursue a formal Islamic legal education as many *ulema* members in the Ottoman Empire did. Nevertheless, he took several courses by the prominent scholars of his age such as Keçi Mehmed Efendi, Arec Mustafa Efendi and Kadızade Mehmed.¹⁵³ Katip Çelebi soon became an authority in many of different fields as well

¹⁵¹ Halil İnalçık, *The Ottoman Empire The Classical Age 1300-1600*, (London, Phoenix,1973) p.72

¹⁵² Halil İnalçık, *The Ottoman Empire The Classical Age 1300-1600*, (London, Phoenix,1973) p.75

¹⁵³ Gottfried Hagen ottomanhistorians.com p.2

as within the broader context of Islamic law. Therefore, he was consulted by the authorities about his opinion on a variety of subjects. Thus, Katip Çelebi's position on an issue was not determinant in any of the issues, in other words, he was not in a position to legislate or administer. Despite this fact, his opinion might be seen a legitimate way of interpreting an issue by the state administration, because he was perceived as an important scholar. Today Islamic historiography generally rejects the supposition that Katip Çelebi's image was not understood and neglected by the elite of his age.¹⁵⁴ Thus, it might be argued that what Katip Çelebi expressed on a legal issue mattered to his contemporaries.

III.2.3. *Kadızedeli versus Sufi Debate*

The question of how Katip Çelebi responded to the debate between the *Kadızedelis* and Sufi groups should be elaborated. Seventeenth century Ottoman society was greatly influenced by the debates and clashes between the *Kadızedeli* and sufi groups. Katip Çelebi mostly sought the middle ground between these two groups. However, he did not abstain from expressing his own opinion on several issues.

The *Kadızedeli* movement originated from Kadızade Mehmed Efendi, the son of a provincial judge. He became a preacher in Istanbul Mosques. As Zilfi points out, Kadızade aimed to get rid of all the practices in Islam which appeared after the period of the Prophet.¹⁵⁵ The group considered all the practices that took place after the time of the Prophet to be innovation and they argued that those should be abrogated.

Zilfi describes how the *Kadızedelis* clashed with sufi groups. Gottfried Hagen states that although Katip Çelebi might be considered close to the rationalism of the *Kadızedelis*, he was not sympathetic to the actions of *Kadızedelis* towards the sufi groups and lodges. Therefore, Katip Çelebi condemned violence of the *Kadızedelis* and argued that it was damaging Ottoman society.¹⁵⁶

In *Balance of Truth*, Katip Çelebi mostly mentions several issues which were debated in these different social groups and also within the larger society. These issues include social practices such as dancing, smoking, coffee drinking as well as theological questions like the status of some

¹⁵⁴ Bilal Yurtoğlu, *Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, 2009) p.161

¹⁵⁵ Madeline C. Zilfi "The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* vol.45 no.4 (Oct., 1986) p.253

¹⁵⁶ Gottfried Hagen, ottomanhistorians.com "Katip Çelebi" p.1

prayers, the belief of the Pharaoh and the status of the parents of the Prophet in terms of belief. These social and theological issues had been controversial because of the fact that different social or political groups adopted different views on these issues. Therefore, the debates around them also became political questions.

In this respect, even if Katip Çelebi tried to respond to these issue with Islamic law and reason, he was well aware of the fact that these issues had become political. Thus, he preached the middle ground solution, which might be interpreted as a reconciliatory and also a political stance. In addition, he accuses those groups of extremism, which might also mean political extremism rather than simply theological or social extremism.

Moreover, Katip Çelebi argues that some people use that “extremist” rhetoric in order to gain a political following and become famous. These comments of Katip Çelebi show that he was well aware of the fact that the issues that different groups debated and fought about were also political issues. Therefore, he also answers them as political questions. His message is basically to preach the middle path.

Madeline Zilfi argues that Katip Çelebi warns the public against the overzealousness of the mosque preachers of Istanbul.¹⁵⁷ In addition, Zilfi adds that Friday sermons in Istanbul mosques tended to turn into bloody confrontations. Zilfi also adds that the main issue about the debates of the age that *Kadizadelis* reacted was the problem of *bida* or innovation. In contrast, Katip Çelebi argues that there are both “good” and “bad” kinds of innovation. Thus, not all kinds of innovations should be abrogated.

III.2.4. *Singing, Dancing and Whirling*

In this section, I probe into how Katip Çelebi analyzes the controversies concerning reason, logic and Islamic law. For instance, singing became an issue in the age of Katip Çelebi and some groups argued against the practice of singing because they argued that it did not exist in the time of the Prophet, and therefore it should be banned. On the other hand, many sufi orders practiced signing and rituals involving music or rhythms. Therefore, when the issue of whether or not singing and rituals related with rhythms and music should be banned or not, this issue became more than a

¹⁵⁷ Madeline C. Zilfi “The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* vol.45 no.4 (Oct., 1986) p.251

theological question. In other words, since these practices are performed by a sufficient portion of the society and especially by sufi groups, it became not only a religious but also a social and political issue.

Katip Çelebi claims that in signing, there are both benefits and harm involved.¹⁵⁸ He argues whether singing and music should be banned, depends on whether it praises God or not. Katip Çelebi expresses that this issue depended on the people. In other words, it depends on the social and intellectual position of the listeners. Furthermore, Katip Çelebi claims that the wise men who listen music to develop their spirituality and who try to connect with God will cause no harm and it is therefore permissible for them to listen to music. Nevertheless, Katip Çelebi acknowledges that music might lead other men to desire and passion, and might therefore lead to sin, and accordingly it should be banned.¹⁵⁹

Katip Çelebi interpreted this matter according to the purpose of the music and also according to social and intellectual position of the listener or singer. Thus it might be argued that Katip Çelebi grounded his reasoning both on religious-legal (*shari*) principles and a more mundane, rational approach. The listeners' position on music, in other words, whether or not he was listening for divine reasons was the religious part of Katip Çelebi's interpretation.

On the other hand, the intellectual and social position of the listener is key to Katip Çelebi's rational interpretation of the singing-music issue. Katip Çelebi expresses that the prohibitions on the sacred law on the music issue are based on wisdom. Then he discusses the effects of songs on the body and the soul and how the situation differs from the ones whose souls prevail over their bodies and those whose bodies prevail over their souls. Katip Çelebi argues that the prohibitions in the Koran are based on sound judgement.¹⁶⁰ Here, it might be argued that Katip Çelebi saw the divine law as the manifestation of sound reasoning.

Moreover, Katip Çelebi refers to various scholars' and their opinions on the issue. As stated earlier, he did not necessarily agree with all points other scholars that he made. However, by citing them as important voices on the issue concerned he acknowledges that at the very least their works should be taken into account. For instance, he cites Kinalizade Ali as a significant authority and he suggests that Kinalizade's work should be read. He praises Kinalizade's book because he believes

¹⁵⁸ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.40

¹⁵⁹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.39

¹⁶⁰ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.39-40

that it reconciles sacred law and philosophy.¹⁶¹

Another issue Katip Çelebi discusses is dancing and whirling. This matter had been interpreted in a variety of ways by sufis and various puritanical movements of the time. He admits that the *ulema* prohibit whirling and dancing for political reasons. In other words, Katip Çelebi claims that the *ulema* had prohibited whirling and dancing because it was mostly a sufi phenomenon and in the past, the state felt threatened by the sufi groups which allied themselves with the Safavid state.¹⁶² Therefore Katip Çelebi observes and criticizes the interpretation of Islamic law based on a political agenda.

As I previously discussed, Katip Çelebi contributed to the political discussion on music, whirling and dancing. His contribution to these issues, in terms of politics is to find and preach the middle ground. He does not agree with the ban of these practices as a whole. However, he also does not argue that dancing, whirling and singing might be practiced in total freedom. His political middle ground is to suggest that these practices should be performed within some learned circles for the purpose of honoring the God. Besides the political aspect of his argument, the same argument also involves a theological-legal aspect. It involves a theological-legal aspect because Katip Çelebi reached this conclusion with an interpretation of the Islamic law and customs. Thus, it might be argued that Katip Çelebi's argument is a political argument which is based on a rational interpretation of the Islamic law.

III.2.5. Tobacco

In a long chapter, Katip Çelebi discusses the controversy of tobacco and smoking in the 17th century Ottoman Empire. He states that the *ulema* is mostly against smoking. However, Katip Çelebi reminds his readers that the habits and customs of the “ordinary people” are hard to change. Therefore, he considers the attempts to ban tobacco to be useless. As he states, “men desire what is forbidden”.¹⁶³ Katip Çelebi argues that prohibitions even increased the numbers of smokers and they outnumbered the non-smokers. Katip Çelebi illustrates several harsh measures and argues that those simply do not prevent people from smoking, and therefore posits that prohibitions generally do not work.

¹⁶¹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.38-39

¹⁶² Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.42

¹⁶³ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.51

Katip Çelebi discusses the smoking issue within different perspectives. First, he questions the idea that people will give up smoking with the help of prohibitions. Katip Çelebi criticizes this idea because he believes that people will not simply give up smoking due to prohibitions. He supports his idea with the examples of people smoking in spite of harsh punishments. He also profoundly questions the idea that state should interfere in people's private life. He believes that it is not the state's business to interfere in people's own homes.

Second, Katip Çelebi discusses whether tobacco is a good or bad thing. He questions whether this might change according to the person. For example, he thinks that addicts would think it good thing and common sense judges would consider it a bad thing. Katip Çelebi argues one might consider something good only by relating two things. According to Katip Çelebi, these two things are intelligence and sacred law. Katip Çelebi claims that tobacco is bad according to both intelligence and sacred law. On the other hand, however, he also argues that in some situations like medical treatment, tobacco might be considered useful and good.¹⁶⁴

Third, Katip Çelebi discusses the good and harmful effects of tobacco. He asserts that tobacco is medically, a poisonous substance. Moreover, Katip Çelebi argues that people are divided into two classes, a person is either of a moist or dry temperament.¹⁶⁵ He argues that if a man is of moist temperament it might be good for him to smoke.

Fourth, Katip Çelebi questions whether tobacco might be considered an innovation (*bid'a*). Katip Çelebi argues that it certainly is an innovation and one might not consider it as a “good innovation”.

Fifth, Katip Çelebi discusses whether tobacco might be considered abominable (*mekruh*). Katip Çelebi asserts that tobacco must be used extensively in order to consider it abominable.¹⁶⁶ On the other hand, Katip Çelebi concludes that there is not a practical possibility to interfere with those who smoke and try to ban the tobacco. Katip Çelebi argues that such a ban would be preaching to the winds.

Sixth, Katip Çelebi questions whether tobacco is canonically forbidden (*haram*). He admits that in the holy scripture and legal tradition there is no statement that prohibits smoking. Thus Katip

¹⁶⁴ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp. 53-55

¹⁶⁵ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.54

¹⁶⁶ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.54-55

Çelebi reaches the conclusion that smoking is permissible. Furthermore, Katip Çelebi claims that making tobacco permissible would prevent a great number of the population from being sinners, would therefore be an act of compassion.¹⁶⁷

On the whole, it can be argued that Katip Çelebi seems to be against banning certain things; a stance which was widespread in society at the time. Although tobacco spread in the last centuries, it became very widespread according to Katip Çelebi's narrative. He argues that the prohibitions will not work and even make the prohibited substance more attractive.

Katip Çelebi believes that any concept or substance can be considered good and bad according to either *sharia* (the sacred law) or intelligence. Therefore, it might be reasonable to assume that Katip Çelebi's notion of reason and sacred law can be analyzed in relation to one another. In other words, sacred law and reason both exist and are complementary to one another in Katip Çelebi's mental world.

Concerning the tobacco issue, Katip Çelebi claims that, according to both sacred law and reason, tobacco is harmful. On the other hand, he also admits the benefits of tobacco for human health as a medical treatment. Thus, as a medical treatment, Katip Çelebi thinks that it might be beneficial to use tobacco.

Both reason and sacred law are important tools according to Katip Çelebi. He not only states this, but also he uses reason and sacred law extensively in his reasoning. However, he argues that canonically, in other words, according to the scripture and Islamic legal tradition, the use of tobacco is permissible, because there is no clear prohibition of the item. In addition, Katip Çelebi is well aware of the fact that different scholars have different views on tobacco.

Then, Katip Çelebi questions how the same substance might be considered simultaneously indifferent, disapproved and forbidden. He suggests that even if a substance is permissible, its excessive use might be not permissible and he gives the example of a man who eats baklava when he is already sated. In this respect, he thinks that tobacco might be permissible in some cases; however its excessive use is not permissible and is actively harmful.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁷ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.56

¹⁶⁸ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.57-58

By using the legal principle of *qiyas*, Katip Çelebi reaches the conclusion that tobacco is harmful when used excessively. He does not mention this principle, however, the example that he gives might be analyzed similarly to the founding of the *illa* of a matter. This principle is used in Islamic law when a matter cannot be found in the scripture. In this case, the scholar could not find information about tobacco in holy scripture and *hadith* because it did not exist in the region in the time of prophet. Therefore, the scholar decides that it might be permissible. However, he finds the extensive use of anything not to be permissible and thus concludes that the extensive use of tobacco is not permissible and might even be harmful.

As it is understood, Katip Çelebi elaborates on the controversy on tobacco and smoking with six questions. With these six questions, Katip Çelebi tries to establish a logical and rational interpretation of tobacco and smoking in terms of Islamic law, medicine and social customs. He points out that in the *Sunna* and the Islamic tradition, there is no mention of tobacco which makes it an innovation. Nevertheless, Katip Çelebi finds using *kıyas*, that tobacco might be harmful. For this reason, he suggests that it should not be smoked. However, he also explores some examples where tobacco might be used as a medicine, which might make it a good innovation. Katip Çelebi also expresses concern that its consumption in large amounts might cause problems in terms of sacred law. Thus, he concludes that nobody should have the right to prohibit this practice and no authority might make people give up from its habits.

III.2.6. Coffee, Opium and Drugs

Katip Çelebi mentions that when coffee first arrived in Istanbul, the habit of drinking coffee and coffeehouses spread quickly. Many legal scholars tried to prohibit the substance. Some considered coffee to be a substance like the forbidden alcoholic drinks considering the way it was drunk by some portions of the society. However, Katip Çelebi does not have a different attitude regarding drinking of coffee. He argues that prohibitions and *fatwas* against it did and would not work.¹⁶⁹

Katip Çelebi argues that the substances like opium and other drugs should be used only in medical situations as treatments. When a person is not suffering from a disease, according to Katip Çelebi, it is not permissible to use those substances. He argues that in the holy law, the *sharia*, there is no argument against the use of these drugs. However, Katip Çelebi argues that addiction to these

¹⁶⁹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.60

drugs makes a person half dead and half alive.¹⁷⁰

III.2.7. *Parents of the Prophet*

Katip Çelebi discusses another controversial and legal issue of the time in the next chapter. This issue was debated ardently by most of people, because it was perceived as a sensible issue by many. Gottfried Hagen mentions that this chapter was removed from the printed edition of the book.¹⁷¹ This issue is whether the parents of the Prophet were believers or not. Katip Çelebi asserts that certain people are against the discussion of this issue. Katip Çelebi claims that those people are ignorants and their will not discuss this issue and closing the doors of the debate is a fallacy.¹⁷²

In different part of his work, Katip Çelebi cites different scholars who worked on Islamic law to illustrate his point or make comparisons. Here, Katip Çelebi gives the example of Sadeddin Taftazani's mention of the Koranic verse “had there been gods other than God in heaven or earth, both would have crumbled in corruption”. Katip Çelebi illustrates that this example, according to Taftazani, cannot be considered a proof for the unity of God. Katip Çelebi mentions that in the age of Taftazani, scholars accused him of being infidel. Katip Çelebi uses this example to point out that in every age there are some people who are against reason and debate. Therefore, it might be claimed that Katip Çelebi makes a comparison between those who abstain from the discussion on the belief of prophet's parents and those who are against the argument of Taftazani and accuse Taftazani of infidelity.¹⁷³

Katip Çelebi mentions that the parents of the prophet lived in the age of *cahiliye*, “the pagan ignorance”. According to Katip Çelebi, there is no controversy on this fact. Then, Katip Çelebi discusses certain legal theological questions regarding this issue. Firstly, he asks whether the parents of the prophet should be considered believers or not. Then, he gives a response to the question as in the *fatwa* collections. He reminds the reader that the parents of the prophets, such as Abraham and Noah, were not faithful persons. He argues that this fact is indicated in the Koran. Katip Çelebi illustrates this example with the fact that prophecy is a divine will and therefore things such as birth or pedigree do not play any role in it.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁰ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.63-64

¹⁷¹ Gottfried Hagen ottomanhistorians.com “Katip Çelebi” p.10

¹⁷² Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p. 65

¹⁷³ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.65

¹⁷⁴ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.66-67

Then, Katip Çelebi asks another question which is “what is the situation of those died before the mission of the Prophet?” He asserts that scholars are not in agreement regarding this issue. Katip Çelebi gives different opinions of different scholars regarding this matter. He illustrates how some theologians argue that the people who lived before the mission of the Prophet were excused and not punished. He based this argument on a Koranic verse. Katip Çelebi argues that, according to other scholars the people who lived before the Prophet would not be excused as a whole. Instead, on Judgement Day, some will be excused and some not. In other words, the blessed will be excused and the damned will not be excused.¹⁷⁵

Another controversial point raised by Katip Çelebi is whether *fiqh-i akbar* is a work of Abu Hanife. Then, he discusses the question of whether the parents of prophets are considered unbelievers in *fiqh-i akbar* of Abu Hanife. Here, Katip Çelebi continues the discussion of the belief of the Prophet's parents. He mentions Abu Hanifa's words, which state that some people had too much respect for the parents of the Prophet and too little respect for the principles of the faith.¹⁷⁶

Subsequently, Katip Çelebi asks what the criterion of belief might be. In this respect he argues that belief and disbelief are categories that only God can know. However, he further argues that it might be guessed from certain indications. Katip Çelebi asserts that, from a legal point of view, the outward signs should be taken into consideration in order to call someone believer or a non-believer. Katip Çelebi cites Şeyh Maqdisi who argues that it is not for prophets to ask pardon for their kin. Katip Çelebi argues that many scholars favor this approach which makes the claim that the parents of the Prophet were infidels.¹⁷⁷

Moreover, Katip Çelebi argues that, while many people think that it would be appropriate to take a positive stance on the parents of the prophet, that is far from the truth. In the next question, Katip Çelebi asks which side to take on this discussion. In his answer, he argues that it is probably be better for people to acknowledge the truth for themselves and then not to enter in this discussion. He further argues that using infidelity as an insult is a sin and people should avoid it.¹⁷⁸

III.2.8. The Faith of the Pharaoh

¹⁷⁵ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.67

¹⁷⁶ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.69

¹⁷⁷ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.70-71

¹⁷⁸ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.71-72

In the next chapter, Katip Çelebi discusses the issue of the faith of the Pharaoh. Katip Çelebi reminds the reader that, the last pharaoh in Moses' time was known for his oppression and bad treatment by the Israelites. Then, he cites Muhyiddin Ibn Arabi's statement that Pharaoh was a believer and he was given salvation. Katip Çelebi asserts that the controversy of Pharaoh's belief had continued to his own day. Katip Çelebi argues that the controversy originates from two distinct methods of argument: the method of speculation and the method of purification. The method of speculation, he argues, is based on deduction and the method of purification was based on insight. Katip Çelebi postulates that all attempts to refute Ibn Arabi use this method are therefore invalid and unacceptable. He further posits that Jews might be willing to accept Pharaoh's unbelief in terms of revenge, however to an ordinary Muslim it should not matter whether the Pharaoh was a believer or not.¹⁷⁹

III.2.9. *Ibn Arabi and Katip Çelebi*

The next chapter is about the famous sufi, Ibn Arabi. Katip Çelebi reports that he is known as “the first *şeyh*”. Ibn Arabi was the person who the sufi groups of the age were mostly influenced by. Correspondingly, the opponents of the sufi groups were against showing respect to Ibn Arabi and even considered him a heretic or infidel. Katip Çelebi posits that Ibn Arabi chose the unity of existence as a doctrine. He further argues that Ibn Arabi emphasized the gentle aspects of divinity. Katip Çelebi focuses the chapter on discussing the views on “those who disapprove of him”, “those who accept him” and “those who suspend judgement about him”. Katip Çelebi claims that those who adhered to the principles of purification and speculation were against Ibn Arabi and his idea of the unity of existence.

Katip Çelebi further argues that some went even further and accused Ibn Arabi of infidelity. In addition, Katip Çelebi mentions that there are also people who oppose Ibn Arabi within the rules of his own doctrine, and according to Katip Çelebi, those people criticize him gently and pay him respect. Katip Çelebi argues that those who judge Ibn Arabi correctly accept him. He further argues that most of the sufi *şeyhs* after Ibn Arabi embraced him and his doctrine of “unity of existence”. Katip Çelebi mentions that there is also another group of people who are neutral to Ibn Arabi.

Katip Çelebi thinks that those people made a right and safe decision and had no harm from the controversies about Ibn Arabi. He further argues that the ideas of Ibn Arabi are not suitable for

¹⁷⁹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.75-78

broader society and only a limited few should use his ideas. In order to support his claim, Katip Çelebi illustrates the statement of Sadreddin Konevi, a disciple of Ibn Arabi, who argues that his ideas and those of Ibn Arabi are not suitable to the majority of mankind and only few should seek to learn from them. Katip Çelebi ends his chapter by calling the “seeker of truth” reasonable and he argues that if a person cannot understand the words of Ibn Arabi, he should not fall into uncertainty. In other words, Katip Çelebi advises that the reader to think well of Ibn Arabi but if the person cannot do so, he should at least not think badly of him.¹⁸⁰

III.2.10. *The Cursing of Yazid*

In the next chapter Katip Çelebi deals with the “cursing of Yazid”. Katip Çelebi argues that this was a controversial issue between the Umayyads and the Abbasids and between the Sunnites and the Shiites. Then, Katip Çelebi discusses early Islamic history with a special focus on issues involving the notion of sovereignty. Katip Çelebi reminds the reader that Shiites developed the practice of cursing Yazid and afterwards, the Shiite *ulema* declared the cursing of Yazid lawful. On the other hand, Katip Çelebi illustrates that Imam Gazali declared the cursing of Yazid unlawful. In addition, Katip Çelebi mentions Gazali's argument that forbade the practice of cursing. Katip Çelebi harshly criticizes the people who do not listen to the words of Gazali. Katip Çelebi further argues that those who ignore Gazali and continue to curse Yazid, act with fanaticism and ignorance. He further adds that the man of the “middle course” would choose the way of the Sunnite *ulema*.¹⁸¹

III.2.11. *Innovation*

In the next chapter, Katip Çelebi discusses *bid'a*, a key concept in discussions of Islamic law and social issues. The concept of *bid'a* includes all the new things established after the time of the Prophet. Katip Çelebi illustrates that *bid'a* could be both good and bad. Katip Çelebi defines the “good innovation” as things that did not exist in the time of the Prophet and emerged later in order to fill a gap.¹⁸²

Katip Çelebi presents minarets and the manufacturing of books as good innovations. Katip Çelebi defines “bad innovation” as matters of faith which diverge from the principles of *Sunna*. Katip Çelebi argued that once an innovation takes root in society and becomes a custom, it becomes

¹⁸⁰ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.80-83

¹⁸¹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.86-87

¹⁸² Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.89

an important part of that society. Therefore, Katip Çelebi argues it is naive to expect people to abandon their customs even if that custom is an innovation.¹⁸³

In view of this, Katip Çelebi argues that those who try to eliminate practices that the majority of society follows are naive cannot possibly reach their aims. Puritanical groups had tried to abolish various practices which they considered innovations. Katip Çelebi accuses those who, with the help of “enjoining right and forbidding wrong” principle, attempt to delegitimize common practices, of stupidity and ignorance. Katip Çelebi adds that rulers should try to protect the social order rather than force change upon society. Preachers should try to encourage people to adopt the *Sunna*. However, Katip Çelebi warns, this should not be done with force because people cannot be forced to change their customs.¹⁸⁴

According to Haim Gerber, Katip Çelebi has two arguments claiming that the term *bid'a* should not be applied to the customs of the common people. Gerber asserts that the first argument is that the people will not change their behaviors. The second argument, Gerber states, is the fact that *bid'a* have always existed and therefore it is impossible to use the term consistently. For these two reasons, Katip Çelebi suggests that *bid'a* might not continue to be applied for the practices of the common people. Gerber also argues that Katip Çelebi, in this sense, shared much with the *şeyhülislam* of the 16th century Ebussuud. According to Gerber, both Katip Çelebi and Ebussuud looked to the *sharia* from the outside. Both suggest that *sharia* should be interpreted in a flexible way. Gerber also argues that both Katip Çelebi and Ebussuud were in favor of innovation, although they were not able to express this in public.¹⁸⁵

Others such as Eunjeong Yi argue that *bid'a* might be considered good and bad for Katip Çelebi, but added that, for *Kadızedelis*, *bid'a* was always something negative. In addition, Yi asserts that *adet* is always considered positive and when something becomes an *adet*, it also becomes acceptable.¹⁸⁶

Katip Çelebi argues that adopting the *Sunna* as a whole is a myth: “If everybody were to carry out an honest self-examination, nothing approaching conformity with the Sunna would be

¹⁸³ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.89-90

¹⁸⁴ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.90

¹⁸⁵ Haim Gerber, *State, Society, and Law in Islam Ottoman Law in Comparative Perspective*, (Albany, State University of New York, 1994) pp. 184-185

¹⁸⁶ Eunjeong Yi, *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth Century Istanbul: Fluidity and Leverage*, (Leiden; Boston, Brill, 2004) pp.115-116

found”.¹⁸⁷ Then, Katip Çelebi adds that it is impossible for an individual to live without innovation. Moreover, Katip Çelebi argues that the Prophet will grant forgiveness to those with faith who committed sins of innovation. Here, Katip Çelebi argues that innovation is something that the believer should not worry about and use innovation as long as it does not conflict with principles of the faith. Thus reaching the “pure” *Sunna* is a myth and no one can live a life free from innovation. It might be argued that Katip Çelebi embraced a pragmatic interpretation of the Islamic law instead of a puritanical one.

III.2.12. *The Visiting of the Tombs*

In the next chapter, Katip Çelebi discussed the issue of the visiting of the tombs. He began his chapter by mentioning the Prophet's ban and then permission of tomb and grave visits. Afterwards, he acknowledged the controversy of this issue among the *ulema*. According to Katip Çelebi, one view claimed that to seek help from the tombs is permissible and also advisable. This was due to interpretation that places such as tombs involved a certain kind of spirituality.¹⁸⁸

Another view among the *ulema* states that seeking help from the dead might lead to idolatry. Therefore, they favored prohibition of such practices. Katip Çelebi seems not to have adhered this second view. He asserts that Ibn Taymiyya, a scholar of the 15th century, went too far to ban the visiting of the tomb of the Prophet. Katip Çelebi illustrates that Ibn Taymiyya had some supporters in Egypt at that time, and the population was divided in terms of which side to support. However, he admits that Ibn Taymiyya was imprisoned and condemned because of his position regarding the Prophet's tomb. The issue of visiting of tombs continued to be a controversial one especially after the increase of *Kadızedeli* power. Katip Çelebi reports that Egyptian authorities embraced arbitration as a solution and afterwards chose a middle course.¹⁸⁹

Katip Çelebi reports the agreement that the *ulema* of Egypt had reached by arbitration. According to Katip Çelebi, this agreement suggested that seeking intermediaries to reach God did not mean polytheism and there are different degrees of monotheism. They considered the monotheism of Abraham to be the most pure with a direct link between man and God. Nevertheless, the *ulema* concluded that those who sought intermediaries, could use those intermediaries to reach

¹⁸⁷ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.90

¹⁸⁸ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.92

¹⁸⁹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.93

the God as long as they did not worship intermediaries.¹⁹⁰ Katip Çelebi also adds that the clinging and kissing of the tombs were prohibited within this agreement. Thus, according to this agreement the visiting of tombs became acceptable in the eyes of most of the *ulema* of the age. However, Katip Çelebi suggests that people and especially women and children, whom Katip Çelebi considered people of loose intellect, would not change their practices of kissing and rubbing their faces to the tombs.

III.2.13. *The Supererogatory Prayers*

The next chapter analyzed the “supererogatory prayers of Raghaib, Berat and Qadr. Katip Çelebi argues that in his time, it became customary for people to perform the supererogatory prayers of Raghaib, Berat and Qadr with the congregation. Katip Çelebi mentions that some *ulema* opposed this practice while others argued in favor of letting people pray.¹⁹¹ Katip Çelebi, who always considered custom to be a strong force, argues that people will persist in performing these prayers. Katip Çelebi expresses that the authorities saw no harm in the performance of these practices, as long as people were praying to God. Therefore, Katip Çelebi favors the position that authorities could do nothing more than let people perform these prayers.¹⁹²

III.2.14. *Shaking Hands and Bowing*

Katip Çelebi then discusses the practice of shaking hands. He argues that the Prophet used this practice. On the other hand, he mentioned that some preachers banned the practice of shaking hands and considered it a *shiite* custom and therefore heretical.¹⁹³ However, Katip Çelebi concludes that the practice of shaking hands is in the *Sunna* and there is no harm in performing that action.¹⁹⁴ On the one hand, Katip Çelebi suggests that it had originated as a heretic practice, on the other hand, he avoids suggesting its prohibition. Katip Çelebi's position regarding prohibitions is mostly against them, because he believed that the established customs of the people could not be altered. Ultimately, Katip Çelebi also suggests that there is no harm in shaking hands.

Katip Çelebi, in the next chapter, spells out his views on the practice of bowing. He asserts that this practice was becoming a custom in society which replaced the former salutation practices.

¹⁹⁰ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.94

¹⁹¹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.97

¹⁹² Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.98

¹⁹³ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.101

¹⁹⁴ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.102

Katip Çelebi argues that according to the *Sunna*, the salutation was the word “Peace”, however, with time, other salutation practices emerged and became widespread. The original *sunna* practice of salutation became an exception rather than norm. Katip Çelebi states that certain people would prefer to ban those practices. However, according to Katip Çelebi, that is impossible. Therefore, although Katip Çelebi admits that the *sunna* version of salutation is the word “Peace”, he is in favor of permitting the use of different versions.¹⁹⁵

III.2.15. Enjoining Right and Forbidding Wrong

In the next chapter, Katip Çelebi discusses the principle of “enjoining right and forbidding wrong” in Islamic law. He analyzes how this principle led to some discussions in the Ottoman society in which he lived. Katip Çelebi argues that the *ulema* was not in agreement on the principle of “enjoining the right and forbidding the wrong”. He cites the scholar Imam Sayf al-Din al-Amadi's work, *Abkar al-afkar* and Adud al-Din al Iji's *Mawaqif* on their thought regarding this principle. Katip Çelebi argues that both scholars demonstrate the circumstances in which the principle of “enjoining the right and forbidding the wrong” could be applied.¹⁹⁶

Then, Katip Çelebi begins to cite those rules in which this principle might be valid. The first rule is that one who condemns and one who is condemned should both have reached the age of discretion and should fully understand the sacred law. The second rule is the condemned person who wishes to enjoy Right, should accept what is Wrong and what is right. The third states that the Wrong thing should be forbidden and the right thing should be obligatory. The fourth rule is the obligatory nature should be certain and without dispute. The fifth rule is that there should be one person who should deal with enjoining and forbidding and if there is many, it becomes an individual responsibility. The sixth rule regarded the enjoiner should enjoin in peace and should not resist it. The seventh rule is that the practice should not involve prying and spying into one's personal life. Afterwards, Katip Çelebi argues that if any one of these rules is not available in the process, the principle of “enjoining right and forbidding wrong” cannot be applied.¹⁹⁷

III.2.16. The Religion of Abraham

Katip Çelebi analyzes the debates mentioning of “the religion of Abraham” in Ottoman

¹⁹⁵ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.101-102

¹⁹⁶ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.106

¹⁹⁷ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.106-109

society. He argues that in his society, a great portion of the population continued to denote themselves as adherents of the “religion of Abraham” instead of saying rightly that they were Muslims. Katip Çelebi reports those with a puritanical understanding of religion consider this practice heretical and condemn it. Katip Çelebi mentions that some people of *ulema* decided that this practice is not permissible. On the other hand, Katip Çelebi who believes that those people are not right, analyzes thoroughly why it might be permissible for a Muslim to call himself an adherent of the religion of Abraham. He consults the works of the scholar Fadil and Şeyh Mujib to discuss this issue.¹⁹⁸

When Katip Çelebi discusses the treatise of Fadil. He cites “three possible attitudes towards the codes of revealed law of former peoples” in the treatise. According to Fadil, one should comply with the laws of an earlier prophet unless its laws were abrogated. In other words, one should “comply with the law of an earlier prophet but only by virtue of being the law of our Prophet”.¹⁹⁹

Afterwards, Katip Çelebi cites al-Baydawi's statement that the Prophet was a compiler of laws, the religion of Islam came after such a compilation. Therefore, Katip Çelebi argues that the Islamic law actually originated from Abraham's law, and that the same law passed to Muhammad and became his law.²⁰⁰ Katip Çelebi further cites Baydawi and Ebussud's statements to conclude that it is not permissible for one to say that he belongs to the religion of Abraham because it will mean that the religion belongs to Abraham and not to Muhammad.

Additionally, Katip Çelebi states that, for the majority of people, it is not permissible to say that they are following the religion of Abraham, because they might not know what that means. Katip Çelebi argues that only a few people in his time understood that the religion of Abraham was actually the religion of Muhammad. Only for those few, might it be permissible to say that they belonged to the religion of Abraham. In other words, Katip Çelebi claims that only few people were be smart enough not to take the literal meaning of the concept of religion of Abraham.²⁰¹

Then, Katip Çelebi discusses Şeyh Mujib's treatise. Katip Çelebi harshly criticizes the sheiks' treatise. He argues that the *şeyh* omitted many scholars' and theologians' point of view on the issue. In addition, Katip Çelebi criticizes Şeyh Mujib for his lack of dialectic ability or vision.²⁰²

¹⁹⁸ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.110

¹⁹⁹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.110-111

²⁰⁰ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.111

²⁰¹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.112

²⁰² Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.118

III.2.17. *Bribery*

In the next chapter Katip Çelebi discusses the practice of bribery. He cites Imam Qadikhan's *fatawa* on bribery. He reminds the reader that bribery is forbidden for both the bribe giving and receiving parties. However, he further states that if someone gives bribe in order to reduce harm to himself or to his property, then it might be permissible for that person to give bribe. However he also reminds the reader that in this case too, the receiving of bribe is still not permissible.²⁰³ Then, Katip Çelebi cites the scholar Ibn Hammam's different classifications of bribery. According to Ibn Hammam, when the bribe is given to secure an office or to get a favorable verdict from a judge, it is not permissible to either give and receive the bribe. However, if the bribe is given to avert harm or secure advantage and to avert the risk of harm to oneself or to one's property, it is permissible to give the bribe but not to receive it.²⁰⁴

III.2.18. *Katip Çelebi and the Controversies of the Age*

In the next chapter, Katip Çelebi discusses the controversy between Ebussuud and Birgili Mehmed Efendi. Abussuud was a famous *seyhülislam* of the 16th century who made attempts to reconcile the *kanun* and the *sharia*. Birgili Mehmed Efendi was a scholar who criticized the religious interpretations of Abussuud. Birgili especially opposed the approval of cash *waqfs* by Abussuud.²⁰⁵ This controversy is crucial to understand the dynamics of the 16th century as well as the era in which Katip Çelebi lived.

Katip Çelebi asserts that Abussuud as well as Kemalpashazade occupied the highest positions in the Ottoman legal hierarchy and, according to Katip Çelebi, they helped to put the state into order. Afterwards, Katip Çelebi mentions the life of Birgili Mehmed. He argues that Birgili considered it unlawful to accept money in return of reciting the Koran. He also adds that Birgili devoted his life to the study of legal sciences together with logic. Katip Çelebi argues that he gave no importance to social customs and usages. Furthermore, Birgili argued that cash *waqfs* were illegal. Katip Çelebi argues that Birgili had no chance to be supported by the common people because Birgili was against customs.²⁰⁶

²⁰³ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.125

²⁰⁴ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.125

²⁰⁵ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.129

²⁰⁶ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.130-131

In the next chapter, Katip Çelebi discusses the controversy between Sivasi and Kadızade. Kadızade Mehmed Efendi was a famous scholar and preacher. Kadızade also taught Katip Çelebi. Seyh Sivasi was the famous Halveti *şeyh*. This controversy was a common one which divided the people of the empire or at least of the capital in the 17th century. Katip Çelebi argues that these two *şeyhs* were of different temperaments and took completely different sides in controversies of the time. Katip Çelebi accuses both of going to the extremes while he himself embraces the moderate view in most controversies. He further claims that intelligent people also accuse both sides of fanaticism. Katip Çelebi argues that the both *şeyhs* became famous by opposing one another. In addition, Katip Çelebi declares the followers of these two *şeyhs* to be foolish people. He accuses those people of going to extremes to become famous. Moreover, Katip Çelebi argues that it should be the duty of the sultans to restore the order and to deal with these fanatics.

III.2.19. *The Recital of God's Bounty or the Conclusion*

The next chapter is called the Recital of God's Bounty. In this section, Katip Çelebi mentions his own life. According to his own narrative on his life, his name was Mustafa ibn Abdallah and he was called Hajji Kalfa among the learned men of Istanbul. He refers to himself in the third person. He writes that his father was a soldier who participated in the campaigns such as Terjan Campaign, Baghdad Expedition and the Siege of Erzurum. Katip Çelebi states that he was interested in the sciences of penmanship, accountancy and *siyaqat*.²⁰⁷

In another part, Katip Çelebi recounts hearing the sermons of Kadızade Mehmed. He describes Kadızade Mehmed as “an effective speaker whose sermons never failed to move his hearers”.²⁰⁸ Afterwards, Katip Çelebi discusses his studies and also mentions that he attended sheiks' lectures. He asserts that he had mastered the ancillary sciences, Arabic grammar and composition. He acknowledges that he learned Koran interpretation, the revival of religious sciences, the commentary on the *Mawaqif*, the *Durar* and the *Tariqat*.²⁰⁹ Most of the studies that Katip Çelebi mentions here are the titles of the works that *medrese* students studied at the time.

Katip Çelebi found that the sheiks' lectures were generally simple and did not involve natural sciences. He argues that the *şeyh* was in dispute with the people of the world. Furthermore,

²⁰⁷ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.135

²⁰⁸ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.135

²⁰⁹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.136

Katip Çelebi argues that he was an expert at arguing against an opponent.²¹⁰ Katip Çelebi seems to be praising the oratory powers of the *şeyh*. Thus, it might be argued that, while Katip Çelebi had been the student of his *şeyh* and admired some of his qualities, he also admitted that the *şeyh* was not competent enough in some subjects such as natural sciences.

Afterwards, Katip Çelebi discusses the *şeyh*'s objections to the Halveti and Mevlevi orders in terms of dancing and gyrating. Katip Çelebi expresses that the sufi orders considered him as an heretic or as an infidel who denied the saints. Katip Çelebi argues that foolish people tried to imitate the *şeyh* and for this reason, they fell into fanaticism. Katip Çelebi argues that because of this, those who imitate the *şeyh* had gotten a lot of reproach from the people. Moreover, Katip Çelebi expresses that he tried to save people from this fanaticism and he also tried to move people toward moderation.

Then, Katip Çelebi narrates his experience of *hajj* (pilgrimage) duty, and his visit to the tomb of the Prophet. Afterwards, he says that he joined the imperial army in Diyarbakir and learned a great deal from the scholars of the city. Then, Katip Çelebi went to the Erivan campaign with Sultan Murad. Katip Çelebi, after years that he spent on campaigns and battles, he decided that he would devote himself to what he considered much bigger struggles of learning and knowledge. Then, he says that he began to compose a biographical dictionary. He mentions that he spent a lot of his time with the booksellers of Aleppo. After inheriting money, Katip Çelebi spent this money on many books. He further states that he will no longer participate in campaigns and will instead stay at home to study.²¹¹

Katip Çelebi mentions that afterwards he attended the lectures of a man called Arec Mustafa Efendi, a former judge turned teacher. Katip Çelebi states that he got Baydawi's *Commentary* from him. Afterwards, Katip Çelebi expresses that at St. Sophia, he attended the lectures of Kürd Abdullah Efendi at St. Sophia whom Katip Çelebi describes as a master of sacred and profane sciences. He then attended the lectures of Keçi Mehmed Efendi at Sülemaniye whom Katip Çelebi described as a consummate of Arabic. Katip Çelebi states that Mehmed Efendi argued that, if he himself did not know one subject, he let others speak about it. Katip Çelebi argues that Kadızade did not do the same thing and would not accept that he did not know something, going so far as to deny that he did not know it.²¹²

²¹⁰ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.136

²¹¹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp. 137-139

²¹² Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.139

Afterwards, Katip Çelebi says that he wrote a Koran commentary. He claims that he devoted himself to study, sometimes studying the whole night. Then, when the Cretan expedition began, he became interested in the sea and wrote a treatise on the topic. Then, Katip Çelebi mentions that he had had a fight with the chief clerk. He explains why, after twenty years he did not get the post of chief clerk. Katip Çelebi then recounts their response to himself in which the authorities made clear that the post was for a life time.²¹³

Katip Çelebi mentions that he wrote a commentary on Ali Kuschu's *Muhammadiya* which is a work on arithmetics, after a request from his pupil. Afterwards, Katip Çelebi says that he wrote the *Taqwim-üt-Tewarih* as an index to his *Fadhlaka*. Then he says that *şeyhülislam* wrote a note to the grand vizier in which he suggested that Katip Çelebi should be appointed to a high rank and praised Katip Çelebi's knowledge and character. Katip Çelebi mentions that he was given a diploma as a second clerk.²¹⁴

Afterwards, Katip Çelebi began to read books on “foreign sciences”, and taught his pupils lessons of medicine, mathematics and philosophy. He completed his biographical dictionary: *Sullam al-Wusul ila Tabaqat al-Fuhul*. Then, he mentions his alphabetically arranged commonplace book *Tuhfat al-Akhyar*. Katip Çelebi acknowledges that he collected biographical dictionaries. He discusses many topics and unusual questions and designed the comprehensive work of *Kashf al-Zunun an Asami'l Kutub wa'l-Funun*. Then, Katip Çelebi mentions that he started to compose a work on geography entitled “Geography”. Then, Katip Çelebi states that a former French priest who became a Muslim, Şeyh Mehmed Ihlasi who knew Latin, translated several works into Ottoman Turkish as *Rawnaq al-Saltana*.²¹⁵

Then, Katip Çelebi says he asked the *şeyhülislam* Bahai Efendi for a *fetwa* on three unusual questions. He says that he received no answer from the *şeyhülislam* and thus, he wrote a treatise where he elaborated on those questions. This was his *İlham ul-Mukaddes* treatise. In addition, he asserts that he wrote *Düstur ül-amel* as a suggestion to state administration. Afterwards, he wrote *Qanunnmae-i Tashrifat* which is the code of ceremonies and *Rajm al-Rajim bi'l-sin wa'l Jim* which can be translated as “The Stoning of the Accursed” with *sin* and *jim*. He suggests that that was a collection of *fetwas* about unusual problems.

²¹³ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.140-141

²¹⁴ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.142-143

²¹⁵ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.144

Katip Çelebi writes that, when naval affairs became an issue, he wrote *Tuhfat al-Kibar fi Asfar al-Bihar*. In other words, when the Cretan expedition begun, Katip Çelebi's curiosity of the sea and the Navy increased. In this treatise, Katip Çelebi tries to evaluate the Navy and the seas. His treatise concerned “sea battles and voyages of the captains with some information on naval construction and the sea”.²¹⁶

Afterwards, Katip Çelebi narrates a dream in which he claims to have seen the Prophet. He asserts that saw the Prophet with a sword in an open field. Then, he begins to analyze or interpret that dream by concluding that the Prophet guided him in various ways. Katip Çelebi interprets the fact that the Prophet was dressed for a battle to mean that there would be a holy war in order to occupy some islands. In addition, Katip Çelebi mentions that the Prophet told him to occupy himself with the name of the Prophet. Katip Çelebi interprets this statement to mean that he should resume his works and studies of mathematics, religious studies and natural sciences. Then, Katip Çelebi concludes that religious sciences and natural sciences were two wings necessary to fly.²¹⁷

Afterwards, Katip Çelebi describes some recommendations that he addressed the sultan. In the first recommendation, he states that the sultan should be able to perform the principles of faith, pay attention to science and religion, should read history and derive knowledge from history and never neglect of making holy war.²¹⁸

The second recommendation is for the learned preachers. Katip Çelebi makes clear that preachers should not use comments against the established customs of the citizens which might cause dissent amongst citizens. In addition, Katip Çelebi suggests to preachers they should establish a reconciliation between different opposing views of Muslims. He reprimands the preachers who take a sides on controversies and speak badly about the other side, i.e., about the established customs of the society.²¹⁹

In addition, Katip Çelebi recommends that the preachers should avoid going to extremes and perform the duties of faith and command and prohibit by being sage and temperate. He suggests that the people should go between fear and hope. Moreover, Katip Çelebi suggests that the sermons

²¹⁶ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.145

²¹⁷ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.145-147

²¹⁸ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.147

²¹⁹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.147-149

should always be appropriate to the time and place, and should respond to the particular days or time of the year. He even suggests that there is no harm in adopting some traditions that are not present in the canonical tradition.

Katip Çelebi suggests that the preachers should avoid speaking topics that are beyond the understanding of the common people and that they should adopt a clear vocabulary. He supports his views with the saying of Imam Raghib Isfahani, “sermons are for the commons, not for the few”.²²⁰ Katip Çelebi suggests that anecdotes, pleasantries and verses might be added to the sermons. However, he does not suggest that the preachers discuss controversies in order to gain a widespread audience and to be famous.

The third recommendation that Katip Çelebi made was for the ordinary Muslims. He suggests to ordinary Muslims that they obey the Word and perform the basic duties of the religion. In addition, he suggests they should do what they understand and also suggests that they should not deal with the learned people's controversies. From this recommendation, we might ascertain that Katip Çelebi thought that what he calls “ordinary people”, should obey the basic principles of the religion. In other words, they should interpret religion and the word of God literally but they should not engage themselves to seek its deeper meanings. In addition, they should avoid participating in learned debates. With this suggestion, Katip Çelebi made clear the boundaries that were present in Medieval and Early Modern societies.

The next recommendation is addressed to the students who took lectures from Katip Çelebi. Katip Çelebi suggests that the students should master the knowledge of Islamic dogmas, then they should master one branch of knowledge. Then, they might seek another knowledge. However, he suggests to the students that they should not look for any post or appointment before completing their education. Moreover, Katip Çelebi suggests that if a student is looking for a sound education, he should not look for a judgeship.²²¹

Finally, Katip Çelebi mentions the subjects that the students should master to gain a sound education. He expresses that students should study the doctrines of the *Sunna*, the *Citadel of the Book*, the *Consensus of the Community*. In addition, Katip Çelebi suggests that students should study the works of philosophers, speculative theologians and the words of the sufis. The last

²²⁰ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.149

²²¹ Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) pp.150-151

suggestion that Katip Çelebi makes is that the students should deny or reject any of the studies, or works and avoid fall into bigotry. In other words, they should be guided with reason, and should “take the clear and leave the turbid”.²²²

III.2.20. *İlham ül-Mukaddes*

In the treatise *İlham ül-Mukaddes min-al Feyz al-Akdes*, Katip Çelebi discusses three legal problems that he requested *fetwas* on and was ignored by the *şeyhülislam*. These problems are related to the geographical and astronomical issues and how they might effect basic Islamic doctrines. For instance, finding the times of daily prayers and feast times in the northern countries, whether is it possible that the sunrise and sunset happen in the same direction somewhere else in the world and whether there is a place where every direction might be considered *kible* outside of Mecca. Katip Çelebi, after failing to receive answers from the *şeyhülislam*, wrote his own ideas on the three controversial questions.²²³

III.2.21. *Katip Çelebi and Enlightenment, Science and Reason*

Historians, especially in the early years of the Turkish republic, tended to see Katip Çelebi as a forerunner of the secularization and westernization in the Ottoman Empire. Katip Çelebi uses reason as a tool in his pursuit of the truth. In his treatise, *İlham al-Mukaddes*, Katip Çelebi attributes an essential role to the reason.

It can be questioned whether Katip Çelebi represents modernity or to what extent, or did he represent a proto-version of it? The answer cannot be thought separately from the definition of “Early Modernity”. In the historiography, Early Modernity has tended to be seen as a bridge like period between Medieval and Early Modern times. In this sense, Bolay's argument that Katip Çelebi was somewhere between the classical age and the modernity might be right.²²⁴ Nevertheless, it does not tell much about what an Early Modern mentality might be like.

Can the attempts of Katip Çelebi to collect the knowledge of the world be seen as an early enlightenment project? It is argued above that Katip Çelebi tried to collect knowledge of the world

²²² Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957) p.151

²²³ Bedi Şehsuvaroğlu, “İlham-al Mukaddes min-al Feyz al-Akdes Risalesi ve Katip Çelebi'nin İlmi Zihniyeti Hakkında Birkaç Söz” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991) pp.146-148

²²⁴ Süleyman Hayri Bolay, *Osmanlılarda Düşünce Hayatı ve Felsefe*, (Ankara, Akçağ, 2005) p.237

to reform the state. Nevertheless, it is problematic to see these attempts as an enlightenment project which involves the education of at least the middle classes. This is because Katip Çelebi's notion of knowledge and education was that it should be, limited to few people who were not ignorants and who could use their reason.

In other words, Katip Çelebi's understanding of knowledge and education were similar to the Medieval understanding of the world, where members of each class should be treated according to their positions in the society. In other words, Katip Çelebi's attempts to collect the knowledge aimed to address the state and bureaucracy circles which might consider to reform the state, not to encourage universal knowledge.

III.2.22. Religion, Islamic Law and Katip Çelebi

A certain observation of some works of Katip Çelebi will show the reader Katip Çelebi's approach to Islamic law. According to Katip Çelebi, Islamic law, the *sharia*, should be the basis of politics and social life. Thus, it might be argued that Katip Çelebi perceived Islamic law as the most legitimizing factor together with reason. Therefore, he believed that the man of the sword who would make reforms and end the crisis of the society would be loyal only to *sharia*. This example suggest the main role that Katip Çelebi attributed to the sharia as the basic ideal that should be sought in the state administration.

Moreover, when Katip Çelebi explained or reflected certain issues or controversies that were debated in Ottoman society such as dancing, smoking or coffee drinking, Katip Çelebi based his reasoning on whether these practices were appropriate for *sharia* or not. This fact shows the audience that Katip Çelebi attributed an essential role to *sharia* as well as to reason. In addition, although it is thought to be based on divine revelation, Katip Çelebi's relationship with *sharia* points out that it might be used together with reason.

At some point in his book, Katip Çelebi mentions the popular saying “the world is not destroyed by unbelief but can be destroyed with injustice.” This saying illustrates the emphasis of the concept of justice in Islamic societies. On the other hand, it also suggests a realm of politics which is not necessarily lead by religion. Toby Huff argues that in any civilization, the sources of rationality and reason might be found in its religion, law and philosophy.²²⁵

²²⁵ Toby E. Huff, *The Rise of Early Modern Science: Islam, China and the West*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University

III.2.23. *Katip Çelebi and Philosophy*

The most famous phrase quoted by the scholars on Katip Çelebi is his complaint of the removal of philosophy courses in the curricula of the *medreses* in Istanbul. Considering this quote, the historiography tends to associate Katip Çelebi with philosophy. For instance, Kafadar describes Katip Çelebi as a great Ottoman thinker. On the other hand, Tezcan claims that the removal of the philosophy courses out of the curricula of the *medreses* points to the fact that the philosophy and rational science education existed outside of the realm of the *medreses*.²²⁶ Similarly, Katip Çelebi expresses that the people who came from the eastern provinces had better knowledge of philosophy, which also indicates an example of philosophy and rational science education in the provinces, different from the Istanbul *medreses*.

In the historiography, Katip Çelebi tends to be associated with the Illuminative philosophy. However, Hagen claims that Katip Çelebi's embracing of the Illuminative philosophy needs further study.²²⁷ On the other hand, Adıvar claims that Katip Çelebi was not an Ishraqi even if he considered himself one.²²⁸

Thus, it might be interpreted that Katip Çelebi favored the close relationship between sacred law and philosophy. In a different place, he again complains about the removal of philosophy classes in the curricula of Istanbul *medreses*. Therefore, considering the prestigious status that he attached to the sacred law and reason, it might be argued Katip Çelebi favored a union or cooperation of the sacred law and philosophy.

III.2.24. *Katip Çelebi and Practical Knowledge*

In his works, Katip Çelebi sought to find knowledge and share it with his audience. Then, it might be asked that what Katip Çelebi hoped to achieve by sharing the knowledge of the world with his audience. There is no doubt that he studied sciences, law, politics, society and history to seek knowledge and share it with his audience. It is difficult to give a single answer to this question. However, Gottfried Hagen argues that Katip Çelebi tried to “collect, save and share” a wide scale of

Press, 1993) p.91

²²⁶ Baki Tezcan, “Politics of Early Modern Science” in *The Journal of Ottoman Studies*, v.36, 2010, p.147

²²⁷ Gottfried Hagen ottomanhistorians.com p.1

²²⁸ Adnan Adıvar, *Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim*, (İstanbul, Remzi Kitabevi, 2000) pp.139-140

human knowledge. In this respect, Hagen considers much of Katip Çelebi's works within an “encyclopedic project”.

According to Hagen, Katip Çelebi believed that by sharing a certain kind of practical knowledge, he would help the Ottoman state out of crisis. In other words, Katip Çelebi asserts that western superiority is the consequence of the developments of the West in geography.²²⁹ Therefore he might have thought that by expanding their knowledge of geography, the Ottoman state might regain its superiority. Thus, it might be argued that Katip Çelebi's practical knowledge aimed to restore the order of the society and reform the state. One might ask whether Katip Çelebi realized that knowledge was a source of power and the need to “collect” the knowledge of the world in order to make the Empire more “powerful” or “powerful again”?

III.3. Summary of the Chapter

As discussed above, Katip Çelebi used Islamic law, his reasoning and logic in order to interpret the daily issues and social problems that the society of 17th century Ottoman Empire ardently discussed. His commentaries, arguments and the way he evaluated and responded to different perspectives made Katip Çelebi an original intellectual and scholar of his age. When Katip Çelebi elaborated on different controversial topics regarding Islamic law, he was mostly against the prohibition of customs that an important portion of the society embraced and practiced. In addition, he suggested that the preachers and the men of Islamic learning should avoid speaking against and from banning the customs that were embraced and practiced by a greater portion of the society. Katip Çelebi believed that prohibitions made prohibited practices even more appealing. In addition, he always believed that ordinary people should not be forced to abandon their customs, because it would be a meaningless pursuit.

In 17th century Ottoman Istanbul, the controversies that were widespread among the populace became hot issues in which different social groups clashed with each other. Therefore, the positions that the Islamic scholars took had political consequences. Katip Çelebi criticized those people who interpreted the Islamic law according to their own political purposes or to become famous. On the other hand, the debates on Islamic law were new and it was crucial to examine how novelties that came and were embraced by some portion of society, were interpreted and evaluated

²²⁹ Gottfried Hagen, “Afterword” in *An Ottoman Mentality: The World of Evliya Çelebi*, Robert Dankoff (Leiden; Boston, Brill, 2006) p.231

by other portions of society. As I previously discussed, products such as tobacco and coffee were relatively new substances that had become widespread in most of Ottoman society only in the preceding few centuries.

Authorities' opinions on the consumption of some substances or the performance of some practices differed according to different legal reasonings. However, they tended, to prohibit some substances. Several legal scholars issued *fatwas* suggesting the ban of those substances. Different perspectives were examined to decide whether those substances were permissible or not.

The first step was to examine whether the substance or the practice in question was mentioned in the *Sunna* tradition. The *Sunna* includes the Holy Book and the deeds and sayings of the Prophet. If it was not mentioned in those sources, then the scholars often implemented the *kıyas* method in order to find out if the given practice or substance might be harmful for Muslims. Some other scholars might not use this method and they might decide that these substances or practices were permissible if it was not mentioned in the Sunna.

Mostly, Katip Çelebi's arguments on different issues were based on people's positions in society. In other words, Katip Çelebi tended to favor the prohibition of some practices for certain people, whereas he argued that the same practices should be allowed for others. In what sense this stance Katip Çelebi took might be seen and be interpreted within Islamic law is a topic for further study.

This stance of Katip Çelebi is also in harmony with the sufi understanding of society. According to this understanding, only a small minority of people have the deeper spiritual qualities required to follow a different version of the religion. Some people might follow different paths to reach God. Thus, some practices might be permissible for those, whereas, those practices might not be permissible for the majority of the population.

In addition, this fact should be a secret and ordinary people should not be allowed to pursue different paths. According to sufis, the existence of these paths to God should be kept secret. However, it might be argued that the understanding of a compartmentalized society in which one should be evaluated according to different criteria existed in most of the social and political theorists of the Medieval and Early Modern age.

Katip Çelebi interpreted Islamic law with his own understanding of reason and logic. Moreover, he preached what he called “moderation” as opposed to the “fanaticism” that he accused most of society of following on controversial issues. In this sense, he might be considered an unusual voice in Ottoman society. Nevertheless, it might be misleading to see him as a partial voice who was not influenced by existing traditions. Gottfried Hagen thinks that the link between the Illuminationist philosophy of Suhrawardi and Katip Çelebi require further study.²³⁰ In this respect, it would not be out of the question to suggest that Katip Çelebi might have embraced some notions of the *Ishraqi* philosophy.

Hagen suggests that Katip Çelebi had great respect for Ibn Arabi to whom he devoted one chapter of his work. However, Hagen states that in *Mizan ül-hak* Katip Çelebi tried to reach a middle ground of the debates between the *Kadızadelis* and the sufi groups. Hagen writes that Katip Çelebi was closer to the *Kadızadeli* rationalism than the mysticism of the sufi groups. However, he does not say in which respects he believed that *Kadızadeli* rationalism to be closer to Katip Çelebi's thought. Hagen also adds that after a while, Katip Çelebi distanced himself from the movement.²³¹

Thus, it might be argued that Katip Çelebi elaborated different social issues by considering reason, logic and Islamic law. Therefore, his understanding of those perspectives might be considered integral parts of his whole mentality. In this section, I tried to analyze how Katip Çelebi interpreted the law and how he responded to the debates of his age.

As I made clear above, for Katip Çelebi, in order for some practices to be accepted as legitimate practice, it must be based on Islamic law or the reason. An important portion of the debates Katip Çelebi commented upon seems to be issues specific to Islamic theology. However, an important amount of the populace discussed took different positions on those issues. Therefore, legal issues had mostly social and political consequences.

²³⁰ Gottfried Hagen ottomanhistorians.com “Katip Çelebi” p.1

²³¹ Gottfried Hagen ottomanhistorians.com “Katip Çelebi” p.1

CHAPTER IV

A HISTORIAN AT WORK

KATİP ÇELEBİ BETWEEN THE EAST AND THE WEST

IV.1. A Discussion of the Sources

In this chapter, I will analyze Katip Çelebi's translation projects of some European chronicles and what he might have intended to achieve by translating and editing those chronicles. The two sources that I will use in this chapter are *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire* and *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*. Katip Çelebi sponsored the translation of these Western chronicles with the help of French convert Seyh Mehmed Ihlasi. Ihlasi knew the Latin language and translated those works from Latin. According to Ibrahim Solak who edited the publishing of these chronicles, Katip Çelebi edited the chronicles with annotations on the margins of the chronicle.²³²

IV.2. Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire

This book is titled the *History of Constantinople and Caesars*. Although Constantinople is not the current usage of the city of Istanbul, the modern reader might guess what the author is referring to. *Kayasire* means of the Caesars. Thus, the chronicle's name suggested that it is a history of Istanbul and also its rulers.

After a quick glimpse at the table of contents, the reader will notice that the book is divided into chapters such as *Islamic conquest of Sicily, Islamic conquest of Crete, Battle of Hungary, Earthquake, The Beginning of Western Supremacy, Reconquest of Constantinople, Appendix of Kalkondilas, Battle of Kosovo, After the Conquest, Siege of Belgrade*. The chapters suggest a time

²³² Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*, Ibrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Palet Yayınları, 2010) p.11

frame beginning from the “High” to the Late Middle Ages. A more detailed reading of the book might lead the reader to see that the book covers the rules of the Byzantine emperors beginning from 9th century to the times of the Ottomans and their conquests of Constantinople and some of the former “Roman lands”. In addition, after a detailed reading, the reader might realize that the book discusses the lands around the Mediterranean and mostly the Eastern Mediterranean lands where the Byzantine Empire reached a climax and where the Ottoman Empire flourished. However, it also involved the lands of Central Europe and non- Mediterranean Middle East.

The Afterword of Kalkondilas which was a short chapter within the chronicle might make one wonder the author or authors of the initial text. The authorship of the text should be discussed to get a clearer understanding of the content and the uses of the text. In this respect the author or authors and their intent to write the text might be elaborated. In addition, how many times and with what purposes the text is edited also matters. In the beginning of the chronicle, the authors names appear. According to the account, in other words, to the translation, the sources of the chronicle were Cevanis Zoumaras (John Zonaras, 12th century), Nisetas Akomitanos Konyates (Niketas Choniates, late 12th and 13th centuries), Niseforos Gregoras (Nicephorus Gregoras, late 13th and 14th centuries) and Vladonikos Karkokondilis (Laonikos Chalkokondyles, 15th century). The timeline that the chronicle encompasses ends in the late 15th century. Likewise, the modern publisher of the text maintains that the chronicle was published in 1587 in Frankfurt.²³³

Considering the scope of this study, I will focus on Katip Çelebi's possible editing of the text while it was being translated by Ihlası. Considering the possible editing by Katip Çelebi and why the editing is conducted, I will argue that, the reader might reach an understanding of history as Katip Çelebi perceived it. Moreover, I will also argue that studying the possible editing of Katip Çelebi will help the Ottoman historian to understand the wider aspects of Katip Çelebi's intellectual curiosity on history and the “practical knowledge” that he sought from history.

IV.2.1. The Footnotes

Apart from the multiple authors who contributed to the writing process of the compilation, there is an obvious Ottoman editing of the text. The most obvious proof of this editing is the footnotes where the editor puts the Byzantine concepts and geographic names into an Ottoman context. For instance, the Ottoman editor of the text, that is Katip Çelebi, mentions that

²³³ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasıre*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009) p.10

perütestirator is a special person of service (*perütestirator bir mahsus hizmet sahibidir*).²³⁴

Similarly, in a different context, Katip Çelebi explains in a footnote that *sebastakrator* is the highest authority after the emperor and he tries to clarify the concept further by saying that, it is in the position of a grand vizier (*sebastakrator imparatoradan sonra en büyük hakimdir vezir-i azam makamında*).²³⁵ In different contexts, Katip Çelebi explains the geographic names which have Greek or Byzantine names into terms familiar to the Ottoman audience. One example is the mention of the name of *Sevirna*, which refers to Izmir (*Ya'ni İzmir*).²³⁶ As these examples point out, Katip Çelebi puts the concepts that he thinks the Ottoman audience might find unfamiliar into a familiar setting. Was Katip Çelebi's intervention to the text limited to the footnotes? One wonders if he altered some parts of the chronicle for a more Ottoman friendly setting?

Apart from the footnotes, the double spellings of some Ottoman names might surprise the reader. Why were names such as Orhan and Hasan were written just after their mention as Orhanis and Hasanis?²³⁷ A similar case refers to both Osman and Otoman.²³⁸ Did the Greek authors know both versions of names and choose to use both? Did one Greek author know one version and another Greek author know the other? Did the Greek authors write those names as Orhanis and Hasanis, and Katip Çelebi edited the exact translation of *Ihlasi* to an Ottoman setting and correct them as Orhan and Hasan; or Otoman and Osman? Were both versions of the names kept on purpose or is only one version corrected due to lack of attention? Or there is a post-Katip Çelebi editor at work? Certainly the speculations on this issue might easily be carried further. Nevertheless, I assume that what is certain in this issue is that there are multiple authors and editors of the text as well as at least one translator. Therefore, the multiple authorship and editing of the text led somehow to a non-standardization of the terms and concepts of the chronicle.

IV.2.2. The Problem of Ethnicity

Another interesting point that the reader might notice in the chronicle, is the mention of different ethnicities. For example “Turks” as an entity are present and active subjects of the chronicle. At first glimpse, this might not surprise the Ottoman historian because some Ottoman

²³⁴ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasıre*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009) p.19

²³⁵ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasıre*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009) p.34

²³⁶ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasıre*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009) p.47

²³⁷ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasıre*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009) p.50 ;p.83

²³⁸ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasıre*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009) p.47; p.52

chronicles mentioned “Turks” as an ethnic group, and it might even be a tool to be proud of.²³⁹ However, in *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*, because of the fact that it is a translation, Turks are used to denote first “Seljuks of Rum” and then “Ottomans”. In addition, there is no mention of the name of “Ottomans” as a group or state and Ottomans are presented as “Turks”. This might be because of the fact that in Western sources the name “Turks” was mostly to denote the Ottomans. However, here, the modern reader might wonder why the Ottoman editor who put the Byzantine usage into an Ottoman setting did not make the “Turks” the “Seljuks” or the “Ottomans” but kept “Turks”? Did not the editor care about possible different understandings of “Turks” and “Ottomans” in an Ottoman audience? Or did he keep the name of “Turks” as Ottomans on purpose?

Greeks are another group mentioned in the chronicle. As the word “Greek” is a Latin word it is obvious why it is used. Nevertheless, “Greek” is not the only word to denote “Greeks”. Besides “Greek” (grek), Roman (*romani, rumi*) as well as *yunani* are used to denote “Greeks”. However, the author distinguishes between the Latin speaking Romans and Greek speaking Romans (Byzantines). “[A]fter, Romans ruled many times, they gave Rome to the Pope and they migrated to Byzantium. Since then, Greeks were mixed with Romans and they protected their creeds and rituals, however they changed their names and they began to be known as Romans, and after they separated their religion with the Latins.”²⁴⁰

IV.2.3. History Writing and Katip Çelebi

Another interesting point that the reader might realize is that the chronicle began as a Byzantine centered account and evolved gradually into an Ottoman centered one. What might Katip Çelebi have thought about this fact? Did Katip Çelebi wish to present an account of A Byzantine-Ottoman account about the “lands of the Romans”? Likewise one might wonder what Katip Çelebi thought about the account of the Ottomans in the chronicle.

Katip Çelebi was also a historian and wrote some history books, such as *Fezleke* and *Takvim üt-Tevarih*. Katip Çelebi might have used the translation of these two Western chronicles as sources for his own history writing projects. As a person with great intellectual enthusiasm, he did not hesitate to intervene in the works by adding footnotes in order to include more information or to put

²³⁹ Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihan-nüma*, (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995) p.269

²⁴⁰ *Katip Çelebi, Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009) p.52
“...bade Romaniler nice zaman saltanat sürdükten sonra Romayı papaya teslim idüb kendileri Bizansiyum'a göçdüler. Ol zamandan beri Yunaniler Romaniler'e karışub kendi delillerini ve ayinlerini gözettiler, lakin isimlerini tebdil idüb Romaniler ismiyle müsemma oldular ve zaman-ı medidden sonra Latiniler ile dinde ihtilaf eylediler.”

the available information into an Ottoman context where people who are not close to the cultural milieu of the chronicle, might also understand what its meaning.

Similarly, Katip Çelebi intervened in the text so that he could to share information with the audience. In some cases, Katip Çelebi only does so to show his enthusiasm for the intellectual inquiry. In other words, he states some names of the scholars that he had been impressed with or the names of people to whom he wished to draw the reader's attention. For example, he includes the names of Leyo and Kapstiranos as scholars in the footnotes of the account. “Leo the caesar wrote in the book of Constantinople kings, he wrote about future realm and Constantin. This Leyo has many works, he was sage in astrology.”²⁴¹ “This Kapstiranos was an infidel scholar, he was sent for infidel guiding to Bohemia, at the time, the people of Bohemia were worshipping the fire. He converted them with great efforts, as intelligent and wise, he became the king's councilor and helped a lot in this campaign”²⁴²

Katip Çelebi intervenes in the account with informative purposes, most probably because of his intellectual enthusiasm. He may have intervened with footnotes when he thought the author's account is not sufficient or perhaps only because he enjoyed sharing information with the reader. For instance, when the chronicle mentions the Venetians, Katip Çelebi intervenes with a footnote and gives a detailed account of Venetian history.²⁴³ These accounts indicate Katip Çelebi's intellectual enthusiasm, however the question of whether this intellectual enthusiasm might have led Katip Çelebi to alter the chronicle's account, should be further elaborated.

IV.2.4. Turks According to the Chronicle *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*

Above, I tried to point out how ethnicity might have posed some problems in the understanding of the chronicles. Here, I intend to discuss the kind of image Katip Çelebi tried to project while editing the translation of the chronicle. In other words, in the chronicle, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*, Turks and Ottomans are an active part of the “history makers”. Therefore, Katip Çelebi's possible editing might help us to understand how he saw history and what

²⁴¹ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009) p.82 “Leyo kayser yazduğu Kostantiniyye padişahları defterinde gelecek müluki yazub inkırazı bu Kostantinde yazmış idi. Bu Leyo'nun nice asarı vardır; hükmünde ve 'ilm-i nücumda mahir idi.”

²⁴² Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009) p.83 “Bu Kapstiranos bir alim kafir idi, papa tarafından küffar irşadına irsal olunub Bohemya halkı ol zamanda ateşe tapardı. Mezbur 'azim zahmetle anları döndürdü, akil ve dana olmağla Panonis padişahın musahibi oldu ve bu seferde 'azim imdad eyledi.”

²⁴³ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009) p.62

he intended to do with the history he wrote. Obviously, the account of the “Turks” in the chronicle mattered, because both the Greek authors of the chronicle and Katip Çelebi and his sponsorship witnessed an age where Ottomans were not only a regional power, but also a world power. Therefore, the account of the “Turks” retrospectively mattered because the origins of the power of Ottomans may have required emphasis in a world where Ottomans were a major force. The context in which the chronicle is written and translated can not be separated from the major dynamics of the age, in which the Ottomans were the new “Romans” and ruled throughout Constantinople and the “Lands of the Caesars” (*Kayasire*).

At the first glimpse of the chronicle of *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*'s translation, it might be difficult to argue that it was written from a certain point of view, or based on the glories of a certain group or state. However, in the later part of the chronicle, Ottomans increasingly become the focus. This fact is clearly due to the increase of Ottoman power in the Late Middle Ages. Here, Katip Çelebi's possible editing of the account of Ottoman history should be questioned because of the fact that Katip Çelebi wrote Ottoman history.

Another interesting point is how Katip Çelebi reacted to the conflict between Timur and Bayezid. In the account, Katip Çelebi intervened with several footnotes to represent his own understanding of Timur. Besides, as a history writer, Katip Çelebi intervened to add information to the translated account. “Timur's father was a person of modest substance. After Timur grew up, he looked after his horses, he allied with shepherds and collected horses and as he rebelled he climbed to a stable's wall and when he saw the proprietor he jumped down and broke his leg and some says it happened in the war.”²⁴⁴

That is what Katip Çelebi added as a footnote when he mentioned Timur. Obviously, as he used *ba'zılar cenkde oldu dirler* (some say it happened in the war), Katip Çelebi was probably intervening with some information that he had read in different chronicles.²⁴⁵ However, why should Katip Çelebi need to share this information with the reader? Did he want to project an image of Timur, not as a noble person, but as an ordinary shepherd? Did he want to suggest that Timur was not wounded while fighting with honor, but instead fell from a wall? Was Katip Çelebi trying to belittle the Timur image because he was considered an “enemy” and “danger” for the Ottoman state.

²⁴⁴ *Katip Çelebi, Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009) p.58 “Timur'un babası bir vasatü'l hal kimse idi. Timur büyüyüb yerlünün atlarını güderdi, şeriki çobanlar ile ittifak idüb sirkadan vafir atlar cem' eylediler ve huruç etti deyu yarar ve bir ağıl divarına çıkub sahibini gördükde kendüyü aşağı atub ayağı kırıldı ve ba'zılar cenkde oldu dirler.”

²⁴⁵ *Katip Çelebi, Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009) p.58

Did he wanted to create a “barbarian” Timur image?

In another footnote, Katip Çelebi adds that Timur consulted his wife. It is clear that Katip Çelebi did not approve women intervening in politics as he stated this in relation to the Ottoman state.²⁴⁶ Therefore, was he trying to project a weaker Timur image who consulted women in politics? Considering Katip Çelebi's urban and intellectual life, he would certainly not see a nomadic ruler such as Timur with sympathy. Besides, as a ruler who posed a threat to Ottoman Empire, Katip Çelebi may have wished to present a more weak and barbaric image of Timur.

IV.2.5. Geographic Regions in the Chronicle

Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire includes a wide range of geographic names. Besides the non-standardization of geographic names, another point might also be interesting for the modern reader. The use of the geographic concepts such as Europe and Asia are given non-geographic denotations. In other words, European and Asian things are attributed qualities or defects based on their political attachments. For instance, this quote is suggesting a historical fact about Asian and European powers. “...Asian kings had not been victorious over Europe, probably European kings had been victorious over Asia and if Timur did not come, Bayezid will be conquering more in the West.”²⁴⁷

As the quote suggests, the author argues that European kings were more likely to be victorious than Asian kings. Therefore, Timur, who is considered an Asian king, is seen as an exception for Asian kings to be victorious over Europe. Likewise, the author suggested that Bayezid was a European king and therefore, his defeat is considered surprising for the author of this account. The uses of Europe and Asia might remind the modern reader of concepts such as “East” and “West”. The fact that the authors considered the “West” victorious in a time before the debates of “Westernization” emerged, is interesting to observe. For the scope of this study, how Katip Çelebi might have seen these usages will be elaborated.

As I pointed out, the chronicle showed the Ottoman rulers as European forces. How might Katip Çelebi might have reacted to this fact? Would Katip Çelebi have approved or disapproved of

²⁴⁶ Marc Baer, “Manliness, Male Virtue and History Writing at the 17th Century Ottoman Court”, *Gender and History* vol.20 no.1 200

²⁴⁷ *Katip Çelebi, Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009) p.57
“...Asya padişahları Avrupa'ya galib ola gelmiş değil idi, belki Avrupa padişahları Asya'ya galip ola gelmiş idi ve bi'l-cümle Timur gelmese Bayezid garbda çok fütühat ederdi.”

the representation of Ottomans as a European power? What did being European meant at the time? Katip Çelebi did not have an image of Europe as the most advanced version of civilization that existed and one which the Ottomans should emulate. Therefore the modern reader should not consider Katip Çelebi's vision within a Westernization perspective.

IV.3. Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi

The other chronicle which Şeyh Mehmed İhlasi translated from Latin is the Johann Carion's "Chronic". Johann Carion was a historian, astronomer and mathematician.²⁴⁸ The "Chronic" is designed as a world history. Therefore, it consists of chapters about the creation, the "flood" and a section of history of the prophets mostly based on the Old Testament. The chronicle also has detailed chapters about the ancient Greeks, Hellenistic Age and Romans. After those accounts, it includes a very detailed section about Medieval Europe as well as the Crusades. In the parts about Medieval and Early Modern history, the account focuses mostly on German-Imperial and Papal history. However, some accounts about Turks are included as well. Apart from the afterwords (*zeyl*) added to the end of the chapter, the account ends in 16th century.

The title of the book is *Chronic*, and it aims to give a detailed account of the whole world history. However, Katip Çelebi gives the title of *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*, to the book, which means "The Translation of the History of Europe". Therefore, with giving this title to the translation of the chronicle, Katip Çelebi suggests that the book is firstly about European History and there is not much information about non-European realms. Another possibility about Katip Çelebi's title might be that he meant the history of the European (*Frenk*) man, which implies that the author of the book, Johann Carion was European. However, I argue that the former assumption should be considered in this case.

In the beginning of the book, the modern editor argues that it was most probably Katip Çelebi who edited the translation of the chronicle with marginal notes (*derkenar*) and footnotes. I argue that Katip Çelebi intensively intervened in the chronicle. Aside from the footnotes, Katip Çelebi intervened in the text by adding some titles. Solak argues that Katip Çelebi so in red ink.²⁴⁹ If the account is analyzed carefully, the reader might understand that the titles were added by Katip Çelebi. This fact is obvious because, Katip Çelebi added some titles, such as *The Origin of Turks*

²⁴⁸ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Palet Yayınları, 2010) p.9

²⁴⁹ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Palet Yayınları, 2010) p.11

and *Emergence of Turks*. However, those parts actually involve only a couple of sentences about the Turks. Therefore, it is obvious that Katip Çelebi marked the parts that he was most interested in and put some titles in those parts.

In order to understand Katip Çelebi's editing and thoughts about this chronicle in particular and about history in general, one should ask the reason why Katip Çelebi might have need to translate and edit this chronicle. Katip Çelebi himself states the reason for the translation and editing in the beginning of the work. “And this book is translated to Turkish in the year one thousand and sixty five of the Hijra in Constantinople by Şeyh Muhammed and, the scribe of the text, Hacı Halife to incorporate this history into the other Islamic histories.”²⁵⁰

As asserted by Katip Çelebi, the work is translated and edited because Katip Çelebi wished for this chronicle and history to be incorporated into the cultural milieu in which he felt attached. In other words, Katip Çelebi wished to get the “practical knowledge” that Europe possessed and incorporate it into the Islamic-Ottoman realm by translating and editing it. For this reason, Katip Çelebi's project of translation might be seen within a wider perspective in which he tried to collect, save and share (with a specific elite) information and knowledge that he believed that would help his state and culture to flourish and strengthen again.

IV.3.1. Perception of Turks According to *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*

Turks appear in the chronicle as an exogenous force. In other words, they intervene in the process of history in several places. They were considered an important element in history therefore mentioned in certain places. Turks tend to be mentioned more especially after the “Conquest of Constantinople”. However, they are not the main focus of the account of history. Katip Çelebi was well aware of this fact. However, because of his enthusiasm for collecting knowledge, he did not hesitate to incorporate a European history account into the sources of Ottoman history writing. Therefore, Katip Çelebi's project was beyond a mere translation project but sought to incorporate elements of a different “cultural milieu” to his own “cultural milieu”. For this reason, he actively intervened in the translated account and facilitated with notes that might allow the people of his own “cultural milieu” to understand what the European (*Frenk*) author meant.

²⁵⁰ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Palet Yayınları, 2010) p.15
“*Ve bu kitabı tarih-i hicretin bin altmışbeş salında şehri Kostantiniyye'de Şeyh Muhammed ile rakımı'l-huruf Hacı Halife sair tevarih-i İslamiyye'ye nakl ve ilhak için Türki tercüme eyledi.*”

The titles that Katip Çelebi put in the translation might give the modern reader an impression about how the reading process and perspective of the early reader might be altered. In other words, Katip Çelebi's inclusion of titles changes the way the reader reads the chronicle. For instance, Katip Çelebi put titles where the Turks are mentioned. However the actual mentions of the Turks are not more a couple of sentences. The title given to the paragraph about Timur might again be considered an act of editing and therefore changing the way people read the chronicle. Therefore, Katip Çelebi might have intended to point out to his audience the parts in which he and they might be interested.

The titles also might shape the perspective of the reader, not only with the places in the chronicle, but also in what they meant. For instance, the title *Feth-i Kostantiniye* means the “Conquest of Constantinople”.²⁵¹ Therefore, it means that the event was a “conquest” from the Ottoman point of view. Nevertheless, in the section, the author talks about how it will be not enough to call Turks cruel; rather savage monsters. As this example suggests, by introducing the title *Conquest* to the text, Katip Çelebi tried to remind the Ottoman reader that although it was a European chronicle, they could orient themselves in the chronicle with the concepts that they are used to.

The question of to what extent Katip Çelebi might have intervened in the text, apart from the footnotes and titles, matters in order for the modern reader to understand both the chronicle as well as Katip Çelebi better. In order to elaborate on this question, the modern reader should carefully read the parts that Katip Çelebi might have found most interesting. The parts that he might have been most interested in might be understood from his titles, his footnotes and also the parts about the Ottoman Empire, which he felt attached to. For this reason, I will focus more on the parts of the chronicle where the Turks are mentioned most.

When the reader looks at the accounts in the chronicle about the Turks more carefully, the reader might see that both positive and negative elements about the Turks coexist in one text. For instance, in the part about the siege of Constantinople, the violent acts that the Turks performed are narrated. “...after siege Turkish King Muhammetis, incessantly disturbed Constantinople and did so many oppression that can not be described”²⁵² “This event and the others like it point to the

²⁵¹ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Palet Yayınları, 2010) p.152

²⁵² Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Palet Yayınları, 2010) p.152

“...*Türk Padişahı Muhammetis medid muhasaradan sonra Kostantinya'ya musallat oldu ve anda şol mertebe zulm eyledi ki, kalem ile vasfı mümkün değildir.*”

unmercifulness of the Turks, whom we really wish to force out, because they are not called cruel, rather they are called savage monsters.”²⁵³ On the other hand, there were other circumstances where Turks are described as a strong and victorious. “...They knew about the force of the Turks...”²⁵⁴ “Hungarians fought with great.... and killed many soldiers of the enemy, however, in the end, the majority of Turks defeated them.”²⁵⁵

The modern reader might think that Turks are represented negatively in certain parts of the chronicle based, on the violent acts that they committed. Nevertheless, with a pre-modern mentality, the violent acts performed against the “enemy” or “infidel” can be considered elements of “pride” and “honor”. Therefore, it would be difficult to argue that Katip Çelebi felt that Turks did wrong and thus tried to change the account into a more complimentary description of Turks.

Katip Çelebi added the title “The Origins of Turks” to the account. In this part, the author discusses the origins of the Turks and their perception in Europe. In this respect, Katip Çelebi criticized how the author represents the Turks in the account and did not hesitate to intervene in the original text. The author narrates how Turks began to bother the Austrian state and how the Austrian King repelled the Turks. Then, Katip Çelebi intervened in the account by stating the authors' narration is actually nonsense (...*Avusturya neslinden olan padişah bunları def' eyleye deyu herze söyler.*) and argued that the Turkish dynasty was described in the Holy Book (...*bu Türk saltanatının hevlnak sureti Kitab-ı Kudsiyye'de resm olunmuşdur ki...*).²⁵⁶

IV.4. Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter, I tried to discuss what Katip Çelebi might have intended by editing the chronicles of *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire* and *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*. As I tried to point out when Katip Çelebi, edited the translated chronicles by Mehmed Ihlasi, he added footnotes and titles in order to make the chronicle understandable to an Ottoman audience. Therefore, I suggested that Katip Çelebi's contribution made this work much more than a mere linguistic translation. Katip

²⁵³ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Palet Yayınları, 2010) p.152

“Bu vakayi ve ana benzer Türk'ün aher merhametsiz mezalimi bizi tahrik ider ki, gerçekden anları def'e sa'y ideriz, zira bunlara zalim dinmez, lakin ol emrden bunlara vahşi canverler dinülür.”

²⁵⁴ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Palet Yayınları, 2010) p.150

“...Türklerin kuvveti ana malum olmuş idi...”

²⁵⁵ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Palet Yayınları, 2010) pp.150-151

“Hungariler azim şeca'atla döğüşüb düşmanın çok askerini kırdılar, lakin akıbet Türk'ün kesreti bunlara galib oldu.”

²⁵⁶ Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*, İbrahim Solak ed. (Konya, Palet Yayınları, 2010) p.100

Çelebi gave a cultural context to the text translated by Mehmed Ihlasi.

As I pointed out in this chapter, Katip Çelebi was aware of the fact that these chronicles might not be directly appealing to an Ottoman audience due to its European centered history and European centered cultural elements. However, despite this fact, Katip Çelebi was open to information and knowledge from different sources. Therefore, he tried to provide an Ottoman context as much as possible.

Also, in this chapter, I tried to discuss the potential affiliations of Katip Çelebi. In other words, I speculated and analyzed whether Katip Çelebi considered himself and the place that he lived to be part of a “Turkish” cultural milieu and why he preferred to keep “Turks” instead of Ottomans. Likewise, I tried to project Katip Çelebi's ideas about being part of Europe and Asia, East and West. In addition, how he might thought about the cultural spheres of the world. I believe that understanding Katip Çelebi's thoughts about these chronicles will help the historians to have a more accurate image of Katip Çelebi's perception of history as well as his perception of “East” versus “West” and how he projected on the cultural milieu in which he lived as well as how he might have perceived himself.

CONCLUSION

I examined throughout the work how Katip Çelebi possessed a mentality which had many common elements with the Early Modern mentalities. I explored how Katip Çelebi favored the classical Islamic and pre-modern ideals of society in which different classes existed without much room for porousness. I elaborated on what Early Modernity meant and how the transformations of the Ottoman Empire in the Early Modern Age affected the mental frameworks of the intellectuals and elites of the Empire.

The transformations of Early Modernity which affected the Empire also affected Katip Çelebi's ideals and worldview. Major political transformations that occurred during Katip Çelebi's age included a less powerful monarch and more powerful factions, a new need to interpret the sacred law, and a change in succession practices. Likewise, the transformation in provincial administration and new practices in the tax collection, a bad climate and degradation of the provinces, as well as a different military organization were among the social and economical transformations of the age which can be traced in the works of Katip Çelebi.

I demonstrated that Katip Çelebi's ideals and position in the political spectrum cannot be clearly perceived in the first glance. I argued that Katip Çelebi favored the traditional organization of social classes. He is also known for his idealization of the Süleymanic rule. Nevertheless, these should be perceived as ideals that Katip Çelebi possessed and expressed to represent an ideal vision of society. I suggested that Katip Çelebi was against random rule of monarchs. Therefore, he was not against the new rising power holders. Moreover, we know that he criticized Osman II's absolutist ambitions.

I suggested that Katip Çelebi had political views which he did not hesitate to express. In addition, although Katip Çelebi did not hesitate to express his political views on various aspects of the Ottoman state administration, he did not embrace one particular political fraction as a whole or act as its ideologue. Instead, he expressed his vision of Ottoman society and he expressed the sides

he took with sound and rational argumentation. In this respect, the views of Katip Çelebi are significantly valuable to provide a broader picture of Ottoman intellectual history.

I argued that Katip Çelebi answered the social and theological-legal controversies and social problems of his age. I also explored and emphasized how these debates had political implications. I pointed out how Katip Çelebi preached the middle ground in the debates and also in politics. Consequently, I argued that Katip Çelebi tried to reach the “good” and the “truth” by using both reason and sacred law. In other words, both reason and the sacred law were elements which complement each other and were equally valid ways for Katip Çelebi to reach the truth.

In the work, I asserted that Katip Çelebi tried to point out numerous examples of different groups and individuals that constituted the Empire. I elaborated on how Katip Çelebi expressed social problems of the Ottoman state in the 17th century and what he suggested to the authorities as reform projects. Considering this evidence, the work explores what might be the ideal society that Katip Çelebi had envisioned.

I elaborated on Katip Çelebi's discussion of legal and theological controversies. I demonstrated how Katip Çelebi pursued these discussions in response to the arguments of the puritanical groups who were against many of the practices that had become customs and traditions for large portions of Ottoman society. Nevertheless, Katip Çelebi mostly disapproved of the arguments of the sufi groups who defended these practices. Instead he sought the middle ground. However, seeking the middle ground was never an act of random compromise for Katip Çelebi. He tried to understand the reasons behind the debates and whether or not the practices were compatible with the sacred law, which carried great weight for him.

I mentioned that Katip Çelebi mostly favored the continuation of the customs of the “common people” as far as they did not constitute a threat to religion. Therefore he suggested that the common people should not be forced to give up their customs and they should instead be left free to practice those customs as long as they presented no threat to the basic principles of Islam.

I pointed out that Katip Çelebi was an intellectual who did not hesitate to categorize people according to their level of intelligence. He also did not hesitate to accuse prominent people of ignorance. In this sense, the work suggests that Katip Çelebi shared an elitist intellectualist view of society in which only the few might and should occupy administrative and other prominent

positions.

I emphasized that Katip Çelebi acted in society and the intellectual circles of the Empire. This fact is crucial to understand Katip Çelebi and the intellectual agenda or his message that he aimed to spread to the educated realm of the Empire. In other words, preaching the “middle way” with rational argumentation based on the sacred law. In addition, he aimed to disseminate the “practical knowledge of the world” to reform the state and make the Empire prosper again.

Greater understanding of the political position and message of Katip Çelebi should be pursued. Katip Çelebi was a prominent in the Ottoman intelligentsia and was considered an advisor to the state administration of the Empire. Likewise, understanding the mentality of Katip Çelebi would provide the contemporary scholar with greater perspective about the mentalities of the Early Modern Era. In other words, the way in which reason and the divine law coexisted in the mental framework of an Early Modern intellectual present an interesting subject for study. Reason and religion have mostly been perceived as mutually exclusive features in the Modern cosmology. Therefore, it has been argued that the message that Katip Çelebi tried to disseminate was based on theological, legal and rational argumentation, and more significantly it was also a political message.

Ultimately, understanding and reflecting on Katip Çelebi's message will provide the Ottoman historiography to reconsider the “decline thesis” which was available in the Ottoman historiography as a dominant paradigm and which historians have begun to challenge. Reinterpreting Katip Çelebi would prompt the Ottoman historiography to assess new paradigms in order to understand the transformation of the Early Modern Era. It will increase Ottoman historians' capacity to understand and reconsider the relationships of the political factions and the struggle of social groups vis-a-vis the state. Likewise, as Katip Çelebi was an intellectual of the age, analyzing the way he perceived and reflected on his age and society will enrich the history of mentalities in the Ottoman historiography.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Defterdar Sarı Mehmed Paşa, *Devlet Adamlarına Öğütler* ed. Hüseyin Ragıp Ural (Ankara, Türkiye Kültür Bakanlığı, 2000)

Gökyay, Orhan Şaik. “Düstur ül-amel” in *Katip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1968)

Katip Çelebi, *Balance of Truth*, translated by G. L. Lewis, (London, George and Unwin Ltd, 1957)

Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Frengi Tercümesi*, ed. İbrahim Solak, (Konya, Palet Yayınları, 2010)

Katip Çelebi, *Tarih-i Kostantiniyye ve Kayasire*, ed. İbrahim Solak, (Konya, Gençlik Kitabevi Yayınları, 2009)

Koçi Bey, *Koçibey Risalesi*, ed. Yılmaz Kurt, (Ankara, Akçağ, 1998)

Neşri, *Kitab-ı Cihan-nüma*, (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995)

SECONDARY SOURCES

Adıvar, Adnan. *Osmanlı Türklerinde İlim*, (İstanbul, Remzi Kitabevi, 2000)

Ak, Mahmut. “Osmanlı Coğrafya Eserlerinde Şehirlerin Tasnifi: Menazırü'l-Avalim ve Cihannüma Örneği” *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Aksan, Virginia & Daniel Goffman. *The Early Modern Ottomans*, (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Ayan, Dursun. “Katip Çelebi'nin Geometri Bilen Kadısı- Bilgi Sosyolojisi Üzerine Notlar”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Aycibin, Zeynep. “Katip Çelebi'nin Tarihçiliği”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Aydüz, Salim. “Katip Çelebi'nin Osmanlı Medreseleri Müfredatı ile İlgili Tespitleri ve Önerileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Babinger, Franz. *Osmanlı Tarih Yazarları ve Eserleri*, (Ankara, Kültür Bakanlığı, 2000)

Bacque-Grammont, Jean-Louis. “Katip Çelebi'nin Cihannümasında Osmanlı Devleti'nin Kuruluşu Hakkında Birkaç Not”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Baer, Marc David. *Honored by the Glory of Islam: Conversion and Conquest in Ottoman Europe*, (New York, Oxford University Press, 2008)

Baer, Marc. “Manliness, Male Virtue and History Writing at the 17th Century Ottoman Court”, *Gender and History* vol.20 no.1 2008

Barkey, Karen. *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*, (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Barkey, Karen. *Bandits and Bureaucrats: The Ottoman Route to State Centralization*, (Ithaca; New York,

Cornell University Press, 1994)

Brentjes, Sonja. "On the Relationship Between the Ottoman Empire and the West European Republic of Letters (17th-18th centuries)" in *International Congress on Learning and Education in the Ottoman World*, ed. Ali Çaksu, Istanbul, 2001, pp.121-148

Bolay, Süleyman Hayri. *Osmanlılarda Düşünce Hayatı ve Felsefe*, (Ankara, Akçağ, 2005)

Canatar, Mehmet. "Katip Çelebi ve Fezleketü't-Tevarih Adlı Tarih Kitabı Hakkında Bazı Görüşler", *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Civelek, Yakup. "Keşfü'z-Zunun'un Pek Tanınmayan Zeyilleri", *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Curry, John. "Bir Osmanlı Araştırmacısının Batı Yarım Kürenin Keşfi Üzerindeki Düşünceleri: Katip Çelebi'nin Cihannüma'da Amerika Kıtasına Bakışı", *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Çavuşoğlu, Semiramis & Mustafa Kaçar. "Kadızedeliler Hareketi: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Şeriate Dayanan Bir Reform Teşebbüsü", Bekir Karlıağa and Mustafa Kaçar, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Dankoff, Robert. "Üç Osmanlı Coğrafyacısı ve Kaynakları: Aşık Mehmet, Katip Çelebi ve Evliya Çelebi'ye Göre Tiflis ve Bitlis", *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Faroqhi, Suraiya N. "Rural Life" in *The Cambridge History of Turkey vol,3 1603-1839*, ed. Faroqhi, (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2006)

Faroqhi, Suraiya. *The Ottoman Empire and the World Around It*, (London; New York, I.B. Tauris, 2004)

Fleischer, Cornell. *Tarihçi Mustafa Ali: Bir Osmanlı Aydın ve Bürokrati*, (İstanbul, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1996)

Gerber, Haim. *State, Society, and Law in Islam Ottoman Law in Comparative Perspective*, (Albany, State University of New York, 1994)

Goodrich, Thomas. "Osmanlı Haritacılığı 1450-1700", *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Gökbilgin, Tayyib. "XVII. Asırda Osmanlı Devleti ve Katip Çelebi" in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri*

Hakkında İncelemeler, Orhan Şaik Gökyay (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991)

Gökbilgin, Tayyib. “Katip Çelebi'nin Kronolojik Eseri: Takvimüttevarih” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991)

Gökyay, Orhan Şaik. “ Katib Celebi” in *The Encyclopedia of Islam vol. IV*, (Leiden, Brill, 1997)

Gökyay, Orhan Şaik (ed.). “Katip Çelebi Hayatı, Şahsiyeti, Eserleri” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler* (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991)

Gökyay, Orhan Şaik. “Katip Çelebi'nin Kişiliği”, Bekir Karlığa and Mustafa Kaçar, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Hallaq, Wael. *Sharia' Theory, Practice, Transformations* (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Hagen, Gottfried. ottomanhistorians.com, “Katip Çelebi”

Hagen, Gottfried. “Afterword” in *An Ottoman Mentality: The World of Evliya Çelebi*, Robert Dankoff (Leiden; Boston, Brill, 2006)

Hagen, Gottfried. *Ein Osmanischer Geograph bei der Arbeit: Entstehung und Gedankenwelt von Katib Celebis Gihannüma*, (Berlin, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2003)

Hagen, Gottfried. “Legitimacy and World Order”, in *Legitimizing the Order* ed. Reinkowski & Karateke (Leiden; Boston, Brill, 2005)

von Hammer Purgstall, Joseph. *Büyük Osmanlı Tarihi 6 (vol.II)*, (İstanbul, Üçdal Neşriyat, 1996)

Howard, Douglas. “The Ottoman Advice for Kings Literature” in *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire* ed. Aksan & Goffman, (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Huff, Toby E. *The Rise of Early Modern Science: Islam, China and the West*, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993)

İnalçık, Halil. *The Ottoman Empire The Classical Age 1300-1600*, (London, Phoenix,1973)

İpşirli, Mehmet. “XVII. Yüzyılda Batı'ya Açılan Geniş Bir Pencere: Katip Çelebi”, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Itzkowitz, Norman. *Ottoman Empire and Islamic Tradition*, (Chicago; London, University of Chicago Press, 1972)

Kaçar, Mustafa & Atilla Bir. "Cihannüma'da Evren ve Yerinin Belirlenmesi", *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Kafadar, Cemal. *Kim Var İmiş Biz Burada Yoğ İken* (İstanbul, Metis, 2009)

Karateke, Hakan. "Legitimizing the Ottoman Sultanate" in *Legitimizing the Order*, ed. Karateke & Reinkowski (Leiden; Boston, Brill, 2005)

Karlığa, Bekir. "Cihana Tutulan Ayna ya da Katip Çelebi'nin Kainat Tasarımı" *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Karlığa, Bekir & Mustafa Kaçar (ed.). *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Kutluer, İlhan. "Keşfü'z-Zunun: Klasik Bilim Geleneğimizin Büyük Atlası", *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Leaman, Oliver. "Scientific and Philosophical Inquiry: Achievements and Reactions in Muslim History" in *Intellectual Traditions in Islam* ed. Farhad Daftary, I. B. Tauris 2000

Lewis, Bernard. "Ottoman Observers of Ottoman Decline" in *Islam in History* 1993

Onat, Yavuz & İnan Kalaycıoğulları. "XVII. Yüzyıl Başlarında Osmanlılarda Astronomi ve Katip Çelebi'nin Astronomi Anlayışı", *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Orman, Sabri. "Katip Çelebi'de Sosyo-Ekonomik Düşünce", *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Özcan, Abdülkadir. "Katip Çelebi'nin Eğitimi ve Ders Aldığı Hocalar", *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Özel, Oktay. "Population Changes in Ottoman Anatolia During the 16th and 17th centuries The Demographic Crisis", *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, vol.36, 2004

Öztürk, Said. "Katip Çelebi'nin Hayatı ve Eserleri", Bekir Karlığa and Mustafa Kaçar, *Doğumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Piterberg, Gabriel. *An Ottoman Tragedy*, (London, University of California Press, 2003)

Sariođlu, Hüseyin. “Katip Çelebi’de İnsan ve Ahlak”, *Dođumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Selen, Hamit Sadi. “Cihannüma” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991)

Şehsuvarođlu, Bedi N. “Katip Çelebi’nin İlmi Zihniyeti” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991)

Tezcan, Baki. “Politics of Early Modern Historiography” in *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire* ed. Aksan & Goffman (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Tezcan, Baki. “Some Thoughts on the Politics of Early Modern Ottoman Science” in *Beyond Dominant Paradigms in Ottoman and Middle Eastern/North African Studies: A Tribute to Rifa’at Abou-El-Haj*, ed. By Donald Quatert and Baki Tezcan, pp. 135-156. Istanbul, İSAM, 2010

Tezcan, Baki. *The Second Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World*, (New York, Cambridge, 2010)

Ülken, Hilmi Ziya. “Katip Çelebi ve Fikir Hayatımız” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991)

Ünver, Süheyl. “Katip Çelebi’nin Cihannümasında Çin ve Hatay Hakkında Verilen Malumat Kaynađı Üzerine” in *Katip Çelebi Hayatı ve Eserleri Hakkında İncelemeler*, Orhan Şaik Gökyay (Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1991)

Yi, Eunjeong. *Guild Dynamics in Seventeenth Century Istanbul: Fluidity and Leverage*, (Leiden; Boston, Brill, 2004)

Yılmaz, Mehmet. *Katip Çelebi Bibliyografyası*, (İstanbul, İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş. Yayınları, 2011)

Yurtođlu, Bilal. *Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, Atatürk Kültür Merkezi, 2009)

Yurtođlu, Bilal. “XVII. Yüzyılda Bir İřraki: Katip Çelebi’nin Bilim Anlayışı”, *Dođumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Yücesoy, Hayrettin. “İslam Tarihinde Evrensel Tarihçilik Geleneđi ve Katip Çelebi: Kısa Bir Ön Mülahaza”, *Dođumunun 400.Yıl Dönümünde Katip Çelebi*, (Ankara, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2009)

Zilfi, Madeline. “The Ottoman Ulema”, in *The Cambridge History of Turkey* vol.3, Suraiya Faroqhi (New York, Cambridge University Pressi, 2006)

Zilfi, Madeline C. "The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* vol.45 no.4 (Oct., 1986)